Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies
Volume 4 Number 10, October, 2024
p- ISSN 2775-3735- e-ISSN 2775-3727

The Role of International Normalized Ratio (INR) in Heart Failure Patient With Sepsis: Hidden in Plain Sight

Pradhika Perdana Sakti
Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia
Email: pradhikaperdana94@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Heart failure is a clinical syndrome characterized by symptoms and signs caused by a structural and/or functional impairment of the heart. Sepsis in heart failure may cause significant mortality and morbidity rates. Clinically, the presence of heart dysfunction in heart failure worsens outcomes in unstable hemodynamic conditions, for instance, in cases of sepsis, particularly in patients with HFrEF. This research aims to survey the blend of heart failure and sepsis and current updates regarding using the International Normalized Ratio (INR) to detect sepsis. Information was collected from various sources, and updated literature was compiled into a review article. The presence of heart failure with sepsis is associated with horrible clinical results. If fluid alone is insufficient to restore perfusion, the fundamental structure of sepsis includes strong fluid recovery followed by vasopressor association (and possibly inotropic support). In any case, in patients with heart failure, high-portion fluid boluses and vasoactive experts might deteriorate the condition. Heart failure and sepsis can overlap and lead to hemodynamic disturbances and challenging treatment. Meanwhile, aggressive fluid resuscitation is necessary for sepsis; conventional heart failure management requires reducing fluid intake. The International Normalized Ratio (INR) is one of the coagulation parameters that may help determine sepsis in patients with heart failure, thus improving appropriate diagnosis and treatment.

KEYWORDS *Heart Failure, Sepsis, International Normalized Ratio, Coagulopathy*

INTRODUCTION

Heart failure is a clinical problem with signs like lung rales, peripheral edema, and elevated jugular venous pressure. This condition is caused by elevated intracardiac pressure and/or inadequate cardiac output at rest and/or during exercise. Considering assessments of left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), there are three sorts of heart failure: 1) heart failure with reduced ejection fraction

How to cite: Pradhika Perdana Sakti. (2023). The Role of International Normalized Ratio (INR) in Heart Failure Patient With Sepsis: Hidden in Plain Sight. *Journal Eduvest*. *4*(10), 9315-9327
E-ISSN: 2775-3727
Published by: https://greenpublisher.id/

(HFrEF) portrayed by coincidental impacts and indications of heart failure and LVEF ≤ 40%; (2) heart failure with mildly reduced ejection fraction (HFmrEF), portrayed by the side effects and indications of heart failure and an LVEF of 4 to 49%; and 3) heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), depicted by accidental impacts and indications of heart failure and LVEF ≥50% (McDonagh & Metra, 2023).

The age-specific incidence of heart failure is decreasing in developed countries due to improved cardiovascular disease management. However, overall incidence continues to rise due to aging processes (Conrad et al., 2018; Dunlay & Roger, 2014; Roth et al., 2015). Heart failure has affected approximately 38 million people worldwide and 10 million people in Indonesia. According to the reported research, the prevalence of heart failure in Indonesia reaches 5%, contributing to 1.8 million hospitalizations annually. The readmission rate for heart failure in Indonesia is estimated at 29%, with a 30-day mortality rate of 17% (Nauli et al., 2023).

In addition to the increasing incidence of non-communicable diseases, such as cardiovascular diseases impacting heart failure, Indonesia is a tropical country. Tropical nations tend to have a high incidence of sepsis. Out of 10,069 patients treated for sepsis in serious thought units (ICUs), 35.3% passed on, marvelous the overall clinical facility demise speed of 22.4% for all patients, according to an overall survey. According to various reports, most contamination-related deaths occur in low- to middle-income nations, many of which are located in tropical regions (McGloughlin et al., 2018).

This condition affects the likelihood of sepsis in patients who already have heart failure. Both heart failure and sepsis generally increase mortality and morbidity, with septic shock death rates reaching up to 40%, while a heart failure diagnosis results in a 50% mortality within 5 years. These two conditions can overlap pathophysiologically, leading to hemodynamic disturbances and substantial implications for disease management. In sepsis cases, the board depends upon extraordinary liquid reclamation with crystalloid liquids and hemodynamic help utilizing vasopressors. However, this differs from conventional heart failure management, which requires reducing preload and afterload (Vincent et al., 2019).

