



Efficacy and Safety of Daprodustat for Anemia Therapy in Chronic Kidney Disease Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Qiyan Zheng^{1,2†}, Yahui Wang^{1,2†}, Huisheng Yang³, Luying Sun^{1,2}, Xinwen Fu^{1,2}, Ruojun Wei^{1,2}, Yu Ning Liu^{1,2}* and Wei Jing Liu^{1,2,4}*

¹Renal Research Institution of Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China, ²Key Laboratory of Chinese Internal Medicine of Ministry of Education and Beijing, Dongzhimen Hospital Affiliated to Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China, ³Institute of Acupuncture and Moxibustion, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, Beijing, China, ⁴Institute of Nephrology, and Zhanjiang Key Laboratory of Prevention and Management of Chronic Kidney Disease, Guangdong Medical University, Zhanjiang, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Olayinka Olabode Ogunleye, Lagos State University, Nigeria

Reviewed by:

Anatole Besarab, Stanford University, United States Adina Turcu-Stiolica, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania

*Correspondence:

Yu Ning Liu yunin1946@sina.com Wei Jing Liu liuweijing-1977@hotmail.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Pharmaceutical Medicine and Outcomes Research, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 29 June 2020 Accepted: 27 November 2020 Published: 12 January 2021

Citation:

Zheng Q, Wang Y, Yang H, Sun L, Fu X, Wei R, Liu YN and Liu WJ (2021) Efficacy and Safety of Daprodustat for Anemia Therapy in Chronic Kidney Disease Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Pharmacol. 11:573645. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2020.573645 **Objective:** Daprodustat is a novel oral agent in treating anemia of chronic kidney disease (CKD), and several clinical trials have been conducted to compare daprodustat with recombinant human erythropoietin (rhEPO) or placebo. Our systematic review aimed to investigate the efficacy and safety of daprodustat for anemia treatment in both dialysis-dependent (DD) and non-dialysis-dependent (NDD) patients.

Methods: Six databases were searched for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) reporting daprodustat vs. rhEPO or placebo for anemia patients in CKD. The outcome indicators were focused on hemoglobin (Hb), ferritin, transferrin saturation (TSAT), total iron-binding capacity (TIBC), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), and serious adverse events (SAEs).

Results: Eight eligible studies with 1,516 participants were included. For both NDD and DD patients, changes in Hb levels from baseline were significantly higher in daprodustat group than that in the placebo (mean difference (MD) = 1.73, [95% confidence interval (Cl), 0.34 to 3.12], p = 0.01; MD = 1.88, [95% Cl, 0.68 to 3.09], p = 0.002; respectively), and there was no significant difference between daprodustat and rhEPO group (MD = 0.05, [95% Cl, -0.49 to 0.59], p = 0.86; MD = 0.12, [95% Cl, -0.28 to 0.52], p = 0.55; respectively). The indexes of iron metabolism were improved significantly in the daprodustat group compared to placebo- or rhEPO-treated patients, while there was no similar change in terms of TSAT for DD patients. Furthermore, no trend of increasing plasma VEGF was observed in daprodustat-treated subjects. As for safety, there was no significant difference in the incidence of SAEs between daprodustat and placebo treatment, while the incidence of SAEs in the daprodustat group was significantly lower than that in the rhEPO group.

Conclusion: Daprodustat was efficacious and well tolerated for anemia in both NDD and DD patients in the short term based on current RCTs. And daprodustat may become an effective alternative for treatment of anemia with CKD. Since the application of daprodustat is still under exploration, future researches should consider the limitations of our study to evaluate the value of daprodustat.

Keywords: daprodustat, anemia, chronic kidney disease, systematic review, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Chronic kidney disease (CKD), as a major global health problem, is estimated to affect 8-16% of adult populations globally (Stanifer et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2019). Anemia, which is frequently observed in CKD, is not only a highly prevalent risk factor for many adverse events in CKD patients but also contributes to the progression of CKD and increases morbidity and mortality (Hörl, 2013; Cases et al., 2018). The causes of anemia in CKD patients are multi-factorial, including deficiency in erythropoietin (EPO), reduced iron availability, and inflammation (Babitt and Lin, 2012; Zumbrennen-Bullough and Babitt, 2014). Current treatments for anemia in CKD mainly require recombinant human erythropoietin (rhEPO) or its analogs (erythropoiesis stimulating agents [ESAs]) and iron supplementation (intravenous and/or oral) (KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline Working Group, 2012; US Food and Drug Administration, 2011; Shepshelovich et al., 2016). While these therapies can greatly benefit patients by improving their quality of life and reducing the need for blood transfusions (Finkelstein et al., 2009; Parfrey et al., 2009), each has significant limitations, such as the inconvenience of subcutaneous injection that impact its use. Therefore, safer and more effective drugs are continuously being developed by a number of pharmaceutical companies for treatment of anemia in CKD patients.

Daprodustat (GSK1278863) is an orally active, small-molecule hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor (PHI) and belongs to an emerging new class of agents being developed for anemia in CKD in both non-dialysis dependent (NDD) and dialysis-dependent (DD) patients (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016). Daprodustat can inhibit HIF-prolyl hydroxylase domain enzymes (PHD1, PHD2, and PHD3), resulting in the accumulation of HIF-a transcription factor and increased expression of HIF-responsive genes and inducing responses to hypoxia under normoxic conditions (Gupta and Wish, 2017). Increased expression of HIFresponsive genes promotes the synthesis of related proteins, such as EPO and proteins involved in iron uptake, mobilization, and transport, which lead to increased erythropoiesis and elevation of circulating Hb levels (Haase, 2013a). Compared with agents commonly used in treating anemia in CKD patients, daprodustat has certain potential advantages, such as avoiding the risk of supraphysiologic EPO levels and improving iron availability, which may reduce the need for iron replacement therapy (Lenihan and Winkelmayer, 2016). Although a pervious meta-analysis (Xie et al., 2018) showed that daprodustat could improve Hb without increasing adverse events in CKD patients, this study only included randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that compared with daprodustat and placebo but not daprodustat vs. rhEPO, and the evidence for efficacy and safety of daprodustat in two distinct groups of NDD patients and DD patients is lacking. In addition, several new clinical trials have been conducted to compare daprodustat with rhEPO or placebo for the treatment of anemia in dialyzed or non-dialyzed patients with CKD. Therefore, our systematic review aimed to investigate the efficacy and safety of daprodustat therapy for anemia in CKD in both NDD and DD patients, based on current phase 2 and

phase 3 randomized controlled trial (RCT) results, and to provide evidence-based medicine for the clinical application of daprodustat.

METHODS

The review complies with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009) (**Supplementary Table S1**)

Data Sources and Search Strategy

To identify potentially eligible studies, we searched PubMed, embase, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, ClinicalTrials.gov, and SinoMed databases from inception until March 2020 for clinical trials investigating daprodustat for anemia in patients with CKD in adults. Additional studies were searched in the reference lists of all identified publications, including relevant meta-analyses and systematic reviews.

Inclusion Criteria

We included clinical studies that satisfied the following criteria: 1) type of study limited to randomized controlled trials (RCTs); 2) participants in the included studies were anemia with CKD (KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline Working Group, 2012); 3) daprodustat as an intervention arm (the dosage of daprodustat were not restricted); 4) the control arm receiving other ways to contrast with daprodustat (included rhEPO or placebo); 5) the outcome indicators were focused on: 1) Hb, ferritin, transferrin saturation (TSAT), total iron-binding capacity (TIBC) and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) (changes of five outcomes levels from baseline), 2) serious adverse events (SAEs).

Data Extraction

Two investigators (XW. Fu and RJ. Wei) independently extracted data from included studies using a standardized form. Any disagreement was resolved by consensus between the reviewers or adjudication with a third party (HS. Yang), if necessary. Data extracted included study characteristics (first author, publication year, country, single or multi-center, sample size, intervention and control, the period of treatment, and duration of follow-up), characteristics of patients (inclusion criteria, background treatments, mean age, the proportion of men, the baseline of BMI, baseline of hemoglobin levels, and baseline of iron metabolism indices), reported outcomes (hemoglobin, ferritin, transferrin saturation, TIBC, VEGF, and SAEs), and information on methodology.

Quality Assessment

The risk of bias of RCTs was assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool (Sterne et al., 2019). The included trials were graded as low quality, high quality, or moderate quality based on the following criteria: 1) trials were considered low quality if either randomization or allocation concealment was assessed as a high risk of bias, regardless of the risk of other items; 2) trials were considered high quality when both randomization and allocation concealment were assessed as low risk of bias, and



all other items were assessed as low or unclear risk of bias; 3) trials were considered moderate quality if they did not meet criteria for high or low risk. Two investigators (HS. Yang and YH. Wang) independently coded the risk of bias for each included study, and discrepancies were discussed with a third party and resolved by consensus.

Statistical Analyses

All analyses were performed using the Review Manager (RevMan) software version 5.3 Risk ratio (RR) and mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence interval (95% CI) of the outcomes were calculated as the effect measure. Heterogeneity was examined using a chi-squared test with Cochrane's Q and I² statistics. A fixed-effect (FE) model was used if $I^2 < 30\%$; otherwise, the random-effect (RE) model was used. Publication bias was tested by the visual inspection of the funnel plots. When a few studies are included in the analysis, the power of the tests is too low; therefore, publication bias was only examined if more than 10 study comparisons were included in the analysis (Shuster, 2011).

