Overview of critical care and fluid management in brain injury

Dr. Mustafa Ibrahim Alsomali, Dr. Ziad Ali Alamri

Abstract:

The goal of this narrative review is: to sum up existing guidelines and contemporary literature on routine (maintenance) fluid management in critically sick brain-injured patients (traumatic brain injury (TBI), subarachnoid haemorrhage (SAH), intracerebral haemorrhage (ICH), ischaemic stroke), with a focus on the amounts and types of fluids and volume and circulatory status monitoring; and to discuss practical problems of fluid management. Search Strategy. We performed a comprehensive search of a large number of computerized databases restricted to the English language from inception to November, 2017 (MEDLINE, CINAHL, Cochrane Network). Search terms were related to critical care and fluid management in brain injury.Routine fluid management might affect clinical outcomes in brain-injured patients. However, the effect of fluid management on brain pathophysiology is complicated due to numerous intermediate aspects governing their relationship. More recent literature has shown that hypervolemia might be detrimental similar to non-brain-injured seriously ill patients. Nonetheless, research study on outcomes of fluid overload is seriously obstructed by an absence of uniform meanings and the fact that cerebral oedema is difficult to regularly examine. Although the general aim of fluid management in critically sick brain-injured patients is euvolemia using

isotonic fluids, ascertainment of euvolemia is problematic in regular clinical technique without haemodynamic monitoring. For that reason, awareness of possible damage from both hypovolemia and hypervolemia may presently be insufficient.

Introduction:

Fluid management in critically sick brain-injured patients is aimed at maintaining appropriate cerebral blood flow (CBF) and oxygenation. However, fluid management in brain-injured patients has numerous distinguishing characteristics compared to non-brain-injured seriously sick patients: (1) fluid tonicity is a more significant problem; (2) tissue oedema not just results in oxygen diffusion disabilities but might also hinder CBF due to the unfavourable volume--pressure characteristics of the intracranial content; (3) fluid management is frequently considered 'fundamental care' in mind injury, whereas liquid management in various other seriously ill patients is typically directed by haemodynamic monitoring, rendering it 'intensive care'; and (4) optimizing CBF with adequate fluid management appears intrinsically extra tough compared to systemic circulation, due to the fact that advanced monitoring tools for CBF and cerebral oxygenation are usually much less well carried out in medical practice. These distinctive functions of fluid management in brain-injured patients should have examination, due to the fact that recent data (both within and outside the area of neurocritical care) suggest that the 'basic care' of fluid administration in brain-injured patients might have an influence on end result [1], [2], [3].This is particularly significant since liquid management techniques in brain-injured patients are extremely variable [4], [5], which may partially be triggered by that released guideline

referrals on fluid management [6] are based on low-grade proof or may be regarded as imprecise (e.g. 'euvolemia' undergoes interpretation).

The goal of this narrative review is: to sum up existing guidelines and contemporary literature on routine (maintenance) fluid management in critically sick brain-injured patients (traumatic brain injury (TBI), subarachnoid haemorrhage (SAH), intracerebral haemorrhage (ICH), ischaemic stroke), with a focus on the amounts and types of fluids and volume and circulatory status monitoring; and to discuss practical problems of fluid management.

Methodology:

Search Strategy. We performed a comprehensive search of a large number of computerized databases restricted to the English language from inception to November, 2017 (MEDLINE, CINAHL, Cochrane Network). Search terms were related to critical care and fluid management in brain injury. In addition, we perused the references from all included studies and enlisted the help of a librarian to ensure a thorough search.

Discussion:

- **Pathophysiological considerations**

Some standard concepts are relevant to recognize reliable fluid management in brain injury. The impact of fluid administration or quantity status on CBF and cerebral oxygenation is complicated

because lots of factors figure out the impact of the initial on the latter (Fig. 1). Additionally, critically ill brain-injured patients are especially vulnerable to disturbances of intravascular volume, electrolyte and osmotic disruptions as a result of central neuroendocrine disruptions and use of treatments that irritate water and sodium homeostasis, additional complicating effective fluid management.

