ADVANCED CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE IN LUPUS NEPHRITIS: IS DIALYSIS INEVITABLE?

AUTHORS

Konstantinos Tselios, MD, PhD, Dafna D Gladman, MD, FRCPC, Jiandong Su, MB, MSc, Murray B Urowitz, MD, FRCPC

AUTHORS' AFFILIATION

Centre for Prognosis Studies in Rheumatic Diseases, Toronto Lupus Clinic, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Murray B. Urowitz, MD, FRCPC

University of Toronto Lupus Clinic

Centre for Prognosis Studies in the Rheumatic Diseases

Toronto Western Hospital, 399 Bathurst St. 1E-410B, Toronto, Ontario, M5T 2S8, Canada

Tel: 416-603-5828; Fax 416-602-9387. Email: m.urowitz@utoronto.ca

Running Title*:* ADVANCED CKD IN LUPUS NEPHRITIS

Key Words: lupus nephritis, advanced kidney disease, progression

Word Count: 2678

ABSTRACT

Background: Advanced chronic kidney disease (CKD) carries an increased risk for progression to end-stage renal disease (ESRD). We aimed to determine the rate of progression and the factors that drive the decline of renal function in lupus nephritis (LN).

Patients and Methods: Patients with advanced LN-related CKD were identified from our long-term longitudinal cohort. Advanced CKD was defined as stage 3b (eGFR=30-44ml/min/1.73m^2) and stage 4 (eGFR=15-29ml/min/1.73m^2). All individuals were followed until progression to ESRD or the last visit and were divided into "progressors" and "non-progressors". Demographic, clinical, immunological, and therapeutic variables were compared at baseline. Multivariable Cox regression analysis (both time-dependent and independent) was performed to identify predictors for progression.

Results: One hundred eighteen patients (74 CKD 3b and 44 CKD 4) were included. Forty-five patients progressed (29 to ESRD and 16 from CKD 3b to CKD 4) after six years on average. No significant decline in the renal function was observed in 73 patients ("non-progressors") after 10 years on average. Active serology (high anti-dsDNA titers and low complements C3/C4) at the time of CKD diagnosis and any increase of the daily prednisone dose after baseline were strongly associated with progression. Treatment with renin angiotensin system (RAS) blockers was associated with less risk for progression.

Conclusions: Dialysis is not inevitable in LN-related advanced CKD since 62% of our patients did not progress over 10 years of follow-up on average. Certain predictors were identified to affect progression to ESRD.

INTRODUCTION

Lupus nephritis (LN) affects nearly 40% of patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) with the majority of the cases (80%) diagnosed upon presentation [1]. Despite the advances in the management of LN during the past two decades [2], the 10-year incidence of end-stage renal disease (ESRD) was 10.1% in a multi-ethnic inception cohort [1]. In a recent meta-analysis of 18309 patients worldwide, Tektonidou et al. reported that the 10-year incidence of ESRD was significantly decreased from the 1970s to the mid-1990s and then plateaued to a level of 17% in developed countries [3]. Diffuse proliferative lupus nephritis (class IV) had the worst outcome with a 10-year incidence of ESRD equal to 33% that climbed to 44% at 15 years [3]. In that meta-analysis, studies that had enrolled patients with advanced chronic kidney disease (CKD, no specific definition was provided) were excluded since the rate of progression to ESRD is distinctly greater [4]. Moreover, such patients are significantly under-represented or even excluded from the usual protocols of the clinical trials [5-7] based on the belief that progression to more severe stages of kidney insufficiency is inevitable. Indeed, a subgroup analysis of 32 (out of 370) patients with poor kidney function [as defined by an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) <30 ml/min/1.73m^2] of the Aspreva Lupus Management Study showed that the response rate was approximately 20% at 24 weeks [8]. This was substantially smaller than the overall 55% of response in the initial study [6].

Thus, there is a paucity of information with regards to advanced CKD in LN. The aim of the present study was to assess the characteristics and outcomes of patients with advanced LN-related CKD with a particular emphasis on the rate of the decline of renal function and ~~the~~ its associated factors.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

At the time of this study, the University of Toronto Lupus Clinic (UTLC) had enrolled 1954 patients since its establishment in 1970. All patients fulfilled the revised American College of Rheumatology criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) [9] or had three criteria and a supportive kidney biopsy. Patients are followed regularly at 2-6 months intervals according to a standardized research protocol, which is regularly updated. This protocol captures demographic, clinical, immunological, and therapeutic variables as well as most co-morbidities.

