

Impact of Hypertension on Left Heart Remodelling: Echocardiography and Computed Tomography Study

Running Title: Lange A, et al. Left Heart Remodelling in Hypertension

Aleksandra Lange, MD,DM,FRACP¹; Viktoria Palka²; Chris Bian, BChME,MEng,PhD;¹

Harry Huntress MSc^{1,2}; Jill Morgan, BSc¹; Sean Allwood BAppSc,MSc,DMU¹;

Rohan Swann, ADCLT,GDClinPhys,DMU¹; Przemysław Palka, MD,PhD,FRACP¹

¹Queensland Cardiovascular Group, Brisbane, Australia

²University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Address for correspondence:

Dr Aleksandra Lange, DM
Orcid ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3556-1214>
Queensland Cardiovascular Group
Level 8; 457, Wickham Terrace (QLD 4000)
Brisbane, Australia
Phone: +61-07-30161111
Email: aleksandra@qcg.com.au

Word count: 5993

ABSTRACT

Background

Early recognition of left atrial (LA) and left ventricular (LV) remodelling may improve prognosis of patients with hypertension.

Methods

Left heart coupling indices were studied to investigate the adaptive effect of hypertension on cardiac remodelling. The ratio of LV to LA volumes was measured at selected phases of a cardiac cycle using computed tomography (CT) coronary angiography and transthoracic echocardiogram (TTE). A group of 180 patients was divided into Group 1 (no hypertension) and Group 2 (hypertension). Volume ratios were measured in diastasis by both CT and TTE: LV_{dias} and LA_{dias} . Using TTE, volumes were measured at end-diastole (LV_{ED} and LA_{min}), and end-systole (LV_{ES} and LA_{max}). LA function and LV/LA ratios were analysed at: LV_{ED}/LA_{max} , LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} , LV_{ED}/LA_{min} , LV_{ES}/LA_{min} .

Results

There were no differences between the age groups, LV_{ED} , and LV mass index. Compared to Group 1, Group 2 had bigger mean LV wall thickness (0.90 ± 0.16 cm vs 0.83 ± 0.14 cm; $p=0.006$), increased relative wall thickness ratio (0.39 ± 0.09 vs 0.35 ± 0.008 , $p=0.004$), and more frequent concentric LV remodelling (31 vs 12, $p=0.020$). LA volumes were bigger in Group 2 for LA_{max} , LA_{dias} , and LA_{min} . All LV/LA volume ratios were lower in Group 2 compared to Group 1 (LV_{ED}/LA_{max} 1.55 ± 0.56 vs 1.79 ± 0.69 , $p=0.010$; LV_{ED}/LA_{min} 3.56 ± 2.00 vs 4.59 ± 2.56 , $p=0.003$; LV_{ES}/LA_{min} 1.36 ± 0.77 , $p=0.005$, LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} (TTE) 1.75 ± 0.61 vs 2.24 ± 1.24 , $p<0.001$, LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} (CT) 1.49 ± 0.23 vs 1.69 ± 0.41 , $p<0.001$). LA reservoir function and conduit function indexed by E/e' ratio was lower in Group 2. Combined TTE parameters of relative wall thickness >40 , $LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} \leq 1.81$, and indexed

by E/e' LA reservoir function ≤ 0.068 had the highest discriminate power to differential patients from Group 1 and Group 2 (area under the curve 0.737).

Conclusions

In hypertension, prior to the development of LV hypertrophy, adaptive remodelling is based on reduced LV/LA volume ratio, reduced indexed reservoir LA function, and increased relative LV wall thickness.

Abbreviations and non-standard acronyms:

CT: Computed Tomography

HF: Heart Failure

LA: Left Atrial/Atrium

LA_{dias}: Left Atrial diastasis volume

LA_{max}: Left atrial maximum volume

LA_{min}: Left atrial minimal volume

LV: Left Ventricle/Ventricular

LV_{dias}: Left Ventricular diastasis volume

LV_{ED}: Left Ventricular end-diastolic volume

LV_{ES}: Left Ventricular end-systolic volume

TTE: Transthoracic Echocardiogram

INTRODUCTION

Between 1990 and 2019, the number of people with hypertension doubled from 648 million to 1.277 billion worldwide.¹ Although treatment and control rates have improved, more timely detection of hypertension is needed as the cumulative effect of hypertension ultimately leads to cardiac overload, remodelling, and heart failure (HF).²⁻⁴ Each month of active antihypertensive therapy is associated with 1-day prolongation of life expectancy free from cardiovascular death.⁵ While it is clear that hypertension increases all-cause mortality, the detection of early adaptive stages of cardiac remodelling is not straightforward.^{3,6-10} Current criteria focuses on the effects of the maladaptive process, assessed at the point when the left ventricular (LV) wall thickness and mass^{11,12} are already increased, and LV filling has changed with additional dilatation of both, the left atrium (LA) and the LV.^{6,9} It has been shown that the best prognosis for patients is during the adaptive stage.^{13,14} By proposing an easily obtainable score for the early detection of cardiac remodelling, during the adaptive response and prior to the development of LV hypertrophy and LA dysfunction, we would facilitate early diagnosis and better prognosis. We sought to test the clinical significance of the LV to LA volume relationship to address the concept of atrioventricular interplay and changes in hypertensive heart disease in patients with no underlying ischaemic heart disease.^{15,16} The assessment of LV to LA volume ratio was measured at selected phases of the cardiac cycle using transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) and computed tomography (CT) coronary angiography and modelled as a surrogate for global (net) left-heart atrio-ventricular adaptive remodelling in patients with hypertension.

