

# The CKD-EPI Equation for Estimating GFR from Serum Creatinine: Real Improvement or More of the Same?

Andrew D. Rule

*Division of Nephrology and Hypertension, Department of Medicine and Division of Epidemiology, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota*

*Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 5: 951–953, 2010. doi: 10.2215/CJN.03110410

The Cockcroft-Gault equation was published in 1976 and was widely adopted for estimation of creatinine clearance from serum creatinine levels (1). The equation was developed using two steps: First, urinary creatinine excretion per body weight (UV/kg) was estimated from age in hospitalized patients; creatinine clearance was then calculated by multiplying by weight and dividing by serum creatinine (P) using the standard “UV/P” clearance formula. Not surprising, the high-risk patients who were used to develop the Cockcroft-Gault equation had lower muscle mass (creatinine excretion) than healthier individuals in the general population (2). The lack of a standardized serum creatinine assay has also been considered a problem with the Cockcroft-Gault equation, but this is not the case. Serum creatinine assay calibration has no influence on the coefficients of the Cockcroft-Gault equation, because the regression did not involve serum creatinine. Because the Cockcroft-Gault equation was developed using only white men, however, the model was not optimized to account for gender and race differences in muscle mass. Nonetheless, the Cockcroft-Gault equation is still used widely, particularly for drug dosing, for which estimates in ml/min units are desired. Because the Cockcroft-Gault equation has been used to determine recommended dosages for various medications (3), there is a consistent approach when using this equation to adjust medication dosage. However, the clinician should keep in mind that many dosing recommendations were made prior to serum creatinine standardization.

By contrast, the most widely used GFR-estimating equation today is the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD) equation, which was published in 1999 and later simplified (4,5). This equation automatically estimates GFR from serum creatinine for most laboratories (6). This equation was developed using patients who had CKD identified by elevated serum creatinine levels and who had a fourfold higher risk for progressing to ESRD than dying first (7,8). Despite this criterion for the equation population, it has been widely advocated that estimated GFR (eGFR) be reported when  $<60$  ml/min per  $1.73$  m<sup>2</sup> instead of when serum creatinine levels are elevated. Subsequently, several studies have shown that in “low-risk” pop-

ulations, such as living kidney donors or individuals with early diabetes, the MDRD equation systematically underestimated GFR, particularly in patients with high-normal serum creatinine levels (9–11). This suggests that no one equation can accurately estimate GFR regardless of clinical presentation. Studies further showed that the use of an equation that is developed with mostly healthy individuals would lead to a much lower prevalence of an eGFR  $<60$  ml/min per  $1.73$  m<sup>2</sup> (12–14).

Despite this problem, the CKD Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation was published in 2009 and intended to be more generalizable across various clinical settings than the MDRD equation (15). Weight, diabetes, and transplant were considered as potential variables, but the final equation uses the same variables as the MDRD equation (16). The source studies that were used for the CKD-EPI equation can be broken down into two groups: High-risk populations such as patients with clinical CKD, characterized by an average measured GFR (mGFR)  $<90$  ml/min per  $1.73$  m<sup>2</sup>, and low-risk populations such as potential kidney donors, characterized by an average mGFR  $>90$  ml/min per  $1.73$  m<sup>2</sup>. The CKD-EPI equation was developed using a sample size of 8254, 71% ( $n = 5858$ ) of whom came from high-risk populations. The CKD-EPI equation was externally validated using a sample size of 3896, 72% ( $n = 2810$ ) of whom came from high-risk populations. Not surprising, the CKD-EPI equation performed better in the external validation sample than did the MDRD equation that was derived using only a high-risk population (4,16); however, this validation did not address the underlying problem with the performance of GFR-estimating equations in different populations. The CKD-EPI equation authors recognized this, stating that “a single equation is unlikely to work equally well in all populations” (15). For instance, the CKD-EPI equation leads to a lower prevalence of eGFR  $<60$  ml/min per  $1.73$  m<sup>2</sup> in low-risk white women than the MDRD equation (17), but when demographics in GFR-estimating equations start to model CKD risk, this comes at the cost of less optimally modeling muscle mass (2).