Clinically, the presence of heart dysfunction in heart failure worsens outcomes in unstable hemodynamic conditions, for instance, in cases of sepsis, particularly in patients with HFrEF (Jones et al., 2021). Recent studies have demonstrated that, in comparison to patients without heart failure, those who were admitted for sepsis had higher death rates. Other reports demonstrate that patients with sepsis and concomitant HFrEF have higher mortality rates (Abou Dagher et al., 2018). Although some reports suggest no correlation between ejection fraction and clinical outcomes in sepsis patients, overall, available evidence indicates that the simultaneous occurrence of sepsis and patients with heart failure has more terrible clinical results and a higher gamble of creating septic myocardial breakdown.

The poor clinical outcomes of patients with sepsis who have a foundation of heart failure trigger the need for diagnostic tools to serve as predictors of sepsis events in heart failure patients, both for preventive and curative efforts. In clinical

practice, the quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) score has been used as an easy, quick, and basic technique for assessing sepsis. In any case, it is understood that the qSOFA score has a low responsiveness for early sepsis areas in specific reports, with a sensitivity as low as 29.7%. This controversy surrounds using the qSOFA score as a sepsis detection modality (Askim et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2021).

Recent studies have linked sepsis with the coagulation system because sepsis is a systemic inflammatory response affecting various aspects, including endothelial dysfunction and coagulation. Coagulation function examinations vary from conventional tests to thromboelastography, rotational thromboelastometry, etc. Despite various complex tests, there is a trend in using conventional coagulation function examinations, attributed to their ability to detect sepsis early and identify it rapidly. One such examination is the international normalized ratio (INR) (Williams et al., 2017).

Given the low responsiveness of the qSOFA score in sepsis recognizing evidence and the possible utility of coagulation markers in sepsis revelation, further studies are needed to compare these two diagnostic modalities. Recent studies have found that INR correlates with the SOFA score. However, there is no research investigating the correlation between INR and sepsis events in heart failure patients at risk for coagulation disorders (Czempik et al., 2022; Fantz, 2020; Siniarski et al., 2023).

RESEARCH METHOD

Information was collected from various sources, and updated literature was compiled into a review article. The presence of heart failure with sepsis is associated with horrible clinical results. If fluid alone is insufficient to restore perfusion, the fundamental structure of sepsis includes strong fluid recovery followed by vasopressor association (and possibly inotropic support). In any case, in patients with heart failure, high-portion fluid boluses and vasoactive experts might deteriorate the condition. Heart failure and sepsis can overlap and lead to hemodynamic disturbances and challenging treatment

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Discussion

Definition, Epidemiology, and Classification of Heart Failure

Heart failure is a clinical condition including cardinal coincidental impacts joined by signs (like raised jugular venous pressure, lung rales, and leg edema). Extended intracardiac pressure or low cardiac output (CO) exceptionally still and during exercise are the eventual outcomes of heart essential and utilitarian anomalies.

A purposeful survey uncovered appraisals facilitated between 1994 and 2014 on people groups in Latin America and the Caribbean (with research predominantly in South America at 92%, mainly in Brazil accounting for 64%). The survey showed that the inevitability of heart failure came to 1%. Other examinations summed up the general repeat of heart failure. The middle yearly repeat of heart failure was 3.2

cases per 1,000 individuals all around the planet (going from < 2 in Italy to ≥ 6 in Estonia and Germany). Another hoard in the Netherlands, covering 8,592 people from 1998-2010, organized an occasion speed of heart failure at 3.7 cases per 1,000 individuals and 2.4 cases per 1,000 females yearly. In approximately 66% of the Dutch reports, heart failure patients with reduced discharge division were included. Curiously, in contrast to previous studies, older adults (those over 70 years old) have a higher prevalence of cardiovascular disease than younger adults (those under 55 years old), which was 4.3% in 2012 and is expected to rise to 8.5% in 2030. Moreover, the very elderly (> 85 years old) remained stable or increased, while in the elderly group (60-84 years old), the incidence decreased (Shahim et al., 2023).

Heart failure is more likely to be a part of the geriatric cardiovascular syndrome because of this condition. Fourteen have the most significant speeds of heart failure, with the magnitude of issues related to multimorbidity and frailty considered to increase the social and personal impact of the disease (Roger, 2021; Van Nuys et al., 2018).

