



HAL
open science

Impact of Arterial Blood Pressure on Ultrasound Hemodynamic Assessment of Aortic Valve Stenosis Severity

A. Hayek, F. Derimay, L. Green, M. Rosset, H. Thibault, G. Rioufol, G. Finet

► **To cite this version:**

A. Hayek, F. Derimay, L. Green, M. Rosset, H. Thibault, et al.. Impact of Arterial Blood Pressure on Ultrasound Hemodynamic Assessment of Aortic Valve Stenosis Severity. *Journal of The American Society of Echocardiography*, 2020, 33 (11), pp.1324-1333. 10.1016/j.echo.2020.06.013 . inserm-03268234

HAL Id: inserm-03268234

<https://inserm.hal.science/inserm-03268234>

Submitted on 7 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 **Impact of arterial blood pressure on ultrasound**
2 **hemodynamic assessment of aortic valve**
3 **stenosis severity**

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Ahmad Hayek¹ MD, François Derimay¹ MD, PhD, Lisa Green¹ MD, Marion Rosset² MD, H el ene Thibault² MD, PhD, Gilles Rioufol¹ MD, PhD, Gerard Finet¹ MD, PhD,

¹Department of Cardiology and Interventional Cardiology, H opital Cardiologique Louis Pradel, Universit e Claude-Bernard, Inserm UMR 1060, Lyon, France

²Echocardiography Lab, H opital Cardiologique Louis Pradel, Lyon Universit e Claude-Bernard, Inserm UMR 1060, Lyon, France

Corresponding author:
Pr G erard FINET
H opital Cardiologique Louis Pradel
Service de Cardiologie, Fili ere Coronaires-Valves
28 Avenue Doyen L epine
69677 Bron
France
Tel. : +33472118880
Email: gerard.finet@univ-lyon1.fr

Word count: 3,555

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

44 **Abstract**

45

46 **Background**

47 Aortic stenosis (AS) severity assessment is based on several indices. Aortic valve area
48 (AVA) is subject to inaccuracies inherent to the measurement method, while velocities
49 and gradients depend on hemodynamic status. There is controversy as to whether blood
50 pressure directly affects common indices of AS severity.

51 **Objectives**

52 The study objective was to assess the effect of systolic blood pressure (SBP) variation on
53 AS indices, in a clinical setting.

54 **Methods**

55 A prospective, single-center study included 100 patients with at least moderately severe
56 AS with preserved left-ventricle ejection fraction. Patients underwent ultrasound
57 examination during which AS severity indices were collected, with 3 hemodynamic
58 conditions: 1) low SBP: <120mmHg; 2) intermediate SBP: between 120 and 150mmHg;
59 3) high SBP: ≥150mmHg. SBP profiles were obtained, for each patient, by injection of
60 isosorbide dinitrate or phenylephrine.

61 **Results**

62 At baseline state, 59% presented a mean gradient (G_{mean}) ≥40mmHg, 44% a peak aortic
63 jet velocity (V_{peak}) ≥4m/s, 66% a dimensionless index (DI) ≤0.25 and 87% an indexed
64 aortic valve area (AVA_i) ≤0.6cm²/m². Compared with intermediate and low SBP, high
65 SBP induced a significant decrease in G_{mean} (39±12 vs. 43±12 and 47±12mmHg
66 respectively), (p<0.05) and in V_{peak} (3.8±0.6 vs. 4.0±0.6 and 4.2±0.6mmHg), (p <0.05).
67 Compared with the baseline measures, in 16% of patients with an initial
68 G_{mean} <40mmHg, gradient rose above 40mmHg after optimization of the afterload (low
69 SBP) (p <0.05). Conversely, DI and AVA_i did not vary with changes in hemodynamic
70 conditions. Flow rate, not Stroke volume was found to impact G_{mean} and V_{peak} but not
71 AVA and DI (p<0.05).

72 **Conclusion**

73 Hemodynamic conditions may affect the AS ultrasound assessment. High SBP, or
74 afterload, leads to an underestimation of AS severity when based on gradients and
75 velocities. SBP monitoring and control is crucial during AS ultrasound assessment.

76

77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109

Key-words: Aortic stenosis, afterload, Aortic valve area, Mean transaortic gradient, Dimensionless index, Echocardiography; Flow rate;

Abbreviations

- AS** = aortic stenosis
AVA = aortic valve area
CI = Cardiac index
DI = Dimensionless index
FR = Flow rate
G_{mean} = Mean gradient
LF-LG SAS = Low flow low gradient severe aortic stenosis
LVEF = left ventricle ejection fraction
LVOT = Left ventricle outflow tract
NF-LG SAS = Normal flow log gradient severe aortic stenosis
SBP = Systolic blood pressure
SPAP = systolic pulmonary arterial pressure
SV_i = Indexed stroke volume
V_{peak} = Peak aortic jet velocity
VTI_A = Aortic velocity time integral
VTI_{LVOT} = LVOT velocity time integral
Z_{va} = Valvuloarterial impedance

110 INTRODUCTION

111

112 Calcific aortic stenosis (AS) is the third most common cardiovascular disease in Western
113 countries¹. Doppler-echocardiography is the primary method to confirm diagnosis and
114 severity². The European Society of Cardiology guidelines³ define a number of
115 echocardiographic parameters to evaluate the severity of aortic stenosis, in patients
116 with preserved left ventricle ejection fraction (LVEF). However, there may often be
117 discrepancies between the various parameters: peak aortic jet velocity (V_{peak}), mean
118 gradient (G_{mean}), dimensionless index (DI) and aortic valve area (AVA), generally leading
119 to misestimating the aortic valve pathology⁴. Indeed, highly contributive studies
120 suggested that classifying AS severity by AVA leads to a higher proportion of severe AS⁵.
121 This is due to underestimation of left ventricle outflow tract (LVOT), due to its
122 ellipticity^{6,7}, which is not taken into account in the ultrasound estimation of AVA⁸.

