

International Surgery

A comparative study of intraoperative fluid management using stroke volume variation in liver resection --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	INTSURG-D-17-00094R1
Full Title:	A comparative study of intraoperative fluid management using stroke volume variation in liver resection
Article Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Liver resection; Intraoperative monitoring; Stroke volume variation; Surgical blood loss
Corresponding Author:	Naoto Gotohda, M.D., Ph.D. National Cancer Center Hospital East Kashiwa, JAPAN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	National Cancer Center Hospital East
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	kazuhiko kitaguchi
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	kazuhiko kitaguchi Naoto Gotohda Hiroyuki Yamamoto Shinichiro Takahashi Masaru Konishi Ryuichi Hayashi
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	<p>The aim of this study is to examine whether intraoperative fluid management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contribute to decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.</p> <p>In liver surgery, maintaining the central venous pressure (CVP) at a low level is effective in decreasing intraoperative blood loss. Recently, several studies have suggested that stroke volume variation (SVV) obtained using the FloTrac™ system demonstrated a better fluid responsiveness than CVP.</p> <p>We enrolled 30 patients undergoing liver resection since May 2015 in this prospective observational study, and we set the SVV target during liver transection at 13-20% (SVV-group). Forty-three cases of liver resection that we performed between January 2014 and March 2015 without using CVP or SVV were used as the Control-group. We compared the two groups by using intraoperative blood loss as the primary endpoint. There was no significant difference in patient characteristics between the two groups. The mean SVV during liver transection in the SVV-group was $15.6 \pm 4.4\%$. The infusion volume until completion of liver transection in the Control-group was 9.4 ml/kg/h, while that in the SVV-group was 3.3 ml/kg/h, a significantly lower volume ($P < 0.001$). The median intraoperative blood loss was significantly decreased in the SVV-group compared to the Control-group (391 vs. 1068ml; $P < 0.001$). The intraoperative transfusion rate was also significantly decreased in the SVV-group.</p> <p>We demonstrated that intraoperative management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and is useful for decrease intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.</p>

Original Article

A comparative study of intraoperative fluid management using stroke volume variation in liver resection

K. Kitaguchi, MD¹⁾²⁾, N. Gotohda, MD, PhD²⁾, H. Yamamoto, MD³⁾, Y Kato, MD²⁾, S. Takahashi, MD, PhD²⁾, M. Konishi, MD²⁾, R. Hayashi, MD¹⁾⁴⁾.

1) Course of Advanced Clinical Research of Cancer, Junntendo University Graduate School of Medicine, 2-1-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-Ku, Tokyo, 113-8421, Japan.

2) Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreatic Surgery, National Cancer Center Hospital East, 6-5-1 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, 277-8577, Japan.

3) Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Unit, National Cancer Center Hospital East, 6-5-1 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, 277-8577, Japan.

4) Department of Head and Neck Surgery, National Cancer Center Hospital East, 6-5-1 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, 277-8577, Japan.

Running headline

Intraoperative management with SVV in liver resection

Grant support and other assistance

None

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The protocol of this study has been approved by the Institutional Ethical Review Board of the National Cancer Center, Japan.

Conflict of interest

Kitaguchi K. and the other co-authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Corresponding author:

Naoto Gotohda,

Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreatic Surgery, National Cancer Center Hospital East, 6-5-1 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, 277-8577, Japan

Telephone: 81-4-7133-1111

Fax: 81-4-7131-9960

E-mail: ngotohda@east.ncc.go.jp

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine whether intraoperative fluid management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contribute to decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.

In liver surgery, maintaining the central venous pressure (CVP) at a low level is effective in decreasing intraoperative blood loss. Recently, several studies have suggested that stroke volume variation (SVV) obtained using the FloTrac™ system demonstrated a better fluid responsiveness than CVP.

