TITLE PAGE

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

Authors:
Cyril O. Burke III[1*], Leanne M. Burke[2], Joshua Ray Tanzer[3]

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

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

[3] 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)

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES

Primary care for chronic kidney disease (CKD) stage 1-2 has recently been shown to slow CKD progression. We describe an approach to detect early decline in glomerular filtration rate (GFR) above 60 milliliters per minute (mL/min), before CKD stage 3.

METHODS

We re-examined a standard reference that found low tubular secretion of creatinine (TScr) at GFRs above 80 mL/min and suggested "…observation of subtle changes in serum creatinine levels". We explain why that method extends down to 60 mL/min and summarize why estimated GFR (eGFR) is unreliable above 60 mL/min.

RESULTS

Four patient cases show how serum creatinine (sCr) referenced to an individual's historical maximum suggests increased risk, triggering investigation to separate benign processes that alter sCr from decline in GFR of prechronic kidney disease (preCKD).

CONCLUSIONS

At GFRs above 60 mL/min, serial creatinine is more reliable than GFR estimating equations and appears practical for 'race-free' clinical monitoring and early intervention.



STRENGTHS OF THIS STUDY

1. Includes serial creatinine proof-of-concept cases that show preCKD
2. Reviews 'race-free' 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 CKD stage 1-2

1. INTRODUCTION

Note: Our two research articles include this proof-of-concept study of 'race-free' diagnosis of early kidney disease and a re-analysis of APOL1-kidney-disease studies that demonstrate equal kidney outcomes, regardless of 'race' [1].

An estimated 90% of adults with CKD remain undiagnosed [2,3] because current practice relies on estimates of GFR that have mathematical limitations at GFRs above 60 mL/min, precluding diagnosis of CKD stage 1-2 without a non-creatinine biomarker (e.g., proteinuria). GFR indicates CKD when halved to 60 mL/min (equivalent to functional loss of one kidney) and recommend nephrology evaluation when halved again to 30 mL/min (equivalent to functional loss of 1.5 kidneys).

Niu et al showed that simple clinical practices (including renal function monitoring by CKD case managers, who provided nursing and lifestyle education and facilitated communication with doctors and families) slowed progression of CKD stage 1–3a [4].

Our data re-analysis of a study in veterans with high-risk vs low-risk *APOL1* genotypes showed that, after study "enrollment", progression to CKD was equal across the *APOL1* risk groups, suggesting beneficial effects of monitoring, patient awareness, and lifestyle changes (see 11th figure of our associated article [1]).

Despite a three times higher rate of kidney failure (KF), Black people were once purported to have less CKD stage 1-2 and offered less early intervention and counseling, which could explain different CKD associations with socioeconomic

measures. Using ‘race-free’ eGFR equations, Grobman et al showed that Black people have higher prevalence at all stages of CKD and that

> …higher income, having insurance, and higher education were associated with a lower prevalence of CKD among White adults but not among Black adults….
>
> …when separated into albuminuria/stage 1-2 CKD and stage 3-5 CKD, … this discordant association was largely limited to albuminuria/stage 1-2 CKD [5].

These studies suggest that early diagnosis for targeted, disease-specific, CKD-specialized nursing care can reduce CKD progression in primary care practices.

PreCKD is primary care

Primary care clinicians manage GFRs down to 30 mL/min [6,7,8] because CKD exceeds the availability of nephrology specialists [9]. Because early stages of CKD occur in the primary care patient population, primary care research is essential for early detection of CKD and for studying interventions to reduce CKD progression.

Because the sCr ‘normal range’ (reference interval or population variation) is much broader than any person’s usual within-individual variation, detecting early CKD without a non-creatinine marker (e.g., proteinuria) is challenging. We present a method to detect GFR decline at the top of the primary care range—above 60 mL/min—where sCr is within its reference interval and eGFR is unreliable.

