Diagnostic and Prognostic Value of Global Longitudinal Strain in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

1 Yujiao Shi¹, Wang Qing¹, Chunqiu Liu¹, Xiong Shuang¹, Chenguang Yang¹,

2 Wenbo Qiao¹, Guoju Dong^{1, 2*}Jiangang Liu^{2*}

- ⁴ ¹Department of Cardiovascular Internal Medicine, Xiyuan Hospital, Chinese Academy of
- 5 Traditional Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China
- 6 ²National Clinical Research Center for Chinese Medicine Cardiology, Xiyuan Hospital,
- 7 Chinese Academy of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China
- 8
- 9 * Corresponding Author
- E-mail: Guoju Dong. e-mail: 13691393589@163.com (GD); liujiangang2002@sina.com
 (JL)
- 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

25 Abstract

Objective: Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), an increasing public health concern, is increasing in prevalence and is associated with an elevated risk of hospitalization and mortality. Currently, data on the clinical application value of left ventricular global longitudinal strain (LV GLS) in HFpEF are contradictory. Therefore, we performed the following meta-analysis to appraise the diagnostic and prognostic value of LV GLS in HFpEF.

Methods: PubMed, Medline, Scopus, and Web of Science were retrieved exhaustively from their inception until December 20, 2022, to obtain literature assessing the diagnostic and prognostic value of LV GLS in HFpEF.

35 **Results:** Forty-one studies (including 14,543 patients) published from 2008 to 2022 were 36 included. The results of the meta-analysis were as follows: First, the LV GLS values in 37 HFpEF patients were significantly lower than in healthy individuals (SMD:1.21; 95% CI 38 (0.94, 1.47), p<0.00001, I²=85%; P<0.00001), but substantially higher than in HErEF 39 patients (SMD: -2.03; 95% CI (-2.23, -1.72), p<0.00001, I²=92%; P<0.00001). Second, 40 the pooled diagnostic parameters of LV GLS for HFpEF were as follows: sensitivity, 41 0.77 (95% CI: 0.71–0.82); specificity, 0.66 (95% CI: 0.58–0.74); DOR, 7.53 (95% CI: 42 3.19–17.74); AUC for the SROC, 0.81 (95% CI: 0.79–0.87). Finally, the low LV GLS 43 values were correlated with a higher risk of all-cause death (HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 1.01-44 1.25; p=0.000, I^2 =84%; P = 0.031) in HFpEF patients.

45 Conclusions: LV GLS is impaired in HFpEF patients despite a normal left ventricular
46 ejection fraction, indicating the existence of mild LV contractile dysfunction. Moreover,
47 LV GLS might be an auxiliary indicator for diagnosing HFpEF and predicting all-cause

48 death in HFpEF patients.

49	Keywords:	Global	longitudinal	strain;	Heart	failure	with	preserved	ejection	fraction;
50	Diagnosis; P	Prognosi	s; Meta-analy	ysis						
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
57										
58										
59										
60										
61										
62										
63										
64										
65										
66										
67										
68										
69										
70										

71 **1** Introduction

72 Heart failure (HF) with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), a complex and 73 heterogeneous ailment, is a multi-organ disorder caused by an aging populace and 74 comorbidities such as obesity, hypertension, diabetes, and chronic renal insufficiency[1]. 75 HFpEF, comprising approximately half of the population of HF, is increasing in 76 prevalence and is associated with an elevated risk of hospitalization and mortality[2,3]. 77 Nevertheless, the clinical manifestations of HFpEF are atypical, and the pathogenic 78 mechanism remains poorly understood, limiting clinical diagnosis and therapeutic 79 options[4,5]. Accordingly, early and accurate diagnosis of HFpEF and determination of 80 prognosis can contribute to implementing appropriate interventions to slow or halt 81 disease progression and improve long-term consequences.

82 Despite the fact that patients with HFpEF have a left ventricular (LV) ejection 83 fraction (LVEF) of greater than or equal to 50%, cardiac contractile performance may 84 still be damaged, especially in individuals with severe concentric cardiac hypertrophy or 85 a small LV cavity[6]. LVEF, a measure of overall cardiac systolic function derived from 86 two-dimensional echocardiographic images, may be limited by altered cardiac geometry, 87 boundary tracking difficulties, and other factors [7,8]. Compared with LVEF 88 measurement, myocardial strain, which represents the percentage deformation of the 89 myocardium in three directions (longitudinal, circumferential, and radial) during the 90 cardiac cycle, is an emerging metric allowing more precise quantification of global and 91 regional myocardial contractile function[9]. LV global longitudinal strain (LV GLS), 92 which can be measured by speckle-tracking echocardiography (STE) or feature-tracking 93 cardiovascular magnetic resonance (FT-CMR), is a commonly used myocardial strain

94 parameter in cardiovascular diseases[10]. In recent years, multiple clinical trials have 95 analyzed the diagnostic or prognostic significance of LV GLS in HFpEF, but they 96 provided inconsistent results. In this situation, we implemented a meta-analysis to 97 estimate the diagnostic and prognostic value of LV GLS in HFpEF.

98

99 2 Materials and methods

100 2.1 Literature Search Strategy

101 This systematic review and meta-analysis was performed depending on the principles 102 of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis 2020 103 statement (PRISMA)[11]. Two investigators (Shi and Wang) systematically performed 104 documentary searches in four electronic databases (PubMed, Medline, Scopus, and Web 105 of Science). English-language literature published from the inception of each database 106 until December 20, 2022, was searched. Terms related to "Heart Failure, Diastolic", 107 "Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction", "Heart Failure with Normal Ejection 108 Fraction", "Diastolic Dysfunction", "Preserved Ejection Fraction", "Global Longitudinal 109 Strain", and "GLS" were utilized following the rules of each database. For PubMed, the 110 following search was performed: (((((Heart Failure, Diastolic[MeSH Terms]) OR (Heart 111 Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction[Title/Abstract])) OR (Heart Failure with Normal 112 Ejection Fraction[Title/Abstract])) OR (Diastolic Dysfunction[Title/Abstract])) OR 113 (Preserved Ejection Fraction[Title/Abstract])) AND ((Global Longitudinal 114 Strain[Title/Abstract]) OR (GLS[Title/Abstract]))

115 2.2 Literature Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

116 The inclusion criteria for this study were as follows: (i) diagnostic criteria: Fulfilment 117 of diagnostic criteria for HF, patients with HFpEF had an LVEF 245%, while HFrEF patients had an LVEF $\leq 40\%$ [12,13]; (ii) study design: observational studies like case-118 119 control studies, prospective and retrospective cohort studies; (ii) endpoints: difference in 120 LV GLS values between HFpEF patients and control groups (health controls or HFrEF 121 patients), as well as the connection between LV GLS and diagnosis or adverse endpoints 122 of HFpEF. The exclusion criteria for this study were as follows: (i) irrelevant or 123 duplicated studies; (ii) the papers were case reports, reviews, letters, commentaries, 124 editorials, or non-human studies; and (iii) the articles lacked full text or sufficient crude 125 data.

126 **2.3** Literature Quality Evaluation and Data Extraction

The quality estimation of the enrolled studies was evaluated by two independent reviewers (Xiong and Liu) using the Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) system, a "star-based" grading system comprised of three parts (selection, comparability, and outcomes). A total NOS score ranged from 0 to 9, and studies achieving a score of 6 or above were considered high quality (Supplementary Table 1).

The required data from the included research was extracted and tabulated in specifically constructed Microsoft Excel spreadsheets for analysis. The extracted contents were as follows: (i) publication details: last name of the first author, year of publication, and the country setting; (ii) demographic characteristics: sample size, proportions of males, and mean age; (iii) study details: study design, LV GLS measurement method, data available to calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) of LV GLS values between HFpEF patients and control groups (sample size, mean of LV GLS values and

139 standard deviation), data related to diagnostic meta-analysis (LV GLS cut-off, area under 140 the curve (AUC), sensitivity (SEN), specificity (SPE), true positive (TP), false positive 141 (FP), false negative (FN), true negative (TN)), and data associated with prognostic meta-142 analysis (variables adjusted, follow-up duration, endpoints (HF hospitalization, 143 cardiovascular (CV) hospitalization, CV death, and All-cause death), hazard ratios (HRs) 144 and 95% confidence intervals (CIs); and (iv) NOS quality scores. Two independent 145 researchers (Yang and Qiao) conducted data extraction, and disagreements were resolved 146 by mutual coordination or third-party adjudication (Dong and Liu).

