Deteriorated mechanics of left ventricular diastolic filling one year after coronary artery bypass grafting

Running title - Deteriorated LV diastolic mechanics post-CABG

Joakim Norderfeldt MD[a], Martin G Sundqvist MD PhD[b], Eva Maret MD PhD[a], Ulrika Löfström MD[c, d], Matthias Corbascio MD PhD[a, e], Camilla Hage PhD[f, g], Mattias Ekström MD PhD[h, i], Håkan Wallén MD PhD[h, i], Patrik Lyngå PhD[b], Bengt Persson MD PhD[j], Hans E Persson MD PhD[h], Cecilia Linde MD PhD[f, g], David Marlevi PhD[a, k, *], Maria J Eriksson MD PhD[a, l, *], Martin Ugander MD PhD[a, l, m, *, §]

[a] Department of Molecular Medicine and Surgery, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,
[b] Department of Clinical Science and Education and Cardiology Unit, Södersjukhuset, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,
[c] Department of Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,
[d] Department of Cardiology, Capio St. Görans Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden,
[e] Department of Cardiothoracic surgery, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden,
[f] Department of Cardiology, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden,
[g] Department of Medicine, Cardiology Unit, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,
[h] Department of Cardiology, Danderyd Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden,
[i] Department of Clinical Sciences, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden,
[j] Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Science for Life Laboratory, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden,

[k] Institute for Medical Engineering and Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA,

[l] Department of Clinical Physiology, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden,

[m] Kolling Institute, Royal North Shore Hospital, and University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia,

The study was performed at Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

[§] Corresponding author

[*] Shared last author

Address for correspondence,

Martin Ugander

martin.ugander@gmail.com

Kolling Building, Level 12

Royal North Shore Hospital

St Leonards, Sydney, NSW 2065

Australia

Total word count of the manuscript: 5535

Funding

The research was funded in part by a grant to HEP and CL from AstraZeneca, a grant to DM from the European Union (ERC, MultiPRESS, 101075494), a grant to MJE from the Swedish

Heart and Lung Foundation, and grants to MU from New South Wales Health, Heart Research Australia, and the University of Sydney. Views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency.

Disclosures

CH reports consulting fees from Novartis, Roche Diagnostics, Abbott, and AnaCardio; research grants from Bayer; and speaker honoraria from AstraZeneca and Novartis. ME reports postdoctoral research grants from the Novartis Foundation for Medical and Biological Research. PL reports lecture honoraria from Novartis, Boehringer-Ingelheim, and Pfizer. HEP reports research grants from Novartis, and Roche, as well as speaker honoraria from Vifor, AstraZeneca, Novartis, and Läkartidningen.

All other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data availability

Data is available upon reasonable request.

Abstract

Background: Ischemic heart disease impairs left ventricular (LV) diastolic function, but little is known about changes in the mechanical properties of LV relaxation following coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). **Objectives:** This study aimed to explore if and how the mechanics of LV filling change following CABG. **Methods**: Patients underwent transthoracic echocardiography before and one year after elective CABG. Mitral inflow E-waves were analysed using the parameterized diastolic filling (PDF) method, allowing for quantification of mechanical properties of diastolic function. **Results**: Among patients (n=96, 10% female, median [interquartile range] age 68 [62–74] years), LV ejection fraction (LVEF) at baseline was 59 [53–63] %. At follow-up, there was an increase in the PDF-derived measures of myocardial stiffness, damping, peak driving and resistive forces, together with increase in left atrial (LA) volume index, and a decrease in LA conduit and contractile strains and tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion ($p<0.001$ for all). There was no change in heart rate, LV size, LVEF, E/e´ ratio, or LV filling efficiency. Furthermore, there were no differences in the mechanics of LV filling in patients when grouped according to baseline LVEF, or the number of revascularized coronary arteries. **Conclusions**: One year after CABG, there was consistent deterioration in the mechanics of diastolic filling assessed using mechanistic evaluation. Revascularization with CABG worsens diastolic function one year after CABG. However, causes and significance of these changes remain to be further investigated. The PREFERS study is registered at clinicaltrials.gov with ID-number NCT03671122.

Key words: Diastolic dysfunction, Echocardiography, Coronary Artery Bypass Graft surgery, Cardiac mechanics, Left Ventricular Function.

1. Introduction

Ischemic heart disease gives rise to a broad range of symptoms and myocardial changes driven by different pathophysiological processes. Diastolic dysfunction is one of the first manifestations of impaired cardiac function due to myocardial ischemia[1].

Left ventricular (LV) diastolic function is characterized by LV relaxation, stiffness, and early diastolic recoil. All of these factors influence LV filling pressure. Furthermore, LV diastolic dysfunction has been shown to impact both patient symptoms and outcomes[2]. Echocardiography is a cornerstone in the evaluation of LV diastolic properties and function[2].

Current clinical guidelines on echocardiographic evaluation of LV diastolic function[3] aim to determine whether LV filling pressure is elevated or not. However, such analysis does not consider the inherent mechanical characteristics of the myocardium, with elevated myocardial stiffness a quantifiable marker of progressive heart failure[4, 5]. The echocardiographic parameterized diastolic filling (PDF) method is a validated approach for assessing the mechanics of LV diastolic filling. The method uses the velocity profile of early diastolic transmitral flow (the E-wave) from pulsed-wave Doppler echocardiography to quantify mechanical stiffness, damping, and load[6, 7], together providing quantitative information on intrinsic mechanical properties of the LV. Stiffness contributes to the forces *driving* the recoil of the LV, whereas damping contributes to the forces *resisting* the recoil of the LV. Load is related to the stroke volume, and is closely correlated with the E-wave velocity time integral[7] (see **Table 1**). The PDF method has up until now been used to illustrate mechanical differences in cardiac relaxation in clinical situations such as patients with diabetes mellitus and hypertension[10, 15, 16.]

