Published in final edited form as:

J Card Fail. 2020 May ; 26(5): 383–390. doi:10.1016/j.cardfail.2020.01.020.

Longitudinal Trajectories of Hemodynamics Following Left Ventricular Assist Device Implantation

Takeo Fujino¹, Aline Sayer¹, Daisuke Nitta¹, Teruhiko Imamura¹, Nikhil Narang¹, Ann Nguyen¹, Daniel Rodgers¹, Jayant Raikhelkar¹, Bryan Smith¹, Gene Kim¹, Colleen LaBuhn², Valluvan Jeevanandam², Daniel Burkhoff³, Gabriel Sayer¹, Nir Uriel¹

¹Department of Medicine, University of Chicago Medical Center, 5841 S. Maryland Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60637, USA

²Department of Surgery, University of Chicago Medical Center, 5841 S. Maryland Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60637, USA

³Columbia University Medical Center, and Cardiovascular Research Foundation, 1700 Broadway, New York, NY

Abstract

Background—Continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices (LVADs) improve the hemodynamics of patients with advanced heart failure. However, longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamics in LVAD patients remain unknown. The aim of this study was to investigate the trends of hemodynamic parameters following LVAD implantation.

Methods and Results—We retrospectively reviewed patients who underwent LVAD implantation between 4/2014 and 8/2018. We collected hemodynamic parameters from right heart catheterizations (RHCs). Among 199 consecutive patients, we enrolled 150 patients who had both pre- and post-implant RHCs. They had 3 (2, 4) post-implant RHCs during follow-up of 2.3 (1.3, 3.1) years. Mean age was 57±13 years and 102 patients (68%) were male. Following LVAD implantation, pulmonary arterial pressure and pulmonary capillary wedge pressure decreased and cardiac index increased significantly, and then remained unchanged throughout follow-up. Right atrial pressure (RAP) decreased initially, and then gradually increased to pre-implant values. Pulmonary artery pulsatility index (PAPI) decreased initially and returned to pre-implant values, and then progressively decreased over longer follow-up. Subgroup analysis showed significant differences in the trajectories of PAPI based on gender.

Corresponding Author: Nir Uriel, MD, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago Medical Center, 5841 S. Maryland Avenue, Chicago, IL, 60637, USA, Office: (773) 702-9396, Fax: (773) 834-1764, nuriel@medicine.bsd.uchicago.edu.

Declaration of Interest

Takeo Fujino receives financial support from MSD Life Support Foundation and Mochida Memorial Foundation for Medical and Pharmaceutical Research. Nir Uriel receives grant support from Abbott and Medtronic. Gabriel Sayer is a consultant for Medtronic. Valluvan Jeevanandam is a consultant for Abbott. The other authors report no conflicts.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain

Conclusions—Despite improvement in left-side filling pressures and cardiac index following LVAD implantation, RAP increased and PAPI decreased over time suggesting progressive right ventricular dysfunction.

Keywords

Left ventricular assist device; Heart failure; Hemodynamics

Introduction

Continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices (LVADs) have become the mainstay therapy for advanced heart failure (HF) patients, both as a bridge to transplantation and as destination therapy.¹ LVADs improve clinical outcomes in HF patients by improving hemodynamics.^{2, 3} However, some patients develop HF symptoms following LVAD implantation, mainly due to right ventricular failure (RVF), a significant early postoperative complication following LVAD implantation.^{4, 5} Late-onset RVF can also occur during long-term LVAD support and is associated with increased morbidity and mortality.^{6, 7}

We have recently reported that almost half of clinically stable LVAD patients have abnormal hemodynamics.³ We have also shown that abnormal hemodynamics are related to worse clinical outcomes, which underscores how the optimization of hemodynamics during long-term LVAD support is critical.^{8–11} However, the longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamics following LVAD implantation are unknown. The aim of this study was to describe the longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamic parameters obtained from right heart catheterizations (RHCs) following LVAD implantation.

Methods

Patient Selection

We retrospectively reviewed electronic medical records of patients who underwent LVAD implantation at our institution between April 2014 and August 2018. We enrolled patients who had RHCs at least once following LVAD implantation. LVAD patients underwent RHCs according to institutional protocol (hemodynamic ramp study at 1–3 months following implantation) and when clinically indicated according to the physicians' discretion. All patients had a RHC before LVAD implantation, and this ensured that we had a minimum of 2 RHCs per patient for longitudinal analysis. All patients were followed until November 2018. Follow-up was ceased at death, heart transplantation, pump exchange or pump explantation. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Chicago.

