Differences between brachial and aortic blood pressure in adolescence and their impact on classification of hypertension

Alun D Hughes,[1] George Davey Smith,[2] Laura D Howe, Deborah Lawlor, Siana Jones,[1] Chloe M Park,[1] Nish Chaturvedi.[1]

[1] MRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing, Department of Population Science & Experimental Medicine, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College London, London, UK.

[2] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Oakfield House, Oakfield Grove, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

Short title: Brachial and aortic blood pressure in adolescence

Author for correspondence:

Alun Hughes, MRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College London, London, UK.

Email alun.hughes@ucl.ac.uk

Word count: 3389

Clinical perspective

What is new?

- Blood pressure measured at the brachial artery substantially overestimates aortic blood pressure in adolescents due to marked aortic to brachial amplification.

What are the clinical implications?

- Use of brachial blood pressure may result in overdiagnosis of hypertension in adolescence.

Abstract

Background Blood pressure is the leading global cause of mortality and its prevalence is rising in children and adolescents. Aortic blood pressure (BP) is known to be lower than brachial BP but the extent of this difference and its impact on the diagnosis of hypertension in adolescents is not known.

Methods We used data from 3850 participants from a UK cohort of births in the early 1990s in the South West of England, who attended their ~17 year follow-up and had valid measures of brachial and aortic BP at that clinic (mean(SD) age 17.8(0.4)y, 66% female). Data are presented as mean differences [95% prediction intervals] for both sexes separately.

Results Aortic systolic BP was lower than brachial systolic BP (male -22.3[-31.2, -13.3]mmHg and female -17.8[-25.5, -10.0]mmHg). Differences between aortic and brachial diastolic BP were minimal. Based on measurements of brachial BP 101 males (6%) and 22 females (1%) were classified as hypertensive. In contrast only 9 males (<1%) and 14 females (<1%) met criteria for hypertension based on aortic BP and the predictive value of brachial BP for aortic hypertension was poor (positive predictive value = 13.8%). Participants with aortic hypertension had higher left ventricular mass index than those with brachial hypertension.

Conclusions Brachial BP substantially overestimates aortic BP in adolescents due to marked aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification. Use of brachial blood pressure may result in overdiagnosis of hypertension during screening in adolescence.

Keywords: blood pressure, hypertension, adolescence, aortic

Introduction

Blood pressure (BP) is the leading global cause of mortality.[1] BP typically increases with age,[2] however elevated BP is frequently evident in youth, with recent studies reporting that around 2 to 13% of young people may be hypertensive, depending on geographical region and definition used to classify hypertension.[3, 4] Disturbingly, there is evidence that the prevalence of elevated BP in children is increasing,[5] probably as a result of the global epidemic of obesity and physical inactivity.[6] Elevated BP in young people is important as there is evidence that BP tracks into adulthood,[7] and has long term implications for cardiovascular health and mortality.[8, 9] Conversely, a diagnosis of hypertension can have adverse psychological consequences[10] and pharmacological treatment for hypertension has adverse effects. This is particularly relevant since the benefits and harms of antihypertensive medication have not been studied extensively in young people.[11, 12]

It is well recognised that systolic BP can differ substantially depending on the site of measurement. Typically brachial systolic BP is higher than aortic systolic BP because of pulse pressure amplification due to wave reflection.[13] In adults pulse pressure amplification is highly variable,[14] tends to decrease with age[15] and can account for isolated systolic hypertension (ISH).[16] ISH in adults between 18 and 39 years is more common than systolic plus diastolic hypertension,[17] although its clinical significance is debated in this age-group.[18, 19] Further, there is evidence that aortic as opposed to brachial BP is a more relevant prognostic indicator - being more strongly associated with cardiovascular events in adults,[20, 21] and with more target organ damage in both adults[22] and adolescents.[23]

At present, there is limited evidence on the extent of the difference between aortic and brachial BP in adolescence, the prevalence of isolated systolic hypertension in people below the age of 18, or its impact on the diagnosis of hypertension in youth, an issue highlighted by recent international guidelines.[4] We therefore aimed to determine the difference in 1) brachial and aortic BP in a large sample of adolescents drawn from an English birth cohort, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC); 2) the proportion of people with hypertension or ISH in this sample based on the use of brachial or aortic BP. A further aim was to determine aortic and brachial blood pressure, hypertension and ISBP differed in

relation to target organ damage to the heart (i.e left ventricular mass index (LVMI)) or vasculature (i.e. carotid intima media thickness (cIMT) and carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity (cfPWV)), and investigated possible factors that contributed to aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification (ABPPA) in adolescents.

