

CARDIOLOGY UPDATE 2006

Pharmacologic and Nonpharmacologic Therapeutic Approaches of Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure

Michalis Efremidis, MD, Loukas Pappas, MD

*2nd Department of Cardiology,
Evangelismos General Hospital of
Athens*

KEY WORDS: *atrial fibrillation;
congestive heart failure; rhythm
control; rate control; anticoagulation;
cardiac resynchronization therapy;
cardioversion; antiarrhythmic drugs;
catheter ablation*

ABSTRACT

Atrial fibrillation (AF) and congestive heart failure (CHF) constitute the two “epidemics” of cardiovascular disease that often coexist and result in significant morbidity and mortality. Due to the complex interaction between AF and CHF, neither can be treated optimally without treating both. Despite an extensive amount of research and literature about each of these disorders separately, there is a paucity of controlled clinical trial data for the management of AF among patients with CHF. Consequently, the optimal therapy of these patients remains controversial. New treatment approaches, both pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic, including catheter ablation techniques, as well as the results of ongoing clinical trials are likely to alter future AF management in CHF patients.

Atrial fibrillation (AF) and congestive heart failure (CHF) are the two “epidemics” of cardiovascular disease that often coexist and result in considerable morbidity and mortality. A causal reciprocal relation exists between AF and CHF. The prevalence of AF has been observed to increase in proportion to the severity of CHF [1].

The objectives of AF treatment include rate control, cardioversion and maintenance of sinus rhythm, and prevention of thromboembolism. In patients with recent-onset AF, anticoagulation and rate control should be used as front-line therapy before cardioversion is considered. If the patient is hemodynamically unstable, urgent cardioversion is clinically mandatory. For both acute and chronic AF it is clear that effective treatment of the arrhythmia depends on optimal management of CHF. It is essential not to overlook the treatment of precipitating factors and of the underlying etiology. A decrease in filling pressures and reduction of neuroendocrine activation will enhance spontaneous conversion to sinus rhythm in acute AF and help reduce ventricular rate in both acute and chronic AF. On the other hand, effective treatment of CHF may not be possible until ventricular rate is controlled or sinus rhythm restored. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition and AT1 receptor blockade may prevent or delay the development of AF in patients with CHF by unloading the left atrium and inhibiting atrial fibrosis [2-9]. Anticoagulation with warfarin is imperative in patients with AF and CHF, even if sinus rhythm is maintained.

*Address for correspondence:
Michalis Efremidis, MD
E-mail: micbear@otenet.gr*

RHYTHM VERSUS RATE CONTROL

The issue of rhythm control versus rate control for long-term therapy of AF in CHF represents a challenging therapeutic dilemma and an object of intense debate. A subgroup analysis of the AFFIRM trial [10] showed a trend toward better survival associated with rhythm control among patients with CHF. However, AFFIRM was not adequately designed to assess treatment strategies in this subset of patients because only 23% of patients in this study had a history of CHF. A recent retrospective analysis [11] showed that there was no difference in mortality after 2 years of rate control or rhythm control treatments in patients with CHF in predominantly New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional classes III and IV. A recently published prespecified substudy of the RACE trial [12] demonstrated that in patients with mild to moderate CHF (NYHA II and III), cardiovascular morbidity and mortality were comparable between those treated with rate control and those treated with rhythm control. However, there was a trend for higher mortality and major bleeding in the rate control group. The primary objective of the ongoing AF-CHF trial [13] is to determine whether restoring and maintaining sinus rhythm significantly reduces cardiovascular mortality compared to a rate control strategy in patients with AF and CHF.

RHYTHM CONTROL (RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF SINUS RHYTHM)

Because of the high risk of proarrhythmia and the danger of exacerbating heart failure of class I antiarrhythmic drugs [14,15], IV ibutilide, IV or oral amiodarone, oral dofetilide, or direct current cardioversion are the preferred approaches to convert AF in patients with CHF. Although ibutilide is hemodynamically well tolerated in patients with left ventricular (LV) dysfunction [16], the incidence of torsade de pointes (TdP) is increased in patients with a LV ejection fraction (LVEF) of <35% and therefore should be used with caution in this setting. The recurrence rate of AF after cardioversion in CHF is high. Prevention of AF with antiarrhythmic drugs is suboptimal. Oral amiodarone [17] or dofetilide [18,19] are the drugs of choice for maintenance of sinus rhythm. The use of amiodarone in patients with CHF and AF is not without risk. This population is very prone to the development of bradyarrhythmias requiring pacemaker implantation [20]. Amiodarone may increase the risk of sudden death in CHF patients with a history of previous TdP [21]. The rate of discontinuation due to noncardiac adverse effects is high. Additionally, amiodarone increases the plasma levels of warfarin.

