

Epicardial fat accumulation and left heart remodelling in patients with chronic coronary syndrome

Hikari Seki¹, Koki Nakanishi (b^{1,*}, Masao Daimon (b^{1,2}, Kazutoshi Hirose¹, Yasuhiro Mukai¹, Yuriko Yoshida^{1,3}, Tomoko Nakao^{1,2}, Hiroyuki Morita¹, Marco R. Di Tullio³, Shunichi Homma³, and Issei Komuro¹

¹Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8655, Japan; ²Department of Clinical Laboratory, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8655, Japan; and ³Department of Medicine, Columbia University, 630 W 168th St, New York, NY 10032, USA

Received 29 September 2022; revised 15 November 2022; accepted 16 December 2022; online publish-ahead-of-print 17 December 2022 Handling Editor: Maciej Banach

Aims	Patients with chronic coronary syndrome (CCS) suffer from subsequent cardiovascular events, even after complete revas- cularization; thus, elucidation of the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms is required. Epicardial adipose tissue (EAT) is increasingly recognized as a metabolically active organ with a key role in the pathogenesis of metabolic-related cardiac dis- eases. The present study investigated the association between EAT burden and left heart remodelling in patients with CCS.
Methods and results	We studied 267 CCS patients (210 men; 71 ± 9 years) with complete revascularization and normal left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction who underwent follow-up echocardiography. All patients underwent the measurement of EAT thickness and speckle-tracking analysis to evaluate LV global longitudinal strain (LVGLS) and left atrial (LA) phasic strain. The mean EAT thickness was 5.0 ± 1.8 mm. Age, sex, body mass index, and diabetes mellitus were independently associated with EAT thickness (all $P < 0.05$). Multivariable linear regression analysis demonstrated that EAT thickness was significantly associated with LV mass index, early diastolic mitral annular velocity, and LA conduit strain independent of age, sex, and cardiovascular risk factors (all $P < 0.05$). On the other hand, there was no relationship between EAT thickness and LV systolic parameters including LV ejection fraction and LVGLS.
Conclusion	CCS patients with increased EAT thickness had unfavourable left heart remodelling. The assessment of EAT thickness by echocardiography may have clinical utility as a simple surrogate to aid in risk stratification for impaired left heart function in CCS patients.

* Corresponding author. Tel: #81 3 3815 5411 Fax: #81 3 5800 9171, Email: knakanishi82@gmail.com

© 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

Graphical Abstract



Keywords Chronic coronary syndrome • Epicardial adipose tissue • Left heart remodelling • Speckle-tracking echocardiography

Introduction

Patients with chronic coronary syndrome (CCS) are at higher risk of various form of cardiovascular disease, even with adequate revascularization and optimal medical therapy;¹ thus, elucidation of the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms is needed. Recently, particular attention has been given to epicardial adipose tissue (EAT) accumulation in the context of metabolic-related cardiac diseases.^{2,3} However, the association between EAT accumulation and left ventricular(LV)/left atrial (LA) functional remodelling in patients with CCS has not been studied. LV global longitudinal strain (LVGLS) and LA phasic strain derived from speckle-tracking echocardiography emerge as highly sensitive measures to unmask subclinical left heart impairment.⁴ The aim of the present study was to investigate the association between EAT and left heart remodelling in patients with CCS with complete percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and preserved LV ejection fraction (LVEF) using conventional and speckle-tracking echocardiography.

Methods

Consecutive 476 patients with CCS who had completed elective coronary revascularization and undergone follow-up echocardiography at the University of Tokyo Hospital between 2014 and 2016 were retrospectively recruited. Patients with a history of myocardial infarction (n = 62), coronary artery bypass grafting surgery (n = 16), atrial fibrillation or atrial flutter (n = 34), congenital heart disease (n = 2), LVEF <50% or significant valvular heart disease (n = 34), poor echocardiographic image quality for EAT measurement including patients with pericardial effusion (n = 46), lacking clinical information (n = 1), and inadequate image quality for strain analysis (n = 14) were excluded. Thus, 267 Asian patients with CCS who met the study criteria were included for the analysis. The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tokyo approved the study.

