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Submitted
Quality of life (QoL) is a complex concept that encompasses physical, psychological and social domains of health.\(^1\) QoL is a “personal perception”, denoting the way individual patients feel about their health status. Patients with heart failure (HF) experience severe impairment in all domains of QoL.\(^2\) Thus, improvement of patients’ QoL has become of prime importance in achieving treatment goals.\(^3\) However, at present, confusion exists with regard to the best measure of assessing QoL in HF, and clinical trials incorporate measures from simple New York Heart Association (NYHA) class, exercise tolerance, symptom questionnaires, or the complex QoL questionnaires. Nevertheless, QoL questionnaires, especially disease specific are considered the measurement of election, as they focus on all domains relevant for HF. Currently, two disease specific QoL questionnaires are used most often to in HF, the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire (MLHF)\(^4\), and the Quality of Life with Heart Failure questionnaire (QLHF).\(^5\)

However, findings on QoL (as assessed by these questionnaires) with different classes of medication yielded controversial results. Modest benefits in QoL at ≤ 1 year follow-up were reported with the angiotensin-converting-enzyme-inhibitor (ACEI) enalapril (on top of diuretics/digitalis) in symptomatic HF patients, but not in asymptomatic patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction in the SOLVD study.\(^6\) In contrast, no significant difference in physical activity, psychological distress or life satisfaction was reported with enalapril in the CONSENSUS trial.\(^7\)

In the Val-HeFT trial, the results are more promising. Overall, when added on top of various background therapies, the angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) Valsartan slows the progressive worsening of QoL. Moreover, when added on top of an ACEI, Valsartan significantly improves QoL.\(^8\) However, it is of notice that despite large sample size (3000 patients) a significant difference in QoL between Valsartan and placebo becomes evident after 20 months of follow-up. So, what can we conclude from these results? Certainly the study gives hope that medication that improves survival and morbidity in HF has also a positive effect on QoL. However, if judged critically, the effect on QoL becomes evident in long term follow-up, which for many patients with HF may be too late.

Prescription of a β-blocker on top of an ACEI has not shown a significant improvement in QoL (as assessed mostly by MLHF), although most trials reported a trend for a better QoL in patients receiving a β-blocker.\(^9\) So why a β-blocker would not improve significantly QoL when added on top of ACEI/diuretics/digitalis, while its benefits on mortality and morbidity are now clearly established? Some may argue that β-blockers have more side effects than ARBs, especially during the initiation of therapy.\(^10\)
Others have blamed the MLHF questionnaire, as not being sensitive enough to capture small changes in QoL. However, more methodological issues are to be discussed when interpreting these results. First, the Val-HeFT trial included more than 3000 patients, while the largest β-blocker trial (MERIT-HF) included only 741 patients in the QoL sample. When we added up all the patients included in the QoL samples of β-blocker trials, we reached approximately 2000 patients, still much less than the number included in the single Val-HeFT trial. It could be therefore that the β-blocker trials did not have enough power to detect a significant effect on QoL. The second important difference is the follow-up of the patients. In the Val-HeFT, patients have been followed-up for an average of 23 months, while in the β-blocker trials patients have been followed up for an average of 3 months, 6 months, 12 months (MERIT HF) or a max of 18 months (MDC trial).

Other classes of medication, such as inotropic agents (Vesnarinone in high dose) on top of ACEI/digoxin/diretics have shown to improve significantly QoL in short term (two months), however at the risk of increased mortality. While some patients with HF would be willing to accept therapies that improve their QoL even at the risk of shortening life, this is a very controversial topic. Nevertheless it should be acknowledged that prognosis is not the major concern in very elderly, those with refractory symptoms for whom transplantation is not an option, or in individuals with terminal malignancy.

Device therapy on top of standard medication have shown to improve both prognosis and QoL in advanced HF, but its indication remains limited to a certain segment of patients with HF. Finally, some disease management programs have shown also a significant improvement on QoL, but others presented neutral results.

HF is a progressive disease, and QoL deteriorates gradually after the diagnosis. In this context, is hard to have clear expectations with respect to the impact of medication on QoL. Given the course of the disease, slowing of progressive worsening of QoL or a modest improvement may be the ideal. On the other hand, patients expect a timely and clear improvement in their QoL. The aim of pharmacological treatment is in fact to improve QoL, although QoL is not a full criterion to evaluate the effects of medication.

Improvement of QoL in HF remains therefore an open field, in which new therapies but also clarification of methodology is required. In the mean time, the use of life prolonging therapies appears as a safe measure to modestly improve or maintain QoL.
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