

Cardiac Abnormalities in Hispanic Women with Prior De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy

Odayme Quesada, MD,^{a,b} Shathiyah Kulandavelu, PhD,^c Catherine J. Vladutiu, PhD, MPH,^d
Emily DeFranco, DO, MS,^e Margo B. Minissian, PhD^f Nour Makarem, PhD,^g Natalie A. Bello,
MD, MPH,^c Melissa S. Wong, MD,^h Maria Pabón, MD,ⁱ Alvin A. Chandra, MD,^j Larissa Avilés-
Santa, MD, MPH,^k Carlos J. Rodríguez, MD,^l C. Noel Bairey Merz, MD,^{c,m} Tamar Sofer, PhD,ⁿ
Barry E Hurwitz, PhD,^o Gregory A. Talavera, MD, MPH,^p Brian L. Claggett, PhDⁱ Scott D.
Solomon, MD,ⁱ Susan Cheng, MD, MPH^c

^aWomen's Heart Center, The Christ Hospital Heart and Vascular Institute, Cincinnati, OH; ^b The
Carl and Edyth Lindner Center for Research and Education, The Christ Hospital, Cincinnati, OH;
^cDepartment of Pediatrics, Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL; ^dDepartment of Obstetrics and
Gynecology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC; ^eDivision of Maternal Fetal Medicine,
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; ^fBrowman
Nursing Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA; ^gMialman School of Public
Health, Columbia University Irving Center, NY, NY; ^hDivision of Maternal Fetal Medicine,
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA;
ⁱDivision of Cardiovascular Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School,
Boston, MA; ^jUniversity of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX; ^kNational Institute
on Minority Health and Health Disparities, Bethesda, MD; ^lAlbert Einstein College of Medicine,
Bronx, NY; ^mBarbra Streisand Women's Heart Center; ⁿDepartment of Medicine, Brigham and
Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA; ^oDepartment of Psychology, University
of Miami, Miami, FL. ^pSouth Bay Latino Research Center, Department of Psychology, San
Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

27

28 **Short Title: Cardiac Abnormalities in Women with HDP**

29

30 **Address for Correspondence:**

31 Odayme Quesada, MD, Women's Heart Center, The Christ Hospital Heart, Vascular, and Lung

32 Institute, Cincinnati, OH, phone 513-585-1777, email odayme.quesada@thechristhospital.com,

33 Twitter: @OdaymeMD; and Susan Cheng, MD, MPH, Department of Cardiology, Smidt Heart

34 Institute, Cedars Sinai Medical Center

35

36 **Word count:** 6,979

37

38

39

ABSTRACT

Background. Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy (HDP) are associated with longer-term maternal risks for cardiovascular disease for reasons that remain incompletely understood.

Methods. The Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), a multi-center community-based cohort of Hispanic/Latino adults recruited 2008 to 2011 was used to evaluate the associations of history of de novo HDP (gestational hypertension, preeclampsia, eclampsia) with echocardiographic measures of left ventricular (LV) structure and function in Hispanic/Latina women with ≥ 1 prior pregnancy and the proportion of association mediated by current hypertension.

Results. The study cohort included 5,168 Hispanic/Latina women. Prior de novo HDP was reported by 724 (14%) of the women studied with an average age of 58.7 ± 9.7 years at time of echocardiogram and was associated with lower ejection fraction -0.66 (-1.21 , -0.11), greater relative wall thickness (RWT) 0.09 (0 , 0.18), and 1.39 (1.02 , 1.89) greater odds of abnormal LV geometry after adjusting for blood pressure and other risk factors. The proportion of association mediated by current hypertension between HDP and LV ejection fraction was 0.09 (95% CI 0.03 , 0.45), any abnormal LV geometry was 0.14 (0.12 , 0.48), LV RWT 0.28 (0.16 , 0.51), concentric LVH was 0.31 (0.19 , 0.86), and abnormal LV diastolic dysfunction was 0.58 (0.26 , 1.79).

Conclusions. In a large cohort of Hispanic/Latina women those with de novo HDP had detectable and measurable subclinical alterations in cardiac structure and both systolic and diastolic dysfunction that were only partially mediated by current hypertension.

63 **KEY WORDS**

64 Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, women cardiovascular risk, left ventricular geometry,

65 diastolic dysfunction, systolic dysfunction

66

67 **ABBREVIATIONS**

68 BP: blood pressure

69 CVD: Cardiovascular disease

70 HCHS/SOL: Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos

71 HDP: Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy

72 LV: Left ventricle

73 LVH: Left ventricular hypertrophy

74 RWT: Relative wall thickness

75 TTE: Transthoracic echocardiography

76

INTRODUCTION

The rates of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy (HDP), including preeclampsia and gestational hypertension, more than doubled from 2007 to 2019 in the United States (U.S.) with highest rates in Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic/Latina women.^{1,2} Growing evidence demonstrates that history of HDP is associated with higher maternal risk for long-term cardiovascular disease (CVD) and CVD-related death; resulting in the addition of HPDs as risk-modifiers in the 2019 American College of Cardiology/ American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) primary prevention guidelines.³⁻⁸

Prior investigations have found evidence of structural cardiac abnormalities during the antepartum and immediate postpartum period, attributable in part to the short-term hemodynamic effects of pregnancy due to the stress of excess afterload.⁹⁻¹² These cardiac structural changes, including increased left ventricular (LV) wall thickness, LV mass index, diastolic dysfunction and abnormalities in right ventricular (RV) strain, have been shown to persist postpartum.^{11,13,14} However, the role of chronic hypertension on these changes remains debatable.

Up to 20% of women with pregnancies complicated by HDP remain hypertensive after 6 months postpartum and have a 4-fold lifetime risk of chronic hypertension.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Some studies show that adverse remodeling is driven by chronic hypertension regardless of HDP-history,^{11,13} whereas others demonstrate adverse remodeling associated with HDP is independent of development of chronic hypertension and a cumulative effect in those with both history of HDP and subsequent chronic hypertension.¹⁴ However, very little is known about the effects of HDP on cardiac abnormalities and the role of chronic hypertension in Hispanic/Latina women, one of the fastest-growing ethnic minority group in the U.S. with a diverse and broadly representative genetic architecture.¹⁸

The degree to which any important cardiac abnormalities occur well beyond the early postpartum period prior to the development of CVD decades later— notwithstanding the effects of postpartum or age-related chronic hypertension – has remained unclear. We hypothesize that history of de novo HDP is associated with pathologic alterations in cardiac structure and function that are only partially mediated by current hypertension. We aimed to examine this hypothesis in a diverse cohort of Hispanic/Latina women in the U.S.

