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4. **Rationale:**
There is little doubt that hemodynamic forces are associated with the development of focal atherosclerotic plaques; however, these forces are difficult to measure directly. Instead, it was proposed by Friedman [Atherosclerosis 1983 Feb;46(2):225-31] that the geometry of the carotid bifurcation, as the primary determinant of local hemodynamics, could be a clinically feasible surrogate “local” risk factor for atherosclerosis. To date this hypothesis has not been satisfactorily tested, owing to small sample sizes (effect of systemic factors) and confounding effect of age/disease on geometry.

Recent evidence from the CARDIA study (N~3000) demonstrates that IMT at the carotid bulb is more weakly associated with conventional CV risk factors than IMT at the common carotid artery [Polak et al. Stroke 2010 Jan;41(1):9-15], which the authors speculated is due to the local geometric/hemodynamic influence at the bulb. As explained below, the ARIC Carotid MRI study provides all of the necessary ingredients to directly confirm this, for the first time.

5. **Main Hypothesis/Study Questions:**
We hypothesize the certain factors characterizing the shape of the carotid bifurcation are significant predictors of early carotid bulb wall thickening, independent of systemic risk factors. A secondary hypothesis is such significant relationship can only be found by controlling for both systemic risk factors and the secondary effect of age/disease on geometry.

6. **Design and analysis (study design, inclusion/exclusion, outcome and other variables of interest with specific reference to the time of their collection, summary of data analysis, and any anticipated methodologic limitations or challenges if present).**
Our starting point is the ARIC Carotid MRI wall remodeling study [Astor et al., Radiology 2010 Sep;256(3):879-86], which identified 1064 cases for which CCA and ICA wall thickness from black blood magnetic resonance imaging (BBMRI) and systemic risk factor data are already available in spreadsheet form courtesy of Brad Astor. The only extra ingredient is digital 3D segmentation of the carotid bifurcation lumen from contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance angiograms (CEMRA) acquired at the same time as the black blood MRI scans. Carotid bifurcation segmentation and geometric analysis is done using the automated techniques we have previously published [Bijari et al., J Magn Reson Imaging 2011 Feb;33(2):482-9 and Bijari et al., J Biomech 2012 Jun 1;45(9):1632-7].

Our analysis focuses on two groups, identified from Astor’s spreadsheet: those participants with complete systemic risk factor data (based on the same systemic risk factors considered by Polak et al.), sufficient quality CEMRA for digital segmentation, and 0% stenosis severity; and the subset of these with ICA and CCA wall thickness below the threshold for luminal narrowing (based on thresholds from Astor et al.).

Following the approach of Polak et al., multiple linear regression is carried out for each of the two groups with CCA and ICA wall thickness, separately, as dependent variables; and systemic risk factors + local (geometric) factors as independent variables. The expected outcome is that $R^2_{adj}$ will be higher for regressions that include local
geometric factors, and that one or more of these factors will be a significant independent predictor (i.e., \( \beta \)-value with \( p < 0.05 \)).

Preliminary results suggest that even with our strict inclusion criteria we may include cases having “abnormal” carotid bifurcation geometries, which may weaken or mask associations with geometric factors we have identified as surrogate markers of disturbed flow in the normal carotid bifurcation. To test this, we considered a subset of cases having “normal” carotid bifurcation geometries according to the descriptive statistics of young adult carotid bifurcation geometry published by Thomas et al. [Stroke. 2005 Nov;36(11):2450-6.]. Preliminary results (table below) demonstrates a strong association with FlareA, a geometric factor that we had previously shown to be a strong predictor of disturbed flow at the carotid bulb. They also confirm Polak et al.’s finding that such local factors would influence ICA wall thickness (WT), but not CCA WT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Geometric Factors</th>
<th>Maximum ICA WT</th>
<th>Mean CCA WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )  (p-value)</td>
<td>Partial R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlareA</td>
<td>0.302 (0.0001)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tort2D</td>
<td>-0.231 (0.020)</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ica Angle</td>
<td>-0.222 (0.029)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifurcation Angle</td>
<td>0.198 (NS)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemic + New Geometric</strong></td>
<td><strong>R² = 0.311</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²_adj = 0.212</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Geometric Factors</th>
<th>( \beta ) (p-value)</th>
<th>Partial R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR1</td>
<td>0.167 (NS)</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortuosity</td>
<td>0.136 (NS)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ica Angle</td>
<td>-0.555 (NS)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifurcation Angle</td>
<td>0.025 (NS)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemic + Old Geometric</strong></td>
<td><strong>R² = 0.246</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²_adj = 0.137</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemic Factors Alone</strong></td>
<td><strong>R² = 0.197</strong></td>
<td><strong>R²_adj = 0.112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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