Original Research Article

Effect of Sodium Glucose Co-Transporter-2 Inhibitors in Heart Failure Patients

ABSTRACT

Aim: To study the management outcomes of heart failure therapy with SGLT2-inhibitors added to conventional therapy and compare its effect in diabetic and non- diabetic heart failure patients.

Study Design: Prospective observational study.

Place and Duration of the Study: Department of Cardiology, Princess Esra Hospital, Telangana, Hyderabad, from August 2020 to January 2022.

Methods: The study included 100 heart failure patients who were divided into two groups based on administration of SGLT2 inhibitors. Group I consists of HF patients without SGLT2i and Group II: HF patients with SGLT2i. Subjective and objective parameters were recorded as well as the management patterns of the patioents were recorded during the hospital stay and the outcomes (improvement in NYHA class, rehospitalisation and mortality) were assessed at follow up.

Results:. Most of the patients included in the study belonged to NYHA class-III. In this study HFrEF was found to be more prevalent in both group I (71.4%) and group II (83.6%). There was a significant difference observed for ejection fraction both in Group-I (36.45 ± 0.6 vs 38.85 ± 0.75) and Group- II (34.3 ± 0..6 vs 39.2 ± 1.01) at admission and after follow up (P=0.001). In our study when the outcomes were compared between group-I and group-II, there was statistical significance observed for the improvement in NYHA class (54.2% vs 61.2%) and decrease in mortality (11.4% vs 4%) was also observed (P=0.01) at the end of 1 year follow up. The effect of SGLT2i on the primary outcome was consistent in patients regardless of the presence or absence of diabetes.

Conclusion: Our study highlights that when SGLT2 inhibitors are used for treating HF patients with or without diabetes, they can have a positive impact as they achieve outcomes like improvement in NYHA class, decreased rehospitalisation and reduction in mortality risk. The

study also indicates improvement in Left ventricular ejection fraction in case of HFrEF patients. Furthermore, randomization trials are required to determine the efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors in Indian population to ascertain its association with better outcomes and to further promote its use.

Keywords— **heart failure, left ventricular ejection fraction, SGLT2 inhibitors, diabetes, HFrEF.**

1. INTRODUCTION:

Heart failure (HF) occurs when the heart is unable to supply adequate blood and oxygen to the peripheral tissues to meet their metabolic demands. (1) India lacks reliable heart failure estimates due to a lack of a surveillance programme to evaluate incidence, prevalence, outcomes, and key causes of heart failure. (2; 3) Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a well-established risk factor for cardiovascular diseases, including HF. (4; 5) Although there is still an unmet need for additional HF therapies in diabetic patients, SGLT2i have begun to shift this paradigm. (4; 6; 7) SGLT2 are major transport proteins responsible for reabsorption of glucose (90%) in the kidneys proximal convoluted tubule. (8) Land-mark cardiovascular outcome trials have shown a benefit of SGLT2 inhibitors over placebo in the composite end point of cardiovascular mortality or HF hospitalizations. (4; 7; 9; 10) At this point, a number of SGLT2i that have been approved for treatment of T2D, are: empagliflozin (11), canagliflozin (10), and dapagliflozin (12), which have each shown improvement in cardiovascular outcomes in clinical trials.

This study aims for the management outcomes of heart failure therapy with SGLT2-inhibitors added to conventional therapy and compare its effect in diabetic and non- diabetic heart failure patients.

We sought to perform a prospective observational study examining the efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors, Empagliflozin (Jardiance 10 mg) and Dapagliflozin (Udapa 10 mg) in patients with HF, with or without diabetes, specifically interested in mortality and hospitalization endpoints, as well as the outcomes in subpopulations of HF patient.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

2.1 Objectives:

The primary objective of the study was to assess the variation in the management outcomes of heart failure (HF) therapy with SGLT2-inhibitors added to conventional therapy and compare its effect in diabetic and non- diabetic heart failure patients. The secondary objectives were to assess and compare the clinical characteristics, laboratory parameters, medication adherence and mortality risk in acute heart failure patients. The study also aims for optimizing the use of sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitor (SGLT2i) in patients with HFrEF.and HFmEF.

2.2 Study Design and Participants

This is a prospective observational study with a sample size of 100 patients who were admitted in the cardiology department of a tertiary care hospital. Patient enrolment was done from August 2021 to January 2022. The subjects were divided into two groups depending on the administration of SGLT2i- Group I: conventional HF therapy without SGLT2i (n=35) and Group-II: conventional HF therapy with SGLT2i (n=49).

