

Differences Between Brachial And Aortic Blood Pressure In Adolescence and their implications for diagnosis of hypertension

Alun D Hughes,^a MBBS, PhD, George Davey Smith,^b DSc, Laura D Howe,^b PhD, Deborah Lawlor,^b MBChB, PhD, Siana Jones,^a PhD, Chloe M Park,^a PhD, Nish Chaturvedi.^a MD, MRCP.

Affiliations: ^aMRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing, Department of Population Science & Experimental Medicine, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College London, London, UK; and ^bMRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Oakfield House, Oakfield Grove, Bristol, UK

Short title: Blood pressure in adolescence

Funding

Cardiovascular measurements at age 17 years were supported by grants from the Wellcome Trust (086676/7/08/Z) and the British Heart Foundation (PG/06/145 & CS/15/6/31468 & SP/F/21/150020). Drs. Davey Smith, Howe, and Lawlor worked within the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, which is supported by the Medical Research Council (MC_UU_00011/1&6). The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome Trust (102215/2/13/2) together with the University of

Bristol provided core support for the ALSPAC study. The other authors declare no relevant financial relationships.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design or conduct of the study.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

Dr Davey Smith reports Scientific Advisory Board Membership for Relation Therapeutics and Insitro. Dr Chaturvedi receives remuneration for membership of data monitoring and safety committees for trials sponsored by AstraZeneca pharmaceuticals. The other authors have no relevant conflicts to report.

Address correspondence to: Alun Hughes, MRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing, Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College London, London, WC1E 6BT, UK. [alun.hughes@ucl.ac.uk] +44 20 7679 9432.

Word count: 3394

Tables: 2

Figures: 1

Supplementary digital content files: 1

Abstract

Objectives Blood pressure is the leading global cause of mortality, and its prevalence is increasing in children and adolescents. Aortic blood pressure (BP) is lower than brachial BP in adults. We aimed to assess the extent of this difference and its impact on the diagnosis of hypertension among adolescents.

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

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

Conclusions Brachial BP substantially overestimates aortic BP in adolescents due to marked aortic-to-brachial pulse pressure amplification. The use of brachial BP measurement may result in an overdiagnosis of hypertension during screening in adolescence.

Keywords: blood pressure, hypertension, adolescence, aortic

1 **Introduction**

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

14 It is well recognised that systolic BP can differ substantially depending on the site of
15 measurement. Typically brachial systolic BP is higher than aortic systolic BP because of
16 pulse pressure amplification due to wave reflection.[11] In adults pulse pressure
17 amplification is highly variable,[12] tends to decrease with age[13] and can account for
18 isolated systolic hypertension (ISH).[14] ISH in adults between 18 and 39 years is more
19 common than systolic plus diastolic hypertension,[15] although its clinical significance
20 is debated in this age-group.[16,17] Further, there is evidence that aortic as opposed to
21 brachial BP is a more relevant prognostic indicator - being more strongly associated
22 with cardiovascular events in adults,[18,19] and with more target organ damage in both
23 adults[20] and adolescents.[21]

1 At present, there is limited evidence on the extent of the difference between aortic and
2 brachial BP in adolescents, the prevalence of isolated systolic hypertension in people
3 below the age of 18, or its impact on the diagnosis of hypertension in youth, an issue
4 highlighted by recent international guidelines.[3] We therefore, we aimed to determine
5 the difference in 1) brachial and aortic BP in a large sample of adolescents drawn from
6 an English birth cohort, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
7 (ALSPAC); and 2) the proportion of people with hypertension or ISH in this sample
8 based on the use of brachial or aortic BP. A further aim was to determine whether aortic
9 and brachial blood pressure, hypertension, and ISBP differed in relation to target organ
10 damage to the heart (i.e., left ventricular mass index (LVMI)) or vasculature (i.e.,
11 carotid intima media thickness (cIMT) and carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity
12 (cfPWV)), and to investigate possible factors that contributed to aortic to brachial pulse
13 pressure amplification in adolescents.

