Feature-tracking global longitudinal strain has prognostic value in heart failure patients with diabetes

Word Count: 4657 words

Nithin R. Iyer MD[1,2], Siew-Pang Chan PhD[3], Jennifer A. Bryant PhD[1], Thu-Thao Le PhD[1,4] Patrick J. Cozzone PhD[5], Frank Eisenhaber MD PhD[6,7,8], Roger Foo MD[7,9], A. Mark Richards MD PhD[9,10], Carolyn S.P. Lam MD PhD[1,11,12,13], Martin Ugander§ MD PhD[2,14], Calvin W-L. Chin§ MD PhD[4,11] and on behalf of the ATTRaCT investigators

[1]National Heart Research Institute Singapore, National Heart Centre Singapore, Singapore
[2]Kolling Institute, Royal North Shore Hospital, and University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
[3]Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore
[4]Cardiovascular Sciences ACP, Duke NUS Medical School, Singapore, Singapore
[5]Singapore Bioimaging Consortium, Agency for Science, Technology and Research, Singapore
[6]Bioinformatics Institute, Agency for Science, Technology and Research, Singapore
[7]Genome Institute of Singapore, Agency for Science, Technology and Research, Singapore
[8]School of Biological Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
[9]Cardiovascular Research Institute, National University Heart Centre, Singapore
[10]Christchurch Heart Institute, University of Otago, Christchurch, New Zealand
[11]National Heart Centre Singapore, Singapore
[12]Faculty of Medicine, Duke-National University Singapore, Singapore
[13]University Medical Centre Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
[14]Department of Clinical Physiology, Karolinska University Hospital, and Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
§ denotes equal contribution

Acknowledgements

The contribution of all the site investigators and clinical co-ordinators is acknowledged.

Abstract

Background: Heart failure (HF) and diabetes epidemiologically share a bidirectional relationship, with each increasing the incidence and worsening the prognosis of the other. Global longitudinal strain (GLS) measured by feature tracking cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) has prognostic value in HF. However, this has not been established in HF patients with diabetes. **Objectives:** This study aimed to assess the prognostic value of GLS in HF patients with diabetes. **Methods:** Consecutive patients (n=315) with HF from six tertiary cardiac centres in Singapore underwent CMR at 3T, including GLS, late gadolinium enhancement (LGE), native T1 mapping, and extracellular volume fraction (ECV) mapping. The primary outcome was a composite of all-cause mortality or HF hospitalisation. **Results:** Compared to those without diabetes (n=156), the diabetes group (n=159) had a higher prevalence of LGE (76 vs 60%, $p<0.05$), higher T1 (1285±42 vs 1269±42ms, $p<0.001$) and higher ECV (30.5±3.5 vs 28.8±4.1%, $p<0.001$). Compared to those without diabetes, diabetes conferred a worse prognosis (log rank chi-squared 12, $p<0.001$, 74 events, median [interquartile range] 23 [18-24] months follow-up). In multivariable Cox regression models in the diabetes group, GLS was prognostic (hazard ratio 1.15 [95% confidence interval 1.06-1.25], $p<0.001$). When stratified by both diabetes status and median absolute GLS (9.9%), patients with diabetes and poorer GLS had the worst prognosis (log-rank chi-squared 31, $p<0.001$). **Conclusion:** Compared to heart failure patients without diabetes, those with diabetes have worse CMR markers of fibrosis and adverse prognosis. GLS is a powerful and independent prognostic marker in heart failure patients with diabetes.

Introduction

The diabetic heart is characterised by a number of structural abnormalities including diffuse interstitial myocardial fibrosis, myocyte hypertrophy, and impaired coronary microvascular perfusion, which have all been implicated in the development of both diastolic and systolic dysfunction [1, 2]. Patients with heart failure (HF) and diabetes have consistently worse clinical outcomes, including higher risk of hospitalisation for HF and death, compared to those without diabetes [3-5]. These findings appear to hold regardless of whether the HF is ischaemic or non-ischaemic in etiology, and regardless of left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction.

Cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging has become the non-invasive reference standard for evaluating the etiology of heart failure due to its ability to accurately assess cardiac morphology, function, and myocardial tissue characteristics. In particular, late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) permits visualisation of focal replacement myocardial fibrosis, while T1 mapping pre- and post-gadolinium contrast enables non-invasive measurement of the myocardial extracellular volume fraction (ECV), a quantitative marker of myocardial diffuse interstitial fibrosis. Additionally, global longitudinal strain (GLS), defined as the change in the LV myocardial length between diastole and systole divided by the original end-diastolic length, provides a measure of LV systolic function by CMR that is effectively the same as GLS measured by echocardiography [6, 7].

Patients with diabetes frequently have impaired GLS and have a higher degree of myocardial fibrosis as assessed by ECV and histology [8, 9]. GLS by CMR has been shown to have prognostic value in HF regardless of ejection fraction [10-12]. This has not been confirmed in the subgroup of patients with HF and diabetes. The current study therefore aimed to assess

the prognostic significance of GLS by CMR in a cohort of patients with HF and diabetes across the spectrum of LV ejection fraction. We hypothesized that GLS would have an incremental prognostic association in this group, beyond LV ejection fraction and LGE.

