ISSN: 3068-2789

Review Article

Journal of All Physics Research and Applications

PiCCO Monitoring in Intensive Care: Pathophysiological Analysis and Practical Recommendations for Infusion Strategy

Belousov AN*

Laboratory of Applied Nanotechnology of Belousov, Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine

***Corresponding author:**
Belousov AN, Laboratory of Applied Nanotechnology of Belousov, Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine.

Abstract

Monitoring with the PiCCO technology (Pulse Contour Cardiac Output) has become a widely adopted method for hemodynamic assessment and fluid management in critically ill patients. The technique combines transpulmonary thermodilution and pulse contour analysis to provide continuous or intermittent measurements of cardiac output, global end-diastolic volume index (GEDVI), extravascular lung water index (EVLWI), and systemic vascular resistance index (SVRI). Despite its technological sophistication and broad clinical use, the validity, reproducibility, and universal applicability of PiCCO-derived data remain subject to ongoing debate. Particular concern arises in clinical scenarios involving altered physicochemical properties of blood, vascular dysregulation, vasoplegia, or hypoproteinemia, where thermodilution-based calculations may become inaccurate. Furthermore, neurohumoral and reflex circulatory mechanisms - such as the Schwik-Larin reflex - are not accounted for in the PiCCO model, yet may significantly impact hemodynamic dynamics and confound interpretation. This review provides a critical analysis of the methodological, physiological, and clinical limitations of PiCCO monitoring. Special emphasis is placed on the influence of blood rheology, temperature, microcirculatory changes, and endothelial dysfunction on the reliability of computed hemodynamic variables. The necessity of an integrative approach to data interpretation is emphasized, involving the correlation of PiCCO-derived parameters with the clinical picture, laboratory findings, therapeutic response, and the patient's pathophysiological status. In conclusion, PiCCO remains a potentially valuable tool in critical care; however, its effective use requires clinical vigilance, awareness of physiological constraints, and individualized therapeutic decision-making, particularly in fluid management strategies.

Keywords: PiCCO, Hemodynamic Monitoring, Transpulmonary Thermodilution, Critical Care, Vascular Tone, Blood Rheology, Pathophysiological Interpretation.

Received: January 09, 2026;
Accepted: January 19, 2026;
Published: January 26, 2026

Introduction

Modern intensive care is impossible without accurate and timely hemodynamic monitoring. Adequate infusion therapy is the cornerstone of stabilizing critically ill patients, particularly in cases of septic shock, ARDS (acute respiratory distress syndrome), trauma, severe infections, and multiple organ failure. However, traditional parameters such as arterial pressure, central venous pressure (CVP), urine output, and lactate levels often fail to provide a comprehensive picture of intravascular volume, preload, and tissue perfusion efficiency. This creates the risk of both hypovolemia and fluid overload, which may worsen the prognosis.

In the search for more reliable and informative tools to assess volume status, the PiCCO (Pulse Contour Cardiac Output) method was developed, combining transpulmonary thermodilution with arterial pressure waveform analysis. Unlike invasive pulmonary artery catheterization (Swan–Ganz method), PiCCO provides information on parameters such as cardiac output (CO), global end-diastolic volume index (GEDVI), extravascular lung water index (EVLWI), systemic vascular resistance index (SVRI), myocardial contractility (dPmax), and others [1–4]. This makes the technology particularly attractive for use in intensive care units,

Citation: Belousov AN (2026) PiCCO Monitoring in Intensive Care: Pathophysiological Analysis and Practical Recommendations for Infusion Strategy. J All Phy Res Appli 1: 1-4.

where rapid and precise hemodynamic assessment is required in unstable patients.

Moreover, the method allows for the evaluation of so-called "volume responsiveness" and enables tailoring of infusion strategies to individual patient needs, which is especially important in goal-directed therapy. In many guidelines and clinical protocols, PiCCO is recommended as a reference tool for determining the required volume of fluid resuscitation, preventing pulmonary edema, and ensuring the rational use of vasoactive agents [5–7].

Rationale for Critical Appraisal

Nevertheless, despite its attractiveness and technological sophistication, the PiCCO method is not without limitations. Its accuracy and reproducibility may be significantly affected by physiological, biochemical, and rheological factors such as blood properties, vascular wall condition, concomitant metabolic disturbances, as well as the specifics of the measurement procedure itself. In addition, certain theoretical assumptions underlying the interpretation of PiCCO-derived parameters remain controversial and require reconsideration in light of clinical practice.

