

1 **Inferior vena cava ultrasound *versus* passive leg raising test in guiding fluid**  
2 **administration in surgical patients prior to spinal anaesthesia: a post-hoc analysis of the**  
3 **ProCRHYSA randomized trial.**

4 ***PRO*TOCOLIZED Care to Reduce *HY*potension after Spinal Anaesthesia**

5

6 Samuele Ceruti MD<sup>1</sup>, Andrea Glotta RN<sup>2</sup>, Mathieu Favre MD<sup>3</sup>, Edoardo Tasciotti MD<sup>4</sup>, Giovanni  
7 Bona MD<sup>5</sup>, Antonietta Petrusic MD<sup>6</sup>, Alain Borgeat Prof<sup>7</sup>, José Aguirre PD<sup>7</sup>, Andrea Saporito PD<sup>4,8</sup>

8

- 9 1. Department of Critical Care Medicine, St. Anna Clinic – Sorengo, Lugano, Switzerland  
10 2. Department of Intensive Care Unit, Istituto Cardiocentro Ticino – Lugano, Switzerland  
11 3. Service of Anaesthesia, Geneva University Hospital (HUG) - Geneva, Switzerland.  
12 4. Service of Anaesthesia, Bellinzona Regional Hospital (ORBV) - Bellinzona, Switzerland  
13 5. Department of Internal Medicine Clinica Moncucco- Lugano, Switzerland  
14 6. Department of General Surgery, Clinica Moncucco- Lugano, Switzerland  
15 7. Department of Anaesthesiology, Balgrist University Hospital, - Zurich, Switzerland  
16 8. Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, University of Lugano (USI), - Lugano, Switzerland

17

18 **Clinical Trial Registration**

19 International Trial number NCT02070276 (<http://www.clinicaltrials.gov> )

20

21 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

22 Samuele Ceruti, MD

23 Critical Care Medicine - St. Anna Clinic

24 Via Sant'Anna 1 – 6924 – Sorengo – Lugano – Switzerland

25 E-mail: [SCeruti@clnicasantanna.ch](mailto:SCeruti@clnicasantanna.ch)

26 Phone: +41 (0) 91/995.15.15

27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 **Background:** Spinal anaesthesia is commonly used for many surgical procedures. One of its potential  
30 complications is arterial hypotension, which is nowadays prevented by an empirical fluid  
31 administration without any hemodynamic status assessment. However, this practice could increase the  
32 risk of volume overload in cardiovascular high-risk patients. Two non-invasive tests are performed to  
33 identify fluid-responsiveness: the Inferior Vena Cava Ultrasound (IVCUS) and the Passive Leg  
34 Raising Test (PLRT). Aim of this post-hoc analysis was to compare these two methods in  
35 spontaneous-breathing patients to assess fluid responsiveness before spinal anaesthesia. Primary  
36 outcome was to analyze the incidence of arterial hypotension after spinal anaesthesia in elective  
37 surgery patients. Secondary endpoints compared the total fluids amount, the vasoactive drugs  
38 administered and the time needed to accomplish the whole procedure in both groups.

39 **Results:** The patients analyzed were 132 in the IVCUS group and 148 in the PLRT group; 39.6% of  
40 all patients developed arterial hypotension after spinal anaesthesia, 34.8% in the IVCUS group and  
41 43.9% in the PLRT group (Chi-square 2.39, df = 1, p = 0.77). The mean total fluids amount was  $794 \pm$   
42  $592$  ml;  $925 \pm 631$  ml for IVCUS group and  $678 \pm 529$  ml for PLRT group (p < 0.001). Patients  
43 needed vasoactive drugs to restore normal arterial pressure were 18.2% of total, 15% in the IVCUS  
44 group and 20% in the PLRT group (p = 0.136). The mean time required to complete the entire  
45 procedure was  $52 \pm 18$  min,  $48 \pm 10$  min in the IVCUS group and  $56 \pm 13$  min in the PLRT group (p <  
46 0.001). Complications or out of protocol treatment were registered in 4.6% patients.

47 **Conclusions:** Fluid responsiveness assessment in spontaneous breathing patients before spinal  
48 anaesthesia could potentially prevent the risk of post-spinal hypotension. In elective surgery, IVCUS  
49 could be an accurate method to guide fluid administration in patients undergoing spinal anaesthesia,  
50 reducing the incidence of post-spinal hypotension when compared to PLRT.

51

52 **KEYWORDS**

53 Fluid therapy; Hypotension; Inferior Vena Cava; Spinal Anaesthesia; Ultrasonography.

54

55 **INTRODUCTION**

56 Spinal anaesthesia is commonly used for a wide range of surgical procedures [1]. Despite its routine  
57 use, it remains a technique burdened by potentially severe complications, especially arterial  
58 hypotension [2–8]. Subarachnoid administration of local anaesthetics blocks the autonomous nervous  
59 system controlling vascular tone [4,6], potentially leading to a sudden decrease in peripheral vascular  
60 resistances which may result in arterial hypotension, further aggravated by a relative hypovolemia  
61 [2,7–11]. Transient hypotensive episodes are generally well tolerated in patients without severe  
62 comorbidities, due to cardiovascular compensatory mechanism [11,12]. However, these events may  
63 lead to major complications in emergency situations and in cardiovascular high-risk patients [5,10];  
64 patients older than 65 years [2,13] as well as with an ongoing drugs therapy such as beta-blockers [2],  
65 angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE)-inhibitors, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) or  
66 monoamine oxidase (MAO) inhibitors [14] presented an increased risk of developing a severe  
67 hypotensive response after spinal anaesthesia. The induced reduction in both cardiac output and  
68 systemic vascular resistance (SVR) are the main causes of the hypotension. Furthermore, Monk et al.  
69 observed how a significant intra-operative hypotension is associated with a greater mortality in the 30  
70 days following surgery [15]. Spinal anaesthesia related mortality may thus be currently still  
71 underestimated.

72 In common clinical practice, post-spinal hypotension is usually prevented by an empirical fluid  
73 administration [3–5,10,16], without a routine evaluation of patient’s hemodynamic status. However,  
74 this practice brings an intrinsic risk of volume overload, which may be counterproductive in some  
75 high-risk subjects, as mentioned above [5,16,17].