We enrolled 30 patients undergoing liver resection since May 2015 in this prospective observational study, and we set the SVV target during liver transection at 13–20% (SVV-group). Forty-three cases of liver resection that we performed between January 2014 and March 2015 without using CVP or SVV were used as the Control-group. We compared the two groups by using intraoperative blood loss as the primary endpoint.

There was no significant difference in patient characteristics between the two groups. The mean SVV during liver transection in the SVV-group was $15.6 \pm 4.4\%$. The infusion volume until completion of liver transection in the Control-group was 9.4 ml/kg/h, while that in the SVV-group was 3.3 ml/kg/h, a significantly lower volume ($P < 0.001$). The median intraoperative blood loss was significantly decreased in the SVV-group compared to the Control-group (391 vs. 1068ml; $P < 0.001$). The intraoperative transfusion rate was also significantly decreased in the SVV-group.

We demonstrated that intraoperative management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid

restriction and is useful for decrease intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.

Keywords

Liver resection • Intraoperative monitoring • Stroke volume variation • Surgical blood loss

Introduction

Maintaining the central venous pressure (CVP) at a low level during parenchymal transection is effective for decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery. It has been reported that both intraoperative blood loss and blood transfusion were significantly decreased in intraoperative management that maintained the CVP at 5 cmH₂O or lower¹. Intravenous fluid restriction by low CVP management is still standard in liver surgery. Regarding the relationship between blood loss and postoperative complications, previous reports mentioned that intraoperative blood loss is a risk factor for surgical site infection after liver resections^{2,3}, and we believe that decreased blood loss will lead to safer perioperative management. However, to measure CVP, invasive central venous catheterization is necessary. Major complications associated with central venous catheterization include mechanical complications such as arterial puncture, hematoma, pneumothorax and hemothorax; catheter-related bloodstream infections; and thrombotic complications. The prevalence of mechanical complications, in particular, is reported to be 5–19%⁴.

The FloTrac™ system (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, USA) was developed recently for hemodynamic

monitoring during intraoperative circulatory management. This system usually needs cannulation into the radial artery. Although it is not a non-invasive monitor, it is less invasive than central venous catheterization because no large vessels need to be cannulated. It has been confirmed that stroke volume variation (SVV) obtained by the FloTrac™ system serves as a predictor of fluid responsiveness⁵ and another study has shown that SVV has better responsiveness to decreased circulatory blood volume than CVP dose⁶. In addition, recent reports showed that there was a strong correlation between SVV and CVP in liver surgery, and Dunki-Jacobs et al. reported that $CVP < 3 \text{ mm Hg}$ corresponds to $SVV > 13 \%$ ^{7,8}.

We presumed that intraoperative management with SVV as a new indicator alternative to CVP makes it possible to provide safe dry-side management during liver transection. However, there remain few reports indicating that SVV is useful for intraoperative fluid management in conventional liver surgery. Therefore, we conducted a prospective observational dry-side management with the SVV value set to be higher than the cut-off value in order to verify whether intraoperative management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contributes to decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.

Materials and methods

Study design

This study is a historically controlled prospective observational study to verify whether intraoperative fluid management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contributes to decreasing

intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery. Forty-three consecutive cases of liver resection that we performed between January 2014 and March 2015 without using CVP or SVV as a predictor for intraoperative management were included as the Control-group. Liver resection cases using SVV as a predictor for intraoperative management since May 2015 were accumulated for a prospective observational study (the SVV-group). Patients received open liver resections in both groups.

The protocol of this study has been approved by the Institutional Ethical Review Board of the National Cancer Center, Japan. Patient consent was waived owing to anonymization of patient data and the features of this study such as its non-invasiveness and lack of need for material sampling.

