

## Serial Serum Albumin Levels as A Prognostic Marker in Critically Ill Patients

Manish Kumar Gurjar<sup>1</sup>, Vijendra Sharma<sup>2</sup>, Ravindra Kumar Tiwari<sup>3</sup>, Pinki Tak<sup>4</sup>, Rajesh Jain<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Junior Resident, Department of General Medicine, JLN Medical College, Ajmer

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of General Medicine, JLN Medical College, Ajmer

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of General Medicine, JLN Medical College, Ajmer

<sup>4</sup>Associate Professor, Department of General Medicine, JLN Medical College, Ajmer

<sup>5</sup>Unit Head and Senior Professor, Department of General Medicine, JLN Medical College, Ajmer

Received: 27-03-2023 / Revised: 25-04-2023 / Accepted: 30-05-2023

Corresponding author: Dr Pinki Tak

Conflict of interest: Nil

### Abstract

**Introduction:** Albumin's the most plentiful protein in human plasma. As an index of patients' nutritional and metabolic status, it has been employed by a number of investigators.

**Aim:** To estimate serum albumin concentrations in critically ill patients after they have been admitted to Intensive Care Unit and assess the role of continuous SA measurement as an independent diagnostic indicator.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional observational study on 100 critically ill Patients admitted to ICU for at least 5 days or more at tertiary care hospital, Ajmer from September 2021 to September 2022. Patient with chronic liver or kidney disease, nephritic syndrome, protein-losing enteropathy and chronic malnutrition were excluded from study.

**Results:** Out of 100 patients 62% were discharged (survivors) and 38% died (non-survivors). Using the logistic regression equation derived from our study, it was found that it correctly identified 83.87 % (Sensitivity) patients to survive and 78.95 % (Specificity) patients to die. Overall, it was 82% accurate (accuracy) in the prediction of the outcome of the patient.

**Conclusion:** One major factor influencing the outcome of severely ill patients dependent on mechanical ventilation is likely to be a serial estimation of serum albumine levels.

**Keywords:** Serum Albumin, Prognostic Marker, Critically Ill.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

### Introduction

Albumin's the most plentiful protein in human plasma. Extensive studies have been conducted on this subject. The amino acid sequences of albumins, the entire gene sequence for humans and the locations of mutations are currently known. This helps maintain the colloid oncologic pressure, acts as a carrier protein and participates in other functions such as metabolism, antioxidant function.[1]

Patients who are admitted to Intensive Care Unit MICU are at an increased risk of mortality due to the severity of their illness. Therefore, identifying patients at time of admission who are unlikely to achieve a good outcome so that they can be effectively managed is essential.[2]

As an index of patients' nutritional and metabolic status, it has been employed by

a number of investigators. The reduction of serum albumin concentrations in critically ill patients with Septic shock and after severe surgery or other diseases has been shown to be rapid.[3]

An analysis of a range of studies reviewed showed that the risk of death for each 2.5 g L per litre reduction in SA concentration was increased from 24% to 56%. Higher mean concentrations of SA were found in patients who spent five days or more in the Intensive Care Unit and survived compared to nonsurvivors.[4]

In addition, it was observed that patients who were not survivors had a decrease in the concentration of SA on admission into an intensive care unit during the first 24 to 48 hours and their concentrations decreased more rapidly thereafter.[5]

**Aim:** To estimate serum albumin concentrations in critically ill patients after they have been admitted to Intensive Care Unit and assess the role of continuous SA measurement as an independent diagnostic indicator.

### Materials and Methods

A cross-sectional observational study on 100 critically ill Patients admitted to ICU for at least 5 days or more at tertiary care hospital, Ajmer from September 2021 to September 2022. Patient with chronic liver or kidney disease, nephritic syndrome, protein-losing enteropathy and chronic malnutrition were excluded from study.

After taking informed consent patient or a relative in case of an unconscious patient, clinical and demographic profiles were recorded. Careful and detailed records have been kept and a thorough clinical examination has been carried out. All the points mentioned in the explanatory note have been recorded. A total of blood counts, renal functions, liver function and serum albumin) SA were also recorded at the time of admission. Chest X-ray and arterial blood gas analysis were obtained. For all patients, days on ventilators, days

in the Intensive Care Unit, and days in the hospital were recorded.