76 In this setting, two main non-invasive tests have been developed to identify fluid-responsiveness in  
77 spontaneously breathing patients: the Inferior Vena Cava Ultrasound (IVCUS) and Passive Leg  
78 Raising Test (PLRT) [18,19]. Nowadays ultrasound evaluation, especially cardiac ultrasonography,  
79 has become widely used in the clinical practice and in 2013 the American Society of  
80 Echocardiography (ASE) published a consensus suggesting the use of *Point of Care UltraSound*  
81 (POCUS) as adjunctive therapeutic aid at patients’ bedside [20]. Following these recommendations,  
82 the use of POCUS is progressively increasing in the preoperative setting to identify and prevent

83 complication before spinal or general anaesthesia [21–23]. The IVCUS consists in a measurement of  
84 the IVC diameter variation by M-mode ultrasound analysis during spontaneous breathing activity  
85 [24,25]; regarding this technique, while recent data in the non-critical patients population are  
86 encouraging [26,27], there are contrasting results in critically ill patients, for whom the method had  
87 originally being validated [18,25,26,28–32].

88 The PLRT consists in passively raising the patient's legs to increase venous return and therefore  
89 cardiac output [19]; potential fluid responsiveness can consequently be assessed by measuring changes  
90 in stroke volume (SV) with echocardiography or other non-invasive methods, like etCO<sub>2</sub>  
91 [16,19,33,34]. PLRT has been identified as a test for predicting fluid responsiveness in spontaneous  
92 breathing patients [35], and it has been recommended by the European Society of Intensive Care  
93 Medicine (ESICM) as a potential non-invasive method to analyze fluid-responsiveness in critically ill  
94 patients [36].

95 We have previously published the protocol of the *ProCRHYSA trial* [37], aiming at determining  
96 whether these two methods (IVCUS and PLRT) are effective in guiding fluid therapy to reduce both  
97 the hypotension rate and the amount of volume needed in non-critical patients undergoing elective  
98 spinal anaesthesia for surgical procedures. We previously concluded that IVCUS resulted a valid  
99 method to significantly reduce the post-anaesthesia hypotension rate in comparison to the standard of  
100 care, through the identification of those patients who are eligible for fluid replacement [37]. Some  
101 studies have identified the PLRT as the preferred method for fluid-responsive identification in  
102 spontaneous-breathing patients [27,35,38]; however, the aforementioned ProCRHYSA trial indirectly  
103 suggested a relatively little benefit of PLRT use in comparison to standard of care [39]. The main  
104 objective of this study is the comparison between these two non-invasive techniques to determine  
105 fluid-responsiveness in the context of preoperative spinal anaesthesia.

106

## 107 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### 108 **1. Study design and enrollment criteria**

109 The analyses of this project are based on the data collected in the ProCRHYSA trial [37], which was a  
110 prospective, controlled, randomized monocentric clinical trial including consecutive pre-operative

111 patients receiving elective spinal anaesthesia, treated according to current clinical practice or with  
112 optimized fluid-responsiveness status assessment according to IVCUS or PLRT methods [37]. The trial  
113 was performed in a tertiary care hospital (Bellinzona Regional Hospital - ORBV, Service of  
114 Anaesthesia, Bellinzona) in Switzerland.

115 Inclusion criteria were adult patients of both sexes, with an anaesthesia risk score I to III on the basis  
116 of the American Society of Anaesthesiology (ASA) scoring system [40], undergoing an elective  
117 surgical intervention under spinal anaesthesia. Exclusion criteria were the need of invasive blood  
118 pressure monitoring, any condition determining a pre-procedural arterial hypotension, patients with  
119 unilateral anaesthetic block, patients needing any form of assisted ventilation prior or during the  
120 surgical intervention and those unable to give informed consent [37] (Table 1).

121 The CONSORT reporting guidelines has been used throughout the entire trial [41] (SM 1); all clinical  
122 and pharmacological data were registered and collected in a codified electronic database by an  
123 anaesthesiologist not directly involved in patient management.

124

## 125 **2. Clinical trial conduction**

126 The study started upon patient's arrival in the operating room (time 0) and ended 30 minutes after  
127 completion of spinal anaesthesia. It was divided in the *pre-anaesthetic phase* from time 0 to the  
128 beginning of spinal anaesthesia, in the *anaesthetic phase* corresponding to the performance of spinal  
129 anaesthesia, and in the *post-anaesthetic phase* from the end of anaesthesia to the following 30 minutes.

130 Spinal anaesthesia was performed following a standardized procedure, with intrathecal administration  
131 of hyperbaric bupivacaine 0.5%, with dosing according to surgical procedure and patient's body  
132 structure, at L<sub>3</sub>-L<sub>4</sub> level in the lateral decubitus position, using a 27G pencil point cranially orientated  
133 spinal needle (BBraun Medical SA, Melsungen, Germany). After the injection patients rested supine  
134 during 30 minutes before surgery. A nurse not involved in the trial and blind to groups allocation was  
135 assigned to assess the sensory block extension with cold test for a T<sub>H8</sub>-T<sub>H6</sub> targeted level block [39].

136 Arterial hypotension was previously defined as two measurements of systolic arterial pressure inferior  
137 to 90 mmHg, a mean arterial pressure (MAP) inferior to 60 mmHg [27,39], any fall in systolic blood

138 pressure more than 50 mmHg or more than 25% from baseline, a reduction in mean arterial pressure of  
139 more than 30% from baseline and/or clinical signs and symptoms of inadequate perfusion [27,37].

140 After spinal anaesthesia, hypotensive patients were treated according to a standard protocol with  
141 crystalloid replacement and vasoactive drugs (e.g. ephedrine, phenylephrine or atropine depending on  
142 the clinical status and in agreement with the anaesthesiologist's evaluation), until haemodynamic  
143 stability was accomplished and all clinical criteria for arterial hypotension were solved.

144

#### 145 2.1 IVCUS group

146 Patients allocated in this group underwent IVCUS-based fluid status assessment before spinal  
147 anaesthesia. According to the protocol, an *IVC collapsibility index* (IVC-CI) greater than 36% was  
148 chosen as cut-off [24–26,37,39,42]; the index was measured in the IVC intra-abdominal portion (2 cm  
149 from the right atrium) through a subcostal view and was calculated as  $(IVC_{max}-IVC_{min})/IVC_{max}$ , with  
150 the diameters being registered in spontaneous breathing activity for 30 seconds. An infusion of 500 ml  
151 of crystalloid for 20 minutes was considered adequate and safe, although no published consensus  
152 regarding this matter exists [16]. Patient's haemodynamic status was re-assessed after each refilling:  
153 patients with an IVC-CI greater than 36% were identified as *responsive patients*: crystalloid fluids  
154 were therefore administered, followed by IVCUS reassessment; otherwise, they were considered as  
155 *unresponsive patients* and directly underwent spinal anaesthesia.

