Overview of Strain Imaging and Common Clinical Applications

Samer Sayyed, MD

University of Nebraska Medical Center



Nebraska Medicine

Presenter Disclosures

Consultant/	No Disclosures
Speakers bureaus	
Research funding	No Disclosures
Stock ownership/Corporate boards-employment	No Disclosures
Off-label uses	None



Learning Objectives

- 1. Discuss the basic principles of strain and myocardial deformation imaging
- 2. Describe common clinical applications of left ventricular strain

What is Strain?



Strain = Deformation



Strain = Differential displacement of an object expressed as % (-ve → shortening; +ve → elongation)

LV chamber deformation is determined by myofiber architecture



Strain =
$$\frac{Lo-L}{Lo} = \frac{\Delta L}{Lo}$$

Fiber Architecture

3D LV myocardial deformation is the result complex electrical and mechanical inter-connection of all fibers throughout the wall





Cardiac Muscle Fiber Orientation

Epicardium [L]





J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2007 May; 20(5): 539-551.



Endocardium [R]

Fibers in the sub-endocardium are arranged in right-handed helix, then smoothly transition to a transverse circular arrangement in the midmyocardium and then finally a lefthanded helix in the epicardium

Mayo Clin Proc. January 2019;94(1):125-138

Principle myocardial deformations











JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2019 Sep;12(9):1849-1863

Acoustic Pattern (Speckle) Tracking

Velocity is estimated as a shift of each speckle divided by time between successive frames (or multiplied by Frame Rate)

2D vector:(Vx, Vy) = (dX, dY) * FR

Improved signal noise levels, less angle dependency, & freedom to assess strain using regular B-Mode datasets in 2D, rather than a single dimension locked along the scan line



J Am Coll Cardiol 2006;47:1313-27

GLS Results Display



Technical Challenges and Barriers to Adoption







Age, Gender, & Vendor Variability

- Individuals > 60 years show clinically and statistically relevant impairment in GLS, compared with younger subjects (19.9% ± 2.9% vs 21.1% ± 2.6%, P <.01)
- Normal ranges for GLS also varied with covariates such as *weight* and *BP*
- Strain reported *lower in women* vs. men, presumably due to smaller female heart (



Regardless of vendor or clinical covariate

- GLS <16% is almost certainly abnormal</p>
- GLS >18% is considered normal
 - GLS between –16% and –18% is ambiguous (probably abnormal), although normal measurements may still be in this category due to increased afterload and older age



Definition of Cancer Therapeutics–Related Cardiac Dysfunction (CTRCD)

Established Criteria for Cardiotoxicity

Standard	Definition of Cardiotoxicity	Clinical and Imaging Features
American Society of Echocardiography and European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging (ASE/EACVI)	LVEF full by >10% to absolute EF <53%	May be global or regional change in LV function Symptomatic or asymptomatic for HE
European Society of Cardiology (ESC)	LVEF full by >10% from baseline to EF <50%	Symptomatic or asymptomatic for HF
National Cancer Institute (NCI)	HF grade 1–5 adopted in common terminology criteria for adverse events	Grade 1 (asymptomatic) Grade 2 (mild to moderate symptoms) Grade 3 (symptomatic on minimal exertion or at rest) Grade 4 (life threatening) Grade 5 (death)
Canadian Cardiovascular Society (CCS)	LVEF fill by >10% from baseline or LVEF <53%	Guidelines also recommend (1) 3D echocardiography or same imaging modality during cancer therapy, (2) myocardial strain imaging, and (3) cardiac biomarkers (N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide, troponin) for early detection
European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO)	Symptomatic decline in LVEF of at least 5% to <55% or asymptomatic decline in LVEF of at least 10% to <55%	Symptoms for congestive HF with signs including but not limited to S3 gallop, tachycardia, or both Decline in LVEF either global or regional



EXPERT CONSENSUS STATEMENT

Expert Consensus for Multimodality Imaging Evaluation of Adult Patients during and after Cancer Therapy: A Report from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging

Juan Carlos Plana, MD, FASE, Chair, Maurizio Galderisi, MD, FESC, Co-Chair, Ana Barac, MD, PhD, Michael S. Ewer, MD, JD, Bonnie Ky, MD, FASE, Marielle Scherrer-Crosbie, MD, PhD, FASE, Javier Ganame, MD, PhD, FASE, Igal A. Sebag, MD, FASE, Deborah A. Agler, RCT, RDCS, FASE, Luigi P. Badano, MD, PhD, FESC, Jose Banchs, MD, FASE, Daniela Cardinale, MD, PhD, FESC, Joseph Carver, MD, Manuel Cerqueira, MD, Jeanne M. DeCara, MD, FASE, Thor Edvardsen, MD, PhD, FESC, Scott D. Flamm, MD, MBA, Thomas Force, MD, Brian P. Griffin, MD, Guy Jerusalem, MD, PhD, Jennifer E. Liu, MD, FASE, Andreia Magalhães, MD, Thomas Marwick, MBBS, PhD, MPH, Liza Y. Sanchez, RCS, FASE, Rosa Sicari, MD, PhD, FESC, Hector R. Villarraga, MD, FASE, and Patrizio Lancellotti, MD, PhD, FESC, *Cleveland, Ohio; Naples, Padua, Milan, and Pisa, Italy; Washington, District of Columbia; Houston, Texas; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Boston, Massachusetts; Hamilton, Ontario and Montreal, Quebec, Canada; Chicago, Illinois; Oslo, Norway; Liege, Belgium; New York, New York; Lisbon, Portugal; Hobart, Australia; Rochester, Minnesota*



The following authors reported no actual or potential conflicts of interest in relation to this document: Juan Carlos Piana, MD, FASE, Maurizio Gaderisi, MD, FESC, Marielle Scherrer-Crosbie, MD, PhD, FASE, Javier Ganame, MD, PhD, FASE, Deborah A, Agler, RCT, RDCS, FASE, Luigi P, Badano, MD, PhD, FESC, Jose Banchis, MD, FASE; Daniela Cardinale, MD, Joseph Carver, MD, Thor Edvardsen, MD, PhD, FESC, Brian Griffin, MD, Guy Jenzalem, MD, PhD, Hennifer E, Lui, MD, FASE; Andreis Magafhaer, MD, Liza Y, Sanchez, RCS, FASE, Ross Sicari, MD, PhD, FESC, Hector R, Vilarraga, MD, FASE, and Patrizo Lanceliotti, MD, PhD, FESC. The following authors reported relationships with one or more commercial interests; Ana Barac, MD, received research funding and lectures hororara from Gerentech and consultancy fees from Cell Therapaulta. Maruel Cerqueira, MD, Inem. Scott D. Flamm, MD, MEA, serves on advisory boards for Phage Heathcare, Bayer Heathcare, and TeraRecon and received institutional research support from Sismens Heathcare. Thomas Force, MD consults for GlacoSmthKine, Bornie Ky, MD, FASE, received an investigator-initiated award from Pitzer, Inc. Thomas Marwick, MBBS, PrD, MPH, received research funding from the National Heath and Madical Research Council in Australia and the Royal Hobart Hoopital Foundation, an equipment grant from Philips Medical Systems and Semens, and a project grant from GE Medical Systems. Igal A, Sebag, MD, FASE, serves on the speakers bureau for Lamtheus.

Attention ASEMonbers:

The ASE has gone green! Visit www.commercity ting to earn herecontinuing medical education credit through an online additivity related to this article. Certificates are available for immediate access upon successful completion of the activity. Nonmembers will need to join the ASE to access this great member benefit!

