

Ambulatory blood pressure measurement in the evaluation of blood pressure lowering drugs

Eoin O'Brien, John P. Cox and Kevin O'Malley

Journal of Hypertension 1989, 7:243-247

Keywords: Hypertension, clinical trials, ambulatory blood pressure measurement, clinic blood pressure measurement, placebo effect.

Introduction

Since the indirect measurement of blood pressure based on the principle of arterial occlusion using a forearm cuff was introduced by Scipione Riva-Rocci in 1896 [1] and subsequently modified to incorporate auscultation by Nicolai Korotkoff in 1905 [2], this technique has been the universal method used in the assessment of blood pressure in medical practice. Most of the evidence showing that the antihypertensive drugs in everyday use lower blood pressure derives from studies of clinic blood pressure measured by this technique [3-5]. However, it is well known that casual blood pressure measured in the clinic may be influenced by a number of factors and as long ago as 1904, Theodore Janeway, writing before Korotkoff had reported the now accepted auscultatory method of measuring blood pressure, showed that stress could raise blood pressure [6].

Factors influencing blood pressure measurement

Apart from potential error and inconsistencies in technique [7], random variation of blood pressure readings is large; in one study a series of 40 readings from individuals on 20 different occasions showed a within-subject range of 25-39 mmHg [8]. Moreover, there is the circadian variation of blood pressure whereby blood pressure reaches its highest level at mid-morning, to fall thereafter throughout the day to its nadir in sleep with a rise again before waking [9].

Another confounding factor is the alarm or alerting reaction whereby the mere presence of the physician performing the measurement can induce substantial increases

in blood pressure [10]. This phenomenon is also present, albeit to a lesser degree, when blood pressure is measured by a technician [11] or a nurse [12]. Recently, Pickering and his colleagues reported that 21% of 292 patients with borderline hypertension diagnosed by clinic measurement had normal daytime ambulatory pressure [11]. These patients with 'white coat' hypertension did not show any generalized increase in blood pressure lability or exaggerated pressor response while at work. In a study of 638 patients with hypertension we found that using the World Health Organization level of hypertension (blood pressure $\geq 160/95$ mmHg) 89% of these patients would have been diagnosed hypertensive by the family practitioner, 65% by the hospital clinic and 46% by ambulatory blood pressure [13].

When attempting to ascertain the effect of drugs on blood pressure, good trial design can reduce the influence of factors affecting the measurement technique and blood pressure behaviour. Multiple recordings of blood pressure may reduce error from random variation, and taking blood pressure at the same time of day throughout a study should minimize errors associated with circadian variation. A cross-over design in which recordings are performed by the same doctor or nurse in the same room under standardized conditions reduces, but does not necessarily remove, error from the alarm reaction.

Assessing blood pressure lowering effect

One of the most surprising aspects of research into the efficacy of antihypertensive drugs, is the readiness with which a blood pressure lowering effect observed at one moment in the 24-h cycle, often without reference to the time of drug administration, is taken to indicate therapeutic

From the Blood Pressure Unit, Beaumont Hospital, Dublin 9 and the Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Sponsorship: Research quoted from this unit was supported by the Charitable Infirmary Trust, the Research Committee of the Royal Col-

lege of Surgeons in Ireland, and the Health Research Board (Ireland).

Requests for reprints to: Dr Eoin O'Brien, The Blood Pressure Unit, Beaumont Hospital, Dublin 9, Ireland.

Date of receipt: 6 January 1989.

tic efficacy through the day. It is, of course, difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate the duration of drug effect with clinic measurement as repeated readings are tedious to perform both for the patient and investigator. In any event, the methodology of conventional blood pressure measurement in many of these studies leaves much to be desired [14]. However, with the increasing use of new formulations of drugs that permit once and twice daily dosage in an effort to improve compliance [15], it is now more important than ever to be able to assess accurately the duration of drug effect. Furthermore, studies using ambulatory techniques have demonstrated the naivety of assessing the response to antihypertensive treatment by conventional clinical measurement alone [16]. To overcome the limitations of infrequent clinic measurements in assessing the efficacy and duration of action of antihypertensive drugs, self-measurement and ambulatory measurement have been used.

