

Clinical Utility of Blood Pressure Measurement Using the Newer Palpatory Method for Both Systolic and Diastolic Blood Pressure

Abstract

Background: Blood pressure (BP) measurement being a part of clinical examination gives a fair idea about the hemodynamic status. The auscultatory method is considered as a gold standard, a simple, noninvasive way to measure BP in patients as well as in the healthy controls. The present study was designed to compare systolic BP (SBP) and diastolic BP (DBP) readings using a newer palpatory method with the standard auscultatory method and further assessing the reliability of the newer palpatory method. **Materials and Methods:** A cross-sectional study comprising of a total of 400 (240 males and 160 females) individuals in the age range of 20–60 years were included in this study. BP measurement was done by the standard auscultatory method by one observer. Another observer blinded with BP records of the auscultatory method, measured BP using the newer palpatory method on the same individuals. The two methods were compared for the inter-rater reliability using intraclass correlation (ICC) statistics and agreement between two methods using Bland–Altman analysis. **Results:** The present study observed excellent reliability of the newer palpatory method with the standard auscultatory method with an ICC value of 0.997 and 0.993 for SBP and DBP, respectively. Bland–Altman plot for both SBP and DBP using the auscultatory and newer palpatory method has shown minimum variability and good reliability when both methods are used by independent observers. **Conclusions:** With practice and experience newer palpatory method can be used to assess BP with accuracy.

Keywords: Blood pressure determination, blood pressure, diastolic pressure, reproducibility of results

Introduction

Blood pressure (BP) measurement is a routine part of clinical examination in practice. It gives a fair idea about the hemodynamic and circulatory status of the subject. Samuel Siegfried Karl Ritter von Basch in 1881 used mercury sphygmomanometer for recording arterial BP.^[1] Mercury being stable at room temperature and has a high density (13.6 times denser than water), expands less as pressure changes, that favor its use in the mercury sphygmomanometer.^[2] Various methods, such as auscultatory, palpatory, ultrasound, oscillometric, and tonometric methods,^[3] give reliable BP readings and are prevalent in clinical practice.^[4] However, there has been decreased use of mercury instruments globally due to the fear of the harmful effects of its potential toxicity and disposal-related problems. Due to the alike reasons, many countries

have directed phasing out of mercury instruments.^[5] Similarly, the use of nonmercury sphygmomanometers, like aneroid, and a digital light emitting diode (LED) devices use is going on the rise and are replaced by digital sphygmomanometers in many settings.^[6] Palpatory methods for BP recording give only systolic BP values which are used to get approximates of SBPs, while the auscultatory method is used to get both SBP and DBP readings.

In addition, the auscultatory method for BP recording is considered as a gold standard simple noninvasive way to measure BP in patients as well as in the healthy controls.^[7]

Advantages of the auscultatory method are as follows:^[8]

1. It is universal for clinical measurement of BP.
2. It gives an accurate estimation of SBP and DBP at the appearance and disappearance of Korotkoff sounds.

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

How to cite this article: Danish M, Thakare AE, Salkar PS, Wakode SL. Clinical utility of blood pressure measurement using the newer palpatory method for both systolic and diastolic blood pressure. *Adv Biomed Res* 2020;9:51.

Mohammad Danish,
Avinash E.
Thakare¹,
Pooja S. Salkar²,
Santosh L. Wakode¹

MBBS IInd Year Student and
¹Department of Physiology,
AIIMS, Bhopal, Madhya
Pradesh, ²Department of Oral
Medicine and Radiology,
Rishiraj College of Dental
Sciences, Bhopal, Madhya
Pradesh, India

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Avinash E. Thakare,
Associate Professor, Department
of Physiology, AIIMS, Bhopal,
Madhya Pradesh, India.
E-mail: dravinash1979@gmail.
com

Received: 06 December 2019

Revised: 20 June 2020

Accepted: 08 July 2020

Published: 30 September 2020

Access this article online

Website: www.advbiores.net

DOI: 10.4103/abr.abr_254_19

Quick Response Code:



is dropped to a level equal to that of the patient's SBP, the blood starts flowing through the brachial artery with turbulence flow, which produces thrill and can be palpated with palmer surface of the digits. As the cuff pressure dropped to a level below the DBP, the flow becomes laminar flow and the thrilling characteristic of the pulse disappears or the pulse becomes soft and then disappears very shortly. One can learn to differentiate by experience the purring nature of thrill from the soft nature of pulse before the disappearance.

