BMJ Open

Development and validation of risk models to predict chronic kidney disease among people living with HIV: protocol for a systematic review

Oluwatosin Olaseni Odubela ,[1,2] Nkiruka Odunukwe,[2] Nasheeta Peer,[1,3] Adesola Z Musa,[2] Babatunde L Salako,[2,4] A P Kengne[1,5]

To cite: Odubela OO, Odunukwe N, Peer N, *et al*. Development and validation of risk models to predict chronic kidney disease among people living with HIV: protocol for a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e061149. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061149

► 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-2022-061149).

Received 28 January 2022
Accepted 01 July 2022

[1]Medicine, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, South Africa
[2]Clinical Sciences Department, Nigerian Institute of Medical Research, Lagos, Nigeria
[3]Non-Communicable Diseases Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council, Durban, South Africa
[4]Medicine, University College Hospital Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
[5]Non-Communicable Diseases Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council, Tygerberg, South Africa

Correspondence to
Dr Oluwatosin Olaseni Odubela; odubstosin08@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is estimated to affect about 9.1% of the global population with a substantially increased risk of the condition (6.8%–17.2%) among people living with HIV (PLWH). This increased risk is attributed to HIV infection itself, antiretroviral therapy, coexisting viral infections, non-infectious comorbidities and traditional risk factors for CKD. Predictive models have been employed in the estimation of prevalent and incident CKD risk in both PLWH and the general population. A predictive model showing an individual's risk of prevalent and/or progression to kidney failure is useful for initiating timely interventions that prevent further worsening of kidney function. This study will systematically review published prediction models developed and/or validated for prevalent and incident CKD in PLWH, describe their characteristics, compare performance and assess methodological quality and applicability.

Methods and analysis Studies with predictive models of interest will be identified by searching MEDLINE, Web of Science, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature, Cochrane library and Scopus from inception to May 2022. Title and abstract screening, full-text review and data extraction will be completed independently by two reviewers. Using appropriate tools designed for predictive modelling investigations, the included papers will be rigorously assessed for bias and applicability. Extracted data will be presented in tables, so that published prediction models can be compared qualitatively. Quantitative data on the predictive performance of these models will be synthesised with meta-analyses if appropriate.

Ethics and dissemination The findings of the review will be disseminated in peer-reviewed journals and seminar presentations. Ethical approval is not required as this is a protocol for a systematic review.

PROSPERO registration number CRD42021279694.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

⇒ This systematic review protocol follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols 2015 guidelines.
⇒ This review addresses the knowledge gap regarding chronic kidney disease prediction models specific for people living with HIV.
⇒ The review will also incorporate models predicting progression to kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy.
⇒ This review is not limited to randomised controlled trials.
⇒ In the absence of a sufficient number of studies/models, meta-analysis may not be performed.

INTRODUCTION

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) has become a global threat as it constitutes a sizeable proportion of morbidity and premature deaths.[1] CKD is estimated to affect 697.5 million people globally representing a global prevalence of 9.1%.[1] The traditional risk factors for CKD include increasing age, hypertension, diabetes mellitus and obesity. CKD is a predictor of poor quality of life as well as increased healthcare expenses.[2 3]

There is a substantially increased risk of developing CKD (6.8%–17.2%) among people living with HIV (PLWH).[4 5] This is corroborated by postulations of HIV infection and antiretroviral therapy (ART) regimens in the acquisition of CKD.[6 7] CKD could arise among PLWH from the classic HIV-associated nephropathy or immune complex disease, non-infectious comorbidities (hypertension and diabetes), coexisting viral infections (Hepatitis B and C) and antiretroviral toxicity.[8 9]

CKD is known to contribute to the increased morbidity and mortality among PLWH as the number of PLWH with kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy increases globally.[2 3] CKD is an important non-infectious cause of morbidity and mortality among PLWH and could reverse the gains achieved via ART roll-out.[10 11] Thus, risk assessments using predictive models remain a veritable tool for mitigating CKD in the populace (and HIV cohort).

Rationale

Predictive models have been developed to assist with CKD risk evaluation in both the HIV and general population. These predictive models have been employed to identify persons at greater risk of CKD (diagnosis or prognosis) and found to be helpful in clinical decision-making as well as public health interventions to mitigate against CKD.[12 13] These models use biological markers (urinary protein and albumin, serum creatinine and cystine C, uric acid) along with other traditional risk factors for CKD (age, sex, blood pressure readings and diabetes mellitus) in their formulation. Early detection and management of hypertension, diabetes mellitus and CKD in this population can help improve renal and cardiovascular outcomes thereby regressing or slowing the progression towards kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy.

