Superior prognostic value of three-dimensional echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction: a meta-analysis

Brief title: Prognostic value of 3D echo-derived RVEF

Authors:
Alex Ali Sayour MD[a]*
Márton Tokodi MD, PhD[a,b]*
Csilla Celeng MD, PhD[c]
Richard A. P. Takx MD, PhD[d]
Alexandra Fábián MD[a]
Bálint K. Lakatos MD, PhD[a]
Rocco Friebel PhD[e]
Elena Surkova MD, PhD[f]
Béla Merkely MD, PhD[a]*
Attila Kovács MD, PhD[a]*

*Drs. Sayour, Tokodi, Merkely, and Kovács contributed equally to the present manuscript

[a]Heart and Vascular Center, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary
[b]Division of Cardiovascular Diseases, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Brunswick, NJ, USA
[c]Department of Radiology, St. Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, The Netherlands
[d]Department of Radiology, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
[e]Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom
[f]Harefield Hospital, Royal Brompton and Harefield Hospitals, Part of Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author:
Attila Kovács MD, PhD
Heart and Vascular Center, Semmelweis University
Városmajor str. 68, Budapest, H-1122, Hungary

Phone: +36206663427, Fax: +3614586842
E-mail: attila.kovacs@med.semmelweis-univ.hu; kovatti@gmail.com
Twitter: @kovatti87

Funding

The research was supported by project NKFIH-1277-2/2020 by the Thematic Excellence Programme (2020-4.1.1.-TKP2020) of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology in Hungary, within the framework of the Bioimaging thematic programme of the Semmelweis University. The research was also supported by the ÚNKP-21-5 and the ÚNKP- 21-3-I New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. Dr. Kovács was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Conflict of interest

Drs. Tokodi, Fábián, Lakatos, and Kovács report personal fees from Argus Cognitive, Inc., outside the submitted work. Dr. Friebel is a scientific advisor to Cardiovascular Imaging, Inc., Alberta, Canada, and receives personal fees for his services. Dr. Surkova received speaker fees from GE Healthcare and 123 sonography Ltd., outside the submitted work. Dr. Merkely reports grants from Boston Scientific and Medtronic, personal fees from Biotronic, Abbott, Astra Zeneca, Novartis, and Boehringer-Ingelheim, outside the submitted work. All other authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

ABSTRACT

Objective: Due to the complexity of right ventricular (RV) geometry and mechanics, conventional echocardiographic parameters may fail to capture the prognostic significance of RV systolic dysfunction. We hypothesized that three-dimensional (3D) echocardiography-derived RV ejection fraction (EF) is a more robust predictor of adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes than the conventional echocardiographic parameters of RV function.

Methods: We performed a meta-analysis of studies reporting the impact of unit change of RVEF, tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion (TAPSE), fractional area change (FAC), and free-wall longitudinal strain (FWLS) on clinical outcomes (all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes). Hazard ratios (HR) of RV metrics were rescaled by the within-study standard deviations (SD) to represent standardized changes. Within each study, we then calculated the ratio of HRs related to 1 SD reduction in RVEF versus TAPSE, or FAC, or FWLS, to quantify the predictive value of RVEF relative to the other metrics. These ratios of HRs were pooled using random-effects models. Heterogeneity resulting from different study designs was assessed through mixed-effects meta-regression.

Results: Ten independent studies were identified as suitable, including data on 1,928 patients with various cardiopulmonary conditions. Overall, 1 SD reduction in RVEF was robustly associated with adverse outcomes (HR: 2.64 [95% CI: 2.18 to 3.20], p<0.001; heterogeneity: I^2=65%, p=0.002). In studies reporting HRs for RVEF and TAPSE, FAC, or FWLS in the same cohort, RVEF had superior predictive value per SD reduction versus the other three parameters (vs. TAPSE, HR: 1.54 [95% CI: 1.04 to 2.28], p=0.031; vs. FAC, HR: 1.45 [95% CI: 1.15 to 1.81], p=0.001; vs. FWLS, HR: 1.44 [95% CI: 1.07 to 1.95], p=0.018). Differences in study designs did not contribute to heterogeneity.

Conclusions: 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF has superior prognostic value compared with conventional RV function indices, therefore, it might further refine the risk stratification of patients with cardiopulmonary diseases.

What is already known on this topic – Impairment of RV systolic function diagnosed by echocardiography is significantly associated with adverse clinical outcomes in patients with different cardiopulmonary conditions; however, the conventional RV function indices have several shortcomings which might be circumvented by applying 3D echocardiography.

What this study adds – 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF has a superior prognostic value compared with conventional echocardiographic RV function indices.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy – Routine measurement of RVEF might further refine the risk stratification of patients with cardiopulmonary diseases. Further automation of the 3D echocardiography-derived calculation of RVEF might enable the widespread use of this sensitive and prognostically powerful metric.

