TITLE PAGE

Title:

Pre-chronic kidney disease -- Serial creatinine tracks glomerular filtration rate decline above 60 mL/min

Authors:
Cyril O. Burke III[1*], John G. Toffaletti[2,3], Leanne M. Burke[4], Joshua Ray Tanzer[5]

[1] Department of Neurology, Brown University Health, Providence, Rhode Island, United States of America

[2] Department of Pathology/Clinical Laboratories, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, United States of America

[3] Department of Clinical Chemistry, Veterans Administration Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, United States of America

[4] Cardiovascular Institute, Brown University Health, Providence, Rhode Island, United States of America

[5] Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Research Design, and Informatics Core, Brown University Health, Providence, Rhode Island, United States of America

[*] *corresponding author*
E-mail: cyrilburke@alum.mit.edu (cob3)

Pre-chronic kidney disease (preCKD) -- Serial creatinine tracks glomerular filtration rate (GFR) decline above 60 mL/min

Methods

Shemesh et al recommended "observation of subtle changes in serum creatinine" to 80 mL/min [1].
Our re-analysis extends this below 60 mL/min.

1. Shemesh et al. doi: 10.1038/ki.1985.205.

- Connect 'maximum serum creatinine' (sCr-max) levels (solid black line) for more reliable reference.
- Levels below sCr-max often reflect non-renal sCr influences (e.g., oral hydration, infusions).
- Within-individual referencing makes stable traits (e.g., sex, 'race', diet, muscle mass) irrelevant.

Findings



medRχiv
THE PREPRINT SERVER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES
Burke CO, Toffaletti JG, Tanzer JR, Burke LM.
doi: 10.1101/2024.09.17.24313678

Conclusions: Rising sCr-max revealed preCKD in a limited number of patients with sCr ≥ 1.0 mg/dL (88 µmol/L), suggesting the approach may be practical for primary care.

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES

To allow primary clinicians to detect early decline in glomerular filtration rates above 60 milliliters per minute, before stage-three chronic kidney disease.

METHODS

We re-examine a standard reference that found low tubular secretion of creatinine at glomerular filtration rates above 80 milliliters per minute and suggested “observation of subtle changes in serum creatinine levels”. We explain why that method extends to the 80 to 60 milliliters per minute range by **(1)** fitting a hyperbolic curve, **(2)** expanding the Y-axis (to reflect accuracy of modern creatinine assays), and **(3)** showing reasonable continuity down to 60 milliliters per minute. We summarize why equations estimating glomerular filtration rate are unsuitable above 60 milliliters per minute.

RESULTS

Four patient cases show how serum creatinine referenced to an individual’s historical maximum can suggest increased risk, triggering investigation to separate benign processes that alter serum creatinine from true decline in glomerular filtration rate of prechronic kidney disease.

CONCLUSIONS

At glomerular filtration rates above 60 milliliters per minute, serial creatinine is more reliable than estimating equations and appears practical for clinical monitoring and early intervention.

STRENGTHS OF THIS STUDY

1. Includes serial creatinine proof-of-concept cases that show preCKD
2. Reviews properties that favor serial creatinine for early kidney disease
3. Addresses mathematical limitations of GFR estimating equations
4. Re-analyzes a 40-year-old standard reference that still influences research, showing its overlooked importance for early kidney diagnosis

KEYWORDS

Chronic Kidney Disease; CKD; PreChronic Kidney Disease; PreCKD; Serial Creatinine; Creatinine; Glomerular Filtration Rate; GFR.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASC = adult serum creatinine, CKD = chronic kidney disease, CrCl = creatinine clearance, eGFR = estimated GFR, GFR = glomerular filtration rate, IDMS = isotope-dilution mass spectrometry, KDIGO = Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes, KF = kidney failure, m^2 = square meters, mGFR = measured GFR, mg/dL = milligrams per deciliter, mL/min = milliliter per minute, µmol/L = micromoles per liter, NSAID = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, P30 = percentage of estimates within ±30%, sCr = serum creatinine, sCr-max = maximum sCr to date, sCysC = serum cystatin C, TScr = tubular secretion of creatinine.

1. INTRODUCTION

NOTE: An eminent European nephrologist insisted that our study (to reduce US 'racial' disparity in kidney disease) separate discussion of 'race' from serial creatinine. After multiple rounds of review, we relented. The sister article added orientation to socially constructed 'race' and re-analyzed racialized kidney data under new ethics of 'race' [1].

Without non-creatinine biomarkers like proteinuria, the 2012 guidelines of the Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) indicate CKD when glomerular filtration rate (GFR) is halved to 60 mL/min (equivalent to functional loss of one kidney) and recommend nephrology evaluation at a GFR of 30 mL/min or less. Early detection of 'preCKD', above 60 mL/min, will allow primary clinicians to slow progression and prevent kidney failure (KF) [2,3].

Early GFR decline occurs well within the serum creatinine (sCr) reference interval ('normal range' or population variation), which is much broader than any person's usual within-individual variation. At GFRs above 60 mL/min, finding a within-individual change of sCr over a defined period can reveal early decline in GFR—'preCKD'. PreCKD is like prediabetes [4] and prehypertension [5], but because serum glucose and blood pressure have smaller between-individual variations, those conditions do not require within-individual comparison.

Tracking serial sCr to monitor within-individual change of sCr has been shown to increase detection of acute kidney injury (AKI) in both children and adults [6,7,8]. Serial sCr and within-individual referencing can reveal GFR decline even within the sCr 'normal range'. Using graphs of sCr in individual patients, we demonstrate the utility of sCr in a proof-of-concept study.

2. RESULTS

2.1 Diagnosing preCKD

Shemesh et al suggested limitations of creatinine as a filtration marker as GFR falls and insensitivity of its population reference interval—often called the "creatinine-blind range"—but recommended "observation of subtle changes in serum creatinine levels" at GFRs down to 80 mL/min [9]. Our re-analysis of their data (see **Section 5. Methods**) validated extension of their recommendation down to 60 mL/min.

2.1.1 Definitions

Maximum creatinine—sCr-max: Charting sCr levels over time (from first known sCr) potentially creates a cluster of datapoints that reveals an individual's "normal range". While the cluster's lower limit may vary with vigorous hydration, its upper limit—the sCr maximum (sCr-max)—approximates minimum GFR to that date (e.g., during fasting or dehydration). Its Y-axis span reflects combined analytic variability (within and between laboratories), and individual biologic variability due to muscularity, diet, and medicine effects.

When a new creatinine result exceeds the sCr-max, successive increments push the sCr-max higher until it is stable (for a time), making the accuracy and precision of assays and the variability within and between laboratories less critical—sCr-max simply

rises a little higher to encompasses the variability in that patient. However, a subsequent significant increase in sCr-max possibly represents a true decline in GFR.

Reference change value—RCV: The sCr-max reference change value (sCr-max-RCV) represents the minimum meaningful sCr change. Physical activity affects the sCr coefficient of variation: sCr-RCVs are 13.3% in healthy sedentary individuals and 26.8% if physically active [10]. A between-laboratory RCV was reported [11], but because the sCr-max represents the peak of all previous sCr values, a new sCr exceeding all prior values by at least the sCr-RCV represents a true decline in kidney function. Therefore, defining sCr-max as a reference point, a change >sCr-RCV allows charting sCr to reveal preCKD.

PreCKD: We divided KDIGO guidelines [12] for GFRs between 120 and 60 mL/min into three subgroups, **Fig 1**: **(1)** stable 'normal' function (above 90 mL/min; not shown), **(2)** CKD stages G1 (above 90 mL/min) and G2 (90-60 mL/min) with other identifying abnormalities such as proteinuria, and **(3)** preCKD identified by rising sCr-max, which may be either reversible impairment (i.e., not CKD) or early CKD without a non-sCr biomarker for early diagnosis (**Fig 1**).

Primary care management of pre-CKD

Approximate adult serum creatinine (ASC) thresholds for chronic kidney disease stages

GFR mL/min	Net residual function	Approx. sCr mg/dL	Approx. sCr µMol/L	Signs of injury Yes	Signs of injury No	Management
120	**2 kidneys**	**0.8**	**70**			
90	1½ kidneys	0.92	80	CKD G1* CKD G2*	**Pre-CKD**	Counseling and patient engagement
60	**1 kidney**	**1.2**	**110**			
45	**¾ kidney**	**1.7**	**150**	CKD G3a		Primary care
30	**½ kidney**	**2.3**	**200**	CKD G3b		
15	¼ kidney	4.5	400	CKD G4		Refer to Nephrology
				CKD G5		

*** = Requires signs of kidney injury (e.g., proteinuria, urinary red cell casts). ABBREVIATIONS: approx = approximate, CKD = chronic kidney disease, GFR = glomerular filtration rate, mg/dL = milligrams per deciliter, mL/min = milliliters per minute, µMol/L = micromoles per liter, sCr = serum creatinine. CONVERSION FACTOR FOR UNITS: serum creatinine in mg/dL to µmol/L, multiply by 88.4.**

Fig 1. Staging early kidney impairment.

