NEW ERA FOR HEART FAILURE MANAGEMENT



DR KATHERINE FAN CONSULTANT CARDIOLOGIST GRANTHAM HOSPITAL HONG KONG

HEART FAILURE : STILL UNMET NEEDS IN CURRENT ERA

- Over past 4 decades, HF patients have derived substantial benefit from major advances in our understanding of pathophysiology of HF syndrome
 - Evolving treatment paradigms
 - new medications with novel mechanisms of actions
- **BUT** Unmet needs still:
- HF hospital discharges (index of population disease burden and economic impact) remain >1 million between 2000 and 2010
- Prevalence will increase aprox 50% between 2012-2030- >8 million people >18 yrs of age with HF
 - Aging population
 - Improved survival of AMI
 - HF survival increases at rate that exceed our impact to prevent development of HF



Cardiac Failure Review 2017;3(1):7-11

CLINICAL COURSE OF HEART FAILURE AND ITS MANAGEMENT



DURATION OF DISEASE STAGES IN EARLY ERA AND PRESENT/ FUTURE ERA



- 1. Patients in stage B and C may be stable for many years
- 2. Prolongation of life with anti HF therapies
- Sudden death in previous eraoccurred early in clinical syndrome, incurred with increasing frequency as HF progressed
- 4. RHF & cardiorenal syndrome herald progression to stage D HF with referral to palliative care

Circulation 2016;133:2671-2686





*Please refer to CG180 for recommendation on the use of digoxin in patients with atrial fib ** In accordance with TA314

Therapeutic algorithm for a patient with symptomatic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction



Major advances:

- Treatment based on large RCTs with subsequent incorporation of data into guidelines
- Then incorporated into systematic quality improvement efforts with landmark success

ESC Heart Failure Treatment Guidelines 2016

19

SACUBITRIL/ VALSARTAN

Mechanism of action of LCZ696

Damage Beneficial physiological response Pathophysiological response NP system RAAS Ang II Dual NEP NEP/RAAS inhibition AT, receptor (LCZ696) Inactive fragmentS Vasodilation Vasoconstriction I blood pressure HF t blood pressure t sympathetic tone 1 sympathetic tone symptoms/ t aldosterone 1 aldosterone levels progression 1 fibrosis t fibrosis I hypertrophy t hypertrophy Natriuresis/Diuresis Neurohormonal balance

Angiotensin II Receptor Blocker (Valsartan)

Neprilysin inhibitor (Sacubitril)

PARADIGM-HF STUDY

Randomized 8442 pts with NYHA class II-IV HFrEF EF<40% Trial stopped early after recruiting 25% pts at medican FU 27 mths

PARADIGM-HF cause of death and hospitalization data¹ vs. current standard of care ACEi enalapril





PIONEER-HF STUDY ANGIOTENSIN-NEPRILYSIN INHIBITION IN ACUTE DECOMPENSATED HEART FAILURE NEJM 2019;380:539-48

Change from Baseline in NT-proBNP



Death, HF Hospitalization, or LVAD Implantation



SODIUM-GLUCOSE CO-TRANSPORTER 2 INHIBITORS (SGLT2i)

A SERENDIPITOUS STORY IN HEART FAILURE (1)

EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial

- Randomized doubleblind placebo controlled trial
- 7020 pts with type 2 DM at high CV risk/ established ASCVD



NEJM 2015;373:2117-2128

35% RRR

FURTHER STUDIES CONFIRMING BENEFITS OF HHF OR CV DEATH

CANVAS Program

NEJM 2017;377:644-657



DECLARE-TIMI 58 Study

NEJM 2019:380:347-357

Non-inferiority



Dapagliflozin

Canagliflozin

DAPAGLIFLOZIN IN PATIENTS WITH HEART FAILURE AND REDUCED EJECTION FRACTION

- Phase 3, placebocontrolled trial
- 4744 pts- NYHA class II-IV
- Dapagliflozin vs placebo in addition to recommended therapy
- With or without DM



