



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands

Cardiac Rotational Mechanics As a Predictor of Myocardial Recovery in Heart Failure Patients Undergoing Chronic Mechanical Circulatory Support A Pilot Study

Bonios, M.J.; Koliopoulou, A.; Wever-Pinzon, O.; Taleb, I.; Stehlik, J.; Xu, W.N.; ... ; Drakos, S.G.

Citation

Bonios, M. J., Koliopoulou, A., Wever-Pinzon, O., Taleb, I., Stehlik, J., Xu, W. N., ... Drakos, S. G. (2018). Cardiac Rotational Mechanics As a Predictor of Myocardial Recovery in Heart Failure Patients Undergoing Chronic Mechanical Circulatory Support A Pilot Study. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging*, 11(4). doi:10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.117.007117

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/86877>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



Published in final edited form as:

Circ Cardiovasc Imaging. 2018 April ; 11(4): e007117. doi:10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.117.007117.

Cardiac Rotational Mechanics as a Predictor of Myocardial Recovery in Heart Failure Patients Undergoing Chronic Mechanical Circulatory Support: A Pilot Study

Michael J. Bonios, MD/PhD^{1,2}, Antigone Koliopoulou, MD¹, Omar Wever-Pinzon, MD¹, Iosif Taleb, MD¹, Josef Stehlik, MD/MSc¹, Weining Xu, MD¹, James Wever-Pinzon, MD¹, Anna Catino, MD¹, Abdallah G. Kfoury, MD³, Benjamin D. Horne, PhD, MStat, MPH³, Jose Nativi-Nicolau, MD¹, Stamatis N. Adamopoulos, MD/PhD², James C. Fang, MD¹, Craig H. Selzman, MD¹, Jeroen J. Bax, MD⁴, and Stavros G. Drakos, MD/PhD¹

¹University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah ²Onassis Cardiac Surgery Center, Athens, Greece

³Intermountain Medical Center, Salt Lake City, Utah ⁴Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

Background—Impaired qualitative and quantitative left ventricular rotational mechanics predict cardiac remodeling progression and prognosis after myocardial infarction. We investigated whether cardiac rotational mechanics can predict cardiac recovery in chronic advanced cardiomyopathy (CMP) patients.

Methods and Results—63 advanced chronic and dilated CMP patients undergoing implantation of left ventricular assist device (LVAD) were prospectively investigated using speckle tracking echocardiography. Acute heart failure patients were prospectively excluded. We evaluated left ventricular (LV) rotational mechanics [apical and basal LV twist, LV torsion] and deformational mechanics [circumferential (CS) and longitudinal strain (LS)] before LVAD implantation. Cardiac recovery post-LVAD implantation was defined as (i) final resulting LV ejection fraction (EF) {greater than or equal to} 40%, (ii) relative LVEF increase {greater than or equal to} 50%, (iii) relative LVESV decrease {greater than or equal to} 50% (all 3 required). 12 patients fulfilled the criteria for cardiac recovery (Rec Group). The Rec Group had significantly less impaired pre-LVAD “Peak LV Torsion” compared to the Non-Rec Group. Notably, both groups had similarly reduced pre-LVAD LVEF. By receiver-operating characteristic curve analysis, pre-LVAD “Peak LV Torsion” of 0.35 degrees/cm had a 92% sensitivity and a 73% specificity in predicting cardiac recovery. Peak LV torsion before LVAD implantation was found to be an independent predictor of cardiac recovery following LVAD implantation [OR 0.65 per 0.1 degrees/cm (0.49–0.87), p=0.014].

Address for correspondence: Stavros G. Drakos, MD, PhD, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, 30 North 1900 East, Room 4A150, Salt Lake City, UT, Tel: 801-5850727, Fax: 801-5850701, stavros.drakos@hsc.utah.edu.

2015: HFSA Annual Meeting “Jay Cohn Young Investigator Award Finalist”

Disclosures

None.

Conclusions—LV rotational mechanics appear to be useful in selecting patients prone to cardiac recovery after mechanical unloading induced by LVADs. Future studies should investigate the utility of these markers in predicting durable cardiac recovery following the explantation of the cardiac assist device.

Keywords

cardiac rotational mechanics; LVAD; cardiac recovery; prediction

Over the last decade, left ventricular assist devices (LVAD) have established their role in improving the quality and length of life in the advanced heart failure (HF) patient^{1, 2}. An exciting and promising observation of the mechanically unloaded failing heart through LVAD support, is the improvement of the cardiac function to the point that some of these advanced HF patients were able to be weaned from the mechanical support^{3–9}. While left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) during mechanical unloading is used to identify patients achieving myocardial recovery, it has showed no predictive value prior to LVAD implantation¹⁰. The need for measurement of additional quantitative and qualitative indexes of the left ventricle systolic function, beyond EF is a consequence of its complex nature. Myocardial muscle has a helical orientation with the subendocardial fibers following a right-handed orientation and the subepicardial fibers a left-handed orientation. This type of cardiac muscle orientation, during cardiac systole results in a wringing torsional deformation of the left ventricle^{11, 12}. Left ventricular torsion has been found to play a pivotal role in facilitating the homogenous distribution of myocardial forces during systole. Clinical studies in chronic heart failure patients have associated left ventricular rotational dynamics with the degree of remodeling and the extension of myocardial fibrosis^{13, 14}. In addition, left ventricular global longitudinal strain (GLS) has been correlated with the extent of myocardial fibrosis in patients with advanced heart failure^{15, 16}.

We hypothesized that the extent and type of myocardial dysfunction of patients with advanced chronic heart failure is heterogeneous and may be predictive of LVAD facilitated myocardial recovery. Specifically, we theorized that the degree and extent of abnormal torsional myocardial mechanics and the degree of the impairment of GLS could predict those patients who were most likely to achieve myocardial recovery during durable mechanical unloading.

Methods

The data, analytical methods, and study materials will not be made available to other researchers outside the University of Utah Hospital system. Researchers interested in the data, methods, or analysis can contact the corresponding author for more information.