The final readings for both methods were recorded independently by both the observers. Data were checked for correctness and completeness. Using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM Corp Released 2017, IBM SPSS for Windows 10 Version 25.0 Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) software and appropriate statistical tools, data were compared and analyzed to draw a meaningful conclusion. To assess the reliability of the palpatory method, intraclass correlation (ICC) statistics and Bland-Altman analysis were used.

Results

Table 1 shows the anthropometric characteristics of the study individuals. Mean age was 40.81 years (SD ± 16.76) years, with mean weight 61.66 kg (SD ± 14.04). Readings of the BP values using auscultatory method and newer palpatory methods are given in the table.

Table 2 shows the results of the study expressed as a percentage of subjects having the same BP readings with both of the two methods. About 63.75% of individuals

showed similar readings with both methods, while 32.25% showed readings within ± 2 mm of Hg indicating good reliability and reproducibility. While 3.75% of individuals have readings within ± 4 mm of Hg and 0.25% individuals had more than ± 4 mm of Hg variation in BP values among both methods.

The present study observed excellent interrater reliability as evident from the ICC statistics [Tables 3 and 4] for both SBP and DBP reading when a newer palpatory method is compared with the standard auscultatory method. Herein, the obtained ICC value is 0.997 and 0.995 (indicating excellent reliability), its 95% confidence interval ranges between 0.997–0.998 and 0.993–0.996 for SBP and DBP, respectively, meaning that there is 95% chance that the true ICC value lands on any point between 0.997 and 0.998 for SBP and 0.993 and 0.996 for DBP. Therefore, based on statistical inference, it would be more appropriate to conclude the level of reliability as “excellent” on the absolute agreement which concerns the extent to which SBP and DBP by newer palpatory method equals auscultatory method. Figures 1 and 2 show the Bland Altman plot for both SBP and DBP using the auscultatory and the newer palpatory method showing minimum variability and good agreement between the two methods. As evident from the graph DBP is showing the least variability than SBP when measured with a newer palpatory method.

Discussion

We measured BP parameters using the auscultatory and the newer palpatory method. Our study was designed to

Table 1: Characteristics of study population

Study Parameters	Males (n=240)	Females (n=160)	Total (n=400)
Age (years), mean \pm SD	40.80 \pm 16.78	41.01 \pm 16.82	40.81 \pm 16.76
Weight (kg), mean \pm SD	63.95 \pm 13.37	58.24 \pm 14.36	61.66 \pm 14.04
Auscultatory method			
SBP (mm of Hg), mean \pm SD	122.53 \pm 16.45	122.88 \pm 15.64	122.67 \pm 16.18
DBP (mm of Hg), mean \pm SD	79.03 \pm 11.91	75.96 \pm 10	77.80 \pm 11.27
Palpatory method			
SBP (mm of Hg), mean \pm SD	122.82 \pm 16.39	123.15 \pm 15.65	122.95 \pm 16.08
DBP (mm of Hg), mean \pm SD	79.26 \pm 11.97	76.06 \pm 10.22	77.98 \pm 11.40

SBP: Systolic blood pressure, DBP: Diastolic blood pressure, SD: Standard deviation

Table 2: Results of the study expressed as percentages and numbers

Observations	Males (n=240), n (%)	Females (n=160), n (%)	Total (n=400), n (%)
Percentage of observations showing the same BP readings with both methods	162 (67.5)	93 (58.22)	255 (63.75)
Percentage of observations showing readings within ± 2 mm of Hg using both methods	70 (29.16)	59 (36.86)	129 (32.25)
Percentage of observations showing readings within ± 4 mm of Hg using both methods	8 (3.34)	7 (4.30)	15 (3.75)
Percentage of observations showing readings more than ± 4 mm of Hg using both methods	0	1 (0.62)	1 (0.25)

compare and assess the reliability of the newer palpatory method for both systolic and diastolic BP with standard auscultatory method used in clinical practice. The findings of our study have revealed an excellent agreement between the two methods.

