Noninvasive Myocardial Work Assessment Using Echocardiography in Mixed Aortic Valve Disease

Jonghee Sun, MD, Jiesuck Park, MD, Hong-Mi Choi, MD, In-Chang Hwang, MD, Yeonyee E. Yoon, MD, PhD, Goo-Yeong Cho, MD, PhD

Division of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, Seongnam, Gyeonggi, Republic of Korea

Address for correspondence:

Jiesuck Park, MD

Department of Cardiology, Cardiovascular Center

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

82, Gumi-ro 173beon-gil, Seongnam, Gyeonggi-do, 13620 Republic of Korea

Tel: 82-31-787-

E-mail: cardio.jspark@gmail.com

Word count: 2,784

ABSTRACT

Background: Mixed aortic valve disease (MAVD), defined by the coexistence of aortic stenosis (AS) and aortic regurgitation (AR), imposes combined pressure and volume overload on the left ventricle (LV). Conventional echocardiographic indices have limited ability to capture this complex hemodynamic burden.

Objectives: To develop a novel, noninvasive integrated myocardial work index (iMWI) for characterization of LV workload and risk stratification in patients with MAVD.

Methods: We retrospectively studied 1,022 patients (median age 80 years, 60% women) with mild or greater AS and AR who underwent transthoracic echocardiography between 2015 and 2020. iMWI was defined as (systolic blood pressure + mean aortic gradient) × LV global longitudinal strain / E/e′. The primary endpoint was a composite of cardiovascular death, heart failure hospitalization, or aortic valve replacement. Prognostic performance was assessed with Kaplan–Meier analysis, Cox regression, and time-dependent ROC curves.

Results: iMWI values varied by MAVD phenotype, with progressive reductions in groups with ≥moderate AS (p for trend = 0.022). Patients with both ≥moderate AS and ≥moderate AR had the lowest median iMWI (170; IQR 112–225). Lower iMWI was independently associated with higher risk of the composite endpoint (adjusted HR 1.05 per 10-unit decrease; 95% CI 1.02–1.09; p = 0.001). The lowest tertile showed poorer event-free survival (log-rank p < 0.001). iMWI yielded moderate 3-year predictive accuracy (AUC 0.67; 95% CI 0.64–0.76), with consistent value even without severe MAVD.

Conclusions: iMWI integrates afterload, preload, and myocardial deformation into a single noninvasive metric. It independently predicts adverse outcomes in MAVD and may enhance

risk stratification, complementing conventional echocardiographic indices.

Keywords: myocardial work, aortic stenosis, aortic regurgitation

CONDENSED ABSTRACT

Mixed aortic valve disease (MAVD), defined by the coexistence of aortic stenosis and regurgitation, imposes combined pressure and volume overload on the left ventricle. Conventional echocardiographic indices incompletely reflect this complex burden. Among 1,022 patients with MAVD, we developed a novel integrated myocardial work index (iMWI), incorporating afterload, preload, and myocardial deformation into a single noninvasive metric. Lower iMWI was independently associated with adverse outcomes, including cardiovascular death, heart failure hospitalization, and aortic valve replacement. iMWI may provide a simple and feasible tool to improve risk stratification in MAVD, complementing conventional echocardiographic parameters.

Clinical Perspective

Competency in Medical Knowledge:

Mixed aortic valve disease (MAVD), characterized by the coexistence of aortic stenosis and regurgitation, imposes combined pressure and volume overload on the left ventricle. Conventional echocardiographic indices are limited in capturing this dual burden and the performance of the underlying myocardium. In this study, a novel integrated myocardial work index (iMWI), which incorporates afterload, preload, and myocardial deformation into a single noninvasive metric, was shown to independently predict adverse outcomes in a large cohort of patients with MAVD.

Translational Outlook:

Further studies are needed to validate iMWI prospectively and across diverse populations, and to assess its incremental value for guiding clinical decision-making, including timing of aortic valve intervention. Integration of iMWI into routine echocardiographic workflows may provide a practical tool for improving risk stratification in patients with complex valvular heart disease.

INTRODUCTION

Mixed aortic valve disease (MAVD), defined as the coexistence of aortic stenosis (AS) and aortic regurgitation (AR), is the most frequent form of mixed valvular disease [1]. MAVD represents a particularly complex hemodynamic state, where the LV is simultaneously exposed to both pressure and volume overload. This dual burden leads to more severe hypertrophy and elevated filling pressures compared with isolated AS or AR, often resulting in discordant indices and accelerated progression to symptoms [1-3].