METHODS:

Our study population was formed of patients aging between 40 to 80 years who were referred for CT coronary angiography between February 2019 to August 2021. Patients with recent onset of shortness of breath and/or chest pain and a low-moderate risk were chosen from our

clinical referral cohort if they met the following selection criteria: (1) were in sinus rhythm, (2) had absence of valvopathy $\geq 2/4$, (3) LV ejection fraction was $\geq 50\%$, (4) had CT coronary angiography and TTE of diagnostic image quality. Patients with documented myocardial ischaemia and/or history of previous myocardial infarction, coronary artery revascularisation were not included. An original group of 232 patients was selected. From this group, a total of fifty-one patients were excluded. Nine of the fifty-one patients were excluded in view of ongoing symptoms and subsequently documented myocardial ischemia requiring coronary artery revascularisation. Thirty of the fifty-one patients were excluded as their CT coronary angiography was a systolic scan. Twelve of the fifty-one patients were excluded in view of incomplete TTE or CT data (**Figure 1**). This final study group of one-hundred-eighty patients was divided into two groups according to clinical information. Group 1 contained patients who had no clinical evidence of hypertension and diabetes (n=83), and Group 2 had patients diagnosed with hypertension (n=97). There were no differences between Group 1 and Group 2 in relation to basic characteristics including age, gender, and heart rate, **Table 1**. A group of 136 out of 180 (76%) patients were willing to participate in a follow up survey post CT coronary angiography. The average time of the survey was 422 ± 250 days [range 106-1148 days]. Ongoing chest pain was more frequently noted in Group 2 compared to Group 1. No difference was noted between the groups in all other symptoms that included the presence of fatigue, shortness of breath and depression/anxiety.¹⁷ The quality-of-life score (EQ-5D-5L)¹⁸ was similar in both groups. Only two major cardiovascular events were noted at the time of the follow up. In Group 1 – one patient had pulmonary embolism diagnosed at day 451, and in Group 2 – one patient required percutaneous coronary artery intervention at day 814.

The data was prospectively collected and analysed. The study complies with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved by UnitingCare Health Human Research Ethics

Committee (number 2019.29.307), Brisbane, Australia. Informed consent has been obtained from all patients. We followed the STARD guidance for conducting and reporting quality.

TTE was acquired using commercially available equipment Phillips EPIQ CVx (Philips North America Corporation, Andover, MA) or Siemens SC200 (Siemens Medical Solutions, Mountain View, Calif). Standard clinical imaging protocol was applied to each patient. The protocol consisted of M-mode, 2-Dimensional and Doppler analysis.^{19,20} Apical views were optimised to avoid foreshortening of the either LV and/or LA. The LV volume was measured using the biplane Simpson's method at end-diastole – LV_{ED} , end-systole – LV_{ES} , and at diastasis – LV_{dias} . The LA area was planimtered from the 4-chamber and the 2-chamber view, excluding the LA appendage and the pulmonary veins. Subsequent LA volumes were calculated using the biplane area-length method.¹⁹ LA volume was measured in three phases of the cardiac cycle: maximum – LA_{max} (at LV end-systole), minimum – LA_{min} (at LV end-diastole) and during diastasis – LA_{dias} as previously described.²¹ Mitral inflow peaks early (E) and late diastolic (A) velocities were measured by pulsed wave Doppler. Septal and lateral LV annular velocities (e') as well as right ventricle lateral annular velocities (s') were measured using tissue Doppler. Each measurement was averaged from three cardiac cycles. All study patients were divided according to American Society of Echocardiography/European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging recommendations for the classification of LV diastolic dysfunction.²⁰ In the indeterminate subgroup, if the difference in pulmonary venous flow atrial reversal duration to mitral inflow A wave duration was more than 30 ms, the data was used as a marker of diastolic dysfunction and elevated LV filling pressure. **Table 2** lists all measured TTE parameters that were taken for the analysis. LA function parameters include: LA reservoir function: total emptying volume and emptying fraction; LA conduit Function: LA passive emptying volume and emptying fraction; LA pump function: LA active emptying volume and emptying fraction.²¹

CT coronary angiography was acquired in a standard manner using 256iCT Philips scanner (Philips North America Corporation, Andover, MA). The iCT has 270-ms gantry rotation time and a temporal resolution of 135 ms. Scan parameters were 128X0.625 mm collimation. An intravenous injection of iodinated contrast media (Omnipaque 350) was used to opacify the coronary arteries and subsequently the LA and the LV. The scan was acquired during a single breath-hold. Scans were acquired with a Prospective ECG-Gated Axial Step-and-Shoot/Sequential technique. Only patients scanned in diastasis between 75%-81% of the R-R interval were chosen for the analysis with the standard acquisition occurring at 78%. LA volume was measured with exclusion for the LA appendage. LV volume was measured using an automated algorithm within the Cardiac software of the Philips Intellispace Portal. CT Diastolic Function Assessment – The diastolic expansion index was measured as ratio between diastasis LV and LA volume ($LV_{\text{dias}}/LA_{\text{dias}}$).²²

Statistical Analysis. Continuous variables are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation and categorical variables are expressed as a number and percentages. Unpaired t-test, Chi-square, Fisher exact test or Meng's Z-test for correlated correlation coefficients was used when appropriate for comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. For the predefined CT and TTE measurements, logistic regression analysis with the method of DeLong was used to assess the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, Youden index J point with cut off value to differentiate patients from Group 2 and Group 1. Sensitivity and specificity were calculated in a standard manner. For all analyses, p values <0.05 were considered significant. All analysis were performed by JMP 15 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) and MedCalc Version 20.109 (Oostende, Belgium).

RESULTS

Patient characteristics are presented in **Table 1**.

