

Review Article

Advanced fluid management strategies in burn patients undergoing general surgery: a comprehensive review

Laura Yoana Cervantes Ramírez^{1*}, Ángel Alfredo Guzmán Chavira¹,
Bryan Ivan Chavez Avelar¹, Fernanda Guadalupe Nuñez De Lucas²,
Ana Gricel Perales Tamayo³, Yeremi Saúl Miranda Uribe⁴

¹Hospital General de Zona 3 del Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, Jesus Maria, Aguascalientes, Mexico

²Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes, México

³Universidad Cuauhtemoc. Aguascalientes, Mexico

⁴Universidad autonoma de Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico

Received: 05 June 2024

Revised: 07 July 2024

Accepted: 10 July 2024

*Correspondence:

Dr. Laura Yoana Cervantes Ramírez,

E-mail: felixosuna10@hotmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Fluid management in burn patients undergoing general surgery poses unique challenges due to the complex pathophysiological changes associated with burn injuries. Effective resuscitation and perioperative fluid therapy are critical in optimizing outcomes and minimizing complications in this vulnerable patient population. This review explores the latest evidence-based approaches to fluid management in burn patients, emphasizing the importance of individualized strategies that consider burn size, depth, patient age, comorbidities, and surgical factors. We examine the role of advanced hemodynamic monitoring, crystalloid versus colloid solutions, and the integration of goal-directed therapy protocols. Additionally, we discuss the implications of burn-related complications such as systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), sepsis, and multi-organ dysfunction on fluid management strategies. By synthesizing current research and clinical guidelines, this review aims to provide a comprehensive framework for clinicians to enhance perioperative care in burn patients undergoing general surgery.

Keywords: Fluid, Management, Therapy

INTRODUCTION

Burn injuries are a significant source of morbidity and mortality worldwide, necessitating specialized care that extends beyond initial resuscitation to encompass perioperative management during surgical interventions. The unique pathophysiological alterations in burn patients, including extensive fluid shifts, capillary leak syndrome, and hypermetabolism, present considerable challenges in the context of general surgery. Effective fluid management is paramount in mitigating the risks of hypovolemia, tissue hypoperfusion, and subsequent organ dysfunction.^{1,2}

The Parkland formula has traditionally served as a cornerstone for initial fluid resuscitation in burn patients, guiding the administration of crystalloids based on body weight and total body surface area (TBSA) affected by burns. However, this formula may not fully address the nuanced needs of patients undergoing surgical procedures, necessitating a more dynamic and individualized approach. Advanced hemodynamic monitoring techniques, such as pulse contour analysis and transpulmonary thermodilution, offer valuable insights into the patient's fluid status and cardiac function, enabling tailored fluid therapy that aligns with intraoperative and postoperative requirements.^{3,4}

This review delves into the complexities of fluid management in burn patients undergoing general surgery, highlighting the latest advancements and evidence-based practices. We explore the comparative efficacy of crystalloid and colloid solutions, the utility of albumin and hypertonic saline, and the integration of goal-directed therapy (GDT) protocols to optimize fluid resuscitation and maintenance. Additionally, we examine the interplay between burn-induced systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), sepsis, and multi-organ dysfunction syndrome (MODS) on fluid management strategies.^{5,6} By providing a detailed analysis of current research and clinical guidelines, this review aims to equip healthcare providers with a robust framework for enhancing perioperative care in burn patients. Through the application of advanced fluid management strategies, clinicians can improve surgical outcomes, reduce complications, and ultimately contribute to the overall recovery and well-being of burn patients.^{7,8}

EPIDEMIOLOGY OF FLUID MANAGEMENT IN BURN PATIENTS UNDERGOING GENERAL SURGERY

Burn injuries are a major public health issue globally, with significant variability in incidence and outcomes based on geographic, socioeconomic, and demographic factors. Annually, millions of people suffer from burns that require medical attention, and a substantial proportion of these patients necessitate surgical intervention during their treatment course. Effective fluid management in burn patients is a critical component of perioperative care, given the unique pathophysiological challenges these patients face.^{7,8}

GLOBAL INCIDENCE AND DEMOGRAPHICS

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that burns account for approximately 180,000 deaths each year, with the majority occurring in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The incidence of burn injuries is highest in Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Eastern Mediterranean regions. Children and young adults represent a significant portion of the burn patient population, with children under five years being particularly vulnerable due to their higher body surface area to weight ratio, which predisposes them to more severe fluid shifts and higher mortality rates.^{9,10}