Despite its clinical importance, MAVD remains under-recognized and under-studied. Conventional echocardiographic indices such as peak aortic jet velocity, mean gradient, or regurgitant fraction were primarily validated in isolated valve lesions and may be inaccurate in MAVD [4,5]. Diagnostic pitfalls include overestimation of stenosis severity due to AR-related high flow, and underestimation of regurgitation severity in the presence of a non-dilated, hypertrophied left ventricle (LV) [1]. Importantly, these indices reflect lesion severity but provide limited insight into the performance of the underlying myocardium, which is critical for patient outcomes [6,7].

The concept of myocardial work, integrating strain and pressure data, has been introduced to better quantify LV performance beyond load-dependent measures [8]. Conventional myocardial work indices rely on invasive pressure–volume loop analysis [9,10], which is not feasible for routine or longitudinal monitoring. Noninvasive pressure–strain loop–derived myocardial work has been increasingly applied in patients with aortic stenosis and shown to provide incremental insights beyond conventional indices [11,12]. Similar approaches have also been reported in aortic regurgitation [13,14]. Nevertheless, data remain scarce in mixed aortic valve disease, where both pressure and volume overload coexist and the

hemodynamic burden imposed on the underlying myocardium is particularly relevant. Meanwhile, the application of pressure–strain loop measurements in daily practice may be limited, as they are not always easily accessible or practical for routine clinical use. In this context, a simplified and integrated index that captures both valvular hemodynamics and myocardial performance would be of particular value.

Therefore, in the present study, we developed a novel noninvasive integrated myocardial work index (iMWI) specifically tailored to MAVD. We first sought to establish the feasibility of iMWI measurement in a large cohort of patients with MAVD and to examine its relationship with conventional echocardiographic parameters. We further evaluated the prognostic implications of iMWI for adverse clinical outcomes and compared its discriminative performance with conventional aortic valve indices.

METHODS

Study Population

We retrospectively screened 4,513 consecutive patients who underwent transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) at Seoul National University Bundang Hospital between January 1, 2015, and December 31, 2020, and were identified as having at least mild AS or AR. Patients were excluded if they had concomitant moderate or greater mitral valve disease, prior mitral or aortic valve surgery, bicuspid aortic valve, history of coronary revascularization, ischemic or non-ischemic cardiomyopathy, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) <40%, atrial fibrillation or flutter, presence of cardiac implantable electronic devices, conduction abnormalities, uncontrolled hypertension, moderate or greater tricuspid regurgitation, severe pulmonary hypertension, poor echocardiographic image quality, or incomplete clinical/echocardiographic data. The final study cohort comprised 1,022 patients with mild or greater AS and AR (MAVD) (**Figure 1**). The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Seoul National University Bundang Hospital (IRB No. B-2511-1008-105). Informed consent was waived owing to the retrospective nature of the study.

Echocardiographic Assessment

All echocardiographic studies were conducted by trained echocardiographers or cardiologists and interpreted by board-certified cardiologists specialized in echocardiography, following recent guidelines as part of routine clinical care [15]. AS severity was graded using peak aortic jet velocity (AV Vmax), mean transaortic pressure gradient (AV mPG), and aortic valve area (AVA) derived from the continuity equation. AR severity was assessed semi-quantitatively and

categorized as mild, moderate, or severe based on an integrative approach.

Chamber quantification included LV end-diastolic diameter, interventricular septal thickness, relative wall thickness, LV mass index, LVEF by the biplane Simpson method, and left atrial volume index. Diastolic function was assessed using trans-mitral Doppler and tissue Doppler imaging, including the E/e′ ratio, and tricuspid regurgitant velocity. LV Global longitudinal strain (GLS) was quantified by speckle-tracking echocardiography. For calculation of iMWI, LV GLS was entered as an absolute value.

Integrated Myocardial Work Index (iMWI)

The iMWI was designed to estimate myocardial work in the setting of AS and AR by incorporating both afterload and preload conditions. For each patient, systolic LV pressure was approximated by brachial systolic blood pressure measured at the time of TTE, plus the AV mPG, and this value was multiplied by LV GLS to estimate myocardial work, expressed in mmHg·%. Previous indices of myocardial work have typically required invasive measurements of intraventricular and transvalvular pressures, or modeling of continuous pressure–volume loops [8-14]. In contrast, our iMWI incorporates the key elements of afterload and LV GLS in a simplified, noninvasive form, thereby enhancing its potential clinical applicability.

