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Preamble
The medical profession should play a central role in evaluating the evidence related to drugs, devices, and procedures for the detection, management, and prevention of disease. When properly applied, expert analysis of available data on the benefits and risks of these therapies and procedures can improve the quality of care, optimize patient outcomes, and favorably affect costs by focusing resources on the most effective strategies. An organized and directed approach to a thorough review of evidence has resulted in the production of clinical practice guidelines that assist clinicians in selecting the best management strategy for an individual patient. Moreover, clinical practice guidelines can provide a foundation for other applications, such as performance measures, appropriate use criteria, and both quality improvement and clinical decision support tools.

The American College of Cardiology Foundation (ACCF) and the American Heart Association (AHA) have jointly produced guidelines in the area of cardiovascular disease since 1980. The ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Task Force), charged with developing, updating, and revising practice guidelines for cardiovascular diseases and procedures, directs and oversees this effort. Writing committees are charged with regularly reviewing and evaluating all available evidence to develop balanced, patient-centric recommendations for clinical practice.

Experts in the subject under consideration are selected by the ACCF and AHA to examine subject-specific data and write guidelines in partnership with representatives from other medical organizations and specialty groups. Writing committees are asked to perform a literature review; weigh the strength of evidence for or against particular tests, treatments, or procedures; and include estimates of expected outcomes where such data exist. Patient-specific modifiers, comorbidities, and issues of patient preference that may influence the choice of tests or therapies are considered. When available, information from studies on cost is considered, but data on efficacy and outcomes constitute the primary basis for the recommendations contained herein.

In analyzing the data and developing recommendations and supporting text, the writing committee uses evidence-based methodologies developed by the Task Force (1). The Class of Recommendation (COR) is an estimate of the size of the treatment effect considering risks versus benefits in addition to evidence and/or agreement that a given treatment or procedure is or is not useful/effective or in some situations may cause harm. The Level of Evidence (LOE) is an estimate of the certainty or precision of the treatment effect. The writing committee reviews and ranks evidence supporting each recommendation with the weight of evidence ranked as LOE A, B, or C according to specific definitions that are included in Table 1. Studies are identified as observational, retrospective, prospective, or randomized where appropriate. For certain conditions for which inadequate data are available, recommendations are based on expert consensus and clinical experience and are ranked as LOE C. When recommendations at LOE C are supported by historical clinical data, appropriate references (including clinical reviews) are cited if available. For issues for which sparse data are available, a survey of current practice among the clinicians on the writing committee is the basis for LOE C recommendations and no references are cited. The schema for COR and LOE are summarized in Table 1, which
also provides suggested phrases for writing recommendations within each COR. A new addition to this methodology is separation of the Class III recommendations to delineate whether the recommendation is determined to be of “no benefit” or is associated with “harm” to the patient. In addition, in view of the increasing number of comparative effectiveness studies, comparator verbs and suggested phrases for writing recommendations for the comparative effectiveness of one treatment or strategy versus another have been added for COR I and IIa, LOE A or B only.

In view of the advances in medical therapy across the spectrum of cardiovascular diseases, the Task Force has designated the term guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) to represent optimal medical therapy as defined by ACCF/AHA guideline–recommended therapies (primarily Class I). This new term, GDMT, will be used herein and throughout all future guidelines.

Because the ACCF/AHA practice guidelines address patient populations (and clinicians) residing in North America, drugs that are not currently available in North America are discussed in the text without a specific COR. For studies performed in large numbers of subjects outside North America, each writing committee reviews the potential influence of different practice patterns and patient populations on the treatment effect and relevance to the ACCF/AHA target population to determine whether the findings should inform a specific recommendation.

The ACCF/AHA practice guidelines are intended to assist clinicians in clinical decision making by describing a range of generally acceptable approaches to the diagnosis, management, and prevention of specific diseases or conditions. The guidelines attempt to define practices that meet the needs of most patients in most circumstances. The ultimate judgment regarding care of a particular patient must be made by the clinician and patient in light of all the circumstances presented by that patient. As a result, situations may arise for which deviations from these guidelines may be appropriate. Clinical decision making should involve consideration of the quality and availability of expertise in the area where care is provided. When these guidelines are used as the basis for regulatory or payer decisions, the goal should be improvement in quality of care. The Task Force recognizes that situations arise in which additional data are needed to inform patient care more effectively; these areas will be identified within each respective guideline when appropriate.

Prescribed courses of treatment in accordance with these recommendations are effective only if followed. Because lack of patient understanding and adherence may adversely affect outcomes, clinicians should make every effort to engage the patient’s active participation in prescribed medical regimens and lifestyles. In addition, patients should be informed of the risks, benefits, and alternatives to a particular treatment and be involved in shared decision making whenever feasible, particularly for COR IIa and IIb, for which the benefit-to-risk ratio may be lower.

The Task Force makes every effort to avoid actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that may arise as a result of industry relationships or personal interests among the members of the writing committee. All writing committee members and peer reviewers of the guideline are required to disclose all current healthcare-
related relationships, including those existing 12 months before initiation of the writing effort. In December 2009, the ACCF and AHA implemented a new policy for relationship with industry and other entities (RWI) that requires the writing committee chair plus a minimum of 50% of the writing committee to have no relevant RWI (Appendix 1 for the ACCF/AHA definition of relevance). These statements are reviewed by the Task Force and all members during each conference call and/or meeting of the writing committee and are updated as changes occur. All guideline recommendations require a confidential vote by the writing committee and must be approved by a consensus of the voting members. Members are not permitted to draft or vote on any text or recommendations pertaining to their RWI. Members who recused themselves from voting are indicated in the list of writing committee members, and specific section recusals are noted in Appendix 1. Authors’ and peer reviewers’ RWI pertinent to this guideline are disclosed in Appendixes 1 and 2, respectively. Additionally, to ensure complete transparency, writing committee members’ comprehensive disclosure information—including RWI not pertinent to this document—is available as an online supplement. Comprehensive disclosure information for the Task Force is also available online at http://www.cardiosource.org/en/ACC/About-ACCF/Who-We-Are/Leadership/Guidelines-and-Documents-Task-Forces.aspx. The work of writing committees is supported exclusively by the ACCF and AHA without commercial support. Writing committee members volunteered their time for this activity.

In an effort to maintain relevance at the point of care for practicing clinicians, the Task Force continues to oversee an ongoing process improvement initiative. As a result, in response to pilot projects, several changes to these guidelines will be apparent, including limited narrative text, a focus on summary and evidence tables (with references linked to abstracts in PubMed), and more liberal use of summary recommendation tables (with references that support LOE) to serve as a quick reference.

In April 2011, the Institute of Medicine released 2 reports: Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust and Finding What Works in Health Care: Standards for Systematic Reviews (2, 3). It is noteworthy that the ACCF/AHA practice guidelines are cited as being compliant with many of the proposed standards. A thorough review of these reports and of our current methodology is under way, with further enhancements anticipated.

The recommendations in this guideline are considered current until they are superseded by a focused update or the full-text guideline is revised. Guidelines are official policy of both the ACCF and AHA.

Jeffrey L. Anderson, MD, FACC, FAHA
Chair, ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines

1. Introduction

1.1. Methodology and Evidence Review

The recommendations listed in this document are, whenever possible, evidence based. An extensive evidence review was conducted through October 2011 and selected other references through April 2013. Searches were
extended to studies, reviews, and other evidence conducted in human subjects and that were published in English from PubMed, EMBASE, Cochrane, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Reports, and other selected databases relevant to this guideline. Key search words included but were not limited to the following: heart failure, cardiomyopathy, quality of life, mortality, hospitalizations, prevention, biomarkers, hypertension, dyslipidemia, imaging, cardiac catheterization, endomyocardial biopsy, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors, angiotensin-receptor antagonists/blockers, beta blockers, cardiac, cardiac resynchronization therapy, defibrillator, device-based therapy, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator, device implantation, medical therapy, acute decompensated heart failure, preserved ejection fraction, terminal care and transplantation, quality measures, and performance measures. Additionally, the committee reviewed documents related to the subject matter previously published by the ACCF and AHA. References selected and published in this document are representative and not all-inclusive.

To provide clinicians with a representative evidence base, whenever deemed appropriate or when published, the absolute risk difference and number needed to treat or harm are provided in the guideline (within tables), along with confidence intervals and data related to the relative treatment effects such as odds ratio, relative risk, hazard ratio, and incidence rate ratio.

1.2. Organization of the Writing Committee

The committee was composed of physicians and a nurse with broad expertise in the evaluation, care, and management of patients with heart failure (HF). The authors included general cardiologists, HF and transplant specialists, electrophysiologists, general internists, and physicians with methodological expertise. The committee included representatives from the ACCF, AHA, American Academy of Family Physicians, American College of Chest Physicians, Heart Rhythm Society, and International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation.

1.3. Document Review and Approval

This document was reviewed by 2 official reviewers each nominated by both the ACCF and the AHA, as well as 1 to 2 reviewers each from the American Academy of Family Physicians, American College of Chest Physicians, Heart Rhythm Society, and International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation, as well as 32 individual content reviewers (including members of the ACCF Adult Congenital and Pediatric Cardiology Council, ACCF Cardiovascular Team Council, ACCF Council on Cardiovascular Care for Older Adults, ACCF Electrophysiology Committee, ACCF Heart Failure and Transplant Council, ACCF Imaging Council, ACCF Prevention Committee, ACCF Surgeons‘ Scientific Council, and ACCF Task Force on Appropriate Use Criteria). All information on reviewers’ RWI was distributed to the writing committee and is published in this document (Appendix 2).
This document was approved for publication by the governing bodies of the ACCF and AHA and endorsed by the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation and Heart Rhythm Society.

Table 1. Applying Classification of Recommendation and Level of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL A</th>
<th>LEVEL B</th>
<th>LEVEL C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple populations evaluated*</td>
<td>Limited populations evaluated*</td>
<td>Very limited populations evaluated*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials or meta-analyses</td>
<td>Data derived from a single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies</td>
<td>Only consensus opinion of experts, case studies, or standard of care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S I Z E O F T R E A T M E N T E F F E C T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS I</th>
<th>CLASS Ia</th>
<th>CLASS Ibb</th>
<th>CLASS III</th>
<th>CLASS IIIa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit &gt;&gt; Risk</td>
<td>Benefit &gt;&gt; Risk</td>
<td>Benefit ≥ Risk</td>
<td>Benefit ≥ Risk</td>
<td>No Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure/Treatment SHOULD be performed/administered</td>
<td>Additional studies with focused objectives needed</td>
<td>Additional studies with broad objectives needed; additional registry data would be helpful</td>
<td>Procedure/Treatment MAY BE CONSIDERED</td>
<td>Procedure/ Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ESTIMATE OF CERTAINTY (PRECISION) OF TREATMENT EFFECT

- **LEVEL A**
  - Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective
  - Sufficient evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses

- **LEVEL B**
  - Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective
  - Evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies

- **LEVEL C**
  - Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective
  - Only expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care

### DATA AVAILABILITY

- *Data available from clinical trials or registries about the usefulness/efficacy in different subpopulations, such as sex, age, history of diabetes, history of prior myocardial infarction, history of heart failure, and prior aspirin use.

- †For comparative effectiveness recommendations (Class I and Ia; Level of Evidence A and B only), studies that support the use of comparator verbs should involve direct comparisons of the treatments or strategies being evaluated.

1.4. Scope of This Guideline With Reference to Other Relevant Guidelines or Statements
This guideline covers multiple management issues for the adult patient with HF. Although of increasing importance, HF in children and congenital heart lesions in adults are not specifically addressed in this guideline. The reader is referred to publically available resources to address questions in these areas. However, this guideline does address HF with preserved ejection fraction (EF) in more detail and similarly revisits hospitalized HF. Additional areas of renewed interest are in stage D HF, palliative care, transition of care, and quality of care for HF. Certain management strategies appropriate for the patient at risk for HF or already affected by HF are also reviewed in numerous relevant clinical practice guidelines and scientific statements published by the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines, AHA, ACCF Task Force on Appropriate Use Criteria, European Society of Cardiology, Heart Failure Society of America, and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. The writing committee saw no need to reiterate the recommendations contained in those guidelines and chose to harmonize recommendations when appropriate and eliminate discrepancies. This is especially the case for device-based therapeutics, where complete alignment between the HF guideline and the device-based therapy guideline was deemed imperative. Some recommendations from earlier guidelines have been updated as warranted by new evidence or a better understanding of earlier evidence, whereas others that were no longer accurate or relevant or which were overlapping were modified; recommendations from previous guidelines that were similar or redundant were eliminated or consolidated when possible.

The present document recommends a combination of lifestyle modifications and medications that constitute GDMT. GDMT is specifically referenced in the recommendations for the treatment of HF (Figure 1; Section 7.3.2). Both for GDMT and other recommended drug treatment regimens, the reader is advised to confirm dosages with product insert material and to evaluate carefully for contraindications and drug-drug interactions. Table 2 is a list of documents deemed pertinent to this effort and is intended for use as a resource; it obviates the need to repeat already extant guideline recommendations. Additional other HF guideline statements are highlighted as well for the purpose of comparison and completeness.

### Table 2. Associated Guidelines and Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Publication Year (Reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for the Management of Adults With Congenital Heart Disease</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2008 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA/HRS</td>
<td>2011 (6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for Assessment of Cardiovascular Risk in Asymptomatic Adults</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2010 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2011 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Device-Based Therapy of Cardiac Rhythm Abnormalities</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA/HRS</td>
<td>2013 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2011 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA/SCAI</td>
<td>2011 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Prevention and Risk Reduction Therapy for Patients With Coronary and Other Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease: 2011 Update</td>
<td>AHA/ACCF</td>
<td>2011 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Patients With Stable Ischemic Heart Disease</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA/ACP/AATS /PCNA/SCAI/STS</td>
<td>2012 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline for the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2013 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non–ST-</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA</td>
<td>2013 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Definition of HF

HF is a complex clinical syndrome that results from any structural or functional impairment of ventricular filling or ejection of blood. The cardinal manifestations of HF are dyspnea and fatigue, which may limit exercise tolerance, and fluid retention, which may lead to pulmonary and/or splanchnic congestion and/or peripheral edema. Some patients have exercise intolerance but little evidence of fluid retention, whereas others complain primarily of edema, dyspnea, or fatigue. Because some patients present without signs or symptoms of volume overload, the term “heart failure” is preferred over “congestive heart failure.” There is no single diagnostic test for HF because it is largely a clinical diagnosis based on a careful history and physical examination.

The clinical syndrome of HF may result from disorders of the pericardium, myocardium, endocardium, heart valves, or great vessels or from certain metabolic abnormalities, but most patients with HF have symptoms due to impaired left ventricular (LV) myocardial function. It should be emphasized that HF is not synonymous with either cardiomyopathy or LV dysfunction; these latter terms describe possible structural or functional
reasons for the development of HF. HF may be associated with a wide spectrum of LV functional abnormalities, which may range from patients with normal LV size and preserved EF to those with severe dilatation and/or markedly reduced EF. In most patients, abnormalities of systolic and diastolic dysfunction coexist, irrespective of EF. EF is considered important in classification of patients with HF because of differing patient demographics, comorbid conditions, prognosis, and response to therapies (35) and because most clinical trials selected patients based on EF. EF values are dependent on the imaging technique used, method of analysis, and operator. Because other techniques may indicate abnormalities in systolic function among patients with a preserved EF, it is preferable to use the terms preserved or reduced EF over preserved or reduced systolic function. For the remainder of this guideline, we will consistently refer to HF with preserved EF and HF with reduced EF as HFpEF and HFrEF, respectively (Table 3).

2.1. HF With Reduced EF (HFrEF)
In approximately half of patients with HFrEF, variable degrees of LV enlargement may accompany HFrEF (36, 37). The definition of HFrEF has varied, with guidelines of left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤35%, <40%, and ≤40% (18, 19, 38). Randomized clinical trials (RCTs) in patients with HF have mainly enrolled patients with HFrEF with an EF ≤35% or ≤40%, and it is only in these patients that efficacious therapies have been demonstrated to date. For the present guideline, HFrEF is defined as the clinical diagnosis of HF and EF ≤40%. Those with LV systolic dysfunction commonly have elements of diastolic dysfunction as well (39). Although coronary artery disease (CAD) with antecedent myocardial infarction (MI) is a major cause of HFrEF, many other risk factors (Section 4.6) may lead to LV enlargement and HFrEF.

2.2. HF With Preserved EF (HFpEF)
In patients with clinical HF, studies estimate that the prevalence of HFpEF is approximately 50% (range 40% to 71%) (40). These estimates vary largely because of the differing EF cut-off criteria and challenges in diagnostic criteria for HFpEF. HFpEF has been variably classified as EF >40%, >45%, >50%, and ≥55%. Because some of these patients do not have entirely normal EF but also do not have major reduction in systolic function, the term preserved EF has been used. Patients with an EF in the range of 40% to 50% represent an intermediate group. These patients are often treated for underlying risk factors and comorbidities and with GDMT similar to that used in patients with HFrEF. Several criteria have been proposed to define the syndrome of HFpEF. These include (a) clinical signs or symptoms of HF; (b) evidence of preserved or normal LVEF; and (c) evidence of abnormal LV diastolic dysfunction that can be determined by Doppler echocardiography or cardiac catheterization (41). The diagnosis of HFpEF is more challenging than the diagnosis of HFrEF because it is largely one of excluding other potential noncardiac causes of symptoms suggestive of HF. Studies have suggested that the incidence of HFpEF is increasing and that a greater portion of patients hospitalized with HF have HFpEF (42). In the general population, patients with HFpEF are usually older women with a history of
hypertension. Obesity, CAD, diabetes mellitus, atrial fibrillation (AF), and hyperlipidemia are also highly prevalent in HFpEF in population-based studies and registries (40, 43). Despite these associated cardiovascular risk factors, hypertension remains the most important cause of HFpEF, with a prevalence of 60% to 89% from large controlled trials, epidemiological studies, and HF registries (44). It has been recognized that a subset of patients with HFpEF previously had HFrEF (45). These patients with improvement or recovery in EF may be clinically distinct from those with persistently preserved or reduced EF. Further research is needed to better characterize these patients.

### Table 3. Definitions of HFrEF and HFpEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>EF (%)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF)</td>
<td>≤40</td>
<td>Also referred to as systolic HF. Randomized clinical trials have mainly enrolled patients with HFrEF, and it is only in these patients that efficacious therapies have been demonstrated to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF)</td>
<td>≥50</td>
<td>Also referred to as diastolic HF. Several different criteria have been used to further define HFpEF. The diagnosis of HFpEF is challenging because it is largely one of excluding other potential noncardiac causes of symptoms suggestive of HF. To date, efficacious therapies have not been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. HFpEF, borderline</td>
<td>41 to 49</td>
<td>These patients fall into a borderline or intermediate group. Their characteristics, treatment patterns, and outcomes appear similar to those of patients with HFpEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. HFpEF, improved</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>It has been recognized that a subset of patients with HFpEF previously had HFrEF. These patients with improvement or recovery in EF may be clinically distinct from those with persistently preserved or reduced EF. Further research is needed to better characterize these patients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EF indicates ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; and HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction.

See Online Data Supplement 1 for additional data on HFpEF.

### 3. HF Classifications

Both the ACCF/AHA stages of HF (38) and the New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional classification (38, 46) provide useful and complementary information about the presence and severity of HF. The ACCF/AHA stages of HF emphasize the development and progression of disease and can be used to describe individuals and populations, whereas the NYHA classes focus on exercise capacity and the symptomatic status of the disease (Table 4).

The ACCF/AHA stages of HF recognize that both risk factors and abnormalities of cardiac structure are associated with HF. The stages are progressive and inviolate; once a patient moves to a higher stage, regression to an earlier stage of HF is not observed. Progression in HF stages is associated with reduced 5-year survival and increased plasma natriuretic peptide concentrations (47). Therapeutic interventions in each stage aimed at modifying risk factors (stage A), treating structural heart disease (stage B), and reducing morbidity and mortality (stages C and D) (covered in detail in Section 7) are reviewed in this document. The NYHA functional
classification gauges the severity of symptoms in those with structural heart disease, primarily stages C and D. It is a subjective assessment by a clinician and can change frequently over short periods of time. Although reproducibility and validity may be problematic (48), the NYHA functional classification is an independent predictor of mortality (49). It is widely used in clinical practice and research and for determining the eligibility of patients for certain healthcare services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCF/AHA Stages of HF (38)</th>
<th>NYHA Functional Classification (46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I No limitation of physical activity. Ordinary physical activity does not cause symptoms of HF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I No limitation of physical activity. Ordinary physical activity does not cause symptoms of HF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II Slight limitation of physical activity. Comfortable at rest, but ordinary physical activity results in symptoms of HF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III Marked limitation of physical activity. Comfortable at rest, but less than ordinary activity causes symptoms of HF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV Unable to carry on any physical activity without symptoms of HF, or symptoms of HF at rest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCF indicates American College of Cardiology Foundation; AHA, American Heart Association; HF, heart failure; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

See Online Data Supplement 2 for additional data on ACCF/AHA stages of HF and NYHA functional classifications.

### 4. Epidemiology

The lifetime risk of developing HF is 20% for Americans ≥40 years of age (50). In the United States, HF incidence has largely remained stable over the past several decades, with >650,000 new HF cases diagnosed annually (51-53). HF incidence increases with age, rising from approximately 20 per 1,000 individuals 65 to 69 years of age to >80 per 1,000 individuals among those ≥85 years of age (52). Approximately 5.1 million persons in the United States have clinically manifest HF, and the prevalence continues to rise (51). In the Medicare-eligible population, HF prevalence increased from 90 to 121 per 1,000 beneficiaries from 1994 to 2003 (52). HFrEF and HFpEF each make up about half of the overall HF burden (54). One in 5 Americans will be >65 years of age by 2050 (55). Because HF prevalence is highest in this group, the number of Americans with HF is expected to significantly worsen in the future. Disparities in the epidemiology of HF have been identified. Blacks have the highest risk for HF (56). In the ARIC (Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities) study, incidence rate per 1,000 person-years was lowest among white women (52, 53) and highest among black men (57), with
blacks having a greater 5-year mortality rate than whites (58). HF in non-Hispanic black males and females has a prevalence of 4.5% and 3.8%, respectively, versus 2.7% and 1.8% in non-Hispanic white males and females, respectively (51).

4.1. Mortality

Although survival has improved, the absolute mortality rates for HF remain approximately 50% within 5 years of diagnosis (53, 59). In the ARIC study, the 30-day, 1-year, and 5-year case fatality rates after hospitalization for HF were 10.4%, 22%, and 42.3%, respectively (58). In another population cohort study with 5-year mortality data, survival for stage A, B, C, and D HF was 97%, 96%, 75%, and 20%, respectively (47). Thirty-day postadmission mortality rates decreased from 12.6% to 10.8% from 1993 to 2005; however, this was due to lower in-hospital death rates. Postdischarge mortality actually increased from 4.3% to 6.4% during the same time frame (60). These observed temporal trends in HF survival are primarily restricted to patients with reduced EF and are not seen in those with preserved EF (40).

See Online Data Supplement 3 for additional data on mortality.

4.2. Hospitalizations

HF is the primary diagnosis in >1 million hospitalizations annually (51). Patients hospitalized for HF are at high risk for all-cause rehospitalization, with a 1-month readmission rate of 25% (61). In 2010, physician office visits for HF cost $1.8 billion. The total cost of HF care in the United States exceeds $40 billion annually, with over half of these costs spent on hospitalizations (51).

4.3. Asymptomatic LV Dysfunction

The prevalence of asymptomatic LV systolic or diastolic dysfunction ranges from 6% to 21% and increases with age (62-64). In the Left Ventricular Dysfunction Prevention study, participants with untreated asymptomatic LV dysfunction had a 10% risk for developing HF symptoms and an 8% risk of death or HF hospitalization annually (65). In a community-based population, asymptomatic mild LV diastolic dysfunction was seen in 21% and moderate or severe diastolic dysfunction in 7%, and both were associated with an increased risk of symptomatic HF and mortality (64).

4.4. Health-Related Quality of Life and Functional Status

HF significantly decreases health-related quality of life (HRQOL), especially in the areas of physical functioning and vitality (66, 67). Lack of improvement in HRQOL after discharge from the hospital is a powerful predictor of rehospitalization and mortality (68, 69). Women with HF have consistently been found to have poorer HRQOL than men (67, 70). Ethnic differences also have been found, with Mexican Hispanics
reporting better HRQOL than other ethnic groups in the United States (71). Other determinants of poor HRQOL include depression, younger age, higher body mass index (BMI), greater symptom burden, lower systolic blood pressure, sleep apnea, low perceived control, and uncertainty about prognosis (70, 72-76). Memory problems may also contribute to poor HRQOL (76).

Pharmacological therapy is not a consistent determinant of HRQOL; therapies such as angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors and angiotensin-receptor blockers (ARBs) improve HRQOL only modestly or delay the progressive worsening of HRQOL in HF (77). At present, the only therapies shown to improve HRQOL are cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) (78) and certain disease management and educational approaches (79-82). Self-care and exercise may improve HRQOL, but the results of studies evaluating these interventions are mixed (83-86). Throughout this guideline we refer to meaningful survival as a state in which HRQOL is satisfactory to the patient.

See Online Data Supplement 4 for additional data on HRQOL and functional capacity.

4.5. Economic Burden of HF
In 1 in 9 deaths in the United States, HF is mentioned on the death certificate. The number of deaths with any mention of HF was as high in 2006 as it was in 1995 (51). Approximately 7% of all cardiovascular deaths are due to HF.

As previously noted, in 2012, HF costs in the United States exceeded $40 billion (51). This total includes the cost of healthcare services, medications, and lost productivity. The mean cost of HF-related hospitalizations was $23,077 per patient and was higher when HF was a secondary rather than the primary diagnosis. Among patients with HF in 1 large population study, hospitalizations were common after HF diagnosis, with 83% of patients hospitalized at least once and 43% hospitalized at least 4 times. More than half of the hospitalizations were related to noncardiovascular causes (87-89).

4.6. Important Risk Factors for HF (Hypertension, Diabetes Mellitus, Metabolic Syndrome, and Atherosclerotic Disease)
Many conditions or comorbidities are associated with an increased propensity for structural heart disease. The expedient identification and treatment of these comorbid conditions may forestall the onset of HF (14, 27, 90). A list of the important documents that codify treatment for these concomitant conditions appears in Table 2.

Hypertension. Hypertension may be the single most important modifiable risk factor for HF in the United States. Hypertensive men and women have a substantially greater risk for developing HF than normotensive men and women (91). Elevated levels of diastolic and especially systolic blood pressure are major risk factors for the development of HF (91, 92). The incidence of HF is greater with higher levels of blood pressure, older
age, and longer duration of hypertension. Long-term treatment of both systolic and diastolic hypertension reduces the risk of HF by approximately 50% (93-96). With nearly a quarter of the American population afflicted by hypertension and the lifetime risk of developing hypertension at >75% in the United States (97), strategies to control hypertension are a vital part of any public health effort to prevent HF.

**Diabetes mellitus.** Obesity and insulin resistance are important risk factors for the development of HF (98, 99). The presence of clinical diabetes markedly increases the likelihood of developing HF in patients without structural heart disease (100) and adversely affects the outcomes of patients with established HF (101, 102).

**Metabolic syndrome.** The metabolic syndrome includes any 3 of the following: abdominal adiposity, hypertriglyceridemia, low high-density lipoprotein, hypertension, and fasting hyperglycemia. The prevalence of metabolic syndrome in the United States exceeds 20% of persons ≥20 years of age and 40% of those >40 years of age (103). The appropriate treatment of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and dyslipidemia (104) can significantly reduce the development of HF.

**Atherosclerotic disease.** Patients with known atherosclerotic disease (e.g., of the coronary, cerebral, or peripheral blood vessels) are likely to develop HF, and clinicians should seek to control vascular risk factors in such patients according to guidelines (13).

### 5. Cardiac Structural Abnormalities and Other Causes of HF

#### 5.1. Dilated Cardiomyopathies

**5.1.1. Definition and Classification of Dilated Cardiomyopathies**

Dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM) refers to a large group of heterogeneous myocardial disorders that are characterized by ventricular dilation and depressed myocardial contractility in the absence of abnormal loading conditions such as hypertension or valvular disease. In clinical practice and multicenter HF trials, the etiology of HF has often been categorized into ischemic or nonischemic cardiomyopathy, with the term DCM used interchangeably with nonischemic cardiomyopathy. This approach fails to recognize that “nonischemic cardiomyopathy” may include cardiomyopathies due to volume or pressure overload, such as hypertension or valvular heart disease, which are not conventionally accepted as DCM (105). With the identification of genetic defects in several forms of cardiomyopathies, a new classification scheme based on genomics was proposed in 2006 (23). We recognize that classification of cardiomyopathies is challenging, mixing anatomic designations (i.e., hypertrophic and dilated) with functional designations (i.e., restrictive) and is unlikely to satisfy all users. The aim of the present guideline is to target appropriate diagnostic and treatment strategies for preventing the
development and progression of HF in patients with cardiomyopathies; we do not wish to redefine new classification strategies for cardiomyopathies.

5.1.2. Epidemiology and Natural History of DCM
The age-adjusted prevalence of DCM in the United States averages 36 cases per 100,000 population, and DCM accounts for 10,000 deaths annually (106). In most multicenter RCTs and registries in HF, approximately 30% to 40% of enrolled patients have DCM (107-109). Compared with whites, African Americans have almost a 3-fold increased risk for developing DCM, irrespective of comorbidities or socioeconomic factors (108-110). Sex-related differences in the incidence and prognosis of DCM are conflicting and may be confounded by differing etiologies (108, 109, 111). The prognosis in patients with symptomatic HF and DCM is relatively poor, with 25% mortality at 1 year and 50% mortality at 5 years (112). Approximately 25% of patients with DCM with recent onset of HF symptoms will improve within a short time even in the absence of optimal GDMT (113), but patients with symptoms lasting >3 months who present with severe clinical decompensation generally have less chance of recovery (113). Patients with idiopathic DCM have a lower total mortality rate than patients with other types of DCM (114). However, GDMT is beneficial in all forms of DCM (78, 109, 115-117).

5.2. Familial Cardiomyopathies
Increasingly, it is recognized that many (20% to 35%) patients with an idiopathic DCM have a familial cardiomyopathy (defined as 2 closely related family members who meet the criteria for idiopathic DCM) (118, 119). Consideration of familial cardiomyopathies includes the increasingly important discovery of noncompaction cardiomyopathies. Advances in technology permitting high-throughput sequencing and genotyping at reduced costs have brought genetic screening to the clinical arena. For further information on this topic, the reader is referred to published guidelines, position statements, and expert consensus statements (118, 120-123) (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Screening of Family Members</th>
<th>Genetic Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familial DCM</td>
<td>• First-degree relatives not known to be affected should undergo periodic, serial echocardiographic screening with assessment of LV function and size.</td>
<td>• Genetic testing may be considered in conjunction with genetic counseling (118, 121-123).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequency of screening is uncertain, but every 3-5 y is reasonable (118).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiopathic DCM</td>
<td>• Patients should inform first-degree relatives of their diagnosis.</td>
<td>• The utility of genetic testing in this setting remains uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relatives should update their clinicians and discuss whether they should undergo screening by echocardiography.</td>
<td>• Yield of genetic testing may be higher in patients with significant cardiac conduction disease and/or a family history of premature sudden cardiac death (118, 121-123).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DCM indicates dilated cardiomyopathy; and LV, left ventricular.
5.3. Endocrine and Metabolic Causes of Cardiomyopathy

5.3.1. Obesity
Obesity cardiomyopathy is defined as cardiomyopathy due entirely or predominantly to obesity (Section 7.3.1.5). Although the precise mechanisms causing obesity-related HF are not known, excessive adipose accumulation results in an increase in circulating blood volume. A subsequent, persistent increase in cardiac output, cardiac work, and systemic blood pressure (124) along with lipotoxicity-induced cardiac myocyte injury and myocardial lipid accumulation have been implicated as potential mechanisms (125, 126). A study with participants from the Framingham Heart Study reported that after adjustment for established risk factors, obesity was associated with significant future risk of development of HF (99). There are no large-scale studies of the safety or efficacy of weight loss with diet, exercise, or bariatric surgery in obese patients with HF.

5.3.2. Diabetic Cardiomyopathy
Diabetes mellitus is now well recognized as a risk factor for the development of HF independent of age, hypertension, obesity, hypercholesterolemia, or CAD. The association between mortality and hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) in patients with diabetes mellitus and HF appears U-shaped, with the lowest risk of death in those patients with modest glucose control (7.1% <HbA1c ≤7.8%) and with increased risk with extremely high or low HbA1c levels (127). The optimal treatment strategy in patients with diabetes and HF is controversial; some studies have suggested potential harm with several glucose-lowering medications (127, 128). The safety and efficacy of diabetes therapies in HF, including metformin, sulfonylureas, insulin, and glucagon-like peptide analogues await further data from prospective clinical trials (129-131). Treatment with thiazolidinediones (e.g., rosiglitazone) is associated with fluid retention in patients with HF (129, 132) and should be avoided in patients with NYHA class II through IV HF.

5.3.3. Thyroid Disease
Hyperthyroidism has been implicated in causing DCM but most commonly occurs with persistent sinus tachycardia or AF and may be related to tachycardia (133). Abnormalities in cardiac systolic and diastolic performance have been reported in hypothyroidism. However, the classic findings of myxedema do not usually indicate cardiomyopathy. The low cardiac output results from bradycardia, decreased ventricular filling, reduced cardiac contractility, and diminished myocardial work (133, 134).

5.3.4. Acromegaly and Growth Hormone Deficiency
Impaired cardiovascular function has been associated with reduced life expectancy in patients with growth hormone deficiency and excess. Experimental and clinical studies implicate growth hormone and insulin-like growth factor I in cardiac development (135). Cardiomyopathy associated with acromegaly is characterized by...
myocardial hypertrophy with interstitial fibrosis, lympho-mononuclear infiltration, myocyte necrosis, and biventricular concentric hypertrophy (135).

5.4. Toxic Cardiomyopathy

5.4.1. Alcoholic Cardiomyopathy

Chronic alcoholism is one of the most important causes of DCM (136). The clinical diagnosis is suspected when biventricular dysfunction and dilatation are persistently observed in a heavy drinker in the absence of other known causes for myocardial disease. Alcoholic cardiomyopathy most commonly occurs in men 30 to 55 years of age who have been heavy consumers of alcohol for >10 years (137). Women represent approximately 14% of the alcoholic cardiomyopathy cases but may be more vulnerable with less lifetime alcohol consumption (136, 138). The risk of asymptomatic alcoholic cardiomyopathy is increased in those consuming >90 g of alcohol per day (approximately 7 to 8 standard drinks per day) for >5 years (137). Interestingly, in the general population, mild to moderate alcohol consumption has been reported to be protective against development of HF (139, 140). These paradoxical findings suggest that duration of exposure and individual genetic susceptibility play an important role in pathogenesis. Recovery of LV function after cessation of drinking has been reported (141). Even if LV dysfunction persists, the symptoms and signs of HF improve after abstinence (141).

5.4.2. Cocaine Cardiomyopathy

Long-term abuse of cocaine may result in DCM even without CAD, vasculitis, or MI. Depressed LV function has been reported in 4% to 18% of asymptomatic cocaine abusers (142-144). The safety and efficacy of beta blockers for chronic HF due to cocaine use are unknown (145).

5.4.3. Cardiotoxicity Related to Cancer Therapies

Several cytotoxic antineoplastic drugs, especially the anthracyclines, are cardiotoxic and can lead to long-term cardiac morbidity. Iron-chelating agents that prevent generation of oxygen free-radicals, such as dexrazoxane, are cardioprotective (146, 147), and reduce the occurrence and severity of anthracycline-induced cardiotoxicity and development of HF.

Other antineoplastic chemotherapies with cardiac toxicity are the monoclonal antibody trastuzumab (Herceptin), high-dose cyclophosphamide, taxoids, mitomycin-C, 5-fluorouracil, and the interferons (148). In contrast to anthracycline-induced cardiac toxicity, trastuzumab-related cardiac dysfunction does not appear to increase with cumulative dose, nor is it associated with ultrastructural changes in the myocardium. However, concomitant anthracycline therapy significantly increases the risk for cardiotoxicity during trastuzumab treatment. The cardiac dysfunction associated with trastuzumab is most often reversible on discontinuation of treatment and initiation of standard medical therapy for HF (149). The true incidence and reversibility of
chemotherapy-related cardiotoxicity is not well documented, and meaningful interventions to prevent injury have not yet been elucidated.

5.4.4. Other Myocardial Toxins and Nutritional Causes of Cardiomyopathy
In addition to the classic toxins described above, a number of other toxic agents may lead to LV dysfunction and HF, including ephedra, cobalt, anabolic steroids, chloroquine, clozapine, amphetamine, methylphenidate, and catecholamines (150). Ephedra, which has been used for athletic performance enhancement and weight loss, was ultimately banned by the US Food and Drug Administration for its high rate of adverse cardiovascular outcomes, including LV systolic dysfunction, development of HF, and sudden cardiac death (SCD) (151).

Primary and secondary nutritional deficiencies may lead to cardiomyopathy. Chronic alcoholism, anorexia nervosa, AIDS, and pregnancy can account for other rare causes of thiamine deficiency–related cardiomyopathy in the western world (152). Deficiency in L-carnitine, a necessary cofactor for fatty acid oxidation, may be associated with a syndrome of progressive skeletal myopathy and cardiomyopathy (153).

5.5. Tachycardia-Induced Cardiomyopathy
Tachycardia-induced cardiomyopathy is a reversible cause of HF characterized by LV myocardial dysfunction caused by increased ventricular rate. The degree of dysfunction correlates with the duration and rate of the tachyarrhythmia. Virtually any supraventricular tachycardia with a rapid ventricular response may induce cardiomyopathy. Ventricular arrhythmias, including frequent premature ventricular complexes, may also induce cardiomyopathy. Maintenance of sinus rhythm or control of ventricular rate is critical to treating patients with tachycardia-induced cardiomyopathy. Reversibility of the cardiomyopathy with treatment of the arrhythmia is the rule, although this may not be complete in all cases. The underlying mechanisms for this are not well understood.

Ventricular pacing at high rates may cause cardiomyopathy. Additionally, right ventricular pacing alone may exacerbate HF symptoms, increase hospitalization for HF, and increase mortality (155, 156). Use of CRT in patients with a conduction delay due to pacing may result in improved LV function and functional capacity.

5.6. Myocarditis and Cardiomyopathies Due to Inflammation

5.6.1. Myocarditis
Inflammation of the heart may cause HF in about 10% of cases of initially unexplained cardiomyopathy (105, 157). A variety of infectious organisms, as well as toxins and medications, most often postviral in origin, may cause myocarditis. In addition, myocarditis is also seen as part of other systemic diseases such as systemic lupus erythematosus and other myocardial muscle diseases such as HIV cardiomyopathy and possibly peripartum cardiomyopathy. Presentation may be acute, with a distinct onset, severe hemodynamic compromise, and severe LV dysfunction as seen in acute fulminant myocarditis, or it may be subacute, with an indistinct onset and
better-tolerated LV dysfunction (158). Prognosis varies, with spontaneous complete resolution (paradoxically most often seen with acute fulminant myocarditis) (158) to the development of DCM despite immunosuppressive therapy (159). The role of immunosuppressive therapy is controversial (159). Targeting such therapy to specific individuals based on the presence or absence of viral genome in myocardial biopsy samples may improve response to immunosuppressive therapy (160).

Giant-cell myocarditis is a rare form of myocardial inflammation characterized by fulminant HF, often associated with refractory ventricular arrhythmias and a poor prognosis (161, 162). Histologic findings include diffuse myocardial necrosis with numerous multinucleated giant cells without granuloma formation. Consideration for advanced HF therapies, including immunosuppression, mechanical circulatory support (MCS), and transplantation is warranted.

5.6.2. Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
The extent of immunodeficiency influences the incidence of HIV-associated DCM (163-165). In long-term echocardiographic follow-up (166), 8% of initially asymptomatic HIV-positive patients were diagnosed with DCM during the 5-year follow-up. Whether early treatment with ACE inhibitors and/or beta blockers will prevent or delay disease progression in these patients is unknown at this time.

5.6.3. Chagas’ Disease
Although Chagas’ disease is a relatively uncommon cause of DCM in North America, it remains an important cause of death in Central and South America (167). Symptomatic chronic Chagas’ disease develops in an estimated 10% to 30% of infected persons, years or even decades after the Trypanosoma cruzi infection. Cardiac changes may include biventricular enlargement, thinning or thickening of ventricular walls, apical aneurysms, and mural thrombi. The conduction system is often affected, typically resulting in right bundle-branch block, left anterior fascicular block, or complete atrioventricular block.

5.7. Inflammation-Induced Cardiomyopathy: Noninfectious Causes

5.7.1. Hypersensitivity Myocarditis
Hypersensitivity to a variety of agents may result in allergic reactions that involve the myocardium, characterized by peripheral eosinophilia and a perivascular infiltration of the myocardium by eosinophils, lymphocytes, and histiocytes. A variety of drugs, most commonly the sulfonamides, penicillins, methyl dopa, and other agents such as amphotericin B, streptomycin, phenytoin, isoniazid, tetanus toxoid, hydrochlorothiazide, dobutamine, and chlorthalidone have been reported to cause allergic hypersensitivity myocarditis (168). Most patients are not clinically ill but may die suddenly, presumably secondary to an arrhythmia.
5.7.2. Rheumatological/Connective Tissue Disorders
Along with a number of cardiac abnormalities (e.g., pericarditis, pericardial effusion, conduction system abnormalities, including complete atrioventricular heart block), DCM can be a rare manifestation of systemic lupus erythematosus and usually correlates with disease activity (169). Studies suggest that echocardiographic evidence of abnormal LV filling may reflect the presence of myocardial fibrosis and could be a marker of subclinical myocardial involvement in systemic lupus erythematosus patients (170).

Scleroderma is a rare cause of DCM. One echocardiographic study showed that despite normal LV dimensions or fractional shortening, subclinical systolic impairment was present in the majority of patients with scleroderma (171). Cardiac involvement in rheumatoid arthritis generally is in the form of myocarditis and/or pericarditis, and development of DCM is rare (172). Myocardial involvement in rheumatoid arthritis is thought to be secondary to microvasculitis and subsequent microcirculatory disturbances. Myocardial disease in rheumatoid arthritis can occur in the absence of clinical symptoms or abnormalities of the electrocardiogram (ECG) (173).

5.8. Peripartum Cardiomyopathy
Peripartum cardiomyopathy is a disease of unknown cause in which LV dysfunction occurs during the last trimester of pregnancy or the early puerperium. It is reported in 1:1,300 to 1:4,000 live births (174). Risk factors for peripartum cardiomyopathy include advanced maternal age, multiparity, African descent, and long-term tocolysis. Although its etiology remains unknown, most theories have focused on hemodynamic and immunologic causes (174). The prognosis of peripartum cardiomyopathy is related to the recovery of ventricular function. Significant improvement in myocardial function is seen in 30% to 50% of patients in the first 6 months after presentation (174). However, for those patients who do not recover to normal or near-normal function, the prognosis is similar to other forms of DCM (175). Cardiomegaly that persists for >4 to 6 months after diagnosis indicates a poor prognosis, with a 50% mortality rate at 6 years. Subsequent pregnancy in women with a history of peripartum cardiomyopathy may be associated with a further decrease in LV function and can result in clinical deterioration, including death. However, if ventricular function has normalized in women with a history of peripartum cardiomyopathy, the risk may be less (174). There is an increased risk of venous thromboembolism, and anticoagulation is recommended, especially if ventricular dysfunction is persistent.

5.9. Cardiomyopathy Caused By Iron Overload
Iron overload cardiomyopathy manifests itself as systolic or diastolic dysfunction secondary to increased deposition of iron in the heart and occurs with common genetic disorders such as primary hemochromatosis or with lifetime transfusion requirements as seen in beta-thalassemia major (176). Hereditary hemochromatosis, an autosomal recessive disorder, is the most common hereditary disease of Northern Europeans, with a prevalence of approximately 5 per 1,000. The actuarial survival rates of persons who are homozygous for the mutation of
the hemochromatosis gene C282Y have been reported to be 95%, 93%, and 66%, at 5, 10, and 20 years, respectively (177). Similarly, in patients with thalassemia major, cardiac failure is one of the most frequent causes of death. Chelation therapy, including newer forms of oral chelators, such as deferoxamine, and phlebotomy, have dramatically improved the outcome of hemochromatosis, and the roles of gene therapy, hepcidin, and calcium channel blockers are being actively investigated (178).

5.10. Amyloidosis
Cardiac amyloidosis involves the deposition of insoluble proteins as fibrils in the heart, resulting in HF. Primary or AL amyloidosis (monoclonal kappa or lambda light chains), secondary amyloidosis (protein A), familial TTR amyloidosis (mutant transthyretin), dialysis-associated amyloidosis (beta-2-microglobulin), or senile TTR amyloidosis (wild-type transthyretin) can affect the heart, but cardiac involvement is primarily encountered in AL and TTR amyloidosis (179). The disease can be rapidly progressive, and, in patients with ventricular septum thickness >15 mm, LVEF <40%, and symptoms of HF, median survival may be <6 months (180). Cardiac biomarkers (e.g., B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), cardiac troponin) have been reported to predict response and progression of disease and survival (181). Three percent to 4% of African Americans carry an amyloidogenic allele of the human serum protein transthyretin (TTR V122I), which appears to increase risk for cardiac amyloid deposition after 65 years of age (182).

5.11. Cardiac Sarcoidosis
Cardiac sarcoidosis is an underdiagnosed disease that may affect as many as 25% of patients with systemic sarcoidosis. Although most commonly recognized in patients with other manifestations of sarcoidosis, cardiac involvement may occur in isolation and go undetected. Cardiac sarcoidosis may present as asymptomatic LV dysfunction, HF, atrioventricular block, atrial or ventricular arrhythmia, and SCD (183). Although untested in clinical trials, early use of high-dose steroid therapy may halt or reverse cardiac damage (184). Cardiac magnetic resonance and cardiac positron emission tomographic scanning can identify cardiac involvement with patchy areas of myocardial inflammation and fibrosis. In the setting of ventricular tachyarrhythmia, patients may require placement of an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) for primary prevention of SCD (185).

5.12. Stress (Takotsubo) Cardiomyopathy
Stress cardiomyopathy is characterized by acute reversible LV dysfunction in the absence of significant CAD, triggered by acute emotional or physical stress (23). This phenomenon is identified by a distinctive pattern of “apical ballooning,” first described in Japan as takotsubo, and often affects postmenopausal women (186). A majority of patients have a clinical presentation similar to that of acute coronary syndrome (ACS) and may have transiently elevated cardiac enzymes.
6. Initial and Serial Evaluation of the HF Patient

6.1. Clinical Evaluation

6.1.1. History and Physical Examination: Recommendations

Class I

1. A thorough history and physical examination should be obtained/performed in patients presenting with HF to identify cardiac and noncardiac disorders or behaviors that might cause or accelerate the development or progression of HF. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

2. In patients with idiopathic DCM, a 3-generational family history should be obtained to aid in establishing the diagnosis of familial DCM. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

3. Volume status and vital signs should be assessed at each patient encounter. This includes serial assessment of weight, as well as estimates of jugular venous pressure and the presence of peripheral edema or orthopnea (187-190). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

Despite advances in imaging technology and increasing availability of diagnostic laboratory testing, a careful history and physical examination remain the cornerstones in the assessment of patients with HF. The components of a focused history and physical examination for the patient with HF are listed in Table 6. The history provides clues to the etiology of the cardiomyopathy, including the diagnosis of familial cardiomyopathy (defined as ≥2 relatives with idiopathic DCM). Familial syndromes are now recognized to occur in 20% to 35% of patients with apparent idiopathic DCM (118); thus, a 3-generation family history should be obtained. The history also provides information about the severity of the disease and the patient’s prognosis and identifies opportunities for therapeutic interventions. The physical examination provides information about the severity of illness and allows assessment of volume status and adequacy of perfusion. In advanced HF, orthopnea and jugular venous pressure are useful findings to detect elevated LV filling pressures (187, 189, 190).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. History and Physical Examination in HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential clues suggesting etiology of HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity and triggers of dyspnea and fatigue, presence of chest pain, exercise capacity, physical activity, sexual activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia and early satiety, weight loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palpitations, (pre)syncope, ICD shocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms suggesting transient ischemic attack or thromboembolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of peripheral edema or ascites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disordered breathing at night, sleep problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Physical Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Examination</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMI and evidence of weight loss</td>
<td>Obesity may be a contributing cause of HF; cachexia may correspond with poor prognosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure (supine and upright)</td>
<td>Assess for hypertension or hypotension. Width of pulse pressure may reflect adequacy of cardiac output. Response of blood pressure to Valsalva maneuver may reflect LV filling pressures (197).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>Manual palpation will reveal strength and regularity of pulse rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination for orthostatic changes in blood pressure and heart rate</td>
<td>Consistent with volume depletion or excess vasodilation from medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugular venous pressure at rest and following abdominal compression (Heywood video)</td>
<td>Most useful finding on physical examination to identify congestion (187-190, 198).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of extra heart sounds and murmurs</td>
<td>S₃ is associated with adverse prognosis in HF/EF (188). Murmurs may be suggestive of valvular heart disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size and location of point of maximal impulse</td>
<td>Enlarged and displaced point of maximal impulse suggests ventricular enlargement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of right ventricular heave</td>
<td>Suggests significant right ventricular dysfunction and/or pulmonary hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary status: respiratory rate, rales, pleural effusion</td>
<td>In advanced chronic HF, rales are often absent despite major pulmonary congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatomegaly and/or ascites</td>
<td>Usually markers of volume overload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral edema</td>
<td>Many patients, particularly those who are young, may be not edematous despite intravascular volume overload. In obese patients and elderly patients, edema may reflect peripheral rather than cardiac causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of lower extremities</td>
<td>Cool lower extremities may reflect inadequate cardiac output.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI indicates body mass index; DCM, dilated cardiomyopathy; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HF/EF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LV, left ventricular; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

See Online Data Supplements 5, 6, and 7 for additional data on stress testing and clinical evaluation.

### 6.1.2. Risk Scoring: Recommendation

#### Class IIa

1. **Validated multivariable risk scores can be useful to estimate subsequent risk of mortality in ambulatory or hospitalized patients with HF (199-207).** *(Level of Evidence: B)*

In the course of standard evaluation, clinicians should routinely assess the patient’s potential for adverse outcome, because accurate risk stratification may help guide therapeutic decision making, including a more rapid transition to advanced HF therapies. A number of methods objectively assess risk, including biomarker...
testing (Section 6.3), as well as a variety of multivariable clinical risk scores (Table 7); these risk scores are for use in ambulatory (199, 203, 205, 206, 208) and hospitalized patients (200, 202, 204, 205, 209). Risk models specifically for patients with HFrEF have also been described (201).

One well-validated risk score, the Seattle Heart Failure Model, is available in an interactive application on the Internet (210) and provides robust information about risk of mortality in ambulatory patients with HF. For patients hospitalized with acutely decompensated HF, the model developed by ADHERE (Acute Decompensated Heart Failure National Registry) incorporates 3 routinely measured variables on hospital admission (i.e., systolic blood pressure, blood urea nitrogen, and serum creatinine) and stratifies subjects into categories with a 10-fold range of crude in-hospital mortality (from 2.1% to 21.9%) (200). Notably, clinical risk scores have not performed as well in estimating risk of hospital readmission (211). For this purpose, biomarkers such as natriuretic peptides hold considerable promise (212, 213) (Section 6.3).

Table 7. Selected Multivariable Risk Scores to Predict Outcome in HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>Reference/Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All patients with chronic HF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Heart Failure Model</td>
<td>(203) / <a href="http://SeattleHeartFailureModel.org">http://SeattleHeartFailureModel.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Failure Survival Score</td>
<td>(199) / <a href="http://handheld.softpedia.com/get/Health/Calculator/HFSS-Calc-37354.shtml">http://handheld.softpedia.com/get/Health/Calculator/HFSS-Calc-37354.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARM Risk Score</td>
<td>(206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORONA Risk Score</td>
<td>(207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific to chronic HFrEF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-PRESERVE Score</td>
<td>(201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acutely decompensated HF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHERE Classification and Regression Tree (CART) Model</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECT Risk Score</td>
<td>(202) / <a href="http://www.ccort.ca/Research/CHFRiskModel.aspx">http://www.ccort.ca/Research/CHFRiskModel.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAPE Risk Model and Discharge Score</td>
<td>(214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMIZE HF Risk-Prediction Nomogram</td>
<td>(215)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADHERE indicates Acute Decompensated Heart Failure National Registry; CHARM, Candesartan in Heart failure-Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity; CORONA, Controlled Rosuvastatin Multinational Trial in Heart Failure; EFFECT, Enhanced Feedback for Effective Cardiac Treatment; ESCAPE, Evaluation Study of Congestive Heart Failure and Pulmonary Artery Catheterization Effectiveness; HF, heart failure; HFrEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; I-PRESERVE, Irbesartan in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction Study; and OPTIMIZE, Organized Program to Initiate Lifesaving Treatment in Hospitalized Patients with Heart Failure.

See Online Data Supplement 8 for additional data on clinical evaluation risk scoring.
6.2. Diagnostic Tests: Recommendations

Class I

1. Initial laboratory evaluation of patients presenting with HF should include complete blood count, urinalysis, serum electrolytes (including calcium and magnesium), blood urea nitrogen, serum creatinine, glucose, fasting lipid profile, liver function tests, and thyroid-stimulating hormone. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Serial monitoring, when indicated, should include serum electrolytes and renal function. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. A 12-lead ECG should be performed initially on all patients presenting with HF. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. Screening for hemochromatosis or HIV is reasonable in selected patients who present with HF (216). (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Diagnostic tests for rheumatologic diseases, amyloidosis, or pheochromocytoma are reasonable in patients presenting with HF in whom there is a clinical suspicion of these diseases. (Level of Evidence: C)

6.3. Biomarkers: Recommendations

A. Ambulatory/Outpatient

Class I

1. In ambulatory patients with dyspnea, measurement of BNP or N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) is useful to support clinical decision making regarding the diagnosis of HF, especially in the setting of clinical uncertainty (217-223). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Measurement of BNP or NT-proBNP is useful for establishing prognosis or disease severity in chronic HF (222, 224-229). (Level of Evidence: A)

Class IIa

1. BNP- or NT-proBNP-guided HF therapy can be useful to achieve optimal dosing of GDMT in select clinically euvolemic patients followed in a well-structured HF disease management program (230-237). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb

1. The usefulness of serial measurement of BNP or NT-proBNP to reduce hospitalization or mortality in patients with HF is not well established (230-237). (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Measurement of other clinically available tests such as biomarkers of myocardial injury or fibrosis may be considered for additive risk stratification in patients with chronic HF (238-244). (Level of Evidence: B)

B. Hospitalized/Acute

Class I

1. Measurement of BNP or NT-proBNP is useful to support clinical judgment for the diagnosis of acutely decompensated HF, especially in the setting of uncertainty for the diagnosis (212, 245-250). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Measurement of BNP or NT-proBNP and/or cardiac troponin is useful for establishing prognosis or disease severity in acutely decompensated HF (248, 251-258). (Level of Evidence: A)
1. The usefulness of BNP- or NT-proBNP–guided therapy for acutely decompensated HF is not well-established \((259, 260)\). \((Level of Evidence: C)\)

2. Measurement of other clinically available tests such as biomarkers of myocardial injury or fibrosis may be considered for additive risk stratification in patients with acutely decompensated HF \((248, 253, 256, 257, 261-267)\). \((Level of Evidence: A)\)

In addition to routine clinical laboratory tests, other biomarkers are gaining greater attention for their utility in HF management. These biomarkers may reflect various pathophysiological aspects of HF, including myocardial wall stress, hemodynamic abnormalities, inflammation, myocyte injury, neurohormonal upregulation, and myocardial remodeling, as well as extracellular matrix turnover. Thus, these biomarkers are potentially powerful adjuncts to current standards for the diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment of acute and chronic HF.

6.3.1. Natriuretic Peptides: BNP or NT-proBNP

BNP or its amino-terminal cleavage equivalent (NT-proBNP) is derived from a common 108-amino acid precursor peptide \((\text{proBNP}_{108})\) that is generated by cardiomyocytes in the context of numerous triggers, most notably myocardial stretch. Following several steps of processing, BNP and NT-proBNP are released from the cardiomyocyte, along with variable amounts of \text{proBNP}_{108}, the latter of which is detected by all assays that measure either “BNP” or “NT-proBNP.”

Assays for BNP and NT-proBNP have been increasingly used to establish the presence and severity of HF. In general, BNP and NT-proBNP values are reasonably correlated, and either can be used in patient care settings as long as their respective absolute values and cut points are not used interchangeably. BNP and NT-proBNP are useful to support clinical judgment for the diagnosis or exclusion of HF, in the setting of chronic ambulatory HF \((217-223)\) or acute decompensated HF \((245-250)\); the value of natriuretic peptide testing is particularly significant when the etiology of dyspnea is unclear.

Although lower values of BNP or NT-proBNP exclude the presence of HF and higher values have reasonably high positive predictive value to diagnose HF, clinicians should be aware that elevated plasma levels for both natriuretic peptides have been associated with a wide variety of cardiac and noncardiac causes \((Table 8)\) \((268-271)\).

BNP and NT-proBNP levels improve with treatment of chronic HF \((225, 272-274)\), with lowering of levels over time in general, correlating with improved clinical outcomes \((248, 251, 254, 260)\). Thus, BNP or NT-proBNP “guided” therapy has been studied against standard care without natriuretic peptide measurement to determine whether guided therapy renders superior achievement of GDMT in patients with HF. However, RCTs have yielded inconsistent results.

The positive and negative natriuretic peptide–guided therapy trials differ primarily in their study populations, with successful trials enrolling younger patients and only those with HFrEF. In addition, a lower natriuretic peptide goal and/or a substantial reduction in natriuretic peptides during treatment are consistently present in the positive “guided” therapy trials \((275)\). Although most trials examining the strategy of biomarker “guided” HF management were small and underpowered, 2 comprehensive meta-analyses concluded that BNP-
guided therapy reduces all-cause mortality in patients with chronic HF compared with usual clinical care (231, 232), especially in patients <75 years of age. This survival benefit may be attributed to increased achievement of GDMT. In some cases, BNP or NT-proBNP levels may not be easily modifiable. If the BNP or NT-proBNP value does not fall after aggressive HF care, risk for death or hospitalization for HF is significant. On the other hand, some patients with advanced HF have normal BNP or NT-proBNP levels or have falsely low BNP levels because of obesity and HFpEF. All of these patients should still receive appropriate GDMT.

Table 8. Selected Causes of Elevated Natriuretic Peptide Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardiac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Heart failure, including RV syndromes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acute coronary syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heart muscle disease, including LVH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valvular heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pericardial disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Atrial fibrillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myocarditis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cardiac surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cardioversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noncardiac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Advancing age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Renal failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pulmonary: obstructive sleep apnea, severe pneumonia, pulmonary hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critical illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bacterial sepsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Severe burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Toxic-metabolic insults, including cancer chemotherapy and envenomation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LVH indicates left ventricular hypertrophy; and RV, right ventricular.

6.3.2. Biomarkers of Myocardial Injury: Cardiac Troponin T or I
Abnormal concentrations of circulating cardiac troponin are found in patients with HF, often without obvious myocardial ischemia and frequently in those without underlying CAD. This suggests ongoing myocyte injury or necrosis in these patients (238-241, 276). In chronic HF, elaboration of cardiac troponins is associated with impaired hemodynamics (238), progressive LV dysfunction (239), and increased mortality rates (238-241, 276). Similarly, in patients with acute decompensated HF, elevated cardiac troponin levels are associated with worse clinical outcomes and mortality (253, 257, 263); decrease in troponin levels over time with treatment is associated with a better prognosis than persistent elevation in patients with chronic (239) or acute HF (277). Given the tight association with ACS and troponin elevation as well as the link between MI and the
development of acute HF (278), the measurement of troponin I or T should be routine in patients presenting with acutely decompensated HF syndromes.

6.3.3. Other Emerging Biomarkers
Besides natriuretic peptides or troponins, multiple other biomarkers, including those reflecting inflammation, oxidative stress, neurohormonal disarray, and myocardial and matrix remodeling, have been widely examined for their prognostic value in HF. Biomarkers of myocardial fibrosis, soluble ST2 and galectin-3 are not only predictive of hospitalization and death in patients with HF but also additive to natriuretic peptide levels in their prognostic value. Markers of renal injury may also offer additional prognostic value because renal function or injury may be involved in the pathogenesis, progression, decompensation, or complications in chronic or acute decompensated HF (242-244, 264, 265, 279). Strategies that combine multiple biomarkers may ultimately prove beneficial in guiding HF therapy in the future.

See Table 9 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

### Table 9. Recommendations for Biomarkers in HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biomarker, Application</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natriuretic peptides</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis or exclusion of HF</td>
<td>Ambulatory, Acute</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(212, 217-223, 245-250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognosis of HF</td>
<td>Ambulatory, Acute</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(222, 224-229, 248, 251-258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve GDMT</td>
<td>Ambulatory</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(230-237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance for acutely decompensated HF therapy</td>
<td>Acute</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(259, 260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biomarkers of myocardial injury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive risk stratification</td>
<td>Acute, Ambulatory</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(238-244, 248, 253, 256-267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biomarkers of myocardial fibrosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive risk stratification</td>
<td>Ambulatory</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(238, 240-244, 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(248, 253, 256, 257, 261-267)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COR indicates Class of Recommendation; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; and LOE, Level of Evidence.

### 6.4. Noninvasive Cardiac Imaging: Recommendations
See Table 10 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

Class I
1. Patients with suspected or new-onset HF, or those presenting with acute decompensated HF, should undergo a chest x-ray to assess heart size and pulmonary congestion and to detect
alternative cardiac, pulmonary, and other diseases that may cause or contribute to the patient’s symptoms. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. A 2-dimensional echocardiogram with Doppler should be performed during initial evaluation of patients presenting with HF to assess ventricular function, size, wall thickness, wall motion, and valve function. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. Repeat measurement of EF and measurement of the severity of structural remodeling are useful to provide information in patients with HF who have had a significant change in clinical status; who have experienced or recovered from a clinical event; or who have received treatment, including GDMT, that might have had a significant effect on cardiac function; or who may be candidates for device therapy. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. Noninvasive imaging to detect myocardial ischemia and viability is reasonable in patients presenting with de novo HF who have known CAD and no angina unless the patient is not eligible for revascularization of any kind. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Viability assessment is reasonable in select situations when planning revascularization in HF patients with CAD (281-285). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. Radionuclide ventriculography or magnetic resonance imaging can be useful to assess LVEF and volume when echocardiography is inadequate. (Level of Evidence: C)

4. Magnetic resonance imaging is reasonable when assessing myocardial infiltrative processes or scar burden (286-288). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: No Benefit

1. Routine repeat measurement of LV function assessment in the absence of clinical status change or treatment interventions should not be performed (289, 290). (Level of Evidence: B)

The chest x-ray is important for the evaluation of patients presenting with signs and symptoms of HF because it assesses cardiomegaly and pulmonary congestion and may reveal alternative causes, cardiopulmonary or otherwise, of the patient’s symptoms. Apart from congestion, however, other findings on chest x-ray are associated with HF only in the context of clinical presentation. Cardiomegaly may be absent in HF. A chest x-ray may also show other cardiac chamber enlargement, increased pulmonary venous pressure, interstitial or alveolar edema, valvular or pericardial calcification, or coexisting thoracic diseases. Considering its low sensitivity and specificity, the chest x-ray should not be the sole determinant of the specific cause of HF. Moreover, a supine chest x-ray has limited value in acute decompensated HF.

Although a complete history and physical examination are important first steps, the most useful diagnostic test in the evaluation of patients with or at risk for HF (e.g., postacute MI) is a comprehensive 2-dimensional echocardiogram; coupled with Doppler flow studies, the transthoracic echocardiogram can identify abnormalities of myocardium, heart valves, and pericardium. Echocardiography can reveal subclinical HF and predict risk of subsequent events (291-295). Use of echocardiograms in patients with suspected HF improves disease identification and provision of appropriate medical care (296).

Echocardiographic evaluation should address whether LVEF is reduced, LV structure is abnormal, and other structural abnormalities are present that could account for the clinical presentation. This information should be quantified, including numerical estimates of EF measurement, ventricular dimensions, wall thickness,
calculations of ventricular volumes, and evaluation of chamber geometry and regional wall motion. Documentation of LVEF is an HF quality-of-care performance measure (297). Right ventricular size and function as well as atrial size and dimensions should also be measured. All valves should be evaluated for anatomic and flow abnormalities. Secondary changes, particularly the severity of mitral and tricuspid valve insufficiency, should be determined. Noninvasive hemodynamic data constitute important additional information. Mitral valve inflow pattern, pulmonary venous inflow pattern, and mitral annular velocity provide data about LV filling and left atrial pressure. The tricuspid valve regurgitant gradient, coupled with measurement of inferior vena cava diameter and its response during respiration, provides estimates of systolic pulmonary artery pressure and central venous pressure. Many of these abnormalities are prognostically important and can be present without manifest HF.

Serial echocardiographic evaluations are useful because evidence of cardiac reverse remodeling can provide important information in patients who have had a change in clinical status or have experienced or recovered from an event or treatment that affects cardiac function. However, the routine repeat assessment of ventricular function in the absence of changing clinical status or a change in treatment intervention is not indicated.

The preference for echocardiography as an imaging modality is due to its widespread availability and lack of ionizing radiation; however, other imaging modalities may be of use. Magnetic resonance imaging assesses LV volume and EF measurements at least as accurately as echocardiography. However, additional information about myocardial perfusion, viability, and fibrosis from magnetic resonance imaging can help identify HF etiology and assess prognosis (298). Magnetic resonance imaging provides high anatomical resolution of all aspects of the heart and surrounding structure, leading to its recommended use in known or suspected congenital heart diseases (5). Cardiac computed tomography can also provide accurate assessment of cardiac structure and function, including the coronary arteries (299). An advantage of cardiac computed tomography over echocardiography may be its ability to characterize the myocardium, but studies have yet to demonstrate the importance of this factor. Reports of cardiac computed tomography in patients with suspected HF are limited. Furthermore, both cardiac computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging lose accuracy with high heart rates. Radionuclide ventriculography may also be used for evaluation of cardiac function when other tests are unavailable or inadequate. However, as a planar technique, radionuclide ventriculography cannot directly assess valvular structure, function, or ventricular wall thickness; it may be more useful for assessing LV volumes in patients with significant baseline wall motion abnormalities or distorted geometry. Ventriculography is highly reproducible (300). Single photon emission computed tomography or positron emission tomography scans are not primarily used to determine LV systolic global and regional function unless these parameters are quantified from the resultant images during myocardial perfusion and/or viability assessment (301, 302). Candidates for coronary revascularization who present with a high suspicion for obstructive CAD should undergo coronary angiography. Stress nuclear imaging or
echocardiography may be an acceptable option for assessing ischemia in patients presenting with HF who have known CAD and no angina unless they are ineligible for revascularization (303). Although the results of the STICH (Surgical Treatment for Ischemic Heart Failure) trial have cast doubt on the role of myocardial viability assessment to determine the mode of therapy (304), the data are nevertheless predictive of a positive outcome. When these data are taken into consideration with multiple previous studies demonstrating the usefulness of this approach (281-285), it becomes reasonable to recommend viability assessment when treating patients with HFrEF who have known CAD (14).

### Table 10. Recommendations for Noninvasive Cardiac Imaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients with suspected, acute, or new-onset HF should undergo a chest x-ray</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2-dimensional echocardiogram with Doppler should be performed for</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial evaluation of HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat measurement of EF is useful in patients with HF who have had a</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant change in clinical status or received treatment that might affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cardiac function or for consideration of device therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninvasive imaging to detect myocardial ischemia and viability is</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable in HF and CAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability assessment is reasonable before revascularization in HF patients</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with CAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>(281-285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radionuclide ventriculography or MRI can be useful to assess LVEF and volume</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI is reasonable when assessing myocardial infiltration or scar</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine repeat measurement of LV function assessment should not be performed</td>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
<td>B (289, 290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAD indicates coronary artery disease; COR, Class of Recommendation; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; LOE, Level of Evidence; LV, left ventricular; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; and MRI, magnetic resonance imaging.

See Online Data Supplement 9 for additional data on imaging—echocardiography.

### 6.5. Invasive Evaluation: Recommendations

See Table 11 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

**Class I**

1. **Invasive hemodynamic monitoring with a pulmonary artery catheter should be performed to guide therapy in patients who have respiratory distress or clinical evidence of impaired perfusion in whom the adequacy or excess of intracardiac filling pressures cannot be determined from clinical assessment.** *(Level of Evidence: C)*

**Class IIa**

1. **Invasive hemodynamic monitoring can be useful for carefully selected patients with acute HF who have persistent symptoms despite empiric adjustment of standard therapies and a. whose fluid status, perfusion, or systemic or pulmonary vascular resistance is uncertain;**
b. whose systolic pressure remains low, or is associated with symptoms, despite initial therapy;
c. whose renal function is worsening with therapy;
d. who require parenteral vasoactive agents; or
e. who may need consideration for MCS or transplantation. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. When ischemia may be contributing to HF, coronary arteriography is reasonable for patients eligible for revascularization. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. Endomyocardial biopsy can be useful in patients presenting with HF when a specific diagnosis is suspected that would influence therapy. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III: No Benefit

1. Routine use of invasive hemodynamic monitoring is not recommended in normotensive patients with acute decompensated HF and congestion with symptomatic response to diuretics and vasodilators (305). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: Harm

1. Endomyocardial biopsy should not be performed in the routine evaluation of patients with HF. (Level of Evidence: C)

6.5.1. Right-Heart Catheterization

There has been no established role for routine or periodic invasive hemodynamic measurements in the management of HF. Most drugs used for the treatment of HF are prescribed on the basis of their ability to improve symptoms or survival rather than their effect on hemodynamic variables. The initial and target doses of these drugs are generally selected on the basis of controlled trial experience rather than changes produced in cardiac output or pulmonary capillary wedge pressure. Hemodynamic monitoring is indicated in patients with clinically indeterminate volume status and those refractory to initial therapy, particularly if intracardiac filling pressures and cardiac output are unclear. Patients with clinically significant hypotension (systolic blood pressure typically <90 mm Hg or symptomatic low systolic blood pressure) and/or worsening renal function during initial therapy might also benefit from invasive hemodynamic measurements (305, 306). Patients being considered for cardiac transplantation or placement of an MCS device are also candidates for complete right-heart catheterization, including an assessment of pulmonary vascular resistance, a necessary part of the initial transplantation evaluation. Invasive hemodynamic monitoring should be performed in patients with (1) presumed cardiogenic shock requiring escalating pressor therapy and consideration of MCS; (2) severe clinical decompensation in which therapy is limited by uncertain contributions of elevated filling pressures, hypoperfusion, and vascular tone; (3) apparent dependence on intravenous inotropic infusions after initial clinical improvement; or (4) persistent severe symptoms despite adjustment of recommended therapies. On the other hand, routine use of invasive hemodynamic monitoring is not recommended in normotensive patients with acute decompensated HF who have a symptomatic response to diuretics and vasodilators. This reinforces the concept that right-heart catheterization is best reserved for those situations where a specific clinical or therapeutic question needs to be addressed.
6.5.2. **Left-Heart Catheterization**

Left-heart catheterization or coronary angiography is indicated for patients with HF and angina and may be useful for those patients without angina but with LV dysfunction. Invasive coronary angiography should be used in accordance with the ACCF/AHA coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) and percutaneous coronary intervention Guidelines (10, 12) (Table 2) and should only be performed in patients who are potentially eligible for revascularization (307-309). In patients with known CAD and angina or with significant ischemia diagnosed by ECG or noninvasive testing and impaired ventricular function, coronary angiography is indicated. Among those without a prior diagnosis, CAD should be considered as a potential etiology of impaired LV function and should be excluded wherever possible. Coronary angiography may be considered in these circumstances to detect and localize large-vessel coronary obstructions. In patients in whom CAD has been excluded as the cause of LV dysfunction, coronary angiography is generally not indicated unless a change in clinical status suggests interim development of ischemic disease.

6.5.3. **Endomyocardial Biopsy**

Endomyocardial biopsy can be useful when seeking a specific diagnosis that would influence therapy, and biopsy should thus be considered in patients with rapidly progressive clinical HF or worsening ventricular dysfunction that persists despite appropriate medical therapy. Endomyocardial biopsy should also be considered in patients suspected of having acute cardiac rejection status after heart transplantation or having myocardial infiltrative processes. A specific example is to determine chemotherapy for primary cardiac amyloidosis. Additional other indications for endomyocardial biopsy include in patients with rapidly progressive and unexplained cardiomyopathy, those in whom active myocarditis, especially giant cell myocarditis, is being considered (310). Routine endomyocardial biopsy is not recommended in all cases of HF, given limited diagnostic yield and the risk of procedure-related complications.

### Table 11. Recommendations for Invasive Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring with a pulmonary artery catheter should be performed in patients with respiratory distress or impaired systemic perfusion when clinical assessment is inadequate</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive hemodynamic monitoring can be useful for carefully selected patients with acute HF with persistent symptoms and/or when hemodynamics are uncertain</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When ischemia may be contributing to HF, coronary arteriography is reasonable</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endomyocardial biopsy can be useful in patients with HF when a specific diagnosis is suspected that would influence therapy</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine use of invasive hemodynamic monitoring is not recommended in normotensive patients with acute HF</td>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
<td>B (305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endomyocardial biopsy should not be performed in the routine evaluation of HF</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COR indicates Class of Recommendation; HF, heart failure; and LOE, Level of Evidence.
7. Treatment of Stages A to D

7.1. Stage A: Recommendations

Class I

1. Hypertension and lipid disorders should be controlled in accordance with contemporary guidelines to lower the risk of HF (27, 94, 311-314). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Other conditions that may lead to or contribute to HF, such as obesity, diabetes mellitus, tobacco use, and known cardiotoxic agents, should be controlled or avoided. (Level of Evidence: C)

7.1.1. Recognition and Treatment of Elevated Blood Pressure

The lifetime risk for development of hypertension is considerable and represents a major public health issue (97). Elevated blood pressure is a major risk factor for the development of both HFpEF and HFrEF (91, 92), a risk that extends across all age ranges. Long-term treatment of both systolic and diastolic hypertension has been shown to reduce the risk of incident HF by approximately 50% (94, 311-314). Treatment of hypertension is particularly beneficial in older patients (311). One trial of a diuretic-based program demonstrated a number needed to treat of 52 to prevent 1 HF event in 2 years (311). In another study, elderly patients with a history or ECG evidence of prior MI had a >80% risk reduction for incident HF with aggressive blood pressure control (94). Given the robust outcomes with blood pressure reduction, clinicians should lower both systolic and diastolic blood pressure in accordance with published guidelines (27).

Choice of antihypertensive therapy should also follow guidelines (27), with specific options tailored to concomitant medical problems, such as diabetes mellitus or CAD. Diuretic-based antihypertensive therapy has repeatedly been shown to prevent HF in a wide range of patients; ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and beta blockers are also effective. Data are less clear for calcium antagonists and alpha blockers in reducing the risk for incident HF.

7.1.2. Treatment of Dyslipidemia and Vascular Risk

Patients with known atherosclerotic disease are likely to develop HF. Clinicians should seek to control vascular risk factors in such patients according to guidelines (28). Aggressive treatment of hyperlipidemia with statins reduces the likelihood of HF in at-risk patients (315, 316). Long-term treatment with ACE inhibitors in similar patients may also decrease the risk of HF (314, 317).

7.1.3. Obesity and Diabetes Mellitus

Obesity and overweight have been repeatedly linked to an increased risk for HF (99, 318, 319). Presumably, the link between obesity and risk for HF is explained by the clustering of risk factors for heart disease in those with elevated BMI, (i.e., the metabolic syndrome). Similarly, insulin resistance, with or without diabetes mellitus, is also an important risk factor for the development of HF (92, 320-323). Diabetes mellitus is an especially important risk factor for women and may, in fact, triple the risk for developing HF (91, 324). Dysglycemia
appears to be directly linked to risk, with HbA1c concentrations powerfully predicting incident HF. Those with HbA1c >10.5% had a nearly 4-fold increase in the risk for HF compared with those with a value of <6.5% (322). Current consensus advocates that clinicians should make every effort to control hyperglycemia, although such control has not yet been shown to reduce the subsequent risk of HF. Additionally, standard therapies for diabetes mellitus, such as use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs, can prevent the development of other risk factors for HF, such as renal dysfunction (325, 326), and may themselves directly lower the likelihood of HF (327-329). Although risk models for the development of incident HF in patients with diabetes mellitus have been developed (323), their prospective use to reduce risk has not been validated. Despite the lack of supportive, prospective, randomized data, consensus exists that risk factor recognition and modification are vital for the prevention of HF among at-risk patients (e.g., obese patients or patients with diabetes mellitus).

7.1.4. Recognition and Control of Other Conditions That May Lead to HF
A substantial genetic risk exists in some patients for the development of HF. As noted in Section 6.1, obtaining a 3-generation family history of HF is recommended. Adequate therapy of AF is advisable, given a clear association between uncontrolled heart rate and development of HF. Many therapeutic agents can exert important cardiotoxic effects, with consequent risk for HF, and clinicians should be aware of such risk. For example, cardiotoxic chemotherapy regimens and trastuzumab (particularly anthracycline based) may increase the risk for HF in certain patients (330-332); it may be reasonable to evaluate those who are receiving (or who have received) such agents for LV dysfunction. The use of advanced echocardiographic techniques or biomarkers to identify increased HF risk in those receiving chemotherapy may be useful (333) but remain unvalidated as yet.

Tobacco use is strongly associated with risk for incident HF (92, 320, 334), and patients should be strongly advised about the hazards of smoking, with attendant efforts at quitting. Cocaine and amphetamines are anecdotally but strongly associated with HF, and their avoidance is mandatory. Although it is recognized that alcohol consumption is associated with subsequent development of HF (92, 139, 140), there is some uncertainty about the amount of alcohol ingested and the likelihood of developing HF, and there may be sex differences as well. Nevertheless, the heavy use of alcohol has repeatedly been associated with heightened risk for development of HF. Therefore, patients should be counseled about their alcohol intake.

Although several epidemiological studies have revealed an independent link between risk for incident HF and biomarkers such as natriuretic peptides (335, 336), highly sensitive troponin (337), and measures of renal function such as creatinine, phosphorus, urinary albumin, or albumin-creatinine ratio (320, 323, 334, 336, 338-340), it remains unclear whether the risk for HF reflected by any of these biomarkers is modifiable. Although routine screening with BNP before echocardiography may be a cost-effective strategy to identify high-risk patients (341), routine measurement of biomarkers in stage A patients is not yet justified.
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See Online Data Supplement 11 for additional data on stage A HF.

7.2. Stage B: Recommendations

See Table 12 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

Class I

1. In all patients with a recent or remote history of MI or ACS and reduced EF, ACE inhibitors should be used to prevent symptomatic HF and reduce mortality (342-344). In patients intolerant of ACE inhibitors, ARBs are appropriate unless contraindicated (314, 345). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. In all patients with a recent or remote history of MI or ACS and reduced EF, evidence-based beta blockers should be used to reduce mortality (346-348). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. In all patients with a recent or remote history of MI or ACS, statins should be used to prevent symptomatic HF and cardiovascular events (104, 349-354). (Level of Evidence: A)

4. In patients with structural cardiac abnormalities, including LV hypertrophy, in the absence of a history of MI or ACS, blood pressure should be controlled in accordance with clinical practice guidelines for hypertension to prevent symptomatic HF (27, 94, 311-313). (Level of Evidence: A)

5. ACE inhibitors should be used in all patients with a reduced EF to prevent symptomatic HF, even if they do not have a history of MI (65, 344). (Level of Evidence: A)

6. Beta blockers should be used in all patients with a reduced EF to prevent symptomatic HF, even if they do not have a history of MI. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. To prevent sudden death, placement of an ICD is reasonable in patients with asymptomatic ischemic cardiomyopathy who are at least 40 days post-MI, have an LVEF of 30% or less, are on appropriate medical therapy, and have reasonable expectation of survival with a good functional status for more than 1 year (355). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: Harm

1. Nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers with negative inotropic effects may be harmful in asymptomatic patients with low LVEF and no symptoms of HF after MI. (Level of Evidence: C)

Patients with reduced LVEF may not have HF symptoms and are most often identified during an evaluation for another disorder (e.g., abnormal heart sounds, abnormal ECG, abnormal chest x-ray, hypertension or hypotension, an arrhythmia, acute MI, or pulmonary or systemic thromboembolic event). However, the cost-effectiveness of routine periodic population screening for asymptomatic reduced LVEF is not recommended at this time. Echocardiographic evaluation should be performed in selected patients who are at high risk of reduced LVEF (e.g., those with a strong family history of cardiomyopathy, long-standing hypertension, previous MI, or those receiving cardiotoxic therapies). In addition, it should be acknowledged that many adults may have asymptomatic valvular abnormalities or congenital heart lesions that if unrecognized could lead to the development of clinical HF. Although these asymptomatic patients are in stage B as well, the management of valvular and congenital heart disease is beyond the scope of this guideline.
7.2.1. Management Strategies for Stage B

In general, all recommendations for patients with stage A HF also apply to those with stage B HF, particularly with respect to control of blood pressure in the patient with LV hypertrophy (27, 94, 311, 312) and the optimization of lipids with statins (349, 356). CAD is a major risk factor for the development of HF and a key target for prevention of HF. The 5-year risk of developing HF after acute MI is 7% and 12% for men and women, respectively; for men and women between the ages of 40 and 69 and those >70 years of age, the risk is 22% and 25%, respectively (51). Current evidence supports the use of ACE inhibitors and (to a lower level of evidence) beta-blocker therapy to impede maladaptive LV remodeling in patients with stage B HF and low LVEF to improve mortality and morbidity (344). At 3-year follow-up, those patients treated with ACE inhibitors demonstrated combined endpoints of reduced hospitalization or death, a benefit that extended up to a 12-year follow-up (65). ARBs are reasonable alternatives to ACE inhibitors. In 1 study, losartan reduced adverse outcomes in a population with hypertension (357), and in another study of patients post-MI with low LVEF, valsartan was equivalent to captopril (345). Data with beta blockers are less convincing in a population with known CAD, although in 1 trial (346) carvedilol therapy in patients with stage B and low LVEF was associated with a 31% relative risk reduction in adverse long-term outcomes. In patients with previously established structural heart disease, the administration of agents known to have negative inotropic properties such as nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers and certain antiarrhythmics should be avoided.

Elevations in both systolic and diastolic blood pressure are major risk factors for developing LV hypertrophy, another form of stage B (91, 92). Although the magnitude of benefit varies with the trial selection criteria, target blood pressure reduction, and HF criteria, effective hypertension treatment invariably reduces HF events. Consequently, long-term treatment of both systolic and diastolic hypertension reduces the risk of moving from stage A or B to stage C HF (93, 94, 311, 329). Several large controlled studies have uniformly demonstrated that optimal blood pressure control decreases the risk of new HF by approximately 50% (96). It is imperative that strategies to control hypertension be part of any effort to prevent HF.

Clinicians should lower both systolic and diastolic blood pressure in accordance with published guidelines (27). Target levels of blood pressure lowering depend on major cardiovascular risk factors, (e.g., CAD, diabetes mellitus, or renal disease) (358). Thus, when an antihypertensive regimen is devised, optimal control of blood pressure should remain the primary goal, with the choice of drugs determined by the concomitant medical problems.