156

#### 157 2.2 PLRT group

158 Patients in this group underwent PLRT prior to spinal anaesthesia. Active leg elevation exerts an  
159 orthosympathetic reflex that can increase cardiac output; passive lower limb test had the advantage of  
160 mobilizing lower limb venous blood (about 300-500 ml) without activating the orthosympathetic  
161 reflex, making it possible to quantify the clinical response after a bolus of fluids [37]. Before the test,  
162 patients waited 5 minutes in a semi-recumbent supine position at 45°, to reach a phase of  
163 hemodynamic and respiratory balance and general stability, as well as to reduce anxiety and stress.  
164 The etCO<sub>2</sub> measurement with continuous CO<sub>2</sub> sampling through nasal cannula was performed before  
165 and after PLRT, while patients kept a semi-recumbent position at 45°. Patients with an etCO<sub>2</sub> increase

166 of more than 12% from baseline were classified as *responsive* [11], otherwise they were classified as  
167 *unresponsive* to fluid administration. Responsive patients received fluids according to the same  
168 protocol described for the IVCUS group and were reassessed after each fluid administration through  
169 the same PLRT. Spinal anaesthesia was performed once *unresponsiveness* to fluid administration was  
170 reached. Follow-up was identical compared with the previous group.

171

### 172 **3. Outcomes**

173 In this post-hoc analysis of ProCRHYSA trial, the primary endpoint was to report and compare the  
174 post-spinal anaesthesia hypotension rate both in the IVCUS group and in the PLRT group. Secondary  
175 endpoints were a comparison about total fluids amount (further stratified according to pre/post-  
176 anaesthesia stage), about the amount of vasoactive drug use in both groups and about the time needed  
177 to accomplish the whole procedure, since the beginning of the pre-anaesthesia phase until the end of  
178 the post-anaesthesia phase (further stratified according to pre/post-anaesthesia stage).

179

### 180 **4. Statistical analysis**

181 Sample size calculation and randomization were described in the original trial [37]. Descriptive  
182 statistic was performed to summarize the clinical collected data. According to data distribution,  
183 verified by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro–Wilk test, were presented as mean  $\pm$  SD or median  
184 (IQR, min-max) for continuous variables and as absolute number (percentage) for categorical  
185 variables. Differences between patients' outcomes were studied by *t-test* for independent groups or by  
186 *Mann-Whitney test* if non-parametric analysis was required. Similarly, comparison of clinical  
187 evolution over time was performed by *t-paired test* or by non-parametric *Wilcoxon test*, depending on  
188 data distribution. Study of differences between groups of categorical data was carried out by *Chi-*  
189 *square* statistics. All Confidence Intervals (CI) were established at 95%; significance level was  
190 established to be  $< 0.05$ . Statistical data analysis was performed using the SPSS 26.0 package (SPSS  
191 Inc, USA).

192

### 193 **5. Ethics considerations**

194 The study has been approved by the Ethics Committees (Ref. Cantonal Ethics Committee n. CE2796,  
195 international registration number NCT02070276); written informed consent was obtained from  
196 patients prior to randomization. There was no funding source for this study.

197

## 198 **RESULTS**

### 199 **Baseline characteristics**

200 During the study period of the ProCRHYSA trial (3 arms, randomized, parallel group trial), from May  
201 2014 to February 2019, 447 consecutive patients were enrolled and randomized into the three arms. In  
202 this post-hoc analysis, patients enrolled and randomized into the IVCUS and PLRT arms were directly  
203 compared (Figure 1); a total of 298 patients (149 for each arm) were recruited, 17 and 1 patients  
204 respectively in the IVCUS and PLRT group were subsequently excluded for troubles related to the  
205 correct acquisition of the required measures (namely poor ultrasonographic window and intolerance to  
206 nasal cannula for etCO<sub>2</sub> measurement). Therefore, data from 132 patients in the IVCUS group and 148  
207 patients in PLRT group were analyzed (Figure 1). The mean age resulted  $56 \pm 12$  years; 173 (61.7%)  
208 patients were men, 244 (87.1%) were classified as ASA I-II and 36 (12.8%) as ASA III. Seventy-five  
209 patients (26.8%) resulted on an antihypertensive treatment (14.3% on beta-blockers, 10.7% on ACE-  
210 inhibitors, 11.1% on other drugs) and 6.4% were on psychotropic drugs (4.3% on antidepressants,  
211 2.1% on SSRI, while no patients were on MAO-I); pre-anaesthesia hemodynamic data were also  
212 compared for blood pressure ( $p = 0.121$ ), heart rate ( $p = 0.533$ ) and SpO<sub>2</sub> ( $p = 0.04$ ). Clinical data and  
213 demographic characteristics of both groups are reported in Table 2.

214

### 215 **Primary endpoint**

216 After spinal anaesthesia, 111 (39.6%) of all patients developed arterial hypotension; the hypotension  
217 rate resulted 34.8% (46 patients) in the IVCUS group and 43.9% (65 patients) in the PLRT group  
218 (Chi-square 2.39,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.77$ ); the odds ratio (OR) for patients pre-treated according to IVCUS  
219 test compared to PLRT was 0.68 (95% CI, 0.42 – 1.10,  $p = 0.12$ ). According to these data, the  
220 Bayesian posterior predicting model suggested a probability to develop post-spinal arterial



221 hypotension after IVCUS analysis equal to 34.8%; the same probability increased up to 44.6% when  
222 patients were analyzed and managed according to PLRT results.

223

#### 224 **Secondary endpoints**

225 Regarding fluid administration, all patients were treated by Ringerfundin (B. Braun); the mean total  
226 fluid amount was  $794 \pm 592$  ml (Table 3),  $925 \pm 631$  ml for the IVCUS group and  $678 \pm 529$  ml for  
227 the PLRT group ( $p < 0.001$ , Figure 2). The mean fluid amount given during *pre-anaesthesia phase*  
228 was  $335 \pm 314$  ml in the IVCUS group, compared to  $169 \pm 237$  ml in the PLRT group ( $p < 0.001$ ,  
229 Figure 3), while the post-anaesthesia fluid amount resulted identical in both groups ( $589 \pm 370$  ml in  
230 IVCUS group vs  $510 \pm 368$  in PLRT group,  $p = 0.075$ ).

