GOAL DIRECTED THERAPY IN CARDIAC SURGERY

SUE HYUN KIM Department of Critical Care Department of Cardiovascular & Thoracic Surgery Seoul National University Hospital

Definition

- Goal-directed *Hemodynamic & Fluid* therapy (GDT)
 - **Standardized algorithmic approach** to achieve predefined hemodynamic end points through the provision of
 - Fluid
 - Vasopressors
 - Inotropes
 - Guided by advanced monitoring w/
 - Invasive arterial
 - Central venous
 - Pulmonary artery catheters (selected high-risk patients)

Definition

- Goal-directed *Hemodynamic & Fluid* therapy (GDT)
 - Quantified goals
 - Blood pressure
 - Cardiac index
 - Systemic venous oxygen saturation
 - Urine output
 - (+)
 - Oxygen consumption
 - Oxygen debt
 - Lactate levels..
 - \rightarrow Targeting normal or supra-normal **Oxygen Delivery** to the tissue (DO₂)
 - ➔ Augment therapeutic tactics!

Definition

- Corner-stone of GDT
 - Patients who are responsive to fluid administration be identified
 - Thorough dynamic tests including
 - SVV or PPV
 - CO or SV responsiveness

→ Establishing a protocol for appropriate resuscitation interventions

"Guide to Targeted Resuscitation"

Guidelines

JAMA Surgery | Special Communication

Guidelines for Perioperative Care in Cardiac Surgery Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society Recommendations

JAMA Surg. 2019;154(8):755-766.

- Goal-directed fluid therapy (GDT) recommended to reduce postoperative complications
 - Class I, Level B-R

Guidelines

EXPERT CONSENSUS STATEMENT

Perioperative Care in Cardiac Surgery: A Joint Consensus Statement by the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Cardiac Society, ERAS International Society, and The Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS)

Check for updates

Ann Thorac Surg 2024;117:669-89

- Summary Statement
 - Goal-directed fluid & hemodynamic therapy can guide perioperative resuscitation and prevent postoperative organ injury.
 - Quantity of Evidence: Moderate

Evidences

- Trials consistently demonstrate reduced organ injury, medical complications rates & hospital length of stay in
 - Surgery overall
 - Specifically in Cardiac Surgery
- Not universal, inconsistent results
 - High degrees of clinical heterogeneity
 - Varying algorithms, monitoring techniques, and study design
- What are the ideal monitoring indicators & algorithm?
 - Additional study is necessary



Individually Optimized Hemodynamic Therapy Reduces Complications and Length of Stay in the Intensive Care Unit

A Prospective, Randomized Controlled Trial

Anesthesiology. 2013 Oct;119(4):824-36.



Hemodynamic algorithm for patients of the study group.

- CABG and/or AVR patients, n=100
- Study group: hemodynamic therapy guided by SVV, optimized GEDI, MAP, CI



Hemodynamic algorithm for patients of the study group.

- Control group: hemodynamic therapy guided by MAP & CVP
- Therapy started immediately after induction of anesthesia & continued until ICU discharge criteria

Variables	Group	After Induction of Anesthesia Baseline	After Induction of Anesthesia Optimized	Before Starting CPB	Directly after CPB	ICU Admission	6h after EOS	12h after EOS	24h after EOS	36 h after EOS
MAP, mmHg	SG	66±11.7 [67]	71 ± 9.6 [68]	76±11.6 [76]	71 ± 7.7 [70]	81±13.0 [78]	77±11.0 [75]	79±10.5 [77]	80±10.8 [79]	80±13.0 [78]
	CG	68±10.4 [68]	70 ± 7.7 [69]	76±10.4 [72]	70 ± 7.0 [68]	81±13.8 [77]	78±12.1 [76]	78±8.5 [76]	83±9.8 [84]	82±11.1 [83]
	<i>P</i> Value	0.176*	0.594†	0.777*	0.388†	0.956†	0.770†	0.622†	0.549*	0.685*
HR, beats/min	SG	60±9.4 [60]	59±8.5 [60]	66±14.0 [65]	88±6.2 [88]	86±10.0 [87]	84±12.0 [87]	83±12.1 [83]	82±10.2 [84]	83±10.0 [84]
	CG	58±11.4 [57]	59±11.2 [57]	66±13.8 [62]	90±5.4 [90]	90±9.5 [88]	89±9.8 [90]	87±9.6 [89]	84±12.8 [81]	85±12.3 [83]
	<i>P</i> Value	0.386*	0.950*	0.940*	0.109†	0.212†	0.024†	0.089*	0.665*	0.895*
CVP, mmHg	SG	9.1±3.3 [8.0]	9.8±3.3 [9.5]	9.2±3.7 [9.0]	8.7±2.8 [8.0]	11.7±3.1 [12.0]	10.9±3.2 [11.0]	10.2±3.5 [10.0]	8.9±4.7 [8.0]	7.9±1.2 [8.0]
	CG	8.5±2.7 [9.0]	9.2±1.7 [9.0]	9.2±2.4 [9.0]	9.4±1.9 [9.0]	10.3±2.3 [10.0]	10.1±2.6 [10.0]	8.9±2.7 [9.0]	9.8±3.1 [9.5]	10.8±2.7 [12.0]
	<i>P</i> Value	0.340*	0.816†	0.947†	0.173†	0.011*	0.195*	0.041†	0.505*	0.015*
SVV, %	SG CG <i>P</i> Value	9.5±4.7 [8.5] 10.6±5.7 [9.0] 0.500†	6.6±2.2 [7.0] 9.8±4.7 [9.0] <0.001†	7.3±2.7 [7.0] 11.5±6.1 [10.0] <0.001†	8.2±2.4 [8.0] 11.3±4.0 [11.0] <0.001†	8.4±2.1 [9.0] 14.6±4.9 [14.0] <0.001†	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GEDI, ml/m ²	SG	650±123 [637]	673±112 [650]	667±122 [631]	656±118 [600]	701±137 [682]	711±144 [679]	734±130 [762]	807±137 [789]	920±179 [887]
	CG	661±156 [620]	668±155 [621]	638±137 [616]	658±133 [656]	663±134 [641]	683±133 [672]	725±120 [728]	726±133 [741]	828±178 [740]
ELWI, ml/kg	P Value	0.818†	0.545†	0.210†	0.960†	0.186*	0.337*	0.757*	0.060*	0.459†
	SG	7.3±2.0 [7.0]	7.3±2.1 [7.0]	7.2±2.2 [7.0]	7.3±1.6 [7.0]	7.2±1.7 [7.0]	6.2±1.5 [6.0]	6.1±1.7 [6.0]	6.6±1.7 [6.0]	7.9±1.7 [9.0]
	CG	7.0±2.1 [7.0]	7.0±2.1 [7.0]	6.9±2.0 [7.0]	7.6±2.1 [7.0]	7.2±2.1 [7.0]	6.2±1.7 [6.0]	6.6±1.8 [6.0]	6.7±1.7 [6.0]	7.5±1.2 [7.5]
	P Value	0.586†	0.691+	0.649†	0.791+	0.740+	0.796†	0.293†	0.928†	0.597*
Cl, l·min⁻¹·m⁻²	SG	2.3±0.4 [2.3]	2.5±0.3 [2.5]	2.8±0.5 [2.8]	3.2±0.6 [3.1]	3.1±0.7 [3.0]	3.2±0.6 [3.1]	3.3±0.6 [3.2]	3.6±0.5 [3.6]	3.9±1.0 [3.7]
	CG	2.2±0.5 [2.1]	2.2±0.5 [2.1]	2.5±0.5 [2.4]	3.2±0.6 [3.1]	2.9±0.7 [2.8]	3.0±0.5 [3.1]	3.2±0.6 [3.2]	2.9±0.6 [2.9]	3.1±0.5 [3.1]
	<i>P</i> Value	0.106*	<0.001†	0.003*	0.669*	0.186†	0.363*	0.230*	<0.001*	0.046*
SVI, ml/m	SG	39.3±8.9 [38.9]	43.7±7.8 [42.9]	43.2±8.6 [42.9]	36.1±7.2 [34.4]	35.9±7.2 [34.0]	38.0±7.6 [36.1]	40.6±8.4 [41.4]	43.9±5.0 [43.6]	46.6±8.1 [48.3]
	CG	38.1±10.2 [37.3]	38.9±9.9 [37.8]	38.0±8.3 [37.4]	36.0±7.1 [36.1]	32.5±7.6 [32.2]	34.5±6.3 [34.6]	36.7±6.8 [37.5]	35.0±6.6 [35.6]	37.8±9.6 [35.8]
	<i>P</i> Value	0.559*	0.005†	0.004*	0.941*	0.027*	0.020*	0.041†	<0.001*	0.046*
ScvO ₂ , %	SG CG	n.d.	82.3±6.1 [82.3] 80.5±5.9 [81.0]	85.3±4.8 [85.5] 81.6±6.7 [82.4]	85.8±6.2 [85.9] 83.9±7.1 [84.3]	71.2±9.0 [71.9] 71.1±8.4 [71.8]	67.6±7.3 [69.5] 66.2±6.8 [66.1]	70.0±8.5 [70.5] 69.9±5.4 [70.7]	66.9±6.3 [67.0] 68.1±8.5 [67.1]	72.7±10.8 [70.9] 69.3±16.7 [69.1]
Norepinephrine, μg/kg	SG CG P Value	n.d.	n.d.	2.5±2.6 [1.7] 5.0±3.2 [4.7] <0.001†	6.9±6.4 [5.5] 11.0±8.7 [8.6] 0.004†	9.0±7.6 [7.7] 14.9±11.1 [13.2] 0.002†	12.0±9.8 [9.8] 19.2±14.2 [15.9] 0.005†	13.6±11.9 [9.8] 21.3±16.9 [16.5] 0.012†	14.0±12.2 [10.2] 21.6±17.8 [16.5] 0.017†	14.1±12.4 [10.2] 21.7±17.8 [16.5] 0.018†
Epinephrine, μg/kg	SG CG <i>P</i> Value	n.d.	n.d.	0.2±0.6 [0.0] 0.0±0.1 [0.0] 0.086†	0.2±0.7 [0.0] 0.1±0.5 [0.0] 0.448†	0.3±0.8 [0.0] 0.4±1.6 [0.0] 0.770†	$0.4 \pm 1.0 [0.0]$ $0.9 \pm 4.9 [0.0]$ 0.469^{\dagger}	0.4±1.0 [0.0] 1.0±5.0 [0.0] 0.469†	0.4±1.0 [0.0] 1.0±5.0 [0.0] 0.469†	0.4±1.0 [0.0] 1.0±5.0 [0.0] 0.469†