We screened 220 patients with advanced chronic systolic heart failure who had a clinical indication for LVAD implantation (bridge to transplant / destination therapy / bridge to decision). The study was approved by our institutions' Institutional Review Board and the patients provided the type of informed consent required by this approval. All patients had been diagnosed with chronic and dilated cardiomyopathy and end-stage heart failure (NYHA IV), despite optimal medical and device therapy. We included patients that fulfilled

all the following criteria: i) chronic heart failure, ii) adequate quality of two dimensional (2D) echocardiographic images that allowed the analysis of rotational mechanics prior to LVAD implantation, and iii) at least 3 months after LVAD implantation with serial echocardiograms of sufficient quality to assess LVEF. We excluded patients with acute systolic heart failure or patients with clinical or histologic evidence of acute myocarditis. We also excluded patients with atrial fibrillation at the time of echocardiographic analysis, unless the patient was on paced rhythm. Myocardial recovery (**Rec Group**) post-LVAD implantation was defined as (i) final LVEF \geq 40%, (ii) relative increase in LVEF \geq 50%, and (iii) relative left-ventricular end-systolic volume (LVESVi) decrease \geq 50%. Patients who did not fulfill the above criteria constituted the no recovery group (**Non-Rec Group**).

We also included 15 subjects without known structural heart disease (Control Group), who were referred for an echocardiogram for atypical chest pain or palpitations without evidence for myocardial ischemia and other significant arrhythmia. We compared the deformational and rotational echocardiographic parameters of the advanced heart failure patients, before LVAD implantation, to those of the Control Group, to determine the degree of the impairment in our heart failure population. The study was approved by the institutional review board of the participating institutions.

Echocardiography

Study participants were imaged in the left lateral decubitus position with a commercially available systems (Phillips and GE machines) coupled with a 3.5 MHz (M4S) transducer and films were digitally stored in cine-loop format; analyses were subsequently performed offline.

Echocardiogram protocol—Surveillance for functional recovery was undertaken using a protocol developed and tested at the University of Utah⁵. Conventional echocardiograms were performed within 2 weeks before LVAD implantation and 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 12 months after implantation. Echocardiographic studies included complete 2D and Doppler examinations. Assessment of LV volumes and LVEF were performed using the apical 4- and 2-chamber views. Right ventricular (RV) size was evaluated by means of RV dimension obtained at end-diastole from an RV-focused apical 4-chamber view (basal RV end-diastolic dimension). Doppler evaluation included the assessment of mitral inflow velocities. Mitral inflow parameters evaluated included early mitral inflow velocity (E-wave), late or atrial mitral inflow velocity (a-wave), and E-wave deceleration time (EDT). The LV sphericity index (LVSI) was calculated by dividing the LV maximal long-axis internal dimension by the maximal short-axis internal dimension at end-diastole. All measurements were performed in accordance with current American Society of Echocardiography guidelines¹⁷.

Left ventricle rotational echocardiographic analysis—Syngo velocity vector imaging technology software (Siemens Medical Solutions, Inc., Mountain View, Calif.) was used offline to track endomyocardial motion in the pre-LVAD 2D–echocardiogram images. The apical (the smallest cavity achievable distally to the papillary muscles) and basal (identified by the mitral valve) short-axis images were used for velocity vector imaging analysis. After selecting the optimal cardiac cycle, the endomyocardial border was

delineated in a “click to point” approach. Following that the software automatically outlines 6 segments per short axis view. Images that revealed poor tracking quality were excluded from further analysis. LV rotations at the basal or apical short-axis views were determined as average angular displacement of the 6 myocardial segments. The positive peak of apical LV rotation and negative peak of basal LV rotation were automatically measured. Data points depicting the basal and apical LV rotation were exported to Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) to calculate LV twist and torsion. Peak LV twist is defined as the maximal instantaneous difference between the apical and basal rotations. Peak LV torsion is defined as the peak LV twist magnitude normalized to LV length. All measurements are the averages derived from three cardiac cycles.

Deformational echocardiographic analysis

Longitudinal strain: Gray-scale 2D apical images of the LV (4-, 2-, and 3-chamber views) were obtained and peak longitudinal strain analysis of the LV was performed offline by manual tracing of the endomyocardial contour. For each view, longitudinal strain was calculated as an average of the six automatically generated myocardial segments. GLS was calculated as an average of all segments generated by VVI analysis of the 3 apical views.

Circumferential strain: Circumferential strain (CS) of the mid-LV was calculated using the short-axis view at the level of the papillary muscles. Peak CS was defined as the average CS of all 6 segments (generated as previously described) in the particular short-axis view. For GLS and CS, measurements were derived by the average corresponding values of three cardiac cycles. For rotational and deformational analysis, images were acquired at 60–80 frames/sec.

Hemodynamics

Patients underwent right heart catheterization within 1 week preceding LVAD implantation, which included measurement of central venous pressure (CVP), pulmonary artery (PA) pressures, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP), cardiac index (CI).

Intra-observer and inter-observer variability

Fifteen patients were randomly selected to assess the reproducibility of peak LV apical and basal LV twist. Bland-Altman analysis was performed to evaluate intra-observer and inter-observer agreement by repeating the analysis 3 months later by the same observer and by a second independent observer. Intra-observer agreement was excellent. According to Bland-Altman analysis, the mean difference \pm 2 SD for peak LV rotational parameters was $0.09 \pm 1.8^\circ$, $0.2 \pm 3.5\%$ for CS and $0.1 \pm 2.2\%$ for longitudinal strain. Inter-observer agreement was also good. According to Bland-Altman analysis, the mean difference \pm 2 SD for LV rotational parameters was $0.2 \pm 4.2^\circ$, $1.7 \pm 4.8\%$ for CS and $1.5 \pm 4.1\%$ for longitudinal strain.

Statistics

Continuous variables are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables are expressed as numbers and percentages. Independent sample *t*-test and χ^2 square test

were used to compare the continuous and non-continuous characteristics of the heart failure and control subjects respectively, and also the baseline characteristics of the recovered and non-recovered heart failure patients. Univariate and multivariate linear regression analyses were performed to evaluate the relationship between peak LV torsion in the heart failure population and the following baseline variables: age, duration of heart failure symptoms, LVEF, peak CS, GLS, LVEDD, LVESVi, and LVEDVi. Univariate and multivariate binary regression analyses were performed to evaluate the association of peak LV torsion in the heart failure population with recovery after adjustment for the following baseline variables: age, duration of heart failure symptoms, LVEF, CS, GLS, LVEDD, LVESVi, and LVEDVi. Receiver-operator-characteristics curve analysis was performed to determine the accuracy of baseline peak LV torsion to predict myocardial recovery following LVAD implantation. A p value < 0.05 is considered significant.

