JACC: ADVANCES © 2024 THE AUTHORS. PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION. THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CC BY-NC-ND LICENSE (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

HEART FAILURE AND CARDIOMYOPATHIES

Renal Biomarkers in Heart Failure



Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Amudha Kumar, MD,^a Vignesh Chidambaram, MD, MPH,^b Harinivas Shanmugavel Geetha, MD,^c Marie Gilbert Majella, MD,^d Mahesh Bavineni, MD,^e Pramod Kumar Pona, MD,^f Nishank Jain, MD,^g Zarina Sharalaya, MD,^h Subhi J. Al'Aref, MD,^e Aarti Asnani, MD,ⁱ Emily S. Lau, MD, MPH,^j Jawahar L. Mehta, MD, P_HD^{e,k}

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND Cystatin C, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL), and kidney injury molecule (KIM)-1 are renal biomarkers increasingly appreciated for their role in the risk stratification and prognostication of heart failure (HF) patients. However, very few have been adopted clinically, owing to the lack of consistency.

OBJECTIVES The authors aimed to study the association between cystatin C, NGAL, and KIM-1 and outcomes, mortality, hospitalizations, and worsening renal function (WRF) in patients with acute and chronic HF.

METHODS We included peer-reviewed English-language articles from PubMed and EMBASE published up to December 2021. We analyzed the above associations using random-effects meta-analysis. Publication bias was assessed using funnel plots.

RESULTS Among 2,631 articles, 100 articles, including 45,428 patients, met the inclusion criteria. Top-tertile of serum cystatin C, when compared to the bottom-tertile, carried a higher pooled hazard ratio (pHR) for mortality (pHR: 1.59, 95% CI: 1.42-1.77) and for the composite outcome of mortality and HF hospitalizations (pHR: 1.49, 95% CI: 1.23-1.75). Top-tertile of serum NGAL had a higher hazard for mortality (pHR: 2.91, 95% CI: 1.49-5.67) and composite outcome (HR: 4.11, 95% CI: 2.69-6.30). Serum and urine NGAL were significantly associated with WRF, with pHRs of 2.40 (95% CI: 1.48-3.90) and 2.01 (95% CI: 1.21-3.35). Urine KIM-1 was significantly associated with WRF (pHR: 1.60, 95% CI: 1.24-2.07) but not with other outcomes. High heterogeneity was noted between studies without an obvious explanation based on meta-regression.

CONCLUSIONS Serum cystatin C and serum NGAL are independent predictors of adverse outcomes in HF. Serum and urine NGAL are important predictors of WRF in HF. (JACC Adv 2024;3:100765) © 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier on behalf of the American College of Cardiology Foundation. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

From the ^aDivision of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Loyola University Medical Center, Maywood, Illinois, USA; ^bDepartment of Internal Medicine, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA; ^cDepartment of Internal Medicine, St. Vincent's Hospital, Worcester, Massachusetts, USA; ^dDepartment of Community Medicine, Sri Venkateshwaraa Medical College Hospital and Research Center, Pondicherry, India; ^eDivision of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA; ^fDepartment of Internal Medicine, Louisiana State University, Shreveport, Louisiana, USA; ^gDivision of Nephrology, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA; ^hNorth Texas Heart Center, Dallas, Texas, USA; ⁱCardiovascular Institute, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ^jDivision of Cardiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; and the ^kDivision of Cardiovascular Medicine, Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA. The authors attest they are in compliance with human studies committees and animal welfare regulations of the authors'

institutions and Food and Drug Administration guidelines, including patient consent where appropriate. For more information, visit the Author Center.

Manuscript received April 13, 2023; revised manuscript received September 5, 2023, accepted September 21, 2023.

GFR = glomerular function rate

HF = heart failure

2

KIM = kidney injury molecule LVEF = left ventricular ejection function

NGAL = neutrophil gelatinaseassociated lipocalin

WRF = worsening renal failure

eart failure (HF) is a growing healthcare issue contributing to significant morbidity, mortality, and cost of care.¹ By the year 2030, it is estimated that more than 8 million American adults will be affected by HF.² Renal dysfunction is a common accompaniment and an independent predictor of poor clinical outcomes in patients with HF.3 Renal dysfunction in HF can present as acute kidney injury, worsening renal function (WRF), or as a gradual decline leading to chronic kidney disease.⁴ It has been noted that even minor variations in cardiac output can significantly affect renal perfusion by decreasing renal blood flow and increasing renal venous pressure.⁵ These hemodynamic changes, in turn, activate neuro-hormonal, sympathetic, oxidative, and inflammatory pathways leading to altered glomerular structure and function, tubulointerstitial damage, injury, and permanent loss of nephrons.^{6,7} In addition, diagnostic and therapeutic interventions used in these patients can adversely affect renal function.⁸ Conversely, renal disease and the resultant fluid and electrolyte imbalances, anemia, and proteinuria contribute to the development and progression of HF.⁹ Hence, early identification of renal dysfunction can aid in risk stratification and prognostication of patients with HF.10

Appreciation for renal biomarkers in HF has grown remarkably in the last decade, yet very few have been adopted in routine clinical practice.¹¹ Serum creatinine, a breakdown product of skeletal muscle creatinine phosphate, is freely filtered through the glomerulus enabling glomerular filtration rate (GFR) estimation.¹² While serum creatinine is commonly used to assess renal function, several factors such as active tubular secretion, high interindividual variation in creatinine phosphate production, and an exponential relationship with renal function make its GFR estimation unreliable.9 On the contrary, cystatin C, a cysteine protease inhibitor produced by all nucleated cells, is freely filtered through the glomerulus without any active secretion and is unaltered by age, sex, or body mass, thereby allowing a more sensitive and fairly accurate measurement of GFR.¹³ Beyond its role in GFR estimation, cystatin C has also been associated with adverse cardiovascular events in various patient populations.¹⁴

It has been hypothesized that, in patients with HF, renal dysfunction secondary to tubular injury occurs without the loss of excretory function (or decline in GFR) and can have prognostic implications.¹⁵ Neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL) is a protein, upregulated in neutrophils and tubular

epithelial cells in response to renal ischemia.¹⁶ Likewise, kidney injury marker (KIM)-1 is a transmembrane protein expressed by injured (ischemic or nephrotoxic) proximal tubules.¹⁷ Both NGAL and KIM-1 predict acute tubular injury 48 to 72 hours before a rise in serum creatinine and have been shown to be more sensitive and specific.^{18,19} The present meta-analysis aims to collate the current available evidence on the association of the above renal biomarkers with important outcomes in HF patients, such as WRF, HF hospitalizations, and mortality.

METHODS

SEARCH STRATEGY AND STUDY SELECTION. The systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines,²⁰ using the Covidence platform.²¹ The protocol, although not preregistered, can be found in the Supplemental Appendix. We searched for eligible studies in PubMed and Embase from inception to December 21, 2021, using the search strategy noted in Supplemental Table 1. Additionally, we reviewed bibliographies of the included studies and relevant review articles to identify potentially eligible studies. Inclusion was limited to articles published in the English language.