Methods

Patients with HF were recruited prospectively across six tertiary cardiac centres in Singapore (Asian neTwork for Translational Research and Cardiovascular Trials [ATTRaCT], ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02791009). Patients were included if they presented to hospital with a primary diagnosis of HF, or if they attended a hospital clinic within 6 months of an episode of decompensated HF (requiring hospitalization or treatment in an out-patient setting). In all cases, a trained cardiologist adjudicated the clinical diagnosis of HF. The exclusion criteria were: HF primarily due to severe valve disease, HF due to acute coronary syndrome resulting in a transient episode of acute pulmonary oedema, severe renal failure (estimated glomerular filtration rate < 15 mL/min per 1.73m^2), specific causes of HF (constrictive pericarditis, complex adult congenital heart disease, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, eosinophilic myocarditis, cardiac amyloidosis, and acute chemotherapy-induced cardiomyopathy), isolated right heart failure, and life threatening non-cardiac co-morbidity with life expectancy of <1 year.

All patients underwent clinical assessment at baseline. Blood was drawn for biochemistry and circulating biochemical markers (N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide [NT-proBNP] and high-sensitivity troponin T [hs-TnT]).

Ethics approval was obtained from the local Centralized Institutional Review Board in Singapore, and all participants provided written informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Clinical Outcomes

The primary outcome was a composite of time to either first hospitalization for HF (regardless of prior history of hospitalization for HF) or all-cause mortality. Follow-up was conducted through a clinic visit at 6 months after baseline assessment and structured phone interviews with the participants at the 1- and 2-year timepoints. Data in patients who were lost to follow-up were censored at the date when the patient was last known to be alive and had not experienced an event.

Cardiovascular magnetic resonance image acquisition

All patients in the ATTRaCT cohort were invited and assessed for suitability for CMR. Those who agreed and were eligible underwent a standardized CMR protocol with a 3 Tesla MRI scanner (Ingenia, Philips Healthcare, Best, The Netherlands). Balanced steady-state free precision cines were acquired in the standard long-axis views and a short-axis stack from base to apex, as described previously [13]. LGE images were acquired at 10 min after 0.1 mmol/kg of gadobutrol (Gadovist®, Bayer Pharma AG, Germany) with a phase sensitive inversion-recovery gradient-echo imaging sequence. Typical parameters were: repetition time (TR) = 6.1 ms; echo time (TE) = 3 ms; time to inversion (TI) = 320–340 ms, flip angle 25°, voxel size = 1.5x1.7x8 mm, SENSE factor = 2.4, slice thickness 8mm with 2mm gap to match short-axis cine slice positions. The inversion time for optimal myocardial nulling was selected from an inversion time scout sequence. T1 maps were acquired at the basal and mid-ventricular short-axis levels, pre- and 15-min post-contrast with modified Look-Locker

Inversion-recovery (MOLLI) 5s(3s)3s and 4s(1s)3s(1s)2s acquisition schemes, respectively [14].

CMR analysis

Image analysis was performed using CVI42 software (Circle Cardiovascular Imaging, Calgary, Canada) by trained imaging fellows at the National Heart Research Institute of Singapore CMR Core Laboratory, who were blinded to the clinical information of the patients. Ventricular volumes, mass and ejection fraction were measured from the short-axis cine stack, using manual contouring of the left ventricle in end-diastole and end-systole, excluding papillary muscles, as detailed previously [13]. LV volumes and mass data were indexed to body surface area. The presence of LGE was assessed qualitatively by two readers according to the recommendations by the Society of CMR [15]. Average native and post-contrast myocardial T1 values were measured by placing a region of interest (ROI) within the middle third of the short-axis myocardial wall at the basal- and mid-ventricular levels, while avoiding regions of focal LGE. The myocardium-blood pool interface was carefully avoided in order to prevent partial volume effects. Pre- and post-contrast blood T1 values were measured in a ROI drawn within the blood pool. ECV was calculated from the pre- and post-contrast average blood and myocardial T1 values, as described previously [16, 17]. Myocardial strain was analysed in the cine images using the Tissue Tracking Plugin [18].

Statistics

Normality was assessed for continuous variables using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Normally distributed data are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Non-normally distributed data are presented as median [interquartile range]. Comparisons were performed for continuous

variables using the parametric Student *t*-test or the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test. Categorical variables are presented as number (percentage) and compared using the χ^2 test.

Univariable Cox regression analysis was performed to identify prognostic variables in the entire cohort and also in the diabetes subgroup. Clinically relevant variables (age, sex, body mass index, diabetes, smoking, coronary artery disease, hypertension, New York Heart Association functional class, systolic blood pressure, NT-proBNP and hs-TnT) and CMR markers of function, remodelling and fibrosis (LV end diastolic volume index, mass index, ejection fraction, GLS, LGE, Native T1, ECV) were tested in the Cox models. Covariates with a p-value <0.05 in univariable analyses were entered into the multivariable Cox model to identify independently prognostic variables, using forward stepwise selection. Event-free survival curves were examined using the Kaplan-Meier method and compared with the log-rank test. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Version 28 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, International Business Machines, Inc., Armonk, New York, USA) and GraphPad Prism 9.4.1 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, California, USA). A two-sided p-value <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

Results

Figure 1 shows a flow chart describing patient inclusion. Of the 623 patients enrolled in the ATTRaCT study, 523 patients underwent a baseline CMR study. We excluded 168 studies performed without contrast. An additional 40 patients were excluded due to incomplete baseline clinical or CMR data sets, alternative diagnosis on the basis of CMR, or loss to follow-up. In total, 315 subjects (diabetes, n=159; without diabetes, n= 156) were included in the study cohort.