A report indicates that heart failure is becoming more common in Asia. Hong Kong, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand are reported to be 2-3%, 1-2%, 0.6%, 6%, and 0.4%, respectively. Furthermore, in a multicenter cohort study in Japan, heart failure with a normal ejection fraction is alluded to as HFpEF was found to dominate hospital admissions, with proportions of (1) HFrEF at 36%, (2) HFmrEF at 21%, and (3) HFpEF at 41%.

At this point, several estimations are available on the event and inescapability of heart failure in Indonesia. Heart failure has already impacted approximately 38 million people worldwide and 10 million people in Indonesia. Furthermore, a research report shows that the consistency of heart failure in Indonesia is 5%, contributing to 1.8 million hospitalizations annually. The readmission rate for heart failure in Indonesia is estimated to be 29%, with a 30-day mortality rate of 17%.

Broadly, heart failure is classified based on its ejection fraction, including (1) heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), depicted by auxiliary impacts and indications of heart failure and left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤ 40%; (2) heart failure with mildly-reduced ejection fraction (HFmrEF), as shown by the side effects and indications of heart failure and LVEF going from 41-49%; and (3) heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), as shown via heart failure-related secondary effects and LVEF ≥50%.

Heart failure's demographic and clinical characteristics can be evaluated through classifications based on left ventricular ejection fraction. Typically, HFpEF patients are older, more commonly female, and often present with malignant growth, persistent lung infection, heart valve abnormality, and ongoing kidney disease as co-morbidities. In addition, they are bound to have hypertension, raised mean pulse strain, corpulence, atrial fibrillation, and anemia compared to HFrEF patients. Recent reports indicate that HFmrEF presents a different profile from HFpEF, with milder side effects, lower natriuretic peptide, and a less frequent occurrence of cardiovascular events.

Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF)

The pathophysiology of Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF)

Heart failure with decreased discharge part (HFrEF) is a condition portrayed by the presence of optional impacts and indications of heart failure accompanied by a reduction in left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤40%, as yet hanging out there by echocardiography. HFrEF recollects a fundamental downfall for heart yield, further setting off maladaptive cycles. Myocardial injury (for any reason), steady, surprising stacking from conditions like hypertension, valve disease, or arrhythmia. The pathophysiological process of heart failure remodeling is complex; this reflects key neurohormonal activation, ramifications for the peripheral vascular system, and changes in cardiovascular substrates at the nearby level.

In HFrEF, which is portrayed by systolic impairment, the ventricle loses its ability to discharge blood due to disabled myocardial contractility or unnecessary tension stacking, such as expanded afterload. Myocyte harm, strange myocyte capacity, or fibrosis could make contractility vanish. The ventricular release is hurt by raised tension in obvious resistance.

During diastole, a persistent increase in left ventricular pressure is transmitted to the left atrium (via mitral valve opening) and into the pulmonary veins and capillaries. A sufficiently high hydrostatic pressure in pulmonary capillaries (> 20 mmHg) leads to fluid transudation into the pulmonary interstitium, resulting in symptoms of pulmonary congestion.

Sepsis and Septic Shock

Definition and Epidemiology of Sepsis

Organ dysfunction brought on by abnormal host responses to infection is known as sepsis, which puts life at risk. Septic shock can result from abnormalities in circulation, cellular function, and metabolism, dealing with a greater risk of mortality stood out than treating sepsis alone.[26] Sepsis and septic shock remain global problems, presenting challenges for clinicians due to the increasing incidence and the complexity of pathophysiology, subatomic, hereditary, and clinical perspectives.

Since 1991, when the definition of sepsis (Sepsis-1) was presented, the prevalence of sepsis and septic shock has consistently increased. Around the world, there were 49 million cases of sepsis in 2017 and 11 million deaths as a result. The World Thriving Connection (WHO) has communicated sepsis as a general flourishing need. The following factors contribute to the rise in cases of sepsis: 1) an expansion in the average time of patients, especially in Western nations; (2) an increase in invasive procedures; and 3) the far-reaching utilization of immunosuppressive and chemotherapy drugs; besides, impediment because of anti-toxins. Despite the essential for a fundamental improvement in strong association, sepsis patients likewise have a high wagered of clinical office mortality, assessed to address 20% of every single end.

