ACADEMIC PUBLICATION SET

VIEN GUT MODEL

Integrated Outpatient Care for Complex Chronic Multimorbidity

Part B — Operational Model

Vien Gut Model — Academic Publication Set

DOCUMENT B.5
ENABLING CONDITIONS AND PRIORITISATION PRINCIPLES

When Complex Chronic Multimorbidity Co-exists in a Single Patient — Managing Companion Diseases Not to Achieve Independent Targets — But to Keep the Window of Opportunity Open

Vien Gut Model — Academic Publication Set
First Systematic Compilation — March 2026
Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

AUTHORS & ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

Nguyen Dinh Quang
Independent medical researcher | Founder of Vien Gut | Principal architect of the HOW — DATA-to-operate / operational layer

---

HOW AND DATA-TO-OPERATE DESIGN TEAM — VIEN GUT

Nguyen Dinh Quang Huy HOW — DATA-to-operate co-design | System operations management, transfer coordination
Huynh Phuoc Dai, Nguyen Son, **Nguyen Son** Patient-facing language editing | Communications data management, deployment and transfer support

---

ACADEMIC SUPPORT & WHAT (GUIDELINE) BENCHMARKING — INTERNATIONAL EXPERT GROUP

Nicola Dalbeth Co-author of ACR 2012 and 2020 Recommendations.
Thomas Bardin, Pascal Richette, **Pascal Richette** Co-authors of EULAR Recommendations — with specialists at Université Paris Cité and Sorbonne University. WHAT transfer, international benchmarking; HOW design support.

DATA GOVERNANCE TEAM — VIEN GUT

Truong Anh Duong, Huynh Hong Duc, **Huynh Hong Duc** Data governance, transfer support
Le Viet Anh Data governance — Vien Gut

TREATING PHYSICIANS + MULTIDISCIPLINARY CLINICAL TEAM — VIEN GUT POLYCLINIC

Clinical HOW deployment: risk stratification, window of opportunity, longitudinal follow-up, risk management, polypharmacy governance, safety referral valve activation.

RESEARCH SITE

Franco-Vietnamese Centre for Gout and Chronic Disease Research, Vien Gut Polyclinic, 13A Hong Ha Street, Tan Son Hoa Ward, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

1. Clinical Context — A Global Challenge Without a Systemic Solution

At any clinic — from a commune health station to a university hospital — physicians increasingly encounter patients who carry not just one chronic disease but simultaneously bear multiple severe chronic diseases, spanning multiple specialties, at varying damage levels, within a single depleted body, across different age groups [1],[2].

Barnett et al. (Lancet 2012) demonstrated in over 1.7 million patients in Scotland: multimorbidity is not the exception — it is the rule. Over 42% of all adults had at least two chronic conditions; this rose above 80% in those over 80. Notably, in low-income groups (equivalent to LMICs), chronic multimorbidity appeared 10–15 years earlier than in high-income groups — manifesting as early as ages 40–50 [1].

WHO (2023) estimates over 60% of the global disease burden comes from non-communicable chronic diseases, and the majority involve multimorbidity. Yet the entire clinical medicine system — from physician training, specialty organisation, guideline development to research design — remains organised along the single-disease model [1],[2],[3].

This gap is not an individual physician's difficulty — it is an architectural gap in global medicine

General practitioners: encounter multimorbid patients daily but have no operating tools to coordinate multiple severe diseases simultaneously.

Deep specialists: have profound knowledge of one disease, but their specialty's guideline does not describe HOW when the patient simultaneously has 3–4 severe diseases from other specialties.

Health systems: organised by specialty — patients move between specialties but no one holds the 'whole picture', no one bears final responsibility for the entire treatment plan [2],[3].

This is not a challenge exclusive to low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). High-income countries face the same structural gap — their advantage lies only in the number of specialists available, not in a systemic solution.

Yet after years of acknowledging this gap, global medicine still has no operational model — no HOW — capable of systematically managing complex chronic multimorbidity in a single patient on an outpatient basis.

2. Naming — What Is 'Complex Chronic Multimorbidity in a Single Patient'?

Multimorbidity (WHO 2016; Barnett et al. Lancet 2012 [1]): the simultaneous presence of two or more chronic diseases in a single patient. Vien Gut uses the threshold of ≥4 severe diseases with target-organ damage to distinguish 'complex' from simple comorbidity — consistent with 'highly complex multimorbidity' in the international literature.

Multimorbidity (WHO 2016; Barnett et al. Lancet 2012 [1]): the simultaneous presence of two or more chronic diseases in a single patient. Vien Gut uses the threshold of ≥4 severe diseases with target-organ damage to distinguish 'complex' from simple comorbidity — consistent with 'highly complex multimorbidity' in the international literature.*(WHO 2016; Barnett et al. Lancet 2012 [1])*

The simultaneous presence of two or more chronic diseases in a single patient.

