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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

Carotid endarterectomy (CEA) is the treatment of choice for the prevention of stroke in patients affected with symptomatic and/or high-grade carotid stenosis \(^1\text{-}^3\). However, controversies persist regarding the optimal surgical technique to reduce perioperative complications and improve clinical outcome.

The “eversion” CEA (e-CEA) was originally described in 1959 \(^4\) and involves transection of the distal common carotid artery (CCA) and plaque removal by turning inside out both the internal (ICA) and the external carotid artery (ECA) (Figure 1a). However, this technique may not allow a full visualization of the distal end point of the endarterectomy. As a consequence, its wide acceptance in common surgical practice was reached only 30 years later with the introduction of a modified method \(^5\) that entails the transection of the ICA at its origin at the carotid bulb and eversion of the ICA only over the atherosclerotic plaque (Figure 1b). The e-CEA is particularly useful in patients with some elongation with kinking or coiling of the ICA because it allows the correction of arterial redundancy performed by reanastomosing the ICA more proximally to the common carotid artery. Also, it is associated with reduced clamping times and low restenosis rates because sutures are placed at the widest part of the artery, and avoids the use of prosthetic material \(^10\).

A number of studies, including few randomized trials \(^6\text{-}^{,}^9\text{-}^{,}10\), have compared clinical results following e-CEA with those obtained with standard CEA (s-CEA), that is performed through a longitudinal arteriotomy of the ICA (Figure 2). No significant differences were found between the two modalities in terms of perioperative stroke, myocardial infarction or death, early carotid occlusion, local complications and carotid restenosis during follow-up. However, Mehta et al.\(^{11}\) reported an increased risk of
postoperative hypertension in patients submitted to e-CEA compared to those operated on with the s-CEA technique. The Authors attributed such phenomenon to a possible direct iatrogenic damage to the carotid sinus fibers occurring during dissection and exposure of the proximal ICA at the bulb and its oblique circumferential incision. Notably, postoperative hemodynamic instability in patients undergoing CEA is associated with increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality\textsuperscript{12,13}.

The long-term effect of e-CEA on carotid baroreceptors (CB) and on peripheral chemoreceptors (PC) located in the carotid bodies in close proximity to the former has never been previously investigated. Interestingly, recent studies on patients with histologically demonstrated complete carotid sinus denervation as a result of bilateral carotid body tumor resection (bCBTR), showed that in humans, in contrast to what observed in experimental models, the lack of CB is not completely compensated by aortic and cardiopulmonary baroreceptors\textsuperscript{14}. In particular, CB denervation results in a persistent decrease in vagal and sympathetic baroreflex sensitivity and an increase in blood pressure variability\textsuperscript{15}. These findings have practical implications also because reduced baroreceptors sensitivity has a prognostic relevance being associated with the occurrence of ventricular arrhythmias and sudden cardiac death in patients with myocardial infarction\textsuperscript{16}. Furthermore, bCBTR was found to be associated with a peripheral chemoreflex failure that entails the abolition of the ventilatory response to hypoxia\textsuperscript{15}.

The aim of this study is to assess the long-term effect of e-CEA on arterial baroreflex and peripheral chemoreflex function in humans, as assessed in patients submitted to bilateral e-CEA to eliminate the background noise from contralateral
carotid sinus fibers. Also, we will investigate whether such patients may represent a human model of carotid sinus denervation.

**FIGURE 1a. The original eversion carotid endarterectomy.**
FIGURE 1b. The modified version of eversion carotid endarterectomy employed in the study.
FIGURE 2. The standard technique for carotid endarterectomy with patch angioplasty.
M e t h o d s
METHODS

A retrospective review was conducted on a prospectively compiled computerized database of 3128 CEAs performed on 2617 patients at our Center between January 2001 and March 2006. During this period, a total of 292 patients who had bilateral carotid stenosis ≥70% at the time of the first admission underwent staged bilateral CEAs. Of these, 93 patients had staged bilateral e-CEAs, 126 staged bilateral s-CEAs and 73 had different procedures on each carotid.

CEAs were performed with either the eversion or the standard technique with routine Dacron patching in all cases regardless of ICA diameter. Preoperative diagnostic work-up and anesthetic and surgical management were previously described in detail 17.

The study inclusion criteria were bilateral CEA with the same technique on both sides and an uneventful postoperative course after both procedures. Exclusion criteria were: age >70 years, diabetes mellitus, chronic pulmonary disease, symptomatic ischemic cardiac disease or medical therapy with b-blockers, cardiac arrhythmia, permanent neurologic deficits or an abnormal preoperative cerebral CT scan, carotid restenosis and previous neck or chest surgery or irradiation.

Perioperative systolic blood pressure (SBP) and heart rate (HR) values up to 24 hours after surgery were retrospectively collected by means of charts review. Quantification of hemodynamic variability was calculated according to Sternbach et al.18 as a fraction of the preoperative baseline value and expressed as a percentage according to the following equation: (HR or SBP max - HR or SBP min)/HR or SBP baseline x 100.

