Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Azmi Eyiol, Konya Beyhekim State Hospital, Türkiye

REVIEWED BY Jonathan Soldera, University of Caxias do Sul, Brazil Yakup Alsancak, Necmettin Erbakan University, Türkiye

*CORRESPONDENCE Maowei Chen ⊠ chenmaowei2008@163.com Jianlin Wu

RECEIVED 17 April 2025 ACCEPTED 04 June 2025 PUBLISHED 25 June 2025

🖂 wjl4954@163.com

CITATION

Li J, Pang S, Huang H, Lu Y, Tang T, Wu J and Chen M (2025) Association between red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio and all-cause mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis: a retrospective analysis of the MIMIC-IV database. *Front. Med.* 12:1610726. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2025.1610726

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Li, Pang, Huang, Lu, Tang, Wu and Chen. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms. Association between red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio and all-cause mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis: a retrospective analysis of the MIMIC-IV database

Jinfeng Li¹, Shifeng Pang², Huiya Huang³, Yangni Lu¹, Tingting Tang¹, Jianlin Wu^{1*} and Maowei Chen^{1*}

¹Department of Infectious Diseases, Wuming Hospital Affiliated to Guangxi Medical University, Nanning, Guangxi, China, ²Department of Cardiology, Minzu Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Nanning, Guangxi, China, ³Department of General Medicine, Wuming Hospital Affiliated to Guangxi Medical University, Nanning, Guangxi, China

Background: Critically ill cirrhotic patients are at high risk of infections, which are associated with significantly increased mortality. The red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio (RAR) is a validated predictor of mortality in critically ill patients. However, the prognostic value of RAR in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis has not been fully established.

Methods: This study retrospectively analyzed data from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV) database. Patients were stratified into quartiles based on RAR values. The primary outcomes were 30-day and 365day all-cause mortality. Kaplan–Meier survival analysis and multivariable Cox regression models were applied to assess the association between RAR and mortality. Restricted cubic spline (RCS) analysis confirmed a linear relationship and subgroup analyses explored potential interactions.

Results: A total of 2,100 patients were included. Elevated RAR values were significantly associated with increased 30-day and 365-day all-cause mortality. Compared with the lowest quartile, patients in the highest RAR quartile had a 51% higher risk of 30-day mortality [hazard ratio (HR) = 1.51, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.19-1.92) and a 51% higher risk of 365-day mortality (HR = 1.51, 95% CI: 1.25-1.81). RCS analysis confirmed a significant linear relationship between RAR and mortality risk. Subgroup analyses showed a stronger association between RAR and mortality in elderly patients.

Conclusion: In critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis, elevated RAR values are independently associated with increased all-cause mortality risk. This study highlights the potential of RAR as a prognostic biomarker, particularly in elderly patients.

KEYWORDS

cirrhosis, sepsis, all-cause mortality, red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio (RAR), prognosis

Cirrhosis, the terminal stage of chronic progressive liver disease, contributes to approximately 1 million deaths globally each year (1). In cirrhosis, both internal factors (e.g., immune dysfunction) and external factors (e.g., alcohol consumption and invasive procedures) contribute to increased susceptibility to co-infections and disease progression. Approximately twothirds of cirrhotic patients with peripheral organ failure develop sepsis (2-4). Infections quadruple the mortality risk in patients with cirrhosis, with 30% dying within 1 month and another 30% within 1 year (5). Despite advances in intensive care management for patients with cirrhosis, mortality rates remain high (6). The severity and prognosis of cirrhosis can be assessed using scoring systems such as the Child-Turcotte-Pugh score (7), CLIF-C ACLF score (8), and MELD score and its derivatives scoring system (9, 10). However, these scoring systems seem less effective when cirrhosis is complicated by infection. Although scores like the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score (11), the Model for End-stage Liver Disease with the incorporation of serum sodium (MELD-Na) (12), and Age-Bilirubin-International Normalized Ratio (INR)-Creatinine (ABIC) score (13) can be used for prognosis assessment in cirrhotic patients with sepsis, their predictive value is limited due to the specificity of cirrhotic patients with sepsis, and their performance is still suboptimal.

Red blood cell distribution width (RDW), a simple, low-cost, and widely available parameter, reflects red blood cell volume heterogeneity (14). RDW has been shown to reflect systemic inflammation in critically ill patients and is a reliable predictor of sepsis risk (15). It has been reported that RDW can predict shortterm mortality in critically ill patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and atrial fibrillation (AF) (16, 17). Serum albumin, an important protein synthesized by the liver, binds to inflammatory mediators and reflects inflammation severity (18, 19). Evidence suggests that low serum albumin levels are associated with higher mortality in patients with decompensated cirrhosis and sepsis (20, 21). Combining these parameters has led to the development of a novel inflammatory biomarker: the red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio (RAR). Studies have shown that RAR can be used as an important prognostic indicator in critically ill patients with sepsis (22), after burn surgery (23), diabetic foot ulcers (24), acute respiratory distress syndrome (25), and rheumatic diseases (26). However, the association between RAR and outcomes in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis remains incompletely understood. This study aims to investigate the relationship between RAR and all-cause mortality in these patients.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Data source

A retrospective analysis was conducted using the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV) database (version 3.0), which contains a comprehensive and highgranularity dataset of well-defined patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) of Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (BIDMC) between 2008 and 2022 (27). To obtain the qualification to use this database, the first author of this study, Jinfeng Li, completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) course and passed both the "Conflicts of Interest" and "Data or Specimens Only Research" exams (Record ID: 14347715). The database was approved by the institutional review boards of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Cambridge, MA, USA) and BIDMC (Boston, MA, USA) (27). The BIDMC institutional review board waived informed consent due to the use of anonymized and publicly available data, and the sharing of study resources was approved.

2.2 Study design and population

This study included adult patients (age > 18 years) diagnosed with sepsis and severe liver cirrhosis. Liver cirrhosis was diagnosed based on International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) codes (5712, 5715, and 5716) and Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes (K7469, K7031, K7030, K7460, K743, K745, K744, K717, and K741). Sepsis was defined according to the Sepsis-3 criteria, i.e., infection combined with a SOFA score ≥ 2 (28). The method for screening patients meeting the Sepsis-3 criteria from the MIMIC database was consistent with previous studies (29). Exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) patients with an ICU stay <1 day; (2) patients with multiple ICU admissions for sepsis and severe liver cirrhosis, with only the first admission included; and (3) patients with missing values for RDW or serum albumin. A total of 2,100 patients were included and divided into four groups based on RAR index quartiles (Figure 1).

2.3 Demographic and laboratory variables

We used Structured Query Language (SQL) via Navicat Premium (version 15.0.12) to extract data from the MIMIC-IV database. Extracted data included demographics (age, gender, race, height, and weight), vital signs (heart rate, respiratory rate, and mean arterial pressure), laboratory values (hemoglobin, white blood cell count, serum albumin, etc.), comorbidities [heart failure and acute kidney injury (AKI)], clinical severity scores [Acute Physiology Score III (APS III), SOFA score, etc.], and information on vasopressor use and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV). For variables measured multiple times, the first recorded value was used. Missing data were handled using multiple imputations, and variables with missing values exceeding 20% were excluded.

Abbreviations: RAR, red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio; MIMIC-IV, Medical Information Market for Intensive Care database; SOFA, sepsisrelated organ failure assessment; ICU, intensive care unit; ICD, International Classification of Diseases; SQL, Structured Query Language; AKI, acute kidney injury; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; CLIF-C ACLF, chronic liver failure consortium acute-on-chronic liver failure; MELD, Model for End-stage Liver Disease; MELD-Na, Model for End-stage Liver Disease with the incorporation of serum sodium; ABIC, Age-Bilirubin-International Normalized Ratio (INR)-Creatinine; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; AF, atrial fibrillation; BIDMC, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center.



