

DVIII (17/05/23 11:57) Idcpwv8.doc and ART.RMD HYPERTENSION

# Derivation of an Outcome-Driven Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity

# An Individual-Participant Meta-Analysis\*

Running Title: Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity

De-Wei An, † Tine W. Hansen, † Lucas S. Aparicio, Babangida Chori, Qi-Fang Huang, Fang-Fei Wei, Yi-Bang Cheng, Yu-Ling Yu, Chang-Sheng Sheng, Natasza Gilis-Malinowska, José Boggia, Wiktoria Wojciechowska, Teemu J. Niiranen, Valérie Tikhonoff, Edoardo Casiglia, Krzysztof Narkiewicz, Katarzyna Stolarz-Skrzypek, Kalina Kawecka-Jaszcz, Antti M. Jula, Wen-Yi Yang, Angela J. Woodiwiss, Jan Filipovský, Ji-Guang Wang, Marek W. Rajzer, Peter Verhamme, Tim S. Nawrot, Jan A. Staessen, ‡ Yan Li, ‡

The International Database of Central Arterial Properties for Risk Stratification Investigators§

Word Counts: Whole Manuscript 7894; Abstract 250; Number: Tables 4; Figures 2; References 38

Correspondence:

Jan A. Staessen, MD, PhD, 3026-Alliance for the Promotion of Preventive Medicine, Leopoldstraat 59, BE-2800 Mechelen, Belgium

Telephone:	+32-15-41-1747
	+32-47-632-4928 (cell)
Facsimile:	+32-15-41-4542
Email:	jan.staessen@appremed.org
Twitter	jasta49
	<b>)</b> -

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 2 - /R1

- 1 \* This article is dedicated to the memory of Prof Gavin R. Norton, MD, PhD, who passed away on 9
- 2 December 2022 shortly after having attended the IDCARS Consortium Meeting (Mechelen, Belgium,
- 3 1-3 December 2022) and whose comprehensive understanding of arterial physiology inspired all
  4 authors of this paper.
- 5 + Joint first authors who contributed equally.
- 6 ‡ Joint senior and co-corresponding authors who contributed equally.
- 7 § The International Database of Central Arterial Properties for Risk Stratification Investigators are
  8 listed in reference 21.

# 9 Affiliations

10 Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Shanghai Key Laboratory of Hypertension, Shanghai 11 Institute of Hypertension, State Key Laboratory of Medical Genomics, National Research Centre for 12 Translational Medicine, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 13 China (D.-W.A., Q.-F.H., Y. B.C., C. S.S., J. G.W., Y.L.); Non-Profit Research Association Alliance for 14 the Promotion of Preventive Medicine, Belgium (D.-W.A, T.W.H, B.C., Y.-L.Y., J.A.S.); Research Unit 15 Environment and Health, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Leuven, 16 Leuven, Belgium (D.-W.A, Y.-L.Y., T.S.N.); The Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen, Herlev, and 17 Center for Health, Capital Region of Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark (T.W.H.); Servicio de Clínica 18 Médica, Sección Hipertensión Arterial, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Argentina (L.S.A.); Centre 19 for Environmental Sciences, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium (B.C., T.S.N.); Department of 20 Internal Medicine, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, College of Health Sciences, University of Abuja, Abuja, 21 Nigeria (B.C.); Department of Cardiology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-Sen University, 22 Guangzhou, China (F.-F.W.); Hypertension Unit, Department of Hypertension and Diabetology, 23 Medical University of Gdańsk, Poland (N.G.-M., K.N.); Centro de Nefrología and Departamento de 24 Fisiopatología, Hospital de Clínicas, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay (J.B.); First 25 Department of Cardiology, Interventional Electrocardiology and Hypertension, Jagiellonian University 26 Medical College, Kraków, Poland (W.W., K.S.-S., M.R., K.K.-J); Department of Chronic Disease 27 Prevention, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Turku, Finland (T.J.N., A.M.J.); Department of 28 Medicine, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland (T.J.N., A.M.J.); 29 Department of Medicine, University of Padova, Padova, Italy (V.T., E.C.); Department of Cardiology, Shanghai General Hospital, Shanghai, China (W.-Y.Y.); School of Physiology, University of the 30 31 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa (A.W.); Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Pilsen, 32 Czech Republic (J.F.); Center for Molecular and Vascular Biology, KU Leuven Department of 33 Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium (P.V.); Biomedical Science Group, 34 Faculty of Medicine, University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium (J.A.S.).

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 3 - /R1

# 35 **Correspondence**:

- 36 Prof Jan A. Staessen, Research Association Alliance for the Promotion of Preventive Medicine,
- 37 Leopoldstraat 59, BE-2800 Mechelen, Belgium.
- 38 Email: jan.staessen@appremed.org,
- 39 Prof Yan Li, Shanghai Institute of Hypertension, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School
- 40 of Medicine, 192 Ruijin Er Road, Shanghai, 2000025, China. Email: liyanshcn@163.com

41

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 4 - /R1

# 42 ABSTRACT

43	BACKGROUND: Aortic pulse wave velocity (PWV) predicts cardiovascular events (CVE)
44	and total mortality (TM), but previous studies proposing actionable PWV thresholds have
45	limited generalizability. This individual-participant meta-analysis is aimed at defining, testing
46	calibration, and validating an outcome-driven threshold for PWV, using two populations
47	studies, respectively, for derivation (IDCARS) and replication (MONICA).
48	METHODS: A risk-carrying PWV threshold for CVE and TM was defined by multivariable
49	Cox regression, using stepwise increasing PWV thresholds and by determining the threshold
50	yielding a 5-year risk equivalent with systolic blood pressure of 140 mmHg. The predictive
51	performance of the PWV threshold was assessed by computing the integrated discrimination
52	improvement (IDI) and the net reclassification improvement (NRI).
53	<b>RESULTS:</b> In well-calibrated models in IDCARS, the risk-carrying PWV thresholds
54	converged at 9 m/s (10 m/s considering the anatomical pulse wave travel distance). With full
55	adjustments applied, the threshold predicted CVE (HR [CI]: 1.68 [1.15-2.45]) and TM (1.61
56	[1.01-2.55]) in IDCARS and in MONICA (1.40 [1.09-1.79] and 1.55 [1.23-1.95]). In IDCARS
57	and MONICA, the predictive accuracy of the threshold for both endpoints was ~0.75. IDI
58	was significant for TM in IDCARS and for both TM and CVE in MONICA, whereas NRI was
59	not for any outcome.
60	CONCLUSIONS: PWV integrates multiple risk factors into a single variable and might
61	replace a large panel of traditional risk factors. Exceeding the outcome-driven PWV
62	threshold should motivate clinicians to stringent management of risk factors, in particular

63 hypertension, which over a person's lifetime causes stiffening of the elastic arteries as

64 waypoint to CVE and death.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 5 - /R1

- 65 **KEY WORDS**: aortic pulse wave velocity **a** arterial stiffness **a** cardiovascular risk **a** carotid-
- 66 femoral pulse wave velocity mortality

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 6 - /R1

# 67 Nonstandard Abbreviations and Acronyms

68	APPREMED	Non-Profit Research Association "Alliance for the Promotion of
69		Preventive Medicine"
70	BP	blood pressure
71	CI	95% confidence interval
72	CV	Cardiovascular
73	EPOGH	European Project on Genes in Hypertension
74	FLEMENGHO	Flemish Study on Environment Genes and Health Outcomes
75	HDL	high-density lipoprotein
76	HR	hazard ratio
77	IDCARS	International Database of Central Arterial Properties for Risk
78		Stratification
79	IDI	integrated discrimination improvement
80	IQR	interquartile range
81	MONICA	Monitoring of Trends and Determinants in Cardiovascular Disease
82		Health Survey – Copenhagen
83	МАР	Mean arterial pressure
84	NRI	net reclassification improvement
85	SPRINT	Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial
86	PWV	aortic pulse wave velocity (carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity)
87		