Results

Out of 220 patients implanted with LVAD, 63 patients met our inclusion criteria, of which 12 fulfilled the criteria of myocardial recovery. Patients excluded from the study group included (Figure 1): 67 patients with inadequate quality of images and 90 patients with less than 3-month follow-up post LVAD implantation (which is inadequate period of time to assess the effect of LVAD-induced mechanical unloading on cardiac recovery) (5). We compared the baseline characteristics of the excluded patients to those included in the analysis in order to address selection biases and we revealed no significant differences (comparisons were done separately between those with and without myocardial recovery).

Clinical and echocardiographic characteristics of normal controls and heart failure patients

Compared to the control subjects, chronic systolic HF patients (before LVAD implantation) had significantly lower LVEF and LV rotational and deformational characteristics (Table 1). Furthermore, HF patients had significantly more impaired GLS and CS parameters (Table 1).

Parameters affecting left ventricle torsion before LVAD implantation

Univariate linear regression analysis revealed significant association of various parameters with peak LV torsion: HF duration, CS, GLS and LVEDD (Table 2). In linear regression analyses predicting peak LV torsion, a two-variable model adjusting for peak CS ($\beta = -0.057$, $p = 0.001$) showed LVEDD was an independent predictor ($\beta = -0.221$, $p = 0.002$), as did a two-variable model entering global GLS ($\beta = -0.076$, $p = 0.001$) and LVEDD ($\beta = -0.181$, $p = 0.029$). Modeling HF duration, peak CS, and GLS together with LVEDD (Table 2) had a similar result (LVEDD $\beta = -0.164$, $p = 0.029$).

Characteristics of patients with myocardial recovery

Twelve patients (11 with non-ischemic and 1 with ischemic cardiomyopathy) fulfilled the criteria for myocardial recovery (Rec Group) (table 3), while 51 patients did not fulfill the criteria for myocardial recovery. The baseline characteristics of the Rec and Non-Rec Group are shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6. The Rec Group had significantly shorter duration of HF

compared to the Non-Rec group. Additionally, the Rec Group had significantly lower age, higher peak LV torsion and higher CI values before LVAD implantation (Tables 4 and 6, figure 2). Due to the small number of cardiac recovery cases, multivariate logistic regression analyses included only up to two explanatory variables. In such models, peak LV torsion was associated with recovery when adjusted for HF duration, cardiac index, or age (Table 7). No other variables were associated with recovery in two-variable models with peak LV torsion, which also was unaffected by those other variables and it remained significant in those models.

In the Rec Group, peak LVEF was achieved within the first 12 months following LVAD implantation, while in the Non-Rec Group the LVEF remained stable throughout the follow-up period (Figure 3). Interestingly, LVEF did not differ significantly between the Rec and Non-Rec Group before LVAD implantation. Figure 4 shows the correlation between baseline torsion (before LVAD implantation) with the maximum achieved LVEF under LVAD support. By receiver-operator-characteristics (Figure 5), peak LV torsion 0.35 °/cm had a sensitivity of 92% and a specificity of 73% to predict myocardial recovery following LVAD implantation.

Following LVAD implantation, there were no significant differences in the anti-remodeling medical therapy between the Rec Group and Non-Rec Group: b-blocker (83% vs 67%, $p=0.26$), angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor/angiotensin II receptor antagonist (83% vs 56%, $p=0.08$) and aldosterone receptor antagonist (62 % vs 51%, $p=0.55$) respectively.

Discussion

In patients with chronic advanced systolic HF, LV torsion before LVAD implantation was found to predict myocardial recovery following mechanical unloading with a LVAD (Figure 6). It is noteworthy that patients who experienced myocardial recovery following LVAD implantation, had before LVAD implantation LVEF similar to those who did not show post LVAD myocardial recovery (Figure 6). This is also consistent with prior observations studies (5, 7, 9, 10).

Previous studies have identified as independent predictors for myocardial recovery the young age and non-ischemic etiology^{9, 18, 19}. In concordance to those findings, our study also revealed that there was trend for younger and non-ischemic patients to reveal myocardial recovery. Additionally, in our Rec Group of patients, the time from the HF diagnosis to the implantation of the LVAD was significantly shorter compared to the Non-Rec Group of patients. Previous studies also have identified a prognostic role of cardiac deformational and rotational parameters in heart failure patients undergoing cardiac resynchronization therapy²⁰. To our knowledge, this is the first study describing the role of LV torsional mechanics as a predictor for myocardial recovery following mechanical support with a LVAD.

Impact of LV systolic dysfunction on LV torsional and deformational parameters in heart failure patients

In a normal heart, LV systole is associated with counterclockwise rotation at the apex, while the base rotates clockwise (when viewed from the apex), resulting in a twisting motion of the heart¹¹. Furthermore, myocardial energy efficiency is thought to be dependent on LV twist by normalizing the fiber shortening of the endomyocardial and epimyocardial layers during contraction^{21, 22}. Forty percent of the total stroke volume is produced by these twisting forces²³ and not reflected in the LVEF, a relatively crude assessment of LV function.

Clinical studies have shown that in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy, LV twist mechanisms are impaired²⁴ and predictive of outcome. When we compared the rotational parameters of our HF patients before LVAD implantation to patients without structural heart disease, we observed similar results. The occurrence of progressive LV dilatation with concomitant increase in LV sphericity index and widening of the LV apex results in the development of a more transverse myocardial fiber direction that ultimately results in impaired LV rotation^{25, 26}. In our HF study population, both patients who recovered and those that did not experience myocardial recovery had comparable LV sphericity indexes. This finding implies that beyond myocardial architecture disruption and consequent LV remodeling, more extensive myocardial injury as reflected in more abnormal rotational mechanics is more sensitive in predicting post-LVAD recovery. Importantly, LV torsion was related to the duration of HF which likely also reflects the magnitude and extent of irreversible myocardial injury.

In our pilot study we were unable to identify a correlation between baseline LVEF and baseline LV rotation parameters. Previous studies in HF patients have identified a correlation between LVEF and LV torsion, and this correlation was weaker in non-ischemic compared to ischemic patients²⁷. It should be noted that the patient population of our study is characterized by more advanced heart disease as compared to those studies. Half of our patients were inotrope dependent, had lower LVEF, and larger LV chamber volumes compared to the aforementioned clinical studies. LV torsion and LVEF are not identical parameters and studies have shown that LV torsion can provide additional information regarding ventricular systolic performance.