2.3 Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria :

Patients who were above 18 years of age, NYHA(New York Heart Association) classification II-IV, diagnosed with de-novo or pre-existing heart failure(HFREF-

heart failure with reduced ejection fraction and HFMEF- heart failure with mid-range ejection fraction) were included in this study and also subjects with or without diabetes. Exclusion Criteria included patients below 18 years of age, patients with incomplete lab data, patients who do not comply to participate in the study, pregnant and lactating women, patients with type-1 diabetes and hypotension.

2.4 Assessment of medication adherence:

The assessment of medication adherence was done using Morisky Medication Adherence Scale is a validated assessment tool which has an eight item questionnaire that can be used to measure non-adherence in a variety of patient populations. The tool uses a series of short behavioral questions geared in such a way to avoid "yes-saying" bias commonly seen with chronic care patients. This allows the patient to respond to questions about non-adherence in a spirit of full disclosure. If a patient scores higher on the scale, they are evaluated as more adherent. If they score lower on the scale, they are presumed to be struggling with nonadherence. By understanding how the patient scored on the scale, it helps to identify underlying issues that prevent patients from taking their medications correctly. (13)

2.5 Assessment of mortality risk:

The assessment of 1 year and 3 year mortality risk of HF patients was done using Meta-Analysis Global Group in Chronic Heart Failure (MAGGIC) Risk Calculator. (14; 15) The variables included in the risk score are as follows: age, gender, body mass index (BMI), New York Heart Association (NYHA) class, systolic BP, smoking, DM, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), serum creatinine, use of RAAS blockers, beta blocker use, chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder (COPD) and HF diagnosed >18 months ago. (16)

2.6 Follow up:

The follow up of all the patients was done at 3 months (hospital follow up), 6 months (hospital follow up) and 1 year (telephonic follow up) respectively and the outcomes of the study were recorded at each follow up.

2.7 Outcomes:

The primary end point of this study was mortality and the secondary end points were recurrent hospitalizations (for acute heart failure) and improvement in symptoms according to NYHA classification which was compared between both the groups.

2.8 Statistical Analysis:

Means and standard deviations are provided for continuous variables whereas numbers and percentages for qualitative variables. Comparative analysis were performed using chi-square test and fisher's exact test for categorical variables and student t-test was used for continuous variables. The 5% level was used to identify differences in between groups that were of statistical significance (P value <0.05), since the CI is 95%. Statistical evaluations were performed using Sigma Plot Version 12.0

3. RESULTS:

3.1 Groupwise distribution:

Group-I included HF patients that were on conventional drug therapy without SGLT2i (n=35) while Group-II had HF patients with SGLT2i added to the conventional drug therapy (n=49). In Group-II (51.3%) there were mainly two SGLT2i drugs used based on availability of drug in the hospital

pharmacy, these included dapagliflozin (81.08%) and empagliflozin (18.92%). Dapagliflozin is less expensive than Empagliflozin.

3.2 Age and gender distribution:

Heart failure has become the main cause of hospitalization in people older than 65 years of age but in the present study the mean age among HF patients was found to be 56.42 ±2.2 whereas among Group II patients it was found to be 54.81±1.9. There was no significant difference obtained in age when both the groups were compared (p value = 0.586). (Table-1). The data collected on gender distribution revealed that there were more number of male subjects in both Group-I [65.71%] and Group-II [59.46%]. (Table-1).

3.3. Comparison of NYHA class:

The NYHA class was assessed and recorded upon admission for all patients. The results from the data obtained showed that HF patients with and without SGLT2i were found to be more in NYHA class III. We found no significant statistical difference in the NYHA class between the two groups [p-value=0.657].

3.4. Comparison of risk factors and comorbidities:

Smoking is a more common risk factor in both Group-I [28.3%] and Group-II [24.4%], it was observed that there is no statistical significance [p=0.681]. On comparing both the groups for the presence of comorbidities, a significant difference was observed in case CKD [28.5% vs. 8.1%; p=0.014].

3.5. Prevalence of different types of heart failure based on ejection fraction:

In this study HF patients with and without SGLT2i were found to be more with HFrEF. There was a significant difference observed for ejection fraction both in Group-I (36.45 ± 0.6 vs 38.85 ± 0.75; p < 0.001) and Group- II (33.86 ± 1.06 vs 37.15 ±0.99; p<0.001) at admission and after follow up of 1month. [Table-2] Improvement in LVEF was also observed both in diabetics (33.7 ± 0.9 vs. 37.4±1.05; p < 0.001) as well as non-diabetics (34.3 ±3.8 vs. 37.7± 2.7; p<0.03). [Table-3]

3.6. Comparison of random blood sugar:

For our study, we took Random blood sugar [RBS] as a parameter that indicated a significant difference both in Group-I (224.3±16.63 vs 161.65±6.49; p<0.001) and Group- II (253.91 ±14.38 vs 187.08± 9.3; p=<0.001) at admission and discharge.

