The Two-Gasometry Indirect Fick Method: An Inconsistent Method for Measuring Cardiac Output in Critical Patients

Running Title: Two-gasometry indirect Fick method for cardiac output

Authors

- Daniela Cuellar-Mendoza,[1,2]
- Javier Mancilla-Galindo (ORCID: 0000-0002-0718-467X),[3]
- Esmeralda Garza-Santiago (ORCID: 0000-0002-6370-7922),[4]
- Liliana Aline Fernández-Urrutia (ORCID: 0009-0001-9252-2636),[5]
- Gabriela Alejandra Bautista-Aguilar,[1,2]
- Ashuin Kammar-García (ORCID: 0000-0002-3875-0945),[6,7]
- Ernesto Deloya-Tomas (ORCiD: 0000-0002-9623-5263),[1,2]
- Orlando Rubén Pérez-Nieto (ORCID: 0000-0001-8817-7000)[1,2,*]

Affiliations

1. Intensive Care Unit. Hospital General San Juan del Rio, Querétaro, Mexico.
2. Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, Querétaro, México.
3. Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands
4. Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud; Universidad Anáhuac Programa: Maestría en Dirección y Gestión de Instituciones de Salud, Mexico City, Mexico.
5. Erasmus MC Graduate School, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
6. Dirección de Investigación, Instituto Nacional de Geriatría, Mexico City, Mexico

7. Lown Scholars in Cardiovascular Health Program, Departments of Global Health and Population and Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

*__Correspondence__: Orlando R. Pérez-Nieto MD. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8817-7000 Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos, Hospital General San Juan del Rio. Blvd. Luis Donaldo Colosio No. 422 Col. Sagrado Corazon, San Juan del Rio, Querétaro. Mexico. Intensive Care Unit. E-mail: orlando_rpn@hotmail.com

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in the Harvard Dataverse at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/J4ONSU.

Code Availability:

The code documenting the analysis in this study is openly available in https://github.com/javimangal/cardiac-output-fick

Abstract

Background: The two-gasometry indirect Fick method (iFM) is commonly applied to estimate cardiac output (CO) and cardiac index (CI) in low-resource settings. Validation against other accessible methods such as transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) is lacking.

Objective: To determine agreement and clinical interchangeability of CO and CI measurements from TTE (reference test) and two-gasometry iFM (index test) in critical care patients from a low-resource hospital.

Methods: Cross-sectional study including critical patients. CO and CI were measured by intensive care medicine residents with TTE (3 per patient-event) and the two-gasometry iFM (1 per patient-event). Agreement was evaluated using mean absolute difference, linear mixed-effects models, and Bland-Altman analysis for repeated measures with 95% limits of agreement (LoA). Precision, bias, and variability were quantified with coefficients of variation, error, and least significant change (LSC), with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) using bootstrapping.

Results: A total 243 measurements were performed across 81 time points in 52 participants. Bland-Altman analysis and linear mixed-effects models revealed poor correlation for both CO (ICC = 0.09) and CI (ICC = -0.09). The mean bias between TTE and iFM was -1.59 L/min (95 LoA: -8.1 to 4.92) for CO and -1 L/min/m² (95% LoA: -4.8 to 2.8) for CI. The mean absolute percentage error of the two-gasometry iFM method compared to TTE was 57.5% (95%CI: 45.5 to 74.6). The LSC was 11.9% for TTE and 80.4% for two-gasometry iFM.

Conclusions: The two-gasometry indirect Fick method performs poorly compared to TTE and should not be used for decision making in critical patients.

Keywords: *Cardiac output, blood gas analysis, echocardiography, intensive care unit, Fick method, critically ill patients .*

Highlights

- The two-gasometry indirect Fick method shows poor agreement with transthoracic echocardiography for measuring cardiac output and cardiac index.
- Bland-Altman analysis showed significant bias, high variability, and lack of precision of the two-gasometry indirect Fick method measurements.
- Mean absolute percentage error of the two-gasometry indirect Fick method was 57.5%, far exceeding acceptable clinical limits.
- The two-gasometry indirect Fick method is unsuitable for clinical decision-making in critically ill patients.

Introduction

Cardiac output (CO) measurement is used for hemodynamic assessment of critically ill patients, as it provides information on cardiac performance and systemic perfusion. The thermodilution technique using a pulmonary artery catheter (PAC)[1] has been considered the clinical gold standard for CO measurement due to its reliability and direct measurement capability. PACs have been widely used for hemodynamic monitoring in critically ill patients; however, their use is associated with significant complications. These include pulmonary artery rupture, arrhythmia, infection, and thrombosis,[2] which has driven the development of new technologies aimed at measuring cardiac output with less invasive and safer methods.

