Strain measures of the left ventricle and left atrium are composite measures of left heart size and function

Fredrika Fröjdh[1], Dhnanjay Soundappan[2], Peder Sörensson[1], Andreas Sigfridsson[1], Eva Maret[1], Jannike Nickander[1*], Martin Ugander[1,2*§]

1. Department of Clinical Physiology, Karolinska University Hospital, and Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

2. Kolling Institute, Royal North Shore Hospital, and University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

* denotes equal last author contributions

§ denotes corresponding author:

Martin Ugander, MD, PhD

Kolling Building, Level 12

Royal North Shore Hospital

St Leonards, Sydney, NSW 2065

Australia

martin.ugander@gmail.com

Abstract

Left heart systolic and diastolic function are increasingly being assessed using imaging measures of left ventricular and atrial strain. These strain measures are structurally coupled through mitral annular plane systolic excursion (MAPSE). However, to what extent these measures correlate with each other and with chamber geometry is poorly understood. Here, we use cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging to show that left atrial and left ventricular strains are highly correlated with each other, MAPSE, and their respective chamber sizes. While left atrial strain is considered a marker of diastolic dysfunction, this association is mediated through both its correlation between increased left atrial volume inherently coupled to increased filling pressures, and decreased left ventricular systolic function. Our findings inform the understanding that strain measures are composite measures of atrioventricular plane displacement and left atrial and ventricular size, and clarify how these measures should be interpreted in research and clinically.

Key words: strain, MAPSE, left ventricular function, left ventricular size

Introduction

Deformation analysis (strain) from cardiac imaging of the left ventricle (LV), measured as global longitudinal strain (GLS) or global circumferential strain (GCS), and strain of the left atrium (LA), measured as left atrial strain (LAS), are increasingly used for assessment of LV function and patient prognosis. GLS and GCS are more sensitive[1] and reproducible[2] parameters of LV systolic function compared to LV ejection fraction (LVEF), providing incremental prognostic value beyond LVEF[3]. While LVEF is of importance in the characterization of heart failure (HF) according to clinical paradigms, LV strain is a more accurate measure for detecting the presence of LV dysfunction and evaluating disease progression over time[4,5] as well as identifying compromised LV systolic function in patients with preserved EF[6]. Moreover, the analysis of left atrial function using left atrial strain, LAS, also referred to as LA reservoir strain, is emerging as a means for non-invasive assessment of diastolic dysfunction. LAS demonstrates good agreement with the degree of diastolic function as assessed by 2016 American Society of Echocardiography guidelines[7] as well as with invasive pressure measurements. As opposed to many other parameters used to assess diastolic dysfunction, LAS correlates linearly with the severity of disease and has been suggested a potential supplementary or stand-alone parameter for the non-invasive assessment of LV filling pressure[8–10]. However, the physiologic basis for this association remains poorly understood. Alternating and reciprocal shortening and lengthening of the LV and LA, respectively, is intrinsically coupled through the shared atrioventricular valve (AV) plane. Notably, the LV apex and the posterior aspect of the LA remain effectively stationary throughout the cardiac cycle, and as a result, longitudinal movement of the LA and LV almost exclusively translates to the displacement of the AV plane, measured as mitral annular plane systolic excursion (MAPSE). Consequently, MAPSE correlates with GLS, and this

correlation increases when MAPSE is indexed to LV length, providing similar prognostic strength compared with GLS[11,12]. By analogy, we hypothesize that LAS is mainly explained by the variation in MAPSE and left atrial size and that the correlation between LAS and GLS is driven by these associations.

Thus, the aim of this study was to determine the correlation between LA and LV strain, LA and LV dimensions, and MAPSE, with the purpose of better understanding these commonly used measures in both cardiovascular research and clinical cardiac imaging.

