

Pan Arab Angiology Journal



Original Article

PULSATILITY INDEX AS A PREDICTOR OF SIGNIFICANT ILIAC DISEASE

AbdulRahman AlBlooshi¹, Sudhir Nagpal²,

1) Zayed Military Hospital, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2) Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, Canada, Y Su, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. Received: 15 June 2010, Accepted in revised form: 11 December 2012, Published: 22 December 2012

Corresponding author: AbdulRahman AlBlooshi, e-mail: reachmymac@mac.com

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To study the correlation between Pulsatility Index (PI) and the presence of significant (>50%) stenosis of inflow vessels.

Design: Single centre, Retrospective study.

Patients: Between Jan 04 May, 05 all patients who had Doppler arterial studies followed by diagnostic angiograms were analyzed. N=176, 352 limbs.

Results: Using Logistic Regression, Smoking and PI were found to be significant indicators of >50% stenosis of the inflow vessels. PI < 2 correlated with > 50% inflow disease (p<.0001). Furthermore, PI < 3 correlated with > 50% inflow disease (p<.0001). Theses results were verified for Left and Right sides independently.

Conclusions: Pulsatility Index is a good method to detect significant (>50%) inflow disease. Use of Duplex U/S is recommended in all patients undergoing peripheral angiograms/Endovascular procedures to facilitate proper time and resource allocation in cases that might need concomitant intervention either in the Angio suite or the OR.

Keywords: Pulsatility Index, Duplex U/S, Iliac artery.

الملخص العربي: دليل الحفقان كمؤشر لتصيق الشريان الحرققي عبد الرحمن البلوشي، زياد ميلتاري، سيدير ناجيبل مستنفى زايد العسكري، أبوظبي، دولة الإمارات العربية المتحدة، مستشفى أوتاوا، أوتاوا، كندا، جامعة أوتاوا، أوتاوا، كندا الغاية: در اسة العلاقة بين دليل الخفقان ووجود تضيق في الشر ايين > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. (اح). التصميم: أحادي المركز، استعادي. المرضى: جميع المرضي الذين أجري لهم فحص موجات الفوصوتية متبوع بقسطرة تشخيصية مابين يونيو 2004 إلى مايو 2005. العدد التصميم: أحادي المركز، استعادي. 167 عدد الأعضاء 352 النتائج باستعمال 3 تناسقا مع > 50% تضيق الشر ايين المنبعية و احو 2 احاج > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. حيث أن مذي النتائج باستعمال 3 تناسقا مع > 50% تضيق الشر ايين المنبعية و احو 2 احاج > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. ديث أن الخلاصة: دليل الخفقان هو طريقة جيدة لتقصي وجود تضيق > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. الموشرين مهين للاستدلال على الخلاصة: دليل الخفقان هو طريقة جيدة لتقصي وجود تضيق > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. الموشرين مهين للاستدلال على الخلاصة: دليل الخفقان هو طريقة جيدة لتقصي وجود تضيق > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. الصوتية ينصح به منوي المرضى الذين ينوي إجراء القسطرة التشخيصية أو علاجية لهم وذلك لتنسق الوقت المحد والمواد المطوبة في حالة وجود تضيق تضيق المرضى الذين ينوي إجراء القسطرة التشخيصية أو علاجية لهم وذلك لتنسق الوقت المحد والمواد المطوبة في حالة وجود تضيق تشيد في تلك الشر ايين المنبعية. الخلاصة: دليل الخفقان هو طريقة جيدة لتقصي وجود تضيق > 50% في الشر ايين المنبعية. استعمال فحص الموجات الصوتية ينصح به تضيق للمرضى الذين ينوي إجراء القسطرة التشخيصية أو علاجية لهم وذلك لتنسق الوقت المحد والمواد المطوبة في حالة وجود تضيق تشيد في تلاك الشر ايين المنبعية.

Copyright © 2012 PAAJ. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

INTRODUCTION:

linical examination alone as a predictor of significant femoral inflow disease is not very reliable ^{1, 2}. Duplex ultrasound has been used to assess femoral inflow. One parameter used was pulsatility index (PI). PI, however was not validated as a good predictor of inflow disease.³.In this study we attempt to validate the use of PI as a predictor of inflow disease and try to establish a correlation between PI value and significant femoral inflow disease. Figure1, Pulsatility Index is measured by: PI = (Vmax - Vmin) / Vmax mean



Figure1. Example of a study patient with a significant inflow disease and a low PI.

