Journal of International Medical Research 2018, Vol. 46(7) 2558–2568 © The Author(s) 2018 Reprints and permissions: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/0300060518760463 journals.sagepub.com/home/imr



Twenty-four-hour blood pressure variability plays a detrimental role in the neurological outcome of hemorrhagic stroke

Huan-Xin Zhang*, Qun-Xiong Fan*, Shi-Zhen Xue, Min Zhang and Ji-Xian Zhao

Abstract

Background: Blood pressure variability (BPV) is a modifiable risk factor for stroke. This study was performed to determine the prognostic role of BPV in patients with acute hemorrhagic stroke.

Methods: The data of 131 hospitalized hypertensive patients with spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage (sICH) were collected. All patients underwent examinations using several neurological scales (Glasgow Coma Scale, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, and modified Rankin scale [mRS]) and BP measurements at different time points.

Results: Sex, age, hematoma volume, and neurological scores were not significantly different between patients with a favorable and unfavorable prognosis for sICH. However, significant differences were found in hypertension, diabetes, metabolic syndrome, atrial fibrillation, smoking, and stroke history. The standard deviation (SD), coefficient of variation (CV), and maximum-minimum range (Max-Min) of diastolic BP and the mean, SD, CV, and Max-Min of systolic BP significantly differed between the groups. Statistical analysis also demonstrated correlations between the 90-day mRS score and BPV and between systolic BPV and the 90-day mRS score.

Conclusion: High systolic or diastolic BPV within 24 hours of hemorrhagic stroke onset is associated with the 90-day neurological prognosis. The 24-hour BPV plays a critical role in the neurological outcome of hemorrhagic stroke.

Department of Cardiology, Renmin Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, Shiyan, Hubei Province, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding author:

Ji-Xian Zhao, Department of Cardiology, Renmin Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, No. 39 Chaoyang Middle Road, Shiyan, Hubei Province 442000, People's Republic of China. Email: 568813808@qq.com

Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).

Keywords

Blood pressure, variability, stroke, spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage, computed tomography, neurological outcome

Date received: 11 January 2018; accepted: 25 January 2018

Introduction

Stroke, also termed cerebrovascular accident, is a clinical emergency and may be caused by cerebrovascular stenosis, blocking, malformation, or rupture. There are two main types of stroke: ischemic stroke and hemorrhagic stroke. Hemorrhagic stroke, which constitutes about 13% of strokes, is caused by a weakened vessel that ruptures, bleeding into and compressing the surrounding brain tissue.¹ The two main types of hemorrhagic stroke are intracerebral and subarachnoid. Increasing numbers of studies are strongly supporting the notion that hypertension is one of the most common causes of both ischemic stroke and hemorrhagic stroke and that it gradually damages blood vessel walls and accelerates the occurrence and development of atherosclerosis.²⁻⁴ Blood pressure variability (BPV), a natural characteristic of blood pressure (BP), is the result of complex interactions between extrinsic environmental and behavioral factors and intrinsic cardiovascular regulatory mechanisms (neural central, neural reflex, and humoral influences). BPV is correlated with the risk of stroke,⁵ and BPV is especially detrimental to the occurrence of hemorrhagic stroke. However, the clinical implications of markedly elevated BPV in the setting of acute hemorrhagic stroke are incompletely understood. Whether BPV predicts the clinical outcome of acute stroke remains controversial.⁶ Additionally, the significance and management of BP changes in patients with acute hemorrhagic stroke care are

unclear. In the present study, we investigated the impact of 24-hour BPV on 90-day outcomes in patients with acute hemorrhagic stroke. The aim of this study was to determine the correlation between the 90-day modified Rankin scale (mRS) score and BPV in patients with acute hemorrhagic stroke and identify the role of BPV in the prognosis of patients with acute hemorrhagic stroke.

Methods

Study population and design

A prospective cohort study was performed from 10 March 2013 to 10 September 2016. All included patients had a diagnosis of hemorrhagic stroke and were from Renmin Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine. The patients were identified by a primary discharge diagnosis code of 431.xx (hemorrhagic stroke) according to the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision. Patients with no primary diagnosis code but with a secondary diagnosis code of 431. xx were also included in this study. The inclusion criteria for hemorrhagic stroke in this study were in line with the 2013 American Heart Association/American Stroke Association guideline. All patients with spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage (sICH) met the following conditions: age of >18 years, confirmation of hemorrhagic stroke by head computed tomography (CT) scan and/or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in combination with clinical history, presentation <6 hours after sICH onset, and systolic BP of >140 mmHg and/or diastolic BP of >90 mmHg. The exclusion criteria were no CT or MRI examination, inability to confirm sICH, subarachnoid hemorrhage, secondary hemorrhagic stroke due to traumatic head injury, anticoagulant or thrombolytic therapy, other intracranial pathologies, and surgical therapy for intracranial hematoma in patients with hypertensive cerebral hemorrhage. This study was performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Hubei University of Medicine. All patients provided written informed consent.

Data collection

A flow chart of this study is shown in Figure 1. All clinical assessments were performed by experienced neurologists. Hospitalized patients with sICH and hypertension were recruited. All patients underwent examinations using various neurological scales and BP measurements at different time points.

