



Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University
Department of Anesthesia,
Intensive Care and Pain Management

**The Role of Inferior Vena Cava Diameter
Variation ratio Measured by Ultrasonography
versus Central Venous Pressure in Assessment
Of Volume Responsiveness of
Shocked Hepatic Patients**

Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of M.D Degree
In Anesthesiology*

By

Mohamed Abdel Wareth Mohamed

M.B.B.Ch., M.Sc. Anesthesiology
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Raafat Abdel Azim Hammad

Professor of Anesthesia & Intensive Care and Pain Management
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Dina Salah El din Mahmoud

Assistant Professor of Anesthesia & Intensive Care and Pain Management
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Rami Mounir Wahba

Lecturer of Anesthesia & Intensive Care and Pain Management
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohamed Mahmoud Ahmed Maarouf

Lecturer of Anesthesia & Intensive Care and Pain Management
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

*Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University*

2019

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لسببائك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgement

*My thanks are submitted first and foremost to **ALLAH** who gave me the strength and ability to complete this work.*

*I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Raafat Abdel Azim Hammad**, Professor of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Management, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his candid opinions, timely feedback, insights and the effort and time he has devoted to the fulfillment of this work. I am indebted to his meticulous follow-up and constructive criticism.*

*My sincere gratitude and appreciation are also due to **Dr. Dina Salah El din Mahmoud**, Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Management, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her kind help, constant encouragement, constructive criticism, and the time and effort she dedicated to this work.*

*I can't forget to thank with all appreciation, **Dr. Rami Mounir Wahba**, Lecturer of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Management, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for the efforts and time he has devoted to accomplish this work.*

*I would like also to thank **Dr. Mohamed Mahmoud Ahmed Maarouf**, Lecturer of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Management, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his valuable role in the practical part of this work.*

*Last but not least, this work is dedicated to all our **patients**, without them, this work would have been of no value, and also to my **colleagues** for their support and care in every step of my career.*

*I can't forget to thank all members of my family, especially my **Parents** and my **Wife**, for the support and care in every step of my life.*

Mohamed Abdel Wareth Mohamed



Contents

Subjects	Page
• List of Abbreviations.....	I
• List of Tables.....	IV
• List of Figures.....	V
• Introduction	1
• Aim of the Study.....	4
• Review of Literature	
- Liver cirrhosis.....	5
- Shock.....	21
- Intravascular volume assessment.....	35
• Patients and Methods.....	55
• Results	65
• Discussion.....	104
• Conclusion and Recommendations.....	112
• Summary.....	114
• References.....	117
• Summary in Arabic.....	-

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
ADH	Anti diuretic hormone
ALF	Acute liver failure
ALT	Alanine aminotransferase
ANA	Anti nuclear antibody
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
Anti LKM	Anti liver kidney microsome antibody
AP diameter	Anteroposterior diameter
AST	Aspartate aminotransferase
BMI	Body mass index
BUS	Bed side ultrasound
CT	Computed tomography
CVC	Central venous catheter
CVL	central venous line
CVP	Central venous pressure
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
Ea	Effective arterial elastance
ECG	Electrocardiogram
FACTT	Fluid and Catheter Treatment Trial
HE	Hepatic encephalopathy
HR	Heart rate

 List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
HRS	Hepatorenal syndrome
Ht.	Height
ICU	Intensive care unit
IgA	Immunoglobulin A
IgG	Immunoglobulin G
IgM	Immunoglobulin M
INR	International normalized ratio
IVC	Inferior vena cava
IVC-CI	Inferior vena cava collapsibility index
IVCd-max	Maximum inferior vena cava diameter
IVCd-min	Minimum inferior vena cava diameter
LV	Left ventricle
MAP	Mean arterial pressure
MELD	Model for End-Stage Liver Disease
MRCP	Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
NASH	Non alcoholic steatohepatitis
NIBP	Non invasive blood pressure
NO-synthase	Nitric oxide synthase
PAC	Pulmonary artery catheter
PEEP	Positive end expiratory pressure

