



Impact of estimation versus direct measurement of predonation glomerular filtration rate on the eligibility of potential living kidney donors

F. Gaillard, M. Courbebaisse, Nassim Kamar, L. Rostaing, L. Jacquemont, M. Hourmant, Arnaud del Bello, L. Couzi, P. Merville, P. Malvezzi, et al.

► To cite this version:

F. Gaillard, M. Courbebaisse, Nassim Kamar, L. Rostaing, L. Jacquemont, et al.. Impact of estimation versus direct measurement of predonation glomerular filtration rate on the eligibility of potential living kidney donors. *Kidney International*, 2019, 95 (4), pp.896–904. 10.1016/j.kint.2018.11.029 . hal-02195256

HAL Id: hal-02195256

<https://hal.science/hal-02195256>

Submitted on 22 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

[QUERY TO AUTHOR: title and abstract rewritten by Editorial Office – not subject to change]

Title page

Impact of estimation versus direct measurement of pre-donation glomerular filtration rate on the eligibility of potential living kidney donors

Authors:

François Gaillard MD^{1,2}, Marie Courbebaisse MD PhD^{2,3}, Nassim Kamar MD PhD^{4-5£},
Lionel Rostaing MD PhD^{6£}, Lola Jacquemont MD^{7,8}, Maryvonne Hourmant MD
PhD^{7,8}, Arnaud Del Bello MD⁴, Lionel Couzi MD PhD^{9,10}, Pierre Merville MD PhD^{9,10},
Paolo Malvezzi MD⁶, Benedicte Janbon MD⁶, Bruno Moulin MD PhD¹¹, Nicolas
Maillard MD PhD¹², Laurence Dubourg MD^{13,14}, Sandrine Lemoine MD¹³, Cyril
Garrouste MD¹⁵, Hans Pottel PhD¹⁶, Christophe Legendre MD^{1,2}, Pierre Delanaye
MD PhD^{17,#} Christophe Mariat MD PhD^{12,#}

Affiliations:

1. AP-HP, Necker hospital, Renal Transplantation department, Paris, France
2. Paris Descartes university, Sorbonne Paris Cité, France
3. AP-HP, Georges Pompidou European hospital, Physiology department and INSERM, Unit 1151, Paris, France
4. Departments of Nephrology and Organ Transplantation, CHU Rangueil, Toulouse, France
5. INSERM U1043, IFR–BMT, Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France
6. CHU Grenoble, Nephrology and transplantation department, Grenoble, France
7. CHU Nantes, Renal Transplantation department, Nantes, France
8. Nantes university, Nantes, France
9. Department of Nephrology, Transplantation, Dialysis and Apheresis, Bordeaux University Hospital, Bordeaux, France.

10. Immuno ConcEpT, CNRS UMR 5164, Bordeaux University, Bordeaux, France.

11. Department of Nephrology and Transplantation - Nouvel Hôpital Civil -
Hôpitaux Universitaires de Strasbourg

12. Nephrology, Dialysis and Renal Transplantation Department, Hôpital Nord,
CHU de Saint-Etienne, Jean Monnet University, COMUE Université de Lyon

13. Hospices Civils de Lyon, Exploration Fonctionnelle Rénale et Métabolique
Lyon, France

14. UMR 5305 CNRS/Université Claude-Bernard, Lyon I, Biologie tissulaire et
Ingénierie thérapeutique, Lyon, France

15. CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Nephrology department, Clermont-Ferrand, France

16. Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Leuven, Kortrijk,
Belgium

17. Department of Nephrology, Dialysis, Transplantation, University of Liège [CHU
ULg), Liège, Belgium

£ Contributed equally to this work

Contributed equally to this work.

Financial support:

None

Running headline: GFR evaluation technique for living kidney donors

Corresponding author:

François Gaillard, gaillard.f@protonmail.com, Renal transplantation department,
Hôpital Necker-Enfants malades, 149 rue de Sèvres 75015 Paris France. Tel: +33
(0)1 44 49 54 49; □ Fax: +33 (0)1 44 49 25 09; □

Abstract

While direct measurements of glomerular filtration rate (GFR) provide the most accurate evaluation of pre-donation kidney function, guidelines do not systematically require the use of a reference method. We evaluated whether and to what extent relying upon creatinine-based estimating equations (eGFR) rather than direct measurement of GFR (mGFR) alters the selection of potential living donors. We compared the impact of 4 equations (the MDRD study equation, the CKD-EPI equation, the revised Lund-Malmö equation, and the full age spectrum (FAS) equation) on the evaluation of 2733 potential donors with GFR measured by reference methods. We also considered the impact of using either absolute or age-adapted GFR thresholds. The CKD-EPI and FAS equations had the best performances (P10 of 50.6% and 47.8%; P30 of 94.4% and 93.1%, respectively) and led to the lowest proportion of improperly evaluated candidates. Misclassification was more frequent when GFR adequacy was defined as an absolute threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m² as compared to an age-adapted definition (26% and 5 %, respectively). Interpretation of eGFR according to an absolute threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m² identified 1804 candidates eligible to donate, compared to 2648 when mGFR was interpreted with age-adapted thresholds. We conclude that creatinine-based estimates cannot substitute for direct GFR measurement to evaluate candidates for kidney donation. When reference methods for direct GFR measurement are not available, our data suggest that a strategy based on age-adapted eGFR values estimated with either the CKD-EPI or FAS equation should be preferred.

