Two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography in assessing the subclinical myocardial dysfunction in patients with gestational diabetes mellitus
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Abstract

Background: Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) may increase the risk of cardiovascular disease and accompany asymptomatic deterioration of the myocardial function. This study aims to identify the subclinical impact of GDM on maternal left ventricular function by two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography (2D-STE).

Methods: We prospectively recruited 47 women with GDM and 62 healthy pregnant women who underwent transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) at 24 to 28 weeks of pregnancy. GDM diagnosis agreed with the IADPSG criteria. TTE was performed according to the criteria of the American Society of Echocardiography. Conventional echocardiographic data and 2D-STE parameters were compared between the two groups.

Results: Age, gestational weeks, heart rate, and conventional echocardiographic parameters had no difference between the two groups. The average LV global longitudinal strain (LV-GLS) of GDM patients was lower than controls (18.14 ± 2.53 vs. 22.36 ± 6.33, p < 0.001), and 31 patients (66%) in our study had an absolute LV-GLS less than 20%. The LA reservoir and conduit strain in patients with GDM were also significantly reduced (32.71 ± 6.64 vs. 38.00 ± 7.06, 20.41 ± 5.69 vs. 25.56 ± 5.73, p < 0.001). However, there was no significant difference in LA contractile function between the two groups. In multiple regression analysis, LV-GLS and LA conduit strain independently associated with GDM.

Conclusions: 2D-STE could detect the subclinical myocardial dysfunction more sensitively than conventional echocardiography, with LV-GLS and LA conduit strain as independent indicators of the GDM impact on maternal cardiac function during pregnancy.
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Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a systemic metabolic disease that may lead to multiple organ dysfunction, among which cardiovascular impairment is relatively prominent [1, 2]. The number of diabetic patients worldwide is increasing rapidly, and it has threatened young people even pregnant women [3, 4]. Gestational diabetes
mellitus (GDM) is a special entity, which refers to dia-
tes first diagnosed during pregnancy [5–7].
Patients with DM may be asymptomatic, with decreased myocardial diastolic function but pre-
served left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) [1, 8].
Two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography
(2D-STE) has become a powerful tool to describe the subclinical deterioration of myocardial function in cardio-
vascular disease. However, it has not been widely intro-
duced to GDM. We assume that the myocardial dysfunc-
tion already exists at the GDM diagnosis. Early detection of subclinical cardiovascular changes may be
 crucial for optimizing clinical management and prevent-
ing future cardiovascular events. Therefore, in this study,
we performed 2D-STE to evaluate the LV diastolic and
 systolic function in patients with GDM and try to deter-
mine parameters that may identify the early impact of
GDM on maternal myocardial function.

Materials and methods

Study population

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of
Harbin Medical University. From October 2020 to Janu-
ary 2021, we recruited 124 consecutive Chinese women
with a singleton pregnancy who underwent comprehen-
sive transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) assessment.
All the patients have signed the informed consent before
examination. Fifteen patients were excluded due to their
poor acoustic window, and finally 47 GDM patients and
62 healthy pregnant women were included in the study.

The International Association of Diabetes and Preg-
nancy Study Groups (IADPSG) defined GDM as any
degree of low glucose tolerance first diagnosed during
pregnancy [9]. The diagnosis of GDM was made by per-
forming the 75 g oral glucose tolerance test (75 g OGTT)
between 24 and 28 weeks. The diagnose criteria includes
fasting plasma glucose (FPG) ≥ 5.1 mmol/l (92 mg/dL),
1-h plasma glucose ≥ 10.0 mmol/l (180 mg/dL), and 2-h
plasma glucose ≥ 8.5 mmol/l (153 mg/dL). In this study,
GDM patients should have normal LVEF (≥ 54%). Demo-
graphic and clinical data were routinely recorded before
their recruitment. The patients have no history of rel-
levant cardiovascular diseases or other metabolic diseases
and deny smoking or drinking habit. The method of con-
ception was natural.

Clinical information

The age, body mass index (BMI), blood pressure (BP),
heart rate (HR), gestational weeks, and blood glucose
level of the study population were queried at their enroll-
ment. BP was measured three times and averaged after
at least ten minutes of rest. BP was measured in a silent
room 5 to 10 min before echocardiography with an
aneroid sphygmomanometer twice in a seated position,
with the right arm at the level of the heart, after 5 min of
rest.

Ultrasound protocol

Conventional echocardiography

Echocardiography was performed by two senior sonogra-
phers (Ziyao Li and Wei Li) on GE Vivid E9 and E95 (GE
Medical Systems, Milwaukee, WI, USA) with an M5S
probe (2.5–4.0 MHz). All data were averaged from three
consecutive cardiac cycles. Patients with poor image
quality were excluded before recruitment. Images were
recorded and studied according to the recommendations
of the American Society of Echocardiography [10].

