

Long-Term Coronary Microvascular and Cardiac Dysfunction Following Severe COVID-19 Hospitalization

Multiparametric stress perfusion CMR in symptomatic long-COVID

Rebecka Steffen Johansson¹ MD, PhD student, Daniel Loewenstein¹ MD, PhD student, Klara Lodin² MD, PhD student, Judith Bruchfeld³ MD PhD, Michael Runold⁴ MD PhD, Marcus Ståhlberg, MD, PhD⁵, Hui Xue⁶ PhD, Peter Kellman⁷ PhD, Kenneth Caidahl¹ MD PhD, Henrik Engblom^{8*} MD PhD, Jannike Nickander^{1*§} MD PhD.

¹Department of Clinical Physiology, Karolinska University Hospital, and Department of Molecular Medicine and Surgery, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

²Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

³Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Karolinska Institutet and Department of Infectious Diseases, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden.

⁴Department of Respiratory Medicine and Allergy, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden.

⁵Department of Medicine, Solna, Karolinska Institutet and Department of Cardiology, Heart and Vascular Center, Karolinska University Hospital.

⁶Health Futures, Microsoft Research, Redmond, Washington, USA.

⁷National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA.

⁸Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Clinical Physiology, Skåne University Hospital, Lund University, Lund, Sweden.

*Nickander and Engblom contributed equally to this work.

§Corresponding author Jannike Nickander.

Competing interests

Sanofi Genzyme AB has previously awarded JN minor speaker compensation for work unrelated to this study. PK receives research support (source codes) from Siemens Healthineers. Karolinska University Hospital has a research and development agreement with Siemens Healthineers. The rest of the authors declare no competing interests.

Funding

Funding was provided by the Swedish Research Council, Swedish Heart and Lung Foundation, the Swedish Society of Medicine, the Stockholm County Council and Karolinska Institutet. MS has received research grants from Dysautonomia International, Swedish Research Foundation, Swedish Virology Society.

Address for Correspondence

Jannike Nickander

Klinisk Fysiologi A8:01, Karolinska University Hospital, Solna

Eugenivägen 23, 171 76 Stockholm, Sweden.

Email: jannike.nickander@ki.se

Phone number: +4672-5957185. Fax number: +46 8 51775490.

Word count: abstract 228, body text including reference and figure text 4830.

Abstract

Background: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) can lead to long-term cardiopulmonary symptoms and is associated to coronary microvascular dysfunction (CMD). However, long-term data on CMD following severe COVID-19 are lacking.

Objective: To determine long-term left ventricular (LV) function and presence of CMD after severe COVID-19, utilizing cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) and stress perfusion mapping.

Methods: Hospitalized COVID-19 patients underwent CMR at 10 months follow-up (1.5T Aera, Siemens Healthineers) including cine imaging, native T1 and T2, extracellular volume, and adenosine stress perfusion mapping. Clinical data were obtained from patient records. Patients were compared to volunteers without symptomatic ischemic heart disease (IHD).

Results: COVID-19 patients (n=37, age 56 ± 12 years, 76% male) and volunteers (n=22, age 51 ± 13 years, 55% male, p=ns for both) were included. COVID-19 patients demonstrated reduced stress perfusion (2.8 ± 0.81 vs 3.4 ± 0.69 ml/min/g, $p=0.003$), impaired global longitudinal strain (GLS, -17 ± 2 vs -19 ± 2 %, $p=0.003$) and global circumferential strain (GCS, -16 ± 3 vs -19 ± 3 %, $p=0.001$). There were no differences in stress perfusion or myocardial perfusion reserve between COVID-19 patients with or without cardiovascular risk factors or cardiac symptoms.

Conclusion: COVID-19 patients exhibit long-term reduced stress perfusion indicating CMD, and impaired LV function by GLS and GCS. Lack of variation in stress perfusion between patients with and without cardiovascular risk factors suggests that CMD may be a consequence of severe COVID-19, warranting further investigation to elucidate mechanisms, and guide potential therapeutic interventions.

Keywords: COVID-19, coronary microvascular dysfunction, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, myocardial perfusion reserve, troponin

Abbreviations

ARDS: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome

CMD: Coronary Microvascular Dysfunction

CMR: Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Imaging

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019

hs-TnT: High Sensitivity Troponin T

IHD: Ischemic Heart Disease

MPR: Myocardial Perfusion Reserve

PAP: Pulmonary Artery Pressure

PACS: Post-Acute COVID-19 Syndrome

PET: Positron Emission Tomography

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) primarily presents with respiratory symptoms of varying severity, although extrapulmonary manifestations such as cardiac complications are common, and importantly, correlate with disease severity and risk of mortality¹. Long-term follow-up studies reveal heightened risk of arrhythmias, ischemic and non-ischemic heart disease, heart failure, perimyocarditis and thromboembolic events among both non-hospitalized and hospitalized COVID-19 patients, with highest risk in those requiring intensive care during the first waves of the pandemic². Moreover, in long-Covid³, also termed post-acute COVID-19 syndrome (PACS)⁴, it is common with cardiopulmonary symptoms such as dyspnea, palpitations, chest pain and fatigue, which impair quality of life and functional capacity⁵⁻⁷. The underlying pathophysiological mechanisms are not yet fully understood but may stem from myocardial injury sustained during acute COVID-19 due to hypoxia, systemic hyper-inflammation, hypercoagulability and direct viral invasion of endothelial cells and cardiomyocytes^{8,9}. Notably, microvascular dysfunction across various vascular beds, including the coronary circulation, has been documented following COVID-19¹⁰⁻¹³. Coronary microvascular dysfunction (CMD) may manifest as chest pain with or without obstructive coronary artery disease (CAD), and traditional cardiovascular risk factors are associated with both CMD and risk of severe COVID-19¹⁴. CMD can be detected using quantitative cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) adenosine stress perfusion mapping¹⁵. Moreover, comprehensive multiparametric CMR may characterize cardiac anatomy, function, and tissue properties¹⁶. Despite the critical need for understanding long-term cardiovascular implications in PACS, long-term data on critically ill patients are limited. Thus, the aim of this study was to evaluate presence of CMD in patients hospitalized due to severe COVID-19 in long-term follow-up.