RESULTS

Study Characteristics

Our initial electronic database search captured 141 potential articles. Next, 124 titles and abstracts were screened, leaving

28 articles for full-text screening. Finally, eight eligible manuscripts (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2019; Holdstock et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016b) (1,514 participants) evaluated the efficacy and safety of daprodustat for anemia in CKD patients **Figure 1** illustrates the screening process. Characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**.

Evaluation of the Risk of Bias of Selected Studies

The risk of bias involving the included randomized trials was assessed using the Cochrane Risk-of-Bias tool. The outcome was that all studies were judged to be at low risk of bias, because the indicators included in this study were relatively objective. Most RCTs were assessed as having low risk of bias for allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other sources of bias. Most RCTs were assessed as having unclear risk of bias for sequence generation, considering that detailed information was not provided. However, four studies (Holdstock et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016b) had high risk of bias for blinding of participants and personnel, because these could not be done. The risk of assessment bias of the included trials is shown in **Figure 2**.

TABLE 1 | Characteristics of the included studies in the Meta-analysis.

Location	Single/ multicenter	Patients type	•	. ,	Baseline Hb (g/dl)	Interve	ntions	No		Dosage of medication	Study duration	Clinical trial
United States	Multicenter	NDD	69.2	± 11.0	9.91 ± 0.57	Placebo)	18	Orally	y once-daily	4 weeks	Phase 2a
		patients	71.3	± 11.3	10.08 ± 0.72	Daprod	ustat	54	0.5, 2	2, 5 mg once-daily		
		DD patients	64.2	± 12.8	10.89 ± 0.52	rhEPO		20	Not r	mentioned	4 weeks	Phase 2a
			55.6	± 17.9	10.80 ± 0.61	Daprod	ustat	62	0.5, 2	2, 5 mg once-daily		
Australia, New	Multicenter	NDD	54.8 ±	± 17.26	-	Placebo)	9	Orally	y once-daily	28 days	Phase 2a
Zealand, India, Russia		patients	62.1 ±	± 12.38	-	Daprod	ustat	61	10, 2	25, 50, 100 mg once-daily		
		DD patients	57.2	± 7.03	-	Placebo)	6	Orally	y once-daily	28 days	Phase 2a
			50.0 ±	± 12.01	-	Daprod	ustat	31	10, 2	25 mg once-daily		
Global study	Multicenter	DD patients	59.7	± 18.7	10.6 ± 0.94	rhEPO		39	Place	ebo qd for 4w + rhEPO (epoetin or their biosimilars, or	24 weeks	Phase 2
									darbe	epoetin alfa) for the remaining 20 weeks		
			59.6	± 13.3	10.4 ± 0.66	Daprod	ustat	177	a fixe	ed-dose of 4, 6, 8 10,12 mg for 4 weeks+the need for		
									dose	adjustments was evaluated every 4 weeks		
Global study	Multicenter	NDD	65.4	± 13.6	10.1 ± 0.67	rhEPO		80	rhEP	O (epoetins or their biosimilars or darbepoetin), chose	24 weeks	Phase 2
2019		patients							the rh	hEPO dose to achieve and maintain Hb levels within the		
									targe	et range		
			66.5 ±	± 12.78	10.0 ± 0.77	Daprod	ustat	170	rhEP	O-naïve: once-daily daprodustat (1, 2 or 4 mg daily		
									depe	ending on baseline Hb); rhEPO-user:daprodustat 2 mg		
									daily	(fixed 4w,later make dose adjustment to achieve Hb		
									targe	t range)		
Location	-			• •	,		terventio	ons	No	Dosage of medication	Study duration	Clinical trial
	N.4. 111			00.4					10			
Japan	Multicen	iter DD p	atients							5	4 Weeks	Phase 2
								at				
		iter DD p	atients								29 days	Phase 2
lapan	Multicen	iter DD p	atients	$63.5 \pm 10.$.54 10.82 ±			n	135		52 weeks	Phase 3
				64.1 ± 10	$10.94 \pm$	0.77 Da	iprodusta	at	136			
										, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	50 1	D i 0
NCT02791763 Japan	Multioop	iter NDD	1	70.3 ± 9.0	09 10.68 ±	1.07 Ep	oetin bet	ta	150	Subcutaneous epoetin beta pegol (25, 50, 75, 100,	52 weeks	Phase 3
lapan	Multicen											
Japan	Mullicen	patie	nts							150, 200, or 250 μg [μg] as recommended) dose once		
lapan	Mullicen				.57 10.48 ±							
	United States Australia, New Zealand, India, Russia Global study Global study Location lapan Russia,Spain,United States,Canada,Germany lapan	United States Multicenter United States Multicenter Australia, New Zealand, India, Russia Multicenter Global study Multicenter Global study Multicenter Global study Multicenter Image: States Canada, Germany Iapan Multicenter	multicenter type United States Multicenter NDD patients DD patients Australia, New Zealand, India, Russia Multicenter NDD patients Global study Multicenter DD patients Global study Multicenter NDD patients Global study Multicenter NDD patients Global study Multicenter NDD patients Global study Multicenter DD patients Iapan Multicenter DD p Russia,Spain,United States,Canada,Germany Iapan Multicenter DD p	multicentertypemeanUnited StatesMulticenterNDD69.2 patients71.3 DD patients62.1 55.6Australia, NewMulticenterNDD54.8 57.2 DD patients52.1 57.2 50.0Global studyMulticenterDD patients62.1 57.2 50.0Global studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 59.6Global studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 patientsGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD pat	multicentertypemean \pm SDUnited StatesMulticenterNDD 69.2 ± 11.0 patientsAustralia, NewMulticenterNDD 64.2 ± 12.8 55.6 ± 17.9 Australia, NewMulticenterNDD 54.8 ± 17.26 patientsZealand, India, RussiaMulticenterDD patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD patientsSingle/ 59.6 ± 13.3 Global studyMulticenterNDD 66.5 ± 12.78 LocationSingle/ multicenterPatients typeLocationSingle/ multicenterPatients typeAge (year multicenter 62.4 ± 9 62.4 ± 9 Aussia, Spain, UnitedMulticenterDD patientsStates, Canada, Germany 	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD 69.2 ± 11.0 9.91 ± 0.57 patients 71.3 ± 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72 DD patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 S5.6 \pm 17.9 10.80 ± 0.61 Australia, NewMulticenterNDDZealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDDGlobal studyMulticenterDD patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD patientsS9.6 ± 13.3 10.4 ± 0.66 Global studyMulticenterNDD66.5 ± 12.78 10.0 ± 0.77 ExampleSingle/ multicenterPatients66.5 ± 12.78 10.0 ± 0.77 ExampleMulticenterNDD patients66.5 ± 12.78 10.0 ± 0.77 Russia, Spain, UnitedMulticenterDD patientsGapanMulticenterDD patientsGapanMulticenterDD patientsGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients63.4 ± 8.98 $8.5-10$ 64.1 ± 15.0 10.6 ± 0.94 10.3 10.6 ± 0.94 64.1 ± 10.3 10.4 ± 0.66 64.1 ± 10.4 10.5 ± 0.54 10.6 ± 0.94 10.6 ± 0.94 63.4 ± 8.98 10.6 ± 0.94 63.4 ± 8.98 10.6 ± 0.94 63.4 ± 8.97 10.6 ± 0.94 64.1 ± 15.0 10.6 ± 0.94 64.1 ± 10.3 10.6 ± 0.94 10.7 ± 0.94 10.8 ± 0.94 10.8 ± 0.94 10.8 ± 0.94 <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD$69.2 \pm 11.0$$9.91 \pm 0.57$Placebopatients$71.3 \pm 11.3$$10.08 \pm 0.72$DaprodDD patients$64.2 \pm 12.8$$10.89 \pm 0.52$rhEPOAustralia, NewMulticenterNDD54.8 ± 17.26-PlaceboZealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD54.8 ± 17.26-PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients57.2 ± 7.03-PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients$59.7 \pm 18.7$$10.6 \pm 0.94$rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients$63.4 \pm 8.98$$8.5-10.5$Pkglobal studyMulticenterDD patients$63.4 \pm 13.3$$10.6 \pm 0.75$Pkglobal studyMulticenterDD patients$63.5 \pm 10.54$$10.$</td> <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD$69.2 \pm 11.0$$9.91 \pm 0.57$Placebopatients71.3 \pm 11.3$10.08 \pm 0.72$DaprodustatDD patients$64.2 \pm 12.8$$10.89 \pm 0.52$rhEPOAustralia, NewMulticenterNDD54.8 ± 17.26-Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD54.8 ± 17.26-DD patients62.1 ± 12.38-DaprodustatDD patients57.2 ± 7.03-PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients$59.7 \pm 18.7$$10.6 \pm 0.94$Global studyMulticenterNDD$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.0 \pm 0.77$DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterNDD$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.0 \pm 0.77$DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterNDD62.4 ± 9.7-DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients$63.4 \pm 8.98$$8.5-10.5$PlaceboPlaceboDaprodustat62.4 ± 9.7-DaprodustatLocationSingle/DD patients63.4 ± 0.96DaprodustatLocationMulticenterDD patients63.4 ± 0.76DaprodustatLocationMulticenterDD patients63.4 ± 0.76PlaceboLocationMulticenter<td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 DD patients9.91 ± 0.57 10.00 ± 0.72 10.80 ± 0.72 DaprodustatPlacebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.52Placebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.80 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.61 Daprodustat62 Placebo9 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 57.2 ± 7.03Placebo18 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 $-$Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients54.8 ± 17.26 57.2 ± 7.03 $-$Placebo6 Daprodustat 61.0 ± 0.94Global studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 ± 18.7 $59.6 \pm 13.3$$10.4 \pm 0.66$ 10.1 ± 0.67Daprodustat 71.2 ± 17.8Global studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 ± 13.6 $62.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$ 10.1 ± 0.67rhEPOAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients65.4 ± 13.6 $66.5 \pm 12.78$$10.0 \pm 0.77$ 10.0 ± 0.77Daprodustat 170Global studyMulticenterDD patients patients63.4 ± 8.98 6.2 ± 9.7 $8.5-10.5$ $-$Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan Russia, Spain, United States, Canada, Germany IapanMulticenterDD patients $63.5 \pm 10.54$$60.9 \pm 13.3$ 10.6 ± 0.75Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan MulticenterMulticenterDD patients $63.5 \pm 10.54$$10.82 \pm 0.73$Daprodustat $-$ $-$ DaprodustatIapan<</td><td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 DD patients9.91 ± 0.57 71.3 ± 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72Placebo18Orall 54.8 ± 17.26Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients54.8 ± 17.26 $62.1 \pm 12.38$$-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients62.1 ± 12.38 $50.0 \pm 12.01$$-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients57.2 ± 7.03 $50.0 \pm 12.01$$-$ PlaceboDaprodustat61Global studyMulticenterDD patients$59.7 \pm 18.7$$10.6 \pm 0.94$ $thEPO$$70$ Placebo90 relip dapGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO90 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$7hEPO$$80$ rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.0 \pm 0.77$Daprodustat$70$ rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$7hEPO$$80$ rdImport</td><td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 \pm 11.0 71.3 \pm 11.39.91 \pm 0.57 10.89 \pm 0.52Placebo18 54Orally once-dailyAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.26- 55.6 \pm 17.9Placebo18 10.89 \pm 0.52Orally