Measurement of EAT thickness was performed by two experienced cardiologists (K.N. and K.H.) with at least 7 years of experience who were unaware of the clinical data. Epicardial fat was identified as the echo-free space between the outer wall of the myocardium and the visceral layer of the pericardium, and its thickness was measured perpendicularly on the free wall of the right ventricle at end-systole according to the current American Society of Echocardiography recommendation (*Figure 1*).⁵ We further performed

additional measurement of EAT thickness from short-axis images in randomly selected 30 patients and found good correlation between the two views with Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.88 and -0.4 ± 2.5 mm (mean ± 1.96 SD) in Bland–Altman analysis. Speckle-tracking analysis was performed offline using vendor-independent commercially available software (2D Cardiac Performance Analysis; Tomtec Imaging System, Germany). LVGLS was calculated by averaging the negative peak of longitudinal strain from all three apical views including the four-chamber, two-chamber, and long-axis views, and LA phasic strain was obtained by averaging the peak values of six LA segmental strains from the apical two- and four- chamber views.⁴

Categorical variables are presented as numbers and proportions, and continuous variables are presented as means \pm standard deviations or median and interquartile range as appropriate. Association between clinical parameters and EAT thickness was assessed by univariable and multivariable linear regression analysis. Univariable and multivariable linear regression analyses were also carried out to identify the association of EAT thickness as a continuous variable with LV/LA morphology and function, adjusting for potential covariates in a sequential fashion with two models: Model 1, adjustment for age and sex and Model 2, adjustment for age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidaemia, diabetes mellitus, body mass index (BMI), smoking status, and estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR). A *P* value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed with the JMP Pro 15 statistical software (SAS Institute, Inc, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Table 1 shows the clinical characteristics and echocardiographic parameters of the study population. The mean age was 71 ± 9 years, and 210 (78.7%) were men. The mean EAT thickness was 5.0 ± 1.8 mm. Age, sex, BMI, hypertension, and diabetes mellitus were associated with EAT thickness by univariable linear regression analysis, while there was no relationship between the duration of statin therapy and EAT thickness. Multivariable linear regression analysis identified that older age, female gender, higher BMI, and diabetes mellitus were independently associated with increased EAT thickness.

The relationship between EAT thickness and LV morphology and function is shown in *Table 2*. EAT thickness was associated with LV mass index and early diastolic mitral annular velocity (e') in the age- and sex-adjusted



Figure 1 Representative cases of chronic coronary syndrome patients with and without abnormal epicardial adipose tissue thickness. The lower case with abnormal epicardial adipose tissue thickness had left atrium dysfunction (*B*), whereas preserved left atrium function was observed in the upper case with normal epicardial adipose tissue thickness (*A*).

model (Model 1). In the multivariable model adjusted for age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidaemia, diabetes mellitus, BMI, current smoking, and eGFR, EAT thickness remained independently associated with LV mass index (standardized $\beta = 0.15$, P = 0.013) and e' (standardized $\beta - 0.18$, P = 0.005; Model 2). However, EAT thickness was not associated with LV systolic parameters (i.e. LVEF and LVGLS).

As for the LA parameters, EAT thickness was associated with LA volume index, LA reservoir, and conduit strain in univariable analysis (all P < 0.05; *Table 2*). Multivariable model adjusted for age and sex attenuated the association between EAT accumulation and LA reservoir strain (standardized $\beta - 0.11$, P = 0.065), whereas increased EAT thickness was related to larger LA volume index and reduced LA conduit strain (Model 1). Additional adjustment for cardiovascular risk factors and eGFR did not affect the independent association of EAT thickness with LA conduit strain (standardized $\beta = -0.13$, P = 0.037; Model 2). Representative cases are presented in *Figure 1*.

Excellent correlations were observed for the inter-observer variability of EAT thickness and strain measures in 15 randomly selected patients: r = 0.88 for EAT thickness, r = 0.93 for LVGLS, r = 0.92 for LA reservoir strain, r = 0.91 for LA conduit strain, and r = 0.87 for LA pump strain. According to the Bland–Altman analysis, inter-observer variability was 0.1 ± 2.3 mm for EAT thickness, $0.4 \pm 1.7\%$ for LVGLS, $0.8 \pm 4.9\%$ for LA reservoir strain, $0.7 \pm 4.1\%$ for LA conduit strain, and $0.1 \pm 3.6\%$ for LA pump strain (mean ± 1.96 SD, respectively).

Discussion

In the present study, we comprehensively evaluated the association of EAT accumulation with LV/LA morphology and functional remodelling

using conventional and speckle-tracking echocardiography in CCS patients and found that EAT accumulation was independently related to LV mass index, e' and LA conduit strain. The underlying mechanisms by which EAT accumulation was associated with unfavourable left heart remodelling are not entirely clear, but we propose several potential explanations. First, adipocyte direct infiltration within LA/LV myocardium can cause LV and LA dysfunction.⁶ Second, through paracrine transmission, pro-inflammatory, pro-oxidant, and pro-fibrotic cytokines from EAT diffuse into the myocardium, which may lead to unfavourable left heart remodeling.² Finally, impaired coronary microcirculation might be involved in our observation.⁷ On the other hand, we did not find an association between EAT thickness and LV systolic parameters (i.e. LVEF and LVGLS). This may be partially explained by the fact that LV diastolic dysfunction precedes systolic dysfunction in metabolic-related cardiac remodelling. Indeed, increased EAT predominantly augmented the risk of HF with preserved LVEF rather than reduced LVEF in the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis.⁸ Several limitations should be noted. First, measurement of EAT thickness was performed only by transthoracic echocardiography, which might not accurately reflect the total amount of EAT and its distribution. Second, we did not perform sample size calculation because of the retrospective nature of the study. Furthermore, echocardiography was performed at the physicians' discretion; therefore, the timing of echocardiography was varied depending on patients which might affect our observation. Third, the optimal cut-off values of LA/LV remodelling in the setting of CCS are not well established. Future studies are warranted to investigate the thresholds of echocardiographic parameters for the prediction of incident CV events. Finally, this study consisted of CCS patients after revascularization and preserved LVEF, which may limit the applicability of the results to CAD patients with different risk profiles, such as ischaemic cardiomyopathy. In