Variables

Demographic data—Patients' preoperative background characteristics including age, race, gender, etiology for HF, indication for LVADs and device type, and patients' physical data were recorded.

Hemodynamic data—Hemodynamic data were extracted from the most recent RHC performed within 3 months prior to LVAD implantation. We also obtained data from all RHCs following LVAD implantation. All hemodynamic data were obtained at end-expiration and were manually reviewed by the attending cardiologist. Hemodynamic parameters were calculated as follows: *transpulmonary gradient (TPG, mmHg)* = mean pulmonary arterial pressure (mPAP, mmHg) – pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP, mmHg); *pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR, Wood Units)* = (mPAP – PCWP) / cardiac output (CO, L/min); *systemic vascular resistance (SVR, dyne*sec/cm⁵)* = (mean blood pressure (mmHg) – right arterial pressure (RAP, mmHg)) × 80 / CO; *pulmonary arterial pulsatility index (PAPI)* = (systolic PAP (sPAP, mmHg) – diastolic PAP (dPAP, mmHg)) / RAP; *RAP/PCWP ratio* = RAP / PCWP; *right ventricular stroke work index (RVSWI, mmHg*mL/m²)* = (mPAP – RAP) × stroke volume (SV) index (mL/m²); *effective pulmonary arterial elastance (PEa, mmHg/mL)* = sPAP / SV (mL); and *pulmonary arterial compliance (PAC, mL/mmHg)* = SV / (sPAP – dPAP).¹²

Statistical Methods

Descriptive statistics—Categorical variables were expressed as percentages. Continuous variables were expressed as a mean±standard deviation or median (interquartile range) as appropriate. To investigate the time-dependent change of each hemodynamic parameter, we performed paired comparison for each parameter between the time periods of 0–6 months and greater than 1 year following LVAD implantation. We used Wilcoxon signed-rank test for this paired analysis. We also performed a sensitivity analysis that only included patients followed for more than 3 years. The longitudinal trends of RAP and PAPI were compared using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). If there were several tests in one time period, we averaged the values in each period.

Inferential statistics—We used non-parametric (locally weighted error sum of squares, loess) regression to guide our choice of the functional form of the longitudinal trends, and then analyzed the longitudinal trends statistically using multilevel modeling techniques. Loess models are particularly useful when the data are nonlinear. Each value of time defines a window of data (a small percentage of the timepoints around the focal point) and a local polynomial regression line is fit to the data in each span. The width of the span and the type of polynomial function (linear or quadratic) are specified. The regression lines are then connected to make a smooth curve. For each hemodynamic parameter, statistical analysis of change over time was performed by HLM.¹³ HLM models fit a polynomial regression line describing the relationship between the dependent variable (hemodynamic parameter) and time to each patient's data. The coefficients from the individual models are then compared to describe average growth in the cohort. Thus, HLM models incorporate both fixed effects (sample averages) and random effects (individual variability around the sample average). Using the best form of loess curve as a guideline, we created HLM models with 3 terms: intercept, linear time and quadratic time² as both fixed and random effects.

Subgroup analysis—We created subgroups based on demographics (gender, age, race, ischemic etiology, body surface area (BSA) and pump type). For age and BSA, patients were

divided into 2 subgroups based on median values of enrolled patients. Then we compared the trend of PAPI between the subgroups using HLM.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Statistics 23 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA) and HLM 7 (Scientific Software International, Inc., Lincolnwood, IL, USA). A two-tailed p-value <0.05 was considered significant.

Results

Study Cohort

Among 199 consecutive LVAD patients in the study period, 150 patients who had both pre- and post-implant RHCs were included. The time between pre-surgery RHC and LVAD implantation was 8 (4, 15) days. There was a median of 3 (2, 4) RHCs after LVAD implantation during follow-up of 2.3 (1.3, 3.1) years. Patients' demographics and echocardiographic parameters prior to LVAD implantation and at the time of discharge are shown in Table 1. Mean age at implant was 57 ± 13 years and 102 patients (68%) were male. Forty-eight (32%) patients had an ischemic HF etiology. The indication for LVAD was destination therapy in 112 (75%) patients.

