

Prevalence and determinants of poor outcome in patients with chronic kidney disease in low-income countries in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review

Chitalu Chanda *et al.*

Corresponding author: Chitalu Chanda

Email: chtalu@gmail.com

Available online: <https://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/53/168/full/>

Content

Annex 1: Form 1: Data Abstraction

Annex 2: Form 2: Newcastle - Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (adapted for cross-sectional studies)

Form 1: Data Abstraction

- 1) Journal: _____
- 2) First author last name: _____
- 3) Publication year: _____
- 4) Study location (city, state, and country): _____
- 5) Reviewer's initials: _____
- 6) Scoring scale:

The outcome of interest:

1. Prevalence of CKD: Yes Or No
2. Reported prevalence of CKD:
3. Was the Mortality reported: Yes Or No
4. Mortality rates:

Description Study

5. RCT: Yes(1) or No(2)
6. Cross section:
7. Other:.....
8. Newcastle Scoring

Participants description

9. Number of participants:
10. Age of patients: > 60 years OR less than 60 years.....
11. Comorbid condition: yes or No
12. Diabetes mellitus: Yes Or NO
13. Number of diabetes mellitus patients:
14. Odds ratio for DM:
15. Hypertension: Yes or No

16. Odds ratio for hypertension:
17. HIV status: Yes or No
18. Stage of CKD

Form 2: Newcastle - Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (adapted for cross-sectional studies)

Selection: (Maximum 5 scores)

1) Representativeness of the cases:

- a) Truly representative of the HCC patients (consecutive or random sampling of cases). 1 score
- b) Somewhat representative of the average in the HCC patients (non-random sampling). 1 score
- c) Selected demographic group of users. 0 scored No description of the sampling strategy. 0 score

2) Sample size:

- a) Justified and satisfactory (≥ 400 HCC included). 1 score
- b) Not justified (<400 HCC patients included). 0 score

3) Non-Response rate

- a) The response rate is satisfactory ($\geq 95\%$). 1 Score
- b) The response rate is unsatisfactory ($<95\%$), or no description. 0 Score

4) Ascertainment of the screening/surveillance tool:

- a) Validated screening/surveillance tool. 2 scores
- b) Non-validated screening/surveillance tool, but the tool is available or described. 1 score
- c) No description of the measurement tool. 0 score

Comparability: (Maximum 1 stars)

1) The potential confounders were investigated by subgroup analysis or multivariable analysis.

- a) The study investigates potential confounders. 1 score
- b) The study does not investigate potential confounders. 0 score

Outcome: (Maximum 3 stars)

1) Assessment of the outcome:

- a) Independent blind assessment. 2 scores
- b) Record linkage. 2 scores
- c) Self-report. 1 scored) No description. 0 score

2) Statistical test:

- a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and appropriate. 1 score
- b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described, or incomplete. 0 score