GE – Portuguese Journal of Gastroenterology

Research Article

GE Port J Gastroenterol DOI: 10.1159/000516672

Received: December 7, 2020 Accepted: March 20, 2021 Published online: May 25, 2021

Variation in the Care of Acute Liver Failure: A Survey of Intensive Care Professionals

Filipe S. Cardoso^a Mark J. Mcphail^b Constantine J. Karvellas^c Valentin Fuhrmann^d Nuno Germano^a Georg Auzinger^b

^a Intensive Care Unit, Curry Cabral Hospital, Lisbon, Portugal; ^bLiver Intensive Therapy Unit, King's College Hospital, London, UK; ^cDepartment of Critical Care Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ^dDepartment of Medicine B, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

Keywords

Hepatitis · Critical care · Outcomes · Survey

Abstract

Introduction: Acute liver failure (ALF) is a rare disease with potentially high mortality. We sought to assess the individual approach to ALF by intensive care unit (ICU) professionals. Methods: Cross-sectional survey of ICU professionals. Webbased survey capturing data on respondents' demographics, characteristics of patients with ALF admitted to ICU, and their management. Results: Among 204 participants from 50 countries, 140 (68.6%) worked in Europe, 146 (71.6%) were intensivists, 142 (69.6%) admitted <25 patients with ALF per year, and 166 (81.8%) reported <25% of patients had paracetamol-related ALF. On patients' outcomes, 126 (75.0%) reported an emergency liver transplantation (ELT) rate <25% and 140 (73.3%) a hospital mortality rate <50%. The approach to ALF in the ICU varied with age, region, level of training, type of hospital, and etiology (prescribing N-acetylcysteine for paracetamol toxicity, triggers for endotracheal intubation, measurement of and strategies for lowering serum ammonia, extracorporeal device deployment, and prophylactic antibiotics). Conclusions: The management of

karger@karger.com www.karger.com/pjg © 2021 Sociedade Portuguesa de Gastrenterologia Published by S. Karger AG, Basel

This is an Open Access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-4.0 International License (CC BY-NC) (http://www.karger.com/Services/OpenAccessLicense), applicable to the online version of the article only. Usage and distribution for commercial purposes requires written permission. patients with ALF by ICU professionals differed substantially concerning the relevant clinical measures taken. Further education and high-quality research are warranted.

© 2021 Sociedade Portuguesa de Gastrenterologia Published by S. Karger AG, Basel

Variação nos cuidados da falência hepatica aguda: um inquérito a profissionais de cuidados intensivos

Palavras-Chave

Hepatite · Cuidados críticos · Resultados · Inquérito

Resumo

Introdução: A falência hepatica aguda (ALF) é uma doença rara potencialmente letal. Pretendeu-se avaliar a abordagem individual à ALF por profissionais da Unidade de Cuidados Intensivos (UCI). *Métodos:* Inquérito transversal de profissionais da UCI. Inquérito online capturando informação da demografia dos respondedores, características dos doentes com ALF admitidos na UCI e sua abordagem. *Resultados:* Entre 204 participantes de 50 países, 140 (68.6%) trabalhavam na Europa, 146 (71.6%) eram inten-

Correspondence to: Filipe S. Cardoso, filipe_sousacardoso@hotmail.com

 provided by Directory of Open Access Journals

sivistas, 142 (62.9%) admitiam <25 doentes com ALF por ano, e 166 (81.8%) reportaram <25% dos doentes com ALF relacionada com paracetamol. Quanto aos resultados dos doentes, 126 (75.0%) reportaram uma taxa de transplantação hepatica emergente (ELT) <25% e 140 (73.3%) uma taxa de mortalidade hospitalar <50%. A abordagem da ALF variou com a idade, região, nível de treino, tipo de hospital, ou etiologia nos seguintes tópicos: prescrição de N-acetil-cisteína, critérios de intubação orotraqueal, medição e estratégias de control da amoniémia, uso de técnicas extracorporais, e a prescrição de antibióticos profilácticos. **Conclusões:** A abordagem de doentes com ALF por profissionais da UCI diferiu substancialmente em aspectos clínicos importantes. Educação e investigação de qualidade adicionais serão necessárias.

> © 2021 Sociedade Portuguesa de Gastrenterologia Publicado por S. Karger AG, Basel

Introduction

Acute liver failure (ALF) describes a new (no previous cirrhosis) and rapidly evolving (≤ 26 weeks) liver dysfunction associated with neurologic dysfunction (hepatic encephalopathy [HE]) and coagulopathy (international normalized ratio [INR] ≥ 1.5) [1–3]. It is a rare disease with a hospital survival rate of about 60% [1]. This has been improving over the past decades due to earlier diagnosis, timely transfer to specialized centers, better management in the intensive care unit (ICU), and developments in emergency liver transplantation (ELT) [1, 2].

The clinical course of ALF depends on etiology, time from disease onset to the development of HE, and the timely diagnosis and treatment of ensuing organ failure [3, 4]. ELT is the definitive treatment for patients with ALF when the potential to regenerate liver function and survival are predicted to be poor [5].

Reports on ALF epidemiology and outcomes have documented regional variability [6–8]. We hypothesized that the approach to ALF in different ICUs could vary substantially. We performed a survey to characterize the approach to ALF by ICU professionals. We aimed to identify points of care that could be improved, educational goals to be enforced, and research topics to be prioritized.

Methods

This study was endorsed by the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM). Participation was voluntary and consent implied by its completion.

Study Design, Setting, and Participants

We performed a cross-sectional survey aimed at examining current practice on ALF by ICU professionals worldwide, including physicians and nurses. The survey was conducted between November 2018 and June 2019.

Survey Development and Implementation

The survey content was based on literature about ALF [9–12] and comprised questions (online supplementary file 1, for all suppl. material, see www.karger.com/doi/10.1159/000516672) on the demographics of ICU professionals (7 questions), the characterization of patients with ALF admitted to ICU (5 questions), and management of patients (13 questions). All questions were given specific options for answers, with 10 having possible multiple answers and 15 an optional free text response [13]. The survey was reviewed by authors and reviewers of the ESICM Research Committee. It underwent pilot-testing in the ICU at CCH to assess comprehension, feasibility, redundancy, and consistency [14].