Descriptive Longitudinal Trends in Hemodynamic Parameters

Figure 1 shows the descriptive longitudinal trends (loess curves) of hemodynamic parameters following LVAD implantation. RAP decreased initially, and then gradually increased to pre-implant values (Figure 1A). PAP and PCWP decreased and remained lower throughout follow-up (Figure 1B). Cardiac index increased and remained higher (Figure 1C). TPG decreased initially and increased slightly with time (Fig. 1D). PVR and SVR decreased with LVAD implantation and remained lower throughout follow-up (Figure 1E, 1F). PAPI decreased slightly and returned to pre-implant values within 6 months, and then progressively decreased over longer follow-up periods (Figure 1G).

The overall survivals at 1 and 2 years following LVAD implantation were 85% and 78%, respectively (Supplemental Figure 1). Changes in pump speed, physical data and medications during LVAD support are shown in Supplemental Table 1. Twenty-six percent of patients were on inotropes at 0–1 month post-LVAD implantation, and less than 10% in the other time periods. Between 19–29% of patients were on a pulmonary vasodilator at each time period. Beta-blocker use increased over time, increasing from 55% at 1–3 months to 83% after more than 2 years of support. At 1–3 months post-LVAD implantation, PAPI was 2.2 (1.3, 3.5) in patients taking beta-blockers and 1.9 (1.2, 2.9) in those not taking beta-blockers ($P=0.65$).

Changes in Hemodynamics Following LVAD Implantation

We performed paired comparisons for each parameter between the time periods of 0–6 months and greater than 1 year following LVAD implantation (Figure 2). Hemodynamic values were averaged in 12 patients for the 0–6 months period and in 17 patients for the >1 year period. There was a significant increase of RAP (8 (6, 14) to 11 (8, 14) mmHg, $P=0.039$, Figure 2A) and a significant decrease of PAPI (2.2 (1.4, 3.8) to 1.5 (1.2, 2.0),

$P=0.005$, Figure 2H) between the periods. PCWP increased slightly with time, which was not statistically significant (14 (10, 18) to 16 (13, 20) mmHg, $P=0.077$, Figure 2C). We also performed sensitivity analysis using patients who were followed over 3 years ($n=22$, Table 2). In the sensitivity analysis, we averaged hemodynamic values in 3 patients for the 0–6 months period and in 6 patients for the >1 year period. The trend of RAP (Pre, 8 (4, 17) mmHg; 0–6 months, 6 (3, 13) mmHg; >1 year, 10 (7, 13) mmHg) was similar to the LOESS curve in Figure 1. We would not expect that the HLM coefficients would be significantly different from zero because of low power in the smaller sample. However, we note that the direction and magnitude of the coefficients was similar to those reported for the whole cohort and report these in Supplemental Table 2. As in the analysis of the whole cohort, PAPI decreased significantly in the long-term follow-up period (Pre, 2.8 (2.2, 5.8); 0–6 months, 3.7 (2.1, 6.6); >1 year, 1.9 (1.2, 2.2); the coefficient for linear change was -1.042). The trends of the other parameters were also similar to LOESS curves in Figure 1.

Because the loess curves for RAP (Figure 1A) and PAPI (Figure 1G) demonstrated ongoing changes during follow-up, we analyzed these trends with HLM. The RAP trajectory showed a positive quadratic or U-shape (P -value for quadratic trajectory <0.001) over the course of 2 years following LVAD implantation. The PAPI trajectory showed a linear decline (P -value for linear trajectory $=0.001$). The coefficients and P -values of the HLM models are shown in Supplemental Table 3.

The RAP/PCWP ratio increased immediately following LVAD implantation, then decreased for a short period followed by a gradual increase in the long-term (Figure 3A). In contrast, RVSWI did not change during the course of follow-up (Figure 3B). PEa decreased with LVAD implantation and remained lower (Figure 3C), while PAC increased and remained higher throughout follow-up (Figure 3D). In sensitivity analysis, the trends of RAP/PCWP ratio and RVSWI were similar to the whole cohort (Table 2).