Diuretic-based antihypertensive therapy has been shown to prevent HF in a wide range of target populations (359, 360). In refractory hypertensive patients, spironolactone (25 mg) should be considered as an additional agent (27). Eplerenone, in synergy with enalapril, has also demonstrated reduction in LV mass (361).

ACE inhibitors and beta blockers are also effective in the prevention of HF (27). Nevertheless, neither ACE inhibitors nor beta blockers as single therapies are superior to other antihypertensive drug classes, including calcium channel blockers, in the reduction of all cardiovascular outcomes. However, in patients with
type 2 diabetes mellitus, ACE inhibitors and ARBs significantly reduced the incidence of HF in patients (327-329). In contrast, calcium channel blockers and alpha blockers were less effective in preventing the HF syndrome, particularly in HF rEF (359).

The Framingham studies have shown a 60% increased risk of death in patients with asymptomatic low LVEF compared with those with normal LVEF; almost half of these patients remained free of HF before their death (62-65). MADIT-II (Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial II) (362) demonstrated a 31% relative risk reduction in all-cause mortality in patients with post-MI with LVEF ≤30% receiving a prophylactic ICD compared with standard of care (355). These findings provided justification for broad adoption of ICDs for primary prevention of SCD in the post-MI setting with reduced LVEF, even in the absence of HF symptoms, that is, patients in stage B HF.

Several other ACCF/AHA guidelines addressing the appropriate management of patients with stage B—those with cardiac structural abnormalities but no symptoms of HF—are listed in Table 13.

Table 12. Recommendations for Treatment of Stage B HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In patients with a history of MI and reduced EF, ACE inhibitors or ARBs should be used to prevent HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(314, 342-345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In patients with MI and reduced EF, evidence-based beta blockers should be used to prevent HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(346-348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In patients with MI, statins should be used to prevent HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(104, 349-354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure should be controlled to prevent symptomatic HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(27, 94, 311-313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitors should be used in all patients with a reduced EF to prevent HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(65, 344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blockers should be used in all patients with a reduced EF to prevent HF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ICD is reasonable in patients with asymptomatic ischemic cardiomyopathy who are at least 40 d post-MI, have an LVEF ≤30%, and on GDMT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers may be harmful in patients with low LVEF</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; COR, Class of Recommendation; EF, ejection fraction; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LOE, Level of Evidence; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; and N/A, not available.

Table 13. Other ACCF/AHA Guidelines Addressing Patients With Stage B HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients with an acute MI who have not developed HF symptoms treated according to GDMT</td>
<td>2013 UA/NSTEMI Guideline (16)  2013 STEMI Guideline (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary revascularization for patients without symptoms of HF in accordance with GDMT</td>
<td>2011 PCI Guideline (12)  2011 CABG Guideline (10)  2012 SIHD Guideline (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve replacement or repair for patients with hemodynamically significant valvular stenosis or regurgitation and no symptoms</td>
<td>2008 Focused Update incorporated into the 2006 VHD Guideline (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. Stage C

See Online Data Supplement 13 for additional data on stage C HF.

7.3.1. Nonpharmacological Interventions

7.3.1.1. Education: Recommendation

Class I
1. Patients with HF should receive specific education to facilitate HF self-care (363-368). (Level of Evidence: B)

The self-care regimen for patients with HF is complex and multifaceted (363). Patients need to understand how to monitor their symptoms and weight fluctuations, restrict their sodium intake, take their medications as prescribed, and stay physically active. Education regarding these recommendations is necessary, albeit not always sufficient, to significantly improve outcomes. After discharge, many patients with HF need disease management programs, which are reviewed in Section 11.

A systematic review of 35 educational intervention studies for patients with HF demonstrated that education improved knowledge, self-monitoring, medication adherence, time to hospitalization, and days in the hospital (363). Patients who receive in-hospital education have higher knowledge scores at discharge and 1 year later when compared with those who did not receive in-hospital education (364). Data have called into question the survival benefit of discharge education (369, 370). However, prior data have suggested that discharge education may result in fewer days of hospitalization, lower costs, and lower mortality rates within a 6-month follow-up (365). Patients educated in all 6 categories of the HF core measures from The Joint Commission were significantly less likely to be readmitted for any cause, including HF (366). Even a single home-based educational intervention for patients and families has been shown to decrease emergency visits and unplanned hospitalizations in adults with HF (367).

See Online Data Supplement 14 for additional data on patient nonadherence.
7.3.1.2. Social Support

Social support is thought to buffer stress and promote treatment adherence and a healthy lifestyle (371). Most studies examining the relationship between social support and hospitalization in adults with HF have found that a lack of social support is associated with higher hospitalization rates (372, 373) and mortality risk (374, 375).

7.3.1.3. Sodium Restriction: Recommendation

Class IIa
1. Sodium restriction is reasonable for patients with symptomatic HF to reduce congestive symptoms. (Level of Evidence: C)

Dietary sodium restriction is commonly recommended to patients with HF and is endorsed by many guidelines (18, 376, 377). The data on which this recommendation is drawn upon, however, are modest, and variances in protocols, fluid intake, measurement of sodium intake and compliance, and other clinical and therapeutic characteristics among these studies make it challenging to compare data and draw definitive conclusions. Observational data suggest an association between dietary sodium intake with fluid retention and risk for hospitalization (378, 379). Other studies, however, have signaled a worsening neurohormonal profile with sodium restriction in HF (380-390). Sodium homeostasis is altered in patients with HF as opposed to healthy individuals, which may partially explain these trends. In most of these studies, patients were not receiving GDMT; no study to date has evaluated the effects of sodium restriction on neurohormonal activation and outcomes in optimally treated patients with HF. With the exception of 1 observational study that evaluated patients with HFrEF (383), all other studies have focused on patients with HFpEF. These data are mostly from white patients; when the differences in cardiovascular and renal pathophysiology among races are considered, the effects of sodium restriction in nonwhite patients with HF cannot be ascertained from these studies. To make this more complicated, the 3 RCTs that assessed outcomes with sodium restriction have all shown that lower sodium intake is associated with worse outcomes in patients with HFpEF (384-386).

These limitations make it difficult to give precise recommendations about daily sodium intake and whether it should vary with respect to the type of HF (e.g., HFrEF versus HFpEF), disease severity (e.g., NYHA class), HF-related comorbidities (e.g., renal dysfunction), or other characteristics (e.g., age or race). Because of the association between sodium intake and hypertension, LV hypertrophy, and cardiovascular disease, the AHA recommendation for restriction of sodium to 1,500 mg/d appears to be appropriate for most patients with stage A and B HF (387-392). However, for patients with stage C and D HF, currently there are insufficient data to endorse any specific level of sodium intake. Because sodium intake is typically high (>4 g/d) in the general population, clinicians should consider some degree (e.g., <3 g) of sodium restriction in patients with stage C and D HF for symptom improvement.
7.3.1.4. Treatment of Sleep Disorders: Recommendation

Class IIa
1. Continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) can be beneficial to increase LVEF and improve functional status in patients with HF and sleep apnea (393-396). (Level of Evidence: B)

Sleep disorders are common in patients with HF. A study of adults with chronic HF treated with evidence-based therapies found that 61% had either central or obstructive sleep apnea (397). Despite having less sleep time and sleep efficiency compared with those without HF, patients with HF, including those with documented sleep disorders, rarely report excessive daytime sleepiness (398). Thus, a high degree of suspicion for sleep disorders should be maintained for these patients. The decision to refer a patient to a sleep study should be based on clinical judgment.

The primary treatment for obstructive sleep apnea is nocturnal CPAP. In a major trial, CPAP for obstructive sleep apnea was effective in decreasing the apnea–hypopnea index, improving nocturnal oxygenation, increasing LVEF, lowering norepinephrine levels, and increasing the distance walked in 6 minutes; these benefits were sustained for up to 2 years (394). Smaller studies suggest that CPAP can improve cardiac function, sympathetic activity, and HRQOL in patients with HF and obstructive sleep apnea (395, 396).

See Online Data Supplement 15 for additional data on the treatment of sleep disorders.

7.3.1.5. Weight Loss

Obesity is defined as a BMI $\geq$30 kg/m$^2$. Patients with HF who have a BMI between 30 and 35 kg/m$^2$ have lower mortality and hospitalization rates than those with a BMI in the normal range (99). Weight loss may reflect cachexia caused by the higher total energy expenditure associated with HF compared with that of healthy sedentary subjects (399). The diagnosis of cardiac cachexia independently predicts a worse prognosis (191). At the other end of the continuum, morbidly obese patients may have worse outcomes compared with patients within the normal weight range and those who are obese. A U-shaped distribution curve has been suggested in which mortality is greatest in cachectic patients; lower in normal, overweight, and mildly obese patients; and higher again in more severely obese patients (400).

Although there are anecdotal reports about symptomatic improvement after weight reduction in obese patients with HF (401, 402), large-scale clinical trials on the role of weight loss in patients with HF with obesity have not been performed. Because of reports of development of cardiomyopathy, sibutramine is contraindicated in HF (403).

7.3.1.6. Activity, Exercise Prescription, and Cardiac Rehabilitation: Recommendations

Class I
1. Exercise training (or regular physical activity) is recommended as safe and effective for patients with HF who are able to participate to improve functional status (404-407). *(Level of Evidence: A)*

**Class IIa**

1. Cardiac rehabilitation can be useful in clinically stable patients with HF to improve functional capacity, exercise duration, HRQOL, and mortality (404, 406-411). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

Exercise training in patients with HF is safe and has numerous benefits. Meta-analyses show that cardiac rehabilitation reduces mortality; improves functional capacity, exercise duration, and HRQOL; and reduces hospitalizations (409). Other benefits include improved endothelial function, blunted catecholamine spillover, increased peripheral oxygen extraction, and reduced hospital admission (405, 407, 410, 411).

Many RCTs of exercise training in HF have been conducted, but the statistical power of most was low (408). A major trial of exercise and HF randomly assigned 2,331 patients (mean EF, 25%; ischemic etiology, 52%) to either exercise training for 3 months versus usual care (406). In unadjusted analyses, there was no significant difference at the end of the study in either total mortality or hospitalizations. When adjusted for coronary heart disease risk factors, there was an 11% reduction in all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease mortality, or hospitalizations (p<0.03) in the exercise training group (406). A meta-analysis demonstrated improved peak oxygen consumption and decreased all-cause mortality with exercise (409).

*See Online Data Supplement 16 for additional data on cardiac exercise.*

### 7.3.2. Pharmacological Treatment for Stage C HFrEF: Recommendations

**Class I**

1. Measures listed as Class I recommendations for patients in stages A and B are recommended where appropriate for patients in stage C. *(Levels of Evidence: A, B, and C as appropriate)*

2. GDMT as depicted in Figure 1 should be the mainstay of pharmacological therapy for HFrEF (108, 343, 345, 346, 412-426). *(Level of Evidence: A)*

*Figure 1.* Stage C HFrEF: evidence-based, guideline-directed medical therapy.
ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; Hydral-Nitrates, hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate; LOE, Level of Evidence; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

7.3.2.1. Diuretics: Recommendation

Class I

1. **Diuretics are recommended in patients with HFrEF who have evidence of fluid retention, unless contraindicated, to improve symptoms. (Level of Evidence: C)**

Diuretics inhibit the reabsorption of sodium or chloride at specific sites in the renal tubules. Bumetanide, furosemide, and torsemide act at the loop of Henle (thus, the term loop diuretics), whereas thiazides, metolazone, and potassium-sparing agents (e.g., spironolactone) act in the distal portion of the tubule (427, 428). Loop diuretics have emerged as the preferred diuretic agents for use in most patients with HF. Thiazide diuretics
may be considered in hypertensive patients with HF and mild fluid retention because they confer more persistent antihypertensive effects.

Controlled trials have demonstrated the ability of diuretic drugs to increase urinary sodium excretion and decrease physical signs of fluid retention in patients with HF (429, 430). In intermediate-term studies, diuretics have been shown to improve symptoms and exercise tolerance in patients with HF (431-433); however, diuretic effects on morbidity and mortality are not known. Diuretics are the only drugs used for the treatment of HF that can adequately control the fluid retention of HF. Appropriate use of diuretics is a key element in the success of other drugs used for the treatment of HF. The use of inappropriately low doses of diuretics will result in fluid retention. Conversely, the use of inappropriately high doses of diuretics will lead to volume contraction, which can increase the risk of hypotension and renal insufficiency.

### 7.3.2.1.1. Diuretics: Selection of Patients

Diuretics should be prescribed to all patients who have evidence of, and to most patients with a prior history of, fluid retention. Diuretics should generally be combined with an ACE inhibitor, beta blocker, and aldosterone antagonist. Few patients with HF will be able to maintain target weight without the use of diuretics.

### 7.3.2.1.2. Diuretics: Initiation and Maintenance

The most commonly used loop diuretic for the treatment of HF is furosemide, but some patients respond more favorably to other agents in this category (e.g., bumetanide, torsemide) because of their increased oral bioavailability (434, 435). Table 14 lists oral diuretics recommended for use in the treatment of chronic HF. In outpatients with HF, diuretic therapy is commonly initiated with low doses, and the dose is increased until urine output increases and weight decreases, generally by 0.5 to 1.0 kg daily. Further increases in the dose or frequency (i.e., twice-daily dosing) of diuretic administration may be required to maintain an active diuresis and sustain weight loss. The ultimate goal of diuretic treatment is to eliminate clinical evidence of fluid retention. Diuretics are generally combined with moderate dietary sodium restriction. Once fluid retention has resolved, treatment with the diuretic should be maintained in some patients to prevent the recurrence of volume overload. Patients are commonly prescribed a fixed dose of diuretic, but the dose of these drugs frequently may need adjustment. In many cases, this adjustment can be accomplished by having patients record their weight each day and adjusting the diuretic dosage if weight increases or decreases beyond a specified range. Patients may become unresponsive to high doses of diuretic drugs if they consume large amounts of dietary sodium, are taking agents that can block the effects of diuretics (e.g., nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [NSAIDs], including cyclo-oxygenase-2 inhibitors) (436-438) or have a significant impairment of renal function or perfusion (434). Diuretic resistance can generally be overcome by the intravenous administration of diuretics (including the use of continuous infusions) (439) or combination of different diuretic classes (e.g., metolazone with a loop diuretic) (440-443).
**7.3.2.1.3. Diuretics: Risks of Treatment**

The principal adverse effects of diuretics include electrolyte and fluid depletion, as well as hypotension and azotemia. Diuretics can cause the depletion of potassium and magnesium, which can predispose patients to serious cardiac arrhythmias (444). The risk of electrolyte depletion is markedly enhanced when 2 diuretics are used in combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Oral Diuretics Recommended for Use in the Treatment of Chronic HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop diuretics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumetanide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furosemide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsemide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazide diuretics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothiazide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorthalidone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indapamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metolazone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium-sparing diuretics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spironolactone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamterene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential nephron blockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metolazone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothiazide (IV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eplerenone, although also a diuretic, is primarily used in chronic HF.
†Higher doses may occasionally be used with close monitoring.

HF indicates heart failure; IV, intravenous; and N/A, not applicable.

See Online Data Supplement 17 for additional data on diuretics.

**7.3.2.2. ACE Inhibitors: Recommendation**

**Class I**

1. ACE inhibitors are recommended in patients with HFrEF and current or prior symptoms, unless contraindicated, to reduce morbidity and mortality (343, 412-414). *(Level of Evidence: A)*

**7.3.2.2.1. ACE Inhibitors: Selection of Patients**

ACE inhibitors can reduce the risk of death and reduce hospitalization in HFrEF. The benefits of ACE inhibition were seen in patients with mild, moderate, or severe symptoms of HF and in patients with or without CAD. ACE inhibitors should be prescribed to all patients with HFrEF. Unless there is a contraindication, ACE inhibitors are used together with a beta blocker. Patients should not be given an ACE inhibitor if they have experienced life-threatening adverse reactions (i.e., angioedema) during previous medication exposure or if they are pregnant or
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plan to become pregnant. Clinicians should prescribe an ACE inhibitor with caution if the patient has very low systemic blood pressures (systolic blood pressure <80 mm Hg), markedly increased serum levels of creatinine (>3 mg/dL), bilateral renal artery stenosis, or elevated levels of serum potassium (>5.0 mEq/L).

7.3.2.2.2. ACE Inhibitors: Initiation and Maintenance

The available data suggest that there are no differences among available ACE inhibitors in their effects on symptoms or survival (414). Treatment with an ACE inhibitor should be initiated at low doses (Table 15), followed by gradual dose increments if lower doses have been well tolerated. Renal function and serum potassium should be assessed within 1 to 2 weeks of initiation of therapy and periodically thereafter, especially in patients with preexisting hypotension, hyponatremia, diabetes mellitus, azotemia, or in those taking potassium supplements. In controlled clinical trials that were designed to evaluate survival, the dose of the ACE inhibitor was not determined by a patient’s therapeutic response but was increased until the predetermined target dose was reached (343, 413, 414). Clinicians should attempt to use doses that have been shown to reduce the risk of cardiovascular events in clinical trials. If these target doses of an ACE inhibitor cannot be used or are poorly tolerated, intermediate doses should be used with the expectation that there are likely to be only small differences in efficacy between low and high doses. Abrupt withdrawal of treatment with an ACE inhibitor can lead to clinical deterioration and should be avoided.

7.3.2.2.3. ACE Inhibitors: Risks of Treatment

The majority of the adverse reactions of ACE inhibitors can be attributed to the 2 principal pharmacological actions of these drugs: those related to angiotensin suppression and those related to kinin potentiation. Other types of adverse effects may also occur (e.g., rash and taste disturbances). Up to 20% of patients will experience an ACE inhibitor–induced cough. With the use of ACE inhibitors, particular care should be given to the patient’s volume status, renal function, and concomitant medications (Sections 7.3.2.1 and 7.3.2.9). However, most HF patients (85% to 90%) can tolerate these drugs.

See Online Data Supplement 18 for additional data on ACE inhibitors.

**Table 15. Drugs Commonly Used for Stage C HFrEF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Initial Daily Dose(s)</th>
<th>Maximum Dose(s)</th>
<th>Mean Doses Achieved in Clinical Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACE inhibitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captopril</td>
<td>6.25 mg 3 times</td>
<td>50 mg 3 times</td>
<td>122.7 mg/d (422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enalapril</td>
<td>2.5 mg twice</td>
<td>10 to 20 mg twice</td>
<td>16.6 mg/d (413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosinopril</td>
<td>5 to 10 mg once</td>
<td>40 mg once</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>2.5 to 5 mg once</td>
<td>20 to 40 mg once</td>
<td>32.5 to 35.0 mg/d (445)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.2.3. ARBs: Recommendations

Class I

1. ARBs are recommended in patients with HFREF with current or prior symptoms who are ACE inhibitor intolerant, unless contraindicated, to reduce morbidity and mortality (108, 345, 415, 450). (Level of Evidence: A)

Class IIa

1. ARBs are reasonable to reduce morbidity and mortality as alternatives to ACE inhibitors as first-line therapy for patients with HFREF, especially for patients already taking ARBs for other indications, unless contraindicated (451-456). (Level of Evidence: A)

Class IIb

1. Addition of an ARB may be considered in persistently symptomatic patients with HFREF who are already being treated with an ACE inhibitor and a beta blocker in whom an aldosterone antagonist is not indicated or tolerated (420, 457). (Level of Evidence: A)

Class III: Harm

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; CR, controlled release; CR/XL, controlled release/extended release; HFREF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; and N/A, not applicable.
1. Routine combined use of an ACE inhibitor, ARB, and aldosterone antagonist is potentially harmful for patients with HFrEF. (Level of Evidence: C)

ARBs were developed with the rationale that a) angiotensin II production continues in the presence of ACE inhibition, driven through alternative enzyme pathways and b) interference with the renin-angiotensin system without inhibition of kininase would produce all of the benefits of ACE inhibitors while minimizing the risk of adverse reactions to them. However, it is now known that some of the benefits of ACE inhibitors may be related to the accumulation of kinins rather than to the suppression of angiotensin II formation, whereas some of the adverse effects of ACE inhibitors in HF are related to the suppression of angiotensin II formation.

In several placebo-controlled studies, long-term therapy with ARBs produced hemodynamic, neurohormonal, and clinical effects consistent with those expected after interference with the renin-angiotensin system. Reduced hospitalization and mortality have been demonstrated. ACE inhibitors remain the first choice for inhibition of the renin-angiotensin system in systolic HF, but ARBs can now be considered a reasonable alternative.

7.3.2.3.1. ARBs: Selection of Patients

ARBs are used in patients with HFrEF who are ACE inhibitor intolerant; an ACE-inhibition intolerance primarily related to cough is the most common indication. In addition, an ARB may be used as an alternative to an ACE inhibitor in patients who are already taking an ARB for another reason, such as hypertension, and who subsequently develop HF. Angioedema occurs in <1% of patients who take an ACE inhibitor, but it occurs more frequently in blacks. Because its occurrence may be life-threatening, clinical suspicion of this reaction justifies the subsequent avoidance of all ACE inhibitors for the lifetime of the patient. ACE inhibitors should not be initiated in any patient with a history of angioedema. Although ARBs may be considered as alternative therapy for patients who have developed angioedema while taking an ACE inhibitor, there are some patients who have also developed angioedema with ARBs, and caution is advised when substituting an ARB in a patient who has had angioedema associated with use of an ACE inhibitor (458-461).

7.3.2.3.2. ARBs: Initiation and Maintenance

When used, ARBs should be initiated with the starting doses shown in Table 15. Many of the considerations with initiation of an ARB are similar to those with initiation of an ACE inhibitor, as discussed previously. Blood pressure (including postural blood pressure changes), renal function, and potassium should be reassessed within 1 to 2 weeks after initiation and followed closely after changes in dose. Patients with systolic blood pressure <80 mm Hg, low serum sodium, diabetes mellitus, and impaired renal function merit close surveillance during therapy with inhibitors of the renin angiotensin-aldosterone system. Titration is generally achieved by doubling doses. For stable patients, it is reasonable to add therapy with beta-blocking agents before full target doses of either ACE inhibitors or ARBs are reached.
7.3.2.3. ARBs: Risks of Treatment

The risks of ARBs are attributed to suppression of angiotensin stimulation. These risks of hypotension, renal dysfunction, and hyperkalemia are greater when combined with another inhibitor of this neurohormonal axis, such as ACE inhibitors or aldosterone antagonists.

See Online Data Supplement 19 for additional data on ARBs.

7.3.2.4. Beta Blockers: Recommendation

Class I

1. Use of 1 of the 3 beta blockers proven to reduce mortality (i.e., bisoprolol, carvedilol, and sustained-release metoprolol succinate) is recommended for all patients with current or prior symptoms of HFrEF, unless contraindicated, to reduce morbidity and mortality (346, 416-419, 448). (Level of Evidence: A)

Long-term treatment with beta blockers can lessen the symptoms of HF, improve the patient’s clinical status, and enhance the patient’s overall sense of well-being (462-469). In addition, like ACE inhibitors, beta blockers can reduce the risk of death and the combined risk of death or hospitalization (117, 447, 448, 470, 471). These benefits of beta blockers were seen in patients with or without CAD and in patients with or without diabetes mellitus, as well as in women and blacks. The favorable effects of beta blockers were also observed in patients already taking ACE inhibitors.

Three beta blockers have been shown to be effective in reducing the risk of death in patients with chronic HFrEF: bisoprolol and sustained-release metoprolol (succinate), which selectively block beta-1–receptors; and carvedilol, which blocks alpha-1–, beta-1–, and beta-2–receptors. Positive findings with these 3 agents, however, should not be considered a beta-blocker class effect. Bucindolol lacked uniform effectiveness across different populations, and short-acting metoprolol tartrate was less effective in HF clinical trials. Beta-1 selective blocker nebivolol demonstrated a modest reduction in the primary endpoint of all-cause mortality or cardiovascular hospitalization but did not affect mortality alone in an elderly population that included patients with HFpEF (472).

7.3.2.4.1. Beta Blockers: Selection of Patients

Beta blockers should be prescribed to all patients with stable HFrEF unless they have a contraindication to their use or are intolerant of these drugs. Because of its favorable effects on survival and disease progression, a clinical trial–proven beta blocker should be initiated as soon as HFrEF is diagnosed. Even when symptoms are mild or improve with other therapies, beta-blocker therapy is important and should not be delayed until symptoms return or disease progression is documented. Therefore, even if patients have little disability and
experience seemingly minimal symptomatic benefit, they should still be treated with a beta blocker to reduce the risks of disease progression, clinical deterioration, and sudden death (117, 448, 469-471).

Patients need not take high doses of ACE inhibitors before initiation of beta-blocker therapy. In patients taking a low dose of an ACE inhibitor, the addition of a beta blocker produces a greater improvement in symptoms and reduction in the risk of death than does an increase in the dose of the ACE inhibitor, even to the target doses used in clinical trials (445, 473). In patients with a current or recent history of fluid retention, beta blockers should not be prescribed without diuretics, because diuretics are needed to maintain sodium and fluid balance and prevent the exacerbation of fluid retention that can accompany the initiation of beta-blocker therapy (474, 475). Beta blockers may be considered in patients who have reactive airway disease or asymptomatic bradycardia but should be used cautiously in patients with persistent symptoms of either condition.

7.3.2.4.2. Beta Blockers: Initiation and Maintenance

Treatment with a beta blocker should be initiated at very low doses (Table 15), followed by gradual increments in dose if lower doses have been well tolerated. Patients should be monitored closely for changes in vital signs and symptoms during this uptitration period. Planned increments in the dose of a beta blocker should be delayed until any adverse effects observed with lower doses have disappeared. When such a cautious approach was used, most patients (approximately 85%) enrolled in clinical trials who received beta blockers were able to tolerate short- and long-term treatment with these drugs and achieve the maximum planned trial dose (117, 447, 448, 470). Data show that beta blockers can be safely started before discharge even in patients hospitalized for HF, provided they do not require intravenous inotropic therapy for HF (476). Clinicians should make every effort to achieve the target doses of the beta blockers shown to be effective in major clinical trials. Even if symptoms do not improve, long-term treatment should be maintained to reduce the risk of major clinical events. Abrupt withdrawal of treatment with a beta blocker can lead to clinical deterioration and should be avoided (477).

7.3.2.4.3. Beta Blockers: Risks of Treatment

Initiation of treatment with a beta blocker may produce 4 types of adverse reactions that require attention and management: fluid retention and worsening HF; fatigue; bradycardia or heart block; and hypotension. The occurrence of fluid retention or worsening HF is not generally a reason for the permanent withdrawal of treatment. Such patients generally respond favorably to intensification of conventional therapy, and once treated, they remain excellent candidates for long-term treatment with a beta blocker. The slowing of heart rate and cardiac conduction produced by beta blockers is generally asymptomatic and thus requires no treatment; however, if the bradycardia is accompanied by dizziness or lightheadedness or if second- or third-degree heart block occurs, clinicians should decrease the dose of the beta blocker. Clinicians may minimize the risk of hypotension by administering the beta blocker and ACE inhibitor at different times during the day. Hypotensive symptoms may also resolve after a decrease in the dose of diuretics in patients who are volume depleted. If
hypotension is accompanied by other clinical evidence of hypoperfusion, beta-blocker therapy should be
decreased or discontinued pending further patient evaluation. The symptom of fatigue is multifactorial and is
perhaps the hardest symptom to address with confidence. Although fatigue may be related to beta blockers,
other causes of fatigue should be considered, including sleep apnea, overdiuresis, or depression.

See Online Data Supplement 20 for additional data on beta blockers.

7.3.2.5. Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists: Recommendations

Class I

1. Aldosterone receptor antagonists [or mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists] are recommended in
patients with NYHA class II-IV and who have LVEF of 35% or less, unless contraindicated, to
reduce morbidity and mortality. Patients with NYHA class II should have a history of prior
cardiovascular hospitalization or elevated plasma natriuretic peptide levels to be considered for
aldosterone receptor antagonists. Creatinine should be 2.5 mg/dL or less in men or 2.0 mg/dL or
less in women (or estimated glomerular filtration rate >30 mL/min/1.73 m²), and potassium
should be less than 5.0 mEq/L. Careful monitoring of potassium, renal function, and diuretic
dosing should be performed at initiation and closely followed thereafter to minimize risk of
hyperkalemia and renal insufficiency (425, 426, 478). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Aldosterone receptor antagonists are recommended to reduce morbidity and mortality following
an acute MI in patients who have LVEF of 40% or less who develop symptoms of HF or who have
a history of diabetes mellitus, unless contraindicated (446). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: Harm

1. Inappropriate use of aldosterone receptor antagonists is potentially harmful because of life-
threatening hyperkalemia or renal insufficiency when serum creatinine is more than 2.5 mg/dL in
men or more than 2.0 mg/dL in women (or estimated glomerular filtration rate <30 mL/min/1.73
m²), and/or potassium more than 5.0 mEq/L (479, 480). (Level of Evidence: B)

The landmark RALES trial (Randomized Aldactone Evaluation Study) (425) showed a 30% reduction in all-
cause mortality as well as a reduced risk of SCD and HF hospitalizations with the use of spironolactone in
patients with chronic HFrEF and LVEF <35%. Eplerenone has been shown to reduce all-cause deaths,
cardiovascular deaths, or HF hospitalizations in a wider range of patients with HFrEF (426, 446).

7.3.2.5.1. Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists: Selection of Patients

Clinicians should strongly consider the addition of the aldosterone receptor antagonists spironolactone or
eplerenone for all patients with HFrEF who are already on ACE inhibitors (or ARBs) and beta blockers.
Although the entry criteria for the trials of aldosterone receptor antagonists excluded patients with a creatinine
>2.5 mg/dL, the majority of patients had much lower creatinine (95% of patients had creatinine ≤1.7 mg/dL)
(425, 426, 446). In contrast, one third of patients in EMPHASIS-HF (Eplerenone in Mild Patients
Hospitalization and Survival Study in Heart Failure) had an estimated glomerular filtration rate of <60
mL/min/1.73 m² (426). Note also that the entry criteria for the EMPHASIS-HF trial were age of at least ≥55 years, NYHA class II symptoms, and an EF of no more than 30% (or, if >30% to 35%, a QRS duration of >130 ms on ECG). To minimize the risk of life-threatening hyperkalemia in euvolemic patients with HFpEF, patients should have initial serum creatinine <2.5 mg/dL (or an estimated glomerular filtration rate >30 mL/min/1.73 m²) without recent worsening and serum potassium <5.0 mEq/L without a history of severe hyperkalemia. Careful patient selection and risk assessment with availability of close monitoring is essential in initiating the use of aldosterone receptor antagonists.

### 7.3.2.5.2. Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists: Initiation and Maintenance

Spironolactone should be initiated at a dose of 12.5 to 25 mg daily, while eplerenone should be initiated at a dose of 25 mg/d, increasing to 50 mg daily. For those with concerns of hyperkalemia or marginal renal function (estimated glomerular filtration rate 30 to 49 mL/min/1.73 m²), an initial regimen of every-other-day dosing is advised (Table 16). After initiation of aldosterone receptor antagonists, potassium supplementation should be discontinued (or reduced and carefully monitored in those with a history of hypokalemia; Table 17), and patients should be counseled to avoid foods high in potassium and NSAIDs. Potassium levels and renal function should be rechecked within 2 to 3 days and again at 7 days after initiation of an aldosterone receptor antagonist. Subsequent monitoring should be dictated by the general clinical stability of renal function and fluid status but should occur at least monthly for the first 3 months and every 3 months thereafter. The addition or an increase in dosage of ACE inhibitors or ARBs should trigger a new cycle of monitoring.

There are limited data to support or refute that spironolactone and eplerenone are interchangeable. The perceived difference between eplerenone and spironolactone is the selectivity of aldosterone receptor antagonism and not the effectiveness of blocking mineralocorticoid activity. In RALES, there was increased incidence (10%) of gynecomastia or breast pain with use of spironolactone (a nonselective antagonist). The incidence of these adverse events was <1% in EPHESUS (Eplerenone Post-Acute Myocardial Infarction Heart Failure Efficacy and Survival Study) and EMPHASIS-HF without any difference in adverse events between the eplerenone and placebo (426, 446).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Drug Dosing for Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eplerenone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(only if K⁺ ≤5 mEq/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mg once daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 to 25.0 mg once daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance dose (after 4 wk for K* ≤5 mEq/L)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50 mg once daily</th>
<th>25 mg once daily</th>
<th>25 mg once or twice daily</th>
<th>12.5 to 25.0 mg once daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After dose initiation for K*, increase ≤6.0 mEq/L or worsening renal function, hold until K* &lt;5.0 mEq/L. Consider restarting reduced dose after confirming resolution of hyperkalemia/renal insufficiency for at least 72 h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Butler et al. (481).

### Table 17. Strategies to Minimize the Risk of Hyperkalemia in Patients Treated With Aldosterone Antagonists

1. Impaired renal function is a risk factor for hyperkalemia during treatment with aldosterone antagonists. The risk of hyperkalemia increases progressively when serum creatinine is >1.6 mg/dL.* In elderly patients or others with low muscle mass in whom serum creatinine does not accurately reflect glomerular filtration rate, determination that glomerular filtration rate or creatinine clearance is >30 mL/min/1.73 m² is recommended.

2. Aldosterone antagonists would not ordinarily be initiated in patients with baseline serum potassium >5.0 mEq/L.

3. An initial dose of spironolactone of 12.5 mg or eplerenone 25 mg is typical, after which the dose may be increased to spironolactone 25 mg or eplerenone 50 mg if appropriate.

4. The risk of hyperkalemia is increased with concomitant use of higher doses of ACE inhibitors (captopril ≥75 mg daily; enalapril or lisinopril ≥10 mg daily).

5. In most circumstances, potassium supplements are discontinued or reduced when initiating aldosterone antagonists.

6. Close monitoring of serum potassium is required; potassium levels and renal function are most typically checked in 3 d and at 1 wk after initiating therapy and at least monthly for the first 3 mo.

*Although the entry criteria for the trials of aldosterone antagonists included creatinine <2.5 mg/dL, the majority of patients had much lower creatinine; in 1 trial (425), 95% of patients had creatinine ≤1.7 mg/dL. ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme.

### 7.3.2.5.3. Aldosterone Receptor Antagonists: Risks of Treatment

The major risk associated with use of aldosterone receptor antagonists is hyperkalemia due to inhibition of potassium excretion, ranging from 2% to 5% in large clinical trials (425, 426, 446), to 24% to 36% in population-based registries (479, 480). Routine triple combination of an ACE inhibitor, ARB, and aldosterone receptor antagonist should be avoided.

The development of potassium levels >5.5 mEq/L (approximately 12% in EMPHASIS-HF (426)) should generally trigger discontinuation or dose reduction of the aldosterone receptor antagonist unless other causes are identified. The development of worsening renal function should lead to careful evaluation of the entire medical regimen and consideration for stopping the aldosterone receptor antagonist. Patients should be instructed specifically to stop the aldosterone receptor antagonist during an episode of diarrhea or dehydration or while loop diuretic therapy is interrupted.
7.3.2.6. Hydralazine and Isosorbide Dinitrate: Recommendations

Class I

1. The combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate is recommended to reduce morbidity and mortality for patients self-described as African Americans with NYHA class III–IV HFrEF receiving optimal therapy with ACE inhibitors and beta blockers, unless contraindicated (423, 424). (Level of Evidence: A)

Class IIa

1. A combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate can be useful to reduce morbidity or mortality in patients with current or prior symptomatic HFrEF who cannot be given an ACE inhibitor or ARB because of drug intolerance, hypotension, or renal insufficiency, unless contraindicated (449). (Level of Evidence: B)

In a large-scale trial that compared the vasodilator combination with placebo, the use of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate reduced mortality but not hospitalizations in patients with HF treated with digoxin and diuretics but not an ACE inhibitor or beta blocker (449). However, in 2 other trials that compared the vasodilator combination with an ACE inhibitor, the ACE inhibitor produced more favorable effects on survival (412, 482). A post hoc retrospective analysis of these vasodilator trials demonstrated particular efficacy of isosorbide dinitrate and hydralazine in the African American cohort (423). In a subsequent trial, which was limited to patients self-described as African American, the addition of a fixed-dose combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate to standard therapy with an ACE inhibitor or ARB, a beta blocker, and an aldosterone antagonist offered significant benefit (424).

7.3.2.6.1. Hydralazine and Isosorbide Dinitrate: Selection of Patients

The combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate is recommended for African Americans with HFrEF who remain symptomatic despite concomitant use of ACE inhibitors, beta blockers, and aldosterone antagonists. Whether this benefit is evident in non–African Americans with HFrEF remains to be investigated. The combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate should not be used for the treatment of HFrEF in patients who have no prior use of standard neurohumoral antagonist therapy and should not be substituted for ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy in patients who are tolerating therapy without difficulty. Despite the lack of data with the vasodilator combination in patients who are intolerant of ACE inhibitors or ARBs, the combined use of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate may be considered as a therapeutic option in such patients.

7.3.2.6.2. Hydralazine and Isosorbide Dinitrate: Initiation and Maintenance
If the fixed-dose combination is available, the initial dose should be 1 tablet containing 37.5 mg of hydralazine hydrochloride and 20 mg of isosorbide dinitrate 3 times daily. The dose can be increased to 2 tablets 3 times daily for a total daily dose of 225 mg of hydralazine hydrochloride and 120 mg of isosorbide dinitrate. When the 2 drugs are used separately, both pills should be administered at least 3 times daily. Initial low doses of the drugs given separately may be progressively increased to a goal similar to that achieved in the fixed-dose combination trial (424).

7.3.2.6.3. Hydralazine and Isosorbide Dinitrate: Risks of Treatment

Adherence to this combination has generally been poor because of the large number of tablets required, frequency of administration, and the high incidence of adverse reactions (412, 449). Frequent adverse effects include headache, dizziness, and gastrointestinal complaints. Nevertheless, the benefit of these drugs can be substantial and warrant a slower titration of the drugs to enhance tolerance of the therapy.

See Table 18 for a summary of the treatment benefit of GDMT in HFrEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDMT</th>
<th>RR Reduction in Mortality (%)</th>
<th>NNT for Mortality Reduction (Standardized to 36 mo)</th>
<th>RR Reduction in HF Hospitalizations (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitor or ARB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blocker</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone antagonist</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydralazine/nitrate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; NNT, number needed to treat; RCTs, randomized controlled trials; and RR, relative risk.

Adapted with permission from Fonarow et al (483).

7.3.2.7. Digoxin: Recommendation

Class IIa

1. Digoxin can be beneficial in patients with HFrEF, unless contraindicated, to decrease hospitalizations for HF (484-491). (Level of Evidence: B)

Several placebo-controlled trials have shown that treatment with digoxin for 1 to 3 months can improve symptoms, HRQOL, and exercise tolerance in patients with mild to moderate HF (485-491). These benefits have been seen regardless of the underlying rhythm (normal sinus rhythm or AF), cause of HF (ischemic or nonischemic cardiomyopathy), or concomitant therapy (with or without ACE inhibitors). In a long-term trial that primarily enrolled patients with NYHA class II or III HF, treatment with digoxin for 2 to 5 years had no effect on mortality but modestly reduced the combined risk of death and hospitalization (484).
7.3.2.7.1. Digoxin: Selection of Patients
Clinicians may consider adding digoxin in patients with persistent symptoms of HFREF during GDMT. Digoxin may also be added to the initial regimen in patients with severe symptoms who have not yet responded symptomatically during GDMT.

Alternatively, treatment with digoxin may be delayed until the patient’s response to GDMT has been defined and may be used only in patients who remain symptomatic despite therapy with the neurohormonal antagonists. If a patient is taking digoxin but not an ACE inhibitor or a beta blocker, treatment with digoxin should not be withdrawn, but appropriate therapy with the neurohormonal antagonists should be instituted. Digoxin is prescribed occasionally in patients with HF and AF, but beta blockers are usually more effective when added to digoxin in controlling the ventricular response, particularly during exercise (492-495).

Patients should not be given digoxin if they have significant sinus or atrioventricular block unless the block has been addressed with a permanent pacemaker. The drug should be used cautiously in patients taking other drugs that can depress sinus or atrioventricular nodal function or affect digoxin levels (e.g., amiodarone or a beta blocker), even though such patients usually tolerate digoxin without difficulty.

7.3.2.7.2. Digoxin: Initiation and Maintenance
Therapy with digoxin is commonly initiated and maintained at a dose of 0.125 to 0.25 mg daily. Low doses (0.125 mg daily or every other day) should be used initially if the patient is >70 years of age, has impaired renal function, or has a low lean body mass (496). Higher doses (e.g., digoxin 0.375 to 0.50 mg daily) are rarely used or needed in the management of patients with HF. There is no reason to use loading doses of digoxin to initiate therapy in patients with HF.

Doses of digoxin that achieve a plasma concentration of drug in the range of 0.5 to 0.9 ng/mL are suggested, given the limited evidence currently available. There has been no prospective, randomized evaluation of the relative efficacy or safety of different plasma concentrations of digoxin. Retrospective analysis of 2 studies of digoxin withdrawal found that prevention of worsening HF by digoxin at lower concentrations in plasma (0.5 to 0.9 ng/mL) was as great as that achieved at higher concentrations (497, 498).

7.3.2.7.3. Digoxin: Risks of Treatment
When administered with attention to dose and factors that alter its metabolism, digoxin is well tolerated by most patients with HF (499). The principal adverse reactions occur primarily when digoxin is administered in large doses, especially in the elderly, but large doses are not necessary for clinical benefits (500-502). The major adverse effects include cardiac arrhythmias (e.g., ectopic and re-entrant cardiac rhythms and heart block), gastrointestinal symptoms (e.g., anorexia, nausea, and vomiting), and neurological complaints (e.g., visual...
disturbances, disorientation, and confusion). Overt digoxin toxicity is commonly associated with serum digoxin levels >2 ng/mL.

However, toxicity may also occur with lower digoxin levels, especially if hypokalemia, hypomagnesemia, or hypothyroidism coexists (503, 504). The concomitant use of clarithromycin, dronedarone, erythromycin, amiodarone, itraconazole, cyclosporine, propafenone, verapamil, or quinidine can increase serum digoxin concentrations and may increase the likelihood of digoxin toxicity (505-507). The dose of digoxin should be reduced if treatment with these drugs is initiated. In addition, a low lean body mass and impaired renal function can also elevate serum digoxin levels, which may explain the increased risk of digoxin toxicity in elderly patients.

7.3.2.8. Other Drug Treatment

7.3.2.8.1. Anticoagulation: Recommendations

Class I
1. Patients with chronic HF with permanent/persistent/paroxysmal AF and an additional risk factor for cardioembolic stroke (history of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, previous stroke or transient ischemic attack, or ≥75 years of age) should receive chronic anticoagulant therapy* (508-514). *(Level of Evidence: A)

2. The selection of an anticoagulant agent (warfarin, dabigatran, apixaban, or rivaroxaban) for permanent/persistent/paroxysmal AF should be individualized on the basis of risk factors, cost, tolerability, patient preference, potential for drug interactions, and other clinical characteristics, including time in the international normalized ratio therapeutic range if the patient has been taking warfarin. *(Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa
1. Chronic anticoagulation is reasonable for patients with chronic HF who have permanent/persistent/paroxysmal AF but are without an additional risk factor for cardioembolic stroke* (509-511, 515-517). *(Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: No Benefit
1. Anticoagulation is not recommended in patients with chronic HFrEF without AF, a prior thromboembolic event, or a cardioembolic source (518-520). *(Level of Evidence: B)

*In the absence of contraindications to anticoagulation.

Patients with chronic HFrEF are at an increased risk of thromboembolic events due to stasis of blood in dilated hypokinetic cardiac chambers and in peripheral blood vessels (521, 522) and perhaps due to increased activity of procoagulant factors (523). However, in large-scale studies, the risk of thromboembolism in clinically stable patients has been low (1% to 3% per year), even in those with a very depressed EF and echocardiographic evidence of intracardiac thrombi (524-528). These rates are sufficiently low to limit the detectable benefit of anticoagulation in these patients.
In several retrospective analyses, the risk of thromboembolic events was not lower in patients with HF taking warfarin than in patients not treated with antithrombotic drugs (524, 526, 527). The use of warfarin was associated with a reduction in major cardiovascular events and death in patients with HF in some studies but not in others (518, 529, 530). An RCT that compared the outcome of patients with HFrEF assigned to aspirin, warfarin, or clopidogrel was completed (519), but no therapy appeared to be superior. Another trial compared aspirin with warfarin in patients with reduced LVEF, sinus rhythm, and no cardioembolic source and demonstrated no difference in either the primary outcome of death, stroke, or intracerebral hemorrhage (520). There was also no difference in the combined outcome of death, ischemic stroke, intracerebral hemorrhage, MI, or HF hospitalization. Given that there is no overall benefit of warfarin and an increased risk of bleeding, there is no compelling evidence to use warfarin or aspirin in patients with HFrEF in the absence of a specific indication.

The efficacy of long-term warfarin for the prevention of stroke in patients with AF is well established. However, the ACCF/AHA guidelines for chronic AF (6) recommend use of the CHADS2 [Congestive heart failure, Hypertension, Age ≥75 years, Diabetes mellitus, previous Stroke/transient ischemic attack (doubled risk weight)] score to assess patient risk for adverse outcomes before initiating anticoagulation therapy. More recently, a revised score, CHADS2-VASc, has been suggested as more applicable to a wider range of patients (531), but this revised score has not yet been fully studied in patients with HF. Regardless of whether patients receive rhythm or rate control, anticoagulation is recommended for patients with HF and AF for stroke prevention in the presence of at least 1 additional risk factor. For patients with HF and AF in the absence of another cardioembolic risk factor, anticoagulation is reasonable.

Trials of newer oral anticoagulants have compared efficacy and safety with warfarin therapy rather than placebo. Several new oral anticoagulants are now available, including the factor Xa inhibitors apixaban and rivaroxaban and the direct thrombin inhibitor dabigatran (508, 512-514). These drugs have few food and drug interactions compared with warfarin and no need for routine coagulation monitoring or dose adjustment. The fixed dosing together with fewer interactions may simplify patient management, particularly with the polypharmacy commonly seen in HF. These drugs have a potential for an improved benefit–risk profile compared with warfarin, which may increase their use in practice, especially in those at increased bleeding risk. However, important adverse effects have been noted with these new anticoagulants, including gastrointestinal distress, which may limit compliance. At present, there is no commercially available agent to reverse the effect of these newer drugs. Trials comparing new anticoagulants with warfarin have enrolled >10,000 patients with HF. As more detailed evaluations of the comparative benefits and risks of these newer agents in patients with HF are still pending, the writing committee considered their use in patients with HF and nonvalvular AF as an alternative to warfarin to be reasonable.

The benefit afforded by low-dose aspirin in patients with systolic HF but no previous MI or known CAD (or specifically in patients proven free of CAD) remains unknown. A Cochrane review failed to find
sufficient evidence to support its use (532). Retrospective and observational studies again had conflicting results and used very different criteria to identify patients as nonischemic, with some demonstrating protection from aspirin overall (532) or only in patients with more severe depression of systolic function (518), whereas others found no benefit from aspirin (530). The high incidence of diabetes mellitus and hypertension in most HF studies, combined with a failure to use objective methods to exclude CAD in enrolled patients, may leave this question unanswered. Currently, data are insufficient to recommend aspirin for empiric primary prevention in HF patients known to be free of atherosclerotic disease and without additional risk factors.

See Online Data Supplement 21 for additional data on anticoagulants.

7.3.2.8.2. Statins: Recommendation

Class III: No Benefit
1. Statins are not beneficial as adjunctive therapy when prescribed solely for the diagnosis of HF in the absence of other indications for their use (533-538). (Level of Evidence: A)

Statin therapy has been broadly implicated in prevention of adverse cardiovascular events, including new-onset HF. Originally designed to lower cholesterol in patients with cardiovascular disease, statins are increasingly recognized for their favorable effects on inflammation, oxidative stress, and vascular performance. Several observational and post hoc analyses from large clinical trials have implied that statin therapy may provide clinical benefit to patients with HF (533-536). However, 2 large RCTs have demonstrated that rosuvastatin has neutral effects on long-term outcomes in patients with chronic HF (537, 538). At present, statin therapy should not be prescribed primarily for the treatment of HF to improve clinical outcomes.

See Online Data Supplement 22 for additional data on statin therapy.

7.3.2.8.3. Omega-3 Fatty Acids: Recommendation

Class IIa
1. Omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUFA) supplementation is reasonable to use as adjunctive therapy in patients with NYHA class II-IV symptoms and HFrEF or HFpEF, unless contraindicated, to reduce mortality and cardiovascular hospitalizations (539, 540). (Level of Evidence B)

Supplementation with omega-3 PUFA has been evaluated as an adjunctive therapy for cardiovascular disease and HF (541). Trials in primary and secondary prevention of coronary heart disease showed that omega-3 PUFA supplementation results in a 10% to 20% risk reduction in fatal and nonfatal cardiovascular events. The GISSI (Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell’Infarto miocardico) Prevenzione trial demonstrated a 21% reduction in death among post-MI patients taking 1 g of omega-3 PUFA (850 to 882 mg of
eicosapentaenoic acid [EPA] and docosahexaenoic acid [DHA] as ethyl esters in the ratio of 1:1.2) (542). Post hoc subgroup analysis revealed that this reduction in mortality and SCD was concentrated in the approximately 2,000 patients with reduced LVEF (539). The GISSI-HF investigators randomized 6,975 patients in NYHA class II–IV chronic HF to 1 g daily of omega-3 PUFA (850 to 882 mg EPA/DHA) or matching placebo. Death from any cause was reduced from 29% with placebo to 27% in those treated with omega-3 PUFA (540). The outcome of death or admission to hospital for a cardiovascular event was also significantly reduced. In reported studies, this therapy has been safe and very well tolerated (540-543). Further investigations are needed to better define optimal dosing and formulation of omega-3 PUFA supplements. The use of omega-3 PUFA supplementation is reasonable as adjunctive therapy in patients with chronic HF.

See Online Data Supplement 23 for additional data on omega-3 fatty acids.

7.3.2.9. Drugs of Unproven Value or That May Worsen HF: Recommendations

Class III: No Benefit

1. Nutritional supplements as treatment for HF are not recommended in patients with current or prior symptoms of HFrEF (544, 545). (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Hormonal therapies other than to correct deficiencies are not recommended for patients with current or prior symptoms of HFrEF. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III: Harm

1. Drugs known to adversely affect the clinical status of patients with current or prior symptoms of HFrEF are potentially harmful and should be avoided or withdrawn whenever possible (e.g., most antiarrhythmic drugs, most calcium channel blocking drugs (except amlodipine), NSAIDs, or thiazolidinediones) (546-557). (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Long-term use of infused positive inotropic drugs is potentially harmful for patients with HFrEF, except as palliation for patients with end-stage disease who cannot be stabilized with standard medical treatment (see recommendations for stage D). (Level of Evidence: C)

7.3.2.9.1. Nutritional Supplements and Hormonal Therapies

Patients with HF, particularly those treated with diuretics, may become deficient in vitamins and micronutrients. Several nutritional supplements (e.g., coenzyme Q10, carnitine, taurine, and antioxidants) and hormonal therapies (e.g., growth hormone or thyroid hormone) have been proposed for the treatment of HF (558-563). Testosterone has also been evaluated for its beneficial effect in HF with modest albeit preliminary effects (564). Aside from replenishment of documented deficiencies, published data have failed to demonstrate benefit for routine vitamin, nutritional, or hormonal supplementation (565). In most data or other literature regarding nutraceuticals, there are issues, including outcomes analyses, adverse effects, and drug-nutraceutical interactions, that remain unresolved.

No clinical trials have demonstrated improved survival rates with use of nutritional or hormonal therapy, with the exception of omega-3 fatty acid supplementation as previously noted. Some studies have suggested a possible effect for coenzyme Q10 in reduced hospitalization rates, dyspnea, and edema in patients...
with HF, but these benefits have not been seen uniformly (566-569). Because of possible adverse effects and drug interactions of nutritional supplements and their widespread use, clinicians caring for patients with HF should routinely inquire about their use. Until more data are available, nutritional supplements or hormonal therapies are not recommended for the treatment of HF.

7.3.2.9.2. Antiarrhythmic Agents

With atrial and ventricular arrhythmias contributing to the morbidity and mortality of HF, various classes of antiarrhythmic agents have been repeatedly studied in large RCTs. Instead of conferring survival benefit, however, nearly all antiarrhythmic agents increase mortality in the HF population (548-550). Most antiarrhythmics have some negative inotropic effect and some, particularly the class I and class III antiarrhythmic drugs, have proarrhythmic effects. Hence, class I sodium channel antagonists and the class III potassium channel blockers d-sotalol and dronedarone should be avoided in patients with HF. Amiodarone and dofetilide are the only antiarrhythmic agents to have neutral effects on mortality in clinical trials of patients with HF and thus are the preferred drugs for treating arrhythmias in this patient group (570-573).

See Online Data Supplement 24 for additional data on antiarrhythmic agents.

7.3.2.9.3. Calcium Channel Blockers: Recommendation

Class III: No Benefit

1. Calcium channel blocking drugs are not recommended as routine treatment for patients with HFrEF (551, 574, 575). (Level of Evidence: A)

By reducing peripheral vasoconstriction and LV afterload, calcium channel blockers were thought to have a potential role in the management of chronic HF. However, first-generation dihydropyridine and nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers also have myocardial depressant activity. Several clinical trials have demonstrated either no clinical benefit or even worse outcomes in patients with HF treated with these drugs (546, 547, 551-553). Despite their greater selectivity for calcium channels in vascular smooth muscle cells, second-generation calcium channel blockers, dihydropyridine derivatives such as amlodipine and felodipine, have failed to demonstrate any functional or survival benefit in patients with HF (575-579). Amlodipine, however, may be considered in the management of hypertension or ischemic heart disease in patients with HF because it is generally well tolerated and had neutral effects on morbidity and mortality in large RCTs. In general, calcium channel blockers should be avoided in patients with HFrEF.

See Online Data Supplement 25 for additional data on calcium channel blockers.
7.3.2.9.4. Nonsteroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs

NSAIDs inhibit the synthesis of renal prostaglandins, which mediate vasodilation in the kidneys and directly inhibit sodium resorption in the thick ascending loop of Henle and collecting tubule. Hence, NSAIDs can cause sodium and water retention and blunt the effects of diuretics. Several observational cohort studies have revealed increased morbidity and mortality in patients with HF using either nonselective or selective NSAIDs (554-556, 580-582).

See Online Data Supplement 26 for additional data on NSAIDs.

7.3.2.9.5. Thiazolidinediones

Thiazolidinediones increase insulin sensitivity by activating nuclear peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma. Expressed in virtually all tissues, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma also regulates sodium reabsorption in the collecting ducts of the kidney. In clinical trials, thiazolidinediones have been associated with increased incidence of HF events, even in those without any prior history of clinical HF (557, 583-588).

See Table 19 for a summary of recommendations from this section and Table 20 for strategies for achieving optimal GDMT; see Online Data Supplement 27 for additional data on thiazolidinediones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diuretics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics are recommended in patients with HFrEF with fluid retention</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACE inhibitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitors are recommended for all patients with HFrEF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(343, 412-414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARBs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBs are recommended in patients with HFrEF who are ACE inhibitor intolerant</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(108, 345, 415, 450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBs are reasonable as alternatives to ACE inhibitors as first-line therapy in HFrEF</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(451-456)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of an ARB may be considered in persistently symptomatic patients with HFrEF on GDMT</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(420, 457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine combined use of an ACE inhibitor, ARB, and aldosterone antagonist is potentially harmful</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beta blockers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of 1 of the 3 beta blockers proven to reduce mortality is recommended for all stable patients</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(346, 416-419, 448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aldosterone receptor antagonists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone receptor antagonists are recommended in patients</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(425, 426,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with NYHA class II-IV who have LVEF $\leq 35\%$

| Aldosterone receptor antagonists are recommended following an acute MI who have LVEF $\leq 40\%$ with symptoms of HF or DM | I | B | (446) |
| Inappropriate use of aldosterone receptor antagonists may be harmful | III: Harm | B | (479, 480) |

**Hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate**

| The combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate is recommended for African Americans with NYHA class III–IV HF rEF on GDMT | I | A | (423, 424) |
| A combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate can be useful in patients with HF rEF who cannot be given ACE inhibitors or ARBs | IIa | B | (449) |

**Digoxin**

| Digoxin can be beneficial in patients with HF rEF | IIa | B | (484-491) |

**Anticoagulation**

| Patients with chronic HF with permanent/persistent/paroxysmal AF and an additional risk factor for cardioembolic stroke should receive chronic anticoagulant therapy* | I | A | (508-514) |
| The selection of an anticoagulant agent should be individualized | I | C | N/A |
| Chronic anticoagulation is reasonable for patients with chronic HF who have permanent/persistent/paroxysmal AF but are without an additional risk factor for cardioembolic stroke* | IIa | B | (509-511, 515-517) |
| Anticoagulation is not recommended in patients with chronic HF rEF without AF, a prior thromboembolic event, or a cardioembolic source | III: No Benefit | B | (518-520) |

**Statins**

| Statins are not beneficial as adjunctive therapy when prescribed solely for HF | III: No Benefit | A | (533-538) |

**Omega-3 fatty acids**

| Omega-3 PUFA supplementation is reasonable to use as adjunctive therapy in HF rEF or HF pEF patients | IIa | B | (539, 540) |

**Other drugs**

| Nutritional supplements as treatment for HF are not recommended in HF rEF | III: No Benefit | B | (544, 545) |
| Hormonal therapies other than to correct deficiencies are not recommended in HF rEF | III: No Benefit | C | N/A |
| Drugs known to adversely affect the clinical status of patients with HF rEF are potentially harmful and should be avoided or withdrawn | III: Harm | B | (546-557) |
| Long-term use of an infusion of a positive inotropic drug is not recommended and may be harmful except as palliation | III: Harm | C | N/A |

**Calcium channel blockers**

| Calcium channel blocking drugs are not recommended as routine treatment in HF rEF | III: No Benefit | A | (551, 574, 575) |

*In the absence of contraindications to anticoagulation.

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; COR, Class of Recommendation; DM, diabetes mellitus; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HF rEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HF pEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HF rEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; LOE, Level of Evidence;
Table 20. Strategies for Achieving Optimal GDMT

1. **Uptitrate in small increments** to the recommended target dose or the highest tolerated dose for those medications listed in Table 15 with an appreciation that some patients cannot tolerate the full recommended doses of all medications, particularly patients with low baseline heart rate or blood pressure or with a tendency to postural symptoms.

2. Certain patients (e.g., the elderly, patients with chronic kidney disease) may require more frequent visits and laboratory monitoring during dose titration and more gradual dose changes. However, such vulnerable patients may accrue considerable benefits from GDMT. Inability to tolerate optimal doses of GDMT may change after disease-modifying interventions such as CRT.

3. **Monitor vital signs closely** before and during uptitration, including postural changes in blood pressure or heart rate, particularly in patients with orthostatic symptoms, bradycardia, and/or “low” systolic blood pressure (e.g., 80 to 100 mm Hg).

4. **Alternate adjustments of different medication classes** (especially ACE inhibitors/ARBs and beta blockers) listed in Table 15. Patients with elevated or normal blood pressure and heart rate may tolerate faster incremental increases in dosages.

5. **Monitor renal function and electrolytes** for rising creatinine and hyperkalemia, recognizing that an initial rise in creatinine may be expected and does not necessarily require discontinuation of therapy; discuss tolerable levels of creatinine above baseline with a nephrologist if necessary.

6. Patients may complain of symptoms of fatigue and weakness with dosage increases; in the absence of instability in vital signs, reassure them that these symptoms are often transient and usually resolve within a few days of these changes in therapy.

7. **Discourage sudden spontaneous discontinuation of GDMT** medications by the patient and/or other clinicians without discussion with managing clinicians.

8. **Carefully review doses of other medications** for HF symptom control (e.g., diuretics, nitrates) during uptitration.

9. **Consider temporary adjustments in dosages of GDMT** during acute episodes of noncardiac illnesses (e.g., respiratory infections, risk of dehydration, etc.).

10. **Educate patients, family members, and other clinicians** about the expected benefits of achieving GDMT, including an understanding of the potential benefits of myocardial reverse remodeling, increased survival, and improved functional status and HRQOL.

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; and HRQOL, health-related quality of life.

7.3.3. Pharmacological Treatment for Stage C HFpEF: Recommendations

See Table 21 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

**Class I**

1. Systolic and diastolic blood pressure should be controlled in patients with HFpEF in accordance with published clinical practice guidelines to prevent morbidity (27, 91). (**Level of Evidence: B**)

2. Diuretics should be used for relief of symptoms due to volume overload in patients with HFpEF. (**Level of Evidence: C**)

**Class IIa**

1. Coronary revascularization is reasonable in patients with CAD in whom symptoms (angina) or demonstrable myocardial ischemia is judged to be having an adverse effect on symptomatic HFpEF despite GDMT. (**Level of Evidence: C**)

2. Management of AF according to published clinical practice guidelines in patients with HFpEF is reasonable to improve symptomatic HF (Section 9.1). (**Level of Evidence: C**)

3. The use of beta-blocking agents, ACE inhibitors, and ARBs in patients with hypertension is reasonable to control blood pressure in patients with HFpEF. (**Level of Evidence: C**)

LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not available; NYHA, New York Heart Association; and PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acids.
Class IIb
1. The use of ARBs might be considered to decrease hospitalizations for patients with HFpEF (589).  
(Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: No Benefit
1. Routine use of nutritional supplements is not recommended for patients with HFpEF. (Level of Evidence: C)

Trials using comparable and efficacious agents for HFrEF have generally been disappointing (590). Thus, most of the recommended therapies for HFpEF are directed at symptoms, especially comorbidities, and risk factors that may worsen cardiovascular disease.

Blood pressure control concordant with existing hypertension guidelines remains the most important recommendation in patients with HFpEF. Evidence from an RCT has shown that improved blood pressure control reduces hospitalization for HF (591), decreases cardiovascular events, and reduces HF mortality in patients without prevalent HF (311). In hypertensive patients with HFpEF, aggressive treatment (often with several drugs with complementary mechanisms of action) is recommended. ACE inhibitors and/or ARBs are often considered as first-line agents. Specific blood pressure targets in HFpEF have not been firmly established; thus, the recommended targets are those used for general hypertensive populations.

CAD is common in patients with HFpEF (592); however, there are no studies to determine the impact of revascularization on symptoms or outcomes specifically in patients with HFpEF. In general, contemporary revascularization guidelines (10, 12) should be used in the care of patients with HFpEF and concomitant CAD. Specific to this population, it might be reasonable to consider revascularization in patients for whom ischemia appears to contribute to HF symptoms, although this determination can be difficult.

Theoretical mechanisms for the worsening of HF symptoms by AF among patients with HFpEF include shortened diastolic filling time with tachycardia and the loss of atrial contribution to LV diastolic filling. Conversely, chronotropic incompetence is also a concern. Slowing the heart rate is useful in tachycardia but not in normal resting heart rate; a slow heart rate prolongs diastasis and worsens chronotropic incompetence. Currently, there are no specific trials of rate versus rhythm control in HFpEF.

Table 21. Recommendations for Treatment of HFpEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systolic and diastolic blood pressure should be controlled according to published clinical practice guidelines</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B (27, 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics should be used for relief of symptoms due to volume overload.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary revascularization for patients with CAD in whom angina or demonstrable myocardial ischemia is present despite GDMT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of AF according to published clinical practice guidelines for HFpEF to improve symptomatic HF</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of beta-blocking agents, ACE inhibitors, and ARBs for hypertension in HFpEF</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARBs might be considered to decrease hospitalizations in HFpEF

Nutritional supplementation is not recommended in HFpEF

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARBs, angiotensin-receptor blockers; CAD, coronary artery disease; COR, Class of Recommendation; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; and LOE, Level of Evidence.

7.3.4. Device Therapy for Stage C HFrEF: Recommendations

See Table 22 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

Class I

1. ICD therapy is recommended for primary prevention of SCD to reduce total mortality in selected patients with nonischemic DCM or ischemic heart disease at least 40 days post-MI with LVEF of 35% or less and NYHA class II or III symptoms on chronic GDMT, who have reasonable expectation of meaningful survival for more than 1 year (355, 593). (Level of Evidence: A)*

2. CRT is indicated for patients who have LVEF of 35% or less, sinus rhythm, left bundle-branch block (LBBB) with a QRS duration of 150 ms or greater, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT. (Level of Evidence: A for NYHA class III/IV (38, 78, 116, 594); Level of Evidence: B for NYHA class II (595, 596))

3. ICD therapy is recommended for primary prevention of SCD to reduce total mortality in selected patients at least 40 days post-MI with LVEF of 30% or less, and NYHA class I symptoms while receiving GDMT, who have reasonable expectation of meaningful survival for more than 1 year (362, 597, 598). (Level of Evidence: B)*

Class IIa

1. CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF of 35% or less, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with a QRS duration of 150 ms or greater, and NYHA class III/ambulatory class IV symptoms on GDMT (78, 116, 594, 596). (Level of Evidence: A)

2. CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF of 35% or less, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS duration of 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT (78, 116, 594-596, 599). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. CRT can be useful in patients with AF and LVEF of 35% or less on GDMT if a) the patient requires ventricular pacing or otherwise meets CRT criteria and b) atrioventricular nodal ablation or pharmacological rate control will allow near 100% ventricular pacing with CRT (600-605). (Level of Evidence: B)

4. CRT can be useful for patients on GDMT who have LVEF of 35% or less, and are undergoing placement of a new or replacement device with anticipated requirement for significant (>40%) ventricular pacing (155, 602, 606, 607). (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIb

1. The usefulness of implantation of an ICD is of uncertain benefit to prolong meaningful survival in patients with a high risk of nonsudden death as predicted by frequent hospitalizations, advanced frailty, or comorbidities such as systemic malignancy or severe renal dysfunction (608-611). (Level of Evidence: B)*

2. CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF of 35% or less, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with QRS duration of 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class III/ambulatory class IV on GDMT (596, 612). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF of 35% or less, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with a QRS duration of 150 ms or greater, and NYHA class II symptoms on GDMT (595, 596). (Level of Evidence: B)
4. CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF of 30% or less, ischemic etiology of HF, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS duration of 150 ms or greater, and NYHA class I symptoms on GDMT (595, 596). *Level of Evidence: C*

Class III: No Benefit

1. CRT is not recommended for patients with NYHA class I or II symptoms and non-LBBB pattern with QRS duration less than 150 ms (595, 596, 612). *Level of Evidence: B*

2. CRT is not indicated for patients whose comorbidities and/or frailty limit survival with good functional capacity to less than 1 year (38). *Level of Evidence: C*

See Figure 2. Indications for CRT Therapy Algorithm.

*Counseling should be specific to each individual patient and should include documentation of a discussion about the potential for sudden death and nonsudden death from HF or noncardiac conditions. Information should be provided about the efficacy, safety, and potential complications of an ICD and the potential for defibrillation to be inactivated if desired in the future, notably when a patient is approaching end of life. This will facilitate shared decision making between patients, families, and the medical care team about ICDs (30).*

### 7.3.4.1. Implantable Cardioverter-Defibrillator

Patients with reduced LVEF are at increased risk for ventricular tachyarrhythmias leading to SCD. Sudden death in HFpEF has been substantially decreased by neurohormonal antagonists that alter disease progression and also protect against arrhythmias. Nonetheless, patients with systolic dysfunction remain at increased risk for SCD due to ventricular tachyarrhythmias. Patients who have had sustained ventricular tachycardia, ventricular fibrillation, unexplained syncope, or cardiac arrest are at highest risk for recurrence. Indications for ICD therapy as secondary prevention of SCD in these patients is also discussed in the ACCF/AHA/HRS device-based therapy guideline (613).

The use of ICDs for primary prevention of SCD in patients with HFpEF without prior history of arrhythmias or syncope has been evaluated in multiple RCTs. ICD therapy for primary prevention was demonstrated to reduce all-cause mortality. For patients with LVEF ≤30% after remote MI, use of ICD therapy led to a 31% decrease in mortality over 20 months, for an absolute decrease of 5.6% (362). For patients with mild to moderate symptoms of HF with LVEF ≤35% due either to ischemic or nonischemic etiology, there was a 23% decrease in mortality over a 5-year period, for an absolute decrease of 7.2% (593). For both these trials, the survival benefit appeared after the first year. Other smaller trials were consistent with this degree of benefit, except for patients within the first 40 days after acute MI, in whom SCD was decreased but there was an increase in other events such that there was no net benefit for survival (598, 614). Both SCD and total mortality are highest in patients with HFpEF with class IV symptoms, in whom ICDs are not expected to prolong meaningful survival and are not indicated except in those for whom heart transplantation or MCS is anticipated.

The use of ICDs for primary prevention in patients with HFpEF should be considered only in the setting of optimal GDMT and with a minimum of 3 to 6 months of appropriate medical therapy. A repeat assessment of ventricular function is appropriate to assess any recovery of ventricular function on GDMT that would be above
the threshold where an ICD is indicated. This therapy will often improve ventricular function to a range for which the risk of sudden death is too low to warrant placement of an ICD. In addition, the trials of ICDs for primary prevention of SCD studied patients who were already on GDMT.

ICDs are highly effective in preventing death from ventricular arrhythmias, but frequent shocks can decrease HRQOL and lead to posttraumatic stress syndrome (615). Therapy with antiarrhythmic drugs and catheter ablation for ventricular tachycardia can decrease the number of ICD shocks given and can sometimes improve ventricular function in cases of very frequent ventricular tachyarrhythmias. Refined device programming can optimize pacing therapies to avert the need for shocks, minimize inappropriate shocks, and avoid aggravation of HF by frequent ventricular pacing. Although there have been occasional recalls of device generators, these are exceedingly rare in comparison to complications related to intracardiac device leads, such as fracture and infection.

ICDs are indicated only in patients with a reasonable expectation of survival with good functional status beyond a year, but the range of uncertainty remains wide. The complex decision about the relative risks and benefits of ICDs for primary prevention of SCD must be individualized for each patient. Unlike other therapies that can prolong life with HF, the ICD does not modify the disease except in conjunction with CRT. Patients with multiple comorbidities have a higher rate of implant complications and higher competing risks of death from noncardiac causes (616). Older patients, who are at a higher risk of nonsudden death, are often underrepresented in the pivotal trials where the average patient is <65 years of age (617). The major trials for secondary prevention of SCD showed no benefit in patients >75 years of age (618), and a meta-analysis of primary prevention of SCD also suggested lesser effectiveness of ICDs (619). Populations of patients with multiple HF hospitalizations, particularly in the setting of chronic kidney disease, have a median survival rate of <2 years, during which the benefit of the ICD may not be realized (608). There is widespread recognition of the need for further research to identify patients most and least likely to benefit from ICDs for primary prevention of SCD in HF. Similar considerations apply to the decision to replace the device generator.

Consideration of ICD implantation is highly appropriate for shared decision making (30). The risks and benefits carry different relative values depending on patient goals and preferences. Discussion should include the potential for SCD and nonsudden death from HF or noncardiac conditions. Information should be provided in a format that patients can understand about the estimated efficacy, safety, and potential complications of an ICD and the ease with which defibrillation can be inactivated if no longer desired (620). As the prevalence of implantable devices increases, it is essential that clearly defined processes be in place to support patients and families when decisions about deactivation arise (621).

7.3.4.2. Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy

In approximately one third of patients, HF progression is accompanied by substantial prolongation of the QRS interval, which is associated with worse outcome (622). Multisite ventricular pacing (termed CRT or
biventricular pacing) can improve ventricular contractile function, diminish secondary mitral regurgitation, reverse ventricular remodeling, and sustain improvement in LVEF. Increased blood pressure with CRT can allow increased titration of neurohormonal antagonist medications that may further contribute to improvement. Benefits were proven initially in trials of patients with NYHA class III or ambulatory class IV HF symptoms and QRS duration of ≥120 to 130 ms. These results have included a decrease of approximately 30% in rehospitalization and reductions in all-cause mortality in the range of 24% to 36%. Improvement in survival is evident as early as the first 3 months of therapy. Functional improvements have been demonstrated on average as a 1 to 2 mL/kg/min increase in peak oxygen consumption, 50- to 70-meter increase in 6-minute walk distance, and a reduction of 10 points or more in the 0- to 105-point scale of the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire, all considered clinically significant. These results include patients with a wide range of QRS duration and, in most cases, sinus rhythm (78, 116, 594, 623).

Although it is still not possible to predict with confidence which patients will improve with CRT, further experiences have provided some clarification. Benefit appears confined largely to patients with a QRS duration of at least 150 ms and LBBB pattern (624-628). The weight of the evidence has been accumulated from patients with sinus rhythm, with meta-analyses indicating substantially less clinical benefit in patients with permanent AF (604, 605). Because effective CRT requires a high rate of ventricular pacing (629), the benefit for patients with AF is most evident in patients who have undergone atrioventricular nodal ablation, which ensures obligate ventricular pacing (601-603).

In general, most data derive from patients with class III symptoms. Patients labeled as having class IV symptoms account for a small minority of patients enrolled. Furthermore, these patients, characterized as “ambulatory” NYHA class IV, are not refractory due to fluid retention, frequently hospitalized for HF, or dependent on continuous intravenous inotropic therapy. CRT should not be considered as “rescue” therapy for stage D HF. In addition, patients with significant noncardiac limitations are unlikely to derive major benefit from CRT.

Since publication of the 2009 HF guideline (38), new evidence supports extension of CRT to patients with milder symptoms. LV remodeling was consistently reversed or halted, with benefit also in reduction of HF hospitalizations (595, 596, 599). In this population with low 1-year mortality, reduction of HF hospitalization dominated the composite primary endpoints, but a mortality benefit was subsequently observed in a 2-year extended follow-up study (630) and in a meta-analysis of 5 trials of CRT in mild HF that included 4,213 patients with class II symptoms (631). Overall benefits in class II HF were noted only in patients with QRS ≥150 ms and LBBB, with an adverse impact with shorter QRS duration or non-LBBB.

The entry criterion for LVEF in CRT trials has ranged from ≤30% to ≤40%. The trials with class III-IV symptoms included patients with LVEF ≤35% (78, 116, 594). The 2 individual trials showing improvement in mortality with class II HF included patients with LVEF ≤30% (632, 633). Trials demonstrating significant improvement in LV size and EF have included patients with LVEF ≤35% (115) and LVEF ≤40% (599), which
also showed reduction in the secondary endpoint of time to hospitalization and a reduction in the composite of clinical HF events comparable to that of all of the CRT trials (624). The congruence of evidence from the totality of CRT trials with regard to remodeling and HF events supports a common threshold of 35% for benefit from CRT in patients with class II, III, and IV HF symptoms. For patients with class II HF, all but 1 of the trials tested CRT in combination with an ICD, whereas there is evidence for benefit with both CRT-defibrillator and CRT alone in patients with class III-IV symptoms (78, 116).

Although the weight of evidence is substantial for patients with class II symptoms, these CRT trials have included only 372 patients with class I symptoms, most with concomitant ICD for the postinfarction indication (595, 599). Considering the risk–benefit ratio for class I, more concern is raised by the early adverse events, which in 1 trial occurred in 13% of patients with CRT-ICD compared with 6.7% in patients with ICD only (596). On the basis of limited data from MADIT-CRT (Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial-Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy), CRT-ICD may be considered for patients with class I symptoms >40 days after MI, LVEF ≤30%, sinus rhythm, LBBB, and QRS ≥150 ms (595).

These indications for CRT all include expectation for ongoing GDMT and diuretic therapy as needed for fluid retention. In addition, regular monitoring is required after device implantation because adjustment of HF therapies and reprogramming of device intervals may be required. The trials establishing the benefit of these interventions were conducted in centers offering expertise in both implantation and follow-up. Recommendations for CRT are made with the expectation that they will be performed in centers with expertise and outcome comparable to that of the trials that provide the bases of evidence. The benefit–risk ratio for this intervention would be anticipated to be diminished for patients who do not have access to these specialized care settings or who are nonadherent.
Figure 2. Indications for CRT Therapy Algorithm.

CRT indicates cardiac resynchronization therapy; CRT-D, cardiac resynchronization therapy-defibrillator; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LBBB, left bundle-branch block; LV, left ventricular; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.
**Table 22. Recommendations for Device Therapy for Management of Stage C HF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICD therapy is recommended for primary prevention of SCD in selected patients with HFrEF at least 40 d post-MI with LVEF ≤35% and NYHA class II or III symptoms on chronic GDMT, who are expected to live &gt;1 y*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(355, 593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT is indicated for patients who have LVEF ≤35%, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS ≥150 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A (NYHA class III/IV)</td>
<td>(78, 116, 594, 634)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD therapy is recommended for primary prevention of SCD in selected patients with HFrEF at least 40 d post-MI with LVEF ≤30% and NYHA class I symptoms while receiving GDMT, who are expected to live &gt;1 y*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(362, 597, 598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF ≤35%, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with QRS ≥150 ms, and NYHA class III/ambulatory class IV symptoms on GDMT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(78, 116, 594, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT can be useful for patients who have LVEF ≤35%, sinus rhythm, LBBB with a QRS 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class II, III, or ambulatory IV symptoms on GDMT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(78, 116, 594-596, 599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT can be useful in patients with AF and LVEF ≤35% on GDMT if a) the patient requires ventricular pacing or otherwise meets CRT criteria and b) AV nodal ablation or rate control allows near 100% ventricular pacing with CRT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(600-605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT can be useful for patients on GDMT who have LVEF ≤35% and are undergoing new or replacement device with anticipated ventricular pacing (&gt;40%).</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(155, 602, 606, 607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ICD is of uncertain benefit to prolong meaningful survival in patients with a high risk of nonsudden death such as frequent hospitalizations, frailty, or severe comorbidities*</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(608-611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF ≤35%, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with a QRS duration of 120 to 149 ms, and NYHA class III/ambulatory class IV on GDMT</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(596, 612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF ≤35%, sinus rhythm, a non-LBBB pattern with QRS ≥150 ms, and NYHA class II symptoms on GDMT</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(595, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT may be considered for patients who have LVEF ≤30%, ischemic etiology of HF, sinus rhythm, LBBB with QRS ≥150 ms, and NYHA class I symptoms on GDMT</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(595, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT is not recommended for patients with NYHA class I or II symptoms and non-LBBB pattern with QRS &lt;150 ms</td>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(595, 596, 612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT is not indicated for patients whose comorbidities and/or frailty limit survival to &lt;1 y</td>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Counseling should be specific to each individual patient and should include documentation of a discussion about the potential for sudden death and nonsudden death from HF or noncardiac conditions. Information should be provided about the efficacy, safety, and potential complications of an ICD and the potential for defibrillation to be inactivated if desired in the future, notably when a patient is approaching end of life. This will facilitate shared decision making between patients, families, and the medical care team about ICDs (30).

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; AV, atrioventricular; COR, Class of Recommendation; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LBBB, left bundle-branch block; LOE, Level of Evidence; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; and SCD, sudden cardiac death.

See Online Data Supplements 28 and 29 for additional data on device therapy and CRT.

7.4. Stage D

7.4.1. Definition of Advanced HF
A subset of patients with chronic HF will continue to progress and develop persistently severe symptoms despite maximum GDMT. Various terminologies have been used to describe this group of patients who are classified with ACCF/AHA stage D HF, including “advanced HF,” “end-stage HF,” and “refractory HF.” In the 2009 ACCF/AHA HF guideline, stage D was defined as “patients with truly refractory HF who might be eligible for specialized, advanced treatment strategies, such as MCS, procedures to facilitate fluid removal, continuous inotropic infusions, or cardiac transplantation or other innovative or experimental surgical procedures, or for end-of-life care, such as hospice” (38). The European Society of Cardiology has developed a definition of advanced HF with objective criteria that can be useful (32) (Table 23). There are clinical clues that may assist clinicians in identifying patients who are progressing toward advanced HF (Table 24). The Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS) has developed 7 profiles that further stratify patients with advanced HF (Table 25) (635).

7.4.2. Important Considerations in Determining If the Patient Is Refractory
Patients considered to have stage D HF should be thoroughly evaluated to ascertain that the diagnosis is correct and that there are no remediable etiologies or alternative explanations for advanced symptoms. For example, it is important to determine that HF and not a concomitant pulmonary disorder is the basis of dyspnea. Similarly, in those with presumed cardiac cachexia, other causes of weight loss should be ruled out. Likewise, other reversible factors such as thyroid disorders should be treated. Severely symptomatic patients presenting with a new diagnosis of HF can often improve substantially if they are initially stabilized. Patients should also be evaluated for nonadherence to medications (636-639), sodium restriction (640), and/or daily weight monitoring (641). Finally, a careful review of prior medical management should be conducted to verify that all evidence-based therapies likely to improve clinical status have been considered.

Table 23. ESC Definition of Advanced HF
1. Severe symptoms of HF with dyspnea and/or fatigue at rest or with minimal exertion (NYHA class III or IV)

2. Episodes of fluid retention (pulmonary and/or systemic congestion, peripheral edema) and/or reduced cardiac output at rest (peripheral hypoperfusion)

3. Objective evidence of severe cardiac dysfunction shown by at least 1 of the following:
   a. LVEF <30%
   b. Pseudonormal or restrictive mitral inflow pattern
   c. Mean PCWP >16 mm Hg and/or RAP >12 mm Hg by PA catheterization
   d. High BNP or NT-proBNP plasma levels in the absence of noncardiac causes

4. Severe impairment of functional capacity shown by 1 of the following:
   a. Inability to exercise
   b. 6-Minute walk distance ≤300 m
   c. Peak VO₂ <12 to 14 mL/kg/min

5. History of ≥1 HF hospitalization in past 6 mo

6. Presence of all the previous features despite “attempts to optimize” therapy, including diuretics and GDMT, unless these are poorly tolerated or contraindicated, and CRT when indicated

Table 24. Clinical Events and Findings Useful for Identifying Patients With Advanced HF

| Repeated (≥2) hospitalizations or ED visits for HF in the past year |
| Progressive deterioration in renal function (e.g., rise in BUN and creatinine) |
| Weight loss without other cause (e.g., cardiac cachexia) |
| Intolerance to ACE inhibitors due to hypotension and/or worsening renal function |
| Intolerance to beta blockers due to worsening HF or hypotension |
| Frequent systolic blood pressure <90 mm Hg |
| Persistent dyspnea with dressing or bathing requiring rest |
| Inability to walk 1 block on the level ground due to dyspnea or fatigue |
| Recent need to escalate diuretics to maintain volume status, often reaching daily furosemide equivalent dose >160 mg/d and/or use of supplemental metolazone therapy |
| Progressive decline in serum sodium, usually to <133 mEq/L |
| Frequent ICD shocks |

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; ED, emergency department; HF, heart failure; and ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator.

Adapted from Russell et al (642).

Table 25. INTERMACS Profiles
## Critical cardiogenic shock (“Crash and burn”)
Life-threatening hypotension and rapidly escalating inotropic/pressor support, with critical organ hypoperfusion often confirmed by worsening acidosis and lactate levels.

## Progressive decline (“Sliding fast” on inotropes)
“Dependent” on inotropic support but nonetheless shows signs of continuing deterioration in nutrition, renal function, fluid retention, or other major status indicator. Can also apply to a patient with refractory volume overload, perhaps with evidence of impaired perfusion, in whom inotropic infusions cannot be maintained due to tachyarrhythmias, clinical ischemia, or other intolerance.

## Stable but inotrope dependent
Clinically stable on mild-moderate doses of intravenous inotropes (or has a temporary circulatory support device) after repeated documentation of failure to wean without symptomatic hypotension, worsening symptoms, or progressive organ dysfunction (usually renal).

