

Clinical Investigation

Clinical and Hemodynamic Correlates and Prognostic Value of VE/VCO₂ Slope in Patients With Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction and Pulmonary Hypertension

SEBASTIAAN H. C. KLAASSEN, BSc, LICETTE C. Y. LIU, MD, PhD, YORAN M. HUMMEL, PhD, KEVIN DAMMAN, MD, PhD, PETER VAN DER MEER, MD, PhD, ADRIAAN A. VOORS, MD, PhD, ELKE S. HOENDERMIS, MD, PhD, AND DIRK J. VAN VELDHUISEN, MD, PhD

Groningen, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Background: Impaired exercise capacity is one of the hallmarks of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), but the clinical and hemodynamic correlates and prognostic value of exercise testing in patients with HFpEF is unknown.

Methods: Patients with HFpEF (left ventricular ejection fraction [LVEF] $\geq 45\%$) and pulmonary hypertension underwent cardiopulmonary exercise test (CPX) to measure maximal (peak VO₂) and submaximal (ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide [VE/VCO₂] slope) exercise capacity. In addition, right heart catheterization was performed. Patients were grouped in tertiles based on the VE/VCO₂ slope. Univariate and multivariate regression analyses were performed. A Cox regression analysis was performed to determine the mortality during follow-up.

Results: We studied 88 patients: mean age 73 ± 9 years, 67% female, mean LVEF 58%, median N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) 840 (interquartile range 411–1938) ng/L. Patients in the highest VE/VCO₂ tertile had the most severe HF, as reflected in higher New York Heart Association functional class and higher NT-proBNP plasma levels (all $P < .05$ for trend), whereas LVEF was similar between the groups. Multivariable regression analysis with backward elimination on invasive hemodynamic measurements showed that VE/VCO₂ slope was independently associated with pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR). Cox regression analysis showed that increased VE/VCO₂ slope (but not peak VO₂) was independently associated with increased mortality.

Conclusion: Increased VE/VCO₂ slope was associated with more severe disease and higher PVR and was independently associated with increased mortality in patients with HFpEF. (*J Cardiac Fail* 2017;23:777–782)

Key Words: VE/VCO₂ slope, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction, cardiopulmonary exercise test.

Approximately 50% of patients with heart failure have a preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF).¹ HFpEF is associated with high morbidity and mortality, and no evidence-based

therapies are available for these patients.² Increased pulmonary arterial pressure is another important factor that is associated with the severity of HFpEF and consequently results in higher mortality.³

In addition to standard diagnostic tests, cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPX) provides useful information regarding the clinical condition of patients.⁴ Although peak VO₂ is the criterion standard in patients with heart failure, HFpEF patients often do not achieve peak VO₂ owing to elderly age and the presence of multiple comorbidities.⁵ The VE/VCO₂ slope can be determined from submaximal exercise testing. Measurement of the slope of V_E versus V_{CO2} (VE/VCO₂ slope) during incremental exercise below the ventilatory compensation point is a prognostic indicator in patients with heart failure (HF) with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF),⁶

From the Department of Cardiology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

Manuscript received November 23, 2016; revised manuscript received June 28, 2017; revised manuscript accepted July 17, 2017.

Reprint requests: Peter van der Meer MD, PhD, Department of Cardiology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, PO Box 30 0001, Hanzplein 1, 9700 RB Groningen, The Netherlands. Tel: +31 503612355; Fax: +31 503611347. E-mail: p.van.der.meer@umcg.nl.

1071-9164/\$ - see front matter

© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2017.07.397>

wbut the clinical characteristics and prognostic value of increased VE/VCO₂ slope in patients with HFpEF is unknown.⁷ In the present study, we investigated the VE/VCO₂ slope during CPX in HFpEF patients to reveal its association with both invasive and noninvasive predictors and clinical outcome.