Self-measurement of blood pressure

Since Brown's observation in 1930 that blood pressure measured in the home was lower than that recorded by a doctor [17], the discrepancy between pressures recorded in the home and the clinic has often been confirmed [18-20]. Assessed against clinic measurements, blood pressure recorded in the home is accurate whether measured by patients [20] or their relatives or friends [21], and the technique can detect small average changes in blood pressure [22]. The usefulness of self-measurement of blood pressure in the assessment of the effects of therapy has been shown in several studies [19,23,24]. However, the technique has the disadvantage of being dependent on the ability of the subject to measure his or her blood pressure. Also, the patient's over-reaction to the normal fluctuations in blood pressure associated with daily living may cause psychological distress and affect the results in an unpredictable fashion [25]. The technique is further limited in that it is dependent on the subject's participation and cannot, therefore, give multiple readings during the day or any assessment of nocturnal blood pressure.

Non-invasive ambulatory treatment

The first step towards achieving a profile of blood pressure during normal activity was the development of a portable apparatus for direct recording of blood pressure in 1969 [26], which allowed assessment of the antihypertensive effect of blood pressure lowering drugs over a 24-h period [27,28]. However, being invasive, ethical considerations limit the application of this approach. Therefore, much effort has been directed to the development of non-invasive measuring devices which can be used repeatedly in the same patient. The early devices required participation by the subject who had to inflate the cuff at prescribed intervals and were therefore limited to daytime recording [29], but now fully automated recorders are available with automatic cuff inflation allowing the recording of blood pressure over 24-h [30,31].

There are certain disadvantages, however, with non-invasive ambulatory measurement. The cost of the equipment

is high, maintenance costs are often substantial, and the finance for a technician may have to be taken into consideration [32]. There is then the problem of accuracy. Devices should not be purchased (ideally they should not be marketed) unless the manufacturers provide independent validation of accuracy, preferably published in a reputable journal [33] and this is rarely done. Because of the variation in the methodology and statistical analysis of validation studies of ambulatory devices, it is not easy to make dogmatic assertions about the accuracy of the many devices now available. However, the American Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation has recently published a standard for electronic and automated sphygmomanometers [34] which is now being used for assessing new devices [35] and the British Hypertension Society is preparing a standardized protocol for validation which will permit comparison between studies, and hopefully allow prospective purchasers to make reasoned decisions on the basis of independent assessment.

The placebo effect of measurement

The existence of the placebo effect in the treatment of a variety of diseases is a well-substantiated phenomenon [36]. Because clinic blood pressure falls in response to placebo in most hypertensive patients [37,38], placebo control has routinely been incorporated into the design of antihypertensive drug studies. An important observation with ambulatory blood pressure measurement is that blood pressure monitored intra-arterially is not subject to the placebo effect [39]. While non-invasive ambulatory measurement has been found to be free of placebo effect in most studies [40-43], this has not been the experience in all cases [44]. The absence of a placebo effect with indirect ambulatory monitoring, if confirmed, would greatly simplify the design and conduct of efficacy studies of antihypertensive drugs. For example, many studies employ a randomized placebo-controlled cross-over design, on the basis that a comparison between treatments in the same subject is more precise and requires fewer subjects than a comparison between subjects. In such studies, a wash-out period before patients, cross-over treatments is recommended to reduce the possibility of a treatment/period interaction [45]. However, if there was no placebo effect with ambulatory blood pressure monitoring, then measurement performed before and repeated at the end of the treatment period would suffice, making the cross-over design with its risks of carry-over effects unnecessary. In fact, this approach has been adopted by Raftery and his colleagues for the last 7 years using direct intra-arterial ambulatory blood pressure measurement [46-50].

Ambulatory measurement and antihypertensive drug efficacy

For the past decade it has been our policy to incorporate ambulatory measurement into the study protocols of blood pressure lowering drugs [51-56]. Initially, we used daytime ambulatory measurement in double-blind, cross-over studies of drug efficacy. From the results of these and other similar studies a number of patterns emerge.

Firstly, ambulatory blood pressure may be in agreement with clinic blood pressure measurements [56–61]. In such studies, where a clinic fall in blood pressure is confirmed by ambulatory blood pressure measurement, the latter also demonstrates what conventional measurement can never show, namely the pattern of an antihypertensive effect over the dosing interval.