14

15 **Methods**

16 *Study design and participants*

17 Pregnant women resident in the former county of Avon, Southwest England, with
18 expected dates of delivery from April 1, 1991, to December 31, 1992 were invited to
19 participate in The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). The
20 initial number of pregnancies enrolled was 14,541 (for these, at least one questionnaire
21 was returned or a “Children in Focus” clinic was attended by 19/07/99). Of these initial
22 pregnancies, there were 14,062 live births and 13,988 children who were alive at 1 year
23 of age and have been followed since then.[22,23] The study website

1 (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>) contains details of all available
2 data. The present analysis was based on 5,081 participants aged ~17 years who attended
3 the ALSPAC F17 clinic between 2009 and 2011 as part of an ongoing follow-up.
4 Ethical approval was obtained from the ALSPAC Law and Ethics Committee and Local
5 Research Ethics Committee, and all participants provided written informed consent.
6 Individuals with diabetes mellitus (n=21), familial hypercholesterolemia (n=8), known
7 heart disease (n=3), pregnancy (n=15), or those who did not participate in the BP
8 measurement session for any reason (n = 741) were excluded. A further 11 people
9 refused tonometry measurements, and in 392 people tonometry measurements failed
10 quality control procedures, yielding a total of 3850 evaluable recordings
11 (Supplementary Figure S1).

12 *Clinic measurements*

13 Patient age and sex were recorded at the clinic. Demographic and lifestyle data were
14 obtained using a questionnaire. Socioeconomic position was assessed based on the
15 father's occupation (using the 1991 UK Office of Population Censuses and Surveys
16 classification) and mother's education ((less than O-level, O-level, or more than O-level
17 but no degree, and degree or above, where O-levels were the standard school-leaving
18 qualifications taken around age 16 years until recently in the UK). Alcohol consumption
19 was assessed as the number of drinks containing alcohol consumed on a typical day, and
20 smoking was categorized as never, ever but not currently, or currently. Weight and
21 height were measured while the participants wore light clothing and no shoes. Height
22 was estimated to the nearest 0.1 cm with a Harpenden Stadiometer. Body weight was
23 measured to the nearest 0.1 kg using a Tanita TBF 305 scale. Body composition was
24 assessed using a Lunar Prodigy Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scanner (GE

1 Medical Systems, Madison, Wisconsin, USA). Habitual physical activity was assessed
2 using a hip-worn uniaxial ActiGraph device between the age 14-17 (AM7164 2.2;
3 ActiGraph LLC, Fort Walton Beach, FL, USA) and average daily minutes of total
4 physical activity at light, moderate or vigorous intensity was calculated based on cut-
5 points of 200–3,599, 3,600–6,199 and $\geq 6,200$ cpm, respectively. Carotid femoral pulse
6 wave velocity (cfPWV) was measured using a Vicorder device (SMT Medical
7 Technology GmbH, Bristol, UK) as previously described.[24] Carotid intima media
8 thickness (cIMT) was measured in left and right common carotid arteries by ultrasound
9 using a linear 12-MHz transducer (Vivid7, GE Medical, Chicago, Illinois) and
10 averaged.[25] Left ventricular mass was measured in approximately 1 in 2 participants
11 selected in a quasi-random fashion using an ultrasound device (HDI 5000, Philips
12 Healthcare, North Andover, MA, USA) equipped with a P4-2 Phased Array ultrasound
13 transducer according to the American Society of Echocardiography guidelines, as
14 previously described and indexed to height^{1.7}. [26] Blood samples were collected
15 following an overnight fast for those assessed in the morning or a minimum of 6 hours
16 fasting for those assessed in the afternoon. Samples were centrifuged immediately,
17 separated, and frozen at -80°C before analysis. Lipid profiles (total cholesterol, high-
18 density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, triglycerides), glucose, and insulin were
19 measured as described previously.[27] Insulin sensitivity (HOMA-S) was estimated
20 using the Homeostasis Assessment Model (Version 2.2.3).[28]
21 The participants' sitting BP and heart rate were measured at least three times with at
22 least a minute interval using an Omron 705IT device according to contemporary
23 guidelines in the dominant arm using an appropriate cuff size.[29] The average of the
24 final two readings was used. The BP waveform was measured using radial tonometry

1 (SphygmoCor, AtCor Medical), and aortic pressure was estimated using a generalized
2 transfer function (GTF), which has been validated in adults and children.[12,30] The
3 late systolic shoulder (SBP2) was also used as an alternative estimate of aortic systolic
4 BP, which does not rely on a GTF.[31] Amplification was calculated as brachial pulse
5 pressure/aortic pulse pressure. All measurements were made by trained investigators
6 and ongoing quality control was conducted throughout the study; reproducibility was
7 excellent, as has been reported previously.[32]

8 In accordance with ESH guidelines,[33] hypertension was defined as brachial BP
9 $\geq 140/90$ mmHg. Isolated systolic hypertension (ISH) was defined as systolic BP ≥ 140
10 mmHg and diastolic BP < 90 mmHg.[33] For the classification of hypertension based on
11 aortic BP, we used the definition of aortic BP $\geq 130/90$ mmHg as hypertensive,[34,35]
12 and aortic systolic BP ≥ 130 and diastolic BP < 90 mmHg as indicative of aortic ISH
13 (aISH). A subsidiary analysis using the recent American Academy of Pediatrics Clinical
14 Practice Guideline recommendations[2] (Stage I hypertension: $\geq 130/80$ mmHg) was
15 also performed.

