Determinants and prognostic implications of the negative diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient in patients with pulmonary hypertension due to left heart disease

Anikó Ilona Nagy, MD, PhD[*] Ashwin Venkateshvaran, MSc[#,**], Béla Merkely, MD, PhD[*], Lars H. Lund, MD, PhD[§,†], Aristomenis Manouras, MD, PhD[§,†]

Affiliations: [*]Heart and Vascular Center, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary [#]School for Technology and Health, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden; [**]Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Medical Sciences, Bangalore, India; [§]Department of Cardiology, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden; [†]Department of Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Corresponding author:

Anikó Ilona Nagy, MD, PhD

Semmelweis University, Heart and Vascular Center

68. Városmajor utca, Budapest, H-1122, Hungary

Telephone: +36208259738;

E-mail: anychophora@gmail.com

Running title: Nagy et al. Negative DPG in pulmonary hypertension

Keywords: pre-capillary, post-capillary, V-wave

ABSTRACT

Background. The diastolic pressure gradient (DPG) has recently been introduced as specific marker of combined pre-capillary pulmonary hypertension (Cpc-PH) in left heart disease (LHD). However, its diagnostic and prognostic superiority compared to traditional haemodynamic indices has been lately challenged. Current recommendations explicitly denote that in the normal heart, DPG values are greater than zero, with DPG ≥ 7 mmHg indicating Cpc-PH. However, clinicians are perplexed by the frequent observation of DPG < 0 mmHg (DPG_{NEG}), as its physiologic explanation and clinical impact is unclear up-to-date.

Aims. We hypothesized that large V-waves in the pulmonary artery wedge (PAWP) curve yielding asymmetric pressure transmission might stand for DPG_{NEG} and undertook this study to clarify the physiological and prognostic implications of DPG_{NEG}.

Methods and results. Right heart catheterization and echocardiography was performed in 316 patients with LHD due to primary myocardial dysfunction or valvular disease. 256 patients had PH-LHD of whom 48% demonstrated DPG_{NEG}. The V-wave amplitude inversely correlated with DPG ($r=-0.45$, $p<0.001$) in patients with low pulmonary vascular resistance, but not in those with elevated PVR ($p>0.05$). Patients with large V-waves had negative and lower DPG than those without augmented V-wave ($p<0.001$) despite similar PVR ($p>0.05$). Positive, but normal DPG (0-6 mmHg) carried a worse 2-year prognosis for death and/or heart transplantation than DPG_{NEG} (HR: 2.97; $p<0.05$).

Conclusion. Our results advocate against DPG_{NEG} constituting a measurement error. We propose that DPG_{NEG} can partially be ascribed to large V-waves and carries a better prognosis than DPG within the normal positive range.

INTRODUCTION

Pulmonary hypertension (PH) is a common complication of left heart disease (LHD). In isolated post-capillary PH the pulmonary arterial pressure (PAP) elevation is governed solely by the upstream-transmitted left atrial pressure (LAP). Long-standing post-capillary PH may however lead to pathological alterations of the pre-capillary vasculature, contributing to further PAP increase, a state denoted as combined post- and pre-capillary PH (Cpc-PH). Although this latter condition is clearly associated with worse prognosis [1,2], the optimal method to haemodynamically distinguish these two cohorts remains controversial.

Traditionally, pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) and transpulmonary gradient (TPG) have been employed for discerning Cpc-PH, both metrics bearing an established prognostic value in PH due to LHD (PH-LHD) [3,4]. However, as both these markers are influenced by the LAP and stroke volume [5], their specificity has been questioned. In recent times, the diastolic pulmonary gradient (DPG), considered less affected by heart failure (HF) induced haemodynamic changes [5], has been introduced as a more reliable Cpc-PH index. Based on the above rationale and study results demonstrating prognostic superiority of the DPG [6,7], the Fifth World Symposium on PH proposed that a DPG $\geq$ 7 mmHg alone should define Cpc-PH [5]. However, the failure of two recent large-scale studies to confirm the prognostic value of DPG [8,9] raised concerns regarding its use in PH-LHD [8,10]. Despite the significant prevalence of negative DPG values (DPG_{NEG}), reportedly varying between 10- 50% [8,11], the physiological background and the potential prognostic implications of DPG_{NEG} have yet not been investigated; rather, DPG_{NEG} has arbitrarily been considered to represent measurement error [12]. We hypothesized that prominent V-waves in the pulmonary artery wedge pressure (PAWP) recordings might stand for the DPG_{NEG} by causing "asymmetrical" pressure transmission through the pulmonary capillaries i.e. a backward LAP wave reflection characterized by disproportionate phasic pressure changes. We therefore undertook the present study in order to 1, investigate the impact of V-waves on the DPG and particularly on the DPG_{NEG} occurrence 2, elucidate the influence of PAWP as compared

to direct LAP measurements on the DPG and 3, assess the prognostic significance of DPG_{NEG} compared to positive but normal DPG.

METHODS

Study population. The study population consisted of 316 patients in total. 192 patients were enrolled prospectively (86 consecutive patients with PH due to HF (denoted as PH-LHD in the following) referred for right heart catheterization (RHC) for HF assessment between January and December 2014 were enrolled prospectively at Karolinska University Hospital, while 106 consecutive patients with severe rheumatic mitral valve stenosis (denoted as MS in the following) referred for percutaneous transvenous mitral commissurotomy (PTMC) between January and June 2012 were enrolled again prospectively at the Sri Sathya Sai Institute, Bangalore, India). In addition, 124 consecutive patients with PH-LHD referred for RHC at the Karolinska University Hospital were studied retrospectively. In all PH-LHD cases medical treatment had been titrated and haemodynamic stabilization achieved at the time of examination. None of the patients included in the study presented with acute coronary syndrome or had undergone cardiac surgery within 1 year before enrolment. In case of the MS cohort, subjects with > 1 grade mitral regurgitation, aortic valve disease, ischemic heart disease, atrial fibrillation (AF) or hypertension were not included in the study. In the PH-LHD cohort no specific exclusion criteria were applied, apart from patients with pressure tracings of inadequate quality (i.e. that would not have allowed reliable and reproducible identification of waveforms) were not included. A flowchart describing patient enrolment and haemodynamic grouping is provided in Figure S1. Follow-up data were collected form the Karolinska University Hospital database that is updated centrally; patients were followed until death, cardiac transplantation or the end of study period (mean time: 15.6 months). The prognostic value of DPG_{NEG} vs. positive but normal DPG was assessed. The study was approved by the local ethics committee (registration number 2013/1991-32). All prospectively enrolled subjects provided written informed consent. All subjects underwent transthoracic echocardiography and RHC.

