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Background. Diabetic nephropathy (DN) is an important cause of end-stage renal disease and is recognized as a public health problem worldwide. However, there have been no nationwide surveys of DN prevalence in China. This study is aimed at estimating the pooled prevalence of DN among patients with type 2 diabetes in China. Methods. Published studies on the prevalence of DN among patients with type 2 diabetes published from January 1980 to October 2019 were systematically reviewed using PubMed, Embase, Google Scholar, Chinese Wanfang databases, and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure. The pooled prevalence of DN was estimated with the random effects model using R software. Prevalence estimates were also stratified by study design, methodological approach, and study population characteristics. Results. Thirty studies with a total of 79,364 participants were included in our study. The overall pooled prevalence of DN was 21.8% [95% confidence interval (CI): 18.5-25.4%]. Subgroup analysis found that the prevalence of DN varied significantly according to different DM and DN diagnostic criteria (P < 0.05); the pooling estimate was the highest in the west region of 41.3%, followed by that in the east region of China with 22.3%, northeast region with 20.7%, and central region with 15.6% (P < 0.05), and was higher in the male-dominated studies 27.7%, compared with the female-dominated studies 17.6% (P < 0.05). Conclusions. The prevalence of DN is high in Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes and shows geographic and gender variation. These data indicate that national strategies aimed at primary and secondary prevention of DN and screening programs for DN are urgently needed to reduce the risk and burden of DN in China.

1. Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a worldwide public health challenge. WHO estimated that there were around 422 million people living with diabetes and that there was a rising trend in the number of people living with DM [1]. Among these people, type 2 diabetes (T2DM) accounts for over 90% of all persons with diabetes [2]. Diabetic nephropathy (DN) is frequently associated with T2DM and the leading cause of chronic kidney disease and end-stage renal disease [3]. Importantly, with the increasing incidence of T2DM, the frequency of DN has also increased [4]. Examining the prevalence and influencing factors of DN in patients with T2DM is, therefore, an important first step in understanding the disease burden and developing additional research priorities as well.

In China, with the rapid economic growth and urbanization, lifestyle changed significantly. At the same time, the prevalence of T2DM has been increasing dramatically. IDF Diabetes Atlas estimated that in 2017, the prevalence of diabetes was 10.9%, and it estimated that there were 114 million people living with diabetes and 61 million people with undiagnosed diabetes [5]. Besides, the national survey in China also showed that a large proportion of diabetes was undiagnosed and that patients with newly diagnosed diabetes accounted for 60% of the total diabetic population [6]. Consequently, it is striking that DN among those with T2DM has become one of the most important public health crises in
China, and there is an urgent need to assess the epidemiological characteristics and risk factors of DN in T2DM in China to implement effective interventions.

Although the DN epidemic in China is striking [5], the prevalence and risk factors of DN among Chinese patients with T2DM have not been systematically studied nationwide, and the variation of DN prevalence in T2DM in China also has not yet been reported, which limits the ability to realize its severity and characteristics. Therefore, we conducted a meta-analysis of studies on DN to determine the national prevalence of DN and its variation in patients with T2DM in China.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Literature Search. This meta-analysis was conducted according to the PRISMA guideline. The PubMed, Embase, Google Scholar, Chinese Wanfang databases, and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) were searched. We used the following search terms: (“nephropathy” OR “kidney diseases”) AND (“diabetes mellitus” OR “diabetes” OR “mellitus”) AND (“epidemiology” OR “prevalence”). We searched for studies published from January 1980 to October 2019 to identify relevant articles. The literature was limited to those published in Chinese and English as both reviewers are fluent in these languages.

2.2. Study Selection and Data Extraction. Diabetes is a disease that blood glucose levels rise higher than normal and for extended periods. T2DM is the most common form of diabetes [7]. DN is a syndrome characterized by the presence of pathological levels of urinary albumin excretion, diabetic glomerular lesions, and loss of glomerular filtration rate (GFR) in diabetics [8]. In this meta-analysis, the definition and diagnostic criteria of this study were all taken from the included articles. We used the following inclusion and exclusion criteria. Studies were included in our meta-analysis if (1) included Chinese participants and (2) reported quantitative data regarding DN prevalence. Studies were excluded if (1) duplicated reports; (2) included patients with type 1 diabetes or other special populations, such as pregnant women; and (3) were studies that were qualitative or postintervention or included special professional people, such as doctors. When additional data were needed, we attempted to contact the authors to obtain relevant data.

Two investigators (KY and XXZ) independently reviewed the search results and selected articles to determine eligibility and to extract study data. Disagreements of data extraction among two reviewers were reconciled by discussion. Standardized Excel spreadsheet abstraction forms were designed to capture all relevant information required for analyses, including first author, date of publication, diagnosis standard for DN, diagnosis standard for DM, study location, population source, urban/rural, age of subjects, BMI, sex, duration of DM (years), systolic pressure, diastolic pressure, number of patients with DM and DN, and quality score.

2.3. Quality Assessment. Methodological quality assessments were conducted using the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist of observational studies [9]. Two authors (KY and XXZ) evaluated each article’s quality based on the checklist, and discrepancies were addressed by discussion. Each of the items was categorized as yes (1 score) or no (0 score) to denote whether the study fulfillment of corresponding criteria. If an item was not applicable for that study design, it was scored as “not applicable” (NA). The methodological quality score of studies was grouped according to the mean of the total scores into lower than 20 points or equal or higher than 20 points for quality analysis.