123 At the same time, systemic hypertension is a high-prevalence disease⁹, especially in
124 patients with AS (32% are hypertensive)¹⁰. It is a global determinant of left ventricle
125 afterload¹. High systolic blood pressure (SBP) impact on AS severity parameters is
126 difficult to estimate, since it includes complex changes in vascular resistance,
127 transvalvular flow¹¹⁻¹³ and arterial compliance^{14,15}. The natural consequence is that high
128 SBP during examination may lead to misclassification of AS severity. As clearly
129 mentioned by *Minners et al* in a recent editorial, trials with patients with AS of all levels
130 of hemodynamic severity are needed to improve classification and patient care¹⁶.

131 The objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of SBP variations during the
132 ultrasound measurement of each AS severity parameter and the potential impact on
133 severity assessment.

134

135 METHODS

136

137 Patient population

138 A prospective single-center study was conducted in the Louis Pradel Heart Hospital
139 (Hospices Civils de Lyon, Bron, France). Patients were included consecutively from 2017
140 to 2019, after they provided a written informed consent, and the study protocol was
141 approved by the hospital review board. The inclusion-objective was 100 patients. The
142 included patients presented with a moderate to severe native aortic stenosis confirmed

143 with Doppler-echocardiography defined with at least one of the following criteria: i)
144 peak aortic jet velocity between 350 and 500 cm.s⁻¹; ii) mean aortic gradient between 25
145 and 65 mmHg; iii) Dimensionless index between 0.20 and 0.35; and/or iv) aortic valve
146 area between 0.6 and 1.3 cm². Exclusion criteria comprised concomitant valvulopathy
147 liable to interfere with hemodynamic assessment of the aortic stenosis: significant aortic
148 and/or mitral regurgitation grade >2/4, LVEF < 40%, hemodynamic instability and poor
149 echogenicity making impossible all required measurements. The patients were enrolled
150 in the study after a first ultrasound exam confirming the patient eligibility for the study.

151

152 **Ultrasound measurements and hemodynamic profiles**

153 The study used a Vivid S60 ultrasound machine equipped with a cardiologic probe (GE
154 Healthcare Systems, Chicago, Illinois, United States). After patient inclusion and
155 collection of clinical data, a dedicated ultrasound evaluation (baseline) was performed
156 to collect the following baseline parameters independently of hemodynamic state and
157 confirm patient eligibility: LVEF, visual or by the Simpson biplane method (%); Diameter
158 of the aorta (mm) and the LVOT diameter (cm); tri- or bi-cuspid nature of the aortic
159 valve; systolic pulmonary arterial pressure (SPAP); right atrial pressure; aortic or mitral
160 insufficiency grade.

161 We defined three different hemodynamic profiles: 1) low SBP (<120 mmHg), 2)
162 intermediate SBP (between 120 and 150mmHg) and 3) high SBP (≥150mmHg). The
163 different SBP targets were reached by intravenous administration of either isosorbide
164 dinitrate (Risordan®) 1mg/ml (systemic vasodilator), in 2 mg bolus every 2 minutes to
165 decrease blood pressure, or phenylephrine (Néo-synéphrine®) (α1 vasoconstrictor), in
166 250 µg (5 ml) bolus every 2 minutes, up to a maximum dose of 2mg, to increase blood
167 pressure.

168 During the ultrasound exam, hemodynamic condition was systematically collected with:
169 systolic, mean and diastolic blood pressure and heart rate, at each SBP profile. Blood
170 pressure was collected automatically every 2 minutes, using a non-invasive blood
171 pressure monitor, to control its stability at each profile.

172

173 As described in figure 1, the initial ultrasound exam performed was considered to be the
174 baseline profile T₀ and then was repeated to reach all hemodynamic profiles (T₁ and T₂)
175 according to SBP targets. Briefly, if the patient presented with a baseline

176 SBP<120mmHg, he would benefit from two successive injection of phenylephrine to
177 reach the intermediate then the high SBP target. If the patient presented with a baseline
178 SBP \geq 150 mmHg, he would benefit from two successive injections of isosorbide dinitrate
179 to reach the other profile targets. If the patient presented with an intermediate baseline
180 SBP, he would benefit from phenylephrine to reach the high SBP profile and then
181 isosorbide dinitrate until low SBP is reached.

182 The ultrasound examination collected the following data at each profile: V_{peak} ; G_{mean} ;
183 aortic velocity time integral (VTI_A); LVOT velocity time integral (VTI_{LVOT}); DI
184 ($DI=VTI_{LVOT}/VTI_A$); AVA (calculated by the continuity equation); indexed AVA (AVA_i);
185 cardiac index (CI); indexed stroke volume (SV_i); systolic ejection time; flow rate (FR)
186 systemic vascular resistance (SVR) measured as: (mean blood pressure - central venous
187 pressure)*80/CI; valvuloarterial impedance (Z_{va}). Mean blood pressure was measured
188 using the manual tension hand cuff. Central venous pressure was estimated
189 echographically using the maximal inferior vena cava diameter and its inspiratory
190 collapse. For patients with non-sinus rhythm, values of AS indices were means of five
191 recorded cycles.

192 All data collected were interpreted offline, blindly to the hemodynamic condition and
193 the acquisition, by a second operator.

194

195 **Study endpoint**

196 The diagnosis of severe aortic stenosis was established according to the ASE guidelines²
197 ($G_{mean} \geq 40$ mmHg, $V_{peak} \geq 4$ m/s, $DI \leq 0.25$, $AVA \leq 1$ cm², $AVA_i \leq 0.6$ cm²/m²). The
198 primary outcome was the variation of aortic stenosis severity parameters according to
199 changes in SBP. The secondary outcome was the correlation between the parameters.

