

# 1 **Evaluation of ultrasonic renal volume in relation to body size in patients with** 2 **hypertension: Comparative cross-sectional study**

3 Elias Kedir (MD)<sup>1</sup>, Melkamu Berhane (MD)<sup>2</sup>, Tilahun Alemayehu Nigatu (M.Sc)<sup>3</sup>, Almaz  
4 Ayalew (M.Sc)<sup>3</sup>, Mesfin Zewdu (M.Sc)<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Diagnostic Radiology, Institute of Health, Jimma University, Jimma,  
7 Ethiopia.

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Institute of Health, Jimma University, Jimma,  
9 Ethiopia.

10 <sup>3</sup>Department of Biomedical Sciences, Institute of Health, Jimma University, Jimma,  
11 Ethiopia.

12

13

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [tilalemnig2012@gmail.com](mailto:tilalemnig2012@gmail.com) (TAN)

14

## 15 **Abstract**

### 16 **Introduction**

17 Estimation of renal size is useful parameter in the diagnosis of abnormal structural change on the  
18 kidneys due to the adverse effects of chronic diseases like hypertension. This study evaluated  
19 renal volume by ultrasound in relation to body size parameters, notably BMI and body surface  
20 area in hypertensive and non-hypertensive individuals.

### 21 **Methods**

22 A hospital-based comparative cross-sectional study was conducted from February to September  
23 2018 at the Radiology department of the Jimma University Medical Center (JUMC). The study  
24 included consecutively selected samples of ambulatory hypertensive patients and non-  
25 hypertensive controls recruited consecutively on voluntary basis. After providing verbal  
26 informed consent, each subject underwent abdominal ultrasound examination; length, width and  
27 thickness of both kidneys were measured and used for estimation of renal volume. The statistical  
28 evaluation included independent samples t-tests for mean differences with regard to ultrasonic  
29 renal measurements between hypertensive and non-hypertensive groups,

### 30 **Results**

31 A total of 145 adults aged 16 - 80 years (mean  $\pm$ SD= 44  $\pm$ 17) participated in the study. In the  
32 hypertensive group, renal volume ranged 36.1 - 201.6 (mean=97.7) cm<sup>3</sup> for the right kidney and  
33 39.6 - 189.5 (mean=104.4) cm<sup>3</sup> for the left kidney, whilst it was 61.8 - 159.5 (mean=101.1) cm<sup>3</sup>  
34 for the right and 35.8 - 253.7 (mean=111.8) cm<sup>3</sup> for the left kidney among the control group.  
35 Both kidneys were slightly smaller in the hypertensive group as compared to the controls. Right  
36 renal volume to BSA ratio ranged from 23.5 - 100.6 (mean=58.2) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> in hypertensive group,  
37 while it was between 37.0 and 96.1 (mean=62.6) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> among the control group (p=0.076).  
38 Left renal volume to BSA of the patients which ranged from 24.1 - 97.1 (mean=62.2) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>  
39 was significantly (p=0.012) lower than that of the non-hypertensive group, which was between  
40 23.6 and 132.5 (mean=69.3) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>.

#### 41 **Conclusion**

42 The results of this study have shown slightly smaller bilateral renal volume among hypertensive  
43 patients as compared the controls. We recommend large scale research in other parts of Ethiopia  
44 so that nationally representative data can be obtained.

45 **Keywords:** Ultrasonography, renal volume, hypertension, BMI, BSA, Ethiopia

#### 46 **Introduction**

47 Hypertension, defined as persistently elevated blood pressure (BP), is a multifactorial non-  
48 communicable disorder that substantially contributes to the global burden of diseases.  
49 Hypertension is a well-known modifiable risk factor for several illnesses including renal failure  
50 [1], cardiovascular diseases [2] and premature death worldwide [3]. In the recent past, the  
51 prevalence and absolute burden of hypertension has raised globally, especially in low- and  
52 middle-income countries (LMICs), including Ethiopia [4, 5].

53 The kidneys are among the organs commonly affected by hypertension, hence critical targets of  
54 hypertension-induced organ damage [6]. Understanding the early stages of the interaction  
55 between blood weight and renal work is basically vital for prevention of hypertension and  
56 associated renal malady. A distant better understanding of the impacts of basic hypertension on

57 renal work may offer assistance for early location of the illness, follow-up, and to prompt  
58 treatment on evidence base [7].