The survey was created using a Web-based platform (Survey-Monkey[®]) by ESICM staff and implemented and promoted via the ESICM website (https://www.esicm.org/research/surveys/# ALFinICU). All respondents were ESICM website spontaneous visitors.

Statistical Analysis

Continuous and categorical variables were reported as median (interquartile range) and n (%), respectively. Missing data across all variables were 1.9%, so no imputation was performed.

Univariate comparisons were performed using the Mann-Whitney U/Kruskal-Wallis test or χ^2 /Fisher test where appropriate. Statistical significance was defined as p < 0.05 (2-tailed). Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS v20 (IBM Corp., North Castle, NY, USA).

Results

Demographics of Participants

A total of 204 participants completed the survey in a median 7 (IQR 5–10) min. Median age was 42 (IQR 35–50) years, with 140 (68.6%) working in European countries (online suppl. file 2) and 146 (71.6%) as certified intensivists (Table 1). Regarding the hospital setting, 160 (78.4%) worked in tertiary care hospitals (51 [25.0%] with ELT) and 167 (82.3%) in medical and surgical ICUs (Table 1).

Characteristics of Patients with ALF Admitted to the ICU

Of the respondents, 142 (69.6%) worked in ICUs admitting <25 patients with ALF per year, with 166 (81.8%) reporting that <25% of the cases were due to paracetamol toxicity (Table 2). The most frequent reasons for admitting patients with ALF to the ICU were: the need for organ support (89.2%), West Haven criteria grade III–IV

Table 1.	Demographics	of 203	participants
----------	--------------	--------	--------------

Median age (IQR), years	42 (35–50)		
Geographical location			
Europe	140 (68.6)		
North America	5 (2.5)		
South America	17 (8.3)		
Asia	35 (17.2)		
Africa	2 (1.0)		
Australia and New Zealand	5 (2.5)		
Level of training			
Fellow in Intensive Care Medicine	40 (19.6)		
Fellow in other specialty	9 (4.4)		
Intensivist	146 (71.6)		
Other specialist	6 (2.9)		
Nurse or other	3 (1.5)		
Hospital type			
Secondary care	26 (12.7)		
Tertiary care	109 (53.4)		
Liver transplant center	51 (25.0)		
Other	18 (8.8)		
ICU type			
Medical	17 (8.4)		
Surgical	19 (9.4)		
Medical and surgical	167 (82.3)		
ICU model			
Open	80 (39.2)		
Closed	124 (60.8)		
Number of ICU beds	(,		
<10	33 (16.3)		
10-20	95 (46.8)		
≥20	75 (36.9)		

Values express n (%), unless otherwise indicated.

HE (73.5%), a potential indication for ELT (33.8%), or an INR ≥ 2 (26.5%).

In total, 126 (75.0%) reported that ELT was performed in <25% of patients with ALF, with 142 (78.5%) using the King's College Hospital criteria (KCC) for ELT listing. In terms of mortality, 140 (73.3%) estimated a hospital mortality rate <50% for their patients with ALF.

Management of Patients with ALF in the ICU

Eighty-eight (43.3%) reported prescribing N-acetylcysteine (NAC) for all etiologies of ALF (Table 2). As for the triggers used for endotracheal intubation (ETI), the most common were coma (84.8%), respiratory failure (72.5%), and grade III–IV HE (59.8%).

In terms of monitoring the risk of cerebral edema, the most frequent indicators used were pupillary abnormalities (78.7%), head computed tomography (CT; 69.8%), or serum ammonia (53.5%). Regarding serum ammonia, 117 (57.6%) performed daily measurements.

Concerning the treatment of cerebral edema, the most common interventions used were osmotic therapy (86.2%), sedation (81.3%), serum ammonia-lowering strategies (75.4%), and vasopressors (68.5%).

The most frequent serum ammonia-lowering strategies used were laxatives (86.2%), continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT; 57.1%), or L-ornithine-L-aspartate (LOLA; 28.6%). As for other extracorporeal devices, 83 (41.1%) used plasma exchange and 59 (29.2%) used liver-assist devices (e.g., Molecular Adsorbent Recirculating System).

The most common thresholds used for transfusing blood products were bleeding or invasive procedure (86.1%), hemoglobin <70 g/L (81.4%), platelets <50 × 10⁹/ μ L (20.8%), and fibrinogen <1.5 g/L (18.3%).

One hundred and twenty-six (61.8%) used prophylactic antibiotics for ALF with specific triggers, namely, shock (41.7%), progressive HE (28.9%), and procalcitonin >2 ng/mL (22.1%).

Liver biopsy was reported to be requested by 135 (67.5%) respondents, especially in cases of unknown etiology (57.0%), for ELT listing (18.0%), or for prognosis (16.0%).

The most prevalent criteria regarding futility of care were refractory multiorgan failure (86.1%), contraindication for ELT (51.5%), or a history of substance abuse (e.g., alcohol; 31.7%).

Management of Patients with ALF in the ICU: Study of Associations

The prescription of NAC for all etiologies of ALF was more frequent in respondents that admitted a higher number of patients with paracetamol toxicity (Table 3: 38.8% if <25% admitted vs. 54.2% if 25–50% admitted vs. 76.9% if ≥50% admitted; p = 0.003) and those working at ELT centers (58.8 vs. other 38.2%; p = 0.033).

ETI for grade III–IV HE was more common among fellows of intensive care medicine or intensivists (ICU 67.5 vs. other 33.3%; intensivists 61.6 vs. other 22.2%; p = 0.040) and those working at ELT centers (74.5 vs. other 54.9%; p = 0.013).