n = 267 Age, years 71 ± 9 Pien, r(S) 210 (78.7) Systali blod pressure, mmHg 134 ± 19 Databili blod pressure, mmHg 70 ± 12 Hear risk, blod pressure, mmHg 70 ± 12 Current smoking, n(S) 47 ± 12 Databili blod pressure, mmHg 70 ± 12 Current smoking, n(S) 250 (73.6) Databilities of pressure, mmHg 231 (94.0) Polipidisetina, r(S) 251 (94.0) Medication 9 B blocker, n(S) 198 (74.2) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 198 (74.2) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 198 (74.2) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 288 (81.1) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 284 (81.2) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 28 (81.2) Calcium charnel blocker, n(S) 28 (94.2) LDL cholesterol, mgdit 54 ± 16 HblAtc, % 65 ± 10 <th colspan="4">Table 1 Characteristics and echocardiographic parameters of the study population</th>	Table 1 Characteristics and echocardiographic parameters of the study population			
Ace, years 71±9 Hen, n (%) 210 (78.7) Body mass index, kgm ¹ 242±3 Sytolic Bodo pressure, mmHg 13±1+19 Diablec Bodo pressure, mmHg 70±12 Heart rate, beatstmin 67±12 Curnets moleing, n (%) 14 (5.3) Diablec Bodo pressure, mmHg 135 (50.6) Opplipteens, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibute, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibute, n (%) 196 (74.2) Calicum channel bocker, n (%) 196 (74.2) Dotation bockers mgdL 42 ± 23 HDL cholestreent mgdL 42 ± 23 HDL cholestreent mgdL 52 ± 10 CaffK, mL/mmin 1	n = 267			
men, n(k) 20 (28.7) Body mass index, kgm ² 24.2 ± 3.6 Systelic blood pressure, mmlg 79 ± 12 Hart rate, beaktsmini 67 ± 12 Current smoking, n (%) 14 (5.2) Hypertension, n (%) 250 (92.6) Dasteste mellins, n (%) 251 (94.6) Medications 120 (44.9) Bidlocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Doral anti-diabetic gents, n (%) 120 (44.9) Incline channel blocker, n (%) 24.23 Incline channel blocker, n (%) 24.23	Age, years	71±9		
Body mass index, kgm ² 24 2, 36 Systelic blood pressure, mmHg 134 ± 19 Dastolc blood pressure, mmHg 74 ± 12 Current smoking, n(%) 14 (5.3) Up etrassion, n(%) 250 (95.6) Dastolc blood pressure, mmHg 251 (95.6) Dastolc moder pressure, mmHg 251 (95.6) Dastolc moder pressure, mmKg 251 (95.6) Dastolc moder blocker, n (%) 26 (60.7) Calcure channel blocker, n (%) 26 (60.7) Calcure channel blocker, n (%) 28 (98.1) Calcure channel blocker, n (%) 29 ± 29.2 HDL cholestrenol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HbALC, % 65 ± 10 GFR, mL/min17.3 m ² 65 ± 10 Duration between TTE and PCL years 34 (02-64) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 21 1 10 (41.2)	Men, <i>n</i> (%)	210 (78.7)		
Systolc blood pressure, mmHg 194 ± 19 Dastolc blood pressure, mmHg 70 ± 12 Current smoking, n (%) 14 (5.2) Diabtes melitus, n (%) 250 (92.6) Diabtes melitus, n (%) 251 (94.0) Blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 238 (89.1) Oral ant-dubetic agents, n (%) 129 (40.0) Incal, n (%) 288 (89.1) Oral ant-dubetic agents, n (%) 34 (12.2) Lob, colesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 </td <td>Body mass index, kg/m²</td> <td>24.2 ± 3.6</td>	Body mass index, kg/m ²	24.2 ± 3.6		
Distrolic blood pressure, mmHg 70 ± 12 Haar trac, batstmin 67 ± 12 Current smoking, n (%) 14 (6.5.) Hypertension, n (%) 250 (75.6) Disbetes: mellurs, n (%) 251 (24.0) Medications 12 B blocker, n (%) 129 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 128 (18.7) Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Invalin, n (%) 24 (12.7) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 24 (12.7) Isolatin, n (%) 24 (12.7) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 109 (40.8) Invalin, n (%) 24 (12.7) Laboratory dita 82 ± 23 LDL cholecterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholecterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HDL cholecterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 <td< td=""><td>Systolic blood pressure, mmHg</td><td>134 ± 19</td></td<>	Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	134 ± 19		
Heart rate, beats/min 67 ± 12 Current smoking, n (%) 14 (5.2) Dabetes mellitus, n (%) 135 (50.6) Dyslipidaemia, n (%) 251 (94.0) Ø blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Station, n (%) 128 (94.1) Oral anti-dabetic agents, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 238 (89.1) Oral anti-dabetic agents, n (%) 162 (60.7) Isoberstorl, mg/dL 198 (74.2) Laboratory data 110 (41.2) Laboratory data 45 ± 16 Duration between TEE and PCL years 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 2 3 52 (19.5) UPT Isoin, n (%) 105 (63.3) 1 100 (41.2) 2 2 105 (63.6) 125 (60.5) LAP leation, n (%) 153 (60.8) 125 (60.5) LAP leation, n (%) 153 (63.1) 125 (60.5) LAP leation, n (%) 133 (69.6) 133 (69.6) TW end-statolic dameter, mm 28.6 ±	Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	70 ± 12		
Current smoking, n (%) 14 (5.2) Hypertension, n (%) 250 (93.6) Daktets mellitus, n (%) 251 (94.0) Medications 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 120 (44.9) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 128 (69.1) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 238 (69.1) Oral and-dabetic agents, n (%) 34 (12.7) Ibonation, n (%) 34 (12.7) Lobe cholesterol, mg/dL 84 ± 16 HbAL, c, % 65 ± 1.0 Cafkum channel blocker, n (%) 54 ± 16 Number of tractory data 64 ± 16 HbAL, c, % 65 ± 1.0 CafKm, ML/min/17.3 m ² 64 ± 21 PCI bistory 1 1 100 (41.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 15 (65.9) LDX cholesterol, mg/dL 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.07) 1 10 (41.2) 1 10 (41.2) 1 10 (5 (3.3) 3 20 (10.5)	Heart rate, beats/min	67 ± 12		
Hypertension, n (%) 250 (936) Dabates melitus, n (%) 135 (506) Oppliplatemin, n (%) 120 (449) Madications 120 (449) Madications, n (%) 196 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 128 (98.1) Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 238 (98.1) Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 234 (12.7) Lob chesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 64 ± 10 Lob core of the tage of the search sear	Current smoking, n (%)	14 (5.2)		
