medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Feasibility of estimation of aortic wave intensity using non-invasive pressure recordings in the absence of flow velocity in man.

Hughes, A.D.,[1] Park, C.,[1] Ramakrishnan, A.,[2, 3] Mayet, J.,[2] Chaturvedi, N.,[1] Parker K.H.[3]

[1] MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL, Department of Population Science & Experimental Medicine, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, United Kingdom

[2] Cardiovascular Division, National Heart & Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

[3] Department of Bioengineering, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

Running title: Pressure-only wave intensity analysis

Author for correspondence:

Prof Alun Hughes, MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL, Department of Population Science & Experimental Medicine, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

Email: alun.hughes@ucl.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background Wave intensity analysis provides valuable information on ventriculo-arterial function, hemodynamics and energy transfer in the arterial circulation. Widespread use of wave intensity analysis is limited by the need for concurrent measurement of pressure and flow waveforms. We describe a method that can estimate wave intensity patterns using only non-invasive pressure waveforms, and its reproducibility.

Methods Radial artery pressure and left ventricular outflow tract (LVOT) flow velocity waveforms were recorded in 12 participants in the Southall and Brent Revisited (SABRE) study. Pressure waveforms were analysed using custom-written software to derive the excess pressure (P_{xs}) which was compared with the LVOT flow velocity waveform, and used to calculate wave intensity. In a separate study, repeat measures of wave intensity and other wave and reservoir parameters were performed on 34 individuals who attended 2 clinic visits at an interval of approximately 1 month to assess reproducibility and reliability of the method.

Results P_{xs} waveforms were similar in shape to aortic flow velocity waveforms and the time of peak P_{xs} and maximum aortic velocity agreed closely (mean difference = 0.00 (limits of agreement -0.02, 0.02)s). Wave intensity patterns when scaled to peak LVOT velocity gave credible estimates of wave intensity similar to values reported previously in the literature. The method showed fair to good reproducibility for most parameters.

Conclusions The P_{xs} is a surrogate of LVOT flow velocity allowing estimation of aortic wave intensity with acceptable reproducibility. This enables widespread application of wave intensity analysis to large studies.

Keywords: Blood pressure, hemodynamics, waves, wave intensity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Blood pressure (BP) results almost entirely from waves generated by the heart; the intensity of these arterial waves is an important measure of ventriculo-arterial function and their interaction. While wave intensity analysis is not the only method to characterise waves in the circulation,(Westerhof et al., 2005; Caro et al., 2012) it has proved an increasingly valuable approach to understanding hemodynamics and wave propagation in the circulation, since it quantifies the intensity and energy carried by forward and backward-travelling waves.(Parker and Jones, 1990; MacRae et al., 1997; Parker, 2009; Broyd et al., 2015; Su et al., 2017) This has prognostic value: wave reflection has been reported to predict cardiovascular events independently of other cardiovascular risk factors (Manisty et al., 2010) and more recently, elevated wave intensity has been independently associated with greater decline in cognitive function from mid- to late life.(Chiesa et al., 2019) This latter observation is consistent with suggestions that excessive pulsatile energy transfer is responsible for microvascular damage in the cerebral circulation.(Mitchell, 2018)

Traditionally, analysis of wave intensity requires that both pressure and flow (or flow velocity) are measured, ideally simultaneously. These measurements can be onerous and technically challenging in large scale studies. We therefore examined the feasibility of deriving estimates of wave intensity based on measurement of pressure only. The method for calculating wave intensity using only pressure measurements is based on an observation made by Wang et al.(Wang et al., 2003), who reported that excess pressure (P_{xs}), the difference between measured and reservoir pressure, was directly proportional to flow in the aortic root, Q_{in} in dogs. Subsequent studies in humans employing invasive measurements of pressure and flow velocity in the aorta(Davies et al., 2007) and non-invasive measurements of carotid artery pressure and aortic flow(Vermeersch et al., 2009; Michail et al., 2018) have confirmed these findings. Given that wave intensity is the product of the derivatives of pressure and flow velocity this suggests that it should be possible to estimate wave intensity patterns using the measured pressure waveform and P_{xs} derived from reservoir analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We therefore examined if this approach could be used to estimate wave intensity patterns from non-invasive measurements of the pressure waveform in man using a sample from a large UK population-based longitudinal cohort, the Southall and Brent Revisited (SABRE) study. We tested whether the P_{xs} waveform was similar to the measured aortic flow velocity waveform and also studied the test-retest reproducibility of wave intensity and other reservoir parameter estimates.