2.1 Seven Dimensions of Complexity

2.1 Seven Dimensions of Complexity

#	Complexity Dimension	Typical Clinical Manifestation
1	**Multi-specialty**	Patient requires ≥3–4 different specialties (gout/rheumatology, nephrology, cardiology, gastroenterology–hepatology, endocrinology) — no specialty can treat in isolation [1].
2	**Multi-severity**	Each disease is not mild — ≥2–3 are at advanced/end stage (CKD G4–G5, HFrEF EF <40%, cirrhosis Child–Pugh B/C, destructive tophaceous gout) [7].
3	**Multiple pathological spirals**	Diseases interconnect and amplify one another: CKD makes gout harder to control, gout accelerates CKD; heart failure worsens anaemia, anaemia worsens heart failure. One axis deteriorating drags others down [7],[8].
4	**Multiple metabolic derangements**	Hyperuricaemia, dyslipidaemia, insulin resistance/diabetes, chronic electrolyte disorders (K^+, Na^+, HCO_3^-), lactic acidosis, hypoalbuminaemia — intertwined and simultaneously affecting the safety margin of most drugs [7].
5	**Multiple functional impairments**	eGFR <30, EF <35%, FibroScan LSM >12 kPa, albumin <3 g/dL — functional indices declining simultaneously. Each narrows the drug safety margin; combined, the margin becomes extremely thin [7],[8].
6	**Multiple chronic organ damage**	Renal (glomerular/tubular fibrosis), cardiac (remodelling, myocardial fibrosis), hepatic (fibrosis, reduced protein synthesis), articular/tendinous (destructive tophi, bone erosion) — simultaneous, irreversible, only progression-delayable [7].
7	**Survival-axis threat**	≥1 of four axes (cardiac–renal–hepatic–metabolic) at a decompensation threshold that may be life-threatening: acute decompensated HF, hepatorenal syndrome (HRS), dangerous hyperkalaemia, severe hyponatraemia, adrenal crisis. Any event on one axis can collapse the others [7],[8].

2.2 Age and Physical Status — Additional Factors Narrowing the Window of Opportunity

This patient group does not appear only in the elderly. At Vien Gut, complex multimorbidity patients span from 35 to 80+ years of age. The common denominator is not age but the number and severity of simultaneously active diseases.

Frailty (sarcopenia, malnutrition, low albumin) is a factor that narrows the safety margin — making every drug interaction and every dose adjustment more dangerous.

3. Is This Patient Group Represented in the Evidence Pyramid?

The core answer is: virtually not. Not because medicine has lacked effort, but because the evidence pyramid is structured within a reference frame different from the reality of this patient group [9],[10],[11].

3.1 RCTs — Where This Group Is Systematically Excluded

Boyd et al. (2010) showed: over 80% of clinical trials on common chronic diseases excluded severely multimorbid patients; over 70% excluded CKD patients; over 50% excluded severe heart-failure patients [9],[10]. The evidence was generated under conditions that excluded precisely the most complex patients — and that evidence is what physicians must use when encountering this group in practice.

Result: evidence is generated under conditions that systematically exclude exactly those patients who need it most.

Reference-Frame Mismatch (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7])*Reference-Frame Mismatch (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7])*

Guidelines are designed within Reference Frame (1): single disease, selected patients, short follow-up. Clinical reality is Reference Frame (2): multimorbidity over time, complex patients excluded from RCTs. Applying a guideline from RF(1) to RF(2) is not applying it incorrectly — it is applying it to a zone the guideline was not designed to be correct in.

3.2 Summary: Position in the Evidence Pyramid

RCTs: systematically excluded — no Level I evidence. Cohort studies: appear as a minority subgroup — thin evidence, insufficient for HOW guideline development. Case reports: described — but not generalisable. Guidelines: built from Level I/II evidence of selected populations — and silent on integrated HOW when multiple guidelines conflict. Consequence: the most complex patients — with the highest medical needs — are the group least served by the evidence. This is a clinical blind zone [7],[9],[11].

Case reports cover this group — but do not generate generalisable evidence.

RCTs: systematically excluded — no Level I evidence. Cohort studies: appear as a minority subgroup — thin evidence, insufficient for HOW guideline development. Case reports: described — but not generalisable. Guidelines: built from Level I/II evidence of selected populations — and silent on integrated HOW when multiple guidelines conflict. Consequence: the most complex patients — with the highest medical needs — are the group least served by the evidence. This is a clinical blind zone [7],[9],[11].

RCTs: systematically excluded — no Level I evidence.

Cohort studies: appear as a minority subgroup — thin evidence, insufficient for guidelines.

Case reports: described — but cannot be generalised.

Guidelines: built from Level I/II evidence of selected patient populations — do not cover complex multimorbidity.

Consequence: the most complex patients — with the highest medical need — are the group with the least evidence and the least guidance.

4. The Guideline Paradox — Why Even Expert Physicians Cannot Resolve the Conflict

4.1 How Do Single-Disease Guidelines Conflict?

When a patient presents simultaneously with severe gout + CKD G4 + HFrEF + cirrhosis Child–Pugh B, the physician faces an incompatible treatment map [2],[7],[12]:

Conflict Scenario	Guideline A Prescribes	Guideline B Prescribes	Result If Both Followed
Acute gout flare on CKD + HF	EULAR: colchicine or NSAIDs or corticosteroid	KDIGO + ESC: NSAIDs absolutely contraindicated;	Colchicine is the only option — but must be dose-reduced per eGFR. No guideline

		corticosteroid worsens HF	describes the specific dose when eGFR <20 + concurrent cirrhosis [7],[12].
Initiating ULT when CKD G4	ACR/EULAR: increase allopurinol until sUA <6 mg/dL	KDIGO: allopurinol cautious in CKD; oxypurinol accumulation risk	Titration speed and maximum dose undefined for CKD G4 + concurrent cirrhosis. No guideline covers this intersection [7].
Oedema control in HF + cirrhosis	ESC: high-dose loop diuretics, may increase	EASL: refractory diuretics → HRS risk, hypo-Na^+/K^+	No guideline describes a specific safe diuretic threshold when HF + cirrhosis co-exist with CKD. 'Titrate carefully' is the entire available guidance [7],[13].
Renal protection in CKD + HF	KDIGO: ACEi/ARB as renal-protection foundation	ESC: ACEi/ARB reduces preload — but hypokalaemia risk when combined with diuretics	ACEi/ARB needed for both — but safe potassium, creatinine and blood-pressure thresholds with concurrent cirrhosis are undefined in any guideline [7],[14].