Patients

Since May 2015, patients scheduled to undergo open liver resection were eligible for this prospective observational study as the SVV-group. Operative procedures were intended for anatomical resection for subsegmentectomy or above (≥ 1 segmentectomy of Couinaud classification), except for left lateral segmentectomy, regardless of biliary reconstruction. Other inclusion criteria were Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 0–2 and American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status (ASA-PS) of 1–3. Patients with metastatic liver tumors that required simultaneous resection of the primary lesions and those with severe arrhythmia such as atrial fibrillation were excluded. Forty-three consecutive cases of open liver resection that we performed between January 2014 and March 2015 without the use of

CVP or SVV were selected as the Control-group. Their operative procedures were the same as the SVV group. We compared and evaluated the results of both the SVV- and Control-groups.

Endpoints and other clinical parameters

The primary endpoint was intraoperative blood loss. The secondary endpoints included operative duration, intraoperative transfusion rate (red blood cell concentrate), and perioperative complications.

The patient characteristics investigated were sex, age, ASA Physical Status, with or without viral hepatitis, liver disease (primary liver cancer, perihilar cholangiocarcinoma, metastatic tumor, others), Child–Pugh classification, and indocyanine green retention rate at 15 min. The surgical factors included in the analyses were operative procedure, with or without biliary reconstruction, initial/repeat hepatectomy, single/multiple resection, concurrent use/no use of the Pringle maneuver, final in-out balance, infusion volume until completion of liver transection, total dose of vasopressors, mean arterial pressure and heart rate during liver transection, SVV during liver transection, and SVV after liver transection.

Anesthetic management

We prescribed the anesthetic management in considering the essential means of getting accurate SVV readings and achieving the target SVV during liver transection in the SVV-group. Surgeries were basically

performed under general anesthesia combined with epidural anesthesia. Following tracheal intubation, patients' lungs were mechanically ventilated with a constant tidal volume of 8–10ml/kg. The respiratory rate was set to 10/min as the standard and then adjusted as appropriate based on the results of monitoring the end-tidal CO₂ concentration and arterial blood gas analysis. Positive end-expiratory pressure was not used during mechanical ventilation as a rule. Anesthesia was maintained with sevoflurane (1.0–2.0%), fentanyl, remifentanyl and 0.2% ropivacaine for epidural anesthesia. Systolic blood pressure was maintained at ≥ 90 mm Hg. Vasopressor or additional fluids were administered to maintain systolic blood pressure < 80 mm Hg. Urine output throughout surgery was maintained at ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/h to the extent possible. We set a target for SVV during liver transection of 13–20%. In terms of fluid management, the infusion volume until completion of liver transection was set at ≤ 5 ml/kg/h and adjusted as appropriate according to SVV. The final in-out balance was set at 5–7 ml/kg/h.

In the Control-group, surgery was performed under general anesthesia combined with epidural anesthesia. Circulatory management of blood pressure and urine output in the Control-group was similar to that in the SVV-group. Intraoperative fluid management, however, was adjusted properly at an anesthesiologist's discretion according to the intraoperative situation.

In both groups, when hemoglobin level is less than 8 g/dl, we took into consideration the transfusion of red blood cell concentrate.

Surgical procedure

Operative procedure was the same in both groups. The surgical team for each operation was composed of one consultant and two trainees, and there was no change in the members of consultants between the two groups. The liver parenchyma was fractured by the clamp-crushing method, and the devices used during liver parenchymal transection included an ultrasonically activated scalpel and an electrocoagulation device.

The Pringle maneuver was applied for intermittent inflow occlusion to reduce blood loss during surgery. It consisted of clamping the hepatic hilum for 15 minutes, followed by release for 5 minutes.

Statistical analysis

The intraoperative blood loss in Control-group had a mean logarithmic value of 6.98 (equal to 1069.6 ml) and a standard deviation value of 0.70. Then, we hypothesized that intraoperative management with SVV reduced the average intraoperative blood loss to 700 ml. To have a one-sided type 1 error of 5% and a power of 90%, the target accrual was 30 patients in the SVV-group.

