Fluid loading therapy to prevent spinal hypotension in women undergoing elective caesarean section
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BACKGROUND Fluid loading is one of the recognised measures to prevent hypotension due to spinal anaesthesia in women scheduled for a caesarean section.

OBJECTIVE We aimed to evaluate the current evidence on fluid loading in the prevention of spinal anaesthesia-induced hypotension.

DESIGN Systematic review and network meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis and meta-regression.

DATA SOURCES Medline, Epub, Embase.com (Embase and Medline), Cochrane Central, Web of Science and Google Scholar were used.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA Only randomised controlled trials were used. Patients included women undergoing elective caesarean section who received either crystalloid or colloid fluid therapy as a preload or coload. The comparator was a combination of either a different fluid or time of infusion.

RESULTS A total of 49 studies (4317 patients) were included. Network meta-analysis concluded that colloid coload and preload offered the highest chance of success (97 and 67%, respectively). Conventional meta-analysis showed that crystalloid preload is associated with a significantly higher incidence of maternal hypotension than colloid preload: risk ratio 1.48 (95% CI 1.29 to 1.69, \( P < 0.0001 \), \( I^2 = 60\% \)). However, this result was not supported by Trial Sequential Analysis. There was a significant dose–response effect for crystalloid volume preload (regression coefficient \( = −0.073 \)), which was not present in the analysis of only double-blind studies. There was no dose–response effect for the other fluid regimes.

CONCLUSION Unlike previous meta-analyses, we found a lack of data obviating an evidence-based recommendation. In most studies, vasopressors were not given prophylactically as is recommended. Studies on the best fluid regimen in combination with prophylactic vasopressors are needed. Due to official european usage restrictions on the most studied colloid (HES), we recommend crystalloid coload as the most appropriate fluid regimen.
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Introduction

Hypotension following spinal anaesthesia for caesarean section can occur in up to 80% of women without prophylactic measures.\(^1\) For many years, this was believed to arise primarily as a result of venous vasodilation. However, studies that have utilised cardiac output monitoring have demonstrated that arterial vasodilation is more likely to be responsible for the decrease in blood pressure following spinal anaesthesia, at least initially.\(^2\) The focus of attention for prophylaxis and management has therefore shifted from fluid-loading strategies to the extensive investigation of the role of vasopressors. Currently, the alpha-agonist phenylephrine, which directly counteracts the sympatholysis-induced decrease in arterial resistance and is associated with a lower incidence of foetal acidosis, has become the preferred agent.\(^3,4\) A phenylephrine infusion commencing at the time of the spinal injection...
is currently recommended as the most effective approach to prevent hypotension, although phenylephrine boluses given prophylactically or noradrenaline infusion may be at least as effective. However, fluid loading strategies remain another part of an antihypotensive strategy, as they can counteract the relative hypovolaemia due to venodilation and, by increasing the venous return, help to maintain haemodynamic stability. Despite the effectiveness of phenylephrine, a significantly higher frequency of hypotension has been observed when no fluid is given. In addition, the CAESAR study demonstrated that a mixed hydroxyethyl starch–Ringer’s lactate based preload infusion reduced maternal hypotension compared with a pure Ringer’s lactate based preload when combined with intravenous (i.v.) phenylephrine boluses. In addition, the decrease in the incidence of severe and/or symptomatic hypotension is even more pronounced. A survey showed that many obstetric anaesthetists still favour fluid therapy in their clinical practice.

Recently, a meta-analysis was published focusing on the use of vasopressors in the prevention of hypotension after spinal anaesthesia for caesarean delivery. This found that either norepinephrine or metaraminol is less likely than phenylephrine to affect foetal acid-base status adversely. Another meta-analysis addressing methods to prevent hypotension after spinal anaesthesia for caesarean section was also recently published: the main focus was on vasopressor use, but also included fluid therapy. Metaraminol was found to be the most effective vasoppressor, and colloid, given as a preload, was the most effective fluid for preventing maternal hypotension. However, it is unclear whether this meta-analysis is sufficiently powered to make firm conclusions. Previously, it has been shown that the conclusions of meta-analyses that do not incorporate trial sequential analysis (TSA) are often premature due to a lack of sufficient data. The use of TSA can calculate the power of a meta-analysis and thereby provide more definite and reliable conclusions.

Traditional meta-analysis only enables direct pairwise comparison of two interventions. Although most studies have two treatment arms for fluid therapy, there are variations in the combinations of time of administration and type of fluid used. We therefore chose to carry out a network meta-analysis, which allows conclusions from indirect comparisons: if regimen A is better than B and if C is better than B, then network meta-analysis allows for conclusions on the relationship between C and A, although no direct comparisons have been performed. Consequently, this statistical method is more appropriate than conventional meta-analysis, for suggesting the most promising treatment regimen. The aim of this article is to define the best fluid strategy to prevent spinal anaesthesia-induced hypotension in elective caesarean section.