2.4. Statistical Analyses. The pooled prevalence of DN was calculated using the inverse variance method, as previously described. Briefly, if the tests met the hypothesis of homogeneity, fixed effects models were used; otherwise, random effects models were used [10]. Heterogeneity across the included studies was analyzed using the Q test and the I² index (values of 25%, 50%, and 75% are taken as low, medium, and high heterogeneity, respectively). Subgroup analyses were performed by the study year, diagnostic criteria for DN and DM, geographical areas, population source, sample size, age, BMI, sex, DM duration, study quality score, and blood pressure to explore the influence of potential heterogeneity factors on the pooling estimation. The geographic areas are divided according to the standard of the geographical division of China [11].

The leave-one-out sensitivity test was used to confirm that our findings were not driven by any single study. In addition, Egger’s tests were used to detect potential publication bias by examining the funnel plot symmetry. P < 0.05 indicated statistical significance. Statistical analyses were performed using R software (Version 3.0.1.).

3. Results

3.1. Identification and Selection of Eligible Studies. A total of 7161 citations were retrieved in the literature search. Of these, 7075 were excluded after screening titles and abstracts, and 86 were selected for further evaluation. Finally, 30 articles that provided the rates of DN in adults with T2DM were included in this review (Figure 1).

A descriptive summary of the included studies is provided in Table 1. The included studies were conducted between 1991 and 2017 across 13 provinces/cities in China. All the included studies were cross-sectional studies. The sample size ranged from 46 to 31,574. Of the included studies, three were from the central region of China, nineteen from the east region, three from the northeast region, two from the west region, and two from Hong Kong. The study populations were from two different sources: five studies were community-based, whereas twenty-five were hospital-based. The mean participant age was 59.3 years, and the mean course of DM was 7.7 years.

3.2. Estimated Pooled Prevalence of DN in Chinese Adults with Type 2 Diabetes. A total of 30 studies, including 79,364 adults with T2DM, were evaluated. Substantial heterogeneity across the included studies was observed.
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3.4. Differentiating DN (27.6%, and central region with 15.6% (95% CI: 4.9-39.8%), northeast region with 20.7% (95% CI: 15.2-26.5%), followed by that in the east region with 22.3% (95% CI: 17.6% (95% CI: 12.6-24.0%) (P = 0.01). Therefore, random effects models were used, and the pooled prevalence of DN was 21.8% (95% CI: 18.5-25.4%) (Figure 2).

3.3. Subgroup Analysis. Table 2 shows the subgroup analyses of the prevalence of DN among participants with T2DM. Significant differences were found in the diagnostic criteria of DM and DN (P < 0.01), region (P < 0.01), and gender (P < 0.01). The prevalence of DN varied significantly according to different DM and DN diagnostic criteria; studies using the KDOQI 2014 diagnostic criteria for DN (39.4%) and confirmed DM by history of DM (35.3%) had the highest DN prevalence compared to that established using other standards. The pooled prevalence of DN in the west region of China was 41.3% (95% CI: 37.1-45.6%) was the highest, followed by that in the east region with 22.3% (95% CI: 18.6-26.5%), northeast region with 20.7% (95% CI: 15.2-27.6%), and central region with 15.6% (95% CI: 4.9-39.8%) (P < 0.01). The pooled prevalence rates of DN were higher in the male-dominated studies, 27.7% (95% CI: 24.1-31.7%), compared with the female-dominated studies, 17.6% (95% CI: 12.6-24.0%) (P < 0.01).

3.5. Quality Assessment, Sensitivity Analysis, and Publication Bias. The mean (range) quality assessment score was 20 (12-26). Twenty-five studies had equal or higher than the mean strobe quality score (20 points) of all included studies, while 5 had lower than 20 points (Table S1). In sensitivity analyses, the leave-one-out sensitivity tests revealed that no individual study influenced the total outcome (Figure 4). Egger’s regression test of funnel plot asymmetry indicated that there was no potential publication bias among the included studies (t = -1.2966, P = 0.205) (Figure S1).

4. Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first meta-analysis to estimate the pooled prevalence of DN in people with T2DM in China, which included 30 studies with 79,364 patients with T2DM. The pooled prevalence of DN showed that nearly one-fifth of patients with diabetes might have nephropathy complications. The detailed estimates in this study showed that diabetes complicated with nephropathy is a serious public health challenge for the health care system and may result in a large social and economic burden in China. Our findings could help in relevant policy-making and planning and allocation of health care resources.

The pooled DN prevalence in our study was in agreement with a German study (20-30%) [41], but slightly lower than what was found in a cross-sectional population-based study among urban T2DM patients in south India (26.1%) [42]. However, the DN prevalence in our study was higher than that reported by a Saudi national diabetes registry-based study (10.8%) [43]. These phenomena may be explained by racial or ethnic differences in the prevalence of DN [44]. In China, the pandemic of DM, predominantly T2DM, is alarming [5]. Considering the delayed diagnosis of diabetes in China [45], DN would be an important social and economic burden. It should be paid more attention to develop mandatory measures for early detection and prevention. Several studies have proven that diet and exercise interventions seem to be effective methods for risk reduction for metabolic disorders. Early health screening, health education, and combination lifestyle therapies should be implemented in the high-risk population to reduce the disease burden for both individuals and society [46].

