

1 **Title: Cardiac remodeling in moderate aortic stenosis**

2

3 Marilena Giannoudi MRCP MBBS MSc¹, Henry Procter MBChB¹, Sindhoora Kotha MBChB
4 MRCP¹, Nicholas Jex PhD MRCP¹, Amrit Chowdhary PhD MSc MRCP¹, Sharmaine
5 Thirunavukarasu PhD MRCP¹, Peter Swoboda PhD MRCP¹, Sven Plein PhD FRCP¹, Richard M.
6 Cubbon PhD MRCP¹, Hui Xue PhD², Ladislav Valkovič PhD^{3,4}, Peter Kellman PhD², Marc R.
7 Dweck MD PhD⁵, John P Greenwood PhD FRCP^{1,6}, Eylem Levelt DPhil MRCP¹

8

9 1. University of Leeds, Biomedical Imaging Science Department, Leeds Institute of
10 Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

11 2. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health, DHHS, 10 Center
12 Drive MSC-1061, Bethesda, MD, 20892, USA

13 3. Centre for Clinical Magnetic Resonance Research (OCMR), RDM Cardiovascular Medicine,
14 University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

15 4. Department of Imaging Methods, Institute of Measurement Science, Slovak Academy of
16 Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia

17 5. University of Edinburgh/BHF Centre for Cardiovascular Science, Chancellor's Building, 49
18 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 SU4, UK.

19 6. Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute & Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

20

21 **Corresponding author:** Prof. Eylem Levelt DPhil MRCP FHEA FESC

22

23 **Email:** e.levelt@leeds.ac.uk

24 **Word count:** 4268

25

26

27 **STRUCTURED ABSTRACT**

28

29 **Background:** Aortic stenosis (AS) accounts for substantial global morbidity and premature
30 mortality even in moderate AS (Mod-AS). The mechanisms for this adverse prognosis in
31 Mod-AS, however, remain poorly understood, although the myocardial remodeling
32 response is thought to be critical. We aimed to prospectively assess myocardial remodeling,
33 perfusion and energetics differences in Mod-AS and severe AS (Severe-AS).

34 **Methods:** Fifty-two Severe-AS and 25 Mod-AS patients and 18 demographically-matched
35 controls underwent cardiovascular magnetic resonance and phosphorus-magnetic
36 resonance spectroscopy to define left ventricular (LV) mass and function, global longitudinal
37 shortening (GLS), rest and adenosine-stress myocardial blood flow (MBF), myocardial
38 perfusion reserve (MPR), layer-specific perfusion metrics (subendocardial [Endo],
39 subepicardial [Epi] MBF and MPR, and Endo- to Epi-MBF ratio [Endo/Epi]), myocardial scar
40 on late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) imaging, and myocardial energetics
41 (phosphocreatine:ATP ratio [PCr/ATP]).

42 **Results:** Compared to controls, from Mod-AS to Severe-AS there was a progressive increase
43 in LV concentricity (LV-mass/LV-end-diastolic-volume)(controls:0.58[0.54,0.62], Mod-
44 AS:0.74[0.64,0.84], Severe-AS:0.89[0.83,0.95]g/mL; $P<0.0001$), LV mass-index
45 (controls: 46[40,51], Mod-AS: 58[51,65], Severe-AS: 70[65,75]g/m²; $P<0.0001$) and stepwise
46 decline in GLS (controls:19.9[17.6,22.2], Mod-AS:17.7[16.6,18.8], Severe-
47 AS:13.4[12.5,14.4]%; $P<0.0001$) with significant differences between Mod-AS and Severe-AS
48 for all three comparisons.

49 Both stress MBF (controls:2.1[1.9,2.3], Mod-AS:1.9[1.6,2.2], Severe-
50 AS:1.3[1.2,1.5]ml/min/g; $P<0.0001$) and MPR (controls:3.3[2.8,3.6], Mod-AS:2.8[2.4,3.2],
51 Severe-AS:1.9[1.8,2.1]; $P<0.0001$) were only significantly reduced in Severe-AS compared to
52 controls, with significant differences also detected between Mod-AS and Severe-AS.

53 However, stress-endo-MBF (controls:2.0[1.8,2.3], Mod-AS:1.7[1.5,2.0], Severe-
54 AS:1.2[1.1,1.3] ml/min/g; $P<0.0001$), stress-Endo/Epi (controls:1.00[0.93,1.07], Mod-
55 AS:0.87[0.80,0.94], Severe-AS:0.81[0.75,0.82]; $P<0.0001$), rest-Endo/Epi
56 (controls:1.12[1.10,1.14], Mod-AS:1.06[1.03,1.09], Severe-AS:1.03[1.02,1.06]; $P<0.0001$)
57 and endo-MPR (controls:3.2[2.7,3.6], Mod-AS:2.5[2.1,2.9], Severe-
58 AS:1.7[1.5,1.8]; $P<0.0001$) were all significantly reduced in both Mod-AS and Severe-AS.

59 Compared to controls, both AS groups showed significantly lower PCr/ATP
60 (controls:2.2[2.0,2.3], Mod-AS:1.8[1.6,2.0], Severe-AS:1.7[1.6,1.8]; $P<0.0001$) and shorter 6-
61 minute-walk-distance (controls:525[495,555], Mod-AS:420[375,465]m, Severe-
62 AS:345[248,420]m; $P<0.0001$).

63 Only the Severe-AS group had evidence of non-ischemic myocardial scarring on
64 LGE (2.9[0.0,6.2]%), which was detected in 65% (n=34) of patients. Neither group had
65 evidence of ischemic scar.

66 The AS severity (peak aortic valve velocity) correlated with the stress-MBF ($r=-0.45$,
67 $P=0.0003$), MPR ($r=-0.44$, $P=0.0005$) and GLS ($r=-0.47$, $P=0.0001$).

68 **Conclusions:** Moderate and severe AS are both associated with cardiac concentric
69 hypertrophy, reductions in myocardial energetics, subendocardial hypoperfusion, and
70 limitations in exercise distance. Patients with Severe-AS exhibit a more pronounced
71 phenotype with worse LV hypertrophy, contractile dysfunction and myocardial scarring
72 compared to patients with Mod-AS.

73

74 **Abstract word count:** 350

75

76 **KEY WORDS:**

- 77 • Aortic stenosis
- 78 • Moderate aortic stenosis
- 79 • Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging
- 80 • Myocardial remodeling
- 81 • Myocardial perfusion

82

83

84

85 **CLINICAL PERSPECTIVES**

86

87 **What is new:**

- 88 • Patients with moderate aortic stenosis show cardiac concentric hypertrophy,
89 reduction in myocardial energetics, shorter 6-minute walk distance compared to age-
90 and sex-matched controls, but no evidence of myocardial scarring.
- 91 • Global myocardial perfusion metrics of rest and stress myocardial blood flow or
92 myocardial perfusion reserve do not show significant reductions in patients with
93 moderate aortic stenosis.
- 94 • The perfusion dynamics of the epicardial and endocardial layers differ in the
95 presence of moderate aortic stenosis, with significant reductions in endocardial
96 stress myocardial blood flow, rest and stress endocardial to epicardial myocardial
97 blood flow ratio, and endocardial as well as epicardial myocardial perfusion reserve
98 compared to controls.

99

100

101 **What Are the Clinical Implications?**

- 102 • While milder compared to that seen in severe aortic stenosis, the degree of adverse
103 myocardial remodeling and subendocardial hypoperfusion associated with moderate
104 aortic stenosis may be clinically important for the cardiovascular clinical outcomes in
105 patients with moderate aortic stenosis.
- 106 • Larger prospective serial studies and randomized trials are needed to better
107 understand the mechanisms of high cardiovascular and all-cause mortality rates in
108 patients with moderate aortic stenosis.

