RESEARCH ARTICLE

Difference between ejection times measured at two different peripheral locations as a novel marker of vascular stiffness
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Abstract

Pulse wave velocity (PWV) has been recommended as an arterial damage assessment tool and a surrogate of arterial stiffness. However, the current technology does not allow to measure PWV both continuously and in real-time. We reported previously that peripherally measured ejection time (ET) overestimates ET measured centrally. This difference in ET is associated with the inherent vascular properties of the vessel. In the current study we examined ETs derived from plethysmography simultaneously at different peripheral locations and examined the influence of the underlying arterial properties on ET prolongation by changing the subject’s position. We calculated the ET difference between two peripheral locations ($\Delta$ET) and its corresponding PWV for the same heartbeat. The $\Delta$ET increased with a corresponding decrease in PWV. The difference between $\Delta$ET in the supine and standing (which we call ET index) was higher in young subjects with low mean arterial pressure and low PWV. These results suggest that the difference in ET between two peripheral locations in the supine vs standing positions represents the underlying vascular properties. We propose $\Delta$ET in the supine position as a potential novel real-time continuous and non-invasive parameter of vascular properties, and the ET index as a potential non-invasive parameter of vascular reactivity.

Introduction

For the clinician it is important to distinguish patients with a compliant vasculature from those with stiff vessels [1]. The gold standard to measure vascular stiffness is carotid–femoral PWV (cf-PWV) [2], which has been recommended by the European Society of Hypertension and the European Society of Cardiology (ESH/ESC) as a marker for arterial damage and by the American Heart Association (AHA)’s Scientific Statement as a surrogate for arterial stiffness [3,4]. However PWV depends not only on intrinsic vascular stiffness but also on vessel wall tension, which dynamically changes with fluctuations in blood pressure (BP) [5,6]. Several
attempts have been made to develop a BP independent index of vascular stiffness, such as the Cardio-Ankle Vascular Index (CAVI) and the Arterial Stiffness Index (ASI) [7,8]. However, they are not consistently BP independent in all clinical scenarios [8,9]. Moreover the current technology for PWV measurement does not allow to determine these indices continuously and in real time. Hence there is a clinical need to develop a real time continuous and noninvasive marker of vascular stiffness.

The arterial blood pressure waveform changes as the pulse wave travels across the arterial tree to different peripheral locations [10]. Our group has recently reported that the peripherally measured ejection time, derived from the radial artery blood pressure waveform, consistently overestimates a centrally measured ejection time at lower BPs, slow HRs, and low PWVs [11]. This prolongation represents a direct modulating effect of the vasculature on the pulse waveform. Based on these results and the underlying assumption that the effect of the vasculature on the pulse waveform is the main factor for the changes seen in the peripherally measured ET we hypothesized that ET prolongation will be different at different peripheral locations. Furthermore for subjects with a lower vascular tone (younger subjects with lower blood pressure and PWV), a higher degree of distortion and hence a longer ET prolongation would be observed at more distal measurement sites. The aims of the present study were therefore: (1) to compare ETs obtained peripherally by plethysmograph at different locations for the same heartbeat, (2) to examine the influence of the arterial properties on ET prolongation, by changing the subject position, and (3) to develop a simple and non-invasive method for evaluating vascular properties based on measuring ET prolongation.

Materials and methods

Subjects

This study utilized the data derived from the subjects enrolled in the previous study which investigated the effects of posture on pulse arrival to the peripheral vascular beds [12]. The protocol was approved by The Johns Hopkins Medicine Institutional Review Boards (IRB00074229). Inclusion criteria were: Healthy adults, age 21–50 years, both genders. Exclusion criteria were: Subject refusal to participate, known cardiovascular disease of any kind (including hypertension), and pregnancy.

Study protocol

We measured each subject’s height, weight, and the distance from the sternal notch to 1) the ear lobe, 2) the index finger, with the arm abducted at 90 degrees, 3) the big toe. A standard 3 lead ECG (Bio Amp FE132, ADInstruments, Australia) was placed for continuous monitoring of electrical cardiac activity. Plethysmography sensors (MLT1020EC IR Plethysmograph (ear) and MLT1020PPG IR Plethysmograph (finger and toe), Ad Instrument, Australia) were placed on the left ear lobe, left index finger, and left big toe. We simultaneously recorded lead II of the ECG along with the plethysmograph signals for 30 seconds, in each the standing, sitting and supine position. The ECG and plethysmograph sensors were then removed from the subjects and a blood pressure cuff applied on the right upper arm to record systolic, diastolic, and mean blood pressure (SBP, DBP, MAP) in the standing, sitting and supine position respectively. The ECG and plethysmograph signals were simultaneously converted digitally at 1 kHz (PowerLab4/26, ADInstruments, Australia) and recorded in the LabChart software (LabChart 8, Ad Instruments, Australia).
Data extraction

We extracted the ejection time (ET) from the difference between the dicrotic notch arrival time (DAT) and the corresponding pulse arrival time (PAT) for each location (ear, finger, and toe) and position (standing, sitting, and supine). The dicrotic notch arrival time (DAT) at each location was obtained by calculating the time delay between the peak of the R wave on the ECG and the dicrotic notch on the plethysmograph waveform. The pulse arrival time (PAT) at each location was obtained by calculating the time delay between the peak of the R wave on the ECG waveform and the initiation of the upstroke on the plethysmograph waveform.

Data extraction was performed by a computer-automated technique as described previously [13–15]. Briefly, we applied standard 60Hz notch and high-pass filters followed by a smoothing procedure. We then extracted the peak of the R wave based on the published algorithm as proposed by Pan and Tompkins [13]. The initiation of the upstroke of the plethysmograph waveform and the dicrotic notch on the plethysmograph waveform were extracted based on the second derivative [14,15]. Periods consisting of over 10 consecutive heartbeats from each position were used for data extraction. Only pulse waveforms with a distinct dicrotic notch, as defined by the automated computer algorithm, were accounted for in the analysis. Mean variables for each location and in each position were calculated using 17±10 waveforms for each subject.

