Centhaquine Increases Stroke Volume and Cardiac Output in Patients with Hypovolemic Shock

Aman Khanna[1], Krish Vaidya[2], Dharmesh Shah[3], Amaresh K. Ranjan[4*] and Anil Gulati[4,5,6*]

[1] Aman Hospital and Research Centre Organization, Vadodara, Gujarat, INDIA
[2] I cure Heart care, Vadodara, Gujarat, INDIA
[3] Pharmazz India Pvt. Ltd., Greater Noida, UP, INDIA.
[4]Pharmazz Inc. Research and Development, Willowbrook, IL, USA.
[5]Department of Bioengineering, The University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA.
[6]Midwestern University, Downers Grove, IL, USA.

***Correspondence:**
anil.gulati@pharmazz.com & amaresh.ranjan@pharmazz.com

Keywords: Centhaquine, Cardiac Output, Venous Return, Blood Pressure, Shock, Hypovolemia, Resuscitation, Critical Care.

Abstract

Background: Centhaquine is a resuscitative agent that acts on α2B adrenergic receptors to enhance venous return in hypovolemic shock. The effect of centhaquine on cardiac output in patients with hypovolemic shock has not been reported.

Methods: Trans-thoracic echocardiography was utilized to measure stroke volume (SV), cardiac output (CO), left ventricular outflow tract-velocity time integral (LVOT-VTI), left ventricular outflow tract diameter (LVOTd), heart rate (HR), left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), left ventricular fractional shortening (FS) and inferior vena cava (IVC) diameter before (0 min) and after centhaquine (0.01 mg/kg, iv infusion over 60 min) treatment (60 min, 120 min, and 300 min) in 12 randomly selected patients with hypovolemic shock enrolled in a prospective, multicenter, open-label phase IV clinical study (NCT05956418) of centhaquine in patients with hypovolemic shock.

Results: A significant increase in SV (mL) was observed after 60, 120, and 300 minutes of centhaquine treatment. CO (mL/min) increased significantly at 120 and 300 min despite a decrease in HR at these times. A significant increase in IVC diameter and LVOT-VTI (mL) at these time points was observed, which indicated increased venous return. The LVEF and FS did not change, while the mean arterial pressure (MAP, mmHg) increased in patients after 120 and 300 minutes of centhaquine treatment. Positive correlations between IVC diameter and SV ($R^2 = 0.9556$) and between IVC diameter and MAP ($R^2 = 0.8928$) were observed, which indicated the effect of centhaquine mediated increase in venous return on SV, CO, and MAP.

Conclusions: Centhaquine mediated increase in venous return appears to play a critical role in enhancing SV, CO, and MAP in patients with hypovolemic shock; these changes could be pivotal for reducing shock-mediated circulatory failure, promoting tissue perfusion, and improving patient outcomes.

Trial registration: The phase IV trial reported in this study has Clinical Trials Registry, India; ctri.icmr.org.in, CTRI/2021/01/030263; clinicaltrials.gov, NCT05956418.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

1 Introduction

Hypovolemic shock decreases circulating blood volume and reduces stroke volume (SV), cardiac output (CO)[1], and tissue blood perfusion, leading to the possibility of organ failure and death. Managing hypovolemic shock is critical and involves prompt and targeted interventions to restore the circulating blood volume and increase organ perfusion using various fluids and vasopressors[1; 2]. Although the commonly used fluids (crystalloids or colloids) help compensate for the volume loss, patients often require vasopressors to achieve perfusion endpoints (e.g., CO and MAP)[3]. Vasopressors induce constriction of the blood vessels and aid the sympathetic system to increase blood pressure and CO, in an attempt to increase tissue perfusion[4]. However, the use of vasopressors (e.g., epinephrine, norepinephrine, dopamine, vasopressin, and angiotensin) remains debatable due to associated risks, including cardiac arrhythmias, decreased tissue perfusion, fluid extravasation, and organ failure [5].

At the normal physiological state, a significant amount of blood is pooled on the venous side (having high vascular capacitance) of the circulation; however, in hypovolemic shock, blood accumulation in the veins is further increased, and that a significant amount of blood does not participate in tissue perfusion[6]. It is of interest to divert the pooled venous blood towards the arterial side so that the circulating blood volume can be increased, which will help increase stroke volume (SV), cardiac output (CO), and mean arterial pressure (MAP), as well as increase tissue perfusion.

