Efficacy and safety of tacrolimus combined with glucocorticoid treatment for IgA nephropathy: a meta-analysis Journal of International Medical Research 2018, Vol. 46(8) 3236–3250 © The Author(s) 2018 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/030060518776566 journals.sagepub.com/home/imr



Yong Zhang¹, Jun Luo², Bin Hu³ and Tean Ma¹

Abstract

Objective: As a classical immunosuppressant, tacrolimus (TAC) has been widely used in organ transplantation therapy, but the general benefits of TAC for the treatment of IgA nephropathy (IgAN) remain uncertain. We conducted a meta-analysis to examine the effects of TAC combined with glucocorticoid on IgAN.

Methods: We searched the information databases PubMed/Medline, Embase, Science Citation Index, Chinese Biomedical Literature and the Chinese databases VIP, CNKI and Wan Fang for randomized controlled trials of TAC combined with glucocorticoid as a therapy for IgAN.

Results: Ten relevant studies involving 472 patients were included in a meta-analysis. Overall, the TAC group showed a significant decrease in proteinuria compared with the control group (MD: -0.18 g/d, 95% CI: -0.32 to -0.04). No increased risk of adverse events was observed (OR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.65 to 1.33). In general, the TAC group showed good tolerance.

Conclusion: Evidence to date clearly indicates that TAC combined with glucocorticoid is quite effective in reducing proteinuria and albuminuria in patients with IgAN. Moreover, we found that patients receiving TAC therapy did not show an increased risk of side effects compared with control group patients. TAC combined with glucocorticoid is a promising medication and merits further research.

Keywords

Tacrolimus, glucocorticoid, IgA nephropathy, meta-analysis, immunosuppressant, proteinuria

Date received: 11 February 2018; accepted: 21 April 2018

¹Department of Nephrology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Yangtze University, Jingzhou, Hubei, China ²Department of Pediatrics, Renhe Hospital, China Three Gorges University, Yichang, Hubei, China ³Department of Nephrology, Renhe Hospital, China Three Gorges University, Yichang, Hubei, China

Corresponding author:

Tean Ma, Department of Nephrology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Yangtze University, 8 Hangkong Road, Jingzhou, Hubei 434000, China. Email: matean2018@163.com

Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).

Introduction

Immunoglobulin A nephropathy (IgAN) is the most common form of primary glomerulonephritis worldwide, and its underlying mechanism is attributed to immune complex reactions.¹ Many patients develop end-stage renal disease (ESRD) after 20-30 years and require continuous renal-replacement therapy.² A wide variety of therapies have been developed to reduce the likelihood of kidney failure in IgAN patients. IgAN can occur at any age and is more prevalent in males; individuals from Caucasia and Asia are more susceptible to IgAN than are individuals from South Africa and the United States.^{3,4} The renal prognosis following IgAN depends on the presence of proteinuria, impaired renal function, hypertension and further histological lesions.⁵ The immunologic mechanism underlying IgAN was first proposed by Suzuki et al.⁶ in 2011 and was based on the four-hits model. Suzuki et al.⁶ noted that immune complexes activate mesangial cells, which results in renal injury. This may constitute a potential mechanism of immunosuppressive therapy for IgAN.^{7,8}

Tacrolimus (TAC), a powerful calcineurin inhibitor (CNI), can inhibit the immune response by altering transcription of various genes in T cells and is effective in treating patients with nephritic syndrome.9,10 As an immunosuppressive agent, TAC was first used for transplant patients, with successful applications in kidney, heart, pancreas and liver transplantation and is associated with prognosis.11-13 impressive short-term Indeed, TAC has no adverse effects on lipid metabolism or antioxidant status, and it can protect neuronal tissue from hypoxic lesions.¹⁴ TAC exerts its immunemodulatory action by disrupting the expression of cytokines and T cell activation.¹⁵ Most researchers believe that TAC reduces proteinuria by affecting podocyte cytoskeleton stability.^{16,17} Although TAC can relieve symptoms of proteinuria in patients with

refractory IgAN, the efficacy and tolerability of TAC plus glucocorticoid treatment in IgAN patients remain unclear.¹⁸

There are few randomized control trials (RCTs) of TAC plus glucocorticoid for the treatment of IgAN. Owing to the shortage of such clinical trials, we were unable to locate a relevant meta-analysis on this topic. Nonetheless, as several recent studies have used TAC plus glucocorticoid for IgAN patients, the current meta-analysis was conducted to ascertain the benefits and risks of TAC combined with glucocorticoid in these patients.

Methods

The data analysed were derived from previously published studies. Therefore, no ethical approval or patient consent was required.

Search strategy

Two researchers (YZ and JL) performed a comprehensive literature search, which produced 11 relevant studies that met all the eligibility criteria. To identify all relevant randomized placebo-controlled trials regardless of publication status, we searched the electronic databases PubMed/ Medline, Embase, Science Citation Index Chinese Biomedical (SCI), Literature (CBM), Chinese Science and Technology Journal Database (VIP), China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and Fang Data Knowledge Service Wan Platform up to February 24, 2017. The following keywords were used: 'IgA nephropathy', 'IgA nephritis', 'IgAN', 'Bergers disease', 'immunoglobulin A nephropathy', 'tacrolimus', 'TAC', 'FK506' and 'prograf'. Reference lists from the identified studies were also consulted to extend the search.

Selection criteria

Two authors (YZ and BH) independently carried out the primary review to search for

trials that met the inclusion criteria. Any discrepancy was resolved by discussion and consensus (Figure 1). The following criteria were included: 1) the study design was an RCT; 2) the study focused on patients with biopsyproven IgAN; 3) the study compared TAC plus steroids versus steroids/placebo in induction therapy for IgAN; and 4) one of the following outcomes must have been included: partial remission (PR), complete remission

(CR) or total remission (TR, including CR and PR) of proteinuria, changes in clinical outcomes (including proteinuria, serum creatinine (SCr) or estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)) and adverse events.

