medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

International patterns of prevalence of low estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) in population-based surveys of working age adults: The Disadvantaged Populations eGFR Epidemiology Study (DEGREE)

Charlotte E Rutter[1]*, Mary Njoroge[1], Phil Cooper[2], Prabhakaran Dorairaj[3], Vivekanand Jha[4], Prabhdeep Kaur[5], Sailesh Mohan[3], Ravi Raju Tatapudi[6], Annibale Biggeri[7], Peter Rohloff[8], Michelle H Hathaway[9], Amelia Crampin[10], Meghnath Dhimal[11], Anil Poudyal[11], Antonio Bernabe-Ortiz[12], Cristina O'Callaghan-Gordo[13], Pubudu Chulasiri[14], Nalika Gunawardena[15], Thilanga Ruwanpathirana[14], SC Wickramasinghe[14], Sameera Senanayake[16], Chagriya Kitiyakara[17], Marvin Gonzalez-Quiroz[18-20], Sandra Cortés[21], Kristina Jakobsson[22], Ricardo Correa-Rotter[23], Jason Glaser[24], Ajay Singh[25], Sophie Hamilton[26], Devaki Nair[19,27], Aurora Aragón[20], Dorothea Nitsch[28], Steven Robertson[29], Ben Caplin[19], Neil Pearce[1] and the DEGREE Study Group[a]

[1] Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[2] Institute of Infection and Immunity, St George's University of London, UK; School of Medicine, Universidad Internacional del Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador
[3] Public Health Foundation of India, New Delhi, India
[4] George Institute for Global Health, UNSW, New Delhi, India; School of Public Health, Imperial College, London, UK; Prasanna School of Public Health, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India
[5] Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, India
[6] The Apollo University, Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh, India
[7] Department of Cardiac, Thoracic, Vascular Sciences and Public Health, University of Padua, Italy
[8] Center for Indigenous Health Research, Maya Health Alliance, Wuqu' Kawoq, Guatemala
[9] Division of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Illinois Chicago, USA
[10] Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit (MEIRU), Malawi; University of Glasgow, UK
[11] Nepal Health Research Council, Kathmandu, Nepal
[12] CRONICAS Center of Excellence in Chronic Diseases, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru
[13] Faculty of Health Sciences, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain; ISGlobal, Barcelona, Spain; Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain; CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública, Madrid, Spain
[14] Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka
[15] WHO Regional Office, New Delhi, India
[16] Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore
[17] Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Thailand
[18] Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, UT School of Public Health San Antonio, The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA
[19] Centre for Kidney and Bladder Health, University College London, London, UK
[20] Wuqu' Kawoq Maya Health Alliance, Chimaltenango, Guatemala
[21] Advanced Center for Chronic Diseases (ACCDiS), Faculty of Medicine, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Santiago, Chile
[22] School of Public Health and Community Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
[23] Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico; National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico
[24] La Isla Network, Ada, Michigan, USA
[25] Harvard University, USA
[26] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, London, UK
[27] Department of Clinical Biochemistry, Royal Free Hospital, London, UK; Health Services Laboratories, London, UK
[28] Department of Non-communicable Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[29] Clinical Trials Unit, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[a] Study group listed at the end of the paper

***Corresponding author**: Department of Medical Statistics, LSHTM, Keppel St, London WC1E 7HT
Charlotte.Rutter1@lshtm.ac.uk ORCID 0000-0002-9823-7932

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

The Disadvantaged populations estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) epidemiology study (DEGREE) was designed to gain insight into the burden of chronic kidney disease (CKD) of undetermined cause (CKDu) using standard protocols to estimate the general-population prevalence of low eGFR internationally.

Using population-representative surveys of working-age adults, we estimated the prevalence of eGFR<60mL/min/1.73m^2 not due to the common, known causes of CKD by excluding participants with ACR>300mg/g or equivalent, or self-reported or measured hypertension or diabetes (eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$). Included studies were either designed to estimate CKDu burden or were re-analyses of large surveys (in areas with reported high CKDu prevalence or proposed risk factors), alongside two high-income reference datasets.

There were 61 108 participants from 43 areas across 14 countries. High prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ (>5%) was generally only observed in rural men, but there were exceptions. Of the areas considered, prevalence in rural men was highest in Andhra Pradesh, India, (14%) and Northwest Nicaragua (14%); it was low (<2%) outside of Central America and South Asia, including areas in Kenya, Italy, Malawi, Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Thailand, England, and the USA.

These observations represent the first attempts to quantify the prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$, as an estimate of CKDu burden, around the world. These findings have limitations in terms of comparability of study populations and study timing, lack of individual-level exposure assessment, and absent data in many regions. Although clusters of disease may exist elsewhere, to date the available evidence supports a high general-population burden of CKDu in multiple areas within Central America and South Asia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Globally, chronic kidney disease (CKD) is most commonly associated with diabetes, hypertension, other cardiovascular diseases, glomerulonephritis, genetic or congenital abnormalities, or urological diseases. However, there is an increasing recognition of forms of progressive CKD which are not associated with these known risk factors, and which are mostly affecting the working-age populations in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [1,2]. This clinical syndrome has been termed CKD of undetermined cause (CKDu); other names used include CKD of non-traditional cause (CKDnt), Mesoamerican Nephropathy (MeN), Uddanam nephropathy, and chronic interstitial nephritis of agricultural communities (CINAC).

Over the last few decades, clusters of CKDu have been reported in Central America [3], Mexico [4], India [5], and Sri Lanka [6]. Other reports have suggested that similar patterns may be occurring in other regions of the world, but it is only recently that efforts have increased to undertake comparable population surveys in working-age populations elsewhere in LMICs. In common with historical endemic kidney diseases such as Balkan Nephropathy [7], the absence of substantial albuminuria or haematuria, alongside geographical clustering, supports a causal role for environmental exposure(s).

Perhaps the most clearly established risk factor/epidemiological association in both Central America and South Asia, is that CKDu is more common among men engaged in manual labour in hot climates, particularly in agricultural communities [8]. In Central America, CKDu occurs frequently in sugar cane workers but also in other occupational groups, including other agricultural workers, fishermen, miners, brick kiln and construction workers [9]; it also occurs, albeit at a lower frequency, in women, most of whom have not reported working in agriculture.

Many specific potential causes related to agriculture have been suggested for CKDu. Heat/dehydration, infection/inflammation, pesticides, and heavy metals are the main hypotheses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

proposed for Central America, whereas in South Asia the emphasis has been on the possible roles of water contamination by metals and/or pesticides [10-12].

In the past, international comparisons have played a key role in identifying possible causes of chronic disease [13]. For example, many of the discoveries on the causes of cancer (e.g., human papilloma virus and cervical cancer) have their origins, directly or indirectly, in the systematic international comparisons of cancer incidence conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. Hypotheses generated from these studies were investigated in more depth in further studies [14]. A more recent example is the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC), a standardised protocol to estimate the prevalence of asthma internationally [15, 16], which has now evolved into the Global Asthma Network [17, 18]. This has led to a greater understanding of the possible causes of asthma globally, as well as the creation of a large international network of researchers.

We have proposed a similar approach involving a simple and practical protocol to estimate distributions of kidney function, using estimate glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), in disadvantaged communities globally: the Disadvantaged Populations eGFR epidemiology study (DEGREE). The DEGREE protocol was explicitly developed for general population-based surveys [19]. It was noted that the same methodology could be used in other contexts (e.g., workforce surveys), but the current paper focusses on population surveys.

As the causes of CKDu are unknown, diagnosis is often made by exclusion of known causes of kidney disease. The DEGREE protocol uses pragmatic criteria (absence of diabetes, hypertension, or heavy proteinuria) to estimate the prevalence of low eGFR unrelated to known causes of kidney disease (with the latter features being common in most forms of glomerular diseases). This enables standardised comparisons across multiple centres and is intended to identify population patterns of low eGFR, rather than diagnose CKDu in individuals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

We here report the first findings from the DEGREE study, involving 61 108 participants with complete data from 19 studies across 43 areas in 14 countries. These are primarily LMICs, plus one study in rural Italy, another in Chile, and publicly available data from England and the United States as reference points for comparison.