METHODS

Study Sample

We studied participants of the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL), a multi-center community-based cohort of all Hispanic/Latino adults representing diverse backgrounds (Central American, Cuban, Dominican, Mexican, Puerto Rican, and South American).¹⁸ The HCHS/SOL sampling methods and design have been detailed previously.^{19,20} In brief, self-identified Hispanic/Latino men and women were recruited between March 2008 to June 2011 from 4 communities in the United States (Bronx, NY; Chicago, IL; Miami, FL; and San Diego, CA) using a multi-stage area probability sample design. At each stage of sampling, oversampling occurred, and sampling weights were generated to reflect the probabilities of selection. The institutional review board at each study site approved all protocols, and all study participants provided written informed consent. Data from the HCHS/SOL cohort is publicly available to researchers upon application to NHLBI BIOLINCC.

Of the 16,415 HCHS/SOL participants who enrolled in this study, we included women age ≥ 45 years who completed visit 2 and transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) and reported at least 1 prior pregnancy at baseline visit (2008-2011) or visit 2 (2014-2017). We excluded men

(n=4,281), participants that did not complete visit 2 (n=4,792), did not complete echocardiogram (n=1,663), participants that were never pregnant or missing data on pregnancy history (n=405), and participants with missing data on HDP history (n=109). The final sample for this analysis included 5,168 women (724 with HDP and 4444 without HDP) (**Figure 1**).

Clinical and Echocardiographic Data Collection

At each study visit, all study participants underwent a standardized assessment of demographic and clinical characteristics including questionnaires regarding medical and pregnancy history along with standardized measurements of blood pressure (BP), as previously described.²⁰⁻²² All participants included had self-reported data on the history of gestational hypertension, preeclampsia and eclampsia for all their pregnancies collected through questionnaires at visit 1 and 2. We defined composite HDP status as any history of de novo gestational hypertension, preeclampsia, or eclampsia.

At visit 2, participants age ≥ 45 years underwent comprehensive 2D TTE performed according to a previously detailed standardized protocol.²³ In brief, TTE examination was performed with the participant in the partial left decubitus position with image acquisition techniques and measurements of cardiac structure and function performed according to American Society of Echocardiography guidelines.^{24,25} All image acquisition was performed by centrally trained and certified research sonographers and all imaging measurements were conducted by imaging technical specialists at the core HCHS/SOL Echocardiography Reading Center at Brigham and Women's Hospital.²³

As previously described, we defined concentric remodeling as LV mass index ≤ 95 gm/m² and RWT > 0.42 , concentric LVH as LV mass index > 95 gm/m² and RWT > 0.42 , and eccentric LVH as LV mass index > 95 gm/m² and RWT ≤ 0.42 .²⁴ Any abnormal LV geometry was defined as

presence of concentric remodeling, concentric LVH or eccentric LVH. Diastolic function was graded according to an algorithm that integrates American Society of Echocardiography (ASE) guidelines²⁶ with Redfield criteria²⁷ as previously described.^{21,28} In the analysis, LV diastolic dysfunction was dichotomized and grade I-IV diastolic dysfunction was compared to normal diastolic function.

Statistical Analyses

We compared demographic, clinical, and echocardiographic traits in women with and without prior HDP using the Student's t-test for continuous variables and Chi-square test for categorical variables. Holm-Bonferroni method was used to adjust for multiple comparisons. We then used multivariable-adjusted regression models to examine the association of prior HDP status with established measures of LV structure and function: LV ejection fraction, LV stroke volume, LV mass index, LV end-diastolic diameter, LV mass/end-diastolic volume ratio, LV relative wall thickness (RWT), peak tricuspid regurgitation velocity, lateral E/e' ratio, abnormal LV geometry and LV diastolic function. We constructed linear and logistic regression models for continuous and categorical variables, respectively. For all echocardiographic traits, model 1 adjusted for age, study field center, and Hispanic/Latino background. Model 2 adjusted for the covariates in model 1, in addition to SBP and treatment with antihypertensive therapy at the time of TTE (Visit 2). Model 3 adjusted for the covariates in model 2, in addition to body mass index, diabetes, smoking, total number of prior pregnancies, total cholesterol/HDL ratio, and urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio all assessed at the time of TTE. Covariates were selected based on prior studies demonstrating association with HDP and/or LV measures of structure/function.^{11,13,14} No adjustments were made for multiple testing. Stratified analyses were performed by type of HDP for gestational hypertension and preeclampsia, however the sample size was too small to perform adjusted models for eclampsia. Reported values were survey-weighted, to account for

the complex study design and the non-responses for visit 2.¹⁹ Weights were trimmed and calibrated to the 2010 Census characteristics by age, sex, and Hispanic/Latino background. In secondary analyses, we examined the extent to which current hypertension mediated the associations of HDP with echocardiography traits. Models are adjusted for age, field center, Hispanic/Latin background, and current hypertension stage 2 (defined as BP >140/90 mmHg or antihypertensive therapy). These analyses test the extent to which current hypertension mediate the associations of HDP with the given echocardiographic trait, whereby a mediation effect of 0 would indicate that current hypertension does not mediate the association and a mediation effect of 1 would indicate that current hypertension mediates all of the association (range of possible effect is from 0 to 1). We also assessed for potential interaction of current hypertension on HDP associations with each of the echocardiographic traits.

We considered statistical significance as a two-tailed P value and Holm-Bonferroni adjusted P value of less than 0.05. All statistical analysis were conducted using R (v4.0.4).

RESULTS

Of the total study sample including 5,168 women with prior pregnancy, 724 (14%) reported a history of de novo HDP including 439 (61%) gestational hypertension, 219 (30%) preeclampsia, and 66 (9%) eclampsia. The mean age at the time of examination and TTE was 58.7±9.7 years. The demographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample at visit 2 are shown in **Table 1**. Women with a history of HDP, compared to those without HDP were younger, had a higher level of education, greater body mass index, and more frequent dyslipidemia. After the Holm-Bonferroni adjustment, dyslipidemia and HDL-cholesterol levels were no longer statistically different between the groups. With respect to echocardiographic LV characteristics (**Table 2**), women with prior HDP had lower LV ejection fraction, higher LV stroke volume, greater LV

mass index, greater LV RWT, and higher peak tricuspid regurgitation velocity (PTRV). Accordingly, HDP was also associated with greater concentric LVH, presence of any abnormal LV geometry, and presence of abnormal diastolic function. After the Holm-Bonferroni adjustment, LV mass index and PTRV were not significantly different between the groups.

In multivariable-adjusted analyses of the continuous LV structure and function measures, prior HDP was associated with lower LV ejection fraction in all models including adjustment for systolic BP, antihypertensive therapy and traditional risk factors ($P \leq 0.02$) (**Table 3**). Prior HDP was also associated with increased LV RWT in all models ($P \leq 0.039$). Accordingly, among the categorical LV measures, prior HDP was associated with presence of concentric LVH in model 1 adjusted for age and demographic factors ($P = 0.001$), but the association was attenuated in analyses adjusting for systolic BP and antihypertensive therapy ($P = 0.07$). Notably, prior HDP was significantly associated with presence of any abnormal LV geometry in all models ($P \leq 0.038$). In addition, prior HDP was associated with presence of abnormal LV diastolic function in models adjusting for age and demographic factors ($P = 0.006$); this association was attenuated in analyses adjusting for systolic BP and antihypertensive therapy ($P = 0.43$). All other measures of LV structure and function were nonsignificant.