Complications	Study Group	Control Group	<i>P</i> Value
Total	43	75	0.004
Arrhythmias	18	22	0.41
Hemorrhagic	7	8	1.0
Respiratory	2	3	1.0
Neurological	3	9	0.12
PMD	5	10	0.26
I/R damage	1	7	0.06
Infection	2	6	0.27
ICU readmission	2	2	1.0
Acute kidney injury	3	8	0.2

ICU = intensive care unit; I/R damage = ischemia/reperfusion damage; PMD = postoperative myocardial damage.





Fig. 4. Cumulative, algorithm-driven crystalloid and colloid infusion during surgery (excluding cardiopulmonary bypass) and intensive care unit (ICU) treatment. Data are presented as mean + standard error of the mean. CG = control group; SG = study group. *P < 0.001.

Crit Care Med. 2016 Apr;44(4):724-33.

CLINICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Medicine

Critical Care

Effect of Perioperative Goal-Directed Hemodynamic Resuscitation Therapy on Outcomes Following Cardiac Surgery A Randomized Clinical Trial and Systematic Review

- High-risk patients undergoing CABG or valve repair (n=126)
- GDT group (n=62)

Society of

Critical Care Medicine

- Target CI >3L/min2
- IV fluids, inotropes, RBC transfusion
- Starting from CBP weaning
- Ending 8hrs after ICU admission
- Control group (n=64)
 - Usual care

Figure 1. Algorithm of the goal-directed therapy (GDT) group. CPB = cardiopulmonary bypass, CVP = central venous pressure, Ht = hematocrit, IABP = intraaortic balloon pump, SVI = stroke volume index, TEE = transesophageal echocardiogram.



TABLE 2. Hemodynamic Interventions During the Study

Variable	Goal-Direct Therapy (<i>n</i> = 62)	Usual Care (<i>n</i> = 64)	P
Fluid <i>bolus</i> (mL), median (IQR)	1,000 (625–1,500)	500 (500–1,000)	< 0.001
Total fluid input (mL), median (IQR)	1,056 (257–1,568)	894 (229–1,595)	0.85
No. of patients given dobutamine, <i>n</i> (%)	61 (98.4)	61 (95.3)	0.62
Cummulative dosage of dobutamine (μ g/kg)	4 (3–5)	4 (3–6)	0.22
RBC transfusion (U), n (%)	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	0.32

IQR = interquartile range.

Variable	Goal-Directed Therapy Group (<i>n</i> = 62)s	Usual Care Group (<i>n</i> = 64)	p
Primary outcome, <i>n</i> (%)			
Composite endpoint	17 (27.4)	29 (45.3)	0.04
Infection	8 (12.9)	19 (29.7)	0.022
Pneumonia	2 (3.2)	5 (7.8)	
Sternal wound infection/ osteomyelitis	5 (8.1)	14 (21.8)	
Catheter related infection	1 (1.6)	0	
Low cardiac output syndrome	4 (6.5)	17 (26.6)	0.002
Death	3 (4.8)	6 (9.4)	0.49
Stroke	0	5 (7.8)	0.06
Myocardial ischemia	5 (8.1)	4 (6.3)	0.74
Reoperation	3 (4.8)	1 (1.6)	0.36
Dialysis	2 (3.2)	0	0.24

Primary outcome

: Composite endpoint of 30-day mortality & major postoperative complications

TABLE 3. Study Outcomes Following Goal-Directed Therapy for High-Risk Cardiac Surgery

Variable	Goal-Directed Therapy Group (<i>n</i> = 62)s	Usual Care Group (<i>n</i> = 64)	p				
Secondary outcomes, n (%)							
Acute kidney injury							
0	40 (64.5)	38 (59.4)	0.82				
1	14 (22.6)	17 (26.6)					
2	6 (9.7)	8 (12.5)					
3	2 (3.2)	1 (1.6)					
Bradyarrhythmia	1 (1.6)	3 (4.7)	0.62				
Tachyarrhythmia	12 (19.4)	21 (32.8)	0.09				
Seizure	1 (1.6)	1 (1.6)	1.00				
Delirium	6 (9.7)	9(14.1)	0.45	50		0	
Venous thromboembolism	0 (0)	2 (3.1)	0.50				Usu
Duration of mechanical ventilation (hr)	7.25 (5.5–9)	8.2 (6.6-11.5)	0.09	40-		。 T	
Use of dobutamine during ICU stay				(\$	*		
Cumulative dosage (mg/kg)	12 (6–22)	19(11–31)	0.003	v (day			
Duration of use (hr)	54 (49–80)	76 (56–111)	0.001	of stay		0	
Use of norepinephrine during ICU stay				o gth c		T L	
Cumulative dosage (µg/kg)	0 (0-231)	369 (0-1,051)	< 0.001		0		
Length of use (hr)	0 (0–65)	78 (0-112)	0.001		° •		
Length of ICU stay (d)	3 (3–4)	5 (4–7)	< 0.001				
Length of hospital stay (d)	9 (8–16)	12 (9–22)	0.049			- <u> </u>	
ata presented as either <i>n</i> (%) or median (interquartil	le range).			0-1	icu	Hospital	-

Crit Care Med. 2016 Apr;44(4):724-33.



Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier event-free survival probability during 30 days after surgery. GDT = goal-directed therapy.

