

Title Page

Full title : Early left ventricular systolic function is a more sensitive predictor of adverse events after heart transplant

Short title : EF1 predict adverse events after heart transplant

Zhenxing Sun^{a,b*}, Yu Cai^{a,b*}, Yujia Yang^c, Lei Huang^{a,b}, Yuji Xie^{a,b}, Shuangshuang Zhu^{a,b}, Chun Wu^{a,b}, Wei Sun^{a,b}, Ziming Zhang^{a,b}, Yuman Li^{a,b}, Jing Wang^{a,b}, Lingyun Fang^{a,b}, Yali Yang^{a,b}, Qing Lv^{a,b}, Nianguo Dong^{d†}, Li Zhang^{a,b†}, Haotian Gu^{c†}, Mingxing Xie^{a,b†}

a. Department of Ultrasound, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430022, China

b. Hubei Province Key Laboratory of Molecular Imaging, Wuhan 430022, China

c. British Heart Foundation Centre of Research Excellence, King's College London, UK

d. Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430022, China

* Co-first author

† Co-senior author

Corresponding address:

Mingxing Xie, 1277# Jiefang Ave, Wuhan 430022, China. Tel: 86-27-85726430; Fax: 86-27-85726386. E-mail address: xiemx@hust.edu.cn

Haotian Gu, Department of Clinical Pharmacology, St Thomas' Hospital, London, UK, SE1 7EH; Tel: 0044-2071884799; Fax: 0044-2071885116; Email: haotian.gu@kcl.ac.uk

Li Zhang, 1277 Jiefang Avenue, Wuhan, China. Tel: 86-27-85726430; Fax: 86-27-85726386. E-mail address: zli429@hust.edu.cn

Nianguo Dong, 1277 Jiefang Avenue, Wuhan, China. Tel: 86-27-85726430; Fax: 86-27-85726386. E-mail address: dongnianguo@hotmail.com

Word count: 4311

Abbreviations

BSA = Body surface area

BNP = Brain natriuretic peptide

CV = coefficient of variation

EF1 = First-phase ejection fraction

EF = Ejection fraction

EDV = End-diastolic volume

ESV = End-systole volume

HT = Heart transplant Stroke

LAV = Left atrial volume

LAVi = Left atrial volume index

LV = Left ventricular

LVGLS = Left ventricular global longitudinal strain

RV = Right ventricular

RVFAC = Right ventricular fractional area change

SV = Stroke volume

SVi = Stroke volume index

TAPSE = Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion

TPAVF = Time of peak aortic valve flow velocity

Abstract

Background: First-phase ejection fraction (EF1) is a novel measure of early systolic function. This study was to investigate the prognostic value of EF1 in heart transplant recipients.

Methods: Heart transplant recipients were prospectively recruited at the Union Hospital, Wuhan, China between January 2015 and December 2019. All patients underwent clinical examination, biochemistry measures [brain natriuretic peptide (BNP) and creatinine] and transthoracic echocardiography. The primary endpoint was a combined event of all-cause mortality and graft rejection.

Results: In 277 patients (aged 48.6 ± 12.5 years) followed for a median of 38.7 (interquartile range: 18.3) months, there were 35 (12.6%) patients had adverse events including 20 deaths and 15 rejections. EF1 was negatively associated with BNP ($\beta = -0.220$, $p < 0.001$) and was significantly lower in patients with events compared to those without. EF1 had the largest area under the curve in ROC analysis compared to other measures. An optimal cut-off value of 25.8% for EF1 had a sensitivity of 96.3% and a specificity of 97.1% for prediction of events. EF1 was the most powerful predictor of events with hazard ratio per 1% change in EF1: 0.628 (95%CI: 0.555-0.710, $p < 0.001$) after adjustment for left ventricular ejection fraction and global longitudinal strain.

Conclusions: Early left ventricular systolic function as measured by EF1 is a powerful predictor of adverse outcomes after heart transplant. EF1 may be useful in risk stratification and management of heart transplant recipients.

Key words: Early left ventricular systolic function; predictor; adverse events; heart transplant

Introduction

Heart transplant (HT) is the treatment of choice for patients with advanced (end-stage) heart failure. Over the last decades, heart transplants reported to the registry of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) have been steadily increasing (1). Although the advance in immunosuppression therapy has increased the survival rate after HT (1), cardiac allograft vasculopathy (CAV), acute cellular rejection (ACR) and antibody-mediated rejection (AMR) remain as major causes of cardiac complications (2-4).

