Diagnosing dehydration?

Armstrong, Lawrence E; Kavouras, Stavros A; Walsh, Neil P; Roberts, William O.

Current opinion in clinical nutrition and metabolic care

1 **Diagnosing dehydration? Blend evidence with clinical observations**

2

3 Lawrence E. Armstrong, Ph.D., FACSM[1], Stavros A. Kavouras, Ph.D., FACSM [2*], Neil P. Walsh,

4 Ph.D., FACSM [3], and William O. Roberts, M.D., FACSM [4]

5

6 [1] University of Connecticut, Human Performance Laboratory, Storrs CT 06269-1110, USA; Tel:

7 860.486.1120; e-mail: Lawrence.armstrong@uconn.edu

8 [2] University of Arkansas, Hydration Science Lab, Fayetteville AR 72701, USA; Tel: 479.575.5309; e-mail:

9 kavouras@uark.edu

10 [3] Bangor University, Extremes Research Group, George Building, Bangor, Gwynedd, Wales, LL57 2PZ,

11 United Kingdom; Tel: 44 (0) 1248 382756, ext 3480; e-mail: n.walsh@bangor.ac.uk

12 [4] University of Minnesota, Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, St Paul, MN 55106,

13 USA; Tel**:** 651.772-3461; e-mail: rober037@umn.edu

14

15 ***Corresponding Author**

16 Stavros A. Kavouras, Ph.D., FACSM

17 University of Arkansas

18 Hydration Science Lab

19 Fayetteville, AR 72701

20 USA

21 Office telephone: +1 (479) 445-7308

22 e-mail: kavouras@uark.edu

23

24 **Running Head**

25 Diagnostic Considerations for Dehydration

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Purpose of Review**

29 The purpose of the review is to provide recommendations to improve clinical decision making

30 based on the strengths and weaknesses of commonly-used hydration biomarkers and clinical

31 assessment methods.

32 **Recent findings**

33 There is widespread consensus regarding treatment, but not the diagnosis of dehydration. Even

34 though it is generally accepted that a proper clinical diagnosis of dehydration can only be made

35 biochemically rather than relying upon clinical signs and symptoms, no gold standard

36 biochemical hydration index exists. Other than clinical biomarkers in blood (i.e. osmolality,

37 BUN/creatinine) and in urine (i.e. osmolality, specific gravity), blood pressure assessment and

38 clinical symptoms in the eye (i.e. tear production, palpitating pressure) and the mouth (i.e. thirst,

39 mucous wetness) can provide important information for diagnosing dehydration.

40 **Summary**

41 It is recommended that clinical observations based on a combination of history, physical

42 examination, laboratory values, and clinician experience remain the best approach to the

43 diagnosis of dehydration.

44

47   **INTRODUCTION**

48   Adults and children continuously lose and replace body water, and often develop mild, but not

49   clinically significant dehydration several times each week. Although very mild dehydration of 1.5

50   – 2 % body mass loss alters mood and results in reduced cognitive (1, 2) and physical (3)

51   performance, it is easily corrected. When left chronically untreated, moderate-to-severe

52   dehydration increases the risk of urinary tract infection, chronic kidney disease (4-6), and also

53   increases medical costs, morbidity, and mortality (7). Unfortunately, despite numerous

54   investigations (8), the methods of dehydration assessment have not been refined to the point

55   that a single reference standard has been identified for clinical decision making (9); this

56   magnifies the difficulty of diagnosing dehydration in clinical practice (9-12). This article provides

57   recommendations to improve clinical decision making based on the strengths and weaknesses

58   of commonly-used hydration biomarkers and clinical assessment methods.

59

60   **Scientific evidence that informs clinical observations**

61   We approached this problem from three perspectives: (a) rating the scientific and clinical value

62   of hydration assessment techniques; (b) rating the time, monetary cost, and technical expertise

63   required; and (c) incorporating the conclusions of previously published review papers. Table 1

64   provides a synthesis of the findings of previous publications (9, 13-16) and consensus of the

65   present authors.

66   [Table 1]

67   There is widespread consensus regarding treatment, but not the diagnosis of dehydration.

68   Although it is generally accepted that a proper clinical diagnosis of dehydration can only be

69   made biochemically (e.g. using clinical laboratory tests), rather than relying upon clinical signs

70   and symptoms (Table 1) (16), no gold standard biochemical hydration index exists (13, 16).

71   The techniques presented in Table 1 include signs and symptoms that are frequently used in

72   clinical practice for screening purposes because of their relative simplicity, speed of

73   measurement and low cost. Unfortunately, the teaching and choice of signs and symptoms are

74   largely based on clinical experience and medical tradition (11, 16); very often, the underpinning

75   scientific evidence supporting their use is weak (e.g., lack of comparison to a recognized

76   criterion or reference standard). The holy grail of identifying a single gold standard hydration

77   index is unrealistic given that the clinician evaluates different types of dehydration (e.g.