59 Estimation of renal size could be a crucial step in the evaluation and treatment of long standing  
60 illnesses like hypertension [8]. Renal size estimation most commonly incorporates renal length,  
61 volume and cortical thickness [9]. For ordinary hone, renal length estimation is more solid  
62 because of its simple reproducibility, but most precise is the renal volume estimation [10].  
63 Additionally, the foremost exact estimation of renal state is the whole renal volume related with  
64 height, weight, and added up to body surface area (BSA) [11]. In clinical practice, BSA  
65 approximates total surface area of the body and is used to calculate drug dosages and as an  
66 indicator of the health status of individuals [12].

67 Demonstrative imaging modalities and strategies such as ordinary radiography (CR), computed  
68 tomography (CT), attractive reverberation imaging (MRI), atomic medication (NM), and  
69 ultrasonography among others have been utilized for renal assessment, particularly in terms of  
70 estimate and work, but no single strategy is generally acknowledged for renal estimate appraisal  
71 [13–15]. Even though different imaging modalities are available to be used for renal volume  
72 assessment, ultrasonography (US) has replaced standard radiography and has become the  
73 standard imaging modality in the investigation of renal diseases due to its noninvasive nature and  
74 easy availability [7]. Additionally, it offers excellent anatomical details, doesn't require special  
75 patient preparation and does not expose patients to radiation or contrast agents.

76 Different studies have shown that anthropometric estimations like height, weight, and body mass  
77 index (BMI) relate exceptionally well with renal length and volume [16, 17]. Higher BMI is  
78 associated with increased risk of several non-communicable diseases like diabetes mellitus and

79 hypertension, which if not treated timely and properly can lead to end-stage renal disease  
80 (ESRD) [18].

81 Kidney size measurements have traditionally been used as predictors of chronic kidney diseases;  
82 however, these predictions are often based on an incomplete knowledge of accuracy and  
83 evolving evidence of effectiveness. Kidney length may not be an absolute predictor of overall  
84 kidney size, perhaps due in part to the fact that it measures only a single renal dimension, which  
85 is subject to inconsistency pertaining considerably to the varied shape of the kidneys within or  
86 between individuals. Renal volume (RV) rather, has been emphasized by several authors as a  
87 true predictor of kidney size in states of good health and disease [19, 20].

88 There is no study done in Ethiopia on renal size measurements as determinant parameters either  
89 in healthy people or in those with conditions such as hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and renal  
90 disease. Therefore, this study was done with the objectives of evaluating renal volume in patients  
91 with hypertension and correlate it with anthropometric parameters as compared to non-  
92 hypertensive controls.

## 93 **Materials and methods**

### 94 **Study area, design and subjects**

95 A hospital-based comparative cross-sectional study was conducted from February to September  
96 2018 at the Radiology Department of the Jimma University Medical Center (JUMC). The study  
97 participants were consecutively selected samples of hypertensive patients and non-hypertensive  
98 controls. The cases were patients with hypertension who have been on follow up at JUMC  
99 chronic illnesses follow up clinic, whereas the controls were apparently healthy hospital visitors

100 who have no known history of renal diseases, hypertension or diabetes. After obtaining informed  
101 verbal consent, each study subject underwent abdominal ultrasound of both kidneys.

### 102 **Participants' inclusion and exclusion criteria**

103 Inclusion criteria for the hypertensive group were being 16 years or older and on regular follow-  
104 up for  $\geq 1$  year for established hypertension with no history of renal disease whereas for the  
105 controls, it was age  $\geq 16$  years and no any history of hypertension, diabetes mellitus or renal  
106 diseases. Additionally, presence of bilateral, grossly symmetric kidneys on US verified  
107 fulfilment of inclusion criteria of the subjects [21]. People with chronic renal disease, pregnant  
108 women and women who have given birth in the last 12 months were excluded. Further, subjects  
109 with ultrasonic evidences of abnormal kidneys such as horseshoe or ectopic kidney and/or those  
110 with renal cysts were also excluded from final analysis.

