BMJ Open

Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease in France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA: results from the multinational observational REVEAL-CKD study

Navdeep Tangri ,[1] Toshiki Moriyama,[2] Markus P Schneider,[3] Jean Blaise Virgitti,[4] Luca De Nicola,[5] Matthew Arnold,[6] Salvatore Barone,[7] Emily Peach,[8] Eric Wittbrodt,[9] Hungta Chen,[10] Krister Järbrink,[11] Pamela Kushner[12]

To cite: Tangri N, Moriyama T, Schneider MP, *et al*. Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease in France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA: results from the multinational observational REVEAL-CKD study. *BMJ Open* 2023;**13**:e067386. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067386

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067386).

Received 12 August 2022
Accepted 28 April 2023

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to
Dr Navdeep Tangri;
ntangri@sogh.mb.ca

ABSTRACT

Objectives REVEAL-CKD aims to estimate the prevalence of, and factors associated with, undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease (CKD).

Design Multinational, observational study.

Setting Data from six country-specific electronic medical records and/or insurance claims databases from five countries (France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA [two databases]).

Participants Eligible participants (≥18 years old) had ≥2 consecutive estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) measurements (calculated from serum creatinine values, sex and age) taken from 2015 onwards that were indicative of stage 3 CKD (≥30 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2). Undiagnosed cases lacked an International Classification of Diseases 9/10 diagnosis code for CKD (any stage) any time before, and up to 6 months after, the second qualifying eGFR measurement (study index).

Main outcome measures The primary outcome was point prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD. Time to diagnosis was assessed using the Kaplan-Meier approach. Factors associated with lacking a CKD diagnosis and risk of diagnostic delay were assessed using logistic regression adjusted for baseline covariates.

Results The prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD was 95.5% (19 120/20 012 patients) in France, 84.3% (22 557/26 767) in Germany, 77.0% (50 547/65 676) in Italy, 92.1% (83 693/90 902) in Japan, 61.6% (13 845/22 470) in the US Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data database and 64.3% (161 254/250 879) in the US TriNetX database. The prevalence of undiagnosed CKD increased with age. Factors associated with undiagnosed CKD were female sex (vs male, range of odds ratios across countries: 1.29–1.77), stage 3a CKD (vs 3b, 1.81–3.66), no medical history (vs a history) of diabetes (1.26–2.77) or hypertension (1.35–1.78).

Conclusions There are substantial opportunities to improve stage 3 CKD diagnosis, particularly in female patients and older patients. The low diagnosis rates in patients with comorbidities that put them at risk of disease progression and complications require attention.

Trial registration NCT04847531.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

⇒ REVEAL-CKD uses large, contemporary, country-specific databases to provide robust estimates of the prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease (CKD).
⇒ The study uses a strict, consistent and internationally recognised definition of stage 3 CKD to ensure accuracy when calculating the prevalence of diagnosed/undiagnosed CKD.
⇒ Data from the countries and databases examined may not be representative of other countries with substantially different healthcare systems or CKD screening policies.
⇒ There is a risk of misclassification of undiagnosed CKD if diagnoses were made in environments that did not contribute to the databases used or if diagnosing physicians did not use International Classification of Diseases 9/10 codes appropriately.

INTRODUCTION

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is an established global public health concern.[1] CKD has a significant effect on patients, attributable to direct mortality and morbidity, as well as elevated risk of cardiovascular diseases.[2] The global prevalence of CKD is rising,[3] owing to ageing populations and increased prevalence of CKD-associated risk factors including type 2 diabetes (T2D) and hypertension.[4]

Early intervention and appropriate management of CKD is recommended in the internationally recognised Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) guidelines[5] to help delay disease progression and reduce the incidence of complications. Furthermore, in 2019, KDIGO held a controversies conference on the topic of early identification and intervention in CKD. The consensus statement from this conference

urged action, including the implementation of screening programmes and interventions for high-risk individuals.[6] Early-stage CKD is primarily asymptomatic,[7] therefore, CKD is primarily diagnosed at later disease stages and the initiation of effective interventions is delayed or missed.[5] Previous studies have demonstrated low levels of diagnosis of early-stage CKD in Italy,[8] Sweden[9] and the USA.[10–15] However, these previous studies have been limited to single countries or databases, or at-risk groups such as patients with T2D, and did not assess the prevalence of CKD diagnosis across various subgroups (eg, patients with or without comorbidities). There is a need for contemporary information on the prevalence of, and factors associated with, undiagnosed stage 3 CKD, as well as a need to understand factors associated with diagnostic delay in these patients.

REVEAL-CKD (NCT04847531) is a multinational, observational study designed to fill this evidence gap. REVEAL-CKD aims to quantify the prevalence of, and factors associated with, undiagnosed stage 3 CKD in large populations across several countries.[16] Here, we present data on the prevalence of, and factors associated with, undiagnosed stage 3 CKD in France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA.

METHODS

Study design

The study design for REVEAL-CKD has been reported in detail elsewhere[16] and is summarised below.

Existing secondary data were extracted from established, verified relevant databases containing electronic medical records and/or insurance claims in the countries of interest. Data for France were extracted from The Health Improvement Network, a large database of anonymised electronic medical records.[17] Data for Germany were extracted from the German Disease Analyzer, a database of anonymised longitudinal data on drug prescriptions, diagnoses and medical and demographic data contributed by a panel of more than 2500 physicians in Germany.[18] Data for Italy were extracted from the IQVIA Longitudinal Patient Database, a computerised network of over 900 family physicians, which includes anonymised data on patient consultations and treatments.[19] Data for Japan were extracted from Japan Real World Data, an integrated database of medical information including both electronic medical records and claims data.[20] Data for the USA were extracted from two separate databases: Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data (LCED), a database of inpatient and outpatient medical records and claims data from commercially insured individuals,[21] and TriNetX, a database of integrated electronic medical records and claims data from 35 healthcare organisations, which provides clinical patient data from both inpatient and outpatient encounters.[22] The coverage of each database used is described in online supplemental table 1.

Patients aged ≥18 years were included in the analyses if they had at least two consecutive estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) measurements that fell within the range indicative of stage 3 CKD (≥30 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2) and were recorded >90 and ≤730 days apart, taken on or after 1 January 2015. The decision to require at least two eGFR measurements with a gap of at least 90 days between each measurement was made to ensure that patients met the requirements for the KDIGO definition of CKD.[5] In order to investigate the potential impact of requiring two eGFR measurements to classify patients, a sensitivity analysis was performed on data from the TriNetX database that included all patients with at least one eGFR measurement within the range of stage 3 CKD, taken within the same date range used for the main analysis. All patients had at least 12 months of continuous presence in the database before the first qualifying eGFR measurement. Full inclusion and exclusion criteria are shown in online supplemental table 2. eGFR was calculated from serum creatinine values, sex and age, using the CKD Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation.[23] In line with current trends among physicians[24 25] and guidance from expert recommendations,[26] race modifiers were not used in the calculation of eGFR.

To account for potential delays in recording of diagnostic codes, undiagnosed CKD was defined as lacking an International Classification of Diseases (ICD) 9/10 diagnosis code corresponding to CKD (any stage), any time before and up to 6 months after index (date of second qualifying eGFR measurement). The ICD coding system varied by country depending on what was available in each database; the full list of ICD-9/10 codes used to determine diagnosed cases can be found in online supplemental table 3. A sensitivity analysis was performed to calculate the overall prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD using a broader definition of CKD adapted from Winkelmayer *et al*.[27] This sensitivity analysis included diagnostic codes for several additional manifestations of renal disease (online supplemental table 4).

Patient and public involvement

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

Statistical analysis

Overall prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD and patient demographic and clinical characteristics at index are presented descriptively. Comorbidities at index were identified using ICD-9/10 codes. Medication use at index was identified by the presence of at least one prescription for a given medication at or in the 12 months before index. Odds ratios (ORs) for factors associated with being undiagnosed any time before and up to 6 months after index were calculated using logistic regression analysis, adjusted for covariates at index. Hazard ratios for diagnostic delay among patients undiagnosed at index were calculated using Cox regression analysis, adjusted for



Figure 1 Cohort selection. CKD, chronic kidney disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; LPD, Longitudinal Patient Database; RWD, Real World Data; THIN, The Health Improvement Network.

covariates at index. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the time to diagnosis among patients undiagnosed at index. Statistical analysis was performed by using Python V.3.7 and R V.4.0.2.