Tonicity

Osmolality of plasma and brain interstitial fluid and CSF are equal under regular circumstances [7].Hypotonic fluids trigger water changes to the brain due to the fact that the blood- mind obstacle (BBB) is water absorptive whereas hypertonic liquids are popular for their capacity to cause mind dehydration, both when the BBB is intact and is disrupted [8].Neurons could compensate for such liquid changes by active solute depletion to the extracellular area to trigger reactive 'shrinkage', and the BBB endothelial and other extremely specialized cells within the so-called neurovascular system will run in a similar way to remove water to the intravascular area [9]. Nevertheless, BBB disruption locally abolishes its ability to control homeostasis of electrolytes, water and other solutes, and fluid shifts will end up being a lot more dependent on regional pressure differences in between the intravascular and extravascular compartment than osmotic tension. In comparison to outer tissues, where endothelium is extremely absorptive to electrolytes and oedema development is essentially proportional to the infused volume of isotonic fluids, electrolytes do not distribute easily with an intact BBB. This is a vital system securing the brain from oedema even when really high amounts of isotonic fluids are provided [9].

Oedema

Cerebral oedema is stratified relying on area (intracellular or extracellular) and BBB disturbance. Cytotoxic oedema is the cellular oedema of nerve cells or astrocytes and is the result of mainly salt and water shifts right into the cells after an insult with ATP deficiency and mitochondrial dysfunction [10].Vasogenic oedema represents both water and albumin changes via disrupted endothelial limited junctions. An intermediate sort of oedema is ionic oedema, resulting from countervailing solute and water shifts from the vascular area to the interstitium with an undamaged BBB after the formation of cytotoxic oedema has lowered interstitial osmolality.

Autoregulation

Autoregulation concerns the capability of the blood vessels in the brain to sustain CBF by vasodilation or vasoconstriction over a vast array of systemic blood pressures, and in an extra general feeling might be considered as the ability of mind vessels to control blood circulation in feedback to adjustments in metabolic demands. The connection in between volume status and undamaged autoregulation connects to boosted CBF to protect oxygen delivery in reaction to fluid loading and lowered haematocrit or to preserving continuous CBF through vasodilation when high blood pressure drops due to hypovolemia.

Venous outflow impedance

Perfusion pressure determinants are both upstream and downstream pressures, with upstream pressures being arterial and downstream pressures being venous. Both reduced arterial pressures and higher venous pressures will theoretically lead to reduced perfusion stress, albeit with different repercussions (i.e. low flow versus tissue oedema) [11].Enhanced central venous pressure (CVP) may impede venous discharge from the brain and add to raised intracranial

pressure (ICP) or cerebral oedema. Nevertheless, increased CVP will in principle not be moved to the intracranial compartment so long as intracranial venous frameworks are collapsed under the impact of ICP before exiting the cranium, and ICP can not be impacted by the extracranial CVP that is generally a lot lower than the ICP (waterfall result) [12].As a result, venous pressure transferral back to the intracranial components is possible when ICP is reduced compared to either CVP or positive-end expiratory pressure (PEEP) in mechanically aerated patients with brain trauma [13], or when numerous negative scenarios act simultaneously to annoy brain compliance (e.g. hypotonic fluid loading, high CVD, recent brain injury with oedema) as has been received animal experiments, yet examinations have yielded contradictory results [14].Although high PEEP could influence ICP on the 'venous side' via pressure back-transferral, it may also and separately affect ICP on the 'arterial side' depending upon whether autoregulation is intact (e.g. when intact, PEEP impedes venous return, resulting in arterial hypotension with cerebral vasodilation and ICP surges) [13].