For the purpose of the present study, patients with advanced CKD due to LN (based on renal biopsy) were identified from the database. CKD was defined as stage 3b (moderately to severely decreased kidney function) and stage 4 (severely decreased kidney function) according to the Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) 2012 definitions [4]. Enrollment was based on two consecutive clinic visits with eGFR=30-44 ml/min/1.73m^2 for stage 3b and eGFR=15-29 ml/min/1.73m^2 for stage 4. The calculation of eGFR was based on the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease formula in the absence of any acute illness.

Patients were divided into "progressors" and "non-progressors" according to the progression to more severe stages of kidney insufficiency [transition to ESRD (defined as eGFR<15 ml/min/1.73m^2 or initiation of dialysis) or from stage 3b to stage 4]. The time frame of the study was from baseline (2nd visit with advanced CKD) up to the last visit or initiation of dialysis. Baseline variables that were compared between groups included demographics (age, sex, race/ethnicity, disease duration), global disease activity (according to the Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000, SLEDAI-2K) [10] and damage (based on the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics/Damage Index, SDI) [11], histologic type of

LN (according to the International Society of Nephrology/Renal Pathology Society classification) [12], elevated levels of anti-dsDNA antibodies and low complement C3/C4 levels, 24-hour proteinuria, active urinary sediment (presence of casts and/or hematuria>10 red blood cells per high power field), systolic and diastolic blood pressure (SBP, DBP), diabetes and dyslipidemia (abnormal total cholesterol or triglycerides). Therapeutic variables included antimalarials, glucocorticosteroids (and dose) and immunosuppressives (azathioprine, mycophenolate mofetil or cyclosporine). Variables that changed over time (from baseline to the end of follow-up) were also compared between groups in a time-dependent analysis.

Included individuals have provided written informed consent for studies being conducted at the UTLC and approved by the University Health Network Research Ethics Board (UHN/REB 11-0397).

Statistical Analysis

Measurements of continuous variables are represented as mean ± standard deviation, categorical variables as count (percent). Normality of continuous variables was assessed by plotting histograms. Comparisons were made using Wilcoxon rank sums test or un-paired t-tests for continuous and Chi-Square/Exact Chi-Square tests for binary variables. Multivariable Cox regression analysis was performed for the identification of predictors for progression or transition to ESRD (baseline variables). Predictors associated with baseline CKD stages were not entered into the same regression model. A time-dependent multivariable Cox regression analysis was also performed for the identification of associated factors for progression (variables that changed over time). Step-down variable select method was used in the multivariable model building with Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) used as an estimator of model fitting. Both multivariable analyses

were adjusted for the decade of enrolment in the clinic. Statistical analysis was performed with SAS 9.4; $p<0.05$ ~~was~~ considered significant.

RESULTS

Out of 700 patients with LN, 118 (16.86%) satisfied the inclusion criteria (74 with CKD 3b and 44 with CKD 4). The median time from LN (time of biopsy) to advanced CKD (second visit with an abnormal eGFR) was 5.6 years (range 0-34 years); that was 6.9 years for the CKD 3b patients and 3.9 years for the CKD 4 patients. Advanced CKD was evident in the first year after biopsy in 27/74 and 15/44 patients respectively. There were no differences between groups (CKD 3b and CKD 4) at baseline, regarding demographic, clinical, immunological and therapeutic variables (details in Table 1). Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences in the histopathologic class of LN or the activity and chronicity indices.

Progression to ESRD occurred in four patients from the CKD 3b group (5.4%) and in an additional 25 patients from the CKD 4 group (56.8%), $p=0.002$, Figure 1A. The overall incidence of ESRD was 4.3/100 patient-years. Transition from stage 3b to stage 4 occurred in another 16 patients (21.6%). Median time to stage change was 4.1 (IQR 0.6-9.4) and 2.9 years (IQR 0.5-6.5) for the CKD 3b and CKD 4 groups respectively, Figure 1B.