Keywords

Measured GFR, Estimated GFR, Living kidney donors

Introduction

Renal transplantation from living donors is the best treatment for end stage renal disease (ESRD). Compared to deceased donors, kidneys from living donors provide better graft and patient survival¹. Living donors are a significant -if not unique- source of kidneys in many geographical areas where deceased donation is scarce². Prerequisites for living kidney donation have been recently reformulated by the Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcome group (KDIGO) guidelines³. They recommend to accept living donation when glomerular filtration rate (GFR) is at least 90mL/min/1.73m² and to deny it for GFR lower than 60mL/min/1.73m². As for intermediate GFR values, eligibility has to be individually discussed using ESRD risk estimate ³. The GFR thresholds in the KDIGO guidelines for living kidney donors

were chosen following values that define CKD stages³. In the general population, those GFR values have been consistently found to be associated with higher risk of morbi-mortality. Whether those thresholds portend the same excess of risk in an healthier population of donors is however unclear.

Importantly, the preferred technique to be used for pre-donation GFR evaluation is not clearly specified in the guidelines. By acknowledging that reference methods of GFR measurements are not necessarily accessible in every transplant center worldwide, the KDIGO group only recommends that each center should rely upon the “best locally available” technique, including creatinine-based GFR estimation (eGFR). This may be problematic given the potentially large discrepancy between estimated and measured GFR at the individual level in populations of living kidney donors⁴. In this regard, several countries have adopted more stringent guidelines recommending direct measurement of pre-donation GFR with exogenous tracers (mGFR) ^{5–8}. Beyond the traditional metrics (bias, precision, 30%-accuracy) used to qualify a technique evaluating GFR, performance in terms of classification is also crucial in the context of living donation where the key question is to know whether an individual GFR value is high enough for proceeding further with the donation.

Beyond the way GFR is measured (or estimated), the question of the GFR threshold for kidney donation matters⁹. Currently, two approaches coexist to assess adequacy of individual GFR with kidney donation. The first is based on an absolute, one-fits-all GFR threshold and is endorsed by the latest KDIGO guidelines (with the threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m²). The second takes into account the physiologic decline of GFR over time and is based on the range of normality defined for each age category. Whether and to what extent using GFR estimating equations rather than direct measurement of GFR differently impacts those two approaches is not known.

Herein, we assembled a cohort of candidates for kidney donation who underwent conventional donor workup, including GFR measurements by a reference method, with the aim to evaluate the ability of creatinine-based equations in identifying GFR suitable for donation.

Results

Demographic characteristics of potential donors

We included 2733 potential living kidney donors from 7 French transplant centers. A majority of them were female (62%). Mean age was 50.6 ± 11.8 years and mean mGFR was 96.1 ± 17.8 mL/min/1.73m². Detailed characteristics of the cohort are presented in Table 1.

Comparisons of GFR estimating equations in potential donors

We evaluated the performances of four different creatinine-based equations: the modification of diet in renal disease (MDRD) study equation^{10,11}, the Chronic Kidney Disease-Epidemiology equation (CKD-EPI)¹², the revised Lund-Malmö (LM)¹³ equation and the full age spectrum (FAS)¹⁴ equation. Results are summarized in Table 2. Over the full range of mGFR, the CKD-EPI and the FAS equations had the best analytical performance. The CKD-EPI equation had the lowest root-mean square error (RMSE) (15.4 (95CI: 14.8-16.0)), highest P10 (50.7%), highest P30 (94.4%) and lowest absolute bias (-1.1 mL/min/1.73m²). The FAS equation had the highest Lin's Concordance Correlation Coefficient (Lin's CCC) and correlation coefficient (0.58 and 0.59, respectively). We also studied equations' performances around the threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m². Results are summarized in Table 2. Performances of equations greatly varied according to this threshold with no obvious

superiority for one equation in particular across the whole range of GFR. Ranges of mGFR were very different from those of eGFR. While 50% of potential donors had mGFR values between 84 and 107mL/min/1.73m² (Quartile 2 and Quartile 3, range 23mL/min/1.73m²), eGFR values varied from 59 to 135mL/min/1.73m² (range 76mL/min/1.73m²), irrespective of the equation considered.

Impact of eGFR for donor selection: the absolute threshold approach

The KDIGO guidelines identified two thresholds (90 and 60mL/min/1.73m²) in order to guide the clinical decision for donor's eligibility. Table 3 displays the proportions of misclassified subjects at 90 and 60mL/min/1.73m².

