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Abstract—Angiogenic and antiangiogenic factors have proven to be an accurate predictive means of preeclampsia. Echocardiographic studies have shown that women with preeclampsia exhibit significant cardiovascular strain, especially early-onset preeclampsia. The aim of this study is to determine preeclampsia risk with soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor ratio, serum NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide), and biophysical markers of cardiovascular function in a prospective case–control study. We examined a cohort of 110 pregnant women with uneventful pregnancy outcome (controls) and 129 with hypertensive pregnancy disorders, including 77 with preeclampsia and 52 with pregnancy-induced hypertension. Cardiac indices were obtained with a USCOM-1A monitor, and soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1, placental growth factor, and NT-proBNP were measured in serum samples on automated platforms. Logistic regression, as well as Cox proportional hazard analysis, was performed. There were significant contributions from all variables tested, except for heart rate, stroke volume index, and cardiac index to the prediction model. When testing accuracy of respective markers in combination (full model) versus individual markers (soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor ratio and total peripheral resistance) was compared. The soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor ratio and total peripheral resistance performed as good as the full model, except for hypertensive pregnancy disorders and pregnancy-induced hypertension, where the full model performed better. The additional assessment of biophysical and biochemical markers of cardiovascular strain in pregnancy increases the detection of the composite group of hypertensive pregnancy disorders, while not significantly improving detection of preeclampsia alone. This offers a more precise insight into the pathogenesis of the disease, as well as offering a window for intervention, possibly decreasing cardiovascular mortality in these women. (Hypertension. 2017;69:1192-1197. DOI: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.117.09256.) • Online Data Supplement
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Hypertensive pregnancy disorders (HDPs), namely preeclampsia, are a major contributor to maternal and fetal morbidity and mortality.1 Definitions of these disease entities rely largely on clinical evaluations, such as blood pressure measurement and proteinuria assessment, which are known to be relatively crude and imprecise, especially in predicting HDP-related adverse outcomes.2 The understanding of the importance of an imbalance of angiogenic factors, such as soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1 (sFlt-1) and placental growth factor (PIGF), in the pathophysiology of preeclampsia has led to the introduction of sFlt-1/PIGF ratio into clinical practice as a predictive test for preeclampsia, as well as other placental-mediated adverse outcomes.3–5 In nonpregnant patients, circulating sFlt-1 is generated as a result of myocardial injury, and both sFlt-1 and PIGF are associated with the development of heart failure and related adverse outcomes.7,8 In accord with this sFlt-1/PIGF data, echocardiographic studies have consistently shown that women with preeclampsia exhibit significant cardiovascular strain, especially early-onset preeclampsia.9–11 Moreover, women with a history of preeclampsia are known to have an increased risk for premature onset of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in later life.14,15 These findings all support the hypothesis that preeclampsia involves a failure of the maternal cardiovascular system to adapt to the demands of pregnancy. While sFlt-1/PIGF ratio and role of echocardiography in preeclampsia have been evaluated, other biomarkers, such as NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide), a marker for cardiac volume overload and cardiac insufficiency, and whether combinations of biomarker might add to the predictive accuracy of existing tests have not been studied extensively.16–20
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Before biochemical and biophysical cardiovascular markers can be used in combination to predict preeclampsia, their relative importance and independence must first be ascertained. The aim of this study is to determine preeclampsia risk with sFlt-1/PIGF ratio, serum NT-proBNP, and biophysical markers of cardiovascular function in a prospective case–control study of normal and preeclamptic pregnant women.

**Methods**

**Patients**

This is a nested, prospective case–control study conducted at St George’s Hospital London, United Kingdom. Institutional review board approval was granted for this study, and informed written consent was obtained prospectively from all participants in the main ongoing study. Women with singleton pregnancies attending for prenatal care in the Fetal Medicine Unit were recruited. Patients were eligible for recruitment if they presented with either de novo hypertension, de novo proteinuria, or clinical signs and symptoms of preeclampsia. Patients were followed up, and clinical outcome was recorded. Clinical outcome was categorized according to the guidelines of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Briefly, hypertension was defined as the repeated measurement of systolic blood pressure of ≥140 mm Hg (Korotkoff I) and diastolic blood pressure of ≥90 mm Hg (Korotkoff V). Proteinuria was defined as the excretion of 300 mg protein or greater per day in the 24-hour urine collection or a repeated dipstick of ≥1+. Pregnancy-induced hypertension (PIH) was defined as the new onset of hypertension after 20 weeks of gestation, and preeclampsia (PE) was defined when additional proteinuria was diagnosed. Pregnant women who had an unforeseen pregnancy outcome were classified as controls. PE and PIH were analyzed to-
Results