In the parasternal long-axis view, LV end-diastolic
diameter (LVEDd), interventricular septum (IVS) thick-
ness, posterior wall thickness (PWT), and LV end-
systolic diameter (LVESd) were measured by M-mode
echocardiography. LV mass (LVM) was calculated by
using the Devereux formula [11]: LVM = 0.8 × [(LVEDd + IVS + PWT)3−LVEDd3] + 0.6g. Relative
wall thickness (RWT) was calculated using the formula
RWT = 2 × (PWT/LVEDd). LVEF and LA volume (LAV)
were measured using the bpline Simpson method. LVM,
LAV, and stroke volume (SV) were indexed for body sur-
face area (BSA) to get LV mass index (LVMI), LA volume
index (LAVI), and stroke volume index (SVI), respec-
tively. In the apical four-chamber view, pulse Doppler
and tissue Doppler were performed to measure early diastolic
mitral inflow velocity (E), and early diastolic annular
velocity (e'). And mean e' was the averaged velocity of
the septal and lateral mitral annulus [12].

Two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography

LV global longitudinal strain (LV-GLS) and LA phasic
strain were analyzed offline using EchoPAC software
(version 203, GE Healthcare, Horten, Norway). Allow-
the patient to hold their breath to get ultimate images
of three consecutive cardiac cycles at a frame rate ≥ 60
frames per second. The 2D-STE measurements were per-
formed by two physicians in a double-blinded manner for
intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) testing.

To measure LV-GLS, 2D-STE was performed by tracing
the LV endocardial boundary in the apical three-cham-
ber, four-chamber, and two-chamber views [13]. We use
the apical three-chamber view to identify the aortic valve
closure and then mark the mitral annulus points and apex
in each apical view. The software can track the endocar-
dial border and automatically generate six segments of
longitudinal strain from each apical view separately, and
then LV-GLS is averaged from all those 18 segments.

The biplane (4-chamber and 2-chamber) views were
accepted for LA strain evaluation, according to the
consensus from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging (EACVI)/American Society of Echocardiography (ASE)/Industry Task Force [14]. When tracing the LA endocardial border, the atrial appendage and pulmonary veins were eliminated. Then six segmental LA longitudinal strain curves were automatically presented by the software. An R-R gating protocol was applied to get the LA phasic strain, which including reservoir strain (LA-Sr), conduit strain (LA-Scd), and contractile strain (LA-Sct) [15].

Statistical analysis
Continuous variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation (SD) and compared by the student t-test. We firstly performed the univariate logistic regression to assess the crude correlations between clinical/echocardiographic characteristics and GDM. Variables with a p-value less than 0.05 in univariate regression entered the multivariate models, and a forward “likelihood ratio” selection approach was applied to identify parameters that were independently associated with GDM. The current study conducted two multivariate models which separately included either LV-GLS or LA phasic strain, to better identify their associations with GDM. ICC was examined by the Bland–Altman plot. We used SPSS version 25.0 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY) statistical software. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results
Clinical characteristics
Table 1 shows the clinical characteristics of the study population. There were no significant differences between the two groups regarding age, gestation-week, and heart rate (all p > 0.05). Compared with the control group, GDM had increased BMI (27.87 ± 4.11 vs. 24.76 ± 2.92 kg/m², p < 0.001), higher SBP (117.81 ± 9.17 mmHg vs. 113.73 ± 9.17 mmHg, p = 0.017) and DBP (78.04 ± 5.74 mmHg vs. 75.08 ± 7.72 mmHg, p = 0.029). Based on the GDM level, only diet treatment was recommended clinically, no oral hypoglycemic drugs or insulin therapy were initiated.

Conventional echocardiography
Table 2 shows the conventional echocardiographic parameters of the two groups. Compared with control, GDM had bigger IVS, LVPW, RWT, and LVMI (all p < 0.001). LVEF was preserved in GDM and had no statistical difference with control. The mean e' velocity of mitral annulus was lower in GDM than control (13.24 ± 2.34 vs. 14.67 ± 2.17 cm/s, p = 0.002). However, there was no difference regarding the peak mitral inflow velocities (E and A), E/A ratio, or mean E/e'.