16 *Statistical analysis*

17 All analyses were performed in Stata/MP 17.0 (StataCorp). Descriptive statistics for
18 continuous variables are presented as mean (SD), and N(%) for categorical variables.
19 Comparisons between the included sample and those eligible but not included were
20 made using Student's t-tests or Chi² tests as appropriate. Analyses were stratified by
21 sex, based on previous evidence of sex differences in the aortic BP waveform and
22 amplification.[36] For the main analysis of difference in brachial and aortic BP we used
23 unadjusted linear regression or 2-dimension fractional polynomial if there was evidence
24 of non-linearity. If there was evidence of heteroscedasticity, standard errors for the

1 linear model were estimated using the bootstrap estimator. Linear regression results
2 were summarized as beta coefficients with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). When
3 nonlinearity and heteroskedasticity were present, we used a combination of fractional
4 polynomials and quantile regression to produce median, 5%, and 95% quantile
5 boundaries for the nonlinear relationship [95% QI]. For differences in the proportions of
6 different definitions of HR using aortic and brachial BP, we used unadjusted logistic
7 regression. We estimated the sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative
8 prediction metrics for hypertension and ISH by using aortic and brachial BP.
9 Associations between aortic or brachial hypertension in the absence of aortic
10 hypertension and measures of target organ damage were adjusted for potential
11 confounders (age, BMI, fat and lean mass, habitual physical activity, maternal
12 education, and socioeconomic status) chosen on the basis of background knowledge. To
13 investigate potential predictors of AMPLIFICATION, we used a linear model with
14 inclusion of clinical predictors (see Table 1), and model selection was performed using
15 an elastic net with 10-folds. We report the % variation explained in the outcome for all
16 selected variables.

17 Primary analyses were performed using listwise deletion to handle missing data, on the
18 assumption that conditional independence between missingness and aortic-to-brachial
19 pulse pressure amplification (outcome) was more plausible than a missing-at-random
20 assumption.

21 **Results**

22 The participants' characteristics are listed in Table 1. 66% of the participants were
23 female, and the mean age for both sexes was 17.8 years. The mean brachial BP for both

1 sexes was 116.7/64.6 mmHg, with males having a higher brachial BP than females.
2 Compared with all those invited, participants who attended clinics were more likely to
3 be female and come from more advantaged socioeconomic circumstances
4 (Supplementary Table S1).

5 Figure 1A - D show a comparison of brachial and aortic systolic and diastolic BP in
6 males and females. The distribution of differences in brachial and aortic systolic BP
7 between males and females is shown in Supplementary Figure S2.

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

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

1 *Classification and prevalence of hypertension using brachial and aortic BP.*

2 On the basis of brachial BP, 123(3%) participants were classified as hypertensive; of
3 these ISH accounted for 109(88%) were hypertensive. There was a marked sex
4 difference in hypertension prevalence based on brachial BP, with 101 hypertensive
5 males (6% of males) and 22 hypertensive females (1% of females). ISH accounted for
6 98(97%) cases of hypertension in males and only 11(50%) cases of hypertension in
7 females.

8 When aortic BP was used, only 23 patients (0.6%) had aortic hypertension. Of these,
9 five (21%) were due to aISH. A minimal sex difference was observed for aortic
10 hypertension: 9 males (0.5%) had aortic hypertension, of which 4 were attributable to
11 aISH. In contrast, 14 females (0.7%) had aortic hypertension, of which only one had
12 aISH.

13 The classification matrices for aortic and brachial hypertension are presented in Table
14 2A. Although the sensitivity, specificity, and negative predictive value of brachial BP
15 for aortic hypertension were excellent, brachial BP had a poor positive predictive value
16 for aortic hypertension (13.8%).

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

20 The results using a threshold of 130/80 mmHg for diagnosis of hypertension as
21 recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics Clinical Practice Guideline are
22 shown in the Supplementary TableS2; these showed excellent sensitivity and negative

1 predictive values but lower specificity (85.6%) and a poorer positive predictive value
2 (4%) than the ESH-based criteria.