RESULTS

This analysis of patients with stage 3 CKD included 20 012 patients from France, 90 902 patients from Germany, 65 676 patients from Italy, 26 767 patients from Japan, 22 470 patients from the LCED database in the USA and 250 879 patients from the TriNetX database in the USA (figure 1). The characteristics of these patients at index are shown in table 1.

At index, median age was 71–80 years, median eGFR was 49–52 mL/min/1.73 m^2, 66.9%%–77.7% of patients had CKD stage 3a (eGFR ≥45 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2) and 22.3%–33.1% of patients had CKD stage 3b (eGFR ≥30 and <45 mL/min/1.73 m^2). The overall prevalence of urinary albumin-creatinine ratio (UACR) testing was very low and ranged from 1.8% (US, TriNetX) to 5.5% (Japan).

Overall prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD

The proportion of patients with stage 3 CKD without a diagnosis at or within 6 months after index varied by database and was 95.5% in France, 84.3% in Germany, 77.0% in Italy, 92.1% in Japan, 61.6% in the US LCED database and 64.3% in the US TriNetX database (figure 2A). In the sensitivity analysis using a broader set of ICD-9/10 codes to identify CKD diagnoses, the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD was 53.6%–89.9% (online supplemental table 5). In the sensitivity analysis of 532 921 patients in the TriNetX database who had at least one qualifying eGFR measurement, the prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD was 82.2% (online supplemental table 6).

The proportion of patients with undiagnosed CKD per calendar year at index is shown in online supplemental figure 1. Overall, there were no prevailing trends in the proportion of patients with undiagnosed CKD per

Table 1 Overall patient characteristics at study index (date of second eGFR measurement) according to country and database

Country	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	USA	
Database	**THIN cegedim n=20 012**	**Disease analyzer n=26 767**	**LPD n=65 676**	**Japan RWD n=90 902**	**LCED n=22 470**	**TriNetX n=250 879**
CKD status*, n (%)						
Diagnosed	892 (4.5)	4210 (15.7)	15 129 (23.0)	7209 (7.9)	8625 (38.4)	89 625 (35.7)
Undiagnosed	19 120 (95.5)	22 557 (84.3)	50 547 (77.0)	83 693 (92.1)	13 845 (61.6)	161 254 (64.3)
Age, y, median (IQR)	80 (72–86)	79 (72–84)	80 (74–85)	76 (69–83)	74 (64–82)	71 (64–78)
Age groups, y (%)						
<45	67 (0.3)	66 (0.2)	188 (0.3)	791 (0.9)	243 (1.1)	5523 (2.2)
45–64	1677 (8.4)	2431 (9.1)	3780 (5.8)	13 286 (14.6)	5991 (26.7)	63 726 (25.4)
65–74	4641 (23.2)	6032 (22.5)	14 264 (21.7)	25 627 (28.2)	5592 (24.9)	87 880 (35.0)
≥75	13 627 (68.1)	18 238 (68.1)	47 444 (72.2)	51 198 (56.3)	10 644 (47.4)	93 750 (37.4)
Male, n (%)	9091 (45.4)	11 216 (41.9)	27 728 (42.2)	48 123 (52.9)	10 051 (44.7)	105 112 (41.9)
eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m^2, median (IQR)	52 (45–56)	52 (44–56)	49 (42–55)	52 (46–56)	51 (44–56)	51 (44–56)
CKD stage, n (%)						
CKD stage 3a	15 101 (75.5)	19 492 (72.8)	43 937 (66.9)	70 668 (77.7)	16 320 (72.6)	183 618 (73.2)
CKD stage 3b	4911 (24.5)	7275 (27.2)	21 739 (33.1)	20 234 (22.3)	6150 (27.4)	67 261 (26.8)
Baseline UACR available, n (%)	450 (2.2)	0 (0.0)†	9 (<0.1)‡	4992 (5.5)	899 (4.0)	4604 (1.8)
HDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	1.37 (1.11–1.65)	1.34 (1.10–1.63)	1.32 (1.09–1.58)	1.40 (1.14–1.71)	1.22 (0.98–1.50)	1.22 (0.98–1.50)
Missing, n	6514	8232	17 513	35 305	10 022	138 798
LDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	2.89 (2.24–3.61)	2.84 (2.17–3.65)	2.69 (2.07–3.36)	2.74 (2.30–3.31)	2.38 (1.84–3.05)	2.38 (1.81–3.05)
Missing, n	6676	7087	19 475	33 589	8936	125 474
Comorbidities, n (%)						
Hypertension	12 412 (62.0)	13 679 (51.1)	51 324 (78.1)	53 022 (58.3)	20 061 (89.3)	203 155 (81.0)
Type 2 diabetes	3532 (17.6)	6935 (25.9)	21 300 (32.4)§	18 989 (20.9)	9288 (41.3)	95 441 (38.0)
Established CVD¶**	1449 (7.2)	1904 (7.1)	6937 (10.6)	25 637 (28.2)	6292 (28.0)	49 744 (19.8)
Heart failure	986 (4.9)	4364 (16.3)	6378 (9.7)	30 063 (33.1)	5314 (23.6)	47 002 (18.7)
Atrial fibrillation	2161 (10.8)	4217 (15.8)	11 105 (16.9)	11 991 (13.2)	4627 (20.6)	41 214 (16.4)
Medication use, n (%)						
ACE inhibitor	4634 (23.2)	9635 (36.0)	25 098 (38.2)	4501 (5.0)	8783 (39.1)	57 806 (23.0)
ARB	6530 (32.6)	10 573 (39.5)	26 198 (39.9)	21 422 (23.6)	6302 (28.0)	37 946 (15.1)

Continued

Table 1 Continued

Country	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	USA	
Database	**THIN cegedim n=20 012**	**Disease analyzer n=26 767**	**LPD n=65 676**	**Japan RWD n=90 902**	**LCED n=22 470**	**TriNetX n=250 879**
SGLT2 inhibitor	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	353 (0.5)	1363 (1.5)	22 (0.1)	2149 (0.9)
GLD (any)	3489 (17.4)	8319 (31.1)	17 363 (26.4)	13 431 (14.8)	9400 (41.8)	60 259 (24.0)
Antiplatelets	5964 (29.8)	6597 (24.6)	31 151 (47.4)	18 796 (20.7)	2476 (11.0)	16 308 (6.5)
Loop diuretic	2924 (14.6)	10 508 (39.3)	22 160 (33.7)	11 979 (13.2)	5563 (24.8)	43 470 (17.3)
Anticoagulants	3018 (15.1)	8182 (30.6)	16 197 (24.7)	14 486 (15.9)	6347 (28.2)	54 986 (21.9)

Unless otherwise stated, percentages represent the proportion of patients in a specific group (eg, age) or with a specific variable (eg, medical history).
*Percentages represent the proportion of diagnosed/undiagnosed cases in the overall cohort for each country/database.
†UACR testing data not available in the German Disease Analyzer database.
‡Direct measurements of UACR were not available in the IQVIA Longitudinal Patient Database in Italy, however, UACR was calculated as urine albumin (mg/dL) divided by urine creatinine (g/dL) if patients had records for both of these variables on the same day.
§Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 diagnostic codes in the database used, type of diabetes could not be determined in patients from Italy.
¶ Established CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention.
** Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 diagnostic codes in the database used, established CVD does not include coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in patients from Italy.
ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-II receptor blocker; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLD, glucose-lowering drug; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; ICD-9, International Classification of Diseases ninth revision; IQR, interquartile range; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; LPD, Longitudinal Patient Database; RWD, Real World Data; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; THIN, The Health Improvement Network; UACR, urinary albumin-creatinine ratio.



Figure 2 Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD according to country and database (A) overall and (B) by sex. Undiagnosed cases are those that lack a diagnosis code for CKD (any stage), any time before and up to 6 months after study index. CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

calendar year, except in Italy, where the proportion of undiagnosed CKD tended to increase over time (68.2% undiagnosed in 2015 to 83.1% in 2020).

