SCIENTIFIC REPORTS

natureresearch

OPEN

Levosimendan and systemic vascular resistance in cardiac surgery patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Sandra Terbeck¹, Paul Philipp Heinisch², Armando Lenz³, Jan-Oliver Friess¹, Dominik Guensch¹, Thierry Carrel², Balthasar Eberle¹ & Gabor Erdoes^{1*}

Levosimendan is a potent non-adrenergic inodilator agent. The net effect of hemodynamic changes may result in a hyperdynamic state with low systemic vascular resistance. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis assessing hemodynamics in cardiac surgery patients treated with levosimendan. English-language literature was searched systematically from 2006 until October 2018, including randomized controlled trials and case-matched or retrospective studies providing at least two sequentially measured hemodynamic variables in adult patients who underwent cardiac surgery with cardiopulmonary bypass and were treated with levosimendan in comparison to alternative drugs or devices. Cardiac index significantly increased in the levosimendan group by 0.74 (0.24 to 1.23) [standardized mean difference (95% CI); p = 0.003] from baseline to postoperative day (POD) 1, and by 0.75 (0.25 to 1.25; p = 0.003) from baseline to POD 7, when corrected for the standardized mean difference at baseline by a multivariate mixed effects meta-analysis model. With this correction for baseline differences, other hemodynamic variables including systemic vascular resistance did not significantly differ until POD 1 [-0.17 (-0.64 to 0.30), p = 0.48] and POD 7 [-0.13 (-0.61 to 0.34), p = 0.58] between the levosimendan and the comparator group. Levosimendan increases cardiac index in patients undergoing cardiac surgery. Although levosimendan has inodilator properties, this meta-analysis finds no clinical evidence that levosimendan produces vasopressor-resistant vasoplegic syndrome.

Levosimendan exerts its inodilatory effects mainly through three mechanisms of action: calcium sensitization, opening of adenosine triphosphate-dependent-potassium (K_{ATP}) channels in vascular smooth muscle cells and in the mitochondria of cardiomyocytes¹. Through calcium sensitization, levosimendan has positive inotropic effects which result in an increase of cardiac output, whereas its action on K_{ATP} channels causes systemic vasodilation in both arterial and venous vascular beds (Fig. 1)²⁻⁴.

In recent years, levosimendan has been extensively studied in cardiac surgery. In the majority of studies, it was administered as a preoperative bolus, often immediately after anesthesia induction to exploit its preconditioning effect before surgery^{5–8}. A high plasma concentration achieved in a short period of time may significantly lower systemic vascular resistance, since levosimendan acts on vascular smooth muscle cells in a dose-dependent fashion⁹.

It is known that continued preoperative intake of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or beta-blockers, low pre-operative left ventricular ejection fraction (EF), vasopressor use prior to cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) and prolonged duration of CPB are predisposing factors for abnormally low systemic vascular resistance after cardiac surgery^{10,11}. The related syndrome, post-cardiotomy vasoplegia, has been defined as hypotension in the absence of a low cardiac output state¹², and is associated with prolonged hospital stay and increased mortality, mainly due to the resulting end-organ failure. Although the etiology of post-cardiotomy vasoplegia is probably multifactorial, and its mechanisms are not completely understood, studies ascribe a relevant contribution to the CPB circuit itself. The exposure of blood to the foreign surfaces triggers a proinflammatory response, with release

¹Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. ²Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. ³Clinical Trials Unit, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. *email: gabor.erdoes@insel.ch



Figure 1. Descriptive figure illustrating mechanism of action and hemodynamic effects associated with levosimendan administration. CI, cardiac index; EF, ejection fraction; SVR, systemic vascular resistence; MAP, mean arterial pressure; CVP, central venous pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure.



PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram



Figure 2. Study flow chart with numbers of abstracts screened and studies assessed for eligibility and included in the review; reasons for exclusions at each stage are also given.

of vasoactive mediators that may disturb baseline vascular reactivity and tonus. Patients with heart failure express high levels of inflammatory mediators and may therefore be particularly susceptible to vasodilatory effects of drugs¹³. It is precisely this subgroup of patients who frequently receive levosimendan in the perioperative period. Thus, short-term loading of levosimendan in the pre-CPB period, especially administered by bolus injection, may be counterproductive due to a high incidence of hypotension with subsequent need of vasopressor medication.

Recent meta-analyses on levosimendan indicate that its administration in cardiac surgery patients is associated with decreased incidence of acute renal injury and renal replacement therapy and a lower 30-d mortality,

Study	First author, year	Туре	Patients	Surgery	Bolus	Infusion	Subgroups	Comparator
1.	Anastasiadis, 2016	RCT	32	Comb	No	pre-surgery	1	placebo
2.	Atalay, 2016	RCT	58	CABG	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
3.	Eris, 2014	RS	40	CABG	no/post-CPB	pre-surgery/post-CPB	3	placebo
4.	Sharma, 2014	RCT	40	Comb	pre-surgery	No	1	placebo
5.	Erb, 2014	RCT	33	Comb	No	pre-surgery	1	placebo
6.	Ersoy, 2013	RCT	20	Comb	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
7.	Lomivorotov, 2012	RCT	90	Comb	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	2	IABP
8.	Levin, 2012	RCT	252	CABG	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
9.	Severi, 2011	СМ	22	CABG	No	pre-surgery	1	IABP
10.	Leppinkangas, 2011	RCT	24	Comb	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
11.	Lahtinen, 2011	RCT	200	Comb	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
12.	Triapepe, 2009	RCT	102	CABG	pre-surgery	No	1	placebo
13.	Eriksson, 2009	RCT	60	CABG	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	placebo
14.	Jarvela, 2008	RCT	24	Comb	No	pre-surgery	1	placebo
15.	Triapepe, 2006	RCT	24	CABG	pre-surgery	No	1	placebo
16.	Sahu, 2016	RCT	30	CABG	pre-surgery	pre-surgery	1	nitroglycernine

Table 1. Main descriptors of the studies included in meta-analysis. Legend: RCT, randomized controlled trial;RS, retrospective study; CM, case-matched study; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; Comb, combinedprocedure (CABG +/- valve replacement, reconstruction); CPB, cardiopulmonary bypass; IABP, intra-aorticballoon pump. Please note that Eris *et al.* studied 3 subgroups vs. placebo (2 subgroups without a bolus but witha continuous infusion, 1 subgroup with bolus and continuous infusion post-CPB weaning) and Lomivotorov *et al.* studied 2 subgroups vs. IABP (both with bolus and continuous infusion).

Metainformation	N	Median (Range)	N (%)
Year of publication	16	2012 (2006, 2016)	
Study type	16		
RCT			14 (88)
Retrospective study			1 (6)
Case-control study			1 (6)
Surgery	16		
CABG			8 (50)
Combined procedure			8 (50)
Comparator to levosimendan	16		
Placebo			13 (81)
IABP			2 (13)
nitrogycerine			1 (6)
Time point of levosimendan bolus	19*		
Pre-surgery			12 (63)
Post-CPB weaning			1 (5)
No bolus			6 (32)
Time point for levosimendan infusion	19*		
Pre-surgery			15 (79)
During CPB weaning			1 (5)**
No infusion			3 (16)

Table 2. Summary of metadata of studies included in meta-analysis. Legend: RCT, randomized controlled trial; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; IABP, intra-aortic balloon pump; CPB, cardiopulmonary bypass. * The meta-analysis includes 16 (main) studies with 19 subgroups for different levosimendan treatment strategy. ** In the study of Eris *et al.* a subgroup of 10 patients received levosimendan during CPB weaning. Values are number, N; number and percent, N(%) or median with lower and upper quartile, median (lq, uq).

especially in those presenting with reduced left ventricular contractility¹⁴⁻¹⁸. Beyond its unequivocally proven positive inotropism, however, levosimendan's net effect on global hemodynamics of patients undergoing cardiac surgery with CPB remains controversial.