Catheterization. RHC was performed using a 6 F balloon-tipped fluid-filled Swan-Ganz catheter (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, California, USA) through the jugular or femoral vein access. Mean right atrial pressure (RAP_M), diastolic (PAP_D) and mean pulmonary artery pressure (PAP_M), mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure ($PAWP_M$) and right ventricular systolic pressure (RVSP) was recorded under fluoroscopy after calibration with the zero level set at the mid-thoracic line. All pressure tracings were stored in a connected haemodynamic recorder and analysed off-line with commercially available software (Xper Information Management, Philips Medical Systems, The Netherlands). Importantly, in order to ensure the uniformity of data acquisition and the standardization of the study the same investigator (AM) participated in RHC for all MS and the majority of PH-LHD patients and performed the analysis of all waveforms at both sites. From the PAWP recordings, the peak V- and A-wave and the $PAWP_M$ were obtained. All pressure measurements were averaged from a minimum of 5 heart cycles at end-expiration. Cardiac output (CO) was measured using Fick's principle. The oxygen consumption was measured breath-by breath by dedicated gas analysis system. In 15 cases thermodilution was employed.

PVR, TPG and DPG were calculated as: PVR= $(PAP_M-PAWP_M)/CO$; TPG=PAP_M-PAWP_M and DPG=PAP_D-PAWP_M, respectively. The difference between TPG and DPG (ΔPG), which equals PAP_M-PAP_D, was analysed in order to investigate diagnostic discrepancies by the two measures. Right ventricular stroke work index was calculated as RVSWi= $(PAP_M-RAP_M)/SVi * 0.0136$, where SVi denotes stroke volume index measured as: CO/HR/BSA. In MS patients measurements were performed prior PTMC. For full details of methods, please see the Supplementary material online.

Simultaneous LAP and PAWP assessment: In 51 MS patients, simultaneous, beat-to-beat, LAP and PAWP tracings were obtained concurrently to right heart catheterization. Interatrial septal puncture was performed with an 8F Mullins' sheath, dilator and a Brockenbrough needle. The LAP was measured directly through the Mullins' sheath used during valvuloplasty. Both transducers were zeroed after careful calibration, pressures were recorded during a 10 seconds period and stored for off-line analysis.

Statistical analysis. The IBM SPSS statistics version 23.0 was used. Normality was tested by the Kolmogorov - Smirnov test. Continuous variables were expressed as mean ± SD or median and interquartile range. Categorical variables were expressed as absolute values and percentage. Comparisons of groups were performed with Mann-Whitney rank-sum test. Correlations were tested by the Pearson's 2-tailed test. All tests were performed at 95% confidence intervals. A p-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Receiver operator characteristics (ROC) was performed. Survival was analysed in the retrospectively studied 124 PH-LHD patients with Kaplan and Meier non-parametric test and compared using a log-rank test. Univariate and multiple Cox proportional hazards regression models were used to examine the effects of the DPG on patients' survival. Age, creatinine- and sex-adjusted survival curve estimates of the DPG were derived from stratified Cox models.

RESULTS

Study Population. Of the 316 patients enrolled, 269 (84.5%) demonstrated PH ($PAP_M \geq 25$ mmHg). Of these, 256 (95%, MS: 37%) had PH-LHD ($PAP_M \geq 25$ and $PAWP_M > 15$mmHg). Demographics are presented in Table 1. Due to the different underlying pathology, the MS and PH-LHD groups were analysed separately. MS patients had higher PAP_M, A- and V-waves and RVSWi compared to PH-LHD group. However, DPG did not differ between the two groups (Table 2).

V-wave influence on DPG. To evaluate the effect of the V-waves on the DPG we sub-grouped the cohort based on the presence of large V-waves, defined as the V-wave exceeding the $PAWP_M$ by the arbitrary limit of > 10 mmHg as previous investigators have performed [13]. In the 69 cases (45%) with large V-waves (43 MS and 26 PH-LHD patients), the DPG was on average negative and lower ($p < 0.05$) compared to those with smaller V-waves, despite similar levels of TPG, PVR, PAP and cardiac index ($p > 0.05$, for all comparisons, Table 3, Figure S2).

A significant inverse correlation between the V-wave and DPG was evident in patients with PVR <3 WU (r= -0.45, p< 0.001), both in MS (r: - 0.34, p=0.03) and the PH-LHD group (r= - 0.46, p< 0.001). A weaker, yet statistically significant correlation (r=0.36; p=0.01) between the V-wave and DPG was found in patients with PVR 3-7 WU. However, this relation disappeared at higher PVR values (p> 0.05; Figure 1A). Conversely, no association between the V-wave and TPG was observed (p> 0.05; Figure 1B). The modest overall correlation between the V-wave and DPG might be ascribed to the divergent association of the V-waves with PAP_D at higher PAP_M and PVR (Figure 1D), whereas the association between V-waves and $PAWP_M$ was essentially unaltered throughout the examined PAP_M and PVR range (Figure 1C).

Importantly, in patients with PVR< 3 WU, the V-wave showed the strongest correlation with the *Δ*PG (r=0.45, p< 0.001 for the whole cohort, r=0.36, p=0.005 for PH- LHD; r=0.6, p=0.003 for MS group, Figure 1E), with a weaker yet significant association of both the absolute and relative V-wave value with *Δ*PG (r= 0.26 and r=0.19, respectively; p< 0.05). Conversely, neither the A-wave nor the cardiac output correlated with *Δ*PG (p> 0.05, in all cases).

The puzzling finding of normal DPG with concomitantly elevated TPG (>12 mmHg) is not unusual. Indeed, in our study 59 patients (23%, MS: 29%) TPG and DPG demonstrated incongruent diagnostics (TPG> 12, DPG< 7 mmHg). Furthermore, DPG_{NEG} with concomitantly elevated TPG (>12 mmHg) occasionally occur. In our study we decided to quantify this discrepancy by calculating *Δ*PG (*Δ*PG=TPG-DPG). The *Δ*PG value that leads to discrepant Cpc-PH diagnostics between TPG and DPG_{NEG} is 12 mmHg. In order to examine whether the V-wave amplitude impacted on this discrepancy we employed ROC analysis in patients with PVR< 3 WU. The association between *Δ*PG and V-wave amplitude is presented in Figure 1E. At an optimal cut-off limit of 30.5 mmHg, V-wave yielded a sensitivity of 85% and specificity of 70% (AUC: 0.80, CI: 0.72 to 0.88; p< 0.001) for the identification of *Δ*PG>12 mmHg (Figure S3). For the whole cohort of patients with PVR < 7 WU, the corresponding figures were: AUC 0.73, p<0.003; CI 0.61-0.84 at an optimal cut-off limit of V-wave of 31.5 mmHg).