### 111 **Ultrasonic examination and somatic measurements**

112 Participants in both study groups underwent abdominal US examination with the same US  
113 machine (General Electric Health care LOGIQ P6, B-Model) using the 4 MHz curvilinear probe.  
114 Each subject had scanning of both kidneys in supine and decubitus positions in the longitudinal  
115 and transverse planes for renal length, width and antero-posterior (AP) diameter (thickness) in  
116 centimeters. The liver and spleen were used as acoustic windows for the right and left kidneys  
117 respectively [22]. No prior preparations of study subjects were required before examination.  
118 Renal length (RL) was taken on a coronal scan as the longest distance between the superior and  
119 inferior poles of the kidney using an electronic caliper. The AP diameter (thickness) was  
120 measured on a sagittal scan as the maximum distance between the anterior and posterior walls at  
121 the mid-third of the organ. The renal width (W) was measured on a transverse scan as the longest

122 distance between the medial and lateral borders away from the hilum of the kidney. These three  
123 measurements were later used to estimate overall renal volume (RV) of the ipsilateral kidney.

124 Participants were first interviewed for completed age, sex and duration of hypertension in years  
125 since diagnosis and history of kidney problems. The height (H) in meters and weight (W) in  
126 kilograms of the subjects were measured while standing erect against a ZT World Health  
127 Organization (WHO) weighing scale, and used for BMI and BSA calculations.

### 128 **Outcome measures**

129 The main outcome variable in this study was bilateral renal volume (RV), which was derived  
130 from the three absolute ultrasonic renal dimensions measured. On each side, renal volume was  
131 computed electronically on statistical software using an ellipsoid formula  $RV = RL \times W \times AP \times$   
132  $0.523$  as originally described by Hricak and Lieto (1983) [23]. Other variables include BMI and  
133 BSA, both derived from body weight (W) and height (H). BMI was estimated as a ratio of  
134 weight in kg to height in meter squared. Body surface area was computed using the Mosteller  
135 formula that takes the square root of the height (m) multiplied by the weight (kg) divided by 36  
136 [12, 24]. To account for general body physique variation among individuals with respect to renal  
137 size, renal volume to surface area ratio (RV/BSA) was also computed arithmetically as additional  
138 study variable.

### 139 **Data processing and analysis**

140 Collected data were checked for completeness and error, then coded and entered into Statistical  
141 Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for windows version 23 [25]. Preliminary inspection of the  
142 numerical data included minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation (SD), median and  
143 interquartile range (IQR). The statistical evaluation included independent samples t-tests for

144 mean differences with regard to age, somatic and ultrasonic renal measurements between  
145 hypertensive and non-hypertensive groups, as well as between male and female subjects. The  
146 renal sizes on the two sides of the body were also compared with pair-sample t-tests. Bivariate  
147 correlations of the renal volume with age, body weight, height, BMI and BSA were assessed  
148 using Pearson's Product correlation coefficient ( $r$ ), separately for the two study groups. All  
149 statistical tests were two-tailed and considered significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

## 150 **Ethical approval**

151 Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethical Review Board of Jimma University, Institute of  
152 Health. Formal permission was also sought from the hospital administration and radiology  
153 department. Before enrolment, participants were informed about the study purpose and requested  
154 for their interest to participate in the study. Those who agreed and provided voluntary verbal  
155 consent were included in the study.

## 156 **Results**

### 157 **Main characteristics of the study participants**

158 A total of 145 adults (74 males and 71 females) participated in the study; 85 hypertensive  
159 outpatients (40 males and 45 female), and 60 (34 male and 26 female) non-hypertensive controls.  
160 Self-reported duration of hypertension since diagnosis ranged from 1 to 24 completed years, with  
161 a mean duration of 7. The age of the participants ranged from 16 - 80 with a mean ( $\pm$ SD) of 44  
162 ( $\pm 17$ ) years. The mean BMI and BSA were 22.3 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (range: 14.4 - 37.3) and 1.65 m<sup>2</sup> (range:  
163 1.25 - 2.09) respectively (Table 1). With regard to renal size, the RRV ranged from 36.1 to 201.6  
164 cm<sup>3</sup> (mean=99.1), while LRV ranged from 35.8 to 253.7 cm<sup>3</sup> (mean=107.4). The RRV/BSA  
165 ranged from 24.53 to 100.7 (mean=60.0) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>, while LRV/BSA ranged from 23.5 to 132.5

166 (mean=65.1)  $\text{cm}^3/\text{m}^2$ . Both renal volume parameters were significantly different ( $p<0.01$ )  
 167 between the right and left kidneys, the left kidney being larger than the right (Table 1).