In this issue of *CJASN*, Michels *et al.* (18) present a validation analysis of these three equations in a series of clinical patients. Unfortunately, this study adds little insight into equation performance for several reasons: First, the study population was not defined other than as potential kidney donors combined with patients who had a mGFR for “clinical reasons,” but what

*Published online ahead of print. Publication date available at [www.cjasn.org](http://www.cjasn.org).*

**Correspondence:** Dr. Andrew D. Rule, Mayo Clinic, 200 1st Street, SW, Rochester, MN 55905. Phone: 507-266-1045; Fax: 507-284-1161; E-mail: [rule.andrew@mayo.edu](mailto:rule.andrew@mayo.edu)

are these clinical reasons? What was the breakdown between these two groups? Do equations perform differently in the potential kidney donors than in the other group? Without knowing the reasons for why a person is referred for a direct GFR measurement, it is difficult to interpret the study findings reported.

Second, analyses were stratified on mGFR (18). This is not valid because linear regression is asymmetric; in other words, the equation that is used to predict Y from X is not simply the inverse of the equation that is used to predict X from Y (19). Estimating equations are derived such that for any level of eGFR,  $mGFR > eGFR$  will occur equally as often as  $mGFR < eGFR$ . Because of this, mGFR will average higher values when  $mGFR > eGFR$  than when  $mGFR < eGFR$ . Thus,  $eGFR - mGFR$  will have a negative trend with higher levels of mGFR, as shown in Figure 1 of this study (18). From a clinical perspective, it is not helpful to assess equation performance across levels of mGFR, because, if you knew mGFR, then you would not need to estimate it! Instead, equation performance should be assessed across levels of eGFR (20,21).

Third, the mean absolute difference (the authors use the term “absolute bias”) (18) between mGFR and eGFR requires a more nuanced interpretation. The mean absolute difference will increase with both equation bias and imprecision. Both the MDRD equation and CKD-EPI equation were derived to predict logarithmic mGFR because the logarithmic transformation equalizes model error (imprecision) across levels of eGFR. This is known as the *homoscedasticity* assumption of linear regression (19). It is hard to argue that the increased absolute differences between eGFR and mGFR with higher levels of mGFR is a finding, when equations are derived on a logarithmic scale specifically because of this problem. From a clinical perspective, a difference of 15 ml/min per 1.73 m<sup>2</sup> is of much greater concern between a GFR of 10 and 25 ml/min per 1.73 m<sup>2</sup> than between a GFR of 100 and 115 ml/min per 1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Logarithmic (percentage) error may better reflect meaningful differences between mGFR and eGFR.

Finally, the authors also report that older age was associated with lower absolute differences between eGFR and mGFR (18). This was more prominent with the MDRD equation than with the CKD-EPI equation and may be due to bias with how age was modeled. The MDRD equation, in particular, models the decline in muscle mass (source of creatinine) with age as being steepest in young adults when it is actually steepest in older adults (2,22). This finding may also reflect the increased model error at higher levels of GFR since younger age associates with higher GFR.

Michels *et al.* (18) conclude that the CKD-EPI equation is more accurate than the other two GFR-estimating equations in common use. This conclusion is not really germane for clinical care because it is based on equation performance in some arbitrary combination of low-risk and high-risk patients. Patients present with clinical histories, risk factors, laboratory tests, and examination findings that inform the risk for CKD. The normal decline in GFR with aging does not reflect underlying chronic parenchymal injury on renal biopsy (23). Thus, an elevated serum creatinine level representing a GFR less than

expected with normal aging is a more reasonable approach to screen for CKD than a single eGFR threshold (24). To assess disease severity after a diagnosis of CKD has been made, one can choose between the CKD-EPI equation, which loses some accuracy from the inclusion of low-risk patients, or the MDRD equation, which loses some accuracy from the statistical methods that are used to model age.

## Disclosures

None.

