Preserved and reduced ejection fraction manifest as two mechanistically unique phenotypes of diastolic dysfunction

Hayden McColl[1,2], Morgan Brookes[5], Michelle Price[5], Elias Fulthorp[5], Michele McGrady [2,5], Sean Lal[2,3,5,6], Martin Ugander [1,3,4]

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

[2]Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, Australia

[3]University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

[4]Department of Clinical Physiology, Karolinska University Hospital, and Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

[5]Central Sydney Cardiology, Sydney, Australia

[6]University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Corresponding Address:

Martin Ugander, MD, PhD
Professor of Cardiac Imaging, University of Sydney
Kolling Building, Level 12
Royal North Shore Hospital
St Leonards, Sydney NSW 2065
Australia
martin.ugander@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Diastolic dysfunction is present in both heart failure with preserved (pEF) and reduced (rEF) ejection fraction (EF). However, differences in treatment response suggest that these classifications represent two unique phenotypes of diastolic dysfunction. We hypothesized that pEF and rEF would exhibit different mechanics of diastolic dysfunction. **Methods:** Patients undergoing echocardiography with normal EF and normal diastolic function, or grade 2 or 3 diastolic dysfunction with pEF or rEF were retrospectively identified. The mechanistic properties of diastolic function were assessed using the parameterised diastolic filling (PDF) method, which quantifies diastolic mechanics using the early mitral inflow pattern of the E-wave from Doppler echocardiography. **Results:** Patients with diastolic dysfunction and pEF (n=75) or rEF (n=75) did not differ in E/e', tricuspid regurgitation peak velocity, or left atrial volume index ($p>0.05$ for all). Compared to controls (n=75), left ventricular stiffness did not differ in either pEF or rEF ($p>0.3$ for all), while damping was increased in pEF ($p<0.001$), but reduced in rEF ($p=0.005$). **Conclusions:** While pEF and rEF do not differ in key conventional echocardiographic measures of diastolic dysfunction, they are two unique physiologic conditions where the diastolic dysfunction manifests fundamentally differently. These findings challenge traditional assumptions about the role of myocardial stiffness in ventricular filling and underscore the importance of damping as a key mechanistic component of diastolic dysfunction. These insights may help explain differing responses to therapy across heart failure phenotypes and prompt further research into the targetable pathophysiological features that cause these changes.

Introduction

Left ventricular diastolic dysfunction is a term used to describe abnormalities in ventricular relaxation. Abnormalities in diastolic function are present in a range of different cardiac conditions including both heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF)[1]. Diastolic dysfunction can be identified and graded using the 2016 American Society of Echocardiography guidelines[2]. This approach combines measures of mitral annular tissue velocities, left atrial volumes, and the assessment of transmitral inflow Doppler profiles. Whilst useful for diagnosis, this grading system is not designed to assess the mechanisms which underlie diastolic dysfunction. As such, alternate methods of analysing ventricular filling have been proposed to better understand left ventricular (LV) diastolic function.

The parameterised diastolic filling (PDF) formalism is a method which accurately models early diastolic filling measured via pulsed wave (PW) Doppler echocardiography as a case of a damped harmonic oscillator[3]. A damped harmonic oscillator is a system analogous to a spring which experiences a proportionate restorative force when displaced from its resting state. When treating left ventricular filling as such, the velocity of the 'spring' over time can be quantified in terms of constants for ventricular stiffness, damping, and load. The PDF method involves fitting a curve to the mitral valve E-wave PW Doppler signal to solve for these three constants[4].

In the PDF framework, stiffness refers to the ability of the LV to resist deformation and contributes to the force driving ventricular recoil in early ventricular filling. The stiffness constant has a linear correlation with invasively measured LV stiffness ($\Delta P/\Delta V$)[5]. In contrast, damping reflects viscoelastic energy loss and contributes to the force which opposes ventricular filling. This is analogous to a damper or dashpot, a mechanical device that is

commonly used to dampen the closing velocity of a door that closes by a spring mechanism. Finally, load represents the deforming volume on the ventricle which occurs during contraction in systole[3], and load is proportional to the velocity-time integral of the E-wave.