In secondary analyses, we examined the extent to which current hypertension mediated the associations of HDP with echocardiography traits. We found that the proportion of association between HDP and LV ejection fraction that was mediated by current hypertension was modest at 0.09 (95% CI 0.03, 0.45), with similar results seen for any abnormal LV geometry (0.14 [0.12, 0.48]). The proportions of association between HDP and other traits such as LV RWT (0.28 [0.16, 0.51]), concentric LVH (0.31 [0.19, 0.86]), and abnormal LV diastolic dysfunction (0.58 [0.26, 1.79]) that were mediated by postpartum hypertension were higher, as expected given results of multivariable-adjusted models described above (**Table 4**). We also assessed for

potential interaction of current hypertension on HDP associations with each of the echocardiographic traits and found no significant interactions ($P > 0.30$ for all). We observed no material difference in any results of analyzing data using survey-weighted versus unweighted values.

In stratified analysis by type of HDP, there was a trend towards lowest ejection fraction and LV stroke volume and highest LV RWT in women with eclampsia history (**Supplemental Table 1**). The presence of concentric LVH was highest in women with history of gestational hypertension and presence of abnormal LV diastolic function was highest in those with history of preeclampsia and gestational hypertension. In multivariable-adjusted analyses, gestational hypertension was associated with LV RWT and 1.79-fold higher risk of abnormal LV geometry across all models, whereas there was no association between preeclampsia and any of the measures of LV structure and function (**Supplemental Table 2**).

DISCUSSION

In our study of over 5,100 Hispanic/Latina women with prior pregnancy, 14% reported de novo HDP. Women with history of de novo HDP were significantly more likely to have measurable abnormalities in cardiac structure and function, including lower LV systolic function and higher rates of abnormal LV geometry than women without history of HDP. These cardiac alterations were in part mediated by the effects of current hypertension (**Central Illustration**).

The rate of de novo HDP in this study is consistent with the U.S. National Inpatient Sample between 2017 and 2019 which reported 12.5% (95% CI 12.2-12.8).²⁹ To date, a scant number of studies have examined cardiac phenotypes up to a decade or longer following delivery prior to development of clinical CVD; these few studies, each involving sample sizes of less than 200

women with history of HDP, have found evidence of LVH or diastolic dysfunction.^{30,31} In studies accounting for chronic hypertension, findings have also been mixed on whether or not the changes in LV structure and function associated with HDP history are present after adjusting for chronic hypertension – an obvious potentially confounding contributor to subsequent cardiac risk.^{11,13,14} We extend previous work and analyze one of the largest samples of de novo HDP in 724 women and compared their cardiac phenotypes with 4444 similarly aged clinical controls (i.e. women with prior pregnancy but no HDP). Importantly, we found that prior HDP was associated with higher LV RWT and abnormal LV geometry – even after adjusting for current hypertension and CV risk factors – consistent with a recent study by Countouris et al.¹⁴ in a cohort of NHW and Black women. Our study extends these findings to Hispanic/Latina women who are underrepresented in research studies.

In this study history of pregnancy complicated by de novo HDP was associated with higher risk of abnormal LV geometry (defined as concentric LV remodeling, concentric LVH, or eccentric LVH as determined by LVMI and RWT) even after adjusting for important confounders. These findings are of clinical significance because abnormal LV geometry, particularly LVH, is an independent predictor of adverse CVD events including heart failure, ischemic heart disease, and sudden cardiac death.³²⁻³⁴ We also found an association between de novo HDP and abnormal LV diastolic function, which is linked with higher incidence of CVD events in healthy cohorts and is a strong predictor of progression to heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF).^{35,36} Further, individual measures of LV geometry (LVMI, LV RWT) that we found to be associated with history of de novo HDP have also been shown to be associated with CVD events. For instance, in the Framingham Heart Study of Offspring cohort among adults free of CVD, each 10 g/m² increment in LVMI was associated with 33% increased risk of CVD and each 0.1 unit in LV RWT was associated with 59% increased risk of CVD.³⁷

Further, this is the first known study to identify evidence of HDP associated with decrements in LV systolic function. The finding of slightly lower LV ejection fraction despite greater concentric remodeling and a trend towards greater stroke volume suggests a type of contractile inefficiency that is not typically seen in the setting of current hypertension alone, suggesting a pathophysiology distinct form of hypertensive heart disease. These findings and the diastolic dysfunction exhibited by these mothers all suggest a pre- HFpEF remodeling phenotype, supported by the excess risk of HFpEF in women with preeclampsia, that warrants further investigation.^{38,39}

Hypertension results in chronic central pressure overload and myocardial ischemia that leads to the development of LVH and heart failure. Therefore, we evaluated the extent to which current hypertension mediated the association between history of de novo HDP and measures of LV structure and function. Hypertension is associated with significantly higher rates of concentric LVH and is a strong independent predictor of LV diastolic dysfunction, but the association with eccentric LVH and LV systolic dysfunction is less robust.^{40,41} This helps explain why hypertension was a moderate mediator in the association between HDP and concentric LVH and LV diastolic dysfunction but a weaker mediator of LV ejection fraction (a measure of LV systolic function). Our results are consistent with large epidemiologic data indicating that the association of HDP with later-life CVD is only partially mediated by current hypertension.⁵ These findings provide insights into HDP as a potential novel mechanism to explain the disproportionately higher risk of heart failure in women with a history of HDP.^{42,43}

The mechanisms by which HDP may lead to abnormalities in cardiac structure and function beyond the effects of current hypertension remain to be elucidated.⁴⁴ Diabetes was found to be higher in women with history of de novo HDP and although we included diabetes in our adjusted models it may have contributed to some of our findings. In fact, glucose intolerance, insulin

resistance, and diabetes have been shown to be associated with increased LV mass and wall thickness and reduced end-diastolic volume, stroke volume, and ejection fraction.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ Further, endothelial dysfunction is a hallmark of the pathophysiology underlying preeclampsia and some studies suggest this can persist after delivery.^{48,49} Activation of pathways involving the antiangiogenic soluble fms-like tyrosine kinase 1 (sFlt-1) in preeclampsia, which can remain at least modestly elevated postpartum, can contribute to endothelial dysfunction and deranged lipid metabolism.⁵⁰⁻⁵² Dysregulations of the renin-angiotensin system may also contribute to persistent postpartum cardiac abnormalities. Additionally, shared upstream factors such as CV risk factors and/or genetics may predispose women to both HDPs and later in life pathological LV remodeling and function. Further investigations are needed to identify the potential mechanisms contributing to cardiac abnormalities and how these may be different by race and ethnicity.