Tracking within-individual change of sCr increases detection of acute kidney injury (AKI) [10,11,12], correlates with CKD progression [13,14], and can reveal ‘preCKD’. PreCKD is like prediabetes [15] and prehypertension [16], but because serum glucose and blood pressure have smaller between-individual variations, those conditions do not require within-individual comparison.

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 [17]. Re-analysis of their data (see **Section 5.2**) validated extension of their recommendation down to 60 mL/min for use of creatinine over the entire preCKD range.

2.1.1 Definitions

Maximum creatinine—sCr-max: Charting sCr levels over time (from first known sCr) 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 maximum sCr (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 variability within and between laboratories less critical—sCr-max simply rises a little higher to encompass 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 [18]. A between-laboratory RCV was reported [19], 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, by defining sCr-max as a reference point, a change >sCr-RCV allows charting sCr to reveal preCKD.

PreCKD: In **Fig 1**, we divided guidelines [20] for GFRs between 120 and 60 mL/min into three subgroups: **1)** stable 'normal' function (above 90 mL/min, not shown); **2)** CKD stages G1 (>90 mL/min) and G2 (90-60 mL/min) with other identifying abnormalities (e.g., 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.

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*	**Pre-CKD**	Counseling and patient engagement
				CKD G2*		
60	**1 kidney**	**1.2**	**110**			
45	**¾ kidney**	**1.7**	**150**	CKD G3a		Primary care
				CKD G3b		
30	**½ kidney**	**2.3**	**200**			
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. The sCr boundary values are rough approximations (due to marked population variation between individuals) but show that seemingly small increases in sCr can signal significant decline in GFR and loss of kidney function.

Fig 1 highlights the significance of small changes in sCr (using approximated sCr boundaries based on the fitted curve in **Section 5.2.2** and rough error margins). However, these example thresholds, derived from population data, lack specificity for individual care due to broad population variation, especially in the preCKD range. Observing within-individual sCr-max for change that exceeds sCr-RCV offers individually actionable sCr limits for clinical use.

2.2 Selection of cases

From August 2019 to November 2021, in a non-nephrology specialty practice, we prospectively identified and collected historical laboratory data on patients with sCr ≥1.0

mg/dL and without diagnosed kidney disease. We included a “normal” patient (Patient N) for comparison. All had primary care providers and Medicare or private health insurance. Consulted nephrologists were unaware of the pattern of historical serial sCr levels collected at the time, which were analyzed later when defining the adult serum creatinine (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 11 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

	Relevant kidney-related history, diagnoses, 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											
							1.21 **107**	7	3.0	0.57 **50**	1.21 **107**	0.95 **84**	0.75 **66**	**61%**	<6.0 mg/dL (24hr collection)	n/a	Pre-CKD	Possible thiazide effect. Counseled to avoid NSAIDs. Lost to follow up.
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 the referral due to COVID-19 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											
							1.27 **112**	11	3.6	1.0 **88**	1.46 **129**	1.43 **126**	1.1 **97**	**33%**	albumin <12 mg/L (random urine)	"CKD 3a--could be genetic (Alport's)"	CKD 3a	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration. **Nephrology following.**
6	Black	34.1	Yes	Yes	Discoid lupus, first-degree relative with kidney failure	Hydrochlorothiazide, losartan, aspirin, NSAIDs	See ASC Chart: Patient 6											
							1.4 **124**	15	6.1	1.0 **88**	1.4 **124**	1.36 **120**	1.1 **97**	**27%**	98 mg (24hr collection)	"...does NOT have CKD"	Pre-CKD	Counseled to avoid NSAIDs and dehydration. Lost to follow up.
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	21	6.4	0.6 **53**	0.8 **73**	0.8 **73**	0.8 **71**	**0.0%**		n/a		

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, 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.

Median availability of sCr data was 11.6 years (mean 12.8, range 4.4 to 21.0 years), see supporting **S1_dataset**. The higher of two earliest sCr values served as baseline sCr-max for calculating future sCr-max and changes in sCr. In **Fig 2**, four White patients (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** met preCKD criteria, with relative change from 19% to 66%, but highest sCr only 1.16 to 1.2 mg/dL.