Patients have been followed until they are admitted to the hospital. If the patients were not receiving ventilatory support for 5 days or more, they should have been eligible to take part in this study. Serum albumin estimate has been carried out on day 1, 3, and 5 of their hospital stay in patients who participated in the study. Data collection and analysis did not include patients who had been released or discharged without medical advice after a maximum of five days in the hospital.

The estimation of serum albumin was done by automated bromocresol green (BCG) specific dye-binding method. Outcome was noted as survivor (discharge) or non-survivor (death).

### Statistical analysis

Data thus collected was entered in Microsoft excel 2007 and analysis was done by Epi info software of CDC using t test and chi square test, considering p value <0.05 as statistically significant.

### Results

The mean age of survivors was  $47.8 \pm 21.7$  years (19 – 85 years) and of non-survivors was  $62.3 \pm 13.0$  years (28– 86 years)(p = 0.011).

Majority 60% were males, amongst survivors 61.3% were males and in non-survivors 57.9 %.

Out of the 100 cases in a study group, the largest number of patients were with neurological disorders 32%, included stroke 20%, Guillain Barre syndrome 4%, Tubercular meningitis 4%, Normal pressure hydrocephalus 2%, and myasthenia gravis 2%. Respiratory disorders were 18% with 12% of COPD and 6 cases 6% of community-acquired pneumonia. 14% were Organophosphorous compound poisoning. Infective causes were 12% including cerebral malaria 6% and septic shock 6%.

8% cases were diabetic nephropathy. Metabolic causes 4% cases including hyponatremic metabolic encephalopathy 2% and hypoglycemic seizures 2% cases. Left ventricular failure 4 cases (4%), snake bite 2 cases (2%), esophageal carcinoma 2 cases (2%), and other poisons 4(4%) comprised the rest of the cases.

In our study, 62% of patients had to be put on mechanical ventilation secondary to acute respiratory failure with acute respiratory distress syndrome. In this group, the largest number comprised of patients with aspiration

pneumonia 22 cases (22%) and sepsis 20 cases (20%) along with four cases (8%) of pulmonary edema, three cases (6%) of community-acquired pneumonia, two cases(4%) of congestive cardiac failure and one case (2%) of trauma. 20% of patients had to be put on mechanical ventilation secondary to Acute Respiratory Failure with coma, 12% secondary to Acute Respiratory Failure with Chronic pulmonary disease and 6% secondary to Acute Respiratory Failure with neuromuscular disease.

**Table 1: Outcome**

Outcome	Number	Percentage
Survivors	62	62%
Non Survivors	38	38%

Out of 100 patient 62% patients were discharged (survivors) and 38% died (non-survivors).

**Table 2: etiological diagnosis of nonsurvivors and serum albumin levels**

Etiological diagnosis	Sr. Albuminon Day one	Sr. albumin onDay 5	The difference in serum albumin
Stroke	3.2	1.9	1.3
Stroke	3.1	1.3	1.8
Stroke	3.5	1.9	1.6
Stroke	3.1	2.3	0.8
Stroke	3	2.2	0.8
COPD	3.2	2.1	1.1
COPD	3.3	2.4	0.9
COPD	3.2	2.1	1.1
COPD	3.3	2.3	1
Septicemic shock	3	1.7	1.3
Septicemic shock	3	1.3	1.7
Diabetic Nephropathy	3.1	2.1	1
Carcinoma esophagus	3.2	1.6	1.6
Left ventricularfailure	3	2.6	0.4
Traumatic chestinjury	2.7	2.1	0.6
Diabetic nephropathy	3.1	2	1.1
Community-acquired pneumonia	2.9	2	0.9
Organophosphorus compound poisoning	3.5	2.7	0.8
Tubercular meningitis	3	2.1	0.9

The results show that the non-survivor group comprised 10 cases(26.3%) of

stroke, 8 cases (21.1%) of COPD, 4 cases (10.5%) each of septicemic shock and diabetic nephropathy, and 2 cases (5.2%)

each of tubercular meningitis, organophosphorus poisoning, community-acquired pneumonia, traumatic chest injury, left ventricular failure, and carcinoma esophagus. The mean

difference between serum albumin at the time of admission and 5 days later is 1.09 g/dl. In this group the decline in serum albumin is very steep, giving a bad prognosis.