Secondly, conventional clinic measurement may fail to detect the blood pressure lowering effect, demonstrated by ambulatory measurement [51,55,62,63]. The studies showing this phenomenon used smaller numbers (six patients [51]; 11 patients [55]; 12 patients [62]; seven patients [63]), and for this reason their power to detect differences between treatments with clinic measurement was low. However, the greater number of observations available with ambulatory measurement, by reducing within-subject variability, greatly increases their power. For example, applying the power calculations for cross-over studies described by Hills and Armitage [45] to the data from one of these studies [55], it can be shown that eight patients would be required if ambulatory measurement was used to assess blood pressure lowering effect (to achieve a power of 85%), whereas 30 patients would be needed with clinic measurement. Ambulatory blood pressure measurement may also afford a means of determining patients likely to respond to drug treatment. In a recent study diltiazem decreased average whole-day blood pressure by 18/13 mmHg in patients whose clinically diagnosed hypertension was confirmed by pre-treatment 24-h blood pressure, but by only 0/1 mmHg in those whose 24-h pressures were normal [64]. This suggests that there are differing antihypertensive responses among patients diagnosed as hypertensive in the clinic, and those in whom hypertension is confirmed by 24-h ambulatory measurement. Given the increasing demands for and the high costs of studies of blood pressure lowering agents, the potential of ambulatory blood pressure to demonstrate clinically significant reductions using smaller samples than those required using clinic measurement [41] or by determining responder status, has important implications.

Finally, reductions in clinic blood pressure may be significant, but ambulatory blood pressure measurement may be either non-confirmatory [44,52,53,65–67], or show that the clinic reduction coincides only with a brief period of ambulatory reduction [54]. Thus, in a study of the antihypertensive efficacy of verapamil in the elderly evaluated by ambulatory blood pressure measurement where clinic blood pressure assessments were carried out within 4 h of dosing, a marked effect on clinic measurement was observed; ambulatory measurement revealed that control was poor for the remainder of the expected duration of the drug's action [54]. However, in other studies using ambulatory measurement [44,52,53,65–71] this loss of blood pressure control was not observed, raising another possibility, namely that the physiological basis of blood pressure elevation in the clinic may be different from that outside the clinic and that the dose of an antihypertensive agent effective in lowering clinic blood pressure may not be effective in reducing ambulatory blood pressure. This hypothesis is supported by the observation that nitrendipine reduces blood pressure effectively in the clinic, but this effect is blunted on ambulatory measurement during work

periods [66], possibly due to increased adrenergic activity associate with work. Similarly comparison of the β -blocker timolol with methyldopa showed similar significant reductions in clinic measurement, but ambulatory blood pressure was significantly reduced with timolol only [65]. Likewise, both the β -blocker, betaxolol, and verapamil reduced clinic blood pressure, but only betaxolol significantly reduced ambulatory blood pressure [67]. These studies suggest that β -blocking drugs have a sustained effect on ambulatory blood pressure not shared by drugs with other modes of action. Of considerable practical importance is the fact that many preparations would have been declared as quite efficacious blood pressure lowering agents by conventional measurement, whereas ambulatory measurement showed a pattern of activity that was far less impressive.

Future prospects for ambulatory measurement

Ambulatory blood pressure measurement in the words of Norman Kaplan, is 'an idea whose time has come' [68]. It is also moving into a new phase of development. In most of the studies cited, ambulatory measurement was carried out over a 12–16 h period simply because the devices used were not fully automated thus making night-time measurements impractical. With the new generation of ambulatory recorders, it is possible to obtain 24-h ambulatory measurement which provides not only further evidence of the duration of drug effect but also demonstrates the circadian rhythm of blood pressure. This latter facility, quite apart from being of value in the assessment of antihypertensive drugs, may also have important prognostic implications. There is some evidence that hypertensive patients who do not have a nocturnal fall in blood pressure (non-dippers) are at greater risk than the majority who show a significant reduction in nocturnal blood pressure (dippers) [69]. The possibility also exists that antihypertensive drugs with a prolonged duration of effect, or administered frequently, may cause a profound reduction in nocturnal blood pressure in 'dippers', and that such hypotension might lead to myocardial ischaemia and infarction [70]. While the prognostic and therapeutic implications of these findings require further evaluation, they provide cogent evidence in favour of assessing the effects of antihypertensive therapy on sleeping blood pressure, an area where we feel further research is urgently required.

Conclusions

The benefits of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring in the assessment of the efficacy of drug treatment are now well established. Conventional clinic measurement is influenced by many factors which make the technique unsuitable for research into drug efficacy, but more importantly, clinic measurement cannot provide assessment of duration of effect, nor of the effect of antihypertensive drugs on sleeping pressure. If it can be confirmed that non-invasive ambulatory blood pressure measurement is free of any placebo effect, then it is possible that the design of antihypertensive drug studies could be greatly simplified. The

greatest potential for ambulatory blood pressure measurement in assessing drug efficacy may be its ability to reduce significantly the numbers of patients needed in such studies. The time has surely come where studies of antihypertensive drug efficacy which do not assess blood pressure over 24 h should no longer be acceptable.