We included cohort studies, case-control studies, and secondary data analyses of randomized controlled trials that met the following criteria: 1) the study included patients with HF defined using a combination of signs, symptoms, imaging, and laboratory parameters suggestive of HF or with an established diagnosis of HF in medical records; 2) the study examined the association of at least one of following biomarkers, namely serum cystatin C, serum NGAL, urine NGAL, serum KIM-1 or urine KIM-1 with the outcomes of interest; 3) the study assessed the following outcomes: WRF, all-cause mortality, or a composite outcome of all-cause mortality and HF hospitalizations. WRF was defined as any in-hospital rise in serum creatinine $\geq 0.3 \text{ mg/dL}$ (26.5 mmol/L) or ≥25% increase from admission serum creatinine value.⁴ For assessing the association with WRF, the renal biomarkers measured at hospital admission were considered.

LITERATURE SCREENING AND DATA EXTRACTION.

All the studies were imported to the Covidence platform for screening and data extraction. At least 2 authors (A.K., H.S.G., and M.G.M.) independently reviewed the title and abstracts of the imported studies for eligibility. Then, the studies were

screened for full-text eligibility. Discrepancies, if any, were resolved by a third author (V.C.). This was followed by data extraction by atleast 2 independent reviewers (A.K., H.S.G., and M.G.M.) using a predesigned questionnaire in the Qualtrics platform, and discrepancies were cleared by a third author (V.C.). Data on study characteristics, sample size, biomarkers assessed, time points of biomarker collection, outcome definitions, and follow-up periods were collected. In addition, the baseline patient characteristics, including demographics, comorbidities, baseline blood pressure, heart rate, laboratory parameters, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF %), and medications were collected. The Quality in Prognosis Studies tool²² was used to assess the risk of bias and quality of the included studies. The tool estimated the risk of bias through the 6 key domains: study participation, study attrition, prognostic factor measurement, outcome measurement, adjustment for other prognostic factors, and statistical analysis.²²

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS. We pooled the studyspecific estimates using random effects metaanalysis. The HRs of the individual included studies were reported in different ways, such as HR per unit increase, 1 SD increase, 1 log change, 1 log SD change, or HR above and below a cut-off point. To enable a consistent approach to analysis and to allow for direct comparison and combination of the effect sizes of studies, the HRs from the studies were transformed to correspond to the HR for the top tertile with reference to the bottom tertile²³⁻²⁵ of the biomarkers (cystatin C, NGAL, or KIM-1) for each of the outcomes (mortality, composite outcome, or WRF). We assumed that the biomarkers were log-normally distributed and that the association between the exposure and the outcome was log-linear. For a normal distribution, the difference between the means of the top and bottom tertile is 2.18 SD units. Thus, the scaling factor of 2.18 was used to transform log-risk estimates per SD to the log-risk estimates between the top and bottom tertiles.²³⁻²⁵ The methodology is further detailed in the systematic review by Hemingway et al.²⁶ We pooled adjusted and unadjusted effect sizes separately. If multiple adjusted effect sizes were available, we used the 1 adjusted for most variables. We additionally pooled the mean difference (MD) of the biomarkers in patients with or without the above outcomes in separate analyses. We also performed random-effects meta-analyses of the c-statistics for the biomarkers with each outcome of interest. We assessed the between-study heterogeneity using the I² statistic. We performed meta-regression analysis using study-specific characteristics to assess statistical heterogeneity. We performed subgroup analysis using meta-regression for categorical studyspecific characteristics such as geographic location based on the continent, acute or chronic HF, studies published before and after the year 2015, and adjustment for baseline serum creatinine. For continuous study-specific characteristics such as age, LVEF, serum creatinine, and proportions of female sex, diabetes mellitus, and hypertension, we fitted a meta-regression line for each biomarker and the outcome of interest. Publication bias for each outcome was inspected using a funnel plot, and Egger's test was performed if more than ten studies were present. If publication bias was detected, we followed the trim and fill procedure,²⁷ which calculates estimates adjusted for possible publication bias by imputing missing studies. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata version 16 (StataCorp),²⁸ and a 2-sided P value of <0.05 was deemed to represent statistical significance.

RESULTS

LITERATURE SEARCH, STUDY CHARACTERISTICS, **AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT.** We identified 1,954 distinct potentially relevant studies from 2 databases (PubMed and Embase) using our search strategy available in Supplemental Table 1. Of these, 1,702 studies were removed in the title and abstract review, and 152 were removed during the full-text review for reasons mentioned in the study selection flowchart (Figure 1). A total of 100 studies involving 45,428 patients were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Six included studies were retrospective, and the remaining 94 were prospective cohorts or cohorts nested within randomized controlled trials. In terms of biomarkers, serum cystatin C was assessed by 58 studies, serum NGAL by 30, urine NGAL by 25, serum KIM-1 by 2, and urine KIM-1 by 12 studies. With respect to clinical outcomes, 45, 44, and 36 studies reported data on all-cause mortality, composite outcome (all-cause mortality and HF readmissions), and WRF, respectively. Sixty-six studies included patients with acute HF, while the remaining 34 assessed patients with chronic HF. Thirteen studies were conducted in the Americas, 47 in Europe, 17 in Asia, and 23 across multiple continents. Further descriptions of the study characteristics, patient populations, biomarkers, and outcomes of the included studies are outlined in Supplemental Tables 2 and 3.

The risk of bias and quality assessment of the included studies using the Quality in Prognosis Studies tool is shown in Supplemental Table 4. Low



risk-of-bias scores were found in the majority of the studies for the domains of study participation, study attrition, and outcome measurement. Moderate risk of bias was found in most of the studies with respect to the domains of prognostic factor measurement and statistical analysis. Many studies have not adjusted adequately for the confounders; thus, for the domain of study confounding, a high risk of bias was detected in 26% of studies and moderate risk of bias in 23% of studies. The level of adjustment for confounders in each of the studies is detailed in Supplemental Tables 5 and 6.

ASSOCIATION OF SERUM CYSTATIN C WITH HF OUTCOMES. The pooled adjusted HR for all-cause mortality and the composite outcome for the toptertile of serum cystatin C when compared with the bottom-tertile were 2.04 (95% CI: 1.70-2.43) ($I^2 = 87\%$) among 26 studies and 2.26 (95% CI: 1.73-2.96) ($I^2 = 90\%$) among 17 studies, respectively (Figures 2 and 3, Table 1). The adjusted HR for WRF comparing the top-tertile of serum cystatin to the bottom-tertile was 1.30 (95% CI: 0.54-3.14) in 1 study (Table 1).

The pooled MD comparing serum cystatin (mg/dL) levels between patients who died and survived was 0.40 (95% CI: 0.31-0.48) ($I^2 = 76\%$) from 14 studies. Likewise, patients with a composite outcome had significantly higher serum cystatin levels when compared to those who did not (pooled mean difference [pMD] 0.33, 95% CI: 0.25-0.41) ($I^2 = 72\%$) from 12 studies (Supplemental Figures 1 and 2, Table 2). The pooled MD of serum cystatin C (mg/dL) between

