medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title: Stroke Volume Reserve Is an Independent Predictor of Survival and Need for Advanced Therapies in Systolic Heart Failure Patients

Short Title: Selevany, Stroke Volume Reserve in Heart Failure

Authors: Ibrahim Selevany, MD,[1] Florin Vaida, PhD,[2] Eric D. Adler, MD,[1] Paul J. Kim, MD[1]*, Timothy Morris, MD[3]*

[1]Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA; [2]Division of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Department of Family Medicine and Public Health, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA. [3]Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA

*Drs Timothy Morris and Paul J. Kim contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding authors:

Timothy A. Morris, MD

Professor of Medicine

Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine

University of California, San Diego Healthcare

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

200 West Arbor Drive, MC 8378

San Diego, CA, USA 92103

Email: t1morris@health.ucsd.edu Tel: 619-543-5972 Fax: 619-543-3384

Paul J. Kim, MD

Assistant Clinical Professor

Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Medicine

Altman Clinical and Translational Research Institute

9452 Medical Center Drive, MC 7411

La Jolla, CA, USA 92037

Email: pjk017@health.ucsd.edu Tel: 858-246-0638 Fax: 858-657-5028

Total word count: 3,556

Journal Subject Terms: Heart Failure, Prognosis, Transplantation, Mortality/Survival

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Background:

Current predictors of clinical deterioration in patients with heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) have limited accuracy. We investigated whether stroke volume reserve index (SVRI) would predict 1-year mortality and need for advanced therapies in HFrEF patients.

Methods:

We retrospectively studied a consecutive series of 104 ambulatory HFrEF patients (59±11 years, 89% men) at our center who underwent cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET) from January 2017 to September 2018. The primary outcome was defined as heart-transplantation, urgent left ventricular assist device (LVAD) implantation or death within 1 year of evaluation. SVRI was estimated at rest and at anaerobic threshold (AT) by VO_2 (oxygen consumption)/pulse and previously validated estimates of $C[a\text{-}v]O_2$ (arteriovenous difference in oxygen content). Multivariate regression selected the optimal predictors from clinical, CPET and right heart catheterization data.

Results:

Among HFrEF patients studied, 39 (37.5%) deteriorated: 16 required heart-transplantation, 8 required LVADs and 15 died. SVRI 128% or less was the best predictor (OR 6.69, p=0.001), followed by an invasively determined resting cardiac index 2 L/min/m^2 or less (OR 3.18, p=0.02), and peak VO_2 below the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) cut-off (OR 4.15, p=0.01). A scoring system derived from the SVRI (less than 128%: 2 points), peak VO_2 (below the ISHLT

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

cut-off: 1 point), and cardiac index (less than 2 L/min/m^2: 1 point) predicted clinical deterioration with a sensitivity of 64% and specificity of 81%.

Conclusions:

SVRI is a non-invasive measurement that may predict deterioration in HFrEF patients more accurately than currently recommended predictors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

The morbidity and mortality of patients with heart-failure have improved considerably over recent years.[1-3] However, there remain patients who continue to progress in their heart-failure course and require evaluation for advanced therapies.[4] These patients are considered to be in advanced or American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Stage D heart-failure.[5] Exercise tolerance, typically represented as oxygen consumption (VO_2) less than 12-14 ml/kg/min, is a commonly recommended indicator for advanced therapies.[6, 7] However, peak VO_2 has only a limited accuracy to predict serious clinical deterioration in patients with heart failure.[8] Other exercise parameters such as VE/VCO_2 slope, VO_2 at AT and peak VO_2 pulse also have limited accuracy of predicting deterioration in heart failure patients.[8-15]

We recently reported that the ratio of the stroke volume (SV) at AT to the SV at rest (stroke volume reserve index, or SVRI) measured during cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET) reflects right ventricular dysfunction after acute pulmonary embolism.[16] The SVRI is measured non-invasively using a method developed by Stringer et al.[17] and matches invasively-measured values in normal subjects and heart failure patients.[16, 18-21] Because the cardiac response to exercise is an important determinant of outcome in patients with cardiomyopathy[22, 23], and because SVRI reflects SV at two standardized points during exercise, we reasoned that decreased SVRI would predict clinical deterioration more accurately than currently used CPET parameters.[7, 24-26] To test our hypothesis, we analyzed the records of a retrospective series of HFrEF patients who had performed CPET, to determine the accuracy with which decreased SVRI predicted death, the need for heart-transplantation or urgent LVAD implantation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