Centhaquine (2-[2-[4-(3-Methylphenyl)-1-piperazinyl]ethyl] quinoline citrate) is being developed to treat hypovolemic shock. It showed good tolerability and safety in healthy subjects with minimal adverse effects observed at almost ten times the therapeutic dose (NCT02408731). Clinical studies in hypovolemic shock patients (NCT04056065 and NCT04045327) found that centhaquine significantly increased HR and MAP, reduced lactate levels, and increased survival[7; 8]. The proposed mechanism of action of centhaquine is by acting on venous α2B-adrenergic receptors; it augments the blood return to the heart and increases SV[9]. In swine and rat models of hypovolemic shock, centhaquine significantly increased the SV, leading to increased CO and MAP [10; 11] and improved survival. The current study investigates centhaquine's role in increasing cardiovascular variables (SV, CO, and MAP) by enhancing venous blood return in human patients with hypovolemic shock.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study Design

This pilot study was conducted on 12 randomly selected patients enrolled in a prospective, multicenter, open-label phase IV clinical study (NCT05956418) of centhaquine in patients with hypovolemic shock. At the baseline, demographic data, chest X-ray, electrocardiogram (ECG), and vital signs were recorded along with blood counts and chemistry. Patients received 0.01 mg/kg centhaquine by intravenous infusion over 60 min in 100 mL normal saline. Systolic and diastolic blood pressure (SBP and DBP) were recorded using a sphygmomanometer at baseline, hourly for the initial 48 hrs, and in between if needed. The mean arterial pressure [DBP + 1/3 (SBP – DBP)] and pulse pressure (SBP-DBP) were calculated.

All patients received standard of care (SOC) for hypovolemic shock throughout the study. The study duration for an individual patient was seven days or earlier (patient discharge).

2.1.2 Echocardiographic measurements

Transthoracic echocardiography was utilized to assess SV, CO, HR, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), and left ventricular fractional shortening (LVFS) before (0 min) and after centhaquine treatment (60 min, 120 min and 300 min). An expert technician conducted the echocardiography, and the detailed methodology is as follows -

2.1.2.1 LVOT diameter: A parasternal long-axis view was obtained to visualize the left ventricular outflow tract (LVOT) and the aortic valve. The view of the aortic valve opening and closing was ensured. The best view of the aortic valve at mid-systole (when the valves are wide open) was ensured, images were captured, and the distance near the aortic annulus at the base of the leaflets was measured using the tool. This measured distance was the diameter of the LVOT.

2.1.2.2 LVOT VTI (LVOT velocity time integral): The pulse-wave Doppler gate was aligned parallel to the LVOT in the Apical 5 Chamber view to obtain the best VTI tracing. Once the Doppler gate was positioned well, the pulse wave Doppler was activated. The automated LVOT VTI was calculated after tracing the outline of one of the systolic waveforms. The values for the LVOT VTI are denoted as the distance in centimeters (cm) and represent the distance that blood travels in one heartbeat.

2.1.2.3 Heart rate (HR): The specific points on the screen corresponding to individual heartbeats were marked, and the heart rate was automatically calculated by the echocardiography machine based on this input.

2.1.2.4 SV and CO: SV was calculated as the product of the LVOT diameter and the LVOT VTI. CO was calculated as the product of SV and HR.

2.1.2.5 LVEF and LVFS: LVEF was calculated via visual estimation by reviewing different echocardiography windows, as was done in an emergency setting. LVFS was calculated using the formula (%LVFS = [(LVDD-LVDS)/LVDD] × 100, where LVDD is the left ventricle diameter at diastole, and LVDS is the left ventricle diameter at systole, measured through echocardiography.

2.2 Patient population, consent, and regulatory oversight

The phase IV study's detailed inclusion/exclusion criteria (NCT05956418) are provided at https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05956418. Adult hypovolemic shock patients aged ≥ 18 years with an SBP ≤ 90 mmHg upon presentation to the emergency room or ICU, receiving standard shock treatment, and having a blood lactate level >2.0 mmol/L were included in the study.

Informed consent from all enrolled patients or their legally authorized representative (LAR) was obtained verbally and in writing after communicating the study details.

The study adhered to the Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use Guideline for Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP), the Helsinki Declaration, and local regulatory requirements.

2.3 Safety evaluation

Safety was evaluated by the study investigators based on adverse events (AEs), physical examination results, vital signs (including HR, SBP, DBP, body temperature, and respiratory rate), ECG, and clinical variables. Any AEs that occurred or worsened during or after centhaquine treatment were

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

systematically recorded and coded by system organ class and preferred term using the latest version of the International Conference on Harmonization Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities.

2.4 Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE)

Data not available (6.4%) were assessed as "missing values," and they were imputed using "MICE," which is a package that implements a method to address missing data by creating multiple imputations (replacement values) for multivariate missing data[12]. In this study, five patients had multiple imputations for missing echocardiography data. A scalar of 20, given the number of iterations and predictive mean matching "pmm," was used.