References

- Riva-Rocci S: Un nuovo sfigmomanometro. *Gazzetta Medica Italiana* 1896, **47**:981-996.
- Laher M, O'Brien E: In search of Korotkoff. *Br Med J* 1982, **285**:1796-1798.
- The Management Committee. The Australian therapeutic trial in mild hypertension. *Lancet* 1980, **1**:1261-1267.
- The Medical Research Council Working Party. MRC trial of treatment of mild hypertension: principal results. *Br Med J* 1985, **291**:97-104.
- Amery A, Birkenhäger W, Brixko P, Bulpitt C, Clement D, Deruytère M, De Schaepestryver A, Dolbery C, Fagard R, Foretti F, Forte J, Hamdy R, Henry JF, Joossens JV, Leonetti G, Lund-Johansen P, O'Malley K, Petrie J, Strasser T, Twomilehto J, Williams B: Mortality and morbidity results from the European Working Party on High Blood Pressure in the Elderly trial. *Lancet* 1985, **1**:1349-1354.
- Janeway TC: The clinical study of blood pressure. A guide to the sphygmomanometer. New York: Appleton D, 1904, pp 120.
- O'Brien E, O'Malley K: Blood pressure measurement. *In* ABC of hypertension. London: British Medical Journal, 1981, pp 1-17.
- Armitage P, Rose GA: The variability of measurement of casual blood pressure. I. A laboratory study. *Clin Sci* 1966, **30**:325-335.
- Millar-Craig MW, Bishop CN, Raftery EB: Circadian variation of blood-pressure. *Lancet* 1978, **1**:795-797.
- Mancia G, Bertinieri G, Grassi G, Parati G, Pomidossi G, Ferrari A, Gregorini L, Zanchetti A: Effects of blood-pressure measurement by the doctor on patient's blood pressure and heart rate. *Lancet* 1983, **1**:695-698.
- Pickering TG, James GD, Boddie C, Harshfield GA, Blank S, Laragh JH: How common is white coat hypertension? *JAMA* 1988, **259**:225-228.
- Mancia G: Methods for assessing blood pressure in humans. *Hypertension* 1983, **5** (suppl III):III5-III13.
- O'Brien E, O'Malley K: Overdiagnosing hypertension: a fifth of patients with borderline hypertension may be treated unnecessarily. *Br Med J* 1988, **297**:1211.
- Lehane A, O'Brien ET, O'Malley K: Reporting of blood pressure data in medical journals. *Br Med J* 1980, **281**:1603-1604.
- Blackwell B: Drug therapy: patient compliance. *N Engl J Med* 1973, **289**:249-252.
- Waeber B, Scherrer U, Petrillo A, Bidiville J, Nussberger J, Waeber G, Hofstetter J-R, Brunner HR: Are some hypertensives overtreated? A prospective study of ambulatory blood pressure recording. *Lancet* 1987, **II**:732-734.
- Brown GE: Daily and monthly rhythm in the blood pressure of a man with hypertension: a three year study. *Ann Intern Med* 1930, **3**:1177-1189.
- Ayman D, Goldshine AD: Blood pressure determination by patients with essential hypertension I. The difference between clinic and home readings before treatment. *Am J Med Sci* 1940, **200**:465-474.
- Fries ED: The discrepancy between home and office recordings of blood pressure in patients under treatment with pentapyrrolidinium. Importance of home recordings in adjusting dosages. *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia* 1954, **363**-367.
- Julius S, Ellis CN, Pascual AV, Matice M, Hansson L, Hunyor SN, Sandler LN: Home blood pressure determination: Value in borderline ('labile') hypertension. *JAMA* 1974, **229**:663-666.
- Laher MS, O'Boyle CP, Quinn C, O'Malley K, O'Brien ET: Home measurement of blood pressure: training of relatives. *Br Med J* 1981, **74**:113-114.
- Cottier C, Julius S, Gajendragadkar SV, Schork A: Usefulness of home BP determinations in treating borderline hypertension. *JAMA* 1982, **248**:555-558.
- Andersen AR, Nielsen PE: Home readings of blood pressure in evaluation of hypertensive subjects using a new self-recording manometer. *Acta Med Scand* 1981, (suppl 670):97-107.
