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-03268234v1

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

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0894731720304016
Manuscript_ccb6e8c7de59cd09a70f6c30c8bfaa3b

Impact of arterial blood pressure on ultrasound hemodynamic assessment of aortic valve stenosis severity

Ahmad Hayek[1] MD, François Derimay[1] MD, PhD, Lisa Green[1] MD, Marion Rosset[2] MD, Hélène Thibault[2] MD, PhD, Gilles Rioufol[1] MD, PhD, Gerard Finet[1] MD, PhD,

[1]Department of Cardiology and Interventional Cardiology, Hôpital Cardiologique Louis Pradel, Université Claude-Bernard, Inserm UMR 1060, Lyon, France
[2]Echocardiography Lab, Hôpital Cardiologique Louis Pradel, Lyon Université Claude-Bernard, Inserm UMR 1060, Lyon, France

Corresponding author:
Pr Gérard FINET
Hôpital Cardiologique Louis Pradel
Service de Cardiologie, Filière Coronaires-Valves
28 Avenue Doyen Lépine
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.

© 2020 published by Elsevier. This manuscript is made available under the CC BY NC user license
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Abstract

Background

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

Objectives

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

Methods

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

Results

At baseline state, 59% presented a mean gradient (G_{mean}) ≥40mmHg, 44% a peak aortic jet velocity (V_{peak}) ≥4m/s, 66% a dimensionless index (DI) ≤0.25 and 87% an indexed aortic valve area (AVAi) ≤0.6cm^2/m^2. Compared with intermediate and low SBP, high SBP induced a significant decrease in G_{mean} (39±12 vs. 43±12 and 47±12mmHg respectively), ($p<0.05$) and in V_{peak} (3.8±0.6 vs. 4.0±0.6 and 4.2±0.6mmHg), ($p<0.05$). Compared with the baseline measures, in 16% of patients with an initial G_{mean}<40mmHg, gradient rose above 40mmHg after optimization of the afterload (low SBP) ($p<0.05$). Conversely, DI and AVAi did not vary with changes in hemodynamic conditions. Flow rate, not Stroke volume was found to impact G_{mean} and V_{peak} but not AVA and DI ($p<0.05$).

Conclusion

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

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

$\mathbf{G_{mean}}$ = 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

SVi = Indexed stroke volume

$\mathbf{V_{peak}}$ = Peak aortic jet velocity

$\mathbf{VTI_A}$ = Aortic velocity time integral

$\mathbf{VTI_{LVOT}}$ = LVOT velocity time integral

Zva = Valvuloarterial impedance

110 # INTRODUCTION

111

112 Calcific aortic stenosis (AS) is the third most common cardiovascular disease in Western
113 countries[1]. Doppler-echocardiography is the primary method to confirm diagnosis and
114 severity[2]. The European Society of Cardiology guidelines[3] 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 pathology[4]. Indeed, highly contributive studies
120 suggested that classifying AS severity by AVA leads to a higher proportion of severe AS[5].
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 AVA[8].
123 At the same time, systemic hypertension is a high-prevalence disease[9], especially in
124 patients with AS (32% are hypertensive)[10]. It is a global determinant of left ventricle
125 afterload[1]. 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 flow[11–13] 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 care[16].
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 cm^2. 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 T_0 and then was repeated to reach all hemodynamic profiles (T_1 and T_2)
175 according to SBP targets. Briefly, if the patient presented with a baseline

