1	Comparison of the carotid corrected flow time and tidal volume challenge for assessing
2	fluid responsiveness in robot-assisted laparoscopic surgery
3	
4	Short Title: Carotid flow time for assessing fluid responsiveness
5	
6	Xixi Tang, MD <sup>1</sup> ¶, Qi Chen, MD <sup>1</sup> ¶, Zejun Huang, MD <sup>2</sup> , Ran An, MD <sup>1</sup> , Jingqiu Liang, MD <sup>3</sup> ,
7	Hongliang Liu, MD, PhD <sup>1*</sup>
8	
9	<sup>1</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, China
10	<sup>2</sup> Department of Ultrasound, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, China
11	<sup>3</sup> Chongqing Cancer Multi-Omics Big Data Application Engineering Research Center,
12	Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, China
13	
14	*Corresponding Author:
15	E-mail: <u>liuhl75@cqu.edu.cn (HL)</u>
16	
17	<sup>¶</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

#### 23 **Conflicts of Interest:** None

24

Funding: This work was supported by the Laboratory Open Fund of Chongqing University
Cancer Hospital (2022); Chongqing medical scientific research project (Joint project of
Chongqing Health Commission and Science and Technology Bureau 2023MSXM125)

28

### 29 Authors' contributions

Q.C.: This author contributed to the study design, data analysis, and manuscript writing. XX.T.: This author contributed to patient recruitment, ultrasound procedures, and data collection. ZJ.H.: This author contributed to ultrasound procedures. JQ.L.: This author contributed to patient recruitment and data collection. R.A.: This author contributed to statistical analysis. HL.L.: This author is the guarantor of the integrity of the entire study and manuscript review.

36

# 38 Abstract

*Purpose:* We aimed to evaluate the ability of carotid corrected flow time assessed by
ultrasound to predict fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic
gynecological surgery in the modified head-down lithotomy position.

*Methods:* This prospective single-center study conducted at the Chongqing University Cancer 42 Hospital included patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic surgery in the modified 43 head-down lithotomy position. Carotid doppler parameters and hemodynamic data, including 44 corrected flow time, pulse pressure variation (PPV), stroke volume variation, and stroke 45 volume index at a tidal volume of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight and after increasing the tidal 46 volume to 8 mL/kg predicted body weight (tidal volume challenge), respectively, were 47 measured. Fluid responsiveness was defined as a stroke volume index  $\geq 10\%$  increase after 48 49 volume expansion.

Results: Among the 52 patients included, 26 were classified as fluid responders and 26 as 50 non-responders based on the stroke volume index. The area under the receiver operating 51 52 characteristic curve values measured to predict the fluid responsiveness to corrected flow time and changes in PPV ( $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ ) after tidal volume challenge were 0.82 [95% confidence 53 interval (CI): 0.705-0.937; P < 0.0001] and 0.85 (95% CI: 0.740-0.956; P < 0.0001), 54 respectively. Both values were higher than those for PPV at a tidal volume of 8 mL/kg (0.79, 55 95% CI: 0.674–0.911; P = 0003). The optimal cut-off values for corrected flow time and 56  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  were 356.5 ms and >1%, respectively. 57

*Conclusion:* The change in PPV after tidal volume challenge and corrected flow time reliably
predicted fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic

- 60 gynecological surgery in the modified head-down lithotomy position.
- 61 **Trial registration:** Chinese Clinical Trial Register (CHiCTR2200060573)
- 62
- 63 Keywords: Carotid corrected flow time; Doppler ultrasound; Tidal volume challenge; Fluid
- 64 responsiveness; Robotics; Laparoscopic surgery
- 65

# 67 Introduction

The choice between "liberal" and "restrictive" fluid management remains controversial. 68 Preoperative fasting, bowel preparation, and third space loss can lead to hypovolemia. 69 Moreover, inadequate intraoperative administration of fluids can result in poor outcomes, 70 including acute tubular necrosis. However, fluid overload increases the burden on the heart and 71 pulmonary congestion, decreases tissue oxygenation, inhibits wound healing, and delays 72 recovery. Therefore, appropriate perioperative infusion management is essential for optimizing 73 perioperative outcomes [1]. Patients with increased stroke volume (SV) after adequate fluid 74 resuscitation are considered "fluid responsive." 75

Robot-assisted surgery is used extensively owing to its advantages of smaller surgical wounds, early recovery, clearer vision, and manipulation dexterity [2]. Venous return increases cardiac output through the modified head-down lithotomy positioning; however, further increases in intra-abdominal pressure decrease cardiac output. Compression of the abdominal aorta, production of neurohumoral factors, and activation of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone axis increase systemic vascular resistance and depress myocardial contractility [3], thus complicating fluid management.

By Dynamic changes, pulse pressure variation (PPV) and stroke volume variation (SVV), in arterial waveform-derived variables, are superior to traditional static indicators such as central venous pressure and pulmonary artery occlusion pressure [4–6]. PPV and SVV are based on heart-lung interactions, and their reliability is incompletely proven during spontaneous breathing, arrhythmias, low tidal volume (VT), elevated intra-abdominal pressure, high respiratory rate, and right heart failure [4]. The absolute changes in PPV and SVV values

induced by VT challenge predict fluid responsiveness with high sensitivity and specificity;
however, VT challenge may not overcome the other limitations associated with PPV and SVV
use while a patient is spontaneously breathing or has increased intra-abdominal pressure [6,7].
Furthermore, hemodynamic monitoring techniques are often invasive and expensive and can
lead to infection, hematoma, peripheral ischemia, nerve injury, and perforation [8,9].