Methods

Study Design and Patient Selection

From October 2011 to September 2014, we retrospectively identified 102 patients with HFpEF based on heart failure symptoms (New York Heart Association [NYHA] functional class \geq II), left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) \geq 45%, and signs of pulmonary hypertension on an earlier echocardiogram who were referred to the catheterization laboratory for routine left- and right-sided cardiac catheterization. At the same time as the catheterization, echocardiographic assessments were performed. Within 1 week after catheterization, exercise tolerance tests on a treadmill were carried out when patients were capable to do an exercise test, and during the exercise the VO₂ max test was performed. After these screening tests, a subset of the study patients were recruited for a single-center prospective randomized placebo-controlled trial investigating the effects of sildenafil in HFpEF with pulmonary hypertension.⁸ Fifty-two of these patients were included in this trial, of which 26 were allocated to the sildenafil group.

Study Procedures

In all of the screened patients (n = 102), clinical and laboratory assessments were conducted regarding NYHA functional class, heart rhythm, medication usage, and N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) and electrolyte plasma levels. In clinically stable patients, right-sided heart catheterization (HC) and simultaneous echocardiography were performed. These tests were executed by the same cardiologist and ultrasound technician in all of the patients. Echocardiographic parameters LV wall thickness, mitral valve velocities, tissue Doppler parameters, and systolic and diastolic ventricular end volumes were collected. During the right-sided HC the pressures in the right atrium, right ventricle, and pulmonary artery and in wedge position were obtained and cardiac output and pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) calculated with the use of the Fick method. In 88 patients, CPX was performed; 14 patients were either not able or refused to undergo this procedure. All data points from the beginning of the exercise up to the ventilatory anaerobic threshold (VAT) were used to calculate the VE/VCO₂ slope.^{9,10} Furthermore, if the determination of the VAT was difficult in the VE/VCO₂ slope, the VAT was also determined in the slope of the exhaled CO₂.¹¹ Peak VO₂ and respiratory quotient (RQ) ratio were measured.

Statistical Analysis

The patient population was divided into tertiles based on the VE/VCO₂ slope. Data are presented as median (interquartile range [IQR]) for nonnormally distributed data and as mean \pm SD for normally distributed data or percentages. Differences between categoric groups were calculated with the use of the chi-square test. Differences between continuous variables were calculated with the use of the Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test or 1-way analysis of variance where appropriate. To determine the factors relating to the VE/VCO₂ slope, a univariate linear regression model was performed. We performed one multivariable linear regression analysis with backward elimination including variables that showed a *P* value of $<.1$ in univariate analyses. Kaplan-Meier curves were constructed to determine the mortality in the 3 VE/VCO₂ tertiles with the use of the log-rank test of equality. Univariate and multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression models were used to calculate the predictive value of the VE/VCO₂ slope on a continuous scale and by tertiles on mortality. The proportional hazard assumption was checked by investigation of Schoenfeld residuals, and no violations were observed. A *P* value of $<.05$ was considered to be statistically significant. Analyses were conducted with the use of stata version 13 for windows (Statacorp, College Station, Texas).

Results

Baseline Characteristics

The baseline characteristics according to tertiles of VE/VCO₂ slope are presented in Table 1. In all patients, the mean age was 73 ± 9 years and 67% were female. The lowest tertile (25.0–33.0) and middle tertile (33.1–38.3) of VE/VCO₂ slope each consisted of 29 patients, and the highest tertile (38.4–89.0) consisted of 30 patients. Mean age did not differ among the 3 groups. The NYHA functional class did not differ among the tertiles (*P* = .064). NT-proBNP plasma levels were 599.5 ng/L (IQR 312.0–989.0) in the lowest tertile, 930 ng/L in the middle tertile (461–1615), and 1561 ng/L in the highest tertile (535.5–2479.0; *P* = .037). A subdivision of patients with and without atrial fibrillation was analyzed, and no differences were observed in that analysis regarding the VE/VCO₂ slope (*P* = .924).

Results of the peak VO₂ are presented in Table 2. Peak VO₂ did not differ among the VE/VCO₂ slope tertiles (*P* = .150). Interestingly, only 31 patients (35%) reached an RQ ratio of ≥ 1 . The RQ ratio did not differ among tertiles.