In an attempt to investigate potential non-invasive and clinical determinants of the V-wave amplitude, LA-ESVi, LVMi, internal LV dimensions as well as the available clinical variables were tested. None of the tested variables, however, was associated with the V-wave ($p>0.05$ in all cases).

Negative DPG values. In total, 123 patients (48%) demonstrated DPG_{NEG} (median -3 mmHg; interquartile range: -5 to -2mmHg) with higher prevalence in the MS- compared to the PH-LHD group (55% vs. 44%, $p< 0.05$). MS patients had significantly higher V-waves ($p< 0.001$, Table 2). When the whole study population was considered, patients with DPG_{NEG} showed significantly larger V-waves, lower PAP_M, RAP_M, PVR and TPG values whereas the $PAWP_M$ and cardiac index levels were comparable to those with positive DPG (Table 4).

Assuming that pre-capillary changes differ between positive DPG and DPG_{NEG} patients, we compared the two groups within a predefined PVR range (3 – 7 WU) in order to ensure comparatively equivalent degree of pre-capillary alterations between the two groups. Patients with DPG_{NEG} demonstrated higher V-waves in both the MS and PH-LHD group, a less prominent right heart dilatation along with better RV function ($p< 0.001$) as compared to the positive DPG cohort, despite similar PAP_M ($p> 0.05$, Table 4 and Table S1). Interestingly, the V-wave amplitude was similar in MS and PH-LHD patients in the DPG_{NEG} group.

Determinants of the DPG.

1, LAP versus PAWP in DPG assessment. In the 51 MS patients with simultaneous PAWP and LAP recordings, the DPG was calculated from PAWP (DPG_{PAWP}) and LAP (DPG_{LAP}) separately. DPG_{PAWP} was negative in 28 cases while DPG_{LAP} in 22 cases due slightly yet not significantly lower (mean bias: - 2 mmHg) LAP (24.1 ± 8.0 mmHg) as compared to PAWP (26.0 ± 8.1 mmHg; $p> 0.05$). However, in only 3 cases with negative DPG_{PAWP} the corresponding DPG_{LAP} was positive, while in 1 case reclassification occurred in the opposite direction.

2, Heart rhythm. When the analysis was confined to the 192 patients with heart rate < 85 beats/min, 52 % demonstrated DPG_{NEG}. Similarly, when only the 53 patients in AF were considered, DPG_{NEG} was measured in 50%.

3, Alternative PAWP measurements. As detailed in Supplementary Results, when the DPG was calculated using PAWP value measured at the z-point of the PAWP curve, instead of using $PAWP_M$ in patients with DPG_{NEG}, this resulted in significantly higher DPG values. Still, the prevalence of DPG_{NEG} was not significantly reduced.

Prognostic value of DPG. Two-year outcome for the combined end-point of death or cardiac transplantation was significantly better for PH-LHD patients with DPG_{NEG} as compared to those with positive but normal DPG ($0 \leq DPG < 7$ mmHg) (Figure 2A). In the DPG_{NEG} group (n=57) the combined end-point was documented in 16 cases (10 deaths and 6 transplantations), while in the $0 \leq DPG < 7$ mmHg group (n= 53) the corresponding figures were 24 (14 deaths and 10 transplantations). Finally, in the $DPG \geq 7$ mmHg group (n = 17) 8 combined end-point events were recorded (5 deaths and 3 transplantations).

The occurrence of the combined end-point of death or transplantation was significantly higher for $0 \leq DPG < 7$ mmHg both in unadjusted analysis ($p < 0.005$) and when adjusted for age, creatinine and ischemic heart disease (Figure 2B). Conversely, neither TPG (cut-off 12 mmHg) nor PVR (cut-off 3 WU) provided significant prognostic information ($p = 0.522$ and $p = 0.718$, respectively). Furthermore, combining DPG and TPG [DPG_{NEG} and $TPG \leq 12$ mmHg vs. $0 \leq DPG < 7$ and $TPG > 12$ mmHg] also failed to provide prognostic information ($p=0.223$).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we (1) confirm the high prevalence of DPG_{NEG} in PH-LHD patients, (2) demonstrate that DPG_{NEG} does not always represent measurement error, but instead may be ascribed

to high V-wave amplitude in patients with relatively low resistance in the pulmonary vascular bed, and (3) show that DPG_{NEG} is associated with lower mortality as compared to the corresponding group of positive yet not elevated DPG.

In healthy subjects and in patients without significant pre-capillary alterations, PAP_D is closely related to the LAP, with DPG values ranging between 0-5 mmHg [5]. DPG_{NEG} have so far been regarded as measurement bias, ascribed to over-wedging or inaccurate PAP_D recordings [5]. However, the high DPG_{NEG} prevalence, ranging from 20% in critically ill patients [11,14] to 35% [8] and up to 50% [15] in PH-LHD patients calls for a reappraisal of its pathophysiologic origin. DPG_{NEG} was found in 44% of our PH-LHD cohort, most probably reflecting the higher proportion of PH (95%) compared to that (45%) in a recent study [8].

V-wave influence on DPG. During systole, the second phase of LA filling occurs, yielding the most prominent positive deflection of the PAWP waveform designated as the V-wave. The volume and the rate of blood entering the LA as well as this chamber's compliance determine the V-wave's amplitude [16,17], which in healthy subjects averages at 12 mmHg, ranging between 4-19 mmHg, being at most 6 mmHg higher than the LAP_M [18]. Importantly, the LA volume-pressure relation follows an exponential rather than a linear pattern, so that at lower LAP a certain volume entering the LA yields minor pressure elevation, whereas at higher LAP an equal inflowing volume results in a greater pressure rise [13,16]. Conceivably, large V-waves arise not only in the presence of severe acute mitral regurgitation [19] but also in conditions such as MS [20] and longstanding LV dysfunction, when LA distensibility is impaired resulting in an upward shift of the LA volume-pressure curve. In our study, large V-waves were present in 20% of the PH-LHD group and in 46% of the MS cohort, similarly to the findings of Wang and colleagues [20]. It should be emphasized that the augmented V-wave in these two cohorts represent distinct hemodynamic conditions; in MS it reflects increased LA stiffness due to obstructed mitral valve orifice, whereas in PH-LHD is mainly secondary to a rise in LV end-diastolic pressure. It has been shown that the distorted LAP waveform in the presence of large V-waves leads to overestimation of the LVEDP [21]. Furthermore, there is evidence of retrograde superimposition of prominent V-waves on the PAP contour [22]. Caro and colleagues demonstrated that at high LAP, the

