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Fick’s principle states that oxygen consumption of an organ or organism is equal to the product of blood flow and oxygen extraction from the blood. Among all organs, the heart is unique in that oxygen extraction is constantly close to maximal. Thus, the only way that this metabolically demanding organ can increase oxygen consumption is by increasing coronary blood flow. In this aspect of oxygen delivery, the heart also is unique because most flow occurs in diastole instead of in systole. In other organs, blood flows down a pressure gradient from its arterial source through the resistance of the arterioles into the capillary bed and thence venous return. In the heart, the compression of the vasculature by its surrounding muscle during systole impedes flow so that while the pressure head for flow is maximum in systole, flow is maximum in diastole. Thus, a simple “vascular waterfall” model in which flow moves from highest to lowest pressure does not fully explain observed myocardial flow phenomena.

Coronary Blood Flow in Normal Subjects and Those With LVH

In normal subjects, endocardial blood flow exceeds epicardial flow, so the ratio of endocardial to epicardial blood flow is \( \approx 1.2:1.2 \). It is generally held that this distribution matches the nutrient requirements of the endocardium where wall stress higher than that of the epicardium increases endocardial oxygen demand. It has been known for decades that this distribution is reversed in the presence of concentric LVH, predisposing toward endocardial ischemia.\(^2\)\(^-\)\(^5\) Indeed, such ischemically mediated endocardial contractile dysfunction has been demonstrated.\(^6\)\(^-\)\(^7\) Furthermore, it is known that coronary flow reserve is reduced in LVH.\(^8\) Although normal myocardium can increase its flow 5- to 8-fold under stress, it can be reduced by \( \approx 50\% \) in concentric LVH. This mechanism must play a role in the angina observed in some patients with LVH who also have normal epicardial coronary anatomy, although most patients with LVH and reduced flow reserve do not develop angina. Explanations for reduced endocardial flow and reduced flow reserve in LVH have centered around reduced capillary density per unit of myocardium\(^9\) and increased resistance to flow. Decreased capillary density in LVH presumably occurs because capillary growth does not match muscle growth. Increased vascular resistance might occur because the hypertrophied left ventricle requires a higher filling pressure than normal, and higher diastolic filling pressure compresses the endocardium and impeded coronary blood flow,\(^7\) although not all investigators have found this explanation plausible.\(^10\) Alternatively, compromised vasodilator function may be responsible for increased coronary vascular resistance in LVH.\(^11\)

Davies et al\(^1\) offer another plausible explanation for reduced flow in LVH. They found that although the forward-pushing wave was increased in their LVH patients, the backward-moving suction wave primarily responsible for diastolic coronary blood flow was reduced in comparison. The enhanced forward-pushing wave may have been due to higher systolic blood pressure in the LVH group. Although there was no statistical difference in blood pressure between the groups, there may have been differences during some of the measurements because hypertension was the likely cause of LVH in that group. However, the blunted suction wave implies a lusitropic deficit. Although no data regarding ventricular function were presented, intrinsic diastolic dysfunction is extremely common in patients with LVH. In addition, it can be speculated that this problem in relaxation was compounded by a contractile deficit not detected by...
Insensitive measures of function such as ejection fraction. It is well known that subnormal sarcomere shortening in LVH can achieve normal ejection fraction as a result of enhanced thickening of concentrically hypertrophied ventricles. In turn, subnormal contractile function (despite normal ejection fraction) would have reduced LV restoring forces, impairing relaxation and presumably blunting the diastolic suction wave. As LVH increases and left ventricular function worsens, it could easily set up a vicious cycle of reduced flow leading to impaired function leading to reduced flow, etc. The reversal in these changes could lead to improvement after the regression of hypertrophy when pressure overload is relieved.

The presence of LVH is a risk factor for congestive heart failure and for mortality in patients suffering a myocardial infarction. Abnormal coronary blood flow, especially to the endocardium, likely plays a role in this risk. Although blood flow usually is thought of in terms of driving pressure and vascular resistance, the complexities of coronary flow do not follow this simple logic. The present data help us look at coronary flow, especially in LVH, in a new and useful light. Future experiments examining how known acute alterations in ventricular function affect the waves reported in this issue will be of great interest.
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