Abstract. Pericardial effusion secondary to contrast nephropathy is a very rare clinical condition. Patients have a volume load increase secondary to acute renal failure. In such a case, the progression of pericardial effusion with tamponade may follow a very rapid course contrary to what is believed.

In this case, a 78-year-old male patient with diabetes mellitus and hypertension was admitted to the emergency department with complaints of decreased urine output, nausea, and vomiting. The patient was diagnosed with acute renal failure secondary to contrast nephropathy. Pericardial effusion amount was found to be 2 cm by thorax tomography. As the patient who had no urine output when his vital signs were stable became unstable during dialysis preparation and manifested clinical symptoms of cardiac tamponade, immediate pericardiocentesis was performed. Following that, he became stable and was transferred to the intensive care unit. In current guidelines regarding indications for pericardiocentesis, it is stated that drainage should be performed when the amount of effusion is more than 2 cm in the absence of tamponade, suspected bacterial infection or neoplastic etiology. However, in contrast to the standard approach to patients with acute renal failure, our suggestion is that the indications for pericardiocentesis may be broader in the presence of pericardial effusion.
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Introduction. Contrast-enhanced tomography is increasingly used in relation to differential diagnosis in emergency departments [1]. Contrast agents are used to improve image quality and perform target-directed screening in patients who had computed tomography scans (CT). Contrast-induced nephropathy is an important side effect. It is defined as an increase in serum creatinine by 25% or 44 mmol/L within 48-72 hours after exposure [2]. It develops in approximately 6% of patients who had contrast computed tomography scans [3]. Pericardial effusion is an important predictor of mortality in a patient who developed acute renal failure [4].

In this case, our objective was to evaluate the applications of pericardiocentesis in a patient who developed pericardial effusion secondary to acute renal failure followed by cardiac tamponade.

Case report. A 78-year-old male patient with hypertension and diabetes mellitus, who use amlodipine and metformin, presented to the emergency department with a chest complaint, abdominal pain, and decreased urine output. It was found out that the patient was admitted to the emergency department with chest pain 5 days earlier and a thoracic contrast-enhanced computed tomography scan had been done during the etiology investigation. This CT scan had shown no pericardial effusion (figure 1), and the patient on his arrival had been determined to have GCS of 15 with TA: 110/60, pulse:110, and Sato 2:94.

Fig. 1. The thoracic contrast-enhanced CT scan of the patient.
Biochemical examinations of the patient revealed a creatinine level of 4.16 mg/dL, urea level of 94 mg/dL, albumin level of 27 g/L. As a sign of deep metabolic acidosis, blood gas pH value was found out 7.17. 5 days earlier, the creatinine and urea levels of the patient on his arrival had been 1.01 mg/dL and 41 mg/dL.

Having seen that the patient had no urine output during follow-up, contrast nephropathy was accepted due to his history of 5 days earlier. With the patient having chest pain, physical examination revealed bibasilar crackles in respiratory sounds. Moreover, heart sounds were heard deeply during cardiac auscultation. In the emergency department, a non-contrast thoracic computed tomography scan was performed to the patient who had an increased cardiothoracic index as it was seen by portable chest X-ray. 2 cm of pericardial effusion was detected in his CT scan (figure 2).

![Fig. 2. The second non-contrast CT scan of the patient.](image)

Clinical tamponade was not considered for the patient whose vital signs were stable at that time. The patient was evaluated in favor of uremic pericarditis, and hemodialysis was planned rather than pericardiocentesis. Immediate pericardiocentesis was performed to the patient whose general conditions deteriorated and who became instable during follow-up in the emergency department (TA: 80/40, pulse: 145, SS: 25). Approximately 400 mL of serohemorrhagic fluid was drained from the patient by ultrasound-guided subxiphoid approach.

He was dialyzed and followed up daily with echocardiography, urea, creatinine and electrolytes. On the first day of follow-up, the levels of creatinine and urea were observed as 4.62 mg/dL and 90.42 mg/dL. On the fifth day of the treatment, the creatinine and urea levels of the patient were 1.4 mg/dL and 98 mg/dL, while echocardiograms showed no pericardial effusion. No growth was observed in the pericardial fluid culture. The patient was diagnosed with uremic pericarditis caused by acute renal failure secondary to contrast nephropathy.

**Discussion.** Acute renal failure is characterized by a sudden decrease in renal functions. While creatinine increase in contrast nephropathy usually starts within 24 to 48 hours of contrast exposure, creatinine levels begin to decrease within 3 to 7 days [5]. Diagnosis is made by clinical presentation and exclusion of other causes of acute renal failure because drugs can also make it. In this case, our diagnosis was supported due to the fact that the patient was diabetic, he had received a contrast agent on his first arrival of 5 days earlier, he had no history of any renal disease, the levels of urea and creatinine in his previous records had been always within the reference range, and there was no history of nephrotoxic agent intake.

Although pericardial effusion is generally seen in patients with chronic renal failure or genetic diseases, pericardial effusion is very rare in patients with acute renal failure [6]. This condition is very mortal in patients with acute renal failure. Patients with chronic renal failure are more likely to develop chronic pericardial effusion due to a volume load increase [7]. The incidence of patients with acute renal failure who receive dialysis treatment has decreased to approximately 5% [7].

Algorithmic approaches to pericardial effusion generally recommend that pericardial drainage should be performed when clinical tamponade becomes available [8]. Especially in one of the written algorithms, it is stated that drainage should be performed when the amount of effusion is more than 2 cm in the absence of tamponade, suspected bacterial infection or neoplastic etiology [8]. However, there is no specific recommendation for acute pericardial effusion that develops in patients with acute renal failure. Therefore just like other emergency diagnoses, acute renal failure also needs to have alternative methods to understand and manage [9].

It should be kept in mind that pericardial effusion secondary to acute renal failure may cause a clinical tamponade by showing a rapid and aggressive course. This can be a surprising and new condition for clinician such as drug side effects [10]. Especially in cases such as ours, the indications of pericardiocentesis may be considered widely in the presence of pericardial effusion accompanied by acute renal failure. Although pericardiocentesis is recommended when tamponade occurs clinically, it may be beneficial to consider pericardiocentesis when the patient is stable, due to the fact that pericardial effusions associated with acute renal failure can rapidly become unstable. If a radiological effusion is present in patients with acute pericarditis, pericardiocentesis may decrease the mortality of the patient.

**Conclusion.** Pericardial effusion can rapidly become life-threatening in patients with acute renal failure. Emergency pericardiocentesis before RRT may reduce mortality in the presence of radiological cardiac effusion, even if no cardiac tamponade occurs clinically.
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