At the threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m², detailed classification of living donor candidates by mGFR and eGFR is presented in Table S1. The MDRD and LM equations had the highest percentage of misclassification with 33.7% and 35.7% respectively, while both the CKDEPI and the FAS equations misclassified 26% of potential donors.

For a threshold of 60mL/min/1.73m², percentage of misclassification was overall lower (Table 3). At this threshold, detailed classification of living donor candidates by mGFR and eGFR is presented in Table S2.

Misclassification is illustrated in Figure 1 for the CKD-EPI and FAS equations. Black dots represent potential donors with discordant eGFR at threshold of 90 (upper graphs) or 60 (lower graphs).

Impact of eGFR for donor selection: the age-adapted approach

We summarized the percentage of misclassification in Table 4. The MDRD and LM equations had higher percentage of misclassification (11.6% and 7.8% respectively) than the CKD-EPI and FAS equations (4.9% and 5.2% respectively). Detailed

classification of living donor candidates by mGFR and eGFR is presented in Table S3.

Among the 85 potential donors with abnormally low mGFR for age, 27 (31.7%) and 30 (35.3%) were correctly identified with the CKD-EPI equation and the FAS equation, respectively. With 43 (50.5%), the MDRD equation showed the best sensitivity to detect those “ineligible donors” (Table S3 and Figure 2).

Alternatively, we identified potential donors who would have been considered with abnormally low GFR according to creatinine-based estimates, *i.e* people with low eGFR but “good” mGFR. Results are presented in Figure 3. Among the 314 potential donors with low MDRD for age, 43 (13.6%) had low mGFR for age. Among the 104 potential donors with low CKDEPI for age, 27 (25.9%) had low mGFR for age. Among the 115 potential donors with low FAS for age, 30 (26.1%) had low mGFR for age. Among the 200 potential donors with low LM for age, 36 (18%) had normal mGFR for age. Hence the positive predictive value of low eGFR for age to predict low mGFR for age was at best 26.1% for the FAS equation (Table S3).

eGFR vs. mGFR: the net result on the number of eligible donors.

Differences in eligibility of potential donors according to the method of GFR evaluation (estimated vs. measured GFR) and according to the method of GFR interpretation (absolute vs. age-adapted threshold) are presented in Table 5.

Considering age-adapted normality, use of eGFR resulted for all equations in a lower number of eligible donors (ranging from -19 to -229 donors for the CKDEPI and MDRD equations, respectively).

Considering the fixed threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m², the number of eligible donors was higher for the CKDEPI equation as compared to mGFR (+107). For all other equations, the number of eligible donors was lower.

For a threshold of 60mL/min/1.73m², the number of eligible donors was constantly lower for eGFR as compared to mGFR.

Importantly, numbers of eligible donors according to eGFR equations and GFR interpretation contain falsely selected candidates (that is, potential donors with eGFR higher than the threshold but mGFR lower than the threshold). For example, 2629 candidates are considered eligible to donation by the CKDEPI equation, using age-adapted thresholds. That represents -19 donors compared to mGFR. Yet, among those 2629 candidates 58 have a low mGFR for age and should have not been accepted.

Impact of screening strategy on evaluation of potential donors younger than 40.

This population of potential donors is specific regarding the number of years to live with a single kidney and the fact that age-related GFR decline has not yet started in this age group⁹. We studied the performance of equations, the percentage of misclassification, and the number of eligible donors for potential living kidney donors younger than 40. Conclusions remain the in this subgroup of candidates.

Performances were similar for the 4 equations (Table S4). The CKDEPI and FAS still had the lowest percentage of misclassification either at age-adapted GFR threshold (Table S5 and S6) or fixed thresholds (Tables S7, S8, S9) and an age-adapted GFR threshold combined to mGFR led to the highest number of eligible donors (Table S10).

Discussion

Our study has focused on the relationship between the method to evaluate pre-donation kidney function and the way to interpret it. We show that the impact of eGFR on eligibility for donation varies according to the approach used for assessing GFR adequacy (absolute or age-adapted threshold), and that those results are also applicable to potential donors younger than 40.

Diagnostic performances of the FAS and CKD-EPI equations were found to be better than those of the MDRD and revised Lund-Malmö equations. This is not surprising since the CKD-EPI was developed to improve the MDRD equation in population with GFR higher than 60mL/min/1.73m²¹². Performances of the different equations could be considered as optimal at first glance, especially regarding the accuracy within 30%. However, in the specific situation of living kidney donation, high level of precision is crucial and the accuracy within 30% is certainly too permissive: an individual GFR value of 100 mL/min/1.73m² is usually not considered as being equivalent to 70 mL/min/1.73m² nor to 130 mL/min/1.73m². In this context, accuracy within 10% seems a better parameter to consider. Importantly, only 50.6% (in the best scenario) of eGFR reached this level of performance in our cohort. In the same vein, we observed that 50% of potential donors had mGFR values between 84 and 107mL/min/1.73m² (Quartile 2 and Quartile 3, range 23mL/min/1.73m²), while the corresponding eGFR values varied from 59 to 135mL/min/1.73m² (range 76mL/min/1.73m²) irrespective of the equation considered. This magnitude of discrepancy can be seen as a first indication that eGFR and mGFR are not interchangeable for the screening of potential donors. Of note GFR was indexed to BSA. Such a strategy has several limitations^{15–18} especially for obese donors but the impact on donor eligibility still has to be investigated.