3.7. Comparison of mortality risk using MAGGIC risk score:

The MAGGIC risk score was calculated for both group at the time of admission. When both of these groups were compared a very highly significant difference (p value<0.001) was observed in mortality risk at 1year and 3 year.

3.8. Comparison of medication adherence using MMAS-8:

The adherence to SGLT2-inhibitors [77.5%] was observed by comparing the conventional therapy [74.2%] adherence which indicated no statistical significance (p value = 0.661).

3.9. Comparison of final outcomes after 3 months, 6 months and 1 year:

The final outcomes (improvement in NYHA class, rehospitalisation and mortality) were compared and assessed for

both group-I and group-II after a period of 3 months, 6 months and 1 year.

Re-hospitalization was defined as a patient's re-admission to the hospital for acute heart failure. In group I, there was an improvement in NYHA class (14.2% vs 36.7%) and a lower death rate (5.7% vs 2%), and the outcomes were similar in terms of re-hospitalization (20% vs 8.1%) when patients were followed up for three months. (See table-5)

At the 6-month follow-up, there was a significant difference in terms of improvement in NYHA class, rehospitalization and mortality. In group I patients, a one-year follow-up demonstrated significant improvements in NYHA class (54.2 % vs 61.2 %), decreased re-hospitalization (31.4 % vs 24.4 %), but group I patients had a higher mortality rate (P=0.01). (See Table 5) There was one death linked to COVID-19. Only two patients (2.3%) died in the hospital, whereas the majority of the deaths (4.7%) occurred outside of the hospital.

The effect of SGLT2i on the primary outcome was consistent in patients regardless of the presence or absence of diabetes. In group II, when diabetic and non-diabetic patients with HF receiving SGLT2 inhibitor were compared both of them indicated improvements in NYHA class (41.3% vs 50%) and decrease in mortality (3.4% vs 0%).(See Table-4) Comparatively rehospitalisation within 1 year was also reduced in HF patients receiving SGLT2i, but there was no statistical significance.

4. DISCUSSION:

Heart disease associated with diabetes mellitus (DM) continues to be the leading cause of death worldwide. (17) Until recently, there were no HF therapies directed at glucose metabolism (18; 19). However, with the development of renal sodium glucose transport inhibitors (SGLT2i) there appears to be new hope. SGLT2 inhibition can reverse the cardiac remodeling seen in heart failure, thereby reducing left ventricular [LV] wall stress and improving cardiac function. (20) The study aims for the management outcomes of HF therapy with SGLT2-inhibitors added to conventional therapy and compare its effect in diabetic and non-diabetic heart failure patients.

In this study a total of 100 patients admitted in the cardiology department of the hospital during the duration of 6 months i.e. from August 2020 to January 2021 were assessed. Out of which 11 subjects were excluded from the study due to incomplete data and 5 were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. Hence 84 patients who met the inclusion criteria were followed up for 1 year and were included in the study, these HF patients were then categorised into two groups. Group-I included HF patients that were on conventional drug therapy without SGLT2-inhibitor (n=35) while Group-II had HF patients with SGLT2-inhibitor added to the conventional drug therapy (n=49).

Most of the patients included in the study belonged to NYHA class-III which is comparable to the (Empagliflozin) Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial [EMPA-REG trial] that included patients with both class III and IV symptoms. (21)

On comparing for the presence of comorbidities, a significantly more number of heart failure patients suffered with hypertension, diabetes, ischaemic heart disease and CKD.

Table-1: Comparison of general parameters between both the groups:

General parameters	Group-I	Group-II	P-Value
Age			
20-80	56.42±2.2	54.81±1.9	0.668
Gender			
Male	23 [65.71%]	33 [67.31%]	0.938
Female	12 (34.2%)	16 [32.6%]	
NYHA class			
II	5 [14.28%]	4 [8.1%]	0.657
III	20 [57.14%]	29 [59.1%]	
IV	10 [28.57%]	16 [32.6%]	
Variables at admission			
SOB	27 [77.1%]	33 [67.3%]	0.333
Systolic BP	120.87 ±2.26	129 ± 2.4	0.020
Diastolic BP	78.28 ± 1.66	80.7 ± 1.5	0.261
Pedal Edema	16 [45.7%]	23 [46.9%]	0.916
Risk Factors			
Smoking	10 [28.5%]	12 [24.4%]	0.681
Alcoholic	4 [11.4%]	3 [6.1%]	0.394
Tobacco chewer	4 [11.4%]	4 [8.1%]	0.624
Comorbidities			
HTN	24 (68.5%)	41 (83.6%)	0.070
DM	22 (62.8%)	39 (79.5%)	0.093
IHD	13 (37.1%)	19 (38.7%)	0.884
CKD	10 (28.5%)	4 (8.1%)	0.014*
COPD	3 (8.57%)	3 (6.1%)	0.667
Prevalence of HF			
HFrEF [<40% EF]	25 [71.4%]	41 [83.6%]	0.097
HFmEF [40-49% EF]	10 [28.5%]	8 [16.3%]	
Cardiac biomarkers			
Hs-troponin-1	1.64±0.66	3.26 ± 1.21	0.528
Nt-pro BNP	4881.0286±1668.59	5929.65 ± 1050.89	0.389
Length of stay	6.61 ± 0.39	6.78 ± 0.38	0.771
Follow up	35 (100%)	49 (100%)	0.974