Methods

Population

We retrospectively screened patients who had undergone clinically indicated cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) between December 2017 and May 2021 and provided informed written consent. The study was approved by the local human subject research ethics committee. The population was selected to represent a variable spectrum of LVEF, including 20-25 patients from each of the following ranges: LVEF<30%, 30-40%, 40-50%, 50-60%, and >60%, while excluding those with distinct myocardial pathologies such as hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, amyloidosis, hemosiderosis, Anderson-Fabry's disease, congenital heart defects, atrial fibrillation during CMR, or insufficient image quality to perform LV strain analysis. Further exclusion criteria included inadequate tracking of the myocardium by strain image analysis, defined as visually inadequate tracking of >2 segments in any of the long-axis or short-axis views, and visually apparent foreshortening or the presence of ≥3 of the atrial appendage and pulmonary veins in both 2- and 4-chamber views.

CMR imaging

Clinical CMR scans were performed at 1.5T or 3T MAGNETOM (Aera or Skyra, Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) with an 18-channel and 32-channel phased-array body and spine coil, respectively. The exam included retrospectively ECG-gated balanced steady-state free precession cine imaging in short axis (8 mm slice thickness, 1.6 mm slice gap) and long axis 2-, 3- and 4-chamber views (8 mm slice thickness) with 30 phases per cardiac cycle.

Image analysis

All post-processing analyses were performed using freely available software Segment version 3.0 R9405e (Medviso AB, Lund, Sweden). LV volumes were assessed by manual delineation of the endo- and epicardium according to guidelines [14], excluding papillary muscles for LV mass assessment. LV GLS and LV GCS were separately analyzed using a semi-automated feature-tracking module using cine images by an observer (FF) blinded to clinical data and geometric measures. Endo- and epicardial borders were manually traced in end-diastole and automatically propagated throughout the cardiac cycle. LV GLS was measured as the mean longitudinal strain in two-, three- and four-chamber views, and LV GCS as the mean circumferential strain in an apical, midventricular, and basal short-axis view. Delineations were adjusted manually if ≥2 segments did not track myocardial motion adequately as assessed visually.

LA dimensions and volumes were measured using the bi-plane area-length method in the two- and four-chamber views by a single-blinded observer (DS), excluding the left atrial appendage and pulmonary veins. LAS was assessed as the strain measured from end diastole to end systole in a two- or four-chamber view or the mean of both. LV and LA measurements were performed by two different observers.

MAPSE was measured as the mean distance in millimetres travelled by the mitral annular insertion points from end-diastole to end-systole as the average of two manual caliper measurements per view in the 2- and 4- chamber views. In the 3-chamber view, the lateral mitral annular insertion point and septal aortic valve insertion point were used. LV length (LVL) was measured as the distance from the most apical point of the epicardium to the midpoint between the mitral annular insertion points in end-diastole. The longitudinal contribution to LV stroke volume was calculated as the maximal LV short-axis epicardial area multiplied by MAPSE as previously described and validated [15].

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using RStudio Team (2022). Patient characteristics were summarized as the median [interquartile range] for continuous variables and as counts and percentages for categorical variables. Univariable linear regression was used to assess correlations. Multivariable linear regression was used to identify measures associated with GLS, GCS, and LAS, excluding the variable with the lowest univariable correlation in the case of high multicollinearity. Agreements between GCS and GLS were assessed using Bland-Altman plots. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Patient characteristics

A flowchart of patient selection is shown in Figure 1. The final study population included 66 patients: 14 (18%) were female, age was 62 [53–72] years and LVEF was 48 [34–57]%, full range 9–69%. Characteristics of the study population are shown in Table 1.

