



Assessment of cardiac dimensions in children diagnosed with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy

Bakaya, K., Paracha, W., Schievano, S., & Bozkurt, S. (2022). Assessment of cardiac dimensions in children diagnosed with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Echocardiography*, 39(9), 1233-1239. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/echo.15437>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
Echocardiography

Publication Status:
Published (in print/issue): 30/09/2022

DOI:
[10.1111/echo.15437](https://doi.org/10.1111/echo.15437)

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) is an inherited autosomal dominant heart disease,
3 characterised by increased left ventricular wall thickness and abnormal loading conditions. Imaging
4 modalities are the first choice for diagnosis and risk stratification. Although heart dimensions have
5 been characterised widely in HCM adults from cardiac imaging, there is limited information about
6 children affected by HCM. The aim of this study is to evaluate left ventricular function and left heart
7 dimensions in a small population of children diagnosed with HCM.

8 **Methods:** A total of 16 (7 male, 9 female) paediatric patients with an average age of 14.0 ± 2.5 years
9 diagnosed with HCM at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children were included in this study. Cardiac
10 magnetic resonance images were used to measure left and right ventricular dimensions, and septal
11 and left ventricular free wall thicknesses in Simpleware ScanIP. The gender groups were compared
12 using student t-test or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test depending on the sample distribution.

13 **Results:** Differences in heart rate, left ventricular end-diastolic volume and end-diastolic volume
14 index, left ventricular stroke volume and stroke volume index, left ventricular end-systolic long axis
15 length, left ventricular end-systolic long axis length index, left ventricular end-diastolic mid-cavity
16 diameter, left ventricular end-diastolic free wall thickness, left ventricular end-diastolic free wall
17 thickness index, right ventricular end-diastolic long axis length were statistically significant in males
18 and females.

19 **Conclusion:** Left ventricular wall and intraventricular septal thickness increase affecting left ventricle
20 cavity dimensions and there may be differences in anatomical and physiological parameters in males
21 and females affected by HCM.

22 **Keywords:** hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; paediatric patients; cardiac magnetic resonance imaging

23

1 Introduction

2 Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) is an inherited, autosomal dominant primary heart
3 disease, characterised by increased left ventricular wall thickness without ventricle dilation [1]. In the
4 adult population, it is a common genetic cardiovascular disease, affecting 1 in 500 people with
5 increasing diagnosis rate after 40 years of age; however, it has a much lower prevalence in children,
6 where it only affects 0.47 children per 100,000 [2–4].

7 HCM is often associated with left ventricular diastolic dysfunction– reduced ability of the left
8 ventricle to relax fully. This translated in reduced left ventricular filling and, therefore, reduced cardiac
9 output [5]. Histological evidence shows myocardial fibre disarray and fibrosis in HCM samples, often
10 with short runs of severely hypertrophied fibres, especially in the septal tissue [6]. Therefore, HCM-
11 affected hearts produce lower strength per muscle cross-sectional area compared to healthy hearts.

12 In paediatrics, the cause of HCM is generally mutations in various genes, especially those
13 associated with sarcomeres, intercellular calcium modulators or z-discs such as MYBPC3 or MYH7 [7].
14 HCM patients have been found to have a significantly greater indexed LV mass and wall thickness
15 compared to healthy subjects. The extent and distribution of LV hypertrophy in paediatric patients
16 vary considerably due to diverse genetic and molecular causes and concomitant conditions such as
17 arterial hypertension or aortic stenosis [1,8]. For instance, left ventricular mass index and maximal left
18 ventricular wall thickness indices may reach up to 101.4 g/m² and 19.6 mm/m² whereas these
19 variables are around 35.9 g/m² and 5.7 mm/m² in normal children around 13 years old [9]. In
20 childhood, HCM often occurs alongside left ventricular outflow tract obstruction and mitral
21 regurgitation [10,11]. These are most commonly the result of increased myocardial hypertrophy, with
22 subsequent anterior motion of the anterior mitral leaflet and subvalvular apparatus during systole
23 [11,12]. Usually, obstructive HCM in children is linked with substantial thickening of the anterior basal
24 septum opposite to the anterior leaflet of the mitral valve [4].