200

201 **Statistical analysis**

202 Continuous variables were presented as mean \pm SD and dichotomous variables as
203 percentages only. For continuous variables, one-way ANOVA was used to assess
204 significant differences ($p<0.05$) between the 3 groups. For dichotomous variables, chi-
205 squared test was used ($p<0.05$) between the groups. A logistic regression model was
206 used to assess mean gradient effect on coherence percentage ($p<0.05$). The coherence
207 percentage corresponds to the number of patients with an expected pattern. All analyses
208 were performed on R software (R Core-Team, 2018) using the default functions.

209

210 RESULTS

211

212 The main baseline clinical and hemodynamic characteristics and ultrasound data of the
213 100 patients included are presented in *Table 1*. Briefly, mean age was 80 ± 10 years and
214 53% were men. Sixty-four percent of patients had a history of hypertension and 85%
215 were symptomatic (with dyspnea, angina or previous syncope). Their symptoms were
216 not only related to the AS since 43% had coronary artery disease and 29% atrial
217 fibrillation). At baseline, the average of SBP and HR were respectively 130 ± 22 mmHg
218 and 71 ± 14 bpm. Mean LVEF was $59\pm 9\%$. Regarding AS severity indices, average G_{mean} ,
219 V_{peak} , AVA, AVAi and DI were respectively 43 ± 13 mmHg, 4 ± 0.6 m/s, 0.83 ± 0.24 cm²,
220 0.48 ± 0.15 cm²/m² and 0.23 ± 0.06 . At baseline, 37% of the patients had low SBP
221 (<120 mmHg), 20% high SBP (≥ 150 mmHg) and 43% intermediate pressure (120-
222 150mmHg).

223

224 ***Hemodynamic profiles and aortic valve stenosis severity assessment.***

225 The three SBP profiles were systematically reached in all patients (*Table 2*). Mean dose
226 to reach the high SBP profile was 400 mcg for phenylephrine while mean dose of
227 isosorbide dinitrate in order to reach low SBP profile was 3 mg.

228 Induction of high SBP resulted in a significant increase in SVR (<0.05) but did not
229 significantly influence CI or SVi (45 ± 12 vs. 45 ± 12 vs. 44 ± 11 ml.m⁻² for respectively low,
230 intermediate and high SBP; *Table 2*). Ejection time increased (218.5 ± 42.2 vs. 303.7 ± 39.6
231 vs. 320.4 ± 38.0 ms) when SBP rose resulting in a significant decrease in flow rate
232 (162.2 ± 38.0 vs. 151.0 ± 32.0 vs. 137.2 ± 28.3 ml.ms⁻¹.m⁻²; $p<0.05$). Zva increased when SBP
233 was brought up (3.7 ± 1.1 vs. 4.2 ± 1.2 vs. 4.8 ± 1.2 ; $p<0.05$). Between high and low SBP
234 state, the percentage of severe AS increased from 42% to 75% ($p<0.05$), based on G_{mean} ,
235 and from 36% to 61% ($p<0.05$), based on V_{peak} . Conversely, the rate of severe AS based
236 on DI, AVA and AVAi was not significantly impacted by the hemodynamic condition
237 changes (*Table 2*). G_{mean} and V_{peak} values were lower at high SBP profile than when SBP
238 was brought under 120 mmHg (respectively 47 ± 12 vs. 39 ± 12 and 4.2 ± 0.6 vs. 3.8 ± 0.6 ,
239 $p<0.05$). However, DI was not impacted by SBP changes. Hemodynamic state did not
240 affect AVAi with the latter showing a higher percentage of severe AS independently of
241 the arterial pressure (*Figure 2*). Based on G_{mean} and V_{peak} , the percentages of severe AS

242 were significantly higher when SBP was brought under 120 mmHg compared to the
243 basal state, respectively 75% compared with 59% for G_{mean} ($p<0.001$), and 61%
244 compared with 44% for V_{peak} ($p<0.05$) (Figure 3). On the other hand, no significant
245 changes were noted when the severity of AS was assessed by DI or AVAi (Figure 3).

246

247 ***Correlation between Mean gradient and dimensionless index***

248 At high SBP (≥ 150 mmHg), the distribution of G_{mean} values with DI showed a discrepancy
249 rate of 34% between the two indices (29%: $G_{\text{mean}}<40$ mmHg and $DI\leq 0.25$, 5%:
250 $G_{\text{mean}}\geq 40$ mmHg and $DI>0.25$). At low SBP (<120 mmHg), the discrepancy rate dropped
251 significantly to 22% (6%: $G_{\text{mean}}<40$ mmHg and $DI\leq 0.25$, 16%: $G_{\text{mean}}\geq 40$ mmHg and
252 $DI>0.25$, $p<0.05$) (Figure 4).

253

254 ***Correlation between Mean gradient and indexed aortic valve area***

255 The discrepancy rate between G_{mean} and AVAi, dropped as well at low SBP profile
256 compared to high SBP profile (20% compared with 43% $p<0.05$) (Figure 4). Taking all
257 blood pressure profiles together (three hundred data), there was a moderate correlation
258 between G_{mean} and AVAi ($R^2=0.23$). An indexed AVA of $0.6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$ corresponded to a
259 G_{mean} of 36 mmHg in our cohort (Figure 5).

260

261 ***Safety***

262 As previously stated, only stable patients were included in our study. No significant
263 complication, hemodynamic instability, angina, ECG ischemic changes or neurological
264 symptom were recorded. There were no reported side effects as well.

265

266 **DISCUSSION**

267

268 To the best of our knowledge, this is the second study to present and directly assess the
269 effect of blood pressure on AS severity indices in humans, using Doppler
270 echocardiography. *Little et al.*¹², in 22 patients, found that hypertension interfered with
271 the assessment of AS severity and was mainly related to changes in mean flow rate than
272 to an independent effect of change in vascular resistance.

