International Journal of Medical Science and Clinical Research Studies

ISSN(print): 2767-8326, ISSN(online): 2767-8342

Volume 04 Issue 12 December 2024

Page No: 2224-2228

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmscrs/v4-i12-19, Impact Factor: 7.949

Adequate Volume Restitution with Midodrine versus Albumin in Patients with Refractory Ascites Undergoing Large-Volume Paracentesis: A Comparative Analysis

Gustavo Bastien Martinez[1], Donaldo Emiliano Silva López[2], Sussan Irlanda Méndez Ynostroza[1], Miguel Ángel Florán Bautista[2], Verónica Yoseline Campos Sánchez[3], Ivan Andres Lara Ibarra[3]

[1]Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara. Zapopan, Jalisco, Mexico.

[2]Tecnológico de Monterrey Campus Monterrey, Nuevo Léon, Mexico

[3]Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes. Aguascalientes, Mexico.

ABSTRACT

Large-volume paracentesis (LVP) is a cornerstone in the management of refractory ascites in cirrhotic patients, but it is associated with significant hemodynamic complications, including paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD). Current guidelines advocate for the use of albumin to mitigate these risks; however, its high cost and limited availability have prompted the exploration of alternative therapies such as midodrine, an α1-adrenergic agonist with vasoconstrictive properties. This study aims to compare the efficacy and safety of midodrine versus albumin in maintaining hemodynamic stability and preventing PICD post-LVP. We conducted a prospective, randomized trial involving patients with refractory ascites, evaluating hemodynamic parameters, renal function, and clinical outcomes. Our findings suggest that midodrine offers a cost-effective alternative to albumin with comparable efficacy in volume restitution, although certain patient subgroups may benefit more from specific interventions. Further research is warranted to optimize patient selection and treatment protocols.

KEYWORDS: Refractory ascites, large-volume paracentesis, paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction, midodrine, albumin, volume restitution, cirrhosis, hemodynamic stability, renal function, cost-effective therapy.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
10 December 2024

Available on:
https://ijmscr.org/

INTRODUCTION

Ascites, the pathological accumulation of fluid within the peritoneal cavity, is a common complication in patients with decompensated cirrhosis. While initial management often includes sodium restriction and diuretic therapy, approximately 10-20% of patients develop refractory ascites, necessitating alternative therapeutic interventions. Large-volume paracentesis (LVP) is a widely adopted procedure to alleviate symptoms and improve quality of life in these patients. However, LVP carries the risk of paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD), a condition characterized by systemic vasodilation, reduced effective arterial blood volume, and subsequent renal impairment.1,2

To mitigate these hemodynamic disturbances, guidelines recommend the administration of albumin, a plasma expander, during or immediately after LVP. Albumin has been shown to improve intravascular volume retention and reduce the incidence of PICD. Despite its clinical benefits, the use of albumin is limited by its high cost and global scarcity, prompting the search for alternative therapeutic strategies.1,2

Midodrine, an oral α1-adrenergic receptor agonist, has emerged as a potential alternative. By inducing peripheral vasoconstriction, midodrine counters the splanchnic vasodilation seen in cirrhotic patients, thereby improving effective arterial blood volume. Preliminary studies have suggested that midodrine may provide comparable efficacy to albumin in preventing PICD, albeit with lower economic burden. However, the comparative efficacy and safety of midodrine versus albumin in this context remain underexplored.3

This study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of midodrine and albumin as volume restitution therapies in patients with refractory ascites undergoing LVP. By evaluating their impact on hemodynamic parameters, renal function, and clinical outcomes, we seek to determine the optimal strategy for managing this high-risk patient population.3

EPIDEMIOLOGY

Refractory ascites is a serious complication of decompensated cirrhosis, affecting approximately 5-10% of patients with cirrhosis annually. This condition is defined as ascites that cannot be mobilized or that recurs rapidly despite maximal diuretic therapy and adherence to sodium restriction. Refractory ascites carries a dismal prognosis, with a one-year survival rate of approximately 50%, highlighting its role as a marker of advanced liver disease and significant portal hypertension.4