Comparison of PAPI Trends in Subgroups

We created subgroups based on gender, age, race, ischemic etiology, BSA and pump type, and compared the PAPI trend between the subgroups (Figure 4). There were significant gender differences in the trajectories (P -value for quadratic trajectories $=0.025$, Figure 4A). PAPI increased in the short-term but gradually decreased in the long-term in female patients as compared to males. Baseline PAPI prior to LVAD implantation was significantly higher in patients with age ≥ 59 years (P -value for intercepts $=0.012$, Figure 4B), ischemic etiology (P -value for intercepts $=0.001$, Figure 4D), and BSA <2.0 m² (P -value for intercepts $=0.030$, Figure 4E), but the longitudinal trends following LVAD implantation were not significantly different in these groups. The coefficients and P -values of HLM models for differences between subgroups are shown in Supplemental Table 4. Longitudinal trends of PAPI were not significantly different when patients were grouped based on pre-implant tricuspid annual plane systolic excursion, blood product transfusion during surgery, aortic valve opening at the time of discharge or leftward shift of interventricular septum at the time of discharge (Supplemental Figure 2).

Discussion

We described, for the first time, the longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamic parameters following LVAD implantation using inferential statistics. Despite improvements in left-side filling pressures and CO following LVAD implantation, RAP increased and PAPI decreased over time, suggesting progressive right ventricular (RV) dysfunction. Subgroup analysis showed significant differences in the pattern of change of PAPI based on gender.

Hemodynamics after LVAD Implantation

We have previously demonstrated that hemodynamics are frequently unexpectedly abnormal in otherwise stable LVAD patients.³ We have also shown that such abnormal hemodynamics were related to worse clinical outcomes.^{8–11} However, the trajectories of hemodynamic parameters over time have not been described previously.

The results of this study suggest worsening RV function over time following LVAD implantation. The dominant cause of hemodynamic vulnerability in LVAD patients is RV dysfunction. RVF is related to poor clinical outcomes and is a major reason for mortality and morbidity. The longitudinal trend of PAPI in this study showed a transient early postoperative decrease and a progressive decline over a long period, which is consistent with previous reports showing that LVAD patients can suffer from RVF in the late phase as well as the early postoperative period.^{1, 6, 14} The increase of RAP over a long period also supports the progression of RV dysfunction. The measurements of RV afterload such as TPG, PVR, PEa and PAC were mostly stable over this period, whereas PCWP increased slightly, though not statistically significantly. Therefore, the changes in RAP and PAPI more likely reflect worsening of underlying RV contractile function.

The pathophysiology of RV dysfunction in LVAD patients can be divided into 3 main etiologies. First, many patients have RV dysfunction prior to device implantation that worsens in the context of increased CO provided by the LVADs. Second, LVAD surgery may be associated with transient trauma to the RV due to RV ischemia, blood product use, and inflammation. Finally, LVAD itself induces septal shift towards the left, reduces septal force generation and reduces left ventricular (LV) pressure generation which contribute to deterioration of RV function. Furthermore, previous studies have also shown that the decrease of LV volume and leftward shift of intraventricular septum may reduce tricuspid valve coaptation and cause progressive tricuspid regurgitation, and this could also lead to late-onset RV dysfunction.¹⁵ All these pathophysiological mechanisms may contribute to the hemodynamic trends we reported here: the initial decrease of PAPI may be associated with LVAD surgery; longer-term decrease of PAPI and increase of RAP may be associated with the unfavorable effect of LVAD itself on RV function. Further investigations for the mechanism of RV dysfunction are needed.

Interestingly, we did not find significant changes in RVSWI throughout the period of follow-up. In contrast, the trend of RAP/PCWP ratio, which is also known as a marker of RV dysfunction,¹⁶ was consistent with PAPI. To date, there are no data supporting the use of either RVSWI or PAPI to evaluate RV function after LVAD implantation. However, the calculation of RVSWI incorporates CO and may therefore overestimate RV function when

CO is being sustained artificially by an LVAD. In contrast, PAPI is a more specific measurement of the reduced pulsatility generated by the RV in this circumstance and may be better at capturing the degree of RV dysfunction independently from overall CO.¹⁷ Whether PAPI or RVSWI predict subsequent admissions for RVF should be investigated in future studies. Taking the trend of PAPI, RAP and RAP/PCWP ratio together, we conclude that there is progressive RV dysfunction in this study; however, we should point out that it has not been firmly established if PAPI is a better surrogate for RV dysfunction than RVSWI in this population.