Methods

Data were obtained from participants in the SABRE study, a tri-ethnic population-based cohort consisting of white European, South Asian and African Caribbean people resident in West London, UK. (Tillin et al., 2012) In brief, participants, aged 40 to 69 years, were recruited from primary care and baseline measurements performed between 1988 and 1991. Surviving participants were invited to attend a 20-year follow-up for detailed phenotyping between 2008 and 2011 and data collected at this visit were used for this study. Twelve consecutive participants who underwent measurements of aortic flow velocity by echocardiography and blood pressure waveform measurement by radial tonometry were selected to explore the feasibility of performing wave intensity analysis using a pressure-only technique (pWIA). Reproducibility analysis using the pWIA technique was performed on 34 participants who re-attended for study investigations within a month as part of routine quality control. Exclusion criteria for both studies were rhythm other than sinus rhythm, valvular heart disease, or any other clinical condition that prevented full participation in the study.

The study was approved by the local research ethics review committee, and all participants gave written informed consent. The study adhered to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and Title 45, US Code of Federal Regulations, part 46. Protection of Human Subjects. Revised November 13, 2001, effective December 13, 2001, and all procedures were performed in accordance with institutional guidelines.

Investigations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Participants fasted and refrained from alcohol, smoking, and caffeine for ≥12 hours before attendance and omitted any medication on the morning of investigation. A questionnaire was completed, which detailed health behaviours, medical history, and medication. Height, weight, and waist circumference were measured as previously described.(Tillin et al., 2012) Diabetes was defined according to World Health Organization criteria,(Alberti and Zimmet, 1998) self-report of doctor-diagnosed diabetes, or receipt of anti-diabetes medication. Hypertension was defined as use of blood pressure–lowering medication from patient questionnaire and/or general practitioners' medical record review. Coronary heart disease was defined as a coronary event or revascularization identified by medical record review and adjudicated by an independent committee. Diagnosis of stroke was based on predetermined criteria of symptoms, duration of symptoms, and MRI or computed tomography imaging from hospital admission, patient, or medical records.(Tillin et al., 2013) Heart failure, valve disease and atrial fibrillation were identified during the clinic visit and/or from medical records.

Seated brachial blood pressure was measured after 5-10 minutes rest using a validated automatic Oscillometric device (Omron 705IT). Arm circumference was measured and an appropriate sized cuff, based on British Society of Hypertension guidelines, was placed on the left upper arm. Three recordings were taken 2 minutes apart, and the second and third recordings were averaged as an estimate of clinic BP. BP waveforms were also recorded from the radial artery using a tonometer device (SphygmoCor; AtCor, Sydney, Australia) over at least six cardiac cycles, ensemble averaged and calibrated to brachial systolic and diastolic BP according to the manufacturer's instructions. Central BP was calculated using the manufacturer's software, which employs a generalized transfer function. Reservoir analysis (Figure 1) was performed using custom-written Matlab code (Mathworks, Inc, Natick, MA) as previously described.(Davies et al., 2014)

Echocardiography was performed using a Philips iE33 ultrasound machine (Philips, Amsterdam, The Netherlands) with a 5.0 to 1.0 phased array transducer (S5-1), as previously described.(Park et al., 2013) Aortic flow velocity was measured in the left ventricular outflow tract (LVOT) using continuous wave Doppler according to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ASE/EAE guidelines (Quinones et al., 2002) and at least 3 consecutive cardiac cycles were recorded during quiet respiration.

Fitting the reservoir and calculating pressure-only wave intensity

Details of the reservoir approach are provided elsewhere (Hughes & Parker in press). In brief, it is assumed that reservoir pressure, P_{res}, satisfies overall conservation of mass for the circulation:

$$\frac{dP_{res}}{dt} = \frac{Q_{in}}{C} - k_d(P_{res} - P_{zf}) \qquad (1)$$

where Q_{in} is the volumetric flow rate into the aortic root, C is the net compliance of the arteries, k_d is the diastolic rate constant (the reciprocal of the diastolic time constant $\tau = RC$), R is the resistance to flow through the microcirculation, and P_{zf} is the pressure at which flow through the microcirculation ceases.

The excess pressure (P_{xs}) is the difference between the measured pressure and the reservoir pressure $(P\text{-}P_{res})$ and if, as discussed above, P_{xs} is assumed to be directly proportional to the flow in the aortic root, we can substitute

$$Q_{in} = \zeta P_{xs} \qquad (2)$$

into the mass conservation equation, where ζ is a constant of proportionality that has some relationship with the characteristic admittance, or $1/Z_{ac}$, (i.e. the inverse of the characteristic impedance) and has units of admittance.