Baseline Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics
A total of 110 pregnant women with uneventful pregnancy outcome (controls) and 129 with HDP (77 with PE and 52 with PIH) were included in the analysis. Patients with HDPs were more likely to have a higher BMI at booking, a higher systolic and diastolic blood pressure at examination, shorter pregnancy duration, and a smaller baby (Table 1). No differences existed in the gestational week at examination (median 35 weeks), maternal age, or ethnicity (Table 1). At examination, patients with HDP had a significant higher mean Uterine Artery PI, umbilical artery PI, and lower middle cerebral artery PI, as well as lower cerebro-placental ratio (Table 2). Mean arterial pressure, TPRI, sFlt-1/PlGF ratio, and NT-proBNP levels were significantly higher in HDP compared with controls, but no differences existed in heart rate, SV index, or CI (Table 2).

Univariate Logistic Regression and Correlation of Markers
There were significant contributions from all variables tested except for heart rate, SV index, and CI (Figure 1; Table S1 in the online-only Data Supplement). Excluding blood pressure, the highest significant odds ratio was for sFlt-1/PlGF ratio (odds ratio, 1.92; 95% confidence interval, 1.62–2.31), NT-proBNP (odds ratio, 1.51; 95% confidence interval, 1.31–1.76), and TPRI (odds ratio, 1.61; 95% confidence interval, 1.36–1.91). The corresponding receiver operating characteristic analysis gave area under the curve values of 84% for sFlt-1/PlGF ratio, 79% for TPRI, and 69% for NT-proBNP (Table 3). When comparing markers in various quartiles, there is a significant positive correlation between sFlt-1/PlGF ratio and NT-proBNP in HDP but not control pregnancies (Figure 2). There is a moderate but significant correlation of TPRI with sFlt-1/PlGF ratio in HDP, but not control pregnancies (Figure S1).

Multivariable Logistic Regression
For distinction between HDP and control pregnancies, CI, TPRI, sFLT-1/PLGF ratio, but not NT-proBNP, were statistically significant on multivariable logistic regression analysis (Figure 3; Table S2). When testing accuracy of respective markers in combination (full model) versus individual markers (sFlt-1/PlGF, soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor; SVI, stroke volume index; TPRI, total peripheral resistance index; UA, umbilical artery; and UAD mean PI, mean uterine artery pulsatility index).

Table 2. Group Differences, Median (Quartiles) of Raw Data, Mean±SD of MoM Values and t Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Controls (n=110)</th>
<th>Control MoM Values</th>
<th>HDP (n=129)</th>
<th>HDP MoM Values</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAD mean PI</td>
<td>0.66 (0.56/0.81)</td>
<td>0.97±0.241</td>
<td>0.91 (0.66/1.33)</td>
<td>1.46±0.7</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA PI</td>
<td>0.94 (0.85/1.02)</td>
<td>1±0.132</td>
<td>1 (0.85/1.17)</td>
<td>1.14±0.39</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA PI</td>
<td>1.79 (1.6/2)</td>
<td>1.02±0.18</td>
<td>1.64 (1.47/1.88)</td>
<td>0.94±0.212</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>1.91 (1.67/2.17)</td>
<td>1.02±0.194</td>
<td>1.73 (1.41/2)</td>
<td>0.9±0.34</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>85 (76/93)</td>
<td>1±0.147</td>
<td>80 (70/94)</td>
<td>0.98±0.189</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVI</td>
<td>40 (35/45)</td>
<td>0.99±0.226</td>
<td>39 (32/44)</td>
<td>0.98±0.233</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>3.3 (2.9/3.7)</td>
<td>1±0.244</td>
<td>3.1 (2.8/3.8)</td>
<td>0.95±0.202</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>86 (82/92)</td>
<td>0.99±0.091</td>
<td>110 (104/117)</td>
<td>1.24±0.176</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI</td>
<td>2084 (1853/2455)</td>
<td>1±0.33</td>
<td>2813 (2447/3225)</td>
<td>1.31±0.4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT-proBNP</td>
<td>31 (19/52)</td>
<td>1±0.224</td>
<td>56 (28/124)</td>
<td>1.22±0.32</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sFlt-1/PlGF ratio</td>
<td>4.3 (2.2/11.6)</td>
<td>1±0.66</td>
<td>52 (16/157)</td>
<td>3.14±4.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI indicates cardiac index; CPR, cerebro-placental ratio; HDP, hypertensive pregnancy disorders; HR, heart rate; MAP, mean arterial pressure; MCA, middle cerebral artery; MoM, multiples of the medians; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide; PI, pulsatility index; sFlt-1/PlGF, soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor; SVI, stroke volume index; TPRI, total peripheral resistance index; UA, umbilical artery; and UAD mean PI, mean uterine artery pulsatility index.