Materials and methods

Protocol and registration

Our study was registered with PROSPERO (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk, registration number CRD42018099347) and was conducted in agreement with the PRISMA statement.

Search strategy

We performed an electronic search on 22 October 2019, searching the databases Medline, Epub, Embase.com (Embase and Medline), Cochrane Central, Web of Science and Google Scholar, with details of the search strategy given in the appendix (S2. Details of literature search, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A404). There was no language restriction.

Eligibility criteria and study selection

We used the items of the PICOS acronym to define inclusion criteria:

Patients: Adult (as defined by the authors of the studies) women undergoing elective caesarean section.

Intervention: Two types of fluid were studied, crystalloid and colloid, given at one of two possible time-points: A, as a preload before spinal anaesthesia and B, as a coload on injection of the spinal medication.

Comparator: Each of the above fluid/time combinations was compared with a combination that had either a different fluid (number) or time (letter) of administration.

Outcomes: Primary outcome: incidence of maternal hypotension, as defined by the individual authors. Secondary outcomes: umbilical artery pH, ephedrine use, phenylephrine use, nausea and vomiting.

Study type: Only randomised controlled trials were included.

Data collection and data extraction

Two authors (KR, MH) independently extracted data from the original papers and entered them into the RevMan file. These authors also screened the retrieved references and performed the risk of bias assessment, with discrepancies being resolved by discussion. In case this was not possible, our protocol stipulated involvement of a third author (MK). Risk ratios of dichotomous variables or mean differences of continuous variables and 95% confidence intervals were computed.

Assessment of the methodological quality

The risks of selection, performance, detection and attrition bias were assessed with the Cochrane tool and entered into the RevMan file. Only double-blind studies were considered as ‘low risk of bias studies’. For our primary outcome, we assessed the quality of evidence according to The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) working group approach. Evidence may be downgraded due to
risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision and publication bias.

Statistical analysis

Conventional meta-analysis

We used the random effects model because heterogeneity was expected. An aggregate effect estimate was only calculated when there were at least three studies with a combined total of 100 patients (minimum) per treatment group. To estimate heterogeneity in our analyses, the $I^2$ statistic was used. For the calculations, we used the frequentist method, based on the graph-theoretical method by Rücker et al. Treatment effects were expressed as risk ratios or mean difference with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). The $I^2$ statistic was used to assess heterogeneity in the network analysis. Potential inconsistency was explored by looking at differences between estimates from direct and indirect comparisons. The results of the NMA were presented in a league table. All pairwise comparisons are given in a square matrix. The treatments were ranked by $P$-scores. $P$-scores are based on the point estimate and standard errors of the network estimates. A $P$-score is an averaged measure of the extent of certainty that a treatment is better than others. The league table is sorted by the $P$-scores. A sensitivity analysis was performed including only double-blind studies.

Meta-regression

To look for dose–response relationships of volume, we performed a meta-regression. A random effects model was used. Proportions of events were log transformed. All analyses were presented in bubble plots. When significant differences were found, we performed a sensitivity analysis on the double-blind studies.

Trial sequential analysis

This analysis was performed only for the ‘low risk of bias’ studies for our primary outcome namely, the incidence of maternal hypotension. The methodology has been described earlier. In short, cumulative meta-analyses are at risk of type I errors (false positive results) and type II errors (false negative results) because of repetitive testing as data accumulates. Trial sequential analysis (TSA) aims to adjust the statistical threshold to minimise these errors. Results are presented as a graph with lines representing the cumulative $Z$-curve (the $Z$ test curve is updated after each study is added), a conventional line of significance ($Z$ score $= 1.96$ for a $P$ value threshold or alpha of 5%), the required information size (RIS), the futility boundaries and a trial sequential monitoring boundary as based on the O’Brien-Fleming alpha-spending function. RIS is calculated allowing for a type I error of 5% and a type II error of 20% and heterogeneity was set to 25%. TSA figures will only be presented when trial sequential monitoring or futility boundaries were crossed.

Publication bias

A comparison-adjusted funnel plot was made to visually inspect the possibility of publication bias. We also performed the Egger test. We did the analysis for all studies and for the double-blind studies only.

Network meta-analysis

To compare the different treatment regimens, we used network meta-analysis (NMA), a statistical approach that combines direct and indirect evidence into single treatment effects. For the calculations, we used the frequentist method, based on the graph-theoretical method by Rücker et al. Treatment effects were expressed as risk ratios or mean difference with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). The $I^2$ statistic was used to assess heterogeneity in the network analysis. Potential inconsistency was explored by looking at differences between estimates from direct and indirect comparisons. The results of the NMA were presented in a league table. All pairwise comparisons are given in a square matrix. The treatments were ranked by $P$-scores. $P$-scores are based on the point estimate and standard errors of the network estimates. A $P$-score is an averaged measure of the extent of certainty that a treatment is better than others. The league table is sorted by the $P$-scores. A sensitivity analysis was performed including only double-blind studies.