There were 45 "progressors" and 73 "non-progressors" who were followed for 5.8±6.9 and 10.4±8.0 years respectively. Their baseline characteristics are shown in Table 2. Patients who progressed were younger, had higher diastolic blood pressure, and were taking glucocorticosteroids and antimalarials more frequently at baseline. They had proliferative LN (class III or IV) more frequently (66.7% vs. 43.8%, $p=0.033$). ~~and~~ The activity (5.7±4.8 vs. 4.5±4.1, $p=0.18$) and chronicity indices (3.1±3.1 vs. 2.1±2.3, $p=0.066$) were higher, although

insignificantly. Their last median eGFR was 24.3 ml/min/1.73m^2 (from 36 ml/min/1.73m^2) for an average rate of decline of 2 ml/min/1.73m^2 on an annual basis. On the contrary, the non-progressors did not lose any further renal function with their last median eGFR being practically unaltered (37.1 ml/min/1.73m^2 from 38.6 ml/min/1.73m^2) and an annual decline of 0.14 ml/min/1.73m^2. The overall decline in eGFR for progressors and non-progressors is shown in Figure 2.

Multivariate analysis for the identification of predictors for progression (using baseline variables) showed that active serology (positive anti-dsDNA antibodies plus low complements C3/C4) and CKD 4 stage at baseline were predictive of progression (Table 3). In a time-dependent model, considering the changes of the relevant variables over time, prednisone dose (for every increase of 1mg/day) and CKD 4 were independently associated with progression. On the contrary, treatment with angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs) or angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) was protective (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we showed that a substantial proportion (62%) of patients with LN-induced advanced chronic kidney disease (eGFR=15-44 ml/min/1.73m^2) did not progress to a worse stage of kidney insufficiency or ESRD after an average follow-up of 10 years. This was particularly apparent for patients ~~in~~ with CKD 3b, where only 5% progressed to dialysis. Active serology at the time of CKD (5.6 years after LN diagnosis on average) was strongly predictive of progression, implying that subclinical immune-mediated inflammation may still cause renal damage even years after the initial diagnosis. In a time-dependent analysis, prednisone dose was independently

associated with progression (5% increased risk for every 1mg increase of the daily prednisone dose) whereas treatment with ACEIs/ARBs was protective.

Several studies have investigated the factors that are associated with the development of ESRD in lupus nephritis. The most common findings included the initial level of serum creatinine, the level of proteinuria, hypertension and response to treatment [13-20]. More recent studies have also underlined the value of certain histopathologic characteristics that suggest chronic, irreversible damage [21]. However, the trajectory of the decline in renal function inevitably follows the transition from normal kidney function (eGFR >90 ml/min/1.73m^2) to CKD and subsequently, to ESRD. There is a lack of information concerning these intermediate stages of CKD in lupus patients. Studies in the general population have shown significantly higher rates of progression in advanced CKD, albeit their cohorts were significantly older and comprised of non-LN nephropathies. Baek et al. reported that 27.2% of the patients with CKD 3b did not progress in 10 years of follow-up [22], a number significantly lower than the 62% in our cohort. Hoefield et al. reported that about one third of their referred CKD population (mean age 65 years, eGFR<60 ml/min/1.73m^2) died or required renal replacement therapy after a median follow-up of 26 months [23]. The incidence of renal replacement therapy was 5.1 events/100 patient-years, slightly higher than the 4.3 events/100 patient-years in our cohort.

Historically, the rate of renal function decline was believed to be linear and progressive once CKD is established [24]. However, recent studies have shown that the decline in renal function is characterized by episodes of acceleration and prolonged episodes of slower progression [25-27]. Li et al. showed that approximately 40% of the patients (mean age 56 years) with CKD 3 would not progress over 9 years; progression was defined as an eGFR decline of more than 1 ml/min/1.73m^2/year [27]. On the other hand, O'Hare et al. showed that a substantial proportion of

patients who initiated dialysis had an accelerated decline in kidney function two years before dialysis [26]. About 25% of the patients had an annual GFR decrease of 15 ml/min/1.73m^2, 9% had a decrease of 30 ml/min/1.73m^2, while in 3% the kidney compromise was catastrophic with progression from normal renal function to ESRD within two years. Heaf and Mortensen reported that about 62% of their patients had an accelerated loss of eGFR, which was significantly more common in CKD 4 [25]. Patients who progressed to ESRD lost approximately 5.4 ml/min/1.73m^2 during the last year before dialysis whereas individuals with hypertensive and diabetic nephropathy were losing 2.1 and 2.6 ml/min/1.73m^2 annually [25]. In our cohort, the annual loss in eGFR was 2 ml/min/1.73m^2 for the progressors.