We evaluated whether using eGFR instead of mGFR could modify the final decision of donation according to the two most common ways to interpret GFR adequacy. When adequacy was judged through an absolute, fixed threshold, we observed significant discrepancies between eGFR and mGFR. For example, at a threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m², the CKDEPI and FAS equation - which turned out to have the best performance - misclassified one quarter of potential donors. This result is in accordance with our previous findings⁴. On the other hand, when adequacy was judged through age-adapted thresholds, as recommended by some guidelines^{5,6,8,19}, misclassification was improved down to 5.0%, suggesting that this approach might be acceptable in situations where mGFR is not available. This needs however to be tempered given the relative inability of GFR estimating equations to detect abnormally low mGFR for age. Among the 85 potential donors who had such abnormal mGFR in our cohort, only 50.5%, 42.4% and 35.3% of them were properly identified by the MDRD, LM and FAS equations, respectively. The figure was even worse for the CKDEPI equation with only 27 (31.7%) potential donors being adequately pinpointed.

Interestingly, the degree of misclassification is similar between an approach that would be based on a fixed GFR threshold of 60 mL/min/1.73m² and the approach based on age-adapted thresholds. Obviously, 60 mL/min/1.73m² is however far too low to be applicable for the screening of the youngest potential donors. This further underlines the relevance of an age-adapted approach for determining the adequacy of pre-donation GFR at the individual level. In our previous work on this subject we studied a population of effective living kidney donors so that post-donation GFR evolution was used as a read-out of baseline GFR evaluation⁹. Age is associated with the number of nephron²⁰ and we previously reported that age was an important

parameter to interpret GFR since older donors had lower GFR than younger donors⁹. On the contrary, in the present study, we included all the potential living kidney donors who underwent predonation GFR evaluation, to simulate the impact of GFR evaluation method and GFR interpretation on eligibility to donation. By doing so, not only did we confirm our previous observation on the importance of age (in a different population), but also observed that, combination of mGFR with an age-adapted approach leads to the selection of the highest number of candidates. At a time when many countries are facing stagnation or even decline in living kidney donation²¹ that combination is of particular clinical and epidemiological relevance.

Our study has to be understood with its limitations. First, potential donors of our cohort may not be perfectly representative of countries other than France and consequently generalizability of our results may be questioned. Normal GFR references may be different in other populations, notably in Asia^{22,23}. Second, we aggregated mGFR values obtained from different methods of GFR measurement. While they are all considered as reference methods, inulin, ⁵¹Cr-EDTA and Iohexol measured clearances are not strictly equivalent²⁴. Moreover, the performances of equations including Cystatin C, could not be evaluated in the absence of Cystatin C value in this cohort. Third, measured creatinine clearance is sometimes considered to estimate GFR when mGFR is not available. However, such measured creatinine clearances were not available in our cohort, and the real performance of this method in living kidney donation could thus not be tested. However, it can be reminded that 24h urinary creatinine clearance is nowadays not considered as a reference method to measure GFR, because of a systematic bias (overestimation due to tubular secretion), and, more importantly in the context of living donation, a high degree of imprecision²⁴.

Fourth, even though we included all potential donors who underwent pre-donation screening, potential donors who did not undergo GFR measurement were not evaluated. In fact, those potential donors who did not undergo GFR measurement were denied donation due to a reason unrelated to GFR. Hence, our cohort represents *stricto sensu* all potential donors for whom the value of GFR could have changed the decision. We assumed abnormally low GFR for age as a possible contra indication to donation. Last, beyond age-adapted GFR thresholds and overall GFR measurement, the usefulness of differential renal function evaluation for each kidney needs to be addressed.

In conclusion, the KDIGO guidelines on the evaluation of living kidney donors recommend the use of absolute, fixed GFR thresholds without specifying the method to be used for GFR evaluation. This recommendation is mainly justified by the observation that reference methods to measure GFR are not necessarily available in all transplant centers. One may however argue that simple and rigorous methods, such as plasma clearance of iothexol²⁵, exist and can easily be implemented. In this regard, our data show that mGFR, by providing the highest number of eligible donors should remain the gold-standard for potential donors' evaluation. In situations where eGFR is the only resource to evaluate GFR adequacy with donation, we suggest to preferentially rely upon a strategy based on age-adapted GFR values estimated with either the CKD-EPI or the FAS equations.