We calculated the time difference between the ET at the toe and the ET at the ear (ΔET$_{Toe-Ear}$), between the ET at the toe and the ET at the finger (ΔET$_{Toe-Finger}$), and between the ET at the finger and the ET at the ear (ΔET$_{Finger-Ear}$) in each position for each subject and the same heartbeat. ΔPAT and ΔDAT were calculated in the same way (ΔPAT$_{Toe-Ear}$, ΔPAT$_{Toe-Finger}$, ΔPAT$_{Finger-Ear}$, ΔDAT$_{Toe-Ear}$, ΔDAT$_{Toe-Finger}$, and ΔDAT$_{Finger-Ear}$). Systolic PWV (PWV$_{ΔPAT}$) was calculated as suggested by Alivon et al. as the vascular path length divided by ΔPAT for each pair of locations and in each position [16]. The vascular path length was calculated as the difference between the two vascular path lengths. For instance, PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Toe-Ear}$ was calculated as follow, (distance from the sternal notch to the toe—distance from the sternal notch to the ear) / (ΔPAT$_{Toe-Ear}$). We used the same approach to calculate diastolic PWV (PWV$_{ΔDAT}$) based on ΔDAT instead of ΔPAT for each pair of locations and in each position. PWV$_{ΔDAT}$$_{Toe-Ear}$ was calculated as follow, (distance from the sternal notch to the toe—distance from the sternal notch to the ear) / (ΔDAT$_{Toe-Ear}$).

PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Toe-Finger}$, PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Finger-Ear}$, PWV$_{ΔDAT}$$_{Toe-Finger}$ and PWV$_{ΔDAT}$$_{Finger-Ear}$ were calculated in the same way. We defined “ET index” as the difference between the mean of ΔET$_{Toe-Finger}$ in the standing and supine positions in each individual subject by subtracting the former from the latter. We defined “ΔPWV$_{Standing-Supine}$” as the difference between the mean of PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Toe-Finger}$ in the standing and supine positions in each individual subject by subtracting the latter from the former. Since PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Toe-Finger}$ has been validated previously as a good surrogate for arterial stiffness [16], we chose the same locations (toe and finger) to calculate ET index and ΔPWV$_{Standing-Supine}$. We compared ΔET$_{Toe-Finger}$ to PWV$_{ΔPAT}$$_{Toe-Finger}$ and ET index to ΔPWV$_{Standing-Supine}$ in this study. We calculated ET index as a novel index reflecting the effect of both measurement sites and positions on ET prolongation.

Statistical analyses

All Data was analyzed using GraphPad Prism version 7 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, California, USA). Based on the results of the previous study, we estimated that a sample of 4 subjects would provide adequate power (80% power for a mean (SD) difference of 53ms (22 ms)) for the change in ET between two locations at an alpha level of 0.05 in a two-sided paired t-test.
We report continuous variables as mean ± standard deviation (SD) and categorical variables as proportions. The non-parametric Friedman test and a post hoc Dunn’s multiple comparison test were performed to compare three continuous variables measured in different positions or at different locations. Moreover, we performed a Bland-Altman analysis to assess the difference between ETs at two peripheral locations. The relationship between two continuous variables was assessed using a linear regression analysis. A nonlinear regression analysis was performed to assess the relationships between ΔET and PWV. We classified the subjects into two subgroups according to their percentile rank of the ET index, group 1: above the 50th percentile (n = 5), group 2: below the 50th percentile (n = 6). A Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the continuous variables in group 1 with those in group 2. Fisher’s exact test was used to compare the categorical variables in group 1 with those in group 2. Statistical significance was set at P < 0.05 and all test were two sided. We created a generalized linear model (GLM) to assess if the ΔET and ET index could be explained by age, gender, body mass index (BMI), mean arterial pressure (MAP), heart rate (HR), and PWV.

Results

We enrolled 12 healthy volunteers with no history of vascular or cardiac disease. One subject (23 years old female) was excluded as we were unable to obtain the plethysmograph signals on the toe. Demographics, baseline characteristics, values of PWV\(_{\text{ΔPAT Toe-Finger}}\), ΔPWV\(_{\text{Standing-Supine}}\), ΔET Toe-Finger, ET index and the group assignment based on the ET index of individual subjects are presented in Table 1.

S1 Fig is a schematic representation of the simultaneously recorded electrocardiogram and plethysmograph waveforms at the ear, finger and toe in the standing, sitting and supine positions. The dots on the ECG waveforms indicate the peak of the R wave, the dots on the plethysmograph waveforms indicate the beginning of the upstroke of the pulse waveform and the dicrotic notch. The ETs are shaded in gray between the start of the upstroke and the dicrotic notch.

Table 1. Demographics, baseline characteristics, values of PWV\(_{\text{ΔPAT Toe-Finger}}\), ΔPWV\(_{\text{Standing-Supine}}\), ΔET Toe-Finger, ET index and group assignment based on ET index of the subjects.

