

**Supplementary Table 1.**

Case-control and cohort studies addressing the relationship between HBV and CKD  
(outcome: frequency of end-stage renal disease or chronic kidney disease) (clinical characteristics)

\*Numbers are reported as HBsAg positive/HBsAg negative patients, respectively

\*\*Numbers are reported as untreated/uninfected patients, respectively

	Follow-up, mo	Anti-HCV positive, <i>n</i>	HBsAg rate, <i>n</i>	Age, yrs
<b>Case-control studies</b>				
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	6.5	0	20.0% (17,796/88,980)	NA
Su S, <i>et al.</i>	NA	1.6% (169/10,463)	3.6% (371/10,463)	59.8 $\pm$ 1/54 $\pm$ 1*
Kim S, <i>et al.</i>	0	0	20.0% (10,048/50,240)	49.5 $\pm$ 9/49.4 $\pm$ 9
Nguyen M, <i>et al.</i>	NA	2.8% (1,221/43,482)	26.5% (44,026/165,594)	NA
<b>Cohort studies</b>				
Lo M, <i>et al.</i>	1.99 (0.06-4.12)	NA	15.4% (15/97)	62.3 $\pm$ 6.4
Cheng A, <i>et al.</i>	3.5 yrs	NA	10.1% (286/2,838)	59.7 $\pm$ 12.9
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	6.5 yrs	0	20.0% (17,758/88,790)	NA
Lee J, <i>et al.</i>	2.2 $\pm$ 1.6	6.5% (317/4,185)	7.4% (309/4,185)	61.9 $\pm$ 14.8
Kong X, <i>et al.</i>	5 yrs	0	8.1% (352/4,329)	46.2 $\pm$ 13.7
Hwang J, <i>et al.</i>	3.9 $\pm$ 3.06	50.0% (9,787/19,574)	5.4% (1,072/19,574)	55.7 $\pm$ 1
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	8.9 $\pm$ 3.9/7.4 $\pm$ 4.5**	0	20.0% (2,916/14,580)	48.1 $\pm$ 1/47.7 $\pm$ 1**
Si J, <i>et al.</i>	9.1 yrs	NA	3.1% (14,871/469,459)	48.6/51.1*
Hong Y, <i>et al.</i>	5.6 yrs	0	3.9% (11,209/299,913)	37.3 $\pm$ 7.9
Fang J, <i>et al.</i>	25 (2-61) mo	0	9.0% (16/177)	32 (19-62)
Tartof S, <i>et al.</i>	3.8 $\pm$ 2.9	1.0% (1,534/152,708)	0.3% (483/153,577)	72 (64-80)

**Supplementary Table 2.**

Case-control and cohort studies addressing the relationship between HBV and CKD  
(outcome: frequency of end-stage renal disease or chronic kidney disease) (clinical characteristics)

	<b>Male, <i>n</i></b>	<b>Diabetes mellitus, <i>n</i></b>	<b>Hypertension, <i>n</i></b>	<b>Cirrhosis, <i>N</i></b>
<b>Case-control studies</b>				
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	58.5% (52,140/88,980)	7.7% (6,841/88,980)	12.9% (11,531/88,980)	1.2% (1,104/88,980)
Su S, <i>et al.</i>	37.2% (3,893/10,463)	30.4% (3,182/10,463)	55.4% (5,656/10,463)	NA
Kim S, <i>et al.</i>	64.4% (32,355/50,240)	NA	NA	NA
Nguyen M, <i>et al.</i>	NA	15.8% (6,873/43,482)	36.1% (15,740/43,482)	NA
<b>Cohort studies</b>				
Lo M, <i>et al.</i>	63.4% (59/93)	100.0% (97/97)	NA	NA
Cheng A, <i>et al.</i>	41.1% (1,169/2,838)	100.0% (2,838/2,838)	NA	NA
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	58.5% (51,990/88,790)	7.9% (7,062/88,790)	13.5% (12,035/88,790)	1.2% (1,100/88,790)
Lee J, <i>et al.</i>	58.4% (2,447/4,185)	39.9% (1,673/4,185)	61.0% (2,553/4,185)	4.5% (177/4,185)
Kong X, <i>et al.</i>	67.2% (2,907/4,329)	10.5% (454/4,329)	21.4% (927/4,329)	NA
Hwang J, <i>et al.</i>	51.3% (10,044/19,574)	100.0% (19,574/19,574)	39.1% (7,659/19,574)	5.7% (1,114/19,574)
Chen Y, <i>et al.</i>	58.1% (8,475/14,580)	26.0% (3,798/14,580)	29.5% (4,304/14,580)	4.1% (611/14,580)
Si J, <i>et al.</i>	40.9% (192,445/469,459)	5.4% (25,395/469,459)	33.8% (158,908/469,459)	1.2% (5,682/469,459)
Hong Y, <i>et al.</i>	56.7% (170,050/299,913)	2.4% (7,198/299,913)	11.7% (35,089/299,913)	NA
Fang J, <i>et al.</i>	17.5% (31/177)	NA	NA	NA
Tartof S, <i>et al.</i>	45.9% (70,527/153,577)	31.7% (48,735/153,577)	61.1% (93,885/153,577)	1.2% (1,948/153,577)