Methods

Potential living kidney donors

We conducted a retrospective multicentric observational study on candidates for living kidney donation, between 2007 and 2017. Seven transplantation centers

participated in the study (Bordeaux, Clermont-Ferrand, Grenoble, Lyon, Paris-Necker, Toulouse, Nantes). Data were recorded anonymously. We included all potential donors who underwent pre-donation GFR measurement irrespective of whether they finally donated a kidney or not. Our study complies with all the items of the modified STROBE statement (<https://www.strobe-statement.org>) except item 13 (regarding the necessity to report the number of individuals at each stage of the study) that could not be entirely fulfilled. According to French law, anonymous retrospective studies do not require Institutional Review Board approval.

GFR measurement

⁵¹Cr-EDTA

For Paris-Necker, Bordeaux, Grenoble, Nantes, GFR was measured with ⁵¹Cr-EDTA in standardized conditions in the morning. For Paris-Necker, and Bordeaux GFR was assessed through a continuous ⁵¹Cr-ethylene-diamine tetra acetic acid (⁵¹Cr-EDTA, GE Healthcare) infusion method. A priming dose of 0.5 µCurie/kg body weight of ⁵¹Cr-EDTA was injected intravenously, followed by a constant ⁵¹Cr-EDTA infusion. Average renal ⁵¹Cr-EDTA clearance was assessed during six (7 for Bordeaux) consecutive 30-min (45 minutes for Nancy) clearance periods. Blood was drawn at the midpoint of each clearance period with the last collection 300 min after injection of the priming dose. The radioactivity measurements in 1-mL plasma samples and in urine samples were carried out on a Packard Cobra 3-inch crystal γ-ray well counter.

Inulin

For Toulouse, Lyon, Clermont-Ferrand, GFR was measured with inulin clearance. Inulin clearance was performed with a loading dose of 30 mg/kg and a maintenance dose of inulin of 40 mg/kg (INUTEST 25%; Fresenius, Kabi, Austria). The urine was collected every 30 minutes, and blood tests were performed in the middle of each

period of urine collection (3 or 4 periods). The inulin clearance was calculated in each period to obtain the average. Measurements of plasma and urine polyfructosan concentrations were performed using an enzymatic method.

Iohexol

For Lyon, GFR was measured with iohexol. Iohexol plasma clearance, after IV injection of 5 to 10 ml of iohexol (300 mg; Omnipaque; GE Healthcare SAS, Vélizy-Villacoublay, France). The syringe was weighted before and after injection to calculate the injected dose and blood was collected at 120, 180, and 240 minutes. Serum iohexol concentration was measured by High Performance Liquid Chromatography. The GFR was calculated from plasma clearance with the Bröchner–Mortensen correction.

GFR estimation

Creatinine was measured by enzymatic IDMS traceable methods. GFR was estimated using four equations: MDRD^{10,11}, CKD-EPI¹², FAS¹⁴ and revised Lund-Malmö¹³.

Statistical analysis

Data processing was done using Excel (2011, Microsoft), and statistical analyses were performed using R (R Core Team, 2017, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Data are presented as mean and standard deviations. We compared the performances of 4 equations estimating GFR with bias (constant bias eGFR-mGFR, proportional bias eGFR/mGFR, relative bias (eGFR-mGFR)/mGFR), accuracy (within 10% and within 30%), and precision (root mean square error) and Lin's CCC²⁶. Lin's CCC evaluates the degree to which pairs of observations (e.g. eGFR and mGFR) fall on the 45° line through the origin. The CCC contains a measurement of precision p and accuracy: $CCC = p C_b$, where p is

the Pearson correlation coefficient, which measures how far each observation deviates from the best-fit line, and is a measure of precision, and C_b is a bias correction factor that measures how far the best-fit line deviates from the 45° line through the origin, and is a measure of accuracy.

The proportion of potential donors with discordant eGFR and mGFR at a fixed threshold represents the sum of: the percentage of potential donors with eGFR higher, and mGFR lower, than the threshold; and of the percentage of potential donors with eGFR lower, and mGFR higher, than the threshold.

For age-adapted thresholds, we used the previously published definition of low GFR for age $(107.3/1.33 \times 0.988^{(Age-40)} \text{ when } Age > 40))^{27}$ that is very close to the age-threshold proposed by the British Guideline⁸. The proportion of potential donors with discordant eGFR and mGFR for age represents the sum of: the percentage of potential donors with eGFR higher, and mGFR lower than normal for age; and of the percentage of potential donors with eGFR lower, and mGFR higher than normal for age.

Disclosure

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose

Supplementary Material

Table S1: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at the fixed GFR threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m²

Table S2: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at the fixed GFR threshold of 60mL/min/1.73m²

Table S3: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at age-adapted GFR threshold.

Table S4: Comparison of the performances of the 4 equations estimating GFR for potential donors < 40 years.

Table S5: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at age-adapted GFR threshold for potential donors <40 years.