A few studies have reported predictive models for prevalent and incident CKD among PLWH as well as systematic reviews of CKD predictive models in the general population.[14–17] However, none of these studies have provided systematic reviews on CKD predictive models with the HIV population as the focus.

This protocol is for a systematic review with or without meta-analysis of the spectrum of prevalent and/or incident CKD prediction models developed and/or validated in PLWH, to identify existing gaps and guide research endeavours in the future.

Objective

This study aims to conduct a systematic review to identify and characterise predictive models developed and/or validated on prevalent and incident CKD in adult PLWH, evaluate the performances of these models in PLWH and identify existing knowledge gaps as reported in the published literature.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The protocol will be conducted in alignment with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols 2015 guidelines (see online supplemental appendix 1).[18] In addition, the CHARMS checklist will be employed to frame the review questions while the patient population, intervention, comparator, outcome, timing, and setting (PICOTS) criteria will be used to determine inclusion and exclusion criteria.[19 20]

Review questions

The review questions are as follows: (1) are there risk models specifically developed to predict prevalent and/or incident CKD among PLWH; and what are their characteristics? and (2) are there models for predicting prevalent or incident CKD which have been validated in PLWH and how do they perform in this population? The CHARMS checklist was used in the formulation of the review questions.[19]

The above questions will form the basis of our review in identifying both prognostic and diagnostic models for CKD, with all types of prediction modelling studies included (development with or without external validation in independent data and external model validation with possible model updates). The scope of the review will be to inform clinical decision-making as it relates to prevalent and incident CKD among PLWH. The review will include diagnostic and prognostic models for CKD as well as models predicting progression to kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy with reference to HIV diagnosis. PLWH who are ≥18 years of age will be our target population.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The PICOTS framework will be employed in defining the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this review.[20] The population of interest is adult (≥18 years) PLWH with emphasis on predictive models for prevalent and incident CKD among the population. The primary outcomes are predictive models for (1) prevalent CKD, (2) incident CKD and (3) progression to kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy in PLWH. Our secondary outcomes were the evaluation of the performance of the above three groups of models as well as the candidate variables employed in their derivation. Studies to be included in the review are cross-sectional, cohort, clinical controlled and randomised controlled trials with the intent for the models to be used for clinical decision-making and public health advocacy measures.

The exclusion criteria will include the following. Studies primarily among paediatric, adolescents and pregnant women, case–control studies, editorials, letters to editors, models generated from simulation and animal studies as well as those evaluating quality of life among patients with CKD.

Search strategy

From inception to May 2022, a systematic search of the following electronic databases of peer-reviewed journal articles and online search records will be conducted: MEDLINE, Web of Science, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Cochrane library and Scopus. Keywords relating to population (patients with HIV, PLWH, PLWH/AIDS, HIV infected, ART experienced, ART-naive); disease (impaired renal function, impaired kidney function, CKD, chronic renal disease, chronic renal insufficiency, chronic kidney failure, end-stage kidney disease, end-stage renal disease); modelling (prevalence, prevalent, incidence, incident, predict, risk, risk scores, prediction models, prediction tools, risk assessment, risk engineering) and models predicting CKD prevalence and incidence among PLWH as well as factors associated with the validity of these models. To accommodate each database, the search phrases will be concatenated. Reference lists of relevant papers will be scanned for eligible studies. A search strategy using MEDLINE is attached (see online supplemental appendix 2). Grey literature (such as reports, conferences and workshop proceedings) will be searched using the Google Scholar

search engine as well as important relevant websites such as African Journals Online (hand searches). EndNote reference manager will be used to export references and delete any duplications identified.

Selection of studies

The title and abstract of each paper will be evaluated by two independent reviewers before being included in the review. The final selection of papers to be included in the review will be decided after reading the full texts of eligible articles. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion and consensus or consultation with a third reviewer.

A model/risk assessment tool that predicts prevalent and/or incident CKD, as well as models for progression to kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy, must be derived in an adult human population. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC-ROC) or C-statistic, reclassification percentage, net reclassification improvement (NRI) or integrated discrimination improvement index (IDI) are some analyses being proposed for assessing the qualities of the models.