After a few times, the acknowledgment of microorganisms in sepsis and septic shock changes; however, further assessment uncovers a critical expansion in infectious sepsis, both clinically and epidemiologically. The most well-known Gram-positive microorganisms are Staphylococcus aureus and Streptococcus

pneumoniae, while Escherichia coli, Klebsiella, and Pseudomonas spp. are the Gram-negative microorganisms that are most well-known. As to pollution related to this condition, Candida spp. Still play a dominant role, usually identified in immunocompromised patients or patients with malignancies undergoing long-term chemotherapy or immunosuppressive therapy. The respiratory plot or lung parenchyma (43%), the urinary structure (16%), the mid-district (14%), the head, and various locales or causes (14%) are the fundamental tainting regions related to sepsis.

Pathogenesis of Sepsis and Septic Shock

From a pathogenic perspective, sepsis is still considered a result of several mechanisms simultaneously involving certain go-betweens of both positive for and quieting factors. In addition, the significance of sepsis-related cell changes and microcirculation in the transition from sepsis to septic shock has been emphasized. The endothelium has been distinguished as the principal useful unit in sepsis pathophysiology because it directs microcirculation, changes coagulation systems, and flagging cycles of aggravation and calming. Proteoglycans and glycoproteins comprise the glycocalyx, a piece of the endothelial film. It performs various functions, the most notable of which are activating leukocyte and platelet grips, modifying provocative or mitigating reactions, creating a mechanical barrier that directs vascular porousness, and so on. Glycocalyx shedding is the interaction by which oxidizing specialists, cytokines, bacterial exotoxins, and endotoxins hurt the glycocalyx's morphofunctional uprightness. Therefore, leukocyte diapedesis is impacted, and vascular porousness increases, leading to edema, increased interstitial pressure, and impaired tissue perfusion.

More specifically, sepsis is not just a central hot response or safe structure issue; it is a beneficial change in many of the body's organs (Figure 1). Unquestionably involved in the pathogenesis of sepsis at the cell and subatomic levels are an imbalance in the safe reaction, resistant breakage, mitochondrial damage, coagulopathy, irregularities in the immune neuroendocrine network, endoplasmic reticulum stress, autophagy, and a variety of pathophysiological processes. These components accomplish organ failure.

The emphasis is on exhibiting that bothering and coagulation cooperate, which is commonly remembered to assume a focal part in the pathogenesis of sepsis. Unsettling influence can incite a coagulation reaction in sepsis, and the request for the coagulation reaction will set off a protected reaction.

The tissue factor inhibitor system, the activated protein C (APC) system, and the antithrombosis system, which regulates coagulation activation, are the three physiological anticoagulation systems that control coagulation activation under normal circumstances. During sepsis, these three pathways will trigger various instruments. The three anticoagulation inhibitor pathways have minimal utilization, protein corruption, and protein amalgamation aggravations. The endothelium's demeanor of thrombomodulin (TM) and the protein C receptor diminishes when protein C is switched over completely to APC in provocative circumstances. Additionally, during maximal coagulation initiation, fibrinolysis is diminished when plasminogen activators (for example, tissue plasminogen activator [t-PA])

and urokinase-type plasminogen activators (u-Father) are let out of the vascular endothelial cell putting away protests, impelling plasminogen activator intensity and expanded plasmin creation, which in like manner increases plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 (PAI-1), ruining its assets. Neisseria meningitidis infection has been connected to PAI-1 polymorphisms, which raise the gamble of septic shock. Because of the clinical impacts of Gram-negative sepsis, patients with the 4G/4G genotype have an expanded gamble of PAI and mortality.

Diagnostic Criteria of Sepsis

The third worldwide settlement on sepsis and septic shock (Sepsis-3) expresses that patients with defilements starting from various sources ought to be considered to have sepsis. Nevertheless, in the 2021 guidelines, the use of qSOFA as a screening technique has started to be questioned, and there is even a stronger recommendation for using the Public Early Reprimand Score (NEWS) or basic combustible response condition (SIRS) score as they provide better sensitivity in predicting patient outcomes. The assurance of sepsis can be insisted on when the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score is 2. Septic shock is a condition that anticipates that vasopressors should remain aware. Table 1 shows the SOFA scoring system.

