Original Contribution

Right ventricular myocardial stiffness and relaxation components by kinematic model-based transtricuspid flow analysis in children and adolescents with pulmonary arterial hypertension

Short title: RV stiffness and relaxation in PAH

Yasunobu HAYABUCHI, MD, PhD; Yukako HOMMA, MD; Shoji KAGAMI, MD, PhD
Department of Pediatrics, Tokushima University, Tokushima, Japan

Disclosure

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Address for correspondence:

Yasunobu Hayabuchi, MD
Department of Pediatrics, Tokushima University
Kuramoto-cho-3, Tokushima 770-8305, Japan
Tel: +81-886-33-7135; Fax: +81-886-31-8697
E-mail: hayabuchi@tokushima-u.ac.jp
Abstract

We hypothesized that the kinematic model-based parameters obtained from the transtricuspid E-wave would be useful for evaluating RV diastolic property in pediatric pulmonary arterial hypertension (PAH) patients. The model was parametrized by stiffness/elastic recoil $k$, relaxation/damping $c$, and load $x$. These parameters were determined as the solution of $m \cdot \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} + c \cdot \frac{dx}{dt} + kx = 0$, which is based on the theory that the E-wave contour is determined by the interplay of stiffness/restoring force, damping/relaxation force, and load. The PAH group had a significantly higher $k$ and $c$ versus the control group (182.5 ± 72.4 g/s² vs. 135.7 ± 49.5 g/s², $p = 0.0232$ and 21.9 ± 6.5 g/s vs. 10.6 ± 5.2 g/s, $p <$0.0001, respectively). These results show that RV has a higher stiffness/elastic recoil and inferior cross-bridge relaxation in the PAH group.

Present findings indicate the feasibility and utility of kinematic model parameters for assessing RV diastolic function.
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Introduction

Systemic hypertension is recognized as one of the major causes of diastolic dysfunction in the left ventricle (LV) (Marwick et al. 2015). However, there is limited knowledge regarding the effect of chronic pressure overload on the right ventricular (RV) diastolic function. Since the assessment of the RV diastolic function is challenging (Rain et al. 2016; Murch et al. 2015), only a few studies have investigated the RV diastolic function, particularly in pediatric pulmonary arterial hypertension (PAH) patients (Okumura et al. 2014). Thus, development of an accurate measurement of the RV diastolic dysfunction might help contribute to an improved clinical management of these patients (Shiina et al. 2009; Yang W et al. 2018).

Noninvasive assessment of diastolic function is commonly achieved through the use of pulsed Doppler echocardiography. Although conventional echocardiographic parameters are often indicative of dysfunction, their utility in characterizing the relaxation and stiffness/elastic recoil is limited (Cosson and Kevorkian JP 2003). To overcome the limitations of these parameters, Kovács et al. quantified LV diastolic function using a mechanistic model of filling that was determined by cross-bridge uncoupling relaxation, elastic recoil/restoring forces, and initial displacement (load) (Kovács et al. 1987; Bauman et al. 2004; Shmuylovich and Kovács 2006). Based on these findings, we attempted to further evaluate the RV diastolic function by analyzing the transtricuspid E-waves using the parametrized diastolic filling (PDF) formalism. We recently demonstrated the feasibility and usefulness of kinematic model parameters obtained from RV pressure waveform for evaluating RV diastolic function (Hayabuchi et al. 2018). It showed that the PAH group had higher stiffness/restoring and inferior cross-bridge relaxation than the control group. However, these results in our previous studies are obtained by invasive examination. In this investigation, noninvasive assessment by using pulsed Doppler E-wave was examined in PAH patients.
We hypothesized that the physical and physiological principles govern the transtricuspid flow pattern and that a mathematical model would be able to correctly quantify the pathological RV diastolic property in children and adolescents with PAH.

**Materials and Methods**

**Study Population**

This prospective study enrolled 10 consecutive pediatric idiopathic PAH patients (PAH group; mean age ± standard deviation [SD], 12.8 ± 5.4 years; age range, 8-19 years). We also enrolled 34 consecutive age-matched healthy subjects without chest X-rays and electrocardiographic or echocardiographic abnormalities (control group; mean age, 11.3 ± 3.4 years; age range, 7-19 years).

Data analyzed in the study were collected from December 2013 to October 2017. All study protocols conformed to the ethical guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki (1975) and were approved by the Institutional Review Board of Tokushima University Hospital. Written, informed consent for their children to participate in the study was provided by the parents.

