Risk Stratification by Self-Measured Home Blood Pressure across Categories of Conventional Blood Pressure: A Participant-Level Meta-Analysis
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Abstract

Background: The Global Burden of Diseases Study 2010 reported that hypertension is worldwide the leading risk factor for cardiovascular disease, causing 9.4 million deaths annually. We examined to what extent self-measurement of home blood pressure (HBP) refines risk stratification across increasing categories of conventional blood pressure (CBP).

Methods and Findings: This meta-analysis included 5,008 individuals randomly recruited from five populations (56.6% women; mean age, 57.1 y). All were not treated with antihypertensive drugs. In multivariable analyses, hazard ratios (HRs) associated with 10-mm Hg increases in systolic HBP were computed across CBP categories, using the following systolic/diastolic CBP thresholds (in mm Hg): optimal, <120/80; normal, 120–129/80–84; high-normal, 130–139/85–89; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100. Over 8.3 y, 522 participants died, and 414, 225, and 194 had cardiovascular, cardiac, and cerebrovascular events, respectively. In participants with optimal or normal CBP, HRs for a composite cardiovascular end point associated with a 10-mm Hg higher systolic HBP were 1.28 (1.01–1.62) and 1.22 (1.00–1.49), respectively. At high-normal CBP and in mild hypertension, the HRs were 1.24 (1.03–1.49) and 1.20 (1.06–1.37), respectively, for all cardiovascular events and 1.33 (1.07–1.65) and 1.30 (1.09–1.56), respectively, for stroke. In severe hypertension, the HRs were not significant (p ≥ 0.20). Among people with optimal, normal, and high-normal CBP, 67 (5.0%), 187 (18.4%), and 315 (30.3%), respectively, had masked hypertension (HBP ≥ 130 mm Hg systolic or ≥ 85 mm Hg diastolic). Compared to true optimal CBP, masked hypertension was associated with a 2.3-fold (1.5–3.5) higher cardiovascular risk. A limitation was few data from low- and middle-income countries.

Conclusions: HBP substantially refines risk stratification at CBP levels assumed to carry no or only mildly increased risk, in particular in the presence of masked hypertension. Randomized trials could help determine the best use of CBP vs. HBP in guiding BP management. Our study identified a novel indication for HBP, which, in view of its low cost and the increased availability of electronic communication, might be globally applicable, even in remote areas or in low-resource settings.

Please see later in the article for the Editors’ Summary.
Introduction

Current guidelines for the diagnosis and management of hypertension recommend risk stratification based on conventionally measured blood pressure, i.e., blood pressure measured in a medical environment [1,2]. European guidelines [1] categorize blood pressure as optimal, normal, high normal, and grades 1 to 3 of hypertension; US guidelines [2] classify blood pressure as normal, prehypertension, and stages 1 and 2 of hypertension (Table 1). Blood pressure self-measured at home is a more accurate prognosticator than conventionally measured blood pressure, because of the greater number of readings and the avoidance of the white-coat effect, as well as avoidance of measurement error through use of automated blood pressure monitors [3,4]. Affordable and validated automated monitors for blood pressure self-measurement are readily available.

The Global Burden of Diseases Study 2010 reported that high blood pressure is the leading risk factor for global disease burden, and is estimated to cause 9.4 million deaths every year—more than half of the estimated 17 million deaths a year caused by total cardiovascular disease [5]. To succeed in reducing the burden of hypertension [5,6], efforts should be targeted where they are needed most [7]. In line with this statement [7], we examined to what extent blood pressure self-monitoring succeeds in refining risk stratification within established categories of conventional blood pressure (CBP), in particular at levels assumed to be associated with no or only mildly increased risk [1,2]. We addressed the issue in an individual-participant meta-analysis of 5,008 people not being treated for hypertension randomly recruited from five populations and enrolled in the International Database of Home Blood Pressure in Relation to Cardiovascular Outcome (IDHOCO) [8,9].

Methods

Ethics Statement

All studies included in IDHOCO received ethical approval. They have been described in detail in peer-reviewed publications. All participants gave informed written consent.

Search Strategy and Study Inclusion Criteria

Figure 1 describes the selection of studies and participants based on electronic searches of the literature done in February 2012 before publication of the IDHOCO protocol [8] and repeated in July 2013. We searched the PubMed database, using as initial search terms (home blood pressure OR self-measured blood pressure) AND population AND ("1980/01/01"[Date - Publication] : "2012/02/28"[Date - Publication]), yielding 791 publications. We then limited the search as follows: NOT review[Publication Type] AND general population, resulting in 172 hits. Two authors (K. A. and T. J. N.) independently reviewed titles and abstracts. Studies were eligible for inclusion if they met the following criteria: (1) baseline information on conventional and self-measured blood pressure and cardiovascular risk factors was available; (2) the study was reported as an original research study in a peer-reviewed publication; (3) the study was published between 1 January 1980 and 28 February 2012; (4) the study involved a general population sample; and (5) the subsequent follow-up included both fatal and nonfatal outcomes. After eliminating duplicate population cohorts, the two authors (K. A. and T. J. N.) excluded 57 articles because no home blood pressure (HBP) was measured ($n = 34$), HBP was not self-measured ($n = 4$), the study included patients instead of a population sample ($n = 7$), or cardiovascular outcome was not collected ($n = 12$). J. A. S. and K. A. assessed nine studies in detail [10–18] and further eliminated three population cohorts, because no outcome data had been collected [10], only fatal outcomes had been recorded [14], or individual-participant data were unavailable [12].

Study Population

At the time of writing this report, IDHOCO included six eligible population cohorts [11,13,15–18] and 8,486 participants (Table 2). We discarded one cohort because data on cause-specific mortality were still being collected [18]. Of the remaining 6,753 participants, we excluded 1,745 because they were on antihypertensive drug treatment initiated before enrollment based on CBP measurement ($n = 1,465$), because fewer than two measurements of their CBP or HBP were on record ($n = 270$), or because...
Blood Pressure Measurement

Data Collection

IDHOCO was constructed and maintained at the Studies Coordinating Centre in Leuven, Belgium, in accordance with Belgian legislation on the protection of privacy [8]. Investigators provided anonymous information on each participant in electronic format. After integration of the information into the overarching database, investigators received detailed summary statistics on their own cohort. This procedure ensured that the common database incorporated unbiased information without conflicts between the originally published reports [11,13,15–17] and results generated for individual studies as part of the current meta-analysis.

Blood Pressure Measurement

CBP was measured with a standard mercury sphygmomanometer (Mercuro 300 [17] or Baumanometer [15]), an automatic auscultatory (Elquest USM-700F [11]), or a validated oscillometric monitor (Omrorn Form ABI/PWV [16] or Omron HEM-705CP [13]), using the appropriate cuff size, with the participant in the sitting or supine position. The CBP was the average of two consecutive readings obtained at an examination center. Next, we classified the CBP according to the generally accepted thresholds that are available in the European [1] and US [2] guidelines. Optimal blood pressure was a level below 120 mm Hg systolic and below 80 mm Hg diastolic. For normal and high-normal blood pressure and mild hypertension, systolic/diastolic levels encompassed 120–129/80–84 mm Hg, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg, and 140–159/90–99 mm Hg, respectively. Severe hypertension was a level of 160 mm Hg systolic or 100 mm Hg diastolic or higher. An additional category, prehypertension, combines participants with normal and high-normal blood pressure (120–139 mm Hg systolic or 80–89 mm Hg diastolic). When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, we assigned the participant to the higher category.