| No. | (y.o.) | Gender | BMI (kg/m\(^2\)) | MAP (mmHg) | HR (bpm) | PWV\(_{\text{ΔPAT Toe-Finger}}\) | ΔPWV | ΔET (ms) | ET index | Group |
|-----|--------|--------|------------------|------------|---------|-------------------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| 1   | 50     | M      | 26.3             | 82         | 62      | 6.16                          | 1.52  | 59.2    | 2.5      | 1     |
| 2   | 39     | M      | 31.9             | 91         | 77      | 7.17                          | 3.58  | 34.7    | -0.6     | 1     |
| 3   | 36     | F      | 20.2             | 86         | 57      | 8.06                          | 3.02  | 24.2    | 15.5     | 1     |
| 4   | 41     | M      | 27.1             | 82         | 61      | 7.02                          | 19.16 | 30.7    | 40.5     | 1     |
| 5   | 29     | M      | 23.2             | 81         | 56      | 7.38                          | 3.88  | 32.0    | 31.5     | 1     |
| 6   | 31     | M      | 26.0             | 80         | 76      | 6.44                          | 3.50  | 69.8    | 51.3     | 2     |
| 7   | 36     | F      | 21.6             | 67         | 57      | 5.28                          | -0.88 | 31.3    | 59.4     | 2     |
| 8   | 26     | F      | 20.8             | 68         | 78      | 6.20                          | 2.39  | 97.6    | 64.0     | 2     |
| 9   | 23     | F      | 20.6             | 65         | 60      | 3.90                          | 8.89  | 108.2   | 79.9     | 2     |
| 10  | 26     | M      | 30.1             | 81         | 74      | 6.45                          | 4.54  | 78.2    | 65.7     | 2     |
| 11  | 23     | M      | 23.0             | 82         | 84      | 7.48                          | 5.28  | 57.4    | 45.6     | 2     |
| Mean| 33     |        | 24.6             | 79         | 67      | 6.50                          | 4.99  | 56.7    | 41.4     |       |
| SD  | 9      |        | 4.0              | 8          | 10      | 1.16                          | 5.28  | 29.1    | 26.6     |       |

BMI: body mass index; MAP: mean arterial pressure; HR: heart rate; PWV: pulse wave velocity; PAT: pulse arrival time; ET: ejection time.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187781.t001
notch on the plethysmograph waveform. The waveform presented in the figure was obtained from a single subject from each location but the duration of the ET and the dots represent average times, as calculated from all subjects.

All measurements tabulated are shown in Table 2. The RR interval was shorter (faster HR) in the standing compared to the sitting and supine position (standing vs sitting: $P = 0.017$, standing vs supine: $P < 0.001$, sitting vs supine: $P > 0.99$). The ET was shorter in the standing compared to the supine position—irrespective of the location (standing vs supine: $P < 0.001$ at all locations) (Fig 1A–1C). The comparison between the ETs measured at different locations in the standing position didn’t reach statistical significance ($P = 0.085$) (Fig 1D). The ET was shorter at the ear compared to the toe in the sitting and supine positions ($P < 0.001$ in both positions) (Fig 1E and 1F).

The $\Delta$ET was shorter in standing compared to the supine position at all locations ($\text{standing vs supine: } P < 0.001$ for toe-ear, $P = 0.004$ for toe-finger, $P = 0.009$ for finger-ear). The $\Delta$ETs in the standing and the $\Delta$ETs in the sitting position were not significantly different at toe-ear or toe-finger ($P > 0.99$ at both locations), however, the $\Delta$ET in the standing position was shorter compared to sitting for finger-ear ($P = 0.017$). A Bland-Altman analysis comparing ET at different locations (figure vs ear, toe vs finger, toe vs ear) in different positions (standing, sitting, and supine) is depicted in Fig 2. The difference of ETs measured at two different locations are shortest in the standing position and longest in the supine position.

| Table 2. Mean±SD of RR interval, ET, $\Delta$ET, $\Delta$PAT, $\Delta$DAT and PWV in 3 positions. |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Standing                                      | Sitting         | Supine         |
| RR interval (ms)                              | 747.9 ± 154.0   | 866.0 ± 149.9  | 907.3 ± 135.1  |
| ET (ms)                                       | 247.7 ± 28.0    | 283.9 ± 25.7   | 306.5 ± 22.4   |
| Finger                                        | 248.7 ± 27.7    | 304.5 ± 25.3   | 329.0 ± 18.7   |
| Toe                                           | 263.9 ± 16.2    | 323.6 ± 18.6   | 385.6 ± 34.4   |
| $\Delta$ET (ms)                               | 16.2 ± 25.9     | 39.7 ± 29.5    | 79.1 ± 36.3    |
| Toe—Ear                                       | 135.7 ± 23.4    | 141.6 ± 20.0   | 191.0 ± 17.9   |
| Toe—Finger                                    | 65.4 ± 26.9     | 62.6 ± 12.5    | 101.9 ± 20.9   |
| Finger—Ear                                    | 70.3 ± 10.4     | 79.0 ± 12.1    | 89.1 ± 10.6    |
| $\Delta$PAT (ms)                              | 135.7 ± 23.4    | 141.6 ± 20.0   | 191.0 ± 17.9   |
| $\Delta$DAT (ms)                              | 76.5 ± 33.5     | 80.5 ± 29.1    | 158.3 ± 47.2   |
| $\Delta$PAT (m/s)                             | 9.59 ± 1.97     | 9.05 ± 1.26    | 6.65 ± 0.64    |
| $\Delta$DAT (m/s)                             | 11.49 ± 5.44    | 10.64 ± 2.29   | 6.50 ± 1.16    |
| $\Delta$PAT (m/s)                             | 8.98 ± 1.37     | 7.98 ± 1.10    | 7.03 ± 0.83    |
| PWV $\Delta$PAT (m/s)                         | 9.16 ± 2.85     | 7.36 ± 1.76    | 4.81 ± 0.85    |
| PWV $\Delta$DAT (m/s)                         | 11.16 ± 9.35    | 9.01 ± 3.40    | 4.34 ± 1.08    |
| PWV $\Delta$DAT (m/s)                         | 9.24 ± 2.09     | 6.53 ± 1.51    | 5.87 ± 1.29    |

SD: standard deviation, ET: ejection time, PAT: pulse arrival time, DAT: dicrotic notch arrival time, PWV: pulse wave velocity.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187781.t002
PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta PAT} was faster in the standing compared to the supine position irrespective of the pair of locations (standing vs supine: \(P < 0.001\) for toe-ear and finger-ear, \(P = 0.004\) for toe-finger). PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta PAT} in standing and PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta PAT} in the sitting position were not significantly different for all pairs of locations.

PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta DAT} was faster in the standing compared to the supine position irrespective of the pair of locations (standing vs supine: \(P < 0.001\) for all pairs of locations). PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta DAT} in the standing and PWV\textsubscript{\textDelta DAT} in the sitting position were not significantly different for toe-ear and

---

Fig 1. Effect of position and peripheral location on the measured ET. Each plot indicates the mean ET calculated from each individual subject. (A) ETs measured at the ear. (B) ETs measured at the finger. (C) ETs measured at the toe. (D) ETs measured in the standing position. (E) ETs measured in the sitting position. (F) ETs measured in the supine position. ET: ejection time, ns: not significant, \(*\): \(P < 0.05\), \(* * *\): \(P < 0.001\).

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187781.g001
toe-finger, however, PWV\textsubscript{ΔDAT} while standing was faster compared to the sitting position for finger-ear (P = 0.009).

ΔET between all pairs of locations correlated with the corresponding ΔPAT and ΔDAT (S2 Fig). The R\textsuperscript{2} was higher for ΔDAT compared to ΔPAT for all pairs of locations. The best correlation was observed for the difference in ETs between the toe and ear (ΔET\textsubscript{Toe-Ear}) compared to the difference in DAT (ΔDAT\textsubscript{Toe-Ear}) with R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.86. ΔDAT showed a significant correlation with ΔPAT between all locations. (R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.80, P<0.001 for toe-ear, R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.80, P<0.001 for toe-finger, R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.52, P<0.001 for finger-ear).

ΔET decreased exponentially with increasing PWV (either based on ΔPAT or ΔDAT) for each pair of locations (Fig 3A, 3B, 3D, 3E, 3G and 3H). R\textsuperscript{2} was higher for PWV\textsubscript{ΔDAT} compared to PWV\textsubscript{ΔPAT} in all pairs of locations. PWV\textsubscript{ΔDAT} correlated well with PWV\textsubscript{ΔPAT} with a R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.89 for toe-finger (Fig 2F).

We depict the relationships between ΔET\textsubscript{Toe-Finger}, ΔPAT\textsubscript{Toe-Finger}, and ΔDAT\textsubscript{Toe-Finger} in two representative subjects in Fig 4. One subject had the most compliant vasculature and the other the least compliant vasculature, based on PWV\textsubscript{ΔPAT} Toe-Finger in the supine position.
Fig 4A–4C show the relationships between $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$, $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$, and $\Delta DAT_{Toe-Finger}$ as derived from the subject with the most compliant vasculature ($\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$ of 3.90 m/s in the supine and 12.79 m/s in the standing position in a 23 years old female). $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$, $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$, and $\Delta DAT_{Toe-Finger}$ varied with changing positions, with $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$ and $\Delta DAT_{Toe-Finger}$ varying more than $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$. The average of $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$ was 28.3 ms while standing and increased 3.8 times in the supine position to 108.2 ms in this young female with a compliant vasculature. The difference in absolute values between $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$ supine and standing (ET index) was 79.9 ms.

The relationship between $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$, $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$, and $\Delta DAT_{Toe-Finger}$ derived from the subject with the least compliant vasculature as evident by highest $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$ in the supine position ($\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$ of 8.06 m/s in supine and 11.08 m/s in standing in a 36 years old female), are depicted in Fig 4D–4F. The variation of $\Delta ET_{Toe-Finger}$, $\Delta PAT_{Toe-Finger}$, and $\Delta DAT_{Toe-Finger}$...
and ΔDAT_Toe-Finger were small compared to the subject with compliant vasculature. The average ΔET_Toe-Finger was 8.7 ms when standing and increased 2.8 times in the supine position to 24.2 ms. The difference in absolute values between ΔET_Toe-Finger supine and standing (ET index) was 15.5 ms, which is 5.2 times less than the 79.9 ms observed in the subject with a more compliant vasculature.

We compared the relationships between ΔET_Toe-Finger, PWV-ΔPAT_Toe-Finger, and PWV-ΔDAT_Toe-Finger in the same two subjects (most and least compliant vasculature based on PWV-ΔPAT_Toe-Finger in the supine position) (Fig 5). We observed a significant variability in ΔET_Toe-Finger in the supine position in the subject with the most compliant vasculature (Fig 5A and 5B) compared to the subject with the least compliant vasculature (Fig 5D and 5E). Similarly we observed significant variability in PWV (both PWV-ΔPAT_Toe-Finger and PWV-ΔDAT_Toe-Finger) in standing position in the subject with the most compliant vasculature (Fig 5A–5C).

Given that there was a significant change in the ET index between the two subjects with the most and least compliant vasculatures, we explored this parameter, ET index, in all subjects.
Fig 6 depicts the relationship between the ET index and age (Fig 6A), body mass index (BMI) (Fig 6B), HR measured in the supine position (Fig 6C), MAP measured in the supine position (Fig 6D), PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger measured in the supine position (Fig 6E), and the difference between PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger in the supine and standing position ($\Delta$PWV$_{Standing-Supine}$, Fig 6F).

Each individual subject represents a dot on the graph. The ET index correlated significantly with age, MAP, and PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger such that increased age, MAP, and PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger were associated with decreased ET index. However, ET index did not correlate with BMI, HR, or $\Delta$PWV$_{Standing-Supine}$.

Performing a GLM analysis revealed that younger age and lower MAP were significantly associated with a higher ET index (coefficient: -1.75, $p<0.001$; coefficient: -3.16, $p = 0.001$, respectively). However, PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger was not significantly associated with the ET index ($p = 0.40$ (Table 3A)).

