

RESEARCH ARTICLES

Open Access



Dynamic changes of hepatic vein Doppler velocities predict preload responsiveness in mechanically ventilated critically ill patients

Mario Bruna^{1,2}, Sebastian Alfaro¹, Felipe Muñoz³, Liliana Cisternas^{1,2}, Cecilia Gonzalez³, Rodrigo Conlledo^{1,2}, Rodrigo Ulloa-Morrison⁴, Marcos Huilcaman⁵, Jaime Retamal³, Ricardo Castro³, Philippe Rola⁶, Adrian Wong⁷, Eduardo R. Argai^{8,9}, Roberto Contreras¹⁰, Glenn Hernandez³ and Eduardo Kattan^{3*} 

Abstract

Background Assessment of dynamic parameters to guide fluid administration is one of the mainstays of current resuscitation strategies. Each test has its own limitations, but passive leg raising (PLR) has emerged as one of the most versatile preload responsiveness tests. However, it requires real-time cardiac output (CO) measurement either through advanced monitoring devices, which are not routinely available, or echocardiography, which is not always feasible. Analysis of the hepatic vein Doppler waveform change, a simpler ultrasound-based assessment, during a dynamic test such as PLR could be useful in predicting preload responsiveness. The objective of this study was to assess the diagnostic accuracy of hepatic vein Doppler S and D-wave velocities during PLR as a predictor of preload responsiveness.

Methods Prospective observational study conducted in two medical–surgical ICUs in Chile. Patients in circulatory failure and connected to controlled mechanical ventilation were included from August to December 2023. A baseline ultrasound assessment of cardiac function was performed. Then, simultaneously, ultrasound measurements of hepatic vein Doppler S and D waves and cardiac output by continuous pulse contour analysis device were performed during a PLR maneuver.

Results Thirty-seven patients were analyzed. 63% of the patients were preload responsive defined by a 10% increase in CO after passive leg raising. A 20% increase in the maximum S wave velocity after PLR showed the best diagnostic accuracy with a sensitivity of 69.6% (49.1–84.4) and specificity of 92.8 (68.5–99.6) to detect preload responsiveness, with an area under curve of receiving operator characteristic (AUC–ROC) of 0.82 ± 0.07 ($p = 0.001$ vs. AUC–ROC of 0.5). D-wave velocities showed worse diagnostic accuracy.

Conclusions Hepatic vein Doppler assessment emerges as a novel complementary technique with adequate predictive capacity to identify preload responsiveness in patients in mechanical ventilation and circulatory failure. This technique could become valuable in scenarios of basic hemodynamic monitoring and when echocardiography is not feasible. Future studies should confirm these results.

Keywords Passive leg raising, Hepatic vein Doppler, Preload responsiveness tests, Shock

*Correspondence:

Eduardo Kattan
e.kattan@gmail.com

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Background

Expert recommendations suggest that resuscitation strategies should include the assessment of dynamic parameters to identify patients who will significantly increase cardiac output (CO) after fluid administration [1, 2]. Different techniques to predict preload responsiveness have been described in the literature [3] by testing reversible changes in preload and assessing its impact on CO or its surrogates. Each of these tests have variable diagnostic accuracies, technical nuances, and most important, often limited clinical contexts in which they can be adequately applied at the bedside [4].

Among them, passive leg raising (PLR) has become one of the most used preload responsiveness tests, due to its applicability in a wide array of scenarios, including patients in spontaneous ventilation, low tidal volume ventilation or presence of arrhythmias [5]. Unfortunately, the maneuver requires either real-time CO [6] measurement through devices that are not routinely available in all intensive care units (ICU) [7], or ultrasound assessment of left ventricular outflow tract-velocity time integral (LVOT-VTI) [8], which is not always feasible to measure correctly [9]. This may be accentuated during PLR's fast position change of the thorax, which makes image acquisition more challenging.

The Guytonian model of circulation defines that at a steady state, CO is equal to venous return (VR) [10, 11]. Moreover, directly assessing VR in daily clinical practice has proven elusive [11], even though VR is constantly manipulated by administering both fluids and vasopressors. Recent interest has emerged on the analysis of hepatic vein Doppler (HVD) through surface ultrasound as a novel window to assess physiological and pathological cardiovascular states [12, 13]. It has a specific Doppler envelope, where S and D waves represent anterograde blood flow to the right chambers during the cardiac cycle [14], and presents a high image acquisition rate [15]. Thus, tracking changes in HVD after a dynamic test such as PLR could effectively aid clinicians to identify significant changes in VR (and thus, CO), potentially predicting preload responsiveness. Unfortunately, there is paucity of data assessing this phenomenon.

The objective of this observational bi-centric prospective study was to assess the diagnostic accuracy of the changes of HVD S and D-wave velocities during a PLR maneuver as predictor of preload responsiveness in mechanically ventilated critically ill patients requiring hemodynamic resuscitation. We hypothesized that changes in HVD S and D-wave velocities would accurately predict preload responsiveness in this study population.