The aim of this review is to critically examine the limitations, methodological challenges, and risks associated with the use of PiCCO technology in intensive care. Particular attention is given to physiological and clinical-laboratory factors influencing data interpretation, as well as to the rationale for adopting an integrative and balanced approach to the analysis of obtained parameters, which is especially important in the context of high clinical relevance of therapeutic decision-making.

Limitations and Methodological Challenges of the PiCCO Technology

Criticism of the Excessive Emphasis on Central Venous Pressure (CVP)

In recent years, the clinical significance of central venous pressure (CVP) as a predictor of volume responsiveness has been increasingly questioned [8]. A particularly influential position was presented in a meta-analysis [9], which concluded that CVP has low predictive value for assessing the response to fluid loading. However, such a viewpoint is one-sided and methodologically vulnerable.

First, the absolute value of CVP indeed cannot serve as a universal predictor of fluid responsiveness, as it depends on right ventricular compliance, intrathoracic pressure, and numerous other variables. Nevertheless, CVP dynamics over time—particularly in serial measurements before and after fluid administration—can provide valuable insights into changes in preload and hemodynamic adaptation. This is supported by clinical observations where an increase in CVP following a fluid challenge, without improvement in cardiac output, may indicate fluid overload [10].

Second, the cited meta-analyses lacked strict randomization, suffered from heterogeneous populations, and included studies with different methodologies for hemodynamic assessment. As rightly noted by Teboul JL and colleagues (2016), "meta-analyses are quantitative summaries, but not always qualitatively reliable recommendations for clinical practice" [11].

Thus, CVP should not be entirely dismissed as a hemodynamic parameter. Rather, it should be used in conjunction with other indicators, including dynamic tests, ultrasound findings, PiCCO-derived parameters, and laboratory markers of hypovolemia.

Influence of the Physicochemical Properties of Blood on the Accuracy of Transpulmonary Thermodilution

The PiCCO technology is based on the method of transpulmonary thermodilution, in which changes in blood temperature are recorded after intravenous bolus administration of a cold indicator solution. This method enables the calculation of key hemodynamic parameters, including GEDVI and EVLWI. The basis of these calculations is the thermodilution curve, which reflects standard physical interactions of the indicator with blood.

However, in clinical practice, the accuracy of these calculations directly depends on the physicochemical properties of blood. Unlike a homogeneous fluid, blood is a complex colloidal–cellular system composed of formed elements, plasma proteins, lipids, ions, buffering components, and biologically active molecules. Blood viscosity and thermal conductivity are dynamic parameters that can change under the influence of temperature, pH, osmolarity, albumin concentration, fibrinogen levels, and hemostatic activity [12,13].

Most PiCCO calculations are based on models of linear bolus distribution, which do not adequately reflect the true physiological heterogeneity of blood flow and vascular architecture in critically ill patients [14]. Therefore, changes in viscosity, hematocrit, erythrocyte and platelet aggregation, and vascular compliance may substantially distort the thermodilution curve and, consequently, lead to inaccurate values of GEDVI and EVLWI [15–18].

For example, in hypoproteinemia, reduced plasma viscosity accelerates indicator dispersion, resulting in overestimation of cardiac output and underestimation of volumes. Leukocytosis and thrombocytosis affect microcirculation and phase distribution, while hemolysis, the presence of microthrombi, and endothelial dysfunction (e.g., in sepsis) disrupt uniform bolus distribution within the vascular bed [19–23].

Thus, despite the high sensitivity of the method, PiCCO monitoring results must be interpreted with consideration of the physicochemical properties of blood, especially in patients with acute disturbances of homeostasis. This requires clinicians to recognize the limitations of the method and the necessity of periodic recalibration when significant changes in blood composition and properties occur.

Physiological Limitations of Thermodilution Monitoring: The Role of the Shwiegk–Larin Reflex

The hemodynamics of the pulmonary and systemic circulations are closely interconnected through mechanisms of neurohumoral and reflex regulation. One such underexplored yet important mechanism is the Shwiegk–Larin reflex, according to which

an increase in pulmonary vascular pressure induces a reflex decrease in systemic arterial pressure, bradycardia, redistribution of blood to the reticuloendothelial system, and vasodilation in skeletal muscles [24–27]. This protective mechanism is aimed at unloading the pulmonary capillaries and preventing pulmonary edema [28–31].