The product of systolic LV pressure and GLS was divided by E/e′. This adjustment was intended to reflect not only the absolute amount of myocardial work but also the burden imposed on the myocardium in generating that work. E/e′ has been validated as a noninvasive surrogate of LV filling pressure, and its incorporation enables iMWI to account for the diastolic load and elevated filling pressures associated with MAVD. Unlike conventional myocardial

work indices, which primarily incorporate systolic load and contractile deformation, our approach adjusts myocardial work relative to the prevailing diastolic burden. This distinction is particularly important in MAVD, where concomitant pressure overload from AS and volume overload from AR accelerate LV remodeling and elevate filling pressures. By integrating afterload, preload, and myocardial deformation into a single noninvasive index, iMWI provides a more comprehensive reflection of myocardial efficiency and burden in the MAVD setting. The conceptual rationale is illustrated in **Figure 2**.

Clinical Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest was a composite endpoint of cardiovascular (CV) death, hospitalization for heart failure, and aortic valve replacement. Clinical events were ascertained through review of hospital records and the institutional electronic medical database. Follow-up was performed from the index echocardiographic examination until the occurrence of the first endpoint event or the last available clinical contact.

Statistical Analysis

Baseline characteristics are summarized as median (interquartile range) for continuous variables and as counts (percentages) for categorical variables. Group comparisons were performed using the Kruskal–Wallis test for continuous variables and the χ^2 test for categorical variables.

For the prognostic value of iMWI, patients were stratified into tertiles, and survival

analyses were conducted using Kaplan–Meier curves with log-rank tests. In addition, to assess iMWI as a continuous variable, Cox proportional hazards models and restricted cubic spline functions were applied to estimate hazard ratios (HRs). To evaluate the independent predictive value of iMWI, baseline clinical covariates and echocardiographic parameters significant in univariate analyses were further included in multivariable models. To avoid multicollinearity, variables directly included in the calculation of iMWI or those highly correlated with its components were not entered simultaneously into the models. The predictive performance of iMWI for 3-year composite outcomes was further assessed using time-dependent receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) analysis after adjustment for age and sex. Model discrimination was compared by the area under the ROC curve (AUC), and calibration was examined by plotting observed versus predicted event rates across risk deciles.

All statistical analyses were performed using R software (version 4.5.1; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). A two-sided p value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Baseline Characteristics and MAVD Phenotypes

The study population comprised 1,022 patients with mild or greater AS and AR. The median age was 80 years, and 60% were women. The overall cohort demonstrated preserved LV systolic function, with a median LVEF of 64% (IQR 59–68), LVEDD 45 mm (IQR 42–49), E/e′ 14 (IQR 11–19), and LVGLS –17% (IQR –14 to –19) (**Table 1**). The calculated iMWI in the overall patients was 180 (IQR 129-242).

To compare clinical and hemodynamic features according to the grading of concomitant AS and AR, patients were categorized into four MAVD phenotypes: (1) mild AS/mild AR, (2) mild AS/≥moderate AR, (3) ≥moderate AS/mild AR, and (4) ≥moderate AS/≥moderate AR. Baseline characteristics across these groups are summarized in **Table 1**. Systolic blood pressure did not differ among the four categories. Patients with ≥moderate AS/≥moderate AR tended to be younger but exhibited larger LV volumes, higher LVMI, and greater LA enlargement compared with those with mild AS/mild AR, findings suggestive of increased pressure and volume loading.

When comparing iMWI across the MAVD phenotypes, the mild AS/≥moderate AR group showed slightly higher values than the mild AS/mild AR group. In contrast, phenotypes with ≥moderate AS demonstrated a progressive decline in iMWI despite higher AV mPG (p for trend = 0.022), driven by concomitant reductions in GLS and increases in E/e′ (**Table 1** and **Figure 3**). The lowest iMWI was observed in patients with both ≥moderate AS and ≥moderate AR, with a median value of 170 (IQR 112–225).

Representative Hemodynamic Profiles of MAVD

The application of iMWI in representative MAVD scenarios is illustrated in Figure 4. Three MAVD cases demonstrate AR at different stages, from mild to severe, superimposed on moderate. In all cases, LVEF was preserved and calculated AVA by the continuity equation was >1.0 cm^2, consistent with moderate AS. SBP ranged from 134 to 144 mmHg. Case A, a male patient in his 70s, showed mild AR with moderate AS, representing a predominantly stenotic phenotype, with a calculated iMWI of 217. Case B, a female patient in her 60s, demonstrated moderate AR in the setting of moderate AS. AV Vmax and mean PG were 4.6 m/s and 45 mmHg, respectively, whereas the calculated AVA was 1.1 cm^2, suggesting augmented transvalvular flow associated with significant AR. LVEF was 69% and GLS –20%, indicating dynamic LV contraction, while E/e′ remained within the normal range. The calculated iMWI was 319, reflecting increased myocardial work. This scenario likely represents a compensated phase of MAVD in which AR progression increases volume loading and myocardial work, but overall myocardial performance is still preserved. Case C, a male patient in his 40s, represented severe AR superimposed on moderate AS. AV Vmax, mean PG, and calculated AVA were 4.5 m/s, 48 mmHg, and 1.2 cm^2, respectively, which were similar to Case B. Although LVEF remained within the normal range, the patient showed markedly elevated E/e′ (25.9) and reduced GLS (–13%), indicating an advanced phase of MAVD with myocardial dysfunction. The calculated iMWI was only 93, reflecting increased myocardial burden and impaired ability to sustain work under combined pressure and volume overload.

