TITLE PAGE

Full Title: Left Atrioventricular Coupling Index in Heart Failure Patients Using Echocardiography: A Simple Yet Effective Metric

Short Title: LACI in Heart Failure

Hai Nguyen Ngoc Dang, MD[1¶], Thang Viet Luong, MD[2¶], Hung Khanh Tran, MD[2], Ny Ha Tuyet Le, MD[2], Minh Hoang Nhat Nguyen, MD[1], Thang Chi Doan, PhD[3*], Hung Minh Nguyen, PhD[4]

Author Affiliations:

[1]*The Faculty of Medicine, Duy Tan University, 03 Quang Trung, Hai Chau ward, Da Nang, 550000, Vietnam.*

[2]*University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue University, 06 Ngo Quyen, Vinh Ninh ward, Hue, 530000, Vietnam.*

[3]*Cardiovascular Center, Hue Central Hospital, 16 Le Loi, Vinh Ninh ward, Hue, 530000, Vietnam.*

[4]*Bach Mai Hospital, 78 Giai Phong, Phuong Mai ward, Dong Da district, Ha Noi, 100000, Vietnam.*

***Corresponding author:**

Thang Chi Doan.

Cardiovascular Center, Hue Central Hospital, 16 Le Loi, Vinh Ninh ward, Hue, Vietnam.

Address: 16 Le Loi Street, Hue City, Vietnam.

Zip code Hue: 530000

Email: dr.thangchidoan@gmail.com

¶Hai Nguyen Ngoc Dang and Thang Viet Luong contributed equally to this work.

ORCID:

Hai Nguyen Ngoc Dang: 0009-0006-4512-4658

Thang Viet Luong: 0009-0008-5109-9115

Hung Khanh Tran: 0009-0006-1177-4580

Ny Ha Tuyet Le: 0009-0006-9228-0100

Minh Hoang Nhat Nguyen: 0009-0003-5169-1024

Thang Chi Doan: 0009-0006-4603-3678

Hung Minh Nguyen: 0009-0003-4278-8238

Word count: 5940 words

Left Atrioventricular Coupling Index in Heart Failure Patients Using Echocardiography: A Simple yet Effective Metric

Abstract

Background: Heart failure (HF) is a global health challenge, with significant rates of hospitalization and mortality. Timely diagnosis is crucial for patient outcomes. Noninvasive imaging techniques assess early changes in HF but typically focus on specific aspects of the left atrium (LA) or left ventricle (LV). However, the close physiological interplay between the LA and LV suggests that indices evaluating both chambers, like the left atrioventricular coupling index (LACI), may offer superior diagnosis value for HF.

Method: This cross-sectional study involved 160 patients categorized into patient and healthy control groups. The patient group consisted of 60 adults meeting the criteria for HF diagnosis according to the 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline.

Results: LACI levels were significantly higher in the HF group compared to the control group. Notably, LACI levels were higher in the HF with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) group than in the HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) group. The LACI showed a diagnostic value for HFpEF, with the highest AUC of 0.95 (95% CI: 0.921 - 0.981, $p<0.001$) compared to LASr, LAScd, and LAVI, with an optimal threshold of 33.07 (sensitivity: 97.1%, specificity: 87.3%). In multivariate analysis, LACI was an independent

factor of HFpEF when compared to standard indices for diagnosing HFpEF (OR = 1.144, 95% CI: 1.087–1.205, p<0.001).

Conclusion: HF patients display increased LACI variability compared to healthy individuals, with the most significant increase observed in the HFpEF group. The LACI is an easily assessable parameter with potential value in diagnosing HFpEF.

Keywords: Left Atrioventricular Coupling Index, Heart Failure, Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction, Global Longitudinal Strain, Left Atrial Strain

Nonstandard Abbreviations and Acronyms:

AUC = area under the curve

BMI = body mass index,

BSA = body surface area,

DBP = diastolic blood pressure,

E/A ratio = ratio of early to late diastolic filling velocities,

E/e' ratio = average ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annulus velocity,

e' lateral = lateral early diastolic mitral annulur velocity,

e' septal = septal early diastolic mitral annulur velocity,

EF = ejection fraction,

FS = fractional shortening,

GLS = global longitudinal strain,

HF = heart failure,

HFpEF = heart failure with preserved ejection fraction,

HFrEF = heart failure with reduced ejection fraction,

LA = left atrium,

LACI = left atrioventricular coupling index,

Lad = left atrium diameter,

LAEDV = left atrial end-diastolic volume,

LAScd = left atrial strain conduit function,

LASct = left atrial strain contractile function,

LASr = left atrial strain reservoir function,

LAVI = left atrial volume index,

LV = left ventricle,

LV GLS = global longitudinal strain of the left ventricular,

LVEDV = left ventricular end-diastolic volume,

LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction,

LVMI = left ventricular mass index,

NT-proBNP = N-terminal pro–B-type natriuretic peptide,

NYHA = New York Heart Association,

SBP = systolic blood pressure,

TRV = maximum tricuspid regurgitant velocity.

INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) is considered the end stage of various cardiovascular pathologies, such as hypertension, coronary artery disease, valvular diseases, and structural heart diseases. It poses a significant health challenge with high rates of hospitalization and mortality worldwide, including in Vietnam.[1, 2, 3, 4] Estimates suggest that approximately 64 million people suffer from HF globally, with a rising trend attributed partly to population aging.[2] In patients with systolic HF, the 5-year survival rate is approximately 50%, dropping to 35% after ten years.[5] This imposes a substantial economic burden on both patients and communities.[6]

Given this scenario, early diagnosis is deemed crucial because it can enhance both the quality of life and longevity of patients.[7] Studies have utilized noninvasive imaging to assess structural and functional alterations of the left ventricle (LV) and left atrium (LA) early to identify individuals at high risk of HF. Parameters such as the LV ejection fraction (LV EF), LV mass index (LVMI), global longitudinal strain of the LV (LV GLS), or LA volume index (LAVI) and LA strain have shown diagnostic value in HF, particularly in heart failure preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF).[8, 9, 10, 11, 12] However, these findings solely reflect individual structural/functional aspects of the LA or LV. At the same time, the pathophysiology of HF has demonstrated a close physiological relationship between the LA and LV.[13] This raises the hypothesis that an index assessing both the LA and LV simultaneously could better predict HF than other individual indices of the LA or LV.

Recent study has further supported this. This study has shown that the left atrioventricular coupling index (LACI), calculated as the LA end-diastolic volume divided by the LV end-diastolic volume using cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, is a prognostic indicator of cardiovascular events over ten years.[14] Although cardiac magnetic resonance imaging is the gold standard for assessing chamber volumes, the clinical reality in developing countries such as Vietnam limits patient access to cardiac magnetic resonance imaging compared to noninvasive modalities such as echocardiography. Additionally, in Vietnam, the characteristics of LACI among different HF patient groups and its prognostic and diagnostic value have not been investigated. Therefore, we conducted this study to examine the correlation between the LACI and other echocardiographic indices and to investigate the value of the LACI in diagnosing HF with HFpEF.

METHODS

Study population

This cross-sectional study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Hue University (No: H2021/044), and it adhered strictly to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki (2013 version). The participants were adults over 18 who consented to the study before enrollment. One thousand one hundred forty-five randomly selected patients were recruited from a convenience sample from February 2022 to June 2023 at Hue University of Medicine and Pharmacy (the flowchart of

participant recruitment in the study is shown in **Figure 1**). Among them, 160 subjects who met the study criteria and were not excluded were divided into patient and healthy control groups. The patient group consisted of 60 adults who met the selection criteria for the diagnosis of HF according to the 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the management of HF.[15] The exclusion criteria included severe comorbidities, pacemaker implantation, atrial fibrillation, severe aortic valve stenosis, severe aortic valve regurgitation, severe mitral valve stenosis, severe mitral valve regurgitation, life-threatening conditions, incomplete clinical data, inadequate echocardiographic data, poor echocardiographic image quality, and incomplete image analysis results. Within the heart failure patient group, two subgroups were formed: those with an LVEF ≥ 50% (HFpEF) and those with an LVEF < 50% (HFrEF). The control group comprised 100 healthy adults attending regular check-ups for disease screening, without a history of cardiovascular disease, matched in age with the patient group. Exclusion criteria included unclear or incomplete echocardiographic images hindering accurate analysis of cardiac chamber images.

Clinical Data

All study participants were fully informed about the research's benefits and risks and provided consent for data collection. Height and weight measurements were taken with a weight accuracy of 0.5 kg and a height accuracy of 1 cm. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated using the following formula: BMI = weight (kg)/[(height (m) × (height (m)].

Body surface area (BSA) was calculated using the Du Bois formula: BSA = 0.007184 × (weight)^0.425 × (height)^0.725.[16] Blood pressure was measured according to the American Heart Association's 2019 recommendations.[17] Blood samples for biochemical testing were obtained from venous blood. Quantitative measurement of the N-terminal pro–B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) concentration in the blood was performed on a Roche Cobas e 601 automated biochemical analyzer at the central laboratory unit of Hue University Hospital of Medicine and Pharmacy.