HOSPITALIZATION AND SURGICAL INTERVENTIONS

In high-income countries, advances in burn care have significantly improved survival rates for patients with extensive burns, resulting in an increased number of patients undergoing surgical procedures. These surgeries, ranging from excision and grafting to reconstructive procedures, necessitate meticulous perioperative fluid management to ensure optimal outcomes. In the United States alone, the American Burn Association (ABA)

reports that approximately 40,000 patients are hospitalized annually due to burn injuries, with a considerable subset requiring surgical intervention. The ABA National Burn Repository data highlights that adults aged 20-40 years and children under five are the most frequently hospitalized age groups for burns.^{11,12}

PATHOPHYSIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Burn injuries induce profound systemic responses, including inflammatory and hypermetabolic states that significantly alter fluid dynamics. The extent and depth of burns dictate the severity of capillary permeability changes, leading to massive fluid shifts from the intravascular to the interstitial compartments. These shifts necessitate aggressive initial fluid resuscitation, typically guided by formulas such as the Parkland formula, which recommends 4 ml/kg TBSA of lactated Ringer's solution for the first 24 hours post-burn. However, the formula serves as a guideline, and fluid needs must be continuously reassessed to prevent both under-resuscitation and fluid overload.^{13,14}

PERIOPERATIVE FLUID MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Burn patients undergoing general surgery present unique challenges due to their altered physiological state. The systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) induced by severe burns can complicate perioperative fluid management by causing capillary leak and vasodilation, which may persist for weeks after the initial injury. The risk of sepsis further complicates the clinical picture, as septic patients often exhibit complex fluid and electrolyte imbalances. Additionally, burn patients are prone to developing acute kidney injury (AKI) due to hypovolemia and nephrotoxic medications, necessitating careful monitoring and adjustment of fluid therapy.^{15,16}

IMPACT OF BURN SIZE AND DEPTH

The size and depth of the burn injury critically influence fluid management strategies. Patients with burns covering more than 20% of the TBSA require particularly careful fluid resuscitation to maintain adequate tissue perfusion and prevent shock. Full-thickness burns exacerbate the challenge, as they involve deeper tissue destruction and greater fluid losses. The evolving understanding of burn wound pathophysiology underscores the need for individualized fluid resuscitation protocols that account for these variables.^{17,18}

TRENDS AND ADVANCES IN FLUID MANAGEMENT

Recent advancements in burn care have led to the development of more sophisticated fluid management strategies. The use of advanced hemodynamic monitoring techniques, such as pulse contour analysis and transpulmonary thermodilution, allows for real-time

assessment of a patient's fluid status and cardiac function. These techniques facilitate goal-directed therapy (GDT), which tailors fluid administration to the patient's dynamic needs, improving outcomes and reducing complications. Additionally, there is ongoing debate regarding the optimal type of fluid for resuscitation, with studies comparing the efficacy of crystalloids, colloids, and hypertonic solutions.^{19,21}

The epidemiology of fluid management in burn patients undergoing general surgery is multifaceted, influenced by demographic factors, burn severity, and the intricate interplay of systemic responses to injury. Understanding these epidemiological trends and pathophysiological considerations is crucial for developing effective fluid management protocols that enhance patient outcomes. Continued research and advancements in fluid management techniques hold promise for improving the perioperative care of burn patients, ultimately contributing to better survival rates and quality of life for this vulnerable population.^{21,22}

IDEAL FLUID AND ELECTROLYTE REPLACEMENT IN BURN PATIENTS UNDERGOING GENERAL SURGERY

Burn patients represent a unique and challenging cohort in the context of perioperative management due to the extensive physiological disruptions caused by thermal injury. Effective fluid and electrolyte replacement is paramount to mitigating the risk of complications and optimizing patient outcomes during general surgery. The pathophysiological alterations following a burn injury, including significant fluid shifts, capillary leak syndrome, and electrolyte imbalances, necessitate a meticulously tailored approach to fluid resuscitation and maintenance.^{23,24}

INITIAL FLUID RESUSCITATION

The initial phase of fluid resuscitation is critical in burn management, aimed at restoring intravascular volume, preventing hypovolemic shock, and ensuring adequate tissue perfusion. The Parkland formula, which recommends 4 ml/kg TBSA burned of crystalloid solution (typically lactated Ringer's) administered over the first 24 hours post-injury, remains a cornerstone. However, it is imperative to continuously reassess and adjust fluid administration based on the patient's evolving clinical status. The fluid requirement is typically highest within the first 8 hours post-burn, with half of the total calculated volume administered during this period, and the remainder over the subsequent 16 hours.^{25,26}