Global longitudinal strain

A summary of the relationships between strain values and geometric measures is illustrated in representative patients in Figure 2. GLS was -15.5% [-17.2 – -11.6] in the study population. GLS was highly correlated with GCS (R^2=0.86, p<0.001). GLS was also highly correlated with conventional LV metrics, including LV mass, EDV, ESV, LV diameter, MAPSE, and LV length, but not with BSA or age. In multivariable regression analysis using GLS as the dependent variable, MAPSE, LV mass, and LV ESV together contributed to the model with the strongest association (R^2=0.89, p<0.001). MAPSE modeled together with other parameters of LV size yielded models of similar strength of association (MAPSE and LVEDV, R^2=0.87, p<0.001; MAPSE and LV length, R^2=0.84, p<0.001; MAPSE and LV maximal diameter, R^2=0.85, p<0.001). In these multivariable models, the association with LV mass did not remain significant. Moreover, LVEDV and LVM were correlated (R^2=0.51, p<0.001). Results from univariable and multivariable linear regression analysis are presented in Table 2. GLS was strongly associated with MAPSE indexed to LV length (R^2=0.84 p<0.001) and with MAPSE indexed to the sum of LV length and LV diameter (R^2=0.84, p<0.001). GLS could be estimated with high accuracy and precision from MAPSE indexed to LV length (difference 3.7±1.9 %-points). The linear relationship between MAPSE/LVL and GLS was expressed as (Figure 3):

$$GLS = \frac{-\text{MAPSE}}{\text{LVL}} \times 100$$

Global circumferential strain

GCS was -16.2% [-18.75 – -11.6] in the study population. Similarly to GLS, GCS was strongly correlated with LV mass, stroke volume, LVEDV, LVESV, MAPSE, LV length, LVEF, and LV diameter, but not with BSA (Table 3). In multivariable analyses, LVESV and MAPSE together produced the best model for estimating GCS.

Left atrial strain

LAS, measured as LA reservoir strain, was 24 [20–27] % in the study population. Results from the linear analyses of LA and LV parameters are summarized in Table 4. LAS correlated with GLS (R^2=0.51, p<0.001). MAPSE associated positively with LAS (R^2=0.46, p<0.001), and this correlation increased when MAPSE was indexed to LA length (R^2=0.51, p<0.001), in analogy to MAPSE indexed to LVL. In multivariable analysis, LAEDV and MAPSE together yielded the strongest association with LAS (R^2=0.67, p<0.001).

Longitudinal and circumferential contribution to left ventricular stroke volume

The longitudinal contribution to LV stroke volume was 62 [58–66]% in the population. The longitudinal contribution to LV stroke volume did not associate with GLS (p=0.69) or MAPSE indexed to LV length (p=0.12). Similarly, GCS was not associated with the short-axis contribution to LV stroke volume (p=0.93).

Relationship between MAPSE and LV and LA geometries

MAPSE was univariably correlated with LV and LA strain as detailed above, as well as with LV EDV, (p<0.001), LV ESV (p=0.01), LVM (p<0.001) LVEF (p<0.001), LA EDV

($p<0.001$), and trended to a correlation with LA ESV ($p=0.06$), see Table 5. In multivariable analysis excluding strain measures for multicolinearity reasons, only LVESV remained associated.

Discussion

We found that LV strain strongly associated with MAPSE and LV dimensions, representing a composite measure of both function and LV geometry. Similarly, LA strain was closely associated with MAPSE and LA volume. All strain measures were highly correlated, offering insights that aid clinical and clinical research interpretation by considering the associations between strain measures and conventional geometric measures of LV and LA size and function.

GLS. GLS was closely correlated with MAPSE, with the strength of this association increasing when MAPSE was indexed to LV length (R^2=0.83), of similar degree compared to previous published CMR (R^2=0.85)[11] and echocardiographic data (R^2=0.79)[16]. This confirms the dependence of GLS on atrioventricular plane displacement and LV size. Additionally, GLS could be accurately and precisely estimated from MAPSE and LV length using a simple linear formula, with similar accuracy compared to that found in a study using transthoracic echocardiographic data in 220 patients (bias 3.0±3.5 vs 0.0±4.8 %-points)[16]. The difference in bias between the methods can be attributed to the distinct measurement modalities used. Specifically, MAPSE with M-mode is measured at an angle with respect to the LV longitudinal axis, incorporating both longitudinal and some radial movement, whereas MAPSE with CMR is measured along the longitudinal axis alone. The slightly lower variation in the CMR data is likely due to GLS and MAPSE being measured within the same image. Conversely, echocardiographic MAPSE and speckle tracking data are typically acquired at different times during the examination. Given the sizeable inter-vendor variability in strain measures[17], estimating GLS using MAPSE indexed to LV length offers a simple, vendor-independent, and reliable method. In contrast to GLS, both MAPSE and LV length measurements are that are less sensitive to image quality and may serve as surrogate markers

for GLS in cases of limited image quality. This is in line with the previous findings of two independent studies in which MAPSE indexed to LV length provided comparable prognostic value to GLS[11,12].