Data are number (%) of patients, mean, standard deviation P value is calculated by independent t-test, chi square test Group I: patients on conventional therapy; Group II: patients on conventional therapy with SGLT2i; HTN-hypertension; DM-diabetes mellitus; IHD-Ischemic heart disease; AF-Atrial fibrillation; COPD-Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; OSA-obstructive sleep apnea; BP-blood pressure; NT-proBNP-N-terminal pro b-type natriuretic peptide

Table-2: Laboratory parameters comparison between heart failure patients with conventional therapy and SGLT2 inhibitor therapy:

Parameter	HF patients with conventional therapy		P-Value	HF patients with conventional therapy and SGLT2 inhibitor		P-Value
	BEFORE	AFTER		BEFORE	AFTER	
Sodium	139.54 ±1.9	139.14 ± 0.97	0.446	139.5± 1.46	138 ± 1.11	0.150
Potassium	4.58 ± 0.22	4.05 ± 0.12	0.020*	4.2 ± 0.09	3.8 ± 0.09	0.001*
Chloride	100 ± 0.55	99.94 ± 0.66	0.934	99.75 ± 0.6	97.5 ± 0.62	0.007*
Blood urea	50.74 ± 5.4	56.17 ± 5.01	0.285	55.28 ± 4.74	47.1 ±2.4	0.443
Serum creatinine	1.65 ± 0.14	2.22 ± 0.54	0.217	1.5 ± 0.17	1.54 ± 0.07	0.359
RBS	224.3 ± 16.63	161.65± 6.49	<0.001*	249 ± 11.7	181.1 ± 7.2	<0.001*
EF	36.45 ± 0.6	38.85± 0.75	<0.001*	34.3 ± 0.9	39.2 ± 1.01	<0.001*

Data are mean ± standard error, P value is calculated by paired t-test, Group I: patients on conventional therapy; Group II: patients on conventional therapy with SGLT2i; RBS-Random Blood Sugar; EF-Ejection Fraction

Table-3: Comparison based on laboratory parameters for diabetic and non-diabetic patients

Parameter	Diabetic patients [n=39]		P-value	Non-diabetic patients [n=10]		P-value
	BEFORE	AFTER		BEFORE	AFTER	
Sodium	139±1.7	138 ± 1.3	0.317	140.8± 2.8	137 ± 1.8	0.397
Potassium	4.1 ± 0.1	3.8 ± 0.1	0.003*	4.3 ± 0.25	4.1 ± 0.23	0.251
Chloride	99.9 ± 0.6	97 ± 0.7	0.005*	99 ± 1.2	97 ± 1.4	0.478
Blood urea	57 ± 5.7	46 ± 2.9	0.291	45 ± 5.8	47 ± 3.1	0.743
Serum creatinine	1.67 ± 0.2	1.57 ± 0.07	0.68	1.16 ± 0.14	1.56 ± 0.2	0.158
RBS	249 ± 13.03	180 ± 8.5	<0.001*	137 ± 10.1	107 ± 7.2	<0.001*
EF	34 ± 0.9	39 ± 1.14	<0.001*	33.5 ± 3.07	38.6 ± 2.25	<0.03*

Data are mean ± standard error, P value is calculated by paired t-test, Group I: patients on conventional therapy; Group II: patients on conventional therapy with SGLT2i; RBS-Random Blood Sugar; EF-Ejection Fraction

Table-4: Comparison of final outcomes in diabetic and non-diabetic patients after 1 year:

OUTCOMES	GROUP-II		P-VALUE
	Diabetics (n=39)	Non-Diabetics (n=10)	
Improvement in NYHA class	18 (46.1%)	6 (60%)	0.448
Rehospitalisation	6 (15.3%)	0 (0%)	0.222
Mortality	1 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	0.649