109

110 **ABBREVIATIONS**

111	ACEi	Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor
112	ADP	Adenosine diphosphate
113	AF	Atrial fibrillation
114	AS	Aortic stenosis
115	ATP	Adenosine triphosphate
116	AVR	Aortic valve replacement
117	AW	Acquisition Weighting
118	BMI	Body mass index
119	CK	Creatine kinase
120	CMR	Cardiovascular magnetic resonance
121	CSI	Chemical shift imaging
122	CV	Cardiovascular
123	ECV	Extra cellular volume fraction
124	ESC	European Society of Cardiology
125	FFA	Free fatty acids
126	LGE	Late gadolinium enhancement
127	LV	Left ventricle
128	Mod-AS	Moderate aortic stenosis
129	MOLLI	Modified look locker inversion recovery
130	NT-proBNP	N-terminal pro hormone B-type natriuretic peptide
131	NYHA	New York Heart Association
132	³¹ P-MRS	³¹ Phosphorus magnetic resonance spectroscopy
133	PCr	Phosphocreatine
134	RV	Right ventricle
135	Severe-AS	Severe aortic stenosis
136	SSFP	Steady State Free Precession
137	SAVR	Surgical aortic valve replacement
138	SV	Stroke volume
139	TAVR	Transcatheter aortic valve replacement

140

141 INTRODUCTION

142 Aortic stenosis (AS) is the most common valvular heart disease in the Western world¹. AS
143 represents a progressive degeneration process which can have a decade-long asymptomatic
144 subclinical stage¹. The degree of valve restriction varies from mild, to moderate, to
145 eventually severe with gradual worsening over time, in the absence of effective medical
146 therapy capable of slowing disease progression. AS accounts for substantial global morbidity
147 and premature mortality even in patients with less than severe AS^{2,3}. Epidemiological studies
148 suggest reduced survival rates in patients with moderate AS with 5-year mortality rates as
149 high as 56%, which is nearly equivalent to severe AS^{4,5}. Compared with no AS, the adjusted
150 risk of all-cause mortality was shown to be 1.92-fold higher in moderate AS, and 2.27-fold
151 higher in severe AS⁶. However, the mechanisms for this adverse prognosis in moderate AS
152 remain poorly understood.

153 Emerging evidence suggests that the myocardial remodeling response to AS is critical for the
154 long-term prognosis, with the extent of cardiac damage shown to be linked to worse
155 prognosis, independent of valvular obstruction severity^{7,8}. During the asymptomatic period,
156 the heart compensates for the pressure overload with increased wall thickness, which
157 maintains normal wall stress and contraction⁹. But with a long period of excessive left
158 ventricular (LV) pressure loading, eventually the compensatory mechanisms fail, resulting in
159 myocardial damage and symptoms of angina, syncope or heart failure.⁹ In this situation the
160 only effective treatment is aortic valve replacement (AVR), either surgically (SAVR) or using a
161 transcatheter approach (TAVR). The current guidelines recommend AVR in patients with
162 severe AS in the presence of symptoms or evidence of cardiac dysfunction (LV ejection
163 fraction <50% on cardiac imaging)^{1,10}.

164 Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) is the reference standard for the
165 assessment of the myocardial remodeling observed in AS, including LV volumes, mass and
166 wall thickness as well as changes in systolic function⁷. CMR also provides assessment of
167 myocardial fibrosis using late gadolinium enhancement and T1 mapping techniques, which
168 provide powerful prognostic information in patients with AS undergoing AVR¹¹. CMR
169 perfusion mapping allows pixel-wise quantification of global perfusion indices at rest and
170 pharmacological stress including myocardial blood flow (MBF) in ml/g/min and myocardial
171 perfusion reserve¹². The perfusion dynamics of the epicardial and endocardial layers differ in
172 severe AS, with preferential flow shifting from the endocardium to epicardium¹³. Automated

173 in-line myocardial perfusion quantification using CMR also provides a comprehensive
174 assessment of the endocardium and epicardium perfusion¹⁴. Moreover, ³¹phosphorus
175 magnetic resonance spectroscopy (³¹P-MRS) allows non-invasive assessment of the
176 myocardial energetic state¹⁵. Using ³¹P-MRS, multiple studies have shown myocardial
177 energetic compromise as reflected by reductions in myocardial energetics index
178 phosphocreatine to ATP (PCr/ATP) to be an important feature of the metabolic phenotype of
179 the AS.

180 To date only few studies, and of small sample size, assessed and compared myocardial
181 remodeling in patients with moderate and severe AS¹⁶. This prospective study aimed to test
182 the hypothesis that not only patients with severe AS but also patients with moderate AS
183 exhibit significant myocardial remodeling which may underpin their adverse prognosis
184 compared to the general population^{17,18}. Therefore, using CMR and ³¹P-MRS, cardiac
185 phenotype differences between patients with moderate AS and severe AS in comparison to
186 demographically matched volunteers with normal aortic valve function were assessed
187 prospectively. Imaging assessments were supported by 6-minute walk tests and plasma N-
188 terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) levels.

189

190

191 **METHODS**

192 **Study design and oversight**

193 This single-center, prospective case-control study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki
194 and was approved by National Research Ethics Committees (ref:18/YH/0168 for the severe
195 AS cohort and ref:18/YH/0168 for the moderate AS cohort and healthy volunteers). The
196 study was funded by the Wellcome Trust (Grant 207726/Z/17/Z). We have previously
197 reported changes in myocardial energetics and perfusion parameters and LV structure and
198 function in patients with severe AS (30 with and 65 without T2D) before and after AVR, and
199 reported myocardial recovery differences after AVR between severe AS patients with and
200 without T2D.

201

202 **Inclusion criteria**

203 Adult patients with severe AS who had been referred for surgical or transcatheter AVR and
204 patients with moderate AS who were under the routine clinical care of the local valve clinic

205 at the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust were eligible for inclusion. The diagnosis of severe
206 AS was based on peak aortic forward flow velocity of greater than 4m/s on valve clinic
207 echocardiography according to current cardiovascular society guidelines^{1,10}. The diagnosis of
208 moderate AS was based on peak aortic velocity of 3.0–3.9m/s or mean gradient of 20–
209 39mmHg and aortic valve area (AVA) >1 and <1.5cm² on valve clinic echocardiography²⁸.
210 Controls were contemporary participants and were recruited from adverts posted at leisure
211 activity walking groups in Yorkshire, United Kingdom.

212 The local patient population with moderate AS under regular valve clinic follow up consisted
213 of 244 patients. Electronic health records were prescreened against the eligibility criteria
214 and potentially eligible patients with moderate AS were invited for participation.

215

216 **Exclusion criteria**

217 Participants were excluded if they had previous myocardial infarction, coronary artery
218 bypass grafting or angioplasty, flow-limiting coronary artery disease (CAD), chronic
219 obstructive lung disease, more than mild bystander valve disease, significant kidney
220 dysfunction (estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] <30mL/min/1.73m²), known heart
221 failure or reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (<55%), cardiomyopathy (based on
222 infiltrative diseases [e.g., amyloidosis], accumulation diseases [e.g., haemochromatosis,
223 Fabry disease], or hypertrophic cardiomyopathy), or any contraindication to CMR scanning.
224 As the research protocol included a 6-minute walk test, potential participants with
225 mechanical or permanent mobility issues were excluded. All patients with severe AS were
226 listed for AVR and had flow-limiting CAD excluded by invasive angiography. Prior myocardial
227 infarction was excluded by late gadolinium enhancement imaging in all participants.

228

229 **Anthropometric measurements**

230 Height and weight were recorded, and body mass index (BMI) was calculated. The blood
231 pressure was recorded whilst seated over 10 minutes. A 12-lead electrocardiogram was
232 recorded. A fasting blood sample was taken for assessments of full blood count, eGFR, lipid
233 profile, glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), renal function, lipid profile, glucose level, and NT-
234 proBNP levels.

235

236 **Six-minute walk test**

237 Functional exercise capacity was assessed using a 6-minute walk test according to
238 established guidelines¹⁹. Participants were instructed to walk along a 30-meter corridor and
239 cover the maximum achievable distance in 6 minutes under the supervision of investigators
240 trained in conducting the test. At the end of 6 minutes, participants were asked to stop, and
241 the distance walked was measured in meters.

242

243 **³¹P Phosphorus magnetic resonance spectroscopy**

244 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and ³¹P-MRS were performed on a 3.0 Tesla MR system
245 (Prisma, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany). ³¹P-MRS was performed to assess myocardial
246 PCr/ATP from a mid-ventricular septum voxel selected from a 3D MRS imaging matrix, with
247 patients lying supine and a ³¹P transmitter/receiver cardiac coil (Rapid Biomedical GmbH,
248 Rimpar, Germany) placed over the heart as previously described²⁰. ³¹P-MRS data were
249 acquired with a non-gated 3D acquisition-weighted chemical shift imaging (CSI) sequence.

