# Resuscitation to **De-resuscitation:**

**The Forgotten Phase of Shock Management**

## Why Fluid Strategy Matters in Modern ICU Care[1,2]

Intravenous fluid resuscitation is often the **first and most instinctive intervention** in the management of circulatory shock. The primary objective is clear: **to restore intravascular volume, improve cardiac output, and reverse tissue hypoperfusion.**

While fluids are undeniably lifesaving during the initial **"golden hour" (the first 60 minutes after the onset of shock),** clinical practice has revealed a more complex reality. Increasing evidence shows that **excessive or prolonged fluid administration can lead to significant complications.** As a result, modern critical care is shifting away from the traditional "more is better" approach toward a **more precise and disciplined model of fluid stewardship.**

## Risks of Excessive Fluid Administration[3]

A positive fluid balance is not merely a benign consequence of resuscitation; it can directly contribute to **organ dysfunction**. Over-resuscitation frequently leads to pulmonary edema, delayed liberation from mechanical ventilation, and impaired tissue oxygenation. The kidneys are particularly vulnerable, as fluid congestion can precipitate or worsen **acute kidney injury (AKI).**

Observational studies suggest that **30–50% of critically ill patients develop pathological fluid overload during their ICU stay,** which has been consistently associated with increased morbidity and mortality.[1]

## Clinical Relevance in the Indian ICU Setting[2]

For clinicians in India, these challenges are particularly significant due to the **high burden of sepsis and septic shock in ICUs**. Data from the **INDICAPS multicentre registry** indicate that mortality rates in septic shock cohorts in India may approach **45–50% in certain settings.**[2]

Another important clinical concern is the **high prevalence of hypoalbuminemia among critically ill patients**. Evidence from tertiary care centres in India suggests that **more than half of patients with sepsis present with hypoalbuminemia at ICU admission**.[9]

Hypoalbuminemia is not simply a laboratory abnormality; it reflects **a state of physiological vulnerability**, often associated with increased vasopressor requirements, impaired vascular integrity, and poorer clinical outcomes.

## Refining the Clinical Imperative

These observations highlight the need to reconsider how intravenous fluids are used in shock management. Fluids should no longer be viewed as inherently safe interventions administered until blood pressure stabilizes. Instead, clinicians must aim to **restore effective perfusion while minimizing the risks associated with fluid accumulation.**

## Albumin and the Physiology of Oncotic Support: Beyond Simple Volume Expansion[4,5]

Albumin plays a central role in maintaining **plasma colloid oncotic pressure**, thereby helping to preserve intravascular volume and vascular integrity.

In septic shock, however, profound physiological disturbances occur. Systemic inflammation not only reduces hepatic albumin synthesis but also increases **capillary permeability,** resulting in the well-recognized **capillary leak phenomenon**. This process allows intravascular fluid to shift into the interstitial space, contributing to tissue edema and organ dysfunction.

Administration of human albumin therefore serves a dual purpose. In addition to expanding intravascular volume, albumin helps **restore oncotic balance**, enabling more sustained plasma volume expansion compared with crystalloids alone. Furthermore, emerging evidence suggests that albumin may exert **anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, and endothelial-stabilizing effects**, which may be particularly relevant in patients with septic shock.[5]

## Evidence from Landmark Randomized Clinical Trials[6,7]

The clinical role of albumin has been evaluated in several important randomized controlled trials.

**The SAFE Trial:**
The Saline versus Albumin Fluid Evaluation (SAFE) trial included nearly 7,000 critically ill patients and compared resuscitation with 4% albumin versus normal saline. The results demonstrated that albumin was as safe and effective as saline for fluid resuscitation. Subgroup analyses suggested a potential benefit among patients with severe sepsis.[6]

**The ALBIOS Trial:**
The Albumin Italian Outcome Sepsis (ALBIOS) trial evaluated the use of 20% albumin to maintain serum albumin levels ≥30 g/L, alongside standard crystalloid therapy in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock. While the trial did not demonstrate a significant overall mortality reduction, it did show improved hemodynamic stability and reduced vasopressor requirements in the albumin group.[7]

## The Transition to De-resuscitation: Recognizing When to Stop Fluid Expansion[10]

One of the most challenging aspects of shock management is not initiating fluid resuscitation but **recognizing the appropriate time to limit further fluid administration.**

As the patient stabilizes, the therapeutic goal must shift from aggressive volume expansion to **optimization of fluid balance and prevention of fluid overload.** This transition—known as **de-resuscitation** is a critical component of modern fluid stewardship.

Clinicians must identify the clinical **"tipping point"** at which additional fluid ceases to improve perfusion and instead contributes to tissue congestion and organ dysfunction.