FIGURE 2 Forest Plots of Pooled HR for Serum Cystatin C, Serum NGAL, and Urine NGAL for All-Cause Mortality in Patients With Heart Failure Serum Cystatin C Weight HR, top vs bottom tertile Study Total Dead [95% CI] (%) Jackson 2016 628 290 1.18 [0.75, 1.86] 4.14 Zamora 2012 879 312 1.20 [1.02, 1.40] 5.42 Van Deursen 2014 562 232 1.21 [0.92, 1.58] 5.00 Wang 2021 6311 2945 1.23 [1.15, 1.30] 5.61 Wijk 2015 112 23 1.33 [0.86, 2.07] 4.21 Alehagen 2009 464 170 1.43 [1.06, 1.94] 4.85 Demissei 2016 1157 88 1.45 [1.07, 1.95] 4.88 Yamamoto 2013 117 34 1.47 [1.10, 1.96] 4.92 Alonso 2016 1069 534 1.80 [1.26, 2.57] 4.60 Shlipak 2005 1.80 [1.40, 2.31] 279 182 5 09 Breidthardt 2017 207 95 1.84 [1.04, 3.27] 3 55 Ruan 2014 1.92 [1.45, 2.55] 162 45 4.94 Tang 2015 811 95 2.03 [1.38, 2.96] 4.49 Welsh 2017 2278 932 2.11 [1.69, 2.65] 5.18 Franeková 2015 121 16 2.14 [1.21, 3.78] 3.58 Campbell 2009 240 53 2.37 [1.24, 4.53] 3.22 Naruse 2009 2.70 [1.69, 4.32] 328 52 4.06 Wijk 2015 458 88 3.02 [2.04, 4.45] 4.45 Biasucci 2012 3.72 [1.75, 7.92] 276 60 2 80 Pérez-Calvo 2012 526 55 4.21 [2.10, 8.47] 3.02 Arimoto 2005 140 12 4.24 [0.71, 25.29] 0.84 Bjurman 2013 131 70 4.57 [1.61, 12.98] 1.92 Lassus 2007 480 122 4.92 [2.52, 9.58] 3.15 Molvin 2019 258 56 5.09 [2.63, 9.86] 3.18 Sanchez 2011 218 1.46 70 6.06 [1.70, 21.57] Sanchez 2014 195 40 8.73 [2.44, 31.25] 1.45 Overall 2.04 [1.70, 2.43] Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.15$, $I^2 = 87.04\%$, $H^2 = 7.71$ Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(25) = 143.58, p = 0.00 Test of θ = 0: z = 7.83, p = 0.00 1.00 Serum NGAL HR, top vs bottom tertile Weight Study Total Dead [95% CI] (%) Nymo 2012 1415 327 1.57 [1.05, 2.36] 31.21 Van Deursen 2014 562 232 2.32 [1.70, 3.16] 32.77 Alvelos 2011 120 27 4.98 [1.34, 18.46] 14.94 Villacorta 2015 61 7.09 [2.82, 17.81] 21.08 Overall 2.91 [1.49, 5.67] Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.33$, $I^2 = 81.02\%$, $H^2 = 5.27$ Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(3) = 10.41, p = 0.02 Test of θ = 0: z = 3.14, p = 0.00 1.00 **Urine NGAL** Weight HR, top vs bottom tertile Study Total Dead [95% CI] (%) Wettersten 2020 927 65 58.25 1.77 [0.69, 4.55] Wettersten 2020 927 43 2.42 [0.79, 7.37] 41.75 Overall 2.02 [0.98, 4.14] Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.00$, $I^2 = 0.00\%$, $H^2 = 1.00$ Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(1) = 0.18, p = 0.68 Test of θ = 0: z = 1.91, p = 0.06 1.00 NGAL = neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin.

Study	Total C	Compos	HR, top vs bottom tei te [95% CI]	tile Weigl (%)
Palazzuali 2015	202			
Palazzuoli 2015	203	116		oj 0.20
	112	20		·] 0.17
VVIJK 2015	022	201		-j 5.00
Vamamata 2012	023	201] 7.55
	2270			·] /./ I
Kim 2012	597	69		0 7.02
Tana 2015	907 811	00		-j 5.00
Campbell 2009	240	153		oj 0.09 si 7.01
Sanchez 2011	240	126		n 630
Kim 2015	210	77		1 456
Fernandez 2009	138	60] 4.00
Georgiopoulou 2016	166	63		0.52 0] <u>4</u> 76
Tang 2008	139	41		1 4.85
Wiik 2015	458	150		5.93
Damman 2011	102	21		51 2.20
Gao 2011	138	21	– – 14.64 [3.84, 55.82	2.69
Overall				1
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(16) = 14 Test of $\theta = 0$: z = 5.98, p	0.84, p = = 0.00	= 0.00	1.00	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(16) = 14 Test of $\theta = 0$: z = 5.98, p Serum NGAL	0.84, p = = 0.00	= 0.00	1.00 HR, top vs bottom te	rtile Weigh
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(16) = 14 Test of $\theta = 0$: z = 5.98, p Serum NGAL Study Tota	0.84, p = 0.00	= 0.00	HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI]	rtile Weigh (%)
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13	0.84, p = = 0.00	= 0.00	HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13 Palazzuoli 2014 17 Shrestha 2014 17 Shrestha 2020 2020	al Comp 0	= 0.00	HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33 -] 32.17
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13 Palazzuoli 2014 175 Wettersten 2020 92	al Com 0.84, p = = 0.00 al Com 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 52	posite	HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.22	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33 -] 32.17] 15.88
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i: Q(16) = 14$ Test of $\theta = 0: z = 5.98, p$ Serum NGALStudyTotalShrestha 2011130Palazzuoli2014179Wettersten2020927Alvelos2011120Wottersten2020927	al Comp 0.84, p = = 0.00 al Comp 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85	posite	1.00 HR, top vs bottom te 1.00 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 130 Palazzuoli 2014 179 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 120	al Com al Com 0.84, p = 0.00 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85	posite	HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24 6.15 [1.76, 21.49	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13 Palazzuoli 2014 17 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 124 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 124 Wettersten 2020 92' Overall 2020 92'	al Com al Com 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85	posite	1.00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24 6.15 [1.76, 21.494 4.11 [2.69, 6.30	rtile Weigh (%) 20.33 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Total Shrestha 2011 131 Palazzuoli 2014 175 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 121 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 121 Wettersten 2020 92' Overall Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$,	al Comp al Comp 0 9 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00	<pre>posite</pre>	000 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] 	rtile Weigh (%) 20.33 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(16) = 14Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 5.98$, pSerum NGALStudyTotaShrestha 2011130Palazzuoli 2014179Wettersten 202092'Alvelos 2011120Wettersten 202092'OverallHeterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$,Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(4) = 1.33	al Comp al Comp 0 9 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8	posite %, H ² = 1	00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24 6.15 [1.76, 21.49 4.11 [2.69, 6.30	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 130 Palazzuoli 2014 179 Wettersten 2020 927 Alvelos 2011 120 Wettersten 2020 927 Diverster 2020 927 Strest of $\theta_1 = \theta_1$: Q(4) = 1.38 1.33 Test of $\theta_1 = \theta_2$: Q(4) = 1.38 Test of $\theta_2 = 0.26$, p	al Comp 0.84, p = 0.00 al Comp 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8 = 0.00	posite %, H ² = 1	000 HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl]	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 130 Palazzuoli 2014 179 Wettersten 2020 927 Alvelos 2011 120 Wettersten 2020 927 Doverall Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(4) = 1.38 Test of $\theta_i = 0$: $z = 6.51$, p	al Comp 0.84, p = 0.00 al Comp 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8 = 0.00	posite %, H ² = 1	000 HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24 6.15 [1.76, 21.49 4.11 [2.69, 6.30 1.00	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 130 Palazzuoli 2014 179 Wettersten 2020 927 Alvelos 2011 120 Wettersten 2020 927 Alvelos 2011 120 Wettersten 2020 927 Doverall Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(4) = 1.33 Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 6.51$, p Urine NGAL	al Comp 0.84, p = 0.00 al Comp 0 . 9 . 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8 = 0.00	posite %, H ² = 1 35	000 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI]	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58]]
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13i Palazzuoli 2014 17i Wettersten 2020 92i Alvelos 2011 12i Wettersten 2020 92i Alvelos 2011 12i Wettersten 2020 92i Doverall 13i Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(4) = 1.35 Test of $\theta_i = 0$: $z = 6.51$, Urine NGAL Study Total	$\frac{al Com}{compc}$	<pre>posite %, H² = 1 35 posite</pre>	00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI]	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58]]
Serum NGAL Study Tota Shrestha 2011 13i Palazzuoli 2014 17: Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 12i Wettersten 2020 92' Overall Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: $Q(4) = 1.33$ Test of $\theta_i = 0$: $z = 6.51$, p Urine NGAL Study Total Wettersten 2020 927	$\frac{al Com_{1}}{c_{0}, 84, p} = 0.00$ $\frac{al Com_{1}}{c_{0}} = 0.00$ $\frac{c_{0}}{c_{1}} = 0.00$ $\frac{c_{0}}{c_{1}} = 0.00$	9%, H ² = 1 9%, H ² = 1 35	00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI] 	rtile Weigh (%) 20.33 2.17 15.88 20.05 1 11.58 1 20.05 1 11.58
Serum NGAL Study Total Shrestha 2011 13i Palazzuoli 2014 17: Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 12i Wettersten 2020 92' Overall 12i Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: $Q(4) = 1.33$ Test of $\theta_i = 0$: $z = 6.51$, Urine NGAL Study Total Wettersten 2020 927 Wettersten 2020 927	al Comp al Comp al Comp 0 9 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8 = 0.00 Comp 65 43	posite %, H ² = 1 35	00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% CI]	rtile Weigh (%) 20.33 32.17 15.88 20.05 11.58 11.58] 11.58 1 1.57 1 1.07 1 48.93
Reteringenery, $r = 0.20$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(16) = 14 Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 5.98$, p Study Total Shrestha 2011 130 Palazzuoli 2014 179 Wettersten 2020 92' Alvelos 2011 120 Wettersten 2020 92' Overall Heterogeneity: $r^2 = 0.00$, Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(4) = 1.33 Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 6.51$, p Urine NGAL Study Total Wettersten 2020 927 Wettersten 2020 927 Overall 2020	al Comp al Comp al Comp 0 7 154 0 53 7 85 12 = 0.00 9, p = 0.8 = 0.00 Compc 65 43	posite %, H ² = 1 35	1.00 HR, top vs bottom te [95% Cl] 3.10 [1.20, 7.97 3.39 [1.60, 7.18 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 4.53 [1.56, 13.20 5.50 [2.12, 14.24 6.15 [1.76, 21.49 6.15 [1.76, 21.49 00 4.11 [2.69, 6.30 1.00 HR, top vs bottom te 1.00 1.49 [0.79, 2.79] 1.77 [0.93, 3.36] 1.62 [1.04, 2.54]	rtile Weigh (%)] 20.33] 32.17] 15.88] 20.05] 11.58] 11.58]] 51.07 [51.07] 48.93

