Pulse Oximeter-Derived Pleth Variability Index is a Reliable Indicator of Cardiac Preload in Patients Undergoing Liver Transplantation.
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BACKGROUND: Accurate estimation of cardiac preload during liver transplantation is essential. The right ventricular end-diastolic volume index (RVEDVI) is recognized as a good preload indicator in patients undergoing liver transplantation. Recently, dynamic variation parameters including pleth variability index (PVI) have been used as predictors of fluid responsiveness. However, the correlation between PVI and preload status has not been well studied. We evaluated the relationship between PVI and RVEDVI during liver transplantation.

METHODS: Eighteen patients undergoing liver transplantation were enrolled in this study. Data of hemodynamic parameters including PVI derived by Masimo Rainbow SET Pulse CO-Oximeter, central venous pressure (CVP), pulmonary arterial occlusion pressure (PAOP), and RVEDI were obtained at 10 defined time points throughout liver transplantation. The correlation between RVEDI and CVP, PAOP, and PVI was analyzed using Spearman rank test. We also investigated the ability of PVI to accurately differentiate RVEDI <123 or >142 mL/m² using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis.

RESULTS: There was fair to good correlation between PVI and RVEDI (correlation coefficient = -0.492, P < .001). The correlation coefficient between CVP, PAOP, and RVEDI was 0.345 and 0.463, respectively. A 13.5% cutoff value of PVI estimated the RVEDI <123 mL/m² (area under the curve [AUC] = 0.762). A 12.5% cutoff value of PVI estimated the RVEDI >142 mL/m² (AUC = 0.745).

CONCLUSIONS: PVI presented as a reliable estimate of preload status and may be a useful predictor of fluid responsiveness in patients undergoing liver transplantation.