**Echocardiography**

Standard and pulsed Doppler echocardiography was performed using a Preirus digital ultrasound system (Hitachi-Aloka Medical Co., Tokyo, Japan) equipped with 1-5- and 3-7-MHz sector transducers. All Doppler data were acquired from patients in the left lateral decubitus position during shallow respiration or end-expiratory apnea. Participants were assessed by conventional, M-mode, pulsed, and color Doppler echocardiography. Transmitral and transtricuspid diastolic blood flow velocities were determined in the apical 4-chamber view by placing the pulsed Doppler sample volume at the tip of the valve leaflets. Mitral and tricuspid annular velocities were recorded.
using the pulsed wave tissue Doppler imaging (TDI) technique. The conventional
echocardiographic parameters that were measured included: E-wave acceleration time
(AT), deceleration time (DT), peak E- and A-wave velocities (E-peak and A-peak,
respectively), and the E/A ratio. Peak early mitral and tricuspid annular velocity (e')
and peak late annular velocity (a'), E/e', and e'/a' were similarly calculated from the
Doppler tissue recordings. Values were calculated for each of the 5 wave images in each
subject and then averaged.

**Doppler E-wave analysis using kinematic model**

For each subject, 5 transmitral and transtricuspid E- and A-waves were
selected. Transmitral and transtricuspid E-waves were evaluated as follows. Using a
custom MATLAB release 2015a (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) program, beats with
clear contours were selected, digitized, and cropped. The maximum velocity envelope
was determined from the digitized E-wave image and then used to obtain the
automated PDF fit. For the purpose of detecting the appropriate velocity profile, the
program searches each time point of the image from the top down for the first pixel
having a brightness higher than or equal to a user defined threshold level, matching
each time point with a velocity. Furthermore, it is assumed that there must be an upper
limit to the velocity difference between two time points a few milliseconds apart. The
algorithm accordingly discards a detected velocity that differs too much from the
previous velocity. Discarded velocities are displayed for reference and transparency as
to the behavior of the algorithm.

The E-waves were then used to compute the PDF parameters. The PDF
formalism characterizes the suction-initiated transmitral or transtricuspid flow. This is
analogous to the kinematics of a previously displaced, damped, harmonic oscillator after
it recoils from a resting state. This methodology utilizes Newton's Second Law, with the
predictions of the E-wave contours parametrized on the basis of the chamber stiffness, relaxation/viscoelasticity, and the load. The equation that describes the balance of forces in a damped harmonic oscillator is:

\[
m \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} + c \frac{dx}{dt} + kx = 0
\]  

(1)

where \( m \) (g), \( c \) (g/s) and \( k \) (g/s²) represent inertia, relaxation (damping) and ventricular stiffness/elastic recoil (spring constant), respectively. The parameter \( x_0 \) (cm) indicates the load and represents the initial displacement of the spring before motion, which corresponds to the elastic strain stored in the myocardium and surrounding structures available at the mitral or tricuspid valve openings that facilitate the mechanical recoil (Kovács et al. 1987; Bauman et al. 2004; Shmuylovich and Kovács 2006). When the initial velocity (\( dx/dt \)) of the system is zero, this corresponds to no transmitral or transtricuspid flow prior to the valve opening. The inertial term \( m \) (g) is normalized to 1 in order to enable the computation of \( c \) and \( k \) per unit mass. These parameters (\( k \), \( c \), and \( x_0 \)) can be directly determined from the clinical E-wave contour. The estimated model parameters are averaged values within the cardiac phase of interest. Expressions describing the velocity of motion as a function of time are derived from the foundational equation (1). For underdamped cases, which are defined by \( c^2 - 4k < 0 \), the expression for the velocity (\( v \)) as a function of time (\( t \)) is

\[
v(t) = \frac{-kx_0}{\omega} \exp(-c \cdot t/2) \cdot \sin(\omega \cdot t)
\]  

(2)

where
For the overdamped cases, which are defined by \( c^2 - 4k > 0 \), the expression is

\[
v(t) = \frac{-kx_0}{\beta} \exp(-c \cdot t/2) \cdot \sin(\beta \cdot t)
\]

where

\[
\beta = \sqrt{c^2 - 4k}/2
\]

For critically damped cases, which are defined by \( c^2 - 4k = 0 \), the expression is

\[
v(t) = -kx_0 \cdot t \cdot \exp(-c \cdot t/2)
\]