Table S6: Proportions of misclassified potential donors for age-adapted GFR thresholds, for potential donors <40 years.

Table S7: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at the fixed GFR threshold of 60mL/min/1.73m² for potential donors <40 years.

Table S8: Comparison of eGFR and mGFR on the classification of potential donors at the fixed GFR threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m² for potential donors <40 years.

Table S9: Proportions of misclassified potential donors for absolute GFR thresholds of 90 and 60 mL/min/1.73m² for potential donors <40 years.

Table S10: Simulation of the numbers of eligible donors according to the methods of GFR evaluation and GFR interpretation for potential donors younger than 40.

Supplementary information is available at Kidney International's website

References

1. Legendre C, Canaud G, Martinez F. Factors influencing long-term outcome after kidney transplantation. *Transpl Int*. 2014;27(1):19-27. doi:10.1111/tri.12217
2. Those 2017 data are based on the Global Observatory on Donation and Transplantation (GODT) data, produced by the WHO-ONT collaboration.
3. Lentine KL, Kasiske BL, Levey AS, et al. KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline on the Evaluation and Care of Living Kidney Donors. *Transplantation*. 2017;101(8 Suppl 1):S7.
4. Gaillard F, Flamant M, Lemoine S, et al. Estimated or Measured GFR in Living Kidney Donors Work-up? *Am J Transplant*. 2016;16(10):3024-3032. doi:10.1111/ajt.13908
5. Thuong M. Prélèvement et greffe rénale à partir de donneur vivant. Recommandations formalisées d'experts–texte court. *Néphrologie Thérapeutique*. 2010;6(2):138–144.
6. Richardson R, Connelly M, Dipchand C, et al. Kidney Paired Donation

- Protocol for Participating Donors 2014. *Transplantation*. 2015;99:Suppl-S88.
7. The European Renal Best Practice (ERBP) Transplantation guideline development group, Abramowicz D, Cochat P, et al. Guideline. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2013;28(suppl 2):ii1-ii71. doi:10.1093/ndt/gft218
 8. British Transplantation Society. BTS/RA Living Donor Kidney Transplantation Guidelines 2018. 2018. https://bts.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/FINAL_LDKT-guidelines_June-2018.pdf.
 9. Gaillard F, Courbebaisse M, Kamar N, et al. The age-calibrated measured glomerular filtration rate improves living kidney donation selection process. *Kidney Int*. 2018;94(3):616-624. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2018.05.016
 10. Levey AS, Bosch JP, Lewis JB, Greene T, Rogers N, Roth D. A more accurate method to estimate glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine: a new prediction equation. Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group. *Ann Intern Med*. 1999;130(6):461-470.
 11. Levey AS, Coresh J, Greene T, et al. Expressing the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Equation for Estimating Glomerular Filtration Rate with Standardized Serum Creatinine Values. *Clin Chem*. 2007;53(4):766-772. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2006.077180
 12. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, et al. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;150(9):604-612.
 13. Nyman U, Grubb A, Larsson A, et al. The revised Lund-Malmö GFR estimating equation outperforms MDRD and CKD-EPI across GFR, age and BMI intervals in a large Swedish population. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2014;52(6). doi:10.1515/cclm-2013-0741
 14. Pottel H, Hoste L, Dubourg L, et al. An estimated glomerular filtration rate equation for the full age spectrum. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2016;31(5):798. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfv454
 15. Delanaye P, Krzesinski J-M. Indexing of Renal Function Parameters by Body Surface Area: Intelligence or Folly. *Nephron Clin Pract*. 2011;119(4):c289-c292. doi:10.1159/000330276
 16. Eriksen BO, Melsom T, Mathisen UD, Jenssen TG, Solbu MD, Toft I. GFR Normalized to Total Body Water Allows Comparisons across Genders and Body Sizes. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2011;22(8):1517-1525. doi:10.1681/ASN.2010121321
 17. Turner ST, Reilly SL. Fallacy of indexing renal and systemic hemodynamic measurements for body surface area. *Am J Physiol-Regul Integr Comp Physiol*. 1995;268(4):R978-R988. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.1995.268.4.R978
 18. Kronmal RA. Spurious Correlation and the Fallacy of the Ratio Standard Revisited. *J R Stat Soc Ser A Stat Soc*. 1993;156(3):379-392. doi:10.2307/2983064
 19. European Renal Best Practice Transplantation Guideline Development Group. ERBP Guideline on the Management and Evaluation of the Kidney Donor and Recipient. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2013;28:Suppl-71.
 20. Denic A, Mathew J, Lerman LO, et al. Single-Nephron Glomerular Filtration Rate in Healthy Adults. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376(24):2349-2357. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1614329
 21. Gill J, Joffres Y, Rose C, et al. The Change in Living Kidney Donation in Women and Men in the United States (2005-2015): A Population-Based Analysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol JASN*. 2018;29(4):1301-1308. doi:10.1681/ASN.2017111160
 22. Low glomerular filtration rate in the Indian population is apparently physiological. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*. doi:10.1038/ncpneph0776
 23. Barai S, Gambhir S, Prasad N, et al. Levels of GFR and Protein-induced

