

Author's Proof

Before checking your proof, please read the instructions below

- Carefully read the entire proof and mark all corrections in the appropriate place, using the Adobe Reader commenting tools (Adobe Help). Do not use the Edit tool, as direct edits could be missed (the PDF was blocked for editing to prevent this); annotate your corrections instead.
- Provide your corrections in a single PDF file or post your comments in the Production Forum, making sure to reference the relevant query/line number. Upload or post all your corrections directly in the Production Forum to avoid any comments being missed.
- We do not accept corrections via email or in the form of edited manuscripts.
- Do not provide scanned or handwritten corrections.
- Before you submit your corrections, make sure that you have checked your proof carefully as once you approve it you won't be able to make any further corrections.
- To ensure timely publication of your article, please submit your corrections within 48 hours. We will inform you if we need anything else; do not contact us to confirm receipt.
- Note that the column alignment at the bottom of each page is not ensured during this Author's Proof stage. The columns will be correctly aligned in the final PDF publication. You may therefore notice small differences in the structure of the Author's Proof PDF versus the final publication.

Do you need help? Visit our Production Help Center for more information. If you can't find an answer to your question, contact your Production team directly by posting in the Production Forum.

NOTE FOR CHINESE-SPEAKING AUTHORS: If you'd like to see a Chinese translation, click on the () symbol next to each query. Only respond in English as non-English responses will not be considered. Translated instructions for providing corrections can be found here.

Quick checklist

- **Author names** Complete, accurate and consistent with your previous publications.
- Affiliations Complete and accurate. Follow this style when applicable: Department, Institute, University, City, Country.
- **Tables** Make sure the meaning/alignment of your Tables is correct with the applied formatting style.
- **Figures** Make sure we are using the latest versions.
- **Funding and Acknowledgments** List all relevant funders and acknowledgments.
- Conflict of Interest Ensure any relevant conflicts are declared.
- **Supplementary files** Ensure the latest files are published and that no line numbers and tracked changes are visible. Also, the supplementary files should be cited in the article body text.
- Queries You must reply to all typesetter's queries below in order for production to proceed.
- Content Read all content carefully and ensure any necessary corrections are made, then upload them to the Production Forum.

Author queries form

Query no.	Details required	Author's response
Q1	Confirm that the article title is correct and check that it makes sense. $\ref{eq:sense}$	Yes, the title is correct

Query no.	Details required	Author's response
Q2	The citation and surnames of all of the authors have been high- lighted. Check that they are correct and consistent with your previous publications, and correct them if needed. Please note that this may affect the indexing of your article in repositories such as PubMed. If adding/removing authors, or changing the order of this list, please provide us with a signed Authorship Change form, which should be uploaded as a "Related Article" file type with your Author's Proof Corrections. (?)	The author's name has some mistakes. Zijin Wang should be change to Zijing Wang.
Q3	Provide a URL for the LOOP profile for the following authors if they wish this to be linked to the final published version. If they are not yet registered, ensure that they register with Frontiers at the provided link. Yunyun Liang, Pei Mo, Xinwu Liu, Lin Chen, Xiaomin Zhou, Zijin Wang. If a URL is not provided, the profile link will not be added to the article. Non-registered authors and authors with profiles set to "Private" will have the default profile image displayed. Note that we will not be able to add profile links after publication. 🕥	Thank you, I don't need this for now.
Q4	Provide the department details for affiliation [4]. 😚	2Department of Cardiology, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China 3Department of Neurology, Institute of Neuroscience, Key Laboratory of Neurogenetics and Chanelonathies of
Q5	Confirm that all author affiliations are correctly listed. Per our style guidelines, affiliations are listed sequentially and follow author order. Requests for non-sequential affiliation listing will not be fulfilled. Note that affiliations should reflect those at the time during which the work was undertaken. If adding new affiliations, specify if these should be listed as a present address instead of a regular affiliation. (?)	Guangdong Province and the Ministry of Education of China, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China 4Guilin Medical University, Guilin, China The affiliation has changed to the correct affiliation. IDepartment of Rehabilitation Medicine, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China 2Department of Cardiology, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China 3Department of Neurology, Institute of Neuroscience,
Q6	Confirm that the email address in your correspondence section is accurate. Any changes to corresponding authors requires individ- ual confirmation from all original and added/removed corresponding authors. 📀	Key Laboratory of Neurogenetics and Channelopathies of Guangdong Province and the Ministry of Education of China, The Second Affiliated Hospital, Guangzhou Me Yes, it is correct.
Q7	Confirm that the keywords are correct, and keep them to a maxi- mum of eight and a minimum of five. (Note: a keyword can be made up of one or more words.). (?	Yes, it is correct.
Q8	Check if the section headers (i.e., section levelling) have been correctly captured. $\ref{eq:correctly}$	Yes, it is correctly captured.
Q9	Check that all equations and special characters are displayed cor- rectly. 📀	Yes, it is correct.
Q10	Confirm that the Data Availability statement is accurate. Note that this statement may have been amended to adhere to our Publication Ethics guidelines. (?)	Yes, it is correct.