GLS was also highly correlated with LVEF. Like LVEF, GLS measures the relative change in LV size, although LVEF represents the inner volume change, GLS represents the change in mid-wall circumference of the LV myocardium in the long-axis direction, and as a consequence, incorporates both LV volume and myocardial wall thickness. This means that in most patients, GLS and LVEF are concordant. However, in patients with increased myocardial wall thickness, the greater difference in endocardial and mid-wall circumference translates to a relatively lower GLS compared to LVEF. This depends on the degree of hypertrophy, and consequently GLS provides incremental functional and prognostic information beyond LVEF in such patients[18].

GLS correlated with myocardial mass in our cohort. However, when considering other dimensional parameters, this correlation did not retain statistical significance, most likely due to multicollinearity with LV volume. This explanation may be particularly prominent in our cohort that excluded patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy.

GCS. GLS and GCS were highly correlated with each other. Although a direct correlation between circumferential and longitudinal strain has not previously been reported, both have been found to correlate linearly with LVEF, indirectly supporting their high degree of correlation[20].

Strain measures are two-dimensional, simultaneously assessing both shortening along one direction and the resultant perpendicular myocardial thickening. It should be noted that myocardial mass does not change during the cardiac cycle, it rearranges. Radial inward

motion is incorporated in both GLS and GCS measures. The high correlation between GLS and GCS can thus both be explained by their inherent anatomical interdependence and the fact that myocyte function most likely varies little depending on its location in the myocardium. GCS also showed a strong correlation with MAPSE, and this is not surprising given the multi-collinearity of the already described correlations. Similarly to GLS, the correlation with GCS increased when MAPSE was indexed to LV length or LV diameter. In summary, GLS and GCS are both measures of global LV function and should not be viewed as distinctly separate measures of longitudinal and circumferential function, respectively.

Associations with longitudinal function. In the current study, the median longitudinal contribution to LV stroke volume was 62%, consistent with previous research showing that longitudinal function varies very little across a broad range of LVEF values[22]. The longitudinal contribution to stroke volume was not correlated with GLS or MAPSE and, similarly, GCS was not correlated with the short-axis contribution to LV stroke volume. Therefore, while MAPSE and GLS measure longitudinal shortening, they may not be appropriate to describe in terms of longitudinal function or the longitudinal contribution to stroke volume *per se*.

LAS. Similar to LV strain, LAS was highly positively correlated with LV systolic longitudinal shortening (MAPSE) and inversely correlated with LA dimensions. The Central Illustration (figure 4) provides a schematic overview of the physiologic relationships between strain measures, MAPSE and geometry. Although the correlation between MAPSE, LA measures, and LA strain was not as strong as that seen for LV strain, this may be due to the more irregular shape of the LA and the insertion of pulmonary veins and the atrial appendage[24]. Subsequently, LAS was highly correlated with both GLS and GCS, corroborating previous findings[23]. Our results indicate that LAS to a substantial degree can be explained by the

variation in MAPSE and LA dimensions. As systolic function is a common cause of increased filling pressures and LA dilatation is a well-recognized consequence of prolonged pressure overload[24], these correlations provide a physiologic mechanism coupling LAS with increased filling pressures. Because of this, LAS can also be seen to function as a composite marker of reduced myocardial function and left atrial enlargement. While left atrial strain (LAS) may be influenced by the duration of elevated filling pressures, it is also influence by additional factors contributing to left atrial (LA) dilatation such as mitral valve dysfunction and intermittent atrial fibrillation. Consequently, the applicability of LAS in certain patient populations may be less reliable and warrants further study.