Subgroup	Dapagliflozin (N=2373)	Placebo (N=2371) ts/total no.	Hazard Ratio (S	95% CI)
All patients	386/2373	502/2371	=	0.74 (0.65-0.85)
Age	,	,		(<i>1</i>
≤65 yr	162/1032	196/998		0.78 (0.63-0.96)
>65 yr	224/1341	306/1373		0.72 (0.60-0.85)
Sex				
Male	307/1809	406/1826		0.73 (0.63-0.85)
Female	79/564	96/545		0.79 (0.59-1.06)
Race				
White	275/1662	348/1671	_	0.78 (0.66-0.91)
Black	26/122	32/104	- -	0.62 (0.37-1.04)
Asian	78/552	118/564		0.64 (0.48-0.86)
Other	7/37	4/32		
Geographic region				
Asia	77/543	114/553	←	0.65 Ye
Europe	193/1094	218/1060		0.84
North America	54/335	73/342		0.73 N
South America	62/401	97/416		0.64
NYHA class				IVI KA
11	190/1606	289/1597		0.63 Ye
III or IV	196/767	213/774		0.90
LVEF				N
≤Median	222/1230	307/1239		0.70
>Median	164/1143	195/1132		0.82 Type
NT-proBNP				Ye
≤Median	100/1193	155/1179		0.2
>Median	286/1179	347/1191		0.79 N
Hospitalization for heart failure				Atui
Yes	195/1124	279/1127		0.67 Atria
No	191/1249	223/1244		0.84 Ye
MRA at baseline				
Yes	281/1696	361/1674		0.74 N
No	105/677	141/697	e	0.74
Type 2 diabetes at baseline				
Yes	215/1075	271/1064		0.75 (0.63-0.90)
No	171/1298	231/1307		0.73 (0.60-0.88)
Atrial fibrillation or flutter on enrollment ECG	5			
Yes	109/569	126/559		0.82 (0.63-1.06)
No	277/1804	376/1812	_	0.72 (0.61-0.84)
Main cause of heart failure				
Ischemic	223/1316	289/1358		0.77 (0.65-0.92)
Nonischemic or unknown	163/1057	213/1013		0.71 (0.58-0.87)
Body-mass index				. ,
<30	259/1537	320/1533	_	0.78 (0.66-0.92)
≥30	127/834	182/838		0.69 (0.55-0.86)
Baseline eGFR (ml/min/1.73m ²)				
<60	191/962	254/964	e	0.72 (0.59-0.86)
≥60	195/1410	248/1406		0.76 (0.63-0.92)
			0.5 0.8 1.0 1.	2
			Dapagliflozin Better Placet	o Better

0.85)			
0.85) 0.06)			
0.91) 1.04) 8.86)			
Yes	195/1124	279/1127 —	 0.67 (0.56–0.80)
No	191/1249	223/1244	 0.84 (0.69-1.01)
/IRA at baseline			
Yes	201/1606	361/1674	0.74 (0.63-0.87)
No	105/677	141/697 —	 0.71 (0.57–0.95)
ype 2 diabetes at baseline			
Yes	215/1075	271/1064	 0.75 (0.63–0.90)
No	171/1298	231/1307 -	 0.73 (0.60-0.88)
Atrial multilition or flutter on enrollment ECG			
Yes	100/560	126/550	0.82 (0.63-1.06)
No	277/1804	376/1812	 0.72 (0.61-0.84)



CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION: Stepwise Approach to Prescription of SGLT2 inhibitors by Cardiologists



Vardeny, O. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol HF. 2019;7(2):169-72.