Daily serum ammonia measurements were more frequently performed by individuals from North America (Europe 62.6% vs. North America 80.0% vs. other 44.1%; p = 0.008), those that admitted a lower number of patients with paracetamol toxicity (59.4% if <25% admitted vs. 45.8% if 25–50% admitted vs. 53.8% if ≥50% admitted; p = 0.017), and those working at ELT centers (ELT center 74.5% vs. other 52.0%; p = 0.026). The use of a serum ammonia level ≥150 µmol/L to monitor the risk of cerebral
 Table 2. Characteristics and management of patients with ALF admitted to ICU

	Patients with ALF in ICU per year	
25-50 45 (22.1) ≥50 17 (8.3) Patients with ALF due to paracetamol toxicity ($n = 203$) <25%	<25	142 (69.6)
≥50	25-50	45 (22.1)
Patients with ALF due to paracetamol toxicity $(n = 203)$ <25%	≥50	17 (8.3)
<25%	Patients with ALF due to paracetamol toxici	tv(n = 203)
25-50% 24 (11.8) ≥50% 13 (6.4) ICU admission criteria Grade III-IV HE Grade III-IV HE 150 (73.5) INR ≥2 54 (26.5) Organ support 182 (89.2) Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate (n = 168) 225% <25%	<25%	166 (81.8)
≥50%13 (6.4)ICU admission criteriaGrade III–IV HE150 (73.5)INR ≥254 (26.5)Organ support182 (89.2)Indication for ELT69 (33.8)Other3 (1.5)ELT rate (n = 168)<25%	25-50%	24 (11.8)
LU admission criteria If b (61) Grade III-IV HE 150 (73.5) INR ≥2 54 (26.5) Organ support 182 (89.2) Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate (n = 168) (25%) <25%	>50%	13(64)
Grade III-IV HE 150 (73.5) INR ≥2 54 (26.5) Organ support 182 (89.2) Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate (n = 168) <25%	ICU admission criteria	10 (0.1)
INR ≥2 100 (19.5) INR ≥2 54 (26.5) Organ support 182 (89.2) Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate (n = 168) 25.50% <25%	Grade III–IV HF	150(735)
Organ support 182 (89.2) Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate ($n = 168$) - <25%	INR >2	54 (26 5)
Indication for ELT 69 (33.8) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate ($n = 168$) (25%) $< 25^{-50\%}$ 33 (19.6) $\geq 50\%$ 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria ($n = 181$) KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate ($n = 191$) <25%	Ω rgan support	182(89.2)
Initiation for ELT 69 (3).3) Other 3 (1.5) ELT rate ($n = 168$) (25%) $< 25-50\%$ 33 (19.6) $\geq 50\%$ 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria ($n = 181$) KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate ($n = 191$) <	Indication for ELT	60(33.8)
ELT rate $(n = 168)$ 225% $<25\%$ 126 (75.0) $\geq 50\%$ 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria $(n = 181)$ KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <	Other	3(15)
L1 rate $(n - 108)$ 126 (75.0) 25-50% 33 (19.6) ≥50% 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria $(n = 181)$ KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <25%	EIT rate (n - 169)	5 (1.5)
225-50% 33 (19.6) ≥50% 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria $(n = 181)$ KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate ($n = 191$) <25%	250%	126(750)
≥50% 9 (5.4) ELT listing criteria (n = 181) KCC KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate (n = 191) <25%	25 50%	120(73.0)
ELT listing criteria $(n = 181)$ $9 (3.4)$ KCC 142 (78.5) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ $< 25\%$ $< 25.50\%$ 55 (28.8) $25-50\%$ 85 (44.5) $\geq 50\%$ 51 (26.7) N-acetylcysteine $(n = 203)$ Paracetamol Paracetamol 114 (56.2) All etiologies 88 (43.3) Other 1 (0.5) Endotracheal intubation triggers Respiratory failure ^a Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5) Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8) Grade III-IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9) Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalities Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) <td< td=""><td>>5004</td><td>0(54)</td></td<>	>5004	0(54)
EL1 insting criteria $(n = 181)$ KCC142 (78.5)Clichy30 (16.6)USALFSG12 (6.6)MELD/PELD6 (3.3)Other5 (2.8)None or not applicable18 (9.9)Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <25%	$\geq 30\%$	9 (5.4)
RCC 142 (78.3) Clichy 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate ($n = 191$) <	ELT listing criteria ($n = 181$)	142(705)
Clicity 30 (16.6) USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <		142(70.5)
USALFSG 12 (6.6) MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <25%		30(10.0)
MELD/PELD 6 (3.3) Other 5 (2.8) None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ 25% $< 25\%$ 55 (28.8) $25-50\%$ 85 (44.5) $\geq 50\%$ 51 (26.7) N-acetylcysteine $(n = 203)$ 114 (56.2) All etiologies 88 (43.3) Other 1 (0.5) Endotracheal intubation triggers Respiratory failure ^a Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5) Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8) Grade III-IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalities Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \mu$ mol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement $(n = 203)$ At ICU admission only	USALFSG	12(6.6)
Other5 (2.8)None or not applicable18 (9.9)Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <	MELD/PELD	6 (3.3)
None or not applicable 18 (9.9) Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$ <	Other	5 (2.8)
Hospital mortality rate (n = 191) <25%	None or not applicable	18 (9.9)
<25%	Hospital mortality rate $(n = 191)$	
25-50% 85 (44.5) ≥50% 51 (26.7) N-acetylcysteine (n = 203) 114 (56.2) All etiologies 88 (43.3) Other 1 (0.5) Endotracheal intubation triggers Respiratory failure ^a Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5) Glasgow coma scale ≤8 173 (84.8) Grade III-IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema (n = 202) Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement (n = 203) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	<25%	55 (28.8)
≥50% 51 (26.7) N-acetylcysteine ($n = 203$) Paracetamol 114 (56.2) All etiologies 88 (43.3) Other 1 (0.5) Endotracheal intubation triggers Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5) Glasgow coma scale ≤8 173 (84.8) Grade III–IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$) Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	25-50%	85 (44.5)
N-acetylcysteine $(n = 203)$ Paracetamol 114 (56.2) All etiologies 88 (43.3) Other 1 (0.5) Endotracheal intubation triggers Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5) Glasgow coma scale ≤8 173 (84.8) Grade III–IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement $(n = 203)$ At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	≥50%	51 (26.7)
Paracetamol114 (56.2)All etiologies88 (43.3)Other1 (0.5)Endotracheal intubation triggersRespiratory failure ^a Respiratory failure ^a 148 (72.5)Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8)Grade III–IV HE122 (59.8)Clonus53 (26.0)Other12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission onlyAt ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	N-acetylcysteine ($n = 203$)	
All etiologies88 (43.3)Other1 (0.5)Endotracheal intubation triggersRespiratory failureaRespiratory failurea148 (72.5)Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8)Grade III–IV HE122 (59.8)Clonus53 (26.0)Other12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Paracetamol	114 (56.2)
Other1 (0.5)Endotracheal intubation triggersRespiratory failureaRespiratory failureaGlasgow coma scale ≤ 8 Grade III-IV HE122 (59.8)ClonusOther12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)Pupillary abnormalitiesPupillary abnormalities150 µmol/L108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission only38 (18.7)DailyOther40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	All etiologies	88 (43.3)
Endotracheal intubation triggersRespiratory failurea148 (72.5)Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8)Grade III-IV HE122 (59.8)Clonus53 (26.0)Other12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Other	1 (0.5)
Respiratory failurea148 (72.5)Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8)Grade III-IV HE122 (59.8)Clonus53 (26.0)Other12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Endotracheal intubation triggers	
Glasgow coma scale ≤ 8 173 (84.8) Grade III–IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$) Pupillary abnormalities Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Respiratory failure ^a	148 (72.5)
Grade III-IV HE 122 (59.8) Clonus 53 (26.0) Other 12 (5.9 Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$) Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5) Head CT Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9) 100	Glasgow coma scale ≤8	173 (84.8)
Clonus53 (26.0)Other12 (5.9)Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement $(n = 203)$ At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Grade III–IV HE	122 (59.8)
Other12 (5.9Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalitiesSerum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None44 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)At ICU admission only38 (18.7)DailyOther40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Clonus	53 (26.0)
Monitor risk of cerebral edema $(n = 202)$ Pupillary abnormalities159 (78.7)Serum ammonia $\geq 150 \ \mu mol/L$ 108 (53.5)Head CT141 (69.8)Transcranial Doppler53 (26.2)ONSD47 (23.3)Intracranial bolt26 (12.9)Other2 (1.0)None4 (2.0)Serum ammonia measurement $(n = 203)$ At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	Other	12 (5.9
Pupillary abnormalities 159 (78.7) Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement (n = 203) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)	
Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L 108 (53.5) Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Pupillary abnormalities	159 (78.7)
Head CT 141 (69.8) Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L	108 (53.5)
Transcranial Doppler 53 (26.2) ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Head CT	141 (69.8)
ONSD 47 (23.3) Intracranial bolt 26 (12.9) Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) 4 ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Transcranial Doppler	53 (26.2)
Intracranial bolt $26 (12.9)$ Other $2 (1.0)$ None $4 (2.0)$ Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) At ICU admission only At ICU admission only $38 (18.7)$ Daily $117 (57.6)$ Other $40 (19.7)$ Never $8 (3.9)$	ONSD	47 (23.3)
Other 2 (1.0) None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) 41 ICU admission only At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Intracranial bolt	26 (12.9)
None 4 (2.0) Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$) 38 (18.7) At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Other	2 (1.0)
Serum ammonia measurement $(n = 203)$ At ICU admission only38 (18.7)Daily117 (57.6)Other40 (19.7)Never8 (3.9)	None	4 (2.0)
At ICU admission only 38 (18.7) Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)	
Daily 117 (57.6) Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	At ICU admission only	38 (18.7)
Other 40 (19.7) Never 8 (3.9)	Daily	117 (57.6)
Never 8 (3.9)	Other	40 (19.7)
	Never	8 (3.9)