ratio of pulmonary arterial to pulmonary venous compliance changes, promoting an asymmetrical backward transmission of the phasic LAP [23]. Although, studies concomitantly reporting the V-wave amplitude and the PAP_D are infrequent, the existing data on large V-waves in the context of increased LA stiffness reveal DPG_{NEG} in essentially all cases [17]. Importantly, we demonstrate that the inverse correlation between V-wave and DPG was confined to patients with relatively low PVR in accordance with the findings of Falicov and colleagues [15]. Under physiological conditions, at end-diastole the pulmonary vascular bed allows pressure equilibration [24] which is otherwise hindered by the presence of vascular remodelling. Taken together, our results indicate that in PH-LHD the V-wave amplitude significantly influences the DPG calculation unless significant pre-capillary remodelling is present. However, with progressive maladaptive pre-capillary alterations the V-wave does not any more act as an important determinant of the DPG, which might be explained by increased stiffening of the pulmonary arteries and thus dampening of the backward LAP transmission. Previous investigations suggest that large V-waves inversely correlate to the ratio between the systolic and diastolic pulmonary inflow velocities [25]. In accordance to previous investigators, LA-volume was not associated with the V-wave amplitude [26]. As echocardiography plays a key role in the initial PH assessment in HF, further studies are warranted to address potential incremental value of this modality.

Methodological considerations. The current findings argue against the notion that DPG_{NEG} represents merely inaccurate measurement. Firstly, the PAWP and PAP waveforms were assessed manually at end-expiration by a single investigator, limiting the possibility of erroneous computerized PAP_D measurements and preventing potential $PAWP_M$ underestimation due to pressure averaging throughout the respiratory cycle [27]. Experimental studies have shown that heart rate (HR) impacts on DPG; at higher HR, DPG rises due to lower LVEDP and a concomitant PAP_D elevation [28]. Our results reveal that even when confining the analysis to patients with normal HR or patients with AF, the incidence of DPG_{NEG} was unaltered. Finally, our simultaneously performed PAWP and LAP measurements partly contradict the opinion that DPG would be a result of erroneous PAWP recordings. Direct LAP measurements yielded slightly higher DPG values as compared to PAWP. In

roughly 11% cases with negative DPG_{PAWP} the corresponding DPG_{LAP} was positive, while in 1 case reclassification occurred in the opposite direction (4.5%). This finding points to the fact, that due to its low absolute value, even a small measurement error will affect the DPG value, however, it also demonstrates, that measurement error stands only for a minority of DPG_{NEG} cases. Taken together, although the slight discrepancy between LAP and PAWP might stand for a minor portion of the DPG_{NEG}, our findings suggest that DPG_{NEG} values can for the most part be ascribed to the augmented V waves.

Prognostic significance. The prognostic impact of DPG_{NEG} is as yet unknown. It has been suggested that patients with DPG_{NEG}, instead of being a subclass of the isolated post-capillary PH (DPG<7 mmHg) group, in fact represent a cohort with worse haemodynamics [8]. Our findings contradict this hypothesis. We demonstrate that when comparing DPG_{NEG} patients to those with $0 \leq DPG < 7$, within a predefined range of PVR (3-7 WU), the DPG_{NEG} cohort is characterized by lower RAP, and higher TAPSE reflecting a state of less pronounced right heart loading and remodelling advocating for milder haemodynamic derangements in the DPG_{NEG} group. This together with the lower event rate in the DPG_{NEG} as compared to the DPG 0 – 7 mmHg cohort further supports the concept that DPG_{NEG} in large part results from high V-waves shifting the DPG towards lower values, and suggests limited pre-capillary changes.

In our study, neither the PVR nor the TPG was associated with worse outcome. Furthermore, combining TPG and PVR with DPG failed to demonstrate significant prognostic value ($p= 0.223$ and $p= 0.195$, respectively). This observation stands in contrast to previous results and might be partly related to differences in patient profile. Indeed, as compared to the report by Tampakakis et al., the occurrence of ischemic heart disease was much higher in our study [8]; additionally, our patient cohort comprised of older patients than that studied by Tampakakis et al. or Tedford et al. [8,9]. Finally, the follow-up period was shorter in our study. The constellation of the aforementioned issues as well as the fact that our study comprised of fewer patients might stand for this discrepancy.

Limitations. Heterogeneity might be considered as comprising a limitation of the current study as catheterizations were performed in two different centres. However, all studies in India were performed in the presence of AM who was responsible for the standardization of the studies in the two centres; additionally the same technical equipment and catheters were used at both sites. Patient characteristics as well as haemodynamics of the two studied cohorts are also rather divergent, as demonstrated in Table 1 (e.g. patients with AF, hypertension or ischemic heart disease were excluded from the MS but not PH-LHD group), however as the objective of the present study was not to assess the influence of AF or other comorbidities on the DPG, but rather the effect of the V-wave amplitude on the DPG measurement, we believe that despite the patients' heterogeneity, the hemodynamic essence of our hypothesis is still addressed. Our cohort comprised of patients with PH-LHD (including both preserved and reduced EF) and MS, in which respect it is different from previous comparable studies. Indeed, pre-capillary involvement as defined by DPG $\geq$ 7 mmHg was more frequent in MS patients (20.2%). However, the prevalence of Cpc-PH in the PH-LHD group was 13.6% that is comparable to previous studies (8-16%) [6,8,9]. Finally, the current study was performed on hemodynamically stable patients implying that our findings might not be valid in a state of decompensated acute HF.

CONCLUSION

The present study verifies the recently observed high frequency of DPG_{NEG}. We propose an applicable physiologic explanation for this haemodynamic finding demonstrating a significant inverse association of the V-wave amplitude in the PAWP waveform with the DPG in patients with low PVR. Using direct LAP measurements we show that the occurrence of DPG_{NEG} is clearly not reflecting methodological inaccuracies; rather it largely represents the augmented disproportionate phasic LAP transmission. Finally, DPG_{NEG} in patients with PH-LHD appears to be associated with milder haemodynamic derangements and better two-year prognosis compared to patients with DPG within the normal positive range.