250

251 **Cardiovascular magnetic resonance**

252 The CMR protocol (Figure-1) consisted of cine imaging using a steady-state free precession
253 sequence, native pre- and post-contrast T1 mapping, stress and rest perfusion and late
254 gadolinium enhancement imaging.

255 Native T1 maps were acquired in 3 short-axis slices, using a breath-held modified look-locker
256 inversion recovery acquisition as previously described²¹. Post-contrast T1 mapping was
257 performed using the same approach 15 minutes after the last contrast injection.

258 Perfusion imaging used free-breathing, motion-corrected automated in-line perfusion
259 mapping. Adenosine was infused at a rate of 140µg/kg/min, for a minimum of 3 minutes
260 according to hemodynamic and symptomatic response as previously described²¹. Two
261 trained cardiologists with advanced life support training monitored the patients during
262 adenosine stress imaging, however adenosine stress was tolerated well by all patients during
263 the stress perfusion studies. Late gadolinium enhancement was performed using a phase-
264 sensitive inversion recovery sequence >8 minutes after contrast administration.

265

266 **Quantitate analysis of ³¹P-MRS and CMR data**

267 All ³¹P-MRS and CMR post-processing analyses (with the exception of perfusion mapping and
268 global longitudinal shortening [GLS] data) were performed offline. Perfusion mapping used

269 artificial intelligence (Gadgetron Framework) for instant quantification of perfusion indices in
270 addition to rest and stress MBF and MPR. Segmental layer-specific perfusion metrics
271 (subendocardial [Endo], subepicardial [Epi] MBF and MPR, and Endo to Epi MBF ratio
272 [Endo/Epi]) values were automatically obtained as an average of all pixel values of each of
273 the 16 segments²². The 16 segments were further sub-divided transmurally to create
274 endocardial and epicardial segments with corresponding rest and adenosine-stress MBF
275 values and ratios to reflect transmural gradient. Global endocardial:epicardial (Endo/Epi)
276 ratio was calculated by averaging the ratio across the 3 slices.

277 The ³¹P-MRS was performed offline by MG using software within the MATLAB version
278 R2021a (MathWorks) as previously described.²⁰

279 Cvi42 software (Circle cardiovascular imaging) was used to perform CMR analysis by MG and
280 subsequently reviewed by EL. The images for biventricular and atrial volumes, biventricular
281 and atrial function, as well LV maximal wall thickness were analyzed as previously
282 described.²³

283 Automated software provided GLS and mitral annular plane systolic excursion (MAPSE)
284 measurements. T1 maps and extracellular volume (ECV) were analyzed using cvi42 software
285 as previously described.²⁰

286 After an initial visual assessment of the LV short axis stack images for presence of late
287 gadolinium hyperenhancement, quantification was formally assessed using the tissue
288 characterization tool within cvi42, as previously described.²⁴ Late gadolinium
289 hyperenhancement was defined as areas of signal intensity ≥ 5 SDs from normal
290 myocardium and was expressed as the percentage of LV mass, quantified in a blinded
291 fashion.

292

293 **Sample size**

294 A priori sample size calculations were performed based on pilot data (LV concentricity index:
295 relative ratio of LV mass to LV end-diastolic volume [EDV] and vasodilator-stress MBF)
296 obtained from patients with moderate AS data (n=5) and healthy controls (n=15). These
297 pilot study assessments showed mean LV mass to LVEDV ratio of 0.86 ± 0.19 in patients with
298 moderate AS versus 0.70 ± 0.20 in controls. Based on these pilot data for the two groups, a
299 minimum of 18 patients were needed to be recruited per group to detect a significant
300 difference in LV mass to LVEDV ratio between patients with moderate AS and controls with

301 80% power at a 5% significance level on a two-sample t-test (calculations performed on
302 ClinCalc.com software). A second sample size calculation was performed for comparisons of
303 vasodilator-stress MBF between the two groups (Moderate-AS:1.74±0.24 versus
304 controls:2.11±0.25ml/min/g). Based on these pilot data for the two groups, a minimum of
305 18 patients were needed to be recruited (9 per group) to detect a significant difference in
306 vasodilator-stress MBF between patients with moderate AS with and controls with 90%
307 power at a 5% significance level on a two-sample t-test (calculations performed on
308 ClinCalc.com software). These targets were achieved in this study. In addition to these pre-
309 specified comparisons other exploratory analyses were performed with due allowance for
310 their exploratory nature. Power calculations were not performed for the exploratory
311 endpoints.

312

313 **Statistical analysis**

314 Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism software (version 10.0.3). All data
315 were checked for normality using the D'Agostino-Pearson Test. Data are presented as mean
316 ±95% confidence intervals (when normally distributed) or means with corresponding IQR (if
317 nonparametric continuous variables). Categorical data are presented as numbers and
318 percentages and compared with the Pearson χ^2 test. All comparisons between >2 groups
319 were performed by 1-way ANOVA with post hoc Bonferroni corrections. Differences in
320 nonparametric variables were assessed using a Kruskal-Wallis test. Student t-test was used
321 for comparison of normally distributed datasets and Mann-Whitney U test was used for
322 non-parametric tests where data were obtained for only two groups. Bivariate correlations
323 were performed using Pearson's or Spearman's method, as appropriate. A 2-sided *P* value of
324 <0.05 was applied as indicating threshold of significance.

325

326

327

328 **RESULTS**

329 **Participant demographics and clinical characteristics**

330 Fifty-two patients with severe symptomatic AS awaiting AVR (18 with T2D), 25 patients with
331 moderate AS (8 with T2D) under routine clinical monitoring and 18 controls with no valvular
332 dysfunction or any other cardiovascular disease (5 with T2D) were prospectively recruited
333 between September 2022 and October 2023 (supplementary materials figure, CONSORT
334 diagram) were recruited. There were no significant differences in sex distributions or T2D
335 prevalence across all study groups. The moderate AS (Mod-AS) and control groups were
336 matched in age; however, the severe AS group (Severe-AS) were older (Table-1). Patients
337 with severe AS were more symptomatic with 90% of the group classified NYHA Class II to IV
338 (Table-1).

339 Compared to controls, patients with severe and moderate AS had higher BMI
340 (controls:25[24,27], Mod-AS:30[28,32], Severe-AS:30[28,31]; $P=0.0019$). The 3 groups were
341 matched for blood pressure, fasting glucose and HBA1c; but the resting heart rate was
342 higher, and the haemoglobin was lower in the severe AS group (Table-1).

343 Patients with severe AS had significantly higher NTproBNP levels than the moderate AS and
344 the control groups (controls:88 [61,160], Mod-AS:124[72,218], Severe-AS:499[216,1260];
345 $P<0.0001$).

346

347 **Cardiovascular magnetic resonance and ³¹phosphorus-magnetic resonance spectroscopy** 348 **findings**

349 **Cardiac remodeling**

350 Compared to controls, both AS groups showed LV concentric remodeling with a stepwise
351 increase from the moderate to severe AS groups in the LV mass-index (controls:46[40,51],
352 Mod-AS:58[51,65], Severe-AS:70[65,75]g/m²; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-2A), LV concentricity index
353 (LV mass to LV end-diastolic volume) (controls:0.58[0.54,0.62], Mod-AS:0.74[0.64,0.84],
354 Severe-AS:0.89[0.83,0.95]g/mL; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-2B), and LV wall thickness
355 (controls:9.9[9.2,10.5], Mod-AS:12.3[11.2,13.3], Severe-AS:14.8[14.1,15.5]; $P<0.0001$) with
356 significant differences also between the moderate and severe AS groups. However, the LV
357 mass (controls:87[74,100], Mod-AS:103[86,120], Severe-AS:133[121,145]g; $P<0.0001$) was
358 only significantly increased in patients with severe AS compared to both the Mod-AS and
359 the control groups.