- **Monitoring of volume and circulatory status**

A thorough literature search by delegates from a 2010 SAH consensus conference that selected studies on clinical tracking and volume condition (n= 16) highlighted several essential findings [15].Initially, bedside evaluation of volume status is not exact due to the fact that sensitivity and favorable predictive values for hypovolemia and hypervolemia were much less compared to or equivalent to 0.37 and 0.06 respectively. These data seem to bring into question the efficiency of alert fluid equilibrium management in establishing euvolemia. Second, blood volume dimensions to guide fluid management appear feasible and could contribute to the prevention of hypovolemia, but these results are from a little study and blood quantity measurements are not commonly offered. Third, transpulmonary thermodilution (TPT) strategies seem feasible to assist

fluid management after SAH. The wrapping up remarks of this literary works search concentrated on fluid 'discrepancy', but stressed hypovolemia as a more stringent problem after SAH than hypervolemia. A current systematic testimonial on innovative hemodynamic monitoring in brain-injured patients (SAH, heart attack, TBI, stroke [16] revealed that such monitoring is extensively applied using various protocols based on regional experience. Lots of various other- at some time inconsistent- organizations between haemodynamic specifications and clinically relevant outcomes were located, however the authors concluded that even more study is required. The publication revealed that the connection between systemic haemodynamics and cerebral perfusion and oxygenation was hardly examined [16].

- **Transpulmonary thermodilution**

In SAH patients, TPT monitoring seems a practical technique of assessing quantity status and may aid to boost end result [24].SAH patients had lower international end-diastolic index (GEDI, as a criterion for cardiac preload) but greater cardiac index instantly after SAH, pertaining to enhanced catecholamines indicating supportive activation. The enhanced cardiac result in spite of lowered GEDI is difficult to explain by real hypovolemia, because this would lead to reduced GEDI and low cardiac output. Splanchnic vasoconstriction with acute fluid changes from the abdominal to the thoracic compartment was explained in pet experiments as a causal device for neurogenic pulmonary oedema in acute brain trauma [17], and might describe volume contraction in the scenario of increased cardiac outcome [18].A relation between reduced GEDI and the incident of DCI has been explained however whether this shows real hypovolemia remains to be developed [23].With TPT, fluid consumption might be dramatically decreased as compared with a fluid strategy focusing on a CVP of 5- 8 mmHg, causing less DCI and a pattern to better functional end result, confirmed in a succeeding study by the exact same detectives [24] Another

study located that influencing GEDI and cardiac output by 'triple-H' did not succeed despite properly greater fluid consumption and high blood pressure [22].

- **Fluid responsiveness**

Fluid responsiveness (boosted cardiac output in reaction to a fluid obstacle) in patients with cardiac output monitoring may aid to enhance cerebral oxygenation (partial pressure of brain tissue oxygen (PBrO2)), which was undoubtedly well shown in a current study in SAH patients: fluid responsiveness was related to improvements in PBrO2 and cerebral perfusion pressure [19].In comparison, other researches in both SAH and TBI patients could not verify such organizations between fluid loading or cardiac outcome and CBF or PBrO2. Intravascular pressures, especially CVP, have not been shown to be particularly helpful as medical specifications to examine fluid responsiveness [20].In contrast, vena cava distensibility is called a trustworthy dynamic indication of quantity standing in SAH patients and might hold promise for clinical usage [21].

- **Fluid management in critically ill brain-injured patients: practical issues**

Goals of fluid management

In accordance with the consensus statement on multimodality monitoring in neurocritical care [25] the goal of fluid management is optimization of cerebral perfusion and oxygenation and lessening additional brain disrespects. Notably, ample fluid management in brain injury ought to preferably be directed by some step of brain function as a representation of adequacy of cerebral perfusion and oxygenation, given that these are the actual endpoints of fluid titration.

Volume standing: how to define in brain injury?

