

*Editorial for CIRCCVIM/2017/007451-T3
Progression of Hypertrophy and Myocardial Fibrosis in Aortic Stenosis:
A Multicenter Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Study*

Myocardial Hypertrophy, Matrix Expansion And Focal Scar – Progression And Regression In Aortic Stenosis

Treibel TA^{1,2}, Scully PR^{1,2}, Moon JC^{1,2}.

Affiliations:

¹ Institute for Cardiovascular Sciences, University College London, London, UK.

² Barts Health NHS Trust and University College London, London, United Kingdom.

Total Word count: 1978 (including references)

Keywords: Myocardial fibrosis, T1 mapping, magnetic resonance imaging, aortic stenosis.

Financial Support: TAT and JCM directly and indirectly supported by the University College London Hospitals NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and Biomedical Research Unit at Barts Hospital, respectively. PRS is supported by a clinical research training fellowship of the British Heart Foundation.

Disclosures: None.

Correspondence to Prof James C Moon, Barts Heart Centre, St Bartholomew's Hospital, 2nd Floor, King George V Block, London EC1A 7BE, United Kingdom.
Email: james.moon@bartshealth.nhs.uk Tel: +442034563081, Fax: +442034563086.

Severe aortic stenosis (AS) is common. Once symptomatic or left ventricular (LV) impairment develops, current guidelines recommend aortic valve replacement (AVR) to improve survival and symptom status.¹ But the etiology of symptoms may be difficult to ascertain in the elderly with multiple co-morbidities, and indeed LV impairment may be late – occurring potentially after irreversible changes have occurred in the heart, which in turn may result in residual risk to patients even after AVR. The current focus of AS management remains the valve itself, however over the last decade there has been increasing recognition of the importance of the myocardium. The stenosed valve is the insult – necessary, but perhaps not sufficient to cause the adverse consequences of AS. How the myocardium responds is equally important and may determine the urgency of intervention. The myocardium itself is adaptable – but there are limits. In response to afterload, early changes are benign and physiologically appropriate with myocardial cellular hypertrophy and proportionate extracellular matrix (ECM) expansion to maintain wall stress. However, the afterload of AS is proximal to the coronary origins so reduction of microvascular function starts with reduced capillary density, compensatory vasodilation and impaired myocardial blood flow – so even if myocytes were infinitely adaptable, compensation through adaptation cannot be indefinite.^{2, 3} Further, increasingly maladaptive changes occur with cell death by apoptosis or autophagy, microvascular ischemia, alterations of ECM components (e.g. increased collagen I and III deposition),⁴ and the development of irreversible microscars particularly in the subendocardium. The combination of an increasingly precarious systemic circulation with its physiological autonomic adaptability lost, and myocardium, that is now heterogeneous, ischemic and arrhythmogenic, is dangerous. Arrhythmia becomes increasingly likely and intolerable due to hypoperfusion-related positive feedback. Many of the processes

leading to these scenarios are detectable. Transvalvular gradients and by inference myocardial perfusion pressures, left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) and cardiac function have long been measurable. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) adds extra information with late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) detecting focal fibrosis and T1 mapping for the derived parameter that is extracellular volume fraction (ECV), which reflects fibrosis burden and its reciprocal ($1-ECV=ICV$) reflecting the cell (mainly myocyte) volume.^{5, 6} These can be expressed either as proportions (ECV in %) or as absolute volumes if the ECV or ICV are multiplied by the myocardial volume; this matrix volume or iECV is therefore obtained by the simple equation of $LVM/1.05*ECV$ (1.05 being the specific gravity of the myocardium). With this armamentarium at our disposal, we can now better interrogate the biology of LVH.^{7, 8}

In the current issue, Everett et al⁹ report serial imaging using the above methods in two cohorts of patients with AS – one asymptomatic group (mild, moderate or severe AS) under a watchful-waiting regimen and one symptomatic group undergoing surgical AVR. What they found was that without intervention, the AS severity progressed (by peak velocity and valve area), with increased filling pressures. Myocardial changes were: a decrease in longitudinal function, increased hypertrophy (wall thickness, mass) and, importantly, increased amounts of focal fibrosis (LGE). Indeed, there appeared to be an acceleration in AS progression, coupled with scar number and extent. Diffuse fibrosis remained in proportion to cell volume during this phase, however. In the cohort of patients undergoing AVR, LV mass regression did occur due to a reduction in both myocyte and interstitial volume (by the ECV technique) – both parameters demonstrating plasticity and reversibility,

but with the cellular hypertrophy regression more (so the ECV rose post AVR). Scar however did not reverse.