ABBREVIATIONS

2D	two-dimensional
3D	three-dimensional
CI	confidence interval
FAC	fractional area change
FWLS	free wall longitudinal strain
GLS	global longitudinal strain
HFpEF	heart failure with preserved ejection fraction
HFrEF	heart failure with reduced ejection fraction
HR	hazard ratio
LV	left ventricular
MOOSE	meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology
QUIPS	quality in prognosis studies
RV	right ventricular
RVEF	right ventricular ejection fraction
TAPSE	tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion

INTRODUCTION

Assessment of right ventricular (RV) morphology and function is commonly included in comprehensive echocardiographic protocols of the clinical routine.[1] RV dysfunction is closely associated with symptom burden and excess mortality in patients with various cardiopulmonary conditions, warranting efforts to discover the condition in the early stage of the disease.[2]

The easily and routinely assessed parameters (e.g., tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion - TAPSE, fractional area change - FAC, free wall longitudinal strain - FWLS) can only partially portray the complex functional characteristics of the RV; therefore, they may fail to capture the full spectrum of RV dysfunction and associated adverse clinical outcomes.[3,4]

Geometrically, the normal RV consists of a concave free wall surface and an opposing convex interventricular septum resulting in a crescent-shaped short-axis beyond the separated inflow and outflow parts. In that particular context, the M-mode and two-dimensional (2D) echocardiography-based measurements are rather simplistic approaches that do not account for such a complex three-dimensional (3D) shape, with the inherent risk of significant information loss. Moreover, from the functional aspect, recent data highlighted the importance of non-longitudinal mechanical components, which are entirely neglected or just partially reflected by conventional measures.[5] 3D echocardiography-derived RV ejection fraction (RVEF) is a well-validated and reproducible parameter, which may overcome the shortcomings discussed above.[6] Despite the physiological and technical advantages of RVEF measurement, it remains to be elucidated whether this translates into added prognostic value versus the conventional echocardiographic metrics.

Accordingly, we hypothesized that 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF is a more robust predictor of all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes than conventional echocardiographic parameters of RV systolic function.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Data Sources and Study Selection

This meta-analysis was conducted according to the Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) Guidelines.[7] The study protocol was preregistered on PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42018110771). Two collaborators (M.T. and A.K.) independently assessed articles from PubMed and EMBASE from inception until 11 March 2022 using a predefined search strategy with the following inclusion criteria (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1): (1) English language studies published in peer-reviewed scientific journals; (2) studies reporting original investigations on human subjects; (3) adult age (>18 years) of all included participants; (4) studies with more than 20 subjects; (5) studies with 3D echocardiography performed and RVEF measured; (6) studies with all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes reported as hazard ratios (HRs, and 95% confidence intervals, CI) per unit change in 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF; and (7) at the same time, on the same cohort, reported at least one of the following RV functional parameters: TAPSE, FAC or FWLS. A manual reference check of eligible full-text articles was performed to identify studies missed by our systematic search. Disagreement was resolved by consensus. When separate publications from the same research group on seemingly overlapping cohorts were identified, the study involving the higher number of subjects was included in our final analysis.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data were extracted on study design, baseline characteristics of the cohorts, echocardiographic parameters, and the predefined outcomes for all included studies by two collaborators (M.T. and A.K.). Study quality was ascertained using the Quality In Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) tool in consensus.[8]

Data Synthesis and Analysis

HRs and respective 95% CIs reporting the association between the unit change of the prespecified echocardiography-derived RV functional parameters (RVEF and TAPSE, or FAC, or FWLS) and clinical outcomes were extracted from eligible publications. We limited

our inclusion to studies that allocated HRs for RVEF and TAPSE, or FAC, or FWLS to the same endpoint within each study, as per the inclusion criteria. The majority of studies reported HRs and 95% CIs relative to 1 unit increase in 3D RVEF (1% increase), TAPSE (1mm increase), FAC (1% increase), and FWLS (1% increase in absolute value). Others reported these effect sizes per standard deviation (SD) change.[9] To facilitate comparison of RVEF with TAPSE, FAC, and FWLS, all HRs and 95% CIs were rescaled by the within-study SD of the respective echocardiographic parameter to present a standardized change in the absolute value of each parameter (RVEF and TAPSE, or FAC, or FWLS) as previously described.[10] Each SD reduction in the given echocardiographic parameter represents an increase in hazard, resulting in direct comparability of the predictive value of these parameters. Then, within each study, we calculated the ratio of HRs related to SD change in RVEF and TAPSE, FAC, or FWLS, to quantify the predictive value of RVEF relative to the other metrics. A ratio of >1.00 denotes that 1 SD reduction in RVEF is related to a greater hazard increment relative to 1 SD reduction in the other metric. The ratios of HRs related to each study were pooled using a random-effects model (DerSimonian-Laird). These pooled estimates represent the overall difference in predictive value of 1 SD reduction in RVEF versus 1 SD reduction in TAPSE, FAC, or FWLS, respectively. Forest plots were generated to visualize these differences. Statistical heterogeneity (referred to as heterogeneity) was assessed using the Cochran Q homogeneity test, and Higgins and Thompson I^2.[11] The I^2 heterogeneity was categorized as follows: 0-50% low, 50-75% moderate, >75% high. As a post hoc analysis using mixed-effects meta-regression, we explored whether follow-up duration, differences in baseline disease of cohorts (primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension vs. other cardiopulmonary conditions), or the type of endpoints (mortality only vs. composite) explained heterogeneity of the pooled estimates, yielding pseudo-R^2 values (which refers to the percentage of heterogeneity explained by the given variable).