Diastolic dysfunction is a key component in the pathophysiology and development of symptoms in both HFpEF and HFrEF and has prognostic importance in both these conditions[1, 6]. Whilst diastolic dysfunction is ubiquitous in both these conditions, treatment options and treatment efficacy differ greatly and an understanding of the mechanisms driving these differences is currently lacking. The aim of this study was to investigate mechanistic differences in patients with diastolic dysfunction and preserved ejection fraction (pEF) or reduced ejection fraction (rEF) using the PDF method. We hypothesized that diastolic dysfunction in these conditions represents two mechanistically unique disease phenotypes.

Methods

Study Design

This single-centre, retrospective study compared control patients with normal systolic and diastolic function to patients with diastolic dysfunction and preserved or reduced ejection fraction. All included patients were referred for cardiac assessment at a large academic out-patient cardiology practice between January 2018 and December 2023**.** Ethics approval was received from the Sydney Local Health District Ethics Board (X19-0286 & 2019/ETH12064) as well as the human research ethics committee of the participating centre, with a retrospective waiver of informed consent.

Patients aged >50 years who underwent transthoracic echocardiography were eligible for inclusion in this study. Patients were excluded if they had moderate or greater valvular disease, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy or cardiac surgery including valvular replacement, coronary artery bypass grafting or interventions that would disrupt the pericardium. Patients

were additionally excluded in the cases where insufficient transmitral Doppler signals were able to be obtained. Figure 1 outlines the patient inclusion flowchart.

Echocardiographic analysis was performed using a commercially available clinical echocardiography system (VIVID, GE Healthcare, Chicago, Illinois, USA) in accordance with the American Society of Echocardiography (ASE) guidelines for a comprehensive transthoracic echocardiographic examination[7]. Patients were classified as having either normal or impaired diastolic function. Impaired diastolic function was defined as the presence of either grade 2 or 3 diastolic dysfunction as per the 2016 ASE guidelines[2].

Parameterised Diastolic Filling Analysis

PDF analysis was performed using the web-based application, Echo E-waves (www.echoewaves.org)[4]. A curve-fit of the velocity profile of the PW doppler signal of early diastolic fitting was estimated using measures of peak E-wave velocity, E-wave acceleration time, and E-wave deceleration time according to validated methods[8]. From this, the PDF parameters for stiffness, damping and load were derived, in addition to secondary calculated parameters for the estimated time constant of isovolumic relaxation (tau), kinematic filling efficiency index (KFEI), filling energy, peak driving force, peak resistive force and damping index[4]. Figure 2 outlines the workflow for PDF analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 29. Continuous variables were compared using either one-way ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis methods depending on the distribution. Continuous variables are reported as mean ± standard deviation or median [interquartile range] as appropriate.

Results

The study population consisted of 225 patients; 75 control patients with normal systolic and diastolic function, and 150 with abnormal diastolic function (grade 2 or 3 diastolic function). Patients with impaired diastolic function were further subdivided into either preserved (EF>55%, n=75) or reduced (EF<40%, n=75) left ventricular ejection fraction groups. The baseline characteristics of the 3 groups are presented in Table 1. Patients with diastolic dysfunction and pEF or rEF did not differ in the ratio of early transmitral blood flow to early myocardial velocity (E/e'), left atrial volume index (LAVI) or tricuspid regurgitation maximum blood flow velocity (TR Vmax). E peak velocity and average e' was increased in patients with diastolic dysfunction and pEF compared with rEF (87 [72-97] vs 77 [65-91] cm/s, p=0.009, and 5.8 [4.8-7.0] vs 4.1 [3.5-5.7] cm/s, p=0.001, respectively). The early-to-atrial transmitral blood flow velocity ratio (E/A) was decreased in patients with diastolic dysfunction and pEF compared to rEF (0.87 [0.70-1.14] vs 1.60 [1.00-2.27], p<0.001).