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 7 - /R1

# 88 INTRODUCTION

89 Over the human lifespan, aging and age-related risk factors, such as hypertension and 90 type-2 diabetes, lead to stiffening of the central elastic arteries. Consequently, the systolic 91 load on the arterial walls is cushioned less, a phenomenon further amplified by the early 92 return of reflected waves in late systole, while the tensile force maintaining a continuous 93 blood flow during diastole diminishes.<sup>1</sup> Aortic pulse wave velocity (PWV) is the gold 94 standard for the non-invasive assessment of central arterial stiffness<sup>2</sup> and predicts adverse 95 cardiovascular (CV) outcomes in a continuous manner.<sup>1</sup> However, in support of clinical 96 decision making European<sup>3</sup> and Chinese<sup>4</sup> guidelines proposed a fixed risk threshold of >12 97 m/s, which European experts subsequently lowered to >10 m/s, considering the difference 98 between the measured and anatomical pulse wave travel distance.<sup>2,5-7</sup> 99 The literature supporting the guideline-endorsed PWV thresholds<sup>2-5</sup> consists of patient<sup>8-15</sup> 100 and community-based<sup>16-19</sup> studies with total or CV mortality or a composite CV endpoint as 101 outcome. In patients with end-stage kidney disease.<sup>9-12,15</sup> metabolic syndrome.<sup>14</sup> 102 hypertension,<sup>8</sup> or in patients undergoing transluminal aortic valve replacement,<sup>13</sup> PWV risk 103 thresholds ranged from 10.5 m/s<sup>11</sup> to 11.8 m/s<sup>12</sup> In Japanese-Americans,<sup>16</sup> Japanese 104 men,<sup>20</sup> or middle-aged or elderly community-dwelling individuals,<sup>17,19</sup> the PWV risk 105 thresholds ranged from 9.0 m/s<sup>18</sup> to 13.7 m/s.<sup>19</sup> In a cross-sectional meta-analysis of 106 16,867 individuals,<sup>7</sup> the distribution of PWV was described as function of age in various 107 patient strata, including a subset of 1455 patients with optimal or normal blood pressure (BP) 108 considered to mirror population-based levels. Notwithstanding the merits of the previous 109 publications, 11-14, 16-19 PWV thresholds derived in patients with advanced disease 11-13 or 110 disturbed metabolic profile,<sup>14</sup> in single-center population cohorts,<sup>16-19</sup> in the elderly,<sup>17</sup> or 111 based on the PWV distribution rather than adverse health outcomes<sup>7</sup> cannot be 112 straightforwardly extrapolated to clinical practice. In view of these potential limitations, the

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 8 - /R1

- 113 current individual-participant level meta-analysis, covering a wide age range, was
- prospectively and specifically designed to define, test the calibration, and validate an
- 115 outcome-driven threshold for PWV, using the International <u>Database of Central Arterial</u>
- 116 Properties for <u>Risk Stratification (IDCARS)<sup>21</sup> as derivation dataset and the Copenhagen</u>
- 117 subset of the <u>Moni</u>toring of Trends and Determinants in <u>Ca</u>rdiovascular Disease Study
- 118 (MONICA) for replication.<sup>22</sup>

### 119 **METHODS**

# 120 Data Availability

121 All available data are shown within the article and the online-only Data Supplement.

122 Anonymized data are available from the corresponding author upon request, on condition

that an analysis plan is accompanying the request and that the principal investigators of all

124 cohorts approve data sharing.

### 125 Study Cohorts

126 The population studies included in the current meta-analysis met the principles outlined in 127 the Helsinki declaration for investigation of human participants.<sup>23</sup> The IDCARS study 128 protocols and the secondary analyses of anonymized data were approved by the competent 129 local Institutional or National Review Boards. Anonymized data from the Copenhagen 130 subset of the MONICA study were used for analysis. Participants gave written informed 131 consent at recruitment and renewed consent at each follow-up visit. The online only Data 132 Supplement provides full details on the selection of the study population and the methods 133 applied for collecting the clinical, biochemical and hemodynamic measurements and the 134 statistical analysis.

# 135 IDCARS — Derivation Cohort

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 9 - /R1

136 IDCARS cohorts qualified for inclusion in the present analysis, if peripheral and central BP 137 and CV risk factors had been measured at baseline, and if follow-up included both fatal and 138 nonfatal outcomes. Eight cohorts met these eligibility criteria (**Table S1**). Initial enrollment 139 took place from 1985 until 2015. For the present analysis, baseline refers to the first 140 measurement of central and peripheral BP along with CV risk factors (October 2000 until 141 February 2016). Across studies, the last follow-up took place from October 2012 to 142 December 2018 (**Table S1**). In the 8 qualifying IDCARS cohorts, 6546 individuals took part 143 in a re-examination including also the vascular examination. Of those, 2706 (41.3%) only 144 underwent a tonometric pulse wave analysis or had a substandard assessment of PWV. Of 145 the remaining 3840 participants, 462 (12.0%) were discarded, because they were younger 146 than 30 years, leaving 3378 IDCARS participants for statistical analysis.

## 147 MONICA — Replication Cohort

In 1982-1984, a random sample of the residents of Glostrup County, one of the Western suburbs of Copenhagen, Denmark was drawn with the goal to recruit an equal number of women and men aged 30, 40, 50, and 60 years. In 1993-1994, the 3785 former participants were invited for a follow-up examination at the Research Center for Prevention and Health in Glostrup, of whom 2493 (65.9%) without history of CV disease between recruitment and follow-up were examined.<sup>22</sup> For the current analysis, 35 (1.40%) were excluded because of inaccurate or missing PWV measurements, leaving 2458 participants for analysis.

#### 155 **BP and PWV Measurement**

156 In IDCARS, brachial BP was the average of the first 2 consecutive readings. Mean arterial

157 pressure (MAP) was peripheral diastolic BP plus one-third of pulse pressure. In all IDCARS

158 cohorts included in the current analysis, PWV was measured by sequential

159 electrocardiographically gated recordings of the arterial pressure waveform at the carotid and

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 10 - /R1

160 femoral arteries. The observers measured the distance from the suprasternal notch to the 161 carotid sampling site (distance A), and from the suprasternal notch to the femoral sampling 162 site (distance B). Pulse wave travel distance was calculated as distance B minus distance A. 163 <sup>21</sup> Pulse transit time was the average of 10 consecutive beats.<sup>21</sup> PWV is the ratio of the 164 travel distance in meters to transit time in seconds. PWV measurements were discarded if 165 the standard error of the mean of 10 beats was more than 10%.<sup>21</sup>

166 In MONICA, a trained nurse obtained 2 consecutive BP readings with a random zero 167 mercury sphygmomanometer, which were averaged for analysis. Immediately thereafter, the 168 same trained nurse used 2 piezoelectric pressure transducers (Hellige GmbH, Freiburg im 169 Breisgau, Germany) to record the arterial wave simultaneously at the left common carotid 170 and femoral arteries. <sup>24</sup> PWV was the travel distance between the 2 transducers, measured 171 on the body surface, divided by the transit time, determined manually by the foot-to-foot 172 velocity method.<sup>24</sup> For analysis, PWV measurements from 2 to 15 heart cycles were 173 averaged. The directly measured path length (MONICA) was converted to the subtracted 174 path length (IDCARS) in analyses involving both cohorts.<sup>7,25</sup> For comparison of IDCARS 175 and MONICA data in normal participants with a published meta-analysis,<sup>7</sup> path length was 176 converted to the path length considered to reflect the true anatomical distance, using 177 published formula.<sup>7</sup> The biochemical methods are available in the online-only Data 178 Supplement (**p S5**).