Figure 1. Univariate analyses (logistic regression) for preselection of variables and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis for sensitivity and specificity. For the comparison of the control group (CO) with hypertensive pregnancy disease group (HTPD), odds ratios (OR) and confidence intervals (CI) are displayed for multiples of the medians (MoM) of the following parameters: diastolic blood pressure at examination (Exam.dBP), systolic blood pressure at examination (Exam.sBP), soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor (sFlt-1/PlGF ratio in logarithmic scale (sFlt1_PlGF_ratio_log), total peripheral resistance index (TPRI), mean uterine artery pulsatility index (UAD.mean.PI), NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide) in logarithmic scale (NT.proBNP_log), body mass index at booking for an increase of 5 units (Bookin.BMI_5units), umbilical artery pulsatility index (UA.PI), age for an increase of 5 years (Age_5y), weight at examination (Exam.Weight), stroke volume index (SVI), heart rate (HR), cardiac index (CI), cerebro-placental ratio (CPR), and middle cerebral artery (MCA).
ratio and TPRI) was compared, the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio performed as good as the full model, except for controls versus HDP and controls versus PIH, where the full model performed better. TPRI performed as well as the full model in controls versus HDP; in all other comparisons, the full model performed better. TPRI performed as well as the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio for controls versus HDP and controls versus PIH. In controls versus PE, the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio performed significantly better than TPRI (Table 3).

Cox Proportional Hazard
An analysis of the prediction of using Cox proportional hazard showed that lower CI and higher TPRI, NT-proBNP, and sFlt-1/PlGF ratio corresponded with shorter remaining pregnancy duration (Table S3).

Discussion
This is the first study to prospectively assess both biochemical and biophysical markers of cardiovascular strain or placental dysfunction in a cohort of patients with HDP and in healthy pregnant women. Many studies have shown the potential usefulness of biochemical markers, namely sFlt-1/PlGF ratio, in predicting preeclampsia. More recently, studies have demonstrated that preeclampsia involves maternal cardiovascular impairment—principally involving adverse cardiac remodeling and diastolic dysfunction. While the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio is increasingly becoming a part of routine clinical care and was recently recommended as a rule out test by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence in the United Kingdom, biophysical assessment of maternal cardiovascular function does not yet have a defined role in clinical practice.21 In our cohort, we aimed to clarify to what extent the assessment of biochemical and biophysical cardiovascular marker in isolation or combination could improve prediction of preeclampsia. In addition to routinely collected clinical data and standard Doppler evaluations, we evaluated biophysical (heart rate, SV, CI, and TPRI) as well as biochemical (sFlt-1/PlGF ratio and NT-proBNP) markers of cardiovascular function in women with a healthy pregnancy and those with HDP—a group that included preeclampsia and PIH. The rational for combining these different HDP groups was that both categories have been shown to exhibit cardiovascular strain.12 To eliminate the bias of latent placental dysfunction in the

Table 3. Comparative ROC Analysis of Prediction Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>AUC Full Model</th>
<th>AUC sFLT-1/PlGF</th>
<th>AUC TPRI</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Full vs sFLT/PlGF</th>
<th>Full vs TPRI</th>
<th>TPRI vs sFLT/PlGF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control vs HDP</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control vs PIH</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control vs PE</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIH vs PE</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late PE vs early PE</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC indicates area under the curve; HDP, hypertensive pregnancy disorders; PE, preeclampsia; PIH, pregnancy-induced hypertension; ROC, receiver operating characteristic; sFlt-1/PlGF, soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor; and TPRI, total peripheral resistance index.