360 In line with the recruitment criteria, LV ejection fraction was normal in all patients with
361 moderate or severe AS with no significant differences across the study groups (Table-2).
362 However, patients with severe AS showed significantly impaired GLS
363 (controls:19.9[17.6,22.2], Mod-AS:17.7[16.6,18.8], Severe-AS:13.4[12.5,14.4]%; $P<0.0001$)
364 (Figure-2C) and left atrial (LA) function (controls:57[52,63], Mod-AS:59[52,66], Severe-
365 AS:40[35,44]%; $P<0.0001$) compared to both the moderate AS group and the controls.
366 Only the severe AS group showed significant myocardial scarring on LGE (2.9[0,6.2]%). The
367 native T1 was higher in both AS groups compared to controls, with significant differences
368 also between the moderate and severe AS groups (controls:1262[1242,1282], Mod-
369 AS:1309[1280,1339], Severe-AS:1333[1317,1348]; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-2D). There was no
370 significant difference in ECV fraction across the groups (controls: 0.22[0.20,0.23], Mod-
371 AS:0.24[0.21,0.26], Severe-AS:0.24[0.23,0.25]%; $P=0.20$), suggesting the increase in T1 was
372 reflective of cellular hypertrophy as opposed to interstitial fibrosis in the AS cohorts.
373 The AS severity (peak aortic valve velocity [Vmax]) correlated with the LV-mass ($r=0.42$,
374 $P=0.0005$, Figure-5A) and GLS ($r=-0.47$, $P=0.0001$, Figure-5B). There were similar correlations
375 detected with aortic valve area by planimetry with the LV mass and LV mass-index and GLS
376 (supplementary materials figure 2).
377 Figure 6 shows representative adenosine-stress myocardial perfusion map examples from a
378 patient with moderate aortic stenosis and a patient with severe aortic stenosis.

379

380 Cardiac energetics and perfusion

381 Compared to controls, both AS groups showed significantly lower myocardial PCr/ATP ratio
382 (controls:2.2[2.0,2.5], Mod-AS:1.8[1.6,2.0], Severe-AS:1.7[1.6,1.8]; $P<0.0001$) with no
383 significant difference between the moderate and severe AS groups (Figure-3). There was a
384 negative correlation between the PCr/ATP and the LV mass ($r=-0.30$, $P=0.008$), but not LV
385 mass-index.
386 Only the severe AS group showed significant reductions in global adenosine-stress MBF
387 (controls:2.1[1.9,2.3], Mod-AS:1.9[1.6,2.2], Severe-AS:1.3[1.2,1.5]ml/min/g; $P<0.0001$)
388 (Figure-4A) and global MPR (controls:3.3[2.8,3.6], Mod-AS:2.8[2.4,3.2], Severe-
389 AS:1.9[1.8,2.1]; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-4E).

390

391 However, adenosine-stress Endo-MBF (controls: 2.0 [1.8, 2.3], Mod-AS: 1.7 [1.5,2.0], Severe-
392 AS: 1.2 [1.1, 1.3] ml/min/g; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-4C), adenosine-stress Endo/Epi ratio
393 (controls:1.00[0.93,1.07], Mod-AS:0.87[0.80,0.94], Severe-AS:0.81[0.75,0.82]; $P<0.0001$),
394 (Figure-4D), Epi-MPR (controls: 3.6 [3.1, 4.0], Mod-AS: 3.0 [2.6, 3.4], Severe-AS: 2.2 [2.0,
395 2.4]; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-4F), Endo-MPR (controls:3.2 [2.7, 3.6], Mod-AS: 2.5 [2.1, 2.9],
396 Severe-AS: 1.7 [1.5, 1.8]; $P<0.0001$) (Figure-4G) and rest-Endo/Epi (controls:1.12[1.10,1.14],
397 Mod-AS:1.06[1.03,1.09], Severe-AS:1.03[1.02,1.06]; $P<0.0001$) were all significantly reduced
398 in both Mod-AS and Severe-AS. Among the layer-specific perfusion metrics only Epi-MBF
399 was not significantly reduced in Mod-AS but only in Severe-AS (controls: 2.1 [1.8, 2.3], Mod-
400 AS: 2.0 [1.7, 2.3], Severe-AS: 1.5 [1.4, 1.6] ml/min/g; $P<0.0001$).

401 There were significant correlations between the AS severity (V_{max} on TTE) and the global-
402 global MPR ($r=-0.44$; $P=0.0005$) (Figure-5C), Endo-MPR ($r=0.1852$; $P=0.0007$) (Figure-5D),
403 stress-MBF ($r=-0.45$; $P=0.0003$) (Figure-5E) and adenosine-stress Endo-MBF ($r=0.2746$;
404 $P<0.0001$) (Figure-5F). In parallel, there were also significant correlations detected with
405 aortic valve area (cm^2) by planimetry with the perfusion metrics (supplementary materials
406 figure 2).

407

408

409 **DISCUSSION**

410

411 Given the relevance of myocardial health in the prognosis of patients with AS, this study
412 prospectively compared myocardial remodelling, energetics and perfusion parameters in
413 patients with moderate and severe AS with preserved LV ejection fraction against controls
414 without AS^{7,11,25}. Moderate and severe AS were both associated with cardiac concentric
415 hypertrophy, myocardial energetic impairment, and reduced exercise distance on 6-minute
416 walk test. While moderate AS was not associated with reductions in the global myocardial
417 perfusion metrics of rest and stress MBF or MPR, the transmural perfusion dynamics were
418 significantly affected, with significant reductions in stress Endo-MBF, Endo/Epi-MBF gradient,
419 and Endo- and Epi-MPR compared to controls. Severe AS was associated with global as well
420 as endocardial and epicardial reductions in MBF and MPR, and reductions in the Endo/Epi-
421 MBF gradient values. However, there was a stepwise worsening of the hypertrophic
422 remodeling of the LV with progression of the severity of the valve stenosis. The patients with
423 moderate AS did not exhibit significant reductions in LV contractile function, nor did they

424 show evidence of myocardial scarring, when these findings were evident in patients with
425 severe AS.

426

427 Cardiac remodeling

428 In line with the findings from this study, a previous longitudinal surveillance study of
429 patients with AS showed the main phenotypic change with progression of AS severity to be
430 the development of concentric LV hypertrophy.²⁶ While milder compared to that seen in
431 severe AS, the degree of adverse myocardial remodeling associated with moderate AS in this
432 study may be clinically important for the cardiovascular clinical outcomes in patients with
433 moderate AS. There is consistent evidence strongly linking LV concentric remodeling and
434 hypertrophy to adverse cardiovascular outcomes²⁷⁻²⁹. An adverse association between
435 greater LV mass-index and worse clinical outcomes was shown among patients with severe
436 and moderate AS³⁰.

437 The remodeling of the LV in AS involves the process of cardiomyocyte hypertrophy and
438 extracellular matrix expansion to normalize the wall tension and maintain cardiac output
439 and eventually interstitial fibrosis and scarring³¹. The lack of myocardial scarring in moderate
440 AS group in this study in particular may be of significant clinical relevance because among
441 the imaging biomarkers of ventricular decompensation in AS, myocardial scarring on CMR
442 has consistently been shown to be the strongest associate of all-cause and cardiovascular
443 mortality after AVR^{7,25,32}.

444 In this study, the native T1 values were significantly elevated in both AS groups, increasing
445 with the rising stenosis severity. However, the T1 elevation was in isolation, without an
446 accompanying significant increase in the ECV fraction even in the severe AS group. This
447 finding is also consistent with a previous study showing that ECV values do not change with
448 the severity of AS³³. The normal-range ECV values even in the severe AS category may
449 potentially be reflective of the low surgical risk score (Society of Thoracic Surgeons risk
450 score<1%) of the severe AS group and may suggest cardiomyocyte hypertrophy without
451 myocardial fibrosis^{11,34}. In AS, myocardial fibrosis is a key pathological process driving the
452 transition from hypertrophy to heart failure. In a study using invasive myocardial biopsy and
453 CMR imaging, myocardial fibrosis in severe AS was shown to have three main alterations:
454 endocardial thickening, subendocardial microscars, and diffuse interstitial fibrosis³⁵. This
455 landmark study demonstrated that neither histological collagen volume fraction nor the

456 CMR parameters ECV and LGE capture this fibrosis in its totality. This may provide a
457 potential explanation for the discordance between the LGE findings showing scar in the
458 severe AS group while the ECV remains within the normal range.