2.2 Selection of cases

From August 2019 to November 2021, in a non-nephrology specialty practice, 11 patients had sCr ≥1.0 mg/dL without diagnosed kidney disease. A "normal" patient (Patient N) was also included for comparison. All had primary care providers and Medicare or private insurance. Consulted nephrologists were unaware of the pattern of serial sCr, which we analyzed later when defining the ASC charts. Patients who either were referred back to their primary clinicians or declined ongoing care were 'lost to follow up', and were not contacted thereafter for this retrospective data re-analysis.

The eleven patients listed in **Fig 2** included seven White, three Black, and one Asian American-Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. The median age was 73 for White and 65 for Black patients. Hypertension was present in 10 of the 11 patients. Diabetes or pre-diabetes was noted only in the three Black patients.

Patients with serum creatinine ≥ 1.0 mg/dL, without diagnosed kidney disease, over 2 years in a non-nephrology specialty practice

	Pertinent kidney-related history, diagnoses, and medicines						Serum creatinine (mg/dL, µmol/L)											
	'Race'	BMI	HTN	DM	Other diagnoses	Medicines	sCr trigger	Years of sCr data	Longest gap (yrs)	Lowest	Highest	Last	sCr-max of 2 earliest values	Highest % above baseline sCr-max	Urine protein	Nephrology consultation impression	Clinical impression and management	
11	White	32.5	Yes	No		Furosemide, NSAIDs	1.02 90	6	3.6	0.68 60	1.16 103	1.16 103	0.7 62	66%	11.1 mg/dL (24hr collection)	n/a	Pre-CKD	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration.
10	AA-NH/PI	38.6	Yes	No		Chlorothalidone, losartan	See ASC Chart: Patient 10								<6.0 mg/dL (24hr collection)	n/a	Pre-CKD	Possible thiazide effect. Lost to follow up.
							1.21 107	7	3.0	0.57 50	1.21 107	0.95 84	0.75 66	61%				
9	White	23.4	Yes	No		Hydrochlorothiazide, losartan, aspirin	1.1 97	17	2.2	0.8 71	1.4 124	1.1 97	1.0 88	40%	Neg protein (urinalysis)	n/a	Pre-CKD	"Historical labs suggest fairly stable renal function". Lost to follow up.
8	White	25.5	Yes	No	Sarcoidosis, kidney stones		1.87 165	13	4.3	1.19 105	2.8 248	1.2 106	2.1 186	33%	99 mg (24hr collection)	(Patient declined referral during COVID pandemic.)	Pre-CKD	Sarcoidosis-related AKI? Lost to follow up.
7	Black	28.4	Yes	Yes	Microscopic 2+ hematuria, CHF, first-degree relative with kidney failure	NSAIDs	See ASC Chart: Patient 7								albumin <12 mg/L (random urine)	"CKD 3a--could be genetic (Alport's)"	CKD 3a	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration. **Nephrology following.**
							1.27 112	11	3.6	1.0 88	1.46 129	1.43 126	1.1 97	33%				
6	Black	34.1	Yes	Yes	Discoid lupus, first-degree relative with kidney failure	Hydrochlorothiazide, losartan, aspirin, NSAIDs	See ASC Chart: Patient 6								98 mg (24hr collection)	"...does NOT have CKD"	Pre-CKD	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration. Lost to follow up.
							1.4 124	15	6.1	1.0 88	1.4 124	1.36 120	1.1 97	27%				
5	White	31.7	Yes	No		Hydrochlorothiazide, irbesartan, spironolactone, aspirin	1.2 106	17	4.6	0.7 62	1.2 106	1.11 98	1.0 88	20%	1+ protein (urinalysis)	n/a	Pre-CKD	Lost to follow up.
4	White	24.0	No	No		Hydrochlorothiazide	1.04 92	22	5.2	0.9 80	1.19 105	1.17 103	1.0 88	19%	Neg/trace protein (urinalysis)	n/a	Pre-CKD	Deceased in 80s.
3	White	27.9	Yes	No	Gout (NSAID-dependent)	Allopurinol, colchicine, diclofenac	1.45 128	10	1.1	1.14 101	1.68 149	1.49 132	1.5 133	12%	Neg protein (urinalysis)	"CKD 3a—creatinine up because of starting NSAIDs probably"	CKD 3a	**Nephrology following.**
2	Black	25.8	Yes	Yes	Bilateral multiple kidney cysts, chronic pain	Furosemide, aspirin, NSAIDs	1.41 125	9	3.1	1.08 95	1.54 136	1.54 136	1.5 133	2.7%	215 mg (24hr collection)	"CKD 3a--Autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease" and HTN nephropathy	CKD 3a	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration. **Nephrology following.**
1	White	31.2	Yes	No			1.0 88	8	2.4	0.9 80	1.0 88	1.0 88	1.0 88	0.0%		n/a		
N	White	24.3	Yes	No		Ibuprofen	See ASC Chart: Patient N for 'normal' comparison									n/a		
							n/a	21	6.4	0.6 53	0.8 73	0.8 73	0.8 71	0.0%				

ABBREVIATIONS: AA-NH/PI = Asian American-Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, ASC = adult serum creatinine, BMI = body mass index, CHF = congestive heart failure, CKD = chronic kidney disease, DM = pre-diabetes or diabetes mellitus, HTN = hypertension, KF = kidney failure, mg/dL = milligrams per deciliter, mg/L = milligrams per liter, µmol/L = micromoles per liter, n/a = not applicable, Neg = negative, NSAID = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug, s/p = status post, sCr = serum creatinine, sCr-max = maximum serum creatinine.

Fig 2. Patients with serum creatinine ≥1.0 mg/dL and no kidney diagnosis in a non-nephrology specialty practice. Highlighted (orange) cells indicate results that prompted referral to nephrology and impressions of the various nephrologists. Dashed lines represent boundaries of serum creatinine reference change value (sCr-RCV) for "change relative to sCr-max": 13.3% (lower) in healthy sedentary individuals and 26.8% (upper) if physically active patients. For comparison, Patient N, in green, had stable medical issues and kidney function over many years.

The median availability of retrospective sCr data was 11.6 years (mean 12.8, range 4.4 to 21.0 years), see supporting file **S1_dataset**. The higher of the earliest two sCr values served as baseline sCr-max for calculating future sCr-max and/or significant changes in sCr. In **Fig 2**, four White patients (1, 4, 5, 11; mean age 72.3) had sCr too low for nephrology referral. **Patient 1** had peak sCr 1.0 mg/dL and relative change 0.0%. **Patients 4, 5, and 11** fit the definition of preCKD, with relative change from 19% to 66%, but highest sCr was only 1.16 to 1.2 mg/dL.

Six patients had sCr ≥1.4 mg/dL: three White (3, 8, 9; mean age 75.3) and three Black (2, 6, 7; mean age 66.7). Two of the three White patients were referred to nephrology: **Patient 3** had gout dependent on nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) (sCr range: 1.14-1.68 mg/dL), and **Patient 8** had sarcoidosis but declined nephrology evaluation (sCr range: 1.19-2.8 mg/dL). The third, **Patient 9**, was octogenarian, with "fairly stable sCr" that regressed (sCr range: 0.8-1.4 mg/dL).

All three Black patients had sCr ≥1.4 mg/dL and were referred to nephrology. **Patient 2** was later diagnosed with "polycystic kidney disease" (sCr range: 1.08-1.54 mg/dL, relative change 2.7%—lacking an earlier baseline sCr, urine protein 215 mg/24hr, renal cysts by computed tomography). **Patient 7** was later back-referred as "does NOT have CKD" (sCr range: 1.0-1.4 mg/dL, urine protein 98 mg/24hr, relative change 27%). **Patient 6** was later diagnosed as "could be genetic (Alport's)" (sCr range: 1.0-1.46 mg/dL, relative change 33%).

2.3 Longitudinal creatinine

As examples, we present charts for three of the 11 patients with sCr ≥1.0 mg/dL as well as one "normal" patient, with stable sCr <1.0 mg/dL.

Even though all the patients in **Fig 2** showed a gap of several years in sCr measurements, early diagnosis of kidney disease may be possible even from limited longitudinal sCr data. In a non-nephrology specialty practice, the small number of cases identified over two years suggests the specificity of sCr-max, sCr-RCV, and serial sCr for early kidney disease may be a practical method for primary care clinicians to identify a subset at higher risk.

2.3.1 Stable for decades

Patient N ("normal") was White, on no relevant medicines, with normal-range sCr-max for 21 years, **Fig 3**. Plotting sCr over time provided more reliable confirmation than isolated sCr levels.



Fig 3. Adult serum creatinine (ASC) chart, stable for two decades. Patient N, for "normal", was on no relevant medicines. This ASC chart shows a six-year gap in sCr testing but stable maximum sCr (sCr-max) for 21 years.

Note: In ASC charts, sCr levels below the line of sCr-max (see text) represent improved glomerular filtration (e.g., after fluid hydration, volume expansion), varying within a range that may reflect renovascular adaptive capacity. The sCr-max line smooths the limit of apparent minimum glomerular filtration capacity.

