## Evaluation of Pre-Operative Nutritional Status as a Prognostic Value of Outcome in Patients Subjected to Living Donor Liver Transplantation

# Thesis Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of MD Degree in Critical Care Medicine

By

Yahya Abdel Twab Mohamed Meky M.B.,B.Ch, M.Sc. of Critical Care Medicine Cairo University

#### **Under Supervisin of**

#### Prof. Dr / Mohamed Abdel Khalek Mohamed Ali

Professor of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### Prof.Dr/ Hanan Mahmoud Farag Awad

Assistant Professor of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine

Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### Dr / Mahmoud Ahamad Abdel-Hakim Galal

Lecturer of Anaesthesiology and intensive Care Medicine Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

> Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University

> > 2012

## Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I thank Allah who gave me the strength to fulfill this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr**/ **Mohamed Abdel Khalek Mohamed Ali,** Professor of
Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Faculty of
Medicine – Ain Shams University, for his kind supervision,
encouragement and constant help. Under his supervision, I have
the honor to complete this work.

I am grateful to **Dr/ Hanan Mahmoud Farag Awad**, Assistant Professor of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for her constant supervision and honest assistance. Her moral support cannot be praised enough with words.

It is a great honor to express my sincere appreciation to **Dr / Mahmoud Ahamad Abdel-Hakim Galal**, Lecturer of, Anaesthesiology and intensive Care Medicine, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for his kind supervision, continuous encouragement and persistent support

Yehia Abdel Cawab

## **Contents**

|   | Page No. |
|---|----------|
| List of abbreviations                             | i        |
| List of Tables                                    | iii      |
| List of Figures                                   | v        |
| Introduction                                      |          |
| Aim of the Work                                   | 4        |
| Review of Literature                              |          |
| Living Donor Liver Tyransplant                    | 5        |
| Methods for Nutritional Status Evaluation         | 21       |
| Malnutrition                                      | 44       |
| Impact of Nutritional Status on Postoperative LDL | Γ65      |
| Patients and Methods                              | 73       |
| Results   | 77       |
| Discussion  |          |
| Conclusion  | 116      |
| Summary   | 117      |
| References  |          |
| Arabic Summary                                    |          |

#### List of Abbreviations

**AASLD** : American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases

**AH** : Acute hepatitis

**AMC** : Arm muscle circumference

**ASPEN**: American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition

**BIA** : Bioelectrical impedance analysis

**BMI** : Body mass index

CAH : Chronic active hepatitisCHI : Creatine-height index

**CMV** : Cytomegalovirus

CT : Computed tomographyCTP : Child-Turcotte-Pugh

DCH : Delayed cutaneous hypersensitivity
 DDLT : Deceased donor liver transplantation
 DEXA : Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry

**EBV** : Ebstein Barr virus

**ESLD** : End-stage liver disease

**FFM** : Fat-free mass

**FGD** : Fist-grip dynamometry

**FM** : Free mass

**HBV** : Hepatitis B virus

**HCC**: Hepatocellular carcinoma

**HCV** : Hepatitis C virus

**HIV** : Human immunodeficiency virus

IBW : Ideal body weightICU : Intensive care unit

**Kg** : Kilograms

**LDLT** : Living-donor liver transplantation

LT : Liver transplantation

MAC : Midarm muscle circumference
MAMC : Mid-arm muscle circumference

MELD : Model for End-Stage Liver DiseaseMHD : Maintenance hemodialysis patients

MNA : Mini-Nutritional AssessmentMST : Malnutrition Screening Tool

MUST : Malnutrition Universal Screening Tool

N : Nitrogen

**OLT** : Orthotopic liver transplantation

**PAB** : Prealbumin

PBC : Primary biliary cirrhosis
PCM : Protein-calorie malnutrition

**PCV** : Packed red cells

**PEM** : Protein-energy malnutrition

**PINI**: Prognostic Inflammatory and Nutritional Index

**PN**: Parenteral nutrition

PNI : Prognostic Nutrition IndexRBP : Retinol-binding proteinSC : Sclerosing cholangitis