Comparison of clinical data: Group 2 had higher blood pressure (mm Hg) for both systolic (138 ± 15 vs 125 ± 12 , $p<0.001$, respectively), and diastolic (80 ± 9 vs 75 ± 9 , $p<0.001$, respectively) readings. Hyperlipidaemia was noted more frequently in Group 2 (67 (69%) vs 44 (53%), $p=0.027$)

Comparison of 2-Dimensional Echocardiographic Data (Table 2):

Patients in Group 2 had thicker interventricular septum (cm) (0.93 ± 0.19 vs 0.85 ± 0.16 , $p=0.005$, respectively), LV posterior wall (cm) (0.87 ± 0.17 vs 0.82 ± 0.16 , $p=0.042$, respectively), and mean LV wall thickness (0.90 ± 0.16 vs 0.83 ± 0.14 , $p=0.006$, respectively). There was no presence of LV hypertrophy in either of the groups. The ratios of LV_{ED} to mean wall thickness as well as LV_{ED} index to mean wall thickness ratio were higher in Group 1 as compared to Group 2 (117 ± 32 vs 107 ± 29 , $p=0.028$, respectively and 61 ± 16 vs 55 ± 14 , $p=0.005$, respectively). The LV relative wall thickness ratio was higher in Group 2 (0.39 ± 0.09 vs 0.35 ± 0.08 , $p=0.004$, respectively). Concentric LV remodelling was present more often in Group 2 (31 (32%) vs 12 (14%), $p=0.020$, respectively).

There were no differences between the groups in the measurements of the following: LV mass index, and LV ejection fraction. There were also no differences between the groups in the measurements of LV volumes (minimum - LV_{ES} , maximum - LV_{ED} , and in diastasis - LV_{dias}).

The analysis of the LA showed that in Group 2, the LA was bigger for the following measurements: LA_{max} (67 ± 26 vs 59 ± 23 , $p=0.040$, respectively), LA_{dias} (48 ± 19 vs 41 ± 17 , $p=0.006$, respectively), and LA_{dias} index (25 ± 9 vs 21 ± 9 , $p=0.012$, respectively), and both LA_{min} (31 ± 14 vs 26 ± 14 , $p=0.022$, respectively) and LA_{min} index (16 ± 7 vs 14 ± 7 , $p=0.037$, respectively).

All LV/LA volume coupling indices were lower in Group 2 as compared to Group 1, with the biggest difference being in diastasis: LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} (1.75 ± 0.61 vs. 2.24 ± 1.24 $p < 0.001$, respectively).

None of the standard LA function parameters differed between Group 1 and 2.

Indexed reservoir function (LA total emptying fraction divided by E/e' ratio) and indexed conduit function (LA passive emptying fraction divided by E/e' ratio) were higher in Group 1 (0.082 ± 0.054 vs 0.056 ± 0.023 , $p < 0.001$, respectively; and 0.052 ± 0.038 vs 0.032 ± 0.019 , $p < 0.001$).

Comparison of Doppler Data (Table 2): Group 2 had lower e' values for both septum (6.8 ± 1.7 cm/s vs 7.5 ± 2.2 cm/s, $p = 0.047$, respectively), and lateral wall (8.2 ± 2.2 cm/s vs 9.7 ± 3.2 cm/s, $p = 0.005$, respectively). The mean value of E/e' ratio averaged for both septum and lateral was higher in Group 2 (9.7 ± 3.1 vs 8.1 ± 2.8 , $p = 0.003$, respectively). There was no difference between Group 1 and Group 2 when the cut off value for E/e' was set at above 14. Tricuspid Regurgitation velocity higher than 2.8 m/sec was more frequent in Group 2.

Comparison of combined criteria for LV diastolic dysfunction (Table 2): LV diastolic dysfunction was more common in Group 2. Normal LV diastolic function was noted in 58 (59%) patients in Group 2 and 54 (65%) patients in Group 1. LV diastolic dysfunction was noted in 22 (22%) patients in Group 2 and in 7 (8%) patients in Group 1. An indeterminate LV diastolic function was noted in 17 (17%) patients in Group 2 and in 22 (27%) patients in Group 1.

CT Data (Table 2):

As noted in the TTE data, there was no difference between the groups for LV mass and LV mass index. There was no difference between the groups in LV volume measured in diastasis whether taken as mean value or indexed for body surface area. The ratio of LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} was lower in Group 2 than in Group 1 (1.49 ± 0.23 vs 1.68 ± 0.41 , $p < 0.001$, respectively). Also,

LA_{dias} was bigger in Group 2 for total volume (88 ±20 ml vs 81 ±20 ml, p=0.016, respectively), and indexed for body surface area (45 ±9 ml/m² vs 42 ±9 ml/m², p=0.033, respectively).

Receiver operating characteristics of both TTE and CT derived parameters are presented in **Table 3**. All measured parameters were analysed using receiver operating characteristics in order to discriminate patients with hypertension. We have followed the original concept of classifying the symptoms into one of the two categories, disease or no disease.

Predictive modelling for **CT data** showed that the following measurements had discriminatory power to differentiate patients with hypertension: (i) for LA_{dias} >77 ml (area under the curve (AUC) 0.617, confidence interval (CI) 0.542-0.689, p=0.006); (ii) for LA_{dias} index >44 ml/m² (AUC 0.602, CI 0.527-0.674, p=0.016), (iii) and for LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} ratio ≤1.76 (AUC 0.643, CI 0.569-0.713, p<0.001). The LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} ratio ≤1.76 had the highest sensitivity of 91% but low 36% specificity.

Predictive modelling for **TTE data** includes a few parameters listed in **Table 3**. The three parameters with AUC >0.63 were: E/e' (average) ≥8 (AUC 0.662, CI 0.576-0.741, p=0.001), e' lateral ≤9.5 (AUC 0.643, CI 0.546-0.732, p=0.009), and LV_{ED}/LA_{min} ≤3.81 (AUC 0.629, CI 0.554-0.700, p=0.002) (**Figure 2A**). All three had similar range of sensitivity and specificity. The two indexed LA function indices were lower in hypertension (**Figure 2B**): indexed reservoir function (AUC 0.694, CI 0.609-0.770, p<0.001), and indexed LA conduit function (AUC 0.678, CI 0.592-0.756, p<0.001). Their sensitivity and specificity were 74%, 62% and 92% and 44%, respectively.

