



Artery Research

ISSN (Online): 1876-4401

ISSN (Print): 1872-9312

Journal Home Page: <https://www.atlantis-press.com/journals/artres>

2.4: CENTRAL SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE PROVIDES ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN RISK PREDICTION IN HEMODIALYSIS PATIENTS

Christopher C. Mayer, Julia Matschkal, Pantelis A. Sarafidis, Stefan Hagmair, Georg Lorenz, Susanne Angermann, Matthias C. Braunisch, Marcus Baumann, Uwe Heemann, Christoph Schmaderer, Siegfried Wassertheurer

To cite this article: Christopher C. Mayer, Julia Matschkal, Pantelis A. Sarafidis, Stefan Hagmair, Georg Lorenz, Susanne Angermann, Matthias C. Braunisch, Marcus Baumann, Uwe Heemann, Christoph Schmaderer, Siegfried Wassertheurer (2018) 2.4: CENTRAL SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE PROVIDES ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN RISK PREDICTION IN HEMODIALYSIS PATIENTS, Artery Research 24:C, 70–70, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artres.2018.10.027>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artres.2018.10.027>

Published online: 7 December 2019

SD greater dBPV was associated with lower IPS (beta [SD difference]; 95% CI: -0.10; -0.20 to -0.00) and EF (-0.12; -0.22 to -0.01), and borderline associated with lower MF (-0.09; -0.20 to 0.01). A 1-SD greater sBPV, however, was not associated with IPS (-0.040; -0.14 to 0.06), or EF (-0.09; -0.20 to 0.022), but was borderline associated with lower MF (-0.11; -0.21 to 0.00). This effect of greater dBPV on cognitive performance is equivalent to ± 3 additional years of ageing. The stronger association of dBPV than sBPV with cognitive performance may be explained by the fact that DBP is the main determinant of MAP. Excessive dBPV may then lead to inadequate cerebral perfusion. In conclusion, greater very short- to mid-term dBPV and, to a lesser extent, sBPV could be a modifiable risk factor for cognitive impairment.

2.3

OCCUPATIONAL, SPORT AND LEISURE RELATED PHYSICAL ACTIVITY HAVE CONTRASTING EFFECTS ON NEURAL BAROREFLEX SENSITIVITY. THE PARIS PROSPECTIVE STUDY III

Rachel Climie¹, Pierre Boutouyrie¹, Marie-Cecile Perier¹, Edouard Chaussade², Matthieu Plichart², Lucile Offredo¹, Catherine Guilbout¹, Thomas van Sloten¹, Frederique Thomas³, Bruno Pannier³, James Sharman⁴, Stephane Laurent⁵, Xavier Jouven⁶, Jean-Philippe Empana⁷

¹INSERM U970, France

²APHU, Paris Descartes university, Paris, France

³Investigations Préventives et cliniques (IPC), Paris, France

⁴Menzies Institute for Medical Research, France

⁵INSERM 970, France

⁶INSERM, France

⁷INS, France

Background: Physical activity (PA) is beneficial for baroreflex sensitivity (BRS), but it is unclear whether the type of PA has similar effects on the neural (nBRS) or vascular (carotid stiffness) components of BRS. We sought to determine this in healthy adults from a community-based study via assessment of occupational (OPA), sport (SPA), leisure (LPA) and total PA (TPA).

Methods: In 8649 adults aged 50 to 75 years, resting nBRS (estimated by low frequency gain, from carotid distension rate and heart rate) and carotid stiffness were measured by high-precision carotid echotracking. PA was self-reported using the Baecke questionnaire, which distinguishes OPA, SPA, LPA and TPA. The associations between PA and nBRS and carotid stiffness were quantified using multivariate linear regression analysis. Analyses were conducted separately in the working and non-working population.

Results: In working adults (n = 5039), OPA was associated with lower nBRS function (p = 0.026) and borderline higher carotid stiffness (p = 0.08). When stratified by education, this association remained only in those with less than tertiary education. SPA was associated with higher nBRS (p = 0.0005) and borderline lower carotid stiffness (p = 0.052). Neither LPA nor TPA was associated with nBRS or carotid stiffness. In non-working adults (n = 3610), SPA and TPA were both associated with lower carotid stiffness (p = 0.012 and p = 0.020), but not nBRS. LPA was not associated with either parameter.

Conclusion: Occupation-related PA is associated with lower nBRS function and higher carotid stiffness, especially in those with lower education. Higher amounts of sport-related PA are associated with higher nBRS and lower carotid stiffness.

2.4

CENTRAL SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE PROVIDES ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN RISK PREDICTION IN HEMODIALYSIS PATIENTS

Christopher C. Mayer¹, Julia Matschkal², Pantelis A. Sarafidis³, Stefan Hagmair¹, Georg Lorenz², Susanne Angermann², Matthias C. Braunisch², Marcus Baumann², Uwe Heemann², Christoph Schmauder², Siegfried Wassertheurer¹

¹AIT Austrian Institute of Technology, Center for Health & Bioresources, Vienna, Austria

²Department of Nephrology, Technical University of Munich, Klinikum rechts der Isar, Munich, Germany

³AIT Department of Nephrology, Hippokraton Hospital, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece

Background: Association of Ambulatory Blood Pressure Monitoring (ABPM) with mortality depends on cardiac function in hemodialysis patients. Evidence for the predictive power of central Systolic Pressure (cSBP) is

inconclusive. Thus, this study aimed to investigate the additional information of ambulatory cSBP in risk prediction in a cohort of hemodialysis patients.