Methods

The detailed rationale and methods for the DEGREE study have previously been published [17]. Ten studies formally registered with DEGREE and agreed to conduct population surveys using the DEGREE protocol. In addition, we identified seven other studies, using methodology compatible with the DEGREE protocol, that had already been conducted in areas with reported high CKDu prevalence or in settings with proposed CKDu risk-factors. The organisers of these other studies were therefore invited to contribute their data to the joint analyses. The studies varied both in the size of the sample and the size of the source population, from focused surveys of specific communities to regional or national surveillance projects (details in Table 1). However, all surveyed the general population of the relevant area. Seven studies provided us with their data in tabular form, whereas 10 provided us with individual level datasets to create the relevant tables (see supplemental Table S1). Additionally, publicly available data from health surveys in England [20] and the USA [21] were obtained to provide reference data from high-income countries. Thus, a total of 19 studies were involved in the current analysis, each reporting data from one or more separately sampled areas.

The main outcome was the age-standardised prevalence of eGFR<60ml/min/1.73m^2 in those without hypertension, diabetes, and heavy proteinuria (eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$), for working-age adults, stratified by rural-urban classification (except the USA where this was not available) and sex. We estimated the prevalence within the age bands: 18-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51-60, and standardised them based on the WHO global standard population [22] (except the Chilean study which only surveyed those over 40 so the age-standardised prevalence for ages 41-60 was calculated). We also calculated the overall prevalence of eGFR<60ml/min/1.73m^2 without excluding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

the population with hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria (eGFR<60), for comparison. Confidence intervals were calculated for all standardised prevalence estimates.

Except where indicated in supplemental Table S1, eGFR was calculated using the creatinine-based CKD-EPI 2009 equation but without race adjustment; heavy proteinuria was defined by an albumin-to-creatinine ratio (ACR) of >300mg/g or ≥++ when studies used dipstick urinalysis; diabetes was determined by self-report or HbA1c ≥6.5%; and hypertension was determined by self-report, systolic blood pressure ≥140mmHg, or diastolic blood pressure ≥90mmHg.

To better understand any selection bias impacting the prevalence estimates, we compared the prevalence of eGFR<60 in the whole available sample to those with complete data for hypertension, diabetes, and proteinuria (before making any exclusions).

Similar analyses were completed using secondary outcomes with a cut-off of 90ml/min/1.73m^2(eGFR<90 and eGFR<90$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$) to help understand the distribution of low to moderate kidney function and whether the patterns follow or differ to that of low eGFR.

The main analysis used eGFR calculated from serum creatinine, but in a subset, data was available to calculate eGFR from serum cystatin-C (using the CKD-EPI 2012 equation). We compared the results from the two different methods within this subset.

Prevalence estimates of the main outcome (eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$) were plotted on international maps, categorised into low (<2%), moderate (2-5%) and high (>5%), to enable visualisation of geographical differences.

Data were analysed using Stata version 17 [23] and maps were created using the free open source QGIS software [24].

Results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

The characteristics of the 19 studies and 43 areas, including study rationale, response rates and the size of representative populations are shown in Table 1 (with location maps in Supplementary Figure S1). Most studies were in tropical regions and in LMICs. The studies were undertaken at different times, ranging from 2007 in Leon and Chinandega, Nicaragua to 2023 in Molina, Chile.

Response rates were mainly high (above 75% and up to 98%), with the exceptions of the high-income reference datasets (England 59%, USA 49%) and the Ecuador (61%), Guatemala (58% and 69%) and Malawi (66% and 37%) studies plus one area of Thailand (South 73%).

Overall, 2129 (3.4%) participants were missing data on hypertension, diabetes, or proteinuria, used in the exclusions, leaving a total sample size of 61 108. The study with the most missing data on these factors was Nepal where 874 participants (8.9%) had missing data. For all areas considered, estimates of the prevalence of eGFR<60 in the total sample were very similar to those in the sample with complete data (Table S2).

There were 22 360 (36.6%) participants identified as having one or more conditions of hypertension, diabetes, and heavy proteinuria, leaving a sample size of 38 748 for the restricted analyses. The proportion of participants with these conditions varied greatly by area, ranging from about 16% in two Kenyan areas to over 50% in four areas of India. Some of this difference could be explained by the age structure of the samples (as this is before age-standardisation) (Table 2).

The age-standardised prevalence estimates of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ stratified by area, sex, and rural-urban classification are shown in Table 2 and Figures 1-4. For men, standardised prevalence estimates of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ were highest in rural areas of Uddanam, India (up to 13.7%, 95% confidence interval (CI) [4.8%, 22.6%]) and areas in northwest Nicaragua (up to 13.6% [6.3%, 20.9%]). Of the other areas considered, prevalence in rural males was low (<2%) in Nepal and some other areas of India, and in all areas outside of Central America and South Asia; including Kenya, Peru, Chile, Malawi, and Thailand. High prevalence (>5%) in men was generally only seen in rural

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

areas but there was one high prevalence urban area in Leon, Nicaragua and moderate prevalence in Lilongwe, Malawi. There was one low prevalence (<2%) rural area in Nicaragua that was included on the basis that residents mainly worked in the service sector. As expected, prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ was low in the USA, England and Italy.

For women, prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ was generally low, except rural women had an 8.0% [2.0%, 14.1%] prevalence in one area of Uddanam and 6.0% [2.2%, 9.7%] in Ecuador. There was moderately high prevalence (2-5%) in women in Malawi and urban women in Nepal (Table 2 and Figures 1 and 2).

Standardised prevalence of eGFR<60 (without exclusions) was generally higher than the standardised prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ as expected, but followed a similar pattern, being highest in rural Uddanam, India (men up to 18.4%, women up to 11.0%) and rural men in Nicaragua (up to 19.0%) (Table 2).

When considering low-moderate eGFR values (eGFR<90$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$) there was great variability of prevalence and much higher prevalences in some areas, even those without a high prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ such as England (Supplementary Table S3).

In the five studies where serum cystatin C measures were available, the concordance between eGFR measurement using creatinine and cystatin-C was 0.53 (95% CI=0.50-0.56) in England, 0.24 (0.21-0.26) in the UDAY study in India, 0.44 (0.38-0.59) in Kenya, 0.24 (0.18-0.29) in Malawi, and 0.49 (0.46-0.56) in Peru. The standardised prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ using cystatin-C was substantially higher in Sonipat and Vizag, India compared to using creatinine (12.7-16.7% versus 0.0-4.8%). This was similar in two areas from the Kenyan study which had prevalence of 7.0% and 7.1% compared to 0.0% for both areas using creatinine, although numbers with cystatin-C measures were small and this was mainly driven by an increase in the prevalence in women. Estimates of the prevalence of eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ did not differ substantially by measure in the Peru study,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

and were lower in the Malawi and England studies when using cystatin-C. Similar patterns were seen for eGFR<60 (without exclusions) (Table 4 and Supplementary Table S3).

Discussion

The DEGREE collaboration aims to gain insight into the burden of CKDu by using standard protocols to estimate the prevalence of low eGFR disease in population-representative surveys. Here we use the term CKDu to describe the endemic kidney disease of unknown cause occurring at epidemic levels in geographic clusters (i.e., the disease(s) also termed Mesoamerican nephropathy, Uddanam nephropathy or chronic interstitial nephritis in agricultural communities) rather than all forms of CKD without a diagnosis. Defining CKDu is challenging, both at the individual level and for epidemiological studies, as there is no gold-standard diagnostic test, and diagnosis currently relies on the exclusion of known causes of kidney disease, with few cases fully documented as tubulointerstitial disease with a kidney biopsy. For these international comparisons of general population prevalence, we have used a pragmatic definition of an eGFR <60mL/min/1.73m^2 in the absence of diabetes, hypertension, and heavy proteinuria in the working-age population as a surrogate indicator of CKDu burden.

Our findings are consistent with, and build upon, previous evidence, suggesting that there is a high general population burden of impaired kidney function in the absence of traditional risk factors in areas of Central America, and South Asia (Sri Lanka and South India). Applying the same definition to reference populations from high income countries, as expected, demonstrated a low prevalence.

The rationale and scale of the studies included in this analysis varied substantially. Some studies were part of large country-wide non-communicable disease surveys, some were specific to kidney disease but covering smaller areas with typical CKDu population characteristics but without previous reports of a high burden of disease, and others were targeted at specific areas chosen on the basis of prior expectation that the prevalence was high or low. However, all studies were population

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

representative and although response rates varied, this did not appear to relate to study population size, region, or prevalence of the outcome.

Similarly, working age men tended to be under-represented in most studies. However, this will not affect the prevalence estimates for this group (i.e., the proportion with low eGFR in the working age men who actually participated), unless specific high-risk subgroups (e.g., men in occupations with high prevalence) are under- or over-represented. Any such biases are likely to be highly context-specific to particular studies, and information to assess any such biases is generally not available, although it is noteworthy that there is no association between the proportion of men included and the main outcome across the study centres (data not shown).