168 **Table 1.** Main characteristics of study participants, Jimma University Medical Center (JUMC),  
 169 Jimma, Southwest Ethiopia, 2018.

Variables (Valid N= 145)	Mean	SD	Min.	Q1, 25%	Q2, Median	Q3, 75%	Max.
Age (year)	44.4	17.3	16.0	28.0	46.0	58.0	80.0
Body weight (kg)	59.96	12.0	37.3	50.9	68.1	76.0	96.0
Body height (m)	1.640*	0.092	1.44	1.440	1.850	1.700	1.85
BMI ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ )	22.32*	4.30	14.39	21.50	22.00	24.93	37.3
BSA ( $\text{m}^2$ )	1.646*	0.184	1.247	1.508	1.635	1.768	2.09
Right renal length (cm)	9.598	0.957	6.970	8.035	9.570	10.375	11.8
Left renal length (cm)	9.570	0.892	6.950	9.100	9.550	10.070	12.0
Right renal width (cm)	4.956*	0.595	3.380	4.515	5.00	5.390	6.30
Left renal width (cm)	3.956	0.652	1.630	4.485	4.970	5.390	7.20
Right renal thickness (cm)	3.908 <sup>a</sup>	0.540	2.700	3.460	3.900	4.200	5.70
Left renal thickness (cm)	4.242 <sup>a</sup>	0.578	2.820	2.830	4.200	4.620	6.18
Right renal volume ( $\text{cm}^3$ )	9.115 <sup>b*</sup>	28.160	36.073	80.499	96.984	118.577	201.5
Left renal volume ( $\text{cm}^3$ )	107.416 <sup>b</sup>	31.410	35.828	88.456	106.530	128.057	253.6
RRV/BSA ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{m}^2$ )	60.008 <sup>c</sup>	14.678	24.525	50.116	58.908	68.359	100.6
LRV/BSA ( $\text{cm}^3/\text{m}^2$ )	65.130 <sup>c</sup>	16.967	23.522	53.755	65.812	74.307	132.4

170 <sup>a,b,c</sup>, the mean values in the row are statistically significant for the right and left kidneys; Min., minimum; Max.,  
 171 maximum; BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; Q1, first quartile; Q2, second quartile, Q3, third  
 172 quartile; SD, standard deviation; LRV, left renal volume; RRV, right renal volume; \*the mean scores are  
 173 significantly different between male and female.

174

175 **Comparison of hypertensive and non-hypertensive groups**

176 Table 2 shows comparison of the two study groups disaggregated by sex with regard to their  
 177 renal size and other variables. The mean age of the non-hypertensive group was 33 (range: 16-  
 178 80) years, while that of the hypertensives was 53 (range: 20-78) years with no age difference  
 179 between male and female subjects in both groups. Overall, the mean BMI was significantly  
 180 higher in hypertensive group (mean= 23.4  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ) than non-hypertensive group (20.9  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ) in  
 181 both sexes (Table 2).



182 **Table 2.** Comparison of ultrasonic renal volume and somatic variables between hypertensive patients and non-hypertensive controls  
 183 stratified by sex, Southwest Ethiopia 2018.