**SGA** : Subjective global assessment

**TPN**: Total parenteral nutrition

**TSF** : Triceps skin fold

TTR : Transthyretin

**UUN** : Urinary urea nitrogen

## List of Tables

| Table               | No. Title   | Page No. |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| Table (1):          | Transplantation Evaluation Process:                                       | 6        |
| <b>Table (2):</b>   | Child-Turcotte-Pugh (CTP) Scoring Syste<br>Assess                         |          |
| <b>Table (3):</b>   | Protocol for Evaluation of Potential:                                     | 9        |
| <b>Table (4):</b>   | Criteria of living donors   | 10       |
| <b>Table (5):</b>   | Medical Complications in the Immediate Transplantation Period             |          |
| <b>Table (6):</b>   | Classification of Nutritional Status by<br>Mass Index in Adults           |          |
| <b>Table (7):</b>   | Hepatically Synthesized Proteins Used<br>Assessment of Nutritional Status |          |
| <b>Table (8):</b>   | Subjective Global Assessment (SGA Nutritional Status                      |          |
| <b>Table (9):</b>   | Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA):  | 39       |
| <b>Table (10):</b>  | Methods for Nutritional Status Evaluation                                 | 41       |
| <b>Table (11):</b>  | Definitions of malnutrition:  | 45       |
| <b>Table (12):</b>  | Three validated tools for nutrition screening their rating systems        | _        |
| <b>Table (13):</b>  | Etiology of Malnutrition in ESLD  | 53       |
| <b>Table (14):</b>  | Goals of Nutritional Therapy in Patients ESLD Waiting for LT:             |          |
| <b>Table (15):</b>  | Prognostic Indices in Hospitalized Patients                               | s71      |
| <b>Table (16)</b> : | Demographic characteristics of the two grou                               | ıps78    |
| <b>Table (17)</b> : | Risk factors in the two studied groups                                    | 80       |
| <b>Table (18)</b> : | Child score in the two studied groups                                     | 81       |

| <b>Table (19):</b>   | Anthropometric measures of the two studied groups                                      | 83 |
|----------------------|--|----|
| <b>Table (20):</b>   | Subjective global assessments in the two studied groups                                | 84 |
| <b>Table (21):</b>   | Mean values of hematological and biochemical parameters of the two studied groups      | 86 |
| <b>Table (22):</b> N | Mean values of prealbumin and transferrin in the two studied groups                    | 88 |
| <b>Table (23):</b>   | Mean values of prealbumin and transferrin in the two studied groups                    | 89 |
| <b>Table (24):</b>   | Multinominal logistic regression used for prediction of mortality in the studied group | 90 |
| <b>Table (25):</b>   | Complications in the two studied groups  | 91 |
| <b>Table (26):</b>   | Mortality in the two studied groups  | 93 |
| <b>Table (27):</b>   | Mid arm circumference (MAC) correlation with ICU stay                                  | 94 |
| <b>Table (28):</b>   | Mid arm circumference (MAC) correlation with days of mechanical ventilation            | 94 |
| <b>Table (29):</b>   | Triceps skin fold (TSF) correlation with ICU stay:                                     | 95 |
| <b>Table (30):</b>   | Triceps skin fold (TSF) correlation with days of mechanical ventilation                | 96 |
| <b>Table (31):</b>   | Prealbumin levels correlation with ICU stay:   | 97 |
| <b>Table (32):</b>   | Prealbumin and albumin levels correlation with mechanical ventilatory days:            | 97 |
| <b>Table (33):</b>   | Transferrin levels correlation with ICU stay   | 98 |
| <b>Table (34):</b>   | Transferrin levels correlation with mechanical ventilatory days:                       | 99 |
|                      |  |    |

