

# Management of heart failure in patients with kidney disease

Edwards, Nicky; Price, Anna; Steeds, Richard; Ferro, Charles; Townend, Jon

DOI:

[10.1093/ndt/gfad011](https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfad011)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Edwards, N, Price, A, Steeds, R, Ferro, C & Townend, J 2023, 'Management of heart failure in patients with kidney disease: updates from the 2021 ESC guidelines', *Nephrology, Dialysis, Transplantation*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfad011>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation* following peer review. The version of record, Nicola C Edwards, Anna M Price, Richard P Steeds, Charles J Ferro, Jonathan N Townend, the Birmingham Cardio-Renal Group, Management of heart failure in patients with kidney disease – updates from the 2021 ESC guidelines, *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, 2023;, gfad011, is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfad011>

## **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# Management of heart failure in patients with kidney disease – updates from the 2021


## ESC guidelines

Nicola C. Edwards<sup>1,2</sup>, Anna M. Price<sup>1,3</sup>, Richard P. Steeds<sup>1,3</sup>, Charles J. Ferro<sup>1,3</sup>, Jonathan N. Townend<sup>1,3</sup>

On behalf of the Birmingham Cardio-Renal Group. Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Birmingham. UK. <sup>1</sup> Green Lane Cardiovascular Service. Auckland. New Zealand. <sup>2</sup> Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Birmingham. UK. <sup>3</sup>

Correspondence to: Nicola C. Edwards; E-mail: [nicolaed@adhb.govt.nz](mailto:nicolaed@adhb.govt.nz)

## GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



ORIG

## ABSTRACT

The wide overlap between the syndromes of chronic kidney disease and chronic heart failure means that familiarity with the 2021 European Society of Cardiology guidelines is of importance to nephrologists. The common risk factors for the two syndromes together with the adverse cardiac structural remodelling associated with chronic kidney disease means that many kidney disease patients are breathless and fall within the heart failure phenotypes categorised in the guidelines. The management of heart failure is evolving rapidly leading to significant changes in the latest guideline iteration. The 2021 guideline has changed from the 2016 version firstly by an increased focus on identifying the three phenotypes of heart failure to guide appropriate evidence based management. Secondly a new and simplified treatment algorithm for heart failure with reduced ejection fraction involving the rapid sequential initiation and up-titration of 4 ‘pillars’ of drug treatment – ACE inhibitors or angiotensin-neprilysin inhibitors, beta blockers, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists and now, thanks to convincing trial data, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors. Thirdly, guidelines for device therapy have been changed with down-graded advice on indications for primary prevention implantable cardioverter defibrillator therapy for patients with non-ischaemic heart failure and for cardiac resynchronisation therapy with left bundle branch block and a QRS duration <150ms. There are updated treatment plans for heart failure associated with non-cardiovascular co-morbidities including chronic kidney disease.

**Keywords:** cardiorenal syndrome, cardiovascular, CKD, echocardiography, guidelines, heart failure

## INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) affects 1-2% of the population in developed countries and at least 10% of those over 65 years of age [1]. There is extensive overlap between the syndromes of chronic heart failure and chronic kidney disease (CKD) not just because they share common risk factors such as diabetes and hypertension but because of the high prevalence of coronary disease and the even higher prevalence of non-ischaemic abnormalities of left ventricular structure and function in CKD. Historically, these changes have been termed uraemic cardiomyopathy, although the term CKD associated cardiomyopathy might be more appropriate given the high prevalence of changes evident in mild-moderate CKD [2]. The complex bidirectional relationship between cardiac and kidney function is well recognised but not fully understood [3, 4]. Standard heart failure therapies are chronically under-utilised in CKD, which reflects historical concerns about efficacy and observed reductions in eGFR with initiation of treatments [5, 6].

Clinical trials have shown that most of the guideline directed heart failure medications are effective in improving prognosis in patients with mild or moderately reduced kidney function but these trials have usually excluded patients with advanced CKD (eGFR <25-30ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) leading to a lack of evidence on which to base treatment in this group [6]. Perhaps the major contributions of the new 2021 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Heart Failure Guidelines to the field of cardio-renal medicine is to stress the long-term benefits of medical therapy on both prognosis and on kidney function in heart failure. The updated 2021 ESC guideline reflected the increasing complexity of heart failure management in its scope and size; they now extend to 128 pages [7, 8]. The major changes from the previous 2016 version with respect to heart failure with reduced ejection fraction are summarised in **Figure 1**.

In this review we aim to familiarise the nephrology community with the major updates which have emerged from the latest guidelines and where possible highlight applicability to the CKD-heart failure patient. Through sub-topics we outline i) the proposed diagnostic pathway including natriuretic peptides and imaging, predominantly echocardiography); ii) the changing terminology in heart failure classification, specifically the three phenotypes based on left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction and applicability of evidence-based treatment for patients with concomitant CKD; iii) the role of device therapies in HF with ejection fraction <35% and the reasons for judicious use in CKD. Finally, we outline newer therapies which have been prospectively evaluated in CKD cohorts but which were published after the 2021 guideline.