No difference in 30-day mortality rates (4.8% vs 9.4, P=0.492)

Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on mortality

	EGD	T	Standa	ard		Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	1	M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl	
Kapoor	0	13	0	14		Not estimable			Concernence of the second seco	
McKendry	4	89	2	90	25.8%	2.07 [0.37, 11.60]		_	•	
Mythen	0	30	1	30	7.3%	0.32 [0.01, 8.24]	-			
Osawa	3	62	6	64	37.4%	0.49 [0.12, 2.06]			-	
Polonen	2	196	6	197	29.5%	0.33 [0.07, 1.65]			-	
Smetkin	0	20	0	20		Not estimable				
Total (95% Cl)		410		415	100.0%	0.61 [0.26, 1.47]		-	-	
Total events	9		15			POCKU TRA SERIOUNIT-				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ²	= 2.74	, df = 3 (F	9 = 0.43	3); I ² = 0%		-		1	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.09 (P = 0.2	7)		*******		0.01	Favours [EGDT]	Favours (Standar	100 [b

Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on postoperative complications.



Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on hospital stay

		EGDT	Standard				Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Kapoor	5.8	1.2	13	8.8	2.1	14	19.5%	-3.00 [-4.28, -1.72]	2]
McKendry	11.4	13.2	89	13.9	15	90	16.2%	-2.50 [-6.64, 1.64]	.] — • - •
Mythen	6.4	1.1	30	10.1	9.4	30	17.3%	-3.70 [-7.09, -0.31]]
Osawa	13.95	12.24	62	21.29	21.34	64	13.3%	-7.34 [-13.39, -1.29])]
Polonen	7.3	6.6	196	17.9	7.5	197	19.4%	-10.60 [-12.00, -9.20])]
Smetkin	14	7.1	20	19.4	10	20	14.3%	-5.40 [-10.77, -0.03]	§] — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
Total (95% CI)			410			415	100.0%	-5.44 [-9.28, -1.60]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	19.29; C	chi² = 67	7.51, df	= 5 (P ·	< 0.000	01); I² =	93%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.77 (P = 0.006)								Favours [EGDT] Favours [Standard]	





Home Perioperative utility of goal-directed therapy in high-risk cardiac patients undergoing ent issue coronary artery bypass grafting: "A clinical outcome and biomarker-based study"

Ann Card Anaesth. 2016 Oct-Dec;19(4):638-682.



➔ Monitoring gradually withdrawn after 24h

Parameter	Time	Control group (<i>n</i> =60)	GDT group (<i>n</i> =60)	Р
Heart rate	T ₁	69.42±5.02*	68.17±6.85*	0.257
	T_2	92.18±7.24*	93.75±6.51	0.215
	Τ ₃	99.75±8.29*	100.45±7.69*	0.633
	T ₄	99.95±8.30*	102.37±6.13*	0.072
	T ₅	101.95±8.60*	103.33±6.10*	0.312
	T ₆	100.00±6.81*	100.92±7.11*	0.473
MAP	T ₁	89.33±6.98*	91.57±7.17*	0.087
	T ₂	94.20±6.54*	94.78±6.85*	0.634
	T ₃	96.07±6.06*	97.82±4.16*	0.068
	T ₄	94.73±6.37*	96.78±5.65*	0.065
	T ₅	94.98±5.39*	97.02±5.91*	0.052
	T_6	98.30±6.38*	100.45±5.59*	0.052
CVP	T ₁	6.50±0.93*	6.08±1.09*	0.117
	T_2	6.42±0.56*	6.45±0.77*	0.753
	T ₃	6.22±0.49*	6.35±0.58*	0.175
	T ₄	6.17±0.46*	6.3±0.80*	0.182
	T ₅	6.37±0.48*	6.4±0.58*	0.736
	T	6.28±0.52*	6.53±0.87*	0.059

Table 2: Heart rate, mean arterial pressure, and

central venous pressure in the two groups

*Standard deviation, P < 0.05 is considered significant. T₁ (baseline), T₂ (sternal closure), T₃ (0), T₄ (6), T₅ (12), T₆ (24) h in ICU. ICU: Intensive Care Unit, MAP: Mean arterial pressure, CVP: Central venous pressure, GDT: Goal-directed therapy Table 3: Comparison of the outcomes between the control and the goal-directed therapy group

Parameter	Control group	GDT group	Р
Average extra volume added	343.33±62.02*	376.33±55.23*	0.003
Number of times inotropes adjusted	2.77±0.91*	3.12±0.80*	0.029
Duration of ventilation (h)	19.89±3.96*	18.05±4.53*	0.025
Duration of inotrope usage (days)	3.09±0.59*	2.81±0.94*	0.063
Length of ICU stay (days)	3.74±0.59*	3.41±0.75*	0.012
Length of hospital stay (days)	7.94±1.64*	7.17±1.93*	0.025
Mortality	6/60	2/60	0.272

*Standard deviation, P<0.05 is considered significant. Apart from the first two parameters, the *n* for the outcome measures for the control group was 54 and 58 for the GDT group in view of the mortality. GDT: Goal-directed therapy, ICU: Intensive Care Unit



Biomarker	Time	Control group (<i>n</i> =60)	GDT group (<i>n</i> =60)	Р
BNP (pg/mL)	T ₁	152.27±11.60*	153.72±9.41*	0.454
	T ₄	187.85±13.34*	184.20±10.24*	0.095
	T_6	207.70±28.44*	198.98±9.33*	0.026
NGAL (ng/mL)	T ₁	77.45±12.86*	81.25±11.29*	0.088
	T ₄	116.95±16.76*	112.62±9.79*	0.086
	T_6	127.45±13.52*	122.18±8.85*	0.013
Lactate	T ₁	1.00±0.30*	1.01±0.29*	0.752
(mmol/L)	T ₂	2.00±0.60*	2.03±0.59*	0.752
	Τ ₃	2.52±0.40*	2.38±0.47*	0.015
	T ₄	4.72±0.43*	4.51±0.53*	0.024
	T ₅	5.22±0.64*	4.14±0.55*	<0.001
	T_6	3.77±0.31*	3.23±0.41*	<0.001

*Standard deviation, *P*<0.05 is considered significant). T₁ (baseline), T₂ (sternal closure), T₃ (0), T₄ (6), T₅ (12), T₆ (24) h in ICU. ICU: Intensive Care Unit, GDT: Goal-directed therapy, BNP: Brain natriuretic peptide, NGAL: Neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin



Figure 2: The lactate at T₁ (baseline), T₂ (sternal closure), T₃ (0, T₄ (6), T₅ (12), and T₆ (24) h in Intensive Care Unit. The arrow shows the peak in the groups



Figure 3: The brain natriuretic peptide, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin, average hourly urine output at T_1, T_4, T_6 , where the rise in brain natriuretic peptide/neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin is clear at T_6

Journal of Critical Care Goal-directed therapy after cardiac surgery and the incidence of acute J Crit Care. 2014 Dec;29(6):997-1000.

kidney injury

Goal-directed therapy protocol for patients following



Fig. 1. Algorithm for SV maximization.

Table 1

Characteristics

			ST, n = 141	GDT, n = 123	Р
Age	Mean (SD)	Years	69.8 (9.8)	69 (10.9)	.51
Sex		F:M	1: 3.03	1:3.24	.81
Surgery	CABG total		99	90	.85
(Off pump)			(2)	(2)	
(MIDCAB)			(2)	(2)	
	AVR		18	15	
	CABG & AVR		24	18	
Height	Mean (SD)	cm	169 (9)	171 (9)	.23
Weight	Mean (SD)	kg	80 (18)	84 (16)	.05
BMI	Mean (SD)	kg/m ⁻²	27.77 (4.98)	28.84 (4.80)	.08
Ethnicity	White British		95 (67.4%)	99 (80.5%)	.01
	Asian		19 (13.5%)	15 (12.2%)	
	White other		21 (14.9%)	4 (3.3%)	
	Afro-Caribbea	n	2 (1.4%)	3 (2.4%)	
	Other		4 (2.8%)	2 (1.6%)	
Euroscore	median (IQR))	4.78 [5.87]	4.83 [5.98]	.57
Baseline creatinine	median (IQR)	μ mol/L ⁻¹	85 [29]	91 [29]	.32
Creatinine clearance (Cockroft-Gault) median (IQR)	mL/min ⁻¹		73 [40]	76 [49]	.50

BMI indicates body mass index; MIDCAB, minimally invasive direct coronary artery bypass.