Demographics and clinical characteristics of patients with diagnosed and undiagnosed stage 3 CKD

Characteristics for patients with diagnosed and undiagnosed stage 3 CKD at index are presented in online supplemental table 7.

Patients with undiagnosed CKD tended to have slightly higher eGFR values than those with diagnosed CKD. A greater proportion of patients with stage 3a CKD were undiagnosed than patients with stage 3b CKD. There were fewer comorbidities such as hypertension, T2D and established cardiovascular disease in patients who were undiagnosed than in those who were diagnosed. Similarly, the proportion of patients taking medicines such as glucose-lowering drugs, loop diuretics, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers tended to be lower in undiagnosed patients than in those who were diagnosed. In the sensitivity analysis of 532 921 patients in the US TriNetX database who had at least one qualifying eGFR measurement, the prevalence of comorbidities was lower than in the main cohort (online supplemental table 6). In all databases, a greater proportion of stage 3 CKD cases were undiagnosed in female patients than in male patients (figure 2B). In addition, in all databases, patients aged less than 45 years had the lowest proportion of undiagnosed CKD; the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD increased in older age groups in France, Germany, Italy and in the US TriNetX database (online supplemental figure 2).

Factors associated with undiagnosed CKD

The proportion of undiagnosed CKD tended to be higher in those without comorbidities at study index versus those with such comorbidities (figure 3). When adjusting for baseline covariates, female patients (vs male patients), patients with CKD stage 3a (vs 3b) and patients without a diagnosis of diabetes or hypertension (vs those with a diagnosis) were consistently more likely to lack a CKD diagnosis before and up to 6 months after index (online supplemental figure 3).

Time to CKD diagnosis

Among patients who lacked a diagnosis of stage 3 CKD at or before study index, the median (interquartile range [IQR]) follow-up duration was 2.22 (1.18–3.64) years in France, 0.61 (0.27–1.03) years in Germany, 3.64 (2.08–4.88) years in Italy, 1.96 (0.84–3.41) years in Japan, 1.28



Figure 3 Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD according to the presence of comorbidities at study index, by country and database. Established CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischaemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention. Study index is defined as the date of a patient's second qualifying eGFR measurement. *Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 diagnostic codes in the database used, type of diabetes could not be determined in patients from Italy. †Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 codes in the database used, established CVD does not include coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in patients from Italy. CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ICD-9, International Classification of Diseases 9; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

(0.53–2.34) years in the US LCED database and 1.19 (0.44–2.32) years in the US TriNetX database. In patients undiagnosed at index, only a small proportion received a diagnosis during follow-up: 686/19 293 patients (3.6%) in France, 1157/23 302 patients (5.0%) in Germany, 8152/52 533 patients (15.5%) in Italy, 3855/84 603 patients (4.6%) in Japan, 3987/15 376 patients (25.9%) in the US LCED database and 44 007/178 410 patients (24.7%) in the US TriNetX database.

Among patients undiagnosed at index, diagnoses tended to accrue slowly over the whole duration of follow-up (figure 4). The proportion of patients with initial eGFR values indicative of stage 3b CKD (≥30 and <45 mL/min/1.73 m^2) who received a diagnosis during follow-up was consistently higher than patients with initial eGFR values indicative of stage 3a CKD (≥45 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2; figure 4).

Among all patients undiagnosed at index (regardless of whether they received a diagnosis during follow-up), median time to diagnosis was only calculable using the Kaplan-Meier method for the US TriNetX database, because more than half of the patients in the other databases remained undiagnosed at the end of the study period. In this database, the overall median (IQR) time to diagnosis was 4.75 (4.68–4.82) years.

After adjusting for selected baseline covariates, in all countries, female patients (vs male patients) and patients with stage 3a CKD at index (vs 3b) were more likely to be diagnosed later during follow-up (online supplemental figure 4). Although less pronounced, patients without a



Figure 4 Kaplan-Meier estimates of time to CKD diagnosis according to country and database in patients undiagnosed at index, overall and by CKD stage (3a/3b). Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals. CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

history of comorbidities such as diabetes, heart failure or hypertension had a slightly elevated likelihood of delayed diagnosis (vs patients with a history of these conditions). Older patients also typically had a greater likelihood of delayed diagnosis than patients aged less than 45 years.

DISCUSSION

REVEAL-CKD is a large, multinational, observational study that uses a consistent, strict definition for undiagnosed CKD based on internationally recognised guidelines. By extracting data from contemporary, country-specific databases, the study provides a robust estimate of the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD in countries across the globe. The results from this analysis of six databases from five countries (France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA) demonstrate severe shortcomings in the diagnosis of stage 3 CKD. Although there was some variability among countries, the consistently high proportions of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD despite clinical evidence of the disease are highly concerning, as are the low levels of UACR testing. Of note, except in Japan, the prevalence of UACR testing did not appear to be substantially higher even in patients

with a diagnosis of stage 3 CKD. UACR testing, however, is necessary for assessing the risk of future progression to kidney failure.[28] Missing opportunities for early diagnosis, prognostic assessment and management leaves patients at greater risk of further disease progression and complications, including end-stage renal disease and cardiovascular events.[6 29–31] Early interventions in CKD have been shown to improve outcomes by slowing CKD progression and reducing cardiovascular risk,[6 32] and healthcare costs associated with the disease increase substantially as CKD stage advances.[33] It is, therefore, vital for clinicians to seize the opportunity to diagnose and manage the condition as early as possible to minimise the impact of the disease, both in terms of financial burden and effects on health-related quality of life.

It is reassuring that the patients who have comorbidities that are established risk factors for CKD, such as hypertension and T2D, had higher rates of diagnosis and tended to be diagnosed sooner than patients without these conditions. However, even in patients with these comorbidities, the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD remained high. In the US databases, which had the lowest rates of undiagnosed CKD, approximately 50% of patients with comorbidities in addition to CKD still lacked a CKD diagnosis. Alarmingly, this was the case for patients with hypertension, T2D and established cardiovascular disease: groups in which KDIGO recommends screening for CKD,[6] owing to their elevated risks of CKD progression and associated complications.[34–36] Without an appropriate CKD diagnosis, opportunities may also be missed to prescribe newer therapies such as sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors which have been shown to improve cardiorenal outcomes in patients with CKD.[37 38]

We observed that the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD tended to rise with age, and older patients tended to have a higher risk of increased diagnostic delay than younger patients. In elderly patients, physicians may assume that eGFR values indicative of stage 3 CKD are caused by age-related decline of kidney function.[39 40] However, large population-based studies indicate that even in older adults at lower risk for kidney failure, stage 3 CKD is associated with an elevated risk of mortality, cardiovascular events and acute kidney injury.[41] Accordingly, KDIGO guidelines support the use of a single threshold value to define CKD across age subgroups consistent with criteria for other chronic non-communicable diseases.[5] In elderly patients, the effects of late-stage CKD are likely to have a substantial influence on physical and cognitive abilities, medication safety and cardiovascular prognosis.[2 6 41] It is therefore important that physicians do not underestimate the burden and effects of CKD in elderly patients and initiate guideline-appropriate management in a timely manner. Existing clinical tools (such as confirmatory cystatin C testing in suspected cases of CKD) can help mitigate the risk of overdiagnosis, although these remain underutilised.[6] CKD management in elderly patients should be adapted taking into consideration factors such as their age, frailty, comedications and comorbidities.

In line with previous studies that suggest CKD is more prevalent in women than in men,[42 43] the proportion of female patients with stage 3 CKD was higher than in male patients in all countries except Japan. Despite the higher prevalence of CKD in female patients, after adjusting for potential confounding factors, female patients had a higher likelihood of being undiagnosed than male patients in all countries. It has been suggested that the rate of progression of CKD is slower in women than in men,[44–47] and physicians may, therefore, be less likely to diagnose the condition at early stages in women. However, the inequality demonstrated in this study is substantial and suggests a need for elevated awareness to minimise this gender disparity.