Treat cerebral edema ($n = 203$)	
Sedation	165 (81.3)
Osmotic therapy	175 (86.2)
Vasopressors for MAP \geq 75 mm Hg	139 (68.5)
Hyperventilation	61 (30.0)
Hypothermia	27 (13.3)
Serum ammonia-lowering strategies	153(754)
Other	2(10)
None	$\frac{2}{4}(2.0)$
Serum ammonia lowering strategies $(n - 203)$	f (2.0)
$L_{avatives}$	175 (86.2)
	173 (80.2) 59 (29.6)
LOLA Intermittent DDT	30(20.0)
Continuous DDT	22(10.0)
Transial antibiation (and all antibiation)	110(57.1)
Topical antibiotics (e.g., rifaximin)	10 (4.9)
Liver-assist devices (e.g., MARS)	6 (2.9)
Other	2(1.0)
None	4 (2.0)
Plasma exchange ($n = 202$)	
No	119 (58.9)
Depended on etiology	55 (27.2)
Failure of RRT	13 (6.4)
Bridge to ELT	34 (16.8)
Other	2 (1.0)
Liver-assist devices ($n = 202$)	
No	143 (70.8)
MARS	43 (21.3)
Prometheus	17 (8.4)
Other	3 (1.5)
Targets for transfusions $(n = 202)$	
Hemoglobin <70 g/L	166 (81.4)
Platelets $<50 \times 10^9/\mu L$	42 (20.8)
INR >1.5	13 (6.4)
Fibringen <1 5 g/L	37 (18 3)
Bleeding occurs or an invasive procedure	174(861)
ROTEM or TEG	4(20)
Other	3(15)
Prophylactic antibiotics for ALE $(n - 204)$	5 (1.5)
No	78 (38 2)
$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	70 (30.2) 45 (32.1)
Procaction HE	43(22.1)
ch a sh	39(20.9)
Shock	85 (41.7)
Waitlist for EL1	24 (11.8)
Other	8 (3.9)
Liver biopsy ($n = 200$)	
Never	65 (32.5)
Unknown etiology	114 (57.0)
Prognostic information	32 (16.0)
Listing for ELT	36 (18.0)
Other	3 (1.5)
Futility of care criteria ($n = 202$)	
Substance abuse history (e.g., alcohol)	64 (31.7)
Contraindication for ELT	104 (51.5)
ABO-incompatible organ available only	16 (7.9)
Refractory multiorgan failure	174 (86.1)
Other	1 (0.5)

edema was more common among participants that admitted a higher number of patients with paracetamol toxicity (50.6% if <25% admitted vs. 50.0% if 25–50% admitted vs. 92.3% if \geq 50% admitted; *p* = 0.014) and those working at ELT centers (ELT center 66.7% vs. other 49.0%; *p* = 0.029).