1.00

FIGURE 3 Forest Plots of Pooled HR for Serum Cystatin C, Serum NGAL, and Urine NGAL for the Composite Outcome of All-Cause Mortality and Hospitalizations in Patients With Heart Failure

 $\mathsf{NGAL} = \mathsf{neutrophil} \ \mathsf{gelatinase}\mathsf{-}\mathsf{associated} \ \mathsf{lipocalin}.$

Random-Effects Meta-Ar	nalysis of HRs	With Att-Caus	e mortanty, comp	osite outeo	ine, and worsen	ing Kenat Function of	iig			
		Pooled HR*								
Outcome	Biomarkers	No. of Studies	Unadjusted HR (95% CI)	I ² Statistic	No. of Studies	Adjusted HR (95% CI)	I ² Statistic			
All-cause mortality	Serum Cystatin C	22	2.61 (2.16-3.16)	92.49%	26	2.04 (1.70-2.43)†	87.0%			
	Serum NGAL	4	2.95 (1.09-7.96)	96.33%	4	2.91 (1.49-5.67)†	81.0%			
	Urine NGAL	3	2.10 (1.36-3.25)	1.49%	2	2.02 (0.98-4.14)	0%			
	Serum KIM-1	2	1.59 (1.19-2.11)	0%	2	1.31 (0.80-2.13)	58.3%			
	Urine KIM-1	1	1.74 (0.96-3.22)	-	1	1.33 (0.98-1.80)	-			
Composite outcome	Serum Cystatin C	18	2.41 (1.82-3.18)	97.09%	17	2.26 (1.73-2.96)†	89.8%			
	Serum NGAL	5	2.91 (1.44-5.90)	82.35%	5	4.11 (2.69-6.30)†	0%			
	Urine NGAL	2	2.12 (1.35-3.34)	0%	2	1.62 (1.04-2.54)†	0%			
	Serum KIM-1	3	2.09 (0.57-7.58)	80.86%	2	1.61 (0.61-4.22)	0%			
	Urine KIM-1	3	2.16 (1.80-2.59)	0%	2	1.22 (0.84-1.77)	84.1%			
Worsening renal function	Serum Cystatin C	1	3.25 (1.69-6.25)	-	1	1.30 (0.54-3.14)	-			
	Serum NGAL	10	3.86 (2.40-6.21)	61.31%	7	2.40 (1.48-3.90)†	73.6%			
	Urine NGAL	7	2.43 (1.48-3.99)	89.94%	6	2.01 (1.21-3.35)†	64.6%			
	Serum KIM-1	0	-	-	0	-	-			
	Urine KIM-1	2	2.22 (1.77-2.80)	1.41%	2	1.60 (1.24-2.07)†	0%			

TABLE 1 Association of Ponal Riomarkovs With All-Cause Mortality, Composite Outcome, and Worsening Renal Function Usin

*The pooled HRs represent the random-effects meta-analysis of HRs from the studies to represent the HR between the top and bottom tertile of the biomarkers for each outcome. †Refers to statistical significance (P < 0.05).

 $\mathsf{NGAL} = \mathsf{neutrophil} \ \mathsf{gelatinase} \text{-} \mathsf{associated} \ \mathsf{lipocalin}; \ \mathsf{KIM} = \mathsf{kidney} \ \mathsf{injury} \ \mathsf{molecule}.$

patients who developed WRF vs those who did not was 0.37 (95% CI: -0.01 to 0.74) (I 2 = 98%) from 6 studies (Figure 4, Table 2).

