ISSN Print: 2664-6595
ISSN Online: 2664-6609
IJHR 2024; 6(1): 18-20
www.hepatologyjournal.in
Received: 28-12-2023
Accepted: 30-01-2024

Fatima Abdel-Rahman
Professor, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Cairo University Medical School, Cairo, Egypt

Dr. Ahmed Youssef
Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Cairo University Medical School, Cairo, Egypt

Corresponding Author:
Fatima Abdel-Rahman
Professor, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Cairo University Medical School, Cairo, Egypt

Evaluating treatment outcomes in patients with acute on chronic liver failure

Fatima Abdel-Rahman and Dr. Ahmed Youssef

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26646595.2024.v6.i1a.8

Abstract
Background: Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure (ACLF) is a complex and life-threatening condition characterized by acute decompensation of chronic liver disease, often triggered by infections, alcohol, or other insults. Despite advancements in the understanding of ACLF, the prognosis remains poor, and treatment outcomes vary widely depending on several factors. Evaluating the effectiveness of different treatment modalities is crucial for improving patient management and outcomes.
Objective: This study aims to evaluate treatment outcomes in patients with ACLF, focusing on survival rates, prognostic factors, and the effectiveness of specific therapeutic interventions, including liver transplantation.
Methods: A retrospective cohort study was conducted using data from 500 patients diagnosed with ACLF at tertiary care centers over the past five years. Data were analyzed to assess survival rates, treatment outcomes, and the impact of various interventions, including medical management, liver support therapies, and liver transplantation. Statistical analyses were performed to identify key prognostic factors influencing outcomes.
Results: The overall survival rate at 28 days was 55%, with significant variation depending on the severity of ACLF and the type of treatment received. Liver transplantation offered the highest survival benefit, with a 28-day survival rate of 85%. Medical management alone was associated with a 40% survival rate, while liver support therapies showed intermediate outcomes. Prognostic factors such as the presence of systemic infections, renal failure, and the degree of hepatic encephalopathy significantly influenced survival.
Conclusion: Treatment outcomes in ACLF are highly variable, with liver transplantation providing the best chance of survival. Early identification of prognostic factors and timely intervention are critical in improving outcomes. Further research is needed to optimize treatment strategies and improve survival rates for patients with ACLF.

Keywords: ACLF, Evaluating treatment, chronic liver failure, influenced survival, liver transplantation

1. Introduction
Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure (ACLF) is a syndrome that arises in patients with chronic liver disease, characterized by acute decompensation, organ failure, and high short-term mortality. The condition often develops in the context of underlying cirrhosis and can be precipitated by various triggers such as infections, alcohol binge, or other acute insults. The pathophysiology of ACLF involves a complex interplay between systemic inflammation, immune dysregulation, and multi-organ failure, making it a challenging condition to manage. Despite significant advancements in the understanding of ACLF, treatment remains a challenge, with mortality rates ranging from 30% to 70%, depending on the severity and the presence of organ failures. While liver transplantation is considered the definitive treatment for eligible patients, many patients are managed with supportive care and liver support therapies due to the scarcity of donor organs or contraindications to transplantation.
This study aims to evaluate the outcomes of different treatment modalities in patients with ACLF, focusing on survival rates, the effectiveness of therapeutic interventions, and the identification of key prognostic factors that influence patient outcomes. By understanding the factors that contribute to better survival, clinicians can optimize treatment strategies and improve the management of ACLF.

1.1 Main Objective
The main objective of the paper is to evaluate the treatment outcomes in patients with Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure (ACLF) and identify key prognostic factors influencing survival.

2. Methods

2.1 Study Design and Population

A retrospective cohort study was conducted using medical records from 500 patients diagnosed with ACLF at five tertiary care centers between 2018 and 2023. The study included patients aged 18 and older with a confirmed diagnosis of ACLF according to the European Association for the Study of the Liver-Chronic Liver Failure (EASL-CLIF) criteria. Exclusion criteria included patients with non-cirrhotic liver disease, those who underwent liver transplantation for conditions other than ACLF, and patients with incomplete medical records.

2.2 Data Collection

Data were collected on demographics, clinical characteristics, underlying liver disease etiology, triggers of ACLF, organ failures, treatment modalities, and outcomes. Specific interventions analyzed included medical management (e.g., antibiotics, antivirals, corticosteroids), liver support therapies (e.g., albumin dialysis, plasma exchange), and liver transplantation.

2.3 Outcome Measures

The primary outcome measure was 28-day survival following the diagnosis of ACLF. Secondary outcomes included 90-day survival, hospital length of stay, and the impact of specific treatment modalities on survival. Prognostic factors such as the presence of systemic infections, renal failure, hepatic encephalopathy, and the Model for End-Stage Liver Disease (MELD) score were also analyzed.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient characteristics and treatment outcomes. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was performed to estimate survival rates at 28 and 90 days. Cox proportional hazards models were used to identify independent prognostic factors associated with survival. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 26.

3. Results

3.1 Patient Characteristics: The study population included 500 patients with ACLF, with a mean age of 52 years (range 18-78) and a male predominance (65%). The most common underlying etiologies of chronic liver disease were alcohol-related liver disease (45%), hepatitis C virus infection (25%), and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (20%). The most frequent triggers of ACLF were bacterial infections (35%), acute alcohol consumption (30%), and gastrointestinal bleeding (15%).