The output of the Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm is used to determine the PDF parameter values for \( k \), \( c \), and \( x_0 \), while the E-wave maximum velocity envelope is used as the input via a custom LabVIEW 2016 (National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA) interface. The gold-standard methods (simultaneous micromanometric hemodynamics and echocardiography) have been extensively used to validate the physiological interpretation. Results have shown these parameters are causally related to the chamber properties that determine diastolic function (Kovács et al. 1987; Kovács et al. 1997; Kovács et al. 2000; Lisauskas et al. 2001). Physiological conditions can additionally be determined from the damped harmonic oscillator derived parameters such as \( kx_0 \), which is the peak force in the spring that corresponds to the peak atrioventricular pressure gradient that generates the E-wave (Kovács et al. 1987; Bauman et al. 2004); \( 1/2kx_0^2 \), which indicates the stored potential elastic energy that is capable of generating the recoil (Kovács et al. 1987); the peak resistive force (\( cE_{\text{peak}} \)),
which is the force that resists filling at the peak flow; and $c^2-4k$, which indicates the
balance between the factors both driving and resisting the ventricular filling (Kovács et
al. 1987; Bauman et al. 2004; Shmuylovich and Kovács 2006). The consecutive 5
selected beats in each subject were used to calculate the $c$, $k$, and $x_0$ averages, as well as
the other indexes that corresponded to the determinants of the E-wave.

In the first step of our study, we compared the kinematic model parameters $c$, $k$, and $x_0$ between the LV and the RV in the control group in order to assess the
characteristics of the normal RV diastolic physiology. Subsequently, results from the
E-waves in the PAH group were compared with those obtained from the normal RV to
elucidate the RV diastolic pathophysiology during the RV pressure overload.

**Statistical analysis**

All data are expressed as mean ± SD or as median with range from the
minimum to maximum. The significance of difference was determined using the
Mann–Whitney U-test or Student’s $t$-test, as appropriate. Linear regression analyses
were performed for correlations between the kinematic parameters and hemodynamic
parameters, and Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated. All statistical data
were analyzed using Prism (version 6.0: GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA) and
JMP 11 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA). $P < 0.05$ (2-sided) was considered to
indicate significance. Intra-observer variability was assessed by one investigator, who
conducted measurements on the same patients 8 weeks apart, while the inter-observer
variability was assessed by a second investigator who was unaware of the previous
results and performed the same measurements on 20 randomly selected participants.
Intra- and inter-observer agreements were assessed using intraclass correlation
coefficients (ICCs). In addition, agreement between investigators was tested using a
Bland-Altman analysis by calculating the bias (mean difference) and 1.96 SD around the mean difference.

**Results**

None of the subjects were excluded from the analysis due to suboptimal Doppler E-wave recordings. As a result, the study population comprised 10 PAH patients (PAH group: mean age ± SD, 12.8 ± 5.4 years; age range, 8–19 years) and 34 healthy subjects (control group: 11.3 ± 3.4 years; 7–19 years). Table 1 presents the participants’ clinical and echocardiographic data, along with the ranges. The groups were well matched, and no statistically significant differences were observed between the groups for any of the clinical categories. Figure 1 shows 2 representative examples of transtricuspid Doppler E-wave velocity profile edge detection and fitted curves. These examples demonstrate the method and process on how the digitized E-wave image was used to determine the maximum velocity envelope, from which the automated PDF fit was obtained.

**PDF indexes of normal LV and RV in the control group**

The kinematic model parameters were compared between the normal LV and RV. In the control group, k, c, and x₀ were significantly lower in the normal RV versus the normal LV (Table 2). These results indicate that normal RV exhibits lower stiffness/elastic recoil, superior cross-bridge relaxation, and a lower initial load. Model validation was assessed in all 34 participants. During the assessment of the kinematic model fit, there was a consistent and significantly lower mean square error (MSE, cm²/s²) for the RV versus the LV, thereby demonstrating that a mathematical difference between the detected envelop and the fitting curve is smaller. This might result from the fine fitting of RV diastolic performance to the PDF model, or less noise/scattering in
the ultrasound signal of the tricuspid flow.

Conventional RV diastolic parameters in the control and PAH groups

Table 3 shows the conventional and kinematic model-based diastolic parameters in the control and PAH groups. The E-peak was significantly lower, whereas the A-peak was significantly higher in the PAH versus the control group. Similarly, the value of e′ was significantly lower, while a′ was significantly higher in the PAH group. E-waves of the PAH group revealed there was a significantly shorter AT, whereas there was no significant difference found between the PAH and control subjects for DT. Furthermore, there was no significant difference for the value of E/e′ between the 2 groups. Guidelines for the echocardiographic assessment of the right heart from the American Society of Echocardiography (ASE) recommend using the 3 Doppler parameters, E/A, E/e′, and DT, for the evaluation of RV diastolic dysfunction (Rudski et al. 2010). The normal range of E/A has been shown to be 0.8 to 2.1, with an E/e′ >6 and DT <120 ms defined as indicative of an abnormal diastolic function. Since these criteria are adapted for adults, we understand that assessments using these criteria could be relatively problematic in our subjects (Rudski et al. 2010; Berman et al. 1990; Innelli et al. 2009; Zoghbi et al. 1990). Our results showed that only the E/A ratio exhibited a significant difference between the control and PAH groups, whereas there was no significant difference in E/e′ and DT (Fig.2A-C).

