

# Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction among Hypertensive Subjects

ANUGYA APARAJITA BEHERA<sup>1</sup>, SURESH KUMAR BEHERA<sup>2</sup>, DIPTI MOHAPATRA<sup>3</sup>, ARATI MOHANTY<sup>4</sup>

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Hypertension has been established as one of the most significant causes of heart failure. Left ventricular function is a useful measure in the assessment and prognostication of heart disease.

**Aim:** To determine the prevalence of Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction (LVSD) in hypertensive patients and assess the echocardiographic characteristics associated with LVSD.

**Materials and Methods:** After obtaining informed consent, 650 eligible adults of age  $\geq 18$  years attending cardiology OPD diagnosed to have essential hypertension with or without medication were included in the study. Using a predesigned structured questionnaire, details of demographic characteristics

and echocardiographic data were obtained from the study participants.

**Results:** The prevalence of LVSD was 136 (20.9%) in the study population {mild LVSD 78 (12%), moderate LVSD 40 (6.2%), severe LVSD 18 (2.8%)}. In Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), variables such as blood pressure, body surface area, size of left atrium and ventricle, relative wall thickness, stroke volume, left ventricular mass index, diastolic function, ejection fraction, fractional shortening were significantly associated with moderate-severe LVSD.

**Conclusion:** Higher prevalence of LVSD among hypertensive subjects in this study advocates for use of echocardiography as part of routine evaluation in hypertensive patients.

**Keywords:** Echocardiography, Ejection fraction, Left ventricular mass, Stroke volume

## INTRODUCTION

Globally cardiovascular diseases contribute to major amount of health problems, and hypertension is the most significant risk factor for cardiovascular diseases [1]. In southern Asia, hypertension is considered as the third most important risk factor for attributable burden of disease [2]. It is predicted that by 2025, more than 1.5 billion people will have arterial hypertension worldwide [3,4]. In the year 2001, hypertension was estimated to be responsible for 7.6 million deaths and 92 million disability adjusted life years worldwide [5,6]. In India, hypertension contributes 57% of all stroke deaths and 24% of all Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) deaths [7]. Systemic hypertension as a hypertensive heart disease is a common cause of Left Ventricular Hypertrophy (LVH), systolic and diastolic dysfunction, arrhythmias, and decompensated heart failure [8]. Early identification of symptomless ventricular dysfunction in individuals helps in the treatment by Angiotensin Converting Enzyme (ACE) inhibitors and prevention of heart failure. The ability to measure the abnormalities of left ventricular function is important for both the initial detection of heart failure and for monitoring changes in severity. Echocardiography is helpful in evaluating multiple systolic and diastolic properties of the left ventricle [9,10].

In India, information regarding prevalence of LVSD and associated echocardiographic characteristics among hypertensive patients is scarce [11,12]. The present study was therefore undertaken to determine the prevalence of LVSD in hypertensive patients and assess the echocardiographic characteristics associated with LVSD.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This cross sectional study was conducted in Institute of Medical Sciences and SUM hospital, Bhubaneswar, at the Department of Cardiology/Physiology during the period from May 2015 to June 2017. Assuming prevalence of LVSD as 18% [5] with absolute

precision 3% and 95% confidence interval, the sample size was calculated as 630. However, 650 adults of age  $\geq 18$  years, attending cardiology OPD diagnosed to have essential hypertension with or without medication; who were willing to participate were included in our study. All the study participants were explained about the nature and purpose of the study; informed consent was obtained prior to their participation in the study. The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of the authors' institution and all procedures were followed in accordance with appropriate ethical guidelines. Using a predesigned structured questionnaire, details of demographic characteristics and echocardiographic data were obtained from all the eligible study individuals. Patients with secondary hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary insufficiency, pulmonary heart disease (cor pulmonale), congestive heart failure, and renal failure were excluded from the study.

Height of the study respondents was measured with a stadiometer and the reading was taken to the nearest 0.5 cm and body weight was measured with bare feet and in light clothes on a calibrated scale. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by square of the height in meters. BMI cut-off values for Asians as per the NICE guideline were followed to define obesity as having a BMI more than 27.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, overweight 23-27.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, normal 18.5-23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and underweight  $\leq 18.5$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> [13]. Body Surface Area (BSA) calculation was done using Dubois formula {BSA=0.007184×0.725 (height)×0.425 (weight)} [14]. Hypertension was defined as per JNC7 guidelines [15]. Blood pressure was measured using a standardised calibrated mercury column type sphygmomanometer with subject in sitting position. Two separate measurements were done at five minutes apart and the average of the two reading was recorded.