Fig 3 (continued). Different markers represent results from various standardized laboratories. Dashed horizontal lines represent sCr limits at 68.6 µmol/L for increased risk of CKD (per Jhee et al [13]), at 110 µmol/L residual function of one kidney and boundary between preCKD and CKD stage G3 , and at 150 µmol/L for residual function of one-half kidney and KDIGO cutoff between CKD stages 3a and 3b. The top margin, at 200 µmol/L, approaches KDIGO CKD stage G4 and recommendation for referral to nephrology. When shown, a blue arrow indicates the sCr result that prompted search for all prior sCr levels. In the lower right, a blue '**x**' represents the eGFR reported with the sCr at that age, the horizontal blue line is the 60 mL/min eGFR boundary between CKD stages 2 and 3, and a blue '+' above that line indicates a reported eGFR of ">60 mL/min" or its equivalent.

2.3.2 High-risk, stepwise progression

Patient 6 was Black and 'muscular' (stable diet and activity for over 15 years). Serum creatinine of 1.4 mg/dL prompted nephrology consultation, and back-referral

concluded, “muscular build…. elevated serum creatinine level — normal renal function…. does NOT have CKD”.

After the sCr at time 0, increases at years 7 and 13 totaled 27.8% rise, **Fig 4**, exceeding the ‘physically active’ sCr-RCV. Urine albumin-creatinine ratio, 16.67 µg/mg Cr, and 24-hour urine protein-creatinine ratio, 98 mg/g Cr, appeared normal, but high urine creatinine (1,905 mg/24 hours) can mask non-nephrotic proteinuria [14], suggesting possible KDIGO CKD stage A2 [15,16]. The preCKD pattern prompted counseling and referral to endocrinology to optimize diabetes care.



Fig 4. High pre-test probability, stepwise progression. Patient 6 had hypertension, discoid lupus, type-2 diabetes mellitus, microproteinuria, and a first-degree relative with kidney failure. Relevant medicines included low-dose aspirin, losartan, and frequent NSAIDs. Adult serum creatinine (ASC) chart showed a six-year gap in sCr testing and a stepwise progression in sCr-max, suggesting two periods of injury, at years 7 and 13. See **Fig 3** for a description of chart axes, reference lines, and construction.

2.3.3 Familial and environmental

Patient 7 was Black. Relevant medicines included NSAIDs. Nephrology consultation suspected genetic nephropathy (Alport syndrome).

Patient 7’s sCr chart showed progressive rise in sCr, **Fig 5**, possibly worsened by NSAID use. Horizontal lines indicate stable sCr-max from 0 to 3 years and from 7 to 8.5 years. The sloped lines indicate increasing sCr, sometimes over prolonged unmonitored intervals, and although these increases were insufficient to trigger referral to nephrology in this patient, they suggest need for guidelines on minimum frequency of sCr sampling.



Fig 5. Familial and environmental factors. Patient 7 had hypertension, congestive heart failure (CHF), microscopic 2+ hematuria, pre-diabetes, and a first-degree relative with kidney failure. Relevant medicines included NSAIDs. Adult serum creatinine (ASC) chart showed a three-year gap in sCr testing and progressive increase in sCr-max. See **Fig 3** for a description of chart axes, reference lines, and construction.

2.3.4 Thiazide holiday

Patient 10 was Asian American-Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, with hypertension. The inciting sCr level (blue arrow) raised concern for significant loss of kidney function. The 24-hour creatinine clearance (CrCl) was 84 mL/min, with no significant proteinuria. The sCr-max rose progressively over 11 years (solid line), **Fig 6**. The drops in sCr during two intervals when thiazide diuretic was stopped for hyponatremia, then resumed for ankle edema or reduced (arrow), suggested thiazide caused the decline in kidney function and potential for trial off thiazides before invoking preCKD or nephrology consultation.



Fig 6. Chlorthalidone holiday. Patient 10 had hypertension. Relevant medicines included thiazide diuretics, losartan, and frequent NSAIDs. Adult serum creatinine (ASC) chart showed a four-year gap in sCr testing and a progressive increase of maximum sCr (sCr-max) over eleven years. Gray zones represent treatment with a thiazide diuretic. The five-month clear zone represents sCr without thiazide bias—off due to hyponatremia, then resumed for ankle swelling. The blue zone indicates imprecise date of resuming thiazide diuretic. See **Fig 3** for a description of chart axes, reference lines, and construction.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Early diagnosis

Detecting early kidney disease remains challenging, but the patient cases suggest earlier diagnosis may be possible using longitudinal sCr, selective nephrology consultation to confirm nascent kidney disease, and appropriate back-referral for ongoing preCKD management.

3.2 Why sCr works in preCKD

3.2.1 Optimal clinical use

A lab test should provide optimal clinical use whether or not it agrees with a highly variable physiologic parameter, such as the measured GFR. For preCKD, sCr is a convenient, stable, and almost ideal endogenous filtration marker and explained virtually all eGFR variability in longitudinal studies [17]. Within-individual change gives superior decision-making for preCKD, versus a measured GFR or a newly modified eGFR, and eliminates the need to tolerate an enormous (±30%) “error”. Of the two reported physiologic limitations to monitoring GFR with creatinine [18], sCr is only affected by tubular secretion of creatinine (TScr), which is acceptably low at preCKD GFRs (see **Section 5. Methods** for detailed justification).

3.2.2 PreCKD urine flow

Urine collection is simpler with adequate urine flows during preCKD. Thus, without the complexities of exogenous mGFRs (see **Section 3.3 eGFR Drawbacks**), a ‘quick CrCl’ may have acceptable performance under certain conditions [19]. Above 60 mL/min, GFR changes can signal marked increase of “augmented renal clearance” [20,21,22], which could mask a decline into preCKD.

3.2.3 Low Index of Individuality

Despite larger between-individual (population) variation, sCr has both low analytical variation (especially with enzymatic assays) and low within-individual variation [23,24]. This low Index of Individuality favors comparison to an individual’s baseline sCr rather than a population reference range [25,26]. This should also be true for laboratory values derived from sCr, including eGFR. Creatinine’s low Index of Individuality undermines one goal of eGFR equations—to offer universal population reference intervals, a goal that remains elusive despite their decades of incremental adjustments.

The problem with population reference intervals is less noticeable after entering CKD stage G3, both because the effects diminish as GFR falls with advancing CKD and these smaller shifts mainly occur under the expert care of nephrologists. However, where early CKD overlaps normal kidney function, false-negative results have major consequences by masking awareness of possible kidney disease.

False-positive results also have consequences. A decision analysis by den Hartog et al concluded that the benefit of eGFR over sCr was reversed with even minimal reduction in quality of life from incorrect diagnosis of CKD [27]. This was due to markedly more false-positive diagnoses of CKD with eGFR than with sCr alone.

3.2.4 Makes ‘race’ and other confounders irrelevant

Within-individual sCr reference makes ‘race’ irrelevant, mitigating one source of disparities in kidney care [28]. Secondary re-analysis of ‘race’ under more equal conditions revealed similar CKD and KF, regardless of ‘race’ [1].

Within-individual sCr reference also minimizes effects of age, sex, and (if stability can be confirmed) individual traits. However, primary clinicians will have to exclude benign changes in sCr, such as those due to acute illness or changes in BMI, meat ingestion [29,30], fasting or dehydration [31], and activity [32]. In athletes, the effect varies by sport and is transient, suggesting that periods of training, competition, and recovery should be assessed separately [33]. Serum creatinine may reflect functional impairment from drug effects, including NSAIDs, thiazides, and even nephroprotective treatment using ACEI/ARB and SGLT2-I classes of drugs that induce a dip in eGFR.

While often touted as superior to sCr, serum cystatin C (sCysC) is affected by inflammation, corticosteroid use, diabetes, age, height, weight, smoking status, concentration of C-reactive protein, and cystatin C gene variants [34,35].

3.3 eGFR drawbacks above 60 mL/min

Comparing CrCl to the measured GFRs (mGFRs) shows why sCr is potentially useful.

Because mGFR has population variation as wide as sCr, with much greater individual physiologic variability compared to the relatively stable sCr and sCysC [23,36], eGFR equations have wide error margins that often overlap the CKD stages. The eGFR equations (Modification of Diet in Renal Disease, CKD Epidemiology Collaboration, others) cannot eliminate this overlap. Consequently, eGFR has poor predictive value at GFRs above 60 mL/min (often misinterpreted as “absence of kidney disease”).

At sCr below 1.0 mg/dL (GFR above 60 mL/min), the inverse of sCr in the calculation amplifies differences between the calculated eGFR and the mGFR, contributing to wide “P30” error margins—percentage of estimates within ±30% of the reference value. An eGFR of 60 could represent an mGFR between 42 and 78 mL/min, with 15% of eGFRs falling outside even that broad range.

Porrini et al examined eGFR equations from the 1950s to the present and identified the mismatch between the eGFR equations and the measured GFR, noting that regardless of the analyte (sCr, sCysC, or Beta Trace Protein), the eGFR equations classify the stage of CKD differently in 30 to 60 percent of patients [37], especially in the preCKD range. Misclassification was shown for potential kidney donors [38]. Even the recently proposed “race-free” eGFR equations classify 29 to 33 percent of patients differently compared to a mGFR [39,40].

