Article title: Chronic Kidney Disease: Current Scenario of diagnosis and treatment in India: CKD: diagnosis and treatment in India

Authors: Bhavya V[1]

Affiliations: 74/2, The university of trans-disciplinary health sciences and technology[1]

Orcid ids: 0000-0002-9212-139X[1]

Contact e-mail: bhavya.v@tdu.edu.in

License information: This work has been published open access under Creative Commons Attribution License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Conditions, terms of use and publishing policy can be found at <https://www.scienceopen.com/>.

Preprint statement: This article is a preprint and has not been peer-reviewed, under consideration and submitted to ScienceOpen Preprints for open peer review.

DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-.PPTUJXI.v1

Preprint first posted online: 20 August 2021

Keywords: Chronic Kidney Disease, Burden of treatment, Diagnostic markers, Limitation of treatment

Chronic Kidney Disease: Current Scenario of diagnosis and treatment in India

Bhavya Vijay^{*1}

^{*1} Senior Research Fellow, The University of Trans-Disciplinary Health Sciences and Technology, Bangalore, India.

Abstract

Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) is one of the most burdensome disease with high mortality rate globally. Even though there are diagnostically accepted markers for the detection of CKD, the unreliability of the non-specific marker is a lacuna in the clinical world for an early prognosis and prevention of this chronic disease. Further, the economically challenging conventional treatment options available currently are a burden for many low-income countries to overcome this disease. This article discusses the current treatment scenario for CKD, and limitations of the diagnostic and treatment options available for CKD.

Introduction

Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) is an important cause of morbidity and mortality globally(1,2). The global burden data from 2013 estimated that CKD caused almost a million deaths. This is one of the largest rises among the top causes of death from 1990(2,3). Constant efforts have been undertaken to improve the solution in kidney care(4,5). Considering the morbidity and mortality of this fatal condition(6,7), this article attempts to highlight the burden of CKD in India, the current diagnostics and treatment in detailed sections.

Current diagnostic markers in CKD and its limitations

Serum creatinine

Current diagnostic marker used in clinic for assessment of CKD is through Serum Creatinine (sCr), Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and Proteinuria, where, change in sCr is the core parameter for CKD diagnosis(8,9). But, the measurement of creatinine from blood is prone to errors such as interference, insensitivity and imprecision(10). Primarily, serum creatinine is not a disease specific marker and varies with many conditions such as muscle mass, muscle composition, protein content in the diet, drugs in the diet, etc. which result in imprecision of GFR calculation. Also, it has no correlation with co morbidities observed in CKD(10). Further, the association of muscle mass with creatinine may result in similar sCr values for individuals with different GFR, which in turn results in false positive CKD diagnosis. Additionally, at least approximately 50% of GFR has to be lost before clinically detectable sCr elevation is observed beyond the normal limit(11). By this time the disease has already progressed to third stage. This is due to inverse relation of GFR and sCr, which predicts that large reduction of GFR in

a person results in only small increase in sCr and thus results in normal range despite substantial kidney functional deterioration(12,13).

Cystatin C

Cystatin C is a non-glycosylated protein which is completely metabolized in tubular cells. Presence of Cys C in urine and serum is an indicative of kidney damage(14). However, this marker is influenced by factors such as thyroid disease, liver disease, smoking, age, weight, and CRP etc. which adversely indicated kidney damage. Cystatin C is also an inflammatory marker which can predict kidney damage better than sCr but is not an independent kidney damage marker(14,15).

Inulin

Recent studies have identified various biomarkers for early detection of CKD(16–18). One of the exogenous gold standard marker used to assess GFR is inulin(19,20). Inulin is an exogenous filtration marker which needs to be infused for its detection from urine and blood multiple times, which is a tiring and a cumbersome process. Another most recent kidney marker is iohexol which is injected and its clearance range from kidney is measured using HPLC methods. However, due to the complexity of detection, this marker is not diagnostically used(12).

Proteinuria markers

Markers such as proteinuria, albuminuria are also used as supporting markers with sCr and Cys C(9). Urine contains traces of proteins. Persistent increase of proteins in urine is a sign of kidney damage and an increase in the ratio of albumin to creatinine is an indicative of kidney dysfunction. However, these markers do not contribute individually to kidney dysfunction and are not optimal for early detection. Blood Urea Nitrogen (BUN) is also assessed for kidney function but BUN varies independent of GFR as well based on diet and thus is not used as a marker(12).

Other clinically used markers

B2-microglobulin is sensitive than Cys C and is elevated in kidney dysfunction, also with other conditions like infections, autoimmune disorders. B2-M is superior than Cys C as a marker for GFR assessment(21). But a lack of further research on this marker limited its use in clinical diagnosis. In the current diagnostic setting, sCr and Cys C are used as endogenous markers for GFR calculations despite the limitations with measurements like diet, muscle mass, diabetes, etc. using predictive equations(22–24).