Table 1. Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) Score

Score	0	1	2	3	4
System					
Respiratory PaO2/FiO2, mmHg (kPa)	≥ 400	< 400	< 300	< 200 with respiratory support	< 100 with respiratory support
Coagulation					
Platelet count × 103/uL	≥ 150	< 150	< 100	< 50	< 20
Liver					
Bilirubin, mg/dL	< 1.2	1.2 – 1.9	2.0 – 5.9	6.0 – 11.9	> 12.0
Cardiovascular	MAP ≥70 mmHg	MAP <70 mmHg	Dopamine <5 or dobutamine (all doses)	Dopamine 5.1 – 15 or epinephrine ≤0.1 or norepinephrine ≤0.1	nor-/epinephrine >0.1 or multiple vasopressors
Central Nervous System					
Glasgow Coma Scale	15	13 - 14	10 - 12	6 - 9	< 6
Renal					
Creatinine, mg/dL	<1.2	1.2 – 1.9	2.0 – 3.4	3.5 – 4.9	> 5.0
Urine Output				< 500	< 200

Detection and Diagnosis of Sepsis

Sepsis screening modalities are designed to achieve early detection of sepsis. The indicative exactness of existing modalities fluctuates significantly. Several variations exist concerning clinical variables and the modalities used, counting proportions of crucial combustible response issues (SIRS), essential physical processes, indications of infection, quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) or Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) norms, National Early Warning Score (NEWS), and Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS).

To dissect sepsis, the SOFA score and its faster accomplice, the q-SOFA, have been portrayed in Sepsis-3. The qSOFA modality is designed to assist clinicians in recognizing potential sepsis conditions outside the intensive care unit. Patients with at least two qSOFA models should be examined for sepsis.

However, the use of qSOFA remains controversial. Previous research findings show that qSOFA is more unambiguous yet less delicate, standing apart from including 2 of the 4 SIRS standards for early unmistakable verification of contamination-actuated organ failure. However, in Sepsis-3, it has been stated that there is no ideal choice between SIRS and qSOFA for sepsis screening modalities. Much more in this way, it is known that just 24% of tainted patients have qSOFA scores of 2 or 3, while 70% of patients with scores meeting qSOFA criteria have poor clinical outcomes.

The use of the SOFA score can assess the seriousness of damage to six organ systems in severely ill patients on a fundamental level. This remains to be determined upon admission to the crisis unit and at regular intervals. In patients without known organ failure, an increment of no less than two focuses from the pattern score — which is thought to be 0 preceding sepsis — implies an expanded death pace of over 20% and a possible conclusion of sepsis.

Sepsis and Heart Failure with reduced Ejection Fraction

The presence of heart failure in sepsis patients is connected to more terrible clinical results. Following forceful liquid revival, vasopressors (and potentially inotrope support) are controlled if forceful liquid revival neglects to reestablish perfusion. Notwithstanding, liquid boluses and vasoactive specialists could burden cardiovascular function in patients with heart failure.

Mortality and morbidity are linked to heart failure and septic shock. The death rate from septic shock is 40%, while if heart failure is diagnosed, the mortality within 5 years is up to 50%. Sepsis and heart failure are the first and second leading causes after 30 days; in which the readmission rates are highest from insurance data in the United States in 2018. Additionally, septic shock and sepsis have occurred in about a quarter of deaths in heart failure patients.

Some studies identify signs of sepsis as unfavorable liquid revival with crystalloid liquids and hemodynamic assistance with vasopressors. This contradicts the conventional management of heart failure, triggering a decrease in preload and afterload. However, according to the available evidence, patients with sepsis, septic shock, and heart failure cannot be treated reasonably, and the available evidence is still limited regarding the impact of therapy on patients with heart failure and sepsis.

The presence of heart dysfunction from heart failure will worsen clinical outcomes related to patients with sepsis or septic shock's hemodynamic instability,

particularly those with HFrEF. A research report shows that patients who present with sepsis and have an impairment in their cardiovascular system are more likely to have a higher mortality rate than patients who do not. Sepsis patients with HFrEF had a higher in-emergency clinic death rate than patients without HFrEF, as per a review survey of 174 patients. In any case, a different study found that, when adjusted for severity, patients with sepsis and HFrEF or HFpEF were not associated with prolonged 28-day mortality. Still, HFrEF patients had an association with increased new-onset arrhythmias. Furthermore, a report shows that sepsis patients with an ejection fraction < 50% have higher mortality.

In addition to reports stating a relationship between ejection fraction and sepsis patient mortality, several reports show no relationship between ejection fraction and clinical outcomes in sepsis patients. This suggests that mortality rates and intubation requirements for sepsis patients are not correlated with patient ejection fraction. Table 2 below shows comprehensive reports for each study regarding the clinical consequences of sepsis patients with heart failure:

Table 2. Clinical outcome of sepsis with heart failure patients.