147

2.4 Statistical Analysis

148 Meta-Disc (Version 14.0) was used to analyze the diagnostic value of LV GLS in 149 HFpEF. The pooled SEN, SPE, positive likelihood ratio (PLR), negative likelihood ratio 150 (NLR), diagnostic odds ratio (DOR), and AUC for the summary receiver operating 151 characteristic curves (SROC) were used to characterize the diagnostic performance. 152 Review Manager (Version 5.4) was used to analyze the difference in LV GLS values 153 between HFpEF patients and control groups. SMD and 95% CIs expressed the pooled 154 effect sizes. STATA (Version 16.0) was used to assess the association between LV GLS 155 and adverse outcomes of HFpEF. HRs and 95% CIs represented the pooled effect sizes. 156 The heterogeneity among the included studies was appraised by the Cochran Q statistics 157 (chi-square test) and quantified with the I2 statistic. The fixed-effect model was 158 employed when the Q test ($I^2 < 50\%$, p>0.05) revealed no significant heterogeneity across 159 studies. When the Q test ($I^2 \ge 50\%$ or p<0.05) found prominent heterogeneity among 160 studies, the random-effect model was utilized, followed by a Galbraith plot to explore the 161 source of heterogeneity. Publication bias was evaluated using Deeks' funnel plot, Funnel

162	plot, and Egger's test. Sensitivity analysis was employed to assess the impact of single
163	research on the overall estimate by omitting one study each time. P<0.05 was considered
164	to be statistically significant.

165

166 **3 Results**

167 3.1 Literature Search Results

168 A flowchart of the database search and text screening procedure is demonstrated in 169 Fig 1. 2,492 publications were retrieved through database searching, consisting of 372 170 from PubMed, 624 from Medline, 559 from Scopus, and 937 from Web of Science. After 171 excluding 874 duplicates, we screened the titles and abstracts of 1,618 papers. 1,524 172 articles were removed following the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Finally, among the 173 remaining 94 studies, two independent researchers (Shi and Wang) read the full text and 174 excluded 53 records due to repetitive research, irrelevant results, and insufficient data. 175 Overall, 41 articles in total were enrolled in the meta-analysis.

176 **3.2** Characteristics of Included Studies

Forty-one studies [14-53] published from 2008 to 2022 were investigated, including 27 case-control studies, 12 prospective cohort studies, and 2 retrospective cohort studies. Table 1 shows the baseline features of the selected research. A total of 14,543 patients (10,193 HFpEF patients, 6,931 males, mean age of 67.66 years) were involved. Thirtytwo studies detected LV GLS using STE, and the other 9 utilizing FT-CMR. Thirty-eight studies reported mean LV GLS values in HFpEF patients (-8.2% - -20.8%), whereas the

remaining 3 informed the median values (-15.3% - -20%). Concerning endpoint events, 27 studies evaluated the differences in LV GLS values between HFpEF patients and healthy controls (21 research) or HFrEF patients (16 research), and 26 studies assessed the diagnostic (6 trials) and prognostic (18 trials) significance of LV GLS in HFpEF. The NOS scores of included research varied from 6 to 9, indicating that the methodological quality was generally reliable (**S1 Appendix**).

189 **3.3** Differences in LV GLS Values Between HFpEF Patients and Control Groups

190 Twenty-one studies[14-34] explored the differences in LV GLS values between 191 HFpEF patients (n=1431) and healthy controls (n=864), with a mean LV GLS of -192 16.07%±3.32% vs. -19.54%± 2.57% (Fig 2A). Moreover, 16 studies[14–18,21,26,30,33– 193 40] examined discrepancies in LV GLS values between HFpEF patients (n=2,234) and 194 HFrEF patients (n=3,355), with an average LV GLS of $-16.42\%\pm3.56\%$ vs. $-9.3\%\pm3.48\%$ 195 (Fig 2B). Meta-analysis using a random-effect model revealed that the LV GLS values in 196 HFpEF patients were significantly lower than in healthy individuals (SMD:1.21; 95% CI 197 (0.94, 1.47), p<0.00001, I²=85%; P<0.00001) (Fig 2C), but substantially higher than in 198 HErEF patients (SMD: -2.03; 95% CI (-2.23, -1.72), p<0.00001, I²=92%; P<0.00001) 199 (Fig 2D). According to the Galbraith radial plots, the research by (Fang et al., Wang et 200 al., Sanchis et al.) and (Maffeis et al., Carluccio et al., and Yip et al.) were sources of 201 heterogeneity for the above two comparison groups, respectively (S2 Appendix. 1A, 202 2A).

The associated Funnel plots were asymmetrical (S2 Appendix. 1B, 2B) and the p-values of Egger's test were 0.2 and 0.41 (S2 Appendix. 1C, 2C), indicating a potential publication bias among included studies. The sensitivity analyses removing one research

each time indicated that none of the individual trials substantially impacted the pooled
estimates (S2 Appendix. 1D, 2D). Overall, the results of this study were relatively
constant.

209

3.4 Diagnostic Value of LVGLS in HFpEF

210 Six studies 20,23,27,31–33] estimated the diagnostic usefulness of LV GLS values in 211 HFpEF compared with healthy controls, with LV GLS cut-off values ranging from -16% 212 to -24.1 and AUC from 0.68 to 0.98 (Table 2). Five trails provided complete data for 213 diagnostic meta-analysis (SEN, SPN, TP, FP, FN, and TN). The SROC curve revealed no 214 typical "shoulder-arm" pattern, while the Spearman correlation coefficient between the 215 logarithm of sensitivity and the logarithm of (1-specificity) was -0.1, P=0.873, suggesting 216 no threshold effect in the meta-analysis. Summary assessments of the diagnostic 217 performance of LV GLS in HFpEF were as follows: SEN was 0.77 (95% CI: 0.71–0.82) 218 (Fig 3A); SPE was 0.66 (95% CI: 0.58–0.74) (Fig 3B); PLR was 2.17 (95% CI: 1.36– 219 3.47) (Fig 3C); NLR was 0.35 (95% CI: 0.21–0.59) (Fig 3D); DOR was 7.53 (95% CI: 220 3.19–17.74) (Fig 3E); AUC for the SROC was 0.81 (95% CI: 0.79–0.87) (Fig 3F). The p-221 value of Deeks' test (0.18) was greater than 0.05, suggesting no significant publication 222 bias. (S2 Appendix. 3).

223 **3.5 Prognostic Value of LV GLS in HFpEF Patients**

Eighteen studies[6,28,37,40–53] examined the connection between LV GLS values as a continuous variable and adverse outcomes in HFpEF patients. The duration of followup varied from 4 to 144 months. In 9 studies, variables such as age, sex, race, history of CV disease, medication history, laboratory tests, and others that might affect the

228 association between LV GLS and research outcomes were adjusted (Table 3). Meta-229 analyzes with random-effects models showed that the low LV GLS values in HFpEF 230 patients were associated with a higher risk of all-cause death (HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 1.01-231 1.25; p=0.000, $I^2=84\%$; P=0.031)[29,42,44,47,49,51] (Fig 4A), but not with the 232 composite outcomes (all-cause death and HF hospitalization (HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.95-233 1.11; p=0.000, $I^2 = 83\%$; P=0.51)[29,45-48,51,52] (Fig 4B) or CV death and HF 234 hospitalization (HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.94-1.14; p=0.000, $I^2 = 81\%$; P = 0.49)) 235 [6,28,37,41,43] (Fig 4C)). Additionally, three studies by Xu et al., Freed et al., and 236 Kosmala et al. reported no association between low LV GLS values in HFpEF patients 237 and the composite outcome of all-cause death and CV hospitalization [40,50,53]. The 238 result for all-cause death showed substantial heterogeneity. The Galbraith radial plot 239 suggested that the studies by Romano2020 et al. and Buggey2017 et al. may be the 240 source of heterogeneity (S2 Appendix. 4A). the associated Funnel plot was asymmetric 241 (S2 Appendix. 4B) and the p-value of Egger's test was 0.67 (S2 Appendix. 4C), 242 suggesting a possible publication bias across included studies. The sensitivity analysis 243 indicated that none of the studies significantly affected the pooled estimates (S2 244 Appendix. 4D).