Results are summarized graphically in figure 3. Stiffness did not differ between controls (0.13 [0.06-0.20] mmHg/ml) and pEF (0.12 [0.06-0.18] mmHg/ml, p=1.0) or rEF (0.11 [0.05-0.17] mmHg/ml, p=0.33). Compared to controls, damping was increased in pEF (24.1 [20.5-33.2] vs 19.8 [15.1-24.8] g/s^2, p<0.001) and reduced in rEF (16.1 [12.5-19.8] g/s^2, p=0.005). Compared to controls, load was increased in pEF (13.7 [11.3-16.8] vs 9.7[8.5-11.2]cm, p<0.001) but did not differ in patients with rEF (10.4 [8.9-12.0]cm, p=0.22).

Compared to controls, estimated tau was increased in patients with pEF (76 [69-87] vs 64 [58-73] ms, p<0.001) and reduced in rEF (56 [51-63] ms, p=0.006). Conversely, KFEI was decreased in pEF (51.2 [47.3-52.7] vs 53.7 [51.7-56.0] %, p<0.001) but increased in rEF

(56.7 [54.1-60.1] %, p=0.002). Comprehensive numerical results are detailed in Appendix Table 1.

Discussion

The main finding of this study is that despite similar diastolic dysfunction grading using conventional echocardiographic guidelines, diastolic dysfunction in patients with pEF represents a fundamentally different mechanistic phenotype to that of patients with rEF.

The mechanisms which govern LV filling are complex and represent an interplay between intrinsic properties of the myocardium, pericardial physiology, and hemodynamic loading conditions[9]. By modelling this process as a case of damped harmonic motion we gain an appreciation of the mechanistic differences between phenotypes of diastolic dysfunction. A clear appreciation of the definitions and application of key parameters, particularly the primary parameters of the PDF method (stiffness, damping and load) is essential for meaningful interpretation of these results.

Diastolic dysfunction and HFpEF is commonly described as being due to a "stiff" ventricle. However, the term stiffness is often poorly defined and is inconsistently used throughout literature. In mechanistic terms, stiffness is a measure of an object's ability to resist deformation in response to an applied force[10]. The stiffer an object, like the myocardium of the left ventricle, the more force which is required to deform it. Consequently, this also means that a stiffer ventricle will exert a greater force to recoil to its resting shape. When we apply this to early diastole, the stiffness of myocardium *aids* ventricular relaxation and filling as the compressed myocardium at end-systole returns to a relative resting state during diastasis.

By comparison, damping represents viscoelastic energy loss. Viscoelasticity is a common property of biological tissues, including myocardium, which describes the presence

of both elastic elements which allow the ventricle to deform and recoil, as well as viscous elements which generates velocity-dependent resistance to motion. When modelling diastole, viscoelastic energy loss represents energy dissipated, commonly as heat, during ventricular relaxation[11]. In contrast to stiffness, the damping properties of the myocardium contribute to the force which *opposes* ventricular filling.

Load represents the volume of displacement from the resting state. It does not have a direct comparison in the myocardium, however, is linearly related to the E-wave velocity-time integral and likely reflects volumetric preload[3, 4]. Taken together, applying these definitions aids in understanding the findings of this study.

Differences in damping emerged as a key driver of the distinct diastolic dysfunction phenotypes observed in patients with preserved versus reduced ejection fraction. Patients with diastolic dysfunction and pEF had higher values of damping when compared with controls. Increased damping has also been noted in hypertensive heart disease and patients with diabetes, both thought to be a potential precursors for overt diastolic dysfunction[12,13]. In contrast, we found that damping is *decreased* in HFrEF compared to controls. Damping is velocity-dependent, and potentially reduced systolic contraction in rEF patients generates less stored elastic energy and subsequent velocity, resulting in overall less impact of damping during ventricular filling. The kinematic filling efficiency index (KFEI) is a measure derived from PDF analysis that similarly highlights the impact of damping on diastolic function. This dimensionless measure is the ratio of the measured PDF contour-fit E-wave, to a predicted optimal E-wave which keeps the same load and stiffness but sets damping to zero[14]. Patients with pEF have worse KFEI than controls, suggesting a greater degree of diastolic impairment. This is in line with prior research demonstrating impaired KFEI in patients with diabetes, a condition which has been linked with the development of HFpEF[14].

