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**Predicting risk of recurrent acute kidney injury: a systematic review**

**Abstract**

**Background:** Although the epidemiology of acute kidney injury (AKI) has been well described, less is known about recurrent AKI (r-AKI). We undertook a systematic review to identify incidence, risk factors, and outcomes of r-AKI.

**Methods:** Medline, Embase, CINAHL, Cochrane, Web of Science were searched, from inception to December 2017, for quantitative studies on adults with AKI, where follow-up included reporting of r-AKI. Two reviewers independently identified studies and assessed study quality.

**Summary:** From 2824 citations, 10 cohort studies met inclusion criteria (total patients n=538,667). There were 2 distinct set of studies; Four studies assessed r-AKI within the same hospital admission (most were intensive care unit (ICU) patients) and six studies assessed post-discharge r-AKI. The median percentage of people developing r-AKI within the same hospital admission was 23.4% (IQR: 20.3% - 27.2%) and post-discharge r-AKI was 31.3% (IQR: 26.4% - 33.7%). A higher Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) score was associated with increased risk of r-AKI within the same hospital admission in ICU patients. Cardiovascular disease and AKI severity were associated with increased risk of post-discharge r-AKI. R-AKI (within same admission and post-discharge) was associated with worse survival. It was not possible to pool results due to methodological differences across studies, such as varying definitions for AKI and r-AKI, varying length of follow up and effect measures.

**Key messages:** More representative population based studies with robust assessment of predictors and consensus definition of r-AKI are needed to identify risk factors and develop risk stratification tools to reduce recurrence and improve outcomes.

*Systematic Review Registration:* CRD42017082668.

Abstract word count: 252.

Main body word count: 3076

**Introduction**

Acute kidney injury (AKI) is common and associated with poor clinical outcomes, including increased risk of development and progression of chronic kidney disease (CKD), and mortality1-3. The incidence of AKI has been well described, particularly for AKI acquired in hospital, but less is known about which factors contribute to adverse outcomes for people with AKI, particularly recurrence of AKI (r-AKI). Recent studies have shown that many AKI survivors, including those with complete recovery, may experience further AKI episodes and that each recurrent AKI episode further increases the risk of developing advanced CKD and mortality4-6. These findings suggest that strategies aimed at prevention of r-AKI may help improve long-term outcomes of AKI survivors. Preventing r-AKI is an important component of reducing AKI incidence and associated deaths, in line with the aims of the International Society of Nephrology 0by25 initiative7.

Previous studies of r-AKI have reported varying rates and risk factors for r-AKI, likely due to the different populations and factors being studied, as well as differences in study sample size and length of follow up. For example, some studies have reported no significant predictors for r-AKI8-9, while other studies have indicated patient and clinical factors (such as older age, diabetes, volume depletion) predict r-AKI5-6. In order to improve understanding of incidence and predictors, this study reviews the current evidence on risk and outcomes of r-AKI.

**Materials and Methods**

A systematic review of quantitative studies was undertaken in accordance with Cochrane Systematic Reviews and the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination recommendations10 and we have reported our findings according to PRISMA reporting guidelines11,12.

The study protocol was registered a priori with PROSPERO (PROSPERO 2017 CRD42017082668). Ethical approval was not required for this study as there was no patient-identifiable data.

*Search strategy*

The databases Ovid Medline, Ovid Embase, Ebsco CINAHL, Cochrane and Web of Science were searched from inception to December 2017 using a combination of search terms for AKI (acute renal failure, acute kidney injury, acute renal insufficiency), recurrence (recurrence, repeat, re-occur), and prognosis (prognosis, predict, course). Search strategies for each database are available in Appendix 1. Reference lists of relevant studies and review articles, conference proceedings, websites of kidney organisations (such as ERA-EDTA, British Renal Society, Kidney Research UK, The Renal Association) were also searched. We also conducted citation-tracking and additional searches through Google®. Searches were limited to studies on adult humans, published in the English language, and consisting of at least 100 study participants. Authors of identified studies were contacted and asked for clarification where necessary.

*Study selection*

Two reviewers (HH, SF) independently screened the titles and abstracts of all identified studies using a priori selection criteria. Both reviewers independently assessed full text of potentially relevant studies and determined eligibility. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion, though a third reviewer (PR) was available for adjudication if needed.

Quantitative studies were included if they described an adult population with AKI acquired in any setting (hospital or community) where follow-up included reporting of r-AKI. We excluded studies with a small sample size (less than 100 people) in order to exclude case series, qualitative studies and very small cohorts with potential for high risk of bias13. Studies conducted on children and case reports (consisting of less than 3 cases) were also excluded.

