

**Kidney donation:
update searches and screening
for
Universitätsklinikum Schleswig-Holstein/Campus Kiel**



Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd

December 2021

Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd
Unit 6, Escrick Business Park
Riccall Road
Escrick
York
YO19 6FD
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)1904 727980
Fax: +44 (0)1904 720429
Email: robert@systematic-reviews.com
Website: www.systematic-reviews.com

Pawel Posadzki
Adrian Hernandez
Lisa Stirk
Jos Kleijnen
Robert Wolff

1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

A key aim of the research project “Making SDM a reality” is to inform patients as part of shared decision making (SDM).

Kleijnen Systematic Reviews (KSR) Ltd has prepared an evidence report with a synthesis of the evidence for kidney donation.

2. METHODS

LITERATURE SEARCHES

Literature searches were conducted to identify systematic reviews and evidence-based guidelines about living kidney donation to update the 2019 evidence report.

The search strategies were developed specifically for each database and the keywords adapted according to the configuration of each database. Searches were limited by date range for systematic reviews and guidelines to 2019-2021. Searches were not limited by language or publication status.

Systematic reviews and guidelines

The following systematic review and health technology assessment specific databases were searched:

- Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) (Wiley): Issue 11 of 12, September 2021
- KSR Evidence (Internet) (<https://ksrevidence.com/>): 2019-15.11.21
- Epistemonikos (Internet) (<https://www.epistemonikos.org/>): 2019-15.11.21
- International HTA Database (INAHTA) (<https://database.inahta.org/>): 2019-15.11.21

The following guidelines resources were searched:

- Guidelines International Network (GIN) (Internet) (<https://www.g-i-n.net/home>): up to 2019-16.11.21
- NICE Evidence (Internet) (www.evidence.nhs.uk/): 2019-15.11.21
- NICE Guidance (Internet) (<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance>): 2019-15.11.21
- ECRI Guidelines Trust (Internet) (<https://guidelines.ecri.org/>): 2019-15.11.21
- Trip Database (<https://www.tripdatabase.com/>): 2019-16.11.21
- Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) (www.cadth.ca): 2019-16.11.21

Full details of all search strategies are presented in Appendix 1.

Handling of citations

References identified from the searches were downloaded into EndNote bibliographic management software for further assessment and handling.

Supplementary searches

The bibliographies of included studies and review articles were also checked for additional relevant articles.

Prioritisation

During formal screening of titles and abstracts, studies were subject to a prioritisation process whereby the recency e.g., to most up-to-date clinical practice guidelines (CPG), methodological quality e.g., Cochrane systematic review (CSR), quality of the analyses per outcome (e.g., ratio of RCTs to observational studies), the number of included RCTs, the breadth of the timepoints reported etc. were considered to further prioritise which studies would be used to inform analyses. Studies were categorised into the following three categories: '1' = German, American, European or similar CPG; '2' = CSR or similar quality SR; '3' = potentially lower/other quality SR.

3. RESULTS

The original KSR searches were conducted on February 22, 2018; and of the 2540 references screened, 11 studies were deemed eligible. In the current update, a total of 167 records were retrieved from the electronic literature searches (see Appendix 1). After the removal of duplicate records, 124 titles and abstracts were screened by two reviewers. Twenty-five records were found to be potentially eligible and were longlisted after a consensus. Of those, two were short-listed and included in the analyses (Table 1).^{1, 2} See also Table 2 for an overview of primary studies included in the identified SRs/CPGs.

UPDATE – Concluding Assessment by SHARE TO CARE Evidence Team (26/08/22)

Based on the update searches conducted by KSR Ltd in November 2021, we want to highlight the following aspects: the recently published clinical practice guideline by Breda et al. (2021) aligns with the current version of the decision aid, whereas the meta-analysis conducted by Xiao et al. (2020) suggests no significant differences between robot-assisted donor nephrectomy and laparoscopy in terms of effectiveness and safety (as assumed in the 2019 evidence report).

Conclusion regarding the evidence report: No evidence update required. The present evidence report (September, 2019) remains valid until further notice.

