



Published in final edited form as:

J Am Coll Cardiol. 2017 October 17; 70(16): 2097–2098. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2017.07.795.

Reply: The Benefit of Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy Is Not Hindered by the Number of Comorbidities

Emily P. Zeitler, MD, MHS, Daniel J. Friedman, MD, James P. Daubert, MD, Sana M. Al-Khatib, MD, MHS, Scott D. Solomon, MD, Yitschak Biton, MD, Scott McNitt, MS, Wojciech Zareba, MD, PhD, Arthur J. Moss, MD, Valentina Kutiyfa, MD, PhD*

Heart Research Follow-up Program, Cardiology Division, University of Rochester Medical Center, 265 Crittenden Boulevard, P.O. Box 653, Rochester, New York 14642

We appreciate the thoughtful commentary by Dr. Barra and colleagues in response to our analysis of cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator (CRT-D) over implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) alone in patients with multiple comorbidities enrolled in MADIT-CRT (Multicenter Automatic Defibrillator Implantation Trial with Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy). Our findings support the ongoing use of CRT-D in qualifying ICD-eligible patients across a range of common comorbidities (1). Dr. Barra and colleagues have done a complementary analysis demonstrating a similar finding in a large “real-world” population in a clinical practice registry. This is important for 2 major reasons. First, the patients and health care in clinical trials are often different from those seen in clinical practice. Second, registry data from current clinical practice incorporate contemporary devices, programming, and patient selection. Thus, the data from Dr. Barra and colleagues add external validity to our findings (1).

As in our analysis, Dr. Barra and colleagues evaluated the association of CRT response with 6 common comorbidities including some comorbidities not incorporated in our analysis (i.e., previous malignancy) and others that were similar but not identical (e.g., atrial fibrillation vs. atrial arrhythmias). Despite these differences, similar patterns emerged. Unsurprisingly, patients with the greatest comorbidity burden had the highest mortality. Dr. Barra and colleagues found no interaction between comorbidity burden and response to CRT in patients with 2 comorbidities, whereas attenuated response was seen in those with 3 comorbidities. However, nearly 50% of the cohort assessed by Dr. Barra and colleagues had New York Association functional class III or IV heart failure, whereas MADIT-CRT enrolled patients with New York Association functional class I or II only 2, 3; this difference may explain the attenuated response.

Traditional randomized clinical trials serve an essential role in the evaluation of medical therapies, but these trials are often limited in providing information on diverse patient populations in a real-world setting. Real-world data from sources such as electronic health records, clinical registries, claims databases, and others can therefore complement and enrich our understanding (4). Until data from clinical trials and clinical practice can be

*Heart Research Follow-up Program, Cardiology Division, University of Rochester Medical Center, 265 Crittenden Boulevard, P.O. Box 653, Rochester, New York 14642, Valentina.Kutyifa@heart.rochester.edu.

seamlessly acquired, integrated, and compared, post hoc analyses like ours and analyses of clinical practice registries like the one by Dr. Barra and colleagues can provide meaningful data to help inform clinical decision making.

Acknowledgments

Please note: The MADIT-CRT study was supported by a research grant from Boston Scientific, St. Paul, Minnesota, to the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry. Dr. Kutyifa has received research grants and a one-time speaker honorarium from ZOLL. Drs. Kutyifa, Moss, Zareba, Goldenberg, and Solomon have received research grants from Boston Scientific. Drs. Friedman and Zeitler were funded by National Institutes of Health T-32 training grant 2 T32 HL 69749–11 A1. Dr. Friedman has received modest educational grants from Boston Scientific and St. Jude Medical. All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

References

1. Zeitler EP, Friedman DJ, Daubert JP, et al. Multiple comorbidities and response to cardiac resynchronization therapy: MADIT-CRT long-term follow-up. *J Am Coll Cardiol*, 69 (2017), pp. 2369–2379. [PubMed: 28494974]
2. Moss AJ, Hall WJ, Cannom DS, et al., for the MADIT-CRT Trial Investigators Cardiac-resynchronization therapy for the prevention of heart-failure events. *N Engl J Med*, 361 (2009), pp. 1329–1338. [PubMed: 19723701]
3. Goldenberg I, Kutyifa V, Moss AJ. Survival with cardiac-resynchronization therapy. *N Engl J Med*, 371 (2014), pp. 477–478.
4. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, et al. Real-world evidence—what is it and what can it tell us? *N Engl J Med*, 375 (2016), pp. 2293–2297. [PubMed: 27959688]