REVEAL-CKD used the internationally recognised CKD-EPI equation to calculate eGFR values from available serum creatinine measurements.[23] Multiple consecutive eGFR measurements indicative of stage 3 CKD were required to confirm the presence of CKD, in line with KDIGO recommendations suggesting a threshold of >90 days to consider the condition to be chronic.[5] This decision was made to conform to these widely used guidelines, and to avoid overestimating the prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD by including patients who had isolated eGFR measurements within the threshold of inclusion for stage 3 CKD (as a result of, for example, transient dehydration or acute kidney injury). To investigate the potential impact of requiring two qualifying eGFR measurements for inclusion in REVEAL-CKD, a sensitivity analysis was performed using the TriNetX database that included patients with at least one eGFR measurement indicative of stage 3 CKD. Among these patients, the prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD was higher than in the main REVEAL-CKD cohort (82.2% vs 64.3%, respectively), whereas the prevalence of comorbidities was lower. This suggests that the requirement of multiple eGFR measurements may have biased the sample to select for patients with inherently poorer health status, because they may have been receiving more frequent healthcare visits than those with a single measurement, and therefore, may have had more eGFR measurements taken. Although it is difficult to confirm which patients in this sensitivity analysis truly had stage 3 CKD and which patients were included as a result of transient eGFR dips, it should be noted that these findings suggest that the true prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD may be even higher than identified in this study.

When calculating eGFR, race was not included as a modifier in line with recent trends among physicians[24 25] and guidance from expert recommendations.[26] Inclusion of the race modifier may have been expected to inflate eGFR in Black patients. Indeed, in a sensitivity analysis performed on the US TriNetX database which included data on race (online supplemental table 8), we saw that a substantial proportion of Black patients (46.1%, corresponding to 9.2% of the overall TriNetX cohort) were reclassified as having stage 2 CKD (eGFR between 60 and 89 mL/min/1.73 m^2) when the race modifier was

included in the calculation of eGFR. The inclusion of this modifier may, therefore, allow CKD to progress further in Black patients before they receive appropriate diagnosis and intervention. The decision to use the CKD-EPI equation without race was made in part to facilitate comparisons among countries and databases in which race was not available, and also to provide a consistent method of calculating eGFR for measurements taken across a time period where the inclusion of the race modifier was being actively debated.[48–52]

Some limitations must be kept in mind when interpreting these data. Results from the included countries may not be generalisable to other countries, which could have significantly different diagnostic coding practices, healthcare systems and screening policies; conclusions regarding the observed differences between countries cannot be drawn for similar reasons. The TriNetX and LCED databases contained a high proportion of commercially insured patients, and therefore, may not be representative of the overall US population. Furthermore, data licensing issues prevented the pooling of data from multiple databases to provide an overall estimate of the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD. Confirmatory UACR testing was not necessary to meet the study definition of stage 3 CKD owing to the extremely low levels of UACR testing in most of the cohorts. For the same reason, UACR testing was not included in the multivariate analyses which assessed factors associated with a lack of CKD diagnosis and factors associated with time to CKD diagnosis. The proportion of inpatient versus outpatient encounters was unavailable for many of the databases used, and therefore comparisons between diagnoses in these two settings could not be made. Because many of the databases used did not include data on race, variability in the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD according to race could not be assessed. Because data were collected from between 2015 and 2020, physicians may have still been using the race modifier for Black patients. Therefore, some Black patients may have been classified as having stage 2 CKD and have been less likely to receive a diagnosis as a result. It is important to note that this study focused on underdiagnosis for stage 3 CKD; low levels of UACR testing in all countries studied suggest that the prevalence of undiagnosed stage 1 and 2 CKD may be even higher. Lastly, there is a risk of misclassification if CKD diagnoses were made in clinical settings that do not contribute to the databases, or if patients had CKD that was recognised by their healthcare providers but was not recorded with an appropriate ICD-9/10 code in the databases. Although a lack of such codes may not always indicate that a patient's CKD is undiagnosed, this definition of CKD diagnosis has been validated by previous real-world studies,[8 11 12 27] and provides an appropriate surrogate measure for rates of diagnosis in large epidemiological studies such as REVEAL-CKD.

In conclusion, this analysis of six large, secondary databases from five countries demonstrates that most cases of stage 3 CKD are not diagnosed in a timely manner despite clinical evidence of the disease. Furthermore, although patients with existing risk factors for, or complications from, CKD were typically more likely to receive a CKD diagnosis, the prevalence of undiagnosed CKD in these patients remained alarmingly high. Clear opportunities exist for improved diagnosis of stage 3 CKD, particularly in female patients, elderly patients and patients at high risk of CKD progression and complications. Future research will help to quantify the impact of early diagnosis and initiation of effective therapies on the risk of CKD progression, complications and long-term patient outcomes.

Author affiliations
[1]Department of Internal Medicine, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
[2]Department of Nephrology, Osaka University, Suita, Osaka, Japan
[3]Department of Nephrology and Hypertension, Erlangen University Hospital, Erlangen, Germany
[4]Cabinet Médical, Orry-La-Ville, France
[5]Department of Advanced Medical and Surgical Sciences, Nephrology and Dialysis Unit, Università degli Studi della Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Napoli, Italy
[6]Real World Evidence Data & Analytics, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK
[7]Global Medical Affairs, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA
[8]Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Epidemiology, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK
[9]Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Medical Affairs, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA
[10]Medical/Payer Evidence Statistics, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA
[11]Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Evidence, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gothenburg, Sweden
[12]Department of Family Medicine, University of California Irvine Medical Center, Orange, California, USA

Acknowledgements Medical writing support was provided by Bobby Thompson, MSc(Res), of Oxford PharmaGenesis, Oxford, UK, and was funded by AstraZeneca. Analysis of data from the IQVIA Longitudinal Patient Database was conducted by Claudio Ripellino and Franca Heiman of IQVIA Solutions S.r.l., Milan, Italy, and was funded by AstraZeneca.

Contributors NT, SB, EP, EW, HC, KJ and PK were responsible for the study concept and design. EP had full access to all the data in the study and took responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. MA, EP and HC developed and conducted the statistical analysis plan. NT, TM, MPS, JBV, LDN, MA, SB, EP, EW, HC, KJ and PK were involved in review and editing of manuscript drafts, as well as critical revision of the content during its development. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript before its submission. As the guarantor, NT accepts full responsibility for the work and conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author (NT) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Funding REVEAL-CKD is funded by AstraZeneca (grant number N/A). It is a non-interventional observational study, and as such, no drugs are supplied or funded. AstraZeneca designed the REVEAL-CKD study with input and guidance from the external authors. AstraZeneca provided funding for data collection, management and analysis. An AstraZeneca team reviewed this manuscript for scientific accuracy during its development and was allowed to make suggestions. However, the final content, analysis and interpretation of the data was determined by the authors. The decision to submit the data for publication was determined by the authors.

Competing interests SB, EP, HC, KJ, and EW are employees of AstraZeneca and hold stock options. MA is an employee of AstraZeneca. NT has received grants from AstraZeneca, Boehringer 21 Ingelheim/Eli Lilly and Company, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd and Tricida, has received honoraria from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim/Eli Lilly and Company, Janssen

Pharmaceuticals, Otsuka Pharmaceutical and Tricida and holds stock options from Mesentech, Rénibus Therapeutics, pulseData and Tricida. MPS has received advisory board fees and honoraria from AstraZeneca, Bayer AG, Vifor Pharma Group and Boehringer Ingelheim/Eli Lilly and Company. LDN has received fees for scientific consultation and/or lectures by Astellas Pharma, AstraZeneca, Mundipharma and Vifor Pharma Group. PK has received speaker's bureau and advisory board fees from AstraZeneca, Eli Lilly and Company and Novo Nordisk A/S, speaker's fees from Bayer AG and honoraria from AstraZeneca and Eli Lilly and Company. TM and JBV have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data used in this study were obtained from a third party and may not be publicly available. Data underlying the findings described in this manuscript may be obtained in accordance with AstraZeneca's data sharing policy described at https://astrazenecagrouptrials.pharmacm.com/ST/Submission/Disclosure.