Furthermore, there is some evidence of variation in prevalence within regions [6,25]. Thus, studies with large source populations (hundreds of thousands to millions) may not detect the outcome occurring in localised clusters whilst studies conducted in smaller source populations (thousands to tens of thousands) may miss high prevalence areas elsewhere within the same country or region. Nonetheless some inferences can be drawn despite the heterogenous nature of the source populations, and these are discussed by disease burden, region, and study type below.

We identified a high burden of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in men in studies from South Asia (South India, Sri Lanka), and Central America. In India, studies with a range of sizes of source populations (from thousands to millions) and conducted both with the specific aim of quantifying CKDu prevalence and as part of non-CKDu focused non-communicable disease surveillance surveys, demonstrated similar patterns. That is of a high general population burden of disease in areas of rural coastal Andhra Pradesh, but not in urban areas of South India or urban or rural areas in northern India. Interestingly, in the rural coastal areas of Andhra Pradesh, where women may also work in the agricultural sector, the prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in women approached or exceeded that in men in some study sites.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

In Anuradhapura district, Sri Lanka, we observed high prevalence amongst men in two out of five rural communities (with moderate prevalence in another two) with small source populations. These findings support a burden of CKDu in these specific areas. However, these communities were specifically selected on the basis of clinical data on CKDu burden, and it was expected that two would have high prevalence, two medium, and two low [6]; thus, it is impossible to make generalisations as to the burden of disease across the wider district.

In northwest Nicaragua, similar to India, data from both a study with a small source population (of thousands) focused in reported high CKDu communities and a non-CKDu focused non-communicable disease surveillance survey with a large source population (hundreds of thousands), demonstrated similar patterns with a high prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in men. Perhaps unusually, there was also a high prevalence of this outcome in the urban population in the latter study, although it is possible that those living in this urban area may still work in agricultural settings. Unfortunately, we were unable to include data from a national survey conducted in El-Salvador (source populations of millions; [26]), but this study used similar definitions, and consistent with the data from Nicaragua, also reported a prevalence elevated above reference levels among rural males. The single study in Guatemala also showed moderate levels of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in males living in the lowland population sample but low levels in the high-altitude sample.

Many of the studies were conducted using the DEGREE protocol specifically to explore whether there was a burden of CKDu in areas with similar profiles to those seen in areas reported to be affected by a high burden of disease. However, prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in rural males was low in Tumbes, Peru (Pacific Coast Latin America, subtropical climate, agricultural), Manabi Province, Ecuador (Pacific Coast Latin America, tropical, agricultural), Karonga District, Malawi (subtropical, agricultural) and Muhoroni Sub-County, Kenya (subtropical, agricultural [specifically sugarcane]). Interestingly, we did identify high prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ amongst women in Ecuador, and amongst urban males and both urban and rural women in Malawi,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

patterns which are not considered typical of CKDu in Central America and South Asia. The relevance of these findings remains unclear.

Both the Nepal and Thailand studies were re-analyses of national population surveys with large source populations (millions). Sub-populations with a higher prevalence of individuals meeting the case definition may therefore be obscured in the larger sampling frames. In other words, it is possible that there are localized "hot spots" that are missed in national surveys. However, as (i) prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ is lower than that in the high-income reference populations, and (ii), the source populations of the individual regions in the Thai study are comparable to other large population surveys (included and not included [26] in this analysis), it suggests that the general population burden of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$, is several fold lower in rural regions of Thailand than in the areas most impacted by CKDu in Central America or India. Another population-based study conducted in NE Thailand reported rates of eGFR<60mL/min of ~10% (without excluding diabetes, hypertension or heavy proteinuria), [27] but this was almost entirely driven by participants over 60 years of age, and estimates in the working age population were completely consistent with those reported from the Thai study included in this analysis. The aggregated data from Nepal meant that the source population was very large, and as reports of CKDu are mainly focused on returning migrant workers in this country [28], it would likely not be possible to detect a high burden of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ in this national population survey if the burden of CKDu were restricted to this group or other specific sub-groups.

The above findings must be considered in the context of other strengths and weaknesses of our approach. The pragmatic definition we have used will of course be prone to misclassification in both directions. For example, the definition we used will lead to the inclusion of a range of non-proteinuric (and moderately-proteinuric, non-hypertensive) chronic kidney diseases of both known (e.g., due to congenital abnormalities, granulomatous, or drug-induced chronic interstitial nephritides) and unknown (but non-CKDu) causes. Furthermore, the absence of confirmatory eGFR

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

measures means a proportion of cases reflect those with acute, rather than chronic, kidney injury. Conversely, some true cases of CKDu were probably excluded, particularly where the disease co-exists with diabetes or hypertension, or in advanced disease where proteinuria is well described (although this would only have biased the prevalence estimates if the prevalence of CKDu was markedly different in people with these conditions than in those without). Given this potential for misclassification, a low burden of disease will not be observable using our definitions. Nonetheless a high general population prevalence of $eGFR<60_{[absent\ HT,\ DM,\ high\ ACR]}$ clearly identifies regions known to be hotspots of CKDu.

A further key strength of the approach used, is that it only depends on eGFR and is independent of the presence or absence of a kidney disease diagnosis. This is of critical importance as such diagnoses are highly dependent on access to nephrology care, which is extremely limited in many CKDu affected regions, in turn making comparisons that rely on 'absence of diagnosis' across regions almost impossible to interpret.

Another important consideration when conducting international comparisons of eGFR is analytical variability in laboratory assays. A strength of this analysis is that all studies used isotope-dilution mass spectrometry referenced methods for creatinine determinations which should minimise this problem, although inter-laboratory and time-dependent variation are still present [29]. Similar quality control methods are not widely used for cystatin C determination.

Aside from laboratory quality control an important limitation is the potential for differential misclassification due to the lack of precision of the creatinine-based CKD-EPI equations in different populations around the globe. Although this equation has been shown to be reasonably accurate in European and Nicaraguan populations [30] it has been demonstrated to substantially overestimate eGFR around the 60mL/min/1.73m^2 threshold in Indian [31] and sub-Saharan African [32] populations, whereas the validity is unknown in others, such as indigenous American groups. We were able to use cystatin C-based equations which have been shown to be more precise [33] to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

address this issue in a number of the studies included in this analysis, but although this substantially increased the prevalence in affected regions in the Indian study and for women in the Kenyan study, it did not change the major conclusions elsewhere. We did not use any population-specific adjustments that have been proposed to correct for equation-based misclassification in the Thai population, however we note that substituting this equation further lowered the estimates of an eGFR<60mL/min/1.73m^2 in the original report from this study [34].

It is important to highlight that although we report substantial variability in age-standardised eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$ we only aim to describe international patterns in the general population. In both Central America [11,35] and South Asia [36] there is evidence supporting an even higher prevalence of CKDu in specific high-risk, i.e., occupational, groups. Therefore, there might be an important burden of CKDu in similar groups located in regions where we have not identified evidence of a high general population prevalence of disease. Only adequately powered, targeted studies in these high-risk populations can address this, and specific studies are therefore needed. Furthermore, other than sex- and urban-rural residence, we have not explored any ecological or individual-level risk factors for eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$. We cannot therefore contribute to the evidence, for or against, any specific proposed cause of disease. In particular, our focus is on patterns in the general populations, and we cannot address any specific occupational hypotheses.

Taking the above limitations into account, the findings nevertheless provide useful estimates of population patterns and are of considerable interest. Taken alongside published evidence, the observations from large surveys and smaller studies support a high general-population burden of CKDu in Central America and Andhra Pradesh, India, however there is no evidence for a similar population burden of disease from large surveys in other parts of India or in Thailand. There is also evidence from smaller surveys for a substantial burden of disease, in particular communities in the Anuradhapura district of Sri Lanka, again supporting published evidence. However, even within these high burden regions there appears to be substantial heterogeneity in the prevalence of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

eGFR<60$_{[\text{absent HT, DM, high ACR}]}$. Several other regions surveyed, that have superficially similar characteristics to affected areas (i.e., hot, low-income, agricultural settings) did not demonstrate a prevalence of low eGFR consistent with a high general population burden of CKDu.

Funding Statement

This work was funded by grants from the UK Colt Foundation (CF/02/18) and the UK Medical Research Council (MR/P02386X/1 and MR/V033743/1).