Therefore, close monitoring of graft function is essential. Transthoracic echocardiography as a most widely used cardiac imaging modality has been recommended for routine surveillance of graft function by the American Society of Echocardiography (ASE) (5) and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging (EACVI) (6). However, recent studies indicated that left ventricular ejection fraction (EF) and diastolic functional measures may not be the most optimal markers for detection of early graft failure (7,8). Left ventricular longitudinal strain (LVGLS) has been shown to have prognostic value of adverse cardiac events (9,10). However, LVGLS is still limited by the lack of standardization between various vendor platforms with lack of uniform established reference values. There is an ongoing search for more sensitive imaging biomarkers of early rejection, which can (partially) supplant regular endomyocardial screening biopsies and their attendant risks.

First-phase ejection fraction (EF1), a novel but simple measure of early systolic function, is a sensitive marker of early systolic impairment in patients with aortic stenosis, COVID-19 and a powerful predictor of response to cardiac resynchronization therapy (11-14). The impairment of early systolic function could be related to diastolic relaxation and dysfunction through the shortening-deactivation phenomenon: shortening of the myocyte after depolarization leads to alterations in the cytosolic calcium transient and reduced contraction (15-17). Therefore, the objective of the present study was to examine the relative prognostic impact of EF1 compared to other measures of systolic function including LVEF and LVGLS, diastolic function and brain natriuretic peptide (BNP) in heart transplant recipients.

Methods

Patient population

A prospective observational study of the predictive value of EF1 for adverse events was undertaken in consecutive HT patients at The Union Hospital, Wuhan, China between January 2015 and December 2019. The study was approved by the Union Hospital Tongji Medical College Ethical committee and complied with the Declaration of Helsinki. All adult

patients underwent clinical examination, biochemistry measures (BNP and creatinine) and transthoracic echocardiography. All patients were followed until defined endpoint or censoring date on 31st December 2021. All patients received immunosuppression regimens (including tacrolimus, and mycophenolate mofetil).

Rejection

Endomyocardial biopsies (EMB) was performed as part of post-heart transplantation evaluation based on the standard institutional follow-up protocol. A minimum of 3 ventricular myocardial fragments (each consisting of at least 50% myocardium) were obtained and analysed by the pathology laboratory.

Cellular rejection was graded according to ISHLT grading system (18): grade 0R biopsies being classified as negative for cellular rejection, grade 1R biopsies as mild cellular rejection, and grades 2R and 3R biopsies as significant cellular rejection. Rejection in the present study was defined as Grade $\geq 2R$ cellular rejection on histopathology or as antibody-mediated rejection (18).

Endpoint

The primary endpoint was defined as a combined event: all-cause mortality and graft rejection. Outcome data were verified from hospital records and death registry database.

Transthoracic echocardiography and first phase ejection fraction

Transthoracic echocardiography was performed using a Philips Epiq 7C and IE Elite (Philips Healthcare, Guildford, UK) ultrasound platforms. All echocardiographic measurements were performed according to the recommendations of the American Society of Echocardiography (19). Image analysis was performed by two authors blinded to clinical information and outcomes using a Tomtec analysis package (Tomtec, Munich, Germany). Left atrial volume (LAV) was measured from apical 4 and 2 chamber views. LAV index (LAVi) were obtained from BSA. Stroke volume (SV) was calculated as the difference between end-diastolic volume (EDV) and end-systolic volume (ESV) and indexed to BSA to give stroke volume index (SVi). Tissue Doppler measures were obtained at levels of the lateral and septal mitral annulus to obtain an optimal spectral Doppler waveform. E/e' ratio was calculated as a measure of diastolic function from the ratio of transmitral Doppler E wave velocity to the mean of basal lateral and septal tissue Doppler e' waves (20). Left ventricular global longitudinal strain was measured from speckle tracking echocardiography from apical views.

LV volumes were measured by 2D Simpson's method from apical views at end-diastole, time of peak aortic valve flow velocity (TPAVF) and end-systole. LVEF was calculated as the percentage change of LV volume from end-diastole to end-systole. EF1 was taken as the percentage change in LV volume from end-diastole to TPAVF, a time that approximates the time of peak ventricular contraction and expressed as a percentage of EDV (figure 1). The frame from apical views for determining LV volume at TPAVF is estimated by the measuring the total number of frames from the R wave to the end systole and multiplying this by the fraction of time from the R wave to TPAVF and from R wave to end systole.(21) Right ventricular fractional area change (RVFAC) was measured as percentage change between RV area at the end-diastole and area at the end-systole. Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion (TAPSE) was measured using M-mode from an apical 4-chamber view.