Study Limitations

Several limitations of our study merit consideration. The cross-sectional design of our study precludes inference of causality, although timing of reported prior HDP consistently preceded timing of assessed cardiac traits. Prior HDP status was based on self-report, which is subject to recall bias and limits precision with respect to subtypes of HDP; nonetheless, self-report has been evaluated as valid and thus applied in the vast majority of cohort studies on HDP.^{53,54} Data on severity of preeclampsia, number of pregnancies complicated by HDP, time period between HDP pregnancy and echocardiography, and length of postpartum hypertension is not available. Additionally, multiple echocardiographic measures were analyzed, which can lead to heightened Type 1 error rate. Despite these limitations, our study offered several strengths including analyses from the largest study to date investigating the relations of prior HDP with cardiac traits in Hispanic/Latina women who represent a demographically important yet historically understudied population. In addition, all cardiac traits were assessed from echocardiographic

protocols that involved standardized image acquisition and centralized measures performed at a core center with high inter- and intra-reader reproducibility and BP obtained in a standardized method.

Conclusions

In summary, we found in a large cohort of previously pregnant Hispanic/Latina women that those with history of de novo HDP had detectable and measurable pathological alterations in cardiac structure and systolic and diastolic dysfunction. Our findings suggest that women with prior HDP have pathophysiologic cardiac sequelae decades later, that likely play a role in modulating long-term CV risk. Notwithstanding the need for further investigations into the mechanisms driving HDP pathophysiology, our findings highlight the potential importance of targeted surveillance and interventions aimed at preventing later-life CVD events in these at-risk understudied women.

Perspectives

Hispanic/Latina women are disproportionally affected by HDP, yet very little is known on how HDP affects cardiac structure and function in this growing population in the U.S. In this study of a diverse cohort of Hispanic/Latina women, those with history of de novo HDP had higher rates of abnormal LV geometry, and alterations in LV geometry (LVMI, RWT) and function (LVEF, diastolic dysfunction), known predictors of CV events and mortality. Notably, these findings appear to be in part mediated by current hypertension – underscoring the importance of screening for and managing hypertension in this cohort. Hypertension alone did not account for all the associations between history of de novo HDP and morphologic and functional cardiac alterations. With the higher rates of heart failure, particularly HFpEF, in women and the alterations in cardiac structure and function identified in this study we hypothesize HDP may be a sex-specific risk factor that warrants further investigation.

Acknowledgements:

The authors thank the participants and staff of HCHS/SOL for their important contributions to this research. The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institutes of Health; or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Sources of Funding:

The HCHS/SOL study is a collaborative study supported by National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) contracts N01-HC65233, N01-HC65234, N01-HC65235, N01-HC65236, and N01-HC65237. The following institutes, centers, or offices contribute to the HCHS/SOL through a transfer of funds to the NHLBI: National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communications Disorders, the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, and the Office of Dietary Supplements. The authors report the following additional sources of funding: NIH K23-HL136853, NIH K23-HL151867, Erika J. Glazer Women's Heart Research Initiative, and the Barbra Streisand Women's Cardiovascular Research and Education Program.

Disclosures

The authors report no relevant disclosures.

REFERENCES

1. Freaney PM, Harrington K, Molsberry R, Perak AM, Wang MC, Grobman W, Greenland P, Allen NB, Capewell S, O'Flaherty M, et al. Temporal Trends in Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes in Birthing Individuals Aged 15 to 44 Years in the United States, 2007 to 2019. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2022;11:e025050. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.025050
2. Shah NS, Harrington KA, Huang X, Cameron NA, Yee LM, Khan SS. Trends in De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy Among Asian and Hispanic Population Subgroups in the United States, 2011 to 2019. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2022;7:742-746. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2022.1378
3. Bellamy L, Casas JP, Hingorani AD, Williams DJ. Pre-eclampsia and risk of cardiovascular disease and cancer in later life: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2007;335:974. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39335.385301.BE
4. Garovic VD, White WM, Vaughan L, Saiki M, Parashuram S, Garcia-Valencia O, Weissgerber TL, Milic N, Weaver A, Mielke MM. Incidence and Long-Term Outcomes of Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2020;75:2323-2334. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2020.03.028
5. Honigberg MC, Zekavat SM, Aragam K, Klarin D, Bhatt DL, Scott NS, Peloso GM, Natarajan P. Long-Term Cardiovascular Risk in Women With Hypertension During Pregnancy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2019;74:2743-2754. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.09.052
6. Torosyan N, Aziz D, Quesada O. Long-term sequelae of adverse pregnancy outcomes. *Maturitas.* 2022;165:1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2022.06.012
7. Wu P, Haththotuwa R, Kwok CS, Babu A, Kotronias RA, Rushton C, Zaman A, Fryer AA, Kadam U, Chew-Graham CA, et al. Preeclampsia and Future Cardiovascular Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes.* 2017;10. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.116.003497
8. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, Buroker AB, Goldberger ZD, Hahn EJ, Himmelfarb CD, Khera A, Lloyd-Jones D, McEvoy JW, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation.* 2019;140:e596-e646. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000678
9. Castleman JS, Ganapathy R, Taki F, Lip GY, Steeds RP, Kotecha D. Echocardiographic Structure and Function in Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy: A Systematic Review. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2016;9. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.116.004888
10. Melchiorre K, Sutherland GR, Baltabaeva A, Liberati M, Thilaganathan B. Maternal cardiac dysfunction and remodeling in women with preeclampsia at term. *Hypertension.* 2011;57:85-93. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.110.162321
11. Scantlebury DC, Kane GC, Wiste HJ, Bailey KR, Turner ST, Arnett DK, Devereux RB, Mosley TH, Jr., Hunt SC, Weder AB, et al. Left ventricular hypertrophy after hypertensive pregnancy disorders. *Heart.* 2015;101:1584-1590. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308098
12. Vaught AJ, Kovell LC, Szymanski LM, Mayer SA, Seifert SM, Vaidya D, Murphy JD, Argani C, O'Kelly A, York S, et al. Acute Cardiac Effects of Severe Pre-Eclampsia. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018;72:1-11. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.04.048
13. Levine LD, Ky B, Chirinos JA, Koshinski J, Arany Z, Riis V, Elovitz MA, Koelper N, Lewey J. Prospective Evaluation of Cardiovascular Risk 10 Years After a Hypertensive