Six patients had sCr ≥1.4 mg/dL. Of three White patients (mean age 75.3), two were referred to nephrology: **Patient 3** had gout dependent on nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs); **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).

Three Black patients (mean age 66.7) were referred to nephrology: **Patient 2** was diagnosed with “polycystic kidney disease” (sCr range: 1.08-1.54 mg/dL, relative change 2.7%—urine protein 215 mg/24hr, renal cysts by computed tomography); **Patients 6 and 7** are described below, in **Section 2.3**.

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 Longitudinal creatinine

As examples, we present charts for three of the 11 patients with sCr ≥1.0 mg/dL and one “normal” patient, with stable sCr <1.0 mg/dL. The ASC charts show four dashed horizontal guidelines: the lowest at 68.9 µmol/L (best sensitivity and specificity for increased CKD risk in men [21]) and three spaced at 40 µmol/L intervals—not meant as absolute boundaries (due to wide population variation) but approximating lost kidney function from small changes in sCr.

2.3.1 Stable for decades

Patient N (“normal”) was White, on no relevant medicines, with stable diet, muscle mass, physical activity, and normal-range sCr-max for 21 years, **Fig 3**. Plotting sCr over time provided more reliable confirmation than isolated sCr levels.



Fig 3. Stable for two decades. Patient N (“normal”). This adult serum creatinine (ASC) chart shows a six-year gap in sCr testing but stable maximum sCr (sCr-max) for 21 years. **Note:** The sCr levels below the line of sCr-max represent improved glomerular filtration (e.g., after hydration), varying within a range that may reflect renovascular adaptive capacity. The sCr-max line smooths the limit of apparent minimum glomerular filtration capacity.

2.3.2 High-risk, stepwise progression

Patient 6 was Black, ‘muscular’, with stable diet and activity for 15 years. Serum creatinine of 1.4 mg/dL prompted nephrology consultation. Back-referral concluded, “muscular build…. elevated serum creatinine level — normal renal function…. does NOT have CKD”.

Relative to sCr at time zero, increases at years 7 and 13 totaled 27.8%, **Fig 4**, exceeding ‘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 [22], suggesting possible CKD stage A2 [23,24]. The preCKD pattern prompted counseling and referral to endocrinology to optimize diabetes care.



Fig 4. High pre-test probability, stepwise progression. Patient 6. The ASC chart shows a six-year gap in sCr testing and stepwise progression in sCr-max, suggesting two periods of injury, at years 7 and 13. See **Fig 3** for an explanation of ASC chart construction.

2.3.3 Familial and environmental

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

The sCr chart showed progressive rise in sCr of 33%, **Fig 5**, possibly worsened by NSAID use. Horizontal lines indicate stable sCr-max from 0 to 3 years and 7 to 8.5 years. Sloped lines indicate increasing sCr-max (i.e., without intervening measurements), sometimes over prolonged intervals, suggesting the need for guidelines on minimum frequency of sCr sampling.



Fig 5. Familial and environmental factors. Patient 7. The ASC chart shows a three-year gap in sCr testing and progressive increase in sCr-max. See **Fig 3** for an explanation of ASC chart construction.

2.3.4 Thiazide holiday

Patient 10 was Asian American-Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, with hypertension. The inciting sCr level (blue arrow) suggested significant loss of kidney function. The 24-hour creatinine clearance (CrCl) was 84 mL/min, without 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 altered kidney function and potential for trial off thiazides before invoking preCKD or nephrology consultation.



Fig 6. Chlorthalidone holiday. Patient 10. The ASC chart shows a four-year gap in sCr testing and a progressive increase of 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. The blue zone indicates imprecise date of resuming thiazide diuretic for ankle swelling. See **Fig 3** for an explanation of ASC chart construction.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Early diagnosis

The patient cases show early diagnosis using within-individual referencing of longitudinal sCr.