All statistical analyses were performed in Stata 17.0 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA). A two-tailed $p<0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Sensitivity analyses

Funnel plots were constructed to visually inspect the small-study effect (corresponding to publication bias) according to each echocardiographic parameter and related clinical outcomes. The nonparametric Begg's rank correlation test was used to quantify the

association between the effect sizes and measures of precision (standard errors). Nonparametric trim-and-fill analysis as per Duval and Tweedie was performed to correct for the small-study effect using the R0 estimator.[12] We used the DerSimonian Laird random-effects method for both the iteration and pooling steps during the trim-and-fill analyses.

RESULTS

Study selection and characteristics

A total of 189 articles were subject to full-text review. According to the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, 13 studies were found suitable. In three instances (including 3-3 studies), there was an apparent overlap between the patient cohorts;[9,13-17] therefore, studies with a higher number of participants were included.[13,15,17] Overall, ten[13,15,17-24] independent studies were included in the final quantitative analysis (Figure 1), which reported the impact of unit change of RVEF and TAPSE (n=8),[13,16,18,20-24] or FAC (n=7),[13,19-24] or FWLS (n=7),[17,19-24] on clinical outcomes (all-cause mortality and/or cardiopulmonary adverse events) as HRs. Four studies were prospective, while six were retrospective. Only three studies reported associations with all-cause mortality,[13,22,24] the others reported composite cardiopulmonary endpoints (Table 1). We assessed the risk of bias within the studies using the QUIPS tool (Supplementary Figure 1).

Echocardiographic measurements

All study subjects underwent standard echocardiographic examination by experienced sonographers using commercially available ultrasound scanners (Supplementary Table 2). RVEF was measured by a single commercially available software (TomTec 4D RV-Function, TomTec Imaging GmbH, Unterschleissheim, Germany; reported version 2.0 or newer, standalone or embedded into another vendor's platform). In the vast majority of the cases, an RV-focused apical window was used to acquire the full-volume 3D echocardiographic dataset using multi-beat reconstruction, which was finally utilized to measure RVEF. The initial semi-automated 3D contouring was further corrected manually by the investigators. TAPSE was measured using an M-mode recording, while FAC was assessed by contouring the end-diastolic and end-systolic RV endocardial surfaces on apical four-chamber views in accordance with current guidelines.[1,3] Two-dimensional free wall longitudinal strain was measured using commercially available software packages from two vendors (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3).

Patient characteristics

The ten studies comprised data on 1928 patients. Clinical characteristics and definitions of composite endpoints are shown in Tables 1 and 2. The mean (±SD) age of the patient population was 63±15 years, 46% were females, and the follow-up duration ranged from 3 to 44 months. Three studies included patients with pulmonary hypertension exclusively,[15,17,21] one included patients with COVID-19 only,[24] one included patients with dilated cardiomyopathy only,[23] one included patients with aortic stenosis only,[19] one included heart failure patients with preserved left ventricular (LV) EF (HFpEF) only,[20] and the remaining three studies included populations with a mixture of cardiovascular diseases.[13,18,22]

Outcomes

Table 1 contains the definitions of endpoints assessed in each included study. Among the 1928 patients, 394 (20.4%) reached the endpoint of all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary events.

In the ten studies, 1 SD reduction in RVEF was associated with a 2.64-fold (95% CI: 2.18 to 3.20, p<0.001) increase in the risk of all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary events (Figure 2). The moderate heterogeneity (I^2=65%, p=0.002) found across studies was not explained by differences between follow-up duration (pseudo-R^2=2%, p=0.062), endpoint definitions (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.806), or primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.524). The funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 2) and Begg's test for small-study effects (z=-1.43, p=0.15) showed that risk of publication bias was low. Accordingly, the trim-and-fill analysis (Supplementary Figure 3) showed that even if significant one-tailed publication bias occurred that favored the publication of highly positive studies (suggesting that RVEF is a powerful predictor of clinical outcomes), our pooled study estimate would not have been significantly altered (adjusted HR: 2.32 [95% CI: 1.86 to 2.90]).