Subgroup analyses were performed to evaluate the impact of different stratifications on the prevalence of pooled DN. We found that DN prevalence varied significantly according to different diagnostic criteria for DM and DN. In fact, over the past 40 years, the diagnosis criteria of DM and DN have been changed several times, and different diagnostic criteria might influence the diagnosis and surveillance.
| First author (publication year) | Survey date | Diagnosis standards for DN | Diagnosis standards for DM | Area | Population source | Age (years) | BMI | Sex (%males) | Course of DM (years) | Systolic blood pressure | Diastolic blood pressure | Sample size | Quality score |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------|-------------------|-------------|-----|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Song (2014) [12]                | 2012        | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Shanghai | Community-based    | <59         | 25  | 55.7         | NA                | NA                    | NA                     | 436        | 12           |
| Xu (2012) [13]                  | 2008-2009   | KDOQI 2007                  | ADA criteria 2005           | Shanghai | Community-based    | 61.3 ± 9.7  | NA  | 40.8         | 7.9 ± 6.3         | NA                    | NA                     | 1421       | 22           |
| Ke (2013) [14]                  | 2011        | Mogensen criteria           | WHO criteria 1999           | Huangshi, Hubei | Community-based    | NA          | NA  | 53.1         | NA                | NA                    | NA                     | 918        | 20           |
| Guo (2006) [15]                 | 2002        | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1999           | Beijing | Hospital-based     | 51.1 ± 11.8 | NA  | 60           | NA                | NA                    | NA                     | 402        | 22           |
| Mou (2010) [16]                 | 2003-2008   | Renal biopsy                | History of DM              | Shanghai | Hospital-based     | 53.1 ± 7.5  | NA  | 52.2         | 140.9 ± 26.3      | 85.1 ± 11.5           | NA                     | 69         | 22           |
| Kung (2014) [17]                | 2009-2011   | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Hong Kong | Hospital-based     | 60(20-)     | 25  | 48.8         | 7.3 ± 6.2         | 138 ± 18.3            | 76 ± 10.5              | 15856      | 22           |
| Zhou (2012) [18]                | 2003-2010   | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1999           | Beijing | Hospital-based     | 60.8 ± 12.8 | 25  | 56.8         | 9.2 ± 7.5         | NA                    | NA                     | 1758       | 21           |
| Qu (2003) [19]                  | 1994-2001   | Mogensen criteria           | 1985 WHO/1999 China criteria | Changsha, Hunan | Hospital-based    | 57.3 ± 21.3 | NA  | 47.4         | 7.9 ± 4.3         | NA                    | NA                     | 1718       | 17           |
| Teng (2001) [20]                | 1997-2000   | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1985           | Shanghai | Hospital-based     | >43         | NA  | NA           | NA                | NA                    | NA                     | 1059       | 22           |
| Xing (2009) [21]                | 2007-2009   | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1999           | Benxi, Liaoning | Hospital-based    | 61.2 ± 11.0 | NA  | 51.2         | 9.6 ± 2.8         | NA                    | NA                     | 2276       | 22           |
| Lu (2002) [22]                  | 1996-2001   | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Suzhou, Jiangsu | Hospital-based    | >45         | 23 ± 3 | NA           | NA                | NA                    | NA                     | 821        | 21           |
| Liu (2010) [23]                 | 2003-2006   | Renal biopsy                | Clinical diagnosis          | Shanghai | Hospital-based     | 53 ± 7.7    | NA  | 56.5         | 6                 | NA                    | NA                     | 46         | 21           |
| Zou (2000) [24]                 | 1993-1998   | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1985           | Beijing | Hospital-based     | 57.7 ± 15.0 | NA  | 62.8         | 6.4 ± 7.4         | NA                    | NA                     | 1217       | 20           |
| Tang (2005) [25]                | NA          | Clinical diagnosis          | History of DM              | Panzhihua, Sichuan | Hospital-based    | 17-83       | NA  | 52.5         | 0-20              | NA                    | NA                     | 324        | 18           |
| Yu (2006) [26]                  | 1991-2000   | Clinical diagnosis          | History of DM              | Hangzhou, Zhejiang | Hospital-based    | 59 ± 12     | NA  | 49.3         | 6 ± 6              | NA                    | NA                     | 874        | 19           |
| Wang (2014) [27]                | 2013        | Clinical diagnosis          | History of DM              | Fushun, Liaoning | Hospital-based    | 59.2 ± 12   | 24.6 ± 3 | 45.1         | 7.1 ± 6.1         | NA                    | NA                     | 750        | 20           |
| Chen (2007) [28]                | 2005        | ADA criteria 1997           | Clinical diagnosis          | Shanghai | Hospital-based     | 60.3 ± 9.7  | 24.3 ± 3.3 | 48.1         | 5.4 ± 5.3         | 133.2 ± 17.6         | 77.9 ± 9.1             | 408        | 20           |
| Yu (2012) [29]                  | 2011        | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1999           | Shanghai | Community-based    | 70.2 ± 10.5 | 24.7 ± 3.3 | 40.5         | 134 ± 12          | 80.8 ± 6.9            | NA                     | 516        | 21           |
Table 1: Continued.