The use of CRRT to decrease serum ammonia was more frequent among older respondents (44 vs. 39 years; p = 0.038), those from North America (Europe 64.7% vs. North America 80.0% vs. other 37.3%; p = 0.010), those working at ELT centers (ELT center 78.4% vs. other 50.0%; p < 0.001), and those that admitted a higher number of patients with paracetamol toxicity (52.1% if <25% admitted vs. 79.2% if 25–50% admitted vs. 84.5% if ≥50% admitted; p = 0.005).

The use of plasma exchange (ELT center 58.8% vs. other 35.1%; p = 0.003) or liver-assist devices (ELT center 56.9% vs. other 19.9%; p < 0.001) was more common among individuals working at ELT centers.

The prescription of prophylactic antibiotics was more frequently made by those working in secondary care hospitals (secondary care 76.9% vs. tertiary care 61.5% vs. ELT center 64.7%; p = 0.031).

Discussion

Key Results and Comparisons with the Previous Literature

The majority of individuals admitted <25 patients with ALF per year (69.6%) and <25% had paracetamol toxicity (81.8%). The incidence of ALF is \leq 10 cases per million people per year in developed countries, so only ELT centers within highly populated areas may treat a high volume of cases [4]. In the UK, North America, and Austra-

Table 2 (Footnote)

Values are expressed as n (%). ALF, acute liver failure; ICU, intensive care unit; HE, hepatic encephalopathy (West Haven criteria); INR, international normalized ratio; ELT, emergency liver transplantation; KCC, King's College Hospital criteria; USALFSG, United States Acute Liver Failure Study Group; MELD, model end-stage liver disease; PELD, pediatric end-stage liver disease; PF, oxygen arterial partial pressure/oxygen inspired fraction; PaCO₂, carbon dioxide arterial partial pressure; CT, computed tomography; ONSD, optic-nerve sheath diameter; MAP, mean arterial pressure; LOLA, L-ornithine-L-aspartate; RRT, renal replacement therapy; MARS, Molecular Adsorbent Recirculating System; ROTEM, rotational thromboelastometry; TEG, thromboelastography. ^a PF \leq 300 mm Hg or PaCO₂ <30 mm Hg.

lia/New Zealand, paracetamol overdose has been the leading etiology of ALF [1, 2, 15]. In continental Europe, the most common causes of ALF have been nonparacetamol drug-induced liver injury, seronegative liver injury, and hepatitis B [8, 16, 17]. Consequently, ICU professionals outside the UK, North America, and Australia/ New Zealand (>80.0%) are expected to deal mostly with non-paracetamol ALF.

Most of the respondents reported an ELT rate <25% (75.0%) and an in-hospital mortality rate <50% (73.3%). As the majority admitted patients with non-paracetamol ALF, we would have expected a higher ELT rate. Although the decision to list patients with ALF for ELT is complex, clinicians have been relying more on prognostic systems, such as the KCC (78.5%), to select patients for ELT. However, jurisdiction-specific legislation on organ donation may have influenced organ availability in different regions. Nevertheless, the in-hospital mortality rate reported by the majority of the participants was comparable to the literature [1, 8, 16–19]. This suggests that patients are being better managed with medical treatment alone.

A minority prescribed NAC for all etiologies of ALF (43.3%); this was more frequent among ICU professionals working with a higher volume of patients with paracetamol toxicity or at ELT centers. NAC is the antidote for paracetamol toxicity via its action of replenishing glutathione, a crucial molecule for paracetamol detoxification in the liver [20]. However, NAC has also improved transplant-free survival in patients with non-paracetamol ALF [21]. This may be related to its improvement of hemodynamics and oxygen use or the decrease in the risk of cerebral edema [22, 23]. Therefore, current management of ALF should consider prescribing NAC for all etiologies of ALF [9, 10, 21, 24].

Around 59.8% respondents intubated patients with ALF due to grade III–IV HE, with this being more common among intensive care fellows, intensivists, and ICU professionals from ELT centers. Patients with ALF may be at risk of developing cerebral edema due to astrocyte swelling, a complex process in which ammonia and lactate are involved [25]. ETI for grade III–IV HE is recommended to prevent aspiration and allow for the early treatment of cerebral edema [11, 12].

The majority of respondents monitored the risk of cerebral edema using pupillary abnormalities (78.7%), head CT (69.8%), or serum ammonia (53.5%), with a minority using transcranial Doppler (TCD; 26.2%), optic-nerve sheath diameter (ONSD; 23.3%), or intracranial bolt (12.9%). Frequent pupillary exam is mandatory to detect signs of intracranial hypertension. Moreover, these signs present often