Statistical programmes

Conventional meta-analysis, NMA and meta-regression were performed using RStudio (version 1.0.153; Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts, USA) with package ‘netmeta’ (version 0.9–8), and ‘meta’ (version 4.9–7). Trial sequential analysis software (version 0.9; Copenhagen Trial Unit, Copenhagen, Denmark) was used to perform this analysis.

Results

Study selection and study characteristics

With our systematic literature search, we found 49 trials considered as eligible for our analysis (Fig. 1). These included 4317 patients in total. Details of the studies are given in Table 1. Only three of the 49 studies (6%) used a prophylactic vasopressor. All 49 studies included therapeutic vasopressor use in their study protocol. Ephedrine was most often used as the vasopressor (74%), followed by phenylephrine (14%), a combination of ephedrine and phenylephrine (8%), and less often used were mephentermine (2%) and metaraminol (2%).

Risk of bias within studies

The risk of bias summary is presented in Fig. 2 and the GRADE quality of evidence can be found in Table 2. A total of 19 out of 49 studies (39%) were double-blind.

Primary outcome was incidence of hypotension

Conventional meta-analysis

Figure 3 shows the conventional meta-analysis for the incidence of hypotension. Significant results were found for the comparison of crystalloid coload with colloid coload, with a risk ratio of 1.55 (95% CI 1.25 to 1.92, $P < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 3a). Crystalloid preload compared with colloid preload gave a risk ratio for incidence of hypotension of 1.48 (95% CI 1.29 to 1.69, $P < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 60\%$) (Fig. 3b). Risk ratio for crystalloid preload compared with crystalloid coload was 1.31 (95% CI 1.04 to 1.65, $P = 0.02$, $I^2 = 69\%$) (Fig. 3c). There were no significant differences.
for the comparison colloid preload vs. colloid coload; risk ratio of 1.01 (95% CI 0.84 to 1.20, \( P = 0.92 \), \( I^2 = 12\% \)) (Fig. 3d). The other comparisons had less than three studies; hence, no effect estimate was calculated.

**Trial sequential analysis**

For all comparisons, the cumulative Z-curve did not cross the trial sequential monitoring or futility boundary, indicating that all these meta-analyses were insufficiently powered to answer the clinical question.

**Network meta-analysis**

In Figure 4a, we present the network geometry for the primary outcome. Figure 4b shows a forest plot of the network meta-analysis for the primary outcome. In Figure 4c, we present a league table sorted by rank. This shows that colloid coload had a 97% chance of being the
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Table 1 Study details