ADVANCED HEMODYNAMIC MONITORING

Traditional fluid resuscitation formulas may not fully capture the dynamic needs of burn patients, especially those undergoing surgery. Advanced hemodynamic monitoring techniques, such as pulse contour analysis,

transpulmonary thermodilution, and echocardiography, provide real-time data on cardiac output, stroke volume variation, and systemic vascular resistance. These tools facilitate goal-directed therapy (GDT), enabling precise fluid management tailored to the patient's immediate physiological needs, thereby reducing the risk of both under-resuscitation and fluid overload.^{13,14}

CRYSTALLOIDS VS COLLOIDS

The choice of resuscitation fluids remains a topic of debate. Crystalloids, such as lactated Ringer's solution, are commonly used due to their efficacy in restoring intravascular volume. However, large volumes can contribute to edema and secondary complications. Colloid solutions, including albumin, may be beneficial in certain scenarios by maintaining oncotic pressure and reducing interstitial edema. Studies suggest that albumin administration during the late resuscitation phase (beyond the initial 24 hours) may improve outcomes by stabilizing hemodynamic parameters and reducing fluid requirements.^{25,26}

ELECTROLYTE MANAGEMENT

Electrolyte imbalances are common in burn patients and must be vigilantly monitored and corrected. Hyponatremia can occur due to the administration of hypotonic fluids and sodium losses through burn exudates. Hyperkalemia or hypokalemia may arise from cellular damage and shifts in potassium balance, necessitating careful monitoring and appropriate supplementation. Hypocalcemia and hypomagnesemia should also be addressed, as they can contribute to cardiovascular instability and neuromuscular dysfunction.^{13,14}

PERIOPERATIVE FLUID MANAGEMENT

During surgery, fluid management must account for ongoing evaporative losses, insensible losses, and potential blood loss. Intraoperative fluid therapy should be guided by continuous hemodynamic monitoring to ensure adequate perfusion and oxygen delivery. Goal-directed fluid therapy protocols, which adjust fluid administration based on dynamic indicators such as stroke volume variation and cardiac output, have been shown to improve surgical outcomes and reduce postoperative complications.^{15,16}

MAINTENANCE FLUIDS

Postoperatively, fluid management shifts towards maintaining homeostasis and facilitating recovery. Maintenance fluids should be isotonic to prevent electrolyte imbalances and support renal function. The use of balanced solutions, such as plasmalyte, can help maintain acid-base balance and provide necessary electrolytes. The total fluid intake should be adjusted

based on ongoing losses, renal function, and the patient's overall clinical status.^{25,26}

MANAGING COMPLICATIONS

Burn patients are at heightened risk for complications such as acute kidney injury (AKI), acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and sepsis, all of which impact fluid and electrolyte management. AKI necessitates careful balancing of fluid administration to avoid exacerbating renal dysfunction, while ARDS may require fluid restriction and diuretic therapy to manage pulmonary edema. Sepsis management includes aggressive fluid resuscitation early on, followed by de-escalation and tight fluid balance to prevent fluid overload.^{27,28}

Ideal fluid and electrolyte replacement in burn patients undergoing general surgery is a dynamic and complex process requiring a comprehensive understanding of burn pathophysiology and meticulous monitoring. The integration of advanced hemodynamic monitoring, individualized fluid therapy, and vigilant correction of electrolyte imbalances is essential to optimizing outcomes. Ongoing research and clinical innovations continue to refine these strategies, contributing to improved survival rates and quality of life for burn patients. By adhering to evidence-based practices and adapting to the unique needs of each patient, healthcare providers can enhance perioperative care and ultimately improve the prognosis for those suffering from severe burn injuries.^{29,30}

ADVANCED RESUSCITATION STRATEGIES

The initial resuscitation phase is crucial in burn management, with the Parkland formula serving as a foundational guideline for fluid administration. However, this formula must be adapted based on continuous clinical assessment to prevent both under-resuscitation, which can lead to hypovolemic shock, and over-resuscitation, which can cause complications such as compartment syndrome and pulmonary edema. The incorporation of advanced hemodynamic monitoring techniques, such as pulse contour analysis and transpulmonary thermodilution, provides invaluable real-time data, enabling a more nuanced and goal-directed fluid therapy approach. These advanced monitoring methods facilitate the precise titration of fluids to meet the dynamic needs of burn patients, thereby improving hemodynamic stability and reducing the incidence of resuscitation-related complications.^{29,30}

OPTIMIZING FLUID CHOICES

The debate between the use of crystalloids versus colloids in burn resuscitation continues to evolve. Crystalloids, such as lactated Ringer's solution, are favored for their efficacy in restoring intravascular volume; however, they require careful administration to avoid excessive

interstitial edema. Colloid solutions, including albumin, may offer benefits in maintaining oncotic pressure and reducing fluid requirements, particularly during the later stages of resuscitation. Emerging evidence suggests that a balanced approach, utilizing both crystalloids and colloids at appropriate phases of resuscitation, may optimize patient outcomes by addressing the specific physiological demands at different stages of recovery.^{30,31}