ASSOCIATION OF SERUM AND URINE NGAL WITH HF **OUTCOMES.** Patients in the top-tertile of serum NGAL had significantly higher pooled hazards of allcause mortality (HR: 2.91, 95% CI: 1.49-5.67) $(I^2 = 81\%)$ and composite outcome (HR: 4.11, 95% CI: 2.69-6.30) ($I^2 = 0$ %) when compared to the patients in the bottom-tertile (Figures 2 and 3, Table 1). The pooled adjusted HR for WRF comparing the toptertile of NGAL to the bottom-tertile was 2.40 (95% CI: 1.48-3.90) ($I^2 = 74\%$) among 7 studies (Table 1). Likewise, serum NGAL (ng/mL) was significantly higher among patients who died (pMD 38.65,

TABLE 2 Association of Renal Biomarkers With All-Cause Mortality, Composite Outcome, and Worsening Renal Function Using Random-Effects Meta-Analysis of Mean Difference of the Biomarkers in Patients With and Without the Outcome

		Pooled Mean Difference*								
Outcome	Biomarkers	No. of Studies	Mean Difference (95% CI)	P Value	I ² Statistic					
All-cause mortality	Serum Cystatin C (mg/L)	14	0.40 (0.31-0.48)†	<0.001	75.9%					
	Serum NGAL (ng/mL)	4	38.65 (26.09-51.22)†	<0.001	17.7%					
	Urine NGAL (ng/mL)	0	-	-	-					
	Serum KIM-1 (pg/mL)	0	-	-	-					
	Urine KIM-1 (ng/gCr)	0	-	-	-					
Composite outcome	Serum Cystatin C (mg/L)	12	0.33 (0.25-0.41)†	<0.001	71.6%					
	Serum NGAL (ng/mL)	6	44.60 (12.98-76.21)†	0.010	75.9%					
	Urine NGAL (ng/mL)	3	7.86 (-2.05-17.76)	0.120	66.8%					
	Serum KIM-1 (pg/mL)	0	-	-	-					
	Urine KIM-1 (ng/gCr)	2	448.02 (-198.76-1094.8)	0.170	95.8%					
Worsening renal function	Serum Cystatin C (mg/L)	6	0.37 (-0.01-0.74)	0.060	97.8%					
	Serum NGAL (ng/mL)	16	84.29 (50.47-118.11)†	<0.001	90.5%					
	Urine NGAL (ng/mL)	6	13.74 (8.60-18.89)†	<0.001	0%					
	Serum KIM-1 (pg/mL)	0	-	-	-					
	Urine KIM-1 (ng/gCr)	6	0.58 (0.25-0.91)†	<0.001	85.6%					

*The pooled HRs represent the random-effects meta-analysis of mean difference (MD) from the studies to represent the HR between the top and bottom tertile of the biomarkers for each outcome. Refers to statistical significance (P < 0.05).

NGAL = neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin; KIM = kidney injury molecule.

FIGURE 4 Forest Plots of Pooled Mean Difference for Serum Cystatin C, Serum NGAL, Urine NGAL, and Urine KIM-1 for Worsening Renal Function in Patients With Heart Failure

Serum Cystatin	С										
		WRF			No WRF	-				Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD				[95% CI]	(%)
Fernandez 2011	66	1.12	.62	220	1.19	.47				-0.07 [-0.23, 0.09]	16.84
Palazzuoli 2015	78	1.2	.5	125	1.1	.5	+	- 1		0.10 [-0.04, 0.24]	16.97
Ruan 2014	28	1.51	.34	134	1.32	.29	-	-		0.19 [0.05, 0.33]	17.01
Lassus 2010	46	1.44	.55	146	1.22	.45	-	-		0.22 [0.05, 0.39]	16.76
Breidthardt 2017	60	2	1.31	147	1.45	.67		-	_	0.55 [0.20, 0.90]	15.12
Yang 2016	49	3	.2	54	1.8	.1			-	1.20 [1.14, 1.26]	17.31
Overall							-			0.37 [-0.01, 0.74]	
Heterogeneity: r ² = 0.21, l ² = 97.79%, H ² = 45.24											
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(5) =	= 484	.20, p = 0	0.00								
Test of θ = 0: z = 1.9	91, p =	= 0.06									

0

Serum NGAL

		WRF			No WRF		Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	with 95% CI	(%)
Damman 2017	325	93	68.9	1,122	81	55.6	12.00 [3.83, 20.17]	8.80
Villacorta 2019	30	249.5	304.4	50	216	192.6	33.50 [-87.80, 154.80]	4.14
Breidthardt 2012	60	114.5	99.6	147	75.4	39.9	3 9.10 [13.09, 65.11]	8.41
Horiuchi 2020	193	170.4	164.8	594	123.9	105.9	■ 46.50 [21.74, 71.26]	8.45
Shrestha 2012	21	282	168.9	72	224	121.5	58.00 [-19.50, 135.50]	6.04
Legrand 2014	23	233	170.4	64	174	105	59.00 [-15.24, 133.24]	6.20
Chen 2016	50	238	135.2	163	179	105.9	59.00 [18.15, 99.85]	7.84
De Berardinis 2015	26	234	170.4	75	174	151.1	60.00 [-13.89, 133.89]	6.22
Macdonald 2012	22	130	90.4	68	69	31.9	61.00 [22.47, 99.53]	7.94
Aghel 2009	35	194	105.2	56	128	86.7	66.00 [24.40, 107.60]	7.80
Virzi 2019	13	291	805.2	17	197	70.4	94.00 [-344.98, 532.98]	0.56
Palazzuoli 2014	87	272	205	92	136	127	136.00 [85.71, 186.29]	7.40
Angeletti 2016	8	274	105.9	4	125	54.1	149.00 [58.47, 239.53]	5.41
Palazzuoli 2015	78	295	228	125	129	108		7.22
Virzi 2012	17	391	801.5	36	197	101.5	194.00 [-188.44, 576.44]	0.72
Thai 2020	48	511.63	184.9	91	262.59	154.1		6.86
Overall							\$4.29 [50.47, 118.11]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 3$	365.42	, I ² = 90.4	48%, H ²	= 10.51				
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(15) =	= 127.9	99, p = 0.	00					
Test of θ = 0: z = 4.88	8, p = 0	0.00						
							0	

Urine NGAL

01		WRF	0.0		No WR	F	Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	N	mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	With 95% CI	(%)
Murray 2019	65	22.5	35.3	761	11.9	19.9	1 0.60 [1.90, 19.30]	35.05
Angeletti 2016	8	26	34.8	4	35	27.4	-9.00 [-45.10, 27.10]	2.03
Soyler 2015	19	31.2	25.1	81	16.2	54.1	15.00 [-1.32, 31.32]	9.96
Horiuchi 2020	193	38.1	47.1	594	23.1	35.3	15.00 [7.77, 22.23]	50.76
Shrestha 2012	21	64	88.9	72	33	28	31.00 [-7.57, 69.57]	1.78
Dankova 2020	20	152	180.7	52	19.5	34.7		0.42
Overall							13.74 [8.60, 18.89]	
Heterogeneity: 1	r ² = 0.	00, I ² =	0.00%	$H^2 =$	1.00			
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(5) = 11.45, p = 0.04								
Test of θ = 0: z =	= 5.23	8, p = 0.	00					
							0	

Urine KIM-1

		WRF		Ν	No WRF					Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD				with 95% CI	(%)
Atici 2019	90	2.16	.4	56	1.98	.28				0.18 [0.07, 0.29]	21.09
Legrand 2014	23	.9	1	64	.7	.7		-		0.20 [-0.24, 0.64]	15.51
Ahmad 2018	60	1.12	1.7	223	.8	2.13	_		_	0.32 [-0.19, 0.83]	14.15
Chen 2016	50	2.3	2.1	163	1.4	1.3			-	- 0.90 [0.28, 1.52]	12.29
Damman 2013	290	2.6	2.8	1,721	1.7	2.1		-	-	0.90 [0.56, 1.24]	17.60
Yang 2016	49	2.4	.1	54	1.4	.9				1.00 [0.76, 1.24]	19.35
Overall								-		0.58 [0.25, 0.91]	
Heterogeneity:	r ² = 0.1	3, I ² = 8	5.63%	%, H ² = €	5.96						
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(5) = 50.41, p = 0.00											
Test of $\theta = 0$: z =	= 3.44,	p = 0.00)								
)		_	

 $\mathsf{KIM}=\mathsf{kidney} \text{ injury molecule; } \mathsf{NGAL}=\mathsf{neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin.}$

8



95% CI: 26.09-51.22) ($I^2 = 18\%$), who had a composite outcome (pMD 44.60, 95% CI: 12.98-76.21) ($I^2 = 76\%$) (Supplemental Figures 3 and 4, **Table 2**) and who developed WRF (pMD 84.29, 95% CI: 50.47-118.11) ($I^2 = 90\%$) (Figure 4, Table 2).