Assessment of studies

Diagnostic models are those designed for prevalent purposes while prognostic models are designed for incident purposes.

PROBAST (Prediction model Risk Of Bias ASsessment Tool) will be employed to evaluate the quality of all models. PROBAST evaluates both the risk of bias and the application of multivariable prediction (diagnostic and prognostic) models created or validated in primary research. The PROBAST tool will also be involved in the systematic reviews of predictive models for prevalent and incident CKD as well as progression to kidney failure requiring kidney replacement therapy in PLWH.[21 22]

Disagreements in the use of the above tool for the review will be resolved following consultation with the third reviewer.

Data extraction

The following details will be used to extract data from chosen studies; study specifics (first author, journal name, year of publication, country of study); study population (sample size, age range, sex distribution, number of PLWH, ART-naive or experienced); population characteristics (pre-existing comorbid conditions: hypertension, diabetes mellitus, stroke, myocardial infarction, dyslipidaemia, congestive heart failure).

In addition, model characteristics (number of participants in the derivation and validation cohorts, number of participants with the outcome of interest, number of candidate variables stated as predictors, number and list of variables included in the model, type of statistical analysis used in generating model); study designs employed in deriving the models (cross-sectional, cohort, controlled clinical trials, randomised controlled trials); models' outcome data (prevalence and incidence of CKD, number of multivariable prediction scores/models, definition of CKD, CKD equations used) and performance (discriminatory (AUC or C-statistic), calibration (difference between observed and predicted rates of hypertension, p value of corresponding test statistic), reclassification (NRI and IDI values with their accompanying 95% CIs and p values)) will also be documented. The source of funding and study limitations will be captured. The extracted data will be presented in a tabular (data) form.

Data analysis

The data will be summarised in general (globally) as well as by the WHO regional designation, gender and study population (PLWH, ART-naive or experienced). Meta-analysis will be conducted for CKD predictive models in the presence of an adequate number of models otherwise a narrative review will be undertaken. The meta-analysis would focus on the performance measures of the identified models with reference to the AUC-ROC, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and other appropriate statistical tests. The random effects will be determined using inverse variance weighting and 95% CIs of pooled estimates while heterogeneity will be determined using the inconsistency index (I^2).[23 24] Publication bias will be assessed using funnel plots and when found to be significant, further analysis (Egger's and Begg's tests) will be conducted.[25]

Patient and public involvement

This review does not require patient or public involvement as it will be based on published works. It will involve published articles from the above listed databases and search engines. The selected models predicting CKD would not primarily involve patients.

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval is not required as this is a protocol for a systematic review. The findings of this review will be published in peer-reviewed journals and included as a chapter in a PhD thesis at the University of Cape Town. Furthermore, the findings of this evaluation will be shared with relevant agencies through seminars, conferences and policy development meetings.

Acknowledgements We appreciate the support of the Clinical Sciences Department, Nigerian Institute of Medical Research towards the actualisation of the review.

Contributors This systematic review was conceived and designed by OOO, NO and APK. This protocol was initially drafted by OOO, NP, AZM, NO, BLS and APK. Revisions and comments made to the protocol were approved by all authors. All authors have approved the submission.

Funding This project is part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union (grant number TMA2017GSF-1962—CaDERAL). The content hereof is the sole responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the SAMRC, NIMR or the funders.

Competing interests None declared.

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.

ORCID iD

Oluwatosin Olaseni Odubela http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4432-9137