Baseline invasive hemodynamic measurement results across the VE/VCO₂ slope tertiles are presented in Table 3. The lowest right ventricular systolic pressure (46 ± 15 mm Hg) was found in the lowest VE/VCO₂ slope tertile, and right ventricular systolic pressure was highest (57 ± 19 mm Hg) in the highest tertile (*P* = .011). Mean pulmonary artery pressure (mPAP) was highest (35 ± 12 mm Hg) in the highest tertile, was 29 ± 7 mm Hg in the middle tertile, and was lowest (29 ± 10 mm Hg) in the lowest tertile (*P* = .017).

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics

| Characteristic | Total | VE/VCO ₂ slope tertile | | | P Value |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|
| | | Lowest | Middle | Highest | |
| n | 88 | 29 | 29 | 30 | |
| VE/VCO ₂ | | 25.0–33.0 | 33.1–38.3 | 38.4–89.0 | |
| Age (y) | 73 ± 9 | 73.3 ± 7.4 | 74.8 ± 8.4 | 71.7 ± 11.0 | .430 |
| Sex, male (%) | 33 | 45 | 17 | 37 | .071 |
| NYHA functional classification (%) | | | | | .064 |
| II | 41 | 55 | 45 | 23 | |
| III | 57 | 45 | 55 | 70 | |
| LVEF (%) | 60.0 (55.0–60.0) | 60.0 (55.0–60.0) | 60.0 (57.5–60.0) | 60.0 (55.0–60.0) | .540 |
| SBP (mm Hg) | 151.0 (134.0–165.0) | 152.5 (140.5–161.0) | 154.0 (135.0–171.0) | 144.5 (128.0–162.0) | .270 |
| DBP (mm Hg) | 68.0 (60.0–78.0) | 68.0 (63.0–73.5) | 69.0 (60.0–79.0) | 64.5 (56.0–79.0) | .720 |
| Heart rate (beats/min) | 71 ± 12 | 69 ± 12 | 70 ± 13 | 74 ± 11 | .230 |
| Body mass index (kg/m ²) | 27 (25–31) | 27.5 (24.7–33.2) | 27.1 (25.0–30.7) | 26.3 (24.2–29.4) | .350 |
| Heart rhythm | | | | | .480 |
| SR (%) | 58 | 66 | 55 | 53 | .600 |
| AF (%) | 33 | 24 | 38 | 37 | .460 |
| Medical history (%) | | | | | |
| Cerebrovascular disease | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | .340 |
| AF | 51 | 55 | 48 | 50 | .860 |
| Chronic | 35 | 28 | 45 | 33 | .380 |
| Paroxysmal | 17 | 28 | 7 | 17 | .110 |
| Diabetes mellitus | 28 | 24 | 28 | 33 | .730 |
| Hypertension | 65 | 69 | 62 | 63 | .840 |
| COPD | 16 | 14 | 17 | 17 | .930 |
| Pacemaker | 11 | 10 | 10 | 13 | .920 |
| Medical therapy (%) | | | | | |
| β-Blocker | 78 | 76 | 90 | 70 | .170 |
| Diuretic | 75 | 61 | 76 | 87 | .074 |
| ACE inhibitor | 68 | 64 | 76 | 63 | .520 |
| Aldosterone blocker | 30 | 21 | 31 | 37 | .440 |
| Calcium channel blocker | 5 | 4 | 3 | 7 | .800 |
| Hemoglobin (mmol/L) | 8.2 (7.5–8.6) | 8.3 (7.8–8.7) | 8.1 (7.5–8.6) | 8.1 (7.1–8.7) | .680 |
| Creatinine (μmol/L) | 98.4 ± 37.9 | 96.2 ± 39.6 | 89.1 ± 26.4 | 110.6 ± 44.1 | .097 |
| eGFR (mL/min) | 61.0 (44.0–73.0) | 65.0 (52.0–77.0) | 61.0 (45.0–78.0) | 50.0 (32.0–68.0) | .260 |
| Urea (mmol/L) | 9.1 ± 4.5 | 7.6 ± 3.1 | 8.6 ± 4.1 | 11.2 ± 5.3 | .006 |
| Plasma NT-proBNP (ng/L) | 840 (411–1938) | 599.5 (312.0–989) | 930 (461–1615) | 1561 (535.5–2479) | .037 |
| Sodium (mmol/L) | 141 (138–143) | 142.0 (139.5–144.0) | 140.5 (138.0–142.0) | 140.0 (137.0–142.0) | .120 |
| Potassium (mmol/L) | 4.2 (3.9–4.6) | 4.3 (3.9–4.6) | 4.2 (4.0–4.7) | 4.2 (3.9–4.5) | .750 |
| Mortality during follow-up (%) | 18 | 14 | 14 | 30 | .189 |