Data are number (%) of patients, P value is calculated by chi square test, fisher's exact test Group I: patients on conventional therapy; Group II: patients on conventional therapy with SGLT2i; NYHA-New York heart association

Table-5: Comparison of final outcomes:

Outcomes	GROUP-I	GROUP-II	P-value
3 months			
Improvement in NYHA class	5 (14.2%)	18 (36.7%)	0.045
Rehospitalisation	7 (20%)	4 (8.1%)	0.001
Mortality	2 (5.7%)	1 (2%)	0.057
6 months			
Improvement in NYHA class	11 (31.4%)	24 (48.9%)	0.111
Rehospitalisation	9 (25.7%)	7 (14.2%)	0.193
Mortality	3 (8.57%)	1 (2%)	0.172
1 year			
Improvement in NYHA class	19 (54.2%)	30 (61.2%)	0.013
Rehospitalisation	11 (31.4%)	12 (24.4%)	0.001
Mortality	4 (11.4%)	2 (4%)	0.01

Data are number (%) of patients, P value is calculated by chi square test, fisher's exact test Group I: patients on conventional therapy; Group II: patients on conventional therapy with SGLT2i; NYHA-New York heart association

At admission and discharge, blood samples from all patients underwent biological analysis. The serum electrolytes showed a significant difference for potassium both in Group-I and Group- II at admission and discharge which is comparable to the study conducted by Yshai Yavin that states SGLT2i are not associated with an increased risk of hyperkalemia or severe hypokalemia in patients with T2DM (22). In case of chloride, only Group-II showed significant difference, indicating that SGLT2i do not affect serum chloride levels which was not comparable to other studies. Diabetic patients with HF taking SGLT2i showed a significant difference both in potassium (4.1 ± 0.1 vs. 3.8 ± 0.1; p=0.003) and chloride (99.9 ± 0.6 vs. 97 ± 0.7; p=0.005) at admission and discharge.

There was no significant difference found in blood urea (p=0.443) and serum creatinine (p=0.359) investigated in Group-II (serum creatinine for non-diabetics, p<0.158) at admission and discharge similar to the meta-analysis of Yaowen Wang et.al. that indicated changes in creatinine being reported in two trials and changes in blood urea nitrogen (BUN) were reported in eight trials (23).

For glycemic efficacy, the mean changes from baseline in HbA1c and FPG were reported in ten trials, and the change from baseline in 2-hour PPG was reported in six trials (23; 24) as these are more dynamic parameters but this was not comparable with our study as we could not get HbA1c, FPG and PPG as proper data for this was not recorded. For our study, we took Random blood sugar [RBS] as a parameter that indicated a significant difference both in Group-I (p<0.001) and Group- II (p=<0.001) at admission and discharge this was also observed for both diabetics (p<0.001) and non-diabetics (p=<0.001).

Reduction in NT-proBNP levels as the primary endpoint of this study would have provided robust evidence with respect to

therapeutic effects of SGLT2i in heart failure (22) but in this study only at admission values for troponin and NT-proBNP were obtained for HF patients due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions.

Randomized trials for SGLT-2 inhibitors have indicated reductions in LV mass, LV sphericity and also improvement in LV ejection fraction in patients with HFrEF both in diabetics and non-diabetics (25). In this study HF patients with and without SGLT2i were found to be more with HFrEF. There was a significant difference observed for ejection fraction both in Group-I and Group- II ($p<0.001$) at admission and after follow up of 1 year. Improvement in LVEF was also observed both in diabetics ($p < 0.001$) as well as non-diabetics ($p<0.03$) which is comparable to the results of EMPEROR-reduced [EMPagliflozin outcomE tRial in Patients With chrOnic heaRt Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction] and DAPA-HF trials [The Dapagliflozin And Prevention of Adverse-outcomes in Heart Failure trial]. (25)

Of all the different risk scores the use of Meta-Analysis Global Group in Chronic Heart Failure (MAGGIC) Risk Calculator is recommended which calculates 1 year and 3-year mortality risk. (14; 15; 26) In this study, despite the fact that the MAGGIC risk calculator predicted a three-year difference in mortality between the groups, there was a substantial difference in mortality at one year in our investigation. This is likely attributable to poor outcomes among the Indian population, particularly those in lower socioeconomic strata, such as those in our study cohort. No new evidence was found in literature review that used MAGGIC risk score for predicting mortality risk with the use of SGLT2 inhibitors in HF patients.

There was no new reports regarding adherence to SGLT2-inhibitors in Heart Failure patients, we are reporting this for the first time.

