

**Table 6. Summary of Findings – Hydratie en complicaties**

Population: Patients with impaired renal function (chronic kidney disease, chronic renal failure, CKD stage 3 or higher, eGFR <60 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.

Intervention: NaCl

Comparator: NaHCO<sub>3</sub>

Outcome  Timeframe	Study results and measurements	Absolute effect estimates		Certainty of the evidence  (Quality of evidence)	Conclusions
		NaCl	NaHCO3		
Post-contrast acute kidney injury					
PC-AKI: Short schedule NaHCO3 vs. short schedule NaCl	Relative risk: 0.89  (CI 95% 0.57 – 1.39)  Based on data from 2192 participants in 11 studies	<b>115</b>  per 1000  Difference: <b>13 fewer per 1000</b>  (CI 95% 49 fewer – 45 more)	<b>102</b>  per 1000	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>1</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on post-contrast acute kidney injury when compared with NaHCO3 in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
PC-AKI: Short schedule NaHCO3 vs. long schedule NaCl	Relative risk: 1.23  (CI 95% 0.81 – 1.87)  Based on data from 2369 participants in 9 studies	<b>78</b>  per 1000  Difference: <b>18 more per 1000</b>  (CI 95% 15 fewer – 68 more)	<b>96</b>  per 1000	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>1</sup>	
PC-AKI: All other hydration schedules comparing bicarbonate plus sodium chloride or bicarbonate only to either sodium chloride or bicarbonate only	Based on data from 6 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see results above).  Weisbord (2018) reported a risk difference of -0.01 (95%CI -0.03 to 0.00).		<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>1</sup>	

PC-AKI: NaHCO <sub>3</sub> (ultrashort schedule) precontrast versus pre- and post-CM hydration with NaCl	Based on data from 1 study	Kooiman (2014) reported a risk difference of -0.02 (95%CI -0.05 to 0.01)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to serious indirectness, due to very serious imprecision <sup>2</sup>	
<i>Start renal replacement therapy (RRT)</i>				
Start RRT: Short schedule NaHCO <sub>3</sub> vs. short schedule NaCl	Based on data from 9 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5) Boccalandro (2020) reported a risk difference of -0.01 (95%CI -0.05 to 0.03)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>3</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on the start of renal replacement therapy when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
Start RRT: Short schedule NaHCO <sub>3</sub> vs. long schedule NaCl	Based on data from 7 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>3</sup>	
Start RRT: All other hydration schedules comparing bicarbonate plus sodium chloride or bicarbonate only to either sodium chloride or bicarbonate only	Based on data from 5 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5) Weisbord (2018) reported a risk difference of -0.00 (-0.01 to 0.01)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>3</sup>	
Start RRT: NaHCO <sub>3</sub> (ultrashort schedule) precontrast versus pre- and post-CM hydration with NaCl	Based on data from 1 study	Kooiman (2014) reported that none of the patients who either received prehydration or pre-and posthydration had to start renal replacement therapy.	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to serious indirectness, due to very serious imprecision <sup>2</sup>	

Table 6. Summary of Findings – Hydratie en complicaties  
Richtlijn Veilig gebruik van contrastmiddelen 2025

Start renal replacement therapy – 1 year (important)	Based on data from 1 study	Boccalandro (2020) reported a risk difference of -0.02 (95%CI -0.04 to 0.01)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to very serious imprecision <sup>4</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on the start of renal replacement therapy at 1 year follow-up when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
Start renal replacement therapy – 5 year (important)	Based on data from 1 study	Boccalandro (2020) reported a risk difference of 0.02 (-0.05 to 0.08)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to very serious imprecision <sup>4</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on the start of renal replacement therapy at 5 year follow-up when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
Acute renal failure (important)	-	-	<b>No GRADE</b> (no evidence was found)	No evidence was found regarding the effect of NaCl on acute renal failure when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
Irreversible loss of kidney function (important)	Based on data from 1 study	Weisbord (2018) reported a risk difference of 0.00 (95%CI -0.00 to 0.01)	<b>Very low GRADE</b> Due to very serious imprecision <sup>4</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on irreversible loss of kidney function when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media.
<i>Adverse events</i>				

Adverse events: Short schedule NaHCO <sub>3</sub> vs. short schedule NaCl	Based on data from 5 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5). Boccalandro (2020) reported a risk difference of 0.01 (95%CI -0.06 to 0.08).	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>5</sup>	The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of NaCl on adverse events when compared with NaHCO <sub>3</sub> in patients with impaired renal function undergoing radiological or cardiological examinations with iodine-containing contrast media
Adverse events: Short schedule NaHCO <sub>3</sub> vs. long schedule NaCl	Based on data from 4 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5).	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>5</sup>	
Adverse events: All other hydration schedules comparing bicarbonate plus sodium chloride or bicarbonate only to either sodium chloride or bicarbonate only	Based on data from 4 studies	Studies identified before 2017 varied in their estimates (see table 5). Weisbord (2018) reported a risk difference of -0.01 (95%CI -0.03 to 0.00)	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>5</sup>	
Adverse events: NaHCO <sub>3</sub> (ultrashort schedule) precontrast versus pre- and post-CM hydration with NaCl	Based on data from 1 study	Kooiman (2014) reported a risk difference of -0.03 (95%CI -0.10 to 0.05).	<b>Very low GRADE</b>  Due to serious inconsistency, due to very serious imprecision <sup>6</sup>	

1. **Inconsistency: serious.** Due to conflicting results and heterogeneity  
**Imprecision: very serious.** Due to overlap of the upper and lower limit of the 95% confidence interval with the minimal clinically important difference
2. **Indirectness: serious.** Due to differences in the hydration type (pre- versus pre- and posthydration)  
**Imprecision: very serious.** Due to overlap of the upper and lower limit of the 95% confidence interval with the minimal clinically important difference
3. **Inconsistency: serious.** Due to conflicting results and heterogeneity  
**Imprecision: very serious.** Due to the optimal information size which was not achieved and the low number of events
4. **Imprecision: very serious.** Due to overlap of the upper and lower limit of the 95% confidence interval with the minimal clinically important difference and the optimal information size was not achieved.
5. **Inconsistency: serious.** Due to heterogeneity between the studies  
**Imprecision: very serious.** Due to the optimal information size which was not achieved and the low number of events
6. **Inconsistency: serious.** Due to differences in the hydration type (pre- versus pre- and posthydration)  
**Imprecision: very serious.** Due to the optimal information size which was not achieved and the low number of events