In LN patients, certain factors were identified to predict the progression to more severe CKD stages. Active serology at the time of CKD development (5.6 years after the renal biopsy) was strongly associated with progression. These results are in accordance with the findings of Dall'Era et al. from the long-term analysis of the Aspreva Lupus Management Study [28]. In that study, positive anti-dsDNA antibodies at the end of the induction phase were associated with an 8-fold increased risk of treatment failure (a composite of either death or ESRD or doubling of serum creatinine or renal flare or requirement for rescue therapy). In the same study, failure to restore normal complement levels at week 8 after initiation of therapy was marginally associated with treatment failure. The persistence of anti-dsDNA positivity and/or low C3/C4 levels may imply an ongoing immune complex-mediated tissue damage even in the absence of clinically evident activity (without active urinary sediment or massive proteinuria). About one third of our patients who did not progress had active serology at the time of CKD diagnosis, suggesting that these patients may still benefit from immunosuppressive treatment and could be considered for clinical trials.

The role of inflammation in CKD progression has been also shown in 3440 non-lupus patients in the Chronic Renal Insufficiency Cohort study [29]. Elevated serum levels of fibrinogen, IL-6, TNF-a and low serum albumin were associated with rapid loss of kidney function (defined as a >50% loss of eGFR or ESRD. IL-6 and TNF-a are implicated in the pathogenesis of LN [30], while low serum albumin may reflect the severity of proteinuria and, thus, the extent of the basement membrane damage.

In a time-dependent analysis, an increase in the daily prednisone dose by 1mg was associated with 5% risk of progression in CKD. This finding reflects relapsing or refractory disease after several years from LN diagnosis and coincides with previous reports regarding the effect of treatment failure on progression [13-20]. On the other hand, treatment with ACEIs/ARBs was protective against progression (61% less risk with continuous therapy). The nephro-protective properties of these drugs are well established in diabetic nephropathy as well as other types of proteinuric nephropathies [31, 32]. This is the first study to provide such information ~~on~~ in LN and confirm the value of ACEIs/ARBs treatment even in advanced CKD.

The protective effects of ACEIs/ARBs are multiple and probably extend beyond blood pressure control and proteinuria. In the present study, most patients (56.8%) had proteinuria >0.5g/day (the current threshold for SLEDAI-2K) with a median of 1g/day whereas only 4.2% had active urinary sediment (casts and/or hematuria). However, proteinuria does not necessarily reflect disease activity in such cases. Hoefield et al. reported that the mean proteinuria of their patients (non-lupus CKD) was 0.87g/day for CKD 3b (n=431) and 1.08g/day for CKD 4 (n=481), while that was increased to 2.23g/day in 175 patients with eGFR<15ml/min/1.73m^2 [23]. In the non-lupus CKD patients, this is commonly attributed to glomerulosclerosis with limited reversibility. In LN-related CKD, however, only renal biopsy would offer significant diagnostic assistance. It has been shown

that 53% of the 686 patients with refractory or recurrent LN had a histologic transformation within five years since the first renal biopsy [33]. This led to a change in immunosuppressive therapy in 57% (no changes in 43%) with intensification in 39% and tapering in 18% of ~~the~~ patients. Of note, the chronicity index was increased between biopsies in 83% of the patients, while the activity index was decreased in 97% [33]. The reasons for repeated biopsy in that study included worsening proteinuria and nephrotic syndrome along with increasing serum creatinine and progression to renal failure. Data only on the latter (solely increased serum creatinine) were not provided and long-term outcomes (e.g. renal survival) were not discussed.

Limitations of the present study include its observational nature. As such, details of the initial treatment for LN are not known for all individuals since many were enrolled in late stages of the disease when they already had CKD. Patients' compliance to therapy was also unknown. Individuals were not followed for the same length of time, and disease management (immunosuppressives, antihypertensives etc.) after CKD diagnosis was not standardized. However, to our knowledge this is the first study to assess the progression of advanced LN-related CKD in a prospectively followed cohort ~~in~~ within a single center.