The pooled adjusted HR comparing the top-tertile to the bottom-tertile of urine NGAL for all-cause mortality was 2.02 (95% CI: 0.98-4.14) ($I^2 = 0\%$) and for composite outcome was 1.62 (95% CI: 1.04-2.54) ($I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 2 and 3, Table 1). Among 7 studies, patients in the top tertile of urine NGAL had a significantly higher hazard for WRF (HR: 2.01, 95% CI: 1.21-3.35) ($I^2 = 65\%$) (Table 1). The studies assessing

MD showed a similar association between urine NGAL (ng/mL) and HF outcomes (Figure 4, Table 2).

ASSOCIATION OF SERUM AND URINE KIM-1 WITH HF OUTCOMES. The pooled adjusted HR comparing the top-tertile to the bottom-tertile of serum KIM-1 for all-cause mortality was 1.31 (95% CI: 0.80-2.13) ($I^2 = 58\%$), and for composite outcome, it was 1.61 (95% CI: 0.61-4.22) ($I^2 = 0\%$) (**Table 1**). We did not find any studies assessing the effect of serum KIM-1 on the development of WRF. With reference to urinary KIM-1, 1 study reported data on adjusted hazards for all-cause mortality (HR: 1.33, 95% CI: 0.98-1.80) and

2 studies for the composite outcome (HR: 1.22, 95% CI: 0.84-1.77) (I² = 84%) (Table 1). On the contrary, patients in the top-tertile of urinary KIM-1 had a significantly higher hazard for the development of WRF when compared to the bottom-tertile (HR: 1.60, 95% CI: 1.24-2.07) (I² = 0%) (Table 1). The studies assessing MD showed a similar association between urine KIM-1 (ng/gCr) and HF outcomes (Figure 4, Table 2).

SUBGROUP ANALYSIS AND META-REGRESSION. Subgroup analysis based on the continent of study, study population (acute or chronic HF), year of publication, biochemical assay manufacturer, and adjustment for serum creatinine are described in **Table 3**. None of the above subgroup analyses were statistically significant, suggesting that the association of serum cystatin C with all-cause mortality and composite outcome and the association of serum NGAL with WRF remained the same across the subgroups. Additionally, meta-regression analysis showed that none of the continuous study-level variables were associated with the HR for the association between serum cystatin C and NGAL and HF outcomes (Supplemental Table 7).

META-ANALYSIS OF C-STATISTICS. Using randomeffects meta-analysis, pooled C-statistics for serum cystatin C were 0.76 (0.74-0.78) for all-cause mortality, 0.68 (0.64-0.71) for the composite outcome, and 0.66 (0.55-0.76) for WRF. The pooled C-statistics for serum NGAL were 0.64 (0.58-0.69) for all-cause mortality, 0.66 (0.58-0.73) for the composite outcome, and 0.71 (0.65-0.76) for WRF (Supplemental Figures 5 to 13, Supplemental Table 8).

PUBLICATION BIAS. The Egger tests indicated asymmetry or small-study effects for the HR for the association of serum cystatin C with all-cause mortality (P < 0.001) and composite outcome (P < 0.001). Trim and fill analysis was performed, which yielded corrected HRs of 1.73 (95% CI: 1.40-2.15) for all-cause mortality and 1.80 (95% CI: 1.31-2.48) for the composite outcome. The other associations showed no evidence of publication bias. The funnel plots and the trim and fill imputed plots are provided in the Supplemental Figures 14 to 18.

DISCUSSION

The present systematic review and meta-analysis comprising 100 studies and 45,428 participants demonstrates a strong association between serum cystatin C levels and higher all-cause mortality and HF hospitalizations. Serum NGAL, urine NGAL, and KIM-1 at baseline were strong predictors of WRF. We also found that serum NGAL, but not urine NGAL and urine KIM-1, was associated with all-cause mortality and composite endpoints (**Central Illustration**).

Since its introduction in 1985, serum cystatin C has been shown to be an accurate marker of GFR in various patient populations.²⁹ It is well established that renal dysfunction is a strong predictor of adverse outcomes in patients with HF.³ This aligns with our results that serum cystatin C is a predictor of all-cause mortality and composite outcome in patients with HF. This association was consistent even in the pooled creatinine-adjusted HR for mortality and composite outcome for cystatin C (Table 3). While it is possible that serum cystatin C's ability to estimate renal function better than serum creatinine contributed to its independent predictive ability, mechanisms unrelated to renal function cannot be discounted. For instance, cystatin C has been hypothesized to play a key role in vascular biology,³⁰ and serum cystatin C levels have been independently associated with increased risk of coronary artery disease, ischemic stroke, and HF.³¹ However, serum cystatin C failed to predict WRF in patients admitted for HF in our meta-analysis. One of the key explanations is that WRF, defined based on serum creatinine rise in-hospital, is not necessarily a result of loss of excretory function.¹⁵ Renal dysfunction in patients admitted for HF is often a result of a tubular injury caused by reduced renal blood flow secondary to volume overload, decreased intravascular volume, and nephrotoxins.^{15,32} In addition, extra-renal factors such as hemoconcentration, initiation of reninangiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors, and concurrent illness could contribute to the creatinine rise.4,32

This concept of tubular injury contributing to WRF is further supported by our results that both serum and urine NGAL measured at admission were strong predictors of WRF in patients admitted for HF. After its initial discovery through genomic and proteomic analyses, NGAL has been studied in various animal and clinical models as a marker of tubular injury.^{16,19} NGAL has been hypothesized to aid in epithelization and regeneration of tubular cells, providing biological plausibility for its induction after tubular injury.³³ Both serum and urine NGAL rise within hours after the tubular insult and rapidly decrease with resolution of the injury.¹⁹ Early and accurate identification of tubular injury in HF patients will aid in risk stratification, thereby allowing reno-protective strategies for high-risk patients with tubular injury while avoiding unnecessary suspension of beneficial medical therapy in low-risk patients without tubular injury.³⁴ With respect to mortality and