Noninvasive methods, such as transthoracic echocardiography (TTE), have gained popularity due to reduced risks and increased accessibility, in addition to emerging techniques, such as the Fick principle, which offer alternative approaches to CO estimation, especially in settings where less invasive methods are preferred or where PAC is not available.[3] Fick's principle calculates CO based on the relationship between oxygen consumption (VO_2) and the arteriovenous oxygen difference ($AVDO_2$). According to this principle, cardiac output is calculated using the following formula:

$$CO = \frac{VO_2}{AVDO_2}$$

VO_2 can be measured directly using devices such as a spirometer or a Douglas bag,[4] while $AVDO_2$ is determined by arterial and venous blood gas analysis. Despite its accuracy, this method is rarely implemented due to challenges such as the need for specialized equipment and its resource-intensive nature.

A simplified adaptation, the indirect Fick method (iFM) based on blood gas analysis from two blood samples, has gained acceptance in resource-limited settings.[5,6] Values are obtained by arterial blood gas analysis, typically drawn from the radial artery, and central venous blood gas analysis, taken from a catheter placed near the right atrial inlet, where CO is calculated using the following formula:

$$CO = \frac{AVDO_2 \times 100/CaO_2}{AVDO_2}$$

However, a prospective observational study by Sánchez-Velázquez found no significant correlation between CO measured by thermodilution and formulas based on the Fick method

with two blood gas tests.[7] This raises concerns about its reliability and possible diagnostic errors of the two-gasometry iFM in critically ill patients.

TTE has emerged as a reliable and accessible method due to its strong concordance with PAC in several studies. TTE estimates CO indirectly by assessing stroke volume and heart rate.[8] Multiple studies have shown adequate correlation between CO measured by TTE compared to the thermodilution technique, with adequate accuracy and precision.[9–12]

Given the resource-intensive and invasive nature of the two-gasometry indirect Fick method, its reliability requires further evaluation. Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the clinical concordance and interchangeability of CO and cardiac index (CI) measurements obtained by TTE (reference test) and the two-gasometry iFM (index test) in critically ill patients in a resource-limited hospital.

Methods

Study Design

This was a cross-sectional study conducted in the Adult Intensive Care Unit service of the San Juan del Río General Hospital (Queretaro, Mexico) during the period from June 2021 to December 2023. Patients of both sexes, aged 18 years or older, who had a central venous catheter indicated prior to their admission to the study were considered for inclusion. Patients had to have adequate visualization of the echocardiographic projections necessary for measuring CO: 1) parasternal long axis and 2) apical 5-chamber view, in addition to having a negative Allen test to obtain arterial blood samples from the radial artery.

Written informed consent was obtained and the study was approved by the ethics and research committee of the Health Services of the State of Queretaro, Mexico (registration number: 1616/08/09/2024).

Cardiac Output Determinations

Transthoracic Echocardiography

Intensive care medicine fellows performed TTE measurements. Prior training of residents included at least 60 hours of continuing medical education in critical ultrasound, with more than 50 echocardiographic studies supervised by an expert, a 30-hour course on USG in Critical Patient Resuscitation, and one-month experience performing TTE in a specialized Cardiology Intensive Care Unit. According to the International Expert Statement on Training Standards for Critical Care Echocardiography, a reasonable training goal to achieve competency in image acquisition is suggested to be 30 supervised transthoracic echocardiographic studies.[13,14] The training attained by residents in our study corresponds to the Basic Level of the Australian and New Zaealand classification.[15]

Cardiac output is measured as the product of stroke volume (SV) and heart rate (HR) as $CO = SV \times HR$.[8] The stroke volume (SV) was calculated as $SV = LVOTa \times VTI$, where VTI is the velocity time integral. The left ventricular outflow tract area ($LVOTa$), also named cross-sectional area (CSA), was calculated as $LVOTa = \pi(d/2)^2$, where d is the left ventricular outflow tract diameter ($LVOTd$). The stroke volume (SV) was calculated as $SV = LVOTa \times VTI$, where VTI is

the velocity time integral. The cardiac index (CI) was computed with the formula $CI = CO/BSA$, where the body surface area is $BSA = \sqrt{\frac{height \times weight}{3600}}$.

Ultrasound evaluations were performed with the patient supine with the head of the patient elevated at 30°. A sector probe (3.5-5 mHz) of the G&E Venuo Go™ ultrasound was used to perform the measurements. LVOT was acquired from the parasternal long axis view, in a mid-systolic frame , measured from inner border to inner border of the LVOT or, eventually, between the insertion site of the right and noncoronary aortic leaflets. LVOT VTI was obtained by plotting the envolvent of the Doppler spectrum of LVOT systolic flow from the apical five-chamber view using pulsed wave Doppler (PWD), with the sample volume placed within the LVOT, approximately 1 cm from the aortic valve. An optimal VTI is considered when the alignment of the PWD sample volume is parallel to the subaortic flow or within a maximum of 30° with minimal spectral broadening.

