

#### The Effect of Sacubitril/Valsartan on Supraventricular and Ventricular Arrhythmias in Patients with Heart Failure

Presentation by: Shayan Shojaei

Tehran Heart Center, Cardiovascular Diseases Research Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Collaborators: Alireza Arzhangzadeh, MD; Mohammad Hossein Nikoo, MD; Majid Haghjoo, MD; Asma Mousavi, MD, MPH







This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,

commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.





## Background

• Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) is linked to a high burden of ventricular

and supraventricular arrhythmias

- Sacubitril/Valsartan (SV) therapy has been linked to lower rates of:
  - Mortality
  - Ventricular tachycardia (VT) and ventricular fibrillation (VF),
  - Usage of implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) therapy.





# Background

- Frequent ICD interventions, including anti-tachycardia pacing (ATP) and shocks, are distressing for patients and increase healthcare costs; optimizing patient care.
- Gaps in current research: Limited data on the antiarrhythmic effects of SV in ICD/CRT-D patients
- Aim: Evaluate the impact of SV therapy on:
  - Arrhythmic event reduction
  - ICD/CRT-D therapy interventions
  - Echocardiographic changes





# **Materials and Methods**

#### **Study Design:**

• Single-center, retrospective, longitudinal observational study at a heart failure outpatient clinic

#### **Inclusion Criteria:**

- HFrEF patients with left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤40%
- ICD/CRT-D implantation with device interrogation every 3 months for 12 months before and after SV therapy
- On guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) including beta-blockers, MRAs, SGLT2 inhibitors before adding SV as the final component

#### **Exclusion Criteria:**

- Simultaneous ICD/CRT-D implantation & SV initiation
- New device implantation or modification during study
- NYHA class IV with unstable condition
- Refractory ventricular arrhythmias requiring ablation





### **Materials and Methods**

**Outcomes:** 

• Primary: VT, VF, VT/VF -which was stated for cumulative VT and VF incidences-, non-sustained VT (NsVT),

supraventricular tachycardia (SVT), and related interventions such as ATP and defibrillation shocks.

• Secondary: Changes in echocardiographic parameters, including left ventricular end-diastolic diameter (LVEDD) and

LVEF.

**Statistical Analysis** 

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for pre- vs. post-SV comparisons

Univariate & Multivariate Regression Analysis to evaluate variable relationships





**Population Characteristics:** 

- 181 HFrEF patients completed ≥12-month follow-up:
  - Mean age:  $63.4 \pm 12$  years
  - 36.5% male

#### Key Outcomes (Pre- vs Post-SV Therapy):

- Ventricular Arrhythmia Reduction:
  - VF: ↓ 53% (15 vs. 7, p=0.025)
  - VT + VF (VT/VF): ↓ 29% (24 vs. 17, p=0.047)
- ICD Therapy Reduction:
  - **ATP interventions:**  $\downarrow$  **28%** (14 vs. 10, p=0.043)
  - Shocks delivered:  $\downarrow$  57% (14 vs. 6, p=0.041)
    - **ATP** + **Shocks:** ↓ **57%** (24 vs. 10, p=0.012)

- Echocardiographic Improvements:
  - LVEF: ↑ (29.95% → 31.66%, p=0.033)
    - **LVEDD:**  $\downarrow$  (61.39 mm  $\rightarrow$  59.51 mm, p=0.047)





Variable	
Age (mean ± SD)	$63.39 \pm 12$
Male (%)	36.5
NYHA (%)	
1	47
2	25.4
3	21.5
4	5.5
Smoking (%)	27.6
HTN (%)	39.8
DM (%)	30.9
Dyslipidemia (%)	38.1
CKD (%)	13.3
<b>SBP</b> (mean $\pm$ <b>SD</b> )	$116.79 \pm 21.74$
HR (mean ± SD)	$74.5 \pm 14.28$
HF (%)	
NICMP	30.4
ICMP	69.6
<b>Duration of HF</b> (mean $\pm$ SD) (years)	$8.96 \pm 6.79$
Device (%)	
ICD	60.8
CRT-D	39.2
Previous MI (%)	68
Previous stroke (%)	6.1
<b>CABG</b> (%)	26.5
Atrial fibrillation (%)	2.8
Digoxin (%)	27.1
LVEF	$29.95 \pm 9.61$
LVEDD	$61.39 \pm 9.56$

#### Table 1. Baseline characteristics before initiation of Sacubitril/Valsartan

(CABG = coronary artery bypass grafting, CKD = chronic kidney disease, CRT-D = cardiac resynchronization therapy-device, DM = diabetes mellitus, HF = heart failure, HR = heart rate, HTN = hypertension, ICD = implantable cardioverter defibrillator, ICMP = ischemic cardiomyopathy, LVEDD = left ventricular end-diastolic diameter, LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction, MI = myocardial infarction, NICMP = non-ischemic cardiomyopathy, NYHA = New York Heart Association, SBP = systolic blood pressure, SD = standardized deviation)





**Regression Analysis:** 

- Diabetes Mellitus (DM)  $\rightarrow$  Lower VT incidence (p=0.047)
- ICD presence → Higher VT incidence (p=0.034)
- NYHA Class IV  $\rightarrow$  Higher VF incidence (p=0.014)
- VT/VF:
  - ICD presence  $\rightarrow$  Increased risk (p=0.023)
  - NYHA Class IV  $\rightarrow$  Lower incidence (p=0.030)

