Improving on the Adrogué-Madias Formula
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Abstract

The Adrogué-Madias (A-M) formula is correct as written, but technically it only works when adding one liter of an intravenous (IV) fluid. For all other volumes, the A-M algorithm gives an approximate answer, one that diverges further from the truth as the IV volume is increased. If one liter of an IV fluid is calculated to change the serum sodium by some amount, then it was long assumed that giving a fraction of the liter would change the serum sodium by a proportional amount. We challenged that assumption and now prove that the A-M change in [sodium] is not scalable in a linear way. Rather, the delta [Na] needs to be scaled in a way that accounts for the actual volume of IV fluid being given. This is accomplished by our improved version of the A-M formula in a mathematically rigorous way. Our equation accepts any IV fluid volume, eliminates the illogical infinities, and, most importantly, incorporates the scaling step so that it cannot be forgotten. However, the non-linear scaling makes it harder to obtain a desired delta [Na]. Therefore, we reversed the equation so that clinicians can enter the desired delta [Na], keeping the rate of sodium correction safe, and then get an answer in terms of the volume of IV fluid to infuse. The improved equation can also unify the A-M formula with the corolla A-M loss equation wherein one liter of urine is lost. The method is to treat loss as a negative volume. Since the new equation is just as straightforward as the original formula, we believe that the improved form of A-M is ready for immediate use, alongside frequent [sodium] monitoring.
Knephrologists of the round(ing) table

“They don’t tell you this, but all you have to do is add 500 cc’s instead of a liter.” This is what I (S.C.) overheard my renal fellow (M.S.) telling an Internal Medicine resident on our Nephrology consult service. The resident had seen a patient with hyponatremia, and the primary team was going to give 500 mL of hypertonic saline. She wanted to know how the intravenous (IV) fluid would alter the patient’s serum sodium, by applying the Adrogué-Madias (A-M) formula that calculates the expected change in [sodium] (1, 2). For reference, the formula is $\Delta[\text{Na}] = \frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]}{\text{TBW}+1}$, where $[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}}$ is the sodium plus potassium concentration of the IV fluid, $[\text{Na}]$ is the patient’s serum sodium, and TBW is the total body water. At the time, she was confused by the 500 mL, because it conflicted with the 1 L that is supposed to be added to the TBW in the denominator. She turned to her supervising renal fellow, and after some quick thinking he told her to substitute in the 500. As their attending, I did not immediately correct the mistake, as it dawed on me how the A-M formula is ripe for misuse. The following two scenarios may not be common mistakes, but they are potential mistakes, as the formula gets interpreted by millions of healthcare providers. To minimize the risk of misinterpretation, we suggest ways to improve the A-M formula to be more exact and comprehensive.

Potential mistake #1: dose-response reversed

Even the users who know that the denominator’s “1” refers to one liter may be tempted to substitute in the actual volume of IV fluid if it differs from one liter. In our case, that meant changing the 1 to 0.5. But thinking through the numerical logic, we see that TBW + 0.5 yields a smaller denominator that makes the entire fraction larger in value, implying that the delta $[\text{Na}]$ is greater when less IV fluid is infused. This violates the normal dose-response relationship, but
doctors may not pause long enough to realize the mistake. If 500 mL gave too high a delta [Na], they may try to lower the delta [Na] by increasing the 1 to 2, still thinking that the 1 is adjustable. Once the delta [Na] is acceptably small, the doctor orders a larger volume of hypertonic saline to be infused. Such an error in treating chronic hyponatremia could result in osmotic demyelination.