The data between the two groups were statistically analyzed by the X^2 test for categorical variables, and by the Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant for all tests. All analyses were performed using PASW software version 18.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Patients and characteristics

We accumulated 30 consecutive cases between May 2015 and February 2016 as the SVV-group for a prospective observational study, and compared them with 43 cases in the Control-group. Patient characteristics in both groups are shown in Table 1. There were no significant differences in any factors between the Control-group and the SVV-group.

Surgical factors

Surgical factors are shown in Table 2. For factors such as the operative procedure, with or without biliary reconstruction, there was no significant difference between the two groups. The average SVV during liver transection in the SVV-group was $15.6 \pm 4.4\%$. The infusion volume until completion of liver transection in the Control-group was 9.4 ml/kg/h, while that in the SVV-group was 3.3 ml/kg/h, a significantly lower volume ($P < 0.001$). In all the cases, the target SVV (13–20%) was achieved during liver transection. The urine output throughout surgery was 1.06 ml/kg/h in the Control-group and 0.66 ml/kg/h in the SVV-group, significantly lower in the SVV-group ($P = 0.001$); however, in 25 out of 30 cases, the urine outputs exceeded the targeted 0.5 ml/kg/h. The total dose of vasopressors was higher in the Control-group. The average arterial blood pressure during liver transection was 69.0 mm Hg in the

Control-group, and 74.75 mm Hg in the SVV-group, a significantly higher blood pressure in the SVV-group ($P = 0.027$).

Endpoints

The intraoperative blood loss defined as the primary endpoint was a median of 1068 ml in the Control-group, and 391 ml in the SVV-group, a significant reduction ($P < 0.001$, Table 3).

For secondary endpoints, the operative time was not significantly different between the two groups, but the intraoperative transfusion rate (red blood cell concentrate) was 27.9% in the Control-group, and 3.3% in the SVV-group, a significantly lower rate ($P = 0.007$). Perioperative complications showed no significant difference between the two groups when compared in terms of Grade 3 and higher according to the Clavien-Dindo Classification⁹. However, when compared in terms of Grade 2 and higher, perioperative complications showed significant decrease in the SVV-group ($P = 0.029$). We defined acute kidney injury as a serum creatinine value measured on the first postoperative day being increased by ≥ 0.3 mg/dl above the preoperative value, according to the KDIGO Classification¹⁰. There was no significant difference in this value between the two groups ($P = 0.780$). None of the cases had embolic complications (Table 4).

Discussion

It has been reported that maintaining CVP at a low level with the aim of reducing intraoperative blood loss during liver surgery is useful. Methods to manage CVP at ≤ 5 cm H₂O, < 5 mm Hg, or ≤ 4 mm Hg have been reported. These managements lead to intravenous fluid restriction and a reduction in intraoperative blood loss and intraoperative transfusion rates, which in turn shortens hospital stays^{1, 11, 12}. The method, as standard intraoperative management, is also currently applied to laparoscopic liver surgery¹². As mentioned above, however, CVP measurement needs central venous catheterization, and the complication rate associated with the procedure cannot be disregarded. The frequency of mechanical complications is reported to be 5–19%⁴. Although another report shows that real-time ultrasound-guided central venous catheterization can reduce the frequency of mechanical complications to 0–1.1%, there is still a high rate of catheter-related bloodstream infections (approximately 10%)¹³. In addition, improved and advanced surgical techniques and instruments are providing added patient safety in liver surgery. Under these circumstances, not all patients now need central venous catheterization.

The FloTrac™ system, used for hemodynamic monitoring during intraoperative circulatory management, is capable of continuously measuring arterial pressure-based cardiac output. With the system installed on an arterial line that is established during surgery, parameters such as cardiac output can easily be determined from analysis of arterial pressure waveforms. Among the parameters obtained from the FloTrac™ system, SVV indicates the numerical value of respiratory variation in stroke volume caused mainly by intrathoracic pressure elevation during inspiration on mechanical ventilation. In general, a high SVV value and low