In conclusion, approximately 62% of our patients with LN-related CKD did not progress to ESRD or to a worse stage of renal insufficiency after 10 years of follow-up on average. That was particularly apparent in patients on CKD 3b since only 5% of them developed ESRD. The annual rate of renal function decline was similar to that of hypertensive nephropathy for the patients who progressed (approximately 2 ml/min/1.73m^2), while that was negligible (0.14 ml/min/1.73m^2) in the non-progressors. Active serology (increased anti-dsDNA antibodies and low complements C3/C4) at the time of CKD development were predictive of progression. Any increase in prednisone dose after that time was associated with progression, while therapy with ACEIs/ARBs

was related to a lesser likelihood of progression. Dialysis is not inevitable in LN-related advanced CKD.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, COMPETING INTEREST AND FUNDING

Contributors: All authors were involved in the study conception and design, acquisition of data as well as analysis and interpretation of data. All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all authors approved the final version to be published. Dr. Urowitz had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Funding: The University of Toronto Lupus Clinic is supported by the University Health Network, Lou & Marissa Rocca, Mark & Diana Bozzo and the Lupus Foundation of Ontario. The sponsors had no role in study design, collection and interpretation of the data or drafting the report.

Competing interests: None declared.

REFERENCES

1. Hanly JG, O'Keeffe AG, Su L, Urowitz MB, Romero-Diaz J, Gordon C et al. The frequency and outcome of lupus nephritis: results from an international inception cohort. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2016;55:252-62
2. Dall'Era M. Treatment of lupus nephritis: current paradigms and emerging strategies. Curr Opin Rheumatol 2017;29:241-7
3. Tektonidou MG, Dasgupta A, Ward MM. Risk of end-stage renal disease in patients with lupus nephritis 1970-205: a systematic review and Bayesian meta-analysis. Arthritis Rheumatol 2016;68:1432-41
4. 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
5. Ginzler EM, Dooley MA, Aranow C, Kim MY, Buyon J, Merrill JT et al. Mycophenolate mofetil or intravenous cyclophosphamide for lupus nephritis. N Engl J Med 2005;353:2219-28
6. Appel GB, Contreras G, Dooley MA, Ginzler EM, Isenberg D, Jayne D et al. Mycophenolate mofetil versus cyclophosphamide for induction treatment of lupus nephritis. J Am Soc Nephrol 2009;20:1103-12
7. Houssiau FA, D'Cruz D, Sangle S, Remy P, Vasconcelos C, Petrovic R et al. Azathioprine versus mycophenolate mofetil for long-term immunosuppression in lupus nephritis: results from the MAINTAIN nephritis trial. Ann Rheum Dis 2010;69:2083-9

8. Walsh M, Solomons N, Lisk L, Jayne DR. Mycophenolate mofetil or intravenous cyclophosphamide for lupus nephritis with poor kidney function: a subgroup analysis of the Aspreva Lupus Management Study. Am J Kidney Dis 2013;61:710-5
9. Hochberg MC. Updating the American College of Rheumatology revised criteria for the classification of systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum 1997;40:1725
10. Gladman DD, Ibanez D, Urowitz MB. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000. J Rheumatol 2002;29:288-91
11. Gladman DD, Ginzler E, Goldsmith C, Fortin P, Liang M, Urowitz MB et al. The development and initial validation of the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics/American College of Rheumatology damage index for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum. 1996;39:363-9
12. Weening JJ, D'Agati VD, Schwartz MM, Seshan SV, Alpers CE, Appel GB et al. The classification of glomerulonephritis in systemic lupus erythematosus revisited. Kidney Int 2004;65:521-30
13. Austin HA 3rd, Boumpas DT, Vaughan EM, Balow JE. Predicting renal outcomes in severe lupus nephritis: contributions of clinical and histologic data. Kidney Int 1994;45:544-50
14. MacGowan JR, Ellis S, Griffiths M, Isenberg DA. Retrospective analysis of outcome in a cohort of patients with lupus nephritis treated between 1977 and 1999. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2002;41:981-7
15. Korbet SM, Schwartz MM, Evans J, Lewis EJ for the Collaborative Study Group. Severe lupus nephritis: racial differences in presentation and outcome. J Am Soc Nephrol 2007;18:244-54

16. Chrysochou C, Randhawa H, Reeve R, Waldek S, Wood GN, O'Donoghue DJ et al. Determinants of renal functional outcome in lupus nephritis: a single centre retrospective study. QJM 2008;101:313-6