78   hypertonic and isotonic), different severities of dehydration, and often observes a patient only

79   once (i.e., static assessment in an emergency department), as opposed to monitoring hydration

80   relative to a euhydrated baseline (i.e., dynamic assessment in a nursing facility). Further, the

81   clinician accounts for the potentially confounding effects of illness and medications, and

82   considers the desired precision, accuracy, cost, analytical time and expertise required to

83   perform the measurement (Table 1).

84

85   Blood osmolality has been proposed as a suitable index of dehydration (typically defined as >

86   300 mOsm·kg^{-1}) (9, 12); however, this is not universally accepted (13, 17). Evidence supporting

87   blood osmolality as a hydration index typically comes from studies that incorporate a sweat-loss

88   model of hypertonic hypovolemia in young, fit, and healthy individuals. As such, blood osmolality

89   is unsuitable to detect isotonic hypovolemia that often results from illness and medications (e.g.,

90   diuretics) in a clinical setting. This situation is compounded by a lack of standardization in blood

91   osmolality measurements (calculated values versus direct measurements via osmometer, Table

92   1) and other clinical laboratory indices of hydration.

93

94   Guidelines for the treatment of dehydration are widely accepted, as published by the U.S.

95   Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the World Health Organization, the American

96   Academy of Pediatrics, and the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence of the

97   United Kingdom. Guidelines for the diagnosis of dehydration are not universally accepted.

98

99   **The decision algorithm**

100   From the clinical perspective, volume depletion (loss of sodium from the extracellular space)

101   and dehydration (loss of water from the intracellular space) must be distinguished because this

102   influences the type and rate of fluid and electrolyte replacement. At this time, the evaluation for

103   both remains largely a clinically based process incorporating the patient history, physical

104   examination, and available laboratory values. The history and presenting circumstances often

105   drive the decision algorithm. Confounding factors influence the decision to treat for dehydration,

106   including intravascular volume depletion in the face of obvious total body water increase with

107   peripheral edema on physical exam.

108   [Figure 1]

109   Clinical observations such as skin turgor, mucous membrane moisture, sunken eyes, and tear

110   production can be helpful in children when multiple findings are present, but are not as reliable

111   in the elderly (16). Physical examination measurements such as orthostatic blood pressure and

112   heart rate responses support the clinical observation of dehydration. However, orthostatic

113   changes can be difficult to obtain in a compromised patient and may reflect dilated lower

114   extremity vasculature in an athlete post competition. Body weight can vary from day to day and

115   is useful in the acute clinical setting when there is a reasonable baseline weight to compare to

116   the current weight; however, variations in scales make this assessment less reliable. The

117   admission body weight measurement provides a useful baseline to assess body fluid changes,

118   especially when measured within a 24-h period on the same scale.

119

120   Clinical laboratory values are helpful in the context of the history and physical exam.

121   BUN/creatinine ratio, hematocrit/hemoglobin ratio, serum sodium concentration, serum

122   osmolality, and urine specific gravity are commonly measured in clinics, emergency

123   departments and on the wards, but have not been validated as a reference standard. In

124   particular, urine specific gravity reportedly is unreliable in diagnosing dehydration in children

125   with gastroenteritis (18). Medications, especially from the diuretic classes, can confuse the

126   biochemical picture by varying the renal clearance of water and electrolytes. Invasive

127   procedures with central intravascular lines help establish the volume status and fluid balance of

128   critically ill patients, but are not used in non-critical dehydration patients. Chronic kidney

129   disease, heart failure, and other maladies that affect renal blood flow also confound the clinical

130   picture and complicate diagnostic efforts. Recent evidence further complicates the assessment

131   of hydration status, in that different hydration indices may validly identify dehydration in one

132   circumstance but not another (19).

133

134   **CONCLUSION**

135   Clearly, a pressing need exists for well-controlled studies of clinically relevant dehydration

136   models (i.e., both hypertonic and isotonic hypovolemia) in appropriate patient populations (i.e.,

137   other than athletes and military personnel) that identify hydration indices with scientific and

138   clinical validity and precision. Only then can normal and clinically significant population ranges

139   be determined. At present, clinical observations based on a combination of history, physical

140   examination, laboratory values, and clinician experience remain the best approach to the

141   diagnosis of dehydration. Figure 1 and Table 1 provide guidance to that end.

142

143 **KEY POINTS**

144 • Clinical observations based on a combination of history, physical examination, laboratory

145 values, and clinician experience is the best approach to the diagnosis of dehydration.

146 • There is widespread consensus regarding treatment, but not the diagnosis of

147 dehydration.