Then we investigated if the effect of age, BMI, HR, MAP, PWV$_{\Delta PAT}$ Toe-Finger, and $\Delta$PWV$_{Standing-Supine}$ on $\Delta$ET$_{Toe-Finger}$ in the supine position were similar to the ET index.
$R^2$ was lower for age vs $\Delta ET_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ ($R^2 = 0.30, P = 0.08$), and for MAP vs $\Delta ET_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ ($R^2 = 0.35, P = 0.06$) and higher for $\Delta PWV_{\text{PAT Toe-Finger}}$ vs $\Delta ET_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ ($R^2 = 0.42, P = 0.03$). Similar to the ET index, BMI, HR, and $\Delta PWV_{\text{Standing-Supine}}$ were not correlated with $\Delta ET_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$.

The GLM analysis revealed further that increased HR and decreased $\Delta PWV_{\text{PAT Toe-Finger}}$ were significantly associated with an increased $\Delta ET_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ (coefficient: $1.37, P = 0.016$; coefficient: $-21.29, P = 0.018$, respectively) (Table 3B).

We also investigated the effect of age, BMI, HR, MAP, and $\Delta PWV_{\text{PAT Toe-Finger}}$ on $\Delta PWV_{\text{Standing-Supine}}$. All variables were not correlated with $\Delta PWV_{\text{Standing-Supine}}$ (S3 Fig).

To investigate if the ET index could differentiate a more compliant from a less compliant vasculature we divided all subjects into two groups according to their percentile rank of the ET index: group 1 (below 50% of ET index, mean $\pm$SD of $17.9 \pm 17.9$ ms) and group 2 (above 50% of ET index, mean $\pm$SD of $61.0 \pm 12.0$ ms) (Fig 7A). The group assignment is also shown in Table 1. The number of males and females were not significantly different between the two groups ($P = 0.55$). Subjects in group 2 with a higher ET index were younger ($28 \pm 5$ years vs $39 \pm 8$ years, $P = 0.024$) (Fig 7B), had lower MAPs ($74 \pm 8$ mmHg vs $84 \pm 4$ mmHg, $P = 0.022$).
Table 3. GLM analysis.

| Parameter                        | Coefficient | 95% confidence interval | p value |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------|
| (A) Dependent variable: ET index |             |                         |         |
| (Intercept)                      | 273.15      | 194.77–351.54           | <0.001  |
| Age                              | -1.75       | -2.57–0.94              | <0.001  |
| Gender                           | 3.51        | -13.63–20.65            | 0.69    |
| BMI                              | 2.58        | -0.17–5.33              | 0.066   |
| MAP supine                       | -3.16       | -5.02–1.31              | 0.001   |
| HR supine                        | -0.30       | -0.96–0.36              | 0.37    |
| PWV ΔPAT Toe-Finger              | 4.49        | -5.95–14.92             | 0.40    |
| (B) Dependent variable: ΔET_{Toe-Finger} |     |                         |         |
| (Intercept)                      | 112.89      | -19.33–245.12           | 0.094   |
| Age                              | -0.75       | -2.13–0.62              | 0.28    |
| Gender                           | 4.32        | -24.59–33.23            | 0.77    |
| BMI                              | -1.90       | -6.54–2.74              | 0.42    |
| MAP supine                       | 0.75        | -2.38–3.87              | 0.64    |
| HR supine                        | 1.37        | 0.25–2.48               | 0.016   |
| PWV ΔPAT Toe-Finger              | -21.29      | -38.88–3.69             | 0.018   |

GLM: generalized linear model; ET: ejection time; BMI: body mass index; HR: heart rate; MAP: mean arterial pressure; PWV: pulse wave velocity; PAT: pulse arrival time.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187781.t003

(Fig 7E), and tended to have lower $\text{PWV}_{\Delta \text{PAT \ Toe-Finger}}$ (5.96±1.23 m/s vs 7.16±0.69 m/s, $P = 0.18$) (Fig 7F) compared to the subjects in group 1 with a lower ET index. BMI, HR, and $\Delta \text{PWV}_{\text{Standing-Supine}}$ were not different between the two groups ($P = 0.43$, $P = 0.33$, and $P > 0.99$ respectively) (Fig 7C, 7D and 7G).

Lastly, we divided all subjects into two groups according to their percentile rank of the $\Delta \text{ET}_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ in the supine position to investigate if $\Delta \text{ET}_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ could differentiate a more compliant from a less compliant vasculature similar to the ET index (S4A Fig). We found that subjects in group 2 with a higher $\Delta \text{ET}_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$ tended to be younger (30±10 years vs 36±5 years, $P = 0.11$) (S4B Fig), have lower MAPs (76±8 mmHg vs 81±9 mmHg, $P = 0.26$) (S4E Fig), and lower $\text{PWV}_{\Delta \text{PAT \ Toe-Finger}}$ (6.12±1.18 m/s vs 6.98±1.03 m/s, $P = 0.25$) (S4F Fig) compared to subjects in group 1 with a lower $\Delta \text{ET}_{\text{Toe-Finger}}$. However, this didn’t reach statistical significance.