17. Ayodele OE, Okpechi IG, Swanepoel CR. Predictors of poor renal outcome in patients with biopsy-proven lupus nephritis. Nephrology (Carlton) 2010;15:482-90

18. Park DJ, Kang JH, Lee JW, Lee KE, Kim TJ, Park YW et al. Risk factor to predict the development of chronic kidney disease in patients with lupus nephritis. Lupus 2017;26:1139-48

19. Ginzler EM, Felson DT, Anthony JM, Anderson JJ. Hypertension increases the risk of renal deterioration in systemic lupus erythematosus. J Rheumatol 1993;20:1694-1700

20. De Castro WP, Morales JV, Wagner MB, Graudenz M, Edelweiss MI, Goncalves LF. Hypertension and Afro-descendant ethnicity: a bad interaction for lupus nephritis treated with cyclophosphamide? Lupus 2007 16:724-30

21. Rijnink EC, Teng YKO, Wilhelmus S, Almekinders M, Wolterbeek R, Cransberg K et al. Clinical and histopathologic characteristics associated with renal outcomes in lupus nephritis. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 2017;12:734-43

22. Baek SD, Baek CH, Kim JS, Kim SM, Kim JH, Kim SB. Does stage III chronic kidney disease always progress to end-stage renal disease? A ten-year follow-up study. Scand J Urol Nephrol 2012;46:232-8

23. Hoefield RA, Kalra PA, Baker P, Lane B, New JP, O'Donoghue DJ et al. Factors associated with kidney disease progression and mortality in a referred CKD population. Am J Kidney Dis 2010;56:1072-81

24. Hunsicker LG, Adler S, Caggiula A, England BK, Greene T, Kusek JW et al. Predictors of the progression of renal disease in the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease study. Kidney Int 1997;51:1908-19

25. Heaf JG, Mortensen LS. Uraemia progression in chronic kidney disease stages 3-5 is not constant. Nephron Clin Pract 2011;118:367-74

26. O'Hare AM, Batten A, Burrows NR, Pavkov ME, Taylor L, Gupta I et al. Trajectories of kidney function decline in the 2 years before initiation of long-term dialysis. Am J Kidney Dis 2012;59:513-22

27. Li L, Astor BC, Lewis J, Hu B, Appel LJ, Lipkowitz MS et al. Longitudinal progression trajectory of GFR among patients with CKD. Am J Kidney Dis 2012;59:504-12

28. Dall'Era M, Levesque V, Solomons N, Truman M, Wolfsy D. Identification of clinical and serological factors during induction treatment of lupus nephritis that are associated with renal outcome. Lupus Sci Med 2015;2:e000089

29. Amdur RL, Feldman HI, Gupta J, Yang W, Kanetsky P, Shlipak M et al. Inflammation and progression of CKD: the CRIC study. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 2016;11:1546-56

30. Lech M, Anders JH. The pathogenesis of lupus nephritis. J Am Soc Nephrol 2013;24:1357-66

31. Wang K, Hu J, Luo T, Wang Y, Qing H, Cheng Q et al. Effects of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II receptor blockers on all-cause mortality and renal outcomes in patients with diabetes and albuminuria: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Kidney Blood Press Res 2018; 43: 768-79

32. Rutkowski B, Tylicki L. Nephroprotective action of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system blockade in chronic kidney disease patients: the landscape after ALTITUDE and VA NEPHRON-D trials. J Ren Nutr 2015; 25: 194-200

33. Narvaez J, Ricse M, Goma M, Mitiavila F, Fulladosa X, Cavdevila O et al. The value of repeat kidney biopsy in lupus nephritis flares. Medicine (Baltimore) 2017;96:e7099.

FIGURE LEGEND

Figure 1. A. Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the progression to ESRD in the CKD 3b (blue line) and CKD 4 (red line) groups. **B.** Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the rate of progression to a worse stage of CKD for the two groups.