| Ref. | Year | Comparison | Number of patients | Colloid | Crystalloid | Vasopressor and amount | Vasopressor given as | Spinal analgesia | Definition of hypotension | Primary outcome | Blinding |
|------|------|------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------|
| Mercier et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 82/85 | HES 0.5I | Lactated Ringer 1l | Phenylephrine 50, or 150 μg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3, L3/4 or L4/5, 11 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 5 μg subcutaneous and 100 μg morphine | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Akman et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | Unclear: A total of 90 patients in 3 groups, so presumably 30/30/30 | HES 6% 7.5 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringer 1l | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | Lateral position L3/4 or L4/5, 12 mg of HB bupivacaine 0.5%. Patients immediately turned to supine position | 20% decrease in SBP or SBP < 100 mmHg | Incidence of hypotension and ephedrine administration | Double |
| Arora et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 30 / 30 / 30 | HES 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringer 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | Left lateral position L3/4, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine 3 ml | SBP < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Bottiger et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 37 / 37 | HES 0.5I in 0.9% normal saline | Lactated Ringer 1.5l | Phenylephrine infusion | Therapeutic and prophylactic | Sitting position L2/3 or L3/4, 12 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 5 μg fentanyl and 200 μg intrathecally injected | Incidence of hypotension | Single |
| Bouchmak et al. | 2012 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 30 / 30 | Isotonic saline 1l | Lactated Ringer 1 l | Ephedrine 6mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L4/5, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 0.75% sucrose and 100 μg morphine | Incidence of hypotension | Single |
| Cardoso et al. | 2004 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 25 / 25 | Modified fluid gelatin 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringer 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Metaraminol 0.2 mg or 0.4 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position at L2/3 or L3/4 interspace. Spinal injectate 0.5% HB bupivacaine with 40 μg fentanyl, 100 μg 0% glucose and 0.5% morphine | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Canhoto et al. | 2009 | Colloid preload vs. Colloid preload | 23 / 23 | HES 0.5I as coload or preload | NA | Ephedrine 5mg with phenylephrine 25 μg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3 or L3/4, 12 mg of 0.75% HB bupivacaine and 10 μg fentanyl and 200 μg morphine | SBP decrease < 90% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| Chumnanvej et al. | 2018 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 51 / 51 | Acetated solution 10 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | NA | Ephedrine 6mg | Therapeutic | L3/4, 2 to 2.4 ml of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 0.25% morphine | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease < 30% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single |
| Dahlgren et al. | 2005 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 56 / 53 | Dextran 60 1l | Lactated Ringer 11 l | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4 or L3/5 of 0.5% HB bupivacaine in 8.35% glucose and 10 mcg fentanyl | Incidence of hypotension: overall; SBP < 100 mmHg, clinically significant hypertension: above maternal discomfort, severe hypertension: SBP < 80 mmHg | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Dahlgren et al. | 2007 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 28 / 25 | Dextran 60 1l | Lactated Ringer 11 l | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4 or L3/5 of 0.5% HB bupivacaine in 8.35% glucose and 10 mcg fentanyl | Incidence of hypotension: overall; SBP < 100 mmHg, clinically significant hypertension: above maternal discomfort, severe hypertension: SBP < 80 mmHg | Frequency of hypotension and ephedrine consumption in patients with positive stress test | Double |
| Dyer et al. | 2004 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 25 / 25 | Lactated Ringer 20 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | NA | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | L3/4, 5 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 10 μg fentanyl | MAP < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| Ewaldsson et al. | 2011 | Colloid coload vs. Colloid coload | 25 / 25 | Dextran 2 ml kg⁻¹ | Acetated Ringer 5ml kg⁻¹ | Ephedrine 5mg | Therapeutic | Left lateral position L2/3 or L3/4, HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease > 30% from baseline | Haemodynamic outcomes | Not blinded |
| Ref. | Year | Comparison | Number of patients | Colliod | Crystalloid | Vasopressor/ or amount | Vasopressor given as | Spinal anaesthesia | Definitions of hypotension | Primary outcome | Blinding |
|------|------|------------|-------------------|---------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|---------|
| Fadd I et al. | 2016 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 37 / 37 | NA | Lactated Ringers 15 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | Ephemidine or phenylephrine | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4 or L4/5, 1.6 ml of 0.75% HB bupivacaine | MAP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| French et al. | 1999 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 80 / 80 | HES 15 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringers 15 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephemidine 3 to 6 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3, 2.5 to 3 ml 0.5 HB bupivacaine | SBP < 90 mmHg or < 70% of baseline from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Qechtahmedi et al. | 2013 | Colloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 56 / 56 | 6% HES 0.5% or 0.9% NaCl as preload or 15 ml kg⁻¹ as coload | NA | Ephemidine or phenylephrine | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4 or L3/4, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Hasen et al. | 2013 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 30 / 30 | 6% HES 8 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringers 20 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP < 100 mmHg or < 20% below baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Jacob et al. | 2012 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 50 / 50 | NA | Lactated Ringers 15 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | Ephemidine 6 mg | Therapeutic | Left lateral position L3/4 or L4/5, 2.5 ml Of HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Karien et al. | 1995 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 13 / 13 | 6% HES 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 11 | Ephemidine 5 to 10 mg | Therapeutic | Right lateral position L3/4, 13 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP < 90 mmHg or < 80% of baseline from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single |
| Kaya et al. | 2007 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 30 / 40 | Gelidexine 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 0.5% | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | L2/3 or L3/4, 10 or 4 mg of 0.5% bupivacaine | SBP < 90 mmHg or 30% decrease from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Khan et al. | 2013 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 50 / 50 | NA | Lactated Ringers 20 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Left lateral position L3/4, 3 ml of 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| Ko et al. | 2007 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 50 / 50 | 6% HES 500ml | Lactated Ringers 20 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Right lateral position L3/4, 9 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 20 μg fentanyl | SBP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Lin et al. | 1999 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 30 / 30 | 10% Dextan 40 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 11 | Ephemidine 8 mg | Therapeutic | Right lateral position L3/4 or L4/5, 11 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease of ≥ 30% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Mard-jebara et al. | 2008 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 61 / 59 | 6% HES 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 11 | Ephemidine 3 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3 or L3/4, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 2.5 μg of fentanyl and 0.1 mg of morphine | SBP < 100 mmHg or decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Matosta et al. | 2015 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 15 / 15 | 6% HES 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 11 | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4 or L4/5, 0.75% ropivacaine and 20 μg of fentanyl | SBP < 100 mmHg or decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single |