Transthoracic echocardiography

Our study utilized a Philips Affiniti 70 ultrasound machine, which simultaneously recorded electrocardiographic signals during echocardiography. The measurement protocol followed the comprehensive transthoracic echocardiography guidelines for adults established by the American Society of Echocardiography.[18]

The myocardium was analyzed using offline QLAB software version 15 to analyze the LV GLS. All analyses were performed by a highly echocardiographer blinded to the other patient characteristics. Endocardial borders of the LV were delineated on three planes (4-chamber, 2-chamber, and 3-chamber) at end-systole when the LV size was smallest using the point-and-click technique on the LV endocardium. The software automatically performed this. In cases of incomplete tracking, manual adjustments to the endocardial borders were attempted, and if not satisfactory, the patient was excluded from the analysis. The software automatically tracked the endocardial surface of the LV, creating a

region of interest adjusted to encompass the entire myocardial thickness throughout the cardiac cycle. LV GLS was calculated as the change in length divided by the original length of the speckle pattern in the cardiac cycle and expressed as a percentage, with myocardial lengthening represented as positive strain and shortening as negative strain.[19, 20] LV GLS was calculated as the average of 18 peak systolic strain segmental results.[21] LA strain assessment was conducted in both the two-chamber and four-chamber views, with reference points set at the onset of the P wave in the cardiac cycle. Measurements of LA strain were acquired during the reservoir, conduit, and contractile phases of LA function, designated left atrium strain reservoir function (LASr), left atrium strain conduit function (LAScd), and left atrium strain contractile function (LASct), respectively. The results of the LV and LA strains are conventionally represented as negative values. However, for convenience in analysis and display, we utilized the absolute values of these results.

Two-Dimensional echocardiographic methods for assessment of left atrioventricular coupling index

The LACI is the ratio between the left atrial end-diastolic volume (LAEDV) and the left ventricular end-diastolic volume (LVEDV). LA and LV volumes are measured during the end-diastolic phase of the cardiac cycle, identified by the peak of the QRS complex on the electrocardiogram or by the fully closed mitral valve on echocardiography. Measurements were sequentially conducted on four-chamber and two-chamber views.

Biplane Simpson's method was employed to evaluate the LVEDV and LAEDV. The LACI value is expressed as a percentage, with higher LACI values indicating a more significant imbalance between LA and LV volumes during end-diastole, reflecting changes in left atrioventricular coupling[20, 22]. To avoid influencing the research results, the echocardiography procedure for acquiring the LACI was conducted by a separate echocardiography specialist independent of the research team. **Figure 2** illustrates the procedure for calculating the LACI.

Statistical analysis

All the statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS statistical software version 26.0, GraphPad Prism software version 10.1.2.324, and The R Project for Statistical Computing version 4.0.3. The normality of the distribution of variables was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Categorical variables are presented as frequencies and percentages. Normally distributed continuous variables are expressed as the mean ± standard deviation (X ± SD) and median (interquartile range 25 and 75) if the distribution is nonnormal. The study results are presented in tables and graphs. The $\chi 2$ and Fisher's exact tests were used to compare observed proportions and examine relationships between categorical variables. Independent samples t tests were used to compare the mean values of normally distributed continuous variables between two groups with equivalent variances. One-way ANOVA was used for comparisons involving three or more groups. The Mann–Whitney U test was used for comparisons between

two groups, and the Kruskal–Wallis test was used for comparisons involving three or more groups when the distribution was nonnormal or variances were not equivalent. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) between LAVI and other echocardiographic indices was assessed using Pearson correlation to determine whether the distribution was normal or Spearman correlation (r_s) to determine whether the distribution was nonnormal. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were generated to evaluate the diagnostic value of the LACI and other echocardiographic parameters for predicting heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction (LVEF), and the area under the curve (AUC), sensitivity, and specificity were assessed. The AUC indicates the accuracy of the predictive factor, ranging from 0.5 to 1. AUC comparison was conducted using the DeLong method to assess the diagnostic value of strain compared to existing guideline criteria[23]. All the statistical tests were two-sided, and a p value < 0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance. Logistic multivariable regression was conducted to assess the risk of HFpEF of the LACI and other echocardiographic values. We randomly selected 30 of the 160 study participants to evaluate the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). Intraobserver and interobserver variability of LACI was assessed using the ICC. Additionally, the Bland-Altman method assessed inter- and intraobserver reliability among echocardiography experts' results. For intraobserver variability, the same operator independently remeasured the data after seven days. For interobserver

variability, the data were reanalyzed by a second operator blinded to the initial measurements. A p value <0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance.

RESULTS

Baseline demographic and clinical features of the study population

In our study, when comparing the HF group and the control group, there were no differences in age, gender, BMI, or BSA ($p > 0.05$). However, there were statistically significant differences in age, heart rate, systolic blood pressure, and diastolic blood pressure ($p < 0.001$). The detailed parameters are presented in **Table 1**.

In the present study, echocardiographic indices significantly differed between the control and HF groups ($p < 0.001$). Specifically, the LVMI and LAVI were more significant in the HF group than in the control group. Conversely, the LVEF, LV GLS, LASr, LAScd, and LASct were lower in the HF group than in the control group. Details of the echocardiographic parameters are shown in **Table 1**.