Echocardiography was performed using a commercially available GE vivid E9 with XD clear (Echocardiography machine-GE VINGMED ULTRASOUND AS Norway, equipped with a broad

band transducer) in patients in supine left lateral decubitus position. All echocardiographic measurements were performed by a cardiologist. Echocardiography was performed as per American Society of Echocardiography guidelines [16]. Left Atrial (LA) and Left Ventricular (LV) volume, LV end-diastolic and end-systolic diameter, septal and LV posterior wall thicknesses in diastole and systole were obtained using standard M-mode recordings and 2-Dimensional (2D) imaging. LV mass was determined using the method described by Devereux RB [9] and LV Mass Index (LVMI) was calculated dividing LV mass by body surface area. Left ventricular systolic performance was assessed using the fractional shortening of the left ventricle and the ejection fraction. Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction (LVEF) was calculated using the Teichholz formula [17]. As per the protocol followed in the Department of Cardiology of the authors' institution, LVSD is diagnosed by the echocardiography instrument using Teichholz formula. Fractional shortening was calculated from LV internal dimensions in diastole and systole (Fractional shortening=LVIDd-LVIDs/LVIDd $\times$ 100, where LVIDd=Left ventricular internal diameter at end diastole, LVIDs=Left ventricular internal diameter at end systole). Relative Wall Thickness (RWT) was derived from  $2 \times \text{LVPWd} / \text{LVIDd}$  (where LVPWd=Left ventricular posterior wall thickness in diastole). RWT was considered as increased when it is  $>0.42$  [9]. Conventional doppler tracings of the mitral inflow were obtained from an apical 4-chamber view. For each parameter, the average of 3 cycles was used.

Subjects were categorised into four groups according to their LVEF [18] as normal LV systolic function (LVEF=52-72% in men and 54-74% women), mild LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF=41-51% in men and 41-53% in women), moderate LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF=30-40% both in men and women), and severe LV systolic dysfunction (LVEF <30% both in men and women). Stroke Volume (SV) was calculated by the formula EDV-ESV, where EDV=End Diastolic Volume and ESV=End Systolic Volume.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All the data were compiled and analysed using SPSS version 21.0 software. Continuous variables were expressed as mean $\pm$ SD while categorical variables were expressed as percentages. Student's t-test was used for comparison between two groups and ANOVA with Games Howell post-hoc test was used for comparisons between multiple groups. A two-tailed p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## RESULTS

Data for 650 study subjects 398 (61.2%) males and 252 (38.8%) females were analysed. [Table/Fig-1] shows the demographic characteristics of the three groups of subjects categorised according to their left ventricular systolic function. About 136 (20.9%) of the study participants had LVSD {(mild LVSD=78 (12%), moderate LVSD=40 (6.2%), severe LVSD=18 (2.8%)}. It was observed that LVSD was more prevalent (87, 21.9%) in males than females (49, 19.4%). The overall mean values for age, BMI, BSA, Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP), Diastolic Blood Pressure (DBP), Mean Arterial Pressure (MAP) and Pulse Pressure (PP) of the study subjects were 50.4 $\pm$ 12.9, 26.6 $\pm$ 4.2, 1.6 $\pm$ 0.1, 148.0 $\pm$ 9.7, 94.3 $\pm$ 5.0, 112.2 $\pm$ 6.1, and 53.6 $\pm$ 7.0 respectively. Subjects with normal left ventricular systolic function or mild dysfunction had significantly lower BMI, SBP, DBP and MAP compared to those with moderate-severe LVSD whereas subjects with normal LVSF had significantly higher DBP and BSA than those with mild LVSD.

As observed in [Table/Fig-2], aortic root diameter, left atrial diameter, left ventricular internal diameter both in systole and diastole, end systolic and end diastolic volume, LV mass and LV mass index were significantly higher in subjects with moderate-severe LVSD than the other two groups. The LVPWT in systole ( $p=0.003$ ), RWT ( $p<0.001$ ), EF ( $p<0.001$ ) and FS ( $p<0.001$ ) were highest in subjects with normal

LV systolic function compared to those with mild/moderate-severe LVSD ( $p<0.01$ ). Further, subjects with moderate-severe LVSD had significantly worse diastolic function (highest mitral E/A ratio ( $p=0.038$ ) compared to those with normal LVSF.