once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.23- 57.2 \pm 7.03- PlaceboPlacebo0 60.5, 2, 5 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 12.0 + 0.5 12.0 +10.2 Es, 50, 100 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 2.7170.7 mEPO mean \pm 20713.2 mg for 4 weeks-the need for dose adjustments was evaluated every 4 weeks the remaining 20 weeksGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.6 atients10.1 \pm 0.67mEPO mean \pm 2080 merodustat771.7 mEPO mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.8 62.4 \pm 2.7.810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 20Placebo mean \pm 2019Orally once daily depondustatIapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.6 \pm 0.75Pla</td><td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)(duration)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 $10.0 \pm 0.77$$9.91 \pm 0.57$ 10.0 ± 0.72 20 20 pardutatat18 20 DaprodustatOrally once-daily $54$$4$ weeksAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients64.2 ± 12.8 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$$0.91 \pm 0.52$ 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$$20$ Ox to mentioned 20 Ox to mentioned<</td></td>	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD 69.2 ± 11.0 9.91 ± 0.57 Placebopatients 71.3 ± 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72 DaprodDD patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 rhEPOAustralia, NewMulticenterNDD 54.8 ± 17.26 -PlaceboZealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD 54.8 ± 17.26 -PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients 57.2 ± 7.03 -PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients 59.7 ± 18.7 10.6 ± 0.94 rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 rhEPOglobal studyMulticenterDD patients 63.4 ± 8.98 $8.5-10.5$ Pkglobal studyMulticenterDD patients 63.4 ± 13.3 10.6 ± 0.75 Pkglobal studyMulticenterDD patients 63.5 ± 10.54 $10.$	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD 69.2 ± 11.0 9.91 ± 0.57 Placebopatients71.3 \pm 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72 DaprodustatDD patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 rhEPOAustralia, NewMulticenterNDD 54.8 ± 17.26 -Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD 54.8 ± 17.26 -DD patients 62.1 ± 12.38 -DaprodustatDD patients 57.2 ± 7.03 -PlaceboGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients 59.7 ± 18.7 10.6 ± 0.94 Global studyMulticenterNDD 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 rhEPOGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 65.4 ± 13.6 10.0 ± 0.77 DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 65.4 ± 13.6 10.0 ± 0.77 DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 62.4 ± 9.7 -DaprodustatGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients 63.4 ± 8.98 $8.5-10.5$ PlaceboPlaceboDaprodustat 62.4 ± 9.7 -DaprodustatLocationSingle/DD patients 63.4 ± 0.96 DaprodustatLocationMulticenterDD patients 63.4 ± 0.76 DaprodustatLocationMulticenterDD patients 63.4 ± 0.76 PlaceboLocationMulticenter <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 DD patients9.91 ± 0.57 10.00 ± 0.72 10.80 ± 0.72 DaprodustatPlacebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.52Placebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.80 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.61 Daprodustat62 Placebo9 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 57.2 ± 7.03Placebo18 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 $-$Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients54.8 ± 17.26 57.2 ± 7.03 $-$Placebo6 Daprodustat 61.0 ± 0.94Global studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 ± 18.7 $59.6 \pm 13.3$$10.4 \pm 0.66$ 10.1 ± 0.67Daprodustat 71.2 ± 17.8Global studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 ± 13.6 $62.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$ 10.1 ± 0.67rhEPOAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients65.4 ± 13.6 $66.5 \pm 12.78$$10.0 \pm 0.77$ 10.0 ± 0.77Daprodustat 170Global studyMulticenterDD patients patients63.4 ± 8.98 6.2 ± 9.7 $8.5-10.5$ $-$Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan Russia, Spain, United States, Canada, Germany IapanMulticenterDD patients $63.5 \pm 10.54$$60.9 \pm 13.3$ 10.6 ± 0.75Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan MulticenterMulticenterDD patients $63.5 \pm 10.54$$10.82 \pm 0.73$Daprodustat $-$ $-$ DaprodustatIapan<</td> <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 DD patients9.91 ± 0.57 71.3 ± 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72Placebo18Orall 54.8 ± 17.26Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients54.8 ± 17.26 $62.1 \pm 12.38$$-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients62.1 ± 12.38 $50.0 \pm 12.01$$-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients57.2 ± 7.03 $50.0 \pm 12.01$$-$ PlaceboDaprodustat61Global studyMulticenterDD patients$59.7 \pm 18.7$$10.6 \pm 0.94$ $thEPO$$70$ Placebo90 relip dapGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO90 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$rhEPO$$80$ rhEPO70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$7hEPO$$80$ rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.0 \pm 0.77$Daprodustat$70$ rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients$65.4 \pm 13.6$$10.1 \pm 0.67$$7hEPO$$80$ rdImport</td> <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 \pm 11.0 71.3 \pm 11.39.91 \pm 0.57 10.89 \pm 0.52Placebo18 54Orally once-dailyAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.26- 55.6 \pm 17.9Placebo18 10.89 \pm 0.52Orally once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.23- 57.2 \pm 7.03- PlaceboPlacebo0 60.5, 2, 5 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 12.0 + 0.5 12.0 +10.2 Es, 50, 100 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 2.7170.7 mEPO mean \pm 20713.2 mg for 4 weeks-the need for dose adjustments was evaluated every 4 weeks the remaining 20 weeksGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.6 atients10.1 \pm 0.67mEPO mean \pm 2080 merodustat771.7 mEPO mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.8 62.4 \pm 2.7.810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 20Placebo mean \pm 2019Orally once daily depondustatIapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.6 \pm 0.75Pla</td> <td>multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)(duration)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 $10.0 \pm 0.77$$9.91 \pm 0.57$ 10.0 ± 0.72 20 20 pardutatat18 20 DaprodustatOrally once-daily $54$$4$ weeksAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients64.2 ± 12.8 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$$0.91 \pm 0.52$ 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$$20$ Ox to mentioned 20 Ox to mentioned<</td>	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients 69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 DD patients 9.91 ± 0.57 10.00 ± 0.72 10.80 ± 0.72 DaprodustatPlacebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.89 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.52 Placebo18 patients 64.2 ± 12.8 10.80 ± 0.52 10.80 ± 0.61 Daprodustat62 Placebo9 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 57.2 ± 7.03 Placebo18 patients 62.1 ± 12.38 $-$ Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients 54.8 ± 17.26 57.2 ± 7.03 $-$ Placebo6 Daprodustat 61.0 ± 0.94 Global studyMulticenterDD patients 59.7 ± 18.7 59.6 ± 13.3 10.4 ± 0.66 10.1 ± 0.67 Daprodustat 71.2 ± 17.8 Global studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 62.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 10.1 ± 0.67 rhEPOAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 66.5 ± 12.78 10.0 ± 0.77 10.0 ± 0.77 Daprodustat 170 Global studyMulticenterDD patients patients 63.4 ± 8.98 6.2 ± 9.7 $ 8.5-10.5$ $-$ Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan Russia, Spain, United States, Canada, Germany IapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 ± 10.54 60.9 ± 13.3 10.6 ± 0.75 Placebo $-$ DaprodustatIapan MulticenterMulticenterDD patients 63.5 ± 10.54 10.82 ± 0.73 Daprodustat $-$ $-$ DaprodustatIapan<	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients 69.2 ± 11.0 DD patients 9.91 ± 0.57 71.3 ± 11.3 10.08 ± 0.72 Placebo18Orall 54.8 ± 17.26 Australia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients 54.8 ± 17.26 62.1 ± 12.38 $-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients 62.1 ± 12.38 50.0 ± 12.01 $-$ PlaceboPlacebo6Global studyMulticenterDD patients 57.2 ± 7.03 50.0 ± 12.01 $-$ PlaceboDaprodustat61Global studyMulticenterDD patients 59.7 ± 18.7 10.6 ± 0.94 $thEPO$ 70 Placebo 90 relip dapGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 $rhEPO$ 80 rhEPO 90 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 $rhEPO$ 80 rhEPO 70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 $rhEPO$ 80 rhEPO 70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 $7hEPO$ 80 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.0 ± 0.77 Daprodustat 70 rdGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients 65.4 ± 13.6 10.1 ± 0.67 $7hEPO$ 80 rdImport	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/dl)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients69.2 \pm 11.0 71.3 \pm 11.39.91 \pm 0.57 10.89 \pm 0.52Placebo18 54Orally once-dailyAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.26- 55.6 \pm 17.9Placebo18 10.89 \pm 0.52Orally once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD 54.8 \pm 17.23- 57.2 \pm 7.03- PlaceboPlacebo0 60.5, 2, 5 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 12.0 + 0.5 12.0 +10.2 Es, 50, 100 mg once-dailyGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients59.7 \pm 18.7 59.6 \pm 13.310.4 \pm 0.66Daprodustat 0.5 2.7170.7 mEPO mean \pm 20713.2 mg for 4 weeks-the need for dose adjustments was evaluated every 4 weeks the remaining 20 weeksGlobal studyMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.6 atients10.1 \pm 0.67mEPO mean \pm 2080 merodustat771.7 mEPO mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterNDD patients65.4 \pm 13.8 62.4 \pm 2.7.810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 2070 mg daprodustat mean \pm 20IapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.0 \pm 0.77Placebo mean \pm 20Placebo mean \pm 2019Orally once daily depondustatIapanMulticenterDD patients 63.5 \pm 12.7810.6 \pm 0.75Pla	multicentertypemean \pm SD(g/d)(duration)United StatesMulticenterNDD patients 69.2 ± 11.0 71.3 ± 11.3 10.0 ± 0.77 9.91 ± 0.57 10.0 ± 0.72 20 20 pardutatat18 20 DaprodustatOrally once-daily 54 4 weeksAustralia, New Zealand, India, RussiaMulticenterNDD patients 64.2 ± 12.8 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$ 0.91 ± 0.52 57.2 ± 12.8 $10.0 \pm 0.1 \pm 12.01$ 20 Ox to mentioned 20 Ox to mentioned<