Kinematic model-based diastolic parameters of the RV in the PAH group

As compared to the control group, the PAH group exhibited significantly greater values for the parameters k (182.5 ± 72.4 g/s² vs. 135.7 ± 49.5 g/s², p = 0.0232) and c (21.9 ± 6.5 g/s vs. 10.6 ± 5.2 g/s, p <0.0001). These results demonstrate that the PAH RV has a higher stiffness and inferior active relaxation in diastole. The PAH and
control groups had an indistinguishable initial load prior to the tricuspid valve opening (x₀: 7.7 ± 2.4 cm in PAH; 8.2 ± 2.9 cm in the control group) (Fig. 2D-F). The PAH group also exhibited greater values of cE\-peak, kx₀, and 1/2kx₀² (Table 3).

Correlation between kinematic parameters and RV performance in the PAH group

In order to analyze the relationships between the kinematic –based parameter values and PAH severity and RV systolic performance, we evaluated the correlation between kinematic parameters and RVFAC (right ventricular fractional area change) and TRPG (tricuspid regurgitation peak gradient) (Fig. 3A-F). RVFAC did not have significant correlation with k, c, and x₀. Although there was significant correlation between TRPG and k (r = 0.778, p = 0.0008), TRPG did not have significant correlation with c and x₀.

Reproducibility

To assess the reproducibilities of the conventional and the kinematic parameters, intra- and inter-observer variabilities in the measurements were confirmed in 20 randomly selected participants (15 control and 5 PAH) by means of ICCs and Bland-Altman analysis (Table 4). With the exception for the AT, the ICCs of the kinematic model-based parameters, k, c, and x₀, for intra- and inter-observer variabilities were relatively lower than conventional parameters, which included the E\-peak, A\-peak, DT, e', and a'. However, the Bland-Altman analysis showed there was a minimal bias physiologically and clinically, in addition to a substantial agreement for reproducibility.

Discussion

The present study demonstrated that the causality-based RV diastolic function
assessment by analysis of the tricuspid E-waves via the PDF method generated
parameters of chamber stiffness/elastic recoil and relaxation/viscosity that could be
differentiated between the PAH patients and the age-matched control subjects.

The parameter k represents the chamber stiffness/elastic recoil property. Due
to its thin wall, the RV is considered to be a passive compliant chamber, and thus, the
parameter k of the RV was found to be much lower than that for the LV in the control
group. Recent studies have demonstrated RV hypertrophy with extracellular collagen
deposition (Rain et al. 2013), increased sarcomeric stiffness ((Rain et al. 2014), and
changes in the giant elastic protein titin isoform and phosphorylation (LeWinter and
contributes closely to stiffening of the cardiomyocytes.

Chamber stiffness (dP/dV) as evaluated by invasive cardiac catheterization, has
been shown to be linearly related to the spring constant k (g/s²) (Kovács et al. 1997;
Kovács et al. 2001: Lisauskas et al. 2001). It has been shown that PDF analysis of the
Doppler E-wave can accurately determine the LV diastatic passive chamber stiffness
(Mossahebi and Kovács 2012). The higher k value for the RV in the PAH group is
consistent with an elevated RV filling pressure.

Kinematically, the lumped viscoelastic (resistive) properties of the system are
represented by the c parameter. Thus, any source of energy loss that opposes motion
during the filling are considered to be a part of the physiological analog. Increased
values of c can be manifested by various factors that can influence filling via an energy
loss. These factors can include blood viscosity, delayed relaxation, dynamic friction
during sarcomere lengthening that occurs as the detached myosin heads slide past the
thin filaments, pericardial effects, and the viscosity of the extracellular matrix (Dent et
al. 2001: Kass 2003: Chung et al. 2011). Changes in intracellular calcium handling and
high myofilament calcium sensitivity in PAH have been reported to impair proper
relaxation of cardiomyocytes (Rain et al. 2016). Moreover, these pathological conditions are known to affect the kinematic model parameters.