Each patient's BP was measured using an electronic sphygmomanometer once every 15 minutes from admission to 1 hour post-admission, once every 30 minutes from 1 to 6 hours post-admission, and once every hour from 6 to 24 hours post-admission.

The sICH-associated hematoma volumes were measured with the simple formula ABC/2, where A is the longest diameter of the hematoma on the CT slice with the largest hematoma area, B is the longest diameter perpendicular to A on the same slice, and C is the approximate number of CT slices with hemorrhage multiplied by the slice thickness.^{7–9}

The Glasgow coma scale (GCS), a neurological scale, was used to assess each patient's conscious level. A GCS score of <8 indicated severe impairment of conscious (coma), a GCS score of 8 to 12 indicated moderate impairment, and a GCS score of \geq 13 indicated minor impairment. The National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) and the modified Rankin scale (mRS) were used to evaluate the clinical outcomes at admission, discharge, and 90 days after stroke. The mRS was used to evaluate the neurological deficits both within 6 hours of hospital admission and 90 days after hemorrhagic stroke. An mRS score of 0 to 1 indicated a favorable prognosis for patients with sICH, and an mRS score of 2 to 6 indicated an unfavorable prognosis.

Statistical analysis

IBM SPSS for Windows, version 19.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) and Excel (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA) were used for statistical analysis. The BP and BPV parameters were the mean BP (Mean), maximum BP (Max), minimum BP (Min), range from Max to Min (Max-Min), standard deviation (SD), and coefficient of variation (CV, calculated as $[100 \times SD]$ /mean). A univariate analysis was first performed for each parameter to identify the independent variables. The 90day mRS score was used as a dependent variable. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test was conducted. Multiple logistics regression was performed to investigate the association between the 90-day mRS score and BPV (systolic BP: Max-Min < 60, 60 < Max-Min < 80, and Max- $Min \ge 80$; diastolic BP: Max-Min < 20, 20 < Max-Min < 40, and Max-Min > 40). For parameters with normal distributions and homogeneous variances, the significance of differences between the mean values in the two groups was verified using Student's t-test. The chi square test or Fisher's exact test was used for numerical data to analyze the associations between two different variables. A p value of <0.05indicated statistical significance.



Figure 1. Flow chart of patient recruitment and selection.

Results

Demographic and baseline characteristics

In total, 131 hospitalized patients with sICH and hypertension were recruited. The demographic and baseline

characteristics of the patients are shown in Table 1. According to the mRS score, 62 patients had a favorable prognosis and 69 had an unfavorable prognosis. The variables sex, age, hematoma volume, and neurological scales scores (GCS, NIHSS, and mRS scores) were not significantly different