METHODS

Study Population and Design

We retrospectively analyzed all HFrEF patients who underwent CPET at the University of California, San Diego (UC San Diego) physiology laboratory for advanced therapies evaluation between January 1, 2017 and September 30, 2018. We defined HFrEF as left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) of 35% or less by echocardiography. Patients less than 18 years old, with congenital heart disease, planned coronary revascularization, previous transplantation, intravenous inotropic therapy and those who did not reach AT during CPET were excluded. The UC San Diego Human Research Protections Program approved the retrospective analysis of data without the need for informed consent. All of the authors have full access to the data in the study and take full responsibility for its integrity and the analysis.

Exercise Protocol

Incremental symptom-limited CPET was performed using a V-max metabolic cart (CareFusion, San Diego, CA), as previously described.[16] All patients performed exercise testing on a treadmill. The treadmill protocols had been clinically validated within each weight interval to produce a uniform increase in mechanical work and metabolic energy expenditure per incremental step. Exhaled gases, electrocardiography and pulse oximetry were measured continuously. AT was determined by a board certified pulmonologist (TM) with the V-slope method.[27]

SV at rest and at AT

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We estimated SVRI as previously described.[16] SV during rest and AT were estimated with the equation

$$SV = (VO_2/HR) / C_{[a-v]}O_2,$$

where SV = stroke volume, VO_2 = oxygen consumption, HR = heart rate (both measured simultaneously), (O_2·pulse = VO_2/HR) and $C[a-v]O_2$ = arteriovenous oxygen content difference.[17] $C_{[a-v]}O_2$,when previously measured by arterial and pulmonary artery blood sampling in healthy subjects and in patients at various stages of heart failure, is approximately 6.1 ml O_2 / 100 ml blood at rest and 11.3 ml O_2 / 100 ml blood at AT.[17-21] The ratio between the two $C_{[a-v]}O_2$ values also corresponds to the ratios we observed in patients with pulmonary hypertension who underwent exercise testing in our center's catheterization laboratory with pulmonary artery and arterial catheters in place.[16] Based on those observations, we estimated the SVRI as:

$$SVRI = (SV_{AT}/SV_{rest}) \times 100$$

$$SVRI = [(O_2\cdot pulse_{AT}/C[a-v]O_{2\,AT}) / (O_2\cdot pulse_{rest}/C[a-v]O_{2\,rest})] \times 100$$

$$SVRI = [(O_2\cdot pulse_{AT}/O_2\cdot pulse_{rest}) \times (6.1/11.3)] \times 100$$

$$SVRI = (O_2\cdot pulse_{AT:rest} \times 54)$$

where O_2·$pulse_{AT:rest}$ = the ratio of the O_2·pulse at AT to the O_2·pulse at rest.[17] The SVRI measured with this method is approximately 140% +/- 12%[17-19, 21] among healthy subjects, which corresponds to an O_2·$pulse_{AT:rest}$ of 2.59 +/- 0.22.[17, 28] Before data collection, we pre-defined an abnormally low SVRI to be 128% or lower based on the variability observed in in healthy subjects who underwent invasive studies.[16, 17]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Clinical Characteristics

From the clinical data collected by review of the electronic medical records prior to the observation period, we calculated three clinically validated risk stratification scores, namely the Heart Failure Survival Score (HFSS)[29], the Seattle Heart Failure Model (SHFM) score[30], and the Kato model score.[31]

Right heart catheterization

We also included data from all right heart catheterization procedures that had been performed for clinical reasons within 30 days of the CPET. Resting cardiac output (CO) and cardiac index was determined by the Fick method. Pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) was calculated as: PVR = [mean pulmonary artery pressure (MPA) - pulmonary capillary wedge pressure / CO. The right ventricular stroke work index (RVSWI) was calculated as (MPA - mean RAP, right atrial pressure) x SV index x 0.0136 (g-m2/beat).