TABLE 3 Meta-R	egression of Categorio	cal Study-Level Charact	teristics				
Outcome	Biomarker	Study-Level Characteristic	Subgroup	No. of Studies	pHR (95% CI)	I ² Statistic	P Value
All-cause	Serum Cystatin-C	Continent	Asia	4	1.94 (1.42-2.64)	52.7%	0.605
mortality			Europe	12	2.43 (1.70-3.47)	86.7%	
			North America	2	1.87 (1.48-2.35)	0%	
			Multicontinent	6	1.78 (1.25-2.52)	90.9%	
		Study population	Acute HF	16	2.36 (1.76-3.16)	88.5%	0.109
			Chronic HF	10	1.77 (1.46-2.15)	74.2%	
		Year of publication	Before 2015	15	2.32 (1.74-3.11)	86.2%	0.170
			After 2015	9	1.79 (1.41-3.26)	81.9%	
		Assay manufacturer	Abbott	5	1.72 (1.35-2.21)	51.7%	0.060
			Roche	4	2.47 (1.49-4.09)	84.8%	
			Siemens	6	2.96 (1.96-4.45)	62.0%	
			Dako	3	2.94 (1.24-6.95)	81.9%	
			Radim	2	1.42 (0.96-2.21)	76.5%	
		Creatinine adjustment	Creatinine adjusted	13	2.11 (1.59-2.80)	90.7%	0.794
			Creatinine unadjusted	13	2.01 (1.58-2.56)	79.1%	
		Duration of follow-up	≤12 mo	8	2.76 (1.87-4.09)	77.4%	0.069
			>12 mo	18	1.82 (1.51-2.20)	86.5%	
Composite	Serum Cystatin-C	Continent	Asia	4	2.88 (1.27-6.51)	84.1%	0.727
outcome	,		Europe	5	1.91 (1.06-3.43)	85.9%	
			North America	4	2.39 (1.53-3.73)	79.9%	
			Multicontinent	2	1.98 (1.63-2.41)	0%	
		Study population	Acute HF	8	1.92 (1.40-2.63)	85.9%	0.195
		· · · · · · · · · · · ·	Chronic HF	9	2.80 (1.74-4.49)	89.6%	
		Year of publication	Before 2015	10	2.29 (1.61-3.26)	91.5%	0.619
			After 2015	5	2.00 (1.35-2.97)	67.5%	
		Assav manufacturer	Abbott	3	2.02 (1.28-3.2)	64.0%	0.926
		···· ,	Roche	3	2.46 (1.05-5.75)	89.9%	
			Siemens	8	2.10 (4.43-3.09)	89.4%	
		Creatinine adjustment	Creatinine adjusted	8	2.56 (1.71-3.81)	97.7%	0.437
		· · · · , · · · · ,	Creatinine unadiusted	9	2.05 (1.40-3.01)	81.6%	
		Duration of follow-up	≤12 mo	5	2.09 (1.47-2.98)	69.2%	0.678
			>12 mo	12	2.44 (1.67-3.56)	92.5%	
WRF	Serum NGAL (na/mL)	Continent	Asia	3	121.0 (-0.51 to 242.5)	95.3%	0.105*
			Europe	7	106.57 (56.73-156.40)	76.6%	
			North America	1	58.0 (-19.5 to 135.5)	-	
			South America	1	33.5 (-87.8 to 154.8)	-	
			Multicontinent	4	33 7 (6 35-61 14)	65.7%	
		Year of publication	Before 2015	7	67.71 (40.03-97 38)	52.8%	0.406*
		publication	After 2015	9	84.29 (50.47-118 11)	94.1%	000
		Assay manufacturer	Abbott	10	67.91 (33.74-102.08)	5 / 6	0.217*
			Bioporto	4	107 34 (16 17-198 52)		0.217
			Siemens	1	149 0 (58 48-239 52)		
		Creatinine adjustment	Creatinine adjusted	q	74 18 (30 91-117 45)	87.7%	0.456*
		e. eutimite aujustment	Creatinine unadjusted	7	101 75 (43 59-159 90)	87.1%	0.150
				,		07.170	

*P value calculated using meta-regression.

HF = heart failure; NGAL = neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipoprotein; pHR = pooled hazard ratio; pMD = pooled mean difference; WRF = worsening renal function.

hospitalizations, we found a significant association with serum NGAL but not with urine NGAL. The potential explanations lie in the distinct pathophysiologic processes represented by the markers. Serum NGAL is produced by renal (proximal tubules) and extra-renal sources in response to renal tubular injury, inflammation, and sepsis.³⁵ Serum NGAL is a compensatory protective mechanism in these acute

states, but chronic elevations are maladaptive and associated with myocardial remodeling, fibrosis, and atherosclerotic plaque instability.³⁶ Hence, the association of serum NGAL with adverse clinical outcomes might reflect a systematic process beyond renal injury. On the contrary, urinary NGAL is produced by distal nephrons solely in response to local tubular injury.³⁵ Pertaining to the above hypothesis, Mori et al³⁷ showed that tagged NGAL injected systemically accumulates in the proximal tubule but does not appear in urine.

Unlike NGAL, KIM-1 is solely produced in the proximal tubular cells in response to acute and chronic insults.¹⁷ KIM-1 expression aids in phagocytosis of apoptotic tubular epithelial cells, which decreases inflammation and promotes tissue repair.³⁸ Urine KIM-1 represents the shed ectodomains, while plasma KIM-1 is obtained as a leak from compromised renal microvasculature and correlates with urine levels.³⁹ We found that serum and urine KIM-1 were associated with WRF, aligning with its role as a sensitive and specific marker of tubular injury in previous research models. We did not find a significant association between serum or urinary KIM-1 and mortality or composite outcomes.

STUDY STRENGTHS. Our study has several strengths. Our systematic review examined the association of 3 renal biomarkers and clinical endpoints, such as mortality, hospitalizations, and WRF, in patients with HF. We included over 100 studies with 45,428 HF patients from 15 countries with diverse patient populations, disease characteristics, healthcare access, and expertise, which allows generalizability of our results. The study not only assesses the prognostic role of these biomarkers in HF but also enables us to understand the complex pathophysiological process, as reflected by our results. We further assessed the strength of our associations through meta-regression of characteristics such as age, sex, blood pressure, heart rate, LVEF, comorbidities such as diabetes mellitus and hypertension, and serum creatinine. Our subgroup analysis based on the year of study was able to account for significant advancements in HF management in recent years. We were able to show that the prognostic role of the biomarkers was similar across different biochemical assays.

STUDY LIMITATIONS. However, our results should be interpreted in the context of the following limitations. Most of the included studies had a single timepoint measurement, restricting our ability to assess the effect of biomarker changes over time on the outcomes, especially mortality and the composite outcome. Factors such as steroid use,

hyperthyroidism, inflammatory states, sepsis, and malignancies can influence renal biomarker levels but were not adjusted for in many included studies. Significant heterogeneity was observed in our analyses, but no single culpable variable was identified from our meta-regression, and thus it was likely multifactorial. In addition, inconsistencies in the reporting of covariates across studies restricted our ability to perform meta-regression for many variables. In the meta-analysis of adjusted effect sizes, individual studies were adjusted for comparable but different parameters, thus preventing uniform pooling of the results. Though we pooled prognostic c-statistics in our study, unlike diagnostic c-statistics, they cannot be relied upon to assess a biomarker's clinical utility⁴⁰ Biomarkers with good risk prediction could still have low prognostic c-statistics. All studies of WRF were conducted in patients hospitalized with acute HF, whereas mortality and composite outcomes were extracted from both acute and chronic HF. We did not obtain individual patient-level data, which might help address the possible clinical and methodological heterogeneity of the included studies. The decision to assume a log-normal distribution was made based on literature precedents and the nature of biomarker data, which often exhibits right-skewed distributions. However, we acknowledge that this is an assumption, and without access to individual patient data from the original studies, it's a limitation of our approach.

CONCLUSIONS

Our results have several important clinical implications. Serum cystatin C and serum NGAL are strong and independent predictors of adverse clinical outcomes in patients with HF, thus enabling risk stratification and therapeutic decision-making. In addition, we showed that serum and urine NGAL are important predictors of WRF in HF patients admitted to the hospital, thus aiding in the identification of patients at risk of WRF using tubular injury markers. A multimarker model that will differentiate normal functional kidneys from reduced GFR, loss in glomerular integrity, and tubulointerstitial injury is imperative in managing patients with HF.

FUNDING SUPPORT AND AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

The authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Dr Jawahar L. Mehta, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, 4301 W. Markham Street # 532, Little Rock, Arkansas 72205, USA. E-mail: MehtaJL@uams.edu.

