The Limitations of the 6-Minute Walk Test as a Measurement Tool in Chronic Heart Failure Patients. Response

Limitaciones de la prueba de marcha de 6 minutos como instrumento de medida en pacientes con insuficiencia cardiaca crónica. Respuesta

To the Editor,

We thank Ganga and Jantz for their interest in our article.1 Assessment of functional capacity in heart failure is complex; available tools are the 6-minute walk test (6MWT), functional class, and cardiopulmonary exercise testing with gas exchange measurements, but each of them evaluates a specific aspect of functional status and their interpretations are complementary. Any limitations of the interpretation of the 6MWT related to comorbidities are likewise applicable to tests involving oxygen consumption. A number of the clinical trials carried out to study heart failure have used the 6MWT as the primary endpoint for evaluating the effectiveness of a given treatment and the beneficial effects on the symptoms.2 Likewise, in the study of pulmonary hypertension, comparable to heart failure because of its impact on quality of life, the 6MWT is the only test approved for the assessment of functional class and is the primary endpoint in the assessment of exercise capacity.3 The evaluation of functional capacity using the New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional classification is a subjective assessment from the perspective of the physician that does not correlate perfectly with other patient-centered outcomes, such as quality of life and the 6MWT.4 Like other authors,5 we did not include the NYHA class in the model because of the risk of its collinearity with the dependent variable, that is, the 6MWT distance.

Efforts to investigate evaluation methods that provide more information on functional aspects are undoubtedly necessary.
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Timing of Pacemaker Implantation After Percutaneous Aortic Valve Replacement

Momento del implante de un marcapasos tras el recambio valvular aórtico percutáneo

To the Editor,

We have read with interest the article concerning atrioventricular conduction disturbances secondary to implantation of the CoreValve transcatheter aortic valve (Medtronic CoreValve System [MCS]) published by López-Aguilera et al1 in Revista Española de Cardiología. After congratulating the authors for adding to the evidence regarding this feared complication, we believe that some of our reflections on the timeline of these disturbances would be highly pertinent. The implantation of MCS prostheses has been related to the need for pacemaker implantation in up to 35% of patients.2 This high rate is due to the development of a complete atrioventricular block (CAVB) during or after valve implantation. The early timing of pacemaker implantation, sometimes within the same procedure, could be due to the lack of data on the time course of CAVB secondary to valve implantation, which may have influenced the reported rates. However, there is a growing body of evidence of the temporality of these disturbances. A number of authors have reported that around 50% of the patients treated with the MCS prosthesis eventually returned to their normal rhythm,3,4 suggesting that perhaps the causal mechanism of the CAVB is only temporal. This was pointed out by López-Aguilera et al1 upon observing the improvement in the electrophysiological parameters just days after the procedure. On the other hand, there is a group of patients treated with the MCS prosthesis who require a pacemaker during long-term follow-up. Although several authors consider CAVB to be related to valve implantation if it occurs within 30 days,5,6 it is difficult to set an exact time limit on the causality of valve implantation in the development of CAVB. Importantly, the percentage of patients treated with the MCS prosthesis who require a pacemaker during the first year of follow-up is higher than that expected for a population of similar age and characteristics.7,8 In this respect, López-Aguilera et al1 found that 3.8% of the patients treated with MCS prostheses required a pacemaker sometime after the second month of follow-up due to the development of CAVB, and that 1.1% needed it because of symptoms associated with significant alterations in a late electrophysiological study. Thus, there appears to be a causal relationship between valve implantation and the development of CAVB during long-term follow-up. This theory may be supported by the fact that some authors have demonstrated the protective role of pacemaker implantation against sudden death in patients treated with transcatheter aortic valve prostheses.9

To correctly select those patients who require a permanent pacemaker after valve implantation, is it essential to establish a time limit prior to undertaking pacemaker implantation, since the CAVB may be reversible. It is also necessary to define the predictive factors related to the development of a late CAVB. Thus, patients