Methods

Study design and participants

Pregnant women resident in the former county of Avon, in the South West of England, with expected dates of delivery 1st April 1991 to 31st December 1992. were invited to take part in The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). The initial number of pregnancies enrolled was 14,541 (for these at least one questionnaire has been returned or a “Children in Focus” clinic had been attended by 19/07/99). Of these initial pregnancies, there was a total of 14,062 live births and 13,988 children who were alive at 1 year of age and have been followed since then.[24, 25] The study website (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/) contains details of all available data. The present analysis is based on 5,217 participants aged ~17, who attended the ALSPAC clinic between 2009 and 2011 as part of on-going follow-up. Ethical approval was obtained from the ALSPAC Law and Ethics Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committee, and all participants provided written informed consent.

Individuals with diabetes mellitus (n=21), familial hypercholesterolemia (n=8), and known heart disease (n=3), women who were pregnant (n=15) or those who did not participate in the BP measurement session for any reason (n = 862) were excluded. A further 11 people refused tonometry measurements and in 392 people tonometry measurements failed QC procedures, yielding a total of 3850 evaluable recordings (Supplementary Figure S1).

Clinic measurements

Age and sex were recorded in clinic. Other demographic and lifestyle data were ascertained by questionnaire. Socioeconomic position was assessed on the basis of father’s occupation and mother’s education. Alcohol consumption was assessed as the number of drinks containing alcohol consumed on a typical day, smoking was

categorized as never, ever but not current, or current. Weight and height were measured while the participants were wearing light clothing and no shoes. Height was estimated to the nearest 0.1 cm with a Harpenden Stadiometer. Body weight was measured to the nearest 0.1 kg using a Tanita TBF 305 scale. Body composition was assessed using a Lunar Prodigy Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scanner (GE Medical Systems, Madison, Wisconsin). Habitual physical activity was assessed using a hip-worn uniaxial ActiGraph device between age 14-17 (AM7164 2.2, ActiGraph LLC, Fort Walton Beach, FL, USA). Carotid femoral pulse wave velocity (cfPWV) and carotid radial pulse wave velocity (crPWV) were measured using a Vicorder device (SMT Medical Technology GmbH, Bristol, UK). Left ventricular mass was measured in approximately 1 in 2 participants using an ultrasound device (HDI 5000, Philips Healthcare, North Andover, MA, USA) equipped with a P4-2 Phased Array ultrasound transducer according to American Society of Echocardiography guidelines as previously described[23] and indexed to height[1.7]. [Hannah ref if accepted – Chirinos if not] Blood samples were collected following an overnight fast for those assessed in the morning or a minimum of 6 hours fasting for those assessed in the afternoon. Samples were spun immediately, separated, and frozen at -80°C before analysis. Lipid profile (total cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, triglycerides), glucose, and insulin, were measured as described previously.[26]

The participant's sitting BP and heart rate was measured at least three times with at least a minute interval using an Omron 705IT device according to contemporary guidelines in the dominant arm using an appropriate cuff size.[27] The average of the final 2 readings was used. The BP waveform was measured using radial tonometry (SphygmoCor, AtCor Medical) and aortic pressure was estimated using a generalized transfer function (GTF) that has been validated in adults and children.[14, 28] SBP2 was also used as an alternative estimate of aortic systolic BP which does not rely on a GTF.[29] ABPPA was calculated as brachial pulse pressure/aortic pulse pressure. All measurements were made by trained investigators and on-going quality control was conducted throughout the study; reproducibility was excellent as has been reported previously.[30]

In accordance with the recent American Academy of Pediatrics Clinical Practice Guideline[12] and ESH guidelines,[31] hypertension was defined as brachial BP ≥140/90

mmHg. Isolated systolic hypertension (ISH) was defined as systolic BP ≥140 and diastolic BP <90 mmHg.[31] For classification of hypertension based on aortic BP we used a definition of aortic BP ≥130/90 mmHg as hypertensive,[32, 33] and aortic systolic BP ≥130 and diastolic BP <90 mmHg as indicative of aortic ISH (aISH).

Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed in Stata/MP 17.0 (StataCorp). Descriptive statistics for continuous variables are presented as means (SD) and N(%) for categorical variables. Comparisons between the included sample and those eligible but not included were made using a Student's t-test or Chi^2 as appropriate. Analyses were stratified by sex, based on previous evidence of sex differences in the aortic BP waveform and ABPPA.[34] For the main analysis of difference in brachial and aortic BP we used unadjusted linear regression or 2-dimension fractional polynomial if there was evidence of non-linearity. If there was evidence of heteroskedasticity, standard errors for the linear model were estimated using the bootstrap estimator. Linear regression results are summarised as beta coefficients with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). When non-linearity and heteroskedasticity were present we used a combination of fractional polynomials and quantile regression to produce median, 5% and 95% quantile boundaries for the non-linear relationship [95% QI]. For differences in proportions of different definitions of HR using aortic and brachial BP we used unadjusted logistic regression. We estimated sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative prediction metrics for hypertension and ISH by aortic and brachial BP. Associations between aortic hypertension or brachial hypertension in the absence of aortic hypertension and measures of target organ damage were adjusted for potential cofounders (age, BMI, fat and lean mass, habitual physical activity, maternal education and socioeconomic status) chosen on based on background knowledge. To investigate potential predictors of ABPPA we used a linear model with inclusion of clinical predictors, (see Table 1) model selection was performed using elastic net using cross-validation with 10-folds. We report the % variation explained in the outcome by all the selected variables.

Primary analyses were performed using listwise deletion to handle missing data, on the assumption that conditional independence between missingness and aortic to

brachial pulse pressure amplification (outcome) was more plausible than a missing at random assumption.

Results

Characteristics of participants are shown in Table 1. 66% of participants were female, and the mean age for both sexes was 17.8 years. Mean brachial BP for both sexes was 116.7/64.6 mmHg, with males having a higher brachial BP than females. Compared with all those invited, participants who attended clinic were more likely to be female and to come from more advantaged socio-economic circumstances (supplementary Table S1).

Figure 1A - D shows a comparison of brachial and aortic systolic and diastolic BP for males and females. The distribution of differences in brachial and aortic systolic BP for males and females is shown in supplementary Figure S2.

For both males and females, there was a difference between aortic and brachial systolic BP (male: -22.3 [-31.2, -13.3] mmHg; female: -17.8 [-25.5, -10.0] mmHg). The difference between aortic and brachial systolic BP was attributable to large ABPPA which was of similar magnitude in both sexes (male: median 1.71 (range 1.23 to 1.96); female: median 1.71 (range 1.10 to 2.08), although because BP in males was higher absolute differences were larger for males than females. There was no evidence of a difference in the slope of the relationship between aortic and brachial systolic BP (p interaction = 0.13). Differences between SBP2, an alternative measure of aortic systolic BP and brachial systolic BP were even larger (male: -33.7 [-53.0, -14.4] mmHg; female: -25.0 [-40.7, -9.2]) with larger differences between males and females.

In contrast, there was a minimal difference between aortic and brachial diastolic BP in either sex (male: 1.4 [-0.4, 3.1] mmHg; female: 1.2 [-0.3, 2.8] mmHg) (Figure 1 C & D).

Classification and prevalence of hypertension using brachial and aortic BP.

Based on brachial BP, 123(3%) participants were classified as hypertensive; of these ISH accounted for 109(88%) of hypertensive cases. There was a marked sex difference in hypertension prevalence based on brachial BP; there were 101

hypertensive males (6% of males) and 22 hypertensive females (1% of females). ISH accounted for 98(97%) cases of hypertension in males but only 11(50%) cases of hypertension in females.

When aortic BP was used, there were only 23(0.6%) cases of aortic hypertension. Of these 5(21%) were due to aISH. A minimal sex difference was observed for aortic hypertension: 9 males (0.5% of males) had aortic hypertension of which 4 were attributable to aISH. In contrast 14 females (0.7%) had aortic hypertension of which only 1 had aISH.

A classification matrix for aortic and brachial hypertension is shown in Table 2A. While the sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value of brachial BP for aortic hypertension were excellent, brachial BP had a poor positive predictive value for aortic hypertension (13.8%).

Results for ISH were similar (Table 2B) with excellent sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value of brachial BP for aortic ISH but very poor positive predictive value for aortic ISH (4.6%).

Relationship of aortic hypertension compared with ISH on early target organ damage in adolescence.