**Table 3: Comparison of serum albumin levels**

Day One		
S. Albumin InG/Dl	Survivors (N=62)	Non-Survivors(N=38)
< 3.5	34	34
≥ 3.5	28	4
Day Three		
< 3.5	46	38
≥ 3.5	16	0
Day Five		
< 3.5	52	38
≥ 3.5	10	0

At admission, mean S. albumin was  $3.43 \pm 0.41$  g/dl in Survivor whereas  $3.12 \pm 0.19$  g/dl in non-survivors ( $p=0.003$ ). On subsequent follow up  $3.04 \pm 0.51$  and  $2.75 \pm 0.22$  respectively ( $p=0.027$ ) on third and  $2.76 \pm 0.50$  and  $2.31 \pm 0.32$  respectively ( $p=0.001$ ) on fifth day were observed.

**Table 4: Comparative levels of mean serum albumin**

Day	Mean S albumin (g/dl)	
	Survivors	Non-survivors
Day 1	3.3	3.18
Day 3	3.09	2.66
Day 5	3.1	2.45

The total decline in serum albumin in the survivors from admission to day 5 is 0.86 g/dl. For a five day period, it is 1.09 gdl in nonsurvivors.

it was found that 52 patients were correctly identified as survivors but 10 patients who were predicted to die, actually survived. The results indicate that in almost 84% of

patients, this equation is capable of accurately predicting survival. Similarly, 30 patients were correctly identified as non-survivors but 8 patients who were predicted to survive, actually died. It suggests that in almost 80% of cases, this equation accurately predicts the patient's death.

**Table 6: Accuracy of prediction of outcome**

	Sensitivity	Specificity	Accuracy	NPV	PPV
S albumin	83.87%	78.95%	82%	86.67%	75%

Using the logistic regression equation derived from our study, it was found that it correctly identified 83.87 % (Sensitivity) patients to survive and 78.95 % (Specificity) patients to die. Overall, it was 82% accurate in the prediction of the outcome of the patient. It was also found

that the probability that this equation will predict the outcome of survivors correctly is 86.67 % (NPV). Also, the probability that this equation will correctly predict the outcome of non-survivors correctly is slightly lower at 75 % (PPV).

**Table 7: ICU and hospital stay.**

	Survivors (N=62)	Non-Survivors (N=38)
<b>No. of Days of ICU Stay</b>		
<b>5 – 7</b>	4 (6.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>8 – 10</b>	26 (41.9%)	4 (10.5%)
<b>11 – 13</b>	18 (29.0%)	18 (47.3%)
<b>&gt; 13</b>	14 (22.5%)	16 (42.1%)
<b>No. of Days of Hospital Stay</b>		
<b>5-10</b>	6 (9.6%)	4 (10.5%)
<b>11 – 15</b>	30 (48.3%)	30 (78.9%)
<b>16 – 20</b>	14 (22.5%)	2 (5.2%)
<b>&gt;20</b>	12 (19.3%)	2 (5.2%)

ICU stay was higher in non survivors ( $15.4 \pm 2.9$ ) than survivors ( $p = 0.0127$ ).

Hospital stay was  $16.3 \pm 4.5$  in survivors whereas  $14.9 \pm 3.6$  for non-survivors ( $p = 0.0275$ ).

### Discussion

In our study, the mean age was  $47.8 \pm 21.7$  in survivor group whereas  $62.3 \pm 13.0$  in non-survivors ( $p = 0.032$ ). similar age groups were seen by many study. Amongst survivors (62), 38 (61.3%) were males whereas in non-survivors (38), 22 (57.9 %) were males. Similar male preponderance was seen by other studies[5,6]

Our study suggests that the largest number of patients requiring mechanical ventilation had the neurological disease as the etiology. In that also, stroke was the most common cause requiring mechanical ventilation. One study reports sepsis (24%), COPD (22%), and severe pneumonia (20%) as the common causes among others. The smaller sample sizes observed in both trials are the reason for this difference.