### **Heart failure diagnosis**

As in previous guidelines, the diagnosis of heart failure requires the presence of typical symptoms, usually breathlessness on exertion, fatigue and ankle swelling with signs such as elevated venous pressure and peripheral oedema. These features are non-specific, common in CKD and cannot be used alone to make a diagnosis. The recommended diagnostic tests are an electrocardiogram (ECG) (a normal ECG makes a diagnosis of heart failure unlikely), plasma natriuretic peptide (NP) concentration, usually N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide (BNP), echocardiography and chest radiography. Echocardiography allows the measurement of left ventricular ejection fraction (EF) and the classification of patients into heart failure with reduced EF (HFrEF <40%), heart failure with mildly reduced EF (HFmrEF 41-49%) and heart failure with preserved EF (HFpEF > 50%). For the diagnosis of HFpEF other abnormalities of cardiac structure and function such as left atrial enlargement and evidence of diastolic dysfunction are required together with elevated NPs. Guidance is given on further

investigation with cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, coronary angiography, cardio-pulmonary exercise testing and right heart catheterization for the diagnosis of specific causes of heart failure and for optimising management including evaluation for heart transplantation or mechanical circulatory support [7].

The use of NPs is strongly recommended, and it is usefully stated, that a plasma NT-proBNP of < 125 pg/ml makes a diagnosis of chronic heart failure highly unlikely (negative predictive value 94-98%). The magnitude of any elevation in NP is of prognostic value. A list of other causes of an elevated NP is given which includes those of cardiac origin, such as atrial fibrillation and left ventricular hypertrophy, and non-cardiac causes, including 'renal dysfunction'. No specific guidance is given on the use of NPs for the diagnosis of heart failure in patients with CKD although there are data suggesting that renal excretion varies minimally with an eGFR  $\geq 30$  ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>. This supports the diagnostic accuracy of standard cut-off for NPs in heart failure until the onset of CKD stage 4 [9]. In the diagnosis of *acute* heart failure where specific cut-offs are higher, a similar accuracy for patients with stage 3 CKD was identified and using age specific cut-offs (450pg/L for those under 50 years, 900pg/L for those 50-75 years and 1800pg/L for those over 75 years) proposed to negate the need to consider specific cut-offs based on renal function [10]. For patients requiring dialysis, elevated NPs are strongly associated with cardiovascular and total mortality but provide no diagnostic value for heart failure or left ventricular systolic dysfunction [11].

### **Heart failure phenotype classification; why the change to HFmrEF?**

The 2021 guidelines changed the terminology for patients with evidence of heart failure and an LVEF of 40-49% from heart failure with 'mid-range' EF to 'mildly reduced' heart failure,

cleverly keeping the abbreviation of HFmrEF. This was a pragmatic alteration introduced in part because of the inherent inaccuracy of EF measurement on echo ( $\pm 5\%$ ) which might lead some patients with borderline results to be misclassified and deprived of prognostically important medications. Although there are no dedicated randomised controlled trials (RCT) examining this phenotype of patients exclusively, retrospective analyses of HFrfEF trials including patients with LVEF 40-50% indicate prognostic benefit from the same drugs, albeit with reduced effect sizes [12]. This has significance for patients with CKD given that milder reductions in LVEF  $>40\%$  are more common in early-stage CKD and LVEF  $<40\%$  is seen as a late feature of CKD-associated cardiomyopathy [2].

### **Heart Failure Treatment Recommendations**

While clinical trials over almost 40 years have enabled the guidelines to recommend multiple drugs with clear evidence of prognostic benefit in HFrfEF, data for HFmrEF and HFpEF phenotypes have been less consistent, a difficulty widely thought to reflect heterogeneity and co-morbidities across the patient cohorts as well as differential treatment effects. There are major changes in recommended treatment in the 2021 guideline which are detailed below. The most important by far is the introduction of sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitors (SGLT2-I) for patients with HFrfEF independent of diabetic status.

#### ***Heart failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction***

The major strategy change in the 2021 Guideline has been termed the “Foundational 4 Pillars” (Figure 2). These consist of the three traditional drug classes; i) ACE inhibitors (ACE-I) or angiotensin receptor neprilysin inhibitors (ARNI) which are recommended to

replace ACE-I in ambulatory persistently symptomatic patients or in stable hospitalised patients who are ACE-I naïve patients or angiotensin receptor antagonists (ARB) if these are not tolerated, ii) beta blockers (BB) and iii) mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (MRA). The fourth pillar is SGLT2-I (currently dapagliflozin or empagliflozin) which receive a new class I recommendation irrespective of diabetic status. These drugs were introduced to treat hyperglycaemia in type 2 diabetes by causing glycosuria but have been incorporated into heart failure guidelines because of findings of impressive reductions in cardiovascular mortality (and in the case of dapagliflozin, total mortality) and in hospitalisation for heart failure (HHF) in large placebo controlled randomised trials (RCTs) in patients with HFrEF irrespective of diabetic status and in CKD with eGFR >30 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup> [13-15]. The new algorithm has moved away from slow sequential introduction and up-titration of drugs and instead focusses on rapid, low dose introduction of the four 'pillar' treatments over 4 weeks. The order in which these therapies are introduced remains debated and in CKD, is perhaps more complex because of their effects on renal haemodynamics and on the risk of hyperkalaemia. A proposed strategy for initiation and monitoring according to eGFR has recently been proposed involving careful monitoring and the use of MRA in moderate CKD (eGFR 30-60 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) only if eGFR remains stable on ACE-I, BB and SGLT2-I [16].