Carotid ultrasound measurement techniques have the advantages of simple operation and non-invasive, easy-to-obtain, and straightforward display of the measured data. There is a direct and significant correlation between carotid corrected flow time (FTc) and intravascular volume status [10]. Carotid FTc is a reliable predictor of fluid responsiveness during spontaneous breathing or mechanical ventilation [11,12].

99 This study investigated the feasibility of using carotid FTc measured via Doppler 100 ultrasound to predict fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic 101 surgery in the modified head-down lithotomy position. Further, we compared the ability of 102 carotid FTc with those of the changes in PPV and SVV observed after VT challenge to predict 103 fluid responsiveness.

104

## 105 Methods

### 106 Study population

107 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Chongqing University 108 Cancer Hospital (approval number: CZLS2021041-A) and registered before patient enrollment 109 on the Chinese Clinical Trial Register (CHiCTR2200060573). Fifty-five patients with an 110 American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status of class I–III, scheduled to undergo

robot-assisted laparoscopic surgery with pneumoperitoneum in the modified head-down 111 lithotomy position, were enrolled after obtaining written informed consent(Fig 1). The 112 exclusion criteria were body mass index of >30 or <15 kg/m<sup>2</sup>; arrhythmia; moderate-to-severe 113 valvular heart disease; presence of >50% carotid artery stenosis by conventional angiography. 114 115 computed tomographic angiography, magnetic resonance angiography, duplex ultrasonography, or newly detected carotid artery stenosis during the study period; left 116 ventricular ejection fraction of <50%; right ventricular dysfunction; moderate-to-severe 117 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; chronic kidney disease; and pregnancy. 118

119

## 120 Anesthesia technique

After the patients entered the operating room, the following parameters were monitored 121 122 using standard intraoperative methods: heart rate (HR), peripheral oxygen saturation, continuous electrocardiographic values, and non-invasive blood pressure. Anesthesia was 123 induced with midazolam (1-2 mg), propofol (2-3 mg/kg), sufertanil (0.3-0.5 µg/kg), and 124 rocuronium (0.6-0.9 mg/kg). Anesthesia was maintained with a continuous infusion of 125 propofol (1.5-3 mg/kg/h), sevoflurane (1-3 vol%), and remifentanil (0.02-0.2 µg/kg/min). 126 Neuromuscular blockade was maintained throughout each procedure via the intermittent 127 administration of rocuronium bromide (0.15 mg/kg every 30-40 min). 128

After tracheal intubation, VT was maintained at 6 mL/kg of the predicted body weight (PBW) (determined as x + 0.91[height (in cm) - 152.4], where x = 50 for males and 45.5 for females) [13], and positive end-expiratory pressure was set at 5 cmH<sub>2</sub>O. An end-tidal carbon dioxide concentration of 35–45 mmHg was maintained by adjusting the ventilation frequency.

All respiratory parameters, including plateau pressure (Pplat) and compliance of the respiratory system (Crs), were recorded using the WATO EX-65 anesthesia machine (Mindray Medical Systems, Shenzhen, China). All patients were placed in the modified head-down lithotomy position during the surgery. Pneumoperitoneum was maintained via continuous carbon dioxide insufflation to maintain an intra-abdominal pressure of 12 mmHg, and 4 mL/kg/h Ringer's solution was administered for fluid maintenance.

139

140 Hemodynamic monitoring

A radial arterial catheter was inserted after anesthesia induction. The arterial pressure transducer was levelled and zeroed at the intersection of the anterior axillary line and fifth intercostal space. The arterial pressure signal was connected to an IntelliVue MP40 monitor (Philips Medizin Systeme Böblingen GmbH, Böblingen, Germany) and the MostCare device (Vygon, Vytech, Padova, Italy) using a Y cable. The square-wave test was performed to exclude under- or overdamping of the pressure signal [14–16].

MostCare, which has a sampling rate of 1.000 point per second, calculates SV using the 147 following equation: SV = Asys/Ztot, where Asys is the area under the systolic part of the 148 arterial pressure waveform and Ztot is systemic vascular resistance. SVV was calculated by 149 assessing the changes in SV as follows: SVV = (maximum SV – minimum SV)/mean SV  $\times$ 150 100. All indexed values, including stroke volume index (SVI), were calculated using the 151 anthropometric measurements of each patient. Hemodynamic variables were recorded using 152 MostCare according to the manufacturer's default time setting (30 s) and imported into a 153 dedicated Excel spreadsheet for further analysis [16]. The Philips monitor directly measured 154

systolic and diastolic blood pressure and mean arterial pressure (MAP) from the arterial pressure waveform. The PPV value was calculated automatically and continuously recorded in real-time by the monitor. The pulse pressure (PP) was defined as the difference between the diastolic and systolic arterial pressure, and PPV was calculated as follows: PPV = (maximum PP – minimum PP)/mean PP × 100. All values were averages of the three consecutive measurements acquired.