Reference	Study Type	Population and number (n)	Outcome	HF-related results
Abou Dagher et al	Retrospective	Patients with preexisting HF (LVEF < 40%) presenting with sepsis, n = 174 (87 with HF)	The effect of preexisting HFrEF on mortality	Patients with HF had a higher in-hospital mortality (57.5% vs 34.5%; P = .002) and had higher odds of death (OR: 2.45; 95% CI: 1.22-4.88; P .01)
Ishak Gabra et al	Retrospective	Septic shock, n = 226 (96 with HF)	The effect of preexisting HF on mortality	HFrEF was not significantly associated with increased 28-day mortality (OR: 1.88; 95% CI: 0.98-3.63; P = .06). HFpEF was not as strongly associated with 28-day mortality (OR: 1.56; P = .25)
Alkhalaf et al	Retrospective	Severe sepsis/septic, n = 195	HF effects on sepsis survivor 1-year ourtcomes and perfomance status	High rate of 1-year mortality (>70%) noted in patients with HF and sepsis
Ouellette and Shah	Retrospective, matched cohort	Sepsis stratified into with low EF (n = 197) and control (n = 197), N = 394	Differences in outcomes based on presence or absence of preexisting LVD	No difference in mortality (32% vs 24%; P = .12) or intubation (49% vs 50%; P = .687) between the low EF group and normal EF

group

Abbreviations: EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF, heart failure reduced ejection fraction; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVD, left ventricular dysfunction; OR, odds ratio.

From a pathophysiological perspective, the overlapping mechanisms between sepsis and heart failure are considered. Endothelial cell impairment is achieved by the host-mediated safe response in sepsis, augmenting thin permeability and shifting the fluid from veins to the interstitial space. Increasing intravascular volume with liquid boluses to increase preload, improve cardiovascular function, and reestablish end-organ perfusion is the most effective treatment for sepsis. By increasing cytokine enactment of nitric oxide synthase, sepsis directly affects heart function by lowering top systolic calcium levels, aggravating cell constriction, and having a negative inotropic effect. Septic shock occurs when liquid fails to stabilize hemodynamics. In a healthy heart, sepsis-induced tachycardia may decrease preload and disrupt myocardial contractility, resulting in neither a change nor an increase in cardiovascular results. This is in addition to the decreased afterload caused by vasodilation. The compensatory effects in patients with heart dysfunction have not been fully described but have made people aware that heart failure and sepsis patients have a higher mortality rate. Autonomously, sepsis can similarly cause heart failure (e.g., septic myocardial depression), which is separate from heart failure, thus exerting a cumulative negative effect when patients already have heart failure.

Normal for heart failure is a pattern of decreased cardiovascular results and neurohormonal compensation that harms the heart and necessitates liquid maintenance. Lacking oxygenation improves well-enacted catecholamine discharge, dealing with direct cardiotoxic impacts and developing myocardial commitment. Further incitation of the sagacious substantial structure empowers the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone framework, setting off vein vasoconstriction and developing intravascular and interstitial volume through sodium and liquid help, ultimately affecting heart remodeling. In chronic heart failure patients, decreased capillary endothelial permeability results in the loss of intravascular albumin and a decrease in hydrostatic pressure. The fluid goes to the interstitial space along the strain tendency, affecting fluid homeostasis by intravascular fluid expansion to interstitial space from growing. Long haul broadened preload will extend myofibrils past their regular flexibility, causing exacerbation in pressure, stroke volume, and cardiovascular results.

Utilization of International Normalized Ratio (INR) in Sepsis Detection

Sepsis is an organ dysfunction that poses a life-threatening risk due to the dysregulation of the host's reaction to contamination. It was acknowledged that prior definitions lacked in capturing the disease severity from septic shock to serious sepsis. In addition, the Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (SIRS) guidelines emphasize a lack of expressivity and mindfulness. Various sepsis screening modalities have been developed, and research results show that the SOFA score has the most interesting strength, with Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) bend worth of 0.78 stood apart from different modalities,

like MEWS (0.5) and SIRS measures (0.70).