## **List of Figures**

| Figure N            | o. Title   | Page No. |
|---------------------|--|----------|
| Figure (1):         | Hepatic vasculature and bile ducts                                       | 12       |
| Figure (2):         | Segmental anatomy of the liver as original described by Couinaud         | •        |
| Figure (3):         | Risk factors in the two studied groups                                   | 80       |
| Figure (4):         | Child score in the two studied groups                                    | 81       |
| Figure (5):         | Anthropometric measures of the two stud groups.                          |          |
| Figure (6):         | Subjective global assessments in the t studied groups                    |          |
| Figure (7):         | Mean value of prealbumin in the t studied groups                         |          |
| Figure (8):         | Mean value of transferrin in the two stud groups.                        |          |
| Figure (9): 1       | Mean value of prealbumin in the two stud groups                          |          |
| <b>Figure (10):</b> | Mean value of transferrin in the two stud groups                         |          |
| Figure (11):        | Complications in the two studied groups.                                 | 92       |
| <b>Figure (12):</b> | Mortality in the two studied groups                                      | 93       |
| <b>Figure (13):</b> | Mid arm circumference (MAC) correlat with days of mechanical ventilation |          |
| Figure (14):        | Triceps skin fold (TSF) correlation we days of mechanical ventilation    |          |

| <b>Figure (15):</b> | Prealbumin levels correlation with mechanical ventilatory days9  | 8 |
|---------------------|--|---|
| <b>Figure (16):</b> | Transferrin levels correlation with mechanical ventilatory days9 | 9 |
| <b>Figure (17):</b> | Cut-off point of serum prealbumin for prediction of mortality    | 0 |
| <b>Figure (18):</b> | Cut-off point of serum transferrin for prediction of mortality   | 1 |

#### Introduction

Liver transplantation is potentially applicable to any acute or chronic condition resulting in irreversible liver dysfunction, provided that the recipient does not have other conditions that will preclude a successful transplant. Metastatic cancer outside liver, active drug or alcohol abuse and active septic infections are absolute contraindications. While infection with HIV was once considered an absolute contraindication, this has been changing recently. Advanced age and serious pulmonary or other disease may also transplantation (relative contraindications). Most transplants are performed for chronic liver diseases that lead to irreversible scarring or cirrhosis of the liver. Another cause is cryptogenic liver disease (Adam et al., 2003).

Living donor liver transplantation has emerged in recent decades as a critical surgical option for patients with end stage liver disease, such as cirrhosis and/or hepatocellular carcinoma often attributable to one or more of the following: long-term alcohol abuse, long-term untreated Hepatitis C infection, long-term untreated Hepatitis B infection. The concept of living donor liver transplant is based on the remarkable regenerative capacities of the human liver and the widespread shortage of cadaveric livers for patients awaiting transplant. In living donor liver transplant, a piece of healthy liver is surgically removed from a living person and transplanted into a recipient,



immediately after the recipient's diseased liver has been entirely removed (Tuttle-Newhall et al., 2005).

Nutrition assessment and therapy in end-stage liver disease has become increasingly important with the advent of living donor liver transplantation. Reduced lean body mass, increased risk of sepsis, and altered metabolism carbohydrates, protein, and fat are characteristic of patients with liver dysfunction (Akerman et al., 1993).

Appropriate nutritional assessment and identification of specific nutrition requirements, whether maintenance, repletion, or the need for weight reduction prior to transplantation, require individualized assessment and, in some cases, aggressive nutrition intervention. The goals are to reduce postoperative complications after transplantation (Rebecca et al., 2008).

Nutritional therapy is essential in patients with end stage liver diseases and during all phases of liver transplantation. Adequate nutritional assessment before a transplant helps identify individual problems and may prevent complications. A multidisciplinary team involving the patient's primary care physician, hepatologist, intensivist, registered dietitian, and nursepractitioner should be involved in management and education of patients under liver transplantation evaluation. In the acute posttransplant phase, early nutritional support can reduce complications. Long-term management should be aimed at preventive measures for the metabolic complications of liver transplantation. Provision of adequate nutritional support before



and after liver transplantation will lead to improved outcomes (Tran et al., 2004).