161

162 **Carotid ultrasonography** 

Carotid ultrasound images were obtained using a portable ultrasound device (Mindray 163 Medical Systems, Shenzhen, China) with the participants in the modified head-down lithotomy 164 position. FTc was measured as previously described by Blehar et al [17]. A linear array (12 165 166 MHz) transducer was placed longitudinally on the neck with the probe marker pointing to the patient's head. A long-axis B-mode image of the right common carotid artery was obtained at 167 the level of the lower border of the thyroid cartilage. Spectral Doppler tracings were then 168 obtained by placing a 0.5-mm sample gate through the center of the vessel, within 2–3 cm 169 proximal to the carotid bulb in the longitudinal plane and an insonation angle controlled 170 at ≤60° to accurately measure blood flow velocity [18,19]. After the pulsed-wave Doppler 171 spectrum was displayed, the optimal sampling volume and angle were adjusted to obtain a 172 satisfactory spectrum, and the image was frozen. Flow time (FT) was gauged from the 173 beginning of the systolic upstroke to the dicrotic notch. FTc was calculated using Wodey's 174 formula as follows:  $FTc = FT + [1.29 \times (HR - 60)]$  [20]. The examiner obtained FTc 175 measurements during three continuous heartbeat periods, and all three values were averaged 176

and recorded for subsequent analysis. HR was obtained by measuring the interval between the
heartbeats at the beginning of the Doppler flow upstroke through two consecutive cycles (Fig
2).

180

## **181** Study procedures

Fig 3 illustrates the study design. No vasoactive medications were used during the 182 measurement period, and all measurements were obtained during surgery while the patient was 183 hemodynamically stable, defined as MAP and HR changes of <10% over 5 min. The protocol 184 185 was initiated at least 45 min after increasing the intra-abdominal pressure to 12 mmHg, and the first set of measurements (HR, MAP, SVV<sub>6</sub>, PPV<sub>6</sub>, SVI, VT, Pplat, Crs, and FTc) was recorded 186 concurrently (time-point  $T_{6a}$ ). After obtaining the baseline measurements, the VT setting was 187 188 increased from 6 to 8 mL/kg PBW for 3 min (VT challenge), and the hemodynamic and respiratory variables, including SVV8 and PPV8, were measured again during the last minute at 189 8 mL/kg PBW VT ventilation (time-point  $T_8$ ). VT was then returned to 6 mL/kg PBW, and the 190 third set of data was recorded after 5 min (time-point T<sub>6b</sub>). Subsequently, 250 mL of Ringer's 191 solution was injected over 10 min. The last set of parameters (time-point  $T_{VE}$ ) was recorded 5 192 min after fluid administration. The changes in PPV and SVV due to the VT challenge were 193 calculated as follows:  $\Delta PPV_{6-8} = PPV_8 - PPV_6$ ; and  $\Delta SVV_{6-8} = SVV_8 - SVV_6$ . Fluid 194 responsiveness was defined as an SVI increase of  $\geq 10\%$  and assessed using the MostCare 195 monitor after administering balanced crystalloids [21,22]. 196

197

## 198 Sample size calculation and statistical analysis

we assumed a relatively low AUC of 0.75 for carotid FTc. At least 50 patients were required to compare this value to the null hypothesis (AUC = 0.50), with a type I error of 0.05, power of 0.90, and sample size of negative/positive group ratio of 1. A 10% dropout or withdrawal rate was estimated; therefore, enrollment of 55 patients was planned.

Distribution normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Data are 206 207 presented as median (interquartile range), mean (standard deviation), and the number of patients (%). The characteristics of responders and non-responders were compared using the 208 independent t-test for non-normally distributed data and Mann-Whitney U test for 209 210 non-normally distributed data, while categorical variables were analyzed using the chi-square test. Hemodynamic variables at  $T_{6a}$ ,  $T_8$ ,  $T_{6b}$ , and  $T_{VE}$  were compared using the paired t-test or 211 Wilcoxon signed-rank sum test. Between-group comparisons were performed using the t-test 212 213 or Mann-Whitney U test.

A receiver operating characteristic curve analysis was performed to assess reliability, and the AUC values were compared using the DeLong test [24]. The best cut-off value was determined by maximizing the Youden index (sensitivity + specificity - 1) [25]. The cut-off values delimiting the grey zone were defined by the values associated with a 90% sensitivity and 90% specificity [11].

219 Relationships between the percentage change in SVI after VE and  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  were assessed 220 using the Spearman rank correlation test. Relationships between the percentage change in SVI

after VE and carotid ultrasound FTc were assessed using Pearson correlation analysis.

Statistical analyses were performed using MedCalc ver. 20.1.0 (MedCalc Software,
Ostend, Belgium), GraphPad Prism ver. 9.4.0 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA), and
SPSS ver. 27.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Statistical significance was set at P <0.05.</li>

226 **Results** 

Among the 59 patients assessed for eligibility in the study, 55 were enrolled. Among them, three were excluded for the following reasons: high airway pressure (n = 1), severe hypotension (n = 1), and frequent intraoperative premature ventricular contraction (n = 1). Therefore, 52 patients were included in the final analysis (Fig 1). A between-group comparison of responders and non-responders revealed that patients' clinical characteristics did not differ

232 (Table 1).