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

5 Both aortic and brachial hypertension without aortic hypertension were associated with
6 cardiac target organ damage (higher LVMI), although the elevation in LVMI was larger
7 in patients with aortic hypertension than in those with ISH (13.4 (95% CI, 4.0, 22.8)
8 $\text{g/m}^{1.7}$; $p = 0.005$ versus 7.1(95% CI, 1.4, 12.8) $\text{g/m}^{1.7}$; $p = 0.015$) after adjustment for
9 potential confounders. There was no convincing evidence that either brachial or aortic
10 hypertension or ISH was associated with vascular target organ damage, as assessed by
11 cIMT or cfPWV.

12 *Predictors of aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification*

13 For males 4 variables were identified as predictors of aortic to brachial pulse pressure
14 amplification (age, heart rate, crPWV, and room temperature). The out-of-sample r^2 was
15 small ($r^2 = 0.04$), indicating that it was largely unexplained by these variables. A
16 sensitivity analysis excluding physical activity identified a total of eight predictors (age,
17 total fat mass, HDL-cholesterol, heart rate, smoking, crPWV, cfPWV, and room
18 temperature) that were only minimally different in terms of model fit ($r^2 = 0.08$) despite
19 the larger number of predictors and fewer missing values.

20 For females, five variables (HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides, heart rate, maternal
21 education, and cfPWV) were predictors of amplification; however, the out-of-sample r^2
22 was very modest ($r^2 = 0.03$). Sensitivity analysis excluding physical activity only
23 marginally improved the variance explained by the model ($r^2 = 0.08$).

1 **Discussion**

2 Brachial systolic BP was substantially higher than aortic systolic BP in both sexes in a
3 birth cohort of adolescents and that this difference varied considerably between
4 individuals. This difference in adolescents (male: 22mmHg, female: 18mmHg) was
5 considerably higher than has been typically found in adults (~12mmHg[13,37]). Higher
6 brachial systolic BP was attributable to pulse pressure amplification and led to a large
7 discrepancy in hypertension diagnosis when criteria based on brachial and aortic BP
8 were compared.

9 Both aortic hypertension and brachial hypertension without aortic hypertension, which
10 corresponded to ISH in almost all instances, were associated with increased LVMI,
11 although the association was stronger with aortic hypertension and there was no
12 evidence of vascular target organ damage (based on PWV or cIMT) in people with
13 hypertension or ISH. Penalized regression (elastic net) using a wide range of measured
14 variables, (including age, heart rate, cfPWV, crPWV, and CV risk factors) explained
15 <10% of the variance in amplification in either sex, indicating that differences between
16 brachial systolic BP and aortic systolic BP cannot be predicted, at least by these
17 variables; therefore, amplification is an important and unexplained source of variation in
18 brachial SBP. Our finding of large differences in brachial and aortic systolic BP due to
19 amplification in young people is consistent with previous studies. In the Anglo-Cardiff
20 Collaborative Trial II, younger age was by far the strongest predictor of amplification,
21 with smaller contributions from sex, diabetes, smoking, and cardiovascular
22 diseases.[13] Since the age range in our birth cohort was narrow and participants were
23 younger and predominantly healthy our findings are broadly consistent with these
24 observations.

1 Aortic to brachial pulse pressure amplification is attributable to wave reflection from the
2 downstream circulation, which arises because of impedance mismatching in the
3 peripheral arterial tree.[11] At an individual bifurcation, the magnitude of wave
4 reflection depends on the geometrical and biophysical properties of the parent and
5 daughter arteries,[38] but reflection patterns from anatomically asymmetric trees such
6 as those in the upper limb are complex[39] which probably explains why the magnitude
7 of pulse pressure amplification is unpredictable between individuals.

8 The high variability in amplification between individuals in this age group results in
9 discrepancies in the identification of hypertension based on aortic or brachial BP. The
10 definition of hypertension is inherently arbitrary,[40] and while it is relatively
11 uncommon in children and adolescents (current global estimates are around 2-
12 13%,[2,3]), its prevalence has risen sharply since the 1990's and there are calls for more
13 screening.[41] Previous studies have reported that aortic BP is a better predictor of
14 outcomes than brachial BP in adults, and we have reported previously in ALSPAC that
15 aortic pulse pressure is more closely associated with left ventricular hypertrophy than
16 brachial pulse pressure in adolescence.[21] Another more recent study using ambulatory
17 aortic BP in selected normotensive and hypertensive young people drew similar
18 conclusions with regard to the superiority of aortic BP as a predictor of elevated LV
19 mass.[42] While the evidence cannot be definitive in the absence of hard endpoints
20 (which will take years to accrue), our data suggest that aortic BP may be a more
21 appropriate indicator of risk in young people - this is consistent with most key organs
22 being exposed to aortic, not brachial systolic BP. Since cuff-based devices are now
23 available for measurement of aortic pressure, this suggests that their wider use in
24 children and adolescents may support therapeutic decision-making.