PERSPECTIVES

COMPETENCY IN PATIENT CARE AND

PROCEDURAL SKILLS: Early and accurate identification of renal dysfunction in HF patients will aid in risk stratification, thereby allowing reno-protective strategies for high-risk patients while avoiding unnecessary suspension of beneficial medical therapy in low-risk patients. **TRANSLATIONAL OUTLOOK:** Further efforts are needed to evaluate a multibiomarker model that will differentiate normal functional kidneys from reduced GFR, loss in glomerular integrity, and tubulointerstitial injury in managing patients with HF.

REFERENCES

1. Roger VL, Weston SA, Redfield MM, et al. Trends in heart failure incidence and survival in a community-based population. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2004;292:344–350.

2. Heidenreich PA, Albert NM, Allen LA, et al. Forecasting the impact of heart failure in the United States a policy statement from the American Heart Association. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2013;6: 606–619.

3. Smith GL, Lichtman JH, Bracken MB, et al. Renal impairment and outcomes in heart failure. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2006;47:1987-1996.

 Damman K, Tang WHW, Testani JM, McMurray JJV. Terminology and definition of changes renal function in heart failure. *Eur Heart J*. 2014:35:3413–3416.

5. Claudio R, Mikko H, HA A, Nagesh A, Rinaldo B. Cardiorenal syndrome. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2008;52: 1527-1539.

6. Cody RJ, Ljungman S, Covit AB, et al. Regulation of glomerular filtration rate in chronic congestive heart failure patients. *Kidney Int.* 1988;34:361-367.

7. Bock JS, Gottlieb SS. Cardiorenal syndrome. *Circulation*. 2010;121:2592–2600.

8. Butler J, Forman DE, Abraham WT, et al. Relationship between heart failure treatment and development of worsening renal function among hospitalized patients. *Am Heart J.* 2004;147:331-338.

9. Metra M, Cotter G, Gheorghiade M, Dei Cas L, Voors AA. The role of the kidney in heart failure. *Eur Heart J.* 2012;33:2135-2142.

10. RL M, van Veldhuisen DJ, Eberhard R, Luscher TF. Renal function: the Cinderella of cardiovascular risk profile. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2001;38: 1782–1787.

11. Chow SL, Maisel AS, Anand I, et al. Role of biomarkers for the prevention, assessment, and management of heart failure: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;135(22):e1054-e1091.

12. Levey AS, Coresh J, Greene T, et al. Using standardized serum creatinine values in the modification of diet in renal disease study equation for estimating glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med.* 2006;145:247-254.

13. Newman DJ, Thakkar H, Edwards RG, et al. Serum cystatin C measured by automated immunoassay: a more sensitive marker of changes in GFR than serum creatinine. *Kidney Int.* 1995;47: 312-318.

14. SM G, SM J, Ronit K, et al. Cystatin-C and mortality in elderly persons with heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2005;45:268–271.

15. Michael H, Prasad D, Anja H-F, et al. The outcome of neutrophil gelatinase-associated lip-ocalin-positive subclinical acute kidney injury. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;57:1752-1761.

16. Mishra J, Ma Q, Prada A, et al. Identification of neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin as a novel early urinary biomarker for ischemic renal injury. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2003;14:2534-2543.

17. Han WK, Bailly V, Abichandani R, Thadhani R, Bonventre JV. Kidney Injury Molecule-1 (KIM-1): a novel biomarker for human renal proximal tubule injury. *Kidney Int.* 2002;62:237-244.

18. Han WK, Waikar SS, Johnson A, et al. Urinary biomarkers in the early diagnosis of acute kidney injury. *Kidney Int.* 2008;73:863-869.

19. Mishra J, Dent C, Tarabishi R, et al. Neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL) as a biomarker for acute renal injury after cardiac surgery. *Lancet.* 2005;365:1231–1238.

20. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group TP. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6:e1000097.

21. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne, Australia: Veritas Health Innovation. Accessed December 21, 2021. http://www. covidence.org

22. Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158:280-286.

23. Anon. The effectiveness and costeffectiveness of biomarkers for the prioritisation of patients awaiting coronary revascularisation: a systematic review and decision model. *Clin Govern Int J.* 2010;15:1–151.

24. Chêne G, Thompson SG. Methods for summarizing the risk associations of quantitative variables in epidemiologic studies in a consistent form. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1996;144:610-621.

25. Danesh J, Collins R, Appleby P, Peto R. Association of fibrinogen, C-reactive protein, albumin, or leukocyte count with coronary heart disease: meta-analyses of prospective studies. *J Am Med Assoc.* 1998;279:1477-1482.

26. Hemingway H, Henriksson M, Chen R, et al. The effectiveness and costeffectiveness of biomarkers for the prioritisation of patients awaiting coronary revascularisation: a systematic review and decision model. *Health Technol Assess.* 2010;14:1–178.

27. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*. 2000;56:455-463.

28. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station TSLLC. Stata | StataCorp LLC; 2019.

29. Simonsen O, Grubb A, Thysell H. The blood serum concentration of cystatin C (γ-trace) as a measure of the glomerular filtration rate. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest.* 1985;45:97-101.

30. Shi G-P, Sukhova GK, Grubb A, et al. Cystatin C deficiency in human atherosclerosis and aortic aneurysms. *J Clin Invest.* 1999;104:1191-1197.

31. Shlipak MG, Sarnak MJ, Katz R, et al. Cystatin C and the risk of death and cardiovascular events among elderly persons. *N Engl J Med.* 2005;352: 2049–2060.

32. Dupont M, Mullens W, Finucan M, Taylor DO, Starling RC, Tang WHW. Determinants of dynamic changes in serum creatinine in acute decompensated heart failure: the importance of blood pressure reduction during treatment. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2013;15:433-440.

33. Yang J, Goetz D, Li J-Y, et al. An iron delivery pathway mediated by a lipocalin. *Mol Cell*. 2002;10:1045-1056.

34. Ahmad T, Jackson K, Rao VS, et al. Worsening renal function in patients with acute heart failure undergoing aggressive diuresis is not associated with tubular injury. *Circulation*. 2018;137:2016-2028.

35. Schmidt-Ott KM, Mori K, Li JY, et al. Dual action of neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2007;18:407-413.

36. Yndestad A, Landrø L, Ueland T, et al. Increased systemic and myocardial expression of neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin in

clinical and experimental heart failure. *Eur Heart J.* 2009;30:1229–1236.

37. Mori K, Lee HT, Rapoport D, et al. Endocytic delivery of lipocalin-siderophore-iron complex rescues the kidney from ischemia-reperfusion injury. *J Clin Invest*. 2005;115:610-621.

38. Ichimura T, Asseldonk EJP V, Humphreys BD, Gunaratnam L, Duffield JS, Bonventre JV. Kidney injury molecule-1 is a phosphatidylserine receptor that confers a phagocytic phenotype on epithelial cells. *J Clin Invest*. 2008;118:1657-1668.

39. Sutton TA. Alteration of microvascular permeability in acute kidney injury. *Microvasc Res.* 2009;77:4-7.

40. Cook NR. Statistical evaluation of prognostic versus diagnostic models: beyond the ROC curve. *Clin Chem.* 2008;54:17-23.

KEY WORDS cystatin C, KIM-1, NGAL, tubular injury, worsening renal function

APPENDIX For supplemental tables and figures, please see the online version of this paper.