The baseline clinical characteristics are shown in Table 1. Compared to patients without diabetes, patients with diabetes were older (60±10 vs 56±12 years, p<0.001), more likely to have a history of hypertension (76 vs 52%, p<0.001), coronary artery disease (72 vs 52%, p<0.001) and had worse NYHA Functional Class (median Class II vs I, p=0.04). Patients with diabetes had higher creatinine (96 [81-118] vs 91 [77-105] μmol/L, p=0.02), elevated cardiac biomarkers of NT-proBNP (1091 [326-2272] vs 579 [232-1136] pg/mL, p<0.001) and hs-TnT (27 [14-41] versus 15 [9-22] ng/L, p<0.001). There was no difference in LV ejection fraction and GLS between the groups. The diabetes group had a higher prevalence of LGE (76 vs 60%, p=0.002, driven by higher rates of ischaemic LGE (51 vs 33%, p=0.003). Prevalence of non-ischaemic LGE did not differ between the groups. The diabetes group had higher native T1 (1285±42 vs 1269±42 ms, p<0.001) and ECV (30.5±3.5 vs 28.8±4.1%, p<0.001). Diabetes was independently associated with the presence of LGE and increased ECV, after adjustment for potential confounders (p<0.005 for both analyses).

Predictors of Primary Outcome in All Patients with Heart Failure

Over a median follow-up of 23 [18-24] months, 74 patients experienced the primary outcome (52 hospitalisations for HF, 22 deaths). In univariable Cox regression analyses for the entire cohort, clinical and plasma biomarkers associated with the primary outcome included diabetes, NYHA functional class, systolic blood pressure, NT-proBNP. CMR markers of adverse remodelling (LV mass index and end diastolic volume index), contractile function (LV ejection fraction and GLS) and myocardial fibrosis (presence of LGE, native T1 and ECV) were predictors of worse outcomes. Diabetes, NYHA functional class and GLS remained independently associated with outcomes in the multivariable analysis (Table 2 and Figure 2).

Predictors of Primary Outcome in Patients with Heart Failure and Diabetes

In the diabetes group, 50 patients experienced the primary outcome (35 hospitalisations for HF, 15 deaths). In univariable analyses, systolic blood pressure, NT-proBNP, LV ejection fraction, GLS and native T1 were associated with the primary outcome (Table 3). GLS remained associated with outcomes in the multivariable analysis (hazard ratio 1.15 [95% confidence interval 1.06-1.25], $p<0.001$). In other words, each percentage point of worsening in GLS was associated with a 15% increase in risk of hospitalisation for HF or death. Patients with diabetes and worse GLS (GLS > median value of -9.9%) had the worst prognosis (log-rank $p<0.001$, Figure 3). Of note, patients with diabetes and GLS ≤ -9.9% and patients without diabetes and GLS > -9.9% had similar outcomes (Figure 2B; $p=0.70$).

Discussion

The main finding of this study is that GLS is a powerful independent predictor of adverse outcomes in patients with HF and diabetes, providing incremental prognostic information beyond several CMR markers of cardiac remodelling, function, and fibrosis. In the diabetes group, worse GLS (> median -9.9%) was associated with adverse prognosis. GLS is known to have prognostic value in HF, regardless of etiology or whether the EF is reduced or preserved [11, 12]. In this study, we have extended those findings to the diabetes subgroup, who are known to have a higher risk of adverse cardiovascular outcomes. Our findings are in agreement with a prior study which showed that speckle tracking echocardiography (STE) GLS has prognostic value in diabetes patients with dilated cardiomyopathy [19]. The results from the current study raise the possibility of GLS-guided risk stratification and management in patients with HF and diabetes. Indeed, there is emerging evidence of improvement in GLS with antidiabetic medications which may enable this in future [19-21].

GLS by CMR is well-suited for routine clinical use. The technique relies on software packages which track the endocardial and epicardial borders, and reference values are specific for the software used for analysis. STE has a number of limitations, including dependence on high quality 2D images, and results are often affected by foreshortening, dropout of the apical and anterolateral segments on apical views, and/or suboptimal acoustic windows [12, 22, 23]. GLS by CMR overcomes these limitations and can be measured from routinely acquired bright-blood, steady-state free precession long-axis cine imaging. Disadvantages of GLS by CMR include its susceptibility to through-plane motion artefacts, limited temporal resolution for quantification of strain rate, and limitations in patients with contraindications to CMR [12]. Furthermore, GLS by CMR values may be affected by inter-vendor differences in algorithms, similar to STE, which has resulted in difficulties establishing reference values [23]. Nonetheless, GLS has shown close correlation with STE and has become an important component of the CMR examination alongside volumetric analysis and tissue characterisation in the assessment of HF [24]. A number of the limitations for GLS may be overcome by the mitral annular plane systolic excursion (MAPSE), a measure of left ventricular longitudinal function measured as the left-sided atrioventricular plane displacement. A recent study showed that artificial intelligence-derived MAPSE remained robust across vendors and demonstrated stronger associations with adverse outcomes in a large patient cohort compared to GLS [25]. Unfortunately, MAPSE was not measured in our study.