# 179 Ascertainment of Endpoint

The co-primary endpoints in the current study were a composite CV endpoint, including CV
death and nonfatal CV events, and total mortality. The secondary endpoints included CV
mortality and fatal combined with nonfatal coronary events are defined in the Data

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 11 - /R1

183	Supplement (pp <b>S5-S6</b> ). In all outcome analyses, only the first event within each category
184	was considered. Participants free of events were censored at last follow-up.

#### 185 Statistical Analysis

186 Statistical methods are described in detail in the online-only Data Supplement (pp **S6-S9**). In

187 exploratory analyses, incidence rates of endpoints were tabulated by tertiles of the PWV

distribution, while applying the direct method for standardizing rates in IDCARS for cohort,

189 sex and age (<40, 40-59, ≥60 years) and for sex and age group (40, 50, 60, and 70 years) in

190 MONICA. The cumulative incidence of the primary and secondary endpoints was plotted,

191 while accounting for cohort (in IDCARS only) and sex and age (IDCARS) or age group

192 (MONICA).

193 Multivariable-adjusted Cox models accounted for sex, age (IDCARS) or age group

194 (MONICA), MAP, heart rate, body mass index, the total-to-HDL serum cholesterol ratio,

smoking and drinking, use of antihypertensive drugs, history of diabetes mellitus,<sup>26</sup> and

196 previous CV disease (IDCARS only). Multivariable analyses involving IDCARS additionally

accounted for cohort. The proportional hazards assumption was checked by the

Kolmogorov-type supremum test. To compare relative risk across strata, deviation from
 mean coding<sup>27</sup> was applied.

To determine an operational threshold for PWV, a two-pronged strategy<sup>28,29</sup> was applied using Cox regression in IDCARS. First, multivariable-adjusted HRs were computed for 0.1 m/s increments in PWV from the 10th to the 90th percentile of the PWV distribution. These HRs expressed the risk in participants, whose PWV exceeded the cut-off point *vs* the average risk in the whole population. The HRs with CIs were plotted as function of increasing PWV thresholds to assess at which PWV level the lower 95% confidence limit of the HRs crossed unity, signifying increased risk.<sup>28</sup> Next, PWV thresholds were obtained by

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 12 - /R1

207	determining the PWV levels yielding a 5-year risk equivalent to the risk associated with an
208	office systolic BP of 120-, 130-, 140- and 160 mm Hg. <sup>29</sup> Model calibration was evaluated by
209	comparing the predicted risk against overoptimism-corrected Kaplan-Meier estimates in PWV
210	quintiles. The performance of PWV in risk stratification was assessed from 2-by-2 tables
211	providing specificity, sensitivity and related statistics, the area under the curve, and by the
212	integrated discrimination improvement (IDI) and the net reclassification improvement (NRI). <sup>30</sup>
213	Finally, subgroup analyses were conducted in participants stratified by sex, age (<60 $vs \ge 60$
214	years), and the approximate median systolic BP in IDCARS and MONICA (<130 $vs \ge$ 130
215	mm Hg).

# 216 **RESULTS**

# 217 Baseline Characteristics

In IDCARS, the number of interpolated values amounted to 108 (3.2%) for total serum

cholesterol, 198 (5.9%) for HDL cholesterol, 89 (2.6%) for blood glucose, 161 (4.8%) for

smoking and 723 (21.4%) for use of alcohol. In MONICA, the corresponding number of

interpolated values were 1 (0.04%), 1 (0.04%), 5 (0.20%), 0 (0%), and 49 (1.99%),

222 respectively.

The differences in the baseline characteristics between the IDCARS (2000-2016) and the MONICA (1993-1994) participants at the time of the vascular examinations (**Table 1**) reflect how lifestyle and treatment rates of hypertension changed over time, the ethnic make-up and the age structure of the discovery and replication cohorts, and the high tax rates levels levied on alcoholic beverages in Denmark. In both IDCARS and MONICA, women compared with men had smaller body height, lower body weight and body mass index, lower systolic and diastolic BP and MAP, and higher HDL cholesterol (**Table S2**). Across the IDCARS cohorts,

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 13 - /R1

mean PWV (SD) ranged from 7.2 (1.5) m/s in the Polish Gdańsk cohort to 8.9 (2.4) m/s in the
 participants recruited in Buenos Aires, Argentina (Figure S1). In the Copenhagen MONICA

cohort, PWV averaged 8.0 (2.5) m/s (**Figure S1**).

233 To assess concordance between the data resources used, normal individuals were

sampled from IDCARS and MONICA by excluding patients with a history of CV disease,

235 diabetes or treated hypertension and by discarding patients with dyslipidemia and smokers

236 (Figure S2). With standardization of the travel path applied, PWV by age group was largely

similar in IDCARS and MONICA (**Table S3**). Furthermore, in single regression, the main

correlates of PWV were age, systolic BP, pulse pressure and MAP (**Table S4**) with Pearson

correlation coefficients amounting to were 0.57, 0.45, 0.43 and 0.33 in IDCARS and to 0.55,

240 0.53, 0.48 and 0.47 in MONICA (*P*<0.001 for all).

#### 241 Incidence of Endpoints

242 Median follow-up of IDCARS participants amounted to 4.3 years (IQR: 3.8-6.9 years; 5th-

95th percentile interval: 2.1-11.6 years. Over follow-up (**Table S5**), 105 participants (3.11%)

died: 25 (0.74%) because of CV disease, 74 (2.19%) because of a non-CV illness (including

kidney failure), and 6 (0.18%) because of non-documented illnesses. The number of

246 IDCARS participants experiencing a major CV event or a coronary endpoint amounted to 155

247 (4.59%) and 77 (2.28%), respectively.

248 Median follow-up in MONICA was 12.6 years (IQR: 12.2-13.1 years; 5th to 95th percentile

249 interval: 3.5-13.4 years). Over this time period (**Table S5**), 393 (16.0%) died: 139 (5.66%)

because of CV disease and 254 (10.3%) because of a non-CV ailment. The number of

251 MONICA participants experiencing a major CV event, or a coronary endpoint amounted to

354 (14.4%) and 202 (8.22%), respectively. Across tertiles of the PWV distribution, in

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 14 - /R1

- 253 IDCARS as well as in MONICA, the co-primary (**Table S6**) and secondary (**Table S7**)
- endpoints steeply increased with higher PWV category (*P*<0.001).

#### 255 **PWV Thresholds in IDCARS**

256 Multivariable-adjusted HRs were plotted against PWV thresholds stepwise increasing by 257 0.1-m/s over the 10th-90th percentile range of the PWV distribution (Figure 1A and Figure 258 **1B**). These multivariable-adjusted HRs expressed the 5-year risks of the co-primary 259 endpoints associated with successively increasing PWV thresholds compared to the average 260 risk in the whole IDCARS cohort. The lower limit of the 95% CI of the HRs crossed unity at a 261 PWV level of 8.7 m/s for the composite CV endpoint and at 8.8 m/s for total mortality. In 262 multivariable-adjusted Cox models (Figure 1C and Figure 1D), the PWV thresholds yielding 263 a risk equivalent with a systolic BP of 140 mm Hg were 8.5 m/s (CI: 7.5-9.6) for the 264 composite CV endpoint and 8.2 m/s (7.1-9.4) for total mortality. In all models PWV met the 265 proportional hazard assumption (test statistic  $\leq 1.26$ ;  $P \geq 0.175$ ). In IDCARS, with adjustments 266 applied for cohort, sex, age and MAP, a PWV threshold of <9 m/s vs ≥9 m/s separated 267 (Figure S3) the cumulative incidence of the co-primary and secondary endpoints in a highly 268 significantly way ( $P \le 0.013$ ). The fully adjusted HRs associated with a PWV  $\ge 9$  m/s vs <9 269 m/s, were 1.68 (CI: 1.15-2.45) for the composite CV endpoint and 1.61 (1.01-2.55) for total 270 mortality (Table 2); for CV mortality and coronary endpoints (Table S8), the corresponding 271 HRs were 3.21 (1.06-9.69) and 2.08 (1.21-3.59), respectively. In **Table 2** and **Table S8**, the 272 HRs associated with a 1-SD PWV increment were also presented allowing comparison with 273 the literature. The fully adjusted Cox models including the 9-m/s PWV threshold were well 274 calibrated as evidenced by similarity between the Kaplan-Meier estimates and the 275 multivariable-adjusted mean predicted risk for the CV endpoint (P=0.654) and total mortality 276 (P=0.691) across guintiles of observed and predicted risk (Figure 1E and Figure 1F). In

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 15 - /R1

277	subgroup analyses stratified for sex, age or median systolic BP, none of the interactions
278	between the 9-m/s threshold and stratification groups reached significance ( <b>Figure S4</b> ).