Two-gasometry Indirect Fick Method

The two-gasometry iFM requires one arterial blood sample obtained from the radial artery and a central venous blood sample obtained from the central venous catheter. The blood samples were collected in a heparinized syringe (0.1 mL; 1000 UI/mL) and immediately analyzed using a blood gas analyzer. The arteriovenous oxygen difference (AVDO□) was calculated as the difference between the arterial and venous oxygen content, with the oxygen content calculated as $CaO_2 = (1.34 \times Hb \times SaO_2) + (0.0031 \times PaO_2)$ for the arterial blood sample and $CvO_2 = (1.34 \times Hb \times SvO_2) + (0.0031 \times PvO_2)$ for the venous blood sample, where Hb is the hemoglobin concentration. The CO was calculated using the formula $CO = \frac{AVDO_2 \times 100/CaO_2}{AVDO_2}$.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive measures of categorical variables are given as the absolute frequency (n) and percentage (%). The distribution of continuous variables was assessed with histograms and Q-Q plots and the mean and standard deviation (SD) is used for normally distributed variables, and the median with interquartile range (IQR) for those with biased distributions.

The mean absolute difference (MAD) between methods is provided with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). The correlation between CO with the Fick and TTE methods is provided as Pearson correlation coefficient and as the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), the latter of

which accounts for repeated patient-time measurements. A linear mixed-effects model with random patient slopes was fitted to describe the change in TTE CO per unit increase in Fick CO. Bland-Altman analysis for repeated measurements[16] was applied by fitting linear mixed-effects models with a random intercept for each patient (ID) to account for between-subject variance, a nested random intercept for each time point within a patient to account for within-subject variability across repeated observations, and a random intercept for each TTE measurement to account for intra-individual variability due to repeated TTE determinations at each time point. The mean bias was obtained as the fixed effect of each model and the 95% limits of agreement were calculated as the mean difference ± 1.96 x SD of differences, the latter derived from the combined variance components of the random effects and residual variance.

The coefficient of variation (CV) was calculated as $CV = \frac{SD}{mean} \times 100$ for the Fick CO and average TTE CO. The coefficient of error (CE) of TTE CO was calculated as the CV of the three CO repeated determinations per time-point divided by the squared root of 3 as described by Cecconi, et al.[17] to obtain the precision of the reference test (TTE) as 2 times CE; 95%CI were computed through bootstrapping with the bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) method in 10,000 re-samples. The formula described by Cecconi, et al.[17] was used to estimate the precision of the method under study (b) by using the precision of the reference test (a):

$$Precision_b = \sqrt{{PE_{a-b}}^2 + {Precision_a}^2}$$

Where b is CO by Fick method, a is CO by TTE, and ${PE_{a-b}}^2$ is the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) determined with bootstrapping, and has the formula $\mathrm{MAPE} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\mathrm{TTE}_i - \mathrm{Fick}_i}{\mathrm{TTE}_i}\right| \times 100$. The least significant change (LSC) was calculated as $LSC = precision \times \sqrt{2}$ to represent the minimum change in the output measurement that corresponds to a real change in CO. All analyses and visualizations were conducted in R (v.4.4.0, RStudio v.2024.04.0). Statistical significance was defined as p = 0.05. Complete-case analysis are provided as there were no missing data.

Results

Descriptive characteristics of participants

A total of 243 transthoracic echocardiography cardiac output measurements were performed in 81 different time points, from a total number of 52 unique participants. The number of time points assessed per patient was 1 (n = 37), 2 (n = 8), 3 (n = 5), 4 (n = 1), and 9 (n = 1). The summary of characteristics of participants is shown in **Table 1**.

Patient status at the moment of measurement

Out of the total number of measurements, 31 (38.3%) measurements were taken while the patient was under vasopressor use. The number of measurements taken while the patient was under inotropic use was 3 (3.7%). The mean blood pressure was 83.6 (SD: 11.5) mmHg; and heart rate, 94.7 (SD: 19.7) bpm; and median FiO2, 0.33 (IQR: 0.28 - 0.4). A summary of the blood gas analysis is shown in **Table 2**.

The ventilation mode at the moment of measurement was Without MV (n = 32, 39.5%), MR (n = 2, 2.5%), HFNC (n = 5, 6.2%), Spontaneous (n = 5, 6.2%), CPAP|PS (n = 20, 24.7%), and ACV (n = 17, 21.0%). Of the participants who were under IMV (CPAP|PS or ACV), the median PEEP value was 5 (IQR: 5 - 5.5) cmH2O; FiO2, 0.38 (IQR: 0.3 - 0.47); Pmax, 22 (IQR: 19.75 - 25); and mean Vt 377.9 (SD: 109). In those with the ACV mode, the median Pmes and DP were 22 (IQR: 16 - 23) and 14 (IQR: 12 - 17) cmH2O, respectively.