Role of left ventricular rotational and deformational mechanics in predicting myocardial recovery

In the current study, LV torsion before LVAD implantation was the only independent parameter that correlated with the maximum LVEF following LVAD implantation, predicting myocardial recovery (tables 4, 5 and 6). Impaired quantitative and qualitative LV rotational parameters in HF patients, have been associated with more advanced stages of heart disease^{13, 14}. In a group of HF patients with non-ischemic cardiomyopathy, those with reversed apical rotation correlated with more extensive remodeling and more advanced heart failure stages¹³. Similarly, in our study the Non-Rec Group of patients had higher rates of abnormal direction of apical or basal rotation prior to LVAD implantation. The prognostic role of LV torsion has been studied in heart failure patients undergoing cardiac

resynchronization therapy (CRT)²⁷. Immediately following CRT implantation, patients with improvement in LV torsion predicted LV reverse remodeling six months later.

A prognostic role for LV torsion has also been found in patients following an acute myocardial infarction (AMI). In that study decreased LV torsion immediately following MI predicted adverse LV remodeling after 6 months²⁸. A preserved CS in post – MI patients has also been found to predict a favorable outcome and consistent with less LV remodeling^{29, 30}.

In HF patients, deformational LV parameters have also been identified as a prognostic tool. For example, worsening in GLS independently predicted long-term adverse events³¹. In contrast, CS and GLS in our study was not associated with myocardial recovery. However, our patients had likely developed extensive LV remodeling at the time of LV mechanical unloading. This might indicate that as heart failure and LV remodeling evolves, left ventricle torsion constitutes the last effective contractile mechanism of the failing heart.

Rotational and deformational parameters of left ventricular function could provide significant prognostic information. In an era of imbalance between heart donation and demand, rotational mechanics could be a guidance tool for patient selection with a higher likelihood for myocardial recovery. This could have significant implications more specifically in young patients, where the protentional implantation of the LVAD in earlier stages of heart failure could enhance the changes for myocardial recovery. These strategies warrant future prospective clinical investigations.

Cardiac rotational /deformational mechanics and myocardial recovery in ischemic vs non-ischemic cardiomyopathy

In our study of 20 patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy, only 1 revealed myocardial recovery following LVAD implantation. This is consistent with our recently reported study which revealed that LVAD-associated unloading resulted in a substantial improvement in myocardial structure, and systolic and diastolic function in 1 in 20 ischemic cardiomyopathy patients and 1 in 5 non-ischemic cardiomyopathy patients³². Previous studies have also shown that myocardial recovery is significantly less common in patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy compared to the patients with non-ischemic cardiomyopathy. In our study, when we compared torsional values of the 19 patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy who had no myocardial recovery with those of patients with non-ischemic cardiomyopathy who had no myocardial recovery, we detected no significant difference.

Study limitations

Because of the well-identified challenges of imaging patients with LVAD devices, there was a large proportion of our patient population with poor quality echo images following LVAD implantation that we were unable to quantify torsional parameters on. For this reason, it is unclear whether the improvement in LVEF in LVAD patients is accompanied by concomitant improvement in torsional parameters. Transesophageal echocardiography could bypass the obstacle of poor imaging quality in LVAD patients with recovered myocardium³³. Nonetheless, this piece of information could provide additional criteria for potential LVAD

explantation and potentially minimizing the risk of heart failure recurrence. We were however able to acquire short axis (SAX) basal images (to calculate basal rotation) and SAX images at the mid-level of the LV (for the calculation of the CS) in many of our patients. This data is provided in Supplemental Materials (Online Table 1, Online Figure 1). Regardless, the lack of this information does not invalidate the role of LV torsion as a predictor of myocardial recovery following LV mechanical unloading.

Additionally, the number of patients that fulfilled the criteria for myocardial recovery is relatively small. However, in the two-variable model, LV torsion was still the parameter associated with myocardial recovery. Future prospective studies with larger samples are needed aiming identify the role of cardiac mechanics in myocardial recovery and provide mechanistic insights, following cardiac unloading with an LVAD.

Conclusion

The interesting observation of myocardial recovery in a subset of mechanically unloaded advanced heart population is desirable and should be further pursued as a therapeutic strategy. The application of criteria for early identification, before LVAD implantation, of the population prone to a favorable response could result in enhancement of myocardial recovery by intensifying the anti-remodeling medication regimen and also to closely monitor the cardiac function with serial imaging. In the current pilot study, cardiac rotational mechanics before LVAD implantation identified a population prone to myocardial recovery following cardiac mechanical support. Notably, the recovered group of patients compared to the non-recovered group had similarly reduced pre-LVAD LVEF. Further study of cardiac rotational mechanics in LVAD supported HF patients are needed to confirm the results of the present study and potentially provide an additional guiding tool for LVAD explantation in patients with recovered myocardial function.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Sources of Funding

- American Heart Association (AHA) HF Strategically Focused Research Networks – Clinical Project 1 (Dr Drakos)
- NHLBI R01 Grant R01HL135121 (Dr. Drakos)
- Doris Duke Foundation Grant 7/ 2013 (Dr. Drakos).
- National Institutes of Health National Center for Research Resources grant that supports the Center Clinical Translational Sciences UL1-RR025764 and C06-RR11234, Deseret Foundation #00571 (Dr. Drakos and Dr. Kfoury).

References

1. Miller LW, Pagani FD, Russell SD, John R, Boyle AJ, Aaronson KD, Conte JV, Naka Y, Mancini D, Delgado RM, MacGillivray TE, Farrar DJ, Frazier OH, Investigators HIC. Use of a continuous-flow