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

REFERENCES

1. Guazzi M, Borlaug BA. Pulmonary hypertension due to left heart disease. *Circulation* 2012;126:975-990.
2. Mehra MR, Jessup M, Gronda E, Costanzo MR. Rationale and process: International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation guidelines for the care of cardiac transplant candidates--2006. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2006;25:1001-1002.
3. Khush KK, Tasissa G, Butler J, McGlothlin D, De Marco T, Investigators E. Effect of pulmonary hypertension on clinical outcomes in advanced heart failure: analysis of the Evaluation Study of Congestive Heart Failure and Pulmonary Artery Catheterization Effectiveness (ESCAPE) database. *Am Heart J* 2009;157:1026-1034.
4. Miller WL, Grill DE, Borlaug BA. Clinical features, hemodynamics, and outcomes of pulmonary hypertension due to chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: pulmonary hypertension and heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail* 2013;1:290-299.
5. Naeije R, Vachiery JL, Yerly P, Vanderpool R. The transpulmonary pressure gradient for the diagnosis of pulmonary vascular disease. *Eur Respir J* 2013;41:217-223.
6. Gerges C, Gerges M, Lang MB, Zhang Y, Jakowitsch J, Probst P, Maurer G, Lang IM. Diastolic pulmonary vascular pressure gradient: a predictor of prognosis in "out-of-proportion" pulmonary hypertension. *Chest* 2013;143:758-766.
7. Sibbald WJ, Paterson NA, Holliday RL, Anderson RA, Lobb TR, Duff JH. Pulmonary hypertension in sepsis: measurement by the pulmonary arterial diastolic-pulmonary wedge pressure gradient and the influence of passive and active factors. *Chest* 1978;73:583-591.
8. Tampakakis E, Leary PJ, Selby VN, De Marco T, Cappola TP, Felker GM, Russell SD, Kasper EK, Tedford RJ. The diastolic pulmonary gradient does not predict survival in patients with pulmonary hypertension due to left heart disease. *JACC Heart Fail* 2015;3:9-16.
9. Tedford RJ, Beaty CA, Mathai SC, Kolb TM, Damico R, Hassoun PM, Leary PJ, Kass DA, Shah AS. Prognostic value of the pre-transplant diastolic pulmonary artery pressure-to-pulmonary capillary wedge pressure gradient in cardiac transplant recipients with pulmonary hypertension. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2014;33:289-297.
10. Gerges C, Gerges M, Lang IM. Characterization of pulmonary hypertension in heart failure using the diastolic pressure gradient: the conundrum of high and low diastolic pulmonary gradient. *JACC Heart Fail* 2015;3:424-425.
11. Wilson RF, Beckman SB, Tyburski JG, Scholten DJ. Pulmonary artery diastolic and wedge pressure relationships in critically ill and injured patients. *Arch Surg* 1988;123:933-936.
12. Chatterjee NA, Lewis GD. Characterization of pulmonary hypertension in heart failure using the diastolic pressure gradient: limitations of a solitary measurement. *JACC Heart Fail* 2015;3:17-21.
13. Pichard AD, Kay R, Smith H, Rentrop P, Holt J, Gorlin R. Large V waves in the pulmonary wedge pressure tracing in the absence of mitral regurgitation. *Am J Cardiol* 1982;50:1044-1050.
14. Heinonen J, Salmenpera M, Takkunen O. Increased pulmonary artery diastolic-pulmonary wedge pressure gradient after cardiopulmonary bypass. *Can Anaesth Soc J* 1985;32:165-170.
15. Falicov RE, Resnekov L. Relationship of the pulmonary artery end-diastolic pressure to the left ventricular end-diastolic and mean filling pressures in patients with and without left ventricular dysfunction. *Circulation* 1970;42:65-73.

16. Morrow AG, Braunwald E, Haller JA, Jr., Sharp EH. Left heart catheterization by the transbronchial route: technic and applications in physiologic and diagnostic investigations. *Circulation* 1957;16:1033-1039.
17. Mehta S, Charbonneau F, Fitchett DH, Marpole DG, Patton R, Sniderman AD. The clinical consequences of a stiff left atrium. *Am Heart J* 1991;122:1184-1191.
18. Braunwald E, Brockenbrough EC, Frahm CJ, Ross J, Jr. Left atrial and left ventricular pressures in subjects without cardiovascular disease: observations in eighteen patients studied by transseptal left heart catheterization. *Circulation* 1961;24:267-269.
19. Baxley WA, Kennedy JW, Feild B, Dodge HT. Hemodynamics in ruptured chordae tendineae and chronic rheumatic mitral regurgitation. *Circulation* 1973;48:1288-1294.
20. Wang A, Harrison JK, Pieper KS, Kisslo KB, Bashore TM. What does the left atrial v wave signify during balloon commissurotomy of mitral stenosis? *Am J Cardiol* 1998;82:1388-1393.
21. Haskell RJ, French WJ. Accuracy of left atrial and pulmonary artery wedge pressure in pure mitral regurgitation in predicting left ventricular end-diastolic pressure. *Am J Cardiol* 1988;61:136-141.
22. Levinson DC, Wilburne M, Meehan JP, Jr., Shubin H. Evidence for retrograde transpulmonary propagation of the V (or regurgitant) wave in mitral insufficiency. *Am J Cardiol* 1958;2:159-169.
23. Caro CG, Bergel DH, Seed WA. Forward and backward transmission of pressure waves in the pulmonary vascular bed of the dog. *Circ Res* 1967;20:185-193.
24. Kaltman AJ, Herbert WH, Conroy RJ, Kossmann CE. The gradient in pressure across the pulmonary vascular bed during diastole. *Circulation* 1966;34:377-384.
25. Klein AL, Stewart WJ, Bartlett J, Cohen GI, Kahan F, Pearce G, Husbands K, Bailey AS, Salcedo EE, Cosgrove DM. Effects of mitral regurgitation on pulmonary venous flow and left atrial pressure: an intraoperative transesophageal echocardiographic study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992;20:1345-1352.
26. Pizzarello RA, Turnier J, Padmanabhan VT, Goldman MA, Tortolani AJ. Left atrial size, pressure, and V wave height in patients with isolated, severe, pure mitral regurgitation. *Cathet Cardiovasc Diagn* 1984;10:445-454.
27. Ryan JJ, Rich JD, Thiruvoipati T, Swamy R, Kim GH, Rich S. Current practice for determining pulmonary capillary wedge pressure predisposes to serious errors in the classification of patients with pulmonary hypertension. *Am Heart J* 2012;163:589-594.
28. Enson Y, Wood JA, Mantaras NB, Harvey RM. The influence of heart rate on pulmonary arterial-left ventricular pressure relationships at end-diastole. *Circulation* 1977;56:533-539.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1 A, correlation between the diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient (DPG) and the V-wave amplitude in patients with low (PVR< 3 WU) and high (PVR ≥ 3 WU) pulmonary vascular resistance. **B,** correlation between the transpulmonary pressure gradient (TPG) and the V-wave amplitude in patients with low (PVR< 3 WU) and high (PVR ≥ 3 WU) PVR. **C,** Correlation between the mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure ($PAWP_M$) and the V-wave amplitude in patients with low (PVR< 3 WU) and high (PVR ≥ 3 WU) PVR. **D,** Correlation between the diastolic pulmonary artery pressure (PAP_D) and the V-wave amplitude in patients with low (PVR< 3 WU) and high (PVR ≥ 3 WU) PVR. **E,** Correlation between the V-wave amplitude and *Δ*PG in patients with MS and PH-LHD.