	Overall(n=52)	Responder(n=26)	Non-Responders(n=26)	P-Value
Age, year	50.98±10.9	51.4±10.1	50.5±11.8	0.773ª
BMI, kg/m2	23.6±3.2	23.6±3.6	23.7±2.8	0.966ª
ASA physical status (II/III)	43,9	22,4	21,5	1 <sup>b</sup>
Diagnosis, n (%)				0.637°
Vaginal cancer	6(11.5)	4(15.4)	2(7.7)	
Cervical Cancer	28(53.8)	14(53.8)	14(53.8)	
Endometrial cancer	18(34.6)	8(30.8)	10(38.5)	
Comorbidities, n (%)				0.206°
Hypertension	5(9.6)	1(3.8)	4(13.8)	
Others	5(9.6)	4(13.8)	1(3.8)	

Table 1. Patient characteristics

BMI Body mass index, ASA American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status

a: Independent t-test, b: Mann-Whitney U c: chi-square test

Data are presented as mean (range), mean (standard deviation), number of patients (%)

233

234	Table 2 presents the hemodynamic and respiratory characteristics of the patients at each
235	time point. The MAP values of responders were significantly higher than those of
236	non-responders at all time points. In responders, when VT was increased to 8 mL/kg PBW,
237	PPV and SVV significantly increased, and decreased significantly after VE. All responders had
238	significantly lower SVI and FTc values than non-responders before VE; however, SVI and FTc
239	increased in all patients after rehydration. Despite rehydration, the FTc values of the groups

240 remained significantly different.

Table 2. The hemodynamic and respiratory characteristics at baseline, after tidal ventilation challenge, before volume expansion, and after volume expansion

	T <sub>6a</sub>	$T_8$	P1(T <sub>6a</sub> VS T <sub>8</sub> )	T <sub>6b</sub>	$T_{VE}$	P2(T <sub>6b</sub> VS T <sub>VE</sub> )
HR (beats/min)						
R	69.2±9.6	69.0±9.7	0.629	68.7±9.5	66.9±7.8	0.016
NR	65.7±7.1	65.2±7.2	0.155	65.6±8.3	68.3±7.3	0.002
Map (mm Hg)						
R	75.4±6.0 *	74.9±6.4 *	0.179	75.6±6.7 *	75.5±6.4 *	0.689
NR	80.4±8.9	80.3±8.2	0.778	80.3±8.4	80.4±8.5	0.889
Pplat (cm H <sub>2</sub> O)						
R	21.1±3.4	24.9±3.2	< 0.001	20.9±3.3	21.4±3.1	0.004
NR	20.1±2.5	23.7±2.9	< 0.001	20.6±2.8	21.0±2.7	0.009
VT (ml)						
R	317.9±28.6	412.8±40.9	< 0.001	319.1±31.4	318.2±32.9	0.697
NR	321.8±23.0	418.7±23.4	< 0.001	323.5±24.2	323.1±23.3	0.777
Crs (ml/cmH <sub>2</sub> O)						
R	16.8±3.9	18.0±3.7	< 0.001	17.0±4.1	16.6±3.8	0.11
NR	17.7±3.0	19.2±3.0	< 0.001	17.8±3.2	17.2±2.8	0.013

SVV (%)

	R	7.0(3.6-9.2)	8.5(4.7-10.6)	0.028	7.0(3.8-9.3)	4.5(3.4-7.4)	0.034
	NR	5.0(4.0-7.0)	6.0(4.0-8.0)	0.104	5.6(4.2-8.4)	5.0(3.7-7.0)	0.461
PPV	/ (%)						
	R	6.0(5.0-8.0)*	9.0(6.0-11.0)*	< 0.001	7.0(4.8-9.0)*	6.0(4.8-6.3)*	0.014
	NR	5.0(4.0-7.0)	6.0(4.0-8.0)	0.005	5.0(4.0-7.0)	4.0(3.8-5.3)	0.003
SVI	(ml/min <sup>2</sup> )						
	R	42.3±9.6*	42.1±8.7*	0.828	41.4±9.8*	46.5±10.1	< 0.001
	NR	48.3±5.8	47.9±5.6	0.097	48.2±6.3	48.2±7.1	0.932
FTc	(ms)						
	R	346.2±10.3*	344.5±11.5*	0.179	347.3±11.4*	364.5±11.8*	< 0.001
	NR	360.9±13.4	362.0±14.4	0.339	362.7±15.1	373.1±17.2	< 0.001

HR Heart rate, MAP Mean arterial pressure, Pplat Plateau pressure, VT Tidal volume, Crs Respiratory compliance, SVV Stroke volume variation, PPV Pulse pressure variation, SVI Stroke volume index, FTc Carotid corrected flow time, R Responder, NR Non-responders

Data are mean ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range)

\* p < 0.05, responders vs. non-responders at each time point

241

242	The AUC values of FTc and $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ were 0.82 [95% confidence interval (CI):
243	0.705–0.937; P $<$ 0.0001] and 0.85 (95% CI: 0.740–0.956; P $<$ 0.0001), respectively,
244	indicating both are excellent predictors of fluid responsiveness (Fig 4). The optimal cut-off
245	values for FTc and $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ were 356.5 ms (sensitivity, 84.6%; specificity, 69.2%) and >1%
246	(sensitivity, 80.8%; specificity, 76.9%), respectively. The grey zones for FTc and $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$
247	were 347.1-359.9 ms and 0.3-2.7, respectively, containing 27% and 48% of patients,
248	respectively (Table 3).