2.4 RAR assessment and outcomes

The RAR was calculated as RDW (%) divided by serum albumin (g/dl). Outcomes included all-cause mortality at 30, 90, 180, and 365 days. Primary outcomes were 30-day and 365-day all-cause mortality, while secondary outcomes were 90-day and 180-day all-cause mortality.

2.5 Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were tested for normality. Normally distributed data were analyzed using Student's t-test and oneway ANOVA and presented as mean \pm SD. Non-normally distributed data were analyzed using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test and presented as median (IQR). Categorical variables, expressed as absolute numbers and percentages, were analyzed using the Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Patients were stratified into quartiles 1-4 according to the LAR quartile. Kaplan-Meier (K-M) curves were used to evaluate the incidence of primary and secondary outcomes. The association between the RAR index and primary outcomes was assessed using Cox proportional hazards models, with adjustments for multiple covariates. To avoid overfitting due to multicollinearity, variance inflation factors (VIFs) were calculated, and variables with VIF \geq 10 were excluded. Clinical and prognostic-related variables were included in the multivariable models: model 1 included only the RAR index; model 2 adjusted for age, gender, race, and BMI; and model 3 further adjusted for heart failure, AKI, white blood cell count, red blood cell count, hematocrit, chloride, glucose, anion gap, lactate, partial thromboplastin time (PTT), total bilirubin, alanine aminotransferase (ALT), SOFA score, APS III score, Charlson score, ICU length of stay, liver transplantation, IMV, and vasopressor use. The RAR index was entered into the models both as a continuous variable and as a categorical variable (with the lowest quartile as the reference group). The *P* for trend was calculated using linear regression analysis by converting RAR quartiles into their respective median values. The RAR index was analyzed as a continuous variable using restricted cubic splines (RCS) to clarify the dose-effect correlations with the risk of major and secondary outcome events. Subgroup analyses were performed based on gender, age (<60 years or \geq 60 years), race, heart failure, and AKI.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (version 23.0, IBM Corporation, USA) and R software (version 4.2.2, R Foundation).¹

3 Results

3.1 Baseline characteristics of study subjects

A total of 2,100 critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis were included in the analysis. The mean age of participants was 59.00 (52.00, 67.00) years, and 64.29% were male. Baseline characteristics of study participants, stratified by RAR quartiles at admission (Q1:

¹ http://www.R-project.org

TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics of patients grouped according to RAR index quartiles.

| Variables | Total (<i>N</i> = 2,100) | Q1 < 4.97 (<i>N</i> = 525) | Q2 4.97–5.93 (N = 522) | Q3 5.93–7.19 (N = 528) | Q4 > 7.19 (<i>N</i> = 525) | Р |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| General characteristics | | | | | | |
| Gender (male), <i>n</i> (%) | 1,350 (64.29) | 353 (67.24) | 339 (64.94) | 340 (64.39) | 318 (60.57) | 0.154 |
| Race (white), <i>n</i> (%) | 1,614 (76.86) | 411 (78.29) | 400 (76.63) | 406 (76.89) | 397 (75.62) | 0.293 |
| Age (years) | 59.00 (52.00, 67.00) | 60.00 (53.00, 68.00) | 59.00 (53.00, 67.00) | 59.00 (51.00, 66.00) | 58.00 (50.00, 66.00) | 0.005 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 29.79 (26.96, 30.58) | 29.79 (27.33, 30.61) | 29.79 (27.05, 30.21) | 29.79 (26.82, 30.62) | 29.79 (26.70, 30.85) | 0.914 |
| Vital signs | | | | | | |
| Heart rate (beats/min) | 93.00 (80.00, 107.00) | 90.00 (76.00, 103.00) | 92.00 (78.00, 107.00) | 93.00 (81.00, 107.00) | 95.00 (82.00, 109.00) | < 0.001 |
| Respiratory rate (breaths/min) | 19.00 (16.00, 23.00) | 19.00 (16.00, 23.00) | 19.00 (16.00, 22.00) | 19.00 (16.00, 23.00) | 20.00 (16.00, 24.00) | 0.138 |
| MBP (mmHg) | 78.00 (67.00, 90.00) | 78.00 (67.00, 93.00) | 78.00 (67.00, 90.00) | 77.00 (68.00, 89.25) | 77.00 (66.00, 87.00) | 0.106 |
| Laboratory parameters | | | | | | |
| WBC (10 ⁹ /L) | 10.30 (6.50, 15.80) | 9.80 (6.40, 13.90) | 10.05 (6.60, 15.38) | 10.10 (6.10, 16.20) | 11.60 (7.20, 18.30) | < 0.001 |
| RBC (10 ¹² /L) | 2.96 (2.52, 3.46) | 3.10 (2.59, 3.66) | 3.06 (2.62, 3.55) | 2.92 (2.49, 3.40) | 2.78 (2.43, 3.24) | < 0.001 |
| Hemoglobin (g/dl) | 9.30 (8.00, 10.70) | 9.80 (8.40, 11.40) | 9.60 (8.30, 10.90) | 9.10 (7.88, 10.60) | 8.80 (7.60, 10.10) | < 0.001 |
| RDW (%) | 17.00 (15.28, 19.10) | 15.10 (14.20, 16.50) | 16.30 (15.10, 17.98) | 17.50 (16.20, 19.22) | 19.20 (17.20, 21.60) | < 0.001 |
| Hematocrit (%) | 27.90 (24.30, 32.40) | 29.40 (25.40, 34.20) | 28.70 (25.13, 33.08) | 27.30 (23.70, 31.50) | 26.90 (23.20, 30.70) | < 0.001 |
| Albumin (g/dl) | 2.90 (2.50, 3.30) | 3.50 (3.20, 3.90) | 3.00 (2.80, 3.30) | 2.70 (2.50, 3.00) | 2.30 (2.00, 2.50) | < 0.001 |
| Sodium (mmol/L) | 137.00 (132.00, 140.00) | 137.00 (132.00, 140.00) | 138.00 (134.00, 141.00) | 137.00 (132.00, 140.00) | 136.00 (132.00, 139.00) | < 0.001 |
| Potassium (mmol/L) | 4.20 (3.70, 4.70) | 4.20 (3.80, 4.70) | 4.10 (3.70, 4.70) | 4.20 (3.70, 4.80) | 4.10 (3.60, 4.80) | 0.075 |
| Chloride (mmol/L) | 103.00 (97.00, 107.00) | 102.00 (97.00, 106.00) | 103.00 (98.25, 107.00) | 103.00 (97.00, 108.00) | 102.00 (98.00, 107.00) | 0.002 |
| Glucose (mg/dl) | 127.00 (102.00, 167.00) | 129.00 (105.00, 173.00) | 130.00 (104.25, 176.75) | 124.00 (102.00, 164.00) | 122.00 (97.00, 158.00) | 0.003 |
| Anion gap (mmol/L) | 15.00 (12.00, 19.00) | 16.00 (13.00, 20.00) | 15.00 (12.00, 19.00) | 15.00 (12.00, 18.00) | 14.00 (12.00, 18.00) | < 0.001 |
| Ph | 7.35 (7.31, 7.41) | 7.35 (7.31, 7.41) | 7.36 (7.31, 7.42) | 7.36 (7.31, 7.41) | 7.35 (7.30, 7.42) | 0.215 |
| Lactate (mmol/L) | 2.60 (1.70, 3.60) | 2.50 (1.60, 3.38) | 2.50 (1.70, 3.48) | 2.70 (1.70, 3.70) | 2.80 (1.80, 4.10) | 0.009 |
| PTT (s) | 37.85 (32.00, 47.20) | 37.20 (31.20, 49.40) | 36.50 (31.60, 45.08) | 37.20 (32.18, 45.30) | 41.00 (33.80, 50.40) | < 0.001 |
| Total bilirubin (mg/dl) | 3.30 (1.50, 8.00) | 2.30 (1.10, 5.20) | 2.90 (1.40, 6.70) | 3.90 (1.80, 8.53) | 4.90 (2.00, 10.50) | < 0.001 |
| ALT (U/L) | 36.00 (21.00, 88.00) | 33.00 (19.00, 80.00) | 37.00 (21.00, 108.50) | 34.50 (21.00, 80.00) | 38.00 (22.00, 88.00) | 0.113 |
| AST (U/L) | 76.00 (42.00, 181.00) | 60.00 (37.00, 151.00) | 74.00 (42.00, 199.25) | 79.00 (44.00, 171.00) | 91.00 (46.00, 212.00) | < 0.001 |

