# HF and CRT: CRT-P versus CRT-D

Andrew E. Epstein, MD

Professor of Medicine, Cardiovascular Division University of Pennsylvania

> Chief, Cardiology Section Philadelphia VA Medical Center Philadelphia, PA



Research Grants:

Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Medtronic, St. Jude Medical

Speaker's Bureaus/Honoraria:

Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Medtronic, St. Jude Medical

<u>Advisor Relationships</u>: Boston Scientific, St. Jude Medical

<u>EP Fellowship Program Support</u>: Boston Scientific, Medtronic, St. Jude Medical

## SCD Risks in HF Patients with LV Dysfunction



Total Mortality ~15-40%; SCD accounts for ~50% of total mortality.

\* MADIT II control group total mortality at 24 months 22%.

# Secondary Prevention Trials: AVID/CASH/CIDS Meta-analysis



Connolly et al. *Eur Heart J* 2000;21:2071-2078.

## MADIT II Conventional versus ICD Therapy



Moss et al. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:877-883.

### SCD-HEFT Mortality by Intention-to-treat



## **CRT Improves Quality of Life** and NYHA Functional Class

80%

Average Change in QoL Score (MLWHF) NYHA: Proportion Improving 1 or More Class

\*

\*



● Control ■ CRT 1845-53

2. NEJM 2001;344:873-80

1. NEJM 2002;346:1845-53

- 3. Eur Heart J 2002;23:1780-1787
- 4. http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf/P010012b.pdf. Accessed August 2, 2002
- 5. JAMA 2003; 289:2685-94



\* P < 0.05

\*

#### MADIT CRT: Changes in Mean LV Volumes and EF at 1 Year



Moss AJ, et al. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:1329-1338.

# **Trials of CRT and ICDs** ICD MADIT-CRT RAFT **CRT-P CRT-D** COMPANION REVERSE CeRtiTuDe

# MADIT-CRT



Moss et al. N Engl J Med 2009:361:1329-1338.



### Kaplan-Meier Estimates of the Primary Outcome





### COMPANION: Primary Endpoint: Mortality+Hospitalization



### **COMPANION:** Secondary Endpoint: All-Cause Mortality



#### **REVERSE CRT "ON":** Mortality CRT-P vs. CRT-D

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

Gold M, et al. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol 2013;6:1163-1168.

# CeRtiTuDe

- Prospective Multicenter Cohort Study
  - Funded and Coordinated by the French Society of Cardiology
- To evaluate the extent to which:
  - CRT-P patients differ from CRT-D patients in real life settings
  - CRT-P patients could have additionally benefited from a back-up defibrillator
- Enrollment from Jan. 2008 to Dec. 2010
- 1,705 patients: 535 CRT-P and 1170 CRT-D
- Follow-up at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months
  - Clinical / Echo / Rhythm
  - Completed in 1,611 (94.5%)

![](_page_15_Picture_11.jpeg)

# **CeRtiTuDe - Overall Mortality**

Among the 1,611 patients with complete follow-up, 286 deaths

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Why Consider CRT-P without "D"?

- 1. Both appropriate and inappropriate shocks are avoided.
- 2. Some patients may not want "D".
- 3. Some CRT-P indications are independent of ICD indications.
- 4. If LVEF is anticipated to improve, the benefit of "D" may be minimized.
- 5. CRT-P saves lives (COMPANION and CARE-HF)
- 6. Decreased cost.

# **CRT Indications Algorithm**

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

Colors correspond to the class of recommendations in the ACCF/AHA Table 1.

Benefit for NYHA class I and II patients has been shown in CRT-D trials, and while patients may not experience immediate symptomatic benefit, late remodeling may be avoided along with long-term HF consequences. There are no trials that support CRT-pacing (without ICD) in NYHA class I and II patients. Thus, it is anticipated these patients would receive CRT-D unless clinical reasons or personal wishes make CRT-pacing more appropriate. In patients who are NYHA class III and ambulatory class IV, CRT-D may be chosen but clinical reasons and personal wishes may make CRT-pacing appropriate to improve symptoms and quality of life when an ICD is not expected to produce meaningful benefit in survival.

#### J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;60:2604-5.

### DBT Considerations Regarding Longevity and Comorbidities: What are the Patient's Goals/Focus on the Elderly

"Physicians, patients, and their families increasingly will be  $\bullet$ faced with decisions about device-based therapies (ICD and CRT) in elderly patients who meet conventional criteria for implantation. These decisions require ... estimates of life expectancy, consideration of comorbidities and procedural risk, and patient preferences. Although these factors are important when device implantation is considered in any age group, they assume greater weight in clinical decision-making among the elderly."

Epstein AE, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2013;61:e6-75.

# Survival vs QOL

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

Stevenson et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2008;52:1702-8.

# **Comorbidities and Survival**

- Observational study of ICD outcomes in Canada
- 2,467 patients age  $\geq$ 18 and  $\leq$ 105 years
- Comorbidities associated with death
  - PVD
  - Pulmonary disease
  - CKD
  - HF
- HRs adjusted for age, gender, and HF
  - 1 noncardiac comorbidity: 1.72
  - 2 noncardiac comorbidities: 2.79
  - 3 noncardiac comorbidities: 2.98

### **Comorbidities and Survival**

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

Lee et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2007;49:2408-15.

#### **Risk and Mortality in MADIT II:** U-shaped Curve of ICD Efficacy

- 5 risk factor model
  - Age
  - NYHA class
  - BUN
  - Atrial fibrillation
  - QRS duration
- Excluded VHR patients (BUN ≥50 and/or Cr ≥2.5 mg/dl [MADIT II exclusion BUN ≥70 and/or Cr ≥3.0 mg/dl]). N = 60

![](_page_23_Figure_8.jpeg)

Goldenberg et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2008;51:288-296.

### Mortality by Risk Score Quintile in Patients with ICDs

Age >= 75 (62 points) NYHA class 3 (36 points) AF (27 points) COPD (52 points) CKD (100 points) LVEF <= 20 (28 points) DM (41 points) Total Points Prob. Survival 1 year Prob. Survival 2 years Prob. Survival 3 years Prob. Survival 4 years

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

Bilchick KC, et al. J Am J Cardiol 2010;60:1647-1655.

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### CARE-HF Care Primary Endpoint (All-cause Mortality or Unplanned Hospitalization for Major CV Event)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

Cleland et al. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:1539-49.

# Summary

- CRT alone (CRT-P) or with an ICD (CRT-D) is highly effective therapy to decrease morbidity and mortality.
- Almost all patients with a CRT-P indication have an indication for and ICD at the time of implantation, and CRT-D is reasonable.
- The decision to implant a CRT-P or CRT-D requires discussion with the patient and their telling you what are their goals.
- CRT-P is appropriate when LVEF is relatively wellpreserved and pacing is needed (CHB, AF/slow VR), but CRT-D is appropriate in borderline circumstances to avoid second operation/pocket opening.