- Corcoran AC, Dustan HP, Page IH: The evaluation of antihypertensive procedures, with particular reference to their effects on blood pressure. *Ann Intern Med* 1955, **43**:1161-1177.
- Self-measurement of blood pressure: a statement by the World Hypertension League. *J Hypertension* 1988, **6**:257-261.
- Bevan AT, Honour AJ, Stott FD: Direct arterial pressure recording in unrestricted man. *Clin Sci* 1969, **36**:329-344.
- Millar Craig MW, Kenny D, Mann S, Balasubramanian V, Raftery EB: Effect of once-daily atenolol on ambulatory blood pressure. *Br Med J* 1979, **1**:237-238.
- Mann S, Millar Craig MW, Balasubramanian V, Raftery EB: Propranolol LA and ambulatory blood pressure. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1980, **10**:443-447.
- Fitzgerald DJ, O'Callaghan WG, McQuaid R, O'Malley K, O'Brien E: Accuracy and reliability of two indirect ambulatory blood pressure recorders: Remler M2,000 and Cardiodyne Sphygmolog. *Br Heart J* 1982, **48**:572-579.
- Harshfield GA, Pickering TG, Laragh JH: A validation study of the Del Mar Avionics ambulatory blood pressure system. *Ambulatory Electrocardiography* 1979, **1**:7-12.
- Maheswaran R, Zenzuka AV, Gill JS, Beevers DG: Clinical evaluation of the SpaceLabs Model 5200 ambulatory blood-pressure monitor. *J Ambulatory Monitoring* 1988, **1**:33-37.
- O'Brien E, Fitzgerald D, O'Malley K: Blood pressure measurement current practice and future trends. *Br Med J* 1985, **290**:729-734.
- O'Brien E, Petrie JC, Littler WA, de Swiet M: Standards for blood pressure measuring devices. *Br Med J* 1987, **294**:1245-1246.
- Association for the Advancement of Medical Measurement. Standard for electronic or automated sphygmomanometer. Arlington VA 22209, 1986.
- Hope SL, Alun-Jones E, Sleight P: Validation of the accuracy of the Medilog ABP non-invasive blood-pressure monitor. *J Ambulatory Monitoring* 1988, **1**:39-51.
- Benson M, Epstein MD: The placebo effect—a neglected asset in the care of patients. *JAMA* 1975, **232**:1225-1227.
- Monstos SE, Sapira JD, Scheib ET, Shapiro AP: An analysis of the placebo effect in hospitalized hypertensive patients. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 1967, **8**:676-683.
- Doyle AE: Response to placebo treatment in hypertension. *Hypertension* 1983, **5** (suppl III):III3-III4.
- Gould BA, Mann S, Davies AB, Altman DG, Raftery EB: Does placebo lower blood-pressure? *Lancet* 1981, **II**:1377-1381.
- Dupont AG, Van der Niepen P, Six RO: Placebo does not lower ambulatory blood pressure. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1987, **24**:106-109.
- Conway J, Johnston J, Coats A, Somes V, Sleight P: The use of blood pressure monitoring to improve the accuracy and reduce the numbers of subjects in clinical trials of antihypertensive agents. *J Hypertension* 1988, **6**:111-116.
- Drayer JI, Weber MA, DeYoung JL, Brewer DD: Long-term BF monitoring in the evaluation of antihypertensive therapy. *Arch Intern Med* 1983, **143**:898-901.
- Poggi L, Vaisse B, Bernard F, Agabriel P: Etude de l'effet placebo par mesure ambulatoire non sanglante de la pression artérielle. *Arch Mal Coeur* 1987, **80**:1031-1036.
- Bellet M, Pagny Y-L, Chatellier G, Corvol P, Menard J: Evaluation of slow release nifedipine in essential hypertension by casual and ambulatory blood pressure measurement. Effects of acute versus chronic administration. *J Hypertension* 1987, **5**:599-604.
- Hills M, Armitage P: The two-period cross-over clinical trial. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1979, **8**:7-20.