Query no.	Details required	Author's response
Q11	Confirm that the Ethics statement in this proof is correct. If this is not the latest version, please provide a revised Ethics statement. If your article contains identifiable human images, please check our Policies and Publication Ethics here. The statement of	Yes, it is correct.
Q12	Confirm that the details in the "Author Contributions" section are correct. If any contributions need to be added/edited, choose the appropriate CRedIT roles from the list available here and indicate which one(s) apply. Please be aware that writing roles ("Writing – original draft" and/or "Writing – review & editing") are a requirement for authorship. 📀	Yes, it is correct.
Q13	Ensure all grant numbers and funding information are included and accurate (after publication it is not possible to change this information). All funders should be credited, and all grant num- bers should be correctly included in this section. If you provided a positive funding statement but don't provide funding details, then the statement will be updated to say no funding was received.	We have miss one funding. The correct is as follows. This work was supported by a plan on enhancing scientific research in GMU, the Basic and Applied Basic Research Fund of Guangdong Province (2021A1515110596, 2022A1515220024), the Basic and Applied Basic Research Fund of Guangzhou science project (2024A04J3630).Guangzhou Health Science and Technology Project (20241A011079)
Q14	Confirm if the text included in the Conflict of Interest statement is correct. Please do not suggest edits to the wording of the final sentence, as this is standard for Frontiers' journal style, per our guidelines.	Yes, it is correct.
Q15	Please provide the DOI for reference [16], if applicable. 😚	Thank you, we have noticed that the proof has the DOI for reference.
Q16	If you decide to use previously published and/or copyrighted figures in your article, please keep in mind that it is your respon- sibility as the author to obtain the appropriate permissions and licenses to reproduce them, and to follow any citation instruc- tions requested by third-party rights holders. If obtaining the reproduction rights involves the payment of a fee, these charges are to be paid by the authors.	Sure, we will follow any citation instructions.
Q17	Ensure that all the figures, tables, and captions are correct, and that all figures are of the highest quality/resolution. You may upload improved figures to the Production Forum. If so, please describe in visual terms the exact changes(s) made to help us confirm that the updated version has been used in the finalized proof. Please note that figures and tables must be cited sequentially, per the author guidelines. (*)	Yes, it is correct.
Q18	The image used in Figure 2c has part labels; however, the part labels are missing in the caption. Please either provide a revised figure or modify the caption, as necessary. (?)	Thanks, we have provided a revised figure.

Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Mario Ammirati, Temple University, United States REVIEWED BY Bin Xu. Fudan University, China Mohamed Arafa, Tanta University, Egypt *CORRESPONDENCE Junvi Fu 🖂 fujunyi@gzhmu.edu.cn Longchang Xie 🖂 longchang3907@163.com [†]These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 29 August 2024 ACCEPTED 12 December 2024

published xx xx 2024

CITATION

Liang Y, Mo P, Chen Y, Liu X, Chen L, Zhou X,

Wang Z, Fu J and Xie L (2024) The method described by Czosnyka is particularly suitable for measuring CPPe in patients undergoing

cerebral angiography.

Front. Surg. 11:1488265.

doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2024.1488265

31 COPYRIGHT

32 © 2024 Liang, Mo, Chen, Liu, Chen, Zhou, Wang, Fu and Xie. This is an open-access

³³ article distributed under the terms of the

34 Creative Commons Attribution License (CC

BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in

- other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s)
- 6 original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in
- 37 are credited and that the original publication this journal is cited, in accordance with
- ³⁸ accepted academic practice. No use,
- distribution or reproduction is permitted
 which does not comply with these terms.
- 40 which does not comply with the

The method described by Czosnyka is particularly suitable for measuring CPPe in patients undergoing cerebral angiography a

Yunyun <mark>Liang^{1†}, Pei Mo^{2†}, Yonghong Chen^{3†}, Xinwu Liu³, Lin Chen⁵, Xiaomin Zhou³, Zijin Wang⁴, Junyi <mark>Fu</mark>³* and Longchang Xie³*</mark>

¹Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China, ²Department of Cardiology, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China, ³Department of Neurology, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China, ⁴Guilin Medical University, Guilin, China **Q4 Q5**

Background: The primary objective of this study was to estimate the effective cerebral perfusion pressure (CPPe), critical closing pressure (CrCP), and resistance-area product (RAP) of the intravascular common carotid artery using three different methods. These estimates were then compared to the reference method of linear regression (LR).

Methods: In our previous study, we employed linear regression to evaluate the values of CrCP and RAP. To assess the consistency of results obtained from alternative assessment methods (CPPe, CrCP, and RAP) with the linear regression LR, we conducted a secondary analysis of the previously collected data. We estimated the CPPe, CrCP, and RAP of the intravascular common carotid artery using three different methods: Belford's method (mean/diastolic pressure), Czosnyka's method (systolic/diastolic pressure, CZO), and Schmidt's method (systolic/diastolic pressure, SCH), and compared these estimates with LR. CPPe is calculated as the difference between mean arterial pressure and CrCP. The primary outcome was the mean differences and biases between CPPe, CrCP, and RAP of intravascular common carotid artery, the secondary outcome was correlations and agreement among these various estimates of CPPe measurements.

Results: Nineteen patients were included in this analysis. The median age was 53.5 ± 11.6 years, with 73.7% being men. There were no significant differences in CPPe, RAP and CrCP between the right common carotid artery (RCCA) and the left common carotid artery (LCCA) by using three different methods. Compared to the LR, the mean differences in CPPe and CrCP values were no significant for LCCA according to SCH, CZO and BEL method. But for RAP, the three methods are different in terms of mean differences compared with the LR. CPPe and CrCP revealed a small mean bias compared CPP_{CZO} with CPP_{LR}. Comparing CPPLR measurements with CPPBEL, the mean bias was higher with wider LoA. BEL and CZO showed a strong correlation with LR in Pearson correlation coefficients.

Q2 Q3

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

159

160

161

162

163

121 Q7

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

Conclusion: The CPPe, CrCP, and RAP values obtained using the CZO calculation methods are comparable to those measured using the reference method. These findings may provide valuable insights for patients undergoing digital subtraction brain angiography, aiding in the determination of the most suitable approach for individualized blood pressure management.

KEYWORDS

cerebral perfusion pressure, cerebral blood flow, resistance-area product, cerebrovascular resistance, critical closing pressure

Q8 1 Introduction

The maintenance of constant cerebral blood flow (CBF) is essential for normal brain function (1). Among the various Q9 mechanisms that regulate CBF, cerebral autoregulation (CA) is recognized as one of the most critical physiological processes. Cerebral autoregulation involves the adjustment of cerebral blood vessel tone in response to fluctuations in cerebral perfusion pressure (CPP), thereby ensuring stable CBF. Under physiological conditions, CA can be assessed clinically by measuring CBF or other substitutes related to CPP. When CA is intact and the mean arterial pressure (MAP) falls within the CA range, variations in CPP do not affect CBF. Conversely, when CA is impaired or MAP is outside the CA range, changes in CBF become directly dependent on CPP. Maintaining CPP above a certain threshold can mitigate cerebral ischemia; however, excessive CPP may lead to cerebral edema or induce systemic complications (2). CPP serves as a major determinant of CBF, and its monitoring is fundamental in the practice of neurosurgery (3).