2.5 Statistical analysis

The results are presented as the mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM). The statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 10.1.2 (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). Parametric analysis was carried out using a one-way analysis of variance without assuming equal variances with a normal probability distribution. The post hoc Tukey's multiple comparisons test was performed to estimate the significance of differences. p values < 0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance at the 95% confidence level.

3 Results

3.1 Patient demographics, baseline characteristics, and volume of fluid administration during the first 5 hours of resuscitation.

The demographics and baseline characteristics are shown in Table 1.

3.2 Centhaquine Increases Stroke Volume, Cardiac Output, and Mean Arterial Pressure

At baseline (0 min), the mean SV (mL) was 63.36 ± 4.06. At 60 min, 120 min, and 300 min, the mean SV (mL) was 78.07 ± 4.98 (Δ23.2%, p=0.0084), 83.51 ± 3.78 (Δ31.8%, p=0.0002), and 89.18 ± 3.71 (Δ40.74%, p<0.0001), respectively (Fig. 1A).

The mean CO (mL/min) at baseline was 5728.58 ± 263.4. At 60 min, 120 min, and 300 min, the mean SV (mL) was 6273.91 ± 318.33 (Δ9.52%, p=0.3097), 7212.74 ± 291.2 (Δ25.9%, p=0.0002), and 7004.28 ± 255.36 (Δ22.23%, p=0.0013), respectively (Fig. 1B).

At baseline, the mean HR (bpm) was 92.08 ± 3.55. At 60 min, 120 min, and 300 min, the mean HR (bpm) was 81.33 ± 2.23 (Δ11.69%, p=0.0006), 82.1 ± 0.96 (Δ10.97%, p=0.0015) and 79.42 ± 1.80 (Δ13.41%, p<0.0001), respectively (Fig. 1C).

MAP (mmHg) at baseline or 0 min was 58.89 ± 1.03. At 60 min, 120 min, and 300 min, the MAP values were 62.22 ±1.44 (Δ5.66%, p=.4601), 68.33 ± 1.86 (Δ16.04%, p=0.0015), and 69.27 ± 2.4 (Δ17.64%, p=0.0005), respectively (Fig. 1D).

3.3 Centhaquine Increases the Venous Return (increase in IVC Diameter)

The mean IVC diameter (cm) at baseline was 0.92 ± 0.04. A change in IVC diameter was observed after centhaquine treatment at 60, 120, and 300 min; the mean IVC diameter (cm) was 1.07 ± 0.03 (Δ15.94%, p=0.0091), 1.14 ± 0.02 (Δ25.00%, p<0.0001) and 1.14 ± 0.03 (Δ23.19%, p<0.0001), respectively (Fig. 2A).

The relationships between "IVC diameter and SV" and "IVC diameter and MAP" were evaluated. A direct correlation (R^2 = 0.9556; p=0.02245) between IVC diameter and SV (Fig. 2B) and between IVC diameter and MAP was observed (R^2 = 0.8928; p=0.05514) (Fig. 2C).

3.4 **Centhaquine Increases LVOT-VTI (Blood Flow towards Aortic Annulus/Valve)**

LVOT-VTI (cm) indicates the blood flow from the left ventricle of the heart towards the aorta. LVOT-VTI was 18.54 ± 1.11 at the baseline, while it was 21.97 ± 1.05 (Δ18.52%, p=0.0159) 24.14 ± 0.76 (Δ30.2%, p<0.0001), and 24.9 ± 0.8 (Δ34.15%, p<0.0001) at 60 min, 120 min, and 300 min, respectively (Fig. 3A), while LVOT diameter and area remain unchanged (Fig. 3B and C) at these time points.

4 Discussions

The current study was conducted on 12 hypovolemic shock patients from a single cohort phase IV (NCT05956418) study; centhaquine increased SV and decreased HR (Fig. 1A and C) with ~40% increase in SV, which is much higher compared to other studies relying on fluid infusion alone (~10-25%) [13; 14]. Kumar et al. demonstrated a 15-25% increase in SV in healthy humans after infusion of 3 liters of normal saline at the rate of 1 liter per hour and observed cardiac inotropic effect of fluids with a ~14% increase in LVEF. On the other hand, in our current study, only 746.12 ± 87.42 ml of fluid was required for 5 hours (~150 ml per hour) of resuscitation (Table 2), and no change in LVEF and LVFS (suppl fig. 1A and B) was seen, indicating no effect on cardiac inotropy. Thus, centhaquine increases SV independent of the volume of fluids during resuscitation and does not affect cardiac inotropy. Hence, risks of fluid extravasation and cardiac arrhythmia are mitigated [15], which are associated with a higher volume of fluids and using vasopressors to treat shock[16; 17].