We performed a study-level meta-analysis of the available literature. Our aim was to investigate hemodynamic parameters - especially those indicating vasoplegia - in the context of perioperative levosimendan administration in patients undergoing cardiac surgery with CPB.

Study	Selection (max4stars)	Compa rability (max 2	Outcome (max 3 stars)	Total (max 9 stars)
		stars)		
Anastasiadis, 2016	****	**	**	8
Atalay, 2016	***	**	***	8
Eris, 2014	***	**	**	7
Sharma, 2014	***	**	**	7
Erb, 2014	***	**	*	6
Ersoy, 2013	***	**	**	7
Lomivorotov, 2012	****	**	**	8
Levin, 2012	****	**	**	8
Severi, 2011	****	*	**	7
Leppinkangas, 2011	***	**	**	7
Lahtinen, 2011	***	*	*	5
Triapepe, 2009	***	*	**	6
Eriksson, 2009	***	**	***	8
Jarvela, 2008	***	**	***	8
Triapepe, 2006	***	**	**	7
Sahu, 2016	***	**	**	7

Figure 3. Results of the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for evaluation of risk of bias and quality of studies included in the meta-analysis. Studies with nine stars have a low risk of bias (high quality), seven or eight stars a medium risk (moderate quality), and six or less a high risk of bias (low quality).

43 (22, 69)

122 (74, 185)

74 (44, 137)

53 (26, 182)

288 (98, 448)

	Levo	simendan	Com	parator
	N	Median (lq, uq)	N	Median (lq, uq)
No. of patients	16	18 (10, 127)	16	16 (10, 125)
Age (yrs)	16	65 (50, 76)	16	63 (46, 75)

39 (18, 63)

106 (73, 177)

72 (43, 140)

57 (25, 199)

271 (52, 631)

16

15

13

10

12

risk (moderate quality), and six or less a high risk of blas (low quality).

Table 3. Summary of baseline characteristics. Legend: AoX, aortic cross clamp; LOS, length of stay, ICU, intensive care unit. Values are number, N and median with lower and upper quartile (lq, uq).

.....

15

15

13

10

12

A sensitivity analysis with correction of the standardized mean difference (SMD) in hemodynamic parameters at baseline was conducted to reduce heterogeneity in the baseline parameters collected by the included studies.

Methods

Ejection fraction (%)

Perfusion time (min)

AoX time (min)

LOS ICU (hrs)

LOS Hospital (hrs)

This analysis included randomized controlled trials (RCTs), retrospective and case-control studies providing appropriate hemodynamic datasets from adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery with CPB, and being treated with levosimendan *vs.* a comparator. The manuscript contains all data and complies with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) recommendations (Fig. 2, Supplements A1 and A2)¹⁹.

Search strategy and eligibility criteria. Literature sources allowing unrestricted access to full texts and supplements in the US National Library of Medicine database (PUBMED), MEDLINE, EMBASE, and CENTRAL were searched systematically from 2006 until July 2018. Medical Subject Headings terms and free words referring to levosimendan in cardiac surgery were used as key words, including the following: levosimendan, cardiac surgery, cardiopulmonary bypass OR levosimendan OR milrinone OR dobutamine OR nitroglycerine OR intra-aortic balloon pump OR mechanical circulatory support AND cardiac surgery, cardiopulmonary bypass.

	Basel	ine		24 ho	urs post surgery		7 day	rs post surgery	
	N	SMD (95% CI)	p-value	N	SMD (95% CI)	p-value	N	SMD (95% CI)	p-value
Cardiac index	10	-0.08 (-0.30 to 0.14)	0.49	9	0.60 (0.38 to 0.82)	< 0.001	8	0.61 (0.15 to 1.07)	0.009
Central venous pressure	7	0.10 (-0.16 to 0.36)	0.44	8	-0.26 (-0.53 to 0.01)	0.05	7	-0.44 (-0.89 to 0.01)	0.05
Ejection fraction	14	-0.16 (-0.40 to 0.08)	0.20	2	-0.36 (-0.94 to 0.23)	0.23	3	-0.34 (-1.18 to 0.50)	0.43
Mean arterial pressure	9	-0.00 (-0.21 to 0.20)	0.97	9	-0.10 (-0.42 to 0.23)	0.56	8	0.10 (-0.30 to 0.50)	0.63
Pulmonary capillary wedge pressure	10	-0.00 (-0.20 to 0.19)	0.96	10	-0.28 (-0.51 to -0.05)	0.02	7	-0.32 (-0.66 to 0.02)	0.06
Systemic vascular resistance/-index	9	-0.13 (-0.34 to 0.08)	0.21	8	-0.42 (-0.67 to -0.16)	0.001	7	-0.40 (-0.63 to -0.17)	<0.001

Table 4. Number of studies, standardized mean difference and p-values of random effects meta-analyses for every outcome and all three time points. N, number, SMD standardized mean difference CI, confidence intervall.

	SMD (95% CI)	p-value	SMD (95% CI)	p-value
Cardiac index	0.74 (0.24 to 1.23)	0.003	0.75 (0.25 to 1.25)	0.003
Central venous pressure	-0.31 (-0.92 to 0.30)	0.32	-0.50 (-1.12 to 0.11)	0.11
Ejection fraction	0.23 (-0.56 to 1.02)	0.57	0.21 (-0.44 to 0.85)	0.53
Mean arterial pressure	-0.18 (-0.67 to 0.31)	0.47	0.14 (-0.36 to 0.64)	0.58
Pulmonary capillary wedge pressure	-0.32 (-0.78 to 0.14)	0.18	-0.34 (-0.81 to 0.13)	0.16
Systemic vascular resistance/-index	-0.17 (-0.64 to 0.30)	0.48	-0.13 (-0.61 to 0.34)	0.58

Table 5. Standardized mean difference at 24 hours and 7 days post-surgery, corrected for the standardized mean difference at baseline, calculated by a multivariate mixed effects meta-analysis model with the time as moderator and the study as random effect. Legend: SMD standardized mean difference CI, confidence intervall.

Key words were chosen by two authors on the basis of their own experience and other articles on similar topics. The reference lists of all selected papers were also screened for relevant studies. Eligibility criteria were: (a) English-language literature published from 2006 to October 2018, (b) study design (RCT, retrospective and case-control studies), (c) adult patient population, (d) cardiac surgery with CPB, (d) availability of at least two sequentially measured hemodynamic variables for the perioperative period, (e) levosimendan administration as a bolus and/or a continuous infusion before starting CPB, also including study subgroups with levosimendan administration at a bolus and/or a continuous infusion during CPB weaning, and (f) comparison of levosimendan to another drug or device.

Study selection and data extraction. Two authors independently screened the titles and abstracts of the selected studies. Articles were excluded if they: (a) were not original research (e.g., case reports, editorials, reviews, congress abstracts), (b) did not provide at least two hemodynamic variables in the full-text version or in the supplement, (c) started levosimendan exclusively after cardiac surgery (after CPB weaning, post-operatively on the intensive care unit, ICU) and (d) were a duplicate. In cases where the article reported on hemodynamic variables without providing them as numbers (mean or median), the corresponding author was contacted for the original data set.

The full text versions of the articles selected by one or more of the assessors were retrieved for evaluation. Two assessors read the full texts and independently extracted the information from the selected studies. A third assessor reviewed the data extraction, and any disagreement was resolved through consensus.

Assessment of risk of bias. The quality of the studies was evaluated with the Newcastle Ottawa Scale²⁰. Two authors independently rated each study, and consensus discussion was used to resolve any dis-agreement.