231 A total of 51 patients (18.2%) required vasoactive support to restore normal arterial pressure, 20  
232 patients (15%) in the IVCUS group and 31 (20%) in the PLRT group ( $p = 0.136$ ); ephedrine was the  
233 drug more used (13.6% in the IVCUS group and 19.6% in the PLRT group,  $p = 0.094$ , Table 3). The  
234 mean time required to complete the entire procedure was  $52 \pm 18$  min in all patients,  $48 \pm 10$  min in  
235 the IVCUS group and  $56 \pm 13$  min in the PLRT group ( $p < 0.001$ , Figure 4). Finally, deviation from  
236 protocol were detected in 13 (4,6%) cases and led to a drop-out; 2 patients (0.7 %) were given  
237 prilocaine for spinal anaesthesia, while 3 patients (1%) developed selective block.

238

#### 239 **DISCUSSION**

240 In critical setting, non-invasive methods to evaluate patients' volemic status have been of interest  
241 during recent years [17]. Fluid responsiveness assessment in spontaneous breathing patients prior to  
242 spinal anaesthesia could potentially prevent spinal anaesthesia-induced hypotension, thus ameliorating  
243 patients' outcome [18,19,24,26–32]. PLRT has hitherto been the method of choice in this setting,  
244 although literature in favor of IVCUS appears to become more common [23,33,34]. No definite  
245 superiority of one method over the other has however been assessed so far. In our post-hoc analysis of  
246 the ProCRHYSA trial, the rate of post-spinal arterial hypotension was lower in the IVCUS group in  
247 comparison to the PLRT group, even though it resulted in a trend that did not reach statistical

248 significance. This can be in part due to the design of the post-hoc analysis itself, for which a specific  
249 power analysis was not performed. Nonetheless, the suggested reduction in the relative risk of post-  
250 spinal hypotension through IVC ultrasound instead of PLRT, a test often considered as “standard  
251 procedure” in spontaneous-breathing patients, could still influence the every-day practice.

252 Moreover, the analysis of fluid management also resulted of relevant interest. The IVCUS group  
253 received an increased fluid amount before anaesthesia compared to the PLRT group; this fluid  
254 administration was not indiscriminate to all IVCUS group patients, but tailored instead to each  
255 patient’s haemodynamic status as resulted from the IVCUS assessment. This tailored fluid  
256 administration allowed to achieve less arterial hypotension, avoiding at the same time possibly  
257 dangerous fluid overload. Although the ProCRHYSA trial was reserved for ASA I-III patients, a  
258 similar protocol could in the future be applied to more fragile and unstable patients, given the  
259 capability to avoid dangerous fluid overload deriving from this method. This data, associated with a  
260 trend towards greater use of amines in the PLRT group, could further suggest a greater efficacy of  
261 IVCUS compared to PLRT, even if future validation studies concerning the implementation of  
262 portable ultrasound in pre-spinal anaesthesia setting will clarify the role of POCUS in this specific  
263 regard.

264

265 To date, POCUS applications is rapidly expanding to many clinical fields, included peri-operative  
266 medicine; according to recent *World Health Organization* recommendations, it represents one of the 5  
267 priorities to be developed in the field of Critical Care during the next years [43]. The measurement of  
268 IVC diameter through the subcostal window is an easy to learn, safe and non-invasive method [44,45].  
269 If routinely applied to fragile patients with cardiovascular comorbidities before anaesthesia, it could  
270 not only detect hypovolemic patients benefitting from a pre-procedural volemic repletion, but also  
271 guide the titration of fluid therapy, avoiding empiric fluid challenges and the subsequent risk of  
272 volume overload and potential heart failure in subjects with a reduced cardiovascular compliance.  
273 IVCUS should thus be increasingly considered by anaesthesiologists as a POCUS tool for pre-  
274 operative assessment and optimization.

275 The PLRT method resulted more time-consuming; this aspect may have significant implication, if this  
276 test has to be considered for a routine application to high-turnover surgical unit, where anaesthesia-  
277 controlled time represents an important part of the total turnover time [46,47]. Although Teboul JL et  
278 colleagues identified PLRT as the method of choice in order to predict fluid responsiveness in  
279 spontaneous breathing patients [35], others studies draw different conclusions and circumscribe the  
280 possible applications of this test. Monnet X. and colleagues [48] state that the high diagnostic  
281 sensitivity of PLRT remains confined to the critical care setting, where it should be used in the context  
282 of a more global cardiovascular assessment and where a direct measurement of cardiac output can also  
283 be performed. In the ProCRHYSA trial, the use of PLRT was not associated to a reduction of the  
284 incidence of post-spinal anaesthesia hypotensive episodes compared to the standard method [39].

285

286 This analysis presents some limitations. First, it was a post-hoc analysis for which a pre-trial power  
287 analysis has not been performed; the limitation of the results' significance can be mainly due to the  
288 study design, and necessarily requires the execution of future studies with greater statistical power to  
289 confirm the statistical trend suggested. Moreover, additional studies are also needed to assess whether  
290 IVCUS can be implemented to prevent excessive fluid overload in more fragile patients undergoing  
291 anaesthesia (i.e. ASA IV-V patients). The addressing of this specific patients' group demands however  
292 a new specifically designed, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Additional limitations are the  
293 same discussed in the ProCRHYSA study [49], especially the impossibility to blind patients to the  
294 group allocation, the exclusive involvement of ASA I-III patients and the ultrasound operator-  
295 dependency intrinsic to ultrasound evaluations.

296

## 297 **CONCLUSION:**

298 Fluid responsiveness assessment in spontaneous breathing patients prior to spinal anaesthesia could  
299 potentially prevent post-spinal hypotension, thus ameliorating patients' outcome; PLRT has hitherto  
300 been the method of choice in this setting. In our post-hoc analysis we reported that IVCUS, as a  
301 method to guide fluid administration in patients undergoing spinal anaesthesia prior to elective  
302 surgery, enables to reduce the incidence of post-spinal hypotension when compared to PLRT. Further

303 studies with greater statistical power are required to determine if the trend shown in our study is  
304 confirmed. In this scenario, identifying further ways to implement POCUS in the daily practice could  
305 allow ever better patient-tailored approach and management.