In our study, 62% of patients had to be put on mechanical ventilation secondary to acute respiratory distress syndrome, 20% secondary to coma, 12% secondary to acute respiratory failure on Chronic pulmonary disease, and 6% secondary to neuromuscular disease. The largest number of patients had to be put on mechanical ventilation secondary to

aspiration pneumonia (22%). The next leading cause was sepsis with 20% of patients. Similarly reported by Esteban A et al.[5]

Out of 100 patient 62% patients were discharged (survivors) and 38% died (non-survivors). Also Khilnani GC et al.2 reported 69% survivors.

At admission, mean S. albumin was  $3.43 \pm 0.41$  g/dl in Survivor whereas  $3.12 \pm 0.19$  g/dl in non-survivors ( $p=0.003$ ). On subsequent follow up  $3.04 \pm 0.51$  and  $2.75 \pm 0.22$  respectively ( $p=0.027$ ) on third and  $2.76 \pm 0.50$  and  $2.31 \pm 0.32$  respectively ( $p=0.001$ ) on fifth day were observed.

Similarly Yap FM et al.[8] found similar S. albumin on admission. Also Banga A et al.[7] found higher level in survivors than non-survivors ( $p < 0.05$ ).[7]

In our study, total decline in serum albumin in the survivors from admission to day 5 is 0.86 g/dl. For a five day period, it is 1.09 gdl in nonsurvivors. The results show that serum albumin levels are decreasing steadily in both groups. However, the decline among survivors is less steep than that of those who are not survivors. This suggests that the prognosis of the patient in terms of mortality is influenced by the rapid decrease in serum albumin levels. A poor prognosis may be seen with a steep decline in serum albumin.

ICU stay was higher in non survivors ( $15.4 \pm 2.9$ ) than survivors ( $p = 0.0127$ ). Similarly reported by Esteban A et al.[6]

Hospital stay was  $16.3 \pm 4.5$  in survivors whereas  $14.9 \pm 3.6$  for non-survivors ( $p = 0.0275$ ). Also Banga A et al reported similar hospital stay.

### Conclusion

One major factor influencing the outcome of severely ill patients dependent on mechanical ventilation is likely to be a serial estimation of serum albumin levels.

### Bibliography

1. Nicholson JP, Wolmarans MR, Park GR. The role of albumin in critical illness. *Br J Anaesth.* 2000; 85: 599-610
2. Khilnani GC, Banga A, Sharma SK. Predictors of mortality of patients with acute respiratory failure secondary to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease admitted to an intensive care unit. A one-year study. *BMC Pulm Med.* 2004; 4: 12
3. McCluskey A, Thomas AN, Bowles BJM, Kishen R. The prognostic value of serial measurements of serum albumin in patients admitted to an intensive care unit. *Anaesthesia.* 1996; 51: 724-7.
4. Goldwasser P, Feldman J. Association of serum albumin and mortality risk. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1997; 50: 693-703.
5. Esteban A, Anzueto A, Frutos F, Alia I, Brochard L, Stewart TE, Benito S, Epstein SK, Apezteguia C, Nightingale P, Arroliga AC, Tobin MJ, Mechanical Ventilation International Study Group: Characteristics and outcomes in adult patients receiving mechanical ventilation: a 28-day international study. *JAMA.* 2002;287:345-35
6. Blunt MC, Nicholson JP, Park GR. Serum albumin and colloid osmotic pressure in survivors and non-survivors of prolonged critical illness. *Anaesthesia.* 1998; 53: 755-61
7. Banga A, Guleria R, Khilnani GC, Khanna S. Serum albumin as A Prognostic Marker in Critically ill patients. *JAPI.* 2003; 51:1223-4.
8. Yap FM, Joynt GM, Buckley TA, Wong ELY. Association of serum albumin concentration and mortality Risk in Critically ill patients. *Anaesth Intensive Care.* 2002; 30(2):202-7.