If we define $k_s = \zeta/C$ and $k_d = 1/RC$, then equation (1) can be written as:

$$\frac{dP_{res}}{dt} = k_s\left(P(t) - P_{res}\right) - k_d\left(P_{res} - P_{zf}\right) \qquad (3)$$

This first-order linear differential equation can be solved as

$$P_{res} = e^{-(k_s+k_d)t}\int_0^t P(t')e^{(k_s+k_d)t'}dt' + \frac{k_d}{k_s+k_d}(1-e^{-(k_s+k_d)t})P_{zf} \qquad (4)$$

by fitting an exponential curve to the pressure during diastole to estimate the diastolic parameters k_d and P_{zf} ζ

$$P_{res} - P_\infty = (P_{es} - P_\infty)e^{-k_d t} \qquad (5)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

where the offset of the fit is assumed to be equal to P_{zf}. Then k_s is estimated by minimising the squared error between P and P_{res} obtained over diastole in equation (2).

Wave intensity (dI) is the total rate of working, i.e. the power, per unit cross-sectional area of an artery due to the pressure, P, with the blood flowing with velocity U. If flow velocity, $U = \frac{Q_{in}}{A}$ where A is the cross-sectional area of the aorta, and $\zeta \cdot A = \rho \cdot c$, where ρ is the density of blood (assumed to be 1060 kg.m^{-3}) and c is the wave speed. Then

$$U = \frac{P_{xs}}{\rho \cdot c} \qquad (6)$$

and

$$dI = dP \cdot dU = dP \cdot d(\frac{P_{xs}}{\rho \cdot c}) \qquad (7)$$

If flow velocity is measured then c can be estimated from equation (6). In addition to wave intensity, wave reflection index (WRI: the ratio of the area of the reflected wave to the early systolic incident wave), the ratio of peak forward to peak backward pressure (P_b/P_f) and the ratio of backward to total pressure, termed reflection index (RI) were also calculated.(Westerhof et al., 2005)

For this analysis we chose *a priori* to use P_{xs} calculated from the estimated aortic (central) pressure waveform (which was also used as the measured pressure), as it was assumed to correspond more closely to aortic pressure. However, we also examined the relationship between the aortic velocity waveform and P_{xs} calculated from the radial artery pressure waveform to compare this with the morphology of P_{xs} calculated from the estimated aortic pressure waveform.

All analyses were performed using custom written software in Matlab (R2019a, The Mathworks Inc.)

Repeatability and reproducibility of blood pressure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Reproducibility (test-retest) data for reservoir pressure, excess pressure and estimated wave intensity was performed on 34 participants (age 69.8 (SD =5.6y; 26 male) who attended on two occasions separated by an interval of approximately 1-month.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using Stata 15.1 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas, USA). Continuous variables derived from the samples were summarised as mean±SD. Reproducibility data were analysed using Bland–Altman analysis and presented as mean differences with limits of agreement.(Bland and Altman, 2003) Reliability was summarised using Lin's concordance coefficient (rho)(Steichen and Cox, 2002) and was classified as: <0.40 - poor; between 0.40 and <0.59 - fair; between 0.60 and 0.74 – good, and >0.75 - excellent.(Cicchetti et al., 2006)

Results

Comparison of aortic velocity waveform with P_{xs}

The characteristics of the 12 participants in this study are shown in Table 1. Reservoir analysis was successful in all cases and the fits were excellent (r^2 for exponential fit in diastole = .98 (SD 0.02)). The P_{xs} waveforms agreed fairly closely with the LVOT flow velocity waveforms measured using ultrasound (Figure 2 and Supplementary Figure S2) and there was evident correlation between the systolic upstroke of both waveforms. This was confirmed by the close agreement between the time of peak of P_{xs} and aortic V_{max} (mean difference = 0.00 (LOA -0.02, 0.02)s). Visual examination of the peripheral and central P_{xs} waveforms and the aortic velocity waveforms suggested that there was a slightly better correspondence with brachial rather than aortic P_{xs}, especially in the phase following the peak of the waveform (Supplementary figure S1); however the linear cross-correlation between the peripheral and central P_{xs} waveform was extremely high (r = 0.97 (SD 0.01)).

Wave intensity estimated using P_{xs} gave a characteristic pattern consisting of a large forward compression wave (Wf1) in early systole, followed by a small backward wave (Wb1 - reflected wave), and followed by a moderate sized forward decompression wave in protodiastole (Wf2) (Figure 3). Estimated c based on P_{xs} and V_{max} was 7.5 (SD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.3) m.s^{-1}. When these data were calibrated to measured aortic flow velocity the intensity of the waves were Wf1 = 17.3(SD 13.6) x 10^5 W/m^2 per cycle^2, Wb1 = 2.3(SD 2.1) x 10^5 W/m^2 per cycle^2 and Wf2 = 4.7(SD 4.3) x 10^5 W/m2 per cycle^2.

