We need evidence-based futility thresholds to transplant grade-3 acute on chronic liver failure patients with poor respiratory, haemodynamic, and metabolic parameters



Alfonso W. Avolio, Alfonso W. Avolio, Alfonso W. Avolio, Massimo Antonelli, Lucio Caccamo, Francesco Frongillo, Luca Del Prete, Alberto Ferrarese, Massimo Iavarone, and Patrizia Burraf, Burr



^aFondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, IRCCS, Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Chirurgiche Addominali ed Endocrino Metaboliche - Unità di Chirurgia Generale e del Trapianto di Fegato, Rome, Italy

^bUniversità Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy

^cFondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, IRCCS, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Emergenza, Anestesiologiche e della Rianimazione - Unità di Anestesia, Rianimazione, Terapia Intensiva e Tossicologia Clinica, Rome, Italy

^dFondazione Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, IRCCS, Milan, Italy

^eUniversità degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy

^fAzienda Ospedale Università di Padova, Unità Trapianto Multiviscerale, Gastroenterologia, Padua, Italy

^gUniversità degli Studi di Padova, Padua, Italy

Bernal and colleagues showed that liver transplantation (LT) in grade-3 acute on chronic liver failure patients (ACLF-3) was highly efficacious under the recently implemented British prioritisation policy. An even greater effect was that the LT-free survival was null (survival benefit). After the pioneering articles reporting the LT-feasibility in well-selected ACLF-3, Centres started listing and prioritising them according to the Model for End-stage Liver Disease sodium score. However, national or regional prioritisation rules remain undefined and identification of delisting criteria when progression occurs is lacking.

In the literature, respiratory (by PaO2/FiO2 ratio), haemodynamic (by number and dosage of vasopressors), and metabolic (by arterial lactate levels) failures have been reported as poor prognostic factors. Expert opinions suggested thresholds to separate patients considered eligible for LT from those considered too sick and, therefore, at unsustainable futility risk. Nevertheless, the impact of evidence-based thresholds remains to be prospectively investigated.

Bernal and colleagues adopted general exclusion criteria, while the role of respiratory, haemodynamic, and metabolic failures seems to have not been considered *per se.*¹ Notably, PaO2/FiO2, number of vasopressors (given that dosages have not been reported), and lactate levels were not different compared to transplanted patients. The authors may have excluded severe cases according to general clinical conditions, perhaps also according to failure parameters.

We speculate whether the listing/prioritisation and de-prioritisation/de-listing pathways in the already listed and newly listed candidates may be more appropriate. Notably, in the British experience, LT achieved a significantly better result than expected. Will these excellent results suggest enlarging the criteria for listing?

Contributors

AWA had the original idea and wrote the first draft of this correspondence. MA, LC, FF, LDP, AF, and MI, discussed the problem and refined the draft. PB performed the critical revision of the final text for important intellectual content. All authors contributed to the writing and approved the final submitted version.

Declaration of interests

PB has received lecture and consulting fees from Alpha Wasserman, Biotest, Chiesi Farmaceutici, IPSEN, Kedrion, Mayoly, Novartis, and has received consulting/advisory board fees from Astellas Pharma, Biotest, Gilead, Kedrion, MSD, Sandoz. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests regarding this manuscript.

References

- Bernal W, Taylor R, Rowe IA, et al. Liver transplantation for critically ill patients with acute on chronic liver failure: a prospective national program of waitlist prioritisation. Lancet Reg Health Eur. 2024;46:101067.
- 2 Artru F, Louvet A, Ruitz I, et al. Liver transplantation in the most severely ill cirrhotic patients: a multicenter study in acute on chronic liver failure grade 3. J Hepatol. 2017;67:708–715.
- 3 Heise M, Weiler N, Iken S, et al. Liver transplantation in acute-onchronic liver failure: considerations for a systematic approach to decision making. Visc Med. 2018;34(4):291–294.
- 4 Artru F, Goldberg D, Kamath PS. Should patients with acute-on-chronic liver failure grade 3 receive higher priority for liver transplantation? *J Hepatol.* 2023;78(6):1118–1123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2022.12.026.
- Weiss E, Saner F, Asrani SK, et al. When is a critically ill cirrhotic patient too sick to transplant? Development of consensus criteria by a multidisciplinary panel of 35 international experts. *Transplantation*. 2021;105(3):561–568.

The Lancet Regional Health - Europe 2025;49: 101194 Published Online xxx

Published Online xxx https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.lanepe.2024. 101194

 $DOIs \ of \ original \ articles: \ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2024.101193, \ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2024.101067, \ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2024.101198$

E-mail address: alfonso.avolio@unicatt.it (A.W. Avolio).

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

^{*}Corresponding author. Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, IRCCS, Unità di Chirurgia Generale e del Trapianto di Fegato - Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Largo A.Gemelli 8, 00168, Rome, Italy.