Risk of bias assessment

The quality of all trials was assessed independently by two authors (YZ and BH)



Figure 1. Flowchart of the process for selecting studies for the systematic review. SCI: Science Citation Index; CBM: Chinese Biomedical Literature; VIP: Chinese Science and Technology Journal Database; CNKI: China National Knowledge Infrastructure.

according to the Cochrane quality criteria (Figure 2). Any disagreement between the two authors was resolved by discussion with a third author (JL) until a consensus was reached.

Statistical analysis

Cochrane RevMan 5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration, The Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark) was used to perform statistical analyses. The odds ratio (OR) was used as the effect size. The weighted fixed-effect model was used with the Mantel-Haenszel statistical test, followed by a test of homogeneity. Heterogeneity was analysed statistically using the heterogeneity I² statistic and visually using scatter plots. The critical value for homogeneity was a P value less than 0.05. The random effect model was used when the hypothesis of homogeneity was rejected (P > 0.05). To explore sources of heterogeneity, meta-regression analyses were used. Sensitivity analysis was performed by omitting each study in turn to assess the quality and consistency of the results using STATA 12.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA). Funnel plots were used to detect publication biases. Additionally, we performed subgroup analysis to assess adverse reactions and remission ratios for all outcomes based on TAC treatment and control groups.

Heterogeneity was categorized as follows: light when the I² statistic was 0% to 25%; medium: 25% to 50%; heavy: 50% to 75%; and powerful heterogeneity: 75% to 100%.¹⁹ The *P* value was determined using the χ^2 test; *P* values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant for all included studies.

Results

Study selection

We identified 1223 articles in the initial retrieval. Of these, 198 duplicate articles were excluded after carefully examining the title and abstract. After detailed evaluation, 1011 articles were excluded because 351 were conference abstracts, 346 were case reports or reviews, 168 were basic research, 92 were non-controlled studies and 54 were on post-transplant IgAN. The remaining 14 articles were reviewed for further selection. An additional four articles were excluded because of insufficient data. Eventually, 10 studies (n = 472)were included in this meta-analysis, as listed in Table 1.^{20–29} Our search strategy is described in the flow diagram (Figure 1).

Zhan	21×819 201 2015 2016 2019 2018 2013 2013 2016 2016 2016 2016											
•	•	?	•	+	•	•	•	•	•	Random sequence generation (selection bias)		
?	•	?	?	+	?	+	+	?	+	Allocation concealment (selection bias)		
?	?	?	•	?	?	•	•	?	?	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)		
+	?	•	•	?	•	+	•	?	?	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)		
•	•	•	+	•	?	+	?	•	•	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)		
		•			•	•		•		Selective reporting (reporting bias)		
+	•	+	+	+	+	+	+	•	•	Other bias		

Figure 2. Assessment of risk of bias in included studies.

Table I.	Main cl	naracterist	tics of the	included studie	S				
		Sample s	size	Age				Follow-up	
Study	Year	T(F/M)	C(F/M)	Т	C	TAC group	Control group	(months)	Pathology
Hong ²⁰	2016	12/10	4/15	32.9 ± 10. 5	32.7 ± 8.5	TAC 0.05 mg/kg/d. PDN 0.5 mg/kg/d, then tapered.	PDN 0.5 mg/kg/day, then tapered.	24	Lee Grade II–IV
Gan ²¹	2016	6/14	7/13	36.4 ± 10.3	35.8±11.0	TAC 0.05–0.08 mg/kg/d. PDN 0.5–0.08 mg/kg/d, then tapered	PDN 0.5 mg/kg/day, then tapered.	6	Unclear
Liao ²²	2013	20	4	35.2 (18–54)		TAC I mg/d, then tapered. PDN 30 mg/d. then tapered.	PDN 30 mg/d, then tapered.	6	Lee Grade III–V
Song ²³	2010	6/8	13/4	37.7 ± 21.3		TAC 0.075-0.1 mg/kg/d. PDN 30 mg/d. then tapered.	PDN I mg/kg/day, then tapered.	9	Unclear
Kim ²⁴	2013	14/6	14/6	$\textbf{36.9} \pm \textbf{11.4}$	$\textbf{40.1} \pm \textbf{12.8}$	TAC 0.1 mg/kg/day,	Placebo	4	Oxford
Zhang ²⁵	2013	4	=	36.3 (16–57)		then tapered. TAC 0.075 mg/kg/d.	PDN 0.5 mg/kg/day	9	classification Lee Grade II–IV
Shen ²⁶	2014	2/10	11/1	$\textbf{32.8}\pm\textbf{8.3}$	$\textbf{37.2}\pm\textbf{8.6}$	TDN 30 mg/day, then tapered TAC 0.05–0.08 mg/kg/d. PDN 10–15 mg/d,	(max ou mg/day) PDN 0.5–0.8 mg/ kg/d, then	6	Unclear
Sun ²⁷	2016	20/14	15/15	30.7 ± 10.5	34.0 ± 11.4	then tapered. TAC 0.02–0.05 mg/kg/d, PDN 0.5 mg/kg/d,	tapered. PDN 1.0 mg/kg/day, then tapered.	6	Lee Grade III-V
Bao ²⁸	2016	25/22	23/20	28.2 ± 2.7	27.3 ± 2.8	TAC 0.05-0.08 mg/kg/d, PDN 0.5 mg/kg/d,	PDN 0.5 mg/kg/day, then tapered.	6	Unclear
Wu ²⁹	2015	13/29	11/31	38.8 ±12.1	36.5 ± 10.2	TAC 0.075 mg/kg/d. PDN 30 mg/d, then tapered.	PDN 30 mg/d, then tapered.	6	Lee Grade II–IV

TAC: tacrolimus; PDN: prednisolone.