Outcomes and Data Acquisition

The primary outcome was a composite of death, the need for either urgent LVAD implantation or heart-transplantation one year following CPET. A trained investigator (IS) determined the outcomes by a structured chart review, as well as structured telephone interviews for patients that were not seen in the hospital system within the past three months. At the time of each patient's evaluation by the advanced therapies selection committee, the committee was not informed of the SVRI and thus it did not influence the committee's decisions regarding the patient's candidacy for advanced therapies.

Statistical Analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The primary analysis was to determine the accuracy of SVRI for predicting the 1-year composite outcome, compared to other candidate predictors. The predictors were identified using single- and multi-predictor logistic regression. Multi-predictor logistic regression used backwards model selection, starting with the covariates significant at $p<0.05$ in single-predictor models, and with a $p<0.05$ threshold for inclusion.

As an additional step, the predictors from the final multi-predictor model were dichotomized using pre-defined cut-offs. The cut-off value for SVRI was pre-determined to be 128% or lower as previously described. The cut-off value for invasively determined resting cardiac index was chosen to minimize the Euclidian distance from the receiver-operating-characteristic (ROC) curve to the upper-left corner of the ROC graph, in effect maximizing a combination of sensitivity and specificity. The cut-off values for peak VO_2 (12 or 14 ml/kg/min in the presence of a β-blocker) followed the 2016 ISHLT guidelines for heart-transplant listing.[7]

We also compared the demographic and clinical characteristics of the two cohorts with SVRI above and below the cut-off. Comparison of variables used independent Student's t-test for continuous variables, and Fisher's exact test for binary variables.

Based on the final multi-predictor logistic regression model, which included the dichotomized SVRI, peak VO_2, and resting cardiac index, we created a "SVRI risk score", which uses simple integer weights for each of the three covariates, based on their model coefficient (i.e., log odds ratio), with the lowest coefficient receiving 1 point, as a reference value. The reason for using the logistic regression model coefficients as a basis for the score is that in the predictive model the risk score is linearly associated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

with the log-odds of the event. This method is similar but not identical to that of Kato et al.[31]

The time-to-event distributions were generated separately for the two groups based on SVRI below and above the threshold, and for the four groups based on the cross-classification of SVRI below/above threshold and peak VO_2 below/above threshold, using the Kaplan-Meier estimator. The relative risk in the different groups was assessed via the hazard ratio from the Cox proportional hazards model, and group comparison was based on the log-rank test.

In all analyses $p < 0.05$ was considered significant; two-sided hypothesis tests and confidence intervals were used throughout. Statistical analyses were performed using Prism 8 for Windows (GraphPad Software, Inc, San Diego, CA) and Excel's XLMiner Analysis ToolPak (Microsoft Excel; Microsoft Corp, Bellevue, WA).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

RESULTS

Clinical Characteristics and 1-year Outcomes

Between January 1, 2017 and September 30, 2018, 129 patients with LVEF $\leq$ 35% by echocardiography underwent CPET at our center. 25 patients were excluded: nine had congenital heart disease, six were scheduled for coronary revascularization, three had previous heart transplantation, two were being treated with intravenous inotropic therapy and five did not reach AT during CPET. (Three of the five patients who failed to reach AT died within one year: a phenomenon also observed by Agostoni and colleagues.[32]) The remaining 104 patients constituted our study group.

The clinical characteristics of the study population are summarized in Table 1. The mean age of the patients was 59 years, 89% were male, and 51% had an ischemic etiology. 88% of patients were on β-blocker therapy, 25% also requiring digoxin or ivabradine, 95% on either ACEI/ARB, ARNI or isosorbide dinitrate/hydralazine therapy, and 84% received either an ICD or CRT. All patients had symptomatic heart failure, with a mean NYHA class of 2.8 $\pm$ 0.6. Mean peak VO_2 at the time of heart-transplant evaluation was 15.5 ml/kg/min, mean LVEF was 22.3% and mean SVRI was 1.2. Right heart catheterization had been performed for 82 of the 104 patients. The mean RAP was 8.9 mmHg, PCWP was 18.2 mmHg, PVR 2.8 Wood units and resting cardiac index of 2.2 liters/min/m^2.