4.2 Why Can't a Guideline Covering This Group Be Designed?

The number of possible disease combinations on a single patient grows exponentially with disease count. With 10 common chronic diseases, 2-disease combinations number 45, 4-disease combinations 210, 6-disease combinations 210 — totalling thousands of combinations, each with multiple severity levels per disease. There are not enough RCTs, not enough time, not enough budget to generate evidence for each combination [10].

The number of possible disease combinations on a single patient grows exponentially with disease count. With 10 common chronic diseases, 2-disease combinations number 45, 4-disease combinations 210, 6-disease combinations 210 — totalling thousands of combinations, each with multiple severity levels per disease. There are not enough RCTs, not enough time, not enough budget to generate evidence for each combination [10].

Guideline Paradox (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7]; Tinetti 2004 NEJM [12]) *Guideline Paradox (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7]; Tinetti 2004 NEJM [12])*

A common but rarely named situation: guidelines are built to deliver correct, safe treatment — but when applied to complex multimorbid patients, 'following the guideline correctly' disease by disease can lead to an overall reference-frame error. Consequence: conflicting treatment targets, escalating polypharmacy–interactions–toxicity, and the patient sliding faster into decompensation. The paradox is not the guideline's fault — it is the inevitable consequence when a guideline is applied outside the zone it was designed to be correct in.

4.3 Why Can't Expert Multidisciplinary Consultation Solve It?

When a complex multimorbid patient is discussed by expert specialists from multiple disciplines, each brings full specialist knowledge. But the consultation structure itself is insufficient because it lacks three structural elements: (1) No shared timeline — each specialty tracks its disease's evolution on its own timescale; no one sees all axes' time series simultaneously. (2) No final decision-maker — when specialty A's decision conflicts with specialty B, no one has the authority and information to make an integrated decision. (3) No continuous response mechanism — consultation occurs at a single point, not continuously; events between consultations fall into a structural gap [7],[15].

When a complex multimorbid patient is discussed by expert specialists from multiple disciplines, each brings full specialist knowledge. But the consultation structure itself is insufficient because it lacks three structural elements: (1) No shared timeline — each specialty tracks its disease's evolution on its own timescale; no one sees all axes' time series simultaneously. (2) No final decision-maker — when specialty A's decision conflicts with specialty B, no one has the authority and information to make an integrated decision. (3) No continuous response mechanism — consultation occurs at a single point, not continuously; events between consultations fall into a structural gap [7],[15].

(1) No shared timeline: each specialty tracks the progression of its own disease on a separate timeline — nobody sees the overall trajectory.

(2) No final decision-maker: when a decision by specialty A conflicts with specialty B, there is no person or mechanism to make the trade-off and take responsibility.

(3) No continuous response mechanism: the consultation occurs at one point in time, but the patient's condition changes continuously — no system monitors the cascading effects of decisions in real time.

Structural Break Point*(Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7]; Grol & Grimshaw Lancet 2003 [15])*

The point in the EBM chain where the chain encounters an architectural limit — not the fault of any individual but an inherent design constraint of the system itself.

Both represent the farthest boundary the Vien Gut Model can maintain — protecting survival axes and opening a window of opportunity for conservative outpatient care. Both meet all seven complexity dimensions [7].

5. Two Anonymised Cases DTH and LAU — The Model's Ultimate Boundary

Both represent the farthest boundary the Vien Gut Model can maintain — protecting survival axes and opening a window of opportunity for conservative outpatient care. Both meet all seven complexity dimensions [7].

Why Vien Gut selected precisely these two cases, among thousands of treated patients:

Both represent the farthest boundary the Vien Gut Model can maintain — protecting survival axes and opening a window of opportunity for conservative outpatient care. Both meet all seven complexity dimensions [7].

Both threaten the survival axis: not ordinary severe patients — but patients at the decompensation threshold of ≥2 vital organ axes simultaneously.

Both are complex chronic multimorbidity across all 7 dimensions: multi-specialty, multi-drug, multi-organ, multi-guideline conflict, functional decline, chronic organ damage, survival-axis threat.

Both represent the ultimate boundary: the farthest limit the Vien Gut Model can maintain — if the model works here, it works in all less severe cases.

Precisely because they are the ultimate boundary, only these two cases can most clearly demonstrate the enabling conditions and conflict resolution principles described in this document.

5.1 Anonymised Case DTH

Anonymised Case DTHCirrhosis F4 Child–Pugh B + severe CKD + very severe anaemia + secondary adrenal insufficiency + destructive tophaceous gout.

Overall clinical picture:

Cirrhosis F4 Child–Pugh B + severe CKD + very severe anaemia + secondary adrenal insufficiency + destructive tophaceous gout.