Variables prognosis (n = 62) prognosis (n = 62) prognosis (n = 62) prognosis (n = 63) p value Sex 0.889 Male 37 (59.7) 42 (60.9) Female 25 (40.3) 27 (39.1) Age, years 58.22 ± 18.63 62.01 ± 19.32 0.675 Hematoma volume, cm ³ 40.23 ± 11.93 43.15 ± 13.28 0.637 Baseline GCS score 12.64 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline MIHSS score 15.32 ± 6.73 16.78 ± 7.13 0.435 Baseline mRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 (54.4) 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) 0.018 No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) 0.018 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.105 No 34 (54.8)		Favorable	Unfavorable	
Sex 0.889 Male 37 (59.7) 42 (60.9) Female 25 (40.3) 27 (39.1) Age, years 58.22 ± 18.63 62.01 ± 19.32 0.675 Hematoma volume, cm ³ 40.23 ± 11.93 43.15 ± 13.28 0.637 Baseline GCS score 12.68 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline MRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 0.021 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) 0.021 No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) 0.018 Pies 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) 0.018 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.034 Mo 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) 0.034 Hyperlipidemia (0.03 0.021 0.034 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.008 No 39 (65.9) 32 (46.4) 0.015 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.052 No 39 (56.9) 30 (43.5) 0.652 No 31 (34.8) 39 (56.5)	Variables	prognosis (n = 62)	prognosis (n = 69)	p value
Male 37 (59.7) 42 (60.9) Female 25 (40.3) 27 (39.1) Age, years 58.22 ± 18.63 62.01 ± 19.32 0.675 Hematoma volume, cm ³ 40.23 ± 11.93 43.15 ± 13.28 0.637 Baseline GCS score 12.68 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline NIHSS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 0.021 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) 0.021 No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) 0.018 Diabetes 0.018 0.14 0.334 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) 0.034 Hyperlipidemia 0.334 28 (40.6) 0.034 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.008 No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) 0.001 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) 0.105 No 39 (62.9) 33 (33.9) 0.415.9 No 39 (56.5) 38 (51.1) 39 (56.5) <tr< td=""><td>Sex</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.889</td></tr<>	Sex			0.889
Female 25 (40.3) 27 (39.1) Age, years 58.22 ± 18.63 62.01 ± 19.32 0.675 Hematoma volume, cm ³ 40.23 ± 11.93 43.15 ± 13.28 0.637 Baseline CCS score 12.68 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline NIHSS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 0.021 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) 0.021 No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) 0.018 Diabetes 0.018 0.018 0.018 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) 0.034 No 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) 0.334 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.008 No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) 0.015 Atrial fibrillation 0.105 0.052 0.051 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) 0.052 No 39 (65.5) 38 (55.1) 0.652 No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) 0.874	Male	37 (59.7)	42 (60.9)	
Age, years 58.22 ± 18.63 62.01 ± 19.32 0.675 Hematoma volume, cm³ 40.23 ± 11.93 43.15 ± 13.28 0.637 Baseline GCS score 12.68 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline NHSS score 15.32 ± 6.73 16.78 ± 7.13 0.435 Baseline mRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension0.021Yes46 (74.2)61 (88.4)0.021No16 (25.8)8 (11.6)0.018Diabetes0.0180.034Yes24 (38.7)41 (59.4)0.018Yes24 (38.7)41 (59.4)0.034Mo38 (61.3)28 (40.6)0.008Hyperlipidemia0.032 (46.4)0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)0.008No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)0.105No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)0.005No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)0.001Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)0.014Yes14 (22.6)39 (Female	25 (40.3)	27 (39.1)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age, years	58.22 ± 18.63	62.01 ± 19.32	0.675
Baseline GCS score 12.68 ± 3.62 13.57 ± 4.09 0.369 Baseline NIHSS score 15.32 ± 6.73 16.78 ± 7.13 0.435 Baseline mRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) 0.018 No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) 0.018 0.018 Ves 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) 0.0334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) 0.008 No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) 0.105 No 41 (66.1) 36 (52.2) 0.652 Carotid stenosis 0.652 0.655 0.651 No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) 0.874 Yes 27 (43.5) 31 (44.9) 0.874 Yes 27 (43.5) 31 (44.9) 0.874 Yes 27 (43.	Hematoma volume, cm ³	$\textbf{40.23} \pm \textbf{11.93}$	$\textbf{43.15} \pm \textbf{13.28}$	0.637
Baseline NIHSS score 15.32 ± 6.73 16.78 ± 7.13 0.435 Baseline mRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) Diabetes 0.018 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) No 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) Hyperlipidemia 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) No 34 (54.8) 32 (46.4) Metabolic syndrome 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) Atrial fibrillation 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) Smoking 0.001 Yes	Baseline GCS score	12.68 ± 3.62	13.57 ± 4.09	0.369
Baseline mRS score 2.02 ± 0.16 2.64 ± 0.28 0.512 Hypertension 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) Diabetes 0.018 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) No 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) Hyperlipidemia 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) No 34 (54.8) 32 (46.4) Metabolic syndrome 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) Atrial fibrillation 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) No 41 (66.1) 36 (52.2) Carotid stenosis 0.652 Yes 28 (45.2) 30 (43.5) No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) Smoking 0.001 Yes 14 (22.6) 39 (56.5) No 48 (77.4) 30 (43.5) HHcy, mmol/L 12.16 ± 8.01 13.98 ± 10.31 0.3	Baseline NIHSS score	15.32 ± 6.73	16.78 ± 7.13	0.435
Hypertension 0.021 Yes 46 (74.2) 61 (88.4) No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) Diabetes 0.018 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) No 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) Hyperlipidemia 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) No 34 (54.8) 32 (46.4) Metabolic syndrome 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) Atrial fibrillation 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) No 41 (66.1) 36 (52.2) Carotid stenosis 0.652 Yes 28 (45.2) 30 (43.5) No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) No 48 (77.4) 30 (43.5) Metabolic consumption 0.001 Yes 14 (22.6) 39 (56.5) No 48 (77.4)<	Baseline mRS score	2.02 ± 0.16	2.64 ± 0.28	0.512
Yes46 (74.2)61 (88.4)No16 (25.8)8 (11.6)Diabetes0.018Yes24 (38.7)41 (59.4)No38 (61.3)28 (40.6)Hyperlipidemia0.334Yes28 (45.2)37 (53.6)No34 (54.8)32 (46.4)Metabolic syndrome0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.31Yes (>10 mmol/L)16 (41.9)26 (37.7)No (<10 mmol/L)	Hypertension			0.021