**Potential mistake #2: forgetting to scale**

Users may keep the “1” as is, but the properly calculated delta [Na] may be too big or too small. Well, the next step of the A-M algorithm is to scale the delta [Na] to the desired value, assuming that the dose-response relationship is linear (1, 3). For example, if a liter of hypertonic saline gave a delta [Na] of +12 mEq/L, but you only wanted to raise the patient’s [Na] by 6, then you would infuse half a liter of 3% NaCl. But this scaling step of the A-M algorithm is not embedded in the formula and could be forgotten. Instead, to attenuate the delta [Na], the doctor may change the only variable under our control and plug in a less concentrated IV fluid like normal saline (NS). Unfortunately, the drop off between 3% at 513 mEq/L and NS at 154 mEq/L is steep, and then the delta [Na] becomes much too small. Will the doctor go with 1.5% saline, thinking that half the concentration should give half the delta [Na]? (It does not.) Mistakes can also be made in formulating and mixing a non-commercial IV fluid, not to mention the possible breaks in sterility.

**Seemingly mismatched units**

At first glance, it may seem that the units on either side of the A-M equation do not match. The numerator is a difference between an IV fluid’s cationic solute concentration and the patient’s serum sodium. Hence, the numerator’s unit is in mEq/L. That is divided by TBW + 1 which has
a unit of Liter. Thus, the overall units appear to be mEq L⁻¹. On the other side of the equation, delta [Na] has a unit of mEq L⁻¹. Such a mismatch would normally invalidate an equation, but the A-M formula is saved by a single phrase in their papers: \([\text{[Na}^+]_{\text{inf}} - \text{[Na}^+]_{s}\) is a simplification of the expression \((\text{[Na}^+]_{\text{inf}} - \text{initial [Na}^+]_{s}) \times 1\text{ L} (1, 3)\). In other words, the numerator is shorthand for a hidden multiplication. Multiplying by 1 can be omitted, but that 1 carries a unit of volume (i.e., liter) that is needed to restore the numerator’s unit back to mEq (and thus self-consistency). Most users are unaware of this fact. Not seeing the “× 1 L,” they may forget that the IV fluid volume is fixed at one liter, leading some to tinker with the “1” in the denominator.

To infinity and beyond

Many of the A-M clinical examples use hypertonic saline, because the delta [Na] is large and it is less objectionable to scale the effect downward, meaning that <1 L of IV fluid is infused. What if the delta [Na] is to be scaled up? Let us say that giving one liter of NS results in a delta [Na] of +1, because in a hypothetical patient the A-M formula yields \(\frac{154-111}{42+1} = 1\). If we want to correct the serum sodium from 111 all the way to 140, the A-M algorithm (1, 3) implies that 29 L of NS should be infused. Adrogué and Madias would reject this plan, judging by a similar example in their paper, but their reason has more to do with clinical futility rather than a scaling flaw (1). Using the A-M scaling paradigm, we could in theory raise the serum sodium from 111 to 181. But is it even possible to reach 181 with NS? Wouldn’t the serum sodium plateau at NS’s [sodium] of 154? Our thought experiments raise concerns about the A-M methodology.

Adrogué and Madias derived their formula from the principles of sodium physiology as deduced by Edelman et al. (4). A-M’s mathematical proof of the first step involving one liter of fluid is
valid and enduring. However, in the second step of applying the math to patient care (in their example cases), they assume that the effect of one liter on the delta $[\text{Na}]$ can be scaled proportionally (1, 3). This dose-response relationship may seem logical, but can the delta $[\text{Na}]$ be scaled in a linear way? If so, could the scaling continue all the way to infinity? We hint above that the answer is no, but mathematics can answer the preceding two questions definitively.

**Proof strategy**

If the A-M volume must be one liter (as in TBW + 1) and the non-one-liter volumes do *not* scale linearly, then the A-M algorithm is technically only correct when one liter of IV fluid is being given. We wanted to generalize A-M so that it could accommodate the entire range of volumes that are going to be administered in the real world. We can allow any volume to be infused by representing it as the generic variable $V$. Plug $V$, instead of 1, back into the Edelman equation and solve for the delta $[\text{Na}]$ as Adrogué and Madias did long ago. Fortuitously, many terms cancel that simplify the more versatile equation into a final form that is almost as elegantly simple as the A-M formula.