Dewey et al. indicated that the cerebral perfusion pressure 144 (CPPe) of cerebral autoregulation (CA) can be calculated by 145 measuring the critical closing pressure (CrCP). Dewey posited 146 that within the effective regulatory range of CA, a decrease in 147 blood pressure corresponds to a reduction in the contraction of 148 vascular smooth muscle, leading to a decline in cerebrovascular 149 tone and CrCP. Ultimately, when the smooth muscle is fully 150 relaxed, CrCP reaches zero and does not decrease further with 151 additional reductions in blood pressure. At this juncture, the 152 effective perfusion pressure can no longer remain constant and 153 begins to fluctuate in response to changes in blood pressure, 154 resulting in a decrease in cerebral blood flow (4). The mean 155 arterial pressure (MAP) at this point is equivalent to CPPe, 156 which can be simply calculated by subtracting CrCP from MAP 157 prior to the change in blood pressure (5). 158

Since the introduction of transcranial Doppler sonography, several methods have been developed to assess brain CrCP, CPPe, and resistance-area product (RAP) through the evaluation of pressure-velocity relationships (6–8). CrCP is the pressure at which CBF reaches zero, and it can be extrapolated through line regression (LR) of CBFv-ABP. Meanwhile, the RAP refers to the slope of the instantaneous pressure-velocity relationship, calculated indirectly by dividing the mean cross-sectional blood flow velocity by the absolute flow divided by the arterial crosssectional area (9). However, determining the most effective methods for measuring CPPe, CrCP, and RAP continues to pose a challenge. The evaluation of CrCP through linear regression analysis of pressure-flow data necessitates a sophisticated computational approach. In contrast, we employ three previously published methods for estimating CrCP that utilize the slopeintercept formula. These methods are more straightforward than the regression analysis of digital ABP and CBFV curves and can be readily applied to bedside assessments without the need to correct for time delays between ABP and CBFV.

This study aims to utilize clinical data from prior studies to conduct a secondary analysis, estimating CPPe, RAP, and CrCP of the intravascular common carotid artery using three different methods (10-12), and comparing these estimates with the reference method of linear regression.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Research design, setting, and patients

The protocol was submitted to the hospital's ethics review committee prior to the trial. It was determined that no ethical approval was necessary, as the study did not interfere with or cause additional harm to the patients. All procedures were conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and all subjects provided informed consent.

This research involved 67 subjects who underwent cerebral digital subtraction angiography (DSA) due to cerebrovascular disease in the Department of Neurology between July 23, 2010, and February 9, 2011. The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) patients exhibiting signs and symptoms of cerebrovascular disease; (2) CT and MRI examinations of the brain meeting the diagnostic criteria for acute ischemic stroke; and (3) patients who

Abbreviations

ABP, arterial blood pressure; CA, cerebral autoregulation; CBF, cerebral blood flow; CBFV, cerebral blood flow velocity; CCA, common carotid artery; CPPe, effective
 cerebral perfusion pressure; CrCP, cerebral critical closing pressure; DAP, diastolic arterial pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; DSA, digital subtractive
 angiography; FV, flow velocity; MAP, mean arterial pressure; MCA, middle cerebral artery; PaCO2, partial pressure of carbon dioxide; PP, pulse pressure; RA,
 radial artery; RAP, resistance-area product; SAP, systolic arterial pressure; TCD, transcranial doppler ultrasound; Vd, diastolic blood flow velocity; Vm, mean
 blood flow velocity; Vs, systolic blood flow velocity; LR, linear regression; Belford (BEL, 2-point: mean/diastolic); Czosnyka (CZO, 2-point: systolic/diastolic);
 Schmidt (SCH, 2-point: systolic/diastolic).

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

consented to undergo the DSA examination. Subjects were excluded if their condition could compromise the arterial blood pressure (ABP) survey in the common carotid artery and middle cerebral artery, such as severe stenosis or occlusion of blood vessels, or if poor middle cerebral artery (MCA) velocity signals were observed using transcranial Doppler (TCD) ultrasound. Specifically, the MCA velocity of four patients displayed a Doppler envelope difference. Consequently, 63 patients were included in the examination, while 44 were excluded due to cerebrovascular stenosis. The data from 19 patients were subsequently considered for secondary analysis.

2.2 Experimental procedures

All procedures were performed in an intervention room. All DSA examinations were performed using standard biplane fluoroscopy (Axiom Artis; Siemens Corporation, Munich, Germany). Since the operation was performed on the right side of patients, all monitoring indicators used were on the left side. Two investigators performed all measurements. The MCA velocity signal was acquired using transcranial Doppler ultrasound (TCD, Multidrop; DWL, Sipplingen, Germany) with a 2 MHz probe fixed on the head frame. All measurements used a temporal acoustic window and Doppler depth that yielded the maximum velocity. Non-invasive radial ABP was recorded from a radial artery with a continuous ABP monitor (CBM7000; Colin Medical Technology Corp., Komaki, Japan). After automatic calibration and correction, changes in blood pressure were continuously monitored with pulse fluctuations, and calibration was repeated once every 5 min.

All procedures were performed with the patient under local anesthesia and using a unilateral femoral approach. During the procedure, when the angiography catheter (451–503H5, Cordis Corp, Hialeah, Florida, USA) was 1–2 cm away from the opening of the innominate artery, we simultaneously monitored the aortic blood pressure, radial blood pressure, and MCA blood FV as a set of data. When the angiography catheter (451–514H0; Cordis Corp., Hialeah, FL, USA) was 2–3 cm from the CCA opening, we simultaneously monitored the common carotid ABP, radial ABP, and MCA blood FV as a set of data, after the three waveforms became stable. To mitigate the impact of heartbeat and respiratory fluctuations on the waveforms, Stability was defined as the rate of change per minute of less than 10%. The trend graph was plotted and recorded for 5 min, and all data were synchronized to the hard disk of the TCD machine.