273

274 ***Variation of G_{mean} and V_{peak} according to the changes in SBP***

275 High blood pressure significantly reduced G_{mean} and V_{peak} , independently of stroke
276 volume.

277 In the present study, 16% of the baseline cohort, with low G_{mean} and 17% with low V_{peak}
278 showed a rise above 40mmHg and $4\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ respectively when SBP was brought under 120
279 mmHg ($p<0.05$). Several mechanisms may explain these variations in G_{mean} and V_{peak} . As
280 shown in previous studies^{12,13}, aortic severity parameters are mainly determined by
281 transvalvular flow. *Laskey et al.*¹⁴ suggested that the gradient may decrease irrespective
282 of flow as a direct consequence of increased systemic arterial resistance, whereas
283 *Razzolini et al.*¹⁵ found that, for each flow level, gradient increased linearly with systemic
284 arterial resistance, thus overestimating AS severity. In the present study, neither SVi nor
285 CI varied between groups. The change in blood pressure was the result of a change in
286 systemic arterial resistance but also in flow rate (*Table 2*). *Kadem et al.*, in an animal
287 model of supra-avalvular AS, found a significant reduction in peak-to-peak gradient
288 measured by catheter, which was significantly related to arterial compliance and mean
289 flow rate. In our study, we also showed an increase in Zva with the increase of SBP. Zva
290 is an indicator of global LV load but does not discriminate valvular and arterial
291 contribution to LV load¹⁷. It has been shown, to be a predictor of mortality in
292 asymptomatic AS patients with preserved LVEF¹⁸ and is correlated to poor clinical
293 outcome¹⁹. In our work, induction of systemic hypertension contributed to an increase
294 in the afterload and therefore in Zva with a concomitant decrease in the FR. This is
295 related to the fact that systolic ejection time is prolonged when afterload is increased²⁰.
296 It is also worth discussing how FR impacted AS severity indices. The flow state in severe
297 AS has been a hot topic in the last decade. *Pibarot et al.*^{21,22} described its importance even
298 in patients with preserved LVEF. Transvalvular flow determination became a challenge
299 since it influences the hemodynamic indices of AS. SV remains the most commonly
300 transvalvular determinant used parameter in a routine setting with a cut-off value of 35
301 $\text{ml}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$. FR is measured as a ratio of SV to ejection time. Unlike SV which is defined by the
302 blood volume, FR represents the volume per ejection time and may allow a better
303 estimation of flow state²³. In a recent retrospective study, the authors showed that FR at
304 exercise, and not SV, could play a crucial role in the risk stratification of patients with
305 asymptomatic AS²⁴, highlighting its prognostic value and that it may be the best
306 indicator of the output state. *Namasivayam et al.*²⁵ recently, also shed light on why flow
307 rate assessment should be incorporated into clinical diagnosis and prognosis of AS. In

308 our study, the gradients and velocities decreased when afterload rose and were
309 associated with a decrease in the FR but unchanged SV. This is related to the fact that LV
310 ejection time depends upon LV afterload. When mean aortic pressure elevates, the
311 duration of ejection is lengthened²⁰. This shows the diagnostic value of FR in AS setting
312 and why its measurement is necessary in any ultrasound report. On these basis, AVA and
313 DI appear to provide a more accurate assessment when BP is high since the impact on
314 FR (even with unchanged SV) will impact transvalvular velocities and gradients.
315 This result provides some explanation for the intriguing pattern associating severe
316 aortic stenosis and low mean gradient and may partially explain why some patients with
317 normal flow have low DI and AVA. In agreement with *Sakthi et al.*,²⁶ besides
318 discrepancies between parameters, high blood pressure may interfere significantly with
319 the assessment of aortic stenosis severity parameters on Doppler-echocardiography or
320 catheterization.

321

322 ***Dimensionless index is less dependent on hemodynamic profiles***

323 The dimensionless index, an index with relatively scarce evidence in the literature, did
324 not vary between groups (table 2). One approach to reducing error related to LVOT
325 ultrasound measurements is to remove cross-sectional area from the simplified
326 continuity equation. Since this is a ratio of two hemodynamic values (VTI_{LVOT} and VTI_A),
327 it appears that DI is less dependent than other aortic severity indices on hemodynamic
328 conditions. In fact, in our cohort, SBP changes did not impact DI and the percentage of
329 severe AS based on this parameter was the same at baseline and when SBP was brought
330 under 120 mmHg. Moreover, the discrepancy rate between G_{mean} and DI was
331 significantly lower when afterload was optimized, low SPB vs. high SPB: 22% vs. 34%
332 respectively.

333 DI, as well as AVA did not vary despite an increase in gradients and unchanged SV. Since
334 $AVA = SV/VTI_A$, a variation in gradients without stroke volume modification can only be
335 explained by changes in systolic ejection time resulting in flow rate variations. This
336 explains VTI stability (LVOT and aortic) despite gradient changes. Thus, in patients with
337 aortic stenosis, FR appears to be a more reliable indicator of transvalvular flow (which is
338 a basic determinant of pressure gradients²⁷) than SV.

339 This supports the notion not only that hemodynamics interferes with the evaluation of
340 AS severity indices, but also that DI is a robust parameter emphasizing its value, since it

341 was the index subject to the least variation under changing blood pressure. *Jander et al*,
342 confirmed the prognostic value of this parameter. Four hundred thirty five patients with
343 $AVA < 1\text{cm}^2$ and $G_{\text{mean}} \leq 40$ mmHg and $LVEF > 55\%$ were stratified according to DI with a
344 cutoff value of 0.25. Patients with $DI < 0.25$ had significantly more aortic valve related
345 events²⁸. As suggested by *Minners et al.* in 2019, DI may be a parameter deserving
346 increased attention, and our result does support DI to be a flow independent parameter
347 of stenosis severity¹⁶.

348 Furthermore, LVOT diameter may be altered by volume and pressure changes. Even
349 more in patients with severe AS, LVOT is less distensible and undergoes remodeling as
350 shown by *Mehrotra et al.*²⁹, another issue highlighting the importance of the DI.
351 However, in our study, LVOT diameter did not vary.