There is wide agreement that hypovolemia must typically be prevented in acute brain injuries. Hypovolemia in this context may be specified as an intravascular volume that is inadequate to receive minimally sufficient cerebral perfusion and oxygenation. Euvolemia might be defined as an intravascular volume that sustains the needed cerebral perfusion for adequate mind oxygenation. Specifying 'hypervolemia' in brain injury is less straightforward. Of note, the distinguishing characteristic of hypervolemia versus hypovolemia or euvolemia is that it concerns exactly what is outside the blood circulation (i.e. the extravascular room), which makes its evaluation and meaning far more difficult. For contrast, clinical instances outside neurocritical care are oliguria in fluid-overloaded septic and decompensated cardiac arrest patients representing venous blockage [26].Certainly, these scenarios with oliguria do not call for liquid loading, considering that venous blockage will after that increase and the 'congestive kidney failing' get worse. A boost in CVP will promote tissue oedema, leading to a dilution of the capillaries and enhanced tissue diffusion ranges for oxygen to the cells. This definition of hypervolemia originated from systemic circulation problems with the basic usage of 'hypervolemia' within the older SAH literary works, because this classification has been connected with potential benefit for 'clinical vasospasm' (DCI) in some timeless researches that assumed useful impacts of 'hypervolemia' on blood rheology and prevention of hypovolemia [27].Better, because meanings of 'hypervolemia' as a restorative approach have not been consistent in previous research studies, comparability of these studies is hindered [28].

A sensible technique to liquid management; example for SAH

A practical method to liquid management in brain-injured patients may include: maintenance fluid volumes regularly provided, the kind(s) of liquids enabled and their tonicity; and sets off for advanced haemodynamic monitoring. Monitoring may consist of invasive methods (e.g. TPT-

guided) or less invasive methods (e.g. oesophageal Doppler). Further, liquid management based on liquid responsiveness [29], various other vibrant hemodynamic measures (e.g. pulse pressure variant) or volumetric measures of preload (e.g. GEDI) might be favoured over filling-pressure steps such as PAOP [30].

An algorithm has been used with success by the writer in seriously ill SAH patients to substantially minimize liquid intake whilst preserving sufficient cardiac outcome and indices of cardiac preload. This formula works as an instance of exactly how the standard tenets already explained may be appeared and made sensible. Maintenance fluids must normally be focused on 30-40 ml/kg/day of isotonic crystalloids (normal saline 0.9 %), with SAH patients normally needing around 40 ml/kg/day because of greater propensity of polyuria compared with the majority of various other brain-injured patients. Triggers for application of haemodynamic surveillance with TPT have been specified in the formula, including subsequent haemodynamic objectives and 'quiting guidelines'. Because the target body organ worries the brain, awareness examined with the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) is included in the formula presuming that a flawlessly awake patient will make up a patient with appropriate CBF. The method is usually stuck to for as much as 5 days. Associated co-morbidities and scenarios that are rather frequent in brain-injured patients (diabetes insipidus, cerebral salt losing, osmotic therapies for increased ICP) are not within the scope of this testimonial and the visitor is described existing literary works [31].

Conclusion:

Routine fluid management might affect clinical outcomes in brain-injured patients. However, the effect of fluid management on brain pathophysiology is complicated due to numerous intermediate aspects governing their relationship. More recent literature has shown that

hypervolemia might be detrimental similar to non-brain-injured seriously ill patients. Nonetheless, research study on outcomes of fluid overload is seriously obstructed by an absence of uniform meanings and the fact that cerebral oedema is difficult to regularly examine. Although the general aim of fluid management in critically sick brain-injured patients is euvolemia using isotonic fluids, ascertainment of euvolemia is problematic in regular clinical technique without haemodynamic monitoring. For that reason, awareness of possible damage from both hypovolemia and hypervolemia may presently be insufficient.