Prognostic Impact of iMWI

When patients were stratified by tertiles of iMWI, the risk of the composite outcome increased gradually from the highest to the lowest tertile (log-rank p<0.001) (**Figure 5A**). In Cox proportional hazards analysis, iMWI as a continuous variable was strongly associated with the composite outcome, with lower values predicting higher risk (univariate HR 1.07 [95% CI 1.04–1.09] per 10-unit decrease, p value =0.001) (**Table 2**). Restricted cubic spline analysis further demonstrated a graded increase in outcome risk with decreasing iMWI (**Figure 5B**). In predictive models with serial adjustments for age, sex, LVEF, and AV Vmax, the prognostic value of iMWI remained consistent. In fully adjusted multivariable models including relevant clinical and echocardiographic covariates, iMWI persisted as an independent predictor of the composite outcome (multivariate HR 1.05 [95% CI 1.02–1.09] per 10 score decrease, p value =0.001) (**Table 2**).

In discrimination analyses, iMWI showed moderate predictive performance for 3-year composite outcomes, with an AUC of 0.67 (95% CI 0.64–0.76) in the time-dependent ROC curve (**Figure 5C**). Calibration plots further demonstrated good agreement between predicted and observed event rates across deciles of risk, supporting the robustness of iMWI-based prediction (**Figure 5D**).

Subgroup Analysis

In a subgroup analysis restricted to patients without severe MAVD (severe AS or AR), iMWI continued to stratify the risk of adverse outcomes. Kaplan–Meier curves showed significantly higher event rates in the lowest iMWI tertile compared with the higher tertiles (log-rank p<0.001) (**Figure 6A**). In time-dependent ROC analysis, iMWI demonstrated numerically higher discrimination for 3-year outcomes than AV Vmax (AUC 0.75 [95% CI 0.68–0.83] vs.

0.72 [95% CI 0.64–0.79]), although the difference was not statistically significant (**Figure 6B**).

DISCUSSIONS

In this study of 1,022 patients with MAVD, we developed and evaluated a novel non-invasive integrated index (iMWI) designed to capture the combined hemodynamic burden of AS and AR. The iMWI incorporates afterload, preload, and LV deformation into a single noninvasive parameter. We found that iMWI values differed according to MAVD phenotype, with progressive reductions in patients with ≥moderate AS, and the lowest values observed in those with concomitant ≥moderate AS and AR. Lower iMWI was independently associated with higher risk of cardiovascular death, HF hospitalization, or AVR, and remained predictive even in patients without severe MAVD.

MAVD imposes unique and often discordant loading conditions on the LV, with pressure overload driving concentric hypertrophy and volume overload promoting dilatation and elevated filling pressures. Prior studies have shown that such maladaptive remodeling and impaired diastolic function are key determinants of adverse outcomes in MAVD, independent of conventional measures of valvular severity [6,7]. Conventional echocardiographic indices, including AV Vmax, mean gradient, or regurgitant fraction, primarily reflect lesion severity and may either overestimate or underestimate the true hemodynamic impact when AS and AR coexist. In this context, the decline in iMWI across more advanced MAVD phenotypes suggests that the index integrates the net effect of combined pressure and volume overload on myocardial performance. By incorporating afterload, preload, and deformation into a single parameter, iMWI provides a pathophysiologically grounded measure of LV workload that complements traditional valve-centered indices.

Risk stratification in MAVD remains challenging because conventional echocardiographic parameters are often discordant and insufficient to capture the true

myocardial burden. In our cohort, lower iMWI was consistently associated with higher risk of cardiovascular death, HF hospitalization, or AVR, with a graded relationship across tertiles and on continuous analyses. Importantly, iMWI retained its prognostic value even in patients without severe MAVD, suggesting that it can identify subgroups at risk who might otherwise be overlooked by conventional severity grading. These findings align with prior evidence showing that markers of myocardial performance, such as GLS, diastolic function indices, and adverse remodeling, are stronger predictors of outcomes in valvular heart disease than lesion severity alone [6,7,16]. Beyond individual parameters, iMWI offers a comprehensive assessment by integrating loading conditions and myocardial deformation, thereby providing incremental clinical insight for prognostic information [2,3].