Beyond optimal medical therapy, patients diagnosed with ischemic heart disease benefit from surgical revascularization with CABG[17]. Whilst CABG is known to alleviate regional stress-induced myocardial ischemia, by comparison, long-term changes in LV diastolic function after CABG have been scarcely studied[7, 18, 19]. During the first hour after CABG, it is known that there is an increase in LV stiffness and reduced LV compliance[18], and the extent of deterioration in diastolic function has been associated with the duration of aortic cross clamp[18]. Furthermore, an immediate leftward shift in the curve of the LV end-diastolic pressure to LV end-diastolic diameter has been reported after CABG[18]. However, the intrinsic mechanical properties of LV diastolic function quantified by the PDF method have not yet been studied after CABG. Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate if and how the mechanical properties of LV diastolic function were affected one year after CABG using the PDF method.

2. Methods

2.1 Study population. The current study is a substudy of CABG PREFERS (Preserved and Reduced Ejection Fraction Epidemiological Regional Study) performed in Stockholm, Sweden, as previously described[20]. Briefly, all patients admitted for elective isolated Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting (CABG) surgery with or without previous acute myocardial infarction (AMI) or history of heart failure at the Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery at Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden, between March 2016 and January 2020, were asked to participate. Inclusion and exclusion criteria have been described in detail in the original study design publication.

At enrolment and one year after CABG, patients underwent comprehensive examination including ECG, blood sampling, cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR), and transthoracic echocardiography (TTE). The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the regional ethics committee in Stockholm, Sweden (DNR 2013/1869-31/1). All patients provided written informed consent prior to participation.

Before surgery, the perioperative risk was assessed using the risk stratification score EuroSCORE 2. CABG operations (n=96) were performed with patients on cardiopulmonary bypass according to clinical routine. All but three were performed at the Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, with three performed at the Örebro University Hospital, Örebro. Ninety patients were operated on by the same consultant surgeon. Revascularization was accomplished using double mammary arterial grafting and, in some cases also by venous grafts, where applicable. The duration of cardiopulmonary bypass and aortic cross-clamp were collected from medical records.

2.3 Echocardiography. TTE image acquisition and analysis was performed according to clinical recommendations[21, 22] by two experienced sonographers using Vivid E95 (General Electric, Horten, Norway). All echocardiographic examinations were analysed by two experienced specialists in cardiovascular imaging (MJE and EM) blinded to timepoint of examination, using commercial software (EchoPac, General Electric, Horten, Norway).

2.4 Parameterized diastolic filling (PDF). PDF measurements quantitatively describe the intrinsic mechanical properties of the LV in analogy to that of a recoiling spring, and has previously been described[6, 7]. In brief, the analysis results in three main parameters; stiffness (k), damping (c) and load (x_0). From these main parameters, additional parameters can be derived, all representing different aspects of the LV recoil, e.g. peak driving force and peak resistive force. For analysis of mitral E-waves by the PDF method, pulsed wave Doppler of the mitral inflow with a horizontal sweep speed of 100 mm/s was collected for 30 seconds during free breathing. If there was fusion of the E- and the A-wave, the examination was excluded if the fusion occurred at or above 50 % of the maximum E-wave velocity, as has previously been recommended[7]. All PDF analyses were performed using the freely available software Echo E-waves (www.echoewaves.org, version 1.01), see **Graphical abstract**. PDF analysis was performed blinded to knowledge of baseline or follow-up timepoint. PDF measures of LV myocardial stiffness are reported as mmHg/ml after unit conversion as previously described[8].

Approximate position of Table 1

2.5 Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging. Patients without contraindications underwent CMR at baseline and follow-up at 1.5 Tesla (MAGNETOM Aera, Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany). Following a routine clinical protocol, cine imaging and late gadolinium enhancement was acquired, with assessments performed by experienced observers with level III qualifications. The presence of previous myocardial infarction was assessed using late gadolinium enhancement according to existing recommendations[23].

2.6 Cardiac phenotype definitions. Patients were divided into phenotypes of Normal, preserved EF (pEF), or reduced EF (rEF) following pre-specified approach and criteria using echocardiographic findings and N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) concentrations as previously described[20], in brief using the ratio of E/e' together with left atrial volume index (LAVI) and in equivocal cases determined by consensus between two experts (MJE and HP).

Patients were also categorized into three groups depending on distribution of coronary lesions on coronary angiography as: left main stem with lesions in two or three additional vessels; three-vessel disease without involvement of the left main stem; and one- or two-vessel disease without involvement of the left main stem. Furthermore, based on CMR results, patients were divided into either having previous, or having no previous MI by late gadolinium enhancement.