Parameters that have the best predictive value for the presence of hypertension (**Figure 3**):

Three TTE derived parameters were chosen for their best overall accuracy to predict the presence of hypertension. These are: 1- relative wall thickness >40, 2- LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} ≤1.81, and 3-LA reservoir function indexed by E/e' ≤0.068. They were subsequently grouped

together to propose an overall diagnostic score. This method provided the highest AUC of 0.737. Sensitivity, specificity, and overall accuracy of combined TTE score are shown in **Table 4**. The score was graded accordingly where 0 is the minimum, and 3 is the maximum score obtained if each of the three parameters scored one point.

DISCUSSION

The presence of LV hypertrophy remains the hallmark of hypertension and represents the effect of the maladaptive process that leads to contractile dysfunction.^{6,11,12,23} It is the most widely used measure of assessment for established features of systemic hypertension and is familiar to clinicians. The sequence of gradual adaptive changes in left heart anatomy and function that eventually lead to the presence of LV hypertrophy is of ongoing interest.^{7,8,24,25} Most of the previous studies which describe noted features of early hypertension are predominantly based on studying the changes isolated either to the LV and/or to the LA. In this study the concept of volume ratio as a single left atrioventricular parameter in detecting early remodelling in hypertension was assessed. By using TTE we were able to compare the diagnostic values of preselected phases of the cardiac cycle. The concept of the ratio of LA to LV diameter as a potential non-invasive marker of LV compliance was used previously using TTE, and LA to LV diameter ratio ≥ 1.0 was observed in hypertension and diabetes.¹⁵ The importance of left atrioventricular coupling index was highlighted by Pezel et. al.²⁶, who derived the ratio of LA to LV volume, from end-diastole, using Cardiac Magnetic Resonance. They have noted that the ratio is a strong predictor for the incidence of HF, atrial fibrillation, and coronary disease mortality.²⁶ Since the cumulative effect of hypertension leads to cardiac remodelling and vascular aging²⁷, early diagnosis is paramount. Therefore, establishing a protocol that is easy to follow, of routinely obtained parameters, to detect and to monitor hypertension, would be very useful in clinical routine in improving the diagnosis rate and to improve long term prognosis.

In this patient population of hypertensive patients, we found that there was a trend among left heart coupling indices, all of them being available from a routine clinical echocardiogram, each of which allowed to bring new information on left heart remodelling process in hypertension.

LA Volume and Function:

Larger LA volumes were noted at end-systole - maximum (LA_{max}), end-diastole - the minimum (LA_{min}), and in diastasis (LA_{dias}). This process of LA dilatation is a response to increasing LV filling pressure, in due course increasing LA pressure and finally, increased LA wall stress.^{25,28} In order to maintain adequate preload in the setting of increasing LV filling pressure, LA contraction will need to increase correspondingly.²⁹ We have observed only a borderline increase in active emptying volume ($p=0.057$), and a borderline reduction in passive LA emptying. However, when total emptying fraction (reservoir) and passive emptying fraction (conduit) were indexed by E/e' ratio, we found those to be lower in patients with hypertension. This finding is in support of the concept that the changes in LA reservoir and LA conduit dysfunction are noted earlier and LA systolic dysfunction occurs later in disease progression and is secondary to LV structural remodelling and LA afterload mismatch.^{24,30} LA diastolic filling i.e. reservoir filling, is determined by both LA relaxation and compliance, the latter being determinant of stroke volume and an important determinant of LA function.³¹ A similar reduction in indexed LA reservoir function was noted in the past in patients with HF with preserved ejection fraction.¹⁶ In the current study, indexed LA reservoir function and indexed LA conduit function were found both to be better than LV mass index in diagnosing hypertension with their cut off values of 0.068 and 0.053, respectively.

Volume ratio Analysis:

Earlier studies of others used retrospective cardiac CT volumetric data in the evaluation of diastolic dysfunction and prediction of HF.³² In this study, prospective gated cardiac CT diastasis volumetric data and TTE were used to analyse LV/LA volume ratio in selected phases of the cardiac cycle. Despite the absence of both LV dilatation and LV hypertrophy, the ratio of LV/LA volume was reduced in patients with hypertension. This LV/LA volume ratio index was reduced not only when measured in diastasis (LV_{dias}/LA_{dias}) using both CT and TTE, but also in TTE as maximum to minimum (LV_{ED}/LA_{min}), maximum to maximum (LV_{ED}/LA_{max}), and minimum to minimum (LV_{ES}/LA_{min}). Power analysis of TTE derived volume ratio indices showed that LV_{ED}/LA_{min} ratio and LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} were the most accurate to distinguish patients with hypertension with cut off values of 3.81 and 1.81, respectively. Both were more accurate in describing hypertension than either LA_{max} index or LV mass index.

The three TTE parameters with $AUC > 0.63$ were: E/e' (average) ≥ 8 , e' lateral ≤ 9.5 , and $LV_{ED}/LA_{min} \leq 3.81$. All three had a similar range of sensitivity and specificity. The advantage of LV/LA volume ratio is that it is a simple parameter, available in most patients and as examined in this paper, of value using both TTE and CT coronary angiography. Whether this will be also applicable to other cardiac imaging techniques remains to be seen.

Combined TTE Scoring Index:

We have proposed a new scoring index in which three parameters: (1) relative wall thickness > 40 ; (2) $LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} \leq 1.81$; and (3) indexed LA reservoir function ≤ 0.068 , are used to diagnose patients with hypertension. Each parameter if present is worth one point and the maximum total score of three is possible. This concept of combining those three parameters proved more accurate than using either LV mass index, relative wall thickness, or any of the other measured parameters alone. The score of 3 was 95% specific with the score of 2

showing 75% specificity and 56% sensitivity to diagnose hypertension. The score of 0 to 1 had high sensitivity of 100% to 84% but low specificity to exclude hypertension.

PERSPECTIVES

Using TTE and CT data, a new left atrioventricular coupling index was identified to detect early left heart remodelling in patients with hypertension. An abnormal ratio of LV to LA volume measured in diastasis, using both TTE and CT, was a predictor of underlying hypertension. A combined power of three TTE parameters had a better diagnostic value than individual LA or LV parameters measured separately. The new index score of three parameters could prove useful in improving early diagnosis, define progress of left heart remodelling, and subsequently may lead to the improvement of long term prognosis.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Professor Robert Ware from the Griffith University, Queensland for his critical comments and statistical advice. We would like to thank Professor Andrzej Lange for his critical comments and guidance.