Despite the high diagnostic capability of SOFA, its utilization in clinical practice remains challenging due to its complexity and numerous indicators. This limitation has resulted in the limited widespread use of the SOFA score and its inability to serve as a rapid modality for sepsis detection, especially in emergency room patient management. Another modality, qSOFA, has been developed to be fast, simple, and non-invasive. However, a report states that qSOFA provides low sensitivity in sepsis screening, with a positive qSOFA criterion, when finding at least two out of three criteria, yielding only 29.7% sensitivity. Therefore, the controversy around sepsis screening modalities persists, and the search for more sensitive and accurate diagnostic modalities for sepsis detection continues.

Sepsis and coagulation factors affect hematological components like red platelets, white platelets, and platelets. Systemic dysregulation during sepsis involves oxygen transport disturbances, specifically in red blood cells. Emotional (volume, morphology, deformability, collection, processing, and intracellular calcium molecule homeostasis) and quantitative changes occur in red blood cells.

Open coagulation tests solidify halfway through thromboplastin time (aPTT), prothrombin time (PT), thrombin time (TT), fibrinogen focus, and platelet count. Patients might foster sepsis-related coagulopathy (SAC) if their platelet counts are low and their PT is drawn out. Another possibility is disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), also known as prolonged PT, low platelets, low levels of fibrinogen, and elevated fibrin-related markers (such as D-dimer).

With platelets and coagulation factors, sepsis-related coagulopathy (SAC) can occur when the normal safe system activates platelets and coagulation factors, resulting in microthrombus formation throughout the body. This condition influences scattered intravascular coagulation (DIC). As indications of systemic inflammation and activation of the coagulation system, routine coagulation tests such as platelet count, aPTT, PT, International Normalized Ratio (INR), fibrinogen, and D-dimer will alter in SAC or DIC cases. These standard coagulation tests may predict mortality risk and reflect the severity of the aggravation.

Based on this understanding, several hematological and coagulation parameters can be used in sepsis examination parameters in patients with heart failure. This is based on the effect of sepsis as a systemic inflammatory response involving endothelial and coagulation disturbances. Various studies have shown a relationship between sepsis and the degree of coagulopathy. Coagulopathy in sepsis is based on inflammatory factors, ranging from procoagulant (subclinical) status to terminal-stage DIC. In this case, conventional coagulation tests can be used as a rapid and easy screening method for sepsis. One developed test is the International Normalized Ratio (INR) examination.

A study using coagulation parameters to measure the rate and result of sepsis in trauma center patients has been conducted. This report shows a huge contrast among sepsis and non-sepsis patients in red blood cell distribution width (RDW), INR, aPTT, D-dimer, fibrinogen, and platelets. However, of all the types of tests, only INR is a parameter to predict sepsis adequately, with an AUROC of 0.70. The study also analyzed the use of INR, fibrinogen, and clinical severity, demonstrating an enhanced predictive ability for sepsis in ICU patients.

Existing data on using coagulation system examinations such as INR for sepsis incidence still needs to be improved. There is no research examining the use of coagulation system examinations for sepsis incidence in patients with heart failure with a low rate of discharge. This is important to understand because heart failure patients risk thromboembolic confusions like stroke, fringe embolism, and pneumonic embolism. This is due to the Virchow triad mechanism in heart failure patients caused by abnormalities in blood vessels, blood flow abnormalities (low cardiac output, dilation of heart chambers, and poor contractility), and blood abnormalities (increased fibrinogen, D-dimer, t-PAI, PAI-1, increased platelet activation, and hemoconcentration due to diuretics).

In more detail, patients with low ejection fraction heart failure indeed have a higher risk of thromboembolism. A prothrombotic profile, a higher opportunity of thromboembolic complications, and a risk of the formation of clots in the left ventricle accompany this.

CONCLUSION

Heart failure is a clinical issue accomplished by fundamental and utilitarian irregularities of the heart. When combined with sepsis, morbidity, and mortality rates are significantly increased. The two conditions can overlap and lead to hemodynamic disturbances and challenging treatment. While aggressive fluid resuscitation is necessary for sepsis, conventional heart failure management requires reducing fluid intake. The International Normalized Ratio (INR) is one of the coagulation parameters that may help determine sepsis in patients with heart failure, thus improving appropriate diagnosis and treatment. However, further studies are still necessary.

REFERENCES

Abou Dagher, G., Hajjar, K., Khoury, C., El Hajj, N., Kanso, M., Makki, M., Mailhac, A., & Chebl, R. B. (2018). Outcomes of patients with systolic heart failure presenting with sepsis to the emergency department of a tertiary hospital: a retrospective chart review study from Lebanon. *BMJ Open*, *8*(7), e022185.