245

246 4 Discussion

Current European Society of Cardiology guidelines graded HF based on LVEF into
reduced (LVEF≤40%), mildly reduced (LVEF 41-49%), and preserved (LVEF≥50%)
three subtypes[13]. HFpEF, which accounts for about half of all HF, is evolving as an
increasingly severe public health concern[2]. Presently, HFpEF is diagnosed depending

on representative symptoms and/or signs of HF (breathlessness, fatigue, edema, and others), an LVEF of more than 50%, objective evidence of cardiac structural or functional abnormalities, and a growing level of BNP or NT pro-BNP[5]. However, most sufferers lack specific clinical manifestations in the initial stages and are usually not detected until the impairment of cardiac structure and function develops [54]. It is essential to explore effective metrics for identifying high-risk individuals, early diagnosis, prognosis assessment, and treatment monitoring.

258 During cardiac systole, the obliquely and oppositely oriented subendocardial and 259 epicardial myofibers produce apical counter-clockwise torsion and basal clockwise 260 torsion, causing the LV to shorten in the longitudinal and circumferential planes while 261 thickening in the radial plane[55]. Cardiac strain assesses the change in length of the 262 myocardium in three planes (longitudinal and circumferential (expressed by a negative 263 value), radial (represented by a positive value) relative to the initial length during the 264 cardiac cycle. It can be calculated using the following formula: strain (epsilon) = L-265 Lo/Lo (where Lo is the baseline length of the myocardium, and L is the length after 266 deformation)[7]. LV GLS, a sensitive and objective diagnostic indicator in cardiac strain 267 imaging, can detect LV mild contractile dysfunction before changes in LVEF[8]. It is 268 currently used as an auxiliary parameter for diagnosis and prognostic assessment in 269 cardio-oncology[56] and is being expanded to other fields such as cardiac cardiomyopathies[58], valvular heart diseases[59], 270 amyloidosis[57], pulmonary 271 hypertension[60], and HF[58]. Although numerous studies have confirmed the presence 272 of abnormal LV GLS in HFpEF patients and the Heart Failure Association consensus has 273 unanimously recommended impaired V GLS as an ancillary criterion for the diagnosis of

HFpEF[54], there is controversy about whether LV GLS has independent diagnostic and
prognostic value for HFpEF. We consequently performed this meta-analysis to assess the
diagnostic and prognostic value of LV GLS in HFpEF.

277 The results of the current meta-analysis illustrated a significant link between LV GLS 278 and the diagnosis and prognosis of HFpEF. First, the LV GLS values in HFpEF patients 279 were significantly lower than in healthy individuals, but substantially higher than in 280 HErEF patients, confirming the presence of mild LV systolic dysfunction in HFpEF 281 patients. The longitudinal systolic function of LV is determined by the endocardium, 282 which is highly susceptible to the detrimental impacts of ischemia or hypertrophy[61,62]. 283 Multiple comorbidities in HFpEF patients may promote microvascular malfunction and 284 muscle fibrosis[63], reducing LV longitudinal systolic function and ultimately leading to 285 LV GLS impairment. Second, LV GLS has excellent auxiliary diagnostic value for 286 HFpEF, with with an AUC of 0.81 (95% CI: 0.79–0.87). Finally, the low LV GLS values 287 in HFpEF patients were correlated with a higher risk of all-cause death, indicating that 288 LV GLS is a powerful independent predictor of all-cause mortality in HFpEF patients.

289 This meta-analysis involved a relatively comprehensive literature search, and the 290 included studies were of excellent quality according to the NOS score. Nonetheless, some 291 limitations must be considered: First, the heterogeneity of the included studies was high, 292 with probable causes including the detection method of LV GLS, the diagnostic criteria of HF, and the study design. Second, in the diagnostic meta-analysis, the diagnostic cut-293 294 off values of LV GLS were not consistent, which might be related to factors like the 295 detection technique. Third, in the prognostic meta-analysis, the follow-up periods were 296 inconsistent, and the number of studies in which effect sizes could be combined for the

297	same endpoint was low, limiting the ability to draw significant conclusions. As a result,
298	our meta-analysis is exploratory, and further high-quality original research is needed to
299	support the findings of this study.

300

301 **5** Conclusion

LV GLS is impaired in HFpEF patients despite a normal left ventricular ejection
 fraction, indicating the existence of mild LV contractile dysfunction. Moreover, LV GLS
 might be an auxiliary indicator for diagnosing HFpEF and predicting all-cause death in
 HFpEF patients.

306

307 6 Supporting information

- 308 S1 Appendix. NOS score of the included studies (PDF)
- 309 S2 Appendix. Heterogeneity, publication bias, and sensitivity analysis of relevant
- 310 meta-analyses (PDF)
- 311 S3 Appendix.PRISMA checklist (PDF)

312

313 7 Acknowledgments

314 The authors would like to express their gratitude to Professor W. Szymański for his

315 valuable help in the process of retrieving relevant literature.

316

318 8 Author Contributions

- 319 Conceptualization: Yujiao Shi, Guoju Dong, Jiangang Liu
- 320 Data curation: Yujiao Shi, Wang Qing
- 321 Formal analysis: Wang Qing, Chunqiu Liu, Xiong Shuang
- 322 Investigation: Chenguang Yang, Wenbo Qiao
- 323 Methodology: Yujiao Shi, Guoju Dong, Jiangang Liu
- 324 Project administration: Wang Qing, Chunqiu Liu, Xiong Shuang
- 325 **Supervision:** Guoju Dong, Jiangang Liu
- 326 Visualization: Yujiao Shi, Chunqiu Liu
- 327 Writing original draft: Guoju Dong, Jiangang Liu
- 328 Writing review & editing: Yujiao Shi, Guoju Dong, Jiangang Liu
- 329
- **330 9 Data availability statement**
- 331 All relevant data are within the paper.

332

333 10 Funding

This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (8207153216) and the Major Innovation Project of the China Academy of Traditional Chinese Medicine (CI2021A00903).

337

338

340 **Reference**

- 3411.Borlaug BA. Evaluation and management of heart failure with preserved ejection342fraction. Nature Reviews Cardiology (2020) 17:559–73. doi: 10.1038/s41569-343020-0363-2
- Shah SJ, Borlaug BA, Kitzman DW, McCulloch AD, Blaxall BC, Agarwal R, Chirinos JA, Collins S, Deo RC, Gladwin MT, et al. Research Priorities for Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction. *Circulation* (2020) 141:1001–26. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.119.041886
- Dunlay SM, Roger VL, Redfield MM. Epidemiology of heart failure with
 preserved ejection fraction. *Nature Reviews Cardiology* (2017) 14:591–602. doi:
 10.1038/nrcardio.2017.65
- 4. Omote K, Verbrugge FH, Borlaug BA. Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection
 Fraction: Mechanisms and Treatment Strategies. *Annual Review of Medicine*(2022) 73:321–37. doi: 10.1146/annurev-med-042220-022745
- 354
 5. Nagueh SF. Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction: Insights into
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 359
 359
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 350
 35
- Shah AM, Claggett B, Sweitzer NK, Shah SJ, Anand IS, Liu L, Pitt B, Pfeffer
 MA, Solomon SD. Prognostic Importance of Impaired Systolic Function in Heart
 Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction and the Impact of Spironolactone. *Circulation* (2015) 132:402–14. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.015884
- 361
 7. Potter E, Marwick TH. Assessment of Left Ventricular Function by
 362 Echocardiography. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging* (2018) 11:260–74. doi:
 363 10.1016/j.jcmg.2017.11.017
- Nauta JF, Jin X, Hummel YM, Voors AA. Markers of left ventricular systolic dysfunction when left ventricular ejection fraction is normal. *European Journal* of *Heart Failure* (2018) 20:1636–8. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.1326
- 367
 368
 368
 369
 9. Halliday BP, Senior R, Pennell DJ. Assessing left ventricular systolic function: from ejection fraction to strain analysis. *European Heart Journal* (2021) 42:789– 97. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ ehaa587
- 10. Amzulescu MS, De Craene M, Langet H, Pasquet A, Vancraeynest D, Pouleur
 AC, Vanoverschelde JL, Gerber BL. Myocardial strain imaging: review of
 general principles, validation, and sources of discrepancies. *European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging* (2019) 20:605–19. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jez041
- 11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD,
 Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, et al. The PRISMA 2020
 statement: an Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews. *British Medical Journal* (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71
- Solomon SD, McMurray JJV, Anand IS, Ge J, Lam CSP, Maggioni AP, Martinez
 F, Packer M, Pfeffer MA, Pieske B, et al. Angiotensin–Neprilysin Inhibition in
 Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. *New England Journal of Medicine* (2019) 381:1609–20. doi: 10.1056/nejmoa1908655
- McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, Gardner RS, Baumbach A, Böhm M, Burri
 H, Butler J, Čelutkienė J, Chioncel O, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the
 Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure. *European Heart Journal* (2021) 42:3599–726. doi: 10.1093/ eurheartj/ehab368