The newer palpatory method can give reliable and reproducible BP values as compared to the standard auscultatory method. Sahu and Bhaskaran^[9] estimated SBP and DBP using palpatory method in 200 patients. It was reported that 51% of patients had SBP and DBP, within ± 2 mmHg range, 20% patients within ± 4 mmHg, 25% of patients had the same readings by both the methods. While in 0.5% of patients, BP could not be measured.

Our study, however, has shown consistency of 63.75% with both these methods and recorded the same BP values using the two methods. While in 32.25% of the individuals, the difference for BP was within a range of ± 2 mm of Hg. We observed a difference of ± 4 mm of Hg in 3.75% of

the individuals and difference in both methods $> \pm 4$ mm of Hg in 0.25% individuals. The findings of our study are in agreement with those of Sahu and Bhaskaran.^[9]

Clinically, the measurement of both SBP and DBP has equal importance and this method can record both the values with confidence. Hence, the newer palpatory method has added advantage over the conventional palpatory method which measures only SBP. The results of our study indicated excellent absolute agreement indicating minimal variability in the BP readings. Thus by repeated practice, this new method can be mastered and could be easy and convenient for application. The other advantage of this method is that there is the least dependency on the stethoscope. As pointed out by Perloff *et al.*,^[10] the known limitation of the auscultatory method is the lack of consistency for reliably measuring BP in a person using a treadmill, so in such cases, this newer palpatory method can be used. Similarly, it can also be useful in the setting




Figure 1: Bland Altman plot for systolic blood pressure by auscultatory and palpatory method




Figure 2: Bland–Altman plot for diastolic blood pressure by auscultatory and palpatory method

Table 3: Intraclass correlation statistics for inter-rater reliability for the palpatory method and auscultatory method for systolic blood pressure

Systolic BP palpatory method versus auscultatory method	ICC ^b	95% CI		F test with true value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single measures	0.997	0.997	0.998	697.176	399	399	<0.001

^bICC estimates and their 95% confidence intervals were calculated using SPSS statistical package version 25 based on a mean-rating ($k=3$), absolute-agreement, two-way mixed-effects model. CI: Confidence interval, ICC: Intraclass correlation

Table 4: Intra class correlation statistics for inter-rater reliability for palpatory method and auscultatory method for diastolic blood pressure

Diastolic BP palpatory method versus auscultatory method	ICC ^b	95% CI		F test with true value 0			
		Lower bound	Upper bound	Value	df1	df2	Significant
Single measures	0.995	0.993	0.996	368.818	399	399	<0.001

^bICC estimates and their 95% CIs were calculated using SPSS statistical package version 25 based on a mean-rating ($k=3$), absolute-agreement, two-way mixed-effects model. CI: Confidence interval, BP: Blood pressure, ICC: Intraclass correlation

of nonavailability of automated BP monitoring setup, nonavailability of stethoscope, and noisy environment.

Shivering, severe obesity, tremor, and moderate-to-severe hypotension are the other known limitations of the palpatory method. We also noted similar limitations in recording BP with this method as shivering, and the tremor causes mechanical interference in measurement. In the case of a severely obese person, thick subcutaneous fat probably prevents the thrill transmission to the skin surface. Likewise in elderly subjects with very thin subcutaneous fat, there is continuous palpation of the pulse throughout measurement which poses difficulty to identify thrill.