Among the 104 patients included in the study, 39 (37.5%) reached the primary composite end-point in the year subsequent to the index CPET: 16 patients (15.4%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

required heart transplantation, 8 (7.7%) required urgent LVAD implantation and 15 (14.4%) died within 1 year.

Comparison of Patients Dichotomized by SVRI

Patients who were above and below the predetermined cut-off of SVRI≤128% were similar in clinical characteristics, except that the low SVRI group had slightly lower HFSS (7.6 +/- 0.8 vs 8.5 +/- 1.1, p = 0.01), more diuretic use (55% vs 37%, p = 0.02) and slightly lower hemoglobin level (8.5 mmol/L vs 9.0 mmol/L, p = 0.03) (Table 1). Although there were no significant differences in right heart catheterization values, CPETs in the low SVRI group had lower exercise times (422.2 sec vs 587.4 sec, $p < 0.001$), lower VO_2 at AT (AT VO_2; 8.2 ml/kg/min vs 13.6 ml/kg/min, $p < 0.001$), lower peak VO_2, (12.8 ml/kg/min vs 18.8 ml/kg/min, $p < 0.001$) and higher VE/VCO_2 slopes (37.9 vs 28.6, $p < 0.001$).

SVRI as a Predictor of Adverse Outcome

The 1-year event-free survival rate for patients with SVRI 128% or less was significantly lower than for those with higher SVRI (44% vs 85%, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 1). As illustrated in Figure 2, the C-statistic for SVRI (0.865, 95% CI 0.795, 0.936) was greater than the C-statistic for peak VO_2 (0.774, 95% CI 0.684, 0.865), AT VO_2 (0.676, 95% CI 0.571, 0.781) and PCWP (0.678, 95% CI 0.573, 0.783).

Figure 3 shows cross-classification into four cohorts using SVRI and peak VO_2. The top two cohorts with the best survival were defined by normal SVRI while the bottom two cohorts with the worst survival were defined by low SVRI.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Patients with peak VO_2 above the 2016 ISHLT cut-off and low SVRI demonstrated similar prognosis to HFrEF patients with peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off (57% vs 42%, p = 0.37; supplemental fig. S1). HFrEF patients with a peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off but normal SVRI showed similar prognosis to HFrEF patients with peak VO_2 greater than the ISHLT cut-off (70% vs 74%, p = 0.95; supplemental fig. S2).

SVRI as a Predictor Among Patients with Adequate Peak VO_2

Among the entire group, Cox proportional hazards analysis disclosed that low SVRI (HR 6.27, 95% CI 2.19, 17.94, p<0.001) and peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off (HR 2.45, 95% CI 1.22, 4.92, p=0.012) were both independently predictive of the clinical outcome. Among only those patients with “adequate” peak VO_2 by ISHLT guidelines, patients with low SVRI had significantly worse 1-year event free survival than those with high SVRI (57% vs 89%, p = 0.001) (Fig. 3).

Single-Predictor and Multi-Predictor Logistic Regression of Candidate Predictors of Adverse Outcome

The continuous variables, higher NYHA functional class, lower SVRI, higher VE/VCO_2 slope, lower AT VO_2, lower peak VO_2 pulse, lower HFSS score and decreased hemoglobin levels were found to be significantly associated with the primary outcome (Table 2). In addition, several hemodynamic parameters obtained from right heart catheterization, including higher mean RAP, higher MPA, higher PCWP, lower mixed venous oxygen saturation and decreased resting cardiac index, were associated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

with 1-year outcome. The categorical variable of the Kato model score four or greater significantly correlated with 1-year outcome, while the SHFM score predicting < 80% 1-year survival did not. Subsequently, SVRI, peak VO_2, AT VO_2, VE/VCO_2 slope, peak oxygen pulse, mean RAP, MPA, PCWP, resting cardiac index, mixed venous oxygen saturation, hemoglobin level, and NYHA class were selected for inclusion in the multi-predictor model. Stepwise backward logistic regression was used to arrive at the final predictive model (table 3)—notably SVRI≤128%, peak VO_2<12 to 14 ml/kg/min or ≤ 50% predicted as per the 2016 ISHLT heart-transplant listing guidelines[7], and resting cardiac index≤2.0 were independently associated with clinical outcomes. The OR using the pre-defined cut-off of SVRI≤128% was highest at 6.7.