All participants measured their blood pressure at home after 2–5 min of rest in the sitting position with a validated oscillometric device (Omrorn HEM-722G [17], Omron HEM-705CP [15], Omron HEM-401C [11], Omron HEM-747 [16], or SpaceLabs 90207 [13]) using the appropriate cuff size. Each participant’s HBP was the average of all available readings. Masked hypertension was a CBP of less than 140 mm Hg systolic and 90 mm Hg diastolic in the presence of a HBP of 130 mm Hg systolic or 85 mm Hg diastolic or higher [1,9]. In sensitivity analyses, we also used 135 mm Hg as the systolic threshold for HBP to define masked hypertension [1,2].

Other Measurements

Via questionnaires, we obtained information on each participant’s medical history and smoking habits. Body mass index was body weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared. Biochemical measurements included serum cholesterol and blood glucose. Information on serum total cholesterol level was not available for the Didima population and was, as in previous publications [8,9], extrapolated from data provided by the ATTICA study investigators by sex and 10-y age strata. The ATTICA study population was a large population cohort examined in the same time period and in the same geographical area as the Didima cohort [19,20]. Diabetes mellitus was defined as the use of antidiabetic drugs, a fasting blood glucose concentration of at least 7.0 mmol/l [21], a random blood glucose concentration of at least 11.1 mmol/l [21], a self-reported diagnosis, or diabetes documented in practice or hospital records.

Ascertainment of Events

We ascertained vital status and incidence of fatal and nonfatal diseases from the appropriate sources in each country, as described in detail in a previous publication [8]. Fatal and nonfatal stroke did not include transient ischemic attacks. Cardiac events comprised fatal and nonfatal myocardial infarction, death because of ischemic heart disease, sudden death, fatal and nonfatal heart failure, surgical and percutaneous coronary revascularization, pacemaker implantation, and other cardiac deaths. The composite cardiovascular end point included cardiovascular mortality, cerebrovascular, and cardiac end points. In all outcome analyses, we considered only the first occurrence per participant in each event category.

Statistical Analysis

For database management and statistical analysis, we used SAS software, version 9.3 (SAS Institute). We compared means and proportions using the standard normal z-test for large samples or ANOVA and the χ² statistic, respectively. Statistical significance was α level less than 0.05 on two-sided tests. We plotted incidence rates by the five categories of CBP, while standardizing by the direct method for sex and age (<40, 40–59, and ≥60 y).

Table 1. Classification of conventional blood pressure according to European and American guidelines and the current study.

| Systolic BP (mm Hg) | Diastolic BP (mm Hg) | Blood Pressure Categories | European Guideline [1] | American Guideline [2] | Current Study |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| ≤120                | ≤80                  | Optimal                   | Normal                 | Optimal                |              |
| 120–129             | 80–84                | Normal                    | Prehypertension        | Normal                 |              |
| 130–139             | 85–89                | High normal               | Prehypertension        | High-normal            |              |
| 140–159             | 90–99                | Grade 1 hypertension      | Stage 1 hypertension   | Mild hypertension      |              |
| 160–179             | 100–109              | Grade 2 hypertension      | Stage 2 hypertension   | Severe hypertension    |              |
| ≥180                | ≥110                 | Grade 3 hypertension      | Stage 2 hypertension   | Severe hypertension    |              |

BP indicates blood pressure.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t001
We used Cox proportional hazards models to compute hazard ratios (HRs), while adjusting for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, and history of cardiovascular disease and diabetes mellitus as fixed effects. We checked the proportional hazards assumption and the functional forms of the covariates using the Kolmogorov-type supremum test, as implemented in the PROC PHREG procedure of the SAS package. In multivariable-adjusted Cox proportional hazards models, we explored whether, within each category of CBP, HBP analyzed as continuous variable refined risk.

Figure 1. Flow diagram of selected studies and participants. Electronic searches of the literature were performed in February 2012 before publication of the IDHOCO protocol [8] and were repeated in July 2013. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.g001
stratification. We derived HRs that expressed the change in risk associated with increases in the systolic and diastolic HBP of 10 and 5 mm Hg, respectively. In sensitivity analyses, we computed the differences in the HRs between subgroups by introducing the appropriate interaction term in the Cox proportional hazards models. Finally, we computed multivariable-adjusted HRs comparing the risk of masked hypertension in participants with optimal, normal, or high-normal CBP with the risk incurred by participants with optimal CBP without masked hypertension. We tested heterogeneity in the HRs among the three subgroups with masked hypertension by testing an ordinal variable coding for these subgroups among participants with masked hypertension.

Results

Baseline Characteristics

Of 5,008 participants, 2,834 (56.6%) were female, 2,115 (42.2%) were 60 y or older, 1,148 (22.9%) were current smokers, 317 (6.3%) had diabetes mellitus, and 327 (6.5%) had a history of cardiovascular disease. Age averaged 57.1 y (standard deviation [SD], 13.6). Across all participants, CBP averaged 130.9 (SD, 19.7) mm Hg systolic and 77.9 (SD, 11.5) mm Hg diastolic. The corresponding means for HBP were 123.9 (SD, 17.2) mm Hg and 74.9 (SD, 9.8) mm Hg. The mean self-measured HBP was therefore 7.0 mm Hg (95% CI, 6.5–7.4; \( p \leq 0.0001 \)) and 3.0 mm Hg (95% CI, 2.8–3.3; \( p \leq 0.0001 \)) lower than mean CBP. Table 3 lists the baseline characteristics of the 5,008 participants by CBP category. All of the ANOVA and \( \chi^2 \) statistic \( p \)-values for differences across the five categories were significant (\( p \leq 0.015 \)) except for the prevalence of smoking (\( p = 0.083 \)).

Incidence of Events

Median follow-up was 8.3 y (5th to 95th percentile interval, 4.7 to 16.8) and ranged by study from 5.5 y (2.3 to 5.6) in Tsurugaya to 11.9 y (3.8 to 16.9) in Ohasama (Table 2). During 46,593 person-years of follow-up, 522 participants died (11.2 per 1,000 person-years), and 414 experienced a fatal or nonfatal cardiovascular event (9.1 per 1,000 person-years). Considering cause-specific first cardiovascular events, the incidence of stroke and cardiac events amounted to 225 (4.9 per 1,000 person-years) and 194 (4.2 per 1,000 person-years), respectively.

Risk Associated with Increasing Categories of Conventional Blood Pressure

Figure 2 displays the Kaplan-Meier survival function estimates. The log-rank test for difference across the categories of CBP was highly significant for all of the end points under study (\( p \leq 0.0001 \)). Similarly, incidence rates standardized by the direct method for sex and age (\( <40, 40–49, \) and \( \geq 60 \) y) increased across the categories of CBP (Figure 3; \( p \leq 0.0009 \)). The multivariable-adjusted HRs, expressing the risk compared with optimal blood pressure (Table 4), increased with higher categories of CBP for total mortality (\( p = 0.011 \)) as well as for fatal combined with nonfatal outcomes (\( p \leq 0.0004 \)).