3.2 Why sCr works in preCKD

3.2.1 Optimal clinical use

Lab tests should provide optimal clinical use, regardless of agreement with highly variable physiologic parameters, like measured GFR (mGFR). For preCKD, sCr is a convenient, stable, and almost ideal endogenous filtration marker that explained virtually all eGFR variability in longitudinal studies [25]. Within-individual change gives superior decision-making for preCKD, versus a mGFR or a newly modified eGFR, eliminating the need to tolerate an enormous (±30%) “error”. Of two physiologic limitations to monitoring GFR with creatinine [26], sCr is affected by tubular secretion of creatinine (TScr), which is acceptably low at preCKD GFRs (see **Section 5.2** for detailed justification).

3.2.2 PreCKD urine flow

Urine collection is simpler at preCKD urine flows. Without the complexities of exogenous filtration markers (see **Section 3.3**), ‘quick CrCl’ may have acceptable performance under some conditions [27]. Above 60 mL/min, GFR changes can signal marked increase of “augmented renal clearance” [28,29,30], which could mask a decline into preCKD.

3.2.3 Low Index of Individuality

Despite larger population variation (between individuals), sCr has both low analytical variation and low within-individual variation [31,32]. Its low Index of Individuality favors comparison to an individual’s baseline sCr rather than a population reference range [33,34], which should also be true for values derived from sCr, including eGFR. Creatinine’s low Index of Individuality undermines one goal of eGFR equations—to offer universal population reference intervals, which remains elusive despite 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 due to markedly more false-positive diagnoses of CKD with eGFR than with sCr alone [35].

3.2.4 Makes ‘race’ and other confounders irrelevant

Within-individual sCr reference makes ‘race’ irrelevant, mitigating one source of disparities in kidney care [36] and setting research expectations for similar rates of 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. Primary clinicians must exclude non-renal influences on sCr, including acute illness; changes in activity [37], BMI, meat ingestion [38,39], fasting, or dehydration [40]; and drug effects from NSAIDs, thiazides, and even nephroprotective treatment using ACEI/ARB and SGLT2-I classes. In athletes, the sCr effect varies by sport and is transient, suggesting that periods of training, competition, and recovery should be assessed separately [41].

Although 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 [42,43].

3.3 eGFR drawbacks above 60 mL/min

Comparing CrCl to the 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 [31,44], 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 (i.e., percentage of estimates within ±30% of the reference value). A currently acceptable P30 of 85% means that 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 eGFR and mGFR: <u>regardless of the analyte</u> (sCr, sCysC, Beta Trace Protein), eGFR classifies the stage of CKD differently in 30 to 60 percent of patients [45], especially for preCKD. Similar misclassification was shown for potential kidney donors [46] and recent “race-free” eGFRs [47,48].

Farrance et al showed uncertainty in eGFR is mathematically unavoidable [49]—neither a switch to sCysC nor a panel of tests [50] is likely to remedy them. Kallner noted, “the larger uncertainty associated with the eGFR will emphasize the sensitivity of S-Creatinine in relation to eGFR” [51].

Although within-individual referencing of eGFRs could suggest early decline in GFR, accumulated inaccuracies in eGFR make it especially misleading for preCKD, even when 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 [49].

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”). 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: loss of functional nephrons, which cationic ferritin-enhanced MRI (CFE-MRI) might eventually reveal [52,53].

3.3.2 Gold standard vs reference standard

Because GFR cannot be measured instantaneously or directly, it has no true, 100% sensitive, 100% specific “gold standard” (GS). Lack of a GS precludes having an imperfect GFR reference standard with known diagnostic accuracy. While some regard inulin clearance as a GS, we do not agree for this reason: like CrCl, all the mGFRs are simply clearances of a filtration marker, with the exogenous mGFRs subject to significant additional complexities [26,77,54]. The common assertion that injecting inulin or another filtration marker for mGFR is the GS overlooks unverifiable assumptions in their various methods [55], 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 [56,57,58,59] and have misclassification errors [60].