Soluble Guanylate Cyclase (sGC) STIMULATOR



THE VICTORIA TRIAL STUDY RATIONALE AND BACKGROUND

Worsening HF is common despite GDMT

There is substantial risk of death or hospitalization after a worsening HF event

Vericiguat, a novel sGC stimulator, is a potential new therapy

The Victoria trial assessed the efficacy and safety of vericiguat in patients with HFrEF after a recent worsening event

(randomized, placebi-controlled, parallel group, multi-center double-blind Phase 3 study)



"Another win in HFrEF treatment" New physiologic target New target population- worsening HF







VERICIGUAT SUCCESS IN HFREF MAY NOT APPLY TO SICKEST AFTERALL: VICTORIA POST-HOC ANALYSIS

- Modest but significant clinical advantage in the 86% who had baseline NTproBNP levels 8000 pg/ml or lower
- Further amplified in pts with NTproBNP <4000 pg/ml
- Risk reduction in lowest NTproBNP reached 23%
- [DAPA HF 26% reduction; PARADIGM-HF 20% reduction]
- "demonstrated the potential upper limit of medication benefit in HFrEF population- subgroup identified the most advanced stage of disease and probably need for non-pharmacological treatment or palliative care"

HR (95% CI) for outcomes by baseline NT-proBNP in Victoria

Endpoints	<4000 pg/ml (n=3100)	>4000 to 8000 pg/ml (n=1033)	>8000 pg/ml (n=672)
Primary endpoint	0.77 (0.68- 0.88)	0.85 (0.76- 0.95)	1.16 (0.94- 1.41)
CV death	0.75 (0.6-0.94)	0.84 (0.71- 0.99)	1.32 (1.01- 1.71)
HF hospitalization	0.78 (0.67=0.9)	0.84 (0.75- 0.95)	1.16 (0.94- 1.41)

Presented HFA Discoveries Late Breaking Science Session June 19th 2020

Omecamtiv Mecarbil (OM) MOA Novel Selective Cardiac Myosin Activator

Mechanochemical Cycle of Myosin



Omecamtiv mecarbil increases the entry rate of myosin into the tightly bound, force-producing state with actin "More hands pulling on the rope"

Increases duration of systole

Increases stroke volume

No increase in myocyte calcium

No change in dP/dt_{max}

No increase in MVO₂

Malik FI, et al. Science. 2011; 331:1439-1443.

MANAGEMENT OF HFREF IS BREAKING NEW GROUNDS 7 PARALLEL INDEPENDENT PATHWAYS IN HFREF



IRON DEFICIENCY IN HEART FAILURE

- Iron deficiency (ID) is common in patients with and without anemia with HFrEF
 - Estimated prevalence of over 50% in ambulatory patients
 - Risk factors: female sex, advanced HF, higher levels of NTproBNP and C reactive protein
- Associated with worse symptoms, quality of life and clinical outcomes of patients with HF across the whole spectrum of LVEF
- Definition of ID in heart failure differs from other conditions of chronic inflammation:
 - Ferritin <100 ug/L or ferritin of 100-299 ug/L with a transferrin saturation <20%
- Tremendous research effort into iron deficiency in HF patients:
 - Multiple placebo-controlled randomized clinical trials with IV iron in patients with NYHA class II-III HF with EF<45% who met criteria for iron deficiency, *regardless of whether anemia was present*
 - Improved patient-reported outcomes and functional capacity

POTENTIAL MECHANISM INVOLVED IN PATHOGENESIS & DIAGNOSTIC ALGORITHM OF ANEMIA IN HEART FAILURE



CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION: Diagnostic Algorithm for Treatment of Iron Deficiency in Patients With HF According to ESC Guidelines and Expert Consensus Recommendations



von Haehling, S. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol HF. 2019;7(1):36-46.