Variable	Non-hypertensive controls ( N=60)						Hypertensive patients (N=85)						p-value
	Sexes	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	□- statistic	
Age (year)	F	26	16.0	80.0	33.19	16.46	45	22.0	70.0	50.1	12.52	-4.878**	0.000
	M	34	18.0	63.0	32.23	13.25	40	20.0	78.0	55.75	15.06	-7.070**	0.000
	F + M	60	16.0	80.0	32.65	14.60	85	20.0	78.0	52.76	13.98	-8.377**	0.000
Body weight (kg)	F	26	37.3	80.0	56.71	11.37	45	41.0	96.0	61.70	14.47	-1.507	0.136
	M	34	43.8	77.3	57.20	7.66	40	45.0	86.0	62.46	11.86	-2.297	0.025
	F + M	60	37.3	80.0	56.99	9.36	85	41.0	96.0	62.06	13.24	-2.701*	0.008
Body height (m)	F	26	1.44	1.76	1.58 <sup>a</sup>	0.07	45	1.47	1.80	1.58 <sup>c</sup>	0.06	-0.019	0.985
	M	34	1.52	1.85	1.72 <sup>a</sup>	0.07	40	1.50	1.82	1.69 <sup>c</sup>	0.07	1.746	0.085
	F + M	60	1.44	1.85	1.66	0.10	85	1.47	1.82	1.63	0.08	1.709	0.090
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	F	26	14.39	29.38	22.70 <sup>b</sup>	3.72	45	19.0	37.32	24.65 <sup>d</sup>	4.93	-1.750	0.084
	M	34	15.47	25.46	19.46 <sup>b</sup>	2.53	40	16.56	32.39	21.88 <sup>d</sup>	3.59	-3.389*	0.001
	F + M	60	14.39	29.38	20.86	3.47	85	16.56	37.32	23.35	4.54	-3.562**	0.000
BSA (m <sup>2</sup> )	F	26	1.23	1.92	1.57	0.18	45	1.32	2.09	1.64	0.21	-1.316	0.192
	M	34	1.41	1.94	1.65	0.12	40	1.42	2.01	1.71	0.18	-1.597	0.115
	F + M	60	1.25	1.94	1.61	0.15	85	1.32	2.09	1.67	0.20	-1.829	0.069
RRV (cm <sup>3</sup> )	F	26	61.75	159.5	96.41	24.53	45	45.81	163.9	92.63	23.52	0.643	0.522
	M	34	63.72	152.7	104.68	22.65	40	36.07	201.6	103.44	36.68	0.176	0.861
	F + M	60	61.75	159.5	101.10	24.20	85	36.07	201.6	97.72	30.72	0.711	0.478
LRV (cm <sup>3</sup> )	F	26	35.83	253.7	105.21	40.67	45	53.71	162.7	102.9	25.64	0.294	0.770
	M	34	77.06	169.1	116.76	22.40	40	39.56	189.5	105.98	36.20	1.556	0.122
	F + M	60	35.83	253.7	111.76	31.86	85	39.56	189.5	104.35	30.91	1.405	0.162
RRV/BSA (cm <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> )	F	26	41.9	96.1	61.48	14.33	45	33.62	99.1	56.58	12.31	1.520	0.133
	M	34	37.0	93.4	63.43	13.01	40	23.53	100.6	60.01	18.01	0.924	0.358

	F + M	60	37.0	96.1	62.58	13.51	85	23.53	100.6	58.19	15.26	1.789	0.076
LRV/BSA (cm <sup>3</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> )	F	26	23.52	132.5	67.10	22.85	45	38.6	97.4	63.04	14.64	0.905	0.369
	M	34	41.5	104.1	71.01	13.10	40	24.05	94.7	61.23	16.99	2.734*	0.008
	F + M	60	23.62	132.5	69.30	17.92	85	24.05	97.4	62.19	15.71	2.532*	0.012

184 F, female; M, male; BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SD, standard deviation; <sup>a,b,c,d,e</sup>, the values indicated are  
 185 statistically significant for the right and left kidneys; LRV, left renal volume; RRV, right renal kidney volume \*significant at p<0.01; \*\*significant at p<0.001  
 186 between men and women

187 In the hypertensive group, renal volume of both sexes ranged from 36.1 to 201.6 (mean=97.7)  
188 cm<sup>3</sup> for the right kidney and 39.6 to 189.5 (mean=104.4) cm<sup>3</sup> for the left kidney. In this group,  
189 mean volumes of the right and left kidneys in males were 103.4 (±36.7) and 106.0 (±36.2) cm<sup>3</sup>  
190 respectively, while it was 92.6 (±23.5) and 102.9 (±25.6) cm<sup>3</sup> respectively for females (Table 2).  
191 In the non-hypertensive group, the renal volume ranged from 61.8 to 159.5 (mean=101.1) cm<sup>3</sup>  
192 for the right and from 35.8 to 253.7 (mean=111.8) cm<sup>3</sup> for the left kidney, indicating slightly  
193 larger kidneys on both sides in this group as compared to the hypertensive group.

194 When renal volume on each side is seen in terms of body surface area, RRV/BSA ranged from  
195 23.5 to 100.6 (mean=58.2) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> in the hypertensive group, while it was between 37.0 and 96.1  
196 (mean=62.6) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> among the non-hypertensive group (p=0.076). In contrary, LRV/BSA of the  
197 hypertensive group ranging from 24.1 to 97.1 (mean=62.2) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> was significantly (p=0.012)  
198 lower than that of the non-hypertensive group, which was 23.6-132.5 (mean=69.3) cm<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>  
199 (Table 2).