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Patients with ACLF

Characteristic	Value
Mean Age (years)	52±14
Gender (Male %)	65%
Underlying Liver Disease Etiology	
Alcohol-Related Liver Disease	45%
Hepatitis C Virus Infection	25%
Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease	20%
Other (e.g., Hepatitis B, Autoimmune)	10%
Common Triggers of ACLF	
Bacterial Infections	35%
Acute Alcohol Consumption	30%
Gastrointestinal Bleeding	15%

3.2 Treatment Modalities and Outcomes: The overall 28-day survival rate for the cohort was 55%, with a 90-day survival rate of 40%. Survival rates varied significantly depending on the treatment modality. Patients who underwent liver transplantation had the highest 28-day survival rate at 85%, compared to 40% for those who received medical management alone and 60% for those treated with liver support therapies.

Table 2: Survival rates by treatment modality

Treatment Modality	28-Day Survival Rate (%)	90-Day Survival Rate (%)
Liver Transplantation	85%	70%
Medical Management	40%	30%
Liver Support Therapies	60%	45%

3.3 Prognostic Factors: Multivariate analysis identified several independent prognostic factors associated with reduced survival in patients with ACLF. The presence of systemic infections, acute kidney injury (AKI), and severe hepatic encephalopathy were the strongest predictors of poor outcomes. Patients with systemic infections had a hazard ratio (HR) of 2.5 (95% CI: 1.8-3.4) for 28-day mortality, while those with AKI had an HR of 2.2 (95% CI: 1.6-3.0). The MELD score was also a significant predictor, with higher scores associated with increased mortality risk.

Table 3: Prognostic Factors for 28-Day Mortality

Prognostic Factor	Hazard Ratio (HR)	95% Confidence Interval (CI)	P-Value
Systemic Infections	2.5	1.8-3.4	< 0.001
Acute Kidney Injury (AKI)	2.2	1.6-3.0	< 0.001
Severe Hepatic Encephalopathy	1.9	1.4-2.7	< 0.01
MELD Score (per unit increase)	1.1	1.05-1.15	< 0.05

4. Discussion

This study provides valuable insights into the treatment outcomes of patients with ACLF, highlighting the variability in survival rates depending on the intervention received. Liver transplantation was associated with the highest survival rates, underscoring its role as the definitive treatment for ACLF when feasible. However, the availability of donor organs remains a significant limiting factor, and many patients must be managed with alternative therapies.

Medical management alone, which includes the use of antibiotics, antivirals, and supportive care, was associated with lower survival rates, particularly in patients with multiple organ failures. This finding emphasizes the need for early and aggressive intervention in patients with ACLF to prevent the progression of organ failure.

Liver support therapies, such as albumin dialysis and plasma exchange, provided intermediate survival benefits. These therapies may serve as a bridge to liver transplantation or as palliative care in patients who are not transplant candidates. The study's findings suggest that while these therapies can improve short-term outcomes, they do not replace the need for transplantation in eligible patients.

The identification of key prognostic factors, such as systemic infections, AKI, and severe hepatic encephalopathy, provides critical information for risk stratification and clinical decision-making. Early identification and management of these factors could improve outcomes by guiding the timing and selection of therapeutic interventions.

Despite the strengths of this study, including a large cohort and comprehensive data analysis, there are limitations to consider. The retrospective design may introduce selection bias, and the findings may not be generalizable to all healthcare settings. Additionally, the study did not assess the long-term outcomes beyond 90 days, which are important for understanding the full impact of treatment on survival and quality of life.

5. Conclusion

The treatment of ACLF remains challenging, with significant variability in outcomes depending on the therapeutic approach. Liver transplantation offers the best chance of survival, but access to transplantation is limited by organ availability and patient eligibility. Early intervention, particularly in managing prognostic factors such as systemic infections and renal failure, is crucial for improving outcomes. Further research is needed to refine treatment strategies, optimize the use of liver support therapies, and improve patient selection for transplantation to enhance survival in patients with ACLF.

6. References

1. European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL). EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines on the Management of Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure. J Hepatol. 2021;75(2):467-484.
2. Olson JC, Wendon JA, Kramer DJ, *et al*. Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure: Mechanisms of Multi-Organ Failure and Prognostic Indicators. J Hepatol. 2018;69(2):610-622.
3. Moreau R, Jalan R, Gines P, *et al*. Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure is a Distinct Syndrome that Develops in Patients with Acute Decompensation of Cirrhosis. Gastroenterology. 2013;144(7):1426-1437.
4. Sundaram V, Jalan R, Wu T, *et al*. Factors Associated with Survival of Patients with Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2017;15(12):2042-2050.
5. Singh V, Sharma MK, Narasimhan RL, *et al*. Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure: A Prospective Study to Determine the Prognostic Factors, Long-Term Outcome, and the Role of Liver Transplantation. Am J Gastroenterol. 2015;110(7):1006-1013.
6. Shi Y, Yang Y, Hu Y, *et al*. Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure Prognostic Model: A Multinational Survey from the Asia-Pacific Region. Hepatology. 2019;69(2):651-662.