Limiting observations to preCKD range, creatinine appears at least comparable to inulin and superior to other filtration markers, **Fig 7**.

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	^{99m}Tc-DTPA	^{51}Cr-EDTA
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 US	Widely available in EU
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	No	Probable tubular reabsorption
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	6 hours	28 days

Favorable characteristics are highlighted in green. There is no mathematical “gold standard” GFR, and no measured GFR is a true GFR. Urine collection at preCKD urine flow avoids the errors of low urine flow at low GFRs (e.g., incomplete bladder emptying). **ABBREVIATIONS: 51Cr = chromium-51, 99mTc = 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, especially at GFRs above 60 mL/min. Favorable characteristics are highlighted in green.

Bland-Altman plots of two “field-methods” properly put their difference on the Y-axis against their mean on the X-axis when both are sources of error [61,62]. Plotting a true GS on the Bland-Altman X-axis makes sense [63], but studies often plot mGFR on the

X-axis [44], wrongly attributing all error to creatinine [64,65,55,17]. Bland-Altman plots demonstrate challenges in properly interpreting numeric information that has limits on the values it can assume. Cross sectional data are not equipped to represent this dynamic system. We noted influences of urine volume, sCr, and value of the denominator, which could explain these patterns of relationships. Even today, collecting data on time-specific dynamic systems like this would be challenging. We offer this as an explanation of how limited methods could result in systematic problems with interpreting lab tests, but 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 another mGFR had better reliability and 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 show, 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.

With fractional TScr 16% over the preCKD range, screening with creatinine is an imperfect reference standard with known diagnostic accuracy. This suggests that clinical validation may be most appropriate to assess the predictive value of longitudinal changes in sCr [66]. It also suggests that interpretive parameters will be clarified with experience gained over time by validation studies [67], 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 [68]. At preCKD GFRs, all favor creatinine.

4. CONCLUSION

At GFRs above 60 mL/min, TScr is low and direct measurement of sCr offers a ‘race-free’ approach to detect early kidney impairment.

Our 12 patients illustrate interpretation of modest changes in sCr relative to sCr-max for earlier, ‘race-free’ warning of potential preCKD. By tracking within-individual comparisons of longitudinal maximum sCr and Reference Change Value, and excluding benign causes like 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. Further research may show an optimal

change in sCr for clinical use and whether monitoring changes from a youthful sCr-max will allow earlier preventive measures that 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 [69].

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 required neither patient consent nor review or waiver by a research ethics board [70].

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") [17]. 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 third figure (mGFR versus sCr) [17], 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, sCr versus mGFR. The effect of scale and hyperbola on perception. Solid circles (●) represent 171 patients with glomerular disease, eighty-eight (51%) below the "normal" cutoff—dashed horizontal line at sCr 1.4 mg/dL (124 μmol/L) on the left Y-axis scale. Open circles (○) represent the same patients below the same "normal" cutoff at the top edge on the right Y-axis scale. Overlaying basic hyperbolic curves offered a first visual approximation of the mGFR-sCr relationship. Vertical lines represent boundaries of the three GFR segments.

5.2.1 Improving perception with International Units

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**.

Reporting sCr in µmol/L or mg/L units could improve the perception of sCr sensitivity in the preCKD range, but the rough cutoffs alone, in **Fig 1**, may be enough to raise clinician awareness of the implications of small changes in sCr. 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) [71].

Enzymatic methods, standardization by isotope-dilution mass spectrometry (IDMS), and other advances further strengthen the recommendation to observe for subtle changes in sCr [17]. 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. [72]. 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 [73].

Hyperbolic functions graphed to zero along the X-axis necessarily compact data along the Y-axis, as Shemesh et al did when plotting all sCr data from 0 to 10 mg/dL (0 to 884 µmol/L) [17]. That compression can suggest little change in sCr along the Y-axis at higher GFRs, above 60 mL/min. However, expanding the Y-axis better matches visual perception to sCr accuracy over the entire preCKD range [74].

