

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: [liuhl75@cqu.edu.cn](mailto:liuhl75@cqu.edu.cn) (HL)

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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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

25 **Funding:** This work was supported by the Laboratory Open Fund of Chongqing University

26 Cancer Hospital (2022); Chongqing medical scientific research project (Joint project of

27 Chongqing Health Commission and Science and Technology Bureau 2023MSXM125)

28

29 **Authors' contributions**

30 Q.C.: This author contributed to the study design, data analysis, and manuscript writing.

31 XX.T.: This author contributed to patient recruitment, ultrasound procedures, and data

32 collection. ZJ.H.: This author contributed to ultrasound procedures. JQ.L.: This author

33 contributed to patient recruitment and data collection. R.A.: This author contributed to

34 statistical analysis. HL.L.: This author is the guarantor of the integrity of the entire study and

35 manuscript review.

36

## 38 **Abstract**

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

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

50 *Results:* Among the 52 patients included, 26 were classified as fluid responders and 26 as  
51 non-responders based on the stroke volume index. The area under the receiver operating  
52 characteristic curve values measured to predict the fluid responsiveness to corrected flow time  
53 and changes in PPV ( $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$ ) after tidal volume challenge were 0.82 [95% confidence  
54 interval (CI): 0.705–0.937;  $P < 0.0001$ ] and 0.85 (95% CI: 0.740–0.956;  $P < 0.0001$ ),  
55 respectively. Both values were higher than those for PPV at a tidal volume of 8 mL/kg (0.79,  
56 95% CI: 0.674–0.911;  $P = 0.003$ ). The optimal cut-off values for corrected flow time and  
57  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  were 356.5 ms and  $>1\%$ , respectively.

58 *Conclusion:* The change in PPV after tidal volume challenge and corrected flow time reliably  
59 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**

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

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

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

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

94 Carotid ultrasound measurement techniques have the advantages of simple operation and  
95 non-invasive, easy-to-obtain, and straightforward display of the measured data. There is a  
96 direct and significant correlation between carotid corrected flow time (FTc) and intravascular  
97 volume status [10]. Carotid FTc is a reliable predictor of fluid responsiveness during  
98 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

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

119

## 120 **Anesthesia technique**

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

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

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

139

## 140 **Hemodynamic monitoring**

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

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



155 systolic and diastolic blood pressure and mean arterial pressure (MAP) from the arterial  
156 pressure waveform. The PPV value was calculated automatically and continuously recorded in  
157 real-time by the monitor. The pulse pressure (PP) was defined as the difference between the  
158 diastolic and systolic arterial pressure, and PPV was calculated as follows:  $PPV = (\text{maximum}$   
159  $PP - \text{minimum PP})/\text{mean PP} \times 100$ . All values were averages of the three consecutive  
160 measurements acquired.

161

## 162 **Carotid ultrasonography**

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

177 and recorded for subsequent analysis. HR was obtained by measuring the interval between the  
178 heartbeats at the beginning of the Doppler flow upstroke through two consecutive cycles (Fig  
179 2).

180

## 181 **Study procedures**

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

197

## 198 **Sample size calculation and statistical analysis**

199 The sample size was calculated using tests for a one-curve module using PASS ver.15.0  
200 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). A previous study has reported that the area under the curve  
201 (AUC) for predicting fluid responsiveness using descending aorta FTc is 0.82 [23]. Therefore,  
202 we assumed a relatively low AUC of 0.75 for carotid FTc. At least 50 patients were required to  
203 compare this value to the null hypothesis (AUC = 0.50), with a type I error of 0.05, power of  
204 0.90, and sample size of negative/positive group ratio of 1. A 10% dropout or withdrawal rate  
205 was estimated; therefore, enrollment of 55 patients was planned.

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

214 A receiver operating characteristic curve analysis was performed to assess reliability, and  
215 the AUC values were compared using the DeLong test [24]. The best cut-off value was  
216 determined by maximizing the Youden index (sensitivity + specificity - 1) [25]. The cut-off  
217 values delimiting the grey zone were defined by the values associated with a 90% sensitivity  
218 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

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

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

225

## 226 Results

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

Table 1. Patient characteristics

|                                 | 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            | 0.773 <sup>a</sup> |
| BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>          | 23.6±3.2      | 23.6±3.6        | 23.7±2.8             | 0.966 <sup>a</sup> |
| ASA physical status<br>(II/III) | 43,9          | 22,4            | 21,5                 | 1 <sup>b</sup>     |
| Diagnosis, n (%)                |               |                 |                      | 0.637 <sup>c</sup> |
| 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 <sup>c</sup> |
| Hypertension                    | 5(9.6)        | 1(3.8)          | 4(13.8)              |                    |
| Others                          | 5(9.6)        | 4(13.8)         | 1(3.8)               |                    |