459

460 Cardiac energetics and perfusion

461 At metabolic level, LV hypertrophy is associated with decreased myocardial high-energy
462 phosphate pool (energetics) and reductions in the creatine kinase flux³⁶. These changes in
463 turn cause myocardial energetic starvation in patients with severe AS¹⁶. Eventually, this
464 energy-starved, sub-optimally perfused myocardial state causes myocardial ischemia,
465 cardiomyocyte death, irreversible myocardial scarring, and even sudden death^{15,37}. Although
466 the momentum of these changes varies between patients, the progression of the valve
467 restriction and aggravation of cardiac hypertrophy eventually results in development of
468 symptoms, HF and death³¹. However, the level of energetic deficit was similar between the
469 moderate and severe AS groups and this correlated with the LV mass. This suggests that
470 even a milder degree of hypertrophy is associated with a decreased myocardial high-energy
471 phosphate pool.

472 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report of global and transmural myocardial
473 perfusion parameters using automated, in-line pixelwise quantitative myocardial perfusion
474 CMR in patients with moderate AS. Myocardial hypertrophy is accompanied by capillary
475 density reduction, microcirculatory dysfunction and impaired stress MBF^{38,39}. The results
476 from this study confirm the previous studies showing significant reductions in global stress
477 MBF in severe AS, whilst also highlighting that the extent of the impaired myocardial
478 perfusion is subject to the severity of AS. In normal hearts, resting MBF is the greatest in the
479 endocardium (Endo/Epi ratio >1), but epicardial MBF is augmented during adenosine-
480 induced hyperemia to a greater extent. Prior investigations have consistently reported that
481 in AS, preferential coronary flow shifts from the endocardium to epicardium results in a
482 significant decrease in endocardial MBF¹³. The reversal of normal Endo/Epi blood flow ratio
483 is fundamental to the pathophysiology of AS, resulting in subendocardial
484 ischemia, apoptosis, and fibrosis—with clinical manifestation as angina despite non-
485 obstructed epicardial coronary arteries. This study shows for the first time that myocardial
486 layer-specific perfusion parameters are already significantly affected in moderate AS.

487

488 Clinical perspectives

489 Underscoring the importance of myocardial health in the prognosis, patients with AS even
490 after timely AVR remain at higher risk of cardiovascular mortality (Hazard Ratio [HR] 1.79
491 [95% CI: 1.75-1.83])^{40,41}, which is primarily associated with heart failure^{42,43}. Studies of early
492 intervention strategies are currently proceeding to address the issue of excess cardiovascular
493 death in patients with AS compared with the reference population even after undergoing
494 AVR^{40,41}. These trials propose that early intervention can prevent irreversible myocardial pre-
495 AVR damage and will therefore prevent adverse post-AVR outcomes, as myocardial health
496 governs post-AVR prognosis. Therefore, the paradigm for treatment of AS might be shifting
497 from the focus on valvular obstruction to extra-valvular myocardial damage.

498 The accumulating evidence from small-sized randomized clinical trials^{44,45} supports further
499 expansion of indications for earlier AVR for patients with AS before the onset of symptoms
500 to prevent myocardial decompensation, and several large trials are currently underway
501 testing this hypothesis⁴⁶. In particular, there is ongoing work to investigate whether
502 myocardial scar can be used to guide the intervention timings of AS patients.⁴⁷ A separate
503 large trial is comparing the efficacy of early transcatheter AVR strategy to that of clinical
504 surveillance for patients with moderate AS on reducing major adverse cardiac events⁴⁸.

505 However, the evidence of worse outcomes even in moderate AS may suggest there are
506 other important prognostic factors at play that are evident even in less than severe AS. This
507 study contributes to the existing literature by showing that while milder compared to that
508 seen in severe AS, the degree of adverse myocardial remodeling associated with moderate
509 AS may be clinically important for the cardiovascular clinical outcomes in patients with
510 moderate AS. Larger prospective serial studies and randomized trials are needed to better
511 understand the mechanisms of the high cardiovascular and all-cause mortality rates in
512 patients with moderate AS.

513 **LIMITATIONS**

514 This study had several limitations. Due to the cross-sectional nature of the study causality of
515 the observed differences cannot be inferred and the small sample recruited at a single site
516 increases the risk of bias and type I error. While obstructive coronary artery stenosis was
517 excluded using X-ray coronary angiography in all patients with severe AS, the control group
518 and the moderate AS group did not undergo anatomical coronary imaging. Significant

519 coronary artery disease was deemed to be unlikely in these cohorts supported by the
520 absence of both myocardial infarction and regional stress perfusion defects on their imaging
521 studies.

522 A larger study with a longer follow-up duration will be required to confirm the clinical
523 significance of the cardiac remodeling findings to the high cardiovascular and all-cause
524 mortality rates in patients with moderate AS. Finally, the complexity of the imaging
525 protocol, in particular the MR spectroscopy, may limit its widespread use.

526

527 **CONCLUSIONS**

528 Moderate and severe AS are both associated with cardiac concentric hypertrophy,
529 reductions in myocardial energetics, subendocardial hypoperfusion, and limitations in
530 exercise distance. Patients with Severe-AS exhibit a more pronounced phenotype with worse
531 LV hypertrophy, contractile dysfunction and myocardial scarring compared to patients with
532 Mod-AS.

533

534

535 **DISCLOSURES**

536

537 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

538 None.

539

540 **Funding**

541 The study was jointly supported by the Wellcome Trust (grant number: 221690/Z/20/Z) and
542 Diabetes UK (grant number:18/0005870).

543 EL acknowledges support from the Wellcome Trust Clinical Career Development Fellowship
544 (grant number: 221690/Z/20/Z), Diabetes UK (grant number:18/0005870) and National
545 Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Leeds Biomedical Research Centre. LV is
546 funded by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship supported jointly by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal
547 Society (#221805/Z/20/Z), and he also acknowledges the support of the Slovak Grant
548 Agencies VEGA (#2/0003/20) and APVV (#19-0032). Funding for open access charge:
549 Wellcome Trust (grant number: 221690/Z/20/Z).

550

551 **Acknowledgements**

552 Author-specific contributions to the study are as follows: MG and HP contributed to patient
553 recruitment, data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript and
554 revisions. AC, ST, NJ and SK contributed to data analysis, interpretation, and manuscript
555 revision. RC, LDR, PS, SP, MRD, and JPG contributed to data interpretation and manuscript
556 revision. HX, LV, PK provided essential support for the scan sequences and manuscript
557 revision. EL contributed to study conception and design, funding, data acquisition, analysis,
558 and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript, revisions, and study supervision. All authors
559 approved the final version of the manuscript. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors
560 will apply a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising
561 from this submission. The funding bodies played no role in the design of the study and
562 collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. The views
563 expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the
564 Department of Health and Social Care.

References

1. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP, 3rd, Fleisher LA, Jneid H, Mack MJ, McLeod CJ, O'Gara PT, et al. 2017 AHA/ACC Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of Patients With Valvular Heart Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2017;135:e1159-e1195. doi: 10.1161/cir.0000000000000503
2. Badiani S, Bhattacharyya S, Azimonia N, Treibel TA, Lloyd G. Moderate Aortic Stenosis: What is it and When Should We Intervene? *Interv Cardiol*. 2021;16:e09. doi: 10.15420/icr.2021.04
3. Pankayatselvan V, Raber I, Playford D, Stewart S, Strange G, Strom JB. Moderate aortic stenosis: culprit or bystander? *Open Heart*. 2022;9. doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2021-001743
4. Strange G, Stewart S, Celermajer D, Prior D, Scalia GM, Marwick T, Ilton M, Joseph M, Codde J, Playford D. Poor Long-Term Survival in Patients With Moderate Aortic Stenosis. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2019;74:1851-1863. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2019.08.004>
5. Delesalle G, Bohbot Y, Rusinaru D, Delpierre Q, Maréchaux S, Tribouilloy C. Characteristics and Prognosis of Patients With Moderate Aortic Stenosis and Preserved Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2019;8:e011036. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.118.011036
6. Stewart S, Chan Y-K, Playford D, Strange GA. Incident aortic stenosis in 49 449 men and 42 229 women investigated with routine echocardiography. *Heart*. 2022;108:875. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2021-319697
7. Musa TA, Treibel TA, Vassiliou VS, Captur G, Singh A, Chin C, Dobson LE, Pica S, Loudon M, Malley T, et al. Myocardial Scar and Mortality in Severe Aortic Stenosis. *Circulation*. 2018;138:1935-1947. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.032839
8. Thornton GD, Musa TA, Rigolli M, Loudon M, Chin C, Pica S, Malley T, Foley JRJ, Vassiliou VS, Davies RH, et al. Association of Myocardial Fibrosis and Stroke Volume by Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance in Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis With Outcome After Valve Replacement: The British Society of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance AS700 Study. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2022;7:513-520. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2022.0340
9. Rosenhek R, Klaar U, Schemper M, Scholten C, Heger M, Gabriel H, Binder T, Maurer G, Baumgartner H. Mild and moderate aortic stenosis. Natural history and risk stratification by echocardiography. *Eur Heart J*. 2004;25:199-205. doi: 10.1016/j.ehj.2003.12.002
10. Iung B, Delgado V, Rosenhek R, Price S, Prendergast B, Wendler O, De Bonis M, Tribouilloy C, Evangelista A, Bogachev-Prokophiev A, et al. Contemporary Presentation and Management of Valvular Heart Disease: The EURObservational Research Programme Valvular Heart Disease II Survey. *Circulation*. 2019;140:1156-1169. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.119.041080
11. Everett RJ, Treibel TA, Fukui M, Lee H, Rigolli M, Singh A, Bijsterveld P, Tastet L, Musa TA, Dobson L, et al. Extracellular Myocardial Volume in Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2020;75:304-316. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.11.032