25 Cardiac imaging modalities such as echocardiography, magnetic resonance imaging or nuclear
26 imaging and computerised tomography are used as diagnostic tools to identify the morphologic and
27 functional changes in patients [13]. HCM is diagnosed measuring left ventricular diastolic septal
28 thickness and free wall thickness. Suggested diagnostic criteria for HCM defined using a z-score which
29 shows how many standard deviations below or above the population mean and z-score two times
30 higher than healthy population shows existence of HCM [5,13,14]. However, use of z-score two times
31 higher than healthy population is criticised because left ventricular wall is too sensitive in children
32 when compared to adults [15]. Therefore, diagnostics criteria remain non-established in children and
33 recent guidelines suggest that a maximal wall thickness that with a z-score ≥ 20 whilst >10 can be used

1 with combination of different risk factors [16]. Although in adults information about the diagnosis and
2 risk stratification of HCM is well established, there is limited data on the cardiac function and heart
3 chamber dimensions in children [9]. Sahin et al. [17] investigated clinical characteristics of paediatric
4 patients diagnosed with HCM in syndromic and non-syndromic patients. They concluded that the
5 morphological, functional, and clinical features of HCM in children are heterogeneous and highly
6 depends on the cause and age. Wang and Zhu [18] reviewed clinical characteristics of paediatric
7 patients affected by HCM and concluded that novel prognostic markers are needed to predict sudden
8 cardiac death in children with HCM. El Assaad et al. [19] utilised exercise stress echocardiography to
9 evaluate clinical characteristics of HCM in children at rest and exercise and concluded exercise stress
10 echocardiography can be used in children with HCM as risk-stratifying tool. Windram et al. [20]
11 compared myocardial dimensions measured with echocardiography and magnetic resonance imaging
12 finding that magnetic resonance imaging is more reliable than echocardiography to measure
13 circumferential myocardial thickness. As there is limited data available about HCM in children, z-scores
14 ranges for children in HCM have not been defined yet, therefore, adult z-score thresholds are
15 recommended as diagnostic criteria in paediatric patients [5]. Therefore, investigating cardiac
16 dimension ranges in children diagnosed with HCM will help to establish better diagnostic criteria for
17 paediatric patients. The aim of this study is to investigate anatomical and haemodynamic
18 characteristics in children diagnosed with HCM along with comparing the anatomical and
19 haemodynamic characteristics in male and female patients.

20 **Materials and Methods**


21 A total of 16 (7 male, 9 female, 14.0 ± 2.5 [10-17] years old) paediatric patients diagnosed with
22 HCM at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, London were included in this study. The average
23 age for male patients was 13.9 ± 3.4 years ranging between 7 and 17 years, whilst for females was
24 14.1 ± 1.8 years, ranging between 11 and 16 years.

25 Patient demographics and hemodynamic parameters were collected from the hospital database:
26 age, gender, height, weight, body mass index, heart rate, end-diastolic and end-systolic volumes, end-
27 diastolic and end-diastolic volume indices, left ventricular ejection fraction, cardiac output, cardiac
28 index and left ventricular mass index. Cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) images (1.5-Tesla Magnetom
29 Avanto scanner, Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany) were reviewed for this study. The
30 steady-state free precession (SSFP) sequences, displaying relatively high blood to muscle contrast
31 compared to other CMR sequences, allowed ventricular measurement [21], acquired at both end-
32 diastole, and end-systole, each identified as the point of the cardiac cycle with the largest and smallest
33 left ventricular cavity size, respectively. Four-chamber and short-axis views were used to measure left

1 ventricular long axis length, left ventricular mid-cavity diameter, right ventricular long axis length, right
2 ventricular mid-cavity diameter, intraventricular septal thickness, left ventricular lateral septal
3 diameter and left ventricular free wall thickness at the end of diastolic and systolic phases using the
4 image segmentation and processing software Simpleware ScanIP 2018 (Synopsis, CA, USA) as given in
5 Figure 1.

6 The measurements from the two groups (male vs. female) were statistically compared using
7 student t-test or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test depending on the sample distribution
8 evaluated utilising the Shapiro-Wilk test [22] (IBM SPSS 27, Armonk, New York, USA). P-values <0.05
9 were assumed to be statistically significant.

10 Reproducibility of the measurements was assessed in four randomly selected subjects. Intra-
11 class correlation coefficients (ICC) with 95% confidence interval were calculated to assess the inter
12 and intra observer variability using MedCalc 19.7 (MedCalc, Ostend, Belgium). Inter-observer
13 reproducibility analysis was done using one-way random effects model to evaluate randomly selected
14 observers for each subject. Intra-observer variability analysis was done utilising two-way model to
15 evaluate the same observer for the selected measurements.



16

17 **Figure 1.** Heart chamber and wall dimensions measured on the cardiac magnetic images. 1. left ventricular
18 long axis length, 2. left ventricular mid-cavity diameter, 3. right ventricular long axis length, 4. right
19 ventricular mid-cavity diameter, 5. intraventricular septal thickness, 6. left ventricular lateral septal diameter, 7. left
20 ventricular free wall thickness, (LV and RV represent left and right ventricles).

21 Results

22 Average values and standard deviations of the patient characteristics and haemodynamic
23 variables in left ventricle and p-values for the statistical comparison between the groups are given in
24 Table 1.