values of cardiac output (CO) and stroke volume (SV) suggest insufficient circulatory blood volume¹⁴. In recent years, it has been recommended that fluid variables be managed based on the concept of individualized goal-directed fluid management. Dynamic variables such as CO, SV, and SVV, depending on the case, are reported to be useful for fluid management¹⁵. It has already been confirmed that SVV predicts fluid responsiveness (giving fluids leads to stabilizing the hemodynamic status)⁵. SVV is more responsive to decreased circulatory blood volume than CVP, and SVV is also more useful than CVP as an indicator of preload⁶. The frequency of major complications such as permanent ischemic damage, sepsis, and pseudoaneurysm formation associated with peripheral artery catheterization is reported to be less than 1%¹⁶. Because of the necessity of arterial line in liver surgery, it can be safely said that using the FloTrac™ system is less invasive than central venous catheterization. Furthermore, recent reports showed that there was a strong correlation between SVV and CVP in liver surgery^{7,8}. It will be important to verify, for added safety, whether intraoperative management with SVV instead of CVP is effective for safe intravenous fluid restriction and decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver resection.

In the present study, safe intravenous fluid restriction and significant reduction in intraoperative blood loss was achieved with good results by intraoperative management with SVV. We considered that adequate intravenous fluid restriction contributed to bloodless operative field and made it easy to perform liver transection. Regarding the setting of the target SVV, the lower limit value of 13% is generally considered to be the cut-off value of SVV¹⁷ and Dunki-Jacobs et al. reported that an SVV of 13% corresponds to a

CVP of 3 mm Hg⁸. To secure safety in dry-side management, we set the upper limit value at 20%. This value was set based on our considerations about SVV fluctuations in laparoscopic liver resection that we previously reported¹⁸. In actual intraoperative management, infusion volume was generally maintained at 2–4ml/kg/h from start of anesthetic induction until completion of liver transection (the fluid restriction period). As a result, we achieved the target SVV (13–20%) in all cases of the SVV-group. We defined the fluid resuscitation period as the period from completion of liver transection until completion of surgery, with the target final in-out balance set at 5–7 ml/kg/h. We practiced management with the systolic blood pressure targeted at 90 mm Hg or above, and urine output at 0.5 ml/kg/h throughout the surgery (Fig. 1).

During the period of this study, two reports were presented regarding high SVV management during liver transection in living-donor right hepatectomy set at 10–20%^{19, 20}, but there has been no report of management with SVV as an indicator in conventional open liver resection for liver diseases. In this study, in order to achieve the target SVV, we mainly addressed fluid restriction only. Seo et al., however, reported that administration of mannitol at 0.5 g/kg was effective in high SVV management²⁰. Furthermore, some reports show that reverse Trendelenburg position leads to a reduction in CVP²¹, and that low CVP is maintained by vasodilation using isoflurane and sublingual nitroglycerine²². It is highly possible that these results will be applied to intraoperative management with SVV in the future.

In this study, there was no case in which the hemodynamic status became remarkably unstable, and the use of vasopressors was required more frequently in the Control-group. We speculate that intraoperative

blood loss had a stronger influence on hemodynamic status than dry-side management. As for perioperative complications, when compared in terms of Grade 2 and higher according to the Clavien-Dindo Classification, the SVV-group had a significant reduction. Postoperative infectious complications that required the administration of antibiotics except for prophylactic antibiotics were clearly decreased in the SVV-group. It has been reported that intraoperative transfusion is related to immunological deterioration and perioperative complications²³. We think that the decrease in both intraoperative blood loss and the transfusion rate led to reduction in complications. As complications associated with dry-side management, there were concerns about kidney injury and embolic complication. However, no significant increase was found as compared with the Control-group, and in particular, there was no embolic complication in either of the two groups. As for kidney injury, in the SVV-group, there was only one case in which serum creatinine value measured on the first postoperative day increased by ≥ 0.3 from the preoperative value, but this case was not clinically problematic and did not affect the length of hospital stay. Meanwhile, Correa-Gallego et al. applied goal-directed fluid therapy using SVV to fluid resuscitation after completion of liver transection, and performed fluid management so that the SVV value can return to a baseline level²². The final in-out balance in liver surgery will need further consideration.