[Table/Fig-3] describes that male subjects had significantly higher aortic root diameter, left atrial diameter, inter ventricular septal thickness and LV posterior wall thickness both in systole and diastole, end systolic and end diastolic volume, stroke volume, LV mass and LV mass index and lower fractional shortening compared to females.

Variable	Normal LV systolic function (n=514) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	Mild LV systolic dysfunction (n=78) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	Moderate/ Severe dysfunction (n=58) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	p-value <sup>§</sup>
Age (years)	49.6 $\pm$ 12.9	53.1 $\pm$ 12.3	53.6 $\pm$ 12.6	0.012 <sup>§</sup>
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	26.6 $\pm$ 4.2	25.9 $\pm$ 3.9	28.0 $\pm$ 4.0 <sup>††</sup>	0.017
SBP (mmHg)	147.5 $\pm$ 9.1	147.4 $\pm$ 9.7	152.7 $\pm$ 13.7 <sup>††</sup>	0.022
DBP (mmHg)	94.2 $\pm$ 4.9	92.7 $\pm$ 3.6 <sup>†</sup>	97.0 $\pm$ 6.8 <sup>††</sup>	0.000
PP (mmHg)	53.3 $\pm$ 6.5	54.6 $\pm$ 7.8	55.7 $\pm$ 9.5	0.080
MAP (mmHg)	112.0 $\pm$ 5.8	110.9 $\pm$ 5.1	115.6 $\pm$ 8.6 <sup>††</sup>	0.002
BSA (m <sup>2</sup> )	1.63 $\pm$ 0.15	1.59 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>†</sup>	1.66 $\pm$ 0.13 <sup>†</sup>	0.012

**[Table/Fig-1]:** Demographic characteristics of study participants categorised according to Left ventricular function (n=650).

BMI: Body mass index; SBP: Systolic blood pressure; DBP: Diastolic blood pressure; PP: Pulse pressure; MAP: Mean arterial pressure; BSA: Body surface area

<sup>†</sup>p<0.05 statistically significant with ANOVA

<sup>††</sup>p<0.05 vs. normal left ventricular systolic function

<sup>‡</sup>p<0.05 vs. mild left ventricular systolic function

<sup>§</sup>Statistically significant with ANOVA, but not significant with Games-Howell post-hoc test

Variable	Normal LV systolic function (n=514) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	Mild LV systolic dysfunction (n=78) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	Moderate/ Severe dysfunction (n=58) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	p-value <sup>§</sup>
AoRD (cm)	2.94 $\pm$ 0.51	2.86 $\pm$ 0.48	3.14 $\pm$ 0.49 <sup>††</sup>	0.005
LAD (cm)	3.29 $\pm$ 0.56	3.53 $\pm$ 0.85 <sup>†</sup>	3.98 $\pm$ 0.82 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
AV cusp (cm)	1.56 $\pm$ 0.26	1.54 $\pm$ 0.24	1.63 $\pm$ 0.20 <sup>††</sup>	0.063
IVSTd (cm)	1.20 $\pm$ 0.23	1.13 $\pm$ 0.19 <sup>†</sup>	1.14 $\pm$ 0.28	0.010
LVIDd (cm)	4.27 $\pm$ 0.60	4.21 $\pm$ 0.91	5.32 $\pm$ 0.98 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
LVPWTd (cm)	1.27 $\pm$ 0.29	1.21 $\pm$ 0.22	1.19 $\pm$ 0.25	0.043 <sup>§†</sup>
IVSTs (cm)	1.40 $\pm$ 0.26	1.31 $\pm$ 0.26 <sup>†</sup>	1.28 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>†</sup>	<0.001
LVIDs (cm)	2.74 $\pm$ 0.46	3.10 $\pm$ 0.86 <sup>†</sup>	4.49 $\pm$ 0.97 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
LVPWTs (cm)	1.47 $\pm$ 0.30	1.41 $\pm$ 0.27	1.35 $\pm$ 0.26 <sup>†</sup>	0.003
RWT	0.60 $\pm$ 0.20	0.59 $\pm$ 0.15	0.47 $\pm$ 0.14 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
EDV (mL)	84.94 $\pm$ 28.41	87.35 $\pm$ 40.79	139.86 $\pm$ 56.81	<0.001
ESV (mL)	30.73 $\pm$ 12.30	46.97 $\pm$ 23.31 <sup>†</sup>	95.86 $\pm$ 45.28 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
SV (mL)	54.22 $\pm$ 18.79	40.37 $\pm$ 17.81 <sup>†</sup>	44.0 $\pm$ 16.93 <sup>†</sup>	<0.001
LVM (g)	235.66 $\pm$ 87.73	226.87 $\pm$ 95.50	298.55 $\pm$ 122.20 <sup>††</sup>	0.001
LVMI (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	143.20 $\pm$ 47.39	140.97 $\pm$ 54.46	179.09 $\pm$ 67.74 <sup>††</sup>	0.001
EF (%)	63.71 $\pm$ 6.48	46.84 $\pm$ 3.28 <sup>†</sup>	32.82 $\pm$ 7.12 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
FS (%)	35.64 $\pm$ 5.96	26.89 $\pm$ 9.58 <sup>†</sup>	15.41 $\pm$ 9.19 <sup>††</sup>	<0.001
MV E/A ratio	1.09 $\pm$ 0.48	1.17 $\pm$ 0.68	1.43 $\pm$ 1.04 <sup>†</sup>	0.038