Methods

Study population

Patients were identified from the prospective study “Follow-up of patients with severe COVID-19” (UppCov), aiming to comprehensively assess long-term outcome following hospitalization due to severe COVID-19, at Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden¹⁷. Severe COVID-19 was defined as respiratory failure requiring ventilatory support and/or oxygen therapy (oxygen flow ≥ 5 L/minute). In total, 40 COVID-19 patients with and without cardiac involvement during hospitalization were included in the present study from November 2020 to February 2021 for CMR at approximately 10 months follow-up. Cardiac involvement was defined as high-sensitive troponin T (hs-TnT) >14 ng/L and/or pulmonary artery pressure (PAP) >34 mmHg. Exclusion criteria were general contraindications for adenosine stress CMR, including claustrophobia, pacemaker or CMR-incompatible metal implants, severe asthma or severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), high degree atrioventricular block and renal failure (estimated glomerular filtration rate, eGFR <30 mL/minute/1.73 m²). Patients with known angina pectoris, previous myocardial infarction (MI), previous coronary artery bypass grafting and/or percutaneous coronary intervention, stroke, heart failure, aortic stenosis or arrhythmias including atrial fibrillation were excluded. Historical volunteers with similar age and sex, without symptomatic ischemic heart disease (IHD), were included for comparison^{18,19}. COVID-19 patients were invited to clinical follow-up 244 [214-288] days post-discharge. Residual respiratory symptoms were evaluated using the COPD assessment test (CAT)²⁰ and the modified medical research council dyspnea scale (mMRC)²¹. Quality of life was assessed using the EQ visual analogue scale (EQ-VAS)²². Clinical data including previous diseases and cardiovascular risk factors, medications, details regarding the hospital stay and clinical follow-up, were obtained from medical records and by interviews. All procedures were granted ethical approval by the Swedish Ethical Review

Authority (Dnr 2021-03293, 2022-0695, 2020-02397). All participants provided written informed consent.

Image acquisition

Patients and volunteers underwent the same CMR protocol. CMR was performed supine with a 1.5 T Aera® scanner (Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany), a phased-array 18-channel body matrix coil and a spine matrix coil. Hematocrit and blood creatinine were determined prior to CMR. Full coverage retrospective electrocardiographic (ECG)-gated balanced steady state free precession (bSSFP) cine imaging was acquired in short-axis and three-long axis slices. Typical parameters were flip angle (FA) 68°, pixel size 1.4x1.9 mm², slice thickness 8.0 mm, echo time (TE)/repetition time (TR) 1.19/37.05 ms, matrix size 256x144 and field of view (FOV) 360x270 mm².

Quantitative perfusion maps were acquired in three short-axis slices using first pass perfusion imaging, during adenosine infusion (140 µg/kg/min or increased according to clinical routine to 210 µg/kg/min (Adenosin, Life Medical AB, Stockholm, Sweden)) and in rest, during injection of intravenous contrast (0.05 mmol/kg, gadobutrol, Gadovist, Bayer AB, Solna, Sweden). Subjects were asked to abstain from caffeine for 24 hours and nicotine for 12 hours prior to CMR. Adenosine response was assessed based on symptoms and heart rate response. Contrast and adenosine were administered in separate cannulas. Perfusion maps were computed using the distributed tissue exchange model²³ and generated using the Gadgetron inline perfusion mapping software²⁴. Typical parameters were bSSFP single shot readout, FA 50°, slice thickness 8.0 mm, TE/TR 1.04/2.5 ms, bandwidth 1085 Hz/pixel, FOV 360x270 mm², saturation delay/trigger delay 95/40 ms.

Native T2 maps were acquired in three or five short-axis slices using a T2-prepared sequence (Siemens MyoMaps product sequence). Typical parameters were FA 70°, pixel size 1.4x1.4 mm², slice thickness 8.0 mm, acquisition window 700 ms, TE/TR 1.06/2.49 ms, matrix size 144x256 mm². Native T1 maps were acquired in three or five short-axis slices using an ECG-gated modified look-locker inversion recovery (MOLLI) ²⁵5s(3s)3s research sequence. Typical parameters were end-diastole single shot SSFP, FA 35°, pixel size 1.4x1.4 mm², slice thickness 8.0 mm, imaging duration 167 ms, TE/TR 1.12/2.7 ms, matrix size 256x144 and FOV 360x270 mm². Post-contrast T1 maps were acquired following a contrast bolus (0.2 mmol/kg, gadobutrol) with the same image positions as the native T1 maps. Extracellular volume (ECV) maps were generated from native and post-contrast T1 maps and calibrated by hematocrit²⁶. Furthermore, post-contrast late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) images were acquired in short-axis and three long-axis slices using a free breathing phase-sensitive inversion recovery (PSIR) sequence with bSSFP single shot readout. Typical parameters were image matrix 256x156, voxel size 1.3x1.3x7 mm³, slice thickness 8 mm, FOV 340x276 mm, TR 8.25 ms, TE 3.4 ms and FA 50°.