Reproducibility study

The characteristics of the 34 participants in the reproducibility study are shown in Table 2. Reservoir fitting and wave intensity calculation failed quality control in 3 and 5 cases at visit 1 and 2 respectively (12% failure rate), largely due to poor quality tonometry traces. An example of test-retest recordings in a single individual (selected to have a difference in the forward compression wave similar to the average difference) is shown in Figure 3. Bland Altman plots of all intra-individual differences for the three major waves, Wf1, Wb, Wf2 are shown in figure 4). The reliability of wave intensity was good, except for Wf2 which was poor and showed evidence of correlation between the difference and the mean (r = 0.79). Results for other measures are shown in Table 3; most showed fair or good reliability.

Discussion

We found that the P_{xs} waveform is an acceptable surrogate of LVOT (aortic) flow velocity, and that this allowed us to calculate wave intensity patterns from recordings of the pressure waveform made at the radial artery without concurrent measurements of flow. Wave intensity and related parameters estimated in this way generally showed acceptable reproducibility and reliability that was similar to or better than the reliability of systolic BP. The only exception was Wf2 which showed poor reliability; this may relate to the same size of this wave and the variability in duration of ejection which introduces some noise into the ensemble average of the waveform in late systole. The observed wave intensity patterns using the pressure-only approach were very similar to those reported previously using invasive or non-invasive methods based on measurement of pressure (or diameter) and flow velocity.(Parker and Jones, 1990; Koh et al., 1998; Niki et al., 1999; Zambanini et al., 2005) The major disadvantage of the current approach is the lack of absolute calibration in the absence of a flow velocity measure. In many studies peak aortic or LVOT peak flow velocity may be measured as part of the echocardiography protocol, and this can be used to calibrate P_{xs}. When the data from our study were calibrated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

in this way the intensity of the waves were similar to values previously reported in the literature allowing for differences in form of units. (Koh et al., 1998; Niki et al., 1999; Zambanini et al., 2005) However, if there is no measure of aortic flow velocity the issue of calibration is problematic. One possibility may be to use an assumed aortic flow velocity based on previous studies. Some relevant studies are reviewed below.

In a study of 97 healthy individuals, (45 women, age 21–78y) (Gardin et al., 1987) reported that peak flow velocity in the ascending aorta was approximately 80 (SD 13) $cm.s^{-1}$ in people aged 51-60y, with no difference by sex, blood pressure, or body surface area (BSA)) but increasing age was associated with a lower peak flow velocity. Van Dam et al. (van Dam et al., 1987) studied 215 healthy individuals (95 women, age 1–65y) and measured peak velocities in the ascending aorta and LVOT. Typical velocities were ~80$cm.s^{-1}$ in both locations. These researchers also found no relationship between sex, BSA, or heart rate and peak velocity in adults. They also reported that peak flow velocity decreased with increasing age in the ascending aorta, whereas peak velocity in the LVOT increased slightly with age. Lazarus et al. (Lazarus et al., 1988) studied 60 individuals (21 women, age 15–74y) and observed flow velocities in the ascending aorta of ~80 $cm.s^{-1}$. They also saw no difference in peak velocity by sex, blood pressure, heart rate and reported that peak velocity fell with age. Kupari et al. studied a random population-based sample of 93 Helskini residents (51 women, age 36–37 years) and reported a spatial average peak velocity of 89cm.s-1 in the LVOT, while noting that the peak velocity was skewed towards the medial wall and that the difference between the medial and lateral wall peak velocity was 18$cm.s^{-1}$ on average. Swinne et al. (Swinne et al., 1996) measured LVOT peak velocity in 56 consecutive healthy participants of the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging (34 women, age 19–90y). They observed that peak velocity was 108(SD 20)$cm.s^{-1}$ and that there was a weak positive relationship between velocity and age (r = 0.26) but no relationship with sex, BSA or septo-aortic angle. Dalen et al. (Dalen et al., 2010) measured LVOT peak velocity in 1266 healthy participants in the Nord-Trøndelag Health (HUNT) study (663 female, age range <30 to >70 years). In this large study there was no convincing evidence of a relationship between age and peak LVOT velocity in either men or women. The average LVOT velocities in this study were 98(SD 18)$cm.s^{-1}$ in men and 101(SD 16)$cm.s^{-1}$ in women. Choi et al. (Choi