| McDonald et al. | 2011 | Colloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 30 / 30 | 6% HES 11 | Lactated Ringers 11 | Phenylinephrine 100 μg | Therapeutic and prophylactic | Sitting position L3/4, 1.2 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 15 μg of fentanyl | SBP decrease ≥ 20% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Mira et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 64 / 32 | 6% HES 10 ml kg⁻¹ 2.4% modified fluid, gelatin 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Lactated Ringers 30 ml kg⁻¹ | Phenylinephrine 80 μg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L3/4, 2 ml of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 25 μg of fentanyl | SBP < 100 mmHg or decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Nishikawa et al. | 2007 | Colloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 18 / 18 | 6% HES 15 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | NA | Ephemidine 4 mg | Therapeutic | Lateral position L3/4, 11.5 to 15 ml 0.5% HB bupivacaine | SBP decrease ≥ 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Oh et al. | 2014 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 30 / 30 | NA | Hartmann’s solution 15 ml kg⁻¹ as coload or preload | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Right lateral position L3/4, 8 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and fentanyl | SBP decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| Razavi et al. | 2018 | Crystalloid preload vs. Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 24 / 25 | 6% HES 7 ml kg⁻¹ as preload or coload | Lactated Ringers solution 15 ml kg⁻¹ as preload or coload | Ephemidine 5 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3 or L3/4, 12 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine with 20 μg of fentanyl | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease ≥ 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double |
| Rondhani et al. | 2014 | Colloid preload vs. Crystalloid preload | 48 / 53 | 6% HES 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 0.9% saline solution 5 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephemidine 6 mg | Therapeutic | Sitting position L2/3 or L3/4, 10 mg of 0.5% HB bupivacaine and 2.5 μg of fentanyl and 100 μg of morphine | SBP > 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not blinded |
| Ref.          | Year   | Comparison                        | Number of patients | Collloid                  | Crystalloid                  | Vasopressor given as | Spinal anaesthesia | Definition of hypotension | Primary outcome | Blinding |
|--------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Rupner et al. | 2018   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 150 / 150          | NA                        | Lactated Ringers           | Ephedrine 6 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 20% below baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single   |
| Saghafinia et al. | 2017 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 60 / 60            | 6%: HES 7 ml kg⁻¹         | Normal saline 15 ml kg⁻¹  | Ephedrine 5 to 10 mg | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or decrease > 20% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single   |
| Saleem et al. | 2016   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 100 / 100          | 3%: Hesamid 0.5% I   | Lactated Ringers 20 ml kg⁻¹ | Phenylephrine         | Therapeutic         | 0.75% HB bupivacaine with standard technique | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Shah et al.   | 2015   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 50 / 50            | NA                        | Lactated Ringers 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Ephedrine or phenylephrine | Therapeutic         | Not mentioned          | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Sharma et al. | 1997   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 19 / 21            | 6%: HES 0.5% I   | Lactated Ringers 11       | Ephedrine 5 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP decrease < 75% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single   |
| Siddik et al. | 2000   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 20 / 20            | 10%: HES 0.5% I   | Lactated Ringers 11       | Ephedrine 5 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Single   |
| Siddik/Sajid et al. | 2009  | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid preload | 68 / 90            | 6%: HES 0.5% I as coload or preload | Lactated Ringers 12.5 mg | Ephedrine 6 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or decrease < 80% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double   |
| Singh et al.  | 2009   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 30 / 30            | 6%: HES 10 ml kg⁻¹ E1   | Lactated Ringers 20 ml kg⁻¹ | Magnepentetamine 3 mg | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease > 30% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Tamilselvan et al. | 2009 | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 40 / 20            | 1.6%: HES 0.5% I 2, 6%   | Lactated Ringers 1.5 I   | Ephedrine 6 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease > 20% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double   |
| Tawfik et al. | 2014   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 103 / 102          | 6%: HES in 0.9% NaCl 0.5% | Lactated Ringers 11       | Phenylephrine 5 µg   | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double   |
| Tech et al.   | 2009   | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid preload | 20 / 20            | 6%: HES 15 ml kg⁻¹ E1 as coload or preload | Lactated Ringers 15 I 2, 6% | Phenylephrine 25 µg  | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Ueyama et al. | 1999   | Crystalloid preload vs. Crystalloid coload | 24 / 12            | 6%: HES 0.5% I 6%: HES 11 | Lactated Ringers 1.5 I | Ephedrine 10 mg      | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Changes in blood volume and cardiac output | Not mentioned |
| Unlugenc et al. | 2015 | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 30 / 30            | 6%: HES 11 I         | Lactated Ringers 11       | Ephedrine 10 mg      | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension and blood pressure use | Double   |
| Upadja et al. | 2016   | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 25 / 25            | 6%: HES 0.5% I   | Lactated Ringers 11       | Ephedrine 5 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 100 mmHg or < 80% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Vanghry et al. | 2013   | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 20 / 20            | 6%: HES 10 ml kg⁻¹ E1 as coload or preload | Lactated Ringers 12.5 mg | Phenylephrine 25 µg  | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease > 25% of baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double   |
| Wark et al.   | 2018   | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 48 / 49            | 6%: HES 11 I         | Lactated Ringers 11       | Ephedrine 5 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or 20% decrease from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Double   |
| Yalcinkaya et al. | 2010 | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 40 / 40            | 6%: HES 10 ml kg⁻¹ E1  | Lactated Ringers 10 ml kg⁻¹ | Phenylephrine 5 mg  | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg or decrease > 25% from baseline | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned |
| Yonan et al.  | 2002   | Crystalloid coload vs. Crystalloid coload | 32 / 35            | Lactated Ringer 32       | Ephedrine 5 mg       | Therapeutic         | SBP < 90 mmHg | Incidence of hypotension | Not mentioned | Double |

