| Biomarker | Biomarker Name | Assay |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|
| KIM-1 | Kidney injury molecule-1 | Duoset DY1750, R & D Systems Inc., Minneapolis, |
| | | MN |
| IL-18 | Interleukin-18 | Medical & Biological Laboratories Co., Nagoya, |
| | | Japan |
| MCP-1 | Monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 | Meso Scale Diagnostics, Gaithersberg, MD |
| UMOD | Uromodulin | Meso Scale Diagnostics, Gaithersberg, MD |
| NGAL | Neutrophil gelatinase-associated | NGAL ELISA Kit 036; Bioporto, Grusbakken, |
| | lipocalin | Denmark |
| YKL-40 | Chitinase 3-like 1 | Meso Scale Diagnostics, Gaithersberg, MD |
| Albumin | Albumin | Siemens ProSpec analyzer (Siemens GMBH) |
| Creatinine | Creatinine | Roche ModP Chemistry Analyzer (Roche |
| | | Diagnostics) before January 2014 |
| | | Cobas 6000 Chemistry Analyzer after January |
| | | 2014 |
| Osmolarity | Osmolarity | Advanced Instruments Micro-Osmometer Model |
| | | 3320 |

Supplemental Table S1. Biomarker Measurement Details

| | A | КІ | No AKI | | |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--|
| | No CKD (n=463) | CKD (n=306) | No CKD (n=463) | CKD (n=306) | |
| Baseline eGFR | 83.8 (17.8) | 42 (12.1) | 86.1 (16.1) | 46 (10.2) | |
| eGFR at 3 months | 79.8 (22.5) | 44.3 (17.3) | 86.9 (17.9) | 51.2 (14.7) | |
| Number (%) of CKD incidence or progression | 137 (30%) | 70 (23%) | 66 (14%) | 27 (9%) | |
| eGFR decline from baseline to events for participants with the outcome | -16.3 (10.3) | -32 (15.1) | -29.1 (10.7) | -20 (12.4) | |
| eGFR decline from baseline to censoring for participants without the outcome | -3.9 (14.5) | -0.7 (13.8) | -3.1 (11.7) | 1.7 (12.9) | |

Supplemental Table S2. Kidney Function at Different Study Timepoints in Participants Stratified by AKI and Baseline CKD Status

eGFR values and changes are presented as mean (SD).

AKI and CKD are defined at hospitalization and as baseline, respectively.

Supplemental Table S3. Predictive performance of biomarkers for 3-year composite CKD outcomes using different approaches to account for urine concentration.