Image analysis

Images were anonymized and analyzed offline using Segment® (vers 2.7, Medviso AB, Lund, Sweden)^{27,28}. Left ventricular (LV) volumes and mass were acquired using automatic segmentation of the cine short-axis stack in end-diastole and end-systole, with manual corrections. LV volumes and mass were indexed to body surface area (BSA), calculated with the Mosteller formula²⁹. LV global longitudinal strain (GLS) and global circumferential strain (GCS) were acquired using the feature-tracking module in Segment, following delineation in end-diastole of the LV endo- and epicardial borders in the cine long-axis slices and short-axis stack. Native T1, native T2, ECV and perfusion maps were analyzed by manually delineating

epi- and endocardial contours in respective short-axis stack. To avoid contamination from blood pool and adjacent tissues, a 10% erosion margin was set for endo- and epicardial borders. Segmental values were acquired in a 16-segment LV model³⁰. Inter-observer analysis was performed in all patients by two separate observers, and intra-observer analysis was performed in 10 patients by one observer, by repeated analysis of the short-axis cine stack, native T1, native T2, ECV, and perfusion maps.

Statistical analysis

Normality was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Continuous data were presented as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) or as median [interquartile range], categorical data as frequencies (percentages). Global native T1, native T2, ECV and perfusion values were acquired by averaging segmental values. Myocardial perfusion reserve (MPR) was calculated as stress perfusion divided by rest perfusion. Rest perfusion was adjusted for rate pressure product (RPP), resting heart rate multiplied by resting systolic blood pressure. Patients and volunteers were compared with the independent t-test, Mann Whitney U-test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate. Intra- and interobserver agreement for LV ejection fraction (LVEF), GLS, GCS, global native T1, native T2, ECV, rest and stress perfusion and MPR, were calculated as intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), using two-way random effects with absolute agreement. ICC ranged 0.72-1.00 ($p < 0.05$ for all), Table 1 in Appendix. Microsoft Excel (version 16.6, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA) and IBM SPSS Statistics (version 28, SPSS Statistics, IBM, New York, USA) were used for statistical analysis. The significance level was defined as $p < 0.05$ in all statistical tests.

Results

Hospitalization due to COVID-19

COVID-19 patients were hospitalized 37 [20-54] days, from March to September of 2020. At presentation, 35 (95%) had fever, 34 (92%) had cough, 32 (86%) had dyspnea, 14 (38%) had myalgia, 13 (35%) had gastrointestinal symptoms and 2 (5%) had anosmia. Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) was diagnosed in 30 (81%) and graded as mild 2 (7%), moderate 6 (20 %) and severe 22 (73 %). Mechanical ventilation was required in 28 (76%) and 5 (14%) were placed on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO). Continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) was utilized in 5 (14%), however all had eGFR>30 mL/minute/1.73 m² at follow-up CMR. During hospitalization, 33 (89%) had hs-TnT>14 ng/L and 11 (30%) had PAP>34 mmHg – all but one of patients with elevated PAP also had elevated hs-TnT. Peak median hs-TnT during hospitalization was 51 [23-174] ng/L and peak median PAP was 50 [40-53] mmHg. Pulmonary embolism (PE) was present in 9/11 patients with elevated PAP, and in total 13 (35%) suffered PE during hospitalization. Additionally, 13 (35%) patients had arrhythmias, 11 (30%) had bacterial pneumonia and 13 (35%) had sepsis during hospitalization.

Clinical characteristics and follow-up

Clinical characteristics are presented in Table 1. Although age and sex did not differ, COVID-19 patients had greater weight (88±19 vs 73±12 kg, $p=0.001$) and body mass index (BMI; 29±5 vs 24±3 kg/m², $p<0.001$) compared to volunteers. No one in the study had a history of angina pectoris, MI, aortic stenosis, heart failure or arrhythmias and no one had severe asthma or COPD at follow-up CMR. There were no other differences between patients and volunteers in cardiovascular risk factors and medications. Clinical follow-up was performed 244 [214-

288] days post-discharge. At follow-up, persistent cough was reported in 10 (27%), dyspnea in 16 (43%), chest pressure in 7 (19%) and fatigue in 13 (35%). Mean CAT score was 10 ± 7 and median mMRC score was 1 [1-1.75] (data missing for 6 patients). Mean EQ VAS score was 72 ± 18 (data missing for 7 patients). At clinical follow-up, 11 (44%) of the 25 patients that worked prior to hospitalization were still on sick leave; 12 patients were retirees.

CMR at follow-up

CMR was performed 292 [203-367] days following discharge, or at approximately 10 months. Due to poor image quality or contraindications to stress CMR, three COVID-19 patients were excluded, rendering 37 patients included. CMR findings are presented in Table 2. Native T2 maps were not obtained in two COVID-19 patients due to operator dependency. COVID-19 patients had worse GLS (-17 ± 2 vs $-19 \pm 2\%$, $p=0.003$) and GCS (-16 ± 3 vs $-19 \pm 3\%$, $p=0.001$) compared to volunteers. There were no differences in LV mass or volumes, global native T1, native T2, or ECV. Minimal LGE was found in four COVID-19 patients; two had LGE consistent with a prior MI and two had LGE consistent with prior myocarditis. Due to limited scarring (<1 segment), the patients were included in the analysis.