Patients with end-stage liver disease often reveal significant protein-energy malnutrition, which may deteriorate after listing for transplantation. Since malnutrition affects posttransplant survival, precise assessment must be an integral part of pre- and post-surgical management. While there is wide agreement that aggressive treatment of nutritional deficiencies is required, strong scientific evidence supporting nutritional therapy is sparse. In practice, oral nutritional supplements are preferred over parenteral nutrition, but enteral tube feeding may be necessary to maintain adequate calorie intake. Protein restriction should be avoided and administration of branchedchain amino acids may help yield a sufficient protein supply. Specific problems such as micronutrient deficiency, fluid balance, cholestasis, encephalopathy, and comorbid conditions need attention in order to optimize patient outcome (Felix Stickel et al., 2008).

## Aim of the Work

The purpose of this study was to examine preoperative nutritional status as a prognostic parameter of outcome in patients subjected to living donor liver transplantion.

### **Living Donor Liver Tyransplant**

A living-donor liver transplantation, or transplant, is when a live person donates a part of his or her healthy liver. The donated part then grows to full size in the person who receives it (the recipient). After the transplant, the donor's liver also grows back to full size over a very short period of time, usually days or weeks. Sometimes, however, it can take up to several months. The donor may be a family member, such as a parent, sister, brother, or adult child. The donor can also be a husband or wife. Living-donor transplantation was first done in the 1980s in children as a way to shorten the long wait times for a liver (*Robert et al.*, 2007).

Living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) is undoubtedly the single most important development in liver transplantation in the past 10 years. Apart from the growing need, a better understanding of the intrahepatic liver anatomy and liver regeneration, more precise and safe liver-splitting techniques, and refinements in recipient technique and postoperative management have propelled the emergence and wide acceptance of LDLT (*Lo et al.*, 1997).

#### Live-donor liver transplantation:

The details of the formal liver transplantation evaluation vary from center to center, but the essentials are to establish that liver transplantation is indicated in the management of the potential recipient's liver disease, the patient has no

comorbidities severe enough to preclude transplantation, and the patient has adequate emotional and social resources to undergo a major surgical procedure and continue on long-term immunosuppression afterward; table (1).

#### **Table (1):** Transplantation Evaluation Process:

Financial screening Secure approval for evaluation **Medical evaluation** 

Hepatology evaluation Confirm diagnosis and optimize management

Laboratory testing Assess hepatic synthetic function, serum electrolytes, renal function, viral serologies, markers of other causes of liver disease, tumor markers, ABO-Rh blood typing; 24-hour urine for creatinine clearance; urinalysis and urine drug screen.

Cardiac evaluation: Electrocardiography two-dimensional and echocardiography, stress testing and cardiology consult if risk factors are present and/or patient is age 40 years or older

Hepatic imaging: Ultrasonography with Doppler to document portal vein patency, triple-phase computed tomography or gadolinium magnetic resonance imaging for tumor screening.

General health assessment: Chest film, prostate specific antigen level (men), Pap smear and mammogram (women), colonoscopy if patient is age 50 years or older or has primary sclerosing cholangitis.

Transplantation surgery evaluation: Assess technical issues and discuss risks of procedure.

Anesthesia evaluation: Required if unusually high operative risk, e.g., patient has portopulmonary hypertension, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, previous anesthesia complications.

Psychiatry or psychology consultation: If history of substance abuse, psychiatric illness, or adjustment difficulties.

**Social work evaluation:** Address potential psychosocial issues and possible effect of transplantation on patient's personal and social system.

Financial and insurance counseling itemize costs of transplantation and post-transplantation care; help develop financial management plans

**Nutritional evaluation:** Assess nutritional status and patient education

(O'Leary et al., 2008)