46. Raftery EB, Melville DI, Gould BA, Mausi S, Whittington JR: A study of the antihypertensive action of xipamide using ambulatory intra-arterial monitoring. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1981, **12**:381-385.
47. Hornung RS, Gould BA, Kieso M, Raftery EB: A study of nadolol to determine its effect on ambulatory blood pressure over 24 hours, and during exercise testing. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1982, **14**:83-88.
48. Gould BA, Mann S, Kieso H, Balasubramanian V, Raftery EB: The 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure profile with verapamil. *Circulation* 1982, **65**:22-27.
49. Hornung RS, Gould BA, Jones RI, Sonecha TH, Raftery EB: Nifedipine tablets for systemic hypertension: A study using continuous ambulatory intra-arterial recording. *Am J Cardiol* 1983, **51**:1323-1327.
50. Jones RI, Hornung RS, Sonecha T, Raftery EB: The effect of a new calcium channel blocker nifedipine on 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure and the pressor response to isometric and dynamic exercise. *J Hypertension* 1983, **1**:85-89.
51. O'Boyle C, Fitzgerald D, Kelly JG, O'Malley K, O'Brien E: The efficacy of indapamide in hypertensive patients failing to respond to a β -blocker alone. *Drugs of Today* 1984, **20**:27-31.
52. Brennan M, O'Malley K, O'Brien E: The contribution of non-invasive ambulatory blood pressure measurement to antihypertensive drug evaluation. *ISAM 1985, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of Ambulatory Monitoring*, edited by Dal Palu C, Pessina AC. Italy: Cleup Editore, 1986, pp 105-112.
53. Harrington K, Fitzgerald P, O'Donnell P, Hill KW, O'Brien E, O'Malley K: Short and long term treatment of essential hypertension with feladipine as monotherapy. *Drugs* 1987, **34** (suppl 3):178-185.
54. Cox JP, O'Boyle CA, Mee F, Kelly J, Atkins N, Coakley D, O'Brien E, O'Malley K: The antihypertensive efficacy of verapamil in the elderly evaluated by ambulatory blood pressure. *J Human Hypertens* 1988, **2**:41-47.
55. O'Brien E, Ryan J, O'Malley K: Nicardipine as monotherapy in treatment of hypertension. *J Irish Coll Phys Surg*, 1988, **17**:31 (abstract).
56. Cox JP, Duggan J, Walsh JB, Coakley D, O'Brien E, O'Malley K: Captopril in the management of hypertension in the elderly. *J Hypertension* 1989, (in press).
57. Berglund G, de Faire U, Castenfors J, Anderson G, Hartford M, Liedholm H, Ljungman S, Thulin T, Wikstrand J: Monitoring 24-hour blood pressure in a drug trial: Evaluation of a non-invasive device. *Hypertension* 1985, **7**:688-694.
58. Dupont AG, van der Viepen P, Vanhaelst L: Ambulatory blood pressure lowering effects of butizide/potassium clenvenate in hypertensive patients. *Curr Ther Res* 1986, **40**:990-997.
59. Dupont AG, Vandernienpen P, Six RO: Effect of quafacine on ambulatory blood pressure and its variability in elderly patients with essential hypertension. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1987, **23**:397-401.
60. Cardillo C, Savi L, Musumeci V, Mores N, Meltimano M, Costalunga A, Guerrero G, Melina D, Falli G: Casual versus 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure recording in the evaluation of chronic administration of sustained-release verapamil. *J Hum Hypertension* 1988, **1**:281-285.
61. White WB, McCabe EJ: Effects of once-daily ACE inhibition with ciluzapril on casual, ambulatory and exercise blood pressure. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 1988, **43**:180 (abstract).
62. Gould BA, Mann S, Davies A, Altman DG, Raftery EB: Indormin: 24-hour profile of intra-arterial ambulatory blood pressure, a double-blind placebo controlled crossover study. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1981, **12**:675-735.
63. Schaller MD, Nussberger J, Waeber B, Porchet M, Brunner HR: Transdermal clonidine therapy in hypertensive patients. *JAMA* 1985, **253**:233-235.
64. Weber MA, Cheung DG, Graettinger WF, Lipson JL: Characterization of antihypertensive therapy by whole-day blood pressure monitoring. *JAMA* 1988, **259**:3281-3285.
65. Rion F, Waeber B, Graf MG, Laussi A, Porchet M, Brunner HR: Blood pressure response to antihypertensive therapy: ambulatory versus office blood pressure readings. *J Hypertension* 1985, **3**:139-143.
66. White WB, Smith V-E, McCabe EJ, Mieran MK: Effects of chronic nifedipine on casual (office) and 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 1985, **38**:60-64.
67. Waeber G, Beck G, Waeber B, Bidiville J, Nussberger J, Brunner HR: Comparison of betaxolol with verapamil in hypertensive patients: discrepancy between office and ambulatory blood pressures. *J Hypertension* 1988, **6**:239-245.
68. Garret BN, Kaplan N: Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring: a question of now and the future. *J Clin Hypertens* 1987, **3**:378-380.
69. O'Brien E, Sheridan J, O'Malley K: Dippers and non-dippers. *Lancet* 1988, **ii**:397-398.
70. Floras JS: Antihypertensive treatment, myocardial infarction, and nocturnal myocardial ischaemia. *Lancet* 1988, **ii**:994-996.