- Hyperfiltration in Kidney Donors: A Single-Center Experience in India. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2008;51(3):407-414. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2007.11.008
24. Soveri I, Berg UB, Björk J, et al. Measuring GFR: a systematic review. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2014;64(3):411-424. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2014.04.010
25. Yayo E, Ayé M, Yao C, et al. Measured (and estimated) glomerular filtration rate: reference values in West Africa. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* August 2017. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfx244
26. Lin LI. A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility. *Biometrics.* 1989;45(1):255-268.
27. Pottel H, Delanaye P, Weekers L, et al. Age-dependent reference intervals for estimated and measured glomerular filtration rate. *Clin Kidney J.* 2017;10(4):545-551. doi:10.1093/ckj/sfx026

Acknowledgments

Authors thank Catherine Fournier for data collection of Necker donors, Monica Pampillonia La Manna for data collection of Grenoble donors, Lydie Lerat for Nantes donors. François Gaillard thanks Ecole de l'INSERM Liliane Bettencourt for financial support. All the members of the transplantation commission of the Société Francophone de Néphrologie, Dialyse et Transplantation for data collection.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of potential donors (n=2733).

<i>Number of potential donors</i>	<i>2733</i>
Female (%)	1694 (62.0)
Age years (SD)	50.6 (11.8)
Age > 40 (%)	2199 (80.5)
Weight kg (SD)	71.0 (14.1)
Height cm (SD)	167.4 (9.0)
BMI kg/m² (SD)	25.3 (4.1)

BSA m^2 (SD)	1.79 (0.20)
Obese (%)	325 (11.9)
mGFR $mL/min/1.73m^2$ (SD)	96.1 (17.8)
Creatinine $\mu mol/L$ (SD)	70.5 (13.9)
MDRD $mL/min/1.73m^2$ (SD)	89.3 (17.4)
CKDEPI $mL/min/1.73m^2$ (SD)	95.1 (14.9)
FAS $mL/min/1.73m^2$ (SD)	93.6 (18.8)
LM $mL/min/1.73m^2$ (SD)	85.5 (12.4)

Data are presented as mean and standard deviation. SD: standard deviation. BMI:

Body mass index. mGFR: Measured glomerular filtration rate, obese: BMI > 30kg/m²,

BSA: body surface area.

Table 2: Comparison of the performances of the 4 estimating GFR equations.

Full mGFR range (46.5 – 183 $mL/min/1.73m^2$)	MDRD 29-167	CKDEPI 31-139	LM 27-126	FAS 33-168
RMSE	18.9 (18.3, 19.6)	15.4 (14.8, 16.0)	18.2 (17.7, 18.8)	16.9 (16.3, 17.5)
P10	41.4 (41.5, 41.5)	50.7 (50.7, 50.7)	41.7 (41.7, 41.7)	47.8 (47.8, 47.8)
P30	90.0 (90.0, 90.0)	94.4 (94.4, 94.4)	92.9 (92.9, 92.9)	93.1 (93.1, 93.1)
Proportional Bias	0.95 (0.94, 0.96)	1.02 (1.01, 1.02)	0.92 (0.91, 0.92)	1.00 (0.98, 1.00)
Absolute Bias	-6.7 (-7.4, -6.1)	-1.1 (-1.6, -0.4)	-10.6 (-11.2, -10.6)	-2.5 (-3.2, -1.9)
Relative Bias	-0.05 (-0.06, -0.05)	0.00 (0.00, 0.01)	-0.09 (-0.10, -0.09)	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.00)