Statistical analysis. Sixteen studies were included in this meta-analysis. One study had three different levosimendan groups and another study had two different levosimendan groups. Both studies were compared only to one control group. We thus collapsed the hemodynamic endpoints of the levosimendan groups for these two studies, taking the mean of means, and the mean of the square-root of the sum of squares of standard deviations. For non-parametric results, we calculated the mean from the median, the lower quartile and the upper quartile, and the standard deviation from lower quartile, upper quartile and the number of patients, according to Wan and co-workers²¹. As our primary analysis, we calculated Hedges' g as the standardized mean differences in order to meta-analyze endpoints among studies using the R package meta²². We calculated a separate meta-analysis for each endpoint and period. For sensitivity analysis we used multivariate mixed effects linear meta-analysis models, using time (baseline, a period (I) from baseline to 24 hours (inclusive) after surgery, and a period (II) from 24 hours to 7 days after surgery) as a moderator, and the individual studies as random effect, using the R package meta²³. We used this model to correct the standardized mean difference (SMD) at period (I), or at period (II) after surgery by the SMD at baseline. All analyses were performed using R version 3.5.0²⁴. Values are numbers and percentages (n, %), or median with lower and upper quartile (m [lq, uq]).

а											
	Lev	osime	ndan	(Compa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	3.10	0.60	16	2.80	0.70	4	0.45	[-0.25; 1.15]	8.1%	8.6%
Atalay 2016	25	2.30	0.47	33	2.40	0.46		-0.21	[-0.73; 0.31]	14.8%	14.1%
Eris 2014	30	2.17	0.28	10	2.17	0.43		0.00	[-0.72; 0.72]	7.8%	8.4%
Erb 2014	17	2.10	1.00	16	2.30	0.70		-0.22	[-0.91; 0.46]	8.5%	9.0%
Ersoy 2013	10	1.89	0.30	10	2.60	1.26		-0.74	[-1.66; 0.17]	4.8%	5.4%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	1.59	0.26	30	1.58	0.30		0.03	[-0.41; 0.47]	20.9%	18.3%
Eriksson 2009	30	1.80	0.30	30	1.90	0.40		-0.28	[-0.79; 0.23]	15.5%	14.7%
Jarvela 2008	12	2.58	0.82	12	2.94	0.61		-0.48	[-1.29; 0.33]	6.1%	6.7%
Tritapepe 2006	12	2.30	0.50	12	2.40	0.50		-0.19	[-0.99; 0.61]	6.2%	6.8%
Sahu 2016	15	3.10	0.70	15	2.60	0.70	*	0.69	[-0.05; 1.44]	7.3%	7.9%
Fixed effect model	227			184			4	-0.08	[-0.28; 0.12]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	fel						4	-0.08	[-0.30; 0.14]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 16%	$\tau^2 = 0.0$	203. p	= 0.30)		Г					
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect): z =	0.75 (p = 0.4	5)	-3	-2 -1 0 1	2 3			

Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -0.75 (p = 0.45) Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -0.68 (p = 0.49)

	Lev	osime	ndan	(Compa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	2 70	0.50	16	2.40	0.60		0.53	[-0.18:1.24]	9 9%	0.0%
Atalay 2016	25	2.30	0.24	33	2.10	0.31	7	0.70	[0.17: 1.24]	17.2%	17.2%
Eris 2014	30	2.49	0.30	10	2.35	0.43	-	0.42	[-0.30; 1.14]	9.5%	9.5%
Erb 2014	17	3.37	0.97	16	3.30	0.49		0.08	[-0.60; 0.77]	10.6%	10.6%
Ersoy 2013	10	3.43	0.66	10	2.74	0.31		1.28	[0.30; 2.26]	5.1%	5.1%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	2.82	0.52	30	2.45	0.61		0.66	[0.21; 1.11]	24.5%	24.5%
Jarvela 2008	12	2.93	0.91	12	2.78	0.85		0.16	[-0.64; 0.97]	7.7%	7.7%
Tritapepe 2006	12	2.83	0.50	12	2.50	0.42	+ ×	0.69	[-0.13; 1.52]	7.2%	7.2%
Sahu 2016	15	3.30	0.70	15	2.60	0.60	- 1 *	1.04	[0.27; 1.81]	8.3%	8.3%
Fixed effect model	197			154			-	0.60	[0.38; 0.82]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el						\$	0.60	[0.38; 0.82]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 0%.	r ² = 0. p	= 0.54				Г		_			
Test for overall effect (foo	ed effect	t): $z = 5$	29 (p	< 0.01)	-3	-2 -1 0 1 2	3			

Test for overall effect (random effects): z = 5.29 (p < 0.01)

C	Levo	simondan		omoa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total N	Mean SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	3.10 0.70	16	2.60	0.50		0.80	[0.08; 1.53]	10.7%	12.5%
Atalay 2016	25	3.14 0.57	33	2.29	0.63	<u></u>	1.39	[0.80; 1.97]	18.5%	14.1%
Eris 2014	30	2.91 0.37	10	2.62	0.34		0.80	[0.06; 1.53]	10.3%	12.3%
Erb 2014	17	3.10 0.73	16	3.60	1.06		-0.54	[-1.24; 0.16]	11.5%	12.8%
Ersoy 2013	10	3.84 0.81	10	2.94	0.29	!	1.42	[0.41; 2.42]	5.5%	9.7%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	2.56 0.63	30	2.33	0.79		0.33	[-0.11; 0.77]	28.8%	15.6%
Jarvela 2008	12	3.22 1.14	12	3.19	0.51	-+	0.03	[-0.77; 0.83]	8.7%	11.7%
Tritapepe 2008	12	3.03 0.59	12	2.60	0.42	-1×	0.82	[-0.02; 1.66]	7.9%	11.3%
Fixed effect model	182		139			-	0.58	[0.34; 0.81]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	el					-	0.61	[0.15; 1.07]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: 12 = 71%,	t ² = 0.29	61, p < 0.01	1							
Test for overall effect (for	ed effect):	z = 4.77 (p	< 0.01)	-3	-2 -1 0 1 2	3			
Test for overall effect (ran	ndom effect	cts): z = 2.6	2 (p < 0	0.01)						

Figure 4. Forest plots for cardiac index: (a) at baseline, (b) during period (I) and (c) during period (II).

Results

Description of studies. The final analysis included 16 studies (14 RCTs, 1 retrospective study and 1 casematched study) with 1071 patients overall (Table 1). Coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) and combined procedures (CABG and valve repair/replacement) were equally represented. The most common comparator to levosimendan was placebo (n = 13, 81%). In the majority of 19 subgroups levosimendan was administered as a pre-operative bolus of 12 mcg/kg [3, 200] and was followed by a continuous infusion of 0.1 mcg/kg/min [0.05, 0.2] (Table 2).

Risk of bias and the quality of the studies was assessed by using The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (Fig. 3).

Description of populations. Age and number of patients were the only baseline characteristics available in all studies. The least frequently reported characteristic was length of stay in the intensive care unit. Across all studies, baseline characteristics were similar between the levosimendan and the comparator groups (Table 3).

L.