Active pathological spiral:

Active pathological spiral: Cirrhosis → albumin decline → extremely narrow drug safety margin → cannot use NSAIDs/high-dose corticosteroids → uncontrolled gout flares → systemic inflammation → CKD progression → ULT dose reduction → crystal-free increasingly remote. Simultaneously: CKD → electrolyte retention → arrhythmia risk → acute cardiac decompensation → potential liver collapse (HRS). Hidden adrenal insufficiency → any physiological stress → multi-organ adrenal crisis.

If treated by fragmented model:

Vien Gut Model management — three prerequisites: (1) Detect and manage secondary adrenal insufficiency before anything else. (2) Every drug assessed simultaneously through the CKD + cirrhosis + adrenal insufficiency lens. (3) DATA-to-operate monitoring cortisol, K^+, Na^+, albumin, INR via time series — safety valve on standby.

Vien Gut Model management — three prerequisites:

Vien Gut Model management — three prerequisites: (1) Detect and manage secondary adrenal insufficiency before anything else. (2) Every drug assessed simultaneously through the CKD + cirrhosis + adrenal insufficiency lens. (3) DATA-to-operate monitoring cortisol, K^+, Na^+, albumin, INR via time series — safety valve on standby.

4-Year Longitudinal Results — Case DTH

Gout axis: AU 599→271–276 µmol/L (−54%). Tophi reduced 22–31%. No acute flares in 4 years.

Renal axis: eGFR(CysC) stable 10–11 ml/min — RRT not yet needed after 4 years.

Hepatic axis: Fibroscan 23→11 kPa (F4→F3). Grade III splenomegaly fully resolved. Ascites disappeared. GGT 397.1→87.1 U/L.

Enabling conditions: Hb 5.2→11–11.5 g/dL (+120%). Weight 54→65–67 kg (+24%). Adrenal crisis prevention plan never activated in 4 years.

→ DTH Case Report v5.4 CARE (Vien Gut, 2026) — Level IV, proof-of-concept.

→ DTH Case Report v5.4 CARE (Vien Gut, 2026) — Level IV, proof-of-concept.

5.2 Anonymised Case LAU

Anonymised Case LAUHFrEF + CKD + low cortisol + peripheral vascular disease + severe gout.

Overall clinical picture:

HFrEF + CKD + low cortisol + peripheral vascular disease + severe gout.

Typical drug–disease conflict on this case:

Typical drug–disease conflict: diuretic dose increase for cardiac oedema → uric acid rise + eGFR decline → ULT titration limited → crystal-free delayed. Beta-blocker needed for heart → masks hypoglycaemia when cortisol is low. NSAIDs needed for flare → absolutely contraindicated in CKD + HF. Every drug needed for one axis creates risk for another.

If treated by fragmented model:

Typical drug–disease conflict: diuretic dose increase for cardiac oedema → uric acid rise + eGFR decline → ULT titration limited → crystal-free delayed. Beta-blocker needed for heart → masks hypoglycaemia when cortisol is low. NSAIDs needed for flare → absolutely contraindicated in CKD + HF. Every drug needed for one axis creates risk for another.

Prerequisite to maintain the outpatient window:

Typical drug–disease conflict: diuretic dose increase for cardiac oedema → uric acid rise + eGFR decline → ULT titration limited → crystal-free delayed. Beta-blocker needed for heart → masks hypoglycaemia when cortisol is low. NSAIDs needed for flare → absolutely contraindicated in CKD + HF. Every drug needed for one axis creates risk for another.

6. Enabling Conditions — Definition, Classification and Pathological Spirals

6. Enabling Conditions — Definition, Classification and Pathological Spirals

Enabling Conditions (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7])*Enabling Conditions (Vien Gut Term — A.4 Group C [7])*

Comorbidities managed as prerequisites for the four verification targets to be achieved safely — not as independent targets. The 'sufficiently controlled' threshold is not the single-disease guideline's ideal threshold but the minimum safe threshold adjusted to the specific multimorbidity context.

Enabling Condition	Mechanism Group	Directly Affected Verification Targets
Diabetes mellitus	Metabolic – Small vessel	Accelerates CKD (T2); increases CV decompensation risk via diabetic cardiomyopathy (T3); raises uric acid via insulin resistance (T1) [3],[16].
Hypertension	Haemodynamic – Target organ	Direct renal damage via glomerular hyperfiltration (T2); cardiac remodelling → CV decompensation (T3) [4], [14].
Chronic anaemia	Tissue oxygenation – Cardiac load	Worsens HF via compensatory cardiac output increase (T3); narrows safety margin for most interventions [5].
Corticosteroid-induced adrenal insufficiency (GIAI)	Endocrine – Stress response	Adrenal crisis risk under physiological stress; simultaneous interactions with glucose, electrolytes and blood pressure [6].
Chronic electrolyte disorders (K^+, Na^+, HCO_3^-)	Homeostasis – Cardiac rhythm	Hypokalaemia increases arrhythmia risk (T3); chronic metabolic acidosis accelerates CKD (T2); hyponatraemia reduces cirrhosis re-compensation chance (T4) [4].
Malnutrition / hypoalbuminaemia	Survival reserve – Drug margin	Low albumin narrows safety margin for most protein-bound drugs (all 4 targets); determines cirrhosis re-compensation capacity (T4) [8],[17].
Dyslipidaemia	Atherosclerosis – Large vessel	Accelerates atherosclerosis → CV decompensation (T3); indirect CKD impact via renal vascular damage; statin interaction with cirrhosis (T4) [7].
Hyperuricaemia without clinical gout	Purine metabolism – Renal – Cardiac	Independently associated with CKD progression and increased CV risk (T2, T3); monitored as enabling condition, not independent target [7],[18].