Normally distributed data are presented as mean ± SD, nonnormally distributed data as median (interquartile range), categorical variables as percentages of observations. VE/VCO₂, ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide; NYHA, New York Heart Association; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; SR, sinus rhythm; AF, atrial fibrillation; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide.

Correlation Among Baseline Parameters and the VE/VO₂ Slope in HFpEF

Results of the univariate and multivariable regression analyses are presented in Table 4. Multiple significant correlations were observed between invasively measured pressures and the VE/VO₂ slope. mPAP was correlated with the VE/VCO₂ slope: correlation coefficient (CE) = 0.287; *P* = .002. When

adjusted for age and log NT-proBNP, mPAP was still correlated with the VE/VCO₂ slope: CE = 0.233; *P* = .027. Even so, PVR was correlated with the VE/VCO₂ slope when adjusted for age and log NT-proBNP levels: CE = 0.015; *P* = .024. No correlation was observed between pulmonary capillary wedge pressure and the VE/VCO₂ slope: CE = 0.061; *P* = .704. After stepwise multivariable regression analysis of the invasive hemodynamic and the clinical variables with backward elimination, the only variable that remained independently associated with VE/VCO₂ slope was PVR.

The correlation between baseline parameters or invasively measured pressures and peak VO₂ could not be interpreted, because, as mentioned above, only 35% of the patients reached an RQ ≥ 1.

Survival Analysis

Sixteen (18%) patients died during a mean follow-up time of 2 ± 1 years. Increased VE/VCO₂ slope tertiles showed a

Table 2. Peak VO₂ and respiratory quotient (RQ)

| Measurement | Lowest | Middle | Highest | P Value |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| | VE/VCO ₂ (25.0–33.0) | VE/VCO ₂ (33.1–38.3) | VE/VCO ₂ (38.4–89.0) | |
| n | 29 | 29 | 30 | |
| Peak VO ₂ | 14 ± 4 | 12 ± 3 | 12 ± 4 | .150 |
| RQ | 0.96 ± 0.13 | 0.94 ± 0.11 | 0.91 ± 0.11 | .436 |
| RQ ≥ 1 (%) | 35 | 38 | 33 | .891 |

VE/VCO₂, ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide; VO₂, oxygen consumption.