Methods

The study protocol was approved by the Comité Ético Científico HGF-SSVQ (N: 07/2023), and Comité Ético Asistencial UC (N°: 220923006) and written informed consent was waived due to the observational and non-invasive nature of the study design. This study was conducted in accordance with the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and followed the STARD guidelines for diagnostic accuracy studies [16].

Patients

Subjects older than 18 years of age who were admitted to the ICU of Hospital de Quilpué, in Quilpué, Chile and Hospital Clínico UC-Christus, in Santiago, Chile requiring controlled mechanical ventilation, in circulatory failure, and in which the attending physician performed a PLR with cardiac output assessment (PLR-CO) as part of routine clinical care were considered eligible for this study. Circulatory failure was defined as the need for vasoactive drugs to maintain MAP \geq 65 mm Hg and the presence of at least one clinical sign of inadequate tissue perfusion, including: Lactate level $>$ 2 mmol/l, capillary refill time $>$ 3 s or a mottling score \geq 1.

Exclusion criteria included the impossibility to obtain an adequate hepatic ultrasound assessment; pregnancy; S-wave reversal in hepatic vein Doppler; confirmed or suspected abdominal hypertension; chronic kidney disease in hemodialysis [17]; patients with limitations of therapeutic effort; Child C cirrhosis [18]; moderate to severe tricuspid regurgitation; cardiac arrhythmias; spontaneous ventilation; extracorporeal life support; severe respiratory failure (PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio of $<$ 100 mm Hg) and/or need of PEEP $>$ 15 cm H₂O.

Ultrasound measurements

A baseline ultrasound assessment was performed as part of standard hemodynamic ICU management. This included echocardiography measures such as color Doppler of the tricuspid valve, left ventricular outflow tract-velocity time integral (LVOT-VTI), lateral mitral E/E' ratio, tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion (TAPSE), tricuspid annular systolic velocity by tissue Doppler imaging and ejection fraction (EF), which was calculated using Simpson's biplane or Teichholz method.

The middle hepatic vein (MHV) was identified from lateral or mid-subcostal view according to previously published reports [19, 20]. A phased array transducer was used with cardiac presets to facilitate study measurements. The MHV was interrogated 2–3 cm from its junction to the inferior vena cava. Color flow Doppler was used to identify high flow parallel to the ultrasound beam and then pulsed wave Doppler was obtained. The sample volume used was 2–3 mm, with velocity range of

65–80 mm/s, and the intercept angle between the Doppler beam and the vessels’ long axis was lower than 45°. Normal hepatic vein morphology follows a triphasic pattern, including two forward and one backward related. S-wave represents forward flow during early–mid systole, D-wave represents forward flow during early–mid diastole, and A-wave represents backward flow during late diastole [12]. The maximum velocity of D and S waves, as well as the VTI of D and S waves were recorded. All Doppler findings were obtained during the end-expiratory phase of the patients’ respiratory cycle with concurrent multi-lead ECG tracings. Trained operators performed ultrasound measurements using Mindray M9 (Bio-Medical Electronics Co., Shenzhen, China).

PLR maneuver

Whenever the attending clinician performed a PLR–CO to assess fluid responsiveness status, the technique was performed according to current recommendations [21]. Baseline patient positioning was in semi-recumbent at 45° angle and ended with the trunk in supine position and both legs elevated [22], as shown in Fig. 1.

Stroke volume and cardiac output were obtained with a continuous pulse contour analysis device (Argos® Cardiac Output Monitor, Retia Medical, USA). The monitors’ refresh rate was set at 20 s to detect meaningful variations during the PLR maneuver. Arterial line transducing

adequacy was checked before the PLR maneuver. The HVD measurements were repeated between 1–2 min after leg elevation, at end expiration as well. We did not measure LVOT–VTI after PLR due to the limited time-frame of the maneuver’s effect on CO (1–2 min) [6]. Due to this small window of opportunity, we focused on obtaining proper HVD measurements. During the measurement period, adequacy of arterial line transduction and a minimum tidal volume of 8 ml/kg IBW during controlled mechanical ventilation was ensured. Patients were considered preload responders if CO increased 10% or more after PLR, as suggested by previous studies and recent expert recommendations [23–25].

Data registry

Demographic data such as age, sex, comorbidities, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II (APACHE II), Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, Charlson comorbidity index, diagnostic group on admission, laboratory tests, mechanical ventilation parameters [23] and clinically relevant outcomes such as ICU length of stay and 28-day mortality were registered.

Statistical analysis

Demographic variables are presented as frequency (percentage) and mean ± standard error (SD) or median [interquartile range] as appropriate, depending on data




Fig. 1 Study protocol. VTI velocity time integral

normality distribution. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) were constructed to assess the diagnostic accuracy of HVD S and D-wave velocity and VTI changes to predict a preload responsive status. Data are presented as the area under the ROC curve (AUC–ROC) ± SD (with a 95% confidence interval), sensitivity (95% CI) and specificity (95% CI). The Youden index (sensitivity + specificity – 1) was calculated to determine the best cutoff values. The grey zone approach was performed to define cases under 90% of sensitivity and specificity (diagnostic tolerance of 10%). AUC–ROC between variables were compared according to Hanley and McNeil method [26]. We performed two exploratory sensitivity analyses: first, using a 15% increase of CO cutoff after PLR, and second, using a 10% cutoff on stroke volume (SV).