In studies reporting HRs for RVEF and TAPSE simultaneously in the same cohort, the SD reduction in RVEF (HR: 2.76 [95% CI: 2.16 to 3.54]) and TAPSE (HR: 1.81 [95% CI: 1.43 to 2.28]) were both significantly associated with adverse clinical outcomes (Supplementary Figure 4). However, the HR per SD change for RVEF as a correlate of outcomes was 1.54 (95% CI: 1.04 to 2.28, p=0.031) times greater than that of TAPSE, with moderate heterogeneity (I^2=74%, p<0.001) (Figure 3). The latter was not related to study differences in

follow-up duration (pseudo-R^2=17%, p=0.15), endpoint definitions (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.95), or primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.68). Begg's test for small-study effects (z=0.62, p=0.54) indicated no evidence of substantial one-sided publication bias (Supplementary Figure 5).

We found that 1 SD reduction in RVEF (HR: 2.68 [95% CI: 2.09 to 3.42]) and FAC (HR: 1.71 [95% CI: 1.44 to 2.02]), respectively, were associated with adverse outcomes in patients with various diseases (Supplementary Figure 6). The above HR per SD reduction in RVEF translates into 1.45 (95% CI: 1.15 to 1.81, p=0.001) times greater risk of adverse outcomes as compared to that of FAC (Figure 4). In this analysis, heterogeneity was low (I^2=39%, p=0.13), to which differences in follow-up duration (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.39), endpoint definitions (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.22), and primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension (pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.89) had no significant contribution. The presence of publication bias in this analysis was not supported by the visual inspection of the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 7) and Begg's test (z=0.30, p=0.76).

Finally, in studies reporting the association of unit change in RVEF and FWLS on clinical outcomes in the same cohort, we found that 1 SD decrease in these parameters was significantly associated with adverse events (RVEF, HR: 2.76 [95% CI: 2.06 to 3.70]; FWLS, HR: 1.77 [95% CI: 1.42 to 2.21]) (Supplementary Figure 8). However, the strength of effect for the HR per SD reduction for RVEF was 1.44 (95% CI: 1.07 to 1.95, p=0.018) times higher than that of FWLS, suggesting a superior predictive value (Figure 5). None of the investigated factors (follow-up duration: pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.96; endpoint differences: pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.18; primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension: pseudo-R^2=0%, p=0.60) contributed significantly to the low level of heterogeneity (I^2=47%, p=0.08). No substantial small study effect was present based on the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure 9) and Begg's test (z=0.30, p=0.76).

DISCUSSION

In this meta-analysis, we found that RV dysfunction is a robust predictor of all-cause mortality and adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes in patients with various cardiopulmonary diseases. All four investigated echocardiographic parameters of RV systolic function were associated with these endpoints; however, 1 SD reduction in 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF was a significantly stronger predictor of adverse events compared with the same change in TAPSE, FAC, or FWLS (Figure 6).

Clinical significance of RV systolic dysfunction

Studies over the last decade have identified RV dysfunction as a correlate of symptom burden and a powerful predictor of adverse outcomes not only in right-sided heart diseases but also in conditions affecting the left ventricle primarily.[25] In fact, the prevalence of RV dysfunction in patients with heart failure (HF) with reduced left ventricular EF (HFrEF) is 47%, being independently associated with excess mortality and HF admissions.[26] Furthermore, one-third of patients with HFpEF present with a significant RV dysfunction.[27] The presence of RV systolic dysfunction alongside the diagnosis of HFpEF harbors a ~6-times higher risk of two-year mortality compared with the absence of it.[27] Therefore, timely identification of RV dysfunction using sensitive and reliable functional parameters might enable a more sophisticated risk stratification in the clinical setting.

Role of echocardiography in the assessment of RV function

According to two recent surveys, the most commonly used echocardiographic parameters to assess RV systolic function in the clinical routine is the M-mode TAPSE, followed by tissue Doppler imaging-derived S' and FAC.[28,29] There is evidence that RV dysfunction is diagnosed in 37% of HFpEF patients by TAPSE, whereas FAC identifies a considerably lower fraction of cases (26%).[30] A meta-analysis also reported vast differences in the identification of RV dysfunction across parameters, with TAPSE suggesting RV dysfunction in 31% of HFpEF subjects, compared with 26% and 13% by S' and FAC, respectively.[31] These considerable diagnostic dissimilarities between conventional echocardiography-

derived indices of RV function might stem from the complex 3D anatomy and distinct contraction patterns of the RV.[14,15,32] Therefore, a unifying RV functional parameter that can circumvent such limitations would be ideal for quantifying RV dysfunction and associated clinical risk in various pathological conditions. While 2D speckle-tracking echocardiography might overcome many limitations of conventional parameters by being less dependent on the angle of insonation and RV loading conditions,[33] it still represents a single 2D tomographic plane. On the contrary, 3D echocardiography maps the entire endocardial surface of the RV independent of any assumption about its shape and function, providing an integrative parameter of RV systolic function – RVEF.[25] Nonetheless, it is currently unclear whether 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF outperforms other RV function metrics in predicting adverse clinical outcomes.