1 Our findings of large variability in amplification may also help explain previous
2 conflicting observations in young adults comparing the relationships of systolic and
3 diastolic BP with later CV mortality,[7,43,44] since this variability is likely to
4 introduce uncertainty in estimated risk relationships. Although aortic BP was a stronger
5 predictor of early cardiac target organ damage than brachial BP, there was a weak
6 association between ISH and higher LVMI in males. This is consistent with previous
7 work showing associations between systolic hypertension and increased LVMI in
8 children.[45]

9 Our study has several limitations. At recruitment, ALSPAC was not representative of
10 the UK population,[22] and it may also differ from more contemporary cohorts. As with
11 all cohort studies, there has been attrition over time, which may introduce further bias
12 and limit the generalizability of the findings. Further studies in different geographic
13 regions covering different age ranges during childhood would be valuable. In ALSPAC
14 measurement of BP was made on only one occasion while diagnosis of hypertension
15 usually requires BP measurements on multiple occasions. This may have led to a higher
16 proportion of people identified as having BP in the hypertensive range. Nevertheless, it
17 should not have influenced the difference between brachial and aortic pressure,[46] and
18 the white coat effect is similar on brachial and aortic pressure, at least in adults.[47] The
19 strengths of the study include its large sample size and the standardized measurements
20 of BP and other cardiovascular indices.

21 *Conclusion*

22 Blood pressure measured at the brachial artery overestimates aortic blood pressure in
23 adolescents owing to marked aortic-to-brachial pulse pressure amplification. The use of

1 brachial blood pressure could result in an overdiagnosis of hypertension during

2 adolescence.

3

4

5

6

1 **Acknowledgements**

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

6

1 **References**

- 2 1. Ezzati M, Lopez AD, Rodgers A, Vander Hoorn S, Murray CJ, Comparative Risk
3 Assessment Collaborating G. Selected major risk factors and global and regional burden
4 of disease. *Lancet* 2002; 360 (9343):1347-1360.
- 5 2. Flynn JT, Kaelber DC, Baker-Smith CM, Blowey D, Carroll AE, Daniels SR, et al.
6 Clinical Practice Guideline for Screening and Management of High Blood Pressure in
7 Children and Adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2017; 140 (3):e20171904.
- 8 3. Lurbe E, Agabiti-Rosei E, Cruickshank JK, Dominiczak A, Erdine S, Hirth A, et al.
9 2016 European Society of Hypertension guidelines for the management of high blood
10 pressure in children and adolescents. *J Hypertens* 2016; 34 (10):1887-1920.
- 11 4. Rosner B, Cook NR, Daniels S, Falkner B. Childhood Blood Pressure Trends and
12 Risk Factors for High Blood Pressure: The NHANES Experience 1988-2008.
13 *Hypertension* 2013; 62 (2):247-254.
- 14 5. Lurbe E. Childhood blood pressure: trends and future tracks. *Hypertension* 2013; 62
15 (2):242-243.
- 16 6. Chen X, Wang Y. Tracking of Blood Pressure From Childhood to Adulthood: A
17 Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis. *Circulation* 2008; 117 (25):3171-
18 3180.
- 19 7. Sundstrom J, Neovius M, Tynelius P, Rasmussen F. Association of blood pressure in
20 late adolescence with subsequent mortality: cohort study of Swedish male conscripts. *Br*
21 *Med J* 2011; 342 (feb22 2):d643.
- 22 8. Ghosh AK, Francis DP, Chaturvedi N, Kuh D, Mayet J, Hughes AD, et al.
23 Cardiovascular Risk Factors from Early Life Predict Future Adult Cardiac Structural
24 and Functional Abnormalities: A Systematic Review of the Published Literature. *J*
25 *Cardiol Ther* 2014; 2 (2):78-87.
- 26 9. Hamer M, Batty GD, Stamatakis E, Kivimaki M. Hypertension awareness and
27 psychological distress. *Hypertension* 2010; 56 (3):547-550.
- 28 10. Hinton TC, Adams ZH, Baker RP, Hope KA, Paton JFR, Hart EC, et al.
29 Investigation and Treatment of High Blood Pressure in Young People: Too Much
30 Medicine or Appropriate Risk Reduction? *Hypertension* 2020; 75 (1):16-22.
- 31 11. Zambanini A, Cunningham SL, Parker KH, Khir AW, Mc GTSA, Hughes AD.
32 Wave-energy patterns in carotid, brachial, and radial arteries: a noninvasive approach
33 using wave-intensity analysis. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol* 2005; 289 (1):H270-
34 276.
- 35 12. Pauca AL, O'Rourke MF, Kon ND. Prospective evaluation of a method for
36 estimating ascending aortic pressure from the radial artery pressure waveform.
37 *Hypertension* 2001; 38 (4):932-937.
- 38 13. McEniery CM, Yasmin, McDonnell B, Munnery M, Wallace SM, Rowe CV, et al.
39 Central pressure: variability and impact of cardiovascular risk factors: the Anglo-Cardiff
40 Collaborative Trial II. *Hypertension* 2008; 51 (6):1476-1482.
- 41 14. O'Rourke MF, Vlachopoulos C, Graham RM. Spurious systolic hypertension in
42 youth. *Vasc Med* 2000; 5 (3):141-145.
- 43 15. Grebla RC, Rodriguez CJ, Borrell LN, Pickering TG. Prevalence and determinants
44 of isolated systolic hypertension among young adults: the 1999-2004 US National
45 Health And Nutrition Examination Survey. *J Hypertens* 2010; 28 (1):15-23.
- 46 16. Lurbe E, Redon J. Isolated Systolic Hypertension in Young People Is Not Spurious
47 and Should Be Treated: Con Side of the Argument. *Hypertension* 2016; 68 (2):276-280.