Considering previous reports [25, 27], we estimated the sample size comparing an expected AUC–ROC of 0.78 curve with the null hypothesis of 0.50, assuming a two-sided α error of 0.05 and power of 80%. In total, at least 36 cases were required to be included. A *p* value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Data were analyzed with Graphpad Prism 10.0 (Graphpad Softwares, La Joya, CA) statistical package.

Results

From August to December 2023, we screened 50 patients for eligibility and 37 met inclusion and exclusion criteria, as shown in the study flow (Additional File 1). The main patient characteristics at baseline are presented in Table 1. Median age was of 59 ± 15 years, and most had sepsis-related circulatory dysfunction. Median SOFA score was 8 [6–10], and median norepinephrine dose at measurement time was of 0.15 [0.06–0.37] mcg/kg/min. 8% (3/37) of patients were on vasopressin infusion as a second vasopressor. Regarding the tissue perfusion triggers that prompted clinicians to perform a PLR assessment, 40% of patients had abnormal lactate, 46% altered CRT, and 14% an altered mottling score [28].

62% of the patients were preload responsive defined by a 10% increase in CO after PLR. Table 2 shows key hemodynamic, echocardiographic and HV Doppler variables in preload responsive and unresponsive patients. In 11% (4/37) of patients, LVOT–VTI was not assessable due to poor 5-chamber view window. Additional File 2 shows key ventilatory settings in both study groups, while Additional File 3 shows the relationship between TAPSE and Delta S-wave velocity in the whole study cohort.

Figure 2 shows ROC curves of the different HVD velocities studied to predict preload responsiveness status. Among them, Delta of S-wave velocity had the higher AUC–ROC (0.82 ± 0.07, *p* = 0.001), as shown in Table 3, followed by delta S-wave VTI (0.76 ± 0.08, *p* = 0.008). No statistically significant differences were found when

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of study population

Variable	Value
Age (years)	59 ± 15
Male (%)	54%
Diagnosis (%)	
Sepsis/septic shock	81%
Non-cardiac surgery	8%
Other	11%
SOFA score	8 [6–10]
APACHE 2 score	15 [8–22]
Charlson comorbidity index	2 [0–5]
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.5 [1–2.9]
CRT (secs)	3 [2–7]
ScvO2 (%)	83 [69–80]
Delta pCO2 a-v (mmHg)	7 [5–9]
Norepinephrine dose (mcg/kg/min)	0.15 [0.06–0.37]
CVP (mmHg)	10 [7–13]
Use of Vasopressin (%)	8%
ICU LOS (Days)	8 [4–13]
28-day mortality (%)	32%

CVP: Central venous pressure, SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, ICU LOS: Intensive care unit length of stay, CRF Capillary refill time, ScvO2 Central venous oxygen saturation, APACHE II Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II

Table 2 Hemodynamic parameters and ultrasound measurements according to preload responsiveness status

	PR+	PR–	<i>P</i> value
Number of patients	62% (23/37)	38% (14/37)	
HR (bpm)	84 ± 21	77 ± 18	0.3
MAP (mmHg)	72 [65–77]	79 [72–88]	0.04
CVP (mmHg)	9 [8–15]	10 [7–15]	0.8
CRT (s)	4 [2–7]	3 [2–5]	0.17
NE dose (mcg/kg/min)	0.1 [0.03–0.23]	0.28 [0.08–0.56]	0.1
Stroke volume (mL)	52.5 ± 21.4	61.1 ± 15.5	0.17
Cardiac output (L/min)	4.3 ± 1.5	5.0 ± 2.1	0.25
LVOT–VTI	16.1 ± 4.3	15.1 ± 4.2	0.51
TAPSE (mm)	19.9 ± 4.1	17.2 ± 3.2	0.045
LVEF (%)	49 ± 13	51 ± 11	0.59
<i>E/E'</i> ratio	7.7 ± 2.5	8.3 ± 2.5	0.5
Baseline S-wave velocity (m/s)	19 [16–23.1]	21 [17–24.7]	0.34
Baseline D-wave velocity (m/s)	16.5 [13.6–17.7]	17.1 [13–20.4]	0.58
Baseline S-wave VTI (cm)	4.1 [3.5–4.9]	4.0 [3.4–5.8]	0.88
Baseline D-wave VTI (cm)	3.1 [1.9–4.6]	3.5 [2.1–4.9]	0.68

HR heart rate, MAP mean arterial pressure, CVP central venous pressure, CRT capillary refill time, NE norepinephrine, LVOT–VTI left ventricular outflow tract–velocity time integral, TAPSE tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion, LVEF Left ventricle ejection fraction, *E/E'* ratio mitral peak Doppler E-wave to peak mitral annulus velocity ratio, VTI velocity time integral, PR preload responsiveness status




Fig. 2 Receiver operating curves of different hepatic vein Doppler parameters to identify preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of CO > 10%). VTI velocity time integral




Fig. 3 Grey-zone approach of delta-velocity of S-wave hepatic vein Doppler

comparing AUC–ROC of the S-waves related variables ($p=0.58$). The other variables studied (delta D-wave velocity and delta VTI D-wave), had lower diagnostic yield. Additional File 4 and 5 show ROC curves, AUC–ROC and optimal cutoff values to predict an increase of >10% of stroke volume of the studied parameters. Additional Files 6 and 7 show ROC curves, AUC–ROC and optimal cutoff values to predict an increase of >15% of CO, showing similar diagnostic accuracies for Delta S-wave velocity in these contexts.