In addition, individual centres received funding as follows: The study in Chile was supported by the Chilean Agency of Research and Development (ANID), FONDECYT grant 1221680, and FONDAP-MAUCO grant 1523A0008; The study in Ecuador was supported by Universidad Internacional del Ecuador grant EDM-INV-04-19; The study in Guatemala was supported by NIH Grant NIH/FIC 5R21TW010831; The Indian study in Uddanam was supported by a Grand Challenge Award from the Indian Council of Medical Research and the State Government of Andhra Pradesh; The Sri Lankan study was supported by the National Science Foundation of Sri Lanka (RPHS/2016/CKDu 07), the Ministry of Health, Nutrition and Indigenous Medicine and the World Health Organization Country Office Sri Lanka. The study in Italy was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme grant 824484; The Kenyan study was supported by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Illinois Education and Research Center (ERC) Pilot Project Research Training Grant (T42/OH008672), Environmental and Occupational Health unrestricted global health research funds, Michael Bruton Workplace Safety Foundation Scholarship (2019), UIC Graduate College Award for Graduate Research (2019), Paul Brandt-Rauf Scholarship in Global Health (2018–19), and Donna Farley Global Health Scholarship (2020–21); The UDAY study in India was supported by an unrestricted educational grant from Eli Lilly and Company under the Lilly NCD Partnership Program. The funding agency had no role in the design, conduct or analysis of the study; The Indian study in Prakasam district was supported by the Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi; The earlier Nicaraguan study was supported by the Swedish International

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Agency for Development Cooperation (Sida), through the SAREC project of Bilateral Research Cooperation with UNAN-León and the Sida-Health supported SALTRA; The later Nicaraguan study was supported by a grant from the Dutch National Postcode Lottery provided funding to Solidaridad covering a proportion of the fieldwork costs and by the La Isla Network.

Disclosure Statement

In addition to the funding listed above, author disclosures related to this work are as follows: AB is President of Epidemiologia e Prevenzione, a non-profit social enterprise; PJC has received funding from the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) (grant 134801); BC has received grants from Kidney Research UK, the Colt foundation and AstraZeneca, has participated on the board of the AstraZeneca ORTIZ study, and has leadership roles in ISN Consortium of CKDu Collaborators (i3C), ISN Western European Board, Consortium for the Epidemic of Nephropathy in Central America and Mexico (CENCAM), and Kidney Research UK Grants Commitee; RCR has received grants from AstraZeneca, Novonordisk, Boehringer Ingelheim, Roche, and Chinook, to his institution, fees for consultancy from AstraZeneca, Novonordisk, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chinook, and Bayer, and honoraria payments from AstraZeneca, Novonordisk, Boehringer Ingelheim, Amgen, and Bayer; SC has received a grant from the NIHR (134801); VJ has received consultancy fees from Bayer, AstraZeneca, Visterra, Chinook, Vera, Biocryst, and Otsuka; DN is the UK Kidney Association Director of Informatics research (unrelated to this work); COCG has received grants from the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC) and Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal); PR received funding from the National Institutes of Health (USA) and is Chief Science Officer of the Maya Health Alliance Guatemala, a community based organization; all other authors declare no competing interests.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

1. Johnson RJ, Wesseling C, Newman LS. Chronic Kidney Disease of Unknown Cause in Agricultural Communities. N Engl J Med. 2019 May 9;380(19):1843-1852. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1813869
2. Jayasumana C, Orantes C, Herrera R, *et al*. Chronic interstitial nephritis in agricultural communities: a worldwide epidemic with social, occupational and environmental determinants. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2017 Feb 1;32(2):234-241. doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfw346
3. Torres C, Aragón A, González M, *et al*. Decreased kidney function of unknown cause in Nicaragua: a community-based survey. Am J Kidney Dis. 2010 Mar;55(3):485-96. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2009.12.012. Epub 2010 Feb 8
4. Aguilar-Ramirez D, Raña-Custodio A, Villa A, *et al*. Decreased kidney function and agricultural work: a cross-sectional study in middle-aged adults from Tierra Blanca, Mexico. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2021 May 27;36(6):1030-1038. doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfaa041
5. O'Callaghan-Gordo C, Shivashankar R, Anand S, *et al*. Prevalence of and risk factors for chronic kidney disease of unknown aetiology in India: secondary data analysis of three population-based cross-sectional studies. BMJ Open. 2019 Mar 7;9(3):e023353. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023353. Erratum in: BMJ Open. 2019 Mar 18;9(3):e023353corr1
6. Ruwanpathirana T, Senanayake S, Gunawardana N, *et al*. Prevalence and risk factors for impaired kidney function in the district of Anuradhapura, Sri Lanka: a cross-sectional population-representative survey in those at risk of chronic kidney disease of unknown aetiology. BMC Public Health. 2019 Jun 14;19(1):763. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7117-2
7. Jelaković B, Dika Ž, Arlt VM, *et al*. Balkan Endemic Nephropathy and the Causative Role of Aristolochic Acid. Semin Nephrol. 2019 May;39(3):284-296. doi: 10.1016/j.semnephrol.2019.02.007
8. Pearce N, Caplin B. Let's take the heat out of the CKDu debate: more evidence is needed. Occup Environ Med. 2019 Jun;76(6):357-359. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2018-105427. Epub 2019 Mar 30
9. Keogh SA, Leibler JH, Sennett Decker CM, *et al*. High prevalence of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology among workers in the Mesoamerican Nephropathy Occupational Study. BMC Nephrol. 2022 Jul 7;23(1):238. doi: 10.1186/s12882-022-02861-0
10. González-Quiroz M, Pearce N, Caplin B, *et al*. What do epidemiological studies tell us about chronic kidney disease of undetermined cause in Meso-America? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Kidney J. 2018 Aug;11(4):496-506. doi: 10.1093/ckj/sfx136. Epub 2017 Dec 8
11. Wesseling C, Glaser J, Rodríguez-Guzmán J, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease of non-traditional origin in Mesoamerica: a disease primarily driven by occupational heat stress. Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2020 Jan 27;44:e15. doi: 10.26633/RPSP.2020.15
12. Redmon JH, Levine KE, Lebov J, Harrington J, Kondash AJ. A comparative review: Chronic Kidney Disease of unknown etiology (CKDu) research conducted in Latin America versus Asia. Environ Res. 2021 Jan;192:110270. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110270. Epub 2020 Oct 7. PMID: 33035557

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

13. Pearce N. Global epidemiology: the importance of international comparisons and collaborations. Open Access Epidemiology 2013; 1: 15

14. Pearce N. Traditional epidemiology, modern epidemiology, and public health. Am J Public Health. 1996 May;86(5):678-83. doi: 10.2105/ajph.86.5.678

15. The International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) Steering Committee. Worldwide variations in the prevalence of asthma symptoms: the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC). Eur Respir J 1998; 12(2): 315-335

16. Lai CKW, Beasley R, Crane J, *et al*. Global variation in the prevalence and severity of asthma symptoms: phase three of the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC). Thorax. 2009;64(6):476-483. doi: 10.1136/thx.2008.106609. Epub 2009 Feb 22

17. García-Marcos L, Asher MI, Pearce N, *et al*. The burden of asthma, hay fever and eczema in children in 25 countries: GAN Phase I study. Eur Respir J. 2022 Sep 15;60(3):2102866. doi: 10.1183/13993003.02866-2021.