Figure 2. Relation of NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide) to soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor (sFlt-1/PlGF) ratio. For the comparison of the control group (CO) with hypertensive pregnancy disease group (HTPD), the correlation between NT-proBNP (logarithmic scale, y axis) and sFlt-1/PlGF ratio (logarithmic scale, x axis) is displayed. In controls, this correlations is not significant (r=1.33), while it is in HTPD (r=0.56).

Figure 3. Multivariate logistic regressions for controls (CO) versus hypertensive pregnancy disease group (HTPD). The variables contributing to the model were total peripheral resistance index (TPRI), cardiac index (CI), soluble fms-like tyrosin kinase 1/placental growth factor (sFlt-1/PlGF) ratio in logarithmic scale (sFlt1_PlGF_ratio_log), and NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide) in logarithmic scale (NT.proBNP_log). MoM indicates multiples of the medians.
control group, we constructed an optimal control cohort containing well-grown fetuses with normal uterine and umbilical Doppler indices.\textsuperscript{22} We demonstrated that sFlt-1/PlGF ratio and TPRI showed usefulness in the prediction for HDP, with some additional, moderate contribution from NT-proBNP and CI.

**Clinical and Research Implications**

There are several implications for clinical practice arising from these findings apart from confirming the high predictive accuracy of the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio in line with recent findings from large prospective studies.\textsuperscript{8} Our analysis demonstrated that several additional biochemical and biophysical cardiovascular markers are also related to HDP, namely NT-proBNP, TPRI, and UtA Doppler assessment, suggesting that these variables may potentially contribute toward HDP prediction. However, an analysis of correlations demonstrated a strong interdependence of the putative placental biomarkers sFlt-1/PlGF to NT-proBNP, an established cardiovascular biomarker produced by cardiac myocytes exposed to volume overload. This is an interesting finding, which suggests that either NT-proBNP is also related to placental dysfunction or that sFlt-1/PlGF may also be acting as a cardiovascular biomarker in HDP. Multivariable logistic regression analysis demonstrated that only TPRI, CI, and sFlt-1/PlGF, but not NT-proBNP, were independent predictors of HDP, suggesting that prediction models using combinations of these cardiovascular markers may have increased performance and predictive accuracy for HDP. Similarly, the Cox proportional hazard analysis showed that an increase in the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio, TPRI, and NT-proBNP or decrease in CI were all associated with a higher likelihood for imminent delivery.

Assessment of biomarker performance by comparative receiver operating characteristic curve analysis demonstrated similar performance for prediction models of HDP containing all biomarkers, TPRI alone, or sFlt-1/PlGF alone. It is important to acknowledge that as a case–cohort rather than a screening study, measures of test performance are biased with attenuation of the receiver operating characteristic curve because of pooled covariate data.\textsuperscript{21} Regardless of this limitation, the data provide cause for optimism that assessing biophysical and biochemical markers of cardiovascular strain in pregnancy offers a more precise insight into the pathogenesis of HDP, as well as offering a window for prediction, intervention, and possibly decreasing subsequent cardiovascular mortality in these women.

**Study Strengths and Limitations**

The strength of the study is that biochemical and biophysical marker of cardiovascular function have been concurrently in the same patients nested within a large prospective study cohort. The study has only a single assessment point, when >1 measurement and analysis of marker slopes may have yielded higher predictive accuracy. Our mean time of assessment was 35 weeks of gestation corresponding to a mainly late-onset HDP cohort. Furthermore, the majority of patients with preeclampsia had mild rather than severe disease. Future studies should distinguish between early and late HDP cohorts because this disease classification may affect precision in detection. Finally, as previously mentioned, the case–control study design does not lend itself to accurate assessment of screening performance by receiver operating characteristic analysis.