Two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography
LV-GLS and LA phasic strain of the study population are depicted in Table 3. The amplitude of LV-GLS in GDM patients was significantly lower than normal pregnant women (18.14 ± 2.53 vs. 22.36 ± 6.33, p < 0.001) (Fig. 1), and 31 patients (66%) in our study had an absolute LV-GLS less than 20%. As for the absolute value of LA phasic strain, LA-Sr and LA-Scd were significantly lower than the control group (32.71 ± 6.64 vs. 38.00 ± 7.06, and 20.41 ± 5.69 vs. 25.56 ± 5.73, respectively, p < 0.001). However, LA-Sct had no difference between the two groups (p > 0.05) (Fig. 2).

| Variables     | Controls   | GDM        | p-value |
|---------------|------------|------------|---------|
| IVS (mm)      | 8.40 ± 0.93| 9.46 ± 1.07| < 0.001 |
| LVPW (mm)     | 8.57 ± 0.90| 9.61 ± 0.99| < 0.001 |
| LVESd (mm)    | 22.90 ± 2.92| 23.89 ± 2.87| 0.080   |
| RWT           | 0.39 ± 0.04| 0.43 ± 0.05| < 0.001 |
| LVMi (g/m²)   | 69.65 ± 12.92| 79.86 ± 14.77| < 0.001 |
| LVEF (%)      | 68.08 ± 5.59| 66.26 ± 6.73| 0.135   |
| E velocity (cm/s) | 94.16 ± 14.89| 90.76 ± 16.72| 0.277   |
| A velocity (cm/s) | 63.56 ± 13.56| 67.09 ± 15.94| 0.226   |
| E/A           | 1.54 ± 0.05| 1.54 ± 0.02| 0.975   |
| Mean e' (cm/s) | 14.67 ± 2.17| 13.24 ± 2.34| 0.002   |
| Mean E/e'     | 6.50 ± 1.17| 7.09 ± 1.77| 0.053   |

GDM Gestational diabetes mellitus, IVS Interventricular septum, LVPW Left ventricular posterior wall, LVESd Left ventricular end-diastolic diameter, LVEF Left ventricular ejection fraction, SD Standard deviation, GDM Gestational diabetes mellitus, BMI Body mass index, SBP Systolic blood pressure, DBP Diastolic blood pressure, HR Heart rate, FPG Fasting plasma glucose
Regression analyses

In Table 4, univariate logistic regression analysis shows that BMI, SBP, DBP, RWT, LVMI, mean e’, LV-GLS, LA-Sr, and LA-Scd were associated with GDM. In the multivariate model that focused on LV-GLS, LV-GLS (OR, 0.439; 95% CI, 0.320–0.603; \( p < 0.001 \)) was independently associated with GDM. In another model that mainly involved LA phasic strain, LA-Scd showed a good independent association with GDM (OR, 0.874; 95% CI, 0.802–0.952; \( p = 0.002 \)) (Table 5).

Reproducibility of strain measurements

To assess the reproducibility of strain measurements, we randomly selected 15 patients from the study population for the ICC test. There was good reproducibility between inter-observer and intra-observer measurements (Fig. 3, Table 6).

Discussion

GDM is one of the most common complications of pregnancy [16]. Given that DM is a risk factor for future cardiovascular events [17–19], the impact of GDM on maternal cardiac function changes could not be ignored. Aiming to early detecting the myocardial
dysfunction in newly diagnosed GDM women, we com-
pared the 2D-STE with conventional echocardiography
during their 24 ~ 28 weeks of gestation. The main find-
ings of the study were as follows: [1] GDM preserved
LV systolic and diastolic function by conventional
echocardiography and had no difference with control;
[2] LV-GLS provides early information of LV systolic
myocardial deformation in GDM; [3] LA conduit strain
may be the prominent phasic parameter to early iden-
tify LV diastolic dysfunction in GDM.

Owing to the hemodynamic changes during normal
pregnancy [20, 21], physiological remodeling of the
myocardium may occur [22, 23]. In GDM, hyperglyc-
emia and insulin resistance may lead to the disruption of
Ca^{2+} balance, the accumulation of advanced glycation
end products (AGEs), and the increase of oxidative stress
and inflammation. They may trigger extracellular matrix
accumulation, cardiomyocyte apoptosis, and myocardial
fibrosis. Eventually, the left ventricle will develop cen-
tripetal hypertrophy and diastolic dysfunction [24–26].

As expected, we found that GDM women had thicker
myocardium, higher RWT, and increased LVMI than
normal pregnant women, indicating the myocardial
remodeling may accompany GDM progression. Similar
to the findings by Merra et al. [27], we found LV-GLS of
GDM was lower than that of controls despite their nor-
mal LVEF. In the setting of GDM may have an associa-
tion with obesity [28], we also found an increased BMI in
our GDM patients. Of note, after adjusting confounders
that include BMI, LV-GLS could remain its independent
association with GDM, indicating LV-GLS may serve as
an indicator of subclinical systolic dysfunction of GDM.

