

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^{1¶}, Qi Chen, MD^{1¶}, Zejun Huang, MD², Ran An, MD¹, Jingqiu Liang, MD³,
7 Hongliang Liu, MD, PhD^{1*}

8

9 ¹ Department of Anesthesiology, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, China

10 ² Department of Ultrasound, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, China

11 ³ 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 (HL)

16

17 [¶]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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 (ΔPPV_{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 ΔPPV_{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/m²; 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 cmH₂O. 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, SVV₆, PPV₆, SVI, VT, Pplat, Crs, and FTc) was recorded
187 concurrently (time-point T_{6a}). 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 SVV₈ and PPV₈, were measured again during the last minute at
190 8 mL/kg PBW VT ventilation (time-point T₈). VT was then returned to 6 mL/kg PBW, and the
191 third set of data was recorded after 5 min (time-point T_{6b}). Subsequently, 250 mL of Ringer's
192 solution was injected over 10 min. The last set of parameters (time-point T_{VE}) 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 ΔPPV_{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 ^a
BMI, kg/m ²	23.6±3.2	23.6±3.6	23.7±2.8	0.966 ^a
ASA physical status (II/III)	43,9	22,4	21,5	1 ^b
Diagnosis, n (%)				0.637 ^c
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 ^c
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 _{6a}	T ₈	P1(T _{6a} VS T ₈)	T _{6b}	T _{VE}	P2(T _{6b} VS T _{VE})
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 ₂ 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 ₂ 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 ²)						
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 Δ PPV₆₋₈ 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 Δ PPV₆₋₈ 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 Δ PPV₆₋₈

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 ₈	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	-	-	-	-	-
ΔPPV 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
ΔSVV 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

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 PPV₈, with an AUC of 0.79 (95% CI: 0.674–0.911; P = 0.003),
 254 showed only fair capability. However, PPV₆ 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 ΔPPV₆₋₈, FTc, and PPV₈ did not differ
 257 significantly (P > 0.05).

258 FTc and ΔPPV₆₋₈ 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 ΔPPV_{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, SVV_6 and SVV_8 at low- or high-VT mechanical ventilation and
271 absolute SVV change (ΔSVV_{6-8}) obtained via VT challenge failed to predict fluid
272 responsiveness. Except for FTc, PPV_8 and ΔPPV_{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 ΔPPV_{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/ajrccm.162.1.9903035](https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.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; ΔPPV_{6-8} : change in the value of pulse pressure variation after VT challenge; ΔSVV_{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 (ΔPPV_{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 ΔPPV_{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