Previous studies in isolated AS and AR have demonstrated that noninvasive myocardial work indices provide incremental information beyond conventional echocardiographic parameters. In patients with AS, myocardial work has been associated with LV remodeling and improved prediction of outcomes compared with LVEF or transvalvular gradients [11,12]. Similarly, in chronic AR, impaired myocardial work was linked to adverse remodeling and worse prognosis, even when LVEF was preserved [13,14]. These findings underscore the clinical relevance of integrating loading conditions with myocardial deformation. In contrast, evidence regarding MAVD has been sparse. Prior outcome studies have largely relied on conventional indices such as AV Vmax, AVA, and regurgitant fraction, which often yield discordant results and insufficiently reflect myocardial performance [2,3]. Egbe et al. demonstrated that diastolic indices and adverse remodeling were stronger prognosticators than lesion severity in MAVD [6,7]. Our study extends these observations by demonstrating, for the first time, that an integrated metric combining afterload, preload, and

deformation—iMWI—provides robust prognostic value in a large MAVD cohort. This suggests that approaches centered on myocardial performance may complement the conventional valve-focused assessment and offer more accurate risk stratification in patients with complex mixed valve lesions.

Management of MAVD is challenging because current guidelines provide limited recommendations, and treatment decisions are often extrapolated from isolated AS or AR [1,15]. Conventional echocardiographic indices may fail to capture the combined hemodynamic burden, leading to uncertainty in timely management. Our findings indicate that iMWI, by integrating afterload, preload, and LV deformation, offers a comprehensive measure of myocardial workload that is strongly associated with clinical outcomes. In practice, iMWI could complement standard echocardiographic assessment by identifying high-risk patients who might otherwise be underestimated by conventional indices. This may be particularly relevant for patients without severe MAVD, in whom clinical decision-making is unclear. By reflecting the functional consequence of combined pressure and volume overload on the LV, iMWI has the potential to improve risk stratification, guide closer follow-up, and inform the timing of AVR.

This study has several limitations. First, it was retrospective and conducted at a single tertiary referral center, which may limit generalizability. Second, iMWI was derived from echocardiographic and noninvasive blood pressure measurements rather than invasive pressure–volume loops, which remain the gold standard for myocardial work assessment. However, this simplified approach enhances feasibility for daily practice and highlights the potential clinical applicability of iMWI in real-world workflows. Third, patients with concomitant significant mitral or tricuspid valve disease, atrial fibrillation, or reduced LVEF

were excluded in order to focus specifically on the population with MAVD. While this allowed us to minimize confounding from other cardiovascular conditions, future studies are needed to validate the performance of iMWI in broader cohorts with diverse comorbidities. Finally, prospective multicenter investigations are warranted to determine whether incorporating iMWI into routine echocardiographic evaluation can improve patient selection for earlier intervention and ultimately enhance clinical outcomes.

In this large MAVD cohort, we presented an integrated myocardial work index that combines afterload, preload, and myocardial deformation into a single noninvasive metric. Lower iMWI was independently associated with adverse outcomes and remained predictive even in patients without severe MAVD. iMWI may serve as a feasible tool for capturing the myocardial consequences of combined pressure and volume overload in MAVD and provide complementary prognostic information beyond conventional echocardiographic indices.

Data Sharing Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are not publicly available due to institutional review board restrictions intended to protect patient confidentiality. Deidentified data will be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Declaration of Interests

The authors report no relationships to disclose.

Reference

1. Unger P, Galloo X, Pibarot P. Mixed valvular heart disease: diagnosis and management. *Eur Heart J*. 2025;46:2261–74.

2. Egbe AC, Poterucha JT, Warnes CA. Mixed aortic valve disease: midterm outcome and predictors of adverse events. *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37:2671–8.

3. Zilberszac R, Gabriel H, Schemper M, Zahler D, Czerny M, Maurer G, *et al.* Outcome of combined stenotic and regurgitant aortic valve disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:1489–95.

4. Baumgartner H, Hung J, Bermejo J, Chambers JB, Edvardsen T, Goldstein S, et al. Recommendations on the echocardiographic assessment of aortic valve stenosis: a focused update from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging and the American Society of Echocardiography. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2017;18:254-275

5. Zoghbi WA, Adams D, Bonow RO, Enriquez-Sarano M, Foster E, Grayburn PA, *et al.* Recommendations for noninvasive evaluation of native valvular regurgitation. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2019;32:303–71.