Both aortic hypertension and brachial hypertension without aortic hypertension were associated with cardiac target organ damage (higher LVMI), although the elevation in LVMI was larger in people with aortic hypertension than ISH (13.4 (95% CI 4.0, 22.8) $g/m^{1.7}$; p = 0.005 versus 7.1(95% CI 1.4, 12.8) $g/m^{1.7}$; p = 0.015) after adjustment for potential confounders. There was no convincing evidence that either brachial or aortic hypertension or ISH were associated with vascular target organ damage as assessed by cIMT or cfPWV (Supplementary data TBA)

Predictors of aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification

For males 4 variables were identified as predictors of ABPPA (age, heart rate, crPWV and room temperature). The out-of-sample r^2 was very modest (r^2 = 0.04) indicating that ABPPA was largely unexplained by these variables. A sensitivity analysis excluding physical activity identified a total of 8 predictors (age, total fat mass, HDL-cholesterol, heart rate, smoking, crPWV, cfPWV and room temperature) was only minimally different in terms of model fit (r^2 = 0.08) despite the larger numbers of predictors and fewer missing values.

For females a total of 5 variables (HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides, heart rate, maternal education and cfPWV) were predictors of ABPPA; however the out-of-sample r^2 was again very modest (r^2 = 0.03;). A sensitivity analysis excluding physical activity only marginally improved the variance explained by the model (r^2 = 0.08).

Discussion

We observed that brachial systolic BP was substantially higher than aortic systolic BP in both sexes in a birth cohort of adolescents and that this difference varied considerably between individuals. Higher brachial systolic BP is attributable to strong pulse pressure amplification in young people, this amplification led to a large discrepancy in hypertension diagnosis when criteria based on brachial BP and aortic BP were compared. Both aortic hypertension and brachial hypertension without aortic hypertension, which corresponded to cases of ISH in almost all instances, were associated with increased LVMI, although the association was stronger with aortic hypertension and there was no evidence of vascular target organ damage (based on PWV or cIMT) in people with hypertension or ISH. Penalized regression (elastic net) using a wide range of measured variables, (including age, heart rate, cfPWV, crPWV and CV risk factors) explained <10% of the variance in ABPPA in either sex, indicating that differences between brachial systolic BP and aortic systolic BP cannot be predicted, at least by these variables. ABPPA is therefore an important and unexplained source of variation in brachial systolic BP. Our finding of large differences in brachial and aortic systolic BP due to ABPPA in young people is consistent with previous studies.[15, 16] In the Anglo-Cardiff Collaborative Trial II younger age was by far the strongest predictor of ABPPA, with smaller contributions from sex, diabetes, smoking and cardiovascular diseases.[15] Since the age range in our birth cohort was narrow and participants were young and predominantly healthy, our findings with respect to ABBPA are broadly consistent with these observations.

ABPPA is attributable to wave reflection from the downstream circulation, which arises because of impedance mismatching in the peripheral arterial tree.[13] At an individual bifurcation the magnitude of wave reflection depends on the geometrical and biophysical properties of the parent and daughter arteries,[35] but reflection patterns from anatomically asymmetric trees such as those in the upper limb are

complex[36] which probably explains why the magnitude of pulse pressure amplification is unpredictable between individuals.

The high variability in ABPPA between individuals results in discrepancies in diagnosis of hypertension based on aortic or brachial BP in this age group. Hypertension is relatively uncommon in children and adolescents; current global estimates are around 2-13%,[3, 4] but its prevalence has risen sharply since the 1990's and there are calls for more screening.[37] Previous studies have reported that aortic BP is a better predictor of outcomes than brachial BP in adults, and we have reported previously in ALSPAC that aortic pulse pressure is more closely associated with left ventricular hypertrophy than brachial pulse pressure in adolescence.[23] Another more recent study using ambulatory aortic BP in selected normotensive and hypertensive young people drew similar conclusions with regard to the superiority of aortic BP as a predictor of elevated LV mass.[38] While the evidence cannot be definitive in the absence of hard endpoints (which will take years to accrue), our data suggest that aortic BP may be a more appropriate indicator of risk in young people - this is consistent with most key organs being exposed to aortic, not brachial systolic BP. Since cuff-based devices are now available for measurement of aortic pressure this suggests that their wider use in children and adolescence may support therapeutic decision making.

Our findings of large variability in ABPPA may also help explain previous conflicting observations in young adults comparing relationships of systolic and diastolic BP with later CV mortality,[8, 39, 40] since this variability is likely to introduce uncertainty in estimated risk relationships. Although aortic BP was a stronger predictor of early cardiac target organ damage than brachial BP, there was an association, albeit weaker, between ISH and higher LVMI in males. This may indicate that ISH in youth is not entirely benign, consistent with suggestions based on studies in older adults.[41, 42]

Our study has limitations. At recruitment ALSPAC was not representative of the UK population,[24] and as with all cohort studies there has been attrition over time, which may introduce further bias and could limit the generalizability of the findings. Further studies in different geographic regions and covering different age ranges in childhood would be valuable. We also acknowledge that % variation explained has

limitations as a metric of model performance,[43] but it is widely used and easy to understand.