ORCID iD

Navdeep Tangri http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5075-6370

REFERENCES

1 Levey AS, Atkins R, Coresh J, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease as a global public health problem: approaches and initiatives – a position statement from Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes. *Kidney Int* 2007;72:247–59.
2 Bikbov B, Purcell CA, Levey AS, *et al*. Global, regional, and national burden of chronic kidney disease, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2017. *Lancet* 2020;395:709–33.
3 Xie Y, Bowe B, Mokdad AH, *et al*. Analysis of the global burden of disease study highlights the global, regional, and national trends of chronic kidney disease epidemiology from 1990 to 2016. *Kidney Int* 2018;94:567–81.
4 Gansevoort RT, Correa-Rotter R, Hemmelgarn BR, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease and cardiovascular risk: epidemiology, mechanisms, and prevention. *Lancet* 2013;382:339–52.
5 Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) CKD work group. KDIGO 2012 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease. *Kidney Int Suppl* 2013;3:1–150.
6 Shlipak MG, Tummalapalli SL, Boulware LE, *et al*. The case for early identification and intervention of chronic kidney disease: conclusions from a Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) controversies conference. *Kidney Int* 2021;99:34–47.
7 Fraser SD, Blakeman T. Chronic kidney disease: identification and management in primary care. *Pragmat Obs Res* 2016;7:21–32.
8 Ravera M, Noberasco G, Weiss U, *et al*. CKD awareness and blood pressure control in the primary care hypertensive population. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2011;57:71–7.
9 Gasparini A, Evans M, Coresh J, *et al*. Prevalence and recognition of chronic kidney disease in Stockholm healthcare. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2016;31:2086–94.
10 Ryan TP, Sloand JA, Winters PC, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease prevalence and rate of diagnosis. *Am J Med* 2007;120:981–6.
11 Diamantidis CJ, Hale SL, Wang V, *et al*. Lab-based and diagnosis-based chronic kidney disease recognition and staging concordance. *BMC Nephrol* 2019;20:357.
12 Bakris G. Prevalence and factors associated with undiagnosed chronic kidney disease in diabetes mellitus. National Kidney Foundation 2019 Spring Clinical Meetings; Boston, MA, USA, 2019
13 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Chronic kidney disease often undiagnosed in Medicare beneficiaries. 2020. Available: https://www.cms.gov/files/document/ckd-data-highlight102020-2.pdf [Accessed Nov 2022].
14 Tuttle KR, Alicic RZ, Duru OK, *et al*. Clinical characteristics of and risk factors for chronic kidney disease among adults and children: an analysis of the CURE-CKD registry. *JAMA Netw Open* 2019;2:e1918169.
15 Szczech LA, Stewart RC, Su H-L, *et al*. Primary care detection of chronic kidney disease in adults with type-2 diabetes: the ADD-CKD study (awareness, detection and drug therapy in type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease). *PLoS One* 2014;9:e110535.
16 Kushner P, Peach E, Wittbrodt E, *et al*. Investigating the global prevalence and consequences of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease: methods and rationale for the REVEAL-CKD study. *Clin Kidney J* 2022;15:738–46.
17 Cegedim Health Data. THIN: The Health Improvement Network. 2021. Available: https://www.cegedim-health-data.com/cegedim-health-data/thin-the-health-improvement-network [Accessed Nov 2022].
18 Rathmann W, Bongaerts B, Carius H-J, *et al*. Basic characteristics and representativeness of the German Disease Analyzer database . *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2018;56:459–66.
19 Health Search. XV report healthsearch [Italian]. 2022. Available: https://report.healthsearch.it/ [Accessed Nov 2022].
20 Ono Y, Taneda Y, Takeshima T, *et al*. Validity of claims diagnosis codes for cardiovascular diseases in diabetes patients in Japanese administrative database. *Clin Epidemiol* 2020;12:367–75.
21 Hensley Alford S, Piccone J, Sexton M, *et al*. Watson health: a new approach to population health and research. *JPCRR* 2016;3:201.
22 TriNetX. TriNetX research. 2021. Available: https://trinetx.com/ [Accessed Mar 2021].
23 Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, *et al*. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;150:604–12.
24 Duggal V, Thomas I-C, Montez-Rath ME, *et al*. National estimates of CKD prevalence and potential impact of estimating glomerular filtration rate without race. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2021;32:1454–63.
25 Diao JA, Wu GJ, Taylor HA, *et al*. Clinical implications of removing race from estimates of kidney function. *JAMA* 2021;325:184–6.
26 Delgado C, Baweja M, Crews DC, *et al*. A unifying approach for GFR estimation: recommendations of the NKF-ASN Task Force on reassessing the inclusion of race in diagnosing kidney disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2021;32:2994–3015.
27 Winkelmayer WC, Schneeweiss S, Mogun H, *et al*. Identification of individuals with CKD from Medicare claims data: a validation study. *Am J Kid Dis* 2005;46:225–32.
28 Tangri N, Stevens LA, Griffith J, *et al*. A predictive model for progression of chronic kidney disease to kidney failure. *JAMA* 2011;305:1553–9.
29 Astor BC, Matsushita K, Gansevoort RT, *et al*. Lower estimated glomerular filtration rate and higher albuminuria are associated with mortality and end-stage renal disease. A collaborative meta-analysis of kidney disease population cohorts. *Kidney Int* 2011;79:1331–40.
30 van der Velde M, Matsushita K, Coresh J, *et al*. Lower estimated glomerular filtration rate and higher albuminuria are associated with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. A collaborative meta-analysis of high-risk population cohorts. *Kidney Int* 2011;79:1341–52.
31 Matsushita K, Coresh J, Sang Y, *et al*. Estimated glomerular filtration rate and albuminuria for prediction of cardiovascular outcomes: a collaborative meta-analysis of individual participant data. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;3:514–25.
32 Smart NA, Titus TT. Outcomes of early versus late nephrology referral in chronic kidney disease: a systematic review. *Am J Med* 2011;124:1073–80.
33 Dieguez G, Smith R. The impact of earlier CKD detection and delayed disease progression. 2021. Available: https://www.milliman.com/-/media/milliman/pdfs/2021-articles/7-13-21-the_impact_of_earlier_ckd_detection_and_delayed.ashx [Accessed Nov 2022].
34 Rahman M, Xie D, Feldman HI, *et al*. Association between chronic kidney disease progression and cardiovascular disease: results from the CRIC study. *Am J Nephrol* 2014;40:399–407.
35 Cabrera CS, Lee AS, Olsson M, *et al*. Impact of CKD progression on cardiovascular disease risk in a contemporary UK cohort of individuals with diabetes. *Kidney Int Rep* 2020;5:1651–60.

36 Kovesdy CP, Isaman D, Petruski-Ivleva N, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease progression among patients with type 2 diabetes identified in US administrative claims: a population cohort study. *Clin Kidney J* 2021;14:1657–64.
37 Fontes-Carvalho R, Santos-Ferreira D, Raz I, *et al*. Protective effects of SGLT-2 inhibitors across the cardiorenal continuum: two faces of the same coin. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2022;29:1352–60.
38 Rangaswami J, Bhalla V, de Boer IH, *et al*. Cardiorenal protection with the newer antidiabetic agents in patients with diabetes and chronic kidney disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2020;142:e265–86.
39 Glassock RJ, Rule AD. Aging and the kidneys: anatomy, physiology and consequences for defining chronic kidney disease. *Nephron* 2016;134:25–9.
40 Schmitt R, Melk A. Molecular mechanisms of renal aging. *Kidney Int* 2017;92:569–79.
41 De Nicola L, Minutolo R, Chiodini P, *et al*. The effect of increasing age on the prognosis of non-dialysis patients with chronic kidney disease receiving stable nephrology care. *Kidney Int* 2012;82:482–8.
42 Carrero JJ, Hecking M, Chesnaye NC, *et al*. Sex and gender disparities in the epidemiology and outcomes of chronic kidney disease. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2018;14:151–64.
43 Hill NR, Fatoba ST, Oke JL, *et al*. Global prevalence of chronic kidney disease – a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2016;11:e0158765.
44 Silbiger S, Neugarten J. Gender and human chronic renal disease. *Gend Med* 2008;5 Suppl A:S3–10.
45 Jafar TH, Schmid CH, Stark PC, *et al*. The rate of progression of renal disease may not be slower in women compared with men: a patient-level meta-analysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2003;18:2047–53.
46 Eriksen BO, Ingebretsen OC. The progression of chronic kidney disease: a 10-year population-based study of the effects of gender and age. *Kidney Int* 2006;69:375–82.
47 Swartling O, Rydell H, Stendahl M, *et al*. CKD progression and mortality among men and women: a nationwide study in Sweden. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2021;78:190–9.
48 Diao JA, Inker LA, Levey AS, *et al*. In search of a better equation-performance and equity in estimates of kidney function. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:396–9.
49 Eneanya ND, Yang W, Reese PP. Reconsidering the consequences of using race to estimate kidney function. *JAMA* 2019;322:113–4.
50 Norris KC, Eneanya ND, Boulware LE. Removal of race from estimates of kidney function: first, do no harm. *JAMA* 2021;325:135–7.
51 Powe NR. Black kidney function matters: use or misuse of race? *JAMA* 2020;324:737–8.
52 Vyas DA, Eisenstein LG, Jones DS. Hidden in plain sight-reconsidering the use of race correction in clinical algorithms. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:874–82.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 chronic kidney disease in France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the USA: results from the multinational observational REVEAL-CKD study