The $x_0$ value is related to the load responsible for compressing the elastic myocardium at the end of systole, which is a prerequisite in order for the restoring force to arise. The $x_0$ value is also closely related to the velocity time integral (VTI) of the $E$-wave. In normal subjects, the parameter $x_0$ was lower in the RV versus the LV. This might be because of the difference of the area at the tip of the valve leaflets found between them. Furthermore, this could possibly be due to the difference of the E/A ratio, Doppler beam angle, and respiratory condition present at the time of the recording. In our current study, there was no significant difference in the volumetric preload parameter $x_0$ between the control and PAH groups. This value is specifically determined by several factors, including stroke volume, volumetric E/A ratio, RV filling pressure, and right atrial pressure. This finding suggests that during pathological conditions, these PAH patients maintained the stroke volume while at rest.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first application of kinematic model parameters obtained from transtricuspid $E$-wave contours for use in assessing RV diastolic function. Our data also showed that the initial maximum recoil force ($kx_0$) and the stored potential elastic energy ($1/2kx_0^2$) were significantly higher in the PAH versus the control group. The product $kx_0$, which is analogous to the maximum atrioventricular pressure gradient that generates the $E$-wave by mechanical suction, represents the initial peak force in the spring. The results of a previous investigation that found the $kx_0$ was more consistent than the modified Bernoulli equation ($PG = 4V^2$; $PG$, pressure gradient; $V$, blood flow velocity) with regard to predicting the instantaneous maximum pressure gradient also validates the above predictions (Bauman et al. 2004).

Kinematically, the potential energy in the spring prior to its release is represented by $1/2kx_0^2$. The physiological analog for this factor is the stored elastic
strain energy that is available at the tricuspid valve opening. This energy generates the chamber recoil, which leads to the generation of the E-wave. The significantly greater values for $kx_0$ and $1/2kx_0^2$ in the PAH group suggest that an adaptive mechanism via the hypertrophic RV chamber is required in order to maintain a stroke volume. This is shown by our results that indicated that there was no significant difference for the load $x_0$ between the control and PAH groups. However, this occurs at the cost of increased energy utilization. In addition, our data also indicated that the $cE'$-peak was significantly higher in the PAH patients versus the control subjects, which indicates a higher resistance (impaired relaxation) to the RV filling. A greater atrioventricular pressure gradient $kx_0$ (and consequently, $1/2kx_0^2$) would be expected to be generated in response to increased damping (resistive losses) of the tricuspid flow, as is manifested by greater values of $c$ and $cE'$-peak, in order to maintain the load $x_0$ or stroke volume.

Although previous reports and the ASE guidelines have suggested the usefulness of conventional parameters in the assessment of RV diastolic dysfunction (Okumura et al. 2014; Rudski et al. 2010; Sade et al. 2007; Sundereswaran et al. 1998; Leeuwenburgh et al. 2002), the utilization of these parameters has remained controversial (Sade et al. 2007; Sundereswaran et al. 1998; Leeuwenburgh et al. 2002). The present study revealed that $E/e'$ and DT of the tricuspid E-wave did not exhibit any significant differences between the control and PAH groups, whereas there was a significant difference for the E/A. This discrepancy regarding the usefulness of the conventional indexes might be associated with the subjects’ age, disease duration, and pathological severity. Moreover, the progression of the RV diastolic function deterioration, which consists of active relaxation and stiffness/elastic recoil, might differ between children and adults.

In most of the studies that have examined these differences, results indicated
there was a modest correlation between the E/A ratio and increasing age (Innelli et al. 2009; Zoghbi et al. 1990). Since the peak velocity of E-wave increases during inspiration, this causes an increase in the E/A ratio. Furthermore, while increases in the E′-peak are caused by tachycardia, a relatively greater increase in the A′-peak will result in a decrease in the E/A ratio (Zoghbi et al. 1990; Yu et al. 2003).

These parameters are also sensitive to changes in preload. Thus, while a reduction in the preload will lead to a decrease in E, there will be a relatively smaller decrease in A, thereby causing the E/A to decrease (Guazzi et al. 2000; O’Sullivan et al. 2005; Pelà et al. 2004). However, it should be noted that since the conventional echocardiographic diastolic function indexes are empirical, these values will not provide any mechanistic information on the chamber property, e.g., stiffness and relaxation.

Moreover, since E′-wave parameters are not derived from basic physiologic principles that govern filling, these parameters are considered to be load dependent (King et al. 2008; Paelinck et al. 2003; Pepi et al. 2000). In addition, the complex interplay of simultaneous physiologic determinants and chamber properties are responsible for generating these indexes (such as E/A). Moreover, a previous study has demonstrated that E′-wave DT was specifically dependent upon both the chamber stiffness and the chamber relaxation/viscoelasticity (Shmuylovich and Kovács 2007).