The optimal cutoff value was obtained for each variable through the Youden index. A 20% increase in the maximum S wave velocity after PLR showed a sensitivity of 69.6 (49.1–84.4) and specificity of 92.8 (68.5–99.6) to detect preload responsiveness, as shown in Table 3. Figure 3 shows the grey-zone approach for delta S-wave velocity, in which 33% of the study group was located between the grey-zone limits. Additional File 8 shows a plot of individual values of different HVD parameters vs. delta CO, which shows the best correlation with Delta S-wave velocity.

Discussion

The main results of our study can be summarized as follows. A change of 20% of S-wave peak velocity or 25% of S-wave VTI may identify preload responsiveness during

a PLR maneuver in sedated and mechanically ventilated critically ill patients. Analysis of D-wave velocities had worse predictive capacity.

The hemodynamic effects of a PLR maneuver have been estimated to mimic a fluid challenge of approximately 300 ml [21]. Current expert recommendations suggest performing the test from a semi-recumbent rather than from supine position, to induce shifts from two vascular beds (the legs and the splanchnic region) and enhance diagnostic accuracy [21]. This was hypothesized in the study by Jabot et al., in which sequential postural changes from semirecumbent to supine and from supine to leg elevation had similar net effect to that of the entire maneuver performed at once [22]. The authors inferred that the scaffolded approach isolated the relative contributions of both vascular territories (splanchnic and legs), but unfortunately, it wasn’t measured [22]. The current study provides direct assessment on the impact of PLR on splanchnic flow through Doppler assessment, potentially confirming this hypothesis. In this sense, the fact that significant changes in flow-related measurements of the splanchnic region accurately predicted changes in CO, support that the contribution of this venous reservoir is relevant, at least in this clinical context. Future research endeavors should further investigate the relative contribution of each territory in this and other clinical contexts.

Table 3 Diagnostic accuracy of preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of CO > 10%), and selected cutoff values for hepatic vein Doppler measurements

	AUC–ROC	95% CI	p value	Best Cutoff (%)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	LR +	LR–
Delta S-wave velocity	0.82 ± 0.07	0.68–0.96	0.001	20	69.6 (49.1–84.4)	92.8 (68.5–99.6)	9.7	0.33
Delta D-wave velocity	0.73 ± 0.09	0.56–0.91	0.02	2.1	82.6 (62.8–93)	64.3 (38.8–83.7)	2.3	0.27
Delta S-wave VTI	0.76 ± 0.08	0.61–0.92	0.008	> 25	56.5 (36.8–74.4)	92.8 (68.5–99.6)	7.9	0.47
Delta D-wave VTI	0.67 ± 0.1	0.47–0.87	0.09	> 2.1	73.9 (53.5–87.5)	64.3 (38.8–83.6)	2.1	0.4

AUC–ROC area under curve–receiver operator characteristic, LR likelihood ratio, VTI velocity time integral

Contemporary research has assessed the accuracy of splanchnic Doppler signals to predict preload responsiveness. Cheong et al. analyzed the utility of portal vein pulsatility index (PVPi), finding that a value of $PVPi > 32\%$ predicted fluid unresponsiveness with a sensitivity 30.8% (17–47.6%) and specificity of 100% (85.8–100) [29]. On the other hand, Wu et al. analyzed absolute values of S and D waves of HVD, finding higher delta S-wave velocity on patients where cardiac output increased after volume expansion as compared to those where it did not ($30.1 \text{ cm/s} \pm 10.2$ to $37.1 \text{ cm/s} \pm 12.5$; $p < 0.003$) [30], moreover, no diagnostic accuracy was analyzed. Our study further expands the results obtained by these previous researchers, since they aim specifically at interrogating Doppler waves that represent forward flow to the atrium and are near inferior vena cava drainage, as compared to portal vein. Thus, we believe it has a stronger physiological background and could interrogate more directly changes in VR, explaining their increased accuracy.

Multiple tests to predict preload responsiveness have focused on measuring arterial flow-related variables to identify markers of CO increase [31], such as pulse pressure or stroke volume. Only two proposed preload responsiveness tests have focused on interrogating the venous side of circulation, namely SVC and IVC diameter variability [32, 33]. However, both present technical and conceptual challenges. The former requires transesophageal ultrasound (US) measurements [34], hindering its' widespread applicability, while the latter has multiple technical drawbacks related to insonation angle, IVC sphericity and venous compliance, limiting its' diagnostic accuracy [35]. The novel approach proposed on this study, which focuses on blood flow variations measured through pulsed Doppler rather than anatomical variations, such as diameter, could help overcome these issues, and approach indirectly to VR changes. Due to the angulation required, obtaining flow patterns from the IVC is not feasible, but the HV provides an adequate US assessment site that drains directly into the IVC without major valves or obstructions, becoming a valuable and emerging window for hemodynamic assessment.