Navdeep Tangri,[1] Toshiki Moriyama,[2] Markus P Schneider,[3] Jean Blaise J Virgitti,[4] Luca De Nicola,[5] Matthew Arnold,[6] Salvatore Barone,[7] Emily J Peach,[8] Eric Wittbrodt,[9] Hungta Chen,[10] Krister Järbrink,[11] Pamela Kushner[12]

[1] Department of Internal Medicine, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

[2] Osaka University, Suita, Osaka, Japan

[3] Department of Nephrology and Hypertension, University Hospital Erlangen, University of Erlangen–Nuremberg, Erlangen, Germany

[4] Cabinet Médical, Orry-La-Ville, France

[5] Department of Advanced Medical and Surgical Sciences, Nephrology and Dialysis Unit, University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Naples, Italy

[6] Real World Evidence Data & Analytics, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK

[7] Global Medical Affairs, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA

[8] Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Epidemiology, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK

[9] Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Medical Affairs, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA

[10] Medical/Payer Evidence Statistics, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA

[11] Cardiovascular, Renal and Metabolism Evidence, BioPharmaceuticals Medical, AstraZeneca, Gothenburg, Sweden

[12] Department of Family Medicine, University of California Irvine Medical Center, Orange, California, USA

Supplementary table 1. Data sources used in the REVEAL-CKD study.

Country	Data source(s)	Database type (EMR/claims)	Coverage
France	THIN: The Health Improvement Network/Cegedim Health Data	EMR	Primary care
Germany	IQVIA Disease Analyzer	EMR	Primary care/endocrinology
Japan	Japan RWD	EMR and claims	Inpatient/outpatient
USA	TriNetX	EMR and claims	Inpatient/outpatient
	LCED	EMR and claims	Inpatient/outpatient
Italy	The Health Search Database/IQVIA Health Solutions Italy	EMR	Primary care

EMR, electronic medical records; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; RWD, Real World Data.

Supplementary table 2. REVEAL-CKD study inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria:
• ≥2 consecutive eGFR laboratory measurements recorded in 2015 or later, with values ≥30 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2 (stage 3a/3b CKD using the CKD-EPI[1] equation) that are >90 and ≤730 days apart • ≥12 months of continuous presence in the database before the first qualifying eGFR measurement (look-back period) • Age ≥18 years at the index date (defined as the date of the second qualifying laboratory eGFR measurement indicative of stage 3a/3b CKD).
Exclusion criteria:
• Solid organ transplant recorded before the index date • Any evidence of advanced CKD (stages 4, 5, and end-stage renal disease) based on CKD diagnosis codes or renal replacement therapy before the index date.

CKD, chronic kidney disease; CKD-EPI, Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate.

Supplementary table 3. ICD-9/10 codes used to identify patients with diagnosed stage 3 CKD

Description	ICD-9*	ICD-10†
CKD, stage I	585.1‡	N18.1§
CKD, stage II	585.2	N18.2
CKD, stage III	585.3	N18.3
CKD, stage IV (severe)	585.4	N18.4
CKD, stage V	585.5	N18.5
End-stage renal disease	585.6	N18.6
CKD, unspecified	585.9	N18.9
Hypertensive CKD	403, 403.01, 403.1, 403.11, 403.9, 403.91, 404, 404.01, 404.02, 404.03, 404.1, 404.11, 404.12, 404.13, 404.9, 404.91, 404.92, 404.93	I12.0, I12.9, I13.0, I13.10, I13.11, I13.2
Diabetes with renal manifestation	250.4, 250.41, 250.42, 250.43	E10.2, E11.2, E11.21, E11.22, E11.29
Disorders from impaired renal function	588, 588.1, 588.81, 588.89, 588.9	N25.0, N25.1, N25.81, N25.89, N25.9

*ICD-9 codes were used to identify CKD in Italy and in the US LCED and TriNetX databases.
†ICD 10 codes were used to identify CKD in France, Germany, Japan and the US LCED and TriNetX databases.
‡The ICD-9 code 585 (CKD, unspecified) was included in the code list for Italy owing to the large proportion of non-specific CKD reporting in this database.
§The ICD-10 codes N18 and N18.0 (CKD, unspecified) were included in the code list for France owing to the large proportion of non-specific CKD reporting in this database.
CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; ICD, International Classification of Diseases.

Supplementary table 4. ICD-9/10 codes used to identify CKD in the sensitivity analysis using a broader definition for CKD adapted from Winkelmayer et al., 2005[2]

Description	ICD-9*	ICD-10†
CKD, stage I	585.1‡	N18.1§
CKD, stage II	585.2	N18.2
CKD, stage III	585.3	N18.3
CKD, stage IV (severe)	585.4	N18.4
CKD, stage V	585.5	N18.5
End-stage renal disease	585.6	N18.6
CKD, unspecified	585.9	N18.9
Chronic renal insufficiency	582, 582.1, 582.2, 582.4, 582.81, 582.89, 582.9, 583, 583.1, 583.2, 583.4, 583.6, 583.7, 583.81, 583.89, 583.9	N03.0, N03.1, N03.2, N03.3, N03.4, N03.5, N03.6, N03.7, N03.8, N03.9, N05.0, N05.1, N05.2, N05.3, N05.4, N05.5, N05.6, N05.7, N05.8, N05.9, N19, N26.9
Hypertensive CKD	403, 403.01, 403.1, 403.11, 403.9, 403.91, 404, 404.01, 404.02, 404.03, 404.1, 404.11, 404.12, 404.13, 404.9, 404.91, 404.92, 404.93	I12.0, I12.9, I13.0, I13.10, I13.11, I13.2
Diabetes with renal manifestation	250.4, 250.41, 250.42, 250.43	E10.2, E11.2, E11.21, E11.22, E11.29
Disorders from impaired renal function	588, 588.1, 588.81, 588.89, 588.9	N25.0, N25.1, N25.81, N25.89, N25.9, M10.30, M10.311, M10.312, M10.319, M10.321, M10.322, M10.329, M10.331, M10.332, M10.339, M10.341, M10.342, M10.349, M10.351, M10.352, M10.359,

Description	ICD-9*	ICD-10†
		M10.361, M10.362, M10.369, M10.371, M10.372, M10.379, M10.38, M10.39
Acute renal failure	572.4, 580, 580.4, 580.81, 580.89, 580.9, 584.5, 584.6, 584.7, 584.8, 584.9, 791.2, 791.3	K76.7, N00.3, N00.8, N00.9, N01.3, N17.0, N17.1, N17.2, N17.8, N17.9, R82.1, R82.3
Miscellaneous	274.1, 440.1, 442.1, 453.3, 581, 581.1, 581.2, 581.3, 581.81, 581.89, 581.9, 586, 587, 593, 593.1, 593.2, 593.3, 593.4, 593.5, 593.6, 593.7, 593.71, 593.72, 593.73, 593.81, 593.82, 593.89, 593.9, 753, 753.3, 866, 866.01, 866.1, 866.11, 866.12, 866.13	I70.1, I72.2, I82.3, N02.2, N04.0, N04.1, N04.2, N04.3, N04.4, N04.5, N04.6, N04.7, N04.8, N04.9, N08, N13.4, N13.5, N13.70, N13.71, N13.721, N13.722, N13.729, N13.731, N13.732, N13.739, N13.8, N28.1, N28.81, N28.82, N28.83, N28.89, N28.9, Q60.2, Q60.5, Q63.0, Q63.1, Q63.2, Q63.3, Q63.8, Q63.9, R80.2, S31.001, S37.009, S37.019, S37.029, S37.039, S37.049, S37.059, S37.069

*ICD-9 codes were used to identify CKD in Italy and in the US LCED and TriNetX databases.
†ICD-10 codes were used to identify CKD in France, Germany, Japan and the US LCED and TriNetX databases.
‡The ICD-9 code 585 (CKD, unspecified) was included in the code list for Italy owing to the large proportion of non-specific CKD reporting in this database.
§The ICD-10 codes N18 and N18.0 (CKD, unspecified) were included in the code list for France owing to the large proportion of non-specific CKD reporting in this database.
CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; ICD, International Classification of Diseases.