RATE CONTROL

Current ACC/AHA/ESC guidelines [22] consider the ventricular rate controlled when the ventricular response ranges between 60 and 80 bpm at rest and between 90 and 115 bpm during moderate exercise. However, no study has validated these criteria. Rate control in AF is mainly based on pharmacological depression of atrioventricular (AV) nodal conduction.

There are no data on the safety and efficacy of β -blockers in acute AF and CHF. Esmolol, an intravenous, ultra-short acting β -blocker, may be a useful therapeutic option in the acute clinical setting due to its ability to be titrated according to changing circumstances. Moreover, despite the fact that β -blocker therapy is considered the standard of care in chronic heart failure, it is uncertain whether β -blockade provides a similar degree of clinical benefit for CHF patients with AF. A retrospective analysis, which assessed the use of metoprolol or carvedilol in patients with CHF and sinus rhythm or AF, demonstrated a significant improvement in LVEF in both groups [23]. A retrospective analysis of the US Carvedilol Heart Failure Trials Project showed a significant improvement in LVEF and a trend towards reduced mortality and CHF hospitalization [24]. Bisoprolol failed to show a survival benefit in patients with AF in a retrospective analysis of CIBIS II [25]. Prospective trials to clarify the impact of β -blocker therapy and the optimal therapeutic strategy in this group of patients are warranted.

In acute AF, digoxin is relatively slow and ineffective in controlling heart rate. Digoxin may also be ineffective in controlling heart rate in chronic AF when sympathetic tone is increased, as occurs in worsening CHF and during exercise [26-28]. However, in the context of chronic heart failure, digoxin may improve symptoms and reduce hospitalization [29,30]. Additionally, digoxin and β -blockers produce a synergistic effect on the AV node [31]. A retrospective analysis of the US Carvedilol Heart Failure Trials Project demonstrated a better survival benefit of carvedilol in patients with CHF treated with digoxin [24]. In a group of 47 patients with predominantly NYHA II CHF, the combination of carvedilol and digoxin was superior to either carvedilol or digoxin alone in controlling ventricular rate and reducing symptoms [33].

Amiodarone is an interesting alternative in patients in whom both rapid rate control and cardioversion are considered appropriate [33]. Verapamil and diltiazem should be avoided in the acute setting as they may worsen CHF. For long-term rate control of chronic AF, diltiazem is a controversial alternative [34-36].

NONPHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY

In 10% to 15% of patients with AF ventricular rate cannot be controlled sufficiently by pharmacologic means [37]. In such cases, radiofrequency catheter ablation of the AV node with permanent pacemaker implantation (“ablate and pace” strategy) is a useful alternative. The only randomized controlled study comparing pharmacological rate control versus AV node ablation and VVIR pacing in AF patients with CHF demonstrated an improvement in symptoms in the “ablate and pace” group [38]. The choice of pacing site appears crucial in the setting of CHF. The PAVE trial [39] prospectively compared chronic biventricular pacing to right ventricular pacing in patients undergoing ablation of the AV node for management of AF with rapid ventricular rates and demonstrated that biventricular pacing provides a significant improvement in the 6-min walk test and in LVEF compared to right ventricular pacing. These beneficial effects of cardiac resynchronization appear to be greater in patients with impaired systolic function or with symptomatic heart failure.

