LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Is There a Role for Levosimendan in Hospital Emergency Departments?

To the Editor:

We read with interest the article by Llorens-Soriano et al.,1 in which they report their experience with levosimendan and conclude that it is a safe and effective therapeutic option for the treatment of acute heart failure (AHF) in hospital emergency departments. The purpose of this letter is to reflect on certain aspects of the above mentioned article.

In the first place, there are notable differences between the indications for levosimendan in the clinical practice guidelines2 and the protocol followed by the authors.1 Whereas the guidelines recommend its use in heart failure with symptomatic reduced cardiac output secondary to left ventricular dysfunction with no severe hypotension, the authors of the above mentioned study consider its use in multiple clinical situations, including AHF with a left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) >45% and hypotension, or shock.

To date, no scientific evidence is available regarding the use of levosimendan in patients with AHF and conserved systolic function. It is therefore surprising that more than 40% of the patients included in the study belonged to this subgroup. The administration of levosimendan is known to produce a reduction in peripheral vascular resistance and an improvement in the etiology, NYHA Class III/IV, absence of concomitant treatment with vasodilators or antiarrhythmic drugs, and systolic blood pressure >100 mm Hg. Another important aspect to consider is the dosage of this drug. In the REVIVE and SURVIVE studies, the relative depletion of intravascular volume secondary to diuretic therapy, together with the administration of a high loading dose, favors the onset of hypotension and is probably associated with worse survival.3 The authors of this study, like us, are in favor of using a more flexible dose of levosimendan depending on the hemodynamic status of the patient, as well as its early use in order to avoid situations of excessive volume depletion caused by the use of diuretics.

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize the need for adequate identification of those patients who might benefit from this promising drug, which, pending the results of further studies, should have its use restricted to the indications already approved in consensus guidelines. Additionally, it would seem reasonable to perform an echocardiogram prior to the administration of this drug and to have better co-ordination between the various hospital services involved in treating these patients.

Sergio Manzano-Fernández, Francisco Martín, Iris P. Garrido Bravo, and Domingo A. Pascual Fidal
Servicio de Cardiología, Hospital Universitario Virgen de la Arrixaca, Murcia, Spain
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Response

To the Editor:

The question posed by the authors is interesting, although at the same time disappointing, because at no point do they suggest an answer. In order to provide an answer, it would have been necessary to be aware of our situation: the patient with acute heart failure (AHF) in Spanish emergency wards presents a different profile to the patient usually seen on the cardiology ward or in the office, and even different to the patients who form the object of the guidelines for AHF. A recent multicenter study carried out in Spain comes to the conclusion that patients with AHF in the emergency ward are older (a population considered by the guidelines to be special), and have a high degree of comorbidity, functional, and social deterioration, and previous diagnoses of chronic heart failure (CHF), as well as presenting functional decompensation or progression even though most of them receive a correct pharmacological treatment. Moreover, as they are patients with CHF, most are unaware of the type and degree of cardiac dysfunction, and when this is known, both systolic and diastolic dysfunction are predominant. Fewer than 3% undergo an echocardiographic study in the emergency wards, and fewer than 10% are admitted to the cardiology ward, which shows that AHF is very important in the emergency wards and that the treatment of these patients is no less important.

The clinical practice guidelines on AHF must be understood to provide advice on the management of these patients, and we should be able to adapt this advice to the circumstances of our environment and not treat it as dogma for the attendance of our patients. Our working protocol coincides with the current recommendations drawn up by experts in cardiology, emergency medicine and intensive medicine for the early stages of AHF, during which levosimendan is administered to patients who remain symptomatic after initial conventional therapy and in the case of shock associated with vasopressors.

There are currently more than 3000 patients who have been included in randomized clinical trials, in whom the efficacy and safety of levosimendan have been demonstrated, without mentioning observational studies and case series. It is the first inodilator to improve diastolic dysfunction and left ventricular filling pressures and increases contractility with little consumption of energy, all of which are ideal effects for the different
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