			ST, n = 141	GDT, n = 123	Р
Surgical drain loss median (IQR)		mL	500 [440]	520 [360]	.48
Total fluids received	Median (IQR)	mLs	2704 [1393]	2905 [1367]	.09
Creatinine clearance (day 3) median (IQR)		mL/min ⁻¹	73 [49]	79 [51]	.048
AKI (day 3)		n	28 (19.9%)	8 (6.5%)	.002
RRT		n	15 (10.6%)	4 (3.3%)	.021
Readmission		n	13 (9.2%)	4 (3.3%)	.049
Time to readiness to discharge from ICU	Median (IQR)	Hours	24 [25]	20 [6]	<.001
Duration of hospital stay	Median (IQR)	Days	7 [8]	6 [4]	.004
Mortality		n	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.6%)	.89



The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery Volume 159, Issue 5, May 2020, Pages 1868-1877.e1

Adult: Perioperative Management

Goal-directed resuscitation following cardiac surgery reduces acute kidney injury: A quality initiative pre-post analysis

J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2020 May;159(5):1868-1877.

JTCVS

188

- Formalize assessment of volume status
- Quantifiable physiologic goals
 - $CI > 2.5L/min/m_2$
 - MAP > 65mmHg
- Classification of patients as fluid responders vs nonresponders
 - PPV
 - PLR





Outcomes	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Pre-QI}\\ (n=725) \end{array}$	Post-QI $(n = 1254)$	<i>P</i> value
Operative mortality	14 (1.9)	23 (1.8)	.88
STS major morbidity	96 (13.2)	150 (12.0)	.41
Prolonged ventilation	48 (6.6)	96 (7.7)	.39
Reoperation	31 (4.3)	52 (4.1)	.89
Permanent stroke	14 (1.9)	16 (1.3)	.25
Values are presented as n (%) Surgeons.). <i>QI</i> , Quality impro	wement; STS, Society	of Thoracic

TABLE 3. Short-term complications by quality improvement (QI) era

J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2020 May;159(5):1868-1877.



FIGURE 3. Risk, Injury, Failure, Loss of Kidney Function, and End-stage Kidney Disease (*RIFLE*) injury or failure in the pre-quality improvement (*QI*) versus post-QI groups. RIFLE injury or failure is significantly reduced in the post- compared with the pre-QI cohorts from 12.4% to 7.8% (P = .001).

TABLE 2. Renal outcome	es by quality impr	ovement (QI) era	
Outcome	Pre-QI (n = 725)	Post-QI (n = 1254)	P value
Minimum GFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²)	58.7 (41.3-75.7)	62.0 (45.9-78.1)	.016
RIFLE classification No injury Risk	428 (59.0)	818 (65.2) 338 (27.0)	.002
Injury Failure	59 (8.1) 31 (4.3)	58 (4.6) 40 (3.2)	
Renal injury or failure	90 (12.4)	98 (7.8)	.001
Temporary or permanent postoperative dialysis	17 (2.3)	26 (2.1)	.69

Values are presented as median (interquartile range) for continuous variables or n (%). *QI*, Quality improvement; *GFR*, glomerular filtration rate; *RIFLE*, Risk, Injury, Failure, Loss of Kidney Function, and End-stage Kidney Disease classification criteria.



FIGURE 4. Observed to expected rates (O/E) of acute kidney injury (AKI) based on Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) definitions and risk models. The left panel depicts the rates of expected and observed cases of kidney injury, with expected cases based on the STS risk model. The right panel transforms these observed and expected cases into the O/E ratio depicted by the orange square and the bars represent the 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The O/E with confidence interval is significantly < 1 in the post-quality improvement (QI), but not the pre-QI, group.

	Logistic only		IPTW adjusted	
	Odds ratio	Р	Odds ratio	Р
Variable	(95% Confidence interval)	value	(95% Confidence interval)	value
Quality improvement era	0.63 (0.43-0.90)	.012	0.66 (0.44-0.97)	.037
STS predicted risk of morbidity or mortality score	31.7 (9.0-111.6)	<.0001	20.2 (3.8-106)	<.001
Last preoperative hematocrit	0.93 (0.90-0.96)	<.0001	0.93 (0.90-0.97)	.001
Intraoperative blood products	1.15 (0.78-1.70)	.5	1.09 (0.65-1.81)	.8
MELD score	1.04 (0.99-1.10)	.1	1.03 (0.96-1.09)	.4
ACE inhibitor or ARB	0.744 (0.41-1.34)	.3	0.79 (0.39-1.58)	.5
Last preoperative HbA1c	1.10 (0.98-1.22)	.1	1.02 (0.89-1.17)	.7
Family history of cardiac disease	0.94 (0.74-1.19)	.6	0.88 (0.45-1.73)	.7
Obstructive sleep apnea	0.89 (0.70-1.14)	.4	0.62 (0.31-1.23)	.2
Dyslipidemia	1.17 (0.66-2.09)	.6	1.01 (0.47-2.17)	1.0
Endocarditis	0.92 (0.39-2.17)	.9	0.74 (0.28-1.90)	.5
Crossclamp time	1.20 (1.05-1.38)	.008	1.06 (0.87-1.28)	.6
Procedure vs isolated CABG				
Isolated AVR	0.74 (0.46-1.21)	.2	0.72 (0.38-1.33)	.3
AVR/CABG	0.65 (0.37-1.13)	.1	1.11 (0.52-2.38)	.8
Isolated MVR	0.54 (0.27-1.04)	.07	0.46 (0.21-1.00)	.05
MVR/CABG	0.60 (0.26-1.38)	.2	0.88 (0.33-2.36)	.8

TABLE 4. Multivariable model for renal injury or failure by Risk, Injury, Failure, Loss of Kidney Function, and End-Stage Kidney Disease(RIFLE) classification criteria

IPTW, Inverse probability of treatment weighting; *STS*, Society of Thoracic Surgeons; *MELD*, Model for End-stage Liver Disease; *ACE*, angiotensin-converting enzyme; *ARB*, angiotensin II receptor blocker; *HbA1c*, glycated hemoglobin; *CABG*, coronary artery bypass graft; *AVR*, aortic valve replacement; *MVR*, mitral valve repair or replacement.

BJA

Open archive

Cardiac complications associated with goal-directed therapy in high-risk surgical patients: a meta-analysis British Journal of Anaesthesia

Br J Anaesth. 2014 Apr;112(4):648-59.

