Journal of Diabetes and Its Complications xxx (2018) xxx–xxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Diabetes and Its Complications

journal homepage: www.jdcjournal.com

Is there an association between non-dipping blood pressure and measures of glucose variability in type 1 diabetes?

Mamta Jaiswal [a], Lynn Ang [b], Kara Mizokami-Stout [b], Rodica Pop-Busui [b,*]

[a] Department of Neurology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, United States of America
[b] Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Metabolism, Endocrinology and Diabetes, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, United States of America

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 6 June 2018
Received in revised form 23 July 2018
Accepted 24 July 2018
Available online xxxx

Keywords:
Non-dipping blood pressure
Cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy
Glucose variability
Type 1 diabetes
Blood pressure variability

ABSTRACT

Aim: To assess the relationship between glucose variability (GV) and non-dipping of blood pressure (BP) as a marker of cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy (CAN) among patients with type 1 diabetes (T1D).
Methods: Forty-one subjects with T1D (age 34 ± 13 years, duration 13 ± 6 years, HbA1c 8 ± 1.2%) without cardiovascular disease, dyslipidemia, or hypertension at baseline were enrolled in a 3-year observational cohort study. Subjects were phenotyped for CAN with heart rate variability, cardiovascular autonomic reflex tests, and 24-h BP profiles at baseline and during follow-up. Non-dipping was defined as nocturnal systolic and diastolic BP fall of ≤10%. Reverse dipping BP was defined as a <0% change in the day to night for systolic and diastolic BP. Indices of GV were derived from 5-day continuous glucose monitoring obtained at 3-month intervals, and serum inflammatory biomarkers in all subjects.
Results: At baseline 10% of the T1D subjects were non-dippers. The dippers and non-dippers were similar in age, diabetes duration, glucose control, traditional cardiovascular risk factors, GV and inflammatory markers. No significant correlations were found at baseline between non-dipping nocturnal blood pressure and measures of GV. At 3 years there were no differences in risk factor profile of subjects who were non-dippers over time (progressors) and those who were dippers (non-progressors).
Conclusion: In a cohort of contemporary patients with T1D following the current standard of care in diabetes, the prevalence of non-dipping is relatively low. There were no clear phenotypes that explained the difference in the risk for non-dipping, including GV. Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring could be used as a tool for improved CVD risk stratification and development of therapeutic interventions in these patients.

1. Introduction

The attenuation of the physiological nocturnal decline in the blood pressure (BP), or non-dipping, as measured by ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM) is a stronger predictor of target organ damage and CVD risk than office BP readings in subjects with type 1 (T1D)[1] and type 2 diabetes (T2D).[2,3] The prevalence of non-dipping has been reported up to 73% in patients with T1D and linked to increased risk of hypertension, retinopathy, and nephropathy.[2] ABPM is currently accepted as the most sensitive method for assessing circadian BP profile and non-dipping status for estimating future CVD risk.[2,3]

The etiology of non-dipping has been linked to hypertension, renal function impairment and to altered nocturnal sympathovagal balance associated with cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy (CAN).[1–4] Indeed, CAN is an independent predictor of CVD mortality and CVD events in diabetes.[5] Traditionally, poor glucose control, as documented by HbA1c levels is considered the main factor driving the development of diabetic complications including CAN in patients with diabetes. Emerging evidence suggests that wide glucose fluctuations may play an important role in the development of chronic complications, including CAN, independent of HbA1c.[6,7] Furthermore, chronic inflammation, mediated by increased glucose variability (GV),[8,9] is emerging as a potential critical factor in the development of diabetes complications including CAN.[8] However, the effects of GV on non-dipping have not been directly studied.

The objective of this study was to evaluate the association between non-dipping, as a surrogate measure of CAN, and GV in patients with T1D and no known history of CVD. Risk factor profiles for non-dipping and inflammatory biomarkers were also evaluated as potential explanatory variables.

2. Subjects, materials and methods

Forty-one subjects with T1D were recruited from the University of Michigan Health System clinics to participate in this 3-year longitudinal

Conflicts of interest: None of the authors have any conflicts of interest.