| First author (publication year) | Survey date | Diagnosis standards for DN | Diagnosis standards for DM | Area | Population source | Age (years) | BMI | Sex (% males) | Course of DM (years) | Systolic blood pressure | Diastolic blood pressure | Sample size | Quality score |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------|-------------------|-------------|-----|--------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Xu (2016) [30]                  | 2014-2015   | CTM criteria 2010           | WHO criteria 2004           | Linyi, Shandong               | Hospital-based | 56.9 ± 9.9 | NA | NA           | NA                   | NA                     | NA                     | 500         | 19            |
| Zhang (2016) [31]               | 2011        | ADA criteria 2007           | WHO criteria 1999           | Dalian, Liaoning             | Hospital-based | 61.5       | 25.7 | NA           | NA                   | 152.9                  | 83.23                   | 2345        | 20            |
| Li (2014)-1 [32]                | 2009        | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Tongxiang, Zhejiang          | Hospital-based | >60        | NA  | 57.7         | NA                   | NA                     | NA                     | 302         | 20            |
| Li (2014)-2 [32]                | 2012        | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Tongxiang, Zhejiang          | Hospital-based | >60        | NA  | 57.7         | NA                   | NA                     | NA                     | 494         | 20            |
| Zeng (2014) [33]                | 2010-2013   | Clinical diagnosis          | ADA criteria 2009           | Guangzhou, Guangdong        | Hospital-based | 53.3 ± 13.1 | NA | 56.7         | 1-24                 | NA                     | NA                     | 842         | 21            |
| Hu (2016) [34]                  | 2011-2012   | Clinical diagnosis          | WHO criteria 1999           | Guangdong                   | Hospital-based | 59 ± 12.9  | NA  | 48.8         | NA                   | NA                     | NA                     | 4101        | 23            |
| Wang (2017) [35]                | 2014-2015   | KDOQI 2014                  | History of DM               | Lanzhou, Gansu              | Hospital-based | 67.4 ± 16.9 | NA | 58.6         | 10.6 ± 7.9           | NA                     | NA                     | 558         | 21            |
| Guo (2016) [36]                 | 2005-2012   | KDOQI 2012                  | WHO criteria 1999           | Shanghai                    | Hospital-based | 59.3 ± 12.3 | 25 ± 3.5 | 55.1         | 8.48                 | 132 ± 17.0             | 79.9 ± 9.6             | 3301        | 22            |
| Zhuo (2013) [37]                | 2003-2011   | Renal biopsy                | ADA criteria 2007           | Beijing                     | Hospital-based | 28-64      | NA  | 61.9         | 2-20                 | NA                     | NA                     | 244         | 22            |
| Yang (2018) [38]                | 2014-2017   | KDIGO guidelines 2012       | History of DM               | Hong Kong                   | Hospital-based | 63.0 ± 10.8 | NA | 50.4         | 7.4 ± 6.4            | 131.7 ± 16.2           | 74.8 ± 10.2            | 31574       | 26            |
| Duan (2019) [39]                | 2015-2017   | Clinical diagnosis          | The American Diabetes Association (ADA) 2009 | Henan | Community-based | 56.4 ± 13.1 | 24.4 ± 3.5 | 40.2         | NA                   | NA                     | NA                     | 2710        | 26            |
| Liu (2010) [40]                 | 2007        | Clinical diagnosis          | Clinical diagnosis          | Multicenter (Shanghai, Chengdu, Beijing and Guangzhou) | Hospital-based | 63.3 ± 10.2 | NA | 41.8         | 8.7                  | NA                     | NA                     | 1524        | 26            |

Abbreviations: NA: not available; KDIGO: Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes; ADA: American Dental Association; KDOQI: Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative; CTM: Chinese Traditional Chinese Medicine Association. *Quality score of STROBE checklist.
of DN [47]. This finding inspired us that the harm and benefit of different biomarkers and definitions for DM and DN on identification of cases, population prevalence estimation, and health costs should be evaluated. At the same time, the finding also suggests multicenter studies in the future with different healthy lifestyles, diet, and development of health care systems may also account for this difference [50], such as physical inactivity, control of hypertension, serum cholesterol control, and quitting smoking. Besides, environmental and genetic factors that might explain this phenomenon need further investigation [51] and indicating that more intervention resources of DM and DN should be put in the west of China. Meanwhile, the promotion of awareness of keeping a healthy lifestyle, diabetes prevention, and early medical intervention is still needed for the prevention of DN.

We also found that the pooled prevalence of DN was higher in the male-dominated studies than in the female-dominated studies, which echoed by the study of de Hautecloque et al. [52]. However, some other studies found that females with T2DM had a higher risk of DN than males.

### Table: Prevalence of DN

| Study | Events | Total | Proportion | 95% CI |
|-------|--------|-------|------------|--------|
| Song R (2014) | 183 | 436 | 0.42 | [0.37; 0.47] |
| Xu R (2012) | 263 | 1421 | 0.19 | [0.17; 0.21] |
| Ke XY (2013) | 94 | 918 | 0.10 | [0.08; 0.12] |
| Yu J (2012) | 26 | 516 | 0.05 | [0.03; 0.07] |
| Duan JY (2019) | 962 | 2710 | 0.35 | [0.34; 0.37] |
| Fixed effect model | | | 0.25 | [0.24; 0.27] |
| Random effects model | | | 0.18 | [0.09; 0.34] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%, r^2 = 0.9232, P < 0.01$