The characteristics, drug dosages, period of treatment, interventions and pathological grade of the patients are summarized in Table 1. Forest plots (Figures 3–7) show the number of patients in the TAC treatment and control groups who exhibited an alteration in proteinuria, SCr, eGFR or adverse events.

Effect on clinical remission rate

The definitions of PR and CR are shown in Table 2. A measure of CR, PR or TR was reported in 9 of the 10 trials, including 432 patients. CR (OR: 2.22, 95% CI: 1.16 to 4.26, $I^2 = 55\%$, P = 0.02) and TR (OR: 3.01, 95% CI: 1.21 to 7.50, $I^2 = 35\%$, P = 0.02) occurred more frequently in

	TAC		Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events 1	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H, Random, 95% Cl			
1.2.1 CR										
Bao 2016	8	47	11	43	5.6%	0.60 [0.21, 1.66]				
Gan 2016	14	20	13	20	4.5%	1.26 [0.33, 4.73]				
Hong 2016	16	22	9	18	4.6%	2.67 [0.71, 9.95]				
Liao 2013	8	20	4	14	4.1%	1.67 [0.39, 7.21]	· · · · ·			
Shen 2014	9	12	7	12	3.4%	2.14 [0.38, 12.20]				
Song 2010	8	14	7	17	4.2%	1.90 [0.45, 7.98]				
Sun 2016	26	34	20	30	5.3%	1.63 [0.54, 4.87]				
Wu 2015	31	42	10	42	5.7%	9.02 [3.36, 24.24]				
Zhang 2013	8	11	3	14	3.2%	9.78 [1.55, 61,65]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Subtotal (95% CI)		222		210	40.7%	2.22 [1.16, 4.26]	◆			
Total events	128		84							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0 53 Chi2 =	17.8	df = 8(P = 0.0	$(2) \cdot ^2 = 55$	%				
Test for overall effect:	7 = 240 (P)	= 0.02	2)	0.0	-,					
	2.40 (1	0.01	-/							
1.2.2 PR										
Bao 2016	26	47	22	43	6.3%	1 18 [0 52 2 71]				
Gan 2016	6	20	7	20	4.5%	0.80 [0.21, 3.00]				
Hong 2016	6	22	8	18	4.6%	0 47 [0 13 1 76]				
Liao 2013	12	20	7	14	4 4%	1 50 [0 38 5 95]				
Shen 2014	3	12	3	12	3 2%	1 00 [0 16 6 35]				
Song 2010	5	14	5	17	4.0%	1 33 [0 29 6 04]				
Sup 2016	2	34	1	30	2 10/	1 81 [0 16 21 06]				
Wu 2015	11	42	22	42	6.0%	0 32 [0 13 0 81]				
7hang 2013	3	11	22	42	3.5%	0.32 [0.13, 0.01]	· · · ·			
Subtotal (95% CI)	3	222	0	210	38.6%	0.74 [0.48, 1.15]	•			
Total events	74		83	0.000			10.00 C			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.02: Chi ² =	8.30	df = 8 (P	= 0.40): $ ^2 = 4\%$					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.35$ ($P = 0.18$)										
			-,							
1.2.3 TR										
Bao 2016	34	47	33	43	5.9%	0.79 [0.31, 2.06]				
Gan 2016	20	20	20	20		Not estimable				
Hong 2016	22	22	17	18	1.4%	3.86 [0.15, 100.58]				
Liao 2013	20	20	11	14	1.5%	12.48 [0.59, 263.46]				
Shen 2014	12	12	10	12	1.4%	5.95 [0.26, 138.25]				
Song 2010	13	14	12	17	2.4%	5.42 [0.55, 53.27]	· · · · ·			
Sun 2016	28	34	21	30	5.0%	2.00 [0.62, 6.49]				
Wu 2015	42	42	32	42	1.7%	27.46 [1.55, 486.07]	→			
Zhang 2013	11	11	11	14	1.5%	7.00 [0.32, 151.38]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		222		210	20.7%	3.01 [1.21, 7.50]	-			
Total events	202		167							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.53; Chi ² =	10.74	4, df = 7 (P = 0.1	5); l ² = 35	%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.37 (P	= 0.02	2)							
			QL ()							
Total (95% CI)		666		630	100.0%	1.56 [1.03, 2.36]	•			
Total events	404		334							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.52; Chi ² =	50.73	3, df = 25	(P = 0.	.002); l ² =	51%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.12 (P	= 0.03	3)				Eavours [TAC] Eavours [Control]			
Test for subaroup diffe	rences. Chi	$^{2} = 12$	03 df = 3	P = 0	002) I2 =	= 83.4%				

Figure 3. Forest plot of the relative risks for CR, PR and TR for TAC group versus control group in the treatment of IgAN.

TAC: tacrolimus; PR: partial remission; CR: complete remission; TR: total remission.



Figure 4. Forest plot of the effect on proteinuria (g/d) for TAC group versus control group at the end of treatment or during follow-up.

TAC: tacrolimus; SD: standard deviation; CI: confidence interval.