We applied the PDF formalism in order to elucidate the RV diastolic property in the present investigation. In this study, we attempted to characterize the kinematic properties of the diastolic chamber. In order to define the individual components of each E′-wave, we used the digitized E′-wave contour as input, along with the best-fit, mathematically unique \((c, k, \text{and } x_0)\) parameters. All the global physiologic determinants of the contour were accounted for by the 3 lumped parameters \(c, k, \text{and } x_0\). RV diastolic dysfunction determines ventricular performance and patient outcomes for many conditions. Moreover, this dysfunction may precede the apparent systolic
dysfunction (Rudski et al. 2010; Leeuwenburgh et al. 2002; Dernellis 2001; Gan et al. 2007).

Overall, we believe that our current findings indicate that there are great clinical implications for this method with regard to the management of PAH patients.

**Study limitations**

As the aim of the present study was to establish the kinematic parameters as RV diastolic functional indexes, we attempted to validate these parameters by evaluating the normal LV, normal RV, and PAH RV diastolic function. Although we analyze the relation between the parameter values and the PAH severity (TRPG), only the parameter k was correlated with TRPG. RVFAC did not have significant correlation with k, c, and xo. We consider that since the present study population was small, and the patients' clinical courses and treatment were heterogeneous, it might be not appropriate to undertake a detailed analysis with sufficient statistical power to detect statistically reliable significance. Further studies will be needed in order to determine whether these parameters might be useful evaluation tools and could become the gold standard for assessing RV diastolic function and for predicting the prognosis of patients with this disease.

In the present investigation, we did not perform invasive cardiac catheterization examination to confirm the feasibility of the kinematic model indexes. However, with the combined pressure conductance catheter, it has become possible to simultaneously determine the ventricular pressure and volume. Since this gold standard method for measuring load-independent diastolic stiffness by pressure-volume (PV) analysis requires temporal preload reduction, this procedure is not without risk in PAH patients (Senzaki and Kass 2010). However, the development of single-beat analyses of the diastolic PV relationship have helped to circumvent this issue in left
heart failure patients (Klotz et al. 2006). Even so, whether the use of this analysis can be conducted for the RV in PAH patients remains unclear. Furthermore, it can be quite difficult to assess the RV diastolic function when using PV analysis, as precise RV volumetric measurements are also challenging. Moreover, unlike for stiffness (dP/dV), currently there is no simple catheterization-based analog that can be used for the relaxation parameter c. As a result, it might not necessarily be useful to perform cardiac catheterization in order to confirm the utility of these model-based parameters.

Conclusions

This study demonstrated the feasibility and usefulness of the causality-based kinematic model parameters obtained from the transtricuspid E-wave contours for characterizing the RV diastolic pathophysiological property.
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Figure captions list

Figure 1
Quantitation of diastolic function via the PDF formalism.
Representative A-wave Doppler images from a normal subject (A, B) and a PAH patient (C, D) are shown. Doppler A-wave velocity profile edge detection and fitted curves were shown. The digitized A-wave maximum velocity envelope is identified (A, C) and fitted using the Levenberg-Marquardt method by the solution to the PDF model (B, D), which yielded the 3 unique best fit PDF parameters of chamber stiffness k, relaxation c, and initial load x_0.
Control subject (A, B) parameters: x_0 = 11.4 cm, c = 10.1 g/s, k = 88.6 g/s^2; MSE 5.3 cm^2/s^2.
PAH patient (C, D) parameters: x_0 = 9.2 cm, c = 27.7 g/s, k = 148.1 g/s^2; MSE 5.1 cm^2/s^2.

Figure 2
Conventional and kinematic model-based RV diastolic parameters.
The values of E/A (A), E/e′ (B), DT (C), k (D), c (E), and x_0 (F) were compared between the control and the PAH groups.
Boxes, IQR: Central line, median; Whiskers, minimum and maximum.