Cardiac output with the TTE and Fick methods

The mean cardiac output with the TTE method was 6.26 L/min (95%CI: 5.73 to 6.81) and Fick method, 7.62 L/min (95%CI: 7.14 to 8.18). The correlation between the two methods was rho = 0.06 (95%CI: -0.17 to 0.27, p=0.626) and ICC = 0.09 (95%CI: -0.32 to 0.39). In the linear mixed model, there was a change in TTE CO of Fick CO of -0.01 (95% CI: -0.2 to 0.18) L/min for each unit change in mean TTE CO.

The mean absolute difference in CO between TTE and Fick was 2.76 (95%CI: 2 to 3.5) L/min. The coefficient of variation for an individual measurement of TTE was 39.5% and 31.44% for

Fick. The mean CV of TTE for the repeated measurements per patient was 7.3% (95%CI: 6.2 to 8.7) and the CE was 4.2% (95%CI: 3.6 to 5), corresponding to a precision of 8.4% (95%CI: 7.2 to 10.1). The MAPE of the Fick method compared to TTE was 57.5% (95%CI: 45.5 to 74.6). The precision of the Fick method was 56.84% (95%CI: 44.34 to 74.22). The LSC was 11.9% (95%CI: 10.1 to 14.3) for TTE and 80.4% (95%CI: 62.7 to 105) for the Fick method.

The Bland-Altman plot for the repeated measures model with random effects for between-subject variance (**Figure1A**) and within-subject variance (**Figure1B**) shows that the mean difference (systematic bias) between TTE and Fick CO was -1.58 (95%CI: -2.44 to -0.72, p <0.001) L/min, with 95% limits of agreement of -8.16 to 5 L/min in the latter model.

Cardiac index with the TTE and Fick methods

The mean cardiac index was 3.47 L/min/m² and 4.33 L/min/m² (95% CI: 4.04 to 4.67) with the TTE and Fick methods, respectively. The correlation between the two was rho = -0.05 (95%CI: -0.27 to 0.17, p=0.637) and the ICC was -0.09 (95%CI: -0.59 to 0.26). There was a change in the Fick CI of -0.03 (95% CI: -0.26 to 0.2) for each unit increase in mean TTE CI.

The mean absolute difference of TTE and Fick CI was 1.59 (95%CI: 1.2 to 2) L/min/m². The coefficient of variation for an individual measurement of TTE and Fick CI were 35% and 33.52%, respectively, while the repeated measurements per patient of TTE had a CV of 7.3% (95%CI: 6.2 to 8.7) and CE 4.2% (95%CI: 3.6 to 5), the latter matches a precision of 8.4% (95%CI: 7.2 to 10.1). The MAPE of the Fick method against TTE was 57.5% (95%CI: 45.5 - 74.6). The precision of the Fick method was 56.84% (95%CI: 44.34 to 74.22). The LSC of TTE was 11.9% (95%CI: 10.1 to 14.3) and 80.4% (95%CI: 62.7 to 105) for the Fick method.

The mean difference (systematic bias) between TTE and Fick cardiac index was -1 (95%CI: -1.5 to -0.49, p < 0.001) L/min/m², with 95% limits of agreement of -4.81 to 2.82 L/min/m² (**Figure 2**).

Discussion

In this cross-sectional study including critical patients in a low-resource critical care unit, we aimed to determine agreement and clinical interchangeability of CO and CI measurements from TTE (reference test) and Fick method (index test). We found poor agreement between the two methods, with error from the use of the Fick method largely exceeding the expected level of variation determined with repeated TTE measurements in our study. Furthermore, we found systematic overestimation of CO and CI measurements with the Fick method, which could mislead clinicians to make incorrect interpretations of a non-reduced CO in patients with decreased cardiac output who could benefit from additional interventions to optimize heart function.

We used three repeated TTE measurements to determine the precision of the reference test. In the past, a fixed precision of 30% has been used for cardiac output studies using intermittent dilution as the reference test.[18] Nonetheless, there are situations where the precision of the reference test can be lower or higher than 30% and it is thus better to determine its precision in the context of the study population for validation of the technique being compared.[17] In our study, the precision of TTE was of 8.4% (95%CI: 7.2 to 10.1) and the LSC was 11.9% (95%CI: 10.1 to 14.3) for both CO and CI. This means that a change in CO or CI of less than 11.9% is not clinically significant and could be due to measurement error. Said differently, a change in CO or CI of 11.9% or more is needed to be confident that there is a real change in patient status. This estimate is very similar to the 11% LSC reported by Jozwiak, et al. for three repeated TTE measurements in patients with sinus rhythm.[19] In comparison, the precision of the two-gasometry Fick method was poor (56.8%, 95%CI: 44.34 to 74.22), with a LSC of 80.4% (95%CI: 62.7 to 105), implying that any change in CO or CI lower than 80.3% is not clinically significant and likely due to measurement error. Lastly, the MAPE of 57.5% (95%CI: 45.5 to 74.6) indicates that there is substantial error in the two-gasometry Fick method when compared to TTE, which could lead to misinterpretation of patient status.