2.7 Statistical analysis. All results were tested for normal distribution using the Lilliefors-corrected Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Results are presented as median [interquartile range], with statistical significance set at $p<0.05$. Differences between baseline and follow-up were tested using the Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction. Only patients with available data at both baseline and follow-up were included. If missing values, the number of

patients included in the analysis is noted in respective tables. For subgroup analyses, comparison between groups were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. For differences between the phenotype groups regarding echocardiography and NT-proBNP, the Mann Whitney U-test was used. The change in mechanical properties (PDF) within each cardiac phenotype group was analysed using Wilcoxon signed rank sum test. Variable changes were correlated to the duration of cardiopulmonary bypass, aortic cross-clamp time, and preoperative Euroscore2 using the Spearman correlation coefficient. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics, New York, USA), version 28.0.0.0.

3. Results

3.1 Patient population. 138 patients were included in CABG PREFERS. Out of these, patients were excluded based on insufficient image quality to perform PDF analysis at either baseline or follow-up (n=15), absence of follow-up examination (n=15), absence of CABG surgery (n=9), admission for acute surgery (n=1), concomitant valve surgery (n=1) and transfer to another hospital for surgery (n=1).

Out of the 96 remaining patients, 86 (90 %) were males with an age of 68 [62–74] years. **Table 2** summarizes the population characteristics. The time between baseline TTE and surgery was 63 [29–104] days, and the interval between baseline and follow-up TTE 427 [392–462] days. The interval between surgery and follow-up TTE was 363 [351–372] days.

Approximate position of Table 2

3.2 Echocardiographic parameters. Conventional echocardiographic parameters are presented in **Table 3**. A total of 14 (15%) patients had a baseline left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) below ≤45 %. Left ventricular diastolic volume at follow-up was slightly reduced, while left ventricular systolic volume did not change. There was no difference in LVEF, mitral annular plane systolic excursion or LV global longitudinal strain between baseline and follow-up. No difference could be observed in right ventricular size between baseline and follow-up, but tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion was lower at follow-up. Left atrial (LA) reservoir strain and conduit strain were decreased at follow-up compared to baseline, but no change could be seen in LA contraction strain. NT-proBNP did not differ between baseline and follow-up.

Approximate position of Table 3

3.3 Myocardial mechanics

All PDF parameters are displayed in **Table 4** and **Figure 1**. Notably, both stiffness (p <0.001) and damping (p=0.012) increased at follow-up. However, there was no difference in load (p=0.97). Changes consistent with worsened mechanics of diastolic function could also be observed in E-wave maximal velocity, peak driving force, and peak resistive force (p<0.001 for all).

Approximate position of Table 4 and Figure 1

No correlations with a correlation coefficient exceeding ±0.7 were observed between any PDF parameters and conventional echocardiographic variables, suggesting that

conventional echocardiographic measures are not strong surrogates for the mechanistic measures quantified by the PDF method (see **Supplemental Table 1)**.

At baseline 58 patients (60 %) were characterized as having Normal phenotype, 24 (25%) as pEF, and 14 (15%) as rEF. In post hoc-analyses, PDF analysis revealed higher stiffness in the Normal and rEF-group and higher damping in all phenotype-groups. No difference in Load could be observed in any phenotype group (**Figure 2** and **Table 5)**. Between the pEF and rEF groups, a difference in the parameters constituting the phenotypical classification at baseline, e.g. LV size and systolic function, E/e´, LAVI and also NT-proBNP was observed (**Table 5)**. A previous myocardial infarction detected at baseline by CMR late gadolinium enhancement was not associated with any differences in stiffness, damping, or load at baseline. Furthermore, the extent of myocardium subtended by stenosis assessed as the number of affected coronary arteries, was not associated with differences in stiffness, damping, or load at baseline.

Approximate position of Table 5 and Figure 2

3.4 Relationship between surgical procedure and postoperative LV function.

No correlations with a correlation coefficient exceeding ±0.7 were observed between derived echocardiographic or mechanical parameters and the duration of cardiopulmonary bypass, aortic cross clamp time, or preoperative Euroscore2 (**Supplemental table 2)**.

4. Discussion

The main finding of this study is that at one year after elective revascularization by CABG, echocardiographic PDF analysis shows an overall mechanical stiffening and increased

mechanical damping of the left ventricle, both indicating deterioration in the mechanics of diastolic function. Regarding damping, significant changes were seen in all cardiac phenotype groups while stiffness increased in the Normal and rEF-groups. The changes in conventional diastolic parameters were somewhat inconsistent and of small magnitude, and with no clear change in clinical assessment of diastolic function.

4.1 Diastolic left ventricular function following CABG

A number of studies have evaluated LV stiffness and associated biomechanical properties after surgical intervention. Notably, LV stiffness has been shown to increase immediately after CABG when quantified as the change in intraoperative end-diastolic pressure-area[25] measured as the change in pulmonary artery wedge pressure per unit LV end-diastolic area measured by transoesophageal echocardiography. The acute impairment of diastolic function has been corroborated by other studies[26, 27], but has been challenged by other work showing *decreased* regional stiffness in myocardium revascularized by CABG when defined as the regional work of the ventricle per unit volume of the revascularized myocardium three to four weeks after CABG[28]. In comparison, our study focused on assessing mechanical properties before and one-year post-CABG, seeking to define persistent changes manifesting relatively long-term post-intervention.