Diabetes was a strong independent predictor of the composite outcome of hospitalisation for HF or all-cause mortality in this HF cohort. This is in agreement with prior studies which have consistently shown worse cardiovascular outcomes in HF patients with diabetes, regardless of HF etiology and whether the ejection fraction is reduced or preserved [5, 26,

27]. Furthermore, Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed similar event rates in the diabetes group with above median GLS (≤ -9.9%) compared to those without diabetes and below median GLS. These findings are similar to data from the Candesartan in Heart failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity (CHARM) study, which demonstrated that patients with HF, preserved ejection fraction, and diabetes had a greater rate of HF hospitalisation than those with low ejection fraction and no diabetes [5]. These findings highlight the urgent need for therapeutic advances in patients with HF and concomitant diabetes.

In this study, HF patients with diabetes had worse CMR markers of myocardial injury, inflammation, and fibrosis. The association between diabetes and elevated ECV remained after adjusting for potential confounders that differed between the diabetic and non-diabetic groups including age, hypertension, coronary artery disease and presence of LGE. Furthermore, diabetes remained associated with the presence of LGE in logistic regression models, even accounting for age, sex, hypertension and coronary artery disease. These findings are in agreement with prior studies, including a recent meta-analysis, which showed an association between diabetes and a higher degree of myocardial fibrosis as assessed by histology as well as ECV by CMR [8].

Both focal and diffuse myocardial fibrotic processes are known to occur in patients with diabetes independently of co-morbid conditions, including coronary atherosclerosis and hypertension. Diffuse interstitial and perivascular fibrosis are structural hallmarks of diabetic cardiomyopathy, but focal replacement fibrosis can also be seen, even in the absence of coronary artery disease [28]. Several mechanisms may explain the fibrosis burden in diabetes. Hyperglycaemia is thought to upregulate the expression of profibrotic factors such as

transforming growth factor beta 1 and down-regulate the activity of the matrix metalloproteinases [29]. Hyperglycaemia is also known to promote the formation of advanced glycation end products (AGEs) which can cross-link collagen in the interstitium, increasing their resistance to degradation. AGEs can result in generation of reactive oxygen species and oxidative stress which further promotes a pro-fibrotic state [8]. Pro-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines, as well as increased renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system activity in diabetes have also been implicated in the development of myocardial fibrosis.

Native T1 values were higher in the diabetes group and may reflect interstitial expansion due to myocardial fibrosis as well as myocardial oedema affecting the cellular and interstitial compartments [30]. There is some disagreement in the literature regarding whether native T1 values are increased in diabetes. Several studies have shown an association between diabetes and increased T1 [31-34]. Although a positive association was found between diabetes and native T1 in a recent meta-analysis, the result was not statistically significant [8]. The authors of that study suggested that the lack of statistical significance may have resulted from limited sample size of the included studies. Indeed, the diabetes cohort in the present study was larger than any of those in the included studies. Furthermore, T1 values are known to be dependent on a variety of factors, including field strength, pulse sequence, and region of measurement within the myocardium. In the present study, T1 maps were obtained at 3T using the same MOLLI sequence for all patients, and with experienced observers performing standardized analyses that may improve reproducibility and eliminate technical cofounders [35, 36]. Whilst it does appear that diabetes is associated with higher T1, larger studies controlling for the variability in T1 are required to more conclusively answer this question.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is the absence of measures of glycaemic control, which are known to be prognostic in patients with HF and diabetes [37]. However, STE GLS is known to have prognostic value independent of glycaemic control in diabetes cohorts with preserved and reduced ejection fraction, and therefore this is unlikely to have altered the prognostic associations for GLS by CMR [19, 38]. Our HF cohort included patients with both ischaemic and non-ischaemic etiologies, as well as both preserved and reduced ejection fraction. Unfortunately, the study was not powered for analyses of these subgroups. Documented history of coronary artery disease did not associate with outcomes in the univariable analysis and therefore etiology of HF is unlikely to have affected the results. Finally, this was a single centre study using feature tracking software from a single vendor. A larger, multicentre study would be required to determine whether these results are more broadly applicable across different analysis platforms.

Conclusion

Patients with HF and diabetes had worse CMR markers of injury, inflammation, and fibrosis, and an adverse prognosis. GLS is an important and independent prognostic marker in this group. Future studies should explore whether GLS-guided risk stratification and management can improve outcomes in this group of patients.