386 387 388 389	14.	Bekfani T, Hamadanchi A, Ijuin S, Bekhite M, Nisser J, Derlien S, Westphal J, Bogoviku J, Morris DA, Fudim M, et al. Relation of left atrial function with exercise capacity and muscle endurance in patients with heart failure. <i>ESC Heart Failure</i> (2021) 8:4528–38 doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13656
390 391	15.	Blum M, Hashemi D, Motzkus LA, Neye M, Dordevic A, Zieschang V, Zamani SM, Lapinskas T, Runte K, Kelm M, et al. Variability of Myocardial Strain
392 393		During Isometric Exercise in Subjects With and Without Heart Failure. <i>Frontiers</i> in Cardiovascular Medicine (2020) 7:111 doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2020.00111
394	16	Bosch I. Lam CSP. Gong L. Chan SP. Sim D. Yeo D. Jaufeerally F. Leong
395	10.	KTG Ong HV Ng TP et al Right ventricular dysfunction in left-sided heart
396		failure with preserved versus reduced ejection fraction <i>European Journal of</i>
307		Heart Failure (2017) 19:1664-71 doi: 10.1002/eihf 873
308	17	Behiehish HAH Al-Musawi AH Khudeir SA Role of global longitudinal strain
200	1/.	in assassment of left ventricular systelia function in nationts with heart failure
399		with preserved ejection fraction lowrnal of the Saudi Heart Association (2010)
400		21:100 5 doi: 10.1016/j.jsha.2018.12.002
401	10	Carluagia E. Diagiali D. Alunni G. Murrana A. Laanalli V. Dantana D. Disaattini
402	10.	E Daulus WI Ambrogia G. Advantages of deformation indices over systelia
403		L, Faulus WJ, Amolosio G. Advantages of deformation induces over systeme
404		for the second normal size of the second for the second se
405		12:202 02 doi: 10.1002/ourihf/hfa202
400	10	Carlyagia E. Diagiali D. Zyahi C. Dardelli C. Murrana A. Laugialla D. D'Addaria
407	19.	S. Mangani A. Alunni G. Ambradia G. Eibradia assessment by integrated
408		5, Mengoini A, Alumin O, Amorosio O. Fibrosis assessment by integrated
409		backscatter and its relationship with ingludinal deformation and diastonic
410		Initial in heart familie with preserved ejection fraction. The International Journal of Candiovascular Imaging (2016) 22:1071-80 doi: 10.1007/s10554
411		016 0891 5
412	20	Eang S. Zhang Z. Wang V. Jiang F. Vang K. He F. Zhang C. Predictive value of
414	20.	left ventricular myocardial strain by four-dimensional speckle tracking
415		echocardiography combined with red cell distribution width in heart failure with
416		preserved ejection fraction <i>Echocardiography</i> (2019) 36:1074–83 doi:
417		10 1111/echo 14373
418	21	Hashemi D. Motzkus I. Blum M. Kraft R. Tanacli R. Tahirovic F. Doeblin P.
<u>410</u>	21.	Zieschang V. Zamani SM. Kelm M. et al. Myocardial deformation assessed
420		among heart failure entities by cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging ESC
420		Heart Failure (2021) 8:890-7 doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13193
421	22	Ito H. Ishida M. Makino W. Goto V. Ishikawa V. Kitagawa K. Omori T. Dohi K.
422	22.	Ito M. Sakuma H. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance feature tracking for
423		characterization of patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:
424		correlation of global longitudinal strain with invasive diastolic functional indices
425		Lowrad of Cardiovascular Magnatic Pasonance (2020) 22:42 doi:
420		10 1186/s12068 020 00636 w
421 128	22	Vim UV Dark S I Loo S C Chang SV Vim E V Chang S A Chai I O Dark
+20 120	<i>23</i> .	SW Kim S M Chao VH at al Comparison of clobal and ragional mycocardial
+27 120		strains in patients with heart failure with a preserved significant fraction fraction
430		sualis in patients with heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction vs
431		nypertension vs age-matched control. Caratovascular Ultrasouna (2020) 18:44.

432		doi: 10 1186/s12947-020-00223-0
433	24	Kraigher-Krainer F. Shah AM. Gunta DK. Santos A. Claggett B. Pieske B. Zile
434		MR Voors AA Lefkowitz MP Packer M et al Impaired Systolic Function by
435		Strain Imaging in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction <i>Journal of the</i>
436		American College of Cardiology (2014) 63:447–56 doi:
437		10 1016/i jacc 2013 09 052
438	25	Löffler AL Pan IA Balfour PC Shaw PW Vang V Nasir M Auger DA Enstein
430	29.	FH Kramer CM Gan L-M et al Frequency of Coronary Microvascular
440		Dysfunction and Diffuse Myocardial Fibrosis (Measured by Cardiovascular
441		Magnetic Resonance) in Patients With Heart Failure and Preserved Left
447		Ventricular Fiection Fraction The American Journal of Cardiology (2019)
443		124:1584_9 doi: 10.1016/i amicard 2019.08.011
14J 111	26	I_{124} , I_{304} , I_{101} ,
444 115	20.	ISW Zhang O Wang I et al What can three-dimensional speckle-tracking
44 <i>5</i> 116		achocardiography contribute to evaluate global left ventricular systelic
440		performance in patients with heart failure? International Journal of Cardiology
447		(2014) 172:132 7 doi: 10.1016/i.jicard 2013.12.314
440	27	Mordi IR Singh S Rudd A Srinivasan I Frenneaux M Tzemos N Dawson DK
450	27.	Comprehensive Echocardiographic and Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Evaluation
451		Differentiates Among Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Eraction Patients
452		Hypertensive Patients and Healthy Control Subjects IACC: Cardiovascular
453		Imaging (2018) 11:577-85 doi: 10.1016/i jemg.2017.05.022
454	28	Pellicori P Kallvikhacka-Bennett A Khaleva O Carubelli V Costanzo P
455	20.	Castiello T Wong K Zhang I Cleland IGE Clark AI Global longitudinal strain
456		in patients with suspected heart failure and a normal ejection fraction: does it
457		improve diagnosis and risk stratification? The International Journal of
458		Cardiovascular Imaging (2013) 30:69–79 doi: 10 1007/s10554-013-0310-v
459	29.	Roy C. Leieune S. Slimani A. Meester C. Ahn AS SA. Rousseau MF. Mihaela A.
460		Ginion A, Ferracin B, Pasquet A, et al. Fibroblast growth factor 23: a biomarker
461		of fibrosis and prognosis in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. ESC
462		Heart Failure (2020) 7:2494–507. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.12816
463	30.	Sanchis L. Gabrielli L. Andrea R. Falces C. Duchateau N. Perez-Villa F. Bijnens
464		B, Sitges M. Left atrial dysfunction relates to symptom onset in patients with
465		heart failure and preserved left ventricular ejection fraction. European Heart
466		Journal - Cardiovascular Imaging (2015) 16:62–7. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jeu165
467	31.	Stoichescu-Hogea G, Buleu FN, Christodorescu R, Sosdean R, Tudor A, Ember
468		A, Brie DM, Drăgan S. Contribution of Global and Regional Longitudinal Strain
469		for Clinical Assessment of HFpEF in Coronary and Hypertensive Patients.
470		<i>Medicina</i> (2021) 57:1372. doi: 10.3390/medicina57121372
471	32.	Tanacli R, Hashemi D, Neye M, Motzkus LA, Blum M, Tahirovic E, Dordevic
472		A, Kraft R, Zamani SM, Pieske B, et al. Multilayer myocardial strain improves
473		the diagnosis of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. ESC Heart Failure
474		(2020) 7:3240–5. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.12826
475	33.	Wang J, Khoury DS, Yue Y, Torre-Amione G, Nagueh SF. Preserved left
476		ventricular twist and circumferential deformation, but depressed longitudinal and
477		radial deformation in patients with diastolic heart failure. European Heart