Table 1 Summary of included studies

Study	Year	Jadad score	Type of surgery	No. of patients in the GDT group	No. of patients in the control group	Type of monitor in the GDT group	Intervention type	Goals in the GDT group	Goals in the control group	CVS complications, GDT (%)	CVS complications, control (%)
Bender and colleagues	1997	1	Elective vascular/ aortic	51	53	PAC	Fluid and inotropes	CI≥2.8; PAWP 8−14; SVR<1100	Standard care	4 (7.8)	6 (11.3)
Benes and colleagues	2010	3	Elective abdominal	60	60	Flotrac	Fluid and inotropes	SVV<10%;CI≥2.5	MAP >65; HR<100; CVP 8-12	6 (10.0)	12 (20.0)
Berlauk and colleagues	1991	2	Peripheral vascular surgery	68	21	PAC	Fluid and inotropes	CI≥2.8; PAWP 8−14; SVR<1100	Standard care	5 (7.4)	5 (23.8)
Bonazzi and colleagues	2002	2	Elective vascular	50	50	PAC	Fluid and inotropes	CI >3.0; PWP 10-18; SVR<1450; DO ₂ I >600	Standard care	2 (4.0)	4 (8.0)
Boyd and colleagues	1993	1	Abdominal/ vascular	53	54	PAC	Fluid and inotropes	$\begin{array}{l} \text{MAP 80-110;} \\ \text{PAWP 12-14; S } p_{O_2} \\ > 94\%; \text{Hb} > 12; \\ \text{UO} > 0.5 \text{ ml kg} \\ h^{-1}; \text{DO}_2 I > 600 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{MAP 80-110; PAWP} \\ 12-14; S p_{\text{O}_2}\!>\!94\%; \\ \text{Hb}\!>\!12; \text{UO}\!>\!0.5\text{ml} \\ \text{kg} h^{-1} \end{array}$	5 (9.4)	14 (25.9)
Buettner and colleagues	2008	2	Major abdominal or gynaecological	40	40	PiCCO	Fluids	SPV <10%; HCt >23%; normal clotting	Standard care	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Cecconi and colleagues	2011	4	Hip THR	20	20	Flotrac	Fluid and inotropes	SV change; DO ₂ I >600	Standard care	0 (0.0)	6 (30.0)
Donati and colleagues	2007	3	Elective major abdominal/aortic	68	67	CVC	Fluids	O ₂ ER <27%; MAP >80; UO> 0.5; CVP 8-12; Hb >10	MAP >80; UO >0.5; CVP 8-12; Hb >10	1 (1.5)	5 (7.5)
Forget and colleagues	2010	2	Major intra-abdominal	41	41	Masimo pulsoximeter	Fluids	PVI <13%	Standard care	4 (9.8)	8 (19.5)
Gan and colleagues	2002	5	Elective general, urological, gynaecological	50	50	OD	Fluids	FTc >0.35; SV change	Increase HR >20% baseline; sAP <90 or CVP <20% baseline	1 (2.0)	2 (4.0)
Jhanji and colleagues	2010	3	Major surgery	45	45	Lidco	Fluids	SV	CVP standard care	6 (13.3)	4 (8.9)
Lobo and colleagues	2000	3	Major surgery	19	18	PAC	Fluid and inotropes	$DO_2I > 600$	Standard care	0 (0.0)	4 (22.2)
Lopes and colleagues	2007	2	Major surgery	17	16	IBPplus; Dixtal	Fluids	$\Delta \mathrm{PP} < 10\%$	Standard care	3 (17.6)	8 (50.0)
Mayer and colleagues	2010	2	Major GI surgery	30	30	Flotrac	Fluid and inotropes	CI >2.5; SVV <12%	CVP-8-12; MAP >65; UO >0.5	2 (6.7)	7 (23.3)
Pearse and colleagues	2005	3	Major surgery	62	60	Lidco	Fluid and inotropes	D02I >600	$\begin{array}{l} Sa_{0_2}\!\geq\!\!94\%;Hb>8;\\ Temp\!>\!37^\circ\!C;HR\\ <\!100\;or<\!20\;above\\ baseline;MAP\;60-\\ 100;CI\!\geq\!2.5 \end{array}$	8 (12.9)	16 (26.7)

	GDT		Contro	ol		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M–H, Random, 95% CI	M–H, Random, 95% Cl
Bender 1997	4	51	6	53	5.2%	0.67 [0.18, 2.52]	
Benes 2010	6	60	12	60	7.2%	0.44 [0.15, 1.28]	
Berlauk 1991	5	68	5	21	5.0%	0.25 [0.07, 0.99]	
Bonazzi 2002	2	50	4	50	3.4%	0.48 [0.08, 2.74]	
Boyd 1993	5	53	14	54	6.7%	0.30 [0.10, 0.90]	
Buettner 2008	0	40	0	40		Not estimable	
Cecconi 2011	0	20	6	20	1.3%	0.05 [0.00, 1.04]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Donati 2007	1	68	5	67	2.3%	0.19 [0.02, 1.63]	
Forget 2010	4	41	8	41	5.4%	0.45 [0.12, 1.62]	
Gan 2002	1	50	2	50	1.9%	0.49 [0.04, 5.58]	
Jhanji 2010	3	45	4	45	4.1%	0.73 [0.15, 3.48]	
Lobo 2000	0	19	4	18	1.3%	0.08 [0.00, 1.66]	<
Lopes 2007	3	17	8	16	3.9%	0.21 [0.04, 1.05]	
Mayer 2010	2	30	7	30	3.6%	0.23 [0.04, 1.24]	
Pearse 2005	8	62	16	60	8.3%	0.41 [0.16, 1.04]	
Senagore 2009	6	42	2	22	3.5%	1.67 [0.31, 9.04]	
Shoemaker 1988	3	28	2	60	3.1%	3.48 [0.55, 22.12]	
Valentine 1998	9	60	5	60	6.3%	1.94 [0.61, 6.18]	
Wakeling 2005	8	67	9	67	7.5%	0.87 [0.32, 2.42]	
Wenkui 2010	2	109	9	105	4.1%	0.20 [0.04, 0.95]	
Wilson 1999	39	92	26	46	11.0%	0.57 [0.25, 1.16]	
Ziegler 1997	6	32	4	40	5.0%	2.08 [0.53, 8.11]	
Total (95% CI)		1104		1025	100.0%	0.54 [0.38, 0.76]	•
Total events	117		158				Ŧ
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.1$	6: $\gamma^2 = 26.3$	72. df=2	20 (P=0.1	4): / ² =	25%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=3.49 (I	P=0.000)5)	.,,		0	.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours GDT Favours control

Fig 2 Effect of GDT in the protocol group vs control group on total cardiovascular events. M–H, Mantel–Haenszel.

Table 2 Cardiovascular complications. *P < 0.05

Total CVS events	No. of studies	No. of patients in the GDT group	CVS in the GDT group (%)	No. of patients in the control group	CVS in the control group (%)	Odds ratio	95% CI	P-value
Total	22	1104	117 (10.6)	1025	158 (15.4)	0.54	0.38-0.76	0.0005*
Fluid/inotropes								
Fluid	9	479	31 (6.4)	453	47 (10.3)	0.57	0.31-1.04	0.07
Fluid+inotrope	13	625	89 (14.2)	572	111 (19.4)	0.55	0.34-0.89	0.01*
Goal								
Supranormal	12	593	83 (13.9)	532	107 (20.1)	0.50	0.31-0.79	0.002*
Normal	10	511	37 (6.6)	493	51 (10.3)	0.61	0.35-1.06	0.08
Type of monitor								
PAC	9	453	73 (16.1)	402	70 (17.4)	0.70	0.38-1.29	0.25
Other	13	651	47 (7.2)	623	88 (14.1)	0.47	0.31-0.73	0.0008*
Arrhythmias	No. of studies	No. of patients in the GDT group	Arrhythmia in the GDT group (%)	No. of patients in the control group	Arrhythmia in the control group (%)	Odds ratio	95% CI	P-value
Total	15	752	41 (5.4)	641	60 (9.3)	0.54	0.35-0.85	0.007*
Fluid/inotropes								
Fluid	4	208	8 (3.8)	183	16 (8.7)	0.38	0.11-1.26	0.11
Fluid+inotrope	11	544	33 (6.0)	458	44 (9.6)	0.58	0.35-0.96	0.03*
Goal								
Supranormal	9	452	29 (6.4)	358	39 (10.8)	0.55	0.32-0.94	0.03*
Normal	6	300	12 (4.0)	283	21 (7.4)	0.51	0.21-1.22	0.13
Type of monitor								
PAC	7	372	23 (6.2)	288	23 (8.0)	0.66	0.35-1.25	0.20
Other	8	380	18 (4.7)	353	37 (10.4)	0.45	0.24-0.83	0.01*

Acute pulmonary oedema	No. of studies	No. of patients in the GDT group	APO in the GDT group (%)	No. of patients in the control group	APO in the control group (%)	Odds ratio	95% CI	P-value
Total	15	773	39 (5.0)	695	44 (6.3)	0.69	0.43-1.10	0.12
Fluid/inotropes								
Fluid	3	168	0 (0.0)	143	3 (2.0)	0.23	0.02-2.13	0.19
Fluid+inotrope	12	605	39 (6.4)	552	41 (7.4)	0.72	0.44-1.18	0.19
Goal								
Supranormal	11	573	37 (6.4)	512	40 (7.8)	0.68	0.42-1.13	0.14
Normal	4	200	2 (1.0)	183	4 (2.1)	0.67	0.12-3.77	0.65
Type of monitor								
PAC	9	453	33 (7.2)	402	29 (7.2)	0.81	0.46-1.41	0.45

Ac ûte enyocardial ischaemia	No. of studies	N&20f patients in the GDT group	CV S (ሰ.8 ϸe GDT group (%)	ND3 of patients in the control group	Mbir(ālilt)y in the control group (%)	0.dás ratio	95%-ct 11	₿-0⁄&lue
Total	16	793	22 (2.7)	715	27 (3.7)	0.70	0.38-1.28	0.25
Fluid/inotropes								
Fluid	3	168	3 (1.7)	143	0 (0)	2.84	0.31-26.2	0.36
Fluid+inotrope	13	625	18 (2.8)	572	23 (4.0)	0.62	0.33-1.17	0.14
Goal								
Supranormal	12	593	16 (2.6)	532	24 (4.5)	0.55	0.28-1.09	0.09
Normal	4	200	6 (3.0)	183	3 (1.6)	1.70	0.45-6.49	0.43
Type of monitor								
PAC	9	453	19 (4.1)	402	19 (4.7)	0.79	0.39-1.58	0.50
Other	7	340	3 (0.9)	313	8 (2.5)	0.46	0.13-1.65	0.23



A series

British Journal of Anaesthesia

Review Articles

Editor's choice

Goal-directed therapy in cardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis



Br J Anaesth. 2013 Apr;110(4):510-7.