Figure 2. Overall decline in eGFR (median difference from baseline to the last visit or initiation of dialysis) for progressors and non-progressors.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the patients according to CKD severity

		CKD 3b (n=74)	CKD 4 (n=44)	*p*
Age (y, mean±SD)		44.7 ± 13.4	40.8 ± 13.6	0.129
Females (%, n)		87.8% (65)	81.8% (36)	0.368
SLE duration (y, mean±SD)		12.3 ± 11.4	9.3 ± 6.7	0.116
Race/ethnicity	**Caucasians**	67.6% (50)	56.8% (25)	0.35
	Blacks	17.6% (13)	15.9% (7)	
	Chinese	4.1% (3)	11.4% (5)	
	Others	10.8% (8)	15.9% (7)	
LN class (%, n)				0.655
	II	27% (20)	20.5% (9)	
	III	18.9% (14)	15.9% (7)	
	IV	29.7% (22)	43.2% (19)	
	V	16.2% (12)	15.9% (7)	
	IV/V	2.7% (2)	0 (0%)	
Activity Index		4.5 ± 4.1	5.8 ± 4.8	0.149
Chronicity Index		2.3 ± 2.6	2.8 ± 2.9	0.334
Creatinine (µmol/l, mean±SD)		149 ± 20	202 ± 56	<0.001
eGFR (ml/min/1.73m^2, mean±SD)		37.5 ± 5.5	24.4 ± 6.1	<0.001
Proteinuria >0.5g/day (%, n)		58.1% (43)	54.5% (24)	0.558
Proteinuria, g/day (median, IQR)		1.1 (0.4-3.4)	1.0 (0.3-3.3)	0.952
Active urinary sediment (%, n)*		3 (4.1%)	2 (4.5%)	0.898

Anti-dsDNA + (%, n)	59.5% (44)	54.5% (24)	0.795
Low C3/C4 (%, n)	48.6% (36)	50% (22)	0.887
Hb<12g/dl (%, n)	27% (20)	47.7% (21)	0.022
Systolic BP (mmHg, mean±SD)	137 ± 22	139 ± 24	0.51
Diastolic BP (mmHg, mean±SD)	84 ± 12	85 ± 12	0.635
Antihypertensives (%, n)	63.5% (47)	68.2% (30)	0.795
Treated with ACEIs/ARBs (%, n)	51.4% (38)	47.7% (21)	0.703
Diabetes (%, n)	12.2% (9)	13.6% (6)	0.725
Treated with statins (%, n)	24.3% (18)	20.5% (9)	0.628
Glucocorticosteroids (%, n)	82.4% (61)	86.4% (38)	0.574
Mean prednisone dose (mg/day, mean±SD)	21.9 ±19.2	19.3 ± 17.0	0.495
Cumulative glucocorticosteroid dose (g, median)**	16.4	16.6	0.796
Antimalarials (%, n)	39.2% (29)	36.4% (16)	0.76
Immunosuppressives (%, n)	51.4% (38)	63.6% (28)	0.194

CKD: chronic kidney disease, eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate, BP: blood pressure, ACEIs: angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, ARBs: angiotensin receptor blockers

*Casts and/or hematuria>10 red blood cells per high power field, **From LN diagnosis (time of biopsy) up to the baseline

Table 2. Baseline characteristics of the patients according to progression to a more severe CKD stage or not

	Progressors (n=45)	Non-progressors (n=73)	*p*
Age (y, mean±SD)	38.5 ± 11.9	46.2 ± 13.7	0.002
Females (%, n)	84.4% (38)	86.3% (63)	0.78
SLE duration (y, mean±SD)	10.7 ± 8.2	11.4 ± 11.0	0.703
Caucasians (%, n)	62.2% (28)	64.4% (47)	0.63
Blacks (%, n)	20% (9)	15.1% (11)	
Chinese (%, n)	8.9% (4)	5.5% (4)	
Others (%, n)	8.9% (4)	15.1% (11)	
LN class (%, n)			0.2
II	17.8% (8)	28.8% (21)	
III	20% (9)	16.4% (12)	
IV	46.7% (21)	27.4% (20)	
V	13.3% (6)	17.8% (13)	
IV/V	0 (0%)	2.7% (2)	
Activity Index	5.7 ± 4.8	4.5 ± 4.1	0.18
Chronicity Index	3.1 ± 3.1	2.1 ± 2.3	0.066
SLEDAI-2K (mean±SD)	8.5 ± 5.7	7.6 ± 6.7	0.466
SDI (mean±SD)	1.7 ± 2.4	1.6 ± 1.9	0.866
Creatinine (µmol/l, mean±SD)	174 ± 41	165 ± 48	0.264
eGFR (ml/min/1.73m^2, mean±SD)	34.7 ± 6.9	35.9 ± 7.8	0.393
Proteinuria >0.5g/day (%, n)	57.8% (26)	56.2% (41)	0.695