### 279 **Replication in MONICA**

- 280 The MONICA data were interrogated to replicate the clinical relevance of the proposed 9-m/s
- threshold. In line with the IDCARS findings, with adjustments applied for sex, age group and
- MAP, a PWV threshold of <9 m/s  $vs \ge 9$  m/s differentiated (**Figure S5**) the cumulative
- incidence of the co-primary and secondary endpoints in a significant manner ( $P \le 0.001$ ),
- except for coronary event (P=0.145). The fully adjusted HRs associated with a PWV ≥9 m/s
- 285 *vs* <9 m/s, were 1.40 (1.09-1.79) for the CV endpoint and 1.55 (1.23-1.95) for total mortality
- (Table 2); for CV mortality (Table S8) the HR was 1.53 (1.04-2.25), and for coronary events
- it was not significant (*P*=0.553). In subgroup analyses stratified for sex, age or median
- systolic BP, none of the interactions between the 9-m/s threshold and the stratification
- groups reached significance (**Figure S4**).

## 290 **Predictive Performance**

- 291 In IDCARS, specificity, sensitivity and overall accuracy of the categorized PWV for the
- prediction of the CV endpoint were 0.775, 0.607 and 0.769 and for the prediction of death
- 293 0.767, 0.571 and 0.764, respectively. Estimates in MONICA were of similar magnitude
- (Table 3). In IDCARS, IDI for the 9-m/s PWV threshold amounted to 0.59% for the CV
- endpoint (*P*=0.020) and to 0.28% (*P*=0.198) for total mortality, while in MONICA the
- corresponding IDI values were 0.47 (*P*=0.028) and 0.85 (*P*=0.002), respectively (**Table 4**).
- However, none of the NRI estimates in IDCARS or MONICA reached statistical significance  $(P \ge 0.108)$ .

### 299 **Rescaling of the PWV Threshold**

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 16 - /R1

306	(Figure 2).
305	travel path. With this adjustment applied the 9-m/s threshold corresponded with 10 m/s
304	rescaled to account for the difference between the measured and anatomical pulse wave
303	PWV measurement, the 9-m/s threshold derived in IDCARS and replicated in MONICA was
302	consistency with current guidelines and the software presently implemented in devices for
301	distance was standardized to the subtraction method, as applied in IDCARS. To keep
300	In the analysis of the IDCARS and Copenhagen MONICA data the pulse wave travel

# 307 **DISCUSSION**

308 In IDCARS a two-pronged approach was applied to determine outcome-driven PWV 309 thresholds in relation to the CV endpoint and total mortality. The PWV thresholds in well 310 calibrated models converged to 9 m/s, of which the prognostic value was replicated in 311 MONICA. The 2007 European Guideline for the Management of Hypertension<sup>3</sup> proposed a 312 risk-carrying PWV threshold of 12 m/s, because this level was believed to represent a rough 313 estimate of high CV risk. The 2012 Consensus Document on the Measurement of PWV<sup>2</sup> 314 referred to the longitudinal patient and population studies published at that time to justify the 315 12-m/s threshold. However, the document<sup>2</sup> went on stating that the 12-m/s cut-off limit was 316 based on the direct measurement of the pulse transit distance. It therefore proposed a new 317 standard distance, i.e., (common carotid artery – common femoral artery)  $\times$  0.8).<sup>6</sup> Applying 318 the new standard<sup>6</sup> would result in a PWV threshold of 9.6 m/s, which was rounded to 10 m/s 319 as an easy to remember value for use in daily clinical practice.<sup>2</sup> In the current study, where 320 relevant, the directly measured travel distance (MONICA) was converted to the subtraction 321 distance (IDCARS)<sup>2,7</sup> to increase comparability of the PWV estimates, either as descriptive 322 variable (Figure S1) or as exposure variable. Accounting for the anatomical pulse wave

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 17 - /R1

travel distance showed that the 9-m/s threshold was equivalent with the 10-m/s cut-off, as
 proposed in the European guidelines.<sup>3,7</sup>

325 Several results presented in the current manuscript were generated as validation of the 326 data resources being used. First, the sex distribution of anthropometric and hemodynamic 327 characteristics and serum lipids was in line with the literature. In both IDCARS and MONICA, 328 women compared with men had smaller body height, lower body weight and body mass 329 index, lower systolic and diastolic BP and MAP, and higher HDL cholesterol (**Table S2**). 330 Second, the main correlates of PWV were age, systolic BP, pulse pressure and MAP (Table 331 **S4**). Third, to assess concordance with the literature, normal individuals were sampled from 332 the IDCARS and the MONICA cohorts, using the same exclusion criteria as described by 333 The Reference Values for Arterial Stiffness' Collaboration (Figure S2).7 With 334 standardization of the pulse wave travel path applied,<sup>2,7</sup> PWV by age group was largely 335 similar in IDCARS and MONICA and in agreement with the normal subgroup in the

336 previously published cross-sectional meta-analysis (**Table S3**).

#### 337 Clinical Significance

338 Modelling time-to-event using proportional hazard regression implies that the association 339 between adverse health outcomes and a risk factor is log-linear without a threshold at which 340 the risk suddenly increases. Population studies of office<sup>31</sup> or out-of-office<sup>32</sup> BP or serum 341 cholesterol<sup>33</sup> have unmistakably illustrated this concept. Given that in the present analysis, 342 the proportional hazard assumption for PWV was met, this construct is also applicable to 343 PWV. For this reason, throughout the current manuscript, the risk with PWV was not only 344 tabulated for the 9-m/s threshold, but also for a 1-SD increment in the continuously 345 distributed PWV. Notwithstanding the continuous associations between adverse health 346 outcomes and risk factors, operational or actionable thresholds of risk factors support

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 18 - /R1

347 clinicians in risk stratification and in identifying the need to start pharmacological treatment. 348 Both in IDCARS and MONICA (**Table 3**), specificity of the 9-m/s threshold for the co-primary 349 endpoints was  $\sim 0.80$ , sensitivity was  $\sim 0.55$ , and the overall predictive accuracy close to 0.75. 350 IDI was significant for the CV endpoint in IDCARS and both co-primary endpoints in 351 MONICA, whereas NRI did not reach statistical significance. The multivariable-adjusted IDI 352 and NRI provide complementary information. Indeed, if addition of a marker to a model 353 including several risk factors increases the predicted probability of an endpoint, this is 354 reflected by a significant increase in IDI (**Table 4**). NRI indicates the extent to which a 355 biomarker improves diagnostic accuracy, which in the current analyses was not significant, 356 indicating that the discriminatory performance of PWV on top of commonly measured risk 357 factors, in particular sex, age, various BP indexes (**Table S4**) and dyslipidemia, is small. A risk calculator is made available as **Data Supplement 2**. The SPARTE Investigators<sup>34</sup> and 358 359 the pathophysiology of aortic stiffness<sup>35-37</sup> provide the interpretation of these findings. Aortic 360 stiffness, as captured by PWV, integrates the lifetime injury to the arterial wall. Elastin and 361 collagen are the major constituents of the extracellular matrix in the media of the central 362 elastic arteries. Elastin provides reversible extensibility during systole, while collagen 363 generates tensile strength. As people age, the elastin fibers become fragmented and the 364 mechanical load is transferred to collagen fibers, which are up to 1000 times stiffer than 365 elastin.<sup>35</sup> This process already starts in young adulthood, but the deposition of elastin by 366 vascular smooth muscle cells only occurs during fetal development and in early infancy, and 367 is switched-off thereafter.<sup>36</sup> This implies that elastin fiber damage is basically irreversible.<sup>37</sup> 368 In the SPARTE Trial,<sup>34</sup> hypertensive patients were randomized to a therapeutic strategy 369 targeting the normalization of PWV, measured every 6 months (N=264) or to a therapeutic 370 strategy only implementing the European Hypertension Guidelines<sup>3</sup> (N=272). After a median 371 follow-up of 48.3 months, there was no significant between-group difference in the primary

