METHODS

BACKGROUND

- Acute kidney injury AKI is becoming more widely recognized as a serious public health issue, particularly in developing countries since AKI affects over 133 million people each year, electronic alerts (ealerts) are being used in different settings to enhance detection and effective management but the main impact on patient's health care outcome still uncertain.
- Therefore, we propose to conduct an evidence synthesis and to describe the various e-alerts systems for AKI detection, and to assess their impact for patient care, outcomes and resource use



Study Design:

Systematic review and meta-analysis following PRISMA guidelines.

Searches were conducted in PubMed, Cochrane Library, and EBSCOhost, covering studies from 2000 to 2023.

Indusion Criteria:

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) investigating e-Alerts for AKI based on KDIGO criteria in hospitalized adults.

Outcomes Evaluated:

- **= Primary Outcomes:** Mortality, dialysis, and AKI progression.
- = Secondary Outcomes: Resource utilization (e.g., nephrology consultations, medication adjustments).

RESULTS

Impact of Using Automated Electronic Alert on Acute Kidney Injury Outcomes Systematic Review and meta-analysis

A total of 588 records were identified through systematic database searches. Following title and abstract screening, 27 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility. Ultimately, four studies were included in the final analysis, including the pivotal study by Wilson et al., 2023. The study selection process is illustrated in the PRISMA flow diagram.



Meta-Analysis results in Forest plots explained

Nephrology consultation During hospital admission; 2 studies with 3268 Pts. The pooled odds ratio was 1.62 [95% CI 0.72 to 3.68]; I2 = 84%

	_											
	E-alert		Usual care		Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Rand	om, 95% CI		
Wilson 2015	139	1201	125	1192	55.5%	1.12 [0.86, 1.44]	2015		-	•		
Wu 2018	42	467	15	408	44.5%	2.59 [1.41, 4.74]	2018			-		
Total (95% CI)		1668		1600	100.0%	1.62 [0.72, 3.68]			-	•		
Total events	161		140									
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.30: CI	n² = 6.	30. df =	1 (P =	0.01): 12	- 84%		4 4 4	414		<u> </u>	
Test for overall effect:								0.01	0.1		0	100
			,						Usual care	E-alert		

Nephrology consultation comparison in the ICU, 2 studies with 1597 Pts. The pooled odds ratio was 1.51 [95% CI 0.97 to 2.35]; $I^2 = 48\%$.

 E-alert
 Usual care
 Odds Ratio

 Events Total
 Events Total
 Weight M-H, Random, 95% Cl. Vec

 24
 140
 16
 138
 29.3
 1.38 [0.71, 2.67]
 201

 38
 224
 32
 220
 38.2%
 1.20 [0.72, 2.00]
 201

 42
 467
 15
 408
 32.4%
 2.59 [1.41, 4.74]
 201
 Total (95% CI) 831 766 100.0% Total (95% CI) 104 65 Heterogenety, Tau'r = 0.08; fin" = 3.84, df = 2 (P = 0.15); $t^2 = 48$ % Test for overall effect: Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)0.1 Usual care

- Mortality: Analysis revealed no significant improvement in mortality outcomes with the use of e-alerts compared to usual care. (RR = 1.02, 95% CI 0.88-1.17).
- Dialysis: E-alerts did not reduce the risk of renal replacement therapy (RR = 1.16, 95% CI 0.96–1.42).
- **AKI Progression:** The benefits of e-alerts on AKI progression were limited.
- Nephrology Consultation: Pooled analysis showed significant heterogenicity between the e-alert group and usual care, pooled odds ratio was 1.62 [95% CI 0.72 to 3.68]; $\hat{12} = 84\%$.

Medication Discontinuation: The alerts improved medication discontinuation, rates (61.1% vs. 55.9%, p = 0.0003)











Author	Title	Year	Country	setting	period	design	sample size	Conclusion	
(Wilson et al., 2015)	Automated, electronic alerts for acute kodney injury. A single-bland, parallel-group, randomised controlled trial	2014	Philadelphia, PA, USA	University of Pennyivania in Pennyivania in Pennyivania in Philadelphia, PA, USA intensive care units (ICUs), cardiology divisions (eight divisions), coronary care units (ICCUs) and cardiac surface (ICUs) and cardiac surface (ICUs) and cardiac surface (ICUs)	Between Sept 17, 2013, and April 14, 2014	Investigator- marked, purallel-group, randomized controlled trial A prospective, randomized, controlled study	participants were adults aged 18 years or older who were in the hospital with stage 1 or greater acute kidney injury 1201 alert group and 1192 were assigned to the usual care group	this randomined, controlle study did not show a meaningful berieft of an electronic abet system for cond bidney; justy in patients in hospital. The e-alert system describ- here was a reliable tool make an accurate diagnos- of AKI.	
(Wu et al., 2018)	Value of electronic alerts for acute kidney injury in high-risk wards: a palot randomized controlled trial	2018			from July 1 to November 31, 2016		Patients were assigned randomly to an e-alert group (467 patients) or a non-e-alert group (408 patients).		
(Perry Wilson et al., 2021)	Electronic health record alerts for acute kidney squey. Multicenter, randomized clinical trial	2020	Connecticut and Rhode Island, US	Six hospitals (four teaching and two non-teaching)	4 May 2018	Double blinded, multicenter, parallel, randomized controlled trial.	6030 adult impotients with acute kidney injury, alert care 2039, usual care 2971	Alerts did not reduce the risk of our primary outcome among patients in hospital with acute kidney injury. The beterogeneity of effect across clinical centers should lead to a re-evaluation of existing alerting systems for acute kidney injury.	
Perry Wilson et al., 2023	A randomized clinical trial assessing the effect of autoenated medication- targeted alerts on acute ladney mjury outcomes	2023	USA	National Institutes of Health (NIH) hospitals	August 16, 2020 to November 29, 2021,	Open-label, NIH-funded, parallel group randomized controlled trial	5060 hospitalized adults with acute kidney injury and active prescriptions for nephotoxic medications (NSAIDs, RAAS inhibites, PPIs). 61.1% of medication discontinuation in the alert group vs.55.9% in usual care.	Medication-targeted alerts improved discontinuation rates of nephrotoxic medications but showed no significant impact on progression of acute kidney injury, dailysis, or mortality outcomes.	

DISCUSSION

- Our systematic review found the introducing of electronic alert for AKI had a modest effect on secondary health care services and no effect on the risk of progression of acute kidney injury, dialysis, or death.
- Potential for alert fatigue and inconsistent clinical adherence.
- Our review highlights significant proplem which is knwledge gap related to the tackling of e-alert and its implementation toward AKI management.
- The impact of e-alerts on processes of care appears variable, reflecting defeasances in alert type, degree of integration with health care processes and the context in which they are applied

LIMITATIONS

- ☐3 of RCT was done in the same country.
- □3 RCT was done by the same resercher.
- ☐ We were unable to perform significant pooled analyses for all outcomes.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- Before drawing definitive conclusions regarding E-alert efficacy and effectiveness, further high-quality research(mixed-method research) and rigorous studies are required to strengthen the evidence base.
- An important domain before implementation of e-alert resembling in doing ARA (AKI Risk Assessment), all patents who develop AKI already has risk factors... so we must be proactive not reactive mind.
 - Providing targeted training on AKI management and e-alert usage, alongside routine feedback about the alerts' impact on patient outcomes.