Reprint requests: American Society of Echocardiography, 2100 Gateway Centre Boulevard, Suite 310, Montsville, NG 27560 (E-mail: ase Gasecho.org). 0894-7317/\$36.00

Copyright 2014 by the American Society of Echocardiography. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/Lecho.2014.07.012

J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2014;27:911-39

Expert consensus for screening & diagnosis of CTRCD





Strain sUrveillance during Chemotherapy for improving Cardiovascular Outcomes (SUCCOUR)

International, multicenter, prospective, RCT

Approved 21/03/2014 31/03/2014

Retrospectively registered



Trial ID	
Ethics application status	
Date submitted	
Date registered	
Type of registration	

Titles & IDs

Public title	Strain sUrveillance-during Chemotherapy for improving Cardiovascular OUIcomen	
Scientific title	Randomised controlled trial (RCT) of chemotherapy patients at risk of cardiotoxicity undergoing cardioprotection guided by measurement of LV strain compared with cardioprotection guided by measurement of left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction for avoidance of cardiotoxicity	
Secondary ID [1]	noher	
Universal Trial Number (UTN)		
Trial acronym	SUCCOUR Study	
Linked study record		

Strain-Guided Management of Potentially Cardiotoxic Cancer Therapy

Paaladinesh Thavendiranathan, MD, SM,^{a,+} Tomoko Negishi, MD,^{b,c,*} Emily Somerset, MS,^a Kazuaki Negishi, MD, PHD,^{b,c} Martin Penicka, MD, PHD,^e Julie Lemieux, MD, MSc,[†] Svend Aakhus, MD, PHD,^B Sakiko Miyazaki, MD,^b Mitra Shirazi, MD,[†] Maurizio Galderisi, MD, PHD,^L† Thomas H. Marwick, MBBS, PHD, MPH,^{b,k} on behalf of the SUCCOUR Investigators;

Patients were followed for change in EF and development of CTRCD (symptomatic EF reduction of >5% or >10% asymptomatic to <55%) over 1 year



Prognostic value of Strain imaging



GLS adds significant incremental predictive value for mortality in patients with LVEF >35%, irrespective of WMSI



Baseline clinical variables: Diabetes, Age, & HTN were selected based on independent univariable predictors. Data from Stanton et al.



- GLS is a stronger predictor than LVEF of all-cause mortality and a composite of cardiac death, HF hospitalization, and malignant arrhythmias in meta-analysis of 5,721 subjects across 16 studies of various cardiac diseases
- In 603 patients in the VALIANT (Valsartan in Acute Myocardial Infarction Study) echocardiographic sub-study, GLS provided prognostic value for the prediction of all-cause mortality, independent of and incremental to clinical variables and LVEF, and circumferential strain rate identified patients at risk of LV remodeling.
- GLS *improved predictive ability* of the Framingham risk score in a *Danish population* when natriuretic peptides did not





- Patients with HFrEF had slightly higher mortality than those with HFmEF or HFpEF, whereas patients with reduced strain had significantly higher mortality
- In multivariable analysis, each 1% improvement in GLS was associated with a 5% decreased risk for mortality





Compared with normal controls & pts with hypertensive heart disease, HFpEF/HFmEF pts demonstrated significantly lower longitudinal strain

Strain Abnormalities in HCM vs. Healthy Controls

72 patients with HCM and 32 controls evaluated using 2-dimensional velocity vector imaging



Longitudinal strain in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy is significantly lower than in control subjects without notable regional variability *Circumferential* strain *increased* from base to apex, & was significantly *higher* in HCM for all segments except lateral apex



Association Between Regional Strain and Myocardial Fibrosis in HCM



- LS significantly decreased from apex-to-base in all pts w non-apical HCM
- Apex-to-base decrease of LS was greatest in HCM w fibrosis > HCM wo fibrosis > healthy controls
- All 3 patients with *apical form of HCM* (all with fibrosis) had an *apex-to-base increase* of LS
- Mean ES LS had moderate correlation with # of fibrotic segments (r =0.47, P=.002) and total LV mass (r=0.46, P=.003)
- Fibrosis & wall thickness were multivariate predictors of lower segmental longitudinal strain (P=.003)