Methods: Within the ISAR-study cohort, 344 hemodialysis patients underwent 24 h ABPM on the dialysis day. All-cause and cardiovascular mortality served as endpoints. Risk prediction was performed using Cox regression in patients with or without atrial fibrillation (AF) or heart failure (HF) for peripheral (pSBP) and central systolic pressure calibrated with peripheral systolic and diastolic pressure (cSBP1) or peripheral mean and diastolic pressure (cSBP2). **Results:** During a mean follow-up of 37.6 (17.5 SD) months, 115 patients died, of whom 47 due to cardiovascular reasons. In patients with AF or HF, a negative association to mortality could be observed, independent of pressure location and calibration (see Table). In patients without AF or HF, these associations were to the opposite directions and cSBP2 was superior to pSBP and cSBP1 for all-cause (pSBP: HR = 1.01, p = 0.30; cSBP1: HR = 1.00, p = 0.77; cSBP2: HR = 1.01, p = 0.06) and cardiovascular (pSBP: HR = 1.03, p = 0.02; cSBP1: HR = 1.02, p = 0.06; cSBP2: HR = 1.03, p = 0.003) mortality. This circumstance was confirmed in multivariable analysis combining pSBP and differences between pSBP and cSBP (see Table).

Conclusions: This study provides evidence for the additional information of central systolic blood pressure and its dependency on calibration in risk prediction in hemodialysis patients. Further studies are needed to confirm these findings.

	AF or HF (n = 105)		no AF or HF (n = 239)	
	HR	p	HR	p
All-cause Mortality				
	59 events		56 events	
Univariate				
pSBP	0.97 (0.96, 0.98)	<0.001	1.01 (0.99, 1.03)	0.30
cSBP1	0.97 (0.95, 0.98)	<0.001	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.77
cSBP2	0.97 (0.96, 0.99)	<0.001	1.01 (1.00, 1.03)	0.08
pSBP-cSBP1	0.93 (0.85, 1.01)	0.09	1.10 (1.04, 1.17)	<0.001
pSBP-cSBP2	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	0.59	0.95 (0.91, 0.98)	0.005
Multivariable				
pSBP	0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	<0.001	1.00 (0.98, 1.01)	0.60
pSBP-cSBP1	1.01 (0.92, 1.12)	0.80	1.11 (1.04, 1.19)	0.002
pSBP	0.97 (0.96, 0.98)	<0.001	1.00 (0.99, 1.02)	0.79
pSBP-cSBP2	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)	0.83	0.95 (0.91, 0.99)	0.009
Cardiovascular Mortality				
	20 events		27 events	
Univariate				
pSBP	0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	<0.001	1.03 (1.00, 1.05)	0.02
cSBP1	0.95 (0.93, 0.97)	<0.001	1.02 (1.00, 1.05)	0.06
cSBP2	0.96 (0.94, 0.98)	<0.001	1.03 (1.01, 1.05)	0.003
pSBP-cSBP1	0.86 (0.74, 1.02)	0.08	1.12 (1.03, 1.20)	0.006
pSBP-cSBP2	1.01 (0.94, 1.07)	0.87	0.93 (0.88, 0.98)	0.006
Multivariable				
pSBP	0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	<0.001	1.02 (0.99, 1.04)	0.22
pSBP-cSBP1	0.98 (0.81, 1.19)	0.87	1.08 (0.98, 1.18)	0.12
pSBP	0.95 (0.93, 0.98)	<0.001	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)	0.12
pSBP-cSBP2	0.98 (0.91, 1.05)	0.59	0.94 (0.89, 1.00)	0.04

Table: Univariate and multivariable hazard ratios (95% confidence intervals) per mmHg increase and significance levels (p) for all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. Abbreviations: pSBP, peripheral systolic pressure; cSBP, central systolic pressure (1=brachial systolic and diastolic pressure calibration; 2= brachial mean and diastolic pressure calibration); HR, hazard ratio; AF, atrial fibrillation; HF, heart failure.

2.5

DOES WAVE REFLECTION PROTECT THE MICROVASCULATURE FROM HIGH PULSE PRESSURE?

Avinash Kondiboyina^{1,2}, Joe Smolich^{3,2}, Michael Cheung^{3,2,4}, Berend Westerhof⁵, Nico Westerhof⁵, Jonathan Mynard^{1,2,6}

¹Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, VIC, Australia
²University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia
³Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, VIC, Australia
⁴Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia
⁵VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
⁶Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Background: Wave reflection (caused by a stiffness increase from large to small arteries) has been considered to protect against high microvasculature Pulse Pressures (mPP) (1). However, according to transmission line theory, Transmission (T) and Reflection (R) coefficients are proportional (T = 1+R), implying that reflection would not be protective. Proximal arterial stiffening with aging is associated with reduced Total Arterial Compliance (TAC) and increased forward Pressure (Pfw). We hypothesized that a high TAC and low Pfw, rather than high R, are responsible for protection from mPP.

Methods: We constructed a fractal arterial tree containing 5008 vessels across 14 generations (fractal exponent 2.76, asymmetry ratio 0.8). Wave speed in each vessel was prescribed to achieve a uniform reflection coefficient (R = -0.025, 0, 0.025 or 0.05) at every junction, achieved by progressively stiffening distal vessels while keeping aortic wave speed constant ("distal-stiffening") or by progressively stiffening proximal vessels while