| Study | Events | Total | Proportion | 95% CI |
|-------|--------|-------|------------|--------|
| Guo LX (2006) | 65 | 402 | 0.16 | [0.13; 0.20] |
| Mou S (2010) | 33 | 69 | 0.48 | [0.36; 0.60] |
| Kung K (2014) | 2045 | 15856 | 0.13 | [0.12; 0.13] |
| Zhou Y (2012) | 512 | 1758 | 0.29 | [0.27; 0.31] |
| Qu XL (2003) | 155 | 1718 | 0.09 | [0.08; 0.10] |
| Teng XY (2001) | 103 | 1059 | 0.10 | [0.08; 0.12] |
| Xing GH (2009) | 465 | 2276 | 0.20 | [0.19; 0.22] |
| Liu HH (2002) | 89 | 821 | 0.11 | [0.09; 0.13] |
| Liu J (2010) | 22 | 46 | 0.48 | [0.33; 0.63] |
| Zou XM (2000) | 235 | 1217 | 0.19 | [0.17; 0.22] |
| Tang FR (2005) | 142 | 324 | 0.44 | [0.38; 0.49] |
| Yu XF (2006) | 280 | 874 | 0.32 | [0.29; 0.35] |
| Wang L (2014) | 208 | 750 | 0.28 | [0.25; 0.31] |
| Chen Y (2007) | 96 | 408 | 0.24 | [0.19; 0.28] |
| Xu BX (2016) | 90 | 300 | 0.18 | [0.15; 0.22] |
| Zhang N (2016) | 362 | 2345 | 0.15 | [0.14; 0.17] |
| Li GQ (2014)–1 | 85 | 302 | 0.28 | [0.23; 0.34] |
| Li GQ (2014)–2 | 230 | 494 | 0.47 | [0.42; 0.51] |
| Zeng HY (2014) | 199 | 842 | 0.24 | [0.21; 0.27] |
| Hu YH (2016) | 850 | 4101 | 0.21 | [0.19; 0.22] |
| Wang YL (2017) | 220 | 558 | 0.39 | [0.35; 0.44] |
| Guo KF (2016) | 895 | 3301 | 0.27 | [0.26; 0.29] |
| Li Z (2013) | 20 | 244 | 0.08 | [0.05; 0.12] |
| Yang L (2018) | 9386 | 31574 | 0.30 | [0.29; 0.30] |
| Liu JL (2010) | 163 | 1524 | 0.11 | [0.09; 0.12] |
| Fixed effect model | 73363 | | 0.23 | [0.23; 0.23] |
| Random effects model | | | 0.22 | [0.18; 0.27] |

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%, r^2 = 0.4560, P = 0$

| Study | Events | Total | Proportion | 95% CI |
|-------|--------|-------|------------|--------|
| Fixed effect model | 79364 | | 0.23 | [0.23; 0.24] |
| Random effects model | | | 0.22 | [0.18; 0.27] |

Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%, P = 0$

| 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

### Figure 2: Forest plot displaying the pooled prevalence of DN in patients with type 2 diabetes in both population sources.
| Subgroups                              | No. of studies | Prevalence estimate (%) and 95% CI          | Heterogeneity $I^2$ (%) | P value |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Time                                   |                |                                            |                         | 0.73    |
| ≤2000                                  | 3              | 18.7 (9.6-33.3)                             | 98.6                    |         |
| 2001–2010                              | 9              | 24.2 (19.0-30.4)                            | 96.5                    |         |
| >2010                                  | 11             | 24.0 (19.4-29.3)                            | 98.7                    |         |
| Diagnostic criteria for DN             |                |                                            |                         | <0.01   |
| ADA criteria 1997                      | 1              | 23.5 (19.7-27.9)                            | —                       |         |
| ADA criteria 2007                      | 1              | 15.4 (14.0-17.0)                            | —                       |         |
| Clinical diagnosis                     | 18             | 21.8 (17.2-27.2)                            | 99.0                    |         |
| CTM criteria 2010                      | 1              | 18.0 (14.9-21.6)                            | —                       |         |
| KDIGO 2012                             | 1              | 29.7 (29.2-30.2)                            | —                       |         |
| KDOQI 2007                             | 1              | 18.5 (16.6-20.6)                            | —                       |         |
| KDOQI 2012                             | 1              | 27.1 (25.6-28.7)                            | —                       |         |
| KDOQI 2014                             | 1              | 39.4 (35.5-43.6)                            | —                       |         |
| Mogensen criteria                      | 2              | 9.5 (8.4-10.7)                              | 3.4                     |         |
| Renal biopsy                           | 3              | 29.6 (7.9-67.3)                             | 96.7                    |         |
| Diagnostic criteria for DM             |                |                                            |                         | <0.01   |
| 1985 WHO/1999 China diagnostic standards | 1          | 9.0 (7.7-10.5)                             | —                       |         |
| ADA criteria 2005                      | 1              | 18.5 (16.6-20.6)                            | —                       |         |
| ADA criteria 2007                      | 1              | 8.2 (5.4-12.4)                              | —                       |         |
| ADA criteria 2009                      | 2              | 29.3 (19.1-42.2)                            | 97.5                    |         |
| Clinical diagnosis                     | 8              | 24.7 (15.5-36.9)                            | 99.0                    |         |
| History of DM                          | 6              | 35.3 (30.7-40.2)                            | 92.5                    |         |
| WHO criteria 1985                      | 2              | 13.9 (6.9-26.1)                             | 97.5                    |         |
| WHO criteria 1999                      | 8              | 16.9 (13.4-21.2)                            | 97.8                    |         |
| WHO criteria 2004                      | 1              | 18.0 (14.9-21.6)                            | —                       |         |
| Region                                 |                |                                            |                         | <0.01   |
| Central region                         | 3              | 15.6 (4.9-39.8)                             | 99.6                    |         |
| East region                            | 19             | 22.3 (18.6-26.5)                            | 97.4                    |         |
| Northeast region                       | 3              | 20.7 (15.2-27.6)                            | 96.5                    |         |
| West region                            | 2              | 41.3 (37.1-45.6)                            | 39.0                    |         |
| Population source                      |                |                                            |                         | 0.52    |
| Community-based                        | 5              | 18.5 (10.0-31.5)                            | 99.0                    |         |
| Hospital-based                         | 25             | 22.4 (18.8-26.5)                            | 99.1                    |         |
| Age                                    |                |                                            |                         | 0.15    |
| <60                                    | 12             | 24.8 (20.2-30.1)                            | 97.9                    |         |
| ≥60                                    | 9              | 19.5 (14.9-25.1)                            | 98.8                    |         |
| BMI                                    |                |                                            |                         | 0.20    |
| <25                                    | 4              | 14.4 (7.3-26.4)                             | 97.7                    |         |
| ≥25                                    | 5              | 23.8 (15.4-34.8)                            | 99.5                    |         |
| Sex                                    |                |                                            |                         | <0.01   |
| Male-dominated                         | 16             | 27.7 (24.1-31.7)                            | 97.3                    |         |
| Female-dominated                       | 10             | 17.6 (12.6-24.0)                            | 99.2                    |         |
| Urban and rural                        |                |                                            |                         | 0.12    |
| Rural                                  | 2              | 26.2 (13.0-45.7)                            | 99.2                    |         |
| Urban                                  | 26             | 20.5 (17.1-24.3)                            | 99.1                    |         |
| Urban and rural                        | 2              | 37.0 (21.2-56.2)                            | 96.2                    |         |
The inconsistent results regarding sex differences might have been caused by different risk factors with diabetes incidence and late diabetes diagnosis [54], and this finding could be furtherly explored in the future.