2.3 Data analysis

We selected the ABP (abscissa) and Vmca (ordinate) curves corresponding to 8–10 continuous cardiac cycles (spanning at least one respiratory cycle) with envelope rules from raw data of previous studies. Customized software was used to move the blood FV wave and blood pressure wave relative to each other until the correlation coefficient between these two parameters reached a maximum. CrCP represents the blood pressure axis intercept (that is, CBFV = 0) (13) (Figure 1). The RAP is obtained from the inverse of the gradient of the regression line. The CrCP and RAP of each cardiac cycle were estimated by regression analysis of the pressure-velocity graphs. The mean values of CrCP and RAP for all heartbeats during these breathing cycles were used for further study. We calculated the systolic blood flow velocity (V_S), diastolic blood flow velocity (V_S), mean blood flow velocity (Vm), mean arterial pressure (MAP), systolic blood pressure (SAP), and diastolic blood pressure (DAP) values for each cardiac cycle. The other methods applied formulae to estimate CrCP.

Calculations:

Belfort et al. (14) CrCP(BEL) = MAP - Vm $\times \frac{(MAP-DBP)}{(Vm-Vd)}$ Czosnyka et al. (12) CrCP(CZO) = SBP - Vs $\times \frac{(SBP-DBP)}{(Vs-Vd)}$ Schmidt et al. (15) CrCP(SCH) = MAP - (MAP $\times \frac{Vd}{Vm}$ + 14)

Subsequently, we calculated RAP as follows: RAP = (MAP - CrCP)/Vm. The CPPe for all methods was calculated as the difference between MAP and the respective CrCP.

2.4 Statistical analysis

Continuous classification and data are expressed as proportions (counts) and mean \pm standard deviation. Paired Student's *t*-test was used to compare data between CCA. CPPe, CrCP, and RAP were compared [based on three methods: Belford, Czosnyka, and



FIGURE 1

(a) The CBFV wave (red) and the ABP wave (blue) have been dragged horizontally, and the correlation coefficient between the two has reached the maximum. (b) The CrCP can be extrapolated through line regression (LR) of CBFV-ABP. The CrCP represents the intercept on the blood pressure axis (that is CBFV = 0).

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

3

392

Schmidt (BEL, CZO, and SCH)] with the LR for analysis of variance (ANOVA). Further, multiple comparisons were conducted using Dunnett's method. The relationship and agreement were tested with Pearson or Spearman correlation tests and Bland-Altman analyses. Statistical analysis was performed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 software package (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) and GraphPad Prism version 7.0. P < 0.05 indicated statistical significance.

3 Results

The baseline characteristics of the nineteen patients are presented in Table 1. The mean age of the patients was 53.5 ± 11.6 years, with 73.7% being men. Additionally, the prevalence of a history of hypertension, diabetes, and cerebral infarction among the patients was 36.8%, 26.3%, and 15.8%, respectively.

There were no significant differences observed between the right common carotid artery (RCCA) and the left common carotid artery (LCCA) in terms of vessel speed (Vs), diastolic velocity (Vd), mean velocity (Vm), mean arterial pressure (MAP), systolic arterial pressure (SAP), and diastolic arterial pressure (DAP) during the corresponding measurements. Additionally, no significant differences in cerebral perfusion pressure (CPPe), right atrial pressure (RAP), and cranial compliance pressure (CrCP) were detected using three different methods (Table 2).

Compared to the reference method, the mean differences in CPPe and CrCP values for the left common carotid artery (LCCA) according to the SCH method were 7.7 (-5.0, 20.4) mmHg and -7.7 (-24.1, 8.6) mmHg, respectively. For the right common carotid artery (RCCA), the mean differences in CPPe and CrCP were 5.8 (-4.6, 16.2) mmHg and -5.8 (-22.6, 11.0) mmHg, respectively. According to the CZO calculation method,

TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics of 19 patients.

376	Variable	Mean + SD
377	Age (year)	53.5 ± 11.6
378	Male	14 (73.7%)
379	Temperature (°C)	36.3 ± 0.3
380	Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	142.1 ± 24.2
381	Diastolic blood pressure, (mmHg)	85.0 ± 14.7
387	Heart rate (beats/min)	71.19 ± 7.9
202	Hypertension	7 (36.8%)
565	Diabetes	5 (26.3%)
384	Hyperlipidemia	10 (15.9%)
385	Cerebral infarction	3 (15.8%)
386	Medications	
387	Beta-blockers	1 (5.3%)
388	Calcium channel blockers	4 (21.1%)
389	ACE inhibitors	2 (10.5%)
390	Smoking	9 (47.4%)
391	Drinking	1 (5.3%)

Values are mean + SD/N (%).

TABLE 2 Comparison of parameters estimated by 4 different methods: between the common carotid artery.

	The difference between LCCA and RCCA			
	LCCA (n = 19)	RCCA (<i>n</i> = 19)	P value	
VM (cm s ⁻¹)	56.3 ± 16.8	56.4 ± 15.6	0.782	
VS (cm s ⁻¹)	90.5 ± 26.5	89.8 ± 25.3	0.525	
VD (cm s ⁻¹)	33.5 ± 10.8	33.4 ± 10.4	0.843	
MAP (mmHg)	106.9 ± 20.8	105.9 ± 20.6	0.182	
SBP (mmHg)	155.3 ± 27.1	154.7 ± 26.6	0.755	
DBP (mmHg)	83.2 ± 20.1	81.8 ± 19.6	0.147	
CPP _{LR} (mmHg)	69.5 ± 19.9	70.6 ± 15.9	0.817	
CPP _{BEL} (mmHg)	58.3 ± 13.8	58.5 ± 12.8	0.914	
CPP _{CZO} (mmHg)	65.8 ± 16.9	66.5 ± 14.0	0.685	
CPP _{SCH} (mmHg)	77.3 ± 13.7	76.4 ± 10.3	0.838	
CrCP _{LR} (mmHg)	37.4 ± 26.0	35.3 ± 23.3	0.300	
CrCP _{BEL} (mmHg)	48.7 ± 21.2	47.4 ± 18.1	0.497	
CrCP _{CZO} (mmHg)	41.1 ± 22.9	39.4 ± 19.4	0.342	
CrCP _{SCH} (mmHg)	29.7 ± 10.6	29.5 ± 24.7	0.961	
RAP _{LR} (mmHg s cm ⁻¹)	0.78 ± 0.23	0.76 ± 0.21	0.778	
RAP _{BEL} (mmHg s cm ⁻¹)	1.11 ± 0.38	1.11 ± 0.40	0.967	
RAP _{CZO} (mmHg s cm ⁻¹)	1.24 ± 0.43	1.26 ± 0.43	0.715	
RAP _{SCH} (mmHg s cm ⁻¹)	1.50 ± 0.55	1.47 ± 0.51	0.752	