- 1 17. McEniery CM, Franklin SS, Cockcroft JR, Wilkinson IB. Isolated Systolic
2 Hypertension in Young People Is Not Spurious and Should Be Treated: Pro Side of the
3 Argument. *Hypertension* 2016; 68 (2):269-275.
- 4 18. Cheng YB, Thijs L, Aparicio LS, Huang QF, Wei FF, Yu YL, et al. Risk
5 Stratification by Cross-Classification of Central and Brachial Systolic Blood Pressure.
6 *Hypertension* 2022; 79 (5):1101-1111.
- 7 19. Vlachopoulos C, Aznaouridis K, O'Rourke MF, Safar ME, Baou K, Stefanadis C.
8 Prediction of cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality with central
9 haemodynamics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2010; 31
10 (15):1865-1871.
- 11 20. Kollias A, Lagou S, Zeniodi ME, Boubouchairopoulou N, Stergiou GS. Association
12 of Central Versus Brachial Blood Pressure With Target-Organ Damage: Systematic
13 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Hypertension* 2016; 67 (1):183-190.
- 14 21. Ferreira DL, Fraser A, Howe LD, Jones S, Smith GD, Lawlor DA, et al.
15 Associations of Central and Peripheral Blood Pressure With Cardiac Structure and
16 Function in an Adolescent Birth Cohort: The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and
17 Children. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2015; 65 (18):2048-2050.
- 18 22. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort
19 Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of
20 Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013; 42 (1):111-127.
- 21 23. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The
22 Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled
23 sample of index children in 2019. *Wellcome Open Res* 2019; 4:51.
- 24 24. Dangardt F, Charakida M, Georgiopoulos G, Chiesa ST, Rapala A, Wade KH, et al.
25 Association between fat mass through adolescence and arterial stiffness: a population-
26 based study from The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Lancet Child
27 Adolesc Health* 2019; 3 (7):474-481.
- 28 25. Chiesa ST, Charakida M, Georgiopoulos G, Dangardt F, Wade KH, Rapala A, et al.
29 Determinants of Intima-Media Thickness in the Young: The ALSPAC Study. *JACC
30 Cardiovasc Imaging* 2021; 14 (2):468-478.
- 31 26. Taylor HCM, Chaturvedi N, Davey Smith G, Ferreira DLS, Fraser A, Howe LD, et
32 al. Is Height(2.7) Appropriate for Indexation of Left Ventricular Mass in Healthy
33 Adolescents? The Importance of Sex Differences. *Hypertension* 2023; 80 (10):2033-
34 2042.
- 35 27. Falaschetti E, Hingorani AD, Jones A, Charakida M, Finer N, Whincup P, et al.
36 Adiposity and cardiovascular risk factors in a large contemporary population of pre-
37 pubertal children. *Eur Heart J* 2010; 31 (24):3063-3072.
- 38 28. Levy JC, Matthews DR, Hermans MP. Correct homeostasis model assessment
39 (HOMA) evaluation uses the computer program. *Diabetes Care* 1998; 21 (12):2191-
40 2192.
- 41 29. Williams B, Poulter NR, Brown MJ, Davis M, McInnes GT, Potter JF, et al.
42 Guidelines for management of hypertension: report of the fourth working party of the
43 British Hypertension Society, 2004-BHS IV. *J Hum Hypertens* 2004; 18 (3):139-185.
- 44 30. Cai TY, Haghighi MM, Roberts PA, Mervis J, Qasem A, Butlin M, et al.
45 Assessment of Central Arterial Hemodynamics in Children: Comparison of
46 Noninvasive and Invasive Measurements. *Am J Hypertens* 2021; 34 (2):163-171.