Comparison of LACI and speckle tracking echocardiography parameters of the LA and LV in the HF and control groups

Our study revealed that the LACI in both the HFrEF and HFpEF groups was greater than that in the control group, with values of 41.28 ± 15.27% and 59.16 ± 17.94%, respectively, compared to 13.15 ± 3.92%. The LACI in the HFpEF group was significantly greater than that in the HFrEF group. The LV GLS in the HFrEF and HFpEF groups were lower than those in the control group (11.15 ± 3.29%; 17.46 ± 3.83% compared to 20.13

± 2.34%, respectively; all $p<0.001$). Further details are presented in **Table 2** and illustrated in **Figure 3**.

Correlation between LACI and other echocardiographic indices

The correlation analysis of LA and LV parameters obtained from echocardiography is visualized in **Figure 4** as a heatmap. Significant correlations were observed between LACI and EF, LAVI, LVMI, and LV GLS (EF: $r = -0.45$, LAVI: $r_s = 0.59$, LVMI: $r_s = 0.41$, LV GLS: $r = -0.43$, all $p < 0.05$). Further correlational details are clearly illustrated in the heatmap (**Figure 4**).

The value of the LACI and other echocardiographic parameters in diagnosing HFpEF

The sensitivity and specificity of the LACI in diagnosing HFpEF were analyzed by constructing ROC curves. The largest area under the ROC curve (AUC) for LACI was 0.95, with an optimal threshold value of 33.07 (sensitivity 97.1%, specificity 87.3%). A statistically significant difference was observed when comparing the AUC of LACI with that of other echocardiographic parameters using the DeLong method ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, the other parameters' AUC, cutoff points, sensitivity, and specificity are presented in **Table 3** and **Figure 5**.

Logistic regression analysis for assessing HFpEF risk factors

Logistic regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the risk factors for HFpEF using LACI and other echocardiographic indices as covariates. According to the univariate

analysis, higher LACI and lower LASr were identified as risk factors for HFpEF. Furthermore, our multivariate analysis found that LACI and LASr are independent factors of HFpEF compared to standard indices for diagnosing HFpEF. Further details are provided in **Table 4**.

Reliability of LACI measurement

Figure 6 presents the intraobserver and interobserver variability for LACI measurements. The LACI demonstrated good reproducibility, indicated by high ICC values.

DISCUSSION

Our study aimed to examine the LACI among subgroups of HF patients using echocardiography. Our findings were highly promising, as we observed significant differences in LACI among the HFpEF, HFrEF, and control groups (see **Table 2** and **Figure 3**). Furthermore, the LACI showed a high diagnostic value and accuracy in diagnosing HFpEF compared with commonly used indices (**Table 3** and **Figure 5**). Our study indicated an increase in LACI, particularly in the HFpEF group, followed by a significant decrease in the HFrEF group. The pathophysiology of HF can explain this phenomenon. In the HFpEF group, there was a characteristic increase in myocardial stiffness due to fibrosis or alterations in the extracellular matrix of the myocardial tissue, leading to impaired ventricular relaxation, particularly in the LV, resulting in diastolic dysfunction.[24, 25] Inadequate ventricular relaxation impedes blood flow from the LA to the LV, causing increased pressure in the LA and pulmonary veins to compensate during

the early diastolic phase.[26] However, prolonged high pressure exerts more pressure on the LA wall, causing dilation of the LA, thereby increasing both the minimal and maximal LA volumes.[13] In their study, Sung-Hee Shin and colleagues demonstrated that LAVImin is a superior index for reflecting left ventricular filling pressure and predicting HF compared to LAVImax.[27] This is further supported by the fact that the LA bears direct pressure from the LV during end-diastole, making the LA size an optimal indicator of LV diastolic function.[28] However, unlike changes in the LA, in HFpEF patients, the predominant change in the LV is concentric hypertrophy, leading to increased LV wall thickness but minimal impact on the LV chamber volume.[25, 29] Epidemiological and clinical imaging studies have consistently shown that in HFpEF patients, the average LV size falls within normal limits.[29] The disproportionate increase in LA volume relative to the LV during end-diastole results in a high LACI in HFpEF patients. Conversely, although the LACI increased in the HFrEF compared to the control group, it tended to be smaller than that in the HFpEF group. These findings are consistent because both HFrEF and HFpEF give rise to LA dilation. Specifically, eccentric LA remodeling is more pronounced in HFrEF patients, resulting in a larger LA volume than in HFpEF patients.[30] The key difference here is the LV changes in HFrEF, characterized by diastolic dysfunction and LV dilation, eventually leading to increased LV end-diastolic volume.[25] Consequently, the disproportionate volume between the LA and LV during end-diastole is reduced compared to that in HFpEF patients. LV diastolic and filling parameters are often used to

assess cardiac function in HF patients. However, these indicators alone may not accurately reflect overall cardiac function, particularly in HFpEF patients, where LV filling parameters may not accurately reflect the severity of HF. Recent studies have highlighted the LACI as an index that can assess LV diastolic function effectively and predict HFpEF.[28, 31] The current research demonstrated significant differences in LACI between HF patients and controls, especially in HFpEF patients. Therefore, LACI, as additional data, may be helpful for clinicians in diagnosing HFpEF.