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 19 - /R1

372 outcome, a composite CV endpoint (HR: 0.74; CI: 0.40-1.38). However, the secondary 373 endpoints were met by showing that PWV-driven treatment for hypertension reduces office 374 and ambulatory BP and aortic stiffening more than with application of BP-based guidelines. 375 In a subgroup of 337 participants enrolled in the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial 376 (SPRINT; 45% women; mean age: 64 years),<sup>38</sup> intensive treatment (target systolic BP <120 377 mm Hg) compared with usual treatment (<140 mm Hg) produced a mean between-group 378 reduction in systolic BP of 12.7 mm Hg (CI: 11.1-14.3 mm Hg) and at the end of the 379 18-month follow-up had attenuated the increase in PWV (9.0 vs 10 m/s; P<0.001). Basically, 380 both trials highlighted the pathophysiological concept, that age and high BP are the main 381 drivers of aortic stiffening. However, clinicians should be particularly concerned about 382 patients, in whom there is disparity between PWV, age and MAP, and retrace the previous 383 and current medical history of such patients to identify hidden risk factors. In the context of 384 the current study, a PWV risk threshold of 9 m/s (or 10 m/s with the correction for the 385 anatomical pulse wave travel path applied) should motivate clinicians to achieve stringent 386 control of BP, in particular systolic BP, the extending force to be buffered by the elastin 387 fibers.

#### 388 Limitations

The current study should be carefully interpreted within the context of its limitations. First,
the diagnostic criteria and invasive management of coronary heart disease improved
drastically from the early 1990s to the current state of the art. In MONICA only a single case
of coronary revascularization was registered, whereas this number in IDCARS was 57 (**Table S5**). These period effects might explain why the 9-m/s PWV threshold was not replicated for
coronary endpoints in MONICA, whereas PWV analyzed as continuously distributed variable
retained significance (**Table S8**). Second, as shown by the NRI, the incremental value

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 20 - /R1

396	associated with PWV on top of all other risk factors was not significant (Table 4), explaining
397	why the NRI results were not graphically translated into an analysis of the area under the
398	curve of nested models. Finally, although IDCARS was a multi-ethnic cohort, Blacks were
399	not represented in the current data resource.

#### 400 **Perspectives**

- 401 This individual-participants meta-analysis of longitudinal population studies with a composite
- 402 CV endpoint and total mortality as co-primary endpoints identified, validated and replicated
- 403 9 m/s as new outcome-driven threshold for aortic PWV. With correction for the anatomical
- 404 travel path, this cut-off corresponds with the 10-m/s threshold proposed in European
- 405 guidelines.<sup>3,7</sup> In quantitative terms, these outcome-driven thresholds refine risk stratification
- 406 (IDI), albeit with a nonsignificant amount (NRI). In settings where PWV measurement can be
- 407 implemented, exceeding the actionable thresholds should motivate clinicians to stringent
- 408 management of modifiable CV risk factors, in particular systolic BP, which over a person's
- 409 lifetime leads to elastin fragmentation in the wall of the central arteries, thereby causing
- 410 major CV complication and premature mortality.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 21 - /R1

# 411 ARTICLE INFORMATION

#### 412 Sources of funding

- 413 The Non-Profit Research Association Alliance for the Promotion of Preventive Medicine, Mechelen,
- 414 Belgium (www.appremed.org) received a nonbinding grant from OMRON Healthcare Co. Ltd., Kyoto,
- 415 Japan, which supports the scholarships of D.-W.A, B.C., and Y.-L.Y.
- 416 The grants which supported the cohort studies are listed by country.
- 417 Argentina: The Internal Medicine Service, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina;
- 418 Belgium: European Union (HEALTH-F7-305507 HOMAGE), European Research Council (Advanced
- 419 Researcher Grant 2011-294713-EPLORE and Proof-of-Concept Grant 713601-uPROPHET),
- 420 European Research Area Net for Cardiovascular Diseases (JTC2017-046-PROACT), and Research
- 421 Foundation Flanders, Ministry of the Flemish Community, Brussels, Belgium (G.0881.13);
- 422 *China*: The National Natural Science Foundation of China (grants 82270469, 82070432 and
- 423 82070435), the Ministry of Science and Technology (2018YFC1704902), Beijing, China, and by
- 424 Shanghai Municipal Health Commission (2022LJ022 and 2017BR025);
- 425 Czech Republic: European Union (grants LSHM-CT-2006–037093 and HEALTH-F4-2007–201550)
- 426 and Charles University Research program "Cooperatio Cardiovascular Science".
- 427 *Denmark*: 01-2-9-9A-22914 from the Danish Heart Foundation and R32-A2740 from the Lundbeck
- 428 Fonden.
- 429 Finland: Academy of Finland (grant 321351), Emil Aaltonen Foundation, the Paavo Nurmi Foundation,
- 430 the Urmas Pekkala Foundation, and the Hospital District of South-Western Finland;
- 431 Italy: European Union (grants LSHM-CT-2006–037093 and HEALTH-F4-2007–201550);
- 432 Poland (Gdańsk): European Union (grants LSHM-CT-2006–037093 and HEALTH-F4-2007–201550);
- 433 Poland (Kraków): European Union (grants LSHM-CT-2006–037093 and HEALTH-F4-2007–201550)
- 434 and Foundation for Polish Science.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 22 - /R1

435

- 436 Disclosures
- 437 None.

438

- 439 Supplemental Material
- 440 Expanded Methods
- 441 Tables S1-S8
- 442 Figure S1-S5

443

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 23 - /R1

#### REFERENCES 444

445	1	Chirinos JA, Segers P, Hughes T, Townsend R. Large-artery stiffness in health and
446		disease: JACC state-of-the-art review. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019; 74:1237-1263.
447	2	Van Bortel LM, Laurent S, Boutouyrie P, Chowienczyk P, Cruickshank JK, De Backer T,
448		Filipovsky J, Huybrechts S, Mattace-Raso FU, Protogerou AD, et al. Expert consensus
449		document on the measurement of aortic stiffness in daily practice using carotid-femoral
450		pulse wave velocity. <i>J Hypertens</i> . 2012; 30:445-448.
451	3	Mancia G, De BG, Dominiczak A, Cifkova R, Fagard R, Germano G, Grassi G, Heagerty
452		AM, Kjeldsen SE, Laurent S, et al. 2007 ESH-ESC practice Guidelines for the
453		Management of Arterial Hypertension: ESH-ESC Task Force on the Management of
454		Arterial Hypertension. J Hypertens. 2007; 25:1751-1762.
455	4	Joint Committee for Guideline Revision. 2018 Chinese guidelines for prevention and
456		treatment of hypertension — A report of the Revision Committee of Chinese Guidelines
457		for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension. <i>J Geriatr Cardiol</i> . 2022; 16:182-241.
458	5	Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, Clement DL,
459		Coca A, de Simone G, Dominiczak A, et al. 2018 ESC/ESH guidelines for the
460		management of arterial hypertension. <i>Eur Heart J</i> . 2018; 39:3021-3104.
461	6	Huybrechts SAM, Devos DG, Vermeersch SJ, Mahieu D, Achten E, de Backer TLM,
462		Segers P, Van Bortel LM. Carotid to femoral pulse wave velocity: a comparison of real
463		travelled aortic path lengths determined by MRI and superficial measurements. $J$
464		Hypertens. 2011; 29:1577-1582.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 24 - /R1

465	7	The Reference Values for Arterial Stiffness' collaboration. Determinants of pulse wave
466		velocity in healthy people and the presence of cardiovascular risk factors: 'establishing
467		normal and reference values'. <i>Eur Heart J</i> . 2010; 31:2338-2350.