The current study showed no change in septal e' and E/e', and a low magnitude increase in lateral e' one year after CABG. Furthermore, there was a concomitant increase in left atrial volume and reduction in left atrial strain. Taken together, the changes in these echocardiographic measures point towards a worsening of diastolic function. Previous studies using conventional echocardiographic variables reported an improved diastolic function within the first days after CABG but a return to preoperative values 18 months after

surgery[29]. This considered, neither that study nor the current study were able to identify an improvement in diastolic function at one year when using conventional echocardiographic measures. The differences between this previous study and the current study likely arise from heterogeneities in acute post-operative response amongst patients with prior myocardial infarction, along with methodological differences in the assessment of diastolic function. In the current study, 62 % had previous myocardial infarction by CMR late gadolinium enhancement, which is a slightly lower prevalence than previously reported[30]. Furthermore, in contrast to prior studies, the current study highlights persistent changes in myocardial stiffness one year after CABG. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to evaluate changes in LV diastolic function at the one-year postoperative timepoint in patients undergoing elective CABG. These results indicate persistent and continued deterioration in LV diastolic performance after CABG.

4.2 Differences between PDF and conventional diastolic parameters

The PDF method was chosen for analysis of diastolic function because of its ability to mechanistically describe LV relaxation. Moreover, tools for quantifying the PDF measures have improved following developments enabling rapid and precise semiautomatic measurement with excellent intra- and inter-reader reproducibility[7].

The unique approach to diastolic LV functional assessment provided by the PDF method is the quantification of stiffness, damping, and load. Importantly, the differences observed in PDF parameters in our study were observed in the *absence* of changes in conventional echocardiographic measures of diastolic LV function including E/A, E/e´, and E-wave deceleration time. This emphasizes the added mechanistic information provided by

the PDF method, with early changes in mechanical behaviour possibly appearing prior to any obvious functional deterioration[10].

Previous studies have been somewhat contradictory with regards to if, and to what extent, other diseases or conditions affect the main PDF parameters. Whilst the measures have been shown to be fairly uninfluenced by demographic parameters such as age and sex[10, 15], conditions such as diabetes mellitus have been shown to more so increase stiffness and to a lesser extent damping, while hypertension has been found to increase both damping and stiffness[10]. These differences might be due to the selection of subjects based on different definitions of hypertension. Notably, diabetes and hypertension have only been shown to have a weak association with conventional echocardiographic diastolic parameters when adjusted for age[26].

4.3 Potential mechanisms behind diastolic dysfunction following CABG

The role of the pericardium in cardiac relaxation is not fully understood[31]. Since CABG surgery entails opening the pericardium to access the epicardial coronary arteries, this could provide a possible explanation for persisting post-operative alterations in LV relaxation, and further studies are warranted to clarify this mechanism. Another possible mechanism of action is that myocardial ischemia might not be the predominant cause of diastolic dysfunction, and as such, revascularization of the LV may not restore diastolic function[1]. This could be related to residual coronary microvascular dysfunction, or a combination of progression over time of the deleterious effects related to the risk factors associated with the need for revascularization. Especially among patients with preserved ejection fraction, diastolic dysfunction may develop as a result of diffuse interstitial myocardial fibrosis related

to changes in the titin protein[32]. Taken together, the cause of postoperative deterioration in diastolic function and its clinical implications remains to be determined.

The assessment of the mechanical properties of the myocardium is directly coupled to the biomechanical features of LV myocardial ejection and relaxation, where constitutive descriptors including strain rates, pressure-volume responses, and elastography maps have all been used to investigate myocardial stiffness in varying clinical conditions[33]. In this context, the PDF method offers added value, where routinely acquired mitral E-wave velocity profiles by pulsed Doppler registrations can also be used to estimate LV stiffness mechanistically.

4.4 Limitations. The study cohort consisted of 90% male patients and is thus the results may not applicable for both sexes. However, this population is representative of the percentage of males undergoing isolated, on-pump CABG in Sweden during 2022, which was 84 %[34]. Sex differences regarding the changes in diastolic function following CABG could therefore not be assessed, and further future such investigations are justified. The design of the current study was adapted to the definitions of heart failure available at the time of enrolment, when the definition of heart failure with mildly reduced ejection fraction (HFmrEF) was yet not established. Since then, new suggestions of classification of heart failure have been published[35], with such currently under consideration as consensus definitions. Instead, the definition of cardiac phenotype used in our study was based on well-established echocardiographic criteria and NT-proBNP and is compliant with the universal American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association definition of stages of heart failure[35, 36]. The symptoms caused by heart failure may be difficult to discriminate from the ones caused by stable angina pectoris[37, 38]. The patients included in our study were assessed by experienced cardiologists. As assessed by the 2022 guidelines[35], all patients in preoperative

cardiac phenotype group Normal are considered to be in Stage A ("At-Risk for Heart Failure") and all in the groups pEF and rEF in stage B ("Pre-Heart Failure"). For consistency, the PDF analysis was performed by a single observer, and this could be seen as a potential limitation. However, previous work from our group has highlighted excellent intra- and inter-reader reproducibility of the PDF method[7], providing added confidence to the results of the current study. Like all measurements, the PDF method is subject to measurement variability, and a small number of extreme values were observed. However, statistical analyses were based on non-parametric methods that mitigate the influence of outliers by relying on the rank ordering of observations rather than their absolute magnitude. While it is acknowledged that the PDF method has a known measurement variability that may preclude meaningful individual clinical differentiation between health and disease[7], the current study illustrates the robust utility of the method for gleaning mechanistic insight into differences between groups of sufficient sample sizes. With the assessment of early diastolic function provided by the PDF method using the mitral E-wave, no considerations are made to the possible contribution of atrial contraction as assessed by the mitral A-wave.