- 1 31. Guilcher A, Brett S, Munir S, Clapp B, Chowienczyk PJ. Estimating central SBP
2 from the peripheral pulse: influence of waveform analysis and calibration error. *J*
3 *Hypertens* 2011; 29 (7):1357-1366.
- 4 32. Park C, Fraser A, Howe LD, Jones S, Davey Smith G, Lawlor DA, et al. Elevated
5 Blood Pressure in Adolescence Is Attributable to a Combination of Elevated Cardiac
6 Output and Total Peripheral Resistance. *Hypertension* 2018; 72 (5):1103-1108.
- 7 33. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, et al.
8 2018 ESC/ESH Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension. *Eur Heart J*
9 2018; 39 (33):3021-3104.
- 10 34. Cheng HM, Chuang SY, Sung SH, Yu WC, Pearson A, Lakatta EG, et al.
11 Derivation and validation of diagnostic thresholds for central blood pressure
12 measurements based on long-term cardiovascular risks. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013; 62
13 (19):1780-1787.
- 14 35. Takase H, Dohi Y, Kimura G. Distribution of central blood pressure values
15 estimated by Omron HEM-9000AI in the Japanese general population. *Hypertension*
16 *research : official journal of the Japanese Society of Hypertension* 2013; 36 (1):50-57.
- 17 36. Hayward CS, Kelly RP. Gender-related differences in the central arterial pressure
18 waveform. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997; 30 (7):1863-1871.
- 19 37. Adji A, O'Rourke MF. Brachial artery tonometry and the Popeye phenomenon:
20 explanation of anomalies in generating central from upper limb pressure waveforms. *J*
21 *Hypertens* 2012; 30 (8):1540-1551.
- 22 38. Brown N. Impedance Matching at Arterial Bifurcations. *J Biomech* 1993; 26 (1):59-
23 67.
- 24 39. Taylor MG. The input impedance of an assembly of randomly branching elastic
25 tubes. *Biophys J* 1966; 6 (1):29-51.
- 26 40. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 1985; 14 (1):32-38.
- 27 41. Robinson CH, Chanchlani R. High Blood Pressure in Children and Adolescents:
28 Current Perspectives and Strategies to Improve Future Kidney and Cardiovascular
29 Health. *Kidney Int Rep* 2022; 7 (5):954-970.
- 30 42. Ntineri A, Kollias A, Bountzona I, Servos G, Moysakis I, Destounis A, et al.
31 Twenty-four-hour ambulatory central blood pressure in adolescents and young adults:
32 association with peripheral blood pressure and preclinical organ damage. *J Hypertens*
33 2020; 38 (10):1980-1988.
- 34 43. McCarron P, Smith GD, Okasha M, McEwen J. Blood pressure in young adulthood
35 and mortality from cardiovascular disease. *Lancet* 2000; 355 (9213):1430-1431.
- 36 44. Miura K, Daviglius ML, Dyer AR, Liu K, Garside DB, Stamler J, et al. Relationship
37 of blood pressure to 25-year mortality due to coronary heart disease, cardiovascular
38 diseases, and all causes in young adult men - The Chicago Heart Association Detection
39 Project in Industry. *Arch Intern Med* 2001; 161 (12):1501-1508.
- 40 45. Sorof JM. Prevalence and consequence of systolic hypertension in children. *Am J*
41 *Hypertens* 2002; 15 (2 Pt 2):57S-60S.
- 42 46. Park CM, Korolkova O, Davies JE, Parker KH, Siggers JH, March K, et al. Arterial
43 pressure: agreement between a brachial cuff-based device and radial tonometry. *J*
44 *Hypertens* 2014; 32 (4):865-872.
- 45 47. Mizuno H, Hoshida S, Yano Y, Nozue R, Kario K. Comparison of Brachial Blood
46 Pressure and Central Blood Pressure in Attended, Unattended, and Unattended Standing
47 Situations. *Hypertension research : official journal of the Japanese Society of*
48 *Hypertension* 2021; 44 (10):1283-1290.