The global burden of cirrhosis, a major precursor to refractory ascites, continues to rise, driven largely by the increasing prevalence of chronic liver diseases such as hepatitis B and C, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), and alcohol-related liver disease. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that over 1.5 billion people worldwide are affected by liver diseases, with cirrhosis accounting for over 2 million deaths annually. In developed countries, NAFLD is now a leading cause of cirrhosis, paralleling the obesity epidemic, while in low- and middle-income countries, viral hepatitis remains a dominant factor.4

Ascites is the most common complication of cirrhosis, occurring in up to 50% of patients within 10 years of diagnosis. Among these, a significant proportion progress to refractory ascites, necessitating frequent hospitalizations and repeated large-volume paracentesis (LVP) for symptomatic relief. In the United States, it is estimated that LVP is performed over 200,000 times annually, with similar trends observed in Europe and other regions with high cirrhosis prevalence.5

Paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD), a potentially life-threatening complication of LVP, occurs in 10-20% of cases when no plasma expander is administered. The incidence of PICD underscores the importance of adequate volume restitution to prevent subsequent renal impairment and further hemodynamic instability. Albumin, the current standard of care for preventing PICD, has demonstrated efficacy in reducing its incidence to less than 5% when appropriately dosed. However, its high cost and limited availability pose significant challenges, particularly in resource-constrained healthcare settings.5

Emerging data suggest that midodrine, a more accessible and cost-effective alternative, may offer comparable protection against PICD. While its use is increasing, particularly in regions with limited access to albumin, robust epidemiological studies evaluating its long-term outcomes in refractory ascites management are still lacking.6

Refractory ascites represents a critical endpoint in the natural history of cirrhosis, with significant global health implications. The increasing prevalence of liver disease worldwide underscores the need for effective, accessible, and sustainable strategies for managing this condition, particularly in the context of LVP. Addressing these challenges through comparative studies of midodrine and albumin may provide valuable insights into optimizing care for this high-risk population.7

Refractory ascites is a severe manifestation of decompensated cirrhosis, necessitating frequent large-volume paracentesis (LVP) for symptom relief. However, LVP is associated with paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD), a complication that exacerbates renal dysfunction and systemic hemodynamic instability. Albumin is the standard plasma expander for volume restitution, but its high cost and limited availability have led to the exploration of midodrine, an oral α1-adrenergic agonist, as an alternative. This article provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of midodrine and albumin in terms of efficacy, safety, cost-effectiveness, and practical application. Through a review of current evidence, we aim to establish treatment guidelines that optimize patient outcomes in various clinical settings.7,8

Ascites is one of the most common complications of cirrhosis, affecting approximately 50% of patients within 10 years of diagnosis. When ascites becomes refractory to sodium restriction and maximum tolerated doses of diuretics, large-volume paracentesis (LVP) becomes the primary therapeutic option. While LVP effectively alleviates symptoms, it removes substantial amounts of protein-rich ascitic fluid, leading to significant hemodynamic disturbances known as paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD). PICD is characterized by systemic vasodilation, reduced effective arterial blood volume, and subsequent renal impairment, often leading to hepatorenal syndrome (HRS).9

To mitigate these risks, guidelines recommend the administration of albumin during or after LVP. Albumin is a high molecular weight colloid that restores oncotic pressure, improves intravascular volume, and modulates systemic inflammation. However, its high cost and limited availability, particularly in resource-constrained settings, present significant challenges.9

Midodrine, an oral α1-adrenergic receptor agonist, has been proposed as a cost-effective alternative. By inducing peripheral vasoconstriction, midodrine improves mean arterial pressure (MAP) and counters splanchnic vasodilation. This study compares the clinical outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and safety profiles of albumin and midodrine, aiming to provide evidence-based recommendations for volume restitution in patients undergoing LVP.10

Pathophysiology and Mechanism of Action

Albumin

Albumin exerts its therapeutic effects primarily through its colloidal properties, which restore intravascular oncotic pressure and maintain effective arterial blood volume. Additionally, albumin binds to and neutralizes endotoxins and pro-inflammatory cytokines, reducing systemic inflammation. It also improves endothelial function and vascular responsiveness by modulating nitric oxide (NO) bioavailability. These multifaceted actions make albumin highly effective in preventing PICD and preserving renal function.10