Table 1 Evidence sources

Study/year	Evidence type	Primary studies	Number of studies	Intervention	Comparator	Outcome	Date searched	Conclusions
Breda 2021 ¹	CPG	SR**	25	Transplant [^]	Various	Multiple	April 1, 2020	See section 3 of the CPG
Xiao 2020 ²	SR	RCT,OS	43	Open living donor nephrectomy (LDN)	Laparoscopic LDN (LLDN), hand-assisted LLDN (HALLDN), and robot-assisted	Body mass index, warm ischemia time, estimated blood loss, operation time, donor complications, pain, morphine intake on day 1, length of hospital stay, delayed graft function, acute rejection, and 1-year graft survival	July 22, 2020	“There are no significant differences in donor postoperative complications, recipient delayed graft function, and graft survival among the 4 surgical techniques.”

* = only SRs were extracted
 ** = pertains to studies published after 2015
 ^ = covers Pure or hand-assisted transperitoneal laparoscopy; Pure or hand-assisted retroperitoneal approach; Laparo-Endoscopic Single Site Surgery (LESS); Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery-assisted (NOTES); Laparo-Endoscopic Single Site Surgery and robotic-assisted transperitoneal or retroperitoneal approach
 CGP = clinical practice guideline; GRADE = The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; NICE = National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; OS = observational study; RCT = randomised controlled trial; SR = systematic review.

Table 2 Overview of primary studies included in the identified SRs/CPGs

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
Breda 2021 ¹	SR*	1. Gupta, A., et al. Laparoendoscopic single-site donor nephrectomy (LESS-DN) versus standard laparoscopic donor nephrectomy [Systematic Review]. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 6: 6. 2. Tingle, S.J., et al. Machine perfusion preservation versus static cold storage for deceased donor kidney transplantation. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2019. 3: CD011671. 3. Haller, M.C., et al. Steroid avoidance or withdrawal for kidney transplant recipients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016: CD005632. 4. Hahn, D., et al. Target of rapamycin inhibitors (TOR-I; sirolimus and everolimus) for primary immunosuppression in kidney transplant recipients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2019. 2019: CD004290

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		5. Hill, P., et al. Polyclonal and monoclonal antibodies for induction therapy in kidney transplant recipients. Cochrane Database of Syst Rev, 2017. 2017: CD004759 6. Webster, A.C., et al. Polyclonal and monoclonal antibodies for treating acute rejection episodes in kidney transplant recipients. Cochrane Database of Syst Rev, 2017. 2017: CD004756. 7. Wan, S.S., et al. The Treatment of Antibody-Mediated Rejection in Kidney Transplantation: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Transplantation, 2018. 102: 557. 8. Wolf, S., et al. Infections after kidney transplantation: A comparison of mTOR-Is and CNIs as basic immunosuppressants. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Transpl Infect Dis, 2020. 9. He, L., et al. Efficacy and safety of everolimus plus lowdose calcineurin inhibitor vs. mycophenolate mofetil plus standard-dose calcineurin inhibitor in renal transplant recipients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Nephrol, 2018. 89: 336. 10. Kumar, J., et al. Systematic review on role of mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitors as an alternative to calcineurin inhibitors in renal transplant: Challenges and window to excel. Exp Clin Transplant, 2017. 15: 241. 11. Wolf, S., et al. Effects of mTOR-Is on malignancy and survival following renal transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials with a minimum follow-up of 24 months. PLoS One, 2018. 13: e0194975 12. Kahn, J., et al. Immunosuppression with generic tacrolimus in liver and kidney transplantationsystematic review and meta-analysis on biopsy-proven acute rejection and bioequivalence. Transplant Int, 2020. 33: 356. 13. Saengram, W., et al. Extended release versus immediate release tacrolimus in kidney transplant recipients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Clin Pharmacol, 2018: 1. 14. Xia, T., et al. Risk factors for calcineurin inhibitor nephrotoxicity after renal transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Drug Des Devel Ther, 2018. 12: 417. 15. Sawinski, D., et al. Calcineurin Inhibitor Minimization, Conversion, Withdrawal, and Avoidance Strategies in Renal Transplantation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Am J Transplant, 2016. 16: 2117. 16. Jones-Hughes, T., et al. Immunosuppressive therapy for kidney transplantation in adults: a systematic review and economic model. Health Technol Assess, 2016. 20: 1. 17. Marra, G., et al. Prostate cancer treatment in renal transplant recipients: a systematic review. BJU Int, 2018. 121: 327 18. Hevia, V., et al. Management of Localised Prostate Cancer in Kidney Transplant Patients: A Systematic Review from the EAU Guidelines on Renal Transplantation Panel. Eur Urol Focus, 2018. 4: 153. 19. Hevia, V., et al. Effectiveness and Harms of Using Kidneys with Small Renal Tumors from Deceased or Living Donors as a Source of Renal Transplantation: A Systematic Review. Eur Urol Focus, 2018.