306

## 307 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

308 ACE-Inhibitors – Angiotensin-converting enzyme

309 ASA – American Society of Anesthesiologists

310 CI – Confidence Interval

311 ESICM – European Society Intensive Care Medicine

312 etCO<sub>2</sub> – End-tidal carbon dioxide

313 IMAO – Monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs)

314 IQR – Interquartile Range

315 IVC – Inferior Vena Cava

316 IVC-CI - IVC Collapsability Index

317 IVCUS – Inferior Vena Cava Ultrasound

318 MAP – Mean Arterial Pressure

319 PLRT – Passive Leg Raise Test

320 POCUS – point-of-care ultrasound

321 ProCRHYSA – PROtocolized Care to Reduce HYpotension after Spinal Anaesthesia

322 SA – Spinal Anesthesia

323 SSRI – Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors

324 SVR - systemic vascular resistance

325

## 326 **DECLARATION**

### 327 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

328 The study has been approved by the Ethics Committees (Ref. Cantonal Ethics Committee n. CE2796,  
329 international registration number NCT02070276); written informed consent was obtained from  
330 patients prior to randomization.

331 **Consent for publication**

332 Not applicable

333 **Availability of data and material**

334 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding  
335 author on reasonable request.

336 **Competing interests**

337 The authors declare that they have no competing interests related to this study.

338 **Funding**

339 No funding was obtained for this study.

340 **Authors' contributions**

341 SC conceived the study, designed and coordinated the protocol and recruited patients, furthermore he  
342 drafted the manuscript and performed the statistical analysis, AG drafted the manuscript and  
343 performed the statistical analysis, MF participated in the design of the study, performed the statistical  
344 analysis and drafted the manuscript, ET participated in the draft of the manuscript, GB participated in  
345 the statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript, AP participated in the design of the study,  
346 performed the statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript, AB performed the statistical analysis and  
347 drafted the manuscript, JA participated in the design of the study, performed the statistical analysis  
348 and drafted the manuscript, AS participated in the design of the study, coordinated the protocol  
349 recruited patients, furthermore he drafted the manuscript and performed the statistical analysis. All  
350 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

351

352 **REFERENCES**

- 353 1. Mordecai MM, Brull SJ. Spinal anesthesia. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* [Internet]. Lippincott Williams  
354 and Wilkins; 2005 [cited 2020 Sep 28];18:527–33. Available from:  
355 <http://journals.lww.com/00001503-200510000-00014>
- 356 2. Carpenter RL, Caplan RA, Brown DL, Stephenson C, Wu R. Incidence and risk factors for side  
357 effects of spinal anesthesia. *Anesthesiology* [Internet]. *Anesthesiology*; 1992 [cited 2020 Sep  
358 28];76:906–16. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1599111/>
- 359 3. Jabalameli M, Hashemi J, Soleimani B, Soltani H, Behdad S. Prevention of post-spinal hypotension  
360 using crystalloid, colloid and ephedrine with three different combinations: A double blind randomized  
361 study. *Adv Biomed Res* [Internet]. *Medknow*; 2012 [cited 2020 Sep 28];1:36. Available from:  
362 </pmc/articles/PMC3544136/?report=abstract>
- 363 4. Xu SQ, Wu HB, Zhao QS, Shen XF, Guo XR, Wang FZ. The Median Effective Volume of  
364 Crystalloid in Preventing Hypotension in Patients Undergoing Cesarean Delivery with Spinal  
365 Anesthesia. *Rev Bras Anesthesiol*. Elsevier; 2012;62:312–24.
- 366 5. Buggy DJ, Power CK, Meeke R, O’Callaghan S, Moran C, O’Brien GT. Prevention of spinal  
367 anaesthesia-induced hypotension in the elderly: i.m. methoxamine or combined hetastarch and  
368 crystalloid. *Br J Anaesth* [Internet]. Oxford University Press; 1998 [cited 2020 Sep 28];80:199–203.  
369 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9602585/>
- 370 6. Hanss R, Bein B, Weseloh H, Bauer M, Cavus E, Steinfath M, et al. Heart rate variability predicts  
371 severe hypotension after spinal anesthesia. *Anesthesiology* [Internet]. American Society of  
372 Anesthesiologists; 2006 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 537–45. Available from:  
373 <http://pubs.asahq.org/anesthesiology/article-pdf/104/3/537/361173/0000542-200603000-00022.pdf>
- 374 7. Hartmann B, Junger A, Klasen J, Benson M, Jost A, Banzhaf A, et al. The incidence and risk factors  
375 for hypotension after spinal anesthesia induction: An analysis with automated data collection. *Anesth*  
376 *Analg* [Internet]. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2002 [cited 2020 Sep 28];94:1521–9. Available  
377 from: <http://journals.lww.com/00000539-200206000-00027>
- 378 8. Liu SS, McDonald SB. Current issues in spinal anesthesia [Internet]. *Anesthesiology*. Lippincott  
379 Williams and Wilkins; 2001 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 888–906. Available from:

380 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11388543/>

381 9. Kim HJ, Kim JS. A cardiovascular collapse following vigorous cough during spinal anesthesia  
382 [Internet]. Korean J. Anesthesiol. Korean Society of Anesthesiologists; 2014 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p.  
383 S49. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3903858/>

384 10. Nakasuji M, Suh SH, Nomura M, Nakamura M, Imanaka N, Tanaka M, et al. Hypotension from  
385 spinal anesthesia in patients aged greater than 80 years is due to a decrease in systemic vascular  
386 resistance. *J Clin Anesth.* Elsevier; 2012;24:201–6.

387 11. Salinas F V., Sueda LA, Liu SS. Physiology of spinal anaesthesia and practical suggestions for  
388 successful spinal anaesthesia [Internet]. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Anaesthesiol.* Best Pract Res Clin  
389 Anaesthesiol; 2003 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 289–303. Available from:  
390 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14529003/>

391 12. Doherty M, Buggy DJ. Intraoperative fluids: How much is too much? [Internet]. *Br. J. Anaesth.*  
392 Oxford University Press; 2012 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 69–79. Available from:  
393 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22661747/>

394 13. Park S. Prediction of hypotension in spinal anesthesia [Internet]. *Korean J. Anesthesiol.* Korean  
395 Society of Anesthesiologists; 2013 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 291–2. Available from:  
396 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3822018/>

397 14. Shin HJ, Choi ES, Lee GW, Do SH. Effects of Preoperative Serotonin-Receptor-Antagonist  
398 Administration in Spinal Anesthesia-Induced Hypotension: A Randomized, Double-blind Comparison  
399 Study of Ramosetron and Ondansetron. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* [Internet]. Lippincott Williams and  
400 Wilkins; 2015 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 583–8. Available from:  
401 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26263075/>