Prognostic significance of different echocardiographic parameters of RV systolic function

The present meta-analysis demonstrated that 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF was a robust predictor of adverse outcomes. We estimated that 1 SD reduction in RVEF conferred a ~2.6 times higher risk of all-cause mortality and/or adverse cardiopulmonary events in a broad spectrum of patients with various cardiopulmonary conditions. This predictive value was unaffected by whether the population consisted of patients with a primary diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension. Therefore, our meta-analysis extends previous studies by showing that RV dysfunction forecasts adverse clinical events not only in patients with pulmonary hypertension[34,35] but also in those with HF, COVID-19, and aortic stenosis. Furthermore, our estimate was not affected by differences in follow-up durations, whether the endpoint included all-cause mortality only or other composite cardiopulmonary endpoints. Finally, we estimated that even if substantial publication bias occurred, our estimate would not significantly change.

As for the other parameters, we calculated that TAPSE, FAC, and FWLS are also predictors of adverse clinical outcomes, respectively. In fact, 1 SD reduction in each of these parameters was associated with a 1.71-1.81 times higher risk of unfavorable events. Therefore, RV dysfunction is a solid predictor of clinical outcomes irrespective of the echocardiographic parameter used. However, in a head-to-head comparison, we found that 1 SD reduction in

RVEF conferred a 1.44-1.54 times higher risk of adverse outcomes as compared with a similar reduction in TAPSE, FAC, and FWLS, respectively, in the very same patient population. Consequently, 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF might identify a broader spectrum of patients at risk with RV dysfunction, in contrast with the other parameters, rendering it a more valuable tool to stratify patients with various cardiopulmonary conditions. This might translate into a timely identification of high-risk patients, paving the way for early effective countermeasures.

In the head-to-head comparison, RVEF remained a significantly better predictor of adverse clinical outcomes irrespective of whether the studied population included patients with pulmonary hypertension only or not. Therefore, RVEF might also overcome the limitations of TAPSE, FAC, and FWLS in primary left-heart diseases. Furthermore, differences in endpoint definitions and follow-up durations had no significant impact on the superiority of RVEF as a predictor of adverse outcomes. In a similar attempt to assess the pooled prognostic significance of different parameters of LV systolic function, a previous meta-analysis showed that LV global longitudinal strain (GLS) had a superior predictive value compared to LVEF.[10] Notably, in our present meta-analysis focusing on RV function, RVEF was shown to outperform the predictive power of FWLS. This important finding may be attributable to the fact that RV FWLS reflects only one mechanical component (longitudinal shortening) in a single 2D tomographic plane (unlike three planes for LV GLS assessment) and, therefore, may not be an adequate representation of the contraction pattern of the complex 3D structure of the RV, especially under different pathophysiological conditions.

Overall, the results of our current meta-analysis support the broader implementation of 3D echocardiography for the assessment of RV systolic function in patients with cardiopulmonary disorders – irrespective of the primary site of the disease. As the prognostically most powerful index of RV function, the inclusion of RVEF in everyday clinical decision-making and risk stratification models seems justified by the current knowledge base. Moreover, the assessment of RVEF as a trigger for specific therapies may also lead to clinical benefits for patients in the future.

LIMITATIONS

The validity of the present meta-analysis is subject to the quality of the reporting of the included studies, rendering our findings hypothesis-generating only. First, the studies included in this meta-analysis were non-uniform in design, varied in the inclusion criteria, patients' populations, echocardiographic equipment, technical aspects of 3D RV data acquisition, duration of follow-up, and definition of endpoints. Therefore, we opted for using a random-effects meta-analysis and performed a mixed-effects meta-regression to estimate the contribution of select factors (differences in patient populations, follow-up, and endpoint definitions) to the observed results. Second, not all 10 studies included in the current meta-analysis provided quantification of 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF and all three other RV parameters of interest at the same time, which led to a smaller number of studies included in each comparison (8 for RVEF vs. TAPSE, 7 for RVEF vs. FAC, and 7 for RVEF vs. FWLS). Third, as prespecified, due to a considerably lower amount of available and comparable data, tissue Doppler-derived tricuspid annular S' velocity and RV GLS were not included in our analysis. While the former measures longitudinal shortening exclusively, the predictive value of the latter has recently been shown to be inferior compared to FWLS in HFrEF.[36]

CONCLUSIONS

Reduction in RV systolic function is robustly associated with adverse clinical outcomes in patients with various cardiopulmonary conditions. 3D echocardiography-derived RVEF identifies a broader spectrum of patients at risk than other RV systolic functional parameters. Therefore, RVEF might further refine the risk stratification of patients and inform clinical decision-making, potentially facilitating timely interventions.