а	Levo	simend	dan	C	ompar	ator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2018	16	2463	441	16	2537	622		-0.13	1-0.83-0.581	0 196	0 1%
Atalay 2016	25	2110	274	33	2078	357	3-	0.10	[-0.42: 0.62]	16.2%	16.2%
Eris 2014	30	2161 5	508	10	2153	585	<u></u>	0.01	[-0.70; 0.73]	8.5%	8.5%
Ersoy 2013	10	1681 4	423	10	1740	698		-0.10	[-0.97; 0.78]	5.7%	5.7%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	3339 (609	30	3435	890		-0.13	[-0.57; 0.31]	22.7%	22.7%
Severi 2011	11	1655 4	477	11	1969	874		-0.43	[-1.28; 0.42]	6.1%	6.1%
Eriksson 2009	30	1100	400	30	1200	500		-0.22	[-0.73; 0.29]	17.0%	17.0%
Tritapepe 2006	12	2148	221	12	2078	387	- x	0.21	[-0.59; 1.02]	6.8%	6.8%
Sahu 2016	15	1221 3	390	15	1489	383		-0.67	[-1.41; 0.06]	8.0%	8.0%
Fixed effect model	209			167				-0.13	[-0.34: 0.08]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	el						4	-0.13	[-0.34: 0.08]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 0%, t	2 = 0. p	= 0.83				Г					
Test for overall effect (fixe	d effect): z = -1	.26	(p = 0.2	21)	-3	-2 -1 0 1 2	3			
Test for overall effect (ran	dom eff	ects): z :	= -1	26 (p	= 0.21)						

D	Leve	osimen	dan	C	ompa	ator	S	tandar	dised	Mean				Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD		Dif	ferenc	e		SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	2808	472	16	2648	983		4	(<u>*</u>	-		0.20	[-0.49; 0.90]	9.9%	10.8%
Atalay 2016	25	1972	230	33	2092	373		\rightarrow	-			-0.37	[-0.90; 0.15]	17.3%	16.5%
Eris 2014	30	1799	360	10	1928	574		_	× ·			-0.30	[-1.02; 0.42]	9.2%	10.2%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	1833	524	30	2289	887			- 1			-0.68	[-1.13; -0.23]	23.6%	20.3%
Severi 2011	11	1067	508	11	962	162		-	- ×	_		0.27	[-0.57; 1.11]	6.8%	7.8%
Eriksson 2009	30	630	210	30	810	280		- 10				-0.72	[-1.24; -0.19]	17.4%	16.6%
Tritapepe 2006	12	1799	436	12	2005	367		\rightarrow	<u>+</u>			-0.49	[-1.31; 0.32]	7.2%	8.3%
Sahu 2016	15	1117	312	15	1369	350			H			-0.74	[-1.48; 0.00]	8.6%	9.6%
Fixed effect model	199			157				~	5			-0.44	[-0.66; -0.22]	100.0%	
Random effects mo	del							<	>			-0.42	[-0.67; -0.16]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: 12 = 22	%, = = 0.0	0297.p	= 0.2	5		Г				1 1					
Test for overall effect (f	ixed effect	t): z = -:	3.94	(p < 0.	01)	-3	-2	-1	0	1 2	3				
Test for oursell offect (andom of	lacte 1. +	2	22 10	< 0.01)	-	_								

overall effect (random effects): z = -3.23 (p < 0.01)

С		Levo	simer	dan	c	ompar	ator	Standardised Mean	1		Weight	Weight
Study	1	fotal	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anasta	siadis 2016	16	2039	553	16	2345	744	-*-	-0.46	[-1.16: 0.25]	10.5%	10.5%
Atalay 2	2016	25	1933	321	33	1998	311	- 18	-0.20	[-0.73: 0.32]	19,1%	19,1%
Eris 20	14	30	1644	238	10	1819	410		-0.60	[-1.32; 0.13]	9.8%	9.8%
Ersoy 2	013	10	1039	354	10	1272	376		-0.61	[-1.51; 0.29]	6.4%	6.4%
Lomivo	rotov 2012	60	2354	633	30	2630	937	- 18	-0.37	[-0.81; 0.07]	26.6%	26.6%
Eriksso	n 2009	30	690	280	30	820	290	- 10	-0.45	[-0.96; 0.06]	19.7%	19.7%
Tritaper	pe 2006	12	1799	516	12	2006	470		-0.40	[-1.21; 0.41]	7.9%	7.9%
Fixed e	effect model	183			141				-0.40	[-0.63; -0.17]	100.0%	
Rando	m effects model							\$	-0.40	[-0.63; -0.17]		100.0%
Heterog	eneity: /2 = 0%, r2 =	= 0, p	= 0.98				1			• • •		
Test for	overall effect (fixed	effect): z = -	3.46	(p < 0.0	01)	-	3 -2 -1 0 1	2 3			
Test for	overall effect (rando	om eff	ects): z	= -3	.46 (p	< 0.01)						

Figure 5. Forest plots for systemic vascular resistance: (a) at baseline, (b) during period (I) and (c) during period (II).

Primary analysis. Reporting of endpoints differed widely among the studies and between the time points. The most frequently reported endpoints were cardiac index and pulmonary capillary wedge pressure. Mean arterial pressure was reported in nearly two thirds of the studies. Systemic vascular resistance was reported either as non-indexed (SVR) or indexed to body surface area (SVRI). Inclusion or exclusion of the studies reporting SVR (study number 6, 9, 16, Table 1) did not change the results of the sensitivity analysis. Thus, the manuscript reports the results obtained from all studies as SVR.

Central venous pressure and ejection fraction were the least frequently reported endpoints, although ejection fraction was reported in nearly all studies at baseline.

At baseline, none of the endpoints differed between the two groups. Within the first 24 hours postoperatively, levosimendan increased cardiac index, and decreased pulmonary capillary wedge pressure and SVR. This pattern prevailed until postoperative day (POD) 7, when a higher cardiac index and lower SVR were reported for patients а

Study	Total	Mean	ndan SD	Total	Mean	SD	S	Dif	ferenc	Mear e	n		SMD	95	%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Apactociadic 2016	10	2 10	2 20	10	2 60	2.00			-				0.12	1-0.00	0 671	44.200	44.90
Anastasiadis 2010	10	5.10	2.30	10	5.50	3.80		_	10				0.12	[-0.02	0.57	14.370	14.370
Eris 2014	30	10.00	3.37	10	9.83	5.16		-		-			0.04	[-0.67	0.76]	13,4%	13.4%
Erb 2014	17	10.00	8.89	16	8.00	4.06			- 100	_			0.28	[-0.41	0.97]	14.6%	14.6%
Severi 2011	11	10.00	5.30	11	9.00	3.10		-					0.22	[-0.62	1.06]	9.8%	9.8%
Eriksson 2009	30	8.00	3.30	30	8.00	2.40			-				0.00	[-0.51	0.51]	26.8%	26.8%
Jarvela 2008	12	11.00	7.00	12	9.00	3.00			-i-	_			0.36	[-0.45	1.17]	10.5%	10.5%
Tritapepe 2006	12	10.90	2.35	12	10.57	2.35		-	-	-			0.14	[-0.66	0.94]	10.7%	10.7%
Fixed effect model	128			107					Ŀ				0.10	[-0.16]	0.361	100.0%	
Random effects mode	1								\$				0.10	[-0.16	0.36]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 0%, t	2 = 0, p	= 0.97				ſ	1	1		1	1						
Test for overall effect (fixe	d effect	(): z = 0	.77 (p	= 0.44)	-3	3 -2	-1	0	1	2	3					
Test for overall effect (ran	dom eff	(ects): z	= 0.7	7(0 = 1)	0.44)												

b	Lev	osime	ndan		Compa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	7.10	2.10	16	7.60	4.30	<u></u>	-0.14	[-0.84; 0.55]	11.6%	12.1%
Atalay 2016	25	10.57	3.77	33	12.23	2.09		-0.56	[-1.09; -0.03]	19.9%	18.3%
Eris 2014	30	11.33	3.21	10	12.00	5.16	<u></u>	-0.17	[-0.89; 0.54]	10.9%	11.5%
Erb 2014	17	7.67	4.85	16	7.00	1.63	+	0.18	[-0.51: 0.86]	12.0%	12.4%
Severi 2011	11	8.00	3.00	11	11.00	3.10		-0.95	[-1.84; -0.06]	7.1%	7.9%
Eriksson 2009	30	9.50	2.70	30	9.20	2.90	÷	0.11	[-0.40; 0.61]	21.8%	19.6%
Jarvela 2008	12	10.00	2.00	12	12.00	3.00		-0.76	[-1.59; 0.08]	8.1%	8.9%
Tritapepe 2006	12	9.90	3.10	12	10.57	2.35		-0.23	[-1.04; 0.57]	8.7%	9.4%
Fixed effect model	153			140				-0.25	[-0.49; -0.01]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	lel						\$	-0.26	[-0.53; 0.01]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 19%	$\tau^2 = 0.0$	0276. p	= 0.2	в		Г					
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect	t): z = -	2.08 (p = 0.0	(4)	-3	-2 -1 0 1 2	3			