Farrance et al showed that uncertainty in eGFR equations is mathematically unavoidable [41], and neither a switch to sCysC nor a panel of tests [42] is likely to remedy them. As Kallner noted, “the larger uncertainty associated with the eGFR will emphasize the sensitivity of S-Creatinine in relation to eGFR” [43].

Although within-individual referencing of eGFRs could suggest early decline in GFR, the accumulated inaccuracies in eGFR make it especially misleading for preCKD regardless of whether a baseline is available. Compared to sCr alone, in the preCKD range, there appears no need to introduce the mathematical errors and uncertainties of

converting sCr to eGFR. Direct, within-individual comparison of sCr by direct analytical measurement is mathematically cleaner, and preferable for preCKD, versus manipulating calculated eGFR "quantity values" that accumulate uncertainties of the equations and their inputs [41].

3.3.1 True GFR

True GFR is a dynamic variable, constantly changing with variation in physiologic factors like blood pressure, sympathetic autonomic activity, and volume status (e.g., volume expansion from intravenous infusion or contraction from "dehydration"). And because compensatory mechanisms blunt the decline in GFR by increasing pressure, perfusion, and filtration in remaining nephrons, even 'true' GFR is not strictly proportional to perhaps the ultimate measure of CKD: the loss of functional nephrons, which cationic ferritin-enhanced MRI (CFE-MRI) might eventually reveal [44,45].

Serum creatinine is produced, sequestered, metabolized, and secreted [46]. The latter two processes are significant at higher levels of sCr, but at steady state, these creatinine processes are balanced. As GFR approaches zero, filtered clearance of creatinine and TScr are critically limited by low urine flow. While the differences may increase analytical errors in CrCl, even greater analytical errors occur in inulin clearance because declining GFR can markedly lengthen collection times for the exogenous filtration markers [47] and increase error in measuring urine volumes at low GFRs.

3.3.2 Gold standard vs reference standard

Because GFR cannot be measured instantaneously or directly, it has no <u>true</u>, 100% sensitive, 100% specific "gold standard" (GS). Lack of a GS precludes having an imperfect GFR reference standard with <u>known</u> diagnostic accuracy. While some regard inulin clearance as a GS, we do not agree for this reason: like CrCl, <u>all</u> the mGFRs are simply clearances of a filtration marker, with the exogenous mGFRs subject to significant additional complexities [18,47,48]. The common assertion that injecting inulin or another filtration marker for mGFR is the GS overlooks unverifiable assumptions in their various methods [49], which cannot be validated. There are also physiologic, within-individual variations that potentially alter GFR (e.g., by expanding volume). Thus exogenous mGFRs are mutually inconsistent [50,51,52,53] and potentially have misclassification errors [54].

Many studies plot mGFR on the X-axis [36] and wrongly attribute all error to creatinine [55,9]. This practice misleads because error must be divided between the two methods and properly put their <u>difference</u> on the Y-axis against their <u>mean</u> on the X-axis because both are sources of error [56,57,58].

For Bland and Altman plots we note influences of urine volume, sCr, and value of the denominator. Even today, collecting data on a time-specific dynamic system like this is challenging, which can show how limited methods could result in systematic problems with interpreting lab tests. More research is needed to understand these relationships in more detail.

3.3.3 Validity and reliability

The validity of clinical measurements is context-dependent, so more important than identifying an unobtainable GS, the focus should be on the context in which obtainable measurements are valid indicators of GFR in CKD patients.

For this reason, we emphasize the importance of examining sCr over time. Even if other measures of mGFR were to have better reliability, and thereby better concurrent validity as an estimate of GFR at a single point of measurement, CKD by definition is longitudinal, so a limitation of interpreting a single measurement would be overcome by interpreting a pattern of results within the same individual.

Furthermore, given the availability of sCr relative to other mGFRs, sCr is a more practical indicator of CKD condition so long as the interpretation is informed by any identified limitations in reliability. As our cases have shown, a valid inference can still be drawn from a pattern of increasing sCr values within the same individual over time. This pattern may already be evident in historical sCr results, which could be stored in personal devices for access during acute care.

As shown in **Fig 7**, limiting our observations to preCKD GFRs in the range above 60 mL/min, creatinine appears at least comparable to inulin and, in many respects, superior to other mGFRs.

Comparative advantages/disadvantages of clearance of filtration markers at GFRs above 60 mL/min							
	Endogenous		Exogenous				
	Creatinine within-individual reference	Cystatin C	Inulin	Iohexol	^{125}I-Iothalamate	^{51}Cr-EDTA	^{99m}Tc-DTPA
Practical for clinical use	Yes	Maybe	No	No	No	No	No
Standardized assay	Yes	No		No			
Cost for marker / assay	None / low	None / $$	Expensive	Expensive assay for low doses	Low for ^{125}I, high if non-radioactive I used		
Market potential	Widely available	$$$	Not available in US			Widely available in EU	Widely available in US
Requires storage, IV hydration, infusion Post-injection distribution and equilibration phases Urine timing depends on distribution assumptions	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Limitations of plasma clearance model	Physiologic	Physiologic	Blood collection times increase to 24 hours or more as renal function declines. Inadequate collection times potentially yield false GFR values 30% to 50% higher				
Tubular secretion or reabsorption	Yes, but fractional tubular secretion is low over the pre-CKD range	Essentially complete reabsorption, so unable to measure renal clearance	No	Possible tubular secretion or protein binding	Probable tubular secretion	Probable tubular reabsorption	No
Tissue buffering, extrarenal elimination (gut/liver)	Yes, but no effect at steady state						Yes
Other non-GFR determinants	Various drugs; Some population variables (diet, muscle mass, etc) but few when monitoring for within-individual changes	Affected by age, height, weight, smoking status, diabetes, inflammation, corticosteroid use, concentration of C-reactive protein, cystatin C gene variants	Difficult to dissolve, glucose interference	Stability at room temperature			
Possible adverse/other effects	None reported, except after kidney failure	May inhibit apotosis (Alz dis., ALS), worsen depression		Iodinated contrast allergy, thyrotoxicosis, kidney failure at high doses			
Radioactive	No	No	No	No	Potentially	Yes	Yes
Stability of calibration reference curve					3.2 hours	28 days	6 hours

No measured GFR is a true GFR—there is no mathematical "gold standard". Urine collection at preCKD urine flow avoids the errors of low urine flow at low GFRs (e.g., incomplete bladder emptying). **ABBREVIATIONS:** ^{51}Cr = chromium-51, ^{99}mTc = techecium-99m, ^{125}I = iodine-125, ALS = amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Alz. dis. = Alzheimer disease, CKD = chronic kidney disease, DTPA = diethethylenetriaminopenta-acetic acid, EDTA = ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid, EU = European Union, GFR = glomerular filtration rate, mL/min = milliliters per minute, US = United States.

Fig 7. Comparative advantages/disadvantages of filtration markers at GFRs above 60 mL/min. Favorable characteristics, at least over the preCKD range, are highlighted in green.

With fractional TScr at most 16% over the preCKD range, screening with creatinine becomes an imperfect reference standard with known diagnostic accuracy. This suggests that the clinical validation may be most appropriate to assess the predictive value of longitudinal changes in sCr [59]. It also suggests that interpretive parameters will be clarified by experience gained over time by validation studies [60] which may appeal to primary care clinicians.

Finally, in addition to clinical validity, Kassirer advocated weighing clinical utility—expense, risks, invasiveness, availability, and practicality for clinical use [61]. At GFRs above 60 mL/min, all favor creatinine.

4. CONCLUSION

At GFRs above 60 mL/min, TScr is low and direct measurement of sCr offers an approach to detect early kidney impairment, which is supported by several of the reports cited here [7,8,68,69]. By tracking within-individual comparisons of longitudinal sCr and evaluating preCKD (to identify and exclude benign causes like changes in diet, medicine effect, muscle mass), primary clinicians may achieve early diagnosis of CKD.

In a non-nephrology specialty practice, an incidental sCr 1.0 mg/dL or higher triggered limited investigations for preCKD. However, our report suggests that monitoring changes from an earlier sCr-max can better highlight changes that may need further clinical investigation. Our report on 12 patients illustrates the concept of interpreting modest changes in sCr relative to sCr-max to detect Pre-CKD earlier. Further research may show an optimal change in sCr for clinical use that may encourage patients to avoid kidney risks.

5. METHODS

5.1 Ethics statement

'Race' in research: We do not present 'race' as an input to clinical decisions, a means of stratifying care, nor to hypothesize genetic difference without data [62].

Human subjects: The data presented in patient cases were obtained for non-research purposes in a direct-treatment relationship that was not considered human subject research. Brown University Health (formerly Lifespan Health System) Human Reseach Protection Program waived ethical approval for this work.

Privacy: Our de-identified cases are not protected health information and require neither patient consent nor review or waiver by a research ethics board [63].

5.2 A standard reference

Shemesh et al used cross-sectional sampling of 171 patients (i.e., population variation, rather than individual variation) to dichotomize a continuous physiologic process and suggest limitations of creatinine as a filtration marker and insensitivity of its population reference interval (often called the "creatinine-blind range") [9]. However, from data in three GFR segments (above 80, 80 to 40, and below 40 mL/min), they recommended "observation of subtle changes in serum creatinine levels" at GFRs above 80 mL/min.