TABLES

Table 1. Study designs and clinical endpoints

Study	Sample size (n)	Design	Population	FU duration (months)	Endpoint	Events, n (%)
Murata *(2016)*	86	Retrospective	PAH	14.1	cardiac events (death, hosp, intervention including PEA or BPA)	19 (22.1)
Moceri *(2017)*	104	Prospective	PH	6.7	cardio-pulmonary death	16 (15.4)
Surkova *(2019)*	394	Retrospective	various cardiac diseases	44.4	all-cause mortality	56 (14.2)
Zhang *(2021)*	128	Prospective	COVID-19	3	all-cause mortality	18 (14.1)
Vîjîiac *(2021)*	50	Prospective	DCM	16	cardiac death, nonfatal cardiac arrest, acute HF hosp	29 (53.7)
Li *(2021)*	203	Retrospective	PH	20.9	PH-related hosp; intervention or surgery including PEA or BPA; death	87 (42.9)
Meng *(2021)*	81	Prospective	HFpEF	17	HF death or HF rehosp	39 (48.1)
Tolvaj *(2021)*	174	Retrospective	various cardiac diseases	24	all-cause mortality	24 (13.8)
Nabeshima *(2021)*	367	Retrospective	AS	26.7	cardiac death, HF hosp, VT/VF, or non-fatal MI	57 (15.5)
Kitano *(2022)*	341	Retrospective	various cardiac diseases	19.8	cardiac death, VT, or HF hosp	49 (14.4)

AS: aortic stenosis, BPA: balloon pulmonary angioplasty, DCM: dilated cardiomyopathy, HF: heart failure, HFpEF: heart failure with preserved left ventricular ejection fraction, hosp: hospitalization, MI: myocardial infarction, PAH: pulmonary arterial hypertension, PEA: pulmonary endarterectomy, PH: pulmonary hypertension, VF: ventricular fibrillation, VT: ventricular tachycardia

Table 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study populations

Study	Age, years	Female, n (%)	BMI, kg/m^2	BSA, m^2	HR, bpm	SBP, mmHg	DBP, mmHg	DM, n (%)	HTN, n (%)	DLP, n (%)	CAD, n (%)	CKD, n (%)
Murata *(2016)*	50±17	63 (72)	NA	1.6±0.2	72±14	111±17	64±13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Moceri *(2017)*	66 (62-69)	58 (56)	NA	1.72±0.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Surkova *(2019)*	57 (42-69)	136 (35)	24.5 (22.1-26.8)	1.81 (1.67-1.95)	68 (59-77)	120 (110-130)	70 (70-80)	51 (12.9)	190 (48.2)	143 (36.3)	119 (30.2)	NA
Zhang *(2021)*	61±13	80 (50)	NA	1.67±0.15	86 (80-99)	130 (120-140)	80 (73-88)	18 (14.1)	52 (40.6)	NA	NA	1 (0.8)
Vîjîiac *(2021)*	61±14	16 (32)	NA	NA	79±16	124±13	75±11	9 (18)	34 (68)	NA	0 (0)	NA
Li *(2021)*	49±15	146 (72)	NA	1.7±0.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Meng *(2021)*	62±12	18 (35)	25.5±3.6	NA	72.4±11.5	136.3±22.6	83.0±14.9	36 (44.4)	46 (56.8)	NA	NA	NA
Tolvaj *(2021)*	62±14	48 (28)	NA	1.9±0.2	NA	126.2±19.7	74.7±16.5	39 (22.5)	113 (65.3)	NA	38 (22)	NA
Nabeshima *(2021)*	77±10	199 (54)	22.7±3.9	1.52±0.21	69.5±12.6	147.5±23.5	75.0±13.5	115 (31)	295 (80)	NA	79 (22)	174 (47)
Kitano *(2022)*	68 (58-76)	115 (34)	NA	1.62 (1.50-1.75)	67 (59-76)	127 (112-145)	71 (63-79)	101 (30)	191 (56)	149 (44)	143 (42)	149 (44)

Data are presented as mean±SD or median (interquartile range). BMI: body mass index, BSA: body surface area, CAD: coronary artery disease, CKD: chronic kidney disease, DBP: diastolic blood pressure, DLP: dyslipidemia, DM: diabetes mellitus, HR: heart rate, HTN: systemic arterial hypertension, SBP: systolic blood pressure

FIGURES

Figure 1. Study selection flowchart.