No 16 (25.8) 8 (11.6) Diabetes 0.018 Yes 24 (38.7) 41 (59.4) No 38 (61.3) 28 (40.6) Hyperlipidemia 0.334 Yes 28 (45.2) 37 (53.6) No 34 (54.8) 32 (46.4) Metabolic syndrome 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) Atrial fibrillation 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) No 41 (66.1) 36 (52.2) Carotid stenosis 0.652 Yes 28 (45.2) 30 (43.5) No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) Alcohol consumption 0.874 Yes 27 (43.5) 31 (44.9) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) Smoking 0.001 Yes 14 (22.6) 39 (56.5) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) Smoking 0.001 Yes (>10 mmol/L) 16 (41.9) 26 (37.7) No (≤10 mmol/L) 16 (41.9)	Yes	46 (74.2)	61 (88.4)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	No	16 (25.8)	8 (11.6)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Diabetes			0.018
No38 (61.3)28 (40.6)Hyperlipidemia0.334Yes28 (45.2)No34 (54.8)32 (46.4)0.008Metabolic syndrome0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)0.652Yes28 (45.2)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)0.652Yes28 (45.2)No34 (54.8)No34 (54.8)No34 (54.8)Yes27 (43.5)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)36 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)0.314HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)0.002Yes15 (24.2)Stroke history0.002Yes15 (24.2)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)34 (49.3)	Yes	24 (38.7)	41 (59.4)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No	38 (61.3)	28 (40.6)	
Yes28 (45.2)37 (53.6)No34 (54.8)32 (46.4)Metabolic syndrome0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (≤ 10 mmol/L)16 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (≤ 10 mmol/L)16 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (≤ 10 mmol/L)15 (24.2)35 (50.7)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	Hyperlipidemia			0.334
No34 (54.8)32 (46.4)Metabolic syndrome0.008Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.31HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.013.98 ± 10.31No (≤ 10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (≤ 10 mmol/L)15 (24.2)35 (50.7)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	Yes	28 (45.2)	37 (53.6)	
Metabolic syndrome 0.008 Yes 23 (37.1) 46 (66.7) No 39 (62.9) 23 (33.3) Atrial fibrillation 0.105 Yes 21 (33.9) 33 (47.8) No 41 (66.1) 36 (52.2) Carotid stenosis 0.652 Yes 28 (45.2) 30 (43.5) No 34 (54.8) 39 (56.5) Alcohol consumption 0.874 Yes 27 (43.5) 31 (44.9) No 35 (56.5) 38 (55.1) Smoking 0.001 Yes 14 (22.6) 39 (56.5) No 48 (77.4) 30 (43.5) HHcy, mmol/L 12.16 ± 8.01 13.98 ± 10.31 0.314 Yes (>10 mmol/L) 36 (58.1) 43 (62.3) 0.002 No (≤10 mmol/L) 16 (41.9) 26 (37.7) 0.002 Stroke history 0.002 Yes 15 (24.2) 35 (50.7) No 47 (75.8) 34 (49.3) 34 (49.3)	No	34 (54.8)	32 (46.4)	
Yes23 (37.1)46 (66.7)No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)0.002Yes15 (24.2)35 (50.7)0.002Yes15 (24.2)35 (50.7)0.002No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)0.011	Metabolic syndrome			0.008
No39 (62.9)23 (33.3)Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 ± 8.0113.98 ± 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)16 (41.9)26 (37.7)Stroke history0.002Yes15 (24.2)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	Yes	23 (37.1)	46 (66.7)	
Atrial fibrillation0.105Yes21 (33.9)33 (47.8)No41 (66.1)36 (52.2)Carotid stenosis0.652Yes28 (45.2)30 (43.5)No34 (54.8)39 (56.5)Alcohol consumption0.874Yes27 (43.5)31 (44.9)No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 \pm 8.0113.98 \pm 10.31Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (\leq 10 mmol/L)16 (41.9)26 (37.7)Stroke history0.002Yes15 (24.2)35 (50.7)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	No	39 (62.9)	23 (33.3)	
$\begin{array}{cccc} Yes & 21 (33.9) & 33 (47.8) \\ No & 41 (66.1) & 36 (52.2) \\ \hline Carotid stenosis & 0.652 \\ Yes & 28 (45.2) & 30 (43.5) \\ No & 34 (54.8) & 39 (56.5) \\ \hline Alcohol consumption & 0.874 \\ Yes & 27 (43.5) & 31 (44.9) \\ No & 35 (56.5) & 38 (55.1) \\ \hline Smoking & 0.001 \\ Yes & 14 (22.6) & 39 (56.5) \\ No & 48 (77.4) & 30 (43.5) \\ \hline HHcy, mmol/L & 12.16 \pm 8.01 & 13.98 \pm 10.31 & 0.314 \\ Yes (>10 mmol/L) & 16 (41.9) & 26 (37.7) \\ \hline Stroke history & 0.002 \\ Yes & 15 (24.2) & 35 (50.7) \\ No & 47 (75.8) & 34 (49.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$	Atrial fibrillation			0.105
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	21 (33.9)	33 (47.8)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} Carotid stenosis & 0.652 \\ Yes & 28 & (45.2) & 30 & (43.5) \\ No & 34 & (54.8) & 39 & (56.5) \\ Alcohol consumption & 0.874 \\ Yes & 27 & (43.5) & 31 & (44.9) \\ No & 35 & (56.5) & 38 & (55.1) \\ Smoking & 0.001 \\ Yes & 14 & (22.6) & 39 & (56.5) \\ No & 48 & (77.4) & 30 & (43.5) \\ HHcy, mmol/L & 12.16 \pm 8.01 & 13.98 \pm 10.31 & 0.314 \\ Yes & (>10 mmol/L) & 36 & (58.1) & 43 & (62.3) \\ No & (\le 10 mmol/L) & 16 & (41.9) & 26 & (37.7) \\ Stroke history & 0.002 \\ Yes & 15 & (24.2) & 35 & (50.7) \\ No & 47 & (75.8) & 34 & (49.3) \\ \end{array}$	No	41 (66.1)	36 (52.2)	
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} Yes & 28 (45.2) & 30 (43.5) \\ No & 34 (54.8) & 39 (56.5) \\ \\ \mbox{Alcohol consumption} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Carotid stenosis			0.652
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	28 (45.2)	30 (43.5)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} \mbox{Alcohol consumption} & 0.874 \\ \mbox{Yes} & 27 (43.5) & 31 (44.9) \\ \mbox{No} & 35 (56.5) & 38 (55.1) \\ \mbox{Smoking} & 0.001 \\ \mbox{Yes} & 14 (22.6) & 39 (56.5) \\ \mbox{No} & 48 (77.4) & 30 (43.5) \\ \mbox{HHcy, mmol/L} & 12.16 \pm 8.01 & 13.98 \pm 10.31 & 0.314 \\ \mbox{Yes} (>10 mmol/L) & 36 (58.1) & 43 (62.3) \\ \mbox{No} (\le 10 mmol/L) & 16 (41.9) & 26 (37.7) \\ \mbox{Stroke history} & 0.002 \\ \mbox{Yes} & 15 (24.2) & 35 (50.7) \\ \mbox{No} & 47 (75.8) & 34 (49.3) \\ \end{array}$	No	34 (54.8)	39 (56.5)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Alcohol consumption			0.874
No35 (56.5)38 (55.1)Smoking0.001Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 \pm 8.0113.98 \pm 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (\leq 10 mmol/L)16 (41.9)26 (37.7)Stroke history0.002Yes15 (24.2)35 (50.7)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	Yes	27 (43.5)	31 (44.9)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No	35 (56.5)	38 (55.1)	
Yes14 (22.6)39 (56.5)No48 (77.4)30 (43.5)HHcy, mmol/L12.16 \pm 8.0113.98 \pm 10.310.314Yes (>10 mmol/L)36 (58.1)43 (62.3)No (\leq 10 mmol/L)16 (41.9)26 (37.7)Stroke history0.002Yes15 (24.2)35 (50.7)No47 (75.8)34 (49.3)	Smoking			0.001
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	14 (22.6)	39 (56.5)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} HHcy, mmol/L & 12.16 \pm 8.01 & 13.98 \pm 10.31 & 0.314 \\ Yes (>10 mmol/L) & 36 (58.1) & 43 (62.3) & \\ No (\leq 10 mmol/L) & 16 (41.9) & 26 (37.7) & \\ Stroke history & & & & \\ Yes & 15 (24.2) & 35 (50.7) & \\ No & 47 (75.8) & 34 (49.3) & \\ \end{array}$	No	48 (77.4)	30 (43.5)	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} Yes (>10 \text{ mmol/L}) & 36 (58.1) & 43 (62.3) \\ No (\leq 10 \text{ mmol/L}) & 16 (41.9) & 26 (37.7) \\ \text{Stroke history} & & & & & & \\ Yes & 15 (24.2) & 35 (50.7) \\ No & 47 (75.8) & 34 (49.3) \\ \end{array} $	HHcy, mmol/L	12.16±8.01	13.98±10.31	0.314
No (≤10 mmol/L) 16 (41.9) 26 (37.7) Stroke history 0.002 Yes 15 (24.2) 35 (50.7) No 47 (75.8) 34 (49.3)	Yes (>10 mmol/L)	36 (58.1)	43 (62.3)	
Stroke history 0.002 Yes 15 (24.2) 35 (50.7) No 47 (75.8) 34 (49.3)	No (<10 mmol/L)	l6 (41.9)	26 (37.7)	
Yes 15 (24.2) 35 (50.7) No 47 (75.8) 34 (49.3)	Stroke history			0.002
No 47 (75.8) 34 (49.3)	Yes	15 (24.2)	35 (50.7)	
	No	47 (75.8)	34 (49.3)	