LCCA, left common carotid artery; RCCA, right common carotid artery; Vd, Vm, Vs = diastolic, mean, and systolic blood flow velocity; DAP, MAP, SAP, diastolic, mean, and systolic arterial pressure; CPP, cerebral perfusion pressure; CrCP, cerebral critical closing pressure; RAP, resistance-area product; LR (linear regression); Belford (BEL, 2-point: mean/diastolic); Czosnyka (CZO, 2-point: systolic/diastolic), and Schmidt (SCH, 2-point: systolic/diastolic). \mbox{CPP}_{BEL} indicates effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on BEL; CPP_{CZO} and CPP_{SCH}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on CZO and SCH; CPP_{LR}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on LR.

the mean differences in CPPe and CrCP values for LCCA were -3.7 (-16.4, 9.0) mmHg and 3.7 (-12.6, 20.0) mmHg, respectively. The average differences between CPPe and CrCP in RCCA were -4.1 (-14.5, 6.4) mmHg and 4.1 (-12.7, 20.9) mmHg, respectively. According to BEL's calculation method, the average differences in CPPe and CrCP values for LCCA were -11.2 (-23.9, 1.5) mmHg and 11.2 (-5.1, 27.6) mmHg, respectively. The mean differences between CPPe and CrCP in RCCA were -12.1 (-22.6, -1.7) mmHg and 12.2 (-4.6, 28.9) mmHg, respectively. It is noteworthy that RAP is not affected by this calculation method (Table 3).

The Bland-Altman analysis of CPPe and CrCP revealed a small mean bias when comparing CPP_{CZO} with CPP_{LR}, Comparing CPP_{LR} measurements with CPP_{BEL} , the mean bias was moderately higher with wider LoA (mean bias -11.2 mm Hg, LoA: -28.2 to 5.8 mm Hg). CPP_{SCH} showed less agreement with the reference method, with a mean bias of 7.7 mm Hg (wideranging LoA: -36.5 to 52.0 mm Hg). Biases and the 95% limits of agreement between RAP_{LR} values (reference method) and the RAP_{BEL}, RAP_{CZO}, and RAP_{SCH} calculation methods were small (Table 4; Figure 2).

The Pearson correlation coefficients between the CPPe, CrCP, and RAP estimates, based on the BEL and CZO estimates as well as the LR, indicated a strong correlation. In contrast, the correlation between the CPPe and RAP assessed using the SCH estimations and the LR was slightly weaker (Table 5).

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

393

394

0.887

0.744

0.024

0.001

0.000

CrCP_{CZO} (mmHg)

CrCP_{SCH} (mmHg)

RAP_{LR} (mmHg s cm⁻¹)

RAP_{BEL} (mmHg s cm⁻¹)

RAP_{CZO} (mmHg s cm⁻¹)

RAP_{SCH} (mmHg s cm⁻¹)

449 45

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473 474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

multiple comparis	on (Dunnett)			· · · ·			
)							
		The difference between LCCA and RCCA					
2	LCCA	LCCA (<i>n</i> = 19)		RCCA (<i>n</i> = 19)			
	MD	P value	MD	P value			
CPP _{LR} (mmHg)				-			
CPP _{BEL} (mmHg)	-11.2 (-23.9, 1.5)	0.094	-12.1 (-22.6, -1.7)	0.018			
CPP _{CZO} (mmHg)	-3.7 (-16.4, 9.0)	0.824	-4.1 (-14.5, 6.4)	0.668			
CPP _{SCH} (mmHg)	7.7 (-5.0, 20.4)	0.332	5.8 (-4.6, 16.2)	0.406			
CrCP _{LR} (mmHg)				-			
CrCP _{BEL} (mmHg)	11.2 (-5.1, 27.6)	0.242	12.2 (-4.6, 28.9)	0.206			

0.906

0.532

0.044

0.003

0.000

LCCA, left common carotid artery; RCCA, right common carotid artery; CPP, cerebral perfusion pressure; CrCP, cerebral critical closing pressure; RAP, resistance-area product; LR (linear

regression). Belford (BEL, 2-point: mean/diastolic), Czosnyka (CZO, 2-point: systolic/diastolic), and Schmidt (SCH, 2-point: systolic/diastolic). CPPBEL indicates effective cerebral perfusion

pressure based on BEL; CPP_{CZO} and CPP_{SCH}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on CZO and SCH; CPP_{LR}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on LR.

3.7 (-12.6, 20.0)

-7.7(-24.1, 8.6)

0.33 (0.01, 0.65)

0.46 (0.14, 0.79)

0.72 (0.39, 1.04)

TABLE 3 Differences between the 3 test methods of estimation (BEL, CZO, and SCH) and LR were tested by analysis of variance, with correction for

TABLE 4 Bland-Altman analysis of the difference of CPPe, crCP and RAP between the 3 test methods of estimation (BEL, CZO, and SCH) and LR.

Dependent	Independent Sample variable size	LCCA		RCCA		
variable		size	Mean difference	95% Limits of agreement	Mean difference	95% Limits of agreement
CPP _{BEL}	CPP _{LR}	19	-11.2	(-28.2 to 5.8)	12.2	(-5.5 to 29.8)
CPP _{CZO}	CPP _{LR}	19	-3.7	(-16.8 to 9.4)	4.1	(-10.3 to 18.5)
CPP _{SCH}	CPP _{LR}	19	7.7	(-36.5 to 52.0)	-5.8	(-46.5 to 34.9)
CrCP _{BEL}	CrCP _{LR}	19	11.2	(-5.8 to 28.2)	-12.1	(-29.8 to 5.5)
CrCP _{CZO}	CrCP _{LR}	19	3.7	(-9.4 to 16.8)	-4.1	(-18.5 to 10.3)
CrCP _{SCH}	CrCP _{LR}	19	-7.7	(-52.0 to 36.5)	5.8	(-34.9 to 46.5)
RAP _{BEL}	RAPLR	19	0.33	(-0.83 to 1.49)	-0.35	(-1.51 to 0.81)
RAP _{CZO}	RAPLR	19	0.46	(-0.79 to 1.72)	-0.50	(-1.72 to 0.72)
RAP _{SCH}	RAPLR	19	0.72	(-0.59 to 2.02)	-0.71	(-2.00 to 0.59)

LCCA, left common carotid artery; RCCA, right common carotid artery; CPP, cerebral perfusion pressure; CrCP, cerebral critical closing pressure; RAP, resistance-area product; LR (linear regression). Belford (BEL, 2-point: mean/diastolic), Czosnyka (CZO, 2-point: systolic/diastolic), and Schmidt (SCH, 2-point: systolic/diastolic). CPPBEL indicates effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on BEL; CPP_{CZO} and CPP_{SCH}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on CZO and SCH; CPP_{LR}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on LR.