The rationale for the change from ESC 2016 "traditional recipe" reflects; the prolonged duration (> 6 months) of sequential introduction and up-titration if clinicians continue to strive to achieve *target* doses of each individual drug. This outdated approach has been superseded firstly because consistent data shows that a low dose of each of four agents yields significantly greater benefit than that observed with individual dose titration. Secondly, sub-analyses of recent large-scale trials have shown the magnitude of treatment benefit of each pillar drug to be independent of other agents reflecting different mechanisms of action [17]. Thirdly, trial data show that the Kaplan-Meier for curves for the effects of the 4 pillar drugs



on mortality and morbidity begin to separate early, within 30 days [18]. Finally, this approach appears to improve safety and tolerability as evidenced by lower rates of renal dysfunction and lower rates of hyperkalaemia. The 2021 guidelines provide no recommendation on monitoring of kidney function or dose titration if eGFR falls slightly (3-4 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>), as is commonly observed within 2-3 weeks of initiation [19]. In a later section on concomitant heart failure and CKD, the authors do note that although all the 4 pillar drugs including SGLT2-I cause an initial reduction in eGFR of around 5%, a moderate early decrease in renal function should not prompt their interruption. They state that an increase in serum creatinine of <50% above baseline, as long as it is <266 µmol/L (3 mg/dL), or a decrease in eGFR of <10% from baseline, as long as eGFR is >25 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, can be considered as 'acceptable'. In the longer term, SGLT2-I and the other pillar drugs, slow the progressive decline in eGFR, reduce proteinuria and ultimately preserve kidney function compared to placebo and should not be discontinued without strong reason [15, 20].

It is interesting to consider whether a similar approach to the '4-pillar' drugs could be applied to the management of CKD patients, especially those with diabetic nephropathy. The established approach of ACE-I/ARB could be combined with rapid prescription of SGLT2-I and MRAs. Indeed, trials with both SGLT2-I and the new non-steroidal MRA finerenone mandated treatment with maximally tolerated doses of ACEi/ARB. There is also strong theoretical and emerging evidence that the combination of SGLT2-inhibitors and MRA may have synergistic beneficial effects.

### ***Heart Failure with Mildly Reduced Ejection Fraction***

The HFmrEF (EF 41-49%) phenotype includes up to 25% of all heart failure patients and has mortality rates similar to HFrEF [12]. There remains debate as to whether this represents a

distinct phenotype or whether it reflects a transition phase depending on response to treatment and variability in the echo assessment of LVEF. To date there are no dedicated trials examining drug treatments in HFmrEF. Current evidence, drawn from observational studies and post hoc analyses of subsets of patients in HFrEF trials, suggests that patients with HFmrEF benefit prognostically from the 3 older 'pillar' drugs leading to weak class IIa (should be considered, level of evidence C) ESC recommendations. Although SGLT2-I were not recommended in the guideline, the landmark EMPEROR-Preserved trial in which over 30% of the 5988 patient cohort had a left ventricular EF of 40-50% demonstrated a reduction in cardiovascular death or HHF, primarily driven by lower risk of HHF [21]. Given these impressive clinical outcome benefits and the overlap between HFrEF, HFpEF and HFmrEF increasing SGLT2-I use is anticipated. In patients with CKD, the presence of HFmrEF should probably be seen as another indication for treatment with an SGLT2-I. This view is supported by the recently published EMPA-KIDNEY trial which confirmed safety and efficacy of empagliflozin across a range of kidney disease severities (eGFR 20-90 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>), levels of proteinuria and presence or absence of diabetes (see 'Heart failure patients with concomitant CKD' below) [22].

### ***Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction***

Heart failure with preserved EF remains the most heterogenous and problematic heart failure phenotype in terms of definition, aetiology, co-morbidities, diagnostic criteria and evidence-based treatment. It accounts for about 50% of heart failure cases in the community and in patients with CKD [23]. Its prevalence in CKD may be underestimated. Both exercise intolerance and the echocardiographic features of HFpEF including concentric LV remodelling, left atrial dilatation and diastolic dysfunction are common and increase with

CKD stage [24]. Abnormalities of both arterial and LV elastance are evident in HFpEF and have been reported in unselected patients with stage 2 and 3 CKD [25]. The guidelines focus on identifying the underlying cause of HFpEF (though they notably fail to mention CKD in this context) to direct appropriate treatment as well as excluding “mimics” such as obesity, physical deconditioning and obstructive sleep apnoea many of which are common in CKD.

At the time the guideline was published, no large RCT in HFpEF had achieved a significant reduction in their primary endpoint, although there were very promising signals in sub-group analyses of trials of spironolactone (particularly data from North America) and ARNI [26, 27] and this potentially explains the continued high use of ACE-I, ARNI, BB and MRAs by heart failure physicians. As mentioned above, the EMPEROR-Preserved trial showed that empagliflozin caused a reduction in the primary end-point of cardiovascular death and HHF of 21%, driven primarily by a reduction in HHF. The effect size was comparable to the benefit observed in HFrEF and was consistent across sub-groups of EF [21]. We anticipate that treatment with SGLT2-I will become widely adopted for HFpEF as it has for the other phenotypes. The impressive recent progress made on defining the place of SGLT2-I in heart failure has made the 2021 guidelines seem already in need of revision and provides support for reconvening guidelines committees to provide an agile and updated response for clinicians as new robust data emerges.