- device in patients awaiting heart transplantation. *N Engl J Med.* 2007; 357:885–96. [PubMed: 17761592]
2. Slaughter MS, Rogers JG, Milano CA, Russell SD, Conte JV, Feldman D, Sun B, Tatroles AJ, Delgado RM, Long JW, Wozniak TC, Ghumman W, Farrar DJ, Frazier OH, Investigators HI. Advanced heart failure treated with continuous-flow left ventricular assist device. *N Engl J Med.* 2009; 361:2241–51. [PubMed: 19920051]
 3. Drakos SG, Kfoury AG, Stehlik J, Selzman CH, Reid BB, Terrovitis JV, Nanas JN, Li DY. Bridge to recovery: understanding the disconnect between clinical and biological outcomes. *Circulation.* 2012; 126:230–41. [PubMed: 22777666]
 4. Al-Sarie M, Rauf A, Kfoury AG, Catino A, Wever-Pinzon J, Bonios M, Horne BD, Diakos NA, Wever-Pinzon O, McKellar SH, Kelkhoff A, McCreath L, Fang J, Stehlik J, Selzman CH, Drakos SG. Myocardial Structural and Functional Response After Long-Term Mechanical Unloading With Continuous Flow Left Ventricular Assist Device: Axial Versus Centrifugal Flow. *JACC Heart Fail.* 2016; 4:570–6. [PubMed: 27179831]
 5. Drakos SG, Wever-Pinzon O, Selzman CH, Gilbert EM, Alharethi R, Reid BB, Saidi A, Diakos NA, Stoker S, Davis ES, Movsesian M, Li DY, Stehlik J, Kfoury AG, Investigators UUCRP. Magnitude and time course of changes induced by continuous-flow left ventricular assist device unloading in chronic heart failure: insights into cardiac recovery. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013; 61:1985–94. [PubMed: 23500219]
 6. Diakos NA, Selzman CH, Sachse FB, Stehlik J, Kfoury AG, Wever-Pinzon O, Catino A, Alharethi R, Reid BB, Miller DV, Salama M, Zaitsev AV, Shibayama J, Li H, Fang JC, Li DY, Drakos SG. Myocardial atrophy and chronic mechanical unloading of the failing human heart: implications for cardiac assist device-induced myocardial recovery. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2014; 64:1602–12. [PubMed: 25301465]
 7. Birks EJ, Tansley PD, Hardy J, George RS, Bowles CT, Burke M, Banner NR, Khaghani A, Yacoub MH. Left ventricular assist device and drug therapy for the reversal of heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* 2006; 355:1873–84. [PubMed: 17079761]
 8. Selzman CH, Madden JL, Healy AH, McKellar SH, Koliopoulou A, Stehlik J, Drakos SG. Bridge to removal: a paradigm shift for left ventricular assist device therapy. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2015; 99:360–7. [PubMed: 25442985]
 9. Wever-Pinzon O, Drakos SG, McKellar SH, Horne BD, Caine WT, Kfoury AG, Li DY, Fang JC, Stehlik J, Selzman CH. Cardiac Recovery During Long-Term Left Ventricular Assist Device Support. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016; 68:1540–53. [PubMed: 27687196]
 10. Dandel M, Weng Y, Siniawski H, Stepanenko A, Krabatsch T, Potapov E, Lehmkühl HB, Knosalla C, Hetzer R. Heart failure reversal by ventricular unloading in patients with chronic cardiomyopathy: criteria for weaning from ventricular assist devices. *Eur Heart J.* 2011; 32:1148–60. [PubMed: 20929978]
 11. Sengupta PP, Tajik AJ, Chandrasekaran K, Khandheria BK. Twist mechanics of the left ventricle: principles and application. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2008; 1:366–76. [PubMed: 19356451]
 12. Taber LA, Yang M, Podszus WW. Mechanics of ventricular torsion. *J Biomech.* 1996; 29:745–52. [PubMed: 9147971]
 13. Popescu BA, Beladan CC, Calin A, Muraru D, Deleanu D, Rosca M, Ginghina C. Left ventricular remodelling and torsional dynamics in dilated cardiomyopathy: reversed apical rotation as a marker of disease severity. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2009; 11:945–51. [PubMed: 19789397]
 14. Karahmet T, Gürel E, Tigen K, Güler A, Dündar C, Fotbolcu H, Basaran Y. The effect of myocardial fibrosis on left ventricular torsion and twist in patients with non-ischemic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Cardiol J.* 2013; 20:276–86. [PubMed: 23788302]
 15. Cameli M, Mondillo S, Righini FM, Lisi M, Dokollari A, Lindqvist P, Maccherini M, Henein M. Left Ventricular Deformation and Myocardial Fibrosis in Patients With Advanced Heart Failure Requiring Transplantation. *J Card Fail.* 2016; 22:901–907. [PubMed: 26952240]
 16. Bertini M, Ng AC, Antoni ML, Nucifora G, Ewe SH, Auger D, Marsan NA, Schaliq MJ, Bax JJ, Delgado V. Global longitudinal strain predicts long-term survival in patients with chronic ischemic cardiomyopathy. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2012; 5:383–91. [PubMed: 22412068]

17. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, Flachskampf FA, Foster E, Goldstein SA, Kuznetsova T, Lancellotti P, Muraru D, Picard MH, Rietzschel ER, Rudski L, Spencer KT, Tsang W, Voigt JU. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2015; 28:1–39. e14. [PubMed: 25559473]
18. Goldstein DJ, Maybaum S, MacGillivray TE, Moore SA, Bogaev R, Farrar DJ, Frazier OH, Investigators HIC. Young patients with nonischemic cardiomyopathy have higher likelihood of left ventricular recovery during left ventricular assist device support. *J Card Fail.* 2012; 18:392–5. [PubMed: 22555270]
19. Simon MA, Kormos RL, Murali S, Nair P, Heffernan M, Gorcsan J, Winowich S, McNamara DM. Myocardial recovery using ventricular assist devices: prevalence, clinical characteristics, and outcomes. *Circulation.* 2005; 112:132–6. [PubMed: 16159839]
20. Bertini M, Sengupta PP, Nucifora G, Delgado V, Ng AC, Marsan NA, Shanks M, van Bommel RJ, Schalij MJ, Narula J, Bax JJ. Role of left ventricular twist mechanics in the assessment of cardiac dyssynchrony in heart failure. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2009; 2:1425–35. [PubMed: 20083079]
21. Arts T, Veenstra PC, Reneman RS. Epicardial deformation and left ventricular wall mechanisms during ejection in the dog. *Am J Physiol.* 1982; 243:H379–90. [PubMed: 7114270]
22. Beyar R, Sideman S. Left ventricular mechanics related to the local distribution of oxygen demand throughout the wall. *Circ Res.* 1986; 58:664–77. [PubMed: 3708764]
23. Esch BT, Scott JM, Warburton DE, Thompson R, Taylor D, Cheng Baron J, Paterson I, Haykowsky MJ. Left ventricular torsion and untwisting during exercise in heart transplant recipients. *J Physiol.* 2009; 587:2375–86. [PubMed: 19332498]
24. Saito M, Okayama H, Nishimura K, Ogimoto A, Ohtsuka T, Inoue K, Hiasa G, Sumimoto T, Funada J, Shigematsu Y, Higaki J. Determinants of left ventricular untwisting behaviour in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy: analysis by two-dimensional speckle tracking. *Heart.* 2009; 95:290–6. [PubMed: 18801783]
25. Buckberg GD, Hoffman JI, Coghlan HC, Nanda NC. Ventricular structure-function relations in health and disease: Part I. The normal heart. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2015; 47:587–601. [PubMed: 25086103]
26. van Dalen BM, Kauer F, Vletter WB, Soliman OI, van der Zwaan HB, Ten Cate FJ, Geleijnse ML. Influence of cardiac shape on left ventricular twist. *J Appl Physiol (1985).* 2010; 108:146–51. [PubMed: 19850734]
27. Bertini M, Marsan NA, Delgado V, van Bommel RJ, Nucifora G, Borleffs CJ, Boriani G, Biffi M, Holman ER, van der Wall EE, Schalij MJ, Bax JJ. Effects of cardiac resynchronization therapy on left ventricular twist. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2009; 54:1317–25. [PubMed: 19778675]
28. Nucifora G, Marsan NA, Bertini M, Delgado V, Siebelink HM, van Werkhoven JM, Scholte AJ, Schalij MJ, van der Wall EE, Holman ER, Bax JJ. Reduced left ventricular torsion early after myocardial infarction is related to left ventricular remodeling. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2010; 3:433–42. [PubMed: 20478987]
29. Hung CL, Verma A, Uno H, Shin SH, Bourgoun M, Hassanein AH, McMurray JJ, Velazquez EJ, Kober L, Pfeffer MA, Solomon SD, investigators V. Longitudinal and circumferential strain rate, left ventricular remodeling, and prognosis after myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2010; 56:1812–22. [PubMed: 21087709]
30. Bonios MJ, Kaladaridou A, Tasoulis A, Papadopoulou E, Pamboukas C, Ntalianis A, Kanakakis J, Terrovitis JV, Toumanidis ST. Value of apical circumferential strain in the early post-myocardial infarction period for prediction of left ventricular remodeling. *Hellenic J Cardiol.* 2014; 55:305–12. [PubMed: 25039026]
31. Motoki H, Borowski AG, Shrestha K, Troughton RW, Tang WH, Thomas JD, Klein AL. Incremental prognostic value of assessing left ventricular myocardial mechanics in patients with chronic systolic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012; 60:2074–81. [PubMed: 23083779]
32. Wever-Pinzon J, Selzman CH, Stoddard G, Wever-Pinzon O, Catino A, Kfoury AG, Diakos NA, Reid BB, McKellar S, Bonios M, Koliopoulou A, Budge D, Kelkhoff A, Stehlik J, Fang JC, Drakos SG. Impact of Ischemic Heart Failure Etiology on Cardiac Recovery During Mechanical Unloading. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016; 68:1741–1752. [PubMed: 27737740]