Risk Associated with Home Blood Pressure by Category of Conventional Blood Pressure

Among participants with an optimal CBP, the multivariable-adjusted HRs associated with a 10-mm Hg increment in home systolic blood pressure were 1.21 (95% CI, 1.00–1.46) and 1.28

---

Table 2. Population sampling methods in IDHOCO cohorts.

| Catchment Area [Reference] | Sampling Frame | Starting Point | Recruitment Period | Number in IDHOCO Database | Number Analyzed | Length of Follow-Up (Year) | Number of Follow-Up Events |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Finland (nationwide) [17]  | Two-stage cluster sample of people aged 45–74 y | Population register to represent Finnish adults | 2000–2001 | 2,075 | 1,605 | 8.1 (7.3–9.3) | 227 |
| Dijon, France [18]        | Randomly selected people aged \( \geq 65 \) y | Electoral rolls list | 2006–2008 | 1,733 | 1,312 | 11.0 (8.9–14.1) | 122 |
| Didima, Argolida of Peloponnesus, Greece [15] | Local registry | Local registry | 1997–1998 | 665 | 458 | 8.1 (7.3–8.9) | 58 |
| Tsurugaya, Sendai, Japan [16] | Address list | Address list | 2002 | 2,777 | 2,010 | 11.9 (3.8–16.9) | 128 |
| Ohasama, Iwate prefecture, Japan [11] | Address list | Address list | 1988–1995 | 1,774 | 1,354 | 11.9 (3.8–16.9) | 128 |
| Montevideo, Uruguay [13] | Age-stratified random sample | Members of a health insurance medical care institution | 1996–1998 | 400 | 356 | 8.9 (5.7–10.6) | 57 |

Median (5th to 95th percentile interval). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t002
Risk Stratification by HBP and CBP

Table 3. Participants characteristics according to conventional blood pressure categories.

| Characteristic                   | Optimal (n = 1,337) | Normal (n = 1,015) | High-Normal (n = 1,038) | Mild Hypertension (n = 1,126) | Severe Hypertension (n = 492) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number (percent) with characteristic |                     |                    |                         |                               |                               |
| Women                            | 900 (67.3)          | 570 (56.2)         | 538 (51.8)*             | 573 (50.9)                    | 253 (51.4)                     |
| Current smoking                  | 333 (24.9)          | 238 (23.5)         | 243 (23.4)              | 236 (21.0)                    | 98 (19.9)                      |
| Diabetes mellitus                | 60 (4.5)            | 64 (6.3)           | 74 (7.1)                | 79 (7.0)                      | 40 (8.1)                       |
| Previous cardiovascular diseases | 70 (5.2)            | 55 (5.4)           | 68 (6.6)                | 97 (8.6)                      | 37 (7.5)                       |
| White (race)                     | 724 (54.2)          | 457 (45.0)*        | 488 (47.0)              | 589 (52.3)*                   | 271 (55.1)                     |
| Mean (SD) of characteristic      |                     |                    |                         |                               |                               |
| Age (years)                      | 50.9 (14.1)         | 56.1 (12.8)        | 58.5 (12.5)             | 61.0 (12.1)                   | 64.1 (11.6)                    |
| Body mass index (kg/m²)          | 23.9 (3.6)          | 24.7 (3.8)         | 25.4 (4.0)†             | 26.1 (4.3)†                   | 26.6 (4.6)‡                    |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/l)       | 5.19 (0.95)         | 5.38 (1.00)        | 5.43 (1.06)             | 5.62 (1.12)†                  | 5.87 (1.22)‡                   |
| Conventional systolic pressure (mm Hg) | 109.0 (7.6)      | 123.3 (4.5)‡       | 132.5 (5.5)‡            | 145.6 (7.6)‡                  | 168.6 (14.7)‡                  |
| Conventional diastolic pressure (mm Hg) | 76.6 (6.8)     | 74.3 (6.6)‡        | 78.9 (7.8)‡             | 85.3 (8.3)‡                   | 94.8 (10.9)‡                   |
| Home systolic pressure (mm Hg)   | 110.3 (10.9)        | 119.3 (12.1)‡      | 124.4 (12.4)‡           | 133.8 (14.5)‡                 | 146.5 (17.7)‡                  |
| Home diastolic pressure (mm Hg)  | 68.2 (7.6)          | 73.1 (8.0)‡        | 75.4 (8.0)‡             | 79.7 (8.7)‡                   | 84.8 (10.1)‡                   |

White (race) included Finns, Greeks and Uruguayans. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, 120/80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. All of the ANOVA and xt² statistic p-values for differences across the five categories were significant (p<0.015) except for the prevalence of smoking (p=0.083). Significance of the difference with the adjacent lower category of CBP: *p<0.05; †p<0.001; and ‡p<0.0001.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t003

(95% CI, 1.01–1.62) for total mortality and cardiovascular events. The corresponding HRs among participants with normal CBP were 1.10 (95% CI, 0.99–1.40) and 1.22 (95% CI, 1.00–1.49), respectively. The home systolic blood pressure also predicted the composite cardiovascular end point and stroke (Table 5) in participants with high-normal blood pressure, prehypertension, and mild hypertension. For these categories, the HRs for the composite cardiovascular end point were 1.24 (95% CI, 1.03–1.49), 1.24 (95% CI, 1.09–1.41), and 1.20 (95% CI, 1.06–1.37), respectively, and for stroke were 1.33 (95% CI, 1.07–1.63), 1.27 (95% CI, 1.08–1.50), and 1.30 (95% CI, 1.09–1.56), respectively. However, in participants with severe hypertension, the HBP did not significantly add to the prediction of any end point under study (p≥0.20). The home diastolic blood pressure was a weak and inconsistent predictor across the categories of CBP (Table 6).

Excluding one cohort at a time or stratifying participants by sex, ethnicity, or age (<60 versus ≥60 y) confirmed the main analyses of home systolic blood pressure, as reported in Tables 7 and 8.

Characteristics of Participants with Masked Hypertension

Participants with masked hypertension according to the 130/85 mm Hg threshold, compared with participants with true optimal, normal, or high-normal blood pressure (Table 9), were more likely to be male (53.7% versus 38.7%; p<0.0001), to smoke (29.6% versus 23.3%; p=0.0053), to have diabetes mellitus (11.6% versus 5.1%; p<0.0001) or a history of cardiovascular disease (9.1% versus 5.2%; p=0.0015), and to be older (62.8 versus 53.7 y; p<0.0001) and more obese (26.5 versus 24.4 kg/m²; p<0.0001).

Risk Conferred by Masked Hypertension

Using 130/85 mm Hg as threshold for HBP to define masked hypertension (Figure 4; Table 9), the number of participants with masked hypertension amounted to 67 (5.0%), 187 (18.4%), and 315 (30.3%) among participants with optimal, normal, and high-normal blood pressure, respectively. In these three categories of participants with masked hypertension, with optimal blood pressure without masked hypertension as reference, the multivariable-adjusted HRs for total mortality were 2.21 (95% CI, 1.27–3.85), 1.57 (95% CI, 1.02–2.41), and 1.54 (95% CI, 1.07–2.25), respectively. The corresponding HRs for the composite cardiovascular end point were 2.65 (95% CI, 1.30–5.34), 2.25 (95% CI, 1.08–4.67), and 1.35 (95% CI, 1.01–1.83), respectively.

Using 135/85 mm Hg as the HBP threshold to define masked hypertension (Figure 5; Table 10), the number of participants with masked hypertension amounted to 233 (22.4%) among participants with optimal, normal, and high-normal blood pressure, respectively. In these three categories of participants with masked hypertension, with optimal blood pressure without masked hypertension as reference, the multivariable-adjusted HRs for total mortality were 1.91 (95% CI, 0.98–3.74), 1.57 (95% CI, 1.04–2.63), and 1.47 (95% CI, 0.96–2.22), respectively. The corresponding HRs for the composite cardiovascular end point were 2.65 (95% CI, 1.30–5.34), 2.25 (95% CI, 1.08–4.67), and 1.35 (95% CI, 1.01–1.83), respectively.
Discussion

Current guidelines for the diagnosis and management of hypertension [1,2] stratify risk and treatment decisions based on defined categories of CBP (Table 1), as measured in a medical environment. Self-measured HBP or ambulatory blood pressure is a more accurate prognosticator than CBP. Expert committees therefore recommend the use of out-of-the-office blood pressure measurement to confirm the diagnosis of hypertension and assess treatment effects [1,2]. The key finding of our current study is that HBP substantially refines risk stratification at levels of CBP that are presumably associated with no or only mildly elevated risk. In

Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier survival function estimates by five categories of conventional blood pressure in 5,008 participants. (A) indicates risk for total mortality, and (B–D) indicate risks for cardiovascular events, stroke, and cardiac events, respectively. CBP categories were optimal (<120/<80 mm Hg), normal (120–129/80–84 mm Hg), high-normal (130–139/85–89 mm Hg), mild hypertension (140–159/90–99 mm Hg), and severe hypertension ($\geq160/$\geq100 mm Hg). When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. The significance of the log-rank test for difference across the five categories was significant ($p<0.0001$) for all of the end points.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.g002
hypertension. HT, contributing to the rates is presented. The blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. The participant was assigned to the higher category. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category.