Our study found that the LACI yielded promising results in diagnosing HFpEF. Compared to other modern techniques, such as speckle tracking echocardiography for assessing LV GLS and LA strain, which require sophisticated ultrasound machines and analysis software, widespread investment and application may be challenging, particularly in developing countries such as Vietnam. On the other hand, LACI is a simple technique that can be directly performed on 2D echocardiographic images available on most current ultrasound devices. With its favorable results and ease of implementation, LACI could be widely applied as a cost-effective technique for diagnosing HFpEF, especially in developing countries lacking resources for other advanced equipment.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Our study has provided valuable insights into the LACI among HF patients, especially those with HFpEF. However, certain limitations need to be acknowledged. Firstly, its small sample size and single-center focus limited the study, which may introduce

selection bias. Secondly, our study on LACI did not assess patients with specific rhythm disorders, particularly atrial fibrillation, which can contribute to HF. Thirdly, this cross-sectional study can only establish correlations rather than causal relationships. Therefore, a longitudinal study is needed to address this issue. Lastly, there is a limitation regarding the research equipment, as the study was conducted using a specific ultrasound machine and ultrasound software. Further research could compare results from various manufacturers of ultrasound software.

CONCLUSION

HF patients exhibit increased variability in LACI compared to healthy individuals, with the most significant increase observed in the HFpEF group. The LACI is an easily assessable parameter with potential value in diagnosing HFpEF.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author contributions: Hai Nguyen Ngoc Dang: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, writing - original draft, writing - review & editing. Thang Viet Luong: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, writing - original draft, writing - review & editing. Hung Khanh Tran, Ny Ha Tuyet Le, Minh Hoang Nhat Nguyen, Thang Chi Doan, Hung Minh Nguyen: Writing - original draft, writing - review & editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

DISCLOSURES

None

REFERENCES

1. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, Delling FN, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics—2020 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 Jun 25];141. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000757

2. Shahim B, Kapelios CJ, Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure: An Updated Review. *Card. Fail. Rev.* 2023;9:e11.

3. Davis RC. ABC of heart failure: History and epidemiology. *BMJ*. 2000;320:39–42.

4. Nguyen N-T-V, Tran DT, Le An P, Van Hoang S, Nguyen H-A, Chau HN. Clinical Phenotypes and Age-Related Differences in Presentation, Treatment, and Outcome of Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Vietnamese Multicenter Research. *Cardiol. Res. Pract.* 2021;2021:1–9.

5. Jones NR, Roalfe AK, Adoki I, Hobbs FDR, Taylor CJ. Survival of patients with chronic heart failure in the community: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur. J. Heart Fail.* 2019;21:1306–1325.

6. James SL, Abate D, Abate KH, Abay SM, Abbafati C, Abbasi N, Abbastabar H, Abd-Allah F, Abdela J, Abdelalim A, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2018;392:1789–1858.

7. Thomson C, Cuthbert J, O'Nwere-Tan TA. How can we improve the diagnosis of heart failure? *InnovAiT Educ. Inspir. Gen. Pract.* 2022;15:706–711.

8. Pezel T, Viallon M, Croisille P, Sebbag L, Bochaton T, Garot J, Lima JAC, Mewton N. Imaging Interstitial Fibrosis, Left Ventricular Remodeling, and Function in Stage A and B Heart Failure. *JACC Cardiovasc. Imaging*. 2021;14:1038–1052.

9. 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 Fail.* 2019;21:891–900.

10. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, Gardner RS, Baumbach A, Böhm M, Burri H, Butler J, Čelutkienė J, Chioncel O, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *Eur. Heart J.* 2021;42:3599–3726.

11. Dal Canto E, Remmelzwaal S, Van Ballegooijen AJ, Handoko ML, Heymans S, Van Empel V, Paulus WJ, Nijpels G, Elders P, Beulens JW. Diagnostic value of echocardiographic markers for diastolic dysfunction and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Heart Fail. Rev.* 2022;27:207–218.

12. Otani K, Higa Y, Kitano T, Nabeshima Y, Takeuchi M. Prediction of cardiac events using fully automated GLS and BNP titers in patients with known or suspected heart failure. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15:e0234294.