Furthermore, we included measurements at different time-points for a subset of patients to model the nested intra-individual variation due to varying clinical patient status at different time points. Overall, the largest variation was explained by inter-individual factors, followed by varying status within the individual, whereas variation due to repeated TTE measurements at the same time point was negligible. Accounting for these sources of variation in our study design allowed us to obtain robust estimations of the systematic bias and limits of agreement

between the two methods. For CO, the mean bias was -1.58 (95%CI: -2.44 to -0.72) L/min and for CI, -1 (95%CI: -1.5 to -0.49) L/min/m^2, both with wide limits of agreement. The practical implications are that the Fick method overestimates CO and CI by 1.58 L/min and 1 L/min/m^2, respectively, which could lead to conservative management of patients with decreased cardiac function. Importantly, TTE is known to underestimate CO in a magnitude of 0.64 L/min, compared to other reference methods such as thermodilution.[20] Thus, the true bias of the two-gasometry Fick method could be lower than reported here. The wide limits of agreement indicate that the Fick method is not interchangeable with TTE for CO and CI measurements.

We observed poor correlation between the two methods. Furthermore, it is not possible to predict the change in TTE CO per unit increase in Fick CO based on the results from the linear mixed effects model. In these particular regression models, we used the three-measurements averaged TTE as the predictor and the Fick method as the outcome because error in the independent variable can cause regression dilution (bias towards the null),[21] whereas error in the dependent variable causes unbiased estimates with wider error intervals.[22] A beta coefficient of 1 would indicate that a change of 1 L/min in TTE CO would correspond to a change of 1 L/min in Fick CO. In such situations, correction factors for systematic bias can be applied. Nonetheless, we obtained coefficients of 0.01 L/min for CO and 0.02 L/min/m^2 for CI, reflecting that applying a correction factor for systematic bias would not be appropriate due to the lack of predictive ability.

Sánchez Velázquez compared CO measurements obtained by thermodilution with estimates derived from two formulas based on the arteriovenous oxygen difference. Fifty-four patients in intensive care units were included, with a total of 540 measurements. The correlation coefficients between TDB and the formulas were low: 0.15 for the first formula and 0.33 for the second. The mean differences (bias) were 0.001 L/min and -1.4 L/min, respectively. These results indicate a significant discrepancy between the methods, suggesting that the formulas evaluated are not adequate substitutes for measuring CO by thermodilution in critically ill patients.[7]]

De la Cruz et al. compared the CO measurements by the thermodilution method, transesophageal bioimpedance, and by the equation already described (CO = 125 x SC/8.5 x D(a-v)O_2). Noteworthy, the VO_2 used in the equation is not measured directly or indirectly, but assumed by the authors, without being modified by any possible medical condition of the patients. The CO measured by thermodilution was 10.2 + 3.8 L/min; by electrical bioimpedance, 10.4 + 3.6 L/min; and the one estimated by the two-gasometry equation was 6.2 + 1.3 L/min (p

< 0.05). No correlation analysis was performed in this study, but there was significant deviation in the average measurements with the two-gasometry method compared to thermodilution and bioimpedance.[23]

In addition to its lack of correlation with CO, the 2-gasometry method is associated with other drawbacks such the need for frequent arterial punctures, which can lead to pain, thrombosis, aneurysms, nerve damage, arteriovenous fistulas, among others,[24] or the placement of an arterial line when for frequent readings, which elevates costs and also conveys risk of complications. A systematic review provided a pooled point estimate of bloodstream infection rates due to arterial lines of 1.7 per 1000 device days, close to that of non-tunneled central venous catheters (2.7) and significantly higher than that of peripheral venous catheters (0.5, 95%CI: 0.2-0.7).[25]The rates of vascular complications associated with radial artery catheter were 19.7%, temporary ischemia 0.1%, permanent ischemia: 14.4%, hematoma: 0.5%, pseudoaneurysm 0.1%.[26,27] The costs of blood gas analysis have been reported at 37.25 australian dolars (~23 USD) per sample. At least two samples are ordered to estimate CO with the iFM and technical failures may lead to performing more than one arterial puncture.[28] Lastly, the placement of a central venous catheter and the taking of samples that requires opening the line and that may consider a risk for bloodstream infection.[25]

Strengths of this study include the use of TTE as the reference test, which is a widely recognized and validated method for the measurement of CO in critical patients. Furthermore, the statistical analysis was robust, accounting for repeated measurements and sources of intra- and inter-individual variation. The main limitation of our study is the lack of a gold standard method for CO measurement, such as the thermodilution technique with a PAC, which would have allowed us to determine the true accuracy of the two-gasometry Fick method. However, the thermodilution technique is not without limitations, is invasive and associated with complications, and not frequently available in resource-limited settings. Another limitation is the lack of a direct measurement of VO□, which is a key component of the Fick principle. However, the VO□ is not routinely measured in clinical practice, and the Fick principle is often used with assumed values of VO□. Lastly, the study was conducted in a single center and in a limited sample size.