Table 3. Diagnostic accuracy of various variables to predict fluid responsiveness

	AUC(95%CI)	P-value	Cut-off value (% /ms)	Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	Specificity (%)(95% CI)	Youden index	Grey zone (%)
$PPV_6$	0.678(0.531-0.825)	0.028	> 7	38.5 (	96.2 (	0.34	3.9-7.3

				22.4-57.5)	81.1-99.8)		
$SVV_6$	0.640(0.484-0.795)	0.084	-	-	-	-	-
PPV <sub>8</sub>	0.793(0.674-0.911)	< 0.0001	>8	53.9 ( 35.5-71.2)	84.6( 66.5-93.9)	0.39	5.3-9.7
$SVV_8$	0.655(0.505-0.806)	0.055	-	-	-	-	-
$\Delta PPV_{6-8}$	0.848(0.740-0.956)	< 0.0001	>1	84.6 ( 66.5-93.9)	80.8( 62.1-91.5)	0.58	0.3-2.7
$\Delta SVV_{6-8}$	0.560(0.402-0.718)	0.459	-	-	-	-	-
FTc	0.822(0.706-0.938)	< 0.0001	<356.5	84.62 ( 66.5-93.9)	69.23 ( 50.0-83.5)	0.54	347.1-359.9

- AUC The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, CI Confidence interval, PPV Pulse pressurevariation,
- 251 SVV Stroke volume variation, FTc Carotid corrected flow time, CI Confidence interval
- 252

253 The predictive power of PPV<sub>8</sub>, with an AUC of 0.79 (95% CI: 0.674–0.911; P = 0.003), 254 showed only fair capability. However, PPV<sub>6</sub> was a poor predictor, with an AUC of only 0.68 255 (95% CI: 0.530–0.825; P = 0.028). Additionally, the SVV-related index did not significantly 256 predict fluid responsiveness. The AUC values of  $\Delta$ PPV<sub>6-8</sub>, FTc, and PPV<sub>8</sub> did not differ 257 significantly (P > 0.05). 258 FTc and  $\Delta$ PPV<sub>6-8</sub> were correlated with the percent change in SVI after VE (r = -0.45, 95% 259 CI: -0.647– -0.207, P < 0.001 and r=0.465, 95% CI: 0.212–0.659, P < 0.001, respectively; Fig

260 5).

261

262

# 264 **Discussion**

Nearly half of the patients in this study were classified as non-responders. In patients 265 undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic gynecological surgery in the modified head-down 266 lithotomy position, the carotid FTc measured by Doppler ultrasound and  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  obtained 267 through the VT challenge reliably predicted fluid responsiveness. PPV is a reliable predictor 268 after increasing VT to 8 mL/kg PBW; however, its predictive capacity at VT of 6 mL/kg PBW 269 is inferior. Unlike PPV, SVV<sub>6</sub> and SVV<sub>8</sub> at low- or high-VT mechanical ventilation and 270 absolute SVV change ( $\Delta$ SVV<sub>6-8</sub>) obtained via VT challenge failed to predict fluid 271 responsiveness. Except for FTc, PPV<sub>8</sub> and  $\Delta$ PPV<sub>6-8</sub> determined the larger grey areas (almost 272 half) for which fluid responsiveness cannot be reliably predicted; this may affect the clinical 273 application. 274

Ultrasound imaging has been increasingly used in the perioperative period in recent years, 275 and carotid ultrasonography is a potential tool for intraoperative fluid management. Compared 276 with the aorta and peripheral arteries, the carotid artery is easily accessible and may be used to 277 approximate the cardiac systolic flow time. The carotid FTc can be determined in a fast, 278 simple, and non-invasive manner; thus, it is widely reported. Kim et al. [11] and Xu et al. [26] 279 reported that FTc can predict fluid responsiveness in spontaneously breathing patients and 280 provides the optimal cut-off value to predict fluid responsiveness; thus, FTc may be a 281 substitute for dynamic indices relying on heart-lung interactions, including PPV. No 282 manipulation of the VT setting or other additional invasive procedures are required in 283 mechanically ventilated patients. The carotid FTc was also a good predictor of fluid 284 responsiveness during low and high VT mechanical ventilation, indicating that variations in 285

intra-thoracic pressure during respiration did not significantly affect carotid FTc [27,28].
Afterload or cardiac contractility can be affected by vasopressor infusion, thereby rendering
the FTc values inaccurate. Therefore, changes in the carotid FTc may be a more useful
predictor of fluid responsiveness than absolute FTc [22].

Our research aimed to overcome the limitations of conventional assessment methods 290 including pneumoperitoneum, low ventilation volume, and body position-based variation in 291 intra-thoracic pressure. Consistent with prior findings, this study showed that FTc can 292 discriminate between fluid responders and non-responders. The threshold value of 356.5 ms 293 294 (sensitivity, 84.6%; specificity, 69.2%) in this study was higher than those of other reports, possibly due to the cardiac output changes caused by the modified head-down lithotomy 295 position, which unintentionally increased the false-negative rate; therefore, higher values were 296 297 needed to identify affected patients. Furthermore, fluid responsiveness is defined as a  $\geq$ 10%–15% increase in SVI, a range that allows cut-off values to vary due to a lack of 298 uniformity; different researchers have chosen different values, and our study chose 10%. Our 299 300 findings are consistent with those of Chen et al. [12], who found that FTc increased following fluid administration to the non-responsive group. 301