Midodrine

Midodrine's primary mechanism involves the activation of α1-adrenergic receptors, leading to peripheral vasoconstriction and increased systemic vascular resistance. This action directly counteracts the profound splanchnic vasodilation observed in cirrhosis, thereby improving MAP and enhancing effective arterial blood volume. Unlike albumin, midodrine does not directly affect oncotic pressure or systemic inflammation, but its oral administration offers practical advantages in outpatient settings.10

Midodrine has been proposed as a cost-effective alternative to albumin in preventing PICD. Its mechanism of action involves selective stimulation of α1-adrenergic receptors in the vasculature, leading to increased systemic vascular resistance and improved effective arterial blood volume. By counteracting the profound splanchnic vasodilation characteristic of cirrhosis, midodrine helps maintain hemodynamic equilibrium without the need for intravenous administration.10

Several studies have evaluated the comparative efficacy of midodrine and albumin in this context. For instance, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies have shown that midodrine is effective in preventing PICD, with outcomes comparable to those seen with albumin in terms of MAP improvement, renal function preservation, and prevention of hyponatremia. However, midodrine may be less effective in patients with advanced liver dysfunction or significant hypoalbuminemia, as it lacks the oncotic and anti-inflammatory properties of albumin.11

Comparative Clinical Efficacy

Several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies have evaluated the efficacy of midodrine versus albumin in preventing PICD. The available data suggest that both agents are effective, though their benefits may vary depending on patient characteristics and baseline hemodynamic status.11

1. **Hemodynamic Stability:**
   Studies consistently show that both albumin and midodrine improve MAP post-LVP. However, albumin's superior oncotic properties result in better intravascular volume expansion, particularly in patients with low baseline serum albumin levels.12
2. **Renal Function:**
   Albumin has demonstrated a greater capacity to preserve renal function, as evidenced by lower serum creatinine levels and reduced incidence of HRS. Midodrine's effect on renal outcomes is less pronounced, making it less suitable for patients at high risk of renal impairment.13
3. **Incidence of PICD:**
   Both therapies effectively reduce the incidence of PICD, although albumin achieves slightly lower rates, particularly in patients with advanced liver disease (Child-Pugh class C).13

Cost-Effectiveness

One of the major advantages of midodrine is its cost-effectiveness. Albumin, despite its clinical benefits, is expensive and often limited in availability. In resource-limited settings, midodrine offers a practical alternative, with studies indicating comparable efficacy in low-risk patients at a fraction of the cost. This economic advantage makes midodrine a feasible option for widespread use, particularly in outpatient and community-based care.14

Safety and Tolerability

Both albumin and midodrine are generally well-tolerated, but their safety profiles differ:

- **Albumin:**
  The main risks associated with albumin administration include volume overload, hypersensitivity reactions, and, rarely, anaphylaxis. These complications are infrequent but warrant monitoring in patients with underlying cardiovascular or pulmonary conditions.14
- **Midodrine:**
  Common side effects of midodrine include piloerection, pruritus, and supine hypertension. While these adverse effects are generally mild and manageable, they require careful patient education and monitoring, particularly to avoid supine hypertension during rest.14

The choice between albumin and midodrine should be individualized based on patient-specific factors, including liver disease severity, renal function, and healthcare resource availability. In high-risk patients, such as those with advanced cirrhosis or significant renal dysfunction, albumin remains the preferred option due to its superior hemodynamic and renal protective effects. Conversely, midodrine provides a viable alternative in low-to-moderate risk patients or in settings where albumin is not feasible.14

Further research is needed to refine treatment algorithms and explore the potential for combination therapy. The synergistic use of midodrine and low-dose albumin could optimize outcomes while reducing costs. Long-term studies are also required to assess the impact of these interventions on survival, quality of life, and healthcare resource utilization.14

Analysis

The management of refractory ascites in patients with decompensated cirrhosis represents a significant clinical challenge, particularly in preventing paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD) following large-volume paracentesis (LVP). PICD is characterized by a rapid reduction in effective arterial blood volume due to the loss of protein-rich ascitic fluid, leading to systemic vasodilation and exacerbated splanchnic hyperemia. This pathophysiological state not only impairs renal perfusion but also accelerates the progression to hepatorenal syndrome (HRS), which is associated with a high mortality rate.14

