Serial blood pressure measurements
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Abstract

The objective of the present investigation was to study the effects of a 60-s interval of venous congestion between two noninvasive measurements of arterial blood pressure (ABP) on the fluctuation of ABP, assessed by the standard deviation of the differences between two readings. ABP was measured in 345 successive patients, at rest, four times each. For 269 participants, one pair of readings was obtained with a 60-s interval and the other pair without an interval. For 76 patients, the first pair was read at the same interval, and the second pair had venous congestion interposed and there was no waiting interval. There was no increased ABP oscillation, either when there was no interval between ABP readings, or when venous congestion was interposed compared to pairs of ABP measurements performed with a 60-s interval. There was no increase in ABP oscillations when successive ABP readings were taken without an interval or even with venous congestion interposed. Contrary to the present belief, there seems to be no loss of reliability when blood pressure recordings are taken immediately one after another, in the clinical setting.
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Introduction

Hypertension is a leading risk factor for coronary artery disease, congestive heart failure, renal disease and stroke. Cost, invasiveness and technical limitations restrict the use of the most accurate devices available for measuring arterial blood pressure (ABP). Therefore, ABP cuff measurement remains the most appropriate screening test for hypertension. This method of ABP measurement is prone to errors resulting from instrument, observer and patient factors. Among other standards, guidelines on ABP measurement recommend that two or more readings separated by at least 30-60 s should be averaged. The recommendation of having an interval of 30 to 60 s between two consecutive ABP measurements is present in textbooks and even in the guidelines prepared by societies or committees involved in blood pressure and high blood pressure investigation (1-8). However, we are not aware of documentation in the literature describing experimental studies supporting this recommendation.

There are reports that venous congestion following the first ABP measurement could be responsible for a possible alteration of the next reading (9). Foot blood flow is reduced under venous occlusion when the leg is positioned below the level of the heart. The increased response of precapillary resistance (by a local myogenic or sympathetic reflex) can act as a protective mechanism against edema formation (10). Although the existence of a peripheral circulation regulatory reflex in humans (the venoarterial cutaneous vasoconstrictor reflex) is known, an effect of venous congestion on ABP measurement is speculative.

When venous congestion is produced,
hydrostatic overload develops, triggering the
venoarterial cutaneous vasoconstrictor reflex, a physiological reaction that produces a
reduction in local flow of about 50% through
an increase in vascular resistance caused by
vasoconstriction. This reflex consists of con-
striction of small arteries or arterioles in
response to venous distension, probably cor-
responding to a local axonal reflex situated
between a distension vein receptor and a
constrictor arterial effector. Sympathetic al-
terations can affect the performance of this
reflex (10).

Therefore, we decided to compare the
oscillation of ABP assessed in pairs of mea-
surements separated by the conventional 60-
s interval with the variation observed with-
out this delay between records. We also
investigated the effect of venous congestion
upon the second reading by comparing two
measurements following the recommended
time interval with pairs of readings with
venous congestion interposed without an
additional time interval.

Patients and Methods

A total of 345 consecutive patients had
their ABP measured four times at rest, in the
right arm, by the conventional noninvasive
method. In group A (N = 92), aged 21-86
years, blood pressure was measured in the
sitting position using a mercury sphygmo-
manometer. In group B (N = 158), aged 17-
80 years, blood pressure was measured with
the patients in the supine position using a
mercury sphygmomanometer. In group C (N
= 19), aged 27-82 years, blood pressure was
measured in the sitting position using an
automatic Datascope device, model 2NEL
(Datascope Corporation, Paramus, NJ, USA).
In group D (N = 44), aged 17-82 years, blood
pressure was measured in the supine position
using a mercury sphygmomanometer. In
group E (N = 32), aged 18-75 years, blood
pressure was measured using a Nihon
Seimitsu Sokk (Nissei, Japan) digital elec-
tronic device, model DS-91, with the sub-
jects in the supine position.

All measurements were made by the first
author. The first pair of readings was ob-
tained at the beginning of the consultation,
and the second one at the end. In groups A
and B this sequence was inverted in one third
of the subjects. The patients did not smoke
or drink coffee during the last 15 min. They
were relaxed, the arm examined was at heart
level and they did not cross their legs or talk
during the examination. There was no ran-
donization of the patients at admission to
the study.

In the last two groups (D and E), the first
pair of readings was obtained with an inter-
val of 60 s, while in the second pair of
readings venous congestion of the right arm
was caused immediately after the first read-
ing, with no delay before the second reading.

The patients attended either the private
clinic of one of the authors (groups B, C, D
and E) or a cardiology outpatient clinic of
the public health system (Sistema Unificado
de Saúde, SUS). Systolic blood pressure was
measured at Korotkoff phase I and diastolic
blood pressure at Korotkoff phase V.

The noninvasive automatic and non-au-
tomatic blood pressure devices used were
not checked for previous validation because
the variable under study was blood pressure
fluctuation or oscillation and not the accu-
curacy of measurements. Both mercury sphyg-
momanometers used had meniscus at zero
level, column in vertical position and were
free of dust and air bubbles.