 Table 1. Demographic and general characteristics of patients with sICH

Data are presented as n (%) or mean \pm standard deviation. HHcy, hyperhomocysteinemia; mRS, modified rankin scale; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; sICH, spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage.

between the favorable and unfavorable prognosis groups according to the univariate analysis of each variable separately. However, significant differences were found in the following risk factors: hypertension, diabetes, metabolic syndrome, atrial fibrillation, smoking, and stroke history (p < 0.05).

Variables	Favorable prognosis(n = 62)	Unfavorable prognosis(n = 69)	t value	þ value
SBP				
Mean	151.23 ± 14.09	164.51 ± 16.32	3.562	0.016
SD	16.85 ± 3.36	$\textbf{19.25} \pm \textbf{5.91}$	3.125	0.032
CV	11.82 ± 3.02	13.75 ± 3.87	2.641	0.006
Max–Min	$\textbf{71.08} \pm \textbf{22.34}$	82.27 ± 23.64	2.712	0.001
DBP				
Mean	$\textbf{89.10} \pm \textbf{15.12}$	$\textbf{92.16} \pm \textbf{14.78}$	1.612	0.135
SD	11.32 ± 2.39	13.56 ± 2.97	2.160	0.036
CV	$\textbf{9.63} \pm \textbf{2.52}$	$\textbf{12.14} \pm \textbf{2.18}$	1.523	0.026
Max-Min	$\textbf{42.36} \pm \textbf{12.27}$	$\textbf{52.38} \pm \textbf{I3.29}$	2.635	0.001