402 15. Monk TG, Bronsert MR, Henderson WG, Mangione MP, Sum-Ping STJ, Bentt DR, et al.  
403 Association between intraoperative hypotension and hypertension and 30-day postoperative mortality  
404 in noncardiac surgery [Internet]. *Anesthesiology.* Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2015 [cited 2021  
405 Apr 27]. p. 307–19. Available from: [http://pubs.asahq.org/anesthesiology/article-](http://pubs.asahq.org/anesthesiology/article-pdf/123/2/307/267446/20150800_0-00016.pdf)  
406 [pdf/123/2/307/267446/20150800\\_0-00016.pdf](http://pubs.asahq.org/anesthesiology/article-pdf/123/2/307/267446/20150800_0-00016.pdf)

407 16. Cherpanath TGV, Geerts BF, Lagrand WK, Schultz MJ, Groeneveld ABJ. Basic concepts of fluid

408 responsiveness. *Netherlands Hear J.* 2013;21:530–6.

409 17. Pinsky MR, Payen D. Functional hemodynamic monitoring [Internet]. *Crit. Care. Crit Care*; 2005  
410 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 566–72. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16356240/>

411 18. Lamia B, Ochagavia A, Monnet X, Chemla D, Richard C, Teboul JL. Echocardiographic  
412 prediction of volume responsiveness in critically ill patients with spontaneously breathing activity.  
413 *Intensive Care Med.* 2007;33:1125–32.

414 19. Monge García MI, Cano AG, Romero MG, Pintado RM, Madueño VP, Díaz Monrové JC. Non-  
415 invasive assessment of fluid responsiveness by changes in partial end-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> pressure during a  
416 passive leg-raising maneuver. *Ann Intensive Care* [Internet]. Springer; 2012 [cited 2020 Sep 28];2:2–  
417 9. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC3327636/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22400903/)

418 20. Spencer KT, Kimura BJ, Korcarz CE, Pellikka PA, Rahko PS, Siegel RJ. Focused cardiac  
419 ultrasound: Recommendations from the american society of echocardiography. *J Am Soc*  
420 *Echocardiogr* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2021 Apr 30];26:567–81. Available from:  
421 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2013.04.001>

422 21. Haskins SC, Tanaka CY, Boublik J, Wu CL, Sloth E. Focused Cardiac Ultrasound for the Regional  
423 Anesthesiologist and Pain Specialist. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* [Internet]. 2017;42:632–44. Available  
424 from: <https://rapm.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1097/AAP.0000000000000650>

425 22. Coker BJ, Zimmerman JM. Why Anesthesiologists Must Incorporate Focused Cardiac Ultrasound  
426 into Daily Practice [Internet]. *Anesth. Analg.* Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2017 [cited 2021 Apr  
427 30]. p. 761–5. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28207446/>

428 23. Gillman LM, Kirkpatrick AW. Portable bedside ultrasound: The visual stethoscope of the 21  
429 stcentury [Internet]. *Scand. J. Trauma. Resusc. Emerg. Med.* *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*;  
430 2012 [cited 2021 Apr 30]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22400903/>

431 24. Barbier C, Loubières Y, Schmit C, Hayon J, Ricôme JL, Jardin F, et al. Respiratory changes in  
432 inferior vena cava diameter are helpful in predicting fluid responsiveness in ventilated septic patients.  
433 *Intensive Care Med* [Internet]. *Intensive Care Med*; 2004 [cited 2020 Sep 28];30:1740–6. Available  
434 from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15034650/>

435 25. Zhang Z, Xu X, Ye S, Xu L. Ultrasonographic measurement of the respiratory variation in the



436 inferior vena cava diameter is predictive of fluid responsiveness in critically ill patients: Systematic  
437 review and meta-analysis [Internet]. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* Elsevier USA; 2014 [cited 2020 Sep 28].  
438 p. 845–53. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK208470/>

439 26. Muller L, Bobbia X, Toumi M, Louart G, Molinari N, Ragonnet B, et al. Respiratory variations of  
440 inferior vena cava diameter to predict fluid responsiveness in spontaneously breathing patients with  
441 acute circulatory failure: Need for a cautious use. *Crit Care* [Internet]. *Crit Care*; 2012 [cited 2020 Sep  
442 28];16. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23043910/>

443 27. Antonelli M, Levy M, Andrews PJD, Chastre J, Hudson LD, Manthous C, et al. Hemodynamic  
444 monitoring in shock and implications for management: International Consensus Conference, Paris,  
445 France, 27–28 April 2006. *Intensive Care Med* [Internet]. Springer; 2007 [cited 2020 Sep 28];33:575–  
446 90. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17285286/>

447 28. Zöllei É, Bertalan V, Németh A, Csábi P, László I, Kaszaki J, et al. Non-invasive detection of  
448 hypovolemia or fluid responsiveness in spontaneously breathing subjects. *BMC Anesthesiol* [Internet].  
449 BioMed Central; 2013 [cited 2020 Sep 28];13:40. Available from:  
450 [https://hungary.pure.elsevier.com/hu/publications/non-invasive-detection-of-hypovolemia-or-fluid-](https://hungary.pure.elsevier.com/hu/publications/non-invasive-detection-of-hypovolemia-or-fluid-responsiveness-in-)  
451 [responsiveness-in-](https://hungary.pure.elsevier.com/hu/publications/non-invasive-detection-of-hypovolemia-or-fluid-responsiveness-in-)

452 29. Hu B, Zhou H, Zou X. Preoperative ultrasonographic evaluation of inferior vena cava  
453 collapsibility index and caval aorta index. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* [Internet]. 2020;37:833–5. Available  
454 from: <https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/EJA.0000000000001228>

455 30. Fiza B, Duggal N, McMillan CE, Mentz G, Maile MD. Feasibility of Anesthesiologist-Performed  
456 Preoperative Echocardiography for the Prediction of Postinduction Hypotension: A Prospective  
457 Observational Study. Hayashi Y, editor. *Anesthesiol Res Pract* [Internet]. 2020;2020:1–9. Available  
458 from: <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/arp/2020/1375741/>

459 31. Jaremko I, Mačiulienė A, Gelmanas A, Baranauskas T, Tamošiūnas R, Smailys A, et al. Can the  
460 inferior vena cava collapsibility index be useful in predicting hypotension during spinal anaesthesia in  
461 a spontaneously breathing patient? A mini fluid challenge. *Acta medica Litu* [Internet]. 2019;26:1–7.  
462 Available from: <https://www.journals.vu.lt/AML/article/view/21267>