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		20. Boissier, R., et al. The Risk of Tumour Recurrence in Patients Undergoing Renal Transplantation for End-stage Renal Disease after Previous Treatment for a Urological Cancer: A Systematic Review. <i>Eur Urol</i>, 2018. 73: 94. 21. Kortram, K., et al. Perioperative Events and Complications in Minimally Invasive Live Donor Nephrectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2016. 22. Visser, I.J., et al. Timing of Ureteric Stent Removal and Occurrence of Urological Complications after Kidney Transplantation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. <i>J Clin Med</i>, 2019. 8. 23. Wagenaar, S., et al. Minimally Invasive, Laparoscopic, and Robotic-assisted Techniques Versus Open Techniques for Kidney Transplant Recipients: A Systematic Review. <i>Eur Urol</i>, 2017. 72: 205. 24. Martinez Arcos, L., et al. Functional Results of Renal Preservation in Hypothermic Pulsatile Machine Perfusion Versus Cold Preservation: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Clinical Trials. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2018. 50: 24. 25. Creta, M., et al. Donor and Recipient Outcomes following Robotic-Assisted Laparoscopic Living Donor Nephrectomy: A Systematic Review. <i>Biomed Res Int</i>, 2019. 2019: 1729138.
Xiao 2020 ²	RCT,OS	1. Brook NR, Harper SJ, Bagul A et al: Laparoscopic donor nephrectomy yields kidneys with structure and function equivalent to those retrieved by open surgery. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2005; 37(2): 625–26 2. Brook NR, Gibbons N, Nicol DL et al: Open and laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: Activity and outcomes from all Australasian transplant centers. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2010; 89(12): 1482–88 3. Hamidi V, Andersen MH, Oyen O et al: Cost effectiveness of open versus laparoscopic living-donor nephrectomy. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2009; 87(6): 831–38 4. Øyen O, Andersen M, Mathisen L et al: Laparoscopic versus open living-donor nephrectomy: Experiences from a prospective, randomized, single-center study focusing on donor safety. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2005; 79(9): 1236–40 5. Kok NF, Lind MY, Hansson BM et al: Comparison of laparoscopic and mini incision open donor nephrectomy: Single blind, randomised controlled clinical trial. <i>BMJ</i>, 2006; 333(7561): 221 6. Nicholson ML, Kaushik M, Lewis GR et al: Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic versus open donor nephrectomy. <i>Br J Surg</i>, 2010; 97(1): 21–28 7. Nicholson ML, Elwell R, Kaushik M et al: Health-related quality of life after living donor nephrectomy: A randomized controlled trial of laparoscopic versus open nephrectomy. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2011; 91(4): 457–61 8. Simforoosh N, Basiri A, Tabibi A et al: Comparison of laparoscopic and open donor nephrectomy: A randomized controlled trial. <i>BJU Int</i>, 2005; 95(6): 851–55 9. Simforoosh N, Basiri A, Shakhssalim N et al: Long-term graft function in a randomized clinical trial comparing laparoscopic versus open donor nephrectomy. <i>Exp Clin Transplant</i>, 2012; 10(5): 428–32