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

et al., 2016) reported findings from 1003 healthy Korean adults (age 20–79y). LVOT peak velocities were slightly higher in women (men = 96(SD 15) cm.s-1 vs. women = 99(SD 16) cm.s-1) and there was a small positive relationship between increased age and higher peak LVOT velocity (corresponding to ~4 $cm.s^{-1}$ and ~10$cm.s^{-1}$ difference in peak velocity between age 21 to 30 and 71 to 80 in men and women respectively). Garcia et al. (Garcia et al., 2018) used 4D flow MRI to measure peak velocity in the thoracic aorta of 98 healthy subjects (41 women, age 9–78 years). They observed peak aortic velocity to be slightly higher in men than women (1.28 (SD 0.23) $cm.s^{-1}$ vs 1.18 (SD 0.26) $cm.s^{-1}$ respectively). Increased age above 21 y was associated with higher peak velocities (corresponding to an increase of 37 $cm.s^{-1}$ comparing the 21–30 age group with the >70 age group), peak velocity was also inversely associated with heart rate (r = -0.228). This study also noted marked age associations with measures of spatially skewed blood flow velocity distributions in the aorta; this potentially bears on other results obtained using Doppler techniques. It should be noted however that wave intensity analysis assumes that viscous losses that account for a non-uniform flow velocity profile are ignorable in large arteries, so the significance of this problem is moot.

Overall these studies appear to indicate that there is little or no sex difference in peak aortic velocity and that while peak velocity declines with age in the ascending aorta it shows little or no increase with age in the LVOT. There is also clear evidence that peak aortic velocity is not associated with BSA or BP. This suggests that it might be possible, at least in individuals without established cardiac disease, to use an assumed peak aortic velocity to calibrate the P_{xs} waveform, although it may be necessary to take account of age. Based particularly on the more recent large population studies in Norway and Korea, (Dalen et al., 2010; Choi et al., 2016) ~100cms^{-1} seems a reasonable estimate for an assumed peak velocity in the LVOT, though a more detailed quantitative study of the question would be valuable.

A second unresolved issue is whether it would be better to use the unmodified brachial pressure waveform to estimate P_{xs} rather than P_{xs} derived from the derived central pressure waveform. This question merits further study; however given their close correlation it could well be that the choice of which P_{xs} waveform is not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

particularly important and the simplicity of using unmodified radial or brachial recordings may be an advantage in clinical use.

Our study has several other limitations. It employs a small sample based on existing data using tonometry to record the BP waveform. This is relevant to many existing datasets but the approach requires further validation if it is to be used in future studies employing other methods to measure pressure waveforms. Nevertheless the approach seems promising and could also be applied to invasive data where only pressure has been measured, for example in investigations of suspected pulmonary hypertension. While outside the scope of this article, it is also possible that a related approach could be used to calculate wave intensity in circumstances where only flow velocity was measured if accompanied by measurements of clinic BP.

In conclusion, use of the P_{xs} waveform as a surrogate of LVOT flow velocity permits estimation of aortic wave intensity based on non-invasive measurement of pressure waveforms and this technique shows acceptable reproducibility. This approach should allow the more widespread application of wave intensity analysis to large scale trials and observational studies.

References

Alberti, K.G., and Zimmet, P.Z. (1998). Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus provisional report of a WHO consultation. *Diabet Med* 15(7), 539-553. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9136(199807)15:7<539::AID-DIA668>3.0.CO;2-S.

Bland, J.M., and Altman, D.G. (2003). Applying the right statistics: analyses of measurement studies. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 22(1), 85-93. doi: 10.1002/uog.122.

Broyd, C.J., Davies, J.E., Escaned, J.E., Hughes, A., and Parker, K. (2015). Wave intensity analysis and its application to the coronary circulation. *Global Cardiology Science and Practice* 2015(5), 64. doi: 10.5339/gcsp.2015.64.

Caro, C.G., Pedley, T.J., Schroter, R.C., and Seed, W.A. (2012). *The mechanics of the circulation.* Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chiesa, S.T., Masi, S., Shipley, M.J., Ellins, E.A., Fraser, A.G., Hughes, A.D., et al. (2019). Carotid artery wave intensity in mid- to late-life predicts cognitive decline: the Whitehall II study. *Eur Heart J* 40(28), 2300-2309. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehz189.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Choi, J.O., Shin, M.S., Kim, M.J., Jung, H.O., Park, J.R., Sohn, I.S., et al. (2016). Normal Echocardiographic Measurements in a Korean Population Study: Part II. Doppler and Tissue Doppler Imaging. *J Cardiovasc Ultrasound* 24(2), 144-152. doi: 10.4250/jcu.2016.24.2.144.