Selected patients were divided in two groups based on operative technique, i.e. bilateral e-CEA or bilateral s-CEA, and underwent noninvasive assessment of
baroreflex and chemoreflex function after discontinuation of antihypertensive medication and restrain from smoking and from alcohol and caffeine assumption for 48 hours. Young and aged-matched healthy subjects were also recruited and submitted to the same tests under the same conditions to provide reference values for comparison with patients. Health was judged by standard clinical evaluation, _ad hoc_ carotid duplex scanning, EKG and medical history.

Internal Review Board approval and patients informed consent were obtained.

**Surgical technique**

In the s-CEA, after systemic heparinization, the common (CCA), external (ECA), and internal ICA carotid arteries are clamped and a longitudinal arteriotomy is made in the CCA and extended to the ICA, distal to the end of the atherosclerotic plaque. The endarterectomy is then performed, followed by distal intimal endpoint tacking sutures whenever indicated, and closure of the arteriotomy using a syntethic or biological patch. In the e-CEA, the CCA, ECA, and ICA are exposed as in the standard technique. However, the proximal ICA at the carotid bifurcation is mobilized circumferentially to facilitate its transection from the CCA at the carotid bulb. During this approach, carotid sinus nerve fibers derived from the glossopharyngeal nerve and innervating the carotid body within the adventitia of the proximal ICA are divided. After systemic heparinization and clamping of the carotid vessels, the ICA is obliquely transected at the carotid bulb and everted over the atherosclerotic plaque. After completion of the endarterectomy, the everted ICA is brought down to its normal anatomic position and reanastomosed to the distal CCA or more proximally in case of kinking or coiling of the ICA.
**Cardiovascular reflex tests**

Heart rate reflexes occur within seconds of a perturbation, and beat-to-beat heart rate analysis comes from analysis of EKG. Standard precordial placements of the recording electrodes were used. Patients were assessed by 4 tests: Lying-to-standing (LS) Orthostatic hypotension (OH) Deep breathing (DB), and Valsalva Maneuver (VM). Investigations were performed in a room with an ambient temperature of 22°C to 24°C.

**Lying-to-standing.** Studying the heart rate changes to standing (30:15 ratio was calculated dividing R-R interval at the 30th beat by the R-R interval at the 15th beat) is indicated in testing the integrity of parasympathetic cholinergic cardiovagal function. In to gravitational changes from upright posture, standing induces an exercise reflex and mechanical squeeze on both venous capacitance and arterial resistance vessels. These changes stimulate the baroreceptors, and there ensues a pronounced neurally mediated reflex, which decreases sympathetic outflow, releases vasoconstrictor tone, decreases total peripheral resistance by up to 40% and drops blood pressure by up to 20 mmHg. These changes last 6-8 s.

**Orthostatic hypotension.** Studying blood pressure changes to standing is indicated in testing the integrity of the sympathetic adrenergic function. Orthostatic hypotension is a reduction of systolic blood pressure of at least 20 mm Hg or diastolic blood pressure. Blood pressure was measured with the patient supine, and after at 30, 60, 90, 120 and 180 s after standing following 3 min of recumbency.

**Deep breathing.** Studying heart rate variation with respirations is indicated in testing the integrity of the parasympathetic cholinergic (cardiovagal) function. Inspiration increases heart rate, and expiration decreases it. The patient breathed deeply at six
breaths per min for 1 min, while the heart rate was recorded by EKG. The maximum and minimum R-R intervals during each breathing cycle were measured and converted to beats per min. Each test was repeated three times and the mean value was calculated. The mean difference between maximum and minimum heart rate was calculated.

**Valsalva maneuver.** Testing heart rate changes during the Valsalva maneuver (Valsalva ratio) is indicated in testing the integrity of parasympathetic cholinergic function. The patient blowed through a mouthpiece attacked to a manometer, maintaining 40 mmHg pressure for 15 s under continuous EKG monitoring. The Valsalva ratio was calculated dividing the longest R-R interval after strain release by the shortest R-R interval during the strain period.

**Spectral analysis of heart rate and blood pressure variability**

Cardiovascular signals were acquired by a Micromed Myoquick SystemPLUS 4 channel digital polygraph (Micromed s.r.l., Mogliano Veneto (TV), Italy). EKG was recorded with two electrodes placed on the patient’s thorax, breathing pattern (PNG) was recorded by a piezoelectric thoracometer and finger arterial blood pressure (BP) was continuously monitored by a Ohmeda Finapres 2300 system (model 5, TNO-BioMedical Instrumentation, Ohmeda, Englewood (CO), USA) connected to the Micromed system. For each patient, EKG, PNG and BP were concurrently recorded during two different epochs: (1) resting (e.g. the patient lying horizontal on a bed); (2) standing (e.g. the patient changed to the orthostatic position). Each epoch lasted at least 5 min.