Circulation 2018; 138(1):80-98

TREATMENT OF IRON DEFICIENCY IN HF GUIDELINES INTRAVENOUS IRON IS PREFERRED ROUTE

ESC 2016 Guidelines for diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure





	9.2. Anemia	: Recommend	dations			
	Recommend	lations for A	nemia			
	COR	LOE	RECOMMENDATIONS	COMMENT/RATIONALE		
	ШЬ	B-R	In patients with NYHA class II and III HF and iron deficiency (ferritin <100 ng/mL or 100 to 300 ng/mL	d iron NEW: New evidence consistent with therapeutic 00 ng/mL benefit.		
	See Or Suppl	Online Data plement D. replacement might be reasonable to improve				
			functional status and QoL (173,174).			
III. N/	Ponofit	D_D	In patients with HF and anemia, erythropoietin-	NEW: Current recommendation reflects new evidence		
iii: NG	Denent	D-K	stimulating agents should not be used to improve	demonstrating absence of therapeutic benefit.		
	See Online Da Supplement	ata D.	morbiaity and mortauty (176).			

- 1. IV iron sucrose (max dose 200mg per setting or
- 2. Ferric carboxymaltose (max dose 1000 mg /week)

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

ESTABLISHED IN 1812

FEBRUARY 1, 2018

VOL. 378 NO. 5

Catheter Ablation for Atrial Fibrillation with Heart Failure

Nassir F. Marrouche, M.D., Johannes Brachmann, M.D., Dietrich Andresen, M.D., Jürgen Siebels, M.D., Lucas Boersma, M.D., Luc Jordaens, M.D., Béla Merkely, M.D., Evgeny Pokushalov, M.D., Prashanthan Sanders, M.D., Jochen Proff, B.S., Heribert Schunkert, M.D., Hildegard Christ, M.D., Jürgen Vogt, M.D., and Dietmar Bänsch, M.D., for the CASTLE-AF Investigators*



CATHETER ABLATION OF AF IN PATIENTS WITH HEART FAILURE TURAGAM ET AL. ANNALS OF INTERNAL MEDICINE 2019; 170(1): 41-50

Decrease in All cause mortality and

Study, Year (Reference) Ablation, n No Ablation, n Follow-RR (95% CI) Events Total Events Total up, mo CAMTAF, 2014 (11) 0.32 (0.01-7.28) 24 26 1 6 0 ARC-HF, 2013 (9) 1 24 0 26 12 3.08 (0.14-69.23) AATAC, 2016 (8) 102 18 101 24 0.44 (0.20-0.97) 8 CASTLE-AF, 2018 (14) 24 179 46 184 37.8 0.54 (0.34-0.84) CAMERA-MRI, 2017 (10) 0 33 0 33 6 Random-effects model 364 368 0.52 (0.33-0.81) Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$; $\tau^2 = 0$; P = 0.670.1 0.2 0.5 1.0 2.0 5.0 10.0 Favors ablation Favors no ablation Study, Year (Reference) Ablation, n No Ablation, n Follow-RR (95% CI) Events Total Events Total up, mo MacDonald et al, 2011 (12) 20 18 1.80 (0.18-18.21 2 0.20 (0.01-4.01) CAMERA-MRI, 2017 (10) 0 33 33 6 ARC-HF, 2014 (9) 24 3 26 12 1.08 (0.24-4.86) 3 CASTLE-AF, 2018 (14) 37 179 66 184 37.8 0.58 (0.41-0.81) Random-effects model 256 261 0.60 (0.39-0.93) Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$; $\tau^2 = 0$; P = 0.570.1 0.2 0.5 1.0 2.0 5.0 10.0 Favors ablation Favors no ablation