Predictive Model and Risk Score Generation

We subsequently created a novel SVRI risk score in which SVRI≤128% is weighted 2 points, and peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off and resting cardiac index≤2.0 were both weighted 1 point. A receiver operator curve of the SVRI risk score disclosed a C-statistic of 0.886 (95% CI 0.819, 0.943) for association with 1-year events after CPET (Fig. 4). A cut-off of 3 points or greater yielded a sensitivity of 63.8%, a specificity of 80.6% and a predictive accuracy of 73.8%.

DISCUSSION

Our results disclosed that SVRI, a novel CPET parameter, independently predicted serious deterioration (death, heart-transplantation or urgent LVAD implantation) among HFrEF patients, with “excellent” to “outstanding” accuracy.[33] SVRI provides prognostic information more accurate than currently recommended CPET

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

parameters, such as peak VO_2, AT VO_2, and VE/VCO_2 slope. Ambulatory HFrEF patients with low SVRI had a little over half the 1-year survival rate of those with normal SVRI. Notably, low SVRI also predicted a poor 1-year prognosis among HFrEF patients with otherwise "adequate" peak VO_2. Based on our results, we created a simple risk-stratification model based in large part on the SVRI that reliably identified patients with a high risk for 1-year events in this cohort.

During the initial and intermediate phases of exercise, SV contributes to the increase in cardiac output, after which output primarily depends on heart rate.[17, 34] Our method focuses on the critical exercise period between rest and AT and the consistent change in SV from rest to AT observed in normal patients.[16-19, 21] We calculated SVRI during CPET performance without requiring changes to the standard protocol or patient instructions. SVRI was not shared with the advanced therapies selection committee and did not contribute to the committee's decision for candidacy for heart-transplant or LVAD implantation.

Although peak VO_2 during CPET in part reflects the capacity to increase cardiac output during exercise[35], it is also influenced by noncardiac factors such muscle deconditioning, age, gender, race, obesity, anemia, lung function and use of **β**-blockers.[36] Perhaps for this reason, peak VO_2 has had a limited ability to distinguish HFrEF patients with imminent risk of deterioration from those with better prognoses.[22, 37, 38] For example, the C-statistic of peak VO_2 for detecting deterioration among various groups of heart failure patients was only 0.62–0.69, below the discriminatory limit commonly considered acceptable.[33] Other CPET parameters such as peak VO_2 pulse, VE/VCO_2 slope and AT VO_2 are similarly limited in accuracy.[39]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

SVRI has other important advantages. It is a noninvasive test of inotropic reserve. Since the measurements are completed once the patient reaches AT, it does not rely on maximal effort, which can vary particularly among HFrEF patients.[39] In addition, SVRI performed well in our study without the requirement for age-, sex-, race-matched controls for determination of abnormal values.

Risk-stratification in HFrEF Patients

Currently, there are no universal criteria for identifying HFrEF patients who should be evaluated for advanced heart-failure therapies.[4] Consequently, risk scores such as the SHFM and HFSS are often used to identify HFrEF patients at high risk for 1-year events. For this study, we chose to evaluate the SVRI risk score with SHFM and HFSS as they are the most commonly recommended multivariable risk scores by the ISHLT, American College of Cardiology, and European Society of Cardiology.[7, 40, 41] Additionally, we evaluated the Kato model score as this is a more recent risk score that uses peak VO_2 and markers of left and right sided congestion to guide risk assessment.[31] In our patient population, the HFSS and Kato model score showed predictive value while the SHFM did not. The SVRI risk score shows a trend to superior predictive accuracy compared to both HFSS and Kato model scores. Thus, in a patient population where multivariable risk scores historically have shown only moderate accuracy[42], we demonstrate the incremental value of utilizing SVRI.