3DE: three-dimensional echocardiography, FAC: fractional area change, FWLS: free-wall longitudinal strain, HR: hazard ratio, RVEF: right ventricular ejection fraction, TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion

Figure 2. Three-dimensional echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction (RVEF) as predictor of all-cause mortality and/or composite adverse cardiopulmonary endpoints.



The hazard ratios (HR) are per 1 standard deviation (SD) reduction in RVEF according to each study. Accordingly, a HR of >1.00 means that 1 SD reduction in RVEF is associated with increased risk of adverse events.

CI: confidence interval

Figure 3. Three-dimensional echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction (RVEF) versus tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion (TAPSE) as predictors of all-cause mortality and/or composite adverse cardiopulmonary endpoints.



The ratios of hazard ratios (HR) per 1 standard deviation (SD) reduction in RVEF/TAPSE are depicted. Accordingly, a ratio of HR >1.00 means that 1 SD reduction in RVEF is associated with a higher risk of adverse events compared to 1 SD reduction in TAPSE.

CI: confidence interval

Figure 4. Three-dimensional echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction (3D RVEF) versus fractional area change (FAC) as predictors of all-cause mortality and/or composite adverse cardiopulmonary endpoints.



The ratios of hazard ratios (HR) per 1 standard deviation (SD) reduction in RVEF/FAC are shown. Accordingly, a ratio of HR >1.00 means that 1 SD reduction in RVEF is associated with a higher risk of adverse events compared to 1 SD reduction in FAC.

CI: confidence interval

Figure 5. Three-dimensional echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction (3D RVEF) versus free-wall longitudinal strain (FWLS) as predictors of all-cause mortality and/or composite adverse cardiopulmonary endpoints.



The ratios of hazard ratios (HR) per 1 standard deviation (SD) reduction in RVEF/FWLS are depicted. Accordingly, a ratio of HR >1.00 means that 1 SD reduction in RVEF is associated with a higher risk of adverse events compared to 1 SD reduction in FWLS.

CI: confidence interval

Figure 6. Added predictive value of three-dimensional (3D) echocardiography-derived right ventricular ejection fraction (RVEF) versus conventional metrics of RV systolic function on clinical outcomes: a meta-analysis of 10 studies. FAC: fractional area change, FWLS: free-wall longitudinal strain, HR: hazard ratio, SD: standard deviation, TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion



REFERENCES

1. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, et al. 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. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2014.10.003
2. Konstam MA, Kiernan MS, Bernstein D, et al. Evaluation and Management of Right-Sided Heart Failure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;137:e578-e622. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000560
3. Rudski LG, Lai WW, Afilalo J, et al. Guidelines for the echocardiographic assessment of the right heart in adults: a report from the American Society of Echocardiography endorsed by the European Association of Echocardiography, a registered branch of the European Society of Cardiology, and the Canadian Society of Echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2010;23:685-713; quiz 786-688. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2010.05.010
4. Kovacs A, Lakatos B, Tokodi M, Merkely B. Right ventricular mechanical pattern in health and disease: beyond longitudinal shortening. *Heart Fail Rev*. 2019;24:511-520. doi: 10.1007/s10741-019-09778-1
5. Lakatos BK, Nabeshima Y, Tokodi M, et al. Importance of Nonlongitudinal Motion Components in Right Ventricular Function: Three-Dimensional Echocardiographic Study in Healthy Volunteers. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2020;33:995-1005 e1001. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2020.04.002
6. Muraru D, Spadotto V, Cecchetto A, et al. New speckle-tracking algorithm for right ventricular volume analysis from three-dimensional echocardiographic data sets:

validation with cardiac magnetic resonance and comparison with the previous analysis tool. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2016;17:1279-1289. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jev309

7. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA*. 2000;283:2008-2012. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008
8. Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Cote P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158:280-286. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-158-4-201302190-00009
9. Li Y, Liang L, Guo D, et al. Right Ventricular Function Predicts Adverse Clinical Outcomes in Patients With Chronic Thromboembolic Pulmonary Hypertension: A Three-Dimensional Echocardiographic Study. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:697396. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.697396
10. Kalam K, Otahal P, Marwick TH. Prognostic implications of global LV dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of global longitudinal strain and ejection fraction. *Heart*. 2014;100:1673-1680. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2014-305538
11. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327:557-560. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
12. Duval S, Tweedie R. A Nonparametric "Trim and Fill" Method of Accounting for Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2000;95:89-98. doi: 10.2307/2669529
13. Surkova E, Muraru D, Genovese D, et al. Relative Prognostic Importance of Left and Right Ventricular Ejection Fraction in Patients With Cardiac Diseases. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2019;32:1407-1415 e1403. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2019.06.009

14. Surkova E, Kovacs A, Tokodi M, et al. Contraction Patterns of the Right Ventricle Associated with Different Degrees of Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2021;14:e012774. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.121.012774