Recently, the visual inspection of HVD has also been studied as a marker for venous congestion or fluid intolerance, being a pivotal component of the VExUS score [36]. S-wave reversal, which represents retrograde flow, has been proposed as a marker of hepatosplanchnic congestion. Altered VexUS has correlated to key hemodynamic parameters such as high CVP values [37], and could predict the risk of acute kidney injury in different contexts. HVD has also been used as a marker of venous congestion in heart failure context with prognostic implications as well [38]. As proposed by Kenny et al., the

dynamic assessment of waveform patterns (i.e., increase in D wave or reversion of S wave) through a PLR maneuver or fluid challenge could aid in identifying potential congestion [39, 40]. Thus, HVD could be a fairly unique tool able to assess not only fluid responsiveness as seen this manuscript, but also assess fluid tolerance, which is of growing clinical importance [41, 42]. Moreover, future research efforts should answer these areas of uncertainty.

Of note, in this cohort, preload responsive patients had significantly higher baseline TAPSE readings as compared to non-responders (although median values were within normal range). Thus, it could be argued that the difference in preload responsiveness status was determined because patients had better right ventricular function, determining a steeper cardiac function curve. Recent reports such as Zhang et al. have shown that TAPSE correlates with HVD-derived indexes such as the systolic filling fraction [$S\text{-wave velocity}/(S\text{-wave} + D\text{-wave velocities})$] [20]. Our results show that delta S-wave velocity correlates with TAPSE (Additional File 3). Both phenomena could be explained by the fact that during ventricular systole the tricuspid annulus moves inward to the cardiac apex, which causes a further anterograde flow during systole (thus reflected in the S wave of HVD) [14]. Moreover, this study was not designed to address this question, and clinical interpretation should be made with caution considering other key echocardiographic results obtained, but certainly it deserves further exploration.

This study has several strengths. First, it's bicentric nature. Second, delta S-wave velocity presented an adequate AUC–ROC (> 0.8), with less than 40% of measurements in the gray zone of diagnostic tolerance. This becomes particularly relevant when considering the easiness of image acquisition, as compared to LVOT–VTI. In fact, Spiegel et al. only reported 7.9% of inadequate HVD window in a cohort of patients admitted to ICU [43], similar rate to that shown by Prager et al. in a cohort of septic shock patients [15]. Even though our study was not designed to assess image acquisition feasibility of HVD, we excluded only 4% of patients for this reason out of the eligible patients screened (Additional File 1). This contrasts significantly to the prevalence of inadequate windows to obtain LVOT–VTI, which can amount up to 22% [44, 45]. Added to the non-invasive nature of the technique, no requirement of CO monitor and its' easier learning curve, HVD could emerge as a valuable tool at the bedside assessment of critically ill patients.

This study has several limitations. First, as all ultrasound-based assessments, the technique is operator dependent and intra or inter-observer variability could occur. Second, we decided to assess changes in CO through a PLR rather than the more classic design of administering a fluid challenge [25] to assess fluid

responsiveness. Even though the fluid challenge has been praised as a gold-standard technique, both the physiological determinants of PLR (± 300 ml of autotransfusion) and the diagnostic accuracy of its' derived measurements (sensitivities and specificities $> 85\%$) [24], provide a comparable alternative. This approach has already been used in the contemporary literature of diagnostic accuracy of preload responsiveness tests [46, 47], and has the added benefit of avoiding potential deleterious fluids [48, 49] to patients which are preload unresponsive. Another potential criticism could be the use of non-calibrated CO monitors such as those used in this study. Moreover, the technical determinants (i.e., pulse contour analysis) for tracking relative changes of CO are the same as those used in transpulmonary thermodilution (TPTD), and the least significant changes of CO variability has been estimated around 1%, significantly under our detection threshold of PR of 10% [50]. The multibeat pulse contour monitoring used has a short refresh rate (20 s), and presents an adequate ability to capture quick and relative changes such as those happening during a PLR, as shown in recent studies [51, 52]. There was a predominance of septic patients, which could present with higher rates of preload responsiveness [53]. Thus, this could preclude extrapolation to other diagnostic groups of circulatory failure. Since our study was the first assessment of the diagnostic accuracy of this novel technique, we decided to avoid potential physiological confounders, such as right sided valvular diseases, light sedation or patients with respiratory efforts, which could introduce bias or error and preclude a correct interpretation of results.

Future studies should confirm these results and test the diagnostic capacity of HVD in broader contexts of critical illness, such as patients with spontaneous breathing, light sedation, arrhythmias or valvular diseases. Aswell, the usefulness of the dynamic assessment of fluid intolerance through identification of flow patterns of S and D waves in concomitance with preload responsiveness could aid clinicians on identifying the best balance between risk/benefit ratio on fluid administration. Finally, future studies could compare, through hand-tracking devices, the difference on number of movements and distance travelled between HVD and LVOT–VTI during a PLR maneuver [54].