Quantitative myocardial perfusion

Stress perfusion was lower in COVID-19 patients compared to volunteers (2.8 ± 0.81 vs 3.4 ± 0.69 ml/min/g, $p=0.003$) but there was no difference in rest perfusion, Figure 1. There was a trend towards lower MPR in COVID-19 patients (2.7 ± 0.9 vs 3.2 ± 1.1 , $p=0.07$). Rest perfusion maps were excluded in one volunteer due to residual hyperemia. Representative examples of perfusion maps of a COVID-19 patient with suspected CMD and a volunteer are presented in Figure 3. Stress and rest perfusion, and MPR, did not differ between female and male COVID-19 patients, nor between COVID-19 patients with or without a history of

hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes mellitus or cigarette smoking ($p>0.05$ for all, data not shown). COVID-19 patients reporting chest pressure at follow-up had higher MPR compared to patients without (3.3 ± 1.2 vs 2.5 ± 0.7 , $p=0.03$), driven by non-significantly higher stress perfusion and lower rest perfusion (3.11 ± 0.68 vs 2.72 ± 0.82 , $p=0.26$, and 0.99 ± 0.25 vs 1.12 ± 0.41 ml/min/g, $p=0.78$). Otherwise, there were no differences in perfusion or MPR between COVID-19 patients with or without chest pressure, dyspnea, or fatigue at follow-up ($p>0.05$ for all, data not shown).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study evaluating possible CMD in long-term follow-up after hospitalization due to severe COVID-19, utilizing multiparametric CMR including quantitative adenosine stress perfusion mapping. Our study shows that COVID-19 patients from the first wave of the pandemic, with initially increased hs-TnT and/or PAP, 10 months later exhibit lower stress perfusion and a trend towards lower MPR, compared to volunteers without symptomatic IHD, Central Illustration. Additionally, COVID-19 patients had worse GLS and GCS, indicating impaired myocardial deformation, but volumes and LVEF did not differ. Minimal LGE was noted in four patients, but no focal perfusion defects. Notably, there were no differences in perfusion or MPR between COVID-19 patients with or without prior cardiovascular risk factors, or symptoms at follow-up.

Conventional CMR in follow-up of COVID-19

Perfusion defects and predominantly non-ischemic LGE have been noted on CMR during acute COVID-19 or in early convalescence, with varying degrees of elevated native T1, native T2 and ECV, indicating inflammation, edema, and/or diffuse fibrosis³¹. Particularly, markers of systemic inflammation, native T1, native T2, and LGE have been shown to be higher in early convalescence following severe COVID-19 compared to mild or moderate cases, potentially due to inflammation-mediated cardiac injury³². Increased native T1 and native T2 in hospitalized COVID-19 patients may normalize within 6 months despite persistent cardiopulmonary symptoms^{33,34}, while ECV may normalize within one year³⁵. This is accordance with our study, where no differences were found for LV mass or volumes, native T1 or T2, nor ECV, between COVID-19 patients and volunteers 10 months post-discharge.

There is a discrepancy between long-term PACS symptoms and the relatively minor objective findings in previous cardiopulmonary evaluations³⁶. In line with this, despite symptoms like chest pressure and dyspnea as possible indicators of heart failure, neither cardiac volumes nor LVEF differed between patients and volunteers. In COVID-19 patients with initial LV or RV functional and/or structural alterations, CMR a year later showed improved cardiac strain together with symptomatic improvement³⁷. However, impaired GLS with normal LVEF has been shown 6 months after intensive care for COVID-19³⁸. We showed impaired GLS and GCS at 10 months after intensive care for severe COVID-19, indicating some degree of persistently reduced cardiac function. Previous studies have shown that impaired GLS may be used, not only to evaluate cardiac improvement during follow-up of COVID-19, but also predict early mortality risk³⁹.

CMD and perfusion imaging in PACS

CMD may cause symptoms such as chest pain and dyspnea, but cannot be identified through conventional CMR, pulmonary radiology or functional testing. In early convalescence following COVID-19 with persistent cardiovascular symptoms, increased rest perfusion and/or reduced stress perfusion and MPR indicating CMD have been observed, even in mild Covid-19^{40,41}. However, findings are inconsistent. Longitudinal studies using adenosine stress perfusion CMR in mild to moderate initial COVID-19 and persistent symptoms^{42,43}, and even with severe COVID-19 requiring hospitalization including intensive care^{44,45}, have shown varying results regarding CMD. Alternative findings include focal inducible perfusion deficits and/or LGE with MI- or non-ischemic patterns⁴⁴ and mild myocarditis-like injury and signs of IHD, in many with no prior history of such⁴⁵. Our study demonstrates reduced stress perfusion and a tendency towards lower MPR 10 months after severe COVID-19.

Quantitative CMR perfusion mapping has been validated against positron emission tomography (PET)⁴⁶, which is reference standard for non-invasive quantitative perfusion imaging⁴⁷. However, PET lacks the broader differential diagnostic capabilities of multiparametric CMR, which was employed in this study. Previous PET studies have indicated CMD in PACS by reduced stress perfusion and MPR at 5 months in hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients with ongoing symptoms⁴⁸. At 11 months follow-up, combining PET with computed tomography (CT) to exclude CAD, MPR was decreased due to elevated rest perfusion, while stress perfusion was unaffected⁴⁹. Importantly, reduced stress perfusion and MPR, identified via PET, were found in 50% of above middle-aged symptomatic males with cardiovascular risk factors at 6 months⁵⁰. This finding was associated with increased risk of major adverse cardiovascular events including death at 10 months⁵⁰. The MPR impairment was particularly pronounced following severe COVID-19, especially in patients admitted to intensive care⁵¹. Therefore, it is noteworthy that our study, which focuses on a predominantly male cohort of previously severely ill PACS patients, also found reduced stress perfusion and persistent cardiac symptoms at 10 months follow-up.