4.5 Conclusion

The current study found a deterioration in the mechanistic properties of diastolic function one year after CABG, seen as an increase in mechanical stiffness and damping while there were no or negligible changes in conventional echocardiographic measures of diastolic LV dysfunction. This work highlights the complexity of cardiac diastolic remodelling, and the value of including mechanistic evaluation by methods beyond conventional echocardiographic measures to understand changes in mechanical LV relaxation.

4.6 Clinical perspective

It is unclear whether or not CABG has beneficial effects on diastolic dysfunction. Conventional echocardiographic measures of diastolic function cannot characterize the mechanics of diastolic function. The use of a mechanistic approach to analysing left ventricular relaxation using the echocardiographic parameterized diastolic filling (PDF) method was able to identify consistent deterioration in diastolic function one year after CABG in a way that is not clinically apparent by conventional echocardiographic evaluation.

Table 1. PDF parameters with explanation of physiological basis and clinical relevance.

Name	Parameter	Unit (SI)	Physiological basis and clinical relevance
Stiffness	k	g/s² (N/m) mmHg/ml	• The force per unit displacement with which the LV restores its volume during early diastolic filling • Contributes to the restoring force that *drives* early filling (Peak driving force of filling, kx_o) • Linearly related to invasively measured chamber stiffness in mmHg/ml (dP/dV)[8] • Increased in diabetes and commonly also in both constrictive and restrictive filling[9]
Damping	c	g/s (N·s/m)	• The viscous energy loss that counteracts LV recoil during early diastolic filling • Contributes to the resistive force that *opposes* early filling (Peak resistive force of filling, cE) • Reflects impaired relaxation and increased myocardial viscoelasticity • Non-linearly related to the time constant of LV isovolumic pressure decay (*Tau*, τ) • Increased in diabetes[9], hypertension[9, 10] and aortic stenosis[11]
Load	$x_{\square}$	cm	• The volume load that compresses the myocardium at end systole • Proportional to the E-wave velocity-time integral and the early component of the LV filling volume
E-wave peak velocity	E	m/s	• The peak velocity of blood flow across the mitral valve during early LV filling
Peak driving force of filling	$kx_{\square}$	mN	• The peak force driving LV filling • The product of stiffness (k) and load ($x_{\square}$) • Analogous to the peak atrioventricular pressure gradient[12]
Peak resistive force of filling	cE	mN	• The peak force opposing LV filling • The product of damping (c) and the E-wave peak velocity (E) • Represents the maximum viscoelastic resistive force during filling[13]
Time constant of isovolumic pressure decay	*Tau*, τ	ms	• Time constant describing the exponential rate at which LV pressure declines before mitral valve opening • Can be estimated by a non-linear combination of damping (c) and stiffness (k) • Increased in impaired relaxation[14]

Legend: Key PDF parameters with mechanistic background and clinical significance.

Table 2. Patient characteristics at baseline.

Total number of included patients, n	96
Male sex, n (%)	86 (90)
Age, years	68 [62–74]
Height, m	1.75 [1.71–1.81]
Weight, kg	83 [73–92]
BSA, m^2	1.95 [1.85–2.10]
BMI, kg/m^2	25.6 [23.5–29.0]
Hypertension, n (%)	39 (72)
Previous infarction by LGE CMR[§], n/n (%)	48/78 (62)
Diabetes mellitus type I, n (%)	1 (1)
Diabetes mellitus type II, n (%)	30 (31)
Diabetes mellitus type unknown, n (%)	1 (1)
Sinus rhythm at echocardiographic examination, n (%)	90 (94)
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	144 [128-152]
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	79 [73-87]
Patients treated with:	
- Beta blocker, n (%)	56 (58)
- ACE-I, n (%)	23 (24)
- ARB, n (%)	23 (24)
- ACE-I and ARB, n (%)	2 (2)
- ARNI, n (%)	0 (0)

- MRA, n (%)	3 (3)
- CCB, n (%)	27 (28)
- Long-acting nitrate, n (%)	36 (38)
- Loop or thiazide diuretic, n (%)	4 (4) / 5 (5)

Legend

Data are presented as median [interquartile range] or number, n, and percent.

Abbreviations: ACE-I – angiotensin converting enzyme Inhibitor, ARB – angiotensin receptor blocker, ARNI – angiotensin receptor and neprilysin inhibitor, BMI – body mass index, BSA – body surface area, LGE – late gadolinium enhancement, MRA – Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists. § denotes that 18 patients did not undergo examination by CMR.

Table 3. Conventional echocardiographic parameters at baseline and at follow-up one year after CABG.