18. Mortimer K, Lesosky M, García-Marcos L, *et al*. The burden of asthma, hay fever and eczema in adults in 17 countries: GAN Phase I study. Eur Respir J. 2022 Sep 15;60(3):2102865. doi: 10.1183/13993003.02865-2021

19. Caplin B, Jakobsson K, Glaser J, *et al*. International Collaboration for the Epidemiology of eGFR in Low and Middle Income Populations – Rationale and core protocol for the Disadvantaged Populations eGFR Epidemiology Study (DEGREE). BMC Nephrol 18, 1 (2017). doi: 10.1186/s12882-016-0417-1

20. NatCen Social Research, University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health. (2023). Health Survey for England, 2016. [data collection]. *4th Edition*. UK Data Service. SN: 8334, doi: 10.5255/UKDA-SN-8334-4

21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2017-2018 Data. Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/index.htm. Accessed 03/10/2023

22. Ahmad O, Boschi-Pinto C, Lopez A, *et al*. Age standardization of rates: a new WHO standard. GPE Discussion Paper Series, No.31. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001, http://www.who.int/healthinfo/paper31.pdf. Accessed 01/08/2023

23. StataCorp. 2021. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 17*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC

24. QGIS.org. QGIS Geographic Information System. QGIS Association. www.qgis.org

25. Hansson E, Mansourian A, Farnaghi M, *et al*. An ecological study of chronic kidney disease in five Mesoamerican countries: associations with crop and heat. BMC Public Health. 2021 May 1;21(1):840. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10822-9

26. Orantes-Navarro CM, Almaguer-López MM, Alonso-Galbán P, *et al*. The Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemic in El Salvador: A Cross-Sectional Study. MEDICC Rev. 2019 Apr-Jul;21(2-3):29-37. doi: 10.37757/MR2019.V21.N2-3.7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

27. Cha'on U, Tippayawat P, Sae-Ung N, *et al*. High prevalence of chronic kidney disease and its related risk factors in rural areas of Northeast Thailand. Sci Rep. 2022 Oct 28;12(1):18188. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-22538-w

28. Dhakal N, Singh DS. SAT-136 chronic kidney disease in migrant workers in Nepal. Kidney International Reports. 2020;5(3):S58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ekir.2020.02

29. Pottel H, Cavalier E, Björk J, *et al*. Standardization of serum creatinine is essential for accurate use of unbiased estimated GFR equations: evidence from three cohorts matched on renal function. Clin Kidney J. 2022 Aug 3;15(12):2258-2265. doi: 10.1093/ckj/sfac182

30. Raines NH, Inker LA, Seegmiller JC, *et al*. Estimated Versus Measured Glomerular Filtration Rate in Men at Risk for Mesoamerican Nephropathy. Am J Kidney Dis. 2023 Mar;81(3):370-373. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2022.08.026. Epub 2022 Oct 31

31. Kumar V, Yadav AK, Yasuda Y, *et al*. Existing creatinine-based equations overestimate glomerular filtration rate in Indians. BMC Nephrol 19, 22 (2018). doi: 10.1186/s12882-018-0813-9

32. Fabian J, Kalyesubula R, Mkandawire J, *et al*. African Research on Kidney Disease Consortium. Measurement of kidney function in Malawi, South Africa, and Uganda: a multicentre cohort study. Lancet Glob Health. 2022 Aug;10(8):e1159-e1169. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00239-X

33. Wang Y, Levey AS, Inker LA, *et al*. Performance and Determinants of Serum Creatinine and Cystatin C-Based GFR Estimating Equations in South Asians. Kidney Int Rep. 2021 Jan 16;6(4):962-975. doi: 10.1016/j.ekir.2021.01.005

34. Aekplakorn W, Chariyalertsak S, Kessomboon P, *et al*. Women and other risk factors for chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology in Thailand: National Health Examination V Survey. Sci Rep. 2021 Nov 1;11(1):21366. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-00694-9. Erratum in: Sci Rep. 2021 Nov 16;11(1):22674

35. Gallo-Ruiz L, Sennett CM, Sánchez-Delgado M, *et al*. Prevalence and Risk Factors for CKD Among Brickmaking Workers in La Paz Centro, Nicaragua. Am J Kidney Dis. 2019 Aug;74(2):239-247. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2019.01.017. Epub 2019 Feb 27

36. Venugopal V, Lennqvist R, Latha PK, *et al*. Occupational Heat Stress and Kidney Health in Salt Pan Workers. Kidney Int Rep. 2023 Apr 20;8(7):1363-1372. doi: 10.1016/j.ekir.2023.04.011

37. Ferreccio C, Roa JC, Bambs C, *et al*. Study protocol for the Maule Cohort (MAUCO) of chronic diseases, Chile 2014-2024. BMC Public Health. 2016 Feb 4;16:122. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-2454-2

38. Miller AC, Tuiz E, Shaw L, *et al*. Population Estimates of GFR and Risk Factors for CKD in Guatemala. Kidney Int Rep. 2021 Jan 1;6(3):796-805. doi: 10.1016/j.ekir.2020.12.015

39. Nair M, Ali MK, Ajay VS, *et al*. CARRS Surveillance study: design and methods to assess burdens from multiple perspectives. BMC Public Health 12, 701 (2012). doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-701

40. Prabhakaran D, Roy A, Praveen PA, *et al*. 20-Year Trend of CVD Risk Factors: Urban and Rural National Capital Region of India. Glob Heart. 2017 Sep;12(3):209-217. doi: 10.1016/j.gheart.2016.11.004. Epub 2017 Apr 11

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

41. Mohan S, Jarhyan P, Ghosh S, *et al*. UDAY: A comprehensive diabetes and hypertension prevention and management program in India. BMJ Open. 2018 Jul 10;8(6):e015919. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-015919

42. Gummidi B, John O, Ghosh A, *et al*. A Systematic Study of the Prevalence and Risk Factors of CKD in Uddanam, India. Kidney Int Rep. 2020 Oct 16;5(12):2246-2255. doi: 10.1016/j.ekir.2020.10.004

43. De Marchi B, Ficorilli A and Biggeri A. (2022). Research is in the air in Valle del Serchio. Futures. 137. 10.1016/j.futures.2022.102906

44. Hathaway MH, Patil CL, Odhiambo A, *et al*. Prevalence and predictors of chronic kidney disease of undetermined causes (CKDu) in Western Kenya's "sugar belt": a cross-sectional study. BMC Nephrol. 2023 Jun 6;24(1):157. doi: 10.1186/s12882-023-03213-2

45. Hamilton SA, Nakanga WP, Prynn JE, *et al*. Prevalence and risk factors for chronic kidney disease of unknown cause in Malawi: a cross-sectional analysis in a rural and urban population. BMC Nephrol. 2020 Sep 7;21(1):387. doi: 10.1186/s12882-020-02034-x

46. Poudyal A, Karki KB, Shrestha N, *et al*. Prevalence and risk factors associated with chronic kidney disease in Nepal: evidence from a nationally representative population-based cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2022 Mar 21;12(3):e057509. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-057509

47. Strasma A, Reyes ÁM, Aragón A, *et al*. Kidney disease characteristics, prevalence, and risk factors in León, Nicaragua: a population-based study. BMC Nephrol. 2023 Nov 12;24(1):335. doi: 10.1186/s12882-023-03381-1

48. Ruiz-Alejos A, Caplin B, Miranda JJ, *et al*. CKD and CKDu in northern Peru: a cross-sectional analysis under the DEGREE protocol. BMC Nephrol. 2021 Jan 21;22(1):37. doi: 10.1186/s12882-021-02239-8

Acknowledgements

We thank all the participating studies, their researchers, and fieldworkers, along with all the participants for enabling this work to be completed.

Data Sharing

Data from the reference datasets can be found in the public domain: NHANES at https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/index.htm and Health Survey England at https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/series/series?id=2000021.

Data for the other included studies may be available by contacting the authors of the respective study papers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

The DEGREE Study Group

Wichai Aekplakorn, Ramathibodi Hospital, Thailand

Shuchi Anand, Stanford University, USA

Aurora Aragón, Wuqu' Kawoq Maya Health Alliance, Guatemala

Antonio Bernabe-Ortiz, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru

Annibale Biggeri, University of Padua, Italy

Emmanuel Burdmann, Sao Paulo University, Brazil

Ben Caplin, University College London, UK

Dolores Catelan, University of Padua, Italy

Pubudu Chulasiri, Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka

Philip Cooper, St George's University of London, UK; International University of Ecuador, Ecuador

Ricardo Correa-Rotter, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

Sandra Cortés, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Chile

Amelia Crampin, Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit (MEIRU), Malawi; University of Glasgow, Scotland

Melissa de Santiago, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA

Meghnath Dhimal, Nepal Health Research Council, Nepal

Chiara Doccioli, University of Florence, Italy

Prabhakaran Dorairaj, Public Health Foundation of India, India

Samuel Dorevitch, University of Illinois Chicago, Kenya

Catterina Ferreccio, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Chile

Jason Glaser, La Isla Network, USA

Marvin Gonzalez-Quiroz, The University of Texas Health Science Centre at San Antonio, USA; Wuqu' Kawoq Maya Health Alliance, Guatemala; University College London, UK

Emily Granadillo, International University of Ecuador, Ecuador

Monsermin Gualan, International University of Ecuador, Ecuador

Balaji Gummidi, George Institute, India

Nalika Gunawardena, WHO, India

Sophie Hamilton, UK Health Security Agency, UK

Michelle Hathaway, University of Illinois Chicago, Kenya

Kristina Jakobsson, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Prashant Jarhyan , Public Health Foundation of India, India