Cicchetti, D., Bronen, R., Spencer, S., Haut, S., Berg, A., Oliver, P., et al. (2006). Rating scales, scales of measurement, issues of reliability: resolving some critical issues for clinicians and researchers. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 194(8), 557-564. doi: 10.1097/01.nmd.0000230392.83607.c5.

Dalen, H., Thorstensen, A., Vatten, L.J., Aase, S.A., and Stoylen, A. (2010). Reference values and distribution of conventional echocardiographic Doppler measures and longitudinal tissue Doppler velocities in a population free from cardiovascular disease. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging* 3(5), 614-622. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.109.926022.

Davies, J.E., Hadjiloizou, N., Leibovich, D., Malaweera, A., Alastruey-Arimon, J., Whinnett, Z.I., et al. (2007). Importance of the aortic reservoir in determining the shape of the arterial pressure waveform – The forgotten lessons of Frank. *Artery Res* 1(2), 40-45. doi: 10.1016/j.artres.2007.08.001.

Davies, J.E., Lacy, P., Tillin, T., Collier, D., Cruickshank, J.K., Francis, D.P., et al. (2014). Excess pressure integral predicts cardiovascular events independent of other risk factors in the conduit artery functional evaluation substudy of Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial. *Hypertension* 64(1), 60-68. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.113.02838.

Garcia, J., van der Palen, R.L.F., Bollache, E., Jarvis, K., Rose, M.J., Barker, A.J., et al. (2018). Distribution of blood flow velocity in the normal aorta: Effect of age and gender. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 47(2), 487-498. doi: 10.1002/jmri.25773.

Gardin, J.M., Davidson, D.M., Rohan, M.K., Butman, S., Knoll, M., Garcia, R., et al. (1987). Relationship between age, body size, gender, and blood pressure and Doppler flow measurements in the aorta and pulmonary artery. *Am Heart J* 113(1), 101-109.

Koh, T.W., Pepper, J.R., DeSouza, A.C., and Parker, K.H. (1998). Analysis of wave reflections in the arterial system using wave intensity: a novel method for predicting the timing and amplitude of reflected waves. *Heart Vessels* 13(3), 103-113. doi: Doi 10.1007/Bf01747827.

Lazarus, M., Dang, T.Y., Gardin, J.M., Allfie, A., and Henry, W.L. (1988). Evaluation of age, gender, heart rate and blood pressure changes and exercise conditioning on Doppler measured aortic blood flow acceleration and velocity during upright treadmill testing. *Am J Cardiol* 62(7), 439-443.

MacRae, J.M., Sun, Y.H., Isaac, D.L., Dobson, G.M., Cheng, C.P., Little, W.C., et al. (1997). Wave-intensity analysis: a new approach to left ventricular filling dynamics. *Heart Vessels* 12(2), 53-59.

Manisty, C., Mayet, J., Tapp, R.J., Parker, K.H., Sever, P., Poulter, N.R., et al. (2010). Wave reflection predicts cardiovascular events in hypertensive individuals independent of blood pressure and other cardiovascular risk factors: an ASCOT (Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcome Trial) substudy. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 56(1), 24-30. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2010.03.030.

Michail, M., Narayan, O., Parker, K.H., and Cameron, J.D. (2018). Relationship of aortic excess pressure obtained using pressure-only reservoir pressure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

analysis to directly measured aortic flow in humans. *Physiol Meas* 39(6), 064006. doi: 10.1088/1361-6579/aaca87.

Mitchell, G.F. (2018). Aortic stiffness, pressure and flow pulsatility, and target organ damage. *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 125(6), 1871-1880. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00108.2018.

Niki, K., Sugawara, M., Uchida, K., Tanaka, R., Tanimoto, K., Imamura, H., et al. (1999). A noninvasive method of measuring wave intensity, a new hemodynamic index: application to the carotid artery in patients with mitral regurgitation before and after surgery. *Heart Vessels* 14(6), 263-271.

Park, C.M., March, K., Ghosh, A.K., Jones, S., Coady, E., Tuson, C., et al. (2013). Left-ventricular structure in the Southall And Brent REvisited (SABRE) study: explaining ethnic differences. *Hypertension* 61(5), 1014-1020. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.111.00610.

Parker, K.H. (2009). An introduction to wave intensity analysis. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 47(2), 175-188. doi: 10.1007/s11517-009-0439-y.