25

Table 1. Average values and standard deviations of the patient data and haemodynamics, superscript *n* represents non-parametric statistical comparison, * shows the statistically significant differences between the groups. (LV represents left ventricle).

	All patients	Male	Female	p-values
Age [years]	14.0 ± 2.5	13.9 ± 3.4	14.1 ± 1.8	0.861
Body Surface Area [m ²]	1.58 ± 0.30	1.65 ± 0.34	1.52 ± 0.26	0.395
Height [m]	1.62 ± 0.14	1.67 ± 0.17	1.59 ± 0.10	0.252 ⁿ
Weight [kg]	55.68 ± 18.06	59.16 ± 17.76	52.97 ± 18.87	0.512
Body Mass Index [kg/m ²]	20.65 ± 4.94	20.60 ± 3.24	20.70 ± 6.15	0.606 ⁿ
Heart Rate [bpm]	68.19 ± 13.02	59.14 ± 6.20	75.22 ± 12.73	0.006*
End-diastolic LV Volume [mL]	115.25 ± 33.23	141.57 ± 31.30	94.78 ± 16.06	0.006*
End-diastolic LV Volume Index [mL/m ²]	73.44 ± 17.20	86.57 ± 15.43	63.22 ± 10.40	0.006*
End-systolic LV Volume [mL]	34.56 ± 16.04	43.86 ± 19.02	27.33 ± 8.76	0.066
End-systolic LV Volume Index [mL/m ²]	22.06 ± 9.40	27.00 ± 11.31	18.22 ± 5.63	0.096
LV Stroke Volume [mL]	80.69 ± 21.38	97.71 ± 20.62	67.44 ± 9.34	0.007*
LV Stroke Volume Index [mL/m ²]	51.39 ± 10.30	59.58 ± 8.97	45.02 ± 5.85	0.004*
LV Ejection Fraction [%]	70.63 ± 7.09	69.29 ± 8.92	71.67 ± 5.63	0.552
Cardiac Output [L/min]	5.37 ± 1.13	5.79 ± 1.29	5.04 ± 0.93	0.091 ⁿ
Cardiac Index [L/min/m ²]	3.45 ± 0.72	3.50 ± 0.53	3.41 ± 0.87	0.806
LV Mass Index [g/m ²]	79.93 ± 16.38	87.79 ± 14.48	73.82 ± 15.81	0.088
E/A Ratio	1.57 ± 0.12	1.53 ± 0.52	1.63 ± 0.34	<0.001*

1 Average body surface area of the cohort was 1.58 m², height was 1.62 m and weight was 55.68
2 kg. Although the males had higher average body surface area, height and weight than the females,
3 there was no significant difference between the two groups. Average body mass index of all patients
4 was 20.65 kg/m², with male and female patients presenting similar values. There was a significant
5 difference in the heart rate between male and female patients. Average left ventricular end-diastolic
6 volume, and end-diastolic volume index were significantly higher in the male patients. Although there
7 was a difference for the average left ventricular end-systolic volume and end-systolic volume index
8 between the groups, this was not statistically significant. Left ventricular stroke volume and stroke
9 volume index were significantly different between the male and female patients.

1 Average left ventricular ejection fraction was similar for males and females. Average cardiac output
 2 for the cohort was 5.37 L/min. Although there was a relatively high cardiac output in the male patients,
 3 the difference in the cardiac output for females and males was not statistically significant. Also, cardiac
 4 index was similar in both groups. Average left ventricular mass index was no significantly different in
 5 male and female patients. E/A ratio was significantly different in male and female patients. Average
 6 values and standard deviations of the left and right ventricular dimensions and p-values for the
 7 statistical comparison between the groups are given in Table 2. Available CMR images from the
 8 patients are given as supplementary material.

9 **Table 2.** Average values and standard deviations of the left and right ventricular dimensions, superscript
 10 *n* represents non-parametric statistical comparison, * shows the statistically significant differences
 11 between the groups. (LV, RV and IV represent left and right ventricle and intraventricular respectively)