Interestingly, stiffness did not differ between the control, pEF, and rEF groups. This unique finding contrasts prior studies which suggests that patients with diastolic dysfunction may have increased chamber stiffness[15, 16]. This discrepancy may reflect the variable techniques with which stiffness can be invasively measured. The most common invasive assessment of stiffness quantifies instantaneous measures of the pressure-volume relationship at end diastole, often termed passive chamber stiffness. However, diastolic filling is a dynamic process, and the PDF methodology helps capture this by quantifying diastolic mechanics over the entirety of early ventricular filling. This may offer a more nuanced assessment of diastolic function compared with purely instantaneous measures. Furthermore, previous studies typically compared patients with symptomatic HFpEF to controls, without classifying diastolic dysfunction using contemporary echocardiographic guidelines, and the number of study participants in prior studies has been relatively modest. These differences in methodology make direct comparison with our results difficult. Finally, there may only be modest differences in stiffness between patients with preserved and reduced ejection fraction, and a larger sample size may be required to establish such differences with certainty.

Load, and its closely related parameter peak driving force, was elevated in those with pEF but not with rEF when compared to controls. Load has a close linear relationship with the E-wave velocity-time integral and is representative of the volumetric contribution of early diastolic filling[5]. Peak driving force represents the peak transmitral pressure gradient and correlates with invasive haemodynamic measurements[4]. Increased load in pEF may reasonably reflect increased relative contribution of early diastolic filling, which is a known phenomenon with progressive diastolic dysfunction represented by increase in the E/A ratio[17]. Increased load and damping has been noted in aortic stenosis populations, which is another heart failure phenotype which can manifest as HFpEF with ventricular remodelling driven by increased afterload[18]. Notably, damping is not limited to relaxation but also contributes

velocity-dependent resistance during both systole and diastole. The increased load observed in pEF may reflect the greater energy required during systole to overcome the heightened damping properties of the myocardium in pEF. Although the precise mechanisms remain unclear, these findings suggest that patients with pEF may experience elevated left ventricular filling pressures, potentially exceeding those seen in rEF.

This study demonstrates that diastolic dysfunction with preserved or reduced ejection fraction are unique mechanistic entities that in many ways manifest with deviations from controls that go in opposite directions. The reasons for this are likely complex and multifactorial. This may be related to differences in ventricular remodelling at a cellular level resulting in global structural changes. In HFpEF, cardiomyocytes have been shown to exhibit transverse hypertrophy whilst keeping a relatively fixed cell length. This subsequently results in the concentric remodelling seen in numerous HFpEF phenotypes[19]. In comparison, HFrEF is commonly due to cardiomyocyte loss with resultant chamber dilation and eccentric remodelling. At a cellular level, there is relative sparsity of cardiomyocytes with elongation in longitudinal dimensions resulting on overall chamber dilation[20]. Myocardial fibrosis is increased in both HFpEF and HFrEF, though the underlying patterns differ[21]. HFpEF is typically characterised by diffuse myocardial fibrosis with expansion of the extracellular matrix, often occurring in the absence of significant cardiomyocyte loss[22]. In contrast, HFrEF more commonly exhibits dense replacement myocardial fibrosis resulting from scarring due to focal cardiomyocyte injury and loss with the typical example being chronic myocardial infarction[21]. These distinct patterns of diffuse as opposed to focal myocardial fibrosis likely impact diastolic function differently and may contribute to the observed differences between the two phenotypes. Finally, molecular differences including modification in titin protein isoform and intracellular calcium sequestration have also been noted between HFpEF and HFrEF[23]. Conceptually, increased damping could be related to diffuse myocardial fibrosis,