6.1 Pathological Spirals — Why Enabling Conditions Are Not Independent

6.1 Pathological Spirals — Why Enabling Conditions Are Not Independent

Initiating Spiral	Amplifying Axis	Consequence for Window of Opportunity
Chronic anaemia → increased cardiac load	HF worsens → diuretic increase → K^+ drop	Arrhythmia risk; acute cardiac decompensation interrupts ULT → gout flare → corticosteroid → hyperglycaemia → CKD acceleration [4],[5].

CKD progression → reduced uric acid excretion	SU rises → flare → inflammation → further renal damage	Self-amplifying gout–kidney spiral: insufficient ULT dose due to nephrotoxicity fear → crystal-free unachievable [3],[5].
Decompensated cirrhosis → albumin decline → oedema	Refractory diuretics → Na^+/K^+ drop → HRS	Maximum narrowing of drug safety margin. Any intervention risks collapsing another axis [8],[17].
GIAI → physiological stress	Cortisol crisis → hypoglycaemia, hypotension	Most hidden enabling condition: no warning symptoms. If undetected beforehand → window of opportunity closes abruptly [6].

7. Disease–Disease / Drug–Disease Conflict Resolution — The Prerequisite Necessary Condition of HOW

Conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE step BEFORE the treatment plan is built — integrated into the phase-based planning process from the very first encounter (see B.1, B.2). The Clinical Conductor applies four consistent principles: (1) Determine urgency level. (2) Prioritise vital organs: Heart → Kidney → Liver → remaining enabling conditions. (3) Choose the intervention least harmful to the opposing axis. (4) Every decision includes a specific monitoring SLA [7].

Why conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE — not a supplement

Conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE step BEFORE the treatment plan is built — integrated into the phase-based planning process from the very first encounter (see B.1, B.2). The Clinical Conductor applies four consistent principles: (1) Determine urgency level. (2) Prioritise vital organs: Heart → Kidney → Liver → remaining enabling conditions. (3) Choose the intervention least harmful to the opposing axis. (4) Every decision includes a specific monitoring SLA [7].

Conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE step BEFORE the treatment plan is built — integrated into the phase-based planning process from the very first encounter (see B.1, B.2). The Clinical Conductor applies four consistent principles: (1) Determine urgency level. (2) Prioritise vital organs: Heart → Kidney → Liver → remaining enabling conditions. (3) Choose the intervention least harmful to the opposing axis. (4) Every decision includes a specific monitoring SLA [7].

Conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE step BEFORE the treatment plan is built — integrated into the phase-based planning process from the very first encounter (see B.1, B.2). The Clinical Conductor applies four consistent principles: (1) Determine urgency level. (2) Prioritise vital organs: Heart → Kidney → Liver → remaining enabling conditions. (3) Choose the intervention least harmful to the opposing axis. (4) Every decision includes a specific monitoring SLA [7].

7.1 Conflict-Resolution Matrix — 8 Typical Clinical Pairs

Conflict resolution is a PREREQUISITE step BEFORE the treatment plan is built — integrated into the phase-based planning process from the very first encounter (see B.1, B.2). The Clinical Conductor applies four consistent principles: (1) Determine urgency level. (2) Prioritise vital organs: Heart → Kidney → Liver → remaining enabling conditions. (3) Choose the intervention least harmful to the opposing axis. (4) Every decision includes a specific monitoring SLA [7].

	Axis A (Higher Priority)	Axis B (To Protect)	Resolution Principle	Specific Action
1	**Increase ULT per T2T**	CKD G3b–G4: oxypurinol accumulation	**Kidney > ULT speed**	Febuxostat preferred; allopurinol ultra-slow titration, creatinine

				monitored every 4 weeks [5],[7].
2	**Diuretics for HF oedema**	CKD: GFR decline; gout: uric acid rise	**Heart > temporary GFR**	Add spironolactone/eplerenone to reduce furosemide dose needed; monitor uric acid in parallel [4],[7].
3	**NSAIDs for acute gout flare**	CKD + HF: absolute contraindication	**CKD + Heart > pain relief**	Lowest effective colchicine dose per eGFR; short-course low-dose prednisolone if colchicine limited [2],[7].
4	**ACEi/ARB renal protection**	Cirrhosis: hypotension, HRS	**Decompensated cirrhosis > CKD**	Defer ACEi/ARB when Child–Pugh B/C decompensated; reassess after re-compensation [8], [17].
5	**Short-course corticosteroid for flare**	DM: hyperglycaemia; Adrenal: GIAI risk	**DM > corticosteroid convenience**	If used: minimum dose, glucose monitored 2–3×/day, insulin adjustment prepared. Prefer colchicine [6],[7].
6	**Statin for CV risk**	Cirrhosis Child–Pugh C: hepatotoxicity	**Cirrhosis C > statin**	Defer statin when Child–Pugh C; monitor ALT/AST if used at stable Child–Pugh B [17].
7	**Increase ULT to sUA <5**	Cirrhosis: reduced drug metabolism	**Cirrhosis > ULT speed**	Febuxostat absolutely preferred with cirrhosis; no allopurinol at Child–Pugh C [7],[17].
8	**Beta-blocker for HF**	Masks hypoglycaemia when cortisol low	**Heart > hidden hypoglycaemia risk**	Measure cortisol before and during beta-blocker use; educate patient on asymptomatic hypoglycaemia recognition [6].