Figure 2A, Kaplan Meier analysis for the three diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient (DPG) groups. Group I, DPG < 0 mmHg; Group II, 0 ≥ DPG < 7 mmHg; Group III, DPG ≥ 7 mmHg. **B,** Hazard ratio for death and/or transplantation for patients with positive normal DPG (0 ≤ DPG < 7 mmHg) and negative DPG. Due to few patients in Group III, only the statistical comparison between Group I and II is presented. DPG, diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient; CI, confidence interval; IHD, ischemic heart disease.

Supplementary figures

Figure S1 Flowchart demonstrating the patient enrolment process and haemodynamic classification. MS, mitral valve stenosis; PH-LHD, pulmonary hypertension due to primary myocardial dysfunction; PTMC, percutaneous transvenous mitral commissurotomy; RHC, right heat catheterisation; HF, heart failure; MR, mitral regurgitation; IHD, ischaemic heart disease; AF, atrial fibrillation; HTN, systemic arterial hypertension, HTX, heart transplantation, PAP_M, pulmonary artery mean pressure, $PAWP_M$,

mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure; Cpc-PH, combined post- and pre-capillary pulmonary hypertension.

Figure S2 Representative pressure tracings illustrating the influence of V-waves on the DPG value. **A**, PAWP waveform. **B,** PA waveform. DPG, diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient; TPG, transpulmonary gradient; PAWP, pulmonary artery wedge pressure; PAP_D, pulmonary artery diastolic pressure

Figure S3 Receiver operator characteristics (ROC) analysis of the prognostic ability of the V-wave ($PAWP_V$) for identifying a *Δ*PG >12mmHg in patients with pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) < 3 Wood Units. *Δ*PG is defined as the difference between the transpulmonary pressure gradient (TPG) and the diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient (DPG).

TABLES

Table 1: Demographic and echocardiographic data of the study population.

	All patients (256)	**MS** (94)	**PH-LHD** (162)	**P**	**PH-LHD R** (124)
Demographics					
Age	50 ± 19	31 ± 9	61±15	<0.001	61±15
Female (%)	51%	72%	39%	<0.001	40%
BSA (m^2)	1.8 ± 0.3	1.4 ± 0.2	2.0 ± 0.2	<0.001	1.9± 0.2
HT (%)		0%	85%		51%
DM (%)		0%	60%		45%
Aetiology of HF					
IHD (n, %)		0%	36 (22%)		32 (26%)
Idiopathic HF			68 (42%)		48 (39%)
Myocarditis			21 (13%)		6 (5%)
Other			37 (23%)		38 (31)
AF (n, %)	53 (21%)	0	53 (33%)		43 (35%)
Functional class					
NYHA II - IIIa		60 (64%)	84 (52%)	<0.001	70 (56%)
NYHA IIIb		34 (36%)	49 (30%)	<0.001	29 (23%)
NYHA IV		-	29 (18%)		25 (20%)
Medication					
Diuretics		100%	81%		78%
ACEi			85%		81%
Beta Blockers		100%	98%		93%
CCA			25%		18%
MRA			31%		34%
Echo data					
EF ≤45%	69 (27%)	5 (5%)	62 (38%)	<0.001	55 (44%)
LVEDD (mm)		44 ± 7	52 ± 13	<0.001	54 ± 14
LVESD (mm)		29 ± 0.4	41 ± 15	<0.001	43 ± 16
LVMi (gr/m2)		64 ± 18	105 ± 50	<0.001	114 ± 55
LA-ESVi (mL/m2)		68 ± 19	50 ± 21	<0.001	58 ± 20
MVA (cm2)		0.8 ± 0.2			
MVG (mmHg)		19 ± 9			
RVEDD (mm)		36 ± 5	40 ± 8	<0.001	41 ± 7
TAPSE (mm)		18 ± 3	14 ± 5	<0.001	14 ± 4
MR grade					
Mild	163 (63%)	64 (68%)	99 (61%)	<0.001	82 (66%)
Moderate	23 (9%)	-	23 (14%)		14 (11%)
Severe	17 (6%)	-	17 (10.5%)		11 (9%)
AS grade					
Moderate	3 (1%)	-	3 (2%)		4 (3%)
AR (grade)					
Mild	32 (13%)	-	32 (20%)		31 (25%)
Moderate	3 (1%)	-	3 (2%)		6 (5%)

Data are expressed as expressed as mean ± SD. P values indicate the difference between the two prospective cohorts, i.e. MS and LHD. Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; MS, mitral valve stenosis; PH-LHD, Pulmonary hypertension due to myocardial dysfunction; PH-LHD R, retrospective arm of the PH-LHD group; BSA, body surface area; HT, hypertension; DM, diabetes mellitus; IHD, ischemic heart disease; AF, atrial fibrillation; ACE-i, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, β-blockers, beta-blockers; CCA, calcium channel blockers; MRA, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist, HR, heart rate; EF, ejection fraction; LVEDD, left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVESD, LV end-systolic diameter; LVMi, LV mass index; LA-ESVi, left atrial end-systolic volume index; MVA, mitral valve area; MVG, mitral valve mean diastolic gradient; RVEDD, right ventricular end-diastolic diameter; TAPSE, tricuspid annular positive systolic excursion; MR, mitral valve regurgitation; AS, aortic valve stenosis; AR, aortic valve regurgitation

.

Table 2: Haemodynamics of the entire cohort.