	All patients	Male	Female	p-values
LV end-diastolic lateral septal diameter [mm]	43.58 ± 5.28	46.16 ± 5.35	41.57 ± 4.52	0.094
LV end-diastolic lateral septal diameter index [mm/m ²]	28.33 ± 5.26	28.96 ± 6.92	27.85 ± 3.90	0.713
LV end-systolic lateral septal diameter [mm]	22.59 ± 5.96	24.67 ± 6.36	20.98 ± 5.44	0.681 ⁿ
LV end-systolic lateral septal diameter index [mm/m ²]	14.62 ± 3.92	15.31 ± 4.00	14.08 ± 4.01	0.554
LV end-diastolic long axis length [mm]	84.13 ± 12.06	92.56 ± 12.65	77.57 ± 6.49	0.020*
LV end-diastolic long axis length index [mm/m ²]	54.42 ± 8.39	57.07 ± 7.57	52.35 ± 8.84	0.270
LV end-systolic long axis length [mm]	61.43 ± 18.31	74.31 ± 10.01	51.4 ± 17.18	0.005*
LV end-systolic long axis length index [mm/m ²]	39.25 ± 11.34	45.98 ± 7.43	34.02 ± 11.36	0.024*
RV end-diastolic long axis length [mm]	61.70 ± 17.18	72.94 ± 18.05	52.96 ± 10.59	0.028*
RV end-diastolic long axis length index [mm/m ²]	39.89 ± 11.67	45.84 ± 14.12	35.27 ± 7.11	0.106
RV end-systolic long axis length [mm]	38.89 ± 11.81	44.87 ± 12.11	34.23 ± 9.80	0.084
RV end-systolic long axis length index [mm/m ²]	24.98 ± 7.25	27.76 ± 7.40	22.82 ± 6.74	0.114 ⁿ
LV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter [mm]	41.78 ± 7.21	46.86 ± 3.69	37.83 ± 6.86	0.005*
LV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter index [mm/m ²]	27.06 ± 5.59	29.40 ± 6.58	25.23 ± 4.19	0.175
LV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter [mm]	20.56 ± 5.17	22.49 ± 4.89	19.06 ± 5.13	0.196
LV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter index [mm/m ²]	13.51 ± 4.38	14.39 ± 5.18	12.82 ± 3.82	0.516
RV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter [mm]	34.24 ± 5.84	36.64 ± 3.32	32.38 ± 6.83	0.127
RV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter index [mm/m ²]	22.09 ± 4.46	23.11 ± 6.18	21.30 ± 2.65	0.606 ⁿ
RV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter [mm]	17.2 ± 5.43	18.84 ± 4.59	15.93 ± 5.95	0.351 ⁿ
RV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter index [mm/m ²]	11.15 ± 3.99	12.00 ± 4.74	10.49 ± 3.44	0.492
LV end-diastolic free wall thickness [mm]	7.81 ± 1.64	9.27 ± 1.09	6.68 ± 0.93	<0.001*
LV end-diastolic free wall thickness index [mm/m ²]	5.05 ± 1.16	5.82 ± 1.36	4.45 ± 0.47	0.037*
LV end-systolic free wall thickness [mm]	16.21 ± 3.96	17.24 ± 3.52	15.40 ± 4.30	0.362
LV end-systolic free wall thickness index [mm/m ²]	10.63 ± 3.66	11.01 ± 4.52	10.33 ± 3.09	0.606 ⁿ
IV end-diastolic septal thickness [mm]	17.24 ± 5.11	16.86 ± 5.61	17.54 ± 5.02	0.803
IV end-diastolic septal thickness index [mm/m ²]	11.16 ± 3.40	10.22 ± 2.51	11.89 ± 3.94	0.536 ⁿ
IV end-systolic septal thickness [mm]	21.99 ± 6.00	23.06 ± 5.68	21.16 ± 6.44	0.470 ⁿ
IV end-systolic septal thickness index [mm/m ²]	14.15 ± 3.64	13.99 ± 2.09	14.28 ± 4.63	0.870

1 Although there was a high difference in the left ventricular end-diastolic lateral septal diameter
2 between the groups, this difference was not statistically different. Average left ventricular end-
3 diastolic lateral septal diameter index was similar for both groups. Left ventricular end-systolic lateral
4 septal diameter and left ventricular end-systolic lateral septal diameter index were also similar in both
5 groups.

6 There was a significant difference in left ventricular end-diastolic long axis length between the
7 male and female patients. However, the difference in the left ventricular end-diastolic long axis length
8 index between the groups was not statistically significant. Average left ventricular end-systolic long
9 axis length, and end-systolic long axis length index were significantly different in male and female
10 patients.

11 Although the difference in the right ventricular end-diastolic long axis length for male and females
12 were statistically significant, there was no statistical significance for the right ventricular end-diastolic
13 long axis length index. There was no significant difference for the groups in average right ventricular
14 end-systolic long axis length. Similarly, the right ventricular end-systolic long axis length index was not
15 statistically significant either for both groups.

16 Although there was a significant difference between male and female patients for the left
17 ventricular end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter, indexed left ventricular end-diastolic mid-cavity
18 diameter was not statistically different in both groups. Also left ventricular end-systolic mid cavity
19 diameter and end-systolic mid cavity diameter index were not statistically different.

