Introduction

In clinical practice, estimating glomerular filtration rate (GFR) has proven to be the best indicator of renal function, and therefore the progression of renal illnesses as well (1). An endogenous substance that would meet the criteria of an ideal GFR indicator, should be produced at a constant rate within an organism, and should have its clearance performed exclusively by glomerular filtration, without additional
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Cystatin C is a protein of low molecular mass and belongs to the cysteine protease inhibitor group. It is produced at a constant rate by all cells with a nucleus. Considering its low molecular weight, it is freely filtrated through the glomeruli (13) with over 99% of the cystatin C filtrated that way being taken over by tubular cells, mostly by means of the receptor megaline, and dissolved there (14). That is exactly the reason why the daily excretion of cystatin C through urine is extremely low: 0.0074 ± 0.0034 mg/L (15). The production of cystatin C is influenced by very high doses of corticosteroids (16), as well as thyroid dysfunction (17). Cystatin C levels are lower in hypothyreosis, and higher in hyperthyreosis, compared to the levels in euthyroid state. An estimate of the function of the thyroid gland is therefore necessary before determining GFR based on cystatin C.

Determining cystatin C levels to estimate GFR is very useful for persons with reduced muscle mass or those undergoing quick changes in their muscle mass (children and elderly persons), because unlike creatinine, the serum cystatin C concentration remains constant between the ages of 1 and 50 (18, 19). There are no statistically significant differences between men and women when serum cystatin C concentrations are concerned (15). What is more, cystatin C has an important role in monitoring allograft function in persons who have undergone kidney transplantation, although it is still unclear whether cystatin C has any advantages to serum creatinine and/or the derived formulas for estimating GFR (20).

Glomerular filtration rate can be calculated by applying predictive equations based on serum cystatin C concentration. The aim of this paper was to determine the significance of different predictive formulas derived from cystatin C and used for calculating GFR, and to compare them to the predictive formulas derived from serum creatinine concentrations for calculating GFR, as well as creatinine clearance determined using standard biochemical methods.

**Materials and Methods**

This prospective study included 104 participants, with their characteristics shown in Table I.

The participants in Group 1 and Group 2 were patients suffering from CRI who had been treated at the Department for Nuclear Medicine of the Clinical Center of Vojvodina for purposes of renal function tests.

Serum creatinine and serum urea concentrations, as well as concentrations of creatinine in urine were determined using standard methods on an Olympus AU400 biochemical analyzer and commercial sets produced by Olympus. The calculated values of CrCl were normalized relative to a body surface of 1.73m².
Serum cystatin C concentrations were determined immunoturbidimetrically on the same biochemical analyzer using commercial sets produced by the DakoCytomation Company (Denmark).

The Cockcroft-Gault formula used for calculating creatinine clearance was the following one:

\[
Ccr \ (\text{mL/min}) = \frac{(140 - \text{years of age}) \times \text{body mass (kg)}}{0.81 \times \text{Scr} \times 0.85 \text{ if female}},
\]

where \( Ccr \) – creatinine clearance, \( \text{Scr} \) – serum creatinine in \( \mu\text{mol/L} \).

The resulting creatinine clearance was then normalized to a surface of \( 1.73\text{m}^2 \), using the following formula for calculating body surface:

\[
\text{BS} = \frac{(\text{BM} \times \text{BH})^{1/2}}{60}
\]

where \( \text{BS} \) – body surface in \( \text{m}^2 \), \( \text{BM} \) – body mass in kg, \( \text{BH} \) – body height in cm.

The MDRD equation used was the following one:

\[
\text{GFR} = 32.788 \times (\text{Scr})^{-1.154} \times (\text{years of age})^{-0.203} \times (0.742 \text{ if female}),
\]

where \( \text{GFR} \) – glomerular filtration rate in \( \text{mL/min/1.73m}^2 \), \( \text{Scr} \) – serum creatinine in \( \mu\text{mol/L} \).

Two predictive equations for calculating GFR based on serum cystatin C concentration were used and compared (6):

\[
\text{GFR (mL/min/1.73m}^2\) = 84.69 \times [ \text{cystatin C } \text{(in mg/L)}]^{-1.68} \text{ and }
\]

\[
\text{GFR (mL/min/1.73m}^2\) = 80.35 \times [1/ \text{cystatin C } \text{(mg/L)}]^{-4.3}
\]

**Statistics**

Statistical processing was done using Microsoft Office Excel 2003 software package. The results were shown as averages ± SD. Statistical methods applied were: f-test, t-test, correlation and linear regression analysis.

**Results**

Figure 1 shows the number of participants with elevated levels of serum cystatin C and creatinine per group.