- Disorder of Pregnancy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2022;79:2401-2411. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2022.03.383
14. Countouris ME, Villanueva FS, Berlacher KL, Cavalcante JL, Parks WT, Catov JM. Association of Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy With Left Ventricular Remodeling Later in Life. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2021;77:1057-1068. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2020.12.051
15. Behrens I, Basit S, Melbye M, Lykke JA, Wohlfahrt J, Bundgaard H, Thilaganathan B, Boyd HA. Risk of post-pregnancy hypertension in women with a history of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: nationwide cohort study. *BMJ.* 2017;358:j3078. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j3078
16. Benschop L, Duvekot JJ, Versmissen J, van Broekhoven V, Steegers EAP, Roeters van Lennep JE. Blood Pressure Profile 1 Year After Severe Preeclampsia. *Hypertension.* 2018;71:491-498. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.117.10338
17. Podymow T, August P. Postpartum course of gestational hypertension and preeclampsia. *Hypertens Pregnancy.* 2010;29:294-300. doi: 10.3109/10641950902777747
18. Conomos MP, Laurie CA, Stilp AM, Gogarten SM, McHugh CP, Nelson SC, Sofer T, Fernandez-Rhodes L, Justice AE, Graff M, et al. Genetic Diversity and Association Studies in US Hispanic/Latino Populations: Applications in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2016;98:165-184. doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2015.12.001
19. Lavange LM, Kalsbeek WD, Sorlie PD, Aviles-Santa LM, Kaplan RC, Barnhart J, Liu K, Giachello A, Lee DJ, Ryan J, et al. Sample design and cohort selection in the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2010;20:642-649. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2010.05.006
20. Sorlie PD, Aviles-Santa LM, Wassertheil-Smoller S, Kaplan RC, Daviglius ML, Giachello AL, Schneiderman N, Raij L, Talavera G, Allison M, et al. Design and implementation of the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2010;20:629-641. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2010.03.015
21. Aggarwal SR, Herrington DM, Vladutiu CJ, Newman JC, Swett K, Gonzalez F, Kizer JR, Kominiarek MA, Tabb KM, Gallo LC, et al. Higher number of live births is associated with left ventricular diastolic dysfunction and adverse cardiac remodelling among US Hispanic/Latina women: results from the Echocardiographic Study of Latinos. *Open Heart.* 2017;4:e000530. doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2016-000530
22. Vladutiu CJ, Siega-Riz AM, Sotres-Alvarez D, Stuebe AM, Ni A, Tabb KM, Gallo LC, Potter JE, Heiss G. Parity and Components of the Metabolic Syndrome Among US Hispanic/Latina Women. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes.* 2016;9:S62-S69. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.115.002464
23. Shah AM, Cheng S, Skali H, Wu J, Mangion JR, Kitzman D, Matsushita K, Konety S, Butler KR, Fox ER, et al. Rationale and design of a multicenter echocardiographic study to assess the relationship between cardiac structure and function and heart failure risk in a biracial cohort of community-dwelling elderly persons: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities study. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2014;7:173-181. doi: 10.1161/circimaging.113.000736
24. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, Flachskampf FA, Foster E, Goldstein SA, Kuznetsova T, 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;16:233-270. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jev014
25. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP, Byrd BF, 3rd, Dokainish H, Edvardsen T, Flachskampf FA, Gillebert TC, Klein AL, Lancellotti P, et al. Recommendations for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Diastolic Function by Echocardiography: An Update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2016;29:277-314. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2016.01.011
26. Nagueh SF, Appleton CP, Gillebert TC, Marino PN, Oh JK, Smiseth OA, Waggoner AD, Flachskampf FA, Pellikka PA, Evangelista A. Recommendations for the evaluation of left ventricular diastolic function by echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2009;22:107-133. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2008.11.023
27. Redfield MM, Jacobsen SJ, Burnett JC, Jr., Mahoney DW, Bailey KR, Rodeheffer RJ. Burden of systolic and diastolic ventricular dysfunction in the community: appreciating the scope of the heart failure epidemic. *Jama*. 2003;289:194-202. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.2.194
28. Mehta H, Armstrong A, Swett K, Shah SJ, Allison MA, Hurwitz B, Bangdiwala S, Dadhania R, Kitzman DW, Arguelles W, et al. Burden of Systolic and Diastolic Left Ventricular Dysfunction Among Hispanics in the United States: Insights From the Echocardiographic Study of Latinos. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2016;9:e002733. doi: 10.1161/circheartfailure.115.002733
29. Ford ND, Cox S, Ko JY, Ouyang L, Romero L, Colarusso T, Ferre CD, Kroelinger CD, Hayes DK, Barfield WD. Hypertensive Disorders in Pregnancy and Mortality at Delivery Hospitalization - United States, 2017-2019. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2022;71:585-591. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7117a1
30. Boardman H, Lamata P, Lazdam M, Verburg A, Siepmann T, Upton R, Bilderbeck A, Dore R, Smedley C, Kenworthy Y, et al. Variations in Cardiovascular Structure, Function, and Geometry in Midlife Associated With a History of Hypertensive Pregnancy. *Hypertension*. 2020;75:1542-1550. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.119.14530
31. Bokslag A, Franssen C, Alma LJ, Kovacevic I, Kesteren FV, Teunissen PW, Kamp O, Ganzevoort W, Hordijk PL, Groot CJM, et al. Early-onset preeclampsia predisposes to preclinical diastolic left ventricular dysfunction in the fifth decade of life: An observational study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13:e0198908. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0198908
32. Bluemke DA, Kronmal RA, Lima JA, Liu K, Olson J, Burke GL, Folsom AR. The relationship of left ventricular mass and geometry to incident cardiovascular events: the MESA (Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis) study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2008;52:2148-2155. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2008.09.014
33. Cheng S, Fernandes VR, Bluemke DA, McClelland RL, Kronmal RA, Lima JA. Age-related left ventricular remodeling and associated risk for cardiovascular outcomes: the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2009;2:191-198. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.108.819938
34. Levy D, Garrison RJ, Savage DD, Kannel WB, Castelli WP. Prognostic implications of echocardiographically determined left ventricular mass in the Framingham Heart Study. *N Engl J Med*. 1990;322:1561-1566. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199005313222203