| | | Hospitalization | | | | 3 Months after Discharge | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|
| | | Ał | (I | No | AKI | AKI | | No AKI | |
| Biomarker | model | C-statistics | p value | C-statistics | p value | C-statistics | p value | C-statistics | p value |
| KIM-1 | Biomarker Alone | 0.51 | Reference | 0.54 | Reference | 0.61 | Reference | 0.52 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.57 | <0.001 | 0.51 | 0.73 | 0.65 | 0.029 | 0.57 | 0.18 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.55 | < 0.001 | 0.51 | 0.79 | 0.66 | <0.001 | 0.57 | 0.019 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.6 | 0.016 | 0.61 | 0.095 | 0.65 | 0.065 | 0.57 | 0.45 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.63 | < 0.001 | 0.64 | 0.033 | 0.68 | 0.008 | 0.61 | 0.13 |
| IL-18 | Biomarker Alone | 0.52 | Reference | 0.55 | Reference | 0.59 | Reference | 0.51 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.55 | 0.015 | 0.52 | 0.82 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.54 | 0.74 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.54 | 0.001 | 0.5 | 0.68 | 0.63 | 0.001 | 0.52 | 0.9 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.59 | 0.047 | 0.59 | 0.32 | 0.61 | 0.51 | 0.54 | 0.6 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.62 | 0.002 | 0.63 | 0.083 | 0.65 | 0.013 | 0.6 | 0.29 |
| MCP-1 | Biomarker Alone | 0.55 | Reference | 0.57 | Reference | 0.62 | Reference | 0.54 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.6 | 0.001 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.64 | 0.13 | 0.57 | 0.35 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.58 | <0.001 | 0.48 | 0.33 | 0.65 | 0 | 0.58 | 0.051 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.61 | 0.039 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 0.65 | 0.16 | 0.58 | 0.54 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.63 | 0.007 | 0.63 | 0.12 | 0.68 | 0.006 | 0.63 | 0.15 |
| Albumin | Biomarker Alone | 0.61 | Reference | 0.5 | Reference | 0.67 | Reference | 0.56 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.63 | 0.091 | 0.46 | 0.7 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.54 | 0.5 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.62 | 0.1 | 0.53 | 0.066 | 0.69 | 0.046 | 0.56 | 0.98 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.64 | 0.1 | 0.59 | 0.14 | 0.68 | 0.8 | 0.53 | 0.62 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.64 | 0.071 | 0.63 | 0.041 | 0.7 | 0.18 | 0.57 | 0.74 |
| NGAL | Biomarker Alone | 0.57 | Reference | 0.54 | Reference | 0.64 | Reference | 0.58 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.59 | 0.086 | 0.53 | 0.6 | 0.63 | 0.76 | 0.59 | 0.87 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.59 | 0.004 | 0.51 | 0.12 | 0.66 | 0.03 | 0.6 | 0.22 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.61 | 0.081 | 0.58 | 0.3 | 0.64 | 0.9 | 0.59 | 0.8 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.63 | 0.008 | 0.63 | 0.13 | 0.66 | 0.17 | 0.62 | 0.44 |
| YKL-40 | Biomarker Alone | 0.59 | Reference | 0.54 | Reference | 0.65 | Reference | 0.62 | Reference |

| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.6 | 0.042 | 0.53 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.7 | 0.63 | 0.72 |
|------|----------------------------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.6 | 0.008 | 0.53 | 0.27 | 0.67 | 0.025 | 0.65 | 0.2 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.62 | 0.12 | 0.59 | 0.49 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.87 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.63 | 0.021 | 0.63 | 0.18 | 0.67 | 0.2 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| UMOD | Biomarker Alone | 0.58 | Reference | 0.57 | Reference | 0.63 | Reference | 0.57 | Reference |
| | Biomarker-Cr Ratio | 0.45 | 0.011 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.59 | 0.048 | 0.53 | 0.45 |
| | Biomarker-Osm Ratio | 0.45 | 0.017 | 0.51 | 0.009 | 0.57 | 0 | 0.53 | 0.18 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Cr | 0.59 | 0.32 | 0.6 | 0.51 | 0.63 | 0.86 | 0.57 | 0.76 |
| | Biomarker Adjusted for Osm | 0.63 | 0.004 | 0.65 | 0.14 | 0.65 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.43 |

Supplemental Figure S1A. Hazard ratio of urine IL-18, MCP-1, NGAL and YKL-40 collected during hospitalization in AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to account for urine concentration.



Supplemental Figure S1B. Hazard ratio of urine IL-18, MCP-1, NGAL and YKL-40 collected during hospitalization in non- AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to account for urine concentration.



* p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when urine creatinine or osmolarity is accounted for versus biomarker alone.

p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when using urine creatinine versus urine osmolarity

All urine measurements were converted to log-2 base normally distributed Z score. HR therefore represents change per 1 standard deviation (SD) increase of each biomarker on its log-2 scale.

IL-18: interleukin-18; MCP-1: monocyte chemoattractant protein-1; NGAL: neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL); YKL-40: chitinase 3-like 1

Supplemental Figure S2A. Hazard ratio of urine biomarkers collected 3 months after discharge in AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to control for urine concentration.



Supplemental Figure S2B. Hazard ratio of urine biomarkers collected 3 months after discharge in non-AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to control for urine concentration.