Venous congestion was obtained by using
the same cuff as used for blood pressure mea-
surements. The pressure exerted was the mean
of the systolic and diastolic pressures over a
period of 10 to 15 s, causing venous dilatation
and cyanosis of the right upper limb.

Patients with hemodynamic instability,
cardiac arrhythmias, pregnant women, pa-
tients with weak Korotkoff sounds and pa-
tients younger than 15 years were not in-
cluded in the study.
Short-term variation in the arterial pressure at rest (seconds to minutes) was reported as the mean of the standard deviations of the differences in arterial pressure between the pairs of measurement separated by a 60-s interval or by no interval or with venous congestion interposed.

The paired t-test was used to compare the fluctuation between paired samples, with the level of significance set at P<0.05.

### Results

The clinical and demographic characterization of the patients are displayed in Table 1. As observed in Table 2, in groups B, C, D and E the fluctuation of ABP in the pairs of measurement without an interval or with venous congestion interposed was not significantly greater than that observed in the ABP measurement pairs with a 60-s interval.

### Table 1. Clinical and demographic characterization of the patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age (mean ± SD) Range (min-max)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>Normotensive</th>
<th>Hypertensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57 ± 12 21-86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>47 ± 16 17-80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56 ± 16 27-82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49 ± 18 17-82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57 ± 13 18-75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>53 ± 14 18-75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Analysis of the difference in mean fluctuation between two pairs of blood pressure measurements (systolic and diastolic) with and without a 60-s interval between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Interval (s)</th>
<th>Systolic variation</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Diastolic (mmHg)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.47 ± 0.53</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td>3.41 ± 0.29</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.14 ± 0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94 ± 0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.60 ± 0.27</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>2.91 ± 0.23</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.11 ± 0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69 ± 0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.46 ± 0.69</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>3.24 ± 0.66</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 + VC</td>
<td>5.32 ± 0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.24 ± 0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 + VC</td>
<td>3.25 ± 0.41</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>2.69 ± 0.33</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 + VC</td>
<td>2.80 ± 0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96 ± 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 + VC</td>
<td>5.70 ± 1.11</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>5.75 ± 1.14</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 + VC</td>
<td>8.29 ± 1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.45 ± 0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other comparison was among mean changes in pairs of blood pressure measurements with a 60-s interval versus no interval and venous congestion interposed. Variation is reported as the mean of standard deviation (mmHg) ± mean error. The readings were obtained from the right arm. VC: venous congestion interposed.

*P<0.05 comparing groups with and without interval (bilateral t-test for paired samples).
and no venous congestion between assessments. For group A the fluctuation in systolic ABP was significant and was greater for pairs of measurement obtained with a 60-s interval. Analysis of smaller strata in groups A and B (women vs men, white vs non-white, adults vs aged) did show significant differences in the oscillation of ABP with a 60-s interval vs no interval, with the variation being greater in ABP measurement pairs with a 60-s interval than in ABP pairs measured without such interval (data not shown).

Discussion

The data did not demonstrate a significantly greater variation in ABP between pairs of measurement without an interval and with interspersed venous congestion when compared with the oscillation in pairs of measurement with a 60-s interval. Only one sample stratum (A) showed a significantly greater oscillation in systolic ABP in the pairs of measurements with a 60-s interval.

The present results do not support the established guidelines for blood pressure measurement techniques. Neither elimination of a time interval nor the occurrence of venous congestion between measurements increased ABP variation in the sample studied. The absence of randomization of the subjects upon admission to the study was a real limitation of the present study.

There is evidence of a strong correlation between venous and arterial blood flow at least under certain conditions. The skin circulation not only provides the skin with nutrients, but is also an important factor in thermoregulation: in the presence of thermal changes, human beings regulate the tonus of skin vessels through many reflexes which modulate the heat exchanges with the environment. Extremities such as the plantar areas of toes, palmar areas of finger extremities, nose and ears present a plethora of arterial-venous anastomoses with a rich innervation, as well as nutrient capillary loops, venous plexuses and subpapillary arteries (8). The human subcutaneous blood flow is reduced by approximately 50% when the transmural vascular pressure rises by 25 mmHg or more. This phenomenon also occurs in the skin and skeletal muscle. Precapillary resistance increases while post-capillary resistance is reduced during venous stasis (9).

With venous congestion in the extremities, a reflex response of probably peripheral origin occurs, causing arterial constriction and blood flow reduction to these tissues (10). This phenomenon was investigated in cirrhotic patients with or without palmar erythema and compared with controls (11). In the control subjects blood flow reductions were observed after venous occlusion, with a rise in vascular resistance. However, arterial pressure in the corresponding area was not estimated. In cirrhotic patients with palmar erythema, the venoarterial cutaneous vasoconstrictor reflex was not affected in the dorsum of the hand, but was depressed in the palmar region. Nevertheless, the authors did not report that venous congestion affected ABP.

Our main finding was that overall results do not support the hypothesis that absence of the time interval or presence of venous congestion that may occur in clinical practice significantly affects the ABP oscillation that occurs naturally.
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