463 32. Kalshetty K, Jahan N, Setlur R, Jaiswal A, Dwivedi D. Inferior vena cava collapsibility index for

464 the assessment of fluid responsiveness among spontaneously breathing preoperative fasting patients -  
465 An observational study. *J Mar Med Soc* [Internet]. Medknow; 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 30];22:151.  
466 Available from: <http://www.marinemedicalsociety.in/text.asp?2020/22/2/151/297613>

467 33. Maizel J, Airapetian N, Lorne E, Tribouilloy C, Massy Z, Slama M. Diagnosis of central  
468 hypovolemia by using passive leg raising. *Intensive Care Med* [Internet]. Springer; 2007 [cited 2020  
469 Sep 28];33:1133–8. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00134-007-0642-y>

470 34. Xiao-Ting W, Hua Z, Da-Wei L, Hong-Min Z, Huai-Wu H, Yun L, et al. Changes in end-tidal  
471 CO<sub>2</sub> could predict fluid responsiveness in the passive leg raising test but not in the mini-fluid  
472 challenge test: A prospective and observational study. *J Crit Care* [Internet]. 2015;30:1061–6.  
473 Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883944115003275>

474 35. Teboul JL, Monnet X. Prediction of volume responsiveness in critically ill patients with  
475 spontaneous breathing activity. *Curr Opin Crit Care* [Internet]. 2008;14:334–9. Available from:  
476 <http://journals.lww.com/00075198-200806000-00016>

477 36. Cecconi M, De Backer D, Antonelli M, Beale R, Bakker J, Hofer C, et al. Consensus on  
478 circulatory shock and hemodynamic monitoring. Task force of the European Society of Intensive Care  
479 Medicine [Internet]. *Intensive Care Med*. Springer Verlag; 2014 [cited 2021 Apr 30]. p. 1795–815.  
480 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25392034/>

481 37. Ceruti S, Minotti B, De Vivo S, De Christophoris P, Anselmi L, Saporito A. PROtocolized care to  
482 reduce HYpotension after spinal anaesthesia (ProCRHYSA randomized trial): Study protocol for a  
483 randomized controlled trial. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun* [Internet]. Elsevier Inc; 2016 [cited 2020  
484 Sep 28];4:39–45. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S245186541530034X>

485 38. Monnet X, Teboul JL. Passive leg raising. *Intensive Care Med*. 2008;34:659–63.

486 39. Ceruti S, Anselmi L, Minotti B, Franceschini D, Aguirre J, Borgeat A, et al. Prevention of arterial  
487 hypotension after spinal anaesthesia using vena cava ultrasound to guide fluid management. *Br J*  
488 *Anaesth* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2018 [cited 2020 Sep 28];120:101–8. Available from:  
489 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29397116/>

490 40. Hackett NJ, De Oliveira GS, Jain UK, Kim JYS. ASA class is a reliable independent predictor of  
491 medical complications and mortality following surgery. *Int J Surg* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2015 [cited

492 2020 Sep 28];18:184–90. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25937154/>

493 41. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 Statement: Updated guidelines for reporting  
494 parallel group randomised trials. *BMC Med* [Internet]. BioMed Central; 2010 [cited 2023 May  
495 11];8:1–9. Available from: <https://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-8-18>

496 42. Thanakitcharu P, Charoenwut M, Siriwiwatanakul N. Inferior vena cava diameter and  
497 collapsibility index: A practical non-invasive evaluation of intravascular fluid volume in critically-III  
498 patients. *J Med Assoc Thail* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2020 Sep 28];96:14–22. Available from:  
499 <http://europepmc.org/article/MED/23682518>

500 43. Citerio G, Bakker J, Bassetti M, Benoit D, Cecconi M, Curtis JR, et al. Year in review in Intensive  
501 Care Medicine 2013: I. Acute kidney injury, ultrasound, hemodynamics, cardiac arrest, transfusion,  
502 neurocritical care, and nutrition. *Intensive Care Med* [Internet]. Springer; 2014 [cited 2023 Mar  
503 23];40:147–59. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00134-013-3184-5>

504 44. Bodson L, Vieillard-Baron A. Respiratory variation in inferior vena cava diameter: surrogate of  
505 central venous pressure or parameter of fluid responsiveness? Let the physiology reply. *Crit Care*  
506 [Internet]. BioMed Central; 2012 [cited 2023 Mar 23];16:181. Available from:  
507 </pmc/articles/PMC3672574/>

508 45. Kircher BJ, Himelman RB, Schiller NB. Noninvasive estimation of right atrial pressure from the  
509 inspiratory collapse of the inferior vena cava. *Am J Cardiol* [Internet]. *Am J Cardiol*; 1990 [cited 2023  
510 Mar 23];66:493–6. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2386120/>

511 46. Chan WH, Lee MS, Lin C, Wu CC, Lai HC, Chan SM, et al. Comparison of anesthesia-controlled  
512 operating room time between propofol-based total intravenous anesthesia and desflurane anesthesia in  
513 open colorectal surgery: A retrospective study. *PLoS One* [Internet]. Public Library of Science; 2016  
514 [cited 2023 Mar 23];11:e0165407. Available from:  
515 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0165407>

516 47. Mariano ER, Chu LF, Peinado CR, Mazzei WJ. Anesthesia-controlled time and turnover time for  
517 ambulatory upper extremity surgery performed with regional versus general anesthesia. *J Clin Anesth*  
518 [Internet]. NIH Public Access; 2009 [cited 2023 Mar 23];21:253–7. Available from:  
519 </pmc/articles/PMC2745934/>

520 48. Monnet X, Marik P, Teboul JL. Passive leg raising for predicting fluid responsiveness: a  
521 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med.* 2016;42:1935–47.