Test for overall effect (fixed effect): z = -2.08 (p = 0.04)Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -1.92 (p = 0.05)

С	Lev	osimer	ndan	(Compa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	5.20	2.00	16	8.10	2.50		-1.25	[-2.01; -0.48]	10.7%	13.3%
Atalay 2016	25	9.73	2.52	33	12.67	2.32		-1.20	[-1.77; -0.63]	19.6%	16.1%
Eris 2014	30	9.83	2.82	10	10.50	6.02		-0.17	[-0.89; 0.55]	12.3%	13.9%
Erb 2014	17	9.33	4.85	16	8.67	8.13		0.10	[-0.59; 0.78]	13.5%	14,4%
Eriksson 2009	30	9.50	4.00	30	9.20	3.30	2- <u>18-</u> -	0.08	[-0.43; 0.59]	24.6%	16.9%
Jarvela 2008	12	7.00	4.00	12	8.00	3.00		-0.27	[-1.08; 0.53]	9.7%	12.7%
Tritapepe 2006	12	9.57	2.35	12	10.57	2.35		-0.41	[-1.22; 0.40]	9.6%	12.7%
Fixed effect model Random effects mod	142 el			129				-0.42	[-0.67; -0.17] [-0.89; 0.01]	100.0%	100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 67%	$\tau^2 = 0.2$	419. p	< 0.01	1							
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect	(): z = -;	3.31 (p < 0.0	1)	-	3 -2 -1 0 1 2	3			
Test for overall effect (ra	ndom eff	fects): z	= -1.	93 (p =	= 0.05)						

Figure 6. Forest plots for central venous pressure: (**a**) at baseline, (**b**) during period (I) and (**c**) during period (II).

.....

with levosimendan than for patients treated with comparators. All other endpoints did not differ between patients receiving levosimendan and those from the comparison group (Table 4).

Sensitivity analysis. The mixed effects model meta-analysis, corrected for the standardized mean difference at baseline, confirmed most results from the primary analysis. Cardiac index increased significantly from baseline to later time periods. The other endpoints did not change significantly from baseline to the two later periods (Table 5). In sensitivity analysis, the difference of SVR between levosimendan and comparators, as described in the primary analysis section, became insignificant due to the correction for baseline differences.

Forest plots for cardiac index and systemic vascular resistance at baseline (a), and during periods (I) and (II) are given in Figs. 4 and 5. Forest plots for central venous pressure, ejection fraction, mean arterial pressure, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure b) during period (I) and (II) are presented in the Figs. 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Discussion

The present systematic review and meta-analysis showed a similar pattern of hemodynamic changes across the different studies when levosimendan was prophylactically administered to adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery with CPB. During the first postoperative week, levosimendan increased cardiac index when compared to the respective comparator, whereas its use was not associated with significant reduction of systemic vascular resistance in the context of postoperative care in the studies.

During the past decade, 72 meta-analyses have been published on levosimendan in various settings, with focus on mortality, neurohormones, troponin release, renal function, length of hospital stay, pharmaco-economics etc.

a	Le	vosim	endan		Comp	arator	SI	tanda	rdised Mea	in				Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD		Dif	ference		SMD	9	5%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	35.80	4.90	16	37.50	3.40		_	<u>.</u>		-0.39	[-1.09;	0.31]	5.6%	6.8%
Atalay 2016	25	44.60	0.55	33	42.80	13.90					0.17	[-0.35;	0.69]	10.1%	9.1%
Eris 2014	30	28.22	2.66	10	28.33	4.30		_	- 11		-0.03	(-0.75;	0.68]	5.3%	6.6%
Sharma 2014	20	23.55	4.87	20	22.55	0.92			- 1		0.28	[-0.34]	0.901	7.1%	7.7%
Erb 2014	17	22.00	4.50	16	22.40	5,50		_	<u>*</u>		-0.08	[-0.76]	0.61]	5.9%	7.0%
Ersoy 2013	10	46.80	10.90	10	49.00	12.00		_	- i		-0.18	[-1.06;	0.701	3.5%	5.1%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	30.33	2.49	30	30.67	3.11			- <u></u>		-0.12	[-0.56;	0.32]	14.2%	10.3%
Severi 2011	11	30.00	6.40	11	26.00	6.20			÷		0.61	(-0.25;	1.47]	3.7%	5.3%
Leppikangas 2011	12	63.00	9.00	12	69.00	9.00			- 1 -		-0.64	[-1.47;	0.18]	4.0%	5.6%
Tritapepe 2009	52	41.60	10,70	50	44.10	3,80		+	-		-0.31	[-0.70;	0.08]	18.0%	11.1%
Eriksson 2009	30	36.00	8.00	30	36.00	8.00					0.00	[-0.51;	0.51]	10.7%	9.3%
Jarvela 2008	12	51.00	5.03	12	64.33	5.87	<u> </u>	_	3		-2.35	[-3.44;	-1.27]	2.3%	3.8%
Tritapepe 2006	12	50.00	7.00	12	52.00	5.00		_	*		-0.32	[-1.12;	0.49]	4.2%	5.7%
Sahu 2016	15	57.00	3.50	15	56.80	2.00		-	- <u>i</u> -		0.07	[-0.65;	0.78]	5.3%	6.6%
Fixed effect model	322			277					3		-0.14	[-0.30;	0.03]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el								4		-0.16	[-0.40:	0.08]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: 12 = 49%,	T2 = 0.1	002, p	= 0.02						1 1	1	1				
Test for overall effect (fixe	ed effect): z = -	1.64 (0	= 0.10))		-3 -2	-1	0 1	2	3				
W		a carbo m													

at for overall effect (random effects): z = -1.29 (p = 0.20)

.

D	Levosimer	ndan	Comparator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total Mean	SD Tota	Mean SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Severi 2011	11 36.00	7.40 11	37.00 7.60		-0.13	[-0.97; 0.71]	49.0%	49.0%
Jarvela 2008	12 45.00	5.03 12	48.00 5.03		-0.58	[-1.40; 0.24]	51.0%	51.0%
Fixed effect model	23	23	3	-	-0.36	[-0.94; 0.23]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el			-	-0.36	[-0.94: 0.23]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$	$r^2 = 0$ $n = 0.45$		Г		¬	•		

2 3

Test for overall effect (fixed effect): z = -1.19 (p = 0.23)

-3 -2 -1 0 1 Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -1.19 (p = 0.23)

С	Levesimendan	Comparator	Standardized Mean		Weight Weight
Study	Total Mean SD	Total Mean SD	Difference	SMD 95%-C	(fixed) (random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16 42.80 7.80	16 41.20 8.30		0.19 [-0.50; 0.89]	39.3% 35.1%
Eris 2014	30 35,06 5,33	10 35.33 9.46		-0.04 [-0.76; 0.67]	37.0% 34.6%
Jarvela 2008	12 55.00 5.03	12 63.00 6.71		-1.30 [-2.20; -0.41	23.6% 30.3%
Fixed effect model	58	38	÷	-0.25 [-0.68; 0.19]	100.0%
Random effects mode	1	_		-0.34 [-1.18; 0.50]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: 12 = 72%,	$\tau^2 = 0.3934, p = 0.0$	3		-	
Test for overall effect (fixed	d effect): z = -1.11 ((p = 0.27) -3	-2 -1 0 1 2	3	
Test for overall effect (rand	dom effects): z = -0	.80 (p = 0.43)			

Figure 7. Forest plots for ejection fraction: (a) at baseline, (b) during period (I) and (c) during period (II).

None of these meta-analyses focused specifically on perioperative endpoints of the hemodynamic profile. The positive inotropic action with associated increase of cardiac output, stroke volume, and ejection fraction is a well-known pharmacodynamic property of levosimendan and represents the main indication for the use of levosimendan in cardiac surgery.