Our study had several limitations. First, most studies included in our study were hospital-based, which might have led to an overestimation of DN prevalence among the T2DM population because of referral bias. Thus, dichotomized outcomes according to population source (hospital-based and community-based) were both provided, and this should be considered in interpreting our results. Second, potential heterogeneous factors, such as the different diagnostic criteria

Table 2: Continued.

| Subgroups       | No. of studies | Prevalence estimate (%) and 95% CI | Heterogeneity $I^2$ (%) | $P$ value |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| DM duration     |                |                                   |                         | 0.27      |
| <8              | 7              | 26.0 (17.7-36.4)                  | 99.6                    |           |
| 8~9             | 5              | 17.4 (11.2-26.1)                  | 98.9                    |           |
| 10~             | 2              | 29.0 (14.1-50.4)                  | 98.8                    |           |
| Sample size     |                |                                   |                         | 0.25      |
| <1000           | 17             | 24.5 (18.8-31.3)                  | 97.6                    |           |
| 1000~3000       | 9              | 17.3 (12.4-23.6)                  | 98.9                    |           |
| 3000~           | 4              | 21.8 (13.7-33.0)                  | 99.8                    |           |
| Quality         |                |                                   |                         | 0.47      |
| 20              | 5              | 26.3 (14.0-43.8)                  | 98.9                    |           |
| ≥20             | 25             | 20.9 (17.5-24.7)                  | 99.1                    |           |
| Systolic blood pressure |       |                                   |                         | 0.71      |
| ≥140            | 2              | 28.7 (7.6-66.2)                   | 97.6                    |           |
| <140            | 4              | 22.5 (13.6-35.1)                  | 99.8                    |           |
| Diastolic blood pressure |     |                                   |                         | 0.61      |
| ≥80             | 3              | 17.0 (5.9-40.0)                   | 97.6                    |           |
| <80             | 4              | 22.5 (13.6-35.1)                  | 99.8                    |           |

Figure 3: Regional distribution of pooled prevalence of DN among patients with type 2 diabetes.
for DM and DN, and variation of study sample size, might add heterogeneity of pooled prevalence estimation. To evaluate the influence, subgroup analyses and leave-one-out sensitivity analysis were both used to quantify the potential impact.

In conclusion, our results indicate that the prevalence of DN in China is high and shows geographic and gender variation. National strategies aimed at primary and secondary prevention, as well as a geographically targeted screening program for DN among participants with T2DM, are urgently needed to reduce the increasing burden of DN in China.

Additional Points

What’s New? This is the first meta-analysis to investigate the pooled prevalence of DN among Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). There is geographic and gender variation of DN prevalence among T2DM patients in China. Early screening and more effective interventions targeting DN should be implemented for people with T2DM.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors’ Contributions

XXZ and JK designed the study. KY and XXZ worked on data collection. XXZ analyzed the data, interpreted the results, and wrote the paper. All authors supplied comments and revised the manuscript and approved the manuscript before submission.

Acknowledgments

The study was supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2017M621175).

Supplementary Materials

Supplement Table S1: methodological quality assessment results for the included studies. Supplement Figure S1: funnel plot of estimation of DN prevalence. (Supplementary Materials)

References

[1] WHO, Diabetes, WHO, Geneva, 2018.
[2] N. H. Cho, J. E. Shaw, S. Karuranga et al., “IDF Diabetes Atlas: global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2017 and projections for 2045,” Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice, vol. 138, pp. 271–281, 2018.
[3] E. Ritz, I. Rychlik, F. Locatelli, and S. Halimi, “End-stage renal failure in type 2 diabetes: a medical catastrophe of worldwide dimensions,” American Journal of Kidney Diseases, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 795–808, 1999.
[4] A. Y. T. Wu, N. C. T. Kong, F. A. de Leon et al., “An alarmingly high prevalence of diabetic nephropathy in Asian type 2
diabetic patients: the MicroAlbuminuria Prevalence (MAP) study," Diabetologia, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 17–26, 2005.

[5] The IDF Diabetes Atlas, China Country report, 8th edition, 2017, http://reports.instantatlas.com/report/view/846e7612b54f76fafe09471965aedd/CHN. [accessed 2019-11-05].

[6] J. Weng, L. Ji, W. Jia et al., “Standards of care for type 2 diabetes in China,” Diabetes/Metabolism Research and Reviews, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 442–458, 2016.

