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ABSTRACT

Objectives: Automatic devices based on oscillometric principle are widely used for the estimation of blood pressure (BP). Mercury sphygmomanometer mean systolic BP (MSBP) and its derived cuff pressure are the traditional mode of estimation which is a validated and authenticated procedure. Automated machines using oscillometric method are slowly replacing the conventional technique. This study was done to compare the BP recorded by the mercury sphygmomanometer MSBP and the automated technique using oscillometric method automated office BP (AOBP).

Methods: Two hundred subjects aged 40–65 years with mid-arm circumference 27–34 cm were recruited. MSBP and AOBP were recorded adhering to guidelines given by the American Heart Association Joint National Committee. The subjects were divided into two groups as normotensive (Group 1) and hypertensive (Group 2), and statistical analysis was performed.

Results: The mean systolic and diastolic pressures estimated by oscillometric method and sphygmomanometer were calculated and compared with each other by paired t-test separately for Groups 1 and 2. In normotensives (Group 1), the mean systolic pressure MSBP was 144.21±7.5 mmHg and AOBP was 118.24±11.0 mmHg. The mean diastolic MSBP was 72.1±3.5 mmHg and AOBP was 76.4±1.2 mmHg. Subjects of Group 2 (hypertensive) showed mean systolic pressure MSBP of 144.42±10.5 mm Hg and AOBP of 159.74±22 mmHg. The mean diastolic MSBP was 97.2±9.5 mmHg and AOBP was 118.24±11.0 mmHg. In Group 1, the difference was statistically not significant, while in Group 2, comparison by paired t-test showed a mean difference of systolic pressure by 15.32±1.25 (p<0.005), and mean difference of diastolic pressure by 8.9±5.8 (p<0.005).

Conclusion: Hence, we conclude that oscillometric pressure recordings by the automated device are closer to manual measurements in normotensives but showed a significant high value in hypertensives. We suggest caution in treating hypertensives with values derived from automated machines only.
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INTRODUCTION

Global burden of disease study had identified hypertension as one of the highly prevalent (20% in urban and 14% in rural population) disease leading to cardiovascular mortality and morbidity [1]. It is included in the diseases listed by the WHO to estimate “Daly’s disability adjusted life years” a predictor of health and wellness [2]. Early detection of hypertension and appropriate treatment is emphasized by the US Preventive Task Force 2017 [3].

Estimation of blood pressure (BP) in various clinical settings is routinely done by sphygmomanometer [4]. However, considering environmental safety, it is globally recommended to reduce the usage of mercury [5]. Hence, automatic devices have gained more acceptability, and they are slowly replacing sphygmomanometer [6]. They work with the principle of detecting the oscillations in the arterial wall during deflation of the cuff [7]. They have several advantages over the sphygmomanometer such as compliance, reproducibility, technical advancement, feasibility for home, and ambulatory BP measurements [8].

To validate the authenticity of oscillometric devices, studies have been done comparing the BP recorded by sphygmomanometer and automated devices [9]. Clinical trials in healthy subjects showed both values to be concordant and acceptable [10]. Certain wristband devices tend to vary with other methods of detection [11].

However, the accuracy of BP estimation in hypertensives needs a high degree of precision, and studies are so far not done in hypertensive patients. Hence, we had done this study to compare the BP recorded by sphygmomanometer and automated devices in both normotensives and hypertensives.

METHODS

The study was conducted in a tertiary care center after obtaining the Institutional Ethical Clearance. Informed consent was obtained from the patients.

Inclusion criteria

Subjects attending the outpatient Department of General Medicine of both sexes and age 40–65 years with mid-arm circumference 27–34 cm were included in the study. Expecting a change of more than 10% in values and with the previous studies, a sample size of 126 was adequate.

Exclusion criteria

Subjects with contraindication for cuff placement, diagnosed as arrhythmias, peripheral arterial disease, critically ill, and hemodynamically unstable subjects were excluded from the study.

 Consort diagram

The BP was recorded by both sphygmomanometer and the automated device which works on oscillometric principle. The same machine was used in all the recordings. The American Heart Association JNC recommendations for BP measurements were strictly adhered [12]. Ten steps of accurate BP measurement, by Kenneth Andersen, were taken as the thumb rule [13]. The recordings were done by a blinded observer trained in the techniques of BP measurement. Apparatus testing and validation were done before the study adhering to the British
hypertensive society guidelines which states that “out of 5 readings by 2 observers at least 50% of readings must have difference not more than 5 mmHg [14].” It is recommended to use an ideal cuff with bladder length 80%, and a width 40% of arm circumference as miscuffing leads to erroneous results [15]. To nullify the factor of miscuffing subjects with mid-arm circumference 27–34 cm only were recruited for the study [16].

Precautions
All patients were rested for 5 min, recorded in sitting posture with feet flat on the floor, arm positioned at heart level, avoid talking, and excess tight clothing.

Procedure of mean SBP (MSBP) measurement
Cuff placement was above the elbow crease according to standard recommendations, and the bell of the stethoscope placed over the palpable pulse at the antecubital fossa. Cuff was inflated until the blood flow stopped and no sounds were heard. The pressure was raised to 30–40 mmHg more than normal BP, and slow deflation 2–3 mmHg/s was done. The sphygmomanometer reading corresponding to the first rhythmic tapping sound heard when blood begins to flow through the artery indicated SBP. The gauge reading when the cuff pressure drops and sounds fade corresponded to diastolic pressure.