Reference:

1. Orfanakis A, Brambrink AM. Long-term outcome call into question the benefit of positive fluid balance and colloid treatment after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2013;19(2):137–139. doi: 10.1007/s12028-013-9900-8.
2. Acheampong A, Vincent JL. A positive fluid balance is an independent prognostic factor in patients with sepsis. Crit Care. 2015;19:251. doi: 10.1186/s13054-015-0970-1.
3. Mascia L, Sakr Y, Pasero D, Payen D, Reinhart K, Vincent JL. Sepsis Occurrence in Acutely Ill Patients I. Extracranial complications in patients with acute brain injury: a post-hoc analysis of the SOAP study. Intensive Care Med. 2008;34(4):720–727. doi: 10.1007/s00134-007-0974-7.

4. Meyer R, Deem S, Yanez ND, Souter M, Lam A, Treggiari MM. Current practices of triple-H prophylaxis and therapy in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2011;14(1):24–36. doi: 10.1007/s12028-010-9437-z.
5. Velly LJ, Bilotta F, Fabregas N, Soehle M, Bruder NJ, Nathanson MH, et al. Anaesthetic and ICU management of aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage: a survey of European practice. Eur J Anaesthesiol. 2015;32(3):168–176. Diringer MN, Bleck TP, Claude Hemphill J, 3rd, Menon D, Shutter L, Vespa P, et al. Critical care management of patients following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: recommendations from the Neurocritical Care Society's Multidisciplinary Consensus Conference. Neurocrit Care. 2011;15(2):211–240. doi: 10.1007/s12028-011-9605-9.
6. Stokum JA, Gerzanich V, Simard JM. Molecular pathophysiology of cerebral edema. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab. 2016;36(3):513–38.
7. Tommasino C, Moore S, Todd MM. Cerebral effects of isovolemic hemodilution with crystalloid or colloid solutions. Crit Care Med. 1988;16(9):862–868. doi: 10.1097/00003246-198809000-00009.
8. Ertmer C, Van Aken H. Fluid therapy in patients with brain injury: what does physiology tell us? Crit Care. 2014;18(2):119. doi: 10.1186/cc13764.
9. Michinaga S, Koyama Y. Pathogenesis of brain edema and investigation into anti-edema drugs. Int J Mol Sci. 2015;16(5):9949–9975. doi: 10.3390/ijms16059949.
10. Leone M, Asfar P, Radermacher P, Vincent JL, Martin C. Optimizing mean arterial pressure in septic shock: a critical reappraisal of the literature. Crit Care. 2015;19:101. doi: 10.1186/s13054-015-0794-z.
11. Luce JM, Huseby JS, Kirk W, Butler J. A Starling resistor regulates cerebral venous outflow in dogs. J Appl Physiol Respir Environ Exerc Physiol. 1982;53(6):1496–1503.
12. Kurishima C, Tsuda M, Shiima Y, Kasai M, Abe S, Ohata J, et al. Coupling of central venous pressure and intracranial pressure in a 6-year-old patient with fontan circulation and intracranial hemorrhage. Ann Thorac Surg. 2011;91(5):1611–1613. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2010.09.068.
13. Mascia L, Grasso S, Fiore T, Bruno F, Berardino M, Ducati A. Cerebro-pulmonary interactions during the application of low levels of positive end-expiratory pressure. Intensive Care Med. 2005;31(3):373–379. doi: 10.1007/s00134-004-2491-2.
14. Trevisani GT, Shackford SR, Zhuang J, Schmoker JD. Brain edema formation after brain injury, shock, and resuscitation: effects of venous and arterial pressure. J Trauma. 1994;37(3):452–458. doi: 10.1097/00005373-199409000-00021.
15. Gress DR, Participants in the International Multi-Disciplinary Consensus Conference on the Critical Care Management of Subarachnoid Hemmorhage Monitoring of volume status after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2011;15(2):270–274. doi: 10.1007/s12028-011-9604-x.
16. Taccone FS, Citerio G, Participants in the International Multi-disciplinary Consensus Conference on Multimodality Monitoring Advanced monitoring of systemic

hemodynamics in critically ill patients with acute brain injury. Neurocrit Care. 2014;21(2):S38–S63. doi: 10.1007/s12028-014-0033-5.