The Shemesh et al recommendation that subtle changes in sCr levels can herald changes in GFR [17] 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 [13,14,21] .

However, expanding the scale is helpful but insufficient if the sCr upper reference limit is insensitive. For example, of the 171 glomerulopathic patients in **Fig 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) [17]. **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—that the inverse function of kidney filtration and implied sCr and mGFR would better fit their data and allow interpretation with more precision over the preCKD range.

Curve fitting: We included <u>all</u> datapoints in the statistical analysis but to model the relationship of sCr to mGFR, we excluded seven extreme values from fitting the regression curve.

First, we visually fitted a simple hyperbola (dashed line): $y = m/x + k$, with $m = 40$, $k = 0.5$. We derived the regression curve by **1)** defining a one-sided confidence box (lower limit at 'slope = minus one'), **2)** minimizing the sum of squared residuals (squaring the difference between each original data point and corresponding output of best-fit equation), and **3)** repeating till the cutoff converged to 6.2 mL/min, well below the 80 mL/min dichotomization, for a best-fit curve of $m = 39.2$, $k = 0.60$.

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 analytic and physiologic 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, **Fig 9**. Lack of demographics for individual data points precluded calculating residuals from (or comparing) recent eGFR equations.



Fig 9. Residuals of Shemesh's measured sCr minus calculated best-fit sCr. The symmetrical, funnel-shaped variation around the X-axis extends from GFRs of 180 down to the dashed vertical line, indicating the lower limit of the one-sided confidence box—6.2 mL/min—to which the hyperbolic function converged. Dotted black curves represent the limits of sampling error from obtaining data by digitizing figure of Shemesh et al. Large residuals from even small measurement errors at the lower end skewed the statistics (note the Y-axis discontinuity).

Funnel-shaped residuals down to 6.2 mL/min, **Fig 9**, appear equally distributed above and below the X-axis, suggesting random errors, random inter-individual baseline differences, and reasonable agreement between best-fit curve and data over preCKD GFRs. This pattern 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).

We used maximum likelihood estimation, which represents the most probable numeric solution for a proposed model, to compare the accuracy of understanding the data either as three segmented groups (sCr below 1.36, between 1.37 and 2.36, or above 2.37 mg/dL—the sample sCr maxima for each GFR segment proposed by Shemesh et al [17]) or as the more conventional continuous inverse function. Although our clinical focus was on GFRs above 60 mL/min, statistical comparison required including the entire mGFR range and all 170 datapoints (one mGFR-sCr pair was not a datapoint because the inverse of zero is mathematically undefined).

Note the marked discontinuity in the Y-axis scale to accommodate three extreme residuals most affected by digitization error at extremely low GFRs. Including these datapoints significantly altered the statistical model equation from our fitted regression curve. Close agreement of fitted and statistical model equations over the preCKD range is not well demonstrated in the model fit statistics, **Fig 10**, that still favor the simpler continuous (inverse/hyperbolic) curve over the dichotomized (grouped) model. Segmenting and dichotomizing continuous measurements [75] introduces ambiguity that confounds dichotomized eGFRs (broken into ranges by arbitrary limits), wherein a slight change in eGFR can mean the difference between CKD and 'not CKD'.

Our model of continuous function, with each segment equally 'hyperbolic', supports incremental comparison to the patient's baseline. This result is not surprising for a physiologic process but is important to validate use of within-individual change for preCKD. Spanaus et al used a similar approach [13].

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. The goal of regression modeling is 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

Serum creatinine is produced, sequestered, metabolized, and excreted [76]. At steady state, these processes are balanced. Production should be stable on clinical confirmation of stable muscle mass [76]. Sequestration and metabolism may be significant in late CKD, when sCr levels are higher, but are insignificant in steady state or preCKD. Excretion includes renal elimination (glomerular filtration plus tubular secretion) and gastrointestinal elimination (insignificant in preCKD).