recommended) dose once daily

Note: DD, dialysis-dependent; NDD, non-dialysis dependent; rhEPO, recombinant human erythropoietin; IV, intravenous.



Meta-Analysis Changes in Hemoglobin Levels From Baseline (△Hemoglobin)

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a) involving 441 participants reported \triangle Hb levels for NDD patients. Among them, two trails were comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies were comparisons between daprodustat and rhEPO. Six studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016b) involving 618 participants reported △Hb levels for DD patients. Among these, three trials involved comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and three studies were comparisons between daprodustat and rhEPO. The pooled results showed that for both NDD patients (Figure 3A) and DD patients (Figure 3B), \triangle Hb levels were significantly higher in the daprodustat group than that in placebo cohort (MD = 1.73, [95% CI, 0.34 to 3.12], p = 0.01; MD = 1.88, [95% CI, 0.68 to 3.09], p = 0.002; respectively), but there was no significant difference between daprodustat and rhEPO in terms of changes in Hb levels (MD = 0.05, [95% CI, -0.49 to 0.59], *p* = 0.86; MD = 0.12, [95% CI, -0.28 to 0.52], p = 0.55; respectively).

Changes in Ferritin Levels From Baseline (Aferritin)

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a) involving 428 participants reported \triangle ferritin levels for NDD patients, and four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Meadowcroft et al., 2019), including 236 participants, reported △ferritin levels in DD patients. Among these, for both NDD patients and DD patients, two trials involved comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies compared daprodustat and rhEPO. Pooled results showed that for NDD patients (Figure 4A) and DD patients (Figure 4B), △ferritin levels were significantly lower in the daprodustat group than that in the placebo group (MD = -85.40, [95% CI, -126.17 to -44.64], p < 0.0001; MD = -141.31, [95% CI, -196.02 to -86.60], p <0.00001; respectively) or in the rhEPO group (MD = -28.66, [95% CI, -33.02 to -24.30], p < 0.00001; MD = -82.17, [95% CI, -146.51 to -17.83], p = 0.01; respectively).

Changes in Transferrin Saturation Levels From Baseline(\triangle Transferrin Saturation)

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a) involving 425 participants reported \triangle TSAT levels for NDD patients. Among them, two trails were comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies compared daprodustat with rhEPO. As shown in **Figure 5A**, \triangle TSAT levels were significantly lower in the daprodustat cohort than in placebo or rhEPO groups for NDD patients (MD = -5.90, [95% CI, -11.31 to -0.49], *p* = 0.03; MD = -17.69, [95% CI, -19.92 to -15.45], *p* < 0.00001; respectively).

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Meadowcroft et al., 2019) involving 234 participants reported \triangle TSAT levels for DD patients. Among these, two trials involved comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies were comparisons between daprodustat and rhEPO. As shown in **Figure 5B**, there was no significant difference in \triangle TSAT levels between daprodustat and placebo or rhEPO for DD patients (MD = -20.00, [95% CI, -82.70 to 42.70], p = 0.53; MD = 3.03, [95% CI, -1.84 to 7.90], p = 0.22; respectively).

Changes in Total Iron-Binding Capacity Levels From Baseline (\triangle Total Iron-Binding Capacity)

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a) involving 425 participants reported \triangle TIBC levels for NDD patients. Among these, two trials were comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies compared daprodustat and rhEPO. Five studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019) involving 318 participants reported∆TIBC levels for DD patients. Among these, three trials were comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies compared daprodustat with rhEPO. The pooled results showed that for both NDD patients (Figure 6A) and DD patients (Figure 6B), \triangle TIBC levels was significantly higher in the daprodustat group than that in the placebo cohort (MD = 7.73, [95% CI, 3.97 to 11.48], p < 0.0001) or in the rhEPO group (MD = 5.71, [95% CI, 1.60 to 9.82], *p* = 0.007; MD = 6.28, [95% CI, 4.71 to 7.84], *p* < 0.00001; respectively), while there

	Dap	rodusta	at	c	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	I IV, Random, 95% CI
1Daprodustat VS Pla	cebo								
Brigandi2016	2	1.4	15	-0.61	1.7	9	39.4%	2.61 [1.29, 3.93]	
Holdstock2016	1.01	0.26	18	-0.15	0.19	19	60.6%	1.16 [1.01, 1.31]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			33				100.0%	1.73 [0.34, 3.12]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				= 1 (P =	0.03); I	² = 789	6		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.44	ł (P = 0	.01)						
2Daprodustat VS rh	PO								
Holdstock2019	0.55	1.1	142	0.75	1.01	70	54.8%	-0.20 [-0.50, 0.10]	• • •
NCT02791763	1.56	1.527	87	1.21	1.432	81	45.2%	0.35 [-0.10, 0.80]	t∎−
Subtotal (95% CI)			229			151	100.0%	0.05 [-0.49, 0.59]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.11; C	hi² = 4.0)2, df =	= 1 (P =	0.04); I	² = 75%	6		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.18	3 (P = 0	.86)						
									-4 -2 0 2 4
5									control daprodustat
•	Dan	rodust	at	c	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean			Mean		Total	Weight		
1Daprodustat VS Pla	cebo							, ,	
Akizawa2017	0.97	0.75	19	-1.41	0.667	15	35.0%	2.38 [1.90, 2.86]	
Brigandi2016	1.77	1.33	12	-0.8	0.75	6	29.9%	2.57 [1.61, 3.53]	_
Christine2019	0.2	1.43	67	-0.6	0.65	17	35.1%	0.80 [0.34, 1.26]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			98			38	100.0%	1.88 [0.68, 3.09]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				= 2 (P	< 0.000	01); l² :	= 92%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.06	3 (P = 0	.002)						
	PO								_
Daprodustat VS rhEl	0.21	0.75		-0.27	0.63	19	30.7%	0.48 [0.03, 0.93]	
Daprodustat VS rhEl Holdstock2016		1.05	171		1.43	39	29.2%	0.14 [-0.34, 0.62]	
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018	0.03		115	0.01	1.019	120		-0.17 [-0.45, 0.11]	T
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018 Tadao2019		1.169					100 0%	0.12 [-0.28, 0.52]	—
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018 Tadao2019 Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.16		304	a (=			100.0%	. , .	
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018 Tadao2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	-0.16 0.08; C	hi² = 6.0	304 03, df =	= 2 (P =	0.05); I			•	
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018 Tadao2019 Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.16 0.08; C	hi² = 6.0	304 03, df =	= 2 (P =	0.05); I			•	
Holdstock2016 Meadowcroft2018 Tadao2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	-0.16 0.08; C	hi² = 6.0	304 03, df =	= 2 (P =	0.05); I			• / •	-4 -2 0 2 4

FIGURE 3 | The meta-analysis results of daprodustat for \triangle Hb. (A) The pooled results for NDD patients; (B) The pooled results for DD patients.

was no significant difference in \triangle TIBC levels between daprodustat and placebo for DD patients (MD = 8.10, [95% CI, -2.73 to 18.93], p = 0.14).