352

353 ***AS severity assessment with AVA parameter***

354 AVA is a major determinant of G_{mean} . Because fluid is incompressible, Poiseuille's law
355 imposes that blood flow in any conduit is inversely proportional to its cross-sectional
356 area. In our study, AVA_i was not impacted by the changes in SBP and there were fewer
357 discrepancies between G_{mean} and AVA_i when blood pressure was brought under control
358 even more highlighting the importance of SBP monitoring.

359 In our study, there was a higher percentage of severe AS regardless of blood pressure
360 profile, in line with data from *Minners et al.* study⁵. This is, of course, partly the result of
361 underestimation of LVOT because of its elliptical form and of the fact that severity cut
362 points for AVA have been derived and extensively validated using the continuity
363 equation methodology.

364 The data presented in our study suggest that cut points defining severe AS are different
365 with severity thresholds for both DI and AVA_i not well aligned. That said, since no
366 outcome data was provided, this study cannot truly determine if the echocardiographic
367 defined cut points are sufficient or not. Clinical outcome would be of interest to assess
368 the diagnostic and prognostic values of these indices.

369

370 ***Clinical implications***

371 Systolic hypertension is highly prevalent in patients with calcific AS (one third of
372 patients)¹⁰. As shown in our study, Doppler echocardiographic parameters of the aortic
373 stenosis may lead to a misjudgment of the AS severity if the hemodynamic properties of

374 the circulation are not taken into account. When evaluating for possible aortic stenosis,
375 the mean gradient is only a single variable that can be misleading. This has been shown
376 with patients with low output low gradient, concomitant mitral regurgitation and low
377 ejection fraction³⁰. High SBP may lead to underestimation of AS severity, based on G_{mean}
378 or V_{peak} , and hence misclassification of patients, which may delay surgical valve
379 replacement. Conversely, if DI or AVA are used, the severity doesn't change during
380 hemodynamic manipulations (or natural variations in pressure or flow) with both
381 parameters less dependent on the hemodynamic conditions, despite their severity cut
382 points not well aligned. These patients present a challenge with regard to management,
383 as they may have symptomatic AS without for severity criteria according to
384 international guidelines. Thus, the following recommendations can be made: 1) blood
385 pressure monitoring must be an integral part of AS assessment (as recommended by
386 ASE³¹), and control must be optimal (< 120 mmHg); 2) DI seems to be less dependent on
387 hemodynamic properties and should be measured in any ultrasound report; and 3)
388 Every parameter should be taken into account keeping in mind their respective limits.
389 During pharmacological challenge, no side effects or AS related de novo symptom were
390 reported. We chose to include patients with $G_{\text{mean}} < 65$ mmHg, since hemodynamic
391 manipulations could be riskier at higher velocities ($V_{\text{max}} \geq 5$ m/s) and even useless at
392 this stage of the pathology. That said, these maneuvers remain interesting in the case of
393 discrepancies between severity indices. Furthermore, in patients with moderately
394 severe AS based on G_{mean} with concomitant high SBP, isosorbide dinitrate administration
395 during ultrasound examen may be beneficial in revealing severe AS.

396

397 ***Study limitations***

398 The patients in the present study had been admitted to hospital; prevalence of systemic
399 hypertension (64%) was higher than reported by *Antonini et al.*¹⁰, who assessed the
400 prevalence of systemic hypertension in a cohort of symptomatic patients with AS. Also,
401 the present study was performed in a single center with acquisition realized by only one
402 operator. Finally, there was no invasive continuous monitoring during ultrasound
403 measurement, but blood pressure was measured several times ($/2$ min) during all data
404 acquisition.

405 Routine hemodynamic evaluation, particularly in cardiac catheterization, showed
406 discrepancies between systemic blood pressure measured by non-invasive peripheral

407 monitoring and central arterial pressure measured by catheter in the ascending aorta.
408 Reduced arterial compliance in the present cohort may be the principal reason for this.
409 Finally, since patients had their blood pressure manipulated by vasoconstriction or
410 vasodilatation, any deleterious or favorable impact of these hemodynamic alterations on
411 myocardial blood pressure blood flow and therefore on myocardial mechanics and
412 ejection fraction can be suspected but hardly assessed.

413 *Lloyd et al.*³² in a recent study showed, invasively, changes in SV and AVA following
414 nitrate. He compared the acute hemodynamic response to nitrate between low flow low
415 gradient severe AS (LF-LGSAS) and normal flow low gradient severe AS (NF-LGSAS)
416 with preserved LVEF. SV did vary significantly in the LF-LGSAS group but not in the NF-
417 LGSAS. In our study, only 13% of a 100 patient cohort (*Supplementary table 1*) had a LF
418 state ($SV < 35 \text{ml/m}^2$). This mainly explains the discordance between both studies. As for
419 AVA determination, it was calculated using the Gorlin invasive formula while we used
420 the Doppler continuity equation. Flow-related discrepancies between Gorlin AVA and
421 Doppler AVA assessment can occur in the clinical setting of patients with isolated AS³³.
422 On the other hand, there were similarities showing a decrease in gradients and
423 velocities when SBP is increased.

424

425

426 **CONCLUSION**

427

428 Hemodynamic profiles during AS severity assessment influence the parameters. High
429 blood pressure might cause a significant decrease in indices, and notably in gradients
430 and velocities, mainly due to decreased flow rate. This may lead to underestimation of
431 AS severity. In this regard, blood pressure monitoring should be an integral part of
432 Doppler ultrasound examination. Finally, DI and AVA appeared to be the less influenced
433 by changes in hemodynamic profiles.