Male gender  $\rightarrow$  Lower LVEDD & shock treatment requirement (p=0.033 & p=0.044, respectively)





Outcome	Gender	Age	NHYA4	HTN	DM	ICD	Duration of HF disease (year)	Т
								10
SVT Standardized Coefficient	-0.063	0.032	0.005	0.065	-0 112	0.009	0.035	R
beta	0.005	0.052	0.005	0.005	0.112	0.009	0.055	0.1
P-value	0.439	0.686	0.947	0.430	0.161	0.910	0.659	a
VF								(DN
Standardized Coefficient								hyp
beta	-0.040	0.083	-0.194	-0.003	-0.026	0.101	-0.030	care
P-value								Nev
	0.617	0.285	0.014	0.972	0.734	0.184	0.697	пп tack
	0.027	0.057	0.111	0.007	0.150	0.1.61	0.004	ven
Standardized Coefficient	-0.027	0.057	-0.111	-0.007	-0.153	0.161	0.084	ven
Deta D voluo	0.722	0.456	0.152	0.020	0.047	0.024	0.270	non
VT/VF	0.732	0.430	0.132	0.930	0.047	0.034	0.270	sust
Standardized Coefficient	-0.037	0.079	-0.167	-0.007	-0.135	0.170	0.056	ven
beta	01007	01077	01107	0.007	0.122	011/0	01020	
P-value	0.631	0.296	0.030	0.932	0.077	0.023	0.456	
NSVT								
Standardized Coefficient	-0.088	-0.032	-0.063	0.069	-0.084	-0.050	0.091	
beta								
P-value	0.272	0.684	0.431	0.394	0.285	0.516	0.246	
ATP								
Standardized Coefficient	0.079	0.111	-0.012	0.096	-0.079	0.134	-0.036	
beta B volue	0.217	0.152	0.870	0.222	0.212	0.082	0 6 4 7	
r-value Shock	0.517	0.132	0.879	0.235	0.515	0.082	0.04/	
Standardized Coefficient	-0.162	0.116	-0.004	0.012	-0.057	0.115	0.030	
beta	0.102	0.110	0.004	0.012	0.037	0.115	0.050	
P-value	0.044	0.139	0.958	0.879	0.472	0.137	0.702	
LVEF								
Standardized Coefficient	-0.009	-0.036	0.102	-0.048	-0.010	0.022	-0.116	
beta								
p-value	0.913	0.649	0.203	0.557	0.902	0.777	0.141	

Table 2. Regression analysis

(DM = diabetes mellitus,, HTN = hypertension, ICD = implantable cardioverter defibrillator, NYHA = New York Heart Association, HTN = hypertension, ATP = antitachycardia pacing, VT = ventricular tachycardia, VF = ventricular fibrillation, NsVT = non-sustained VT, SVT = sustained VT, LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction,)





# Conclusion

- SV therapy significantly reduces ventricular arrhythmias (VT & VF) in HFrEF patients.
- Decreases the need for ICD interventions (ATP & shocks), indicating potential antiarrhythmic benefits
- Optimizes heart failure management by reducing both arrhythmic burden & device dependency
- Strengths:
  - Comprehensive analysis of multiple outcomes
  - Moderately long follow-up period
  - Adresses the gap in recent studies by evaluating HFrEF patients previously treated with ICT or CRT-D





## Conclusion

- Limitations:
  - Observational and retrospective design:
  - Lack of a control group
  - Limited study populations
- Future research needed to:
  - Confirm findings in larger, diverse patient populations in RCT settings
  - Assess various clinical outcomes in longer follow-up periods
  - Determine ideal timing & patient selection for SV therapy in arrhythmia prevention





### Take home message

 Sacubitril/Valsartan: More than just heart failure therapy—reducing arrhythmias, improving outcomes, and enhancing patient care.





# **Summary Graph**

			٠		
-27	٠	T.		1	
		1		u	

 To investigate the add-on impact of Sacubitril/Valsartan (SV) therapy on the burden of Supraventricular and Ventricular Arrhythmias in Patients with Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF)

#### **Design and Population**

- Single cener, retrospective, longitudinal observational study, Between January 2020 to December 2023
- Adult HFrEF patients with ICD or CRT-D who were prescribed SV as an addition to their existing treatment
- 181 patients, Mean Age: 63.39±12, Male: 36.5%
- ICD: 60.8%, CRT-D: 39.2%



#### Primary outcomes 🛛 🥝

Change in the cumulative incidence of Ventricular tachycardia (VT) and Ventricular fibrillation (VF), total VT/VF events, non-sustained VT, supraventricular tachycardia, anti-tachycardi pacing and defibrillation shocks in 12 months follow-up after starting SV

	an internation of the second		
Outcome	Pre-SV therapy Episodes	Post-SV therapy Episodes	P-Value
Sustained ventricular tachycardia	6	11	0.185
Non-sustained ventricular tachycardia	29	32	0.480
Ventricular tachycardia	12	14	0.400
Ventricular fibrillation	15	7	0.025
Ventricular tachycardia + Ventricular fibrillation	24	17	0.047
Anti-tachycardia pacing	14	10	0.043
Shock	14	6	0.041
Anti-tachycardia pacing + Shock	24	10	0.012

**Findings** 

#### Conclusion

SV therapy significantly reduces VTVF events and associated clinical interventions, indicating its potential to reduce the likelihood of lethal arrhythmic events and probable sudden cardiac death.





#### Acknowledgement