CO and MAP were increased (Fig. 1B, D, and Suppl Table 1) after centhaquine treatment despite reduced HR and unchanged total peripheral resistance (Suppl Fig. 2), indicating an impact of increased SV on arterial circulation and tissue perfusion. IVC diameter was also significantly increased (Fig. 2A), reflecting increased venous return and cardiac preload [18; 19; 20] after centhaquine treatment. A direct correlation between IVC diameter and SV (R^2 = 0.9556) (Fig. 2B), and IVC diameter and MAP (R^2 = 0.8928) (Fig. 2C) was observed, which indicated an effect of increased venous return on SV, CO, and MAP.

Furthermore, LVOT-VTI was significantly upregulated after centhaquine treatment, which indicated increased blood flow in the left ventricular outflow tract during systole, leading to enhanced SV[21; 22]. The increased blood flow towards LVOT could be attributed to increased chronotropy, cardiac inotropy, or venous return. After centhaquine treatment, however, patients were observed with decreased cardiac chronotropy and no change in inotropy (Suppl Fig. 1A and B); hence, increased venous return would be the main reason for the increased LVOT-VTI.

Increased venous return and flow in LVOT would increase the blood volume in the arterial system, leading to increased MAP. Besides blood volume, vascular resistance is also vital for regulating blood pressure. Nonetheless, centhaquine treatment demonstrated no significant change in total peripheral resistance (Suppl Fig. 2), further supporting the role of centhaquine mediated increased venous return on arterial blood volume, causing an increase in MAP in patients with hypovolemic shock.

All patients treated with centhaquine in the study showed improved HR, respiratory rate, and body temperature. A reduction in serum lactate, base deficit, and an increase in PO2/FiO2 was observed in hypovolemic shock patients treated with centhaquine (Table 3). Improved patient outcomes were

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

observed with decreased MODS (0.17 ± 0.11 at the time of discharge vs 2.5 ± 0.38 at the baseline), and stabilized hematological, biochemical, and serum electrolyte levels (Suppl Table 1). All 12 centhaquine treated patients recovered and were discharged at 3.1 ± 0.074 days. Thus, the efficacy and safety of centhaquine in hypovolemic shock patients is promising.

These findings align with studies in animal models of hypovolemic shock[10; 11; 23; 24; 25], leading to increased venous return, CO, MAP, and tissue perfusion and underscore the significance of venous return in managing shock[26], with centhaquine targeting this through α2B-AR agonism. Thus, the current study and other studies[22; 23; 24] highlight the importance of venous return for treating shock. The venous return is modulated through the venous tone, which is primarily regulated by the sympatho-adrenergic system, and thus, adrenergic signaling appears to be an important target in treating various types of shock[27; 28; 29; 30]. Interestingly, ARs are distributed distinctly in the arterial and venous systems and play a key role in coordinating the arterial and venous circulation. Most arteries and large veins (e.g., vena cava) are mainly regulated by α1/α2-ARs, while peripheral veins are regulated by α2B-ARs[25; 31; 32; 33]. The high abundance of α2B-ARs in the peripheral veins highlights their involvement in the constriction of these peripheral veins. The peripheral veins have relatively higher capacitance than central veins (58.95% vs 11.05%) and hence are vital players for regulating venous return and cardiac preload, which proportionately affects SV. Therefore, findings of the study demonstrating increased SV with increased IVC diameter indicate that centhaquine would be acting on the α2B-ARs present in the peripheral veins and inducing venoconstriction, which would mobilize the unstressed blood present in these veins towards the vena cava and leading to increased blood volume in IVC causing increase in its diameter (Fig. 2A).

However, further studies are required to elucidate which specific venous systems are affected after centhaquine treatment. Studies have shown that cutaneous and splanchnic veins, which together constitute the major blood reservoir in the body, respond to various factors, e.g., temperature, stress, arterial blood parameters, and blood pressure[27], elucidating the effect of centhaquine on the individual venous system would help explore its potential further for treatment of different types of shock involving circulatory failure in different regions. Moreover, further randomized controlled trials with larger cohorts are necessary to fully understand centhaquine's effects on venous systems and its potential in treating different types of shock associated with circulatory failure.