35. Naylor M, Cooper LL, Enserro DM, Xanthakis V, Larson MG, Benjamin EJ, Aragam J, Mitchell GF, Vasan RS. Left Ventricular Diastolic Dysfunction in the Community: Impact of Diagnostic Criteria on the Burden, Correlates, and Prognosis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2018;7. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.117.008291
36. Kane GC, Karon BL, Mahoney DW, Redfield MM, Roger VL, Burnett JC, Jr., Jacobsen SJ, Rodeheffer RJ. Progression of left ventricular diastolic dysfunction and risk of heart failure. *JAMA.* 2011;306:856-863. doi: 10.1001/jama.2011.1201
37. Tsao CW, Gona PN, Salton CJ, Chuang ML, Levy D, Manning WJ, O'Donnell CJ. Left Ventricular Structure and Risk of Cardiovascular Events: A Framingham Heart Study Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Study. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2015;4:e002188. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.115.002188
38. Williams D, Stout MJ, Rosenbloom JJ, Olsen MA, Joynt Maddox KE, Deych E, Davila-Roman VG, Lindley KJ. Preeclampsia Predicts Risk of Hospitalization for Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2021;78:2281-2290. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2021.09.1360
39. Hansen AL, Sondergaard MM, Hlatky MA, Vittinghof E, Nah G, Stefanick ML, Manson JE, Farland LV, Wells GL, Mongraw-Chaffin M, et al. Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes and Incident Heart Failure in the Women's Health Initiative. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4:e2138071. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.38071
40. Yun M, Li S, Yan Y, Sun D, Guo Y, Fernandez C, Bazzano L, He J, Zhang T, Chen W. Blood Pressure and Left Ventricular Geometric Changes: A Directionality Analysis. *Hypertension.* 2021;78:1259-1266. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.121.18035
41. Verdecchia P, Angeli F, Gattobigio R, Sardone M, Porcellati C. Asymptomatic left ventricular systolic dysfunction in essential hypertension: prevalence, determinants, and prognostic value. *Hypertension.* 2005;45:412-418. doi: 10.1161/01.HYP.0000154822.37141.f6
42. Behrens I, Basit S, Lykke JA, Ranthe MF, Wohlfahrt J, Bundgaard H, Melbye M, Boyd HA. Association Between Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Later Risk of Cardiomyopathy. *JAMA.* 2016;315:1026-1033. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.1869
43. Honigberg MC, Riise HKR, Daltveit AK, Tell GS, Sulo G, Igland J, Klungsoyr K, Scott NS, Wood MJ, Natarajan P, et al. Heart Failure in Women With Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy: Insights From the Cardiovascular Disease in Norway Project. *Hypertension.* 2020;76:1506-1513. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.15654
44. Rana S, Lemoine E, Granger JP, Karumanchi SA. Preeclampsia: Pathophysiology, Challenges, and Perspectives. *Circ Res.* 2019;124:1094-1112. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.313276
45. Kishi S, Gidding SS, Reis JP, Colangelo LA, Venkatesh BA, Armstrong AC, Isogawa A, Lewis CE, Wu C, Jacobs DR, Jr., et al. Association of Insulin Resistance and Glycemic Metabolic Abnormalities With LV Structure and Function in Middle Age: The CARDIA Study. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2017;10:105-114. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2016.02.033
46. Rutter MK, Parise H, Benjamin EJ, Levy D, Larson MG, Meigs JB, Nesto RW, Wilson PW, Vasan RS. Impact of glucose intolerance and insulin resistance on cardiac structure and function: sex-related differences in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation.* 2003;107:448-454. doi: 10.1161/01.cir.0000045671.62860.98
47. Lv J, Liu Y, Yan Y, Sun D, Fan L, Guo Y, Fernandez C, Bazzano L, He J, Li S, et al. Relationship Between Left Ventricular Hypertrophy and Diabetes Is Likely Bidirectional:

- 567 A Temporality Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2023;12:e028219. doi:
568 10.1161/JAHA.122.028219
- 569 48. Savvidou MD, Hingorani AD, Tsikas D, Frolich JC, Vallance P, Nicolaides KH.
570 Endothelial dysfunction and raised plasma concentrations of asymmetric
571 dimethylarginine in pregnant women who subsequently develop pre-eclampsia. *Lancet.*
572 2003;361:1511-1517. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)13177-7
- 573 49. Germain AM, Romanik MC, Guerra I, Solari S, Reyes MS, Johnson RJ, Price K,
574 Karumanchi SA, Valdes G. Endothelial dysfunction: a link among preeclampsia,
575 recurrent pregnancy loss, and future cardiovascular events? *Hypertension.* 2007;49:90-
576 95. doi: 10.1161/01.HYP.0000251522.18094.d4
- 577 50. Wolf M, Hubel CA, Lam C, Sampson M, Ecker JL, Ness RB, Rajakumar A, Daftary A,
578 Shakir AS, Seely EW, et al. Preeclampsia and future cardiovascular disease: potential
579 role of altered angiogenesis and insulin resistance. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.*
580 2004;89:6239-6243. doi: 10.1210/jc.2004-0548
- 581 51. Maynard SE, Min JY, Merchan J, Lim KH, Li J, Mondal S, Libermann TA, Morgan JP,
582 Sellke FW, Stillman IE, et al. Excess placental soluble fms-like tyrosine kinase 1 (sFlt1)
583 may contribute to endothelial dysfunction, hypertension, and proteinuria in preeclampsia.
584 *J Clin Invest.* 2003;111:649-658. doi: 10.1172/JCI17189
- 585 52. Bytautiene E, Bulayeva N, Bhat G, Li L, Rosenblatt KP, Saade GR. Long-term
586 alterations in maternal plasma proteome after sFlt1-induced preeclampsia in mice. *Am J*
587 *Obstet Gynecol.* 2013;208:388.e381-388.e310. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2013.01.042
- 588 53. Stuart JJ, Bairey Merz CN, Berga SL, Miller VM, Ouyang P, Shufelt CL, Steiner M,
589 Wenger NK, Rich-Edwards JW. Maternal recall of hypertensive disorders in pregnancy:
590 a systematic review. *J Womens Health (Larchmt).* 2013;22:37-47. doi:
591 10.1089/jwh.2012.3740
- 592 54. Carter EB, Stuart JJ, Farland LV, Rich-Edwards JW, Zera CA, McElrath TF, Seely EW.
593 Pregnancy Complications as Markers for Subsequent Maternal Cardiovascular Disease:
594 Validation of a Maternal Recall Questionnaire. *J Womens Health (Larchmt).*
595 2015;24:702-712. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2014.4953
- 596

Pathophysiological Novelty and Relevance

What is new?

- First study to evaluate the cardiac sequelae of de novo hypertensive disorder of pregnancy (HDP) in a cohort of 5,168 Hispanic/Latina women.

What is relevant?

- Women with de novo HDP had detectable and measurable subclinical alterations in cardiac structure and both systolic and diastolic dysfunction, above and beyond the effects of current hypertension.

Clinical/Pathophysiologic Implications?

- Our findings suggest that women with de novo HDP have pathophysiologic cardiac sequelae decades later that likely play a role in modulating long-term cardiovascular risk in women.

610 **Figure Legend**

611 **Figure 1.** Sampling Strategy and Study Design.

612 **Central Illustration.** Proportion of association between hypertensive disorders of pregnancy
613 and measures of left ventricular structure and function mediated by current hypertension.