In conclusion, in sedated and mechanically ventilated critically ill patients, dynamic changes of S-wave on HVD after a PLR maneuver had a suitable predictable capacity to identify preload responsiveness. This technique could become valuable in scenarios of basic hemodynamic monitoring and when cardiac US is not

feasible. Future studies should confirm these results and their relationship with dynamic venous congestion assessment.

Abbreviations

CO	Cardiac output
PLR	Passive leg raising
ICU	Intensive care unit
LVOT–VTI	Left ventricular outflow tract–velocity time integral
VR	Venous return
HVD	Hepatic vein Doppler
PLR–CO	PLR with cardiac output assessment
MAP	Mean arterial pressure
PEEP	Positive end-expiratory pressure
TAPSE	Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion
EF	Ejection fraction
MHV	Middle hepatic vein
VTI	Velocity time integral
IBW	Ideal body weight
APACHE-II	Acute physiology and chronic health disease classification system II
SOFA	Sequential organ failure assessment score
AUC–ROC	Area under the curve receiver–operating characteristic
ROC	Receiver–operating characteristic
PVPI	Portal vein pulsatility index
SVC	Superior vena cava
IVC	Inferior vena cava
US	Ultrasound
VexUS	Venous excess ultrasound score
TPTD	Transpulmonary thermodilution

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40635-024-00631-w>.

Additional File 1. Study flow

Additional File 2. Ventilatory parameters of the study cohort.

Additional File 3. Linear relationship between Delta S-wave velocity and TAPSE.

Additional File 4. Diagnostic accuracy of preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of stroke volume $> 10\%$), and selected cutoff values for hepatic vein Doppler measurements.

Additional File 5. Receiver operating curves of different hepatic vein Doppler parameters to identify preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of stroke volume $> 10\%$).

Additional File 6. Diagnostic accuracy of preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of cardiac output $> 15\%$), and selected cutoff values for hepatic vein Doppler measurements

Additional File 7. Receiver operating curves of different hepatic vein Doppler parameters to identify preload responsiveness (defined by an increase of cardiac output $> 15\%$).

Additional File 8. Linear relationship between HVD velocities variation and cardiac output variation. CO: cardiac output; VTI: velocity time integral.

Acknowledgements

None.

Author contributions

MB, FM and EK contributed to the study conception, and design. MB, SA, FM, LC, CG, RC, RU and MH contributed to clinical conduction of the study. MB, FM, CG, JR, RC, AW, GH and EK contributed to statistical analysis and interpretation. MB, FM, RU, JR, RC, PR, AW, ERA, RC, GH and EK contributed on the manuscript drafting. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

Funding

This study has been funded by FONDECYT ANID Grant N° 1230475.

Availability of data and materials

The data sets are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations**Ethics approval and consent to participate**

The study protocol was approved by the Comité Ético Científico HGF-SSVQ (N: 07/2023), and Comité Ético Asistencial UC (N°: 220923006) and written informed consent was waived due to the observational and non-invasive nature of the study design.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos, Hospital de Quilpué, Quilpué, Chile. ²Facultad de Medicina, Escuela de Medicina, Universidad Andrés Bello, Viña del Mar, Chile. ³Departamento de Medicina Intensiva, Facultad de Medicina, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Avenida Diagonal Paraguay 362, Santiago, Chile. ⁴Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos, Hospital Las Higueras, Talcahuano, Chile. ⁵Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos, Hospital Gustavo Frické, Viña del Mar, Chile. ⁶Intensive Care Unit, Hopital Santa Cabrini, CIUSSS EMTL, Montreal, Canada. ⁷Department of Critical Care, King's College Hospital, London, UK. ⁸Departamento de Nefrología y Metabolismo Mineral, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico. ⁹Tecnológico de Monterrey, Escuela de Medicina y Ciencias de la Salud, Mexico City, Mexico. ¹⁰Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos, Hospital Biprovincial Quillota-Petorca, Quillota, Chile.