7.2 Conflict Resolution Principles in the Context of Pathological Spirals

When resolving conflicts, cascading effects must be considered — not just individual pairs
Resolving conflict pair A–B is insufficient if the impact of that solution on axes C, D, E is not assessed.

Example: resolving flare–CKD conflict with colchicine is correct — but if the patient is also taking beta-blockers for HF and has low cortisol, colchicine may mask hypoglycaemia symptoms and trigger an adrenal crisis.

HOW requires: every conflict resolution decision must be evaluated across the full matrix of all active axes — not just the pair in question.

8. HOW + DATA-to-operate Expanding the Safety Margin — Three Multi-Centre Verification Targets

8. HOW + DATA-to-operate Expanding the Safety Margin — Three Multi-Centre Verification Targets

Verification Target	Characteristic Conflicts	HOW + DATA Expanding the Window
Target 2: Dialysis deferral (CKD end-stage) — multi-centre invitation **Dialysis deferral** End-stage CKD *(multi-centre verification invitation)*	ULT accumulates oxypurinol; ACEi/ARB increases K^+; diuretics reduce GFR; NSAIDs impossible; corticosteroid worsens HTN and DM [5], [10].	DATA-to-operate monitors eGFR, K^+, SU via time series → distinguishes 'temporary GFR decline' from 'true CKD progression'. Dynamic safety margin: maintain ACEi/ARB and ULT at adjusted thresholds rather than stopping entirely. Vien Gut observation: eGFR 10–14 stable >12 months with tight structured operations [7].
Target 3: CV decompensation reduction (chronic HF) — multi-centre invitation **Cardiac decompensation reduction** Chronic heart failure *(multi-centre verification invitation)*	Diuretics increase uric acid + reduce GFR; beta-blocker masks hypoglycaemia; NSAIDs impossible; gout flare is a systemic inflammation trigger for cardiac decompensation [4],[10].	Spironolactone/eplerenone combined to reduce furosemide dose → reduced impact on uric acid and GFR. Colchicine replaces NSAIDs. DATA-to-operate monitors weight, oedema, electrolytes + SU + flares simultaneously. Measurable endpoint: reduced HF decompensation hospitalisation frequency [7].
Target 4: Cirrhosis re-compensation (end-stage decompensated) — multi-centre invitation **Cirrhosis recompensation** End-stage decompensated cirrhosis *(multi-centre verification invitation)*	NSAIDs and most drugs contraindicated; statin contraindicated at Child C; low albumin maximally narrows margin; refractory diuretics; any infection triggers decompensation [9],[17].	DATA-to-operate monitors albumin, INR, bilirubin, weight, waist circumference, Na^+ via time series. Febuxostat replaces allopurinol; lowest-dose colchicine. Vien Gut observation: Child–Pugh B stable and ULT initiation feasible in selected cases with tight structured operations [7],[9].

MULTI-CENTRE VERIFICATION INVITATION — From the Vien Gut Model

Hypothesis: With HOW + DATA-to-operate capable of structured and continuous disease–disease/drug–disease conflict resolution, the rate of maintained conservative outpatient treatment, the rate of RRT deferral, and the rate of clinical stability will be significantly higher than usual care in LMICs.

The Vien Gut Model sincerely invites gout, nephrology, cardiology and hepatology centres in Vietnam and the region to participate in multi-centre verification — especially in settings where the outpatient HOW gap is the most practical break point of treatment [7].

The Vien Gut Model sincerely invites gout, nephrology, cardiology and hepatology centres in Vietnam and the

region to participate in multi-centre verification — especially in settings where the outpatient HOW gap is the most practical break point of treatment [7].

9. Enabling-Condition Control Thresholds per Updated Guidelines

9. Enabling-Condition Control Thresholds per Updated Guidelines

Enabling Condition	Ideal Threshold (Single Disease)	Practical Multimorbidity Threshold	Safety-Valve Activation Threshold
HbA1c (DM)	<7% (ADA/ESC)	<8–8.5% when multimorbid	HbA1c >9% + symptoms → SLA 48h | Severe hypoglycaemia → SLA 4h [3].
Systolic BP	<130 mmHg (ESC 2021)	<140 mmHg when CKD+Cirrhosis	BP >180/110 → SLA 4h | BP <90/60 with CKD+Cirrhosis → SLA 4h [4].
Haemoglobin	≥12 g/dL (F) / ≥13 (M)	Hb ≥9 g/dL acceptable	Hb <7 g/dL → SLA 12h | Hb <8 + cardiac symptoms → SLA 4h [5].
Serum K^+	3.5–5.0 mmol/L	3.5–5.5 mmol/L in CKD	K^+ >6.0 → SLA 4h | K^+ <3.0 + HF → SLA 4h [4],[14].
Albumin	≥4 g/dL	≥3 g/dL sustained stable	Albumin <2.8 → SLA 48h | <2.5 + ascites → SLA 24h [8],[17].
Morning cortisol	≥18–20 µg/dL	Individualised per corticosteroid history	Cortisol <3 µg/dL → SLA 4h | Crisis symptoms → emergency management [6].