12. Kellman P, Hansen MS, Nielles-Vallespin S, Nickander J, Themudo R, Ugander M, Xue H. Myocardial perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance: optimized dual sequence and reconstruction for quantification. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance*. 2017;19:43. doi: 10.1186/s12968-017-0355-5
13. McConkey HZR, Marber M, Chiribiri A, Pibarot P, Redwood SR, Prendergast BD. Coronary Microcirculation in Aortic Stenosis. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions*.12:e007547. doi: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.118.007547
14. Markley R, Del Buono MG, Mihalick V, Pandelidis A, Trankle C, Jordan JH, Decamp K, Winston C, Carbone S, Billingsley H, et al. Abnormal left ventricular subendocardial perfusion and diastolic function in women with obesity and heart failure and preserved ejection fraction. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2023;39:811-819. doi: 10.1007/s10554-022-02782-x
15. Neubauer S. The Failing Heart — An Engine Out of Fuel. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2007;356:1140-1151. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra063052
16. Peterzan Mark A, Clarke William T, Lygate Craig A, Lake Hannah A, Lau Justin YC, Miller Jack J, Johnson E, Rayner Jennifer J, Hundertmark Moritz J, Sayeed R, et al. Cardiac Energetics in Patients With Aortic Stenosis and Preserved Versus Reduced Ejection Fraction. *Circulation*. 2020;141:1971-1985. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.119.043450
17. Delesalle G, Bohbot Y, Rusinaru D, Delpierre Q, Marechaux S, Tribouilloy C. Characteristics and Prognosis of Patients With Moderate Aortic Stenosis and Preserved Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2019;8(6) (no pagination).
18. Howard T, Majmundar M, Sarin S, Kumar A, Ajay A, Krishnaswamy A, Reed GW, Harb SC, Harmon E, Dykun I, et al. Predictors of Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events in Patients with Moderate Aortic Stenosis: Implications for Aortic Valve Replacement. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2023;16(7):557-565.
19. Casanova C, Celli BR, Barria P, Casas A, Cote C, Torres JPd, Jardim J, Lopez MV, Marin JM, Oca MMd, et al. The 6-min walk distance in healthy subjects: reference standards from seven countries. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2011;37:150. doi: 10.1183/09031936.00194909
20. Thirunavukarasu S, Jex N, Chowdhary A, Hassan IU, Straw S, Craven TP, Gorecka M, Broadbent D, Swoboda P, Witte KK, et al. Empagliflozin Treatment Is Associated With Improvements in Cardiac Energetics and Function and Reductions in Myocardial Cellular Volume in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes*. 2021;70:2810-2822. doi: 10.2337/db21-0270
21. Chowdhary A, Thirunavukarasu S, Jex N, Coles L, Bowers C, Sengupta A, Swoboda P, Witte K, Cubbon R, Xue H, et al. Coronary microvascular function and visceral adiposity in patients with normal body weight and type 2 diabetes. *Obesity*. 2022;30:1079-1090. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.23413>
22. Cerqueira MD, Weissman NJ, Dilsizian V, Jacobs AK, Kaul S, Laskey WK, Pennell DJ, Rumberger JA, Ryan T, Verani MS, et al. Standardized myocardial segmentation and nomenclature for tomographic imaging of the heart. A statement for healthcare professionals from the Cardiac Imaging Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology of the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2002;105:539-542. doi: 10.1161/hc0402.102975

23. Kellman P, Hansen MS, Nielles-Vallespin S, Nickander J, Themudo R, Ugander M, Xue H. Myocardial perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance: optimized dual sequence and reconstruction for quantification. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. 2017;19:43. doi: 10.1186/s12968-017-0355-5
24. Jex N, Chowdhary A, Thirunavukarasu S, Procter H, Sengupta A, Natarajan P, Kotha S, Poenar AM, Swoboda P, Xue H, et al. Coexistent Diabetes Is Associated With the Presence of Adverse Phenotypic Features in Patients With Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. *Diabetes Care*. 2022;45:1852-1862. doi: 10.2337/dc22-0083
25. Thornton GD, Vassiliou VS, Musa TA, Azimonia N, Craig N, Dattani A, Davies RH, Captur G, Moon JC, Dweck MR, et al. Myocardial Scar and Remodelling Predict Long-Term Mortality in Severe Aortic Stenosis Beyond 10 Years. *European Heart Journal*. 2024;ehae067. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehae067
26. Stassen J, Ewe SH, Pio SM, Pibarot P, Redfors B, Leipsic J, Genereux P, Van Mieghem NM, Kuneman JH, Makkar R, et al. Managing Patients With Moderate Aortic Stenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2023;16:837-855. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2022.12.013
27. Bluemke DA, Kronmal RA, Lima JAC, Liu K, Olson J, Burke GL, Folsom AR. The Relationship of Left Ventricular Mass and Geometry to Incident Cardiovascular Events: The MESA Study. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2008;52:2148-2155. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2008.09.014
28. Bang CN, Gerdtts E, Aurigemma GP, Boman K, de Simone G, Dahlöf B, Køber L, Wachtell K, Devereux RB. Four-Group Classification of Left Ventricular Hypertrophy Based on Ventricular Concentricity and Dilatation Identifies a Low-Risk Subset of Eccentric Hypertrophy in Hypertensive Patients. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2014;7:422-429. doi: 10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.113.001275
29. Koren MJ, Devereux RB, Casale PN, Savage DD, Laragh JH. Relation of Left Ventricular Mass and Geometry to Morbidity and Mortality in Uncomplicated Essential Hypertension. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 1991;114:345-352. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-114-5-345
30. Gonzales H, Douglas PS, Pibarot P, Hahn RT, Khaliq OK, Jaber WA, Cremer P, Weissman NJ, Asch FM, Zhang Y, et al. Left Ventricular Hypertrophy and Clinical Outcomes Over 5 Years After TAVR: An Analysis of the PARTNER Trials and Registries. *JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions*. 2020;13:1329-1339. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2020.03.011>
31. Everett RJ, Clavel M-A, Pibarot P, Dweck MR. Timing of intervention in aortic stenosis: a review of current and future strategies. *Heart*. 2018;104:2067. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2017-312304
32. Dweck MR, Joshi S, Murigu T, Alpendurada F, Jabbour A, Melina G, Banya W, Gulati A, Roussin I, Raza S, et al. Midwall Fibrosis Is an Independent Predictor of Mortality in Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2011;58:1271-1279. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2011.03.064>
33. Chin CWL, Everett RJ, Kwiecinski J, Vesey AT, Yeung E, Esson G, Jenkins W, Koo M, Mirsadraee S, White AC, et al. Myocardial Fibrosis and Cardiac Decompensation in Aortic Stenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2017;10:1320-1333. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2016.10.007
34. Swoboda PP, McDiarmid AK, Erhayiem B, Ripley DP, Dobson LE, Garg P, Musa TA, Witte KK, Kearney MT, Barth JH, et al. Diabetes Mellitus, Microalbuminuria, and Subclinical Cardiac Disease: Identification and Monitoring of Individuals at Risk of