5 Conclusions

The increased venous return induced by centhaquine plays a pivotal role in elevating SV, CO, and MAP mediated through increased LVOT-VTI and IVC diameter in patients experiencing hypovolemic shock. An increase in SV, CO, and MAP occurs concurrently with a decrease in heart rate without influencing the inotropic function of the heart. This unique combination of outcomes suggests that centhaquine has remarkable potential to mitigate circulatory failure associated with hypovolemic shock, thereby promoting blood flow and tissue perfusion and improving overall patient outcomes. Understanding centhaquine's distinctive mechanism of action raises the possibility of its development as a novel resuscitative agent not only for hypovolemic shock but also for other shock types (e.g., septic shock and vasodilatory shock) that share pathophysiological characteristics involving circulatory failure and hypotension. While further research and clinical studies are needed to fully elucidate centhaquine's effectiveness and safety profile across diverse shock conditions, its ability to enhance venous return and cardiac performance without undesirable effects on heart rate or inotropy could be pivotal for the development of a highly effective and safer resuscitative agent for the treatment of shock.

6 References

[1] E.M. Snyder, Jr., Management of refractory shock. Calif Med 80 (1954) 13-5.

[2] K.J. Kalkwarf, and B.A. Cotton, Resuscitation for Hypovolemic Shock. Surg Clin North Am 97 (2017) 1307-1321.

[3] S.M. Hollenberg, Vasoactive drugs in circulatory shock. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine 183 (2011) 847-55.

[4] P.P. Manolopoulos, I. Boutsikos, P. Boutsikos, N. Iacovidou, and K. Ekmektzoglou, Current use and advances in vasopressors and inotropes support in shock. Journal of Emergency and Critical Care Medicine 4 (2020).

[5] N. Fage, P. Asfar, P. Radermacher, and J. Demiselle, Norepinephrine and Vasopressin in Hemorrhagic Shock: A Focus on Renal Hemodynamics. Int J Mol Sci 24 (2023).

[6] R.S. Alexander, Venomotor tone in hemorrhage and shock. Circ Res 3 (1955) 181-90.

[7] A. Gulati, R. Choudhuri, A. Gupta, S. Singh, S.K.N. Ali, G.K. Sidhu, P.D. Haque, P. Rahate, A.R. Bothra, G.P. Singh, S. Maheshwari, D. Jeswani, S. Haveri, A. Agarwal, and N.R. Agrawal, A Multicentric, Randomized, Controlled Phase III Study of Centhaquine (Lyfaquin((R))) as a Resuscitative Agent in Hypovolemic Shock Patients. Drugs 81 (2021) 1079-1100.

[8] A. Gulati, D. Jain, N.R. Agrawal, P. Rahate, R. Choudhuri, S. Das, D.P. Dhibar, M. Prabhu, S. Haveri, R. Agarwal, and M.S. Lavhale, Resuscitative Effect of Centhaquine (Lyfaquin((R))) in Hypovolemic Shock Patients: A Randomized, Multicentric, Controlled Trial. Adv Ther 38 (2021) 3223-3265.

[9] A. Chalkias, Shear Stress and Endothelial Mechanotransduction in Trauma Patients with Hemorrhagic Shock: Hidden Coagulopathy Pathways and Novel Therapeutic Strategies. Int J Mol Sci 24 (2023).

[10] Z. Kontouli, C. Staikou, N. Iacovidou, I. Mamais, E. Kouskouni, A. Papalois, P. Papapanagiotou, A. Gulati, A. Chalkias, and T. Xanthos, Resuscitation with centhaquin and 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 improves survival in a swine model of hemorrhagic shock: a randomized experimental study. Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg 45 (2019) 1077-1085.

[11] A. Gulati, M.S. Lavhale, D.J. Garcia, and S. Havalad, Centhaquin improves resuscitative effect of hypertonic saline in hemorrhaged rats. J Surg Res 178 (2012) 415-23.

[12] M.J. Azur, E.A. Stuart, C. Frangakis, and P.J. Leaf, Multiple imputation by chained equations: what is it and how does it work? Int J Methods Psychiatr Res 20 (2011) 40-9.

[13] A. Kumar, R. Anel, E. Bunnell, S. Zanotti, K. Habet, C. Haery, S. Marshall, M. Cheang, A. Neumann, A. Ali, C. Kavinsky, and J.E. Parrillo, Preload-independent mechanisms contribute to increased stroke volume following large volume saline infusion in normal volunteers: a prospective interventional study. Crit Care 8 (2004) R128-36.

[14] A. Carsetti, M. Cecconi, and A. Rhodes, Fluid bolus therapy: monitoring and predicting fluid responsiveness. Curr Opin Crit Care 21 (2015) 388-94.