33. Simmons LA, Weidemann F, Sutherland GR, D'hooge J, Bijnens B, Sergeant P, Wouters PF. Doppler tissue velocity, strain, and strain rate imaging with transesophageal echocardiography in the operating room: a feasibility study. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2002; 15:768–76. [PubMed: 12174345]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Clinical Perspective

Rotational and deformational parameters of the left ventricular function can provide additional to left ventricle ejection fraction information on the damage of a failing heart. Furthermore, left ventricle rotational mechanics can play the role of prognosticator for myocardial recovery following mechanical unloading with a left ventricular assist device. This piece of information is particularly important in an era characterized by an imbalance between the number of heart donors and recipients. The potential early identification of a patient with heart failure undergoing mechanical unloading with a left ventricular assist device could further maximize his/her anti-remodeling medication and make a patient's follow up monitoring closer as a strategy for left ventricular remodeling identification. Future studies should explore the mechanisms underlying the differences in cardiac rotational and deformational mechanisms in advanced heart failure patients and how these parameters are affected by mechanical unloading in context with myocardial recovery.






Figure 1. Flow diagram of patients included in the study
pts: patients



A)



B)

Figure 2. LV twist curves

LV rotational mechanics curves derived before LVAD implantation from a patient that developed post-LVAD myocardial recovery (A) and from a patient that did not develop myocardial recovery (B). Patient (A) has LV twist of 5.1°. Patient (B), in contrast to patient A, reveals a clockwise rotation of the apex (the apical rotation is negative instead of positive). This results in both the base and the apex rotating to the same direction during cardiac systole and to practically zero LV twist.

LV: Left Ventricle, LVAD: Left Ventricular Assist Device, LVEF: Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction




Figure 3. Time course of left ventricular ejection fraction changes following LVAD implantation
Time course of left ventricle ejection fraction following LVAD implantation in recovery and non-recovery group of patients.




Figure 4. Correlation between peak LV torsion before LVAD implantation and end systolic volume indexed following LVAD implantation
($r=0.605$, $p=001$)




Figure 5. Receiver–operator characteristics curve

Receiver–operator characteristics curve, testing the accuracy of peak LV torsion, before LVAD implantation, to predict myocardial recovery following LVAD support. Peak LV torsion > 0.35 °/cm had a 92% sensitivity and a 74% specificity to predict LV myocardial recovery.




Figure 6. Role of cardiac rotational mechanics in predicting myocardial recovery following LVAD-induced mechanical unloading

Two groups of advanced HF patients presenting with similarly low LVEF had differential left ventricular rotational mechanics at the pre-LVAD implantation time point. Only the group with partially preserved rotational mechanics responded favorably following LVAD-induced mechanical unloading with a significant increase in its LVEF. Left ventricular rotational mechanics can provide prognostic insights and improve patient selection for cardiac recovery before LVAD implantation.

HF: Heart Failure, LV: Left Ventricle, LVAD: Left Ventricular Assist Device, LVEF: Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction

Table 1

Baseline clinical and echocardiographic characteristics of control subjects and heart failure patients (before LVAD implantation)