Parker, K.H., and Jones, C.J.H. (1990). Forward and Backward Running Waves in the Arteries - Analysis Using the Method of Characteristics. *J Biomech Eng* 112(3), 322-326. doi: Doi 10.1115/1.2891191.

Quinones, M.A., Otto, C.M., Stoddard, M., Waggoner, A., Zoghbi, W.A., Doppler Quantification Task Force of the, N., et al. (2002). Recommendations for quantification of Doppler echocardiography: a report from the Doppler Quantification Task Force of the Nomenclature and Standards Committee of the American Society of Echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr* 15(2), 167-184. doi: 10.1067/mje.2002.120202.

Steichen, T.J., and Cox, N.J. (2002). A note on the concordance correlation coefficient. *Stata Journal* 2(2), 183-189.

Su, J., Manisty, C., Parker, K.H., Simonsen, U., Nielsen-Kudsk, J.E., Mellemkjaer, S., et al. (2017). Wave Intensity Analysis Provides Novel Insights Into Pulmonary Arterial Hypertension and Chronic Thromboembolic Pulmonary Hypertension. *J Am Heart Assoc* 6(11). doi: 10.1161/JAHA.117.006679.

Swinne, C.J., Shapiro, E.P., Jamart, J., and Fleg, J.L. (1996). Age-associated changes in left ventricular outflow tract geometry in normal subjects. *Am J Cardiol* 78(9), 1070-1073. doi: 10.1016/s0002-9149(96)00542-5.

Tillin, T., Forouhi, N.G., McKeigue, P.M., and Chaturvedi, N. (2012). Southall And Brent REvisited: Cohort profile of SABRE, a UK population-based comparison of cardiovascular disease and diabetes in people of European, Indian Asian and African Caribbean origins. *Int J Epidemiol* 41(1), 33-42. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq175.

Tillin, T., Hughes, A.D., Mayet, J., Whincup, P., Sattar, N., Forouhi, N.G., et al. (2013). The relationship between metabolic risk factors and incident cardiovascular disease in Europeans, South Asians, and African Caribbeans: SABRE (Southall and Brent Revisited) -- a prospective population-based study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 61(17), 1777-1786. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012.12.046.

van Dam, I., Heringa, A., de Boo, T., Alsters, J., van Oort, A., Hopman, J., et al. (1987). Reference values for pulsed Doppler signals from the blood flow on both sides of the aortic valve. *Eur Heart J* 8(11), 1221-1228. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.eurheartj.a062196.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Vermeersch, S.J., Rietzschel, E.R., De Buyzere, M.L., Van Bortel, L.M., Gillebert, T.C., Verdonck, P.R., et al. (2009). The reservoir pressure concept: the 3-element windkessel model revisited? Application to the Asklepios population study. *Journal of Engineering Mathematics* 64(4), 417-428. doi: 10.1007/s10665-009-9286-y.

Wang, J.J., O'Brien, A.B., Shrive, N.G., Parker, K.H., and Tyberg, J.V. (2003). Time-domain representation of ventricular-arterial coupling as a windkessel and wave system. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol* 284(4), H1358-1368. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00175.2002.

Westerhof, N., Stergiopulos, N., and Noble, M.I.M. (2005). *Snapshots of hemodynamics : an aid for clinical research and graduate education.* New York, NY: Springer.

Zambanini, A., Cunningham, S.L., Parker, K.H., Khir, A.W., Mc, G.T.S.A., and Hughes, A.D. (2005). Wave-energy patterns in carotid, brachial, and radial arteries: a noninvasive approach using wave-intensity analysis. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol* 289(1), H270-276. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00636.2003.

Acknowledgements and funding sources

The SABRE study was funded at baseline by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC), Diabetes UK, and the British Heart Foundation (BHF). The follow-up study in 2008 and 2011 was funded by the Wellcome Trust (067100, 37055891 & 086676/7/08/Z), the BHF (PG/06/145, PG/08/103/26133, PG/12/29/29497 & CS/13/1/30327) and Diabetes UK (13/0004774).

AH receives support from the British Heart Foundation, the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute for Health Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre, the UK Medical Research Council and works in a unit that receives support from the Medical Research Council. CP is supported by a grant from the BHF. AR is supported by a grant from the BHF.

Declarations of interest

None.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristic of participants in the study comparing excess pressure (P_{xs}) with aortic flow velocity waveforms (N = 12).

