

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Pomella, N., Wilhelm, Eurico N., Kolyva, C., González-Alonso, J., Rakobowchuk, M. and Khir, A. W. (2018) Reply to Mynard et al. American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology, 315 (5). H1496-H1498. ISSN 0363-6135

Published by: American Physiological Society

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpheart.00656.2018> <<https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpheart.00656.2018>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/42492/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE



UniversityLibrary

1 **Reply: Letter to Editor**

2
3
4 **Non-invasive assessment of carotid arterial wave speed and distensibility**

5
6
7 N. Pomella¹, E. N. Wilhelm², C. Kolyva¹, J. González-Alonso²,
8 M. Rakobowchuk², and A. W. Khir²
9

10
11
12 *1 Institute of Environment, Health and Societies, Biomedical Engineering Research Theme,*
13 *Brunel University London, Middlesex, United Kingdom; and*
14 *2Centre for Human Performance, Exercise and Rehabilitation, College of Health and Life*
15 *Sciences, Brunel University London, Middlesex, United Kingdom*
16
17

18
19 Corresponding Author
20
21

22
23 **Ashraf W Khir, BSc MSc PhD**

24 Professor of Cardiovascular Mechanics
25 Department of Mechanical Engineering
26 College of Engineering, Design and Physical Sciences
27 Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH
28 UK

29 **T:** +44 1895 265857

30 **E:** ashraf.khir@brunel.ac.uk
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **To the Editor:** We would like to thank Maynard et al. for their interest in our work and raising
51 important questions with a Letter to Editor. We are also please to reply as follows.

52
53 **Comparisons**

54 First of all, we are not aware of any studies that directly measured local wave speed (c) in
55 similar exercise conditions to those performed in our study. This indeed limits the ability to
56 compare our results with those found previously by other investigators. Specifically, the literature
57 offered by Mynard et al., may not enable a fair scientific comparison, for several reasons. At the
58 level of timing, Mutter et al. (10) measured c post aerobic exercise, whilst in our work c was
59 measured during heavy exercise. In fact, the trend of our results agree with that of (10) at > 5
60 minutes post-exercise with c returning to control values. Further, the works of both Rakobowchuk
61 et al. (14) and Babcock et al. (1) report c values at rest before and after exercise but not during
62 exercise; an important aim and novel contribution of our present work.

63 Several additional differences between our study and those of (14) and (1) relate to the
64 cohorts involved and methodology used in determining c . Participants of our study (13) comprised
65 of exclusively young male athletes, whereas, the cohorts participating in those two studies were
66 recreational active in (14) and a mix that included both athletes and inactive in (1). In relation to
67 determining c , the studies suggested in the Letter to Editor for comparisons used different
68 fundamental assumptions that limit a direct comparison. Whilst the InDU-loop method assumes
69 unidirectional waves in the earliest period of systole, it is not subject to the calibration and
70 methodological issues of applanation tonometry, which involves forcefully flattening an arterial
71 segment by pushing against a bone. In the case of the carotid artery, this is particularly difficult
72 during exercise. In addition, the potential variable force applied by the operator(s) presents a
73 question on the reproducibility. Therefore, these user-dependent issues associated with
74 applanation tonometry make it difficult to use the results in (1) as “the” carotid PWV reference
75 value. One distinct advantage of the InDU-loop method, however, is that it provides a means for
76 determining c using measurements, which are direct and local to a specific arterial segment. It is
77 worth noting that we have previously demonstrated the reproducibility of the InDU-loop method
78 (12) and the results agree with those in (13). At 40 % of maximum workload c values of the current
79 study is 9.5 m/s closely agreed with 9.7 m/s during exercise in (12).

80 Furthermore, classical work by Bramwell and Hill (5), Hystand and Anliker (7) have
81 established that c is a function of pressure in several arteries of various mammals, and of flow
82 velocity in (7). Table III – Fig. 9 in (5) shows an increase of 50% in pressure leads to 100% increase
83 in c . Similar patterns could be seen in Fig. 5 in (7). In our work (13) systolic pressure increased by
84 45%, carotid flow by 50%, ΔU by 93%, heart rate by 200%, and cardiac output by 270%, all at 70%
85 workrate intensity compared to at rest condition. These hemodynamic changes resulted in an
86 increase in ΔD by 58% and the carotid wall during exercise at that level must have experienced a
87 significant increase in both wall stress and Young’s modules. Therefore, 136% increase in c under
88 such hemodynamic conditions is not very surprising.

89
90 **InDU-loop: Theoretical considerations**

91 Secondly, the notion of the InDU-loop method (6) is prone to increasing ‘true’ c in the
92 carotid artery may not be supported theoretically. According to (6) c can be calculated as

93
$$c = \frac{1}{2} \frac{dU_{\pm}}{d \ln D_{\pm}} \quad (1)$$

94 A reflected wave in the carotid artery that is compression in nature (BCW) as generally accepted
95 would decrease the term dU in equation (1), leading to a decrease of c . We acknowledge that a
96 backward decompression wave (BDW) arriving in early systole would increase dU leading to a
97 possible increase in c , however, we are not aware of any published work to suggest the existence
98 of BDC in the carotid artery in early systole.