Intraoperative use of lung-protective ventilation strategies may reduce postoperative pulmonary complications; therefore, they are widely used in perioperative and critical situations [29]. However, the use of low VT ventilation is a common limitation of PPV and SVV use during controlled mechanical ventilation. PPV and SVV cannot reliably predict fluid responsiveness during low VT ventilation, regardless of the patient's position (supine, prone, and Trendelenburg), possibly due to inadequate intra-thoracic pressure [7,15,16,30]. Similar to

the findings of previous studies, pneumoperitoneum did not alter the ability of PPV to predict
fluid responsiveness if VT was at least 8 mL/kg PBW [7,31]. Our optimal cut-off value for
PPV was 8%, which is 1% higher than that reported by Jun et al. [7]; our results showed less
sensitivity but more specificity, which may be due to differences in study design and patient
population.

To improve dynamic indicators, functional hemodynamic tests combined with 313 hemodynamic parameters, such as passive leg raising, end-expiratory occlusion, and mini-fluid 314 challenge, may be used. The VT challenge test was proposed to improve the reliability of PPV 315 316 and SVV measurement at low VT ventilation [30]. Myatra et al. [30] hypothesized that increasing VT from 6 to 8 mL/kg PBW increases the intra-thoracic pressure and magnitude of 317 heart-lung interactions, thereby unmasking fluid responsiveness during low VT ventilation in 318 319 responders, subsequently showing that the changes in PPV and SVV after the VT challenge identify true fluid responders, which has been recognized by numerous studies [7,15,16]. 320

Our study also confirmed that changes in PPV allow surgeons to discriminate between 321 fluid responders and non-responders; however, SVV at VT of 8 mL/kg PBW and the change in 322 SVV after the VT challenge were poor predictors. According to Wajima et al. [32], SVV values 323 must be estimated cautiously during pneumoperitoneum, and the ability of SVV to predict fluid 324 responsiveness decreases after pneumoperitoneum is established. The changes in intra-thoracic 325 pressure may be caused by intra-abdominal pressure alterations during pneumoperitoneum; 326 however, this idea remains controversial and warrants further research [33]. SVV is affected by 327 respiratory and posture factors, diminishing reliability in patients with poor lung compliance, 328 excessively low VT values, or excessively high respiratory rates [34]. Furthermore, differences 329

in operating principles and calculation methods of different devices (FloTrac/Vigileo,
PiCCOplus, MostCare, etc.) may also contribute to inter-study differences in SVV values.

332 Our study has several limitations. Compared with the clinical gold standard of pulmonary artery catheters, our analysis of volume status and fluid responsiveness using uncalibrated 333 pulse contouring of arterial waveforms may have been insufficient in hemodynamically stable 334 patients, although the MostCare monitor estimated CO with a good level of agreement with 335 echocardiographic measures [35]. Second, our study population included patients with 336 gynecologic tumors; therefore, the findings might not apply to all patient populations. We did 337 338 not consider the changes in peripheral vascular resistance caused by increased pressure of the arterial baroreceptor (carotid sinus) in the head-down position and the cerebral autoregulatory 339 function activated by fluid redistribution. 340

In conclusion, FTc and  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  are relatively reliable predictors of fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic gynecological surgery in the modified head-down lithotomy position with lung-protective ventilation. Moreover, since FTc is non-invasive, easily accessible, rapid, and reproducible, its measurement is particularly valuable for vessel volume assessment.

346

## 347 Acknowledgements

348 None

349

# 351 **References**

- 352 1. Makaryus R, Miller TE, Gan TJ. Current concepts of fluid management in enhanced
- 353 recovery pathways. Br J Anaesth. 2018;120: 376-383. doi: <u>10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.011</u>.
- 2. Shimizu A, Ito M, Lefor AK. Laparoscopic and robot-assisted hepatic surgery: an
- 355 historical review. J Clin Med. 2022;11: 3254. doi: <u>10.3390/jcm11123254</u>.
- 356 3. Oti C, Mahendran M, Sabir N. Anaesthesia for laparoscopic surgery. Br J Hosp Med
- 357 (Lond). 2016;77: 24-28. doi: <u>10.12968/hmed.2016.77.1.24</u>.
- 4. Marik PE, Cavallazzi R, Vasu T, Hirani A. Dynamic changes in arterial waveform derived
- variables and fluid responsiveness in mechanically ventilated patients: a systematic review of
- the literature. Crit Care Med. 2009;37: 2642-2647. doi: <u>10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181a590da</u>.
- 361 5. Michard F, Boussat S, Chemla D, Anguel N, Mercat A, Lecarpentier Y, et al. Relation
- 362 between respiratory changes in arterial pulse pressure and fluid responsiveness in septic
- patients with acute circulatory failure. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2000;162: 134-138. doi:
- 364 <u>10.1164/ajrccm.162.1.9903035</u>.
- 365 6. Myatra SN, Monnet X, Teboul JL. Use of 'tidal volume challenge' to improve the
- reliability of pulse pressure variation. Crit Care. 2017;21: 60. doi:
- 367 <u>10.1186/s13054-017-1637-x</u>.
- 368 7. Jun JH, Chung RK, Baik HJ, Chung MH, Hyeon JS, Lee YG, et al. The tidal volume
- 369 challenge improves the reliability of dynamic preload indices during robot-assisted
- 370 laparoscopic surgery in the Trendelenburg position with lung-protective ventilation. BMC
- 371 Anesthesiol. 2019;19: 142. doi: <u>10.1186/s12871-019-0807-6</u>.