*Data extraction and risk of bias assessment*

One reviewer (HH) extracted information from the included studies into tables (developed a priori), with confirmation by a second reviewer (SF). Study characteristics extracted from eligible papers were: author name, year of publication, study location, study aims, study design, study population details (sample size, population), outcomes, results and conclusions.

Two reviewers independently assessed risk of bias using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale14 since all included studies were observational studies rather than intervention studies. This scale has been designed for observational studies and is recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration10,14. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale uses a star system (with a maximum of nine stars) to evaluate 3 domains: selection, comparability and outcome bias. Selection bias refers to the representativeness of the exposed cohort, selection of the non-exposed cohort, ascertainment of exposure and outcome, demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study. Comparability bias refers to adjustment for potential covariates (e.g.; age, comorbidities), and outcome bias refers to assessment of outcome, length and adequacy of follow up. Each item was classified as at high, low, or unclear risk of bias and overall level of bias for each study was achieved by adding the number of stars in each domain. Following the Newcastle Ottawa scale methods, good quality was defined as scoring 3-4 stars in the selection domain, 1-2 stars in comparability domain, and 2-3 stars in the outcome domain. Fair quality was defined as 2 stars in the selection domain, 1-2 stars in the comparability domain, and 2-3 stars in outcome domain. Poor quality was defined as 0-1 star in the selection domain, 0 stars in the comparability domain, and 0-1 star in the outcome domain.

*Data synthesis and statistical analyses*

Studies were grouped according to whether they assessed r-AKI within the same hospital admission or recurrence post-discharge. Within each group, incidence across different clinical settings was reported. Heterogeneity across studies in each group was assessed using the I2 statistic (tested by Higgins I-squared test). Substantial statistical heterogeneity was considered to be present if the I² statistic was > 50% 10. A narrative synthesis approach was taken for studies that were considered too clinically heterogeneous to pool. Where data were considered statistically and clinically homogenous, a pooled proportion (and 95% confidence interval) of the incidence of r-AKI in each clinical group was estimated. Forest plots displaying incidence with the corresponding 95% CIs for each study were generated. A weighted random-effects model was used to pool incidence rates.

Risk factors from included studies in each group were summarised descriptively. Meta-analyses of pooled odds ratios from studies that provided adjusted odds ratios for potential risk factors was considered if studies proved to be sufficiently homogeneous. Outcomes from included studies in each group were summarised descriptively.

**Results**

Figure 1 presents a flow chart of the systematic review process. The searches identified 2,824 references. After screening titles and abstracts, 22 studies were selected for full text review. Of these studies, 10 were excluded as they did not meet inclusion criteria. Of the 12 eligible studies, 1 full paper and 2 abstracts were based on the same study population, and full text was not available for 1 study, resulting in 9 unique studies. One conference abstract and 1 additional paper (based on the same study cohort) were identified through citation tracking and Google® searches. The final inclusion consisted of 10 unique studies (n=538,667 patients).

Table 1 presents the characteristics of each included study. Studies were published between 2004 and 2018. Six studies were in a US population, 2 in a Spanish population and 1 each in Canada and the UK. Each was a cohort study (7 retrospective and 3 prospective). Six studies examined general hospitalised (acute, emergency, elective admissions) patients (including 1 that focused on diabetic patients and 1 that focused on patients with severe sepsis), 3 studies examined general ICU patients, and 1 study focused on patients undergoing percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI: including elective, emergent, urgent, or salvage). Sample size of studies ranged from 170 to 453,475 (median: 2,353; IQR: 370.5 - 15,646.8) patients. Ascertainment of AKI and r-AKI were obtained through medical records15-16, healthcare databases4,5,9,17, regional administration database6,18, or national data registries19. Studies used varying definitions of AKI, based on serum creatinine: RIFLE6,9,16, KDIGO5,15 or AKIN criteria4,18-20. There were 2 distinct set of studies; some studies assessed recurrence within the same hospital admission only (n=4) and some studies assessed post discharge recurrence up to 10 years (n=6).

*Quality assessment*

Based on the Newcastle-Ottawa scale, 6 of the 10 studies were rated overall good quality (6-8 stars)4-6,18-19, 3 studies were deemed fair quality (5-6 stars)16,17,20 and 1 study was rated poor quality (0-5 stars, with 0 stars in the comparability domain)9. Table 1A presents quality assessment domains for each study. Studies rated fair or good quality accounted for 99.6% (82,186/82,482) of the total AKI population across studies. Length of follow up varied across studies (median 227.5 days; IQR: 74.5 – 512.8 days for studies on r-AKI within same admission; median 3.5 years; IQR: 1.5 – 4 years for studies on r-AKI post-discharge). Most of the studies rated good quality assessed independent effect of factors such as sex, age, and comorbidities (for example, diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease) and AKI severity. Most studies did not include any statement on loss to follow up.