## **Devices for Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction**

### ***Implantable Cardiac Defibrillators (ICD)***

As in 2016, implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) implantation has a class I indication for secondary prevention in survivors of ventricular arrhythmia causing haemodynamic instability who are expected to survive for > 1 year. Implantation of ICDs for the primary

prevention of sudden cardiac also continues to have a Class 1 indication for patients with symptomatic HFrEF (NYHA II-III) with an EF of < 35% due to coronary artery disease (but not within 40 days of an acute myocardial infarction) independent of QRS duration [28, 29]. There has however, been a major shift in the 2021 guideline for the use of primary prevention ICDs for patients with HFrEF due to non-ischaemic causes. The use of ICDs for this group receives only a class IIa (should be considered) indication. Although the early landmark RCTs demonstrated significant total mortality reductions in HFrEF compared to treatment with amiodarone or medical therapy, albeit before high use of MRAs and availability of ARNI and SGLT2-I, subsequent trials failed to find convincing effects on mortality in non-ischaemic disease [30, 31]. The DANISH trial randomized patients with symptomatic non-ischaemic heart failure and left ventricular EF  $\leq$ 35% to ICD implantation or medical treatment alone. Total mortality was not reduced by ICDs even when follow up was extended to 9 years though sudden cardiac death was reduced by half. This probably reflects the diversity of causes of death in these patients. In a prespecified subgroup analysis, a significant age interaction was observed with reduction in all-cause mortality in patients under 68 years of age [31]. To date, however, no RCT provides compelling evidence of the benefit of ICDs for patients with non-ischaemic HFrEF despite the fact that repeated pooled analyses from RCTs have shown rates of ventricular arrhythmias to be similar between ischaemic and non-ischaemic groups.

### ***Cardiac Resynchronization therapy (CRT)***

Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) attempts to synchronise left ventricular contraction by pacing the lateral wall of the left ventricle via the coronary sinus. Prospective randomized studies have shown that this improves LVEF, functional class and rates of HFrEF and mortality in patients with HFrEF and an interventricular conduction delay (prolonged QRS duration) [32-34]. The 2021 guideline is consistent with the 2016 recommendation providing a class I

indication for patients with symptomatic HF, EF  $\leq 35\%$  (despite optimized medical treatment), LBBB and a QRS duration  $\geq 150$  ms. However, there has been a down-grading of patients with LBBB and a QRS width of 130–149 ms to a Class IIa (should be considered) indication. This change was based on results of two trials which have demonstrated unfavourable effects in patients with a QRS  $< 130$  ms despite echocardiographic evidence of LV dys-synchrony [32, 35]. The choice of device, CRT-P (pacing only) or CRT-D (pacing and defibrillator), remains challenging due to the overlap of indications for ICD and CRT therapies, contradictory retrospective analyses and a lack of prospective randomized studies showing mortality benefit from CRT-D compared to CRT-P [36, 37]. The current guideline is unchanged from 2016, with a class I indication for CRT-D in patients with HFrEF in NYHA class II-IV, sinus rhythm with LBBB and a QRS duration  $\geq 150$ ms and a class II (consideration) with QRS duration 130-149ms.

#### ***Device therapy in heart failure with concomitant CKD***

Cardiovascular disease, predominantly heart failure and sudden cardiac death are estimated to cause approximately 50% of deaths in end-stage kidney disease (ESRD) [38, 39] and yet the prevalence of device therapy in this cohort (including pacemakers for bradycardia) is estimated at only 5-10%. In keeping with pharmacological trials, patients with advanced CKD (eGFR  $< 30$  ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) have been excluded from most device trials leading to a lack of evidence of efficacy. A meta-analysis of three ICD trials and further retrospective data found no survival benefits in patients with a guideline indication and eGFR  $< 35$  ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>, a finding that likely reflects the competing risk of non-arrhythmic death [40]. In the only prospective trial investigating the value and safety of ICD implantation in dialysis patients with a left ventricular EF  $\geq 35\%$  (patient with a class I indication were excluded), ICD implantation was associated with no reduction in rates of sudden cardiac death or all-cause mortality after a median follow up of 6.8 years and the trial was terminated due to

futility and high rates of adverse events (27.5%) in the ICD group [41]. Furthermore, the high burden of non-cardiovascular comorbidities including vascular access issues, bacteraemia, bleeding and higher rates of lead related complications are important factors to be considered given the absence of data showing improved survival. The 2021 guideline acknowledges these data and highlights caution with ICD implantation in dialysis patients.