Dabetes melitus, n (%) 135 (50.6) Dyslipidemin, n (%) 251 (94.0) β blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 198 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 122 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 238 (95.1) O'ral arti-diabetic agents, n (%) 139 (74.2) Ibolic channel blocker, n (%) 238 (95.1) O'ral arti-diabetic agents, n (%) 36 (12.7) Laboratory dta 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HALC, % 65 ± 10 cGRF, mL/min/173 m³ 65 ± 10 PCI history 100 (41.2) 2 100 (11.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 100 (11.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 100 (11.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 100 (11.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 100 (12.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 100 (12.1) 2 100 (12.1) 3 100 (12.1)	Hypertension, n (%)	250 (93.6)		
Dyslipdaemia, n (%) 251 (94.0) Medications 120 (94.9) RASt inhibitor, n (%) 198 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 198 (74.2) Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (90.8) Insulin, n (%) 28 (89.1) Libboratory data 82 ± 23 Libboratory data 82 ± 23 Libboratory data 65 ± 1.0 c6KR, m.Lmin/1.73 m ¹ 65 ± 1.0 PCI history 1 Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 100 (41.2) 1 100 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) JLNT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LMT lesion, n (%) 13 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 155 (43.1) LV end-dastocic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 45.5 LV end-systocic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 45.2 LV end-systocic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 45.2 LV end-systocic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 45.2	Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	135 (50.6)		
Medications 120 (44.9) β blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibro, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 28 (97.1) Oral ant-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory data 82 \pm 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 52 \pm 13 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 \pm 16 HALc, $\%$ 65 \pm 1.0 GFR, mL/min/1.73 m ³ 65 \pm 1.0 PCI history 100 (41.2) Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 1 110 (41.2) 2 2 13 (49.8) 25 (19.5) LVT lesion, n (%) 21 (50.5) 21 (50.5) LX lesion, n (%) 123 (49.8) 124 (44.7) LV end-diasticle diameter, mm 453 \pm 5.2 LV decion fraction, % 124 (44.7) LV end-diasticle diameter, mm 453 \pm 5.2 LV decion fraction, % 614 \pm 47.7 LV end-diasticle diameter, mm 26 \pm 4.5 24 (42.7) LV e	Dyslipidaemia, n (%)	251 (94.0)		
β blocker, n (%) 120 (44.9) RAS inhibitor, n (%) 198 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 132 (40.9) Statin, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory data 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 65 ± 1.0 cGFR, mL/min/1.73 m ² 60 ± 21 PCI history 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 11 1 110 (41.2) 2 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 25 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 25 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 15 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 15 (43.1) LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 26.6 ± 4.5 LV edotty, cm/s 64.1 ± 6.4 Kavave, cm/s 61.0 ± 1.6 E/er / ratio	Medications			
RAS inhibitor, n (%) 198 (74.2) Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 109 (40.8) Oral anti-dabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory data 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 64 ± 16 HoA1c, % 60 ± 21 PCI history 00 ± 21 Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (09-64) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 10 (41.2) 1 10 (41.2) 25 (19.5) LT lesion, n (%) 25 (19.5) LT lesion, n (%) 25 (19.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA istor, n (%) 125 (80.5) LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 28 6.4 ± 5 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 28 6.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, gm ³ 65.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 61.1 ± 6.5 ± 1.8 LV elocith, crin/s 61.5 ± 1.6	β blocker, n (%)	120 (44.9)		
Calcium channel blocker, n (%) 162 (60.7) Statin, n (%) 238 (89.1) Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory data 82 ± 23 LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HDAC % 65 ± 1.0 cGFR, mL/min/1.73 m² 60 ± 21 PCI history 1 Duration between TTE and PCL years 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LVH lesion, n (%) 215 (60.5) LX bloon, n (%) 125 (60.5) LX bloon, n (%) 13 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 5.5.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 1.63 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 5.5.3 LV edoity, cm/s 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m²	RAS inhibitor, n (%)	198 (74.2)		
Statin, n (%) 238 (89,1) Oral ant-idabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory data 82 ± 23 LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HbA1c, % 65 ± 1.0 cGFR, mL/min/1.73 n ² 60 ± 21 PCI history U Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ediastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ediastol	Calcium channel blocker, n (%)	162 (60.7)		
Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%) 109 (40.8) Insulin, n (%) 34 (12.7) Laboratory dat 82 ± 23 LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HbA1c, % 65 ± 1.0 cGRR, mLmin/1.73 m ² 60 ± 21 PCI history 000000000000000000000000000000000000	Statin, n (%)	238 (89.1)		
Insulin, $n(\$)$ $34(12.7)$ Laboratory data 82 ± 23 LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HbAtc, $\$$ 65 ± 1.0 eGR, $mL/min/1.73 m^3$ 60 ± 21 PCI history 00 ± 21 Duration between TTE and PCI, years $3.4(0.9-6.4)$ Number of treated vessels, $n(\%)$ 1 1 $100(41.2)$ 2 $105(97.3)$ 3 $52(19.5)$ LVT lesion, $n(\%)$ $29(10.9)$ LAD lesion, $n(\%)$ $215(80.5)$ LX lesion, $n(\%)$ $115(43.1)$ RCA lesion, $n(\%)$ $133(49.8)$ Two-dimensional echocardiography 12 LV end-discloid diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-discloid diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV yawe, cm/s 61.4 ± 4.7 A wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 4.7 A wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 1.68 A wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 1.68 A wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 1.68 LV odi.finds, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 LA reservoir strain, $\%$ 20.27 ± 1.8 LVGLS, $\%$ -21.1 ± 2.3 <td>Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%)</td> <td>109 (40.8)</td>	Oral anti-diabetic agents, n (%)	109 (40.8)		