**Savory math**

The Edelman equation states that the serum sodium is a function of the sum of exchangeable sodium and exchangeable potassium divided by the total body water: $[\text{Na}] = \frac{N_{ae}+K_e}{TBW}$ (4). There is also a slope and a $y$-intercept that make this linear relationship more precise, but for simplicity we (and Adrogué and Madias) used a slope of one and a $y$-intercept of zero (5, 6). Define the initial serum sodium as $[\text{Na}]_1 = \frac{N_{ae}+K_e}{TBW}$. Allow an IV fluid to be added. Its effect on the serum sodium will depend on the fluid’s sodium + potassium concentration and its total volume. After
the IV fluid is infused, the serum sodium becomes $[\text{Na}]_2 = \frac{\text{Na}_e + \text{K}_e + [\text{Na}+\text{K}]_{\text{IVF}}}{\text{TBW} + V} V$, where $[\text{Na}+\text{K}]_{\text{IVF}}$ is the sodium plus potassium concentration of the IV fluid (in mEq/L) and $V$ is the volume of IV fluid given (in L). $[\text{Na}]_2$ minus $[\text{Na}]_1$ is the delta $[\text{Na}]$:

$$\Delta[\text{Na}] = [\text{Na}]_2 - [\text{Na}]_1 = \frac{\text{Na}_e + \text{K}_e + [\text{Na}+\text{K}]_{\text{IVF}}}{\text{TBW} + V} V - \frac{\text{Na}_e + \text{K}_e}{\text{TBW}}$$

Use algebra to simplify Equation (1) into (see Appendix):

$$\Delta[\text{Na}] = \left[\frac{\text{Na}+\text{K}}{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]\right] \cdot \frac{V}{\text{TBW} + V}$$

(2)

**Form factor**

The final equation above follows the template of the A-M formula. In fact, their numerators look identical. As expected, their denominators are similar but different. Adrogué and Madias chose to add one liter, hence the TBW + 1. We allowed for any volume of IV fluid, reflected in the TBW + $V$. The scaling step in the A-M algorithm that was based on “common sense” was added post hoc, manually. It is a separate step that does not appear in the original A-M equation. But the scaling step in our equation (2) was generated by the math, automatically. It is a built-in step and cannot be overlooked. Sensibly, multiplying the main fraction by a $V$ that is less than one (liter) scales the delta $[\text{Na}]$ downward (in accordance with dose-response), and multiplying by a $V$ that is greater than one scales the delta $[\text{Na}]$ upward. In the case of multiplying by a $V$ equal to one, our equation (2) reduces exactly to the original A-M formula, as it must.

**Objections overruled**

This improved A-M formula resolves all of the previously mentioned shortcomings. It does not force us to add one liter but allows us to add any volume of IV fluid. A-M’s scaling step was
implicit and retrofitted onto the formula. But the improved equation’s scaling step is overt and integrated into the formula. Also, the scaling is now done correctly. Although it seems rational, the delta [Na] of the A-M formula does not scale up or down in a linear way. If A-M calculates the delta [Na] to be $+1 \text{ mEq/L}$, but we want to increase the serum sodium by 6, then it is not as simple as giving 6 liters of IV fluid. However, the correct volume is more difficult to calculate because of the non-linearity. At least the scaling to infinity that was possible with A-M has been mathematically prohibited. No matter how big the $V$ term gets, the serum sodium cannot rise or fall beyond that IV fluid’s [Na+K]. Even if our prior hypothetical patient with a serum sodium of 111 is flooded with NS, the highest the serum sodium can go is 154, capping the delta [Na] in this case at 43. This limit is corroborated by letting $V$ go to infinity (see Appendix).