6. Egbe AC, Warnes CA. Predictor of left ventricular dysfunction after aortic valve replacement in mixed aortic valve disease. *Int J Cardiol*. 2017;228:511–7.

7. Egbe AC, Khan AR, Boler A, Said SM, Geske JB, Miranda WR, *et al.* Role of diastolic function indices in the risk stratification of patients with mixed aortic valve disease. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2018;19:668–74.

8. Russell K, Eriksen M, Aaberge L, Wilhelmsen N, Skulstad H, Remme EW, *et al.* A novel clinical method for quantification of regional left ventricular pressure–strain loop area: a non-invasive index of myocardial work. *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33:724–33.

9. Suga H. Total mechanical energy of a ventricle model and cardiac oxygen consumption. *Am J Physiol*. 1979;236:H498–505.

10. Sagawa K, Maughan L, Suga H, Sunagawa K. *Cardiac Contraction and the Pressure–Volume Relationship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1988.

11. Fortuni F, Butcher SC, van der Kley F, Lustosa RP, Karalis I, de Weger A, *et al.* Left ventricular myocardial work in patients with severe aortic stenosis. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2021;34:257–66.

12. Jain R, Bajwa T, Roemer S, Huisheree H, Allaqaband SQ, Kroboth S, *et al.* Myocardial work assessment in severe aortic stenosis undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2021;22:715–21.

13. Meucci MC, Butcher SC, Galloo X, van der Velde ET, Marsan NA, Bax JJ, et al. Noninvasive Left Ventricular Myocardial Work in Patients with Chronic Aortic Regurgitation and Preserved Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2022 Jul;35:703-11.

14. Tan YT, Wang YL, Abulipizi A, Ji X, Zhang RZ, Zhao RH, et al. Non-invasive myocardial work in severe aortic regurgitation: implications for post-operative left ventricular dysfunction. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2025;26:654-63.

15. Otto CM, Nishimura RA, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP 3rd, Gentile F, *et al.* 2020 ACC/AHA guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2021;77:e25–197.

16. Kong WKF, Vollema EM, Prevedello F, Perry R, Ng ACT, Poh KK, et al. Prognostic implications of left ventricular global longitudinal strain in patients with bicuspid aortic valve disease and preserved ejection fraction. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2020;21:759–67.

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics

Variable	Overall (n=1022)	Mild AS, Mild AR (n=647)	Mild AS, ≥ Moderate AR (n=50)	≥ Moderated AS, Mild AR (n=257)	≥ Moderate AS, ≥ Moderate AR (n=68)	P difference
Age, years	80 (74–85)	80 (74–85)	78 (69–84)	80 (74–85)	77 (68–83)	0.016
Male	409 (40.0)	243 (37.6)	31 (62.0)	139 (54.1)	39 (57.4)	0.131
Female	613 (60.0)	404 (62.4)	19 (38.0)	118 (45.9)	29 (42.6)	
BMI, kg/m^2	24 (22–27)	24 (22–27)	23 (21–25)	24 (22–27)	24 (21–26)	0.131
SBP, mmHg	133 (121–145)	133 (122–146)	135 (120–143)	131 (120–142)	137 (118–149)	0.387
DBP, mmHg	71 (64–79)	71 (65–79)	73 (66–78)	71 (64–78)	68 (59–76)	0.024
mBP, mmHg	92 (85–100)	92 (85–100)	94 (85–99)	91 (84–98)	91 (81–98)	0.122
AS severity						0.001
Mild	697 (68.2)	647 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Moderate	192 (18.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	149 (58.0)	43 (63.2)	
Severe	133 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	108 (42.0)	25 (36.8)	
AR severity						<0.001
Mild	904 (88.5)	647 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	257 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
Moderate	103 (10.1)	0 (0.0)	47 (94.0)	0 (0.0)	56 (82.4)	
Severe	15 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	3 (6.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (17.6)	
iMWI, mmHg*%	180 (129–242)	184 (132–249)	191 (147–224)	171 (112–236)	170 (112–225)	0.022
LVEDD, mm	45 (42–49)	45 (42–48)	49 (46–53)	45 (40–49)	48 (43–54)	0.001