Table 3. Invasive Hemodynamic Measurements

| Measurement | Total | Lowest VE/VCO ₂ (25.0–33.0) | Middle VE/VCO ₂ (33.1–38.3) | Highest VE/VCO ₂ (38.4–89) | P Value |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--|---------|
| n | 88 | 29 | 29 | 30 | |
| RAM (mm Hg) | 8.4 ± 4.9 | 7.6 ± 4.7 | 8.3 ± 4.2 | 9.3 ± 5.7 | .380 |
| RVS (mm Hg) | 50.0 ± 16.5 | 46.3 ± 15.3 | 46.0 ± 11.2 | 57.2 ± 19.5 | .011 |
| RVED (mm Hg) | 9.2 ± 4.5 | 8.3 ± 4.7 | 9.6 ± 3.4 | 9.7 ± 5.1 | .380 |
| sPAP (mm Hg) | 49.0 ± 16.4 | 46.0 ± 15.7 | 44.7 ± 10.6 | 55.9 ± 19.5 | .014 |
| dPAP (mm Hg) | 18.1 ± 6.9 | 16.7 ± 6.7 | 17.1 ± 5.5 | 20.3 ± 8.0 | .088 |
| mPAP (mm Hg) | 31.0 ± 10.2 | 28.9 ± 9.8 | 28.7 ± 7.2 | 35.2 ± 11.7 | .017 |
| PH | 65 (74) | 19 (66) | 22 (76) | 24 (80) | .429 |
| PCWP (mm Hg) | 17.4 ± 6.1 | 16.0 ± 5.7 | 17.4 ± 5.3 | 18.8 ± 6.9 | .210 |
| PCWpdi | 65 (74) | 19 (66) | 21 (72) | 25 (83) | .291 |
| LVS (mm Hg) | 152.2 ± 22.2 | 153.9 ± 19.8 | 158.4 ± 22.4 | 144.1 ± 22.5 | .056 |
| LVED (mm Hg) | 16.6 ± 5.8 | 15.1 ± 6.0 | 17.1 ± 5.1 | 17.5 ± 6.2 | .310 |
| AOS (mm Hg) | 149.1 ± 22.6 | 151.6 ± 21.0 | 152.9 ± 23.6 | 143.2 ± 22.6 | .210 |
| AOD (mm Hg) | 69.1 ± 12.8 | 70.3 ± 11.5 | 70.2 ± 13.1 | 67.1 ± 13.8 | .570 |
| AOM (mm Hg) | 100.6 ± 14.3 | 101.7 ± 11.7 | 103.0 ± 16.1 | 97.1 ± 14.5 | .250 |
| PVR (dyne·s/cm ⁵) | 212 ± 161 | 190 ± 156 | 175 ± 93 | 264 ± 201 | .078 |

Normally distributed data are presented as mean ± SD, and categorical variables as n (%). RAM, mean right atrial pressure; RVS, right ventricular systolic pressure; RVED, right ventricular end-diastolic pressure; sPAP, systolic pulmonary artery pressure; dPAP, diastolic pulmonary arterial pressure; mPAP, mean pulmonary arterial pressure; PH, pulmonary arterial hypertension; PCWP, mean pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; PCWpdi, PCWP as dichotomous variable, >16 cutoff; LVS, left ventricular systolic pressure; LVED, left ventricular end-diastolic pressure; AOS, aortic systolic pressure; AOD, aortic diastolic pressure; AOM, aortic mean pressure; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance.

Table 4. Regression: Correlation With the VE/VCO₂ Slope

| | Univariate | | Model 1 | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Coefficients | P Value | | P Value |
| mPAP | 0.287 | .002 | 0.233 | .027 |
| sPAP | 0.172 | .003 | 0.134 | .042 |
| PVR | 0.019 | .002 | 0.015 | .024 |
| RVS | 0.175 | .002 | 0.134 | .041 |
| LVS | -0.123 | .008 | -0.107 | .030 |
| Sodium | -0.494 | .092 | — | — |
| Diuretic use | 3.723 | .091 | — | — |
| Log NT-proBNP | 0.917 | .127 | — | — |
| NYHA functional class | 2.873 | .145 | — | — |
| Log urea | 2.111 | .173 | — | — |
| Age | -0.130 | .222 | — | — |
| Sex | -2.084 | .308 | — | — |
| β-Blocker use | 0.453 | .847 | — | — |
| LVED | -0.160 | .281 | — | — |
| PCWP | 0.061 | .704 | — | — |

Model 1: adjusted for log NT-proBNP and age. Abbreviations as in Tables 1 and 3.

trend toward increased mortality ($P = .076$). No differences were observed among the peak VO₂-based tertiles ($P = .783$).

In univariable analyses, the increase of VE/VCO₂ showed a significant increase risk for all-cause mortality (hazard ratio [HR] 1.92 [per 10 increase], 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.34–2.74; $P < .001$; Table 5). an association that was unaffected by adjustment for age and sex. When adjusted for independent predictors of outcome, including age, sex, PAP, renal function, NT-proBNP plasma levels, and atrial fibrillation, VE/VCO₂ slope was independently associated with an increased risk for all-cause mortality: HR 1.74 (per 10 increase), 95% CI 1.03–2.94; $P = .040$. When the same analysis was performed on peak VO₂, no association with all-cause mortality in either univariate (Table 5) or multivariable analysis was found: multivariable HR 1.42, 95% CI 0.39–5.24; $P = .600$).