Conclusions

Blood pressure measured at the brachial artery overestimates aortic blood pressure in adolescents due to marked aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification. Use of brachial blood pressure may result in overdiagnosis of hypertension in adolescence.

Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in the study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviews, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists, and nurses.

Sources of Funding

Cardiovascular measurements at age 17 were supported by grants from the Wellcome Trust (086676/7/08/Z) and the British Heart Foundation (PG/06/145 & CS/15/6/31468 & SP/F/21/150020). GDS, LDH and DL work within the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, which is supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00011/1&6).The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome Trust (102215/2/13/2), together with the University of Bristol, provide core support for the ALSPAC study.

Disclosures

ADH – None

GDS - GDS reports Scientific Advisory Board Membership for Relation Therapeutics and Insitro.

LDH - None

DL – None

SJ - None

CMP - None

NC – Receives remuneration for membership of data monitoring and safety committees for trials sponsored by AstraZeneca pharmaceuticals.

References

1. Ezzati M, Lopez AD, Rodgers A, Vander Hoorn S, Murray CJ, Comparative Risk Assessment Collaborating G. Selected major risk factors and global and regional burden of disease. *Lancet*. 2002;360:1347-1360
2. Singh GM, Danaei G, Pelizzari PM, Lin JK, Cowan MJ, Stevens GA, Farzadfar F, Khang YH, Lu Y, Riley LM, Lim SS, Ezzati M. The age associations of blood pressure, cholesterol, and glucose: Analysis of health

examination surveys from international populations. *Circulation*. 2012;125:2204-2211
3. Flynn JT, Kaelber DC, Baker-Smith CM, Blowey D, Carroll AE, Daniels SR, de Ferranti SD, Dionne JM, Falkner B, Flinn SK, Gidding SS, Goodwin C, Leu MG, Powers ME, Rea C, Samuels J, Simasek M, Thaker VV, Urbina EM, Subcommittee On S, Management Of High Blood Pressure In C. Clinical practice guideline for screening and management of high blood pressure in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140:e20171904
4. Lurbe E, Agabiti-Rosei E, Cruickshank JK, Dominiczak A, Erdine S, Hirth A, Invitti C, Litwin M, Mancia G, Pall D, Rascher W, Redon J, Schaefer F, Seeman T, Sinha M, Stabouli S, Webb NJ, Wuhl E, Zanchetti A. 2016 european society of hypertension guidelines for the management of high blood pressure in children and adolescents. *J. Hypertens.* 2016;34:1887-1920
5. Rosner B, Cook NR, Daniels S, Falkner B. Childhood blood pressure trends and risk factors for high blood pressure: The nhanes experience 1988-2008. *Hypertension*. 2013;62:247--254
6. Lurbe E. Childhood blood pressure: Trends and future tracks. *Hypertension*. 2013;62:242-243
7. Chen X, Wang Y. Tracking of blood pressure from childhood to adulthood: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *Circulation*. 2008;117:3171--3180
8. Sundstrom J, Neovius M, Tynelius P, Rasmussen F. Association of blood pressure in late adolescence with subsequent mortality: Cohort study of swedish male conscripts. *Br. Med. J.* 2011;342:d643
9. Ghosh AK, Francis DP, Chaturvedi N, Kuh D, Mayet J, Hughes AD, Hardy RJ. Cardiovascular risk factors from early life predict future adult cardiac structural and functional abnormalities: A systematic review of the published literature. *J Cardiol Ther*. 2014;2:78-87
10. Hamer M, Batty GD, Stamatakis E, Kivimaki M. Hypertension awareness and psychological distress. *Hypertension*. 2010;56:547-550
11. Hinton TC, Adams ZH, Baker RP, Hope KA, Paton JFR, Hart EC, Nightingale AK. Investigation and treatment of high blood pressure in young people: Too much medicine or appropriate risk reduction? *Hypertension*. 2020;75:16-22
12. Khoury M, Madsen N. Screening and management of high blood pressure in children and adolescents. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2018;172:1087-1088
13. Zambanini A, Cunningham SL, Parker KH, Khir AW, Mc GTSA, Hughes AD. Wave-energy patterns in carotid, brachial, and radial arteries: A noninvasive approach using wave-intensity analysis. *Am. J. Physiol. Heart Circ. Physiol.* 2005;289:H270-276
14. Pauca AL, O'Rourke MF, Kon ND. Prospective evaluation of a method for estimating ascending aortic pressure from the radial artery pressure waveform. *Hypertension*. 2001;38:932--937
15. McEniery CM, Yasmin, McDonnell B, Munnery M, Wallace SM, Rowe CV, Cockcroft JR, Wilkinson IB. Central pressure: Variability and impact of cardiovascular risk factors: The anglo-cardiff collaborative trial ii. *Hypertension*. 2008;51:1476-1482
16. O'Rourke MF, Vlachopoulos C, Graham RM. Spurious systolic hypertension in youth. *Vasc. Med.* 2000;5:141-145
17. Grebla RC, Rodriguez CJ, Borrell LN, Pickering TG. Prevalence and determinants of isolated systolic hypertension among young adults: The 1999-