	TAC			C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
Bao 2016	117	2	47	116	1	43	57.5%	1.00 [0.35, 1.65]	(m. 1997)
Gan 2016	112.5	31.37	20	111.55	30.72	20	2.5%	0.95 [-18.29, 20.19]	
Liao 2013	74.8	12.3	20	79.6	10.3	14	12.9%	-4.80 [-12.43, 2.83]	
Shen 2014	124.18	26.53	12	111.72	31.23	12	1.7%	12.46 [-10.72, 35.64]	
Song 2010	103.6	29.3	14	85	19.52	17	2.8%	18.60 [0.67, 36.53]	
Sun 2016	83.09	21.02	34	88.33	25.91	30	6.3%	-5.24 [-16.90, 6.42]	
Nu 2015	87.41	16.85	42	89.53	20.16	42	12.1%	-2.12 [-10.07, 5.83]	
Zhang 2013	87.4	17.6	11	89.5	20.4	14	4.0%	-2.10 [-17.01, 12.81]	
otal (95% CI)			200			192	100.0%	0.05 [-3.05, 3.15]	+
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	4.24; Chi	² = 8.69	, df = 7	(P = 0.2)	8); I ² =	19%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.03	(P = 0.9	7)						-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours [TAC] Favours [Control]

Figure 5. Forest plot of the effect on SCr for TAC group versus control group at the end of treatment or during follow-up.

TAC: tacrolimus; SD: standard deviation; CI: confidence interval.



Figure 6. Forest plot of the effect on eGFR for TAC group versus control group at the end of treatment or during follow-up.

TAC: tacrolimus; SD: standard deviation; CI: confidence interval.

patients in the TAC group than in those in the control group. However, there was no significant difference in PR between the TAC group and the control group (OR: 0.74, 95% CI: 0.48 to 1.15) (Figure 3).

Effect on proteinuria

Six studies reported the outcome of 24-hour proteinuria in a total of 218 patients, of whom 111 were assigned to treatment groups and 107 to control groups. Compared with controls, patients receiving TAC plus glucocorticoid treatment showed a statistically significant reduction in proteinuria (MD: -0.18, 95% CI: -0.32 to -0.04, $I^2 = 56\%$, P = 0.01) (Figure 4). As there was substantial heterogeneity, meta-regression analyses were used to explore possible sources of heterogeneity among studies. The results suggested that publication year was a potential major source of

	TAC		Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.2.1 Diabetes or Impa	ired gluc	ose tol	erance				
Zhang 2013	2	11	7	14	8.0%	0.22 [0.03, 1.42]	
Wu 2015	5	42	6	42	8.4%	0.81 [0.23, 2.89]	
Sun 2016	4	34	5	30	7.5%	0.67 [0.16, 2.75]	
Song 2010	2	14	2	12	2.5%	2.67 [0.15, 10.23]	
Kim 2013	1	20	0	20	0.7%	3 15 [0 12 82 16]	
Hong 2016	1	22	1	18	1 7%	0.81 [0.05 13 92]	· · · · · ·
Gan 2016	4	20	3	20	3.8%	1 42 [0 27 7 34]	S
Bao 2016	2	47	1	43	1.6%	1.87 [0.16, 21.35]	· · · ·
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	222		216	35.4%	0.94 [0.51, 1.70]	•
Total events	24		26				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4. Test for overall effect: Z	96, df = 8 = 0.22 (P	P = 0.83	76); l² =)	0%			
1.2.2 Gastrointestinal	discomfo	ort or liv	er func	tion di	sorder		
Wu 2015	1	42	0	42	0.8%	3.07 [0.12, 77.59]	•
Sun 2016	4	34	6	30	9.0%	0.53 [0.13, 2.11]	
Song 2010	2	14	0	17	0.6%	7.00 [0.31, 158.83]	
Shen 2014	1	12	1	12	1.5%	1.00 [0.06, 18.08]	
Kim 2013	2	20	4	20	5.7%	0.44 [0.07, 2.76]	· · · ·
Hong 2016	0	22	4	18	7.7%	0.07 [0.00, 1.43]	
Bao 2016	3	47	2	43	3.1%	1.40 [0.22, 8.79]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	(ag),	191	2.5345	182	28.3%	0.72 [0.35, 1.46]	-
Total events	13		17	00/			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6. Test for overall effect: Z	10, df = 6 = 0.92 (P	P = 0.36	41); l² =)	2%			
1.2.3 Infection							
Zhang 2013	0	11	1	14	2.0%	0.39 [0.01, 10.57]	
Wu 2015	0	42	1	42	2.4%	0.33 [0.01, 8.22]	· · · ·
Sun 2016	1	34	0	30	0.8%	2.73 [0.11, 69.60]	
Song 2010	0	14	2	17	3.5%	0.21 [0.01, 4.84]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kim 2013	2	20	1	20	1.4%	2.11 [0.18, 25.35]	
Hong 2016	0	22	1	18	2.6%	0.26 [0.01, 6.76]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		143		141	12.7%	0.65 [0.21, 1.95]	
Total events	3		6				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2. Test for overall effect: Z	68, df = 5 = 0.77 (P	e (P = 0. P = 0.44	75); l² =)	0%			
1.2.4 Hypertension							
Song 2010	0	14	2	17	3.5%	0.21 [0.01, 4.84]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kim 2013	2	20	1	20	1.4%	2.11 [0.18, 25.35]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Bao 2016	2	47	2	43	3.2%	0.91 [0.12, 6.77]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		81		80	8.1%	0.82 [0.23, 2.99]	
Total events	4		5				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1. Test for overall effect: Z	28, df = 2 = 0.30 (P	P = 0.77	53); l² =)	0%			
1.2.5 Neurologic or mu	sculoske	eletal s	ymptom	S			
Zhang 2013	1	11	0	14	0.6%	4.14 [0.15, 112.06]	
Wu 2015	2	42	0	42	0.8%	5.25 [0.24, 112.66]	
Song 2010	1	14	0	17	0.7%	3.89 [0.15, 103.19]	
Kim 2013	5	20	4	20	4.8%	1.33 [0.30, 5.93]	
Hong 2016	0	22	1	18	2.6%	0.26 [0.01, 6.76]	· · · ·
Subtotal (95% CI)		109		111	9.4%	1.72 [0.62, 4.72]	-
Total events	9		5				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2. Test for overall effect: Z	42, df = 4 = 1.05 (P	(P = 0. = 0.29	66); l² =)	0%			
126 Abnormal ranal f	unation						
1.2.0 Abnormal renal f	unction				4.001	4 00 10 07 01 01	
Song 2010	1	14	1	17	1.3%	1.23 [0.07, 21.64]	
Hong 2016	2	22	1	18	1.6%	1.70 [0.14, 20.42]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	3	83	2	43	6.0%	1.40 [0.22, 0.79]	
Total events	6	00	4	10	0.070	1.44 [0.00, 0.04]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	03. df = 2	(P = 0)	99): l ² =	0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.55 (P	9 = 0.59)	0 /0			
Total (95% CI)		829		808	100.0%	0.93 [0.65, 1.33]	+
Total events	59		63				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 19	9.59, df =	32 (P =	0.96); 12	= 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.39 (P	9 = 0.69)				UUT U.T T TU 100
Test for subgroup differe	ences: Ch	$i^2 = 2.8$	1. df = 5	(P = 0)	(73), $l^2 = 0$	1%	ravours [TAO] ravours [Control]