(Continued)

TABLE 1 Continued

| Variables | Total (<i>N</i> = 2,100) | Q1 < 4.97 (<i>N</i> = 525) | Q2 4.97–5.93 (N = 522) | Q3 5.93–7.19 (<i>N</i> = 528) | Q4 > 7.19 (N = 525) | Р |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Comorbidities | | | | | | |
| Heart failure | 336 (16.00) | 92 (17.52) | 87 (16.67) | 74 (14.02) | 83 (15.81) | 0.450 |
| AKI | 1,347 (64.14) | 336 (64.00) | 332 (63.60) | 335 (63.45) | 344 (65.52) | 0.892 |
| Disease severity scores | | | | | | |
| SOFA (scores) | 9.00 (6.00, 12.00) | 9.00 (6.00, 11.00) | 8.50 (6.00, 11.00) | 9.00 (7.00, 12.00) | 9.00 (7.00, 12.00) | < 0.001 |
| APS III (scores) | 60.00 (45.00, 77.00) | 54.00 (40.00, 74.00) | 55.00 (42.00, 72.75) | 60.00 (46.00, 77.00) | 66.00 (53.00, 84.00) | < 0.001 |
| SAPS II (scores) | 41.00 (32.00, 51.00) | 40.00 (31.00, 50.00) | 41.00 (32.00, 49.00) | 42.00 (32.00, 51.25) | 44.00 (34.00, 55.00) | < 0.001 |
| OASIS (scores) | 34.00 (28.00, 40.00) | 33.00 (27.00, 39.00) | 33.00 (28.00, 39.00) | 34.00 (28.00, 41.00) | 36.00 (30.00, 42.00) | < 0.001 |
| SIRS (scores) | 3.00 (2.00, 3.00) | 3.00 (2.00, 3.00) | 3.00 (2.00, 3.00) | 3.00 (2.00, 3.00) | 3.00 (2.00, 3.00) | < 0.001 |
| CCI (scores) | 6.00 (4.00, 8.00) | 6.00 (4.00, 7.00) | 6.00 (4.00, 8.00) | 5.00 (4.00, 7.00) | 6.00 (4.00, 8.00) | 0.870 |
| Medication or procedures on the first day of ICU a | dmission | | | | | |
| Vasoactive agent, n (%) | 994 (47.33) | 233 (44.38) | 242 (46.36) | 262 (49.62) | 257 (48.95) | 0.296 |
| IMV, <i>n</i> (%) | 1,118 (53.24) | 273 (52.00) | 275 (52.68) | 293 (55.49) | 277 (52.76) | 0.679 |
| Length of stay (LOS) | | | | | | |
| LOS in hospital | 12.86 (6.97, 23.66) | 12.31 (6.68, 23.08) | 12.71 (7.45, 23.30) | 12.71 (6.52, 22.91) | 13.54 (7.68, 24.90) | 0.404 |
| LOS in ICU | 3.83 (2.08, 7.80) | 3.86 (1.92, 7.71) | 3.79 (2.16, 7.82) | 3.76 (2.14, 7.76) | 3.87 (2.11, 7.89) | 0.720 |
| Liver transplantation (%) | 160 (7.62) | 37 (7.05) | 38 (7.28) | 42 (7.95) | 43 (8.19) | 0.883 |
| Outcomes | | | | | | |
| 30-day mortality, n (%) | 648 (30.86) | 125 (23.81) | 149 (28.54) | 166 (31.44) | 208 (39.62) | < 0.001 |
| 90-day mortality, <i>n</i> (%) | 853 (40.62) | 180 (34.29) | 195 (37.36) | 212 (40.15) | 266 (50.67) | < 0.001 |
| 180-day mortality, <i>n</i> (%) | 944 (44.95) | 206 (39.24) | 213 (40.80) | 232 (43.94) | 293 (55.81) | < 0.001 |
| 365-day mortality, <i>n</i> (%) | 1,058 (50.38) | 228 (43.43) | 240 (45.98) | 274 (51.89) | 316 (60.19) | < 0.001 |
| | | | | | | |

BMI, body mass index; MBP, mean blood pressure; WBC, white blood cell; RBC, red blood cell; RDW, red blood cell distribution width; PTT, partial thromboplastin time; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate transaminase; AKI, acute kidney injury; SOFA, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment score; APS III, acute physiology score II; SAPS II, simplified acute physiology score II; OASIS, oxford acute severity of illness score; SIRS, systemic inflammatory response syndrome score; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; ICU, intensive care unit.



<4.97, Q2: 4.97–5.93, Q3: 5.93–7.19, and Q4: >7.19), are presented in Table 1. Patients in the high RAR group exhibited higher heart rate, WBC, RDW, PTT, AST, lactate, total bilirubin, SOFA, APS III, SAPS II, OASIS, and SIRS scores, but lower age, red blood cell count, hemoglobin, albumin, sodium, chloride, glucose, and anion gap. The 30-day, 90-day, 180-day, and 365-day all-cause mortality rates were 30.86%, 40.62%, 44.95%, and 50.38%, respectively, with higher mortality observed in the high RAR group. The mortality rate increased in a dose-dependent manner with higher RAR quartiles at all time points. The 30-day mortality rate rose from 23.81% in Q1 to 39.62% in Q4, corresponding to an Absolute Risk Increase (ARI) of +4.73%, +2.90%, and +8.18% per quartile. Similarly, the 365-day mortality rate increased from 43.43% in Q1 to 60.19% in Q4, with an ARI per quartile of +2.55%, +5.91%, and +8.30%. The detailed results are presented in Table 1.

3.2 Association between RAR and mortality

Kaplan–Meier survival analysis (Figure 2) revealed significant differences in survival probabilities across RAR quartiles (all log-rank P < 0.001). Survival rates at 30, 90, 180, and 365 days decreased significantly with increasing RAR quartiles.

Three Cox regression models were developed to evaluate the independent effect of the RAR index on mortality (Table 2). When treated as a continuous variable, RAR was significantly

associated with increased risk of mortality at 30, 90, 180, and 365 days (P < 0.001), with hazard ratios (HRs) indicating a 7%, 8%, 8%, and 8% increase in mortality risk, respectively. Even after adjusting for confounders in model 3, RAR remained significantly associated with mortality (P < 0.001), with a 9% increase in mortality risk at all time points. A consistent trend was observed when RAR was categorized into quartiles, with higher RAR quartiles corresponding to higher all-cause mortality risks (P for trend < 0.001). After adjusting for model 2 and model 3, the consistent trend remained (P for trend < 0.001). Specifically, even after model 3 adjustment, mortality risk across all time points increased stepwise with higher RAR quartiles. Each quartile increase was associated with a 10%-26% rise in mortality risk. Notably, the Q4 group exhibited a 49% to 51% higher risk than the Q1 group. Variance inflation factors (VIFs) for covariates were all below 10, indicating minimal multicollinearity and robustness of the multivariable models.