13. Sengupta PP, Narula J. À LA Mode Atrioventricular Mechanical Coupling. *JACC Cardiovasc. Imaging*. 2014;7:109–111.

14. Pezel T, Garot P, Toupin S, Sanguineti F, Hovasse T, Unterseeh T, Champagne S, Morisset S, Chitiboi T, Jacob AJ, et al. AI-Based Fully Automated Left Atrioventricular Coupling Index as a Prognostic Marker in Patients Undergoing Stress CMR. *JACC Cardiovasc. Imaging*. 2023;16:1288–1302.

15. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, Allen LA, Byun JJ, Colvin MM, Deswal A, Drazner MH, Dunlay SM, Evers LR, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the

Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Jun 25];145. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIR.0000000000001063

16. Du Bois D, Du Bois EF. A formula to estimate the approximate surface area if height and weight be known. 1916. *Nutr. Burbank Los Angel. Cty. Calif*. 1989;5:303–311; discussion 312-313.

17. Casey DE, Thomas RJ, Bhalla V, Commodore-Mensah Y, Heidenreich PA, Kolte D, Muntner P, Smith SC, Spertus JA, Windle JR, et al. 2019 AHA/ACC Clinical Performance and Quality Measures for Adults With High Blood Pressure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Performance Measures. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes*. 2019;12:e000057.

18. Mitchell C, Rahko PS, Blauwet LA, Canaday B, Finstuen JA, Foster MC, Horton K, Ogunyankin KO, Palma RA, Velazquez EJ. Guidelines for Performing a Comprehensive Transthoracic Echocardiographic Examination in Adults: Recommendations from the American Society of Echocardiography. *J. Am. Soc. Echocardiogr*. 2019;32:1–64.

19. Laufer-Perl M, Gilon D, Kapusta L, Iakobishvili Z. The Role of Speckle Strain Echocardiography in the Diagnosis of Early Subclinical Cardiac Injury in Cancer

Patients—Is There More Than Just Left Ventricle Global Longitudinal Strain? *J. Clin. Med.* 2021;10:154.

20. Dang HNN, Luong TV, Ho BA. Evaluation of the relationship between left atrial stiffness, left ventricular stiffness, and left atrioventricular coupling index in type 2 diabetes patients: a speckle tracking echocardiography study. *Front. Cardiovasc. Med.* 2024;11:1372181.

21. Yingchoncharoen T, Agarwal S, Popović ZB, Marwick TH. Normal Ranges of Left Ventricular Strain: A Meta-Analysis. *J. Am. Soc. Echocardiogr.* 2013;26:185–191.

22. Leiner T. Left Atrioventricular Coupling for Early Prediction of Incident Atrial Fibrillation. *Radiology*. 2022;303:327–328.

23. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. *Biometrics*. 1988;44:837–845.

24. Schwinger RHG. Pathophysiology of heart failure. *Cardiovasc. Diagn. Ther.* 2021;11:263–276.

25. Heinzel FR, Hegemann N, Hohendanner F, Primessnig U, Grune J, Blaschke F, De Boer RA, Pieske B, Schiattarella GG, Kuebler WM. Left ventricular dysfunction in

heart failure with preserved ejection fraction—molecular mechanisms and impact on right ventricular function. *Cardiovasc. Diagn. Ther.* 2020;10:1541–1560.

26. Lester SJ, Tajik AJ, Nishimura RA, Oh JK, Khandheria BK, Seward JB. Unlocking the Mysteries of Diastolic Function. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2008;51:679–689.

27. Shin S, Claggett B, Inciardi RM, Santos ABS, Shah SJ, Zile MR, Pfeffer MA, Shah AM, Solomon SD. Prognostic Value of Minimal Left Atrial Volume in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* 2021;10:e019545.

28. Lange T, Backhaus SJ, Schulz A, Evertz R, Kowallick JT, Bigalke B, Hasenfuß G, Thiele H, Stiermaier T, Eitel I, et al. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance-derived left atrioventricular coupling index and major adverse cardiac events in patients following acute myocardial infarction. *J. Cardiovasc. Magn. Reson.* 2023;25:24.

29. Shah AM. Ventricular Remodeling in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. *Curr. Heart Fail. Rep.* 2013;10:341–349.

30. Melenovsky V, Hwang S-J, Redfield MM, Zakeri R, Lin G, Borlaug BA. Left Atrial Remodeling and Function in Advanced Heart Failure With Preserved or Reduced Ejection Fraction. *Circ. Heart Fail.* 2015;8:295–303.

31. Backhaus SJ, Lange T, Schulz A, Evertz R, Frey SM, Hasenfuß G, Schuster A. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance rest and exercise-stress left atrioventricular

coupling index to detect diastolic dysfunction. *Am. J. Physiol.-Heart Circ. Physiol.* 2023;324:H686–H695.