Blacher J, Asmar R, Djane S, London GM, Safar ME. Aortic pulse wave velocity as a
marker of cardiovascular risk in hypertensive patients. *Hypertension*. 1999; 33:11111117.

- 471 9 London GM, Blacher J, Pannier B, Guerin AP, Marchais SJ, Safar ME. Arterial wave
- 472 reflections and survival in end-stage renal failure. *Hypertension*. 2001; 38:434-438.
- Pannier B, Guérin AP, Marchais SJ, Safar ME, London GM. Stiffness of capacitive and
  conduit arteries. Prognostic significance for end-stage renal disease patients. *Hypertension*. 2005; 45:592-596.
- Adragâo T, Pires A, Birne R, Dias Curto J, Lucas C, Gonçalves M, Pita Negrâo A. A plain
  X-ray vascular calcification score is associated with arterial stiffness and mortality in
  dialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2009; 24:997-1002.
- 479 12 Avramovski P, Janakievska P, Sotiroski K, Zafirova-Ivanovska B, Sikole A. Aortic pulse
  480 wave velocity is a strong predictor of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in chronic
  481 dialysis patients. *Ren Fail.* 2013; 36:176-186.

Broyd CJ, Patel K, Pugliese F, Chebab O, Mathur A, Baumbach A, Ozkor M, Kennon S,
Mullen M. Pulse wave velocity can be accurately measured during transcatheter aortic
calve implantation and used for post-procedure risk stratification. *J Hypertens*. 2019;
37:1845-1852.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 25 - /R1

486	14	Ryliškyte L, Navickas R, Šerpytis P, Puronaite R, Zupkauskiene J, Juceviciene A,
487		Badariene J, Rimkiene MA, Ryliškiene K, Skiauteryte E, et al. Association of aortic
488		stiffness, carotid intima-media thickness and endothelial function with cardiovascular
489		events in metabolic syndrome subjects. <i>Blood Press</i> . 2019; 28:131-138.
490	15	Zhang Q, Yin K, Zhu M, Lin X, Fang Y, Lu J, Li Z, Ni Z. Combining pulse wave velocity
491		with galectin-3 to predict mortality and cerebrovascular and cardiovascular events in
492		hemodialysis patients. <i>Front Med</i> . 2020; 7:579021.
493	16	Shokawa T, Imazu M, Yamamoto H, Toyofuku M, Tasaki N, Okimoto T, Yamane K,
494		Kohno N. Pulse wave velocity predicts cardiovascular mortality: findings from the Hawaii-
495		Los Angeles-Hiroshima study. <i>Circ J</i> . 2005; 69:259-264.
496	17	Sutton-Tyrrell K, Najjar SS, Boudreau RM, Venkitachalam L, Kupelian V, Simonsick EM,
497		Havlik R, Lakatta EG, Spurgeon H, Kritchevsky S, et al. Elevated aortic pulse wave
498		velocity, a marker of arterial stiffness, predicts cardiovascular events in well-functioning
499		older adults. <i>Circulation</i> . 2005; 111:3384-3390.
500	18	Inoue N, Maeda R, Kawakami H, Shokawa T, Yamamoto H, Ito C, Sasaki H. Aortic pulse
501		wave velocity predicts cardiovascular mortality in middle-aged and elderly Japanse men.
502		<i>Circ J.</i> 2009; 73:549-553.
503	19	Sehestedt T, Jeppesen J, Hansen TW, Rasmussen S, Wachtell K, Ibsen H, Torp
504		Pedersen C, Olsen MH. Thresholds for pulse wave velocity, urinary albumin creatinine
505		ratio and left ventricular mass index using SCORE, Framingham and ESH/ESC risk
506		charts. <i>J Hypertens</i> . 2012; 30:1928-1936.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 26 - /R1

507	20	Takami T, Shigemasa M. Efficacy of various antihypertensive agents as evaluated by
508		indices of vascular stiffness in elderly hypertensive patients. Hypertens Res. 2003;
509		26:609-614.

Aparicio LS, Huang QF, Melgarejo JD, Wei DM, Thijs L, We FF, Gilis-Malinowska N, 511 Sheng CS, Boggia J, Niiranen TJ, et al. The International Database of Central Arterial 512 Properties for Risk Stratification: research objectives and baseline characteristics of 513 participants. Am J Hypertens. 2021; 35:54-64.

514 Hansen TW, Staessen JA, Torp-Pedersen C, Rasmussen S, Thijs L, Ibsen H, Jeppesen 22

J. Prognostic value of aortic pulse wave velocity as index of arterial stiffness in the 515 516 general population. Circulation. 2006; 113:664-670.

- 517 23 World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical 518 principles for medical research involving human subjects. J Am Med Assoc. 2013; 519 310:2191-2194.
- 520 24 Asmar R, Benetos A, Topouchian J, Laurent P, Pannier B, Brisac AM, Target R, Levy BI. 521 Assessment of arterial distensibility by automatic pulse wave velocity measurement. 522 Validation and clinical application studies. *Hypertension*. 1995; 26:485-490.
- 523 25 Vermeersch SJ, Rietzschel ER, De Buyere ML, Van Bortel LM, Gillebert TC, Verdonck 524 PR, Laurent S, Segers P, Boutouyrie P. Distance measurements for the assessment of
- 525 carotid to femoral pulse wave velocity. J Hypertens. 2009; 27:2377-2385.
- 526 26 Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Report of the 527 Expert Committee on the diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabet Care*.
- 2003; 26 (Suppl. 1):S5-S20. 528

510

21

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 27 - /R1

- 529 27 Hosmer DW, Jr., Leleshow S. Applied Logistic Regression. New York, NY: John Wiley &
  530 Sons, 1989.
- 531 28 Gu YM, Thijs L, Li Y, Asayama K, Boggia J, Hansen TW, Liu YP, Ohkubo T, Bjorklund-
- 532 Bodegard K, Jeppesen J, et al. Outcome-driven thresholds for ambulatory pulse pressure
- 533 in 9938 participants recruited from 11 populations. *Hypertension*. 2014; 63:229-237.
- 534 29 Kikuya M, Hansen TW, Thijs L, Björklund-Bodegård K, Kuznetsova T, Ohkubo T, Richart
- 535 T, Torp-Pedersen C, Lind L, Ibsen H, et al. Diagnostic thresholds for ambulatory blood
- pressure monitoring based on 10-year cardiovascular risk. *Circulation*. 2007; 115:2145-
- 537 2152.
- 538 30 Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., D'Agostino RB, Jr., Vasan RS. Evaluating the added
  539 predictive ability of a new marker: from area under the ROC curve to reclassification and
  540 beyond. *Stat Med*. 2008; 27:157-172.
- Lewington S, Clarke R, Qizilbash N, Peto R, Collins R, Prospective Studies Collaboration.
  Age-specific relevance of usual blood pressure to vascular mortality: a meta-analysis of
  individual data for one million adults in 61 prospective studies. *Lancet*. 2002; 360:19031913.
- Li Y, Thijs L, Zhang ZY, Asayama K, Hansen TW, Boggia J, Björklund-Bodegård K, Yang
  WY, Niiranen TJ, Ntineri A, et al. Opposing age-related trends in absolute and relative
  risk of adverse health outcomes associated with out-of-office blood pressure.
- 548 *Hypertension*. 2019; 74:1333-1342.
- Asia Pacific Cohort Studies Collaboration. Cholesterol, coronary heart disease, and
  stroke in the Asia Pacific region. *Intern J Epidemiol*. 2003; N32:563-572.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 28 - /R1