**[Table/Fig-2]:** Echocardiographic characteristics of study participants categorised according to left ventricular systolic function (n=650).

AoRD: Aortic root diameter; LAD: Left atrium diameter; AV: Aortic valve; IVSTd: Interventricular septal thickness in diastole; LVIDd: Left ventricular internal diameter in diastole; LVPWTd: Left ventricular posterior wall thickness in diastole; IVSTs: Interventricular septal thickness in systole; LVIDs: Left ventricular diameter in systole; LVPWTs: Left ventricular posterior wall thickness in systole; RWT: Relative wall thickness; EDV: End diastolic volume; ESV: End systolic volume; SV: Stroke volume; LVM: Left ventricular mass; LVMI: Left ventricular mass index; EF: Ejection fraction; FS: Fractional shortening; MV E/A: Mitral valve early diastolic filling wave/late diastolic filling wave

<sup>†</sup>p<0.05 statistically significant with ANOVA, <sup>††</sup>p<0.05 vs. normal left ventricular systolic function,

<sup>‡</sup>p<0.05 vs. mild left ventricular systolic function, <sup>§</sup>Statistically significant with ANOVA, not significant with Games-Howell post-hoc test

Variable	Male (n=398) Mean±SD	Female (n=252) (Mean±SD)	p-value*
AoRD (cm)	3.04±0.50	2.81±0.49	<0.001
LAD (cm)	3.49±0.67	3.22±0.61	<0.001
AV cusp (cm)	1.59±0.26	1.53±0.25	0.007
IVSTd (cm)	1.23±0.25	1.12±0.19	<0.001
LVIDd (cm)	4.48±0.76	4.16±0.66	<0.001
LVPWTd (cm)	1.30±0.31	1.18±0.21	<0.001
IVSTs (cm)	1.43±0.27	1.31±0.24	<0.001
LVIDs (cm)	3.06±0.79	2.77±0.71	<0.001
LVPWTs(cm)	1.49±0.29	1.40±0.28	<0.001
RWT	0.59±0.23	0.58±0.13	0.270
EDV (mL)	96.13±38.95	80.66±31.25	<0.001
ESV (mL)	41.48±28.43	33.77±23.08	<0.001
SV (mL)	54.65±20.12	46.89±16.55	<0.001
LVM (g)	262.95±98.28	204.31±73.59	<0.001
LVMI (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	156.77±53.71	129.35±42.34	<0.001
EF (%)	58.57±12.03	59.50±10.99	0.317
FS (%)	32.11±9.78	33.86±8.00	0.018
MV E/A ratio	1.09±0.57	1.18±0.60	0.089

**[Table/Fig-3]:** Gender wise distribution of echocardiographic characteristics among study participants (n=650).

AoRD: Aortic root diameter; LAD: Left atrial diameter; AV: Aortic valve; IVSTd: Interventricular septal thickness in diastole; LVIDd: Left ventricular internal diameter in diastole; LVPWTd: Left ventricular posterior wall thickness in diastole; IVSTs: Interventricular septal thickness in systole; LVIDs: Left ventricular internal diameter in systole; LVPWTs: Left ventricular posterior wall thickness in systole; RWT: Relative wall thickness; EDV: End diastolic volume; ESV: End systolic volume; SV: Stroke volume; LVM: Left ventricular mass; LVMI: Left ventricular mass index; EF: Ejection fraction; FS: Fractional shortening; MV E/A: Mitral valve early diastolic filling wave/late diastolic filling wave