## Resting symptoms on oral therapy at home
Patient who is at home on oral therapy but frequently has symptoms of congestion at rest or with activities of daily living (dressing or bathing). He or she may have orthopnea, shortness of breath during dressing or bathing, gastrointestinal symptoms (abdominal discomfort, nausea, poor appetite), disabling ascites, or severe lower-extremity edema.

## Exertion intolerant (“housebound”)
Patient who is comfortable at rest but unable to engage in any activity, living predominantly within the house or housebound.

## Exertion limited (“walking wounded”)
Patient who is comfortable at rest without evidence of fluid overload but who is able to do some mild activity. Activities of daily living are comfortable and minor activities outside the home such as visiting friends or going to a restaurant can be performed, but fatigue results within a few minutes or with any meaningful physical exertion.

## Advanced NYHA class III
Patient who is clinically stable with a reasonable level of comfortable activity, despite a history of previous decompensation that is not recent. This patient is usually able to walk more than a block. Any decompensation requiring intravenous diuretics or hospitalization within the previous month should make this person a Patient Profile 6 or lower.

*Modifier options: Profiles 3-6 can be modified with the designation FF (frequent flyer) for patients with recurrent decompensations leading to frequent (generally at least 2 in last 3 mo or 3 in last 6 mo) emergency department visits or hospitalizations for intravenous diuretics, ultrafiltration, or brief inotropic therapy. Profile 3 can be modified in this fashion if the patient is usually at home. If a Profile 7 patient meets the definition of FF, the patient should be moved to Profile 6 or worse. Other modifier options include A (arrhythmia), which should be used in the presence of recurrent ventricular tachyarrhythmias contributing to the overall clinical course (e.g., frequent ICD shocks or requirement of external defibrillation, usually more than twice weekly); or TCS (temporary circulatory support) for hospitalized patients profiles 1-3 (635).

ICD indicates implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; INTERMACS, Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

Adapted from Stevenson et al (643).

See Online Data Supplements 30 and 31 for additional data on therapies—important considerations and sildenafil.

### 7.4.3. Water Restriction: Recommendation

**Class IIa**

1. Fluid restriction (1.5 to 2 L/d) is reasonable in stage D, especially in patients with hyponatremia, to reduce congestive symptoms. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

Recommendations for fluid restriction in HF are largely driven by clinical experience. Sodium and fluid balance recommendations are best implemented in the context of weight and symptom monitoring programs. Routine
strict fluid restriction in all patients with HF regardless of symptoms or other considerations does not appear to result in significant benefit (644). Limiting fluid intake to around 2 L/d is usually adequate for most hospitalized patients who are not diuretic resistant or significantly hyponatremic. In 1 study, patients on a similar sodium and diuretic regimen showed higher readmission rates with higher fluid intake, suggesting that fluid intake affects HF outcomes (385). Strict fluid restriction may best be used in patients who are either refractory to diuretics or have hyponatremia. Fluid restriction, especially in conjunction with sodium restriction, enhances volume management with diuretics. Fluid restriction is important to manage hyponatremia, which is relatively common with advanced HF and portends a poor prognosis (645, 646). Fluid restriction may improve serum sodium concentration; however, it is difficult to achieve and maintain. In hot or low-humidity climates, excessive fluid restriction predisposes patients with advanced HF to the risk of heat stroke. Hyponatremia in HF is primarily due to an inability to excrete free water. Norepinephrine and angiotensin II activation result in decreased sodium delivery to the distal tubule, whereas arginine vasopressin increases water absorption from the distal tubule. In addition, angiotensin II also promotes thirst. Thus, sodium and fluid restriction in advanced patients with HF is important.

7.4.4. Inotropic Support: Recommendations

Class I
1. Until definitive therapy (e.g., coronary revascularization, MCS, heart transplantation) or resolution of the acute precipitating problem, patients with cardiogenic shock should receive temporary intravenous inotropic support to maintain systemic perfusion and preserve end-organ performance. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa
1. Continuous intravenous inotropic support is reasonable as “bridge therapy” in patients with stage D refractory to GDMT and device therapy who are eligible for and awaiting MCS or cardiac transplantation (647, 648). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb
1. Short-term, continuous intravenous inotropic support may be reasonable in those hospitalized patients presenting with documented severe systolic dysfunction who present with low blood pressure and significantly depressed cardiac output to maintain systemic perfusion and preserve end-organ performance (592, 649, 650). (Level of Evidence: B)
2. Long-term, continuous intravenous inotropic support may be considered as palliative therapy for symptom control in select patients with stage D despite optimal GDMT and device therapy who are not eligible for either MCS or cardiac transplantation (651-653). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III: Harm
1. Long-term use of either continuous or intermittent, intravenous parenteral positive inotropic agents, in the absence of specific indications or for reasons other than palliative care, is potentially harmful in the patient with HF (416, 654-659). (Level of Evidence: B)
2. Use of parenteral inotropic agents in hospitalized patients without documented severe systolic dysfunction, low blood pressure, or impaired perfusion, and evidence of significantly depressed cardiac output, with or without congestion, is potentially harmful (592, 649, 650). (Level of Evidence: B)
Despite improving hemodynamic compromise, positive inotropic agents have not demonstrated improved outcomes in patients with HF in either the hospital or outpatient setting (416, 654-658). Regardless of their mechanism of action (e.g., inhibition of phosphodiesterase, stimulation of adrenergic or dopaminergic receptors, calcium sensitization), chronic oral inotrope treatment increased mortality, mostly related to arrhythmic events. Parenteral inotropes, however, remain as an option to help the subset of patients with HF who are refractory to other therapies and are suffering consequences from end-organ hypoperfusion. Inotropes should be considered only in such patients with systolic dysfunction who have low cardiac index and evidence of systemic hypoperfusion and/or congestion (Table 26). To minimize adverse effects, lower doses are preferred. Similarly, the ongoing need for inotropic support and the possibility of discontinuation should be regularly assessed.

See Online Data Supplements 32 and 33 for additional data on inotropes.

### Table 26. Intravenous Inotropic Agents Used in Management of HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inotropic Agent</th>
<th>Dose (mcg/kg)</th>
<th>Drug Kinetics and Metabolism</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Adverse Effects</th>
<th>Special Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrenergic agonists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dopamine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 to 10, t½: 2 to 20 min R.H.P</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↔ ↔</td>
<td>T, HA, N, tissue necrosis</td>
<td>Caution: MAO-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↑ ↔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobutamine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.5 to 5.0, t½: 2 to 3 min H</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↓ ↓</td>
<td>↑/↓BP, HA, T, N, F, hypersensitivity</td>
<td>Caution: MAO-I; Cl: sulfite allergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 to 20</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↔ ↔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE inhibitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milrinone</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>0.125 to 0.75, t½: 2.5 h H</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↓ ↓</td>
<td>T, ↓BP</td>
<td>Renal dosing, monitor LFTs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`t½` Indicates elimination half-life; BP, blood pressure; CI, contraindication; CO, cardiac output; F, fever; H, hepatic; HA, headache; HF, heart failure; HR, heart rate; LFT, liver function test; MAO-I, monoamine oxidase inhibitor; N, nausea; N/A, not applicable; N/R, not recommended; P, plasma; PDE, phosphodiesterase; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; R, renal; SVR, systemic vascular resistance; and T, tachyarrhythmias.

### 7.4.5. Mechanical Circulatory Support: Recommendations

**Class Ia**

1. MCS is beneficial in carefully selected* patients with stage D HFrEF in whom definitive management (e.g., cardiac transplantation) or cardiac recovery is anticipated or planned (660-667). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. Nondurable MCS, including the use of percutaneous and extracorporeal ventricular assist devices (VADs), is reasonable as a “bridge to recovery” or “bridge to decision” for carefully selected* patients with HFrEF with acute, profound hemodynamic compromise (668-671). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

3. Durable MCS is reasonable to prolong survival for carefully selected* patients with stage D HFrEF (672-675). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
Although optimal patient selection for MCS remains an active area of investigation, general indications for referral for MCS therapy include patients with LVEF <25% and NYHA class III-IV functional status despite GDMT, including, when indicated, CRT, with either high predicted 1- to 2-y mortality (e.g., as suggested by markedly reduced peak oxygen consumption, clinical prognostic scores) or dependence on continuous parenteral inotropic support. Patient selection requires a multidisciplinary team of experienced advanced HF and transplantation cardiologists, cardiothoracic surgeons, nurses, and, ideally, social workers and palliative care clinicians.

MCS has emerged as a viable therapeutic option for patients with advanced stage D HF rEF refractory to optimal GDMT and cardiac device intervention. Since its initial use 50 years ago for postcardiotomy shock (676), the implantable VAD continues to evolve.

Designed to assist the native heart, VADs are differentiated by the implant location (intracorporeal versus extracorporeal), approach (percutaneous versus surgical), flow characteristic (pulsatile versus continuous), pump mechanism (volume displacement, axial, centrifugal), and the ventricle(s) supported (left, right, biventricular). VADs are effective in both the short-term (hours to days) management of acute decompensated, hemodynamically unstable HF rEF that is refractory to inotropic support, and the long-term (months to years) management of stage D chronic HF rEF. Nondurable, or temporary, MCS provides an opportunity for decisions about the appropriateness of transition to definitive management such as cardiac surgery or durable, that is, permanent, MCS or, in the case of improvement and recovery, suitability for device removal. Nondurable MCS thereby may be helpful as either a bridge to decision or a bridge to recovery.

More common scenarios for MCS, however, are long-term strategies, including 1) bridge to transplantation, 2) bridge to candidacy, and 3) destination therapy. Bridge to transport and destination therapy have the strongest evidence base with respect to survival, functional capacity, and HRQOL benefits.

Data from INTERMACS provides valuable information on risk factors and outcomes for patients undergoing MCS. The greatest risk factors for death among patients undergoing BTT include acuity and severity of clinical condition and evidence of right ventricular failure (677). MCS may also be used as a bridge to candidacy. Retrospective studies have shown reduction in pulmonary pressures with MCS therapy in patients with HF considered to have “fixed” pulmonary hypertension (661-663). Thus, patients who may be transplant-ineligible due to irreversible severe pulmonary hypertension may become eligible with MCS support over time. Other bridge-to-candidacy indications may include obesity and tobacco use in patients who are otherwise candidates for cardiac transplantation. There is ongoing interest in understanding how MCS facilitates LV reverse remodeling. Current scientific and translational research in the area aims to identify clinical, cellular, molecular, and genomic markers of cardiac recovery in the patient with VAD (678, 679).

*See Online Data Supplements 34 and 35 for additional data on MCS and left VADs.*

### 7.4.6. Cardiac Transplantation: Recommendation

**Class I**
1. **Evaluation for cardiac transplantation is indicated for carefully selected patients with stage D HF despite GDMT, device, and surgical management (680). (Level of Evidence: C)**

Cardiac transplantation is considered the gold standard for the treatment of refractory end-stage HF. Since the first successful cardiac transplantation in 1967, advances in immunosuppressive therapy have vastly improved the long-term survival of transplant recipients with a 1-, 3-, and 5-year posttransplant survival rate of 87.8%, 78.5%, and 71.7% in adults, respectively (681). Similarly, cardiac transplantation has been shown to improve functional status and HRQOL (682-688). The greatest survival benefit is seen in those patients who are at highest risk of death from advanced HF (689). Cardiopulmonary exercise testing helps refine candidate selection (690-696). Data suggest acceptable posttransplant outcomes in patients with reversible pulmonary hypertension (697), hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (698), peripartum cardiomyopathy (699), restrictive cardiomyopathy (700, 701), and muscular dystrophy (702). Selected patients with stage D HF and poor prognosis should be referred to a cardiac transplantation center for evaluation and transplant consideration. Determination of HF prognosis is addressed in Sections 6.1.2 and 7.4.2. The listing criteria and evaluation and management of patients undergoing cardiac transplantation are described in detail by the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (680).

*See Table 27 for a summary of recommendations from this section, Figure 3 for the stages of HF development; and online Data Supplement 36 for additional data on transplantation.*

**Table 27. Recommendations for Inotropic Support, MCS, and Cardiac Transplantation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inotropic support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiogenic shock pending definitive therapy or resolution</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTT or MCS in stage D refractory to GDMT</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(647, 648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term support for threatened end-organ dysfunction in hospitalized patients with stage D and severe HFrEF</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(592, 649, 650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term support with continuous infusion palliative therapy in select stage D HF</td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(651-653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine intravenous use, either continuous or intermittent, is potentially harmful in stage D HF</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(416, 654-659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term intravenous use in hospitalized patients without evidence of shock or threatened end-organ performance is potentially harmful</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(592, 649, 650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS is beneficial in carefully selected* patients with stage D HF in whom definitive management (e.g., cardiac transplantation) is anticipated or planned</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(660-667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable MCS is reasonable as a “bridge to recovery” or “bridge to decision” for carefully selected* patients with HF and acute profound disease</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(668-671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable MCS is reasonable to prolong survival for carefully selected* patients with HF and acute profound disease</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(672-675)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation for cardiac transplantation is indicated for carefully selected patients with stage D HF despite GDMT, device, and surgical management.

*Although optimal patient selection for MCS remains an active area of investigation, general indications for referral for MCS therapy include patients with LVEF <25% and NYHA class III-IV functional status despite GDMT, including, when indicated, CRT, with either high predicted 1- to 2-y mortality (as suggested by markedly reduced peak oxygen consumption, clinical prognostic scores, etc.) or dependence on continuous parenteral inotropic support. Patient selection requires a multidisciplinary team of experienced advanced HF and transplantation cardiologists, cardiothoracic surgeons, nurses, and, ideally, social workers and palliative care clinicians.

BTT indicates bridge to transplant; COR, Class of Recommendation; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; EF, ejection fraction; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; LOE, Level of Evidence; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

**Figure 3.** Stages in the development of HF and recommended therapy by stage.

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; CAD, coronary artery disease; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; DM, diabetes mellitus; EF, ejection fraction; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HRQOL, health-related quality of life; HTN, hypertension; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LV, left ventricular; LVH, left ventricular hypertrophy; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; and MI, myocardial infarction.

Adapted from Hunt et al (38).
8. The Hospitalized Patient

8.1. Classification of Acute Decompensated HF

Hospitalization for HF is a growing and major public health issue (703). Presently, HF is the leading cause of hospitalization among patients >65 years of age (51); the largest percentage of expenditures related to HF are directly attributable to hospital costs. Moreover, in addition to costs, hospitalization for acutely decompensated HF represents a sentinel prognostic event in the course of many patients with HF, with a high risk for recurrent hospitalization (e.g., 50% at 6 months) and a 1-year mortality rate of approximately 30% (211, 704). The AHA has published a scientific statement about this condition (705).

There is no widely accepted nomenclature for HF syndromes requiring hospitalization. Patients are described as having “acute HF,” “acute HF syndromes,” or “acute(ly) decompensated HF”; while the third has gained greatest acceptance, it too has limitations, for it does not make the important distinction between those with a de novo presentation of HF from those with worsening of previously chronic stable HF.

Data from HF registries have clarified the profile of patients with HF requiring hospitalization (107, 704, 706, 707). Characteristically, such patients are elderly or near elderly, equally male or female, and typically have a history of hypertension, as well as other medical comorbidities, including chronic kidney disease, hyponatremia, hematologic abnormalities, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (107, 706, 708-713). A relatively equal percentage of patients with acutely decompensated HF have impaired versus preserved LV systolic function (707, 714, 715); clinically, patients with preserved systolic function are older, more likely to be female, to have significant hypertension, and to have less CAD. The overall morbidity and mortality for both groups is high.

Hospitalized patients with HF can be classified into important subgroups. These include patients with acute coronary ischemia, accelerated hypertension and acutely decompensated HF, shock, and acutely worsening right HF. Patients who develop HF decompensation after surgical procedures also bear mention. Each of these various categories of HF has specific etiologic factors leading to decompensation, presentation, management, and outcomes.

Noninvasive modalities can be used to classify the patient with hospitalized HF. The history and physical examination allows estimation of a patient’s hemodynamic status, that is, the degree of congestion (“dry” versus “wet”), as well as the adequacy of their peripheral perfusion (“warm” versus “cold”) (716) (Figure 4). Chest radiography is variably sensitive for the presence of interstitial or alveolar edema, even in the presence of elevated filling pressures. Thus, a normal chest radiograph does not exclude acutely decompensated HF (717). The utility of natriuretic peptides in patients with acutely decompensated HF has been described in detail in Section 6.3.1. Both BNP and NT-proBNP are useful for the identification or exclusion of acutely decompensated HF in dyspneic patients (247, 249, 250, 718, 719), particularly in the context of uncertain diagnosis (720-722). Other options for diagnostic evaluation of patients with suspected acutely decompensated
HF, such as acoustic cardiography (723), bioimpedance vector monitoring (724), or noninvasive cardiac output monitoring (725) are not yet validated.

Figure 4. Classification of patients presenting with acutely decompensated HF.

Adapted with permission from Nohria et al (716).

8.2. Precipitating Causes of Decompensated HF: Recommendations

Class I

1. ACS precipitating acute HF decompensation should be promptly identified by ECG and serum biomarkers, including cardiac troponin testing, and treated optimally as appropriate to the overall condition and prognosis of the patient. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Common precipitating factors for acute HF should be considered during initial evaluation, as recognition of these conditions is critical to guide appropriate therapy. (Level of Evidence: C)

ACS is an important cause of worsening or new-onset HF (726). Although acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction can be readily apparent on an ECG, other ACS cases may be more challenging to diagnose. Complicating the clinical scenario is that many patients with acute HF, with or without CAD, have serum troponin levels that are elevated (727).

However, many other patients may have low levels of detectable troponins not meeting criteria for an acute ischemic event (278, 728). Registry data have suggested that the use of coronary angiography is low for patients hospitalized with decompensated HF, and opportunities to diagnose important CAD may be missed (729). For the patient with newly discovered HF, clinicians should always consider the possibility that CAD is an underlying cause of HF (726).

Besides ACS, several other precipitating causes of acute HF decompensation must be carefully assessed to inform appropriate treatment, optimize outcomes, and prevent future acute events in patients with HF (730). See list below.
Common Factors That Precipitate Acute Decompensated HF

- Nonadherence with medication regimen, sodium and/or fluid restriction
- Acute myocardial ischemia
- Uncorrected high blood pressure
- AF and other arrhythmias
- Recent addition of negative inotropic drugs (e.g., verapamil, nifedipine, diltiazem, beta blockers)
- Pulmonary embolus
- Initiation of drugs that increase salt retention (e.g., steroids, thiazolidinediones, NSAIDs)
- Excessive alcohol or illicit drug use
- Endocrine abnormalities (e.g., diabetes mellitus, hyperthyroidism, hypothyroidism)
- Concurrent infections (e.g., pneumonia, viral illnesses)
- Additional acute cardiovascular disorders (e.g., valve disease endocarditis, myopericarditis, aortic dissection)

Hypertension is an important contributor to acute HF, particularly among blacks, women, and those with HFpEF (731). In the ADHERE registry, almost 50% of patients admitted with HF had blood pressure >140/90 mm Hg (107). Abrupt discontinuation of antihypertensive therapy may precipitate worsening HF. The prevalence of AF in patients with acute HF is >30% (731). Infection increases metabolic demands in general. Pulmonary infections, which are common in patients with HF, may add hypoxia to the increased metabolic demands and is associated with worse outcomes (730). The sepsis syndrome is associated with reversible myocardial depression that is likely mediated by cytokine release (732). Patients with HF are hypercoagulable, and the possibility of pulmonary embolus as an etiology of acute decompensation should be considered. Deterioration of renal function can be both a consequence and contributor to decompensated HF. Restoration of normal thyroid function in those with hypothyroidism or hyperthyroidism may reverse abnormal cardiovascular function (733). In patients treated with amiodarone, thyroid disturbances should be suspected.

Excessive sodium and fluid intake may precipitate acute HF (379, 384). Medication nonadherence for financial or other reasons is a major cause of hospital admission (734). Several drugs may precipitate acute HF (e.g., calcium channel blockers, antiarrhythmic agents, glucocorticoids, NSAIDs and cyclooxygenase-2 inhibitors, thiazolidinediones, and over-the-counter agents like pseudoephedrine). Finally, excessive alcohol intake and use of illicit drugs, such as cocaine and methamphetamine, also need to be investigated as potential causes of HF decompensation.

See Online Data Supplement 37 for additional data on comorbidities in the hospitalized patient.

8.3. Maintenance of GDMT During Hospitalization: Recommendations

Class I
1. In patients with HFrEF experiencing a symptomatic exacerbation of HF requiring hospitalization during chronic maintenance treatment with GDMT, it is recommended that GDMT be continued in the absence of hemodynamic instability or contraindications (195, 735, 736). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. Initiation of beta-blocker therapy is recommended after optimization of volume status and successful discontinuation of intravenous diuretics, vasodilators, and inotropic agents. Beta-blocker therapy should be initiated at a low dose and only in stable patients. Caution should be used when initiating beta blockers in patients who have required inotropes during their hospital course (195, 735, 736). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

The patient’s maintenance HF medications should be carefully reviewed on admission, and it should be decided whether adjustments should be made as a result of the hospitalization. In the majority of patients with HFrEF who are admitted to the hospital, oral HF therapy should be continued, or even uptitrated, during hospitalization. It has been demonstrated that continuation of ACE inhibitors or ARBs and beta blockers for most patients is well tolerated and results in better outcomes (195, 735, 736). Withholding of, or reduction in, beta-blocker therapy should be considered only in patients hospitalized after recent initiation or increase in beta-blocker therapy or with marked volume overload or marginal/low cardiac output. Patients admitted with significant worsening of renal function should be considered for a reduction in, or temporary discontinuation of ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and/or aldosterone antagonists until renal function improves. Although it is important to ensure that evidence-based medications are instituted before hospital discharge, it is equally critical to reassess medications on admission and adjust their administration in light of the worsening HF.

### 8.4. Diuretics in Hospitalized Patients: Recommendations

**Class I**

1. Patients with HF admitted with evidence of significant fluid overload should be promptly treated with intravenous loop diuretics to reduce morbidity (737, 738). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. If patients are already receiving loop diuretic therapy, the initial intravenous dose should equal or exceed their chronic oral daily dose and should be given as either intermittent boluses or continuous infusion. Urine output and signs and symptoms of congestion should be serially assessed, and the diuretic dose should be adjusted accordingly to relieve symptoms, reduce volume excess, and avoid hypotension (739). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

3. The effect of HF treatment should be monitored with careful measurement of fluid intake and output, vital signs, body weight that is determined at the same time each day, and clinical signs and symptoms of systemic perfusion and congestion. Daily serum electrolytes, urea nitrogen, and creatinine concentrations should be measured during the use of intravenous diuretics or active titration of HF medications. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

**Class IIa**

1. When diuresis is inadequate to relieve symptoms, it is reasonable to intensify the diuretic regimen using either:
   a. higher doses of intravenous loop diuretics (38, 739). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
   b. addition of a second (e.g., thiazide) diuretic (740-743). *(Level of Evidence: B).*

**Class IIb**
1. **Low-dose dopamine infusion may be considered in addition to loop diuretic therapy to improve diuresis and better preserve renal function and renal blood flow** (744, 745). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

Patients with significant fluid overload should be initially treated with loop diuretics given intravenously during hospitalization. Therapy should begin in the emergency department without delay, as early therapy has been associated with better outcomes (737, 738). Patients should be carefully monitored, including serial evaluation of volume status and systemic perfusion. Monitoring of daily weight, supine and standing vital signs, and fluid input and output is necessary for daily management. Assessment of daily electrolytes and renal function should be performed while intravenous diuretics are administered or HF medications are actively titrated. Intravenous loop diuretics have the potential to reduce glomerular filtration rate, further worsen neurohumoral activation, and produce electrolyte disturbances. Thus, although the use of diuretics may relieve symptoms, their impact on mortality has not been well studied. Diuretics should be administered at doses sufficient to achieve optimal volume status and relieve congestion without inducing an excessively rapid reduction in intravascular volume, which could result in hypotension, renal dysfunction, or both. Because loop diuretics have a relatively short half-life, sodium reabsorption in the tubules will occur once the tubular concentration of the diuretics declines. Therefore, limiting sodium intake and dosing the diuretic continuously or multiple times per day will enhance diuretic effectiveness (434, 737, 746-748).

Some patients may present with moderate to severe renal dysfunction such that the diuretic response may be blunted, necessitating higher initial diuretic doses. In many cases, reduction of fluid overload may improve congestion and improve renal function, particularly if significant venous congestion is reduced (749). Clinical experience suggests it is difficult to determine whether congestion has been adequately treated in many patients, and registry data have confirmed that patients are frequently discharged after a net weight loss of only a few pounds. Although patients may rapidly improve symptomatically, they may remain congested or hemodynamically compromised. Routine use of serial natriuretic peptide measurement or Swan-Ganz catheter has not been conclusively shown to improve outcomes among these patients. Nevertheless, careful evaluation of all physical findings, laboratory parameters, weight change, and net fluid change should be considered before discharge.

When a patient does not respond to initial intravenous diuretics, several options may be considered. Efforts should be made to make certain that congestion persists and that another hemodynamic profile or alternate disease process is not evident. If there is doubt about the fluid status, consideration should be given for assessment of filling pressures and cardiac output using right-heart catheterization. If volume overload is confirmed, the dose of the loop diuretic should be increased to ensure that adequate drug levels reach the kidney. Adding a second diuretic, typically a thiazide, can improve diuretic responsiveness (435, 442, 443). Theoretically, continuous diuretic infusion may enhance diuresis because continuous diuretic delivery to the nephron avoids rebound sodium and fluid reabsorption (440, 441, 750, 751). However, the DOSE (Diuretic Optimization Strategies Evaluation) trial did not find any significant difference between continuous infusion
versus intermittent bolus strategies for symptoms, diuresis, or outcomes (739). It is reasonable to try an alternate approach of using either bolus or continuous infusion therapy different from the initial strategy among patients who are resistant to diuresis. Finally, some data suggest that low-dose dopamine infusion in addition to loop diuretics may improve diuresis and better preserve renal function, although ongoing trials will provide further data on this effect (744).

See Online Data Supplement 17 for additional data on diuretics.

### 8.5. Renal Replacement Therapy—Ultrafiltration: Recommendations

**Class IIb**

1. **Ultrafiltration may be considered for patients with obvious volume overload to alleviate congestive symptoms and fluid weight** (752). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. **Ultrafiltration may be considered for patients with refractory congestion not responding to medical therapy.** *(Level of Evidence: C)*

If all diuretic strategies are unsuccessful, ultrafiltration may be considered. Ultrafiltration moves water and small- to medium-weight solutes across a semipermeable membrane to reduce volume overload. Because the electrolyte concentration is similar to plasma, relatively more sodium can be removed than by diuretics (753-755). Initial studies supporting use of ultrafiltration in HF were small but provided safety and efficacy data in acute HF (755-757). Use of ultrafiltration in HF has been shown to reduce neurohormone levels and increase diuretic responsiveness. In a larger trial of 200 unselected patients with acute HF, ultrafiltration did reduce weight compared with bolus or continuous diuretics at 48 hours, had similar effects on the dyspnea score compared with diuretics, and improved readmission rate at 90 days (752). A randomized acute HF trial in patients with cardiorenal syndrome and persistent congestion has failed to demonstrate a significant advantage of ultrafiltration over bolus diuretic therapy (758, 759). Cost, the need for veno-venous access, provider experience, and nursing support remain concerns about the routine use of ultrafiltration. Consultation with a nephrologist is appropriate before initiating ultrafiltration, especially in circumstances where the non-nephrology provider does not have sufficient experience with ultrafiltration.

See Online Data Supplements 17 and 38 for additional data on diuretics versus ultrafiltration in acute decompensated HF and worsening renal function and mortality.

### 8.6. Parenteral Therapy in Hospitalized HF: Recommendation

**Class IIb**

1. **If symptomatic hypotension is absent, intravenous nitroglycerin, nitroprusside, or nesiritide may be considered an adjuvant to diuretic therapy for relief of dyspnea in patients admitted with acutely decompensated HF** (760-763). *(Level of Evidence: A)*

The different vasodilators include 1) intravenous nitroglycerin, 2) sodium nitroprusside, and 3) nesiritide.
Intravenous nitroglycerin acts primarily through venodilation, lowers preload, and may help to rapidly reduce pulmonary congestion (764, 765). Patients with HF and hypertension, coronary ischemia, or significant mitral regurgitation are often cited as ideal candidates for the use of intravenous nitroglycerin. However, tachyphylaxis to nitroglycerin may develop within 24 hours, and up to 20% of those with HF may develop resistance to even high doses (766-768).

Sodium nitroprusside is a balanced preload-reducing venodilator and afterload-reducing arteriodilator that also dilates the pulmonary vasculature (769). Data demonstrating efficacy are limited, and invasive hemodynamic blood pressure monitoring (such as an arterial line) is typically required; in such cases, blood pressure and volume status should be monitored frequently. Nitroprusside has the potential for producing marked hypotension and is usually used in the intensive care setting as well; longer infusions of the drug have been rarely associated with thiocyanate toxicity, particularly in the setting of renal insufficiency. Nitroprusside is potentially of value in severely congested patients with hypertension or severe mitral valve regurgitation complicating LV dysfunction.

Nesiritide (human BNP) reduces LV filling pressure but has variable effects on cardiac output, urinary output, and sodium excretion. An initial study demonstrated that the severity of dyspnea is reduced more rapidly compared with diuretics alone (760). A large randomized trial in patients with acute decompensated HF demonstrated nesiritide had no impact on mortality, rehospitalization, or renal function, a small but statistically significant impact on dyspnea, and an increased risk of hypotension (762). Because nesiritide has a longer effective half-life than nitroglycerin or nitroprusside, adverse effects such as hypotension may persist longer. Overall, presently there are no data that suggest that intravenous vasodilators improve outcomes in the patient hospitalized with HF; as such, use of intravenous vasodilators is limited to the relief of dyspnea in the hospitalized HF patient with intact blood pressure. Administration of intravenous vasodilators in patients with HFpEF should be done with caution because these patients are typically more volume sensitive.

The use of inotropic support as indicated for hospitalized HF with shock or impending shock and/or end-organ perfusion limitations is addressed in Section 7.4.4. See Table 26 for drug therapies and Online Data Supplements 32 and 33 for additional information on inotropic support.

See Online Data Supplement 39 for additional data on nesiritide.

8.7. Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis in Hospitalized Patients: Recommendation

Class I

1. A patient admitted to the hospital with decompensated HF should receive venous thromboembolism prophylaxis with an anticoagulant medication if the risk–benefit ratio is favorable (770-775). (Level of Evidence: B)
HF has long been recognized as affording additional risk for venous thromboembolic disease, associated with a number of pathophysiologic changes, including reduced cardiac output, increased systemic venous pressure, and chemical changes promoting blood clotting. When patients are hospitalized for decompensated HF or when patients with chronic stable HF are hospitalized for other reasons, they are at increased risk for venous thromboembolic disease, although accurate numerical estimates are lacking in the literature.

Most early data on the effectiveness of different anticoagulant regimens to reduce the incidence of venous thromboembolic disease in hospitalized patients were either observational, retrospective reports (776, 777) or prospective studies using a variety of drugs and differing definitions of therapeutic effect and endpoints (774, 778-780), making summary conclusions difficult. Early studies involved patients with far longer hospital lengths of stay than occur presently and were performed well before present standard-of-care treatments and diagnostic tests were available (774, 778-780). Newer trials using presently available antithrombotic drugs often were not limited to patients with HF but included those with other acute illnesses, severe respiratory diseases, or simply a broad spectrum of hospitalized medical patients (771-774, 781). In most studies, patients were categorized as having HF by admitting diagnosis, clinical signs, or functional class, whereas only 1 study (782) provided LVEF data on enrolled study patients. All included trials tried to exclude patients perceived to have an elevated risk of bleeding complications or with an elevated risk of toxicity from the specific agent tested (e.g., enoxaparin in patients with compromised renal function). Patients with HF typically made up a minority of the study cohort, and significance of results were not always reported by the authors, making ACCF/AHA class I recommendations difficult to support using this guideline methodology. In some trials, concurrent aspirin was allowed but not controlled for as a confounding variable (772, 783).

For patients admitted specifically for decompensated HF and with adequate renal function (serum creatinine <2.0 mg/dL), randomized trials suggest that enoxaparin 40 mg subcutaneously once daily (770, 773, 774, 783) or unfractionated heparin 5,000 units subcutaneously every 8 hours (771) will reduce radiographically demonstrable venous thrombosis. Effects on mortality or clinically significant pulmonary embolism rates are unclear. Lower doses of enoxaparin do not appear superior to placebo (770, 773), whereas continuing weight-based enoxaparin therapy up to 3 months after hospital discharge does not appear to provide additional benefit (782).

A single prospective study failed to demonstrate certoparin to be noninferior to unfractionated heparin (783), whereas retrospective analysis of a prospective trial of dalteparin was underpowered to determine benefit in its HF cohort (776). Fondaparinux failed to show significant difference from placebo in an RCT that included a subgroup of 160 patients with HF (781).

No adequate trials have evaluated anticoagulant benefit in patients with chronic but stable HF admitted to the hospital for other reasons. However, the MEDENOX (Medical Patients with Enoxaparin) trial suggested that the benefit of enoxaparin may extend to this population (770, 773, 774).
A systematic review (784) failed to demonstrate prophylactic efficacy of graded compression stockings in general medical patients, but significant cutaneous complications were associated with their use. No studies were performed exclusively on patients with HF. Two RCTs in patients with stroke found no efficacy of these devices (785, 786).

See Online Data Supplement 20 for additional data on anticoagulation.

8.8. Arginine Vasopressin Antagonists: Recommendation

Class IIb

1. In patients hospitalized with volume overload, including HF, who have persistent severe hyponatremia and are at risk for or having active cognitive symptoms despite water restriction and maximization of GDMT, vasopressin antagonists may be considered in the short term to improve serum sodium concentration in hypervolemic, hyponatremic states with either a V$_2$ receptor selective or a nonselective vasopressin antagonist (787, 788). (Level of Evidence: B)

Even mild hyponatremia may be associated with neurocognitive problems, including falls and attention deficits (789). Treatment of hypervolemic hyponatremia with a V$_2$-selective vasopressin antagonist (tolvaptan) was associated with a significant improvement in the mental component of the Medical Outcomes Study Short Form General Health Survey (788). Hyponatremia may be treated with water restriction and maximization of GDMT that modulate angiotensin II, leading to improved renal perfusion and decreased thirst. Alternative causes of hyponatremia (e.g., syndrome of inappropriate antidiuretic hormone, hypothyroidism, and hypoaldosteronism) should be assessed. Vasopressin antagonists improve serum sodium in hypervolemic, hyponatremic states (787, 788); however, longer-term therapy with a V$_2$-selective vasopressin antagonist did not improve mortality in patients with HF (790, 791). Currently, 2 vasopressin antagonists are available for clinical use: conivaptan and tolvaptan. It may be reasonable to use a nonselective vasopressin antagonist to treat hyponatremia in patients with HF with cognitive symptoms due to hyponatremia. However, the long-term safety and benefit of this approach remains unknown. A summary of the recommendations for the hospitalized patient appears in Table 28.

Table 28. Recommendations for Therapies in the Hospitalized HF Patient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HF patients hospitalized with fluid overload should be treated with intravenous diuretics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(737, 738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF patients receiving loop diuretic therapy should receive an initial parenteral dose greater than or equal to their chronic oral daily dose; then should be serially adjusted</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFrEF patients requiring HF hospitalization on GDMT should continue GDMT unless hemodynamic instability or contraindicated</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(195, 735, 736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of beta-blocker therapy at a low dose is recommended after optimization of volume status and discontinuation of intravenous</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(195, 735, 736)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thrombosis/thromboembolism prophylaxis is recommended for patients hospitalized with HF

| Serum electrolytes, urea nitrogen, and creatinine should be measured during titration of HF medications, including diuretics |
| When diuresis is inadequate, it is reasonable to a) give higher doses of intravenous loop diuretics; or b) add a second diuretic (e.g., thiazide) |
| Low-dose dopamine infusion may be considered with loop diuretics to improve diuresis |
| Ultrafiltration may be considered for patients with obvious volume overload |
| Ultrafiltration may be considered for patients with refractory congestion |
| Intravenous nitroglycerin, nitroprusside, or nesiritide may be considered an adjuvant to diuretic therapy for stable patients with HF |
| In patients hospitalized with volume overload and severe hyponatremia, vasopressin antagonists may be considered |

COR indicates Class of Recommendation; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; LOE, Level of Evidence; and N/A, not available.

8.9. Inpatient and Transitions of Care: Recommendations

See Table 29 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

Class I

1. The use of performance improvement systems and/or evidence-based systems of care is recommended in the hospital and early postdischarge outpatient setting to identify appropriate HF patients for GDMT, provide clinicians with useful reminders to advance GDMT, and assess the clinical response (82, 365, 706, 792-796). (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Throughout the hospitalization as appropriate, before hospital discharge, at the first postdischarge visit, and in subsequent follow-up visits, the following should be addressed (204, 795, 797-799). (Level of Evidence: B):
   a. initiation of GDMT if not previously established and not contraindicated;
   b. precipitant causes of HF, barriers to optimal care transitions, and limitations in postdischarge support;
   c. assessment of volume status and supine/upright hypotension with adjustment of HF therapy as appropriate;
   d. titration and optimization of chronic oral HF therapy;
   e. assessment of renal function and electrolytes where appropriate;
   f. assessment and management of comorbid conditions;
   g. reinforcement of HF education, self-care, emergency plans, and need for adherence; and
   h. consideration for palliative care or hospice care in selected patients.

3. Multidisciplinary HF disease-management programs are recommended for patients at high risk for hospital readmission, to facilitate the implementation of GDMT, to address different barriers to behavioral change, and to reduce the risk of subsequent rehospitalization for HF (82, 800-802). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIa

1. Scheduling an early follow-up visit (within 7 to 14 days) and early telephone follow-up (within 3 days) of hospital discharge is reasonable (101, 803). (Level of Evidence: B)
2. Use of clinical risk-prediction tools and/or biomarkers to identify patients at higher risk for postdischarge clinical events is reasonable (215). (Level of Evidence: B)

Decisions about pharmacological therapies delivered during hospitalization likely can impact postdischarge outcome. Continuation or initiation of HF GDMT prior to hospital discharge is associated with substantially improved clinical outcomes for patients with HFrEF. However, caution should be used when initiating beta blockers in patients who have required inotropes during their hospital course or when initiating ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or aldosterone antagonists in those patients who have experienced marked azotemia or are at risk for hyperkalemia. The patient should be transitioned to oral diuretic therapy to verify its effectiveness. Similarly, optimal volume status should be achieved, blood pressure should be adequately controlled, and, in patients with AF, ventricular response should also be well controlled. The hospitalization is a “teachable moment” to reinforce patient and family education and develop a plan of care, which should be communicated to the appropriate healthcare team.

Safety for patients hospitalized with HF is crucial. System changes necessary to achieve safer care include the adoption by all US hospitals of a standardized set of 30 “Safe Practices” endorsed by the National Quality Forum (804) and National Patient Safety Goals espoused by The Joint Commission (805). Improved communication between clinicians and nurses, medication reconciliation, carefully planned transitions between care settings, and consistent documentation are examples of patient safety standards that should be ensured for patients with HF discharged from the hospital.

The prognosis of patients hospitalized with HF, and especially those with serial readmissions, is suboptimal. Hence, appropriate levels of symptomatic relief, support, and palliative care for patients with chronic HF should be addressed as an ongoing key component of the plan of care, especially when patients are hospitalized with acute decompensation (806). The appropriateness of discussion about advanced therapy or end-of-life preferences is reviewed in Section 11.

For patients with HF, the transition from inpatient to outpatient care can be an especially vulnerable period because of the progressive nature of the disease state, complex medical regimens, the large number of comorbid conditions, and the multiple clinicians who may be involved. Patient education and written discharge instructions or educational material given to the patient, family members, and/or caregiver during the hospital stay or at discharge to home are essential components of transition care. These should address all of the following: activity level, diet, discharge medications, follow-up appointment, weight monitoring, and what to do if symptoms worsen (297). Thorough discharge planning that includes special emphasis on ensuring adherence to an evidence-based medication regimen (795) is associated with improved patient outcomes (792, 797, 807). More intensive delivery of discharge instructions, coupled tightly with subsequent well-coordinated follow-up care for patients hospitalized with HF, has produced positive results in several studies (82, 793, 800). The addition of a 1-hour, nurse educator–delivered teaching session at the time of hospital discharge, using standardized instructions, resulted in improved clinical outcomes, increased self-care and treatment adherence,
and reduced cost of care. Patients receiving the education intervention also had a lower risk of rehospitalization or death and lower costs of care (365). There are ongoing efforts to further develop evidence-based interventions in this population.

Transitional care extends beyond patient education. Care information, especially changes in orders and new diagnostic information, must be transmitted in a timely and clearly understandable form to all of the patient’s clinicians who will be delivering follow-up care. Other important components of transitional care include preparation of the patient and caregiver for what to expect at the next site of care, reconciliation of medications, follow-up plans for outstanding tests, and discussions about monitoring signs and symptoms of worsening conditions. Early outpatient follow-up, a central element of transitional care, varies significantly across US hospitals. Early postdischarge follow-up may help minimize gaps in understanding of changes to the care plan or knowledge of test results and has been associated with a lower risk of subsequent rehospitalization (803). A follow-up visit within 7 to 14 days and/or a telephone follow-up within 3 days of hospital discharge are reasonable goals of care.

Table 29. Recommendations for Hospital Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation or Indication</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance improvement systems in the hospital and early postdischarge outpatient setting to identify HF for GDMT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(82, 365, 706, 792-796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before hospital discharge, at the first postdischarge visit, and in subsequent follow-up visits, the following should be addressed: a. initiation of GDMT if not done or contraindicated; b. causes of HF, barriers to care, and limitations in support; c. assessment of volume status and blood pressure with adjustment of HF therapy; d. optimization of chronic oral HF therapy; e. renal function and electrolytes; f. management of comorbid conditions; g. HF education, self-care, emergency plans, and adherence; and h. palliative or hospice care</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(204, 795, 797-799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary HF disease-management programs for patients at high risk for hospital readmission are recommended</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(82, 800-802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A follow-up visit within 7 to 14 d and/or a telephone follow-up within 3 d of hospital discharge is reasonable</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(101, 803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of clinical risk-prediction tools and/or biomarkers to identify higher-risk patients is reasonable</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(215)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COR indicates Class of Recommendation; GDMT, guideline-directed medical therapy; HF, heart failure; and LOE, Level of Evidence.

See Online Data Supplement 40 for additional data on oral medications for the hospitalized patient.

9. Important Comorbidities in HF

9.1. Atrial Fibrillation*
Patients with HF are more likely than the general population to develop AF (808). There is a direct relationship between the NYHA class and prevalence of AF in patients with HF progressing from 4% in those who are NYHA class I to 40% in those who are NYHA class IV (809). AF is also a strong independent risk factor for subsequent development of HF (808, 810). In addition to those with HFrEF, patients with HFrEF are also at greater risk for AF (811). HF and AF can interact to promote their perpetuation and worsening through mechanisms such as rate-dependent worsening of cardiac function, fibrosis, and activation of neurohumoral vasoconstrictors. AF can worsen symptoms in patients with HF, and, conversely, worsened HF can promote a rapid ventricular response in AF.

Similar to other patient populations, for those with AF and HF, the main goals of therapy are prevention of thromboembolism and symptom control. Most patients with AF and HF would be expected to be candidates for systemic anticoagulation unless otherwise contraindicated. General principles of management include correction of underlying causes of AF and HF as well as optimization of HF management (Table 30). As in other patient populations, the issue of rate control versus rhythm control has been investigated. For patients who develop HF as a result of AF, a rhythm control strategy should be pursued. It is important to recognize that AF with a rapid ventricular response is one of the few potentially reversible causes of HF. Because of this, a patient who presents with newly detected HF in the presence of AF with a rapid ventricular response should be presumed to have a rate-related cardiomyopathy until proved otherwise. In this situation, 2 strategies can be considered. One is rate control of the patient’s AF and see if HF and EF improve. The other is to try to restore and maintain sinus rhythm. In this situation, it is common practice to initiate amiodarone and then arrange for cardioversion 1 month later. Amiodarone has the advantage of being both an effective rate-control medication and the most effective antiarrhythmic medication with a lower risk of proarrhythmic effect.

In patients with HF who develop AF, a rhythm-control strategy has not been shown to be superior to a rate-control strategy (812). If rhythm control is chosen, limited data suggest that AF catheter ablation in HF patients may lead to improvement in LV function and quality of life but is less likely to be effective than in patients with intact cardiac function (813, 814). Because of their favorable effect on morbidity and mortality in patients with systolic HF, beta-adrenergic blockers are the preferred agents for achieving rate control unless otherwise contraindicated. Digoxin may be an effective adjunct to a beta blocker. The nondihydropyridine calcium antagonists, such as diltiazem, should be used with caution in those with depressed EF because of their negative inotropic effect. For those with HFrEF, nondihydropyridine calcium antagonists can be effective for achieving rate control but may be more effective when used in combination with digoxin. For those for whom a rate-control strategy is chosen, when rate control cannot be achieved either because of drug inefficacy or intolerance, atrioventricular node ablation and CRT device placement can be useful (78, 116, 595, 596). See Figures 5 and 6 for AF treatment algorithms.
The “ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation” and the 2 subsequent focused updates from 2011 (815-817) are considered policy at the time of publication of the present HF Guideline; however, a fully revised AF guideline, which will include updated recommendations on AF, is in development, with publication expected in 2013 or 2014.

*See Online Data Supplement 41 for additional data on AF.*

**Table 30. Clinical Evaluation in Patients With AF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. History and physical examination, to define</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence and nature of symptoms associated with AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical type of AF (paroxysmal, persistent, or permanent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Onset of first symptomatic attack or date of discovery of AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequency, duration, precipitating factors, and modes of termination of AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response to any pharmacological agents that have been administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of any underlying heart disease or other reversible conditions (e.g., hyperthyroidism or alcohol consumption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ECG, to identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rhythm (verify AF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LV hypertrophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• P-wave duration and morphology or fibrillatory waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preexcitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bundle-branch block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prior MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other atrial arrhythmias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To measure and follow the R-R, QRS, and QT intervals in conjunction with antiarrhythmic drug therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transthoracic echocardiogram, to identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valvular heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LA and RA size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LV and RV size and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peak RV pressure (pulmonary hypertension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LV hypertrophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LA thrombus (low sensitivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pericardial disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Blood tests of thyroid, renal, and hepatic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For a first episode of AF, when the ventricular rate is difficult to control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional testing (one or several tests may be necessary)**

| 1. 6-Minute walk test | • If the adequacy of rate control is in question |

---

Yancy, CW et al.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Exercise testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• If the adequacy of rate control is in question (permanent AF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reproduce exercise-induced AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To exclude ischemia before treatment of selected patients with a type IC antiarrhythmic drug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Holter monitoring or event recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• If diagnosis of the type of arrhythmia is in question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a means of evaluating rate control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Transesophageal echocardiography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To identify LA thrombus (in the LA appendage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To guide cardioversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Electrophysiological study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To clarify the mechanism of wide-QRS-complex tachycardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To identify a predisposing arrhythmia such as atrial flutter or paroxysmal supraventricular tachycardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To seek sites for curative ablation or AV conduction block/modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Chest radiograph, to evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lung parenchyma, when clinical findings suggest an abnormality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pulmonary vasculature, when clinical findings suggest an abnormality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type IC refers to the Vaughan Williams classification of antiarrhythmic drugs. 
AF indicates atrial fibrillation; AV, atrioventricular; ECG, electrocardiogram; LA, left atrial; LV, left ventricular; MI, myocardial infarction; RA, right atrial; and RV, right ventricular. 
Reproduced from Fuster et al (6).

**Figure 5.** Pharmacological management of patients with newly discovered AF.
AF indicates atrial fibrillation; and HF, heart failure.
Reproduced from Fuster et al (6).

Figure 6. Pharmacological management of patients with recurrent paroxysmal AF.
9.2. Anemia

Anemia is a common finding in patients with chronic HF. Although variably reported, in part due to the lack of consensus on the definition of anemia, the prevalence of anemia among patients with HF increases with HF severity. Anemia is also more common in women and is seen in both patients with HFrEF and HFpEF (818-823). The World Health Organization defines anemia as a hemoglobin level of <12 g/dL in women and <13 g/dL in men. Registries have reported anemia to be present in 25% to 40% of HF patients (818-820). Anemia is
associated with an increased mortality risk in HF. In a large study of >150,000 patients, the mortality risk was approximately doubled in anemic HF patients compared with those without anemia, and this risk persisted after controlling for other confounders, including renal dysfunction and HF severity (818). Anemia is also associated with reduced exercise capacity, impaired HRQOL, and a higher risk for hospitalization (225, 819, 824, 825). These risks are inversely and linearly associated with hemoglobin levels, although a U-shaped risk with the highest hemoglobin levels has been reported (822, 826).

Multiple etiological factors, many of which coexist within individual patients, contribute to the development of anemia in HF. Anemia in patients with HF is often normocytic and accompanied by an abnormally low reticulocyte count (825, 827). Evaluation of anemia in HF requires careful consideration of other causes, the most common being secondary causes of iron deficiency anemia.

In persons without identifiable causes of anemia, erythropoiesis-stimulating agents have gained significant interest as potential adjunctive therapy in the patient with HF. In a retrospective study of erythropoiesis-stimulating agents in 26 patients with HF and anemia, the hemoglobin level, LVEF, and functional class improved (828). These patients required lower diuretic doses and were hospitalized less often. Similar findings were also observed in a randomized open-label study of 32 patients (829). A single-blind RCT showed that erythropoietin increased hemoglobin, peak oxygen uptake, and exercise duration in patients with severe HF and anemia (830). Two further studies confirmed these findings; however, none of these were double blind (831, 832).

These positive data led to 2 larger studies. A 165-patient study showed that darbepoetin alfa was associated with improvement in several HRQOL measures with a trend toward improved exercise capacity (6-minute walking distance +34 ±7 m versus +11 ±10 m, p=0.074) (833). In STAMINA-HeFT (Study of Anemia in Heart Failure Trial), 319 patients were randomly assigned to darbepoetin alfa or placebo for 12 months (834). Although darbepoetin alfa did not improve exercise duration, it was well tolerated, and a trend toward improvement in the composite endpoint of all-cause mortality or first hospitalization for HF was seen (hazard ratio: 0.68; 95% confidence interval: 0.43 to 1.08; p=0.10) (834). These favorable data led to the design and initiation of the RED-HF (Phase III Reduction of Events With Darbepoetin alfa in Heart Failure) trial (835).

Two trials in erythropoiesis-stimulating agents, however, later raised concerns that patients treated with an erythropoiesis-stimulating agent may have an increased risk of cardiovascular events (836, 837). Because the populations in these trials differed, the RED-HF trial was continued. Concerns about the use of erythropoiesis-stimulating agents remain. The use of darbepoetin alfa in patients with HF (n=1,347), however, seems safe (838). Also, a substudy of the CHOIR (Correction in Hemoglobin and Outcomes in Renal Insufficiency) trial showed that the increased risk associated with the higher hemoglobin target was not observed in patients with HF at baseline (hazard ratio: 0.99) (839). Finally, a trial using intravenous iron as a supplement in patients with HFrEF with iron deficiency showed an improvement in functional status (840). There were no untoward adverse
effects of iron in this trial. In the absence of a definitive evidence base, the writing committee has deferred a specific treatment recommendation regarding anemia until ongoing randomized trials are completed.

9.3. Depression

Depression is common in patients with HF; those with depressive symptoms have lower HRQOL, poorer self-care, worse clinical outcomes, and more use of healthcare services (841-843). Although it might be assumed that depression occurs only among hospitalized patients (844), a multicenter study demonstrated that even at least 3 months after a hospitalization, 63% of patients with HF reported symptoms of depression (845). Potential pathophysiologic mechanisms proposed to explain the high prevalence of depression in HF include autonomic nervous system dysfunction, inflammation, cardiac arrhythmias, and altered platelet function, but the mechanism remains unclear (846). Although remission from depression may improve cardiovascular outcomes, the most effective intervention strategy is not yet known (842).

9.4. Other Multiple Comorbidities

Although there are additional and important comorbidities that afflict patients with HF as shown in Table 31, how best to generate specific recommendations remains uncertain, given the status of current evidence.

Table 31. Ten Most Common Co-Occurring Chronic Conditions Among Medicare Beneficiaries With Heart Failure (N=4,947,918), 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>3,685,373</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>461,235</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>3,145,718</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>Ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>365,889</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>2,623,601</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>338,687</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>2,200,674</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>325,498</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>2,027,875</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>284,102</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>1,901,447</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>Chronic kidney disease</td>
<td>257,015</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic kidney disease</td>
<td>1,851,812</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>207,082</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD</td>
<td>1,311,118</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>201,964</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation</td>
<td>1,247,748</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>COPD</td>
<td>191,016</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s disease/dementia</td>
<td>1,207,704</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>88,816</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean No. of conditions is 6.1; median is 6.
†Mean No. of conditions is 5.5; median is 5.
Data source: CMS administrative claims data, January 2011–December 2011, from the Chronic Condition Warehouse (CCW), ccwdata.org (847).
CMS indicates Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; and COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
10. Surgical/Percutaneous/Transcather Interventional Treatments of HF: Recommendations

See Table 32 for a summary of recommendations from this section.

Class I
1. Coronary artery revascularization via CABG or percutaneous intervention is indicated for patients (HFpEF and HFrEF) on GDMT with angina and suitable coronary anatomy, especially for a left main stenosis (>50%) or left main equivalent disease (10, 12, 14, 848). *(Level of Evidence: C)*

Class IIa
1. CABG to improve survival is reasonable in patients with mild to moderate LV systolic dysfunction (EF 35% to 50%) and significant (>70% diameter stenosis) multivessel CAD or proximal left anterior descending coronary artery stenosis when viable myocardium is present in the region of intended revascularization (848-850). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
2. CABG or medical therapy is reasonable to improve morbidity and cardiovascular mortality for patients with severe LV dysfunction (EF <35%), HF, and significant CAD (309, 851). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
3. Surgical aortic valve replacement is reasonable for patients with critical aortic stenosis and a predicted surgical mortality of no greater than 10% (852). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
4. Transcatheter aortic valve replacement after careful candidate consideration is reasonable for patients with critical aortic stenosis who are deemed inoperable (853). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

Class IIb
1. CABG may be considered with the intent of improving survival in patients with ischemic heart disease with severe LV systolic dysfunction (EF <35%) and operable coronary anatomy whether or not viable myocardium is present (307-309). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
2. Transcatheter mitral valve repair or mitral valve surgery for functional mitral insufficiency is of uncertain benefit and should only be considered after careful candidate selection and with a background of GDMT (854-857). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
3. Surgical reverse remodeling or LV aneurysmectomy may be considered in carefully selected patients with HFrEF for specific indications, including intractable HF and ventricular arrhythmias (858). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

Surgical therapies and percutaneous interventions that are commonly integrated, or at least considered, in HF management include coronary revascularization (e.g., CABG, angioplasty, stenting); aortic valve replacement; mitral valve replacement or repair; septal myectomy or alcohol septal ablation for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; surgical ablation of ventricular arrhythmia; MCS; and cardiac transplantation (675, 680, 859, 860). Surgical placement of ICDs or LV pacing leads is of historical importance but may be considered in situations where transvenous access is not feasible.

The most common reason for intervention is CAD. Myocardial viability indicates the likelihood of improved outcomes with either surgical or medical therapy but does not identify patients with greater survival benefit from revascularization (304). The dictum of CABG for left main CAD and reduced LV function was considered absolute and subsequently extrapolated to all severities of LV dysfunction without a confirmatory evidence base (848). Newer studies have addressed patients with multivessel CAD, HF, and at least moderately
severe to severe LV systolic dysfunction (861, 862). Both surgical and medical therapies have similar outcomes, and decisions about revascularization should be made jointly by the HF team and cardiothoracic surgeon. The most important considerations in the decision to proceed with a surgical or interventional approach include coronary anatomy that is amenable to revascularization and appropriate concomitant GDMT. Valvular heart disease is not an infrequent cause of HF; however, when valvular disease is managed correctly and preemptively, its adverse consequences on ventricular mechanics can be ameliorated. The advent of effective transcatheter approaches to both mitral and aortic disease creates the need for greater considerations of structural interventions for patients with LV systolic dysfunction and valvular heart disease. To date, the surgical or transcatheter management of functional mitral insufficiency has not been proven superior to medical therapy. A decision to intervene in functional mitral regurgitation should be made on a case-by-case basis, and consideration should be given to participation in clinical trials and/or databases. The surgical or transcatheter management of critical aortic stenosis is an effective strategy with reasonable outcomes noted even in patients with advanced age (>80 years). Indications for other surgical or percutaneous interventions in the setting of HF are driven by other relevant guidelines or other sections of this guideline, including myomectomy for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, surgical or electrophysiological procedures for AF, nondurable or durable MCS, and heart transplantation.

Several procedures under evaluation hold promise but are not yet appropriate for a guideline-driven indication (Table 33). This includes revascularization as a means to support cellular regenerative therapies. For patients willing to consider regenerative technologies, the ideal strategy is referral to an enrolling clinical trial at a center experienced in both high-risk revascularization and cell-based science (863-865). Surgical reverse-ventricular remodeling (ventricular reconstruction) does not appear to be of benefit but may be considered in carefully selected patients with HFrEF for specified indications, including retractable HF and ventricular arrhythmias (858).

Table 32. Recommendations for Surgical/Percutaneous/Transcatheter Interventional Treatments of HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CABG or percutaneous intervention is indicated for HF patients on GDMT with angina and suitable coronary anatomy, especially significant left main stenosis or left main equivalent</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(10, 12, 14, 848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG to improve survival is reasonable in patients with mild to moderate LV systolic dysfunction and significant multivessel CAD or proximal LAD stenosis when viable myocardium is present</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(848-850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG or medical therapy is reasonable to improve morbidity and mortality for patients with severe LV dysfunction (EF &lt; 35%), HF, and significant CAD</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(309, 851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical aortic valve replacement is reasonable for patients with critical aortic stenosis and a predicted surgical mortality of no greater than 10%</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcatheter aortic valve replacement is reasonable for patients with critical aortic stenosis who are deemed inoperable</td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(853)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CABG may be considered in patients with ischemic heart disease, severe LV systolic dysfunction, and operable coronary anatomy whether or not viable myocardium is present

Table 33. Surgical/Percutaneous/Transcatheter Interventions in Patients With HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate Guideline-Directed Surgical/Percutaneous/Transcatheter Interventions for HF</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Surgical or percutaneous revascularization</td>
<td>(10, 12, 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surgical or transcatheter aortic valve replacement</td>
<td>(852, 853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surgical myomectomy or alcohol ablation for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nondurable MCS for cardiogenic shock</td>
<td>(668-671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Durable MCS for advanced HF</td>
<td>(672-675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Heart transplantation</td>
<td>(680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Surgical/electrophysiological ablation of ventricular tachycardia</td>
<td>(866)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surgical/Percutaneous/Transcatheter Interventions Under Evaluation in Patients With HF</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcatheter intervention for functional mitral insufficiency</td>
<td>(854, 857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Left atrial resection/left atrial appendage removal, surgical or percutaneous, for AF</td>
<td>(867)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MCS for advanced HF as a bridge to recovery</td>
<td>(868, 869)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; HF, heart failure; and MCS, mechanical circulatory support.

11. Coordinating Care for Patients With Chronic HF

11.1. Coordinating Care for Patients With Chronic HF: Recommendations

Class I

1. Effective systems of care coordination with special attention to care transitions should be deployed for every patient with chronic HF that facilitate and ensure effective care that is designed to achieve GDMT and prevent hospitalization (80, 82, 793, 870-884). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. Every patient with HF should have a clear, detailed, and evidence-based plan of care that ensures the achievement of GDMT goals, effective management of comorbid conditions, timely follow-up with the healthcare team, appropriate dietary and physical activities, and compliance with Secondary Prevention Guidelines for cardiovascular disease. This plan of care should be updated regularly and made readily available to all members of each patient’s healthcare team (13). *(Level of Evidence: C)*

3. Palliative and supportive care is effective for patients with symptomatic advanced HF to improve quality of life (30, 885-888). *(Level of Evidence: B)*
Education, support, and involvement of patients with HF and their families are critical and often complex, especially during transitions of care. Failure to understand and follow a detailed and often nuanced plan of care likely contributes to the high rates of HF 30-day rehospitalization and mortality seen across the United States (61, 889). One critical intervention to ensure effective care coordination and transition is the provision of a comprehensive plan of care, with easily understood, culturally sensitive, and evidence-based educational materials, to patients with HF and/or caregivers during both hospital and office-based encounters. A comprehensive plan of care should promote successful patient self-care (870, 884, 890). Hence, the plan of care for patients with HF should continuously address in detail a number of complex issues, including adherence to GDMT, timely follow-up with the healthcare professionals who manage the patient's HF and associated comorbidities, appropriate dietary and physical activities, including cardiac rehabilitation, and adherence to an extensive list of secondary prevention recommendations based on established guidelines for cardiovascular disease (Table 34). Clinicians must maintain vigilance about psychosocial, behavioral, and socioeconomic issues that patients with HF and their caregivers face, including access to care, risk of depression, and healthcare disparities (639, 891-895). For example, patients with HF who live in skilled nursing facilities are at higher risk for adverse events, with a 1-year mortality rate >50% (896). Furthermore, community-dwelling patients with HF are often unable to afford the large number of medications prescribed, thereby leading to suboptimal medication adherence (897).

11.2. Systems of Care to Promote Care Coordination for Patients With Chronic HF

Improved communication between clinicians and nurses, medication reconciliation, carefully planned transitions between care settings, and consistent documentation are examples of patient safety standards that should be ensured for all patients with HF. The National Quality Forum has also endorsed a set of patient-centered “Preferred Practices for Care Coordination” (898), which detail comprehensive specifications for successful care coordination for patients and their families.

Systems of care designed to support patients with HF and other cardiac diseases can produce a significant improvement in outcomes. Furthermore, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is now financially penalizing hospitals for avoidable hospitalizations and readmissions, thereby emphasizing the importance of such systems-based care coordination of patients with HF (899). However, the quality of evidence is mixed for specific components of HF clinical management interventions, such as home-based care (871, 872), disease management (873, 874, 880), and remote telemonitoring programs (80, 875, 876, 878). Unfortunately, numerous and nonstandardized definitions of disease management (873, 879, 880), including the specific elements that compose disease management, impede on efforts to improve the care of patients with HF. Hence, more generic multidisciplinary strategies for improving the quality and cost-effectiveness of systems-based HF care should be evaluated with equal weight to those interventions focused on improving adherence to GDMT.
For example, multidisciplinary approaches can reduce rates of hospitalization for HF. Programs involving specialized follow-up by a multidisciplinary team decrease all-cause hospitalizations and mortality; however, this has not been shown for “disease management programs” that focus only on self-care activities (82, 793, 881, 882, 900). Furthermore, patient characteristics may be important predictors of HF and other cardiac disease–related survival and hospitalization. Overall, very few specific interventions have been consistently identified and successfully applied in clinical practice (204, 214, 901-903).

See Online Data Supplements 42 and 43 for additional data on disease management and telemonitoring.

### 11.3. Palliative Care for Patients With HF

The core elements of comprehensive palliative care for HF delivered by clinicians include expert symptom assessment and management. Ongoing care should address symptom control, psychosocial distress, HRQOL, preferences about end-of-life care, caregiver support, and assurance of access to evidence-based disease-modifying interventions. The HF team can help patients and their families explore treatment options and prognosis. The HF and palliative care teams are best suited to help patients and families decide when end-of-life care (including hospice) is appropriate (30, 885-888, 904). Assessment for frailty and dementia is part of this decision care process offered to the patient and family.

Data suggest that advance directives specifying limitations in end-of-life care are associated with significantly lower levels of Medicare spending, lower likelihood of in-hospital death, and higher use of hospice care in regions characterized by higher levels of end-of-life spending (905). In newly diagnosed cancer patients, palliative care interventions delivered early have had a positive impact on survival and HRQOL. This approach may also be relevant for HF (906). Access to formally trained palliative care specialists may be limited in ambulatory settings. Therefore, cardiologists, primary care physicians, physician assistants, advanced practice nurses, and other members of the HF healthcare team should be familiar with these local treatment options. Evaluation for cardiac transplantation or MCS in experienced centers should include formal palliative care consultation, which can improve advanced care planning and enhance the overall quality of decision making and integrated care for these patients, regardless of the advanced HF therapy selected (907).

#### Table 34. Plan of Care for Patients With Chronic HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan of Care</th>
<th>Relevant Guideline Section/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline-directed medical and device therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitor/ARB</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blocker</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone receptor antagonist</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretic</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.1 and 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuation of drugs that may worsen HF</td>
<td>Section 7.3.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomarker-related therapeutic goals</td>
<td>Section 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-related devices (MCS, CRT, ICD)</td>
<td>Sections 7.3.4 and 7.4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Management of comorbidities (examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comorbidity</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>ACCF/AHA SIHD Guideline (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antithrombotic therapies</td>
<td>Sections 7.3.2.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrhythmia/arrhythmia risk</td>
<td>Sections 7.3.2.9.2 and 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Section 7.1.1, JNC-VII (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>2012 ADA Standards (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic renal failure</td>
<td>Section 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease</td>
<td>2011 ACCP/ATS/ERS Guideline (908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary prevention interventions (e.g., lipids, smoking cessation, influenza and pneumococcal vaccines)</td>
<td>2011 AHA/ACCF Secondary Prevention and Risk Reduction Guidelines and Centers for Disease Control Adult Vaccinations (13, 909, 910)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Patient/family education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Area</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diet and fluid restriction, weight monitoring</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.1, 7.3.1.3, 7.3.1.5, and 7.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing signs and symptoms of worsening HF</td>
<td>Table 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment and prognosis</td>
<td>Sections 3, 4.6, 6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOL assessment</td>
<td>AHA (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance care planning (e.g., palliative care and advance directives)</td>
<td>Section 11.3 (30, 888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR training for family members</td>
<td>AHA Family &amp; Friends CPR (911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Physical activity/cardiac rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehabilitation Area</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise regimen</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of daily living</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional status assessment and classification</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Psychosocial factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosocial Area</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex-specific issues</td>
<td>2011 AHA Effectiveness-Based Guidelines for the Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease in Women (912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual activity</td>
<td>2012 AHA Scientific Statement on Sexual Activity (913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression screening</td>
<td>US Preventive Services Task Force Guidelines (914)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Clinician follow-up and care coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Care Coordination Area</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiologists and other relevant specialists</td>
<td>2000 AHA Scientific Statement for Team Management of Patients With HF (900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care physician</td>
<td>National Quality Forum Preferred Practices for Care Coordination (898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other healthcare providers (e.g., home care)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication reconciliation</td>
<td>HHS Meaningful Use Criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Socioeconomic and cultural factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Area</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and health literacy</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Section 7.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCF indicates American College of Cardiology Foundation; ACCP, American College of Chest Physicians; ACE; angiotensin-converting enzyme; ADA, American Diabetes Association; AHA, American Heart Association; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; ATS, American Thoracic Society; CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; ERS, European Respiratory Society; HF, heart failure; HHS, Health and Human Services; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; JNC, Joint National Committee; LVAD, left ventricular assist device; QOL, quality of life; SIHD, stable ischemic heart disease; and VAD, ventricular assist device.
12. Quality Metrics/Performance Measures: Recommendations

Class I

1. Performance measures based on professionally developed clinical practice guidelines should be used with the goal of improving quality of care for HF (706, 801, 917). (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIa

1. Participation in quality improvement programs and patient registries based on nationally endorsed, clinical practice guideline–based quality and performance measures can be beneficial in improving the quality of HF care (706, 801). (Level of Evidence: B)

Quality measurement and accountability have become integral parts of medical practice over the past 2 decades. HF has been a specific target of quality measurement, improvement, and reporting because of its substantial impact on population morbidity and mortality. Commonly used performance measures for HF can be considered in 2 distinct categories: process measures and outcomes measures.

Process performance measures focus on the aspects of care that are delivered to a patient (e.g., the prescription of a particular drug such as an ACE inhibitor in patients with LV systolic dysfunction and without contraindications). Process measures derive from the most definitive guideline recommendations (i.e., class I and class III recommendations). A small group of process measures for hospitalized patients with HF have been reported to the public by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services as part of the Hospital Compare program (918).

Measures used to characterize the care of patients with HF should be those developed in a multiorganizational consensus process using an explicit methodology focusing on measurability, validity, reliability, feasibility, and ideally, correlation with patient outcomes (919, 920), and with transparent disclosure and management of possible conflicts of interest. In the case of HF, several national outcome measures are currently in use (Table 35), and the ACCF/AHA/American Medical Association–Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement recently published revised performance measures document includes several process measures for both inpatient and outpatient HF care (Table 36) (921). Of note, the ACCF/AHA distinguish between processes of care that can be considered “Performance Measures” (i.e., suitable for use for accountability purposes) and “Quality Metrics” (i.e., suitable for use for quality improvement but not accountability) (922).

Measures are appealing for several reasons; by definition, they reflect the strongest guideline recommendations. When appropriately specified, they are relatively easy to calculate and they provide a clear target for improvement. However, they do not capture the broader range of care; they apply only to those patients without contraindications to therapy. Evidence of the relation between better performance with respect to process measures and patient outcomes is conflicting, and performance rates for those measures that have been used as part of public reporting programs are generally high for all institutions, limiting the ability of these measures to identify high- and low-performing centers.
These limitations of process measures have generated interest in the use of outcomes measures as a complementary approach to characterize quality. With respect to HF, 30-day mortality and 30-day readmission are reported by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services as part of the Hospital Compare program (Table 35) and are incorporated in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services value-based purchasing program (918). Outcomes measures are appealing because they apply universally to almost all patients, and they provide a perspective on the performance of health systems (923). On the other hand, they are limited by the questionable adequacy of risk adjustment and by the challenges of improvement. The ACCF and AHA have published criteria that characterize the necessary attributes of robust outcomes measures (924).

Table 35. Outcome Measures for HF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Developer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestive HF mortality rate (NQF endorsed)</td>
<td>Agency for Health Research and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 30-day mortality rate (NQF endorsed)</td>
<td>Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive HF admission rate (NQF endorsed)</td>
<td>Agency for Health Research and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 30-day risk-standardized HF readmission rate (NQF endorsed)</td>
<td>Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HF indicates heart failure; and NQF, National Quality Forum.

Table 36. ACCF/AHA/AMA-PCPI 2011 HF Measurement Set
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description*</th>
<th>Care Setting</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LVEF assessment</td>
<td>Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF for whom the quantitative or qualitative results of a recent or prior (any time in the past) LVEF assessment is documented within a 12-mo period</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>Individual practitioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. LVEF assessment | Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF with documentation in the hospital record of the results of an LVEF assessment performed either before arrival or during hospitalization, OR documentation in the hospital record that LVEF assessment is planned for after discharge | Inpatient | • Individual practitioner  
• Facility |
| 3. Symptom and activity assessment | Percentage of patient visits for those patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF with quantitative results of an evaluation of both current level of activity and clinical symptoms documented | Outpatient | Individual practitioner |
| 4. Symptom management† | Percentage of patient visits for those patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF and with quantitative results of an evaluation of both level of activity AND clinical symptoms documented in which patient symptoms have improved or remained consistent with treatment goals since last assessment OR patient symptoms have demonstrated clinically important deterioration since last assessment with a documented plan of care | Outpatient | Individual practitioner |
| 5. Patient self-care education‡ | Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF who were provided with self-care education on ≥3 elements of education during ≥1 visits within a 12-mo period | Outpatient | Individual practitioner |
| 6. Beta-blocker therapy for LVSD (outpatient and inpatient setting) | Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF with a current or prior LVEF <40% who were prescribed beta-blocker therapy with bisoprolol, carvedilol, or sustained-release metoprolol succinate either within a 12-mo period when seen in the outpatient setting or at hospital discharge | Inpatient and outpatient | • Individual practitioner  
• Facility |
| 7. ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy for LVSD (outpatient and inpatient setting) | Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF with a current or prior LVEF <40% who were prescribed ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy either within a 12-mo period when seen in the outpatient setting or at hospital discharge | Inpatient and outpatient | • Individual practitioner  
• Facility |
| 8. Counseling about ICD implantation for patients with LVSD on combination medical therapy†‡ | Percentage of patients aged ≥18 y with a diagnosis of HF with current LVEF ≤35% despite ACE inhibitor/ARB and beta-blocker therapy for at least 3 mo who were counseled about ICD implantation as a treatment option for the prophylaxis of sudden death | Outpatient | Individual practitioner |
| 9. Postdischarge appointment for HF patients | Percentage of patients, regardless of age, discharged from an inpatient facility to ambulatory care or home health care with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF for whom a follow-up appointment was scheduled and documented, including location, date, and time for a follow-up office visit or home health visit (as specified) | Inpatient | Facility |

*Refer to the complete measures for comprehensive information, including measure exception.  
†Test measure designated for use in internal quality improvement programs only. These measures are not appropriate for any other purpose (e.g., pay for performance, physician ranking, or public reporting programs).  
‡New measure.
N.B., Regarding test measure no. 8, implantation of ICD must be consistent with published guidelines. This measure is intended to promote counseling only.

ACCF indicates American College of Cardiology Foundation; ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; AHA, American Heart Association; AMA-PCPI, American Medical Association–Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; HF, heart failure; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; and LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction.

Adapted from Bonow et al (921).

See Online Data Supplement 44 for additional data on quality metrics and performance measures.

13. Evidence Gaps and Future Research Directions

Despite the objective evidence compiled by the writing committee on the basis of hundreds of clinical trials, there are huge gaps in our knowledge base about many fundamental aspects of HF care. Some key examples include an effective management strategy for patients with HFpEF beyond blood pressure control; a convincing method to use biomarkers in the optimization of medical therapy; the recognition and treatment of cardiorenal syndrome; and the critical need for improving patient adherence to therapeutic regimens. Even the widely embraced dictum of sodium restriction in HF is not well supported by current evidence. Moreover, the majority of the clinical trials that inform GDMT were designed around the primary endpoint of mortality, so that there is less certainty about the impact of therapies on the HRQOL of patients. It is also of major concern that the majority of RCTs failed to randomize a sufficient number of the elderly, women, and underrepresented minorities, thus, limiting insight into these important patient cohorts. A growing body of studies on patient-centered outcomes research is likely to address some of these deficiencies, but time will be required.

HF is a syndrome with a high prevalence of comorbidities and multiple chronic conditions, but most guidelines are developed for patients with a single disease. Nevertheless, the coexistence of additional diseases such as arthritis, renal insufficiency, diabetes, or chronic lung disease to the HF syndrome should logically require a modification of treatment, outcome assessment, or follow-up care. About 25% of Americans have multiple chronic conditions; this figure rises to 75% in those >65 years of age, including the diseases referred to above, as well as asthma, hypertension, cognitive disorders, or depression (847). Most RCTs in HF specifically excluded patients with significant other comorbidities from enrollment, thus limiting our ability to generalize our recommendations to many real-world patients. Therefore, the clinician must, as always, practice the art of using the best of the guideline recommendations as they apply to a specific patient.

Future research will need to focus on novel pharmacological therapies, especially for hospitalized HF; regenerative cell-based therapies to restore myocardium; and new device platforms that will either improve existing technologies (e.g., CRT, ICD, left VAD) or introduce simpler, less morbid devices that are capable of changing the natural history of HF. What is critically needed is an evidence base that clearly identifies best processes of care, especially in the transition from hospital to home. Finally, preventing the burden of this disease through more successful risk modification, sophisticated screening, perhaps using specific omics
technologies (i.e., systems biology) or effective treatment interventions that reduce the progression from stage A to stage B is an urgent need.
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Appendix 3. Abbreviations

ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme
ACS = acute coronary syndrome
AF = atrial fibrillation
ARB = angiotensin-receptor blocker
BMI = body mass index
BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide
BTT = bridge to transplantation
CABG = coronary artery bypass graft
CAD = coronary artery disease
CPAP = continuous positive airway pressure
CRT = cardiac resynchronization therapy
DCM = dilated cardiomyopathy
ECG = electrocardiogram
EF = ejection fraction
GDMT = guideline-directed medical therapy
HbA1c = hemoglobin A1c
HF = heart failure
HFpEF = heart failure with preserved ejection fraction
HFrEF = heart failure with reduced ejection fraction
HRQOL = health-related quality of life
ICD = implantable cardioverter-defibrillator
LBBB = left bundle-branch block
LV = left ventricular
LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction
MCS = mechanical circulatory support
MI = myocardial infarction
NSAIDs = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
NT-proBNP = N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide
NYHA = New York Heart Association
PUFA = polyunsaturated fatty acids
RCT = randomized controlled trial
SCD = sudden cardiac death
VAD = ventricular assist device
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masoudi JACC 2003;41:217-223 12353812 (1)</td>
<td>To assess factors associated with preserved LVSF in pts with HF</td>
<td>Cross sectional cohort study</td>
<td>19,710</td>
<td>Medicare beneficiary; hospitalized with principal discharge diagnosis of HF; acute care hospitalization; hospitalized between 4/1998-3/1999</td>
<td>No documentation of LVEF</td>
<td>Preserved LVSF</td>
<td>Multivariable logistic regression to assess factors associated with preserved LVSF</td>
<td>Limited to Medicare population; limited to hospitalized pts; missing LVEF in a portion of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owan NEJM 2006;355:251-259 16855265 (2)</td>
<td>Define temporal trends in prevalence of HF with preserved LVEF over 15 y period</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>4,596</td>
<td>Consecutive pts admitted to Mayo Clinic hospitals; Discharge code for HF; 1987-2001</td>
<td>No documentation of LVEF</td>
<td>Proportion of pts with preserved LVSF; survival</td>
<td>Linear regression and survival analysis</td>
<td>Limited to Olmsted County, MN; limited to hospitalized pts; missing LVEF in a portion of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatia NEJM 2006;355:260-269 16855266 (3)</td>
<td>Evaluate the epidemiological features and outcomes of pts with HFpEF vs. HFrEF</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>Pts admitted to 103 Ontario hospitals; 4/1999-3/2001; discharge diagnosis of HF</td>
<td>No documentation of LVEF</td>
<td>Death within 1 y; readmission for HF</td>
<td>Multivariable survival analysis</td>
<td>Limited to Ontario; limited to hospitalized pts; missing LVEF in a portion of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Circulation 2009;119:3070-3077 19506115 (4)</td>
<td>Assess the contribution of risk factors and disease pathogenesis to HFpEF</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>Framingham participants; incident HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Factors associated with HFpEF; Mortality</td>
<td>Multivariable logistic regression (risk factors); multivariable survival analysis (mortality)</td>
<td>Limited to Framingham cohort; relatively small sample size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Data Supplement 2. NYHA and AHA/ACC Class (Section 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madsen BK, 1994 8013501 (6)</td>
<td>Predict CHF mortality</td>
<td>Longitudinal registry</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Must be ambulatory</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Kaplan-Meier Mortality increased with increased NYHA class and with decreased EF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland R, 2010 20142027 (7)</td>
<td>Predict CHF mortality using self-assessed NYHA class</td>
<td>Longitudinal registry</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Readmission over 6 mo</td>
<td>MLHF questionnaire and death</td>
<td>Survival analysis Readmission rate increased with higher NYHA class</td>
<td>No clinician assessment to compare to pt assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anmar KA, 2007 17353436 (8)</td>
<td>Measure association of HF stages with mortality</td>
<td>Cross-sectional cohort</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-y survival rates</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>Survival analysis HF stages associated with progressively worsening 5-y survival rates</td>
<td>Retrospective classification of stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman L, 1981 7296795 (9)</td>
<td>Reproducibility for assessing CV functional class</td>
<td>Longitudinal registry</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reproducibility testing</td>
<td>NYHA classification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reproducibility only 56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; CAD, coronary artery disease; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFREF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HTN, hypertension; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVSF, left ventricular systolic function; MN, Minnesota; N/A, not applicable; pts, patients, and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

BNP indicates B-type natriuretic peptide; CHF, congestive heart failure; CV, cardiovascular; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; MLHF, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure; N/A, not applicable; NYHA, New York Heart Association; and pt, patient.
## Data Supplement 3. Prognosis - Mortality (Section 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Seattle HF Model: Prediction of Survival in HF Levy, Wayne Circ 2006 16534009 (10)</td>
<td>Develop and validate a risk model for 1,2, and 3-y mortality</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Derivation: 1,125 Validation: 9,942</td>
<td>Derivation Cohort: EF &lt;30%, NYHA class III-IV Validation Cohort: EF &lt;40%, NYHA class II-IV Both derivation and validation cohorts primarily out-pts (both clinical trial populations)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Prediction of 1,2,3-y mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 variables included in risk score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting Mortality Among Pts Hospitalized with HF (EFFECT) Lee, Douglas JAMA 2003 14625335 (11)</td>
<td>Develop and validate a risk model for 30-d and 1-y mortality</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Derivation: 2,624 Validation: 1,407</td>
<td>No EF requirement; Community-based pts hospitalized with HF in Canada (met modified Framingham HF criteria) Pts who developed HF after admit, transferred from different facility, over 105 y, nonresidents</td>
<td>30-d and 1-y mortality</td>
<td>Derivation Cohort: in-hospital mortality: 8.9%, 30-d mortality: 10.7%; 1-y mortality: 32.9% Validation cohort: in-hospital mortality: 8.2%, 30-d mortality: 10.4%; 1-y mortality:30.5%</td>
<td>ROC: 0.79 for 30-d mortality; ROC: 0.76 for 1-y mortality</td>
<td>Population not representative of HF population in general: clinical trial populations, restricted to HF with LVSD. Estimation of risk score is complex and requires computer/calculator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of Mortality After Discharge in pts Hospitalized w HF (OPTIMIZE-HF) O'Connor, Christopher AHJ 2008 18926148 (12)</td>
<td>Develop models predictive of 60 and 90 d mortality</td>
<td>Cohort study/registry</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>No EF criteria (49% with LVSD); pts hospitalized with HF at institutions participating in OPIMIZE-HF performance-improvement program</td>
<td>Death at 60-90 d Hospitalization; death or rehospitalization 60-90 d mortality: 8.6%; death or rehospitalization: 36.2% c index: 0.735; bias-corrected c index: 0.723</td>
<td>Validity - assessed by bootstrapping</td>
<td>Developed a nomogram. Variables included in score: Age, weight, SBP, sodium, Cr, liver disease, depression, cirrhosis, cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of Mortality and Morbidity in Pts with Chronic HF</td>
<td>Pocock, Stuart. EHJ 2006 16219658 (13)</td>
<td>Develop prognostic models for 2-y mortality</td>
<td>Cohorts: used pts in the CHARM program</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td>No EF criteria; out-pts; symptomatic HF K &gt;5.5; Cr &gt;265 umol/L; MI or stroke in prior 4 wk; noncardiac disease limiting survival</td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>CV death or hospitalization</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ROC:0.75, bias corrected: 0.74; ROC: 0.73 in low EF and in preserved EF cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Stratification for Inhospital Mortality in Acutely Decompensated HF: Classification and Regression Tree Analysis Fonarow, Gregg JAMA 2005 15687312 (14)</td>
<td>Estimate mortality risk in pts hospitalized with HF</td>
<td>Cohort/registry Derivation:33,046 Validation: 32,229</td>
<td>Pts admitted with HF to hospital participating in the ADHERE registry; no EF criteria;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>In-hospital mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Classification and regression tree analysis; In-hospital mortality: 4.1%; 95% CI2.1%-21.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A validated risk score of in-hospital mortality in pts with HF, from the AHA GWTG Program Peterson, Pamela CircCQO 2010 20123668 (15)</td>
<td>Develop a risk score for in-hospital mortality</td>
<td>Cohort/registry Derivation:27,850; Validation:11,933</td>
<td>Pts admitted with HF to hospitals participating in the GWTG-HF program Transfers, missing LVEF data</td>
<td>Inhospital mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In-hospital mortality</td>
<td>2.86%; C index 0.75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Validation cohort from same population. GWTG is a voluntary registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of in-hospital mortality in pts hospitalized for HF. Insights from OPTIMIZE-HF Abraham, William JACC 2008 18652942 (16)</td>
<td>Develop a clinical predictive model of in-hospital mortality</td>
<td>Cohort/registry 40,201</td>
<td>Pts admitted to hospital participating in OPTIMIZE-HF (registry/performance improvement program); no EF criteria (LVSD in 49% of those with measured EF); included those admitted with different diagnosis than the discharge diagnosis of HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Inhospital mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Inhospital mortality: 3.8%; C index 0.77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Validity - assessed by bootstrapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of fatal and non-fatal outcomes in the CORONA:</td>
<td>Develop prognostic models in elderly pts and</td>
<td>Cohort 3,342</td>
<td>Pts enrolled in the CORONA study. Pts ≥60 y; NYHA class II-IV HF; investigator reported Recent CV event or procedure/operation, acute or chronic liver disease or ALT &gt;2x ULN; BUN &gt;2.5 mg/dL;</td>
<td>Composite: CV mortality, nonfatal MI or nonfatal All-cause mortality; CV mortality, fatal or nonfatal MI; Total mortality; C index of 0.719; death due to HF: C index of 0.80;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Used a clinical trial population; limited to ischemic etiology Elderly pts on contemporary HF therapy; NT-proBNP added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
evaluate the relative prognostic significance of new biomarkers

ischemic etiology; EF ≤40% (or 35% if NYHA II)
chronic muscle disease or unexplained CK >2.5x ULN; TSH >2x ULN; any condition substantially reducing life expectancy
stroke (time to event)
death from any cause or hospitalization for HF
all-cause mortality or HF hospitalization: C index of 0.701 (all models included NT-proBNP)

Comparison of Four Clinical Prediction Rules for Estimating Risk in HF

Examine the performance of 4 clinical prediction rules (ADHERE decision tree, ADHERE regression model, EFFECT, Brigham and Women's Hospital rule) for inpatient death, 30-d death, and in-hospital death or serious complications

Cohort
33,533
Pts with primary ICD-9 discharge diagnosis of HF admitted at one of 2 Pennsylvania hospitals from the ED
N/A
In-hospital mortality; in-hospital mortality or serious complication; 30-d mortality
N/A
In-hospital mortality; 4.5%; In-hospital mortality or serious medical complication: 11.2%; 30-d mortality: 7.9% ADHERE rules could not be used in 4.1% because BUN or SCr were N/A.
N/A
Variability among rules in the number of pts assigned to risk groups and the observed mortality within risk group. EFFECT identified pts at the lowest risk, ADHERE tree identified largest proportion of pts in the lowest risk group.

