

# Cardiotoxicity assessment in breast cancer patients: is it straining?

Hector Villarraga and Joerg Herrmann\*

Department of Cardiovascular Diseases, Mayo Clinic, 200 First Street SW, Rochester, MN 55902, USA

**This editorial refers to ‘Serial changes of layer specific myocardial function according to chemotherapy regimen in patients with breast cancer’, by M-N. Kim et al., <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehjopen/oeac008>.**

In the last 15 years, two-dimensional speckle tracking echocardiography has positioned itself as a method to detect cardiac toxicity before a drop in ejection fraction becomes eminent. Basic strain analysis by global longitudinal strain (GLS) can be performed with the majority of currently available ultrasound machines in <5 min during the echocardiographic examination, and importantly, with good inter- and intra-observer reproducibility.<sup>1</sup> Other domains of contractility (e.g. circumferential and radial strain) can be evaluated offline by stand-alone software packages once proper images are uploaded in DICOM format. These aspects are exemplified in the study by Kim et al.,<sup>2</sup> published in *EHJ Open*, which assessed several different strain parameters in 105 patients with breast cancer followed for 6 months.

The human heart, as described by Torrent-Guasp and coworkers,<sup>3</sup> has an outer and an inner arm that defines three layers of contractility: (i) endocardial level longitudinal fibres, (ii) mid-myocardial level fibres, and (iii) epicardial level fibres that contract circumferentially.<sup>4</sup> When histologically dissected, the orientation of these fibres spans from 90° at the endocardial level to 0° at the mid-myocardial level, and to 130° at the epicardial level.<sup>4</sup> This differential orientation may allow for a differential strain assessment of the different layers.<sup>5</sup> This very topic was addressed by Kim et al., which is not an easy task, requiring methodological soundness and aspiring to provide meaningful impact. Based on the current analysis, one may conclude that assessing layer-specific strain values does not seem to add value to GLS, and GLS is to remain the gold standard for strain imaging for cardiotoxicity detection/prediction.<sup>6</sup>

A bigger question raised by the present study is the value of strain assessment in general. A significant decline in left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) at 3 months follow-up was noted already in those patients who developed a drop in LVEF by >10% at 6 months follow-up, which was the definition used for cardiotoxicity.<sup>2</sup> Who would need to add strain assessment, if we can tell by an early trend in

LVEF dynamics? The relatively high incidence of cardiotoxicity (19%) within a 6-month observation period is also very striking and may have contributed to detection dynamics. Just over half of the patients (55%) received anthracyclines at <300 mg/m<sup>2</sup> and about half with the use of dexrazoxane; yet, even so, 19% incidence of cardiotoxicity. Trastuzumab was used in ~30% of the patients; only 10 patients had combined anthracycline–trastuzumab therapy, which showed the highest incidence of cardiotoxicity at 30%. This being said, even in patients on taxanes, 19% developed cardiotoxicity, and dynamics were rather similar across all subgroups.

Taken together, the article by Kim et al. pursued a novel layer-specific approach to strain imaging in breast cancer patients at risk of cardiotoxicity and provides an important impulse. The findings need to be reproduced and validated against the standard of GLS and its relative changes. Factors that can influence endocardial stress such as high afterload conditions need to be taken into account. Akin to the old differentiation of myocardial infarction, cardiotoxicity in breast cancer patients: is it endocardial, transmural, or of another kind? For this question to be answered, we need another find.

**Conflict of interest:** H.V. and J.H.: Research support has been received from the National Cancer Institute (R01CA233610), the Miami Heart Foundation, and the Department of Cardiovascular Diseases, Mayo Clinic.

## References

1. D'Elia N, Caselli S, Kosmala W, Lancellotti P, Morris D, Muraru D, Takeuchi M, van den Bosch A, van Grootel RWJ, Villarraga H, Marwick TH. Normal global longitudinal strain: an individual patient meta-analysis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2020;**13**:167–169.
2. Kim M-N, Kim S-R, Kim H-D, Cho D-H, Jung SP, Park KH, Park S-M. Serial changes in layer-specific myocardial function according to chemotherapy regimen in patients with breast cancer. *Eur Heart J Open* 2022;**2**:1–9.
3. Kocica MJ, Corno AF, Carreras-Costa F, Ballester-Rodes M, Moghbel MC, Cueva CN, Lackovic V, Kanjuh VI, Torrent-Guasp F. The helical ventricular myocardial band: global, three-dimensional, functional architecture of the ventricular myocardium. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2006;**29**:S21–S40.
4. Greenbaum RA, Ho SY, Gibson DG, Becker AE, Anderson RH. Left ventricular fibre architecture in man. *Br Heart J* 1981;**45**:248–263.
5. Xia H, Yeung DF, Di Stefano C, Cha SS, Pellikka PA, Ye Z, Thaden JJ, Villarraga HR. Ventricular strain analysis in patients with no structural heart disease using a vendor-independent speckle-tracking software. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2020;**20**:274.

\* Corresponding author. Tel: +1 507 284 2904, Fax: +1 507 266 0228, Email: [herrmann.joerg@mayo.edu](mailto:herrmann.joerg@mayo.edu)

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the Editors of the *European Heart Journal Open* or of the European Society of Cardiology.

© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact [journals.permissions@oup.com](mailto:journals.permissions@oup.com)

- 
6. Plana JC, Galderisi M, Barac A, Ewer MS, Ky B, Scherrer-Crosbie M, Ganame J, Sebag IA, Agler DA, Badano LP, Banchs J, Cardinale D, Carver J, Cerqueira M, DeCara JM, Edvardsen T, Flamm SD, Force T, Griffin BP, Jerusalem G, Liu JE, Magalhães A, Marwick T, Sanchez LY, Sicari R, Villarraga HR, Lancellotti P. 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. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr* 2014;**27**: 911–939.