**Clinical teaching**

A few patient cases can illustrate the right and wrong ways to use the A-M equation. In the case from the introduction that the resident and fellow were consulted on, the man weighed 95 kg so the TBW was calculated at 57 L. His initial sodium was 110 mEq/L, and 500 mL of 3% NaCl was going to be given. What would the delta [Na] be? Mistake #1 from before: If the TBW were changed to TBW + 0.5, then the computation would be:

$$\Delta[\text{Na}] = \frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]}{\text{TBW} + 0.5} = \frac{513 - 110}{57 + 0.5} = 7$$

(The correct A-M would be $\Delta[\text{Na}] = \frac{513 - 110}{57 + 1} = 6.95$, which is not too far off.) An increase of 7 mEq/L in the serum sodium sounded reasonable. What if they stopped there? Then they would be committing mistake #2. The delta [Na] of 7 is *per liter* of IV fluid, an easily forgettable fact. Since the actual volume was 500 mL, the (invisible) scaling step of the A-M algorithm would attenuate the delta [Na] by one-half. If the primary team wanted to raise the sodium by 7, then
they would be undertreating the patient by giving only 500 mL. The two mistakes would have been averted by using the improved A-M formula:

$$\Delta [\text{Na}] = \frac{[\text{Na}+\text{K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]}{\text{TBW} + V} \cdot V = \frac{513 - 110}{57 + 0.5} \cdot 0.5 = 3.50434782608695652173913$$

Another way to arrive at the same answer is to go back to basics. The principle of total body cationic osmoles (TBCO) interprets the initial sodium as being $$\frac{6.270}{57} = 6.270$$. The 500 mL of 3% NaCl would deliver $$\frac{513}{L} \cdot 0.5 = 256.5$$ mEq of sodium. This gets added to the numerator, while 0.5 L is added to the TBW in the denominator to get a new sodium of $$\frac{6.270 + 256.5}{57 + 0.5} \approx 113.5$$. This gives a delta [Na] of $$113.5 - 110 = 3.5 \cdots$$, and this is *exactly* the value—down to the last decimal place (extra, repeating digits not shown)—obtained by the improved A-M equation.

Next, a 28-year-old woman who abuses alcohol was found to have a sodium of 105. She weighed 63.5 kg, so her TBW was estimated at 31.75 L. When she is given 2 L of NS, the A-M formula would predict that the $$\Delta [\text{Na}] = \frac{154 - 105}{31.75 + 1} = 1.5$$. A misused A-M formula would give $$\Delta [\text{Na}] = \frac{154 - 105}{31.75 + 2} = 1.45$$. After getting the NS, she had a sodium of 109, so the actual delta [Na] was 4, which differs noticeably from the 1.5 calculated above. Trainees might be confused at this point, until they realize that they omitted the scaling step. Multiply 1.5 by 2 to get 3 for the delta [Na]. If the improved A-M equation were used, trainees would get $$\Delta [\text{Na}] = \frac{154 - 105}{31.75 + 2} \cdot 2 = 2.90737$$. This is actually the correct delta [Na], not the 3 according to the scaled A-M. The ~2.9 value is corroborated by the TBCO method: $$\frac{3.333.75 + 154.2}{31.75 + 2} - 105 = 2.90737$$. TBCO is good for teaching purposes. After trainees truly understand TBCO, they can use the improved A-M as a shortcut.
Metamorphosis

Alluded to above, the reality that scaling is non-linear makes it more difficult to titrate the $V$ to achieve a desired delta $[\text{Na}]$. Plug in a guess for $V$. Was the calculated delta $[\text{Na}]$ too large or too small? Oh well, refine the guess for $V$ and re-calculate. Such trial-and-error is not going to be indulged by clinicians. They have a delta $[\text{Na}]$ goal in mind and would prefer that the equation produce the required $V$. Then they can divide that $V$ by the time it takes to correct the serum sodium at a safe rate (7-11). Of course, $V$ divided by time is the IV fluid rate. Pragmatically, this is what the clinician really wants to know in order to prescribe therapy for a dysnatremia. We can rearrange the improved A-M equation to solve for $V$ directly (see Appendix):

$$V = \frac{\Delta [\text{Na}] \cdot \text{TBW}}{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]_2}$$ (3)

where $[\text{Na}]_2$ is the target sodium that the clinician is aiming for in a patient. Getting a $V$ that is infinite or negative means that a desired delta $[\text{Na}]$ is not achievable with that particular IV fluid. A different IV fluid should be tried.

