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Citation for published version (APA):

Document status and date:
Published: 01/01/2008

Document Version:
Publisher’s PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:
• A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher’s website.
• The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
• The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

Link to publication

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:
www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:
openaccess@tue.nl
providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Predicting the initial postoperative flow after AVF creation for hemodialysis: two modeling approaches
W. Huberts, E. M. H. Bosboom, J. H. M. Tordoir, F. N. van de Vosse

Introduction
Functioning of hemodialysis arteriovenous fistula (AVF) immediately after surgical creation is mainly hampered by nonmaturation, which is characterized by insufficient flow increase and insufficient vessel remodeling. Despite available preoperative diagnostics 20-50 of all newly created AVFs fail [1, 4]. The initial postoperative flow (pFV) increase is generally accepted to be indicative for proper maturation [4].

Objective
The aim of this study is to compare a lumped parameter model with a 1D-wave propagation model in their ability to predict the postoperative flow increase after AVF creation.

Methods
Vascular hemodynamics is simulated with two different modeling approaches, lumped parameter modeling [3, 5] and 1D-wave propagation modeling [2]. For both models the human vascular tree is divided into segments representing local blood and vessel wall properties (Fig.1). All models are adapted to patient-specific conditions and results are compared with clinical measurements.

0D-lumped parameter model [3, 5]: Pressure is represented by electrical potential and flow by electrical current. A resistor and an inductor are used to model the viscous and inertial blood properties. Vessel compliance is modeled with a condenser.

1D-wave propagation model [2]: Flow in a vessel is divided in an inertia dominated core and a friction dominated boundary layer. By assuming equilibrium between inertia and viscous forces at the transition from core to boundary layer, a velocity profile as function of the flow and the pressure gradient is derived that is used to solve the 1D momentum equation.

Results and discussion
Both modeling approaches were able to describe the acute hemodynamical effects associated with AVF creation and give similar results (Fig. 2,3). In both models the flow increases dramatically after RCAVF creation in accordance with duplex measurements.

Fig. 2 Example of the pressure contours before and after RCAVF

Fig. 3 Example of the flow contours before and after RCAVF creation for the 0D- (black) and the 1D-model (red).

The 0D-model is easier to adapt to patientspecific conditions, while it is more difficult to incorporate nonlinear terms (e.g. viscoelasticity). In addition, vessel tapering within a segment is neglected in the 0D-model. Model improvements are necessary to improve the patient-specific predictions.

Future work
• Improve the modeling of the veins and anastomosis
• Perform a parameter study
• Obtain more accurate input data: MR and US (n=60)
• Determine the models predictive value
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