Procedure of automated office BP (AOBP) measurement
The automated measurements were done based on the oscillations in the arterial wall during deflation of the cuff. Oscillations begin before SBP and continue below diastolic BP (DBP), maximum during mean arterial pressure, and the SBP and DBP are derived from the empirical formula built into the device. Measurements were done twice, once with the sphygmomanometer and then after 5 min with the automated oscillometric method. Subjects are divided into two groups based on their previous history of hypertension: Group 1 - Normotensive and Group 2 - Hypertensive based on the 2017 AHA JNC guidelines. All patients of Group 2 were known hypertensives on drugs. In Group 1, the mean SBP and DBPs were similar whether we measure manually or with an automated device as shown in Table 1.

When we compared the BP recordings in hypertensives, there was a higher recording of both systolic and diastolic values in the automated machine than in sphygmomanometer (Tables 2 and 3 and Fig. 1).

There were no dropouts in the study, and the study was completed without any untoward events.

DISCUSSION
Our study results showed that BP recorded manually using sphygmomanometer and by the automated apparatus in normotensives were concordant and within the acceptable range of difference (<5 mm Hg) as indicated by the European Society of Hypertension. However, in hypertensives, the two recordings differed widely. SBP showed a mean difference of 15.32±1.25 and DBP 8.9±5.8, the values being higher in automated machine. It is beyond the accepted range stated by the European Society of Hypertension.

This discrepancy between oscillometric recording when compared to BP estimated by other devices was compared and documented by few researchers done in diverse clinical settings. Xianghu Meng et al. compared automated BP with invasive arterial pressure recorded from radial and dorsalis pedis arteries in surgical patients [18]. The results were in concordance with ours, as it showed high values of SBP recorded by automated instrument [19]. These results were beyond the standards set by the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation [20].

A study by van Bergen et al., in their different observation, concluded that automated BP recorded was accurate compared even to the intra-arterial pressure [21]. This study was carried out in healthy adults with the majority of normotensives, who in our study also had both readings in the acceptable range. We can assume that, in the normotensives, oscillometric apparatus recordings are accurate and reliable.

The importance of accurate BP estimation is strongly emphasized by recent guidelines based on clinical trials. The Indian guidelines of hypertension based on the Kidney Disease Global Outcome study strictly prohibit BP reduction beyond 130/85 mmHg considering the consequence of hypotension, especially in the elderly [22]. The report

### Table 1: Mean SBP and DBP of normotensives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blood pressure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Standard error mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systolic manual (MSBP)</td>
<td>114.21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic automatic (AOBP)</td>
<td>118.24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic manual (MSBP)</td>
<td>72.14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic automatic (AOBP)</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBP: Non-invasive cuff pressure, AOBP: Automatic blood pressure (mmHg) Statistically insignificant. MSBP: Mean systolic blood pressure, AOBP: Automated office blood pressure, SD: Standard deviation, DBP: Diastolic blood pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Mean SBP and DBP of hypertensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blood pressure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Standard error mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systolic manual (MSBP)</td>
<td>144.42</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18.535</td>
<td>1.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic automatic (AOBP)</td>
<td>159.74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22.485</td>
<td>2.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic manual (MSBP)</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.543</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic automatic (AOBP)</td>
<td>96.91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.769</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBP: Mean systolic blood pressure, AOBP: Automated office blood pressure, SD: Standard deviation, DBP: Diastolic blood pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Group 1, the mean SBP and DBPs were similar whether we measure manually or with an automated device as shown in Table 1.
Table 3: Comparison of mean MSBP versus AOBP in hypertensive patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blood pressure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Standard error mean</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systolic MSBP versus AOBP</td>
<td>-15.320</td>
<td>11.253</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>-17.553 to -13.087</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic MSBP versus AOBP</td>
<td>-5.900</td>
<td>5.853</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>-7.061 to -4.739</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSBP: Non-invasive cuff pressure, AOBP: Automatic blood pressure. MSBP: Mean systolic blood pressure, AOBP: Automated office blood pressure, SD: Standard deviation

Fig. 1: Comparison of systolic and diastolic pressures (NIBP vs manual)

of the systolic blood pressure intervention trial recommends SBP target of <140 mmHg in patients with high cardiovascular risk. Patients were divided into intensive treatment group (BP target >120 mmHg) and standard treatment group (BP target >140 mmHg). It concluded that there is a 25% lower risk of the adverse cardiac outcome in the standard treatment group [23]. Failure to adherence to intake of drug protocol also leads to various complications. Hence, it is important to categorize those patients for prescribing medicines [24].

Automated device is used for BP estimation in day-to-day clinical practice in multiple settings such as outpatient, critical care, and continuous BP monitoring. Critical decision and pharmacological interventions are done based on this parameter [25,26]. We observed from our results that there is a higher value of recorded BP with automated device, especially in hypertensives. Hence, if treatment is based on a false high readings, it can lead to serious adverse effects such as hypotension which can be disastrous, especially in the elderly.

CONCLUSION

We conclude that BP recordings of both systolic and diastolic values were higher when measured with an automated device than the MSBP mercury sphygmomanometer in hypertensives. The values were similar in normotensives. We suggest that we should be extra cautious while prescribing drugs to hypertension with measurements on automated monitors. We suggest that we should be extra cautious while prescribing drugs to hypertension with measurements on automated monitors. We suggest that we should be extra cautious while prescribing drugs to hypertension with measurements on automated monitors.
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