- Heart Failure. *Journal of the American Heart Association: Cardiovascular and Cerebrovascular Disease*. 2017;6:e005539. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.117.005539
35. Treibel TA, López B, González A, Menacho K, Schofield RS, Ravassa S, Fontana M, White SK, DiSalvo C, Roberts N, et al. Reappraising myocardial fibrosis in severe aortic stenosis: an invasive and non-invasive study in 133 patients. *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39:699-709. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehx353
 36. Bottomley PA, Wu KC, Gerstenblith G, Schulman SP, Steinberg A, Weiss RG. Reduced myocardial creatine kinase flux in human myocardial infarction: an in vivo phosphorus magnetic resonance spectroscopy study. *Circulation*. 2009;119:1918-1924. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.823187
 37. Treibel Thomas A, Badiani S, Lloyd G, Moon James C. Multimodality Imaging Markers of Adverse Myocardial Remodeling in Aortic Stenosis. *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2019;12:1532-1548. doi: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2019.02.034
 38. Beyerbacht HP, Lamb HJ, van der Laarse A, Vliegen HW, Leujes F, Hazekamp MG, de Roos A, van der Wall EE. Aortic Valve Replacement in Patients with Aortic Valve Stenosis Improves Myocardial Metabolism and Diastolic Function. *Radiology*. 2001;219:637-643. doi: 10.1148/radiology.219.3.r01jn25637
 39. Mahmood M, Francis JM, Pal N, Lewis A, Dass S, De Silva R, Petrou M, Sayeed R, Westaby S, Robson MD, et al. Myocardial perfusion and oxygenation are impaired during stress in severe aortic stenosis and correlate with impaired energetics and subclinical left ventricular dysfunction. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. 2014;16:29. doi: 10.1186/1532-429x-16-29
 40. Glaser N, Persson M, Franco-Cereceda A, Sartipy U. Cause of Death After Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: SWEDEHEART Observational Study. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2021;10:e022627. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.022627
 41. Glaser N, Persson M, Jackson V, Holzmann MJ, Franco-Cereceda A, Sartipy U. Loss in Life Expectancy After Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: SWEDEHEART Study. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2019;74:26-33. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2019.04.053>
 42. Huded CP, Arnold SV, Chhatrivala AK, Saxon JT, Kapadia S, Yu X, Webb JG, Thourani VH, Kodali SK, Smith CR, et al. Rehospitalization Events After Aortic Valve Replacement: Insights From the PARTNER Trial. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions*. 2022;15:e012195. doi: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.122.012195
 43. Lancellotti P, Magne J, Dulgheru R, Clavel M-A, Donal E, Vannan MA, Chambers J, Rosenhek R, Habib G, Lloyd G, et al. Outcomes of Patients With Asymptomatic Aortic Stenosis Followed Up in Heart Valve Clinics. *JAMA Cardiology*. 2018;3:1060-1068. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2018.3152
 44. Banovic M, Putnik S, Penicka M, Doros G, Deja MA, Kockova R, Kotrc M, Glaveckaite S, Gasparovic H, Pavlovic N, et al. Aortic Valve Replacement Versus Conservative Treatment in Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis: The AVATAR Trial. *Circulation*. 2022;145:648-658. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.121.057639
 45. Kang D-H, Park S-J, Lee S-A, Lee S, Kim D-H, Kim H-K, Yun S-C, Hong G-R, Song J-M, Chung C-H, et al. Early Surgery or Conservative Care for Asymptomatic Aortic Stenosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2019;382:111-119. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1912846

46. Hillis GS, McCann GP, Newby DE. Is Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis Still a Waiting Game? *Circulation*. 2022;145:874-876. doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.121.058598
47. Neubauer S, Horn M, Pabst T, Harre K, Strömer H, Bertsch G, Sandstede J, Ertl G, Hahn D, Kochsiek K. Cardiac high-energy phosphate metabolism in patients with aortic valve disease assessed by 31P-magnetic resonance spectroscopy. *J Investig Med*. 1997;45:453-462.
48. Edwards. The PROGRESS trial. www.edwards.com/healthcare-professionals/trial/progress-hcp. 2024. Accessed December.

Table 1: Clinical Characteristics and Biochemistry of All Groups

Variable	Controls n= 23	Moderate AS n= 25	Severe AS n= 52	P value
Age, y	66 (63,70)	68 (63, 72)	73 (70, 76)	0.0273*
Female, n (%)	11 (48)	10 (42)	18 (35)	0.5395
BMI, kg/m ²	25(24, 27)	30(28, 32)	30(28, 31)	0.0019^{€*}
Heart rate, bpm	60 (56, 64)	66 (61,71)	69 (66,73)	0.0093*
Systolic BP, mmHg	131 (124, 138)	136 (129, 142)	134 (129, 140)	0.6469
Diastolic BP, mmHg	78 (75, 80)	76 (71, 80)	74 (71, 77)	0.4173
Creatinine, umol/L	68 (63, 73)	79 (71, 86)	81 (75, 86)	0.0181*
Haemoglobin, g/L	144 (138, 150)	145 (141,149)	137 (133, 141)	0.0213[†]
Haematocrit, L/L	0.44 (0.42, 0.45)	0.44 (0.43, 0.45)	0.42 (0.41, 0.43)	0.0332[†]
TG, mmol/L	1.4 (1.1, 1.6)	2.0 (1.6, 2.5)	1.6 (1.3, 1.9)	0.0527
HbA1c, mmol/mol	40 (37, 44)	44 (40, 48)	42 (40, 45)	0.3596
Glucose, mmol/L	5.7 (4.9, 6.5)	6.5 (5.4, 7.5)	6.0 (5.6, 6.4)	0.3742
NT- proBNP, ng/L	88 [61, 160]	124 [72, 218]	499 [216, 1260]	<0.0001[*]
Medications				
ACEi	1(4)	9(38)	10(19)	0.0177
ARB	1(4)	1(4)	12(23)	0.0246
Beta blocker	-	3(13)	17(33)	0.0017
CCB	2(9)	8(33)	12(23)	0.1242
Loop diuretic	1(4)	1(4)	8(15)	0.2079
Statin	5(22)	19(79)	36(69)	<0.0001
Antiplatelets	-	10(42)	21(40)	0.0011
DOAC	-	-	6(12)	0.0014
Metformin	4(17)	5(21)	12(23)	0.8559
Sulfonylurea	-	2(8)	5(10)	0.3134
DPP4i	-	-	-	-
GLP-1RA	-	-	1(2)	0.4941
SGLT2i	-	3(13)	1(2)	0.0549
AS Clinical Details				
TTE Vmax, m/s	-	3.3(3.2, 3.5)	4.6(4.4, 4.7)	<0.0001[†]
Bicuspid AV, n (%)	-	6 (25)	15 (29)	0.0650
NYHA Class, (%)				
I	23 (100)	22 (88)	5 (10)	<0.0001
II	-	3 (12)	30 (58)	<0.0001
III	-	-	16 (31)	0.0004
IV	-	-	1 (1)	-
6 min walk test, m	525[495, 555]	420[375, 465]	345[248, 420]	<0.0001^{€*}
Cardiovascular Past Medical History				
Stroke TIA, n(%)	-	2 (8)	6 (12)	0.2423
PAF, n(%)	-	-	6 (12)	0.0829
Hyperlipidemia, n (%)	5(22)	17 (71)	35 (67)	0.0004
STS Surgical Risk Score (%)	-	1.14 [0.8, 1.95]	1.31[0.80,2.72]	0.3547

€ signifies p<0.05 between controls and moderate AS group, * signifies p<0.05 between controls and severe-AS group, † signifies p≤0.05 between mod-AS and severe-AS.

AV indicates aortic valve; AS, aortic stenosis; T2D, type 2 diabetes; BMI, body mass index; TIA, transient ischemic attack; HTN, hypertension; PAF, paroxysmal atrial fibrillation; n, number; y, years; bpm, beats per minute; TG, triglycerides; HbA1c, glycemic hemoglobin; NT-proBNP, N-terminal-pro hormone b-type natriuretic peptide; ACEi, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; CCB, calcium channel blocker; ASA, aspirin; DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; DPP4i, dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor; GLP-1RA, glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; SGLT2i, sodium glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor; TTE, trans-thoracic echocardiogram; STS, society of thoracic surgeons; V max, peak aortic forward flow velocity.