ELECTROLYTE MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING

Electrolyte imbalances are a frequent and critical concern in burn patients due to extensive tissue damage and the subsequent release of intracellular contents. Continuous monitoring and timely correction of electrolyte disturbances, such as hyponatremia, hyperkalemia, hypocalcemia, and hypomagnesemia, are essential to maintaining cellular function and preventing complications such as cardiac arrhythmias and neuromuscular dysfunction. The use of isotonic and balanced electrolyte solutions during maintenance therapy helps to stabilize electrolyte levels and supports overall homeostasis.^{31,32}

PERIOPERATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

The perioperative period introduces additional challenges in fluid and electrolyte management. During surgery, fluid administration must be meticulously managed to compensate for evaporative losses, insensible losses, and potential hemorrhage. Goal-directed fluid therapy protocols, informed by continuous hemodynamic monitoring, are critical in ensuring adequate perfusion and oxygen delivery while minimizing the risk of fluid overload. Postoperative fluid management focuses on maintaining homeostasis and facilitating recovery, with adjustments made based on ongoing losses, renal function, and overall clinical status.³²

COMPLICATION MANAGEMENT

Burn patients are at increased risk for complications such as acute kidney injury (AKI), acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and sepsis, each of which significantly influences fluid and electrolyte management strategies. AKI necessitates careful balancing of fluid administration to avoid exacerbating renal dysfunction, while ARDS may require fluid restriction and diuretic therapy to manage pulmonary edema. In the context of sepsis, early aggressive fluid resuscitation followed by careful de-escalation and maintenance of fluid balance is crucial to prevent fluid overload and support organ function.^{32,33}

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The evolving landscape of burn care demands ongoing research and innovation in fluid and electrolyte

management. Future studies should focus on refining resuscitation protocols, optimizing fluid types and administration strategies, and developing advanced monitoring technologies to enhance individualized patient care. Integrating new evidence-based practices into clinical guidelines will ensure that burn patients receive the most effective and efficient care, ultimately improving survival rates and quality of life.³³

CONCLUSION

Fluid management in burn patients undergoing general surgery presents a complex and challenging aspect of perioperative care due to the profound physiological changes induced by thermal injury. The unique pathophysiological responses, including significant fluid shifts, increased capillary permeability, and a heightened inflammatory state, necessitate a sophisticated and individualized approach to fluid and electrolyte replacement to ensure optimal outcomes. In conclusion, the management of hydration and electrolyte balance in burn patients undergoing general surgery requires a multifaceted and adaptive approach. By leveraging advanced monitoring techniques, employing a balanced fluid resuscitation strategy, and vigilantly managing electrolyte imbalances, healthcare providers can significantly improve perioperative outcomes. Continued advancements in research and clinical practice will further enhance the care and recovery of burn patients, underscoring the importance of a dynamic and individualized approach to fluid and electrolyte management in this vulnerable population.