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		10. Waller JR, Veitch PS, Nicholson ML: Laparoscopic live donor nephrectomy: A comparison with the open operation. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2001; 33(7–8): 3787–88 11. Waller JR, Hiley AL, Mullin EJ et al: Living kidney donation: A comparison of laparoscopic and conventional open operations. <i>Postgrad Med J</i>, 2002; 78(917): 153–57 12. Wolf JS Jr., Merion RM, Leichtman AB et al: Randomized controlled trial of hand-assisted laparoscopic versus open surgical live donor nephrectomy. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2001; 72(2): 284–90 13. Yadav K, Aggarwal S, Guleria S et al: Comparative study of laparoscopic and mini-incision open donor nephrectomy: Have we heard the last word in the debate? <i>Clin Transplant</i>, 2016; 30(3): 328–34 14. Bhattu AS, Ganpule A, Sabnis RB et al: Robot-assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy vs. standard laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: A prospective randomized comparative study. <i>J Endourol</i>, 2015; 29(12): 1334–40 15. Cohen AJ, Williams DS, Bohorquez H et al: Robotic-assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: Decreasing length of stay. <i>Ochsner J</i>, 2015; 15(1): 19–24 16. Geffner S, Klaassen Z, Tichauer M et al: Robotic-assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomies: Early experience and review of the literature. <i>J Robot Surg</i>, 2011; 5(2): 115–20 17. Janki S, Klop KWJ, Hagen SM et al: Robotic surgery rapidly and successfully implemented in a high-volume laparoscopic center on living kidney donation. <i>Int J Med Robot</i>, 2017; 13(2): rcs.1743 18. Liu XS, Narins HW, Maley WR et al: Robotic-assistance does not enhance standard laparoscopic technique for right-sided donor nephrectomy. <i>JSLs</i>, 2012; 16(2): 202–7 19. Luke PP, Aquil S, Alharbi B et al: First Canadian experience with robotic laparoendoscopic single-site vs. standard laparoscopic living-donor nephrectomy: A prospective comparative study. <i>Can Urol Assoc J</i>, 2018; 12(11): E440–46 20. Yang A, Barman N, Chin E et al: Robotic-assisted vs. laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: A retrospective comparison of perioperative course and postoperative outcome after 1 year. <i>J Robot Surg</i>, 2018; 12(2): 343–50 21. Bargman V, Sundaram CP, Bernie J et al: Randomized trial of laparoscopic donor nephrectomy with and without hand assistance. <i>J Endourol</i>, 2006; 20(10): 717–22 22. Branco AW, Kondo W, Branco Filho AJ et al: A comparison of hand-assisted and pure laparoscopic techniques in live donor nephrectomy. <i>Clinics (Sao Paulo)</i>, 2008; 63(6): 795–800 23. Buell JF, Abreu SC, Hanaway MJ et al: Right donor nephrectomy: A comparison of hand-assisted transperitoneal and retroperitoneal laparoscopic approaches. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2004; 77(4): 521–25 24. Choi SW, Kim KS, Kim S et al: Hand-assisted and pure laparoscopic living donor nephrectomy: A matched-cohort comparison over 10 yr at a single institute. <i>Clin Transplant</i>, 2014; 28(11): 1287–93