* Corresponding author at: University of Michigan, Division of Metabolism, Endocrinology and Diabetes, 5329 Brehm Tower, 1000 Wall Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, United States of America.
E-mail address: rpbusui@umich.edu. (R. Pop-Busui).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2018.07.008
1056-8727/

observational study. Inclusion criteria: type 1 diabetes, age 18–65 years, duration ≥5 years, no evidence of any diabetic complications. Exclusion criteria: history of CVD, hypertension or use of antihypertensive medication (including beta blockers), chronic kidney disease, dyslipidemia, use of glucocorticoids or other medication. All study participants signed a written informed consent and the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan approved the study.

3. Study procedures

Demographic data and anthropometric measures were collected through questionnaires and physical examination. Fasting blood samples were obtained for the measurement of glucose, HbA1c, lipid panel, renal function tests, and inflammatory markers: interferon gamma (IFN-g), IL-1ra (interleukin), IL-1b, IL-10, monocyte chemoattractant protein (MCP-1), tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF-a), TNF-receptor and C-reactive protein (CRP).

4. Assessment of GV

Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) data were obtained at 5-minute intervals over a period of five days at baseline and every 3 months intervals for 3 years with the iPro CGM System (Medtronic, Northridge CA).[7] The following indices of GV were computed: low and high blood glucose index (LBGI and HBGI), mean amplitude of glucose excursions (MAGE), coefficient of variation (CV) of glucose, and area under the curve (AUC) for hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia.[7]

5. Assessment of CAN

CAN was assessed by standardized cardiovascular reflex testing (CARTs) (paced deep breathing, Valsalva maneuver and postural changes) and by heart rate variability (HRV) studies performed annually for 3 years, and analyzed with the ANX 3.1 (ANSAR Inc., PA) as described.[7] R-R response to paced breathing analyzed as E/I (Expiration: Inspiration) ratio, Valsalva ratio, the postural R-R response analyzed as 30:15 ratios, time-domain measures of HRV [Standard deviation of normal RR interval (SDNN) and root mean square of successive differences of normal RR intervals (RMSSD)] and frequency-domain measure of HRV [low frequency (LF) power, high frequency (HF) power and LH/HF at rest and during CARTs].[7]

6. Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring

24-h BP profiles were obtained with a portable oscillometric recorder (Spacelabs90207, Redmond, WA), annually for 3 years to assess ABPM.[1] Non-dipping of BP defined as a ≤10% change from day to night for systolic and diastolic BP ([mean daytime BP − mean night-time BP] / daytime BP × 100%), arithmetically equivalent to a night-to-day BP ratio of >0.9 as described.[4] Reverse dipping BP was defined as a <0% change in the day to night for systolic and diastolic BP.[4]

7. Statistical analysis

Differences between dippers and non-dippers were evaluated using the Student's *t*-test and Wilcoxon rank sum test. Spearman's correlation coefficient (r) was calculated to evaluate the relationships between GV indices and BPV variables. In longitudinal analyses we defined as progressors: who had a worsening of non-dipping (non-dipping status remained same or change from dipper into non-dipper) and non-progressors: who had improvement in their dipping status from baseline to 3 years.

Data analysis was performed using SAS software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina, USA).

8. Results

In this cohort of patients with T1D (mean age 34 ± 13 years, duration 13 ± 6 years, 61% females, HbA1c 8 ± 1.2%) the prevalence of BP non-dipping at baseline was 10%. Reverse-dipping, defined as nocturnal BP fall of <0% was found in only 2 subjects. None of the subjects had evidence of orthostatic hypotension (defined as a drop of 20 mm Hg of systolic BP and 10 mm Hg of diastolic BP from supine to standing position).[1] Table 1 shows the clinical characteristic of the subjects with T1D stratified by their non-dipping status. At baseline there were no differences in clinical characteristics between these groups. Measures of glucose control (HbA1c 7.2 ± 1.4% vs. 8.0 ± 1.2%, $P = 0.32$), GV and inflammatory biomarkers were also similar between the groups. There were no significant differences between the levels of inflammatory biomarkers between dippers and non-dippers (Table 1).

No significant correlations were found at baseline between BPV (% dipping of BP over 24 h) and measures of GV [HBGI ($r = -0.05$, $P = 0.71$), LBGI ($r = 0.05$, $P = 0.75$), CV ($r = 0.02$, $P = 0.45$), AUC Hypo ($r = 0.055$, $P = 0.73$), AUC Hyper ($r = 0.045$, $P = 0.62$), and MAGE ($r = 0.39$, $P = 0.062$)] and HbA1c ($r = 0.09$, $P = 0.53$).