* p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when urine creatinine or osmolarity is accounted for versus biomarker alone.

The different between biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when using urine creatinine versus urine osmolarity were insignificant in any models (p value greater than 0.01 for all comparisons)

All urine measurements were converted to log-2 base normally distributed Z score. HR therefore represents change per 1 standard deviation (SD) increase of UCr or UOsm on their log-2 scale.

IL-18: interleukin-18; KIM-1: kidney injury molecule-1; MCP-1: monocyte chemoattractant protein-1; NGAL: neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL); UMOD: uromodulin; YKL-40: chitinase 3-like 1

Supplemental Figure S3A. Hazard ratio of urine biomarkers collected during in subgroup of stage 2-3 AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to control for urine concentration



* p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when urine creatinine or osmolarity is accounted for versus biomarker alone.

p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when using urine creatinine versus urine osmolarity

All urine measurements were converted to log-2 base normally distributed Z score. HR therefore represents change per 1 standard deviation (SD) increase of UCr or UOsm on their log-2 scale.

IL-18: interleukin-18; KIM-1: kidney injury molecule-1; MCP-1: monocyte chemoattractant protein-1; NGAL: neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL); UMOD: uromodulin; YKL-40: chitinase 3-like 1

Supplemental Figure S3B. Hazard ratio of urine biomarkers collected three months after discharge in subgroup of stage 2-3 AKI patients with composite CKD outcome using different approaches to control for urine concentration



* p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when urine creatinine or osmolarity is accounted for versus biomarker alone.

p value less than 0.01 comparing biomarker's association with composite CKD outcome when using urine creatinine versus urine osmolarity

All urine measurements were converted to log-2 base normally distributed Z score. HR therefore represents change per 1 standard deviation (SD) increase of UCr or UOsm on their log-2 scale.

IL-18: interleukin-18; KIM-1: kidney injury molecule-1; MCP-1: monocyte chemoattractant protein-1; NGAL: neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL); UMOD: uromodulin; YKL-40: chitinase 3-like 1

Supplemental Figure S4. Direct Acyclic Graph Depicting the Conceptual Framework of Urine Creatinine and Urine Osmolarity as Confounders rather than Surrogates for Urine Concentration in Investigating Etiological Relationship between Urine Biomarkers and Outcomes.



*Urine concentration may be affected by the outcome (such as chronic kidney disease progression)

Abbreviations: UCr: urine creatinine; UOsm: urine osmolarity

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

| | Item No | Recommendation | Page No |
|------------------------|------------|---|------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the | |
| | | abstract | |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was | 3 |
| | | done and what was found | |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being | 3, 5 |
| | | reported | |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses | 6 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 6-7 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of | 6-7 |
| | | recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | |
| Participants | 6 | (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of | 7 |
| | | participants. Describe methods of follow-up | |
| | | (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and | |
| | | unexposed | |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and | 7-8 |
| | | effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | |
| Data sources/ | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of | 8 |
| measurement | | assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if | |
| | | there is more than one group | _ |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | 7 |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 7 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, | 8-9 |
| | | describe which groupings were chosen and why | |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for | |
| | | confounding | 0.10 |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | 8-10 |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | |
| | | (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed | |
| | | (<u>e</u>) Describe any sensitivity analyses | |
| Results | | | 1.0 |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially | 10 |
| | | eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, | |
| | | completing follow-up, and analysed | |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | 10 |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) | 10 |
| | | and information on exposures and potential confounders | |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | |
| | | (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 10 |
| Outcome data | 15* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time | 10 |

| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into checkute risk for a | 10- 14 | | |
|-------------------|----|--|-----------|--|--|
| | | meaningful time period | | | |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | 13 | | |
| Discussion | | | | | |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 14- 15 | | |
| Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias | 19- 20 | | |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 20- 21 | | |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 20 | | |
| Other information | | | | | |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 21- 22 | | |

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at http://www.strobe-statement.org.