Limited available evidence suggests a beneficial effect of cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) in patients with chronic AF, although larger studies are needed. Several single-center studies with a relatively small number of patients have demonstrated acute hemodynamic improvement in patients with chronic AF receiving CRT [40,41], as well as improvement in echocardiographic parameters [42]. Two studies reported comparable benefit of CRT in patients with AF as compared to patients with sinus rhythm [43,44]. To date, only one prospective randomized and controlled trial designed to assess the efficacy of CRT in AF patients with severe CHF has been published [45]. It showed a significant improvement in NYHA functional class, 6-min walking distance and quality of life with effective CRT therapy (>85% of time). In addition, LV reverse remodeling was observed with a reduction in hospitalization rate for CHF. It was subsequently demonstrated that the benefit of CRT was sustained at 12 months [46]. An important issue remains whether CRT in patients with chronic AF should be accompanied by AV nodal ablation in order to avoid inhibition of resynchronization therapy by the rapid intrinsic AV nodal conduction.

Curative catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation, currently effected with pulmonary vein isolation procedures, has been established as an effective therapeutic option mainly for patients without significant heart disease. A recent retrospective study examined the effect of catheter ablation of AF on LV function in 94 patients with LV dysfunction [47]. The study showed a nonsignificant overall increase of 5% in LVEF after ablation. However, a recently published study [48], which prospectively evaluated the effect of catheter ablation for AF on LV function in patients with CHF, showed that restoration and maintenance of sinus rhythm by catheter ablation without the

use of drugs significantly improve cardiac function, symptoms, exercise capacity, and quality of life.

CONCLUSION

Because of the complex interaction between AF and CHF, neither can be treated optimally without treating both. Despite the extensive amount of research and literature about each of these disorders separately, there is a paucity of controlled clinical trial data for the management of AF among patients with CHF. Consequently, the optimal therapy of these patients remains controversial. New treatment approaches, both pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic, as well as the results of ongoing clinical trials are likely to alter AF management in CHF patients in the near future.

REFERENCES

1. Maisel WH, Stevenson LW. Atrial fibrillation in heart failure: epidemiology, pathophysiology, and rationale for therapy. *Am J Cardiol* 2003; 91:2D-8D.
2. Pedersen OD, Bagger H, Køber L, et al., for the TRACE Study Group. Trandolapril reduces the incidence of atrial fibrillation after acute myocardial infarction in patients with left ventricular dysfunction. *Circulation* 1999; 100:376-380.
3. Hernandez-Madrid A, Bueno MG, Rebollo JG, et al. Use of irbesartan to maintain sinus rhythm in patients with long lasting persistent atrial fibrillation: a prospective and randomized study. *Circulation* 2002; 106:331-336.
4. Vermees E, Tardif JC, Bourassa MG, et al. Enalapril decreases the incidence of atrial fibrillation in patients with left ventricular dysfunction: insight from the Studies Of Left Ventricular Dysfunction. *Circulation* 2003; 107:2926-2931.
5. Wachtell K, Lehto M, Hornestam B, et al. Losartan reduces the risk of new-onset atrial fibrillation in hypertensive patients with ECG left ventricular hypertrophy: the LIFE study. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24:504 [abstract].
6. Ueng KC, Tsai TP, et al. Use of enalapril to facilitate sinus rhythm maintenance after external cardioversion of long-standing persistent atrial fibrillation. Results of a prospective and controlled study. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24:2090-2998.
7. Swedberg K, Pfeffer M, Cohen-Solal A, et al. Prevention of atrial fibrillation in symptomatic chronic heart failure by candesartan: results from CHARM. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004; 43: 222A [abstract].
8. Murray KT, Rottman JN, Arbogast PJ, et al; the AFFIRM investigators. Inhibition of angiotensin II signaling and occurrence of atrial fibrillation in AFFIRM. *Heart Rhythm* 2004 6: 669-675.
9. Maggioni AP, Latini R, et al, Val-HeFT Investigators. Valsartan reduces the incidence of atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure: results from the Valsartan Heart Failure Trial (Val-HeFT). *Am Heart J* 2005; 149:548-557.