 List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
PELD	Pediatric End-Stage Liver Disease
PLR	Passive leg raising
P-value	Probability value
RA	Right atrium
RAP	Right atrial pressure
RV	Right ventricle
SBP	Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis
SD	Standard deviation
SPO₂	Peripheral oxygen saturation
SVR	Systemic vascular resistance
TNF-alpha	Tumor necrosis factor alpha
USA	United States of America
USG	Ultrasonography
Wt.	Weight

List of Tables

No	Table	Page
1	Methods to assess volume status in patients with cirrhosis and their limitations	36
2	Demographic data distribution.	66
3	MAP changes in volume responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	69
4	MAP changes in volume non responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	72
5	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to MAP.	73
6	HR changes in volume responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	77
7	HR changes in volume non responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management	80
8	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to heart rate.	81
9	CVP changes in volume responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	85
10	CVP changes in volume non responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	88
11	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to central venous pressure.	89
12	IVC-CI changes in volume responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	92
13	IVC-CI changes in volume non responder patients in response to volume resuscitation over time periods of management.	95

 List of Tables

No	Table	Page
14	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to Inferior vena cava collapsibility index.	96
15	Correlation between CVP (cmH ₂ O) and Caval index over the periods, using Pearson Correlation Coefficient in volume responders.	98
16	Correlation between CVP (cmH ₂ O) and Caval index over the study periods, using Pearson Correlation Coefficient in volume non responders.	101

List of Figures

No	Figure	Page
1	Etiology and complications of cirrhosis	6
2	Pathophysiology of liver cirrhosis	9
3	Sonographic view of short axis view of the IVC	46
4	Sonographic view of long axis view of the IVC	46
5	Sonographic view of short-axis view of a small IVC with inspiratory collapse	48
6	Sonographic view of long-axis view of small IVC with inspiratory collapse	48
7	Sonographic view of M-mode long-axis view of small IVC with inspiratory collapse	49
8	Sonographic view of M-mode short-axis view of small IVC with inspiratory collapse	49
9	Sonographic view of short-axis view of a large IVC without inspiratory collapse	50
10	Sonographic view of long-axis view of a large IVC without inspiratory collapse	50
11	Sonographic view of M-mode short-axis view of a large IVC without inspiratory collapse	51
12	Age distribution curve	65
13	Body mass index distribution curve.	66
14	Baseline MAP distribution in volume responders.	67
15	MAP distribution in volume responders after 1 hour	68
16	MAP distribution in volume responders after 4 hours	68
17	MAP distribution in volume responders after 8 hours.	69

No	Figure	Page
18	Baseline MAP distribution in volume non responders.	70
19	MAP distribution in volume non responders after 1 hour.	71
20	MAP distribution in volume non responders after 4 hours.	71
21	MAP distribution in volume non responders after 8 hours.	72
22	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to MAP.	74
23	Baseline heart rate distribution in volume responders.	75
24	Heart rate distribution in volume responders after 1 hour.	75
25	Heart rate distribution in volume responders after 4 hours.	76
26	Heart rate distribution in volume responders after 8 hours.	76
27	Baseline heart rate distribution in volume non responders.	78
28	Heart rate distribution in volume non responders after 1 hour.	79
29	Heart rate distribution in volume non responders after 4 hours.	79
30	Heart rate distribution in volume non responders after 8 hours.	80
31	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to heart rate.	82
32	Baseline CVP distribution in volume responders.	83

No	Figure	Page
33	CVP distribution in volume responders after 1 hour.	83
34	CVP distribution in volume responders after 4 hours.	84
35	CVP distribution in volume responders after 8 hours.	84
36	Baseline CVP distribution in volume non responders.	86
37	CVP distribution in volume non responders after 1 hour.	86
38	CVP distribution in volume non responders after 4 hours.	87
39	CVP distribution in volume non responders after 8 hours.	87
40	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to CVP (cmH ₂ O).	89
41	Baseline IVC-CI distribution in volume responders.	90
42	IVC-CI distribution in volume responders after 1 hour.	91
43	IVC-CI distribution in volume responders after 4 hours.	91
44	IVC-CI distribution in volume responders after 8 hours.	92
45	Baseline IVC-CI distribution in volume non responders.	93
46	IVC-CI distribution in volume non responders after 1 hour.	94