[15] M. Mandal, Ideal resuscitation fluid in hypovolemia: The quest is on and miles to go! Int J Crit Illn Inj Sci 6 (2016) 54-5.

[16] J.A. Russell, Vasopressor therapy in critically ill patients with shock. Intensive Care Med 45 (2019) 1503-1517.

[17] D. De Backer, P. Biston, J. Devriendt, C. Madl, D. Chochrad, C. Aldecoa, A. Brasseur, P. Defrance, P. Gottignies, J.L. Vincent, and S.I. Investigators, Comparison of dopamine and norepinephrine in the treatment of shock. N Engl J Med 362 (2010) 779-89.

[18] M. Lyon, M. Blaivas, and L. Brannam, Sonographic measurement of the inferior vena cava as a marker of blood loss. Am J Emerg Med 23 (2005) 45-50.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

[19] S. Sefidbakht, R. Assadsangabi, H.R. Abbasi, and A. Nabavizadeh, Sonographic measurement of the inferior vena cava as a predictor of shock in trauma patients. Emerg Radiol 14 (2007) 181-5.
[20] M. Massalha, R. Faranish, S. Romano, and R. Salim, Decreased inferior vena cava diameter as an early marker in postpartum hemorrhage. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 59 (2022) 234-240.
[21] J. Wang, D. Zhou, Y. Gao, Z. Wu, X. Wang, and C. Lv, Effect of VTILVOT variation rate on the assessment of fluid responsiveness in septic shock patients. Medicine (Baltimore) 99 (2020) e22702.
[22] A. Perez-Manjarrez, E. Garcia-Cruz, R. Gopar-Nieto, G.M. Jimenez-Rodriguez, E. Lazcano-Diaz, G. Rojas-Velasco, and D. Manzur-Sandoval, Usefulness of the velocity-time integral of the left ventricular outflow tract variability index to predict fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing cardiac surgery. Echo Res Pract 10 (2023) 9.
[23] M.S. Lavhale, S. Havalad, and A. Gulati, Resuscitative effect of centhaquin after hemorrhagic shock in rats. J Surg Res 179 (2013) 115-24.
[24] P. Papapanagiotou, T. Xanthos, A. Gulati, A. Chalkias, A. Papalois, Z. Kontouli, A. Alegakis, and N. Iacovidou, Centhaquin improves survival in a swine model of hemorrhagic shock. J Surg Res 200 (2016) 227-35.
[25] M. Geevarghese, 3rd, K. Patel, A. Gulati, and A.K. Ranjan, Role of adrenergic receptors in shock. Front Physiol 14 (2023) 1094591.
[26] A. Chalkias, E. Laou, N. Papagiannakis, V. Spyropoulos, E. Kouskouni, K. Theodoraki, and T. Xanthos, Assessment of Dynamic Changes in Stressed Volume and Venous Return during Hyperdynamic Septic Shock. J Pers Med 12 (2022).
[27] P.M. Vanhoutte, The Role of the Systemic Veins: An Update. Phlebology 2 (1987) 61-73.
[28] T. Shen, and K. Baker, Venous return and clinical hemodynamics: how the body works during acute hemorrhage. Adv Physiol Educ 39 (2015) 267-71.
[29] D.J. Funk, E. Jacobsohn, and A. Kumar, Role of the venous return in critical illness and shock: part II-shock and mechanical ventilation. Crit Care Med 41 (2013) 573-9.
[30] R. Spiegel, Stressed vs. unstressed volume and its relevance to critical care practitioners. Clin Exp Emerg Med 3 (2016) 52-54.
[31] J.A. Giovannitti, Jr., S.M. Thoms, and J.J. Crawford, Alpha-2 adrenergic receptor agonists: a review of current clinical applications. Anesth Prog 62 (2015) 31-9.
[32] X.L. Rudner, D.E. Berkowitz, J.V. Booth, B.L. Funk, K.L. Cozart, E.B. D'Amico, H. El-Moalem, S.O. Page, C.D. Richardson, B. Winters, L. Marucci, and D.A. Schwinn, Subtype specific regulation of human vascular alpha(1)-adrenergic receptors by vessel bed and age. Circulation 100 (1999) 2336-43.
[33] L. Hering, M. Rahman, S.A. Potthoff, L.C. Rump, and J. Stegbauer, Role of alpha2-Adrenoceptors in Hypertension: Focus on Renal Sympathetic Neurotransmitter Release, Inflammation, and Sodium Homeostasis. Front Physiol 11 (2020) 566871.