Table 5. Cox Regression Analysis

| Variable | Univariate | | Multivariable | |
|--|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
| | HR (95% CI) | P Value | HR (95% CI) | P Value |
| VE/VCO ₂ | | | | |
| Continuous (per 10 increase) | 1.92 (1.34–2.74) | <.001 | 2.04 (1.42–2.93) | <.001 |
| Lowest tertile | Ref | — | Ref | — |
| Middle tertile | 1.44 (0.32–6.52) | .630 | 1.26 (0.28–5.82) | .760 |
| Highest tertile | 3.57 (0.96–13.3) | .060 | 4.11 (1.09–15.46) | .040 |
| Peak VO ₂ | | | | |
| Continuous (per 5 mL·min ⁻¹ ·kg ⁻² decrease) | 3.53 (1.29–9.62) | .014 | 3.49 (1.26–9.69) | .017 |
| Highest tertile | REF | — | REF | — |
| Middle tertile | 0.97 (0.21–4.39) | .960 | 0.96 (0.21–4.36) | .950 |
| Lowest tertile | 3.03 (0.78–11.8) | .110 | 2.93 (0.74–11.6) | .130 |

Model 1: adjusted for age and sex. Abbreviations as in Table 2.

Discussion

This study shows that increased VE/VCO₂ slope, established from submaximal exercise testing, is related to more severe disease and higher intracardiac and intrapulmonary pressures and had an independent association with increased mortality in patients with HFpEF and pulmonary hypertension. These associations were not found with peak VO₂, which was frequently not reached in these patients, as evidenced by an RQ <1.0 in 65% of the patients.

Although the mechanisms behind HFpEF are not fully understood, the main symptoms of the patients are shortness of breath and impaired exercise tolerance. These symptoms are not very specific for HFpEF. We therefore tried to identify independent predictors of the exercise capacity in HFpEF patients. Peak VO₂ is the criterion standard in CPX, so peak VO₂ is often used as the main parameter in exercise tolerance studies in HF.^{12,13} Peak VO₂ depends on heart rate, stroke volume, and arterial-mixed venous oxygen content difference (C[a-v]O₂). Each of these 3 parameters, however, has been shown to be of limited use in HFpEF patients.¹⁴ A reliable peak VO₂ measurement can be achieved only when patients perform at the maximum of their cardiopulmonary capacity, ie, achieve an RQ ratio ≥1.⁵ However, most of the peak VO₂ measurements in our study were not reliable, because the RQ ratio ≥ 1 was not reached.¹⁵ It should be noted that we included an elderly population with multiple comorbidities and with severe HFpEF with evidence of increased PAPs. In this elderly and diseased population, VE/VCO₂ slope was ideal to study exercise capacity even when peak VO₂ was not reached. VE versus VCO₂ is a linear relationship in incremental exercise. In the final phase of exercise, oxygen supply to the tissue is not sufficient and blood lactate concentration increases at a steep rate. At that point, the VAT, excess CO₂ is produced which results in a steeper bend of the VE/VCO₂ slope.¹⁶ The linear relationship up to the VAT is a reliable measure for exercise capacity in HF patients because patients do not need to reach their maximum exercise capacity.^{16,17}

