EDITORIAL

The Reality of Evaluating Urine Spot Sodium and Urine Spot Sodium Creatinine Ratio in Furosemide Stress Test as a New Biomarker in Diagnosing Progressive AKI in Critically Ill

Ranajit Chatterjee[1], Lalit Gupta[2]

Keywords: Furosemide stress test, Spot urine sodium creatinine ratio, Urine spot sodium.
Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine (2024): 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24865

Early identification and treatment of acute kidney injury (AKI) still poses a challenge in the ever-evolving field of critical care medicine.[1] As part of a recent study on "Role of spot urine sodium in a furosemide stress test (FST) in volume overloaded critically ill patients with AKI", there are some interesting findings concerning this clinical dilemma.[2] In this study, which concerned mainly volume-overloaded critically ill patients with early-stage AKI, a novel strategy for the risk stratification of disease progression is proposed.

The study's significance lies in its practical approach to addressing a common clinical dilemma of identifying which subsets of patients with early AKI will progress to more severe stages. The authors suggested that alteration of urine spot sodium (USS) and urine spot sodium creatinine ratio (USSCR) after FST may be valid predictors of AKI progression, which, from a clinician's perspective, could be an improved risk stratification indicator. Diagnostic tools, including many biomarkers, are unfortunately not sufficiently specific for reliable prediction.[3] This aligns with the consensus recommendations developed by Ostermann M et al., that damage markers and functional biomarkers alone are insufficient and should be integrated with clinical data to enhance diagnostic accuracy and patient care.[4]

The prospective study examined 50 critically ill patients with volume overload and AKIN stage I or II kidney injury. The methodology involved the administration of a standardized dose of furosemide (1 mg/kg) followed by careful monitoring of various parameters, including hourly urine output, spot sodium measurements, and sodium-creatinine ratios. This approach was based on previous research by Koyner JL et al., while adding the novel element of combining FST with spot sodium measurements.[5]

The findings reveal several important insights. Perhaps most significantly, the study demonstrated that hourly urine output in the first 2 hours post-FST, combined with maximum changes in USSCR within 6 hours, could effectively differentiate between progressive and non-progressive AKI. This observation aligns with earlier work by Chawla et al., who found that urine output response to FST could predict AKI progression and concluded that post-FST reduced urine output was a good predictor for progression of AKI, and an optimal cut-off value of < 200 mL within the first 2 hours was found to possess high sensitivity at 87.1% and specificity at 84.1%.[6]

However, the results also challenge some initial assumptions. Although the researchers hypothesized that changes in sodium levels would be related to the progression of AKI, they found that USSCR was a more reliable predictor than USS alone. These findings suggest that the relationship between sodium excretion and kidney function is more complex than previously thought.[7]

The strength of the study lies in its practical application and the simplicity of the measures involved. In resource limited settings, it would be helpful to have a risk stratification method based on tests that can be performed with minimal effort and cost. This research deserves appreciation as it concentrates on the practical biomarkers, which can be measured with relative ease. The implementation of USS and USSCR presents a novel strategy for the early identification of patients with impending deterioration of renal function. Also, the design of the study permits real-time visualization of renal response to diuresis, promising the possibility of timely interventions aimed at improving patients' outcomes.

There are also broader implications of this study besides its short-term results. First, it sheds light on the injury and stress testing of the kidneys, which may be applicable in understanding the mechanisms behind the worsening of AKI. Second, it provides a more structured approach to risk stratification that promotes better decision-making on the need for monitoring and intervention by clinicians. The implications of this research go beyond the immediate findings. It expands current knowledge regarding kidney stress testing during early injury and its potential relevance to the mechanism of AKI progress.[8] Moreover, it proposes a realistic framework for risk-stratification, that might assist in the proper selection of monitoring and intervention strategies.

Nonetheless, it is important to note some limitations. The study is limited both by its size and follow-up period. Although the sample size of 50 patients is too small to make generalizations

[1]Department of Intensive Care, Swami Dayanand Hospital, New Delhi, India

[2]Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Maulana Azad Medical College (MAMC), New Delhi, India

Corresponding Author: Ranajit Chatterjee, Department of Intensive Care, Swami Dayanand Hospital, New Delhi, India, Phone: +91 9891257572, e-mail: titir2002@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Chatterjee R, Gupta L. The Reality of Evaluating Urine Spot Sodium and Urine Spot Sodium Creatinine Ratio in Furosemide Stress Test as a New Biomarker in Diagnosing Progressive AKI in Critically Ill. Indian J Crit Care Med 2024;28(12):1089–1090.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

so as to implement it into regular clinical practice. Similarly, a follow-up period of only three days may miss important long-term consequences. Moreover, according to the authors themselves, the fixed timings for the collection of spot samples may not be sufficient to represent the full kinetics of electrolyte excretion.