HF hospitalization

Improvement in LVEF and

6 minute walk test

Study, Year (Reference)	A	blation		No	Ablation	<u> </u>	Comparison	RBA			Mean Difference
2	Total, n	Mean, n	s SD	Total, n	Mean, I	1 SD					(95% CI)
MacDonald, 2011 (12)	20	8.2	12.0	18	1.4	5.9	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk	-	÷	6.80 (0.88 to 12.72)
ARC-HF, 2013 (9)	24	10.9	11.5	26	5.4	8.5	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk		 	5.50 (-0.14 to 11.14
CAMTAF, 2014 (11)	26	8.1	12.5	24	-3.6	9.7	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk	1.1.1.1		11.70 (5.52 to 17.88)
AATAC, 2016 (8)	102	8.1	4.0	101	6.2	5.0	Ablation vs. rate/rhythm control	Low risk	*		1.90 (0.65 to 3.15)
CASTLE-AF, 2018 (14)	51	8.7	1.9	37	-1.0	3.1	Ablation vs. rate/rhythm control	Low risk		*	9.70 (8.57 to 10.83)
CAMERA-MRI, 2017 (10	33	17.7	10.8	33	8.9	v28.2	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk	-		- 8.80 (-1.51 to 19.11)
Random-effects model	256			239					-	1	6.95 (3.00 to 10.90)
Heterogeneity: P = 94%	r2 = 12	1207- P	< 0.0					-	1 1	T T	
								-5	0 5	10 15	20
							Favo	ors no ablation	Favor	s ablation	
Study, Year (Reference)	A	blation		No	Ablation		Comparison	RBA			Mean Difference
	Total, n	Mean, n	50	Total, n	Mean, I	1 SD	1		1.00		(95% CI)
MacDonald, 2011 (12)	17	20.1	76.5	15	21.4	77.4	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk -		1	-1.30 (-54.75 to 52.15)
ARC-HF, 2013 (9)	26	21.0	103.7	26	-10.0	65.2	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk	-		31.00 (-16.08 to 78.08)
AATAC, 2016 (8)	102	22.0	41.0	101	10.0	37.0	Ablation vs. rate/rhythm control	Low risk		-	12.00 (1.26 to 22.74)
CASTLE-AF, 2018 (14)	50	-6.9	26.7	35	-38.5	31.3	Ablation vs. rate/rhythm control	Low risk			31.60 (18.86 to 44.34)
CAMERA-MRI, 2017 (10	33	55.0	114.5	33	29.0	125.5	Ablation vs. rate control	Low risk			- 26.00 (-31.96 to 83.96
Random-effects model	228			210						-	20.93 (5.91 to 35.95)
Heterogeneity: P = 35%	$\tau^2 = 90$.6227; P	= 0.1	9				- E	a	10	
and a set								-50	0 0	50	100



IN 2018, THE WORLD OF FUNCTIONAL MITRAL REGURGITATION CHANGED WITH THE PRESENTATION OF 2 TRIALS- *MITRA-FR* VS *COAPT*

PERCUTANEOUS MITRAL REPAIR

 Transcatheter mitral valve repair may be considered for severely symptomatic patients (NYHA class III to IV) with chronic severe primary MR (stage D) who have favorable anatomy for the repair procedure and a reasonable life expectancy but who have a prohibitive surgical risk because of severe comorbidities and remain severely symptomatic despite optimal GDMT for HF (IIB)

MitraClip





- 614 patients in US and Canada
- MR 3 or 4+ (EROA > 30, RV vol >45 ml)
- LVEF 20%-50% and LVESD <70mm
- Symptomatic after optimal HF treatment
- HF hospitalization within 12 mths and/or BNP >300pg/ml or NTproBNP >1500pg/ml

Randomized 1:1 MitraClip +GDMT vs GDMT alone Stricter exclusion criteria



* Additionally, all 10 secondary endpoints met statistical significance In favor of MitraClip with GDMT over GDMT alone. N Engl J Med 2018;379:2307-2318



- 304 patients in France
- Inclusion:
 - EF 15-40%
 - No LVESD criteria
 - RV vol >30ml or EROA >20mm2 (actual mean EROA was 31)
 - Minimum of 1 hospitalization for HF within 12 mths preceding rndomization
- Primary outcome: all cause mortality + HF hospitalization at 12 months