20 There was no significant difference between the groups in average right ventricular end-
21 diastolic mid-cavity diameter, end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter index, end-systolic mid-cavity
22 diameter and end-systolic mid-cavity diameter index.

23 There was a significant difference between the male and female patients in left ventricular end-
24 diastolic free wall thickness and end-diastolic free wall thickness index whereas end-systolic free wall
25 thickness and end-systolic free wall thickness index were similar in both groups.

26 There was no statistical significance between the groups for average end-diastolic septal
27 thickness, end-diastolic septal thickness index, end-systolic septal thickness and indexed end-systolic
28 septal thickness. ICC and 95% intervals for the reproducibility of the measurements are given in Table
29 3.

1 **Table 3.** Reproducibility for the measurements. (ICC represents intra-class correlation coefficient, LV,
 2 RV and IV represent left and right ventricle and intraventricular respectively)

	Inter-observer		Intra-observer	
	ICC	95% interval	ICC	95% interval
LV end-diastolic lateral septal diameter	0,99	0,96 - 0,99	0,99	0,61 - 0,99
LV end-systolic lateral septal diameter	0,98	0,93 - 0,99	0,99	0,70 - 0,99
LV end-diastolic long axis length	0,95	0,75 - 0,99	0,98	0,47 - 0,99
LV end-systolic long axis length	0,98	0,91 - 0,99	0,97	0,58 - 0,99
RV end-diastolic long axis length index	0,98	0,88 - 0,99	0,99	0,86 - 0,99
RV end-systolic long axis length	0,89	0,42 - 0,99	0,99	0,95 - 0,99
LV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter	0,99	0,97 - 0,99	0,99	0,99 - 1,00
LV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter	0,84	0,16 - 0,99	0,98	0,86 - 0,99
RV end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter	0,99	0,93 - 0,99	0,98	0,79 - 0,99
RV end-systolic mid-cavity diameter	0,86	0,26 - 0,99	0,92	-0,38 - 0,99
LV end-diastolic free wall thickness	0,48	-1,77 - 0,96	0,81	-0,57 - 0,99
LV end-systolic free wall thickness	0,83	0,11 - 0,99	0,96	0,48 - 0,99
IV end-diastolic septal thickness	0,99	0,99 - 0,99	0,99	0,98 - 0,99
IV end-systolic septal thickness	0,98	0,88 - 0,99	0,99	0,58 - 0,99

3
4

5 ICC values were above 0.80 except in the inter-observer left ventricular analysis for the end-diastolic
 6 free wall thickness. High ICC values show reproducible and consistent measurements.

7 **Discussion/Conclusion**

8 In this study, we investigated dimensions of the left and right ventricles and left ventricular wall
 9 and septum in children diagnosed with HCM. Cardiac dimensions such as long axis length mid cavity
 10 diameter, free wall thickness in the left ventricle or intraventricular septal thickness together with
 11 right ventricular dimensions have been reported in this study. Therefore, findings in this study
 12 provides information not only about the ventricular wall dimensions but also how the ventricular
 13 cavity is influenced by HCM. We also compared ventricular and wall dimensions in male and female
 14 patients using statistical analyses. Previously, Chaowu et al. [9] reported cardiac magnetic resonance
 15 characteristics in children diagnosed with HCM. Patient characteristics such as age and body surface
 16 area in [9] were similar to the patients' age and body surface area in this study. Moreover, left

1 ventricular end-diastolic and end-systolic volumes, left ventricular end-diastolic, and end-systolic
2 volume indexes and cardiac index of the patients were similar as well. Therefore, the findings about
3 the left ventricular size in this study confirm the findings in [9]. There was a statistically significant
4 difference in body surface area of the male and female patients in Chaowu et al. [9] whereas in this
5 study age and body surface area of the male and female patients was not significantly different.
6 Statistical comparison in [9] showed that left ventricular mass and mass index, left ventricular maximal
7 wall thickness and left ventricular end-systolic volume index were significantly different for male and
8 female patients. In our study, there was not statistical significance in these variables between males
9 and females. This might be because the body surface area of the males and females were significantly
10 different in Chaowu et al. [9]. In this study, heart rate, left ventricular end-diastolic volume and volume
11 index, left ventricular stroke volume and stroke volume index, left ventricular end-diastolic and end-
12 systolic long axis lengths, left ventricular end-systolic long axis index, right ventricular end-diastolic
13 long axis length, left ventricular end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter, left ventricular end-diastolic free
14 wall thickness and free wall thickness index were significantly different in male and female patients.
15 Intraventricular septal thickness is around 6 mm in children at 6 years old [23], and it reaches around
16 8 mm after 20 years of age [24]. Average intraventricular septal thickness was around 17 mm at the
17 end of diastole and 14 mm at the end of systole in the children diagnosed with HCM (Table 2). Left
18 ventricular diastolic free wall thickness is around 7 mm, and systolic wall thickness is around 10 mm
19 at 10 years of age [25]. It changes within a similar range at the year of age as well [24]. The findings in
20 this study shows that left ventricular wall thickness was almost doubled in children with HCM (Table
21 2).