Averages of cystatin C per group displayed statistically significant differences between all of the groups with \( p<0.001 \), apart from Group I and the
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### Table I Subjects features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>I group</th>
<th>II group</th>
<th>III group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (f/m)</td>
<td>GFR&gt;60 mL/min/1.73m²</td>
<td>GFR&lt;60 mL/min/1.73m²</td>
<td>Hemodialysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>12/21</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine (µmol/L)</td>
<td>51.2 ± 12.4</td>
<td>65.1 ± 10.6</td>
<td>47.5 ± 10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine clearance (mL/min/1.73m²)</td>
<td>100.5 ± 22.2</td>
<td>202.8 ± 128.1</td>
<td>1025.5 ± 202.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockcroft-Gault formula/1,73m²</td>
<td>6.3 ± 2.5</td>
<td>10.6 ± 5.7</td>
<td>32.2 ± 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRD (mL/min/1,73m²)</td>
<td>64.2 ± 15.3</td>
<td>36.1 ± 14.9</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cystatin C (mg/L)</td>
<td>78.9 ± 15.8</td>
<td>34.1 ± 15.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula I</td>
<td>110.2 ± 27.5</td>
<td>45.8 ± 24.8</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula II</td>
<td>91.5 ± 15.7</td>
<td>48.6 ± 19.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: GFR – glomerular filtration rate, MDRD – modification of diet in renal disease, Formula I: GFR (mL/min/1.73m²) = 84.69 × [cystatin C (mg/L)]^{-1.68}, Formula II: GFR (mL/min/1.73m²) = 80.35 × [1/cystatin C (mg/L)]^{-4.3}

---

**Figure 1** Review of subjects with high serum concentrations of cystatin C and creatinine.
control group, in which p<0.01. Using regression analysis, high inverse correlations between serum cystatin C concentration and CrCl (r = –0.74, p<0.001), between cystatin C and MDRD (r = –0.69, p<0.001), and between cystatin C and the C&G formula corrected for a surface of 1.73m² (r = –0.87, p<0.001) were determined. There was also a high correlation between serum creatinine and cystatin C (r = 0.75, p<0.001). The level of correlation between serum creatinine and CrCl was high (r = –0.69, p<0.001).

Between equation I for calculating GFR from serum cystatin C concentration, and CrCl, there was a significant correlation in participants from Group 1 (r = 0.45, p = 0.02), as in comparison with MDRD (r = 0.42, p = 0.03) and the C&G formulas (r = 0.44, p = 0.02). Equation II exhibited a similar correlation to the one of equation I: relative to CrCl (r = 0.47, p = 0.015), relative to MDRD (r = 0.42, p = 0.03), and relative to C&G (r = 0.44, p = 0.02). In this group of participants there was a significant correlation between CrCl and serum creatinine (r = –0.47, p = 0.014) and serum cystatin C (r = –0.46, p = 0.0016).

In participants from Group 2 there was a significant correlation between equation I for calculating GFR from serum cystatin C concentration, and CrCl, just as compared to the C&G formula (r = 0.57, p<0.001), but not compared to MDRD (r = 0.29, p>0.05). Equation II showed a somewhat higher correlation relative to CrCl (r = 0.63, p<0.0001) and the C&G equation (r = 0.59, p<0.001), while in relation to MDRD a significant correlation did not occur (r = 0.26, p = 0.14).

Between CrCl and serum creatinine concentration in this group there was a high correlation (r = 0.77, p<0.001), with a slightly lower, but still significant correlation occurring between CrCl and cystatin C (0.65, p<0.001).

Looking at all the participants with CRI (apart from the ones on dialysis), between equation I and CrCl there was a high correlation (r = 0.83, p<0.0001), as when comparing it to the C&G formula (r = 0.78, p<0.001) as well as MDRD (r = 0.63, p<0.001). Between equation II and CrCl the correlation was also high (r = 0.84, p<0.0001), as well as when this equation was compared to the C&G formula (r = 0.77, p<0.001), and to MDRD (r = 0.64, p<0.001).

The number of participants compared to the discrepancies between the formulas for calculating GFR from serum cystatin C concentration and formulas for calculating creatinine clearance and thereby GFR (expressed in mL/min/1.73m²) in Groups 1 and 2, is shown in Table II. In all these cases the values resulting from formulas based on cystatin C concentration were higher than the values based on CrCl, C&G and MDRD.