Table 1 Randomized clinical trials of goal-directed therapy in cardiac surgical patients. CI, cardiac index; CVP, central venous pressure; SVV, stroke volume variation; Scv₀₂, central venous saturation of oxygen; SVI, stroke volume index; SVRI, systemic vascular resistance index; DO₂I, delivery oxygen index; Hct, haematocrit; MAP, mean arterial pressure; UO, urine output; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CPB, cardio-pulmonary bypass

Author	Year	Participants	Intervention	Timing	Monitor	Goals of therapy	Control group
Smetkin and colleagues	2009	40 patients (20 EGDT and 20 control group). CABG off-pump. EuroSCORE 2 control group, 2.5 EGDT group	Fluids, inotropes and blood transfusion	Perioperative	PiCCOplus cardiac output monitoring and CeVOX (continuous Scv _{O2} monitoring)	$\begin{array}{l} ITBVI=850-1000 \mbox{ ml} \\ m^{-2}; \mbox{ MAP}=60-100 \\ mm \mbox{ Hg}; \mbox{ HR} < 90 \mbox{ bpm}; \\ \mbox{ Hb} \geq 8 \mbox{ g} \mbox{ dl}^{-1}; \mbox{ CI} \geq 2 \\ \mbox{ litre min}^{-1} \mbox{ m}^{-2}; \\ Scv_{0_2} > 60\% \end{array}$	CVP=6-14 mm Hg; MAP=60-100 mm Hg; HR <90 bpm
Kapoor and colleagues	2008	30 patients (13 intervention, 14 control). CABG on CPB. EuroSCORE ≥3	Fluids and inotropes	Postoperative	FloTrac TM cardiac output monitoring sensor and PreSep TM catheter (continuous central venous oximetry)	CI 2.5-4.2 ml min ⁻¹ m ⁻² ; CVP 6-8 mm Hg; SVV <10%; Scv ₀₂ >70%; SVI 30-65 ml bet ⁻¹ m ⁻² ; SVRI 1500-2500 dynes s cm ⁻⁵ m ⁻² ; DO ₂ I 450-600 ml min ⁻¹ m ⁻² ; Hct >30%; MAP 90-105 mm Hg; pH 7.35-7.45; Po ₂ >100 mm Hg; Pco ₂ 35-45 mm Hg; Sp ₀₂ >95%; UO >1 ml kg ⁻¹ h ⁻¹	Hct ≥ 30%; MAP 90-105 mm Hg; pH 7.35-7.45; Po_2 >100 mm Hg; Pco_2 35-45 mm Hg; Sp_{O_2} >95%; UO >1 ml kg ⁻¹ h ⁻¹
McKendry and colleagues	2004	179 patients (89 EGDT and 90 control group). CABG, valve replacement or both on CPB. Parsonnet score 9.7 both groups	Fluids, inotropes and nitrates	Postoperative	Oesophageal Doppler	SVI >35 ml m ⁻² ; MAP=70 mm Hg	Standard care
Pölönen and colleagues	2000	403 patients (9 excluded; 196 EGDT group; 197 control group). CABG, valve replacement or other surgery on CPB	Fluid and inotropes	Postoperative	Thermodilution pulmonary artery catheter	$Scv_{O_2} > 70\%$ and Lactate ≤ 2 mmol litre ⁻¹ up to 8 h post-op	Standard care
Mythen and colleagues	1995	60 patients (30 protocol group, 30 control group). CABG, valve replacement or both on CPB	Fluids	Perioperative	Oesophageal Doppler	Maximum SV, increase of CVP <3 mm Hg	Standard care

Br J Anaesth. 2013 Apr;110(4):510-7.

Table 2 Length of stay (LOS) in days for hospital and intensive care unit for early goal-directed therapy group (EGDT) vs control group among different studies. *Median with interquartile range. [†] Mean with range

Author/Study Smetkin and colleagues* Kapoor and colleagues	LOS ICU (days)		LOS hospital (days)			
	EGDT	Control	EGDT	Control		
Smetkin and colleagues*	0.8 (0.8-1.0)	1.0 (0.9–1.6)	12 (8–19)	15 (13–24)		
Kapoor and colleagues	2.6 ± 0.9	$\textbf{4.9} \pm \textbf{1.8}$	5.8 ± 1.2	$\textbf{8.8} \pm \textbf{2.1}$		
McKendry and colleagues	2.5	3.2	11.4 ± 13.2	13.9 ± 15		
Pölönen and colleagues*	1 [1-1]	1 [1-1]	6 [5-7]	7 [5-8]		
Mythen and colleagues [†]	1 [1,1]	1.7 [1,11]	6.4 [5, 9]	10.1 [5, 48]		



Fig 4 Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on hospital length of stay (LOS) vs control group. IV, inverse of variance. Data obtained by direct contact with author.

	EGD	т	Stand	ard		Odds ratio			Od	ds ratio		
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year		M-H, Ra	ndom, 9	5% CI	
Mythen and webb ²¹	0	30	6	30	6.6%	0.66 [0.00, 1.15]	1995	•	•			
Polonen and colleagues ²	20 2	196	13	197	20.9%	0.15 [0.03, 0.66]	2000		-	-		
McKendry et al.22	17	89	26	90	53.7%	0.58 [0.29, 1.17]	2004		-	∎∔		
Kapoor et al.23	1	13	2	14	8.6%	0.50 [0.04, 6.28]	2008			• + -		
Smetkin et al.24	1	20	4	20	10.3%	0.21 [0.02, 2.08]	2009	-				
Total (95% CI)		348		351	100.0%	0.33 [0.15, 0.73]						
Total events	21		51									
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0.17$;	$\chi^2 = 4.93$	df=4 (P=0.29);	/ ² =19%				H				
Test for overall effect: Z=	2.76 (P=	0.006)						0.01	0.1	1	10	100
								Fa	avours EG	DT F	avours cor	ntrols

Fig 3 Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on postoperative complications rate vs control group. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel.

Ohada an an harran		Tetel	-	Tatal	Martala ha	M II Developm 050/ Ol	Vee	M II Dandam 05% Ol
Study or subgroup	Events	Iotal	Events	Iotal	weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Mythen and webb ²¹	0	30	1	30	14.6%	0.32 [0.01, 8.24]	1995	
Polonen and collegues ²⁰	2	196	6	197	44.7%	0.33 [0.07, 1.65]	2000	
McKendry et al.22	4	89	2	90	40.7%	2.07 [0.37, 11.60]	2004	
Kapoor et al.23	0	13	0	14		Not estimable	2008	
Smetkin et al.24	0	20	0	20		Not estimable	2009	
Total (95% CI)		348		351	100.0%	0.69 [0.19, 2.56]		
Total events	6		9					
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.32$;	$\chi^2 = 2.59$,	df=2 (P=0.27);	² =23%				

Fig 2 Forest plot showing the effect of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) on mortality rate vs control group. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel.

Original Article

Annals of Medicine

Significance of perioperative goal-directed hemodynamic approach in preventing postoperative complications in patients after cardiac surgery: a meta-analysis and systematic review

The protocol of goal-directed therapy.