The EMPA -REG - Outcome trial demonstrated a striking reduction for hospitalization for heart failure in subjects with established cardiovascular disease, an effect later also seen with other compounds of the SGLT2 inhibitor class (27) . In our study when the outcomes were compared between the HF patient without and with SGLT2 inhibitors, improvements in NYHA class (54.2% vs 61.2%), reduced rehospitalisation (31.4% vs 24.4%) and decrease in mortality (11.4% vs 4%) was observed in case of patients taking SGLT2-inhibitors, although there was no statistical significance observed. The effect of SGLT2i on the primary outcome was consistent in patients regardless of the presence or absence of diabetes. In group II, when diabetic and non-diabetic patients with HF receiving SGLT2 inhibitor were compared both of them also indicated improvements in NYHA class (46.1% vs 60%), reduced rehospitalisation (15.3% vs 0%) and decrease in mortality (2.5% vs 0%) but this indicated no statistical significance.

Our study highlights that when SGLT2 inhibitors are used for treating HF patients with or without diabetes, they can have a positive impact as they achieve outcomes like improvement in NYHA class, decreased rehospitalisation and reduction in mortality risk. The study also indicates improvement in Left ventricular ejection fraction in case of HFrEF patients. Furthermore, randomization trials are

required to determine the efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors in Indian population to ascertain its association with better outcomes and to further promote its use.

5. LIMITATIONS:

The design of our study is a prospective observational study. It is a single centre study, considering our institution's management of HF with SGLT2i differs from that of other institutions, the findings are less generalizable across all populations. Because of the pandemic condition and the limited number of hospital admissions, the sample size was reduced, and the study length was similarly limited. Self-reported adherence and adverse events evaluation interview have short comings such as social desirability bias and a tendency to overestimate adherence. Although measures such as pill count method was used, it can sometimes misinterpret adherence, since it fails to measure whether the medication was taken on schedule. For reasons of feasibility, we limited the sub grouping of patients according to ejection fraction. We restricted the study population to only reduced and mid-range EF. The COVID-19 pandemic may have also had an impact on the outcome.

6. CONCLUSION:

This study provides an insight into the effect of SGLT2 inhibitors when treating Heart failure patients in a tertiary care hospital setting. We have also determined the effect of SGLT2 inhibitors in HF diabetic and non-diabetic patients. In our study, we compared two groups: one that did not receive an SGLT2 inhibitor and was treated with conventional therapy, and another that received an SGLT2 inhibitor with conventional therapy. We found that HF patients who received a SGLT2i had better outcomes, such as improvement in NYHA class, fewer rehospitalizations, and a lower mortality risk. The MMAS-8 Scale used in the study indicated higher adherence to SGLT2-inhibitors. When both of these groups were compared to predict mortality risk using MAGGIC risk score for a period of 1year and 3 year, SGLT2i showed a decrease in mortality risk for a period of 3 years (60% vs 62%). Furthermore, we also compared the second group i.e., HF patients receiving SGLT2i based on the presence of diabetes. Outcomes obtained based on the comparison of diabetic and non-diabetic HF patients indicated that both the groups achieved similar outcomes i.e., improvement in NYHA class, decreased rehospitalisation and reduction in mortality risk. The study also indicated improvement in Left ventricular ejection fraction in case of HFrEF patients both in diabetics and non-diabetics Furthermore, randomization trials are required to determine the efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors in Indian population to ascertain its association with better outcomes and to further promote its use. This analysis needs repeating on a larger scale to ensure these findings are representative of wider practice.

CONSENT AND ETHICAL APPROVAL –

This study has been approved by institutional review board (IRB) of the hospital. A written informed consent form was obtained from all the subjects enrolled in the study.

References:

1. Malik, Ahmad; Brito, Daniel; Vaqar, Sarosh; Chhabra, Lovely. Congestive Heart Failure. *In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2022 Jan* . [Online] Nov 2, 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK430873/.
2. Huffman MD, Prabhakaran D. Heart failure: epidemiology and prevention in India. *Natl Med J India*. 2010;23(5):283-288. PMID: 21250584
3. Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev*. 2017;3(1):7-11. doi:10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2. PMID: 28785469
4. Cardoso R, Graffunder FP, Ternes CMP, et al. SGLT2 inhibitors decrease cardiovascular death and heart failure hospitalizations in patients with heart failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;36:100933. Published 2021 Jun 5. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100933 PMID: 34308311
5. Martín-Timón I, Sevillano-Collantes C, Segura-Galindo A, Del Cañizo-Gómez FJ. Type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease: Have all risk factors the same strength? World J Diabetes. 2014 Aug 15;5(4):444-70. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v5.i4.444. PMID: 25126392
6. Bhatt DL, Verma S, Braunwald E. The DAPA-HF Trial: A Momentous Victory in the War against Heart Failure. Cell Metab. 2019 Nov 5;30(5):847-849. doi: 10.1016/j.cmet.2019.10.008. PMID: 31693879
7. Verma S, Bhatt DL. More CREDENCE for SGLT2 Inhibition. Circulation. 2019 Oct 29;140(18):1448-1450. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.119.041181. Epub 2019 Jun 11. PMID: 31181959.
8. Ha CM, Wende AR. The Growing Case for Use of SGLT2i in Heart Failure: Additional Benefits of Empagliflozin in a HFpEF Rodent Model. JACC Basic Transl Sci. 2019 Feb 25;4(1):38-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jacbts.2019.01.003. PMID: 30847417.
9. McMurray JJV, Solomon SD, Inzucchi SE, Køber L, Kosiborod MN, Martinez FA, et.al.; DAPA-HF Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in Patients with Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction. N Engl J Med. 2019 Nov 21;381(21):1995-2008. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1911303. PMID: 31535829.
10. Neal B, Perkovic V, Matthews DR. Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular

and Renal Events in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2017 Nov 23;377(21):2099. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc1712572. PMID: 29166232.

11. Zinman B, Lachin JM, Inzucchi SE. Empagliflozin, Cardiovascular Outcomes, and Mortality in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2016 Mar 17;374(11):1094. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc1600827. PMID: 26981940.

12. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, Mosenzon O, Kato ET,et.al; DECLARE–TIMI 58 Investigators. Dapagliflozin and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2019 Jan 24;380(4):347-357. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1812389. Epub 2018 Nov 10. PMID: 30415602.

13. Gerardo Sison, (PharmD). The Morisky Medication Adherence Scale: An Overview. [Online] pillsy, 2018. https://www.pillsy.com/articles/the-morisky-medication-adherence-scale-definition-alternatives-and-overview.

14. Sawano M, Shiraishi Y, Kohsaka S, Nagai T, Goda A, Mizuno A, Sujino Y, Nagatomo Y, Kohno T, Anzai T, Fukuda K, Yoshikawa T. Performance of the MAGGIC heart failure risk score and its modification with the addition of discharge natriuretic peptides. ESC Heart Fail. 2018 Aug;5(4):610-619. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.12278. Epub 2018 Mar 9. PMID: 29520978.

15. Lytvyn Y, Bjornstad P, Udell JA, Lovshin JA, Cherney DZI. Sodium Glucose Cotransporter-2 Inhibition in Heart Failure: Potential Mechanisms, Clinical Applications, and Summary of Clinical Trials. Circulation. 2017 Oct 24;136(17):1643-1658. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.030012. PMID: 29061576; PMCID: PMC5846470.

16. Crespo-Leiro MG, Anker SD, Maggioni AP, Coats AJ, Filippatos G, Ruschitzka F, Ferrari R, et.al; Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). European Society of Cardiology Heart Failure Long-Term Registry (ESC-HF-LT): 1-year follow-up outcomes and differences across regions. Eur J Heart Fail. 2016 Jun;18(6):613-25. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.566. Erratum in: Eur J Heart Fail. 2017 Mar;19(3):438. PMID: 27324686.

17. Leon BM, Maddox TM. Diabetes and cardiovascular disease: Epidemiology, biological mechanisms, treatment recommendations and future research. World J Diabetes. 2015 Oct 10;6(13):1246-58. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v6.i13.1246. PMID: 26468341

18. Dunlay SM, Givertz MM, Aguilar D, Allen LA, Chan M, Desai AS, et.al ; Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Heart Failure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association and the Heart Failure Society of America: This statement does not represent an update of the 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA heart failure guideline update. Circulation. 2019 Aug 13;140(7):e294-e324. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000691. PMID: 31167558.

19. American Diabetes Association. 8. Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2018*. Diabetes Care. 2018 Jan;41(Suppl 1):S73-S85. doi: 10.2337/dc18-S008. PMID: 29222379.