Figure 7. Forest plot of the relative risk of adverse events at the end of treatment or during follow-up. TAC: tacrolimus; CI: confidence interval M–H: Mantel–Haenszel test.

Study	Year	Definitions of PR and CR
Hong ²⁰	2016	CR: Normal SCr, serum albumin >35g/L, and proteinuria less than 0.5g/day. PR: Normal SCr, serum albumin >30g/L, and proteinuria reduced to at least half the baseline measurement and an absolute value of >0.5g/day.
Gan ²¹	2016	CR: Stable SCr, and proteinuria less than $0.3g/day$. PR: Stable SCr, and proteinuria higher than $0.3g/day$, but reduced by $>50\%$.
Liao ²²	2013	 CR: No reactive urinary sediment, and proteinuria less than 0.5g/day. PR: Normal SCr (range less than 30%), and proteinuria reduced to at least half the baseline measurement and an absolute value of <3.5g/day.
Song ²³	2010	 CR: Normal SCr, serum albumin >35g/L, and proteinuria less than 0.5g/day. PR: Normal SCr, serum albumin >30g/L, and proteinuria reduced to at least half the baseline measurement and an absolute value of 0.5–3.0g/day.
Kim ²⁴	2013	Not described in detail.
Zhang ²⁵	2013	CR: Normal SCr (range less than 20%), and proteinuria less than 0.3g/day. PR: Normal SCr (range less than 20%), and proteinuria higher than 0.3g/day, but
Shen ²⁶	2014	CR: Stable SCr (range less than 15%), and proteinuria less than 0.3g/day. PR: Stable SCr (range less than 15%), and proteinuria higher than 0.3g/day, but reduced by >50%.
Sun ²⁷	2016	 CR: Normal SCr and BUN (range less than 15%), and proteinuria less than 0.3g/day. PR: Normal SCr and BUN (range less than 15%), and proteinuria higher than 0.3g/day, but reduced by >50%
Bao ²⁸	2016	 CR: Normal SCr and BUN (range less than 15%), and proteinuria less than 0.3g/day. PR: Normal SCr and BUN (range less than 15%), and proteinuria higher than 0.3g/day, but reduced by >50%
Wu ²⁹	2015	CR: Stable SCr (range less than 15%), and proteinuria less than 0.3g/day. PR: Stable SCr (range less than 15%), and proteinuria higher than 0.3g/day, but reduced by >50%.

Table 2. Definitions of partial remission (PR) and complete remission (CR)

SCr: serum creatinine; BUN: blood urea nitrogen.

heterogeneity (P = 0.04). Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the influence of each individual study on the pooled ORs by omitting individual studies. The analysis results suggested that no individual studies significantly affected the pooled OR, indicating that the results were statistically robust.

Effect on SCr

Seven studies assessed SCr in a total of 392 patients, 200 of whom were assigned to treatment groups and 192 to control

groups. Because there was no significant heterogeneity, the fixed-effects model was used. The statistical analysis showed no significant difference (MD: 0.05, 95% CI: -3.05 to 3.15) (Figure 5).

Effect on eGFR

Only three studies assessed eGFR; 66 patients were assigned to treatment groups and 62 to control groups. The fixed-effects model was used for evaluation because there was no significant heterogeneity. There was no significant difference (MD: -1.24, 95%)

CI: -6.55 to 4.07) between the TAC group and the control group (Figure 6).

Adverse effects of treatment

All adverse events mentioned in the included articles were recorded and the most prevalent events were analysed. The following outcomes were included: diabetes or impaired glucose tolerance; gastrointestinal discomfort or liver function disorder; infection; hypertension; neurologic or musculoskeletal symptoms; abnormal renal function and withdrawal (Figure 7).

The analysis showed that the TAC therapy group exhibited no significant difference (OR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.65 to 1.33) from the control group. The fixed-effects model was used for evaluation because heterogeneity was extremely low. Significantly, patients receiving TAC therapy experienced no additional risk compared with control group patients.

Publication bias

A symmetrical funnel plot was constructed for adverse events, proteinuria, remission rate, eGFR and SCr. The plot indicated that there was no significant publication bias.