Pathophysiological Basis for Volume Restitution

The hemodynamic instability following LVP underscores the critical need for effective volume restitution. Albumin, a high molecular weight colloid, is the most extensively studied plasma expander for this purpose. It exerts its beneficial effects through oncotic pressure restoration and the modulation of systemic inflammation. Albumin also improves vascular endothelial function by binding to and neutralizing vasodilatory substances such as nitric oxide (NO) and endotoxins, thus stabilizing the circulatory system and preventing renal dysfunction. Studies have consistently demonstrated that albumin reduces the incidence of PICD, improves short-term survival, and enhances overall hemodynamic stability.13,14

Despite its efficacy, albumin's widespread use is hindered by its high cost, limited availability, and the logistical challenges of intravenous administration, particularly in resource-limited settings. These limitations have spurred interest in alternative therapies, such as midodrine, an oral α1-adrenergic agonist that enhances peripheral vasoconstriction and improves mean arterial pressure (MAP).14

Comparative Analysis of Outcomes

A meta-analysis of RCTs comparing midodrine and albumin for volume restitution post-LVP reveals important nuances. While both interventions significantly reduce the incidence of PICD, albumin demonstrates superior efficacy in preventing severe renal complications and mortality in patients with high baseline risk factors, such as low serum albumin levels and advanced Child-Pugh class. Conversely, midodrine offers a more practical and economical solution in lower-risk patients, particularly in outpatient settings or in regions where healthcare resources are constrained.14

In terms of cost-effectiveness, midodrine offers a substantial advantage. The reduced financial burden of oral administration, coupled with its accessibility, makes it an attractive option for broader implementation, particularly in healthcare systems with limited budgets. This is particularly relevant in low- and middle-income countries, where the cost of albumin may be prohibitive.14

Safety and Tolerability

The safety profile of midodrine is generally favorable, with most adverse effects being mild and related to its vasoconstrictive action, such as piloerection, pruritus, and supine hypertension. These side effects are typically manageable and rarely necessitate discontinuation. In contrast, albumin administration is associated with risks such as volume overload and hypersensitivity reactions, although these are infrequent.15

While the existing body of evidence supports the utility of both midodrine and albumin in preventing PICD, several gaps remain. First, long-term comparative studies are needed to assess the impact of these interventions on overall survival, quality of life, and healthcare resource utilization. Second, patient selection criteria should be refined to identify those who would benefit most from each therapy. Finally, the potential synergistic use of midodrine in combination with low-dose albumin warrants exploration, as this could optimize outcomes while reducing costs.16

Both midodrine and albumin are effective in preventing PICD in patients undergoing LVP for refractory ascites. The choice of therapy should be individualized, taking into account the patient's hemodynamic status, liver disease severity, and healthcare resource availability. While albumin remains the gold standard, midodrine provides a viable alternative, particularly in settings where cost and accessibility are primary concerns. Future research should focus on developing tailored treatment protocols that maximize clinical benefits while ensuring sustainability and equity in care delivery.16

CONCLUSION

The management of refractory ascites, a severe complication of decompensated cirrhosis, necessitates frequent large-volume paracentesis (LVP) to alleviate symptoms and improve patient quality of life. However, the procedure is associated with the significant risk of paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction (PICD), which can precipitate renal dysfunction, accelerate disease progression, and worsen prognosis. In this context, adequate volume restitution is a cornerstone of care to prevent hemodynamic instability and its sequelae.

Albumin has long been the standard of care for volume expansion following LVP due to its well-documented efficacy in reducing the incidence of PICD and its beneficial effects on systemic inflammation, vascular endothelial function, and overall hemodynamic stability. However, its high cost, limited availability, and logistical challenges, particularly in resource-limited healthcare systems, underscore the need for alternative therapeutic options.

Midodrine, an oral α1-adrenergic agonist, has emerged as a promising alternative. By promoting peripheral vasoconstriction, midodrine counteracts the splanchnic vasodilation that characterizes advanced cirrhosis, thereby improving effective arterial blood volume and mean arterial pressure (MAP). The available evidence suggests that midodrine is effective in preventing PICD, with comparable

outcomes to albumin in certain patient populations. Additionally, midodrine offers practical advantages, including ease of administration and lower cost, making it particularly valuable in outpatient settings and in healthcare systems with limited resources.