References

1. Connelly KA, Sarak B. Diabetes and Myocardial Fibrosis: Is CMR the Force Leading to the Rise of "Scar Wars"? JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2022;15(5):809-11. Epub 2022/05/06. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2022.01.015. PubMed PMID: 35512953.
2. Ritchie RH, Abel ED. Basic Mechanisms of Diabetic Heart Disease. Circ Res. 2020;126(11):1501-25. Epub 2020/05/22. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.315913. PubMed PMID: 32437308; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7251974.
3. Rosano GM, Vitale C, Seferovic P. Heart Failure in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus. Card Fail Rev. 2017;3(1):52-5. Epub 2017/08/09. doi: 10.15420/cfr.2016:20:2. PubMed PMID: 28785476; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5494155.
4. Johansson I, Dahlstrom U, Edner M, Nasman P, Ryden L, Norhammar A. Prognostic Implications of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Ischemic and Nonischemic Heart Failure. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;68(13):1404-16. Epub 2016/09/24. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2016.06.061. PubMed PMID: 27659462.
5. MacDonald MR, Petrie MC, Varyani F, Ostergren J, Michelson EL, Young JB, et al. Impact of diabetes on outcomes in patients with low and preserved ejection fraction heart failure: an analysis of the Candesartan in Heart failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity (CHARM) programme. Eur Heart J. 2008;29(11):1377-85. Epub 2008/04/17. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehn153. PubMed PMID: 18413309.
6. Chamsi-Pasha MA, Zhan Y, Debs D, Shah DJ. CMR in the Evaluation of Diastolic Dysfunction and Phenotyping of HFpEF: Current Role and Future Perspectives. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;13(1 Pt 2):283-96. Epub 2019/06/17. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2019.02.031. PubMed PMID: 31202753.
7. Kinno M, Nagpal P, Horgan S, Waller AH. Comparison of Echocardiography, Cardiac Magnetic Resonance, and Computed Tomographic Imaging for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Myocardial Function: Part 1 (Global Assessment). Curr Cardiol Rep. 2017;19(1):9. Epub 2017/02/09. doi: 10.1007/s11886-017-0815-4. PubMed PMID: 28176279.
8. Salvador DB, Jr., Gamba MR, Gonzalez-Jaramillo N, Gonzalez-Jaramillo V, Raguindin PFN, Minder B, et al. Diabetes and Myocardial Fibrosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2022;15(5):796-808. Epub 2022/05/06. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2021.12.008. PubMed PMID: 35512952.
9. Marwick TH, Ritchie R, Shaw JE, Kaye D. Implications of Underlying Mechanisms for the Recognition and Management of Diabetic Cardiomyopathy. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2018;71(3):339-51. Epub 2018/01/20. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2017.11.019. PubMed PMID: 29348027.
10. Frojdh F, Fridman Y, Bering P, Sayeed A, Maanja M, Niklasson L, et al. Extracellular Volume and Global Longitudinal Strain Both Associate With Outcomes But Correlate Minimally. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;13(11):2343-54. Epub 2020/06/22. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2020.04.026. PubMed PMID: 32563637.
11. Romano S, Judd RM, Kim RJ, Kim HW, Klem I, Heitner JF, et al. Feature-Tracking Global Longitudinal Strain Predicts Death in a Multicenter Population of Patients With Ischemic and Nonischemic Dilated Cardiomyopathy Incremental to Ejection Fraction and Late Gadolinium Enhancement. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2018;11(10):1419-29. Epub 2018/01/24. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2017.10.024. PubMed PMID: 29361479; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6043421.
12. Kammerlander AA, Dona C, Nitsche C, Koschutnik M, Schonbauer R, Duca F, et al. Feature Tracking of Global Longitudinal Strain by Using Cardiovascular MRI Improves Risk

Stratification in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. Radiology. 2020;296(2):290-8. Epub 2020/06/03. doi: 10.1148/radiol.2020200195. PubMed PMID: 32484413.
13. Le TT, Tan RS, De Deyn M, Goh EP, Han Y, Leong BR, et al. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance reference ranges for the heart and aorta in Chinese at 3T. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2016;18:21. Epub 2016/04/14. doi: 10.1186/s12968-016-0236-3. PubMed PMID: 27071974; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4830061.
14. Zhang S, Le TT, Kabus S, Su B, Hausenloy DJ, Cook SA, et al. Cardiac magnetic resonance T1 and extracellular volume mapping with motion correction and co-registration based on fast elastic image registration. MAGMA. 2018;31(1):115-29. Epub 2017/12/23. doi: 10.1007/s10334-017-0668-2. PubMed PMID: 29270904; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5813095.
15. Schulz-Menger J, Bluemke DA, Bremerich J, Flamm SD, Fogel MA, Friedrich MG, et al. Standardized image interpretation and post processing in cardiovascular magnetic resonance: Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) board of trustees task force on standardized post processing. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2013;15(1):35. Epub 2013/05/03. doi: 10.1186/1532-429X-15-35. PubMed PMID: 23634753; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3695769.
16. Ugander M, Oki AJ, Hsu LY, Kellman P, Greiser A, Aletras AH, et al. Extracellular volume imaging by magnetic resonance imaging provides insights into overt and sub-clinical myocardial pathology. Eur Heart J. 2012;33(10):1268-78. Epub 2012/01/27. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehr481. PubMed PMID: 22279111; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3350985.
17. Arheden H, Saeed M, Higgins CB, Gao DW, Bremerich J, Wyttenbach R, et al. Measurement of the distribution volume of gadopentetate dimeglumine at echo-planar MR imaging to quantify myocardial infarction: comparison with 99mTc-DTPA autoradiography in rats. Radiology. 1999;211(3):698-708. Epub 1999/06/03. doi: 10.1148/radiology.211.3.r99jn41698. PubMed PMID: 10352594.
18. Cai J, Bryant JA, Le TT, Su B, de Marvao A, O'Regan DP, et al. Fractal analysis of left ventricular trabeculations is associated with impaired myocardial deformation in healthy Chinese. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2017;19(1):102. Epub 2017/12/16. doi: 10.1186/s12968-017-0413-z. PubMed PMID: 29241460; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5729602.
19. Tanaka H, Tatsumi K, Matsuzoe H, Matsumoto K, Hirata KI. Impact of diabetes mellitus on left ventricular longitudinal function of patients with non-ischemic dilated cardiomyopathy. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2020;19(1):84. Epub 2020/06/15. doi: 10.1186/s12933-020-01063-y. PubMed PMID: 32534593; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7293795.
20. Gamaza-Chulian S, Diaz-Retamino E, Gonzalez-Teston F, Gaitero JC, Castillo MJ, Alfaro R, et al. Effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors on left ventricular remodelling and longitudinal strain: a prospective observational study. BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2021;21(1):456. Epub 2021/09/23. doi: 10.1186/s12872-021-02250-9. PubMed PMID: 34548011; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8456580.
21. Tanaka H, Soga F, Tatsumi K, Mochizuki Y, Sano H, Toki H, et al. Positive effect of dapagliflozin on left ventricular longitudinal function for type 2 diabetic mellitus patients with chronic heart failure. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2020;19(1):6. Epub 2020/01/09. doi: 10.1186/s12933-019-0985-z. PubMed PMID: 31910853; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6947966.
22. 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(21):1673-80. Epub 2014/05/27. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2014-305538. PubMed PMID: 24860005.