## Identifying the Window for Fluid Removal

Indicators that a patient may be ready for active fluid management include:

- **Metabolic recovery:** decreasing lactate levels and improving acid–base balance
- **Vasopressor weaning:** progressive reduction in vasopressor support
- **Adequate organ perfusion:** sustained urine output

- **Hemodynamic stability:** stable blood pressure and heart rate without escalating support

At the bedside, tools such as **point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS)** and **dynamic hemodynamic monitoring** can assist clinicians in determining whether additional fluid administration will improve cardiac output or merely worsen tissue congestion.[10]

## Active Strategies for Restoring Fluid Balance[11]

Once hemodynamic stability has been achieved, the focus should shift toward **active fluid removal and restoration of physiological balance.**

Key strategies include:

**Fluid Restriction**
Limiting unnecessary maintenance fluids and avoiding non-essential intravenous infusions.

**Diuretic Therapy**
Loop diuretics are typically the first-line option in patients with preserved renal function to achieve a **negative fluid balance.**

**Controlled Ultrafiltration**
In patients with severe or persistent fluid overload—particularly when renal function is impaired—renal replacement therapy with ultrafiltration allows precise and gradual fluid removal while maintaining organ perfusion.[11]

## The Future of ICU Care: Phase-Based Fluid Stewardship[12]

Shock management should not be viewed as a single intervention but rather as a **dynamic process that evolves throughout the course of critical illness**.

Failure to recognize the transition from necessary resuscitation to harmful fluid accumulation remains a common challenge in ICU practice. Persistent positive fluid balance has been strongly associated with **pulmonary edema, impaired organ function, and increased mortality**.

To address this challenge, many experts advocate a **phase-based approach to fluid therapy**, commonly described using the **ROSE model**:

- **Resuscitation** – rapid restoration of perfusion
- **Optimization** – adjustment of hemodynamics
- **Stabilization** – maintenance of organ perfusion
- **De-resuscitation** – active removal of excess fluid

This framework emphasizes that **intravenous fluids should be treated as a therapeutic intervention requiring continuous reassessment**, rather than administered reflexively.

## Where Albumin Fits Within the Fluid Stewardship Framework

Within this phase-based model, albumin-containing solutions can play an important role during the **optimization and stabilization phases** of shock management.

In patients requiring significant intravascular support, albumin may help achieve hemodynamic targets **with smaller fluid volumes**, thereby reducing the cumulative crystalloid burden that contributes to tissue edema.

Albumin may be particularly useful in situations where clinicians approach the "**crystalloid ceiling**," beyond which additional crystalloid administration offers limited benefit while increasing the risk of fluid overload.[12]

By scanning the code, you will be directed to an external website which is owned and managed by Takeda

Flexbumin®

*The cases presented are hypothetical in nature and intended for illustrative purposes only. The management strategies discussed are evidence-based and aligned with established clinical guidelines and scientific literature.

Disclaimer: This information is solely intended for the use of Registered Healthcare Practitioner / Registered Medical Practitioner only. This information should not be used or shared or distributed to any other person / party and should be strictly by the intended parties for the intended purposes only. Registered Healthcare Practitioner / Registered Medical Practitioner shall apply their independent medical judgment for assessing any patient. Takeda makes no representation or warranty concerning the information / content provided, and assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of the information or content or for any opinion furnished or any outcome based on the application of such information. This material contains copyright protected information, content; the use of which is limited by law and this material cannot be reproduced, replicated, used or modified by any person for their own use or further distribution. For more information, please refer to full Prescribing Information.

TAKEDA and the TAKEDA logo are trademarks or registered trademarks of Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited. Flexbumin® is a trademark or registered trademark of Baxalta Incorporated.

Copyright (C) 2026 Takeda Pharmaceutical Company. All Right Reserved.

## References

1. Malbrain MLNG, Marik PE, Witters I, et al. Fluid overload, de-resuscitation, and outcomes in critically ill patients. Annals of Intensive Care. 2014;4:16.
2. Divatia JV, Amin PR, Ramakrishnan N, et al. Intensive care in India: The INDICAPS study. Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine. 2016;20(4):216–225.
3. Evans L, Rhodes A, Alhazzani W, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021. Intensive Care Medicine. 2021;47:1181–1247.
4. Vincent JL, Dubois MJ, Navickis RJ, Wilkes MM. Hypoalbuminemia in acute illness: Is there a rationale for intervention? Annals of Surgery. 2003;237(3):319–334.
5. Caironi P, Tognoni G, Masson S, et al. Albumin replacement in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock (ALBIOS trial). New England Journal of Medicine. 2014;370:1412–1421.
6. Finfer S, Bellomo R, Boyce N, et al. A comparison of albumin and saline for fluid resuscitation in the intensive care unit (SAFE study). New England Journal of Medicine. 2004;350:2247–2256.
7. Caironi P, Tognoni G, Masson S, et al. Albumin replacement therapy in severe sepsis and septic shock. New England Journal of Medicine. 2014;370:1412–1421.
8. Acheampong A, Vincent JL. A positive fluid balance is an independent prognostic factor in critically ill patients. Critical Care. 2015;19:251.
9. Kumar HG, Kanakaraju K, Manikandan VAC, et al. The relationship between serum albumin levels and sepsis in patients admitted to a tertiary care center in India. Cureus. 2024;16(4):e59424.
10. Monnet X, Marik PE, Teboul JL. Prediction of fluid responsiveness: An update. Annals of Intensive Care. 2016;6:111.
11. Malbrain MLNG, Van Regenmortel N, Saugel B, et al. Principles of fluid management and stewardship in septic shock. Intensive Care Medicine. 2018;44:117–130.
12. Hoste EA, Maitland K, Brudney CS, et al. Four phases of intravenous fluid therapy: A conceptual model. British Journal of Anaesthesia 2014;113(5):740–747..

C-APROM/IN/FLEX/0342; 19 Mar 2026