614 Figure created using BioRender.

615

616

617

Table 1. Demographics and Clinical Characteristics by De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History

Characteristics at Visit 2	Overall N=5168	De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History		P value	Adjusted P value
		No N=4444	Yes N=724		
Demographics					
Age, years, mean (SD)	58.7 (9.7)	59.2 (9.7)	56.3 (8.8)	<0.001	<0.001
Hispanic/Latino Background, %				0.07	0.68
Dominican	11	11	13		
Central/South American	12	12	12		
Cuban	22	22	23		
Mexican	34	36	28		
Puerto-Rican	18	17	21		
Other or more than one heritage	3	2	4		
Participant's Field Center, %				0.1	0.86
Bronx	29	28	33		
Chicago	13	13	11		
Miami	32	32	34		
San Diego	26	27	23		
Years living in US, years, mean (SD)	29.3 (16.6)	29.3 (16.5)	28.9 (16.7)	0.71	1.0
Annual Family income ≥\$30,000, %	62	62	62	1.0	1.0
Health Insurance Coverage, %	81	81	82	0.49	1.0
Clinical Characteristics					
Blood pressure based on ACC/AHA, %				<0.001	<0.001
Normal	27	30	18		
Elevated BP	9	10	6		
Stage 1 Hypertension	43	41	58		
Stage 2 Hypertension	11	11	10		
Antihypertensive therapy, %	43	41	58	<0.001	<0.001

Diabetes Mellitus, %	31	30	39	<0.001	<0.001
Dyslipidemia, %	30	29	35	0.021	0.27
Metabolic Syndrome, %	53	51	63	<0.001	<0.001
Current smoker, %	13	13	14	0.66	1.0
Number of Pregnancy, mean (SD)	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (2)	0.6	1.0
HDP Type, %					
Gestational Hypertension	61	-	61		
Preeclampsia	30	-	30		
Eclampsia	9	-	9		
Clinical Measures					
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg, mean (SD)	127 (20)	127 (20)	129 (19)	0.047	0.51
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg, mean (SD)	73 (11)	72 (10)	76 (12)	<0.001	<0.001
Body Mass Index, kg/m ² , mean (SD)	31 (6)	30 (6)	32 (7)	<0.001	<0.001
Cholesterol, Total, mg/dL, mean (SD)	201 (40)	200 (40)	203 (41)	0.31	1.0
LDL cholesterol, mg/dL, mean (SD)	121 (36)	121 (36)	121 (37)	0.76	1.0
HDL cholesterol, mg/dL, mean (SD)	54 (15)	55 (15)	53 (15)	0.032	0.38
Triglycerides, mg/dL, mean (SD)	130 (80)	127 (72)	144 (116)	0.003	0.049
Urine Albumin/creatinine ratio, mean (SD)	46 (330)	40 (318)	77 (404)	0.12	0.93

Table 2. Differences in Measures of Left Ventricle Structure and Function by De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History

Echocardiographic Measures	Overall	De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History		P value	Adjusted P value
		No	Yes		
Continuous Measures					
LV ejection fraction, %	71.55 (4.50)	71.72 (4.44)	70.68 (4.76)	<0.001	0.005
LV stroke volume, mL	60.35 (11.43)	59.86 (11.15)	62.65 (12.42)	<0.001	0.003
LV mass index, g/m ²	76.09 (16.57)	75.61 (15.90)	78.40 (19.35)	0.015	0.12
LV end-diastolic diameter, cm	4.24 (0.37)	4.23 (0.36)	4.26 (0.41)	0.24	1.0
LVMI/EDV ratio	0.92 (0.24)	0.93 (0.23)	0.90 (0.25)	0.13	0.79
LV relative wall thickness, cm	0.44 (0.07)	0.44 (0.07)	0.46 (0.07)	0.001	0.009
PTRV, cm/s	220.48 (30.04)	219.72 (30.36)	224.90 (27.94)	0.045	0.32
Lateral E/e' ratio	8.8 (3.4)	8.7 (3.4)	8.9 (3.4)	0.38	1.0
Categorical Measures					
Concentric LV remodeling, %	46	45	49	0.26	1.0
Concentric LVH, %	9	8	13	0.005	0.04
Eccentric LVH, %	3	2	5	0.2	1.0
Abnormal LV geometry, %	57	56	66	0.002	0.017
Abnormal LV diastolic function, %	35	35	35	0.98	1.0

LV, left ventricle; LVMI, LV mass index; EDV, end-diastolic volume; PTRG, Peak tricuspid regurgitation velocity; LVH, left ventricular hypertrophy

Table 3. Associations between De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History and Measures of Left Ventricle Structure and Function.

Echocardiographic Measures	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value
Continuous Measures						
LV ejection fraction, %	-0.90 (-1.45, -0.04)	0.001	-0.75 (-1.30, -0.21)	0.007	-0.66 (-1.21, -0.11)	0.02
LV stroke volume, mL	1.72 (0.32, 3.12)	0.016	0.94 (-0.41, 2.29)	0.17	0.32 (-0.96, 1.61)	0.62
LV mass index, g/m ²	3.70 (1.46, 5.94)	0.001	1.57 (-0.50, 3.64)	0.14	1.05 (-1.01, 3.10)	0.32
LV end-diastolic diameter, cm	0.01 (-0.49, 0.52)	0.96	-0.12 (-0.62, 0.38)	0.65	-0.29 (-0.75, 0.18)	0.23
LVMI/EDV ratio	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.72	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.03)	0.72	0 (-0.04, 0.03)	0.92
LV relative wall thickness, cm	0.22 (0.13, 0.31)	<0.001	0.14 (0.05, 0.23)	0.003	0.09 (0.00, 0.18)	0.039
PTRV, cm/s	7.37 (2.50, 12.25)	0.003	4.0 (-0.92, 8.92)	0.11	2.22 (-2.65, 7.09)	0.37
Lateral E/e' ratio	0.58 (0.19, 0.96)	0.004	0.19 (-0.19, 0.58)	0.33	0 (-0.37, 0.38)	0.10
Categorical Measures						
Concentric LV remodeling, %	1.33 (1.01, 1.75)	0.046	1.25 (0.94, 1.67)	0.12	1.16 (0.87, 1.55)	0.31
Concentric LVH, %	1.92 (1.32, 2.79)	0.001	1.45 (0.97, 2.16)	0.07	1.30 (0.85, 1.99)	0.22
Eccentric LVH, %	1.60 (0.80, 3.21)	0.19	1.32 (0.64, 2.75)	0.45	1.38 (0.63, 3.00)	0.42
Abnormal LV geometry, %	1.86 (1.39, 2.49)	<0.001	1.51 (1.12, 2.03)	0.007	1.39 (1.02, 1.89)	0.038
Abnormal LV diastolic function, %	1.52 (1.13, 2.05)	0.006	1.14 (0.83, 1.57)	0.43	1.02 (0.73, 1.42)	0.90

LV, left ventricle; LVMI, LV mass index; EDV, end-diastolic volume; PTRG, Peak tricuspid regurgitation velocity; LVH, left ventricular hypertrophy

Model 1 is adjusted for age, field center, Hispanic background; Model 2 is adjusted for all variables in Model 1, in addition to systolic blood pressure and antihypertensive therapy at Visit 2; Model 3 is adjusted for all variables in Model 2, in addition to diabetes status, smoking, total cholesterol HDL ratio, number of pregnancies, BMI, urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio

Table 4. Causal Mediation Analysis to Assess Mediation Effect of Current Hypertension for Observed Association Between De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Measures of Left Ventricle Structure and Function.