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 <sub>8</sub> | P1(T <sub>6a</sub> VS T <sub>8</sub> ) | T <sub>6b</sub> | T <sub>VE</sub> | 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<sub>6-8</sub> 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<sub>6-8</sub> 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<sub>6-8</sub>

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 <sub>6</sub> | 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 <sub>6</sub>            | 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 <sub>8</sub>            | 0.655(0.505-0.806) | 0.055   | -      | -                 | -                 | -    | -           |
| $\Delta$ PPV <sub>6-8</sub> | 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 <sub>6-8</sub> | 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 |

249 AUC The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, CI Confidence interval, PPV Pulse pressure  
 250 variation,  
 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

265 Nearly half of the patients in this study were classified as non-responders. In patients  
266 undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic gynecological surgery in the modified head-down  
267 lithotomy position, the carotid FTc measured by Doppler ultrasound and  $\Delta\text{PPV}_{6-8}$  obtained  
268 through the VT challenge reliably predicted fluid responsiveness. PPV is a reliable predictor  
269 after increasing VT to 8 mL/kg PBW; however, its predictive capacity at VT of 6 mL/kg PBW  
270 is inferior. Unlike PPV,  $\text{SVV}_6$  and  $\text{SVV}_8$  at low- or high-VT mechanical ventilation and  
271 absolute SVV change ( $\Delta\text{SVV}_{6-8}$ ) obtained via VT challenge failed to predict fluid  
272 responsiveness. Except for FTc,  $\text{PPV}_8$  and  $\Delta\text{PPV}_{6-8}$  determined the larger grey areas (almost  
273 half) for which fluid responsiveness cannot be reliably predicted; this may affect the clinical  
274 application.

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

330 in operating principles and calculation methods of different devices (FloTrac/Vigileo,  
331 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  
333 artery catheters, our analysis of volume status and fluid responsiveness using uncalibrated  
334 pulse contouring of arterial waveforms may have been insufficient in hemodynamically stable  
335 patients, although the MostCare monitor estimated CO with a good level of agreement with  
336 echocardiographic measures [35]. Second, our study population included patients with  
337 gynecologic tumors; therefore, the findings might not apply to all patient populations. We did  
338 not consider the changes in peripheral vascular resistance caused by increased pressure of the  
339 arterial baroreceptor (carotid sinus) in the head-down position and the cerebral autoregulatory  
340 function activated by fluid redistribution.

341 In conclusion, FTc and  $\Delta PPV_{6-8}$  are relatively reliable predictors of fluid responsiveness in  
342 patients undergoing robot-assisted laparoscopic gynecological surgery in the modified  
343 head-down lithotomy position with lung-protective ventilation. Moreover, since FTc is  
344 non-invasive, easily accessible, rapid, and reproducible, its measurement is particularly  
345 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: [10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.011).
- 354 2. Shimizu A, Ito M, Lefor AK. Laparoscopic and robot-assisted hepatic surgery: an  
355 historical review. *J Clin Med.* 2022;11: 3254. doi: [10.3390/jcm11123254](https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11123254).
- 356 3. Oti C, Mahendran M, Sabir N. Anaesthesia for laparoscopic surgery. *Br J Hosp Med*  
357 (Lond). 2016;77: 24-28. doi: [10.12968/hmed.2016.77.1.24](https://doi.org/10.12968/hmed.2016.77.1.24).
- 358 4. Marik PE, Cavallazzi R, Vasu T, Hirani A. Dynamic changes in arterial waveform derived  
359 variables and fluid responsiveness in mechanically ventilated patients: a systematic review of  
360 the literature. *Crit Care Med.* 2009;37: 2642-2647. doi: [10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181a590da](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181a590da).
- 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  
363 patients with acute circulatory failure. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2000;162: 134-138. doi:  
364 [10.1164/ajrcm.162.1.9903035](https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrcm.162.1.9903035).
- 365 6. Myatra SN, Monnet X, Teboul JL. Use of 'tidal volume challenge' to improve the  
366 reliability of pulse pressure variation. *Crit Care.* 2017;21: 60. doi:  
367 [10.1186/s13054-017-1637-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-017-1637-x).
- 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: [10.1186/s12871-019-0807-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-019-0807-6).

