



HAL
open science

His bundle pacing for correcting atrioventricular dyssynchrony in heart failure: HYPE or HOPE?

Christophe Leclercq, Haran Burri

► To cite this version:

Christophe Leclercq, Haran Burri. His bundle pacing for correcting atrioventricular dyssynchrony in heart failure: HYPE or HOPE?. *European Journal of Heart Failure*, 2023, 10.1002/ejhf.2775 . hal-03980418

HAL Id: hal-03980418

<https://hal.science/hal-03980418v1>

Submitted on 16 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Title: His bundle pacing for correcting atrioventricular dyssynchrony in heart failure: HYPE or HOPE?

Corresponding Author

Christophe Leclercq

christophe.leclercq@chu-rennes.fr

CHU Pontchaillou
2 rue Henri Le Guillou
Not Available
Rennes Cedex 9
Bretagne
35033
France

Haran Burri

cardiac pacing unit, Cardiology Department, Geneva University Hospital
rue Gabrielle Perret-Gentil 4
Geneva
geneva
Switzerland

Disclosures: H.B. has received speaker honoraria and institutional research/fellowship grants from Abbott, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Medtronic and Microport. C.L. has received speaker honoraria and institutional research/fellowship grants from Abbott, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Medtronic and Microport.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/ejhf.2775](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejhf.2775)

Heart failure is a clinical syndrome resulting from structural and/or functional abnormalities of the heart that result in elevated intracardiac pressures and/or inadequate cardiac output. In patients with heart failure with reduced (≤ 0.40) left ventricular ejection fraction (HFrEF), impaired left ventricular filling due to atrioventricular (AV) dyssynchrony resulting from prolonged PR intervals may contribute to pump failure. The mechanisms which have been suggested are transmitral EA fusion leading to shortening of left ventricular filling time, diastolic mitral regurgitation, and in case of very prolonged PR intervals, simultaneous atrial and ventricular contraction.¹ Computer simulations have suggested that AV timing plays a crucial role in cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) by impacting ventricular filling.²

In the COMPANION trial, a PR ≥ 200 ms was observed in 52% of the subjects and was associated with increased mortality and heart failure hospitalization in patients under medical therapy (HR 1.41, P=0.44). Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) had a greater impact on reducing these endpoints in patients with a prolonged PR (HR 0.54 P<0.01) than in those with a normal PR (HR 0.71, P=0.019). A subgroup analysis of MADIT-CRT showed that patients with non-left bundle branch block QRS morphology and a PR ≥ 230 ms benefitted from CRT in terms of heart failure and mortality, whereas those with intervals <230 ms did not.³ Patients with a narrow QRS have been shown in the EchoCRT trial to have increased mortality when treated with CRT,⁴ so biventricular pacing in patients with a prolonged PR interval in this population is unlikely to be of benefit. Right ventricular pacing (RVP) is known to have a detrimental effect on left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) resulting from dyssynchrony.^{5,6} His bundle pacing (HBP) on the other hand provides a more physiological form of pacing and provides an opportunity to correct AV dyssynchrony without inducing ventricular dyssynchrony.

In the current issue of the journal, Whinnett et al.⁷ present the results of the HOPE-HF study, which evaluated whether HBP improves the primary endpoint of peak oxygen uptake in patients with HFrEF, PR interval > 200ms and either QRS <140ms or right bundle branch block. A total of 167

patients were randomized using a cross-over design to 6-months of DDD pacing (with non-invasive hemodynamic optimization of AV intervals) and 6-months of backup RVP, with double-blinding of treatment allocation. There was no significant difference in the primary endpoint, nor in the secondary endpoints of LVEF, left ventricular diameters, BNP or quality of life as measured by EQ5D5L VAS. However, there was a slight improvement in quality of life as measured by the MLWHF questionnaire and 112/167 (67%) of patients preferred the HBP pacing period.

Although the results are disappointing, the authors may be congratulated for their endeavour and for having conducted the largest randomized controlled study published to date. A number of points may be raised regarding the findings.