Limitation of existing markers in CKD diagnosis

The accuracy of GFR changes with the values of sCr and Cys C is limited and this causes a barrier for early detection of CKD much sooner than GFR is deteriorated drastically(25). Additionally, the biomarkers are not validated in Asian phenotypes, whose diet and lifestyle is different from western system(26). Assessment of ethnicity specific-biomarkers will provide better understanding on the diet and lifestyle impact on renal function(27). There is a need to validate diagnostically effective markers of renal function which can help in early prognosis and prevention of kidney deterioration towards CKD.

Current Scenario of CKD treatment

In terms of CKD treatment, the conventional approach of CKD management patients are advised to make changes to their diet like low protein diet restricted fluid intake, advice on diet to balance electrolytes etc(28–30). Despite this, if kidney function is deranged as determined by serum creatinine, ultimately dialysis and renal transplantation are the only solution but associated with immense financial burden(31–34). Also there are complications of dialysis that include thrombosis, infection, ischemic steal syndrome, aneurysms, venous hypertension, hematomas, heart failure, and prolonged bleeding and result in frequent interventions and increased morbidity and mortality(35,36). Moreover, these interventions are not only expensive, but also technically demanding(37). As they require specialized surgical expertise, it is a challenge to make them available to all affected persons. In addition, severe shortage in the number of suitable kidney donors has been a major cause of huge waiting periods, also hampering the quality of life of the patient(38–40).

Conclusion

For persons living in low and middle-income countries including India, CRRT efficacy and safety are inadequate from multiple viewpoints namely information resources, material resources, time and money. An unprecedented rise in cases of hypertension, diabetes and other diseases that increase CKD risk has contributed significantly to the increase in CKD prevalence 62. Even in early CKD stages, the fatal as well as not-fatal risk of cardiovascular events directly attributable to kidney disease is substantially high 63. This puts an enormous pressure on health care resources. Therefore, exploration of a kidney-specific diagnostic marker and a safe, non-invasive alternative therapy helpful in reducing the requirement of frequent dialysis and / or in postponing the renal transplantation can be a welcome change for the patients.

References:

1. Vos T, Barber RM, Bell B, Bertozzi-Villa A, Biryukov S, Bolliger I, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 301 acute and chronic diseases and injuries in 188 countries, 1990-2013: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet*. 2015;
2. Naghavi M, Wang H, Lozano R, Davis A, Liang X, Zhou M, et al. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet*. 2015;
3. Ene-Iordache B, Perico N, Bikbov B, Carminati S, Remuzzi A, Perna A, et al. Chronic kidney disease and cardiovascular risk in six regions of the world (ISN-KDDC): A cross-sectional study. *Lancet Glob Heal*. 2016;
4. Levin A, Stevens PE, Bilous RW, Coresh J, De Francisco ALM, De Jong PE, et al. Kidney disease: Improving global outcomes (KDIGO) CKD work group. KDIGO 2012 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease. *Kidney International Supplements*. 2013.

- 118 5. Bharati J, Jha V, Levin A. The Global Kidney Health Atlas: Burden and Opportunities
119 to Improve Kidney Health Worldwide. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2021;
- 120 6. Carney EF. The impact of chronic kidney disease on global health. *Nature Reviews*
121 *Nephrology.* 2020.
- 122 7. Chapter 3: Morbidity and Mortality in Patients with CKD. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2019;
- 123 8. Davies R. The metabolomic quest for a biomarker in chronic kidney disease. *Clinical*
124 *Kidney Journal.* 2018.
- 125 9. Johnson CA, Levey AS, Coresh J, Levin A, Lau J, Eknoyan G. Clinical practice
126 guidelines for chronic kidney disease in adults: Part II. Glomerular filtration rate,
127 proteinuria, and other markers. *Am Fam Physician.* 2004;
- 128 10. Delanaye P, Cavalier E, Pottel H. Serum Creatinine: Not so Simple! *Nephron.* 2017.
- 129 11. Waikar SS, Bonventre J V. Creatinine kinetics and the definition of acute kidney
130 injury. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2009;
- 131 12. Lopez-Giacoman S. Biomarkers in chronic kidney disease, from kidney function to
132 kidney damage. *World J Nephrol.* 2015;
- 133 13. Nordin F, Shaharir SS, Abdul Wahab A, Mustafar R, Abdul Gafor AH, Mohamed Said
134 MS, et al. Serum and urine interleukin-17A levels as biomarkers of disease activity in
135 systemic lupus erythematosus. *Int J Rheum Dis.* 2019;
- 136 14. Curhan G. Cystatin C: A marker of renal function or something more? *Clinical*
137 *Chemistry.* 2005.
- 138 15. Benoit SW, Ciccia EA, Devarajan P. Cystatin C as a biomarker of chronic kidney
139 disease: latest developments. *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics.* 2020.
- 140 16. Tonelli M, Dickinson JA. Early Detection of CKD: Implications for Low-Income,
141 Middle-Income, and High-Income Countries. *Journal of the American Society of*
142 *Nephrology.* 2020.
- 143 17. Liu KZ, Tian G, Ko ACT, Geissler M, Brassard D, Veres T. Detection of renal
144 biomarkers in chronic kidney disease using microfluidics: progress, challenges and
145 opportunities. *Biomed Microdevices.* 2020;
- 146 18. Bello AK, Nwankwo E, El Nahas AM. Prevention of chronic kidney disease: A global
147 challenge. *Kidney Int Suppl.* 2005;
- 148 19. Delanaye P, Rule AD. Assessing Kidney Function. In: *Chronic Renal Disease.* 2015.
- 149 20. Lai S, Mazzaferro S, Muscaritoli M, Mastroluca D, Testorio M, Perrotta A, et al.
150 Prebiotic therapy with inulin associated with low protein diet in chronic kidney disease
151 patients: Evaluation of nutritional, cardiovascular and psychocognitive parameters.
152 *Toxins (Basel).* 2020;
- 153 21. Argyropoulos CP, Chen SS, Ng YH, Roumelioti ME, Shaffi K, Singh PP, et al.
154 Rediscovering Beta-2 microglobulin as a biomarker across the spectrum of kidney
155 diseases. *Frontiers in Medicine.* 2017.
- 156 22. Scarr D, Bjornstad P, Lovblom LE, Lovshin JA, Boulet G, Lytvyn Y, et al. Estimating
157 GFR by Serum Creatinine, Cystatin C, and β 2-Microglobulin in Older Adults: Results