NA, not applicable; SBP, systolic blood pressure; HB, hyperbaric; IB, isobaric.
best among all four treatments with the other treatments much lower: colloid preload (67%), crystalloid coload (36%) and crystalloid preload (0%). Colloid coload had a significantly lower incidence of hypotension when compared with crystalloid coload and crystalloid preload: risk ratio 0.76 (95% CI 0.61 to 0.95) and RR 0.59 (95% CI 0.47 to 0.73), respectively. There was no significant difference between colloid coload and colloid preload: risk ratio 0.87 (95% CI 0.71 to 1.07). Colloid preload lowers the incidence of hypotension significantly compared with crystalloid preload: risk ratio 0.68 (95% CI 0.60 to 0.76). Crystalloid coload lowers the incidence of hypotension significantly compared with crystalloid preload: risk ratio 0.77 (95% CI 0.65 to 0.92).

The tau² for the network model was 0.0475 and the I² statistic was 52.6%. No significant differences were found in the consistency analysis that compared the direct and indirect outcomes (P = 0.63).

Sensitivity analysis
In Figure S4a (supplementary material, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403), we present the network graph. Conventional meta-analysis of the low-bias studies showed a nonsignificant difference between comparison colloid preload and colloid coload, RR 0.83 (95% CI 0.68 to 1.03, P = 0.09, I² = 0%). Significant differences were found between the comparisons crystalloid coload and colloid coload, as well as between crystalloid preload and colloid preload: risk ratio 1.46 (95% CI 1.08 to 1.96, P = 0.01, I² = 61%) and risk ratio 1.59 (95% CI 1.28 to 1.97, P < 0.0001, I² = 61%), respectively (Figure S3b & S3c, supplementary material, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). For comparisons crystalloid preload with colloid coload, colloid coload with colloid preload and colloid preload with crystalloid coload, no forest plot is shown because less than three studies could be included.

As only a limited number of studies used a prophylactic vasopressor, we decided to not perform a sensitivity analysis.

Network meta-analysis results of the low-bias-studies can be found in Figure S4c (supplementary material, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). The ranking showed colloid preload had the highest chance of being the best (79%) followed by colloid coload (78%), crystalloid coload (37%) and crystalloid preload (6%). Colloid preload had a lower chance of hypotension if compared to crystalloid preload: risk ratio 0.64 (95% CI, 0.52 to 0.78). Colloid coload had a lower chance of hypotension if compared to crystalloid preload: risk ratio 0.64 (95% CI, 0.42 to 0.98). All other comparisons were not significant.

Publication bias
Comparison-adjusted funnel plots can be found in Fig. 5. The Egger test was significant if we included all studies (P < 0.01), suggesting possible publication bias. Sensitivity analysis with only double-blind studies showed a nonsignificant Egger test (P = 0.14), suggesting no publication bias.

Meta regression
The meta regression can be found in Figure S15 (supplementary material, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403).
We found a significant dose–response relationship for the volume of crystalloid preload (regression coefficient = −0.073 (95% CI, −0.142 to −0.005), Figure S15a, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). Sensitivity analysis with only the double-blind studies found no such relationship (regression coefficient = −0.06 (95% CI, −0.175 to −0.055). No significant dose–response was found for crystalloid coload (Figure S15b, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403), colloid preload (Figure S15c, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403) or colloid coload (Figure S15d, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403).

**Secondary outcomes**

**Ephedrine use**

Conventional analysis of studies comparing crystalloid preload with colloid preload found a lower requirement...
for ephedrine use in the colloid preload group, with a mean difference of 4.49 mg (95% CI 0.66 to 8.32, \( P = 0.02 \), \( I^2 = 90\% \)) (Figure S5b, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). Similarly, comparing crystalloid preload with crystalloid coload found a lower requirement for ephedrine use in the crystalloid coload group, with a mean difference of 7.77 mg (95% CI 1.34 to 14.20, \( P = 0.02 \), \( I^2 = 90\% \)) (Figure S5c, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). No significant differences were found between colloid preload and colloid coload (Figure S5a, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403).

Network results are shown in Figure S10, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403. Crystalloid preload required most additional ephedrine if compared to all other fluid regimes.