With repeated practice and experience, the appreciation of appearance and disappearance of the thrill can be learned and the difficulty of thrill palpation in the elderly can be overcome. Jules constant^[11] has also described a palpatory method to measure diastolic pressure in which they said that the brachial artery is palpated at the cuff edge when pulse return after deflation will give SBP readings and the value at which dynamic pulse suddenly feels normal will give DBP readings. Considering this thing in mind, the newer method was designed.

Earlier researchers noted a variation of ± 2 to ± 4 mm of Hg using this method and have suggested that this could be used to get fair estimates of SBP and DBP values.^[9] The present study can be regarded as a further extension of the work involving a larger sample size and observed good reliability and excellent agreement between the two methods.

As per the findings of this study, even for hypertensive patients, the BP readings were closer, or same with both of these methods and no significant difference was observed for BP readings using the two methods.

The auscultatory gap which is observed in some hypertensive patients is not a stable finding and is often variable. In present study, there was not any difficulty measuring BP among hypertensives using newer palpatory method. Auscultatory gap has an incidence ranging from 5% to 20% among hypertensives. In addition, it is associated with female sex, age >65 years ages and arterial stiffness index >8.5 .^[12]

Although in hypertensives with systemic sclerosis auscultatory gap has found to be having incidence up to 32% due to characteristic thickening and stiffening of arteries.^[13] Further auscultatory gap is associated when only the auscultatory method is used while recording BP if not supplemented by palpation of the radial pulse. As pointed out by Mudd and White, an auscultatory gap in sphygmomanometry is a period of abnormal silence or diminished intensity during one of the Korotkoff sound phases.^[14] During the auscultatory gap, the pulse wave is palpable and appreciable. Since in newer palpatory method we are feeling the thrill for the measurement of both SBP

and DBP, the auscultatory gap did not have posed any problem.^[15] Hence, it can be asserted that this method may be applicable in measuring BP with auscultatory gap as well. Further study related to applicability of this newer palpatory method can be taken over in subjects showing the auscultatory gap.

The novelty of this study is that the newer palpatory method for both SBP and DBP was applied and tested in larger study population (sample size 400) and found to be reliable in 67.5% of subjects recording the exactly same reading. However, where both methods recorded BP within acceptable range of ± 4 mm of Hg for both SBP and DBP.

The narrow acceptable range of BP in this study as compared to previous studies add validity to our study. Further ICC statistics of the study revealed excellent inter-rater reliability and agreement between two methods for both SBP and DBP when a narrow with narrow range in BP values was considered (± 2 to ± 4 mm of Hg).

Sadwarte *et al.*^[16] applied similar palpatory method for BP recording and had reported exact readings in larger percentage of subject with acceptable BP range of up to 20 mm of Hg for systolic and up to 10 mm of Hg for diastolic BP. Although they found the palpatory method more acceptable in terms of larger accuracy as evident from their observations. In contrast to these findings of ICC statistics which shown excellent agreement for SBP (ICC coefficient 0.951) and moderate agreement for DBP (ICC coefficient 0.566), the present study observed has observed excellent agreement for both SBP and DBP values using the two methods.

Similarly, Dinesh Sahu *et al.* reported accuracy of 51% within range of ± 2 mm of Hg and 20% within range of ± 4 mm of Hg and proposed this method for BP measurement in noisy environment and when stethoscope is not available. ICC coefficient was not assessed and hence the level of agreement was not commented on.

The results of present study indicated excellent inter-rater reliability and good agreement between the newer palpatory method and gold standard auscultatory method.

Being an important part of BP evaluation, DBP readings can be fairly obtained using the newer palpatory method which is an easy, quick, and convenient method for the purpose. The incorporation of DBP reading in this newer palpatory method would make it a very useful and popular method. It is also very useful in settings where frequent BP measurements are done manually as in IPD wards, in OPD, during cardiac pulmonary resuscitation and patients on the treadmill.