Vivekanand Jha, George Institute, India

Oomen John, George Institute, India

Richard J Johnson, Colorado University, USA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Prabhdeep Kaur, Indian Institute of Science, India

Chagriya Kitiyakara, Ramathibodi Hospital, Thailand

Pornpimol Kongtip, Mahdiol University, Thailand

Hans Kromhout, Utrecht University, Netherlands

Adeera Levin, University of British Columbia, Canada

Magdalena Madero, Ignacio Chavez Institute, Mexico

Estelle McLean, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

J. Jaime Miranda, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru

Joseph Mkandawire, Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit (MEIRU), Malawi

Sailesh Mohan, Public Health Foundation of India, India

Sharan Murali, Indian Council of Medical Research - National Institute of Epidemiology (ICMR-NIE), India

Devaki Nair, University College London; Health Service Laboratory, UK

Wisdom Nakanga, Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit (MEIRU), Malawi

Dorothea Nitsch, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Mary Njoroge, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Moffat Nyirenda, Medical Research Council/Uganda Virus Research Institute and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Uganda Research Unit, Uganda; Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit (MEIRU), Malawi

Cristina O'Callaghan-Gordo, Open University of Catalonia, Spain; ISGlobal, Spain; Pompeu Fabra University, Spain; Epidemiology and Public Health area of the Red Biomedical Research Centre (CIBERESP), Spain

Neil Pearce, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Anil Poudyal, Nepal Health Research Council, Nepal

Narayan Prasad, Sanjay Gandhi Post Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences, India

Lesliam Quirós-Alcalá, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA

Giuseppe Remuzzi, Istituto Mario Negri, Italy

Steven Robertson, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Peter Rohloff, Wuqu' Kawoq Maya Health Alliance, Guatemala

Natalia Romero-Sandoval, International University of Ecuador, Ecuador

Andrea Ruiz-Alejos, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru

Charlotte Rutter, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Thilanga Ruwanpathirana, Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka

Manikandanesan Sakthivel, Indian Council of Medical Research, India

Rajiv Saran, University of Michigan, USA

Sameera Senanayake, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

Ajay Singh, Harvard University, USA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Liam Smeeth, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

Camilo Sotomayor, Universidad de Chile, Chile

Ravi Raju Tatapudi, The Apollo University, India

Eva Tuiz, Wuqu' Kawoq Maya Health Alliance, Guatemala

Nikhil Srinivasapura Venkateshmurthy, Public Health Foundation of India, India

Vidhya Venugopal, Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research, India

SC Wickramasinghe, Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figures and Tables



Figure 1: Age-standardised prevalence of creatinine-based eGFR<60 in rural[a] men without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria

[a]USA includes rural and urban together; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate in ml/min/1.73m^2



Figure 2: Age-standardised prevalence of creatinine-based eGFR<60 in urban[a] men without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria

[a]USA includes rural and urban together; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate in ml/min/1.73m^2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 3: Age-standardised prevalence of creatinine-based eGFR<60 in rural[a] women without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria

[a]USA includes rural and urban together; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate in ml/min/1.73m^2



Figure 4: Age-standardised prevalence of creatinine-based eGFR<60 in urban[a] women without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria

[a]USA includes rural and urban together; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate in ml/min/1.73m^2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 5: Age-standardised prevalence of eGFR<60 by sex in population without hypertension, diabetes mellitus, or heavy proteinuria
eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate in ml/min/1.73m^2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

Table 1: Characteristics of study areas and samples

Country	Study type	Rationale	Area name	Urban %[a]	Climate	Survey dates	Survey season	Source Population	Sample size[b]	Response rate %	Sample male %
Chile	Reuse of population survey [37]	Proposed risk factors	Molina	69	Mediterranean	Oct22-Nov23	All year	45 976	476	92	41
Ecuador	CKD focussed study[c]	DEGREE registered	Miguelillo, Manabi Province	0	Tropical	Jul21-Sep21	Dry	14 164	754	61	41
England	HSE 2016 – Reuse of population survey [20]	Reference	England	83	Temperate	2016	All year	56 000 000	2 135	59	42
Guatemala	CKD focussed study [38]	DEGREE registered	Tecpán, Chimaltenango	0	Temperate Highland Tropical	Jun18-Oct19	All year	85 000	336	58	34
			San Antonio Suchitepéquez	0	Tropical Wet	Jun18-Oct19	All year	52 000	318	69	34
India	1. CARRS - Reuse of population survey [39]	DEGREE registered	Chennai	100	Tropical	Oct10-Nov11	All year	4 680 000	3 564	92	43
			Delhi	100	Semi-arid	Oct10-Nov11	All year	16 300 000	5 366	96	49
	2. ICMR-CHD – Reuse of population survey [40]	DEGREE registered	Delhi	100	Semi-arid	Aug11-Jan12	Rainy, autumn, winter	16 300 000	1 888	Not reported	44
			Faridabad	0	Semi-arid	Aug11-Jan12	Rainy, autumn, winter	90 000	1 413	Not reported	45
	3. UDAY - Reuse of population survey [41]	DEGREE registered	Sonipat	50	Semi-arid	Jul14-Dec14	Rainy, autumn, winter	203 000	4 126	90[e]	44
			Vizag	50	Tropical	Jul14-Dec14	Rainy, autumn, winter	275 000	4 209		44
	4. Uddanam - CKD focussed study [42]	Reported high CKDu area	Kanchili	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18- Dec19	Summer, winter	66 657	317	85[e]	47
			Kaviti	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18-Dec19	Summer, winter	75 974	212		48
			Mandasa	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18-Dec19	Summer, winter	82 699	200		48
			Palasa	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18-Dec19	Summer, winter	97 551	362		51
			Sompeta	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18-Dec19	Summer, winter	78 908	443		46
			V_kothuru	0	Hot Tropical	Jun18-Dec19	Summer, winter	73 212	531		47
	5. Prakasham – CKD focussed study[d]	DEGREE registered	Kanigiri	0	Hot Tropical	Dec21-Feb22	Winter	1 780	1 052	84	40
Italy	CKD focussed study [43]	Reported high CKD area	Barga	0	Temperate	Jun21-Mar22	Summer, autumn, winter	9 574	301	92[f] (or 50[g])	43
Kenya	CKD focussed study [44]	DEGREE registered	Muhoroni East	100	Sub-tropical	Jul20-Nov20	Dry	3 740	260	85	53
			Owaga	0	Sub-tropical	Jul20-Nov20	Dry	3 769	242	87	47
			Tonde	0	Sub-tropical	Jul20-Nov20	Dry	3 045	233	98	49
Malawi	CKD focussed study [45]	DEGREE registered	Southern Karonga District	0	Sub-tropical	Jan18-Aug18	Dry, rainy	40 000	646	66	42
			Lilongwe	100	Sub-tropical	Jan18-Aug18	Dry, rainy	66 000	312	37	31
Nepal	Reuse of population survey [46]	Proposed risk factors	Nepal	67	Sub-tropical to	2016-2018	All year	29 000 000	8 916	92	37

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

					Arctic						
Nicaragua	1. CKD focussed study [3]	Reported high CKDu area	Chinandega (banana/sugarcane)	0	Tropical	Jul07-Oct07	Rainy	384	331	86	47
			Chinandega (service)	0	Tropical	Jul07-Oct07	Rainy	177	140	79	36
			Leon (coffee)	0	Tropical	Jul07-Oct07	Rainy	92	77	84	52
			Leon (fishing)	0	Tropical	Jul07-Oct07	Rainy	216	166	77	46
			Leon (mining)	0	Tropical	Jul07-Oct07	Rainy	445	382	86	41
	2. CKD focussed study [47]	Reported high CKDu area	Leon municipality	70	Tropical	Jun14-Sep14	Rainy	204 000	1 672	97	39
Peru	CKD focussed study [48]	DEGREE registered	Tumbes	94	Arid and Sub-tropical	Nov17-May18	Spring, summer, autumn	224 863	1 238	83	43
Sri Lanka	Anuradhapura District - CKD focussed study [6]	DEGREE registered	Halambagaswewa, Rambewa	0	Tropical	Mar17-May17	Dry	1 188	739	90	33
			Lolugaswewa, Medawachchiya	0	Tropical	Mar17-May17	Dry	1 262	790	86	28
			Pothana, Mihintale	0	Tropical	Mar17-May17	Dry	1 391	691	88	28
			Puhudivula, Medawachchiya	0	Tropical	Mar17-May17	Dry	1 362	798	91	28
			Sangilikandarawa, Rambewa	0	Tropical	Mar17-May17	Dry	1 228	818	90	33
Thailand	Reuse of population survey [34]	Proposed risk factors	Bangkok	100	Tropical	Nov13-Aug14	Cool, hot, rainy	6 969 010[h]	1 604	81	24
			Central	46	Tropical	Nov13-Aug14	Cool, hot, rainy	14 424 785[h]	2 752	92	41
			North	35	Tropical	Nov13-Aug14	Cool, hot, rainy	8 638 732[h]	2 447	83	45
			North East	29	Tropical	Nov13-Aug14	Cool, hot, rainy	13 445 305[h]	2 315	80	46
			South	34	Tropical	Nov13-Aug14	Cool, hot, rainy	6 442 937[h]	2 019	73	42
USA	NHANES 2017-8 – Reuse of population survey [21]	Reference	USA	83	All types	2017-2018	All year	320 842 721	3 517	49	47