478		<i>Journal</i> (2008) 29:1283–9 doi: 10.1093/eurhearti/ehn141
479	34	Vin GW-K Zhang O Xie LM Liang V-I Liu V-M Van B Lam V-V Vu
480	51.	C-M Resting global and regional left ventricular contractility in patients with
481		heart failure and normal ejection fraction: insights from speckle-tracking
187		echocardiography Heart (2011) 07:287_04 doi: 10.1136/hrt 2010.205815
402	25	Maffais C Dossi A Cannota I Zooco C Balvavskiv E Badhakrishnan AK
403	55.	Equaratain A. Marria DA. Diagka Kraighar E. Diagka D. at al. Laft atrial atrain
404 405		redicta averaisa consister in heart failure independently of left ventricular
403		predicts exercise capacity in heart failure independently of left ventricular
480	20	ejection fraction. ESC Heart Failure (2022) $9.842-52$. doi: 10.1002/en12.15/88
48/	30.	Michalski B, Irzeiński P, Kupczyńska K, Miskowiec D, Pęczek Ł, Nawrot B,
488		Lipiec P, Kasprzak JD. The differences in the relationship between diastolic
489		dystunction, selected biomarkers and collagen turn-over in heart failure patients
490		with preserved and reduced ejection fraction. Cardiology Journal (2017) 24:35–
491		42. doi: 10.5603/cj.a2016.0098
492	37.	Obokata M, Takeuchi M, Negishi K, Ohte N, Izumo M, Yamashita E, Ebato M,
493		Yuda S, Kurabayashi M, Nakatani S. Relation Between Echocardiogram-Based
494		Cardiac Parameters and Outcome in Heart Failure With Preserved and Reduced
495		Ejection Fraction. <i>The American Journal of Cardiology</i> (2016) 118:1356–62. doi:
496		10.1016/j.amjcard.2016.07.060
497	38.	Park JJ, Park J-B, Park J-H, Cho G-Y. Global Longitudinal Strain to Predict
498		Mortality in Patients With Acute Heart Failure. Journal of the American College
499		of Cardiology (2018) 71:1947–57. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.02.064
500	39.	Tanacli R, Hashemi D, Lapinskas T, Edelmann F, Gebker R, Pedrizzetti G,
501		Schuster A, Nagel E, Pieske B, Düngen H-D, et al. Range Variability in CMR
502		Feature Tracking Multilayer Strain across Different Stages of Heart Failure.
503		Scientific Reports (2019) 9:16478. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-52683-8
504	40.	Xu L, Pagano J, Chow K, Oudit GY, Haykowsky MJ, Mikami Y, Howarth AG,
505		White JA, Howlett JG, Dyck JRB, et al. Cardiac remodelling predicts outcome in
506		patients with chronic heart failure. ESC Heart Failure (2021) 8:5352–62. doi:
507		10 1002/ehf2 13626
508	41	Gozdzik A Marwick TH Przewlocka-Kosmala M Jankowska EA Ponikowski
509		P Kosmala W Comparison of left ventricular longitudinal systolic function
510		narameters in the prediction of adverse outcome in heart failure with preserved
511		ejection fraction ESC Heart Eailure (2021) 8:1531–40 doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13247
512	12	Kalra R. Gunta K. Sheets R. Arval S. Ebrahimi A. Rajanrevar I. Cribbs MG.
512	72.	Rooker OL Prabhu SD Bajai NS Cardiac Function and Suddan Cardiac Death in
517		Hoart Eailure With Preserved Ejection Erection (from the TOPCAT Trial) The
515		<i>American Lewral</i> of <i>Candialary</i> (2020) 120:46-52 doi:
516		American Journal of Caralology (2020) 129.40–52. doi: 10.1016/j.emicord.2020.04.028
510	12	10.1010/J.amjcard.2020.04.038
51/ 510	43.	43. Kammerlander AA, Dona C, Nitsche C, Koschutnik M, Schonbauer K, Duca
518		F, Zotter-Tutaro C, Binder C, Aschauer S, Beitzke D, et al. Feature Tracking of
519		Global Longitudinal Strain by Using Cardiovascular MRI Improves Risk
520		Stratification in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. <i>Radiology</i> (2020)
521		296:290–8. doi: 10.1148/radiol.2020200195
522	44.	Romano S, Judd RM, Kim RJ, Heitner JF, Shah DJ, Shenoy C, Evans K, Romer
523		B, Salazar P, Farzaneh-Far A. Feature-Tracking Global Longitudinal Strain

524		Predicts Mortality in Patients With Preserved Ejection Fraction. JACC:
525		<i>Cardiovascular Imaging</i> (2020) 13:940–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2019.10.004
526	45.	Hwang I-C, Cho G-Y, Choi H-M, Yoon YE, Park JJ, Park J-B, Park J-H, Lee S-
527		P. Kim H-K. Kim Y-J. H2FPEF Score Reflects the Left Atrial Strain and Predicts
528		Prognosis in Patients With Heart Failure With Preserved Election Fraction.
529		Journal of Cardiac Failure (2021) 27:198–207 doi:
530		10 1016/i cardfail 2020 09 474
531	46	Donal E Lund LH Oger E Bosseau C Revnaud A Hage C Drouet E Daubert
532		I-Claude Linde C Importance of combined left atrial size and estimated
533		pulmonary pressure for clinical outcome in patients presenting with heart failure
534		with preserved ejection fraction European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular
535		<i>Imaging</i> (2017) 18:629–35 doi: 10.1093/ehici/iex005
536	47	Buggev I Alenezi F Yoon HJ Phelan M DeVore AD Khouri MG Schulte PI
537	• • •	Velazouez EL Left ventricular global longitudinal strain in patients with heart
538		failure with preserved ejection fraction: outcomes following an acute heart failure
539		hospitalization ESC Heart Failure (2017) 4:432–9 doi: 10.1002/ehf2.12159
540	48	Wang I Fang F Wai-Kwok Vin G Sanderson IF Feng W Xie I-M Luo X-X
541	40.	Lee AP-W I am V-V Left ventricular long-axis performance during exercise is
542		an important prognosticator in patients with heart failure and preserved ejection
543		fraction International Journal of Cardiology (2015) 178-131-5 doi:
544		10 1016/i jicard 2014 10 130
545	<u>4</u> 9	Huang W Chai SC Lee SGS MacDonald MR Leong KTG Prognostic Factors
546	чγ.	After Index Hospitalization for Heart Failure With Preserved Frection Fraction
547		The American Journal of Cardiology (2017) 119:2017-20 doi:
548		$10\ 1016/i\ \text{amicard}\ 2017\ 03\ 032$
549	50	Freed BH Daruwalla V Cheng IV Aguilar FG Beussink L Choi A Klein DA
550	50.	Dixon D Baldridge A Rasmussen-Torvik I I et al Prognostic Utility and
551		Clinical Significance of Cardiac Mechanics in Heart Failure With Preserved
552		Election Fraction Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging (2016) 9:e003754 doi:
553		10 1161/circimaging 115 003754
554	51	Leieune S. Roy C. Ciocea V. Slimani A. de Meester C. Amzulescu M. Pasquet A.
555	01.	Vancraevnest D Beaulove C Vanoverschelde I-L et al Right Ventricular
556		Global Longitudinal Strain and Outcomes in Heart Failure with Preserved
557		Fiection Fraction Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography (2020)
558		33:973-984 e2 doi: 10.1016/i.echo.2020.02.016
559	52	Weerts I Barandiarán Aizpurua A Henkens MTHM I von A van Mourik MIW
560	52.	van Gemert MRAA Raafs A Sanders-van Wijk S Bavés-Genís A Heymans
561		SRB et al. The prognostic impact of mechanical atrial dysfunction and atrial
562		fibrillation in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction <i>European Heart</i>
563		Journal - Cardiovascular Imaging (2021) 23:74_84 doi: 10.1093/ehici/ieab222
561	53	Kosmala W Przewlocka-Kosmala M Rojek A Mysiak A Dabrowski A
565	55.	Marwick TH Association of Abnormal Left Ventricular Eulerical Reserve
566		With Outcome in Heart Failure With Dreserved Fraction Fraction 1400.
567		Cardiovascular Imaging (2018) 11:1737 46 doi: 10.1016/j.jomg.2017.07.029
568	51	Dieske B. Tschöne C. Boer RA. Freser A.C. Anker SD. Donal E. Edalmann E. Eu
560	54.	M Guarzi M Lam CSD at al How to diagnosa heart failure with preserved
509		IVI, Guazzi IVI, Lani CSF, et al. now to diagnose heart failure with preserved