	All patients (256)	MS (94)	PH-LHD (162)	p
PAP_M (mmHg)	35 (29 to 44) *(256)*	38 (30 to 50) *(94)*	34 (29 to 43) *(162)*	*0.024*
PAP_D (mmHg)	24 (20 to 31) *(255)*	27 (19 to 36) *(94)*	23 (20 to 29) *(161)*	*0.026*
RVSP (mmHg)	24 (21 to 29) *(256)*	59 (47 to 83) *(94)*	40 (49 to 63) *(162)*	*<0.001*
$PAWP_M$ (mmHg)	24 (21 to 29) *(256)*	25 (23 to 32) *(94)*	23 (20 to 27) *(162)*	*0.026*
A-wave (mmHg)	26 (22 to 32) *(229)*	31 (26 to 37) *(91)*	24 (21 to 28) *(138)*	*<0.001*
V-wave (mmHg)	31 (27 to 37) *(235)*	35 (31 to 44) *(94)*	28 (25 to 33) *(141)*	*<0.001*
CI ($L/min/m^2$)	1.9 (1.6 to 2.4) *(256)*	1.7 (1.4 to 2.1) *(94)*	2 (1.7 to 2.5) *(162)*	*<0.001*
RAP_M (mmHg)	10 (6 to 15) *(255)*	6 (3.8 to 8) *(94)*	12 (9 to 17) *(161)*	*<0.001*
RVSWi($g/m^2/beat$)	9 (6.6 to 13) *(255)*	10.4 (7.8 to 14.8) *(94)*	8.2 (6 to 12.2) *(161)*	*<0.001*
AV (mL/L)	54 (45 to 65) *(241)*	50 (42 to 57) *(94)*	57 (45 to 17) *(147)*	*<0.001*
DPG (mmHg)	0 (-3 to 4) *(255)*	-1 (-4 to 5) *(94)*	0 (-3 to 3) *(161)*	*0.327*
DPG < 7	-1 (-4 to 1) *(83%)*	-2 (-5 to 0) *(79%)*	-1 (-3 to 1) *(85%)*	
DPG ≥ 7	13 (9 to 15) *(17%)*	14 (10 to 18) *(21%)*	12 (9 to 14) *(14%)*	
TPG (mmHg)	10 (7 to 18) *(256)*	9 (6 to 21) *(94)*	11 (7 to 16) *(162)*	*0.72*
TPG ≤ 12	8 (5.5 to 9) *(61%)*	7 (5 to 9) *(62%)*	8 (6 to 10) *(61%)*	
TPG > 12	20 (16 to 27) *(39%)*	25 (18 to 34) *(38%)*	19 (15 to 23) *(39%)*	
PVR (WU)	3 (1.8 to 5.2) *(256)*	4 (2.5 to 8.8) *(94)*	2.6 (1.7 to 4.5) *(162)*	*<0.001*
PVR < 3	1.8 (1.4 to 2.5) *(51%)*	1.9 (1.3 to 2.6) *(36%)*	1.8 (1. 3 to 2.4) *(59%)*	
PVR ≥ 3	5.3 (3.8 to 7.8) *(49%)*	7.1 (4.1 to 11.6) *(64%)*	4.8 (3.8 to 6.1) *(41%)*	

Abbreviations: MS, mitral stenosis; PH-LHD, pulmonary hypertension due to myocardial dysfunction; PAP_M, PAP_D , pulmonary artery mean and diastolic pressure, respectively; RVSP; Right ventricular systolic pressure; $PAWP_M$, mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure; V- and A-wave, the maximal amplitude of the V- and A-wave of the PAWP waveform, respectively; CI, cardiac index; RAP_M, mean right atrial pressure; RVSWi, right ventricular stroke work index; AV, arterio-venous difference of oxygen saturation; DPG, diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; WU, Wood Units. P value report the statistical difference between MS and LHD. Values are expressed in median and interquartile range.

Table 3. Haemodynamics stratified according to V-wave amplitude.

	Small V-waves n=166 (51 MS)	**Large V-waves n=69 (43 MS)**	**p**
PAP_M (mmHg)	34 (29 to 44)	35 (30 to 45)	*0.36*
PAP_D (mmHg)	24 (20 to 30)	23 (19 to 32)	*0.77*
$PAWP_M$ (mm Hg)	23 (20 to 27)	25 (22 to 31)	*0.001*
V-wave (mmHg)	28 (25 to 32)	39 (34 to 46)	*< 0.001*
$V\text{-}wave_{abs}$ (mmHg)	5 (3 to 7)	13 (11 to 17)	*< 0.001*
PVR (WU)	2.9 (1.9 to 5.6)	3.1 (1.7 to 5.2)	*0.73*
TPG (mmHg)	11 (7 to 19)	9 (7 to 15)	*0.39*
DPG (mmHg)	0 (-2 to 5)	-2 (-4 to 1)	*0.002*
CI ($L/min/m^2$)	1.9 (1.6 to 2.4)	1.8 (1.6 to 2.5)	*0.26*

Small V-wave signifies a difference between maximal amplitude of the V-wave of the PAWP waveform (PAWPv) and the mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure ($PAWP_M$) i.e. $V\text{-}wave_{abs}$ of < 10 mmHg. Large V-wave signifies a $V\text{-}wave_{abs} \geq 10$ mmHg. MS, mitral stenosis; PAP_M and PAP_D, pulmonary artery mean and diastolic pressure respectively; $PAWP_M$, mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; DPG, diastolic pulmonary pressure gradient; CI, cardiac index; WU, Wood Units; Values are expressed in median and interquartile range.

Table 4. Comparison of negative and positive DPG groups within the entire study population and in patients with a predefined PVR range of 3 - 7 WU.