Received: 4 March 2024 Accepted: 4 May 2024

Published online: 08 May 2024

References

- Evans L, Rhodes A, Alhazzani W et al (2021) Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021. *Intensive Care Med* 47:1181–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-021-06506-y>
- Bakker J, Kattan E, Annane D et al (2022) Current practice and evolving concepts in septic shock resuscitation. *Intensive Care Med* 48:148–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-021-06595-9>
- Monnet X, Marik PE, Teboul JL (2016) Prediction of fluid responsiveness: an update. *Ann Intensive Care* 6:111
- Monnet X, Shi R, Teboul JL (2022) Prediction of fluid responsiveness. What's new? *Ann Intensive Care* 12:46
- Mesquida J, Gruartmoner G, Ferrer R (2017) Passive leg raising for assessment of volume responsiveness: a review. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 23:237–243
- Monnet X, Rienzo M, Osman D et al (2006) Passive leg raising predicts fluid responsiveness in the critically ill. *Crit Care Med* 34:1402–1407. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CCM.0000215453.11735.06>
- Estenssoro E, Alegría L, Murias G et al (2017) Organizational issues, structure, and processes of care in 257 ICUs in Latin America: a study from the Latin America Intensive Care Network. *Crit Care Med* 45:1325–1336. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000002413>
- Blanco P (2020) Rationale for using the velocity–time integral and the minute distance for assessing the stroke volume and cardiac output in point-of-care settings. *Ultrasound J* 12:21
- Blanco P, Aguiar FM, Blaivas M (2015) Rapid ultrasound in shock (RUSH) velocity–time integral: a proposal to expand the RUSH protocol. *J Ultrasound Med* 34:1691–1700. <https://doi.org/10.7863/ultra.15.14.08059>
- Guyton AC, Lindsey AW, Abernathy B et al (1957) Venous return at various right atrial pressures and the normal venous return curve. *Am J Physiol* 189:609–615
- Persichini R, Lai C, Teboul JL et al (2022) Venous return and mean systemic filling pressure: physiology and clinical applications. *Crit Care* 26:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-022-04024-x>
- Fadel BM, Alkalbani A, Husain A et al (2015) Respiratory hemodynamics in the hepatic veins—normal pattern. *Echocardiography* 32:585–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/echo.12744>
- Bang DH, Son Y, Lee YH, Yoon KH (2014) Doppler ultrasonography measurement of hepatic hemodynamics during Valsalva maneuver: healthy volunteer study. *Ultrasonography* 34:32–38. <https://doi.org/10.14366/usg.14029>
- Scheinfeld MH, Bilali A, Koenigsberg M (2009) Understanding the Spectral Doppler waveform of the hepatic veins in health and disease. *Radiographics* 29:2081–2098. <https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.297095715>
- Prager R, Arntfield R, Wong MYS et al (2024) Venous congestion in septic shock quantified with point-of-care ultrasound: a pilot prospective multicentre cohort study. *Can J Anaesth*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12630-024-02717-1>
- Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE et al (2015) STARD 2015: an updated list of essential items for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. *BMJ* 351:h5527. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h5527>
- Provenzano M, Rivoli L, Garofalo C et al (2020) Renal resistive index in chronic kidney disease patients: possible determinants and risk profile. *PLoS ONE* 15:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230020>
- Iranpour P, Lall C, Houshyar R et al (2016) Altered Doppler flow patterns in cirrhosis patients: an overview. *Ultrasonography* 35:3–12. <https://doi.org/10.14366/usg.15020>
- Coulden RA, Lomas DJ, Farman P et al (1992) Doppler ultrasound of the hepatic veins: normal appearances. *Clin Radiol* 45:223–227
- Zhang H, Liu Y, Zhang Q et al (2022) Hepatic vein Doppler in critically ill patients: a reflection of central venous pressure or right ventricular systolic function? *BMC Anesthesiol* 22:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-022-01872-6>
- Monnet X, Teboul JL (2015) Passive leg raising: five rules, not a drop of fluid! *Crit Care* 19:18
- Jabot J, Teboul JL, Richard C, Monnet X (2009) Passive leg raising for predicting fluid responsiveness: importance of the postural change. *Intensive Care Med* 35:85–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-008-1293-3>
- Messina A, Chew MS, Poole D et al (2024) Consistency of data reporting in fluid responsiveness studies in the critically ill setting: the CODEFIRE consensus from the Cardiovascular Dynamic section of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care Med*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-024-07344-4>
- Monnet X, Marik P, Teboul JL (2016) Passive leg raising for predicting fluid responsiveness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 42:1935–1947. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-015-4134-1>
- Shi R, Moretto F, Prat D et al (2022) Dynamic changes of pulse pressure but not of pulse pressure variation during passive leg raising predict preload responsiveness in critically ill patients with spontaneous breathing activity. *J Crit Care* 72:154141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jccr.2022.154141>
- Hanley JA, McNeil BJ (1983) A method of comparing the areas under receiver operating characteristic curves derived from the same cases. *Radiology* 148:839–843. <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiology.148.3.6878708>
- Messina A, Caporale M, Calabrò L et al (2023) Reliability of pulse pressure and stroke volume variation in assessing fluid responsiveness in the operating room: a meta-analysis and a metaregression. *Crit Care* 27:431. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04706-0>
- Ceccconi M, Hofer C, Teboul JL et al (2015) Fluid challenges in intensive care: the FENICE study: a global inception cohort study. *Intensive Care Med* 41:1529–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-015-3850-x>
- Cheong I, Amador EDO, Gómez RA et al (2023) Evaluating the utility of portal vein pulsatility index for detecting fluid unresponsiveness in the intensive care unit. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 37:1677–1682. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2023.05.039>
- Du W, Wang XT, Long Y, Liu DW (2017) Monitoring changes in hepatic venous velocities flow after a fluid challenge can identify shock patients who lack fluid responsiveness. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 130:1202–1210. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0366-6999.205848>