ADHERE indicates Acute Decompensated Heart Failure National Registry; AHA, American Heart Association; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; CHARM, Candesartan in Heart Failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CORONA, Controlled Rosuvastatin Multinational Trial in HF; CV, cardiovascular; CVD, cardiovascular disease; ED, emergency department; EF, ejection fraction; EFFECT, Enhanced Feedback for Effective Cardiac Treatment; GWTG, Get With the Guidelines; HF, heart failure; Hgb, hemoglobin; HR, heart rate; ICD-9, international classification of diseases; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; MI, myocardial infarction; Na, sodium, N/A, not applicable; NT-proBNP, n-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OPIMIZE-HF, Organized Program to Initiate Lifesaving Treatment in Hospitalized Patients with Heart Failure; pts, patients; RAD, reactive airway disease; ROC, receiver operating characteristic curve; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SCr, serum creatinine; TSH, thyroid stimulating hormone; ULN, upper limit of normal.

Data Supplement 4. Health-Related Quality of Life and Functional Capacity (Section 4.4)
### Improvement in HRQoL after hospitalization predicts event-free survival in pts with advanced HF. Moser et al 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary analysis of data from the ESCAPE trial.</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalized for NYHA class IV, at least 1 sign of fluid overload, EF &lt;30%, history of prior HF hospitalization or chronic high maintenance diuretic doses survived to discharge from index admission.</td>
<td>Event-free survival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRQoL measured with the MLHFQ.

At baseline HRQoL was severely impaired but improved on average at 1 mo (74.2 ± 17.4 vs. 56.7 ± 22.7) and improved most at 6 mo. HRQoL worsened in 51 (16.3%) pts and remained the same in 49 (15.7%). OR: 3.3; p<.009

The only characteristic that distinguished among these groups was whether or not the pt was too ill to perform the 6-min walk. There was a group by time interaction; the degree of improvement across time differed between pts who survived without an event and those who died or were rehospitalized by 6 mo. Pts with events between 1 and 6 mo did not experience as much improvement in HRQoL. A decrease in MLHFQ of >5 points predicted better event-free survival. (p<.0001 group time interaction)

Potential for survivor bias. Self-reported HRQoL. Relatively short follow-up period of 6 mo.

In pts hospitalized with severe HF decompensation, HRQoL is seriously impaired but improves substantially within 1 mo for most pts and remains improved for 6 mo. Pts for whom HRQoL does not improve by 1 mo after hospital admission merit specific attention both to improve HRQoL and to address high risk for poor event-free survival.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary analysis of COACH trial data plus enrollment of a community sample from Netherlands.</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA II-IV, ≥18 y, structural heart disease. Community sample randomly selected from population ≥55 y and not living at same address. 45% response rate.</td>
<td>Enrolled in a study requiring additional research visits or invasive intervention within last 6 mo or next 3 mo, terminal disease, active psychiatric diagnosis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRQoL measured with Medical Outcome Study 36-item General Health Survey and Cantril Ladder of Life. Depressive symptoms with CES-D.

Chronic conditions abstracted from chart of pts, self-reported by community sample. QoL significantly impaired in HF pts compared to matched elderly. Largest differences were in physical functioning and vitality. Role limitations due to physical functioning very low in HF pts. QoL was lower in HF pts with COPD or diabetes. Depressive symptoms higher in HF pts (39% vs 21%) all p<0.001.

Manner in which comorbid conditions were assessed differed between HF pts and controls. List used was not all inclusive.

HF has a large impact on QoL and depressive symptoms, especially in women with HF. Differences persist, even in the absence of common comorbidities. Results demonstrate the need for studies of representative HF pts with direct comparisons to age- and gender-matched controls.
| Ethnic Differences in HRQoL in Persons With HF. | To compare HRQoL in non-Hispanic white, black, and Hispanic adults with HF | Longitudinal comparative study with propensity scoring | 1,212 | Established diagnosis of chronic HF | Recent MI, USA, cognitive impairment, severe psychiatric problems, homeless, or discharged to an extended care or skilled nursing facility | HRQoL measured with the MLHFQ | N/A | HRQoL improved over time (baseline to 3- and 6-mo) in all groups but most dramatically among Hispanics. Hispanics improved more than whites (p<0.0001). Hispanics improved more than blacks (p=0.004). | Secondary analysis of existing data. Hispanic sample was primarily Mexican so results cannot be generalized to all Hispanics. Samples received different treatments at various sites; treatment was controlled in the analysis. Other factors that could explain these differences were not measured. Cultural bias in the data obtained from the MLHFQ is possible. | Cultural differences in the interpretation of and response to chronic illness may explain why HRQoL improves more over time in Hispanic pts with HF compared with white and black pts. |

The impact of chronic HF on HRQoL data acquired in the baseline phase of the CARE-HF study. Calvert, Melanie. 2005 15701474 (22) | To assess the QoL of pts with HF, due to LV dysfunction, taking optimal medical therapy using baseline QoL assessments from the CARE-HF trial, and to evaluate the appropriateness of using the EQ-5D in pts with HF. | RCT | 813 | NYHA II-IV HF | None specified | QoL Euroqol EQ-5D and MLHFQ | N/A | There is a relationship between the EQ-5D score and gender, on average females enrolled had a worse QoL than male participants. r=-0.08; 95% CI: -0.13 to -0.04; p=0.0004 Mean EQ-5D score for NYHA III pts was higher than for NYHA IV pts (mean difference 0.17) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 0.08-0.25 Association between MLWIF and EQ-5D scores (increasing MLWFH associated with a decrease in EQ-5D) r=-0.00795; 95% CI: (-0.00885 to -0.00706); p<0.0001 HF is shown to have an important impact on all aspects of QoL but particularly on pts mobility and usual activities and leads to significant reductions in comparison with a representative sample of the UK population. Pts assessed in the study are not a random sample of pts with severe HF. CARE-HF is an int'l study but used available normative data from a representative sample of the UK population to evaluate burden of disease. A study comparing UK and Spanish time trade-off values for EQ-5D health states demonstrated that although the general pattern of value assignation was similar, there were differences in values assigned to a number of health states. The impact of HF varies amongst pts but the overall burden of disease appears to be comparable to other chronic conditions such as motor neurone or Parkinson’s disease. The EQ-5D appears to be an acceptable valid measure for use in pts with HF although further evidence of the responsiveness of this measure in such pts is required. | The impact of chronic HF on HRQoL data acquired in the baseline phase of the CARE-HF study. Calvert, Melanie. 2005 15701474 (22) | To assess the QoL of pts with HF, due to LV dysfunction, taking optimal medical therapy using baseline QoL assessments from the CARE-HF trial, and to evaluate the appropriateness of using the EQ-5D in pts with HF. | RCT | 813 | NYHA II-IV HF | None specified | QoL Euroqol EQ-5D and MLHFQ | N/A | There is a relationship between the EQ-5D score and gender, on average females enrolled had a worse QoL than male participants. r=-0.08; 95% CI: -0.13 to -0.04; p=0.0004 Mean EQ-5D score for NYHA III pts was higher than for NYHA IV pts (mean difference 0.17) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 0.08-0.25 Association between MLWIF and EQ-5D scores (increasing MLWFH associated with a decrease in EQ-5D) r=-0.00795; 95% CI: (-0.00885 to -0.00706); p<0.0001 HF is shown to have an important impact on all aspects of QoL but particularly on pts mobility and usual activities and leads to significant reductions in comparison with a representative sample of the UK population. Pts assessed in the study are not a random sample of pts with severe HF. CARE-HF is an int'l study but used available normative data from a representative sample of the UK population to evaluate burden of disease. A study comparing UK and Spanish time trade-off values for EQ-5D health states demonstrated that although the general pattern of value assignation was similar, there were differences in values assigned to a number of health states. The impact of HF varies amongst pts but the overall burden of disease appears to be comparable to other chronic conditions such as motor neurone or Parkinson’s disease. The EQ-5D appears to be an acceptable valid measure for use in pts with HF although further evidence of the responsiveness of this measure in such pts is required. | The impact of chronic HF on HRQoL data acquired in the baseline phase of the CARE-HF study. Calvert, Melanie. 2005 15701474 (22) | To assess the QoL of pts with HF, due to LV dysfunction, taking optimal medical therapy using baseline QoL assessments from the CARE-HF trial, and to evaluate the appropriateness of using the EQ-5D in pts with HF. | RCT | 813 | NYHA II-IV HF | None specified | QoL Euroqol EQ-5D and MLHFQ | N/A | There is a relationship between the EQ-5D score and gender, on average females enrolled had a worse QoL than male participants. r=-0.08; 95% CI: -0.13 to -0.04; p=0.0004 Mean EQ-5D score for NYHA III pts was higher than for NYHA IV pts (mean difference 0.17) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 0.08-0.25 Association between MLWIF and EQ-5D scores (increasing MLWFH associated with a decrease in EQ-5D) r=-0.00795; 95% CI: (-0.00885 to -0.00706); p<0.0001 HF is shown to have an important impact on all aspects of QoL but particularly on pts mobility and usual activities and leads to significant reductions in comparison with a representative sample of the UK population. Pts assessed in the study are not a random sample of pts with severe HF. CARE-HF is an int'l study but used available normative data from a representative sample of the UK population to evaluate burden of disease. A study comparing UK and Spanish time trade-off values for EQ-5D health states demonstrated that although the general pattern of value assignation was similar, there were differences in values assigned to a number of health states. The impact of HF varies amongst pts but the overall burden of disease appears to be comparable to other chronic conditions such as motor neurone or Parkinson’s disease. The EQ-5D appears to be an acceptable valid measure for use in pts with HF although further evidence of the responsiveness of this measure in such pts is required. | The impact of chronic HF on HRQoL data acquired in the baseline phase of the CARE-HF study. Calvert, Melanie. 2005 15701474 (22) | To assess the QoL of pts with HF, due to LV dysfunction, taking optimal medical therapy using baseline QoL assessments from the CARE-HF trial, and to evaluate the appropriateness of using the EQ-5D in pts with HF. | RCT | 813 | NYHA II-IV HF | None specified | QoL Euroqol EQ-5D and MLHFQ | N/A | There is a relationship between the EQ-5D score and gender, on average females enrolled had a worse QoL than male participants. r=-0.08; 95% CI: -0.13 to -0.04; p=0.0004 Mean EQ-5D score for NYHA III pts was higher than for NYHA IV pts (mean difference 0.17) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 0.08-0.25 Association between MLWIF and EQ-5D scores (increasing MLWFH associated with a decrease in EQ-5D) r=-0.00795; 95% CI: (-0.00885 to -0.00706); p<0.0001 HF is shown to have an important impact on all aspects of QoL but particularly on pts mobility and usual activities and leads to significant reductions in comparison with a representative sample of the UK population. Pts assessed in the study are not a random sample of pts with severe HF. CARE-HF is an int'l study but used available normative data from a representative sample of the UK population to evaluate burden of disease. A study comparing UK and Spanish time trade-off values for EQ-5D health states demonstrated that although the general pattern of value assignation was similar, there were differences in values assigned to a number of health states. The impact of HF varies amongst pts but the overall burden of disease appears to be comparable to other chronic conditions such as motor neurone or Parkinson’s disease. The EQ-5D appears to be an acceptable valid measure for use in pts with HF although further evidence of the responsiveness of this measure in such pts is required. | The impact of chronic HF on HRQoL data acquired in the baseline phase of the CARE-HF study. Calvert, Melanie. 2005 15701474 (22) | To assess the QoL of pts with HF, due to LV dysfunction, taking optimal medical therapy using baseline QoL assessments from the CARE-HF trial, and to evaluate the appropriateness of using the EQ-5D in pts with HF. | RCT | 813 | NYHA II-IV HF | None specified | QoL Euroqol EQ-5D and MLHFQ | N/A | There is a relationship between the EQ-5D score and gender, on average females enrolled had a worse QoL than male participants. r=-0.08; 95% CI: -0.13 to -0.04; p=0.0004 Mean EQ-5D score for NYHA III pts was higher than for NYHA IV pts (mean difference 0.17) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 0.08-0.25 Association between MLWIF and EQ-5D scores (increasing MLWFH associated with a decrease in EQ-5D) r=-0.00795; 95% CI: (-0.00885 to -0.00706); p<0.0001 HF is shown to have an important impact on all aspects of QoL but particularly on pts mobility and usual activities and leads to significant reductions in comparison with a representative sample of the UK population. Pts assessed in the study are not a random sample of pts with severe HF. CARE-HF is an int'l study but used available normative data from a representative sample of the UK population to evaluate burden of disease. A study comparing UK and Spanish time trade-off values for EQ-5D health states demonstrated that although the general pattern of value assignation was similar, there were differences in values assigned to a number of health states. The impact of HF varies amongst pts but the overall burden of disease appears to be comparable to other chronic conditions such as motor neurone or Parkinson’s disease. The EQ-5D appears to be an acceptable valid measure for use in pts with HF although further evidence of the responsiveness of this measure in such pts is required.
| Characterization of HRQoL in HF pts with preserved vs low EF in CHARM, Lewis et al, 2007 | To characterize HRQoL in a large population of HF pts with preserved and low LVEF and to determine the factors associated with worse HRQoL. Secondary analysis of data from the CHARM trial | 2,709 | “CHARM-Alternative” pts: LVEF ≤40% and not receiving an ACE-I; “CHARM-Added” pts: LVEF ≤40% and taking ACE-I. Pts in NYHA class II required admission to hospital with a CV problem in prior 6 mo (which increased proportion of NYHA class III/IV in CHARM-Added. “CHARM-Preserved” pts had LVEF >40% with or without ACEI | N/A | QoL | N/A | 9 independent clinical determinants of worse HRQoL: younger age, higher BMI, lower SBP, female sex, worse NYHA class, angina, PND, rest dyspnea, lack of ACE-I. Characteristics did not differ by group. LVEF was NS. | Population was healthy enough to enroll so may have fewer comorbidities. Asymptomatic pts were excluded. Only enrolled in Canada and US. Groups without ACE-I therapy may have affected HRQoL. No gold standard for measuring HRQoL. | Independent factors associated with worse HRQoL in both populations included female sex, younger age, higher BMI, lower SBP, greater symptom burden, and worse functional status. |
| The enigma of QoL in pts with HF. Dobre D, 2008 | To review RCTs that assessed the impact of pharmacologic treatments on QoL | N/A | Clinical trials | N/A | QoL | Survival | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Life prolonging therapies, such as ACE-Is and ARBs improve modestly or only delay the progressive worsening of QoL in HF. Beta blockers do not affect QoL in any way. Therapies that improve QoL (e.g., inotropic agents) do not seem beneficial in relation to survival. |
To evaluate whether the use of usual providers and a reorganization of discharge planning and transition care with improved intersector linkages between nurses, could improve QoL and health services utilization for individuals admitted to hospital with HF.

Prospective randomized trial 192
Admitted to hospital with a diagnosis of CHF Residing in the regional home care radius. Expected to be discharged with home nursing care English or French speaking Admitted for more than 24 h to the nursing units
Cognitively impaired (score >8 on Short Portable Mental Status Exam) HRQoL, (MLWHF), symptom distress and function at 6- and 12-wk postdischarge
The no. of all-cause ED visits, hospital readmissions, and QoL measured with a generic measure, Medical Outcome Study Short Form
The overall MLHFQ score was better among the Transitional Care pts than the usual care pts: At 6 wk after hospital discharge (p=0.002) At 12 wk after hospital discharge (p=0.001)
The MLHFQ's Physical Dimension subscale score was better among the Transitional Care pts than the usual care pts: At 6 wk after hospital discharge (p=0.01) At 12 wk after hospital discharge (p=0.001)
The MLHFQ's Emotional Dimension subscale score was better among the Transitional Care pts than the usual care pts at 6 wk after hospital discharge (p=0.008) 46% of the Usual Care group visited the ED compared with 29% in the Transitional Care group (p=0.03) At 12 wk postdischarge, 31% of the Usual Care pts had been readmitted compared with 23% of the Transitional Care pts (p=0.26).

Conducted the trial in a naturalistic manner in the usual setting of care with usual providers. Possibility of contamination with the hospital nurses providing usual care. Pts may have inadvertently alerted the research coordinators of their assignment to usual care or transitional care. With multiple interventions it’s not easy to assess neither the relative contribution of each component nor the synergistic effect of the sum of the parts.

Transitional Care has an important role to play in altering the course of pts hospitalized with HF. Our results suggest that with modest adjustments to usual discharge and transition from hospital-to-home, pts with CHF can experience improved QoL, and decreased use of ED, for 3 mo after hospitalization. This approach will provide the needed adjunct to current management of HF.

ACEI; angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BMI, body mass index; CARE-HF Cardiac Resynchronisation in Heart Failure; CES-D, Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression scale; CHARM, Candesartan in Heart failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity; CHF, congestive heart failure; COACH, Comparative study on guideline adherence and patient compliance in heart failure patients; CTX, chest x-ray; CV, cardiovascular; ED, emergency department; EF, ejection fraction; ESCAPE, Evaluation Study of Congestive Heart Failure and PulmonaryArtery Catheterization Effectiveness; HF, heart failure; HRQoL, health-related quality of life; MI, myocardial infarction; MLHFQ score, Minnesota Living With Heart Failure; N/A, not applicable; NYHA, New York Heart Association; pts, patients; PND, Paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea; QoL, quality of life; RCT, randomized control trial; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Data Supplement 5. Stress Testing (Initial and Serial Evaluation) of the HF Patient (Section 6.1.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining the Optimal Prognostic Window for CPX in Pts with HF. Arena et al. Circ Heart Fail 2010; 3: 405-411</th>
<th>20200329 (26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess the change in prognostic characteristics of CPX at different time intervals</td>
<td>Cohort 1 year 791 51% ischemic HF and LV dysfunction NYHA 2.4 +/- 0.67 N/A Major cardiac events - mortality, LV device implantation, urgent heart transplant Cardiac mortality N/A 75 deaths (of 791) 36 mo FU For 24 mo post CPX (high vs. low Ve/VCO2): cardiac events p&lt;0.001 (95% CI: 2.1 - 5.5); cardiac mortality p&lt;0.001 (95% CI: 2.2 - 5.8) HR: dichotomous3.4; 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of peak exercise oxygen consumption for optimal timing of cardiac transplantation in ambulatory pts with HF. Mancini et al. Circulation 1991;83;778-786</th>
<th>1999029 (27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine if maximal exercise testing and measurement of PKVO2 identifies pts in whom heart transplant can be safely deferred</td>
<td>Observational prospective cohort Focus on hemodynamic and NYHA class 122 52 (PKVO2&gt;14) 35 (PKVO2=&lt;14) 46% ischemic Ambulatory pts referred for heart transplant Unable to perform exercise testing due to angina 70% NYHA III N/A Survival N/A N/A 94% survival in those with high PKVO2 vs. 70% for those with low PKVO2 2 y FU p&lt;0.005 Wide complex tachycardia in 1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine whether PKVO2 is a reliable indicator of prognosis in the beta blocker era</td>
<td>Observational prospective cohort Cutoff of 14 mL/kg1 2.105; n=909 on beta blocker; n=1,196 no beta blocker 52% ischemic Referral for HF with LVEF&lt;35% Age &lt;20, ESRD, prior OHT N/A N/A Death Death or transplantatio n N/A N/A N/A Pts on beta blockers: Death p&lt;0.001, (95% CI: 1.18-1.36); death and transplant p&lt;0.001, (95% CI: 1.18-1.32) aHR: 1.26; 1.25 per 1-mL/min/kg N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPX indicates cardiopulmonary exercise testing; EF, ejection fraction; ESRD, end-stage renal disease; FU, follow up; HF, heart failure; pts, patients; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; N/A, not applicable; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OHT, orthotopic heart transplantation; PKVO2, peak oxygen consumption; and RCT, randomized control trial.
### Data Supplement 6. Clinical Evaluation – History (Orthopnea) (Section 6.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Utility in Detecting Elevated PCWP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, LW; Perloff JAMA 1989:261:884-888 2913385 (29)</td>
<td>Single center, prospective</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Orthopnea within preceding wk 91% of 43 pts with PCWP ≥22 0/7 pts with PCWP &lt;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al Circ HF 2008:1:170-177 19675681 (31)</td>
<td>Multicenter substudy of ESCAPE 194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Orthopnea (≥ 2 pillows) OR 2.1 (95% CI: 1.0-4.4); PPV 66%, NPV 51%; +LR 1.15, (-) LR 1.8; all for PCWP&gt;22 OR 3.6 (95% CI: 1.02 -12.8) for PCWP&gt;30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESCAPE indicates Evaluation Study of Congestive Heart Failure and Pulmonary Artery Catheterization Effectiveness; LR, likelihood ratio; NPV, negative predictive value; OR, odds ratio; PAC, pulmonary artery catheter; PCWP, Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure; PPV, positive predictive value; and pts, patients.

### Data Supplement 7. Clinical Evaluation - Examination (Section 6.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Utility in Detecting Elevated PCWP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, LW; Perloff JAMA 1989:261:884-888 2913385 (29)</td>
<td>Single center, prospective</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>21/28 (75%) of pts with RAP ≥10 had elevated JVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein et al AJC 1997:80:1615-1618 9416951 (33)</td>
<td>Single center</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Class 3-4</td>
<td>RAP estimated from JVP vs. measured RA: r=0.92. Clinical estimates underestimate elevated JVP. Interaction between utility of estimated RAP and measured RAP (more of an underestimate as measured RAP increased). Bias 0.1 (RAP 0-8), 3.6 (RAP 9-14), 5 (RAP ≥15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al Circ HF 2008:1:170-177 19675681 (31)</td>
<td>Multicenter substudy of ESCAPE 194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Estimated RAP for RAP &gt;12 AUC 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, LW; Perloff</td>
<td>Single center, prospective</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Elevated JVP associated with PCWP ≥22 mm Hg. 58% sensitivity, 100% specificity (0/7 with PCWP ≤18 mm Hg). However, 8/18 pts with PCWP ≥35 mm Hg without elevated JVP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakko et al</td>
<td>Single center, prospective</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>“High JVP” for PCWP &gt;20 mm Hg. Sensitivity 70%, Specificity 79%, PPV 85%, NPV 62%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butman et al</td>
<td>Single center, prospective</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>JVD at rest or with HJR for PCWP&gt;18 mm Hg: Sens 81%, Spec 80%, PPV 91%, NPV 63%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgett et al</td>
<td>Literature review “Rational Clinical Examination” series</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Stage D citing above 3 studies</td>
<td>Suggested algorithm: If known low LVEF, and population with high prevalence of increased filling pressure, then elevated JVP is “very helpful” and associated with &gt;90% chance of elevated filling pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al</td>
<td>Multicenter substudy of ESCAPE</td>
<td>194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>JVP≥12 mm Hg for PCWP&gt;22 mm Hg. Sensitivity: 66%, Specificity: 64%, PPV 75%, NPV 52%, +LR 1.79, (-)LR 1.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of SOLVD Treatment Trial</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>Stage C</td>
<td>Multivariate analysis for elevated JVP. Mean f/u 32 months. Death RR 1.15 (95% CI: 0.95-1.38), HF hospitalization 1.32 (95% CI: 1.08-1.62), Death/HF hospitalization 1.30 (95% CI: 1.11-1.53).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of SOLVD Prevention Trial</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>Stage B</td>
<td>Multivariate analysis for elevated JVD. Mean follow-up 34 mo. Development of HF RR 1.38 (95% CI: 1.1-1.7), Death or Development of HF RR 1.34 (95% CI: 1-1.6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Outcome Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al, Circ HF 2008;1:170-177 19675681 (31)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Multicenter substudy of ESCAPE 194 (with PAC)</td>
<td>Enrollment estimated RAP associated with survival outside hospital at 6 mo (Referent RAP&lt;13) RAP 13-16 HR 1.2 (95% CI: 0.96-1.5) RAP &gt;16 HR 1.6 (95% CI: 1.2-2.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer et al, AJC 2009;103;839-844 19268742 (37)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of DIG trial 7788</td>
<td>Mean follow-up 34 mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utility of Valsalva Maneuver for Detecting Elevated PCWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt et al, AJC 1993;71;462-5 8430644 (38)</td>
<td>Single center, prospective study</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Utility of square wave for LVEDP ≥15 mm Hg: sens 100%, spec 91%, PPV 82%, NPV 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocca et al, Chest. 1999; 116:861-7 10531144 (39)</td>
<td>Single center, prospective study</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pulse amplitude ratio by Valsalva correlated with BNP (r=0.6, p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givertz et al, AJC 2001 1213-1215 11356404 (40)</td>
<td>Single center, prospective study of Vericor system 30 men</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Predicted PCWP by Valsalva vs measured PCWP: r=0.9, p&lt;0.001. Mean difference 0.07 ±2.9 mm Hg Predicted PCWP had sensitivity: 91%, specificity: 100% for PCWP ≥18 mm Hg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma et al, Arch Intern Med 2002;162:2084-2088 12374516 (41)</td>
<td>Prospective study of commercial device (VeriCor) at 2 centers 57 pts (2 women)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pulse amplitude ratio correlated with LVEDP (r=0.86) 84% of measurements within 4 mm Hg of LVEDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC indicates area under the concentration curve; BNP, B-Type Natriuretic Peptide; CAD, coronary artery disease; CV, cardiovascular; DIG, Digitalis Investigation Group; f/u, follow-up; ESCAPE, Evaluation Study of Congestive Heart Failure and Pulmonary Artery Catheterization Effectiveness HJR, hepatojugular reflux; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVEDP, Left Ventricular End-Diastolic Pressure; JVD, jugular venous distension; JVP, jugular venous pressure; N/A, not applicable; NPV, negative predictive value; PCWP, Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure; PPV, positive predictive value; Pts, patients; r, Pearson’s correlation coefficient; RAP, right arterial pressure; and SOLVD, Studies of left ventricular dysfunction.
### Data Supplement 8. Clinical Evaluation – Risk Scoring (Section 6.1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient population</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy et al Circulation 2006;113:1424-1433 Seattle HF score 16534009 (10)</td>
<td>Derivation cohort (PRAISE 1); then tested in 5 additional trial databases</td>
<td>1125 (Derivation) 9942 (Validation)</td>
<td>Largely Stage C</td>
<td>Available on website</td>
<td>2 year survival for scores 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 was: 93%, 89%, 78% 58%, 30%, 11% AUC 0.729 (0.71 to 0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocock et al Eur Heart J 2006;27:65-75 CHARM 16219658 (13)</td>
<td>Analysis of CHARM</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td>Stage C HF</td>
<td>21 variables</td>
<td>2 year mortality Lowest to highest deciles 2.5% to 44% C statistic 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaronson et al Circulation 1997;95:2660-7 HF Survival Score 9193435 (2)</td>
<td>Derivation and Validation 2 transplant centers</td>
<td>268 (Derivation) 199 (Validation)</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Ischemic cardiomyopathy, resting heart rate, LVEF, IVCD (QRS duration 0.12 sec of any cause), mean resting BP, peak O2, and serum sodium PCWP (invasive)</td>
<td>3 strata Event-free survival rates at 1 y for the low-, medium-, and high-risk HFSS strata were 93±2%, 72±5%, and 43±7% AUC 1 y 0.76-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas et al Am Heart J 2000;140:840-7 “Congestion Score” 11099986 (43)</td>
<td>Retrospective, single center</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Congestion score: orthopnea, JVD, edema, weight gain, new increase diuretics</td>
<td>Post discharge (4-6 wk) score vs. 2 y death 0: 54% 1-2: 67% 3-5: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nohria et al JACC 2003;41:1797-1804 “Stevenson profiles” 12767666 (44)</td>
<td>Prospective, single center</td>
<td>452 pts</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Stevenson classification Profiles A,B,C,L</td>
<td>Profile B associated with death+urgent transplant in multivariate analysis (HR: 2.5, p=0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner et al Circ HF 2008;1:170-7 “Stevenson profiles” 19675681 (31)</td>
<td>Substudy of ESCAPE</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Stevenson classification</td>
<td>Discharge profile “wet or cold” HR 1.5 (1.1, 2.1) for number of d alive outside hosp at 6 mo in multivariate analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy et al J Heart Lung Tx</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of REMATCH</td>
<td>129 REMATCH</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Seattle HF Score</td>
<td>The 1-y ROC was 0.71 (95% CI: 0.62-0.80).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Model Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorodeski et al</td>
<td>Single center study of ambulatory pts presented to transplant committee</td>
<td>215 (between 2004-2007)</td>
<td>Stage D</td>
<td>Seattle HF score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al</td>
<td>Retrospective study of multiple hospitals in Ontario Canada</td>
<td>2624 (derivation 1999-2001) 1407 (validation 1997-1999)</td>
<td>Hospitalized pts</td>
<td>Age, SBP, RR, Na&lt;136, Hgb &lt;10, BUN, CVA, Dementia, COPD, cirrhosis, Cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow et al</td>
<td>CART analysis of ADHERE national registry 2001-2003</td>
<td>33,046 (derivation) 32,229 (Validation)</td>
<td>Hospitalized pts</td>
<td>BUN ≥43, SBP&lt;115, SCr ≥2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde et al</td>
<td>Single center study 2000-2004</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Hospitalized pts</td>
<td>Cancer, SBP ≤124, Cr &gt;1.4m BUN&gt;37, Na &lt;136, Age&gt;70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hospitalized Patients**

- Predicted and observed mortality rates matched well
- 30 d mortality AUC derivation 0.82 Validation 0.79
- 1 y mortality AUC Derivation 0.77 Validation 0.76
- In-hospital mortality AUC 67-69%
- Mortality ranges from 1.8(low risk) to ~25% (high risk)
- In-hospital mortality Bootstrap C=0.77 (0.689-0.85)
- 6 increasing groups: 0.5%, 7%, 10%, 29%, 83%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS. Syed 2010 20159642 (49)</td>
<td>Evaluate LGE-CMR in identifying CA; investigate associations between LGE and clinical, morphologic, functional, and biochemical features.</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>120 (35 with positive cardiac histology, 49 without cardiac histology but with echo evidence of CA, 36 without histology or echo evidence of CA)</td>
<td>Histologically proven amyloidosis and, in the case of AL amyloidosis, confirmatory evidence of monoclonal protein in the serum or urine and/or a monoclonal population of plasma cells in the bone marrow.</td>
<td>Prior MI, myocarditis, prior peripheral blood stem cell transplantation, or prior heart transplantation</td>
<td>LGE-CMR presentation in pts with amyloidosis; associations between LGE and clinical, morphologic, functional, and biochemical features.</td>
<td>Of the 35 pts with histology, abnormal LGE was present in 97% of the 49 with echo evidence, abnormal LGE was present in 86% of the 36 without histology or ECHO evidence of CA. Abnormal LGE was present in 47%. In all pts, LGE presence and pattern was associated with NYHA functional class, ECG voltage, LV mass index, RV wall thickness, troponin-T, and BNP levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gheorghiade et al Eur J of Heart Failure 2010:12:423-433 ESC Congestion Score 20354029 (48)</td>
<td>Scientific Statement from Acute HF Committee of HF Association of ESC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Congestion score bedside assessment (Orthopnea, JVD, HM, Edema) Lab (BNP or NT proBNP) Orthostatic BP 6 min walk test Valsalva</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Needs to be tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V Rizzello  
2009  
19443475  
(50)  
Evaluate the prognosis of viable pts with and without improvement of LVEF after coronary revascularisation.

Observational 90; group 1: viable pts with LVEF improvement (n=27); group 2, viable pts without LVEF improvement (n=15), group 3, non-viable pts (n=48)

Pts were already scheduled for coronary revascularization according to clinical criteria of reduced LVEF (40%), symptoms of HF and/or angina, presence/absence of ischemia and presence of critical coronary disease at angiography. Only pts who had undergone coronary revascularisation alone were included in the study.

Pts who had undergone mitral valvuloplasty or aneurismectomy in association with revascularisation were excluded.

Cardiac events were evaluated during a 4-y follow-up (cardiac death, new MI, admission to hospital for HF)

Cardiac event rate was low (4%) in group 1, intermediate (21%) in group 2 and high (33%) in group 3. After revascularization, the mean (SD) LVEF improved from 32 (9)% to 42 (10)% in group 1, but did not change significantly in group 2 and in group 3, p=0.001 by ANOVA. HF symptoms improved in both groups 1 (mean (SD) NYHA class from 3.1 (0.9) to 1.7 (0.7)) and 2 (from 3.2 (0.7) to 1.7 (0.9)), but not in group 3 (from 2.8 (1.0) to 2.7 (0.5)), p=0.001 by ANOVA.

The difference in event rate was not statistically significant between groups 1 and 2 -small number of pts- but it was significant between the 3 groups using Kaplan–Meier p=0.01

Kevin C Allman  
2002  
11923039  
(51)  
Examines late survival with revascularization vs medical therapy after myocardial viability testing in pts with severe CAD and LV dysfunction

Meta-analysis of observational studies 3,088 (viability demonstrated in 42%)

Pts with CAD and LV dysfunction who were tested for myocardial viability with cardiac imaging procedures from 24 viability studies reporting pt survival using thallium perfusion imaging, F-18 fluorodeoxyglucose metabolic imaging or dobutamine ECHO.

Those not reporting deaths or where deaths could not be apportioned to pts with vs without viability were excluded

Annual mortality rates, pts followed for 25±10 mo.

For pts with defined myocardial viability, annual mortality rate was 16% in medically treated pts but only 3.2% in revascularized pts ($\chi^2=147, p<0.0001$). This represents a 79.6% relative reduction in risk of death for revascularized pts. For pts without viability, annual mortality was not significantly different by treatment method: 7.7% with revascularization vs 6.2% for medical therapy (p=NS).

The individual studies are observational, nonrandomized, unblinded and subject to publication and other biases. In this metaanalysis, viability could only be interpreted as “present” or “absent” based on individual studies’ definitions

Beanlands RS.  
2002  
12446055  
(52)  
Whether the extent of viability or scar is important in the amount of recovery of LV function and to develop a model for predicting recovery after revascularisation that could be tested in a randomized trial.

Prospective multicenter cohort 82; Complete follow-up was available on 70 pts.

Pts CAD and severe LV dysfunction with EF 35% by any quantitative technique, who were being scheduled for revascularization

Pts with MI within the preceding 6 wk, severe valve disease requiring valve replacement, requirement for aneurysm resection, and inability to obtain informed consent.

Amount of scar was a significant independent predictor of LV function recovery after revascularization. Across tertiles of scar scores (I, small: 0% to 16%; II, moderate: 16% to 27.5%; III, large: 27.5% to 47%), the changes in EFs were 9.0±1.9%, 3.7±1.6%, and 1.3±1.5% (p=0.003: I vs. III), respectively.

Pts population in this study included pts who were predominantly men, predominately between 53-71 y of age (1 SD from the mean), had multivessel disease, and had bypassable vessels. Although improvement in LV function has been noted at 3 mo of follow-up in many previous studies, recent data suggest that more recovery may be observed with longer follow-up time
The viability index was significantly related to 3-y survival free of cardiac event (cardiac death or heart transplant) after CV death or cardiac bypass surgery ($p=0.011$) and was independent of age, EF, and number of diseased coronary vessels. Survival free of cardiac death or transplantation was significantly better in Prior CABG, time to follow-up was 1177 d (range, 590 to 1826) group 1 pts on Kaplan-Meier analysis ($p=0.018$).

Hypothesized that pts with poor ventricular function and predominantly viable myocardium have a better outcome after bypass surgery compared with those with less viability.

### Retrospective cohort

**Paul R. Pagley 1997**

9264484

(53)

*On Cox proportional hazard survival analysis, quantified scar was greater than the median (30% of total myocardium), and female gender predicted events (RR: 1.75; 95% CI: 1.02-3.03 and RR:1.83; 95% CI: 1.06-3.16, respectively, both $p=0.03$).

### Observational prospective

**Senior R. 1999**

19356530

(54)

Selection bias may have favored taking one group to surgery over another.

### Observational

**Kwon DH 2009**

19356530

(55)

Selection bias of an observational study conducted at a large tertiary referral center. Only the pts with no contraindications to CMR underwent the examination.

### Review paper

**Ordovas KG. 2011**

22012903

(56)

AF, atrial fibrillation; AL, Amyloid Light-chain; ANOVA, analysis of variance; CA, cardiac amyloidosis; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CAD, coronary artery disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CMR, cardiovascular magnetic resonance; CV, cardiovascular; DHE-CMR, delayed hyperenhancement cardiac magnetic resonance; ECHO, echocardiography; EF, ejection fraction; Gd, gadolinium; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; LGE-CMR, late gadolinium enhancement cardiac magnetic resonance; LV, left ventricular; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not applicable; NS, not significant; NYHA, New York Heart Association; pts, patients; RV, right ventricular; SD, standard deviation; and SPECT, single-photon emission computed tomography.
### Data Supplement 10. Biopsy (Section 6.5.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper LT, Baughman KL, Feldman AM et al. The role of endomyocardial biopsy in the management of CV disease: Circulation 2007 November 6;116(19):2216-33.</td>
<td>Role of endomyocardial biopsy for management of CV disease</td>
<td>A scientific statement from the AHA, ACC, &amp; ESC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasper EK, Agema WR, Hutchins GM, Deckers JW, Hare JM, Baughman KL. The causes of dilated cardiomyopathy: a clinicopathologic review of 673 consecutive pts. J Am Coll Cardiol 1994 March 1;23(3):586-90.</td>
<td>To document causes of DCM in a large group of adult HF pts</td>
<td>Retrospective Cohort</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>DCM pts with symptoms within 6 mo, evaluated at Johns Hopkins Hospital 1982-1991</td>
<td>Most common causes of DCM: idiopathic (47%), myocarditis (12%) and CAD (11%), other causes (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowles RE, Mason JW. Endomyocardial biopsy. Ann Intern Med 1982 December;97(6):885-94.</td>
<td>Complication risk with RV biopsies</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complication rate of 1% in 4000 biopsies (performed in transplantation and CMP pts) 4 tamponade (0.14%), 3 pneumothorax, 3 AF, 1 ventricular arrhythmia, and 3 focal neurological complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deckers JW, Hare JM, Baughman KL. Complications of transvenous right ventricular endomyocardial biopsy in adult pts with cardiomyopathy: a seven-year survey of 546 consecutive diagnostic procedures in a tertiary referral center. J Am Coll Cardiol 1992 January;19(1):43-7.</td>
<td>To determine the incidence, nature and subsequent management of complications occurring during RV endomyocardial biopsy in pts with cardiomyopathy</td>
<td>Prospective Cohort</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>546 consecutive biopsies for DCM pts at single center,</td>
<td>33 total complications (6%): 15 (2.7%) during catheter insertion; 12 arterial punctures (2%), 2 vasovagal reactions (0.4%) and 1 prolonged bleeding (0.2%), 18 (3.3%) during biopsy: 6 arrhythmias (1.1%), 5 conduction abnormalities (1%), 4 possible perforations (0.7%) and 3 definite perforations (0.5%), 2 (0.4%) of the 3 pts with a perforation died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardehali H, Qasim A, Cappola T et al. Endomyocardial biopsy plays a role in diagnosing pts with unexplained cardiomyopathy. Am Heart J 2004 May;147(5):919-23.</td>
<td>To evaluate the utility of RV biopsy in confirming or excluding a clinically suspected diagnosis</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>Pts with initially unexplained cardiomyopathy (1982-1997) at The Johns Hopkins Hospital.</td>
<td>Clinical assessment of the etiology inaccurate in 31% EMBx helps establish the final diagnosis in most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holzmann M, Nicko A, Kühl U, et al. Complication rate of right ventricular endomyocardial biopsy via the femoral approach. A retrospective and prospective study analyzing 3048 diagnostic procedures over an 11-year period. Circulation 2008;118:1722–8.</td>
<td>To determine complication rate of RV biopsy</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>1919 pts underwent 2505 endomyocardial biopsy retrospectively (1995-2003), and 496 pts underwent 543</td>
<td>Major complications cardiac tamponade requiring pericardiocentesis or complete AV block requiring permanent pacing rare: 0.12% in the retrospective study and 0% in the prospective study. Minor complications such as pericardial effusion, conduction abnormalities, or arrhythmias in 0.20% in the retrospective study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
endomyocardial biopsy prospectively (2004-2005) to evaluate unexplained LV dysfunction and 5.5% in the prospective study


Data Supplement 11. Stage A: Prevention of HF (Section 7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd-Jones et al, The lifetime risk for developing HF; Circulation, 2002; 106:3068-3072 12473553 (64)</td>
<td>Examine lifetime risk of developing CHF among those without incident or prevalent disease</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>8229</td>
<td>Free of CHF at baseline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lifetime risk is 1 in 5 for men and women; significant association between MI and HTN in lifetime risk of CHF. Subjects mostly white and results not generalizable to other races.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasan et al, Residual lifetime risk for developing HTN in middle-aged women and men; JAMA, 2002;287:1003-1010. 11866648 (65)</td>
<td>Quantify risk of HTN development</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>Ages 55-65 y and free of HTN at baseline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Residual lifetime risk for developing HTN was 90%. Risk did not differ by sex or age, lifetime risk for women vs men aged 55 y, HR: 0.91 (95% CI, 0.80-1.04); for those aged 65 y, HR:0.88 (95% CI, 0.76-1.04) Measured HTN in middle age, when a large portion of people develop HTN at younger ages so actual risk may be different for younger people. Did not take into account other risks for HTN like obesity, family history of high BP, dietary sodium and potassium intake, and alcohol consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy et al, The progression from HTN to CHF; JAMA, 1996;276:1557-62 8622246 (66)</td>
<td>Analysis of expected rates of HF associated with diagnosis of HTN</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>Free of CHF at baseline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developmen t of HF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Those with HTN at a higher risk for CHF: Men, HR: 2.04; 95% CI: 1.50-2.78; Women, HR: 3.21; 95% CI: 2.20-4.67 Subjects mostly white and results not generalizable to other races. Possible misclassification bias as some subjects diagnosed w/HTN before use of echocardiography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>RR (95% CI)</td>
<td>p Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelmsen et al, 2001 1285045 (67)</td>
<td>Identification of risk associated with HTN</td>
<td>Population-based intervention trial</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developmen t of HF</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CAD and HTN were the most common concomitant diseases in HF pts (79.1%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelmsen et al, HF in the general population of men: morbidity, risk factors, and prognosis; J Intern Med 2001;249:293-261</td>
<td>To assess the effect of antihypertensive care on the incidence of HF in older pts with systolic HTN: JAMA 1997;276:212-216. 9218667 (68)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>4,736; 2,365; 2,371</td>
<td>Age ≥60y, Isolated systolic HTN: SBP 160-219 mm Hg with DBP &lt;90 mm Hg.</td>
<td>Recent MI, CABG, DM, alcohol abuse, dementia, stroke, AF, AV block, multiform premature ventricular contractions, bradycardia &lt;50 beats/min; diuretic therapy.</td>
<td>Fatal and non-fatal HF</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>49% reduction RR: 0.51; 95% CI: 0.37-0.71; p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostis, et al, Prevention of HF by antihypertensive drug treatment in older persons with isolated systolic HTN; JAMA 1997;278:212-216. 9218667 (68)</td>
<td>Assessment of various drugs and their reduction of HF</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>120,574</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CV events</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CCB, resulted in better stroke protection than older drugs: including (-8%, p=0.07) or excluding verapamil (-10%, p=0.02), as well as ARB (-24%, p=0.0002). The opposite trend was observed for ACEI (+10%, Pp=0.03). The risk of HF was higher (p&lt; 0.0001) on CCB (+33%) and alpha blockers (+102%) than on conventional therapy involving diuretics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staessen, Wang and Thijs; CV prevention and BP reduction: a quantitative overview updated until 1 March 2003; J Hypertens 2003;21:1055-1076 12777939 (69)</td>
<td>Compare various drugs and risk for HF</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>223,313</td>
<td>Studies had to be RCTs from 1997-2009, pts with HTN or a population characterized as having a ‘high’ CV risk profile and a predominance of pts with HTN (&gt;65%); the sample size ≥200 pts; and information on the absolute incidence of HF and</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Diuretics vs. placebo: OR: 0.59; 95% Crt: 0.47-0.73; ACE-I vs. placebo: OR: 0.71; 95% Crt: 0.59-0.85; ARB: OR: 0.71; 95% Crt: 0.59-0.85. Beta blockers and CCB less effective</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>A1C</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lind et al.</td>
<td>Glycaemic control and incidence of HF in 20985 pts with type 1 diabetes: an observational study. Lancet 2011; Jun 24. 21705065 (71)</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>20.985 or higher A1C &lt;6.5%</td>
<td>Type 1 DM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A1C ≥10.5% vs A1C &lt;6.5%: aHR: 3.96; 95% CI: 2.23-7.14; p&lt;.001; Used hospital admissions and did not include asymptomatic HF pts, so true incidence of HF underestimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfister, et al.</td>
<td>A clinical risk score for HF in pts with type 2 diabetes and macrovascular disease: an analysis of the PROactive study. Int J Cardiol. 2011;May 31. 21636144 (72)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>Type 2 DM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium risk: HR: 3.5; 95% CI: 2.0-6.2; p&lt;0.0001 High risk: HR: 10.5; 95% CI: 6.3-17.6; p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenchaiah et al.</td>
<td>Obesity and the risk of HF. NEJM, 2002;347:305-313. 12151467 (73)</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>5,881</td>
<td>≥30 y; BMI ≥18.5; free of HF at baseline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Women, HR: 2.12; 95% CI: 1.51-2.97 Men, HR: 1.90; 95% CI: 1.30-2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenchaiah, Sesso, Gaziano</td>
<td>Body mass index and vigorous physical activity and the risk of HF among men. Circulation. 2009;119:44-52. 19103991 (74)</td>
<td>Prospective cohort, secondary analysis of RCT</td>
<td>21,094</td>
<td>Free of known heart disease at baseline.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Incidence of HF</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Every 1 kg/m2 increase in BMI is associated with 11% (95% CI: 9-13) increase in risk of HF. Compared to lean active men: Lean inactive: HR:1.19; 95% CI: 0.94-1.51, Overweight active: HR:1.46; 95% CI: 1.30-1.71), Overweight inactive: HR: 1.78; 95% CI: 1.43-2.23), Obese active: HR: 2.68; 95% CI: 2.08-3.45, Obese inactive: HR: 3.93; 95% CI: 2.60-5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Hazard Ratio (HR) or Odds Ratio (OR)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdecchia et al.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Telmisartan, ramipril, or their combination</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>LVH</td>
<td>OR: 0.79, 95% CI: 0.68-0.91</td>
<td>p = 0.0017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnosis of LVH was based on ECG, which is less sensitive than echocardiography and was binary (yes/no) instead of quantitative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in individuals at high vascular risk in ONTARGET and TRANSCEND.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunaold et al; ACE inhibition in stable coronary artery disease. NEJM 2004;351:2058-2065.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Telmisartan vs. ramipril</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Major CV events</td>
<td>HR: 0.95, 95% CI: 0.88-1.06</td>
<td>p = 0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Results not significant possibly because the pts enrolled were at lower risk for CV events compared to other trials of ACEI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills et al.</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>Telmisartan vs. ramipril</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Major CV events</td>
<td>RR: 0.84, 95% CI: 0.77-0.95</td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al, Statins for the primary prevention of CV disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2011; CD004816 21249663</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>RCTs of statins with minimum duration of 1 y and flu of 6 mo, in adults with no restrictions on their total LDL or HDL cholesterol levels, and where ≤10% had a hx of CVD, were included.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All-cause mortality and fatal/nonfatal CVD</td>
<td>RR: 0.84, 95% CI: 0.73-0.96</td>
<td>Fatal/non-fatal CVD: RR: 0.70, 95% CI: 0.61-0.79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abramson et al; Moderate alcohol consumption and risk fo HF among older persons. JAMA, 2001;285:1971-1977. 11308433</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>Age ≥65 y; lived in New Haven, Conn, and free of HF at baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>All-cause mortality and fatal/nonfatal CVD</td>
<td>RR: 0.84, 95% CI: 0.73-0.96</td>
<td>Fatal/non-fatal CVD: RR: 0.70, 95% CI: 0.61-0.79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Observational study, could not account for all possible confounders, alcohol consumption was self-reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Assessment of risk associated with alcohol use</td>
<td>Community based cohort</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>New CHF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Compared to men who consumed &lt;1 drink/wk, men who consumed 8-14 drinks/wk: HR for CHF: 0.41; 95% CI: 0.21-0.81. In women: those who consumed 3-7 drinks/wk HR: 0.49; 95% CI: 0.25-0.96, compared with those who consumed &lt;1 drink/wk.</td>
<td>Self-reported alcohol consumption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du et al; Cardiac risk associated with the receipt of anthracycline and trastuzumab in a large nationwide cohort of older women with breast cancer, 1998-2005. Med Oncol, 2010;Oct 22. 20967512 (82)</td>
<td>To assess whether early ECHO measurements of myocardial deformation and biomarkers (hsTnI and NT-proBNP) could predict the development of chemotherapy-induced cardiotoxicity in pts treated with anthracyclines and trastuzumab. Prospective cohort</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Elevated hsTnI at 3 mo (p =0.02) and a decrease in longitudinal strain between baseline and 3 mo (p =0.02) remained independent predictors of later cardiotoxicity. Neither the change in NT-proBNP between baseline and 3 mo nor an NT-proBNP level higher than normal limits at 3 mo predicted cardiotoxicity</td>
<td>Small sample size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawaya et al; Early detection and prediction of cardiotoxicity in chemotherapy treated pts. Am J Cardiol, 2011; 107:1375-90. 21371685 (83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiotoxicity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>NT-proBNP as a predictor of death, CV events</td>
<td>Evaluation of markers for HF development in the community</td>
<td>Evaluation of albuminuria as risk for new HF</td>
<td>Assessment as to whether baseline cTnT or changes predict HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee et al; The prognostic value of NT-proBNP for death and CV events in healthy normal and stage A/B HF subjects. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2010;55:2140-2147. 20447539 (84)</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>Age ≥45 y, lives in Olmsted County, Minnesota</td>
<td>Symptomatic HF (stages C and D HF)</td>
<td>Death, HF, CVA, MI</td>
<td>8.9 years</td>
<td>HR: 1.26 per log increase in fully adjusted model in stage A/B pts (95% CI: 1.05–1.51; p=0.015). NT-proBNP was not predictive of death or CV events in the healthy normal subgroup.</td>
<td>Underpowered to detect association of NT-proBNP with adverse outcomes in the healthy normal subgroup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velagaleti et al; Multimarker approach for the prediction of HF incidence in the community. Circulation, 2010;122:1700-1706. 20937976 (85)</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>Free of HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>BNP: aHR: 1.52; 95% CI: 1.24–1.87; p&lt;0.0001 UACR: aHR: 1.35; 95% CI: 1.11–1.66; p=0.004</td>
<td>Subjects mostly white and results not generalizable to other races.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blecker et al; High normal albuminuria and risk of HF in the community. Am J Kidney Dis, 2011; 58:47-55. 21549483 (86)</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>10,975</td>
<td>Free of HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>aHR: 1.54 (95% CI: 1.12-2.11) UACR normal to intermediate-normal; aHR: 1.91 (95% CI: 1.38-2.66) high-normal; aHR: 2.49 (95% CI: 1.77-3.50) micro; aHR: 3.47 (95% CI: 2.10-5.72) macro (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deFilippi et al; Association of serial measures of cardiac troponin T using a sensitive assay with incident HF and CV mortality in older adults. JAMA, 2010; 304:2494-2502. 21078811 (87)</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Complex &gt;99th percentile at baseline: 6.4; change from neg to pos: 1.61 increase.</td>
<td>Samples were available in ~3/4 of the cohort at baseline, and differential absence of cTnT measures may have introduced bias into the estimates of associations with HF and CV death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; AV, atrioventricular; BMI, body mass index; BP, blood pressure; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CAD, coronary artery disease; CCB, calcium channel blocker; CHF, congestive heart failure; cTnT, cardiac troponin T; CV, cardiovascular; CVA, cerebrovascular accident; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; ECG, electrocardiography; HDL, high density lipoprotein; HF, heart failure; hsTnI,
Data Supplement 12. Stage B: Preventing the Syndrome of Clinical HF With Low EF (Section 7.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
<th>OR: HR: RR:</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACE Inhibitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Captopril on</td>
<td>Investigate whether captopril could reduce morbidity and mortality in pts</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>Within 3-60 d of MI; EF &lt;40%; no overt HF or ischemic symptoms; age 21-80 y</td>
<td>All-cause mortality; CV mortality; mortality &amp; decrease in EF of 9 units;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All-cause mortality 19% (95% CI: 3-32%; p=0.019); CV mortality 21% (95% CI: 5-35%; p=0.001); development of severe HF 37% (95% CI: 20-50%; p&lt;0.001); HF hospitalization 22% (95% CI: 4-37%; p=0.019); recurrent MI 29% (95% CI: 5-40%; p=0.015)</td>
<td>Risk Reduction: Low rate of beta-blocker use; Recruitment 1967-1990: significant changes in revascularization strategies</td>
<td>Reduction in severe HF and HF hospitalization among pts with MI and LVSD without symptoms of HF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality and Morbidity</td>
<td>with LVD after MI Pfeffer, Marc A; NEJM 1992 (SAVE) 1386652 (89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development of overt HF (despite diuretics and digoxin therapy); hospitalization for HF; fatal or nonfatal MI; mean f/u 42 months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pts with LVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Enalapril on</td>
<td>Study the effect of an ACEI, enalapril, on outcomes in pts with LVSD not</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>4228</td>
<td>EF&lt;35%, not receiving diuretics, digoxin or vasoconstrictors for HF (asymptomatic LVSD)</td>
<td>Development of HF &amp; mortality; HF hospitalization &amp; mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk Reduction: All-cause mortality 8% (95% CI: 6-12%); CV mortality 25% (95% CI: 13-30%); mortality &amp; development of HF 29% (95% CI: 2-30%); mortality &amp; HF hospitalization 20% (95% CI: 8-32%); p=0.001</td>
<td>Low rate of beta-blocker use</td>
<td>Reduction in combined endpoints of development of HF &amp; mortality and HF hospitalization and mortality among pts with asymptomatic LVSD</td>
<td>Low rate of beta-blocker use; Recruitment 1967-1990: significant changes in revascularization strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality and the</td>
<td>receiving drug therapy for HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of HF in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptomatic Pts with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced LVEF. SOLVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigators. NEJM 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SOLVD Prevention) 14469330 (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effect of enalapril on 12-y survival and life expectancy in pts with LVSD: a follow-up study. Jong, P. Lancet 2003 12788569 (91)

12-y follow-up of SOLVD to establish if the mortality reduction with enalapril among pts with HF was sustained and whether subsequent reduction in mortality would emerge among those with asymptomatic ventricular dysfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>SOLVED prevention and treatment trial populations alive at completion of RCTs</th>
<th>All-cause mortality</th>
<th>In combined trials (Prevention and Treatment), enalapril extended median survival 9.4 mo (95% CI 2.6-16.5; p=0.004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In the Prevention Trial mortality 50.9% in enalapril group vs. 56.4% in placebo group; p=0.001. In overall cohort, HR for mortality 0.9 (0.84-0.95); p=0.003 for enalapril vs. placebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statins

### Intensive Statin Therapy and the Risk of Hospitalization for HF After an ACS in the PROVE IT-TIMI 22 Study Scirica, Benjamin M JACC 2006 16750703 (92)

Determine whether intensive statin therapy reduces hospitalization for HF in high risk pts (intensive statin therapy simvastatin 80 mg vs. moderate statin therapy pravastatin 40mg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>ACS (AMI or high-risk UA) within 10 d; total cholesterol &lt;240 mg/dL; stable condition; Life-expectancy &lt;2 y; PCI within the prior 6 mo (other than for qualifying event); CAGB within 2 mo; planned CAGB</th>
<th>Hospitalization for HF (time to first HF hospitalization that occurred 30 d or longer after randomization)</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,162</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meta-analysis of 4 large RCTs of statin therapy (TNT, A to Z, IDEAL, PROVE-IT) N=27,546 Reduction in HF hospitalization: OR: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.63-0.84; p&lt;0.001 when adjusted for heterogeneity = 2.25, p=0.523)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atorvastatin 80mg associated with reduction in HF hospitalization: 1.6% vs. 3.1%; HR 0.55; 95% CI: 0.35-0.85; p=0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-study of PROVE IT-TIMI 22. Did not exclude those with prior HF (low rates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Intensive vs a Delayed Conservative Simvastatin Strategy in Pts with ACS. Phase Z of the A to Z Trial. To compare early initiation of an intensive statin regimen with delayed initiation of a less intensive regimen in pts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>STEMI or NSTEMI; total cholesterol ≤250 mg/dL; age 21-80; at least 1 high-risk characteristic (&gt;70, DM, hx of CAD, PVD or Receiving statin therapy, planned CAGB, PCI planned within 2 wks of enrollment, ALT level &gt;20% ULN, Cr &gt;2.0mg/dL, Composite: CV death, non-fatal MI, readmission for ACS, stroke</th>
<th>Individual components of primary endpoint and revascularization due to documented ischemia, all-cause</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,479</td>
<td></td>
<td>New onset HF reduced with intensive therapy: 5% vs 3.7%; HR 0.72; 95% CI: 0.53-0.98; p=0.04 Primary endpoint did not achieve significance: 16.7% vs 14.4%; HR 0.89; 95% CI: 0.76-1.04; p=0.14 Development of HF was a secondary endpoint Did not achieve primary endpoint</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In pts with ACS, intensive statin therapy reduced new onset HF Also performed meta-analysis of 4 large statin trials (2 ACS, 1 hx of MI, 1 clinically evident CHD) demonstrating benefit of intensive statin therapy in preventing HF hospitalizaton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Name, Author, Year</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Supplement 13. Stage C: Factors Associated With Outcomes, All Patients (Section 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ACS acute coronary syndrome; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; CABG, coronary artery bypass surgery; CAD, coronary artery disease; CHD, chronic heart disease; CKMB, creatine kinase-MB; Cr, creatinine; CV, cardiovascular; DM, diabetes mellitus; ESG, electrocardiogram; EF, ejection fraction; f/u, follow-up; HF, heart failure; HTN, hypertension; hx, history; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; LVD, left ventricular dysfunction; MI, myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction; PCI, Percutaneous coronary intervention; PROVE IT-TIMI 22, Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy -- Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 22; Pts, patients; PVD, Peripheral artery disease; RCT, randomized control trial; SAVE, The Survival and Ventricular Enlargement trial; SOVLD, Studies of Left Ventricular Dysfunction; STEMI, ST elevation myocardial infarction; UA, unstable angina; and ULN, upper limit of normal.
<p>| Effect of discharge instructions on readmission of hospitalized pts with HF: do all of the joint commission on accreditation of healthcare organizations HF core measures reflect better care? VanSuch, M. 2006 17142589 (95) | To determine whether documentation of compliance with any or all of the 6 required discharge instructions is correlated with readmissions to hospital or mortality. | Retrospective study | 782 | Age ≥18 y, principal diagnosis of HF, hypertensive heart disease with HF, or hypertensive heart and renal disease with HF, discharged to home, home care or home care with IV treatment. | Pts discharged to skilled nursing facilities or other acute-care hospitals. | Time to: death and readmission for HF or readmission for any cause | N/A | 68% of pts received all instructions, and 6% received no instructions. Pts with all instructions (compared to those who missed at least one type of instruction) were significantly less likely to be readmitted for any cause or HF (p=0.003). Documentation of discharge instructions was correlated with reduced readmission rates. No association between documentation of discharge and instructions and mortality. | Discharge instructions given but not documented. Discharge instructions could be a surrogate indicator for another intervention such as higher quality nursing care. Pt factor could have influenced confounding results. Generalizability limited. No active follow-up. Not all quality of care outcomes were assessed. | Documentation of discharge information and pt education appears to be associated with reductions in both mortality and readmissions. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge education improves clinical outcomes in pts with chronic HF. Koelling, T. 2005</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Admitted to hospital with a diagnosis of HF and documented left ventricular systolic dysfunction (EF ≤40%)</td>
<td>Evaluation for cardiac surgery, Noncardiac illness likely to increase 6-mo mortality or hospitalization risk, inpatient cardiac transplantation evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of days hospitalized or dead in the 180-d follow-up period.</td>
<td>Clinical events, symptoms, and self-care practices. The intervention group vs. controls had fewer days hospitalized or dead in the 180-d follow-up period (p=0.009), lower risk of rehospitalization or death (RR: 0.65; 95% CI: 0.45-0.93, p=0.018), as well as lower costs of care, including cost of the intervention (lower by $2823 per pt, p=0.035).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Diagnosis of HF (either LVEF &lt; 40% by ECHO or at least 2 of these criteria: pulmonary rates, peripheral edema, a 3rd heart sound and signs of HF on chest x-ray).</td>
<td>Somatic disease, physical handicap with difficulty communicating or handling technical equipment, inability to speak Swedish, incompletion due to alcohol/drug abuse or major psychiatric illness, Participation in another trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference in rate of all cause readmission and death within 6 mo after discharge.</td>
<td>Intervention group achieved better knowledge and a marginally better outcome (p=NS). Intention to treat analysis showed a 37% completed questionnaire, pts had to come twice to the CD-based education, first as inpts, then 2 wk after discharge. Returning to the hospital may have discouraged participation, especially in sicker pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of an interactive CD-program on 6 mo readmission rate in pts with HF- a RCT. Linne, A. 2006</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Diagnosis of HF (either LVEF &lt; 40% by ECHO or at least 2 of these criteria: pulmonary rates, peripheral edema, a 3rd heart sound and signs of HF on chest x-ray).</td>
<td>Somatic disease, physical handicap with difficulty communicating or handling technical equipment, inability to speak Swedish, incompletion due to alcohol/drug abuse or major psychiatric illness, Participation in another trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference in rate of all cause readmission and death within 6 mo after discharge.</td>
<td>Intervention group achieved better knowledge and a marginally better outcome (p=NS). Intention to treat analysis showed a 37% completed questionnaire, pts had to come twice to the CD-based education, first as inpts, then 2 wk after discharge. Returning to the hospital may have discouraged participation, especially in sicker pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Intervention</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-based education for pts with chronic HF.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Diagnosis of HF</td>
<td>Knowledge of HF, treatment compliance, self-care and QoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To evaluate the effects of a single-session, interactive computer-based educational program on knowledge, compliance and QoL in HF pts. To assess gender differences.</td>
<td>Follow-up after a RCT</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>Outpt with stable, chronic HF</td>
<td>Death and hospitalization for HF, 1 and 3 y after intervention ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term result after a telephone intervention in chronic HF.</td>
<td>Systematic review of RCTs</td>
<td>7,413 pts from 35 trials</td>
<td>RCTs evaluating a self-management education program with patient-specific outcome measures.</td>
<td>Programs incorporated 20 educational topics in 4 categories: knowledge and self-management, social interaction and support, fluid management, and diet and activity. 113 unique outcomes were measured and 53% showed significant improvement in at least one study. Education on: sodium restriction associated with decreased mortality (p=0.07), appropriate follow-up associated with decreased cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF self-management education: a systematic review of the evidence.</td>
<td>Systematic review of RCTs</td>
<td>7,413 pts from 35 trials</td>
<td>RCTs evaluating a self-management education program with patient-specific outcome measures.</td>
<td>Programs incorporated 20 educational topics in 4 categories: knowledge and self-management, social interaction and support, fluid management, and diet and activity. 113 unique outcomes were measured and 53% showed significant improvement in at least one study. Education on: sodium restriction associated with decreased mortality (p=0.07), appropriate follow-up associated with decreased cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of sequential education and monitoring program on QoL components in HF. Cruz, Fatima das Dores. 2010 20670963 (101)</td>
<td>Did not identify educational techniques used, Measured only knowledge as an outcome.</td>
<td>cost.</td>
<td>(p=0.10), management and recognition of worsening function associated with lower social functioning (p= 0.10). Discussion of fluids associated with increased hospitalization (p=0.01) and increased cost (p=0.10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine if a DMP applied over the long-term could produce different effects on each of the QoL components.</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis (Extension of REMADHE trial, a RCT)</td>
<td>Under ambulatory care in a tertiary referral center and followed by a cardiologist with experience in HF. Age ≥18 Irreversible HF based on the modified Framingham criteria for at least 6-mo</td>
<td>Unable to attend educational sessions or who could not be monitored due to lack of transportation, or social or communication barriers, MI or unstable angina within past 6 mo, cardiac surgery or angioplasty within past 6 mo, hospitalized or recently discharged, any severe systemic disease that could impair expected survival, procedures that could influence follow-up, pregnancy or child-bearing potential</td>
<td>Change in QoL components during follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To evaluate the effects of social relationships on mortality risk in pts with stable, symptomatic CHF.

Follow-up study

19

Diagnosed with HF

Unable to complete the questionnaires due to mental debilitation, previous heart transplantation

Perceived social support and isolation.

N/A

Social isolation a significant predictor of mortality (controlling for neuroticism, HF severity, functional status, gender, age): RR= 1.36; 95% CI: 1.04-1.78; p<0.03

Small sample size

Perceived social isolation an independent predictor of mortality in HF pts during a 6-y follow-up period. Experience of social isolation seems to be more critical than lack of social support.

To review the literature on what is scientifically known about the impact of social support on outcomes in pts with HF.

Review

17 studies

Studies that investigated the relationship between social support and different outcomes in HF.

None specified

Social support and different outcomes in HF (rehospitalizations and mortality; the relationship between QoL and depression was less clear).

N/A

Social support is a strong predictor of hospital readmissions and mortality in HF pts. Emotional support in particular is important. Some studies show that support is also related to the prevalence of depression and with remission of major depression in HF. Less evidence to support a relationship between social support and QoL.

To examine whether social deprivation has an independent effect on emergency cardiac hospitalization in pts with chronic HF.

Cohort study

478


None specified

Emergency hospital admissions (all causes and for cardiac causes only)

N/A

Social deprivation significantly associated with an increase in the number of cardiac hospitalizations (p=0.007).

Effect mainly caused by increasing the proportion of pts hospitalized in each deprivation category. 20% in deprivation category 1−2 vs. 40% in deprivation category 5−6 (p= 0.03).

Effect of deprivation: independent of disease severity. Possible explanations are that doctors who look after socially deprived pts have a lower threshold for cardiac hospitalization or that social deprivation alters the way a HF pt accesses medical care during decompensation. Understanding how social deprivation influences both doctor and pt behavior in the prehospital phase is crucial to reduce the amplifying effect that social deprivation has
<p>| Social support and self-care in HF. Gallager, R. 2011 | To determine the types of social support provided to HF pts and the impact of differing levels of social support on HF pts' self-care | Cross-sectional, descriptive (COACH sub-study) | 333 | Admitted to hospital for HF at least once before the initial hospitalization of the original study Age &gt;18 y NYHA II-IV; evidence of underlying structural heart disease | Undergone cardiac surgery or PCI in the previous 6 mo, or if these procedures or heart transplantation was planned, Unable to participate in the COACH intervention or to complete the data collection forms | Self-care and social support | N/A | High level of support, compared to low or moderate levels reported significantly better self-care (p= .002) | Secondary analysis. Social support not prespecified in COACH trial. The measure and categories of social support have not been used previously either separately or as a composite measure. It is likely that other important factors influence HF self-care behavior as the multivariate model was not adequate. | The presence of social support by a partner is not sufficient to influence HF pts' self-care. Social support provided by partners needs to be of a quality and content that matches HF pts' perception of need to influence self-care. |
| Comorbidities | A qualitative meta-analysis of HF self-care practices among individuals with multiple comorbid conditions. Dickson, V. 2011 | To explore how comorbidity influences HF self-care | Qualitative meta-analysis | 99 pts from 3 trials | Mixed method studies. Included pts with HF with at least 1 comorbid condition | None specified | Perceptions about HF and HF selfcare | N/A | Narrative accounts revealed the most challenging self-care skills: adherence to diet, symptom monitoring, and differentiating symptoms of multiple conditions. Emerging themes included: 1) attitudes drive self-care prioritization and 2) fragmented self-care instruction leads to poor self-care integration and self-care skill deficits. | Generalizability limited due to homogeneous sample. Interpretation of findings relied on interview data available from the primary studies. Findings may be biased because samples were recruited from HF specialty settings, possibly better managed clinically than community samples. | Individuals with multiple chronic conditions are vulnerable to poor self-care because of difficulties prioritizing and integrating multiple protocols. Adherence to a low-salt diet, symptom monitoring, and differentiating symptoms of HF from other chronic conditions are particularly challenging. Difficulty integrating self-care of different diseases and fragmented instructions regarding those conditions may contribute to poor outcomes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Cohort study</td>
<td>Medicare beneficiaries hospitalized during 1999</td>
<td>HF was not a primary cause of any admission during 1999, Comorbid dementia or organic brain syndrome diagnosis</td>
<td>Psychiatric comorbidity and rehospitalization risk, length of hospitalization, and costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Overall, 15.8% of pts hospitalized for HF had a coded psychiatric comorbidity.</td>
<td>Most commonly coded comorbid psychiatric disorder was depression (0.5% of the sample) (p&lt; 0.001).</td>
<td>Claims usage based administrative data. Information unavailable regarding the severity of HF in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claims usage based administrative data. Information unavailable regarding the severity of HF in the sample.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claims usage based administrative data. Information unavailable regarding the severity of HF in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-sectional design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychiatric comorbidity appears in a significant minority of pts hospitalized for HF and may affect their clinical and economic outcomes. The associations between psychiatric comorbidity and use of inpatient care are likely to be underestimated because psychiatric illness is known to be under detected in older adults and in hospitalized medical pts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Diagnosis of chronic HF and/or a history of MI during a 2-mo period in 1999</td>
<td>Combined drug regimens given to 48% of HF pts (2.2 drugs on average). Pt characteristics accounted for 35%, 42% and 10% of the variance in 1-, 2- and 3-drug regimens, respectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI, AF, DM, HTN, and lung disease influenced prescribing most (OR=1.3; 95% CI: 1.2-1.4) AF made all combinations containing beta blockers more likely. For single drug regimes, MI increased the likelihood of non-recommended beta blocker monotherapy while for combination therapy, recommended regimes were most likely. For both HTN and DM, ACEI were the most likely second drugs were beta blockers in HTN and digoxin in DM.</td>
<td>Drug regimens defined to make comparisons within levels of similar treatment intensity possible. Adherence rates depend on the indicators used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pt characteristics have a clear impact on prescribing in European primary care. Up to 56% of drug regimens were rational, taking pt characteristics into account. Situations of insufficient prescribing, such as pts post MI, need to be addressed specifically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To determine the impact of pt characteristics and comorbidities on chronic HF management, and to identify areas of prescribing that could be improved.

Claire usage based administrative data. Information unavailable regarding the severity of HF in the sample. The possibility that outcomes may be worse for pts with coded comorbid psychiatric diagnoses as opposed to the presence of the conditions themselves cannot be excluded. Cross-sectional design. Psychiatric comorbidity appears in a significant minority of pts hospitalized for HF and may affect their clinical and economic outcomes. The associations between psychiatric comorbidity and use of inpatient care are likely to be underestimated because psychiatric illness is known to be under detected in older adults and in hospitalized medical pts.
To discuss in more detail the impact of co-existing HTN, DM, COPD in pts with HF.

About 50% of pts with untreated HTN will develop HF. Pressure overload leads to the development of LV hypertrophy and diastolic dysfunction.

DM occurs in about 20–30% of pts with HF.

COPD occurs in approximately 20–30% of HF pts.

Anemia occurs in 20–30% of HF pts and is associated with functional impairment and increased mortality and morbidity. Combined treatment with erythropoietin and intravenous iron has shown beneficial effects on clinical symptoms and morbidity.

No limitations addressed.

This review of the literature clearly demonstrates that noncardiac comorbidities are common in pts with HF and that it is important to recognize these conditions and take them into consideration when selecting treatment for these pts. Appropriate treatment of the HF as well as the concomitant diseases will improve the prognosis of these pts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Supplement 14. Nonadherence (Section 7.3.1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of telehealth by older adults to manage HF. Dansky, K. 2008 20078015 (110)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Admitted to a home health agency, Primary or secondary diagnosis of HF</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>Self-management of HF.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Confidence is a predictor of self-management behaviors. Pts using a video-based telehealth system showed the greatest gain in confidence levels with time (p=0.035). Small sample size. The home health agencies may have limited the external validity of the study. Examination of the effects of the telehealth interventions on specific behaviors was not possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristics and inhospital outcomes for nonadherent pts with HF: findings from GWTG-HF. Ambardekar, A. 2009 19781426 (111) | Cohort study | 54,322 | Ages >18, pts reported in the GWTG-HF database from January 1, 2005-December 30, 2007 | Pts with new diagnoses of HF | 2 groups: Those in whom nonadherence contributed to HF admission and those without nonadherence. | Hospital outcomes and quality of care among nonadherent pts vs. those who were adherent. | Multivariate analysis of characteristics of nonadherence: Younger age (per y decrease) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 1.019-1.026; Male gender (vs. female) p<0.0001; 95% CI: (1.196-1.358); Nonwhite race (vs. white) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 1.358-1.632 No health insurance (vs. insurance) p<0.0001; 95% CI: 1.236-1.633 Multivariate analysis of outcomes with vs. without nonadherence: Mortality 1.55% v. 3.49%; p<0.0001 95% CI: 0.51-0.86 Mean length of stay 4.99 d vs. 5.63 p= 0.0017; 95% CI: 0.92-0.97 Rates of nonadherence may be underestimated due to self reporting and biased based on pt characteristics. GWTG-HF is a voluntary program so could over-represent high-performing hospitals. Data collected by chart reviews, only inhospital measures were tracked so long term follow-up unknown. Nonadherence is a common precipitant for HF admission. Medication nonadherence greater in younger pts, ethnic minorities and uninsured whereas dietary nonadherence was observed in older, overweight and diabetic pts. Nonadherent pts present with evidence of lower EF and greater volume overload yet have an inhospital course characterized by a shorter LOS and lower mortality. Care of nonadherent pts conformed with Joint Commission core measures but at lower rates with other.
| Utilization of and adherence to drug therapy among Medicaid beneficiaries with CHF | N/A | 45,572 | Living in Arkansas, California, Indiana or New Jersey, enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid with pharmacy benefit coverage during 1998 and 1999 or until death | Stays in nursing home facilities at any time during 1999 | Adherence based on: MPR (no. of d a pt is supplied with ≥1 HF drug in relation to the no. of dbetween the pt's first and last prescription dates), MP (no. of d of continuous use of HF medications per mo) | N/A | Odds of having a HF prescription claim were higher with people: Age 65-74 vs. <65: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.193-1.344 Age 75-84 vs. <65: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.458-1.676 Age ≥85 vs. <65: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.162, 1.353 Dual Eligible: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.466-1.580 Disabled: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.388-1.537 Had CAD: p<0.01; 95% CI: 3.309-3.676 Had DM: p<0.01 95% CI: 2.085-2.284 Hospitalized for HF in 1998: p<0.01; 95% CI: 1.579-1.701 Odds of having a HF prescription claim were lower among - Blacks vs. whites: p<0.01; 95% CI: 0.735-0.795 Other/unknown ethnic group vs. whites: p<0.01 95% CI: 0.840-0.919 Men vs. women: p<0.01 95% CI: 0.722-0.775 Adherence better among age ≥85 y than ≤64 y, men than women, racial and ethnic minorities, dual guideline-based therapies. | Measures of use and adherence are proxies based on prescriptions filled versus observations; findings may overestimate adherence to HF medications. Diagnoses recorded in claims may be incomplete, resulting in the omission of some pts from the study. Limited number of states may lead to biased results if Medicaid beneficiaries in study states are different than other states. | 15.2% of diagnosed beneficiaries were not using any HF medications. Adults <65 y, men, ethnic minorities with hospital admissions for conditions other than HF, and beneficiaries with high CDPS scores had lower adherence. |
| Drug copayment and adherence in chronic HF: effect on cost and outcomes. Cole, A. 2006 | Eligible and disabled, those with CAD or DM, those with HF related hospitalization (p<0.01).
Adherence lower among those with larger proportions of claims for generic HF drugs, higher CDPS risk scores and those with non-HF-related hospitalizations (p<0.01). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To measure the associations among prescription copayment, drug adherence and subsequent health outcomes in pts with HF</td>
<td>Retrospective Cohort Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,259 receiving ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5,144 receiving Beta Blockers | For pts taking ACEI, a $10 increase in copayment was associated with a 2.6% decrease in MPR (95% CI: 2.0 - 3.1%)
This change in adherence was associated with:
- a predicted 0.8% decrease in medical costs (95% CI: -4.2 - 2.5%)
- a predicted 6.1% increase in the risk of hospitalization for chronic HF (95% CI: 0.5 - 12%).
For pts taking beta blockers, a $10 increase in copayment was associated with a 1.8% decrease in MPR (95% CI: 1.4 - 2.2%)
This change in adherence was associated with:
- a predicted 2.8% decrease in medical costs (95% CI: -5.9 - 0.1%)
- a predicted 8.7% increase in the risk of hospitalization for chronic HF (95% CI: 3.8 - 13.8%)
Using prescription dispensing data to assess drug adherence eliminates pts to whom a drug is dispensed only once so may have contributed to high adherence observed.
Dispensing data does not capture actual usage. ACEI more expensive than beta blockers resulting in higher copayment. Total medical costs might have been insensitive to specific changes in adherence to HF therapies. |
| 2,373 receiving both | Among pts with HF, higher drug copayments were associated with poorer adherence, although the magnitude of change was small and did not affect total health care costs. It was sufficient to increase risk of hospitalization for HF though. |
| In Ingenix Research Data Mart, diagnosed with HF, and enrolled in commercial and/or Medicare supplemental plans in 2002; ≥2 physician visits or hospitalizations related to HF in 2002; $100-10,000 in costs associated with HF diagnoses in 2002; continuously enrolled in health plan for all of 2002 and at least 1 d in 2003. ACEI and/or beta blockers dispensed at least twice. | Receiving 1 dispensing of ACEI, receiving 1 dispensing of beta blockers, had switched ACEI, had switched beta blockers, MPR <20% or >120%, had conflicting data in their dispensing records |
| Total cost of health care and hospitalization for HF MPR: proportion of d a pt was exposed to a drug while receiving a regimen |

Using prescription dispensing data to assess drug adherence eliminates pts to whom a drug is dispensed only once so may have contributed to high adherence observed. Dispensing data does not capture actual usage. ACEI more expensive than beta blockers resulting in higher copayment. Total medical costs might have been insensitive to specific changes in adherence to HF therapies.
| The impact of perceived adverse effects on medication changes in HF pts. De Smedt, R. 2010 | To evaluate the impact of perceived adverse HF drug effects | Retrospective Cohort Study | 754 Hospitalized for symptomatic HF NYHA class II-IV Age ≥18 Evidence of structural underlying heart disease Invasive procedures in the mo before or planned within 3 mo after baseline Already enrolled in other studies Follow-up treatment at another HF clinic | Impact of perceived adverse effects on likelihood and type of changes of potential causal cardiovascular medication & initiation of medication to alleviate the adverse effect. | Risk of a related medication change significantly increased after dry cough, nausea, dizziness, or diarrhea. Dry cough showing the highest increase in risk (83%; 95% CI: 1.35-2.49) Pts with gout had a 4-fold higher likelihood of having alleviating medication started or intensified (95% CI: 2.23-8.05) With dry cough, a 10-fold increase in the likelihood of having ACE inhibitor switched to an ARB (95% CI: 3.2-35.55) Pts with gout had a 3-fold higher likelihood of having diuretics temporarily discontinued and reinitiated at a lower dosage (95% CI: 1.09-10.04) | Cannot be certain that the reported problems resulted from medication. Focused on specific medication changes and did not take all possible adequate actions into account. Recall bias possible- pts may not have reported all perceived problems in the questionnaires. A considerable number of HF pts perceived possible AEs. The likelihood of medication being changed after pts perceived AEs was low. A high number of pts perceive medication AE. |
| Associations between outpatient HF process-of-care measures and mortality. Fonarow, G. 2011 | To examine the relationships between adherence to several current and emerging outpatient HF process measures and clinical outcomes. | Longitudinal/ Registry | 15,177 Clinical diagnosis of HF or post-MI, LVEF <35%, >2 office visits with a cardiologist in the last 2 y Noncardiovascular medical condition associated with an estimated survival of ≤1 y, received cardiac transplantation | Process-of-care HF measures: ACE inhibitor or ARB use, beta blocker use, aldosterone antagonist use, anticoagulant therapy for AF or flutter, CRT with defibrillator or pacemaker, ICD, and HF education for eligible pts. | Each 10% improvement in composite care was associated with a 13% lower odds of 24-mo mortality (p <0.0001; 95% CI: 0.84-0.90) All process measures, except aldosterone antagonist use, were each independently associated with improved 24-mo survival (p <0.01 for all except aldosterone antagonist use). | Errors and omissions in the medical chart review process could have occurred. NYHA functional status was not quantified in many of the records, and was instead based on qualitative description. This study analyzed medications prescribed rather than actual pt adherence. Follow-up on vital status was not achieved for all pts. Race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status or pt adherence may be confounding variables. Findings may not apply to practices that differ from the IMPROVE HF outpatient cardiology practices in this. These data demonstrate that adherence to HF process measures for ACEI/ARB, beta blocker, anticoagulation for AF, and HF education is significantly associated with survival in outpts with HF. These HF measures may be useful for assessing and improving HF care. |
A nurse-based management program in HF pts affects females and persons with cognitive dysfunction most. Karlsson, M. 2005

To assess the effect of a nurse-based management program aimed at increasing HF pts' knowledge about disease and self-care and to relate the results to gender and cognitive function.