	All patients		PVR 3 -7 WU	
	DPG < 0 (n)	**DPG ≥ 0 (n)**	**DPG < 0 (n)**	**DPG ≥ 0 (n)**
MS patients (n)	52 (42 %)	42 (32 %)	18 (64 %)	11 (19 %)
PAP_M (mmHg)	31 (28 to 37) (123)	41 (33 to 49) (132) *(p<0.001)*	38 (30 to 43) (28)	40 (34 to 45) (57) *(p=0.128)*
PAP_D (mmHg)	20 (17 to 26) (123)	28 (23 to 35) (132) *(p<0.001)*	23 (18 to 30) (28)	27 (24 to 31) (57) *(p=0.013)*
V-wave (mmHg)	33 (28 to 39) (112)	29 (25 to 36) (123) *(p<0.001)*	37 (32 to 42) (26)	28 (24 to 33) (52) *(p<0.001)*
$PAWP_M$ (mmHg)	24 (21 to 29) (123)	24 (20 to 28) (132) *(p=0.06)*	25 (21 to 32) (28)	24 (20 to 28) (57) *(p=0.071)*
RVSP (mmHg)	49 (41 to 59) (123)	62 (47 to 78) (132) *(p<0.001)*	51 (46 to 32) (28)	61(47 to 71) (56) *(p=0.67)*
RAP_M (mmHg)	9 (5 to 13.5) (123)	11 (7 to 15) (132) *(p=0.004)*	7.5 (4 to 10) (28)	11 (7 to 15) (57) *(p=0.005)*
PVR (WU)	2.2 (1.4 to 3.0) (123)	4.7 (2.6 to 7.6) (132) *(p<0.001)*	4 (3.4 to 4.8) (28)	4.7 (3.7 to 5.6) (57) *(p=0.09)*
DPG (mmHg)	-3 (-5 to -2) (123)	3 (1 to 9) (132) *(p<0.001)*	-2.5 (-4 to -1) (28)	3.0 (1 to 5) (57) *(p<0.001)*
TPG (mmHg)	7 (5 to 9) (123)	16 (11 to 24) (132) *(p<0.001)*	9 (8 to 14) (28)	15 (12 to 21) (57) *(p<0.001)*
CI ($L/min/m^2$)	1.9 (1.6 to 2.5) (123)	1.9 (1.6 to 2.3) (132) *(p=0.392)*	1.7 (1.3 to 1.9) (28)	1.8 (1.6 to 2.2) (57) *(p=0.034)*
RVSWi ($gr/m^2/beat$)	8.2 (6.4 to 11) (123)	10.5 (6.8 to 15*)* *(p=0.004)*	8.4 (6 to 12.6) (28)	10.3 (6.3 to 14) (57) *(p=0.24)*
A-V (mL/L)	49 (42 to 59) (115)	58 (48 to 69 (126) *(p<0.001)*	49 (41 to 63) (28)	62 (49 to 71) (53) *(p=0.04)*
TAPSE (mm)	17 (12 to 19) (123)	15 (12 to 18) (132) *(p=0.025)*	18 (15 to 21) (28)	14 (11 to 17) (57) *(p=0.004)*
RA area (cm^2)	18 (12 to 24) (123)	22 (15 to 27) (132) *(p=0.002)*	12 (10 to 24) (28)	23 (18 to 29) (57) *(p<0.001)*
RVEDD (mm)	36 (33 to 41) (123)	38 (34 to 46) (132) *(p<0.003)*	34 (33 to 43) (28)	40 (36 to 48) (57) *(p=0.005)*

MS, mitral stenosis; PAP_M and PAP_D pulmonary artery mean and diastolic pressure respectively; $PAWP_M$ and V-wave, mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure and the maximal amplitude of the V-wave of the PAWP waveform, respectively; RVSP; right ventricular systolic pressure**;** RAP_M, right atrial mean pressure; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; DPG, pulmonary diastolic pressure gradient; CI, cardiac index; RVSWi, right ventricular stroke work index; A-V, arterio-venous difference in oxygen saturation; TAPSE, tricuspid annular plane systolic

excursion; RA, right atrium; RVEDD, right ventricular end-diastolic diameter; WU, Wood Units; Values are expressed in median and interquartile range.

Table S1. Comparison of negative and positive DPG groups in MS and LHD patients with a predefined PVR range of 3 - 7 WU.

	PH-LHD			MS		
	DPG < 0 ***(n=10)***	**DPG ≥ 0** ***(n=46)***	**p**	**DPG < 0** ***(n=18)***	**DPG ≥ 0** ***(n=11)***	**p**
PAP_M (mmHg)	40.5 (31.3 to 45.5)	43 (34 to 45)	0.223	33.5 (29.8 to 43.5)	36 (33 to 38) †	0.152
PAP_D (mmHg)	21.5 (18.3 to 28.8)	27 (24 to 31)	0.03	22.5 (18.5 to 30.3)	26 (24 to 31)	0.112
V-wave (mmHg)	37 (31.5 to 39.8)	27 (24 to 32)	0.002	37 (32 to 45)	33 (28 to 39) †	0.02
A-wave (mmHg)	26 (16 to 28)	24 (21 to 28)	0.185	30.5 (26.5 to 37.5)†	28.5 (22 to 35)	0.123
$PAWP_M$ (mmHg)	24 (21.3 to 31.3)	22 (19 to 29)	0.181	25 (21 to 32.5)	24 (23 to 30)	0.176
PVR (WU)	3.9 (3.2 to 4.5)	4.8 (3.8 to 5.7)	0.04	4.1 (3.5 to 5.1)	4.2 (3.5 to 5.7)	0.154
DPG (mmHg)	-2.5 (-3 to -1)	3.0 (1 to 7)	< 0.001	-2.0 (-4 to -1)	2 (0 to 3) †	<0.001
TPG (mmHg)	13.5 (9 to 17.8)	21 (18 to 27)	0.005	9 (7.8 to 11) †	11 (9 to 12) †	0.110

PH-LHD, pulmonary hypertension due to myocardial dysfunction; MS, mitral stenosis; PAP_M and PAP_D pulmonary artery mean and diastolic pressure respectively; $PAWP_M$ and V-wave, mean pulmonary artery wedge pressure and the maximal amplitude of the V-wave of the PAWP waveform, respectively; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; DPG, pulmonary diastolic pressure gradient. Values are expressed in median and interquartile range; † denotes significant difference between MS and PH-LHD group.

Table S2. Alternative PAWP measurements and DPG calculation.

A

DPG	Mean value [mmHg]	SD [mmHg]	Median [mmHg]	Interquartile range [mmHg]	p-value
DPG_{PAWPM}	-3.6	2.63	-3.0	-5 to -1	0.014
$DPG_{z\text{-}point}$	-2.35	2.38	-2.2	-4 to - 0.6	

B

DPG	Mean value [mmHg]	SD [mmHg]	Median [mmHg]	Interquartile range [mmHg]	p-value
DPG_{PAWPM}	-4.1	2.6	-4.0	-6.5 to -2	0.02
$DPG_{z\text{-}point}$	-1.9	2.7	-1.0	-4 to -0.5	

A, 34 PH-LHD patients with $DPG_{NEG.}$ B, Subgroup of the previous 34 patients with large V-waves (16 individuals). DPG, diastolic pressure gradient; DPG_{PAWPM}, DPG calculated using PAWPmean; $DPG_{z\text{-}point}$, DPG calculated using z-point of the PAWP curve; SD, standard deviation.