TScr equals renal elimination (approximated by CrCl) minus glomerular filtration (approximated by mGFR), but the result is limited by combined analytical errors of CrCl and mGFR. Unlike eGFR inaccuracies that are greatest in preCKD, some mGFR inaccuracies worsen in late CKD as declining GFR markedly lengthens collection times of the exogenous filtration markers [77].

In contrast to sCr sensitivity to GFR changes above 80 mL/min, Shemesh et al advised against using sCr alone to monitor GFR in the middle and lower segments: 80 to 40 and below 40 mL/min. They hypothesized that a slow rise of sCr over the middle segment reflected blunting by an accelerating compensatory rise in TScr [17], **Fig 11, Left Panel,** also shown graphically, **Fig 11, Right Panel**. However, the primary data were 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 and competing molecules saturate 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 preCKD GFRs to avoid the marked increase, at lower GFRs, in TScr approximated from the difference between CrCl and mGFR when measuring both simultaneously [17,78,79]. However, that difference was within the range of measurement error on asynchronous (sequential) measurement (i.e., measuring CrCl before beginning fluid infusion for mGFR) [80], suggesting that intravenous infusions for mGFR may perturb steady-state parameters that are not affected in isolated measurements of CrCl.

Discoveries since 1985 may improve TScr approximation. Cimetidine and other drugs (e.g., trimethoprim, probenecid, cobicistat) inhibit creatinine membrane transporters in renal and extrarenal tissues [81,82,83]. Red blood cells sequester enough creatinine in CKD to alter sCr [84,85], with membrane transport that is saturable and susceptible to competitive and noncompetitive inhibition [86]. Further research might show how non-steady-state sCr [87] affects TScr.

More important for prevention, 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. Our re-analysis shows TScr does not significantly increase over the preCKD range.

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.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASC = adult serum creatinine, CKD = chronic kidney disease, CrCl = creatinine clearance, eGFR = estimated GFR, GFR = glomerular filtration rate, 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.

Competing Interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Funding

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

KEYWORDS

Chronic Kidney Disease; CKD; Creatinine; Estimated GFR; Glomerular Filtration Rate; GFR; PreChronic Kidney Disease; PreCKD; Race; Racial disparity.

REFERENCES

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

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Chronic Kidney Disease in the United States, 2021. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

2021 [cited 2021 December 31]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/kidneydisease/publications-resources/ckd-national-facts.html

3. Chu CD, Chen MH, McCulloch CE, Powe NR, Estrella MM, Shlipak MG, et al. Patient Awareness of CKD: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Patient-Oriented Questions and Study Setting. Kidney Med. 2021 Jun 1;3(4):576-585.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.xkme.2021.03.014. PMID: 34401725; PMCID: PMC8350814.

4. 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.

5. Grobman B, Turkson-Ocran RA, Zhang M, Juraschek SP. Socioeconomic Status and Chronic Kidney Disease Among Black and White Adults: An Analysis of 2017-2020 NHANES. Kidney Med. 2025 Jun 16;7(8):101045. doi: 10.1016/j.xkme.2025.101045. PMID: 40740719; PMCID: PMC12309949.

6. Chen TK, Knicely DH, Grams ME. Chronic Kidney Disease Diagnosis and Management: A Review. JAMA. 2019 Oct 1;322(13):1294-1304. Doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.14745. PMID: 31573641; PMCID: PMC7015670.

7. Ellner AL, Phillips RS. The Coming Primary Care Revolution. J Gen Intern Med. 2017 Apr;32(4):380-386. doi: 10.1007/s11606-016-3944-3. Epub 2017 Feb 27. PMID: 28243869; PMCID: PMC5377886.

8. McCleery E, Christensen V, Peterson K, Humphrey L, Helfand M. Evidence Brief: The Quality of Care Provided by Advanced Practice Nurses. 2014 Sep. In: VA Evidence Synthesis Program Evidence Briefs [Internet]. Washington (DC): Department of Veterans Affairs (US); 2011–. PMID: 27606392.