Substudy of the OPTIMAL project- a RCT

208 Age >60 Systolic dysfunction EF <45% NYHA II-IV

None specified Pt knowledge of HF and self-care.

N/A At baseline men knew more about HF compared to women (p<0.01).

Females in the intervention group increased their knowledge of self-care between baseline and 6 mo compared to the female control group (p <0.05).

Pts with cognitive dysfunction (MMSE <24) presented lower scores on knowledge as compared to those with a MMSE of >24 at baseline. These differences disappeared after the intervention (p<0.01).

Some pts were included one d after hospitalization and some the d before discharge; condition improvement may explain low number of pts scoring low on the MMSE. The drop-out rate was high in the MMSE sub-study.

Nurse-based outpt clinic with specially trained nurses effective in increasing pt knowledge about self-care. Females and those with cognitive impairment gain from such programs.
Pharmacist intervention to improve medication adherence in HF. Murray, M. 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist intervention to improve medication adherence in HF. Murray, M. 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Age &gt;50 y, confirmed diagnosis of HF, regularly used at least 1 CV medication for HF, not using or not planning to use a medication container adherence aid, access to a working telephone, and adequate hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short and long-term results of a program for the prevention of readmissions and mortality in pts with HF: are effects maintained after stopping the program? Ojeda, S. 2005</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Discharged with a primary diagnosis of HF from the hospital cardiology ward. Terminal disease, expected survival &lt;6 mo, possibility of specific etiology treatment, wait list for heart transplant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ps were not permitted to use medication container adherence aids. Intervention involved 1 pharmacist and a single study site that served a large, indigent, inner-city population of pts. Because the intervention had several components, results could not be attributed to a single component.

A pharmacist intervention for outpts with HF can improve adherence to cardiovascular medications and decrease health care use and costs, but the benefit probably requires constant intervention because the effect dissipates when the intervention ceases.
Excessive daytime sleepiness is associated with poor medication adherence in adults with HF. Riegel, et al 2011 21440873 (119)

To determine if medication adherence differs in adults with HF and EDS compared to those without EDS and to test cognition as the mechanism of the effect.

Prospective cohort comparison study 280 Chronic stage C HF confirmed, able to complete the protocol (vision, hearing, English literacy), no more than mild cognitive impairment

Living in a long term care setting, working nights or rotating shifts, renal failure requiring dialysis, imminently terminal illness, plans to move out of the area, history of serious drug or alcohol abuse in prior y, major depression

Self-reported medication adherence

Cognition measured with a battery of neuropsychological tests

62% were nonadherent with medication regimen.

Medication nonadherence was significantly more common in those with EDS

Subjects with EDS and cognitive decline were >2 times more likely to be nonadherent (aOR 2.36, 95%CI: 1.12-4.99; p=.033).

Secondary models using the Epworth Sleepiness score:

The odds of nonadherence increased by 11% for each unit increase in ED (aOR 1.11, 95%CI: 1.04-1.19; p=.025).

Subjects with EDS and mild cognitive decline were 1.6 times more likely to be nonadherent over 6 mo follow-up (aOR 1.61; 95%CI: 1-03-2.50; p=.001).

The group with EDS but without cognitive decline was twice as likely to be nonadherent (p=.014).

9% increase in the odds of nonadherence for each unit increase in EDS (p=.001).

Lack of cognitive vigilance associated with nonadherence. (p=.024)

Medication adherence was self-reported.

HF pts who are sleepy have difficulty paying attention and thus forget to take their medications.
| Compliance with non-pharmacological recommendations and outcome in HF pts, van der Wal et al, 2010 20436049 (120) | To investigate the association between compliance with non-pharmacological recommendations (diet, fluid restriction, weighing, exercise) and outcome in pts with HF. Secondary analysis of data from the COACH trial | 830 | Recently hospitalized for symptomatic HF, confirmed by the cardiologist, with evidence for underlying heart disease. Invasive intervention within the last 6 mo or planned for the next 3 mo, inclusion in another study with additional visits to provider, or evaluation of CTX. Composite of death or HF readmission and the number of unfavorable d. Mortality and readmission for HF. Pts non-compliant with ≥1 recommendations had a higher risk of mortality or HF readmission (p=0.01). Non-compliance with exercise was associated with an increased risk for mortality or HF readmission (p=0.01). Non-compliance with daily weighing was associated with an increased risk of mortality (p=0.02). Non-compliance (overall) and non-compliance with exercise were associated with a higher risk for HF readmission (p<0.05). Pts who were overall non-compliant or with weighing and exercise had more unfavorable d than compliant pts (p= 0.01). Almost half had a first diagnosis of HF during the index hospitalization and then compliance was evaluated 1 mo after discharge, which could have influenced rates. ‘Unfavorable d’ difficult to evaluate. Self-report instrument used to measure compliance. Socially desirable responses possible. | HF pts who follow prescribed nonpharmacologic therapy have better outcomes than those who do not. Exercise and monitoring of daily weights are particularly important. |

| Compliance with non-pharmacological recommendations and outcome in HF pts, van der Wal et al, 2010 20436049 (120) | To investigate the association between compliance with non-pharmacological recommendations (diet, fluid restriction, weighing, exercise) and outcome in pts with HF. Secondary analysis of data from the COACH trial | 830 | Recently hospitalized for symptomatic HF, confirmed by the cardiologist, with evidence for underlying heart disease. Invasive intervention within the last 6 mo or planned for the next 3 mo, inclusion in another study with additional visits to provider, or evaluation of CTX. Composite of death or HF readmission and the number of unfavorable d. Mortality and readmission for HF. Pts non-compliant with ≥1 recommendations had a higher risk of mortality or HF readmission (p=0.01). Non-compliance with exercise was associated with an increased risk for mortality or HF readmission (p=0.01). Non-compliance with daily weighing was associated with an increased risk of mortality (p=0.02). Non-compliance (overall) and non-compliance with exercise were associated with a higher risk for HF readmission (p<0.05). Pts who were overall non-compliant or with weighing and exercise had more unfavorable d than compliant pts (p= 0.01). Almost half had a first diagnosis of HF during the index hospitalization and then compliance was evaluated 1 mo after discharge, which could have influenced rates. ‘Unfavorable d’ difficult to evaluate. Self-report instrument used to measure compliance. Socially desirable responses possible. | HF pts who follow prescribed nonpharmacologic therapy have better outcomes than those who do not. Exercise and monitoring of daily weights are particularly important. |

| Nonpharmacologic Measures and Drug Compliance in Pts with HF: Data from the EuroHF Survey, Lainscak et al, 2007 17378994 (121) | To describe the recall of and adherence to nonpharmacologic advice of pts enrolled in the European HF Survey | 2,331 | Clinical diagnosis of HF | After hospitalization for HF, pts recalled receiving 4.1 ± 2.7 items of advice with some regional differences. Recall of dietary advice was higher (63%) than for influenza vaccination (36%) and avoidance of NSAIDS (17%). Among those who recalled the advice, many did not follow it completely (cholesterol and fat intake 61%; dietary salt 63%; influenza vaccination 75%; avoidance of NSAIDS 80%). A few indicated they ignored the advice completely. Pts who recalled >4 items versus <4 items were younger and more often received ACE-I (71% vs 62%), beta blockers (51% vs 38%), and spironolactone (25% vs 21%). Younger pts who were more mobile and had greater social support were more likely to attend interview. Possible response bias. | Younger age and prescription of appropriate pharmacologic treatment are associated with higher rates of recall and implementation. |

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AE, adverse event; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; CAD, coronary artery disease; CBPS, Chronic Illness and disability payment system; CHF, congestive heart failure; COACH, Community Outreach and Cardiovascular Health; CTX, chest x-ray; CRT, Cardiac resynchronization therapy; CV, cardiovascular; DM, diabetes mellitus; ED, emergency department; EDS, excessive daytime sleepiness; EF, ejection fraction; GWTG-HF, Get with the Guidelines-Heart Failure; HF, heart failure; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; IMPROVE-HF, The Registry to Improve the Use of Evidence-Based Heart Failure Therapies in the Outpatient Setting; LOS, length of stay; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MACE, major adverse cardiac event; MD, medical doctor; NHDS, National Health and Diet Survey; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OSAS, obstructive sleep apnea; PA, pulmonary artery; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; QRS, QRS duration; R wave, R wave; SF, Schoenfeld; SGLT2, sulfonylurea; Sigma-T, Sigma-T assay; TIA, transient ischemic attack; TV, tricuspid valve; VPC, ventricular premature complex.
ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire; MMSE, Mini Mental State Examination; MP, Medication Persistence; MPR, medication possession ratio; N/A, not applicable; NSAID, nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OPTIMAL, optimising congestive heart failure outpatient clinic project; pts, patients; QoL, quality of life; and RCT, randomized clinical trial.

### Data Supplement 15. Treatment of Sleep Disorders (Section 7.3.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous positive airway pressure for central sleep apnea and HF (CANPAP). Bradley, T.D. et al. 2005</strong> 16282177 (122)</td>
<td>To test the hypothesis that long-term treatment of CSA with CPAP in HF pts receiving optimal medical therapy reduces the combined rates of death and heart transplant.</td>
<td>11 center RCT</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Age 18 to 79 y, NYHA II-IV, HF due to ischemia, HTN, or idiopathic DCM, stable condition, optimal medical therapy for 1+ mo, LVEF &lt;40%, CSA with ≥15 apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) and &gt;50% of AHI had to be central.</td>
<td>Death and heart transplantation, EF, exercise capacity, QoL, neurohormones</td>
<td>No difference between control (n=130) and CPAP (n=128) groups in number of hospitalizations, QoL, ANP levels. No difference in overall event rates (p=0.54).</td>
<td>Underpowered because trial stopped early for low enrollment</td>
<td>CPAP did not extend life, decrease transplant rate in CSA but may be indicated for OSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppresion CSA by CPAP and transplant-free survival in HF. Arzt, M. 2007 17562959 (123)</strong></td>
<td>To investigate whether suppression of CSA below threshold by CPAP would improve LVEF and heart transplant–free survival.</td>
<td>Post-hoc analysis of a randomized trial.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Age 18 to 79 y, NYHA II-IV HF due to ischemic, hypertensive, or idiopathic DCM, stabilized with optimal medical therapy for at least 1 month LVEF &lt;40%, Central sleep apnea</td>
<td>Combined rate of all-cause mortality or heart transplantation, Apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) mean nocturnal SaO2, and LVEF</td>
<td>Despite similar CPAP pressure and hours of use in the 2 groups, CPAP-CSA– suppressed subjects, compared to controls, experienced: A greater increase in LVEF at 3 mo (p=0.001)</td>
<td>Stratification of CPAP-treated pts based on polysomnogram performed 3 mo after randomization. Because suppressed and unsuppressed status could not be ascertained until completion of PSG, events that occurred during the first 3 mo could not be included; more deaths occurred in the pts randomized to CPAP than control (5 vs. 3). The CPAP-CSA–</td>
<td>These results suggest that in HF pts, CPAP may improve both LVEF and heart transplant–free survival if CSA is suppressed soon after it begins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of continuous positive airway pressure on sleep structure in heart failure pts with central sleep apnea. Ruttanaumpawan, P. 2009 19189783 (124)

To determine whether attenuation of CSA by CPAP in pts with HF reduces the frequency of arousals from sleep or improves sleep structure.

RCT 205

Age 18 to 79 y; NYHA II - IV HF due to ischemic, hypertensive, idiopathic DCM, stabilized on optimal medical therapy ≥ 1 mo, LVEF <40% by radionuclide angiography, CSA defined as an AHI ≥ 15, with >50% of apneas and hypopneas central in nature

Pregnancy, MI, UA or cardiac surgery within 3 mo of enrollment, obstructive sleep apnea

Apnea-hypopnea index and frequency of arousals.

N/A

In controls, there was no change in AHI or frequency of arousals.

No significant change in AHI or frequency of arousals in CPAP group.

(p<0.001).

Attenuation of CSA by CPAP does not reduce arousal frequency in HF pts. Arousals not mainly a consequence of CSA and may not have been a defense mechanism to terminate apneas in the same way they do in OSA.

Relationship between beta blocker treatment and the severity of CSA in chronic HF. Tamura, A. 2007 17218566 (125)

To examine the relationship between use of beta blockers and the severity of CSA in HF.

Cohort study 45

Chronic HF NYHA II-III LVEF <50%.

Previous cerebrovascular disease, Recent (<6 mo) acute coronary syndrome, chronic respiratory disease

Polysomnography, echocardiography, plasma BNP levels

N/A

Pts receiving beta blockers compared to pts not receiving beta blockers had: lower AHI, lower CAI. Negatively correlated with the dose of carvedilol were: AHI, CAI

Multiple regression analysis selected no use of beta blockers as an independent factor of CAI.

In 5 pts with CAI >5 who underwent serial sleep studies, CAI decreased significantly after 6 mo of treatment with carvedilol.

Small sample size. Did not measure central chemosensitivity to CO2.

In pts with chronic HF, CAI was lower according to the dose of beta blockers. No use of beta blockers was independently associated with CAI. 6 mo of treatment with carvedilol decreased CAI. These results suggest that beta blocker therapy may dose-dependently suppress CSA in pts with chronic HF.

Influence of CRT on different types of SDB. Oldenburg, O. 2007 17467333 (126)

To investigate the influence of CRT on SDB in pts with severe HF.

Prospective non-randomized study 77

Eligible for CRT, present with dyspnea, NYHA III-IV LBBB with QRS ≥150

None specified.

Cardiorespiratory polygraphy. NYHA class, frequency of nycturia,

N/A

CSA was documented in 38 (47%) pts, OSA in 26 (34%), and no SDB in 15 (19%).

Categorization of hemodynamic response based on a novel scoring system

In pts with severe HF eligible for CRT, CSA is common and can be influenced by CRT.
msec, LVEDD ≥60mm, LVEF of ≤35%, peak VO2 during standardized cardiopulmonary exercise testing, ≤18 ml/kg/min, during initial testing of several LV-lead positions (posterolateral veins), RV-stimulation sites (apex vs. RVOT) and LV vs. biventricular pacing, pulse pressure as a surrogate parameter of haemodynamic acute response had to increase by >10%.

cardiopulmonary exercise, 6-min walk test, and echocardiography parameters.

Sleep disordered parameters improved in CSA pts only: AHI, SaO2min, Desaturation (p<0.001)
Daytime capillary pCO2 was significantly lower in CSA pts compared to those without SDB with a trend towards increase with CRT (p=0.02).
After classifying short term clinical and hemodynamic CRT effects, improved SDB parameters in CSA occurred in responders only (p=0.004).

not prospectively validated. Prospectively followed CRT pts without calculating statistical power needed to show results for pts without SDB, those with OSA, or CSA in advance.

Improvement depends on good clinical and hemodynamic response to CRT.

AHI indicates apnea hypopnoea index; ANP, atrial natriuretic peptide; BNP, B-Type natriuretic peptide; CAI, central apnea index; CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; CRT, cardiac resynchronisation therapy; CSA, central sleep apnea; DM, dilated cardiomyopathy; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; HTN, hypertension; LBBB, left bundle branch block; LVEDD, left ventricular end diastolic diameter; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not applicable; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OSA, obstructive sleep apnea; pts, patients; QoL, quality of life; RV, right ventricular; RVOT, right ventricular outflow tract; SDB, sleep disordered breathing; UA, unstable angina.

Data Supplement 16. Cardiac Rehabilitation-Exercise (Section 7.3.1.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Type
- Inclusion Criteria
- Exclusion Criteria
- Primary Endpoint
- Secondary Endpoint
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Clinical Outcomes</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiremodeling effect of long-term exercise training in pts with stable chronic HF. Giannuzzi, Pantaleo. 2003 12860904 (127)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>HF secondary to idiopathic DCM, IHD or valvular disease LVEF &lt;35% by ECHO. Clinical stability for at least 3 mo under optimized therapy NYHA II-III Peak oxygen uptake (VO2) &lt; 20mL/kg/min at ergospirometry Echocardiographic images of adequate quality for quantitative analysis</td>
<td>Any systemic disease limiting exercise, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, Valvular disease requiring surgery, Angina pectoris, Sustained ventricular arrhythmias, Severe hypertension, Excess variability &gt;10% at baseline cardiopulmonary exercise test</td>
<td>Cardiopulmonary exercise testing, 6MWT, echocardiography, and QoL.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined endurance-resistance training vs. Endurance training in pts with chronic HF: a prospective randomized study. Beckers, Paul. 2008 18515805 (128)</td>
<td>Prospective randomized study</td>
<td>Chronic HF due to ischemic or dilated cardiomyopathy LVEF &lt;40% NYHA II-III. Optimal and stable pharmacological treatment Recent ACS or revascularization in the past 3 mo, actively listed on the transplant list, logistic problems, exercise limited by angina or peripheral arterial occlusive disease, cerebrovascular or musculoskeletal disease preventing exercise training, respiratory limitation</td>
<td>VO2 peak, ventilatory prognostic parameters, upper and lower limb strength, and QoL</td>
<td>In the combined endurance-resistance training (compared to the endurance training group): SSW increased: p=0.007; Decrease in heart rate at SSW: p=0.002; VO2 peak halftime was reduced: p=0.001 Maximal strength in upper limbs increased: p=0.001 HRQoL improved (reported decrease of cardiac symptoms): p= 0.003; 95% CI: 1.11-12.46.</td>
<td>In chronic HF pts, combined endurance-resistance training had a more pronounced effect on submaximal exercise capacity, muscle strength, and quality of life. The absence of unfavorable effects on left ventricular remodelling and outcome parameters is reassuring and might facilitate further implementation of this particular training modality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Outcome Measures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of hospital-based versus home-based exercise training in pts with HF: effects on functional capacity, QoL, psychological symptoms, and hemodynamic parameters. Karapolat, Hale. 2009</td>
<td>Randomized study</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Diagnosed with HF for at least 3 mo, HF as a result of ischemic and dilated cardiomyopathy, clinical stability for at least 3 mo, LVEF ≤40%, NYHA II-III, optimal and standard pharmacological treatment, ability to speak and understand Turkish, absence of psychiatric disease, ability to remain stable during exercise tests.</td>
<td>Neurological, orthopedic, peripheral vascular, or severe pulmonary disease, NYHA class IV, UA pectoris, poorly controlled or exercise-induced cardiac arrhythmias, recent ACS or revascularization (&lt;3 mo), significant valvular heart disease, AF, uncontrolled arterial HTN, performing exercise training at regular intervals during the previous 6 wk.</td>
<td>Exercise capacity, QoL, psychological symptoms, and hemodynamic parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance exercise training in older pts with HF: results from a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial. Brubaker, Peter. 2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Age ≥60 y, diagnosed with HFrEF, LVEF ≤45%</td>
<td>Valvular disease as the primary etiology of HFrEF, recent stroke or MI, uncontrolled HTN, any other condition limiting exercise duration</td>
<td>Exercise performance, LV structure and function, neuroendocrine activation and HRQoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn, Kathryn. 2009 19351942 (131)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>Medically stable, HF outpt, LVEF ≤35%, NYHA II-IV, ability and willingness to undergo exercise training</td>
<td>Unable to exercise, already exercising regularly (&gt;1/wk), had experienced a major CV event in the previous 6 wk</td>
<td>Health status (assessed by the KCCQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang, Chueh-Lung. 2010 20482475 (132)</td>
<td>Systematic review with meta-analysis of randomized trials</td>
<td>241 pts from 8 trials</td>
<td>Adults with chronic HF Diagnosis based on clinical signs or LVEF &lt;40%</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>Cardiac function, exercise capacity, QoL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise training in older pts with HF and preserved EF.</td>
<td>Kitzman, Dalane. 2010 20852060 (134)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Stable with no medication changes for &gt;6 wk; HFpEF defined as history, symptoms and signs of HF; Preserved LVEF (&gt;50%); no evidence of significant coronary, valvular or pulmonary disease or any other medical condition that could mimic HF symptoms.</td>
<td>Contraindication to exercise testing or training; unable to perform a valid baseline exercise test; currently exercising regularly; had known cancer; significant renal dysfunction; substance abuse; uncontrolled diabetes; dementia; History of noncompliance; any other disorder that would preclude participation in the intervention and follow-up.</td>
<td>Peak exercise oxygen uptake QoL; LV morphology and function, and neuroendocrine function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of exercise training in pts with HF: the exercise rehabilitation trial (EXERT). McKelvie, Robert. 2002.</td>
<td>To examine the effects of exercise training on functional capacity in pts with HF.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Documented clinical signs and symptoms of HF: LVEF &lt;40%, NYHA I-III, 6MWT distance &lt;500 meters</td>
<td>Inability to attend regular exercise training sessions; exercise testing limited by angina or leg claudication; abnormal blood pressure response to exercise testing; cerebrovascular or musculoskeletal disease preventing exercise testing or training; respiratory limitation; poorly controlled cardiac arrhythmias; any noncardiac condition affecting regular exercise training or decreasing survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined endurance and muscle strength training in female and male pts with chronic HF. Miche, Eckart. 2008</td>
<td>To evaluate the effect of a combined endurance and muscle strength training program on clinical performance data and health-related psychosocial factors in women and men.</td>
<td>Non-randomized study of men vs. women.</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Stable chronic HF; LVEF &lt;45%; Peak VO2 &lt;20 ml/min/kg; capable of answering questions on HRQoL and psychological well-being.</td>
<td>Severe pulmonary disorders; neurological deficits; cognitive disorders and physical disabilities which prevented pts from participating in a training program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18432395 (136)</td>
<td>LVEF increased: Female: p&lt;0.001 Male: p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>LVEDV decreased: Female: p&lt;0.05 Male: p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>LVEF: Female: p&lt;0.001 Male: p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Peak VO2: Female: p NS Male: p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Wattmax (W): Female: p&lt;0.001 Male: p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The results of our study confirm the feasibility of a combined endurance and resistance program, especially for women. Our findings show a considerably reduced cardiopulmonary performance, negatively affecting physical health. In contrast, no essential restrictions were reported by our groups regarding mental health. This underlines the importance of a physical training program and its continuation at home following the hospital stay in order to influence performance data favorably.</td>
<td>The results of our study confirm the feasibility of a combined endurance and resistance program, especially for women. Our findings show a considerably reduced cardiopulmonary performance, negatively affecting physical health. In contrast, no essential restrictions were reported by our groups regarding mental health. This underlines the importance of a physical training program and its continuation at home following the hospital stay in order to influence performance data favorably.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term effects of a group-based high-intensity aerobic interval-training program in pts with chronic HF. Nilsson, Birgitta. 2008 18940296 (137)</td>
<td>RCT 80</td>
<td>Stable chronic HF; NYHA II-IIIB; receiving optimal medical treatment; LVEF &lt;40% or &gt;40% with clinical symptoms of diastolic HF. Acute MI within 4 wk; UA pectoris; serious rhythm disturbance; symptomatic peripheral vascular disease; severe obstructive pulmonary disease; 6MWT &lt;550 m; workload on the cycle ergometer test &gt;110 W; significant comorbidities that would prevent study entry due to terminal disease or an inability to exercise in a long-term care establishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy and safety of exercise training in pts with chronic HF. O'Connor, Christopher. 2009 19351941 (138)</td>
<td>RCT 2331</td>
<td>HF LVEF &lt;35%, NYHA II-IV, despite optimal HF therapy for at least 6 wk. Major comorbidities or limitations that could interfere with exercise training, recent or planned major CV events or procedures, performance of regular exercise training, use of devices that limited the ability to achieve target heart rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To evaluate the long-term effects of a 4-mo, group-based, high-intensity aerobic interval training program on functional capacity and the QoL in pts with chronic HF. To test the efficacy and safety of exercise training among pts with HF. Functional capacity, evaluated by 6-min walking distance. QoL After 4 mo, in the exercise group: Functional capacity improved (p<0.001), QoL improved (p<0.001). After 12 mo, in the exercise group: Functional capacity still improved (p<0.001), QoL still improved (p=0.003). The results support the implementation of a group-based aerobic interval training program to improve long-term effects on functional capacity and the QoL in pts with chronic HF.

Regular exercise training in pts with systolic HF was safe. In the protocol-specified primary analysis, exercise training resulted in nonsignificant reductions in nonsignificant reductions in the primary endpoint of all-cause mortality or hospitalization and in secondary endpoints. After adjustment for highly prognostic predictors of the primary endpoint, exercise training was associated with modest significant reductions for both all-cause mortality and HF hospitalization.
| Exercise training meta-analysis of trials in pts with chronic HF (ExTraMATCH). Piepoli. 2004 14729656 (139) | To determine the effect of exercise training on survival in pts with HF due to LV systolic dysfunction. | Collaborative meta-analysis | 801 pts from 9 trials | Randomized parallel group controlled trials, evaluate exercise training without any other simultaneous intervention, study pts with stable HF (3 mo or more of stability) due to left systolic ventricular dysfunction (LVEF <50%), have an exercise program lasting 8 wks or more, utilize training involving at least both legs, have survival follow up of ≥3 mo. | Trials of arm or single leg training were excluded | Time to death. | Death or time to admission to hospital. | Exercise training significantly reduce mortality (p=0.0015; 95% CI: 0.46-0.92). Exercise training significantly reduced death or admission to hospital (p=0.01 95% CI: 0.56-0.93). | Meta-analysis of randomized trials gives no evidence that properly supervised medical training programs for pts with HF might be dangerous, and indeed there is clear evidence of an overall reduction in mortality. |

<p>| Randomized trial of progressive resistance training to counteract the myopathy of chronic HF. Pu, Charles. 2001 11356801 (140) | To evaluate whether strength training in elderly pts with chronic HF would be well tolerated and result in improved overall exercise performance without changes in central cardiac function. | RCT | 96 (16 HF 80 control) | Community-dwelling, female, age &gt;65 mild to moderate, stable systolic HF, NYHA I-III, resting LVEF ≤45% | NYHA class IV, MI within 6 mo, hospitalization for chronic HF within 2 mo, change of HF therapy within 1 mo, UA pectoris, fixed ventricular rate pacemaker, abdominal aortic aneurysm &gt;4 cm, major limb amputation, symptomatic abdominal or inguinal hemias Folstein mini-mental state examination score &lt;23, significant abnormalities on maximal treadmill testing or screening strength testing | Overall exercise capacity (6-min walk distance) and muscle function. | Muscle metabolism and histology, body composition, maximal oxygen consumption, and cardiac function, | Women with chronic HF had significantly lower muscle strength than women without chronic HF (p&lt;0.0001). In resistance trainers (vs. controls): Strength improved (p&lt;0.0001); Muscle endurance improved (p&lt;0.0001); 6-minute walk distance increased (p&lt;0.0003). Increases in type 1 fiber area and citrate synthase activity in skeletal muscle were independently predictive of improved 6-min walk distance (r² = 0.78; p=0.0024). | High-intensity progressive resistance training improves impaired skeletal muscle characteristics and overall exercise performance in older women with chronic HF. These gains are largely explained by skeletal muscle and not resting cardiac adaptations. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The effects of physical training on workload, upper leg muscle function and muscle areas in pts with chronic HF. Senden, Jeff. 2005 15823638 (141)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Chronic HF for at least 6 mo, NYHA II-III, clinically stable for at least 3 mo, received optimal medical therapy, physically able to visit the outpatient clinic, LVEF &lt;35%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Workload and peak oxygen consumption decreased in the control group and increased in the training group (p&lt;0.05). Hamstrings area decreased in the control group and did not change in the training group (p&lt;0.05). Upper leg muscle function improved in the training group and did not change in the control group (p&lt;0.05). At baseline and after intervention nearly 60% of the variance in maximal workload was explained by upper leg muscle function and quadriceps muscle area.</td>
<td>In chronic HF pts, home-based training in conjunction with a supervised strength and endurance training program is safe, feasible and effective and does not require complex training equipment. Physical training prevented loss of hamstrings muscle mass and improved exercise performance by enhancing muscle strength and endurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiremodeling effect of long-term exercise training in pts with stable chronic HF. Giannuzzi, Pantaleo. 2003 12860904 (127)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>HF secondary to idiopathic DCM, IHD or valvular disease, LVEF &lt;35% by ECHO, clinical stability for at least 3 mo under optimized therapy, NYHA II-III, peak oxygen uptake (VO2) &lt;20mL/kg/min at ergospirometry, echocardiographic images of adequate quality for quantitative analysis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Differences from baseline to 6 mo improved in the intervention group for: EF (p&lt;0.001), Work capacity (p&lt;0.001), Peak VO2 (p&lt;0.006), Walking distance (p&lt;0.001), QoL (p&lt;0.01), LV volumes (diminished) (p&lt;0.006), Trend to fewer readmissions for worsening dyspnea (EDV p&lt;0.05 ESV) LV volumes increased in control group (p&lt;0.0.01 EDV ESV)</td>
<td>In stable chronic HF, long-term moderate exercise training has no detrimental effect on LV volumes and function; rather, it attenuates abnormal remodeling. Furthermore, exercise training is safe and effective in improving exercise tolerance and QoL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise training reduces circulating adiponectin levels in pts with chronic HF. Van Berendoncks, An. 2010 19656095 (142)

To assess circulating adiponectin concentrations in chronic HF pts, compare with controls, and evaluate the effects of a 4-mo exercise training program.

Prospective, non-randomized trial
80
LVEF <30%, NYHA II-III, symptoms had been stable on medical treatment for at least 1 mo prior to inclusion
Recent ACS or revascularization, valvular disease requiring surgery, exercise-induced myocardial ischemia or malignant ventricular arrhythmia, acute myocarditis or pericarditis, cerebrovascular or musculoskeletal disease preventing exercise testing or training, acute or chronic infections, allergies, cancer or inflammatory disease, DM.
Circulating adiponectin concentrations, exercise capacity, anthropometric data and NT-proBNP levels.
N/A
At baseline, adiponectin levels were significantly higher in chronic HF pts compared with healthy subjects (p=0.015).
At baseline, stratification of pts according to tertiles of NT-proBNP revealed an increase in adiponectin with disease severity (p<0.001).
Exercise training significantly reduced circulating adiponectin levels in the trained chronic HF group (compared to sedentary chronic HF group) (p=0.008)

Circulating adiponectin concentrations are higher in chronic HF pts compared with healthy subjects and increase with disease severity. Exercise training for 4 mo lowers circulating adiponectin levels. The present findings, together with those from other studies, suggest that dysregulation of the adiponectin pathway contributes to the observed metabolic impairment in chronic HF.

Effects of exercise training on cardiac performance, exercise capacity and QoL in pts with HF. Van Tol, Benno. 2006 16713337 (143)

To determine the effect of exercise training in pts with chronic HF on cardiac performance, exercise capacity and HRQoL.

Meta-analysis of RCTs
35 trials
RCTs, included pts with chronic HF in the control and in the intervention group (diagnosis based on clinical findings or LVEF <40%), included at least 1 treatment group receiving exercise training and 1 control group which received standard medical treatment w/o additional exercise training, evaluated outcome measures in terms of cardiac performance, exercise capacity and/or HRQoL, exercise training had to include at least one of the following training modalities: walking, cycling or resistive training of peripheral muscles.
Studies in which only respiratory muscles or one isolated muscle group was trained.
Cardiac performance, exercise capacity and HRQoL.
N/A
During maximal exercise, significant summary effect sizes were found for: SBP (p=0.03), Heart rate (p=0.011), Cardiac output (p=0.004), Peak oxygen uptake (p=0.00), Anaerobic threshold (p=0.00), 6MWT (p=0.00).
The MLHFQ improved by an average of 9.7 points (p=0.00).

Exercise training has clinically important effects on exercise capacity and health-related quality of life, and may have small positive effects on cardiac performance during exercise.
hypertension; IHD, ischemic heart disease; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; LV, left ventricular; LVEDV, left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVESV, left ventricular end-systolic volume; MI, myocardial infarction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; N/A, not applicable; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-Type natriuretic peptide; NS, not significant; O2, oxygen; pt, patient; QoL, quality of life; r², coefficient of determination; RCT, randomized control trial; SSW, Stead-state workload; UA, unstable angina; UK, United Kingdom; and VO2, oxygen volume.

### Data Supplement 17. Diuretics Versus Ultrafiltration in Acute Decompensated HF (Section 7.3.2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOSE-AHF, Felker, 2011 21366472 (144)</td>
<td>To compare high and low doses of diuretics administered over longer and shorter periods of time to determine the safest and most effective combination.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Prior clinical diagnosis of HF that was treated with daily oral loop diuretics for at least 1 mo; current diagnosis of HF, as defined by the presence of at least 1 symptom (dyspnea, orthopnea, or edema) and 1 sign (rales on auscultation, peripheral edema, ascites, pulmonary vascular congestion on chest radiography); daily oral dose of furosemide 80 mg-240 mg (or equivalent); identified within 24 h of hospital admission; current treatment plan includes IV loop diuretics for at least 48 h</td>
<td>BNP &lt;250 mg/mL or NT-proBNP &lt;1000 mg/mL; IV vasoactive treatment or ultrafiltration therapy since initial presentation; treatment plan includes IV vasoactive treatment or ultra-filtration; substantial diuretic response to pre-randomization diuretic dosing such that higher doses of diuretics would be medically inadvisable; SBP &lt;90 mm Hg; SCr &gt;3.0 mg/dL at baseline or currently undergoing renal replacement therapy; hemodynamically significant arrhythmias; ACS within 4 wk prior to study entry; active myocarditis; hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy; severe stenotic valvular disease; restrictive or constrictive cardiomyopathy; complex congenital heart disease; constrictive pericarditis; non-cardiac pulmonary edema; clinical evidence of digoxin toxicity; need for mechanical hemodynamic support; sepsis; terminal illness (other than HF) with expected survival time of &lt;1 y; history of adverse reaction to the study drugs; use of IV iodinated radiocontrast material within 72 h prior to study entry or planned during hospitalization; enrollment</td>
<td>Pl well-being, as determined by VAS; change in SCr</td>
<td>Weight loss; Proportion of pt free of congestion; change in the bivariate relationship of creatinine vs. weight loss; dyspnea, as determined by VAS; pt global assessment; as determined by VAS; change in SCr; Change in cystatin C; worsening or persistent HF, defined as a need for rescue therapy; development of cardio-renal syndrome, defined as an increase in the SCr level &gt;0.3 mg/dL; net fluid loss; time from study entry to discharge during index hospitalization; death or total days hospitalized for</td>
<td>Comparison of bolus vs. continuous infusion: no significant difference in either pts' global assessment of symptoms (mean AUC, 423±1440 in the bolus vs 437±1404 in the infusion group, p=0.47) Mean change in creatinine level (0.05±0.3 mg/dL in the bolus vs 0.07±0.3 mg/dL in the infusion group, p=0.45) Secondary Endpoints: No significant differences, including SCr and cystatin C levels during index hospitalization and at 60 d. Comparison of high-dose vs. low-dose strategy: no significant difference in pts' global assessment of symptoms, although there was a nonsignificant trend toward greater improvement in the high-dose group (mean AUC, 443±1401 vs. 417±1436; p=0.06; mean change in creatinine level (0.08±0.3 mg/dL with the high-dose strategy and 0.04±0.3 mg/dL with the low-dose strategy, p=0.21). Secondary endpoints: The high-dose strategy was associated with greater diuresis (net fluid loss and weight loss) and greater relief from dyspnea but also with transient worsening of renal function (occurred in 23% of pts in the high-dose vs 14% in the low-dose group, p=0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolofylline, an adenosine A1-receptor antagonist, would improve dyspnea, reduce the risk of WRF, and lead to a more favorable clinical course in pt with acute HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCT</strong> 2,033 Persistent dyspnea at rest or with minimal activity, impaired renal function (an estimated CrCl of 20-80 mL/min with the use of the Cockcroft-Gault equation), a BNP level of ≥500 pg/mL or more or an NT-pBNP level ≥2000 pg/mL, ongoing IV loop-diuretic therapy, and enrollment within 24 h after admission.</td>
<td>RCT 2,033 Persistent dyspnea at rest or with minimal activity, impaired renal function (an estimated CrCl of 20-80 mL/min with the use of the Cockcroft-Gault equation), a BNP level of ≥500 pg/mL or more or an NT-pBNP level ≥2000 pg/mL, ongoing IV loop-diuretic therapy, and enrollment within 24 h after admission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or planned enrollment in another clinical trial during hospitalization; inability to comply with planned study procedures</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was treatment success, treatment failure, or no change in the pt’s condition. Success defined as pt-reported moderate or marked improvement in dyspnea both 24 and 48 h after administration of the study drug, in the absence of any criterion for failure. Failure defined as the occurrence of any of the following: death or readmission for HF through d 7, worsening symptoms and signs of HF occurring &gt;24 h after the initiation of the study drug requiring intervention by d 7 or discharge (if earlier), or persistent WRF, defined as an increase in the SCR level ≥0.3 mg/dL (26.5 μmol/L) from randomization to d 7, confirmed at d 14, or the initiation of hemofiltration or dialysis during the period from initiation of the study drug through d 7. Pts were classified as having unchanged treatment status if they met neither the criteria for treatment success nor the criteria for treatment failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF; death or re-hospitalization</td>
<td>Two secondary outcomes were prespecified: death from any cause or rehospitalization for cardiovascular or renal causes through d 60 and the proportion of pts with persistent renal impairment, defined as an increase in the SCR level ≥0.3 mg/dL by d 7, confirmed at d 14; the initiation of hemofiltration or dialysis through d 7; or death by d 7. Rolofylline did not provide a benefit with respect to the primary endpoint (OR: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.78-1.09; p=0.35). Persistent renal impairment developed in 15% of pts in the rolofylline group and in 13.7% of pts in the placebo group (OR: 1.11; 95% CI: 0.85-1.46; p=0.44). By 60 d, death or readmission for cardiovascular or renal causes had occurred in similar proportions of pts assigned to rolofylline, 386 of 1356 pts (Kaplan-Meier estimate, 30.7%; 95% CI: 27.8-33.6) as compared with 195 of 677 pts assigned to placebo (Kaplan-Meier estimate: 31.9%; 95% CI: 27.4-36.4) (HR: 0.98; 95% CI: 0.83-1.17; p=0.86). AE rates were similar overall; however, only pts in the rolofylline group had seizures, a known potential adverse effect of A1-receptor antagonists1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical composite endpoint of death, rehospitalization, or ED visit during the 60-d follow-up period: HR with continuous infusion: 1.15; 95% CI: 0.83-1.60; p=0.41, HR with high-dose strategy, 0.83; 95% CI: 0.62-1.16; p=0.28</td>
<td>Post hoc selection of the best of 3 dose groups from the pilot trial with multiple small treatment groups carries the risk that an apparent superiority may be the play of chance and may have resulted in the inability to replicate pilot study findings in this more definitive, larger study. Also, clinical relevance of endpoints has been questioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;18 y</td>
<td>History of HF, deterioration of HF, symptoms of recent onset (&lt;6 h), dyspnea at rest, orthopnea, and paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea, accompanied by signs of congestion (third heart sound, jugular venous distension, pulmonary rales) on physical examination; levels of serum BNP &gt;400 pg/mL or NT pBNP &gt;1,500 pg/mL and oxygen saturation &lt;90% on admission.</td>
<td>Acute de novo HF; severe renal failure (admission SCr &gt;215 mmol/L [2.5 mg/dL] or eGFR &lt;30 mL min 1 1.73 m²); admission SBP &lt;90 mm Hg; severe valvular disease; known adverse reactions to furosemide or dopamine; HF secondary to congenital heart disease; a scheduled procedure with a need for IV contrast dye in the present hospitalization; and a scheduled cardiac surgery within 2 mo.</td>
<td>Incidence of WRF during the first 24 h from randomization. 2 definitions were used for WRF: 1) &gt;0.3 mg/dL rise in SCr level from baseline to 24 h; and 2) &gt;20% decrease in eGFR from baseline to 24 h</td>
<td>Changes in SCr, urea, potassium, and eGFR during the first 24 h from randomization; incidence of WRF over the course of hospitalization; total length of stay; and 60-d mortality or rehospitalization rate (all-cause, cardiovascular, and worsening of HF).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean hourly excreted urine volume (272±149mL in high-dose furosemide vs 272±186mL in LDFD plus low-dose dopamine group; p=.965) and changes in dyspnea score (Borg index: 4.4±2.1 in high-dose furosemide group vs 4.7±2.0 in LDFD group; p=.575) during the 8 h of protocol treatment were similar in the two groups. WRF was more frequent in the high-dose furosemide (n=9; 30%) than in the LDFD group (n=2; 6.7%; p=.042). Serum potassium changed from 4.3±0.5 to 3.9±0.4mEq/L at 24 h (p=.003) in the high-dose furosemide group and from4.4±0.5 to 4.2±0.5mEq/L at 24 hours (p=.07) in the LDFD group. Length of stay and 60-d mortality or rehospitalization rates (all-cause, cardiovascular, and worsening of HF).</td>
<td>Relatedly small study, 2 groups did not receive the same dose of furosemide and did not include a low-dose furosemide only group.</td>
<td>This study shows that LDFD infusions are as effective as high-dose furosemide infusions in terms of clinical and diuretic response in pts hospitalized for acute decompensate d HF. Moreover, LDFD infusion was associated with significantly lower rates of WRF than high-dose furosemide, suggesting a renoprotective effect in this pt population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot study of furosemide by continuous infusion vs twice-d bolus injection. (Duke), L Allen, 2010 20538132 (147)</strong></td>
<td>RCT 41</td>
<td>Pilot study of furosemide by continuous infusion vs twice-d bolus injection. Hypothesis that continuous dosing of IV furosemide provides gradual diuresis with less neurohormonal activation, which would manifest as less renal dysfunction, compared to bolus dosing in the treatment of acute decompensated HF with volume overload.</td>
<td>End-stage renal disease or anticipated need for renal replacement therapy; were not expected to survive hospitalization; pregnant</td>
<td>Change in Scr from admission to hospital d 3 or hospital discharge</td>
<td>None of the outcomes showed a statistically significant difference between bolus and continuous dosing from admission to hospital d 3. Nonsignificant trend toward improvement in the bolus dosing arm. Decreases in serum potassium, serum sodium, and SBP showed nonsignificant trends in favor of continuous infusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot study comparing the effectiveness of continuous IV with intermittent IV infusion of furosemide in pt with acute decompensated HF (MUSC), Thomson, 2010 20206891 (148)</strong></td>
<td>RCT 56</td>
<td>Pilot study comparing the effectiveness of continuous IV with intermittent IV infusion of furosemide in pt with acute decompensated HF.</td>
<td>Pts who had received &gt;2 doses of IV furosemide before randomization</td>
<td>Net daily urine output</td>
<td>Smaller study No statistically significant differences noted between bolus and continuous infusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To determine the clinical and renal outcomes associated with lower vs higher IV loop diuretic dose in pts hospitalized with acute decompensated HF. (ADHERE), Peacock, 2008 18480204 (149)</strong></td>
<td>Registry 82,540</td>
<td>Pts in the ADHERE registry who received IV diuretics during a hospitalization for acute decompensated HF.</td>
<td>Pts receiving vasoactive drugs or dialysis. Those who received multiple types of diuretics. Pts with Scr values &gt;6 mg/dL or hospitalizations with LOS &lt;4 h were excluded from the analysis of change in Scr and dialysis</td>
<td>Increase from baseline to last available Scr &gt; 0.5 mg/dL; decrease in GFR &gt;10 mL/min from baseline to discharge; initiation of dialysis during</td>
<td>Both before and after risk and propensity adjustments, an increase in Scr &gt;0.5 mg/dL occurred less frequently in LDD admissions than in HDD admissions (both p&lt;0.0001). The prevalence of a &gt;10 mL/min decrease in GFR from baseline to discharge was ADHERE registry data were retrospective and observational so should be regarded as hypothesis. Among pts in the ADHERE registry, After covariate and propensity adjustments, the inhospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study analyzed data from the ADHERE registry to look at the impact of diuretic dosing. 62,866 pts receiving <160 mg and 19,674 pts ≥160 mg of furosemide were analyzed. Pt with SCR values >6 mg/dL, GFR values >200 mL/min, or hospitalizations with LOS <24 h were excluded from the analysis of change in GFR.

Hospitalization. Significantly lower in LDD vs HDD admissions (p <0.0001). Significant differences between cohorts present after risk and propensity adjustments. LDD treatment was associated with lower prevalence of prolonged ICU LOS (nonsignificant differences). After covariate and propensity adjustments: in-hospital mortality risk of LDD was significantly lower compared to HDD. AUC for adjusted model was 0.78. Unadjusted mortality OR 0.875; 95% CI: 0.787–0.973; p =0.01. After adjustment for covariates known to be associated with mortality – age, BUN, SBP, DBP, sodium, creatinine, heart rate and dyspnea at rest – adjusted OR was 0.888; 95% CI: 0.795–0.993; p =0.0364.

Compared with pts taking LDD (113 pts [62%]), pts taking HDD (70 pts[38%]) had more markers of increased cardiovascular risk (older, ischemic cardiomyopathy, DM and HTN) and were more likely to have a history of recent instability (33% vs 4.4% in low dose, p< .001). SCR significantly higher in pts receiving HDD vs. LDD (1.4 ± 0.5 mg/dL vs 1.1 ± 0.5 mg/dL, respectively, p <.001). 1-y cumulative HF event rates significantly greater in pts taking HDD when to low-dose/no diuretics (HF composite, 29% vs 4.5%, p<.01; HF hospitalization, 26% vs 4.5%, p< .01; MCS or transplant, 7.1% vs 2.7%, P = .02; death, 2.9% vs 0.9%, P = .4; high vs low dose for all). Among pts taking HDD, those with a history of instability had significantly greater HF event rates during a 1-y period compared with pts with recent

Smaller study, observational, single-center

HDD may be more of a marker than a cause of instability. A history of HF stability during the past 6 mo is associated with an 80% lower risk of an HF event during the next y, independently of baseline diuretic dose.
Pilot study was designed to identify an efficacious dose while refining inclusion criteria and endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>Hospitalized for acute HF with an estimated CrCl of 20-80 mL/min and elevated natriuretic peptide levels were enrolled within 24 h of presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SBP <95 or >160 mm Hg; fever >38°C; acute contrast-induced nephropathy; resistant hypokalemia; ongoing or planned IV therapy with positive inotropic agents, vasopressors, vasodilators with the exception of IV nitrates, or mechanical support (intra-aortic balloon pump, endotracheal intubation, or ventricular assist device); severe pulmonary disease; significant stenotic valvular disease; previous heart transplant or admission for cardiac transplantation; clinical evidence of ACS <2 wk before screening; and acute HF caused by significant arrhythmias; pts at high risk of seizures

The prespecified primary analysis for this pilot phase was a trichotomous classification of pts as "success," "unchanged," or "failure" based on their changes in symptoms and renal function. This pilot phase was not powered to demonstrate statistically significant changes. The major objective was to evaluate the performance of this novel endpoint and refine it on the basis of real-world experience. Treatment success was defined as an improvement in dyspnea (reported by the pt using a 7-point Likert scale as moderately or markedly better compared with study start) determined at 24 and 48 h after the start of study drug (d 2 and 3) or d of discharge if earlier, as long as the pt did not meet any of the criteria for treatment failure. Treatment failure was defined as death, early HF readmission (occurring Composite of death or all-cause readmission within 60 d Pts treated with rololfylline more likely to achieve success, as evidenced by improved dyspnea (52.7% vs 37.2%), and less likely to experience failure (manifested by worsening HF, death, or renal impairment) compared with pts treated with placebo (16.2% vs 28.2%). By comparing rololfylline 30 mg with placebo, the OR estimated from the proportional odds model was 0.51 (95% CI: 0.28–0.94). In the prespecified subgroup of pts with higher natriuretic peptide levels, pretreatment BNP level ≥500, or NT pro-BNP ≥2000 pg/mL, most likely representing more severe acute HF, the OR from the proportional odds model was 0.59 (95% CI 0.30–1.17). SCr increased in pts receiving placebo and remained stable or tended to decrease in those receiving rololfylline. On d 14 the absolute differences between placebo and rololfylline for change in creatinine increased with increasing rololfylline dose, reflecting the lesser increase in creatinine in rololfylline-treated pt (r = -0.12, p=0.030). Treatment with 30 mg, the dose selected for the pivotal trials, was associated with a trend toward reduced 60-d mortality or readmission for cardiovascular or renal cause (HR: 0.55; 95% CI: 0.28-1.04). Limited by the study size and number of treatment groups. Study was not powered to quantitatively distinguish between the 3 active doses, although trends emerged suggesting a dose-related preservation of renal function and increase in diuresis, as well as a greater effect on the composite endpoint at the 30 mg dose.

The preservation of renal function associated with rololfylline, a selective renal vasodilator, is the first evidence that an intervention to prevent renal impairment may positively affect acute symptoms and 60-d outcome in pts with acute HF; however, results were not confirmed in the phase III trial.
DIG, Ahmed, 2008
17532064 (152)

The objective of this propensity-matched study was to determine the effect of diuretics on mortality and hospitalizations in HF pts ≥65 y. Registry 7,788 Pts who were at ≥21 y of age were eligible for the main trial if they had HF, a LVEF ≤45%, were in normal sinus rhythm, and did not meet any of 20 easily determined, not overly restrictive exclusion criteria. Age <21 yrs; baseline EF not available; MI, cardiac surgery or PTC within 4 wk; unstable or refractory angina <1 month; II-III AV block without pacemaker; AF or flutter; cor pulmonale; constrictive pericarditis; acute myocarditis; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; amyloid cardiomyopathy; complex CHD; tx with IV inotropic agents; K+ < 3.2 mmol/L or >5.5 mmol/L; on heart transplant list; noncardiac cause of HF; Creatinine >3.0 mg/dL or severe liver disease; unlikely to comply.

All-cause mortality and all-cause hospitalization during 36.7 mo of median follow-up
Mortality and hospitalizations due to cardiovascular causes and HF
All-cause mortality occurred in 173 pts not receiving diuretics and 208 pts receiving diuretics respectively during 2,056 and 1,943 person-y of follow-up (HR: 1.36; 95% CI: 1.08-1.71; p=0.009). All-cause hospitalizations occurred in 413 pts not receiving and 438 pts receiving diuretics respectively during 1,255 and 1,144 person-y of follow-up (HR: 1.18; 95% CI: 0.99-1.39; p=0.063). Diuretic use was associated with significant increased risk of cardiovascular mortality (HR: 1.50; 95% CI: 1.15-1.96; p=0.003) and HF hospitalization (HR: 1.48; 95% CI: 1.13-1.94; p=0.005).

EVEREST, Gheorghiade, 2007 17384438 (153)

To evaluate short-term effects of tolvaptan when added to standard therapy in pts hospitalized with HF
RCT 2,048 (trial A) and 2,085 (trial B)
Age ≥18 y with a history of chronic HF (requiring treatment for a minimum of 30 d before hospitalization) who had been hospitalized primarily for worsening CHF and had a LVEF ≤40% (measured at any point within 1 y of admission), Entry required HF cardiac surgery within 60 d of enrollment, cardiac mechanical support, biventricular pacemaker placement within the last 60 d, comorbid conditions with an expected survival of less than 6 mo, acute MI at the time of hospitalization, hemodynamically significant uncorrected primary cardiac valvular disease, refractory end-stage HF, hemofiltration or dialysis, supine systolic arterial blood pressure of less than 90 mm Hg, SCR concentration >3.5 mg/dL (>312 μmol/L), serum potassium concentration > 5.5 mEq/L, and Composite of changes in global clinical status based on a visual analog scale and body weight at d 7 or discharge if earlier

Dyspnea (d 1), global clinical status (d 7 or discharge), body weight (d 1 and 7 or discharge), and peripheral edema (d 7 or discharge).

Rank sum analysis of the composite primary endpoint showed greater improvement with tolvaptan vs placebo (trial A, mean [±SD], 1.06 [0.43] vs 0.99 [0.44]; and trial B, 1.07 [0.42] vs 0.97 [0.43]; both trials p<.001). Mean (±SD) body weight reduction was greater with tolvaptan on d 1 (trial A, 1.71 [1.80] vs 0.99 [1.83] kg; p<.001; and trial B, 1.82 [2.01] vs 0.95 [1.85] kg; p<.001) and day 7 or discharge (trial A, 3.35 [3.27] vs 2.73 [3.34] kg; p<.001; and trial B, 3.77 [3.59] vs 2.79 [3.46] kg; p<.001). Improvements in global clinical status were not different between groups. More pts receiving tolvaptan (684 N/A In pts hospitalized with HF, oral tolvaptan in addition to standard therapy including diuretics improved many, though not all, HF signs and symptoms, without serious AE.
symptoms at rest or minimal exertion and signs of congestion (≥2 of the following: dyspnea, jugular venous distention, or peripheral edema) at time of randomization.

hgb of less than 9 g/dL

[76.7%] and 67.6% [72.1%] for trial A and trial B, respectively) vs pts receiving placebo (646 [70.6%] and 597 [65.3%], respectively) reported improvement in dyspnea at d 1 (both trials p<.001). Edema at d 7 or discharge improved significantly with tolvaptan in trial B (p = 0.02) but did not reach significance in trial A (p = 0.07). Serious AE frequencies were similar between groups, without excess renal failure or hypotension

EVEREST, Konstam, 2007 17384437 (154)

To investigate the effects of tolvaptan initiated in pts hospitalized with HF

RCT 4,133

Pts age ≥18 y with reduced LVEF ≤40%, signs of volume expansion, NYHA class III/IV symptoms, and hospitalization for exacerbation of chronic HF no more than 48 h earlier were eligible for the study

Cardiac surgery within 60 d of enrollment, cardiac mechanical support, biventricular pacemaker placement within the last 60 d, comorbid conditions with an expected survival of <6 mo, acute MI at the time of hospitalization, hemodynamically significant uncorrected primary cardiac valvular disease, refractory end-stage HF, hemofiltration or dialysis, supine systolic arterial bp < 90 mm Hg, Scr >3.5 mg/dL (309 μmol/L), K+ level greater than 5.5 mEq/L, and hgb <9 g/dL.

Dual primary endpoints were all-cause mortality (superiority and noninferiority) and cardiovascular death or hospitalization for HF (superiority only)

Composite of cardiovascular mortality or cardiovascular hospitalization; incidence of cardiovascular mortality; and incidence of clinical worsening of HF (death, hospitalization for HF, or unscheduled visit for HF). Additional secondary endpoints included changes from baseline in body weight at d 1, serum sodium level at d 7 or discharge in pts with a baseline serum sodium <134 mEq/L, edema score at d 7 or discharge for those with edema at baseline, pt-assessed dyspnea at d 1 for those

During a median follow-up of 9.9 mo, 537 pts (25.9%) in tolvaptan group and 543 (26.3%) in placebo group died HR for mortality: 0.98; 95% CI, 0.87-1.11; p=0.68). Kaplan-Meier estimates of mortality at 1 y were 25.0% in the tolvaptan group and 26.0% in the placebo group.

Composite cardiovascular death or hospitalization for HF: 871 tolvaptan group (42.0%) and 829 placebo group (40.2%) HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.95-1.14; p=0.55).

Secondary endpoints of CV mortality, CV death or hospitalization, and worsening HF were also not different. Tolvaptan significantly improved secondary endpoints of d 1 pt-assessed dyspnea (p<.001), with 74.3% of the tolvaptan group and 68.0% of the placebo group demonstrating an improvement in dyspnea score, as well as d 1 body weight, and d 7 edema. In pts with hyponatremia, serum sodium levels significantly increased. The KCCQ overall summary score was not improved at outpt wk 1, but body weight and serum sodium effects persisted long after discharge.

N/A Tolvaptan initiated for acute treatment of pts hospitalized with HF had no effect on long-term mortality or HF-related morbidity.
Non-potassium-sparing diuretics are commonly used in HF. They activate the neurohormonal system, and are potentially harmful. Yet, the long-term effects of chronic diuretic use in HF are largely unknown. This study retrospectively analysed the DIG data to determine the effects of diuretics on HF outcomes. Effects of diuretics on mortality and hospitalization at 40 mo of median follow-up were assessed using matched Cox Registry. DIG trial enrolled 7,788 ambulatory chronic systolic (LVEF ≤45%; n=6800) and diastolic (LVEF >45%; n=988) HF pts in normal sinus rhythm, of whom 6,076 (78%) were receiving diuretics. Age <21 y; baseline EF unavailable; MI, cardiac surgery or PTCA within 4 wk; unstable or refractory angina <1 mo; II-III AV block without pacemaker; AF or flutter; cor pulmonale; constrictive pericarditis; acute myocarditis; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; amyloid cardiomyopathy; complex CHD; tx with IV inotropic agents; K+ < 3.2 mmol/L or > 5.5 mmol/L; on heart transplant list; noncardiac cause of HF; Creatinine > 3.0 mg/dL or severe liver disease; unlikely to comply. All-cause mortality. Mortality from worsening HF, and hospitalizations due to all causes and worsening HF. Propensity scores for diuretic use were calculated for each of the 7,788 DIG participants using a non-parsimonious multivariable logistic regression model, and were used to match 1,391 (81%) no-diuretic pts with 1,391 diuretic pts. Mean survival times for diuretic vs. no-diuretic pts: 47 (95% CI: 46–48) and 50 (95% CI: 49–51) mo. All-cause mortality was 21% for no-diuretic pts and 29% for diuretic pts (HR: 1.31; 95% CI: 1.11-1.55; p=0.002). HF hospitalizations occurred in 18% of no-diuretic pts and 23% of diuretic pts (HR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.13-1.65; p=0.001). Mortality due to HF occurred in 6% of pts in the no-diuretic group and 9% of those in the diuretic group (HR: 1.36; 95% CI 0.99–1.87; p=0.056). Compared with 8% deaths among pts never receiving diuretics during the first 24 mo of follow-up, 19% of those who Based on non-randomized findings, retrospective. Beta-blockers were not approved for HF during the DIG trial and data on beta-blocker use were not collected. Chronic diuretic use was associated with increased long-term mortality and hospitalizations in a wide spectrum of ambulatory chronic systolic and diastolic HF pts.
| **DIG, Domanski, 2006 16762792 (156)** | **Investigate the associations between death, cardiovascular death, death from worsening HF, SCD, and HF hospitalization among those taking a PSD, NPSD, or no diuretic in the DIG trial** | **DIG Registry 6,797** | **HF and LVEF ≤45% enrolled in the DIG trial. The DIG randomly assigned 6800 pts with HF and LVEF ≤45% to digoxin or placebo in a double-blinded controlled trial.** | **Age <21 y; baseline EF not available; MI, cardiac surgery or PTCA within 4 wk; unstable or refractory angina <1 mo; II-III AV block without pacemaker; AF or flutter; cor pulmonale; constrictive pericarditis; acute myocarditis; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; amyloid cardiomyopathy; complex CHD; tx with IV inotropic agents; K+ < 3.2 mmol/L or > 5.5 mmol/L; on heart transplant list; noncardiac cause of HF; Creatinine > 3.0 mg/dL or severe liver disease; unlikely to comply.** | **All-cause death, cardiovascular death, death from progressive HF, SCD, and HF hospitalization.** | **N/A** | **For death from HF or SCD, the incident rates were not significantly different between the pts taking the PSD only versus no-diuretic group (p=.06, and p=.7, respectively); for the other 4 events (hosp for HF, death from CVD, death from all causes, hosp or death from HF), the incidence rates were all significantly lower in the no-diuretic group than in the PSD-only group (p≤.01). For all 6 events, the incidence rates for the NPSD only group were significantly higher than the PSD-only group (p≤.02). The incidence rates for the NPSD only group and both-diuretic groups were comparable and not significantly different with the p-values ranging from .07 to .6 (date not shown). After multivariate analysis, the risks of all 6 endpoints were increased in pts taking a NPSD, whether or not they were taking a PSD after adjusting for known covariates. There was no significant difference in the risk of any of these events for pts taking only PSD and those taking no diuretics. Compared with not taking diuretic, risk of death (RR: 1.36, 95% CI: 1.17–1.59, p<.0001), cardiovascular death (RR: 1.38, 95% CI: 1.17–1.63; p=.0001), progressive HF death (RR: 1.41, 95% CI: 1.06–1.89, p=.02), SCD (RR: 1.67, 95% CI 1.23–2.27, p=.001), and HF hospitalization (RR: 1.68, 95% CI: 1.41–** | **Post-hoc study and doses of diuretics were not available for analysis. Also, did not analyze effects of treatment over time. Beta-blockers were not approved for HF during the DIG trial and data on beta blocker use were not collected. Among pts in the DIG trial, compared with pts not taking any diuretic or taking a PSD, pts taking non-PSD had a higher RR of death.** |

| Always received diuretics during the same time died from all causes (multivariable adjusted HR: 1.81; 95% CI 1.38–2.38; p<0.0001). | **|
This study was a cohort study low vs. high dose (Cedars Sinai/ UCLA), Eshaghian, 2006 16765130 (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort study</th>
<th>low vs. high dose (Cedars Sinai/ UCLA), Eshaghian, 2006 16765130 (157)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort</strong></td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study population</strong></td>
<td>consisted of 1,354 consecutive pts with advanced systolic HF referred to a single university medical center for HF management and/or transplant evaluation from 1985 to 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pts with LVEF &gt;40%</strong>, those with HF due to valvular disease, and those aged &lt;18 y were excluded from the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All-cause mortality</strong></td>
<td>The composite endpoint of death or urgent transplant (status IA) was analyzed as a secondary endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pts with HF in the highest diuretic dose quartile were found to have significantly impaired survival compared with pts in the lowest quartile.</strong></td>
<td>Survival estimates at 1 y were 91%, 88%, 80%, and 69% for quartiles 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively (p &lt;0.0001). Survival estimates at 2 y were 83%, 81%, 68%, and 53%, respectively (p &lt;0.0001). Death from any cause: HR: 3.4, 95% CI: 2.4-4.7 death and urgent transplantation: HR 2.7, 95% CI 2.0-3.5 death from progressive HF: HR: 3.8; 95% CI 2.1-6.8 sudden death: HR: 3.6; 95% CI: 1.9-6.8 Univariate analysis- compared with the lowest quartile, increasing loop diuretic dose quartiles were associated with a progressive increase in mortality (second quartile, HR: 1.2; 95% CI: 0.8-1.7; third quartile, HR: 2.1, 95% CI 1.5-2.9; and fourth quartile, HR: 3.4; 95% CI 2.4-4.7). Diuretic dose quartiles were associated with increased mortality independent of other covariates. After adjustment the highest diuretic quartile remained a significant predictor of increased mortality at 1 y (HR: 4.2; 95% CI: 1.5-11.3) and at 2 y (HR: 4.0; 95% CI 1.9-8.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible selection bias. Diuretic dose was examined at only a single point in time, without considering changes in doses over time. Baseline characteristics and other HF treatments different among the diuretic dose quartiles. With adjustment for multiple covariates, larger loop diuretic doses could still be a surrogate for other measured and unmeasured variables that reflect more severe HF. Serum potassium and magnesium level information was unavailable. Propensity matching was not performed. So the relation between</strong></td>
<td>This study suggests that in pts with advanced systolic HF, the use of higher doses of loop diuretics is associated with significantly increased all-cause mortality. Although it may appear obvious that pts with HF requiring higher loop diuretic doses to prevent fluid retention and control symptoms might be sicker than pts receiving lower doses, the powerful and independent association with mortality warrants further consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To compare the effects and adverse effects of continuous IV infusion of loop diuretics with those of bolus IV administration among pts with HF class III-IV

Cochrane review, 2005

16034890
(158)

To compare the effects and adverse effects of continuous IV infusion versus bolus IV administration of loop diuretics in HF in a total of 8 RCTs.

Meta-analysis

254

RCTs comparing the efficacy of continuous IV infusion versus bolus IV administration of loop diuretics.

N/A

(7 studies) urine output, cc/24 h; Electrolyte disturbances (hypokalemia, hypomagnesemia); adverse effects (tinnitus and hearing loss); (single study) duration of hospital stay and cardiac mortality; (2 studies) all cause mortality

N/A

Urine output: the output (as measured in cc/24 h) was noted to be greater in pts given continuous infusion with a WMD of 271 cc/24 h (95%CI: 93.1-449; p<0.01). Electrolyte disturbances were not significantly different in the two treatment groups: RR 1.47; 95%CI: 0.52-4.15; p=0.5. Less adverse effects (tinnitus and hearing loss) were noted with continuous infusion: RR 0.06; 95%CI: 0.01-0.44; p=0.005. Duration of hospital stay was significantly shortened by 3.1 d with continuous infusion WMD -3.1; 95%CI -4.06 to -2.20; p<0.0001; while cardiac mortality was significantly different in the two treatment groups, RR: 0.47; 95% CI: 0.33 to 0.69; p<0.0001. All-cause mortality was significantly different in the two treatment groups, RR: 0.52; 95% CI: 0.38-0.71; p=0.0001.

Available data were insufficient to confidently assess the merits of the 2 methods of giving IV diuretics. The existing data did not allow definitive recommendations for clinical practice.

Based on small and relatively heterogeneous studies, this review showed greater diuresis and a better safety profile when loop diuretics were given as continuous infusion.

Study sought to determine whether NPSDs in the absence of a PSD may result in progressive HF.

SOLVD, Domanski, 2003

12932605
(159)

Study sought to determine whether NPSDs in the absence of a PSD may result in progressive HF.

Registry

6,797

Symptomatic and asymptomatic pts with a LVEF fraction <0.36 were randomly assigned to double-blinded treatment with enalapril or placebo.

Only drug class was ascertained; specific medications were not recorded.

Rates of hospitalization for HF, death from cardiovascular disease, death from all causes, and either hospitalization or death due to worsening HF

N/A

The risk of hospitalization from worsening HF in those taking a PSD relative to those taking only a non-PSD was 0.74; 95% CI 0.55-0.99; p= 0.047. The RR for cardiovascular death was 0.74; 95% CI 0.59-0.93; p=0.011), for death from all causes 0.73; 95% CI: 0.59-0.90; p=0.004, and for hospitalization for, or death from, HF 0.75; 95% CI: 0.58-0.97; p=0.030). Compared with pts not taking any diuretic, the risk of hospitalization or death due to worsening HF in pts taking available the study is retrospective and, therefore, not definitive proof that NPSDs cause progressive HF. Because the diuretic dosage was not available, we cannot draw conclusions about a dose-response. This study shows that in pts with moderate or severe LV dysfunction, the use of a PSD is associated with a reduced risk of death or hospitalization due to loop diuretic dose and increased mortality is causative.
non-PSDs alone was significantly increased (RR: 1.31; 95% CI: 1.09-1.57; p=0.0004); this was not observed in pts taking PSDs with or without a NPSD (RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.76-1.30; p=0.95).

**PRAISE**

Neuberg, 2002 12094185 (152)

The prognostic importance of diuretic resistance (as evidenced by a high-dose requirement) was retrospectively evaluated in pts with advanced HF who were enrolled in the PRAISE.

| Registry | 1,153 | LVEF <30% and NYHA functional class IIIb/IV HF despite mandatory background treatment with digoxin, diuretics, and ACE inhibitors. Pts were excluded if their serum potassium level was <3.5 or >5.5 mmol/L and if their SCr level was >3.0 mg/dL (270 >mol/L), and/or if they met other standard exclusion criteria. | Death or cardiac transplantation | N/A | HDD were independently associated with mortality, sudden death, and pump failure death (aHR: 1.37 (p=0.004), aHR: 1.39 (p=0.042), and aHR: 1.51 (p=0.034), respectively. Use of metolazone was an independent predictor of total mortality (aHR: 1.37; p=0.016) but not of cause-specific mortality. In quartiles of loop diuretic dose, total mortality increased progressively without a clear risk threshold, more than doubling from the lowest-dose group to the highest-dose group (p=0.001). Unadjusted mortality rates were 20.7% (n=152), 30.7% (n=313), 36.8% (n=304), and 44.8% (n=84) for increasing dose of furosemide (40 mg, 40-80 mg, 80-120 mg, and 120 mg daily) or bumetanide (1 mg, 1-2 mg, 2-3 mg, and 3 mg daily), respectively. By proportional hazard regression, high diuretic dose was an independent predictor of total mortality (aHR: 1.37; p=0.004), sudden death (a HR: 1.39, p=0.042), and pump failure death (aHR: 1.51, p=0.034). | Retrospective study as pts enrolled in PRAISE were not on beta blockers. | Found that high doses of loop diuretic (>80mg of furosemide or >2mg of bumetanide daily) were independently associated with mortality in pts with advanced HF. When degree of congestion was considered together with its treatment, the associated risks were additive, suggesting that diuretic resistance should be considered an indicator of prognosis in chronic HF. However, retrospective analysis does not establish harm, nor rule out a long-term relationship. Also, baseline data were used, and diuretic treatment status may have changed over time. Progressive HF, relative to pts taking only a non-PSD. |
Ultrafiltration

**ULOAD substudy (Maryland), Rogers, 2008**

This study was designed to evaluate the consequences of UF and standard IV diuretic (furosemide) therapy on GFR and renal plasma flow in pts with acute decompensated HF. This study was designed to evaluate the consequences of UF and standard IV diuretic (furosemide) therapy on GFR and renal plasma flow in pts with acute decompensated HF. Pts with ACS, SCr >3.0 mg/dL, SBP ≤ 90 mm Hg, hematocrit >45%, inability to obtain venous access, or clinical instability likely to require IV nitropresuside or IV pressors, history of administration of IV diuretics and/or vasoactive drugs during the present hospitalization (except for a single dose of IV diuretics administered in the ED before hospitalization), use of iodinated radiocontrast material, contraindication to the use of anticoagulation, systemic infection, or hemodialysis were excluded from the substudy. Pts with ACS, SCr >3.0 mg/dL, SBP ≤ 90 mm Hg, hematocrit >45%, inability to obtain venous access, or clinical instability likely to require IV nitropresuside or IV pressors, history of administration of IV diuretics and/or vasoactive drugs during the present hospitalization (except for a single dose of IV diuretics administered in the ED before hospitalization), use of iodinated radiocontrast material, contraindication to the use of anticoagulation, systemic infection, or hemodialysis were excluded from the substudy. Pts in trial represented

**ULOAD, MR Costanzo, 2007**

To compare the safety and efficacy of venovenous UF and standard IV diuretic therapy for hypervolemic HF pts

- Pts hospitalized with primary diagnosis of acute decompensated congestive HF; evidence of fluid overload as indicated by: pitting edema (2+) of lower extremities; jugular venous distension; pulmonary edema or pleural effusion; ascites; ACS; creatinine >3.0 mg/dL; SBP <90 mmHg; hematocrit >45%; prior administration of IV vasoactive drugs in the ED; clinical instability requiring pressors during hospitalization; recent use of iodinated contrast material; systemic infection, or hemodialysis were excluded from the substudy.
- Primary efficacy endpoints:
  - Weight loss was greater in the UF than in the standard-care group (5.0 ± 3.1 kg vs. 3.1 ± 3.5 kg; p=0.0001)
  - Dyspnea scores were similarly improved in the UF and standard-care group at both 8 and 48 h.
- Primary safety endpoints:
  - Changes in SCR were similar in the 2 groups throughout the study and % of pts with rise in SCR >0.3 mg/dL were Population not representative of HF pts (better renal function, and excluded pts with hypotension; industry sponsored; While weight loss was greater and rehospitalization at 90 d was lower in the UF arm, data not available on long-term effects on renal function or resource utilization. The pts in trial represented

- Total weight loss during first 48 h; change in dyspnea score during first 48 h; change in QoL (living with HF); changes in renin and aldosterone; rate of hospitalizations and
- Change in global assessment; change in GFR (as measured by iothalamate), and renal plasma flow (as measured by para-aminohippurate) were assessed before fluid removal and after 48 h.
- Pts with ACS, SCr >3.0 mg/dL, SBP ≤ 90 mm Hg, hematocrit >45%, inability to obtain venous access, or clinical instability likely to require IV nitropresuside or IV pressors, history of administration of IV diuretics and/or vasoactive drugs during the present hospitalization (except for a single dose of IV diuretics administered in the ED before hospitalization), use of iodinated radiocontrast material, contraindication to the use of anticoagulation, systemic infection, or hemodialysis were excluded from the substudy.
- Pts in ACS; creatinine >3.0 mg/dL; SBP <90 mmHg; hematocrit >45%; prior administration of IV vasoactive drugs in the ED; clinical instability requiring pressors during hospitalization; recent use of iodinated contrast material; severe concomitant disease expected to prolong hospitalization; sepsis; on or
- Total weight loss during first 48 h; change in dyspnea score during first 48 h; change in QoL (living with HF); changes in renin and aldosterone; rate of hospitalizations and
- Change in global assessment; change in GFR (as measured by iothalamate), and renal plasma flow (as measured by para-aminohippurate) were assessed before fluid removal and after 48 h.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Major Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Major Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case-series</td>
<td>Present data on UF from a series of pts treated at the Mayo clinic who were generally sicker and had failed at least 1 IV treatment</td>
<td>Case-series</td>
<td>11 HF pts admitted to Mayo clinic who have failed at least 1 IV diuresis treatment</td>
<td>Contraindication to UF</td>
<td>Change in creatinine, fluid loss; complications from UF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-series</td>
<td>Pilot study which compared a single 8-h UF intervention to usual care in pts admitted with decompensated HF</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>40 Hospitalized with primary diagnosis of HF; at least 2+ edema of the lower extremities and at least either JVP &gt;10, pulmonary edema or pleural effusion on CXR, pulmonary rales, pulmonary wedge or LVEDP &gt;20, ascites, or pre-sacral edema</td>
<td>Severe stenotic valvular disease; ACS; SBP &lt;90; hematocrit &gt;40% 5. poor peripheral venous access; hemodynamic instability; use of iodinated contrast within 72 h of consent or anticipated use; severe concomitant disease</td>
<td>24-h weight loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-series</td>
<td>Compared UF to historical controls in order to determine if use of UF before any IV diuretics in pts with decompensated HF and modest renal dysfunction reestablishes euvoemia and permits hospital discharge in ≤3 d, without hypotension, a ≥25% increase in SCR or other AEs.</td>
<td>Observational study</td>
<td>20 Volume overload; modest degree of renal dysfunction or diuretic resistance (chronic daily PO furosemide ≥80 mg, or torsemide ≥40 mg, or bumetamide ≥2 mg and SCR ≥1.5 mg/dl), relatively high diuretic requirement at baseline; &lt;12 h since hospitalization, given no vasoactive drugs and &lt;1 dose IV diuretic</td>
<td>Hematocrit &gt;40%, end-stage renal disease requiring dialysis; Hypercoagulability; SBP &lt;95 mm Hg; Requirement for IV inotropes; Participation in another research study or previously in this trial</td>
<td>Weight loss; hospital length of stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agostoni, 1994</td>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pts with acute MI (&lt;1 y), angina pectoris, primary valvular disease, intermittent claudication, fibrotic or primary vascular lung diseases, sinus or atrioventricular node dysfunction, effort-induced severe ventricular arrhythmias or an artificial pacemaker</td>
<td>Scores of lung water, exercise test parameters; plasma renin, aldosterone and norepinephrine</td>
<td><strong>3 mo</strong> after UF or IV diuretic, the hemodynamic variables examined at rest had returned to the control values in the diuretic group, but not the UF group. In the UF group, right atrial pressure, pulmonary artery pressure and wedge pressure were still as reduced as they had been 24 h after UF. (p&lt;0.01, only figures displayed).</td>
<td>Small older study</td>
<td>After UF, improved functional capacity continued for 3 mo after the procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepi, 1993</td>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NYHA functional class II-III HF and clinically silent by radiologically evident increased lung water; sinus rhythm and EF &lt;35%</td>
<td>UF decreased radiological score of extravascular lung water (from 15(1)-9(1)) and of right (from 7.1 (2.3)-2.3 (1.7) mm Hg) and left (from 17.6 (8.8)-9.5 (6.4) mm Hg) ventricular filling pressures; an increase in oxygen consumption at peak exercise (from 15.8 (3.3) to 17.6 (2.6) mL/min/kg) and of tolerance time (from 444 (138) to 508 (134) s); decrease in atrial and ventricular dimensions; no changes in the systolic function of the left ventricle; a reduction of the early to late filling ratio in both ventricles (mitral valve from 2 (2) to 1.1 (1.1)); (tricuspid valve from 1.3 (1.3) to 0.69 (0.18)) and an increase in the deceleration time of mitral and tricuspid flow, reflecting a redistribution of filling to late diastole. Variations in the ventricular filling pattern, lung water content, and functional performance persisted for 3 mo in all cases. None of these changes was detected in the control group.</td>
<td>Small older study; single institution</td>
<td>Pathophysiological study involving UF and hemodynamic outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agostoni, 1993</td>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>NYHA functional classes II and III; stable clinical condition; receiving drug treatment (stable over last 6 mo) optimized to prevent development of edema and maintain a stable body weight (+/- 1 kg)</td>
<td>LVSF (from ultrasonography); Doppler evaluation of mitral, tricuspid, and aortic flow and echo-Doppler determination of cardiac output; radiological score of extravascular lung water; R/LV filling pressures; oxygen consumption at peak exercise and exercise tolerance time in cardiopulmonary tests.</td>
<td>Significant reductions in UF group right atrial pressure (from 8 ± 1 - 3.4 ± 0.7 mm Hg), pulmonary wedge pressure (from 18 ± 2.5 - 10 ± 1.9 mm Hg) and cardiac index (from 2.8 ± 0.2 -2.3 ± 0.2 L/min). During the follow-up period, lung function improved, extravascular lung water (X-ray score) decreased and</td>
<td>Small older study</td>
<td>Pathophysiological study involving UF and hemodynamic outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kg in last 6 mo; therapeutic digoxin level (if on digoxin) severe ventricular arrhythmias or an artificial pacemaker

peak oxygen consumption (mL/min per kg) increased from $15.5 \pm 1$ (d -1) to $17.6 \pm 0.9$ (d 4), to $17.8 \pm 0.9$ (d 30), to $18.9 \pm 1$ (d 90) and to $19.1 \pm 1$ (d 180). Oxygen consumption at anaerobic threshold (mL/min per kg) also increased from $11.6 \pm 0.8$ (d -1) to $13 \pm 0.7$ (d 4), to $13.7 \pm 0.5$ (d 30), to $15.5 \pm 0.8$ (d 90) and to $15.2 \pm 0.8$ (d 180). These changes were associated with increased ventilation, tidal volume and dead space/tidal volume ratio at peak exercise. Improvement in exercise performance was associated with a decrease in norepinephrine at rest, a downward shift of norepinephrine kinetics at submaximal exercise and an increase in norepinephrine during orthostatic tilt. None of these changes were recorded in group B.

ACS indicates acute coronary syndrome; ADHERE, Acute Decompensated Heart Failure National Registry; AE, adverse event; AUC, area under the curve; BNP, B-Type natriuretic peptide; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; CHD, chronic heart disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CrCl, creatinine clearance; CV, cardiovascular; DAD-HF, Dopamine in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; DIG, Digitalis Investigation Group; DM, diabetes mellitus; ED, emergency department; eGFR, glomerular filtration rate; EUPHORIA, Early Ultrafiltration Therapy in Patients with Decompensated Heart Failure and Observed Resistance to Intervention with Diuretic Agents; EVEREST, Efficacy of Vasopressin Antagonism in hemodynamic failure: Outcome Study With Tolvaptan; HDD, high dose diuretics; HF, heart failure; Hgb, hemoglobin; HTN, hypertension; ICU, intensive care unit; IV, intravenous; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; LDD, low dose diuretics; LDFD, low-dose furosemide; LOS, length of stay; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MCS, mechanical cardiac support; N/A, not applicable; NPSD, nonpotassium-sparing diuretics; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-Type natriuretic peptide; P, per oral; PRAISE, Prospective Randomized Amlodipine Survival Evaluation; PROTECT, Placebo-controlled Randomized study of the selective A(1) adenosine receptor antagonist rolofylline for patients hospitalized with acute heart failure and volume Overload to assess Treatment Effect on Congestion and renal function; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; PSD, potassium-sparing diuretics; pts, patients; RAPID-HF, Relief for Acutely Fluid-Overloaded Patients With Decompensated Congestive Heart Failure; RCT, randomized control trial; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SCD, sudden cardiac death; SCR, serum creatinine; SOLVD, Studies of left ventricular dysfunction; Tx, treatment; UF, ultrafiltration; UNLOAD, Ultrafiltration Versus Intravenous Diuretics for Patients Hospitalized for Acute Decompensated Heart Failure; VAS, visual analog scale, WMD, weighted mean difference; and WRF, worsening renal function.