Sources of Funding: This project was supported by Wesley Medical Research Clinical Research Grant #2020-23.

Disclosures: All authors report that they have no relationship with the industry to be disclosed.

REFERENCES

1. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD-Risk C): Zhou Bin, Carillo-Larco M, Danaei G, Riley LM, Paciorek CJ, Stevens GA, Gregg EW, Bennett JE, Solomon B, Singleton RK, et al. Worldwide trends in hypertension prevalence and progress in treatment and control from 1990 to 2019: a pooled analysis of 1201 population- representative studies with 104 million participants. *Lancet*. 2021;398:957-80.
2. Messarli FH, Rimoldi SF, Bangalore S. The transition from hypertension to heart failure. Contemporary update. *J Am Coll Cardiol HF*. 2017;8:544-551.
3. Reges O, Ning H, Wilkins JT, Wu CO, Tian X, Domanski MJ, Lloyd-Jones DM, Allen NB. Association of cumulative systolic blood pressure with long-term risk of cardiovascular disease and healthy longevity. Findings from the lifetime risk pooling project cohorts. *Hypertension*. 2021;77:347-356.
4. Tsioufis C, Georgiopoulos G, Oikonomou D, Thomopoulos C, Katsiki N, Kasiakogias A, Chrysochoou C, Konstantinidis D, Kalos T, Tousoulis D. Hypertension and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: Connecting the dots. *Curr Vasc Pharmacol*. 2017;16:15-22.
5. Kostis JB, Cabrera J, Cheng JQ, Cosgrove NM, Deng Y, Pressel SL, Davis BR. Association between chlorthalidone treatment of systolic hypertension and long-term survival. *JAMA*. 2011;306:2588-93.
6. Bang CN, Gerds E, Aurigemma GP, Boman K, de Simone G, Dahlöf B, Køber L, Wachtell K, Devereux RB. Four-group classification of left ventricular hypertrophy based on ventricular concentricity and dilatation identifies a low-risk subset of eccentric hypertrophy in hypertensive heart. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2014;7:422-429.

7. González A, Ravassa S, López B, Moreno MU, Beaumont MJ, José GS, Querejeta R, Bayés-Genís, Díez J. Myocardial remodelling in hypertension. Toward a new view of hypertensive heart disease. *Hypertension*. 2018;72:549-558.
8. Kockskämper J, Pluteanu F. Left atrial myocardium in arterial hypertension. *Cells*. 2022;11:3157.
9. Santos M, Shah AM. Alterations in cardiac structure and function in hypertension. *Curr Hypertens Rep*. 2014;16:428.
10. Rønningen PS, Berge T, Gankås Solberg M, Enger S, Pervez MO, Orstad EB, Kvisvik B, Aagaard EN, Lyngbakken MN, Ariansen I, et al. Impact of blood pressure in the early 40s on left atrial volumes in the mid-60s: data from ACE 1950 study. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2022;11:e023738.
11. Drazner MH. The progression of hypertensive heart disease. *Circulation* 2011;123:327-34.
12. Aronow WS. Hypertension and left ventricular hypertrophy. *Ann Trans Med*. 2017;5:310.
13. Avraham S, Abu-Sharki S, Shofti R, Haas T, Korin B, Kalfon R, Friedman T, Shiran A, Saliba W, Shaked Y, Aronheim A. Early cardiac remodelling promotes tumor growth and metastasis. *Circulation*. 2020;142:670-683.
14. Zakeri R, Moulay G, Chai Q, Ogut O, Hussain S, Takahama H, Lu T, Wang X-L, Linke WA, Lee H-C, Redfield M. Left atrial remodelling and atrioventricular coupling in a canine model of early heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2016;9:e003238.
15. Spevack DM, Blum L, Malhotra D, Nazari R, Ostfeld RJ, Doddamani S, Bello RB, Cohen HW, Sonnenblick EH. Ratio of left atrial to left ventricular size: An anatomical

- marker of the diastolic left ventricular pressure-volume relationship. *Echocardiography*. 2008;25:366-373.
16. Reddy YNV, Obokata M, Egbe A, Yang JH, Pislaru S, Lin G, Carter R, Borlaug BA. Left atrial strain and compliance in the diagnostic evaluation of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Eur J Heart Failure*. 2019;21:891-900.
 17. Henry JD, Crawford JR. The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2005;44:227-239.
 18. Hernandez G, Garin O, Pardo Y, Vilgaut G, Pont A, Suárez M, Neira M, Rajmil L, Gorostiza I, Ramallo-Farina Y, et al. Validity of the EQ-5D-5L and reference norms for the Spanish population. *Quality of Life Research*. 2018;27:2337-2348.
 19. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, Flachskampf FA, Foster E, Goldstein SA, Kuznetsova T, 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. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2015;16:233-71.
 20. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP, Byrd 3rd BF, Dokainish H, Edvardsen T, Flachskampf FA, Gillebert TC, Klein AL, Lancellotti P, et al. Recommendations for the evaluation of left ventricular diastolic function by echocardiography: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2016;29:277-314.
 21. Blume GG, McLeod CJ, Barnes ME, Seward JB, Pellikka PA, Bastiansen PM, Tsang TSM. Left atrial function: physiology, assessment, and clinical implications. *Eur J Echocardiogr*. 2011;12:421-430.