15. Moceri P, Duchateau N, Baudouy D, et al. Three-dimensional right-ventricular regional deformation and survival in pulmonary hypertension. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2018;19:450-458. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jex163

16. Moceri P, Duchateau N, Baudouy D, et al. Additional prognostic value of echocardiographic follow-up in pulmonary hypertension—role of 3D right ventricular area strain. *European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2021. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jeab240

17. Li Y, Guo D, Gong J, et al. Right Ventricular Function and Its Coupling With Pulmonary Circulation in Precapillary Pulmonary Hypertension: A Three-Dimensional Echocardiographic Study. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2021;8:690606. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.690606

18. Kitano T, Kovacs A, Nabeshima Y, et al. Prognostic Value of Right Ventricular Strains Using Novel Three-Dimensional Analytical Software in Patients With Cardiac Disease. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2022;9:837584. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2022.837584

19. Nabeshima Y, Kitano T, Takeuchi M. Prognostic Value of the Three-Dimensional Right Ventricular Ejection Fraction in Patients With Asymptomatic Aortic Stenosis. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2021;8:795016. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.795016

20. Meng Y, Zhu S, Xie Y, et al. Prognostic Value of Right Ventricular 3D Speckle-Tracking Strain and Ejection Fraction in Patients With HFpEF. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2021;8:694365. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.694365

21. Murata M, Tsugu T, Kawakami T, et al. Prognostic value of three-dimensional echocardiographic right ventricular ejection fraction in patients with pulmonary

arterial hypertension. *Oncotarget*. 2016;7:86781-86790. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.13505

22. Tolvaj M, Tokodi M, Lakatos BK, et al. Added predictive value of right ventricular ejection fraction compared with conventional echocardiographic measurements in patients who underwent diverse cardiovascular procedures. *Imaging*. 2021;13:130-137. doi: 10.1556/1647.2021.00049

23. Vijiiac A, Onciul S, Guzu C, et al. The prognostic value of right ventricular longitudinal strain and 3D ejection fraction in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2021;37:3233-3244. doi: 10.1007/s10554-021-02322-z

24. Zhang Y, Sun W, Wu C, et al. Prognostic Value of Right Ventricular Ejection Fraction Assessed by 3D Echocardiography in COVID-19 Patients. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2021;8:641088. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.641088

25. Surkova E, Cosyns B, Gerber B, et al. The dysfunctional right ventricle: the importance of multi-modality imaging. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2022. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jeac037

26. Iglesias-Garriz I, Olalla-Gomez C, Garrote C, et al. Contribution of right ventricular dysfunction to heart failure mortality: a meta-analysis. *Rev Cardiovasc Med*. 2012;13:e62-69. doi: 10.3909/ricm0602

27. Melenovsky V, Hwang SJ, Lin G, Redfield MM, Borlaug BA. Right heart dysfunction in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Eur Heart J*. 2014;35:3452-3462. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu193

28. Schneider M, Aschauer S, Mascherbauer J, et al. Echocardiographic assessment of right ventricular function: current clinical practice. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2019;35:49-56. doi: 10.1007/s10554-018-1428-8

29. Ajmone Marsan N, Michalski B, Cameli M, et al. EACVI survey on standardization of cardiac chambers quantification by transthoracic echocardiography. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;21:119-123. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jez297

30. Lejeune S, Roy C, Ciocea V, et al. Right Ventricular Global Longitudinal Strain and Outcomes in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2020;33:973-984 e972. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2020.02.016

31. Gorter TM, Hoendermis ES, van Veldhuisen DJ, et al. Right ventricular dysfunction in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2016;18:1472-1487. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.630

32. Bidviene J, Muraru D, Maffessanti F, et al. Regional shape, global function and mechanics in right ventricular volume and pressure overload conditions: a three-dimensional echocardiography study. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2021;37:1289-1299. doi: 10.1007/s10554-020-02117-8

33. Badano LP, Muraru D, Parati G, Haugaa K, Voigt JU. How to do right ventricular strain. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;21:825-827. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jeaa126

34. Baggen VJM, Driessen MMP, Post MC, et al. Echocardiographic findings associated with mortality ortransplant in patients with pulmonary arterial hypertension:A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neth Heart J*. 2016;24:374-389. doi: 10.1007/s12471-016-0845-3

35. Dong Y, Pan Z, Wang D, et al. Prognostic Value of Cardiac Magnetic Resonance-Derived Right Ventricular Remodeling Parameters in Pulmonary Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;13:e010568. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.120.010568

36. Carluccio E, Biagioli P, Lauciello R, et al. Superior Prognostic Value of Right Ventricular Free Wall Compared to Global Longitudinal Strain in Patients With Heart

Failure. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2019;32:836-844 e831. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2019.02.011