Data Supplement 18. ACE Inhibitors (Section 7.3.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trial standard treatment</td>
<td>N (Total) n (Experimental) n (Control)</td>
<td>Ischemic/ Non-Ischemic</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Primary Endpoint</td>
<td>Secondary Endpoint</td>
<td>1st Year Mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>CONSENSUS</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>NYHA class IV HF patients</td>
<td>To Evaluate influence of enalapril on prognosis of NYHA class IV HF</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>26% in enalapril group and 44% in placebo group—40% reduction (p = 0.002). Mortality was reduced by 31% at 1 y (p=0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10 y FU of CONSENSUS 1987</td>
<td>10 y open-label follow-up study</td>
<td>NYHA class IV HF patients</td>
<td>All pts were offered open-label enalapril therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>5 pts, all in the enalapril group, were long-term survivors (p=0.004). Averaged over the trial (double-blind plus open-label extension) risk reduction was 30% (p=0.008), 95% CI: 11% - 46%. At end of double-blind study period, mortality considerably higher among pts not receiving open ACEI therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLVD 1991</td>
<td>2097034 (170) Study the effect of enalapril on mortality and hospitalization in pts with chronic HF and EF ≤35%</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Diuretics + Digoxin</td>
<td>2569, 1285; 1284</td>
<td>Ischemic heart disease 72%</td>
<td>LVEF &lt;35%; Mild to severe (11% class I/II; 2% class IV); LVEF 25%; BP: 125/77; HR: 80; AF: 8-12%</td>
<td>Age &gt;80 y; Unstable angina; MI w/in past mo; Cr=2.0 mg/dL</td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>Hospitalizations; Incidence of MI; Mortality by specific causes; Combined mortality and morbidity from both SOLVD+/SOLVD-</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td>3.45 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLVD 1992</td>
<td>1463530 (90) Study effect of ACEIs on total mortality and mortality from CV causes, the development of HF, and hospitalization for HF in pts with EF &lt;35%</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>No drug treatment for HF</td>
<td>4228, 2111; 2117</td>
<td>History of ischemic heart disease 85%</td>
<td>EF &lt;35%; Asymptomatic; NYHA class I (67%) + II; EF: 28%; BP: 126/78; HR: 75; AF: 4%</td>
<td>Mortality; Combined mortality and the incidence of HF and rate of hospitalization for HF</td>
<td>Incidence of HF and rate of hospitalization for HF</td>
<td>3.12 y</td>
<td>Reduced mortality: p=0.30; 95% CI: -8-21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLVD F/U 2003</td>
<td>12788569 (91) 12-y FU of SOLVD to establish if the mortality reduction with enalapril among pts with HF was sustained, and whether a subsequent reduction in mortality would emerge among those with asymptomatic ventricular dysfunction.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6784; 3391; 3393</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Participation in SOLVD+ and SOLVD-Asymptomatic to severe; NYHA I-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Enalapril extended median survival by 9.4 mo in the combined trials (95% CI: 2.8–16.5, p=0.004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS 1999 10687334 (171)</td>
<td>To compare the efficacy and safety of low and high doses of ACEI on the risk of death and hospitalization in chronic HF, than the large doses that have been shown to reduce morbidity and mortality in pts with HF. AIM: Investigate if low doses and high doses of ACEIs have similar benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3164-1596 to the low-dose strategy and 1568 to the high-dose strategy.</td>
<td>CAD 65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEF &lt;=30%; NYHA class II, III, or IV, despite treatment with diuretics for ≥2 mo (Treatment for HF in ED or hospital within 6 mo required for pts in class II); Prior use of digitalis, ACEIs, or vasodilators allowed but not mandated; NYHA II-IV (mainly class II); LVEF 23%; SBP 126 mmHg; HR 80; NYHA class: III (few II and IV)</td>
<td>Acute coronary ischemic event or revascularization procedure within 2 mo; History of sustained or symptomatic ventricular tachycardia; Intolerant of ACEIs; Scr &gt;2.5 mg/dL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality from all causes</td>
<td>Combined risk of all-cause mortality and hospitalization for any reason; CV mortality, CV hospitalizations; All-cause mortality combined with CV hospitalizations; CV mortality combined with CV hospitalizations; Combined risk of fatal and nonfatal MI plus hospitalization for unstable angina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 y</td>
<td>High-dose group had 8% lower risk of all-cause mortality (p=0.128) and 10% lower risk of CV mortality (p=0.073) than low-dose group. Death or hospitalization for any reason, high-dose group had 12% lower risk than low-dose group, p=0.002. Total number of hospitalizations: high-dose group 13% fewer hospitalizations for any reason (p=0.021), 16% fewer hospitalizations for CV reason (p=0.05), and 24% fewer hospitalizations for HF (p=0.002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-MI ACEI Use

© American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
 SAVE, 1992 1386652 (89)  To test the hypothesis that the long-term administration of captopril to survivors of acute MI who had baseline LV dysfunction but did not have overt HF requiring vasodilator therapy would reduce mortality, lessen deterioration in cardiac performance, and improve clinical outcome.  

| RCT | Beta-blockers 38%; Digitalis 26%; Nitrates 51% | Ischemic 100% | Alive 3 d after MI; LVEF <40%; >21 y of age, but <80; Killip class I — 60%; (60% of the ps did not have even transient pulmonary congestion at baseline/the time of their acute MI; EF 31%; BP 113/70; HR 78; | Failure to undergo randomization within 16 d after the MI; Relative contraindication to the use of an ACEIs or the need for such an agent; SCr > 2.5 mg/dl | Mortality from all causes | Mortality from CV causes; Mortality combined with a decrease in the EF of at least 9 units in surviving pts; CV morbidity (development of severe CHF or the recurrence of MI); Combination of CV mortality and morbidity; 2 endpoints of severe HF (treatment failure); 1st, development of overt HF necessitating treatment with ACEI and 2nd, hospitalization to treat CHD. | 3.5 y | Mortality from all causes was significantly reduced in the captopril group (228 deaths, or 20%) as c/w the placebo group (275 deaths, or 25%); the RR:19% (95% CI, 3-32%; p= 0.019). RR:21% (95% CI, 5 -35%; p = 0.014) for death from CV causes, 37% (95% CI, 20-50%; p=0.001) for the development of severe HF, 22% (95% CI, 4-37%; p= 0.019) for CHF requiring hospitalization, and 25% (95% CI, 5-40%; p= 0.015) for recurrent MI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIRE 1993</td>
<td>2006; 1014; 992</td>
<td>Ramipril, with a definite acute MI 3-10 days before randomization; Clinical evidence of HF at any time since acute MI</td>
<td>1.3 y</td>
<td>Use of an ACEI considered to be mandatory, mortality from all causes was significantly lower for pts on ramipril compared to pts on placebo. RR: 0.27; 95% CI: 11-40%; p = 0.002. Prespecified secondary outcomes: risk reduction of 19% for the 1st validated outcome—namely, death, severe/resistant HF, MI, or stroke (95% CI: 5% - 31%; p=0.008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACE 1995</td>
<td>1749; 876; 873</td>
<td>Consecutive pts &gt;18 y hospitalized with MI; Criteria for MI: chest pain or electrocardiographic changes, accompanied by ≥2X increase in one or more cardiac enzymes; LV dysfunction (EF &lt;35%); NYHA class 1 - 41%; BP 121/76; HR 81</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>The mortality from all causes at 1 y was 24%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; AIRE, Acute Infarction Ramipril Efficacy; APE, acute pulmonary embolism; ATLAS, Assessment of Treatment with Lisinopril and Survival; BP, blood pressure; CAD, coronary artery disease; CHD, chronic heart disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CONSENSUS Cooperative North Scandinavian Enalapril Survival Study; Cr, creatinine; CV, cardiovascular; CW, compared with; DM, diabetes mellitus; ED, emergency department; FU, follow-up; HF, heart failure; MI, myocardial infarction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; SE, standard error; Scr, serum creatinine; TIA, transient ischemic attack; Tr, trend; TV, treatment group; USS, United States dollar; W/A, weight-adjusted; Y, year; Yr, year.
### Data Supplement 19. ARBs (Section 7.3.2.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Y)</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARM Alternative; Granger et al; (2003) 13678870 (174)</strong></td>
<td>Discover whether ARB could improve outcome in pts not taking an ACEI (intolerant)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Pre-trial standard treatment.</td>
<td>NYHA ll-lV; EF &lt;40%, no ACEI (b/c of intolerance)</td>
<td>Composite of CV death or hospital admission for CHF</td>
<td>CV death, hospital admission for CHF or non-fatal MI; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke, coronary revascularization; Death (any cause); New DM</td>
<td>3.4 y</td>
<td>Absolute reduction of 4.4 pts with events per 100 pts treated - NNT of 23 to prevent 1 first event of CV death or CHF hospitalization. RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.75-0.96); p=0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARM-ADDED; McMurray et al; (2003) 13678869 (175)</strong></td>
<td>To investigate if ARB + ACEI in pts with chronic HF improve clinical outcomes</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Beta blockers-55%; spironolacton e 17%, Digoxin 58-59%</td>
<td>NYHA class II-IV; mild to severe (&lt;3% class IV); EF 28%; BP 125/75; HR 74; AF 27%</td>
<td>Composite of CV death or hospital admission for CHF</td>
<td>CV death, hospital admission for CHF or non-fatal MI; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke, coronary revascularization; Death (any cause); New DM</td>
<td>2.8 y</td>
<td>Absolute reduction of 7 major events per 100 pts treated - NNT 14 pts to prevent 1 CV death or hospitalization. HR: 0.77 (95% CI: 0.67-0.89); p=0.0004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Secondary Endpoint</th>
<th>1st Y Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARM Alternative; Granger et al; (2003) 13678870 (174)</strong></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Pre-trial standard treatment.</td>
<td>2028; 1013; 1015</td>
<td>Ischemic/Non-Ischemic</td>
<td>Symptomatic HF; EF &lt;40%, no ACEI (b/c of intolerance)</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV; mild to severe (&lt;4% class IV); EF: 30%; BP: 130/70; HR: 74-75; AF: 25-26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARM-ADDED; McMurray et al; (2003) 13678869 (175)</strong></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Pre-trial standard treatment.</td>
<td>2548; 1276; 1272</td>
<td>Ischemic 62-63%</td>
<td>Symptomatic HF; EF &lt;40%; Treatment with ACEI; Age &gt;18 y</td>
<td>NYHA class II-IV; mild to severe (&lt;3% class IV); EF 28%; BP 125/75; HR 74; AF 27%</td>
<td>Composite of CV death or hospital admission for CHF</td>
<td>CV death, hospital admission for CHF or non-fatal MI; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke; CV death, CHF admission, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke, coronary revascularization; Death (any cause); New DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compare the effect of an ARB, ACEI and the combination of the 2 on mortality

Randomized double blind multicenter trial

Beta-blockers; ASA

14,703

Valsartan:4909

Captopril-: 4909

VAL + CAP: 4885

Ischemic 100% (MI inclusion criteria)

Age >18 y: Acute MI complicated by HF; LV systolic dysfunction (EF <35%), (<40% on radionuclide ventriculography); SBP > 100 mmHg; Cr < 2.5 mg/dl

Prior intolerance or contra-indication to ACEI/ARB

NYHA I-IV; asymptomatic-severe, EF 35%; BP: 123/72; HR: 76

Death from any cause

12.5% VAL

12.3% VAL--CAP

13.2% CAP

2.1 y VAL and CAP: 1.0 (97.5% CI - 0.90-1.11); p= 0.98 ; VAL+CAP and CAP: 0.98 (97.5% CI-- 0.89-1.09); p= 0.73

Evaluate long term effects of adding ARB to standard therapy for HF

RCT Diuretics; Digoxin 67%; Beta blocker 35%; ACEI 95%

5010; 2511; 2499

Ischemic 57%

Age>18 y: NYHA II, II, IV; At least 2 wk of background meds including ACEIs; EF <40% and LVID >2.9 cm/BSA

NYHA II-III, IV (only ≤2% class IV); Mild to severe; EF 27%; BP 123/76; AF 12%

Mortality; Combined end point of mortality and morbidity

Change in EF;

NYHA class, QoL scores; Signs and symptoms of HF

1.92 y Mortality similar for the 2 treatment groups.

For the combined endpoint: RR: 0.87, 95% CI, 0.77-0.97, p=0.009

Compared the effects of high-dose vs low-dose losartan on clinical outcomes in pts with HF.

RCT Diuretic drugs (77%), beta blockers (72%), and ARBs (38%)

3846

losartan 150 mg (n=1927) or 50 mg daily (n=1919).

IHD 64%

>18 y: NYHA class II–IV; LVEF <40%, with stable CV medical therapy for at least 2 wk; Intolerance to ACEI; Investigators encouraged to start beta blocker and titrate to a maximum, whenever possible

Pregnancy or lactation; known intolerance to ARBs; Systolic arterial blood pressure <90 mm Hg; Significant stenotic valvular heart disease; Active myocarditis; active pericarditis; Planned

NYHA II–IV (70% II); EF: 33%; BP: 124/77; HR: 71; AF: 28%

Death or admission for HF

Composite endpoint of death or CV admission. Additional prespecified outcomes included: death, death or all-cause admission, CV death, all-cause admission, CV admission, admission for HF, and changes in the severity of heart disease

Additional endpoints included: all-cause admissions, CV admission, and admission for HF.

Death or admission for HF

Composite: 628 (43%) pts in 150 mg group vs. 689 (46%) in 50 mg group died or admitted for HF (HR: 0.90; 95% CI: 0.82-0.99; p=0.027)

• Components: 635 pts in 150 mg group vs. 665 in 50 mg group died (HR: 0.94, 95% CI: 0.84–1.04; p=0.24), and 450 vs. 503 pts admitted for HF (0.87, 0.76–0.98; p=0.025)

Mortality similar for the 2 treatment groups.

For the combined endpoint: RR: 0.87, 95% CI, 0.77-0.97, p=0.009

Treating pts with 150 mg dose instead of 50 mg dose would result in 1 additional pt w/out the primary event at 4 y for every 31 pts treated. Composite: 628 (43%) pts in 150 mg group vs. 689 (46%) in 50 mg group died or admitted for HF (HR: 0.90; 95% CI: 0.82-0.99; p=0.027)

• Components: 635 pts in 150 mg group vs. 665 in 50 mg group died (HR: 0.94, 95% CI: 0.84–1.04; p=0.24), and 450 vs. 503 pts admitted for HF (0.87, 0.76–0.98; p=0.025)
CHARM-Overall
(1367886)

Aimed to find out whether the use of an ARB could reduce mortality and morbidity.

RCT: parallel, randomized, double-blind.

Diuretics: 83%
Beta blockers: 55%
ACEI: 43%
Spironolactone: 17%
Digoxin: 43%

7601 pts (7599 with data)
3803
3796

>18 y;
NYHA class II–IV for at least 4 wk;
3 distinct populations: pts with LVEF <40% who were not receiving ACEIs (previous intolerance) or who were currently receiving ACE, and pts with LVEF >40%.
SCr > 265 μmol/L, serum potassium >5.5 mmol/L, Bilateral renal artery stenosis; symptomatic hypotension;
Women of childbearing potential not using adequate contraception;
Critical aortic or mitral stenosis; MI, stroke, or open-heart surgery in NYHA II–IV
NYHA II–IV
Only 3% class IV

The primary outcome of the overall program: all-cause mortality;
For all the component trials: CV death or hospital admission for CHF.
The annual CV death rate among the placebo group who had reduced LVEF was around 9% and was only 4% in the placebo group of CHARM-Preserved.

3.1 y
886 (23%) pts in candesartan and 945 (25%) in placebo group died (unadjusted HR: 0.91; 95% CI: 0.83–1.00; p=0.055; covariate aHR: 0.90 95% CI: 0.82–0.99; p=0.032)
• Fewer CV deaths (691 [18%] vs 769 [20%], unadjusted HR: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.79–0.97; p=0.012; covariate aHR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.78–0.96; p=0.006)
• Hospital admissions for CHF (757 [20%] vs 918 [24%], p=0.0001)

© American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; ASA, aspirin; BP, blood pressure; BSA, body surface area; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CHARM, Candesartan in Heart Failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and Morbidity; CHD, chronic heart disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; Cr, creatinine; CV, cardiovascular; DM, diabetes mellitus; EF, ejection fraction; FU, follow-up; HEAAL study, effects of high-dose versus low-dose losartan on clinical outcomes in patients with heart failure; HF, heart failure; HR, heart rate; IHD, ischemic heart disease; LV, left ventricular; LVD, left ventricular dilatation; MI, myocardial infarction; MV, mitral valve; N/A, not applicable; NNT, number needed to treat; NYHA, New York Heart Association; QoL, quality of life; pts, patients; SBP, systolic blood pressure; RCT, randomized control trial; SCr, serum creatinine; TIA, transient ischemic attack; UA, unstable angina; Val-HeFT, Valsartan Heart Failure Trial; and VALIANT, Valsartan in Acute Myocardial Infarction.

### Data Supplement 20. Beta Blockers (Section 7.3.2.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIBIS II</td>
<td>CIBIS II investigators and committee members (1999) 10023943 (180)</td>
<td>Investigate the efficacy of bisoprolol in decreasing all-cause mortality in chronic HF</td>
<td>RCT--multicenter double-blind randomised placebo controlled trial (Europe)</td>
<td>Diuretics + ACEI; [amiodarone allowed--14-16%]</td>
<td>2647; 1327; 1320</td>
<td>Documented Ischemic 50%</td>
<td>NYHA class III or IV EF: &lt;35% 10-80 y old</td>
<td>Uncontrolled HTN; MI/UA w/previous 3 mo; PTCA/CABG w/previous 6 mo; AV-block &gt;1st degree w/o BPM; Heart rate &lt; 60 bpm; resting SBP &lt;100 mmHg; renal failure; Reversible obstruct lung disease; Use of beta blocker</td>
<td>Moderate to severe. Mean BP: 130/80; Mean HR: 80; Mean EF: 28%; Mean LVEDD: 6.7 cm; AF: 20%</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>All-cause hospital admissions</td>
<td>N/A 1.3 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT-HF</td>
<td>MERIT study Group; (1999) 10376614 (181)</td>
<td>Investigate whether Metoprolol CR/XL lowered mortality in pts with decreased EF and</td>
<td>RCT--multicenter double-blind randomised placebo control</td>
<td>Diuretics + ACEI [Amiodarone NOT allowed]</td>
<td>3991; 1991; 2001</td>
<td>Ischemic 65%</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV; 40-80 y old; LVEF &lt;40% (36-40 if 6-min walk &lt;450m); HR &gt;88 bpm</td>
<td>MI/UA w/previous 3 mo; Contra-indication or current use of beta blocker; PTCA/CABG w/4 mo Planned transplant or ICD; Heart block &gt;1st degree w/o BPM;</td>
<td>Mild to severe. Mean BP: 130/78; Mean HR: 78; Mean EF: 28%; AF 16-17%</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>All-cause hospital admissions Combined endpoints Permanent treatment withdrawal</td>
<td>N/A 1.0 y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
<p>| COPERNICUS | Packer et al; (2002) 12390947 (182) | Investigate whether Carvedilol is beneficial in severe HF | RCT--double blind | Diuretics (PO or IV) + ACEI (or ARB); [Amiodarone allowed 17-18%] | SBP&lt;100mmHg | Ischemic 67% | ESVolumic NYHA class IV; LVEF &lt;25%; No positive inotropes or vasodilators w/in 4d | Pt requiring hospitalized intensive care; Use of positive inotropes or IV; vasodilators w/in 4d; Coronary revascularization/MI/CVA/sign VT or VF w/in 2 mo; SBP &lt; 85 mmHg, Heart rate &lt;68, Cr &gt;2.8 mg/dl. | Severe Mean BP: 123/76; Mean HR: 83; Mean EF 20%; | All-cause mortality | Combined risk of death or hospitalization-any reason; Combined risk of death or hospitalization-CV reason; Combined risk of death or hospitalization-HF reason; Pt global assessment | 18.7% placebo [24.0% in pts with recent or recurrent cardiac decompensations] | 18.5% in placebo group 11.4% in Carvedilol group | 10.4 mo Treating 1000 pt for 1 y led to savings of 70 premature deaths p=0.0014 |
| SENIORS | Flather et al; (2005) 15642700 (183) | Assess effects of the beta blocker Nebivolol in pts &gt;70 y regardless of EF. | RCT | Diuretics + ACEI (+aldosterone antagonist in 29%) | Mean BP: 139/81; Mean HR: 79; Mean EF 36% (1/3 with EF &gt;35%); Mild to severe Mean BP: 139/81; Mean HR: 79; Mean EF 36% (1/3 with EF &gt;35%); | Composite of all-cause mortality or CV hospital admission | All-cause mortality Composite of all-cause mortality or all-cause hospital admissions All cause hospital admissions CV hospital admissions CV mortality Composite of CV mortality or CV hospital admissions NYHA class assessment; 6 MWT | N/A | N/A | 1.75 y Absolute risk reduction 4.2%; 24 pts would need to be treated for 21 mo to avoid one event RR: 0.96; 95% CI: 0.74-0.99; p=0.039 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Trial of the Beta-Blocker Bucindolol in Pt with Advanced Chronic HF</th>
<th>The Beta-Blocker Evaluation of Survival Trial Investigators (184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed to determine whether bucindolol hydrochloride, a nonselective beta-adrenergic blocker and mild vasodilator, would reduce the rate of death from any cause among pt with advanced HF and to assess its effect in various subgroups defined by ethnic background and demographic criteria — specifically women and members of minority groups.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACEIs (if tolerated) [91% ACE; 7% ARB], for at least 1 mo. Before the publication of the results of the DIG trial, 12 digoxin therapies were required, but thereafter its use became discretionary [DIG 94%].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708; 1354; 1354</td>
<td>Ischemic 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA class III or IV HF LVEF &lt;35% &gt;18 y</td>
<td>Reversible cause of HF present Candidates for heart transplantation Cardiac revascularization procedure within the previous 60 d UA Heart rate &lt;50 beats per minute, SBP &lt;80mmHg Decompensated HF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA III or IV (92% class III) EF 23%; HR 82; BP 117/71; AF 12%</td>
<td>Death from any cause Death from CV causes (death due to pump failure or an ischemic event or sudden death) Hospitalization for any reason Hospitalization because of HF Composite of death or heart transplantation LVEF at 3 and 12 mo Mt; QoL, and any change in the need for concomitant therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>For pt in NYHA functional class III, the annual mortality rate was 16% in the placebo group; For pt with NYHA class IV, the annual mortality rate in the placebo group was 28% Overall: annual mortality of 17% in placebo group c/w 15% in the bucindolol group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 pt in placebo group (33%) died, 411 in the bucindolol group (30%; HR: 0.90; 95% CI, 0.78-1.02; unadjusted p=0.10; adjusted p=0.13)</td>
<td>~2 y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMET; Poole-Wilson et al; (2003) 12853193 (185)
To compare the effects of carvedilol and metoprolol on clinical outcome in pts with HF

RCT  Diuretics,  ACEis  3029; 1511 carvedilol; 1518 metoprolol tartrate  N/A  NYHA class II- IV  EF <35%  Previous CV admission  N/A  Mild to severe  All-cause mortality  Composite endpoint of all-cause mortality, or all-cause admission  N/A  N/A  N/A  4.8 y  All-cause mortality 34% carvedilol and 40% metoprolol (HR: 0.83; 95% CI 0.74-0.93; p=0.0017)

(CIBIS III; 2005 16143696 (186)
Sufficient data do not currently exist to establish the optimum order of initiating chronic HF therapy (ACEI vs. beta blocker). This was the objective of the CIBIS III trial— it compared the effect on mortality and hospitalization of initial monotherapy with either bisoprolol or enalapril for 6 mo, followed by their combination for 6 to 24 mo.

| Multicenter, prospective, randomized, open-label, blinded endpoint evaluation (PROBE) trial,24 with 2 parallel groups. | Diuretics 84%; Digoxin 32% | CAD 62% | >65 y, NYHA class II or III, and LVEF <35% (By echo within the 3 mo). Clinically stable HF (without clinically relevant fluid retention or diuretic adjustment within 7 d) | Treatment with an ACEI, an ARB, or a beta blocker for >7 d during the 3 mo before randomization. Heart rate at rest <60 beats/min without a functioning pacemaker. Supine SBP <100 mm Hg at rest. SCr<220 µmol/L. AV block greater than first degree without a functioning pacemaker. Obstructive lung disease contraindicating bisoprolol treatment | NYHA II or III; mild to moderate CHF LVEF 29%; Heart rate 79; SBP 134 | The primary endpoint was time-to-the-first-event of combined all-cause mortality or all-cause hospitalization | Combined end point at the end of the monotherapy phase and the individual components of the primary end point, at study end and at the end of the monotherapy phase. CV death CV hospitalization | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4.8 y | All-cause mortality 34% carvedilol and 40% metoprolol (HR: 0.83; 95% CI 0.74-0.93; p=0.0017)

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; AV, atrioventricular; BP, blood pressure; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CHF, congestive heart failure; CIBIS II, Cardiac Insufficiency Bisoprolol Study II; COMET, Carvedilol Or Metoprolol European Trial; COPERNICUS, carvedilol prospective randomized cumulative survival; Cr, creatinine; CR/XL, controlled release/extended release; CV, cardiovascular; CVA, cerebrovascular accident; c/w, compared with; DIG, Digitalis Investigation Group; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; h/o, history of; HR, hazard ratio; ICD, implantable cardioverter defibrillator; ITT, intent to treat; MERIT-HF, Metoprolol CR/XL Randomised Intervention Trial in Congestive Heart Failure;
Data Supplement 21. Anticoagulation (Section 7.3.2.8.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size (HF Subpopulation)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WARCEF</strong> Pullicino 2006, 16500579; Homma 2012, 22551105 (187)</td>
<td>Compare efficacy of warfarin (INR 2.75) vs aspirin (325 mg/d) in HF pt in sinus rhythm</td>
<td>RCT, double blind/double dummy, multicenter, parallel group</td>
<td>N=2305, mean flu 3.5 y; (60% power to detect ~18% reduction primary endpoint)</td>
<td>Contraindication to or absolute indication for 1 treatment; MI/PCI/cardiac surgery &lt; 3 mo; decompensated HF, life expectancy otherwise &lt;5 y, HF admission or CEA or PPM insertion &lt;1 mo</td>
<td>Efficacy: time to first of (death+ischemic stroke+intracerebral hemorrhage); Safety: major hemorrhage</td>
<td>Primary Efficacy: 7.47 events (warfarin) vs. 7.93 events (aspirin) /100 person-y. Secondary: ischemic stroke – warfarin, HR: 0.52; Safety major hemorrhage: Warafin 1.78 vs aspirin 0.87/100 person-y. Primary Endpoint: p=0.40: 95% CI: 0.79 - 1.10; ischemic stroke p=0.0005, 95% CI: 0.33 - 0.82; major hemorrhage p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HELAS</strong> Cokkinos 2006 16737850 (188)</td>
<td>Determine if warfarin (INR 2.0-3.0) or aspirin (325 mg/d) reduces thromboemboli in HF</td>
<td>RCT, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled; (converted to pilot study due to inadequate enrolment)</td>
<td>N=194, mean flu 22 mo; Ischemic (aspirin vs warfarin), N=114; DCM (warfarin vs. placebo), N=80 (stopped at 4% target due to poor recruitment)</td>
<td>MI &lt;2 mo; &quot;reversible ischemia&quot;, mitral disease, HoCM, AF, LV thrombus, pregnancy, uncontr HTN, contra-ind to either study drug, otherwise &lt;2 y expected survival</td>
<td>Efficacy: composite [nonfatal stroke + arterial TEE or PE + MI + rehospitalization + worsened HF + all-cause mortality]; Safety: ICH + &quot;bleeding&quot; on treatment</td>
<td>Need for coronary revascularization; readmission for ischemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VASHER</strong> Cleland 2004 15215806 (189)</td>
<td>Pilot Study: feasibility of study comparing warfarin (INR 2.5) to aspirin (300 mg/d) to placebo</td>
<td>Prospective multicenter placebo-controlled RCT, 3-arm, open-label, blinded endpoint</td>
<td>N=279 pts, mean flu 27 mo</td>
<td>Required diuretics; LVEDD &lt;55 mm or &gt;30 mm²/m² or EF ≤35%; Prespecified subgroups: ischemic vs. DCM</td>
<td>&quot;Definite&quot; indication for warfarin or aspirin, MI &lt; 4 wk, inept status, contr-ind to either drug</td>
<td>Time to first event (on treatment or within 10 d of stopping treatment); composite [death + nonfatal MI + nonfatal stroke]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WATCH**
Massie 2009
19289640 (190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses: warfarin superior to aspirin and clopidogrel superior to aspirin for HF pt with reduced LVEF in sinus rhythm</th>
<th>Prospective, multicenter RCT, open label (warfarin) or double blind APT group comparing aspirin (162 mg) vs. clopidogrel (75 mg no load) vs warfarin (target INR 2.5)</th>
<th>N=1587; treatment for 1 y; mean flu 1.9 y (stopped early due to poor recruitment)</th>
<th>NYHA II-IV EF ≤35%; sinus rhythm on entry; on diuretics and ACE-I/ARB or H/N</th>
<th>Reversible HF; contraindicated to any study drug; imminent procedure or surgery; other survival-limiting disease</th>
<th>Efficacy: time to first event of composite (death + nonfatal MI + nonfatal stroke); Safety: major bleeding</th>
<th>Efficacy ITT: Primary - No difference warfarin vs. aspirin vs clopidogrel; Secondary - A group with more total and HF hospital admissions; Safety ITT: warfarin=aspirin, both with more major bleeding than clopidogrel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy PRIMARY: ITT: warfarin vs. aspirin: HR: 0.98; 95% CI: 0.86-1.12; p=0.77. clopidogrel vs. aspirin: HR: 1.08 95% CI: 0.83-1.40; p=0.57. warfarin vs. clopidogrel: HR: 0.89; 95% CI: 0.68-1.16; p=0.39. AT: warfarin superior to aspirin (p=0.006), warfarin superior to clopidogrel (p=0.0031). SECONDARY endpoints: HF hospitalizations aspirin (22.2%) vs. warfarin (16.5%), p=0.019; Total HF admissions aspirin (218) vs. warfarin (159), p &lt;0.001. Safety PRIMARY: major bleeding warfarin (5.2%) vs. clopidogrel (2.1%), p=0.007; warfarin vs. aspirin (p=NS). POST HOC Ischemic group (N=1163); Strokes warfarin (0) vs. aspirin (1.6), p=0.01; warfarin (0) vs. clopidogrel (2.7%), p=0.0009; Nonischemic group (N=424) Major bleed clopidogrel (0.7%) vs. warfarin (6.3%), p=0.0093. AT analysis (not prespecified): warfarin superior to aspirin (p=0.0095); warfarin superior to clopidogrel (p=0.0031).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both warfarin (RR=0.60) and aspirin (RR=0.70) associated with improved survival. Univariate survival: AC (1 y 77.7%; 95% CI: 71.7-82.4), 3 y 55.1%; 95% CI: 48.7-61.5), 5 y 40.4% [95% CI: 34.1-46.8] vs. no AC (1 y 71.5% [95% CI: 64.9-78.1], 3 y 47.0% [95% CI: 38.6-54.3], 5 y 31.0% [95% CI 24.0-38.0]; p=0.01 for AC vs no AC. Multivariate: OAT RR:0.60 [95% CI 0.4-0.8], aspirin RR: 0.7 [95% CI 0.5-0.9].

Survival 1 y and 5 y:

Both warfarin (RR=0.60) and aspirin (RR=0.70) associated with improved survival. Univariate survival: AC (1 y 77.7%; 95% CI: 71.7-82.4), 3 y 55.1%; 95% CI: 48.7-61.5), 5 y 40.4% [95% CI: 34.1-46.8] vs. no AC (1 y 71.5% [95% CI: 64.9-78.1], 3 y 47.0% [95% CI: 38.6-54.3], 5 y 31.0% [95% CI 24.0-38.0]; p=0.01 for AC vs no AC. Multivariate: OAT RR:0.60 [95% CI 0.4-0.8], aspirin RR: 0.7 [95% CI 0.5-0.9].

Survival 1 y and 5 y:

Both warfarin (RR=0.60) and aspirin (RR=0.70) associated with improved survival. Univariate survival: AC (1 y 77.7%; 95% CI: 71.7-82.4), 3 y 55.1%; 95% CI: 48.7-61.5), 5 y 40.4% [95% CI: 34.1-46.8] vs. no AC (1 y 71.5% [95% CI: 64.9-78.1), 3 y 47.0% [95% CI: 38.6-54.3], 5 y 31.0% [95% CI 24.0-38.0]; p=0.01 for AC vs no AC. Multivariate: OAT RR:0.60 [95% CI 0.4-0.8], aspirin RR: 0.7 [95% CI 0.5-0.9].

Stable NYHA II-IV,

Compared with control, data

Failure to meet inclusion criteria (systematic enrollment)

Contraindicated to any heparin, T1DM, valvular HD, recent worsening HF] at 6 and 12 mo

Total survival, BNP, LVEF, echo chamber parameters, NYHA class change, VO2 max, QoL

Primary: no difference secondary to DCM
### ROCKET AF

**Patel 2011 21830957 (196)**

**Compare rivaroxaban to warfarin in preventing ischemic strokes in pt with nonvalvular AF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective multicenter double-blind double-dummy event-driven noninferiority RCT of rivaroxaban 20 mg/d (15 mg if Cr Cl 30-49 mL/min) vs. warfarin (INR 2-3)</th>
<th>N=14,284 randomized, median f/u=707 d</th>
<th>8909 (rivaroxaban 4467, warfarin 4441) (62.5%)</th>
<th>Mitral stenosis, absolute non-AF indication for AC, high risk for anticoagulation</th>
<th>Primary efficacy: composite [ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke + systemic embolism]; Primary safety: composite [major + nonmajor clinically relevant bleeding]</th>
<th>Secondary efficacy: composite stroke + systemic embolism + CV mortality; composite [stroke + systemic embolism + CV mortality + MI]; individual components of primary composite. Secondary safety</th>
<th>Active treatment analysis (by design): rivaroxaban (1.7% per year events) noninferior to warfarin (2.2% per year events) for primary outcome; no difference in safety endpoints; fewer CHN hemorrhage and fatal bleeding in rivaroxaban group. Findings consistent for all subgroups. Efficacy: Per protocol, rivaroxaban HR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.66 - 0.96; p&lt;0.001 for noninferiority; HF subgroup ITT p=0.419. Safety superiority of rivaroxaban p=0.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mortality apixaban: HR: 0.89; 95% CI: 0.80-0.99; p=0.047.**

**Safety: apixaban: HR: 0.69; 95% CI: 0.60-0.80; p<0.001 (apixaban RRR: 27%)**

### Belch 1981 7291971 (197)

**Effect of low-dose SQ H on lower extremity DVT in pts with HF and pts with chest infections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective, randomized, open label, controlled study SQ H 5000 u q8h x 14 d or until discharge</th>
<th>Total N=100</th>
<th>HF subset n=38 (21 treatment, 17 control)</th>
<th>HF NYHA II-IV, clinical signs of volume overload</th>
<th>“Definite” risk of bleeding, DVT or PE on admission. &gt;2 d bed rest prior to admission</th>
<th>DVT diagnosed by I-125 fibrinogen scanning every 2 d or until discharge</th>
<th>Clinical evidence of bleeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**H reduced demonstrable DVT Total group: DVT (Ctl 26% vs H 4% of treated, p<0.01); 20% had minor bleeding (bruising at injection site), no major bleeding**

### ARTEMIS

**Cohen 2006 16439370 (198)**

**Safety and efficacy of fondaparinux in reducing VTE in older, moderate-high risk medical inpt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double-blind, placebo-controlled, block randomized, multicenter RCT of SQ fondaparinux 2.5 mg/d for 6-14 d started within 48 h of admission</th>
<th>N=849 medical inpt, mean f/u=1 mo</th>
<th>HF n=160 (fondaparinux 78, placebo 82)</th>
<th>CHF (NYHA III-IV) or acute respiratory illness; expected bed rest &gt;4 d; age &gt;60</th>
<th>High bleeding risk” or contraindicated to anticoagulation, Creat &gt;2.0 mg/dL, contrast allergy, mechanical vent &gt;24 h (total), indication for AC prophylaxis or therapy, life expectancy otherwise &lt;1 mo</th>
<th>Efficacy: DVT diagnosed by contrast venography (d 5-15), symptomatic VTE (inc PE by imaging or fatal) through d 15; Safety: major bleeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Efficacy: composite [Total VTE + bleeding + death at 1 mo]; Safety: composite [death or minor bleeding** |

**ITT (efficacy): all pt with ≥1 dose of drug (safety): HF pts=predefined subgroup. Fishers Exact and log-rank HF subgroup: Primary: fondaparinux 7/78 (9%) vs placebo 10/82 (12.2%), p=NS, Primary safety: p=NS (1 bleed in each group)**
CERTIFY
Tebbe 2011
21315215
(199)

Compare LMWH to heparin on VTE incidence in elderly HF pt
Prospective, double-blind, double dummy, active control, randomized noninferiority study of certoparin 3000 uID vs H 5000 u TID SQ (HF predefined subgroup)
Total N=3239, mean hospitalization 12.2 +/-5.1 d, mean treatment period = 9 d
HF n=470; 238 pts (cert) vs 232 pts (H),
age ≥70, clinical diagnosis of HF on admission (no further details)
Contraindicated to anticoagulation, History of DVT, PE or HIT2, stroke <3 mo, >3 d immobilization before randomization, cast or fracture, surgery <3 wk, severe sepsis, mechanical ventilation, any heparin <5 d
Efficacy: composite [prox DVT (compression USG d 8-20) + nonfatal PE + VTE-related death]; Safety: composite [major bleeding + minor bleeding + HIT]
Prox DVT, nonfatal PE, fatal VTE, distal DVT, symptomatic DVT, all-cause mortality, documented symptomatic VTE, composite [nonfatal PE + prox DVT + all-cause mortality]
Active treatment only. No difference in efficacy or safety endpoints in HF pt based on treatment arm. Primary: cert 3.78% vs heparin 4.74%; OR: 0.79; 95% CI 0.32-1.94; p=NS; multivariate: insufficient to confirm noninferiority in HF pt.

THE PRINCE
Kleber 2003
12679756
(200)

Compare safety and efficacy of enoxaparin with UFH in preventing VTE in pts with HF or severe respiratory disease
Prospective, randomized, active control/parallel group open label, noninferiority comparison enoxaparin 40 mg/d vs heparin 5000 u TID for 10 +/- 2 d. 1-sided equivalence, upper limit = 5% or 4% difference in efficacy.
Total N=665
HF n=333 for safety endpoint, n=206 for efficacy
NYHA III-IV
Contraindicated to heparin or anticoagulation, contrast allergy, DVT or PE on admission, immobilized >24 h prior to admission, taking warfarin or >low dose aspirin on admission
Efficacy: Confirmed TEE [DVT by venography or autopsy, PE by V/Q, CXR/Q scan [plus confirmatory venogram if +], angiogram or autopsy] within 1 d of completing treatment; Safety: Major bleeding
Efficacy: composite [TEE or death]
No differences in primary, secondary or safety endpoints
12.6% HF pt had events. Primary: enoxaparin (9.7%) vs heparin (16.1%) [CI -1.4 + 14.2], p=0.139. Secondary: mortality: enoxaparin 5.3% vs heparin 6.4% (no statistical comparison); Safety: no difference (1 bleed in entire study population)

MEDENOX
Samama 1999
10477777;
Turpie 2000
11206019;
Alikhan 2003
12945875
(201)

Compare safety and efficacy of 2 doses of enoxaparin vs placebo to prevent VTE in medical pt hospitalized ≤14 d
Prospective, randomized, double-blind, parallel arm of placebo or enoxaparin 20 mg/d vs enoxaparin 40 mg/d
Total N=855; 8u = 110 d
HF n=290 (34%)
NYHA III-IV
Contraindicated to anticoagulation or heparin, contrast allergy, thrombophilic disease or coagulopathy, Creat >1.7, mechanical ventilation, any AC for >48 h prior to enrollment
VTE [DVT (contrast venography or compression USG day 6-14 or earlier with symptoms), PE [high prob V/Q, CTA or angio] or both] d 1-14
VTE d 1-110; Major or minor hemorrhage, mortality, thrombocytopenia, any adverse event, lab abnormalities (multiple)
Exoxaparin 20 mg = Placebo (excluded from final analysis); lower incidence of radiographic DVT in enoxaparin 40 mg vs placebo. No difference in mortality or AEs among treatment groups. Primary: All HF pts: enoxaparin 4.0% vs placebo 14.6%, (RR: 0.29; 95% CI: 0.10-0.84; p=0.02); Class III HF pts: enoxaparin 5.1% vs placebo 12.3% (RR: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.13-1.28; p=0.20); Class IV HF pts: enoxaparin 0% vs. placebo 21.7%., (p=0.05); History of chronic HF as risk (regardless of admission diagnosis): enoxaparin 2.2% vs. placebo 12.1% (RR: 0.26; 95% CI: 0.08-0.92; p=0.04)

AC indicates anticoagulant; ACEI, angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ACT, active control parallel; AE, adverse event; AP, aspirin; APT, antiplatelet therapy; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; AT, as treated; BID, twice a day; BNP, brain natriuretic peptide; CAD, coronary artery disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CrCl, creatinine clearance; CTA, computed tomography angiography; CTR, cardiothoracic ratio; CV, cardiovascular; CXR, chest x-ray; Dab, dabigatran; DCM, dilated...
cardiomyopathy; DVT, deep venous thrombosis; EF, ejection fraction; f/u, follow-up; H, heparin; HD, heart disease; HF, heart failure; HIT2, heparin-induced thrombocytopenia; H/N, hydralazine and nitrates; HTN, hypertension; ICH, ischemia; INR, international normalized ratio; ITT, intent to treat; KM, kaplan-meier; LMWH, low molecular weight heparin; LV, left ventricular; LVEDD, left ventricular end diastolic diameter; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not applicable; NS, not significant; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OAT, oral anticoagulant therapy; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PE, pulmonary embolism; PPM, pacemaker; pt, patient; QoL, quality of life; RCT, randomized control trial; SQ, subcutaneous; TEE, thromboembolic event; TIA, transient ischemic attack; TID, three times a day; UFH, unfractionated heparin; USG, ultrasonography; VO2, oxygen volume; V/Q, ventilation/perfusion scan; and VTE, venous thromboembolic disease.

| Data Supplement 22. Statin Therapy (Section 7.3.2.8.2) | Study Name, Author, Year | Aim of Study | Study Type | Background Therapy | N (Total) | Pretrial standard (Experimental) n (Control) | Ischemic/Non-Ischemic | Inclusion Criteria | Exclusion Criteria | Severity of HF Symptoms | Primary Endpoint | Secondary Endpoint | Annualized Mortality | 1st Year Mortality | Trial Duration | Absolute Benefit | Statistical Results | Study Limitations |
| Horwich et al, 2004 14975476 (202) | To investigate the impact of statin therapy in pts with advanced HF referred for transplant evaluation at UCLA. | Cohort study | ACEI/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics | 551; 248; 303 | 45% | Pts referred for transplant evaluation between 2000-2 | LVEF >40%, baseline data incomplete | NYHA 3-4 | Death or urgent transplant | N/A | N/A | 75% | 2 y | 14% | HR 0.44; 95% CI 0.30-0.67; p<0.0001 | Single-center, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias |
| Mozaffarian et al, 2004 15110204 (203) | To evaluate the relation of statin therapy with clinical outcomes in severe HF enrolled in the PRAISE study | Cohort study | ACEI/ARB, diuretics, digoxin | 1,153; 1,019; 154 | 63% | Dyspnea or fatigue on exertion (NYHA 3b-4), LVEF ≥30% | N/A | NYHA 3b-4 | All-cause mortality | Cause-specific mortality (SCD, pump failure death, fatal MI) | 29 deaths/100 person-y | N/A | Mean 1.5 y | 14% | HR: 0.38; 95% CI: 0.23-0.65; Propensity-matched HR: 0.46. 95% CI: 0.26-0.75 | Post-hoc analysis from clinical trial |
Ray et al., 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort study</th>
<th>To determine whether statin use is associated with a lower risk of death and major CVD among adults newly diagnosed as having HF in Ontario registry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACEI/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics, nitrates</td>
<td>Adults aged 66 to 85 y in Ontario Canada newly hospitalized with primary diagnosis of HF between April 1, 1995, and December 31, 2001 and survived at least 90 d after the index HF hospitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts hospitalized within 36 mo for HF or having diagnosis of cancer within past 365 d prior to index HF hospitalization on discharge date; dispensed statin 365 d prior to hospital discharge, length of stay &gt;60 d, direct transfer to chronic care hospital, cancer within 90 d following index HF hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3% history of MI</td>
<td>HR: 0.62; 95% CI: 0.53–0.69; aHR: 0.72; 95% CI: 0.63–0.83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,828; 1,146; 27,682</td>
<td>28,828; 1,146; 27,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrospective cohort study, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias.

Foody et al., 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort study</th>
<th>To evaluate the association between statin use and survival among a national sample of elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACEI/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics, nitrates</td>
<td>Sampling of Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries hospitalized with a principal diagnosis of HF by ICD-9 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;65 y of age, HF readmissions, transferred out of the hospital, left AMA, or had unknown discharge</td>
<td>NYHA 2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54,960; 9,163; 45,797</td>
<td>54,960; 9,163; 45,797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrospective cohort study, sampling, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Cohort study</th>
<th>ACEI or ARB (as in ELITE-2), diuretics, digoxin</th>
<th>5,200; 1,103; 4,097</th>
<th>67%</th>
<th>ELITE-II: pts age ≥60 y; NYHA 2-4, LVEF &gt;40%. European registry: diagnosis of HF followed by HF clinic</th>
<th>NYHA 2-4</th>
<th>All-cause mortality</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>mean 1.5 y (ELITE-2); 2 y (European registry)</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>ELITE-II: aHR 0.61; 95% CI: 0.44-0.84; p&lt;0.0028 European registry: aHR 0.58; 95% CI adjusted 0.44-0.77; p&lt;0.0001; Retrospective cohort study and post-hoc analysis, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Medicare beneficiaries hospitalized with HF from National Heart Care Project between 4/98-3/99 and 7/00-6/01. disposition, died during hospitalization, had no date of death information available, hospitalized outside the US, discharged to hospice, contraindications to statin therapy, including statin allergy or liver dysfunction, or no medications recorded on discharge.

Anker et al, 2006 18946656 (206) To assess the relationship between statin use and survival in ELITE-II as well as a 5-center registry.
| Folkeringa et al, 2006 | Investigate the effects of statins on survival in CHF pts using a matched case-controlled study in pts admitted to hospital because of severe CHF from the MARCH study | Case-control study | ACEI/ARB, diuretics, digoxin | 524, 262; 262 | 50% | Pts admitted for HF with an uncomplicated survival for at least 1 mo after hospital discharge, group-wise matched between survivors and non-survivors on means of age, LVEF, renal function, and sex. | NR | NYHA 3-4 | All-cause mortality | N/A | NR | NR | Mean 2.6 y | 4% | OR: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.26–0.69 | Retrospective cohort study, sampling, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias |
| Go et al, 2006 | To evaluate the association between initiation of statin therapy and risks for death and hospitalization among adults with chronic HF in the Kaiser Permanente Chronic HF cohort | Cohort study | ACEI/ARB, diuretics, digoxin | 24,598; 12,648; 11,950 | 54% | Adults (age ≥20 y) diagnosed with HF 1/96-12/04 with ≥1 hospitalizations with a principal diagnosis of HF; ≥2 hospitalizations with a secondary diagnosis of HF in which the principal diagnosis is cardiac-related; ≥3 hospitalizations with secondary Pts who were receiving statin therapy at the study at entry date; who were not eligible for treatment based on national guidelines | NYHA 2-4 | Pts from any cause and hospitalization for HF | N/A | 13.90% | NR | Median 2.4 y | NR | aHR: 0.76; 95%CI: 0.72-0.80 | Retrospective cohort study, sampling, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias |
| Krum et al, 2007 | To examine statin/beta blocker interactions within the context of a large-scale clinical trial of pts with systolic CHF in CIBIS-II | Cohort study | ACEIs/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics | 2,647; 220; 2,421 | 59% | Pts enrolled in CIBIS-II study | N/A | NYHA 2-4 | Death | CV deaths included the following specific causes: sudden death, pump failure, MI and any other CV condition not listed above which led to the pt's death. Worsening HF only was counted as an outcome endpoint in CIBIS II when this (critical) event led to the hospitalization | 11.10% | NR | Mean 1.3 y | NR | HR 0.57; 95% CI: 0.37–0.94; aHR 0.60; 95% CI: 0.39–0.94 | Retrospective cohort study, sampling, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias |
To assess the outcome of pts enrolled in Val-HeFT according to statin use at the time of randomization to valsartan or placebo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Cohort study</th>
<th>ACEI/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</th>
<th>Pts enrolled in Val-HeFT study</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>NYHA 2-4</th>
<th>All-cause mortality</th>
<th>Mortality and morbidity (cardiac arrest with resuscitation, hospitalization for HF, or administration of inotropic or vasodilator drugs for 4 h or more without hospitalization)</th>
<th>7.90%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Mean 1.9 y</th>
<th>7.20%</th>
<th>HR 0.81: 95% CI 0.70-0.94; p=0.005</th>
<th>Retrospective cohort study, sampling, non-randomized, reason for drug use unclear, bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krum et al, 2007 17049646 (209)</td>
<td>To examine the effects of statin in reducing mortality in SCD-HeFT</td>
<td>ACEI/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>2,521; 965; 1,556</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Ischemic and non-ischemic cardiomyopathy, NYHA 2-3 HF, LVEF 35% or less</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NYHA 2-3</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mean 3.8 y</td>
<td>aHR 0.7; 95% CI: 0.57-0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dickinson et al, 2007 17383296 (210)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORONA, Kjekshus et al, 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>5,011; 2,497; 2,514</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, IHD, LVEF &lt;40%, does not need statin therapy, optimal medical therapy &gt;2 wk</td>
<td>Myopathy or hypersensitivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-HF, Tavazzi et al, 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>4,574; 2,285; 2,289</td>
<td>42% history of MI</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, if LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Hypersenstivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deaths from any cause, any coronary event (sudden death, fatal or nonfatal MI, PCI or CABG, ventricular defibrillation by an ICD, resuscitation after cardiac arrest, or hospitalization for UA), death from CV causes (with an additional analysis of cause-specific death from a CV cause), and the number of hospitalizations for CV causes, unstable angina, or worsening HF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORONA, Kjekshus et al, 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>5,011; 2,497; 2,514</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, IHD, LVEF &lt;40%, does not need statin therapy, optimal medical therapy &gt;2 wk</td>
<td>Myopathy or hypersensitivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-HF, Tavazzi et al, 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>4,574; 2,285; 2,289</td>
<td>42% history of MI</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, if LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Hypersenstivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deaths from any cause, any coronary event (sudden death, fatal or nonfatal MI, PCI or CABG, ventricular defibrillation by an ICD, resuscitation after cardiac arrest, or hospitalization for UA), death from CV causes (with an additional analysis of cause-specific death from a CV cause), and the number of hospitalizations for CV causes, unstable angina, or worsening HF**

---

**Corona, Kjekshus et al, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORONA, Kjekshus et al, 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>5,011; 2,497; 2,514</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, IHD, LVEF &lt;40%, does not need statin therapy, optimal medical therapy &gt;2 wk</td>
<td>Myopathy or hypersensitivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-HF, Tavazzi et al, 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>4,574; 2,285; 2,289</td>
<td>42% history of MI</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, if LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Hypersenstivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deaths from any cause, any coronary event (sudden death, fatal or nonfatal MI, PCI or CABG, ventricular defibrillation by an ICD, resuscitation after cardiac arrest, or hospitalization for UA), death from CV causes (with an additional analysis of cause-specific death from a CV cause), and the number of hospitalizations for CV causes, unstable angina, or worsening HF**

---

**GISSI-HF, Tavazzi et al, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-HF, Tavazzi et al, 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>ACE/ARB, beta-blockers, spironolactone, diuretics</td>
<td>4,574; 2,285; 2,289</td>
<td>42% history of MI</td>
<td>Age ≥18, symptomatic HF NYHA 2-4, if LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Hypersenstivity to statin, ACS or revascularization &lt;1 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery &lt;3 mo, Cr &gt;2.5 mg/dL, CK &gt;2x ULN, LFTs &gt;1.5x ULN, uncorrected valve or HCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deaths from any cause, any coronary event (sudden death, fatal or nonfatal MI, PCI or CABG, ventricular defibrillation by an ICD, resuscitation after cardiac arrest, or hospitalization for UA), death from CV causes (with an additional analysis of cause-specific death from a CV cause), and the number of hospitalizations for CV causes, unstable angina, or worsening HF**
safety of the statin rosuvastatin in pts with HF.>40% (10%) requires HF hospitalization within 12 mo
nal drug <1 month, MI <6 mo, ACS or revascularization <3 mo, reduced life expectancy, planned surgery/device <3 mo, Cr >2.5 mg/dL, LFTs >1.5x ULN, pregnant
death; time to death or admission for cardiovas- 
cular reasons
admission for any, CV, or HF cause; and the combined outcome measure of CV death or admission to hospital for any cause

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PRAISE, Prospective Randomized Amlodipine Survival Evaluation; SCD, sudden cardiac death; SCD-HeFT, Sudden Cardiac Death in Heart Failure Trial; UA, unstable angina; UCLA, University of California Los Angeles; and Val-HeFT, Valsartan Heart Failure Trial.

Data Supplement 23. Omega 3 Fatty Acids (Section 7.3.2.8.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Complications/Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-HF, Lancet 2008 18757090 (213)</td>
<td>To investigate whether omega-3 fatty acid supplementation could improve morbidity and mortality in a large population</td>
<td>Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (2x2 factorial design, rosuvastatin)</td>
<td>All treatments of proven efficacy for chronic HF (eg, ACEIs, beta blockers, diuretic drugs, spironolactone) were positively recommended</td>
<td>7,046; 3,494; 3,481 (placebo)</td>
<td>48.6% ischemic/5.0% non-ischemic-other</td>
<td>≥18 y, clinical evidence of HF of any cause classified as the ESC GL NYHA class II–IV, provided that LVEF was measured</td>
<td>1.8% absolute mortality reduction (95% CI 0·3–3·9%). Absolute benefit for mortality or admission for cardiovascular reasons was 2·3% (95% CI 0–4·6%). NNT for benefit is 56 pts need to be treated to avoid 1 death and 44 pts treated to avoid 1 event like death</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4.5 y, median f/u 3.9 y</td>
<td>By the end of the study, 1004 (29%) of pts in the omega 3 FA group and 1029 (30%) in the placebo group were no longer taking study</td>
<td>The rate of pts who had permanently discontinued taking the study drug because of adverse reactions was much the same in the omega 3 FA and in the placebo groups (102 [3%])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of pts with symptomati c HF of any cause.</td>
<td>Within 3 mo before enrollment. When LVEF was &gt;40%, the pt had to have been admitted at least 1 hospital for HF in the preceding y to meet the inclusion criteria. (eg, cancer) incompatible with a long fu; treatment with any other investigational agent within 1 mo before randomization; ACS or revascularization procedure within the preceding 1 mo; planned cardiac surgery, expected to be done within 3 mo after randomization; significant liver disease; and pregnant or lactating women or women of childbearing potential who were not adequately protected against becoming pregnant.</td>
<td>Cardiovascular reasons. Admission for any reason, admission for cardiovascular reasons, admission for HF, MI, and stroke.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Background treatment rates of ACEI/ARB 93%, beta blockers 65%, aldosterone antagonists 40%, loop diuretics 90%</td>
<td>11323 pts ; 4324 (with LVEF ≤50%)</td>
<td>100% ischemic</td>
<td>16087142 (214)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To evaluate the effect of omega 3 fatty acid supplementation in post MI pts with LVD. Randomized, multicenter, open-label, clinical trial with blinded validation of events. Standard background therapy for pts who are post AMI. No age limits. Patient with AMI in prior 3 mo. Irrespective of LV function. No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. Contraindicati ons to the dietary supplements (ie, known allergy to omega-3 fatty acids). Unfavorable short-term outlook (eg, poor HF or NYHA Class I). Time to death, and time to death or admission for cardiovas cular reasons. Sudden death 4% per y 4% 3.5 y |

GISSI-Prevenzione, Macchia A et al. EJHF 2005 (subgroup analysis) 16087142 (214) |

To evaluate the effect of omega 3 fatty acid supplementation in post MI pts with LVD. Randomized, multicenter, open-label, clinical trial with blinded validation of events. Standard background therapy for pts who are post AMI. No age limits. Patient with AMI in prior 3 mo. Irrespective of LV function. No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. Contraindications to the dietary supplements (ie, known allergy to omega-3 fatty acids). Unfavorable short-term outlook (eg, poor HF or NYHA Class I). Time to death, and time to death or admission for cardiovascular reasons. Sudden death 4% per y 4% 3.5 y |

Treatment with n-3 PUFA reduced total mortality in pts with and without systolic dysfunction, 24% (40%–4%, p =0.02) and 19% (41% to +10%, p =0.17), respectively (heterogeneity test p=0.55). The effect on SD was not significant. |

Drug for various reasons. Only evaluated a single dose. Study conducted in Italy where there is relatively high amount of intake of omega 3 fatty acids. p=0.45; table 5). |

Well tolerated. |

Gastrointestinal disturbance being the most frequent being the most frequent cause in both groups (table 5). |

Well tolerated. |

No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. No HF or NYHA Class I, subgroup analysis in pts with LVEF ≤50%. Contraindications to the dietary supplements (ie, known allergy to omega-3 fatty acids). Unfavorable short-term outlook (eg, poor HF or NYHA Class I). Time to death, and time to death or admission for cardiovascular reasons. Sudden death 4% per y 4% 3.5 y |

Treatment with n-3 PUFA reduced total mortality in pts with and without systolic dysfunction, 24% (40%–4%, p =0.02) and 19% (41% to +10%, p =0.17), respectively (heterogeneity test p=0.55). The effect on SD was not significant. |

Drug for various reasons. Only evaluated a single dose. Study conducted in Italy where there is relatively high amount of intake of omega 3 fatty acids. p=0.45; table 5). |

Well tolerated. |

Gastrointestinal disturbance being the most frequent being the most frequent cause in both groups (table 5). |

Well tolerated. |
Subgroup analysis of those pts with post MI LVD

- overt CHF, cancers, etc.,

reasons

- reduction was asymmetrical, with a greater effect in pts with LVSD (RRR: 58%; 95% CI: 74%-33%; p =0.0003) as compared to pts with preserved systolic function (RRR: 11%; 95% CI: 54% -69%; p =0.71), although the heterogeneity test was not statistically significant (p=0.07), LVD subgroup (0.60–0.96) p=0.02
- RR 0.76 (subgroup with LVD)

### Omega 3 fatty acids in DCM, Nodari, JACC, 201

This study was designed to test the effects of 3 PUFAs on LV systolic function in chronic HF due to NICM

**Randomized, single center double blind, clinical trial with blinded validation of events.**

Subgroup analysis of those pts with post MI LVD

- Evidence based HF therapy
  - ACE/ARB 100%
  - beta blockers 100%
  - aldosterone antagonists 60%
  - loop diuretics 100%

133; 67 experimental; 66 control

100% non-ischemic

Pts aged 18-75 y with a diagnosis of NICM, LVSD (defined as an EF <45%), and stable clinical conditions with minimal or no symptoms for at least 3 mo on evidence-based medical treatment at maximum tolerated target doses for at least 6 mo.

- presence of symptoms or evidence of CAD diagnosed through noninvasive tests, PAD, presence of congenital or primary VHD, persistent AF, inability to perform bicycle ergometry for noncardiac causes, moderately severely reduced functional capacity, NYHA class IV, poor acoustic windows limiting the ability to assess echo

Mld, Class I, 15%, Class II 85%

Mld severit y on medica l therapy

Change in LVEF

Peak VO2, hospitalization

0%

0%

12 mo

LVEF increased by 10.4% n-3 PUFA and decreased by 5.0% with placebo, p<.0001, peak VO2 (increased by 6.2% and decreased by 4.5%, respectively): exercise duration increased by 7.5% and decreased by 4.8%, and mean NYHA class decreased from 1.88 +/- 0.33 to 1.61 +/- 0.49 and increased from 1.83 +/- 0.38 to 2.14 +/- 0.65. The hospitalization rates for HF were 6% in the n-3 PUFAs and 30% in the placebo group (p = 0.0002).

Single center; small, no deaths.
**Data Supplement 24. Antiarrhythmic Agents to Avoid in HF (7.3.2.9.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I Na Channel Blocker</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Drug Effect</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST 2473403 (216)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Encainide/</td>
<td>↓ with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flecaainide/</td>
<td>encainide,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moricizine</td>
<td>flecaainide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-MI NSVT</td>
<td>RR 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QoL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study terminated early.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class III K Channel Blockers</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Drug Effect</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWORD 8691967 (217)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>d-Sotalol</td>
<td>↓ RR 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-MI LVEF&lt;40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QoL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study terminated early.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; CAD, coronary artery disease; CV, cardiovascular; EF, ejection fraction; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESC GL, European Society for Cardiology guidelines; f/u, follow-up; GISSI-HF, Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell'Infarto Miocardico; HF, heart failure; KM, Kaplan-Meier; LVD, left ventricular dysfunction; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; MI, myocardial infarction; NICM, nonischemic cardiomyopathy; NNT, number needed to treat; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PAD, peripheral arterial disease; PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acids; SD, sudden death.
CAST indicates Cardiac Arrhythmia Suppression Trial; CV, cardiovascular; K, potassium; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; Na, sodium; NSVT, nonsustained ventricular tachycardia; N/A, not applicable; NYHA, New York Heart Association; P, placebo; QoL, quality of life; RCT, randomized control trial; and SWORD, Survival With Oral d-Sotalol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trials</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Drug Effect</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Supplement 25. Calcium Channel Blockers to Avoid in HF (Section 7.3.2.9.3)</td>
<td>Non-dihydropyridine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPIT</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Diltiazem</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2995840</td>
<td>(219)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiDi</td>
<td>Retro</td>
<td>Diltiazem</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9759075</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIDIT-II</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Verapamil</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220572</td>
<td>(222)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dihydropyridine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkayam U Circulation</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Nifedipine</td>
<td>ISDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>(223)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felodipine UK Study</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Felodipine</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>7786857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 26. NSAIDs Use in HF (Section 7.3.2.9.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Cohort Populations</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Experimental (n)</th>
<th>Control (n)</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands PHARMO 9605782 (228)</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>NSAID plus Diuretics</td>
<td>Diuretics alone</td>
<td>Age ≥55 y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑ HF hospitalization aRR 1.8</td>
<td>Data presented in pt-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New South Whales 10737277 (229)</td>
<td>Case-controlled cohort</td>
<td>HF admission (365)</td>
<td>Non-HF admission (658)</td>
<td>Mean age 76 y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑ HF admission with non-ASA NSAID use OR 2.1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotterdam Study 11822918 (230)</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>No history of HF admission (7277)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age ≥55 y FS&gt;30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑ HF readmission during concurrent use of NSAID aRR 9.9</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Drug Benefit Program 15172772 (231)</td>
<td>Retro Cohort</td>
<td>Rofecoxib (14,583) Celecoxib (18,908) Non-selective NSAID (5,391)</td>
<td>No NSAID (100,000)</td>
<td>Age ≥66 y IHD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑ HF hospitalization relative to non-NSAID users Rofecoxib aRR 1.8</td>
<td>No increased risk seen with celecoxib relative to non-NSAID users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quebec 15947399 (232)</td>
<td>Retro Cohort</td>
<td>Rofecoxib (869) Non-selective NSAID (280)</td>
<td>Celecoxib (717)</td>
<td>Age ≥66 y Index HF admission</td>
<td>↑ NS NSAID HR 1.54 Rofecoxib HR 1.44</td>
<td>↑ Recurrent HF ER visit or hospitalization NS NSAID HR 1.21 (0.92-1.6) Rofecoxib HR 1.17 (0.96-1.42)</td>
<td>Combined endpoint significant risk with NS NSAID and rofecoxib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AE indicates adverse event; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; CV, cardiovascular; CXR, chest x-ray; DAVIT-II, Danish Verapamil Infarction Trial II; DCM, dilated cardiomyopathy; DDI, Diltiazem in Dilated Cardiomyopathy Trial; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; HR, hazard ratio; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; ISDN, isosorbide dinitrate; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MDPIT, Multicenter Diltiazem Postinfarction Trial; MI, myocardial infarction; NICM, nonischemic cardiomyopathy; N/A, not applicable; NS, no statistically significant difference; NYHA, New York Heart Association; P, placebo; PRAISE-II, second Prospective Randomized Amlodipine Survival Evaluation; pts, patients; QoL, quality of life; RCT, randomized control trial; Retro, retrospective analysis; UK, United Kingdom; and V-HeFT, Vasodilator-Heart Failure Trial.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish National Patient Registry</th>
<th>Retro Cohort</th>
<th>Rofecoxib (6116)</th>
<th>No NSAID (70376)</th>
<th>Age ≥30 y Index HF admission</th>
<th>↑ Rofecoxib HR 1.7</th>
<th>↑ Rofecoxib HR 1.4</th>
<th>Increased risk with higher doses of NSAIDs for all types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celecoxib (5734)</td>
<td>Ibuprofen (16875)</td>
<td>13% h/o MI</td>
<td>Celecoxib HR 1.75</td>
<td>Celecoxib HR 1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diclofenac (9377)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibuprofen HR 1.31</td>
<td>Ibuprofen HR 1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naproxen (2176)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diclofenac HR 2.08</td>
<td>Diclofenac HR 1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other NSAID (11488)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naproxen HR 1.22</td>
<td>Naproxen HR 1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other HR 1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other NSAID HR 1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Supplement 27. Thiazolidinediones in HF (Section 7.3.2.9.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort/Trial</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>CV events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmetrics Integrated Outcomes Database 14578227 (234)</td>
<td>Retro Cohort T2D (5441)</td>
<td>No T2D (286)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑ incidence of HF T2D HR 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROactive 16214598 (235)</td>
<td>RCT Piroglitazone (2065)</td>
<td>Placebo (2633)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>↓ Composite all-cause mortality, non-fatal MI, and CVA HR 0.84 95% CI 0.72-0.98; p=0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargie HJ JACC 2007 1448371 (236)</td>
<td>RCT Rosiglitazone (110)</td>
<td>Placebo (114)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>↑ HF events 11% Piroglitazone vs 8% placebo, P&lt;0.0001 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipscombe LL JAMA 2007 18073359 (237)</td>
<td>Retro Cohort T2D</td>
<td>Other oral hypoglycemic</td>
<td>↑ RR 1.29 95% CI 1.02-1.62; p=0.03</td>
<td>↑ HF adjusted RR 1.60 95% CI 1.21-2.10; p&lt;.001 AMI RR 1.40 95% CI 1.05-1.86; p=.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORD 19501900, 20118174 (238,239)</td>
<td>RCT Rosiglitazone addition (2220)</td>
<td>MET and SU (2227)</td>
<td>No HF DMII oral MET or SU</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARR indicates adjusted relative risk; ASA, aspirin; ER, emergency room; FS, fractional shortening; HF, heart failure; h/o, history of; IHD, HR, hazard ratio; ischemic heart disease; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not applicable; NS, not statistically significant; NSAID, non-selective nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; Obs, observational study; OR, odds ratio; pt-y, patient years; and Retro, retrospective analysis.
**Giles TD Congestive Heart Failure 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS, Bourge et al. 2008 JACC 18342224 (241)</td>
<td>Determine impact of clinician knowing continuous ambulatory right heart pressures</td>
<td>Single blind RCT</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Class III-IV with hospitalization/6 mo, all EF</td>
<td>HF events</td>
<td>HF hospitalization (post hoc) Failed primary, with 21% reduction (p=0.33). HF hospitalization 36% reduction (HR: 0.64: p=0.03)</td>
<td>Both groups high clinical contact (0.95/wk). No protocol for response to information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS–Diastolic HF, substudy. Zile, 2008 J Cardiac Fail 19041044 (242)</td>
<td>Determine impact of clinician knowing continuous ambulatory right heart pressures</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Class III-IV, EF ≥50%</td>
<td>HF events</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20% reduction (p=0.66). HF hospitalization 29% reduction (p=0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUCE-HF Adamson, Congestive Heart Failure 2011 21906250 (243)</td>
<td>Determine impact of clinician knowing and acting on home pressures</td>
<td>Single blind RCT</td>
<td>400 of 1200 (target)</td>
<td>Class II/III</td>
<td>HF events</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No trend for benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE-HF Conraads 2011 Eur J Echo 21362703 (244)</td>
<td>Determine predictive value of impedance changes</td>
<td>Observational, Doubleblinded Phase I, unblinded Phase II</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Predictive value of impedance changes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PPV for HF hosp increased from 4.7 to 38% during study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST Abraham 2011 Cong H Fail 21449992 (245)</td>
<td>Compare impedance Changes to daily weights for monitoring</td>
<td>RCT (Pts and study team blinded to impedance data)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Class III-IV With ICD or CRT, LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Number of threshold changes associated with HF event within 30 d</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Greater sensitivity for impedance than daily weights: 76% vs 23% (p=0.001) Unexplained change rate 1.9 vs 4.3/p-y, 1 in 7 impedance changes associated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMI, acute myocardial infarction; CVA, cerebral vascular accident; DM II, type 2 diabetes mellitus; HbA1c, hemoglobin A1c; HF, heart failure; HR, hazard ratio; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MET, metformin; MI, myocardial infarction; N/A, not applicable; NS, no statistically significant difference; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PROactive, Prospective pioglitazone Clinical Trial In Macrovascular Events; RCT, randomized control trial; RECORD, Rosiglitazone evaluated for cardiovascular outcomes in oral agent combination therapy for type 2 diabetes; Retro, retrospective analysis; RR, relative risk; SU, sulfonylurea; and TZD, thiazolidinediones.
Determine impact of PAP information from wireless monitor

Single blind RCT

550

Class III HF and hospitalized in past y

HF hospitalizations

AUC 6 mo PAP, % admitted DAOH, MLHF

39% reduction in HF hospitalizations (HR: 0.7; p=0.0001), More reduction in PAP (p=0.008), Lower % pts with HF hospitalizations (HR: 0.7; p=0.02), DAOH, (p=0.02), Better MLHF (p=0.02)

7 procedure-related SAEs

Subgroup small, same trend

Determine impact of PAP information from wireless monitor

Single blind RCT

119

Class III HF and hospitalized in past y

HF hospitalizations N/A

HF hops reduced from 0.33 to 0.16 (p=0.0001)

Feasibility study of daily LAP monitoring to inform pt-directed therapy

Open-label Registry, uncontrolled

40

Class III-IV; hospitalized in past y all EF

N/A N/A

LAP declined 17.6 to 14.8 (p=0.0003); % over 15 declined 67% (p=0.001) Beta blocker/ACE-I doses increased 40/37% (p=0.001) Loop doses decreased 27% (p=0.15)

Pilot observational, no controls.

key concepts: physiology reduce diuretics.

Pt responsibility

Determine impact of knowing impedance information

Single blind RCT N/A N/A N/A N/A Monitoring increased hospitalizations, clinic visits, No decrease in mortality
with a pacemaker–defibrillator, and optimal pharmacologic therapy alone in a population with advanced HF and intraventricular conduction delays.

| CARE-HF | N Engl J Med 2005;352:153-49. | To analyze the effects of cardiac resynchronization on the risk of complications and death among pts who were receiving standard medical therapy for moderate or severe HF and cardiac dyssynchrony. | RCT | 813: 409; medical therapy*: 404 | 29.4 | ACE-Is, beta-blockers, and spironolactone | 3 or 4 | <35 | >120 | • not randomized | • lacked non-CRT control group | • enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm | • had cross-over study design | • did not report the clinical outcomes of interest such | • reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges. | 120-159 (n 290); >159 (n 505) | All cause mortality or hospitalizations for major CV event including HF hospitalization | Primary endpoint was reached by 159 pts in the cardiac-resynchronization group, as compared with 224 pts in the medical-therapy group (39 % vs. 55%; HR: 0.63; 95 % CI: 0.51-0.77; p<0.001). There were 82 deaths in the cardiac-resynchronization group, as compared with 120 in the medical-therapy group (20% vs. 30%; HR: 0.64; 95 %CI: 0.48-0.85; p<0.002). As compared with medical therapy, cardiac resynchronization reduced the interventricular mechanical delay, the end-systolic volume index, and the area of the mitral regurgitant jet; increased the LVEF; and improved symptoms and the QoL (p<0.01 for all comparisons). |

Risk of the combined endpoint of death from or hospitalization for HF was reduced by 34% in the pacemaker group (p<0.002) and by 40 % in the pacemaker–defibrillator group (p<0.001 for the comparison with the pharmacologic-therapy group). Pacemaker reduced the risk of the secondary endpoint of death from any cause by 24% (p=0.059), and a pacemaker–defibrillator reduced the risk by 36% (p=0.003).
To determine the effects of CRT in NYHA functional class II HF and NYHA functional class I (ACC/AHA stage C) pts with previous HF symptoms.

RCT 610; 419; CRT-off : 191

ACE-I, beta blockers, and spironolactone

1 or 2

<40

>120

• not randomized
• lacked non-CRT control group
• enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm
• had cross-over study design
• did not report the clinical outcomes of interest such
• reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges.

120-151 (n 303);
>151 (n 307)

All cause mortality or HF hospitalization or worsened HF resulting in cross-over or drop-out
worsened NYHA class or moderately or markedly worsened HF symptoms

The HF clinical composite response endpoint, which compared only the percent worsened, indicated 16% worsened in CRT-ON compared with 21% in CRT-OFF (p =0.10). Pts assigned to CRT-ON experienced a greater improvement in LV end-systolic volume index (-18.4 + 29.5 ml/m² vs. -1.3 +23.4 ml/m², p < 0.0001) and other measures of LV remodeling. Time-to-first HF hospitalization was significantly delayed in CRT-ON (HR: 0.47; p=0.03).

Aim of trial was to determine whether CRT with biventricular pacing would reduce the risk of death or HF events in pts with mild cardiac symptoms, a reduced EF, and a wide QRS complex.

RCT 1800; 1089 medical therapy*: 731

ACE-I, beta blockers, and spironolactone

1 or 2

<30

>130

• not randomized
• lacked non-CRT control group
• enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm
• had cross-over study design
• did not report the clinical outcomes of interest such
• reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges.

130-149 (n 645);
>149 (n 1175)

All cause mortality or HF event (HF hospitalization or outpatient intravenous diuretic therapy)

The benefit did not differ significantly between pts with ischemic cardiomyopathy and those with nonischemic cardiomyopathy. CRT superiority was driven by a 41% reduction in the risk of HF events evident primarily in a prespecified subgroup of pts with a QRS duration ≥150 msec. CRT was associated with a significant reduction in LV volumes and improvement in the EF. There was no significant difference between the two groups in the overall risk of death, with a 3% annual mortality rate in each treatment group. SAEs were infrequent in the 2 groups.

Primary end point occurred in 17.2% of the CRT–ICD group and in 25.3% of the ICD-only group. CRT–ICD group HR: 0.66; 95% CI: 0.52-0.84; p=0.001. The benefit did not differ significantly between pts with ischemic cardiomyopathy and those with nonischemic cardiomyopathy. CRT superiority was driven by a 41% reduction in the risk of HF events evident primarily in a prespecified subgroup of pts with a QRS duration ≥150 msec. CRT was associated with a significant reduction in LV volumes and improvement in the EF. There was no significant difference between the two groups in the overall risk of death, with a 3% annual mortality rate in each treatment group. SAEs were infrequent in the 2 groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>RAFT</th>
<th>Circulation. 2008;117: 2608-2616. 18458170</th>
<th>PROSPECT</th>
<th>CONNECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim of trial was to evaluate whether adding CRT to an ICD and optimal medical therapy might reduce mortality and morbidity among such pts.</td>
<td>RAFT-21073365 (251)</td>
<td>PROSPECT Circulation. 2008;117: 2608-2616. 18458170 (252)</td>
<td>CONNECT J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;57:1181-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CRT: 904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE, beta-blockers, and spironolactone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>&gt;120</td>
<td>&gt;35</td>
<td>&gt;120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not randomized</td>
<td>• not randomized</td>
<td>• not randomized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lacked non-CRT control group</td>
<td>• lacked non-CRT control group</td>
<td>• lacked non-CRT control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm</td>
<td>• enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm</td>
<td>• enabled ICD implantation only in one study arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• had cross-over study design</td>
<td>• had cross-over study design</td>
<td>• had cross-over study design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• did not report the clinical outcomes of interest such as • reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges.</td>
<td>• reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges.</td>
<td>• reported clinical outcomes without any relation to specific limited QRS ranges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800; 894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cause mortality or HF hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-149 (n 627); &gt;149 (n 1036)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary outcome occurred in 33.2% in the ICD–CRT group and 40.3% in the ICD group; ICD–CRT group HR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.64-0.87; p&lt;0.001. In the ICD–CRT group, 186 pts died, as compared with 236 in the ICD group (HR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.62-0.91; p=0.003), and 174 pts were hospitalized for HF, as compared with 236 in the ICD group (HR: 0.68; 95% CI: 0.56-0.83; p&lt;0.001). 30 d after device implantation, AEs had occurred in 124 pts in the ICD-CRT group, as compared with 58 in the ICD group (p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aim of trial was to evaluate selected, predefined baseline echocardiographic parameters for their ability to predict clinical and echocardiographic response to CRT. | | |
| Baseline | prospective, multicenter, nonrandomized study (observational) | | |
| Prospective parameters | 486-enrolled; 467-implanted; Not applicable | | |
| Medical therapy, unless contraindicated, was to include an ACE-I or ARB for at least 1 mo before enrollment and a beta blocker started at least 3 mo before and unchanged for at least 1 mo before enrollment | 6 | 12 | 15 |
| 3 or 4 | | | |
| >35 | >130 | N/A | N/A |
| Clinical composite score was improved in 69% of 426 pts, whereas LV end-systolic volume decreased ≥15% in 56% of 286 pts with paired data. The ability of the 12 echo parameters to predict clinical composite score response varied widely, with sensitivity ranging from 6%–74% and specificity ranging from 35%–91%, for predicting LVESV response, sensitivity ranged from 9%–77% and specificity from 31%–93%. For all the parameters, the area under the ROC curve for positive clinical or volume response to CRT was ≤0.62. There was large variability in the analysis of the dyssynchrony parameters. | | | |

To determine if wireless remote monitoring with automatic clinician alerts reduces the median time from clinical event to clinical decision per pt was reduced from 22 d in the in-office arm to 4.6 d in the remote arm (p<0.001). The health care
Aim of trial was to compare 3 alternative techniques and to assess the hypotheses that systematic AV delay optimization with echocardiography and/or the SD algorithm is superior to a fixed nominal AV delay as demonstrated by improved LV geometry after 6 mo and that programming according to SD is noninferior to using randomiz ed, multicent er, double- blinded, 3-armed trial

- **SMART AV**
  - Circulation. 2010;122:266-268 21098426 (253)
  - 1014; 323 SD; 325 Echo; 325 Fixed nominal AV delay
  - 6

- **Randomized**
  - 104; 323 SD; 325 Echo; 325 Fixed nominal AV delay
  - 3 or 4
  - <35%, ≥120
  - ≤15 mo

- **NYHA 1-4**
  - No HF as well as NYHA 1-4 were included in study

- **Utilization data**
  - Revealed a decrease in mean length of stay per CV hospitalization visit from 4.0 d in the in-office arm to 3.3 d in the remote arm (p=0.002).
echocardiography-determined AV delay optimization.

- Neuromuscular, orthopedic, or other noncardiac condition that prevents normal, unsupported walking
- Pregnant or planning to become pregnant
- Enrolled in another investigational study or registry that would directly impact the current study

**Data Supplement 30. Therapies, Important Considerations (Section 7.4.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
<th>OR: HR; RR:</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hemodynamic Assessment of Hospitalized Patient</td>
<td>To determine whether PAC use is safe and improves clinical outcomes in pts hospitalized with severe symptomatic and recurrent HF</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Pts with severe symptomatic HF despite recommended therapies. 1) hospitalization for HF within the past y; (2) urgent visit to the ED; or (3) treatment during the preceding mo with &gt;160 mg of furosemide daily (or equivalent), LVEF ≤30%, SBP ≤125mmHg, and at least 1 sign and 1 symptom of congestion. Exclusion criteria to minimize confounding comorbidities or urgent crossover included Cr level &gt;3.5 mg/dL (309.4 μmol/L), or prior use of dobutamine or dopamine ≥3 μg/kg/min, or any prior use of milrinone during the current hospitalization. PAC did not significantly affect the primary endpoint of d alive and out of the hospital during the first 6 mo (133 d vs 135 d; HR: 1.00; 95% CI: 0.82-1.21; p=.99), mortality (43 pts [10%] vs 38 pts [9%]; OR: 1.26; 95% CI: 0.78-2.03; p=.35), or the number of d hospitalized (8.7 vs 8.3; HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.86-1.27; p=.67), HR: 1.0 d alive outside hospital, HR: 1.26 for mortality (p=0.35), h 1.04 For d hospitalized;19 % mortality at 6 mo (dead at 180 d= 43 in PAC, 38 in CAG). Annualized mortality 36%. Inhospital AEs were more common among pts in the PAC group (47 [21.9%] vs 25 [11.5%]; p=.04). There were no deaths related to PAC use, and no difference for in-hospital plus 30-d mortality (10 [4.7%] vs 11 [5.0%]; OR: 0.97; 95% CI, 0.38-2.22; p=.97) Use of inotropes, variability between centers, generalizability of stringent hemodynamic targets ,individualized targets not applied.</td>
<td>p=0.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Objective/Methodology</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Results/Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazner MH, Heilkamp AS, Leier CV et al.</td>
<td>To determine whether estimated hemodynamics from history and physical examination reflect invasive measurements and predict outcomes in advanced HF</td>
<td>2008 September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Estimated RAP ≥12 mm Hg (OR: 4.6; p<0.001) and orthopnea ≥2 pillows (OR: 3.6; p<0.05) were associated with PCWP ≥30 mm Hg. Estimated cardiac index did not reliably reflect measured cardiac index (p=0.09), but “cold” versus “warm” profile was associated with lower median measured cardiac index (1.75 vs. 2.0 L/min/m²; p=0.004).

- In Cox regression analysis, discharge “cold” or “wet” profile conveyed a 50% increased risk of death or rehospitalization.

- In advanced HF, the presence of orthopnea and elevated jugular venous pressure are useful to detect elevated PCWP, and a global assessment of inadequate perfusion (“cold” profile) is useful to detect reduced cardiac index. Hemodynamic profiles estimated from the discharge H&P identify pts at increased risk of early events. |

| Shah MR, Hasselblad V, Stevenson LW et al. | To estimate the impact of the PAC device in critically ill pts. | 2005 October | 

- Use of the PAC was associated with a higher use of inotropes (OR: 1.58; 95% CI: 1.19-2.12; p= .002) and IV vasodilators (OR: 2.35; 95% CI: 1.75-3.15; p<.001). |

- The combined OR for mortality was 1.04 (95% CI: 0.90-1.20; p= .59). The difference in the mean number of d hospitalized for PAC minus the mean for no PAC was 0.11 (95% CI: -0.51-0.74; p= .73). |

- The heterogeneity of studies was 1.04.
To characterize pts enrolled in ESCAPE Registry

Registry 439 ESCAPE sites enrolled 439 pts receiving PAC without randomization in a prospective registry. Baseline characteristics, pertinent trial exclusion criteria, reasons for PAC use, hemodynamics, and complications were collected. Survival was determined from the National Death Index and the Alberta Registry. Much sicker pts than ESCAPE N/A Registry pts had longer hospitalization (13 vs 6 d, p<.001) and higher 6-mo mortality (34% vs 20%, p<.001) than trial pts. On average, registry pts had lower blood pressure, worse renal function, less neurohormonal antagonist therapy, and higher use of IV inotropes compared with trial pts. Although clinical assessment anticipated less volume overload and greater hypoperfusion among the registry population, measured filling pressures were similarly elevated in the registry and trial pts, whereas measured perfusion was slightly higher among registry pts. 6 mo mortality 34%

### Positive Pressure Ventilation Studies


**Noninvasive ventilation CPAP or NIPPV appears to be of benefit in the immediate treatment of pts with acute cardiogenic pulmonary edema and may reduce mortality. To determine whether noninvasive ventilation reduces mortality and whether there are important differences in outcome associated with the method of treatment (CPAP or NIPPV).**

**RCT** 1069 (randomize d to standard oxygen therapy, (n=367) versus CPAP (5 to 15 cm of water) (n=346) OR NIPPV (inspiratory pressure, 6 to 20 cm of water; expiratory pressure, 4 to 10 cm of water) (n=356).

**Age > 16 y, clinical diagnosis of acute cardiogenic PE, PE on chest radiograph, respiratory rate >20 breaths/min, and arterial hydrogen ion concentration >45 nmol/L (pH <7.35).**

| N/A | There was no significant difference in 7-d mortality between pts receiving standard oxygen therapy (9.8%) and those undergoing noninvasive ventilation (9.5%, P=0.87). There was no significant difference in the combined endpoint of death or intubation within 7 d between the two groups of pts undergoing noninvasive ventilation (11.7% for CPAP and 11.1% for NIPPV, P=0.81). In pts with acute cardiogenic PE, noninvasive ventilation induces a more rapid improvement in respiratory distress and metabolic disturbance than does standard oxygen therapy but has no effect on short-term mortality. CPAP or NIPPV MAY be considered as adjunctive therapy in pts with severe acute cardiogenic pulmonary oedema in the presence of severe respiratory distress or when there is a failure to improve with pharmacological therapy. As compared with standard oxygen therapy, noninvasive ventilation was associated with greater mean improvements at 1 h after the beginning of treatment in pt-reported dyspnea (treatment difference, 0.7 on a visual-analogue scale ranging from 1 to 10; 95% CI: 0.2-1.3; p=0.008), heart rate (treatment difference, 4 beats/min; 95% CI: 1-6; p=0.004), acidosis (treatment difference, pH 0.03; 95% CI: 0.02-0.04; p=0.001), and hypercapnia (treatment difference, 0.7 kPa [5.2 mm Hg]; 95% CI: 0.4-0.9; p<0.001). | p=0.87 | N/A | N/A |

To systematically review and quantitatively synthesize the short-term effect of noninvasive ventilation on major clinical outcomes.