*Incidence, predictors, and consequences of r-AKI*

The total population of people with AKI in studies assessing r-AKI within the same admission was 35,943, of whom 8,712 (24%) had r-AKI. There was considerable heterogeneity across studies (I2=96.9%, p<0.01). Figure 2a shows the percentage of people with r-AKI within the same hospital admission. Three out of 4 studies assessing r-AKI within the same hospital admission were in an ICU population. The remaining study focused on transient hospital-acquired AKI patients who recovered and then subsequently developed hospital-acquired AKI. The median percentage of people developing r-AKI within the same admission was 23.4% (25th, 75th percentile: 20.3%, 27.2%).

The total population of people with AKI in studies assessing post-discharge AKI was 52,786, of whom 8,732 (17%) had r-AKI. There was considerable heterogeneity across studies (I2=89.2%, p<0.01). Figure 2b shows the percentage of people with r-AKI post-discharge. The median percentage of people developing r-AKI post-discharge (median follow up: 3.5 years) was 31.3% (25th, 75th percentile: 26.4%, 33.7%). Incidence of r-AKI post-discharge was lowest for patients undergoing PCI (13%, follow up: 1 year) and highest for general hospitalised patients (median: 33.0%, 25th, 75th percentile: 29.6%, 34.0%, median follow up: 3 years).

Risk factors for r-AKI varied across studies. Table 2 presents risk factors evaluated in at least 2 studies. A table showing the full list of risk factors assessed in all of the studies is available in the Appendix (Table 2A). Most studies used multivariable models to evaluate independent effects of each factor. Studies on r-AKI within the same admission that assessed common factors reported that a higher APACHE score (indicating greater severity of disease) was associated with increased risk of r-AKI. There were mixed findings on association of age, AKI severity, and diabetes with r-AKI for this group. One study each identified that black race, lower baseline eGFR, and higher creatinine were associated with increased risk of r-AKI within the same hospital admission.

Studies on post-discharge r-AKI reported that cardiac disease and AKI severity were associated with recurrence post-discharge. Siew et al., (2016) divided cardiac disease into coronary artery disease, congestive heart failure, and acute coronary syndrome. All were significantly associated with r-AKI, though hazard ratios varied. There were mixed findings for diabetes as a risk factor for r-AKI across studies that assessed r-AKI post-discharge. One study each found lower baseline eGFR, higher creatinine, increasing albuminuria, advanced liver disease, malignancy, volume depletion (independent of degree of index AKI severity), nephrology follow up care, and post PCI care were associated with post-discharge r-AKI.

Of the studies on r-AKI within the same admission, 2 studies assessed short term mortality (28 and 90 days) and 2 assessed 1 year mortality. R-AKI within the same hospital admission was associated with longer inpatient stay and worse short (28 day) and longer term survival5,9,15,19. R-AKI post-discharge was associated with higher risk of development of CKD, CKD progression, cardiovascular events and long-term mortality4,6,17,20.

*Quantitative data synthesis*

It was not possible to pool results on risk factors due to heterogeneity across studies. Studies used different populations and evaluated different risk factors. Few studies reported effect estimates and those that did used different effect measures (odds ratios vs hazard ratios). Length of follow up also varied across the studies assessing post-discharge r-AKI.

**Discussion**

This systematic review identified that r-AKI, both within the same hospital admission (largely on high-risk ICU patients) and post-discharge, was common. It is likely that the overall population incidence of r-AKI is higher than observed here, as these studies focused on patients admitted to hospital and did not capture people with r-AKI in the community who are not admitted to hospital. A higher APACHE score was associated with increased risk of recurrence within the same hospital admission and AKI severity and cardiovascular disease were associated with increased risk of recurrence post-discharge. Only 1 study considered heart failure as a separate entity6. Smaller studies reported no significant predictors for AKI recurrence, likely due to insufficient statistical power. Both r-AKI within an admission and post-discharge was associated with poorer outcomes.