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

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

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

Study endpoint

The diagnosis of severe aortic stenosis was established according to the ASE guidelines[2] ($G_{mean} \geq 40$ mmHg, $V_{peak} \geq 4$ m/s, DI ≤ 0.25, AVA ≤ 1 cm^2, AVAi ≤ 0.6 cm^2/m^2). The primary outcome was the variation of aortic stenosis severity parameters according to changes in SBP. The secondary outcome was the correlation between the parameters.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were presented as mean±SD and dichotomous variables as percentages only. For continuous variables, one-way ANOVA was used to assess significant differences ($p<0.05$) between the 3 groups. For dichotomous variables, chi-squared test was used ($p<0.05$) between the groups. A logistic regression model was used to assess mean gradient effect on coherence percentage ($p<0.05$). The coherence percentage corresponds to the number of patients with an expected pattern. All analyses 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±22mmHg
218 and 71±14bpm. Mean LVEF was 59±9%. Regarding AS severity indices, average G_{mean},
219 V_{peak}, AVA, AVAi and DI were respectively 43±13mmHg, 4±0.6m/s, 0.83±0.24cm^2,
220 0.48±0.15cm^2/m^2 and 0.23±0.06. At baseline, 37% of the patients had low SBP
221 (<120mmHg), 20% high SBP (≥150mmHg) 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 (≥150mmHg), the distribution of G_{mean} values with DI showed a discrepancy
249 rate of 34% between the two indices (29%: G_{mean}<40mmHg and DI≤0.25, 5%:
250 G_{mean}≥40mmHg and DI>0.25). At low SBP (<120mmHg), the discrepancy rate dropped
251 significantly to 22% (6%: G_{mean}<40mmHg and DI≤0.25, 16%: G_{mean}≥40mmHg 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 cm^2/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 $4m.s^{-1}$ 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 supravalvular 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 load[17]. It has been shown, to be a predictor of mortality in
292 asymptomatic AS patients with preserved LVEF[18] and is correlated to poor clinical
293 outcome[19]. 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 increased[20].
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 $ml.m^{-2}$. 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 state[23]. 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 AS[24], 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 lengthened[20]. 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 gradients[27]) 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

was the index subject to the least variation under changing blood pressure. *Jander et al,* confirmed the prognostic value of this parameter. Four hundred thirty five patients with AVA<1cm^2 and G_{mean}≤40 mmHg and LVEF>55% were stratified according to DI with a cutoff value of 0.25. Patients with DI<0.25 had significantly more aortic valve related events[28]. As suggested by *Minners et al.* in 2019, DI may be a parameter deserving increased attention, and our result does support DI to be a flow independent parameter of stenosis severity[16].

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

AS severity assessment with AVA parameter

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

In our study, there was a higher percentage of severe AS regardless of blood pressure profile, in line with data from *Minners et al.* study[5]. This is, of course, partly the result of underestimation of LVOT because of its elliptical form and of the fact that severity cut points for AVA have been derived and extensively validated using the continuity equation methodology.

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

Clinical implications

Systolic hypertension is highly prevalent in patients with calcific AS (one third of patients)[10]. As shown in our study, Doppler echocardiographic parameters of the aortic 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 fraction[30]. 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 ASE[31]), 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_{mean}<65 mmHg, since hemodynamic
391 manipulations could be riskier at higher velocities (Vmax ≥ 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

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

Lloyd et al.[32] in a recent study showed, invasively, changes in SV and AVA following nitrate. He compared the acute hemodynamic response to nitrate between low flow low gradient severe AS (LF-LGSAS) and normal flow low gradient severe AS (NF-LGSAS) with preserved LVEF. SV did vary significantly in the LF-LGSAS group but not in the NF-LGSAS. In our study, only 13% of a 100 patient cohort *(Supplementary table 1)* had a LF state (SV<35ml/m^2). This mainly explains the discordance between both studies. As for AVA determination, it was calculated using the Gorlin invasive formula while we used the Doppler continuity equation. Flow-related discrepancies between Gorlin AVA and Doppler AVA assessment can occur in the clinical setting of patients with isolated AS[33]. On the other hand, there were similarities showing a decrease in gradients and velocities when SBP is increased.