Flattening the curve

Comparing the graphs of the original vs. improved A-M formulas is instructive. Vary the scaling on the $x$-axis, which is basically the IV fluid volume, and observe the effect on delta $[\text{Na}]$ on the $y$-axis. For graphing purposes, the A-M equation is $y = \frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}}-\text{[Na]}}{\text{TBW}+1} \cdot x$, and the result is a straight line (Fig. 1A). Its slope is $\frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}}-\text{[Na]}}{\text{TBW}+1}$, a constant determined by whatever values are entered for $[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}}$, $[\text{Na}]$, and TBW. The $y$-intercept is zero. As seen on the $y$-axis, any delta $[\text{Na}]$ is attainable from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ (more on negative volumes later). Obviously, this scaling is unrealistic, as IV fluids are limited in the delta $[\text{Na}]$ that they can effect.
For graphing purposes, the improved equation is \( y = \frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}]}{\text{TBW} + x} \cdot x \), and its resulting curve is shaped like a reciprocal function (Fig. 1A). Between scaling volumes of 0 and 1 L, the curve approximates the linear A-M graph quite closely (Fig. 1B), and the correct delta [Na] differs only slightly from that of the original A-M. Thus, A-M works fairly well if the calculated delta [Na] should be scaled down to a smaller desired delta [Na]. But if A-M’s delta [Na] needs to be scaled up to a larger value, i.e., \( x > 1 \), then the line (original) starts to deviate from the curve (improved) (Fig. 1A). For increasing values of \( x \), the deviation becomes more and more pronounced. The asymptotes of the improved equation are located at \( x = -\text{TBW} \) and \( y = [\text{Na+K}]_{\text{IVF}} - [\text{Na}] \).

**Negative volume and the A-M loss formula**

Negative quantities may seem nonsensical at first, but on further scrutiny they often have a real physical counterpart. A negative volume in human physiology implies a loss of fluid from the body. The lost fluid creates a negative space, so to speak, that needs to be filled in order to get back to zero (or net even). The most familiar example of a negative volume is urinary output. Appropriately, urine is recorded in the negative column of the input/output (I/O) section of the chart, and clinicians are comfortable with the notion of a net negative I/O. To ascertain the effect of urinary loss on serum sodium, Adrogué and Madias derived a “fluid-loss formula” to calculate the delta [Na] if one liter of urine removed a known amount of sodium and potassium (2). The A-M loss equation can be derived from scratch, but a shortcut can be taken from our improved equation to the loss equation by treating urine (fl) volume as a negative quantity. Plug \( V = -1 \) into equation (2) and the result is \( \Delta[\text{Na}] = \frac{[\text{Na+K}]_{\eta} - [\text{Na}]}{\text{TBW} + V} \cdot V \Rightarrow \Delta[\text{Na}] = \frac{[\text{Na}] - [\text{Na+K}]_{\eta}}{\text{TBW}-1} \). One step of
algebra was all it took to recreate the loss equation. Thus, the original A-M and the A-M loss formula are intimately related as two sides of an overarching equation, the improved A-M.