Acquisition parameters were Band pass prefilter: 0.7-70 Hz (EKG channel), DC-70 Hz (PNG and BP channels), sampling frequency: 256 Hz, coding: 12 bits.
A purposely-developed software (Heartscope, ver. 1.6, A.M.P.S. llc, New York, USA) was used to identify the peak of R wave on EKG, the systolic arterial blood pressure (SAP), bursts of Muscle Sympathetic Nerve Activity (MSNA), and respiratory rate (RESP). The software constructs automatically time series of RR intervals, SAP, MSNA and RESP, with low operator-analysis interaction. Spontaneous variability of RR interval, SAP, MSNA and RESP were characterized by means of power spectral analysis using an autoregressive algorithm on all recorded parameters. In short, from beat-to-beat variability series of adequate length and stationarity (usually 250-350 beats), the software calculated simple statistics and the best autoregressive estimate of the power spectral density. The powers and frequencies of the low (0.03-0.14 Hz) and the high (0.15-0.5 Hz) frequency spectral components (LF and HF, respectively), expressed in normalized units, were computed as the percent ratio of the absolute power of either HF or LF to the total power, less the Very Low Frequency (VLF) component, according to the following formula: 

\[ P_{LF[nu]} = \frac{((PLF[ms])^2)/(VAR_{RR[ms]}^2 - VLF[ms]^2)) \times 100, \]

where \( P_{LF[nu]} \) is LF powers in normalized unit; \( VAR = \) tot variance; and \( VLF = \) very low frequency component <0.03 Hz; similar normalization was performed for HF powers. LF/HF of RR interval variability power ratio was also computed. The total power (TP) of RR and SAP variabilities were also calculated.

Cross spectral analysis was used to determine whether there was a stable relationship between RR and SAP series (significance coherence > 0.5). Cross-spectral analysis was performed by means of bivariate autoregressive identification and was used to compute a squared coherence function, \( K^2 \) and phase relationship, Ph. \( K^2 \) was defined as the square cross-spectrum amplitude normalized by the product of the spectra of the two signals. Ph was defined as the phase of the cross-spectrum. \( K^2 \) is a measure.
of the statistical link between RR and SAP series at any given frequency and ranges between 1 (perfect correlation) and 0 (perfect uncorrelation). Ph is a measure of the phase shift between two oscillations at the same frequency detected in both RR and SAP series (negative values indicate that RR series lags behind SAP series at that specific frequency). In this study, coherence values 0.5 were considered significant. LFK$^2$ and HFK$^2$ were derived as the maximum of K$^2$ inside the LF and HF bands, respectively. LFPh and HFPh were defined as the phase in correspondence of LFK$^2$ and HFK$^2$, respectively.

The baroreflex gain was evaluated on the SAP and RR spontaneous variabilities. The following methods were used: 1) the sequence method that evaluates in the plane (RR, SAP) the gain of short spontaneous sequences characterized by simultaneous increase or decrease of both variables (indicated as BRS in the following); 2) the spectral method that calculates the baroreflex sensitivity as the average of the sum of the squared root of the ratio between the RR and SAP powers in both the LF and the HF bands (indicated as $\alpha$ index); 3) the XAR method, that is the exogenous autoregressive causal linear parametric model; 4) the gains of the autoregressive transfer function between RR and SAP variabilities, computed at LF and HF. This computation provides critical values describing the stability of the SAP-RR relationship, as squared coherence ($K^2$) and phase (Ph). LFPh is usually more negative (i.e. SAP precedes RR) than HFPh.

Reference groups (Table 1) of young healthy subjects (young controls, n=15, age 33+6, Body Mass Index=22.88+2.95 Kg/m$^2$) and aged healthy subjects (old controls, n=21, age 66+10, Body Mass Index= 27.65+5.32 Kg/m$^2$) were also recruited and
submitted to the same tests under the same conditions to provide reference values for comparison with patients.

Statistical analysis:

Significance of differences was estimated with GLM Mixed Model, with post hoc contrasts. Additional tests included, as appropriate, 1W ANOVA and T-test. Computations were performed with a commercial statistical package SPSS/PC+ 13.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, Ill) for Windows (Microsoft, Redmond, Wash).

**Peripheral chemoreflex function**

The ventilatory response to oxygen is the measurement of the increase or decrease in the minute ventilation ($V_{E}$) caused by breathing various concentrations of oxygen under isocapnic conditions ($PaCO_2 = 40$ mmHg). The change in ventilation may be recorded in relation to changes in $PaO_2$ or haemoglobin oxygen saturation as monitored by pulse oximetry. This test investigates peripheral chemoreflex sensitivity which may be altered in a number of conditions and may be associated with a selective potentiation of autonomic and hemodynamic responses.

The ventilatory response to hypoxia was assessed in 21 patients at least 3 months after undergoing carotid artery endarterectomy by patch (n=10) or eversion (n=11) technique. The control group consisted of 12 healthy volunteers. Classic rebreathing tests were performed at sea level at $21^\circ$C and 60% relative humidity. The subjects were asked to refrain from smoking and drinking caffeinated beverages for at least 2 h before the experiment. The ventilatory response to decreasing concentrations of oxygen under isocapnic conditions was measured using an open circuit technique. The subjects were seated comfortably breathing through pneumotachograph and non-rebreathing valve
(Hans Rudolph) connected to a 50 l Douglas bag containing a gas mixture of 23% oxygen, 4% carbon dioxide and balance nitrogen regulated by separate rotameters. Tidal volume, breathing frequency, fractional inspired and end-tidal concentrations of oxygen and carbon dioxide were monitored breath by breath using a metabolic cart (Vmax, Sensor Medics, Yorba Linda California, USA). Oxygen saturation was continuously monitored via a pulse oximeter (9600 Nonin, Philadelphia, USA) connected to the metabolic cart via an analog/digital interface permitting a breath by breath record of oxygen saturation and heart rate. After allowing the subjects to reach a steady state, baseline measurements were taken followed by a standard step test was performed. Stepwise decrements in oxygen concentrations (from 20% to 10%) were performed allowing the subjects to reach steady state at every concentration. Carbon dioxide was added as necessary in order to maintain a steady end-tidal carbon dioxide concentration. The chemoreflex sensitivity to hypoxia was obtained from the slopes of the linear regression of minute ventilation vs Sao2%.
Results
RESULTS