CONCLUSION

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

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

REFERENCES

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

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

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

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 ± 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 ($G_{mean} \geq 40$mmHg; $V_{peak} \geq 4 m.s^{-1}$; DI ≤ 0.25; AVAi ≤ 0.6cm²/m²).
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 ≤ 120 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.**

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

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

614

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

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

Variables	Low SBP <120 mmHg N = 100	Intermediate SBP between 120-150 mmHg N = 100	High SBP ≥150 mmHg N = 100	P value
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/m^2)	3.2±0.8	3.2±0.8	3.0±0.8	NS
Svi (ml/m^2)	45±12	45±12	44±11	NS
SVR (dynes.s.cm^{-5})	1083±346	1306±471	1575±446	p<0.05
Zva (mmHg/ml/m^2)	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 (cm^2)	0.85±0.25	0.84±0.23	0.86±0.24	NS
AVAi (cm^2/m^2)	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 cm^2	75	80	74	NS
AVAi ≤ 0.6 cm^2/m^2	85	83	83	NS
Variables	**Low SBP <120 mmHg N = 72**	**Intermediate SBP between 120-150 mmHg N = 72**	**High SBP ≥150 mmHg N = 72**	**P value**
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

649

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

The significance threshold was $p<0.05$.

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


SBP profiles at TTE exam
If baseline SBP :
Low SBP (< 120 mmHg)
Intermediate SBP (120-150 mmHg)
High SBP (≥ 150 mmHg)
< 120mmHg
T0 (Baseline)
N
T1
N
T2
≥ 120 mmHg, < 150mmHg
N
T0 (Baseline)
T1
T2
R
≥ 150mmHg
T0 (Baseline)
R
T1
R
T2


A
Mean Gradient (mmHg)
65
60
55
50
45
40
35
30
25
**
*
[110±9 mmHg]
[132±9 mmHg]
[158±15 mmHg]
<120
[120,150]
>150
SBP (mmHg)
B
Peak Aortic velocity (m/s)
5
4.5
4
3.5
3
**
*
<120
[120,150]
>150
SBP (mmHg)
C
Dimensionless index
0.35
0.3
0.25
0.2
0.15
NS
<120
[120,150]
>150
SBP (mmHg)
D
Indexed aortic valve area (cm2/m2)
0.7
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
NS
<120
[120,150]
>150
SBP (mmHg)


Percentage of severe AS based on mean gradient
100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
[130±22 mmHg]
**
[110±9 mmHg]
59%
75%
Baseline state
SBP ≤ 120 mmHg (optimal state)
Percentage of severe AS based on peak aortic jet velocity
100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
*
44%
61%
Baseline state
SBP ≤ 120 mmHg (optimal state)
Percentage of severe AS based on dimensionless index
100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%
NS
66%
65%
Baseline state
SBP ≤ 120 mmHg (optimal state)
Percentage of severe AS based on indexed aortic valve area
100%
90%
80%
70%
NS
87%
85%
Baseline state
SBP ≤ 120 mmHg (optimal state)


Mean gradient (mmHg)
36%
5%
29%
30%
34% discrepancies
Dimensionless index
R^2=0.30
Mean gradient (mmHg)
59%
16%
6%
19%
22% discrepancies
Dimensionless index
R^2=0.26
Mean Gradient (mmHg)
43%
1%
42%
14%
43% discrepancies
Indexed aortic valve area (cm²/m²)
R^2=0.22
Mean Gradient (mmHg)
70%
5%
15%
10%
20% discrepancies
Indexed aortic valve area (cm²/m²)
R^2=0.23
At High blood pressure
At Low blood pressure


R² = 0.23
Mean gradient (mmHg)
85
75
65
55
45
35
25
15
0.15
0.25
0.35
0.45
0.55
0.65
0.75
0.85
0.95
1.05
1.15
Indexed aortic valve area (cm²/m²)



	A	B	C
G_m (mmHg)	35	38	47
V_{max} (m/s)	3.5	3.7	4.1
DI	0.18	0.18	0.19
AVA (cm^2)	0.61	0.61	0.66
AVAi (cm^2/m^2)	0.29	0.29	0.31
SBP (mmHg)	174	142	116
CO (l/min)	3.9	4.4	4.6
SVR (dynes.s.cm^{-5})	2542	1735	1424
SVi (ml/m^2)	26	29	29

Highlights

- In aortic stenosis, high blood pressure is reponsible 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.