MAPSE. MAPSE unsurprisingly correlated inversely with both LV volumes and myocardial mass, parameters associated with myocardial remodelling and loss of myocyte function, particularly in our cohort in the studied population mainly represented by patients with myocarditis or ischemic heart disease. Naturally, the relationships between MAPSE and LV dimensional measures would be expected to vary between different cardiac pathologies.

Limitations

Images used for strain analyses were standard LV projections, and consequently optimized for visualization of the LV but not the LA. Given the irregular shape of the LA, pulmonary vein and atrial appendage insertion as well as a varying LA-to-LV angle, this likely affected LA length and volume calculations as well as LAS analyses and may in part account for the lower correlation between LAS and GLS-derived estimates of LAS compared to those found previously[26]. The majority of patients included in the current study had some degree of focal myocardial scarring as a consequence of including patients referred for CMR while excluding several other common clinical indications for CMR assessment including hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, valvular, and congenital heart disease. Focal scarring might bias strain

measurements differently depending on the location in the myocardium. However, the exceptionally high correlation between GLS and GCS indicates that this potential source of variability is unlikely to have a large magnitude of effect on the findings. Also, infarct size associates with the magnitude of decrease in MAPSE, but not infarct location[27]. Thus, focal myocardial scarring should not represent a major limitation of this study.

The relative underrepresentation of females in our study may be seen as a limitation. However, while females are known to have smaller hearts than males on a group level, there is no indication that female and male hearts of the same size exhibit different proportions or geometric scaling. Hence, the results should be reasonably applicable across both sexes.

Conclusions

LV and LA strain can be understood as geometrically coupled composite measures of MAPSE, and the size, function, and dimensions of the LV and LA. MAPSE and LV length alone can be used to accurately estimate GLS, which in turn provides similar information to GCS. These highly correlated composite geometrical relationships between strain and geometric measures of known prognostic significance likely explain the excellent prognostic value of strain measures. The research and clinical evaluation of various cardiac pathologies necessitates careful consideration of the dependence of strain measures on cardiac dimensions and myocardial function.

References

1. Oikonomou EK, Kokkinidis DG, Kampaktsis PN, et al. Assessment of Prognostic Value of Left Ventricular Global Longitudinal Strain for Early Prediction of Chemotherapy-Induced Cardiotoxicity A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Author Audio Interview Supplemental content. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2019;4(10):1007-1018.
2. Karlsen S, Dahlslett T, Grenne B, et al. Global longitudinal strain is a more reproducible measure of left ventricular function than ejection fraction regardless of echocardiographic training. *Cardiovasc Ultrasound*. 2019;17(1):1-12.
3. Fröjdh F, Fridman Y, Bering P, et al. Extracellular Volume and Global Longitudinal Strain Both Associate With Outcomes But Correlate Minimally. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;13(11).
4. Hochstadt A, Arnold J, Rosen R, et al. Longitudinal diastolic strain slope as an early sign for systolic dysfunction among patients with active cancer. *Clinical Research in Cardiology*. Published online November 21, 2020:1-10.
5. De E, Gripp A, Escudini De Oliveira G, et al. Global Longitudinal Strain Accuracy for Cardiotoxicity Prediction in a Cohort of Breast Cancer Patients During Anthracycline and/or Trastuzumab Treatment. Published online 2017.
6. Kammerlander AA, Kraiger JA, Nitsche C, et al. Global Longitudinal Strain by CMR Feature Tracking Is Associated With Outcome in HFPEF. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2019;12(8P1):1585-1587.
7. Singh A, Addetia K, Maffessanti F, Mor-Avi V, Lang RM. LA Strain for Categorization of LV Diastolic Dysfunction. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2017;10(7):735-743.
8. Singh A, Medvedofsky D, Mediratta A, et al. Peak left atrial strain as a single measure for the non-invasive assessment of left ventricular filling pressures. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2019;35(1):23-32.
9. Inoue K, Khan FH, Remme EW, et al. Determinants of left atrial reservoir and pump strain and use of atrial strain for evaluation of left ventricular filling pressure. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. Published online January 26, 2021.
10. Frydas A, Morris DA, Belyavskiy E, et al. Left atrial strain as sensitive marker of left ventricular diastolic dysfunction in heart failure. *ESC Heart Fail*. 2020;7(4):1956-1965.
11. Xue H, Artico J, Davies RH, 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*. Published online February 8, 2022.
12. Berg J, Jablonowski R, Mohammad M, et al. Ventricular longitudinal shortening is an independent predictor of death in heart failure patients with reduced ejection fraction. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):20280.
13. Mălăescu GG, Mirea O, Capotă R, Petrescu AM, Duchenne J, Voigt JU. Left Atrial Strain Determinants During the Cardiac Phases. *Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2022;15(3):381-391.
14. Schulz-Menger J, Bluemke DA, Bremerich J, et al. Standardized image interpretation and post-processing in cardiovascular magnetic resonance - 2020 update: Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR): Board of Trustees Task Force on Standardized Post-Processing. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*. 2020;22(1):19.