However, during PiCCO monitoring, such adaptive responses are not taken into account, which may lead to underestimation of pulmonary circulation perfusion and overestimation of systemic vascular resistance. In conditions of hypoproteinemia, increased capillary permeability, and vasoplegia (e.g., in septic shock), the predictive accuracy of parameters such as GEDVI and SVRI is significantly reduced.

Thus, interpreting PiCCO-derived data without considering neurohumoral vascular regulation may result in misleading clinical conclusions and potentially irrational infusion strategies.

The Importance of Infusion Rate in the Interpretation of Preload Parameters

One of the key principles of infusion therapy is the assessment of volume responsiveness, or the ability of cardiac output to increase in response to fluid loading. However, not only the infused volume but also the rate of administration is of critical importance. When infusion is performed slowly, the effect of rapid venous return to the heart and activation of the Frank–Starling mechanism may not be realized.

In this context, PiCCO-derived indicators such as SVV (stroke volume variation) and GEDVI are calculated without accounting for the kinetics of volume loading. As demonstrated by Monnet X et al. (2015) [32], the passive leg raising (PLR) test is reliable only when there is a rapid redistribution of venous blood into the thoracic cavity. If the response to infusion is too prolonged, the test results lose their validity [33].

Furthermore, PiCCO algorithms do not account for the pharmacological effects of vasoactive agents, which alter vascular tone and compromise the predictability of volume responsiveness. Therefore, the interpretation of SVV or GEDVI outside the context of infusion rate and concomitant drug therapy is methodologically vulnerable.

Conclusion

Taken together, these findings underscore that while PiCCO technology represents a valuable advancement in hemodynamic monitoring, its clinical utility is contingent upon rigorous and context-specific interpretation. Reliable decision-making can only be achieved when PiCCO-derived parameters are integrated with a comprehensive evaluation of blood rheology, infusion load dynamics, vascular reflex responses, and corroborating clinical and laboratory indices. Failure to account for these determinants not only diminishes the diagnostic validity of the method but also increases the risk of therapeutic misjudgments in critically ill patients. Consequently, PiCCO should not be regarded as a stand-alone or universally applicable monitoring modality, but rather as an adjunctive tool whose accuracy and clinical impact depend on expert, multifactorial assessment.

References

1. Bigatello LM, George E (2002) Hemodynamic monitoring. Minerva Anestesiol 68: 219-25.
2. Payton Gore, Hong Liu, Christian Bohringer (2024) Can Currently Available Non-invasive Continuous Blood Pressure Monitors Replace Invasive Measurement With an Arterial Catheter? Cureus 16: e54707.
3. Souto Moura T, Aguiar Rosa S, Germano N, Cavaco R, Sequeira T, Alves M, Papoila AL, Bento L (2018) The accuracy of PiCCO® in measuring cardiac output in patients under therapeutic hypothermia: Comparison with transthoracic echocardiography. Med Intensiva (Engl Ed) 42: 92-98.
4. Pour-Ghaz I, Manolukas T, Foray N, Raja J, Rawal A, Ibebuogu UN, Khouzam RN (2019) Accuracy of non-invasive and minimally invasive hemodynamic monitoring: where do we stand? Ann Transl Med 7: 421.
5. University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust (2022) Guidelines for advanced haemodynamic monitoring – PiCCO. UHS East (UK); Available from: https://ru.scribd.com/document/813962775/PiCCO-guidelines-UHSx-2022-1.
6. Pulsion Medical Systems. PiCCO technology FAQs. Available from: https://www.jvsmedicscorner.com/ICU-Cardiovascular_files/PICCO%20guide.pdf
7. Getinge Group. Clinical evidence for PiCCO technology. Available from: https://www.getinge.com/dam/hospital/documents/english/picco-technology-clinical-evidence-brochure-en-non_us.pdf
8. Cecconi M, Aya HD (2014) Central venous pressure cannot predict fluid-responsiveness. Evid Based Med 19: 63.
9. Marik PE, Cavallazzi R (2013) Does the central venous pressure predict fluid responsiveness? An updated meta-analysis and a plea for some common sense. Crit Care Med 41: 1774–1781.
10. Monnet X, Teboul JL (2017) Transpulmonary thermodilution: advantages and limits. Crit Care 21: 147.
11. Teboul JL, Saugel B, Cecconi M, De Backer D, Hofer CK, et al. (2016) Less invasive hemodynamic monitoring in critically ill patients. Intensive Care Med 42: 1350–1359.
12. Baskurt OK, Meiselman HJ (2003) Blood rheology and hemodynamics. Semin Thromb Hemost 29: 435-450.
13. Saugel B, Vincent JL, Wagner JY (2017) Personalized hemodynamic management. Curr Opin Crit Care 23: 334-341.
14. Roch A, Michelet P, D'Journo B, Brousse D, Blayac D, et al. (2005) Accuracy and limits of transpulmonary dilution methods in estimating extravascular lung water after pneumonectomy. Chest 128: 927–933.
15. Xavier Monnet, Jean-Louis Teboul (2017) Transpulmonary thermodilution: advantages and limits. Crit Care 21: 147.
16. Xavier Monnet, Paul Marik, Jean-Louis Teboul (2016) Passive leg raising for predicting fluid responsiveness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive Care Med 42: 1935-1947.
17. Pour-Ghaz I, Manolukas T, Foray N, Raja J, Rawal A, et al. (2019) Accuracy of non-invasive and minimally invasive hemodynamic monitoring: where do we stand? Ann Transl Med 7: 421.
18. Kuzkov VV, Suborov EV, Kirov MY, Kuklin VN,