## 200 **Factors associated with renal volume**

201 Relationship of the RRV and LRV with age, weight, height, BMI and BSA was shown in Table  
202 3. As shown, neither the right nor the left renal volume has significant correlation with age in  
203 either group or sex. The largest mean renal volumes for right and left kidney were recorded in  
204 the same age group (40-49 years) in the male and female hypertensive subjects, in the control  
205 group however largest renal volumes were calculated for those in the fourth decades (30–39  
206 yrs). As depicted in Table 3, on both sides. BMI and BSA strongly correlated with renal volume,  
207 particularly among the hypertensive patients.

208 In hypertensive patients, renal volume was correlated significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) with BMI ( $r = 0.308$   
 209 and 0.383 for right and left kidneys, respectively). Further, significant positive correlation was  
 210 seen between renal volume and BSA in the hypertensive group  $r = 0.576$  and  $0.587$  ( $p < 0.01$ ) for  
 211 the right and left kidneys respectively. When stratified by sex, these correlations were still strong  
 212 and significant (Table 3). Among non-hypertensive controls, in contrast, only BSA showed  
 213 significant correlation with renal volume on both sides in both sexes (Table 3).

214 **Table 3.** Pearson correlations between renal volume and somatic parameters in male and female  
 215 hypertensive patients and controls<sup>a</sup>.

Variable	Sex	Hypertensive patients		Non-hypertensive controls	
		Right RV	Left RV	Right RV	Left RV
Age	Female	0.132	0.083	-0.127	-0.011
	Male	-0.158	-0.179	-0.016	-0.194
	Both sexes	-0.011	-0.058	-0.075	0.057
Body weight	Female	0.538**	0.459**	0.381	0.328
	Male	0.583**	0.698**	0.364*	0.223
	Both sexes	0.531**	0.560**	0.366**	0.293*
Body height	Female	0.372*	0.231	0.267	0.145
	Male	0.547**	0.646**	0.391*	0.128
	Both sexes	0.472**	0.395**	0.353*	0.222
BMI	Female	0.463**	0.436**	0.288	0.295
	Male	0.367*	0.459**	0.150	0.187
	Both sexes	0.308*	0.383*	0.118	0.140
BSA	Female	0.548**	0.456**	0.392*	0.307
	Male	0.620**	0.743**	0.423*	0.234
	Both sexes	0.576**	0.587**	0.425**	0.313*

217 <sup>a</sup>values are Pearson's correlation coefficients; BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; \*\*correlation is  
 218 significant at the  $p < 0.01$  level (2-tailed); \*correlation is significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level (2-tailed).

## 220 Discussion

221 In the recent past, the prevalence and absolute burden of the well-known modifiable risk factor  
 222 of renal failure, hypertension [1], has raised globally especially in LMICs, including Ethiopia [2–  
 223 5]. Currently, ultrasonic renal size reports from Ethiopia are scarce [26].

224 Although ultrasonic length, width and thickness of both kidneys were measured for each study  
225 participant, computed renal volume was used as a proxy measure of overall kidney size in this  
226 study. Preference of renal volume to individual renal dimension is dual imperative. Firstly, the  
227 usual bean-shape of each kidney is subject to considerably varied shape and orientation [27].  
228 This could potentially lead to erroneous recording of the three dimensions (length, width and  
229 thickness) such as exchange of one dimension for the other. Relying on only one dimension, for  
230 instance renal length, for estimation of overall renal size could therefore arrive at significant risk  
231 of wrong conclusion and recommendation about kidney status. Secondly, renal volume is three-  
232 dimensional modality estimated from records of organ size from three scanning planes. As is  
233 composite outcome measure incorporating all the three dimensions, renal volume is believed to  
234 be the more realistic predictor of actual size. As a result, ultrasonic renal volume is increasingly  
235 entering the repertoire of kidney size evaluation in clinical practice [19, 20].

236 The result shows that, the renal volume of the hypertensive group for the left kidney was slightly  
237 smaller than the size calculated for non-hypertensive controls. The renal volume obtained in the  
238 current population is comparable with results reported from Sudan among similar study groups  
239 [28], but smaller than that reported from Nigeria [19], possibly due to the differences in the study  
240 population.