434

435

436 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
437 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

438

439

440 **REFERENCES**

- 441 1. Aggeli C, Lampropoulos K, Stefanadis C. Aortic stenosis and hypertension: is there
442 any relationship? *Hellenic J Cardiol* [Internet]. [cited 2019 Dec 1];50(1):1–2.
443 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19196615>
- 444 2. Baumgartner H, Hung J, Bermejo J, Chambers JB, Evangelista A, Griffin BP, et al.
445 Echocardiographic Assessment of Valve Stenosis: EAE/ASE Recommendations for
446 Clinical Practice. Vol. 22, *Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography*.
447 Mosby Inc.; 2009. p. 1–23.
- 448 3. Baumgartner H, Falk V, Bax JJ, De Bonis M, Hamm C, Holm PJ, et al. 2017
449 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the Management of Valvular Heart Disease. *Rev*
450 *Española Cardiol (English Ed)*. 2018 Feb;71(2):110.
- 451 4. Minners J, Allgeier M, Gohlke-Baerwolf C, Kienzle RP, Neumann FJ, Jander N.
452 Inconsistent grading of aortic valve stenosis by current guidelines:
453 Haemodynamic studies in patients with apparently normal left ventricular
454 function. *Heart*. 2010;96(18):1463–8.
- 455 5. Minners J, Allgeier M, Gohlke-Baerwolf C, Kienzle RP, Neumann FJ, Jander N.
456 Inconsistencies of echocardiographic criteria for the grading of aortic valve
457 stenosis. *Eur Heart J*. 2008 Apr;29(8):1043–8.
- 458 6. Maes F, Pierard S, de Meester C, Boulif J, Amzulescu M, Vancraeynest D, et al.
459 Impact of left ventricular outflow tract ellipticity on the grading of aortic stenosis
460 in patients with normal ejection fraction. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* [Internet].
461 2017 Mar 15 [cited 2019 Dec 1];19(1):37. Available from:
462 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28292302>
- 463 7. Dementhon J, Rioufol G, Obadia J-F, Vergnat M, Green L, Croisille P, et al. A novel
464 contribution towards coherent and reproducible intravalvular measurement of
465 the aortic annulus by multidetector computed tomography ahead of transcatheter
466 aortic valve implantation. *Arch Cardiovasc Dis* [Internet]. 2015 May [cited 2019
467 Dec 1];108(5):281–92. Available from:
468 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25863427>
- 469 8. Bhatia N, Dawn B, Siddiqui TS, Stoddard MF. Impact and predictors of noncircular
470 left ventricular outflow tract shapes on estimating aortic stenosis severity by
471 means of continuity equations. *Texas Hear Inst J* [Internet]. 2015 Feb [cited 2019
472 Dec 1];42(1):16–24. Available from:
473 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25873793>
- 474 9. Mancia G, Fagard R, Narkiewicz K, Redón J, Zanchetti A, Böhm M, et al. 2013
475 Practice guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension of the European
476 Society of Hypertension (ESH) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC):
477 ESH/ESC Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension. Vol. 31, *Journal*
478 *of Hypertension*. 2013. p. 1925–38.
- 479 10. Antonini-Canterin F, Huang G, Cervesato E, Faggiano P, Pavan D, Piazza R, et al.
480 Symptomatic aortic stenosis: does systemic hypertension play an additional role?
481 *Hypertens (Dallas, Tex 1979)* [Internet]. 2003 Jun [cited 2019 Dec
482 1];41(6):1268–72. Available from:
483 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12707297>
- 484 11. Kadem L, Dumesnil JG, Rieu R, Durand LG, Garcia D, Pibarot P. Impact of systemic
485 hypertension on the assessment of aortic stenosis. *Heart*. 2005 Mar;91(3):354–61.
- 486 12. Little SH, Chan KL, Burwash IG. Impact of blood pressure on the Doppler
487 echocardiographic assessment of severity of aortic stenosis. *Heart*. 2007
488 Jul;93(7):848–55.

- 489 13. Mascherbauer J, Fuchs C, Stoiber M, Schima H, Pernicka E, Maurer G, et al.
490 Systemic pressure does not directly affect pressure gradient and valve area
491 estimates in aortic stenosis in vitro. *Eur Heart J*. 2008 Aug;29(16):2049–57.
- 492 14. Laskey WK, Kussmaul WG, Noordergraaf A. Valvular and systemic arterial
493 hemodynamics in aortic valve stenosis: A model-based approach. *Circulation*.
494 1995 Sep 15;92(6):1473–8.
- 495 15. Razzolini R, Gerosa G, Leoni L, Casarotto D, Chioin R, Dalla-Volta S. Transaortic
496 gradient is pressure-dependent in a pulsatile model of the circulation. *J Heart
497 Valve Dis* [Internet]. 1999 May [cited 2019 Dec 1];8(3):279–83. Available from:
498 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10399661>
- 499 16. Minners J. Aortic valve area: too important for splendid isolation. *Heart* [Internet].
500 2019 Jun [cited 2019 Dec 1];105(12):898–9. Available from:
501 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30862642>
- 502 17. Pibarot P, Dumesnil JG. Improving assessment of aortic stenosis. Vol. 60, *Journal of*
503 *the American College of Cardiology*. Elsevier USA; 2012. p. 169–80.
- 504 18. Banovic MD, Vujisic-Tesic BD, Kujacic VG, Callahan MJ, Nedeljkovic IP, Trifunovic
505 DD, et al. Coronary flow reserve in patients with aortic stenosis and
506 nonobstructed coronary arteries. *Acta Cardiol* [Internet]. 2011 Dec [cited 2020
507 Mar 4];66(6):743–9. Available from:
508 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22299385>
- 509 19. Hachicha Z, Dumesnil JG, Pibarot P. Usefulness of the Valvuloarterial Impedance to
510 Predict Adverse Outcome in Asymptomatic Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
511 2009 Sep 8;54(11):1003–11.
- 512 20. BRAUNWALD E, SARNOFF SJ, STAINSBY WN. Determinants of Duration and Mean
513 Rate of Ventricular Ejection. *Circ Res*. 1958 May;6(3):319–25.
- 514 21. Pibarot P, Dumesnil JG. Low-flow, low-gradient aortic stenosis with normal and
515 depressed left ventricular ejection fraction. Vol. 60, *Journal of the American*
516 *College of Cardiology*. Elsevier USA; 2012. p. 1845–53.
- 517 22. Dumesnil JG, Pibarot P. Low-flow, low-gradient severe aortic stenosis in patients
518 with normal ejection fraction. Vol. 28, *Current Opinion in Cardiology*. 2013. p.
519 524–30.
- 520 23. Namasivayam M, Picard MH. Flow Rate in Aortic Stenosis: Clinical Tool,
521 Hemodynamic Insight, or Both? Vol. 33, *Journal of the American Society of*
522 *Echocardiography*. Mosby Inc.; 2020. p. 449–51.
- 523 24. Hirasawa K, Izumo M, Suzuki K, Suzuki T, Ohara H, Watanabe M, et al. Value of
524 Transvalvular Flow Rate during Exercise in Asymptomatic Patients with Aortic
525 Stenosis. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2020 Apr 1;33(4):438–48.
- 526 25. Namasivayam M, He W, Churchill TW, Capoulade R, Liu S, Lee H, et al.
527 Transvalvular Flow Rate Determines Prognostic Value of Aortic Valve Area in
528 Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2020 Apr 21;75(15):1758–69.
- 529 26. Sakthi C, Yee H, Kotlewski A. Overestimation of aortic valve gradient measured by
530 Doppler echocardiography in patients with aortic stenosis. *Catheter Cardiovasc*
531 *Interv*. 2005 Jun;65(2):176–9.
- 532 27. Kapelios CJ, Bonou M, Barbetseas J. Transvalvular Volume Flow Rate: A Useful
533 Tool for Assessment of Aortic Valve Stenosis in Preserved Ejection Fraction
534 Patients. *Cardiology* [Internet]. 2018 Nov 1 [cited 2020 Feb 27];141(1):69–70.
535 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30396179>
- 536 28. Jander N, Hochholzer W, Kaufmann BA, Bahlmann E, Gerdtts E, Boman K, et al.
537 Velocity ratio predicts outcomes in patients with low gradient severe aortic