4 Discussion

In a secondary analysis of previously collected data, we validated three distinct estimates of CPPe, CrCP, and RAP in 19 patients undergoing digital subtraction cerebral angiography (DSA) for cerebrovascular disease. We employed custom software to align blood flow velocity (FV) waves with blood pressure waves, correcting for the time delay between arterial blood pressure (ABP) and cerebral blood flow velocity (CBFV) to minimize errors and enhance data accuracy. Our study demonstrated that the CPPe, CrCP, and RAP assessed from the common carotid artery (CCA) recordings validated the differences, relevance, and consistency among the three estimated test methods (BEL, CZO, and SCH) in comparison to the LR. The main findings of this paper are as follows: (1) the mean differences in the results of the CPPe and CrCP measurements based on the CZO and SCH calculation methods are minimal and align well with the LR; (2) when using LR as the reference method, the consistency of CPPe and CrCP was weak for the BEL method; and (3) RAP remains unaffected by these estimation methods.

4.1 (-12.7, 20.9)

-5.8 (-22.6, 11.0)

0.35 (0.04, 0.66)

0.50 (0.18, 0.81)

0.71 (0.39, 1.02)

Our data suggest that two-point extrapolation (CZO) estimates of CPPe and CrCP, derived from systolic and diastolic blood pressure data, are more accurate. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that, despite its limited capacity to predict CPP, the CZO estimation method effectively detects true CPP changes over time. Consequently, this method can serve as a non-invasive continuous monitoring tool for patients with mild to moderate head injuries (5, 12).

Our results indicate that the consistency of CPPe and CrCP obtained using the BEL method is weaker than that of the LR. This discrepancy may arise from the fact that the CrCP estimate calculated by the BEL method relies solely on the mean and diastolic period, omitting systolic values for both ABP and Vmca. 505

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572 018

573

574

575

576

577

578

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616





FIGURE 2

Bland-Altman analysis of the difference between the 3 test methods of CPPe estimation (BEL, CZO, and SCH) and reference method (LR). The solid horizontal line indicates the mean difference (bias) computed across the study population; dashed lines indicate the 95% CI limits for the mean. (a) Mean differences of CPPe between BEL and LR. (b) Mean differences of CPPe between CZO and LR, (a) mean differences of CPPe between SCH and LR.

TABLE 5 Correlation of CPPe, crCP and RAP between the 3 test methods of estimation (BEL, CZO, and SCH) and LR.

579	Dependent	Independent	Sample	LCCA		RCCA	
580 581	variable	variable	size	Correlation coefficient	P value	Correlation coefficient	P value
582	CPP _{BEL}	CPP _{LR}	19	0.933	P < 0.0001	0.824	<i>P</i> < 0.0001
583	CPP _{CZO}	CPP _{LR}	19	0.948	P < 0.0001	0.886	P < 0.0001
584	CPP _{SCH}	CPP _{LR}	19	0.139	P = 0.570	-0.229	P = 0.346
585	CrCP _{BEL}	CrCP _{LR}	19	0.953	P < 0.0001	0.937	P < 0.0001
586	CrCP _{CZO}	CrCP _{LR}	19	0.971	P < 0.0001	0.958	P < 0.0001
587	CrCP _{SCH}	CrCP _{LR}	19	0.505	P < 0.05	0.628	P < 0.05
588	RAP _{BEL}	RAP _{LR}	19	-0.873	P < 0.0001	-0.872	P < 0.0001
500	RAP _{CZO}	RAP _{LR}	19	-0.916	P < 0.0001	-0.894	P < 0.0001
589 590	RAP _{SCH}	RAP _{LR}	19	-0.349	P = 0.143	-0.605	<i>P</i> < 0.05

LCCA, left common carotid artery; RCCA, right common carotid artery; CPP, cerebral perfusion pressure; CrCP, cerebral critical closing pressure; RAP, resistance-area product; LR (linear regression). Belford (BEL, 2-point: mean/diastolic), Czosnyka (CZO, 2-point: systolic/diastolic), and Schmidt (SCH, 2-point: systolic/diastolic). CPP_BEL indicates effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on BEL; CPP_{CZO} and CPP_{SCH}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on CZO and SCH; CPP_{LR}, effective cerebral perfusion pressure based on LR.

Consequently, this approach reduces the distance of the velocity map, which could impact the accuracy of CrCP and RAP estimates. This omission may account for the broader BEL results observed in comparison to the standard approach (14).

Previous studies have demonstrated that, according to the formula proposed by Schmitt et al., there is a strong correlation between non-invasive CPPe and invasive CPPe values. The advantage of the SCH estimation method lies in its ability to reasonably detect genuine changes in cerebral perfusion pressure (CPP) over time. However, a notable disadvantage of this formula is the lack of a physiological or hemodynamic rationale; it is based solely on the investigator's 6 years of clinical experience. The authors derive the formula from the combination (multiplication) of the mean arterial blood pressure (ABP) and the nonlinear CPP-dependent factors FVd/FVm. When FVd is absent, the method exhibits a low saturation level of 14 mmHg (15). To the best of our knowledge, only a limited number of studies have employed SCH methods to evaluate CrCP, CPPe, or RAP. The CPPe values reported in previous studies utilizing the SCH method on average around 64 mmHg, which is lower than the findings of our study. This discrepancy may be attributed to the fact that those studies focused on

patients with traumatic brain injury and ischemic heart disease, as elevated intracranial pressure and compromised cardiac function can significantly influence perfusion pressure (12, 15).