10. The Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) Investigators. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 347:1825-1833.
11. Al-Khatib SM, Shaw LK, Lee KL, O'Connor C, Califf RM. Is rhythm control superior to rate control in patients with atrial fibrillation and congestive heart failure? *Am J Cardiol* 2004;94: 797-800.
12. Hagens VE, Crijns HJ, et al; RACE study group. Rate control versus rhythm control for patients with persistent atrial fibrillation with mild to moderate heart failure: results from the RATE Control versus Electrical cardioversion (RACE) study. *Am Heart J* 2005;149:1106-1111.
13. Rationale and design of a study assessing treatment strategies of atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure: the Atrial Fibrillation and Congestive Heart Failure (AF-CHF) trial. *Am Heart J* 2002; 144:597-607.
14. Flaker GC, Blackshear JL, McBride R, Kronmal RA, Halperin JL, Hart RG. Antiarrhythmic drug therapy and cardiac mortality in atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1992; 20:527-532.
15. Hallstrom A, Pratt CM, Greene HL, Huther M, Gottlieb S, De-Maria A, Young JB. Relations between heart failure, ejection fraction, arrhythmia suppression and mortality: Analysis of the Cardiac Arrhythmia Suppression Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1995; 25:1250-1257.
16. Vanderlugt JT, Mattioni T, Denker S, et al. Efficacy and safety of ibutilide fumarate for the conversion of atrial arrhythmias after cardiac surgery. *Circulation* 1999; 100:369-375.
17. Deedwania PC, Singh BN, Ellenbogen K, for the Department of Veterans Affairs CHF-STAT Investigators. Spontaneous conversion and maintenance of sinus rhythm by amiodarone in patients with heart failure and atrial fibrillation: observations from the Veterans Affairs Congestive Heart Failure Survival Trial of Antiarrhythmic Therapy (CHFSTAT). *Circulation* 1998; 98:2574-2579.
18. Torp-Pedersen C, Moller M, Bloch-Thomsen PE, Kober L, Sandoe E, Egstrup K, et al. Dofetilide in patients with congestive heart failure and left ventricular dysfunction. Danish Investigations of Arrhythmia and Mortality on Dofetilide Study Group. *New Engl J Med* 1999; 341:857-865.
19. Pedersen OD, Bagger H, Keller N, Marchant B, Kober L, Torp-Pedersen C. Efficacy of dofetilide in the treatment of atrial fibrillation-flutter in patients with reduced left ventricular function: a Danish Investigations of Arrhythmia and Mortality on Dofetilide Study. *Circulation* 2001; 104:292-296.
20. Weinfeld MS, Drazner MH, Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW: Early outcome of initiating amiodarone for atrial fibrillation in advanced heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2000; 19: 638-643.
21. Middlekauff HR, Stevenson WG, Saxon LA, Stevenson LW: Amiodarone and torsades de pointes in patients with advanced heart failure. *Am J Cardiol* 1995; 76:499-502.
22. Fuster V, Ryden LE, Asinger RV, et al. Task Force Report: ACC/AHA/ESC guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation. *Eur Heart J* 2001; 22:1852-923.
23. Fung JW, Chan SK, Yeung LY, Sanderson JE. Is beta-blockade useful in heart failure patients with atrial fibrillation? An analysis of data from two previously completed prospective trials. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2002; 4:489-494.
24. Joglar JA, Acosta AP, Shusterman NH, Ramaswamy K, Kowal RC, Barbera SJ, et al. Effect of carvedilol on survival and hemodynamics in patients with atrial fibrillation and left ventricular dysfunction: retrospective analysis of the US Carvedilol Heart Failure Trials Project. *Am Heart J* 2001; 142:498-501.
25. Lechat P, Hulot JS, Escolano S, Mallet A, Leizorovicz A, Werhlen-Grandjean M, et al. Heart rate and cardiac rhythm relationships with bisoprolol benefit in chronic heart failure in CIBIS II Trial. *Circulation* 2001; 103:1428-1433.
26. Goldman S, Probst P, Selzer A, Cohn K. Inefficacy of "therapeutic" serum levels of digoxin in controlling the ventricular rate in atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol* 1975; 35:651-655.
27. Beasley R, Smith DA, Mchaffe DJ. Exercise heart rates at different serum digoxin concentrations in patients with atrial fibrillation. *Br Med J* 1985; 290: 570-576.
28. Falk RH, Leavitt JI. Digoxin for atrial fibrillation: A drug whose time has gone? *Ann Int Med* 1991; 114: 573-575.
29. Garg R, Gorlin R, Smith T, Yusuf S. The effect of digoxin on mortality and morbidity in patients with heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 1997; 336: 525-533.
30. Yusuf S. Digoxin in heart failure: results of the recent Digoxin Investigation Group trial in the context of other treatments for heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 1997; 18: 1685-1688.
31. Farshi R, Kistner D, Sarma JS, et al. Ventricular rate control in chronic atrial fibrillation during daily activity and programmed exercise: a crossover open label study of five drug regimens. *J Am Col Cardiol* 1999; 33:304-310.
32. Khand AU, Rankin AC, Martin W, et al. Carvedilol alone or in combination with digoxin for the management of atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure? *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;42: 1944-1951.
33. Clemo HF, Wood MA, Gilligan DM, Ellenbogen KA. Intravenous amiodarone for acute heart rate control in the critically ill patient with atrial tachyarrhythmias. *Am J Cardiol* 1998; 81: 594-598.
34. Goldstein RE, Boccuzzi SJ, Cruess D. Diltiazem increases late-onset congestive heart failure in postinfarction patients with early reduction in ejection fraction. *Circulation* 1991; 83: 52-60.
35. Figulla HR, Gletzen F, Zeymer U et al. Diltiazem improves cardiac function and exercise capacity in patients with idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy: Results of the diltiazem in dilated cardiomyopathy trial. *Circulation* 1996; 94:346-352.
36. Liao YH. Interventional study of diltiazem in dilated cardiomyopathy: A report of multiple center clinical trial in China. Chinese cooperative group of diltiazem intervention trial in dilated cardiomyopathy. *Int J Cardiol* 1998; 64:25-30.
37. Crijns HJ, Van Gelder IC, Van Gilst WH, Hillege H, Gosselink AM, Lie KI: Serial antiarrhythmic drug treatment to maintain sinus rhythm after electrical cardioversion for chronic atrial