**Discussion**

In this study we found that ejection times at the ear, finger, and toe are different for the same heartbeat and become longer as the measurement site distance from the heart increases. Furthermore, the ejection times at individual measurement sites are different in different positions: longest in the supine position and shortest in the standing position. As a result, the difference between ET at different locations ($\Delta \text{ET}$) for the same heartbeat is maximal for the toe versus the ear in the supine position. This difference becomes smallest in the standing position for all pairs of locations. Moreover we show that this difference in ETs ($\Delta \text{ET}$) is distinct in different subjects and correlates with age, blood pressure, PWV, and the corresponding pulse arrival times. Consistent with our hypothesis we found that higher values for $\Delta \text{ET}$ in the supine position are generally observed in younger patients with lower MAPs and lower PWVs indicating that the prolongation of the ET at more distal sites (e.g. the toe) compared to more proximal sites (e.g. the ear or finger) might represent novel index of vascular properties.
Our results add further knowledge to two recent studies which demonstrated that LVET correlates with cf-PWV \[17,18\]. They speculated that the initial speed of the resultant pressure wave is mainly determined by the velocity of myocardial shortening which in turn is a function of myocardial wall movement and the duration of left ventricular ejection. Thus, an increase in LVET is correlated with a decrease in cf-PWV \[17\]. Since our study focused on peripherally measured ETs and we calculated ΔET for the same heartbeat, this variable is independent from the true ET (LVET), making our study substantially different from previous studies.

We report a PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger as $6.5 \pm 1.2$ m/s which is 1.5 m/s higher than previously reported MRI based aortic PWV values \[19\]. We believe that the main reason for this is that large vessels (e.g. aorta) have lower PWVs compared to the smaller diameter peripheral vessels \[20\]. PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger is based on a vascular path length which includes both large and small vessels (central aorta and peripheral arteries). That is why the presented PWV is higher than PWV in aorta as reported in MRI based studies. Furthermore, a large multi-center study on normal carotid-femoral PWV as measured by tonometry demonstrated values of 6.1 m/s in healthy less than 30 years old individuals and 6.6 m/s in 30 to 40 years old individuals \[21\]. Our results are therefore comparable to previously reported carotid-femoral PWV values.

---

**Fig 7. The comparison between group 1 and group 2.** Subjects were divided into two groups according to their percentile rank of the ET index: group 1 had low ET index and group 2 had high ET index (A). Each graph showing the distribution of age (B), BMI (C), HR in supine (D), MAP supine (E), PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger supine (F), and ΔPWV Standing-Supine (G) in group 1 and group 2. Each graph represents the individual data points and superimposes a horizontal line at the arithmetic mean; error bars showing plus and minus one SD. ET: ejection time; BMI: body mass index; HR: heart rate; MAP: mean arterial pressure; PWV: pulse wave velocity; SD: standard deviation.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187781.g007
Our group has shown previously that postural changes significantly affect PAT to different locations, most likely due to changes in the vasculature’s distending pressure and wall tension associated with changing positions from supine to sitting and standing [12]. Our group also reported that a peripherally measured ET derived from the radial arterial waveform is longer than the centrally measured ET derived from CW Doppler through the aortic valve [11]. We showed that prolongation of the ET at a peripheral site becomes more pronounced at lower BPs and PWVs suggesting a modulating effect of the vasculature on the central ventricular ejection time [11]. Similarly we believe that the observed difference between ETs at two different peripheral locations appears to be due to the modulating effect of the vasculature on the original central ET and represents intrinsic vascular properties.

Given that the ΔET is longest in the supine position and shortest when standing we looked at the difference (ET index) in individual subjects as a potential marker to distinguish a compliant from a stiff vasculature. By definition, a compliant vasculature is more distensible than a stiff vasculature, the influence of postural changes on ET prolongation should be larger in subjects with a compliant vasculature compared to those with a stiff vasculature. There should also be a significant prolongation of the ET measured at the toe in the supine position if the vasculature is compliant. Indeed both ΔET and ET index are longer in young people with lower blood pressure and lower PWV. Interestingly change in PWV between supine and standing (ΔPWV) does not correlate with either the ET index or ΔET. In contrast to the ET index, ΔPWVStanding-Supine does not correlate with age, MAP nor PWV, suggesting that the ET index better reflects intrinsic vascular properties. Moreover, the ΔPWVStanding-Supine difference between the most compliant (8.89 m/s) and stiffest (3.88 m/s) subjects was only differed by a factor of 2, whereas the ET index (79.9 ms in compliant and 15.5 ms in stiff) differed by a factor of 5 for the same subjects indicating that our novel parameter might potentially be more sensitive to assess arterial stiffness, and vascular properties.

Given that the ΔET in the standing position was small in most subjects and the ET index is different between ΔET in the supine vs standing position, we investigated if ΔET in the supine position alone will have comparable to the ET index correlation with age, MAP, and PWV. In fact ΔET in the supine position had a better correlation with PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger than ET index, however, worse correlation with age and MAP.

We also found that ΔET correlates with the corresponding ΔPAT and PWV. Both ΔPATToe-Finger and PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger have been reported as a good alternatives for the measurement of arterial stiffness [16,22]. Alivon et al. demonstrated that PWVΔPAT Toe-Finger is significantly correlated with cf-PWV which can be considered as the current gold standard of arterial stiffness [16].

These findings suggest that both ΔET and ET index are potential novel markers of vascular properties and support the notion that intra-vascular hydrostatic changes associated with changing position from supine to standing corresponds to significant changes in wall tension and vascular properties. Moreover ΔET and the ET index appear to be more sensitive markers compared to changes in PWV between the supine and standing positions.

Our study has several limitations. We used plethysmography with ECG gating for pulse wave detection. This technique estimates global stiffness along the aortic-peripheral vessel tract rather than stiffness in a specific portion of the vascular tree (e.g. central aorta). The study was conducted on only adult self-reported healthy volunteers. The number of subjects included in the study was small. However it was more than two times higher compared to the calculated sample size. The plethysmograph signal is known to be susceptible to various external or internal influences, including motion artifact, vascular tone and contacting force [23,24]. One subject who met all the inclusion criteria had to be excluded from the study because of the poor quality of plethysmograph trace. We used PWV based on PAT to toe and
finger rather than cf-PWV. Also, we assumed the vascular path length from a body surface measurement, namely the distance from sternal notch to each peripheral location. This might have introduced bias in all PWV measurements. Some of these limitations can be mitigated by MRI measurement, which provides a precise measurement of vascular path length and arterial stiffness in the central aorta, albeit with loss of temporal resolution [25].