The results of this study are particularly applicable to resource-limited hospitals, where access to more complex and highly complicated methods such as pulmonary artery catheter thermodilution may be limited. However, the high variability observed in the Fick method underscores the need to consider TTE as a more reliable and reproducible alternative for

hemodynamic assessment in this type of setting. Although the study design and tools employed were rigorous, the results should be interpreted with caution when extrapolating them to institutions with different resources and clinical contexts.

Conclusion

The CO obtained by the two-gasometry indirect Fick method has poor agreement and clinical interchangeability with the CO obtained by transthoracic echocardiography. Due to its low precision, the two-gasometry Fick method requires a change of at least 80.4% in CO or CI to be considered a real change in patient status. The systematic bias of the Fick method overestimates CO and CI by 1.58 L/min and 1 L/min/m², respectively, which could lead to conservative management of patients with decreased cardiac function. Given its poor precision, high bias, and wide limits of agreement, the two-gasometry indirect Fick method should not be used for clinical decision-making in critically ill patients.

Acknowledgements

None.

Declaration of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. Orlando Rubén Pérez-Nieto and Ashuin Kammar-García received a stipend from the Mexican public entity CONAHCYT as part of the *Sistema Nacional de Investigación* CONAHCYT to conduct their research activities.

References

1. Swan HJC, Ganz W, Forrester J, Marcus H, Diamond G, Chonette D. Catheterization of the Heart in Man with Use of a Flow-Directed Balloon-Tipped Catheter. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 1970;283(9):447-451. doi:10.1056/nejm197008272830902

2. Evans DC, Doraiswamy VA, Prosciak MP, et al. Complications Associated with Pulmonary Artery Catheters: A Comprehensive Clinical Review. *Scandinavian Journal of Surgery*. 2009;98(4):199-208. doi:10.1177/145749690909800402

3. Basnet A, Rout P. *Calculating FICK Cardiac Output and Input*. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/books/NBK606091/; StatPearls Publishing; 2024.

4. Shinozaki K, Yu PJ, Zhou Q, et al. Continuous and repeat metabolic measurements compared between post-cardiothoracic surgery and critical care patients. *BMC Pulmonary Medicine*. 2023;23(1). doi:10.1186/s12890-023-02657-4

5. Márquez González H, Pámanes González J, Márquez Flores H, Gómez Negrete A, Muñoz Ramírez MC, Villa Romero AR. Lo que debe conocerse de la gasometría durante la guardia. *Revista Médica del Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social*. 2012;50(4):389-396. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=457745496010

6. Santiago Giraldo Gutiérrez D, José Velásquez Gutiérrez J, Octavio Ruiz-Villa J. Cardiac output estimation based on arterial and venous blood gas analysis: Proposal of a monitoring method. *Anaesthesiology Intensive Therapy*. Published online 2021. doi:10.5114/ait.2021.105730

7. Sánchez Velázquez LD. Comparación de dos fórmulas para calcular el gasto cardiaco contra el método de termodilución. *Revista de la Asociación Mexicana de Medicina Crítica y Terapia Intensiva*. 1998;12(2):54-60. https://www.imbiomed.com.mx/articulo.php?id=11017

8. Blanco P. Rationale for using the velocitytime integral and the minute distance for assessing the stroke volume and cardiac output in point-of-care settings. *The Ultrasound Journal*. 2020;12(1). doi:10.1186/s13089-020-00170-x

9. Mercado P, Maizel J, Beyls C, et al. Transthoracic echocardiography: an accurate and precise method for estimating cardiac output in the critically ill patient. *Critical Care*. 2017;21(1). doi:10.1186/s13054-017-1737-7

10. Espinosa Romero DM, De Jesús Montelongo F, Gutiérrez de la Cruz JJ, Galindo Ayala J, Alva Arrollo NV, Segura Medina LE. Correlación del gasto cardiaco por fórmula de continuidad a través de ecocardiografía transtorácica vs termodilución por Swan-Ganz en la Unidad de Cuidados Intensivos. *Medicina Crítica*. 2022;36(7):472-475. doi:10.35366/108715

11. Gorrasi J, Pazos A, Florio L, et al. Cardiac output measured by transthoracic echocardiography and Swan-Ganz catheter. A comparative study in mechanically ventilated patients with high positive end-expiratory pressure. *Revista Brasileira de Terapia Intensiva*. 2019;31(4). doi:10.5935/0103-507x.20190073

12. Rincón SJJ, Raullovich AM. Correlation between transthoracic echocardiography and catheter flotation of pulmonary artery in the evaluation hemodynamics in intensive care unit of cardiovascular postsurgical. *Med Crit*. 2012;26(3):152-157.