-up)	Outcome	Intervention Group (N = 152)	Control Group (N=152)	Hazard Ratio or Odds Ratio (95% CI)* P Value
	Composite primary outcome: death from any cause or unplanned hospitalization for heart failure at 12 months — no. (%)	83 (54.6)	78 (51.3)	1.16 (0.73–1.84) 0.53
	Secondary outcomes‡			
nant	Death from any cause	37 (24.3)	34 (22.4)	1.11 (0.69–1.77)
	Cardiovascular death	33 (21.7)	31 (20.4)	1.09 (0.67-1.78)
	Death from any cause 37 (24.3) 34 (22.4) 1.11 (0.69–1.77) Cardiovascular death 33 (21.7) 31 (20.4) 1.09 (0.67–1.78) Unplanned hospitalization for heart failure 74 (48.7) 72 (47.4) 1.13 (0.81–1.56)	1.13 (0.81-1.56)		
t.	Major adverse cardiovascular events§	86 (56.6)	OnControl Group $(N=152)$ Hazard Ratio or Odds Ratio $(95\% CI)*$)78 (51.3)1.16 (0.73–1.84)P Value)78 (51.3)1.16 (0.73–1.84)0.53)34 (22.4)1.11 (0.69–1.77))31 (20.4)1.09 (0.67–1.78))72 (47.4)1.13 (0.81–1.56))78 (51.3)1.22 (0.89–1.66)	

* Hazard ratios were calculated with the use of stratified Cox proportional-hazards models. The primary outcome was
calculated with the use of a logistic-regression model and corresponds to an odds ratio. The 95% confidence intervals
were not corrected for multiple testing; therefore, these intervals should not be used to infer definitive treatment effects.
 † No P values other than that for the primary outcome are reported because no adjustment was made for multiple testing.
 ‡ The rates of the components of the composite primary outcome do not total the rates of the composite because patients could have more than one event.

§ This category is a composite of death, stroke, myocardial infarction, or unplanned hospitalization for heart failure.



WHY ARE THE COAPT RESULTS SO DIFFERENT FROM MITRA-FR? **POSSIBLE REASONS**

	MITRA-FR (n=304)	COAPT (n=614)
Severe MR entry criteria	Severe FMR by EU guidelines: EROA >20mm ² or RV >30ml/beat	Severe FMR by US guidelines: EROA >30mm ² or RV >45ml/beat
EROA	$31\pm10 mm^2$	$41 \pm 15 mm^2$
LVEDV	$135 \pm 35 \ ml/m^2$	$101 \pm 34 \ ml/m^2$
GDMT at baseline and FU	Receiving HF meds at baseline- Allowed variable adjustment in each group during FU per "real world" practice	CEC confirmed pts were failing maximally tolerated GDMT at baseline- few major changes during follow-up
Acute results : No clip/ >3+ MR	9%/ 9%	5%/ 5%
Procedural complications	14.6%	8.5%
12 month MitraClip >3+ MR	17%	5%

FUNCTIONAL MR BEFORE AND AFTER COAPT

Before	After
MR is a risk marker	MR is a risk factor
MR= Color jet area	MR= EROA
Hugh LV volume is bad	Hugh LV volume is really bad
ACC/AHA IIB indication for surgery	ACC/AHA IIA indication for MitraClip?

Interventional Cardiologist Cardiac surgeon Imaging Cardiologist

Advanced HF cardiologist

The 'New' Heart Team?

Interventional cardiologist Heart surgeon Imaging Cardiologist Advanced Heart Failure Cardiologist

Patient selection, medical treatment and procedural timing is key for success

Proportionate and Disproportionate Functional Mitral Regurgitation

A New Conceptual Framework That Reconciles the Results of the MITRA-FR and COAPT Trials





- Novel paradigm/ theory provides a strong pathophysiological basis for selecting patients for specialized interventions and explains the apparently discordant findings from randomized trials
- Concept:
- Characterization of MR as proportionate or disproportionate to LVEDV appears to be critical to the selection of an optimal treatment for patients with CHF and systolic dysfunction
- A patient with EROA/LVEDV ratio well below the line of proportionality has non severe MR and would not be expected to benefit from any intervention directed at mitral valve

Grayburn P et al. JACC Img 2018

LEFT VENTRICULAR ASSIST DEVICE (LVAD)







Girerd, N. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol HF. 2018;6(4):273-85.