**Meta-analysis**

15 trials comparing noninvasive ventilation to conventional oxygen therapy in pts with acute PE. Comparisons of different techniques, either CPAP or bilevel NIPSV, were also included

| N/A |

Overall, noninvasive ventilation significantly reduced the mortality rate by nearly 45% compared with conventional therapy (RR: 0.55; 95% CI: 0.40-0.78; p= .72 for heterogeneity). The results were significant for CPAP (RR: 0.53; 95% CI: 0.35-0.81; p=.44 for heterogeneity) but not for NIPSV (RR: 0.60; 95% CI, 0.34-1.05; p=.76 for heterogeneity), although there were fewer studies in the latter. Both modalities showed a significant decrease in the "need to intubate" rate compared with conventional therapy: CPAP (RR: 0.40; 95% CI: 0.27-0.58; p= .21 for heterogeneity), NIPSV (RR, 0.48; 95% CI: 0.30-0.76; p=.24 for heterogeneity), and together (RR: 0.43; 95% CI: 0.32-0.57; p=.20 for heterogeneity). There were no differences in intubation or mortality rates in the analysis of studies comparing CPAP and NIPSV. Noninvasive ventilation reduces the need for intubation and mortality in pts with acute cardiogenic pulmonary edema. Although the level of evidence is higher for CPAP, there are no significant differences in clinical outcomes when comparing CPAP vs. NIPSV.

**Severe Cardiogenic Shock: Patient, Role of PVADs to Bridge to Recovery or Bridge/Transplant**


To determine the efficacy and safety of the pVAD in pts in SRCS despite IABP/pressor support.

**Prospective Cohort**

117 Cardiogenic shock pts with a SBP of 90 mm Hg, a cardiac index of 2.0 l/(min·m2) and evidence of end-organ failure despite IABP/pressor support. A total of 117 pts with SRCS implanted with TandemHeart pVAD were studied, of whom 56 pts (47.9%) underwent active cardiopulmonary resuscitation immediately before or at the time of implantation

N/A

56 (47.9%) of the 117 pts (41 of 80 [51.2%] with ICM; 15 of 37 [40.5%] with NICM) were undergoing CPR during pVAD placement. The average time from CPR onset to TandemHeart implantation was 65.6+/-13.1 min. 80 pts had ischemic and 37 pts had nonischemic cardiomyopathy. The average duration of support was 5.8 d. After implantation, the cardiac index improved from median 0.52 (IQR: 0.8) l/(min·m2) to 3.0 (IQR: 0.9) l/(min·m2) (p<0.001). The SBP and mixed venous oxygen saturation increased from 75 (IQR: 15) mm Hg to 100 (IQR: 15) mm Hg (p<0.001) and 49 (IQR: 11.5) to 69.3 (IQR: 10) (p<0.001), respectively. The PCWP, lactic acid level, and Cr level decreased, respectively, from 31.5 (IQR: 8.5) mg/dl to 17 (IQR: 6) mg/dl (p<0.001), 24.5 (IQR: 74.2) mg/dl to 11 (IQR: 3) mg/dl (p=0.001), and 1.5 (IQR: 0.9) mg/dl to 1.2 (IQR: 0.9) mg/dl (p=0.009). The mortality rates at 30 d and 6 mo were 40.2% and 45.3%, respectively.
To characterize whether PVAD may offer effective treatment for cardiogenic shock

Case Series 18

VADs were implanted in 18 consecutive pts who had cardiogenic shock after MI.

N/A

Mean duration of cardiac assistance was 4±1 d. Mean flow of the VAD was 3.2±0.6 L/min. Before support, cardiac index was 1.7±0.3 L/min per m(2) and improved to 2.4±0.6 L/min per m(2) (p<0.001). Mean blood pressure increased from 63±8 mm Hg to 80±9 mm Hg (p<0.001). PCWP, central venous pressure, and pulmonary artery pressure were reduced from 21±4, 13±4, and 31±8 mm Hg to 14±4, 9±3, and 23±6 mm Hg (all p<0.001), respectively. Overall 30-d mortality rate was 44%.

To evaluate the efficacy of a PVAD as a bridge to LVAD implantation in pts with severe refractory cardiogenic shock as a bridge to long-term left ventricular assist device implantation. J Heart Lung Transplant 2008 January;27(1):106-111. 18187095

Case Series 18

18 pts in SRCS received a PVAD as a bridge to LVAD placement or orthotopic heart transplantation. 6 pts had ischemic cardiomyopathy, and 12 had nonischemic cardiomyopathy. At the time of PVAD placement, 17 were receiving IABP support, and 10 were undergoing cardiopulmonary resuscitation. The mean duration of PVAD support was 4.2 ± 2.5 d. During this time, the cardiac index improved from 0.86 ±0.66 to 2.50 ±0.93 liters/min/m² (p < 0.001), SBP improved from 72 ±0.72 to 98 ±8 mm Hg (p=0.001), and systemic mixed venous oxygenation improved from 37 ± 7 to 62 ±6 mm Hg (p < 0.001). We terminated life support in 4 of the 18 pts before LVAD placement; 14 were successfully bridged to LVAD or heart transplantation. The mortality rate was 27% at 30 d and 33% at 6 mo. There were no PVAD-associated deaths. CONCLUSION: In pts with terminal hemodynamic collapse, PVAD support is an effective bridging therapy to LVAD and appears to be a viable alternative to other invasive methods of support.


2 trials evaluated the TandemHeart and a recent trial used the Impella device.

Meta-Analysis

After device implantation, percutaneous LVAD pts had higher CI (MD 0.35 L/min/m(2), 95% CI: 0.09-0.61), higher MAP (MD 12.6 mmHg, 95% CI: 3.6-22.0), and lower PCWP (MD -5.3 mm Hg, 95% CI: -9.4 to -1.2) compared with IABP pts. Similar 30-day mortality (RR: 1.06; 95% CI: 0.68-1.66) was observed using percutaneous LVAD compared with IABP. No significant difference was observed in incidence of leg ischaemia (RR: 2.59; 95% CI: 0.75-9.87) in percutaneous LVAD pts compared with IABP pts. Bleeding (RR: 2.35; 95% CI: 1.40-3.93) was significantly more observed in TandemHeart pts compared with pts treated with IABP. Although percutaneous LVAD provides superior haemodynamic support in pts with cardiogenic shock compared with IABP, the use of these more powerful devices did not improve early survival. These results do not yet support percutaneous LVAD as first-choice approach in...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Cardiogenic Shock</th>
<th>Hemodynamic Support</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth M, Sibbing D, Bauer I, Frohlich G, Bolt-Flugel L, Byrne R, Dirschinger J, Kastrati A, Schomig A. A randomized clinical trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a percutaneous left ventricular assist device versus intra-aortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock caused by myocardial infarction. <em>J Am Coll Cardiol</em> 2008 November 4;52(19):1584-1588 19007597 (263)</td>
<td>RCT (ISAR-SHOCK Trial)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cardiogenic shock post AMI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In 25 pts the allocated device (n=13 IABP, n=12 Impella LP2.5) could be safely placed. 1 pt died before implantation. The CI after 30 min of support was significantly increased in pts with the Impella LP2.5 compared with pts with IABP (Impella: DeltaCI = 0.49 +/- 0.46 l/min/m²; IABP: DeltaCI = 0.11 +/- 0.31 l/min/m²; p = 0.02). Overall 30-d mortality was 46% in both groups. Percutaneously placed LVAD (Impella LP 2.5) is feasible and safe, and provides superior hemodynamic support compared with standard treatment using an IABP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhoff D, Cohen H, Brunckhorst C, O'Neill WW. A randomized multicenter clinical study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the TandemHeart percutaneous ventricular assist device versus conventional therapy with intraaortic balloon pumping for treatment of cardiogenic shock. <em>Am Heart J</em> 2006</td>
<td>RCT (Tandem vs IABP)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pts from 12 centers presenting within 24 h of developing cardiogenic shock. randomized to treatment with IABP (n=14) or TandemHeart PVAD (n=19). Thirty pts (71%) had persistent shock despite having an IABP in place at the time of study enrollment.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cardiogenic shock was due to MI in 70% of the pts and decompensated HF in most of the remaining pts. The mean duration of support was 2.5 d. Compared with IABP, the TandemHeart PVAD achieved significantly greater increases in cardiac index and mean arterial blood pressure and significantly greater decreases in PCWP. Overall 30-d survival and SAEs were not significantly different between the 2 groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Data Supplement 31. Sildenafil (Section Section 7.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDE5 Inhibition With Sildenafil Improves LVDF, Cardiac Geometry, and Clinical Status in Pts With Stable Systolic HF, Guazzi M, 2011 21036891 (265)</td>
<td>To test the effects of PDE5 inhibition (sildenafil) on LVEF, LVDF, cardiac geometry, and clinical status</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ischemic/Non-Ischemic</td>
<td>NYHA II-III HF with clinical stable conditions defined as no changes in HF regimen or hospitalization since 6 mo before study entry; Negative exercise stress test before study; FEV1/FVC &gt;70%; LVEF &lt;40%</td>
<td>100% NYHA II-II (42% NYHA II/58% NYHA III) peak VO2 12.8 ml/min/kg VE/VCO2 slope 35.3</td>
<td>LV diastolic function, chamber dimensions, and mass</td>
<td>1 y</td>
<td>D Milral E/A @ 1yr placebo 0 vs SIL -0.19 D IVRT @ 1y placebo +1.4 vs SIL - 6.0 D E/E', lat @ 1yr placebo -0.8 vs. SIL +3.7 D LVEDD (mm)@ 1y placebo +0.9 vs SIL - 4.2d D LVMi @ 1yr placebo no change, SIL decrease (value not provided) D peak VO2  @ 1y placebo +0.3 vs SIL +2.7 D VE/VCO2 slope at 1y placebo +0.4 vs SIL -6.0; D QOL (breathlessness, fatigue, emotional function)</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01 for all parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE5A inhibitor treatment of persistent pulmonary hypertension after mechanical circulatory support, Tedford RJ, 2008 19808294 (266)</td>
<td>To test the hypothesis that when PH persists after adequate LV unloading via recent LVAD therapy, phosphodiesterase type 5A inhibition would decrease PH in this population. Open label clinical trial 58 56% ICM Advanced LV dysfunction, treatment with LVAD implantation, and persistent PH (defined by a PVR &gt;3 Wood Units 7 to 14 d after LVAD implantation) despite normalization of their PCWP to a value &lt;15 mmHg were consented for and received treatment with sildenafil in an attempt to reduce PVR before cardiac transplantation Combined LVAD and RVAD;Pts receiving chronic inotrope therapy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The primary endpoint of the 12 to 15 wk change in PVR and contractility index (dP/dtmax/IP)</td>
<td>Enrolment 1999-2007; 12-15 wk of sildenafil treatment/follow-up; Lowering of PVR from 5.87±1.93 to 2.96±0.92 Wood Units (mm Hg/L/min); after 2-4 wk of sildenafil therapy, vs. no change in PVR in LVAD only group. Also, marked improvement in RV systolic and diastolic function, as measured by RV contractility index (dP/dtmax/IP; 8.69±1.78 to 13.1±3.3) in LVAD + sildenafil group. Change in PVR, p&lt;0.001 for LVAD+sildenafil group Change in RV contractility index for LVAD+sildenafil group, p&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sildenafil Improves Exercise Capacity and Quality of Life in Pts With Systolic HF and Secondary Pulmonary Hypertension, Lewis GD, 2007 17785618 (267)</td>
<td>To test the hypothesis that sildenafil, an effective therapy for pulmonary arterial hypertension, would lower pulmonary vascular resistance and improve exercise capacity in pts with HF complicated by PH RCT 34 50% ICM &gt;18 y of age, LVEF&lt;40%, NYHA II-IV chronic HF despite standard HF therapies Pts were required to have secondary PH as defined by a mean pulmonary arterial pressure &gt;25 mm Hg Pts with a noncardiac limitation to exercise, provocable ischemia, hemodynamic instability, or ongoing nitrate therapy were excluded. Additional exclusion criteria included concentric LV hypertrophy, critical aortic stenosis, or long-term use of medications that inhibit cytochrome P450 3A4.</td>
<td>100% NYHA II-IV (53% NYHA II / 38% NYHA III/ 9% NYHA IV) peak VO2 11.1 ml/kg/min</td>
<td>No predefined primary endpoints; measured exercise capacity, invasive hemodynamic parameters, QoL, and biomarkers</td>
<td>12 wk trial Peak VO2 increased from 12.2±0.7 to 13.9±1.0 mL/kg/min in the sildenafil group (p=0.02) and did not change in the placebo group. Change in peak VO2 from baseline among pts treated with sildenafil (1.8±0.7 mL/kg/min) was greater than the change in the placebo group (-0.27 mL/kg/min; p=0.02). Sildenafil treated pts had improvement in RVEF at rest and with exercise; control group had no improvement in RVEF. Mean MLHFQ score decreased (reflecting improvement) by 13±5 and 16±5 at wk 6 and 12, respectively, among pts receiving sildenafil (p=0.007) and did not change in pts receiving placebo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Participating Patients</td>
<td>Study Objectives</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Main Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term use of sildenafil in the therapeutic management of HF, Guazzi M, 2007 18036451 (268)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>To test the functional exercise capacity and endothelial function in a cohort of CHF pts treated with chronic type 5 phosphodiesterase (PDE5) inhibitor</td>
<td>Unable to complete a maximal exercise test; SBP &gt;140 or &lt;110 mm Hg; DM; Therapy with nitrate; History of sildenafil intolerance; Significant lung or valvular diseases, neuromuscular disorders, AF, claudication, or peripheral vascular disease</td>
<td>NYHA II-III peak VO2 15 ml/min/kg</td>
<td>NYHA II-III peak VO2 15 ml/min/kg</td>
<td>6 mo fu</td>
<td>In the sildenafil group only, at 3 and 6 mo, systolic PAP decreased from 33.7 to 25.2 mm Hg and then 23.9 mm Hg, ergoreflex effect on ventilation decreased from 6.9 to 2.3/min and 1.9 L/min, VE/VCO2 decreased from 35.5 to 32.1 and 29.8, and breathlessness (score) from 23.6 to 16.6 and 17.2. FMD increased from 8.5% to 13.4% and 14.2%, peak VO2 from 14.8 to 18.5 ml/min/kg and 18.7 ml/min/kg, and ratio of VO2 to work rate changes from 7.7 to 9.3 and 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sildenafil Effects on Exercise, Neurohormonal Activation, and Erectile Dysfunction in Congestive HF, Bocci EA, 2002 12196335 (94)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>To investigate the acute effects of sildenafil on exercise, neurohormonal activation, and clinical status of CHF pts with (ED). To evaluate the efficacy and safety of sildenafil for ED treatment in a 1-mo follow-up</td>
<td>CHF outpatients who were referred for ED treatment (ED was defined as the inability to achieve or maintain an erection sufficient to permit satisfactory sexual intercourse); History of ED x &gt; 4 mo, present interest in sex and in a stable relationship; Concomitant new symptoms of CHF, worsening of HF clinical status, or a change in specific medication for CHF; All pts were in stable clinical condition without required changes in treatment within the last 3 mo.</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV</td>
<td>ED considered secondary to causes other than CHF; Previous therapy for ED, Recent use of PDE inhibitors; Severe systemic disease, visual disturbances, psychiatric or psychological disorder; UA or MI within the previous 3 mo; Syncope, Angina, HR &lt;55 bpm, high-risk arrhythmias, new atrial tachycardia/fibrillation/flutter or uncontrolled high ventricular response, new or high degree of AV block, HCM, Valvular disease, Symptomatic hypotension or SBP &lt;85 mm Hg, Unstable CHF, low systemic</td>
<td>1 mo</td>
<td>Peak VO2 (ml/kg/min) placebo 16.6±3.4 vs sildenafil 17.7±3.4 Ve/VCO2 slope placebo 33.8 sildenafil 31.6</td>
<td>p&lt;0.025 p=0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perfusion, or venous or pulmonary congestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit or Major Finding</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Complications/Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (Total); n (Control)</td>
<td>Prophylactic standard treatment Ischemic/ Non-ischemic Inclusion Criteria Exclusion Criteria Severity of HF Symptoms Study Entry Severity Criteria Primary Endpoint Secondary Endpoint Annualized Mortality 1st Year Mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent 6-mo low-dose dobutamine infusion in severe HF: DICE Multicenter Trial, Oliva F, 1999 10426835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACCE 82% Digoxin 95% Furosemide 95% Amiodarone 39%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age &gt;18 y; NYHA III/IV CHF; Hospitalized for CHF and administration of IV inotropes in the 6 mo before the evaluation; ≥ 48 h of Clinical stability on oral therapy. CI ≥ 2.2 L/min/m² 6. LVEF ≥ 35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>History of documented malignant arrhythmias without an automatic defibrillator in place. Neoplastic or systemic disease affecting short-term prognosis UA, angiographically documented effective coronary stenosis Surgically curable valvular heart disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100% NYHA III/IV 6MWTYD 286m</strong></td>
<td><strong>NYHA III/IV symptom s, CI ≤ 2.2L/min/m²2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduction of hospitalizations for worsening of CHF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Changes in NYHA functional class, 6-min walking test, and mortality rates.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lecovsinan Infusion versus Dobutamin e Study (LIDO), Follath F, 2002 12133653 | **To compared the effects of lecovismand an and dobutamin e on haemodyn amic performanc e and clinical outcome in pts with low-output HF** |
|---|
| **RCT** | **Digoxin 75%, Diuretics 53%, ACEI 89%, blockers 38%, oral nitrates 41%, antiocoagulant s 43%, Class III antiarrhythmic agents 15%, Class 4, antiplatelet agents 1%** |
| **203; 193 lecovismandan; 100 dobutamine** | **48% ischemic** |
| **Hospitalized with low-output HF, requiring haemodynam ic monitor 89% and treatment with IV inotropic agent, a) deterioration of severe chronic HF despite optimum oral therapy with vasodilators and diuretics, including those awaiting cardiac transplantati on; b) severe** | **Age <21 y Childscreas potential HF due to restrictive or hypertrrophic cardiomyop athy or to uncorrected stenotic valvular disease; Chest pain at the time of randomisation; Sustained VT/VF within prior 2 wk; AVB of 2nd or 3rd degree; HR >120 bpm at rest; SBP< 85 mm Hg; Severe renal** |
| **Severly determined by invasive haemody na mic monitoring, not symptomat ology. CI < 2.5 L/min/m² Mean PCWP < 15 mm Hg** | **Proportion of pts with haemody na mic improvement (defined as an increase of 30% or more in CO and a decrease of 25% or more in PCWP) at 24 h.** |
| **Changes from baseline in haemo-dynamic variables other than CO and PCWP (eg, CI, stroke volume, or RAOP, mean RAP, BP, HR and total peri pheral resistance) at 24 h; Changes from baseline to 24 h in HF symptoms (dyspnoea and fatigue) on a 4-grade scale (much better, slightly better, no change, worse); Proportion of pts needing IV rescue therapy with positive inotropic** | **N/A** |

| Levosimendan Infusion versus Dobutamin e Study (LIDO), Follath F, 2002 12133653 | **To compared the effects of lecovismand an and dobutamin e on haemodyn amic performanc e and clinical outcome in pts with low-output HF** |
|---|
| **RCT** | **Digoxin 69%, Furosemide 53%, blockers 38%, oral nitrates 41%, antiocoagulant s 43%, Class III antiarrhythmic agents 15%, Class 4, antiplatelet agents 1%** |
| **203; 193 lecovismandan; 100 dobutamine** | **48% ischemic** |
| **Hospitalized with low-output HF, requiring haemodynam ic monitor 89% and treatment with IV inotropic agent, a) deterioration of severe chronic HF despite optimum oral therapy with vasodilators and diuretics, including those awaiting cardiac transplantati on; b) severe** | **Age <21 y Childscreas potential HF due to restrictive or hypertrrophic cardiomyop athy or to uncorrected stenotic valvular disease; Chest pain at the time of randomisation; Sustained VT/VF within prior 2 wk; AVB of 2nd or 3rd degree; HR >120 bpm at rest; SBP< 85 mm Hg; Severe renal** |
| **Severly determined by invasive haemody na mic monitoring, not symptomat ology. CI < 2.5 L/min/m² Mean PCWP < 15 mm Hg** | **Proportion of pts with haemody na mic improvement (defined as an increase of 30% or more in CO and a decrease of 25% or more in PCWP) at 24 h.** |
| **Changes from baseline in haemo-dynamic variables other than CO and PCWP (eg, CI, stroke volume, or RAOP, mean RAP, BP, HR and total peri pheral resistance) at 24 h; Changes from baseline to 24 h in HF symptoms (dyspnoea and fatigue) on a 4-grade scale (much better, slightly better, no change, worse); Proportion of pts needing IV rescue therapy with positive inotropic** | **N/A** |

| Levosimendan Infusion versus Dobutamin e Study (LIDO), Follath F, 2002 12133653 | **To compared the effects of lecovismand an and dobutamin e on haemodyn amic performanc e and clinical outcome in pts with low-output HF** |
|---|
| **RCT** | **Digoxin 75%, Diuretics 53%, ACEI 89%, blockers 38%, oral nitrates 41%, antiocoagulant s 43%, Class III antiarrhythmic agents 15%, Class 4, antiplatelet agents 1%** |
| **203; 193 lecovismandan; 100 dobutamine** | **48% ischemic** |
| **Hospitalized with low-output HF, requiring haemodynam ic monitor 89% and treatment with IV inotropic agent, a) deterioration of severe chronic HF despite optimum oral therapy with vasodilators and diuretics, including those awaiting cardiac transplantati on; b) severe** | **Age <21 y Childscreas potential HF due to restrictive or hypertrrophic cardiomyop athy or to uncorrected stenotic valvular disease; Chest pain at the time of randomisation; Sustained VT/VF within prior 2 wk; AVB of 2nd or 3rd degree; HR >120 bpm at rest; SBP< 85 mm Hg; Severe renal** |
| **Severly determined by invasive haemody na mic monitoring, not symptomat ology. CI < 2.5 L/min/m² Mean PCWP < 15 mm Hg** | **Proportion of pts with haemody na mic improvement (defined as an increase of 30% or more in CO and a decrease of 25% or more in PCWP) at 24 h.** |
| **Changes from baseline in haemo-dynamic variables other than CO and PCWP (eg, CI, stroke volume, or RAOP, mean RAP, BP, HR and total peri pheral resistance) at 24 h; Changes from baseline to 24 h in HF symptoms (dyspnoea and fatigue) on a 4-grade scale (much better, slightly better, no change, worse); Proportion of pts needing IV rescue therapy with positive inotropic** | **N/A** |
OPTIME-CHF, Cuffe MS, 2002 11911756

To prospectively test whether a strategy that includes short-term use of milrinone in addition to standard therapy can improve clinical outcomes of pts hospitalized with an exacerbation of chronic HF

**RCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age ≥18 y</th>
<th>LVEF &lt;40% within the past y. Known systolic chronic HF</th>
<th>Hospitalized for exacerbation of chronic HF ≥48 h earlier.</th>
<th>ACEI 70%, ARB 12%, blocker 22%, Diuretic 96%, Digoxin 73%, CCB 11%</th>
<th>ICM 51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>949; 477 (milrinone), 472 (placebo)</td>
<td>If treating physician judged that IV inotrope was essential (eg, for shock, metabolic acidosis, or severe hypotension)</td>
<td>Active myocardial ischemia within the past 3 mo</td>
<td>100% NYHA II-IV 7% NYHA III 46% NYHA IV 47% NYHA III</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV symptom(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of d hospitalized for CV causes (or d deceased) within the 60 d after randomization</td>
<td>Hospital d were defined as incl’d and ED visit d.</td>
<td>Main secondary outcome included the proportion of cases failing therapy because of AE or worsening HF 48 h after initiation of therapy. Other secondary outcomes included the proportion of pts achieving target doses of ACEI therapy and time to achieve target dose, symptoms, improvement in HF score, length of initial hospitalization, d of hospitalization N/A</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV 7% NYHA III 46% NYHA IV 47% NYHA III</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recruitment**

7/97-11/99 (29 mo); Study drug treatment for up to 72 h with 60 day follow-up period from time of randomization

**No difference in primary efficacy end point**

Milrinone was associated with higher rate of treatment failure at 48 h due to AE (12.6% vs 2.1%)

**Survival results**

p=0.71, d of hospitalization for CV causes within 60 d p=0.92, death or readmission within 60 d p<0.001 for treatment failure due to AE

**Did not directly address pts with ADHF for whom inotropic therapy was felt to be essential (eg, low cardiac output state with tissue hypoperfusion), Not structured to assess pts for NSVT, a known adverse effect of milrinone.**

**Inadequately powered to evaluate mortality.**

<p>| Sustained hypotension, (SBP&lt; 80 mm Hg for more than 30 min, requiring intervention); 10.7% with milrinone, 3.2% with placebo, p=0.001 | Significant atrial arrhythmias during index hospitalization; 4.6% milrinone, 1.5% placebo, p=0.004 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HF Etiology and Response to Milrinone in Decompensated HF (subanalysis of OPTIME-CHF), Felker GM, 2003</th>
<th>12651048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To assess the interaction between HF etiology and response to milrinone in decompensated HF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-hoc analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI 70%, blocker 23%, Amiodarone 15%, Digoxin 73%,</td>
<td>840 (total), 477 (randomized to milrinone), 242 (NICM, milrinone) 235 (ICM, placebo), 229 (NICM, placebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &gt;18 y, LVEF &lt; 40% within the past year, Known systolic chronic HF, Hospitalized for exacerbation of chronic HF &lt; 48 h earlier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If treating physician judged that IV inotrope was essential (eg, for shock, metabolic acidosis, or severe hypotension).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active myocardial ischemia within the past 3 mo, Atrial fibrillation with poor ventricular rate control (&gt;110/min). Sustained ventricular tachycardia or ventricular fibrillation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline SBP&lt; 80 mm Hg, SCr level &gt; 3.0mg/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA II-IV symptoms</td>
<td>D hospitalized for CV causes or death within 60 d after randomization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%, NYHA II-IV 7% NYHA I 46% NYHA III 47% NYHA IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA II-IV symptom s</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main secondary outcome included the proportion of cases failing therapy because of adverse events or worsening HF 48 h after initiation of therapy. Other secondary outcomes included the proportion of pts achieving target doses of ACEI therapy and time to achieve target dose, symptoms, improvement in HF score, length of initial hospitalization, d of hospitalization for CV events from initial hospital discharge to 60 d, d of hospitalization for CV events within 30 d after randomization, all-cause hospitalization, and mortality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D hospitalized for CV causes or death within 60 d after randomization</td>
<td>485 ICM (51% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464 NICM (49% of total)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA II-IV</td>
<td>NYHA II-IV symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D hospitalized for CV causes or death within 60 d after randomization</td>
<td>949 (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 (randomized to milrinone), 242 (NICM, milrinone), 235 (ICM, placebo), 229 (NICM, placebo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other secondary outcomes included the proportion of pts achieving target doses of ACEI therapy and time to achieve target dose, symptoms, improvement in HF score, length of initial hospitalization, d of hospitalization for CV events from initial hospital discharge to 60 d, d of hospitalization for CV events within 30 d after randomization, all-cause hospitalization, and mortality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D hospitalized for CV causes or death within 60 d after randomization</td>
<td>60 d mortality was greater for ischemic (11.6%) than for non-ischemic pts (7.5%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined end point of death or rehospitalization at 60 d was 38.7% in ischemic pts and 31.5% in the nonischemic pts. More pts with nonischemic HF were able to reach target dosing of ACEI at hospital discharge (49%) compared with ischemic HF pts (36%). Treatment failure while on the study drug was similar within the 2 groups (14.2% for ischemic vs. 15.2% for nonischemic pts).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary endpoint, p=0.2</td>
<td>60d mortality, P=0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined endpoint, p=0.02</td>
<td>Able to reach target ACEI dose, p=0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment failure on study drug, p=0.7</td>
<td>Retrospectiv e study; No data collected on the level of care that pts received (i.e., ICU vs. monitored bed), which potentially could have affected the results of study; Imbalanced follow up within etiologic groups (4 pts in ischemic group vs. 8 pts in nonischemic group lost to follow-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospectiv e study; No data collected on the level of care that pts received (i.e., ICU vs. monitored bed), which potentially could have affected the results of study; Imbalanced follow up within etiologic groups (4 pts in ischemic group vs. 8 pts in nonischemic group lost to follow-up)</td>
<td>In pts with ischemic HF, milrinone tended to be associated with prolonged hospitalization and higher mortality. Composite of death or rehospitalization at 60 d was 42% for ischemic pts treated with milrinone and 36% for those treated with placebo (p=0.01 for etiology- treatment interaction). In- hospital mortality for milrinone- treated pts with ischemic HF was 5.0% vs. 1.6% for placebo (p =0.04 for etiology- treatment interaction), and 60 d mortality was 13.3% for milrinone vs 10% for placebo (p=0.2 for etiology- treatment interaction).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inhospital mortality in pts with acute decompensated HF requiring intravenous vasoactive medication: an analysis from the Acute Decompensated HF National Registry (ADHERE), Abraham WR, JACC 2005 15992636 (273)

To compare in hospital mortality in pts with acute decompensated HF receiving treatment with 1 of 4 vasoactive meds (NTG, nesiritide, milrinone, dobutamine)

| Regist ry | Beta blocker 50% (ACEI 43% ARB 12% Spironolactone 19%) | admitted to a participating acute care hospital and given a discharge diagnosis of HF | NYHA IV 45% (dyspneic at rest) | N/A | Inhospital mortality | Total LOS, ICU LOS | N/A | Inpatient mortality Milrinone: 12.3% Dobutamine: 13.9% NTG: 4.7% Nesiritide: 7.1% All others: 3.1% | 1001703

Survival of Pts with Acute HF in Need of Intravenous Inotropic Support (SURVIVE), Mebazaa A, 2007 17473298 (274)

To assess the effect of a short-term IV infusion of levosimendan or dobutamine on long-term survival

| RCT | Beta blocker 51% ACEI/ARB 69% Aldosterone antagonist 63% IV diuretics 79% IV nitrates 37% IV dopamine 6% | 1327, 664 (levosimendan); 803 (dobutamine) | 76% | Severe ventricular outflow obstruction; SBP persistently <85 mm Hg HR persistently >130 bpm; IV inotropic use during the index hospitalization (except dopamine 2 μg/kg/min or digitalis); History of torsade de pointes; SCr> 5.1 mg/dL (450 μmol/L) or on dialysis. | 86% NYHA IV | Low-output ADHF | All-cause mortality during the 180 d following randomization | All-cause mortality during 31 d, change in BNP level from baseline to 24 h; No. of d alive and out of the hospital during the 180 d; change in pt assessed dyspnea at 24 h; Pt assessed global assessment at 24 h; CV mortality through 180 d | N/A | N/A | Enrollees I: 303-1204 (20m), study drug infusion for minimum of 24 h and total duration of unknown period, follow up at 180 d, During the 180 d after study drug infusion, there were 173 deaths (26%) in the levosimendan group and 185 deaths in the dobutamine group (28%). No difference in secondary endpoints, except in mean change in BNP at 24 h from baseline (-631 levosimendan vs -397 dobutamine)

Primary endpoint: HR 0.91; 95% CI 0.74-1.13; p=0.40 Secondary endpoint (DBNP): p<0.001

Short duration of treatment. Detail of duration of infusion and dose of study drug used is not provided. No information regarding clinical symptomatology at baseline. Hypokalemia (6.4% levosimendan vs 5.9% dobutamine, p=0.02) AF (9.1% levosimendan vs 6.1% dobutamine, p=0.05), Headache (9.3% levosimendan vs 4.7% dobutamine, p=0.01), PVCs (6.1% levosimendan vs 3.6% dobutamine, p=0.05), Agitation (1.1% levosimendan vs 0% dobutamine, p=0.02)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enoximone in Intravenous Inotrope-Dependent Subjects Study (EMOTE), Feldman AM, 2007</th>
<th>17967591</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To determine whether low-dose oral enoximone could wean pts with ultra-advanced HF (UA-HF) from intravenous (IV) inotropic support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diuretic 88%, ACEI 62%, ARB 18%, blocker 40%, digoxin 70%, antiarrhythmi c 37%, ICD 42%, Milrinone 62%, dobutaline 36%, both dobutaline and milrinone 3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous IV inotrope 74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low-output ADHF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>201 (enoximone); 100 (placebo)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrollmen t 7/00-2/04 (44mo); 26 wk trial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81% ICM Age ≥ 18 yrs, NYHA III or IV CHF Total number of days on IV inotrope/total number of days alive and free of IV inotropic therapy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time to death/reinitiation of IV inotropic therapy: HR 0.76 Reduction @60d HR 0.62 Reduction @90d HR 0.69</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received a positive inotropic agent other than digoxin, dobutaline, or milrinone within 12 h of randomization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Small sample size. Not designed or powered as mortality study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trough digoxin levels were &gt;1.0 ng/mL. ICD firing within 90 d.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exacerbation of CHF in 54% enoximone vs 52% placebo, NS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyspnea, 5% enoximone vs 0% placebo, P&lt;0.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unadjusted primary end point p=0.14, adjusted for baseline characteristics p&lt;0.016 Time to death/reinitiation of IV inotropic therapy:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the baseline visit). Ongoing and stable (>30 d) therapy with optimal and stable doses of conventional medications

Use and impact of inotropes and vasodilator therapy in hospitalized pts with severe HF (ESCAPE), Elkayam U, Am Heart J 2007 17174645

To determine 6-mo risks of all-cause mortality and all-cause mortality plus rehospitalization associated with the use of vasodilators, inotropes, and their combination

Post-hoc analysis of RCT

ACEI 79% Diuretics 98% bBlocker 62% IV inotrope 42% IV vasodilator 28%

Hospitalized for severe ADHF Age>18 yrs Hx of HF for >3 mo On ACEI and diuretics for ≥3 mo; LVEF<30% in the 12 mo before randomization; SBP <125 mm Hg; elevated LV filling pressure as indicated by at least 1 physical sign and 1 symptom; At least 1 prior admission for ADHF during the previous 12 mo or aggressive outpatient therapy for at least the previous mo.

NIA Mean peak VO2 10.0 mean 6MWTD 414 ft

All-cause mortality Combined end point of all-cause mortality plus rehospitalization N/A 6 mo mortality N/A

Worse 6 mo outcomes (mortality and either mortality/rehospitalization) with inotropes (whether alone or with vasodilator)

6 mo mortality (adjusted), p, 95% CI
Inotrope 1.10-4.15, p=0.024
Both ino & vasodilator 2.34-9.90, p<0.001
6 mo mortality or rehosp (adjusted)
Inotrope 1.37-2.82, p<0.001
Both ino & vasodilator 1.88-4.48, p<0.001
6 mo mortality HR adjusted
Inotrope 2.14
Both inotrope and vasodilator 4.81
6 mo mortality or rehosp HR (adjusted)
Inotrope 1.96
Both ino & vasodilator 2.90

Severe ADHF
Conducted by HF specialists at academic medical centers
Small study size
Non-randomized Retrospective analysis

Prospective Randomize d Milrinone Survival Evaluation (PROMISE), Packer

To determine the effect of oral milrinone on the mortality of

RCT

Niacinax 88% Antiarrhythmics 25% Digoxin level 1.5mmol/L 1081, 651 (milrinone), 527 (placebo)

54% ICM NYHA III/IV CHF x ≥3mo LVEF ≤35% Medical regimen of digoxin, diuretics, Obstructive valvular disease Active myocarditis HCM or cardiac

100% NYHA III/IV 88% NYHA III/IV 42% NYHA IV

NYHA III/ IV All-cause mortality CV mortality, No. of hospitalizations, Addition of vasodilators for treatment of worsening HF.

N/A N/A

Enrollment 22mo (1/89-10/90); stopped early because Increased mortality with milrinone (30% milrinone vs 24% placebo); Log-rank test, milrinone Increased all-cause mortality: nominal P=0.038, 95% CI 0.01-0.61; adjusted P=0.06, CV mortality: 95% CI 0.08-0.69, nominal P=0.016; adjusted Background medical management is outdated and suboptimal

Stopped study drug due to worsening HF. 1.8% milrinone v 0.9% placebo
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Continuous intravenous dobutamine is associated with an increased risk of death in pts with advanced HF. Insights from the Flolan International Randomized Survival Trial (FIRST), O’Connor CM, 1999 10385768

To evaluate clinical characteristics and outcomes of pts with advanced HF receiving intravenous continuous dobutamine in the FIRST Trial (Flolan International Randomized Survival Trial).

Post-hoc analysis

N/A

471; 80 (dobutamine); 391 (no dobutamine)

87% Ischemic

NYHA IIIB or IV HF for >1 mo while receiving a regimen including a loop diuretic, digitalis glycoside, and an ACEI, unless contraindicated. LVEF <25%; by a multigated angiocardiogram obtained within 3 mo of enrollment, unless the pt was being treated with an IV inotropic agent, in which case LVEF <35% was accepted. Pts receiving IV vasoactive medications were required to have not responded to an attempt to wean from the medicines

SBP <80 mm Hg; Significant valvular stenosis; Anticipated revascularization or valvular surgery; MI within 3 mo; Uncontrolled tachyarrhythmias; Unstable or symptom-limiting angina; Requirement for a mechanical assist device to maintain life; Major change in IV vasoactive medications within 12 hr of randomization; CHF caused by uncontrolled thyroid disease, myocarditis, high output failure, or infiltrative cardiomyopathy; Significant

No dobutamine: 47% NYHA III 53% NYHA IV

Dobutamine: 1% NYHA III 86% NYHA IV

Occurrence of clinical events from the FIRST trial, including worsening HF, need for mechanical assist device, resuscitation from sudden cardiac death, MI, and death

QOL measures

N/A

N/A

The dobutamine group had a higher occurrence of first event (85.3% vs 64.5%) and a higher mortality rate (70.5% vs 37.1%) compared with the no dobutamine group. No difference in QOL between groups.

Primary endpt 1st event p=0.0006 mortality p=0.0001

Observation No details provided regarding duration and dose of dobutamine

A 6 mo 1st event 85.3% dobutamine vs 64.5% no dobutamine, p=0.0006 Death 70.5% dobutamine vs 37.1% no dobutamine, p=0.0001
Within 1 wk of enrollment, ineligibility for cardiac transplantation and eligibility for long-term oral anticoagulation therapy were also required.

- Congenital heart disease with shunts, valvular or vascular obstruction; Substance or alcohol abuse within 1 year; Moderate or severe lung disease; Other comorbid conditions likely to shorten survival; Current use of another investigational drug or device.

| Care processes and clinical outcomes of continuous outpatient support with inotropes (COSI) in pts with refractory end-stage HF | Cohort Study | ACEI/ARB 72% Dobutamine 100% Dopamine 22% Milrinone 11% | Hospitalized advanced end-stage HF pts Declined cardiac transplantation or ineligible for cardiac transplantation | N/A | N/A | Survival after hospital discharge | Total hospitalizations, causes for rehospitalization, cause of death | N/A | 1 y mortality 94% 6 mo mortality 74% | N/A | >2 rehospitalizations: 36% 0-1 rehospitalization: 64% 30% of rehospitalizations 2+ worse HF Cause of death: Worsening HF 80% SCD 14% Unknown 6% | N/A | Lack of QOL assessment Lack of cost evaluation Small study size Retrospective | Line infection/sepsis (15% of rehospitalization) |
| To assess the outcomes of chronic home inotropic support in Stage D HF pts | CEI/ARB 72% Dobutamine 100% Dopamine 22% Milrinone 11% | Hospitalized advanced end-stage HF pts Declined cardiac transplantation or ineligible for cardiac transplantation | N/A | N/A | Survival after hospital discharge | Total hospitalizations, causes for rehospitalization, cause of death | N/A | 1 y mortality 94% 6 mo mortality 74% | N/A | >2 rehospitalizations: 36% 0-1 rehospitalization: 64% 30% of rehospitalizations 2+ worse HF Cause of death: Worsening HF 80% SCD 14% Unknown 6% | N/A | Lack of QOL assessment Lack of cost evaluation Small study size Retrospective | Line infection/sepsis (15% of rehospitalization) |

2003 12815567 (279)
To investigate the relationship between choice of dobutamine or milrinone and mortality in inotrope-dependent stage D HF pts

- **ASA**: 10% beta blocker
- **5% (dob) v 34% (mil)**
- **ACEI**: 43%
- **ARB**: 5%
- **Amiodarone**: 52%
- **Furosemide**: 78%
- **Other diuretic**: 17%

**Stage D HF pts deemed inotrope-dependent**

- **112 (dobutamine)**
- **56 (milrinone)**

**41% ICM**

**Stage D HF pts presumably NYHA IIIb-IV**

**Inotrope dependent survival**

- **N/A**

**6 mo mortality (propensity matched)**

- **Dobutamine**: 60%
- **Milrinone**: 54%

**1yr mortality**

- **Dobutamine**: 69%
- **Milrinone**: 63%

No difference in mortality between inotrope type (multivariate analysis)

Propensity matched mortality, log-rank p=0.74

Retrospective e analysis

Single center study

Small study size

Lack of QOL assessment

---

To investigate the effects of low doses of the positive inotrope enoximone on symptoms, exercise capacity, and major clinical outcomes in pts with advanced HF who were also treated with beta blockers and other guideline-recommended background therapy

**ESSENTIAL-I**

- **beta blockers**: 83%
- **ACE/ARBs**: 94%
- **Aldosterone antagonist**: 62%
- **Diuretics**: 95%
- **Digitalis glycosides**: 69%
- **Warfarin**: 31%
- **Amiodarone**: 22%
- **ICD**: 21%

**ESSENTIAL-II**

- **beta blockers**: 90%
- **ACE/ARBs**: 99%
- **Aldosterone antagonist**: 54%
- **Digitalis glycosides**: 46%
- **Warfarin**: 8%
- **Amiodarone**: 14%
- **ICD**: 5%

**ESSENTIAL-I**

- **904 pts**
- **ESSENTIAL-II**: 560 pts
- **ESSENTIAL-I**: 472 pts
- **ESSENTIAL-II**: 450 pts

**ESSENTIAL-II**

- **ESSENTIAL-I and II**

Age >18 y

HF caused by ischaemic or non-ischaemic cardiomyopathy

LVEF ≤ 30%, LVEDD > 3.2 cm/m2 or 6.0 cm

NYHA III-IV for >2 mo or >1 hospitalization or 2 outpatient visits requiring IV diuretic or vasodilator therapy

Acute MI in previous 90 d, CV surgery in prior 60 d, Symptomatic ventricular arrhythmias or ICD firing in prior 90 d

Serum potassium <4.0 or >5.5 mEq/L, Digoxin levels >1.2 ng/mL, Magnesium levels <1.0 mEq/L, Serum bilirubin > 3.0 mg/dL

NYHA III

- **8% NYHA IV**

6MWT 274m (ESSENTIAL-I)

ESSENTIAL-II

6MWT 293m

ESSENTIAL-I

- **52% ICM**

ESSENTIAL-II

- **59% ICM**

**Co-primary endpoint**

- **First co-primary endpoint**: all-cause mortality, all-cause mortality and CV hospitalizations

- **No difference in change in 6MWTD**

- **Change in PGA changes**

HR 0.97

All-cause mortality, p=0.73, 95% CI: 0.80-1.17

All-cause mortality and CV hospitalizations, p=0.71, 95% CI: 0.86-1.11

Change in 6MWTD, p=0.79 (ESSENTIAL-I and II, separately)

Change in PGA, p=0.11 (ESSENTIAL-I and II, separately)

All-cause mortality, HR 0.97

All-cause mortality and CV hospitalizations, HR 0.98

Crude global assessment for QOL, 6MWTD may not be sensitive enough to detect improvement in exercise capacity/functio nal status

Worsening HF, 39% enoximone vs 39% placebo, p=0.08

Diarrhea, 12% enoximone vs 7% placebo, p=0.001

Palpitations 8% enoximone vs 5% placebo, p=0.01
A Prospective Study of Continuous Intravenous Milrinone Therapy for Status IB Pts Awaiting Heart Transplant at Home, Brozena SC, 2003

To determine the feasibility and safety of continuous IV milrinone therapy administered at home in pts listed as Status IB for heart transplant

Cohort Study

Digoxin 96.6% Loop diuretic 88.3% Warfarin 83.3% Statin therapy 66.6% Aspirin 63.3% Spironolactone 41.6% ARB 25.0% Hydralazine/ nitrate 13.3%

Milrinone dose 0.5-2 mg/kg/min; Stable dose of diuretic to maintain dry weight; Long-term venous access; AICO; Adequate social support system as assessed by a transplant social worker; Functional class <NYHA IV on therapy

NYHA II-III Peak VO2 11.4 ml/kg/min NYHA II-III

Survival to transplant QoL measures cost N/A N/A 43 mo fu

88.3% of pts underwent OHT 3.2% died before transplant 1.6% LVAD 3.2% BIVAD QoL improved (MLHFQ score decreased by 13.3±5.4 points)

Not randomized; No control; Limited cost data; Small study size

Comparison of dobutamine versus milrinone therapy in hospitalized pts awaiting cardiac transplantation, Aranda JM, 2003

To compare clinical outcomes and costs associated with the use of dobutamine or milrinone in hospitalized pts awaiting cardiac transplantation

RCT N/A 36; 19 (dobutamine); 17 (milrinone)

56% ICM

Age >18 y; Prior approval for cardiac transplant; Exacerbatio n of HF not only necessitating hospitalization but demonstrati ng inotropic dependency, Any history of intolerance to either dobutamine or milrinone, Hemodynamic instability at time of random assignment requiring mechanical cardiac support (IABP or not presented (presumably NYHA II or III)

Not presented Hemodynamic decompensatio n (assessed by periodic right heart catheterization), occurrence of ventricular arrhythmias requiring increased antiarrhythmici c therapy, death, need for mechanical cardiac support, heart transplantation, and need to add or cross over to the alternative inotropic agent

N/A N/A 17mo (109- 500); No difference between milrinone and dobutamine with respect to clinical outcomes or hemodynamic measures

Data not presented for beta-blocked use in milrinone arm. Small study size No report of SAE/complic
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LVAD as Destination for pts undergoing intravenous inotropic therapy: a subset analysis from REMATCH, Stevenson LW, 2004

| LVAD as Destination for pts undergoing intravenous inotropic therapy: a subset analysis from REMATCH, Stevenson LW, 2004 | To analyze outcomes in pts undergoing inotropic infusions at randomization for LVAD destination therapy | Post-hoc analysis | Diuretic 99% >1 Diuretic 52% blocker 20% ACE-I 55% | 91 (on inotrope at randomization) | (LVAD); 48 (OMM) | NYHA IV | Peak VO2 <14 mL/kg/min | All-Cause mortality during the 180 d following randomization | QoL at 1 y | N/A | N/A | Enrollment 15/98-7/01; | In pts undergoing inotropic therapy at randomization, 1 y survival with LVAD was 49% vs. 24% for OMM and by 2 y, 28% were alive with LVAD group compared with 11% in OMM group | P<0.0014 | Did not capture inotropic dependency status in all pts. Post-hoc subgroup analysis. Outdated LVAD model. | N/A |

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ADHF, acute decompensated heart failure; AE, adverse event; AICD, automated implantable cardioverter defibrillator; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; ASA, aspirin; AVB, atrioventricular block; BIVAD, biventricular assist device; BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; BP, blood pressure; CCB, calcium channel blockers; CHF, congestive heart failure; CMH, Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel; CO, cardiac output; CCr, creatinine clearance; CV, cardiovascular; ED, emergency department; F/U, follow-up; HCM, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; HF, heart failure; HR, heart rate; IABP, intra-aortic balloon pump; ICD, implantable cardioverter defibrillator; ICMI, ischemic cardiomyopathy; ICU, intensive care unit; IV, intravenous; LOS, length of stay; LVAD, left ventricular assist device; LVEDO, left ventricular end diastolic diameter; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionaire; MWTD, minute walk test distance; NA, not applicable; NSVT, non-sustained ventricular tachycardia; NTG, nitroglycerin; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OHT, orthotopic heart transplantation; OMM, optimal medical management; OPTIME-CHF, the Outcomes of a Prospective Trial of Intravenous Milrinone for Exacerbations of Chronic Heart Failure study; PADP, pulmonary artery diastolic pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; PDA, polyethylene; pts, patients; PVC, premature ventricular contraction; QoL, quality of life; RAP, right atrial pressure; RCT, randomized control trial; SAH, serious adverse event; SAS, specific activity scale; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SCD, sudden cardiac death; SCR, serum creatinine; UA, unstable angina; UAHF, ultra-advanced; VF, ventricular fibrillation; VT, ventricular tachycardia. |
## Data Supplement 33. Inotropic Agents in HF (Section 7.4.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Support Duration</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Hemo-dynamics</th>
<th>Functional Capacity</th>
<th>QoL</th>
<th>Hospitalization</th>
<th>Survival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROMISE</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>M vs. P</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>NYHA III-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranda JM 2003*</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>M, D</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>LVEF &lt;35%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>M ≡ D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>M ≡ D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>RCT (post-hoc)</td>
<td>D vs. none</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>NYHA III-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSI</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>M, D</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>Hospitalized</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6% @ 1 y 26% @ 6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brozena SC 2004*</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>Txpil-C (1B)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorodecki EZ 2009</td>
<td>Case Control</td>
<td>M vs. D</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>stage D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85% M ≡ D 31%-37% @ 1 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIME-CHF</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>M vs. P</td>
<td>Short-term (&lt;72 h)</td>
<td>Hospitalized for HF, NYHA II-IV, LVEF &lt;40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAPE</td>
<td>RCT (post-hoc)</td>
<td>M, D</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Hospitalized for HF, LVEF &lt;30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHERE</td>
<td>Retro Obs</td>
<td>M, D</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Hospitalized for HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>LOS in-hosp</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Device</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>HD Support</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>QoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMATCH</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>HM XVE (68)</td>
<td>OMM (61)</td>
<td>TxpIT-IE 74% ICM 71% ino</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTrEPID</td>
<td>pNRCT</td>
<td>NovaCor (37)</td>
<td>OMM (18)</td>
<td>TxpIT-IE 38% ICM 100% ino</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMII-DT</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>HMII (134)</td>
<td>HM XVE (66)</td>
<td>TxpIT-IE 67% ICM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMII-BTT</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>HMII (281)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TxpIT-C 43% ICM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EuroHMII</td>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>HMII (411)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21% TxpIT-IE 73% TxpIT-C 70% ICM 100% ino</td>
<td>21% P 79% T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMACS</td>
<td>pNRCT</td>
<td>HMII (169)</td>
<td>HM XVE (135) Th-IVAD (34)</td>
<td>TxpIT-C 80-89% ino</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Neuro</td>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>Lower rate of infxns with HMII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady K, Ann Thorac Surg 2004 15063260 (293)</td>
<td>pNRCT</td>
<td>HM XVE (78)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Txp/C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE</td>
<td>pNRCT</td>
<td>Heart Ware (137)</td>
<td>INTER MACS (499)</td>
<td>Txp/C 41% ICM 82% ino</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elhenawy A, J Card Surg 2011 2183463 (294)</td>
<td>ObsRS</td>
<td>BTC (22)</td>
<td>NovaCor 6, HMXVE 11, HMII 5, NovaCor 1, HMXVE 7, HMII 7,</td>
<td>41% Txp/C 59% Txp/IE 27% ICM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba A, JHLT 2010 20620083 (295)</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>Fixed pHTN (22)</td>
<td>NovaCor 2, HMXVE 14, HMII 6, NovaCor 4, HMXVE 13, HMII 9</td>
<td>Txp/C 22% ICM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nair P, JHLT 2010 201193910 (296)</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>pHTN (14)</td>
<td>NovaCor, Th-LVAD, Th-IVAD, HM XVE</td>
<td>Txp/C 100% ino 40% ICM</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOMENTUM</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Orqis Cancion (109)</td>
<td>OMM (59)</td>
<td>ADHF 100% ino or vasodilator 47% ICM Post-MI CS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N.S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth M, JACC 2008 19029587 (263)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Impella (12)</td>
<td>IABP (13)</td>
<td>Post-MI CS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhoff D, AHJ 2006 16921414 (264)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>TandemHeart (19)</td>
<td>IABP (14)</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiele H, EHJ 2005 15734771 (298)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Tandem Heart (21)</td>
<td>IABP (20)</td>
<td>Post-MI CS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ indicates survival benefit; ADHF, hospitalized for acute decompensated heart failure; AE, adverse event; BTC, bridge to candidacy; BTT, bridge to transplantation; DOS, duration of support; Expt, Experimental group; HMII, HeartMate II; HMII-BTT, HeartMate II bridge to transplant; HMII-DT, HeartMate II destination therapy; HM XVE, HeartMate XVE; IABP, intra-aortic balloon pump; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; ino, inotrope-dependent at time of randomization/implantation; Infx, infection; Infxn (NV), non-VAD related infection; INTERMACS, Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support; INTRIP, Investigation of Nontransplant-Eligible Patients Who Are Inotrope Dependent; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; MOF, multi-organ failure; MOMENTUM, Multicenter Trial of the Orqis Medical Cancion System for the Enhanced Treatment of Heart Failure Unresponsive to Medical Therapy; mPAP, mean pulmonary artery pressure; N/A, not applicable; Neuro, neurological complication (e.g. stroke); NS, no significant difference; Obs, Observational study; OHT, orthoptic heart transplantation; OMM, optimal medical management; P, permanent; pNRCT, prospective non-randomized clinical trial; post-MI CS, post-myocardial infarction cardiogenic shock; PumpRplt, pump replacement; RCT, randomized clinical trial; Rehosp, rehospitalization; REMATCH, Randomized Evaluation of
Mechanical Assistance in Treatment of Chronic Heart Failure; Renal Fail, renal failure; Resp Fail, respiratory failure; RV Fail, right ventricular failure requiring isotropic support; RVAD, need for right ventricular assist device; RR, relative risk; SVT, supraventricular tachycardia; T, temporary; Th-LVAD, Thoratec implantable ventricular assist device; Th-LVAD, extracorporeal VAD; TPG, transpulmonary gradient; Txplt-C, transplant candidate; Txplt-IE, transplant ineligible; and VT, ventricular tachycardia.

Data Supplement 35. LVADs (Section 7.4.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit or Major Study Findings</th>
<th>Complications/Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyle AJ, JHLT 2011 21168346 (299)</td>
<td>To compare post-implant outcomes across different INTERMACS classification levels.</td>
<td>Case-controlled</td>
<td>101 Pts implanted with an LVAD prior to 9/27/07 at University of Minnesota, University of Pittsburgh, and Columbia University with either a VentraAssist or HM II, classified by INTERMACS level at time of implant (Group 1: INTERMACS profile 1; Group 2: INTERMACS profiles 2-3; Group 3: INTERMACS profiles 4-7)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Survival to discharge. LOS after VAD implantation, actuarial survival while on MCS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>~2 y</td>
<td>Actuarial survival Group 3: 95.8%, Group 2: 68.8%, p=0.06 vs Group 3 Group 1: 51.1%, p=0.01 vs Group 3 survival to discharge Group 3: 95.8%, p=0.02 vs Group 1 Group 2: 93.8%, p=0.09 vs Group 1 Group 1: 70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMATCH, Rose E, 2001 11794191 (285)</td>
<td>To evaluate the suitability of implantable LVAD for their ultimate intended use as a long-term myocardial-replacement therapy for pts who are ineligible for cardiac transplantation</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>129 Adults with chronic end-stage HF and contraindications to transplantation. NYHA IV HF for &gt;60 of 90 d despite attempted therapy with ACEI, diuretics, and digoxin; LVEF ≤ 25% Peak VO2 ≤12-14ml/kg/min or a continued need for IV inotropic therapy owing to symptomatic hypotension, decreasing renal function, or worsening pulmonary</td>
<td>HF due to thyroid disease, obstructive cardiomyopathy, pericardial disease, amyloidosis, or active myocarditis Technical obstacles that pose an inordinately high surgical risk: INR &gt;1.3 or PT &gt;15 sec BSA ≤1.5 m² BMI &gt;40 kg/m² Severe COPD (FEV1 ≤1.5 L/min) Positive serum pregnancy test Fixed pHTN with PVR&gt; 8</td>
<td>The primary end point was death from any cause and was compared between groups with the use of the log-rank statistic. Secondary endpoints included the incidence of SAEs, the no. of d of hospitalizatio n, the QoL, symptoms of depression, and functional status.</td>
<td>1 y Mortality: LVAD 48% OMM 75% p=0.002 2y Mortality: LVAD 77% OMM 92% p=0.09</td>
<td>Reducation of 48 % in the risk of death from any cause — the primary endpoint — in LVAD group, as compared with medical-therapy group (OMM) QoL suggested greater improvement in LVAD group, though not all measures reached statistical significance. (RR 0.52; 95% CI: 0.34-0.78; p=0.001)</td>
<td>Sepsis (Rate Ratio 2.03) Non-neurologic bleeding (Rate Ratio 9.47) Neurologic dysfunction (Rate Ratio 4.35) SVT (Rate Ratio 3.92) Suspected malfunction of LVAD (0.75 rate/pt-y)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc. 138
| Congestion. NYHA III-IV for ≥ 28 d and who had received at least 14 d of support with IABP or with a dependence on IV inotropic agents, with 2 failed weaning attempts. | Wood units Candidate for CABG, valvular repair, LV reduction, or cardiomypasty Hx of cardiac transplantation, LV reduction or cardiomypasty Mechanical AV that will not be converted to bioprosthesis AST, ALT, TBili > 5x normal or biopsy-proved liver cirrhosis Stroke w/in 90d or cerebrovascular dz with > 80% extracranial stenosis Impaired cognitive function, Alzheimer’s disease and/or other irreversible dementia, Untreated AAA ≥5 cm Suspected or active systemic infection Platelet count <50x10^3/mm³ SCr >3.5 mg/dL or dialysis Peripheral vascular disease with rest claudication or leg ulceration CCB (except amlodipine) or type I or type III antiarrhythmic agent. Abdominal operation planned Psychiatric disease/Substance abuse Participating in another clinical study Other condition with survival < 3 y |
### LVAD as Destination for pts undergoing intravenous inotropic therapy: a subset analysis from REMATCH, Stevenson LW, 2004

- **To analyze outcomes in pts undergoing inotropic infusions at randomization for LVAD destination therapy.**

#### Post-hoc analysis
- **91 (on inotrope at randomization)**

#### LVEF <25%
- NYHA IV symptoms for 60 of 90 d despite attempted therapy with ACEI, diuretics, and digoxin. Peak VO2 <12-14 mL/kg/min with evidence of anaerobic metabolism.

#### Advanced age, Diabetes with end-organ damage, Scr >2.5 mg/dL for >90 d
- NYHA IV symptoms for 60 of 90 d despite attempted therapy with ACEI, diuretics, and digoxin. Peak VO2 <12-14 mL/kg/min with evidence of anaerobic metabolism.

#### Dependence on IV inotropic agents supported by completion of a weaning failure form.
- Advanced age, Diabetes with end-organ damage, Scr >2.5 mg/dL for >90 d

#### All-cause mortality during the 180 d following randomization.

### QoL at 1 y
- LVAD 51%
- OMM 76%
- p=0.0014

### 2 y mortality:
- LVAD 72% vs. OMM 89%

---

### Investigation of Nontransplant-Eligible Pts Who Are Inotrope Dependent (INTrEPID Trial), Rogers JG, 2007

- **To evaluate the impact of LVAD support on survival and QoL in inotrope-dependent HF pts ineligible for cardiac transplantation.**

#### Prospective randomized clinical trial
- **55**

#### Adults with inotrope-dependent stage D HF, LVEF < 25%, NYHA IV symptoms for ≥ 3 mo before enrollment and were not candidates for cardiac transplantation. Treated with maximally tolerated doses of ACEI, beta-blockers, digoxin, diuretics, and/or other vasodilators.

#### Unresolved drug or alcohol dependency
- Active systemic infection
- SCr >5.0 mg/dL
- TBil >5.0 mg/dL
- Mechanical ventilatory support for >48 h at the time of enrollment
- Comorbid medical condition limiting life expectancy < 2 y

#### All-cause mortality at 6 mo
- LVAD 49% vs. OMM 24%
- LVAD 28% vs. OMM 11%

#### 1st y mortality:
- LVAD 73% (LVAD) vs 89% (OMT) 6mo mortality: 54% (LVAD) vs 78% (OMT)

#### 2nd y mortality:
- 54% (LVAD) vs 78% (OMT)

#### Enrollment
- 39 mo (3/00-5/03); 12 mo follow-up
- 6 mo survival: 46% (LVAD) vs 22% (OMT) (HR 0.47; 95% CI 0.23-0.93; p=0.03)
- 1 y survival: 27% (LVAD) vs 11% (OMT)

#### Absolute reduction of 1 y mortality by 16% with LVAD
- (HR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.25-0.85; p=0.02)

#### CVA 34.5%

#### Infection 24%

---

### Advanced HF treated with continuous-flow LVAD, Slaughter MS, 2009

- **To compare the outcomes of pts ineligible for cardiac transplantation with pulsatile versus continuous flow.**

#### RCT
- **200**

#### Age >18 y
- BSA > 1.5m2 for a pt to be randomized HM XVE - HM II. If BSA < 1.5 m2and > 1.2 m2, the pt must meet the remaining criteria and can be enrolled in the Small Size

#### HF is due to uncorrected thyroid disease, obstructive cardiomyopathy, pericardial disease, amyloidosis, active myocarditis or RCM.

#### Technical obstacles, which pose an inordinately high surgical risk, in the

#### The primary composite endpoint was, at 2 y, survival free from disabling stroke and reoperation to

#### Secondary endpoints included survival, frequency of AE, the QoL, and functional capacity.

#### 1st y mortality:
- Continuous flow LVAD 42% (pulsatile flow LVAD)
- 1 y mortality: 73% (LVAD) vs 89% (OMT)

#### 2nd y mortality:
- LVAD 46% (LVAD) vs 22% (OMT) (HR: 0.47; 95% CI 0.23-0.93; p=0.03)
- 1 y survival: 27% (LVAD) vs 11% (OMT)

#### Absolute reduction of 1 y mortality by 16% with LVAD
- (HR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.25-0.85; p=0.02)

#### CVA 34.5%

#### Infection 24%
LVAD destination therapy

Cohort. NYHA III-IV HF and 1 of following:

i. On OMM, including dietary salt restriction, diuretics, digitalis, beta blockers, spironolactone and ACE-I, for ≥ 45 out of the last 60 d and failing to respond;

ii. NYHA III-IV HF for ≥ 14 d and dependent on IABP for 7 d and/or inotropes for ≥ 14 d

iii. Treated with ACE-I or beta blockers for ≥ 30 d and found to be intolerant.

Female pts of childbearing potential must agree to use adequate contraception

Ineligible for cardiac transplant. VO2max < 14 mL/kg/min or <50% of predicted VO2max with attainment of anaerobic threshold, if not contraindicated due to IV inotropes, angina or physical disability. LVEF is ≤ 25%.

Judgment of the investigator. Ongoing mechanical circulatory support other than IABP.

BMI ≥ 40 kg/m2. Positive pregnancy test

Presence of mechanical AV that will not be converted to a bioprosthesis

History of cardiac transplant or cardiomyoplasty.

Platelet count < 50,000

Untreated aortic aneurysm > 5cm.

Psychiatric disease, irreversible cognitive dysfunction, psychosocial issues that are likely to impair compliance

Active, uncontrolled infection.

Intolerance to anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapies or any other peri/post operative therapy that may be required

INR > 2.5, not due to anti-coagulant therapy, or Plavix within 5 days

AST, ALT, or total bilirubin > 5x normal or biopsy proven liver cirrhosis

Severe COPD or restrictive lung disease.

Fixed pHTN with a PVR > 8 Wood units

Stroke w/in 90 d. or cerebral vascular disease with > 80% extra cranial stenosis.

SCR > 3.5 mg/dl or on dialysis

Significant peripheral vascular disease with rest

Repair or replace the device.

Expant of LVAD

On the basis of the as-treated analysis, the Kaplan–Meier estimate of actuarial survival was significantly better for pts who had a continuous-flow LVAD as compared with those with a pulsatile-flow LVAD.

Improvements in functional status by NYHA Class and 6MWT did not differ between the two groups.

Primary composite endpoint:

HR 0.38; 95%CI: 0.27 to 0.54; p=0.001.

Actuarial survival, RR: 0.54 95% CI, 0.34 to 0.86; p=0.008.
Use of a continuous-flow device in pts awaiting heart transplantation (HMII BTT), Miller LW, 2007 17761592 (289)

To assess the efficacy of continuous-flow LVAD for providing hemodynamic support of at least 6 mo to pts awaiting heart transplantation

Cohort 133 Transplant listed. BSA > 1.2 m2. NYHA IV HF symptoms. Female pts of childbearing potential must agree to use adequate contraception

Despite medical therapy, the pt must meet one of the following criteria:
a. No contraindication for Status 1A listing
b. No contraindication for Status 1B listing
PCWP or PAD > 20 mmHg, CI < 2.2 L/min/m2 or SBP < 90 mmHg

HF due to uncorrected thyroid disease, obstructive/restrictive cardiomyopathy, pericardial disease, or amyloidosis.

Technical obstacles, which pose an inordinately high surgical risk.

Ongoing mechanical circulatory support other than IABP

BMI > 40 kg/m2.

Positive pregnancy test

Mechanical aortic valve that will not be converted to a bioprosthesis

Technical obstacles, which pose an inordinately high surgical risk.

Ongoing mechanical circulatory support other than IABP

BMI > 40 kg/m2.

Positive pregnancy test

Mechanical aortic valve that will not be converted to a bioprosthesis

Hx of cardiac transplant.

Platelet count <50,000/mL.

Untreated aortic aneurysm > 5cm.

Psychiatric dz irreversible cognitive dysfunction, psychosocial issue

Active uncontrolled infection.

Intolerance to anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapies or any other peri/post operative therapy that may be required

Any one of the following

The principal outcomes were the proportions of pts who, at 180 d, had undergone transplantatio

had undergone explantation of the device because of recovery of ventricular function, or had ongoing mechanical support and remained eligible for transplantatio n (i.e., were not removed from the waiting list owing to irreversible complications or clinical

Secondary outcomes included overall survival, survival while receiving device support, survival after transplantatio n, frequency of AEs, assessment of functional class by a 6-min walk test, independent evaluation of NYHA functional class by a physician, and QoL.

1 y mortality 32%

Enrollment 3/05-5/06 (15mo); follow-up through 180d

75% reached principal outcomes 18.8% died before 180d of support

Bleeding requiring pRBCs

Local infection, non-LVAD Ventricular arrhythmias

Sepsis

Right HF
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risk factors for and indicators of severe end-organ dysfunction or failure:
a) INR >2.5 not due to anticoagulant therapy or Plavix within 5 d.
b) Total bilirubin > 5mg/dl, or shock liver (AST, ALT >2,000), or biopsy proven liver cirrhosis.
c) Severe COPD or severe restrictive lung disease.
d) Fixed pulmonary hypertension, with a recent PVR >6 Wood units,
e) Unresolved stroke or uncorrectable cerebrovascular disease.
f) Scr >3.5 mg/dL or the need for chronic dialysis.
g) Significant peripheral vascular disease with rest pain or ulceration

To evaluate the use of a continuous-flow rotary LVAD as a bridge to heart transplantation over an extended period, up to 18 mo

Extended Mechanical Circulatory Support with a Continuous-Flow Rotary LVAD (HMII BTT), Pagani FD, 2009

Cohort Study

281

Same as above (HMII Study)

Same as above (HMII Study)

Survival and transplantatio n rates were assessed at 18 mo.

Pts were assessed for AEs throughout the study and for QoL, functional status, and organ function for 6 mo.

6 mo Mortality

18% (95% CI: 77-87%) 1 y Mortality

27% (95% CI: 66-80%) 18 Mo Mortality 28% (95% CI: 65-79%)

Enrollment

3/05-4/08 (38 mo); 18 mo follow-up

79% of LVAD pts reached primary outcome measure, either received a transplant, recovered cardiac function and underwent device explantation, or remained alive with ongoing LVAD support at 18-mo follow-up

Bleeding requiring pRBCs

Respiratory failure

Local infection, non-LVAD

Ventricular arrhythmias

Sepsis

Right HF requiring extended inotropic support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of a Percutaneous LVAD vs. IABP for Treatment of Cardiogenic Shock Caused by Myocardial Infarction, Seyfarth M, 2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pts with acute MI within 48 h and cardiogenic shock within 24 h CI ≤ 2 L/min/m² and PCWP &gt;15 mm Hg or an angiographically measured LVEF &lt;30% and LVEDP &gt;20 mm Hg</td>
<td>Age &lt;18 y; Prolonged resuscitation (&gt;30 min) HCM; LV thrombus; Treatment with intra-aortic balloon pump; Severe valvular disease or mechanical heart valve; Cardiogenic shock caused by mechanical complications of AMI such as ventricular septal defect, acute mitral regurgitation greater than second degree, or rupture of the ventricle; Predominant RV failure or the need for a RVAD; Sepsis; Known cerebral disease; bleeding with a need for surgical intervention; Allergy to heparin or any known coagulopathy; Moderate to severe AI; Pregnancy; Inclusion in another study or trial</td>
<td>The hemodynamic improvement at 30 min after implantation defined as the change in CI from baseline. Hemodynamic and metabolic parameters; All-cause mortality at 30 d; Device-related complications including hemolysis, major bleeding, cerebrovascular events, limb ischemia, and multiple-organ dysfunction scores at 30 d using MODS and SOFA criteria.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Center Volume on Outcomes of LVAD Implantation as DT: Analysis of the Thoratec HeartMate Registry, 1998 to 2005, Lietz K, 2009 | Registry | 351 | NYHA IV symptoms for ≥ 60 d despite maximized oral therapy or requirement of inotropic support LVEF ≤ 25% Peak VO2 <12 mL/kg/min or documented failure to wean IV inotropic therapy; Contraindication to HT attributable to age >85 y, insulin-dependent DM with end organ damage, chronic renal failure, or Not specifically outlined; similar to REMATCH | NYHA IV symptoms for ≥ 60 d despite maximized oral therapy or requirement of inotropic support LVEF ≤ 25% Peak VO2 <12 mL/kg/min or documented failure to wean IV inotropic therapy; Contraindication to HT attributable to age >85 y, insulin-dependent DM with end organ damage, chronic renal failure, or Not specifically outlined; similar to REMATCH | 1 y survival with DT | 1 y Mortality low volume: 52.2% medium volume:42.8% high volume: 32.6% | Enrolment: 5/98-12/05 (92 mo); total duration of observation: 102 mo; median follow-up period 9.5mo | High volume center compared with low volume center has an absolute benefit of 19.6% reduction in mortality at 1 y (1y mortality of 32.6% vs 52.2%) OR 0.4; 95% CI 0.2-0.7; p=0.006; Sepsis Multorgan failure Stroke Right HF LVAD failure/complications |
Predictors of death and transplant in pts with a mechanical circulatory support device: a multi-institutional study (INTERMACS), Holman WL, 2009 19134530 (301)

- To identify predictors for death and transplantation based on initial results from INTERMACS
- Registry 420
- Pt underwent implantation of mechanical circulatory support device (INTERMACS registry)
- Not specifically stated
- 1 y survival post LVAD implantation
- AEs
- 1 y Mortality
  - DT: 37%
  - BTT: 24%
- 19 mo, 12 mo follow-up
- Risk factors for death
  1. INTERMACS level 1 (<0.02)
  2. Older age (>60 yr) (<0.01)
  3. Presence of ascites (<0.003)
  4. Elevated total bilirubin (<0.05)
  5. BiVAD (<0.002)
  6. Total artificial heart (<0.03)
- CNS events
- Infection

European results with a continuous-flow VAD for advanced HF pts, Lahpor J, 2010 19616963 (290)

- To report on the European experience with the Heart Mate II LVAD
- Registry 411
- NYHA III-IV CHF on maximum medical treatment including IV inotropic support At least LVAD implantation took place at least 6 mo prior to closing date of study
- Not specifically stated
- 6 mo and 1 y survival
- AEs
- 6 mo mortality: 26%
  - 1st y mortality: 8.5%
- 52mo (3/04-8/08)
- Overall survival to transplantation, recovery of natural heart function with device removal, or ongoing device support at end of study: 69%
- Multiorgan failure infections (sepsis, local non-VAD related, drive line)
- Right heart failure bleeding
- Ventricular arrhythmias
- Neurologic complications
### Post-cardiac transplant survival after support with a continuous-flow LVAD: Impact of duration of LVAD support and other variables, John R, 2010 20447659 (302)

| Registry | 468 | Adult pts with end-stage HF and listed for heart transplantation (SAME AS HMII BTT STUDIES) | Severe renal, pulmonary, or hepatic dysfunction, Active uncontrolled infection Mechanical aortic valve or aortic insufficiency, Aortic aneurysm, Other MCS (other than IABP) Technical obstacles thought to pose an increased surgical risk | 1 mo and 1 y survival; survival after transplantatio n | Overall 1 y mortality: 13% | Enrollment 38 mo (3/05-4/08); follow-up for 1 y post-transplant and for 18 mo post-LVAD if not transplanted | Post-transplant survival at 1y: <30 d LVAD support: 94% 30-89 d LVAD support: 93% 90-179 d LVAD support: 84% >180 d LVAD support: 81% (p=0.18) | Bleeding requiring pRBCs |

### Results of the Post-U.S. FDA-Approval Study With a Continuous Flow LVAD as a Bridge to Heart Transplantation (INTERMACS), Starling RC, JACC 2011 21545946 (291)

| Registry | 338 | INTERMACS registry, LVAD for BTT | Survival (transplant or death) | 30 d mortality, inhospital mortality, LOS, QOL, AE | 12 mo mortality 13% HMII vs- 22%COMP | Enrollment 9/07-2/09; at least 12 mo follow-up post VAD | 12 mo survival: 85% HMII vs 70% COMP no difference between INTERMACS profiles within each group 12 mo survival: log rank p<0.001 | Bleeding event rate/pt-y 1.44 HMII v 1.79 COMP, p=0.19 Infection event rate/pt-y 1.0 HMII v 2.12 COMP, p=0.0001 |

### Survival after biventricular assist device implantation: An analysis of INTERMACS database, Cleveland JC, 2011 21621423 (303)

| Registry | 1852 | INTERMACS registry, LVAD or BiVAD implantation | N/A | Survival | AEs | 6 mo mortality BiVAD: 44% LVAD: 14% p<0.0001 | 15 mo (6/06-9/09) | Risk factors for death with BiVAD Older age Higher BSA Presence of Ascites Elevated creatinine Elevated total bilirubin Elevated INR History of valve surgery Failure to wean from bypass | Bleeding Infection |
To compare percutaneous continuous aortic flow augmentation (flow < 5 L/min for up to 96 h) plus medical therapy vs. medical therapy alone.

RCT 168

LVEF < 35%
 Persistent clinical, hemodynamic, and renal derangement despite standard oral medication and treatment for ≥ 24 h with ≥1 of the following drugs at minimum dosage (stable for ≥ 6 h):
 a) dobutamine 2.5 mg/kg/min
 b) milrinone 0.3 mg/kg/min
 c) dopamine 5 mg/kg/min
 d) nesiritide 0.01 mg/kg/min
 e) nitroprusside 0.25 mg/kg/min
 f) nitroglycerine 0.25 mg/kg/min
 PCWP > 18 mm Hg continuously for 12 h and > 20 mm Hg at time of randomization;
 CI < 2.4 L/min/m²;
 SCr > 4.0 mg/dL or on dialysis;
 CRT device implanted within 14 d.

Recent Q-wave MI or cardiac revascularization;
 Severe lung disease;
 Primary liver disease;
 CRT device implanted within 14 d;
 SBP < 80 mm Hg;
 Need for cardiac mechanical support;
 Platelet count < 50,000/L;
 INR > 1.5 in the absence of anticoagulation;
 Systolic infection;
 CVA or TIA within 3 mo;
 Active status on the cardiac transplantation list unless transplant was considered unlikely within 65 d;
 Peripheral vascular disease with absent pedal pulse or evidence of limb ischemia;
 Significant uncorrected primary valvular disease.

Overall success composite based on technical (device group only), hemodynamic, and clinical success defined as follows:
 Technical success (device group only), insertion and attainment of flow ≥ 1 L/min for ≥ 24 h;
 Hemodynamic success, mean PCWP decrease from baseline of 5 mmHg calculated as the average of values at 72–96 h;
 Clinical success, from d 1–35 after randomization, any of the following:
 > 10 consecutive d alive out of hospital, no alternative mechanical support, absence of death, and absence of readmission for HF.

Change in SCr at d 3 Change in body weight at d 4 Change in CI (72–96 h average); Change in NT-proBNP at d 3; Change in KCCQ Overall Summary score at 2 wk and 35 d.

Overall success composite was seen in 13.6% of the control group and 17.4% of the device group pts (p=0.45). No significant difference was found in SCr, NT-proBNP, or body weight. KCCQ Overall Summary and Clinical Summary scores increased more in the device group (p=0.10) than in the control group (p=0.05), but treatment differences were not significant.

65 d mortality pVAD 33.9% control 32.2% (HR: 1.05; p=0.87)

Enrollment 9/04–8/07 (3y), out to 64 d since randomization

Primary efficacy endpoint success (hemodynamic and clinical success for both groups plus technical success in the device group) was seen in 13.6% of the control group and 17.4% of the device group pts (p=0.45).

Any bleed (40.4% device vs 13.6% control, p=0.0004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Change in QoL and Impact on Survival After LVAD Implantation, Grady KL, 2004</td>
<td>15063260 (293)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Cohort Study</td>
<td>Received either HeartMate VE LVAD or Heart Mate implantable pneumatic LVAD between 8/1/94 and 8/31/99 at 1 of 9 medical centers in US and one medical center in Australia as BTT</td>
<td>Age &gt; 18 y, Able to read and write English, Physically able to participate</td>
<td>QoL questionnaires: QOL Index, Rating Question Form, HF Symptom Checklist, and Sickness Impact Profile</td>
<td>QoL outcomes were fairly good and stable from 1 mo to 1 y after LVAD implantation. Overall QoL was unchanged, however both positive and negative changes in subareas of QoL were noted. Pt satisfaction with life improved in area of health/functioning but worsened in satisfaction with significant others. Cardiopulmonary, neurologic, psychological, and physical symptom distress improved. Functional disability with respect to work, sleep/rest, self-care, and physical disability improved over time. However, functional disability with respect to home management and social interaction worsened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Flow LVAD Improves Functional Capacity and QoL of Advanced HF Pts, Rogers JG, 2010</td>
<td>20413033 (304)</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>Cohort Study</td>
<td>Pts enrolled in either HM II BTT or DT clinical trials</td>
<td>NYHA Functional Class assessed by clinician, PT reported activity levels (METS) and 6MWT, Heart failure-related QOL by MLWHF and KCCQ</td>
<td>LVAD pts demonstrated early and sustained improvements in functional status and QoL. NYHA functional class improved from class IV to class I or II in majority of pts (about 80%). Improved 6MWT distance as well as MLWHF and KCCQ scores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QOL and functional status in pts surviving 12 mo after LVAD implantation, Allen JG, 2010 19837607 (305)

To review QoL in pt on LVAD support for >1 y

Retrosp ective analysis

Pts who underwent HMII or HMI LVAD implantation between 2000-2008 at Johns Hopkins Hospital

Pt transplanted or died before 365 d of MCS

BMWT distance, MET tolerance, MLHFQ, NYHA functional class

Hospital readmissions, infectious complications

N/A

LVAD pts spend the majority of time outside the hospital enjoying a good QoL

90% of pts experienced hospital readmissions, with mean no. of readmissions per year of 2.9 with mean length of stay of 13.8 d. 43% of readmissions were for infectious complications. 77% of LVAD pts required additional operations for various indications.

AAA indicates abdominal aortic aneurysm; ACEI, angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AE, adverse event; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; AV, aortic valve replacement; BMI, body mass index; BSA, body surface area; BTT, bridge to transplantation; CABG, coronary artery bypass surgery; CCB, calcium channel blocker; CHF, congestive heart failure; CI, clearance; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVA, cerebrovascular accident; DM, diabetes mellitus; DT, destination therapy; dz, disease; FEV, forced expiratory volume; HCM, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; HF, heart failure; HM II, HeartMate II; HM XVE, HeartMate XVE; HT, heart transplantation; hx, history; IABP, intra-aortic balloon pump; INR, international normalized ratio; INTERMACS, Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support; IV, intravenous; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; LOF, length of stay; LV, left ventricle; LVAD, left ventricular assist device; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; METS, metabolic equivalents; MLWHF, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure; MWT, minute walk test; MODS, multiple organ dysfunction scores; N/A, not applicable; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-Type natriuretic peptide; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OMM, optimal medical management; PAD, peripheral arterial disease; pRBC, packed red blood cells; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; pHr, normal heart rate; pt, patients; PVR, peripheral vascular resistance; QoL, quality of life; RCM, Restrictive cardiomyopathy; RCT, randomized control trial; RV, right ventricle; SAE, serious adverse event; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SCr, serum creatinine; SOFA, sequential organ failure assessment; SVT, supraventricular tachycardia; TIA, transient ischaemic attack; VAD, ventricular assist device; and VO2, oxygen volume.