241 In clinical practice, bilaterally shrunken kidney as a result of chronic disease supports the  
242 diagnosis of chronic kidney disease [21]. In our study, we observed slightly smaller bilateral  
243 renal volume among hypertensive patients as compared to non-hypertensives. However, the  
244 difference was small and not statistically significant. This finding is in agreement with a report  
245 from Turkey [7], which also reported reduced renal volume in hypertensive patients when  
246 compared with non-hypertensive individuals.

247 The small sample size was one of the limitations of our study. Further, while attempting to  
248 provide insights on the impact of hypertension on the kidneys in this study, the approach focused  
249 only on anatomical aspects i.e. ultrasonic renal size, regardless of pathophysiologic  
250 considerations.

## 251 **Conclusions**

252 The renal volume of both kidneys was found smaller than that reported from Africa and the rest  
253 of the world in both study groups. Moreover, the renal size was slightly smaller among  
254 hypertensive patients as compared their control counter parts. We recommend large scale  
255 research including other regions of Ethiopia so that we will have fully standardized data on the  
256 subject.

## 257 **Acknowledgments**

258 We thank all the staff of JUMC for their assistance and cooperation during the data  
259 collection process. We also thank Jimma University Institute of Health for financially  
260 supporting this study. Finally, we are grateful to the study participants for their cooperation.

## 261 **References**

- 262 1. Sim JJ, Shi J, Kovesdy CP, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Jacobsen SJ. Impact of achieved blood  
263 pressures on mortality risk and end-stage renal disease among a large, diverse hypertension  
264 population. *J. Am College Cardio* 2014; 64 (6). ISSN 0735-1097 /\$36.00. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2014.04.065>.  
265
- 266 2. Kotchen TA. Hypertensive vascular disease, In Kasper, DL, Hauser SL, Jameson JL, Fauci  
267 AL, Longo DL, Loscalzo J, editors. *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine*, 19<sup>th</sup> edition,  
268 2015. McGraw-Hill Education Publishing Inc, New York, PP. 1611-1626, ISBN: 978-0-07-  
269 180216-1.

- 270 3. Mills KT, Stefanescu A, He J. The global epidemiology of hypertension. *Nat Rev Nephrol.*  
271 2020; 16: 223–237.
- 272 4. Abebe S, Yallem WW. Prevalence of hypertension among adult outpatient clients in hospitals  
273 and its associated factors in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a hospital based cross-sectional study.  
274 *BMC Res Notes*, 2019; 12:87. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-019-4127-1>.
- 275 5. Roba HS, Beyene AS, Mengesha MM, Ayele BH. Prevalence of hypertension and associated  
276 factors in Dire Dawa City, Eastern Ethiopia: A community-based cross-sectional study.  
277 *Hindawi Intern J Hypertension*. 2019: Article ID 9878437.
- 278 6. Singh GR, Wendy EH. Kidney volume, blood pressure, and albuminuria; findings in an  
279 Australia aboriginal community. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2004; 43: 254-259.
- 280 7. Zumrutdal AO, Turan C, Cetin F, Adanali S. Relationship between renal size and  
281 hypertension in a patient with CRF. *Nephron*. 2002; 90: 1457-1462.
- 282 8. Muthusamy P, Ananthakrishnan R, Santosh P. Need for a nomogram of renal sizes in the  
283 Indian population. Findings from a single-center sonographic study. *Indian J Med Res*. 2014;  
284 139: 686-639.
- 285 9. Saeed Z, Mirza W, Sayani R, Sheikh A, Yazdani I, Hussain SA, Sonographic measurement  
286 of renal dimensions in adults and its correlates, *Int. J. Collab. Res. Intern. Med. Public*  
287 *Health* 2012; 4 (9): 1626–1641.
- 288 10. Abdullah MB, Garelnabi MB, Ayad CE, Abdalla EA. Establishment of reference values for  
289 renal length and volume for normal adult Sudanese using MRI disc summation method.  
290 *Global J. Medi. Res*. 2014; 14: 29-37.
- 291 11. Maravi P, Khan M, Kaushal L, Goyal S. Renal volumes by ultrasound and its correlation  
292 with body mass index and body surface area in adult population. *Tropical J of Radiology and*  
293 *Imaging* 2019; 1(1): 20-26.
- 294 12. Mosteller RD. Simplified Calculation of Body Surface Area. *N Engl J Med* 1987 Oct 22; 317  
295 (17):1098 (letter). [Cross-referenced by Schnur, M.B., 2017].
- 296 13. Eze CU, Marcie TT. Ultrasonographic kidney sizes among children in Benin, Nigeria:  
297 correlation with age and BMI. *Radiol. Technol* 2013; 84: 341-347.
- 298 14. Jeffri A, Abdulla A. Ultrasonographic measurement of kidney Dimensions. *Acta Medica*  
299 *Philipina*. 2010; 44: 35-38.