The variability in findings in previous studies of PACS patients in short- and long-term follow-up, can likely be attributed to differences in populations studied, initial disease severity, presence of cardiopulmonary symptoms at follow-up, and variations in timing and methodology of imaging⁵². It is surprising that, in contrast to the current study, most earlier studies have reported CMD predominantly in younger female patients with initial mild or moderate COVID-19. Our cohort mainly consisted of middle-aged males, many overweight but with a relatively low prevalence of known hypertension, type 2 diabetes, or hyperlipidemia. An association between CMD as determined by PET, and the metabolic syndrome, diabetes, and hypertension has been established⁵³. Obesity is linked to CMD, as

evidenced by lower stress perfusion and MPR, assessed by stress perfusion CMR⁵⁴. Traditional cardiovascular risk factors associated with CMD also correlate with severe COVID-19¹⁴, complicating efforts to ascertain whether CMD results from severe COVID-19 or represents a pre-existing condition⁵⁵. Although we did not study treatment effects in this study, our findings may inspire therapeutic aspects to be included in future studies of CMD.

Limitations

This study is limited by its small sample size and single-center design. Our study represents the first long-term multiparametric CMR study, including quantitative stress perfusion mapping, in a unique cohort of first wave severely ill COVID-19 patients exhibiting long-term persistent cardiac symptoms. Moreover, we compared findings to age- and sex-matched volunteers. Little long-term data on CMD in this patient category exists and, although generalizability to the general PACS population may be limited, our results should be applicable for the proportion of new COVID-19 patients who become critically ill since they are unvaccinated or not optimally treated. Moreover, symptoms such as dyspnea, chest pressure, and fatigue may arise from respiratory and/or cardiovascular impairment³⁴, but our study aim with a focus on cardiac parameters does not allow any interpretation of pulmonary contribution. Since patients were recruited prospectively after a clinical post-discharge follow-up evaluation, the amount of improvement in CMR parameters from the initial phase cannot be determined. Given prior studies indicating normalization at 6-12 months follow-up, it is conceivable that the reduced stress perfusion and impaired strain identified in this study represent residual effects of initially more severe cardiac involvement.

Conclusions

COVID-19 patients exhibit long-term reduced stress perfusion indicating CMD, and impaired LV function by GLS and GCS. Lack of variation in stress perfusion between patients with and without cardiovascular risk factors suggests that CMD may be a consequence of severe COVID-19, warranting further investigation to elucidate mechanisms, and guide potential therapeutic interventions.

Clinical Perspectives

Competency in medical knowledge: Covid-19 patients with severe initial disease and persistent cardiac symptoms have signs of CMD and cardiac dysfunction in long-term follow-up using multiparametric stress perfusion CMR.

Translational outlook: Future studies should explore, in larger groups in multi-center settings, the presence and pathophysiology of CMD and cardiac dysfunction in Covid-19 patients at index and over time, to establish a firm basis for therapeutic studies and secondary prevention.

References

1. Peiris S, Ordunez P, DiPette D, et al. Cardiac Manifestations in Patients with COVID-19: A Scoping Review. *Glob Heart*. 2022;17(1):2. doi:10.5334/gh.1037
2. Xie Y, Xu E, Bowe B, Al-Aly Z. Long-term cardiovascular outcomes of COVID-19. *Nat Med*. Mar 2022;28(3):583-590. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01689-3
3. Ely EW, Brown LM, Fineberg HV. Long Covid Defined. *N Engl J Med*. Jul 31 2024;doi:10.1056/NEJMs2408466
4. Thaweethai T, Jolley SE, Karlson EW, et al. Development of a Definition of Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA*. Jun 13 2023;329(22):1934-1946. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.8823
5. Alkodaymi MS, Omrani OA, Fawzy NA, et al. Prevalence of post-acute COVID-19 syndrome symptoms at different follow-up periods: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. May 2022;28(5):657-666. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2022.01.014
6. Rischard F, Altman N, Szmuszkowicz J, et al. Long-Term Effects of COVID-19 on the Cardiopulmonary System in Adults and Children: Current Status and Questions to be Resolved by the National Institutes of Health Researching COVID to Enhance Recovery Initiative. *Chest*. Apr 2024;165(4):978-989. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2023.12.030
7. Gandhi RS, Raman B. The complexity of cardiovascular long COVID: where we are. *Cardiovasc Res*. Jul 2 2024;120(8):e30-e32. doi:10.1093/cvr/cvae090
8. Castanares-Zapatero D, Chalon P, Kohn L, et al. Pathophysiology and mechanism of long COVID: a comprehensive review. *Ann Med*. Dec 2022;54(1):1473-1487. doi:10.1080/07853890.2022.2076901

9. Mostafa RH, Moustafa A. Beyond acute infection: molecular mechanisms underpinning cardiovascular complications in long COVID. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2024;11:1268571. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2024.1268571
10. Evans PC, Rainger GE, Mason JC, et al. Endothelial dysfunction in COVID-19: a position paper of the ESC Working Group for Atherosclerosis and Vascular Biology, and the ESC Council of Basic Cardiovascular Science. *Cardiovasc Res.* Dec 1 2020;116(14):2177-2184. doi:10.1093/cvr/cvaa230
11. Roberts KA, Colley L, Agbaedeng TA, Ellison-Hughes GM, Ross MD. Vascular Manifestations of COVID-19 - Thromboembolism and Microvascular Dysfunction. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2020;7:598400. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2020.598400
12. Østergaard L. SARS CoV-2 related microvascular damage and symptoms during and after COVID-19: Consequences of capillary transit-time changes, tissue hypoxia and inflammation. *Physiol Rep.* Feb 2021;9(3):e14726. doi:10.14814/phy2.14726
13. Mahdi A, Collado A, Tengbom J, et al. Erythrocytes Induce Vascular Dysfunction in COVID-19. *JACC Basic Transl Sci.* Mar 2022;7(3):193-204. doi:10.1016/j.jacbts.2021.12.003
14. Yin J, Wang S, Liu Y, Chen J, Li D, Xu T. Coronary microvascular dysfunction pathophysiology in COVID-19. *Microcirculation.* Oct 2021;28(7):e12718. doi:10.1111/micc.12718
15. Hamilton-Craig C, Ugander M, Greenwood JP, Kozor R. Stress perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging: a guide for the general cardiologist. *Heart.* Sep 6 2022;doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2022-321630
16. Russo V, Lovato L, Ligabue G. Cardiac MRI: technical basis. *Radiol Med.* Nov 2020;125(11):1040-1055. doi:10.1007/s11547-020-01282-z