522 49. Bona G, Biggiogero M, Favre M, Roncador M, Saporito A, Ceruti S. Fluid administration guided  
523 by inferior vena cava ultrasound before spinal anaesthesia may reduce post procedural hypotension  
524 rate. A randomizedtrial. *Intensive Care Med Exp [Internet].* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press;  
525 2020 [cited 2023 Mar 23];8:2021.06.20.21258944. Available from:  
526 [https://go.openathens.net/redirector/rsm.ac.uk?url=/docview/2484524450?accountid=138535%0Ahttps://vw4tb4ff7s.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\\_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-](https://go.openathens.net/redirector/rsm.ac.uk?url=/docview/2484524450?accountid=138535%0Ahttps://vw4tb4ff7s.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Aembase&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&)  
527 [s://vw4tb4ff7s.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\\_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-](https://vw4tb4ff7s.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Aembase&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&)  
528 [8&rft\\_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Aembase&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&](https://vw4tb4ff7s.search.serialssolutions.com?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Aembase&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&)  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535

536 **TABLE 1: inclusion and exclusion criteria**

537

<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
Adults from 18 to 80 years	Patients requiring invasive blood pressure monitoring (arterial catheter, pulmonary catheter, thermodilution catheter)
Both sexes	Patients with pre-procedural hypotension
Not critical patients undergoing spinal anaesthesia for an elective surgery ASA class from I to III	Patients with unilateral anaesthetic block  Patients needing assisted ventilation before or during the surgical intervention
	Patients unable to give informed consent
	Contraindications to perform spinal anaesthesia (previous back surgery in the lumbar region, clinical high-risk conditions like thrombocytopenia < 50 G/L or coagulation abnormalities)
	Obstetrical population

538

539 Eligibility inclusion/exclusion criteria from the ProCRHYSA trial.

540

541

542

543

544

545 **TABLE 2: baseline characteristics**

	<b>IVCUS group (n = 132)</b>	<b>PLRT group (n = 148)</b>	<i>p value</i>
Male sex	82 (62.2%)	91 (61.5%)	
Age [yrs]	55.9 ± 18.3	57.2 ± 18.3	0.192
18 – 65	80 (60.6%)	88 (59.5%)	
> 65	52 (39.4%)	60 (40.5%)	
Weight [Kg]	76.7 ± 16.7	77.8 ± 15.1	0.812
ASA	1 (1, 1-3)	1 (1, 1-3)	0.150
ASA I-II	114 (86.4 %)	130 (87.8 %)	
ASA III	18 (13.3 %)	18 (12.2 %)	
<b>Anti-hypertensive therapy</b>	37 (28%)	38 (25.7%)	0.178
<i>B-blockers</i>	19 (14.4%)	21 (14.2%)	0.002 *
<i>ACE-inhibitors</i>	16 (12.1%)	14 (9.5%)	0.854
<i>Other</i>	16 (12.1%)	15 (10.1%)	0.585
<b>Psychotropic drugs</b>	7 (5.3%)	11 (7.4%)	0.260
<i>SSRI</i>	4 (3%)	2 (1.4%)	0.587
<i>Anti-depressive</i>	3 (2.3%)	9 (6.1%)	0.558
<i>IMAO</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-
<b>At anesthesia</b>			
<i>Systolic Arterial Pressure [mmHg]</i>	133.6 ± 21.6	137.9 ± 24.6	0.500
<i>Diastolic Arterial Pressure [mmHg]</i>	71.9 ± 10.9	73.5 ± 12.7	0.621
<i>Mean Arterial Pressure [mmHg]</i>	92.3 ± 13.2	95 ± 15.1	-
<i>Heart Rate [bpm]</i>	71.2 ± 12.5	70.3 ± 11.5	0.670
<i>SpO<sub>2</sub> [%]</i>	96.9 ± 2.2	97.4 ± 1.8	0.956

546

547 Baselines patients' clinical characteristics according to randomization into IVCUS and PLRT group.

548 All data are reported as mean (SD) or median (IQR, min – max) according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov

549 test data distribution.

550

551

552 **TABLE 3: Primary and secondary endpoints**

	<b>IVCUS group</b>	<b>PLRT group</b>	<b>p value</b>
<b>Arterial hypotension</b>	46 (34.8%)	65 (43.9%)	<i>0.077</i>
<b>Total Fluid amount [ml]</b>	925 ± 631	678 ± 529	< <i>0.001*</i>
Preanesthesia [ml]	335 ± 314	169 ± 237	< <i>0.001*</i>
Postanesthesia [ml]	589 ± 370	510 ± 368	<i>0.075</i>
<b>Total Amine Use</b>	20 (15%)	31 (20%)	<i>0.136</i>
Ephedrine	18 (13.6%)	29 (19.6%)	<i>0.094</i>
Neosynephrine	2 (1.5%)	2 (1.4%)	<i>0.645</i>
Atropine	0	0	<i>NA</i>
<b>Total study time [min]</b>	48 ± 10	56 ± 13	< <i>0.001*</i>
Preanesthesia [min]	25 ± 12	29 ± 16	<i>0.018*</i>
Postanesthesia [min]	22 ± 9	26 ± 12	<i>0.002*</i>

553

554 Main primary and secondary endpoints comparing IVCUS and PLRT group; all data are reported as  
 555 mean ± SD or number (percentage). Significance level was established to be < 0.05. NA = not  
 556 applicable.

557

558

559

560

561 **FIGURE 1: Study flow chart**

562 Flow chart according to CONSORT of the primary study from which the post-hoc analysis was carried  
563 out, involving the ultrasound (arm B) and PLRT (arm C) groups.

564

565 **FIGURE 2: Total fluid amount**

566 Total fluid amount administered to all patients, stratified according to IVCUS and PLRT method; 925  
567  $\pm 631$  ml for IVCUS group and  $678 \pm 529$  ml for PLRT group ( $p < 0.001$ ).

568

569 **FIGURE 3: Pre/post-fluid amount distribution**


570 Fluid administration in IVCUS and PLRT group according to pre/post-anaesthesia phase;  $335 \pm 314$   
571 ml in the IVCUS group compared to  $169 \pm 237$  ml in the PLRT group ( $p < 0.001$ ) in the pre-  
572 anaesthesia phase;  $589 \pm 370$  ml in IVCUS group and  $510 \pm 368$  in PLRT group ( $p = 0.075$ ) during the  
573 post-anaesthesia phase.

574

575 **FIGURE 4: Total time anaesthesia**

576 Total time anaesthesia stratified according to method used for fluid responsiveness assessment; the  
577 PLRT group ( $56 \pm 13$  min) resulted more time-consuming compared to IVCUS group ( $48 \pm 10$  min;  $p$   
578  $< 0.001$ ).






**All Fluids**


2500 ml  
2000 ml  
1500 ml  
1000 ml  
500 ml  
0 ml

**IVCUS Group**

**PLRT Group**

*p < 0.001*





**Total Time Anesthesia**

150:00 min  
120:00 min  
90:00 min  
60:00 min  
30:00 min

$p < 0.001$

**IVCUS Group**

**PLRT Group**