9. Vassalotti JA, Centor R, Turner BJ, Greer RC, Choi M, Sequist TD; National Kidney Foundation Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative. Practical Approach to Detection and Management of Chronic Kidney Disease for the Primary Care Clinician. Am J Med. 2016 Feb;129(2):153-162.e7. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.08.025. Epub 2015 Sep 25. PMID: 26391748.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. 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.

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. 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

35. 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.

36. 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.

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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.

42. 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

43. 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.

44. 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

45. 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.

46. 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.

47. 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.

48. 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.

49. 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.

50. 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.

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. 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.

55. 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.

56. 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.

57. 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.

58. 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.

59. 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.

60. 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.

61. 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

62. 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.

63. Krouwer JS. Why Bland-Altman plots should use X, not (Y+X)/2 when X is a reference method. Stat Med. 2008 Feb 28;27(5):778-80. doi: 10.1002/sim.3086. PMID: 17907247.

64. 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.

65. 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.

66. 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.

67. 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.

68. 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.

69. 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.

70. 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

71. 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.

72. 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.

73. 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.

74. 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.

75. Naggara O, Raymond J, Guilbert F, Roy D, Weill A, Altman DG. Analysis by categorizing or dichotomizing continuous variables is inadvisable: an example from the natural history of unruptured aneurysms. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2011 Mar;32(3):437-40. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A2425. Epub 2011 Feb 17. PMID: 21330400; PMCID: PMC8013096.

76. 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.

77. 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

78. 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.

79. 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.

80. 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.

81. Samodelov SL, Kullak-Ublick GA, Gai Z, Visentin M. Organic Cation Transporters in Human Physiology, Pharmacology, and Toxicology. Int J Mol Sci. 2020 Oct 24;21(21):7890. doi: 10.3390/ijms21217890. PMID: 33114309; PMCID: PMC7660683.

82. Lepist EI, Zhang X, Hao J, Huang J, Kosaka A, Birkus G, et al. Contribution of the organic anion transporter OAT2 to the renal active tubular secretion of creatinine and mechanism for serum creatinine elevations caused by cobicistat. Kidney Int. 2014 Aug;86(2):350-7. doi: 10.1038/ki.2014.66. Epub 2014 Mar 19. PMID: 24646860; PMCID: PMC4120670.

83. Ciarimboli G, Lancaster CS, Schlatter E, Franke RM, Sprowl JA, Pavenstädt H, et al. Proximal tubular secretion of creatinine by organic cation transporter OCT2 in cancer patients. Clin Cancer Res. 2012 Feb 15;18(4):1101-8. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-2503. Epub 2012 Jan 5. PMID: 22223530; PMCID: PMC3288323.

84. Tanaka A, Takahashi Y, Mizokuchi M, Shimada N, Koide H. Plasma, urinary, and erythrocyte concentrations of guanidino compounds in patients with chronic renal failure. Ren Fail. 1999 Sep;21(5):499-514. doi: 10.3109/08860229909045190. PMID: 10516995.

85. Shepherd J, Warner MH, Kilpatrick ES. Stability of creatinine with delayed separation of whole blood and implications for eGFR. Ann Clin Biochem. 2007 Jul;44(Pt 4):384-7. doi: 10.1258/000456307780945660. PMID: 17594786.

86. Sager G, Smaglyukova N, Fuskevaag OM. The role of OAT2 (SLC22A7) in the cyclic nucleotide biokinetics of human erythrocytes. J Cell Physiol. 2018 Aug;233(8):5972-5980. doi: 10.1002/jcp.26409. Epub 2018 Feb 27. PMID: 29244191; PMCID: PMC5947735.

87. Niemantsverdriet MSA, Pieters TT, Hoefer IE, Verhaar MC, Joles JA, van Solinge WW, et al. GFR estimation is complicated by a high incidence of non-steady-state serum creatinine concentrations at the emergency department. PLoS One. 2021 Dec 29;16(12):e0261977. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0261977. PMID: 34965267; PMCID: PMC8716053.