Echocardiographic Measures	Proportion of Association with HDP Mediated by Current Hypertension (95% CI)	P value
LV ejection fraction	0.09 (0.03, 0.45)	0.01
LV relative wall thickness	0.28 (0.16, 0.51)	<0.001
Concentric LVH	0.31 (0.19, 0.86)	<0.001
Abnormal LV geometry	0.14 (0.12, 0.48)	<0.001
Abnormal LV diastolic function	0.58 (0.26, 0.79)	0.006

Models are adjusted for age, field center, Hispanic/Latino background, and current hypertension (defined as BP >140/90 or antihypertensive therapy).

Supplemental Table 1. Differences in Measures of Left Ventricle Structure and Function by Type of Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy.

Echocardiographic Measures	De Novo Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy History				p-trend
	None	Gestational Hypertension	Preeclampsia	Eclampsia	
Continuous Measures					
LV ejection fraction, %	71.72 (4.44)	70.65 (4.65)	71.22 (4.26)	69.36 (6.23)	<0.001
LV stroke volume, mL	59.86 (11.15)	63.64 (13.03)	61.90 (11.56)	59.34 (10.67)	<0.001
LV mass index, g/m ²	75.61 (15.91)	80.06 (20.75)	75.70 (16.42)	76.86 (18.35)	0.19
LV end-diastolic diameter, cm	4.23 (0.36)	4.28 (0.44)	4.26 (0.35)	4.19 (0.38)	0.60
LVMI/EDV ratio	0.93 (0.23)	0.91 (0.27)	0.89 (0.21)	0.91 (0.20)	0.003
LV relative wall thickness, cm	0.44 (0.07)	0.46 (0.07)	0.44 (0.07)	0.47 (0.09)	<0.001
PTRV, cm/s	219.72 (30.37)	226.58 (29.95)	221.93 (23.70)	222.72 (27.09)	0.12
Lateral E/e' ratio	8.73 (3.38)	9.22 (3.85)	8.41 (2.62)	8.59 (2.73)	0.01
Categorical Measures					
Concentric LV remodeling, %	45.2	50.4	39.6	66.6	0.07
Concentric LVH, %	8.3	16.8	9.7	4.1	0.005
Eccentric LVH, %	2.3	5.1	0.6	4.2	0.99
Abnormal LV geometry, %	55.9	72.2	50.2	74.9	<0.001
Abnormal LV diastolic function, %	35.3	38.7	29.7	32.7	0.38

Supplemental Table 2. Associations between Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia and Measures of Left Ventricle Structure and Function.

Echocardiographic Measures	Gestational Hypertension					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value
Continuous Measures						
LV ejection fraction, %	-0.92 (-1.60, -0.24)	0.008	-0.77 (-1.45, -0.09)	0.027	-0.61 (-1.32, 0.09)	0.09
LV stroke volume, mL	2.82 (0.95, 4.69)	0.003	1.88 (0.11, 3.65)	0.038	1.14 (-0.53, 2.81)	0.18
LV mass index, g/m ²	5.20 (2.00, 8.41)	0.002	2.63 (-0.45, 5.71)	0.09	1.76 (-1.38, 4.90)	0.27
LV end-diastolic diameter, cm	0.17 (-0.57, 0.90)	0.66	0.002 (-0.71, 0.72)	1.0	-0.27 (-0.96, 0.43)	0.45
LVMI/EDV ratio	0.009 (-0.04, 0.06)	0.69	-0.005 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.83	-0.0006 (-0.05, 0.05)	0.98
LV relative wall thickness, cm	0.27 (0.17, 0.38)	<0.001	0.18 (0.07, 0.29)	0.002	0.12 (0.01, 0.23)	0.03
PTRV, cm/s	9.07 (2.79, 15.35)	0.005	4.82 (-1.64, 11.29)	0.14	1.96 (-4.33, 8.26)	0.54
Categorical Measures						
Concentric LV remodeling, %	1.38 (0.97, 1.96)	0.07	1.32 (0.92, 1.90)	0.13	1.23 (0.85, 1.79)	0.27
Concentric LVH, %	2.48 (1.60, 3.87)	<0.001	1.76 (1.09, 2.85)	0.021	1.54 (0.92, 2.58)	0.10
Eccentric LVH, %	2.24 (1.01, 4.98)	0.048	1.80 (0.78, 4.18)	0.17	1.89 (0.74, 4.79)	0.18
Abnormal LV geometry, %	2.44 (1.69, 3.52)	<0.001	1.96 (1.34, 2.86)	<0.001	1.79 (1.19, 2.69)	0.005
Abnormal LV diastolic function, %	1.86 (1.30, 2.66)	<0.001	1.34 (0.92, 1.94)	0.12	1.17 (0.80, 1.71)	0.42
Echocardiographic Measures	Preeclampsia					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value	Coefficient (95% CI)	P value
Continuous Measures						
LV ejection fraction, %	-0.55 (-1.35, 0.24)	0.17	-0.46 (-1.25, 0.32)	0.25	-0.43 (-1.19, 0.33)	0.27
LV stroke volume, mL	1.11 (-1.01, 3.22)	0.31	0.54 (-1.50, 2.59)	0.60	0.27 (-1.81, 2.34)	0.80
LV mass index, g/m ²	1.33 (-2.18, 4.84)	0.46	-0.34 (-3.37, 2.69)	0.83	-0.22 (-3.18, 2.74)	0.88
LV end-diastolic diameter, cm	-0.03 (-0.78, 0.72)	0.94	-0.11 (-0.84, 0.63)	0.78	-0.15 (-0.82, 0.51)	0.65

LVMl/EDV ratio	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.03)	0.56	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.27	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.37
LV relative wall thickness, cm	0.08 (-0.06, 0.23)	0.24	0.02 (-0.11, 0.15)	0.75	0.008 (-0.12, 0.14)	0.90
PTRV, cm/s	4.40 (-2.73, 11.53)	0.23	1.41 (-5.97, 8.80)	0.71	1.19 (-6.37, 8.75)	0.76
Categorical Measures						
Concentric LV remodeling, %	0.95 (0.58, 1.57)	0.85	0.92 (0.56, 1.53)	0.75	0.86 (0.53, 1.41)	0.56
Concentric LVH, %	1.46 (0.73, 2.93)	0.28	1.14 (0.57, 2.27)	0.71	1.15 (0.57, 2.29)	0.70
Eccentric LVH, %	0.29 (0.06, 1.40)	0.12	0.26 (0.05, 1.28)	0.10	0.27 (0.06, 1.33)	0.11
Abnormal LV geometry, %	1.02 (0.62, 1.68)	0.94	0.87 (0.53, 1.43)	0.57	0.83 (0.50, 1.37)	0.46
Abnormal LV diastolic function, %	1.08 (0.56, 2.07)	0.83	0.88 (0.44, 1.79)	0.73	0.78 (0.37, 1.64)	0.51