We digitized their Figure 3 (mGFR versus sCr) [9], using Graph Grabber v2.0.2 for Windows 10 (Quintessa, Henley-on-Thames, United Kingdom), and plotted the data as solid circles (●), left Y-axis scale in **Fig 8** (see supporting file **S2_dataset**).



Fig 8. Shemesh et al third figure, graph of sCr versus mGFR. Solid circles (●) represent 171 patients with glomerular disease. Overlaying basic hyperbolic curves offered a reasonable first visual approximation (see text) of the mGFR-sCr relationship: sCr = a/GFR + b, where a = 40 for the dotted curves or 20 and 60 for the solid bracketing curves, and where b = 0.5. An equivalent expression is GFR = a/(sCr – b).

The figure also shows the effect of scale and hyperbola on perception. Open circles (○) represent eighty-eight subjects (51%) with sCr below normal 1.4 mg/dL (124 µmol/L) cutoff on the left Y-axis scale (all the solid circles below the dashed horizontal line). On the right Y-axis scale, the top edge is at 1.4 mg/dL (124 µmol/L), roughly the cutoff for referral to nephrology. Accuracy of serum creatinine (sCr) is compressed at 1.0 mg/dL scale (left, primary Y-axis), giving the appearance of small increases in sCr as glomerular filtration rate (GFR) declines along a hyperbolic curve—lower dotted curve. Significance is better represented in on the right, secondary Y-axis, which has been expanded tenfold, and shifted downward. Vertical lines at 40 and 80 mL/min represent boundaries of the three primary segments.

5.2.1 Improving perception with International Units

In figure 8, to better display sCr sensitivity in the preCKD range, we expanded the scale and re-plotted data from the sCr “normal range” as open circles (○), using the right Y-axis scale (downward-shifted), **Fig 8**.

We suggest that reporting sCr in µmol/L or mg/L units could improve the perception of sCr sensitivity in the Pre-CKD range. Modern automated creatinine assays are accurate to 0.05 mg/dL (about 4 µmol/L) or less, and highly precise methods measure differences of 0.03 to 0.04 mg/dL (about 3 to 4 µmol/L) [64].

Enzymatic methods, standardization by isotope-dilution mass spectrometry (IDMS), and other advances further strengthen the recommendation (by Shemesh et al, 1985 [9]) to observe for subtle changes in sCr. Lee et al found absolute interlaboratory biases to within ±0.11 mg/dl and relatively constant across the range of sCr, with standard deviations smaller at lower than higher sCr concentrations—0.06 for sCr <1.36 mg/dl (<120 µmol/L, the entire preCKD range) versus 0.10 for sCr >1.36 mg/dl. [65]. Enzymatic assays had less bias than Jaffe assays. There were smaller ranges of difference between highest and lowest sCr value for patients with lower sCr values: the mean ±SD for sCr <1.36 mg/dl (<120 µmol/L) was 0.20 ±0.09 mg/dl, and despite susceptibility to interfering substances, absolute differences between Jaffe and enzymatic results for sCr <1.36 mg/dl (<120 µmol/L) were only 0.05 ±0.07 mg/dL higher. Neubig et al studied paired creatinine values (performed adjacent to each other on the same analytical machine) and found that 75% fell within 5% of equivalence, and 95% fell within 10.3% of equivalence [66].

Hyperbolic functions graphed along the X-axis necessarily compact data along the Y-axis to allow plotting all sCr data from 0 to 10 mg/dL (0 to 884 μmol/L) [9], which can appear to show little change in sCr along the Y-axis as GFR declines in the range of 160 to 60 mL/min. However, expanding the Y-axis better matches visual perception to sCr accuracy over the entire preCKD range [67].

The Shemesh et al recommendation that subtle changes in serum creatinine levels can herald changes in GFR [9] was reinforced by subsequent studies correlating small increases in "normal-range" sCr—as little as 0.2 mg/dL (18 μmol/L) compared to the patient's baseline—with decreased mGFR and more adverse outcomes during long-term follow-up [13,68,69].

However, expanding the scale is helpful but insufficient if the sCr upper reference limit is insensitive. For example, of the 171 glomerulopathic patients in Figure 8, 88 (51%) had sCr below the 1.4 mg/dL (124 μmol/L) normal limit, implying Shemesh et al diagnosed them from other signs (e.g., proteinuria) [9]. **Fig 8,** shows these patients as solid circles (●) below the horizontal dashed line, left scale, and open circles (○) on the expanded Y-axis right scale.

5.2.2 Modeling Shemesh et al

We hypothesized that modeling Shemesh et al data as a continuous function could extend their observation of using subtle changes in sCr down to 60 mL/min—the preCKD range.

Curve fitting: To visualize the relationship of sCr to mGFR we overlayed a simple hyperbolic curve (dashed line: $y = m/x + k$, with $m = 40$, $k = 0.5$). We included <u>all</u> datapoints in the statistical analysis but excluded seven extreme values from fitting the continuous curve.

We derived the continuous curve by iteratively **(1)** minimizing the sum of the squared residuals (squaring the difference between each original data point and the corresponding output of the best-fit equation), **(2)** adjusting the 'slope = minus one' confidence box, and **(3)** repeating. The cutoff converged to 6.2 mL/min, well below the 80 mL/min dichotomization, for a best-fit curve of $m = 39.2$, $k = 0.60$.

We hypothesized that a continuous model—the inverse function of kidney filtration and implied sCr and mGFR—would better fit the data and allow interpretation with more precision over the preCKD range. Because the inverse relationship between GFR and sCr amplifies errors in the dependent variable when the independent variable is small, this influenced the statistical analysis when deriving sCr (along the Y-axis) from mGFR (along the X-axis), especially as mGFR neared zero, **Fig 8**. Conversely, calculating preCKD eGFRs from the inverse of small values of sCr (e.g., above 60 mL/min) amplifies analytical and physiological variations of sCr into much larger variance in the eGFR, making eGFR a poor indicator in the preCKD range and favoring use of sCr.

Residuals: We calculated best-fit residuals (the difference between original datapoint and regression curve), graphed them against mGFR, and assessed their distribution around the X-axis for insights. Lack of demographics for individual data points precluded calculating residuals from (or comparing) recent eGFR equations.

The funnel-shaped residuals down to 6.2 mL/min, in **Fig 9**, by appearing equally distributed above and below the X-axis, suggested random errors and random inter-individual baseline differences and reasonable agreement between best-fit curve and data over preCKD GFRs, which supports conceptualizing sCr as continuous across the

80 mL/min dichotomized boundary at least down to 60 mL/min, unifying the entire preCKD range. Nonuniformity (heteroskedasticity) of residuals to the immediate right of 6.2 mL/min may reflect increases in residuals proportional to increases in data values (the hyperbolic function amplifies 30% error bands around each mGFR value, solid black curves), **Fig 9**.



Fig 9. Residuals of Shemesh's measured sCr minus calculated best-fit sCr. Statistical analysis prefers homoskedasticity, but heteroskedasticity can be explained in some cases. Here, the symmetrical, funnel-shaped variation around the X-axis extends from GFRs of 180 down to 6.2 mL/min. The P30 standard of ±30% for GFRs means about 85% of the sCr residual values calculated from mGFR will fall between the upper limit defined by the difference between the calculated GFR and the same calculation substituting (1.3 x mGFR) for mGFR (upper solid black curve) and the lower limit defined by subtracting the calculated sCr with (0.7 x mGFR) substituted for mGFR (lower solid black curve). The dotted black curves represent the limits of sampling error from obtaining data by digitizing figure 3 of Shemesh et al. Though small, that error still becomes significant as mGFR approaches zero. The available data was quite limited (only three data points), but correlating the calculated fractional tubular secretion of creatinine (TScr) over Shemesh's three intervals, suggested 16% above 80 mL/min, 57% from 40 to 80 mL/min, and 92% below 40 mL/min, but the absolute TScr may be more modest.

The optimized function is sCr = 39.2/mGFR + 0.60 mg/dL. At 40 and 80 mL/min, solid vertical lines represent boundaries between GFR segments chosen by Shemesh et al. Dashed vertical lines indicate the confidence range to which the hyperbolic function was optimized. Small measurement errors at the lower end cause large residuals, mathematically overweighting those data points and skewing the fitted function.

Datapoints at extremely low GFRs (i.e., those most affected by combined rising TScr and digitization errors) significantly altered the statistical model equation from our fitted regression curve. Nevertheless, although the actual agreement between the preCKD range of our fitted regression curve is not well demonstrated in the model fit statistics, **Fig 10**, the statistics still favor the simpler continuous hyperbolic (inverse) curve over the dichotomized (grouped) model. Statistical superiority of a continuous over dichotomized approach for a physiologic process is not surprising but is important to validate use of within-individual change for preCKD. Spanaus et al used a similar approach [68].