10. Special Case — Glucocorticoid-Induced Adrenal Insufficiency (GIAI)

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

GIAI — four mandatory operational points in the Vien Gut Model

Four mandatory operational points: (1) Mandatory GIAI screening: any patient with history of prednisolone ≥5 mg/day for ≥4 weeks in the past 12 months → measure morning cortisol before 9 AM. (2) Action threshold: cortisol <3 µg/dL → suspected severe GIAI, urgent endocrine consultation. (3) Stress-dose plan: any GIAI patient needing surgery, invasive procedure or severe illness → hydrocortisone stress dose per protocol, without waiting for test results. (4) GIAI conflict resolution: GIAI simultaneously affects glucose, electrolytes and blood pressure — every medication change affecting these three parameters must be evaluated through the GIAI lens [6],[7].

Four mandatory operational points: (1) Mandatory GIAI screening: any patient with history of prednisolone ≥5 mg/day for ≥4 weeks in the past 12 months → measure morning cortisol before 9 AM. (2) Action threshold: cortisol <3 µg/dL → suspected severe GIAI, urgent endocrine consultation. (3) Stress-dose plan: any GIAI patient needing surgery, invasive procedure or severe illness → hydrocortisone stress dose per protocol, without waiting for test results. (4) GIAI conflict resolution: GIAI simultaneously affects glucose, electrolytes

and blood pressure — every medication change affecting these three parameters must be evaluated through the GIAI lens [6],[7].

Four mandatory operational points: (1) Mandatory GIAI screening: any patient with history of prednisolone ≥5 mg/day for ≥4 weeks in the past 12 months → measure morning cortisol before 9 AM. (2) Action threshold: cortisol <3 µg/dL → suspected severe GIAI, urgent endocrine consultation. (3) Stress-dose plan: any GIAI patient needing surgery, invasive procedure or severe illness → hydrocortisone stress dose per protocol, without waiting for test results. (4) GIAI conflict resolution: GIAI simultaneously affects glucose, electrolytes and blood pressure — every medication change affecting these three parameters must be evaluated through the GIAI lens [6],[7].

Four mandatory operational points: (1) Mandatory GIAI screening: any patient with history of prednisolone ≥5 mg/day for ≥4 weeks in the past 12 months → measure morning cortisol before 9 AM. (2) Action threshold: cortisol <3 µg/dL → suspected severe GIAI, urgent endocrine consultation. (3) Stress-dose plan: any GIAI patient needing surgery, invasive procedure or severe illness → hydrocortisone stress dose per protocol, without waiting for test results. (4) GIAI conflict resolution: GIAI simultaneously affects glucose, electrolytes and blood pressure — every medication change affecting these three parameters must be evaluated through the GIAI lens [6],[7].

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

GIAI is a special enabling condition because: (1) no symptoms until the event occurs; (2) extremely common in severe gout patients using corticosteroids for flare control; and (3) risk of sudden multi-organ decompensation under physiological stress [6],[7].

→ DTH Case Report v5.4 CARE (Vien Gut, 2026) — Level IV, proof-of-concept.

11. Enabling Conditions in DATA-to-operate — Monitoring Rhythm and Activation Thresholds

11. Enabling Conditions in DATA-to-operate — Monitoring Rhythm and Activation Thresholds

Data Group	Tier T1–T2	Tier T3–T4	Signal Triggering Rhythm Shortening
Metabolic (HbA1c, glucose, lipids)	Every 3 months	Every 4–6 weeks	Glucose >250 mg/dL ×2; HbA1c increase >1.5% vs prior [3],[7].
Electrolytes (K^+, Na^+, HCO_3^-)	Every 4–6 weeks	Every 1–2 weeks	K^+ >5.5 or <3.2; Na^+ <130; HCO_3^- <18 mmol/L [4],[7].
Haematology (Hb, MCV, ferritin)	Every 3 months	Every 6–8 weeks	Hb drop >1.5 g/dL in 4 weeks; Hb <8 g/dL [5],[7].
Liver function (albumin, INR, bilirubin)	Every 4–6 weeks	Every 2 weeks	Albumin drop >0.5 g/dL in 4 weeks; INR increase >0.5 vs baseline [8],[17].

Morning cortisol (GIAI screening)	1×/year if corticosteroid history	Every 3–6 months	Cortisol <3 µg/dL at any time; suspected GIAI symptoms [6],[7].
Visual longitudinal data (photo, video)	Every follow-up	Every follow-up	Abnormal change in tophi, oedema, or body habitus vs prior [7].

12. Evidence-Level and Inference-Level Declaration

Declaration Type	Content	Evidence Level / Source
International evidence	Enabling-condition definitions, control thresholds, typical disease–disease conflicts	Level B–C from single-disease guidelines (EULAR, ACR, ESC, KDIGO, EASL) — extrapolated to multimorbidity context [1]–[17].
Clinical inference	Conflict-resolution matrix, prioritisation principles, DATA-to-operate rhythm	Inferred from single-disease evidence + 18 years of accumulated clinical observation at Vien Gut. No RCT covers this patient group [7].
Practice observation	Cases DTH, LAU; observations on stable eGFR, Child–Pugh B initiating ULT	Clinical observation from integrated practice at Vien Gut — not yet multi-centre verified. Basis for verification proposal [7].
Verification hypothesis	Three multi-centre targets: CKD G5, chronic HF, decompensated cirrhosis	Evidence Level D (single-centre observation) — needs elevation via multi-centre verification [7].