Discussion

Worldwide, IgAN is the most prevalent form of basic chronic glomerular disease. One Chinese study reported that IgAN accounts for 40–50% of primary glomerulonephritis cases.³⁰ Furthermore, IgAN is one of the most important pathogeneses that lead to ESRD. Studies with a long follow-up time show that approximately 25–30% of patients with IgAN will progress to ESRD within 20 to 25 years.^{31,32} IgAN is considered an autoimmune disease with an aetiology and a pathogenesis that have yet to be fully elucidated.³³ A common pathological feature of primary IgAN is considered to be diffuse deposition of IgA in the glomerular mesangial area, though clinical manifestations and histology vary. One study reported that in patients with IgAN, deposited immune complexes induce proliferation of resident mesangial cells with an increased production of extracellular matrix proteins; the inflammatory cytokines produced by mesangial cells damage the filtration barrier, resulting in haematuria and proteinuria and ultimately leading to progressive renal damage.³⁴

Recent histological, serological, epidemiological and clinical evidence indicates that the risk factors for progressive IgAN are mainly related to proteinuria or chronic renal insufficiency.³⁵

Proteinuria is one of the strongest independent prognostic factors of IgAN.^{36,37} IgAN with severe proteinuria is conventionally treated with various immunosuppressive regimens, with conflicting results,^{38,39} and studies have suggested that TAC is effective at decreasing proteinuria in a variety of glomerular diseases, including IgAN.^{40,41}

TAC (also known as FK 506 or fujimycin) is a new type of immunosuppressant that was previously used mostly in the early stage of organ transplantation rejection. Recently, TAC has been used in therapy for certain autoimmune diseases, such as primary and secondary glomerular diseases. TAC inhibits activation of nuclear factor T (nuclear factor of activated T cells), which is essential for transcription of cytokine genes in T cells, thereby blocking transcription of IL-2 and IFN- γ and ultimately exerting a strong effect on immune suppression.⁴²

However, no studies have specifically analysed the effect of TAC in patients with IgAN. The present meta-analysis of 11 trials involving 540 patients with IgAN showed that TAC combined with glucocorticoid is effective at reducing proteinuria when compared with control conditions. The findings reveal that TAC plus glucocorticoid has

a significant synergistic effect on reducing proteinuria in patients with IgAN.

Our results are similar to those of a previous study showing that patients with IgAN may experience significant improvement in proteinuria and hypoalbuminemia during TAC treatment.⁴³ Moreover, this meta-analysis concluded that there is no significant difference in the relative risk of adverse events at the end of treatment or during follow-up. IgAN patients who achieved remission had far better outcomes than those who did not.44,45 These findings suggest that achieving remission, regardless of the glomerular disease type or CR or PR, is important for improving renal survival in IgAN patients. In the current metaanalysis, the TAC group showed increased rates of CR (P=0.02) and TR (P=0.02)compared with the control group.

A recent meta-analysis by Song et al.⁴⁶ reported that CNI drugs significantly reduced proteinuria in IgAN patients. However, the safety of CNIs was found to be inadequate; for example, the incidence of liver function disorder or neurologic and musculoskeletal symptoms increased in the TAC group, and the incidence of adverse reactions was significantly higher than in the control group. However, in our study, there was no significant difference in incidence of adverse reactions between the TAC and control groups. Song et al. included seven studies in their meta-analysis, only two of which (n=65) involved TAC. Therefore, the high incidence of adverse reactions they found may be associated with the use of cyclosporin A (CsA). Both TAC and CsA are CNIs, but the immunosuppressive effect of TAC is approximately 50–100 times stronger than that of CsA;⁴⁷ therefore, a much smaller dose of TAC is needed compared with CsA to achieve the same level of immunity. Ren⁴⁸ has shown that adverse reactions to TAC are related to different dosages; therefore, small doses

of TAC may reduce the incidence of adverse reactions.

Thus far, the safety of TAC has been poorly understood, particularly in the treatment of proteinuria in IgAN. The main reported adverse reactions to TAC are gastrointestinal symptoms, (such as gastrointestinal discomfort), liver function disorder, increased SCr and hypertension.¹⁸

In a previous study by our group,²⁶ two patients developed elevated blood sugar and one patient developed liver function disorder about 6 months after initiation of treatment with TAC combined with low-dose methylprednisolone. The three patients fully recovered after receiving appropriate therapy. Another study reported that TAC was effective in a patient who had experienced no therapeutic effect when using cyclophosphamide and CsA.⁴⁹

The results of one study showed that TAC combined with glucocorticoid therapy significantly improved renal function in patients with IgAN. Significant reductions in proteinuria after 3 months of treatment have been reported.^{26,49} These findings are consistent with our results.

Weng et al. have proposed that the concentration of TAC should be regularly measured during the treatment period to ascertain the therapeutic window for personalized drug regimens (to determine a reasonable dose).⁵⁰ Detection of the blood concentration of TAC can reduce the incidence of adverse reactions.^{50,51}

Overall, the side effects of TAC are tolerable. The current meta-analysis showed no significant difference in the risk of SCr increase between patients in the TAC and control groups.

There are five limitations to our metaanalysis. First, several studies contained incomplete information and the protein level before treatment was not clearly marked. Second, evaluation indicators in several studies were lacking or incomplete (e.g., lack of data on blood Cr or Cr clearance, or no provision of initial data). Third, this meta-analysis did not include a particularly large number of RCTs, and the quality of the included trials was poor. Fourth, proteinuria outcomes were measured while the patients were on TAC; therefore, it is unclear whether the TACassociated reduction in proteinuria was sustained or whether proteinuria rebounded after treatment was stopped. The limitation of using proteinuria as a surrogate outcome measure, and the implication of rebounding proteinuria after stopping TAC, should also be considered. Fifth, most of the RCTs included adult patients, so the results cannot be used to evaluate the efficacy and safety of TAC plus glucocorticoid in paediatric patients with IgAN. Finally, there is a lack of published small studies with negative outcomes. The risk of publication bias against studies with negative results is also a limitation.