To our knowledge, there are few reports concerning the CPPe, CrCP, and RAP values measured by invasive CCA in patients undergoing brain DSA examinations. A previous study reported CPP values measured by invasive CCA in patients undergoing brain DSA, with their CPP values averaging approximately 110 mmHg. Notably, the CPPe values reported in that study were higher than those observed in our monitoring results. This discrepancy may be attributed to differences in the CPP evaluation methods employed in the earlier research, where CPP was calculated as CPP = CVAP - ICP. The formula used for calculating ICP was ICP = $10.927 \times PI - 1.284$, and the measurement outcomes can also be influenced by variations in CCA measurement locations and monitoring equipment (16).

Comparing CrCP, CPPe, and RAP using pressure-flow velocity presents challenges due to variations in research design, objectives, statistical methods, and assessment techniques. Recently, Grüne validated alternative assessment methods based on the standard LR method, demonstrating good agreement (5). Furthermore, Giovanna evaluated three different equations to assess CPPe in

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701 702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

45 patients with severe traumatic brain injury (17). Their findings 673 indicated that BEL estimation methods closely aligned with the actual measured CPPe. This similarity may be attributed to differences in the research subjects, invasive arterial blood pressure assessments, calculation methodologies, general anesthesia, and artificial ventilation.

In our study, the Cerebral Perfusion Pressure (CPP) and Cerebral perfusion pressure (CrCP) were obtained from the Common Carotid Artery (CCA). The mean CPP recorded from the CCA was 70 ± 17.9 mmHg, aligning with the Brain Trauma Foundation's current guidelines, which recommend a CPP of 60-70 mmHg (18). However, the CPP observed in our study was lower than that reported in previous research (19, 20). This discrepancy may be attributed to variations among subjects and the severity of their conditions.

The CrCP levels observed in this study were consistent with those reported in previous research involving populations with conditions such as head injury (21), cerebral vasospasm (8), cardiac surgery (22), and survivors of comatose cardiac arrest (23). However, earlier studies indicated lower CrCP values (24, 25), which may be attributed to their focus on healthy volunteers or to various physiological, pathological, or pharmacological states that could influence CrCP measurements (26). Additionally, the variability in blood pressure readings across different monitoring equipment may be due to the distinct data processing methods employed by various test systems. In contrast, RAP appears to be unaffected by its estimation method, likely because it is linked to more rapid myogenic responses associated with autoregulation, whereas CrCP reflects a slower metabolic response to cerebral blood flow (CBF) regulation (27, 28).

5 Conclusion

We validated three distinct methods for evaluating CPPe, CrCP, and RAP in a cohort of 19 patients with ischemic stroke. Our study demonstrates that the estimates of CPPe, CrCP, and RAP obtained using CZO are simpler and more user-friendly for bedside assessment compared to standard methods.

5.1 Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the findings are applicable only to patients with access to intravascular blood pressure monitoring in the common carotid artery (CCA). Second, autoregulation is progressively diminished in cases where cerebral perfusion pressure (CPP) falls below 40 mmHg and in the presence of severe vascular stenosis. Consequently, the pressureflow graph may exhibit nonlinearity. Most methods for estimating cerebrovascular resistance (CrCP) are constrained to the linear range of the pressure-flow relationship, as they are derived from linear pressure-flow (velocity) graph analyses, yielding only "hypothetical" or "apparent" values. Thus, LR as the reference method in the classification of CrCP remains a subject of debate. Future investigations should encompass diverse patient populations, ideally including those with varying degrees of cerebrovascular stenosis who are undergoing interventional therapy.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

Ethics statement

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

Q14

012

010

Q11

729

730

The studies involving humans were approved by the institutional committee of the Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University. The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. Written informed consent for participation was not required from the participants or the participants' legal guardians/next of kin in accordance with the national legislation

Author contributions

and institutional requirements.

YL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Writing - original draft. PM: Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing - original draft, Writing review & editing. YC: Methodology, Resources, Writing - original draft. XL: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Software, Writing original draft. LC: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Software, Writing - original draft. XZ: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Software, Writing - original draft. ZW: Methodology, Resources, Writing - original draft. JF: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Writing - review & editing. LX: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Writing - review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare financial support was received for the Q13 research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This work was supported by a plan on enhancing scientific research in GMU, the Basic and Applied Basic Research Fund of Guangdong Province (2021A1515110596, 2022A1515220024), the Basic and Applied Basic Research Fund of Guangzhou science project (2024A04J3630).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

References

 Kvandal P, Sheppard L, Landsverk SA, Stefanovska A, Kirkeboen KA. Impaired cerebrovascular reactivity after acute traumatic brain injury can be detected by wavelet phase coherence analysis of the intracranial and arterial blood pressure signals. J Clin Monit Comput. (2013) 27(4):375–83. doi: 10.1007/ s10877-013-9484-z

2. Robertson CS. Management of cerebral perfusion pressure after traumatic brain injury. *Anesthesiology*. (2001) 95(6):1513–7. doi: 10.1097/00000542-200112000-00034

3. Weyland A, Buhre W, Grund S, Ludwig H, Kazmaier S, Weyland W, et al. Cerebrovascular tone rather than intracranial pressure determines the effective downstream pressure of the cerebral circulation in the absence of intracranial hypertension. J Neurosurg Anesthesiol. (2000) 12(3):210-6. doi: 10.1097/ 00008506-200007000-00002

4. Dewey RC, Pieper HP, Hunt WE. Experimental cerebral hemodynamics. Vasomotor tone, critical closing pressure, and vascular bed resistance. *J Neurosurg*. (1974) 41(5):597-606. doi: 10.3171/jns.1974.41.5.0597

5. Grüne F, Mik EG, Dieters E, Hoeks SE, Stolker RJ, Weyland A, et al. Effective cerebral perfusion pressure: does the estimation method make a difference? *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol.* (2020) 32(4):335-43. doi: 10.1097/ANA.000000000000614

 Aaslid R, Lash SR, Bardy GH, Gild WH, Newell DW. Dynamic pressure-flow velocity relationships in the human cerebral circulation. Stroke. (2003) 34(7):1645-9. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.0000077927.63758.B6