- 8. Nuttall G, Burckhardt J, Hadley A, Kane S, Kor D, Marienau MS, et al. Surgical and
- patient risk factors for severe arterial line complications in adults. Anesthesiology. 2016;124:
- 374 590-597. doi: 10.1097/ALN.000000000000967.
- 375 9. Scheeren TWL, Ramsay MAE. New developments in hemodynamic monitoring. J
- 376 Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth. 2019;33;Suppl 1: S67-S72. doi: <u>10.1053/j.jvca.2019.03.043</u>.
- 10. Hossein-Nejad H, Mohammadinejad P, Lessan-Pezeshki M, Davarani SS, Banaie M.
- 378 Carotid artery corrected flow time measurement via bedside ultrasonography in monitoring
- volume status. J Crit Care. 2015;30: 1199-1203. doi: <u>10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.08.014</u>.
- 11. Kim DH, Shin S, Kim N, Choi T, Choi SH, Choi YS. Carotid ultrasound measurements for
- assessing fluid responsiveness in spontaneously breathing patients: corrected flow time and
- respirophasic variation in blood flow peak velocity. Br J Anaesth. 2018;121: 541-549. doi:
- 383 <u>10.1016/j.bja.2017.12.047</u>.
- 12. Chen Y, Liu Z, Fang J, Xie Y, Zhang M, Yang J. Correlation of carotid corrected flow time
- and respirophasic variation in blood flow peak velocity with stroke volume variation in elderly
- patients under general anesthesia. BMC Anesthesiol. 2022;22: 246. doi:
- 387 <u>10.1186/s12871-022-01792-5</u>.
- 13. Linares-Perdomo O, East TD, Brower R, Morris AH. Standardizing predicted body weight
- equations for mechanical ventilation tidal volume settings. Chest. 2015;148: 73-78. doi:
- 390 <u>10.1378/chest.14-2843</u>.
- 14. Romagnoli S, Ricci Z, Quattrone D, Tofani L, Tujjar O, Villa G, et al. Accuracy of
- invasive arterial pressure monitoring in cardiovascular patients: an observational study. Crit
- 393 Care. 2014;18: 644. doi: <u>10.1186/s13054-014-0644-4</u>.

- 15. Messina A, Montagnini C, Cammarota G, De Rosa S, Giuliani F, Muratore L, et al. Tidal
- volume challenge to predict fluid responsiveness in the operating room: an observational study.
- 396 Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2019;36: 583-591. doi: <u>10.1097/EJA.00000000000998</u>.
- 16. Messina A, Montagnini C, Cammarota G, Giuliani F, Muratore L, Baggiani M, et al.
- 398 Assessment of fluid responsiveness in prone neurosurgical patients undergoing protective
- ventilation: role of dynamic indices, tidal volume challenge, and end-expiratory occlusion test.
- 400 Anesth Analg. 2020;130: 752-761. doi: <u>10.1213/ANE.00000000004494</u>.
- 401 17. Blehar DJ, Glazier S, Gaspari RJ. Correlation of corrected flow time in the carotid artery
- 402 with changes in intravascular volume status. J Crit Care. 2014;29: 486-488. doi:
- 403 <u>10.1016/j.jcrc.2014.03.025</u>.
- 18. AIUM practice parameter for the performance of an ultrasound examination of the
- 405 extracranial cerebrovascular system. J Ultrasound Med. 2016;35: 1-11. doi:
- 406 <u>10.7863/ultra.35.9.1</u>.
- 407 19. Tola M, Yurdakul M. Effect of Doppler angle in diagnosis of internal carotid artery
- 408 stenosis. J Ultrasound Med. 2006;25: 1187-1192. doi: <u>10.7863/jum.2006.25.9.1187</u>.
- 409 20. Wodey E, Carre F, Beneux X, Schaffuser A, Ecoffey C. Limits of corrected flow time to
- 410 monitor hemodynamic status in children. J Clin Monit Comput. 2000;16: 223-228. doi:
- 411 <u>10.1023/a:1009981024804</u>.
- 412 21. Derichard A, Robin E, Tavernier B, Costecalde M, Fleyfel M, Onimus J, et al. Automated
- 413 pulse pressure and stroke volume variations from radial artery: evaluation during major
- 414 abdominal surgery. Br J Anaesth. 2009;103: 678-684. doi: <u>10.1093/bja/aep267</u>.