A total of 29 patients (16 males, age 62.4±8.0 years) were enrolled. Twenty-eight were studied retrospectively and one was evaluated prospectively and longitudinally. Overall, 13 patients had undergone bilateral e-CEA (44.8%) and 16 bilateral s-CEA (55.2%) with a mean interval between the procedures of 62±56 days. Hemodynamic variability was not different between the groups (HR variability (%): 30.7±16.8 vs 25.4±16.9, \( p = 0.4 \); SBP variability (%): 36.2±13.5 vs 30.6±13.7, \( p = 0.3 \)).

After a mean interval of 24±17 months from the last CEA, sixteen patients (55.2%) completed both baroreflex and chemoreflex function tests. Thirteen patients (44.8%), due to lack of compliance or fatigue, underwent only either baroreflex (n=8) or chemoreflex function evaluation (n=5).

Cardiovascular reflex tests

No patient showed signs or symptoms of autonomic dysfunction, including labile hypertension, tachycardia, palpitations, headache, inappropriate diaphoresis, pallor or flushing. The results of standard cardiovascular autonomic test are shown in Figure 3. Among the e-CEA patients, 3 had a DB pathologic test, whereas in the s-CEA group, 5 had a DB pathologic test, and only one of them had also a pathologic LS test. Overall, 8 patients had a DB test below normal values, but all of them were older than 50 years, and had a VR within normal limits. Hence, the DB results must be considered biased by the patients age. In conclusion, our results showed no evidence of autonomic dysfunction in any of the enrolled patients.
**Figure 3.** Results of standard cardiovascular autonomic test in the e-CEA (Δ) and in the s-CEA (ο) groups. Normal values for each test are represented on white background.

**Spectral analysis of heart rate and blood pressure variability**

**Rest**

Table 2A provides summary data on short term cardiovascular variabilities. Monovariate data showed marked, and expected, differences between young and old controls in absolute values of RR variability such as $RR\sigma^2$, and, as a corollary, absolute powers of $LF_{RR}$ and $HF_{RR}$. No difference was observed in normalized powers of RR variability. Old controls and patients did not differ.

Systolic arterial pressure was greater in old controls, as compared to young controls, but, again, patients did not differ from old controls. Likewise (Table 2B) bivariate data expressing different aspects of spontaneous baroreflex regulations of heart period, demonstrated a marked age related impairment, as documented by reductions in the frequency domain $\alpha$ index, in the time domain BRS and in model derived XAR, as well as in the LF and HF gains. Notably, within the obvious reduction in baroreflex functions observed in patients, a slight, but significantly higher value was observed in e-CEA, as compared to s-CEA.

Regarding differences between groups on bivariate parameters, a depressed $K^2$ function, both at LF and HF, should be pointed out in all controls (similar to patients) as compared to young controls.

**Active Stand**

As expected, in young and old controls standing up was associated to reduced RR and to a shift of the RR spectral profile in favor of the LF component. Likewise, an increase was also observed in $LF_{SAP}$. Overall these changes suggest sympathetic activation.
SAP remained unchanged and, notably, was not reduced upon standing in patients, who, however, did not manifest. Significant increases in spectral markers of sympathetic excitation (Fig. R1) of note is that, also in standing (Table 3B) residual baroreflex performance appeared better maintained in e-CEA (as suggested by greater values of BRS and LF gain). Also in standing $K^2$ tended to be more elevated in young controls.
**Peripheral chemoreflex function**

The control group was slightly younger than the patch group (mean age 46.4 ± 18.3 years compared with 54.6 ± 11.7 and 61.8 ± 8.2 for the eversion and patch groups respectively, \( P = 0.03 \) compared with patch, one-way ANOVA with LSD correction for multiple comparisons). There was also a male predominance in the control group (males =10) compared with both patch (n=7) and eversion (n=5).

In all subjects ventilation \( (\bar{V}_E) \) and oximetry data fitted a linear regression model with r values > 0.8. One-way analysis of variance showed a significantly higher slope both for \( \Delta V_E/\Delta SaO_2 \) in controls compared with both patient groups which were not different from each other (-1.37 ± 0.33 compared with -0.33±0.08 and -0.29 ±0.13 l/min/%SaO₂, \( p<0.05 \), Fig.). Similar results were observed for and \( \Delta V_E/\Delta PetO_2 \) (-0.20 ± 0.1 versus -0.01 ± 0.0 and -0.07 ± 0.02 l/min/mmHg, \( p<0.05 \)).