Almost all studies included in this current meta-analysis showed an increase in cardiac index. The RCT by Lomivorotov showed the largest effect, with increases in cardiac index at 24 hours and 7 days after cardiac surgery⁷. This may be due to the selective inclusion of patients with low preoperative ejection fraction (<35%), and/or to the use of IABP in addition to levosimendan in a subgroup of patients. The use of IABP may have had an additional positive effect on coronary perfusion, and hence cardiac performance. Similarly, the RCTs of Anastasiadis²⁵ and Atalay²⁶ observed increases in cardiac index 24 hours and 7 days after cardiac surgery. Both studies, however, included only patients with mild or moderate left ventricular dysfunction undergoing CABG. In the retrospective study of Eris, the positive inotropic effect of levosimendan was still apparent at the time points of observation, however with a reduced fixed weight, mainly owing to the small subgroups (n = 10) and widely varying modalities of levosimendan administration²⁷. Also, not all studies could confirm stimulatory effects of levosimendan on cardiac index with a weighting similar to other studies. Two small RCTs failed to observe a beneficial effect of levosimendan on cardiac index at their RCT's last hemodynamic assessment point^{28,29}. Reasons for this may be the small size and/or non-homogeneity of their samples, such as groups already differing in baseline EF^{28} or in the rate of post-CPB institution of mechanical circulatory support²⁹. Also, in both studies levosimendan was started rather late and slowly, i.e., after anesthesia induction and without bolus, which probably delayed the onset of the drug's inotropic action. A potential between-group difference in cardiac index may have been levelled out in the study of Järvelä by the significantly higher noradrenaline dosage, and hence afterload, in the levosimendan group²⁸. In the RCT of Erb, the more frequent use of IABP and ventricular assist devices in the control group may have masked superior hemodynamic effects of levosimendan in comparison with placebo²⁹.

.

u	Le	vosim	endan		Comp	arator		St	anda	rdise	d Mea	in				Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD			Dit	feren	ce		SMD	95	%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	96.90	10.80	16	83.60	25.50				1	-		0.66	[-0.05]	1.38]	8.2%	8.2%
Atalay 2016	25	71.80	9.83	33	70.77	8.29					-		0.11	[-0,41]	0.63]	15.5%	15.5%
Eris 2014	30	67.89	9.35	10	68.17	11.18			-	+	-		-0.03	[-0.74]	0.69]	8.2%	8.2%
Erb 2014	17	66.00	12.00	16	67.00	11.00	1		-	-			-0.08	[-0.77]	0.60]	9.0%	9.0%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	77.00	9.97	30	78.67	12.45							-0.15	[-0.59	0.29]	21.7%	21.7%
Eriksson 2009	30	74.00	15.00	30	77.00	14.00			-	-			-0.20	(-0.71)	0.30]	16.2%	16.2%
Jarvela 2008	12	82.00	15.00	12	82.00	17.00			_	+	-		0.00	[-0.80]	0.80]	6.5%	6.5%
Tritapepe 2006	12	70.80	13.00	12	70.77	8.97			-	+	-		0.00	[-0.80]	0.80]	6.5%	6.5%
Sahu 2016	15	84.00	5.60	15	84.00	5.30			-	÷	-		0.00	[-0.72	0.72]	8.2%	8.2%
Fixed effect model	217			174						Ŷ			-0.00	[-0.21;	0.20]	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el									4			-0.00	[-0.21;	0.20]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 0%	r2 = 0. p	= 0.80					—				-	-					
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect	t): z = -	0.04 (p	= 0.97)		-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3				
Test for overall effect (ran	ndom ef	fects): z	= -0.0	4 (0 =	0.97)												

b	Lev	osime	ndan		Comp	arator	S	tanda	rdise	d Mean				Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD		Di	fferer	nce		SMD	95%-C	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	87.20	7.70	16	85.50	7.20						0.22	[-0.47: 0.92	8.9%	10.5%
Atalay 2016	25	70.23	9.20	33	68.17	5.04			- 위표	-		0.29	[-0.24: 0.81	15.7%	13.2%
Eris 2014	30	67.67	8.83	10	69.00	14.62		_	-8-	-		-0.12	[-0.84: 0.59	8.3%	10.2%
Erb 2014	17	64.00	6.47	16	67.67	17.88		_	-			-0.27	[-0.96; 0.42	9.1%	10.6%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	71.17	6.34	30	74.67	8.56		-	##			-0.49	[-0.93; -0.04	21.7%	14.6%
Eriksson 2009	30	68.00	9.90	30	78.00	12.40			-3			-0.88	[-1.41; -0.35	15.2%	13.1%
Jarvela 2008	12	62.00	4.00	12	60.00	7.00				-		0.34	[-0.47; 1.15	6.6%	9.0%
Tritapepe 2006	12	76.47	6.29	12	71.67	7.55			-1-	*		0.67	[-0.16; 1.49	6.3%	8.7%
Sahu 2016	15	83.00	4.80	15	84.00	5.20		-	- 1	-		-0.19	[-0.91; 0.52	8.3%	10.1%
Fixed effect model	217			174					-			-0.16	[-0.37; 0.05	100.0%	
Random effects mod	el								4			-0.10	[-0.42: 0.23		100.0%
Heterogeneity: J2 = 57%	$\tau^2 = 0.1$	1350, p	= 0.03	2			1	1	-	1		1			
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect	t): z = -	1.53 (p = 0.1	3)	-3	-2	-1	0	1 3	2 :	3			

Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -0.59 (p = 0.13) Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -0.59 (p = 0.56)

С	Le	vosim	endan		Comp	arator	S	tanda	rdise	d Mea	n					Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD		Dif	feren	ice		SM	D	95	%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	87.30	8.30	16	84.10	13.90				_		0.3	27	[-0.42;	0.97]	9.7%	12.0%
Atalay 2016	25	75.73	6.92	33	69.67	7.75			-E-	10		0.8	81	[0.27;	1.35]	16.0%	13.9%
Eris 2014	30	70.94	6.23	10	71.00	12.90		-	-#-	_		-0.0	01	[-0.72;	0.71]	9.2%	11.7%
Erb 2014	17	65.33	8.89	16	65.33	8.94		-	- #	_		0.0	00	[-0.68;	0.68]	10.1%	12.1%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	81.83	7.16	30	77.33	10.12			- 184			0.5	54	[0.10;	0.99]	23.7%	15.2%
Eriksson 2009	30	73.00	10.10	30	80.00	12.90			H):			-0.6	50	[-1.11; -	-0.08]	17.5%	14.2%
Jarvela 2008	12	71.00	10.00	12	82.00	15.00		*	-6			-0.8	83	[-1.67;	0.01]	6.7%	10.3%
Tritapepe 2006	12	78.73	9.48	12	74.83	8.39			- li *	-		0.4	42	(-0.39;	1.23]	7.2%	10.6%
Fixed effect model	202			159					-			0.	15	[-0.06;	0.37]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	el								-			0.1	10	[-0.30;	0.50]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 69%,	t2 = 0.2	272, p	< 0.01			ſ	1			1	1				-		
Test for overall effect (fixe	effect	(): z = 1	.39 (p =	0.17)		-3	3 -2	-1	0	1	2	3					
Test for overall effect (ran	dom eff	lects): z	= 0.49	(p = 0)	(63)												

Figure 8. Forest plots for mean arterial pressure: (a) at baseline, (b) during period (I) and (c) during period (II).

.....