Model fit statistics			
Model fit statistic	**Grouped**	**Inverse**	**Criterion**
Parameters	**3**	**2**	Smaller is better
-2 log likelihood	1583.17	1569.84	Smaller is better
AIC	1591.17	1575.84	Smaller is better
BIC	1603.67	1585.23	Smaller is better
McFadden's R^2	0.09	0.10	Closer to 1.00
Marginal R^2	0.58	0.63	Closer to 1.00

Fig 10. Model fit statistics. Note: The goal of regression modeling is parsimony—to identify the simplest model that most completely explains the data. The number of parameters represents the number of statistics estimated, with preference given to a model with fewer parameters. The -2 log likelihood estimates the probability of the data given the model, and the AIC and BIC are adjustments to the -2 log likelihood penalizing based on model complexity. A smaller number indicates a better fit of model to data. However, the -2 log likelihood is X^2 distributed and can be used to directly test the comparative fit of two models as the difference of their -2 log likelihood values with degrees of freedom equal to the difference of their degrees of freedom. Here, the inverse model has significantly better model fit (X^2 (1) = 13.33, p = 0.0003). McFadden's R^2 and marginal R^2 both estimate the percentage of variance accounted for by the model from 0.00 (no variance explained) to 1.00 (perfect variance explained). McFadden's R^2 is based on the -2 log likelihood relative to a model which only uses the sample mean to explain the data. Marginal R^2 looks at prediction accuracy, estimated as the correlation between observed GFR scores and predicted GFR scores squared.

5.2.3 Tubular secretion of creatinine

A critical observation is that, while Shemesh et al reported sCr above 80 mL/min was sensitive to changes in GFR, sCr was not sensitive and advised against using sCr alone to monitor GFR in the middle segment, 80 to 40 mL/min. They hypothesized that the slow rise of sCr over the middle segment reflected blunting by increasing compensatory TScr [9], **Fig 11, Left Panel,** also shown graphically, **Fig 11, Right Panel**. However, the primary data was quite limited (only three data points), and the difference between CrCl and InCl could also be interpreted as relatively stable, with increasing ratio due to decreasing GFR in the denominator as rising sCr saturates its membrane transporter, limiting tubular secretion in the numerator—a mathematical artifact.

Shemesh et al, Second Table

"If indeed, inulin clearance represents the true GFR, then the difference between creatinine clearance and inulin clearance should represent the absolute tubular secretion rate of creatinine (TS creatinine), and TS creatinine:inulin clearance is the fraction of cleared creatinine that is secreted", Shemesh et al.

"Effects of graded reduction of GFR on tubular creatinine secretion"

Inulin clearance (*)	"GFR" = InCl (*)	Creatinine clearance (*)	Tubular secretion of creatinine (*)	Fractional TS of creatinine (%)
InCl > 80	113 ± 5	135 ± 7	21 ± 7	16
InCl 40 to 80	60 ± 1	94 ± 4	34 ± 4	57
InCl < 40	22 ± 1	42 ± 2	20 ± 2	92

ABBREVIATIONS: * = milliliters/minute/1.73 meters squared, InCl = inulin clearance, GFR = glomerular filtration rate, TS = tubular secretion. Shemesh O, Golbetz H, Kriss JP, et al. doi: 10.1038/ki.1985.205



Fig 11. Left panel: Because the data is limited (only three data points), tubular secretion of creatinine (TScr) could be viewed as relatively stable as GFR, approximated by inulin clearance (InCl), declines. Increasing fractional TScr (the ratio of TScr to InCl) may be largely due to declining InCl in the denominator. **Right panel:** Displaying the three datapoints graphically suggests the change in TScr over the preCKD range is modest.

We limited our observations to the preCKD range of GFRs to avoid the marked increases in TScr that cause differences between mGFR and CrCl at lower GFRs [9,70], using similar methods to measure both clearances simultaneously. Although they always found CrCl larger than mGFR on simultaneous measurement [71], another reported differences within the range of measurement error on asynchronous measurement (i.e., measuring CrCl before beginning fluid infusion for mGFR) [72], suggesting that intravenous infusions for mGFR perturb steady-state parameters that are not affected in measurements of CrCl.

More importantly, the data suggest TScr does not significantly increase over the preCKD range. The earliest decreases in GFR occur in the upper segment, above 80 mL/min, where fractional TScr averaged only 16%—within modern P30 standards for kidney tests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In memory of Rear Admiral W. Norman Johnson and many others who endured kidney failure after prescribed nephrotoxic drugs that might have been avoided with early warning and caution, and of the Rev. Dr. Canon Cyril C. Burke, Sr, who taught ethics and whose final medical care was complicated by ‘race’.

The authors gratefully acknowledge Edward Feller, MD, FACP, FACG, Ruth Levy Guyer, PhD, and anonymous colleagues for critical review of a draft of this article; and Joseph J. Fins, MD, MACP, FRCP, and John C. Kotelly, PhD, US Air Force mathematician (ret.), for their insights.

REFERENCES

1. Burke CO, Tanzer JR, Toffaletti JG, Burke LM. Re-analyzed *APOL1* kidney data support new ethics of ‘race’. medRxiv doi: 10.1101/2024.09.15.24313684

2. Li PK, Garcia-Garcia G, Lui SF, Andreoli S, Fung WW, Hradsky A, et al; for the World Kidney Day Steering Committee. Kidney Health for Everyone Everywhere - From Prevention to Detection and Equitable Access to Care. Am J Nephrol. 2020;51(4):255-262. doi: 10.1159/000506499. Epub 2020 Mar 11. PMID: 32160623.

3. Niu SF, Wu CK, Chuang NC, Yang YB, Chang TH. Early Chronic Kidney Disease Care Programme delays kidney function deterioration in patients with stage I-IIIa chronic kidney disease: an observational cohort study in Taiwan. BMJ Open. 2021 Jan 19;11(1):e041210. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041210. PMID: 33468527; PMCID: PMC7817788.

4. Tabák AG, Herder C, Rathmann W, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M. Prediabetes: a high-risk state for diabetes development. Lancet. 2012 Jun 16;379(9833):2279-90. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60283-9. Epub 2012 Jun 9. PMID: 22683128; PMCID: PMC3891203.

5. Huang Y, Wang S, Cai X, Mai W, Hu Y, Tang H, et al. Prehypertension and incidence of cardiovascular disease: a meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2013 Aug 2;11:177. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-11-177. PMID: 23915102; PMCID: PMC3750349.

6. Gretz NM. How to assess the rate of progression of chronic renal failure in children? Pediatr Nephrol. 1994 Aug;8(4):499-504. doi: 10.1007/BF00856550. PMID: 7947048.

7. Onuigbo MA, Agbasi N. Diabetic Nephropathy and CKD-Analysis of Individual Patient Serum Creatinine Trajectories: A Forgotten Diagnostic Methodology for Diabetic CKD Prognostication and Prediction. J Clin Med. 2015 Jun 26;4(7):1348-68. Doi: 10.3390/jcm4071348. PMID: 26239680; PMCID: PMC4519794.

8. Graversen HV, Jensen SK, Vestergaard SV, Heide-Jørgensen U, Christiansen CF. Defining Baseline Creatinine for Identification of AKI in Population-Based Laboratory Databases: A Danish Nationwide Cohort Study. Kidney360. 2021 Nov 15;3(2):232-241. doi: 10.34067/KID.0006082021. PMID: 35373126; PMCID: PMC8967652.

9. Shemesh O, Golbetz H, Kriss JP, Myers BD. Limitations of creatinine as a filtration marker in glomerulopathic patients. Kidney Int. 1985 Nov;28(5):830-8. doi: 10.1038/ki.1985.205. PMID: 2418254.

10. Nunes LA, Brenzikofer R, de Macedo DV. Reference change values of blood analytes from physically active subjects. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2010 Sep;110(1):191-8. doi: 10.1007/s00421-010-1493-8. Epub 2010 May 6. PMID: 20446091.

11. Paal M, Habler K, Vogeser M. Estimation of inter-laboratory reference change values from external quality assessment data. Biochem Med (Zagreb). 2021 Oct 15;31(3):030902. doi: 10.11613/BM.2021.030902. Epub 2021 Aug 5. PMID: 34393596; PMCID: PMC8340502.

12. Stevens PE, Levin A; Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes Chronic Kidney Disease Guideline Development Work Group Members. Evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease: synopsis of the kidney disease: improving global outcomes 2012 clinical practice guideline. Ann Intern Med. 2013 Jun 4;158(11):825-30. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-158-11-201306040-00007. PMID: 23732715.

13. Jhee JH, Hwang SD, Song JH, Lee SW. Upper Normal Serum Creatinine Concentrations as a Predictor for Chronic Kidney Disease: Analysis of 14 Years' Korean Genome and Epidemiology Study (KoGES). J Clin Med. 2018 Nov 21;7(11):463. doi: 10.3390/jcm7110463. PMID: 30469454; PMCID: PMC6262490.

14. Mattix HJ, Hsu CY, Shaykevich S, Curhan G. Use of the albumin/creatinine ratio to detect microalbuminuria: implications of sex and race. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2002 Apr;13(4):1034-1039. doi: 10.1681/ASN.V1341034. PMID: 11912263.