Do subjects with stiff arteries have high blood pressure?

John P. Cox, Ruth England*, Tony Cox*, J. Bernard Walsh*,
Davis Coakley*, John Feely†, Kevin O'Malley‡ and Eoin O'Brien

Journal of Hypertension 1989, 7 (suppl 6):S82-S83

It has been argued that age-related increases in arterial stiffness could lead to spuriously high indirect blood pressure measurements, with consequent overdiagnosis of hypertension in older patients. To study the relationship between arterial stiffness and blood pressure, we identified patients with 'arterial stiffness', using Osler's manoeuvre, and compared their blood pressure levels with patients of a similar age. A total of 250 hospital inpatients were assessed independently by two doctors. In the 198 patients (79%) where both observers agreed on Osler's manoeuvre status, positive Osler's manoeuvre was uncommon under the age of 50 years but became more common thereafter, rising to 58% of patients aged over 75 years. However, blood pressure levels were similar in each age group, irrespective of Osler's manoeuvre status. We conclude that increased arterial stiffness as measured by Osler's manoeuvre is not necessarily associated with raised blood pressure levels in the elderly.

Keywords: Osler's manoeuvre, elderly, hypertension, blood pressure measurement.

Introduction

It is well established that blood pressure in Western society rises with age [1,2]. It is also well known that arteries stiffen with age, usually as a result of medial calcification due to Monckeberg's arteriosclerosis [3]. The determination of blood pressure by indirect methods depends on collapse of the brachial artery when pressure within the cuff exceeds that within the vessel. It has therefore been argued that age-related increases in arterial stiffness could lead to spuriously high indirect blood pressure measurements [4]. Furthermore, it has been suggested that this condition, referred to as pseudohypertension, may be associated with an overdiagnosis of hypertension in older patients [5].

However, it remains to be shown whether blood pressure in patients with 'stiff arteries' is higher than in age-matched controls. To address this important question, an

easily performed test of arterial stiffness is required. A suitable test is the procedure first proposed by Sir William Osler in 1892, who stated that if, when the radial artery was compressed, the artery could be felt beyond the point of compression, then its walls were sclerosed [6]. This test has been modified slightly and has become known as Osler's manoeuvre [7]. A patient is described as being Osler's manoeuvre positive if, when a blood pressure cuff is inflated above systolic pressure, either the brachial or radial arteries are clearly palpable.

The aims of this study were to assess the prevalence of arterial stiffness in an elderly population, using Osler's manoeuvre, and to ascertain whether blood pressure differs between those with and without arterial stiffness.

Patients and methods

We assessed a total of 250 hospital inpatients (ranging in age from 16-98 years) from the general medical and geriatric wards at St James's Hospital. The patients were chosen randomly. At the time of analysis, 36 patients were hypertensive, 22 were taking drug treatment and 14 had taken drug treatment previously. Because of the high degree of interobserver variation associated with this clinical sign [8], patients were classified as being Osler's manoeuvre positive or negative by two doctors, each not knowing the other's findings. Only data from those patients for whom both doctors agreed on the Osler's manoeuvre status were used in the analysis. Recordings of blood pressure were made using a standard mercury sphygmomanometer, with the patient in the sitting position, Korotkoff phase V being taken for the diastolic pressure [9]. Assessment were made using the right arm unless the clinical situation dictated otherwise. Age, sex, blood pressure and antihypertensive drugs were recorded.

Results

The two doctors agreed on the Osler's manoeuvre status in 198 patients (79%), of whom just over half were male. A positive Osler's manoeuvre was uncommon under the age of 50 years (four of 46 patients; 8.7%) but became more common thereafter, rising to 58% of patients aged over 75 years. Blood pressure levels were similar in each age group irrespective of Osler's manoeuvre status (Table 1). Of the 22 patients taking antihypertensive medication

From the Blood Pressure Unit, Beaumont Hospital, *Mercer's Institute for Research in Ageing, St James's Hospital, the †Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Trinity College, and the ‡Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Dublin, Ireland.

Trust, the Research Committee of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland and the Health Research Board of Ireland.

Requests for reprints to: Dr Eoin O'Brien, The Blood Pressure Unit, Beaumont Hospital, Dublin 9, Ireland.

Sponsorship: This study was supported by the Charitable Infirmary

Table 1. Osler's manoeuvre status and blood pressure.