148 • There is a pressing need for well-controlled studies of clinically relevant dehydration

149 models in appropriate patient populations (i.e., other than athletes and soldiers) that

150 identify hydration indices with scientific and clinical validity and precision.

151

152 **Acknowledgements**

153 None

154 **Financial support and sponsorship**

155 None

156 **Conflicts of interest**

157 **LEA** is currently a consultant for Drinking Water Research Foundation, Alexandria VA and

158 Danone Research, France; has received grants from Danone Research, France; is on the

159 speaker's bureau for Drinking Water Research Foundation, Alexandria VA and Danone

160 Research, France. **SAK** is currently a consultant for Quest Diagnostics, Secaucus, NJ and

161 Danone Research, France; has active grants with Danone Research, France; is on the

162 speaker's bureau for Danone Research, France. **NPW** has received a grant with HydraDX.

163 **WOR** None.

164

165   **REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING**

166   Papers of particular interest, published within the annual period of review, have been highlighted

167   as:

168   *   of special interest

169   **   of outstanding interest

170

171   1.   Armstrong LE, Ganio MS, Casa DJ, Lee EC, McDermott BP, Klau JF, et al. Mild dehydration affects

172   mood in healthy young women. Journal of Nutrition. 2012;142(2):382-8.

173   2.   Watson P, Whale A, Mears SA, Reyner LA, Maughan RJ. Mild hypohydration increases the

174   frequency of driver errors during a prolonged, monotonous driving task. Physiol Behav. 2015;147:313-8.

175   **The results of the present study indicated that mild hypohydration increased minor driving errors

176   complared to euhydration. The degree of the errors were comperable to the effects observed

177   following ingestion of an alchoholic beverage.

178   3.   Bardis CN, Kavouras SA, Kosti L, Markousi M, Sidossis LS. Mild hypohydration decreases cycling

179   performance in the heat. 2013;45(9):1782-9.

180   4.   Armstrong LE. Challenges of linking chronic dehydration and fluid consumption to health

181   outcomes. Nutr Rev. 2012;70 Suppl 2:S121-7.

182   5.   Clark WF, Sontrop JM, Huang S-H, Moist L, Bouby N, Bankir L. Hydration and Chronic Kidney

183   Disease Progression: A Critical Review of the Evidence. Am J Nephrol. 2016;43(4):281-92.

184   * This is a review on the effect of hydration in kidney health. The paper indicates that increase in water

185   intake has beneficial effects on chronic kidney disease by suppressing vasopressin.

186   6.   Sontrop JM, Dixon SN, Garg AX, Buendia-Jimenez I, Dohein O, Huang S-HS, et al. Association

187   between water intake, chronic kidney disease, and cardiovascular disease: a cross-sectional analysis of

188   NHANES data. Am J Nephrol. 2013;37(5):434-42.

189   7.   Cowen LE, Hodak SP, Verbalis JG. Age-associated abnormalities of water homeostasis.

190   Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am. 2013;42(2):349-70.

191   8.   Cheuvront SN, Kenefick RW. Am I Drinking Enough? Yes, No, and Maybe. J Am Coll Nutr.

192   2016;35(2):185-92.

193   ** This review discusses the adequacy of total water intake by two different angles: avoiding

194   dehydration and balancing renal solute load.

195   9.   Cheuvront SN, Kenefick RW, Charkoudian N, Sawka MN. Physiologic basis for understanding

196   quantitative dehydration assessment. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2013;97(3):455-62.

197   10.   Hayajneh WA, Jdaitawi H, Al Shurman A, Hayajneh YA. Comparison of clinical associations and

198   laboratory abnormalities in children with moderate and severe dehydration. J Pediatr Gastroenterol

199   Nutr. 2010;50(3):290-4.

200   11.   Roland D, Clarke C, Borland ML, Pascoe EM. Does a standardised scoring system of clinical signs

201   reduce variability between doctors' assessments of the potentially dehydrated child? J Paediatr Child

202   Health. 2010;46(3):103-7.

203   12.   Sollanek KJ, Kenefick RW, Walsh NP, Fortes MB, Esmaeelpour M, Cheuvront SN. Assessment of

204   thermal dehydration using the human eye What is the potential? Journal of Thermal Biology. 2012:1-7.

205   13.   Armstrong LE. Assessing hydration status: the elusive gold standard. J Am Coll Nutr. 2007;26(5

206   Suppl):575S-84S.

207   14.   Kavouras SA, Johnson EC, Bougatsas D, Arnaoutis G, Panagiotakos DB, Perrier E, et al. Validation

208   of a urine color scale for assessment of urine osmolality in healthy children. Eur J Nutr. 2016;55(3):907-

209   15.

210   * This study suggested that urine color is a valid marker to assess elevated urine osmolality in young

211   healthy children.