23. Taylor RJ, Moody WE, Umar F, Edwards NC, Taylor TJ, Stegemann B, et al. Myocardial strain measurement with feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic resonance: normal values. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging. 2015;16(8):871-81. Epub 2015/02/26. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jev006. PubMed PMID: 25711353.
24. Onishi T, Saha SK, Delgado-Montero A, Ludwig DR, Onishi T, Schelbert EB, et al. Global longitudinal strain and global circumferential strain by speckle-tracking echocardiography and feature-tracking cardiac magnetic resonance imaging: comparison with left ventricular ejection fraction. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2015;28(5):587-96. Epub 2015/01/13. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2014.11.018. PubMed PMID: 25577185.
25. Xue H, Artico J, Davies RH, Adam R, Shetye A, Augusto JB, et al. Automated In-Line Artificial Intelligence Measured Global Longitudinal Shortening and Mitral Annular Plane Systolic Excursion: Reproducibility and Prognostic Significance. J Am Heart Assoc. 2022;11(4):e023849. Epub 2022/02/09. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.023849. PubMed PMID: 35132872; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9245823.
26. Domanski M, Krause-Steinrauf H, Deedwania P, Follmann D, Ghali JK, Gilbert E, et al. The effect of diabetes on outcomes of patients with advanced heart failure in the BEST trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2003;42(5):914-22. Epub 2003/09/06. doi: 10.1016/s0735-1097(03)00856-8. PubMed PMID: 12957443.
27. Shindler DM, Kostis JB, Yusuf S, Quinones MA, Pitt B, Stewart D, et al. Diabetes mellitus, a predictor of morbidity and mortality in the Studies of Left Ventricular Dysfunction (SOLVD) Trials and Registry. Am J Cardiol. 1996;77(11):1017-20. Epub 1996/05/01. doi: 10.1016/s0002-9149(97)89163-1. PubMed PMID: 8644628.
28. Russo I, Frangogiannis NG. Diabetes-associated cardiac fibrosis: Cellular effectors, molecular mechanisms and therapeutic opportunities. J Mol Cell Cardiol. 2016;90:84-93. Epub 2015/12/26. doi: 10.1016/j.yjmcc.2015.12.011. PubMed PMID: 26705059; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4718740.
29. Borghetti G, von Lewinski D, Eaton DM, Sourij H, Houser SR, Wallner M. Diabetic Cardiomyopathy: Current and Future Therapies. Beyond Glycemic Control. Front Physiol. 2018;9:1514. Epub 2018/11/15. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2018.01514. PubMed PMID: 30425649; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6218509.
30. Haaf P, Garg P, Messroghli DR, Broadbent DA, Greenwood JP, Plein S. Cardiac T1 Mapping and Extracellular Volume (ECV) in clinical practice: a comprehensive review. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2016;18(1):89. Epub 2016/12/03. doi: 10.1186/s12968-016-0308-4. PubMed PMID: 27899132; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5129251.
31. Swoboda PP, McDiarmid AK, Erhayiem B, Ripley DP, Dobson LE, Garg P, et al. Diabetes Mellitus, Microalbuminuria, and Subclinical Cardiac Disease: Identification and Monitoring of Individuals at Risk of Heart Failure. J Am Heart Assoc. 2017;6(7). Epub 2017/07/19. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.117.005539. PubMed PMID: 28716801; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5586286.
32. Cao Y, Zeng W, Cui Y, Kong X, Wang M, Yu J, et al. Increased myocardial extracellular volume assessed by cardiovascular magnetic resonance T1 mapping and its determinants in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients with normal myocardial systolic strain. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2018;17(1):7. Epub 2018/01/06. doi: 10.1186/s12933-017-0651-2. PubMed PMID: 29301529; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5755204.
33. Lam B, Stromp TA, Hui Z, Vandsburger M. Myocardial native-T1 times are elevated as a function of hypertrophy, HbA1c, and heart rate in diabetic adults without diffuse fibrosis. Magn Reson Imaging. 2019;61:83-9. Epub 2019/05/28. doi: 10.1016/j.mri.2019.05.029. PubMed PMID: 31125612; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6663625.
34. Kucukseymen S, Neisius U, Rodriguez J, Tsao CW, Nezafat R. Negative synergism of diabetes mellitus and obesity in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:

a cardiovascular magnetic resonance study. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;36(10):2027-38. Epub 2020/06/14. doi: 10.1007/s10554-020-01915-4. PubMed PMID: 32533279.
35. Kellman P, Hansen MS. T1-mapping in the heart: accuracy and precision. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2014;16(1):2. Epub 2014/01/07. doi: 10.1186/1532-429X-16-2. PubMed PMID: 24387626; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3927683.
36. Treibel TA, Fridman Y, Bering P, Sayeed A, Maanja M, Frojdh F, et al. Extracellular Volume Associates With Outcomes More Strongly Than Native or Post-Contrast Myocardial T1. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;13(1 Pt 1):44-54. Epub 2019/05/20. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2019.03.017. PubMed PMID: 31103587.
37. Aguilar D, Bozkurt B, Ramasubbu K, Deswal A. Relationship of hemoglobin A1C and mortality in heart failure patients with diabetes. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;54(5):422-8. Epub 2009/07/25. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2009.04.049. PubMed PMID: 19628117; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2753214.
38. Holland DJ, Marwick TH, Haluska BA, Leano R, Hordern MD, Hare JL, et al. Subclinical LV dysfunction and 10-year outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Heart. 2015;101(13):1061-6. Epub 2015/05/04. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2014-307391. PubMed PMID: 25935767.

Figure Titles and Legends

Figure 1. Flow chart of patient inclusion. Abbreviations: HF: heart failure; ECG: 12-lead electrocardiogram; CMR: Cardiovascular magnetic resonance; HCM: Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy.

Figure 2. Event-free survival curves showing: (A) Adverse prognosis in patients with heart failure and diabetes; (B) Patients with diabetes and GLS worse than cohort median (-9.9%) had worst prognosis. Patients with either diabetes or GLS worse than median had similar outcomes. Abbreviations: DM: diabetes mellitus; GLS: global longitudinal strain.

Figure 3. Example of GLS measurement in apical 2-chamber view. Top panel shows a patient with heart failure, diabetes and GLS ≤ -9.9%**. Bottom panel** shows a patient with heart failure, diabetes and GLS > -9.9%**. Centre panel:** event-free survival curves showing adverse prognosis in patients with heart failure, diabetes and GLS worse than cohort median (-9.9%). Abbreviations: DM: diabetes mellitus; GLS: global longitudinal strain.

Table 1. Baseline clinical characteristics of the cohort according to presence or absence of diabetes.

	No Diabetes Mellitus (n=156)	Diabetes Mellitus (n=159)	p Value
Clinical			
Age, years	56 ± 12	60 ± 10	<0.001
Male sex, n (%)	129 (83)	126 (79)	0.436
Heart rate, beats/min	71 [63-81]	75 [68-83]	0.020
Systolic BP, mmHg	124 [111-138]	125 [113-143]	0.240
Diastolic BP, mmHg	73 [66-82]	70 [61-80]	0.008
Body mass index, kg/m^2	26 [23-30]	27 [23-31]	0.412
Co-morbidities, n (%)			
Hypertension	80 (52)	120 (76)	<0.001
Coronary artery disease	78 (52)	112 (72)	<0.001
Atrial Fibrillation	22 (14)	29 (18)	0.331
Medications at baseline, n (%)			
Beta Blocker	135 (87)	146 (92)	0.436
ACEi or ARB	129 (83)	140 (88)	0.178
Mineralocorticoid antagonist	98 (63)	102 (64)	0.806
Diuretic	116 (74)	129 (81)	0.148
Statin	120 (77)	146 (92)	<0.001
NYHA Functional Class, n (%)			0.041
Class I	91 (58)	75 (47)	
Class II	51 (33)	74 (47)	
Class III	14 (9)	10 (6)	
MLWHF Score	12 [0-30]	14 [3-29]	0.299
Haematocrit, (%)	43 ± 5	41 ± 6	<0.001
Creatinine, μmol/L	91 [77-105]	96 [81-118]	0.016
Plasma Biomarkers			

NT-proBNP, pg/mL	579 [232-1136]	1091 [326-2272]	<0.001
High-sensitivity troponin T, ng/L	15 [9-22]	27 [14-41]	<0.001
CMR Markers			
LVEDVi, mL/m^2	112 [83-142]	99 [81-129]	0.029
LVESVi, mL/m^2	71 [43-105]	65 [40-94]	0.190
SVi, mL/m^2	39 [32-44]	35 [29-42]	0.005
LVMi, g/m^2	70 [59-89]	67 [55-83]	0.125
LV ejection fraction, %	36 [25-49]	36 [26-49]	0.947
GLS, %	-10.1 ± 4.1	-9.8 ± 3.7	0.443
LAVi, mL/m^2	48 [38-68]	47 [33-65]	0.285
LGE Type			0.003
Nil, n (%)	63 (40)	38 (24)	
Non-ischaemic, n (%)	38 (24)	34 (21)	
Ischaemic, n (%)	52 (33)	81 (51)	
Both, n (%)	3 (2)	6 (4)	
Native T1, ms	1269 ± 42	1285 ± 42	<0.001
ECV, %	28.8 ± 4.1	30.5 ± 3.5	<0.001

Values are given as median [interquartile range], mean ± SD or number (percentage).
Abbreviations:; ACEi: Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB: Angiotensin II receptor blocker; NYHA: New York Heart Association; MLWHF: Minnesota Living with Heart Failure; NT-proBNP: N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; LVEDVi: Left ventricular end-diastolic volume indexed to body surface area; LVESVi: Left ventricular end-systolic volume index; SVi: Stroke volume index; LVMi: Left ventricular mass index; GLS: Global longitudinal strain; LAVi: Left atrial end-systolic volume index; LGE: Late gadolinium enhancement; ECV: Extracellular volume.