Table 2. Effects of BPV on 90-day neurological outcome of patients with sICH

Data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation. BPV, blood pressure variability; CV, coefficient of variation; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SD, standard deviation; sICH, spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage

Effects of BPV on 90-day neurological outcome of patients with sICH

As shown in Table 2, the independentsamples *t* test revealed significant differences in the following parameters between the favorable and unfavorable prognosis groups: SD, CV, and Max–Min of diastolic BP and Mean, SD, CV, and Max–Min of systolic BP (p < 0.05 for all).

Association of greater BPV fluctuation with worse prognosis of sICH

The multiple logistics regression analysis demonstrated a correlation between the 90-day mRS score and BPV (systolic BP: Max–Min < 60, $60 \le$ Max–Min < 80, and Max–Min \ge 80; diastolic BP: Max–Min < 20, $20 \le$ Max–Min < 40, and Max–Min \ge 40) (p < 0.001) (Table 3). The Spearman correlation analysis revealed a positive correlation between BPV of systolic BP and the 90-day mRS score (Table 4). These results indicate greater fluctuation of BPV and a worse prognosis in patients with sICH.

Discussion

Changes in BP are well known to occur in patients with acute stroke. Both short- and long-term BPV can act as a reliable predictor for stroke prognosis and stroke recurrence. Abundant studies have reported that 24-hour BPV plays a critical role in strokeinduced neurological impairment. The present study has shown that high systolic or diastolic BPV within 24 hours of hemorrhagic stroke onset is associated with the 90-day neurological prognosis.

BPV is considered a distinctive novel risk factor for both cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases. BPV is primarily divided into short-term BPV (minutes to hours) and long-term BPV (days to months). Short-term BPV is usually defined as the oscillation of BP within a 24-hour period (minute-to-minute, hour-to-hour, and dayto-night oscillation) in addition to beatto-beat oscillation (very-short-term BPV). Long-term BPV includes day-to-day, visitto-visit, and season-to-season variability.¹⁰ Previous studies have clearly shown that enhanced fluctuation of BP induces vascular stiffness and lesion formation, artery

	SD			C			Max-Min		
Variables	Max–Min < 60	60 ≤ Max–Min < 80	Max-Min ≥ 80	Max–Min < 60	60 ≤ Max–Min < 80	Max-Min ≥ 80	Max-Min < 60	60 ≤ Max–Min < 80	Max-Min ≥ 80
SBP OR (95% CI) \$\u0395 value	1 1	2.31 (1.63–3.64) 0.0012	4.99 (3.86–6.12) 0.0008		4.16 (3.05–5.13) 0.0056	4.37 (2.57–6.72) 0.0032	1 1	1.26 (0.95–2.61) 0.0001	4.39 (4.01–6.34) 0.0001
	Max–Min < 20	20 ≤ Max–Min < 40	Max-Min > 40	Max–Min < 20	20 ≤ Max-Min < 40	Max-Min > 40	Max–Min < 20	20 ≤ Max-Min < 40	Max-Min > 40
DBP OR (95% CI) \$ value		1.36 (1.06–1.78) 0.81	2.02 (1.86–3.61) 0.009	1 1	1.95 (1.36–3.97) 0.23	3.87 (3.02–5.12) 0.0002	1 1	1.03 (1.09–2.52) 0.96	1.41 (1.35–1.99) 0.0005
The variables adj confidence interv deviation; sICH, s	usted for in al; CV, coeffi spontaneous	the multivariate moc icient of variation; D intracerebral hemor	del were hypertensic BP, diastolic blood p rrhage.	on, diabetes, oressure; Ma	metabolic syndrom x, maximum; Min, m	e, smoking, and stro inimum; OR, odds	oke history. E ratio; SBP, s	8PV, blood pressure stolic blood pressu	variability; Cl, re; SD, standard

	,	
Variables	Coefficient r	þ value
SBP		
SD	0.225	0.009
CV	0.641	0.002
Max–Min	0.312	0.007
DBP		
SD	2.186	0.162
CV	3.501	0.231
Max–Min	4.635	0.138

 Table 4.
 Spearman's rank correlation test

 between BPV and 90-day mRS score

BPV, blood pressure variability; CV, coefficient of variation; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SD, standard deviation.

remodeling, and the onset of arteriosclerotic disease.¹¹ Many clinical trials have demonstrated that short-term and long-term BPV not only independently contribute to cerebrovascular events but also implicate prognostic significance.^{12–15} The present study, designed as a clinical investigation of short-term BPV, confirmed that 24-hour BPV after the onset of hemorrhagic stroke is detrimental to the 90-day neurological prognosis. We also found that both systolic and diastolic BPV within 24 hours of hemorrhagic stroke onset determines the 90-day neurological prognosis; this finding differs from preliminary evidence indicating that systolic BPV is independently associated with poor functional outcomes.¹⁶