	Baseline	**Follow-up**	**p-value**
Number of patients	96	96	
Heart rate, beats/min	66 [58 – 74]	67 [57 – 73]	0.785
LVEDD (PLAX), mm	48 [45 – 52]	48 [45 – 52]	0.802
Septal wall thickness, diastole, mm	12 [11 – 14]	12 [11 – 13]	**0.027 ***
Posterior wall thickness, diastole, mm	9 [8 – 10]	9 [8 – 10]	0.661
LV RWT PW2, unitless	0.38 [0.33 – 0.44]	0.38 [0.34 – 0.42]	0.551
LVM index, g/m^2	94 [80 – 109]	90.5 [78 – 105]	0.229
LVEF, %	59 [53 – 63]	59 [53 – 61]	0.785
LV GLS, %	-18.0 [-15.9 – -20.0]	-17.6 [-15.5 – -19.2]	0.313
MAPSE, mm (n=95)	11.1 [9.8 – 12.2]	10.7 [9.6 – 11.9]	0.803
RVEDD (A4Ch), mm	36 [33 – 39]	37 [33 – 41]	0.198
TAPSE, mm	21 [18 – 23]	14 [13 – 17]	**<0.001 *** **
LAVI, ml/m^2	34 [30 – 38]	35 [30 – 42]	**0.008 ** **
Maximum mitral E-wave velocity, m/s	0.68 [0.57 – 0.81]	0.74 [0.62 – 0.90]	**<0.001*** **
E/A ratio, unitless (n=90)	0.9 [0.8 – 1.2]	1.1 [0.9 – 1.4]	**<0.001 *** **
E-wave Deceleration Time, ms	228 [195 – 260]	210 [189 – 245]	**0.016 * **
Septal e', cm/s	0.07 [0.05 – 0.08]	0.06 [0.05 – 0.08]	0.985
Lateral e', cm/s	0.09 [0.07 – 0.10]	0.10 [0.09 – 0.11]	**<0.001 *** **
E/e', unitless	8.9 [7.5 – 10.9]	8.9 [7.3 – 11.2]	0.589
Left atrial reservoir strain, % (n=83)	26 [23 – 29]	24 [20 – 29]	**0.003 ** **
NT-proBNP	190 [111 – 339]	222 [124 – 422]	0.250
Left atrial conduit strain, % (n=83)	-11 [-9 – -14]	-9 [-7 – -12]	**<0.001 *** **

Left atrial contraction strain, % (n=83)	-15 [-12 – -18]	-15 [-11 – -18]	0.584
TR Vmax, m/s (n=57)	2.5 [2.3 – 2.7]	2.6 [2.4 – 2.7]	0.132

Legend

Data are presented as median [interquartile range].

Abbreviations: A4Ch – Apical 4 Chamber View, GLS – Global Longitudinal Strain, LAVI – Left atrial volume index, LVM index – LV mass indexated to Body Surface Area, MAPSE – Mitral annular plane systolic excursion, PLAX – Parasternal long axis, RVEDD – Right ventricular end diastolic diameter, RWT PW2 – Relative wall thickness posterior wall x 2; TR Vmax – Maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity. * denotes <0.05, ** denotes <0.01, *** <0.001.

Table 4. Change in PDF parameters between baseline and follow-up.

	Baseline (n = 96)	**Follow-up (n = 96)**	**p-value**	**Normal reference[#]**
Stiffness, mmHg/ml	0.11 [0.09 – 0.14]	0.14 [0.12 – 0.18]	**<0.001 *****	0.04 – 0.17
Damping, g/s	21.0 [18.0 – 21.0]	24.2 [20.7 – 29.9]	**0.012 ***	10.2 – 25.3
Load, cm	11.4 [9.6 – 12.4]	11.0 [9.6 – 12.7]	0.970	6.3 – 14.4
Peak driving force, mN	23.8 [18.9 – 27.2]	28.6 [24.0 – 33.2]	**<0.001 *****	11.5 – 31.7
Peak resistive force, mN	14.9 [12.1 – 19.0]	18.5 [14.9 – 22.8]	**<0.001 *****	6.2 – 20.4
Time constant of isovolumic pressure decay (tau), ms	75 [68 – 88]	78 [68 – 91]	0.864	48 – 91
Load independent index of diastolic filling (M), unitless	1.11 [1.02 – 1.23]	1.10 [1.00 – 1.24]	0.791	
Intercept (B), mN	5.7 [3.6 – 7.6]	7.3 [4.5 – 9.5]	**0.010 ***	

Legend

* denotes <0.05, ** denotes <0.01, *** <0.001. [#] Normal reference values from the literature[24].

Table 5. Main PDF- and echocardiographic parameters at baseline presented by cardiac phenotype.

	Normal (n = 58)	**pEF (n = 24)**	**rEF (n = 14)**	**p-value for overall trend**
Stiffness, mmHg/ml	0.11 [0.08 – 0.13]	0.13 [0.11 – 0.15]	0.11 [0.08 – 0.13]	0.178
Damping, g/s	21.5 [18.6 – 27.9]	22.9 [18.9 – 26.5] #	17.4 [14.4 – 21.7] #	0.116
Load, cm	11.6 [9.4 – 12.4]	11.1 [10.1 – 12. 8]	11.0 [9.1 – 13.6]	0.937
LVEDV, ml	112 [97 – 127] § ‡	142 [113 – 155] § #	165 143 – 208] ‡ #	<0.001 ***
LVEDVi, ml/m^2	57 [48 - 66] § ‡	68 [59 – 77] § #	85 [67 – 101] ‡ #	<0.001 ***
LVEF, %	59 [57 – 63] ‡	61 [56 – 64] #	40 [37 - 44] ‡ #	<0.001 ***
LV GLS, %	-19.0 [-20.0 – -17.7] ‡	-17.2 [-20.4 – -15.8] #	-12.0 [-13.2 – -10.6] ‡ #	<0.001 ***
E/e’, unitless	7.8 [7.1 – 9.3] § ‡	10.7 [8.9 – 12.2] §	12.0 [9.2 – 15.8] ‡	<0.001 ***
LAVI, ml/m^2	32 [28 – 33] § ‡	41 [37 – 52] §	37.2 [35.6 – 51.5] ‡	<0.001 ***
NT-proBNP, ng/l (n=91)	148 [73 - 227] § ‡	273 [161 – 950] § #	768 [466 – 1113] ‡ #	<0.001 ***

Legend

Overall trend is tested for using the Kruskal Wallis test. All groups have been tested for between groups differences using the Mann Whitney U-test, see below. Abbreviations: pEF – Heart failure with preserved Ejection Fraction, rEF – Heart failure with reduced Ejection Fraction. For all other abbreviations see **Table 3**.