17. Nickander J, Steffen Johansson R, Lodin K, et al. Stress native T1 and native T2 mapping compared to myocardial perfusion reserve in long-term follow-up of severe Covid-19. *Sci Rep*. Mar 13 2023;13(1):4159. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-30989-y
18. Steffen Johansson R, Tornvall P, Sörensson P, Nickander J. Reduced stress perfusion in myocardial infarction with nonobstructive coronary arteries. *Sci Rep*. Dec 13 2023;13(1):22094. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-49223-w
19. Nickander J, Themudo R, Thalén S, et al. The relative contributions of myocardial perfusion, blood volume and extracellular volume to native T1 and native T2 at rest and during adenosine stress in normal physiology. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. Nov 25 2019;21(1):73. doi:10.1186/s12968-019-0585-9
20. Jones PW, Harding G, Berry P, Wiklund I, Chen WH, Kline Leidy N. Development and first validation of the COPD Assessment Test. *Eur Respir J*. Sep 2009;34(3):648-54. doi:10.1183/09031936.00102509
21. Williams N. The MRC breathlessness scale. *Occup Med (Lond)*. Aug 1 2017;67(6):496-497. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqx086
22. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, et al. Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*. Dec 2011;20(10):1727-36. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
23. Bassingthwaite JB, Wang CY, Chan IS. Blood-tissue exchange via transport and transformation by capillary endothelial cells. *Circ Res*. Oct 1989;65(4):997-1020. doi:10.1161/01.res.65.4.997
24. Kellman P, Hansen MS, Nielles-Vallespin S, et al. Myocardial perfusion cardiovascular magnetic resonance: optimized dual sequence and reconstruction for quantification. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. Apr 7 2017;19(1):43. doi:10.1186/s12968-017-0355-5

25. Messroghli DR, Radjenovic A, Kozerke S, Higgins DM, Sivananthan MU, Ridgway JP. Modified Look-Locker inversion recovery (MOLLI) for high-resolution T1 mapping of the heart. *Magn Reson Med*. Jul 2004;52(1):141-6. doi:10.1002/mrm.20110
26. Kellman P, Wilson JR, Xue H, Ugander M, Arai AE. Extracellular volume fraction mapping in the myocardium, part 1: evaluation of an automated method. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. Sep 10 2012;14(1):63. doi:10.1186/1532-429x-14-63
27. Heiberg E, Sjögren J, Ugander M, Carlsson M, Engblom H, Arheden H. Design and validation of Segment--freely available software for cardiovascular image analysis. *BMC Med Imaging*. Jan 11 2010;10:1. doi:10.1186/1471-2342-10-1
28. Tufvesson J, Hedström E, Steding-Ehrenborg K, Carlsson M, Arheden H, Heiberg E. Validation and Development of a New Automatic Algorithm for Time-Resolved Segmentation of the Left Ventricle in Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Biomed Res Int*. 2015;2015:970357. doi:10.1155/2015/970357
29. Mosteller RD. Simplified calculation of body-surface area. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 22 1987;317(17):1098. doi:10.1056/nejm198710223171717
30. Hundley WG, Bluemke D, Bogaert JG, et al. Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance guidelines for reporting cardiovascular magnetic resonance examinations. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. Mar 3 2009;11:5. doi:10.1186/1532-429x-11-5
31. Shafiabadi Hassani N, Talakoob H, Karim H, MozafariBazargany M, Rastad H. Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging Findings in 2954 COVID-19 Adult Survivors: A Comprehensive Systematic Review. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. Mar 2022;55(3):866-880. doi:10.1002/jmri.27852
32. Kunal S, Bagarhatta P, Palleda GM, et al. Role of cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging in COVID-19 recovered patients: A short-term follow-up study. *Echocardiography*. Nov 2022;39(11):1401-1411. doi:10.1111/echo.15466

33. Shanmuganathan M, Kotronias RA, Burrage MK, et al. Acute changes in myocardial tissue characteristics during hospitalization in patients with COVID-19. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2023;10:1097974. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2023.1097974
34. Cassar MP, Tunnicliffe EM, Petousi N, et al. Symptom Persistence Despite Improvement in Cardiopulmonary Health - Insights from longitudinal CMR, CPET and lung function testing post-COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine.* Nov 2021;41:101159. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101159
35. Filippetti L, Pace N, Louis JS, et al. Long-Lasting Myocardial and Skeletal Muscle Damage Evidenced by Serial CMR During the First Year in COVID-19 Patients From the First Wave. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2022;9:831580. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2022.831580
36. Baldwin MR. Making sense of multiorgan MRI imaging for post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Lancet Respir Med.* Nov 2023;11(11):951-952. doi:10.1016/s2213-2600(23)00347-8
37. Gröschel J, Grassow L, van Dijck P, Bhoyroo Y, Blaszczyk E, Schulz-Menger J. Trajectories of functional and structural myocardial parameters in post-COVID-19 syndrome-insights from mid-term follow-up by cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2024;11:1357349. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2024.1357349
38. Raafs AG, Ghossein MA, Brandt Y, et al. Cardiovascular outcome 6 months after severe coronavirus disease 2019 infection. *J Hypertens.* Jul 1 2022;40(7):1278-1287. doi:10.1097/hjh.0000000000003110
39. Xie Y, Wang L, Li M, et al. Biventricular Longitudinal Strain Predict Mortality in COVID-19 Patients. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2020;7:632434. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2020.632434