Repeatability and reproducibility of EF1

Intra- and inter-observer variability in measurements of EF1 was assessed in 30 randomly selected subjects by measurements repeated 2 months apart by 2 observers with the standard deviation of difference in measures on the two occasions and coefficient of variation (CV) used as a measure of variability.

Statistical Analysis

Continuous variables were tested for normality, and those following an approximately normal distribution are presented as means \pm standard deviation (SD). Other variables are presented as medians and inter-quartile range. Comparisons between groups were made by analysis of variance or by χ^2 test for categorical variables. For the prediction of events, receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) analysis was performed to examine the sensitivity and specificity of EF1 for events and the optimal cut-off value for predicting events was determined to maximise values of sensitivity and specificity. The added discriminative power of EF1 over other measures was tested using the C-statistic. Kaplan-Meier curves were used to examine cumulative event rates and the difference between groups was tested using a log rank test. Univariable Cox regression analysis was performed to identify potential predictors of events. Multivariable Cox proportional hazards models were used to test the independent value of echocardiographic and other measures for predicting future events. A two-tailed P-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 24 for Mac (SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

Characteristics of patients

300 consecutive patients underwent heart transplant were recruited of which 23 were excluded from the final analysis, due to poor image quality (n=19), lost to follow-up (n=4).

Thus, a total of 277 patients (aged 48.6 ± 12.5 years) were included in the final analysis.

Echocardiography was performed at median of 11.1 (interquartile range:15.9) months after HT. After a median of 38.7 (interquartile range: 18.3) months of follow-up, 35/277 (12.6%) patients reached endpoints including 20 deaths and 15 rejections. Event-free survival was 94.6%, 92.4% and 88.8% at 12, 24 and 36 months respectively.

Clinical, laboratory and echocardiographic data

EF1 was negatively associated with BNP with ($\beta=-0.161$, $p=0.003$) or without ($\beta=-0.220$, $p<0.001$) adjustment for recipient age, gender, LAVi, e' , LVEF, LVGLS, and TAPSE.

When comparing patients with events to those without events, there was no significant difference in donor age, recipient age, recipient gender, BMI, heart rate, systolic and diastolic blood pressures, history of hypertension and diabetes. Patients with events had significantly higher creatinine and BNP compared to those without events. Patients with events had worse LV systolic function (as measured by LVEF, EF1 and LVGLS), diastolic relaxation (as measured by e') and increased LAVi, but no difference in RV systolic function (table 1).

Intra- and inter-observer coefficients of variation for EF1 were 2.1% and 3.2%, respectively. Bland-Altman plots for inter and intra-observer variability are shown in figure 2.

Prediction of events by EF1 and other measures

Prediction of events by EF1 and other measures by univariate and multivariate Cox regression analysis is shown in table 2. EF1 was the most consistently and strongly predictive of events in univariate and each of multivariate models. Other measures significantly predicting events in univariate analysis included: BNP, Creatinine, LAVi, LVEF, LVGLS, e' , and TAPSE (table 2). In multivariable model 1, including significant predictors in the univariable analysis with a $p<0.001$ (LVEF, LVGLS and EF1), EF1 was the only measure strongly associated with events [hazard ratio (HR) per 1% change in EF1: 0.628, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.555-0.710, $p<0.001$]. Similar HR for EF1 was observed (0.623, 95%CI: 0.548-0.708, $p<0.001$) when all significant predictors ($p<0.05$) in the univariable analysis were included (multivariable model 2). ROC curve analyses of EF1, BNP, LAVi, LVEF, LVGLS and TAPSE for predicting events are shown in figure 3. The area under the

curve (AUC) was the largest for EF1 (0.987, $p < 0.001$), followed by LVGLS, LVEF, LAVi, BNP and TAPSE. An optimal cut-off value of 25.8% for EF1 had a sensitivity of 96.3% and a specificity of 97.1% for prediction of events. The C-statistic index for a logistic model (including variables from Cox regression multivariable model 2) increased significantly by adding EF1 (0.897 to 0.989: change in the c-statistics 0.092, $p < 0.05$).