During the past decade, increasing numbers of clinical investigations have noted a relationship between BPV and the risk of stroke.^{17,18} A significant association has also been established between diastolic BPV and the risk of hemorrhagic but not ischemic stroke. A recent study showed that higher visit-to-visit diastolic BPV contributes to the risk of any stroke and specifically to hemorrhagic stroke, but not ischemic stroke.¹⁹ Several studies have provided evidence that exaggerated BP fluctuations may be harmful and detrimental to stroke recovery.^{20,21} The present study showed that short-term (24-hour) diastolic BPV was also associated with the risk of hemorrhagic stroke and determined the neurological outcome 90 days after the onset of hemorrhagic stroke. Overall, both short-term (24-hour) and long-term (visit-to-visit) diastolic BPV has a detrimental role in the risk of hemorrhagic stroke and the neurological outcome. Therefore, amelioration of BPV has been suggested as an additional clinically relevant treatment of cerebrovascular disease.

Increasing evidence implicates that the stroke outcome is strongly influenced by a multitude of variables related either to metabolic homeostasis, the inflammatory response, or cerebral perfusion and hemodynamics.^{22–24} All these factors may act either at the site of brain damage or at the systemic level; influence neurovascular recovery, secondary brain damage, and systemic complications; and consequently impact the clinical outcome.^{23,25} Accordingly, the ever-growing insight into the stroke pathophysiology and process could aid the identification of the clinical, biochemical, or brain imaging parameters that may improve prognostic algorithms.^{26,27} Preclinical and clinical studies have indicated the detrimental role of BPV in the stroke process,^{24,27,28} and because many of these variables in the stroke process can be controlled, regulation of BPV could represent a potential therapeutic target.

Most research data mainly focuses on the association between BPV and ischemic stroke, and BPV is associated with poorer functional outcomes of ischemic stroke than other types of stroke.^{29,30} However, one prospective study of 608 consecutive patients admitted with acute ischemic stroke demonstrated no association between BPV during the acute phase of ischemic stroke and in-hospital outcomes.³¹ Data on the association between BPV in patients with hemorrhagic stroke and functional outcomes are limited. Moreover, the present study had

a small sample and no long-term follow-up. Hence, larger multicenter clinical observation trials with larger sample sizes are needed to clarify the role of BPV in the neurological prognosis of patients with hemorrhagic stroke.

Accruing evidence is showing that a BPlowering strategy used in the acute setting of sICH may limit the hematoma growth and be potentially beneficial to the stroke outcome.^{32–34} Lowering BP in the acute phase of sICH may influence BPV itself, and different classes of anti-hypertensive agents have different effects on BPV.^{35–37} Nevertheless, the present study provides no data about the anti-hypertensive drug classes used by the patients, or whether or how BP was lowered in the acute setting. This represents another study limitation. Further experimental research of antihypertensive drugs is required to shed new light on the role of BPV in patients with hemorrhagic stroke.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Professor Jia-Ning Wang for contributing to helpful discussions and to Wenbo He for expertly contributing to the clinical analysis.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Albertson M and Sharma J. Stroke: current concepts. S D Med 2014; 67: 455, 457–461, 463–455.
- 2. Suemoto CK, Grinberg LT, Leite REP, et al. Morphometric measurements of extracranial and intracranial atherosclerotic

disease: a population-based autopsy study. *Atherosclerosis* 2018; 270: 218–223.

- 3. Olatunji RB, Adekanmi AJ and Ogunseyinde AO. Intracranial arterial calcification in black Africans with acute ischaemic stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis Extra* 2018; 8: 26–38.
- 4. Gray SP and Jandeleit-Dahm KA. The role of NADPH oxidase in vascular disease –hypertension, atherosclerosis & stroke. *Curr Pharm Des* 2015; 21: 5933–5944.
- Tully PJ, Debette S, Dartigues JF, et al. Antihypertensive drug use, blood pressure variability, and incident stroke risk in older adults: three-city cohort study. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 1194–1200.
- Milonas D and Tziomalos K. Blood pressure variability: does it predict the outcome of acute ischemic stroke? *Am J Hypertens* 2017; 30: 476–477.
- Maeda AK, Aguiar LR, Martins C, et al. Hematoma volumes of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage: the ellipse (ABC/2) method yielded volumes smaller than those measured using the planimetric method. *Arq Neuropsiquiatr* 2013; 71: 540–544.
- 8. Hu TT, Yan L, Yan PF, et al. Assessment of the ABC/2 method of epidural hematoma volume measurement as compared to computer-assisted planimetric analysis. *Biol Res Nurs* 2016; 18: 5–11.
- 9. Kothari RU, Brott T, Broderick JP, et al. The ABCs of measuring intracerebral hemorrhage volumes. *Stroke* 1996; 27: 1304–1305.
- Herpin D and Ragot S. [Variability of blood pressure. Clinical and therapeutic implications]. *Rev Med Interne* 1995; 16: 131–136.
- 11. Nagai M, Dote K, Kato M, et al. Visit-tovisit blood pressure variability and classes of antihypertensive agents; associations with artery remodeling and the risk of stroke. *Curr Pharm Des* 2016; 22: 383–389.
- 12. de Havenon A, Bennett A, Stoddard GJ, et al. Increased blood pressure variability is associated with worse neurologic outcome in acute anterior circulation ischemic stroke. *Stroke Res Treat* 2016; 2016: 7670161.
- Muntner P, Whittle J, Lynch AI, et al. Visitto-visit variability of blood pressure and coronary heart disease, stroke, heart failure, and mortality: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2015; 163: 329–338.