[7] M. E. Craig, C. Jefferies, D. Dabelea, N. Balde, A. Seth, and K. C. Donaghue, “Definition, epidemiology, and classification of diabetes in children and adolescents,” Pediatric Diabetes, vol. 15, no. S20, pp. 4–17, 2014.

[8] A. K. Lim, “Diabetic nephropathy &nash; complications and treatment,” International Journal of Nephrology and Renovascular Disease, vol. 7, pp. 361–381, 2014.

[9] E. E. Von, D. G. Altman, M. Egger, S. J. Pocock, P. G. Gotschke, and J. P. Vandebroucke, "Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies," BMJ, vol. 335, pp. 806–808, 2007.

[10] M. W. Lipsey and D. B. Wilson, Practical meta-analysis, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 2001.

[11] China NBoSo, Method for Dividing the Middle and Northeast of East and West and East, West China NBoSo, Beijing, 2011, http://www.stats.gov.cn/ztjc/zthd/sjtjr/dejtjkfr/tjkp/201106/r20110613_71947.htm [accessed 2019-11-05].

[12] R. Song, H. Xu, X. Wang, Z. Pan, J. Wang, and W. Li, "Analysis of the risk factors of diabetic nephropathy in a community of shanghai in 2012," Chinese Primary Health Care, vol. 28, pp. 75-76, 2014.

[13] R. Xu, Y. Zhong, B. Chen et al., "The prevalence and risk factors of kidney disease in type 2 diabetic patients in rural Shanghai," Chinese Journal of Internal Medicine, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 18–23, 2012.

[14] X. Ke, H. Zhai, and F. Huang, "A epidemiological survey on the incidence of type 2 diabetic nephropathy and its related risk factors in Huangshi community," Chinese General Practice, vol. 16, pp. 1373–1375, 2013.

[15] L. Guo, L. Zhang, M. Li, H. Dai, J. Chi, and Y. Wang, "The prevalence of microvascular complications and relative factors in newly diagnosed with type 2 diabetes," Journal of Clinical Internal Medicine, vol. 23, pp. 545–547, 2006.

[16] S. Mou, Q. Wang, J. Liu et al., "Prevalence of non-diabetic renal disease in patients with type 2 diabetes," Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 354–359, 2010.

[17] K. Kung, K. M. Chow, E. M. T. Hui et al., "Prevalence of complications among Chinese diabetic patients in urban primary care clinics: a cross-sectional study," BMC Family Practice, vol. 15, no. 1, 2014.

[18] Y. Zhou, L. Guo, D. Yu et al., "Analyses on the relative factors regarding diabetic nephropathy among 1758 cases of type 2 diabetic patients," Chinese Journal of Epidemiology, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 610–613, 2012.

[19] X. Qu, D. Chen, X. Yao, X. He, and J. Zhou, "Prevalence of diabetic nephropathy and its distribution of TCM syndrome type characteristics in 1718 patients with type 2 diabetes," Chinese Journal of Integrated Traditional and Western Nephrology, vol. 4, pp. 713–715, 2004.

[20] X. Teng, Y. Yang, Y. Tan, J. Wen, and Z. Lu, "Prevalence of diabetic nephropathy of 10159 cases with type 2 diabetes and its correlated risk factors," Chinese Journal of Diabetes, vol. 9, pp. 131–134, 2001.

[21] G. Xing, D. Qu, H. Zhou, J. Ren, C. Ha, and Y. Cui, "The prevalence of diabetic nephropathy and its associated factors in patients with type 2 diabetes living in the center area of Benxi city during 2008-2009," Chinese Journal of Prevention and Control of Chronic Non-Communicable Disea, vol. 17, pp. 599-600, 2009.

[22] H. Lu and P. Yan, "Prevalence and risk factors of diabetic nephropathy in 821 cases with type 2 diabetes," Medical Journal of CASE, vol. 4, pp. 30–32, 2002.

[23] J. Liu, Q. Wang, X. Che et al., "Prevalence of non-diabetic renal diseases in patients with type 2 diabetes," Chinese Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism, vol. 26, pp. 460–464, 2010.

[24] X. Zou, J. Tao, and C. Pan, "The prevalence and clinical risk factors of microangiopathy in type 2 diabetes mellitus," Journal of Chinese PLA Postgraduate Medical School, vol. 21, pp. 211–214, 2000.

[25] F. Tang, "Prevalence and associated risk factors of type 2 diabetic nephropathy patients," China Journal of Modern Medicine, vol. 15, pp. 784–784, 2005.

[26] X. Yu, Z. Zhang, W. Tan, and H. Li, "The prevalence and its associated factors of chronic complication in type 2 diabetic patients," Zhejiang Journal of Preventive Medicine, vol. 18, pp. 17-18, 2006.

[27] L. Wang, W. Zhang, and H. Liu, "Prevalence and risk factors of chronic complications of patients with type 2 diabetes," China Modern Doctor, vol. 52, pp. 31–33, 2014.

[28] Y. Chen, X. Teng, S. Lu, and W. Liu, "Prevalence of chronic complications in type 2 diabetic out-patients and its risk factors," Shandong Medical Journal, vol. 47, pp. 137-138, 2007.

[29] J. Yu, Y. Zhang, and J. Zhao, "The prevalence and the related factors of type 2 diabetes mellitus with chronic complications in the community-based patients of Huangpu District, Shanghai," Shanghai Journal of Preventive Medicine, vol. 24, pp. 57–61, 2012.

[30] B. X. Xu, "The incidence of diabetic nephropathy and the distribution characteristics of patients with type 2 diabetes," Chinese Practical Medicine, vol. 11, pp. 151–153, 2016.