Kaplan-Meier analysis showed that EF1 was a strong predictor of events (figure 4). When EF1 was less than 25.8%, 34 patients had events compared to only 1 in those with an $EF1 \geq 25.8\%$.

Discussion

The main finding of the present study is a strong association between EF1, a measure of early systolic function and adverse outcomes in patients post HT. The finding is robust being seen irrespective of adjustment for biochemistry biomarkers and other echocardiographic measures of LV and RV function. More importantly, EF1 was superior to LVGLS and other measures of LV systolic function or RV systolic function. There is an incremental prognostic value for EF1 over other clinical and functional predictors. These findings suggest an important role for EF1, a simple but robust measure of early LV systolic function in the risk stratification of HT recipients.

Other prognostic markers in the present study included BNP, LV systolic functional measures (including LVEF and LVGLS), LV diastolic measure (e'), and TAPSE. These findings are consistent with previous studies (7-10,22-24).

Rationale and associations of LV EF1 in heart transplant recipients

EF1 is a novel measure of early LV systolic function. Although overall LVEF and LVGLS were marginally lower in patients with events, EF1 was approx. 30% lower in patients with events compared those without. This may be because early LV systolic function, is more sensitive to compromise in cardiac contractility caused by acute or chronic injury with sarcomeric mechanotransduction maintaining overall contraction/shortening (such as overall LVEF and GLS) at the expense of slower but sustained contraction during systole (25). Less severe damage may impair the ability of the muscle to contract in early systole. Our previous studies have suggested that EF1 is associated with elevated LV myocardial wall stress in hypertensive patients (14) and myocardial fibrosis in patients with aortic stenosis (13). Cardiac allograft vasculopathy is known to affect both epicardial vessels and microvascular

function which leads to impairment of early systolic function (4). Elevated myocardial wall stress induced by increased left ventricular filling pressure is common in long-term heart transplant recipients (26,27). Our finding of association between BNP and EF1 confirms that myocardial wall stress abnormalities may lead to reduced EF1 and sustained systolic contraction (13,14).

Prognosis of EF1

EF1 is an independent predictor of adverse events in our cohort of HT recipients. Previous studies have demonstrated prognostic value of LVGLS in short- and long-term HT patients (9,23), which are consistent with our findings of LVGLS being a significant predictor of events in univariate Cox-regression analysis. In contrast to previous studies, we showed that EF1 is the only LV systolic measure remained as a significant predictor in both multivariate models. It is known that LVGLS is associated with perfusion defect, elevated LV wall stress, myocardial fibrosis and myocardial edema which are often seen in HT patients. However, LV GLS is a measure of myocardial fibre shortening through the entire systole which shares the same limitation as LVEF. The possible explanation is that the reduction of early systolic function characterised by an impaired EF1 is associated with subendocardial myocardial fibrosis and elevated myocardial wall stress.

Clinical Perspective

EF1 is a novel but simple marker of early left ventricular systolic function, which can be easily measured from standard clinical echocardiographic examinations, and it is reproducible and vendor independent compared to GLS. EF1 is more sensitive in detecting early systolic impairment and has better predictive power than EF and GLS, therefore, EF1 has the potential to be incorporated into routine assessments in heart transplant recipients without extra training and financial burden.

Limitations

Our study was subject to several important limitations. The number of patients was relatively small, and we cannot extrapolate our results outside of the inclusion criteria for the present study. A multi-centre study of EF1 is required to confirm its predictive value in routine clinical use. The observation of a relationship between EF1 and BNP supports an interaction between myocardial wall stress and early systolic function, but we cannot be certain of the direction of causality. Although reproducible, EF1 was measured from 2D bi-plane

Simpson's method. Such measurements are limited by geometrical assumptions and measurements made in a routine clinic may exhibit more variability. It is well recognised that automated 3D analysis and Cardiac Magnetic Resonance (CMR) provide more reliable and reproducible measurements of LV volumes and function. Therefore, EF1 measured by 3D echo or CMR would be the preferred method for future studies. The number of events following HT was low and further studies will be required to define the predictive value of EF1 for predicting clinical outcomes in these patients.

Conclusion

In conclusion, early systolic function as captured by first-phase ejection fraction is a powerful predictor of adverse clinical outcomes. If these findings are confirmed in larger multi-centre studies and randomised controlled trials, EF1 may be useful in risk stratification and guide management of heart transplant recipients.

Author contributions

All of the authors participated in the completion of this manuscript.