Looking ahead, several questions arise that need to be explored. Would it be more accurate to predict outcome changes with continuous monitoring of electrolytes as opposed to using spot measurements? What are the implications of these particular results in different patient cohorts or different variants of AKI? Can this in turn be used in conjunction with other markers for the development of superior predictive capabilities? Also, it has to be noted that furosemide is a highly protein-bound drug and is secreted in the proximal tubule, and its site of action is in the Na-K-Cl2 cotransporter in the proximal limb of the ascending loop of Henle. The secretion of furosemide is largely inhibited by hypoalbuminemia, acidosis and drugs like cephalosporins making it ineffective in certain group of patients.[9] Further, the research also raises important considerations regarding fluid management in critically ill patients.[10] The study population included patients with fluid overload. It reflects the growing awareness that excessive fluid intake alone can lead to poor outcomes in critical illness.[11] The model-based prediction of AKI advancement would enable the clinicians to assess more accurately the advantages and disadvantages of employing strategies aimed at fluid therapy.[12]

From a practical standpoint, this study offers clinicians a potentially valuable tool for early risk stratification in AKI. The combination of FST response criteria with topical sodium creatinine ratio may help identify high-risk patients who may benefit from more intensive follow-up or earlier intervention.[13] However, like other clinical tools, these findings must be interpreted in the broader context of the individual patient's condition, and integrate it with other clinical and laboratory parameters. There are advances in the field of critical care nephrology, and this study is one of those advancements as it pertains to looking to improve predictability in AKI outcomes. Although further validation is needed in a larger multicenter trial, but the findings suggest a promising approach to risk stratification that combines physiological testing with easily available laboratory measurements. As we move forward, it will also be important to validate these findings in a variety of patient populations and clinical settings. Developing standardized protocols for FST and electrolyte monitoring may help ensure the applicability of these findings across institutions.[14] Additionally, future research might explore whether this approach could be used to guide therapeutic interventions or modify clinical outcomes.

In conclusion, the analysis of USS and USSCR following FST brings new perspectives in AKI progression analysis in patients in the intensive care unit. There are challenges that still need to be addressed, but the findings highlight the potential of these biomarkers to aid in diagnosis and treatment at an earlier stage. As researchers continue to build upon this work, exploring larger cohorts and refining methodologies will be crucial in equipping clinicians with effective tools to manage AKI in vulnerable populations. The journey toward improved outcomes for critically ill patients with AKI is ongoing, but studies like this one provide a valuable foundation for future advancements.

Orcid

Ranajit Chatterjee https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9327-8180
Lalit Gupta https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7291-5961

References

1. Gameiro J, Fonseca JA, Outerelo C, Lopes JA. Acute kidney injury: From diagnosis to prevention and treatment strategies. J Clin Med 2020;9(6):1704. DOI: 10.3390/jcm9061704.
2. Suhas P, Anand RK, Baidya DK, Dehran M. Role of spot urine sodium in furosemide stress test in volume-overloaded critically ill patients with acute kidney injury. Indian J Crit Care Med 2024;28(12):1107–1111.
3. Bhosale SJ, Kulkarni AP. Biomarkers in acute kidney injury. Indian J Crit Care Med 2020(Suppl 3):S90–S93. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23398.
4. Ostermann M, Zarbock A, Goldstein S, Kashani K, Macedo E, Murugan R, et al. Recommendations on acute kidney injury biomarkers from the acute disease quality initiative consensus conference: A consensus statement. JAMA Netw Open 2020;3(10):e2019209. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19209.
5. Koyner JL, Davison DL, Brasha-Mitchell E, Chalikonda DM, Arthur JM, Shaw AD, et al. "Furosemide stress test and biomarkers for the prediction of AKI severity," J Am Soc Nephrol 2015;26(8):2023–2031. DOI: 10.3410/f.725347402.793509694.
6. Chawla LS, Davison DL, Brasha-Mitchell E, Koyner JL, Arthur JM, Shaw AD, et al. Development and standardization of a furosemide stress test to predict the severity of acute kidney injury. Crit Care 2013;17(5):R207. DOI: 10.1186/cc13015.
7. Kulkarni AP, Bhosale SJ. "Epidemiology and pathogenesis of acute kidney injury in critically ill patients". Indian J Crit Care Med 2020;24(Suppl 3):S84–S89. DOI: 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23394.
8. Makris K, Spanou L. Acute kidney injury: Diagnostic approaches and controversies. Clin Biochem Rev 2016;37(4):153–175. PMID: 28167845.
9. Ho KM, Power BM. Benefits and risks of furosemide in acute kidney injury. Anesthesia 2010;(65):283–293. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2044.2009.06228.x.
10. Zampieri FG, Bagshaw SM, Semler MW. Fluid therapy for critically ill adults with sepsis: A review. JAMA 2023;329(22):1967–1980. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2023.7560.
11. Besen BA, Gobatto AL, Melro LM, Maciel AT, Park M. Fluid and electrolyte overload in critically ill patients: An overview. World J Crit Care Med 2015;4(2):116–129. DOI: 10.5492/wjccm.v4.i2.116.
12. Claure-Del Granado R, Mehta RL. Fluid overload in the ICU: Evaluation and management. BMC Nephrol 2016;17(1):109. DOI: 10.1186/s12882-016-0323-6.
13. Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) CKD Work Group. KDIGO 2024 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease stevens. Kidney Int 105(4S):S117–S314. DOI: 10.1016/j.kint.2023.10.018.
14. Zazzeron L, Ottolina D, Scotti E, Ferrari M, Bruzzone P, Sibilla S, et al. Real-time urinary electrolyte monitoring after furosemide administration in surgical ICU patients with normal renal function. Ann Intensive Care 2016;6(1):72. DOI: 10.1186/s13613-016-0168-y.