 Baker WB, Parthasarathy AB, Gannon KP, Kavuri VC, Busch DR, Abramson K, et al. Noninvasive optical monitoring of critical closing pressure and arteriole compliance in human subjects. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* (2017) 37(8):2691–705. doi: 10.1177/0271678X17709166

 Varsos GV, Budohoski KP, Czosnyka M, Kolias AG, Nasr N, Donnelly J, et al.
 Cerebral vasospasm affects arterial critical closing pressure. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab. (2015) 35(2):285–91. doi: 10.1038/jcbfm.2014.198

9. Evans DH, Levene MI, Shortland DB, Archer LN. Resistance index, blood flow velocity, and resistance-area product in the cerebral arteries of very low birth weight infants during the first week of life. *Ultrasound Med Biol.* (1988) 14(2):103–10. doi: 10.1016/0301-5629(88)90176-7

10. Liang Y, Mo P, Yang X, He Y, Zhang W, Zeng X, et al. Estimation of critical closing pressure using intravascular blood pressure of the common carotid artery. *Med Eng Phys.* (2022) 102:103759. doi: 10.1016/j.medengphy.2022.103759

11. Czosnyka M, Smielewski P, Piechnik S, Al-Rawi PG, Kirkpatrick PJ, Matta BF, et al. Critical closing pressure in cerebrovascular circulation. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr. (1999) 66(5):606–11. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.66.5.606

12. Czosnyka M, Matta BF, Smielewski P, Kirkpatrick PJ, Pickard JD. Cerebral perfusion pressure in head-injured patients: a noninvasive assessment using transcranial Doppler ultrasonography. *J Neurosurg.* (1998) 88(5):802–8. doi: 10. 3171/jns.1998.88.5.0802

13. Marzban C, Illian PR, Morison D, Moore A, Kliot M, Czosnyka M, et al. A method for estimating zero-flow pressure and intracranial pressure. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol.* (2013) 25(1):25–32. doi: 10.1097/ANA.0b013e318263c295

14. Belfort MA, Tooke-Miller C, Varner M, Saade G, Grunewald C, Nisell H, et al. Evaluation of a noninvasive transcranial Doppler and blood pressure-based method for the assessment of cerebral perfusion pressure in pregnant women. *Hypertens Pregnancy.* (2000) 19(3):331–40. doi: 10.1081/PRG-100101995 15. Schmidt EA, Czosnyka M, Gooskens I, Piechnik SK, Matta BF, Whitfield PC, et al. Preliminary experience of the estimation of cerebral perfusion pressure using transcranial Doppler ultrasonography. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr.* (2001) 70(2):198–204. doi: 10.1136/jnnp.70.2.198

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the

reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or

claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed

or endorsed by the publisher.

16. Liu B, Li Q, Li K, Deng N, He P, Qin C, et al. A non-invasive method to assess cerebral perfusion pressure in geriatric patients with suspected cerebrovascular disease. *PLoS One.* (2015) 10(3):e0120146. Q15

17. Brandi G, Béchir M, Sailer S, Haberthür C, Stocker R, Stover JF. Transcranial color-coded duplex sonography allows to assess cerebral perfusion pressure noninvasively following severe traumatic brain injury. *Acta Neurochir.* (2010) 152(6):965–72. doi: 10.1007/s00701-010-0643-4

18. Carney N, Totten AM, O'Reilly C, Ullman JS, Hawryluk GW, Bell MJ, et al. Guidelines for the management of severe traumatic brain injury, fourth edition. *Neurosurgery.* (2017) 80(1):6–15. doi: 10.1227/NEU.000000000001432

19. Bergman L, Cluver C, Carlberg N, Belfort M, Tolcher MC, Panerai RB, et al. Cerebral perfusion pressure and autoregulation in eclampsia-a case control study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* (2021) 225(2):185.e1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2021.03.017

20. Ko SB, Choi HA, Parikh G, Helbok R, Schmidt JM, Lee K, et al. Multimodality monitoring for cerebral perfusion pressure optimization in comatose patients with intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke.* (2011) 42(11):3087–92. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.623165

21. Edouard AR, Vanhille E, Le Moigno S, Benhamou D, Mazoit JX. Non-invasive assessment of cerebral perfusion pressure in brain injured patients with moderate intracranial hypertension. *Br J Anaesth.* (2005) 94(2):216–21. doi: 10.1093/bja/aei034

22. Maas JJ, de Wilde RB, Aarts LP, Pinsky MR, Jansen JR. Determination of vascular waterfall phenomenon by bedside measurement of mean systemic filling pressure and critical closing pressure in the intensive care unit. *Anesth Analg.* (2012) 114(4):803–10. doi: 10.1213/ANE.0b013e318247fa44

23. van den Brule JM, Vinke E, van Loon LM, van der Hoeven JG, Hoedemaekers CW. Middle cerebral artery flow, the critical closing pressure, and the optimal mean arterial pressure in comatose cardiac arrest survivors-an observational study. *Resuscitation.* (2017) 110:85–9. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2016.10.022

24. Barnes SC, Ball N, Haunton VJ, Robinson TG, Panerai RB. The cerebrocardiovascular response to periodic squat-stand maneuvers in healthy subjects: a time-domain analysis. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol.* (2017) 313(6): H1240–8. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00331.2017

25. Panerai RB, Saeed NP, Robinson TG. Cerebrovascular effects of the thigh cuff maneuver. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol.* (2015) 308(7):H688–96. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00887.2014

26. Chemla D, Lau EMT, Hervé P, Millasseau S, Brahimi M, Zhu K, et al. Influence of critical closing pressure on systemic vascular resistance and total arterial compliance: a clinical invasive study. *Arch Cardiovasc Dis.* (2017) 110(12):659–66. doi: 10.1016/j.acvd.2017.03.008

27. Panerai RB, Salinet AS, Brodie FG, Robinson TG. The influence of calculation method on estimates of cerebral critical closing pressure. *Physiol Meas.* (2011) 32(4):467–82. doi: 10.1088/0967-3334/32/4/007

28. Zuj KA, Arbeille P, Shoemaker JK, Hughson RL. Cerebral critical closing pressure and CO2 responses during the progression toward syncope. *J Appl Physiol* (1985). (2013) 114(6):801–7. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.01181.2012