§ denotes statistically significant differences between Normal and pEF.

‡ denotes statistically significant differences between Normal and rEF.

# denotes statistically significant differences between pEF and rEF

4. Figures

See separate files.

5. References

1. Aroesty JM, McKay RG, Heller GV, Royal HD, Als AV, Grossman W. Simultaneous assessment of left ventricular systolic and diastolic dysfunction during pacing-induced ischemia. Circulation. 1985;71(5):889-900.
2. Nagueh SF. Left Ventricular Diastolic Function: Understanding Pathophysiology, Diagnosis, and Prognosis With Echocardiography. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;13(1 Pt 2):228-44.
3. Nagueh SF, Sanborn DY, Oh JK, Anderson B, Billick K, Derumeaux G, et al. Recommendations for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Diastolic Function by Echocardiography and for Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction Diagnosis: An Update From the American Society of Echocardiography. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2025;38(7):537-69.
4. Basu S, Yu H, Murrow JR, Hallow KM. Understanding heterogeneous mechanisms of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction through cardiorenal mathematical modeling. PLoS Comput Biol. 2023;19(11):e1011598.
5. Zile MR, Baicu CF, Gaasch WH. Diastolic heart failure--abnormalities in active relaxation and passive stiffness of the left ventricle. N Engl J Med. 2004;350(19):1953-9.
6. Kovacs SJ, Jr., Barzilai B, Perez JE. Evaluation of diastolic function with Doppler echocardiography: the PDF formalism. Am J Physiol. 1987;252(1 Pt 2):H178-87.
7. Sundqvist MG, Salman K, Tornvall P, Ugander M. Kinematic analysis of diastolic function using the freely available software Echo E-waves - feasibility and reproducibility. BMC Med Imaging. 2016;16(1):60.
8. Lisauskas JB, Singh J, Bowman AW, Kovacs SJ. Chamber properties from transmitral flow: prediction of average and passive left ventricular diastolic stiffness. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2001;91(1):154-62.

9. Riordan MM, Chung CS, Kovacs SJ. Diabetes and diastolic function: stiffness and relaxation from transmitral flow. Ultrasound Med Biol. 2005;31(12):1589-96.

10. Kovacs SJ, Rosado J, Manson McGuire AL, Hall AF. Can trasmitral Doppler E-waves differentiate hypertensive hearts from normal? Hypertension. 1997;30(4):788-95.

11. Salman K, Sundqvist MG, Stevenson J, Cain PA, Ugander M. Diastolic dysfunction in aortic stenosis is associated with greater damping of left ventricular recoil, and not myocardial stiffness. medRxiv. 2025:2024.09.20.24313309.

12. Bauman L, Chung CS, Karamanoglu M, Kovacs SJ. The peak atrioventricular pressure gradient to transmitral flow relation: kinematic model prediction with in vivo validation. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2004;17(8):839-44.

13. Shmuylovich L, Kovacs SJ. Load-independent index of diastolic filling: model-based derivation with in vivo validation in control and diastolic dysfunction subjects. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2006;101(1):92-101.

14. Mossahebi SK, S.J. Kinematic Modeling Based Decomposition of Transmitral Flow (Doppler E-Wave) Deceleration Time into Stiffness and Relaxation Components. Cardiovasc Eng Tech. 2014;5:25-34.

15. Sundqvist MG, Sahlen A, Ding ZP, Ugander M. Diastolic function and its association with diabetes, hypertension and age in an outpatient population with normal stress echocardiography findings. Cardiovasc Ultrasound. 2020;18(1):46.

16. Golman M, Padovano W, Shmuylovich L, Kovacs SJ. Quantifying Diastolic Function: From E-Waves as Triangles to Physiologic Contours via the 'Geometric Method'. Cardiovasc Eng Technol. 2018.

17. Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, Capodanno D, Barbato E, Funck-Brentano C, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of chronic coronary syndromes. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(3):407-77.

18. Spotnitz HM, Bregman D, Bowman FO, Jr., Edie RN, Reemtsma K, King DL, et al. Effects of open heart surgery on end-diastolic pressure-diameter relations of the human left ventricle. Circulation. 1979;59(4):662-71.

19. Liu J, Tanaka N, Murata K, Ueda K, Wada Y, Oyama R, et al. Prognostic value of pseudonormal and restrictive filling patterns on left ventricular remodeling and cardiac events after coronary artery bypass grafting. Am J Cardiol. 2003;91(5):550-4.

20. Linde C, Eriksson MJ, Hage C, Wallen H, Persson B, Corbascio M, et al. Rationale and design of the PREFERS (Preserved and Reduced Ejection Fraction Epidemiological Regional Study) Stockholm heart failure study: an epidemiological regional study in Stockholm county of 2.1 million inhabitants. Eur J Heart Fail. 2016;18(10):1287-97.