22 Average left ventricular long axis length in healthy children is around 9 mm at the diastole and
23 8 mm at the systole in the children with 1.6 m² body surface area [26]. In this study, left ventricular
24 end-diastolic long axis length of the cohort was around 84 mm whereas the end-systolic length of the
25 left ventricle around 61 mm. HCM can present itself in different phenotypes and result in a reduction
26 of left ventricular cavity size [27,28]. Reduced lateral-septal and mid-cavity diameters in the patients
27 also confirm this when compared with healthy values [29].

28 E/A ratio which can be used to evaluate ventricular diastolic function [30] was significantly
29 different in male and female cohorts along with end-diastolic left ventricular volume and end-diastolic
30 left ventricular volume index, left ventricular stroke volume and left ventricular stroke volume index,
31 left ventricular end-systolic long axis length and left ventricular end-systolic long axis length index, left
32 ventricular end-diastolic free wall thickness and left ventricular end-diastolic free wall thickness index.
33 Therefore, the ventricular diastolic function may be correlated with these parameters.

1 Although potential risk factors for sudden cardiac death for HCM in paediatric patients have
2 been reported, there lack of standardised definitions for these risk factors [31]. In adults, major risk
3 factor for HCM are well defined and reported in the guidelines. Factors such as family history of
4 sudden cardiac death, maximum left ventricular wall thickness, abnormal blood pressure response
5 during exercise are considered as major risk factors for sudden cardiac death whereas factors such as
6 reduced ejection fraction or genetic mutations are considered as potential risk modifiers. [32,33].
7 Although this does not focus on the risk stratification for HCM in children, reported results may help
8 to establish diagnostic criteria for the children around 14 years of age and affected by HCM.

9 There were a number of limitations in this study. There was no control group; however, the
10 patients included in this study had been diagnosed with HCM. Therefore, the results give insights
11 about cardiac dimensions in children around 14 years old and diagnosed with HCM. This study includes
12 a relatively small sample size. Larger sample size would allow understanding differences between male
13 and female patients better whilst providing a better estimate for the average values in children
14 affected by HCM. Different phenotypes of HCM were not identified in the patient population.
15 Therefore, the results do not show morphologic and functional changes for each type HCM. Also, this
16 study includes patient characteristics from the initial diagnosis and magnetic resonance images.
17 Therefore, the progress of the HCM is not reported in this study. Moreover, 3D models reconstructed
18 from magnetic resonance image or stress echocardiography could bring new insights about the clinical
19 characteristic of the pediatric patients with HCM during exercise. Also, myocardial fibrosis which may
20 contribute to sudden cardiac death, ventricular tachyarrhythmias and ventricular dysfunction [34] was
21 not evaluated in this study as it may not have an effect on the local contractile function [8].

22 In this study, ventricular dimensions, left ventricular wall thickness, and intraventricular septal
23 thickness was quantified using cardiac magnetic resonance images in children diagnosed with HCM.
24 Also, a statistical comparison was made to evaluate the differences between males and female
25 patients. The results show that the left ventricular wall and intraventricular septal thickness increase
26 affecting left ventricle cavity dimensions in children affected by HCM. There was statistically significant
27 difference in the heart rate, end-diastolic left ventricular volume and end-diastolic left ventricular
28 volume index, left ventricular stroke volume and left ventricular stroke volume index, left ventricular
29 end-systolic long axis length and left ventricular end-systolic long axis length index, left ventricular
30 end-diastolic free wall thickness and left ventricular end-diastolic free wall thickness index and EA ratio
31 for male and female patients in the study population. Although the right ventricular end-diastolic long
32 axis length and left ventricular end-diastolic mid-cavity diameter were statistically different in male
33 and female patients, indexed values for these variables were not statistically different.