**Phenylephrine use**

There were only sufficient data for the comparison of colloid preload versus colloid coload, and crystalloid preload versus colloid coload. No significant differences were found for conventional and network meta-analysis (Figures S6 and S11, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403).

**Nausea and/or vomiting**

A significant increase in the incidence of nausea was found in studies that compared crystalloid preload with crystalloid coload, with a risk ratio of 2.15 (95% CI 1.45 to 3.20, \( P = 0.0002 \), \( I^2 = 0 \)) (Figure S7b, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). Network meta-analysis showed significantly less nausea with crystalloid coload compared with crystalloid preload, and colloid coload compared with crystalloid preload, with risk ratios of 0.51 (95% CI 0.31 to 0.85) and 0.51 (95% CI 0.26 to 0.99), respectively (Figure S12, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). For vomiting, there were no significant differences found in all comparisons (Figure S8 and S13, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). There were insufficient data for an analysis of nausea and vomiting as a combined outcome.

**Neonatal outcomes**

There were no significant differences in the analyses of umbilical artery pH (Figure S9 and S14, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403). There were insufficient data for an analysis of neonatal acidosis.
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Discussion
As a major result, we found an effectiveness in descending order, of colloid coload more than colloid preload, and crystalloid coload more than crystalloid preload, for the management of spinal hypotension in women undergoing elective caesarean section (Fig. 4c). Differing slightly from this, the sensitivity analysis (including double-blind studies only) demonstrated that colloid coload and colloid preload were almost equally effective 78 and 79%, respectively, whereas crystalloid coload and crystalloid preload only had a 37 and 6% chance, respectively, of success (league table: Figure S4c, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403).

In direct comparisons, we found a significantly increased incidence of hypotension when comparing crystalloid
preload with colloid preload. However, the TSA showed that there were insufficient data for a definite conclusion that colloid preload is more effective than crystalloid preload in preventing hypotension.

Likewise, conventional meta-analysis showed that crystalloid coload was more effective in preventing hypotension than crystalloid preload, but again TSA did not confirm this finding.

Meta-regression suggested a dose–response effect for crystalloid preloading only. When nonblind and single-blind studies were excluded, no dose–response relationship could be found.

With this evaluation, we aimed to present the highest level of evidence by adding a sensitivity analysis with only double-blind studies. A total of 39% of our included articles were double-blind. We consider TSA to be the most robust statistical method to decide whether there is sufficient data to make a definite conclusion. In our study, there was insufficient evidence to draw any definite conclusion if we combined TSA with only double-blind studies for the primary outcome, namely the incidence of maternal hypotension. Despite years of research on this topic, based on the negative TSA, we still came to same conclusion as Banerjee et al.\textsuperscript{79} in 2010 that no significant differences between any of the fluid loading groups can be confirmed.

Recently, a network meta-analysis on measures to prevent hypotension was published by Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{14} This focused mainly on vasopressors, therefore allowing for only limited comparisons with our study. Another major difference with our study is that those authors\textsuperscript{14} defined the administration of 500 ml or less of a crystalloid fluid as an inactive control. In our analysis, studies with this comparator would have been included in comparisons with crystalloid administrations, either pre or coload depending on the time of infusion in the individual studies. Therefore, the number of studies in the comparisons differs between Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}, and our analysis. Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{14} reported a significantly lower incidence of hypotension for colloid preload than crystalloid preload for low risk of bias studies. However, those authors used only conventional meta-analysis, while we added TSA, which did not confirm this finding. We therefore conclude that the evidence is too limited to draw a definite conclusion on differences between these two fluid regimens. Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{14} also reported significantly less hypotension after colloid coload compared with crystalloid coload. Again, our TSA analysis did not corroborate this finding. We feel our results are of clinical relevance because if there were a definite benefit of colloids, their use would have to be taken more into consideration despite their potential downsides.

Also, we cannot compare the magnitude of the effect estimate of the study of Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{14} and that of our study because those authors reported odds ratios whereas we report risk ratios. As the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions points out, odds and risk ratio are different when the events of the outcomes investigated are frequent.\textsuperscript{80} This is the case for hypotension, and thus, odds ratios overestimate the effect of the interventions.