1

2

3

4

Tables

Table 1 Participant characteristics

Variable	All			Male			Female		
	N	Mean/ %	SD	N	Mean/ %	SD	N	Mean/ %	SD
Age, y	3,850	17.8	0.4	1,704	17.8	0.4	2,146	17.8	0.4
Height, cm	3,767	171.3	9.4	1,672	178.9	6.7	2,095	165.2	6.2
Weight, kg	3,771	67.0	13.5	1,675	72.3	12.9	2,096	62.9	12.4
BMI, kg/m ²	3,767	22.8	4.0	1,672	22.6	3.7	2,095	23.0	4.2
Fat mass, kg	3,706	18.2	10.4	1,650	13.9	9.7	2,056	21.8	9.6
Lean mass, kg	3,706	45.7	10.0	1,650	55.3	6.1	2,056	38.0	4.3
Fasting glucose, mmol/l	2,562	5.0	0.4	1,233	5.1	0.41	1,329	4.9	0.4
Insulin, pmol/l	2,528	49.4	42.2	1,223	45.5	36.2	1,305	53.0	46.9

HOMA-S, %	2,513	147.2	81.6	1,212	160.5	89.1	1,301	134.9	71.9
Total cholesterol, mmol/l	2,562	3.8	0.7	1,233	3.6	0.6	1,329	3.9	0.7
HDL-cholesterol, mmol/l	2,562	1.3	0.3	1,233	1.2	0.3	1,329	1.3	0.3
Triglycerides, mmol/l	2,562	0.8	0.4	1,233	0.8	0.4	1,329	0.8	0.3
MVPA, min/day	1,488	23.5	18.6	632	30.3	20.4	856	18.6	15.3
Brachial systolic BP, mmHg	3,850	116.7	11.5	1,704	122.6	10.7	2,146	111.9	9.8
Brachial diastolic BP, mmHg	3,850	64.6	7.5	1,704	64.3	7.6	2,146	64.8	7.5
Heart rate, bpm	3,850	69.7	10.8	1,704	66.6	10.6	2,146	17.8	0.4
Carotid-femoral PWV, m/s	3,107	5.8	0.7	1,398	6.0	0.7	1,709	5.5	0.6
Carotid-radial PWV, m/s	3,118	7.9	1.2	1,399	8.0	1.3	1,719	7.8	1.1
Room temperature, °C	3,286	21.6	2.0	1,473	21.7	1.9	1,813	21.6	2.0
Male sex	1,704	44.3%							
Father's occupation	3,465			1,551			1,914		
I - Professional	386	11.1%		175	11.3%		211	11.0%	
II - Managerial and technical	1,340	38.7%		605	39.0%		735	38.4%	

IIINM - Skilled non-manual	410	11.8%	196	12.6%	214	11.2%
IIIM - Skilled manual	986	28.5%	408	26.3%	578	30.2%
IV - Partly skilled	249	7.2%	130	8.4%	119	6.2%
V - Unskilled	94	2.7%	37	2.4%	57	3.0%
Mother's education	3,496		1,551		1,945	
less than O-level	671	19.2%	278	17.9%	393	20.2%
O-level	1,177	33.7%	502	32.4%	675	34.7%
More than O-level but no degree	986	28.2%	456	29.4%	530	27.3%
Degree or above	662	18.9%	315	20.3%	347	17.8%
Smoking	3,279		1,450		1,829	
Never	1,636	49.9%	781	53.9%	855	46.8%
Ex	742	22.6%	304	21.0%	438	24.0%
Current	901	27.5%	365	25.2%	536	29.3%
Alcohol, drinks per typical day	3,191		1,403		1,788	
0	164	5.1%	5.2	5.2%	91	5.1%

1 or 2	655	20.5%	298	21.2%	357	20.0%
3 or 4	862	27.0%	368	26.2%	494	27.6%
5 or 6	794	24.9%	310	22.1%	484	27.1%
7 to 9	454	14.2%	226	16.1%	228	12.8%
10 or more	262	8.2%	128	9.1%	134	7.5%

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

Table 2A Classification matrix for aortic and brachial SBP according to the ESH guideline classification

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

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

Negative predictive value 99.9% (99.8%, 100%)

Table 2B Classification matrix for aortic and brachial ISH




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

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

Negative predictive value 100% (99.9%, 100%)

Figure Legends

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

A**B****C****D**