13. Jozwiak M, Monnet X, Cinotti R, Bontemps F, Reignier J, Belliard G. Prospective assessment of a score for assessing basic critical-care transthoracic echocardiography skills in ventilated critically ill patients. *Annals of Intensive Care*. 2014;4(1):12. doi:10.1186/2110-5820-4-12

14. International expert statement on training standards for critical care ultrasonography. *Intensive Care Medicine*. 2011;37(7):1077-1083. doi:10.1007/s00134-011-2246-9

15. Nanjayya VB, Orde S, Hilton A, et al. Levels of training in critical care echocardiography in adults. Recommendations from the College of Intensive Care Medicine Ultrasound Special Interest Group. *Australasian Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine*. 2019;22(1):73-79. doi:10.1002/ajum.12127

16. Bland JM, Altman DG. Agreement between methods of measurement with multiple observations per individual. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*. 2007;17(4):571-582. doi:10.1080/10543400701329422

17. Cecconi M, Rhodes A, Poloniecki J, Della Rocca G, Grounds RM. Bench-to-bedside review: The importance of the precision of the reference technique in method comparison studies with specific reference to the measurement of cardiac output. *Critical Care*. 2009;13(1):201. doi:10.1186/cc7129

18. Critchley LAH, Critchley JAJH. A meta-analysis of studies using bias and precision statistics to compare cardiac output measurement techniques. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing*. 1999;15(2):85-91. doi:10.1023/A:1009982611386

19. Jozwiak M, Mercado P, Teboul J, et al. What is the lowest change in cardiac output that transthoracic echocardiography can detect? *Critical Care*. 2019;23. doi:10.1186/s13054-019-2413-x

20. Villavicencio C, Leache J, Marin J, et al. Basic critical care echocardiography training of intensivists allows reproducible and reliable measurements of cardiac output. *The Ultrasound Journal*. 2019;11(1):5. doi:10.1186/s13089-019-0120-0

21. Frost C, Thompson SG. Correcting for Regression Dilution Bias: Comparison of Methods for a Single Predictor Variable. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*. 2000;163(2):173-189. doi:10.1111/1467-985X.00164

22. Riggs DS, Guarnieri JA, Addelman S. Fitting straight lines when both variables are subject to error. *Life Sciences*. 1978;22(13-15):1305-1360. doi:10.1016/0024-3205(78)90098-X

23. Cruz BS, Querevalú MW, Barragán MH, et al. Comparación del gasto cardiaco medido por bioempedancia eléctrica transesofágica, termodilución y mediante una ecuación teórica. Estudio comparativo. *Med Crit*. 1999;13(5):165-168.

24. Rowling SC, Fløjstrup M, Henriksen DP, et al. Arterial blood gas analysis: as safe as we think? A multicentre historical cohort study. *ERJ Open Research*. 2022;8(1):00535-02021. doi:10.1183/23120541.00535-2021

25. Maki DG, Kluger DM, Crnich CJ. The Risk of Bloodstream Infection in Adults With Different Intravascular Devices: A Systematic Review of 200 Published Prospective Studies. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2006;81(9):1159-1171. doi:10.4065/81.9.1159

26. Scheer B, Perel A, Pfeiffer UJ. *Critical Care*. 2002;6(3):199. doi:10.1186/cc1489

27. Gershengorn HB, Wunsch H, Scales DC, Zarychanski R, Rubenfeld G, Garland A. Association Between Arterial Catheter Use and Hospital Mortality in Intensive Care Units. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2014;174(11):1746. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.3297

28. Hajiseyedjavady H, Saeedi M, Eslami V, Shahsavarinia K, Farahmand S. Less painful arterial blood gas sampling using jet injection of 2. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2012;30(7):1100-1104. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2011.07.011

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of study population

Variable	**Total sample (n = 52)**
Age (years)	
Mean (SD)	45.7 (16.5)
Sex, n (%)	
Female	22 (42.3%)
Male	30 (57.7%)
BMI (kg/m^2)	
Median (IQR)	25.9 (22.5 - 30.3)
BMI categories, n (%)	
Normal	19 (36.5%)
Overweight	17 (32.7%)
Obesity class I	7 (13.5%)
Obesity class II	8 (15.4%)
Obesity class III	1 (1.9%)
Comorbidities, n (%)	
No comorbidities	10 (19.2%)
Overweight	17 (32.7%)
Obesity	16 (30.8%)
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	11 (21.2%)
Systemic arterial hypertension	7 (13.5%)
Alcoholism	3 (5.8%)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	3 (5.8%)
Chronic kidney disease	2 (3.8%)
Type 1 diabetes mellitus	2 (3.8%)
Human immunodeficiency virus infection	1 (1.9%)
Malnutrition	1 (1.9%)
Parkinson’s disease	1 (1.9%)
Pulmonary arterial hypertension	1 (1.9%)
Status epilepticus	1 (1.9%)
Diagnosis, n (%)	