Our findings regarding longitudinal hemodynamic trends in LVAD patients are different from two previous studies that found an overall improvement in RV parameters during long-term follow-up.^{18, 19} It is important to note that the larger of these two studies excluded patients on inotropes or pulmonary vasodilators by design, in order to examine RV load independent of medications that might impact the physiology.¹⁸ The smaller study also excluded patients on inotropes, and was limited to a single device (HeartMate II).¹⁹ In contrast, our study did not exclude these patients, in order to reduce selection bias and provide a more comprehensive view of the clinical course following LVAD. These differences in study population may explain the difference in hemodynamic trends.

Subgroup Analyses of PAPI Trends

Some reports have previously shown the predictors of late-onset RVF following LVAD implantation;^{6, 15} however, the longitudinal trend of PAPI and its predictors were previously unknown. We performed subgroup analyses based on patients' demographics. Our primary subgroup finding was a difference in the PAPI trend based on gender; in women, PAPI rose more initially and then declined to a greater degree in the long-term.

This result is consistent with previous reports. Blumer et al. reported that female LVAD patients were at greater risk of RVF.²⁰ Defilippis et al. also showed that female LVAD patients had increased mortality and worse clinical status than male patients.²¹ The reasons why female patients have a greater decrease in PAPI over time remain unclear, but one speculation is that women are often referred for LVAD implantation later, when their HF is more advanced. This could potentially explain the increased risk of RVF following LVAD implantation.²⁰ Another potential reason is that LVAD flow might be too high for female and small BSA patients. This can explain the initial increase of PAPI due to aggressive reduction of RV afterload, and subsequent worsening of RV function associated with high LVAD flow. Further investigations are expected to elucidate the mechanism of significant difference in PAPI trend based on gender.

Study Limitations

Several potential limitations of this study should be considered. First, this is a retrospective cohort, and the timing and number of RHCs varied across the patient cohort. With a limited number of measurements, we had less power to identify what might have been clinically significant subgroup differences. Further investigations are required to fully elucidate characteristics which predict the trend of PAPI and the mechanism of significant PAPI reduction in female patients. Second, this is an observational analysis that may be affected

by selection bias. Some of the RHCs were performed in response to clinical symptoms, which may influence the findings of this study. In particular RVF may be more prevalent in this cohort than the LVAD population as a whole. Third, as noted above, the lack of change in RVSWI could be interpreted to say that RV function is in fact preserved over time. Currently, there are no data to determine whether RVSWI or PAPI is a better measurement of RV function in the LVAD patient. Finally, we did not consider the change of therapeutics during the follow-up period. Optimization of LVAD speed and medical therapy were frequently performed according to each physician's discretion and this could have affected the trends of hemodynamic parameters. However, we believe it is unlikely that PAPI was influenced by inotrope discontinuation, as PAPI continued to decline outside of the perioperative period. We also did not find an association between beta-blocker use and PAPI at the 1–3 months timepoint.

Conclusions

We described the longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamic parameters following LVAD implantation. Despite improvement in left-side filling pressures and CO, and no change in RVSWI, RAP increased and PAPI decreased over time suggesting progressive RV dysfunction.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Reference

1. Kirklin JK, Xie R, Cowger J, et al. Second annual report from the ISHLT Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support Registry. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2018;37:685–91. [PubMed: 29550146]
2. Rose EA, Gelijns AC, Moskowitz AJ, et al. Long-term use of a left ventricular assist device for end-stage heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1435–43. [PubMed: 11794191]
3. Nitta D, Kinugawa K, Imamura T, et al. A Useful Scoring System For Predicting Right Ventricular Assist Device Requirement Among Patients with a Paracorporeal Left Ventricular Assist Device. *Int Heart J* 2018;59:983–90. [PubMed: 30158383]
4. Raina A, Seetha Rammohan HR, Gertz ZM, Rame JE, Woo YJ, Kirkpatrick JN. Postoperative right ventricular failure after left ventricular assist device placement is predicted by preoperative echocardiographic structural, hemodynamic, and functional parameters. *J Card Fail* 2013;19:16–24. [PubMed: 23273590]
5. Bellavia D, Iacovoni A, Scardulla C, et al. Prediction of right ventricular failure after ventricular assist device implant: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2017;19:926–46. [PubMed: 28371221]
6. Takeda K, Takayama H, Colombo PC, et al. Incidence and clinical significance of late right heart failure during continuous-flow left ventricular assist device support. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1024–32. [PubMed: 25935438]
7. Lampert BC, Teuteberg JJ. Right ventricular failure after left ventricular assist devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1123–30. [PubMed: 26267741]
8. Imamura T, Kim G, Raikhelkar J, et al. Decoupling Between Diastolic Pulmonary Arterial Pressure and Pulmonary Arterial Wedge Pressure at Incremental Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) Speeds Is Associated With Worse Prognosis After LVAD Implantation. *J Card Fail* 2018;24:575–82. [PubMed: 30103020]