Disclosure statement

Zhenxing Sun, Li Zhang, and Mingxing Xie receives research funding from the National Natural Science Foundation of China; Haotian Gu received research funding from the National Institute for Health Research, UK and British Heart Foundation, UK. All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant 81922033 to Li Zhang; grant 81727805 to MX; and grant 81701716 to ZS) and National Institute for Health Research, UK (ICA-CL-2018-04-ST2-012) to HG and by British Heart Foundation, UK (PG/19/23/34259) to HG.

Data available statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Reference

1. Lund LH, Khush KK, Cherikh WS et al. The Registry of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: Thirty-fourth Adult Heart Transplantation Report—2017; Focus Theme: Allograft ischemic time. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2017;36:1037-1046.
2. Raichlin EMD, Edwards BSMD, Kremers WKP et al. Acute Cellular Rejection and the Subsequent Development of Allograft Vasculopathy After Cardiac Transplantation. *The Journal of heart and lung transplantation* 2009;28:320-327.
3. Shahzad K, Aziz QA, Leva J-P et al. New-onset graft dysfunction after heart transplantation—incidence and mechanism-related outcomes. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2011;30:194-203.
4. Clemmensen TS, Eiskjær H, Løgstrup BB et al. Noninvasive Detection of Cardiac Allograft Vasculopathy by Stress Exercise Echocardiographic Assessment of Myocardial Deformation. *Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography* 2016;29:480-490.
5. Douglas PSMDMFF, Garcia MJMDF, Haines DEMDF et al. ACCF/AHA/ASNC/HFSA/HRS/SCAI/SCCM/SCCT/SCMR 2011 Appropriate Use Criteria for Echocardiography. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2011;57:1126-1166.
6. Badano LP, Miglioranza MH, Edvardsen T et al. European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging/Cardiovascular Imaging Department of the Brazilian Society of Cardiology recommendations for the use of cardiac imaging to assess and follow patients after heart transplantation. *European heart journal cardiovascular imaging* 2015;16:919-948.
7. Clemmensen TS, Eiskjær H, Kofoed-Nielsen PB, Høyer S, Poulsen SH. Case of Acute Graft Failure during Suspected Humoral Rejection with Preserved Ejection Fraction, but Severely Reduced Longitudinal Deformation Detected by 2D-Speckle Tracking. *Case reports in transplantation* 2014;2014:173589-4.
8. Chinali M, Esposito C, Grutter G et al. Cardiac dysfunction in children and young adults with heart transplantation: A comprehensive echocardiography study. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2017;36:559-566.
9. Clemmensen TS, Eiskjær H, Løgstrup BB, Ilkjær LB, Poulsen SH. Left ventricular global longitudinal strain predicts major adverse cardiac events and all-cause mortality in heart transplant patients. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2017;36:567-576.
10. Elkaryoni A, Altibi AM, Khan MS et al. Global longitudinal strain assessment of the left ventricle by speckle tracking echocardiography detects acute cellular rejection in orthotopic heart transplant recipients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Echocardiography (Mount Kisco, NY)* 2020;37:302-309.
11. Gu H, Baldeep S, Fang L et al. First-phase ejection fraction predicts response to cardiac resynchronization therapy and adverse outcomes. *European heart journal* 2020;41.
12. Gu H, Cirillo C, Nabeebaccus AA et al. First-Phase Ejection Fraction, a Measure of Preclinical Heart Failure, Is Strongly Associated with Increased Mortality in Patients with COVID-19. *Hypertension (Dallas, Tex 1979)* 2021;77:2014-2022.