21. Mitchell C, Rahko PS, Blauwet LA, Canaday B, Finstuen JA, Foster MC, et al. Guidelines for Performing a Comprehensive Transthoracic Echocardiographic Examination in Adults: Recommendations from the American Society of Echocardiography. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2019;32(1):1-64.

22. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, 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(3):233-70.

23. Moon JC, Messroghli DR, Kellman P, Piechnik SK, Robson MD, Ugander M, et al. Myocardial T1 mapping and extracellular volume quantification: a Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance (SCMR) and CMR Working Group of the European Society of Cardiology consensus statement. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2013;15(1):92.

24. Sundqvist MG, Sahlen A, Ding ZP, Ugander M. Normal Reference Values for Assessing Diastolic Function Using the Parameterized Diastolic Filling Formalism Method in

Patients with Normal Results of Rest and Stress Echocardiography. Ultrasound Med Biol. 2018;44(11):2261-6.

25. McKenney PA, Apstein CS, Mendes LA, Connelly GP, Aldea GS, Shemin RJ, et al. Increased left ventricular diastolic chamber stiffness immediately after coronary artery bypass surgery. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1994;24(5):1189-94.

26. Ekery DL, Davidoff R, Orlandi QG, Apstein CS, Hesselvik JF, Shemin RJ, et al. Imaging and diagnostic testing: diastolic dysfunction after coronary artery bypass grafting: a frequent finding of clinical significance not influenced by intravenous calcium. Am Heart J. 2003;145(5):896-902.

27. Skarvan K, Filipovic M, Wang J, Brett W, Seeberger M. Use of myocardial tissue Doppler imaging for intraoperative monitoring of left ventricular function. Br J Anaesth. 2003;91(4):473-80.

28. Higashita R, Sugawara M, Kondoh Y, Kawai Y, Mitsui K, Ohki S, et al. Changes in diastolic regional stiffness of the left ventricle before and after coronary artery bypass grafting. Heart Vessels. 1996;11(3):145-51.

29. Diller GP, Wasan BS, Kyriacou A, Patel N, Casula RP, Athanasiou T, et al. Effect of coronary artery bypass surgery on myocardial function as assessed by tissue Doppler echocardiography. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2008;34(5):995-9.

30. Kancharla K, Weissman G, Elagha AA, Kancherla K, Samineni S, Hill PC, et al. Scar quantification by cardiovascular magnetic resonance as an independent predictor of long-term survival in patients with ischemic heart failure treated by coronary artery bypass graft surgery. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2016;18(1):45.

31. Chang SA, Kim HK, Kim YJ, Cho GY, Oh S, Sohn DW. Role of pericardium in the maintenance of left ventricular twist. Heart. 2010;96(10):785-90.

32. Zile MR, Baicu CF, Ikonomidis JS, Stroud RE, Nietert PJ, Bradshaw AD, et al. Myocardial stiffness in patients with heart failure and a preserved ejection fraction: contributions of collagen and titin. Circulation. 2015;131(14):1247-59.

33. Villalobos Lizardi JC, Baranger J, Nguyen MB, Asnacios A, Malik A, Lumens J, et al. A guide for assessment of myocardial stiffness in health and disease. Nature Cardiovascular Research. 2022;1(1):8-22.

34. Registry TSCS. 07 - SWEDEHEART 2022 Swedish Cardiac Surgery Registry. https://www.ucr.uu.se/swedeheart/dokument-sh/arsrapporter-sh/arsrapport-2022/07-swedeheart-2022-swedish-cardiac-surgery-registry-2; 2023.

35. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, Allen LA, Byun JJ, Colvin MM, 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. 2022;145(18):e895-e1032.

36. Mohebi R, Wang D, Lau ES, Parekh JK, Allen N, Psaty BM, et al. Effect of 2022 ACC/AHA/HFSA Criteria on Stages of Heart Failure in a Pooled Community Cohort. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2023;81(23):2231-42.

37. Gulati M, Levy PD, Mukherjee D, Amsterdam E, Bhatt DL, Birtcher KK, et al. 2021 AHA/ACC/ASE/CHEST/SAEM/SCCT/SCMR Guideline for the Evaluation and Diagnosis of Chest Pain: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2021;144(22):e368-e454.

38. Ford TJ, Berry C. Angina: contemporary diagnosis and management. Heart. 2020;106(5):387-98.

6. Supplemental materials

Supplemental tables S1 – S2

7. Figure Legends

Graphical Abstract - Overview of background, study design, methods and main results.

Figure 1 - All PDF parameters at baseline (grey) and follow-up (white). Abbreviations: τ = Tau.

Figure 2 - The main PDF parameters divided by cardiac phenotypes at baseline (grey) and follow-up (white).

Figure 1 - Left ventricular mechanics at baseline and follow-up.



Legend - All PDF parameters at baseline (grey) and follow-up (white) for all 96 included patients. Differences between Baseline and Follow-up were tested for using the Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction. Abbreviations: τ = Tau.

Figure 2 - Left ventricular mechanics by cardiac phenotypes.



Legend - The main PDF parameters divided by cardiac phenotypes at baseline (grey) and follow-up (white) for all 96 included patients. Differences between Baseline and Follow-up were tested for using the Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction.

<u>Graphical abstract</u> – Deterioration in LV diastolic properties one year after CABG.



Legend - Overview of background, study design, methods and main results.