References

- 1 [1] Marian AJ, Braunwald E. Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy: Genetics, Pathogenesis, Clinical
2 Manifestations, Diagnosis, and Therapy. *Circ Res* 2017;121:749–70.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.311059>.
- 4 [2] Canepa Marco, Fumagalli Carlo, Tini Giacomo, Vincent-Tompkins Justin, Day Sharlene M.,
5 Ashley Euan A., et al. Temporal Trend of Age at Diagnosis in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy.
6 *Circulation: Heart Failure* 2020;13:e007230.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.120.007230>.
- 8 [3] Pantazis A, Vischer AS, Perez-Tome MC, Castelletti S. Diagnosis and management of
9 hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Echo Res Pract* 2015;2:R45-53. [https://doi.org/10.1530/ERP-15-](https://doi.org/10.1530/ERP-15-0007)
10 [0007](https://doi.org/10.1530/ERP-15-0007).
- 11 [4] Colan SD. Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy in Childhood. *Heart Fail Clin* 2010;6:433–44.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hfc.2010.05.004>.
- 13 [5] Lipshultz Steven E., Law Yuk M., Asante-Korang Alfred, Austin Eric D., Dipchand Anne I., Everitt
14 Melanie D., et al. Cardiomyopathy in Children: Classification and Diagnosis: A Scientific
15 Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2019;140:e9–68.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000682>.
- 17 [6] Shirani J, Pick R, Roberts WC, Maron BJ. Morphology and significance of the left ventricular
18 collagen network in young patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy and sudden cardiac
19 death. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;35:36–44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0735-1097\(99\)00492-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0735-1097(99)00492-1).
- 20 [7] Konno T, Chang S, Seidman JG, Seidman CE. Genetics of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Curr*
21 *Opin Cardiol* 2010;25:205–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HCO.0b013e3283375698>.
- 22 [8] Ismail TF, Hewins B, Jabbour A, Mistry N, Ferreira PF, Gulati A, et al. The relationship between
23 interstitial fibrosis and contractile function in HCM: a combined T1-mapping and CSPAMM
24 tagging study. *Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance* 2012;14:O97.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1532-429X-14-S1-O97>.
- 26 [9] Chaowu Y, Shihua Z, Jian L, Li L, Wei F. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance characteristics in
27 children with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Circ Heart Fail* 2013;6:1013–20.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.113.000414>.
- 29 [10] Prinz C, Farr M, Hering D, Horstkotte D, Faber L. The Diagnosis and Treatment of Hypertrophic
30 Cardiomyopathy. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2011;108:209–15.
31 <https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2011.0209>.
- 32 [11] Arghami A, Dearani JA, Said SM, O’Leary PW, Schaff HV. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in
33 children. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg* 2017;6:376–85. <https://doi.org/10.21037/acs.2017.07.04>.
- 34 [12] Schwammenthal Ehud, Nakatani Satoshi, He Shengqiu, Hopmeyer Joanne, Sagie Alex, Weyman
35 Arthur E., et al. Mechanism of Mitral Regurgitation in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy.
36 *Circulation* 1998;98:856–65. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.98.9.856>.
- 37 [13] Authors/Task Force members, Elliott PM, Anastakis A, Borger MA, Borggrefe M, Cecchi F, et
38 al. 2014 ESC Guidelines on diagnosis and management of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: the
39 Task Force for the Diagnosis and Management of Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy of the
40 European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2014;35:2733–79.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehu284>.
- 42 [14] Kampmann C, Wiethoff CM, Wenzel A, Stolz G, Betancor M, Wippermann CF, et al. Normal
43 values of M mode echocardiographic measurements of more than 2000 healthy infants and
44 children in central Europe. *Heart* 2000;83:667–72. <https://doi.org/10.1136/heart.83.6.667>.
- 45 [15] Quarta G, Aquaro GD, Pedrotti P, Pontone G, Dellegrottaglie S, Iacovoni A, et al. Cardiovascular
46 magnetic resonance imaging in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: the importance of clinical
47 context. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2018;19:601–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehjci/jex323>.