99 Further, the same notion is not supported by the literature and it is in a diametrically
100 opposite position with findings of Segers et al., who reported a decrease in c when using the InDU-
101 loop method, also at the carotid artery (15). Furthermore, this notion is not supported
102 experimentally as we validated the method in vitro (9) and reported the possibility of decreasing
103 'true' wave speed, inline with the theoretical expectations, in the presence of a large positive
104 wave reflection; such as those resulting when the measurement and positive reflection sites are in
105 close proximity (3).

106 Furthermore, we believe that using c determined by the InDU-loop method with the
107 Bramwell-Hill (BH) equation to derive pulse pressure may not be theoretically permitted. This is
108 because such approach will violate the constituents involved in deriving equation (1). The InDU-
109 loop equation for determining c deals with differential quantities, which are the microscopic
110 elemental changes of flow velocity and diameter, respectively, dU and dD , and their inter-
111 changeability with macroscopic changes of pressure and area (ΔP and ΔA) such as those used in
112 the BH equation (2) has to be exercised with caution as it will likely lead to errors.

$$113 \quad c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho \frac{\Delta A}{A \Delta P}}} \quad (2)$$

114 For equation (1) to be valid in determining c , waves must be unidirectional, hence the
115 choice of using the microscopic parameters in early systole, when it maybe reasonable to assume
116 only forward waves exist. However, with a mix of forward and backward waves in mid-to-late
117 systole, the equation loses its validity to determine c . It follows; using c determined with the InDU-
118 loop in equation (2) for the purpose of establishing pulse pressure ΔP , as proposed by Maynard et
119 al., must be related to the diameter changes corresponding (and restricted) to the duration of the
120 initial linear portion of the loop. Otherwise, it renders the calculations outside the validity domain
121 of equation (1), leading to errors as evidenced by the unrealistic ΔP of 500 mmHg calculated
122 during exercise in the Letter to Editor at hand.

123 If c is determined using equation (1) and is used with the BH equation, it is possible to
124 calculate the change in pressure (ΔP^*) that is related to the initial linear portion of the InDU-loop
125 by rearranging the BH equation terms

$$126 \quad \Delta P^* = 2\rho c^2 \Delta D^* / D_i \quad (3)$$

127 where ΔD^* and D_i are the macroscopic change in diameter corresponding to initial linear portion
128 of the InDU-loop and the initial diameter, respectively. Using this approach gives average values
129 across our cohort of $\Delta P^* = 18 \pm 6$ mmHg at rest and 92 ± 65 mmHg at 70% W_{max} , which are
130 vastly different from those obtained using ΔP and ΔD over the whole cardiac cycle being 78 ± 31
131 mmHg at rest and 545 ± 366 mmHg at 70% W_{max} . The latter values are close to those calculated
132 by Maynard et al., from our average values in (13).

133 134 **Velocity profile**

135 We agree with Maynard et al. that mean velocity is difficult to measure using Doppler
136 ultrasound. However, the authors appear to have assumed incorrectly that we use maximum
137 velocity in the calculations of c . We have used mean velocity in this and in our earlier work (2).
138 Even if the ultrasound scanner being used for data acquisition does not provide mean velocity, we
139 determine it by tracing the outer, inner envelopes of the ultrasound, and use the mean waveform
140 as shown **Fig 1** of (4). It is worth noting that both the maximum and mean velocity waveforms are
141 usually parallel; thus provide the same slope of the initial linear part of the InDU-loop. We have
142 also compared the results of using mean vs. maximum velocity waveforms in determining c using
143 the InDU-loop method and found no difference (unpublished data). This observation is in line with
144 the theoretical understanding of a blunt flow profile in large arteries; i.e negligible difference
145 between mean and maximum velocity. Whilst we acknowledge that for a parabolic profile of fully
146 developed Poiseuille flow, the maximum is approximately double mean velocity, a conservative

147 entrance length (L) to reach fully developed flow, $L = 0.05ReD$; where Re is carotid Reynold's
148 number = 500 and D is an average carotid diameter = 0.008m. Consequently, L will need to be 20
149 cm, which is longer than most human common carotid arteries.

150 We also agree with Maynard et al. that the method proposed by Kowalski et al. (8) maybe
151 practical, but in our opinion robustness remains to be widely demonstrated. This is because the
152 pressure is measured non-invasively with considerable variation between devices (11), and
153 linearity assumptions are made in the calibration involving two different vessels of different
154 locations, dimensions and wall mechanical properties.