15. Roujeau JC, Belghiti D, Hirbec G, Poli F, Sobel AT, Revuz J, et al. Silent lupus nephritis among patients with discoid lupus erythematosus. Acta Derm Venereol. 1984;64(2):160-3. PMID: 6203307.

16. Chedid A, Rossi GM, Peyronel F, Menez S, Atta MG, Bagnasco SM, et al. Low-Level Proteinuria in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. Kidney Int Rep. 2020 Sep 18;5(12):2333-2340. doi: 10.1016/j.ekir.2020.09.007. PMID: 33305127; PMCID: PMC7710831.

17. Delanaye P, Cavalier E, Pottel H. Serum Creatinine: Not So Simple! Nephron. 2017;136(4):302-308. doi: 10.1159/000469669. Epub 2017 Apr 26. PMID: 28441651.

18. Stevens LA, Levey AS. Measured GFR as a confirmatory test for estimated GFR. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2009 Nov;20(11):2305-13. doi: 10.1681/ASN.2009020171. Epub 2009 Oct 15. Erratum in: J Am Soc Nephrol. 2016 Jul;27(7):2216. PMID: 19833901.

19. Herrera-Gutiérrez ME, Seller-Pérez G, Banderas-Bravo E, Muñoz-Bono J, Lebrón-Gallardo M, Fernandez-Ortega JF. Replacement of 24-h creatinine clearance by 2-h creatinine clearance in intensive care unit patients: a single-center study. Intensive Care Med. 2007 Nov;33(11):1900-6. doi: 10.1007/s00134-007-0745-5. Epub 2007 Jul 4. PMID: 17609929.

20. Silva CM, Udy AA, Baptista JP. Urinary Creatinine Clearance and Pharmacokinetics Studies: If We Can Measure It, Why Do We Estimate It? Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2020 Aug 20;64(9):e00980-20. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00980-20. PMID: 32571825; PMCID: PMC7449153.

21. Hefny F, Stuart A, Kung JY, Mahmoud SH. Prevalence and Risk Factors of Augmented Renal Clearance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Pharmaceutics. 2022 Feb 19;14(2):445. doi: 10.3390/pharmaceutics14020445. PMID: 35214177; PMCID: PMC8878755.

22. Dhondt L, Croubels S, De Paepe P, Goethals K, De Cock P, Devreese M. Unraveling the Contribution of Fluid Therapy to the Development of Augmented Renal Clearance in a Piglet Model. Front Pharmacol. 2021 Jan 26;11:607101. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2020.607101. PMID: 33574754; PMCID: PMC7870502.

23. Toffaletti JG, McDonnell EH. Variation of serum creatinine, cystatin C, and creatinine clearance tests in persons with normal renal function. Clin Chim Acta. 2008 Sep;395(1-2):115-9. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2008.05.020. Epub 2008 Jun 3. PMID: 18573244.

24. Selvin E, Juraschek SP, Eckfeldt J, Levey AS, Inker LA, Coresh J. Within-person variability in kidney measures. Am J Kidney Dis. 2013 May;61(5):716-22. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2012.11.048. Epub 2013 Jan 20. PMID: 23337799; PMCID: PMC3628297.

25. Fraser CG. Inherent biological variation and reference values. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2004;42(7):758-64. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2004.128. PMID: 15327011.

26. Fraser C. Estimating GFR: What's wrong with using serum creatinine alone? AACC.org [online]. 2011 January 25 [Cited 2022 April 22]. Available from: https://www.aacc.org/science-and-research/scientific-shorts/2011/estimating-gfr-whats-wrong-with-using-serum-creatinine-alone

27. den Hartog JR, Reese PP, Cizman B, Feldman HI. The costs and benefits of automatic estimated glomerular filtration rate reporting. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2009 Feb;4(2):419-27. doi: 10.2215/CJN.04080808. Epub 2009 Jan 28. PMID: 19176794; PMCID: PMC2637597.

28. Martin T. The color of kidneys. Am J Kidney Dis. 2011 Nov;58(5):xxvii-xxviii. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2011.08.018. PMID: 22014639.

29. Politis MD, Yao M, Gennings C, Tamayo-Ortiz M, Valvi D, Kim-Schulze S, et al. Prenatal Metal Exposures and Associations with Kidney Injury Biomarkers in Children. Toxics. 2022 Nov 16;10(11):692. doi: 10.3390/toxics10110692. PMID: 36422900; PMCID: PMC9699100.

30. Sanders AP, Gennings C, Tamayo-Ortiz M, Mistry S, Pantic I, Martinez M, et al. Prenatal and early childhood critical windows for the association of nephrotoxic metal and metalloid mixtures with kidney function. Environ Int. 2022 Aug;166:107361. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2022.107361. Epub 2022 Jun 27. PMID: 35797845; PMCID: PMC9792626.

31. Barr DB, Wilder LC, Caudill SP, Gonzalez AJ, Needham LL, Pirkle JL. Urinary creatinine concentrations in the U.S. population: implications for urinary biologic monitoring measurements. Environ Health Perspect. 2005 Feb;113(2):192-200. doi: 10.1289/ehp.7337. PMID: 15687057; PMCID: PMC1277864.

32. Fragala MS, Bi C, Chaump M, Kaufman HW, Kroll MH. Associations of aerobic and strength exercise with clinical laboratory test values. PLoS One. 2017 Oct 23;12(10):e0180840. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0180840. PMID: 29059178; PMCID: PMC5653181.

33. Banfi G, Del Fabbro M, Lippi G. Relation between serum creatinine and body mass index in elite athletes of different sport disciplines. Br J Sports Med. 2006 Aug;40(8):675-8; discussion 678. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2006.026658. Epub 2006 May 24. PMID: 16723402; PMCID: PMC2579448.

34. Toffaletti JG. Clarifying the confusion of GFRs, creatinine, and cystatin C. Acute Care Testing [online]. 2018 June [Cited 2022 June 7]. Available from: https://acutecaretesting.org/en/articles/clarifying-the-confusion-of-gfrs-creatinine-and-cystatin-c

35. Lujan HL, DiCarlo SE. The racist "one drop rule" influencing science: it is time to stop teaching "race corrections" in medicine. Adv Physiol Educ. 2021 Sep 1;45(3):644-650. doi: 10.1152/advan.00063.2021. PMID: 34402675.

36. Soveri I, Berg UB, Björk J, Elinder CG, Grubb A, Mejare I, et al; SBU GFR Review Group. Measuring GFR: a systematic review. Am J Kidney Dis. 2014 Sep;64(3):411-24. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2014.04.010. Epub 2014 May 17. PMID: 24840668

37. Porrini E, Ruggenenti P, Luis-Lima S, Carrara F, Jiménez A, de Vries APJ, et al. Estimated GFR: time for a critical appraisal. Nat Rev Nephrol. 2019 Mar;15(3):177-190. doi: 10.1038/s41581-018-0080-9. Erratum in: Nat Rev Nephrol. 2018 Dec 18;: PMID: 30518813.

38. González-Rinne A, Luis-Lima S, Escamilla B, Negrín-Mena N, Ramírez A, Morales A, et al. Impact of errors of creatinine and cystatin C equations in the selection of living kidney donors. Clin Kidney J. 2019 Mar 18;12(5):748-755. doi: 10.1093/ckj/sfz012. Erratum in: Clin Kidney J. 2019 Apr 30;13(5):910. PMID: 31584569; PMCID: PMC6768301.

39. Inker LA, Eneanya ND, Coresh J, Tighiouart H, Wang D, Sang Y, et al; Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration. New Creatinine- and Cystatin C-Based Equations to Estimate GFR without Race. N Engl J Med. 2021 Nov 4;385(19):1737-1749. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2102953. Epub 2021 Sep 23. PMID: 34554658.

40. Delanaye P, Masson I, Maillard N, Pottel H, Mariat C. The New 2021 CKD-EPI Equation Without Race in a European Cohort of Renal Transplanted Patients. Transplantation. 2022 Aug 2:TP.0000000000004234. doi: 10.1097/TP.0000000000004234. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 35915546.

41. Farrance I, Badrick T, Frenkel R. Uncertainty in measurement: A review of the procedures for determining uncertainty in measurement and its use in deriving the biological variation of the estimated

glomerular filtration rate. Pract Lab Med. 2018 Apr 5;12:e00097. doi: 10.1016/j.PLABM.2018.e00097. PMID: 30050968; PMCID: PMC6058083.

42. Inker LA, Couture SJ, Tighiouart H, Abraham AG, Beck GJ, Feldman HI, et al; CKD-EPI GFR Collaborators. A New Panel-Estimated GFR, Including β_2-Microglobulin and β-Trace Protein and Not Including Race, Developed in a Diverse Population. Am J Kidney Dis. 2021 May;77(5):673-683.e1. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2020.11.005. Epub 2020 Dec 7. PMID: 33301877; PMCID: PMC8102017.

43. Kallner A. Estimated GFR. Comparison of five algorithms: implications for drug dosing. J Clin Pathol. 2014 Jul;67(7):609-13. doi: 10.1136/jclinpath-2014-202245. Epub 2014 May 16. PMID: 24839297.