[a] Proportion of the source population of the area living in an urban environment [b] ages 18-60 with complete data available; [c] personal communication, Professor Phil Cooper (pcooper@sgul.ac.uk); [d] personal communication Professor Prabhdeep Kaur (kprabhdeep@gmail.com); [e] overall response rate not area-specific [f] denominator includes refusal/incomplete surveys but excludes mailing failures; [g] denominator includes mailing failures; [h] population over age 20; HSE=Health Survey England; CARRS=Centre for cArdiometabolic Risk Reduction in South-Asia; ICMR-IHD=Indian Council of Medical Research International Health Division; UDAY=means dawn in Sanskrit; NHANES=National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Age-standardised prevalence of eGFR<60 ml/min/1.73m^2 by sex, for ages 18-60

Centre	Area	Rural / Urban	Sample with complete data				Sample of people without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria			
			Men		Women		Men		Women	
			n	eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)
Chile[b]	Molina	Rural	39	0.0 (N/A)	17	0.0 (N/A)	16	0.0 (N/A)	6	0.0 (N/A)
Chile[b]	Molina	Urban	156	0.0 (N/A)	264	1.6 (0.1, 3.1)	66	0.0 (N/A)	137	0.5 (0, 1.6)
Ecuador	Miguelillo	Rural	312	2.2 (0.7, 3.8)	442	6.4 (4.3, 8.5)	180	1.2 (0, 2.8)	235	6.0 (2.2, 9.7)
England	all	Rural	161	0.4 (0, 1.0)	223	2.2 (0.8, 3.7)	98	0.0 (N/A)	169	1.8 (0.4, 3.2)
England	all	Urban	744	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)	1007	1.0 (0.6, 1.5)	515	0.1 (0, 0.4)	759	0.8 (0.3, 1.4)
Guatemala	San Antonio Suchitepequez	Rural	115	3.7 (0.4, 7.0)	221	1.3 (0, 2.8)	86	4.5 (0, 9.2)	171	0.4 (0, 1.2)
Guatemala	Tecpan	Rural	109	0.9 (0, 2.6)	209	0.0 (N/A)	83	0.0 (N/A)	152	0.0 (N/A)
India 1 (CARRS)	Chennai	Urban	2333	0.9 (0.5, 1.3)	3033	0.6 (0.3, 0.9)	1161	0.5 (0.0, 0.9)	1915	0.2 (0, 0.5)
India 1 (CARRS)	Delhi	Urban	1733	1.0 (0.6, 1.5)	1831	1.2 (0.8, 1.6)	770	0.6 (0.1, 1.1)	935	0.6 (0.0, 1.1)
India 2 (ICMR)	Delhi	Urban	837	1.2 (0.6, 1.9)	1051	2.3 (1.5, 3.1)	399	0.6 (0, 1.3)	571	1.8 (0.6, 3.0)
India 2 (ICMR)	Faridabad	Rural	629	1.6 (0.8, 2.4)	784	1.6 (0.9, 2.4)	380	1.9 (0.8, 3.1)	520	1.5 (0.5, 2.5)
India 3 (UDAY)	Sonipat	Rural	768	0.6 (0.2, 1.1)	1136	0.6 (0.2, 1.0)	530	0.4 (0.0, 0.8)	847	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)
India 3 (UDAY)	Sonipat	Urban	1038	0.9 (0.4, 1.3)	1184	0.6 (0.2, 0.9)	586	0.6 (0.1, 1.1)	768	0.3 (0, 0.6)
India 3 (UDAY)	Vizag	Rural	934	6.7 (2.9, 10.4)	1242	3.1 (2.2, 4.1)	696	6.5 (1.9, 11.0)	933	2.6 (1.5, 3.7)
India 3 (UDAY)	Vizag	Urban	903	1.2 (0.6, 1.8)	1130	0.7 (0.3, 1.1)	469	0.4 (0, 1.1)	692	0.5 (0, 1.1)
India 4 (Uddanam)	Kanchili	Rural	148	4.8 (1.1, 8.6)	169	7.2 (3.2, 11.3)	71	6.9 (1.0, 12.9)	83	1.1 (0, 3.2)
India 4 (Uddanam)	Kaviti	Rural	102	12.2 (7.7, 16.7)	110	8.0 (3.5, 12.4)	52	6.7 (1.3, 12.2)	65	8.0 (2.0, 14.1)
India 4 (Uddanam)	Mandasa	Rural	95	18.4 (10.7, 26.1)	105	10.6 (6.0, 15.1)	57	13.7 (4.8, 22.6)	54	5.6 (0.4, 10.7)
India 4 (Uddanam)	Palasa	Rural	186	11.2 (5.9, 16.5)	176	11.0 (6.1, 15.9)	84	6.8 (0.1, 13.4)	81	4.6 (0.5, 8.7)
India 4 (Uddanam)	Sompeta	Rural	202	9.2 (4.9, 13.4)	241	2.7 (0.9, 4.5)	99	8.2 (2.2, 14.3)	127	5.8 (1.1, 10.6)
India 4 (Uddanam)	V_kothuru	Rural	250	5.3 (3.0, 7.5)	281	4.9 (2.9, 7.0)	101	2.1 (0, 4.8)	121	7.5 (3.2, 11.9)
India 5 (Prakasham)	Kanigiri	Rural	420	5.3 (3.4, 7.2)	632	3.4 (2.0, 4.7)	221	2.5 (0.3, 4.6)	432	1.9 (0.7, 3.1)
Italy	Barga	Rural	128	0.9 (0, 2.3)	173	0.7 (0, 1.7)	73	1.2 (0, 3.5)	149	0.0 (N/A)
Kenya	Muhoroni East	Urban	138	0.0 (N/A)	122	0.9 (0, 2.7)	113	0.0 (N/A)	104	0.0 (N/A)
Kenya	Owaga	Rural	113	0.0 (N/A)	129	2.2 (0, 4.8)	88	0.0 (N/A)	98	2.4 (0, 5.8)
Kenya	Tonde	Rural	114	0.0 (N/A)	119	0.0 (N/A)	94	0.0 (N/A)	100	0.0 (N/A)
Malawi	Karonga	Rural	271	3.0 (0.7, 5.4)	375	3.0 (1.0, 5.1)	214	1.4 (0, 3.5)	309	2.8 (0.3, 5.3)
Malawi	Lilongwe	Urban	96	2.2 (0, 6.2)	216	4.9 (1.4, 8.4)	74	3.1 (0, 8.6)	159	4.0 (0.7, 7.2)
Nepal	all	Rural	1690	0.9 (0.6, 1.3)	2790	2.1 (1.6, 2.6)	1002	0.5 (0.1, 1.0)	1981	1.7 (1.1, 2.3)
Nepal	all	Urban	1602	0.8 (0.4, 1.1)	2834	3.0 (2.4, 3.6)	822	0.3 (0.0, 0.7)	1777	2.6 (1.9, 3.4)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