disruption of the normal myofiber organisation, impaired myocardial calcium sequestration, or abnormalities in sarcomere cross-bridge uncoupling[14, 24, 25]. In contrast, stiffness is generated by a multitude of intrinsic myocardial factors. Whilst the abnormal accumulation of collagen seen in diffuse myocardial fibrosis contributes to damping, the innate elastic properties of the normal extracellular matrix, primarily driven by elastin help generate myocardial stiffness[26]. Intracellular titin and cytoskeletal microtubules have also been shown to modulate myocardial stiffness and contribute to ventricular filling[27, 28]. Finally, stiffness is also driven by external factors such as pericardial characteristics and the influence of the great vessels on early ventricular recoil[28, 29].

There are several limitations to the present study. First, the PDF methodology is sensitive to the precise measurement of the components of early diastolic mitral inflow (E-wave), specifically the acceleration time and deceleration time. Small variations in measured acceleration time and deceleration time can result in relatively large differences in derived PDF parameters, thus introducing measurement variability. This sensitivity may limit the clinical utility of the PDF for discriminating between different manifestations of diastolic function at the individual patient level. However, there are available published normal reference values[30]. Notably, this measurement variability does not limit the ability to glean mechanistic insight from group comparisons in sufficiently powered sample sizes such as in the current study. Secondly, while the PDF approach offers mechanistic insight, diastolic function is inherently complex and influenced by multiple dynamic factors. As with traditional echocardiographic parameters, PDF measures are susceptible to changes in preload and afterload, which may confound interpretation. The inherent variability in loading conditions does limit the current utility of PDF analysis on an individual patient diagnostic level. However, we are still able to gain a deeper understanding of overall mechanics when looking at cohorts of patients. Future studies using the PDF methodology could consider

paired TTE and brain natriuretic peptide measurements to further correct for this variation. Thirdly, both HFpEF and HFrEF are two broad classifications of heart failure phenotypes that encompass a heterogenous population of different contributory pathologies. The differences observed between the pEF and rEF groups in the current study may be driven by a dominant disease phenotype within the cohort and may not be generalisable to all aetiologies of heart failure. As data on comorbidities were not available, we are unable to explore these differences. Despite these shortcomings, the current study represents the first application of any method that can quantitatively show the mechanistic differences in diastolic dysfunction between pEF and rEF, thus opening for future prospective studies to better understand the clinical applications of these differences. Finally, the PDF methodology as employed in this study is confined to analysis of the E-wave and therefore does not account for the atrial contribution to diastolic filling. Abnormalities manifesting during late diastole, including those related to atrial dysfunction or increased ventricular stiffness during atrial contraction, are not captured.

Conclusions

Although conventional echocardiographic grading may similarly classify diastolic dysfunction in patients with preserved and reduced ejection fraction, these groups exhibit distinct underlying mechanistic phenotypes. Importantly, the phenomenon of diastolic dysfunction appears to be driven by differences in myocardial damping, rather than stiffness. A deeper understanding of the impact of structural myocardial alterations driving these changes may facilitate the development of targeted therapies, particularly for heart failure with preserved ejection fraction, where effective treatment options remain limited.