570		ejection fraction: the HFA-PEFF diagnostic algorithm: a consensus
571		recommendation from the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the European
572		Society of Cardiology (ESC). European Journal of Heart Failure (2020) 22:391-
573		412. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.1741
574	55.	Buckberg G, Hoffman JIE, Mahajan A, Saleh S, Coghlan C. Cardiac Mechanics
575		Revisited. Circulation (2008) 118:2571–87. doi:
576		10.1161/circulationaha.107.754424
577	56.	Moslehi JJ, Witteles RM. Global Longitudinal Strain in Cardio-Oncology.
578		Journal of the American College of Cardiology (2021) 77:402-4. doi:
579		10.1016/j.jacc.2020.12.014
580	57.	Sivapathan S, Geenty P, Deshmukh T, Boyd A, Richards D, Stewart G, Taylor
581		MS, Kwok F, Thomas L. Alterations in multi-layer strain in AL amyloidosis.
582		Amyloid (2022) 21:1–9. doi: 10.1080/13506129.2022.2026914
583	58.	Steen H, Giusca S, Montenbruck M, Patel AR, Pieske B, Florian A, Erley J,
584		Kelle S, Korosoglou G. Left and right ventricular strain using fast strain-encoded
585		cardiovascular magnetic resonance for the diagnostic classification of patients
586		with chronic non-ischemic heart failure due to dilated hypertrophic
587		cardiomyonathy or cardiac amyloidosis <i>Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic</i>
588		Resonance (2021) 23:45 doi: 10.1186/s12968-021-00711-w
589	59	Hiemstra VI. Tomsic A van Wijngaarden SF. Palmen M. Klautz RIM. Bax II.
590	57.	Delgado V Aimone Marsan N Prognostic Value of Global Longitudinal Strain
591		and Etiology After Surgery for Primary Mitral Regurgitation IACC:
502		Cardiovascular Imaging (2020) 13:577-85 doi: 10.1016/j.jemg.2019.03.024
503	60	Shebata MI Harouni AA Skrok I Basha TA Boyce D Lechtzin N Mathai SC
595	00.	Girgis P. Osman NE, Lima IAC, at al Pagional and Global Pivontrioular
505		Function in Dulmonary Arterial Hypertension: A Cardiac MD Imaging Study
506		Padiology (2012) 266:114, 22, doi: 10.1149/radiol.12111500
507	61	Fan I. Namani P. Chay IS. Kassah CS. Los I.C. Transmural Distribution of
500	01.	Fail L, Nallani K, Choy JS, Kassao GS, Lee LC. Halishulai Distribution of
500		Vontrievlan Loading Commentation and Contractility Eventions in Dhusic loss (2021)
599		Ventricular Loading, Geometry and Contractility. Frontiers in Physiology (2021)
000	(\mathbf{a})	12.744855. dol: 10.5589/Ipnys.2021.744855
601	02.	A White IA Duely IDD Anderson T at al. Leven specific strain in noticets with
602 (02		A, while JA, Dyck JRB, Anderson T, et al. Layer-specific strain in patients with
003		heart failure using cardiovascular magnetic resonance, not all layers are the same.
604		Journal of Caratovascular Magnetic Resonance (2020) 22:81. doi:
605	(\mathbf{a})	10.1186/S12968-020-00680-6
606	63.	Arnold JR, Kanagala P, Budgeon CA, Jerosch-Herold M, Gulsin GS, Singh A,
607		Khan JN, Chan DCS, Squire IB, Ng LL, et al. Prevalence and Prognostic
608		Significance of Microvascular Dysfunction in Heart Failure With Preserved
609		Ejection Fraction. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging (2022) 5:S1936-
610		878X(21)008937. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2021.11.022
611		
612		
613		
614		
615		

Tabel 1. Baseline characteristics of the 41 selected research

NO	Study	Country	Sample size , n	HFpEF patients, n	Males , n	Age, mean (SD), years	Study design	LV GLS detection method	Mean or median values of LV GLS in HFpEF patients (%)	Endpoin t (s)	NOS quality score
1	Ito2020	Japan	36	18	10	63	Case-control	FT-CMR	-14.8±3.3	А	8
2	Mordi2018	Uk	90	62	34	69.3	Case-control	STE	-16.0±2.2	A, C	7
3	Stoichescu- Hogea2018	Romania	102	62	53	61.5	Case-control	STE	-17.6±2.3	A, C	8
4	Carluccio2016	Italy	86	46	38	70	Case-control	STE	-15.4±3.5	А	8
5	Löffler2019	US	34	19	17	61	Case-control	FT-CMR	-17.9±3.5	А	7
6	Maffeis2022	Germany	171	86	136	65	Case-control	STE	-19.0 ± 3.0	В	6
7	Hashemi2021	Germany	49	19	35	66.9	Case-control	FT-CMR	-19.2±1.3	A, B	8
8	Bekfani2021	US	55	17	30	68.3	Case-control	STE	-18.9 ± 5.5	A, B	7
9	Blum2020	Germany	54	17	34	68.3	Case-control	FT-CMR	-19.1±1.2	A, B	8
10	Park2018	South Korea	3530	1335	1848	70.8	Case-control	STE	-15.2±4.6	В	9
11	Sanchis2015	Spain	138	63	90	75	Case-control	STE	-16.0 + 3.7	A, B	7
12	Bosch2017	Netherland s	657	219	328	66	Case-control	STE	-14.5±4.0	Α, Β	7
13	Bshiebish2019	Iraq	66	20	38	59	Case-control	STE	-15.0±2.0	A, B	8
14	Michalski2017	Poland	62	32	32	62.3	Case-control	STE	-16.1±6.4	В	8
15	Luo2014	China	149	45	93	61	Case-control	STE	-14.0±2.7	A, B	7
16	Fang2019	China	112	62	61	67.5	Case-control	STE	-14.5 ± 2.6	A, C	7
17	Tanacli2020	Germany	40	20	24	70.8	Case-control	FT-CMR	-20.8 ± 4.0	A, C	8
18	Kim2020	South Korea	96	50	42	62.8	Case-control	STE	-15.5±5.3	A, C	8
19	Kraigher- Krainer2014	Austria	269	219	140	70	Case-control	STE	-14.6 ±3.3	А	7
20	Tanacli2019	Germany	55	18	30	66.7	Case-control	FT-CMR	-12.2 ± 2.1	В	7
21	Yip2011	China	347	112	158	64.7	Case-control	STE	-15.9 ±3.9	A, B	8
22	Wang2008	US	67	20	42	52.3	Case-control	STE	-13.0 ±6.0	A, B, C	7
23	Carluccio2011	Netherland s	137	47	78	62.7	Case-control	STE	-14.4±3.3	Α, Β	7
24	Pellicori2014	UK	158	138	96	71.5	Case-control	STE	-13.6±3.0	A, D	6