Based on the above issues, we suggest that the following measures would improve future research: i) complete information for the TAC and control groups should be recorded; ii) high-quality RTCs with large numbers of participants are needed to assess TAC plus glucocorticoid therapy in IgAN patients, and the dose of TAC should be strictly monitored; iii) owing to the characteristics of IgAN, the follow-up time should be extended to ESRD, or dialysis or renal transplantation. The present results may be helpful in mitigating the reluctance to use TAC plus glucocorticoid for patients with IgAN. Indeed, the fear of an increase in SCr appears to have prevented researchers from designing clinical trials to study the use of this valuable immunosuppressive agent to treat IgAN, and we suggest that such trials may offer better long-term assessment of its effects.

In conclusion, TAC combined with glucocorticoid therapy for IgAN is both efficacious and safe. The anti-proteinuria effect of TAC plus glucocorticoid therapy is significant, though there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in SCr or eGFR after treatment. The adverse events directly related to TAC plus glucocorticoid therapy are tolerable, but this conclusion needs confirmation by more carefully designed clinical trials.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Bo Wang and Heng Zhang for valuable help with the literature search.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Karnib HH, Gharavi AG, Aftimos G, et al. A 5-year survey of biopsy proven kidney diseases in Lebanon: significant variation in prevalence of primary glomerular diseases by age, population structure and consanguinity. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2010; 25: 3962–3969.
- Goto M, Wakai K, Kawamura T, et al. A scoring system to predict renal outcome in IgA nephropathy: a nationwide 10-year prospective cohort study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2009; 24: 3068–3074.
- 3. Chacko B. IgA nephropathy in India: what we do know. *Ren Fail* 2011; 33: 102–107.
- Kiryluk K, Li Y, Sanna-Cherchi S, et al. Geographic differences in genetic susceptibility to IgA nephropathy: GWAS replication study and geospatial risk analysis. *PLoS Genet* 2012; 8: e1002765.
- Yamamoto R, Nagasawa Y, Shoji T, et al. A candidate gene approach to genetic prognostic factors of IgA nephropathy–a result of Polymorphism REsearch to DIstinguish genetic factors Contributing To progression

of IgA Nephropathy (PREDICT-IgAN). Nephrol Dial Transplant 2009; 24: 3686–3694.

- 6. Suzuki H, Kiryluk K, Novak J, et al. The pathophysiology of IgA nephropathy. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2011; 22: 1795–1803.
- Bonnet F, Deprele C, Sassolas A, et al. Excessive body weight as a new independent risk factor for clinical and pathological progression in primary IgA nephritis. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2001; 37: 720–727.
- Kaartinen K, Syrjanen J, Porsti I, et al. Insulin resistance and the progression of IgA glomerulonephritis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2007; 22: 778–783.
- Loeffler K, Gowrishankar M and Yiu V. Tacrolimus therapy in pediatric patients with treatment-resistant nephrotic syndrome. *Pediatr Nephrol* 2004; 19: 281–287.
- Chen W, Liu Q, Liao Y, et al. Outcomes of tacrolimus therapy in adults with refractory membranous nephrotic syndrome: a prospective, multicenter clinical trial. *Am J Med Sci* 2013; 345: 81–87.
- Flechner SM, Kobashigawa J and Klintmalm G. Calcineurin inhibitor-sparing regimens in solid organ transplantation: focus on improving renal function and nephrotoxicity. *Clin Transplant* 2008; 22: 1–15.
- Naesens M, Kuypers DR and Sarwal M. Calcineurin inhibitor nephrotoxicity. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009; 4: 481–508.
- Girman P, Lipar K, Koznarova R, et al. Similar early complication rate in simultaneous pancreas and kidney recipients on tacrolimus/mycophenolate mofetil versus tacrolimus/sirolimus immunosuppressive regimens. *Transplant Proc* 2010; 42: 1999–2002.
- Noto T, Furuichi Y, Ishiye M, et al. Tacrolimus (FK506) limits accumulation of granulocytes and platelets and protects against brain damage after transient focal cerebral ischemia in rat. *Biol Pharm Bull* 2007; 30: 313–317.
- Aomatsu T, Imaeda H, Takahashi K, et al. Tacrolimus (FK506) suppresses TNF-alphainduced CCL2 (MCP-1) and CXCL10 (IP-10) expression via the inhibition of p38 MAP kinase activation in human colonic myofibroblasts. *Int J Mol Med* 2012; 30: 1152–1158.
- 16. Faul C, Donnelly M, Merscher-Gomez S, et al. The actin cytoskeleton of kidney

podocytes is a direct target of the antiproteinuric effect of cyclosporine A. *Nat Med* 2008; 14: 931–938.

- Mathieson PW. Proteinuria and immunity– an overstated relationship? N Engl J Med 2008; 359: 2492–2494.
- Zhang Q, Shi SF, Zhu L, et al. Tacrolimus improves the proteinuria remission in patients with refractory IgA nephropathy. *Am J Nephrol* 2012; 35: 312–320.
- Higgins J and Deeks J. Cochrane handbook: general methods for Cochrane reviews: Ch 7: selecting studies and collecting data. In: J Higgins and S Green (eds) Cochrane Handbook for: Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, pp.151–186.
- Hong M, Zhang DW, Mei YM, et al. Tacrolimus combined with low-dose glucocorticoid clinical effect on patients with northern IgA nephropathy. *Clin J Med Offic* 2016; 44: 253–258. DOI:10.16680/ j.1671-3826.2016.03.08
- Gan XH and Wang S. Efficacy and safety of tacrolimus combined with corticosteroids in the treatment of primary IgA nephropathy with mild to moderate renal impairment. J Community Med 2016; 24: 31–32 (in Chinese).
- 22. Liao D, Xiao H, Jiang D, et al. Tacrolimus in treatment of refractory IgA nephropathy: a clinical observation. *China Health Care Nutrition* 2013; 9: 16–17 (in Chinese).
- 23. Song YY. Effects of Tacrolimus (FK506) combined with low-dose glucocorticoid in the treatment of IgA Nephropathy: Jilin University, 2010 (in Chinese).
- 24. Kim YC, Chin HJ, Koo HS, et al. Tacrolimus decreases albuminuria in patients with IgA nephropathy and normal blood pressure: a double-blind randomized controlled trial of efficacy of tacrolimus on IgA nephropathy. *PLoS One* 2013; 8: e71545.
- Zhang JX and Qian JZ. Clinical efficacy of tacrolimus combined with small doesof hormone therapy on IgA nephropathy. *Journal* of Jiangsu University (Medicine Edition) 2013; 23: 263–267.
- 26. Shen PY, Jia XY, Wang CH, et al. The treatment of tacrolimus in primary IgA nephropathy with mild or moderate renal

injury: a randomized controlled study. *Chin J Nehphrol* 2014; 30: 885–890.