J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2008;21:1299-1305

GLS for the Diagnosis of Cardiac Amyloid



- Apex-to-base gradients in absolute regional strain were present in all groups
- *Absolute GLS* in CA << HCM or AS (p<0.001)
- GLS Gradients in CA >> AS (p<0.001), but no different than HCM
- Regional LS is significantly lower in CA vs HCM groups at all 3 levels (p<0.001)



JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY # 7021 BY THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER

EXPERT CONSENSUS DECISION PATHWAY

2023 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Comprehensive Multidisciplinary Care for the Patient With Cardiac Amyloidosis

A Report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee

Endorsed by the American Association of Neuromuscular & Electrodiagnostic Medicine, Heart Failure Society of America, and International Society of Amyloidosis. The American Academy of Neurology affirms the value of this statement.

VOL 61, NO 11 2023

TABLE 1 Clues Suggesting a Diagnosis of Cardiac Amyloidosis

Cardiac Manifestations

Clinical

- Fatigue
- Heart failure symptoms
- Family history of heart failure

Electrical

- Conduction system disease/pacemaker
- Atrial fibrillation
- Pseudoinfarct pattern
- Discordant QRS voltage for degree of increased left ventricular wall thickness on imaging Imaging
- Increased left ventricular wall thickness
- Grade 2 or worse diastolic function
- Abnormal longitudinal strain with apical sparing
- Diffuse subendocardial or transmural late gadolinium enhancement on cardiac magnetic resonance imaging with increased extracellular volume fraction

Laboratories

- Persistent low-level troponin elevation
- Elevated 8-type natriuretic peptide or N-terminal pro-8-type natriuretic peptide

Necessary clinical testing will include, at a bare minimum, a screening ECG, cardiac biomarkers (natriuretic peptide and troponin), and an echocardiogram, ideally with strain imaging. If there are symptoms or abnormal

Treatment efficacy will likely be determined by a combination of circulating markers (prealbumin, cardiac troponins, natriuretic peptides, kidney function), imaging markers (the best candidates appear to be echocardio-graphic global longitudinal **strain** and CMR extracellular volume fraction),²³⁸ as well as conventional HF metrics (functional status, hospitalizations, and survival).



Anderson-Fabry Disease

X-linked lysosomal storage disorder caused by deficiency in α -galactosidase A enzyme



<u>J Clin Med.</u> 2021 May; 10(9): 1994.

Application of a Parametric Display of Two-Dimensional Speckle-Tracking Longitudinal Strain to Improve the Etiologic Diagnosis of Mild to Moderate Left Ventricular Hypertrophy

Dermot Phelan, MB, BCh, PhD, Paaladinesh Thavendiranathan, MD, MSc, Zoran Popovic, MD, PhD, Patrick Collier, MB, BCh, PhD, Brian Griffin, MD, James D. Thomas, MD, and Thomas H. Marwick, MBBS, PhD, MPH, *Cleveland, Obio; Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Hobart, Australia*

Background: The distinction of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) or cardiac amyloidosis (CA) from hypertensive heart disease may be difficult. The aim of this study was to determine the impact of parametric (polar) maps of regional longitudinal strain on identification of the etiology of mild to moderate left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH).

Methods: Twenty-four consecutive echocardiographic studies with mild to moderate LVH (eight with CA, eight with HCM, and eight with hypertensive heart disease) were selected on the basis of the availability of adequate images to assess longitudinal strain and absence of electrocardiographic criteria for low voltage or LVH or a pseudoinfarct pattern. Twenty level 3-trained readers provided the most likely of three diagnoses (CA, HCM, or hypertensive heart disease) and scored their confidence in making the diagnosis from two-dimensional images and diastolic parameters. A teaching exercise was provided on the interpretation of longitudinal strain in these cohorts, and interpretation was repeated with the addition of the strain polar map.

Results: Baseline concordance among the readers was poor ($\kappa = 0.28$) and improved with the addition of strain data ($\kappa = 0.57$). Accuracy was improved with the addition of polar maps for the entire study cohort (P < .001), with 22% of cases reclassified correctly. The largest improvements in sensitivity (from 40% to 86%, P < .001), specificity (from 84% to 95%, P < .001), and accuracy (from 70% to 92%, P < .001) were seen for CA. The strain polar map significantly improved reader confidence in making the correct diagnosis overall (P < .001).