### Table 4. Risks associated with increasing categories of conventional blood pressure.

| End Point          | Statistic       | CBP Category               |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
|                    |                 | Optimal                     | Normal | High-Normal | Mild Hypertension | Severe Hypertension |
| Total mortality    | Number (percent)| 90 (6.7)                    | 101 (10.0) | 124 (12.0) | 127 (11.3) | 80 (16.3) |
|                    | HR (95% CI)     | 1.00                        | 1.15 (0.86–1.53) | 1.16 (0.88–1.53) | 1.13 (0.86–1.49) | 1.71 (1.25–2.33)†, ‡ 0.011 |
| Cardiovascular     | Number (percent)| 53 (4.0)                    | 70 (6.9) | 85 (8.2) | 124 (11.0) | 82 (16.7) |
|                    | HR (95% CI)     | 1.00                        | 1.33 (0.93–1.90) | 1.33 (0.94–1.89) | 1.76 (1.26–2.45)† | 2.59 (1.81–3.73)‡, †< 0.0001 |
| Stroke             | Number (percent)| 26 (1.9)                    | 40 (3.9) | 57 (5.5) | 68 (6.0) | 34 (6.9) |
|                    | HR (95% CI)     | 1.00                        | 1.56 (0.95–2.57) | 1.89 (1.18–3.02)* | 2.24 (1.41–3.56)† | 2.72 (1.60–4.62)‡, †< 0.0001 |
| Cardiac events     | Number (percent)| 27 (2.0)                    | 31 (3.1) | 29 (2.8) | 59 (5.2) | 48 (9.8) |
|                    | HR (95% CI)     | 1.00                        | 1.16 (0.69–1.96) | 0.86 (0.51–1.47) | 1.42 (0.88–2.28) | 2.40 (1.46–3.96)†, †< 0.0004 |

Number and HR indicate the number of end points (percentage rate) and HR (95% confidence interval), respectively. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. HRs express the risk compared with optimal blood pressure (reference). HRs were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. The p-value refers to linear trend across the blood pressure categories.

Significance of the HRs:
- *p < 0.01*
- †p < 0.001
- ‡p < 0.0001

See doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t004 for more details.
but with unexplained signs of hypertensive target organ damage. Monitoring should also be carried out in people with a normal CBP older age, obesity, smoking, and diabetes mellitus [24,25]. HBP would qualify for HBP monitoring are above optimal levels of CBP, cardiovascular complications. Risk factors that identify people who should be included in the strategy of primary prevention of individuals at risk for masked hypertension, HBP monitoring of masked hypertension. Consequently, we suggest that in optimal, normal, or high-normal CBP, in particular in the presence of normotensive people not being treated for hypertension with that HBP monitoring substantially refines risk stratification in determined by CBP [26]. In our current analysis, we demonstrated for instance, of all strokes, three-fourths occur in individuals with hypertensive patients, but in normotensive people as well, so that, even in treated normotensive people. Our current findings have important implications for clinical practice. The relation between cardiovascular complications and blood pressure is continuous at least down to a CBP level of 115 mm Hg systolic or 75 mm Hg diastolic [26]. The continuous nature of the relation with blood pressure holds true not only in hypertensive patients, but in normotensive people as well, so that, for instance, of all strokes, three-fourths occur in individuals with normal CBP and only one-fourth in patients with hypertension as determined by CBP [26]. In our current analysis, we demonstrated that HBP monitoring substantially refines risk stratification in normotensive people not being treated for hypertension with optimal, normal, or high-normal CBP, in particular in the presence of masked hypertension. Consequently, we suggest that in individuals at risk for masked hypertension, HBP monitoring should be included in the strategy of primary prevention of cardiovascular complications. Risk factors that identify people who would qualify for HBP monitoring are above optimal levels of CBP, older age, obesity, smoking, and diabetes mellitus [24,25]. HBP monitoring should also be carried out in people with a normal CBP but with unexplained signs of hypertensive target organ damage.

Using HBP measurement to screen for masked hypertension is probably cost-effective. Fukunaga and coworkers studied the cost-effectiveness of HBP measurement from the perspective of the Japanese health care system, using simulations based on the Ohasama population study [27]. Depending on the model applied, estimates of the cost savings produced by applying HBP measurement ranged from US$674,000 to US$2.51 million per 5,000 person-years. Two trials of adjusting treatment based on out-of-the-office blood pressure measurement [28,29] also reported cost savings compared to conventional sphygmomanometry, by using either ambulatory monitoring [28] or self-measurement [29] of blood pressure.

Our individual-participant meta-analysis is clearly an advance over previous publications in the research field of risk stratification based on blood pressure. To our knowledge, our study is the first to assess the risk associated with self-measured HBP across increasing categories of CBP. It raises the issue that the economic analysis of HBP monitoring should be based on cost-savings not only via the avoidance of unnecessary treatment [27–29], but foremost via the addition of quality and years to life in those at

| Category of CBP | HR (95% CI) |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Total Mortality | Cardiovascular Events | Stroke | Cardiac Events |
| Optimal         | 1.21 (1.00–1.46)* | 1.28 (1.01–1.62)* | 1.26 (0.88–1.79) | 1.25 (0.90–1.72) |
| Normal          | 1.18 (0.99–1.40) | 1.22 (1.00–1.49)* | 1.16 (0.89–1.53) | 1.29 (0.95–1.75) |
| High-normal     | 1.01 (0.86–1.18) | 1.24 (1.03–1.49)* | 1.33 (1.07–1.65)† | 1.03 (0.74–1.43) |
| Prehypertension | 1.08 (0.96–1.21) | 1.24 (1.09–1.41)† | 1.27 (1.08–1.50)† | 1.15 (0.93–1.44) |
| Mild hypertension | 1.04 (0.92–1.18) | 1.20 (1.06–1.37)† | 1.30 (1.09–1.56)† | 1.13 (0.94–1.36) |
| Severe hypertension | 0.95 (0.83–1.09) | 0.95 (0.83–1.08) | 1.00 (0.82–1.23) | 0.89 (0.74–1.06) |
| Hypertension    | 1.04 (0.96–1.14) | 1.12 (1.02–1.22)* | 1.19 (1.05–1.35)† | 1.05 (0.93–1.20) |

Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. The category prehypertension includes participants with normal and high-normal blood pressure, and the category hypertension includes participants with mild and severe hypertension. The number of people at risk and the number of events are given in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