9. Imamura T, Jeevanandam V, Kim G, et al. Optimal Hemodynamics During Left Ventricular Assist Device Support Are Associated With Reduced Readmission Rates. *Circ Heart Fail* 2019;12:e005094. [PubMed: 30704291]
10. Imamura T, Nguyen A, Kim G, et al. Optimal haemodynamics during left ventricular assist device support are associated with reduced haemocompatibility-related adverse events. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2019;21:655–62. [PubMed: 30592363]
11. Uriel N, Burkhoff D, Rich JD, et al. Impact of Hemodynamic Ramp Test-Guided HVAD Speed and Medication Adjustments on Clinical Outcomes. *Circ Heart Fail* 2019;12:e006067. [PubMed: 30946600]
12. Tampakakis E, Shah SJ, Borlaug BA, et al. Pulmonary Effective Arterial Elastance as a Measure of Right Ventricular Afterload and Its Prognostic Value in Pulmonary Hypertension Due to Left Heart Disease. *Circ Heart Fail* 2018;11:e004436. [PubMed: 29643065]
13. Lupon J, Gavidia-Bovadilla G, Ferrer E, et al. Dynamic Trajectories of Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction in Heart Failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:591–601. [PubMed: 30071987]
14. Ranganath NK, Smith DE, Moazami N. The Achilles' heel of left ventricular assist device therapy: right ventricle. *Curr Opin Organ Transplant* 2018;23:295–300. [PubMed: 29629994]
15. Imamura T, Kinugawa K, Kato N, et al. Late-onset right ventricular failure in patients with preoperative small left ventricle after implantation of continuous flow left ventricular assist device. *Circ J* 2014;78:625–33. [PubMed: 24430596]
16. Drazner MH, Velez-Martinez M, Ayers CR, et al. Relationship of right- to left-sided ventricular filling pressures in advanced heart failure: insights from the ESCAPE trial. *Circ Heart Fail* 2013;6:264–70. [PubMed: 23392790]
17. Sayer G, Sarswat N, Kim GH, et al. The Hemodynamic Effects of Aortic Insufficiency in Patients Supported With Continuous-Flow Left Ventricular Assist Devices. *J Card Fail* 2017;23:545–51. [PubMed: 28435003]
18. Houston BA, Kalathiya RJ, Hsu S, et al. Right ventricular afterload sensitivity dramatically increases after left ventricular assist device implantation: A multi-center hemodynamic analysis. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:868–76. [PubMed: 27041496]
19. Kalathiya RJ, Houston BA, Chaisson JM, et al. Cardiac Index Declines During Long-Term Left Ventricular Device Support. *Artif Organs* 2016;40:1105–12. [PubMed: 27187888]
20. Blumer V, Mendirichaga R, Hernandez GA, Zablah G, Chaparro SV. Sex-Specific Outcome Disparities in Patients Receiving Continuous-Flow Left Ventricular Assist Devices: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *ASAIO J* 2018;64:440–9. [PubMed: 29084066]
21. DeFilippis EM, Truby LK, Garan AR, et al. Sex-Related Differences in Use and Outcomes of Left Ventricular Assist Devices as Bridge to Transplantation. *JACC Heart Fail* 2019;7:250–7. [PubMed: 30819381]

Highlights

- We described the longitudinal trajectories of hemodynamic parameters following LVAD implantation.
- Despite improvements in left-side filling pressures and CO following LVAD implantation, RAP increased and PAPI decreased over time, suggesting progressive right ventricular dysfunction.
- Subgroup analysis showed significant differences in the pattern of change of PAPI based on gender.

Figure 1. Loess curves of RAP (A), PAP and PCWP (B), cardiac index (C), TPG (D), PVR (E), SVR (F) and PAPI (G).