22. Lange A, Huntress H, Steindl J, Palka P. Incremental role of CT coronary angiography in the assessment of left ventricular diastolic function. *Open Heart*. 2021;8:e001566.
23. Bombelli M, Vanoli J, Facchetti R, Maloberti A, Cuspidi C, Grassi G, Mancia G. Impact of the increase in left ventricular mass on the risk of long-term cardiovascular mortality: a prospective cohort study. *Hypertension*. 2023;80:1321-1330.
24. Baltabaeva A, Marciniak M, Bijmens B, Parsai C, Moggridge J, Antonios TF, Macgregor GA, Sutherland GR. How to detect early left atrial remodelling and dysfunction in mild-to-moderate hypertension. *Journal of Hypertension*. 2009;27:2086-2093.
25. Eshoo S, Ross DL, Thomas L. Impact of mild hypertension on left atrial size and function. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2009;2:93-99.
26. Pezel T, Venkatesh BA, De Vasconcellos HD, Kato Y, Shabani M, Xie E, Heckbert SR, Post WS, Shea SJ, Allen NB, et al. Left atrioventricular coupling index as a prognostic marker of cardiovascular events: The MESA Study. *Hypertension*. 2021;78:661-671.
27. Wang Y, Wang J, Zheng X-W, Du M-F, Zhang X, Chu C, Wang D, Liao Y-Y, Ma Q, Jia H, et al. Early-life cardiovascular risk factor trajectories and vascular aging in midlife: a 30 year prospective cohort study. *Hypertension*. 2023;80:1057-1066.
28. Marwick TH, Gillebert TC, Aurigemma G, Chirinos J, Derumeaux G, Galderisi M, Gottdiener J, Haluska B, Ofili E, Segers P, et al. Recommendations on the use of echocardiography in adult hypertension: A report from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging (EACVI) and the American Society of echocardiography (ASE). *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2015;28:727-54.

29. Thomas JD, Choong CY, Flachskampf FA, Weyman AE. Analysis of the early transmitral Doppler velocity curve: effect of primary physiologic changes and compensatory preload adjustment. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1990;16:644–55.
30. Barbier P, Solomon SB, Schiller NB, Glantz SA. Left atrial relaxation and left ventricular systolic function determine left atrial reservoir function. *Circulation.* 1999;100:427-436.
31. Abhayaratna WP, Seward JB, Appleton CP, Douglas PS, Oh JK, Tajik AJ, Tsang TSM. Left atrial size: Physiologic determinants and clinical applications. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2006;47:2357–2363.
32. Lessick J, Mutlak D, Efraim R, Naami R, Mutlak M, Sheik-Muhamad R, Abadi S, Aronson D. Comparison between echocardiography and cardiac computed tomography in the evaluation of diastolic dysfunction and prediction of heart failure. *Am J Cardiol.* 2022;181:71-78.

Table 1. Patient clinical characteristics and follow-up survey.

Mean \pm Standard deviation or number (%)	Group 1 (No hypertension) n=83	Group 2 (Hypertension) n=97	Correlation coefficient	95% Confidence interval	P value
Age (years)	59 \pm 10	61 \pm 8	0.115	-0.032-0.257	0.126
Female gender	42(51)	55(56)	0.061	-0.086-0.205	0.416
Blood pressure, systolic (mmHg)	125 \pm 12	138 \pm 15	0.418	0.289-0.531	<0.001
Blood pressure, diastolic (mmHg)	75 \pm 9	80 \pm 9	0.269	0.128-0.400	<0.001
Heart rate (beats/min)	66 \pm 13	67 \pm 11	0.057	-0.090-0.201	0.449
Obstructive sleep apnoea	25(30)	38(40)	0.095	-0.052-0.238	0.206
Hyperlipidaemia	44(53)	67(69)	0.167	0.019-0.304	0.027
Type II diabetes	-	9(9)	0.212	0.068-0.348	0.004
Follow-up participants	58(70)	78(80)	0.122	-0.025-0.264	0.102

Days since enrolment	463±263	392±237	-0.141	-0.302-0.028	0.101
[range]	106-1148	92-1114			
Chest pain	1(2)	10(13)	0.223	0.038-0.393	0.019
Shortness of breath	8(14)	15(19)	0.083	-0.106-0.266	0.391
Depression anxiety stress scale score-21*	9±8	9±7	-0.005	-0.192-0.182	0.956
Quality of life score†	75±20	78±18	0.065	-0.124-0.249	0.503

*, DASS-21¹⁷; †, EuroQol 5 dimensions 5 levels¹⁸

Table 2. Echocardiographic (A) and computed tomography (B) data.

Mean \pm Standard deviation or number (%)	Group 1 (No hypertension)	Group 2 (Hypertension)	Correlation coefficient	95% Confidence interval	P value
A.					
Interventricular septal thickness, cm	0.85 \pm 0.16	0.93 \pm 0.19	0.211	0.065-0.347	0.005
LV posterior wall thickness, cm	0.82 \pm 0.16	0.87 \pm 0.17	0.153	0.006-0.293	0.042
Mean LV wall thickness, cm	0.83 \pm 0.14	0.90 \pm 0.16	0.207	0.061-0.343	0.006
LV diameter, cm	4.80 \pm 0.65	4.68 \pm 0.61	-0.095	-0.239-0.052	0.205
LV mass, g	136 \pm 43	144 \pm 47	0.086	-0.061-0.231	0.251
LV mass index, g/m ²	71 \pm 18	73 \pm 19	0.069	-0.079-0.214	0.361
LV _{ED} , ml	96 \pm 26	95 \pm 25	-0.036	-0.181-0.111	0.634
LV _{ED} index, ml/m ²	50 \pm 10	48 \pm 10	-0.084	-0.228-0.063	0.264
LV _{dias} , ml	79 \pm 24	77 \pm 21	-0.045	-0.191-0.102	0.545
LV _{dias} index, ml/m ²	41 \pm 10	39 \pm 8	-0.098	-0.241-0.049	0.192