Data Supplement 36. Transplantation (Section 7.4.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Trial Duration (Years)</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit or Major Finding</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATIENT SELECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of peak exercise oxygen consumption for optimal timing of cardiac transplantation in ambulatory pts with HF, Mancini DM, Circulation, 1991 1969029 (27)

To determine whether measurement of peak VO2 during maximal exercise testing can be used to identify pts in whom transplantation can be safely deferred

Case-control

ACEI 95% Diiuretics 100% Digoxin 100% Vasodilators 99% PDE3 inhibitors 13% Antiarrhythmics 10% ICD 1%

122

Ambulatory HF pt referred for cardiac transplantation evaluation

Dependent on inotrope or mechanical support; Unable to achieve anaerobic threshold on CPX

NYHA II 13% NYHA III 70% NYHA IV 17%

Death

1 y mortality peak VO2 ≤14, accepted for transplant: 30%; peak VO2 >14: 6% peak VO2 ≤14, rejected for transplant: 53%

3

Pts with preserved exercise capacity despite severe resting hemodynamic impairment have survival and functional capacity equal to those afforded by cardiac transplantation

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicting Survival in Ambulatory Pts With Severe HF on Beta Blocker Therapy, Lund LH, Am J Cardiol 2003 14636921 (306)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To examine the predictive value of peak VO2 and the HFSS in pts referred for cardiac transplantation in the beta blocker era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blockers 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory HF pts referred for heart transplant evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome events: death before transplant, LVAD implantation, inotrope-dependent transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y event-free survival: beta blocker 75%; no beta blocker 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference in 1 y event-free survival amongst beta blocker users by peak VO2 statum; however, significant difference by HFSS statum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival by HFSS, p&lt;0.0002 (total cohort), p&lt;0.02 (beta blocker pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival by VO2, p=0.3 (total cohort), p=0.29 (beta blocker pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of Pts for Heart Transplantation in the Current Era of HF Therapy, Butler J, JACC 2004 14998618 (307)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assess the relationship between survival, peak exercise oxygen consumption (VO2), and HF survival score (HFSS) in the current era of HF (HF) therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI 92% Dihytric 96% Digoxin 94% beta blocker 10% (past) vs. 72% (current) Spironolactone 2% (past) vs. 41% (current) Antiarhythmic 13% AICD 11% (past) v 19% (current)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On inotrope; Angina or orthopedic issue restricting exercise capacity; Significant valvular stenosis; Exertional oxygen desaturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA III-IV 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y event-related survival (without need for LVAD or urgent- Status 1A- transplantation) for HF pts; Overall 1-y survival for transplanted pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall 1-y survival Transplanted: 88%; Current era HF: 88%; Past era HF: 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference in 1 y event-free survival in current era by initial peak VO2; trend towards difference in survival when stratified by HFSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak VO2 and VE/VCO2 slope in pts with HF: a prognostic comparison, Arena R, Am Heart J, 2004 14760336 (308)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To examine the ability of peak VO2 and VE/VCO2 slope to predict cardiac-related mortality and hospitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospectiv e analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI 70% Dihytric 57% Dihytric 63% Oral nitrate 29% beta blocker 42% CCB 15% anticoagulant 35% Antiarhythmic 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF diagnosis; Evidence of LV systolic dysfunction by echocardiogram or cardiac catheterization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac-related mortality and hospitalization 1-y after exercise testing via medical chart review and the Social Security Death Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year mortality VE/VCO2 &lt; 34: 0.8% VE/VCO2 &gt;34: 16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 y, 7 mo (CPX from 4/93-10/01), plus 1 y f/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak VO2 (≤14 ml/kg/min) was revealed by multivariate Cox regression analysis to add significantly to the VE/VCO2 slope (&gt;34) in predicting 1-y cardiac-related hospitalization (residual X² &gt;6.5; p=0.01). The addition of peak VO2 did not provide additional value to the VE/VCO2 slope in predicting overall cardiac-related mortality (residual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y cardiac mortality VE/VCO2 slope ≥34, p &lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Prognostic usefulness of the functional aerobic reserve in pts with HF, Chase P, Am J Cardiol, 2010 | Case-control | Beta blocker 86% (no VT) vs 75% (VT) ACEI 76% CCB 7% Diuretic 90% (no VT) vs 70% (VT) 874 | Chronic HF with stable HF symptoms and medications for at least 1 mo before exercise testing, LVEF<45% N/A | NYHA III-IV 89% (no VT) vs. 45% (VT) Major cardi-related events (heart transplantation, LVAD implantation, and cardiac-related death) for 2 y after CPX testing 2 y event-free survival based upon CPX responses---favorable responses defined as VE/VO2pk <36, VO2pk > 10 mL O2/kg/min, FAR > 3mL O2/kg/min All favorable responses: 95% 1 unfavorable: 83.1% 2 unfavorable: 76.0% All unfavorable: 58.3% | 11 y (CPX between 5/97-5/08); 2 y follow-up Pts without a detectable VT had worse prognosis. VE/VO2 slope >36 is the strongest overall univariate and multivariate predictor; FAR <3mL O2/kg/min and peak VO2 <10mL O2/kg/min are additive to the VE/VO2 slope X2 = 0.2; p<0.89 or 1-year cardiac-related mortality (residual X2= 1.5; p=0.29). |
| Ventilatory Efficiency and the Selection of Pts for Heart Transplantation, Ferreira AM, Circulation HF, 2010 | Case-control | N/A 663 | HF pts who underwent cardiopulmonary testing at 4 laboratories; NYHA II-IV; LVEF ≤40% Primary valve disease; Congenital heart disease; Planned coronary; revascularization; Planned cardiac surgery; Age <19 y; Primary pulmonary disease; Previous cardiac transplantation; Submaximal CPX (peak RER) | NYHA II-IV Death or heart transplant During follow-up period, 15.2% underwent transplant 13.7% died | Median f/u 26 mo Ve/VO2 slope <43, 1y survival 97% 3y survival 89.4% Ve/VO2 slope >43 1y survival 77.8% 3y survival 55.1% Ve/VO2 slope <43 1y survival: 95% CI: 95.4-98.6, y survival: 95% CI: 85.8-93.0 p<0.001 Ve/VO2 slope >43 1 y survival: 95% CI: 71.3-84.3%, 3 y survival: 95% CI: 45.2-65.0 No VT vs VT: p<0.001, 95% CI 2.3-4.8 Prognostic classification p<0.001 |
The HF Survival Score outperforms the peak oxygen consumption for heart transplantation selection in the era of device therapy, Goda A, JHLT 2011 21093299 (311)

| Case-control | To evaluate peak VO2 and HFSS as prognostic tools in pts with and without CRT-D referred for heart transplant evaluation | ACEI/ARB 80% b-blocker 64% (no device) v 76% (any device) | 715 | Systolic HF pt referred for heart transplant evaluation | Excluded pts unable to exercise for any reason | mean NYHA class 2.82 (total), 2.7 (no device) v 2.9 (any device) | Outcome events were defined as death, urgent transplantation (UNOS Status 1), or implantation of LVAD. Pts who underwent transplant as non-urgent (UNOS status 2) were censored alive on the date of the transplant. | 1 y event-free survival with peak VO2 <1.05). | N/A | HFSS significantly discriminates between the 3 risk strata across all device groups, whereas peak VO2 <10 only discriminates high risk from low/medium risk. | 1 y event-free survival, amongst CRT+/-ICD pts low risk HFSS 90%, medium risk HFSS 72%, high risk HFSS 96% |

FUNCTIONAL/QOL OUTCOME

Improvement in QoL, in Pts with HF who Undergo Transplantation, Grady KL, 1996 8878757 (312)

<p>| To compare QoL of pts with HF at time of listing for a heart transplant with that 1 y after transplantation | Cohort | Post-transplant maintenance immunosuppression included cyclosporine, prednisone and azathioprine. Some received induction anti-T-cell therapy. | 148 | Underwent cardiac transplantation at Loyola University of Chicago Medical Center or University of Alabama at Birmingham | N/A | N/A | Symptoms, health perception, functional status, stress, coping, life satisfaction, and overall QoL as measured by 6 point-completed instruments. Demographic and clinical data from chart review. | N/A | N/A | Total symptom distress decreased after heart transplantation. Overall level of functional disability improved after heart transplantation, though remained low. | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Controlled Trial of Exercise Rehabilitation After Heart Transplantation, Kobashigawa JA, 1999 902951 (313)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>All pts were treated with triple-drug immunosuppression--cyclosporine, azathioprine, and prednisone.</td>
<td>27 Underwent cardiac transplantation Multiple medical issues limiting ability to participate in exercise training</td>
<td>Differences in results of cardiopulmonary exercise stress testing at 1- and 6-mo after transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of QoL in Pts at 1 y After Heart Transplantation, Grady KL, 1999 10328145 (314)</td>
<td>Cohort study</td>
<td>Some pt received induction anti-T cell therapy with HATG or OKT3, some did not. All pts were on maintenance immunosuppression consisting of cyclosporine, prednisone, and azathioprine. Prednisone was rapidly tapered to 0.1mg/kg/d by 1 y post-OH.</td>
<td>23 Pts who survived to 1 y post-cardiac transplant and completed the study booklet</td>
<td>QoL domains and multiple subscales within these domains: somatic sensation, psychological state, physical and occupational function, social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle and QoL in Long-Term Cardiac Transplant Recipients, Salyer J, 2003 12633699 (315)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study</td>
<td>Cardiac transplant recipients who were: (1) &gt;18 y of age at the time of transplant; (2) could read and write English; and (3) had the visual acuity to read and respond to written questionnaires.</td>
<td>93 Cardiac transplant recipients self-reported questionnaire incorporating: (1) pt characteristics; (2) barriers to health promotion, perceived health competence and health-promoting lifestyle; (3) perceived health status; and (4) QoL.</td>
<td>Predictors of better QoL at 1 y post-OHT were: less total stress, more helpfulness of information, better health perception, better compliance with transplant regimen, more effective coping, more functional ability, less symptom distress, older age, fewer complications Predictors of POOR outcome were primarily psychological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in exercise capacity, ventilation, and body weight following heart transplantation, Habedank D, 2007 17023206 (316)

To prospectively examine changes in peak VO2 and ventilatory efficiency (VE/VCO2 slope) over 24 mo following heart transplantation and evaluate the potentially confounding effects of weight gain

Case control

In bxp pts Immunosuppression: cyclosporine/tacrolimus 100% prenisolone 100% azathioprine/MMF 100% ACE-I/ARB 99% CCB 93% Diuretics 92% alpha blocker 17% beta blocker 12%

125 Underwent cardiac transplantation between 9/97 and 1/02 at German Heart Institute, Berlin; Healthy volunteers

N/A N/A Peak VO2, VE/VCO2 slope N/A N/A

Ve/VCO2 slope improved (decreased) at 6 mo and remained improved at 12, 24 mo post-bxp compared with pre-bxp value and no different than matched normal at 6 mo. Peak VO2 improved at 6 mo and remained improved at 12, 24 mo post-bxp compared to pre-bxp baseline but remained lower than normal matched controls.

Patterns and Predictors of QoL at 5 to 10 Y After Heart Transplantation, Grady KL, 2007 18022086 (317)

To describe QoL over time and identify predictors of QoL longitudinally from 5-10 y after heart transplantation

Cohort

Transplanted between 7/1990 and 6/1999; Survived 5-10 y post-transplant Completed pt survey pamphlet; Age ≥21y; Literate in English

N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A QoL is positive and stable at 5 to 10 y after heart transplantation. Bio-psychosocial variables predicted satisfaction with overall QoL and HRQoL.

SURVIVAL OUTCOMES

Long-term Results of Cardiac Transplantation in Pts Older than 60 Y, Bull DA, 1996

To examine the long-term results of cardiac transplantation in pts >60 y

Case-control

NYHA IV HF unremedial to surgical treatment other than cardiac replacement, Severe pHTN (PVR >6 Wood units, irreversible) Severe irreversible NYHA IV Survival after transplant 6 y mortality >60y/o: 46% <60y/o: 28% 9 y 18% worse survival/higher mortality at 6 y post-transplant for pts transplanted at age > 60 y. 6-y mortality: p<0.05 Death from infection: p<0.003

ischemic etiology of HF, fewer barriers, higher perceived health competence and a health-promoting lifestyle (R² =0.51; F=14.77; p=0.001). Ve/VCO2, p<0.001 vs. baseline, p=0.12 vs matched normals Peak VO2, p<0.01 vs baseline, p<0.0001 vs matched normals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Outcome and Clinical Profiles in Transplantation (COCPIT) Study, Deng MC, 2000 10968814 (319)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine whether there is a survival benefit associated with cardiac transplantation in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective observational cohort N/A 889 Age ≥16 y, listed for cardiac transplantation N/A NYHA IV Mortality, stratified by HF severity. 1 y mortality after listing: high risk: 51% medium risk: 32% low risk: 29% p &lt;0.0001 1 y mortality while waiting on transplant list: high risk: 32% medium risk: 20% low risk: 19% p &lt;0.0003 for high risk compared with low/medium N/A For the total cohort there was no survival benefit from transplantation. However, for high risk pts, a mortality risk reduction was observed within 2 wk of transplantation (RR &lt;1.0). This benefit disappeared after eight months. p=0.04 (mortality risk reduction for high risk pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible pulmonary HTN in heart transplant candidates—pretransplant evaluation and outcome after OHT, Klotz S, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible pulmonary HTN in heart transplant candidates—pretransplant evaluation and outcome after OHT, Klotz S, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving trends in risk profiles and causes of death after heart transplantation: A 10 y multi-institutional study, Kirklin JK, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving trends in risk profiles and causes of death after heart transplantation: A 10 y multi-institutional study, Kirklin JK, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Retransplantation in 7,290 Primary Transplant Pts: A 10-Y Multi-Institutional Study (Cardiac Transplant Research Database Group), Radovancevic B, 2003 12909465 (322)

| Outcome in Cardiac Recipients of Donor Hearts With Increased LV WT, Kuppahally SS, 2007 17845572 (323) | Case-control | Cyclosporine 58% Tacrolimus 41% Sirolimus 31% Mycophenolate 69% | 157 Pts transplanted between 1/01 and 12/04 at Stanford University Medical Center and the affiliated Northern California Kaiser Permanente heart transplant programs | Pediatric pts, multiple organ recipients, recipients who died within 3 d after transplantation | N/A Incidence of cardiac recipient death or cardiac retransplantation | Overall mortality (mean 3 y fl) donor LVH (>1.2): 21.3% donor normal LVWT: 20% donor LVH (>1.4): 50% total: 20.4% | N/A Donor heart LVWT>1.4cm increases post-transplant mortality and risk of allograft vasculopathy | Increased mortality with donor LVWT>1.4, p=0.003, 95% CI 1.8-21.5 VAD BTT, p=0.04, 95% CI 1.02-6.85 |

| Long-term outcomes of cardiac transplantation for PPCM: a multinstitutional analysis (CTRDG), Rasmusson KD, 2007 18022074 (324) | Registry | Induction cytolytic rx 31% Steroids (at 1y): 88% | 671 1. Age <40 y at time of cardiac transplant 2. Etiology of HF: PPCM or IDCM | N/A | N/A Rejection, infection, cardiac allograft vasculopathy, and survival | N/A 15 y registry PPCM recipients had similar long-term survival as male IDCM recipients; PPCM recipients trended towards better survival compared with female IDCM, +h/o pregnancy recipients; PPCM recipients appeared to have better survival than Overall survival PPCM vs male IDCM, p=0.9 PPCM vs +P, P=0.05 PPCM vs -P, p=0.07 |
| Clinical outcomes after cardiac transplantation in muscular dystrophy pts (CTRDG), Wu RS, 2010 | To investigate the clinical outcomes of cardiac transplantation in muscular dystrophy pts with an extended follow-up period and to assess the outcomes in comparison with an age-matched control cohort | Case-controlled | Calcineurin inhibitors Cyclosporine 87% Tacrolimus 9% Unknown 4% Azathioprine 61% Mycophenolate 33% Unknown 6% Steroids (≥1yr) 25% | 304 | Muscular dystrophy pts who underwent cardiac transplantation and matched-control cohort of IDCMP pts (matched by age, BMI, gender, and race) | N/A | N/A | Survival after transplant | 1y post-bxpt mortality: Muscular dystrophy 11% Matched-control 9% 5 y post-bxpt mortality: Muscular dystrophy 17% Matched-control 21% p=0.5 15 y registry N/A p=0.5 (post-bxpt mortality) |

| The effect of transplant center volume on survival after heart transplantation: A multicenter study, Shuhaijer JH, 2010 | To elucidate the effect of transplant center volume on 1-y mortality | Case-control | N/A | 147 transplant centers/13230 heart transplants Data from the Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients of heart transplantations between 1/1/99 and 5/31/05 | N/A | N/A | 1 y mortality | 1 st y post-transplant mortality significantly higher at very low-volume transplant centers compared with low to high volume transplant centers. 5.5 y registry Low-, medium, and high-volume transplant centers have lower 1y post-transplant mortality than very-low volume transplant centers. p<0.001 for each group compared with very-low volume center group, 95% CI: Low volume 0.62-0.82 Med volume 0.56-0.74 High volume 0.48-0.65 |
### Diabetes and Hyperglycemia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background Therapy</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Absolute Benefit</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
<th>OR: HR: RR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive vs. Conventional Glucose Control in Critically Ill Pts: The NICE-SUGAR Investigators. NEJM 2009; 360: 1283-97 (327) 19318384</td>
<td>Randomization of ICU pts to intensive vs. conventional glucose control</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Tight glucose control recommended by some</td>
<td>6104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hospitalized pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Death -2.60% (95% CI: 1.02 - 1.28 (p=0.02))</td>
<td>OR: 1.02 death at 90 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Admission Glucose and Mortality in Elderly Pts Hospitalized with HF. Kosiborod M, Inzucchi SE, Spertus JA, Wang Y, Masoudi FA, Havranek EP, Krumholz HM. Circulation 2009; 119: 1899-1907. (328) 19332465</td>
<td>To investigate the association between admission glucose and mortality in elderly pts hospitalized with HF</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Tight glucose control recommended by some</td>
<td>50,532</td>
<td>59.7% ischemic</td>
<td>Hospitalized pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Death N/A p=0.64</td>
<td>0.998 fully adjusted model per 10 mg/dL increase in admission glucose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven-Year mortality in HF pts with undiagnosed DM: an observational study. Flores-LeRoux JA et al. Cardiovasc Diabetol 2011; 10:39 (329) 21569580</td>
<td>To assess the prognosis of hyperglycemia (previously undiagnosed DM) in pts admitted to the hospital with HF</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>43% ischemic</td>
<td>Acute HF admission</td>
<td>Lost to follow-up</td>
<td>Total mortality N/A</td>
<td>95% CI: 1.17 - 2.46 (p=0.006); 95% CI: 1.10 - 1.99 (p=0.009)</td>
<td>aHR unknown DM 1.69 (ACM); HR clinical DM 1.48 (ACM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry C, Brett M, Stevenson K, McMurray JJV, Norrie J. Nature and prognostic importance of abnormal glucose tolerance and diabetes in acute HF. Heart 2008;94:296-304. (330) 17664189</td>
<td>To investigate the nature and importance of blood glucose abnormalities in an unselected HF population</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Inhospital mortality N/A</td>
<td>p=0.0023; (95% CI: 1.03-1.13)</td>
<td>1.08, aHR per 2 mmol/L increase in glucose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Registry (ADHF National Registry Emergency Module registry)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>ADHF</th>
<th>COPD</th>
<th>Primary Condition</th>
<th>Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Standardized Mortality Ratio</th>
<th>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronchodilator Therapy in ADHF in Pts without a History of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Singer AJ et al. Ann Emerg Med. 2008;51:25-34. (<a href="17949853">332</a>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10,978</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.02; 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should acute treatment with inhaled beta agonists be withheld from patients with dyspnea who may have heart failure? Maak CA et al. J Emerg Med. 2011 Feb;40(2):135-45. (<a href="18572345">333</a>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACM indicates all-cause mortality; ADHF, acute decompen­sated heart failure; BT, blood transfusion; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; ED, emergency department; EMBASE, Excerpta Medica Database; HF, heart failure; ICU, intensive care unit; MEDLINE, Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online; N/A, not applicable; NICE-SUGAR, Normoglycaemia in Intensive Care Evaluation and Survival Using Glucose Algorithm Regulation; pt, patient; and RCT, randomized control trial.
### Data Supplement 38. Worsening Renal Function, Mortality and Readmission in Acute HF (Section 8.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damien Logeart, 2008 (334)</td>
<td>Study prevalence, causes and consequences of WRF during hospitalization for acute HF</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>416 pts admitted for acute HF</td>
<td>Pts hospitalized for acute HF</td>
<td>Chronic and severe renal failure (admission SCR &gt;230 μmol/lol/L); cardiogenic shock or severe low output requiring inotropic agents during the hospitalization; inhospital death</td>
<td>Combined death; first unscheduled readmission for HF Outcome during the 6 mo after discharge was determined by contacting the pts or their general practitioners by telephone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace L. Smith, 2006 (335)</td>
<td>Estimate prevalence of renal impairment in HF pts and the magnitude of associated mortality risk using a systematic review of published studies.</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>80,098 hospitalized and non-hospitalized HF pts.</td>
<td>Cohort studies and secondary analyses of several RCTs.</td>
<td>Studies with &lt;6 mo follow-up and a study that defined renal impairment using ICD-9 code but no direct serum measures</td>
<td>All-cause mortality risks associated with any renal impairment (Cr≥1.0 mg/dL, CrCl or estimated eGFR &lt;90 mL/min, or cystatin-clopodigrel &gt;1.03 mg/dL) and moderate to severe impairment (Cr≥1.5, CrCl or eGFR &lt;53, or cystatin-clopodigrel ≥1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Metra, 2008 (336)</td>
<td>Association between hospitalizations for acute HF and WRF</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>318 consecutive pts admitted for acute HF</td>
<td>Diagnosis of acute HF, as established by the ESC guidelines; treatment with an IV agent, which in all cases included furosemide with or without other vasoactive medications.</td>
<td>Inability to give informed consent and those with evidence of ACS, acute arrhythmia, myocarditis, valve stenosis, cardiac tamponade, aortic dissection, pulmonary embolism, high output syndrome or evidence of non-cardiovascular factors</td>
<td>Cardiac death and urgent, unplanned hospitalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>Prevalence and Risk Factors</td>
<td>All-cause mortality during the initial hospitalization and within 30+7 d and 180+7 d of the index hospitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowie MR, 2006</td>
<td>To determine the prevalence and risk factors for WRF among pts hospitalized for decompensated HF and the association with subsequent rehospitalization and mortality.</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Pts with a planned discharge within 24 h of admission; an investigator-defined history of ACS or cardiogenic shock within 1 mo prior to the index admission; receiving a new prescription for potentially nephrotoxic drugs within 2 d prior to admission; severe aortic stenosis, valvular disease anticipated to require surgery within 6 mo, ‘high output’ cardiac failure, or those undergoing chronic renal replacement therapy or cancer chemotherapy.</td>
<td>Pts with a planned discharge within 24 h of admission; an investigator-defined history of ACS or cardiogenic shock within 1 mo prior to the index admission; receiving a new prescription for potentially nephrotoxic drugs within 2 d prior to admission; severe aortic stenosis, valvular disease anticipated to require surgery within 6 mo, ‘high output’ cardiac failure, or those undergoing chronic renal replacement therapy or cancer chemotherapy.</td>
<td>All-cause mortality during the initial hospitalization and within 30+7 d and 180+7 d of the index hospitalization; date and cause of subsequent hospital re-admissions were also recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komukai K, 2008</td>
<td>To investigate whether renal dysfunction is associated with rehospitalization for CHF after successful discharge</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>109 pts</td>
<td>Pts with CHF who had been admitted and followed up after discharge at the outpatient clinic were reviewed. CHF was diagnosed by ≥2 cardiologists on the basis of the Framingham criteria.</td>
<td>HF complicated by acute MI, undergoing or starting dialysis during the follow-up period, or undergoing cardiac surgery during the follow-up period.</td>
<td>Rehospitalization for HF after discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhter MW, 2004</td>
<td>Evaluate the relation between elevated SCr at baseline, as well as WRF during hospitalization, and secondary analysis of the VMAC trial.</td>
<td>Secondary analysis of the VMAC trial</td>
<td>481 (215 had RI and 266 did not)</td>
<td>Patients with dyspnea at rest caused by acute HF</td>
<td>Length of hospitalization, 30 d readmission rate as well as 30-d and 6-mo mortality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes pts hospitalized for decompensated HF in the VMAC trial</td>
<td>Nohria A, 2008</td>
<td>Examine the ESCAPE database to assess the impact of renal dysfunction in patients with acute HF</td>
<td>Secondary analysis of the ESCAPE trial</td>
<td>A total of 433 pts were enrolled at 26 sites</td>
<td>LVEF ≤30%, recent hospitalization or escalation of outpatient diuretic therapy, and SBP ≤125 mm Hg who were admitted to the hospital with at least 1 sign and 1 symptom of HF, despite adequate treatment with ACEIs and diuretics</td>
<td>Creatinine &gt;3.5 mg/dL, the use of dobutamine/dopamine &gt;3 μg/kg/min or milrinone before randomization, and requirement for early right heart catheterization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Whether the severity of renal dysfunction, the incidence of WRF or outcomes has changed over time (secular trends) in pts hospitalized for HF therapy.</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>6440</td>
<td>All consecutive HF pts admitted to Mayo Clinic hospitals in Rochester, MN, between January 1, 1987, and December 31, 2002</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,681 pts from 18 Connecticut hospitals</td>
<td>Krumholz, 2000</td>
<td>To determine the incidence and identify factors associated with the development of worsening renal function in elderly patients with acute HF and to examine the impact of WRF on morbidity and economic outcomes.</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>Age ≥65 y; discharge with HF without having clear precipitants for renal dysfunction</td>
<td>Pts &lt;65 y of age; pts whose diagnosis could not be validated by medical record review, pts with severe aortic stenosis, severe mitral stenosis, or HF secondary to a medical illness (e.g., sepsis); major complications (stroke, acute MI shock, heart arrest, hypotension, pneumonia, and infection) or underwent a cardiac procedure requiring contrast (cardiac catheterization or angioplasty) or bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forman, 2004 14715185 (342)</td>
<td>To determine the prevalence of WRF among hospitalized HF pts, clinical predictors of WRF, and hospital outcomes associated with WRF.</td>
<td>Cohort (retrospective)</td>
<td>1,004 HF pts hospitalized between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998, at 11 academic medical centers. Pts were excluded if their hospitalizations were for an elective procedure (e.g., percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty, pacemaker, or cardioversion) or if their hospital length of stay was &lt;2 d. Other exclusion criteria included severe aortic stenosis, anticipated cardiac transplantation, transfer from another inhospital setting, chronic dialysis, use of a LV assist device, high-output HF, age &lt;20 y, concomitant use of an investigational product or device, and patients receiving chemotherapy. Subjects were also excluded if Cr values were not documented at admission.</td>
<td>The principal outcome was WRF, defined as an increase in SCr of &gt;0.3 mg/dL (26.5 μmol/L) from admission, consistent with several previous investigations; hospital length of stay, inhospital mortality, and complications occurring after the rise in creatinine. Complications were defined as shock, MI, stroke, major infection/sepsis, clinically significant hypotension, and new onset AF with ventricular rates &gt;100 beats/min.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Among 1,004 HF pts studied, WRF developed in 27%. In the majority of cases, WRF occurred within 3 d of admission. History of HF or DM, admission Cr ≥1.5 mg/dL (132.6 μmol/L), and SBP &gt;160 mm Hg were independently associated with higher risk of WRF. A point score based on these characteristics and their RR ratios predicted those at risk for WRF. Hospital deaths (aRR: 7.5, 95% CI: 2.9-19.3), complications (aRR: 2.1; 95% CI: 1.5-3.0), and length of hospitalizations &gt;10 d (aRR: 3.2, 95% CI: 2.2-4.9) were greater among pts with WRF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although both lower admission eGFR and higher admission BUN were associated with higher risk of death by 60 d after discharge, multivariable proportional-hazards analysis showed that BUN was a stronger predictor of death by 60 d than was eGFR.

Active myocardial ischemia within the past 3 mo, AF with poor ventricular rate control (>110/min), sustained ventricular tachycardia or ventricular fibrillation, baseline SBP ≤ 80 mm Hg or Scr level > 3.0 mg/dL (265 μmol/L) were included in the primary endpoint to avoid bias toward a therapy with an increased death rate.

Total no. of d hospitalized for cardiovascular causes within 60 d of randomization. D lost to follow-up and d deceased were prospectively included in the primary endpoint to avoid bias toward a therapy with an increased death rate.

Although both lower admission eGFR and higher admission BUN were associated with higher risk of death by 60 d after discharge, multivariable proportional-hazards analysis showed that BUN was a stronger predictor of death by 60 d than was eGFR (HR = 11.6 and 0.6 for BUN and eGFR, respectively). Independently of admission values, an increase of ≥10 mg/dL in BUN during hospitalization was associated with worse 60-d survival rate: BUN (per 5-mg/dL increase) had a HR: 1.08; 95% CI: 1.01-1.16). Although milrinone treatment led to a minor improvement in renal function by discharge, the 60-d death and readmission rates were similar between the milrinone and placebo groups.

**Data Supplement 39. Nesiritide (Section 8.7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Background/Controlled trial</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Pt Population</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Complications /AEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nesiritide Study Group (NSGT), Colucci WS, 2000 10911006 (344)</td>
<td>Determine efficacy/clinical use of nesiritide for short term treatment of ADHF.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Chronic medication regimen N/A; any IV medication (dobutamine, milrinone, dopamine, or vasodilator) was</td>
<td>Efficacy trial: 127 Comparative trial: 305. NESIRITIDE Efficacy trial: 43 (0.015 g/kg/min), 42 (0.03 mg/kg/min) Comparative trial: 103 (0.015mg/kg/min)</td>
<td>Symptomatic HF requiring ≥1 IV medication in addition to diuretics.</td>
<td>Efficacy trial: 96% NYHA III-IV mean PCWP 28 mmHg mean CI 1.9 L/min/m², mean SBP 116 mmHg. Comparably symptomatic ADHF requiring ≥1 intravenous medication in addition to diuretics.</td>
<td>Efficacy: change from baseline PCWP @ 6 h after treatment Comparativ e: Global clinical status (independent</td>
<td>1st Year Mortality</td>
<td>Efficacy trial: PCWP - 6.0±7.2mm Hg (p = 0.015 g/kg/min) vs. -9.6±6.2mm Hg (p = 0.03 mg/kg/min). Other hemodynamic ameasure. Background medical therapy not reported.</td>
<td>Asymptomatic/ mildly symptomatic hypotension. NSVT (Comparative trial).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discontinue diuretics were held 4 h before, during, and 6 h after study drug infusion in Efficacy trial. 100 (0.03 mg/kg/min). Efficacy trial: 42 placebo, Comparative Trial: 102 standard rx (investigator choice of up to 2 IV agents—milrinone, dobutamine, nitroglycerin, or nitroprusside, along with diuretics and other oral HF medications). 2, SBP >90 mmHg. Efficacy trial: p<0.001 (pairwise with placebo). NYHA III-IV. t assessment by pt and investigator, 5-point scale: markedly better, better, no change, worse, or markedly worse). Clinical symptoms (dyspnea and fatigue, jointly pt and investigator assessment, 3 point scale: improved, no change, or worse). x 3-5d, 9-14% x 5d. PCWP is a surrogate outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vasodilation in the Management of Acute CHF (VMAC), 2002. 11911755 (345)</th>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>Diuretics 86%, ACEI 60%, ARB 11%, beta blockers 33%, oral nitrates 35%, CCB 14%, digoxin 60%, warfarin 33%, ASA 45%, statins 25%.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To compare the efficacy and safety of intravenous nesiritide, intravenous nitroglycerin, and placebo.</td>
<td>Diuretics 86%, ACEI 60%, ARB 11%, beta blockers 33%, oral nitrates 35%, CCB 14%, digoxin 60%, warfarin 33%, ASA 45%, statins 25%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>204(nesiritide) 143 (nitroglycerin) 142 (placebo)</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspnea at rest due to decompensated CHF Severe enough dyspnea to require hospitalization &amp; IV therapy. A cardiac etiology for dyspnea established by estimated or measured elevation of cardiac filling pressures (PCWP ≥20 mm Hg in catheterized pts) and ≥ 2 of the following: (a) JVD, (b) PND or 2-pillow orthopnea within 72 h before study entry, (c) abdominal discomfort due to mesenteric congestion, or (d) a CXR consistent with decompensated CHF.</td>
<td>SBP &lt;90 mm Hg, cardiogenic shock or volume depletion, any condition that would contraindicate an IV vasodilator, acutely unstable clinical status that would not permit a 3 h placebo period, use of IV nitroglycerin that could not be withheld, mechanical ventilation, and anticipated survival of &lt;30-35 d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCWP at self-assessment of dyspnea @ 3 h of study drug infusion (3 point scale: improved, no change, worse).</td>
<td>PCWP at presentation (dyspnea at rest).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA IV at presentation.</td>
<td>NYHA IV at presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesiritide: −5.8 (6.5) mmHg* Nitroglycerin: −3.8 (5.3) mmHg Placebo: −2.1 (4.2) mmHg ABSOLUTE BENEFIT IN PCWP Nesiritide vs. Placebo: −3.8 mmHg. *p&lt;0.05 (compared with placebo, compared with nitroglycerin).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment: October 1999 and July 2000 (10 mo); study drug infusion, median time 24-25 h.</td>
<td>Enrolment: October 1999 and July 2000 (10 mo); study drug infusion, median time 24-25 h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective measurements of global clinical status and clinical symptoms. Change in PCWP is a surrogate outcome.</td>
<td>Subjective measurements of global clinical status and clinical symptoms. Change in PCWP is a surrogate outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjective measures include global clinical status and clinical symptoms. Change in PCWP is a surrogate outcome.

Generalized headache (8% nesiritide group vs. 20% nitroglycerin group) Asymptomatic (8%) and symptomatic (4%) hypotension in nesiritide group.
To evaluate the safety and efficacy of a standard care treatment regimen with the addition of either nesiritide or placebo in ED/OU pts with decompensated HF.

**RCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diuretics</th>
<th>ACEI</th>
<th>ARB</th>
<th>beta blockers</th>
<th>aldosterone antagonist</th>
<th>CCB</th>
<th>Digoxin</th>
<th>Statins</th>
<th>ASA</th>
<th>Total enrollment period (3/01-1/02); mean study drug infusion time ~20 h (same for both groups); 30d follow-up period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>No pre-defined primary endpoints. Efficacy measures included admission to the hospital after the index visit, readmission within 30 d for any reason, length of stay in the hospital, assessment of dyspnea, and resource utilization. Safety measures included: vital signs, AEs (defined as any pre-existing medical event that worsened or any new medical event that occurred during administration of study drug), NYHA I-II at baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. PT not a candidate for observation (e.g., presented with any condition that obviously mandated hospital admission, such as acute MI, or requirement for invasive monitoring or mechanical ventilation, including BPAP); 2. SBP &lt;90 mmHg; 3. Admitted to the ED primarily for a diagnostic evaluation (e.g., rule out ACS); 4. Receiving chronic dialysis; 5. Had cardiac markers indicative of myocardial necrosis; 6. Medical condition so severe that 30d survival was unlikely; 7. Medical condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No pre-defined primary endpoints.**

**Efficacy measures included:**

- Admission to the hospital after the index visit
- Readmission within 30 d for any reason
- Length of stay in the hospital
- Assessment of dyspnea
- Resource utilization

**Safety measures included:**

- Vital signs
- AEs (defined as any pre-existing medical event that worsened or any new medical event that occurred during administration of study drug)
- NYHA I-II at baseline.

**Dyspnea at rest or with <20 feet ambulation.**

**No** pre-defined primary endpoints.

**Total hospital LOS through study Day 30 excluding index visit (days) Mean ± SD:**

- Placebo + Standard care: 7.1 ± 4.25
- Nesiritide + Standard care: 3.1 ± 2.20

**Subjects readmitted after index hospitalization, excluding those who died or were lost to follow-up:**

- Placebo + Standard care: 23%
- Nesiritide + Standard care: 9%

**p-values:**

- 1. p=0.032
- 2. p=0.049

**N/A**

**Asymptomatic hypotension (10% with nesiritide vs 3% with placebo, p=0.03).**
discomfort, decreased appetite, or nausea attributed by the investigator to be due to hepatosplenic congestion; d) >5lb weight gain in the previous month; e) CXR with findings indicative of HF; or f) pulmonary rales.

(such as cardiogenic shock or volume depletion) that contraindicate d use of IV vasodilators. 8. If within 2 h before the start of study drug administration pt received IV vasodilators or oral ACEI; or they were anticipated to require either IV vasodilators during the first 3 h after the start of study drug or oral ACEI during the first 30 min after the start of study drug.

whether or not related to study drug), and SAEs (defined as AEs that were life-threatening, resulted in hospitalization, or death).

| Risk of Worsening Renal Function With Nesiritide in Pts With Acutely Decompensated HF, Sackner-Bernstein JD, 2005. 15781736 (347) | To investigated the renal effects of nesiritide as treatment for ADHF. | Meta-analysis | Variable (see original RCTs included in meta-analysis). | 1269 787 472 | N/A (see original RCTs) | Five RCTs (1288 pts were enrolled and randomized, 1269 underwent assessment of renal function) reported the effects of nesiritide on renal function as measured | N/A | See original RCTs | Studies were reviewed for the incidence of worsening renal function (increase in SCr >0.5 mg/dL recorded at any time during the input portion | N/A | N/A | N/A | WRF: 21% (nesiritide) vs. 15% (control). WRF requiring medical intervention: 11% (nesiritide) vs. 4% (control). WRF requiring Meta-analysis inability to adjust statistically for differences in other factors beyond treatment group assignment that could have | N/A |
by the frequency of increased (SCr) >0.5 mg/dL forming the basis of meta-

analyses.

of the trial).

hemodialysis: 2% vs 2%.
1) \(p=0.001\)
2) \(p=0.03\)
3) \(p=0.71\)

1) RR

MH: 1.54; 95% CI: 1.19 to 1.98;
2) RR

MH: 2.29; 95% CI: 1.07-4.89;
3) 95% CI: 0.50- 2.76;

influenced the developmen-
t of renal dysfunction. WRF is a surrogate marker for clinical outcome.

| Short-term Risk of Death After Treatment With Nesiritide for Decompensated HF | Variable | Meta-analysis Variable (see original RCTs included in meta-analysis) | Randomized double-blind study of pts with acutely decompensated HF, therapy administered as single infusion (>6 h), inotrope not mandated as control, and reported 30 d mortality (NSGET, VMAC, PROACTION). | Variable: 60-98% NYHA III-IV, overall 79% NYHA III-IV. | See original RCTs | 30 d survival was assessed by meta-analysis using a fixed-effects model and time-dependent risk by Kaplan-Meier analysis with Cox proportional hazards regression modeling. | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To investigate the safety of nesiritide relative to noninotrope-based control therapies, primarily consisting of diuretics or vasodilators. | 862 | 485 | 377 | N/A (see original RCTs) | N/A | N/A | 1) 30 d mortality: 7.2% (nesiritide) vs. 4.0% (control); \(p=0.059\).

1) RR: 1.74; 95% CI: 0.97-3.12.

1) The NSGET, VMAC, and PROACTION studies were not designed to definitively determine whether nesiritide is associated with risk of death, although each prospectively monitored for deaths following therapy. 2) None of the 3 studies collected complete information on the use |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Reference)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNP-CARDS, Witteles RM, 2007. 17980248 (349)</td>
<td>RCT Beta blocker 65%, ACEI/ARB 49%, aldosterone antagonist 13%, digoxin 26%, amiodarone 21% (nesiritide vs. 6% placebo), CCB 24%, hydralazine 5% (nesiritide vs. 25% placebo).</td>
<td>75 39 36</td>
<td>CAD: 77% (nesiritide) vs. 56% (control)</td>
<td>Newly admitted with primary dx of ADHF. Calculated GFR (using the Cockcroft-Gault formula) between 15 to 60 ml/min (changed from 15 to 50 ml/min in December 2004 to be consistent with the published definition of &quot;moderate renal impairment&quot;). Age ≥18 y. Baseline SBP &lt;90 mm Hg. Hemodynamic ally significant aortic stenosis. Need for IV vasodilator therapy. Admission to ICU. Hx of cardiac transplantation Allergy to nesiritide. Prior enrollment in the trial.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Net negative diuresis ≥1 l/day while on the infusion. Change in weight during the infusion. Need to discontinue the infusion due to hypotension. Total diuretic use while receiving the infusion. Median length of stay. Death or N/A 30 mo (3/04 - 8/06); up to 30 d follow-up. No significant differences in the incidence of a 20% creatinine rise (23% nesiritide vs. 25% placebo). No significant difference in the change in SCr (-0.05 vs. +0.05 mg/dl). No significant differences in the secondary end points of 3a) weight (-2.19 vs. -1.58 kg), 3b) IV Small # of participants still could allow for a type II error. Exclusion of important subgroups of ADHF pts, including those needing intensive care and those requiring IV vasodilator therapy; the results of this trial certainly do not exclude a potentially important effect of nesiritide (positive or 13% discontinued infusion d/t hypotension; 10% transferred to ICU; 10% 30 d mortality; 33% 30 d mortality/readmission (of note: no difference in these SAE/complications compared with placebo control).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-Up Serial Infusions of Nesiritide, FUSION I, Yancy CW, 2006. 16828598

| Study | Feasibility of nesiritide as adjunctive therapy for pts with advanced HF and a Hx of recurrent hospitalizations. | RCT | Diuretics 100%, beta blockers 75%, ACEI 56%, ARB 17%, oral nitrates 49%, aldosteron e antagonist 36%, IV milrinone 28%, IV 138 | 65% ICM | Adults (aged >18 y). NYHA III or IV HF for ≥60 d before randomizatio n. ≥2 hospital admissions or unscheduled outpt visits requiring IV vasoactive | SBP<90 mm Hg. Recipient of or listed for cardiac transplantation Placement of a BiV PM within previous 60 d or AICDd within previous 30 d. Currently 100% NYHA III-IV | N/A | Safety, as predetermined by the ability to tolerate out-pt infusions of nesiritide without evidence of an increased AE rate compared with SC. | N/A | N/A | Enrollme nt period N/A; 12 wk follow-up. | The study was not powered to assess outcomes. | AEs related to renal function (i.e., abnormal renal function, acute renal failure, increased blood urea nitrogen, increased SCR, and oliguria, as defined in Coding Symbols for a

was sooner. rehospitali zation within 30 d. Resource utilization—defined by need for dialysis, intensive care monitorin g, pulmonary artery catheteriz ation, and intubation ,

treatment was sooner. rehospitali zation within 30 d. Resource utilization—defined by need for dialysis, intensive care monitorin g, pulmonary artery catheteriz ation, and intubation,

furosemide (125 vs. 107 mg), 3c discontinuation of infusion due to hypotension (13% vs. 6%), 3d death/hospit al readmission (33% vs. 25%)

1) p=0.85
2) p=0.46
3a) p=0.26
3b) p=0.53
3c) p=0.28
3d) p=0.43

negative) on renal function in those pts. Although trial was not powered to evaluate mortality and hospital readmission, there were nonsignifica nt trends observed in favor of placebo. Due to the relatively small sample size, the lack of statistical significance does not rule out differences in these outcomes.

Follow-Up Serial Infusions of Nesiritide, FUSION I, Yancy CW, 2006. 16828598

(350)

To test the feasibility of nesiritide as adjunctive therapy for pts with advanced HF and a Hx of recurrent hospitalizations. | RCT | Diuretics 100%, beta blockers 75%, ACEI 56%, ARB 17%, oral nitrates 49%, aldosteron e antagonist 36%, IV milrinone 28%, IV 138 | 65% ICM | Adults (aged >18 y). NYHA III or IV HF for ≥60 d before randomizatio n. ≥2 hospital admissions or unscheduled outpt visits requiring IV vasoactive | SBP<90 mm Hg. Recipient of or listed for cardiac transplantation Placement of a BiV PM within previous 60 d or AICDd within previous 30 d. Currently 100% NYHA III-IV | N/A | Safety, as predetermined by the ability to tolerate out-pt infusions of nesiritide without evidence of an increased AE rate compared with SC. | N/A | N/A | Enrollme nt period N/A; 12 wk follow-up. | The study was not powered to assess outcomes. | AEs related to renal function (i.e., abnormal renal function, acute renal failure, increased blood urea nitrogen, increased SCR, and oliguria, as defined in Coding Symbols for a

was sooner. rehospitali zation within 30 d. Resource utilization—defined by need for dialysis, intensive care monitorin g, pulmonary artery catheteriz ation, and intubation ,

furosemide (125 vs. 107 mg), 3c discontinuation of infusion due to hypotension (13% vs. 6%), 3d death/hospit al readmission (33% vs. 25%)

1) p=0.85
2) p=0.46
3a) p=0.26
3b) p=0.53
3c) p=0.28
3d) p=0.43

negative) on renal function in those pts. Although trial was not powered to evaluate mortality and hospital readmission, there were nonsignifica nt trends observed in favor of placebo. Due to the relatively small sample size, the lack of statistical significance does not rule out differences in these outcomes.
dobutamin e 10%, IV dopamine 11%.

treatment for ADHF within the 12 mo preceding randomization.
4. ≥1 admission in the preceding 5 to 30 d.
5. 6MWT <400 m.
6. Currently receiving optimal HF treatment with long-term oral medications.

receiving long-term dialysis or likely to require dialysis during the study period.
Inability to complete a 6 m walk test. Evidence of acute MI within previous 30 d.

nesiritide groups were alive and out of the hospital for more days (median 84 d for the 2 groups) than those in the SC-only group (median 77 d).

All cause hospitalization: p=0.037 (nesiritide 0.005 mg/kg/min vs. standard care alone), p=0.011 (nesiritide 0.010 mg/kg/min vs. standard care alone).

Days alive and out of hospital: p=0.005 (nesiritide vs. standard care only).

An increase in SCr to >0.5 mg/dl higher than baseline occurred at some time during the study in 18 of 41 pts (44%) in the standard care-only group, 17 of 49 pts (35%) in the nesiritide 0.005 g/kg/min group, and 16 of 46 pts (35%) in the nesiritide 0.010 g/kg/min group (p=0.614).

The most frequently reported AEs among all pts with RI were worsening HF (42%), asymptomatic hypotension (16%), dyspnea (13%), and symptomatic hypotension (12%).
| Second Follow-Up Serial Infusions of Nesiritide, FUSION II, Yancy CW, 2008. 19808265 (351) | To evaluate the potential clinical utility of outpatient, intermittent nesiritide infusions in ACCF/AHA stage C/D HF pts. | RCT | Loop diuretics 75%, ACEI 43%, ARB 14%, beta blocker 65%, aldosterone antagonist 37%, nitrates 18%, ICD 39%, CRT 24%. | 911 605 306 | 64% Ischemic | 2+ HF hospitalizations or the equivalent within 12 mo, with the most recent within the prior 60 d. (A hospitalization equivalent was defined as an unscheduled outpatient treatment for ADHF with an intravenous vasoactive drug or 3 unscheduled intravenous diuretic treatments for ADHF within 60 d.) LVEF <40% within 24 wk. Investigator documentation of consistent NYHA III or IV symptoms during the previous 60 d (estimated creatinine clearance <60 mL/min calculated by the | SBP <90 mmHg. Dependence on (or inability to discontinue) intermittent or continuous IV vasoactive medications. >2 output infusions of vasoactive therapy within 30 d without a hospitalization Biventricular pacemaker within 45 d or a single- or dual-chamber pacemaker, ICD within 15 d. Cardiogenic shock or volume depletion. Chronic dialysis. | 100% NYHA III-IV | N/A | Time to all-cause death or the first hospitalization for cardiovascular or renal causes from randomization to Week 12. | No. of cardiovascular and renal hospital admission s. D alive and out of the hospital. Time to cardiovascular death, all evaluated through Wk 12. QoL as assessed by change in the KCCQ summary score from baseline to Wk 13. | N/A | Enrolle n 4/04–6/06. Follow-up ended in 12/06. | All-cause mortality or cardiovascular and renal hospitalizations through Week 12 occurred in 36.8% of the placebo combined group and 36.7% of the nesiritide combined group. No statistically significant difference in secondary end-points. Log-rank test p=0.79. HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.82-1.3. | "Because of the much lower than expected event rates, FUSION II was underpowered to evaluate the effect of nesiritide on the primary end point. The resulting power calculation based on the observed placebo event rates yielded only 37% power to detect a conservative relative risk reduction of 15% between groups. In retrospect, a sample size of 3500 pts would have been needed for 90% power to detect this treatment effect. However, it SCr >0.5 mg/dl in 32.1% (nesiritide) vs. 38.8% (placebo), p=0.046. |
| Acute Study of Clinical Effectiveness of Nesiritide in Decompensated HF, ASCEND-HF, O'Connor CM, 2011. 21732835 (352) | To evaluate the effect of nesiritide, in addition to standard care, on rates of self-reported dyspnea at 6 and 24 h, rehospitalization for HF or death from any cause at hospitalization. | RCT | ACEI/ARB 60%, beta blocker 58%, Aldosteron e antagonist 28%, nitrate 23%, hydralazine 7.4%, loop diuretic 95%, | 7007 | 60% ICM | 3496 (nesiritide) | 3511 (placebo) | | Age >17 y. Pts hospitalized for ADHF. Pts hospitalized for a reason other than ADHF, but diagnosed with ADHF within 48 h of admission. | Hospitalized >48 h before randomization. Probable discharge in <24 h. Hypotension risk. Uncontrolled hypertension. Experimental medication (including nesiritide) or | 100% NYHA III-IV at time of enrollment. | NYHA III-IV; at least 1 of following signs: respiratory rate ≥20 breaths/min or pulmonary congestion or edema with rales ≥1/3 way | Two coprimary end points: Composite of HF rehospitalization and all-cause mortality from randomization through D 30. Change in Self-reported overall well-being at 6 and 24 h after study drug initiation. Composit e of persistent or worsening | 30 d mortality: 4.0% placebo vs. 3.6% nesiritide. Enrollee nt 5/07-12/10; study drug infusion, at least 24 h and up to 7 d. | No significant effect on 30 d rehospitalization (6.0% nesiritide vs. 6.1% placebo) or 30 d mortality (3.6% nesiritide vs. 4.0%). Primarily addressed safety concerns, thus broad range of pts. Rudimentary pt assessment of dyspnea. Low clinical event rate. | 30 d all-cause mortality and worsening renal function: 31.4% vs. 29.5% (Nesiritide vs. Placebo, p=0.11). 2. Higher rate of hypotensive events amongst nesiritide group
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30 d, and renal dysfunction.

- Inotropic agent 4%, vasodilator 15%.

- Device use: Pregnant or suspected pregnancy.

- Self-reported dyspnea symptom at 6 and 24 h after drug initiation.

- HF and all-cause mortality from randomization through hospital discharge.

- 3. # of days alive and outside the hospital from randomization through Day 30. Composite of CV death and rehospitalization due to CV causes from randomization through Day 30.

- Results:

  1) Nesiritide improved dyspnea at 6 h and 24 h after treatment compared to placebo but did not reach prespecified level for significance. p=0.31

  2) No difference in rate of worsening renal function. p=0.11.

  3) No difference in rate of worsening renal function. p=0.03 (6hr), p=0.007 (24hr)

- Placebo, p=0.03 (6hr), p=0.007 (24hr)

- Results:

  1) Nesiritide improved dyspnea at 6 h and 24 h after treatment compared to placebo but did not reach prespecified level for significance. p=0.31

  2) No difference in rate of worsening renal function. p=0.11.

  3) No difference in rate of worsening renal function. p=0.03 (6hr), p=0.007 (24hr)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>P Values &amp; 95% CI:</th>
<th>OR: HR:</th>
<th>RR:</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta Blockers During and at Discharge of HF Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Abraham WT, Albert NM et al. Influence of Beta blocker Continuation or Withdrawal on Outcomes in Pts Hospitalized with HF: Findings From the OPTIMIZE-HF Program, J Am Coll Cardiol 2008 July 15;52(3):190-9. 18617087 (353)</td>
<td>To determine whether beta-blocker therapy should be continued or withdrawn during hospitalization for decompensated HF.</td>
<td>Registry (OPTIMIZE-HF)</td>
<td>5791 pts admitted with HF at 91 academic and community hospitals throughout the U.S.</td>
<td>Hospitalization for episode of worsening HF as primary cause of admission.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Among 2373 pts eligible for beta blockers at discharge: 1350 (56.9%) receiving beta blockers before admission and continued on therapy, 632 (26.6%) newly started, 79 (3.3%) in which therapy was withdrawn, and 303 (12.6%) eligible but not treated. Continuation of beta blockers with lower risk for death (HR: 0.60; p=0.04) and death/rehospitalization (HR: 0.69; p=0.01). Withdrawal of beta blocker associated with higher risk for mortality (HR: 2.3; p=0.01), but with similar risk as HF pts eligible but not treated with beta blockers.</td>
<td>95% CI: 0.37-0.99; p=0.04</td>
<td>HR: 0.60</td>
<td>Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Abraham WT, Albert NM et al. Dosing of Beta blocker Therapy Before, During, and After Hospitalization for HF (OPTIMIZE-HF), Ann J Cardiol 2008 December 1;102(11):1524-9. 19026308 (354)</td>
<td>The doses of beta blockers used in pts with HF in routine clinical practice before, during, and after hospitalization for HF.</td>
<td>Registry (OPTIMIZE-HF)</td>
<td>5791 pts admitted with HF at 91 academic and community hospitals throughout the U.S.</td>
<td>Hospitalization for episode of worsening HF as primary cause of admission.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The mean total daily dose for beta blockers before hospital admission &lt;1/2 the recommended target dose (carvedilol 21.5 +/- 17.8 mg and metoprolol succinate 69.2 +/- 51.9 mg), with infrequent up- or down-titration during the HF hospitalization. 2/3 of pts had no change in their beta blocker doses in the first 60-90 d after hospital discharge. At 60-90 d postdischarge follow-up, only 17.5% and 7.9% of pts treated with recommended target doses of carvedilol and metoprolol succinate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gattis WA, O'Connor CM, Gallup DS, Hasselblad V, Gheorghiade M. Predischarge Initiation of Carvedilol in Pts Hospitalized for Decompensated HF: Results of the Initiation Management Predischarge: Process for Assessment of Carvedilol Therapy in HF (IMPACT-HF) trial. <em>J Am Coll Cardiol</em> 2004 May 5;43(9):1534-41. 15120808 (355)</td>
<td>To evaluate if predischarge carvedilol initiation in stabilized pts hospitalized for HF increased the number of pts treated with beta-blockade at 60 d after randomization without increasing side effects or length of hospital stay.</td>
<td>RCT (IMPACT-HF)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Pts hospitalized for HF.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>At 60 d 165 pts (91.2%) randomized to predischarge carvedilol initiation treated with a beta blocker, compared with 130 pts (73.4%) randomized to initiation postdischarge (p &lt; 0.0001). Predischarge initiation was not associated with increased risk of SAEs. The median length of stay was 5 d in both groups.</td>
<td>p&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metra M, Torp-Pedersen C, Cleland JG et al. Should Beta-blocker Therapy be Reduced or Withdrawn After an Episode of Decompensated HF? Results From COMET. <em>Eur J Heart Fail</em> 2007 September;9(9):901-9. 17581778 (356)</td>
<td>To study the relationship between changes in beta blocker dose and outcome in pts surviving a HF hospitalization in COMET.</td>
<td>Retrospective subgroup analysis of RCT.</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>Pts with LVEF &lt;35, NYHA class II-IV HF hospitalized for HF were subdivided on the basis of the beta blocker dose administered at the visit following hospitalization, compared to that administered before.</td>
<td>Intolerance to beta blockers</td>
<td>752/3029 pts (25%) with HF hospitalization. 61 (8%) had beta-blocker treatment withdrawn, 162 (22%) had a dose reduction and 529 (70%) maintained on the same dose. 1 and 2 y cumulative mortality rates 28.7% and 44.6% for pts withdrawn from study medication, 37.4% and 51.4% for those with a reduced dosage, 19.1% and 32.5% for those maintained on the same dose (HR: 1.59; 95% CI: 1.28 to 1.98; p&lt;0.001). No interaction with the beneficial effects of carvedilol, compared to metoprolol.</td>
<td>95%CI: 1.28-1.98; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>HR:1.59</td>
<td>Post-hoc analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Abraham WT, Albert NM et al. Prospective Evaluation of Beta-blocker use at the Time of Hospital Discharge as a HF Performance Measure: Results From OPTIMIZE-HF. <em>J Card Fail</em> 2007;13:722-31. 17996820 (357)</td>
<td>To prospectively evaluate beta blocker use at hospital discharge as an indicator of quality of care and outcomes in pts with HF.</td>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>20118</td>
<td>Data from the OPTIMIZE-HF registry for pts hospitalized with HF from 259 hospitals were prospectively collected and analyzed. 20118 pts with systolic dysfunction were included.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>At discharge, 90.6% of pts eligible to receive beta blockers, 83.7% ACEI or ARB. Eligible pts discharged with beta blockers significantly more likely to be treated at follow-up than those not discharged with beta blockers (93.1% vs. 30.5%; P&lt;0.0001). Discharge use of beta blockers in eligible pts lowers risk of death (HR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.32-0.74; p&lt;0.001) and death/rehospitalization (OR: 0.74; 95% CI: 0.55-0.99; p=0.04).</td>
<td>95% CI: 0.32-0.74; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>HR: 0.48</td>
<td>Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>p Value</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Abraham WT, Albert NM et al.</td>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>5791</td>
<td>OPTIMIZE-HF program enrolled 5791 pts admitted with HF, web-based registry at 91 hospitals participating with prespecified 60-90 d follow-up from March 2003 to December 2004.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2373 (87.2%) eligible to receive a beta blocker at discharge. Carvedilol prescribed in 1162 (49.0%). Discharge carvedilol associated with a significant reduction in mortality (HR: 0.46; p=0.0006) and mortality and rehospitalization (OR: 0.71, p=0.0175) compared to no predischarge beta blocker.</td>
<td>p=0.0006</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willettsimeter R, van Veldhuisen DJ, Silke B et al.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mild to moderate HF and LVEF ≤35%, who were not receiving ACEI, beta blocker, or ARB therapy randomized to open-label bisoprolol (target dose 10 mg QD; n=505) or enalapril (target dose 10 mg BID; n=505) for 6 mo, followed by their combination for 6 to 24 mo.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bisoprolol-first treatment noninferior to enalapril-first treatment (HR: 1.17). Primary end point in 178 pts allocated to bisoprolol-first treatment vs 186 allocated to enalapril-first treatment (HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.77-1.16). Bisoprolol-first treatment: 65 pts died, vs 73 with enalapril-first treatment (HR: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.63 to 1.22), and 151 vs 157 pts hospitalized (HR: 0.95; 95% CI: 0.76-1.19).</td>
<td>p=ns</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thilly N, Briançon S, Juilliére Y, Dufay E, Zannad F.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>20 cardiology units in France (Experimental group (n=10) in each experimental unit, doctors were involved in drafting and implementing CPGs; those at control units were not.)</td>
<td>HF pts &lt;75 y old</td>
<td>Age &gt;75 y</td>
<td>Compliance with the CPG relating to ACEI dose on discharge higher in the experimental group (p=0.003).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ace-Inhibitors During and at Discharge of HF Hospitalization
Hamaguchi S, Kinugawa S, Tsuichi-hashi-Makaya M et al. Spironolactone use at Discharge was Associated With Improved Survival in HospitalizedPts With Systolic HF. Am Heart J 2010;160:1156-62. 21146672 (360)

Whether the discharge use of spironolactone is associated with better mortality and rehospitalization among hospitalized systolic HF pts.

Prospective cohort 946

Hospitalized HF pts with reduced LVEF <40%.

N/A

Spironolactone prescribed at discharge in 435 pts (46%). Discharge use of spironolactone associated with reduction in death (HR: 0.612; p=0.020) and cardiac death (HR: 0.524; p=0.013).

N/A


Appropriateness of spironolactone prescription at discharge.

Population based Cohort 9165


N/A

1502 pts prescribed spironolactone at discharge. 18% had hyperkalemia during hospitalization and 23% were discharged on concurrent potassium supplements. Although only 8% of pts with SCR >2.5 mg/dL, many with stage III (53.1%), stage IV (12.8%), or stage V (3.9%) chronic renal insufficiency.

N/A

Digoxin During and at Discharge of HF Hospitalization


To determine the effect of digoxin at discharge in pts hospitalized with HF.

Cohort 347

Hospitalized pts with HF.

Competing non-HF diagnoses

HF hospitalizations (HR: 1.08; 95% CI: 0.77-1.50; p=0.66), total mortality (HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.78-1.35, p=0.85), or the combined end point of HF hospitalization and total mortality (HR: 1.11, 95% CI: 0.81-1.53, p=0.52) not different in pts treated with digoxin compared with those not treated with digoxin.

p=0.66

HR: 1.08

Retrospective cohort


To determine the correlates of inappropriate digoxin use in older HF pts.

Cohort 603

Older hospitalized HF pts with documented LVEF and EKG.

N/A

Digoxin use considered inappropriate if pts had preserved LVEF (≥40%) or if they had no AF. 376 pts (62%) discharged on digoxin, and 223 (37%) without indication for use. Of 132 pts without an indication and not already on digoxin, 38 (29%) initiated on it.

N/A

Adherence to Performance Measurements or Guidelines for Evidence Based Medication Use During Hospitalization

Krantz MJ, Ambardekar AV, Kaltenbach L, Hernandez AF, Heidenreich PA, Fonarow GC. Patterns and Predictors of To assess noncontraindicated use patterns for ACEI/ARBs, beta-Registery (GTWG-HF) 9474

N/A

N/A

Of those treated before hospitalization, continuation rates: 88.5% for ACEI/ARBs, 91.6% for beta blockers, and 71.9% for aldosterone-antagonists.

N/A

N/A

N/A
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Evidence-Based Medication Continuation Among Hospitalized HF Pts (from Get With the Guidelines-HF). Am J Cardiol 2011 June 15;107(12):1818-23. 21482418 (364)</th>
<th>Of pts untreated before admission, 87.4% started on ACEI/ARBs, 90.1% beta blocker and 25.2% on an aldosterone antagonist during hospitalization or at discharge. Admission therapy most strongly associated with discharge use (OR: 7.4, 6.0, and 20.9 for ACEI/ARBs, beta blockers, and aldosterone antagonists, respectively)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Gheorghiade M, Abraham WT. Importance of In-hospital Initiation of Evidence-based Medical Therapies for HF-a Review. Am J Cardiol 2004 November 1;94(9):1155-60. 15518610 (365)</td>
<td>Review of AHF therapies.</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonarow GC, Yancy CW, Heywood JT. Adherence to HF Quality-of-Care Indicators in US Hospitals: Analysis of the ADHERE Registry. Arch Intern Med 2005 July 11;165(13):1469-77. 16009861 (366)</td>
<td>To determine the current rates of conformity with quality of care indicators or their variability across hospitals.</td>
<td>Registry (ADHERE)</td>
<td>81142 admissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Message: Adopting in-hospital initiation of HF therapies as the standard of care could improve treatment rates, decrease the risk of future hospitalizations, and prolong life.

To develop and implement a program ensuring appropriate prescription of aspirin, statins, beta blockers, ACEI, and warfarin at hospital discharge.

Prospective cohort study

57465 enrolled from 10 largest hospitals in the Utah-based Intermountain Health Care system.

A nonrandomized / before-after study comparing pts hospitalized before (1996-1998) and after (1999-2002) implementation of a DMP.

Rate of prescription of each medication increased significantly to >90% (p<0.001). RR for death and readmission at 30 d decreased after DMP implementation; HRs for death and readmission: 0.81 (95% CI: 0.73-0.89) and 0.92 (95% CI: 0.87-0.99) (p=0.001 and p=0.017, respectively). At 1 y, risk for death still low (HR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.75-0.84; p<0.001) while risk for readmission stabilized (HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.90-0.98; p=0.002).

AHA Scientific Statement for Treatment of Acute HF Syndromes


To characterize acute HF syndromes: from presentation, treatment, and disposition.

AHA scientific statement

Recent Studies with Other Oral Medications for Treatment of Acute HF


To evaluate short-term effects of tolvaptan when added to standard therapy in pts hospitalized with HF.

RCT (EVEREST)

2048 trial A, 2085 (trial B) 4133 tolvaptan (30 mg/d), or matching placebo, within 48 h of admission.

Age ≥18 y; current hospitalization for CHF with admission up to 48 h prior to randomization; chronic HF is defined as requiring treatment for a minimum of 30 d prior to hospitalization. Subject must have signs of extracellular volume expansion, defined as ≥2 of the following: a) JVD; b) pitting edema (>1+); or c) dyspnea. NYHA Class III or IV Women who will not adhere to the reproductive precautions as outlined in the ICF. Positive urine pregnancy test. Inability to provide written informed consent. Cardiac surgery within 60 d of potential study enrollment, excluding PCI. Planned revascularization procedures, EP device implantation, cardiac mechanical support implantation, cardiac transplantation, or other cardiac surgery within 30 d following study enrollment. Subjects who are on cardiac mechanical support. Hx of biventricular pacer placement.

Tolvaptan had no effect on long-term mortality or HF-related morbidity. Mortality for tolvaptan vs placebo not different (HR: 0.98; 95% CI: 0.87-1.11; p=0.68). Composite of CV death or hospitalization for HF not different (HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.95-1.14; p=0.55). Secondary end points CV mortality, CV death or hospitalization, and worsening HF not different between tolvaptan and placebo.

Tolvaptan significantly improved secondary end points of Day 1 pt-assessed dyspnea, Day 1 body weight, and Day 7 edema. In pts with hyponatremia, serum sodium levels significantly increased.
at the time of hospitalization. LVEF ≤40% within 1 y. within the last 60 d. Co-morbid condition with an expected survival less than 6 mo. Subjects with acute STEMI at the time of hospitalization. Hx of sustained ventricular tachycardia or ventricular fibrillation within 30 d, unless in the presence of an automatic ICD. Hx of a cerebrovascular accident within the last 30 d. Hemodynamically significant uncorrected primary cardiac valvular disease. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (obstructive or non-obstructive). CHF due to uncorrected thyroid disease, active myocarditis or known amyloid cardiomyopathy. Subjects with progressive or episodic neurological disease such as multiple sclerosis or Hx of multiple strokes. Hx of primary significant liver disease or acute hepatic failure, as defined by the investigator. Hx of poorly controlled DM. Morbid obesity, defined as >159 kg (or 350 lbs) or BMI >40. Supine systolic arterial blood pressure <90 mmHg. SCR >3.5 mg/dL or >309.4 mmol/L. Serum potassium >5.5 mEq/L or >5.5 mmol/L. Hgb <9 g/dL or <90 g/L. Hx of hypersensitivity and/or idiosyncratic reaction to benzazepine derivatives (such

To investigate the effects of tolvaptan initiated in pts hospitalized with HF.

RCT (EVEREST-Outcome)

4133 (tolvaptan, 30 mg once per day (n=2072) or placebo (2062) within 48 h of admission. Age ≥18 y. Current hospitalization for chronic CHF with admission up to 48 h prior to randomization. Chronic HF is defined as requiring treatment for a minimum of 30 d prior to hospitalization. The subject must have signs of extracellular volume expansion, defined as ≥2 of the following: a) JVD; b) pitting edema (>1+); or c) dyspnea. NYHA Class III or IV at the time of hospitalization. LVEF ≤40% within 1 y. Women who will not adhere to the reproductive precautions as outlined in the ICF. Positive urine pregnancy test. Inability to provide written informed consent. Cardiac surgery within 60 d of potential study enrollment, excluding PCI. Planned revascularization procedures, EP device implantation, cardiac mechanical support implantation, cardiac transplantation, or other cardiac surgery within 30 d following study enrollment. Subjects who are on cardiac mechanical support. Hx of biventricular pacer placement within the last 60 d. Comorbid condition with an expected survival less than 6 mo. Subjects with acute STEMI at the time of hospitalization. Hx of sustained ventricular tachycardia or ventricular fibrillation within 30 d, unless in the presence of an automatic ICD. Hx of a cerebrovascular accident within the last 30 d. Hemodynamically significant uncorrected primary cardiac dysfunction. Hx of drug or medication abuse within the past year, or current alcohol abuse. Inability to take oral medications. Participation in another clinical drug or device trial within the past 30 d. Previous participation in this or any other tolvaptan clinical trial.

Tolvaptan had no effect on long-term mortality or HF-related morbidity. Mortality for tolvaptan versus placebo not different (HR: 0.98; 95% CI: 0.87-1.11; p=0.68). Composite of CV death or hospitalization for HF not different (HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.95-1.14; p=0.55). Secondary end points CV mortality, CV death or hospitalization, and worsening HF not different between tolvaptan and placebo. Tolvaptan significantly improved secondary end points of Day 1 pt-assessed dyspnea, Day 1 body weight, and Day 7 edema.

In pts with hyponatremia, serum sodium levels significantly increased.
valvular disease. Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (obstructive or non-obstructive). CHF due to uncorrected thyroid disease, active myocarditis or known amyloid cardiomyopathy. Subjects with progressive or episodic neurological disease such as multiple sclerosis or Hx of multiple strokes. Hx of primary significant liver disease or acute hepatic failure, as defined by the investigator. Hx of poorly controlled DM. Morbid obesity, defined as >159 kg (or 350 lbs) or BMI >40. Supine systolic arterial blood pressure <90 mmHg. SCr >3.5 mg/dL or >309.4 mmol/L. Serum potassium >5.5 mEq/L or >5.5 mmol/L. Hgb <9 g/dL or <90 g/L. Hx of hypersensitivity and/or idiosyncratic reaction to benzazepine derivatives (such as benazapril). Hx of drug or medication abuse within the past y, or current alcohol abuse. Inability to take oral medications. Participation in another clinical drug or device trial within the past 30 d. Previous participation in this or any other tolvaptan clinical trial.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF CHF Roy, 2008 19102036 (370)</td>
<td>Rhythm control reduces mortality as compared to rate control</td>
<td>Multi-center RCT</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>LVEF ≤35%, history of CHF, and history of AF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Death from CV causes, worsened or CHF, or stroke.</td>
<td>Death from all CV causes: 27% in rhythm-control group vs. 25% in rate-control group. HR: 1.06; p=0.59; 95% CI: 0.86-1.30</td>
<td>Results cannot be generalized to pts with HF and preserved LV function (in whom AF is common). The use of rhythm-control did not reduce the rate of death from CV causes compared with rate-control. No significant differences in secondary outcomes either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRM, 2002 12466506 (371)</td>
<td>Rhythm control reduces mortality as compared to rate control</td>
<td>Multi-center RCT</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>≥65 y with history of AF and other risk factors for stroke or death</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Overall mortality</td>
<td>Composite death, disabling stroke, disabling anoxic encephalopathy, major bleeding or cardiac arrest</td>
<td>Difference in mortality not statistically significant. HR: 1.1595% CI: 0.99-1.34; p=0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-LY, Eikelboom, 2011 21576658 (372)</td>
<td>Compare 2 doses (110 mg and 150 mg) of dabigatran 2 x d vs. warfarin for stroke prevention in pts with AF</td>
<td>Multi-center RCT</td>
<td>18,113</td>
<td>Pts with AF and at least 1 additional risk factor for stroke</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Major bleeding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Both doses of dabigatran were associated with lower risks of major bleeding than warfarin. Found an interaction between treatment and age for major bleeding. Both doses of dabigatran associated with lower risk of extracranial bleeding in pts &lt;75 y, though associated with similar or higher risks in pts ≥75 y. Risk of intracranial bleeding was lower with either dose of dabigatran, regardless of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-LY, Connolly, SJ, 2009 19717844 (193)</td>
<td>Compare 2 doses (110 mg and 150 mg) of dabigatran 2 x d vs. warfarin in pts with AF at increased risk of stroke</td>
<td>Multi-center RCT</td>
<td>18,113</td>
<td>Pts with previous stroke or TIA, LVEF &lt;40%, NYHA class II or higher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Stroke or systemic embolism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Both doses of dabigatran were noninferior to warfarin with respect to the primary outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROCKET AF, Fox KAA, 2011 21873708 (373)

Compare rivaroxaban with warfarin in prevention of stroke or systemic embolism in pts with AF

Double blind RCT

14,264; 2,950 pts with moderate renal impairment (CrCl 30-49 mL/min)

Pts with non-valvular AF and moderate renal impairment

Stroke or systemic embolism

N/A

Primary outcome occurred in 2.32 per 100 pt-y in rivaroxaban vs. 2.77 per 100 pt-y in warfarin group. Fatal bleeding was 0.28% in rivaroxaban vs. 0.74% per 100 pt-y in warfarin (ITT analysis HR: 0.86; 95% CI: 0.63-1.17; p=0.0047)

Analysis was not powered to detect differences between drugs in pts with renal insufficiency

While not able to show a difference between drugs, rivaroxaban was associated with reduction in fatal bleeding in pts with renal insufficiency.

ROCKET AF, Patel MR, 2011 21830957 (196)

Compare rivaroxaban with warfarin in prevention of stroke or systemic embolism in pts with AF

Double blind RCT

14,264

Non-valvular AF

N/A

Stroke or systemic embolism

N/A

Primary outcome occurred in less often in rivaroxaban group than warfarin group (2.1 % vs. 2.4% per y) ITT analysis noninferiority: HR: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.74-1.03; p<0.0001

No between group differences in the ITT analysis.

Showed noninferiority of rivaroxaban.

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; AFFIRM, Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management; CHF, congestive heart failure; CrCl, creatinine clearance; CV, cardiovascular; HR, hazard ratio; ITT, intent-to-treat; LV, left ventricular; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; Pts, patients; RCT, randomized control trial; RE-LY, randomized evaluation of long-term anticoagulant therapy trial; ROCKET-AF, Rivaroxaban Once Daily Oral Direct Factor Xa Inhibitor Compared with Vitamin K Antagonism for Prevention of Stroke and Embolism Trial in Atrial Fibrillation; RR, relative risk; and TIA, transient ischemic attack;

Data Supplement 42. HF Disease Management (Section 11.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Works In Chronic Care Management: The Case Of HF 19124869 (374)</td>
<td>The effect of delivery methods in the management of HF care on hospital readmissions</td>
<td>Meta analysis of RCTs</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>All-cause hospital readmissions and readmission d</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pts enrolled in chronic care management programs using a multidisciplinary team in addition to in-person communication had a 2.9% reduction in readmissions/ mo and a 6.4% reduction in readmission d/mo compared to routine care (p &lt; 0.001).</td>
<td>Possible study selection bias; were not able to evaluate cost savings; retrospective analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM in a heterogeneous CHF population: a RCT</td>
<td>12695272 (375)</td>
<td>Test the effect of CHF case management with the following 4 components: 1. early discharge planning, 2. pt and family CHF education, 3. 12 wk of telephone f/u, and, 4. promotion of optimal CHF medications.</td>
<td>( \text{RCT} ) 287</td>
<td>Primary or secondary diagnosis of CHF, LVD &lt;40%, or radiologic evidence of pulmonary edema for which they underwent diuresis; had to be at risk for early readmission.</td>
<td>Discharge to a long-term care facility, planned cardiac surgery, cognitive impairment, anticipated survival of &lt;3 mo, and long-term hemodialysis.</td>
<td>90-d readmission rate</td>
<td>Adherence to treatment plan and pt satisfaction.</td>
<td>There was no difference between the 2 groups in 90-d re-admission rates (both were 37%, ( p&gt;0.99 )). The intervention group showed greater adherence to most aspects of the treatment plan (( p&lt;0.01 )) and pts in this group reported greater pt satisfaction (( p&lt;0.01 )). Subgroup of pts who live in area and received care from local cardiologists decreased CHF readmission rate (2% vs. 14%; ( p=0.03 )).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CM for pts with chronic systolic HF in primary care: the HICMan exploratory RCT. | 20478035 (376) | To compare CM vs. usual care on pt outcomes. | \( \text{RCT} \) 197 | Adults with LVEF ≤45% | Not reported | HRQoL, HF self-care, and pt-reported quality of care. | Nonsignificant between group differences for the KCCQ overall summary scores favored CM: 1.7 (95%CI: -3.0-6.4; \( p=0.477 \)). Heart failure self-care behavior scores were significant group differences favoring CM: -3.6 (95%CI: -5.7--1.6; Cohen's d 0.55; \( p=0.001 \)). Significant between group differences quality of chronic illness care (0.5; 95% CI: 0.3-0.7; \( p=0.000 \)) and behavior counseling (0.5; 95%CI : 0.3-0.8; \( p=0.000 \), with moderate effect sizes (Cohen's d 0.7 for each summary score). | Small, unblended sample of patients from a non-representative sample of physicians. | The intervention failed to improve overall QoL, though showed significant improvements in pt-reported quality of care and chronic HF self-care. |

| Impact of a specialized outpatient HF follow-up program on hospitalization frequency and functional status of pts with AFH. | 17695729 | To evaluate the impact of a specialized outpatient HF follow-up program. | \( \text{Retrospective} \) 147 | Not reported | Not reported | Frequency and duration of hospitalization for HF and functional status. | Significant improvement in NYHA class during the mean follow-up period: 55% of the pts were in class III, 37% in class II, 5% in class I and 3% in class IV (\( p<0.0001 \)). Hospitalizations for acute decompensation of HF decreased: 87 at baseline vs. 25 (\( p<0.0001 \)). | Small retrospective study | No significant differences were found in the proportion of pts on therapeutic drugs or in mean duration of hospitalization. |
To evaluate an outpatient management program for pts with chronic HF in the Piedmont region of Italy. 4 y of follow-up. 16444925 (378)

Prospective trial

Adults with chronic HF in the Piedmont region of Italy.

Hospitalization and ED admissions in the 12 mo before the 1st evaluation and every y after referral

MLWHF, NYHA functional class, pharmacological therapies at the referral time and at the end of follow-up.

EF improved from 31 +/- 10 to 36 +/- 12%. ED admissions and hospitalizations decreased (p < 0.001). NYHA classes I-II improved from 65.5 to 87.7% and NYHA classes III-IV were reduced from 34.5 to 12.3%. MLWHF score decreased from 25 to 21.9. Pts treated with ACEI + ARB increased from 91 to 96%, beta blockers from 35.2 to 69%, potassium sparing drugs increased from 54 to 64%.

Small trial, not generalizable to populations outside of Italy.

Showed a decrease in the number of hospitalizations and improvement in NYHA functional class and adherence to medical therapy. These results kept constant over time in the subsequent 4 y.

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; AHF, acute heart failure; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; CHF, congestive heart failure; CM, case management; ED, emergency department; EF, ejection fraction; HF, heart failure; HRQoL, health related quality of life; KCCQ, LVD, left ventricular dysfunction; MLHF, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure; NYHA, pts, patients; and QoL, quality of life.

**Data Supplement 43. Telemonitoring (Section 11.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telemonitoring or structured telephone support programs for pts with chronic HF: systematic review and meta-analysis. 17426062 (379)</td>
<td>To determine whether remote monitoring (structured telephone support or telemonitoring) without regular clinic or home visits improves outcomes for pts with chronic HF.</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>Published RCTs comparing remote monitoring programs with usual care in patients with chronic HF managed within the community.</td>
<td>All-cause mortality, all-cause rate of admission to hospital, and rate of admission to hospital as a result of chronic HF</td>
<td>20% reduction in all-cause mortality (95% CI: 8-31%) with telemonitoring. No change in all-cause hospital admission rate. Hospital admissions due to chronic HF saw a reduction of 21% (95% CI: 11-31%) with remote monitoring programmes</td>
<td>Relatively small number of studies and pts; few trials had follow-up beyond 6 mo.</td>
<td>Remote monitoring programs for pts with chronic HF reduced admissions to hospital and all-cause mortality by nearly 1/5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured telephone support or telemonitoring programs for pts with chronic HF</td>
<td>To examine the effect of telemonitoring and structured telephone support on HF outcomes.</td>
<td>Meta analysis</td>
<td>25 studies, 16 structured telephone support (n = 5613) and 11 of telemonitoring (n = 2710)</td>
<td>RCTs, adults ≥18 y, diagnosed with chronic HF. Trials of general cardiac disorders rather than chronic HF were excluded.</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>All-cause readmissions to hospital and chronic HF-related admission to hospital</td>
<td>All-cause mortality: Telemonitoring RR: 0.66; 95% CI: 0.54-0.81; p&lt; 0.0001 Structured telephone support RR: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.76-1.01; p=0.08 All-cause hospitalization: Telemonitoring RR:0.91; 95% CI: 0.84-0.99; p&lt;0.02 Structured telephone support RR: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.85-0.99; p=0.02 Chronic HF-related hospitalizations: Telemonitoring RR: 0.79, 95% CI: 0.67-0.94; p=0.008. Structured telephone support RR: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.68-0.87; p&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>Unable to stratify by age, sex, or NYHA class. Unable to adjust for the differing lengths of follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of a standardized nurse case-management telephone intervention on resource use in patients with chronic HF. 11911726 (381)</td>
<td>To assess the effectiveness of a standardized telephonic case-management intervention in pts with chronic HF.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>358; 130 (intervention); 228 (usual care)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF hospitalization rates</td>
<td>All-cause hospitalization rates; HF readmission rate; HF hospital d</td>
<td>HF hospitalization rate was 45.7% lower in the intervention group at 3 mo (p=0.03) and 47.8% lower at 6 mo (p=0.01). HF hospital d (p=0.03) and multiple readmissions (p&lt;0.03) were significantly lower in the intervention group at 6 mo – though not significant after adjustment for other covariates.</td>
<td>Selection bias due to randomization of physicians, rather than pts. Impossible to completely blind physicians to treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT of telephone case management in Hispanics of Mexican origin with HF. 16624687 (382)</td>
<td>Tested the effectiveness of telephone case management in decreasing hospitalizations and improving HRQL and depression</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>134; 69 (intervention); 65 (usual care)</td>
<td>Hospitalized Hispanics with chronic HF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HF re-hospitalization</td>
<td>No significant group differences were found in HF hospitalizations, HF readmission rate, d in the hospital, HF cost of care, all-cause acute care use or cost, mortality, HRQL or depression.</td>
<td>Small sample size. Possible confounders included very ill population, poorly educated, economically poor, and unacculturated into US society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemonitoring in pts with HF. 21080835 (383)</td>
<td>Test the effectiveness of telemonitoring vs. usual care.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>1653; 826 (intervention); 827 (usual care)</td>
<td>Pts were enrolled from 2006-2009 at 33 cardiology practices across Residence in a long-term nursing home; inability to participate in the protocol for any reason, including a low expected All-cause readmission or all-cause mortality (within 180 d post enrollment)</td>
<td>All-cause readmission or mortality: Telemonitoring vs. usual care HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.91-1.19. No significant differences were seen between the 2 groups with respect to Automated system with low adherence rate.</td>
<td>Telemonitoring did not improve outcomes among pts recently hospitalized for HF.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HF indicates heart failure; HR, hazard ratio; HRQL, health related quality of life; NYHA, New York Heart Association; pts, patients; RCT, randomized control trial; RR, relative risk; and US, United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name, Author, Year</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis (Results)</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
<th>Findings/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal trends in clinical characteristics, treatments, and outcomes for HF hospitalizations, 2002-2004: findings from ADHERE. 17542025 (384)</td>
<td>To assess temporal trends in clinical characteristics, treatments, quality indicators, and outcomes for HF hospitalizations.</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>159,168</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Inhospital treatment changed significantly over time with inotrope use decreasing from 14.7% to 7.9% (p&lt;0.0001). Discharge instructions increased 133%; smoking counseling, 132%; LV function measurement, 8%; and beta blocker use, 29% (all p&lt;0.0001). Clinical outcomes improved over time, including need for mechanical ventilation, RR: 0.64, p &lt; .0001; length of stay (mean), 6.3 to 5.5 d; and mortality, RR: 0.71, p&lt;0.0001).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving evidence-based care for HF outpatient cardiology practices: primary results of the Registry to Improve the Use of Evidence-Based HF Therapies in the Outpatient Setting (IMPROVE HF). 20660805 (385)</td>
<td>To evaluate the effectiveness of a practice-specific performance improvement intervention on the use of guideline-recommended therapies for pts with diagnosed HF and reduced LVEF or prior MI and reduced LVEF in outpatient cardiology practices</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>34,810</td>
<td>HF or prior MI with LVEF ≤35%</td>
<td>Those with noncardiovascula r medical condition associated with an estimated survival of &lt;1 y and those who had undergone cardiac transplantation</td>
<td>7 quality measures: use of 1) ACEI or ARB, 2) Beta blocker, 3) aldosterone antagonist, 4) anticoagulant therapy for AF or flutter, 5) CRT with a defibrillator/CRT with a pacemaker, 6) ICD (ICD or CRT with a defibrillator), and 7) HF education for eligible pts</td>
<td>Significant improvement was demonstrated in 5 of the 7 quality measures at the practice level at 24 mo after implementation of the performance improvement intervention, use of aldosterone antagonists, CRT, ICD, beta blocker, and HF education (p&lt;0.001); Use of anticoagulation in eligible patients with AF did not improve over time. Use of ACEI/ARB increased (+6.8%), but this was not statistically significant (p=0.063)</td>
<td>Data collected by chart review, which may be incomplete; selection bias as eligible pts not included in analysis may differ by contraindication from those who were; analysis not adjusted for differing lengths of follow up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor; ADHERE, Acute Decompensated Heart Failure National Registry; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; HF, heart failure; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; LV, left ventricular; MI, myocardial infarction; pt, patient; and RR, relative risk.
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