- 538 stenosis and preserved EF. *Heart*. 2014 Dec 1;100(24):1946–53.
- 539 29. Mehrotra P, Flynn AW, Jansen K, Tan TC, Mak G, Julien HM, et al. Differential left
540 ventricular outflow tract remodeling and dynamics in aortic stenosis. *J Am Soc*
541 *Echocardiogr* [Internet]. 2015 Nov [cited 2019 Dec 1];28(11):1259–66. Available
542 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26307374>
- 543 30. Lee PH, Hong JA, Sun BJ, Han S, Park S, Jang JY, et al. Impact of Significant Mitral
544 Regurgitation on Assessing the Severity of Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*.
545 2018 Jan 1;31(1):26–33.
- 546 31. Baumgartner H, Hung J, Bermejo J, Chambers JB, Evangelista A, Griffin BP, et al.
547 Corrigendum. *Eur J Echocardiogr* [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2019 Dec 1];10(3):479–
548 479. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2008.11.029>
- 549 32. Lloyd JW, Nishimura RA, Borlaug BA, Eleid MF. Hemodynamic Response to
550 Nitroprusside in Patients With Low-Gradient Severe Aortic Stenosis and
551 Preserved Ejection Fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* [Internet]. 2017 Sep 12 [cited 2019
552 Dec 1];70(11):1339–48. Available from:
553 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28882231>
- 554 33. Burwash IG, Dickinson A, Teskey RJ, Tam JW, Chan KL. Aortic valve area
555 discrepancy by Gorlin equation and Doppler echocardiography continuity
556 equation: relationship to flow in patients with valvular aortic stenosis. *Can J*
557 *Cardiol* [Internet]. 2000 Aug [cited 2020 Feb 27];16(8):985–92. Available from:
558 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10978934>

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567 **Figure legends:**

568

569 **Figure 1: Protocol for obtaining blood pressure target according to baseline**

570 Description of protocol according to baseline systolic blood pressure (T_0). The green
571 squares refer to the three blood pressure profiles at baseline ultrasound. Néo-
572 synéphrine (N) and/or Risordan (R) were administered to reach the other blood
573 pressure profiles, T_1 and T_2 . SBP = systolic blood pressure, TTE = transthoracic
574 echography.

575

576 **Figure 2: Evolution of the AS severity parameters when modulating blood**
577 **pressure**

578 Graphs show mean \pm SD (n=100/group). A: Mean gradient, B: Peak aortic jet velocity, C:
579 velocity ratio, D: indexed aortic valve area. Threshold red lines for severe aortic stenosis
580 are shown ($G_{\text{mean}} \geq 40\text{mmHg}$; $V_{\text{peak}} \geq 4\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$; $DI \leq 0.25$; $AVA_i \leq 0.6\text{cm}^2/\text{m}^2$).

581 * $p < 0.05$ * and ** $p < 0.001$ vs. other SBP profiles. SBP=systolic blood pressure.

582

583 **Figure 3: Reclassification after hemodynamic optimization for each ultrasound AS**
584 **severity parameter.** (n=100)

585 Optimal state refers to the group with $SBP \leq 120\text{ mmHg}$. * $p < 0.05$ * and ** $p < 0.001$ vs.
586 baseline state.