3.3 Linear associations

Adjusted RCS models demonstrated a significant linear relationship between RAR and all-cause mortality at 30, 90, 180, and 365 days (Figures 3A–D). RCS curves indicated a significant linear correlation between RAR and 30-day mortality risk (P for non-linear = 0.805), with increasing RAR values associated with higher mortality risks. Similar linear associations were observed

| Variables | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
| | HR (95% CI) | Р | HR (95% CI) | Р | HR (95% CI) | Р |
| 30-day mortality | | | | | | |
| RAR | $1.07~(1.05 \sim 1.10)$ | < 0.001 | $1.07~(1.04 \sim 1.09)$ | < 0.001 | 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) | < 0.001 |
| RAR quantile | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | |
| 2 | $1.22~(0.96 \sim 1.54)$ | 0.106 | $1.24~(0.98 \sim 1.58)$ | 0.072 | $1.21~(0.95 \sim 1.55)$ | 0.114 |
| 3 | $1.38~(1.09 \sim 1.74)$ | 0.006 | 1.45 (1.15 ~ 1.83) | 0.002 | $1.34~(1.05 \sim 1.70)$ | 0.017 |
| 4 | $1.85~(1.48 \sim 2.31)$ | < 0.001 | 1.99 (1.59 ~ 2.49) | < 0.001 | 1.51 (1.19 ~ 1.92) | < 0.001 |
| P for trend | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 |
| 90-day mortality | | | | | | |
| RAR | $1.08~(1.05 \sim 1.10)$ | < 0.001 | $1.07~(1.05 \sim 1.09)$ | < 0.001 | 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | < 0.001 |
| RAR quantile | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | |
| 2 | $1.12~(0.91 \sim 1.37)$ | 0.271 | $1.15~(0.94 \sim 1.41)$ | 0.183 | $1.18~(0.96 \sim 1.45)$ | 0.116 |
| 3 | $1.25~(1.02\sim 1.52)$ | 0.028 | $1.31~(1.07 \sim 1.60)$ | 0.008 | $1.28~(1.04 \sim 1.57)$ | 0.019 |
| 4 | $1.71~(1.41 \sim 2.07)$ | < 0.001 | 1.86 (1.54 ~ 2.25) | < 0.001 | 1.49 (1.21 ~ 1.83) | < 0.001 |
| P for trend | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 |
| 180-day mortality | | | | | | |
| RAR | $1.08~(1.05 \sim 1.10)$ | < 0.001 | $1.07~(1.05 \sim 1.09)$ | < 0.001 | 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | < 0.001 |
| RAR quantile | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | |
| 2 | $1.07~(0.88 \sim 1.30)$ | 0.487 | 1.10 (0.91 ~ 1.33) | 0.335 | 1.13 (0.93 ~ 1.38) | 0.207 |
| 3 | $1.20~(0.99 \sim 1.44)$ | 0.060 | $1.26~(1.04 \sim 1.52)$ | 0.018 | $1.23~(1.01 \sim 1.49)$ | 0.037 |
| 4 | $1.67~(1.40\sim 2.00)$ | < 0.001 | 1.83 (1.53 ~ 2.19) | < 0.001 | 1.49 (1.23 ~ 1.80) | < 0.001 |
| P for trend | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 |
| 365-day mortality | | | | | | |
| RAR | $1.08~(1.06 \sim 1.10)$ | < 0.001 | $1.07~(1.05 \sim 1.09)$ | < 0.001 | 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | < 0.001 |
| RAR quantile | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | | 1.00 (reference) | |
| 2 | $1.09~(0.91 \sim 1.31)$ | 0.350 | 1.12 (0.93 ~ 1.34) | 0.217 | $1.17~(0.97 \sim 1.40)$ | 0.101 |
| 3 | 1.29 (1.08 ~ 1.53) | 0.005 | 1.35 (1.13 ~ 1.61) | < 0.001 | $1.32~(1.10 \sim 1.58)$ | 0.003 |
| 4 | $1.66~(1.40 \sim 1.97)$ | < 0.001 | 1.83 (1.54 ~ 2.17) | < 0.001 | 1.51 (1.25 ~ 1.81) | < 0.001 |
| P for trend | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 | | < 0.001 |

TABLE 2 Relationship between RAR and mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis.

HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; RAR, red cell distribution width to albumin ratio; BMI, body mass index; WBC, white blood cell; RBC, red blood cell; PTT, partial thromboplastin time; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AKI, acute kidney injury; SOFA, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment score; APS III, acute physiology score III; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; LOS, length of stay; ICU, intensive care unit. Model 1: crude. Model 2: adjust: gender, race, age, and BMI. Model 3: adjust: gender, race, age, BMI, heart failure, AKI, liver transplantation, IMV, vasoactive agent, WBC, RBC, hematocrit, chloride, glucose, anion gap, lactate, PTT, TBIL, ALT, SOFA, APS III, CCI, and LOS in ICU. RAR quartiles: Q1 < 4.97, $4.97 \ge Q2 > 5.93, 5.93 \ge Q3 \le 7.19$, and Q4 > 7.19.

for 90-day, 180-day, and 365-day mortality (*P* for non-linear 0.638, 0.309, and 0.767, respectively).

3.4 Subgroup analyses of the relationship between RAR and mortality

Adjusted forest plots (Figure 4) illustrated the association between RAR and mortality across different clinical characteristics.

Specifically, a positive correlation between RAR and all-cause mortality was observed across various age groups, genders, races, AKI, and heart failure subgroups. Interaction tests indicated significant differences in the relationship between RAR and mortality across age subgroups. Patients aged \geq 60 years exhibited a more pronounced positive correlation between RAR and mortality at 30, 90, 180, and 365 days compared to those aged < 60 years. No significant interactions were found in other subgroups.



Restricted cubic spline analysis of mortality risk with RAR in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis (**A**, 30-day mortality; **B**, 90-day mortality; **C**, 180-day mortality; **D**, 365-day mortality). RAR, red blood cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio.

4 Discussion

This study investigated the association between the red blood cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio (RAR) and mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis. Our analysis of data from the MIMIC-IV database revealed a strong association between elevated RAR and increased mortality risk. Kaplan–Meier survival analysis and multivariable Cox regression models consistently demonstrated that higher RAR quartiles were significantly associated with increased 30-day, 90-day, 180-day, and 365-day mortality. RCS analysis further confirmed a significant linear relationship between elevated RAR values and increased mortality risk. Subgroup analyses and interaction effects indicated a stronger association between RAR and mortality in older patients.

Red cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio, as a simple biochemical marker, has demonstrated superior predictive capabilities compared to the use of RDW and serum albumin alone (30, 31). Seo et al. (23) reported that RAR was associated with 90-day mortality in patients after burn surgery. Additionally, a study on patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD) found that higher RAR was significantly associated with CKD progression, allcause mortality, and cardiovascular events (32). Furthermore, RAR has been identified as a robust prognostic indicator in patients with sepsis, septic patients with AF, and sepsis-related nonthyroidal illness syndrome (22, 33, 34). However, the relationship between RAR and outcomes in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis has not been well-established. Our study, which included 2,100 critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis, demonstrated a significant association between RAR and both short-term and long-term mortality, with higher RAR values corresponding to worse clinical outcomes. These findings support the potential of RAR as a prognostic marker in this patient population.