A Cochrane analysis\textsuperscript{82} from 2017 agrees with the findings of Fitzgerald \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{14} in that crystalloid coload is more effective than preload. Ripollès Melchor \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{82} and the Cochrane review by Chooi \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{81} compared crystalloids with colloids regardless of the time-point of administration and found a significantly reduced risk of hypotension
when colloids were used. Similar conclusions were drawn in another meta-analysis from 2013.83

Another advantage of our study is that we included meta-regressions in the analysis. The dose–response of volume effect that we established suggests that the more crystalloid that is given before spinal anaesthesia, the less maternal hypotension is seen. This is, however, of little clinical relevance because crystalloid preloading is the least effective fluid loading technique. In addition,
sensitivity analyses including only double-blind studies did not find this relationship. This volume relationship was not found for either crystalloid or colloid coloading, perhaps because most of the haemodynamic effects of sympathetic blockade occur during the first 5 to 7 min after intrathecal injection and therefore, more volume would be of little help when given thereafter. From a practical perspective, this means that when using coloading, a moderate volume (1 l) is likely to be enough, and there is no benefit to prolonged i.v. fluid administration thereafter. Excessive fluid may be detrimental after caesarean section. The lack of a volume relationship for the colloid preload is more difficult to explain. A possible explanation could be the more potent volume expanding effect of colloids, that is reaching a ceiling volume effect rapidly. However, this would contrast with a study from Ueyama et al., who found a much lower incidence of maternal hypotension when preload with 11 of colloid instead of only 0.51 (17% versus 58%, respectively).

Finally, our findings must be seen in the light of the growing ambition to include patients undergoing (elective) caesarean sections in enhanced recovery programmes with shortened starvation times and proactive oral fluid consumption prior to surgery. The available data are not convincing, that this form of prehydration really does prevent spinal anaesthesia-induced hypotension. On the contrary, prevention of hypotension has been shown to contribute to enhanced recovery and therefore must be promoted.

Limitations

The use of network meta-analysis is a valuable evolution of standard meta-analysis, although there are some limitations, and interpretation of the results must be undertaken with care. Transitivity and inconsistency of the model can have an impact on the results. We tested for inconsistency between direct and indirect results for all different comparisons and found no significant difference (see Figure S1, S2 (supplementary material, http://links.lww.com/EJA/A403)). Egger’s test implied the possibility of publication bias. A sensitivity analysis restricted to double-blind studies only found no indication for publication bias. Therefore, the corresponding results may be seen as more robust.

Another limitation is the broad range of definitions of hypotension among the included studies, which can lead to different incidences of hypotension. However, the majority of the studies used a decrease in SBP of more than 20% as the definition.

To analyse the possible confounding effect of vasopressors, we planned to do a subgroup analysis, but only three of the 49 included studies used a vasopressor prophylactically, although it has been suggested as best current practice. Because of low sample size and different fluid comparisons, we decided that data were too scarce to perform such an analysis. Because vasopressors were mostly given therapeutically, we believe that the result presented must be considered as an effect of the fluids used. On the contrary, we think this is a major research gap and only studies that combine fluid with a prophylactic vasopressor allow one to define the added value of fluid.

Another cause of the heterogeneity may be due to the fact that we included all amounts of fluids and durations of administration as defined by the authors, because there is no minimal volume defined in the literature. Small volumes of fluid, especially crystalloids, given as a preload or coload are mostly less effective in controlling hypotension when compared with larger volumes. However, only two of the included studies reported using 500 ml of crystalloids, all other studies investigated larger volumes. Also, the exact timing and speed of the infusions play an important role in the treatment effect. For crystalloids, fluid may not remain in the circulation if the infusion is slow or is completed sometime before the spinal. In addition, for an 18-guage cannula a pressure bag might be required to infuse 500 ml of crystalloid in less than 7 min. Unfortunately, not all studies reported this type of important information.

A further limitation is the difficulty of translating the results of finding the highest protective efficacy with colloids into clinical practice. Regulatory restrictions have recently been imposed on hydroxyethylstarch solutions. Secondly, only a small amount of data comes from gelatine solutions and its role in peri-operative care has also recently been seriously questioned.

We only included studies on elective caesarean sections, largely conducted in healthy patients. Our conclusions therefore cannot be extrapolated to nonelective cases or women with complex pregnancies or preexisting comorbidities. Indeed, it has been reported that in some settings, for example pre-eclamptic patients, spinal-induced haemodynamic effects are less pronounced and that fluid loading may not be useful and may even be harmful. More recently, Pretorius et al. performed a meta-analysis on fluid therapy in pre-eclamptic women and could not provide a conclusion given the paucity of data.

Finally, there was a heterogeneity in the doses of the local anaesthetic used across the various studies. Bupivacaine was mainly used as the local anaesthetic in our included articles. Low doses of bupivacaine were found to be associated with less hypotension compared to higher doses and thus the dose of local anaesthetics may also play a significant role in the haemodynamic response to spinal anaesthesia.

Conclusion

Our meta-analysis supports the efficacy of colloid pre- or coloading, and of crystalloid coloading to a lesser extent,
for decreasing the incidence of hypotension during elective caesarean sections performed under spinal anaesthesia. However, TSA combined with sensitivity analysis (including only double-blind studies) showed no definite superiority of any fluid regimen. Due to European restrictions on the most studied colloid (HES), we recommend crystalloid colloid as the most appropriate fluid regimen. More research is needed to exactly define the role of the prophylactic use of vasopressors in relation to fluid therapy.
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