The authors should be lauded for delivering a well-conducted cross-sectional two center CMR AS study, with all the challenges of using different MRI field strengths and sequence parameters. The multiparametric approach (LGE and ECV imaging) in the current study provides important pathophysiological insight into the natural history of LV remodeling in AS. The postoperative data confirm the results of the RELIEF-AS Study (NCT02174471) demonstrating in 116 patients at 1-year post-AVR a 19% regression in indexed LV mass, 16% reduction in matrix volume and a proportionally greater 22% reduction in cell volume with focal fibrosis being irreversible.⁸ What is new is the insights into the accumulation over time of LGE – with its near absence in mild AS (with minimal annual change), but increasing accumulation with moderate and severe AS. We know that small amounts of LGE in AS reflect much larger changes in the myocardium – indeed patients with severe AS and LGE on CMR have 1000s of microscars, with a subendocardial preponderance and marked thickening of the endocardium^{4, 10, 11} coupled with alterations in the qualitative nature of the fibrosis, its maturity, tensile properties and collagen subtypes. There may in addition be other processes at play. LGE represents focal interstitial water, usually fibrosis but it can also be inflammation or amyloid. One recent AVR study showed a 6% prevalence of wild type ATTR amyloidosis at biopsy¹² and two recent studies have shown a prevalence of 1 in 7 using bone scintigraphy in (older) patients undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement^{13, 14}

Does this matter, and how can we use these insights to improve patient care? Judicious timing of surgical or transcatheter intervention is likely to lead to better outcomes. Intervening too early front-loads procedural risk, in some cases may be un-

necessary and may expose patients to on-going risk (anticoagulation, endocarditis, valve failure). Conversely, watchful waiting risks the loss of some patients from sudden death, the conversion of elective surgery in stable patients to salvage surgery in decompensation, and, importantly, the potential accrual by patients of risk or limitation that persists post procedure. There is emerging evidence for this concept of residual risk and of the consequences of delay. Some patients without overt symptoms may be reluctant to undergo surgery, but we need to be careful and look at long-term outcomes. In the CURRENT AS registry, 3 year mortality was 9% in patients who had early AVR compared to 17.9% in propensity-matched patients who were initially managed conservatively.¹⁵ Acute decompensation in watchful waiting strategies is increasingly recognised,¹⁶ and the recently presented AS700 multicenter study suggested that the presence of myocardial scar (present in half of patients with severe AS undergoing AVR) was associated with a doubling of death rates and 3.5 years – the full paper is awaited. New approaches are being explored.¹⁷ The EVOLVED-AS study (NCT03094143) is currently recruiting to investigate whether we can reduce the incidence of heart failure and death by timing intervention based on the presence of scar by MRI, troponin elevation or adverse ECG changes prior to the development of symptoms.

Finally, we remind that although the CMR cell-versus-matrix approach appears relatively new, we acknowledge the pioneering work of Franz Schwarz and colleagues in 1978 who used invasive biopsy to divide LVH into cellular and fibrotic components in AS – in the era of CMR we can now reveal the dynamic changes and track response to therapy.¹⁰ But really this is not about CMR or techniques – it's about patients. We need to think about aortic stenosis as a disease of the myocardium where we should be seeking to avoid irreversible 'AS cardiomyopathy' – and, if that

is unavoidable (first presentation being late in many patients), consider strategies after valve replacement to mitigate residual risk. These approaches may, given how common AS is, yield great improvements in patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Baumgartner H, Falk V, Bax JJ, De Bonis M, Hamm C, Holm PJ, Iung B, Lancellotti P, Lansac E, Rodriguez Munoz D, Rosenhek R, Sjogren J, Tornos Mas P, Vahanian A, Walther T, Wendler O, Windecker S, Zamorano JL and Group ESCSD. 2017 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease. *Eur Heart J*. 2017;38:2739-2791.
2. Rakusan K, Flanagan MF, Geva T, Southern J and Van Praagh R. Morphometry of human coronary capillaries during normal growth and the effect of age in left ventricular pressure-overload hypertrophy. *Circulation*. 1992;86:38-46.
3. Ahn JH, Kim SM, Park SJ, Jeong DS, Woo MA, Jung SH, Lee SC, Park SW, Choe YH, Park PW and Oh JK. Coronary Microvascular Dysfunction as a Mechanism of Angina in Severe AS: Prospective Adenosine-Stress CMR Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67:1412-22.
4. Treibel TA, Lopez B, Gonzalez A, Menacho K, Schofield RS, Ravassa S, Fontana M, White SK, DiSalvo C, Roberts N, Ashworth MT, Diez J and Moon JC. Reappraising myocardial fibrosis in severe aortic stenosis: an invasive and non-invasive study in 133 patients. *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39:699-709.
5. Chin CW, Everett RJ, Kwiecinski J, Vesey AT, Yeung E, Esson G, Jenkins W, Koo M, Mirsadraee S, White AC, Japp AG, Prasad SK, Semple S, Newby DE and Dweck MR. Myocardial Fibrosis and Cardiac Decompensation in Aortic Stenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2016.
6. Treibel TA, Kozor R, Fontana M, Torlasco C, Reant P, Badiani S, Espinoza M, Yap J, Diez J, Hughes AD, Lloyd G and Moon JC. Sex Dimorphism in

the Myocardial Response to Aortic Stenosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2017.