OBJECTIVE:

To study the correlation between PI and the presence of significant (>50%) stenosis of inflow vessels. The Inflow vessels were defined as: Common iliac, External Iliac and common femoral artery.

DESIGN:

Single centre. With Retrospective analysis of prospectively collected Data.

INCLUSION CRITERIA:

All patients who had Doppler arterial studies followed by diagnostic angiograms between Jan 04 - May 05 were entered into the study. A total of one hundred and seventy six patients were entered (N=176). All of those patients had there Doppler done within 3 months prior to the angiograms.

PATIENT DEMOGRAPHICS:

The mean age was 67.7 years (Range: 35-96) years. A hundred and seventeen were males (67.6%) and fifty six were females (32.3%). Sixty six were diabetics (42.3%). Seventy eight were hypertensive (50.3%). Eighty one were smokers (55.8%).

RESULTS:

Ultrasound interogatin was done in a vascular labe by certified technicians. A 10 mhz ultrasound probe was used and placed over the femoral artery at the area of best signal obtained. Of one thousand seven hundred and twenty eight patients' file checked, Four hundred and sixty patients met the inclusion criteria of which only a hundred and seventy six patients had pre-Cath Doppler studies within 3 months. Using logistic regression and a PI cut-off below 2 and a cut-off point below 3. We have found that in the first group a PI cut-off point below 2 was a statistically significant predictor of inflow disease with a P <.0001 and an Odds Ratio of 23.853. Of note; smoking came out as a significant predictor for inflow disease as well P <.0348 and an Odds Ration of 2.88, Table 1.

Table1. Logistic Regression Model of the Primary end point – Right (PI cut-off point = 2)

Variables		®	Wald Chi- Square	p-Value	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval of Odds Ration			
Full Model									
Age		-0.02	0.49	0.4819	0.984	0.941	1.029		
PI-Rt	<2 vs. >=2	1.58	22.00	<.0001	23.422	6.27	87.491		
Sex	F Vs. M	-0.27	0.93	0.3355	0.587	0.198	1.737		
DM	No Vs. Yes	0.16	0.42	0.5185	1.369	0.528	3.553		
HTN	No Vs. Yes	-0.10	0.18	0.6731	0.821	0.328	2.054		
Smok	Yes Vs. No	0.45	2.66	0.1026	2.453	0.835	7.203		
er									
Model of Significant Variables									
PI-Rt.	<2 Vs. >=2	1.59	26.66	<.0001	23.853	7.155	79.52		
Smok er	Yes Vs. No	0.53	4.46	0.0348	2.88	1.078	7.69		

In the Second group; we tried a higher PI cut-off at below 3. Again, both a PI cut-off below 3 and smoking came out significant predictors for significant inflow disease with P<.0001 and P<.0161 respectively, and Odds Ratios of 26.84 and 3.806 respectively, Table 4. An ROC curve was plotted as in, Figure 2.

 Table2
 Logistic Regression Model of the Primary End point – Left (PI Cut-off point =2)

Variables		®	Wald Chi-	p-Value	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval of Odds Rat				
			Square	Eull M	l del					
run Model										
Age		0.00	0.01	0.9397	0.998	0.955	1.044			
PI-Lt	<2 vs. >=2	0.97	13.99	0.0002	6.943	2.515	19.169			
Sex	F Vs. M	-0.08	0.09	0.7637	0.855	0.308	2.372			
DM	No Vs. Yes	0.34	1.91	0.1665	1.956	0.756	5.059			
HTN	No Vs. Yes	0.39	2.87	0.0900	2.164	0.887	5.282			
Smoker	Yes Vs. No	0.94	10.48	0.0012	6.508	2.094	20.224			
Model of Significant Variables										
PI-Lt	<2 Vs. >=2	1.13	20.7	<.0001	9.632	3.63	25.555			
Smoke r	Yes Vs. No	0.90	13.29	0.0003	6.076	2.303	16.037			

 Table3. Logistic Regression Model of the Primary End Point – Right (PI Cut-off point=3)