212 15.   McKenzie AL, Munoz CX, Ellis LA, Perrier ET, Guelinckx I, Klein A, et al. Urine color as an indicator

213 of urine concentration in pregnant and lactating women. Eur J Nutr. 2015.

214 * This study concluded that urine color is a valid marker of urine concentration for pregnant and

215 lactating women.

216 16.   Sinert R, Spektor M. Evidence-based emergency medicine/rational clinical examination abstract.

217 Clinical assessment of hypovolemia. Ann Emerg Med. 2005;45(3):327-9.

218 17.   Fortes MB, Owen JA, Raymond-Barker P, Bishop C, Elghenzai S, Oliver SJ, et al. Is this elderly

219 patient dehydrated? Diagnostic accuracy of hydration assessment using physical signs, urine, and saliva

220 markers. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association. 2015;16(3):221-8.

221 * This study assessed the diagnostic ability of physical, urine and saliva hydration markers in older

222 adults. An interesting finding was that saliva osmolality had superior diagnostic utility than plasma

223 osmolality.

224 18.   Steiner MJ, Nager AL, Wang VJ. Urine specific gravity and other urinary indices: inaccurate tests

225 for dehydration. Pediatr Emerg Care. 2007;23(5):298-303.

226 19.   Munoz CX, Johnson EC, DeMartini JK, Huggins RA, McKenzie AL, Casa DJ, et al. Assessment of

227 hydration biomarkers including salivary osmolality during passive and active dehydration. Eur J Clin Nutr.

228 2013.

229

230 **Figure 1 Legend**

231 Physical examination and laboratory measurements aid diagnosis when multiple findings exist

232

233 **Table 1 Title**

234 Comparison of research and clinical techniques to diagnose dehydration during a single

235 examination.

236

237

238   Table 1

Table 1. Comparison of Research and Clinical Techniques to Diagnose Dehydration, Using a Single Measurement.

Hydration Assessment Techniques	Patient Self-Evaluation	Cost Efficiency	Time Efficiency	Simplicity of Test	Scientific Value [c]
Signs & Symptoms					
Dry mucous membrane		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●○○	●○○○○
Skin turgor		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●○○○	●○○○○
Nail bed refill time (sec)		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●○○	●○○○○
Thirst sensation (thirst scale rating)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●○○
Respiratory pattern		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●○	●○○○○
Dry axilla		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Seated systolic blood pressure (mmHg)		●●●●●	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○
Blood pressure change supine/upright [a] (mmHg)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○
Heart rate change supine/upright (beats·min⁻¹)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●○○○
Absence of tears		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Sunken eyes		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Palpated intraocular pressure		●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Dark urine color (color chart rating)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●○○
Body mass (kg)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests					
BUN/creatinine ratio		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●●○
Serum sodium concentration (mEq·L⁻¹ or mmol·L⁻¹)		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●○○○	●●●○○
Blood osmolality, calculated (mOsm·kg⁻¹ or mmol·kg⁻¹)		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●○○○	●●●●○
Hematocrit/hemoglobin ratio		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○
Mean corpuscular volume (fL)		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○
Urine specific gravity		●●●●●	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○
Research Measurements					
Isotope dilution, total body water (L)		●○○○○	●○○○○	●○○○○	●●●○○
Neutron activation analysis, fluid volumes and ionic content		●○○○○	●○○○○	●○○○○	●●●○○
Bioelectrical impedance analysis, total body water (L)		●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●○○
Body mass (kg)	✓	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●●	●○○○○
Blood osmolality, measured [b] (mOsm·kg⁻¹ or mmol·kg⁻¹)		●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●○○	●●●●○
Urine osmolality (mOsm·kg⁻¹ or mmol·kg⁻¹)		●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○
Salivary osmolality (mOsm·kg⁻¹ or mmol·kg⁻¹)		●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●●○
Tear osmolarity (mOsm·L⁻¹ or mmol·L⁻¹)		●●●●○	●●●●○	●●●○○	●●●○○
Intraocular pressure (mmHg)		●●●●○	●●●○○	●●●○○	●●○○○

[a] lying to sitting, sitting to standing, lying to standing
[b] measured via freezing point depression osmometry
[c] considering measurement resolution, reliability and accuracy

●●●●● = high, ●●●○○ = medium & ●○○○○ = low

239

240   Figure 1

Absence of tears
Sunken Eyes
Palpate Pressure

Dry mucous membrane
Thirst
Salivary osmolality

Change in BP
supine/standing: ≥20 mmHg
Seated systolic BP: ≤100 mmHg

Blood Osmolality: ≥300 mmol/kg
BUN/Cr: ≥20

Osmolality: ≥800 mmol/kg
USG: ≥1.025

241