HRs reflect the risk associated with a 5-mm Hg increase in home diastolic pressure. HRs were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Significance of the HRs: *p<0.05 and †p<0.01. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t006

| Category of CBP | HR (95% CI) |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Total Mortality | Cardiovascular Events | Stroke | Cardiac Events |
| Optimal         | 1.04 (0.91–1.19) | 1.07 (0.89–1.29) | 0.95 (0.72–1.24) | 1.19 (0.92–1.55) |
| Normal          | 1.01 (0.89–1.14) | 1.03 (0.88–1.20) | 1.02 (0.83–1.26) | 1.05 (0.82–1.35) |
| High-normal     | 0.95 (0.84–1.06) | 1.09 (0.95–1.26) | 1.11 (0.94–1.31) | 1.00 (0.77–1.31) |
| Prehypertension | 0.98 (0.90–1.07) | 1.07 (0.97–1.19) | 1.08 (0.95–1.23) | 1.03 (0.86–1.24) |
| Mild hypertension | 1.02 (0.92–1.13) | 1.21 (1.09–1.34)† | 1.26 (1.10–1.44)† | 1.13 (0.96–1.33) |
| Severe hypertension | 0.90 (0.80–1.02) | 0.91 (0.81–1.04) | 1.04 (0.87–1.25) | 0.81 (0.68–0.96)* |
| Hypertension    | 1.01 (0.93–1.08) | 1.11 (1.03–1.20)† | 1.20 (1.08–1.34)‡ | 1.00 (0.89–1.19) |

Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. The category prehypertension includes participants with normal and high-normal blood pressure, and the category hypertension includes participants with mild and severe hypertension. The number of people at risk and the number of events are given in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

HRs reflect the risk associated with a 10-mm Hg increase in home systolic pressure. HRs were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Significance of the HRs: *p<0.05 and †p<0.01; and ‡p<0.001.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t005

Table 6. Standardized hazard ratios associated with diastolic home blood pressure by category of conventional blood pressure.
### Table 7. Sensitivity analysis for total mortality and cardiovascular events with one cohort excluded.

| End Point          | Finn-Home Excluded | Didima Excluded | Ohasama Excluded | Tsurugaya Excluded | Montevideo Excluded |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                    | E/R                 | HR (95% CI)     | E/R             | HR (95% CI)       | E/R                 | HR (95% CI)         |
| **Total mortality**|                     |                 |                 |                   |                     |                     |
| Optimal            | 76/1,043            | 1.13 (0.91–1.40)| 83/1,098        | 1.26 (1.04–1.53)* | 30/779              | 1.08 (0.79–1.46)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 83/1,282            | 1.27 (1.04–1.55)*   |
| Normal             | 83/724              | 1.15 (0.95–1.39)| 96/922          | 1.19 (1.00–1.42)* | 31/532              | 1.43 (1.08–1.91)*   |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 93/940              | 1.14 (0.94–1.38)    |
| High-normal        | 109/694             | 0.99 (0.84–1.18)| 114/940         | 1.00 (0.84–1.18)  | 34/576              | 0.93 (0.70–1.24)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 116/950             | 1.04 (0.88–1.23)    |
| Mild hypertension  | 100/669             | 1.05 (0.91–1.21)| 113/1,027       | 1.09 (0.96–1.23)  | 52/742              | 0.92 (0.75–1.14)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 116/973             | 1.07 (0.94–1.21)    |
| Severe hypertension| 62/273              | 0.87 (0.75–1.01)| 74/453          | 0.93 (0.80–1.07)  | 34/369              | 1.08 (0.87–1.33)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 72/394              | 0.96 (0.83–1.10)    |
| Cardiovascular events|                   |                 |                 |                   |                     |                     |
| Optimal            | 37/1,043            | 1.21 (0.89–1.65)| 49/1,098        | 1.36 (1.07–1.72)* | 25/779              | 1.49 (1.08–2.06)*   |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 50/1,282            | 1.13 (0.87–1.45)    |
| Normal             | 51/724              | 1.24 (0.98–1.57)| 65/922          | 1.27 (1.03–1.56)  | 32/532              | 1.10 (0.81–1.49)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 64/940              | 1.22 (0.97–1.54)    |
| High-normal        | 65/694              | 1.33 (1.08–1.63)†| 80/940          | 1.23 (1.02–1.48)* | 30/576              | 1.08 (0.79–1.48)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 83/950              | 1.22 (1.01–1.47)*   |
| Mild hypertension  | 84/669              | 1.26 (1.07–1.48)†| 111/1,027       | 1.24 (1.09–1.42)† | 67/742              | 1.08 (0.91–1.29)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 112/973             | 1.22 (1.07–1.40)†   |
| Severe hypertension| 48/273              | 0.87 (0.74–1.03)| 77/453          | 0.94 (0.82–1.08)  | 52/369              | 0.95 (0.80–1.14)    |
|                    |                     |                 |                 |                   |                     | 73/394              | 0.99 (0.86–1.15)    |

E/R indicates the number of cardiovascular events/participants at risk. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. HRs reflect the risk for a 10-mm Hg increase in home systolic pressure and were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Significance of the HRs: *p < 0.05 and †p < 0.01.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t007
Table 8. Sensitivity analysis for total mortality and cardiovascular events according to anthropometric characteristics and cardiovascular risk factors.