A regression model using treatment, age, baseline FiCO2 and minimum SaO2 achieved showed only treatment as a significant factor in explaining the variance in minute ventilation \( (R^2= 25\%) \).
**Figure 4.** Slopes of the linear regression of minute ventilation vs Sao2%.
FIGURE 5. Slopes of the linear regression of minute ventilation vs Pet02 mmHg.
DISCUSSION
**Discussion**

Baroreflex and chemoreflex mechanisms play an important part in the dynamic adjustments of circulation and ventilation. Carotid sinus baroreceptors lie in close proximity to the peripheral chemoreceptors of the carotid bodies, and the afferent signals from the former and the latter travel up the carotid sinus nerve to join with the glossopharyngeal nerve towards the brainstem.  

In the late 1920s, Hering and Koch were the first to recognize the reflex nature of changes in heart rate and blood pressure evoked by external massage of the neck. The afferents were tracked as nerve endings at the carotid bifurcation. The arterial baroreflex buffers abrupt transients of blood pressure and originates from stretch sensitive receptors in the arterial wall of the carotid sinus and the aortic arch and large vessels of the thorax. Afferent fibers from carotid sinus baroreceptors join the glossopharyngeal nerve (ninth cranial nerve) and project to the nucleus tractus solitarii in the dorsal medulla, which in turn projects to efferent cardiovascular neurones in the medulla. In addition to carotid baroreceptors, stretch-sensitive baroreceptors are also located in the aortic arch, heart and large pulmonary vessels. The extra-carotid baroreceptors transmit their afferent information along with the vagal nerves to the same brain stem nuclei. The efferent limbs of the baroreflex loop consist of sympathetic and parasympathetic fibres to the heart as well as to blood vessels.  

Adjustment of respiration in response to alterations in levels of oxygen, carbon dioxide and hydrogen ions in the body fluids are mediated by a complex interplay between central and peripheral chemoreceptors. The peripheral arterial chemoreceptors, located in the carotid and aortic bodies, are responsible for the immediate ventilatory and arterial pressure increments during acute hypoxia. Apart
from hypoxaemia, peripheral chemoreceptors play a minor role in the sensing of changes in arterial carbon dioxide tension ($PCO_2$) and pH. Carotid and aortic bodies are supplied with sensory fibres, which course through carotid sinus/glossopharyngeal and vagus nerve respectively towards medullary centres, including the nucleus tractus solitarii. Central chemoreceptive areas located at the rostral ventrolateral medulla respond to changes in the hydrogen ion concentration in the interstitial fluid in the brain and are chiefly responsible for ventilatory and circulatory adjustments during hypercapnia and chronic disturbances of acid–base balance.

Chronic failure of the baroreflex due to bilateral carotid denervation was firstly described in 1993 as a separate clinical syndrome, characterized by a limited blood pressure buffering capacity against excessive rises or falls in response to emotional and physical stimuli. The underlying causes of baroreflex failure included the familial paraganglioma syndrome, neck surgery or radiation therapy for pharyngeal carcinoma, bilateral lesions of the nucleus tractus solitarii, and surgical section of the glossopharyngeal nerves; in two patients the cause was unknown. Symptoms and signs included headache, palpitations, diaphoresis and pale flushing. They bear a strong resemblance to those of a phaeochromocytoma. In baroreflex failure, desinhibition of central activation of efferent sympathetic pathways arises from the absence of tonic inhibitory baroreceptor input to the vasomotor centres of the brainstem. Apart from volatile hypertension, which is most common, baroreflex failure has a broad spectrum of other clinical presentations including predominant hypotension, orthostatic tachycardia and intolerance and malignant vagotonia with severe bradycardia, depending on the extent of baroreceptor denervation and concomitant destruction of
autonomic structures\textsuperscript{33,34}. Centrally acting sympatholytic agents like clonidine may reduce the frequency and severity of the attacks.

Bilateral denervation or removal of carotid body chemoreceptors mainly derived from studies in small numbers of patients who underwent bilateral resection of healthy carotid bodies as an experimental treatment of bronchial asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease\textsuperscript{35}. All the observations obtained in these settings, however, are in fact biased by the possible confounding chronic pulmonary disease, which itself alters chemoreflex function\textsuperscript{36}. More recently, peripheral chemoreflex function was eventually assessed in patients who had undergone bilateral carotid body tumour resection and were free of pulmonary disease\textsuperscript{37}.

Overall, peripheral chemoreflex failure was found to cause a permanent abolition of ventilatory responsiveness to hypoxia under normocapnic conditions. A small residual hypoxic response may be present during simultaneous hypercapnia. In addition, the condition causes a 20–30\% decrease in CO\textsubscript{2} sensitivity. Long-term resting hypoventilation and hypercapnia may occur. The impairment of chemoreflex function is less severe following unilateral than after bilateral carotid body resection. These observations emphasize the importance of carotid relative to aortic chemoreceptor function in humans. The aortic bodies have a minor role in the modulation of spontaneous respiratory activity, but may generate a discernible response when their gain is amplified by hypercapnia\textsuperscript{15}.