- Manning LS, Rothwell PM, Potter JF, et al. Prognostic significance of short-term blood pressure variability in acute stroke: systematic review. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 2482–2490.
- 15. Manning LS, Mistri AK, Potter J, et al. Shortterm blood pressure variability in acute stroke: post hoc analysis of the controlling hypertension and hypotension immediately post stroke and continue or stop post-stroke antihypertensives collaborative study trials. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 1518–1524.
- Kellert L, Hametner C, Ahmed N, et al. Reciprocal interaction of 24-hour blood pressure variability and systolic blood pressure on outcome in stroke thrombolysis. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 1827–1834.
- Fukuda K, Kai H, Kamouchi M, et al. Day-by-day blood pressure variability and functional outcome after acute ischemic stroke: Fukuoka Stroke Registry. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 1832–1839.
- Chung JW, Kim N, Kang J, et al. Blood pressure variability and the development of early neurological deterioration following acute ischemic stroke. *J Hypertens* 2015; 33: 2099–2106.
- Dai H, Lu Y, Song L, et al. Visit-to-visit variability of blood pressure and risk of stroke: results of the Kailuan Cohort Study. Sci Rep 2017; 7: 285.
- Manning L, Hirakawa Y, Arima H, et al. Blood pressure variability and outcome after acute intracerebral haemorrhage: a post-hoc analysis of INTERACT2, a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2014; 13: 364–373.
- Buratti L, Cagnetti C, Balucani C, et al. Blood pressure variability and stroke outcome in patients with internal carotid artery occlusion. *J Neurol Sci* 2014; 339: 164–168.
- Lattanzi S, Bartolini M, Provinciali L, et al. Glycosylated hemoglobin and functional outcome after acute ischemic stroke. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis 2016; 25: 1786–1791.
- Zangari R, Zanier ER, Torgano G, et al. Early ficolin-1 is a sensitive prognostic marker for functional outcome in ischemic stroke. *J Neuroinflammation* 2016; 13: 16.
- 24. Lundholm MD, Rooney M, Maas MB, et al. Wake-up stroke is associated with greater

nocturnal mean arterial pressure variability. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 1668–1670.

- 25. Lattanzi S, Cagnetti C, Provinciali L, et al. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio predicts the outcome of acute intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 1654–1657.
- 26. Sporns PB, Schwake M, Schmidt R, et al. Computed tomographic blend sign is associated with computed tomographic angiography spot sign and predicts secondary neurological deterioration after intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 131–135.
- Shi Z, Li ES, Zhong JS, et al. Predictive significance of day-to-day blood pressure variability in acute ischemic stroke for 12-month functional outcomes. *Am J Hypertens* 2017; 30: 524–531.
- Kang J, Hong JH, Jang MU, et al. Change in blood pressure variability in patients with acute ischemic stroke and its effect on early neurologic outcome. *PLoS One* 2017; 12: e0189216.
- 29. Men X, Sun W, Fan F, et al. China Stroke Primary Prevention Trial: visit-to-visit systolic blood pressure variability is an independent predictor of primary stroke in hypertensive patients. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2017; 6.
- Tian G, Xiong L, Lin W, et al. External counterpulsation reduces beat-to-beat blood pressure variability when augmenting blood pressure and cerebral blood flow in ischemic stroke. *J Clin Neurol* 2016; 12: 308–315.
- Tziomalos K, Giampatzis V, Bouziana SD, et al. No association observed between blood pressure variability during the acute phase of ischemic stroke and in-hospital outcomes. *Am J Hypertens* 2016; 29: 841–846.
- Lattanzi S, Cagnetti C, Provinciali L, et al. How should we lower blood pressure after cerebral hemorrhage? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2017; 43: 207–213.
- Lattanzi S and Silvestrini M. Optimal achieved blood pressure in acute intracerebral hemorrhage: INTERACT2. *Neurology* 2015; 85: 557–558.
- 34. Arima H, Heeley E, Delcourt C, et al. Optimal achieved blood pressure in acute

intracerebral hemorrhage: INTERACT2. *Neurology* 2015; 84: 464–471.

- 35. Webb AJ, Fischer U, Mehta Z, et al. Effects of antihypertensive-drug class on interindividual variation in blood pressure and risk of stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2010; 375: 906–915.
- Lattanzi S, Silvestrini M and Provinciali L. Elevated blood pressure in the acute phase of stroke and the role of Angiotensin receptor blockers. *Int J Hypertens* 2013; 2013: 941783.
- Lattanzi S and Silvestrini M. Blood pressure in acute intra-cerebral hemorrhage. Ann Transl Med 2016; 4: 320.