2004 us national health and nutrition examination survey. *J. Hypertens.* 2010;28:15-23
18. Lurbe E, Redon J. Isolated systolic hypertension in young people is not spurious and should be treated: Con side of the argument. *Hypertension*. 2016;68:276-280
19. McEniery CM, Franklin SS, Cockcroft JR, Wilkinson IB. Isolated systolic hypertension in young people is not spurious and should be treated: Pro side of the argument. *Hypertension*. 2016;68:269-275
20. Cheng YB, Thijs L, Aparicio LS, Huang QF, Wei FF, Yu YL, Barochiner J, Sheng CS, Yang WY, Niiranen TJ, Boggia J, Zhang ZY, Stolarz-Skrzypek K, Gilis-Malinowska N, Tikhonoff V, Wojciechowska W, Casiglia E, Narkiewicz K, Filipovsky J, Kawecka-Jaszcz K, Wang JG, Li Y, Staessen JA, International Database of Central Arterial Properties for Risk Stratification I. Risk stratification by cross-classification of central and brachial systolic blood pressure. *Hypertension*. 2022;79:1101-1111
21. Vlachopoulos C, Aznaouridis K, O'Rourke MF, Safar ME, Baou K, Stefanadis C. Prediction of cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality with central haemodynamics: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur. Heart J.* 2010;31:1865-1871
22. Kollias A, Lagou S, Zeniodi ME, Boubouchairopoulou N, Stergiou GS. Association of central versus brachial blood pressure with target-organ damage: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hypertension*. 2016;67:183-190
23. Ferreira DL, Fraser A, Howe LD, Jones S, Smith GD, Lawlor DA, Tapp RJ, Ness AR, Deanfield JE, Chaturvedi N, Hughes AD. Associations of central and peripheral blood pressure with cardiac structure and function in an adolescent birth cohort: The avon longitudinal study of parents and children. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2015;65:2048-2050
24. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, Molloy L, Ness A, Ring S, Davey Smith G. Cohort profile: The 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the avon longitudinal study of parents and children. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 2013;42:111-127
25. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, Wells N. The avon longitudinal study of parents and children (alspac): An update on the enrolled sample of index children in 2019. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2019;4:51
26. Falaschetti E, Hingorani AD, Jones A, Charakida M, Finer N, Whincup P, Lawlor DA, Davey Smith G, Sattar N, Deanfield JE. Adiposity and cardiovascular risk factors in a large contemporary population of pre-pubertal children. *Eur. Heart J.* 2010;31:3063-3072
27. Williams B, Poulter NR, Brown MJ, Davis M, McInnes GT, Potter JF, Sever PS, McG. TS. Guidelines for management of hypertension: Report of the fourth working party of the british hypertension society, 2004-bhs iv. *J. Hum. Hypertens.* 2004;18:139-185
28. Cai TY, Haghighi MM, Roberts PA, Mervis J, Qasem A, Butlin M, Celermajer DS, Avolio A, Skilton MR, Ayer JG. Assessment of central arterial hemodynamics in children: Comparison of noninvasive and invasive measurements. *Am. J. Hypertens.* 2021;34:163-171
29. Guilcher A, Brett S, Munir S, Clapp B, Chowienczyk PJ. Estimating central sbp from the peripheral pulse: Influence of waveform analysis and calibration error. *J. Hypertens.* 2011;29:1357-1366