### **Iron therapy for heart failure**

Functional iron deficiency (ID), characterized by reduced iron availability and independent of anaemia is estimated to be present in 55% of patients with chronic stable heart failure, a figure that is consistent across the heart failure phenotypes [42]. Iron is a key micronutrient for cellular metabolism of cardiomyocytes and in heart failure the presence of ID is postulated to impair cardiac energetics and myocardial performance. Data from a meta-analysis and single RCT using IV iron in the form of ferric carboxymaltose (FCM) demonstrated reduced rates of HHF, improved HF symptoms burden, exercise capacity and quality of life scores [43, 44]. The stage of HF (NYHA II-IV) is predictive of disordered iron status and the 2021 guideline now gives a Class I indication to periodically screen for ID defined as absolute ID with a ferritin <100ng/mL or relative ID with the higher cut-off values for ferritin (100-299 ng/mL) if associated with reduced transferrin saturation (<20%). As in 2016, IV FCM is proposed for ID with symptomatic heart failure patients and LVEF <45% or recently hospitalised with LVEF <50%. Although not in the ESC Guidelines due to the timing of the publications, both the IRONMAN and AFFIRM-AHF trials strengthen the case for the use of intravenous iron in patients with heart failure [45, 46]. In CKD, ID is common and given the common co-existing HFpEF/HFmrEF phenotypes treatment with FCM is supported [47]. The results of the PIVOTAL trial have done much to alleviate prior concerns

regarding increased risks of thrombosis, vascular calcification, oxidative stress and infection in patients with CKD IV [47, 48]. In haemodialysis, the use of high dose IV iron sucrose in the PIVOTAL RCT, reduced HHF and death further supporting a direct effect of iron on cardiac tissue function [48]. Other formulations are not recommended in heart failure; oral iron replacement has no clinical benefit compared to placebo in intermediate end point trials and erythropoietin stimulating agents which increase haemoglobin but does not replete iron, failed to reduce all-cause death or HHF and increased the risk of thromboembolic events in the only large-scale randomized trial in patients with HF<sub>rEF</sub> [49].

### **Heart Failure Patients with Concomitant CKD**

The 2021 guideline addresses the co-existence of HF and CKD in a short section titled “non-cardiovascular co-morbidities”. This section remains brief as in 2016 and exemplifies the difficulty in extrapolating prospective heart failure RCT data when advanced stage CKD (eGFR <20-30 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) remains an exclusion criterion in most studies. The authors do emphasize that randomized trials have shown that patients with heart failure of all phenotypes and causes with concomitant early-stage CKD are at higher risk of events and that the beneficial effects of appropriate medical therapy, are similar, if not greater, than in the patients with normal renal function. They describe the significant benefits of using ACE-I / ARNI and BB in moderate CKD (eGFR >30 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) based on data from landmark trials compared to subjects with normal renal function. Data from sub-group analyses have highlighted the absence of interaction between drug benefits and renal function. We would also highlight the consistent and accumulating evidence from SGLT2-I trial literature for the benefits of reducing the progression of renal disease irrespective of heart failure or existing atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (**Figure 3**). Indeed the recently published EMPA-

KIDNEY trial demonstrated that empagliflozin is both safe and efficacious in reducing the risk of kidney disease progression or death from a cardiovascular cause in a cohort with a wide range of renal function (eGFR 20-90 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>) and proteinuria [22]. Proportional benefits were observed across a range of renal diagnoses and with a less than a third of patients having known cardiovascular disease.

The guidelines do not provide specific guidance on the use of the 4 pillar therapies in patients with pre-existing CKD including order of introduction, dose adjustment or frequency of monitoring of kidney function but independent groups have proposed strategies according to eGFR [16]. Given the clear evidence of benefit, the use of 4 pillar drugs and their rapid introduction in HFrEF with non-dialysis CKD should be strongly supported by nephrologists allowing for usual cautions and close monitoring of serum potassium. Indeed, withholding this new treatment approach would seem only to perpetuate the often cited complaint of therapeutic nihilism in patients with CKD. More recent evidence on drugs such as finerenone (a non-steroidal MRA) and SGLT2-I provides reasons for optimism that the very high adverse cardiovascular event rate in CKD can be effectively reduced (**Figure 4**). In DAPA-kidney, the beneficial effects of dapagliflozin on cardiovascular death and HFrEF in advanced CKD (eGFR25-30 ml/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) were comparable to that seen in HFrEF with early-stage CKD [50]. Finerenone effectively reduced the same end points in patients with diabetic CKD [51]. Two reviews summarise these data well [52, 53].

Historically renal medicine, unlike cardiology, has had a poor track record for producing good quality, large-scale randomised-controlled trials [54]. Furthermore, patients with CKD stage 4 or higher are routinely excluded from cardiovascular trials [54]. Pressure should continue to be put on regulatory authorities demanding the inclusion of patients with CKD of all stages in trials by governments and learned societies such as the European Renal



Association. Similar approaches together with incentivising measures have already improved the recruitment of women, children, elderly people and ethnic minorities into RCTs.

The evidence based renal landscape is changing rapidly. Even while writing this review, a number of pivotal and practice changing RCTs in both CKD and heart failure have been published utilising SGLT2-inhibitors, non-steroidal MRA and iron which do not feature in the published guideline but would strongly support their use in CKD-heart failure phenotypes. The next challenge is to produce rapid communication channels which translate the results of these studies into more timely guidance for practising clinicians. Guidelines from expert societies take a long time to produce and can often end up disagreeing with each other leading to confusion [55]. A collaborative approach from working groups of different societies such as the ESC and ERA would lead to guidance on ‘crossover’ clinical issues including heart failure and CKD that can be produced much more quickly and updated rapidly as evidence emerges.