44. Charlton JR, Xu Y, Parvin N, Wu T, Gao F, Baldelomar EJ, et al. Image analysis techniques to map pyramids, pyramid structure, glomerular distribution, and pathology in the intact human kidney from 3-D MRI. Am J Physiol Renal Physiol. 2021 Sep 1;321(3):F293-F304. doi: 10.1152/ajprenal.00130.2021. Epub 2021 Jul 20. PMID: 34282957; PMCID: PMC8530750.

45. Bennett KM, Baldelomar EJ, Morozov D, Chevalier RL, Charlton JR. New imaging tools to measure nephron number *in vivo*: opportunities for developmental nephrology. J Dev Orig Health Dis. 2021 Apr;12(2):179-183. doi: 10.1017/S204017442000001X. Epub 2020 Jan 27. PMID: 31983353; PMCID: PMC8765346.

46. Kalantari K, Bolton WK. A good reason to measure 24-hour urine creatinine excretion, but not to assess kidney function. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2013 Nov;8(11):1847-9. doi: 10.2215/CJN.09770913. Epub 2013 Oct 24. PMID: 24158794; PMCID: PMC3817914.

47. Seegmiller JC, Ebert N. Measuring glomerular filtration rate with iohexol plasma disappearance: blood collection duration is essential for accurate glomerular filtration rate determinations. Kidney Int. 2020 Mar;97(3):616. doi: 10.1016/j.kint.2019.11.034. PMID: 32087892

48. Speeckaert MM, Seegmiller J, Glorieux G, Lameire N, Van Biesen W, Vanholder R, et al. Measured Glomerular Filtration Rate: The Query for a Workable Golden Standard Technique. J Pers Med. 2021 Sep 24;11(10):949. doi: 10.3390/jpm11100949. PMID: 34683089; PMCID: PMC8541429.

49. Boele-Schutte E, Gansevoort RT. Measured GFR: not a gold, but a gold-plated standard. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2017 Apr 1;32(suppl_2):ii180-ii184. doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfw441. PMID: 28158649.

50. Malik SI, Abideen ZU, Alam MF, Khan R, Habib R, Shah SU. Glomerular Filtration Rate Estimation With Commonly Used Methods Among Healthy Live Kidney Donors of South Punjab, Pakistan. Cureus. 2021 Nov 15;13(11):e19588. doi: 10.7759/cureus.19588. PMID: 34956743; PMCID: PMC8675590.

51. Al-Dorzi HM, Alsadhan AA, Almozaini AS, M Alamri A, Tamim H, Sadat M, Al-Swaidan L, Elhassan E, Arabi YM. The Performance of Equations That Estimate Glomerular Filtration Rate against Measured Urinary Creatinine Clearance in Critically Ill Patients. Crit Care Res Pract. 2021 May 18;2021:5520653. doi: 10.1155/2021/5520653. PMID: 34055406; PMCID: PMC8149233.

52. Liu X, Cheng MH, Shi CG, Wang C, Cheng CL, Chen JX, Tang H, Chen ZJ, Ye ZC, Lou TQ. Variability of glomerular filtration rate estimation equations in elderly Chinese patients with chronic kidney disease. Clin Interv Aging. 2012;7:409-15. doi: 10.2147/CIA.S36152. Epub 2012 Oct 11. PMID: 23091374; PMCID: PMC3474145.

53. Seegmiller JC, Burns BE, Schinstock CA, Lieske JC, Larson TS. Discordance Between Iothalamate and Iohexol Urinary Clearances. Am J Kidney Dis. 2016 Jan;67(1):49-55. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.08.020. Epub 2015 Oct 9. PMID: 26454686.

54. Umemneku Chikere CM, Wilson K, Graziadio S, Vale L, Allen AJ. Diagnostic test evaluation methodology: A systematic review of methods employed to evaluate diagnostic tests in the absence of gold standard - An update. PLoS One. 2019 Oct 11;14(10):e0223832. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0223832. PMID: 31603953; PMCID: PMC6788703.

55. Onuigbo MA. The CKD enigma with misleading statistics and myths about CKD, and conflicting ESRD and death rates in the literature: results of a 2008 U.S. population-based cross-sectional CKD outcomes analysis. Ren Fail. 2013;35(3):338-43. doi: 10.3109/0886022X.2013.764272. Epub 2013 Feb 8. PMID: 23391263.

56. Bland JM, Altman DG. Comparing methods of measurement: why plotting difference against standard method is misleading. Lancet. 1995 Oct 21;346(8982):1085-7. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(95)91748-9. PMID: 7564793.

57. Altman DG, Bland JM. Measurement in medicine: the analysis of method comparison studies. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician). 1983 Sep;32(3):307-17. doi: 10.2307/2987937

58. Giavarina D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. Biochem Med (Zagreb). 2015 Jun 5;25(2):141-51. doi: 10.11613/BM.2015.015. PMID: 26110027; PMCID: PMC4470095.

59. Trikalinos TA, Balion CM. Chapter 9: options for summarizing medical test performance in the absence of a “gold standard”. J Gen Intern Med. 2012 Jun;27 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S67-75. doi: 10.1007/s11606-012-2031-7. PMID: 22648677; PMCID: PMC3364362.

60. Reitsma JB, Rutjes AW, Khan KS, Coomarasamy A, Bossuyt PM. A review of solutions for diagnostic accuracy studies with an imperfect or missing reference standard. J Clin Epidemiol. 2009 Aug;62(8):797-806. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.02.005. Epub 2009 May 17. PMID: 19447581.

61. Kassirer JP. Clinical evaluation of kidney function--glomerular function. N Engl J Med. 1971 Aug 12;285(7):385-9. doi: 10.1056/NEJM197108122850706. PMID: 4933769.

62. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Using Population Descriptors in Genetics and Genomics Research: A New Framework for an Evolving Field. Washington, DC: National Academies Press (US), 2023 Mar 14. PMID: 36989389. doi: https://doi.org/10.17226/26902.

63. 45 CFR Part 164 Subpart E. United States Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45 - Public Welfare, Part 164 - Security and Privacy, Subpart E. [Cited 2022 April 3]. Available from: https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-45/part-164/subpart-E

64. Toffaletti JG, Hammett-Stabler CA, Gearhart M, Roy Choudhury K, Handel EA. The analytical change in plasma creatinine that constitutes a biologic/physiologic change. Clin Chim Acta. 2016 Aug 1;459:79-83. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2016.05.008. Epub 2016 May 13. PMID: 27181911.

65. Lee E, Collier CP, White CA. Interlaboratory Variability in Plasma Creatinine Measurement and the Relation with Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate and Chronic Kidney Disease Diagnosis. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2017 Jan 6;12(1):29-37. doi: 10.2215/CJN.05400516. Epub 2016 Nov 8. PMID: 27827312; PMCID: PMC5220660.

66. Neubig S, Grotevendt A, Kallner A, Nauck M, Petersmann A. Analytical robustness of nine common assays: frequency of outliers and extreme differences identified by a large number of duplicate measurements. Biochem Med (Zagreb). 2017 Feb 15;27(1):192-198. doi: 10.11613/BM.2017.021. PMID: 28392740; PMCID: PMC5382864.

67. Toffaletti JG. Relationships and Clinical Utility of Creatinine, Cystatin C, eGFRs, GFRs, and Clearances. J Appl Lab Med. 2017 Nov 1;2(3):413-422. doi: 10.1373/jalm.2017.023713. PMID: 33636846.

68. Spanaus KS, Kollerits B, Ritz E, Hersberger M, Kronenberg F, von Eckardstein A; Mild and Moderate Kidney Disease (MMKD) Study Group. Serum creatinine, cystatin C, and beta-trace protein in diagnostic staging and predicting progression of primary nondiabetic chronic kidney disease. Clin Chem. 2010 May;56(5):740-9. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2009.138826. Epub 2010 Mar 11. PMID: 20224047.

69. Bhavsar NA, Appel LJ, Kusek JW, Contreras G, Bakris G, Coresh J, et al; AASK Study Group. Comparison of measured GFR, serum creatinine, cystatin C, and beta-trace protein to predict ESRD in African Americans with hypertensive CKD. Am J Kidney Dis. 2011 Dec;58(6):886-93. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2011.07.018. Epub 2011 Sep 22. PMID: 21944667; PMCID: PMC3221777.

70. Bauer JH, Brooks CS, Burch RN. Clinical appraisal of creatinine clearance as a measurement of glomerular filtration rate. Am J Kidney Dis. 1982 Nov;2(3):337-46. doi: 10.1016/s0272-6386(82)80091-7. PMID: 7148824.

71. Zhang X, Rule AD, McCulloch CE, Lieske JC, Ku E, Hsu CY. Tubular secretion of creatinine and kidney function: an observational study. BMC Nephrol. 2020 Mar 30;21(1):108. doi: 10.1186/s12882-020-01736-6. PMID: 32228497; PMCID: PMC7104490.

72. Zhang X, McCulloch CE, Lin F, Lin YC, Allen IE, Bansal N, et al. Measurement Error as Alternative Explanation for the Observation that CrCl/GFR Ratio is Higher at Lower GFR. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2016 Sep 7;11(9):1574-81. doi: 10.2215/CJN.12821215. Epub 2016 Aug 3. PMID: 27489301; PMCID: PMC5012489.