- 415 22. Barjaktarevic I, Toppen WE, Hu S, Aquije Montoya E, Ong S, Buhr R, et al. Ultrasound
- 416 assessment of the change in carotid corrected flow time in fluid responsiveness in
- 417 undifferentiated shock. Crit Care Med. 2018;4: e1040-6.
- 418 23. Yang SY, Shim JK, Song Y, Seo SJ, Kwak YL. Validation of pulse pressure variation and
- 419 corrected flow time as predictors of fluid responsiveness in patients in the prone position. Br J
- 420 Anaesth. 2013;110: 713-720. doi: <u>10.1093/bja/aes475</u>.
- 421 24. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more
- 422 correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. Biometrics.
- 423 1988;44: 837-845. doi: 10.2307/2531595.
- 424 25. Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. Cancer. 1950;3: 32-35. doi:
- 425 <u>10.1002/1097-0142(1950)3:1<32::aid-cncr2820030106>3.0.co;2-3</u>.
- 426 26. Xu L, Dai S, Shen J, Lv C, Tang Y, Chen X. The predictive ability of carotid artery
- 427 corrected flow time and respirophasic variation in blood flow peak velocity measured by
- 428 ultrasonography for fluid responsiveness in parturients for cesarean delivery. Minerva
- 429 Anestesiol. 2020;86: 1039-1046. doi: <u>10.23736/80375-9393.20.14315-3</u>.
- 430 27. Jung S, Kim J, Na S, Nam WS, Kim DH. Ability of carotid corrected flow time to predict
- 431 fluid responsiveness in patients mechanically ventilated using low tidal volume after surgery. J
- 432 Clin Med. 2021;10: 2676. doi: <u>10.3390/jcm10122676</u>.
- 433 28. Doctor M, Siadecki SD, Cooper D Jr, Rose G, Drake AB, Ku M, et al. Reliability,
- 434 laterality and the effect of respiration on the measured corrected flow time of the carotid
- 435 arteries. J Emerg Med. 2017;53: 91-97. doi: <u>10.1016/j.jemermed.2017.01.056</u>.

- 436 29. Kiss T, Bluth T, Gama de Abreu M. Does intraoperative lung-protective ventilation reduce
- 437 postoperative pulmonary complications. Anaesthesist. 2016;65: 573-579. doi:
- 438 10.1007/s00101-016-0198-8.
- 439 30. Myatra SN, Prabu NR, Divatia JV, Monnet X, Kulkarni AP, Teboul JL. The changes in
- 440 pulse pressure variation or stroke volume variation after a "tidal volume challenge" reliably
- 441 predict fluid responsiveness during low tidal volume ventilation. Crit Care Med. 2017;45:
- 442 415-421. doi: <u>10.1097/CCM.00000000002183</u>.
- 443 31. Chin JH, Lee EH, Hwang GS, Choi WJ. Prediction of fluid responsiveness using dynamic
- 444 preload indices in patients undergoing robot-assisted surgery with pneumoperitoneum in the
- Trendelenburg position. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2013;41: 515-522. doi:
- 446 <u>10.1177/0310057X1304100413</u>.
- 447 32. Wajima Z, Shiga T, Imanaga K. Pneumoperitoneum affects stroke volume variation in
- 448 humans. J Anesth. 2015;29: 508-514. doi: <u>10.1007/s00540-014-1963-y</u>.
- 449 33. Jua Weiai, Jia H. Ability of stroke volume variation to predict fluid responsiveness during
- 450 laparoscopic surgery with lithotomy and dead-down position. Hebei Medical University; 2012.
- 451 34. Min JH, Lee SE, Lee HS, Chae YK, Lee YK, Kang Y, et al. The correlation between the
- 452 Trendelenburg position and the stroke volume variation. Korean J Anesthesiol. 2014;67:
- 453 378-383. doi: <u>10.4097/kjae.2014.67.6.378</u>.
- 454 35. Romagnoli S, Ricci Z, Romano SM, Dimizio F, Bonicolini E, Quattrone D, et al.
- 455 FloTrac/Vigileo(TM) (third generation) and MostCare(®)/PRAM versus echocardiography for
- 456 cardiac output estimation in vascular surgery. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth. 2013;27:
- 457 1114-1121. doi: <u>10.1053/j.jvca.2013.04.017</u>.

#### 459 Figure Legends

- 460 Figure 1. Study design.
- 461  $T_{6a}$ : Time at a tidal volume of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight;  $T_8$ : Time at a tidal volume of 8
- 462 mL/kg predicted body weight;  $T_{6b}$ : Time at a tidal volume of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight;
- 463 T<sub>VE</sub>: Time after volume expansion; VT: Tidal volume; PBW: Predicted body weight

464

- Figure 2. Comparison of the receiver operating characteristic curves in predicting the fluidresponsiveness
- 467 PPV6: pulse pressure variation during tidal volume (VT) of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight
- 468 (PBW); SVV6: stroke volume variation during VT of 6 mL/kg PBW; PPV8: pulse pressure
- 469 variation during VT of 8 mL/kg PBW; SVV8: stroke volume variation during VT of 8 mL/kg
- 470 PBW;  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ : change in the value of pulse pressure variation after VT challenge;  $\Delta SVV_{6-8}$ :
- 471 change in the value of stroke volume variation after VT challenge; FTc: carotid corrected flow
- time of the artery

473

- 474 Figure 3. Relationship between the carotid corrected flow time (FTc) and the change in the
- 475 value of pulse pressure variation after tidal volume challenge ( $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ ) and volume
- 476 expansion-induced percentage changes in the stroke volume index (SVI)

477 A: Relationship between FTc and SVI

478 B: Relationship between  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  and SVI

479

# 481 Supplemental Information

## 482 S1 Fig. Carotid Doppler waveform.

483	The numbers 1, 2, and 3 are flow time: beginning of the systolic upstroke to the dicrotic notch.
484	Number 4 is the heart rate: the interval between the beginning of the two consecutive Doppler
485	flow upstrokes.
486	
487	S2 Fig. Flow chart of the number of patients enrolled in the study and included in the
488	analyses.
489	
490	
491	
492	
493	
494	













В