Table 3. Management of ALF in the ICU: study of associations

Characteristic	Age	Geographical location	Training	ELT hospital	Number of ALF patients	Paracetamol toxicity
N-acetylcvsteine ($n = 203$)						
All etiologies	ns	ns	ns	0.033	ns	0.003
Endotracheal intubation triggers						
Grade III–IV HE	ns	ns	0.040	0.013	ns	ns
Serum ammonia measurement ($n = 203$)						
Daily	ns	0.008	ns	0.026	ns	0.017
Monitor risk of cerebral edema ($n = 202$)						
Serum ammonia ≥150 µmol/L	ns	ns	ns	0.029	ns	0.014
Treat cerebral edema ($n = 203$)						
Serum ammonia-lowering strategies	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Serum ammonia-lowering strategies $(n = 203)$						
Continuous RRT	0.038	0.010	ns	< 0.001	ns	0.005
Plasma exchange ($n = 202$)						
Yes	ns	ns	ns	0.003	ns	ns
Liver-assist devices ($n = 202$)						
Yes	ns	ns	ns	< 0.001	ns	ns
Targets for transfusions ($n = 202$)						
Hemoglobin <70 g/L	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Prophylactic antibiotics for ALF ($n = 204$)						
Yes	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Liver biopsy ($n = 200$)						
Yes	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Futility of care criteria ($n = 202$)						
Substance abuse history (e.g., alcohol)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

p < 0.05 denotes significance; ns, nonsignificant ($p \ge 0.05$). ELT, emergency liver transplant; HE, hepatic encephalopathy (West Haven criteria); ICU, intensive care unit; RRT, renal replacement therapy; ALF, acute liver failure.

late on head CT. TCD or ONSD still lack validation in ALF [26]. Measurement of intracranial pressure with a bolt may be useful but its effect on patients' outcomes has been controversial [27]. Therefore, even if the prevalence of cerebral edema in ALF has been decreasing over the past decades, a coherent strategy to monitor the risk of intracranial hypertension (ICH) is still lacking [28].

Hyperammonemia (\geq 150 µmol/L) has been associated with an increased risk of ICH, so frequent measurement may help to prevent this [29]. However, only 57.6% of the respondents measured serum ammonia daily, this being more frequent among ICU professionals working with a higher volume of patients with paracetamol toxicity or at ELT centers. Frequent measurement of arterial blood ammonia should be further encouraged as a means to monitor the risk of developing neurological complications [9, 11].

To lower serum ammonia, the majority of the respondents administered laxatives (86.2%) or CRRT (57.1%). A minority used LOLA (28.6%), intermittent renal replacement therapy (IRRT; 10.8%), topical antibiotics (4.9%), or liver-assist devices (2.9%). In ALF, while lactulose may reduce ammonia, time to effect is long and there is the added risk of bowel distention [30–34]. The case for LOLA or topical antibiotics still lacks evidence, and they are also frequently unavailable [11, 12, 35]. CRRT, more frequently used by older ICU professionals and those from North America, working at ELT centers, or admitting a higher volume of patients with paracetamol toxicity, has been shown to decrease serum ammonia and improve survival, effects that are lacking with IRRT [36].

Liver-assist devices were used by 29.2% of the respondents for ALF, this being more common among ICU professionals at ELT centers. In fact, the case for use of these devices still lacks evidence [37]. Plasma exchange for ALF was performed by 41.1% of all respondents, also mainly ICU professionals at ELT centers. While there is evidence to support the use of plasma exchange, the timing, dose, and interaction with ELT listing decisions remain uncertain [38].

Regarding the use of extracorporeal devices, CRRT should be the first option to treat metabolic imbalance and control hyperammonemia [36]. For patients with

ALF progressing to multiorgan failure, especially with high-dose vasopressors or if ELT is not an option, plasma exchange may be considered [39].

The majority of respondents prescribed prophylactic antibiotics for ALF (61.8%), with this being more common among ICU professionals from secondary care hospitals. In ALF, prophylactic antibiotics have not been found to improve survival [40]. However, the development of grade III–IV HE or systemic inflammatory response syndrome has been associated with infection and worse outcomes [41, 42]. Therefore, high clinical suspicion and frequent screening for sepsis remain fundamental to initiate antimicrobials [11, 12].

The majority of participants requested liver biopsy for patients with ALF (67.5%). Often, liver biopsy does not provide information about etiology due to sample error, or else the extent of necrosis precludes a thorough evaluation. It may help to exclude cirrhosis, alcoholic hepatitis, or malignancy [43, 44]. Furthermore, submassive or massive patterns of necrosis have been associated with a lower likelihood of liver function regeneration [45]. Therefore, liver biopsy remains a controversial intervention in ALF.

The majority of respondents considered refractory multiorgan failure (86.1%) or contraindication for liver transplant (51.5%) as criteria for futility of care. A small number also accepted substance abuse history (31.7%) or ABO-incompatible organ availability (7.9%). It seems reasonable that patients with ALF and multiorgan failure unresponsive to treatment may be considered for end-oflife discussions. Deciding contraindications for ELT is often complex. Psychosocial factors such as mental health, substance dependence, or presumed compliance with treatment are difficult to assess in an acute context. Therefore, comprehensive case-specific discussion within a multidisciplinary team is likely the best course of action [11]. Regarding ABO-incompatible ELT, these patients can show worse outcomes, but this intervention may, at times, be their only chance of survival [46, 47]. Overall, decisions about futility of care in ALF still lack evidence.

Limitations

Our study has the following limitations that warrant consideration. Firstly, while our survey underwent pilot testing, this was a novel online instrument of research in ALF. Secondly, as it was implemented via the ESICM website, this may have contributed to selection bias, as ESICM members or frequent online visitors were more likely to respond to it. Thirdly, the survey relied on answers from individuals, which may have led to recall bias or other types of response bias. Despite these limitations, we consider that our findings may help to identify pointsof-care reflected in recent guidelines that may benefit from further education and research activities [11, 12]. Although many diagnostic and therapeutic interventions in ALF still lack high-quality evidence, professionals from ELT centers seem to have implemented more of such recommend interventions. Cross-collaboration between referral and ELT centers may therefore continue to be one way to enforce better management of patients with ALF.

Conclusions

The management of patients with ALF by ICU professionals varies with age, region, level of training, type of hospital, and the number of patients with each etiology admitted. Further education and high-quality research can improve the delivery of care in the ICU.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Sherihane Bensemmane from ESICM for the technical support. Thank you to ESICM, especially the Metabolism, Endocrinology, and Nutrition Section, and the Liver Failure Group of the Portuguese Intensive Care Society for the institutional support.