On the other hand, LV diastolic function may also dete-
riorate in GDM patients. Among all the conventional
echocardiography biomarkers of LV diastolic function,
only the mean e’ was independent associated with GDM.
Although LA remodeling is considered a signal of LV
diastolic functional changes [29], LAVI did not present a
significant difference between GDM and controls. Con-
sidering the atrioventricular coupling, we also conducted
LA phasic (reservoir, conduit, and contractile) strain
analysis in GDM women. During LV systole and isovo-
lumic relaxation, LA performs as a reservoir, receiving
blood from pulmonary veins. The conduit phase is mod-
ulated especially by LV diastolic properties (relaxation
and early diastolic pressure). LA contractile performance,
also called booster-pump function, is modulated by LV
compliance, LV end-diastolic pressure, and LA intrinsic
contractility [29–33]. LA reservoir and conduit strain
have been reported to correlate with LV filling pressure
[34] and may gradually decrease even in mild LV diastolic
dysfunction progression [35]. We found LA-Sr and LA-
Scd were significantly lower than controls, and LA-Scd
had an independent association with GDM, which super-
ior to mean e’. Such findings suggest firstly that 2D-STE
is a potential tool to recognize LA functional changes in
GDM, and secondly, the LV relaxation may be impaired
and LV filling pressure may increase in GDM women.
Clinical management should be concerned before fur-
ther deterioration of LV diastolic function happens.

Furthermore, the results from the ICC test support the good

---

**Table 4** Univariate logistic regression analysis of GDM associated parameters

| Variables   | OR (95% CI)   | p-value |
|-------------|---------------|---------|
| Age (years) | 1.000 (0.920–1.087) | 0.998   |
| Gestation week | 1.084 (0.985−1.194) | 0.100   |
| BMI (kg/m²) | 1.289 (1.135–1.465) | <0.001  |
| SBP (mmHg)  | 1.057 (1.008–1.108) | 0.021   |
| DBP (mmHg)  | 1.066 (1.005–1.130) | 0.033   |
| HR (bpm)    | 1.021 (0.986–1.057) | 0.235   |
| RWT         | 3.003 (1.329–6.787) | 0.008   |
| LVMI (g/m²) | 1.054 (1.023–1.086) | 0.001   |
| LVEF (%)    | 0.952 (0.893–1.014) | 0.126   |
| SVI (ml/m²) | 0.952 (0.901–1.007) | 0.084   |
| LAVI (ml/m²) | 0.968 (0.907–1.033) | 0.324   |
| E (cm/s)    | 0.986 (0.962–1.011) | 0.266   |
| A (cm/s)    | 1.017 (0.990–1.044) | 0.214   |
| E/A         | 1.011 (0.563–1.815) | 0.971   |
| Mean e’ (cm/s) | 0.749 (0.620–0.904) | 0.003   |
| Mean E/e’   | 1.278 (0.993–1.646) | 0.057   |
| LV-GLS (%)  | 0.461 (0.349–0.608) | <0.001  |
| LA-Sr (%)   | 0.895 (0.842–0.952) | <0.001  |
| LA-Scd (%)  | 0.855 (0.791–0.924) | <0.001  |
| LA-Scct (%) | 0.948 (0.858–1.048) | 0.300   |

**Table 5** Multivariate regression analysis for identifying variables independently associated with GDM

| Variables   | OR(95% CI)   | p-value |
|-------------|---------------|---------|
| LV-GLS (%)  | 0.439 (0.320–0.603) | <0.001  |
| Mean e’ (cm/s) | 0.695 (0.512–0.943) | 0.020   |
| LA-Scd (%)  | 0.874 (0.802–0.952) | 0.002   |
| BMI (kg/m²) | 1.173 (1.025–1.342) | 0.020   |
| LVMI (g/m²) | 1.041 (1.005–1.078) | 0.023   |

---

* OR Odds ratio, CI Confidence interval, Other abbreviations were as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3
performance and clinical role of strain assessment in myocardial function.

Limitations
The current study reveals the ability of 2D-STE to distinguish the difference in myocardial function between newly diagnosed GDM and healthy pregnant women with preserved LVEF. However, there are intrinsic limitations of the current study. Firstly, the sample size of the study was small and from a single center. Secondly, we are lacking the information regarding the normal threshold of LV GLS and LA strains in pregnant women. Thirdly, we currently do not have either short-term or long-term follow-up information of GDM patients regarding the subclinical myocardial deformation impact on future CVD events, further observations are still needed regarding the cardiovascular outcomes in patients with GDM.

Conclusion
This is a preliminary study on the performance of 2D-STE in GDM, and due to the limited number of patients and lack of follow-up information, the results need to be confirmed by larger studies. However, we have elucidated that 2D-STE may serve as a powerful indicator of transient myocardial deterioration in GDM.
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