Conclusions: Regional variations in strain are easily recognizable, accurate, and reproducible means of differentiating causes of LVH. The detection of LVH etiology may be a useful clinical application for strain. (J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2014;27:888-95.)

Keywords: LV hypertrophy, Hypertension, Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, Amyloidosis, Strain



CA	(1.100 - 1.100		EF = 60% = 14.5 mm	N N	NN					
Table 3 Diagno moderate LVH	ostic accur with and w	acy in pation	ents with r in polar m	mild to ap		c accur	acy in patie	ents with n	nild to	1
Diagnosis	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Accuracy (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	nsitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Accuracy (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
CA		1								
Baseline read	40	84	70	55	75	40	84	70	55	75
Strain read	86	95	92	92	94					
Р	<.001	.002	<.001	<.001	<.001					
HCM										
Baseline read	44	75	65	45	73	44	75	65	45	73
Strain read	52	84	73	63	78					
P	.054	.01	.001	<.001	.005					
HHD						100				
Baseline read	60	59	60	42	72	60	59	60	42	72
Strain read	70	74	73	59	84					
P	.061	.002	.001	.001	.004					
NPV, negative pro	edictive valu	ue; PPV, pos	itive predic	tive valu	ie.	tive valu	ie; PPV, pos	itive predic	tive valu	e.

.

Key take home messages

- **Strain imaging** reflects the direction of the *wall movement* rather than the direction of the muscle fibers themselves
- **GLS** is the most robust & widely used strain parameter in clinical practice
- Despite being systolic phase parameters, *LV-GLS* and *LVEF* do *not* necessarily correlate
- In *HFrEF*, strain may not be needed for the diagnosis, but provides incremental *prognostic* value
- In *HFmrEF*, strain may be useful for the *diagnosis* when LVEF is difficult to assess
- In *HFpEF*, strain can provide significant *diagnostic* and *prognostic* value
- In HCM, the degree of wall thickening, and severity of fibrosis correlate closely with abnormalities in regional and global longitudinal strain
- Regional variations in strain can be easily recognizable, accurate, & reproducible means of differentiating causes of LVH



Match the strain plot to the correct patient



• 58 hypertensive patients with septal bulge, the bull's eye plot is Lohard Clerized by a Mignificantly IVESUCED 1995 Hudinal strain (light red) at the basal part of the septum LVEF = 43 % LV mass = Elevated • 49 hypertensive patients with concentric LVH and normal EF, average LVLB WsGaffy femail® near normal, but Isignificantly required LS patterns may be detected on multiple basal & mid LMVsGardia Plevels

LV mass = Elevated

ତିନ ନେବଂକ with ମୁମ୍ନାର ହୋଟୁ ବେଧି ମୁନ୍ତି ମିଧି କୁନ୍ତି ମୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁ reduced EF, reduced average global LVR ନେଜୁ ଜୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କ ଅନୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତ ଅନୁନ୍ତି କୁନ୍ତି କ

LVEF = 65 %

LV mass = Normal



Match the strain plot to the correct patient



• Jp HCM patients with an asymmetric LVH, typical LS builts eye plot pattern is LVHRAFTERED or anted duced average GLS with significantly reduced strain in hypertrophic regions LVEF = 70 % LV mass = Elevated Ln apical HCM, the bull's eye plot displays blue or pale pink color at the LAVE Work gest if grhm loss of longitudinal deformation, surrounded by the red regions with normal strain LWE we sat the wasal and middle levels

LV mass = Elevated

5 In HCM patients with concentric hypertrophy and normal EF (typically LVRWIDHE S boilds eye plot is characterized by a mildly reduced average GLS and prominently reduced LVSappexitip2Cingments EF = 60 %



Liu et al. Eur J Med Res (2016) 21:21

Match the strain plot to the correct patient





Liu et al. Eur J Med Res (2016) 21:21