Laboratory data 82 ± 23 LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 64 ± 16 HbAt, % 65 ± 10 eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m ³ 60 ± 21 PCI history 0 Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (09-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 1 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 13 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.5 ± 44.5 LV eigetion fraction, % 61.4 ± 47.7 LV away, cm/s 61.4 ± 47.3 E wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 47.3 LV away, cm/s 61.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 19.4 E // ratio 11.2 ± 41. LV oulume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 E // ratio 11.2 ± 41. LV oulume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 E // ratio 11.2 ± 41. LV oulume index	Insulin, n (%)	34 (12.7)		
LDL cholesterol, mg/dL 82 ± 23 HDL cholesterol, mg/dL 54 ± 16 HbA1c, % 65 ± 1.0 cGFR, mL/min/1.73 m³ 60 ± 21 PCI history Duration between TTE and PCI, years 3.4 (09-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 1 1 100 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (195.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 28 54 ± 45 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28 54 ± 45 LV end-stolic diameter, mm 28 54 ± 10 LV avasy endie, g	Laboratory data			
HDL cholesterol, m/dL 54±16 HbAfc, % 65±10 eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m² 60±21 PCI history 34 (0.9–6.4) Duration between TTE and PCI, years 34 (0.9–6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 1 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (195) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD besion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 113 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 1 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 286 ± 4.5 LV end-systolic liameter, mm 286 ± 4.5 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 286 ± 4.5 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 286 ± 4.5 LV exer, m/s 614 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 614 ± 1.6 A wave, cm/s 614 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 41 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.01 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 20.9 ± 1.8 <td>LDL cholesterol, mg/dL</td> <td>82 ± 23</td>	LDL cholesterol, mg/dL	82 ± 23		
HbA1c, % 65 ± 1.0 eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m² 60 ± 21 PCI history	HDL cholesterol, mg/dL	54 ± 16		
eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m ³ 60±21 PCI history 34 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (60.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 133 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m ³ 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 61.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/ ratio 08.3 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 61.1 ± 1.6 E/ ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT tlickness, mm 50.± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0	HbA1c, %	6.5 ± 1.0		
PCI history 3.4 (0.9-6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 1 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 13 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 28 6 ± 45. LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28 6 ± 45. LV ejection fraction, % 64 ± 45.8 LV ed-systolic diameter, mm 68.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 61.2 ± 1.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 50.2 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pubmistrain, % 13.8 ± 5.0	eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m ²	60 ± 21		
Duration between TTE and PCI, years 3.4 (0.9–6.4) Number of treated vessels, n (%) 1 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 13 (40.9–6.4) Two-dimensional echocardiography 115 (43.1) LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 64.4 ± 16.8 K wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 LA volume index, mL/m ³ 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 50 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0	PCI history			
Number of treated vessels, n (%) 110 (41.2) 1 110 (41.2) 2 105 (39.3) 3 52 (19.5) LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 133 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 45.3 \pm 5.2 LV end-disatolic diameter, mm 45.3 \pm 5.2 LV end-disatolic diameter, mm 286 \pm 4.5 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 86.5 \pm 25.3 E wave, cm/s 614 \pm 4.7 LV mass index, g/m ² 86.5 \pm 25.3 E wave, cm/s 61.0 \pm 11.2 \pm 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 \pm 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 50 \pm 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 \pm 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 \pm 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 30.6 \pm 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 148 \pm 47	Duration between TTE and PCI, years	3.4 (0.9–6.4)		
1110 (41.2)2105 (39.3)352 (19.5)LMT lesion, n (%)29 (10.9)LAD lesion, n (%)215 (80.5)LCX lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography28.6 ± 4.5LV end-systolic diameter, mm28.6 ± 4.5LV ejection fraction, %61.4 ± 4.7LV mass index, g/m^2 86.5 ± 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 ± 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 ± 19.4E/A ratio0.83 ± 0.27e' velocity, cm/s6.1 ± 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 ± 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 ± 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 ± 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 ± 2.3LA reservoir strain, %30.6 ± 5.6LA conduit strain, %13.8 ± 5.0LA pump strain, %14.8 ± 4.7	Number of treated vessels, n (%)			
