Editorial Doi:10.18231/j.occ.2025.001

Hemodynamic Monitoring: Do We Interpret It Right?

Saurabh Kumar Das, MD[1] ✉

[1]Dept. of Critical Care, Max Super Speciality Hospital, Shalimar Bagh, New Delhi, India.

Email: dassk1729@gmail.com

Saurabh Kumar Das, MD. Hemodynamic Monitoring: Do We Interpret It Right?. Onco Critical Care 2025;3(1)1-4

Intravenous fluid therapy has evolved significantly from its origins in the cholera epidemics of the 19th century to its modern application in sepsis management. This evolution has been shaped by pivotal medical discoveries and landmark clinical trials, including the introduction of Early Goal-Directed Therapy (EGDT) for septic shock.[1] However, we now recognize that fluid therapy is not without risks—overzealous administration can lead to pulmonary edema, abdominal compartment syndrome, organ dysfunction, and increased mortality. [2]

A crucial question for critical care physicians remains: When should fluids be administered, and how much is appropriate? Hemodynamic monitoring aims to guide fluid therapy by assessing fluid responsiveness, defined as the ability of the heart to increase stroke volume (SV) and cardiac output (CO) in response to fluid administration.[3] Various parameters—such as Central Venous Pressure (CVP), Pulse Pressure Variation (PPV), Passive Leg Raise (PLR), and advanced techniques like pulse contour analysis (PiCCO, LiDCO)—are used to assess fluid responsiveness.[4]

But do these parameters truly guide optimal fluid therapy? This article explores the nuances of hemodynamic monitoring, questioning whether current interpretations align with clinical realities.

Fluid Responsiveness vs. Preload Responsiveness: Are They Interchangeable?

Dynamic hemodynamic parameters assess whether an increase in preload will augment cardiac output. While fluid administration is a primary means of increasing preload in hypovolemic shock, the situation is more complex in septic shock.

Septic shock is characterized by relative hypovolemia due to:

1. Venous pooling (decreased venous return)
2. Systemic vasodilation (reduced vascular tone)
3. Decreased stressed volume (blood volume actively contributing to venous return)[5]

In such cases, norepinephrine—by constricting capacitance vessels—can convert unstressed volume to stressed volume, improving preload without additional fluids.[6-7] Thus, preload responsiveness does not always mandate fluid administration. The distinction between fluid responsiveness and preload responsiveness is critical—patients may benefit more from vasopressors than fluids despite appearing "fluid-responsive."

Fluid Responsiveness vs. Unresponsiveness: What Do We Really Need to Know?

In clinical practice, hemodynamic monitoring is often used to avoid unnecessary fluid administration rather than to justify it. Consider two scenarios:

1. A young, hypovolemic patient with no prior fluid resuscitation – Clinicians rarely hesitate to administer fluids without complex monitoring.
2. An elderly patient with cardiac disease or prior fluid loading – Here, determining fluid unresponsiveness is more crucial to prevent fluid overload.

Thus, the term "test for fluid unresponsiveness" may be more clinically relevant than "test for fluid responsiveness." We administer fluids based on clinical signs of hypoperfusion—not merely because a parameter (e.g., IVC collapsibility or PLR) suggests responsiveness.

Transient Fluid Responsiveness: A Clinically Overlooked Phenomenon

A common yet underappreciated scenario:

A 44-year-old mechanically ventilated patient with hypotension and PPV >20% receives a 300 mL fluid bolus. Hemodynamics stabilize, and PPV drops to 10%. However, 30 minutes later, hypotension recurs, and PPV rises again. Subsequent boluses produce the same transient response.

This transient fluid responsiveness occurs due to:

1. Redistribution of fluid into the interstitial space
2. Rapid renal excretion
3. Increased capillary permeability (e.g., sepsis-induced glycocalyx damage)[8]
4. Compensatory hemodynamic adjustments

Repeated fluid boluses based on dynamic parameters can lead to cumulative fluid overload, yet no studies differentiate between transient vs. sustained fluid responsiveness. Should we instead consider alternative interventions (e.g., vasopressors) when responses are short-lived?

Validity of Fluid Responsiveness Parameters in Sepsis

Most studies validating fluid responsiveness parameters exclude septic patients:

1. A meta-analysis (991 patients) on PLR (ROC 0.95) included only 6% septic patients.[9]
2. A review (600 patients) on CVP included only 30 septic patients.[10]
3. Another study (330 patients) on predictive factors of FR had only 54 septic patients. [11]

While these tools perform well in hypovolemic shock, their accuracy in vasodilatory (septic) shock remains questionable. Sepsis alters vascular tone, cardiac function, and microcirculation—factors not fully accounted for in traditional hemodynamic models.