Sobhkhez M, et al. (2007) Extravascular lung water after pneumonectomy and one-lung ventilation in sheep. Crit Care Med 35: 1550–1559.
19. Camporota L, De Neef M, Beale R (2012) Extravascular lung water in acute respiratory distress syndrome: potential clinical value, assumptions and limitations. Crit Care 16: 114.
20. Livshits L, Bilu T, Peretz S, Bogdanova A, Gassmann M, et al. (2022) Back to the "Gold Standard": how precise is hematocrit detection today? Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis 14: e2022049.
21. Xiang M, Wu X, Jing H, Liu L, Wang C, et al. (2022) The impact of platelets on pulmonary microcirculation throughout COVID-19 and its persistent activating factors. Front Immunol 13: 955654.
22. Sakka SG, Reuter DA, Perel A (2012) The transpulmonary thermodilution technique. J Clin Monit Comput 26: 347–353.
23. Chen S, Lin P, Du Z, Lan F, Wu S, et al. (2014) Comparison of the accuracy of transpulmonary thermodilution measurement using indicators of different temperatures. Int J Clin Exp Med 7: 5711–5714.
24. Larin MA (1991) The Shwiegk-Larin Reflex and Pulmonary-Systemic Hemodynamic Balance. J Cardiopulm Med 14: 97-102.
25. Schwiegk H (1935) Der Lungenentlastungs reflex. Arch Ges Physiol 236: 206.
26. Osorio J, Russek M (1962) Reflex changes on the pulmonary and systemic pressures elicited by stimulation of baroreceptors in the pulmonary artery. Circ Res 10: 664–667.
27. Lammers S, Scott D, Hunter K, Tan W, Shandas R, et al. (2012) Mechanics and function of the pulmonary vasculature: implications for pulmonary vascular disease and right ventricular function. Compr Physiol 2: 295–319.
28. Ciarka A, Doan V, Velez-Roa S, Naeije R, van de Borne P, et al. (2010) Prognostic significance of sympathetic nervous system activation in pulmonary arterial hypertension. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 181: 1269–1275.
29. Currigan DA, Hughes RJ, Wright CE, Angus JA, Soeding PF, et al. (2014) Vasoconstrictor responses to vasopressor agents in human pulmonary and radial arteries: an in vitro study. Anesthesiology 121: 930–936.
30. Fiorentini C, Barbier P, Galli C, Loaldi A, Tamborini G, et al. (1985) Pulmonary vascular overreactivity in systemic hypertension. A pathophysiological link between the greater and the lesser circulation. Hypertension 7: 995–1002.
31. Hackett PH, Roach RC, Hartig GS, Greene ER, Levine BD, et al. (1992) The effect of vasodilators on pulmonary hemodynamics in high altitude pulmonary edema: a comparison. Int J Sports Med 13: S68–S71.
32. Monnet X, Marik PE, Teboul JL (2016) Prediction of fluid responsiveness: an update. Ann Intensive Care 6: 111.
33. Cheong I, Otero Castro V, Brizuela M, Früchtenicht MF, Merlo PM, et al. (2025) Passive leg raising test to predict fluid responsiveness using the right ventricle outflow tract velocity-time integral through a subcostal view. J Ultrasound 28: 19–25.