2105 (39.3)352 (19.5)LMT lesion, n (%)29 (10.9)LAD lesion, n (%)215 (80.5)LCX lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography45.3 \pm 5.2LV end-diastolic diameter, mm45.3 \pm 5.2LV end-diastolic diameter, mm28.6 \pm 4.5LV ejection fraction, %61.4 \pm 4.7LV mass index, g/m²86.5 \pm 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 \pm 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 \pm 19.4E/A ratio0.83 \pm 0.27e' velocity, cm/s6.1 \pm 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 \pm 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 \pm 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 \pm 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 \pm 2.3LA reservoir strain, %13.8 \pm 5.0LA pump strain, %16.8 \pm 4.7	1	110 (41.2)		
352 (19.5)LMT lesion, n (%)29 (10.9)LAD lesion, n (%)215 (80.5)LCX lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography45.3 ± 5.2LV end-diastolic diameter, mm45.3 ± 5.2LV end-systolic diameter, mm28.6 ± 4.5LV ejection fraction, %61.4 ± 4.7LV mass index, g/m²86.5 ± 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 ± 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 ± 19.4E/A ratio0.83 ± 0.27e' velocity, cm/s61.1 ± 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 ± 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 ± 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 ± 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 ± 2.3LA reservoir strain, %138 ± 5.0LA conduit strain, %138 ± 5.0LA pump strain, %138 ± 5.0	2	105 (39.3)		
LMT lesion, n (%) 29 (10.9) LAD lesion, n (%) 215 (80.5) LCX lesion, n (%) 115 (43.1) RCA lesion, n (%) 133 (49.8) Two-dimensional echocardiography 133 (49.8) LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 61.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 168.4 ± 4.7	3	52 (19.5)		
LAD lesion, n (%)215 (80.5)LCX lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography45.3 \pm 5.2LV end-diastolic diameter, mm28.6 \pm 4.5LV end-systolic diameter, mm28.6 \pm 4.5LV end-systolic diameter, mm86.5 \pm 25.3E wave, cm/s61.4 \pm 4.7LV mass index, g/m²86.5 \pm 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 \pm 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 \pm 19.4E/A ratio0.83 \pm 0.27e' velocity, cm/s61.1 \pm 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 \pm 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 \pm 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 \pm 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 \pm 2.3LA reservoir strain, %30.6 \pm 5.6LA conduit strain, %13.8 \pm 5.0LA pump strain, %16.8 \pm 4.7	LMT lesion, n (%)	29 (10.9)		
LCX lesion, n (%)115 (43.1)RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography45.3 ± 5.2LV end-diastolic diameter, mm28.6 ± 4.5LV end-systolic diameter, mm28.6 ± 4.5LV ejection fraction, %61.4 ± 4.7LV mass index, g/m^2 86.5 ± 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 ± 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 ± 19.4E/A ratio0.83 ± 0.27e' velocity, cm/s61.1 ± 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 ± 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 ± 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 ± 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 ± 2.3LA reservoir strain, %13.8 ± 5.0LA conduit strain, %13.8 ± 5.0LA pump strain, %16.8 ± 47	LAD lesion, n (%)	215 (80.5)		
RCA lesion, n (%)133 (49.8)Two-dimensional echocardiography133 (49.8)LV end-diastolic diameter, mm45.3 \pm 5.2LV end-systolic diameter, mm28.6 \pm 4.5LV ejection fraction, %61.4 \pm 4.7LV mass index, g/m^2 86.5 \pm 25.3E wave, cm/s64.4 \pm 16.8A wave, cm/s81.0 \pm 19.4E/A ratio0.83 \pm 0.27e' velocity, cm/s6.1 \pm 1.6E/e' ratio11.2 \pm 4.1LA volume index, mL/m²29.9 \pm 10.1EAT thickness, mm5.0 \pm 1.8LVGLS, %-21.1 \pm 2.3LA reservoir strain, %30.6 \pm 5.6LA conduit strain, %13.8 \pm 5.0LA pump strain, %14.8 \pm 4.7	LCX lesion, n (%)	115 (43.1)		
Two-dimensional echocardiography 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 08.3 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 61.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 47	RCA lesion. n (%)	133 (49.8)		
LV end-diastolic diameter, mm 45.3 ± 5.2 LV end-systolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	Two-dimensional echocardiography			
LV end-systolic diameter, mm 28.6 ± 4.5 LV ejection fraction, % 61.4 ± 4.7 LV mass index, g/m ² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	LV end-diastolic diameter, mm	45.3 + 5.2		
LV $d = 1.4 \pm 4.7$ LVmass index, g/m² 61.4 ± 4.7 LVmass index, g/m² 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	LV end-systolic diameter, mm	28.6 ± 4.5		
LV mass index, g/m^2 86.5 ± 25.3 E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	LV ejection fraction. %	61.4 + 4.7		
E wave, cm/s 64.4 ± 16.8 A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	LV mass index. g/m^2	86.5 + 25.3		
A wave, cm/s 81.0 ± 19.4 E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	E wave, cm/s			
E/A ratio 0.83 ± 0.27 e' velocity, cm/s 6.1 ± 1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	A wave, cm/s	81.0 + 19.4		
e' velocity, cm/s 6.1±1.6 E/e' ratio 11.2±4.1 LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9±10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0±1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1±2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6±5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8±5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8±4.7	E/A ratio	0.83 + 0.27		
E/e' ratio 11.2 ± 4.1 LA volume index, mL/m ² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	e' velocity, cm/s	6.1 + 1.6		
LA volume index, mL/m² 29.9 ± 10.1 EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain. % 16.8 ± 4.7	E/e' ratio	11.2 + 4.1		
EAT thickness, mm 5.0 ± 1.8 LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	LA volume index. mL/m ²			
LVGLS, % -21.1 ± 2.3 LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain, % 16.8 ± 4.7	EAT thickness. mm	5.0 + 1.8		
LA reservoir strain, % 30.6 ± 5.6 LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain. % 16.8 ± 4.7	LVGLS, %			
LA conduit strain, % 13.8 ± 5.0 LA pump strain. % 16.8 ± 4.7	LA reservoir strain, %			
LA pump strain. %	LA conduit strain, %			
	LA pump strain, %			