**Conclusions**

ETs are different at different peripheral locations for the same heartbeat: the further the site of measurement from the heart, the longer the ET. Consisting with our hypotheses, prolongation of the ET at a distal site compared to a proximal site of measurement is much more pronounced in subjects with more compliant vasculature and in the supine position. The ET difference between two peripheral locations (ΔET) correlates with the corresponding PWV, MAP, and age suggesting that the ET difference represents the underlying vascular properties. Similarly, the difference between ΔET in the supine and standing position (ET index) represents the dynamic hydrostatic blood pressure change that correlates with the corresponding PWV, MAP, and age suggesting that the ET difference represents the underlying vascular properties. We propose ΔET as a potential novel real-time continuous and non-invasive parameter of vascular properties, and the ET index as a potential non-invasive parameter of vascular reactivity. Given that this study is an exploratory pilot study, confirmatory evaluations in an adequately large population of subjects of different ages are needed to validate these results. ΔET could be easily extracted from real-time non-invasive monitors of plethysmograph waveforms. The ET index could be quickly and easily obtained at an office setting for risk prediction and stratification. We envision that the ET based approach could be utilized for the assessment of vascular function in patients with hypertension to stratify them and to assess patient responses to different treatment options. Again, further studies are needed to investigate the utilities of ΔET and the ET index in patient monitoring and risk stratification in various clinical populations.

**Supporting information**

S1 Fig. Schematic representation of the electrocardiogram and plethysmograph waveforms at the ear, finger and toe in the standing, sitting and supine positions. The dots on the electrocardiogram waveforms indicate the peak of R wave, the dots on the plethysmograph waveforms indicate the beginning of the upstroke and dicrotic notch. ET defined between the start of upstroke and dicrotic notch on plethysmograph waveform is shaded gray. The waveform is representative from each location but the duration of ET and dots represent average time calculated from all subjects. ET: ejection time.

(TIF)

S2 Fig. Relationship between ΔET and ΔPAT (A, D, G), between ΔET and ΔDAT (B, E, H), between ΔDAT and ΔPAT (C, F, I) for each pair of locations (Toe-Ear: A, B, C, Toe-Finger: D, E, F, Finger-Ear: G, H, I). Each individual subject has three dots on the each graph which indicate mean values derived from the standing (black circles), sitting (gray triangles) and supine (white squares) positions. The dashed line indicates the linear regression line. The regression equation, the coefficient of determination (R²), and P value are presented. ET: ejection time; PAT: pulse arrival time; DAT: dicrotic notch arrival time.

(TIF)

S3 Fig. ΔPWV<sub>Standing-Supine</sub> and age, BMI, HR, MAP, PWV<sub>ΔPAT Toe-Finger</sub><sup>+</sup> (A) ΔPWV<sub>Standing-Supine</sub> as a function of age. (B) ΔPWV<sub>Standing-Supine</sub> as a function of BMI. (C)
ΔPWV_{Standing-Supine} as a function of HR measured in supine position. (D) ΔPWV_{Standing-Supine} as a function of MAP measured in supine position. (E) ΔPWV_{Standing-Supine} as a function of PWV_{ΔPAT Toe-Finger} in supine position. ΔPWV_{Standing-Supine} was calculated by subtracting the mean of PWV_{ΔPAT Toe-Finger} in supine from the mean of ΔPWV_{ΔPAT Toe-Finger} in standing for each individual subject. The dashed line indicates the simple linear regression line. The regression equation, the coefficient of determination (R^2), and P value are presented. PWV: pulse wave velocity; PAT: pulse arrival time; BMI: body mass index; HR: heart rate; MAP: mean arterial pressure.

(TIF)

S4 Fig. The comparison between the subjects with high ΔET and those with low ΔET. The subjects were divided into two groups according to their percentile rank of the ΔET_{Toe-Finger}: group 1 had lower ΔET_{Toe-Finger} and group 2 had higher ΔET_{Toe-Finger} (A). Each graph showing the distribution of age (B), BMI (C), HR in supine (D), MAP in supine (E), PWV_{ΔPAT Toe-Finger} in supine (F), and ΔPWV_{Standing-Supine} (G) in group 1 and group 2. Each graph represents the individual data points and superimposes a horizontal line at the arithmetic mean, and error bars showing plus and minus one SD. ET: ejection time; BMI: body mass index; HR: heart rate; MAP: mean arterial pressure; PWV: pulse wave velocity; SD: standard deviation.

(TIF)

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Viachaslau Barodka.

Formal analysis: Yurie Obata, Pavel Ruzankin, Viachaslau Barodka.

Methodology: Viachaslau Barodka.

Supervision: Dan E. Berkowitz.

Writing – original draft: Yurie Obata, Jochen Steppan, Viachaslau Barodka.

Writing – review & editing: Yurie Obata, Dan E. Berkowitz, Jochen Steppan, Viachaslau Barodka.