Statement of Ethics

This study protocol was approved by the ethics committee at Curry Cabral Hospital (CCH), Central Lisbon University Hospital Center (CLUHC), Lisbon, Portugal (464/2017). Informed consent was implied in the participants responses to the survey. This study abided by the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and Strobe statement.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding Source

The authors have no funding sources to declare.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed to the study conception. Design, material preparation, data collection, and analysis were performed by F.S.C. The first draft of the manuscript was written by F.S.C. All authors read and approved the final version.

References

- Bernal W, Hyyrylainen A, Gera A, Audimoolam VK, McPhail MJ, Auzinger G, et al. Lessons from look-back in acute liver failure? A single centre experience of 3300 patients. J Hepatol. 2013 Jul;59(1):74–80.
- 2 Ostapowicz G, Fontana RJ, Schiødt FV, Larson A, Davern TJ, Han SH, et al.; U.S. Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Results of a prospective study of acute liver failure at 17 tertiary care centers in the United States. Ann Intern Med. 2002 Dec;137(12):947– 54.
- 3 O'Grady JG, Schalm SW, Williams R. Acute liver failure: redefining the syndromes. Lancet. 1993 Jul;342(8866):273–5.
- 4 Bernal W, Wendon J. Acute liver failure. N Engl J Med. 2013 Dec;369(26):2525–34.
- 5 Gulmez SE, Larrey D, Pageaux GP, Bernuau J, Bissoli F, Horsmans Y, et al. Liver transplant associated with paracetamol overdose: results from the seven-country SALT study. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2015 Sep;80(3):599–606.
- 6 Acharya SK, Batra Y, Hazari S, Choudhury V, Panda SK, Dattagupta S. Etiopathogenesis of acute hepatic failure: eastern versus Western countries. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2002 Dec;17 Suppl 3:S268–73.
- 7 Hadem J, Tacke F, Bruns T, Langgartner J, Strnad P, Denk GU, et al.; Acute Liver Failure Study Group Germany. Etiologies and outcomes of acute liver failure in Germany. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2012 Jun;10(6):664– 9.e2.
- 8 Simões C, Santos S, Vicente M, Sousa Cardoso F. Epidemiology of Acute Liver Failure from a Regional Liver Transplant Center in Portugal. GE Port J Gastroenterol. 2018 Dec;26(1):33–9.
- 9 Cardoso FS, Marcelino P, Bagulho L, Karvellas CJ. Acute liver failure: an up-to-date approach. J Crit Care. 2017 Jun;39:25–30.
- 10 Fix OK, Liou I, Karvellas CJ, Ganger DR, Forde KA, Subramanian RM, et al.; Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Development and Pilot of a Checklist for Management of Acute Liver Failure in the Intensive Care Unit. PLoS One. 2016 May;11(5):e0155500.
- 11 Wendon J, Cordoba J, Dhawan A, Larsen FS, Manns M, Samuel D, et al.; EASL Governing Board representative. EASL Clinical Practical Guidelines on the management of acute (fulminant) liver failure. J Hepatol. 2017 May;66(5):1047–81.
- 12 Polson J, Lee WM; American Association for the Study of Liver Disease. AASLD position paper: the management of acute liver failure. Hepatology. 2005 May;41(5):1179–97.
- 13 Gehlbach H, Artino AR Jr. The Survey Checklist (Manifesto). Acad Med. 2018 Mar;93(3):360–6.
- 14 Duffett M, Burns KE, Adhikari NK, Arnold DM, Lauzier F, Kho ME, et al. Quality of reporting of surveys in critical care journals: a methodologic review. Crit Care Med. 2012 Feb;40(2):441–9.

- 15 Hey P, Hanrahan TP, Sinclair M, Testro AG, Angus PW, Peterson A, et al. Epidemiology and outcomes of acute liver failure in Australia. World J Hepatol. 2019 Jul;11(7):586– 95.
- 16 Rabinowich L, Wendon J, Bernal W, Shibolet O. Clinical management of acute liver failure: results of an international multi-center survey. World J Gastroenterol. 2016 Sep;22(33):7595–603.
- 17 Escorsell A, Mas A, de la Mata M; Spanish Group for the Study of Acute Liver Failure. Acute liver failure in Spain: analysis of 267 cases. Liver Transpl. 2007 Oct;13(10):1389– 95.
- 18 Fontana RJ, Ellerbe C, Durkalski VE, Rangnekar A, Reddy RK, Stravitz T, et al.; US Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Two-year outcomes in initial survivors with acute liver failure: results from a prospective, multicentre study. Liver Int. 2015 Feb;35(2):370–80.
- 19 Warrillow S, Bailey M, Pilcher D, Kazemi A, McArthur C, Young P, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of patients with acute liver failure admitted to Australian and New Zealand intensive care units. Intern Med J. 2019 Jul;49(7):874–85.
- 20 Heard KJ. Acetylcysteine for acetaminophen poisoning. N Engl J Med. 2008 Jul;359(3):285– 92.
- 21 Lee WM, Hynan LS, Rossaro L, Fontana RJ, Stravitz RT, Larson AM, et al.; Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Intravenous N-acetylcysteine improves transplant-free survival in early-stage non-acetaminophen acute liver failure. Gastroenterology. 2009 Sep;137(3): 856–64.
- 22 Harrison PM, Wendon JA, Gimson AE, Alexander GJ, Williams R. Improvement by acetylcysteine of hemodynamics and oxygen transport in fulminant hepatic failure. N Engl J Med. 1991 Jun;324(26):1852–7.
- 23 Stravitz RT, Sanyal AJ, Reisch J, Bajaj JS, Mirshahi F, Cheng J, et al.; Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Effects of N-acetylcysteine on cytokines in non-acetaminophen acute liver failure: potential mechanism of improvement in transplant-free survival. Liver Int. 2013 Oct;33(9):1324–31.
- 24 Squires RH, Dhawan A, Alonso E, Narkewicz MR, Shneider BL, Rodriguez-Baez N, et al.; Pediatric Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Intravenous N-acetylcysteine in pediatric patients with nonacetaminophen acute liver failure: a placebo-controlled clinical trial. Hepatology. 2013 Apr;57(4):1542–9.
- 25 Butterworth RF. Pathogenesis of hepatic encephalopathy and brain edema in acute liver failure. J Clin Exp Hepatol. 2015 Mar;5 Suppl 1:S96–103.
- 26 Rajajee V, Williamson CA, Fontana RJ, Courey AJ, Patil PG. Noninvasive Intracranial Pressure Assessment in Acute Liver Failure. Neurocrit Care. 2018 Oct;29(2):280– 90.