Fluid Responsiveness or Vasopressor Responsiveness?

Given the limitations of transient responsiveness and sepsis-specific inaccuracies, a critical question arises:

Should we administer fluids alone, fluids + vasopressors, or vasopressors alone when a patient is "fluid-responsive"?

Current parameters cannot differentiate between fluid- and vasopressor-mediated improvements in preload. This ambiguity risks unnecessary fluid administration, exacerbating organ edema and worsening outcomes. Future research should explore integrated hemodynamic-vasopressor responsiveness assessments.

Central Venous Pressure (CVP): Does It Still Have a Role?

CVP, long used as a surrogate for preload, is based on the assumption that end diastolic pressure reflects preload volume. However, in cardiac dysfunction, this relationship breaks down due to altered ventricular compliance.

Guyton's Model of Venous Return

Venous Return (VR) = (Mean Systemic Filling Pressure [MSFP] – CVP) / Venous Resistance

1. MSFP (~7–10 mmHg) depends on blood volume and venous tone.
2. If CVP > MSFP, venous return ceases.[6]

Thus, CVP should not be a resuscitation target, but it can serve as a safety limit:

If fluids increase CVP without improving CO, further administration risks harm.

Macro circulation vs. Microcirculation: The Disconnect

Hemodynamic monitoring primarily assesses macro circulatory parameters (e.g., CO, blood pressure), but microcirculatory dysfunction can persist despite normal systemic hemodynamics. [12]

Microcirculatory Monitoring Tools[13-14]

1. Sidestream Dark Field (SDF) Imaging – Direct visualization of microvessels.
2. Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) – Tissue oxygenation assessment.
3. Biomarkers (Angiopoietin-2, ICAM-1) – Endothelial dysfunction markers.

Despite their potential, these tools are rarely used at the bedside, leaving clinicians reliant on imperfect macrocirculatory surrogates.

Context Matters in Hemodynamic Monitoring

Critically ill patients often present with mixed shock states (hypovolemic + vasodilatory). While hemodynamic parameters may indicate fluid responsiveness, this does not always equate to a need for fluids. Key considerations include:

1. Underlying cardiac dysfunction (e.g., heart failure)
2. Risk of fluid overload (e.g., ARDS)
3. Capillary leak syndrome (e.g., sepsis)

Dynamic parameters should guide—not dictate—therapy. Future research should focus on:

1. Differentiating transient vs. sustained responsiveness
2. Integrating vasopressor effects into fluid algorithms
3. Validating tools in sepsis-specific cohorts

Ultimately, clinical judgment—not isolated numbers—should drive fluid and vasopressor decisions.

Source of Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S. Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2001;345:1368-77.

2. Boyd JH, Forbes J, Nakada TA. Fluid resuscitation in septic shock: a positive fluid balance and elevated central venous pressure are associated with increased mortality. *Crit Care Med.* 2011;39:259-65.
3. Vincent JL, De Backer D. Circulatory shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;369:1726-34.
4. Michard F, Teboul JL. Predicting fluid responsiveness in ICU patients. *Chest.* 2002;121:2000-8.
5. Hamzaoui O. Norepinephrine in septic shock: When and how much? *Ann Intensive Care.* 2018;8:77.
6. Guyton AC. Determination of cardiac output by equating venous return curves with cardiac response curves. *Physiol Rev.* 1955;35:123-129.
7. Marik PE, Baram M, Vahid B. Does central venous pressure predict fluid responsiveness? *Chest.* 2008;134:172-178.
8. Ince C. The microcirculation is the motor of sepsis. *Crit Care.* 2005;9(4):S13-9.
9. Monnet X, Marik P, Teboul JL. Passive leg raising for predicting fluid responsiveness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive Care Med. 2016;42:1935-47
10. Marik PE, Baram M, Vahid B. Does central venous pressure predict fluid responsiveness? A systematic review of the literature and the tale of seven mares. Chest. 2008;134:172-8.
11. Michard F, Teboul JL. Predicting fluid responsiveness in ICU patients: a critical analysis of the evidence. Chest. 2002;121:2000-8
12. De Backer D. Microcirculatory alterations in shock. *Intensive Care Med.* 2021;47:1171-87.
13. Hernandez G. NIRS and vascular occlusion test in septic shock. *Crit Care.* 2019;23:203.
14. Boerma EC. SDF imaging for microcirculatory assessment. *Crit Care.* 2020;24:311.