Variable	**Mean / N (SD)/[%]**
Age, y	65.7 (6.0)
Male sex, N [%]	12 [100]
Ethnicity, N [%]	
European	4 [33]
South Asian	8 [66]
Height, cm	169.1 (7.4)
Weight, kg	76.8 (13.1)
Diabetes, N [%]	5 [42]
Hypertension, N [%]	10 [83]
Systolic BP, mmHg	147.8 (14.1)
Diastolic BP, mmHg	88.3 (10.9)
Heart rate, min^{-1}	64.4 (10.8)
V_{max}, $cm.s^{-1}$	137.8 (16.9)
Time (V_{max}), s	0.09 (0.01)
P_{xs}, mmHg	40.1 (8.5)
Time (P_{xs}), s	0.09 (0.01)

Abbreviations: BP, blood pressure; P_{xs}, excess pressure; V_{max}, maximum aortic velocity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Characteristic of participants in the reproducibility study (N = 34).

Variable	**mean**	**SD**
Age, y	69.8	5.6
Male sex N (%)	26 (76)	
Ethnicity, N (%)		
European	14 (41)	
South Asian	11 (32)	
African Caribbean	9 (27)	
Height, cm	169.6	9.8
Weight, kg	79.8	14.8
Diabetes N (%)	12 (35)	
Hypertension N (%)	23 (68)	

Table 3. Results and reproducibility of key parameters measured at 2 visits.

	Visit 1			**Visit 2**			**Reproducibility**				
Variables	**N**	**mean**	**SD**	**N**	**mean**	**SD**	**mean difference**	**LOA**	**LOA**	**rho**	**Reliability grading**
Systolic BP, mmHg	34	136.6	10.1	34	134.4	13.8	2.1	-23.5	27.7	0.42	Fair
Diastolic BP, mmHg	34	82.7	10.0	34	80.8	8.7	1.9	-13.5	17.2	0.64	Good
Heart rate, bpm	34	63.4	9.6	34	61.1	9.9	2.3	-10.6	15.2	0.75	Excellent
maximum P_{res}, mmHg	31	113.1	8.7	29	111.7	11.8	0.9	-19.4	21.2	0.48	Fair
maximum P_{xs}, mmHg	31	36.4	9.1	29	36.1	10.1	0.3	-13.8	14.5	0.71	Good
Time maximum P_{xs}, s	31	0.10	0.01	29	0.10	0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.03	0.24	Poor
Time maximum BP, s	31	0.14	0.04	34	0.14	0.04	0.00	-0.09	0.09	0.39	Poor
k_s, s-1	31	7.90	2.31	29	7.65	1.78	0.01	-3.73	3.80	0.55	Fair
k_d, s-1	31	2.68	1.08	29	3.11	2.87	0.24	-1.55	2.02	0.54	Fair
P_{zf}, mmHg	31	74.1	11.3	29	69.3	20.4	1.13	-16.8	19.1	0.66	Good
Wf1, AU	31	9.0	4.7	29	10.0	3.8	-1.16	-7.77	5.45	0.61	Good
Wb1, AU	31	1.0	0.6	29	1.2	0.5	-0.18	-0.82	0.47	0.68	Good
Wf2, AU	31	2.9	1.9	29	2.1	0.8	0.60	-2.48	3.67	0.34	Poor
WRI	31	0.14	0.11	29	0.12	0.04	0.02	-0.17	0.21	0.44	Fair
P_b/P_f	31	0.72	0.04	29	0.71	0.04	0.00	-0.08	0.08	0.53	Fair
RI	31	0.42	0.01	29	0.42	0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.03	0.52	Fair

Abbreviations: BP, blood pressure; k_d, diastolic rate constant; k_s, systolic rate constant; P_b/P_f, ratio of backward to forward pressure; P_{res}, reservoir pressure; P_{xs}, excess pressure; P_{zf}, estimated zero-flow pressure; RI, reflection index; V_{max}, maximum aortic velocity; Wb, backward compression wave; Wf1, forward compression wave; Wf2, forward decompression wave; WRI, wave reflection index.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

FIGURES



Figure 1. An example showing A) the individual radial pressure waveforms recorded using the tonometer and B) the ensemble averaged central pressure (blue), reservoir pressure (red) and excess pressure (black).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Example traces of velocity measured in the left ventricular outflow tract with the respective P_{xs} superimposed. P_{xs} waveforms were scaled to correspond with the peak of the aortic flow waveform.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. An example of wave intensity traces recorded from the same individual on two occasions approximately 1 month apart (first visit (black) and second (repeat) visit (blue) traces). The three major waves, Wf1, Wb and Wf2 are indicated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.22.20018457; this version posted January 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Bland-Altman plots for the three major waves identified by wave intensity analysis (Wf1, Wb, Wf2).