**Point counterpoint: playing diablo’s advocate**

The A-M formula is one of the first “descendants” of the Edelman equation. A-M’s applicability is perhaps limited because it assumes there are no inputs or outputs except for the IV fluid that is going to be used to treat the dysnatremia. That is unrealistic, of course. To handle the realities of patient care, others later derived more capable sodium equations, also based on Edelman, that account for any ongoing gains and losses of Na, K, and H₂O. But can any of the newer equations accurately predict the change in serum sodium in real life? The challenges seem daunting. TBW itself is difficult to estimate. It is a struggle to get complete and reliable information on all of the I’s/O’s (like insensible losses) and their [Na+K]. These measurements are not reported instantly, and the lag time may be sufficient for the data to become obsolete. Even if we could plug in the most up-to-date data, they are likely to change in the near future, sometimes quite rapidly and drastically (12), making it problematic to use _any_ sodium equation prospectively. What about the Edelman equation? There could be hidden variables that significantly affect the correlation with [sodium], including 1) slope ≠ 1, 2) y-intercept ≠ 0 (see Appendix), 3) hyperglycemia, and 4) osmotically-inactive stores of sodium (6, 13-16). With all these hurdles, it may not be surprising that the sodium equations were found to be wanting in accuracy by at least two studies (17-19).

On the other hand, the Edelman equation does form the basis of our understanding of [sodium] physiology. It must work some of the time, even if it needs refining. Because of how math works, the sodium equations derived from Edelman are just as valid as Edelman itself. One study
found that A-M and three other sodium equations could predict delta [Na] fairly well in critically ill patients (20). Another study focused exclusively on A-M and found that its calculated delta [Na] nearly matched the actual in patients with either hypo- or hypernatremia (21, 22). A group that previously showed poor reliability of the sodium equations over a 12-30 h period later retested them but over a 2-4 h period and found a much better accuracy (23). We (S.C. & J.S.) applied our own Edelman-based equation to prescribe IV fluid therapy to five patients with dysnatremia and came close to reaching our therapeutic targets for their serum sodiums (24).

If the predicted strays too far from the actual serum sodium, mid-course corrections can be made by recalculating the predictions with fresh laboratory data. Thus, the sodium equations work hand-in-hand with the safe practice of frequent [sodium] monitoring. To act rationally on each new set of labs, we are encouraged to have “a sound understanding of the pathophysiology of salt and water balance” (1). What better way is there to express our understanding than to use the quantitative tools rooted in the Edelman equation to inform our therapeutic decisions?

Final thoughts
The A-M formula was published in 1997. In the more than 20 years since its debut, A-M has been used on the wards more than any other sodium equation, probably (25). How many of those countless times has the formula been misused? The potential mistakes we pointed out can be avoided by the improved equation, because it uses the actual volume of IV fluid and it embodies the scaling step in its very formula. It may not be completely foolproof, but the general equation is worth adopting now. Lastly, more capable sodium equations exist (20, 24, 26-30), but the A-M
formula has the enviable advantage of simplicity. Our improved equation is barely more complex than A-M, so maybe this “version 2.0” will enjoy the same widespread use and longevity.
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**Figure Legend**

Figure 1. Graph of a scaled Adrogué-Madias (A-M) formula and the improved version of A-M.

A) Suppose a patient with a total body water of 42 L and a serum sodium of 111 mEq/L is going to be treated with normal saline (NS). The A-M formula yields a delta [sodium] of +1 mEq/L per liter of NS that is infused \( \frac{154-111}{42+1} = 1 \). Scale this delta [Na] as desired by multiplying by any volume of NS. The result is a straight line with a slope of 1 (in red). To graph the improved equation, keep the baseline parameters the same for a fair comparison with A-M. Because it can accommodate any volume of NS, not just 1 L, the improved equation appears as a curve (in blue). B) A close-up is shown of the A-M formula and of the improved equation for scaling volumes between 0 and 1 L. The A-M formula’s line (red) almost overlaps with the improved equation’s curve (blue). The two intersect at \( x = 1 \) L, as expected, and then deviate further apart.
Figure 1A

\[ y = \frac{154 - 111}{42 + 1} \cdot x \]

\[ y = \frac{154 - 111}{42 + x} \cdot x \]
Figure 1B