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		25. Dols LF, Kok NF, d'Ancona FC et al: Randomized controlled trial comparing hand-assisted retroperitoneoscopic versus standard laparoscopic donor nephrectomy. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2014; 97(2): 161–67 26. El-Galley R, Hood N, Young CJ et al: Donor nephrectomy: A comparison of techniques and results of open, hand assisted and full laparoscopic nephrectomy. <i>J Urol</i>, 2004; 171(1): 40–43 27. Gershbein AB, Fuchs GJ: Hand-assisted and conventional laparoscopic live donor nephrectomy: A comparison of two contemporary techniques. <i>J Endourol</i>, 2002; 16(7): 509–13 28. Gjertsen H, Sandberg AK, Wadström J et al: Introduction of hand-assisted retroperitoneoscopic living donor nephrectomy at Karolinska University Hospital Huddinge. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2006; 38(8): 2644–45 29. Greco F, Hamza A, Wagner S et al: Hand-assisted laparoscopic living-donor nephrectomy versus open surgery: Evaluation of surgical trauma and late graft function in 82 patients. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2009; 41(10): 4039–43 30. Hirose T, Hotta K, Iwami D et al: Safety and efficacy of retroperitoneoscopic living donor nephrectomy: Comparison of early complication, donor and recipient outcome with hand-assisted laparoscopic living donor nephrectomy. <i>J Endourol</i>, 2018; 32(12): 1120–24 31. Hofker HS, Nijboer WN, Niesing J et al: A randomized clinical trial of living donor nephrectomy: A plea for a differentiated appraisal of mini-open muscle splitting incision and hand-assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy. <i>Transpl Int</i>, 2012; 25(9): 976–86 32. Klop KW, Kok NF, Dols LF et al: Can right-sided hand-assisted retroperitoneoscopic donor nephrectomy be advocated above standard laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: A randomized pilot study. <i>Transpl Int</i>, 2014; 27(2): 162–69 33. Kocak B, Baker TB, Koffron AJ et al: Laparoscopic living donor nephrectomy: A single-center sequential experience comparing hand-assisted versus standard technique. <i>Urology</i>, 2007; 70(6): 1060–63 34. Lai IR, Yang CY, Yeh CC et al: Hand-assisted versus total laparoscopic live donor nephrectomy: Comparison and technique evolution at a single center in Taiwan. <i>Clin Transplant</i>, 2010; 24(5): E182–87 35. Lucas SM, Liaw A, Mhapsekar R et al: Comparison of donor, and early and late recipient outcomes following hand assisted and laparoscopic donor nephrectomy. <i>J Urol</i>, 2013; 189(2): 618–22 36. Mateo RB, Sher L, Jabbour N et al: Comparison of outcomes in noncomplicated and in higher-risk donors after standard versus hand-assisted laparoscopic nephrectomy. <i>Am Surg</i>, 2003; 69(9): 771–78 37. Minnee RC, Bemelman F, Kox C et al: Comparison of hand-assisted laparoscopic and open donor nephrectomy in living donors. <i>Int J Urol</i>, 2008; 15(3): 206–9 38. Mjøen G, Holdaas H, Pfeffer P et al: Minimally invasive living donor nephrectomy -introduction of hand-assistance. <i>Transpl Int</i>, 2010; 23(10): 1008–14

Study/year	Primary study(ies)	Reference (first author & journal)
		39. Percegon LS, Bignelli AT, Adamy A Jr. et al: Hand-assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: Comparison to pure laparoscopic donor nephrectomy. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2008; 40(3): 687–88 40. Ruiz-Deya G, Cheng S, Palmer E et al: Open donor, laparoscopic donor and hand assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: A comparison of outcomes. <i>J Urol</i>, 2001; 166(4): 1270–73 41. Ruszat R, Sulser T, Dickenmann M et al: Retroperitoneoscopic donor nephrectomy: Donor outcome and complication rate in comparison with three different techniques. <i>World J Urol</i>, 2006; 24(1): 113–17 42. Salazar A, Pelletier R, Yilmaz S et al: Use of a minimally invasive donor nephrectomy program to select technique for live donor nephrectomy. <i>Am J Surg</i>, 2005; 189(5): 558–62 43. Stifelman MD, Hull D, Sosa RE et al: Hand assisted laparoscopic donor nephrectomy: A comparison with the open approach. <i>J Urol</i>, 2001; 166(2): 444–48 44. Sundqvist P, Feuk U, Häggman M et al: Hand-assisted retroperitoneoscopic live donor nephrectomy in comparison to open and laparoscopic procedures: A prospective study on donor morbidity and kidney function. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2004; 78(1): 147–53 45. Ungbhakorn P, Kongchareonsombat W, Leenanupan C et al: Comparative outcomes of open nephrectomy, hand-assisted laparoscopic nephrectomy, and full laparoscopic nephrectomy for living donors. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2012; 44(1): 22–25 46. Velidedeoglu E, Williams N, Brayman KL et al: Comparison of open, laparoscopic, and hand-assisted approaches to live-donor nephrectomy. <i>Transplantation</i>, 2002; 74(2): 169–72 47. Wadström J, Lindström P, Engström BM: Hand-assisted retroperitoneoscopic living donor nephrectomy superior to laparoscopic nephrectomy. <i>Transplant Proc</i>, 2003; 35(2): 782–83
* = only studies published after 2015 were extracted NICE = National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; OS = observational study; RCT = randomised controlled trial; SR = systematic review.		