3/19DS14555

DOMAIN MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO HEART FAILURE



HF INTERVENTION DURING EARLY PHYSIOLOGIC CHANGE: PROACTIVE VS REACTIVE



Hospital





HF MANAGEMENT IN NEW ERA INTERNET OF THINGS (IOT)

- Models for the outpatient management of acutely decompensated heart failure have shown that ambulatory infusion of decompensated HF can reduce all-cause hospitalization at 30 days ¹
- Successful outpatient management of HF (*Proactive*):
 - Investment in home-based healthcare services
 - 24 hours telephone access for advice
 - Protocol for the management of electrolytes and changes in renal function



- One tools with immense potential to continue care TELEMEDICINE
- Improve communication with patients
- Triage need for inpatient care or acute visits
- Monitor patients while they are in their communities

CARDIAC CARE CONNECTED TECHNOLOGY PLATFORM

Nuts and Bolts of Connected Cardiac Care



Telemonitoring for Heart Failure: Decision Support

• For patients for health maintenance (majority)

- Daily to maintain health envelope
- Diet
- Medications (principally diuretics)
- For Health Professionals for Alerts
 - "Traffic Lights" of risk status
 - Identify, prevent and manage crisis
 - Schedule tests
 - Alter care plan targets



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: THE FUTURE OF CARDIOLOGY



- "the theory and development of computer systems able to perform tasks normally requiring human intelligence"
- For example: automated predictions of
 cardiovascular disease risk score and HF diagnosis⁶
- Automated method to interpret ECHO



Circulation 2018;138:1623-1635







ASSIST Ventricular assist devices Percutaneously ventricular assist devices Extra-aortic balloon counter pulsation

REPLACE Total artificial heart

REPURPOSE Myocytes: Calcium sensitizers, optimizing mitochondrial function Intertitium: New MRAs Modulators of collagen synthesis/degradation

MODULATE Autonomic nervous system modulation systems

REMODEL Parachute device Infarct exclusion Injections of biopolymer gel

> REPROGRAM Modulation of genetic or post-translational messaging

REPAIR Cell Rx Patches and delivery systems

Circulation 2016;133:2671-2686







CONCLUSIONS

- Residual risk remains in heart failure due to inadequate GDMT implementation
- Targeting alternate parallel pathways may be associated with improved outcomes and modulation (eg SGLT2 inhibition, sGCcGMP, cardiac myosin activation)
- Non pharmacological treatments play increasing important roles
- Physician and patient education, GDMT implementation and targeting all pathways and remote monitoring are important heart failure care.

5 IMAGINATIVE PREDICTIONS FOR TREATMENT OF HEART FAILURE IN 2028 BY DR MILTON PACKER EUROPEAN HEART JOURNAL 2018;39 (1): 5-7

- 1. Heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction will be broken into distinct phenotypes. The most common phenotype that associated with obesity- will be treated as a neurohormonal disorder
- 2. The next wave of new pharmacological agents for heart failure with a reduced ejection fraction will focus on drugs that induce the cellular housekeeping process of autophagy
- 3. Unless major changes take place in the pricing or uptake of new pharmaceuticals, drug development for heat failure will cease. The risks and expense of new drug development for these patients will exceed the likelihood of a meaningful return on investment.
- 4.Most patients with chronic heart failure will be managed by specialist practitioners who will not be cardiologists and may not be physicians
- 5. Cell- and gene-based treatments will fail, but because of advances in mechanical devices that provide effective circulatory support, no one with adequate financial resources will die of heart failure involuntarily



Milton Packer MD Corresponding Author Baylor Heart and Vascular Institute Baylor University Medical Center 621 N. Hall Street, Dallas, TX 75226 Email: milton.packer@baylorhealth.edu

THANK YOU!