Table 2. Univariable and multivariable Cox regression models (stepwise selection) in the entire cohort for the primary outcome of all-cause mortality or heart failure hospitalisation.

	Univariable Model		Multivariable Model (n=313)	
	HR (95% CI)	**P Value**	**HR (95% CI)**	**p Value**
Clinical				
Age (per 10-year increment)	1.20 (0.97-1.47)	0.101		
Male sex	0.82 (0.44-1.53)	0.537		
Body mass index	0.97 (0.93-1.01)	0.137		
Smoking	1.17 (0.74-1.86)	0.503		
Diabetes	2.33 (1.43-3.79)	<0.001	2.24 (1.37-3.65)	0.001
Coronary artery disease	1.54 (0.94-2.53)	0.090		
NYHA Functional Class	1.61 (1.15-2.25)	0.006	1.44 (1.01-2.04)	0.043
Systolic blood pressure (per 10mmHg increment)	0.88 (0.78-0.98)	0.020	§	
Plasma Biomarkers				
NT-proBNP (per 100pg/mL increment)	1.01 (1.01-1.02)	<0.001	§	
High-sensitivity troponin T	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.301		
CMR Markers				
LVEDVi (per 10mL/m^2 increment)	1.07 (1.03-1.12)	<0.001	§	
LVMi (per 10g/m^2 increment)	1.10 (1.01-1.22)	0.032	§	
LV ejection fraction (per 5% increment)	0.90 (0.83-1.00)	0.010	§	
GLS	1.16 (1.09-1.24)	<0.001	1.13 (1.06-1.21)	<0.001
Presence of LGE	1.94 (1.10-3.42)	0.022	§	
Native T1 (per 10ms increment)	1.09 (1.04-1.15)	<0.001	§	
ECV	1.06 (1.02-1.11)	0.005	§	

Abbreviations:; NYHA: New York Heart Association; NT-proBNP: N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; LVEDVi: Left ventricular end-diastolic volume indexed to body surface area; LVMi: Left ventricular mass index; GLS: Global longitudinal strain; LGE: Late gadolinium enhancement; ECV: Extracellular volume.
§ Assessed for inclusion in multivariable model but not retained.

Table 3. Univariable and multivariable Cox regression models (stepwise selection) in the diabetes group for the primary outcome of all-cause mortality or heart failure hospitalisation.

	Univariable Model		Multivariable Model (n=158)	
	HR (95% CI)	P Value	HR (95% CI)	p Value
Clinical				
Age (per 10-year increment)	1.21 (0.90-1.60)	0.202		
Male sex	0.85 (0.41-1.75)	0.665		
Body mass index	0.99 (0.94-1.05)	0.827		
Diabetes Type	0.88 (0.28-2.84)	0.836		
Smoking	0.80 (0.46-1.40)	0.436		
Coronary artery disease	1.41 (0.72-2.75)	0.314		
NYHA Functional Class	1.34 (0.86-2.08)	0.200		
Systolic blood pressure (per 10mmHg increment)	0.86 (0.75-0.98)	0.028	§	
Plasma Biomarkers				
NT-proBNP (per 100pg/mL increment)	1.01 (1.00-1.02)	0.007	§	
High-sensitivity troponin T	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.864		
CMR Markers				
LVEDVi (per 10mL/m^2 increment)	1.07 (0.99-1.15)	0.076		
LVMi (per 10g/m^2 increment)	1.01 (0.88-1.15)	0.928		
LV ejection fraction (per 5% increment)	0.89 (0.81-0.99)	0.031	§	
GLS	1.15 (1.06-1.25)	0.001	1.15 (1.06-1.25)	<0.001
Presence of LGE	1.42 (0.69-2.92)	0.342		
Native T1 (per 10ms increment)	1.07 (1.00-1.14)	0.04	§	
ECV	1.06 (0.98-1.15)	0.139		

Abbreviations:; NYHA: New York Heart Association; NT-proBNP: N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; LVEDVi: Left ventricular end-diastolic volume indexed to body surface area; LVMi: Left ventricular mass index; GLS: Global longitudinal strain; LGE: Late gadolinium enhancement; ECV: Extracellular volume.
§ Assessed for inclusion in multivariable model but not retained.


HF patients enrolled
N = 623
Clinical evaluation, ECG, bloods
Excluded: N = 268
Reasons: Patient declined or contra-indication to CMR (100); Contrast not given (168)
CMR with contrast performed
N = 355
Excluded: N = 40
Reasons: Incomplete baseline clinical or CMR data (26); HCM diagnosed (2); Lost to follow-up (12)
Complete CMR data available
N = 315
No Diabetes
N = 156
Diabetes
N = 159





	0	6	12	18	24
DM-	156	147	142	132	76
DM+	159	139	125	105	49

	0	6	12	18	24
DM-, GLS ≤ -9.9%	81	78	77	74	41
DM+, GLS ≤ -9.9%	78	70	67	58	30
DM-, GLS > -9.9%	75	69	65	58	35
DM+, GLS > -9.9%	81	69	58	47	19


>20
10
0
-10
<-20
100
75
50
Event-free Survival (%)
DM+, GLS ≤ -9.9%
DM+, GLS > -9.9%
Log Rank p<0.001
0
6
12
18
24
30
Months
>20
10
0
-10
<-20