Baroreflex and chemoreflex function after CEA have been previously investigated, but the eversion technique has never been addressed. Also, conflicting results have been reported in the literature due to patient selection and methods for
baroreflex testing. Wade et al.\textsuperscript{38} studied in 8 patients before and after bilateral CEA showing no baroreflex consistent change as a result of surgery. On the other hand, peripheral chemoreflex function, which depends on the integrity of the same afferent innervation as carotid baroreceptors, was markedly impaired by bilateral CEA. In contrast to these findings, Vanmaele et al.\textsuperscript{39} did not observed any loss of chemoreceptor function after bilateral CEA. As far as unilateral CEA is concerned, Tyden et al.\textsuperscript{40} showed an intraoperative increase in baroreflex sensitivity following removal of the atherosclerotic plaque. Hirschl et al.\textsuperscript{41} reported a differential effect of CE on baroreflex function in hyper- and normotensive subjects, with sensitivity increased in hypertensives.

Suggested mechanisms of attenuated baroreflex sensitivity by CEA include trauma to the carotid sinus baroreceptors or to the carotid sinus nerve\textsuperscript{42} and a decrease in wall distensibility due to surgery-induced periarterial fibrosis\textsuperscript{43}. On the other hand, removal of an atherosclerotic plaque may have a beneficial effect on baroreflex function by means of changes in the mechanical properties of the carotid sinus arterial wall and reintegration of baroreceptor areas into circulatory regulation\textsuperscript{42}. Another important determinant of the net effect of unilateral CE on functional baroreflex integrity is the compensatory ability of the residual aortic and contralateral carotid baroreceptors. Compensation by residual baroreceptors probably accounts for the fact that severe and acute baroreflex failure resolves within days to weeks in most cases\textsuperscript{31,14}. After unilateral CE, compensation by the contralateral carotid baroreceptors may be limited by atherosclerotic changes of the nonoperated carotid artery. In atherosclerosis, distensibility of the carotid sinus vessel wall and sensitivity of baroreceptors are reduced\textsuperscript{44,45}. 
In order to eliminate the background noise from contralateral carotid sinus fibers, in order study we employed a model of bilateral eversion CEA. Even though this was the purpose, it is noteworthy that in our experience patients with bilateral significant carotid stenosis at the time of the first hospital admission and scheduled for staged bilateral CEA account for 11.1% of the total population submitted to CEA 17. Also, disease progression in contralateral asymptomatic ICAs after CEA is relatively common in patients with a diseased ICA, with a risk at 10 years of undergoing a contralateral CEA of 8.8%. 46.

Overall, we demonstrated that bilateral e-CEA does not imply a carotid sinus denervation. All patients were asymptomatic and had a residual baroreflex and chemoreflex function, in contrast to those submitted to bilateral carotid body tumor resection 14. As a result of some expected degree of iatrogenic damage, such performance was lower than that of controls. Interestingly though, baroreflex performance appeared better maintained in e-CEA than in s-CEA. This may be related to the changes in the elastic properties of the carotid sinus vascular wall, as the patch is more rigid than the endarterectomized carotid wall that remains in the e-CEA. Finally, these data have relevant clinical implication in the assessment and treatment of the frequent hemodynamic disturbances associated with carotid angioplasty stenting 47, a procedure that has yet to be demonstrated as safe and effective like CEA.
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Table 1 - Study population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young controls</th>
<th>Old controls</th>
<th>e-CEA</th>
<th>s-CEA</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>33±6</td>
<td>66±10</td>
<td>62±11</td>
<td>65±6</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>m-f</td>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>11-10</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>7-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>22.88±2.95</td>
<td>27.88±4.70</td>
<td>28.05±2.69</td>
<td>27.55±4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>119±14</td>
<td>140±16</td>
<td>153±18</td>
<td>143±13</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAP</td>
<td>70±9</td>
<td>73±7</td>
<td>86±7</td>
<td>82±9</td>
<td>0.001 † † † ‡ ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Rate</td>
<td>62.4±9.5</td>
<td>61.4±9.8</td>
<td>70.9±11.8</td>
<td>66.9±9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: BMI=Body Max Index, SAP=Systolic Arterial Pressure, DAP=Diastolic Arterial Pressure.