First author (year)	Timing of optimization	Modality of optimization	Goals of optimization	Monitor tools
Osawa (2016)	Intra-op	Fluid and vasoactive drugs	CI >3.0 L/min/m ² ; SVI >/= 35 ml/m ² , MAP >65mmHg	LiDCOrapid
Fellahi (2015)	Intra-op	Fluid and vasoactive drugs	CI > =2.4 l/min/m ² ; SVV < =11%	Endotracheal cardiac output monitor
Parke (2015)	Post-op	Fluid and vasoactive drugs	CI >2.5 l/min/m ² ; SVV< =13%; MAP> =65 mmHg	FloTrac/EV1000 clinical platform
Goepfert (2013)	Intra-op	Fluid and vasoactive drugs	CI >2.0 l/min/m ² ; SVV < =10%; MAP >65 mmHg; HR 50-100 bpm	PiCCOplus
Smetkin (2009)	Intra-op	Fluid and dobutamine/ephedrine	Iintrathoracic blood volume index: 850–1000ml/m ² ; MAP 60–100mmHg; HR <90bpm; central venous oxygen saturation >60%	PiCCOplus
Kapoor (2008)	Post-op	Fluid and vasoactive drugs	Maintain CI at 2.5–4.2 l/min/m ² ; SVI at 30–65 ml/beat/m ² ; SVRI at 1500–2500 dyne/s/cm,DO2I at 450–600 ml/min/m ² ; ScVO2 more than 70% and SVV less than 10%	FloTrac™/PreSep™
McKendry (2004)	Post-op	Fluid with or without vasodilators and inotropes	Maintain stroke index> = 35 ml/m ²	Esophageal Doppler flowmetry
Pölönen (2000)	Post-op	Fluid with or without vasodilators and inotropes	Maintain Svo2 $>$ 70% and lactate concentration $<$ =2.0 mmol/L from admission to the ICU and up to 8 h thereafter	
Mythen (1995)	Intra-op	Fluid	Maintain stoke volume and rise of CVP> 3mmHg	Esophageal Doppler system

Study name	Peto Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	P-Value	Peto Odds	ratio and 95% CI	Relative Weight
Osawa (2016)	0.51	0.13	1.96	-0.98	0.325	1	<u> </u>	68,191
Fellahi (2015)	0.46	0.05	4.57	-0.66	0.509			23.712
Mythen (1995)	0.14	0.00	6.82	-1.00	0.317			8.097
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT (fixed)	0.45	0.15	1.36	-1.42	0.156			
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT (random)	0.45	0.15	1.36	-1.42	0.156			
McKendry (2004)	1.90	0.37	9.62	0.77	0.440			46.745
Pölönen (2000)	0.36	0.09	1.47	-1.42	0.156			53.255
Subgroup of postoperative GDT (fixed)	0.73	0.25	2.12	-0.57	0.567			
Subgroup of postoperative GDT (random)	0.79	0.16	3.96	-0.29	0.770			
Pooled effects (fixed)	0.58	0.27	1.25	-1.39	0.164			
Pooled effects (random)	0.54	0.21	1.34	-1.33	0.182			
					0.01	0.1	1 10	100
Heterogeneity test:								
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT						Favors GDT Group	Favors Control Group	
Q = 0.3914, $df = 2$, $P = 0.822$, I-squa	re = 0%					99999999999999999999999999999999999999		
Subgroup of postoperative GDT								
O = 2.283, $df = 1$, $P = 0.131$, I-square	e = 56.20%							
Total								
O = 3.077 df = 4 P = 0.545 L-square	e = 0%							

Figure 3. Meta-analysis for all-cause mortality.

Study name	Difference in means	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	P-Value	Differer	ice in means and 95%	6 CI	Relativ Weigh
Osawa (2016)	-0.95	-2.12	0.22	-1.60	0.110				48.96
Goepfert (2013)	-1.70	-3.90	0.50	-1.51	0.130				13.72
Smetkin (2009)	0.20	-1.14	1.54	0.29	0.769				37.31
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT (fixed)	-0.62	-1.44	0.19	-1.50	0.134		⊸		
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT (random)	-0.64	-1.62	0.33	-1.29	0.196		-		
Kapoor (2008)	-6.90	-11.11	-2.69	-3.21	0.001				100.00
Subgroup of postoperative GDT (fixed)	-6.90	-11.11	-2.69	-3.21	0.001				
Subgroup of postoperative GDT (random)	-6.90	-11.11	-2.69	-3.21	0.001				
Pooled effects (fixed)	-0.85	-1.65	-0.05	-2.08	0.037		•		
Pooled effects (random)	-1.48	-3.24	0.28	-1.65	0.099		\bullet		
					-15.00	-7.50	0.00	7.50	15.00
Heterogeneity test:									
Subgroup of intratoperative GDT									
Q =2.679, df = 2, P =0.262, I-square	= 25.34%								
Total						Favors GDT Group		Favors Control Group	
O = 10.90 df = 3 P = 0.012 I-square	e = 72.48%								

(A) duration of mechanical ventilation,



(B) length of ICU stay,

Q =18.147, df = 2, P < 0.001, I-square = 88.98% Total

Q =73.452, df = 7, P < 0.001, I-square = 90.47%

udy name	Difference in means	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	P-Value	Differ	ence in means and 95% CI		Rela Weiş
awa (2016)	-3.00	-5.80	-0.20	-2.10	0.036		— I		42.
llahi (2015)	0.00	-3.99	3.99	0.00	1.000			_	21
netkin (2009)	-3.00	-8.05	2.05	-1.16	0.244				13
ythen (1995)	-1.30	-5.16	2.56	-0.66	0.510				22
bgroup of intratoperative GDT (fixed)	-1.98	-3.82	-0.14	-2.11	0.035				
bgroup of intratoperative GDT (random)	-1.98	-3.82	-0.14	-2.11	0.035				
rke (2015)	-0.30	-0.91	0.31	-0.96	0.338				27
1000r (2008)	-3.00	-4.30	-1.70	-4.51	< 0.001		-		18
cKendry (2004)	-2.00	-2.90	-1.10	-4.35	< 0.001				23
lönen (2000)	-1.00	-1.37	-0.63	-5.25	< 0.001		· •		30.
bgroup of postoperative GDT (fixed)	-1.05	-1.34	-0.75	-7.00	< 0.001		•		
bgroup of postoperative GDT (random)	-1.42	-2.30	-0.54	-3.17	0.002				
oled effects (fixed)	-1.07	-1.36	-0.78	-7.25	< 0.001		•		
oled effects (random)	-1.52	-2.31	-0.73	-3.77	<0.001	I 4			
					-10.00	-5.00	0.00	5.00	10.00
eterogeneity test:									
bgroup of intratoperative GDT $Q = 1.732$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.630$, I-square	= 0%								
bgroup of postoperative GDT Q = 18.666, $df = 3$, $P < 0.001$, I-square	e = 83.93%	0				Favors GDT Group	Fa	vors Control Group	

(C) length of hospital stay.

Ann Med. 2017 Jun;49(4):343-351.



Variable		Group 1 (2017) n = 175	Group 2 (2018) n = 217	Combined Group 1–2 (2017–2018) <i>n</i> = 392	Group 3 (2019) <i>n</i> = 158	Comparison Group	95% CI Estimate (Upper, Lower)	p Values
HLOS (in days)	Median (IQR)	7.00 (5.00)	6.00 (5.00)	7.00 (6.00)	6.00 (6.00)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.00 (0.00, 1.00) 0.00 (-5×10^{-5} , 0.00) 0.00 (0.00, 1.00)	0.071 0.609 0.210
ICU LOS (in days)	Median (IQR)	6.19 (4.88)	5.88 (4.46)	6.01 (4.86)	4.00 (3.00)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	2.11 (1.87, 2.93) 1.89 (1.13, 2.12) 2.00 (1.55, 2.28)	<0.001 <0.001 <0.001
30 Day Hospital Readmission Yes	Count (Percentage)	61 (35%)	67 (31%)	128 (33%)	52 (33%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.09 (0.67, 1.76) 0.911 (0.57, 1.45) 0.988 (0.67, 1.50)	0.729 0.736 1
Stroke Present	Count (Percentage)	7 (4%)	5 (2%)	12 (3%)	2 (1%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	3.24 (0.60, 32.42) 1.84 (0.30, 19.53) 2.46 (0.54, 22.88)	0.179 0.704 0.369
AKI Present	Count (Percentage)	23 (13%)	27 (12%)	50 (13%)	20 (13%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.044 (0.52, 2.10) 0.98 (0.51, 1.92) 1.01 (0.56, 1.86)	1 1 1
Respiratory Failure Present	Count (Percentage)	14 (8%)	18 (8%)	32 (8%)	10 (6%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.28 (0.51, 3.34) 1.34 (0.56, 3.34) 1.31 (0.61, 3.08)	0.673 0.553 0.595
Surgical Site Infection Present	Count (Percentage)	4 (2%)	6 (3%)	10 (2.5%)	3 (2%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.21 (0.20, 8.38) 1.47 (0.31, 9.21) 1.35 (0.34, 7.74)	1 0.739 0.766
Event (Stroke, AKI, RF, SSI) Present Absent	Count	47 events (7%)	56 events (6%)	104 events (7%)	35 events (5%)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.23 (0.76, 1.99) 1.18 (0.75, 1.87) 1.21 (0.81, 1.85)	0.424 0.512 0.384

Table 2. Study Outcome Measures. All complications were determined based on electronic health record review for documented diagnosis during ICU stay.