**Discussion**

One of the relatively new markers, which has been in use for more than two decades for estimating GFR, is cystatin C (1), since it not only meets certain criteria for being an «ideal» marker, but its determination is also very simple. A great number of studies have been done to emphasize the role of specifically cystatin C as the leading marker in the beginning stages of CRI (with creatinine clearance between 61 and 90 mL/min/1.73m²) (21–23). Studies of Xu et al. (24) have shown high inverse correlation between serum cystatin C and creatinine clearance (r = –0.876). Our study also resulted in a high inverse correlation between serum cystatin C and creatinine clearance (r = –0.74), with serum cystatin C concentration within reference values in all patients with creatinine clearance above 60 mL/min/1.73m².

Out of all the equations used, equation I exhibited a significant correlation with creatinine clearance (p = 0.02), the Cockcroft-Gault (p = 0.02) and MDRD (p = 0.03), with a similar correlation occurring between equation II and other GFR indicators. In this group of participants the discrepancies of more than 20 mL/min between equation I and other methods happened in about 61% of the cases comparing to creatinine clearance, in about 80% of the cases comparing to the Cockcroft-Gault equation, and in about 65% of the cases comparing to MDRD. The discrepancies
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**Table II** Number of subjects according to exception between GFR formulas from cystatin C and formulas for calculating creatinine clearance namely GFR (mL/min/1.73m²) in both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exception (mL/min)</th>
<th>Formula I Group I/ Group II</th>
<th>Formula II Group I/ Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10/mL/min</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine clearance</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockroft-Gault formula/1.73m²</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRD</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>2/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Formula I: GFR (mL/min/1.73m²) = 84.69 × [cystatin C (mg/l)]⁻¹.⁶ Formula II: GFR (mL/min/1.73m²) = 80.35 × 1/cystatin C (mg/L) – 4.3; Cockcroft-Gault formula/1.73m² – Cockcroft-Gault formula normalizing according to surface of 1.73m².
were significantly lower for equation II, which therefore favored it for this group of participants.

In the group of participants with GFR <60 mL/min/1.73m² both of the equations derived from serum cystatin C have shown a significant correlation with creatinine clearance and the Cockcroft-Gault formula (with slightly higher levels for equation II), but neither equation exhibited a significant correlation with MDRD. With this group of participants the discrepancies of more than 20 mL/min between equation I and the other methods occurred in about 46% of the cases comparing to creatinine clearance, in about 58% of the cases comparing to the Cockcroft-Gault equation, and in about 42% of the cases comparing to MDRD. Similar discrepancies occurred for equation II.

When looking at participants from both groups, a high level of correlation is present between predictive equations derived from cystatin C and CrCl (r = 0.83 for equation I, and r = 0.84 for equation II), the C&G equation (r = 0.78 for equation I, and r = 0.77 for equation II), and MDRD (r = 0.63 for equation I, and r = 0.64 for equation II).

The data from comparisons of serum cystatin C, serum creatinine, and creatinine clearance calculated from the C&G and MDRD formulas are in contradiction (25–27). Grubb et al. (28) have shown that equations based on cystatin C have a higher precision in estimating GFR than the C&G formula. Hoeck et al. (27) in their study show that serum cystatin C and creatinine clearance calculated from the C&G formula yield a higher diagnostic accuracy than serum creatinine, but a significant difference in the diagnostic accuracy between serum cystatin C and creatinine clearance calculated from the C&G formula was not determined. Although some studies have detected early changes in serum cystatin C rather than creatinine in beginning kidney damage, other studies have not been able to confirm that (29). In a study by Donady et al. (25) a significant difference in diagnostic accuracy between serum cystatin C and serum creatinine was not discovered, while a study by Kyhse-Andersen et al. (26) that included patients with GFR < 80 mL/min/1.73m², discovered a significantly higher correlation of cystatin C and GFR determined by iohexol clearance than with serum creatinine, which led to the conclusion that cystatin C had a higher diagnostic precision in estimating GFR reduction compared to serum creatinine. A study by Hoy et al. (30) did not find a significant difference in the diagnostic accuracy between serum cystatin C and creatinine clearance calculated from the MDRD formula.

In our study, although serum concentrations of cystatin C were within reference values in all participants with creatinine clearance ≥ 60 mL/min/1.73m², in 4 of the participants (~15 %) the serum creatinine concentrations were elevated. In participants with creatinine clearance < 60 mL/min/1.73 m², 27 (~82%) had elevated creatinine levels, while 19 (~58%) had elevated cystatin C levels.

The results of our study indicate that determining cystatin C has no significant advantage for estimating GFR compared to creatinine, or creatinine clearance in the group of participants with relatively preserved renal function reserve. However, in the group of participants with a distinct renal function reserve reduction (GFR < 30 mL/min/1.73m²), determining serum cystatin C reflects the level of the reduction with more reliability, since the additional factors that could interfere in particular with determining cystatin C are a lot fewer in the advanced stages of chronic renal insufficiency than is the case with creatinine.
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