Osler status	Age 50–64 years			Age 65–74 years			Age 75+ years		
	n	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	n	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	n	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)
Positive	20	129 ± 17.4	75 ± 9.1	17	129 ± 17.4	75 ± 8.9	34	139 ± 19.1	78 ± 10.2
Negative	26	129 ± 20.3	75 ± 8.6	30	132 ± 22.3	75 ± 11.2	25	139 ± 20.0	78 ± 13.2

Values are means ± s.d.; n, number of patients

18 were in the Osler's manoeuvre negative group. In the 36 established hypertensive patients, 12 were Osler's positive while 24 were Osler's negative.

Discussion

In this study we examined the relationship between arterial stiffness, as measured by Osler's manoeuvre, and blood pressure in an elderly population. Although the clinical information provided by Osler's manoeuvre is limited by interobserver variation in its assessment [8], we feel that this problem was overcome in the study by analysing only the data from patients where both doctors agreed on the Osler's manoeuvre status. Our findings suggest that arterial stiffness is not associated with raised blood pressure levels in older patients. Prochazka and Martel [10] have reported a study in 582 male outpatients. In that study Osler's manoeuvre positive patients had higher systolic but not diastolic pressures than the negative patients. Why there should be a discrepancy between the two studies is not obvious, although Prochazka and Martel did find a group of patients who were not hypertensive and yet were Osler's manoeuvre positive.

The prevalence of Osler's manoeuvre positive patients in the present study is higher than that reported by Prochazka and Martel [10]. Thus 71 of 152 (46.7%) patients aged 50 years or more were Osler's manoeuvre positive in the present study compared with 41 of 427 (9.6%) in [10]. That the radial artery alone was assessed in [10] may partly explain this difference as medial sclerosis not being uniformly distributed throughout the arterial system [11].

The sensitivity of a sign is defined as the conditional probability that if that sign is present, then the disease is also present [12]. That there was no difference in blood pressure between the positive and negative groups of patients casts some doubt on the sensitivity of the sign as a predictor of spuriously elevated cuff pressures in a population of elderly patients. This contrasts with the findings of

Messerli *et al.* [7], who reported cuff systolic and diastolic blood pressures that averaged 16 mmHg higher than direct intra-arterial measurements in 13 elderly Osler's manoeuvre positive hypertensive patients. However, Messerli *et al.* recruited the patients from a specialized blood pressure clinic and did not select consecutive cases.

Osler's manoeuvre has been suggested as a screening test in the assessment of elderly hypertensive patients, to identify those in whom intra-arterial pressure needs to be measured [5]. However, in view of the findings from this study, we recommend further research into the sensitivity of this sign before it can be advocated for routine use in the assessment of older hypertensive patients.

References

- Miall WE, Brennan PJ: Hypertension in the elderly: The South Wales Study. *In* Hypertension in the Young and Old edited by Onesti G, Kim KE. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1981, pp 227–283.
- Kannel WB, Gordon T: Evaluation of cardiovascular risk in the elderly: The Framingham Study. *Bull NY Acad Med* 1978, **54**:573–591.
- Oster JR, Materson BJ: The dilemma of pseudohypertension. *Geriatr Cardiovasc Med* 1988, **1**:23–27.
- Spence JD, Sibbald WJ, Cape RD: Pseudohypertension in the elderly. *Clin Sci Mol Med* 1978, **55**:399s–402s.
- Messerli FH: Osler's maneuver, pseudohypertension, and true hypertension in the elderly. *Am J Med* 1986, **80**:906–910.
- Osler W: *The Principles and Practice of Medicine*. New York: Appleton, 1892.
- Messerli FH, Ventura HO, Amodeo C: Osler's maneuver and pseudohypertension. *N Engl J Med* 1985, **312**:1548–1551.
- Prochazka AV, de Roin S, Holdcroft C, Lima M, Martel R: Observer variation in Osler's maneuver. *Clin Res* 1987, **35**:756A (abstract).
- Petrie JC, O'Brien ET, Littler WA, de Swiet M: Recommendations on blood pressure measurement: British Hypertension Society. *Br Med J* 1986, **293**:611–615.
- Prochazka AV, Martel R: Osler's maneuver in outpatient veterans. *J Clin Hypertens* 1987, **3**:554–558.
- Silbert S, Lippman HI, Gordon E: Monckeberg's arteriosclerosis. *JAMA* 1953, **151**:1176–1179.
- Traube A: Sensitivity, specificity and predictive values: a graphical approach. *Stat Med* 1986, **5**:585–591.