

## Artery Research Vol. **25(S1)**; 2019, *p.* S105 DOI: https://doi.org/10.2991/artres.k.191224.094; ISSN 1872-9312; eISSN 1876-4401 https://www.atlantis-press.com/journals/artres



## P63 Accuracy (Validation) of Central Blood Pressure Measurement Using the Sphygmocor Xcel-cuff Device

Martin Schultz<sup>1,\*</sup>, Dean Picone<sup>1</sup>, Matthew Armstrong<sup>1</sup>, Andrew Black<sup>2</sup>, Nathan Dwyer<sup>2</sup>, Philip Roberts-Thomson<sup>2</sup>, James Sharman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Numerous devices purport to measure central aortic BP as distinct from conventional brachial BP. This study aimed to determine the accuracy (validation) of the Sphygmocor Xcel-cuff device (AtCor Medical, Sydney, Australia) for measuring central BP.

**Methods:** 330 patients (mean age  $61.3 \pm 10.6$  years) undergoing coronary angiography had simultaneous measurement of invasive aortic BP and non-invasive cuff-derived central BP using the Xcel device (total n = 552 individual comparisons). Methods were undertaken according to Artery Society guidelines and several calibration techniques to derive central SBP were examined

**Results:** Central SBP was significantly underestimated, and with wide variability, when using the default calibration of brachial cuff SBP/DBP ( $-7.7 \pm 11.0 \text{ mmHg}$ ). Similar wide variability was observed using other calibration methods (cuff 33% form-factor MAP/DBP,  $-4.4 \pm 11.5 \text{ mmHg}$ ; cuff 40% form-factor MAP/DBP,  $4.7 \pm 11.9 \text{ mmHg}$ ; cuff oscillometric MAP/DBP,  $-18.2 \pm 12.1 \text{ mmHg}$ ). Only calibration with invasive aortic integrated MAP/DBP resulted in a mean difference  $\pm$  SD ( $3.3 \pm 7.5 \text{ mmHg}$ ) within the minimum tolerable error of  $\leq 5 \pm \leq 8 \text{ mmHg}$ . The difference between brachial cuff SBP and invasive aortic SBP was  $3.3 \pm 10.7 \text{ mmHg}$ . A subsample (n = 151) analysis to determine the accuracy of central-to-brachial SBP amplification, showed this to be over-estimated by the Xcel device ( $4.3 \pm 9.1 \text{ mmHg}$ , p = 0.02).

**Conclusion:** Irrespective of calibration technique, the Sphygmocor Xcel-cuff device does not pass the Artery Society accuracy (validation) criteria for non-invasive measurement of central BP. Further accuracy refinements of this device are required.

© 2019 Association for Research into Arterial Structure and Physiology. Publishing services by Atlantis Press International B.V. This is an open access article distributed under the CC BY-NC 4.0 license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Royal Hobart Hospital, Hobart, Australia