| | Control subjects (n=15) | Heart Failure patients (n=63) | p |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| Age, (years) | 51 ± 7 | 52 ± 15 | 0.72 |
| Males (n, %) | 5 (33.3%) | 46 (74.0%) | 0.28 |
| BSA | 2.0 ± 0.2 | 2.0 ± 0.2 | 0.76 |
| Weight (kg) | 91 ± 22 | 83 ± 18 | 0.16 |
| Diabetes mellitus (n, %) | 1 (6.7%) | 9 (14.3%) | 0.76 |
| Hypertension (n, %) | 2 (13.3%) | 15 (23.8%) | 0.77 |
| LVEF, (%) | 65 ± 6 | 18 ± 7 | <0.001 |
| LVEDV (ml) | 95 ± 17 | 269 ± 84 | <0.001 |
| LVESV (ml) | 30 ± 9 | 216 ± 74 | <0.001 |
| RVEDD (cm) | 3.7 ± 0.4 | 5.0 ± 1.2 | 0.002 |
| Diastolic Filling Pattern | | | <0.001 |
| Normal (%) | 70 | 0 | |
| Delayed relaxation (%) | 30 | 1 | |
| Pseudonormal (%) | 0 | 24 | |
| Restrictive (%) | 0 | 75 | |
| Peak LV Circumferential strain (%) | -24.8 ± 4.9 | -4.9 ± 3.5 | <0.001 |
| Peak LV Longitudinal Strain (%) | -18.1 ± 2.6 | -3.8 ± 3.1 | <0.001 |
| Peak LV basal rotation, ° | -7.4 ± 3.0 | -1.5 ± 2.9 | <0.001 |
| Peak LV apical rotation, ° | 8.4 ± 2.9 | 0.7 ± 2.7 | <0.001 |
| Peak LV rotation, ° | 15.6 ± 3.0 | 2.2 ± 3.2 | <0.001 |
| Peak LV torsion, °/cm | 1.94 ± 0.45 | 0.25 ± 0.36 | <0.001 |

BSA: Body Surface Area, LV: Left Ventricle, LVEF: Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction, LVEDV: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Volume, LVESV: Left Ventricle End-Systolic Volume, RVEDD: Right Ventricle End-Diastolic Diameter

Table 2

Univariate and multiple linear regression analysis to determine the independent correlates to peak left ventricular torsion before LVAD implantation

| | Univariate | | Multivariate | |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | B | p value | β | p value |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.68 | ... | ... |
| Heart Failure symptoms duration | -0.027 | 0.026 | -0.011 | 0.55 |
| LVEF | 0.008 | 0.23 | ... | ... |
| Peak LV CS | -0.047 | 0.010 | -0.007 | 0.72 |
| Peak LV LS | -0.047 | 0.003 | -0.040 | 0.14 |
| LVEDD | -0.137 | 0.004 | -0.164 | 0.029 |
| LVESV | 0.001 | 0.20 | ... | ... |
| LVEDV | 0.001 | 0.11 | ... | ... |

CS: Circumferential Strain, LS: Longitudinal strain, LV: Left Ventricle, LVEDD: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Diameter, LVEF: Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction, LVEDV: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Volume, LVESV: Left Ventricle End-Systolic Volume

Table 3
 Characteristics of the recovery group of patients before and after LVAD implantation

| Patient | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---------------------|-----------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Age | 20 | 48 | 68 | 76 | 22 | 16 | 18 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 44 | 30 |
| Sex | M | F | F | M | M | M | M | M | M | F | M | F |
| Duration HF (years) | 1.7 | 0.83 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0.08 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 |
| Etiology HF | Chemo | Chemo | NICM | ICM | chemo | NICM | NICM | NICM | NICM | NICM | NICM | NICM |
| INTERMACS | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| B-blocker | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| ACE-I/ARB | no | yes | no | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Inotrope support | No (EPIC) | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | No |
| Cr (mg/dl) | 0.7 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.22 | 1.64 | 0.92 | 1.17 | 0.97 | 0.8 | 1.05 | 0.92 |
| LVEF (%) | 13 | 36 | 28 | 38 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 20 | 22 | 15 | 21 |
| LVEDD (mm) | 53 | 49 | 70 | 54 | 59 | 68 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 88 | 73 |
| MVR (*4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| CS (%) | -6 | -8 | | -20 | -4 | -3 | -2 | | -4 | -6 | | -3 |
| LS (%) | -7.3 | -10 | -7.4 | -8.8 | -0.6 | -4.4 | 1.4 | -2.7 | -2.0 | -8.6 | -1.3 | -8.0 |
| LV torsion (°/cm) | 0.57 | 1.21 | 0.35 | 0.73 | 0.62 | 0.47 | 0.58 | 0.35 | 0.56 | 0.70 | 0.35 | 0.32 |
| Follow up (months) | 9 | 12 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 |
| b-blocker | yes | yes | yes | no | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| ACE-I/ARB | yes | yes | no | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| LVEF (%) | 58 | 51 | 55 | 47 | 50 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 42 | 42 | 40 | 45 |
| LVEDD (mm) | 36 | 35 | 28 | 51 | 52 | 47 | 53 | 50 | 47 | 39 | 45 | 44 |
| LVEDV (ml) | 41 | 116 | 55 | 41 | 124 | 98 | 130 | 177 | 90 | 87 | 129 | 106 |
| LVESV (ml) | 17 | 40 | 22 | 23 | 50 | 49 | 61 | 117 | 52 | 50 | 68 | 41 |
| MVR (*4) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Chemo: Chemotherapy induced cardiomyopathy, CS: Circumferential Strain, Cr: serum creatinine, LS: Longitudinal strain, LVEDD: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Diameter, LVEF: Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction, LVESV: Left Ventricle End-Systolic Volume, LVEDV: Left ventricle End-Diastolic Volume, MVR: Mitral Valve Regurgitation

Table 4

Baseline characteristics of the Recovery (Rec) and Non-Recovery (Non-Rec) Groups

| | Rec Group (n=12) | Non-Rec Group (n=51) | p |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Age, (years) | 38 ± 19 | 53 ± 16 | 0.007 |
| Male (n) | 8 | 38 | 0.582 |
| BSA | 1.89 ± 0.1 | 2.00 ± 0.25 | 0.13 |
| Weight | 85 ± 19 | 78 ± 10 | 0.26 |
| Duration of HF Symptoms, (years) | 1.8 ± 1.0 | 6.1 ± 4.1 | 0.03 |
| Etiology of HF (Ischemic/non-ischemic) | 1/11 | 19/32 | 0.06 |
| Inotropic therapy (%) | 50 | 59 | 0.56 |
| Diabetes mellitus (%) | 0 | 19 | 0.10 |
| Hypertension (%) | 30 | 26 | 0.80 |
| Beta blocker (%) | 83 | 77 | 0.66 |
| ACE-i/ARB (%) | 67 | 68 | 0.93 |
| ICD/CRT | 83 | 92 | 0.70 |
| LVAD type | | | 0.83 |
| Heartware (%) | 15 | 18 | |
| Heartmate (%) | 75 | 63 | |
| VentrAssist (%) | 0 | 2 | |
| Jarvik (%) | 10 | 17 | |
| Indication of LVAD | | | 0.22 |
| Destination therapy (%) | 8 | 32 | |
| Bridge to transplant (%) | 84 | 57 | |
| Bridge to decision (%) | 8 | 11 | |
| Follow up (months) | 7.6 ± 3.8 | 7.3 ± 3.7 | 0.85 |
| Creatinine (mh/dl) | 1.2 ± 0.4 | 1.3 ± 0.4 | 0.22 |
| BUN (mg/dl) | 34 ± 25 | 23 ± 16 | 0.79 |
| Hb (g/dl) | 12.8 ± 2.0 | 13.1 ± 2.1 | 0.78 |
| BNP (pg/L) | 1922 ± 1392 | 1552 ± 919 | 0.39 |
| Na (meq/L) | 133 ± 4 | 134 ± 6 | 0.59 |
| T-bilirubin (ng/dl) | 1.47 ± 0.92 | 1.42 ± 0.84 | 0.88 |
| Right Heart Catheterization Parameters | | | |
| Systemic Systolic BP, mmHg | 97 ± 18 | 100 ± 8 | 0.74 |
| Systemic Diastolic BP mmHg | 67 ± 11 | 66 ± 14 | 0.55 |
| RAP, mmHg | 9 ± 8 | 10 ± 6 | 0.67 |
| Mean PAP, mmHg | 37 ± 9 | 38 ± 8 | 0.29 |
| PCWP, mmHg | 24 ± 10 | 25 ± 7 | 0.76 |
| CI, L/min/m ² | 2.24 ± 0.85 | 1.73 ± 0.40 | 0.004 |
| PVR, woods | 2.00 ± 0.67 | 4.77 ± 2.94 | 0.08 |