A few studies have shown that increased VE/VCO₂ is associated with increased mortality in patients with HFrEF.¹⁸ An overview by Guazzi described a solid base for the hypothesis that the VE/VCO₂ slope might be of prognostic value in HFpEF patients.¹⁹ However, this is the 1st study on clinical and hemodynamic correlates and prognostic value of VE/VCO₂ slope specifically in patients with HFpEF. A few others studied the value of CPX in patients with HFpEF.^{20–22} Guazzi et al compared CPX parameters with multiple variables between an HFrEF and an HFpEF population.²⁰ Although that study showed that the VE/VCO₂ slope represents HFpEF severity, no relationship between the VE/VCO₂ slope and mortality was studied. Cahalin et al studied the prognostic relevance of heart rate recovery after a 6-minute walk test in patients with HFrEF (n = 216) and HFpEF (n = 42). They showed that in the combined population with predominantly HFrEF patients, the VE/VCO₂ slope was a significant prognostic parameter in the 6-minute walk test, and they found that the VE/VCO₂ slope was the only predictor of major

cardiac events.²¹ Nedeljkovic et al studied the value of CPX as a diagnostic tool for HFpEF. They concluded that the VE/VCO₂ slope could be a reliable test to diagnose HFpEF in an early stage, but they did not investigate the possible association between VE/VCO₂ and mortality.²²

Hemodynamic measurements in our study showed that increased VE/VCO₂ slope was associated with increased mPAP and PVR. Of note, no association was observed between VE/VCO₂ slope and PWCP. The VE/VCO₂ slope seems to be determined mostly by PAP and PVR and not PWCP. Guazzi et al also described a correlation between increased systolic PAP and a poorer VE/VCO₂ slope.²⁰ However, in contrast with Guazzi et al, we did not find a correlation between the echocardiographic parameters LVEF and E/E' ratio and VE/VCO₂ slope. We hypothesize that this difference can be explained by the fact that our population was a more typical HFpEF population: older, mostly female, with higher levels of NT-proBNP and more severe HF. Differences in etiology of HFpEF can be seen between men and women: generally men are more prone to develop ischemic HF, in contrast to women where the abundance of comorbidities is seen as causing HFpEF.^{23,24}

Study Limitations

The retrospective nature of this study is a limitation, and the relative small group size resulted in limited possibilities for multivariate analysis. Also, despite the predefined hypothesis to determine the diagnostic value of the VE/VCO₂ slope, the subanalyses were at risk of multiple testing uncertainties. To limit this risk, the multivariable regression analysis was performed with backward elimination. This study was not ideal for comparing peak VO₂ and VE/VCO₂ slope, because few patients reached an RQ ratio >1. A strong point of this study is the well defined HFpEF population and the simultaneously performed right-sided HC and echocardiography. However, these patients also showed echocardiographic signs of pulmonary hypertension, so the results cannot be extrapolated to the general HFpEF population.

Conclusion

In elderly patients with HFpEF, increased PAPs, and multiple comorbidities, peak VO₂ could often not be reached. In these patients, increased VE/VCO₂ slope (and not peak VO₂) was associated with more severe disease and higher intracardiac and intrapulmonary pressures and was independently associated with increased mortality.

References

1. Dhingra A, Garg A, Kaur S, Chopra S, Batra JS, Pandey A, et al. Epidemiology of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Curr Heart Fail Rep* 2014;11:354–65.
2. Van Veldhuisen DJ, Linssen GCM, Jaarsma T, Van Gilst WH, Hoes AW, Tijssen JGP, et al. B-Type natriuretic peptide and prognosis in heart