15. Carlsson M, Ugander M, Heiberg E, Arheden H. The quantitative relationship between longitudinal and radial function in left, right, and total heart pumping in humans. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2007;293(1).
16. Johansson Blixt P, Chew MS, Åhman R, et al. Left ventricular longitudinal wall fractional shortening accurately predicts longitudinal strain in critically ill patients with septic shock. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2021;11(1).
17. Dobrovie M, Barreiro-Pérez M, Curione D, et al. Inter-vendor reproducibility and accuracy of segmental left ventricular strain measurements using CMR feature tracking. *Eur Radiol*. 2019;29:6846-6857.
18. Laenens D, Kamperidis V, Tjahjadi C, et al. PROGNOSTIC VALUE OF LEFT VENTRICULAR GLOBAL LONGITUDINAL STRAIN IN PATIENTS WITH HYPERTROPHIC CARDIOMYOPATHY AND LOW-NORMAL LEFT VENTRICULAR EJECTION FRACTION. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2024;83(13):620.
19. Stokke TM, Hasselberg NE, Smedsrud MK, et al. Geometry as a Confounder When Assessing Ventricular Systolic Function. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2017;70(8):942-954.
20. Onishi T, Saha SK, Delgado-Montero A, 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. *Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography*. 2015;28(5):587-596.
21. Ugander M, Carlsson M, Arheden H. Short-axis epicardial volume change is a measure of cardiac left ventricular short-axis function, which is independent of myocardial wall thickness. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2010;298(2).
22. Stephensen S, Steding-Ehrenborg K, Munkhammar P, Heiberg E, Arheden H, Carlsson M. The relationship between longitudinal, lateral, and septal contribution to stroke volume in patients with pulmonary regurgitation and healthy volunteers. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2014;306(6).
23. Margulescu AD, Rees E, Coulson RM, Rees AD, Vinereanu D, Fraser AG. Do left atrial strain and strain rate reflect intrinsic atrial function, or are they determined by left ventricular function? *Kardiol Pol*. 2015;73(7).
24. Khan MA, Yang EY, Zhan Y, et al. Association of left atrial volume index and all-cause mortality in patients referred for routine cardiovascular magnetic resonance: A multicenter study 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1102 Cardiorespiratory Medicine and Haematology. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*. 2019;21(1):1-12.
25. Wenzelburger FWG, Tan YT, Choudhary FJ, Lee ESP, Leyva F, Sanderson JE. Mitral annular plane systolic excursion on exercise: a simple diagnostic tool for heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2011;13(9):953-960.
26. Mălăescu GG, Mirea O, Capotă R, Petrescu AM, Duchenne J, Voigt JU. Left Atrial Strain Determinants During the Cardiac Phases. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. Published online October 2021.
27. Pahlm U, Ostenfeld E, Seemann F, et al. Evolution of left ventricular function among subjects with ST-elevation myocardial infarction after percutaneous coronary intervention. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. 2020;20(1):309.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics

Females, n/total (%)	14/66 (18)
Age, years	62 [53 – 72)]
LVEF, %	48 [34 – 57]
MAPSE, mm	11.1 [8.1 – 13.3]
GLS, %	-15.5 [-17.2 – -11.6]
GCS, %	-16.2 [-18.8 – -11.5]
BSA, m^2	2.0 [1.8 – 2.1]
BMI, kg/m^2	27.5 [24 – 30]
LAS, %	24.4 [19.9 – 26.6]
LVSV, ml	88 [77 – 112]
LV short-axis epicardial diameter, mm	84 [78 – 91]
LVM, g	124 [99 – 150]
LVESV, ml	108 [80 – 170]
LVEDV, ml	216 [166 –280]
LA volume, ml	88 [71 – 112]
LAVi, ml/m^2	43 [36 – 56]

Values are expressed as median [interquartile range]. LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MAPSE, mitral annular plane systolic excursion; GLS, global longitudinal strain; GCS, global circumferential strain; BSA, body surface area; BMI, body mass index; LAS, left atrial strain; LVSV, left ventricular stroke volume; LVM, left ventricular mass; LVESV, left ventricular end-systolic volume; LVEDV, left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LAVi, left atrial volume index.

Table 2. Associations between GLS and left heart measures.

	Univariable		Multivariable		
	R^2	p	Standardized β	p	Global R^2
LVEF, %	0.82	**<0.001**			0.89 **p<0.001**
GCS, %	0.86	**<0.001**			
MAPSE, mm	0.78	**<0.001**	-0.59	**<0.001**	
Indexed MAPSE, %,	0.83	**<0.001**			
LVL, mm	0.23	**<0.001**			
SV, ml	0.19	**<0.001**			
SA area, cm^2	0.53	**<0.001**			
SA area $cm^2 \times$ MAPSE/SV	0.01	0.69			
LVM, g	0.33	**<0.001**	0.12	**0.04**	
LVEDV, ml	0.50	**<0.001**			
LVESV, ml	0.69	**<0.001**	0.37	**<0.001**	
LAS, %	0.51	**<0.001**			
LA, ml	0.13	**<0.01**			

Table 3. Associations between GCS and left heart measures.

	Univariable		Multivariable		
	R^2	p	Standardized β	p	Global R^2
LVEF, %	0.82	**<0.001**			0.80 **p<0.001**
GLS, %	0.86	**<0.001**			
MAPSE, mm	0.61	**<0.001**	-0.41	**<0.001**	
Indexed MAPSE, %	0.84	**<0.001**			
LVL, mm	0.21	**<0.01**			
SV, ml	0.12	**<0.001**			
SA area, cm2	0.53	**<0.001**			
SA area $cm^2 \times$ MAPSE/SV	0.01	0.93			
LVM, g	0.33	**<0.001**	0.02	0.08	
LVEDV, ml	0.50	**<0.001**			
LVESV, ml	0.69	**<0.001**	0.56	**<0.001**	
LAS, %	0.43	**<0.001**			
LAESV, ml	0.13	**<0.01**			

Table 4. Associations between LAS and left heart measures.

	Univariable		**Multivariable**		
	R^2	p	Standardized β	p	Global R^2
LAEDV, ml	0.46	**<0.001**	-0.49	**<0.001**	0.67 **p<0.001**
LAESV, ml	0.18	**<0.001**			
LAES width, mm	0.10	**<0.01**			
LAED width, mm	0.37	**<0.001**			
LAES length, mm	0.13	**<0.01**			
LAED length, mm	0.42	**<0.001**			
GLS, %	0.51	**<0.001**			
MAPSE, mm	0.46	**<0.001**	0.49	**<0.001**	
LVL, mm	0.08	**0.01**			
LVEDV, ml	0.25	**<0.001**			
LVM, g	0.13	**<0.01**			

Table 5. Associations between MAPSE and left heart measures.

