



Halliday, B. P., Cleland, J. G.F. and Prasad, S. K. (2019) When can heart failure treatment be stopped safely? – Authors' reply. *Lancet*, 394(10194), pp. 217-218.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/190809/>

Deposited on: 23 July 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow_
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

When can heart failure treatment be stopped safely? – Authors' reply

Brian P. Halliday^{a,b,c} John G.F. Cleland^{a,c,d} Sanjay K. Prasad^{a,b,c}

^a Cardiovascular Research Centre, Royal Brompton Hospital, London SW3 6NP, UK

^b Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Unit, Royal Brompton Hospital, London SW3 6NP, UK

^c National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College, London, UK

^d Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

We thank Jennifer Thibodeau and Mark Drazner for their comments. As experienced clinicians, it is probable they have cared for patients with dilated cardiomyopathy who have made a full symptomatic recovery with apparent normalisation of cardiac function. Such patients frequently ask whether heart failure treatments can be stopped. What should we tell such patients? We do not think that anecdotes are the optimal basis for advising on treatment. Data from randomised trials provide objective evidence of risk and facilitate shared decision making. Some patients will prefer to avoid the chance of recurrence at all costs, but others might prefer to take a calculated risk, especially if carefully monitored for early evidence of relapse.

Previous observational studies did not use strict criteria to define recovery before withdrawing treatment for dilated cardiomyopathy.^{1,2} For instance, Waagstein and colleagues¹ withdrew beta-blockers from 24 patients with a mean left ventricular ejection fraction of 41% and end-diastolic dimension of 65 mm, of whom 17 had persisting symptoms of heart failure. Plasma concentrations of natriuretic peptides were not reported.¹ Similar issues affect other observational studies.²

In TRED-HF,³ all patients had several robust markers of recovery. We did not contemplate withdrawing therapy from patients with ongoing evidence of heart failure or a reduced ejection fraction. The safety of participants was of paramount importance. All were made aware of the risk of recurrent heart failure and the need for intensive monitoring. Our protocol was approved by the National Research Ethics Committee, the Medicine Healthcare and Products Regulatory Agency, the Institutional Oversight Committee, and the charitable funding body, and received positive feedback and support from patient advisory groups. Multiple steps, outlined in the manuscript, were taken to minimise the risk to participants.

We agree with Tina Ha and colleagues that some patients with dilated cardiomyopathy and improved left ventricular function have alternative indications for heart failure therapies. However, in our trial, at baseline, all patients were in sinus rhythm and normotensive. The only patient with diabetes had no evidence of nephropathy. No indication for therapy exists in patients with preserved left ventricular ejection fraction who carry a truncating variant in *TTN* or who have a family history of dilated cardiomyopathy. Studies suggest that left ventricular ejection fraction might recover in up to 40% of patients with dilated cardiomyopathy.^{4,5} Younger patients, who are more likely to recover, have a low prevalence of comorbidities that might otherwise preclude withdrawing therapy. Therefore, although we agree that recovery, without alternative indications for therapy, occurs in a minority of patients with dilated cardiomyopathy, it is not rare.

JGFC has received personal fees from Johnson & Johnson during the conduct of the study; grants, personal fees, and non-financial support from Medtronic, Vifor, and Novartis; grants and personal fees from Amgen, Bayer, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Stealth Biopharmaceuticals, and Philips; grants and non-financial support from Pharmacosmos and PharmaNord; and personal fees from AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Sanofi, Servier, Torrent Pharmaceuticals, and Myokardia, outside the submitted work. SKP has received honoraria from Bayer Schering and travel support from Circle 42, outside the submitted work. BPH declares no competing interests.

References

1. Waagstein F, Caidahl K, Wallentin I, Bergh CH, Hjalmarson A. Long-term beta-blockade in dilated cardiomyopathy. Effects of short- and long-term metoprolol treatment followed by withdrawal and readministration of metoprolol. *Circulation* 1989; 80: 551–63.
2. Swedberg K, Hjalmarson A, Waagstein F, Wallentin I. Adverse effects of beta-blockade withdrawal in patients with congestive cardiomyopathy. *Br Heart J* 1980; 44: 134–42.
3. Halliday BP, Wassall R, Lota AS, et al. Withdrawal of pharmacological treatment for heart failure in patients with recovered dilated cardiomyopathy (TRED-HF): an open-label, pilot, randomised trial. *Lancet* 2019; 393: 61–73.
4. Merlo M, Pyxaras SA, Pinamonti B, Barbati G, Di Lenarda A, Sinagra G. Prevalence and prognostic significance of left ventricular reverse remodeling in dilated cardiomyopathy receiving tailored medical treatment. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2011; 57: 1468–76.
5. Cleland JGF, Pellicori P, Clark AL, Petrie MC. Time to take the failure out of heart failure: the importance of optimism. *JACC Heart Fail* 2017; 5: 538–40.