LV _{ES} , ml	37±12	36±12	-0.024	-0.170-0.123	0.747
LV _{ES} index, ml/m ²	19±5	18±5	-0.059	-0.204-0.089	0.435
LV ejection fraction, %	62±5	62±5	-0.029	-0.174-0.118	0.702
LA _{max} , ml	59±23	67±26	0.153	0.007-0.293	0.040
LA _{max} index, ml/m ²	31±11	34±12	0.145	-0.002-0.285	0.053
LA _{dias} , ml	41±17	48±19	0.203	0.059-0.339	0.006
LA _{dias} index, ml/m ²	21±9	25±9	0.187	0.042-0.324	0.012
LA _{min} , ml	26±14	31±14	0.171	0.025-0.309	0.022
LA _{min} index, ml/m ²	14±7	16±7	0.155	0.009-0.295	0.037
E/A, ratio	1.2±0.5	1.1±0.4	-0.105	-0.267-0.063	0.221
e' septal, cm/s	7.5±2.2	6.8±1.7	-0.173	-0.333-(-)0.002	0.047
e' later, cm/s	9.7±3.2	8.2±2.2	-0.264	-0.430-(-)0.081	0.005
E/e' (average), ratio	8.1±2.8	9.7±3.1	0.256	0.091-0.408	0.003
Estimated right ventricular systolic pressure, mmHg	24±9	25±10	0.066	-0.115-0.242	0.477
Tricuspid regurgitation, >2.8 m/sec	3(4)	12(12)	0.176	0.004-0.337	0.045

Atrial reversal-A-wave (duration), ms	11±34	15±46	0.050	-0.150-0.246	0.623
LV hypertrophy and remodelling:					
LV hypertrophy, *	5(6)	12(12)	0.003	-0.143-0.150	0.964
Relative wall thickness, ratio	0.35±0.08	0.39±0.09	0.216	0.071-0.351	0.004
LV _{ED} /Mean wall thickness, ratio	117±32	107±29	-0.165	-0.301 - -0.018	0.028
LV _{ED} index/Mean wall thickness, ratio	61±16	55±14	-0.211	-0.348-(-)0.066	0.005
Concentric remodelling †	12(14)	31(32)	0.173	0.027-0.311	0.020
LV/LA volume coupling indices:					
LV _{ED} /LA _{max} , ratio	1.79±0.69	1.55±0.56	-0.191	-0.328-(-)0.046	0.010
LV _{dias} /LA _{dias} , ratio	2.24±1.24	1.75±0.61	-0.249	-0.382-(-)0.107	<0.001
LV _{ED} /LA _{min} , ratio	4.59±2.56	3.56±2.00	-0.221	-0.356-(-)0.076	0.003
LV _{ES} / LA _{min} , ratio	1.75±1.04	1.36±0.77	-0.209	-0.346-(-)0.065	0.005
LA function parameters: ‡					
Total Emptying Volume, ml	33±17	36±19	0.076	-0.071-0.219	0.308
Total Emptying Fraction, %	55±17	52±16	-0.109	-0.246-0.043	0.166

Passive Emptying Volume, ml	22±15	22±16	-0.012	-0.148-0.145	0.981
Passive Emptying Fraction, %	36±16	32±18	-0.135	-0.275-0.012	0.072
Active Emptying Volume, ml	11±9	14±11	0.142	-0.004-0.282	0.057
Active Emptying Fraction, %	29±23	28±22	-0.014	-0.160-0.132	0.853
Combined volume/Doppler indices: §					
Indexed LA reservoir function (LA total emptying fraction/ E/e'), ratio	0.082±0.054	0.056±0.023	-0.312	-0.457-(-)0.151	<0.001
Indexed LA conduit function (LA passive emptying fraction/ E/e'), ratio	0.052±0.038	0.032±0.019	-0.317	-0.461-(-)0.157	<0.001
Diastolic LV dysfunction grade:					
Normal	54(65)	58(59)	-0.196	-0.350-(-)0.032	0.020
Abnormal	7(8)	22(22)	0.199	0.036-0.352	0.017
Indeterminate	22(27)	17(17)	-0.109	-0.251-0.038	0.147
B.					
LV mass, g	123±35	130±38	0.088	-0.064-0.236	0.255

LV mass index, g/m ²	64±14	65±13	0.062	-0.090-0.211	0.423
LV _{dias} , ml	133±34	130±30	-0.048	-0.192-0.099	0.526
LV _{dias} index, ml/m ²	69±14	66±12	-0.108	-0.250-0.039	0.150
LA _{dias} , ml	81±20	88±20	0.179	0.034-0.317	0.016
LA _{dias} index, ml/m ²	42±9	45±9	0.159	0.013-0.298	0.033
LV _{dias} /LA _{dias} ratio	1.69±0.41	1.49±0.23	-0.288	-0.416-(-)0.148	<0.001

*, LV mass index female ≥ 95 or male ≥ 115 , g/m²; †, relative wall thickness ratio >0.42 and LV mass index female <95 or male <115 , g/m²; ‡, as per Blume et al.²¹; §, as per Ready et al.¹⁶ with modification; ||, as per Naguen et al.²⁰ LV, left ventricular, LA, left atrial, LV_{ED}, left ventricular end-diastolic volume, LV_{ES}, left ventricular end-systolic volume, LV_{dias}, left ventricular diastasis volume, LA_{max}, left atrial maximum volume, LA_{dias}, left atrial diastasis volume, LA_{min}, left atrial minimum volume; E/e', early diastolic mitral inflow to mitral annular tissue velocities.

Table 3. Power analysis of (A) transthoracic echocardiographic and (B) computed tomography parameters for diagnosis of hypertension.