No	Figure	Page
47	IVC-CI distribution in volume non responders after 4 hours.	94
48	IVC-CI distribution in volume non responders after 8 hours.	95
49	Comparison between responder and non-responder according to IVC-CI.	97
50	Scatter plot between CVP baseline and Caval Index baseline in volume responders.	99
51	Scatter plot between CVP after 1hr and Caval Index after 1hr in volume responders.	99
52	Scatter plot between CVP after 4hrs and Caval Index after 4hrs in volume responders.	100
53	Scatter plot between CVP after 8hrs and Caval Index after 8hrs in volume responders.	100
54	Scatter plot between CVP baseline and Caval Index baseline in volume non responders.	102
55	Scatter plot between CVP after 1hr and Caval Index after 1hr in volume non responders.	102
56	Scatter plot between CVP after 4hrs and Caval Index after 4hrs in volume non responders.	103
57	Scatter plot between CVP after 8hrs and Caval Index after 8hrs in volume non responders.	103

The Role of Inferior Vena Cava Diameter Variation Ratio Measured by Ultrasonography versus Central venous Pressure in Assessment of Volume Responsiveness of Shocked Hepatic Patients

Abstract

Background: Liver cirrhosis is a major cause of morbidity and mortality in chronic liver disease patients which is multifactorial in nature, leading to several complications including ascites, variceal bleeding, hepatic encephalopathy, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis and hepatorenal syndrome. **Aim of the Work:** to evaluate the relationship between inferior vena cava (IVC) diameter measured by ultrasonography (USG) versus central venous pressure as measured via central venous catheter, and whether it is reliable for use in evaluating intravascular volume status during the management of shock in hepatic patients. **Patients and Methods:** This study included one hundred cirrhotic liver patients with Child-Pugh classification B and C with acute circulatory failure of either sex, aging >18 years old, admitted in the ICU at Ain Shams University hospitals during the last two years, after the approval of the ethical medical committee and obtaining a written informed consent, central venous pressure (CVP) and IVC collapsibility index (IVC-CI) are measured simultaneously at baseline and along the subsequent stages of standard shock management protocol at intervals 1, 4 and 8 hours. **Results:** The current study showed that 77 patients of 93 patients (83%) responded to volume resuscitation. While 16 patients of 93 patients (17%) didn't respond to volume resuscitation regimen, and their blood pressure improved only after introduction of vasopressor. **Conclusion:** Measurements of CVP and IVC-CI throughout the study in volume responder patients were found to have a solid negative correlation denoting that Inferior Vena Cava collapsibility index assessment is relatively safe option being non invasive technique and sensitive at least when compared to measuring CVP and to avoid complications of central venous line (CVL) insertion with its complications especially in hepatic patients with coagulopathy.

Key words: inferior vena cava diameter, ultrasonography, central venous pressure, volume responsiveness of shocked hepatic patients

Introduction

Cirrhotic patients are prone to develop life-threatening complications that require emergency care and intensive care unit (ICU) admission. They can present with specific decompensations related to cirrhosis such as variceal bleeding, hepatorenal syndrome (HRS) or other critical events that are observed in the general population such as severe sepsis or septic shock. Clinical management of all these entities requires a specific approach in cirrhosis (**Ginès et al., 2012**).

Cirrhotic patients have a hyperdynamic circulation with high cardiac output and low systemic vascular resistance in the absence of infection. Circulatory dysfunction increases the susceptibility of critically-ill cirrhotic patients to develop multiple organ failure and attenuates vascular reactivity to vasopressor drugs. Moreover, hypotensive cirrhotic patients require a carefully balanced replacement of volume status, since overtransfusion increases portal hypertension and the risk of variceal bleeding and undertransfusion causes tissue hypoperfusion which increases the risk of multiple organ failure (**Ginès et al., 2012**).