Serious Adverse Events

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016a) involving 691 participants reported SAEs associated with NDD patients. Among these, two trials were comparisons between daprodustat and placebo, and two studies compared daprodustat with rhEPO. Six studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019; GlaxoSmithKline, 2016b) involving 825 participants reported SAEs associated with DD patients. Among these, three trials compared daprodustat and placebo, and three studies involved comparisons of daprodustat and rhEPO. The pooled results showed that for both NDD patients (Figure 7A) and DD patients (Figure 7B), there was no significant difference in the incidence of SAEs between daprodustat and placebo (RR = 1.09, [95% CI, 0.26 to 4.68], p = 0.91; RR = 0.79, [95% CI, 0.26 to 2.43], p = 0.68; respectively). Additionally, the incidence of SAEs in the daprodustat group was significantly lower than that in the rhEPO group (RR = 0.71, [95% CI, 0.52 to 0.97], p = 0.03; RR = 0.60, [95% CI, 0.42 to 0.87], p = 0.007; respectively).

Changes Involving of Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor

Four studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Meadowcroft et al., 2019) reported changes in VEGF levels for NDD patients, and three studies (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2019) similarly reported for DD patients. These studies showed that for both NDD and

	Dap	orodusta	at	c	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean D	Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	1	IV, Fixe	ed, 95% C	1	
Daprodustat VS Placeb	0												
Brigandi2016	-100	111.94	15	7.46	85.07	9	26.4%	-107.46 [-186.82, -28.10]	+ -	_			
Holdstock2016	-101.8	91.1		-24.3	38.6			-77.50 [-125.01, -29.99]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			32			24	100.0%	-85.40 [-126.17, -44.64]					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =				$ ^{2} = 0$	6								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.1	1 (P < 0.	.0001)										
Daprodustat VS rhE	РО												
Holdstock2019	-37.9	118.3	138	-10.6	71.2	66	2.8%	-27.30 [-53.47, -1.13]		<u> </u>	-		
NCT02791763	-42.7	14.42	87	-14	14.81	81	97.2%	-28.70 [-33.13, -24.27]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			225			147	100.0%	-28.66 [-33.02, -24.30]		•			
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =					6								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 12.	87 (P < 0	0.0000	1)									
									-100	-50	0 5	50	100
В										daprodustat	t control		
	Dap	rodustat			Control			Mean Difference		Mean D	ifference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean		Total			Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI			d, 95% CI		
Daprodustat VS Place	00										ľ		
Akizawa2017	-113.3	94.69	19	4.7	114.79	15	57.7%	-118.00 [-190.02, -45.98]					
Brigandi2016	-156.52	139.74	12	16.58	35.9	6	42.3%	-173.10 [-257.22, -88.98]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			31			21	100.0%	-141.31 [-196.02, -86.60]		•			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.9				%									
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 5.06 (P	< 0.0000	1)										
Daprodustat VS rhEPO										_			
Holdstock2016	-80.8	95.9		-27.9	166		54.1%	-52.90 [-140.36, 34.56]			T		
Meadowcroft2018	-59.9	331.8	115	56.8	214.3			-116.70 [-211.69, -21.71]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			132			52	100.0%	-82.17 [-146.51, -17.83]					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.9); I ² = 0	%									
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.50 (P	= 0.01)											
									+				+
									-500	-250	0	250	500

FIGURE 4 | The meta-analysis results of daprodustat for \triangle ferritin. (A) The pooled results for NDD patients; B: The pooled results for DD patients.

DD patients there were considerable inter-subject variability in terms of VEGF levels; there was no trend observed in increasing plasma VEGF abundance in daprodustat-treated subjects when compared to the placebo or rhEPO subjects.

Publication Bias

All outcome indicators were observed for less than ten studies, so publication bias was not examined.

DISCUSSION

By compiling the available RCTs, our meta-analysis evaluated the current totality of evidence investigating the efficacy and safety of the novel oral HIF inhibitor, daprodustat. Overall, for both NDD and DD patients, daprodustat was associated with a superior and significant increase in Hb levels compared to placebo, and was non-inferior to parenteral rhEPO with regard to increased levels of Hb. In terms of iron metabolism, ferritin levels were significantly reduced in the daprodustat group than in the placebo or rhEPO groups for NDD and DD patients. TIBC levels were significantly increased in the daprodustat group than in the placebo or rhEPO groups for NDD patients, and it was also significantly increased in daprodustat groups when compared with rhEPO groups for DD patients. TSAT levels were significantly reduced in the daprodustat

group compared to the placebo or rhEPO groups for NDD patients. However, for DD patients, notable differences in changes in TSAT levels were not detected between the daprodustat group and the placebo or rhEPO groups. Furthermore, current RCTs involving daprodustat have shown that for both NDD and DD patients, no trend of increasing plasma VEGF is observed in daprodustat-treated subjects when compared to placebo or rhEPO subjects (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Holdstock et al., 2019; Meadowcroft et al., 2019). In regard to safety, the incidence of SAEs in the daprodustat group was comparable to that of the placebo group and significantly superior to that of the rhEPO group for the treatment of anemia for both NDD and DD patients. In these cases, the results were rated as providing low-quality or very low-quality evidence.

Daprodustat is a once-daily oral prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor that stimulates erythropoiesis in a manner similar to the natural response to hypoxia, whereby inhibition of HIF prolyl-4hydroxylases (HIF-PH, PHD1, PHD2, PHD3) by daprodustat ultimately results in increased transcription of HIF-responsive genes, including erythropoietin (Johnson et al., 2014; Ariazi et al., 2017). The use of inhibitors of HIF-PH to stimulate erythropoiesis in both animal and human clinical studies has been previously described (Rosen et al., 2010; Barrett et al., 2011; Hong et al., 2013; Hong et al., 2014) and reviewed (Muchnik and Kaplan, 2011; Rabinowitz, 2013; Zhao and Wu, 2013; Kim and



FIGURE 5 | The meta-analysis results of daprodustat for \triangle TSAT. (A) The pooled results for NDD patients; (B) The pooled results for DD patients.

Yang, 2015). A missense mutation in the *HIF-* α gene was discovered in patients with familial erythrocytosis and has been found to lead to stabilization of the HIF- α protein (Percy et al., 2008). Moreover, a study showed that Hb levels increased after treatment with an inhibitor of HIF-PH, while endogenous erythropoietin remained within the normal physiological range (Flamme et al., 2014), which suggests that HIF-PHIs may use a mechanism different from ESAs to improve anemia. All of the above findings support the effectiveness of daprodustat for treatment of anemia. Our study showed that daprodustat can increase Hb levels more effectively than placebo in both NDD and DD patients, and the effect of increasing or maintaining Hb levels is not inferior to that of rhEPO.

Furthermore, HIF also regulates iron metabolism and handling (Yoon et al., 2006). HIF-2 α appears to be an isoform primarily responsible for regulating iron metabolism genes in liver, with HIF-1 α playing a lesser role (Kapitsinou et al., 2010). HIF-1 upregulates transferrin, ceruloplasmin, and transferrin receptor 1, the latter facilitating increased plasma transport of iron to tissues (Rolfs et al., 1997; Bianchi et al., 1999; Tacchini et al., 1999). HIF-2 α boosts intestinal absorption of iron by upregulating crucial genes, including duodenal cytochrome b and divalent metal transporters 1 and 2 involved in iron uptake and export (Mastrogiannaki et al., 2009; Kapitsinou et al., 2010). According to evidence from this meta-analysis, in the NDD population, ferritin and TSAT levels were significantly decreased in the daprodustat arms, whereas TIBC increased more notably than in the placebo or rhEPO groups, suggesting that daprodustat increased iron utilization due to increased erythropoiesis in the NDD population. These results are consistent with experimental data from animal studies (Anderson et al., 2013; Wilkinson and Pantopoulos, 2013), which demonstrated that the PHD/HIF axis coordinates iron metabolism with erythropoiesis via transcriptional regulation of genes involved in iron uptake, release, and transport (Haase, 2013b). On the other hand, in studies involving DD patients, changes in ferritin levels in daprodustat arms were similar to those in NDD patients compared with control groups (both placebo and rhEPO), while there were no similar changes in terms of TSAT and TIBC. Further investigations concerning the effects of daprodustat on iron mobilization in this patient population will require larger-sample sizes and longer-term studies. The above findings will be tested in current largesample phase three trials (ClinicalTrials.gov numbers, NCT02876835 and NCT02879305.)