551 3	34	Laurent S, Chatell	er G, Azizi M.	Calvet D,	Choukroun G,	Danchin N,	Delsart P,	Girerd X,
-------	----	--------------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	------------	-----------

- 552 Gosse P, Khettab H, et al. SPARTE Study: normalization of arterial stiffness and
- 553 cardiovascular events in patients with hypertension at medium to very high risk.
- 554 *Hypertension*. 2021; 78:983-995.
- 555 35 Avolio AP, Chen SG, Wang RP, Zhang CL, Li MF, O'Rourke MF. Effects of aging on
- 556 changing arterial compliance and left ventricular load in a northern Chinese urban
- 557 community. *Circulation*. 1983; 68:50-58.
- 558 36 Wagenseil J, Mecham RP. Vascular extracellular matrix and arterial mechanics. *Physiol*

559 *Rev.* 2009; 89:957-989.

- 560 37 Wagenseil J, Mecham RP. Elastin in large artery stiffness and hypertension. J
  561 *Cardiovasc Trans Res.* 2012; 5:264-273.
- 562 38 Upadhya B, Pajewski NM, Rocco MV, Hundley WG, Aurigemma G, Hamilton CA, Bates
- 563 JT, He J, Chen J, Chonchol M, et al. Effect of intensive blood pressure control on aortic
- 564 stiffness in the SPRINT-HEART. *Hypertension*. 2021; 77:1571-1580.

565

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 29 - /R1

#### 566 Novelty and Relevance

- 567 What is New?
- IDCARS (N=3378) and MONICA (N=2458) are large population studies assuring
- 569 generalizability.
- In well-calibrated multivariable models, the risk-carrying PWV thresholds in IDCARS
- 571 converged to 9 m/s, of which the prognostic utility was replicated in MONICA.
- The 9-m/s PWV refined risk stratification on top of classical risk factors, albeit to a minor
- 573 extent.
- Corrected for the anatomical pulse wave travel distance the 9-m/s threshold is equivalent
- 575 to 10 m/s.

# 576 What Are the Clinical Implications?

- Over a person's lifetime, hypertension leads to irreparable elastin fragmentation in the
- 578 wall of elastic arteries, thereby causing major CV complications and death.
- PWV integrates all unmodifiable and modifiable risk factors in a single variable, so that its
- 580 measurement should be encouraged for risk stratification.
- Exceeding the risk-carrying PWV threshold should motivate clinicians to stringent
- 582 management of risk factors, in particular hypertension.

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 30 - /R1

# 583 FIGURE LEGENDS

584	Figure 1	Threshold and	Calibration of	of Pulse Wave	Velocity in	n 3378 IDCARS	participants.
-----	----------	---------------	----------------	---------------	-------------	---------------	---------------

- 585 Hazard ratios (HRs) express the risk at each PWV level relative to the average risk in the
- 586 whole study population for composite cardiovascular endpoint (A) and total mortality (B) with
- 587 PWV at 8.7 and 8.8 m/s signifying increased risk by crossing unity (dotted line). PWV levels
- 588 yielding equivalent 5-year risks compared with systolic blood pressure categories for
- 589 composite cardiovascular endpoint (C) and total mortality (D) with bars indicating 5-year risks
- and point and line for PWV thresholds. PWV levels at 8.5 and 8.2 m/s indicate equivalent risk
- as a systolic blood pressure of 140 mmHg. Model calibration for the composite

592 cardiovascular endpoint (E) and total mortality (F), showing the predicted risk against

- 593 overoptimism-corrected Kaplan-Meier estimates in PWV quintiles. All analyses were
- 594 multivariable adjusted for cohort, sex, age, mean arterial pressure (excluding **C** and **D**), heart
- 595 rate, the total-to-high-density lipoprotein serum cholesterol ratio, smoking and drinking, use
- 596 of antihypertensive drugs, diabetes, and history of cardiovascular disease.

597 **Figure 2** Rescaling the Outcome-Driven Pulse Wave Threshold for the Anatomical Pulse

- 598 Wave Travel Distance Path
- 599 In the analysis of the IDCARS and the Copenhagen MONICA data the pulse wave travel
- distance was standardized to the subtraction method, as applied in IDCARS. To keep
- 601 consistency with current guidelines and clinical practice, the 9-m/s threshold derived in
- 602 IDCARS and replicated in MONICA was rescaled to account for the difference between the
- 603 measured and anatomical pulse wave travel path, using the formula published in references
- **2** and **7**. With this adjustment applied the 9-m/s threshold corresponded with 10 m/s. The
- 605 gray line represents the line of identity.
- 606

Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 31 - /R1

#### 607 Table 1. Baseline Characteristics by Cohort

Characteristic	IDCARS	MONICA	P-Value	
Number in group	3378	2458		
Number with characteristic (%)				
Ethnicity				
Chinese	637 (18.9)	0 (0)		
White Europeans	1896 (56.1)	2458 (100)	<0.001	
South Americans	845 (25)	0 (0)		
Women	1872 (55.4)	1241 (50.5)	<0.001	
Hypertension	1782 (53.4)	902 (36.7)	<0.001	
Treated hypertension	1221 (36.4)	203 (8.3)	<0.001	
Diabetes mellitus	207 (6.1)	72 (2.9)	<0.001	
History of cardiovascular disease	443 (13.2)	0 (0)	<0.001	
Smokers	600 (18.7)	1319 (53.7)	<0.001	
Drinkers	996 (37.5)	75 (3.1)	<0.001	
Mean of characteristic (SD)				
Age, y	55.2 (14.1)	54.0 (10.6)	<0.001	
Body weight, kg	71.8 (16.0)	74.7 (14.4)	<0.001	
Body height, cm	165.3 (10.3)	169.5 (9.0)	<0.001	
Body mass index, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	26.1 (4.5)	25.9 (4.2)	0.17	
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg	131.4 (19.6)	129.0 (19.0)	0.001	
Diastolic blood pressure, mm Hg	79.7 (10.7)	82.1 (10.6)	<0.001	
Mean arterial pressure, mm Hg	96.9 (11.9)	97.7 (12.5)	0.014	
Heart rate, beats per minute	68.5 (11.1)	65.9 (10.7)	<0.001	
Serum total cholesterol, mmol/L	5.04 (1.00)	6.15 (1.11)	<0.001	
Serum HDL cholesterol, mmol/L	1.49 (0.41)	1.45 (0.42)	0.001	
Total-to-HDL cholesterol ratio	3.7 (4.2)	4.6 (1.5)	<0.001	
Blood glucose, mmol/L	5.18 (0.98)	4.90 (1.08)	<0.001	
Pulse wave velocity, m/s	7.95 (2.14)	8.01 (2.49)	0.29	
Median follow-up (IQR), y	4.3 (3.8-6.9)	12.6 (12.2-13.1)	<0.001	

608

Abbreviations: IDCARS, International Database of Central Arterial Properties for Risk Stratification; MONICA, Monitoring 609 of Trends and Determinants in Cardiovascular Disease Health Study - Copenhagen; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; IQR, 610 interguartile range.