- 372 8. Nuttall G, Burckhardt J, Hadley A, Kane S, Kor D, Marienau MS, et al. Surgical and  
373 patient risk factors for severe arterial line complications in adults. *Anesthesiology*. 2016;124:  
374 590-597. doi: [10.1097/ALN.0000000000000967](https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000000967).
- 375 9. Scheeren TWL, Ramsay MAE. New developments in hemodynamic monitoring. *J*  
376 *Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth*. 2019;33;Suppl 1: S67-S72. doi: [10.1053/j.jvca.2019.03.043](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2019.03.043).
- 377 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  
379 volume status. *J Crit Care*. 2015;30: 1199-1203. doi: [10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.08.014).
- 380 11. Kim DH, Shin S, Kim N, Choi T, Choi SH, Choi YS. Carotid ultrasound measurements for  
381 assessing fluid responsiveness in spontaneously breathing patients: corrected flow time and  
382 respirophasic variation in blood flow peak velocity. *Br J Anaesth*. 2018;121: 541-549. doi:  
383 [10.1016/j.bja.2017.12.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.12.047).
- 384 12. Chen Y, Liu Z, Fang J, Xie Y, Zhang M, Yang J. Correlation of carotid corrected flow time  
385 and respirophasic variation in blood flow peak velocity with stroke volume variation in elderly  
386 patients under general anesthesia. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2022;22: 246. doi:  
387 [10.1186/s12871-022-01792-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-022-01792-5).
- 388 13. Linares-Perdomo O, East TD, Brower R, Morris AH. Standardizing predicted body weight  
389 equations for mechanical ventilation tidal volume settings. *Chest*. 2015;148: 73-78. doi:  
390 [10.1378/chest.14-2843](https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-2843).
- 391 14. Romagnoli S, Ricci Z, Quattrone D, Tofani L, Tujjar O, Villa G, et al. Accuracy of  
392 invasive arterial pressure monitoring in cardiovascular patients: an observational study. *Crit*  
393 *Care*. 2014;18: 644. doi: [10.1186/s13054-014-0644-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-014-0644-4).

- 394 15. Messina A, Montagnini C, Cammarota G, De Rosa S, Giuliani F, Muratore L, et al. Tidal  
395 volume challenge to predict fluid responsiveness in the operating room: an observational study.  
396 Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2019;36: 583-591. doi: [10.1097/EJA.0000000000000998](https://doi.org/10.1097/EJA.0000000000000998).
- 397 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  
399 ventilation: role of dynamic indices, tidal volume challenge, and end-expiratory occlusion test.  
400 Anesth Analg. 2020;130: 752-761. doi: [10.1213/ANE.0000000000004494](https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000004494).
- 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 [10.1016/j.jcrc.2014.03.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2014.03.025).
- 404 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 [10.7863/ultra.35.9.1](https://doi.org/10.7863/ultra.35.9.1).
- 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: [10.7863/jum.2006.25.9.1187](https://doi.org/10.7863/jum.2006.25.9.1187).
- 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 [10.1023/a:1009981024804](https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1009981024804).
- 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: [10.1093/bja/aep267](https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aep267).

- 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: [10.1093/bja/aes475](https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aes475).
- 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](https://doi.org/10.2307/2531595).
- 424 25. Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. *Cancer*. 1950;3: 32-35. doi:  
425 [10.1002/1097-0142\(1950\)3:1<32::aid-encr2820030106>3.0.co;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0142(1950)3:1<32::aid-encr2820030106>3.0.co;2-3).
- 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 *Anesthesiol*. 2020;86: 1039-1046. doi: [10.23736/S0375-9393.20.14315-3](https://doi.org/10.23736/S0375-9393.20.14315-3).
- 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: [10.3390/jcm10122676](https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10122676).
- 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: [10.1016/j.jemermed.2017.01.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2017.01.056).

- 436 29. Kiss T, Bluth T, Gama de Abreu M. Does intraoperative lung-protective ventilation reduce  
437 postoperative pulmonary complications. *Anaesthetist*. 2016;65: 573-579. doi:  
438 [10.1007/s00101-016-0198-8](https://doi.org/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: [10.1097/CCM.0000000000002183](https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000002183).
- 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  
445 Trendelenburg position. *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2013;41: 515-522. doi:  
446 [10.1177/0310057X1304100413](https://doi.org/10.1177/0310057X1304100413).
- 447 32. Wajima Z, Shiga T, Imanaga K. Pneumoperitoneum affects stroke volume variation in  
448 humans. *J Anesth*. 2015;29: 508-514. doi: [10.1007/s00540-014-1963-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00540-014-1963-y).
- 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: [10.4097/kjae.2014.67.6.378](https://doi.org/10.4097/kjae.2014.67.6.378).
- 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: [10.1053/j.jvca.2013.04.017](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2013.04.017).



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  $T_{VE}$ : Time after volume expansion; VT: Tidal volume; PBW: Predicted body weight

464

465 Figure 2. Comparison of the receiver operating characteristic curves in predicting the fluid

466 responsiveness

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

472 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



Figure

AP 96.6% MI 0.4 TIS 0.0



|      |           |
|------|-----------|
| 1 时间 | 346 ms    |
| 2 时间 | 346 ms    |
| 3 时间 | 351 ms    |
| 4 HR | 64(2) Bpm |




mindray

M9T


B  
 F H9.0  
 D 3.5  
 G 62  
 FR 29  
 DR 110  
 iClear 5  
 iBeam 1

C  
 F 5.0  
 G 60  
 WF 692  
 PRF 3.1k


PW  
 F 4.4  
 WF 150  
 G 32  
 SVD 10.2  
 SV 2.0  
 PRF 5.7k  
 Angle -60°





Figure



Figure



Figure



Figure