Figure 3
Correlation between the kinematic model parameters and RV performance in patients with PAH.
RVFAC had no significant correlation with k (A), c (B), and x_0 (C). There was significant correlation between TRPG and k (D), whereas there were no significant correlation with c (E) and x_0 (F). Linear regression lines with the 95% confidence interval (dashed
lines) are indicated. RVFAC, right ventricular fractional area change; TRPG, tricuspid regurgitation peak gradient
Table 1. Clinical characteristics of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control (n = 34)</th>
<th>PAH (n = 10)</th>
<th>p values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (male/female)</strong></td>
<td>15/19</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (y)</strong></td>
<td>11.3 ± 3.4</td>
<td>12.8 ± 5.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 – 19)</td>
<td>(8 – 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight (kg)</strong></td>
<td>38.6 ± 13.4</td>
<td>39.2 ± 15.1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.1 - 66.0)</td>
<td>(20.2 – 63.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (cm)</strong></td>
<td>141.4 ± 20.6</td>
<td>144.9 ± 18.1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.0 – 172.2)</td>
<td>(112.0 – 171.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body surface area (m²)</strong></td>
<td>1.21 ± 0.34</td>
<td>1.24 ± 0.33</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.71 – 1.73)</td>
<td>(0.77 – 1.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heart rate (bpm)</strong></td>
<td>65 ± 11</td>
<td>66 ± 11</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52 – 93)</td>
<td>(54 – 84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVESD (mm)</strong></td>
<td>44.8 ± 5.8</td>
<td>40.8 ± 6.8</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.0 – 49.8)</td>
<td>(31.0 – 49.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVFS (%)</strong></td>
<td>44.4 ± 3.9</td>
<td>41.4 ± 4.9</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38.0 – 48.8)</td>
<td>(38 – 48.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVEF (%)</strong></td>
<td>70.3 ± 3.4</td>
<td>71.3 ± 6.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64.0 – 78.2)</td>
<td>(63.1 – 80.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RVFAC (%)</strong></td>
<td>50.8 ± 5.9</td>
<td>28.6 ± 5.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43.0 – 60.1)</td>
<td>(20.0 – 35.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transmitral flow</strong></td>
<td>0.95 ± 0.11</td>
<td>0.75±0.19</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-wave (m/s)</strong></td>
<td>(0.65 – 1.15)</td>
<td>(0.52 – 1.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-wave (m/s)</strong></td>
<td>(0.15 – 0.59)</td>
<td>(0.45 – 0.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transtricuspid flow</strong></td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-wave (m/s)</strong></td>
<td>(0.34 – 0.73)</td>
<td>(0.29 – 0.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-wave (m/s)</strong></td>
<td>0.31±0.10</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.11 – 0.49)</td>
<td>(0.25 – 0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitral annular motion</strong></td>
<td>18.6 ± 2.4</td>
<td>9.3 ± 2.2</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e' wave (cm/s)</strong></td>
<td>(13.2 – 24.0)</td>
<td>(5.6 – 12.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a' wave (cm/s)</strong></td>
<td>6.7 ± 1.8</td>
<td>10.3 ± 2.3</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.1 – 11.1)</td>
<td>(6.8 – 12.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9 ± 1.9</td>
<td>8.4 ± 2.1</td>
<td>0.0378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.8 – 12.9)</td>
<td>(5.6 – 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tricuspid annular motion</strong></td>
<td>13.5 ± 2.9</td>
<td>8.9 ± 1.7</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e' wave (cm/s)</strong></td>
<td>(9.5 – 19.0)</td>
<td>(6.7 – 12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 ± 2.3</td>
<td>12.9 ± 2.8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a' wave (cm/s)</strong></td>
<td>(4.6 – 13.0)</td>
<td>(9.5 – 18.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 ± 3.92</td>
<td>10.2 ± 2.1</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.5 – 16.2)</td>
<td>(6.5 – 13.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRPG (mmHg)</strong></td>
<td>50.4 ± 11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41 – 80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time on treatment (years)</strong></td>
<td>5.1 ± 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 – 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment</strong></td>
<td>Epoprostenol 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosentan 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data are shown as mean ± SD, with the range shown in parentheses.

LVEDD, left ventricular end-diastolic dimension; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVFS, left ventricular fractional shortening; RVFAC, right ventricular fractional area change; TRPG, tricuspid regurgitation peak gradient; n.s., not significant.
Table 2. Comparison of the kinematic model-based parameters between LV and RV in normal subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Normal LV (n = 34)</th>
<th>Normal RV (n = 34)</th>
<th>p values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k (g/s²)</td>
<td>247.3 ± 59.4</td>
<td>135.7 ± 49.5</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(140.6 – 385.5)</td>
<td>(44.9 – 263.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (g/s)</td>
<td>17.5 ± 5.8</td>
<td>10.6 ± 5.2</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.6 – 29.5)</td>
<td>(3.0 – 20.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₀ (cm)</td>
<td>11.7 ± 2.4</td>
<td>8.2 ± 2.9</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.8 – 16.0)</td>
<td>(3.9 – 13.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE (cm²/s²)</td>
<td>29.2 ± 15.9</td>
<td>8.3 ± 5.0</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.3 – 69.4)</td>
<td>(1.8 – 25.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are shown as mean ± SD, with the range shown in parentheses.