30. Park C, Fraser A, Howe LD, Jones S, Davey Smith G, Lawlor DA, Chaturvedi N, Hughes AD. Elevated blood pressure in adolescence is attributable to a combination of elevated cardiac output and total peripheral resistance. *Hypertension*. 2018;72:1103-1108
31. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, Clement DL, Coca A, de Simone G, Dominiczak A, Kahan T, Mahfoud F, Redon J, Ruilope L, Zanchetti A, Kerins M, Kjeldsen SE, Kreutz R, Laurent S, Lip GYH, McManus R, Narkiewicz K, Ruschitzka F, Schmieder RE, Shlyakhto E, Tsioufis C, Aboyans V, Desormais I, Group ESCSD. 2018 esc/esh guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension. *Eur. Heart J.* 2018;39:3021-3104
32. Cheng HM, Chuang SY, Sung SH, Yu WC, Pearson A, Lakatta EG, Pan WH, Chen CH. Derivation and validation of diagnostic thresholds for central blood pressure measurements based on long-term cardiovascular risks. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2013;62:1780-1787
33. Takase H, Dohi Y, Kimura G. Distribution of central blood pressure values estimated by omron hem-9000ai in the japanese general population. *Hypertension research : official journal of the Japanese Society of Hypertension*. 2013;36:50-57
34. Hayward CS, Kelly RP. Gender-related differences in the central arterial pressure waveform. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 1997;30:1863-1871
35. Brown N. Impedance matching at arterial bifurcations. *J. Biomech.* 1993;26:59-67
36. Taylor MG. The input impedance of an assembly of randomly branching elastic tubes. *Biophys. J.* 1966;6:29-51
37. Robinson CH, Chanchlani R. High blood pressure in children and adolescents: Current perspectives and strategies to improve future kidney and cardiovascular health. *Kidney Int Rep*. 2022;7:954-970
38. Ntineri A, Kollias A, Bountzona I, Servos G, Moyssakis I, Destounis A, Vazeou A, Soldatou A, Stergiou GS. Twenty-four-hour ambulatory central blood pressure in adolescents and young adults: Association with peripheral blood pressure and preclinical organ damage. *J. Hypertens.* 2020;38:1980-1988
39. McCarron P, Smith GD, Okasha M, McEwen J. Blood pressure in young adulthood and mortality from cardiovascular disease. *Lancet*. 2000;355:1430-1431
40. Miura K, Daviglus ML, Dyer AR, Liu K, Garside DB, Stamler J, Greenland P. Relationship of blood pressure to 25-year mortality due to coronary heart disease, cardiovascular diseases, and all causes in young adult men - the chicago heart association detection project in industry. *Arch. Intern. Med.* 2001;161:1501-1508
41. Hulsen HT, Nijdam ME, Bos WJ, Uiterwaal CS, Oren A, Grobbee DE, Bots M. Spurious systolic hypertension in young adults; prevalence of high brachial systolic blood pressure and low central pressure and its determinants. *J. Hypertens.* 2006;24:1027-1032
42. McEniery CM, Yasmin, Wallace S, Maki-Petaja K, McDonnell B, Sharman JE, Retallick C, Franklin SS, Brown MJ, Lloyd RC, Cockcroft JR, Wilkinson IB. Increased stroke volume and aortic stiffness contribute to isolated systolic hypertension in young adults. *Hypertension*. 2005;46:221-226

43. Harrell FE. *Regression modeling strategies : With applications to linear models, logistic regression, and survival analysis*. New York: Springer Science + Business Media

Springer; 2001

Tables

Table 1 Participant characteristics

	All			Male			Female		
Variable	**N**	**Mean/ %**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean/ %**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean/ %**	**SD**
Age, y	3,850	17.8	0.4	1,704	17.8	0.4	2,146	17.8	0.4
Height, cm	3,767	171.3	9.4	1,672	178.9	6.7	2,095	165.2	6.2
Weight, kg	3,771	67.0	13.5	1,675	72.3	12.9	2,096	62.9	12.4
BMI, kg/m^2	3,767	22.8	4.0	1,672	22.6	3.7	2,095	23.0	4.2
Fat mass, kg	3,706	18.2	10.4	1650	13.9	9.7	2,056	21.8	9.6
Lean mass, kg	3,706	45.7	10.0	1,650	55. 3	6.1	2,056	38.0	4.3
Fasting glucose, mmol/l	2,562	5.0	0.4	1,233	5.1	0.41	1,329	4.9	0.4
Insulin, pmol/l	2,528	49.4	42.2	1,223	45.5	36.2	1,305	53.0	46.9
HOMA-S, %	2,513	147.2	81.6	1,212	160.5	89.1	1,301	134.9	71.9
Total cholesterol, mmol/l	2,562	3.8	0.7	1,233	3.6	0.6	1,329	3.9	0.7
HDL-cholesterol, mmol/l	2,562	1.3	0.3	1,233	1.2	0.3	1,329	1.3	0.3
Triglycerides, mmol/l	2,562	0.8	0.4	1,233	0.8	0.4	1,329	0.8	0.3
MVPA, min/day	1,488	23.5	18.6	632	30.3	20.4	856	18.6	15.3
Brachial systolic BP, mmHg	3,850	116.7	11.5	1,704	122.6	10.7	2,146	111.9	9.8