Notably, SVRI is valuable in identifying HFrEF patients who have “adequate” peak VO_2 (by ISHLT criteria) but who are nevertheless at high risk of deterioration. Figure 5 demonstrates a useful schematic for cross-classification of HFrEF patients by SVRI and peak VO_2. Additionally, HFrEF patients who were initially considered to be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

high risk by peak VO_2, but who demonstrate normal inotropic reserve by SVRI have similar survival to patients with a peak VO_2 greater than the ISHLT cut-off. We speculate that HFrEF patients with low peak VO_2 but normal SVRI have noncardiac reasons that contribute to the low peak VO_2, such as deconditioning and anemia, which may improve with interventions such as cardiac rehabilitation and improved nutritional status. Thus, SVRI can potentially identify patients who will subsequently show improvement in peak VO_2, VE/VCO_2 slope and AT VO_2 with pharmacological and non-pharmacological approaches.[43-46] More importantly, low peak VO_2 with normal SVRI might identify patients who would not necessarily benefit from heart-transplantation or LVAD implantation because of their preserved inotropic reserve. Thus, cross-classification of HFrEF patients using both SVRI and peak VO_2 may identify patients with "reversible" noncardiac factors (low peak VO_2 with normal SVRI) while identifying patients with poor inotropic reserve who remain at high risk for 1-year events despite their seemingly adequate exercise tolerance (adequate peak VO_2 with low SVRI). Our SVRI risk score includes SVRI, peak VO_2 and resting cardiac index and thus, we believe shows improved accuracy because it separately accounts for both cardiac and noncardiac factors that would lead to death, heart-transplantation and urgent LVAD implantation.

Methodologic Considerations and Future Directions

Our study contains several limitations. First, this is a single center retrospective cohort study and thus our observations need to be validated in other centers with larger patient samples to confirm our results. Our patient population was predominantly older males with coronary artery disease but not dissimilar to other studies evaluating HFrEF patients.[2, 11, 31] Second, we did not confirm our estimates of SV with noninvasive nor

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

invasive determinations of CO. Confirmation with direct measures of CO would demonstrate whether inappropriate increase in CO is the underlying reason for why SVRI is able to identify patients at high risk for 1-year events. However, our study uses CPET protocols commonly used in other cardiac centers and thus demonstrate the potential generalizability of our observations. Third, we did not include numerous other multivariable risk scores for comparison as they have shown similar results with moderate accuracy and a C-statistic consistently in the 0.7 to 0.8 range.[42, 47] Our goal was to compare the SVRI risk score with currently recommended multivariable risk scores, particularly those that include the use of peak VO_2 in their risk calculation. Finally, this study was conducted using treadmill exercise only (preferred modality in the United States[24]) and thus it is unknown whether the same conclusions can be made in CPETs using a stationary cycle ergometer.

The "SVRI risk score" was generated internally from our own data, so would need to be externally validated in another population of patients with HFrEF. We speculate that the SVRI and SVRI risk score would provide useful prognostic information in other heart-failure patient populations such as heart-failure with preserved ejection fraction and congenital heart disease patients, but further studies would be necessary to confirm its performance. Additionally, it would be useful to evaluate whether SVRI can accurately identify HFrEF patients who can significantly increase their peak VO_2 after cardiac rehabilitation. Finally, this study was conducted during the transition to the heart allocation change by the United Network of Organ Sharing that took place in the United States in November 2018. Future studies will have to take this

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

into consideration as we would expect it to change the time to heart-transplantation in ambulatory HFrEF patients.

CONCLUSION

SVRI is a novel CPET parameter that accurately predicts 1-year prognosis in HFrEF patients. Our SVRI risk score using cut-off values consisting of SVRI$\leq$128%, peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off, and resting cardiac index$\leq$2 suggests improved prognostic accuracy compared to currently recommended multivariable risk scores. Therefore, SVRI should be considered when evaluating HFrEF patients for advanced therapies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Barry Greenberg for his language editing and proofreading of the manuscript.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

This work was supported by the American Heart Association Career Development Grant #18CDA34110250 / Paul J. Kim, MD / 2018 and CHEST Foundation Research Grant in Venous Thromboembolism (2019-1496-CHEST).