587

588 **Figure 4. Comparison of distribution of mean gradient with dimensionless index**
589 **and with indexed aortic valve area according to the blood pressure profiles.**
590 **(n=100)**

591 Dots in green areas correspond to patients with concordant aortic stenosis parameters
592 and dots in red areas to discordant parameter distribution. * $p < 0.05$ vs. high SBP

593

594 **Figure 5. Correlation between mean gradient and indexed aortic valve area**
595 **independently of blood pressure (n=300)**

596

597

598 **Figure 6. Clinical illustration of SBP impact on AS severity estimation.**

599 The patient was an asymptomatic 89 year-old man with history of systemic
600 hypertension. No coronary artery disease was found and ECG was in sinus rhythm. Her
601 echocardiogram showed a LVEF of 55% SBP, no myocardial hypertrophy. Left
602 ventricular outflow tract was 2.1 cm. The aortic valve was tricuspid. At baseline, SBP
603 was high 174 mmHg. TTE showed inconsistencies with G_{mean} 35mmHg, DI 0.18 and AVAi
604 $0.29 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$. The top row shows continuous-wave Doppler spectrograms of the aortic
605 valve jet.

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the study population**

	population (n=100)
Clinical data	
Age	80 year±10
Male sex	53
Body surface (m ²)	1.8±0.2
Systemic hypertension	64
Diabetes mellitus	27
Dyspnea	
NYHA 1	17
NYHA 2	10
NYHA 3	45
NYHA 4	28
Angina	15
Syncope	5
Sinus cardiac rhythm	64
Anti-hypertensive therapy	62
Coronary artery disease	43
Haemodynamic data	
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	130±22
Cardiac index (ml/min/m ²)	3.2±0.9
Indexed stroke volume (ml/m ²)	46± 2
SVR (dynes.s.cm ⁻⁵)	1262±525
Zva (mmHg/ml/m ²)	4.1±1.3
Echocardiographic data	
Peak aortic jet velocity (m/s)	4.0±0.6
Mean gradient (mmHg)	43±13
Dimensionless index	0.23±0.06
Aortic valve area (cm ²)	0.83±0.24
Indexed aortic valve area (cm ² /m ²)	0.48±0.15
LV ejection fraction (%)	59±9
SPAP (mmHg)	42±15
Tricuspid aortic valve	84
Diameter of the aorta (mm)	35±5

615 *Values are mean±SD for continuous variables and percentage for dichotomous variables.*
616 *LV=left ventricular, SVR=systemic vascular resistance, SPAP=systolic pulmonary artery*
617 *pressure, Zva = valvuloarterial impedance*

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647 **Table 2: Comparison of the severity aortic stenosis parameters between the three**
 648 **hemodynamic profile groups.**

Variables	Low SBP	Intermediate SBP	High SBP	P value
	<120 mmHg	between 120-150 mmHg	≥150 mmHg	
	N = 100	N = 100	N = 100	
SBP (mmHg)	110±9	132±9	158±15	p<0.05
DBP (mmHg)	62±10	71±12	77±12	p<0.05
MBP (mmHg)	78±10	91±10	104±13	p<0.05
HR (bpm)	73±13	72±14	69±15	NS
LVOT (mm)	21.2±1.6	21.2±1.6	21.2±1.6	NS
VTI_{LVOT}	22.3±4.4	22.2±4.7	21.9±4.4	NS
VTI_A	96.8±20.6	96.4±19.9	93.8±19.3	NS
CI (ml/min/m²)	3.2±0.8	3.2±0.8	3.0±0.8	NS
Svi (ml/m²)	45±12	45±12	44±11	NS
SVR (dynes.s.cm⁻⁵)	1083±346	1306±471	1575±446	p<0.05
Zva (mmHg/ml/m²)	3.7±1.1	4.2±1.2	4.8±1.2	p<0.05
Gm (mmHg)	47±12	43±12	39±12	p<0.05
Vmax (m/s)	4.2±0.6	4.0±0.6	3.8±0.6	p<0.05
DI	0.24±0.06	0.24±0.06	0.24±0.06	NS
AVA (cm²)	0.85±0.25	0.84±0.23	0.86±0.24	NS
AVAi (cm²/m²)	0.48±0.16	0.47±0.14	0.48±0.14	NS
Gm ≥ 40 mmHg	75	54	42	p<0.05
Vmax ≥ 4 m/s	61	38	36	p<0.05
DI ≤ 0.25	65	65	64	NS
AVA ≤ 1 cm²	75	80	74	NS
AVAi ≤ 0.6 cm²/m²	85	83	83	NS
Variables	Low SBP	Intermediate SBP	High SBP	P value
	<120 mmHg	between 120-150 mmHg	≥150 mmHg	
	N = 72	N = 72	N = 72	
Ejection time (ms)	218.5±42.2	303.7±39.6	320.4±38.0	p<0.05
Flow rate (ml.s⁻¹.m⁻²)	162.2±38.0	151.0±32.0	137.2±28.3	p<0.05

650 *Values are mean±SD for continuous variables and percentage for dichotomous variables.*

651 *The significance threshold was $p<0.05$.*

652 *AVA=aortic valve area, AVAi=indexed aortic valve area, HF=Heart rate, DBP=diastolic blood pressure,*
653 *DI=Dimensionless index, G_{mean} = mean gradient, CI=cardiac index, LVOT=Left ventricle outflow tract,*
654 *MBP=mean blood pressure, SBP=systolic blood pressure, SVi=indexed stroke volume, SVR=systemic vascular*
655 *resistance, V_{max} = peak aortic jet velocity, VTI_A =Aortic velocity time integral, VTI_{LVOT} =LVOT velocity time*
656 *integral, Z_{va} =valvulo-arterial impedance.*

657

658

659

660

661


662





663





664





SBP profiles at TTE exam

If baseline SBP :











At High blood pressure

At Low blood pressure



2 mg Isosorbide dinitrate

3 mg Isosorbide dinitrate



Highlights

- In aortic stenosis, high blood pressure is responsible for a significant decrease in gradients and velocities.
- Blood pressure should be brought under control during any ultrasound exam dedicated to an aortic stenosis assessment.
- Dimensionless index is a flow independent parameter deserving increased attention.
- There is a higher proportion of severe aortic stenosis when its evaluation is exclusively based on aortic valve area.
- Flow rate, not stroke volume was found to impact the transvalvular velocities and gradients but not the aortic valve area or the dimensionless index.