40. Drakos S, Chatzantonis G, Bietenbeck M, et al. A cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging-based pilot study to assess coronary microvascular disease in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Rep*. Aug 2 2021;11(1):15667. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-95277-z
41. Doeblin P, Steinbeis F, Scannell CM, et al. Brief Research Report: Quantitative Analysis of Potential Coronary Microvascular Disease in Suspected Long-COVID Syndrome. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2022;9:877416. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2022.877416
42. Karagodin I, Wang S, Wang H, et al. Myocardial Blood Flow Quantified Using Stress Cardiac Magnetic Resonance After Mild COVID-19 Infection. *JACC Adv*. Mar 2024;3(3)doi:10.1016/j.jacadv.2024.100834
43. Vallejo Camazón N, Teis A, Martínez Membrive MJ, Llibre C, Bayés-Genís A, Mateu L. Long COVID-19 and microvascular disease-related angina. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*. May 2022;75(5):444-446. doi:10.1016/j.rec.2021.10.010
44. Thornton GD, Shetye A, Knight DS, et al. Myocardial Perfusion Imaging After Severe COVID-19 Infection Demonstrates Regional Ischemia Rather Than Global Blood Flow Reduction. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2021;8:764599. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2021.764599
45. Kotecha T, Knight DS, Razvi Y, et al. Patterns of myocardial injury in recovered troponin-positive COVID-19 patients assessed by cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *Eur Heart J*. May 14 2021;42(19):1866-1878. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehab075
46. Engblom H, Xue H, Akil S, et al. Fully quantitative cardiovascular magnetic resonance myocardial perfusion ready for clinical use: a comparison between cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography. *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson*. Oct 19 2017;19(1):78. doi:10.1186/s12968-017-0388-9
47. Sutelman P, Vilahur G. An obscure myocardial blood flow may illuminate post-acute sequelae of COVID-19 cardiovascular syndrome. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2022:e13884. vol. 12.

48. Weber B, Parks S, Huck DM, et al. Prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection Is Associated With Coronary Vasomotor Dysfunction as Assessed by Coronary Flow Reserve From Cardiac Positron Emission Tomography. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Oct 18 2022;11(20):e025844. doi:10.1161/jaha.122.025844
49. Verma A, Ramayya T, Upadhyaya A, et al. Post COVID-19 syndrome with impairment of flow-mediated epicardial vasodilation and flow reserve. *Eur J Clin Invest*. Dec 2022;52(12):e13871. doi:10.1111/eci.13871
50. Ahmed AI, Saad JM, Han Y, et al. Coronary Microvascular Health in Patients With Prior COVID-19 Infection. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. Dec 2022;15(12):2153-2155. doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2022.07.006
51. Ahmed AI, Al Rifai M, Alahdab F, et al. Coronary microvascular health in symptomatic patients with prior COVID-19 infection: an updated analysis. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. Oct 27 2023;24(11):1544-1554. doi:10.1093/ehjci/jead118
52. Tijmes FS, Marschner C, Thavendiranathan P, Hanneman K. Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Cardiovascular Manifestations Following COVID-19. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. Jul 2023;58(1):26-43. doi:10.1002/jmri.28677
53. Bhandiwad AR, Valenta I, Jain S, Schindler TH. PET-determined prevalence of coronary microvascular dysfunction and different types in a cardio-metabolic risk population. *Int J Cardiol Heart Vasc*. Jun 2023;46:101206. doi:10.1016/j.ijcha.2023.101206
54. Crane JD, Joy G, Knott KD, et al. The Impact of Bariatric Surgery on Coronary Microvascular Function Assessed Using Automated Quantitative Perfusion CMR. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. Jul 24 2024;doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2024.05.022
55. Peluso MJ, Deeks SG. Mechanisms of long COVID and the path toward therapeutics. *Cell*. Oct 3 2024;187(20):5500-5529. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2024.07.054

Figure Titles and Legends

Figure 1. Stress and rest perfusion in COVID-19 patients and volunteers. The figure shows mean and standard deviation together with p-values. COVID-19 patients have lower stress perfusion but comparable rest perfusion, compared to volunteers.

Figure 2. Midventricular perfusion maps of a COVID-19 patient (left) with suspected microvascular dysfunction and a volunteer (right), in stress (upper) and rest (lower). Rest perfusion is comparable, while stress perfusion is globally reduced in the COVID-19 patient compared to the volunteer.

Central illustration. This follow-up study of hospitalized critically ill COVID-19 patients, using multiparametric stress perfusion CMR, showed reduced stress perfusion and impaired GCS and GLS at 10 months post-discharge, compared to volunteers of similar age and sex, without symptomatic IHD. Abbreviations: COVID-19 = Coronavirus disease 2019; GCS = global circumferential strain; GLS = global longitudinal strain; IHD = ischemic heart disease; CMR = cardiovascular magnetic resonance.

