2nd Virtual Symposium on Heart Failure

Heart Failure Disease Management

Harlan M. Krumholz

Harold H. Hines, Jr Professor of Medicine

Yale University School of Medicine

US Population Trends



Marital Status by Age



Living Alone



Heart Failure Hospitalization



Prevalence of HF by Age



Life Expectancy



Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System.

Polypharmacy



Arch Intern Med (in press)

Polypharmacy



Arch Intern Med (in press)

Trends in HF in Elderly: 1990s

- No change in 1-year mortality
- Length of stay decreased ~25%
- Admission to nursing homes increased
- Efficacy-Effectiveness Gap

What if we had a pill that...

- Improved outcomes (hospitalization and/or mortality)
- Had no side effects
- May save money

The Promise of Disease Management

- Improves outcomes
- Has No Side Effects
- Save Money

Disease Management: Definition

 System of coordinated healthcare interventions and communications for populations with conditions in which patient self-care efforts are significant.

Potential Mechanisms

- Changing the behavior of physicians
- Extending the abilities of physicians
- Changing the behavior of patients
 - Adherence to meds and lifestyle recommendations
 - Self monitoring and care seeking

Rich Study



N Engl J Med 1995;333:1190-5

Rich Intervention

- Intensive education about HF by an experienced CVD nurse
- Individualized dietary assessment and instruction by dietitian
- Consultation with social-service personnel
- Analysis of medications by a geriatric cardiologist
- Intensive follow-up after discharge through the hospital's home care services, supplemented by individualized home visits and telephone contact

Rich Study

- 282 patients
- 70+ years
- Admitted with heart failure
- Primary outcome: 90 day survival without readmission

Rich Results

Survival without readmission
53.6% versus 64.1% (P=0.09)

N Engl J Med 1995;333:1190-5

Challenges of Disease Management

- Active ingredient
- Inconsistent literature/terminology
- Uncertain scalability
- Efficacy-effectiveness issues
- Incentives

Phillip Meta-Analysis

- 18 RCTs from 8 countries
- 3304 patients; mean follow-up 8 months
- Risk of readmission RR 0.75 (NNT 12)
- Trend lower mortality RR 0.87
- Trend for cost saving

JAMA 2004;291:1358-1367

Gonseth Meta-Analysis: HF/CVD Admission

Study	Treatment	Control	RR (fixed)	1
or sub-calegory	n/N	n/N	95% Cl	
DIAL, 2003 (47,48)	128/760	169/758	-	
Laramee, 2003 (49)	18/131	21/125		
Doughty, 2002 (51)	21/100	23/97		
Krumholz, 2002 (54)	18/44	30/44		
McDonald, 2002 (55)	2/47	13/51	←	
Riegel, 2002 (56)	23/130	63/228		
Blue, 2001 (58)	12/84	26/81		
Jaarsma, 1999 (63)	24/84	37/95		
Rainville, 1999 (65)	4/17	10/17		
Ekman, 1998 (69)	36/79	38/79		
Serxner, 1998 (70)	15/55	27/54		
Total (95% CI)	1531	1629	•	
Total events: 301 (Treatment),	457 (Control)			
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 = "	13.73, df = 10 (P = 0.19), i ² =	27.1%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.5	4 (P < 0.00001)			
			0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5	10
			Favours treatment Favours control	

Gonseth Meta-Analysis: All-Cause Readmission

Study Intervention Control	RR (random)	v
or sub-category n/N n/N	95% CI	
DIAL, 2003 (47,48) 261/760 296/758	-	
Laramee, 2003 (49) 49/131 46/125	_ + _	
Doughty, 2002 (51) 64/100 59/97	-	
Harrison, 2002 (52) 18/79 24/76		
Riegel, 2002 (56) 56/130 114/228		
Blue, 2001 (58) 47/84 49/81	-	
Hughes, 2000 (61) 11/14 14/16		
Jaarsma, 1999 (63) 31/84 47/95		
Naylor, 1999 (64) 18/52 26/56		
Stewart, 1999 (66) 40/100 61/100		
Cline, 1998 (68) 22/56 43/79		
Ekman, 1998 (69) 48/79 45/79		
Stewart, 1998 (71) 24/49 31/48		
Weinberger 1996 (72) 130/249 106/255		
Rich, 1995 (73) 41/142 59/140		
Rich, 1993 (74) 21/63 16/35		
Total (95% Cl) 2172 2268	•	1
Total events: 881 (Intervention), 1036 (Control)		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 29.37, df = 15 (P = 0.01), l ² = 48.9%		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.55$ (P = 0.01)		
0.1 0.2	0.5 1 2	5 10
Favours in	tervention Eavours co	ntrol

EHJ 2004; 25: 1570–95

Gonseth Meta-Analysis: Admission or Death

Study or sub-category	Intervention n/N	Control n/N			RR (r 95	andom) % Cl			
DIAL, 2003 (47,48)	200/760	235/758			-	-			
Stromberg, 2003 (50)	29/52	40/54				-			
Doughty, 2002 (51)	68/100	61/97				-			
Kasper, 2002 (53)	47/102	55/98			-	-			
Krumholz, 2002 (54)	25/44	36/44							
McDonald, 2002 (55)	2/47	13/51	+						
Stewart, 2002 (57)	130/149	135/148				•			
Blue, 2001 (58)	52/84	61/81				_			
Rainville, 1999 (65)	5/17	14/17	-						
Rich, 1995 (73)	51/142	65/140			-	+			
Total (95% Cl)	1497	1488			4	•			
Total events: 609 (Intervention), 715 (Control)								
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 = :	27.87, df = 9 (P = 0.001), l ² =	67.7%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.9	1 (P=0.004)								
			0.1 0	2	0.5	1 2	2	5	10
			Favours intervention Favours co		ontrol				

McAlister Meta-Analysis

Туре	Mortality	HF Admits	All Admits
F/U by multi- team	19%	25%	26%
Enhancing pt self-care	NS	34%	27%
Telephone telemonitor	NS	25%	NS

J Am Coll Cardiol 2004;44:810–9

Taxonomy



Dial



BMJ 2005;331;425

Dial Subgroups



DeBusk Study



Ann Intern Med. 2004;141:606-613

Galbreath: LV Dysfunction Group



Galbreath: Preserved LV Function



Circulation 2004;110:3518-3526

Home Telemonitoring - Cleland



J Am Coll Cardiol 2005;45:1654–64)

Cleland Results

Survival Distribution Function



Figure 3. Mortality in each of the randomized groups. A difference was found between usual care and either nurse telephone support or home telemonitoring (chi-squared test: p = 0.0397). The absolute difference in mortality at one year was 16% to 18%. Dashed line = usual care; dotted line = nurse support; solid line = telemonitoring.

J Am Coll Cardiol 2005;45:1654–64)

Pharos Innovations



Health Buddy



Health Buddy



Health Buddy® System*





Questions

- Patient population
- Content/Focus
- Frequency
- Delivery method
 - Who
 - How
- Consequence

Next Steps

- What should be implemented?
- What needs further testing?
- Who should pay for it?
- How to ensure quality?
- Is it different from devices?