- 27. Sun QC, Zhao HF, Li LN, et al. Clinical efficacy of low-dose tacrolimus joint glucocorticoid on IgA nephropathy with moderate proteinuria: a retrospectively trial. *Journal of Third Military Medical University* 2017; 39: 481–486. DOI:10. 16016/j.1000-5404.201609163
- Bao HM, Guo WG, Ren Z, et al. Curative effect observation of tacrolimus combined with glucocorticoid in the treatment of primary iga nephropathy with mild to moderate renal injury. *Medical Recaputulate* 2016; 22: 2884–2887. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1006-2084.2016.14.052
- Wu GY, Chen XB and Jiang XL. Clinical study of tacrolimus combined with small dose of prednisolone in treatment of IgA nephropathy. *Chin J Prim Med Pham* 2015; 22: 3619–3622.
- Wang W and Chen N. Treatment of progressive IgA nephropathy: an update. *Contrib Nephrol* 2013; 181: 75–83.
- Barratt J and Feehally J. IgA nephropathy. J Am Soc Nephrol 2005; 16: 2088–2097.
- Manno C, Strippoli GF, D'Altri C, et al. A novel simpler histological classification for renal survival in IgA nephropathy: a retrospective study. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2007; 49: 763–775.
- 33. Gharavi AG, Kiryluk K, Choi M, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies susceptibility loci for IgA nephropathy. *Nat Genet* 2011; 43: 321–327.
- 34. Al Hussain T, Hussein MH, Al Mana H, et al. Pathophysiology of IgA nephropathy. *Adv Anat Pathol* 2017; 24: 56–62.
- 35. Maixnerová D, Merta M, Reiterová J, et al. The influence of two megsin polymorphisms on the progression of IgA nephropathy. *Folia Biol (Praha)* 2008; 54: 40–45.
- Bartosik LP, Lajoie G, Sugar L, et al. Predicting progression in IgA nephropathy. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2001; 38: 728–735.
- Cai GY and Chen XM. Immunoglobulin A nephropathy in China: progress and challenges. *Am J Nephrol* 2009; 30: 268–273.

- Lv J, Xu D, Perkovic V, et al. Corticosteroid therapy in IgA nephropathy. J Am Soc Nephrol 2012; 23: 1108–1116.
- Strippoli GF, Manno C and Schena FP. An "evidence-based" survey of therapeutic options for IgA nephropathy: assessment and criticism. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2003; 41: 1129–1139.
- Machiguchi T, Tei M, Ono T, et al. Rebiopsy in a patient with IgA nephropathy showing success of treatment with cyclosporin A and angiotensin-II receptor blocker. *Clin Exp Nephrol* 2002; 6: 166–169.
- Arikan H, Koc M, Cakalagaoglu F, et al. Tacrolimus rescue therapy in resistant or relapsing cases of primary glomerulonephritis. *J Nephrol* 2008; 21: 713–721.
- 42. Skytte DM, Jaroszewski JW, Johansen KT, et al. Some transformations of tacrolimus, an immunosuppressive drug. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2013; 48: 514–522.
- Peng W, Tang Y, Jiang Z, et al. The effect of calcineurin inhibitors in the treatment of IgA nephropathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis (PRISMA). *Medicine* (*Baltimore*) 2016; 95: e4731.
- 44. Kim JK, Kim JH, Lee SC, et al. Clinical features and outcomes of IgA nephropathy with nephrotic syndrome. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2012; 7: 427–436.
- Sandsmark DK, Messe SR, Zhang X, et al. Proteinuria, but not eGFR, predicts stroke risk in chronic kidney disease: chronic renal insufficiency cohort study. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 2075–2080.
- 46. Song YH, Cai GY, Xiao YF, et al. Efficacy and safety of calcineurin inhibitor treatment for IgA nephropathy: a meta-analysis. *BMC Nephrol* 2017; 18: 61.
- Guo HB and Zhang YH. Therapeutic effects of tacrolimus substituting for cyclosporin in renal transplant recipients with hepatic dysfunction. *Chin J Organ Transplant* 2000; 21: 245–247.
- Ren Y. Treatment by tacrolimus in idiopathic membranous glomerulopathy: A meta-analysis: Zhejiang University, 2010 (in Chinese).
- 49. Huang CM, Zhang C and Liu SY. Clinical effect of tacrolimus with refractory

nephrotic syndrome on 23 cases. Journal of Logistics University of CAPF (Medical Sciences) 2013; 22: 552–553 (in Chinese).

- 50. Wen XH, Guan S, Chen RH, et al. Analysis of serum concentration of FK506 in 45 patients with renal transplantation. *Shandong Medical Journal* 2013; 53: 84–85.
- Wei XH, Wen JH, Duan ZP, et al. Analysis of the relationship between tacrolimus dosage, plasma concentration and adverse reactions in patients with renal transplantation. *Jiangxi Medical Journal* 2014; 49: 76–78. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1006-2238.2014.01.036