- 27 Karvellas CJ, Fix OK, Battenhouse H, Durkalski V, Sanders C, Lee WM; U S Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Outcomes and complications of intracranial pressure monitoring in acute liver failure: a retrospective cohort study. Crit Care Med. 2014 May;42(5):1157–67.
- 28 Bernal W, Lee WM, Wendon J, Larsen FS, Williams R. Acute liver failure: A curable disease by 2024? J Hepatol. 2015 Apr;62(1 Suppl):S112–20.
- 29 Bernal W, Hall C, Karvellas CJ, Auzinger G, Sizer E, Wendon J. Arterial ammonia and clinical risk factors for encephalopathy and intracranial hypertension in acute liver failure. Hepatology. 2007 Dec;46(6):1844–52.
- 30 Bernal W, Murphy N, Brown S, Whitehouse T, Bjerring PN, Hauerberg J, et al. A multicentre randomized controlled trial of moderate hypothermia to prevent intracranial hypertension in acute liver failure. J Hepatol. 2016 Aug;65(2):273–9.
- 31 Murphy N, Auzinger G, Bernel W, Wendon J. The effect of hypertonic sodium chloride on intracranial pressure in patients with acute liver failure. Hepatology. 2004 Feb;39(2):464– 70.
- 32 Canalese J, Gimson AE, Davis C, Mellon PJ, Davis M, Williams R. Controlled trial of dexamethasone and mannitol for the cerebral oedema of fulminant hepatic failure. Gut. 1982 Jul;23(7):625–9.
- 33 Ede RJ, Gimson AE, Bihari D, Williams R. Controlled hyperventilation in the prevention of cerebral oedema in fulminant hepatic failure. J Hepatol. 1986;2(1):43–51.
- 34 Alba L, Hay JE, Angulo P, Lee WM. Lactulose therapy in acute liver failure. J Hepatol. 2002;36:33A.
- 35 Acharya SK, Bhatia V, Sreenivas V, Khanal S, Panda SK. Efficacy of L-ornithine L-aspartate in acute liver failure: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Gastroenterology. 2009 Jun;136(7):2159–68.
- 36 Cardoso FS, Gottfried M, Tujios S, Olson JC, Karvellas CJ; US Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Continuous renal replacement therapy is associated with reduced serum ammonia levels and mortality in acute liver failure. Hepatology. 2018 Feb;67(2):711–20.
- 37 Saliba F, Camus C, Durand F, Mathurin P, Letierce A, Delafosse B, et al. Albumin dialysis with a noncell artificial liver support device in patients with acute liver failure: a randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med. 2013 Oct;159(8):522–31.
- 38 Karvellas CJ, Subramanian RM. Current evidence for extracorporeal liver support systems in acute liver failure and acute-onchronic liver failure. Crit Care Clin. 2016 Jul;32(3):439–51.
- 39 Larsen FS, Schmidt LE, Bernsmeier C, Rasmussen A, Isoniemi H, Patel VC, et al. Highvolume plasma exchange in patients with acute liver failure: an open randomised controlled trial. J Hepatol. 2016 Jan;64(1):69–78.

- 40 Karvellas CJ, Cavazos J, Battenhouse H, Durkalski V, Balko J, Sanders C, et al.; US Acute Liver Failure Study Group. Effects of antimicrobial prophylaxis and blood stream infections in patients with acute liver failure: a retrospective cohort study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2014 Nov;12(11):1942–9.e1.
- 41 Vaquero J, Polson J, Chung C, Helenowski I, Schiodt FV, Reisch J, et al. Infection and the progression of hepatic encephalopathy in acute liver failure. Gastroenterology. 2003 Sep;125(3):755–64.
- 42 Rolando N, Wade J, Davalos M, Wendon J, Philpott-Howard J, Williams R. The systemic inflammatory response syndrome in acute liver failure. Hepatology. 2000 Oct;32(4 Pt 1):734–9.
- 43 Dechêne A, Sowa JP, Schlattjan M, Wree A, Blomeyer S, Best J, et al. Mini-laparoscopy guided liver biopsy increases diagnostic accuracy in acute liver failure. Digestion. 2014;90(4):240–7.
- 44 Donaldson BW, Gopinath R, Wanless IR, Phillips MJ, Cameron R, Roberts EA, et al. The role of transjugular liver biopsy in fulminant liver failure: relation to other prognostic indicators. Hepatology. 1993 Dec;18(6): 1370–6.
- 45 Ndekwe P, Ghabril MS, Zang Y, Mann SA, Cummings OW, Lin J. Substantial hepatic necrosis is prognostic in fulminant liver failure. World J Gastroenterol. 2017 Jun;23(23):4303– 10.
- 46 Bernal W, Cross TJ, Auzinger G, Sizer E, Heneghan MA, Bowles M, et al. Outcome after wait-listing for emergency liver transplantation in acute liver failure: a single centre experience. J Hepatol. 2009 Feb;50(2):306–13.
- 47 Germani G, Theocharidou E, Adam R, Karam V, Wendon J, O'Grady J, et al. Liver transplantation for acute liver failure in Europe: outcomes over 20 years from the ELTR database. J Hepatol. 2012 Aug;57(2):288–96.