13. Bing R, Gu H, Chin C et al. Determinants and prognostic value of echocardiographic first-phase ejection fraction in aortic stenosis. *Heart* 2020;106:1236.
14. Gu H, Li Y, Fok H et al. Reduced First-Phase Ejection Fraction and Sustained Myocardial Wall Stress in Hypertensive Patients With Diastolic Dysfunction: A Manifestation of Impaired Shortening Deactivation That Links Systolic to Diastolic Dysfunction and Preserves Systolic Ejection Fraction. *Hypertension (Dallas, Tex 1979)* 2017;69:633-640.
15. Brady AJ. Time and displacement dependence of cardiac contractility: problems in defining the active state and force-velocity relations. *Fed Proc* 1965;24:1410-20.
16. Housmans PR, Lee NK, Blinks JR. Active shortening retards the decline of the intracellular calcium transient in mammalian heart muscle. *Science* 1983;221:159-61.
17. Ezzaher A, el Ouazzani T, Crozatier B. Timing and velocity of ejection as major determinants of end-systolic pressure in isolated rabbit hearts. *Circulation* 1994;90:3055-62.
18. Stewart S, Winters GL, Fishbein MC et al. Revision of the 1990 Working Formulation for the Standardization of Nomenclature in the Diagnosis of Heart Rejection. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2005;24:1710-1720.
19. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V et al. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *European heart journal cardiovascular Imaging* 2015;16:233-70.
20. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP et al. Recommendations for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Diastolic Function by Echocardiography: An Update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2016;17:1321-1360.
21. Bing R, Gu H, Newby DE, Chowienczyk P, Dweck MR. The Authors' reply: instantaneous pressure-flow relationships in aortic stenosis. *Heart* 2020;106:1778-1779.
22. Olymbios M, Kwiecinski J, Berman DS, Kobashigawa JA. Imaging in Heart Transplant Patients. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging* 2018;11:1514-1530.
23. Mingo-Santos S, Monivas-Palomero V, Garcia-Lunar I et al. Usefulness of Two-Dimensional Strain Parameters to Diagnose Acute Rejection after Heart Transplantation. *Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography : official publication of the American Society of Echocardiography* 2015;28:1149-56.
24. Sera F, Kato TS, Farr M et al. Left ventricular longitudinal strain by speckle-tracking echocardiography is associated with treatment-requiring cardiac allograft rejection. *J Card Fail* 2014;20:359-64.
25. Linari M, Brunello E, Reconditi M et al. Force generation by skeletal muscle is controlled by mechanosensing in myosin filaments. *Nature* 2015;528:276-9.
26. Meluzin J, Hude P, Krejci J et al. Noninvasive prediction of the exercise-induced elevation in left ventricular filling pressure in post-heart transplant patients with normal left ventricular ejection fraction. *Experimental and clinical cardiology* 2013;18:63-72.
27. Clemmensen TS, Eiskjær H, Løgstrup BB et al. Clinical features, exercise hemodynamics, and determinants of left ventricular elevated filling pressure in heart-transplanted patients. *Transplant international* 2016;29:196-206.

Figure legend

Figure 1: Measurement of EF1

Figure 2: Bland-Altman plots of intra (a) and inter (b) observer viability of EF1

Figure 3: ROC analysis

Figure 4: Kaplan-Meier curve for event-free survival according EF1 (cut off value 25.8%)

Table 1. Baseline characteristics in patients with and without events

	Events (n=35)	No Events (n=242)	P
Recipient Age (years)	50.0±12.1	48.5±12.6	0.520
Donor Age (years)	46.0±13.7	47.5±12.3	0.527
Recipient Male Sex (%)	28 (80.0)	198 (81.8)	0.816
Body Mass Index (kg/m²)	22.5±4.5	23.2±3.5	0.339
Heart rate (bpm)	91±9	91±10	0.907
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	119±20	119±11	0.750
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	80±11	79±10	0.544
Reason for transplant			0.804
Dilated Cardiomyopathy (%)	17 (48.6)	143 (59.1)	
Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy (%)	1 (2.9)	9 (3.7)	
Ischemic Heart Disease (%)	7 (20)	38 (15.7)	
Heart Valve Disease (%)	3 (8.6)	21 (8.7)	
Adult Congenital Heart Disease (%)	2 (5.7)	11 (4.5)	
Other (%)	5 (14.3)	20 (8.3)	
Co-morbidities			
Hypertension	21 (60.0)	111 (45.9)	0.148
Diabetic Mellitus	24 (68.9)	129 (53.3)	0.103
Medications			
Tacrolimus	21 (60.0)	134 (55.4)	0.606
Mycophenolate mofetil	20 (57.1)	130 (53.7)	0.538
ACE/ARB	6 (17.1)	35 (14.5)	0.618
Clopidogrel	4 (11.4)	14 (5.8)	0.260
CCB	16 (45.7)	93 (38.4)	0.464
Statins	22 (62.9)	142 (58.7)	0.854
Aspirin	7 (20)	81 (33.5)	0.123
Biochemistry			
Creatinine (umol/l)	121.5±62.5	105.8±33.7	0.025
BNP (pg/ml)	204.3±275.2	112.2±92.1	<0.001
Echocardiography			
LV End Diastolic Volume (ml)	90.1±24.3	88.7±18.9	0.689
Stroke Volume index (ml/m²)	31.9±10.3	32.3±6.6	0.760
Left Atrial Volume index (ml/m²)	49.3±15.5	42.4±11.7	0.002
LV Ejection Fraction (%)	59.2±4.3	62.1±3.8	<0.001
EF1 (%)	21.2±2.6	30.4±3.1	<0.001