Supplementary table 5. Sensitivity analysis of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD using a broader CKD definition adapted from Winkelmayer et al., 2005[2] according to country and database

Country	**France**	**Germany**	**Italy**	**Japan**	**USA**	
Database	**THIN Cegedim**	**Disease Analyzer**	**LPD**	**Japan RWD**	**LCED**	**TriNetX**
	n=20 012	**n=26 767**	**n=65 676**	**n=90 902**	**n=22 470**	**n=250 879**
CKD status*, n (%)						
Diagnosed	2031 (10.1)	6165 (23.0)	21 146 (32.2)	12 113 (13.3)	10 421 (46.4)	109 735 (43.7)
Undiagnosed	17 981 (89.9)	20 602 (77.0)	44 530 (67.8)	78 789 (86.7)	12 049 (53.6)	141 144 (56.3)

*Percentages represent the proportion of diagnosed/undiagnosed cases in the overall cohort for each country/database.
CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; LPD, Longitudinal Patient Database; RWD, Real World Data; THIN, The Health Improvement Network.

Supplementary table 6. Sensitivity analysis of undiagnosed CKD in patients in the TriNetX database with one eGFR measurement indicative of stage 3 CKD

Country **Database**	**USA** **TriNetX** **n=532 921**
CKD status*, n (%)	
Diagnosed	94 780 (17.8)
Undiagnosed	438 141 (82.2)
Age, y, median (IQR)	67 (59–75)
Age groups, y	
<45	28 888 (5.4)
45–64	187 109 (35.1)
65–74	174 126 (32.7)
≥75	142 798 (26.8)
Male, n (%)	232 069 (43.5)
eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m^2, median (IQR)	54 (48–58)
CKD stage, n (%)	
CKD stage 3a	439 183 (82.4)
CKD stage 3b	93 738 (17.6)
Baseline UACR available, n (%)	5495 (1.0)
HDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	1.24 (1.01–1.53)
Missing, n	349 531
LDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	2.51 (1.91–3.21)
Missing, n	322 358
Comorbidities, n (%)	
Hypertension	371 933 (69.8)
Type 2 diabetes	160 129 (30.0)
Established CVD†	81 883 (15.4)
Heart failure	66 522 (12.5)
Atrial fibrillation	64 232 (12.1)
Medication use, n (%)	
ACE inhibitor	100 723 (18.9)
ARB	58 812 (11.0)
SGLT2 inhibitor	3777 (0.7)
GLD (any)	100 714 (18.9)
Antiplatelets	25 371 (4.8)
Loop diuretic	64 161 (12.0)
Anticoagulants	107 616 (20.2)

Unless otherwise stated, percentages represent the proportion of patients in a specific group (eg, age) or with a specific variable (eg, medical history).
*Percentages represent the proportion of diagnosed/undiagnosed cases in the overall cohort.
†Established CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention.
ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-II receptor blocker; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLD, glucose-lowering drug; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; IQR, interquartile range; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; UACR, urinary albumin-creatinine ratio.

Supplementary table 7. Overall patient characteristics at study index according to country, by CKD diagnosis status 6 months after index

Country	France		Germany		Italy		Japan		USA			
Database	THIN Cegedim		Disease Analyzer		LPD		Japan RWD		LCED		TriNetX	
	Undiagnosed n=19 120	Diagnosed* n=892	Undiagnosed n=22 557	Diagnosed* n=4210	Undiagnosed n=50 547	Diagnosed* n=15 129	Undiagnosed n=83 693	Diagnosed* n=7209	Undiagnosed n=13 845	Diagnosed* n=8625	Undiagnosed n=161 254	Diagnosed* n=89 625
Age, y, median (IQR)	80 (72–86)	77 (69–84)	79 (72–84)	79 (71–84)	80 (74–85)	80 (73–85)	76 (69–83)	77 (68–83)	74 (64–82)	74 (64–82)	71 (64–79)	70 (62–78)
Age groups, y												
<45	58 (0.3)	9 (1.0)	46 (0.2)	20 (0.5)	95 (0.2)	93 (0.6)	652 (0.8)	139 (1.9)	109 (0.8)	134 (1.6)	2426 (1.5)	3097 (3.5)
45–64	1551 (8.1)	126 (14.1)	1957 (8.7)	474 (11.3)	2724 (5.4)	1056 (7.0)	12 260 (14.6)	1026 (14.2)	3754 (27.1)	2237 (25.9)	38 302 (23.8)	25 424 (28.4)
65–74	4421 (23.1)	220 (24.7)	5088 (22.6)	944 (22.4)	10 976 (21.7)	3288 (21.7)	23 696 (28.3)	1931 (26.8)	3415 (24.7)	2177 (25.2)	57 891 (35.9)	29 989 (33.5)
≥75	13 090 (68.5)	537 (60.2)	15 466 (68.6)	2772 (65.8)	36 752 (72.7)	10 692 (70.7)	47 085 (56.3)	4113 (57.1)	6567 (47.4)	4077 (47.3)	62 635 (38.8)	31 115 (34.7)
Male, n (%)	8599 (45.0)	492 (55.2)	9173 (40.7)	2043 (48.5)	19 820 (39.2)	7908 (52.3)	43 658 (52.2)	4465 (61.9)	5438 (39.3)	4613 (53.5)	57 989 (36.0)	47 123 (52.6)
eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m², median (IQR)	52 (46–56)	45 (38–52)	52 (45–56)	49 (40–55)	51 (44–55)	45 (38–52)	53 (47–56)	45 (37–53)	53 (47–57)	47 (40–53)	53 (47–57)	47 (40–53)
CKD stage, n (%)												
CKD stage 3a	14 661 (76.7)	440 (49.3)	16 871 (74.8)	2621 (62.3)	36 460 (72.1)	7477 (49.4)	66 955 (80.0)	3713 (51.5)	11 348 (82.0)	4972 (57.6)	131 385 (81.5)	52 233 (58.3)
CKD stage 3b	4459 (23.3)	452 (50.7)	5686 (25.2)	1589 (37.7)	14 087 (27.9)	7652 (50.6)	16 738 (20.0)	3496 (48.5)	2497 (18.0)	3653 (42.4)	29 869 (18.5)	37 392 (41.7)
Baseline UACR available, n (%)	424 (2.2)	26 (2.9)	0 (0.0)†	0 (0.0)†	4 (<0.1)‡	5 (<0.1)‡	3851 (4.6)	1141 (15.8)	474 (3.4)	425 (4.9)	2455 (1.5)	2149 (2.4)
HDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	1.37 (1.11–1.65)	1.32 (1.08–1.65)	1.34 (1.11–1.63)	1.29 (1.06–1.55)	1.32 (1.11–1.59)	1.27 (1.06–1.53)	1.40 (1.16–1.71)	1.32 (1.09–1.60)	1.24 (1.03–1.53)	1.16 (0.96–1.45)	1.24 (1.03–1.55)	1.14 (0.93–1.42)
Missing, n	6172	342	6904	1328	13 379	4134	33 243	2062	5673	4349	88 031	50 767
LDL, mmol/L, median (IQR)	2.89 (2.24–3.61)	2.81 (2.18–3.53)	2.87 (2.20–3.70)	2.70 (2.07–3.49)	2.74 (2.12–3.39)	2.53 (1.97–3.21)	2.77 (2.22–3.34)	2.53 (2.04–3.10)	2.46 (1.89–3.13)	2.25 (1.71–2.95)	2.43 (1.87–3.13)	2.22 (1.68–2.92)
Missing, n	6331	345	6026	1061	14 915	4560	31 643	1946	4988	3948	78 408	47 066
Comorbidities, n (%)												
Hypertension	11 737 (61.4)	675 (75.7)	10 969 (48.6)	2710 (64.4)	38 849 (76.9)	12 475 (82.5)	47 311 (56.5)	5711 (79.2)	11 863 (85.7)	8198 (95.0)	123 002 (76.3)	80 153 (89.4)
Type 2 diabetes	3311 (17.3)	221 (24.8)	5145 (22.8)	1790 (42.5)	15 785 (31.2)§	5515 (36.5)§	15 655 (18.7)	3334 (46.2)	4667 (33.7)	4621 (53.6)	49 299 (30.6)	46 142 (51.5)
Established CVD¶	1368 (7.2)	81 (9.1)	1467 (6.5)	437 (10.4)	5153 (10.2)	1784 (11.8)	23 248 (27.8)	2389 (33.1)	3337 (24.1)	2955 (34.3)	26 666 (16.5)	23 078 (25.7)
Heart failure	922 (4.8)	64 (7.2)	3318 (14.7)	1046 (24.8)	4248 (8.4)	2130 (14.1)	26 077 (31.2)	3986 (55.3)	2523 (18.2)	2791 (32.4)	22 422 (13.9)	24 580 (27.4)
Atrial fibrillation	2057 (10.8)	104 (11.7)	3351 (14.9)	866 (20.6)	8293 (16.4)	2812 (18.6)	10 765 (12.9)	1226 (17.0)	2409 (17.4)	2218 (25.7)	23 224 (14.4)	17 990 (20.1)
Medication use, n (%)												
ACE inhibitor	4363 (22.8)	271 (30.4)	8023 (35.6)	1612 (38.3)	19 141 (37.9)	5957 (39.4)	4027 (4.8)	474 (6.6)	5058 (36.5)	3725 (43.2)	33 532 (20.8)	24 274 (27.1)
ARB	6181 (32.3)	349 (39.1)	8855 (39.3)	1718 (40.8)	19 770 (39.1)	6428 (42.5)	18 959 (22.7)	2463 (34.2)	3605 (26.0)	2697 (31.3)	22 656 (14.0)	15 290 (17.1)
SGLT2 inhibitor	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	287 (0.6)	66 (0.4)	1082 (1.3)	281 (3.9)	11 (0.1)	11 (0.1)	1171 (0.7)	978 (1.1)
GLD (any)	3300 (17.3)	189 (21.2)	6742 (29.9)	1577 (37.5)	13 108 (25.9)	4255 (28.1)	11 303 (13.5)	2128 (29.5)	5012 (36.2)	4388 (50.9)	29 690 (18.4)	30 569 (34.1)
Antiplatelets	5636 (29.5)	328 (36.8)	5451 (24.2)	1146 (27.2)	23 245 (46.0)	7906 (52.3)	16 690 (19.9)	2106 (29.2)	1274 (9.2)	1202 (13.9)	8256 (5.1)	8052 (9.0)
Loop diuretic	2747 (14.4)	177 (19.8)	8564 (38.0)	1944 (46.2)	15 719 (31.1)	6441 (42.6)	10 346 (12.4)	1633 (22.7)	2720 (19.6)	2843 (33.0)	21 136 (13.1)	22 334 (24.9)
Anticoagulants	2885 (15.1)	133 (14.9)	6838 (30.3)	1344 (31.9)	12 214 (24.2)	3983 (26.3)	12 886 (15.4)	1600 (22.2)	3434 (24.8)	2913 (33.8)	28 521 (17.7)	26 465 (29.5)