155
156 **In conclusion**, in the absence of direct comparable measurements of wave speed in the
157 carotid artery during exercise, and the lack of evidence of backward decompression wave existing
158 in early systole, the InDU-loop technique should not be claimed to increase wave speed. Such
159 claims are not supported theoretically or experimentally. Also, mixing the microscopic and
160 macroscopic terms of the InDU-loop and Bramwell and Hill techniques may not be allowed for the
161 purpose of calculating pulse pressure, as this is likely to introduce substantial errors.

162
163
164
165
166

167 References

- 168
- 169 1. **Babcock MC, Lefferts WK, Hughes WE, Fitzgerald KL, Leyer BK, Redmond JG, Heffernan KS.** Acute effect of high-intensity cycling exercise on carotid artery hemodynamic pulsatility. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 115: 1037–1045, 2015.
 - 170 2. **Borlotti A, Khir AW, Rietzschel ER, De Buyzere ML, Vermeersch S, Segers P.** Noninvasive
171 determination of local pulse wave velocity and wave intensity: changes with age and gender
172 in the carotid and femoral arteries of healthy human. *J Appl Physiol* 113: 727–35, 2012.
 - 173 3. **Borlotti A, Li Y, Parker KH, Khir AW.** Experimental evaluation of local wave speed in the
174 presence of reflected waves. *J Biomech* 47: 87–95, 2014.
 - 175 4. **Borlotti A, Vermeersch S, Rietzschel E, Segers P, Khir AW.** A comparison between local
176 wave speed in the carotid and femoral arteries in healthy humans: application of a new
177 method. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2010: 2857–60, 2010.
 - 178 5. **Bramwell JC, Hill A V.** The Velocity of the Pulse Wave in Man. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 93: 298–
179 306, 1922.
 - 180 6. **Feng J, Khir AW.** Determination of wave speed and wave separation in the arteries using
181 diameter and velocity. *J Biomech* 43: 455–462, 2010.
 - 182 7. **Histand MB, Anliker M.** Influence of flow and pressure on wave propagation in the canine
183 aorta [Online]. *Circ Res* 32: 524–529, 1973. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/4702044>.
 - 184 8. **Kowalski R, Beare R, Willemet M, Alastruey J, Smolich JJ, Cheung MMH, Mynard JP.**
185 Robust and practical non-invasive estimation of local arterial wave speed and mean blood
186 velocity waveforms. *Physiol Meas* 38: 2081–2099, 2017.
 - 187 9. **Li Y, Khir AW.** Experimental validation of non-invasive and fluid density independent
188 methods for the determination of local wave speed and arrival time of reflected wave. *J*
189 *Biomech* 44: 1393–9, 2011.
 - 190 10. **Mutter AF, Cooke AB, Saleh O, Gomez Y-H, Daskalopoulou SS.** A systematic review on the
191 effect of acute aerobic exercise on arterial stiffness reveals a differential response in the
192 upper and lower arterial segments [Online]. *Hypertens Res* 40: 146, 2016.
193 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/hr.2016.111>.
 - 194
195

- 196 11. **Papaioannou TG, Karageorgopoulou TD, Sergentanis TN, Protogerou AD, Psaltopoulou T,**
197 **Sharman JE, Weber T, Blacher J, Daskalopoulou SS, Wassertheurer S, Khir AW,**
198 **Vlachopoulos C, Stergiopoulos N, Stefanadis C, Nichols WW, Tousoulis D.** Accuracy of
199 commercial devices and methods for noninvasive estimation of aortic systolic blood
200 pressure a systematic review and meta-analysis of invasive validation studies. *J Hypertens*
201 34: 1237–1248, 2016.
- 202 12. **Pomella N, Wilhelm EN, Kolyva C, González-Alonso J, Rakobowchuk M, Khir AW.** Common
203 Carotid Artery Diameter, Blood Flow Velocity and Wave Intensity Responses at Rest and
204 during Exercise in Young Healthy Humans: A Reproducibility Study. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 43:
205 943–957, 2017.
- 206 13. **Pomella N, Wilhelm EN, Kolyva C, González-Alonso J, Rakobowchuk M, Khir AW.** Non-
207 invasive Assessment of the Common Carotid Artery Hemodynamics with Increasing Exercise
208 Workrate Using Wave Intensity Analysis. *Am J Physiol Circ Physiol* (2018). doi:
209 10.1152/ajpheart.00667.2017.
- 210 14. **Rakobowchuk M, Stuckey MI, Millar PJ, Gurr L, Macdonald MJ.** Effect of acute sprint
211 interval exercise on central and peripheral artery distensibility in young healthy males. *Eur J*
212 *Appl Physiol* 105: 787–795, 2009.
- 213 15. **Segers P, Swillens A, Taelman L, Vierendeels J.** Wave reflection leads to over- and
214 underestimation of local wave speed by the PU- and QA-loop methods: Theoretical basis
215 and solution to the problem. *Physiol Meas* 35: 847–861, 2014.
- 216