- failure patients with preserved and reduced ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:1498–506.
3. Lam CSP, Roger VL, Rodeheffer RJ, Borlaug BA, Enders FT, Redfield MM. Pulmonary hypertension in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009;53:1119–26.
 4. Balady GJ, Arena R, Sietsema K, Myers J, Coke L, Fletcher GF, et al. Clinician's guide to cardiopulmonary exercise testing in adults: a scientific statement from the American heart association. *Circulation* 2010;122:191–225.
 5. Metra M, Cas LD, Panina G, Visioli O. Exercise hyperventilation chronic congestive heart failure, and its relation to functional capacity and hemodynamics. *Am J Cardiol* 1992;70:622–8.
 6. Chua TP, Ponikowski P, Harrington D, Anker SD, Webb-Peploe K, Clark AL, et al. Clinical correlates and prognostic significance of the ventilatory response to exercise in chronic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;29:1585–90.
 7. Moore B, Brubaker PH, Stewart KP, Kitzman DW, Carolina N. VE/VCO₂ slope in older heart failure patients with normal versus reduced ejection fraction compared with age-matched healthy controls. *J Card Fail* 2007;13:259–62.
 8. Hoendermis ES, Liu LCY, Hummel YM, van der Meer P, de Boer RA, Berger RMF, et al. Effects of sildenafil on invasive haemodynamics and exercise capacity in heart failure patients with preserved ejection fraction and pulmonary hypertension: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur Heart J* 2015;36:2565–73.
 9. Ingle L, Goode K, Carroll S, Sloan R, Boyes C, Cleland JGF, et al. Prognostic value of the VE/VCO₂ slope calculated from different time intervals in patients with suspected heart failure. *Int J Cardiol* 2007;118:350–5.
 10. Bard RL, Gillespie BW, Clarke NS, Egan TG, Nicklas JM. Determining the best ventilatory efficiency measure to predict mortality in patients with heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2006;25:589–95.
 11. Datta D, Normandin E, ZuWallack R. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing in the assessment of exertional dyspnea. *Ann Thorac Med* 2015;10:77–86.
 12. Stickland MK, Butcher SJ, Marciniuk DD, Bhutani M. Assessing exercise limitation using cardiopulmonary exercise testing. *Pulm Med* 2012;2012:824091.
 13. Arena R, Myers J, Guazzi M. The clinical and research applications of aerobic capacity and ventilatory efficiency in heart failure: an evidence-based review. *Heart Fail Rev* 2008;13:245–69.
 14. Dhakal BP, Malhotra R, Murphy RM, Pappagianopoulos PP, Baggish AL, Weiner RB, et al. Mechanisms of exercise intolerance in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: the role of abnormal peripheral oxygen extraction. *Circ Heart Fail* 2015;8:286–94.
 15. Kervio G, Carre F, Ville NS. Reliability and intensity of the six-minute walk test in healthy elderly subjects. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003;35:169–74.
 16. Mezzani A, Agostoni P, Cohen-Solal A, Corrà U, Jegier A, Kouidi E, et al. Standards for the use of cardiopulmonary exercise testing for the functional evaluation of cardiac patients: a report from the Exercise Physiology Section of the European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention and Rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2009;16:249–67.
 17. Meyer T, Lucía A, Earnest CP, Kindermann W. A conceptual framework for performance diagnosis and training prescription from submaximal gas exchange parameters—theory and application. *Int J Sports Med* 2005;26.
 18. Arena R, Myers J, Aslam SS, Varughese EB, Peberdy MA. Peak VO₂ and VE/VCO₂ slope in patients with heart failure: a prognostic comparison. *Am Heart J* 2004;147:354–60.
 19. Guazzi M. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing in heart failure preserved ejection fraction: time to expand the paradigm in the prognostic algorithm. *Am Heart J* 2016;174:164–6.
 20. Guazzi M, Labate V, Cahalin LP, Arena R. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing reflects similar pathophysiology and disease severity in heart failure patients with reduced and preserved ejection fraction. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2014;21:847–54.
 21. Cahalin LP, Arena R, Labate V, Bandera F, Lavie CJ, Guazzi M. Heart rate recovery after the 6 min walk test rather than distance ambulated is a powerful prognostic indicator in heart failure with reduced and preserved ejection fraction: a comparison with cardiopulmonary exercise testing. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2013;15:519–27.
 22. Nedeljkovic I, Banovic M, Stepanovic J, Giga V, Djordjevic-Dikic A, Trifunovic D, et al. The combined exercise stress echocardiography and cardiopulmonary exercise test for identification of masked heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in patients with hypertension. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2016;23:71–7.
 23. Lam CSP, Carson PE, Anand IS, Rector TS, Kuskowski M, Komajda M, et al. Sex differences in clinical characteristics and outcomes in elderly patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction: the Irbesartan in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction (I-PRESERVE) trial. *Circ Heart Fail* 2012;5:571–8.
 24. Little WC, Zile MR. HFpEF: cardiovascular abnormalities not just comorbidities. *Circ Heart Fail* 2012;5:669–71.