Askim, Å., Moser, F., Gustad, L. T., Stene, H., Gundersen, M., Åsvold, B. O., Dale, J., Bjørnsen, L. P., Damås, J. K., & Solligård, E. (2017). Poor performance of quick-SOFA (qSOFA) score in predicting severe sepsis and mortality–a prospective study of patients admitted with infection to the emergency department. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine*, *25*, 1–9.

Conrad, N., Judge, A., Tran, J., Mohseni, H., Hedgecott, D., Crespillo, A. P., Allison, M., Hemingway, H., Cleland, J. G., & McMurray, J. J. V. (2018). Temporal trends and patterns in heart failure incidence: a population-based study of 4 million individuals. *The Lancet*, *391*(10120), 572–580.

Czempik, P. F., Herzyk, J., Wilczek, D., & Krzych, Ł. J. (2022). Hematologic System Dysregulation in Critically Ill Septic Patients with Anemia—A Retrospective Cohort Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(11), 6626.

Dunlay, S. M., & Roger, V. L. (2014). Understanding the epidemic of heart failure: past, present, and future. *Current Heart Failure Reports*, *11*, 404–415.

Fantz, C. R. (2020). Confirming point-of-care INR test results. *Jama*, *323*(12), 1190–1191.

Jones, T. W., Smith, S. E., Van Tuyl, J. S., & Newsome, A. S. (2021). Sepsis with preexisting heart failure: management of confounding clinical features. *Journal of Intensive Care Medicine*, *36*(9), 989–1012.

McDonagh, T., & Metra, M. (2023). 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *Russian Journal of Cardiology*, *28*(1), 5168.

McGloughlin, S., Richards, G. A., Nor, M. B. M., Prayag, S., Baker, T., & Amin, P. (2018). Sepsis in tropical regions: report from the task force on tropical diseases by the World Federation of Societies of Intensive and Critical Care Medicine. *Journal of Critical Care*, *46*, 115–118.

Nauli, S. E., Putri, V. K. P., Arifianto, H., Prameswari, H. S., Lubis, A. C., Zulkarnain, E., Hasanah, D. Y., Yamin, P. P. D., & Dewi, T. I. (2023). Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: current status of daily clinical practice in Indonesia. *Cureus*, *15*(4).

Roger, V. L. (2021). Epidemiology of heart failure: a contemporary perspective. *Circulation Research*, *128*(10), 1421–1434.

Roth, G. A., Forouzanfar, M. H., Moran, A. E., Barber, R., Nguyen, G., Feigin, V. L., Naghavi, M., Mensah, G. A., & Murray, C. J. L. (2015). Demographic and epidemiologic drivers of global cardiovascular mortality. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *372*(14), 1333–1341.

Shahim, B., Kapelios, C. J., Savarese, G., & Lund, L. H. (2023). Global public health burden of heart failure: an updated review. *Cardiac Failure Review*, *9*.

Siniarski, A., Gąsecka, A., Borovac, J. A., Papakonstantinou, P. E., Bongiovanni, D., Ehrlinder, H., Giustozzi, M., Guerreiro, R. A., & Parker, W. A. E. (2023). Blood coagulation disorders in heart failure: from basic science to clinical perspectives. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*, *29*(4), 517–526.

Van Nuys, K. E., Xie, Z., Tysinger, B., Hlatky, M. A., & Goldman, D. P. (2018). Innovation in heart failure treatment: life expectancy, disability, and health disparities. *JACC: Heart Failure*, *6*(5), 401–409.

Vincent, J.-L., Jones, G., David, S., Olariu, E., & Cadwell, K. K. (2019). Frequency and mortality of septic shock in Europe and North America: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Critical Care*, *23*, 1–11.

Williams, J. M., Greenslade, J. H., McKenzie, J. V, Chu, K., Brown, A. F. T., & Lipman, J. (2017). Systemic inflammatory response syndrome, quick sequential organ function assessment, and organ dysfunction: insights from a prospective database of ED patients with infection. *Chest*, *151*(3), 586–596.

Zhang, J., Du, H.-M., Cheng, M.-X., He, F.-M., & Niu, B.-L. (2021). Role of international normalized ratio in nonpulmonary sepsis screening: an observational study. *World Journal of Clinical Cases*, *9*(25), 7405.