[31] N. Zhang and Z. N. Gao, "Prevalence and risk factor analysis of early diabetic nephropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus," Journal of aerospace medicine, vol. 27, pp. 1473–1476, 2016.

[32] G. Q. Li and L. Y. Fan, "Investigation and analysis of the incidence rate of clinical diabetic nephropathy patients among more than 60 years older people in our region," International Journal of Laboratory Medicine, vol. 35, pp. 190-191, 2014.

[33] H. Y. Zeng, Y. Cao, L. Zhao, and Q. Y. Zhou, "Correlative analysis between the related indexes of obesity and the morbidity of type 2 diabetic nephropathy," World Journal of Integrated Traditional and Western Medicine, vol. 9, 2014.

[34] Y. H. Hu, H. Chen, R. Yang, Z. Zhang, H. Zhang, and L. Lei, "Prevalence and risk factors for diabetic nephropathy in overweight or obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Guangdong Province," Chinese Journal of Modern Medicine, vol. 26, pp. 89–94, 2016.

[35] Y. L. Wang, Y. Xu, X. Zhai et al., "Analysis of the incidence of diabetic nephropathy and TCM syndrome scores in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Lanzhou City," Health Vocational Education, vol. 35, pp. 101–103, 2017.
[36] K. Guo, L. Zhang, F. Zhao et al., “Prevalence of chronic kidney disease and associated factors in Chinese individuals with type 2 diabetes: cross-sectional study,” *Journal of Diabetes and its Complications*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 803–810, 2016.

[37] L. Zhuo, G. Zou, W. Li, J. Lu, and W. Ren, “Prevalence of diabetic nephropathy complicating non-diabetic renal disease among Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus,” *European Journal of Medical Research*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 4, 2013.

[38] L. Yang, T. K. Chu, J. Lian et al., “Risk factors of chronic kidney diseases in Chinese adults with type 2 diabetes,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 14686–14688, 2018.

[39] J. Duan, C. Wang, D. Liu et al., “Prevalence and risk factors of chronic kidney disease and diabetic kidney disease in Chinese rural residents: a cross-sectional survey,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 10408, 2019.

[40] Z. Liu, C. Fu, W. Wang, and B. Xu, “Prevalence of chronic complications of type 2 diabetes mellitus in out-patients a cross-sectional hospital-based survey in urban China,” *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 62, 2010.

[41] W. Pommer, “Prevalence of nephropathy in the German diabetes population—is early referral to nephrological care a realistic demand today?,” *NDT Plus*, vol. 1, suppl 4, pp. iv2–iv5, 2008.

[42] R. Pradeepa, M. Rema, J. Vignesh, M. Deepa, R. Deepa, and V. Mohan, “Prevalence and risk factors for diabetic neuropathy in an urban south Indian population: the Chennai Urban Rural Epidemiology Study (CURES-55),” *Diabetic Medicine*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 407–412, 2008.

[43] K. Al-Rubeaan, A. M. Youssef, S. N. Subhani et al., “Diabetic nephropathy and its risk factors in a society with a type 2 diabetes epidemic: a Saudi National Diabetes Registry-Based Study,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2014.

[44] B. A. Young, C. Maynard, and E. J. Boyko, “Racial differences in diabetic nephropathy, cardiovascular disease, and mortality in a national population of veterans,” *Diabetes Care*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 2392–2399, 2003.

[45] T. Alcorn and Y. D. Ouyang, “Diabetes saps health and wealth from China’s rise,” *Lancet*, vol. 379, no. 9833, pp. 2227–2228, 2012.

[46] G. Li, P. Zhang, J. Wang et al., “The long-term effect of lifestyle interventions to prevent diabetes in the China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study: a 20-year follow-up study,” *Lancet*, vol. 371, no. 9626, pp. 1783–1789, 2008.

[47] G. Danaei, S. Fahimi, Y. Lu et al., “Effects of diabetes definition on global surveillance of diabetes prevalence and diagnosis: a pooled analysis of 96 population-based studies with 331 288 participants,” *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, vol. 3, no. 8, pp. 624–637, 2015.

[48] A. J. Collins, R. Foley, C. Herzog et al., “Excerpts from the United States Renal Data System 2007 annual data report,” *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*, vol. 51, no. 1, Suppl 1, pp. S1–320, 2008.

[49] M. Zhou, T. Astell-Burt, Y. Bi et al., “Geographical variation in diabetes prevalence and detection in China: multilevel spatial analysis of 98,058 adults,” *Diabetes Care*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 72–81, 2015.

[50] G. J. T. P. Randhawa, “Developing culturally competent renal services in the United Kingdom: tackling inequalities in health,” *Transplantation Proceedings*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 21–23, 2003.

[51] J. F. Elgart, J. E. Caporale, S. Asteazarán et al., “Association between socioeconomic status, type 2 diabetes and its chronic complications in Argentina,” *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, vol. 104, no. 2, pp. 241–247, 2014.

[52] A. de Hautecloue, S. Ragot, Y. Slou et al., “The influence of sex on renal function decline in people with type 2 diabetes,” *Diabetic Medicine*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1121–1128, 2014.

[53] M. K. Yu, C. R. Lyles, L. A. Bent-Shaw, B. A. Young, and Pathways Authors, “Risk factor, age and sex differences in chronic kidney disease prevalence in a diabetic cohort: the pathways study,” *American Journal of Nephrology*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 245–251, 2012.

[54] M. M. Roche and P. P. Wang, “Factors associated with a diabetes diagnosis and late diabetes diagnosis for males and females,” *Journal of Clinical & Translational Endocrinology*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 77–84, 2014.