- fibrillation or atrial flutter. *Am J Cardiol* 1991; 68:335-341.
38. Brignole M, Menozzi C, Gianfranchi L, Musso G, Mureddu R, Bottoni N, et al. Assessment of atrioventricular junction ablation and VVIR pacemaker versus pharmacological treatment in patients with heart failure and chronic atrial fibrillation. *Circulation* 1998; 98:953-960.
 39. Doshi RN, Daoud EG, Fellows C, et al; PAVE Study Group. Left ventricular-based cardiac stimulation post AV nodal ablation evaluation (the PAVE study). *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol* 2005; 16:1160-1165.
 40. Etienne Y, Mansourati J, Gilard M, et al. Evaluation of left ventricular based pacing in patients with congestive heart failure and atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol* 2000; 83:1138-1140.
 41. Hay I, Melenosky V, Fetcs B, et al. Short-term effects of right-left heart sequential cardiac resynchronization in patients with heart failure, chronic atrial fibrillation and atrioventricular nodal block. *Circulation* 2004; 110:3404-3410.
 42. Leon A, Greenberg J, Kanuru N, et al. Cardiac resynchronization inpatients with congestive heart failure and chronic atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002; 39:1258-1263.
 43. Leclercq C, Victor F, Alonso C, et al. Comparative effects of permanent biventricular pacing for refractory heart failure in patients with stable sinus rhythm or chronic atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol* 2000; 85:1154-1156.
 44. Molhoek SG, Bax JJ, Bleeker GB, et al. Comparison of response to cardiac resynchronization therapy in patients with sinus rhythm versus chronic atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol* 2004; 94:1506-1509.
 45. Leclercq C, Walker S, Linde C, et al. Comparative effects of permanent biventricular and right-univentricular pacing in heart failure patients with chronic atrial fibrillation. *Eur Heart J* 2002; 23:1780-1787.
 46. Linde C, Leclercq C, Rex S, et al. Long-term benefits of biventricular pacing in congestive heart failure: results from the MUSTIC study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002; 40:111-118.
 47. Chen MS, Marrouche NF, Khaykin Y, et al. Pulmonary vein isolation for the treatment of atrial fibrillation in patients with impaired systolic function. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004; 43:1004-1009.
 48. Hsu LF, Jais P, Sanders P, et al. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351:2373-2383.