Brachial diastolic BP, mmHg	3,850	64.6	7.5	1,704	64.3	7.6	2,146	64.8	7.5
Heart rate, bpm	3,850	69.7	10.8	1,704	66.6	10.6	2,146	17.8	0.4
Carotid-femoral PWV, m/s	3,107	5.8	0.7	1,398	6.0	0.7	1,709	5.5	0.6
Carotid-radial PWV, m/s	3,118	7.9	1.2	1,399	8.0	1.3	1,719	7.8	1.1
Room temperature, °C	3,286	21.6	2.0	1,473	21.7	1.9	1,813	21.6	2.0
Male sex	1,704	44.3%							
Father's occupation	3,465			1,551			1914		
I - Professional	386	11.1%		175	11.3%		211	11.0%	
II - Managerial and technical	1,340	38.7%		605	39.0%		735	38.4%	
IIINM - Skilled non-manual	410	11.8%		196	12.6%		214	11.2%	
IIIM - Skilled manual	986	28.5%		408	26.3%		578	30.2%	
IV - Partly skilled	249	7.2%		130	8.4%		119	6.2%	
V - Unskilled	94	2.7%		37	2.4%		57	3.0%	
Mother's education	3,496			1,551			1,945		
less than O-level	671	19.2%		278	17.9%		393	20.2%	
O-level	1,177	33.7%		502	32.4%		675	34.7%	
A-level	986	28.2%		456	29.4%		530	27.3%	
Degree or above	662	18.9%		315	20.3%		347	17.8%	
Smoking	3,279			1,450			1829		
Never	1,636	49.9%		781	53.9%		855	46.8%	

Ex	742	22.6%	304	21.0%	438	24.0%
Current	901	27.5%	365	25.2%	536	29.3%
Alcohol, drinks per typical day	3,191		1,403		1,788	
0	164	5.1%	5.2	5.2%	91	5.1%
1 or 2	655	20.5%	298	21.2%	357	20.0%
3 or 4	862	27.0%	368	26.2%	494	27.6%
5 or 6	794	24.9%	310	22.1%	484	27.1%
7 to 9	454	14.2%	226	16.1%	228	12.8%
10 or more	262	8.2%	128	9.1%	134	7.5%

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; BP, blood pressure; HOMA-S, homeostasis model assessment of insulin sensitivity; MVPA, time spent in moderate or vigorous physical activity; PWV, pulse wave velocity.

Table 2A Classification matrix for aortic and brachial SBP

	Brachial BP		
Aortic BP	Hypertensive	Normotensive	Total
Aortic Hypertensive	17	2	19
Aortic Normotensive	106	3725	3831
Total	123	3727	3850

Measure	**Estimate**	**95% confidence interval**
Sensitivity	89.5%	(66.9%, 98.7%)
Specificity	97.2%	(96.7%, 97.7%)
Likelihood ratio (+)	32.3	(25.0, 41.0)
Likelihood ratio (-)	0.11	(0.03, 0.40)
Positive predictive value	13.8%	(8.3%, 21.2%)
Negative predictive value	99.9%	(99.8%, 100%)

Table 2B Classification matrix for aortic and brachial ISH

	Brachial BP		
Aortic BP	ISH	No ISH	Total
Aortic ISH	5	0	5
Aortic No ISH	104	3741	3845
Total	109	3741	3850

Measure	**Estimate**	**95% confidence interval**
Sensitivity	100%	(47.8%, 100%)
Specificity	97.3%	(96.7%, 97.8%)
Likelihood ratio (+)	37.0	(30.6, 44.7)
Likelihood ratio (-)	0	- -
Positive predictive value	4.6%	(1.5%, 10.4%)
Negative predictive value	100%	(99.9%, 100%)

FIGURES


A
Brachial systolic BP, mmHg
Aortic systolic BP, mmHg
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200


C
Brachial diastolic BP, mmHg
Aortic diastolic BP, mmHg
40
60
80
100
120



Figure 1 Relationship between brachial and aortic BP. A) Systolic BP (Male), B Systolic BP (Female), C) Diastolic BP (Male), D) Diastolic BP (Female). Lines are fractional polynomial fits (solid line) to the data with 5% and 95% quantile limits (dotted line). The dashed line is the line of unity.