The relationship between RAR and mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis involves complex mechanisms. During critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis, inflammatory cells generate reactive oxygen species (ROS), including hydrogen peroxide, superoxide anions, and hydroxyl radicals, which directly damage red blood cell membranes. Inflammatory cells also produce cytokines such as tumor necrosis factor a (TNF α) and interleukin 1 β (IL-1 β), which activate pathways leading to red blood cell apoptosis. These mechanisms result in the destruction of mature red blood cells and indirectly cause an elevated red cell distribution width (RDW) (35-37). Inflammatory activity can suppress iron metabolism and erythropoietin production (38), inhibiting red blood cell maturation and causing the release of immature red blood cells into the bloodstream, thereby increasing RDW levels. The decrease in serum albumin may be attributed to hepatic synthetic dysfunction (39) and capillary leakage caused by sepsisrelated endothelial damage (22), both of which can significantly FI Fo B

| /ariables | n (%) | HR (95%CI) | | Р | P for interaction | Variables | n (%) | HR (95%CI) | | Р | P for interaction |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| II patients | 2100 (100.00) | $1.09(1.05 \sim 1.13)$ | H | <.001 | | | | | | - | |
| Age (years | .) | (, | | | 0.027 | All patients | 2100 (100.00) | 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) |) H | <.001 | |
| < 60 | 1089 (51.86) | $1.03(0.97 \sim 1.09)$ | i el | 0.411 | | Age | | | | | 0.035 |
| ≥60 | 1011 (48,14) | $1.16(1.10 \sim 1.22)$ | | <.001 | | <60 | 1089 (51.86) | 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) | (=1 | 0.187 | |
| Tender | | , | | | 0.776 | ≥60 | 1011 (48.14) | 1.15 (1.11 ~ 1.20) | - | <.001 | |
| Female | 750 (35.71) | $1.08(1.01 \sim 1.14)$ | | 0.016 | | Gender | | | | | 0.701 |
| Male | 1350 (64 29) | $1.09(1.04 \sim 1.15)$ | in the second | 0.001 | | Female | 750 (35.71) | 1.07 (1.01 ~ 1.12) | }=1 | 0.014 | |
| Pace | 1556 (61125) | 1105 (1101 1110) | | | 0.732 | Male | 1350 (64.29) | 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) | = | <.001 | |
| White | 1614 (76.86) | 1.10 (1.06 ~ 1.15) | - | < 001 | 0.752 | Race | | | | | 0.507 |
| Black | 145 (6 90) | $0.99(0.80 \sim 1.21)$ | — | 0.901 | | White | 1614 (76.86) | 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) | н | <.001 | |
| Liopopi | 149 (6.90) | 0.92 (0.62 - 1.36) | | 0.680 | | Black | 145 (6.90) | 0.95 (0.79 ~ 1.14) | H | 0.594 | |
| Othor | 222 (10.57) | 0.92(0.02 - 1.00) | | 0.486 | | Hispanio | ; 119 (5.67) | 0.94 (0.71 ~ 1.23) | H | 0.635 | |
| Joart Fail | 222 (10.57) | 0.94 (0.79 · 1.12) | | 0.400 | 0.735 | Other | 222 (10.57) | 0.99 (0.86 ~ 1.15) | H i -I | 0.939 | |
| N- | 1764 (94.00) | 1.08(1.04 + 1.12) | | < 001 | 0.755 | Heart Failu | ire | | | | 0.382 |
| NO | 336 (16.00) | 1.00(1.04 - 1.13) 1.15(1.05 - 1.27) | - | 0.004 | | No | 1764 (84.00) | 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) | H | <.001 | |
| Tes | 550 (10.00) | 1.15 (1.05 ~ 1.27) | | 0.004 | 0.055 | Yes | 336 (16.00) | $1.18 \ (1.09 \sim 1.28)$ | H+H | <.001 | |
| M. | 752 (25.96) | 1.15 (1.05 . 1.26) | 1 | 0.002 | 0.055 | AKI | | | | | 0.065 |
| INO Mar | 133 (33.80) | $1.15(1.05 \sim 1.26)$ 1.08(1.02 - 1.12) | 1-1 | < 001 | | No | 753 (35.86) | 1.16 (1.09 ~ 1.25) | Hert | <.001 | |
| res | 1347 (04.14) | 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.12) | :=1 | N.001 | | Yes | 1347 (64.14) | 1.07 (1.04 ~ 1.11) | H | <.001 | |
| | | | 0 i | 2 | | | | | 0 1 | 2 | |
| | | | HR(95%CI) | → | | | | | | ` | |
| | | | | | | | | | HK(45/60) | | |
| D | | | | | | D | | | | | |
| Б | | | | | | D | | | | | |
| D /ariables | n (%) | HR (95%CI) | | Р | P for interaction | Variables | n (%) | HR (95% CI) | | Р | P for interaction |
| D Variables | n (%) | HR (95%CI) | | ₽ < 001 | P for interaction | Variables | n (%) | HR (95% CI) | L. | Р | P for interaction |
| Variables | n (%) 2100 (100.00) | HR (95%CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | H | P <.001 | P for interaction | Variables All patients | n (%) 2100 (100.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | H | P <.001 | P for interaction |
| Variables | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | H | P <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 | Variables All patients Age | n (%) 2100 (100.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) | H | P <.001 | P for interaction |
| Variables | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) | H | P <.001 0.215 | P for interaction 0.031 | Variables All patients Age <60 | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) | H | P <.001 0.103 | P for interaction |
| All patients (40) | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) | H (H | P <.001 0.215 <.001 | P for interaction | Variables All patients Age ≤ 60 ≥ 60 ≥ 60 | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) | M (*) (*) | P <.001 0.103 <.001 | P for interaction |
| Variables All patients Age ≤ 60 ≥ 60 Gender | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (25.71) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.02 - 1.14) | ini (mi | P <.001 0.215 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 | Variables All patients Age ≤ 60 ≥ 60 Gender | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) | H H H | P <.001 0.103 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 |
| Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Gender Female | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.20) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.0 (1.05 - 1.15) | (-) - - | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 ≥60 Gender Female | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.20) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) | # # # | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 |
| Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Gender Female Male 2020 | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) | N - - - | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 Gender Female Male Parce | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) | H - - - | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| Variables All patients Age < 60 ≥ 60 Gender Female Male Race | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) | N - - - | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Gender Fermale Male Race Weito | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.14) | | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Gender Female Male Cace White Black | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6 90) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.15) 0.07 (0.80 ~ 1.19) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 ≥60 Gender Female Male Race White Place | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6 90) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.19) 0.92 (0.78 ~ 1.19) | H H H H | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.295 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| All patients All patients A | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5 67) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 ~ 1.23) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 0.789 0.528 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 Sender Female Male Race White Black Hice patient | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5 67) | HR (95%CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 ~ 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 ~ 1.22) | и и и и и и | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| yariables All patients age <60 ≥60 Bender Female Male tace White Black Hispania | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 232 (10.57) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.01 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.23) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.652 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age <60 ≷60 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 219 (5.67) 222 (10.52) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 ~ 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 ~ 1.23) 0.30 (0.90 ~ 1.18) | H H H H H H | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| yariables √ariables | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) 222 | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 ~ 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 ~ 1.13) | N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age < 60 ≥ 60 Gender Fermale Male Black Hispanic Other Hoget Foliv | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) | HR (95%CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 ~ 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 ~ 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 ~ 1.12) 1.01 (1.06 ~ 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.14) 0.94 (0.73 ~ 1.23) 1.03 (0.90 ~ 1.18) | × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 |
| yariables All patients vec <pre><60 ≥60 Sender Female Male Cace White Black Hispania Other Heart Failt</pre> | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) JFC 4.4.02 | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.23) 0.97 (0.85 ~ 1.23) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 ≥60 Gender Female Male Black Hispanic Other Heart Failu | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) ITEG (48.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) 1.03 (0.09 - 1.18) 1.09 (0.05 - 1.12) | | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients type <60 ≥60 Ender Female Male Black Hispaniu Other Black Hispaniu Other Feart Failu No | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) c 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) JFC 1764 (84.00) 236 (46.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 ~ 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 ~ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) | x x x x x x x | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 | Variables All patients Age <60 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failu No Yee | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) re 1764 (84.00) 36 (16 00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) 1.06 (1.01 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.05 (0.05 - 1.13) 1.15 (0.07 - 1.25) | × • ▼ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.005 0.671 0.653 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 |