7. Treibel TA, Kozor R, Menacho K, Castelletti S, Bulluck H, Rosmini S, Nordin S, Maestrini V, Fontana M and Moon JC. Left Ventricular Hypertrophy Revisited: Cell and Matrix Expansion Have Disease-Specific Relationships. *Circulation*. 2017;136:2519-2521.
8. Treibel TA, Kozor R, Schofield R, Benedetti G, Fontana M, Bhuvana AN, Sheikh A, Lopez B, Gonzalez A, Manisty C, Lloyd G, Kellman P, Diez J and Moon JC. Reverse Myocardial Remodeling Following Valve Replacement in Patients With Aortic Stenosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;71:860-871.
9. Everett RJ. Progression of Hypertrophy and Myocardial Fibrosis in Aortic Stenosis: A Multicentre Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Study. *Circulation Cardiovascular Imaging*. 2018.
10. Schwarz F, Flameng W, Schaper J, Langebartels F, Sesto M, Hehrlein F and Schlepfer M. Myocardial structure and function in patients with aortic valve disease and their relation to postoperative results. *Am J Cardiol*. 1978;41:661-9.
11. Cheitlin MD, Cheitlin MD, Robinowitz M, Robinowitz M, McAllister H, McAllister H, Hoffman JI, Hoffman JI, Bharati S, Bharati S, Lev M and Lev M. The distribution of fibrosis in the left ventricle in congenital aortic stenosis and coarctation of the aorta. *Circulation*. 1980;62:823-830.
12. Treibel TA, Fontana M, Gilbertson JA, Castelletti S, White SK, Scully PR, Roberts N, Hutt DF, Rowczenio DM, Whelan CJ, Ashworth MA, Gillmore JD, Hawkins PN and Moon JC. Occult Transthyretin Cardiac Amyloid in Severe Calcific Aortic Stenosis: Prevalence and Prognosis in Patients

Undergoing Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2016;9.

13. Scully PR, Treibel TA, Fontana M, Lloyd G, Mullen M, Pugliese F, Hartman N, Hawkins PN, Menezes LJ and Moon JC. Prevalence of Cardiac Amyloidosis in Patients Referred for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;71:463-464.
14. Castano A, Narotsky DL, Hamid N, Khalique OK, Morgenstern R, DeLuca A, Rubin J, Chiuzan C, Nazif T, Vahl T, George I, Kodali S, Leon MB, Hahn R, Bokhari S and Maurer MS. Unveiling transthyretin cardiac amyloidosis and its predictors among elderly patients with severe aortic stenosis undergoing transcatheter aortic valve replacement. *Eur Heart J*. 2017;38:2879-2887.
15. Nagao K, Taniguchi T, Morimoto T, Shiomi H, Ando K, Kanamori N, Murata K, Kitai T, Kawase Y, Izumi C, Miyake M, Mitsuoka H, Kato M, Hirano Y, Matsuda S, Inada T, Murakami T, Takeuchi Y, Yamane K, Toyofuku M, Ishii M, Minamino-Muta E, Kato T, Inoko M, Ikeda T, Komasa A, Ishii K, Hotta K, Higashitani N, Kato Y, Inuzuka Y, Maeda C, Jinnai T, Morikami Y, Saito N, Minatoya K, Kimura T and Investigators CAR. Acute Heart Failure in Patients With Severe Aortic Stenosis- Insights From the CURRENT AS Registry. *Circ J*. 2018;82:874-885.
16. Wald DS, Williams S, Bangash F and Bestwick JP. Watchful Waiting in Aortic Stenosis: The Problem of Acute Decompensation. *Am J Med*. 2018;131:173-177.
17. Musa TA, Treibel TA, Vassilou V, Captur G, Singh A, Chin C, Dobson LE, Pica S, Loudon M, Malley T, Rigolli M, Foley JRJ, Bijsterveld P, Law G,

Dweck M, Myerson S, McCann GP, Prasad S, Moon JC, Greenwood JP.
Myocardial Scar Predicts Mortality in Severe Aortic Stenosis: Data from the
BSCMR Valve Consortium. *European Society of Cardiology Conference
Late Breaking Trials 2017.*