References

1. Steppan J, Barodka V, Berkowitz DE, Nyhan D. Vascular stiffness and increased pulse pressure in the aging cardiovascular system. Cardiology Research and Practice. 2011; 2011: 263585. https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/263585 PMID: 21845218

2. Laurent S, Cockcroft J, Van Bortel L, Boutouyrie P, Giannattasio C, Hayoz D, et al. Expert consensus document on arterial stiffness: methodological issues and clinical applications. European Heart Journal. 2006; 27: 2588–2605. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehl254 PMID: 17000623

3. Mancia G, Fagard R, Narkiewicz K, Redon J, Zanchetti A, Bo¨hm M, et al. 2013 ESH/ESC guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension: the Task Force for the Management of Hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). European Heart Journal. 2013; 34: 2159–2219. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/eht151 PMID: 23771844

4. Townsend RR, Wilkinson IB, Schiffrin EL, Avolio AP, Chirinos JA, Cockcroft JR, et al. Recommendations for Improving and Standardizing Vascular Research on Arterial Stiffness: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Hypertension. 2015; 66: 698–722. https://doi.org/10.1161/HYP.0000000000000033 PMID: 26160955

5. Steppan J, Sikka G, Jandu S, Barodka V, Halushka MK, Flavahan NA, et al. Exercise, vascular stiffness, and tissue transglutaminase. J Am Heart Assoc. 2014; 3: e000599. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.113.000599 PMID: 24721796

6. Ng K, Ng K, Hildreth CM, Hildreth CM, Phillips JK, Phillips JK, et al. Aortic stiffness is associated with vascular calcification and remodeling in a chronic kidney disease rat model. AJP: Renal Physiology. 2011; 300: F1431–F1436. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajprenal.00079.2011 PMID: 21478483
7. Shirai K, Utino J, Otsuka K, Takata M. A novel blood pressure-independent arterial wall stiffness parameter; cardio-ankle vascular index (CAVI). J Atheroscler Thromb. 2006; 13: 101–107. PMID: 16733298

8. Steppan J, Sikka G, Hori D, Nyhan D, Berkowitz DE, Gottschalk A, et al. Seeking a blood pressure-independent measure of vascular properties. Hypertens Res. 2015; 39: 27–38. https://doi.org/10.1038/hr.2015.109 PMID: 26490088

9. Lim J, Pearlman ME, Park W, Alkatan M, Machin DR, TANAKA H. Impact of blood pressure perturbations on arterial stiffness. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2015; 309: R1540–1545. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00368.2015 PMID: 26468262

10. Nichols WW. Clinical measurement of arterial stiffness obtained from noninvasive pressure waveforms. Am J Hypertens. 2005; 18: 3S–10S. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjhype r.2004.10.009 PMID: 15683725

11. Obata Y, Mizogami M, Singh S, Nyhan D, Berkowitz DE, Steppan J, et al. Ejection time: influence of hemodynamics and site of measurement in the arterial tree. Hypertens Res. 2017. https://doi.org/10.1038/hr.2017.43 PMID: 28356575

12. Obata Y, Ong QJ, Magruder JT, Grichkevitch H, Berkowitz DE, Nyhan D, et al. Noninvasive Assessment of the Effect of Position and Exercise on Pulse Arrival to Peripheral Vascular Beds in Healthy Volunteers. Front Physiol. 2017; 8: 47. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2017.00047 PMID: 28220077

13. Pan J, Tompkins WJ. A real-time QRS detection algorithm. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng. 1985; 32: 230–236. https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.1985.325532 PMID: 3997178

14. Phillips JP, Kyriacou PA. Comparison of methods for determining pulse arrival time from Doppler and photoplethysmography signals. Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2014; 2014: 3809–3812. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2014.6944453 PMID: 25570821

15. Elgendi M. On the analysis of fingertip photoplethysmogram signals. Curr Cardiol Rev. 2012; 8: 14–25. https://doi.org/10.2174/157340312801215782 PMID: 22845812

16. Alivon M, Vo-Duc Phuong T, Vignon V, Bozec E, Khettab H, Hanon O, et al. A novel device for measuring arterial stiffness using finger-toe pulse wave velocity: Validation study of the pOpmètre®. Arch Cardiovasc Dis. 2015; 108: 227–234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acvd.2014.12.003 PMID: 25682547

17. Nürnberger J, Opazo Saez A, Dammer S, Mitchell A, Wenzel RR, Philipp T, et al. Left ventricular ejection time: a potential determinant of pulse wave velocity in young, healthy males. J Hypertens. 2003; 21: 2125–2132. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.hjh.0000098125.00558.40 PMID: 14597856

18. Salvi P, Palombo C, Salvi GM, Labat C, Parati G, Benetos A. Left ventricular ejection time, not heart rate, is an independent correlate of aortic pulse wave velocity. J Appl Physiol. 2013; 115: 1610–1617. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00475.2013 PMID: 24052034

19. Wentland AL, Wieben O, François CJ, Boncyk C, Munoz Del Rio A, Johnson KM, et al. Aortic pulse wave velocity measurements with undersampled 4D flow-sensitive MRI: comparison with 2D and algorithm determination. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2013; 37: 853–859. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.23877 PMID: 23124585

20. Nichols W, O’Rourke M, Vlachopoulos C. McDonald’s Blood Flow in Arteries: Theoretical, Experimental and Clinical Principles. 6th edition. Hodder Arnold, London; 2011. pp. 77–109.

21. The Reference Values for Arterial Stiffness’ Collaboration. Determinants of pulse wave velocity in healthy people and in the presence of cardiovascular risk factors: “establishing normal and reference values”. European Heart Journal. 2010; 31: 2338–2350. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehq165 PMID: 20530030

22. Tsai WC, Chen JY, Wang MC, Wu HT, Chi CK, Chen YK, et al. Association of Risk Factors With Increased Pulse Wave Velocity Detected by a Novel Method Using Dual-Channel Photoplethysmography. Am J Hypertens. 2005; 18: 1118–1122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjhyper.2005.03.739 PMID: 16109327

23. Avolio A. The finger volume pulse and assessment of arterial properties. J Hypertens. 2002; 20: 2341–2343. PMID: 12473852

24. Teng XF, Zhang YT. The effect of contacting force on photoplethysmographic signals. Physiol Meas. 2004; 25: 1323–1335. PMID: 15535195

25. Wentland AL, Grist TM, Wieben O. Review of MRI-based measurements of pulse wave velocity: a biomarker of arterial stiffness. Cardiovasc Diagn Ther. 2014; 4: 193–206. https://doi.org/10.3978/j.issn.2223-3652.2014.03.04 PMID: 24834415