611 Body mass index was weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared. BP was the average of 2 consecutive 612 readings. Hypertension was a BP of ≥140 mm Hg systolic or ≥90 mm Hg diastolic or being on antihypertensive treatment. 613 Mean arterial pressure was diastolic BP plus one third of pulse pressure. Diabetes was a self-reported diagnosis, use of 614 antidiabetic drugs, fasting blood glucose of ≥7 mmol/L, random blood glucose of ≥11.1 mmol/L, or diabetes documented in 615 practice or hospital records. Smoking was the use of smoking materials on a daily basis. Drinking was an average alcohol

616 intake of  $\geq 5$  g/day.

617 Unit conversion factors: to convert cholesterol from mmol/L to mg/dL, multiply by 38.67; glucose from mmol/L to mg/dL, 618

multiply by 18.

	N. (N.	Model 1		Model 2	Model 2		
Conort / Endpoint	Ne/Nr	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -Value	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -Value		
IDCARS (discovery)							
Cardiovascular endpoint							
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	92/807 vs 63/2571	1.76 (1.21-2.56)	0.003	1.68 (1.15-2.45)	0.007		
PWV (+1 SD)	155/3378	1.18 (1.03-1.36)	0.019	1.18 (1.02-1.36)	0.025		
Total mortality							
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	57/807 vs 48/2571	1.75 (1.10-2.76)	0.017	1.61 (1.01-2.55)	0.045		
PWV (+1 SD)	105/3378	1.36 (1.17-1.58)	<0.001	1.32 (1.13-1.55)	<0.001		
MONICA (replication)							
Cardiovascular endpoint							
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	160/576 <i>vs</i> 194/1882	1.56 (1.23-1.98)	<0.001	1.40 (1.09-1.79)	0.008		
PWV (+1 SD)	354/2458	1.27 (1.18-1.37)	<0.001	1.24 (1.14-1.34)	<0.001		
Total mortality							
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	194/576 <i>vs</i> 199/1882	1.71 (1.37-2.13)	<0.001	1.55 (1.23-1.95)	<0.001		
PWV (+1 SD)	393/2458	1.26 (1.17-1.35)	<0.001	1.22 (1.13-1.32)	<0.001		

# 619 Table 2. Co-Primary Endpoints in Relation to PWV Per Threshold and Analyzed as Continuously Distributed Variable

Ne/Nr indicates number of events/number of participants at risk. PWV in MONICA was standardized to the subtraction method used in IDCARS. Model 1
 accounted for cohort (IDCARS only), sex, age (IDCARS) or age group (MONICA), and MAP. Model 2 additionally accounted for the total-to-HDL serum
 cholesterol ratio, smoking and drinking, use of antihypertensive drugs, and history of CV disease (IDCARS only).

623

624

#### Risk Threshold for Aortic Pulse Wave Velocity - 33 - /R1

Outcome	IDCARS	MONICA
Composite Cardiovascular Endpoint		
Categorized PWV (≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s)		
N° events/at risk (%)	74/807 vs 48/2571	125/576 vs 142/1882
Specificity (95% confidence interval)	0.775 (0.760-0.789)	0.794 (0.777-0.811)
Sensitivity (95% confidence interval)	0.607 (0.514-0.694)	0.468 (0.407-0.530)
PLR (95% confidence interval)	2.694 (2.304-3.151)	2.274 (1.954-2.648)
NLR (95% confidence interval)	0.508 (0.407-0.633)	0.670 (0.597-0.751)
Accuracy	0.769 (0.754-0.783)	0.759 (0.741-0.776)
AUC (95% confidence interval)	0.691 (0.647-0.735)	0.631 (0.600-0.662)*
Continuously distributed PWV		
N° events/at risk (%)	122/3378	267/2458
AUC (95% confidence interval)	0.749 (0.705-0.793)	0.710 (0.679-0.742)
Total Mortality		
Categorized PWV (≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s)		
Nº deaths/at risk (%)	36/807 vs 27/2571	136/576 <i>vs</i> 133/1882
Specificity (95% confidence interval)	0.767 (0.753-0.782)	0.799 (0.782-0.816)
Sensitivity (95% confidence interval)	0.571 (0.440-0.695)	0.506 (0.444-0.567)
PLR (95% confidence interval)	2.457 (1.967-3.070)	2.515 (2.176-2.907)
NLR (95% confidence interval)	0.558 (0.420-0.743)	0.619 (0.547-0.700)
Accuracy	0.764 (0.749-0.778)	0.767 (0.750-0.783)
AUC (95% confidence interval)	0.669 (0.607-0.731)	0.652 (0.621-0.683)
Continuously distributed PWV		
N° deaths/at risk (%)	63/3378	269/2458
AUC (95% confidence interval)	0.714 (0.648-0.779)	0.724 (0.693-0.756)

#### 625 Table 3. Discriminative Performance of Pulse Wave Velocity

626 627 628 629 Calculations were performed for the 5-year risk in IDCARS and the 10-year risk in MONICA. PLR is the

positive likelihood ratio (true positive rate/false positive rate. NLR is the negative likelihood ratio (false

negative rate/true negative rate). Accuracy is the overall probability that an individual is correctly classified.

All estimates in this table were unadjusted for other risk factors.

630 Significance of the AUC difference between IDCARS and MONICA: \* P≤0.05

# 631 Table 4. Integrated Discrimination Improvement and Net Reclassification Improvement by Adding Pulse Wave Velocity Per

# 632 Threshold and as Continuously Distributed Variable to the Base Model

Cohort	Integrated Discrimination Improvement			Net Reclassification Improvement		
PWV Marker	IDI (%)	95% CI (%)	P-value	NRI (%)	95% CI (%)	<i>P</i> -Value
IDCARS (discovery)						
Cardiovascular endpoint						
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	0.59	(0.01, 1.83)	0.020	8.83	(-2.39, 21.0)	0.139
Continuous	0.52	(0.01, 1.74)	0.020	2.45	(-17.5, 13.4)	0.772
Total mortality						
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	0.28	(-0.17, 1.19)	0.198	13.0	(-10.5, 25.3)	0.158
Continuous	0.90	(-0.09, 4.14)	0.079	10.5	(-7.38, 24.3)	0.317
MONICA (replication)						
Cardiovascular endpoint						
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	0.47	(0.02, 1.41)	0.028	4.85	(-6.84, 12.13)	0.238
Continuous	1.25	(0.32, 2.44)	0.004	3.42	(-4.29, 13.03)	0.232
Total mortality						
PWV ≥9 <i>vs</i> <9 m/s	0.85	(0.19, 1.94)	0.002	6.94	(-2.51, 14.31)	0.108
Continuous	1.09	(0.30, 2.04)	0.006	0.02	(-5.98, 8.73)	0.707

633 Calculations were performed for the 5-year risk in IDCARS and the 10-year risk in MONICA. The base model included cohort (IDCARS only), sex, age (IDCARS) or age group (MONICA), mean arterial pressure, heart rate, body mass index, the total-to-HDL serum cholesterol ratio, smoking and drinking, diabetes and history of CV disease (IDCARS only). Pulse wave velocity (PWV) in MONICA was standardized to the subtraction method used in IDCARS. The integrated discrimination improvement (IDI) is the difference between the discrimination slopes of the base model and the base model extended by PWV. The discrimination slope is the difference in predicted probabilities (%) between participants without and with an endpoint. The net reclassification index (NRI) is the sum of the percentages of participants reclassified correctly in individuals without and with an endpoint. The net reclassification index (NRI) is the sum of the percentages of participants reclassified correctly in individuals without and with an endpoint. The net reclassification index (NRI) is the sum of the percentages of participants reclassified correctly in individuals without and with an endpoint. The net reclassification index (NRI) extended by PUV. Classification index (NRI) is the sum of the percentages of participants reclassified correctly in individuals without and with an endpoint. The net reclassification index (NRI) is the sum of the percentages of participants reclassified correctly in individuals without and with an endpoint.

639 endpoint (see Data Supplement pp **S8-S9**). IDI and NRI estimates are given with 95% CI.