IVS, mm	11 (10–12)	11 (10–12)	11 (10–13)	12 (11–13)	12 (11–14)	0.001
RWT	0.4 (0.4–0.5)	0.4 (0.4– 0.5)	0.4 (0.4– 0.5)	0.5 (0.4– 0.6)	0.4 (0.4– 0.5)	0.001
LVMI, g/m^2	106 (89–126)	103 (87–119)	120 (98–149)	111 (93–132)	133 (99–164)	0.001
LVEDV, ml	77 (62–93)	75 (61–89)	103 (82–123)	78 (61–93)	95 (75–135)	0.001
LVEF, %	64 (59–68)	64 (59–68)	60 (57–63)	64 (60–68)	62 (57–67)	0.001
LAVI, ml/m^2	43 (35–55)	41 (34–51)	48 (39–58)	47 (38–59)	53 (39–68)	0.001
AV Vmax, m/s	2.5 (2.3–3.3)	2.4 (2.2– 2.5)	2.5 (2.3– 2.8)	3.8 (3.3– 4.4)	4.0 (3.4– 4.6)	0.001
AV mPG, mmHg	13 (10–23)	11 (9–13)	12 (10–14)	31 (23–44)	34 (26–50)	0.001
AVA, cm^2	1.3 (1.0–1.7)	1.7 (1.5– 1.9)	1.9 (1.6– 2.1)	1.1 (0.9– 1.3)	1.1 (0.8– 1.3)	0.001
E/e'	14 (11–19)	13 (10–17)	13 (11–17)	15 (12–22)	16 (13–23)	0.001
LVGLS, %	17 (14–19)	17 (15–19)	17 (15–18)	16 (14–18)	16 (14–17)	0.001
TR Vmax, m/s	2.5 (2.3–2.8)	2.5 (2.3– 2.8)	2.4 (2.2– 2.7)	2.6 (2.3– 2.8)	2.6 (2.3– 2.9)	0.202

Values are presented as median (interquartile range), or as number (percentage), unless otherwise indicated.
Abbreviations: AR = aortic regurgitation; AS = aortic stenosis; AVA = aortic valve area; BMI = body mass index; DBP = diastolic blood pressure; E/e′ = mitral inflow to annular velocity ratio; iMWI = integrated myocardial work index; IVS = interventricular septum; LAVI = left atrial volume index; LVEDD = left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVEDV = left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; LVGLS = left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LVMI = left ventricular mass index; mBP = mean blood pressure; RWT = relative wall thickness; SBP = systolic blood pressure; TR Vmax = tricuspid regurgitation maximum velocity.

Table 2. Predictors for composite outcome

Variable	Univariate HR (95% CI)	p value	*Multivariate HR (95% CI)	p value
Age, per 10-year increase	1.28 (1.00-1.63)	0.047	1.34 (1.03-1.74)	0.028
Male	1.23 (0.83-1.83)	0.306		
BMI, per 1kg/m^2 increase	1.01 (0.96-1.07)	0.667		
SBP, per 10mmHg increase	1.05 (0.93-1.18)	0.436		
AS grade				
mild	reference			
moderate	2.22 (1.24-3.40)	0.008		
severe	11.88 (7.55-18.71)	0.001		
AR grade				
mild	reference			
moderate	1.65 (0.95-2.87)	0.074		
severe	1.56 (0.38-6.33)	0.537		
iMWI, per 10 score decrease	1.07 (1.04-1.09)	0.001	1.05 (1.02-1.09)	0.003
LVEDD, per 1mm increase	1.03 (0.99-1.07)	0.061		
IVS, per mm increase	1.37 (1.25-1.49)	0.001		
RWT, per 0.1 increase	1.33 (1.12-1.58)	0.001	1.02 (0.82-1.27)	0.872
LVMI, per 10 g/m^2 increase	1.18 (1.12-1.24)	0.001	1.09 (1.01-1.16)	0.021
LVEDV, per 10 ml increase	1.03 (0.94-1.09)	0.335		
LVEF, per 10% decrease	1.55 (1.16-2.08)	0.004	1.30 (0.94-1.80)	0.117

LAVI, per 10 ml/m^2 increase	1.23 (1.11-1.35)	0.001	0.84 (0.72-1.07)	0.089
AV Vmax, per 1m/s increase	2.49 (2.12-2.92)	0.001	2.50 (2.03-3.07)	0.001
AV mPG, per 10mmHg increase	1.53 (1.44-1.65)	0.001		
E/e', per unit increase	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	0.001		
LVGLS, per 1% decrease	1.21 (1.14-1.28)	0.001		

* Adjusted for age, iMWI, RWT, LVMI, LVEF, LAVI, AV Vmax

Abbreviations: AR = aortic regurgitation; AS = aortic stenosis; AV mPG = aortic valve mean pressure gradient; AV Vmax = aortic valve maximum velocity; BMI = body mass index; CI = confidence interval; E/e′ = mitral inflow to annular velocity ratio; HR = hazard ratio; iMWI = integrated myocardial work index; IVS = interventricular septum; LAVI = left atrial volume index; LVEDD = left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVEDV = left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; LVGLS = left ventricular global longitudinal strain; LVMI = left ventricular mass index; RWT = relative wall thickness; SBP = systolic blood pressure.