REFERENCES

1 GBD Chronic Kidney Disease Collaboration. 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.
2 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.
3 Stanifer JW, Jing B, Tolan S, *et al*. The epidemiology of chronic kidney disease in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health* 2014;2:e174–81.
4 Ekrikpo UE, Kengne AP, Bello AK, *et al*. Chronic kidney disease in the global adult HIV-infected population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0195443.
5 Bertoldi A, De Crignis E, Miserocchi A, *et al*. HIV and kidney: a dangerous liaison. *New Microbiol* 2017;40:1–10.
6 Naicker SS, Rahmanian S, Kopp JB. HIV and chronic kidney disease. *Clin Nephrol* 2015;83:S32–8.
7 Islam FM, Wu J, Jansson J, *et al*. Relative risk of renal disease among people living with HIV: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:234.
8 Ekrikpo UE, Kengne AP, Akpan EE, *et al*. Prevalence and correlates of chronic kidney disease (CKD) among ART-naive HIV patients in the Niger-Delta region of Nigeria. *Medicine* 2018;97:e0380.
9 Chukwuonye II, Ogah OS, Anyabolu EN, *et al*. Prevalence of chronic kidney disease in Nigeria: systematic review of population-based studies. *Int J Nephrol Renovasc Dis* 2018;11:165–72.
10 Kalyesubula R, Hau JP, Asiki G, *et al*. Impaired renal function in a rural Ugandan population cohort [version 3. *peer review: 2 approved] view view* 2018.
11 Heron JE, Bagnis CI, Gracey DM. Contemporary issues and new challenges in chronic kidney disease amongst people living with HIV. *AIDS Res Ther* 2020;17:11.
12 Chang H-L, Wu C-C, Lee S-P, *et al*. A predictive model for progression of CKD. *Medicine* 2019;98:e16186.
13 Dai D, Alvarez PJ, Woods SD. A predictive model for progression of chronic kidney disease to kidney failure using a large administrative claims database. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2021;13:475–86.
14 Kshirsagar AV, Bang H, Bomback AS, *et al*. A simple algorithm to predict incident kidney disease. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;168:2466–73.
15 Echouffo-Tcheugui JB, Kengne AP. Risk models to predict chronic kidney disease and its progression: a systematic review. *PLoS Med* 2012;9:e1001344.
16 Tangri N, Kitsios GD, Inker LA, *et al*. Risk prediction models for patients with chronic kidney disease: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;158:596–603.
17 Han WM, Bijker R, Chandrasekaran E, *et al*. Validation of the D: a: D chronic kidney disease risk score model among people living with HIV in the Asia-Pacific. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2020;85:489–97.
18 Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al*. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1.
19 Moons KGM, de Groot JAH, Bouwmeester W, *et al*. Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the charms checklist. *PLoS Med* 2014;11:e1001744.
20 Debray TPA, Damen JAAG, Snell KIE, *et al*. A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis of prediction model performance. *BMJ* 2017;356:i6460.
21 Wolff RF, Moons KGM, Riley RD, *et al*. PROBAST: a tool to assess the risk of bias and applicability of prediction model studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;170:51–8.
22 Moons KGM, Wolff RF, Riley RD, *et al*. PROBAST: a tool to assess risk of bias and applicability of prediction model studies: explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;170:W1–33.
23 Cochran WG. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics* 1954;10:101–29.
24 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;21:1539–58.
25 Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, *et al*. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629–34.

APPENDIX 1

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	2
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	7
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/A
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	7
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	7
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	7
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	4
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	5
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	5

Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	5
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	5
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	6
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	4, 7
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	4, 6
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	5
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	6
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	6
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	6
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	6
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	6
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	N/A

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

APPENDIX 2

Search Strategy

Chronic Kidney disease

"Kidney disease*" OR "kidney failure" OR "Renal disease" OR "Renal insufficiency" OR "Chronic kidney" OR "Chronic renal" OR "CKD" OR "CKF" OR "CRD" OR "end-stage renal" OR "end-stage kidney" OR "end-stage renal" OR "end-stage kidney" OR "uremia" OR "uraemia" OR "dialysis" OR "hemofiltration" OR "haemofiltration" OR "hemodiafiltration" OR "haemodiafiltration" OR "hemodialysis" OR "haemodialysis" OR "renal dialysis"

Nature of association

"incidence" OR "prevalence" OR "occurrence" OR "diagnosis" OR "assessment" OR "identification" OR "screening" OR "progression" OR "end-stage renal"

Modelling and Risk scores

Ingui filter

(Validat$ OR Predict$.ti. OR Rule$) OR (Predict$ AND (Outcome$ OR Risk$ OR Model$)) OR ((History OR Variable$ OR Criteria OR Scor$ OR Characteristic$ OR Finding$ OR Factor$) AND (Predict$ OR Model$ OR Decision$ OR Identif$ OR Prognos$)) OR (Decision$ AND (Model$ OR Clinical$ OR Logistic Models/)) OR (Prognostic AND (History OR Variable$ OR Criteria OR Scor$ OR Characteristic$ OR Finding$ OR Factor$ OR Model$))

Haynes Broad filter

(Predict*[tiab] OR Predictive value of tests[mh] OR Scor*[tiab] OR Observ*[tiab] OR Observer variation[mh])