Funding: No funding sources

Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: Not required

REFERENCES

1. Snell JA, Loh NH, Mahambrey T, Shokrollahi K. Clinical review: the critical care management of the burn patient. *Crit Care*. 2013;17:241.
2. American Burn Association/American College of Surgeons - Guidelines for the operation of burn centers. Gamelli RL. *J Burn Care Res*. 2007;28:134-41.
3. Hospital and prehospital resources for optimal care of patients with burn injury: guidelines for development and operation of burn centers. American Burn Association. *J Burn Care Rehab*. 1990;11:98-104.
4. Lip HT, Idris MA, Imran FH, Azmah TN, Huei TJ, Thomas M. Predictors of mortality and validation of burn mortality prognostic scores in a Malaysian burns intensive care unit. *BMC Emerg Med*. 2019;19:66
5. American Burn Association. Chicago: American Burn Association. 2018. Advanced burn life support course: provider manual 2018.
6. Khemani RG, Randolph A, Markovitz B. Corticosteroids for the prevention and treatment of post-extubation stridor in neonates, children and adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009.
7. Lan X, Huang Z, Tan Z, Huang Z, Wang D, Huang Y. Nebulized heparin for inhalation injury in burn patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Burns Trauma*. 2020;8:0.
8. McGinn KA, Weigartz K, Lintner A, Scalese MJ, Kahn SA. Nebulized heparin with N-acetylcysteine and albuterol reduces duration of mechanical ventilation in patients with inhalation injury. *J Pharm Pract*. 2019;32:163-6.
9. Amin M, Shaarawy H, El-Rab EG. Role of fiberoptic bronchoscopy in management of smoke inhalation lung injury. *Egypt J Chest Dis Tuberc*. 2015;64:733-7.
10. Carr JA, Phillips BD, Bowling WM. The utility of bronchoscopy after inhalation injury complicated by pneumonia in burn patients: results from the National Burn Repository. *J Burn Care Res*. 2009;30:967-74.
11. Blumenthal I. Carbon monoxide poisoning. *J R Soc Med*. 2001;94:270-2.
12. Oh S, Choi SC. Acute carbon monoxide poisoning and delayed neurological sequelae: a potential neuroprotection bundle therapy. *Neural Regen Res*. 2015;10:36-38.
13. Moore SJ, Norris JC, Walsh DA, Hume AS. Antidotal use of methemoglobin forming cyanide antagonists in concurrent carbon monoxide/cyanide intoxication. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 1987;242:70-3.
14. Lawson-Smith P, Jansen EC, Hyldegaard O. Cyanide intoxication as part of smoke inhalation--a review on diagnosis and treatment from the emergency perspective. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2011;19:14.
15. Hettiaratchy S, Dziewulski P. ABC of burns: pathophysiology and types of burns. *BMJ*. 2004;328:1427-9.
16. Haberal M, Sakallioglu Abali AE, Karakayali H. Fluid management in major burn injuries. *Indian J Plast Surg*. 2010;43:0-36.
17. Baxter C. Fluid volume and electrolyte changes in the early post-burn period. *Clin Plastic Surg*. 1974;1:693-703.
18. Pruitt BA. Fluid and electrolyte replacement in the burned patient. *Surg Clin North Am*. 1978;58:1291-312.
19. Friedrich JB, Sullivan SR, Engrav LH, Round KA, Blayney CB, Carrougher GJ, et al. Is supra-Baxter resuscitation in burn patients a new phenomenon? *Burns*. 2004;30:464-6.
20. Sullivan SR, Friedrich JB, Engrav LH, Round KA, Heimbach DM, Heckbert SR, et al. "Opioid creep" is real and may be the cause of "fluid creep" *Burns*. 2004;30:583-90.
21. Pruitt BA. Protection from excessive resuscitation: "pushing the pendulum back." *J Trauma*. 2000;49:567-8.

22. Fodor L, Fodor A, Ramon Y, Shoshani O, Rissin Y, Ullman Y. Controversies in fluid resuscitation for burn management: Literature review and our experience. *Injury Int J Care injured.* 2006;37:374-9.
23. Baxter CR, Shires GT. Physiological response to crystalloid resuscitation of severe burns. *Ann NY Acad Sci.* 1969;150:874-94.
24. Baxter CR. Guidelines for fluid resuscitation. *J Trauma.* 1981;21:687-90.
25. Baxter CR. Fluid resuscitation, burn percentage, and physiologic age. *J Trauma.* 1979;19:864-6.
26. Barry P. Thermal, electrical and chemical injuries. In: Aston SJ, Beasley RW, Thorne CHM, editors. *Grabb and Smith's Plastic Surgery.* 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven; 1997. 164-85.
27. Kucan JO. Thermal burns: resuscitation and management. In: Cohen M, Goldwyn RM, editors. *Mastery of plastic and reconstructive surgery.* New York: Little Brown. 1994: 400-6.
28. Monafó WW, Chuntrasakul C, Ayvazian VH. Hypertonic sodium solutions in the treatment of burn shock. 1973;126:778-83.
29. Monafó WW. Treatment of burn shock by intravenous and oral administration of hypertonic lactated saline solution. *J Trauma.* 1970;10:575-86.
30. Monafó WW. The treatment of burns: principles and practice. St. Louis: Warren H Green; 1971: 267.
31. Monafó WW, Halverson JD, Schechtman K. The role of concentrated sodium solutions in the resuscitation of patients with severe burns. *Surgery.* 1984;95:129-34
32. Pruitt BA., Jr Fluid resuscitation for extensively burned patients. *J Trauma.* 1981;21:690-2.
33. Salisbury RE. Thermal burns. In: McCarthy JG, May JW, Littler JW, editors. *Plastic surgery.* Philadelphia: WB Saunders. *Indian J Plast Surg.* 2010;43:29-36.

Cite this article as: Ramírez LYC, Chavira AAG, Avelar BIC, Lucas FGND, Tamayo AGP, Uribe YSM. Advanced fluid management strategies in burn patients undergoing general surgery: a comprehensive review. *Int Surg J* 2024;11:1433-8.