References

1. Nagueh Sherif F. Left Ventricular Diastolic Function. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging. 2020;13(1_Part_2):228-44.
2. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP, Byrd BF, 3rd, Dokainish H, Edvardsen T, 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(4):277-314.
3. Kovacs SJ, Barzilai B, Perez JE. Evaluation of diastolic function with Doppler echocardiography: the PDF formalism. American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology. 1987;252(1):H178-H87.
4. 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 Medical Imaging. 2016;16(1):60.
5. Lisauskas JB, Singh J, Bowman AW, Kovács SJ. Chamber properties from transmitral flow: prediction of average and passive left ventricular diastolic stiffness. Journal of Applied Physiology. 2001;91(1):154-62.
6. Benfari G, Miller Wayne L, Antoine C, Rossi A, Lin G, Oh Jae K, et al. Diastolic Determinants of Excess Mortality in Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction. JACC: Heart Failure. 2019;7(9):808-17.
7. 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.
8. Golman M, Padovano W, Shmuylovich L, Kovács SJ. Quantifying Diastolic Function: From E-Waves as Triangles to Physiologic Contours via the 'Geometric Method'. Cardiovasc Eng Technol. 2018;9(1):105-19.
9. Obokata M, Reddy YNV, Borlaug BA. Diastolic Dysfunction and Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction: Understanding Mechanisms by Using Noninvasive Methods. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;13(1 Pt 2):245-57.
10. Escudier M, Atkins T. A Dictionary of Mechanical Engineering2019.
11. Nordsletten D, Capilnasiu A, Zhang W, Wittgenstein A, Hadjicharalambous M, Sommer G, et al. A viscoelastic model for human myocardium. Acta Biomaterialia. 2021;135:441-57.
12. Riordan MM, Chung CS, Kovács SJ. Diabetes and diastolic function: Stiffness and relaxation from transmitral flow. Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology. 2005;31(12):1589-96.
13. Kovács SJ, Rosado J, McGuire ALM, Hall AF. Can Transmitral Doppler E-Waves Differentiate Hypertensive Hearts From Normal? Hypertension. 1997;30(4):788-95.
14. Zhang W, Chung CS, Riordan MM, Wu Y, Shmuylovich L, Kovács SJ. The Kinematic Filling Efficiency Index of the Left Ventricle: Contrasting Normal vs. Diabetic Physiology. Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology. 2007;33(6):842-50.
15. Westermann D, Kasner M, Steendijk P, Spillmann F, Riad A, Weitmann K, et al. Role of Left Ventricular Stiffness in Heart Failure With Normal Ejection Fraction. Circulation. 2008;117(16):2051-60.
16. Zile MR, Baicu CF, Gaasch WH. Diastolic Heart Failure — Abnormalities in Active Relaxation and Passive Stiffness of the Left Ventricle. New England Journal of Medicine. 2004;350(19):1953-9.

17. Mitter SS, Shah SJ, Thomas JD. A Test in Context: E/A and E/e′ to Assess Diastolic Dysfunction and LV Filling Pressure. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;69(11):1451-64.
18. 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.
19. Shah AM. Ventricular remodeling in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. Curr Heart Fail Rep. 2013;10(4):341-9.
20. van Heerebeek L, Borbély A, Niessen HWM, Bronzwaer JGF, van der Velden J, Stienen GJM, et al. Myocardial Structure and Function Differ in Systolic and Diastolic Heart Failure. Circulation. 2006;113(16):1966-73.
21. Ravassa S, López B, Treibel TA, San José G, Losada-Fuentenebro B, Tapia L, et al. Cardiac Fibrosis in heart failure: Focus on non-invasive diagnosis and emerging therapeutic strategies. Molecular Aspects of Medicine. 2023;93:101194.
22. Roy C, Slimani A, de Meester C, Amzulescu M, Pasquet A, Vancraeynest D, et al. Associations and prognostic significance of diffuse myocardial fibrosis by cardiovascular magnetic resonance in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2018;20(1):55.
23. Simmonds SJ, Cuijpers I, Heymans S, Jones EAV. Cellular and Molecular Differences between HFpEF and HFrEF: A Step Ahead in an Improved Pathological Understanding. Cells. 2020;9(1).
24. Kovács SJ. Diastolic function in heart failure. Clin Med Insights Cardiol. 2015;9(Suppl 1):49-55.
25. Riordan MM, Kovács SJ. Stiffness- and relaxation-based quantitation of radial left ventricular oscillations: elucidation of regional diastolic function mechanisms. Journal of Applied Physiology. 2007;102(5):1862-70.
26. Chung CS, Kovács SJ. Physical determinants of left ventricular isovolumic pressure decline: model prediction with in vivo validation. American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology. 2008;294(4):H1589-H96.
27. Nishimura S, Nagai S, Katoh M, Yamashita H, Saeki Y, Okada J-i, et al. Microtubules Modulate the Stiffness of Cardiomyocytes Against Shear Stress. Circulation Research. 2006;98(1):81-7.
28. Helmes M, Trombita´s Kr, Granzier H. Titin Develops Restoring Force in Rat Cardiac Myocytes. Circulation Research. 1996;79(3):619-26.
29. Jöbsis PD, Ashikaga H, Wen H, Rothstein EC, Horvath KA, McVeigh ER, et al. The visceral pericardium: macromolecular structure and contribution to passive mechanical properties of the left ventricle. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol. 2007;293(6):H3379-87.
30. Sundqvist MG, Sahlén 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.

Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics of the control, preserved and reduced ejection fraction cohorts

	Control (n=75)	PEF (n=75)	REF (n=75)
Age, years	60 [54-67]	78.0 [72.0-82.5]	68.0 [58.0-75.5]
Female sex, n (%)	40 (53)	45 (60)	15 (20)
BSA, m^2	1.83 [1.68-1.99]	1.80 [1.64-1.98]	1.92 [1.79-2.04]
EF, %	59 [56-62]	60.0 [58.0-64.5]	30.5 [26.2-34.0]
LAVI, mL/m^2	28.9 [25.0-32.5]	41.5 [37.6-48.1]	47.4 [42.2-53.0]
TR peak velocity, m/s	2.3 [2.1-2.4]	2.8 [2.6-2.9]	2.9 [2.5-3.3]
TR measurable, n (%)	35 (47)	62 (83)	57 (76)
E/A, unitless	1.10 [0.912-1.31]	0.881 [0.721-1.09]	1.88 [1.08-2.54]
E peak, cm/s	70.9 [62.5-82.2]	88.0 [76.0-97.2]	82.0 [66.4-95.4]
E/e', unitless	8.3 [6.8-9.8]	15.7 [12.7-17.6]	17.6 [14.1-21.0]
e' avg, cm/s	8.8 [7.7-9.8]	5.8 [4.8-7.2]	4.9 [3.8-5.8]
E acceleration time	73.5[67.0–84.0]	69.5[61.3–78.5]	80.0[72.3–93.3]
E deceleration time	198.0[176.3–226.5]	239.5[207.5–282.5]	175.0[148.8–204.8]
LVEDDi, cm/m^2	2.48 [2.35-2.60]	2.44 [2.23-2.62]	3.07 [2.82-3.43]
IVS, cm	0.88 [0.81-0.98]	1.10 [0.98-1.26]	0.94 [0.80-1.13]
PWT, cm	0.88 [0.81-0.94]	1.01 [0.91-1.10]	0.96 [0.83-1.13]

Abbreviations: BSA = body surface area; EF = ejection fraction; LAVI = left atrial volume index; TR = tricuspid regurgitation; E/A = the ratio of the peak E-wave velocity to the peak A-wave velocity; E/e' = E to septal e' velocity ratio; LVEDDi = left ventricular end diastolic dimensions indexed to BSA; IVS = intraventricular septal thickness; PWT = posterior wall thickness

Figures



Figure 1. Patient inclusion flowchart.



Figure 2. Parameterized diastolic filling methodology. Representative cases of patients with diastolic dysfunction and reduced (left) or preserved (right) ejection fraction (EF). Top row shows pulsed-wave Doppler recording of early transmitral blood flow velocities (E-wave) over time. The red line denotes the acceleration time (AT), the green marker denotes the peak velocity (E), and the blue line denotes the deceleration time (DT). These three measures together uniquely describe the E-wave (Bottom row) that can be defined mathematically according to the expected behaviour of left ventricular filling in terms of a damped harmonic oscillator.



Figure 3. Conventional echocardiographic and parameterized diastolic filling parameters of controls, preserved, and reduced ejection fraction groups.

Brackets denote statistical significance where present. Horizontal grey dotted line indicates median value for control cohort. Abbreviations: TR = tricuspid regurgitation. KFEI = kinematic filling efficiency index