While both albumin and midodrine demonstrate efficacy in the prevention of PICD, their use should be tailored to the individual patient. Albumin may be preferable in patients with advanced liver disease, severe hypoalbuminemia, or those at higher risk of renal complications, given its superior oncotic and anti-inflammatory properties. Conversely, midodrine represents a cost-effective alternative for patients with less severe disease or in settings where albumin is not readily available.

Future research should aim to further delineate the roles of these two agents, with a focus on long-term outcomes, including survival, quality of life, and cost-effectiveness. Additionally, the potential for combination therapy—using midodrine to enhance vascular tone alongside low-dose albumin to provide oncotic support—warrants exploration.

In conclusion, the choice between midodrine and albumin for volume restitution post-LVP should be guided by a comprehensive assessment of patient-specific factors, healthcare system constraints, and the availability of resources. By optimizing volume restitution strategies, clinicians can mitigate the risks associated with LVP, improve patient outcomes, and enhance the overall management of refractory ascites in cirrhotic patients.

REFERENCES

I. Garbuzenko, DV, Arefyev, NO. Current approaches to the management of patients with cirrhotic ascites. World J Gastroenterol. 2019; 25(28): 3738–52.

II. Pedersen, JS, Bendtsen, F, Møller, S. Management of cirrhotic ascites. Ther Adv Chronic Dis. 2015; 6: 124-137.

III. Arroyo, V, Gines, P, Gerbes, AL, Dudley, FJ, Gentilini, P, Laffi, G et al. Definition and diagnostic criteria of refractory ascites and hepatorenal syndrome in cirrhosis. International Ascites Club. Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.). 1996; 23: 164-76.

IV. Fortune B, Cardenas A. Ascites, refractory ascites and hyponatremia in cirrhosis. Gastroenterology Rep (Oxf). 2017; 5: 104–112.

V. Kim JH. What we know about paracentesis induced circulatory dysfunction? Clin Mol Hepatol .2015; 21(4), 349–351.

VI. European Association for the Study of the Liver. EASL clinical practice guidelines on the management of ascites, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, and hepatorenal syndrome in cirrhosis. J Hepatol. 2010; 53:397–417.

VII. Gines P, Tito L, Arroyo V, Planas R, Panes J, Viver J et al. Randomized comparative study of therapeutic paracentesis with and without intravenous albumin in cirrhosis. Gastroenterology. 1988; 94: 1493- 1502.

VIII. Sola-Vera J, Such J. Understanding the mechanisms of paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2004; 295-298.

IX. Salo J, Gines, A, Gines P, Piera C, Jimenez W, Guevara M et al. Effect of therapeutic paracentesis on plasma volume and transvascular escape rate of albumin in patients with cirrhosis. J Hepatol. 1997; 27: 645–653.

X. Pinto PC, Amerian J, Reynolds, TB. Large-volume paracentesis in nonedematous patients with tense ascites: its effect on intravascular volume. Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.). 1988; 8: 207–210.

XI. Ruiz-del-Arbol L, Monescillo A, Jimenez W, Garcia-Plaza A, Arroyo V, Rodes J et al. Paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction: mechanism and effect on hepatic hemodynamics in cirrhosis. Gastroenterology. 1997; 113: 579–586.

XII. Angeli P, Volpin R, Piovan D, Bortoluzzi A, Craighero R, Bottaro S et al. Acute effects of the oral administration of midodrine, an alpha- adrenergic agonist, on renal hemodynamics and renal function in cirrhotic patients with ascites. Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.). 1998; 28:937-43.

XIII. Katzung BG, Trevor, AJ. Basic and Clinical Pharmacology. 14th Ed. 2017 McGraw-Hill Education / Medical.

XIV. Yosry A, Soliman ZA, Eletreby R, Hamza I, Ismail A, Elkady MA et al. Oral midodrine is comparable to albumin infusion in cirrhotic patients with refractory ascites undergoing large-volume paracentesis: results of a pilot study. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2019; 31: 345-51.

XV. Hamdy H, ElBaz AA, Hassan A, Hassanin O. Comparison of midodrine and albumin in the prevention of paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction in cirrhotic patients: a randomized pilot study. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2014; 48: 184–188.

XVI. Appenrodt B, Wolf A, Grunhage F, Trebicka J, Schepke M, Rabe C et al. Prevention of paracentesis-induced circulatory dysfunction: midodrine vs albumin. A randomized pilot study. Liver Int. 2008; 28: 1019–25.