Declarations

Ethics, consent and permission

The study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (Dnr 2021-03293, 2022-0695, 2020-02397). All patients provided written informed consent, including consent for publication of individual details on group level and anonymized images. Consent forms are held in the patient records and are available for review by the Editor-in-Chief. The data supporting the findings are available from corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Authors contributions

RSJ participated in the design of the study, performed patient inclusion, analyzed images, and performed statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript. KL performed inter-observer analysis. DL participated in patient inclusion and image acquisition. KC, JB and MR participated in the study design, while JB and MR were also clinically responsible for all post-COVID-19 patients at Karolinska University Hospital. HX, PK participated in study design and developed the perfusion mapping technique. HE conceived the study, participated in study design and interpretation of data. JN participated in the design of the study, patient inclusion and image acquisition, and supervised all analysis, interpretation of data, and drafting of the manuscript. All authors read, revised and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge radiographer Elina Malkeshi and the biomedical scientist group for their invaluable work performing the image acquisition in this study. The Central Illustration includes a non-adapted figure provided by Servier Medical Art, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Tables

Table 1. Clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 patients and volunteers

Clinical characteristics	COVID-19 patients	Volunteers	<i>p</i>
	(n=37)	(n=22)	
Male sex, n (%)	28 (76%)	12 (55%)	0.15
Age (years)	56±12	51±13	0.19†
Height (cm)	175±8	175±10	0.96
Weight (kg)	88±19	73±12	0.001
BSA (m ²)	2.1±0.3	1.9±0.2	0.006
BMI (kg/m ²)	29±5	24±3	<0.001†
Creatinine (mmol/l)	86±24	77±12	0.19†
Hematocrit (%)	43±4	43±4	0.68†
Hypertension, n (%)	6 (16%)	3 (14%)	1.00
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	1.00
Hyperlipidemia, n (%)	4 (11%)	2 (9%)	1.00
Asthma, n (%)	4 (11%)	0 (0%)	0.29
COPD, n (%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Cigarette smoking, n (%)	17 (46%)	7 (32%)	0.41
Statins, n (%)	6 (16%)	1 (5%)	0.24
Beta blockers, n (%)	9 (24%)	2 (9%)	0.18
ACE-I/ARB, n (%)	8 (22%)	2 (9%)	0.29
Calcium channel blockers, n (%)	7 (19%)	1 (5%)	0.24

Clinical characteristics are presented as mean ± standard deviation, where *p*-values denotes the independent t-test or † the Mann-Whitney U test, or as numbers (percentages), where *p*-values denotes Fisher's exact test. Comorbidities and cardiovascular risk factors of patients at baseline and at the time of CMR of the volunteers; all other clinical characteristics including medications recorded at the time of CMR of both patients and volunteers.

Abbreviations: ACE-I = angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitors; ARB = angiotensin receptor blockers; BMI = body mass index; BSA = body surface area; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Table 2. CMR findings of the COVID-19 patients and volunteers

CMR findings	COVID-19 patients (n=37)	Volunteers (n=22)	<i>p</i>
Heart rate rest (bpm)	67±11	72±9	0.11
SBP rest (mmHg)	130±16	123±15	0.11
RPP rest	8747±1866	8815±1577	0.89
Heart rate stress (bpm)	90±14	91±12	0.81
LVM (g)	110±31	98±24	0.21
LVMi (g/m ²)	53±12	52±9	0.70†
LVEDV (ml)	172±38	172±48	0.97
LVEDVi (ml/m ²)	83±15	91±19	0.11†
LVESV (ml)	74±26	73±25	0.87
LVESVi (ml/m ²)	36±11	39±11	0.35†
LVSV (ml)	98±21	99±29	0.81
LVSVi (ml/m ²)	48±9	52±11	0.09
LVEF (%)	57±8	58±7	0.87
CO (l/min)	7.1±1.7	6.7±1.8	0.47†
GLS (%)	-17±2	-19±2	0.003
GCS (%)	-16±3	-19±3	0.001
Native T1 (ms)	995±28	984±31	0.15
Native T2 (ms)	48±3*	49±3	0.26
ECV (%)	27±3	27±2	0.66
Perfusion rest (ml/min/g)	1.10±0.39	1.16±0.42*	0.41†
Perfusion stress (ml/min/g)	2.80±0.81	3.43±0.69	0.003
MPR	2.7±0.9	3.2±1.1*	0.07

CMR findings are presented as mean ± standard deviation. * T2 maps not acquired in two COVID-19 patients; rest perfusion maps excluded in one volunteer due to residual hyperemia; MPR not calculated for one volunteer. Rest perfusion is corrected for RPP. P-values denotes the independent t-test, † denotes the Mann-Whitney U test.

Abbreviations: bpm = beats per minute; CMR = cardiac magnetic resonance imaging; CO = cardiac output; ECV = extracellular volume; GCS = global circumferential strain; GLS = global longitudinal strain; LVEDV = left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; LVESV = left ventricular end-systolic volume; LVM = left ventricular mass; LVSV = left ventricular

stroke volume; MPR = myocardial perfusion reserve; RPP = rate pressure product; SBP = systolic blood pressure; i signifies indexed to body surface area (BSA) according to the Mosteller formula.

Figures




Figure 1. Stress and rest perfusion in Covid-19 patients and volunteers. The figure shows mean and standard deviation together with p-values. Covid-19 patients have lower stress perfusion but comparable rest perfusion, compared to volunteers.




Figure 2. Midventricular perfusion maps of a Covid-19 patient (left) with suspected microvascular dysfunction and a volunteer (right), in stress (upper) and rest (lower). Rest perfusion is comparable, while stress perfusion is globally reduced in the Covid-19 patient compared to the volunteer.

Long-term follow-up after severe COVID-19

COVID-19 patients (n=37)


Volunteers (n=22)

Multiparametric stress perfusion CMR




Reduced stress perfusion

COVID-19



Volunteer



Systolic dysfunction:
Impaired GLS and GCS