NO	Study	Country	Sample size , n	HFpEF patients, n	Males , n	Age, mean (SD), years	Study design	LV GLS detection method	Mean or median values of LV GLS in HFpEF patients (%)	Endpoin t(s)	NOS quality score
25	Xu2021	Canada	262	97	100	69	Case-control	FT-CMR:	-18.0 ± 3.0	B, D	8
26	Roy2020	Brussels	174	143	56	73	Case-control	STE	-16.5 ± 3.2	A, D	7
27	Obokata2016	Japan	442	102	265	74	Case-control	STE	14.3±2.8	B, D	6
28	Gozdzik2021	Australia	201	201	53	64.8	Prospective cohort	STE	18.3±3.2	D	7
29	Kalra2020	US	1767	1767	885	72	Retrospective cohort	STE	-15.6	D	8
30	Kammerlander2020	Austria	206	206	63	71	Prospective cohort	FT-CMR	-8.2±4.5	D	8
31	Romano2020	US	1274	1274	681	57.1	Retrospective cohort	FT-CMR	-20	D	8
32	Hwang2021	South Korea	1105	1105	435	77	Prospective cohort	STE	-15.3	D	9
33	Donal2017	France	237	237	102	76	Prospective cohort	STE	-14.9 ± 3.71	D	7
34	Buggey2017	US	739	739	177	69	Prospective cohort	STE	-13.4±3.8	D	8
35	Wang2015	China	80	80	50	66	Prospective cohort	STE	-18.15±3.3	D	8
36	Huang2017	Singapore	129	129	67	75.1	Prospective cohort	STE	-13.5±4.0	D	7
37	Shah2015	US	447	447	207	70.3	Prospective cohort	STE	-15.6±3.5	D	9
38	Freed2016	Chicago	308	308	111	65	Prospective cohort	STE	-17.5±4.1	D	8
39	Lejeune2020	Belgium	149	149	58	78	Prospective cohort	STE	-16.7±3.1	D	7
40	Weerts2021	Spain	258	258	79	75.6	Prospective cohort	STE	-17.7±4.4	D	6
41	Kosmala2018	Australia	205	205	55	64.8	Prospective cohort	STE	-18.2±3.4	D	8

619 Continued Tabel 1. Baseline characteristics of the 41 selected research

Abbreviations: HFpEF: Heart (HF) with preserved ejection fraction; **STE:** speckle-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking cardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiovascular magnetic feature-tracking echocardiography; **FT-CMR:** feature-tracking echocardiovascular magnetic feature-tr

622 Endpoint (s) : A: Differences in LV GLS Values between HFpEF Patients and Healthy Controls; B: Differences in LV GLS Values between HFpEF Patients and HFrEF

623 Patients; C: Diagnostic Value of LV GLS Values in HFpEF; D: Prognostic Value of LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients

Table 2. Data related to diagnostic meta-analysis

	Study	LVGLS cut-off (%)	AUC	SEN (%)	SPE(%)	ТР	FP	FN	TN	P-value
1	Mordi2018	-17.8	0.78	0.83	0.63	52	10	11	17	0.037
2	Stoichescu-Hogea2018	-19.35	0.83	0.79	0.47	49	21	13	19	< 0.001
3	Fang2019	—	0.87		—	—	—		—	< 0.001
4	Tanacli2020	-24.1	0.69	0.90	0.41	18	12	2	8	0.037
5	Kim2020	-16.7	0.68	0.54	0.85	27	7	23	39	0.001
6	Wang2008	-16	0.98	0.95	0.95	19	1	1	16	< 0.001

629 Abbreviations: LV GLS: left ventricular global longitudinal strain TP: True positive; FP: False positive; FN: False negative; TN: True negative; SEN: Sensitivity;

SPE: Specificity.

647	Table 3. Data related to Meta-	analysis of prognostic assessment

NO	Study	Variables adjusted	Follow-up Duration (months)	Endpoint(s)	Hazard ratios	95%CIs	P- value
1	Pellicori2014	-	21.6	CV death and HF hospitalization	1.09	1.00-1.19	0.046
2	Xu2021	-	90	All-cause death and CV hospitalization	1.00	0.98-1.02	0.93
		-		All cause death	1.04	0.94-1.15	
3	Roy2020		30	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	1.00	0.93-1.07	0.95
4	Obokata2016	-	11.4	CV death and HF hospitalization	0.99	0.87-1.13	0.92
5	Gozdzik2021	MAGGIC Risk Score, BNP, and peak VO2	48	CV death and HF hospitalization	0.91	0.84-0.98	0.016
6	Kalra2020	Age, sex, race, medical history (stroke, heart rate, and AF), NYHA class, randomization strata, randomized treatment assignment, hematocrit, and creatinine	34.8	All-cause death	1.58	1.12-2.22	0.009
7	Kammerlander20 20	Age, sex, NT-pro BNP, LA volume, RV end-diastolic volume, and RV ejection fraction	39	CV death and HF hospitalization	1.06	1.01- 1.11	0.03
8	Romano2020	Age, BMI, medical history (diabetes, hypertension), heart rate, diastolic blood pressure, LV end diastolic volume index, LV ejection fraction, LA volume, and RV ejection fraction	74.4	All case death	1.21	1.157–1.270	< 0.001
9	Hwang2021	_	30	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	1.40	1.176–1.667	< 0.001
10	Donal2017	Age, sex, medical history (arterial hypertension, AF, and renal insufficiency), and hemoglobin.	18	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	1.94	1.22 3.07	0.0047
		Age, sex, medical history (renal insufficiency, diabetes, hypertension,		All case death	1.02	0.96-1.08	0.562
11	Buggey2017	pressure, moderate mitral stenosis, moderate aortic stenosis, and E/e' ratio	12	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	1.03	0.98–1.08	0.204
12	Wang2015	Age, sex, medical history (hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and anemia), history of cardiac-related medications, the body surface area, NYHA class	36	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	0.79	0.67–0.91	0.008
13	Huang2017	Sex, race, BMI, echocardiography data, NT-pro BNP, and Troponin T.	37.5	All-cause death	4.72	1.25-17.81	0.022
14	Shah2015	Age, sex, race, medical history (AF, stroke), heart rate, NYHA class, creatinine, echocardiography data (LVEF, LV mass, E/e' ratio.), randomization strata, region of enrollment, randomized treatment assignment	34.8	CV death and HF hospitalization	2.14	1.26-3.66	0.005

649 Continued Tabel 3. Data related to Meta-analysis of prognostic assessment

NO	Study	Variables adjusted	Follow-up Duration (months)	Endpoint(s)	Hazard ratios	95%CIs	P- value
15	Freed2016	Sex, AF, MAGGIC Risk Score, LV mass, LA volume, E/e' ratio	13.8	All-cause death and CV hospitalization	1.17	0.95-1.43	0.13
		_		All-cause death	1.066	0.964-1.178	0.22
16 Lejeune2020		30	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	1.019	0.951-1.093	0.59	
17	Weerts2021	-	36	All-cause death and HF hospitalization	0.958	0.909-1.010	0.115
		_		HF Hospitalization	1.76	0.23-13.52	0.584
18 Kosmala2018		26.2	All-cause death and CV hospitalization	2.12	0.35-12.74	0.411	

Abbreviations: MAGGIC Risk Score: age, ejection fraction, creatinine, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, systolic blood pressure, body-mass index, heart
 rate, New York Heart Association functional class, ACE-inhibitor use, beta-blocker use, heart failure duration, and current smoker; AF: atrial fibrillation; NYHA: New
 York Heart Association; LA: left atrial volume; RV: right ventricular; LV: left ventricular; BMI: body-mass index; LVEF: LV ejection fraction.