Values are mean \pm SD, *n* (percentage), or median (25–75th percentile).

A, late diastolic transmitral flow velocity; E, early diastolic transmitral flow velocity; e', early diastolic mitral annular velocity; EAT, epicardial adipose tissue; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLS, global longitudinal strain; HDL, high density lipoprotein; LA, left atrium; LAD, left anterior descending artery; LCX, left circumflex artery; LDL, low density lipoprotein; LMT, left main trunk artery; LV, left ventricle; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; RAS, renin-angiotensin system; RCA, right coronary artery and TTE, transthoracic echocardiography.

LV parameters LV mass index. LVEF. % e' velocity, cm/sec LVGLS. % g/m² Sβ Sβ P-value Sβ P-value P-value Sβ P-value < 0.001 0.10 -0.27 < 0.001 -0.07Univariable 0.21 0.113 0 289 Multivariable model 1 023 < 0.001 0.09 0.165 -0.24 < 0.001 -0.03 0.632 Multivariable model 2 0.15 0.013 0.10 0.132 -0.18 0.005 -0.06 0.329 LA parameters LA volume index. LA reservoir strain, % LA conduit strain, % LA pump strain, % mL/m² P-value P-value P-value P-value Sβ Sβ Sß Sβ Univariable 0.21 < 0.001 -0.13 0.041 -0.20 < 0.001 0.07 0.282 Multivariable model 1 019 0.001 -0.110.065 -0.190.002 0.06 0.302 Multivariable model 2 0.12 0.055 -0.07 0.261 -0.13 0.037 0.411 0.06