Acute respiratory distress syndrome	11 (21.2%)
Traumatic brain injury	10 (19.2%)
Sepsis	9 (17.3%)
Acute kidney injury	8 (15.4%)
COVID-19	7 (13.5%)
Shock	5 (9.6%)
Community-acquired pneumonia	4 (7.7%)
Pancreatitis	4 (7.7%)
Ventilation-associated pneumonia	4 (7.7%)
Diabetic ketoacidosis	3 (5.8%)
Polytrauma	3 (5.8%)
Postsurgical	3 (5.8%)
Cardiac arrest	2 (3.8%)
Urinary tract infection	2 (3.8%)
Abdominal trauma	1 (1.9%)
Acute myocardial infarction	1 (1.9%)
Burns	1 (1.9%)
Endocarditis	1 (1.9%)
Hospital-acquired pneumonia	1 (1.9%)
Hypertensive emergency	1 (1.9%)
Influenza	1 (1.9%)
Peritonitis	1 (1.9%)
Pulmonary thromboembolism	1 (1.9%)
Pyelonephritis	1 (1.9%)
Soft-tissue infection	1 (1.9%)
Strangulation	1 (1.9%)
Tuberculous meningitis	1 (1.9%)
Upper gastrointestinal bleeding	1 (1.9%)

Table 2. Summary of blood gas analysis determinations in arterial blood and central venous blood.

Variable (Unit)	**Measurements (n = 81)**
lactate (mmol/L)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	1.40 (0.80 - 1.90)
pH	
Mean (SD)	7.47 (0.40)
HCO3 (mmol/L)	
Mean (SD)	25.18 (6.34)
base deficit (mmol/L)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	0.40 (-4.10 - 7.30)
PaO2 (mmHg)	
Mean (SD)	70.58 (14.49)
PaCO2 (mmHg)	
Mean (SD)	37.36 (10.39)
SaO2 (%)	
Mean (SD)	0.94 (0.04)
PvO2 (mmHg)	
Mean (SD)	37.32 (8.73)
PvCO2 (mmHg)	
Mean (SD)	43.42 (10.53)
SvO2 (%)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	0.68 (0.56 - 0.76)
PAlvO2 (mmHg)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	168.50 (120.00 - 216.00)
CcO2 (%)	
Mean (SD)	15.49 (4.09)
CaO2 (ml/dl)	
Mean (SD)	14.24 (3.76)
CvO2 (ml/dl)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	10.00 (6.73 - 13.39)
DavO2 (ml/dl)	
Median (Q1 - Q3)	3.73 (2.80 - 4.81)

ExO2 (%)	
Mean (SD)	0.30 (0.14)

Abbreviations: Alveolar oxygen pressure (PAlvO2), Arterial oxygen content (CaO2), Arterial oxygen saturation (SaO2), Arteriovenous oxygen difference (DavO2), Capillary oxygen content (CcO2), Hydrogen potential (pH), Inspiratory fraction of Oxygen (FiO2), Oxygen extraction (ExO2), Oxygen saturation in venous blood (SvO2), Partial pressure of carbon dioxide (PaCO2), Partial pressure of oxygen (PaO2), Partial pressure of oxygen in venous blood (PvO2), Q1 (25th percentile), Q3 (75th percentile), SD (Standard deviation), Serum bicarbonate (HCO3), Serum Lactate (lactate), Venous oxygen content (CvO2), Venous partial pressure of CO2 (PvCO2)



Figure 1. Bland-Altman plot of the difference between **cardiac output** with the transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) and Fick methods, versus the mean of both methods. Linear mixed-effects models were fitted for the differences between methods to account for the (**A**) between-subject variance due to repeated patient measurements and (**B**) within-subject variance due to repeated cardiac output measurements at the same time point. The red dotted line represents the 95% limits of agreement, whereas the blue line represents the mean systematic bias.



Figure 2. Bland-Altman plots of the difference between **cardiac index** with the transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) and Fick methods, versus the mean of both methods. Linear mixed-effects models were fitted for the differences between methods to account for the (**A**) between-subject variance due to repeated patient measurements and (**B**) within-subject variance due to repeated cardiac output measurements at the same time point. The red dotted line represents the 95% limits of agreement, whereas the blue line represents the mean systematic bias.