Table 1
Baseline characteristics in subject with type 1 diabetes by their dipping status.

Variable	Non-dippers N 4 (10%)	Dippers N 37 (90%)	*P*-value
Age, years	43 ± 14	34 ± 13	0.32
Duration, years	16 ± 11	13 ± 6	0.70
BMI, kg/m^2	27 ± 4	26 ± 5	0.77
Systolic BP, mm Hg	118 ± 4	117 ± 12	0.75
Diastolic BP, mm Hg	68 ± 11	73 ± 7	0.38
Mean daytime systolic BP, mm Hg	123 ± 10	125 ± 10	0.68
Mean daytime diastolic BP, mm Hg	73 ± 9	76 ± 6	0.18
Mean nighttime systolic BP, mm Hg	120 ± 9	113 ± 10	0.04
Mean nighttime diastolic BP, mm Hg	68 ± 11	73 ± 7	0.38
HbA1c, %	7.2 ± 1.4	8.0 ± 1.2	0.32
HbA1c, mmol/mol	54 ± 22	64 ± 21	0.32
LDL-c, mg/dL	89 ± 17	92 ± 22	0.81
HDL-c, mg/dL	60 ± 14	64 ± 20	0.58
Triglycerides, md/dL	51 ± 18	69 ± 25	0.14
Serum creatinine, mg/dL	1.0 ± 0.3	0.8 ± 0.2	0.33
HBGI	9.8 ± 10.5	9.9 ± 6.7	0.97
LBGI	3.1 ± 2.6	2.7 ± 2.6	0.82
AUC hyperglycemia	41,589 ± 34,745	33,208 ± 36,634	0.64
AUC hypoglycemia	2660 ± 2861	2867 ± 2521	0.54
MAGE	99.3 ± 51.2	136.7 ± 29.8	0.33
CV glucose	0.42 ± 0.9	0.48 ± 0.29	0.45
IFN-g, pg/mL	2.6 (1.6,4.7)	4.3 (1.9,12.9)	0.32
IL-17A, pg/mL	1.7 (1.5,3.3)	3.75 (1.6,7.7)	0.37
MCP-1, pg/mL	595 (336,889)	568 (429,746)	0.98
TNF-a, pg/mL	7.05 (5.8,8.1)	7.7 (6.2,9.6)	0.47
CRP, ng/mL	0.15 (0.1,0.4)	1.2 (0.1,4.3)	0.13
E:I ratio	1.21 (0.11)	1.23 (0.12)	0.21
Valsalva ratio	1.31 (0.14)	1.28 (0.17)	0.24
30:15 ratio	1.17 ± 0.08	1.27 ± 0.18	0.05
Resting LF, ms	3.7 ± 3.9	2.7 ± 2.4	0.29
Resting HF, ms	3.1 ± 3.3	2.8 ± 3.7	0.80
Resting LF:HF ratio	1.5 ± 0.6	2.4 ± 2.2	0.15
Deep breathing LF, ms	0.94 ± 0.82	0.85 ± 0.58	0.65
Deep breathing HF, ms	18.2 ± 16.8	27.1 ± 24.7	0.22
Deep breathing LF:HF ratio	3.6 ± 8.9	3.2 ± 7.8	0.10
SDNN, ms	52.5 ± 21.9	52.2 ± 21.5	0.96
RMSSD, ms	45.2 ± 33.0	36.7 ± 25.1	0.34

Data are presented as mean ± SD or median (IQR). BMI: body mass index, BP: blood pressure, LDL low density lipoprotein, HDL: high density lipoprotein, HBGI: high blood glucose index, LBGI: low blood glucose index, AUC: area under the curve, MAGE: mean amplitude of glycemic index, CV: coefficient of variation, IFN-g: interferon gamma, IL: interleukin, MCP: monocyte chemoattractant protein-1, TNF-a: tumor necrosis factor alpha, R: receptor, CRP: c reactive protein, E:I: expiration inspiration, LF: low frequency power, HF: high frequency power, SDNN: standard deviation of normal RR interval, RMSSD: root mean square of the difference of the successive normal RR interval.

Please cite this article as: Jaiswal M, et al. Is there an association between non-dipping blood pressure and measures of glucose variability in type 1 diabetes? *Journal of Diabetes and Its Complications* (2018), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2018.07.008