HLOS = hospital length of stay; ICU LOS = intensive care unit length of stay; AKI = acute kidney injury; RF = renal failure; SSI = surgical site infection.

Table 3. Amount of vasopressor, blood products and IV fluid administration.

Variable		Group 1 (2017)	Group 2 (2018)	Combined Group 1–2 (2017–2018)	Group 3 (2019)	Comparison Group	95% CI Estimate (Upper, Lower)	p Values
Total Norepinephrine (mL)	Median (IQR)	113.46 (239.56)	139.74 (333.01)	120.015 (264.46)	131.25 (302.97)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	-24.34 (-71.25, 13.13) -16.8 (-61.92, 29.99) -20.66 (-60.08, 13.19)	0.202 0.431 0.231
Total Phenylephrine (mL)	Median (IQR)	1061.36 (1491.28)	2311.25 (2155.22)	1728.75 (2124.56)	648.75 (834.44)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	490.36 (-753.90, 6048.14) 1557.42 (-476.25, 3110.27) 972.90 (-476.25, 2500.90)	0.412 0.214 0.221
Total Milrinone (mL)	Median (IQR)	317.87 (338.30)	310.54 (331.80)	313.17 (333.95)	215.48 (278.62)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	103.84 (36.12, 171.30) 88.83 (23.49, 155.49) 95.63 (38.29, 153.48)	<0.01 <0.01 <0.01
Total Epinephrine (mL)	Median (IQR)	165.00 (318.73)	221.32 (330.49)	180.00 (328.11)	180.11 (274.33)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	41.39 (-42.25, 108.75) 41.22 (-37.58, 118.00) 41.25 (-22.66, 101.32)	0.271 0.281 0.201
Total Vasopressin (mL)	Median (IQR)	312.00 (909.75)	282.00 (411.00)	300.00 (471.00)	229.50 (342.75)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	69.00 (-78.00, 312.00) 72.00 (-48.00 177.00) 71.86 (-39.00, 180.00)	0.344 0.219 0.182
Fresh Frozen Plasma (unit)	Median (IQR)	2.00 (0.75)	1.00 (1.00)	2.00 (1.00)	1.00 (1.00)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	0.00 (0.00, 0.00) 0.00 (0.00, 0.00) 0.00 (0.00, 1.00)	0.043 0.831 0.129
Packed Red Blood Cells (unit)	Median (IQR)	4.00 (2.00)	3.00 (2.00)	4.00 (2.00)	2.00(4.00)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	0.00 (0.00, 0.00) 0.00 (0.00, 0.00) 0.00 (0.00, 0.00)	0.792 0.665 0.6862
Platelets (unit)	Median (IQR)	2.00 (0.75)	1.00 (0.00)	1.50 (1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1.00 (0.00, 1.00) NA 0.742 (0.00, 1.00)	0.033 NA 0.095
IV Fluids Intra Op (mL)	Median (IQR)	2481.83 (1256.11)	2167.64 (1042.81)	2290.14 (1153.36)	978.75 (899.63)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	1572.65 (1388.23, 1766.17) 1253.40 (1105.80, 1398.33) 1383.05 (1239.96, 1527.90)	<0.001 <0.001 <0.001
IV Fluids ICU (mL)	Median (IQR)	1200.00 (662.50)	1023.75 (800.00)	1100.00 (750.00)	2274.02 (1043.42)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	-1117.98 (-1293.80, -949.85) -1224.90 (-1393.80, -1065.88) -1177.88 (-1324.74, -1028.34)	<0.001 <0.001 <0.001
IV Fluids Total (mL)	Median (IQR)	3788.31 (1481.48)	3307.18 (1336.39)	3473.23 (1363.17)	3309.93 (1285.78)	2017 to 2019 2018 to 2019 2017–2018 to 2019	346.65 (83.46, 613.74) 9.96 (-244.67, 255.33) 160.37 (-71.67, 386.17)	0.011 0.951 0.171

J Clin Med. 2021 Jan 21;10(3):400.

Table 1 Notable cardiac	surgery GDT stud	lies				
Reference	Location	No. of Patients	Design	Intervention	Primary End Point	Major Findings
Pölönen et al, 🔁 2000	Kuopio, Finland	N = 393 (196 in protocol group; 197 in control group)	Randomized controlled trial	GDT guided by lactate and hemodynamics	Hospital and ICU LOS	Median hospital LOS reduced in the protocol group (6 d vs 7 d; P<.05) Less-frequent morbidity in the protocol group (1.1% vs 6.1%, P<.01)
Meersch et al, ^፼ 2017	Münster, Germany	N = 276 (138 in intervention group; 138 in control group)	Randomized controlled trial	KDIGO bundle, urinary biomarkers after cardiac surgery	AKI within 72 h after cardiac surgery	AKI reduced in intervention group (55% vs 72%, P = .004)
Kapoor et al, 🖪 2017	New Delhi and Gurgaon, India	N = 163 (75 in GDT group; 88 in control group)	Randomized, prospective; 2 centers	GDT with hemodynamic management	Duration of mechanical ventilation, inotropic support, and ICU and hospital LOS	ICU LOS (2.5 d vs 4.2 d, P<.001) and hospital LOS (5.6 d vs 7.4 d, P<.001) reduced in GDT group Duration of inotropes (2.9 h vs 3.2 h, P = .005) reduced in GDT group
Goepfert et al, 2007	Munich, Germany	N = 80 (40 in GDT group; 40 in control group)	Prospective vs historical control	GDT hemodynamic management guided by GEDVI	Vasopressors, catecholamines, fluid administration, mechanical ventilation, LOS	GDT decreased the need for vasopressors (187 min vs 1458 min, P <.01), catecholamines (0.01 mg vs 0.8 mg, P <.01), mechanical ventilation (12.6 h vs 15.4 h, P = .002), and reduced ICU LOS (25 h vs 33 h, P = .03)
Johnston et al, 2019	Virginia, USA	N = 1979 (725 in pre-Ql group; 1254 in post-Ql group)	Observational, retrospective; multicenter	QI initiative: GDT volume resuscitation	Rate of AKI by RIFLE criteria	GDT group had less renal injury or failure (7.8% vs 12.4%, P = .001)

Innovation & Research

Novel data sources, improved data management, advanced analytics

→ extend insights into risk-assessment & tx. strategies

- DeepMind's AI AKI research study
 - Investigated 703,782 patients
 - Developed a model providing up to 48hrs of advance warning
 Predicted

55.8% of AKIs overall & 90.2% of AKIs require dialysis

Google Algorithm Aims to Identify At-Risk Kidney Injury Patients

DeepMind unit's effort marks new application of machine learning in health care, but experts say model needs further testing before being applied in a live hospital setting



Conclusions

- Goal directed hemodynamic & fluid therapy (GDT) is a standardized algorithm to achieve adequate oxygen delivery to the tissues
- GDT-directed hemodynamic therapy may reduce postoperative complications & length of ICU/hospital stay
- Guidelines strongly recommended GDT guided resuscitation after cardiac surgery
- Much work remains for GDT to be both personalized & comprehensive, adopting novel biomarkers/biosensors, big data, analytical/decision support information technology.