TABLES

Table 1: Baseline Demographic and Clinical Features and Echocardiographic Parameters of the Study Population

	Heart Failure (n = 60)	**Control (n = 100)**	**p value**
Baseline Demographic and Clinical Features			
Age (years)	60.53 ± 8.21	59.14 ± 6.70	0.244
Male (%)	33 (55.0%)	43 (43.0%)	0.141
BMI (kg/m^2)	22.20 ± 3.82	22.16 ± 2.29	0.953
BSA (m^2)	1.56 ± 0.20	1.55 ± 0.13	0.799
Heart rate (pulse/min)	84.45 ± 10.32	78.36 ± 11.96	< 0.001
SBP (mmHg)	130 [121 - 140]	120 [115 - 130]	< 0.001
DBP (mmHg)	80 [80 - 80]	75 [70 - 80]	< 0.001
NYHA	2 [2 - 3]	NA	NA
NT-proBNP (pg/mL)	833 [292 - 2507]	NA	NA
Echocardiography			
LAd (cm)	3.47 ± 0.60	3.08 ± 0.45	< 0.001

LAVI (mL/m^2)	27.69 [19.80 - 36.93]	17.53 [14.83 - 21.10]	< 0.001
LVMI (g/m^2)	129 [104.25 - 157.25]	94 [81.85 - 114.82]	< 0.001
EF (%)	46.55 ± 15.87	69.76 ± 6.65	< 0.001
FS (%)	30.81 ± 11.08	39.34 ± 5.36	< 0.001
E/A ratio	0.87 [0.58 - 1.27]	0.77 [0.66 - 0.89]	0.338
e' lateral (cm/s)	12.34 [9.47 - 21.67]	9.55 [7.66 - 11.37]	< 0.001
e' septal (cm/s)	14.73 [10.16 - 24.90]	7.31 [5.89 - 9.26]	< 0.001
E/e' ratio	12.35 [9.04 - 21.26]	8.38 [6.88 - 10.37]	< 0.001
TRV (cm/s)	251 [181 - 307]	116 [99- 170]	< 0.001
LV GLS (%)	14.73 ± 4.77	20.13 ± 2.35	< 0.001
LASr (%)	19.31 ± 9.67	32.65 ± 5.39	< 0.001
LAScd (%)	9.01 ± 6.93	16.15 ± 6.44	< 0.001
LASct (%)	10.29 ± 5.85	16.50 ± 4.45	< 0.001
LACI (%)	51.41 ± 18.94	13.16 ± 3.93	< 0.001

Values are presented as the mean ± standard deviation, median [Q25 - Q75], or number (%) as appropriate. BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; NYHA, New York Heart Association; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro–B-type natriuretic peptide; Lad, left atrium diameter; LAVI, left atrial

volume index; LVMI, left ventricular mass index; EF, ejection fraction; FS, fractional shortening; E/A ratio, ratio of early to late diastolic filling velocities; e' lateral, lateral early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; e' septal, septal early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; E/e' ratio, average ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annulus velocity; TRV, maximum tricuspid regurgitant velocity; LV GLS, left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LASr, left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd, left atrial conduit strain; LASct, left atrial contractile strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index.

Table 2: Speckle-tracking echocardiography parameters of the LA, LV, and LACI of the study population.

	Control (n = 100)	**HFpEF (n = 34)**	**HFrEF (n = 26)**	**p value**
LV GLS (%)	20.13 ± 2.34	17.46 ± 3.83	11.15 ± 3.29	< 0.001
LASr (%)	32.65 ± 5.39	23.52 ± 9.07	14.91 ± 8.35	< 0.001
LAScd (%)	16.15 ± 6.44	10.12 ± 6.28	7.85 ± 7.51	< 0.001
LASct (%)	16.50 ± 4.45	13.40 ± 5.40	7.05 ± 4.42	< 0.001
LACI (%)	13.15 ± 3.92	59.16 ± 17.94	41.28 ± 15.27	< 0.001

The values are presented as the means ± standard deviations. LV GLS, left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LASr, left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd, left atrial conduit strain; LASct, left atrial contractile strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index.

Table 3. Values of echocardiographic indices in the diagnosis of HFpEF.

Parameter	AUC	95% CI	p value	Cutoff Point	Sensitivity	Specificity
LV GLS (%)	0.586	0.482 to 0.689	0.130	18.55	61.8%	61.1%
LACI (%)	0.951	0.921 to 0.981	<0.001	33.07	97.1%	87.3%
LASr (%)	0.694	0.583 to 0.804	0.002	22.69	60.0%	77.4%
LAScd (%)	0.685	0.580 to 0.790	0.004	13.62	84.0%	54.8%
LASct (%)	0.584	0.463 to 0.705	0.190	16.00	76.0%	50.0%
LAVI (ml/m^2)	0.662	0.548 to 0.776	0.004	34.00	41.2%	91.3%
E/e' ratio	0.505	0.324 to 0.685	0.960	14.00	9.1%	91.8%
TRV (cm/s)	0.589	0.409 to 0.769	0.290	280.00	23.1%	94.7%
e' septal (cm/s)	0.618	0.452 to 0.785	0.200	7.00	72.7%	50.9%

e' lateral (cm/s)	0.564	0.395 to 0.732	0.490	10.00	81.8%	30.9%

LAVI, left atrial volume index; e' lateral, lateral early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; e' septal, septal early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; E/e' ratio, average ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annulus velocity; TRV, maximum tricuspid regurgitant velocity; LV GLS, left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LASr, left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd, left atrial conduit strain; LASct, left atrial contractile strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index.