## **SUMMARY**

Nephrologists should take the chance to familiarise themselves with the 2021 ESC guidelines on heart failure as not only are patients with CKD at high risk of heart failure but most patients with heart failure will develop some degree of CKD. Recent RCTs in both CKD and heart failure have contributed to our understanding of the overlapping nature of pharmacological treatments. Effective treatments are available to prolong life and reduce hospitalisation with heart failure of all phenotypes. The guidelines correctly state that ‘renal dysfunction and hyperkalaemia are the major causes of underuse of RAAS inhibitors, particularly MRA, in clinical practice’. Preventing unnecessary dose reduction or cessation

of heart failure drugs by advising tolerance of small or moderate falls in eGFR will lead to cardiovascular mortality benefits and simultaneous long-term reductions in the rates of progression of CKD.

#### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

NCE: Lectures fees from Novartis and Aspen.

CJF: Lectures fees from Bayer.

AMP, RPS, JNT: No conflicts to declare.

#### **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

No new data were generated or analysed in support of this research


ORIGINAL UNEDITED MANUSCRIPT

## REFERENCES

1. Groenewegen A, Rutten FH, Mosterd A, *et al.* Epidemiology of heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2020;22(8):1342-1356
2. Law JP, Pickup L, Pavlovic D, *et al.* Hypertension and cardiomyopathy associated with chronic kidney disease: epidemiology, pathogenesis and treatment considerations. *J Hum Hypertens* 2022
3. Edwards NC, Moody WE, Chue CD, *et al.* Defining the natural history of uremic cardiomyopathy in chronic kidney disease: the role of cardiovascular magnetic resonance. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging* 2014;7(7):703-714
4. Moody WE, Edwards NC, Madhani M, *et al.* Endothelial dysfunction and cardiovascular disease in early-stage chronic kidney disease: cause or association? *Atherosclerosis* 2012;223(1):86-94
5. Edwards NC, Steeds RP, Ferro CJ, *et al.* The treatment of coronary artery disease in patients with chronic kidney disease. *Qjm* 2006;99(11):723-736
6. House AA, Wanner C, Sarnak MJ, *et al.* Heart failure in chronic kidney disease: conclusions from a Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) Controversies Conference. *Kidney Int* 2019;95(6):1304-1317
7. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, *et al.* 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 2021;42(36):3599-3726
8. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, *et al.* 2016 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2016;18(8):891-975
9. van Kimmenade RR, Januzzi JL, Jr., Bakker JA, *et al.* Renal clearance of B-type natriuretic peptide and amino terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide a mechanistic study in hypertensive subjects. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009;53(10):884-890
10. DeFilippi C, van Kimmenade RR, Pinto YM. Amino-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide testing in renal disease. *Am J Cardiol* 2008;101(3a):82-88
11. Harrison TG, Shukalek CB, Hemmelgarn BR, *et al.* Association of NT-proBNP and BNP With Future Clinical Outcomes in Patients With ESKD: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2020;76(2):233-247
12. Savarese G, Stolfo D, Sinagra G, *et al.* Heart failure with mid-range or mildly reduced ejection fraction. *Nat Rev Cardiol* 2022;19(2):100-116
13. McMurray JJV, DeMets DL, Inzucchi SE, *et al.* A trial to evaluate the effect of the sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitor dapagliflozin on morbidity and mortality in patients with heart failure and reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (DAPA-HF). *Eur J Heart Fail* 2019;21(5):665-675
14. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, *et al.* Cardiovascular and Renal Outcomes with Empagliflozin in Heart Failure. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(15):1413-1424
15. Sarafidis P, Ortiz A, Ferro CJ, *et al.* Sodium--glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors for patients with diabetic and nondiabetic chronic kidney disease: a new era has already begun. *J Hypertens* 2021;39(6):1090-1097
16. Beltrami M, Milli M, Dei LL, *et al.* The Treatment of Heart Failure in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease: Doubts and New Developments from the Last ESC Guidelines. *J Clin Med* 2022;11(8)


17. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, *et al.* Influence of neprilysin inhibition on the efficacy and safety of empagliflozin in patients with chronic heart failure and a reduced ejection fraction: the EMPEROR-Reduced trial. *Eur Heart J* 2021;42(6):671-680
18. Morrow DA, Velazquez EJ, DeVore AD, *et al.* Clinical Outcomes in Patients With Acute Decompensated Heart Failure Randomly Assigned to Sacubitril/Valsartan or Enalapril in the PIONEER-HF Trial. *Circulation* 2019;139(19):2285-2288
19. Mende CW. Chronic Kidney Disease and SGLT2 Inhibitors: A Review of the Evolving Treatment Landscape. *Adv Ther* 2022;39(1):148-164
20. Sarafidis P, Ferro CJ, Morales E, *et al.* SGLT-2 inhibitors and GLP-1 receptor agonists for nephroprotection and cardioprotection in patients with diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease. A consensus statement by the EURECA-m and the DIABESITY working groups of the ERA-EDTA. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2019;34(2):208-230
21. Packer M, Butler J, Zannad F, *et al.* Effect of Empagliflozin on Worsening Heart Failure Events in Patients With Heart Failure and Preserved Ejection Fraction: EMPEROR-Preserved Trial. *Circulation* 2021;144(16):1284-1294
22. Herrington WG, Staplin N, Wanner C, *et al.* Empagliflozin in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2022
23. Lam CSP, Voors AA, de Boer RA, *et al.* Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: from mechanisms to therapies. *Eur Heart J* 2018;39(30):2780-2792
24. Ananthram MG, Gottlieb SS. Renal Dysfunction and Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. *Heart Fail Clin* 2021;17(3):357-367
25. Edwards NC, Ferro CJ, Townend JN, *et al.* Aortic distensibility and arterial-ventricular coupling in early chronic kidney disease: a pattern resembling heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Heart* 2008;94(8):1038-1043
26. Pfeffer MA, Claggett B, Assmann SF, *et al.* Regional variation in patients and outcomes in the Treatment of Preserved Cardiac Function Heart Failure With an Aldosterone Antagonist (TOPCAT) trial. *Circulation* 2015;131(1):34-42
27. Solomon SD, Rizkala AR, Gong J, *et al.* Angiotensin Receptor Neprilysin Inhibition in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction: Rationale and Design of the PARAGON-HF Trial. *JACC Heart Fail* 2017;5(7):471-482
28. Bardy GH, Lee KL, Mark DB, *et al.* Amiodarone or an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator for congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352(3):225-237
29. Moss AJ, Zareba W, Hall WJ, *et al.* Prophylactic implantation of a defibrillator in patients with myocardial infarction and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346(12):877-883
30. Kadish A, Dyer A, Daubert JP, *et al.* Prophylactic defibrillator implantation in patients with nonischemic dilated cardiomyopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350(21):2151-2158
31. Køber L, Thune JJ, Nielsen JC, *et al.* Defibrillator Implantation in Patients with Nonischemic Systolic Heart Failure. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375(13):1221-1230
32. Cleland JG, Abraham WT, Linde C, *et al.* An individual patient meta-analysis of five randomized trials assessing the effects of cardiac resynchronization therapy on morbidity and mortality in patients with symptomatic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 2013;34(46):3547-3556
33. Cleland JG, Daubert JC, Erdmann E, *et al.* The effect of cardiac resynchronization on morbidity and mortality in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352(15):1539-1549
34. Bristow MR, Saxon LA, Boehmer J, *et al.* Cardiac-resynchronization therapy with or without an implantable defibrillator in advanced chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350(21):2140-2150
35. van 't Sant J, Mast TP, Bos MM, *et al.* Echo response and clinical outcome in CRT patients. *Neth Heart J* 2016;24(1):47-55

36. Hadwiger M, Dagues N, Haug J, *et al.* Survival of patients undergoing cardiac resynchronization therapy with or without defibrillator: the RESET-CRT project. *Eur Heart J* 2022;43(27):2591-2599
37. Leyva F, Zegard A, Okafor O, *et al.* Survival after cardiac resynchronization therapy: results from 50 084 implantations. *Europace* 2019;21(5):754-762
38. Jankowski J, Floege J, Fliser D, *et al.* Cardiovascular Disease in Chronic Kidney Disease: Pathophysiological Insights and Therapeutic Options. *Circulation* 2021;143(11):1157-1172
39. Pickup LC, Law JP, Townend JN, *et al.* Sudden cardiac death in chronic renal disease: aetiology and risk reduction strategies. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2021;36(8):1386-1388
40. Kiage JN, Latif Z, Craig MA, *et al.* Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators and Chronic Kidney Disease. *Curr Probl Cardiol* 2021;46(3):100639
41. Jukema JW, Timal RJ, Rotmans JI, *et al.* Prophylactic Use of Implantable Cardioverter-Defibrillators in the Prevention of Sudden Cardiac Death in Dialysis Patients. *Circulation* 2019;139(23):2628-2638
42. Klip IT, Comin-Colet J, Voors AA, *et al.* Iron deficiency in chronic heart failure: an international pooled analysis. *Am Heart J* 2013;165(4):575-582.e573
43. Anker SD, Kirwan BA, van Veldhuisen DJ, *et al.* Effects of ferric carboxymaltose on hospitalisations and mortality rates in iron-deficient heart failure patients: an individual patient data meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2018;20(1):125-133
44. Ponikowski P, Kirwan BA, Anker SD, *et al.* Ferric carboxymaltose for iron deficiency at discharge after acute heart failure: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet* 2020;396(10266):1895-1904
45. Jankowska EA, Kirwan BA, Kosiborod M, *et al.* The effect of intravenous ferric carboxymaltose on health-related quality of life in iron-deficient patients with acute heart failure: the results of the AFFIRM-AHF study. *Eur Heart J* 2021;42(31):3011-3020
46. Kalra PR, Cleland JGF, Petrie MC, *et al.* Intravenous ferric derisomaltose in patients with heart failure and iron deficiency in the UK (IRONMAN): an investigator-initiated, prospective, randomised, open-label, blinded-endpoint trial. *Lancet* 2022
47. Del Vecchio L, Ekart R, Ferro CJ, *et al.* Intravenous iron therapy and the cardiovascular system: risks and benefits. *Clin Kidney J* 2021;14(4):1067-1076
48. Macdougall IC, White C, Anker SD, *et al.* Intravenous Iron in Patients Undergoing Maintenance Hemodialysis. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380(5):447-458
49. Swedberg K, Young JB, Anand IS, *et al.* Treatment of anemia with darbepoetin alfa in systolic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368(13):1210-1219
50. Heerspink HJL, Stefánsson BV, Correa-Rotter R, *et al.* Dapagliflozin in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(15):1436-1446
51. Pitt B, Filippatos G, Agarwal R, *et al.* Cardiovascular Events with Finerenone in Kidney Disease and Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385(24):2252-2263
52. Ortiz A, Ferro CJ, Balafa O, *et al.* Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists for nephroprotection and cardioprotection in patients with diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2021
53. van der Aart-van der Beek AB, de Boer RA, Heerspink HJL. Kidney and heart failure outcomes associated with SGLT2 inhibitor use. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2022;18(5):294-306
54. Ng KP, Townend JN, Ferro CJ. Randomised-controlled trials in chronic kidney disease--a call to arms! *Int J Clin Pract* 2012;66(10):913-915
55. Carriazo S, Sarafidis P, Ferro CJ, *et al.* Blood pressure targets in CKD 2021: the never-ending guidelines debacle. *Clin Kidney J* 2022;15(5):845-851