- 1 [16] Ommen SR, Mital S, Burke MA, Day SM, Deswal A, Elliott P, et al. 2020 AHA/ACC Guideline for
2 the Diagnosis and Treatment of Patients With Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy: Executive
3 Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint
4 Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2020;142:e533–57.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000938>.
- 6 [17] Tunca Sahin G, Ozgur S, Kafali HC, Sevinc Sengul F, Haydin S, Guzelas A, et al. Clinical
7 characteristics of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in children: An 8-year single center experience.
8 *Pediatrics International* 2021;63:37–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ped.14393>.
- 9 [18] Wang S, Zhu C. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in children. *Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann*
10 2022;30:92–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02184923211041285>.
- 11 [19] Assaad IE, Gauvreau K, Rizwan R, Margossian R, Colan S, Chen MH. Value of Exercise Stress
12 Echocardiography in Children with Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. *Journal of the American*
13 *Society of Echocardiography* 2020;33:888-894.e2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2020.01.020>.
- 14 [20] Windram JD, Dragelescu A, Benson L, Forsey J, Shariat M, Yoo S-J, et al. Myocardial Dimensions
15 in Children With Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy: A Comparison Between Echocardiography and
16 Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Can J Cardiol* 2016;32:1507–12.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjca.2016.06.014>.
- 18 [21] Miller CA, Jordan P, Borg A, Argyle R, Clark D, Pearce K, et al. Quantification of left ventricular
19 indices from SSFP cine imaging: impact of real-world variability in analysis methodology and
20 utility of geometric modeling. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2013;37:1213–22.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.23892>.
- 22 [22] Nayak BK, Hazra A. How to choose the right statistical test? *Indian J Ophthalmol* 2011;59:85–6.
23 <https://doi.org/10.4103/0301-4738.77005>.
- 24 [23] Kervancioglu P, Kervancioglu M, Tuncer MC, Hatipoglu ES. Left Ventricular Mass in Normal
25 Children and its Correlation with Weight, Height and Body Surface Area. *International Journal*
26 *of Morphology* 2011;29:982–7. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022011000300054>.
- 27 [24] Marcomichelakis J, Withers R, Newman GB, O'Brien K, Emanuel R. The relation of age to the
28 thickness of the interventricular septum, the posterior left ventricular wall and their ratio.
29 *International Journal of Cardiology* 1983;4:405–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-5273\(83\)90190-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-5273(83)90190-0).
- 30 [25] Majonga ED, Rehman AM, McHugh G, Mujuru HA, Nathoo K, Patel MS, et al. Echocardiographic
31 reference ranges in older children and adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal*
32 *of Cardiology* 2017;248:409–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2017.06.109>.
- 33 [26] Regen DM, Graham TP, Wyse RKH, Deanfield J, Franklin RCG. Left-ventricular cavity dimensions
34 in children with normal and dilated hearts. *Pediatr Cardiol* 1988;9:17–24.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02279878>.
- 36 [27] Chun EJ, Choi SI, Jin KN, Kwag HJ, Kim YJ, Choi BW, et al. Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy:
37 Assessment with MR Imaging and Multidetector CT. *RadioGraphics* 2010;30:1309–28.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.305095074>.
- 39 [28] Manganelli F, Betocchi S, Losi MA, Briguori C, Pace L, Ciampi Q, et al. Influence of left
40 ventricular cavity size on clinical presentation in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *American*
41 *Journal of Cardiology* 1999;83:547–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9149\(98\)00911-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9149(98)00911-4).
- 42 [29] Bozkurt S. Mathematical modeling of cardiac function to evaluate clinical cases in adults and
43 children. *PLOS ONE* 2019;14:e0224663. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224663>.
- 44 [30] Tissot C, Singh Y, Sekarski N. Echocardiographic Evaluation of Ventricular Function—For the
45 Neonatologist and Pediatric Intensivist. *Frontiers in Pediatrics* 2018;6.
- 46 [31] Norrish G, Kaski JP. Risk stratification in childhood hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *Glob Cardiol*
47 *Sci Pract* n.d.;2018. <https://doi.org/10.21542/gcsp.2018.24>.
- 48

- 1 [32] Jordà P, García-Álvarez A. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: Sudden cardiac death risk
2 stratification in adults. *Glob Cardiol Sci Pract* n.d.;2018.
3 <https://doi.org/10.21542/gcsp.2018.25>.
- 4 [33] Steriotis AK, Sharma S. Risk Stratification in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. *Eur Cardiol*
5 2015;10:31–6. <https://doi.org/10.15420/ecr.2015.10.01.31>.
- 6 [34] Ho CY, López B, Coelho-Filho OR, Lakdawala NK, Cirino AL, Jarolim P, et al. Myocardial Fibrosis
7 as an Early Manifestation of Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:552–63.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1002659>.
- 9

10 **Figure Legends**

11 **Figure 1.** Heart chamber and wall dimensions measured on the cardiac magnetic images. 1. left
12 ventricular long axis length, 2. left ventricular mid-cavity diameter, 3. right ventricular long axis length,
13 4. right ventricular mid-cavity diameter, 5. intraventricular septal thickness, 6. left ventricular lateral
14 septal diameter, 7. left ventricular free wall thickness, (LV and RV represent left and right ventricles).

15

16 **Table Legends**

17 **Table 1.** Average values and standard deviations of the patient data and haemodynamics, superscript
18 *n* represents non-parametric statistical comparison, * shows the statistically significant differences
19 between the groups. (LV represents left ventricle).

20

21 **Table 2.** Average values and standard deviations of the left and right ventricular dimensions,
22 superscript *n* represents non-parametric statistical comparison, * shows the statistically significant
23 differences between the groups. (LV, RV and IV represent left and right ventricle and intraventricular
24 respectively)

25

26 **Table 3.** Reproducibility for the measurements. (ICC represents intra-class correlation coefficient, LV,
27 RV and IV represent left and right ventricle and intraventricular respectively)

28