Variables		R	Wald Chi- Square	p-Value	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval of Odd Ration			
Full Model									
Age		-0.03	1.21	0.2708	0.973	0.925	1.022		
PI- Rt.	<3 vs.>=3	1.79	30.74	<.0001	35.84	10.114	127.002		
Sex	F Vs. M	-0.31	1.07	0.3008	0.542	0.17	1.729		
DM	No Vs. Yes	-0.06	0.05	0.8263	0.887	0.304	2.578		
HTN	No Vs. Yes	-0.03	0.01	0.9149	0.947	0.348	2.579		
Smok er	Yes Vs. No	0.64	3.93	0.0475	3.571	1.014	12.579		
Model of Significant Variables									
PI- Rt.	<3 Vs. >=3	1.65	35.94	<.0001	26.847	9.157	78.717		
Smok er	Yes Vs. No	0.67	5.80	0.0161	3.806	1.282	11.307		

Table4. Logi stic Regression Model of the Primary End Point –Left (PI Cut-off Point 3)

Variables		R	Wald	p-Value	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval of Odds			
		Ũ	Chi-	_		Ration			
			Square						
Full Model									
Age		0.00	0.04	0.8457	1.005	0.958	1.054		
PI-Lt.	<3 vs. >=3	1.16	20.72	<.0001	10.107	3.733	27.364		
Sex	F Vs. M	-0.09	0.10	0.7511	0.842	0.29	2.443		
DM No Vs. Yes		0.30	1.40	0.2371	1.825	0.673	4.944		
HTN No Vs. Yes		0.38	2.44	0.1182	2.118	0.826	5.431		
Smoker	Smoker Yes Vs. No		11.36	0.0007	8.221	2.415	27.985		
Model of Significant Variables									
PI-Lt.	<3 Vs. >=3	1.29	28.02	<.0001	13.238	5.087	34.449		
Smoker	Yes Vs. No	0.97	13.87	0.0002	6.962	2.508	19.328		



Figure2. ROC Curve

Sensitivities and specificities were calculated and were as follows: For Cut point at PI=2; sensitivity: 0.47, Specificity: 0.95. For Cut point at PI=3; Sensitivity: 0.70. Specificity: 0.89 of note, these resulted were verified for right and left sides independently.

CONCLUSIONS:

Pulsatility Index is a good method to detect significant (>50%) inflow disease. Use of Duplex U/S is recommended in all patients undergoing peripheral angiograms/ Endovascular procedures. It might also facilitate proper time and resource allocation in cases that might need concomitant intervention either in the Angio suite or the OR. Pulsatility Index is a valuable tool in following up post intervention patients. Future research recommended to determine a linear correlation between PI and degree of stenosis.

DISCUSSION:

While the efficacy of PI was established in various clinical scenarios 4, 5, 6, the actual validity in detecting upstream significant inflow disease was not established. Some of the technical difficulties that might arise are: the concomitant effect of downstream disease on PI 1 and the exact location where the artery is interrogated for PI in addition to operator variability. Yet the simplicity and reduced cost of this utility renders it as an ideal pre-interventional and follow up assessment method to detect femoral inflow disease. Furthermore, a strength point of this study is the number of patients involved and the direct angiographic validation of all studied subjects.

REFERENCES:

 Ward AS, Martin TP. Some aspects of ultrasound in the diagnosis and assessment of aortoiliac disease. Am J Surg. 1980;140:260-265.
 Baird RN, Bird DR, Clifford PC, Lusby RJ,

Skidmore R, Woodcock JP. Upstream stenosis. Its diagnosis by Doppler signals from the femoral artery. Arch Surg. 1980;115:1316-1322.

3) Campbell WB, Cole SE, Skidmore R, Baird RN. The clinician and the vascular laboratory in the diagnosis of aortoiliac

4) Gosling RG, Dunbar G, King DH, et al. The quantitative analysis of occlusive peripheral arterial disease by a non-intrusive ultrasonic technique. Angiology. 1971;22:52-55.

5) Demorais D, Johnston KW. Assessment of aorto-iliac disease by non-invasive quantitative Doppler waveform analysis. Br J Surg. 1981;68:789-792.

6) Bia M, Taylor KJ. Doppler signal quantitation in renal allografts: comparison in normal and rejecting transplants, with pathologic correlation. Radiology. 1987;162:39-42.