In addition to modulation of EPO expression, HIF-1 also upregulates the expression of VEGF. This protein is known to stimulate angiogenesis and has been implicated in the support

	Dap	rodust			Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean		Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.5.1 Daprodustat VS	Placebo	D							
Brigandi2016		13.29	15		3.71	9		4.30 [-2.85, 11.45]	
Holdstock2016	8.3	5.5	17	-0.5	3.7	15		8.80 [5.58, 12.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			32				100.0%	7.73 [3.97, 11.48]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				1 (P =	0.26); l	² = 21%	6		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.03	(P < 0.	0001)						
1.5.2 Daprodustat VS	rhEPO								
Holdstock2019	3.1	7.2	136	0.4	5.9	65	47.4%	3.50 [1.62, 5.38]	_ _ _
NCT02791763	7.8	0.82	87		0.85	81		7.70 [7.45, 7.95]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	7.0	0.02	223	0.1	0.00		100.0%	5.71 [1.60, 9.82]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	8 35 [.] Ch	i ² = 18		:1 (P <	0 0 0 0				
Test for overall effect:				. (1	. 0.000	·,, · -	0070		
		(, ,	,						
								-	
									-10 -5 0 5 10 control daprodustat
В									control daprodustat
		odusta			ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean		Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.5.1 Daprodustat VS									
Akizawa2017	17.2		19		1.97	14		17.00 [14.58, 19.42]	
Brigandi2016		6.5	12		11.72		27.8%	2.44 [-7.63, 12.51]	
Christine2019	3.7	4.52	67	0.1	3.42	17		3.60 [1.65, 5.55]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			98				100.0%	8.10 [-2.73, 18.93]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				= 2 (P	< 0.00	001); l ²	= 97%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.47	(P = 0.	14)						
2.5.2 Daprodustat VS	rhEPO								
Holdstock2016		3.2	17	1	4.6	19	46.8%	4.20 [1.63, 6.77]	
Meadowcroft2018		6.6	115	-2	4.5		53.2%	7.50 [5.53, 9.47]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.0	0.0	132	_			100.0%	5.96 [2.73, 9.18]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	4.08; Ch	i² = 3.9		1 (P =	0.05): I				
Test for overall effect:				v	,, .				
		,	,						
								-	-20 -10 0 10 20
									-20 -10 0 10 20 control daprodustat

FIGURE 6 | The meta-analysis results of daprodustat for \triangle TIBC. (A) The pooled results for NDD patients; (B) The pooled results for DD patients.

of tumor growth, as well as macular edema and proliferative retinopathy through its angiogenic activity (Goel and Mercurio, 2013; Fogli et al., 2016). In the present study, for both NDD and DD patients, the results demonstrated no trend of increasing plasma VEGF concentrations in the daprodustattreated patients when compared to the placebo or rhEPO subjects. Another study involving diabetic retinopathy patients also indicated that no clinically-significant changes were observed during ophthalmologic exams, nor were any ocular events suggestive of enhanced angiogenesis identified during 24 weeks of daprodustat treatment (Tsubakihara et al., 2020). But these studies all lack long term follow-up and those with diabetic eye changes are the best to follow over several years of therapy. So, the concern that some still have about VEGF still need large, long-term follow-up clinical studies to ease.

This study analyzed the safety of daprodustat in the treatment of anemia in CKD patients. The results showed that for both NDD and DD patients, the proportion of patients with one or more SAEs was comparable to that of the placebo group, and the incidence of SAEs in the daprodustat group was significantly lower than that in the rhEPO group. Similarly, a previous metaanalysis (Zhong et al., 2018) also found no difference in adverse reactions when HIF-PH inhibitors were compared with placebo. The advantage of lower SAE incidence with daprodustat compared to rhEPO may be associated with the mechanisms involved in HIF-PH inhibitor activity in the treatment of renal anemia, which could mitigate adverse outcomes caused by exogenous high-dose EPO treatment due to the fact that they allow for physiological levels of EPO to stimulate red blood cell (RBC) production rather than high intermittent blood levels caused by the pharmacological administration of exogenous ESA. Increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in ESA-treated patients is associated with supraphysiologic EPO dosing and plasma EPO levels (Vaziri and Zhou, 2009; McCullough et al., 2013), HIF-PH inhibitor therapy therefore has the potential to improve cardiovascular outcomes in CKD patients (Sanghani and Haase, 2019). These findings suggest that daprodustat was well tolerated in anemic populations with CKD. Considering that HIF-PH inhibitors are involved in different pathways, publication of some recently completed or ongoing (ClinicalTrials.gov numbers, NCT03029208 and trials NCT02879305) and emergence of real-world data will further aid in determining the safety profile of daprodustat.

Α	Daprod		Contro			Risk Ratio		Risk R	atio	
Study or Subgroup		Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I	M-H, Fixed	l, 95% Cl	
Daprodustat VS Pla										
Brigandi2016	6	61	1	9	53.7%	0.89 [0.12, 6.53]				
Holdstock2016	4	54	1	18	46.3%	1.33 [0.16, 11.17]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		115		27	100.0%	1.09 [0.26, 4.68]				
Total events	10		2							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.08, df =	1 (P =	0.78); l ² =	0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.12	(P = 0.9	91)							
Daprodustat VS rhE		470	10	~~	04 70/	0.0470.54.4.701			_	
Holdstock2019	26	170	13	80	24.7%	0.94 [0.51, 1.73]		- -		
NCT02791763	34	149	54	150	75.3%	0.63 [0.44, 0.91]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		319		230	100.0%	0.71 [0.52, 0.97]		•		
Total events	60		67	400/						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =				16%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.15	(P = 0.0)	33)							
							—	İ	I	
							0.01	0.1 1	10	100
В								daprodustat c	ontrol	
	Daprod	ustat	Contro	Ы		Risk Ratio		Risk R	atio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I	M-H, Fixed	l, 95% Cl	
Daprodustat VS Plac	cebo									
Akizawa2017	1	97	1	19	29.1%	0.20 [0.01, 3.00]		-		
Brigandi2016	3	31	0	6	14.3%	1.53 [0.09, 26.42]				
Christine2019	8	84	2	19	56.7%	0.90 [0.21, 3.92]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		212		44	100.0%	0.79 [0.26, 2.43]				
Total events	12		3							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.24, df =	2 (P =	0.54); l ² =	0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.41	(P = 0.6	68)							
Daprodustat VS rhE										
Holdstock2016	4	62	2	20	5.3%	0.65 [0.13, 3.26]				
Meadowcroft2018	31	177	10	39	29.0%	0.68 [0.37, 1.27]				
Tadao2019	21	136	37	135		0.56 [0.35, 0.91]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		375		194	100.0%	0.60 [0.42, 0.87]		•		
Total events	56	a (5	49							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =			,.	0%						
Test for overall effect:	∠ = 2.68	(P = 0.0	JU7)							
							l			+
							0.005	0.1 1	10	200
								daprodustat c		

Potential advantages of daprodustat compared to rhEPO and its analogs in the treatment of CKD anemia include that daprodustat raises Hb levels without exposing patients to supraphysiologic EPO levels, and that daprodustat can improve iron availability for erythropoiesis, which may reduce the need for iron supplementation and avoid the need for parenteral injection (Lenihan and Winkelmayer, 2016). Current studies show that approximately 5- to 17-fold lower plasma EPO levels were measured in CKD patients who were successfully treated with HIF-PH inhibitors compared to those receiving epoetin alfa (Holdstock et al., 2016; Provenzano et al., 2016). Furthermore, preclinical studies have consistently shown that pre-ischemic HIF activation protects multiple organs from acute ischemia-reperfusion injury, including the kidneys, heart, brain, and liver (Kapitsinou and Haase, 2015). Therefore, HIF- PH inhibitors such as daprodustat are likely to become a crucial alternative tool for management of anemia in CKD patients.

However, there remain many problems in the application of daprodustat in clinical settings and in future research. Given the biology of the HIF pathway, systemic PHD inhibition has the potential to produce undesirable on-target effects ranging from changes in glucose, fat, and mitochondrial metabolism, to alterations to cellular differentiation, inflammation, vascular tone, and cell growth (Chavez et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2014). Furthermore, it is unclear whether HIF-PH inhibitor therapy may be harmful in CKD patients with certain comorbidities, such as a history of previous stroke or autoimmune disease, for example, systemic lupus erythematosus. In addition, patients may experience higher risk of SAEs when administered ESAs to achieve a higher Hb target level (Drücke et al., 2006; Pfeffer et al., 2009), and it is still unknown whether these statements also apply to daprodustat. Future long-term trials should proceed with caution, and studies assessing daprodustat targeting Hb levels are required.