Nicaragua 1	Chinandega (banana/sugarcane)	Rural	155	19.0 (12.5, 25.5)	176	3.5 (0.6, 6.4)	104	13.6 (6.3, 20.9)	111	0.0 (N/A)
Nicaragua 1	Chinandega (service)	Rural	50	0.0 (N/A)	90	0.0 (N/A)	34	0.0 (N/A)	58	0.0 (N/A)
Nicaragua 1	Leon (coffee)	Rural	40	6.3 (0, 14.4)	37	0.0 (N/A)	30	8.6 (0, 19.1)	26	0.0 (N/A)
Nicaragua 1	Leon (fishing)	Rural	76	10.2 (3.2, 17.3)	90	2.1 (0, 5.9)	55	6.4 (0, 13.0)	73	0.0 (N/A)
Nicaragua 1	Leon (mining/subsistence farming)	Rural	158	16.2 (10.4, 22.0)	224	4.8 (1.7, 7.9)	106	12.1 (4.5, 19.6)	144	2.6 (0, 6.6)
Nicaragua 2	Leon municipalities	Rural	247	15.3 (10.9, 19.7)	329	3.1 (1.2, 5.0)	145	9.4 (4.4, 14.3)	211	2.5 (0, 5.4)
Nicaragua 2	Leon municipalities	Urban	400	10.0 (7.2, 12.7)	696	3.6 (2.3, 4.8)	256	6.6 (3.0, 10.1)	436	2.4 (1.0, 3.9)
Peru	Tumbes	Rural	278	0.5 (0, 1.3)	344	0.3 (0, 0.9)	210	0.0 (N/A)	285	0.6 (0, 1.7)
Peru	Tumbes	Urban	257	0.5 (0, 1.2)	359	0.5 (0, 1.1)	186	0.0 (N/A)	305	0.0 (N/A)
Sri Lanka	Halambagaswewa	Rural	242	8.3 (5.5, 11.0)	497	3.8 (2.2, 5.3)	136	3.9 (1.1, 6.8)	336	1.3 (0.1, 2.6)
Sri Lanka	Lolugaswewa	Rural	221	5.8 (3.5, 8.1)	569	4.5 (3.1, 5.9)	138	7.7 (3.9, 11.5)	372	2.6 (1.0, 4.2)
Sri Lanka	Pothana	Rural	194	5.0 (2.6, 7.3)	497	1.7 (0.7, 2.6)	115	0.7 (0, 1.9)	330	0.7 (0, 1.6)
Sri Lanka	Puhudivula	Rural	222	7.7 (5.2, 10.2)	576	3.6 (2.3, 5.0)	112	7.6 (3.8, 11.3)	378	1.4 (0.2, 2.6)
Sri Lanka	Sangilikandarawa	Rural	270	6.1 (3.8, 8.4)	548	2.9 (1.6, 4.3)	157	3.1 (0.6, 5.6)	346	2.4 (0.8, 3.9)
Thailand	Bangkok	Urban	381	1.1 (0.1, 2.2)	1223	0.7 (0.0, 1.3)	233	1.2 (0, 2.7)	943	0.5 (0, 1.1)
Thailand	Central	Rural	606	0.9 (0.3, 1.4)	795	1.1 (0.4, 1.9)	424	0.2 (0, 0.4)	576	1.0 (0.1, 1.8)
Thailand	Central	Urban	519	0.6 (0.1, 1.1)	832	0.4 (0.1, 0.7)	336	0.0 (N/A)	587	0.2 (0, 0.5)
Thailand	North	Rural	668	1.1 (0.6, 1.7)	730	1.0 (0.1, 1.8)	407	0.4 (0, 0.9)	498	0.5 (0, 1.3)
Thailand	North	Urban	445	1.1 (0, 2.3)	604	1.0 (0.4, 1.6)	267	0.7 (0, 1.9)	409	0.3 (0, 0.7)
Thailand	North East	Rural	577	1.3 (0.5, 2.1)	637	0.8 (0.3, 1.3)	428	0.6 (0.1, 1.2)	479	0.3 (0, 0.7)
Thailand	North East	Urban	492	0.7 (0, 1.4)	609	0.6 (0.2, 1.0)	351	0.2 (0, 0.5)	450	0.1 (0, 0.4)
Thailand	South	Rural	549	0.5 (0.1, 1.0)	678	0.2 (0, 0.5)	366	0.2 (0, 0.6)	493	0.2 (0, 0.5)
Thailand	South	Urban	303	0.7 (0.0, 1.4)	489	1.1 (0.3, 2.0)	193	1.1 (0, 2.4)	356	0.7 (0, 1.4)
USA	all	All	1665	2.0 (1.4, 2.6)	1852	1.2 (0.8, 1.7)	944	0.5 (0.1, 1.0)	1163	0.6 (0.2, 1.1)

[a] age-standardised prevalence using WHO global population age weights; [b] only 41-60 years included; eGFR=creatinine-based estimated glomerular filtration rate; CI=confidence interval using normal approximation; N/A=no CI available due to zero estimate

Table 3: Age-standardised prevalence rates of creatinine- and cystatin C-based eGFR<60 ml/min/1.73m^2, by sex, for ages 18-60 years with both measurements available

Centre	Area	Rural / Urban	Sample with complete data						Sample of people without hypertension, diabetes, or heavy proteinuria					
			Men			Women			Men			Women		
			n	Creatinine eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	Cystatin C eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	Creatinine eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	Cystatin C eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	Creatinine eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	Cystatin C eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	n	Creatinine eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)	Cystatin C eGFR<60[a] % (95% CI)
England	all	Rural	161	0.4 (0, 1.0)	0.6 (0, 1.4)	223	2.2 (0.8, 3.7)	0.4 (0, 0.9)	98	0.0 (N/A)	0.5 (0, 1.4)	169	1.8 (0.4, 3.2)	0.3 (0, 0.8)
England	all	Urban	744	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)	1.6 (0.7, 2.5)	1007	1.0 (0.6, 1.5)	1.0 (0.5, 1.4)	515	0.1 (0, 0.4)	0.8 (0.1, 1.4)	759	0.8 (0.3, 1.4)	0.4 (0, 0.7)
India 3 (UDAY)[b]	Sonipat	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	177	0.3 (0, 0.9)	14.3 (10.5, 18.0)	253	0.0 (N/A)	12.9 (7.3, 18.4)
India 3 (UDAY)[b]	Sonipat	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	199	0.0 (N/A)	14.1 (10.4, 17.8)	273	0.0 (N/A)	14.1 (10.6, 17.6)
India 3 (UDAY)[b]	Vizag	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	269	6.7 (0, 15.2)	21.3 (9.9, 32.6)	325	2.8 (1.2, 4.5)	12.1 (8.7, 15.5)
India 3 (UDAY)[b]	Vizag	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	152	0.0 (N/A)	12.5 (3.2, 21.9)	244	0.0 (N/A)	12.8 (8.1, 17.5)
Kenya	Muhoroni East	Urban	4	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)	10	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)	4	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)	9	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)
Kenya	Owaga	Rural	44	0.0 (N/A)	3.6 (0, 10.0)	50	0.0 (N/A)	8.3 (3.2, 13.5)	37	0.0 (N/A)	3.6 (0, 10.0)	43	0.0 (N/A)	10.4 (4.8, 16.0)
Kenya	Tonde	Rural	26	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)	39	0.0 (N/A)	10.6 (2.7, 18.5)	19	0.0 (N/A)	0.0 (N/A)	29	0.0 (N/A)	14.3 (3.7, 24.9)
Malawi	Karonga	Rural	271	3.0 (0.7, 5.4)	0.8 (0, 1.8)	375	3.0 (1.0, 5.1)	1.5 (0, 3.2)	214	1.4 (0, 3.5)	1.1 (0, 2.6)	309	2.8 (0.3, 5.3)	1.6 (0, 3.8)
Malawi	Lilongwe	Urban	96	2.2 (0, 6.2)	0.6 (0, 1.8)	216	4.9 (1.4, 8.4)	0.0 (N/A)	74	3.1 (0, 8.6)	0.7 (0, 2.1)	159	4.0 (0.7, 7.2)	0.0 (N/A)
Peru	Tumbes	Rural	278	0.5 (0, 1.3)	2.1 (0.7, 3.6)	343	0.3 (0, 0.9)	1.5 (0.2, 2.7)	210	0.0 (N/A)	1.7 (0.1, 3.3)	284	0.6 (0, 1.7)	0.9 (0, 2.0)
Peru	Tumbes	Urban	257	0.5 (0, 1.2)	1.5 (0.2, 2.8)	358	0.5 (0, 1.1)	2.4 (1.0, 3.8)	186	0.0 (N/A)	1.5 (0, 3.2)	304	0.0 (N/A)	1.4 (0.1, 2.7)

eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate; [a] age-standardised prevalence using WHO global population age weights; [b] complete data not available as only participants without hypertension, diabetes and heavy proteinuria had cystatin C measured; N/A=no CI available due to zero estimate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.24.24309380; this version posted June 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.