| End Point | Subgroup | Statistic | CBP |
|-----------|----------|-----------|-----|
|           |          | Optimal   | Normal | High-Normal | Mild Hypertension | Severe Hypertension |
| **Total mortality** | **Women** | E/R 37/900 | 40/570 | 54/538 | 43/573 | 30/253 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.19 (0.88–1.62) | 1.24 (0.95–1.61) | 0.96 (0.74–1.25) | 1.04 (0.83–1.31) | 1.00 (0.79–1.27) |
|            | Men | E/R 53/437 | 61/445 | 70/500 | 84/553 | 50/239 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.24 (0.97–1.58) | 1.15 (0.91–1.45) | 1.06 (0.86–1.30) | 0.99 (0.84–1.16) | 0.97 (0.82–1.16) |
|            | <60 y | E/R 28/985 | 26/636 | 30/559 | 25/538 | 10/175 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.27 (0.85–1.88) | 1.52 (1.06–2.20)* | 1.26 (0.91–1.77) | 1.06 (0.74–1.50) | 2.02 (1.20–3.40) |
|            | ≥60 y | E/R 62/352 | 75/379 | 94/479 | 102/588 | 70/317 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.20 (0.96–1.51) | 1.16 (0.96–1.40) | 0.99 (0.83–1.19) | 1.11 (0.96–1.28) | 0.82 (0.68–0.97)* |
|            | Japanese | E/R 67/613 | 78/558 | 98/550 | 86/537 | 54/221 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.20 (0.96–1.51) | 1.16 (0.96–1.40) | 0.99 (0.83–1.19) | 1.11 (0.96–1.28) | 0.82 (0.68–0.97)* |
|            | White (race) | E/R 23/724 | 23/457 | 26/488 | 26/488 | 26/271 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.27 (0.86–1.88) | 1.38 (0.93–2.04) | 1.06 (0.74–1.50) | 0.92 (0.72–1.17) | 1.17 (0.91–1.49) |
|            | Nonsmokers | E/R 56/1,004 | 69/777 | 85/795 | 93/890 | 63/394 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.18 (0.94–1.49) | 1.23 (1.00–1.51)* | 0.90 (0.74–1.11) | 0.92 (0.79–1.08) | 0.91 (0.78–1.05) |
|            | Smokers | E/R 34/333 | 32/238 | 39/243 | 34/236 | 17/98 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.20 (0.96–1.50) | 1.14 (0.94–1.39) | 0.95 (0.79–1.14) | 1.05 (0.92–1.20) | 0.90 (0.78–1.04) |
|            | Body mass index | E/R 70/921 | 75/252 | 88/564 | 84/255 | 55/206 |
|            | <25 kg/m² | HR (95% CI) | 1.26 (1.01–1.58)* | 1.16 (0.96–1.40) | 0.98 (0.81–1.19) | 1.08 (0.94–1.25) | 0.92 (0.78–1.09) |
|            | ≥25 kg/m² | E/R 20/416 | 26/423 | 36/492 | 43/601 | 25/286 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.13 (0.75–1.71) | 1.23 (0.81–1.87) | 1.12 (0.82–1.54) | 0.98 (0.77–1.24) | 0.87 (0.67–1.14) |
|            | Serum cholesterol | E/R 77/1,006 | 80/684 | 102/675 | 99/658 | 59/240 |
|            | <5.69 mmol/l | HR (95% CI) | 1.22 (0.99–1.50) | 1.24 (1.02–1.49)* | 0.99 (0.83–1.19) | 1.01 (0.88–1.16) | 0.89 (0.76–1.04) |
|            | ≥5.69 mmol/l | E/R 13/331 | 21/331 | 22/363 | 28/468 | 21/252 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.07 (0.64–1.81) | 0.80 (0.49–1.29) | 1.07 (0.77–1.50) | 1.10 (0.84–1.44) | 1.24 (0.94–1.63) |
| **Cardiovascular events** | **Women** | E/R 26/900 | 26/570 | 37/538 | 40/573 | 28/253 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.32 (0.96–1.82) | 1.30 (0.96–1.77) | 1.16 (0.85–1.56) | 1.34 (1.06–1.68)* | 0.93 (0.74–1.16) |
|            | Men | E/R 27/437 | 44/445 | 48/500 | 84/553 | 54/239 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.26 (0.88–1.80) | 1.17 (0.90–1.53) | 1.33 (1.06–1.68)* | 1.15 (0.97–1.35) | 0.99 (0.84–1.18) |
|            | <60 y | E/R 19/985 | 26/636 | 24/559 | 32/538 | 20/175 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.71 (1.08–2.71)* | 1.44 (0.98–2.11) | 1.35 (0.94–1.94) | 1.15 (0.85–1.57) | 1.18 (0.88–1.59) |
|            | ≥60 y | E/R 34/352 | 44/379 | 61/479 | 92/588 | 62/317 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.18 (0.87–1.61) | 1.24 (0.97–1.58) | 1.21 (0.98–1.50) | 1.21 (1.05–1.39)* | 0.91 (0.78–1.05) |
|            | Japanese | E/R 31/613 | 44/558 | 57/550 | 69/537 | 39/221 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.43 (1.03–1.99)* | 1.39 (1.09–1.76)* | 1.37 (1.10–1.70)* | 1.33 (1.12–1.58)* | 0.81 (0.66–0.99)* |
|            | White (race) | E/R 22/724 | 26/457 | 28/488 | 55/589 | 43/271 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.17 (0.80–1.71) | 0.95 (0.64–1.43) | 0.99 (0.69–1.40) | 1.06 (0.87–1.29) | 1.05 (0.86–1.28) |
|            | Nonsmokers | E/R 40/1004 | 51/777 | 55/795 | 93/890 | 62/394 |
|            | HR (95% CI) | 1.44 (1.11–1.88)* | 1.13 (0.89–1.44) | 1.26 (1.00–1.59)* | 1.13 (0.97–1.31) | 0.93 (0.80–1.07) |
|            | Smokers | E/R 13/333 | 19/238 | 30/243 | 31/236 | 20/98 |
high cardiovascular risk even though CBP is normal. Other strong points are the relatively large sample size representing populations from Europe, Asia, and South America, and the removal of participants being treated for hypertension from the analysis. Our meta-analysis is also an advance over the removal of participants being treated for hypertension from populations from Europe, Asia, and South America, and the strong points are the relatively large sample size representing high cardiovascular risk even though CBP is normal. Other

Table 8. Cont.

| End Point        | Subgroup              | Statistic   | CBP                    |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|
|                  |                       |             | Optimal (HR; 95% CI)   |
|                  |                       |             | Normal                 |
|                  |                       |             | High-Normal            |
|                  |                       |             | Mild Hypertension       |
|                  |                       |             | Severe Hypertension     |
| Body mass index  | E/R                   | 1.02 (0.61–1.69) | 1.44 (0.96–2.17) | 1.25 (0.91–1.71) | 1.38 (1.07–1.79) | 1.03 (0.75–1.40) |
| <25 kg/m²        | (HR (95% CI))         |             | HR (95% CI)            |
|                  |                       | 35/921      | 46/592                 |
|                  |                       | 54/546      | 64/525                 |
|                  |                       |             | 35/206                 |
| Body mass index  | E/R                   | 1.55 (1.14–2.10) | 1.29 (1.03–1.62) | 1.20 (0.96–1.51) | 1.34 (1.13–1.59) | 0.86 (0.70–1.06) |
| ≥25 kg/m²        | (HR (95% CI))         |             |
|                  |                       | 18/416      | 24/423                 |
|                  |                       | 31/492      | 60/601                 |
|                  |                       |             | 47/286                 |
| Serum cholesterol| E/R                   | 1.02 (0.64–1.61) | 0.97 (0.64–1.47) | 1.39 (1.01–1.92) | 1.05 (0.85–1.28) | 0.94 (0.78–1.14) |
| <5.69 mmol/l     | (HR (95% CI))         |             |
|                  |                       | 40/1,006    | 48/684                 |
|                  |                       | 62/675      | 84/658                 |
|                  |                       |             | 48/240                 |
| Serum cholesterol| E/R                   | 1.46 (1.12–1.91) | 1.37 (1.08–1.74) | 1.43 (1.15–1.78) | 1.19 (1.02–1.40) | 0.95 (0.79–1.13) |
| ≥5.69 mmol/l     | (HR (95% CI))         |             |
|                  |                       | 13/331      | 22/331                 |
|                  |                       | 23/363      | 40/468                 |
|                  |                       |             | 34/252                 |
|                  | E/R                   | 0.95 (0.52–1.71) | 0.95 (0.64–1.42) | 0.91 (0.62–1.33) | 1.24 (0.98–1.55) | 1.00 (0.80–1.23) |
|                  | (HR (95% CI))         |             |

E/R indicates the number of end points/participants at risk. White (race) included Finns, Greeks, and Uruguayans. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/<80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. HRs reflect the risk for a 10-mm Hg increase in home systolic pressure and were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Significance of the HRs: *p<0.05; †p<0.01; and ‡p<0.001.

Table 9. Characteristics of participants with masked hypertension (home blood pressure ≥130/≥85 mm Hg) compared with participants with true optimal, normal, or high-normal blood pressure (home blood pressure <130/<85 mm Hg).

| Characteristic                           | HBP <130/<85 mm Hg | High-Normal (n=723) | HBP ≥130/≥85 mm Hg | High-Normal (n=315) |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Number (percent with characteristic)    |                    |                      |                    |                      |
| Women                                   | 859 (67.6)         | 479 (57.9)           | 391 (54.1)         | 41 (61.2)            |
| Current smoking                         | 316 (24.9)         | 189 (22.8)           | 149 (20.6)         | 17 (25.4)            |
| Diabetes mellitus                       | 53 (4.2)           | 45 (5.4)             | 40 (5.5)           | 7 (10.5)             |
| Previous cardiovascular diseases         | 62 (4.9)           | 37 (4.5)             | 47 (6.5)           | 8 (12.0)             |
| Mean characteristic (SD)                |                    |                      |                    |                      |
| Age (years)                             | 50.4 (13.9)        | 54.5 (12.5)          | 56.5 (12.5)        | 61.3 (13.5)          |
| Body mass index (kg/m²)                 | 23.9 (3.6)         | 24.5 (3.6)           | 25.0 (3.7)         | 24.8 (4.1)           |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/l)              | 5.20 (0.94)        | 5.38 (1.01)          | 5.40 (1.04)        | 5.11 (1.08)          |

Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/<80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. Significance of the difference from the adjacent lower category of CBP: *p<0.05; †p<0.01; ‡p<0.001; and †‡p<0.0001.
On the other hand, our study also has some potential limitations. First, we did not determine the reproducibility of masked hypertension in the context of our current study. However, Viera and colleagues reported prevalence rates of masked hypertension among patients not being treated with hypertension but with borderline elevated CBP to be 54% and 53% on first and repeat assessment, with an agreement of 73% [33]. Among patients who underwent repeated ambulatory monitoring for a medical indication, Ben-Dov and coworkers reported an agreement of 72% in the classification of masked hypertension [34]. Second, CBP values in our study were the average of only two readings obtained at a single examination, which can lead to an overestimation of CBP because of the white-coat effect. However, overestimation of CBP would weaken rather than strengthen our current findings. Moreover, our findings were consistent using a tight (130 mm Hg) and less stringent (135 mm Hg) systolic threshold to define masked hypertension. Third, IDHOCO has no information on treatment status during follow-up. However, antihypertensive treatment instituted during follow-up likely would have been instituted according to current guidelines and based on CBP. Even if treatment had been started during follow-up based on HBP, if anything this would have weakened associations between outcomes and HBP (including masked hypertension). Fourth, few data were available from low- and middle-income countries. Finally, methods of blood pressure measurement and ascertain-

| Table 10. Characteristics of participants with masked hypertension (home blood pressure ≥135/≥85 mm Hg) compared with participants with true optimal, normal, or high-normal blood pressure (home blood pressure <135/<85 mm Hg). |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| **Characteristic**                                    | HBP <135/<85 mm Hg | **HBP ≥135/≥85 mm Hg** |
|                                 | Optimal (n = 1,295) | Normal (n = 884) | Optimal (n = 42) | Normal (n = 131) |
| **Number (percent) with characteristic**              |                     |                   |                   |
| Women                                                  | 874 (67.5)          | 513 (58.0)‡       | 26 (61.9)         | 57 (43.5)*        |
| Current smoking                                        | 321 (24.8)          | 202 (22.9)        | 12 (28.6)         | 36 (27.5)         |
| Diabetes mellitus                                      | 55 (4.3)            | 50 (5.7)          | 5 (11.9)          | 14 (10.7)         |
| Previous cardiovascular diseases                       | 66 (5.1)            | 39 (4.4)          | 4 (9.5)           | 16 (12.2)         |
| **Mean characteristic (SD)**                          |                     |                   |                   |
| Age (years)                                            | 50.6 (14.0)         | 55.1 (12.7)‡      | 57.3 (12.5)†      | 62.0 (11.2)        |
| Body mass index (kg/m²)                                | 23.9 (3.6)          | 24.5 (3.6)†       | 25.0 (3.7)*       | 25.4 (4.2)         |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/l)                             | 5.20 (0.94)         | 5.39 (1.00)‡      | 5.39 (1.05)       | 5.06 (1.15)        |

Systolic/diastolic thresholds for CBP were as follows: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; and high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg. When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. Significance of the difference from the adjacent lower category of CBP: *p < 0.05; †p < 0.001; and ‡p < 0.0001.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.t010

On the other hand, our study also has some potential limitations. First, we did not determine the reproducibility of masked hypertension in the context of our current study. However, Viera and colleagues reported prevalence rates of masked hypertension among patients not being treated with hypertension but with borderline elevated CBP to be 54% and 53% on first and repeat assessment, with an agreement of 73% [33]. Among patients who underwent repeated ambulatory monitoring for a medical indication, Ben-Dov and coworkers reported an agreement of 72% in the classification of masked hypertension [34]. Second, CBP values in our study were the average of only two readings obtained at a single examination, which can lead to an overestimation of CBP because of the white-coat effect. However, overestimation of CBP would weaken rather than strengthen our current findings. Moreover, our findings were consistent using a tight (130 mm Hg) and less stringent (135 mm Hg) systolic threshold to define masked hypertension. Third, IDHOCO has no information on treatment status during follow-up. However, antihypertensive treatment instituted during follow-up likely would have been instituted according to current guidelines and based on CBP. Even if treatment had been started during follow-up based on HBP, if anything this would have weakened associations between outcomes and HBP (including masked hypertension). Fourth, few data were available from low- and middle-income countries. Finally, methods of blood pressure measurement and ascertain-

Figure 4. Hazard ratios associated with masked hypertension (≥130/≥85 mm Hg) in participants with optimal, normal, and high-normal conventional blood pressure. Participants with optimal blood pressure without elevated HBP were the reference group. The categories of CBP were optimal (<120/<80 mm Hg), normal (120–129/80–84 mm Hg), and high-normal (130–139/85–89 mm Hg). When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for hypertension on home measurement were ≥130/≥85 mm Hg. The HRs were adjusted for cohort as random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Horizontal lines denote the 95% confidence interval. The diamond represents the pooled estimate in all participants with masked hypertension (MHT). The p-value for heterogeneity was derived by testing an ordinal variable in Cox proportional hazards regression coding for the three subgroups among participants with masked hypertension. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.g004
Risk Stratification by HBP and CBP

Figure 5. Hazard ratios associated with masked hypertension (≥135/≥85 mm Hg) in participants with optimal, normal, and high-normal conventional blood pressure. Participants with optimal blood pressure without elevated HBP were the reference group. CBP categories were optimal (<120/<80 mm Hg), normal (120–129/80–84 mm Hg), and high-normal (130–139/85–89 mm Hg). When the systolic and diastolic blood pressures were in different categories, the participant was assigned to the higher category. Systolic/diastolic thresholds for hypertension on home measurement were ≥135/≥85 mm Hg. The HRs were adjusted for cohort as a random effect and for sex, age, body mass index, smoking, total cholesterol, diabetes mellitus, and history of cardiovascular disease as fixed effects. Horizontal lines denote the 95% confidence interval. The diamond represents the pooled estimate in all participants with masked hypertension (MHT). The p-value for heterogeneity was derived by testing an ordinal variable in Cox proportional hazards regression coding for the three subgroups among participants with masked hypertension.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.g005
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Editors’ Summary

Background. Globally, hypertension (high blood pressure) is the leading risk factor for cardiovascular disease and is responsible for 9.4 million deaths annually from heart attacks, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases. Hypertension, which rarely has any symptoms, is diagnosed by measuring blood pressure, the force that blood circulating in the body exerts on the inside of large blood vessels. Blood pressure is highest when the heart is pumping out blood (systolic blood pressure) and lowest when the heart is refilling (diastolic blood pressure). European guidelines define optimal blood pressure as a systolic blood pressure of less than 120 millimeters of mercury (mm Hg) and a diastolic blood pressure of less than 80 mm Hg (a blood pressure of less than 120/80 mm Hg). Normal blood pressure, high-normal blood pressure, and mild hypertension are defined as blood pressures in the ranges 120–129/80–84 mm Hg, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg, and 140–159/90–99 mm Hg, respectively. A blood pressure of more than 160 mm Hg systolic or 100 mm Hg diastolic indicates severe hypertension. Many factors affect blood pressure: overweight people and individuals who eat salty or fatty food are at high risk of developing hypertension. Lifestyle changes and/or antihypertensive drugs can be used to control hypertension.

Why Was This Study Done? The current guidelines for the diagnosis and management of hypertension recommend risk stratification based on conventionally measured blood pressure (CBP, the average of two consecutive measurements made at a clinic). However, self-measured home blood pressure (HBP) more accurately predicts outcomes because multiple HBP readings are taken and because HBP measurement avoids the “white-coat effect”—some individuals have a raised blood pressure in a clinical setting but not at home. Could risk stratification across increasing categories of CBP be refined through the use of self-measured HBP, particularly at CBP levels assumed to be associated with no or only mildly increased risk? Here, the researchers undertake a participant-level meta-analysis (a study that uses statistical approaches to pool results from individual participants in several independent studies) to answer this question.