There are some limitations in this study. First, operative procedures are considered by covering from subsegmentectomy to operations with biliary reconstruction. The reason why we included subsegmentectomy in the subjects is that we judged hemorrhage risk was high, from the fact that the liver

transection area has a relatively large, and that the resection is done in such a manner as to expose the main hepatic vein. Secondly, although intraoperative transfusion rate in Control-group was relatively high, as for the Control-group, the cases were selected for the reasons that the operative methods, surgical team, and applicable criteria of blood transfusion are virtually identical to the SVV-group. In the two groups, there is no significant difference in the rate of hepatocellular carcinoma ($P=0.649$). Furthermore, as for the cases, including the control group, experienced before we launched this study, we had not routinely practiced intraoperative management aimed at decreasing blood loss such as fluid restriction in liver resection. Given the decreased intraoperative blood loss, we can accept the decrease of intraoperative transfusion rate. Thirdly, this study covers a relatively small number of cases in a single institution. In this connection, we recommend that further validation should be performed through randomized-controlled trials in many institutions. Especially, a future study based on comparisons of the intraoperative fluid management using SVV and the current standard management using CVP will bring about further beneficial information for liver surgery.

Finally, although this study is a historically controlled prospective observational study in a single institution, we suggested that intraoperative management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contributes to decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery.

Conclusion

In conclusion, by this study we have demonstrated that the intraoperative fluid management with SVV can achieve safe intravenous fluid restriction and contributes to decreasing intraoperative blood loss in liver surgery. It is imperative to accumulate further cases and refine this intraoperative management method. We need to link this study to randomized-controlled trials with larger number of cases in the future, and also hope this study will contribute to further developing this field.

References

1. Jones RM, Moulton CE, Hardy KJ. Central venous pressure and its effect on blood loss during liver resection. *Br J Surg.* 1998 Aug;85(8):1058-1060.
2. Kobayashi S, Gotohda N, Nakagohri T, Takahashi S, Konishi M, Kinoshita T. Risk factors of surgical site infection after hepatectomy for liver cancers. *World J Surg.* 2009 Feb;33(2):312-317.
3. Arikawa T, Kurokawa T, Ohwa Y, Ito N, Kotake K, Nagata H, et al. Risk factors for surgical site infection after hepatectomy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatogastroenterology.* 2011;Jan-Feb;58(105):143-146.
4. McGee DC, Gould MK. Preventing complication of central venous catheterization. *N Engl J Med.* 2003

Mar;348(12):1123-1133.

5. Zhang Z, Lu B, Sheng X, Jin N. Accuracy of stroke volume variation in predicting fluid

responsiveness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Anesth.* 2011 Dec;25(6):904-916.

6. Su BC, Tsai YF, Cheng CW, Yu HP, Yang MW, Lee WC, et al. Stroke volume variation derived by

arterial pulse contour analysis is a good indicator for preload estimation during liver transplantation.

Transplantation Proceedings. 2012 Mar;44(2):429-432.

7. Harimoto N, Matsuyama H, Kajiyama K, Nagaie T, Ikegami T, Yoshizumi T, et al. The significance of

stroke volume variation during hepatic resection under infrahepatic inferior vena cava and portal triad

clamping. *Fukuoka Acta Med.* 2013 Oct;104(10):362-369.

8 Dunki-Jacobs EM, Philips P, Scoggins CR, Mcmasters KM, Martin RC 2nd. Stroke volume variation in

hepatic resection: a replacement for standard central venous pressure monitoring. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2014

Feb;21(2):473-478.

9. Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with

evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of survey. *Ann Surg.* 2004 Aug;240(2):205-213.

10. Kidney Disease: Improving global outcomes (KDIGO) practice guideline for acute kidney injury.

Kidney Int. 2012;Suppl 2:1-138.