**Figure 1: The Evolution of the 2016 and 2021 Heart Failure Guidelines for Heart Failure reduced Ejection Fraction.**


1a. HFrEF management in the 2016 guidelines. 1b. HFrEF management in the 2021 guidelines. The major updates are: i) addition of SGLT2 I, ii) classification of the 4 foundational pillars including ACE I / ARNI, BB, MRBs and SGLT2-I, ii) rapid initiation of the four ‘pillar’ treatments at low doses ideally within 4 weeks with sequential up-titration, iv) reclassification of the recommendation for primary prevention ICD in non-ischemic cardiomyopathy and CRTP/D in with QRS duration  $<$ 150ms.



**Figure 2: The Foundational 4 Pillars.**

The 2021 ESC guidelines advocate the rapid introduction of all 4 pharmacological agents at low doses to reduce cardiovascular mortality and morbidity. These agents have also been demonstrated to be effective in CKD and renal outcomes. As heart failure and CKD often co-exist and exacerbate each other, using these drugs for both conditions should halt progressive decline of both organs in these patients.

ACEi; Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor. ARNI; Angiotensin Receptor-Nepriylsin Inhibitor. BB; Beta-blocker. MRA; Mineralocorticoid antagonist. SGLT-2I; Sodium-Glucose-Co-transporter 2 inhibitor.




**Figure 3: The Overlap between SGLT2 I Randomised Controlled Trials in those with CKD and Heart Failure.**

Heart failure (HF) and Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) are closely associated and share common co-morbidities and traditional risk factors. The renal and cardiovascular endpoints in this diagram are taken from four recent trials; two which recruited patients with CKD – CREDENCE and DAPA-CKD and two which recruited patients with heart failure - DAPA-HF and EMPEROR-preserved. Beneficial effects of treatment with SGLT2-I were seen on both renal and cardiovascular end points in both groups of trials.

\*The EMPEROR-Preserved trial excluded patients with a GFR  $<20\text{ml/min}/1.73\text{m}^2$  and the DAPA-HF trial excluded participants with a GFR  $<30\text{ml/min}$ .

CKD; Chronic kidney disease. CV; Cardiovascular. GFR; Glomerular filtration rate. HF; Heart failure. RRT; Renal replacement therapy





**Figure 4: Timeline of Randomised Controlled Drug Trials in those with CKD with Cardiovascular Mortality or Morbidity End Points.**

This diagram details the progress made in our knowledge of reducing cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in patients with CKD. Studies in the purple box took place prior to 2014. Studies in the yellow box are currently registered as ongoing clinical trials with clinical trials.gov and results are expected this year.

ALCHEMIST; Aldosterone antagonist chronic haemodialysis interventional survival trial. AURORA; A study to evaluate the use of Rosuvastatin in subjects on regular haemodialysis. CANVAS; Canagliflozin and renal events in diabetes with established nephropathy clinical evaluation. CREDENCE; Canagliflozin and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. DAPA-CKD; Dapagliflozin and prevention of adverse outcomes in chronic kidney disease. DAPA-HF; Dapagliflozin and prevention of adverse outcomes in heart failure. DECLARE-TIMI; Dapagliflozin effect on cardiovascular events-thrombolysis in myocardial infarction. DOHAS; Dialysis outcomes heart failure Aldactone study. DCOR; The dialysis clinical outcomes revisited. EMPA KIDNEY; The study of heart and kidney protection with empagliflozin. EMPA-REG; Empagliflozin cardiovascular outcome event trial in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients. EMPEROR-Preserved; Empagliflozin outcome trial in patients with chronic heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. EMPEROR-Reduced;

Empagliflozin outcome trial in patients with chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction. FIDELIO-DKD; The Finerenone in reducing kidney failure and disease progression in diabetic kidney disease. FIND CKD; A trial to learn how well finerenone works and how safe it is in adult participants with non-diabetic chronic kidney disease. FIGARO; Cardiovascular events with finerenone in kidney disease and type 2 diabetes. SHARP; Study of heart and renal protection. 4D STUDY; Die Deutshe diabetes dialyse studies. PIVITOL; Proactive Intravenous Iron Therapy in Haemodialysis Patients. TREAT; Trial to reduce cardiovascular events with Aranesp therapy. VERTIS CV; Evaluation of ertugliflozin efficacy and safety cardiovascular outcomes trial.

ORIGINAL UNEDITED MANUSCRIPT