17. Maire FW, Patton HD. Role of the splanchnic nerve and the adrenal medulla in the genesis of preoptic pulmonary edema. Am J Physiol. 1956;184(2):351–355.
18. Hamzaoui O, Georger JF, Monnet X, Ksouri H, Maizel J, Richard C, et al. Early administration of norepinephrine increases cardiac preload and cardiac output in septic patients with life-threatening hypotension. Crit Care. 2010;14(4):R142. doi: 10.1186/cc9207.
19. Kurtz P, Helbok R, Ko SB, Claassen J, Schmidt JM, Fernandez L, et al. Fluid responsiveness and brain tissue oxygen augmentation after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2014;20(2):247–254. doi: 10.1007/s12028-013-9910-6.
20. Osman D, Ridel C, Ray P, Monnet X, Anguel N, Richard C, et al. Cardiac filling pressures are not appropriate to predict hemodynamic response to volume challenge. Crit Care Med. 2007;35(1):64–68. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000249851.94101.4F.
21. Moretti R, Pizzi B. Inferior vena cava distensibility as a predictor of fluid responsiveness in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2010;13(1):3–9. doi: 10.1007/s12028-010-9356-z.
22. Tagami T, Kuwamoto K, Watanabe A, Unemoto K, Yokobori S, Matsumoto G, et al. Effect of triple-H prophylaxis on global end-diastolic volume and clinical outcomes in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurocrit Care. 2014;21(3):462–469. doi: 10.1007/s12028-014-9973-z.
23. Tagami T, Kuwamoto K, Watanabe A, Unemoto K, Yokobori S, Matsumoto G, et al. Optimal range of global end-diastolic volume for fluid management after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a multicenter prospective cohort study. Crit Care Med. 2014;42(6):1348–1356. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000163.
24. Mutoh T, Kazumata K, Terasaka S, Taki Y, Suzuki A, Ishikawa T. Early intensive versus minimally invasive approach to postoperative hemodynamic management after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Stroke. 2014;45(5):1280–1284. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.004739.
25. Le Roux P, Menon DK, Citerio G, Vespa P, Bader MK, Brophy GM, et al. Consensus summary statement of the International Multidisciplinary Consensus Conference on Multimodality Monitoring in Neurocritical Care: a statement for healthcare professionals from the Neurocritical Care Society and the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. Intensive Care Med. 2014;40(9):1189–1209. doi: 10.1007/s00134-014-3369-6.
26. Boyd JH, Forbes J, Nakada TA, Walley KR, Russell JA. Fluid resuscitation in septic shock: a positive fluid balance and elevated central venous pressure are associated with increased mortality. Crit Care Med. 2011;39(2):259–265. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181feeb15.
27. Awad IA, Carter LP, Spetzler RF, Medina M, Williams FC., Jr Clinical vasospasm after subarachnoid hemorrhage: response to hypervolemic hemodilution and arterial hypertension. Stroke. 1987;18(2):365–372. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.18.2.365.

28. Dankbaar JW, Slooter AJ, Rinkel GJ, Schaaf IC. Effect of different components of triple-H therapy on cerebral perfusion in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage: a systematic review. Crit Care. 2010;14(1):R23. doi: 10.1186/cc8886.
29. Cecconi M, De Backer D, Antonelli M, Beale R, Bakker J, Hofer C, et al. Consensus on circulatory shock and hemodynamic monitoring. Task Force of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. Intensive Care Med. 2014;40(12):1795–1815. doi: 10.1007/s00134-014-3525-z.
30. Lazaridis C. Advanced hemodynamic monitoring: principles and practice in neurocritical care. Neurocrit Care. 2012;16(1):163–169. doi: 10.1007/s12028-011-9568-x.
31. Stocchetti N, Maas AI. Traumatic intracranial hypertension. N Engl J Med. 2014;370(22):2121–30. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1208708.