Systemic arterial vasodilation is a genuine though often undesired effect of levosimendan, since it may be associated with relevant reductions in mean arterial pressure and total peripheral resistance^{6,9,30}. Although no studies have documented increased mortality which could be causally related to levosimendan-associated hypotension^{28,31}, marked arterial hypotension is undesirable during or after cardiac surgery since it may compromise end-organ perfusion³²⁻³⁴. In contrast to the primary analysis of our study, which showed a significant decrease of SVR until the seventh postoperative day, our sensitivity analysis did not confirm a significant difference in the SVR between patients treated with levosimendan and those receiving comparators. While the primary analysis focused on SVR difference between levosimendan and the comparison group at each time point, secondary analysis is due to a pre-existing baseline difference. In this context, it is conceivable that, especially in patients with preoperative IABP use, a decreased SVR was measured due to an afterload reduction. However, since our secondary analysis was corrected for baseline differences and no significant difference between levosimendan and comparator groups could be demonstrated in the further perioperative course, we assume that SVR reduction by IABP is not relevant in this setting.

Low SVR in association with the use of levosimendan in critically ill patients is frequently reported in the clinical literature, as well as in studies included in the present meta-analysis. However, there are discrepancies. Severi reported higher systemic vascular resistance in their levosimendan group when comparing it with a control group treated solely by prophylactic placement of IABP³⁵. Starting study drug infusion 24 hours prior to surgery, Anastasiadis found no significant difference in SVR or MAP between their levosimendan and placebo groups until 24 hours postoperatively²⁵. Similarly, the large randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trials CHEETAH³⁶, LICORN³⁷, and LEVO-CTS³⁸ did not demonstrate an increased incidence of hypotension as an

.

a	Lev	osime	ndan	0	ompa	rator	S	tanda	dised M	ean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD		Dif	ference		SMD	95%-C	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	9.40	3.60	16	8.70	3.40			*		0.19	[-0.50; 0.89	8.2%	8.2%
Atalay 2016	25	13.90	2.91	33	13.13	3.49					0.23	[-0.29: 0.75	14.6%	14.6%
Eris 2014	30	11.89	4.35	10	11.33	7.74		-	*		0.10	[-0.61; 0.82	7.7%	7.7%
Erb 2014	17	15.00	8.00	16	17.00	6.00		_	*		-0.27	[-0.96; 0.41	8.4%	8.4%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	13.67	4.35	30	15.33	7.01					-0.31	[-0.75: 0.13	20.4%	20.4%
Severi 2011	11	15.00	6.30	11	16.00	6.30		_	*		-0.15	[-0.99; 0.68	5.7%	5.7%
Eriksson 2009	30	11.00	4.00	30	11.00	4.00			- 8 -		0.00	(-0.51; 0.51	15.5%	15.5%
Jarvela 2008	12	20.00	6.00	12	15.00	6.00			*	_	0.80	(-0.03; 1.64	5.7%	5.7%
Tritapepe 2006	12	13.90	3.10	12	13,13	3.77		-			0.21	[-0.59; 1.02	6.2%	6.2%
Sahu 2016	15	13.70	1.90	15	14.30	1.40		_	*		-0.35	[-1.07; 0.37	7.6%	7.6%
Fixed effect model	228			185					Ŷ		-0.00	[-0.20; 0.19	100.0%	
Random effects mod	lel								4		-0.00	[-0.20: 0.19	i	100.0%
Heterogeneity: /2 = 0%,	t2 = 0. p	= 0.49				r					_	•	-	
Test for overall effect (fix	ed effect): z = -	0.05 (p = 0.9	6)	-3	3 -2	-1	0 1	2	3			
Test for overall effect (ra	ndom eff	ects): z	= -0.	05 (p =	0.96)									

b	Lev	osime	ndan		Compa	rator	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weight
Study	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
Anastasiadis 2016	16	10.90	3.20	16	10.50	5.10	-+	0.09	[-0.60; 0.78]	8.4%	9.0%
Atalay 2016	25	11.40	5.74	33	15.43	4,49		0.79	[-1.33; -0.25]	13.8%	13.2%
Eris 2014	30	13.44	4.03	10	13.50	7.74		0.01	[-0.73: 0.71]	7.9%	8.5%
Erb 2014	17	13.00	4.85	16	13.33	4.06	- id -	0.07	[-0.76; 0.61]	8.6%	9.2%
Lomivorotov 2012	60	11.00	3.30	30	12.67	4.67		0.43	[-0.88; 0.01]	20.5%	17.3%
Severi 2011	11	13.00	3.90	11	16.00	3.80		0.75	[-1.62; 0.12]	5.3%	6.1%
Eriksson 2009	30	11.00	3.00	30	12.00	4.00		0.28	[-0.79; 0.23]	15.6%	14.4%
Jarvela 2008	12	14.00	3.00	12	12.00	4.00	7 	0.55	[-0.27; 1.36]	6.0%	6.8%
Tritapepe 2006	12	12.83	3.77	12	13.40	3.19		0.16	[-0.96; 0.64]	6.3%	7.1%
Sahu 2016	15	13.10	0.90	15	13,60	0.90		0.54	[-1.27; 0.19]	7.6%	8,3%
Fixed effect model	228			185			-	0.30	[-0.50; -0.10]	100.0%	
Random effects mode	H							0.28	[-0.51: -0.05]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 21\%$.	$\tau^2 = 0.0$	0289.0	= 0.25	5							

-2 -1 0

2

Test for on Test for o

verall effect (fixed effect): $z = -2.91$ ($p < 0.01$)	-3
verall effect (random effects): z = -2.40 (p = 0.02)	

	С		Leve	osimer	ndan	C	Compa	rator	Standa	ardised Me	ean			Weight	Weight
	Study	Тс	otal	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Di	fference		SMD	95%-CI	(fixed)	(random)
	Atalay 20	016	25	11 47	2 38	33	14 33	2 32				-1.21	[=1 78: =0.64]	16 0%	15 8%
	Fris 201	4	30	12.00	3.00	10	11.83	8.60		1		0.03	1-0.69: 0.751	10 1%	12 5%
	Erb 2014	4	17	14 00	5.66	16	14 00	4.08		11		0.00	[-0.68: 0.68]	11 196	13 2%
	Lomivore	otov 2012	60	13.33	3.48	30	13.67	3.89		<u>11</u>		-0.09	[-0.53: 0.35]	26.9%	19.3%
	Eriksson	2009	30	12.00	3.20	30	13.00	4.00		<u>a</u>		-0.27	[-0.78: 0.24]	20.0%	17.4%
	Jarvela 2	2008	12	11.00	5.00	12	12.00	3.00	_	<u>T</u>		-0.23	[-1.04: 0.57]	8.0%	10.9%
	Tritapepe	e 2006	12	11.57	3.10	12	12.67	2.52	_	*		-0.38	[-1.18; 0.43]	7.9%	10.8%
	Fixed ef	fect model	186			143				¢.		-0.32	[-0.55; -0.09]	100.0%	
	Random	n effects model								Ó		-0.32	[-0.66; 0.02]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: 1 ² = 51%, τ ² = 0.1030, p = 0.05															
Test for overall effect (fixed effect): $z = -2.75$ ($p < 0.01$) -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3															
Test for overall effect (random effects): $z = -1.85$ ($\rho = 0.06$)															

Figure 9. Forest plots for pulmonary capillary wedge pressure: (a) at baseline, (b) during period (I) and (c) during period (II).

adverse event. The reasons for such discrepancies are not fully understood, but may be related to a diminished dose-dependent effect on K_{ATP} channels in vessels with low resistance when levosimendan infusion commences early in the pre-operative period, typically between 12 and 24 hours prior to CPB. Another explanation may be the rather moderate dosage of continuous levosimendan infusions (0.05-0.1 mcg/kg/min) in the respective studies or different compensatory dosages of vasopressor drugs.

The main limitation of the present study comes from missing information and inconsistencies in the reporting of hemodynamic data in the studies analyzed. Other common limitations, intrinsic in meta-analyses, are the heterogeneity of patient populations with different etiologies and stages of heart failure and comorbidities, different types of cardiac surgery (coronary artery bypass grafting vs. valve surgery) in the studies analyzed and the large variety of clinical and research protocols, which differ, for example, in terms of levosimendan dosage, administration regimens, comparators and combination therapies, with concomitant use of catecholamines, vasoactive drugs and mechanical circulatory support devices.