Variable	Cut off value	AUC	95% Confidence interval	Sensitivity %	Specificity %	Z statistics	P value
A.							
Interventricular septal thickness, cm	>0.95	0.624	0.548-0.695	41	79	2.965	0.003
Mean LV wall thickness, cm	>0.80	0.617	0.541-0.689	78	44	2.772	0.006
LA _{max} , ml	>52	0.592	0.517-0.665	69	48	2.169	0.030
LA _{max} index, ml/m ²	>30	0.585	0.510-0.658	63	58	1.989	0.047
LA _{dias} , ml	>40	0.617	0.542-0.688	65	61	2.778	0.005
LA _{dias} index, ml/m ²	>20	0.612	0.537-0.684	68	55	2.671	0.008
LA _{min} , ml	>21	0.622	0.547-0.693	78	46	2.896	0.004
LA _{min} index, ml/m ²	>12	0.611	0.536-0.683	70	52	2.631	0.009
e' lateral, cm/s	≤9.5	0.643	0.546-0.732	75	57	2.633	0.009
E/e' (average)	≥8	0.662	0.576-0.741	70	59	3.394	0.001
Tricuspid regurgitation, >2.8 m/sec	-	0.556	0.467-0.643	16	95	2.141	0.032

LV remodelling indices:							
LV relative wall thickness, ratio	>0.40	0.626	0.550-0.697	40	82	3.013	0.003
LV _{ED} /mean wall thickness	≤124	0.604	0.528-0.677	75	43	2.432	0.015
LV _{ED} index/mean wall thickness	≤57	0.627	0.551-0.698	61	62	3.007	0.003
Concentric remodelling		0.572	0.496-0.645	29	86	2.386	0.017
LV/LA volumetric coupling indices:							
LV _{dias} /LA _{dias}	≤1.81	0.627	0.552-0.698	65	58	3.020	0.002
LV _{ES} /LA _{min}	≤1.23	0.614	0.538-0.686	54	67	2.686	0.007
LV _{ED} /LA _{min}	≤3.81	0.629	0.554-0.700	70	55	3.051	0.002
LV _{ED} /LA _{max}	≤1.24	0.626	0.550-0.697	38	87	3.008	0.003
Combined volumetric/Doppler indices: *							
Indexed LA reservoir function (LA total emptying fraction/ _{E/e'}), ratio	≤0.068	0.694	0.609-0.770	74	62	4.103	<0.001
Indexed LA conduit function (LA passive emptying fraction/ _{E/e'}), ratio	≤0.053	0.678	0.592-0.756	92	44	3.726	<0.001

Diastolic LV dysfunction grade: †							
Normal	-	0.580	0.494-0.663	27	89	2.468	0.014
Abnormal	-	0.581	0.495-0.663	27	89	2.512	0.012
B.							
LA _{dias} , ml	>77	0.617	0.542-0.689	66	59	2.766	0.006
LA _{dias} index, ml/m ²	>44	0.602	0.527-0.674	52	67	2.411	0.016
LV _{dias} /LA _{dias} , ratio	≤1.76	0.643	0.569-0.713	91	36	3.381	<0.001


*, as per Ready et al.¹⁶ with modification; †, as per Naguen et al.²⁰; LV, left ventricular; LA, left atrial; LV_{ED}, left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LV_{ES}, left ventricular end-systolic volume; LV_{dias}, left ventricular diastasis volume; LA_{max}, left atrial maximum volume; LA_{dias}, left atrial diastasis volume; LA_{min}, left atrial minimum volume; E/e', early diastolic mitral inflow to mitral annular tissue velocities; AUC, area under the curve.

Table 4. Sensitivity and specificity of combined echocardiographic parameters scoring to diagnose patients with hypertension.

Score*	Sensitivity %	95% confidence interval	Specificity %	95% confidence interval
0	100	96-100	0	0-4.3
1	84	75-90	45	34-56
2	56	45-66	75	64-84
3	22	14-31	95	88-99


*, Score from 0-3. One point for each: (i) relative wall thickness >40, (ii) left ventricular diastasis volume to left atrial diastasis volume ratio (LV_{dias}/LA_{dias}) ≤ 1.81 , and (iii) indexed by E/e' (early diastolic mitral inflow to mitral annular tissue velocities) LA reservoir function ≤ 0.068 .

Figure 1. Patients' selection.




LV, left ventricular; LA, left atrial; CTCA, computed tomography coronary angiography; TTE, transthoracic echocardiogram.

Figure 2. Comparison between the receiver operating characteristics curves for echocardiographic parameters for diagnosis of hypertension, **A**–left heart remodelling indices; **B**–Left atrial (LA) function as compared to left ventricular (LV) mass index and left atrium maximum volume (LA_{max}) index.




B Transthoracic Echocardiogram LA Function indices versus LV mass index



i-Indexed LA reservoir function, ii-Indexed LA Conduit Function, iii-LA total emptying fraction, iv-LA pump emptying fraction, v-LA active emptying volume, vs LV mass index.

*, Relative wall thickness versus LV mass index (Δ area under the curve (AUC) 0.152, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.029 – 0.275, $P=0.015$); †, LV_{ED}/LA_{min} versus LA_{max} index (Δ AUC 0.113, 95% CI 0.138 – 0.212, $P=0.026$); ††, LV_{ED}/LA_{min} versus LV mass index (Δ AUC 0.141, 95% CI 0.006 – 0.276, $P=0.040$); §, LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} versus LA_{max} index (Δ AUC 0.122, 95% CI 0.021 – 0.222, $P=0.018$); ||, LV_{dias}/LA_{dias} versus LV mass index (Δ AUC 0.150, 95% CI 0.008 – 0.291, $P=0.038$); ¶, E/e' versus LV mass index (Δ AUC 0.147, 95% CI 0.014 – 0.281, $P=0.031$); **, Index LA reservoir function versus LV mass index (Δ AUC 0.177, 95% CI 0.044 – 0.307, $P=0.008$); †††, Index LA conduit function versus LV mass index (Δ AUC 0.161, 95% CI 0.037 – 0.285, $P=0.011$).

Figure 3. Power analysis of echocardiographic parameters to diagnose hypertension.



*, scale 0-3 points: (i) Relative wall thickness >40, (ii) Left ventricle diastasis volume to left atrial diastasis volume ratio (LV_{dias}/LA_{dias}) ≤ 1.81 , (iii) Index left atrial (LA) reservoir function ≥ 0.068 .
 AUC, area under the curve; CI, confidence interval; LA, left atrial; LV, left ventricle; E/e', early diastolic mitral inflow to mitral annular tissue velocities.