What Did the Researchers Do and Find? The researchers included 5,008 individuals recruited from five populations and enrolled in the International Database of Home Blood Pressure in Relation to Cardiovascular Outcome (IDHOCCO) in their meta-analysis. CBP readings were available for all the participants, who measured their HBP using an oscillometric device (an electronic device for measuring blood pressure). The researchers used information on fatal and nonfatal cardiovascular, cardiac, and cerebrovascular (stroke) events to calculate the hazard ratios (HRs, indicators of increased risk) associated with a 10-mm Hg increase in systolic HBP across standard CBP categories. In participants with optimal CBP, an increase in systolic HBP of 10 mm Hg increased the risk of any cardiovascular event by nearly 30% (an HR of 1.28). Similar HRs were associated with a 10-mm Hg increase in systolic HBP for all cardiovascular events among people with normal and high-normal CBP and with mild hypertension, but for people with severe hypertension, systolic HBP did not significantly add to the prediction of any end point. Among people with optimal, normal, and high-normal CBP, 5%, 18.4%, and 30.4%, respectively, had a HBP of 130/85 or higher (“masked hypertension,” a higher blood pressure in daily life than in a clinical setting). Finally, compared to individuals with optimal CBP without masked hypertension, individuals with masked hypertension had more than double the risk of cardiovascular disease.

What Do These Findings Mean? These findings indicate that HBP measurements, particularly in individuals with masked hypertension, refine risk stratification at CBP levels assumed to be associated with no or mildly elevated risk of cardiovascular disease. That is, HBP measurements can improve the prediction of cardiovascular complications or death among individuals with optimal, normal, and high-normal CBP but not among individuals with severe hypertension. Clinical trials are needed to test whether the identification and treatment of masked hypertension leads to a reduction of cardiovascular complications and is cost-effective compared to the current standard of care, which does not include HBP measurements and does not treat people with normal or high-normal CBP. Until then, these findings provide support for including HBP monitoring in primary prevention strategies for cardiovascular disease among individuals at risk for masked hypertension (for example, people with diabetes), and for carrying out HBP monitoring in people with a normal CBP but unexplained signs of hypertensive target organ damage.

Additional Information. Please access these websites via the online version of this summary at http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591.

• This study is further discussed in a PLOS Medicine Perspective by Mark Caulfield
• The US National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute has patient information about high blood pressure (in English and Spanish) and a guide to lowering high blood pressure that includes personal stories
• The American Heart Association provides information on high blood pressure and on cardiovascular diseases (in several languages); it also provides personal stories about dealing with high blood pressure
• The UK National Health Service Choices website provides detailed information for patients about hypertension (including a personal story) and about cardiovascular disease
• The World Health Organization provides information on cardiovascular disease and controlling blood pressure; its “A Global Brief on Hypertension” was published on World Health Day 2013
• The UK charity Blood Pressure UK provides information about white-coat hypertension and about home blood pressure monitoring
• MedlinePlus provides links to further information about high blood pressure, heart disease, and stroke (in English and Spanish)
Home Blood Pressure Monitoring: New Evidence for an Expanded Role

Mark Caulfield*
Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

Cardiovascular disease is now the leading cause of death and disability worldwide [1]. The application of electronic blood pressure measurement (home or ambulatory monitoring) has been shown to improve the precision of diagnosis of hypertension and is superior to conventional, or clinic, blood pressure monitoring at predicting prognosis in those with high blood pressure. The global burden of hypertension now affects over 1 billion people and contributes to 80% of cardiovascular disease outcomes in emergent economies [1]. From observational studies of blood pressure (mostly clinic blood pressure) in 1 million people, for every 20-mm Hg increment in systolic blood pressure greater than 115 mm Hg, there is an effective doubling of cardiovascular mortality [2].

The Prognostic Role of Electronic Blood Pressure

There are limited data on the use of home blood pressure monitoring (HBPM) to assess the cardiovascular risk of patients. An analysis as part of the 2011 UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guideline for hypertension suggested that ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM) was superior to HBPM and that both were superior to clinic blood pressure monitoring (CBPM) as a guide to adverse outcomes [3,4]. This analysis led to the recommendation that ABPM be used to confirm a diagnosis when hypertension is suspected, but the panel (in which I was a participant) acknowledged that the relative lack of data on HBPM might have affected prognostic accuracy [3,4].

As published in this week’s PLOS Medicine, Jan Staessen and colleagues undertook an individual-patient meta-analysis based on data from the International Database of Home Blood Pressure in Relation to Cardiovascular Outcome. The meta-analysis included 5,008 people who had home and conventional blood pressure measurements and were not being treated with antihypertensive medications that would have influenced prognostic outcomes [5]. These measurements were used to stratify participants into five categories of blood pressure: optimal, <120/<80 mm Hg; normal, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg; high-normal, 130–139/85–89 mm Hg; mild hypertension, 140–159/90–99 mm Hg; and severe hypertension, ≥160/≥100 mm Hg.

These findings add depth to the evidence base in favour of electronic blood pressure monitoring in the form of HBPM. However, the authors do not have data to provide a head-to-head comparison of HBPM and ABPM, which would be valuable in assessing whether HBPM could be of sufficient diagnostic and

Linked Research Article

- This Perspective discusses the following new study published in PLOS Medicine:
  - Asayama K, Thijs L, Brguljan-Hitij J, Niiranen TJ, Hozawa A, et al. (2014) Risk Stratification by Self-Measured Home Blood Pressure across Categories of Conventional Blood Pressure: A Participant-Level Meta-Analysis. PLoS Med 11(1): e1001591. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001591
- Jan Staessen and colleagues compare the risk of cardiovascular, cardiac, or cerebrovascular events in patients with normal office blood pressure but elevated home blood pressure.

Home Blood Pressure Monitoring Improves Risk Stratification

In keeping with a previous analysis, the meta-analysis found no significant improvement in risk stratification in those defined as severely hypertensive (≥160/≥100 mm Hg); at these levels HBPM and CBPM are both strong predictors of outcomes. This is not unexpected; severe hypertension does not lack precision in risk stratification and is not difficult to decide to treat. On the other hand, at every level of blood pressure below severe hypertension, the additional measurements obtained from HBPM improved risk stratification, providing new evidence supporting the use of HBPM in routine assessment of risk. This result is important because it could refine risk stratification in people with optimal, normal, or high-normal blood pressure based on CBPM, who are not conventionally treated. In addition, HBPM showed improved stratification of risk in those with masked hypertension, that is, those who have normal clinic blood pressure but on HBPM or ABPM have periods of elevated blood pressure and may benefit from treatment [5].
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prognostic precision to replace ABPM in the confirmation of a diagnosis informing a decision to treat. In addition, they were not able to standardise HBPM approaches, but that limitation would be more likely to dilute the observed improved risk stratification by HBPM than create a spurious association. To address this issue and validate these findings, the authors suggest further comparative, prospective randomised controlled trials would be valuable [5].

The Potential Implications of These Findings for Patients with High Blood Pressure

As the authors suggest, the use of electronic blood pressure monitoring (HBPM and ABPM) is likely cost-effective, allows more rapid diagnosis and treatment, saves consultation time, and may in some people avert treatment at least temporarily [6]. In this study by Staessen and colleagues, HBPM appears valuable in assessing those at risk who would not usually be considered as potentially benefiting from treatment. With a growing burden of high blood pressure and a growing availability of affordable devices, HBPM could be used to diagnose high blood pressure and help decide whom to treat. It empowers patients to take on a role in assessment of their blood pressure. Now, with smart phone applications that accept automated data uploads from HBPM and display blood pressure trends over time, HBPM could help avoid travel and may save time for the health care team as they conduct remote consultations exploiting electronic tools for communication.
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