In conclusion, this meta-analysis and systematic review confirms that perioperative treatment with levosimendan improves cardiac index in adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery with CPB. As a new aspect, however, this current review finds no clinical evidence that levosimendan produces vasopressor-resistant vasoplegic syndrome. Thus, objections to the use of levosimendan in cardiac surgery appear unjustified if they are based solely on the fear of triggering postcardiotomy vasoplegic syndrome.

Received: 26 July 2019; Accepted: 16 December 2019; Published online: 30 December 2019

References

- 1. Papp, Z. et al. Levosimendan: molecular mechanisms and clinical implications: consensus of experts on the mechanisms of action of levosimendan. Int. J. Cardiol. 159, 82–87 (2012).
- Haikala, H. et al. Cardiac troponin C as a target protein for a novel calcium sensitizing drug, levosimendan. J. Mol. Cell Cardiol. 27, 1859–1866 (1995).
- Yokoshiki, H., Katsube, Y., Sunagawa, M. & Sperelakis, N. Levosimendan, a novel Ca²⁺ sensitizer, acivates the glibenclamidesensitive K+ channel in rat arterial myocytes. *Eur. J. Pharmakol.* 333, 249–259 (1997).
- Pataricza, J., Hohn, J., Petri, A., Balogh, A. & Papp, J. G. Comparison of the vasorelaxing effect of cromakalim and the new inodilator, levosimendan, in human isolated portal vein. J. Pharm. Pharmacol. 52, 21–27 (2000).
- 5. Eriksson, H. I. *et al.* Levosimendan facilitates weaning from cardiopulmonary bypass in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting with impaired left ventricular function. *Ann. Thorac. Surg.* **87**, 448–454 (2009).
- 6. Lahtinen, P. *et al.* Levosimendan reduces heart failure after cardiac surgery: a prospective randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Crit. Care Med.* **39**, 2263–2270 (2011).
- 7. Lomivorotov, V. V. *et al.* Levosimendan versus an intra-aortic balloon pump in high-risk cardiac patients. *J. Cardiothorac. Vasc.* Anesth. 26, 596–603 (2012).
- Sahu, M. K. et al. Comparison of levosimendan and nitroglycerine in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery. Ann. Card. Anaesth. 19, 52–58 (2016).
- Nieminen, M. S. et al. Hemodynamic and neurohumoral effects of continuous infusion of levosimendan in patients with congestive heart failure. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 36, 1903–1912 (2000).
- 10. Weis, F. et al. Association between vasopressor dependence and early outcome in patients after cardiac surgery. Anaesthesia. 61, 938–942 (2006).
- 11. Levin, M. A. et al. Early on-cardiopulmonary bypass hypotension and other factors associated with vasoplegic syndrome. Circulation. 120, 1664–1671 (2009).
- 12. Lambden, S., Creagh-Brown, B. C., Hunt, J., Summers, C. & Forni, L. G. Definitions and pathophysiology of vasoplegic shock. *Critical. Care.* 22, 174 (2018).
- 13. Sundaram, V. & Fang, J. C. Gastrointestinal and liver issues in heart failure. Circulation. 133, 1696–1703 (2016).
- Ng, K. T., Chan, X. L., Tan, W. & Wang, C. Y. Levosimendan use in patients with preoperative low ejection fraction undergoing cardiac surgery: A systematic review with meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis. J. Clin. Anesth. 52, 37–47 (2019).
- Wang, B., He, X., Gong, Y. & Cheng, B. Levosimendan in Patients with Left Ventricular Dysfunction Undergoing Cardiac Surgery: An Update Meta-Analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis. *Biomed. Res. Int.* 8, 7563083 (2018).
- Kim, W. H. et al. Pharmacological interventions for protecting renal function after cardiac surgery: a Bayesian network metaanalysis of comparative effectiveness. Anaesthesia. 73, 1019–1031 (2018).
- Qiang, H., Luo, X., Huo, J. H. & Wang, Z. Q. Perioperative Use of Levosimendan Improves Clinical Outcomes in Patients Post-Cardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J. Cardiovasc. Pharmacol. 72, 11–18 (2018).
- Tena, M. A. et al. Levosimendan versus placebo in cardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac. Surg. 27, 677–685 (2018).
- Liberati, A. *et al.* The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *J Clin. Epidemiol.* 62, e1–34 (2009).
- Stang, A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in metaanalyses. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* 25, 603–605 (2010).
- Wan, X., Wang, W., Liu, J. & Tong, T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/ or interquartile range. BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 14, 135 (2014).
- 22. Schwarzer, G. Meta: An R package for meta-analysis. R News. 7, 40 (2007).
- 23. Viechtbauer, W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. J. Stat. Softw. 36, 1 (2010).
- 24. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria (2018).
- Anastasiadis, K. et al. Effectiveness of prophylactic levosimendan in patients with impaired left ventricular function undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting: a randomized pilot study. Interact Cardiovasc. Thorac. Surg. 23, 740–747 (2016).
- 26. Atalay, H. *et al.* Levosimendan Use Increases Cardiac Performance after Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting in End-Stage Renal Disease Patients. *Heart. Surg. Forum.* **19**, E230–E236 (2016).
- 27. Eris, C. et al. Preoperative usages of levosimendan in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting. Int. J. Clin. Exp. Med. 7, 219–229 (2014).
- Järvelä, K., Maaranen, P., Sisto, T. & Ruokonen, E. Levosimendan in aortic valve surgery: cardiac performance and recovery. J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth 22, 693–698 (2008).
- 29. Erb, J. et al. Influence of levosimendan on organ dysfunction in patients with severely reduced left ventricular function undergoing cardiac surgery. J. Int. Med. Res. 42, 750–764 (2014).
- Packer, M. et al. Effect of levosimendan on the short-term clinical course of patients with acutely decompensated heart failure. JACC Heart Fail. 1, 103–111 (2013).
- 31. Tritapepe, L. *et al.* Levosimendan pre-treatment improves outcomes in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *Br. J. Anaesth.* **102**, 198–204 (2009).
- Sun, L. Y. et al. Defining an Intraoperative Hypotension Threshold in Association with Stroke in Cardiac Surgery. Anesthesiology. 129, 440–447 (2018).
- Rettig, T. C. D. et al. Impact of Intraoperative Hypotension During Cardiopulmonary Bypass on Acute Kidney Injury After Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting. J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth. 31, 522–528 (2017).
- Siepe, M. et al. Increased systemic perfusion pressure during cardiopulmonary bypass is associated with less early postoperative cognitive dysfunction and delirium. Eur. J. Cardiothorac. Surg. 40, 200–207 (2011).
- Severi, L. et al. Levosimendan versus intra-aortic balloon pump in high-risk cardiac surgery patients. J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth. 25, 632–636 (2011).
- 36. Landoni, G. et al. Levosimendan for hemodynamic support after cardiac surgery. N. Engl. J. Med. 376, 2021–2031 (2017).
- Cholley, B. et al. Effect of levosimendan on low cardiac output syndrome in patients with low ejection fraction undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting with cardiopulmonary bypass: The LICORN randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 318, 548–56 (2017).
- Mehta, R. H. et al. Levosimendan in Patients with Left Ventricular Dysfunction Undergoing Cardiac Surgery. N. Engl J. Med. 376, 2032–2042 (2017).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Jeannie Wurz, medical editor, Department of Anesthesiology, Bern University Hospital, for careful reading of the manuscript.

Author contributions

S.T., P.P.H. and J.O.F. helped collect and analyze the literature and write the manuscript; A.L. helped perform the statistical analyses, D.G., T.C. and B.E. helped analyze the literature; G.E. helped collect and analyze the literature, perform statistical analyses and write the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information is available for this paper at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56831-y.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to G.E.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2019