**Perspectives**

Including markers of cardiovascular function into assessment of HDPs takes into account the contribution of cardiovascular alterations to the pathophysiology of HDPs. The failure of the maternal heart to adapt to the demands of pregnancy is seen to contribute substantially to hypertensive disorder–related adverse outcomes.\textsuperscript{24} Moreover, echocardiographic alterations are observed to persist postpartum, contributing potentially to premature onset of cardiovascular morbidity in later life.\textsuperscript{13,15} The additional assessment of biophysical and biochemical markers of cardiovascular strain in pregnancy does not seem to significantly improve the detection of preeclampsia as yielded by the sFlt-1/PlGF ratio. However, it does increase the detection of the composite group of HDPs. This offers a more precise insight into the pathogenesis of the disease, as well as offering a window for intervention, possibly decreasing cardiovascular mortality in these women.
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**Novelty and Significance**

**What Is New?**

- Assessing biophysical and biochemical markers of cardiovascular function can help to predict hypertensive pregnancy disorders. This is the first study evaluating this combination of diagnostic tools.

**What Is Relevant?**

- Hypertensive pregnancy disorders, especially preeclampsia, go along with cardiovascular impairment. Noninvasively measuring cardiac index and total peripheral resistance, as well as maternal serum NT-proBNP (N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide), can help to improve predictive accuracy of the soluble fms-like tyrosine kinase 1/placental growth factor ratio in certain patients.

**Summary**

The prediction of hypertensive pregnancy disorders but not preeclampsia is improved by adding cardiovascular markers to placental markers. In preeclampsia, the soluble fms-like tyrosine kinase 1/placental growth factor ratio remains the most accurate means of prediction.
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### Table S1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OR (CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>ROC AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (5years)</td>
<td>1.08 (0.94/1.23)</td>
<td>0.28910</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking BMI (5units)</td>
<td>1.28 (1.11/1.47)</td>
<td>0.00051</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Weight</td>
<td>1.02 (1.01/1.03)</td>
<td>0.00420</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam sBP MoM</td>
<td>2.64 (2.2/3.3)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91 (88-95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam dBP MoM</td>
<td>3.12 (2.5/4.1)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94 (91-97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UtA mean PI MoM</td>
<td>1.52 (1.32/1.8)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73 (66-80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA PI MoM</td>
<td>1.2 (1.08/1.35)</td>
<td>0.00104</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61 (54-68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA PI MoM</td>
<td>0.76 (0.63/0.91)</td>
<td>0.00346</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62 (54-70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR MoM</td>
<td>0.81 (0.71/0.94)</td>
<td>0.00523</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64 (57-72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR MoM</td>
<td>0.93 (0.8/1.09)</td>
<td>0.37800</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55 (47-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVI MoM</td>
<td>0.97 (0.82/1.15)</td>
<td>0.72925</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53 (45-61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI MoM</td>
<td>0.87 (0.72/1.05)</td>
<td>0.14402</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54 (46-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI MoM</td>
<td>1.61 (1.36/1.91)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79 (72-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTproBNP logMoM</td>
<td>1.51 (1.31/1.76)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69 (63-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sFlt-1/PIGF-ratio logMoM</td>
<td>1.92 (1.62/2.31)</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84 (79-89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplementary Table S1** Univariate logistic regression and ROC analysis (AUC: 95% confidence interval) for control versus HDP
### Table S2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI MoM</td>
<td>2.38 (1.56-3.66)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI MoM</td>
<td>2.67 (1.83-3.93)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTproBNP logMoM</td>
<td>1.05 (0.87-1.28)</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sFlt-1/PIGF-ratio logMoM</td>
<td>1.71 (1.39-2.13)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplementary Table S2:** Multivariate logistic regression for controls versus HDP

### Table S3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI MoM</td>
<td>0.76 (0.60-0.97)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI MoM</td>
<td>1.39 (1.19-1.63)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTproBNP logMoM</td>
<td>1.56 (1.37-1.79)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sFlt-1/PIGF-ratio logMoM</td>
<td>1.90 (1.69-2.14)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplementary Table S3:** Cox proportional hazards for HDP
Supplementary figure S1: Relation of TPRI to sFlt-1/PIGF-ratio. For the comparison of the control group (CO) with hypertensive pregnancy disease group (HTPD), the correlation between total peripheral resistance (TPRI, y-axis) and sFlt-1PIGF ratio (logarithmic scale x-axis) is displayed. In controls, this correlation is not significant ($r=1.33$,), while it is in HTPD ($r=0.56$).