Proteinuria, g/day (median, IQR)	0.8 (0.3-3)	1.4 (0.4-3)	0.348
Active urinary sediment (%, n)*	6.7% (3)	2.7% (2)	0.304
Anti-dsDNA + (%, n)	66.7% (30)	52.1% (38)	0.129
Low C3/C4 (%, n)	55.6% (25)	45.2% (33)	0.275
Anti-dsDNA + low C3/C4 (%, n)	46.7% (21)	32.9% (24)	0.134
Hb<12g/dl (%, n)	46.7% (21)	27.4% (20)	0.033
Systolic BP (mmHg, mean±SD)	141 ± 22	136 ± 23	0.237
Diastolic BP (mmHg, mean±SD)	87 ± 10	82 ± 12	0.014
Antihypertensives (%, n)	68.9% (31)	63.0% (46)	0.4
Treated with ACEIs/ARBs (%, n)	53.3% (24)	47.9% (35)	0.57
Diabetes (%, n)	11.1% (5)	13.7% (10)	0.667
Treated with statins (%, n)	17.8% (8)	26.0% (19)	0.3
Glucocorticosteroids (%, n)	93.3% (42)	78.1% (57)	0.029
Mean prednisone dose (mg/day, mean±SD)	19.9 ±19.3	16.1 ± 17.9	0.273
Cumulative glucocorticosteroid dose (g, mean±SD)**	21.3 ± 27.4	18.7 ± 32.9	0.651
Antimalarials (%, n)	51.1% (23)	30.1% (22)	0.023
Years on antimalarials (mean±SD)**	0.2 ± 5.8	1.4 ± 5.1	0.222
Immunosuppressives (%, n)	60.0% (27)	53.4% (39)	0.485
Years on immunosuppressives (mean±SD)**	2.1 ± 9.1	1.9 ± 6.0	0.886

CKD: chronic kidney disease, eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate, BP: blood pressure, ACEIs: angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, ARBs: angiotensin receptor blockers

*Casts and/or hematuria>10 red blood cells per high power field, **From LN diagnosis (time of biopsy) up to the baseline

Table 3. Predictors (variables present at baseline) for progression of CKD

	HR	Lower 95%CI	Higher 95%CI	*p*
Univariate analysis				
Age	0.967	0.943	0.991	0.007
Proliferative LN (III + IV)	2.223	1.192	4.145	0.012
SLEDAI-2K	1.049	1.003	1.098	0.038
eGFR	0.929	0.898	0.962	<0.001
Anti-dsDNA + low C3/C4	2.926	1.603	5.34	<0.001
Hb<12g/l	2.334	1.264	4.309	0.007
Antimalarial treatment	1.98	1.089	3.601	0.025
CKD 4 (compared to CKD 3b)	2.487	1.379	4.486	0.003
Multivariate analysis				
Anti-dsDNA + low C3/C4	2.72	1.41	5.24	0.003
CKD 4 (compared to CKD 3b)	2.76	1.5	5.08	0.001

Table 4. Factors associated with progression of CKD (time-dependent multivariate analysis)

	HR	Lower 95%CI	Higher 95%CI	*p*
Simple time-dependent Cox-regression (univariate)				
SLEDAI-2K	1.08	1.02	1.15	0.011
Anemia (Hb<12g/l)	2.07	1.11	3.87	0.023
Systolic BP	1.02	1.001	1.035	0.038
Prednisone dose (for 1mg/day increase)	1.033	1.015	1.051	0.0003
CKD 4 (compared to CKD 3b)	2.458	1.34	4.51	0.004
Multivariate time-dependent Cox-regression				
Prednisone dose (for 1mg/day increase)	1.05	1.03	1.07	<0.0001
CKD 4 (compared to CKD 3b)	2.95	1.53	5.69	0.001
Treatment with ACEIs/ARBs	0.39	0.2	0.77	0.007

Figure 1. A. Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the progression to ESRD in the CKD 3b (blue line) and CKD 4 (red line) groups. **B.** Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the rate of progression to a worse stage of CKD for the two groups.





Figure 1. A. Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the progression to ESRD in the CKD 3b and CKD 4 (dashed line) groups. **B.** Kaplan-Meier curve depicting the rate of progression to a worse stage of CKD for the two groups.