Significant differences: YOUNG controls vs OLD controls *, YOUNG controls vs e-CEA †, YOUNG controls vs s-CEA ‡, OLD controls vs e-CEA ††, OLD controls vs s-CEA ‡‡, e-CEA vs s-CEA §.
### Table 2A - Summary statistics of RR and SAP variability at REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure units</th>
<th>YOUNG controls</th>
<th>OLD controls</th>
<th>e-CEA</th>
<th>s-CEA</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR (msec)</td>
<td>981.51±36.75</td>
<td>966.35±36.71</td>
<td>946.18±45.08</td>
<td>855.03±36.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR $\sigma^2$ (msec$^2$)</td>
<td>3770.24±1038.90</td>
<td>850.59±152.36</td>
<td>823.49±240.93</td>
<td>616.11±160.73</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LFa (msec$^2$)</td>
<td>1460.26±624.88</td>
<td>120.74±18.35</td>
<td>174.82±48.86</td>
<td>102.09±37.86</td>
<td>0.012 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR HFa (msec$^2$)</td>
<td>785.45±126.34</td>
<td>262.72±100.33</td>
<td>208.16±74.57</td>
<td>115.17±36.63</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LFnu (nu)</td>
<td>53.89±3.87</td>
<td>43.20±5.74</td>
<td>41.89±8.81</td>
<td>41.82±7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR HFnu (nu)</td>
<td>43.68±3.72</td>
<td>48.39±5.84</td>
<td>49.46±9.05</td>
<td>48.32±8.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LF/HF</td>
<td>1.51±0.26</td>
<td>2.02±0.59</td>
<td>1.75±0.88</td>
<td>1.75±0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP (mmHg)</td>
<td>117.31±3.35</td>
<td>137.22±4.46</td>
<td>142.61±3.59</td>
<td>146.82±6.10</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP $\sigma^2$ (msec$^2$)</td>
<td>38.43±8.64</td>
<td>30.17±5.28</td>
<td>20.28±7.04</td>
<td>26.15±4.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP LFa (mmHg$^2$)</td>
<td>9.60±3.26</td>
<td>4.29±0.99</td>
<td>3.62±1.05</td>
<td>2.92±0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP HFa (mmHg$^2$)</td>
<td>2.78±0.69</td>
<td>4.61±1.53</td>
<td>2.90±1.04</td>
<td>4.80±1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP HF (mHz)</td>
<td>258.07±10.25</td>
<td>263.33±10.40</td>
<td>258.38±14.30</td>
<td>289.45±13.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** SEM=Standard Error, $\sigma^2$=variance, LF=Low Frequency, HF=High Frequency, a=Absolute Units, nu=Normalized Unit, SAP=Systolic Arterial Pressure, RESP=Respiration.

**Significant differences:** YOUNG controls vs OLD controls *, YOUNG controls vs e-CEA †, YOUNG controls vs s-CEA ‡, OLD controls vs e-CEA ††, OLD controls vs s-CEA ‡‡, e-CEA vs s-CEA §.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure units</th>
<th>Normali Young</th>
<th>Normali OLD</th>
<th>e-CEA</th>
<th>s-CEA</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha m/sec/mmHg</td>
<td>17.08±1.67</td>
<td>8.04±0.81</td>
<td>8.93 ± 1.66</td>
<td>6.41 ± 1.42</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS m/sec/mmHg</td>
<td>19.93±2.45</td>
<td>7.75±1.24</td>
<td>13.85 ± 5.14</td>
<td>4.93 ± 1.15</td>
<td>0.001 * † §</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XAR m/sec/mmHg</td>
<td>5.36±0.85</td>
<td>1.99±0.98</td>
<td>2.00 ± 0.94</td>
<td>0.55 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.008 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF mHz</td>
<td>101.91±5.01</td>
<td>71.59±5.46</td>
<td>57.49 ± 7.59</td>
<td>83.67 ± 12.67</td>
<td>0.002 * † §</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF K²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75±0.04</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.58 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.004 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF Ph rad</td>
<td>-0.95±0.13</td>
<td>-1.14±0.30</td>
<td>-2.09 ± 0.14</td>
<td>-1.10 ± 0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF mHz</td>
<td>231.37±15.72</td>
<td>270.69±12.35</td>
<td>259.16 ± 14.95</td>
<td>285.21 ± 16.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF K²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.85±0.03</td>
<td>0.73±0.05</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF Ph rad</td>
<td>-0.31±0.11</td>
<td>0.61±0.21</td>
<td>-0.17 ± 0.42</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.009 * ††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP Gain (LF) m/sec/mmHg</td>
<td>12.809±1.422</td>
<td>5.221±1.026</td>
<td>6.07 ± 1.24</td>
<td>5.22 ± 1.43</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP Gain (HF) m/sec/mmHg</td>
<td>20.064±2.512</td>
<td>8.384±1.739</td>
<td>9.66 ± 3.16</td>
<td>5.70 ± 1.42</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: SEM=Standard Error, Alpha=frequency domain index of baroreflex sensitivity, BRS=Baroreceptor Reflex Sensitivity, XAR=Causal Baroreflex Index, SAP=Systolic Arterial Pressure, LF=Low Frequency, HF=High Frequency, $K^2$=Squared Coherence, Ph=Phase.