158 From the Canadian Study of Longevity in Type 1 Diabetes. *Kidney Int Reports*. 2019;

159 23. Shah B V., Patel ZM. Role of low protein diet in management of different stages of
160 chronic kidney disease - Practical aspects. *BMC Nephrology*. 2016.

161 24. Wang M, Chou J, Chang Y, Lau WL, Reddy U, Rhee CM, et al. The role of low
162 protein diet in ameliorating proteinuria and deferring dialysis initiation: What is old
163 and what is new. *Panminerva Medica*. 2017.

164 25. Wasung ME, Chawla LS, Madero M. Biomarkers of renal function, which and when?
165 *Clinica Chimica Acta*. 2015.

166 26. Kumar V, Yadav AK, Yasuda Y, Horio M, Kumar V, Sahni N, et al. Existing
167 creatinine-based equations overestimate glomerular filtration rate in Indians. *BMC*
168 *Nephrol*. 2018;

169 27. Kurniawan AL, Hsu CY, Rau HH, Lin LY, Chao JCJ. Association of kidney function-
170 related dietary pattern, weight status, and cardiovascular risk factors with severity of
171 impaired kidney function in middle-aged and older adults with chronic kidney disease:
172 a cross-sectional population study. *Nutr J*. 2019;

173 28. Metzger M, Yuan WL, Haymann JP, Flamant M, Houillier P, Thervet E, et al.
174 Association of a Low-Protein Diet With Slower Progression of CKD. *Kidney Int*
175 *Reports*. 2018;

176 29. Maxia S, Loi V, Capizzi I, Piccoli GB, Cabiddu G, Pani A. Compliance, illiteracy and
177 low-protein diet: Multiple challenges in CKD and a case of self-empowerment. *BMC*
178 *Nephrol*. 2016;

179 30. Garneata L, Stancu A, Dragomir D, Stefan G, Mircescu G. Ketoanalogue-
180 supplemented vegetarian very low-protein diet and CKD progression. *J Am Soc*
181 *Nephrol*. 2016;

182 31. Klarenbach SW, Tonelli M, Chui B, Manns BJ. Economic evaluation of dialysis
183 therapies. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*. 2014.

184 32. Klarenbach S, Manns B. Economic Evaluation of Dialysis Therapies. *Semin Nephrol*.
185 2009;

186 33. Axelrod DA. Economic and financial outcomes in transplantation: Whose dime is it
187 anyway? *Current Opinion in Organ Transplantation*. 2013.

188 34. Illés A, Bugán A, Kovács S, Ladányi E, Szegedi J, József B, et al. Patient Attitudes
189 Toward Transplantation as Preferred Treatment Modality in Different Stages of Renal
190 Disease. *Transplant Proc*. 2017;

191 35. Lazarus JM. Complications in hemodialysis: An overview. *Kidney Int*. 1980;

192 36. Terrill B. Acute complications of haemodialysis. In: *Renal Nursing*. 2020.

193 37. Kiberd BA, Tennankore KK. Lifetime risks of kidney donation: A medical decision
194 analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2017;

195 38. Gozdowska J, Zatorski M, Torchalla P, Białek, Bojanowska A, Tomaszek A, et al.
196 Living-Donor Versus Deceased-Donor Kidney Transplantation: Comparison of
197 Psychosocial Consequences for Recipients. *Transplant Proc*. 2016;

- 198 39. Clemens K, Boudville N, Dew MA, Geddes C, Gill JS, Jassal V, et al. The long-term
199 quality of life of living kidney donors: A multicenter cohort study. Am J Transplant.
200 2011;
- 201 40. Lam NN, Garg AX. Acceptability of older adults as living kidney donors. Current
202 Opinion in Nephrology and Hypertension. 2016.
- 203
- 204