Table 4. Regression analysis for prediction of HFpEF susceptibility.

Variables	**Univariable**				**Multivariable**			
	P value	**OR**	**95%CI**		**P value**	**OR**	**95%CI**	
LACI (%)	**< 0.001**	1.108	1.074	1.143	**< 0.001**	1.144	1.087	1.205
LV GLS (%)	0.330	0.959	0.881	1.043				
LASct (ms)	0.312	0.963	0.894	1.036				
LAScd (ms)	**0.008**	0.907	0.845	0.975	0.208			
LASr (%)	**0.008**	0.942	0.902	0.984	**0.033**	0.847	0.685	0.989
LVMI (g/m^2)	0.052	1.010	1.000	1.020				
LAVI (mL/m^2)	**< 0.001**	1.085	1.043	1.129	0.496	0.977	0.914	1.044

e’ septal (cm/s)	**0.025**	0.633	0.425	0.943	0.565	1.077	0.836	1.388
e’ lateral (cm/s)	0.055	0.580	1.006	1.044				
E/e’ ratio	0.517	1.020	0.951	1.095				
TRV (cm/s)	**0.002**	1.011	1.004	1.019	0.321	0.985	0.956	1.015

Bold values indicate $p \leq 0.050$. Abbreviations: LAVI: left atrial volume index; LVMI: left ventricular mass index; e’ lateral: lateral early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; e’ septal: septal early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; E/e’ ratio: average ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annulus velocity; TRV: maximum tricuspid regurgitant velocity; LV GLS: left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LASr: left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd: left atrial conduit strain; LASct: left atrial contractile strain; LACI: left atrioventricular coupling index.

FIGURE AND FIGURE LEGENDS



Figure 1: Flowchart of the selection process according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFpEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction.



Figure 2: Measurement of the LAEDV and LVEDV using the biplane method to calculate the LACI index using two-dimensional echocardiography. Panel A: Measurement of LV volume in the 4-chamber view. Panel B: Measurement of LV volume in the 2-chamber view. Panel C: Measurement of LA volume in the 4-chamber view. Panel D: Measurement of LA volume in the 2-chamber view.



Figure 3: Comparison of LACI, LAVI, and LV GLS indices among HFpEF, HFrEF, and the control group. LAVI, left atrial volume index; LV GLS, global longitudinal strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFpEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction.



Figure 4: Heatmap illustrating the relationships between echocardiographic parameters. The color of each cell corresponds to the magnitude and direction of the correlation coefficient, with red indicating a positive correlation and blue indicating a negative correlation. The numerical values within the cells represent the two-way correlation coefficient. NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro–B-type natriuretic peptide; LAVI, left

atrial volume index; LVMI, left ventricular mass index; LV EF, left ventricular ejection fraction; E/A, ratio of early to late diastolic filling velocities; e' lateral, lateral early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; e' septal, septal early diastolic mitral annulur velocity; E/e' ratio, average ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annulus velocity; TRV, maximum tricuspid regurgitant velocity; LV GLS, left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LASr, left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd, left atrial conduit strain; LASct, left atrial contractile strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index.



Figure 5: ROC curves of LASr, LAScd, LACI, and LAVI for diagnosing HFpEF. LAVI, left atrial volume index; LASr, left atrial reservoir strain; LAScd, left atrial conduit strain; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index.



Figure 6: Bland-Altman plot with marginal histograms for interobserver and intraobserver agreement in assessing the reliability of LACI measurement. Panel A:

Intraobserver variability of LACI. Panel B: Interobserver variability of LACI. Bias: mean of differences between the two experts, Upper LoA: upper level of limits of agreement = mean of differences + 1.96 standard deviation, Lower LoA: lower level of limits of agreement = mean of differences - 1.96 standard deviation, r: Pearson correlation coefficients, ICC: Intraclass correlation coefficient, SEM: standard error of measurement.

Graphical Abstract



Graphical Abstract: Left Atrioventricular Coupling Index in Heart Failure Patients Using Echocardiography: A Simple Yet Effective Metric. HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; LACI, left atrioventricular coupling index; LAVI, left atrial volume index, LASr, left atrial reservoir strain, LV GLS, left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LV EF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LAEDV, left atrial end-diastolic volume; LVEDV, left ventricular end-diastolic volume.