\*p<0.05 statistically significant with ANOVA

## DISCUSSION

The burden of LVSD in hypertensive subjects is largely unknown in India. Our study revealed that about 21% of hypertensive patients had LVSD and the prevalence was higher in men than in women. The prevalence of LVSD observed in our study (21%) is higher compared to 6.7%, 14%, 18.1% as reported in other studies [5,19,20]. However, higher prevalence of LVSD varying from 24.3% to 34.0% has been observed in other studies [21,22]. BMI was found to be more among subjects with moderate-severe LVSD compared to those having normal or mild dysfunction. The relationship between LVSF and BMI was also reported in other studies [19,20]. However, Ogah OS et al., showed that BMI decreased from subjects with normal LVSF to those with severe LVSD [5]. We observed significant association of blood pressure with LVSF which is contrasted by other investigators [5,19,20].

In this study, aortic root diameter was significantly higher in subjects with moderate-severe LVSD than the other two groups. This finding is not in consistency with other studies [5,19]. The left atrial size and left ventricular size were found to be related to LVSF; the larger the left atrium or left ventricle, the poorer the LVSF. Similar findings have been reported in other literatures [5,19,20]. We also observed that relative wall thickness, stroke volume, ejection fraction and fractional shortening were lower among subjects with LVSD whereas LVM, LVMI and MV E/A ratio increased with LVSD. These findings are supported by the results of other studies [5,19].

The present study revealed that almost all the echocardiographic parameters were higher in male participants as compared to females except ejection fraction and fractional shortening. Adebiji AA et al., also reported similar result [23]. Previous studies reported worse LVSF among males than females [5,19,24] which is similar to result of our study although it is statistically not significant. However, ejection fraction and MV E/A ratio did not differ significantly in both genders. This finding is supported in other study [25].

## LIMITATION

There were certain limitations in this study. It was a hospital based study and thus the findings of the study cannot be generalised to the general population. We could not conduct the metabolic function tests such as blood glucose, lipid, uric acid etc., due to lack of funds. As certain diseases were excluded based on clinical history, this might introduce bias. In spite of these limitations, our study has important implications. The higher prevalence of LVSD among study participants advocates for use of echocardiography in asymptomatic hypertensive patients. This might help in early detection and management of LVSD and thereby delaying the progression to symptomatic heart failure.

## CONCLUSION

The present study revealed that one in every five hypertensive patients had LVSD. Hence, echocardiography should be part of the routine evaluation of hypertensive patients to help in early detection and management of LV systolic dysfunction, so that further complications can be prevented.

## REFERENCES

- WHO Guideline subcommittee. World Health Organization-International Society of Hypertension guidelines for the management of hypertension. *J Hypertens.* 1999;17:151-83.
- Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, Danaei G, Shibuya K, Rohani HA, et al. A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet.* 2012;380(9859):2224-60.
- Kearney PM, Whelton M, Reynolds K, Muntner P, Whelton PK, Jiang H. Global burden of hypertension-analysis of worldwide data. *Lancet.* 2005;365:217-23.
- Perkovic V, Huxley R, Wu Y, Prabhakaran D, MacMahon S. The burden of blood pressure-related disease: A neglected priority for global health. *Hypertension.* 2007;50(6):991-97.
- Ogah OS, Akinyemi RO, Adesina JO, Osinfade JKL, Ogundipe RF, Adegbite GD, et al. Prevalence of asymptomatic left ventricular systolic dysfunction in hypertensive Nigerians: echocardiographic study of 832 subjects. *Cardiovasc J Afr.* 2011;22(6):297-302.
- Lawes C, Vander S, Law M, Elliott P, MacMahon S, Rodgers A. Blood pressure and the global burden of disease 2000. Part 1: estimates of blood pressure levels. *J Hypertens.* 2006;24(3):413-22.
- Gupta R. Trends in hypertension epidemiology in India. *J Human Hypertens.* 2004;18(2):73-78.
- Drazner MH. The progression of hypertensive heart disease. *Circulation.* 2011;123(3):327-34.
- Devereux RB, Reichek N. Echocardiographic determination of left ventricular mass in man. Anatomic validation of the method. *Circulation.* 1977;55(4):613-18.
- Devereux RB, Casale PN, Wallerson DC, Kligfield P, Hammond IW, Liebson PR, et al. Cost-effectiveness of echocardiography and electrocardiography for detection of left ventricular hypertrophy in patients with systemic hypertension. *Hypertens.* 1987;9(2 Pt 2):II69-II76.
- Madaik M, Negi PC, Padam A, Gupta U. Subclinical systolic dysfunction among newly diagnosed hypertensives with preserved left ventricular ejection fraction using two dimensional strain imaging method: Hospital based observational study. *Nat J Med Res.* 2014;4(1):27-32.
- Narayanan K, Oommen R, Thomson VS, Jose JV. Assessment of left ventricular systolic function by velocity vector imaging. *Indian Heart J.* 2012;64(2):146-49.
- BMI: preventing ill health and premature death in black, Asian and other minority death in black, Asian and other minority ethnic groups. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph46/chapter/1-Recommendations>. Published 2013. Access date August 21, 2017.
- Dubois D, Dubois EF. A formula to estimate the approximate surface area if height and weight to be known. *Arch Intern Med.* 1916;17:863-71.
- Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, Cushman WC, Green LA, Izzo JL Jr, et al. National heart, lung, and blood institute joint national committee on prevention, detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood pressure; national high blood pressure education program coordinating committee. The seventh report of the joint national committee on prevention, detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood pressure: the JNC 7 report. *JAMA.* 2003;289:2560-72.
- Lang RM, Bierig M, Devereux RB, Flachskampf FA, Foster E, Pellikka PA, et al. Recommendations for chamber quantification: A report from the American Society of Echocardiography's guidelines and standards committee and the Chamber Quantification Writing Group, developed in conjunction with the European Association of Echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr.* 2005;18(12):1440-63.
- Teichholz LE, Kreulen T, Herman MV, Gorlin R. Problems in echocardiographic volume determinations: echocardiographic-angiographic correlations in the presence of absence of asynergy. *Am J Cardiol.* 1976;37(1):07-11.
- Aurigemma GP, Gottdiener JS, Shemanski L, Gardin J, Kitzman D. Predictive value of systolic and diastolic function for incident congestive heart failure in the elderly: The cardiovascular health study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2001;37(4):1042-48.