31. Alhashemi JA, Cecconi M, Hofer CK (2011) Cardiac output monitoring— an integrative perspective. *Crit Care* 15:214
32. Vieillard-Baron A, Chergui K, Rabiller A et al (2004) Superior vena caval collapsibility as a gauge of volume status in ventilated septic patients. *Intensive Care Med* 30:1734–1739. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-004-2361-y>
33. Barbier C, Loubières Y, Schmit C et al (2004) Respiratory changes in inferior vena cava diameter are helpful in predicting fluid responsiveness in ventilated septic patients. *Intensive Care Med* 30:1740–1746. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-004-2259-8>
34. Vignon P, Repessé X, Begot E et al (2017) Comparison of echocardiographic indices used to predict fluid responsiveness in ventilated patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 195:1022–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201604-0844OC>
35. Vignon P (2004) Evaluation of fluid responsiveness in ventilated septic patients: back to venous return. *Intensive Care Med* 30:1699–1701
36. Denault AY, Beaubien-Souligny W, Elmi-Sarabi M et al (2017) Clinical significance of portal hypertension diagnosed with bedside ultrasound after cardiac surgery. *Anesth Analg* 124:1109–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000001812>
37. Longino A, Martin K, Leyba K et al (2023) Correlation between the VExUS score and right atrial pressure: a pilot prospective observational study. *Crit Care* 27:205. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04471-0>
38. Ohara H, Yoshihisa A, Ishibashi S et al (2023) Hepatic venous stasis index reflects hepatic congestion and predicts adverse outcomes in patients with heart failure. *J Am Heart Assoc* 12:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.029857>
39. Kenny JES, Prager R, Rola P et al (2023) The effect of gravity-induced preload change on the venous excess ultrasound (VExUS) score and internal jugular vein Doppler in healthy volunteers. *Intensive Care Med Exp* 11:19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40635-023-00504-8>
40. Kenny J-ÉS, Prager R, Rola P et al (2023) Unifying fluid responsiveness and tolerance with physiology: a dynamic interpretation of the diamond-Forrester classification. *Crit Care Explor* 5:e1022. <https://doi.org/10.1097/cce.0000000000001022>
41. Muñoz F, Born P, Bruna M et al (2024) Coexistence of a fluid responsive state and venous congestion signals in critically ill patients: a multicenter observational proof-of-concept study. *Crit Care* 28:52. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-024-04834-1>
42. Kattan E, Castro R, Miralles-Aguar F et al (2022) The emerging concept of fluid tolerance : a position paper. *J Crit Care* 71:154070. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2022.154070>
43. Spiegel R, Teeter W, Sullivan S et al (2020) The use of venous Doppler to predict adverse kidney events in a general ICU cohort. *Crit Care* 24:615. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-020-03330-6>
44. Nagueh SF, Kopelen HA, Zoghbi WA (1995) Feasibility and accuracy of Doppler echocardiographic estimation of pulmonary artery occlusive pressure in the intensive care unit. *Am J Cardiol* 15(74):1256–1262
45. Bergenzaun L, Gudmundsson P, Öhlin H et al (2011) Assessing left ventricular systolic function in shock: evaluation of echocardiographic parameters in intensive care. *Crit Care* 15:R200. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc10368>
46. Monnet X, Lai C, Teboul JL (2023) How I personalize fluid therapy in septic shock? *Crit Care* 27:123
47. Maizel J, Airapetian N, Lorne E et al (2007) Diagnosis of central hypovolemia by using passive leg raising. *Intensive Care Med* 33:1133–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-007-0642-y>
48. Boyd JH, Forbes J, Nakada TA et al (2011) Fluid resuscitation in septic shock: a positive fluid balance and elevated central venous pressure are associated with increased mortality. *Crit Care Med* 39:259–265. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181feeb15>
49. Malbrain MLNG, Marik PE, Witters I et al (2014) Fluid overload, de-resuscitation, and outcomes in critically ill or injured patients: a systematic review with suggestions for clinical practice. *Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther* 46:361–380. <https://doi.org/10.5603/AIT.2014.0060>
50. de Courson H, Ferrer L, Cane G et al (2019) Evaluation of least significant changes of pulse contour analysis-derived parameters. *Ann Intensive Care* 9:116. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-019-0590-z>
51. Hernández G, Valenzuela ED, Kattan E et al (2024) Capillary refill time response to a fluid challenge or a vasopressor test: an observational, proof-of-concept study. *Ann Intensive Care* 14:49. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-024-01275-5>
52. Bitker L, Noiro I, Chauvelot L, Mezidi M, Dhelft F, Gaillet M, Yonis H, Deniel G, JR, (2024) Evaluation of bias and trending ability of non-calibrated multi-beat analysis continuous cardiac output monitoring in critically patients. *Crit Care* 28:P080. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-024-04822-5>
53. Cooke K, Sharvill R, Sondergaard S, Aneman A (2018) Volume responsiveness assessed by passive leg raising and a fluid challenge: a critical review focused on mean systemic filling pressure. *Anaesthesia* 73:313–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.14162>
54. Kattan E, De la Fuente R, Putz F et al (2020) Simulation-based mastery learning of bronchoscopy-guided percutaneous dilatational tracheostomy: competency acquisition and skills transfer to a cadaveric model. *Simul Healthc*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0000000000000491>

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.