20. Lopaschuk GD, Verma S. Mechanisms of Cardiovascular Benefits of Sodium Glucose Co-Transporter 2 (SGLT2) Inhibitors: A State-of-the-Art Review. JACC Basic Transl Sci. 2020 Jun 22;5(6):632-644. doi: 10.1016/j.jacbts.2020.02.004. PMID: 32613148

21. Patorno E, Goldfine AB, Schneeweiss S, Everett BM, Glynn RJ, Liu J, Kim SC. Cardiovascular outcomes associated with canagliflozin versus other non-gliflozin antidiabetic drugs: population based cohort study. BMJ. 2018 Feb 6;360:k119. doi: 10.1136/bmj.k119. PMID: 29437648

22. Yavin Y, Mansfield TA, Ptaszynska A, Johnsson K, Parikh S, Johnsson E. Effect of the SGLT2 Inhibitor Dapagliflozin on Potassium Levels in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Pooled Analysis. Diabetes Ther. 2016 Mar;7(1):125-37. doi: 10.1007/s13300-015-0150-y PMID: 26758563

23. Wang Y, Hu X, Liu X, Wang Z. An overview of the effect of sodium glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor monotherapy on glycemic and other clinical laboratory parameters in type 2 diabetes patients. Ther Clin Risk Manag. 2016 Jul 15;12:1113-31. doi: 10.2147/TCRM.S112236. PMID: 27486328

24. Cardoso R, Graffunder FP, Ternes CMP, Fernandes A, Rocha AV, Fernandes G, Bhatt DL. SGLT2 inhibitors decrease cardiovascular death and heart failure hospitalizations in patients with heart failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. EClinicalMedicine. 2021 Jun 5;36:100933. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100933. PMID: 34308311.

25. Zannad F, Ferreira JP, Pocock SJ, Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Brueckmann M, Ofstad AP, Pfarr E, Jamal W, Packer M. SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a meta-analysis of the EMPEROR-Reduced and DAPA-HF trials. Lancet. 2020 Sep 19;396(10254):819-829. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31824-9. PMID: 32877652.

26. Sartipy U, Dahlström U, Edner M, Lund LH. Predicting survival in heart failure: validation of the MAGGIC heart failure risk score in 51,043 patients from the Swedish heart failure registry. Eur J Heart Fail. 2014 Feb;16(2):173-9. doi: 10.1111/ejhf.32. PMID: 24464911.

27. Fitchett D, Inzucchi SE, Cannon CP, McGuire DK,et.al; Empagliflozin Reduced Mortality and Hospitalization for Heart Failure Across the Spectrum of Cardiovascular Risk in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME Trial. Circulation. 2019 Mar 12;139(11):1384-1395. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.037778. PMID: 30586757.

28. Mishra S, Mohan J, Nair T, Chopra V, Harikrishnan S, Guha S, et al. *Management protocol for chronic*

heart failure in India. 2018, Indian Heart Journal, Vol. 70(1), pp. 105-127. doi:10.1016/j.ihj.2017.11.015

29. Ayesta A, Martínez-sellés H, Bayés de luna A & Martínez-sellés M. *Prediction of sudden death in elderly patients with heart failure.* 2018, Journal of Geriatric Cardiology, Vol. 15(2), pp. 185-192. doi : 10.11909/j.issn.1671-5411.2018.02.00.

30. Shah AD, Langenberg C, Rapsomaniki E, Denaxas S, Pujades-Rodriguez M, Gale CP, Deanfield J, Smeeth L, Timmis A, Hemingway H. Type 2 diabetes and incidence of cardiovascular diseases: a cohort study in 1·9 million people. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2015 Feb;3(2):105-13. doi: 10.1016/S2213-8587(14)70219-0. Epub 2014 Nov 11. PMID: 25466521.
31. Dei Cas A, Khan SS, Butler J, Mentz RJ, Bonow RO, Avogaro A, Tschoepe D, Doehner W, Greene SJ, Senni M, Gheorghiade M, Fonarow GC. Impact of diabetes on epidemiology, treatment, and outcomes of patients with heart failure. JACC Heart Fail. 2015 Feb;3(2):136-45. doi: 10.1016/j.jchf.2014.08.004. PMID: 25660838.
32. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Pocock SJ, Carson P, et.al; EMPEROR-Reduced Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular and Renal Outcomes with Empagliflozin in Heart Failure. N Engl J Med. 2020 Oct 8;383(15):1413-1424. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2022190. PMID: 32865377.
33. Murphy SP, Ibrahim NE, Januzzi JL Jr. Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction: A Review. JAMA. 2020 Aug 4;324(5):488-504. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.10262. PMID: 32749493.
34. De Las Cuevas C, Peñate W. Psychometric properties of the eight-item Morisky Medication Adherence Scale (MMAS-8) in a psychiatric outpatient setting. Int J Clin Health Psychol. 2015 May-Aug;15(2):121-129. doi: 10.1016/j.ijchp.2014.11.003. PMID: 30487829.
35. Marwick TH, Ritchie R, Shaw JE, Kaye D. *Implications of Underlying Mechanismsfor the Recognition and Management of Diabetic Cardiomyopathy.* J Am Coll Cardiol 2018, Vol. 71(3):339–51. DOI: 10.1016/j.jacc.2017.11.019 PMID: 29348027