 Table 2
 Association of epicardial adipose tissue thickness with left ventricle/left atrium morphology and function in patients with chronic coronary syndrome

Model 1 adjusted for age and sex. Model 2 adjusted for age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidaemia, diabetes mellitus, body mass index, current smoking, and estimated glomerular filtration rate.

CCS, chronic coronary syndrome; e', early diastolic mitral annular velocity; EAT, epicardial adipose tissue; EF, ejection fraction; GLS, global longitudinal strain; LA, left atrium; LV, left ventricle; Sβ, standardized beta.

conclusion, increased EAT thickness was independently associated with larger LV mass index, decreased e', and impaired LA conduit function, but not with LV systolic parameters in CCS patients with prior PCI and normal LV systolic function.

Lead author biography



Hikari Seki, MD, graduated from Fukushima Medical University in 2015. She is a Board-certified member of the Japanese Society of Internal Medicine, and she is a PhD student at the University of Tokyo. Her research interests include metabolic syndrome and deformation imaging.

Authors' contributions

H.S., K.N., and K.H. contributed to the conception and design of the work. H.S., K.N., M.D., K.H., Y.Y., T.N., H.M., and I.K. contributed to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work. H.S. drafted the manuscript. K.N., M.D., K.H., Y.M., Y.Y., T.N., H.M., M.R.D.T., S.H., and I.K. critically revised the manuscript. All authors gave final approval and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work, ensuring integrity and accuracy.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding

This work was supported in part by a Japan Heart Foundation Research Grant.

Conflict of interest: None declared.

References

- 1. Fox KAA, Metra M, Morais J, Atar D. The myth of 'stable' coronary artery disease. *Nat Rev Cardiol* 2020;**17**:9–21.
- Mazurek T, Zhang L, Zalewski A, Mannion JD, Diehl JT, Arafat H, Sarov-Blat L, O'Brien S, Keiper EA, Johnson AG, Martin J, Goldstein BJ, Shi Y. Human epicardial adipose tissue is a source of inflammatory mediators. *Circulation* 2003;**108**:2460–2466.
- Iacobellis G. Local and systemic effects of the multifaceted epicardial adipose tissue depot. Nat Rev Endocrinol 2015;11:363–371.
- Yoshida Y, Nakanishi K, Daimon M, Ishiwata J, Sawada N, Hirokawa M, Kaneko H, Nakao T, Mizuno Y, Morita H, Di Tullio MR, Homma S, Komuro I. Alteration of cardiac performance and serum B-type natriuretic peptide level in healthy aging. J Am Coll Cardiol 2019;74: 1789–1800.
- Iacobellis G, Willens HJ. Echocardiographic epicardial fat: a review of research and clinical applications. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2009;22:1311–1319.
- Hatem SN, Sanders P. Epicardial adipose tissue and atrial fibrillation. Cardiovasc Res 2014; 102:205–213.
- Nakanishi K, Fukuda S, Tanaka A, Otsuka K, Taguchi H, Shimada K. Relationships between periventricular epicardial adipose tissue accumulation, coronary microcirculation, and left ventricular diastolic dysfunction. *Can J Cardiol* 2017;**33**:1489–1497.
- Kenchaiah S, Ding J, Carr JJ, Allison MA, Budoff MJ, Tracy RP, Burke GL, McClelland RL, Arai AE, Bluemke DA. Pericardial fat and the risk of heart failure. J Am Coll Cardiol 2021; 77:2638–2652.