LV Global Longitudinal Strain (%)	-16.1±2.2	-19.5±2.1	<0.001
S wave (cm/s)	8.5±1.7	8.8±1.4	0.229
e' wave (cm/s)	11.3±2.8	12.6±3.2	0.024
E/e'	7.6±3.2	7.0±2.7	0.203
TAPSE (mm)	14.0±4.0	15.4±6.5	0.202
RV FAC (%)	43.6±7.8	46.2±15.7	0.330
TPAVF (ms)	128.1±16.6	125.5±19.4	0.450
TPAVF/Ejection Time	0.45±0.05	0.44±0.06	0.461

ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme; ARB: angiotensin receptor blockers; CCB: calcium channel blockers; BNP: brain natriuretic peptide; LV: left ventricle; EF1: first-phase ejection fraction; S: tissue Doppler mitral annulus systolic motion; e': tissue Doppler mitral annulus early diastolic motion; E/e': early mitral filling / tissue Doppler mitral annulus early diastolic motion; TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; FAC: fractional area change; TPAVF: time to peak aortic valve flow velocity.

Table 2. Univariable and multivariable analysis of predictors of events

	HR	CI (95%)	P value
Univariable			
Donor Age	0.991	0.965 – 1.017	0.481
Recipient Age	1.009	0.982 – 1.036	0.514
Recipient Gender	0.906	0.396 – 2.076	0.816
Body Mass Index	0.950	0.865 – 1.044	0.289
Heart Rate	1.002	0.969 – 1.036	0.915
Systolic Blood Pressure	1.003	0.976 – 1.032	0.823
Hypertension	0.591	0.300 – 1.161	0.127
Diabetes	0.532	0.260 – 1.085	0.083
Adult Congenital Heart Disease	0.830	0.199 – 3.461	0.798
ln BNP	1.808	1.176 – 2.778	0.007
ln Creatinine	3.012	1.058 – 8.578	0.039
Stroke Volume index	0.996	0.949 – 1.045	0.868
Left Atrial Volume index	1.035	1.012 – 1.058	0.002
LV End-diastolic Volume	1.004	0.988 – 1.021	0.596
LV Ejection Fraction	0.842	0.777 – 0.912	<0.001
LV Global Longitudinal Strain	1.634	1.455 – 1.833	<0.001
e'	0.879	0.790 – 0.978	0.018
E/e'	1.078	0.973 – 1.195	0.153
TPAVF	1.007	0.990 – 1.025	0.426
EF1	0.625	0.565 – 0.691	<0.001
TAPSE	0.884	0.800 – 0.977	0.016
RV FAC	0.954	0.905 – 1.007	0.086
Multivariable Model 1			
Ejection Fraction	1.068	0.975 – 1.170	0.158
Global Longitudinal Strain	1.091	0.891 – 1.336	0.397
EF1	0.628	0.555 – 0.710	<0.001
Multivariable Model 2			
Ln BNP	0.835	0.554 – 1.257	0.387
Ln Creatinine	1.591	0.447 – 5.662	0.473
Left Atrial Volume Index	1.007	0.981 – 1.035	0.585
Ejection Fraction	1.052	0.955 – 1.158	0.305
Global Longitudinal Strain	1.055	0.864 – 1.287	0.775
e'	0.900	0.788 – 1.027	0.118

TAPSE	0.892	0.803 – 0.991	0.034
EF1	0.623	0.548 – 0.708	<0.001



ln BNP: natural log brain natriuretic peptide; e': tissue Doppler mitral annulus early diastolic motion; E/e': early mitral filling / tissue Doppler mitral annulus early diastolic motion; TPAVF: time to peak aortic valve flow velocity; EF1: first-phase ejection fraction; TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; FAC: fractional area change.

Measurement of EF1 - manual

$$EF1 = (EDV - V1) / EDV\%$$

EDV=81.8ml

V1=58.4ml



Time to peak aortic flow=137ms

Figure 1.




Figure 2




Figure 3.




Figure 4.