MSE, mean square error; n.s., not significant.
Table 3. Comparison of RV diastolic functional parameters between the control and PAH groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Normal RV (n = 34)</th>
<th>PAH RV (n = 10)</th>
<th>p values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-peak (m/s)</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.09 (0.34 – 0.73)</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.07 (0.29 – 0.52)</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-peak (m/s)</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.10 (0.11 – 0.49)</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.13 (0.25 – 0.62)</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT (ms)</td>
<td>111.9 ± 24.3 (71 – 199)</td>
<td>80.1 ± 8.4 (64 – 91)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT (ms)</td>
<td>192.1 ± 63.0 (113 – 395)</td>
<td>201.9 ± 106.5 (110 – 367)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/A</td>
<td>1.83 ± 0.73 (0.89 – 3.70)</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.33 (0.61 – 1.69)</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e′ (cm/s)</td>
<td>13.5 ± 2.9 (9.5 – 19.0)</td>
<td>8.9 ± 1.7 (6.7 – 12.5)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a′ (cm/s)</td>
<td>7.6 ± 2.3 (4.6 – 13.0)</td>
<td>12.9 ± 2.8 (9.5 – 18.5)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e′/a′</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.5 (0.91 – 2.9)</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.2 (0.49 – 1.1)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/e′</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.1 (2.1 – 6.5)</td>
<td>4.7 ± 1.1 (2.8 – 6.6)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k (g/s²)</td>
<td>135.7 ± 49.5 (44.9 – 263.5)</td>
<td>182.5 ± 72.4 (106.5 – 368.8)</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (g/s)</td>
<td>10.6 ± 5.2 (3.0 – 20.6)</td>
<td>21.9 ± 6.5 (12.1 – 34.5)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₀ (cm)</td>
<td>8.2 ± 2.9 (3.9 – 13.8)</td>
<td>7.7 ± 2.4 (4.0 – 11.2)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE (cm²/s²)</td>
<td>8.3 ± 5.0 (1.8 – 25.4)</td>
<td>5.3 ± 5.3 (0.8 – 17.2)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c²-4k (s²)</td>
<td>-404.2 ± 196.3 (-884.1 – 37.3)</td>
<td>-210.9±504.9 (-1136.8 – 762.5)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kx₀ (dyn)</td>
<td>1039.2 ± 361.8 (388.5 – 2156.3)</td>
<td>1270.3 ± 168.9 (951.0 – 1482.2)</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2kx₀² (erg)</td>
<td>4480.8 ± 1731.2 (1001.9 – 11301.3)</td>
<td>4916.9 ± 1815.8 (2184.2 – 7706.0)</td>
<td>0.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cE-peak (dyn)</td>
<td>544.0 ± 300.3 (141.8 – 1344.1)</td>
<td>857.5 ± 1704.1 (471.4 – 1072.1)</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are shown as mean ± SD, with the range shown in parentheses.

AT, E-wave acceleration time; DT, E-wave deceleration time; MSE, mean square error; n.s., not significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intra-observer variation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Inter-observer variation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICC (95% CI)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Bland-Altman Bias (95% LOA)</td>
<td>ICC (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-peak (m/s)</td>
<td>0.987 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.951 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.967 – 0.995)</td>
<td>(-0.04 to 0.03)</td>
<td>(0.877 – 0.980)</td>
<td>(-0.10 to 0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-peak (m/s)</td>
<td>0.910 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.882 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.787 – 0.964)</td>
<td>(-0.08 to 0.10)</td>
<td>(0.720 – 0.953)</td>
<td>(-0.11 to 0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT (ms)</td>
<td>0.803 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.743 0.0002</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.559 – 0.919)</td>
<td>(-21.7 to 20.0)</td>
<td>(0.448 – 0.892)</td>
<td>(-23.1 to 25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT (ms)</td>
<td>0.954 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.885 – 0.982)</td>
<td>(-52.4 to 57.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-88.2 to 49.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e' (cm/s)</td>
<td>0.965 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.911 – 0.986)</td>
<td>(-1.25 to 1.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.44 to 2.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a' (cm/s)</td>
<td>0.990 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.974 – 0.996)</td>
<td>(-1.13 to 1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.44 to 1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k (g/s²)</td>
<td>0.893 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.744 – 0.957)</td>
<td>(-42.16 to 38.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-48.00 to 48.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (g/s)</td>
<td>0.899 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>2.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7522 – 0.961)</td>
<td>(-5.01 to 7.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.39 to 9.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₀ (cm)</td>
<td>0.891 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.739 – 0.956)</td>
<td>(-1.5 to 1.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.5 to 2.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are shown as mean ± SD, with the range shown in parentheses.
ICC, intraclass correlation coefficient; LOA, limits of agreement defined as the mean difference ± 1.96 SD of differences; n.s., not significant.
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A. $k$ (g/s²) vs. RVFAC (%)
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