- [19] Ojji D, Atherton J, Sliwa K, Alfa J, Ngabea M, Opie L. Left ventricular systolic dysfunction in asymptomatic black hypertensive subjects. *Am J Hypertens*. 2015;28(7):924-29.
- [20] Devereux RB, Bella JN, Palmieri V, Oberman A, Kitzman DW, Hopkins PN, et al. Left ventricular systolic dysfunction in a biracial sample of hypertensive adults: the hypergen study. *Hypertension*. 2001;38(3):417-23.
- [21] Laddha M, Sachdeva V, Diggikar PM, Satpathy PK, Kakrani AL. Echocardiographic assessment of cardiac dysfunction in patients of end stage renal disease on haemodialysis. *J Assoc Physicians India*. 2014;62:28-32.
- [22] Bountiukos M, Schinkel AFL, Bax JJ, Lampropoulos S, Poldermans D. The impact of hypertension on systolic and diastolic left ventricular function. A tissue Doppler echocardiographic study. *Am Heart J*. 2006;151(6):1323.e7-1323.e12.
- [23] Adebisi AA, Aje A, Ogah OS, Ojji DB, Oladapo OO, Falase AO. Left ventricular diastolic function parameters in hypertensives. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 2005;97(1):41-45. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2568572&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>.
- [24] Perez Cabeza AI, Gomez Doblaz JJ, Hidalgo LM, Bueno FC, Navarro MFJ, Salguero RL, et al. Systolic ventricular dysfunction, a new marker of coronary artery disease in patients with aortic stenosis without previous myocardial infarction. *Rev Esp Cardiol*. 2005;58(2):218-21.
- [25] Ayoub AM, Keddeas VW, Ali YA, El Okl RA. Subclinical LV dysfunction detection using speckle tracking echocardiography in hypertensive patients with preserved LV ejection fraction. *Clin Med Insights: Cardiol*. 2016;10:85-90.

**PARTICULARS OF CONTRIBUTORS:**

1. PhD Student, Department of Physiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.
2. Associate Professor, Department of Cardiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.
3. Professor, Department of Physiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.
4. Professor, Department of Physiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.

**NAME, ADDRESS, E-MAIL ID OF THE CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Dr. Suresh Kumar Behera,  
Associate Professor, Department of Cardiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar-751003, Odisha, India.  
E-mail: [surebehera@yahoo.co.in](mailto:surebehera@yahoo.co.in)

Date of Submission: **Oct 22, 2017**

Date of Peer Review: **Nov 22, 2017**

Date of Acceptance: **Mar 28, 2018**

Date of Publishing: **Apr 01, 2018**

**FINANCIAL OR OTHER COMPETING INTERESTS:** None.