This systematic review and meta-analysis investigated the body of evidence available regarding the use of daprodustat in the treatment of anemia in CKD patients, but there were certain limitations. First, all included RCTs had only short-term results, thus we were not able to determine the long-term efficacy and possible adverse reactions of daprodustat. Second, the dosage of daprodustat in our study varied, and several phase-II studies have demonstrated that daprodustat exerts a dose-response effect on Hb levels, and a number of iron metabolism indices in both NDD and DD patients (Brigandi et al., 2016; Holdstock et al., 2016; Akizawa et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2019). Thus, the results of this meta-analysis may be more relevant for higher daprodustat doses. Third, it should be noted that our findings are based on phase-II and phase-III studies, and the number of studies included in this study was small. Hence, the results of our study still need to be verified in several ongoing large-scale, international, phase-III studies (ClinicalTrials.gov numbers, NCT02876835, NCT03409107, and NCT02879305.)

CONCLUSION

According to the current evidence, daprodustat was able to effectively increase or maintain Hb levels in both NDD and DD patients, and was non-inferior to parenteral rhEPO. The risk of SAEs with daprodustat administration was not observed when compared with placebos and was significantly lower than those in the rhEPO group. These findings support the short-term use of daprodustat for the treatment of anemia in CKD patients.

REFERENCES

- Akizawa, T., Tsubakihara, Y., Nangaku, M., Endo, Y., Nakajima, H., Kohno, T., et al. (2017). Effects of daprodustat, a novel hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor on anemia management in Japanese hemodialysis subjects Am. J. Nephrol. 45, 127–135. doi:10.1159/ 000454818
- Anderson, S. A., Nizzi, C. P., Chang, Y. I., Deck, K. M., Schmidt, P. J., Galy, B., et al. (2013). The IRP1-HIF-2a Axis coordinates iron and oxygen sensing with erythropoiesis and iron absorption. *Cell Metabol.* 17, 282–290. doi:10.1016/j. cmet.2013.01.007
- Ariazi, J. L., Duffy, K. J., Adams, D. F., Fitch, D. M., Luo, L., Pappalardi, M., et al. (2017). Discovery and preclinical characterization of GSK1278863 (daprodustat), a small molecule hypoxia inducible factor-prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor for anemia. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 363, 336–347. doi:10.1124/jpet. 117.242503
- Babitt, J. L., and Lin, H. Y. (2012). Mechanisms of anemia in CKD. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol. 23, 1631–1634. doi:10.1681/ASN.2011111078
- Bailey, C. K., Caltabiano, S., Cobitz, A. R., Huang, C., Mahar, K. M., and Patel, V. V. (2019). A randomized, 29-day, dose-ranging, efficacy and safety study of daprodustat, administered three times weekly in patients with anemia on hemodialysis. *BMC Nephrol.* 20, 372. doi:10.1186/s12882-019-1547-z
- Barrett, T. D., Palomino, H. L., Brondstetter, T. I., Kanelakis, K. C., Wu, X., Haug, P. V., et al. (2011). Pharmacological characterization of 1-(5-Chloro-6-(trifluoromethoxy)-1H-benzoimidazol-2-yl)- 1H-pyrazole-4-carboxylic acid

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the conception, search terms and methodology of the review. QZ, YL, and WL came up with the study idea. QZ, YW, YL, and WL designed the study. YW and XF completed the database searches and study selection. YW and HY completed the assessment of bias of the included studies. XF and RW extracted data from the included studies. QZ, LS and HY completed the meta analyses. QZ and YW wrote the first draft of the manuscript. YL and WL completed the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the writing or revision of the final manuscript. And all authors have read and approve the final version submitted to this journal.

FUNDING

This research was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 81774278 and 81373829).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2020.573645/full#supplementary-material.

(JNJ-42041935), a potent and selective hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 79, 910–920. doi:10.1124/mol.110. 070508

- Bianchi, L., Tacchini, L., and Cairo, G. (1999). HIF-1-mediated activation of transferrin receptor gene transcription by iron chelation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 27, 4223–4227. doi:10.1093/nar/27.21.4223
- Brigandi, R. A., Johnson, B., Oei, C., Westerman, M., Olbina, G., de Zoysa, J., et al. (2016). A novel hypoxiainducible factor-prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor (GSK1278863) for anemia in CKD: a 28-day, phase 2a randomized trial. *Am. J. Kidney Dis.* 67, 861–871. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.11.021
- Cases, A., Egocheaga, M. I., Tranche, S., Pallarés, V., Ojeda, R., Górriz, J. L., et al. (2018). Anemia of chronic kidney disease: protocol of study, management and referral to nephrology. *Nefrologia* 38, 8–12. doi:10. 1016/j.nefro.2017.09.004
- Chavez, A., Miranda, L. F., Pichiule, P., and Chavez, J. C. (2008). Mitochondria and hypoxia-induced gene expression mediated by hypoxia-inducible factors. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1147, 312–320. doi:10.1196/annals.1427.021
- Chen, T. K., Knicely, D. H., and Grams, M. E. (2019). Chronic kidney disease diagnosis and management: a review. JAMA 322, 1294–1304. doi:10.1001/jama. 2019.14745
- Drücke, T. B., Locatelli, F., Clyne, N., Eckardt, K. U., Macdougall, I. C., Tsakiris, D., et al. (2006). Normalization of hemoglobin level in patients with chronic kidney disease and anemia. N. Engl. J. Med. 355, 2071–2084. doi:10.1056/ NEJMoa062276
- Finkelstein, F. O., Story, K., Firanek, C., Mendelssohn, D., Barre, P., Takano, T., et al. (2009). Health-related quality of life and hemoglobin levels in chronic

kidney disease patients. Clin. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol. 4, 33–38. doi:10.2215/CJN. 00630208

- Flamme, I., Oehme, F., Ellinghaus, P., Jeske, M., Keldenich, J., and Thuss, U. (2014). Mimicking hypoxia to treat anemia: HIF-stabilizer BAY 85-3934 (Molidustat) stimulates erythropoietin production without hypertensive effects. *PLoS One* 9, e111838. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111838
- Fogli, S., Mogavero, S., Egan, C. G., Del Re, M., and Danesi, R. (2016). Pathophysiology and pharmacological targets of VEGF in diabetic macular edema. *Pharmacol. Res.* 103, 149–157. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2015. 11.003
- GlaxoSmithKline (2016a). A study to evaluate efficacy and safety of daprodustat compared to darbepoetin alfa in Japanese hemodialysis (HD)-dependent subjects with anemia associated with chronic kidney disease (CKD). Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT02969655 (Accessed April 20, 2020).
- GlaxoSmithKline (2016b). Phase III study of GSK1278863 in Japanese non-dialysis (ND) and peritoneal dialysis (PD) subjects with renal anemia. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT02791763 (Accessed April 20, 2020).
- Goel, H. L., and Mercurio, A. M. (2013). VEGF targets the tumour cell. Nat. Rev. Canc. 13, 871–882. doi:10.1038/nrc3627
- Gupta, N., and Wish, J. B. (2017). Hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl hydroxylase inhibitors: a potential new treatment for anemia in patients with CKD. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 69, 815–826. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2016.12.011
- Haase, V. H. (2013a). Mechanisms of hypoxia responses in renal tissue. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol. 24, 537–541. doi:10.1681/ASN.2012080855
- Haase, V. H. (2013b). Regulation of erythropoiesis by hypoxia-inducible factors. Blood Rev. 27, 41–53. doi:10.1016/j.blre.2012.12.003
- Holdstock, L., Meadowcroft, A. M., Maier, R., Johnson, B. M., Jones, D., Rastogi, A., et al. (2016). Four-week studies of oral hypoxia-inducible factor-prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor GSK1278863 for treatment of anemia. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* 27, 1234–1244. doi:10.1681/ASN.2014111139
- Holdstock, L., Cizman, B., Meadowcroft, A. M., Biswas, N., Johnson, B. M., Jones, D., et al. (2019). Daprodustat for anemia: a 24-week, open-label, randomized controlled trial in participants with chronic kidney disease. *Clin. Kidney J.* 12, 129–138. doi:10.1093/ckj/sfy013
- Hong, Y. R., Kim, H. T., Lee, S. C., Ro, S., Cho, J. M., Kim, I. S., et al. (2013). [(4-Hydroxyl-benzo[4,5]thieno[3,2-c]pyridine-3-carbonyl)-amino]-acetic acid derivatives; HIF prolyl 4-hydroxylase inhibitors as oral erythropoietin secretagogues. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 23, 5953–5957. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl. 2013.08.067
- Hong, Y. R., Kim, H. T., Ro, S., Cho, J. M., Lee, S. H., Kim, I. S., et al. (2014). Discovery of novel 2-[2-(3-hydroxy-pyridin-2-yl)-thiazol-4-yl]-acetamide derivatives as HIF prolyl 4-hydroxylase inhibitors; SAR, synthesis and modeling evaluation. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 24, 3142–3145. doi:10.1016/j. bmcl.2014.05.003
- Hörl, W. H. (2013). Anaemia management and mortality risk in chronic kidney disease. Nat. Rev. Nephrol. 9, 291–301. doi:10.1038/nrneph.2013.21
- Johnson, B. M., Stier, B. A., and Caltabiano, S. (2014). Effect of food and gemfibrozil on the pharmacokinetics of the novel prolyl hydroxylase inhibitor GSK1278863. *Clin. Pharmacol. Drug Dev.* 3, 109–117. doi:10.1002/cpdd.83
- Kapitsinou, P. P., and Haase, V. H. (2015). Molecular mechanisms of ischemic preconditioning in the kidney. Am. J. Physiol. Ren. Physiol. 309, F821–F834. doi:10.1152/ajprenal.00224.2015
- Kapitsinou, P. P., Liu, Q., Unger, T. L., Rha, J., Davidoff, O., Keith, B., et al. (2010). Hepatic HIF-2 regulates erythropoietic responses to hypoxia in renal anemia. *Blood* 116, 3039–3048. doi:10.1182/blood-2010-02-270322
- KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline Working Group (2012). KDIGO clinical practice guideline for anemia in chronic kidney disease. *Kidney Int. Suppl.* 2, 288–335.
- Kim, S. Y., and Yang, E. G. (2015). Recent advances in developing inhibitors for hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl hydroxylases and their therapeutic implications. *Molecules* 20, 20551–20568. doi:10.3390/ molecules201119717
- Lee, Y. S., Kim, J. W., Osborne, O., Oh, D. Y., Sasik, R., Schenk, S., et al. (2014). Increased adipocyte O2 consumption triggers HIF-1α causing inflammation and insulin resistance in obesity. *Cell* 157, 1339–1352. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014. 05.012