11. Wang WD, Liang LJ, Huang XQ, Yin XT. Low central venous pressure reduces blood loss in h

epatectomy. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2006 Feb;12(6):935-939.

12. Tranchart H, O'Rourke, Ronald VD Gaillard M, Lanius P, Sugioka A, et al. Bleeding control during

laparoscopic liver resection: a review of literature. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci.* 2015 May;22(5):371-378.

13. Karakitsos D, Labropoulos N, Groot ED, Patrianakos A, Kouraklis G, Poularas J, et al. Real-time

ultrasound-guided catheterization of the internal jugular vein: a prospective comparison with the landmark

technique in critical care patients. *Critical Care.* 2006;10(6):R162.

14. Michard F. Changes in arterial pressure during mechanical ventilation. *Anesthesiology.*

2005 Aug;103(2):419-428.

15. Mayer J, Boldt J, Mengistu AM, Röhm KD, Suttner S. Goal-directed intraoperative therapy based on autocalibrated arterial pressure waveform analysis reduces hospital stay in high-risk surgical patients: a randomized, controlled trial. *Critical Care*. 2010;14:R18. doi: 10.1186/cc8875.

16. Scheer BV, Perel A, Pfeiffer UJ. Clinical review: complications and risk factors of peripheral arterial catheters used for haemo-dynamic monitoring in anaesthesia and intensive care medicine. *Critical Care*. 2002 Jan;6(3):199-204.

17. McGee WT. A simple physiologic algorithm for managing hemodynamics using stroke volume and stroke volume variation: physiologic optimization program. *J Intensive Care Med*. 2009 Nov-Dec; 24(6):352-360.

18. Kitaguchi K, Gotohda N, Yamamoto H, Kato Y, Takahashi S, Konishi M, et al. Intraoperative circulatory management using the FloTrac™ system in laparoscopic liver resection. *Asian J Endosc Surg* 2015 May;8(2):164-170.

19. Choi SS, Jun IG, Cho SS, Kim SK, Hwang GS, Kim YK. Effect of stroke volume variation-directed fluid management on blood loss during living-donor right hepatectomy: a randomized controlled study.

Anaesthesia. 2015 Nov;70(11):1250-1258.

20. Seo H, Jun IG, Ha TY, Hwang S, Lee SG, Kim YK. High stroke volume variation method by mannitol administration can decrease blood loss during donor hepatectomy. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016 Jan;95(2):e2328. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000002328.

21. Yoneda G, Katagiri S, Yamamoto M. Reverse Trendelenburg position is a safer technique for lowering central venous pressure without decreasing blood pressure than clamping of the inferior vena cava below the liver. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci* 2015 Jan;22(6):463-466.

22. Correa-Gallego C, Tan KS, Arslan-Carlon V, Gonen M, Denis SC, Langdon-Embry L, et al. Goal-directed fluid therapy using stroke volume variation for resuscitation after low central venous pressure-assisted liver resection: a randomized clinical trial. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2015 Aug;221(2):591-601.

23. Kooby DA, Stockman RN, Ben-Porat L, Gonen M, Jarnagin WR, Dematteo RP, et al. Influence of transfusions on perioperative and long-term outcome in patients following hepatic resection for colorectal metastases. *Ann Surg* 2003 Jun;237(6):860-869.