| yariables All patients ge <60 ≥60 Sender Female Male Male Male Male Black Hispanie Other Heart Failt No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) ; 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) JFC 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.97 (0.83 ~ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) 1.18 (1.00 ~ 1.29) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 | Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failt No Ves ¥EI | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 2119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) 336 (16.00) | $\begin{array}{c} \text{HR} (95\%\text{Cl}) \\ 1.09 & (1.06 - 1.13) \\ 1.04 & (0.99 - 1.09) \\ 1.14 & (1.10 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 & (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 & (1.07 - 1.14) \\ 0.29 & (0.78 - 1.08) \\ 0.94 & (0.73 - 1.23) \\ 1.03 & (0.09 - 1.18) \\ 1.09 & (1.05 - 1.13) \\ 1.15 & (1.07 - 1.25) \end{array}$ | N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N | P <.001 0.103 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients Age <pre><60 >60 Gender Female Male Kace White Black Hispania Other Ves KL</pre> | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 2119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) JFC 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 - 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 - 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 - 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 - 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 - 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 ~ 1.29) | × × × · · · · | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age <60 Sender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failt No Yes AKI | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 219 (5.67) 222 (10.57) re 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.09 (1.05 - 1.13) 1.15 (1.08 - 12) | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x | P <.001 0.103 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients See <60 >60 bender Female Male Cace White Black Hispania Other Hispania Other Hispania Other Ko Yes KI No No | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) ; 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) Jre 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 - 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 - 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 - 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 - 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 - 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 - 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 - 1.23) 1.18 (1.09 - 1.23) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 | Variables All patients Age <60 860 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Other Heart Failu No Yes AKI No Yer | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) : 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) rre 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.15 (1.07 - 1.25) 1.15 (1.08 - 1.22) 1.15 (0.08 - 1.22) 1.08 (1.04 - 1.22) | | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.0295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients Age < 60 Sender Female Male Black Mispanic Other Hispanic Other Ves KKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 2119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) Jre 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 - 1.02) 1.05 (1.10 ~ 1.02) 1.08 (1.03 - 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 - 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 - 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 - 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 - 1.33) 1.09 (1.05 - 1.33) 1.18 (1.09 ~ 1.29) 1.17 (1.08 ~ 1.29) | * * * * III * Ix | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Fall No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) IFC 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{HR} (\textbf{95\% CI}) \\ 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) \\ 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) \\ 1.06 (1.01 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.06 - 1.13) \\ 1.05 (0.09 - 1.18) \\ 1.05 (1.05 - 1.13) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.25) \\ 1.05 (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.05 (1.04 - 1.12) \end{array}$ | N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N | P <.001 0.103 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients See < 60 > 60 iender Female Male Back Hispanit Other Black Hispanit Other Ves KI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 219 (5.67) 222 (10.57) JFC 1764 (48.400) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 $-$ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 $-$ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 $-$ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 $-$ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 $-$ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 $-$ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 $-$ 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 $-$ 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 $-$ 1.23) 1.19 (1.05 $-$ 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 $-$ 1.29) 1.17 (1.08 $-$ 1.26) 1.08 (1.04 $-$ 1.21) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 2 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age <60 860 Gender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failu No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (6.90) 2119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) IT67 (44.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.13) 1.15 (1.07 - 1.25) 1.15 (1.08 - 1.22) 1.08 (1.04 - 1.2) | | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 2 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| ariables ariables II patients ge <60 ≥60 iender Fernale ace White Black Hispanic Other Hispanic Other Yes KI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 145 (6.90) 212 (10.57) 222 (10.57) are 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 - 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.91 (0.67 ~ 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 ~ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 ~ 1.29) 1.17 (1.08 ~ 1.26) 1.08 (1.04 ~ 1.2) | | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 2 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 Gender Fermale Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Black Hispanic Other Heart Fail No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (630) 219 (5.67) 129 (10.77) 176 (48.00) 336 (16.00) 136 (40.00) 336 (16.00) 136 (40.00) 336 (16.00) 136 (40.00) 336 (16.00) 136 (16.00) 137 (16.00) 138 (16.00) 149 (16.0 | $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{HR} (95\% \text{CI}) \\ 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) \\ 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) \\ 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) \\ 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) \\ 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) \\ 1.05 (1.05 - 1.13) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.08 (1.04 - 1.12) \end{array}$ | H H H H H H H H H H (95%C)) | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.025 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.025 0.671 .0.653 <.001 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 0.022 .0.01 .0.021 .0.01 .0.021 .0.01 .0.021 .0.01 .0.021 .0.01 .0.021 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.01 .0.011 .0.01 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Variables All patients Age <60 ≥60 Bender Female Male Male Male Male Male Male Male M | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (5.67) 222 (10.57) 222 (10.57) are 1764 (84.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 ~ 1.22) 1.17 (1.08 ~ 1.26) 1.08 (1.04 ~ 1.22) | H H H H H H H H H H H H H (95%CI) | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 2.2 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age <60 Bender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failt No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) are 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% Cl) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.13) 1.15 (1.08 - 1.22) 1.08 (1.04 - 1.12) | | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 0.295 0.671 0.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables Ul patients use <60 ≥60 ender Female Male tace White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failt No Yes KI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (75.86) 145 (69.09) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) 1764 (44.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 $-$ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 $-$ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 $-$ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 $-$ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 $-$ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 $-$ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 $-$ 1.23) 0.97 (0.83 $-$ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 $-$ 1.23) 1.18 (1.09 $-$ 1.29) 1.17 (1.08 $+$ 1.26) 1.08 (1.04 $-$ 1.12) | H H H H H H H (95%Cl) | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 2.2 | P for interaction 0.031 0.633 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age ≤60 Gender Fermale Black Hispank Other Heart Faik No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 119 (5.67) 119 (5.67) 119 (5.67) 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{HR} (95\% \text{CI}) \\ 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) \\ 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.19) \\ 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) \\ 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) \\ 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) \\ 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) \\ 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) \\ 1.05 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.15 (1.07 - 1.23) \\ 1.08 (1.04 - 1.12) \end{array}$ | H H H H H H H H H H (95%Cl) | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 2.001 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |
| Ariables Ariables All patients ge < 60 ≥ 60 iender Female Male iace White Black Hispania Other Heart Fall No Yes KI No Yes 4 | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 1614 (76.86) 145 (5.67) 222 (10.57) 222 (10.57) are 1764 (84.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% CI) 1.09 (1.06 ~ 1.13) 1.03 (0.98 ~ 1.09) 1.15 (1.10 ~ 1.21) 1.08 (1.03 ~ 1.14) 1.10 (1.05 ~ 1.15) 1.11 (1.07 ~ 1.15) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.18) 0.97 (0.80 ~ 1.13) 1.09 (1.05 ~ 1.13) 1.18 (1.09 ~ 1.22) 1.17 (1.08 ~ 1.26) 1.08 (1.04 ~ 1.22) | H H H H H H H H (95%Cl) | P <.001 0.215 <.001 0.004 <.001 0.789 0.538 0.658 <.001 <.001 <.001 <.001 .001 .001 .001 | P for interaction 0.031 0.833 0.644 0.394 0.050 | Variables All patients Age <60 Bender Female Male Race White Black Hispanic Other Heart Failt No Yes AKI No Yes | n (%) 2100 (100.00) 1089 (51.86) 1011 (48.14) 750 (35.71) 1350 (64.29) 119 (5.67) 222 (10.57) are 1764 (84.00) 336 (16.00) 753 (35.86) 1347 (64.14) | HR (95% Cl) 1.09 (1.06 - 1.13) 1.04 (0.99 - 1.09) 1.14 (1.10 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.12) 1.11 (1.06 - 1.16) 1.11 (1.07 - 1.14) 0.92 (0.78 - 1.08) 0.94 (0.73 - 1.23) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.18) 1.03 (0.90 - 1.13) 1.15 (1.08 - 1.22) 1.08 (1.04 - 1.12) | H H H H H H H H H H (95%C) | P <.001 0.103 <.001 0.012 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 <.001 <.001 0.295 0.671 0.653 <.001 2.25 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.295 0.012 0.011 0.025 0.011 0.012 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 0.012 0.011 | P for interaction 0.036 0.552 0.668 0.492 0.174 |

reduce serum albumin levels. RAR, which combines RDW and serum albumin, comprehensively reflects two pathological states: hematopoietic dysfunction and hypoalbuminemia (40–42). Our study showed a significant linear correlation between increased RAR values and higher mortality risk in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis.