7 List of abbreviations

AR	Adrenergic Receptors
SV	Stroke Volume
CO	Cardiac Output
LVEF	Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction
FS	Fractional Shortening (Left Ventricular)
IVC	Inferior Vena Cava
LVOT	Left Ventricular Outflow Tract
VTI	Velocity Time Integral
LVDD	Left Ventricle Diameter at Diastole
LVDS	Left Ventricle Diameter at Systole
DBP	Diastolic Blood Pressure
HR	Heart Rate
MAP	Mean Arterial Pressure
SV	Stroke Volume
SVR	Systemic Vascular Resistance
SBP	Systolic Blood Pressure
SOC	Standard of Care
MICE	Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations
MODS	Multiple Organ Dysfunction Syndrome
ARDS	Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

8 Declaration

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: The study was conducted in compliance with the Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use Guideline for Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP), the Helsinki Declaration, and local regulatory requirements. The study protocol (PMZ-2010/CT-4.1/2019), version 1.0/ dated October 16, 2019, was approved by the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI), Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India (DCGI CT NOC. No.: CT/ND/110/2020). Besides, each institutional ethics committee reviewed and approved the study protocol before initiating patient enrolment. The trial was registered at the Clinical Trials Registry, India (CTRI/2021/01/030263), and the United States National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT05956418). Each site's ethics committee was informed of any protocol deviation, amendment, subject exclusion or withdrawal, and serious adverse events (SAE). (Details of the participating site for this study are in Suppl Table 2)

Consent: The patients included in this study were in a state of life-threatening shock; therefore, for patients who were not fit to give consent themselves at the time of treatment initiation, informed consent was obtained from their legally authorized representative (LAR). The investigator verbally, as well as in writing, informed the patient or LAR of the details of the study relevant to a decision about whether to participate in the study.

No patient identifiable data is present in this article.

9 Conflict of Interest

D.S. is an employee of Pharmazz India Pvt. Ltd., INDIA, and A.K.R. is an employee of Pharmazz, Inc., Willowbrook, IL, USA. A.G. is an employee of Pharmazz, Inc., Willowbrook, IL, USA, and has issued and pending patents related to this study. All the other authors declare no competing interests.

10 Author Contributions

Conceptualization: A.G., and D.S.; Data curation: A.G., A.K.R. and D.S.; Formal analysis: A.K.R., A.G. and D.S.; Investigation: A.K., K.V.; Methodology: A.G., D.S. and A.K.; Project administration: A.K. and D.S.; Visualization: A.G. and A.K.R.; Writing–original draft: A.K.R.; Writing–review & editing: A.K.R., A.G. and D.S. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

11 Funding

Pharmazz India Pvt Ltd. supported the study.

12 Acknowledgments

We acknowledge Sunil Gulati, Pharmazz Inc., USA, for imputing missing data using a package "Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE)," which implements a method to address missing data by creating multiple imputations (replacement values) for multivariate missing data.

13 Data Availability Statement

The anonymized patient datasets generated and/or analyzed during the study are available from the corresponding author on a reasonable request from a bona fide researcher/research group.

Figure legends:

Figure 1. Effects of centhaquine on cardiovascular variables (SV, CO, HR, and MAP).

* P<0.05, ** P<0.01, *** P<0.001, and **** P<0.0001 compared to 0 min. n= 12.

Figure 2. Effect of centhaquine on venous return (IVC diameter) and its correlation with SV and MAP. * P<0.05, ** P<0.01, *** P<0.001, and **** P<0.0001 compared to 0 min (A). n= 12.

Figure 3. Effect of centhaquine on blood flow (LVOT-VTI) in LVOT to the aorta. * P<0.05, ** P<0.01, *** P<0.001, and **** P<0.0001 compared to 0 min (A). n= 12.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Figure 1



Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-14.70	-26.29 to -3.117	0.0084
0 min vs. 120 min	-20.14	-31.73 to -8.559	0.0002
0 min vs. 300 min	-25.81	-37.40 to -14.23	<0.0001

Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-545.3	-1383 to 292.3	0.3097
0 min vs. 120 min	-1484	-2322 to -646.6	0.0002
0 min vs. 300 min	-1276	-2113 to -438.1	0.0013

Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	10.75	4.117 to 17.38	0.0006
0 min vs. 120 min	10.00	3.367 to 16.63	0.0015
0 min vs. 300 min	12.67	6.033 to 19.30	<0.0001

Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-3.417	-9.657 to 2.824	0.4601
0 min vs. 120 min	-9.417	-15.66 to -3.176	0.0015
0 min vs. 300 min	-10.25	-16.49 to -4.010	0.0005

Figure 2



Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-0.1500	-0.2693 to -0.03072	0.0091
0 min vs. 120 min	-0.2250	-0.3443 to -0.1057	<0.0001
0 min vs. 300 min	-0.2250	-0.3443 to -0.1057	<0.0001