- Lenihan, C. R., and Winkelmayer, W. C. (2016). The dawning of a new day in CKD anemia care?. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol. 27, 968–970. doi:10.1681/ASN. 2015091009
- Mastrogiannaki, M., Matak, P., Keith, B., Simon, M. C., Vaulont, S., and Peyssonnaux, C. (2009). HIF-2alpha, but not HIF-1alpha, promotes iron absorption in mice. J. Clin. Invest. 119, 1159–1166. doi:10.1172/JCI38499
- McCullough, P. A., Barnhart, H. X., Inrig, J. K., Reddan, D., Sapp, S., Patel, U. D., et al. (2013). Cardiovascular toxicity of epoetin-alfa in patients with chronic kidney disease. Am. J. Nephrol. 37, 549–558. doi:10.1159/000351175
- Meadowcroft, A. M., Cizman, B., Holdstock, L., Biswas, N., Johnson, B. M., Jones, D., et al. (2019). Daprodustat for anemia: a 24-week, open-label, randomized controlled trial in participants on hemodialysis. *Clin. Kidney J.* 12, 139–148. doi:10.1093/ckj/sfy014
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., and Altman, D. G.; PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 6, e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
- Muchnik, E., and Kaplan, J. (2011). HIF prolyl hydroxylase inhibitors for anemia. Expet Opin. Invest. Drugs 20, 645–656. doi:10.1517/13543784. 2011.566861
- Parfrey, P. S., Lauve, M., Latremouille-Viau, D., and Lefebvre, P. (2009). Erythropoietin therapy and left ventricular mass index in CKD and ESRD patients: a meta-analysis. *Clin. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* 4, 755–762. doi:10.2215/ CJN.02730608
- Percy, M. J., Furlow, P. W., Lucas, G. S., Li, X., Lappin, T. R., McMullin, M. F., et al. (2008). A gain-of-function mutation in the HIF2A gene in familial erythrocytosis. N. Engl. J. Med. 358, 162–168. doi:10.1056/ NEJMoa073123
- Pfeffer, M. A., Burdmann, E. A., Chen, C. Y., Cooper, M. E., de Zeeuw, D., Eckardt, K. U., et al. (2009). A trial of darbepoetin alfa in type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease. N. Engl. J. Med. 361, 2019–2032. doi:10.1056/ NEJMoa0907845
- Provenzano, R., Besarab, A., Wright, S., Dua, S., Zeig, S., Nguyen, P., et al. (2016). Roxadustat (FG-4592) versus epoetin alfa for anemia in patients receiving maintenance hemodialysis: a phase 2, randomized, 6- to 19-week, open-label, activecomparator, dose-ranging, safety and exploratory efficacy study. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 67, 912–924. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.12.020
- Rabinowitz, M. H. (2013). Inhibition of hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl hydroxylase domain oxygen sensors: tricking the body into mounting orchestrated survival and repair responses. J. Med. Chem. 56, 9369–9402. doi:10.1021/jm400386j
- Rolfs, A., Kvietikova, I., Gassmann, M., and Wenger, R. H. (1997). Oxygen regulated transferrin expression is mediated by hypoxia-inducible factor-1. *J. Biol. Chem.* 272, 20055–20062. doi:10.1074/jbc.272.32.20055
- Rosen, M. D., Venkatesan, H., Peltier, H. M., Bembenek, S. D., Kanelakis, K. C., Zhao, L. X., et al. (2010). Benzimidazole-2-pyrazole HIF prolyl 4-hydroxylase inhibitors as oral erythropoietin secretagogues. ACS Med. Chem. Lett. 1, 526–529. doi:10.1021/ml100198y
- Sanghani, N. S., and Haase, V. H. (2019). Hypoxia-inducible factor activators in renal anemia: current clinical experience. *Adv. Chron. Kidney Dis.* 26, 253–266. doi:10.1053/j.ackd.2019.04.004
- Shepshelovich, D., Rozen-Zvi, B., Avni, T., Gafter, U., and Gafter-Gvili, A. (2016). Intravenous versus oral iron supplementation for the treatment of anemia in CKD: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 68, 677–690. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2016.04.018
- Shuster, J. J. (2011). Review: cochrane handbook for systematic reviews for interventions, Version 5.1.0, published 3/2011. Editors J. P.T. Higgins and S green (Gainesville: Res. Synth. Methods), Vol. 2, 126–130.
- Stanifer, J. W., Muiru, A., Jafar, T. H., and Patel, U. D. (2016). Chronic kidney disease in low- and middle-income countries. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 31, 868–874. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfv466
- Sterne, J. A. C., Savović, J., Page, M. J., Elbers, R. G., Blencowe, N. S., Boutron, I., et al. (2019). RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 366, 14898. doi:10.1136/bmj.14898
- Tacchini, L., Bianchi, L., Bernelli-Zazzera, A., and Cairo, G. (1999). Transferrin receptor induction by hypoxia. HIF-1-mediated transcriptional activation and cell-specific post-transcriptional regulation. J. Biol. Chem. 274, 24142–24146. doi:10.1074/jbc.274.34.24142

- Tsubakihara, Y., Akizawa, T., Nangaku, M., Onoue, T., Yonekawa, T., Matsushita, H., et al. (2020). A 24-week anemia correction study of daprodustat in Japanese dialysis patients. *Ther. Apher. Dial.* 24, 108-114. doi:10.1111/1744-9987.12962
- US Food and Drug Administration (2011). FDA drug safety communication: modified dosing recommendations to improve the safe use of erythropoiesisstimulating agents (ESAs) in chronic kidney disease. Available at: https://www. fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm259639.htm (Accessed May 5, 2020).
- Vaziri, N. D., and Zhou, X. J. (2009). Potential mechanisms of adverse outcomes in trials of anemia correction with erythropoietin in chronic kidney disease. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 24, 1082–1088. doi:10.1093/ ndt/gfn601
- Wilkinson, N., and Pantopoulos, K. (2013). IRP1 regulates erythropoiesis and systemic iron homeostasis by controlling HIF2a mRNA translation. *Blood* 122, 1658–1668. doi:10.1182/blood-2013-03-492454
- Xie, D., Wang, J., Wu, X., and Li, M. (2018). Effect of daprodustat on anemia in patients with chronic kidney disease: a meta-analysis. *Int. Urol. Nephrol.* 50, 2201–2206. doi:10.1007/s11255-018-1940-8
- Yoon, D., Pastore, Y. D., Divoky, V., Liu, E., Mlodnicka, A. E., Rainey, K., et al. (2006). Hypoxia-inducible factor-1 deficiency results in dysregulated erythropoiesis signaling and iron homeostasis in mouse development. *J. Biol. Chem.* 281, 25703–25711. doi:10.1074/jbc.M602329200

- Zhao, S., and Wu, J. (2013). Hypoxia inducible factor stabilization as a novel strategy to treat anemia. *Curr. Med. Chem.* 20, 2697–2711. doi:10.2174/ 0929867311320210006
- Zhong, H., Zhou, T., Li, H., and Zhong, Z. (2018). The role of hypoxia-inducible factor stabilizers in the treatment of anemia in patients with chronic kidney disease. Drug Des. Dev. Ther. 12, 3003–3011. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S175887
- Zumbrennen-Bullough, K., and Babitt, J. L. (2014). The iron cycle in chronic kidney disease (CKD): from genetics and experimental models to CKD patients. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 29, 263–273. doi:10.1093/ndt/gft443

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Zheng, Wang, Yang, Sun, Fu, Wei, Liu and Liu. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.