Subgroup analyses revealed a significant interaction between age and RAR as predictors of mortality. Elderly patients with elevated RAR exhibited a more pronounced increase in mortality risk. This interaction may stem from the higher comorbidity burden in elderly patients, combined with elevated RAR, leading to increased mortality risk. These findings underscore the importance of considering age as a modifier when evaluating the prognostic value of RAR. We interpret our subgroup analysis results with caution, as they may be influenced by heterogeneity across different populations. These results warrant further validation through additional studies.

Our study highlights the potential of RAR as a prognostic marker in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis. Compared to existing prognostic scores such as the Child-Pugh score and the MELD score, RAR offers several advantages. It is a direct biochemical indicator of both hematological and hepatic function, with straightforward and low-cost measurement. Moreover, RAR avoids the subjectivity of certain markers (e.g., ascites and encephalopathy) in the Child-Pugh score and the laboratory heterogeneity of creatinine and INR measurements in the MELD score, as well as gender bias (43). By integrating inflammatory and nutritional markers, RAR provides a more comprehensive assessment of a patient's physiological state (26, 44). In critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis, elevated RAR is linked to higher mortality risk. The stepwise rise in mortality risk with increasing RAR quartiles underscores its potential as a stratification tool for the rapid identification of high-risk patients. Additionally, RAR is easy to obtain and low-cost, making it a highly effective stratification tool for resource-limited settings. The use of data from the MIMIC-IV database ensures a large and diverse patient cohort, supporting robust statistical analysis. Our results indicate that RAR can serve as a valuable supplement to existing prognostic tools, particularly in critically ill patients where accurate prognosis is crucial for clinical decision-making.

While our study provides valuable insights into predicting mortality in critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis, it has limitations. First, our analysis is retrospective, limiting our ability to establish causality and potentially introducing biases inherent to observational studies. Second, our study cohort was derived from a single center. This limits the generalizability of our findings to diverse populations and healthcare settings. Although methodological safeguards were implemented, we cannot rule out the possibility of overfitting or chance findings. External validation was not performed due to study limitations, so our results should be interpreted with caution. Third, despite adjusting for numerous confounders, unmeasured variables such as laboratory test results, genetic factors, lifestyle, and specific treatments may still influence the relationship between RAR and mortality. Fourth, due to missing data common in retrospective studies, we were unable to include all metrics for the MELD score or the ACLF score in our analyses, and these will be considered in future prospective studies. Despite these limitations, our study contributes to the growing body of evidence highlighting the importance of RAR in managing critically ill cirrhotic patients with sepsis.

5 Conclusion

In critically ill cirrhosis patients with sepsis admitted to the ICU, elevated RAR is associated with increased short-term and long-term mortality. Thus, RAR measurement may aid in the prognostic management of these patients. Further prospective studies are needed to confirm our findings.

Data availability statement

Publicly available datasets were analyzed in this study. This data can be found here: https://physionet.org/content/mimiciv/3.0/.

Ethics statement

The studies involving humans were approved by Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The ethics committee/institutional review board waived the requirement of written informed consent for participation from the participants or the participants' legal guardians/next of kin because the BIDMC institutional review board waived informed consent due to the use of anonymized and publicly available data, and the sharing of study resources was approved.

Author contributions

JL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft. SP: Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft. HH: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Writing – original draft. YL: Conceptualization, Methodology,

References

1. Ginès P, Krag A, Abraldes J, Solà E, Fabrellas N, Kamath P. Liver cirrhosis. *Lancet.* (2021) 398:1359–76. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)01374-x

2. Allen A, Kim W, Moriarty J, Shah N, Larson J, Kamath P. Time trends in the health care burden and mortality of acute on chronic liver failure in the United States. *Hepatology*. (2016) 64:2165–72. doi: 10.1002/hep.28812

3. Bajaj J, Kamath P, Reddy K. The evolving challenge of infections in cirrhosis. N Engl J Med. (2021) 384:2317–30. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra2021808

4. Bonnel A, Bunchorntavakul C, Reddy K. Immune dysfunction and infections in patients with cirrhosis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2011) 9:727–38. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh. 2011.02.031

Supervision, Writing – original draft. TT: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft. JW: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing. MC: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the MIMIV-IV participants and staff. We appreciate all the reviewers who participated in the review.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

5. Arvaniti V, D'Amico G, Fede G, Manousou P, Tsochatzis E, Pleguezuelo M, et al. Infections in patients with cirrhosis increase mortality four-fold and should be used in determining prognosis. *Gastroenterology.* (2010) 139:1246-56.e1-5. doi: 10.1053/j. gastro.2010.06.019.

6. Kosuta I, Premkumar M, Reddy K. Review article: Evaluation and care of the critically ill patient with cirrhosis. *Aliment Pharmacol. Ther.* (2024) 59:1489–509. doi: 10.1111/apt.18016

7. Wang X, Zhang M, Xiao J, Zhang W, Wang Y, Zhang S, et al. A modified Child-Turcotte-Pugh score based on plasma ammonia predicts survival for patients with decompensated cirrhosis. *Qjm.* (2023) 116:436–42. doi: 10.1093/qjmed/hcad076 9. Nagai S, Chau L, Schilke R, Safwan M, Rizzari M, Collins K, et al. Effects of allocating livers for transplantation based on model for end-stage liver disease-sodium scores on patient outcomes. *Gastroenterology*. (2018) 155:1451–62.e3. doi: 10.1053/j. gastro.2018.07.025.

10. Kim W, Mannalithara A, Heimbach J, Kamath P, Asrani S, Biggins S, et al. MELD 3.0: The model for end-stage liver disease updated for the modern era. *Gastroenterology.* (2021) 161:1887–95.e4. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2021. 08.050

11. Raith E, Udy A, Bailey M, McGloughlin S, MacIsaac C, Bellomo R, et al. Prognostic Accuracy of the SOFA Score, SIRS Criteria, and qSOFA score for in-hospital mortality among adults with suspected infection admitted to the intensive care unit. *Jama*. (2017) 317:290–300. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.20328

12. Leise M, Kim W, Kremers W, Larson J, Benson J, Therneau TM. A revised model for end-stage liver disease optimizes prediction of mortality among patients awaiting liver transplantation. *Gastroenterology.* (2011) 140:1952–60. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2011. 02.017

13. Louvet A, Labreuche J, Artru F, Boursier J, Kim D, O'Grady J, et al. Combining data from liver disease scoring systems better predicts outcomes of patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *Gastroenterology*. (2015) 149:398–406.e8; quiz e16-7. doi: 10.1053/ j.gastro.2015.04.044.