There was incomplete evidence on risk factors for recurrence as individual studies were based on different populations and assessed different risk factors. In addition to that, studies had varying definitions of r-AKI, both in terms of context (r-AKI within same hospital admission versus post-discharge) and how recurrence was measured (index creatinine compared to most recent creatinine post recovery from prior AKI episode vs admission creatinine at r-AKI hospital admission vs 2 fold increase in creatinine within 48 hours). The inconsistency in how r-AKI was measured may have resulted in biased estimates of rates of recurrence as well as biased associations of risk factors with r-AKI. An international consensus on the definition of r-AKI is needed to allow more accurate estimates to be achieved and allow direct comparison across studies. Some studies that assessed r-AKI within the same hospital admission had a short follow up period that may not have been sufficient to observe r-AKI, and studies on r-AKI post-discharge had varying lengths of follow up. More studies that assess post-discharge r-AKI (with similar length of follow up) and examine associations of r-AKI with quality of care and health system factors are needed to better understand these findings and how and to what extent risk of r-AKI may be prevented. Only 2 of the post-discharge r-AKI studies considered the severity of index AKI. Future studies should assess AKI severity as AKI severity has been found to be a strong predictor of AKI outcomes21. Finally, no studies were identified that assessed r-AKI in a community setting – an area that needs exploring as a significant proportion of AKI in the population is not admitted community-acquired22. It is likely the AKI in hospital studies includes both community-acquired and hospital-acquired AKI, but studies did not distinguish between the two. There is a need for population based studies that include all new incident AKI, particularly community-acquired-AKI, in order to understand potentially modifiable factors in the community such as infection, medication, and fluid management. Finally, more work is needed to better understand the heterogeneous AKI population and characteristics (such as older age, more advanced CKD) of patient groups who develop r-AKI causing hospital admission and worse prognosis.

*Strength and limitations*

The meta-analysis pooled data from 86,180 AKI patients to estimate proportions of people with r-AKI. Most of the data were from large population-based or multi-centre studies, therefore allowing results to be generalizable and less prone to selection bias. Statistical heterogeneity between studies was high, which may be expected as studies differed in their inclusion criteria, duration of follow up, ascertainment method, definition of r-AKI.

A limitation was the varying definitions of AKI and r-AKI (Table 1a and 1b), which made it difficult to pool findings across all studies. Terminology for recurrence also varied across studies. Furthermore, 4 of the 10 studies did not describe patient attrition and 1 study that reported high attrition did not report whether characteristics differed for those lost and not lost to follow up. A key limitation was that many studies did not report effect measures of risk factors on r-AKI and studies that did report used different effect measures. Some risk factors were assessed in only 1 study, which prevented inclusion into meta-analyses of risk factors for r-AKI. Due to these reasons, as well as high heterogeneity across studies, it was not possible to perform meta-analysis of risk factors for r-AKI. A further limitation was not all studies excluded dialysis (ESRD) patients, which may have resulted in over ascertainment of AKI, for example due to spurious changes in creatinine levels. Similarly, AKI patients undergoing acute dialysis patients may also have been included in the studies, which may also lead to misclassification bias. This is due to an increase in creatinine levels after discontinuing dialysis for AKI which may be misclassified as recurrent episode of AKI. Furthermore, some studies assessing r-AKI post-discharge did not have access to outpatient data and only used inpatient creatinine values to assess r-AKI. This may have resulted in under ascertainment of AKI episodes, particularly those occurring in the community. Additional limitations included lack of detail on time course of recurrence and the short follow-up period, particularly for studies assessing r-AKI within same admission. It is likely people who don’t recover during the index admission may eventually recover and experience r-AKI. Individual studies may have been limited by the data captured in electronic health records and other clinically important variables may have been omitted. We used a recurrence search term to narrow the field, as the outcome of interest was recurrence. This means that any study that examined recurrence but did not include ‘recurrence’ as a key word will not have been captured in our searches. Finally, most studies were on US populations and there were a lack of studies in other areas.

*Implications for clinical practice and future research*

The finding that r-AKI is common supports recent recommendations that patients should be followed up within 3 months of having an AKI episode and monitored for renal and non-renal events23. High-risk patients (for example, older patients, patients with cardiovascular disease, patients with more severe AKI) may be followed up more closely and may benefit from individualised care based on patient characteristics, characteristics of the AKI episode and degree of renal recovery23. The finding that AKI severity and cardiovascular disease (an adverse outcome of initial AKI) increase risk of r-AKI highlight the importance of AKI prevention strategies. There is a need for more research (using robust assessment of predictors and consensus definition of r-AKI) to identify risk factors post initial AKI in those who survive to discharge and with long-term follow-up in order to develop risk stratification tools to improve post AKI care, prevent recurrence and improve outcomes. Such studies may also lead to development and validation of prediction scores for poor outcomes, whilst recognizing the heterogeneity of the AKI population. Use of routine data may reduce the problem of loss to follow up and allow better tracking of recurrence and other outcomes.
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