	Univariable		**Multivariable**		
	R^2	p	Standardized β	p	Global R^2
LAEDV, ml	0.22	**<0.001**			0.61 **p<0.001**
LAESV, ml	0.05	**0.06**	0.13	0.20	
GLS, %	0.78	**<0.001**			
EF, %	0.71	**<0.001**			
LAS, %	0.57	**<0.001**			
LVM, g	0.17	**<0.001**	-0.44	**0.003**	
LVL, mm	0.06	**0.03**	0.72	**<0.001**	
SA area cm^2	0.33	**<0.001**			
LVESV, ml	0.45	**0.01**	-0.97	**<0.001**	
LVEDV, ml	0.25	**<0.001**			
SV, ml	0.37	**<0.001**			
Age	0.01	**0.64**			

Figure 1. Flowchart of patient inclusion



Figure 2. Representative cases highlighting the association between strain and geometric measures.



Normal		Hypertrophy		Dilation	
LVEF	60 %	**LVEF**	48 %	**LVEF**	27 %
GLS	-19.8 %	**GLS**	-10.3 %	**GLS**	-7.9 %
GCS	-19.8 %	**GCS**	-11.5 %	**GCS**	-7.8 %
MAPSE	15.2 mm	**MAPSE**	9.1 mm	**MAPSE**	7.9 mm
LVEDV	221 ml	**LVEDV**	201 ml	**LVEDV**	338 ml
LV SV	133 ml	**LV SV**	96 ml	**LV SV**	91 ml
LVM	118 g	**LVM**	187 g	**LVM**	216 g
LVL ED	103 mm	**LVL ED**	112 mm	**LVL ED**	104 mm
LAS	39.0 %	**LAS**	18.6 %	**LAS**	11.5 %
LAESV	79 ml	**LAESV**	83 ml	**LAESV**	99 ml
LAL ED	46 mm	**LAL ED**	50 mm	**LAL ED**	69 mm
LAL ES	58 mm	**LAL ES**	66 mm	**LAL ES**	72 mm

All images are shown in the same magnification. End-diastolic (ED) and end-systolic (ES) long-axis (top row) and short-axis (lower row) images of three representative patients with normal (left), hypertrophied (middle), and dilated (right) geometry shown together with measures of left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), global longitudinal strain (GLS), global circumferential strain (GCS), mitral annular plane systolic excursion (MAPSE), LV mass (LVM) and end-diastolic volume (EDV), stroke volume (SV), left atrial strain (LAS), left atrial end-systolic volume (LAESV) and left atrial length (LAL). The white lines denote the LV and left atrial length (LAL) in ED and the white dotted lines LV and LA length in ES. The white double-headed arrows denote septal and lateral MAPSE, respectively. Across all patients and magnitudes of LV function, approximately 60% of the LV stroke volume is generated by the longitudinal movement of the atrioventricular plane (MAPSE), that simultaneously empties and fills the LV and LA. Thus, MAPSE mechanically couples the

function of the LV and LA to each other. Meanwhile, the LV apex and the posterior aspect of the LA are effectively stationary throughout the cardiac cycle. Note that across these representative patients, 1) Intra-individual GLS and GCS are very similar, 2) GLS is a function of both MAPSE and LV volume or length, and 3) LAS is a function of MAPSE and LA volume or length.



Figure 3: Agreement between measured GLS and estimated GLS using MAPSE and LV length. Left: Linear regression (solid line) plot showing the linear correlation between estimated global longitudinal strain (GLS) and GLS, y= -1.10x + 2.59. The dashed line indicates the line of identity. Right: Bland-Altman plot showing the agreement between GLS and GLS estimated as -MAPSE/LVL **100*. Bias±SD was 3.69 ± 1.87%.

Figure 4. Central Illustration



GLS and LAS are geometrically highly associated with MAPSE and LV and LA size as illustrated in the image