Normally distributed continuous variables are expressed as mean (±95% confidence intervals); nonparametric continuous variables are expressed as median [IQR]; and categorical variables are expressed as counts (percent). P signifies p value for comparisons across the groups with ANOVA for normally distributed datasets and Kruskal-Wallis test for non-parametric tests.

Table 2: CMR and ³¹P-MRS findings of All Groups

Variable	Controls n= 23	Moderate AS n= 25	Severe AS n= 52	P value
LV end-diastolic volume indexed to BSA, mL/m ²	79 (72, 85)	73 (65, 80)	79 (74, 84)	0.3283
LV end-systolic volume indexed to BSA, ml/m ²	30 (27, 33)	28 (23, 33)	29 (26, 31)	0.7922
LV mass, g	87 (74, 100)	103 (86, 120)	133 (121, 145)	<0.0001 ^{††}
LV mass indexed to BSA, g/m ²	46 (40, 51)	58 (51, 65)	70 (65, 75)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
LV mass to LV end-diastolic volume, g/mL	0.58 (0.54, 0.62)	0.74 (0.64, 0.84)	0.89 (0.83, 0.95)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
LV stroke volume, ml	91 (81, 102)	91 (82, 100)	94 (89, 100)	0.7409
SV indexed to BSA, ml/m ²	49 (44, 53)	45 (40, 50)	48 (46, 51)	0.3637
LV ejection fraction, %	62 (60, 64)	65 (63, 66)	63 (61, 66)	0.3958
LV maximal wall thickness (manual), mm	9.9 (9.2, 10.5)	12.3 (11.2, 13.3)	14.8 (14.1, 15.5)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
RV end-diastolic volume indexed to BSA, mL/m ²	78 (70, 86)	70 (62, 77)	67 (63, 72)	0.0495 *
RV end-systolic volume indexed to BSA, ml/m ²	30 (25, 34)	30 (25, 34)	27 (24, 29)	0.3570
RV stroke volume, ml	90 (79, 101)	78 (71, 85)	79 (74, 83)	0.0434 *
RV ejection fraction, %	62 (59, 65)	59 (55, 62)	61 (59, 63)	0.2677
LA biplane end-diastolic volumes, mL	73 (63, 83)	68 (55, 80)	88 (78, 97)	0.0170 [†]
LA biplane end-systolic volumes, mL	34 (27, 42)	35 (25, 44)	58 (48, 67)	0.0008 ^{††}
Biplane LA EF, %	57 (52, 63)	59 (52, 66)	40 (35, 44)	<0.0001 ^{††}
GLS	19.9 (17.6, 22.2)	17.7 (16.6, 18.8)	13.4 (12.5, 14.4)	<0.0001 ^{††}
Mean native T1, (ms)	1262 (1242, 1282)	1309 (1280, 1339)	1333 (1317, 1348)	<0.0001 ^{€*}
Extra cellular volume, (%)	0.22 (0.20, 0.23)	0.24 (0.21, 0.26)	0.24 (0.23, 0.25)	0.1971
LGE, (%)	0.0 [0, 0]	0.0 [0, 4.8]	2.9 [0, 6.2]	0.0006 [*]
PCr/ATP ratio	2.2 (2.0, 2.3)	1.8 (1.6, 2.0)	1.7 (1.6, 1.8)	<0.0001 ^{€*}
Stress MBF, ml/min/g	2.1 (1.9, 2.3)	1.9 (1.6, 2.2)	1.3 (1.2, 1.5)	<0.0001 ^{††}
Endo MBF Stress, ml/min/g	2.0 (1.8, 2.3)	1.7 (1.5, 2.0)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
Epi MBF Stress, ml/min/g	2.1 (1.8, 2.3)	2.0 (1.7, 2.3)	1.5 (1.4, 1.6)	<0.0001 ^{††}
Endo/Epi MBF Stress Ratio	1.00 (0.93, 1.07)	0.87 (0.80, 0.94)	0.81 (0.75, 0.82)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
Rest MBF, ml/min/g	0.6 [0.6, 0.7]	0.6 [0.6, 0.8]	0.7 [0.6, 0.8]	0.1673
Endo/Epi MBF Rest ratio	1.12 (1.10, 1.14)	1.06 (1.03, 1.09)	1.03(1.02, 1.06)	<0.0001 ^{€*}
MPR	3.3 (2.8, 3.6)	2.8 (2.4, 3.2)	1.9 (1.8, 2.1)	<0.0001 ^{††}
Endo MPR	3.2 (2.7, 3.6)	2.5 (2.1, 2.9)	1.7 (1.5, 1.8)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
Epi MPR	3.6 (3.1, 4.0)	3.0 (2.6, 3.4)	2.2 (2.0, 2.4)	<0.0001 ^{€††}
Increase in RPP, %	28 (21, 34)	27 (19, 35)	24 (18, 29)	0.2211

€ signifies p<0.05 between controls and moderate AS group, * signifies p<0.05 between controls and severe AS group, † signifies p<0.05 between moderate AS and severe AS.

LV indicates left ventricle; BSA, body surface area; SV, stroke volume; RV, right ventricle; LA, left atrial; LA EF, left atrial ejection fraction; GLS, global longitudinal shortening; LGE, late gadolinium enhancement; PCr/ATP ratio phosphocreatine to adenosine triphosphate ratio; RPP, rate pressure product; MBF, myocardial blood flow; Endo, endocardial; Epi, epicardial; MPR, myocardial perfusion reserve.

Normally distributed continuous variables are expressed as mean (±95% confidence intervals); nonparametric continuous variables are expressed as median [IQR]; and categorical variables are expressed as counts (percent). P signifies p value for comparisons across the groups with ANOVA for normally distributed datasets and Kruskal-Wallis test for non-parametric tests.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Multiparametric scan protocol

Cardiac ^{31}P -MRS was followed by CMR, which included cine imaging, native pre-contrast, and native post-contrast T1 mapping, adenosine stress perfusion imaging and late gadolinium enhancement imaging.

Figure 2: Column scatter graphs with means and 95% confidence intervals showing differences in (A) Left ventricular (LV) mass indexed to the body surface area (g/m^2), (B) LV concentricity index (LV mass over LV end-diastolic volume ratio, g/ml), (C) Global longitudinal shortening (%), (D) Mean native T1 (milliseconds) between the patients with moderate AS, severe AS and controls.

Figure 3: Column scatter graphs with means and 95% confidence intervals showing differences in myocardial phosphocreatine to adenosine triphosphate ratio (PCr/ATP) between the patients with moderate aortic stenosis (AS), severe AS and controls.

Figure 4: Column scatter graphs with means and 95% confidence intervals showing differences in (A) phosphocreatine to ATP ratio (PCr/ATP), (B) Vasodilator stress myocardial blood flow (MBF, $\text{ml}/\text{min}/\text{g}$), (C) myocardial perfusion reserve (MPR) between the patients with moderate AS, severe AS and controls.

Figure 5: Scatterplots showing the correlations of the peak aortic valve velocity (V_{max} , m/s) severity of aortic stenosis with: (A) global longitudinal shortening (GLS, %), (B) Left ventricular mass (LV Mass, g), (C) Myocardial perfusion reserve (MPR), (D) Endocardial (endo) Myocardial perfusion reserve (MPR), (E) Vasodilator stress myocardial blood flow (MBF, $\text{ml}/\text{min}/\text{g}$) and (F) Vasodilator endocardial (Endo) stress myocardial blood flow (MBF, $\text{ml}/\text{min}/\text{g}$). Orange dots represent patients with moderate AS and red dots represent patients with severe AS.

P signifies p value for comparisons between each of the variables when measured against peak aortic valve velocity. The r value represents correlation coefficient as measured by linear regression analysis.

Figure 6: Representative adenosine-stress myocardial perfusion map examples from a patient with moderate aortic stenosis (top row) and a patient with severe aortic stenosis (bottom row).

Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Figure 4.




Figure 5.




Figure 6.