R (Mean; 95.00% CI)	0.9775; 0.2721 to 0.9995
R squared (P (two-tailed)	0.9556 (0.0225)



R (Mean; 95.00% CI)	0.9449; -0.1766 to 0.9989
R squared (P (two-tailed)	0.8928 (0.0551)

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Figure 3



Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-3.433	-6.350 to -0.5170	0.0159
0 min vs. 120 min	-5.600	-8.516 to -2.684	<0.0001
0 min vs. 300 min	-6.333	-9.250 to -3.417	<0.0001

Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-0.03083	-0.1372 to 0.07557	0.8612
0 min vs. 120 min	-0.02750	-0.1339 to 0.07890	0.8967
0 min vs. 300 min	-0.03750	-0.1439 to 0.06890	0.7764

Tukey's test	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Adjusted P Value
0 min vs. 60 min	-0.09750	-0.4690 to 0.2740	0.8924
0 min vs. 120 min	-0.07083	-0.4423 to 0.3006	0.9547
0 min vs. 300 min	-0.1042	-0.4756 to 0.2673	0.8724

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients

Age (years)	37.42 ± 3.68
Body weight (kg)	58.83 ± 1.57
Height (cm)	157.67± 1.2
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	23.64 ± 0.22
Sex	
Men	9 (75%)
Women	3 (25%)
Medical history	
Hypertension	0
Diabetes	0
Renal disorders	0
Respiratory disease	1 (8.33%)
Ischemic heart disease	0
Liver fibrosis	0
Hepatitis (Altered SGPT)	6 (50%)
Preeclampsia	0
Reason for hypovolemic shock	
Gastroenteritis (vomiting, abdominal pain and or diarrhea)	8(66.67%)
Enteric fever	4(33.33%)
Dengue fever	2 (16.67%)
Falciparum malaria	1 (8.33%)
Acute appendicitis	1 (8.33%)
Clinical factors	
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	73.87 ± 2.9
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	45.33 ± 1.64

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients

Heart rate (beats/min)	108 ± 4.4
ECG	Normal
Random blood glucose (mg/dL)	104.24 ± 4.75
Shock index	1.51 ±0.12
MODS	2.5 ± 0.38
ARDS	0.08 ± 0.083
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	23.5 ± 0.23
Body temperature (°F)	102.3 ± 0.36
Blood lactate (mmol/L)	2.5 ± 0.06
Base deficit (mmol/L)	−1.49 ± 0.06
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	12.16 ± 0.45
Hematocrit (%)	37.24 ± 1.26
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.13 ± 0.15
Glomerular filtration rate (mL/min/1.73 m^2)	83.43 ± 7.84
pH	7.21 ± 0.01
pCO_2 (mmHg)	33.17 ± 0.90
PO2/FiO2	376.75 ± 6.32

The data are presented as the mean ± SEM.

Table 2. Volume of fluids administered to patients before randomization and during the first 5 hours of resuscitation.

Normal saline (mL)	Normal saline with dextrose (mL)	Total volume (mL)
345.7 ± 67.2	400.42 ± 32.42	746.12 ± 87.42

The data are presented as the mean ± SEM.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

Table 3. Patient vital signs were recorded from day 1 (baseline) through days 3/4.

Vitals	Baseline	After administration of centhaquine		
	Day 1	**Day 2**	**Day 3**	**Day 4**
SBP (mmHg)	73.83 ± 2.88	102.17 ± 1.17	110.00 ± 1.74	120.00 ± 1.67
DBP (mmHg)	45.33 ± 1.64	63.17 ± 2.47	69.17 ± 1.49	77.78 ± 1.47
Heart rate (beats/min)	108 ± 4.38	95.5 ± 3.27	92.42 ± 2.30	85.56 ± 1.45
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	23.5 ± 0.23	21.83 ± 0.65	21.25 ± 0.64	20.11 ± 0.59
Body temperature (°F)	102.28 ± 0.36	99.51 ± 0.64	98.21 ± 0.30	97.57 ± 0.20
Lactate (mM/L)	2.5 ± 0.06	2.02 ± 0.03	1.67 ± 0.04	1.17 ± 0.05
Base deficit (mM/L)	-149 ± 0.06	-0.52 ± 0.09	0.38 ± 0.18	0.43 ± 0.04
PO2/FiO2	376.75 ± 6.32	405.5 ± 1.74	419.45 ± 1.98	427.51 ± 3.05

The data are presented as the mean ± SEM. *DBP* diastolic blood pressure, *SBP* systolic blood pressure.