Fig.1 Fluid management in liver surgery

Table 1. Patient characteristics

Variable	Control-group (n = 43)	SVV group (n = 30)	P-value
Age (median)	70 (26-80)	67 (50-84)	0.236
Sex (M/F)	14/29	11/19	0.716
HBV (+)	3 (7.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0.501
HCV (+)	5 (11.6%)	1 (3.3%)	0.204
BMI (kg/m ² , median)	21.6 (17.9-30.8)	21.85 (16.6-28.7)	0.858
ASA-PS (1/2/3)	10/32/1	4/24/2	0.409
Diabetes (+)	10 (23.3%)	10 (33.3%)	0.342
Disease (Primary /Perihilar/Meta/Others)	18/10/13/2	7/10/11/2	0.427
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	6 (14.0%)	4 (13.3%)	0.940
Preoperative Hb level (g/dl, median)	12.9 (10.2-16.4)	13.0 (11.2-16.2)	0.400
Preoperative AST level (U/L, median)	32 (16-124)	25 (13-101)	0.141
Child-Pugh classification (A/B)	43/0	30/0	—
ICG R15 (% , median)	11.0 (3.2-27.8)	9.35 (2.7-17.4)	0.158

Primary, primary liver cancer; Perihilar, perihilar cholangiocarcinoma; Meta, metastatic liver tumor; Hb, hemoglobin; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ICG R15, indocyanine green retention rate at 15min; BMI, body mass index; ASA-PS, American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status; SVV, stroke volume variation.

Table 2. Surgical factors

	Control-group (n = 43)	SVV-group (n = 30)	P-value
Procedure (SS/S/BS/TS)	6/7/29/1	5/2/21/2	0.525
Biliary reconstruction	15 (34.9%)	12 (40%)	0.656
Hepatectomy (initial / repeat)	41/2	26/4	0.184
Resection site (single / multiple)	39/4	28/2	0.687
Pringle maneuver	41 (95.3%)	30 (100%)	0.231
Final in-out balance (ml/kg/h, median)	6.1 (1.6-12.0)	6.15 (4.0-9.3)	0.690
Infusion volume until completion of transection (ml/kg/h, median)	9.4 (4.2-19.2)	3.3 (1.9-8.4)	<0.001
Urine output (ml/kg/h, median)	1.06 (0.30-5.92)	0.66 (0.25-2.35)	0.001
Total dose of ephedrine (mg, median)	12 (0-40)	8 (0-30)	0.036
Total dose of phenylephrine (mg, median)	0.3 (0-2.8)	0.3 (0-1.6)	0.685
MAP during liver transection (mmHg, median)	69 (52.4-84.8)	74.75 (58.6-91.9)	0.027
HR during liver transection (bpm, median)	74 (51-99)	77.4 (64-101)	0.120
SVV during liver transection (% , mean)	—	15.6 ± 4.4	—
SVV after liver transection (% , mean)	—	7.5 ± 1.9	—

SS, subsegmentectomy; S, segmentectomy; BS, bisegmentectomy; TS, trisegmentectomy; MAP, mean arterial pressure; HR, heart rate; SVV, stroke volume variation

Table 3. Primary endpoint

	Control-group (n = 43)	SVV group (n = 30)	P-value
Intraoperative blood loss (ml, median)	1068 (66-4983)	391 (97-2498)	<0.001

SVV, stroke volume variation

Table 4. Secondary outcomes

	Control-group (n = 43)	SVV group (n = 30)	P-value
Operative time (min., median)	357 (170-677)	324 (173-602)	0.626
Intraoperative transfusion	12 (27.9%)	1 (3.3%)	0.007
Perioperative complication \geq Grade II *	24 (55.8%)	9 (30.0%)	0.029
Perioperative complication \geq Grade III **	9 (20.9%)	6 (20.0%)	0.923
Acute kidney injury†	2 (4.7%)	1 (3.3%)	0.780
Embolic complication	0	0	—

* Complications were defined as situations \geq Grade II in the criteria of Clavien-Dindo classification.


** Complications were defined as situations \geq Grade III in the criteria of Clavien-Dindo classification.

† Acute kidney injury was defined as \geq 0.3 mg/dl elevation of serum creatinine level.

SVV, stroke volume variation



Click here to access/download
Cover Letter
Cover letter revised.docx





Click here to access/download
Copyright Statement
Copyright Statement 1.pdf



Click here to access/download
Copyright Statement
Copyright Statement 2.pdf



Click here to access/download
Statistical Review
Statistical analysis.docx