Conclusions

BP measurement is critical for assessing the patient admitted in intensive care unit or an ambulant patient attending the Physician's clinic. Although the auscultatory

method is the gold standard for BP measurement, the newer palpatory method for both SBP and DBP values is quick and could be reliable. Similarly, it can give estimates of BP without the need for a stethoscope or automated sphygmomanometers, and can be done in a noisy environment as well.

The present study compared a newer palpatory method with that of standard auscultatory method for BP recording among 400 adult subjects in the age range of 20–60 years. The results of our study have shown that the newer palpatory method is in excellent agreement with the gold standard auscultatory method. It is further concluded that the newer palpatory method is found to be reliable for both SBP and DBP measurements and is easy, quick, and estimates DBP without the need of a stethoscope just by palpating the thrill of brachial artery at ante-cubital fossa level.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the efforts, cooperation and support provided by all study participants and staff of Physiology Research Lab, AIIMS, Bhopal for this study. We are thankful to ICMR for accepting and approving the present study under STS-2019.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Georgia A. The History of Sphygmomanometers. Available from: http://www.ehow.com/about_5339926_history-sphygmomanometers.html.
2. Senviro G. Why is mercury used in measuring blood pressure? eNotes 2015. Available from: <https://www.enotes.com/homework-help/why-mercury-used-measuring-blood-pressure-518795>. [Last accessed on 2019 Jan 16].
3. Marey EJ. *Pressionetvitesse du sang*. Physiologie Experimentale. Paris: Facsimile Publisher; 1876.
4. Ogedegbe G, Pickering T. Principles and techniques of blood pressure measurement. *Cardiol Clin* 2010;28:571-86.
5. Directive 2007/51/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 amending Council Directive 76/769/EEC Relating to Restrictions on the Marketing of Certain Measuring Devices Containing Mercury (Text with EEA Relevance); 2007. Available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32007L0051>. [Last accessed on 2015 Oct 30].
6. Shahbabu B, Dasgupta A, Sarkar K, Sahoo SK. Which is more accurate in measuring the blood pressure? A digital or an aneroid sphygmomanometer. *J Clin Diagn Res* 2016;10:LC11-4.
7. Pickering TG, Hall JE, Appel LJ, Falkner BE, Graves JW, Hill MN, *et al.* Recommendations for blood pressure measurement in humans: An AHA scientific statement from the Council on High Blood Pressure Research Professional and Public Education Subcommittee. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)* 2005;7:102-9.
8. Bonnafoux P. Auscultatory and oscillometric methods of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring, advantages and limits: A technical point of view. *Blood Press Monit* 1996;1:181-5.
9. Sahu D, Bhaskaran M. Palpatory method of measuring diastolic blood pressure. *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol* 2010;26:528-30.
10. Perloff D, Grim C, Flack J, Frohlich ED, Hill M, McDonald M, *et al.* Human blood pressure determination by sphygmomanometry. *Circulation* 1993;88:2460-70.
11. Constant J. Arterial pulses and pressures. In: *Essential of Bed Side Cardiology*. 2nd ed.. New Jersey: Humana Press Inc; 2003. p. 29-46.
12. Cavallini MC, Roman MJ, Blank SG, Pini R, Pickering TG, Devereux RB. Association of the auscultatory gap with vascular disease in hypertensive patients. *Ann Intern Med* 1996;124:877-83.
13. Frech TM, Penrod J, Battistone MJ, Sawitzke AD, Stults BM. The prevalence and clinical correlates of an auscultatory gap in systemic sclerosis patients. *Int J Rheumatol* 2012;2012:590845.
14. Mudd SG, White PD. The auscultatory gap in sphygmomanometry. *Arch Intern Med (Chic)* 1928;41:249-56.
15. Askey JM. The auscultatory gap in sphygmomanometry. *Ann Intern Med* 1974;80:94-7.
16. Sadawarte P, Bhure A, Chauhan S, Gawande R. Measurement of diastolic blood pressure without stethoscope...Is it possible? *Sch J App Med Sci* 2017;5:662-7.