14. Salvagno G, Sanchis-Gomar F, Picanza A, Lippi G. Red blood cell distribution width: A simple parameter with multiple clinical applications. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* (2015) 52:86–105. doi: 10.3109/10408363.2014.992064

15. Bazick H, Chang D, Mahadevappa K, Gibbons F, Christopher K. Red cell distribution width and all-cause mortality in critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med.* (2011) 39:1913–21. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31821b85c6

16. Lan W, Liu E, Sun D, Li W, Zhu J, Zhou J, et al. Red cell distribution in critically ill patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Pulmonology*. (2024) 30:34–42. doi: 10.1016/j.pulmoe.2022.04.001

17. Zhang X, Wang Y, Chen N, Liu Y, Xiao J, Lin Z, et al. Red cell distribution width is associated with short-term mortality in critically ill patients with heart failure. *ESC Heart Fail.* (2022) 9:3210–20. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.14023

18. Casulleras M, Flores-Costa R, Duran-Güell M, Alcaraz-Quiles J, Sanz S, Titos E, et al. Albumin internalizes and inhibits endosomal TLR signaling in leukocytes from patients with decompensated cirrhosis. *Sci Transl Med.* (2020) 12:eaax5135. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aax5135

19. Alcaraz-Quiles J, Casulleras M, Oettl K, Titos E, Flores-Costa R, Duran-Güell M, et al. Oxidized albumin triggers a cytokine storm in leukocytes through p38 mitogenactivated protein kinase: Role in systemic inflammation in decompensated cirrhosis. *Hepatology.* (2018) 68:1937–52. doi: 10.1002/hep.30135

20. Baldassarre M, Naldi M, Zaccherini G, Bartoletti M, Antognoli A, Laggetta M, et al. Determination of effective albumin in patients with decompensated cirrhosis: Clinical and prognostic implications. *Hepatology*. (2021) 74:2058–73. doi: 10.1002/hep. 31798

21. Armentaro G, Condoleo V, Pastura C, Grasso M, Frasca A, Martire D, et al. Prognostic role of serum albumin levels in patients with chronic heart failure. *Intern Emerg Med.* (2024) 19:1323–33. doi: 10.1007/s11739-024-03612-9

22. Xu W, Huo J, Chen G, Yang K, Huang Z, Peng L, et al. Association between red blood cell distribution width to albumin ratio and prognosis of patients with sepsis: A retrospective cohort study. *Front Nutr.* (2022) 9:1019502. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022. 1019502

23. Seo Y, Yu J, Park J, Lee N, Lee J, Park J, et al. Red cell distribution width/albumin ratio and 90-day mortality after burn surgery. *Burns Trauma.* (2022) 10:tkab050. doi: 10.1093/burnst/tkab050

24. Hong J, Hu X, Liu W, Qian X, Jiang F, Xu Z, et al. Impact of red cell distribution width and red cell distribution width/albumin ratio on all-cause mortality in patients with type 2 diabetes and foot ulcers: A retrospective cohort study. *Cardiovasc Diabetol.* (2022) 21:91. doi: 10.1186/s12933-022-01534-4

25. He Q, Hu S, Xie J, Liu H, Li C. The red blood cell distribution width to albumin ratio was a potential prognostic biomarker for acute respiratory failure: A retrospective study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* (2024) 24:253. doi: 10.1186/s12911-024-02639-4

26. Yin L, Min J, Zhong L, Shen Q. The correlation between red cell distribution width to albumin ratio and all-cause mortality in critically ill patients with rheumatic

diseases: A population-based retrospective study. Front Med. (2023) 10:1199861. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2023.1199861

27. Johnson A, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, Gayles A, Shammout A, Horng S, et al. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Sci Data.* (2023) 10:1. doi: 10.1038/s41597-022-01899-x

28. Singer M, Deutschman C, Seymour C, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al. The third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (Sepsis-3). *Jama*. (2016) 315:801–10. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.0287

29. Hu W, Chen H, Ma C, Sun Q, Yang M, Wang H, et al. Identification of indications for albumin administration in septic patients with liver cirrhosis. *Crit Care.* (2023) 27:300. doi: 10.1186/s13054-023-04587-3

30. Li D, Ruan Z, Wu B. Association of red blood cell distribution widthalbumin ratio for acute myocardial infarction patients with mortality: A retrospective cohort study. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost.* (2022) 28:10760296221121286. doi: 10.1177/ 10760296221121286

31. Weng Y, Peng Y, Xu Y, Wang L, Wu B, Xiang H, et al. The ratio of red blood cell distribution width to albumin is correlated with all-cause mortality of patients after percutaneous coronary intervention - a retrospective cohort study. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* (2022) 9:869816. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2022.869816

32. Kimura H, Tanaka K, Saito H, Iwasaki T, Kazama S, Shimabukuro M, et al. Impact of red blood cell distribution width-albumin ratio on prognosis of patients with CKD. *Sci Rep.* (2023) 13:15774. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-42986-2

33. Gu Y, Yang D, Huang Z, Chen Y, Dai Z. Relationship between red blood cell distribution width-to-albumin ratio and outcome of septic patients with atrial fibrillation: A retrospective cohort study. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. (2022) 22:538. doi: 10.1186/s12872-022-02975-1

34. Zhang J, Xu P, Huang Y, Li J, Ma C, Liu G, et al. Diagnostic value of RDWalbumin ratio for the prediction of mortality in sepsis associated nonthyroidal illness syndrome patients: A retrospective cohort study. *J Inflamm Res.* (2024) 17:11305–18. doi: 10.2147/jir.5481760

35. Mahnashi M, Jabbar Z, Alamgeer, Irfan H, Asim M, Akram M, et al. Venlafaxine demonstrated anti-arthritic activity possibly through down regulation of TNF- α , IL-6, IL-1 β , and COX-2. *Inflammopharmacology*. (2021) 29:1413–25. doi: 10.1007/s10787-021-00849-0

36. Orsini M, Chateauvieux S, Rhim J, Gaigneaux A, Cheillan D, Christov C, et al. Sphingolipid-mediated inflammatory signaling leading to autophagy inhibition converts erythropoiesis to myelopoiesis in human hematopoietic stem/progenitor cells. *Cell Death Differ*. (2019) 26:1796–812. doi: 10.1038/s41418-018-0245-x

37. Zhang L, Yu C, Guo K, Huang C, Mo L. Prognostic role of red blood cell distribution width in patients with sepsis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Immunol.* (2020) 21:40. doi: 10.1186/s12865-020-00369-6

38. Zheng Q, Zhang P, Yang H, Geng Y, Tang J, Kang Y, et al. Effects of hypoxiainducible factor prolyl hydroxylase inhibitors versus erythropoiesis-stimulating agents on iron metabolism and inflammation in patients undergoing dialysis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heliyon.* (2023) 9:e15310. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023. e15310

39. Wu N, Liu T, Tian M, Liu C, Ma S, Cao H, et al. Albumin, an interesting and functionally diverse protein, varies from 'native' to 'effective' (Review). *Mol Med Rep.* (2024) 29:24. doi: 10.3892/mmr.2023.13147

40. Chen X, Luo Y, Liu S. Association between red cell distribution width to albumin ratio and all-cause mortality in patients with acute pancreatitis admitted to the intensive care unit: A retrospective study based on the MIMIC-IV database. *Front Med.* (2025) 12:1503378. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2025.1503378

41. Chen J, Zhang D, Zhou D, Dai Z, Wang J. Association between red cell distribution width/serum albumin ratio and diabetic kidney disease. *J Diabetes*. (2024) 16:e13575. doi: 10.1111/1753-0407.13575

42. Zhu X, Hu Y, Long Z, Cao M. Association between RAR and the prevalence and prognosis of depression: A population-based study. *J Affect Disord.* (2025) 380:1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2025.03.100

43. Ruf A, Dirchwolf M, Freeman R. From Child-Pugh to MELD score and beyond: Taking a walk down memory lane. *Ann Hepatol.* (2022) 27:100535. doi: 10.1016/j. aohep.2021.100535

44. Qu J, Tang X, Tang W, Pan L. Association of red cell distribution width/albumin ratio and 28-day mortality in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients with atrial fibrillation: A medical information mart for intensive care IV study. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord.* (2025) 25:146. doi: 10.1186/s12872-025-04537-7