- 1) This was not a study randomizing HBP versus no pacing. During the HBP-off phase, patients were programmed to “backup” RVP at 30 bpm, presumably mostly in the DDD mode as atrial pacing was on average $16\pm 28\%$ and ventricular pacing $13\pm 28\%$. It has been shown that as little as 20% RVP may result in pacing-induced cardiomyopathy, and that pacing percentage as a continuous variable is significantly associated with outcome (i.e. that there is no minimum percentage of RVP which has been demonstrated to be harmless).^{8,9} Therefore, the only positive findings of the study may have resulted from unnecessary RVP, which may have been avoided by turning off pacing (ODO/OVO mode) or minimized by programming to DDI/VVI 30 bpm.
- 2) the average PR interval in the study was only 249 ms with a mean optimized AV delay of 195 ms. Therefore, as acknowledged by the authors, the reduction in AV was modest, and treatment effect may have been greater in a cohort with longer PR intervals. Indeed, patients who would have been most likely to benefit are those with extremely long PR intervals in whom a “P on T” phenomenon may be observed at rest or during exercise, leading to a “pseudo-pacemaker syndrome”. In these patients, atrial and ventricular contraction occur

simultaneously, thereby reducing ventricular filling, increasing atrial pressure and resulting in a backflow of blood. Very long PR intervals may also result from algorithms designed to minimize ventricular pacing.¹⁰ RVP has been shown to improve symptoms in these patients,¹¹ with class IIa level of evidence C recommendation for pacing in symptomatic first degree AV block (PR >300 ms) according to current guidelines.⁹ In these patients with HFrEF and a narrow QRS, HBP is indeed likely to be superior to RVP and even to CRT, but there was no sub-analysis in HOPE-HF of efficacy stratified according to baseline PR interval.

- 3) The authors did not evaluate transmitral flow by echocardiography. This is important as patients with HFrEF may have a restrictive pattern, with low-velocity A waves in whom atrial filling contributes little to ventricular filling and are thus less likely to benefit from AV coupling. EA fusion resulting from PR prolongation is often labelled as being detrimental, and that prolongation of ventricular filling time with EA separation resulting from ventricular pacing is beneficial. However it is important to remember that it is the EA *velocity-time-integral* and not EA *duration* (i.e. ventricular filling time) which determines ventricular filling. Also, EA fusion not only depends on the PR interval but also on heart rate and is physiological during tachycardia. Furthermore, diastolic mitral regurgitation could also have been evaluated by echocardiography, although it is usually only minimal in degree and the correction of this factor is likely to play a minor role in improving hemodynamics.¹⁰ In an elegant acute hemodynamic study on 8 pigs and 22 CRT patients, Salden et al.¹² showed that at AV interval programming impacted left ventricular filling and cardiac output by increasing forward flow over the mitral valve (area under the E- and A-waves) and reducing diastolic mitral regurgitation, although how these factors react to physiological conditions and impact clinical outcome over follow-up is unknown.

- 4) Interatrial conduction delay may mitigate the effect of a long PR interval by delaying left atrial conduction and thereby re-establish left AV synchrony.¹⁰ The HOPE-HF study did not present any data on P-wave duration, and this important factor was not evaluated.

Finally, hemodynamic impact of varying AV delays is not always straightforward. In the BRAVO study, performed by the same group as HOPE-HF, as many as 60% of CRT patients had little impact on EA separation by decrementing AV intervals.¹³

On a positive note, HOPE-HF has shown that HBP was successful in 93% of patients with a single procedure and with reasonable thresholds at randomization and 12-months ($1.33V \pm 1.07$ and $1.47V \pm 1.21 V @ 1 ms$), and did not adversely affect outcome in patients with HFrEF. Lead dislodgment or significant rise in threshold compromising participation in the study was observed in 5.7% of patients, which is in line with previous data reporting a 6% rate of HBP lead revision,¹⁴ which is nevertheless high. Left bundle branch area pacing (LBBAP) is gaining adoption and has overtaken HBP according to a recent survey,¹⁵ mainly due to superior electrical parameters. It is possible that conduction system pacing (CSP) will ultimately replace RVP in many indications, and be used *in lieu* of BiVP in selected cases, e.g. in HFrEF patients with a narrow QRS requiring ventricular pacing.