BNP: Brain Natriuretic Peptide, BP: Blood Pressure, BSA: Body Surface Area, BUN: Blood Urea Nitrogen, CI: Cardiac Index, Hb: Hemoglobin, ICD/CRT: Implantable Cardiac Defibrillator/Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy, LVAD: Left Ventricular Assist Device, Na: Serum Sodium, PCWP: Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure, PVR: Pulmonary Vascular Resistances RAP: Right Atrial Pressure, T-bilirubin: Total-bilirubin

Table 5

Baseline and Post LVAD Support Conventional Echocardiographic Parameters

| | Before LVAD | | After LVAD | | p |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | Rec Group (n=12) | Non-Rec Group (n=51) | Rec Group (n=12) | Non-Rec group (n=51) | |
| LVEF (%) | 20 ± 10 | 17 ± 6 | 50 ± 8* | 23 ± 8* | 0.001 |
| LVEDD, cm | 6.5 ± 1.0 | 6.9 ± 0.9 | 4.5 ± 0.8* | 6.0 ± 1.3* | 0.001 |
| MVR (+/4) | 1.5 ± 1.0 | 1.4 ± 1.0 | 0.4 ± 0.5* | 0.5 ± 0.7* | 0.82 |
| LVEDVi (ml/m ²) | 128 ± 63 | 141 ± 43 | 56 ± 26* | 92 ± 38* | 0.002 |
| LVESVi (ml/m ²) | 103 ± 57 | 113 ± 39 | 27 ± 14* | 74 ± 36* | 0.001 |
| RVEDD (mm) | 4.3 ± 0.6 | 5.0 ± 1.0 | 4.3 ± 0.9 | 4.4 ± 0.9* | 0.54 |
| LV sphericity index | 1.5 ± 0.2 | 1.4 ± 0.2 | - | - | - |
| Diastolic Filling Pattern | | | | | |
| Normal | 0 | 0 | 72 | 28 | |
| Delayed relaxation (%) | 0 | 2 | 14 | 24 | 0.001 |
| Pseudonormal (%) | 30 | 27 | 14 | 10 | |
| Restrictive (%) | 70 | 71 | 14 | 38 | |

LV: Left Ventricle, LVEDD: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Diameter, LVEF: Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction, LVESVi: Left Ventricle End-Systolic Volume index, LVEDVi: Left Ventricle End-Diastolic Volume index, MVR: Mitral Valve Regurgitation, RVEDD: Right Ventricle End-Diastolic Diameter

* p<0.05

Table 6

Baseline Rotational and Deformational Echocardiographic Parameters

| | Rec Group (n=12) | Non-Rec Group (n=51) | p |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Apical rotation, (°) | 1.49 ± 3.3 | 0.5 ± 2.59 | 0.27 |
| Basal rotation, (°) | -3.44 ± 2.98 | -1.05 ± 2.71 | 0.009 |
| Abnormal rotation direction (base or apex) (n) | 3 | 35 | 0.004 |
| Left ventricle twist, (°) | 4.87 ± 1.67 | 1.60 ± 3.16 | 0.001 |
| Left ventricle torsion, (°/cm) | 0.56 ± 0.24 | 0.17 ± 0.34 | 0.001 |
| Left ventricle longitudinal strain, (%) | -4.9 ± 3.8 | -3.5 ± 2.87 | 0.14 |
| Left ventricle circumferential strain, (%) | -6.38 ± 5.44 | -4.31 ± 2.70 | 0.12 |

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 7

Univariate and Multivariable Logistic Regression Analysis To Determine Independent Predictors of LV Recovery Following LVAD Support. Odds ratios (OR)>1.0 indicate the odds of not recovering, thus OR<1.0 provides the relative odds of recovery.

| | Univariate | | Bivariable | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|--|------------|
| | OR (95% CI) | p value | OR (95% CI) | p value |
| Heart Failure Symptoms Duration | 1.65 (1.13 – 2.41) | 0.010 | ----- | ----- |
| Cardiac Index | 0.20 per L/min/m ² (0.06 – 0.78) | 0.020 | ----- | ----- |
| Peak LV Torsion | 0.65 per 0.1 °/cm (0.49 – 0.87) | 0.014 | ----- | ----- |
| Age | 1.66 per decade (1.12, 2.48) | 0.012 | ----- | ----- |
| <u>Bivariable Models</u> | | | | |
| Heart Failure Symptoms Duration | ----- | ----- | 1.67 (1.00, 2.49) | 0.027 |
| Peak LV Torsion | ----- | ----- | 0.63 per 0.1 °/cm (0.42, 0.94) | 0.009 |
| Cardiac Index | ----- | ----- | 0.26 per L/min/m ² (0.06, 1.14) | 0.26 |
| Peak LV Torsion | ----- | ----- | 0.67 per 0.1 °/cm (0.50, 0.91) | 0.019 |
| Age | ----- | ----- | 1.77 per decade (1.13, 2.74) | 0.013 |
| Peak LV Torsion | ----- | ----- | 0.64 per 0.1 °/cm (0.50, 0.88) | 0.005 |

LV: left Ventricle