LVAD indicates left ventricular assist device; RAP, right atrial pressure; sPAP, systolic pulmonary arterial pressure; mPAP, mean pulmonary arterial pressure; dPAP, diastolic pulmonary arterial pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; SVR, systemic vascular resistance; PAPI, pulmonary artery pulsatility index.

Figure 2. Paired comparison of consecutive change of RAP (A), mPAP (B), cardiac index (C), TPG (D), PVR (E), SVR (F) and PAPI (G).

RAP indicates right atrial pressure; mPAP, mean pulmonary arterial pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; SVR, systemic vascular resistance; PAPI, pulmonary artery pulsatility index.

Figure 3. Loess curves of RAP/PCWP ratio (A), RVSWI (B), PAE (C) and PAC (D).

LVAD indicates left ventricular assist device; RAP, right atrial pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; RVSWI, right ventricular stroke work index; PAE, effective pulmonary arterial elastance; PAC, pulmonary arterial compliance.

Figure 4. Loess curves of PAPI in subgroups of gender (A), age (B), race (C), etiology (D), BSA (E) and pump type (F).

P-values represent the difference of quadratic trajectories between the two subgroups in each panel. LVAD indicates left ventricular assist device; PAPI, pulmonary artery pulsatility index; BSA, body surface area.

Table 1.

Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients prior to LVAD implantation and at the time of discharge.

	n=150
Age at implant, years old	57±13
Male, n	102 (68%)
Race, n	
African American	72 (48%)
White	65 (43%)
Others	13 (9%)
Ischemic etiology, n	48 (32%)
Destination therapy, n	112 (75%)
Device type, n	
Centrifugal pump	85 (57%)
Axial pump	65 (43%)
Body height, cm	172±10
Body weight, kg	88±25
Body surface area, m ²	2.0±0.3
Heart rate, beats per minute	88±19
Mean blood pressure, mmHg	82±12
<u>Pre-implant echocardiographic parameters</u>	
LVEDD, mm	70±10
LVEF, %	20±7
E, cm/s	102±31
A, cm/s	52±21
E/A	2.2±1.0
Deceleration time, msec	171±58
TRPG, mmHg	37±13
TAPSE, mm	13±7
<u>Echocardiographic parameters at discharge</u>	
LVEDD, mm	58±12
LVEF, %	23±11
E, cm/s	83±23
A, cm/s	52±24
Deceleration time, msec	1.9±0.9
TRPG, mmHg	20±10
TAPSE, mm	10±3
Interventricular septal position, n	
Midline	103 (69%)
Rightward shift	27 (18%)
Leftward shift	20 (13%)
Aortic valve opening, n	55 (39%)

LVEDD, left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; TRPG, tricuspid regurgitation pressure gradient; TAPSE, tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2.

Longitudinal change of hemodynamic parameters in patients followed for more than 3 years(n=22).

	Pre	0–6 months	>1 year
RAP, mmHg	8 (4, 17)	6 (3, 13)	10 (7, 13)
mPAP, mmHg	33 (23, 41)	23 (17, 27)	24 (20, 29)
PCWP, mmHg	21 (18, 28)	10 (8, 15)	15 (12, 18)
Cardiac index, L/min/m ²	2.0 (1.3, 2.4)	2.7 (2.4, 2.9)	2.6 (2.3, 3.1)
TPG, mmHg	10 (8, 16)	12 (6, 13)	9 (7, 13)
PVR, Wood Units	2.9 (2.2, 4.8)	2.3 (1.4, 2.9)	1.6 (1.3, 2.7)
SVR, dyne*sec/cm ⁵	1600 (1182, 2012)	1268 (1028, 1574)	1106 (963, 1406)
PAPI	2.8 (2.2, 5.8)	3.7 (2.1, 6.6)	1.9 (1.2, 2.2)
RVSWI, mmHg*ml/m ²	451 (303, 729)	458 (353, 662)	432 (311, 678)
RAP/PCWP ratio	0.46 (0.24, 0.58)	0.50 (0.33, 1.00)	0.65 (0.54, 0.89)

RAP, right atrial pressure; mPAP, mean pulmonary arterial pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; TPG, transpulmonary gradient; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; SVR, systemic vascular resistance; PAPI, pulmonary arterial pulsatility index; RVSWI, right ventricular stroke work index.