- 300 15. Maaji SM, Daniel O, Adamu B. Sonographic measurement of renal dimensions of adults in  
301 northwestern Nigeria: a preliminary report. *Sub-Saharan Afr. J. Med.* 2015; 2: 123-7.
- 302 16. Kang KY, Lee YJ, Park SC, et al. A comparative study of methods of estimating kidney  
303 length in kidney transplantation donors. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2007; 22: 2322-2327.
- 304 17. Soheilipour F, Jesmi F, Rahimzadeh N et al. Configuring a better estimation of kidney size in  
305 obese children and adolescents. *Iran J Pedi.* 2016; 26: e4700.
- 306 18. Ren Q, Su C, Wang H, et al. Change in BMI and its impact on the incidence of hypertension  
307 in 18-65-year-old Chinese adults. *PloS One.* 2016; 13: 257.
- 308 19. Adedeji A, Egberongbe, Victor A, et al. Evaluation of renal volume by ultrasonography in  
309 patients with essential hypertension in Ile-Ife, southwestern Nigeria. *Libya. J. Medi.* 2010; 5:  
310 4848-4869.
- 311 20. Sanusi AA, Arogundade FA, Famurewa OC, Akintomide AO, Soyinka FO, Ojo OE et al.,  
312 Relationship of ultrasonographically determined kidney volume with measured GFR,  
313 calculated creatinine clearance and other parameters in chronic kidney disease, *Nephrol.*  
314 *Dial. Transplant.* 2009; 24: 1690–1694. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfp055>.
- 315 21. Bargman JM, Skorecki K, Chronic kidney disease, in: D.L. editions of Kasper SL, Hauser  
316 JL, Jameson AL, Fauci DL, Loscalzo J (Eds.): Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine,  
317 nineteenth ed., McGraw-Hill Education, NewYork, 2015, p. 1811—1921.
- 318 22. Gamal AbS, Esam M, Ali MA. Ultrasonographic estimation of age-dependent changes in  
319 length of spleen and hepatic lobes and diameters of portal vein and common bile duct in  
320 children. *J Am Sci.* 2013; 9(11):31-39. <http://www.jofamericanscience.org>.
- 321 23. Hricak H, Lieto RP. Sonographic determination of renal volume. *Radiology.* 1983; 148: 311-  
322 2.
- 323 24. Schnur MB, 2017. Body Mass Index and Body Surface Area: What's the Difference?  
324 [https://www.nursingcenter.com/ncblog/august-2017/body-mass-index-and-body-surface-](https://www.nursingcenter.com/ncblog/august-2017/body-mass-index-and-body-surface-area-what-s-the-d)  
325 [area-what-s-the-d](https://www.nursingcenter.com/ncblog/august-2017/body-mass-index-and-body-surface-area-what-s-the-d) (last visited on May 19, 2020).
- 326 25. IBM-Corp. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for windows version 23, IBM-  
327 SPSS, 2015.
- 328 26. Diliab D, Mesfin Z, Almaz A, Tilahun, AN. Ultrasonic renal size and its correlates among  
329 diabetic outpatients at Jimma University Medical Center, Southwest Ethiopia. *Translational*



- 330        *Research in Anatomy*. 2020; 20, 100071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tria.2020.10007>  
331        doi:10.4172/2161-0940.1000246.
- 332    27. Abd Elgyoum AM, Osman H, Elzaki A, Abd Elrahim E. Ultrasonography patterns for  
333        diabetic nephropathy according to the body shape. *Sch. J. App. Med. Sci.* 2014; 2(5C):1649-  
334        1652.
- 335    28. Mohamed EMG, Ahmed A, Hossam G, Adil A, Mansour MH. Characterization of renal  
336        function and morphology in hypertensive patients using renal ultrasonography. *European*  
337        *Academic Research*. 2019; 5(12): 2286-4822.