Lin's CCC	0.46 (0.43, 0.49)	0.56 (0.53, 0.58)	0.44 (0.41, 0.46)	0.58 (0.55, 0.60)
Correlation	0.49	0.57	0.57	0.59
P value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
mGFR <90 mL/min/1.73m² (n=1037)	MDRD 29-164	CKDEPI 31-121	LM 27-112	FAS 33-139
RMSE	14.1 (13.2, 14.9)	13.7 (13.1, 14.3)	10.6 (10.0, 11.0)	13.6 (12.8, 14.3)
P10	47.6 (44.5, 50.6)	42.5 (39.5, 45.5)	56.5 (53.4, 59.5)	48.3 (45.2, 51.3)
P30	91.8 (90.1, 93.5)	91.3 (89.6, 93.0)	97.0 (96.0, 98.0)	93.1 (91.6, 94.7)
Proportional Bias	1.02 (1.00, 1.03)	1.09 (1.08, 1.10)	0.98 (0.98, 0.99)	1.03 (1.02, 1.04)
Absolute Bias	0.72 (-0.14, 1.57)	6.34 (5.6, 7.09)	-1.56 (-2.2, -0.93)	2.05 (1.23, 2.87)
Relative Bias	0.02 (0.00, 0.02)	0.08 (0.07, 0.09)	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.00)	0.03 (0.02, 0.04)
mGFR ≥90 mL/min/1.73m² (n=1697)	MDRD 58-152	CKDEPI 61-130	LM 57-119	FAS 56-162
RMSE	21.4 (20.5, 22.3)	16.3 (15.5, 17.2)	21.5 (20.6, 22.4)	18.5 (17.8, 19.4)
P10	37.8 (35.5, 40.1)	55.7 (53.4, 58.1)	32.8 (30.5, 35.0)	47.7 (45.3, 50.1)
P30	88.9 (87.4, 90.4)	96.3 (95.4, 97.2)	90.5 (89.1, 91.9)	93.1 (91.9, 94.3)
Proportional Bias	0.90 (0.89, 0.91)	0.96 (0.95, 0.96)	0.86 (0.85, 0.86)	0.95 (0.95, 0.96)
Absolute Bias	-11.4 (-12.3, -10.6)	-5.7 (-6.4, -4.9)	-16.1 (-16.8, -15.4)	-5.8 (-6.6, -4.9)
Relative Bias	-0.10 (-0.11, -0.09)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.04)	-0.14 (-0.15, -0.14)	-0.04 (-0.05, -0.04)

Data are presented as mean and standard deviation. RMSE: Root Mean Square

Error, P10: percentage of eGFR values within 10% of mGFR, P30: percentage of eGFR values within 30% of mGFR. Numbers in brackets represent the 95 percent confidence interval.

Table 3: Proportions of misclassified potential donors for absolute GFR thresholds of 90 and 60 mL/min/1.73m².

GFR threshold (mL/min/1.73m ²)		GFR estimating Equation			
		MDRD	CKD-EPI	LM	FAS
90		33.7 %	26.1 %	35.7 %	26.0 %
	95%CI	(32.2-35.2)	(24.7-27.5)	(34.2-37.3)	(24.7-27.4)
60		2.6 %	1.2 %	1.8 %	2.0 %
	95%CI	(2.2-3.2)	(0.9-1.6)	(1.4-2.3)	(1.6-2.5)

Data are presented as percentage. GFR: Glomerular Filtration rate.

Table 4: Proportions of misclassified potential donors for age-adapted GFR thresholds

GFR threshold (mL/min/1.73m ²)	Equation estimating GFR			
	MDRD	CKD-EPI	LM	FAS
Age adapted	11.6 %	4.9 %	7.8 %	5.2 %
95%CI	(10.6-12.6)	(4.2-5.6)	(6.9-8.7)	(4.5-5.9)

Data are presented as percentage. GFR: Glomerular Filtration rate. 95%CI: 95% confidence interval.

Table 5: Simulation of the numbers of eligible donors according to the methods of GFR evaluation and GFR interpretation.

	Age adapted threshold			90 mL/min/1.73m ²			60 mL/min/1.73m ²		
	Eligible	Dif vs. mGFR	False positive	Eligible	Dif vs. mGFR	False positive	Eligible	Dif vs. mGFR	False positive
mGFR	2648	-	0	1697	-	0	2707	-	0
MDRD	2419	-229	42	1199	-498	210	2660	-47	12
CKDEPI	2629	-19	58	1804	+107	408	2704	-3	15
FAS	2618	-30	55	1509	-188	261	2684	-23	16
LM	2533	-115	49	966	-731	123	2681	-26	12

Are considered eligible to donation, donors with normal GFR for age (for age adapted approach) or donors with GFR higher than the absolute threshold. Dif vs. mGFR: difference in the number of eligible donors by using eGFR. The number of eligible

donor selected by eGFR contains some false positive candidates *i.e* candidates with eGFR compatible with donation and mGFR not compatible with donation, referred to as False positive.

Figure legends


Figure 1: Relationship between eGFR (CKD-EPI equation: left; FAS equation: right) and mGFR in 2733 potential donors. Black dots represent misclassified individuals according to an absolute GFR threshold of 90mL/min/1.73m² (upper graphs) or 60mL/min/1.73m² (lower graphs)

Figure 2: Misclassification of ineligible donors: eGFR of potential donors with a low mGFR for age among 2733 potential donors. Black dots represent individuals with abnormally low mGFR for age. **A.** Relationship between age and mGFR. **B-E.**

Relationship between age and GFR estimated by 4 equations. Solid blue line represents the lower limit of GFR normality for age.

Figure 3: Misclassification of eligible donors: mGFR of potential donors with a low eGFR for age among 2733 potential donors. Black dots represent potential donors with abnormally low eGFR for age. Relationship between age and mGFR (right column) or eGFR (left column) given by **A-** the MDRD equation, **B-** the CKD-EPI equation, **C-** the FAS equation, and **D-** the LM equation. Solid blue line represents the lower limit of normal GFR for age.

Figure 1






Figure 2




Figure 3