Figure 1. Study Flow

Flow diagram of patient selection. Among 4,513 patients with at least mild AS or AR, exclusions were applied, yielding a final cohort of 1,022 patients with MAVD.

Abbreviations: AS = aortic stenosis; AR = aortic regurgitation; AV = aortic valve; CABG = coronary artery bypass graft; CIED = cardiac implantable electronic device; HTN = hypertension; LBBB = left bundle branch block; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; MAC = mitral annular calcification; MAVD = mixed aortic valve disease; MR = mitral regurgitation; MS = mitral stenosis; MV = mitral valve; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; SBP = systolic blood pressure; SNUBH = Seoul National University Bundang Hospital; TR = tricuspid regurgitation; TTE = transthoracic echocardiography; VPCs = ventricular premature contractions.

Figure 1. Study Flow



Figure 2. Concept of integrated myocardial work index

Schematic illustration of iMWI calculation. Systolic LV pressure was estimated as systolic blood pressure plus mean aortic gradient, multiplied by LV GLS, and divided by E/e′ to account for LV filling pressure. This index reflects myocardial performance under combined pressure and volume overload.

Abbreviations: See abbreviations in Figure 1. E/e’, ratio of early diastolic mitral inflow velocity to early diastolic mitral annular velocity; GLS = global longitudinal strain; iMWI = integrated myocardial work index; LV = left ventricle; mPG = mean pressure gradient.

Figure 2. Concept of integrated myocardial work index (iMWI)



Figure 3. Distribution of echo parameters according to MAVD phenotypes

Box-and-whisker plots showing distribution of iMWI and individual echocardiographic parameters according to four MAVD groups: (1) mild AS/mild AR, (2) mild AS/≥moderate AR, (3) ≥moderate AS/mild AR, and (4) ≥moderate AS/≥moderate AR. Progressive reduction in iMWI was observed with ≥moderate AS (p for trend = 0.022).

Abbreviations: See abbreviations in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Figure 3. Distribution of echo parameters according to MAVD phenotypes



Figure 4. Illustrative Cases Demonstrating iMWI Across MAVD Phenotypes

Three illustrative cases demonstrating the application of iMWI in different MAVD phenotypes with AR at varying stages superimposed on moderate AS. Beyond transvalvular hemodynamics, iMWI captured the impact of worsening AR and diastolic burden on myocardial performance, showing marked reduction in the advanced phase of MAVD.

Abbreviations: Abbreviations: See abbreviations in Figure 1 and Figure 2. AVA = aortic valve area; PG = pressure gradient; Vmax = aortic valve peak velocity.

Figure 4. Illustrative Cases Demonstrating iMWI Across MAVD Phenotypes



SBP (mmHg)	136 mmHg
LVEF (%)	60%
E/e′	13.0
GLS (%)	-17.3 %
iMWI	217

SBP (mmHg)	144 mmHg
LVEF (%)	69%
E/e′	12.1
GLS (%)	-20.4 %
iMWI	319.8

SBP (mmHg)	134 mmHg
LVEF (%)	57%
E/e′	25.9
GLS (%)	-13.3 %
iMWI	93.6

Figure 5. Outcome prediction by iMWI

(A) Kaplan–Meier curves for composite outcomes stratified by iMWI tertiles. (B) Restricted cubic spline analysis showing graded association between lower iMWI and higher risk. (C) Time-dependent ROC curves demonstrating predictive performance of iMWI for 3-year outcomes. (D) Calibration plots of predicted vs observed event rates.

Abbreviations: See abbreviations in Figure 2. AUC = area under the curve; ROC = receiver-operating characteristic; HR = hazard ratio; CI = confidence interval.

Figure 5. Outcome prediction by iMWI



Figure 6. Outcome prediction by iMWI among patients without progression to severe MAVD

(A) Kaplan–Meier curves showing prognostic discrimination of iMWI tertiles in patients without severe AS or AR. (B) Time-dependent ROC curves comparing predictive performance of iMWI and AV Vmax.

Abbreviations: See abbreviations in Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 4, and Figure 5.

Figure 6. Outcome prediction by iMWI among patients without progression to severe MAVD