Percentages represent the proportion of diagnosed/undiagnosed patients in a specific group (eg, age) or with a specific variable (eg, medical history).

*Diagnosed cases include patients with a corresponding ICD-9/10 diagnosis code for CKD at or within 6 months of study index (date of second qualifying eGFR measurement).

†UACR testing data not available in the German Disease Analyzer database.

‡Direct measurements of UACR were not available in the IQVIA Longitudinal Patient Database in Italy, however, UACR was calculated as urine albumin (mg/dL) divided by urine creatinine (g/dL) if patients had records for both of these variables on the same day.
§Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 diagnostic codes in the database used, type of diabetes could not be determined in patients from Italy.
ǁEstablished CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischaemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention.
¶Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 codes in the database used, established CVD does not include coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in patients from Italy.
ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-II receptor blocker; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLD, glucose-lowering drug; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; IQR, interquartile range; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; LPD, Longitudinal Patient Database; RWD, Real World Data; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; THIN, The Health Improvement Network; UACR, urinary albumin-creatinine ratio

Supplementary table 8. Comparison of CKD stages in Black and non-Black patients from the US TriNetX database when calculating eGFR using two different equations: CKD-EPI (without adjusting for race) and CKD-EPI (with race modifier)[1]

	CKD-EPI, no race modifier	**CKD-EPI, with race modifier**
Black (n=50 283)		
Stage 2 CKD, n (%)	0 (0.0)	23 156 (46.1)
Stage 3a CKD, n (%)	36 005 (71.6)	20 455 (40.7)
Stage 3b CKD, n (%)	14 278 (28.4)	6672 (13.3)
Non-Black (n=200 596)		
Stage 2 CKD, n (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Stage 3a CKD, n (%)	147 613 (73.6)	147 613 (73.6)
Stage 3b CKD, n (%)	52 983 (26.4)	52 983 (26.4)

CKD, chronic kidney disease; CKD-EPI, Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate.

Supplementary figure 1. Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD according to calendar year of study index according to country and database



CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

Supplementary figure 2. Prevalence of undiagnosed stage 3 CKD according to age group at study index according to country and database



CKD, chronic kidney disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

Supplementary figure 3. Factors associated with a lack of CKD diagnosis any time before or up to 6 months after index date according to country and database



Whiskers represent 95% confidence intervals.
*Odds ratios adjusted for covariates at index: sex, age, CKD stage, family history of CKD (not available in France, Germany and Japan), number of clinical visits in year before index, medical history (heart failure, established CVD, diabetes [any type], hypertension, other kidney disease) and medication use (diuretics, β-blockers, renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors, calcium channel blockers, lipid-lowering drugs, antithrombotic drugs, metformin, glucagon-like peptide receptor-1 inhibitors or sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors, and other glucose-lowering drugs).
†Upper 95% confidence interval extends beyond the boundary of the graph.
‡Established CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention.
§Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 codes in the database used, established CVD does not include coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in patients from Italy.
CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

Supplementary figure 4. Factors associated with time to CKD diagnosis in patients undiagnosed at index according to country and database



Whiskers represent 95% confidence intervals.
[a]Hazard ratios adjusted for covariates at index: sex, age, CKD stage, family history of CKD (not available in France, Germany and Japan), number of clinical visits in year before index, medical history (heart failure, established CVD, diabetes [any type], hypertension, other kidney disease) and medication use (diuretics, β-blockers, renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors, calcium channel blockers, lipid-lowering drugs, antithrombotic drugs, metformin, glucagon-like peptide receptor-1 inhibitors or sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors and other glucose-lowering drugs).
[b]Established CVD includes patients with a history of myocardial infarction, unstable angina, stroke, transient ischemic attack, coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention.
[c]Owing to a lack of granularity for ICD-9 codes in the database used, established CVD does not include coronary artery bypass graft and percutaneous coronary intervention in patients from Italy.
CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; HR, hazard ratio; LCED, Explorys Linked Claims and Electronic Medical Records Data.

References

1. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH*, et al.* A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;150(9):604–12. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-150-9-200905050-00006
2. Winkelmayer WC, Schneeweiss S, Mogun H, Patrick AR, Avorn J, Solomon DH. Identification of individuals with CKD from Medicare claims data: a validation study. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2005;46(2):225–32. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2005.04.029