13. Scope Limitations

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline

treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

This document does NOT include: detailed treatment protocols for each enabling condition (scope of respective specialty guidelines); practice guidance for single-disease patients without inter-guideline treatment conflicts; randomised clinical trials (B.5 describes HOW and proposes verification hypotheses, not substitutes for RCTs); inpatient emergency treatment (B.5 focuses on conservative outpatient management; inpatient treatment belongs to the safety referral valve scope, see B.2); or definitions of the four verification targets and detailed T2T thresholds (fully described in Part C, C.1–C.4).

14. Position within the Vien Gut Document System

Document B.5 is the enabling-conditions and prioritisation axis of Part B. It provides the conflict-resolution matrix and enabling-condition control thresholds that the Clinical Conductor uses throughout all four treatment phases (B.2). It concretises how HOW + DATA-to-operate expand the safety margin defined by B.3's necessary–sufficient conditions. Without enabling-condition control and disease–disease conflict resolution, the four Part C verification targets cannot be sustainably achieved.

Document	Title & Focus	Link to B.5
B.1	First visit — trigger point for the integrated four-axis operational system	B.1 identifies enabling conditions in the minimum safety core; B.5 defines thresholds and conflict matrix.
B.2	Phase-based treatment and longitudinal monitoring — simultaneous four-axis T2T	B.2 defines phases and follow-up rhythm; B.5 provides prioritisation principles and conflict resolution matrix.
B.3	Necessary and sufficient conditions to find the window of opportunity	B.3 defines the window of opportunity; B.5 specifies how HOW+DATA expands the safety margin.
B.4	Patient role — operational framework from the patient and family perspective	Patient participation capacity (B.4) directly affects enabling-condition control — B.5 takes this as a variable.
B.5	**Enabling conditions and prioritisation principles when complex chronic multimorbidity co-exists**	Comorbidity control framework as prerequisites; pathological spirals; conflict resolution; control thresholds.
Part A	Academic foundations — A.4 Operational Concept Set / A.5 Glossary	B.5 directly uses concepts from A.4: guideline paradox, reference-frame mismatch, structural break point.
Part C	Four verification targets on target organs — the core of the publication set	Enabling conditions controlled = foundation for Part C; uncontrolled = safety margin too narrow.

15. Conclusion

Patients with complex chronic multimorbidity — simultaneously carrying four to seven severe diseases across multiple specialties, with multiple pathological spirals, multiple functional impairments, and survival-axis threats — are a group not served by any single-disease guideline and systematically excluded from the modern medical evidence pyramid. This is not a small gap — it is an architectural gap in global medicine [1],[7],[11].

The guideline paradox and the structural break point of the EBM chain explain why even when multiple expert physicians collaborate, the patient remains at risk of falling into a zone where no one decides — and decompensation-related survival threats persist [7],[12],[15].

The Vien Gut Model proposes an architectural solution: adding a HOW layer (structured clinical operating processes) and DATA-to-operate (longitudinal data triggering real-time decisions) to the EBM chain — rather than merely improving the implementation of existing guidelines. When enabling conditions are managed as an interconnected system, when disease–disease/drug–disease conflict resolution is a prerequisite before every treatment decision, and when DATA-to-operate monitors via time series — the conservative outpatient window of opportunity can be held wider and longer than with usual care [7].

Three of the Vien Gut Model's four verification targets — dialysis deferral, cardiovascular decompensation reduction, and end-stage decompensated cirrhosis re-compensation — are a multi-centre verification invitation to the Vietnamese and LMIC healthcare community [7].

References

[1] Barnett K et al. Lancet. 2012;380(9836):37–43.
[2] FitzGerald JD et al. Arthritis Care Res. 2020;72(6):744–760.
[3] ADA. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes 2024. Diabetes Care. 2024;47(Suppl 1).
[4] McDonagh TA et al. Eur Heart J. 2021;42(36):3599–3726.
[5] KDIGO. 2024 CKD Guideline. Kidney Int. 2024.
[6] Charmandari E et al. Lancet. 2014;383(9935):2152–2167.
[7] Nguyen Dinh Quang. A.4, A.5 — Vien Gut Academic Publication Set. 2026.
[8] Wagner EH et al. Health Aff. 2001;20(6):64–78.
[9] Caraceni P et al. Lancet. 2018;391(10138):2417–2429.
[10] Boyd CM, Fortin M. Public Health Rev. 2010;32(2):451–474.
[11] Guyatt G et al. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(4):383–394.
[12] Tinetti ME et al. N Engl J Med. 2004;351(27):2870–2874.
[13] WHO. Integrated care for older people. 2017.
[14] KDIGO. 2021 Glomerular Diseases Guideline. Kidney Int. 2021.
[15] Grol R, Grimshaw J. Lancet. 2003;362(9391):1225–1230.
[16] Richette P et al. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017;76(1):29–42.
[17] EASL. J Hepatol. 2022;77(3):807–855.
[18] Borghi C et al. J Hypertens. 2015;33(9):1729–1741.

PRACTICE PROVENANCE

2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.

2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised

conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.

2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.

2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.

2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.2007–2010: Building the integrated outpatient model; first observations on pathological spirals and single-disease guideline limits. 2014: Contact with Prof. Thomas Bardin (EULAR); confirmed the global HOW gap. 2017–2021: Systematised conflict-resolution matrix, enabling-condition thresholds and DATA-to-operate rhythm from real clinical case series. 2025–2026: Full academic publication set compiled — including this Document B.5 — for multi-centre verification proposal.

Evidence basis: 18 years of integrated clinical practice at Vien Gut — Nguyen Dinh Quang (2007–2025).