Significant differences: YOUNG controls vs OLD controls *, YOUNG controls vs e-CEA †, YOUNG controls vs s-CEA ‡, OLD controls vs e-CEA ††, OLD controls vs s-CEA ‡‡, e-CEA vs s-CEA §.
Table 3A - Summary statistics of RR and SAP variability at STAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure units</th>
<th>YOUNG controls</th>
<th>OLD controls</th>
<th>e-CEA</th>
<th>s-CEA</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td>Average SEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR (msec)</td>
<td>793.66 ± 34.12</td>
<td>922.86 ± 36.48</td>
<td>900.38 ± 41.27</td>
<td>801.21 ± 44.15</td>
<td>0.037 * ‡‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR σ^2 (msec^2)</td>
<td>3148.41 ± 524.86</td>
<td>717.78 ± 107.59</td>
<td>770.59 ± 142.76</td>
<td>438.87 ± 101.24</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LFa (msec^2)</td>
<td>1533.34 ± 380.23</td>
<td>300.92 ± 84.98</td>
<td>151.60 ± 60.82</td>
<td>102.38 ± 50.81</td>
<td>0.001 * † ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR HFa (msec^2)</td>
<td>131.85 ± 31.30</td>
<td>59.36 ± 15.31</td>
<td>84.10 ± 20.60</td>
<td>56.17 ± 21.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LFnu (nu)</td>
<td>85.46 ± 3.74</td>
<td>67.50 ± 4.91</td>
<td>46.69 ± 6.97</td>
<td>48.15 ± 9.46</td>
<td>0.001 * † † † †‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR HFnu (nu)</td>
<td>11.09 ± 2.47</td>
<td>21.92 ± 4.27</td>
<td>43.80 ± 5.90</td>
<td>40.51 ± 9.45</td>
<td>0.001 † † † † †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR LF/HF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.17 ± 2.45</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.48</td>
<td>7.30 ± 5.21</td>
<td>0.047 * †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP (mmHg)</td>
<td>113.28 ± 5.45</td>
<td>138.87 ± 7.00</td>
<td>148.84 ± 4.38</td>
<td>150.65 ± 4.77</td>
<td>0.001 * † †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP σ^2 (mmHg^2)</td>
<td>153.82 ± 81.27</td>
<td>44.46 ± 5.00</td>
<td>57.00 ± 23.75</td>
<td>51.25 ± 11.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP LFa (mmHg^2)</td>
<td>28.43 ± 4.17</td>
<td>18.03 ± 4.00</td>
<td>3.10 ± 1.08</td>
<td>5.41 ± 1.90</td>
<td>0.001 * † † † †‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP HFa (mmHg^2)</td>
<td>4.62 ± 0.85</td>
<td>4.11 ± 0.62</td>
<td>7.43 ± 5.19</td>
<td>6.15 ± 1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP HF (mHz)</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: SEM=Standard Error, σ^2=variance, LF=Low Frequency, HF=High Frequency, a=Absolute Units, nu=Normalized Unit, SAP=Systolic Arterial Pressure, RESP=Respiration.

Significant differences: YOUNG controls vs OLD controls *, YOUNG controls vs e-CEA †, YOUNG controls vs s-CEA ‡, OLD controls vs e-CEA ††, OLD controls vs s-CEA ‡‡, e-CEA vs s-CEA §.
Table 3B - Summary statistics of bivariate analysis of RR and SAP variability at STAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure units</th>
<th>Normali Young</th>
<th>Normali OLD</th>
<th>e-CEA</th>
<th>s-CEA</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>msec/mmHg</td>
<td>6.44±0.78</td>
<td>4.83±1.00</td>
<td>6.47±1.36</td>
<td>3.91±0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>msec/mmHg</td>
<td>7.83±0.66</td>
<td>3.71±0.35</td>
<td>7.04±1.99</td>
<td>3.57±1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XAR</td>
<td>msec/mmHg</td>
<td>3.77±0.59</td>
<td>2.14±0.99</td>
<td>2.01±1.52</td>
<td>0.61±0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF</td>
<td>mHz</td>
<td>0.10±0.01</td>
<td>0.08±0.01</td>
<td>0.08±0.02</td>
<td>0.06±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF K²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80±0.04</td>
<td>0.67±0.04</td>
<td>0.50±0.07</td>
<td>0.50±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP LF Ph</td>
<td>rad</td>
<td>-1.13±0.08</td>
<td>-1.05±0.31</td>
<td>-0.30±0.68</td>
<td>-1.78±0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF</td>
<td>mHz</td>
<td>0.22±0.02</td>
<td>0.27±0.02</td>
<td>0.24±0.02</td>
<td>0.27±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF K²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.63±0.07</td>
<td>0.60±0.05</td>
<td>0.75±0.08</td>
<td>0.84±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP HF Ph</td>
<td>rad</td>
<td>-0.30±0.15</td>
<td>-0.03±0.29</td>
<td>-0.10±0.23</td>
<td>-0.14±0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP Gain (LF)</td>
<td>msec/mmHg</td>
<td>6.53±0.53</td>
<td>4.04±0.75</td>
<td>5.85±1.79</td>
<td>2.39±0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR-SAP Gain (HF)</td>
<td>msec/mmHg</td>
<td>5.47±0.82</td>
<td>3.49±0.79</td>
<td>5.40±1.38</td>
<td>3.20±1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: SEM=Standard Error, Alpha=frequency domain index of baroreflex sensitivity, BRS=Baroreceptor Reflex Sensitivity, XAR=Causal Baroreflex Index, SAP=Systolic Arterial Pressure, LF=Low Frequency, HF=High Frequency, K²=Squared Coherence, Ph=Phase.

Significant differences: YOUNG controls vs OLD controls * , YOUNG controls vs e-CEA † , YOUNG controls vs s-CEA ‡ , OLD controls vs e-CEA †† , OLD controls vs s-CEA ‡‡ , e-CEA vs s-CEA §.
FIG. R1 - Comparison of simple hemodynamics (HR, left; SAP, right) and power of selected spectral components ($\text{LF}_{\text{RR[nu]}}$, left; $\text{LF}_{\text{SAP}}$, right) in young (Y) and old (O) controls, as well as in e-CEA (E) and S-CEA (P). Notice the lack of orthostatic hypotension in controls and in both groups of patients.

Empty bars = Rest; stippled bars = Stand.
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