REFERENCES

- [1] Breda A, Budde K, Figueiredo KA, Lledo Garcia J, Olsburgh J, Regele H, et al. Renal transplantation [Internet]. Arnhem, The Netherlands: European Association of Urology, 2021 [accessed 2.12.21]. Available from: <https://uroweb.org/guideline/renal-transplantation/>
- [2] Xiao Q, Fu B, Song K, Chen S, Li J, Xiao J. Comparison of surgical techniques in living donor nephrectomy: a systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Ann Transplant* 2020;25:e926677.

APPENDIX 1: SEARCH STRATEGIES

Table 3. Systematic reviews and guideline search results

Database	Dates	Results
CDSR	2019-Issue 11 of 12, November 2021	0
KSR Evidence	2019-15.11.21	53
Epistemonikos	2019-15.11.21	45
INAHTA	2019-15.11.21	0
NHS Evidence	2019-15.11.21	25
NICE Guidance	2019-15.11.21	2
GIN	2019-16.11.21	0
ECRI	2019-15.11.21	14
TRIP	2019-16.11.21	28
CADTH	2019-16.11.21	0
Total		167
Total after internal de-duplication		124
Total after deduplication with original ENL		115

Search strategies

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Wiley): 2019 - Issue 11 of 12, November 2021

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 0

```
#1      MeSH descriptor: [Kidney Transplantation] explode all trees      3648
#2      MeSH descriptor: [Kidney] explode all trees      4029
#3      MeSH descriptor: [Nephrectomy] explode all trees      335
#4      MeSH descriptor: [Living Donors] explode all trees      355
#5      (#1 or #2 or #3) and #4      244
#6      ((Living or live or alive) NEAR/2 (donor* or organ* or donat* or give* or giving or
gift*)):ti,ab,kw      1821
#7      (kidney* or renal or nephrectomy or nefrectomy):ti,ab,kw      84842
#8      #6 and #7      1209
#9      ((Kidney* or renal or nephrectomy or nefrectomy) NEAR/2 (donor* or donat* or
give)):ti,ab,kw      1413
#10     (Living or live or alive):ti,ab,kw      49904
#11     #9 and #10      810
#12     ("kidney exchange*" or "kidney swap*" or "kidney paired donation*" or "kidney paired
exchange*"):ti,ab,kw      6
#13     #5 or #8 or #11 or #12 with Cochrane Library publication date Between Jan 2019 and Nov
2021, in Cochrane Reviews, Cochrane Protocols      0
```

KSR Evidence: 2019-15.11.21

<https://ksrevidence.com/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 53

- 1 (living or live or alive) and (donor* or organ* or donat* or give* or giving* or gift*) and (kidney* or renal or nephrectomy or nefrectomy) in All text 105 results
 - 2 "kidney exchange*" or "kidney swap*" or "kidney paired donation*" or "kidney paired exchange*" in All text 2 results
 - 3 #1 or #2 in All text 53 results
- Filtered by: PUBLICATION DATE 2022, 2021, 2020, 2019

Epistemonikos: 2019-15.11.21

<https://www.epistemonikos.org/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 45

(title:((title:((Living OR live OR alive) AND (donor* OR organ* OR donat* OR give* OR giving OR gift*) AND (kidney* OR renal OR nephrectomy OR nefrectomy)) OR abstract:((Living OR live OR alive) AND (donor* OR organ* OR donat* OR give* OR giving OR gift*) AND (kidney* OR renal OR nephrectomy OR nefrectomy))) OR (title:("kidney exchange*" OR "kidney swap*" OR "kidney paired donation*" OR "kidney paired exchange*")) OR abstract:("kidney exchange*" OR "kidney swap*" OR "kidney paired donation*" OR "kidney paired exchange*")))) OR abstract:((title:((Living OR live OR alive) AND (donor* OR organ* OR donat* OR give* OR giving OR gift*) AND (kidney* OR renal OR nephrectomy OR nefrectomy)) OR abstract:((Living OR live OR alive) AND (donor* OR organ* OR donat* OR give* OR giving OR gift*) AND (kidney* OR renal OR nephrectomy OR nefrectomy))) OR (title:("kidney exchange*" OR "kidney swap*" OR "kidney paired donation*" OR "kidney paired exchange*")) OR abstract:("kidney exchange*" OR "kidney swap*" OR "kidney paired donation*" OR "kidney paired exchange*"))))