662 Figure Legends

- 663 Fig.1 Flowchart of Database Search and Text Screening Procedure
- 664 **Fig.2** Differences in LV GLS Values between HFpEF Patients and Control Groups
- 665 (A) Mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients and Healthy Controls
- 666 (B) Mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients and HFrEF Patients
- 667 (C) Forest Plot of mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients Compared to Healthy Controls
- 668 (D) Forest Plot of mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients Compared to HFrEF Patients
- 669 Fig.3 Diagnostic Value of LVGLS in Patients with HFpEF
- 670 (A) Sensitivity
- 671 (B) Specificity
- 672 (C) Positive Likelihood Ratio
- 673 (D) Negative Likelihood Ratio
- 674 (E) Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- 675 (F) SROC
- 676 Fig.4 Associations between Low LV GLS Values and Adverse Outcomes in HFpEF Patients
- 677 (A) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and All-cause Death in
 678 HFpEF Patients
- 679 (B) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and the Composite Outcome
- 680 of All-cause Death and HF Hospitalization in HFpEF Patients
- 681 (C) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and the Composite Outcome
- 682 of CV Death and HF Hospitalization in HFpEF Patients



Fig.1 Flowchart of Database Search and Text Screening Procedur





(C) Forest Plot of mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients Compared to Healthy Controls

	HFpE	F patie	ents	Health	ny cont	rols	5	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% CI
Bekfani2021	-18.9	5.5	17	-19.8	3.3	20	4.4%	0.20 [-0.45, 0.85]	
Bl medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi	i.org/10.1101	/2023.03.	13.232872	207; This ver	sion poste	d Marth	4, 2023. The o	copyright holder for this preprint	
Bosch 201 was not certified by	peer review It is	is the au made ava	uthor/fund ailable und	er, who has er a CC-BY	granted m 4.0 Intern	edRxiv a l ational lice	icense to disp nse	lay the preprint in perpetuity.	•
Bshiebish 2019	-15.03	2.03	20	-19.74	1.12	20	3.5%	2.82 [1.92, 3.71]	
Carluccio2011	-14.4	3.3	47	-20.5	4.9	50	5.1%	1.44 [0.99, 1.89]	
Carluccio2016	-15.4	3.5	46	-21.5	3.9	40	4.9%	1.64 [1.15, 2.13]	
Fang 2019	-14.5	2.6	62	-19.6	2.4	50	5.0%	2.02 [1.56, 2.48]	
Hashemi2021	-19.27	1.25	19	-20.48	1.62	12	4.0%	0.84 [0.08, 1.60]	
Ito2020	-14.8	3.3	18	-19.5	2.9	18	4.0%	1.48 [0.73, 2.23]	
Kim2020	-15.5	5.3	50	-19.9	2	46	5.1%	1.07 [0.64, 1.50]	
Kraigher-Krainer2014	-14.6	3.3	219	-20	2.1	50	5.4%	1.73 [1.39, 2.07]	-
Löffler2019	-17.9	3.5	19	-20.5	3.6	15	4.2%	0.72 [0.02, 1.42]	
Luo2014	-14.02	2.73	58	-17.13	2.07	46	5.1%	1.25 [0.83, 1.68]	
Mordi2018	-16.05	2.16	62	-19.59	1.49	28	4.8%	1.77 [1.25, 2.29]	
Pellicori2014	-13.6	3	138	-19.1	2.1	20	4.8%	1.88 [1.37, 2.40]	
Roy2020	-16.5	3.2	143	-21	2.5	31	5.2%	1.45 [1.03, 1.87]	
Sanchis2015	-16	3.7	63	-17	3.5	43	5.3%	0.27 [-0.12, 0.66]	-
Stoichescu-Hogea2018	-17.6	2.3	62	-20.2	1.4	40	5.1%	1.29 [0.85, 1.73]	
Tanacli2020	-20.8	4	20	-23.2	3.4	20	4.4%	0.63 [-0.00, 1.27]	
Wang2008	-13	6	20	-14	5	17	4.4%	0.18 [-0.47, 0.82]	
Yip2011	-15.9	3.9	112	-20.9	2.5	60	5.4%	1.43 [1.08, 1.78]	-
Total (95% CI)			1431			864	100.0%	1.21 [0.94, 1.47]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.3	0; Chi ² =	134.57	, df = 20	0 (P < 0.0	00001);	$I^2 = 85^{\circ}$	%	-	
Test for overall effect: Z =	9.03 (P <	< 0.000	01)						

(D) Forest Plot of mean LV GLS Values in HFpEF Patients Compared to HFrEF Patients

	HFpEF patients			HFrEF patients			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% CI	_
Bekfani2021	-18.9	5.5	17	-6.8	2.9	18	4.5%	-2.71 [-3.66, -1.77]		



Fig.2 Differences in LV GLS Values between HFpEF Patients and





Positive LR (95% CI)

i2018	2.23	(1.35 - 3.69)
hescu-Hogea2018	1.51	(1.09 - 2.08)
cli2020	1.50	(1.02 - 2.21)
020	3.55	(1.71 - 7.35)
g2008 1	6.15 (2.41 - 108.42)

Random Effects Model Pooled Positive LR = 2.17 (1.36 to 3.47) Cochran-Q = 14.77; df = 4 (p = 0.0052) Inconsistency (I-square) = 72.9 % Tau-squared = 0.1815



N	legative	e LR (95% CI)
Mordi2018	0.28	(0.15 - 0.51)
Stoichescu-Hogea2018	0.44	(0.25 - 0.79)
Tanacli2020	0.25	(0.06 - 1.03)
Kim2020	0.54	(0.39 - 0.75)
Wang2008	0.05	(0.01 - 0.36)
Random Effects Model	25 (0)	1 10 0 50

Pooled Negative LR = 0.35 (0.21 to 0.59) Cochran-Q = 10.80; df = 4 (p = 0.0289) Inconsistency (I-square) = 63.0 % Tau-squared = 0.1922





Fig.3 Diagnostic Value of LVGLS in Patients with HFpEF

(A) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and All-cause Death in HFpEF Patients								
Study		Patients	Events	HR (95% CI)	Weight(%)			
Roy2020		143	62	1.04 (0.94, 1.15)	21.35			
Kalra2020		1767	77	1.58 (1.12, 2.22)	7.12			
Romano2020		1274	115	1.21 (1.16, 1.27)	25.10			
Buggey2017		739	97	1.02 (0.96, 1.08)	24.41			
Huang2017	•	129	27	4.72 (1.25, 17.81)	0.63			
medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2 Lejeune 2020 as not certified by peer review) in It is ma	023.03.13.23287207; this version posted March 14, 2023. The copyright holder s the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint ade available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .	for this preprint in perpetuity. 149	40	1.07 (0.96, 1.18)	21.39			
Overall, DL(I ² = 84.4%, p = 0.00	0)			1.12 (1.01, 1.25)	100.00			
.5	1 5							

(B) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and the Composite Outcome of All-cause Death and HF Hospitalization in HFpEF Patients Study Patients Events HR (95% CI) Weight(%)

Roy2020		143	87	1.00 (0.93, 1.07)	18.08
Hwang2021		1105	574	1.40 (1.18, 1.67)	10.52
Donal2017		237	_	1.94 (1.22, 3.07)	2.61
Buggey2017	÷	739	134	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	19.49
Wang2015 -	-	80	43	0.79 (0.67, 0.91)	11.84
Lejeune2020	*	149	91	1.02 (0.95, 1.09)	18.17
Weerts2021	-	258	66	0.96 (0.91, 1.01)	19.28
Overall, DL (I ² = 83.1%, p = 0.000)	\diamond			1.03 (0.95, 1.11)	100.00
.5	1	5			

(C) Forest Plot of the Association between Low LV GLS Values and the Composite Outcome of CV Death and HF Hospitalization in HFpEF Patients

Study	Patients	Events	HR (95% CI)	vveignt(%)
Pellicori2014	138	62	1.09 (1.00, 1.19)	24.21
Obokata2016	102	35	0.99 (0.87, 1.13)	19.60
Gozdzik2021 -	201	74	0.91 (0.84, 0.98)	25.22
Kammerlander2020	206	109	1.06 (1.01, 1.11)	27.88
Shah2015	447	115	2.14 (1.26, 3.66)	3.09
Overall, DL (I ² = 80.5%, p = 0.000)			1.04 (0.94, 1.14)	100.00
.5 1	<u>T</u> 5			

Fig.4 Associations between Low LV GLS Values and Adverse Outo