## References

1. Cockcroft DW, Gault MH: Prediction of creatinine clearance from serum creatinine. *Nephron* 16: 31–41, 1976
2. Rule AD, Bailey KR, Schwartz GL, Khosla S, Lieske JC, Melton LJ: For estimating creatinine clearance measuring muscle mass gives better results than those based on demographics. *Kidney Int* 75: 1071–1078, 2009
3. Food and Drug Administration: *Guidance for Industry: Pharmacokinetics in Patients With Impaired Renal Function—Study Design, Data Analysis, and Impact on Dosing and Labeling*, Rockville, US Department of Health and Human Services, 1998
4. 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* 130: 461–470, 1999
5. Levey AS, Coresh J, Balk E, Kausz AT, Levin A, Steffes MW, Hogg RJ, Perrone RD, Lau J, Eknoyan G, National Kidney Foundation: National Kidney Foundation practice guidelines for chronic kidney disease: Evaluation, classification, and stratification [erratum appears in *Ann Intern Med* 139: 605, 2003]. *Ann Intern Med* 139: 137–147, 2003
6. Miller WG: Reporting estimated GFR: A laboratory perspective. *Am J Kidney Dis* 52: 645–648, 2008
7. Beck GJ, Berg RL, Coggins CH, Gassman JJ, Hunsicker LG, Schluchter MD, Williams GW: Design and statistical issues of the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Trial. The Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group. *Control Clin Trials* 12: 566–586, 1991
8. Menon V, Wang X, Sarnak MJ, Hunsicker LH, Madero M, Beck GJ, Collins AJ, Kusek JW, Levey AS, Greene T: Long-term outcomes in nondiabetic chronic kidney disease. *Kidney Int* 73: 1310–1315, 2008
9. Poggio ED, Wang X, Greene T, Van Lente F, Hall PM: Performance of the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease and Cockcroft-Gault equations in the estimation of GFR in health and in chronic kidney disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 16: 459–466, 2005
10. Ibrahim H, Mondress M, Tello A, Fan Y, Koopmeiners J, Thomas W: An alternative formula to the Cockcroft-Gault and the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease formulas in predicting GFR in individuals with type 1 diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 16: 1051–1060, 2005
11. Rule AD, Larson TS, Bergstralh EJ, Slezak JM, Jacobsen SJ, Cosio FG: Using serum creatinine to estimate glomerular filtration rate: Accuracy in good health and in chronic kidney disease. *Ann Intern Med* 141: 929–937, 2004
12. Snyder JJ, Foley RN, Collins AJ: Prevalence of CKD in the

- United States: A sensitivity analysis using the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 1999–2004. *Am J Kidney Dis* 53: 218–228, 2009
13. Snyder JJ, Foley RN, Collins AJ: In Reply to 'Prevalence of CKD in the United States: GFR estimating equations matter.' *Am J Kidney Dis* 54: 185–186, 2009
  14. Rule AD, Rodeheffer RJ, Larson TS, Burnett JC Jr, Cosio FG, Turner ST, Jacobsen SJ: Limitations of estimating glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine in the general population. *Mayo Clin Proc* 81: 1427–1434, 2006
  15. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Castro AF 3rd, Feldman HI, Kusek JW, Eggers P, Van Lente F, Greene T, Coresh J: A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med* 150: 604–612, 2009
  16. Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Coresh J, Manzi J, Landis R, Bakoush O, Contreras G, Genuth S, Klintmalm GB, Poggio E, Rossing P, Rule AD, Weir MR, Kusek J, Greene T, Levey AS: Development and validation of GFR-estimating equations using diabetes, transplant and weight. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 25: 449–457, 2009
  17. Matsushita K, Selvin E, Bash LD, Astor BC, Coresh J: Risk implications of the new CKD Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation compared with the MDRD Study equation for estimated GFR: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study. *Am J Kidney Dis* 55: 648–659, 2010
  18. Michels WM, Grootendorst DC, Verduijn M, Elliott EG, Dekker FW, Krediet RT: Performance of the Cockcroft-Gault, MDRD, and new CKD-EPI formulas in relation to GFR, age, and body size. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 5: 1003–1009, 2010
  19. Motulsky H: *Intuitive Biostatistics*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1995, pp 167–179
  20. Rule AD: Understanding estimated glomerular filtration rate: Implications for identifying chronic kidney disease. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 16: 242–249, 2007
  21. Stevens LA, Zhang Y, Schmid CH: Evaluating the performance of equations for estimating glomerular filtration rate. *J Nephrol* 21: 797–807, 2008
  22. Douville P, Martel AR, Talbot J, Desmeules S, Langlois S, Agharazii M: Impact of age on glomerular filtration estimates. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 24: 97–103, 2009
  23. Rule AD, Am H, Cornell LD, Taler SJ, Cosio FG, Kremers WK, Textor SC, Stegall MD: The association between age and nephrosclerosis on renal biopsy among healthy adults. *Ann Intern Med* 2010, in press
  24. Poggio ED, Rule AD: Can we do better than a single estimated GFR threshold when screening for chronic kidney disease? *Kidney Int* 72: 534–536, 2007

See related article, "Performance of the Cockcroft-Gault, MDRD, and New CKD-EPI Formulas in Relation to GFR, Age, and Body Size," on pages 1003–1009.