Limits:

Publication year: 2019-2021

Publication type: Systematic review

Cochrane review: No

International HTA Database (Internet): 2019 – 15.11.21

<https://database.inahta.org/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 0

- | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--------------------|
| 9 | #8 OR #7 OR #6 | 10 | (0 hits 2019-2021) |
| 8 | ("kidney exchange*" or "kidney swap*" or "kidney paired donation*" or "kidney paired exchange") [Title] | 0 | |
| 7 | (Living or live or alive) [Title] AND (donor* or organ* or donat* or give* or giving or gift*) [Title] AND (kidney* or renal or nephrectomy or nefrectomy) [Title] | 9 | |
| 6 | #5 AND #4 | 10 | |
| 5 | #3 OR #2 OR #1 | 300 | |
| 4 | "Living Donors" [mhe] | 27 | |
| 3 | "Nephrectomy" [mhe] | 11 | |
| 2 | "Kidney" [mhe] | 298 | |

1 "Kidney Transplantation"[mhe] 57

Limits:

Publication date: 2019-2021

NHS Evidence: 2019-15.11.21

<https://www.evidence.nhs.uk/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 25

Search terms	Hits
"live kidney transplant"	1
"live kidney transplantation"	0
"live donor" "kidney transplantation"	3
"live organ donation" kidney	0
Live "kidney donation"	3
Living "kidney donation"	4
Living "kidney donor"	2
Live "kidney donor"	3
"living donor" kidney	20
"living donor" renal	18
"living donor" nephrectomy	6
"living donation" nephrectomy	2
"living donation" renal	5
"living donation" kidney	6
"kidney exchange"	2
"kidney swap"	0
"kidney paired donation"	1
"living organ donation" kidney	5
Total	81
Total after duplicates removed	25

Limits:

Evidence type – Guidance and Policy

Publication date – 2019-2021

NICE Guidance (Internet): 2019-15.11.21

<https://www.nice.org.uk/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 2

Search filtered to Guidance, 2012 - 2019	Hits
"living donors" kidney	1
"kidney transplantation"	1
"living donation" kidney	0
"living donor" renal	1
Nephrectomy	0
Total	3
Total after de-duplication	2

Limits:

Type – Guidance

Status - Published

Last updated – 2019-2021

International Guideline Library (GIN) (Internet): 2019-16.11.21

<https://g-i-n.net/>

Date searched: 16.11.21

Records found: 0

Search terms	Hits
donor	0
donation	0
transplant	0
transplantation	0
Total	0

Limits:

Publication year - 2019-2021

Guideline publication status - published

ECRI Guidelines Trust (Internet): 2019-15.11.21

<https://guidelines.ecri.org/>

Date searched: 15.11.21

Records found: 14

Search terms	Hits
"kidney transplantation"	12
"living donor"	3
"living kidney donor"	1
"living donation" nephrectomy	0
"live kidney donation"	0
"live kidney donor"	1
"kidney exchange"	2
"kidney swap"	0
"kidney paired"	0
"Live renal donation"	0
"living renal donor"	0
"living organ donor"	2
"living renal donation"	0
"Living donor organ transplantation"	2
Total	23
Total after duplications removed	14

Limits:

Publication year – 2019-2021

Trip Database (Internet): 2019-16.11.21

<https://www.tripdatabase.com/>

Date searched 16.11.21

Records found: 28

Search terms	Hits
"living kidney"	7
"living renal"	7
"living donor"	27
"living donation"	3

"live donor"	27
"live donation"	3
"live kidney"	7
"live renal"	7
"kidney exchange"	0
"kidney swap"	0
"kidney paired"	0
Total	88
Total after deduplication	28

Limits:

Publication date: 2019-2021

CADTH (Internet): 2019-16.11.21

<https://www.cadth.ca/>

Date searched 16.11.21

Records found: 0

Search terms [contains all words]	Hits
kidney transplantation	0
living donor	0
living donation	0
live donor	0
live donation	0
kidney exchange	0
kidney swap	0
kidney paired	0
Total	0

Limits:

Project line: Health Technology Review

Last updated: 2019-2021