To conclude, HOPE-HF failed to find a benefit of pacing in HFrEF patients with first-degree AV block, but whether CSP may benefit these patients with more prolonged PR intervals (e.g. $> 300 ms$), deserves further study.

References

- [1] Salden F, Kutyla V, Stockburger M, Prinzen FW, Vernooij K. Atrioventricular dromotopathy: evidence for a distinctive entity in heart failure with prolonged PR interval? *Europace* 2018; **20**: 1067-1077.
- [2] Jones S, Lumens J, Sohaib SMA, Finegold JA, Kanagaratnam P, Tanner M, et al. Cardiac resynchronization therapy: mechanisms of action and scope for further improvement in cardiac function. *Europace* 2017; **19**: 1178-1186.
- [3] Kutyla V, Stockburger M, Daubert JP, Holmqvist F, Olshansky B, Schuger C, et al. PR interval identifies clinical response in patients with non-left bundle branch block: a Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial-Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy substudy. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol* 2014; **7**: 645-651.
- [4] Ruschitzka F, Abraham WT, Singh JP, Bax JJ, Borer JS, Brugada J, et al. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy in heart failure with a narrow QRS complex. *N Engl J Med* 2013; **369**: 1395-1405.
- [5] Cicchitti V, Radico F, Bianco F, Gallina S, Tonti G, De Caterina R. Heart failure due to right ventricular apical pacing: the importance of flow patterns. *Europace* 2016; **18**: 1679-1688.
- [6] Fang F, Luo XX, Zhang Q, Azlan H, Razali O, Ma Z, et al. Deterioration of left ventricular systolic function in extended Pacing to Avoid Cardiac Enlargement (PACE) trial: the predictive value of early systolic dyssynchrony. *Europace* 2015; **17 Suppl 2**: ii47-53.
- [7] Whinnet ZI, Shun-Shin MJ, Tanner M, Foley P, Chandrasekaran B, Moore P, et al. Effects of haemodynamically atrio-ventricular optimized His-pacing on heart failure symptoms and exercise capacity: The His Optimized Pacing Evaluated for Heart Failure (HOPE-HF) randomized, double-blind, cross-over trial. *European journal of heart failure* 2022; **in press**.
- [8] Kiehl EL, Makki T, Kumar R, Gumber D, Kwon DH, Rickard JW, et al. Incidence and predictors of right ventricular pacing-induced cardiomyopathy in patients with complete atrioventricular block and preserved left ventricular systolic function. *Heart Rhythm* 2016; **13**: 2272-2278.

- [9] Glikson M, Nielsen JC, Kronborg MB, Michowitz Y, Auricchio A, Barbash IM, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines on cardiac pacing and cardiac resynchronization therapy. *Europace* 2022; **24**: 71-164.
- [10] Barold SS, Herweg B. Conventional and biventricular pacing in patients with first-degree atrioventricular block. *Europace* 2012; **14**: 1414-1419.
- [11] Carroz P, Delay D, Girod G. Pseudo-pacemaker syndrome in a young woman with first-degree atrio-ventricular block. *Europace* 2010; **12**: 594-596.
- [12] Salden F, Huntjens PR, Schreurs R, Willemen E, Kuiper M, Wouters P, et al. Pacing therapy for atrioventricular dromotopathy: a combined computational-experimental-clinical study. *Europace* 2022; **24**: 784-795.
- [13] Jones S, Shun-Shin MJ, Cole GD, Sau A, March K, Williams S, et al. Applicability of the iterative technique for cardiac resynchronization therapy optimization: full-disclosure, 50-sequential-patient dataset of transmitral Doppler traces, with implications for future research design and guidelines. *Europace* 2014; **16**: 541-550.
- [14] Beer D, Subzposh FA, Colburn S, Naperkowski A, Vijayaraman P. His bundle pacing capture threshold stability during long-term follow-up and correlation with lead slack. *Europace* 2021; **23**: 757-766.
- [15] Kircanski B, Boveda S, Prinzen F, Sorgente A, Anic A, Conte G, et al. Conduction system pacing in everyday clinical practice: EHRA physician survey. *Europace* 2022 (*in press*).