DISCLOSURES

None.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Cohn JN, Archibald DG, Ziesche S, Franciosa JA, Harston WE, Tristani FE, Dunkman WB, Jacobs W, Francis GS, Flohr KH and et al. Effect of vasodilator therapy on mortality in chronic congestive heart failure. Results of a Veterans Administration Cooperative Study. *N Engl J Med*. 1986;314:1547-52.
2. McMurray JJ, Packer M, Desai AS, Gong J, Lefkowitz MP, Rizkala AR, Rouleau JL, Shi VC, Solomon SD, Swedberg K, Zile MR, Investigators P-H and Committees. Angiotensin-neprilysin inhibition versus enalapril in heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371:993-1004.
3. Shen L, Jhund PS and McMurray JJV. Declining Risk of Sudden Death in Heart Failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377:1794-5.
4. Fang JC, Ewald GA, Allen LA, Butler J, Westlake Canary CA, Colvin-Adams M, Dickinson MG, Levy P, Stough WG, Sweitzer NK, Teerlink JR, Whellan DJ, Albert NM, Krishnamani R, Rich MW, Walsh MN, Bonnell MR, Carson PE, Chan MC, Dries DL, Hernandez AF, Hershberger RE, Katz SD, Moore S, Rodgers JE, Rogers JG, Vest AR, Givertz MM and Heart Failure Society of America Guidelines C. Advanced (stage D) heart failure: a statement from the Heart Failure Society of America Guidelines Committee. *J Card Fail*. 2015;21:519-34.
5. Hunt SA, Baker DW, Chin MH, Cinquegrani MP, Feldman AM, Francis GS, Ganiats TG, Goldstein S, Gregoratos G, Jessup ML, Noble RJ, Packer M, Silver MA, Stevenson LW, Gibbons RJ, Antman EM, Alpert JS, Faxon DP, Fuster V, Gregoratos G, Jacobs AK, Hiratzka LF, Russell RO, Smith SC, Jr., American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice G, International Society for H, Lung T and Heart Failure Society of A. ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Evaluation and Management of Chronic Heart Failure in the Adult: Executive Summary A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee to Revise the 1995 Guidelines for the Evaluation and Management of Heart Failure): Developed in Collaboration With the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation; Endorsed by the Heart Failure Society of America. *Circulation*. 2001;104:2996-3007.
6. Crespo-Leiro MG, Metra M, Lund LH, Milicic D, Costanzo MR, Filippatos G, Gustafsson F, Tsui S, Barge-Caballero E, De Jonge N, Frigerio M, Hamdan R, Hasin T, Hulsmann M, Nalbantgil S, Potena L, Bauersachs J, Gkouziouta A, Ruhparwar A, Ristic AD, Straburzynska-Migaj E, McDonagh T, Seferovic P and Ruschitzka F. Advanced heart failure: a position statement of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2018;20:1505-1535.
7. Mehra MR, Canter CE, Hannan MM, Semigran MJ, Uber PA, Baran DA, Danziger-Isakov L, Kirklin JK, Kirk R, Kushwaha SS, Lund LH, Potena L, Ross HJ, Taylor DO, Verschuuren EA, Zuckermann A, International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation Infectious Diseases C, International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation Pediatric Transplantation C, International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation Heart F and Transplantation C. The 2016 International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation listing criteria for heart transplantation: A 10-year update. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2016;35:1-23.
8. Goda A, Lund LH and Mancini D. The Heart Failure Survival Score outperforms the peak oxygen consumption for heart transplantation selection in the era of device therapy. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2011;30:315-25.
9. Lewis GD, Shah RV, Pappagianopolas PP, Systrom DM and Semigran MJ. Determinants of ventilatory efficiency in heart failure: the role of right ventricular performance and pulmonary vascular tone. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2008;1:227-33.
10. Oliveira RB, Myers J, Araujo CG, Arena R, Mandic S, Bensimhon D, Abella J, Chase P, Guazzi M, Brubaker P, Moore B, Kitzman D and Peberdy MA. Does peak oxygen pulse complement peak oxygen uptake in risk stratifying patients with heart failure? *Am J Cardiol*. 2009;104:554-8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

11. Gitt AK, Wasserman K, Kilkowski C, Kleemann T, Kilkowski A, Bangert M, Schneider S, Schwarz A and Senges J. Exercise anaerobic threshold and ventilatory efficiency identify heart failure patients for high risk of early death. *Circulation*. 2002;106:3079-84.
12. Ferreira AM, Tabet JY, Frankenstein L, Metra M, Mendes M, Zugck C, Beauvais F and Cohen-Solal A. Ventilatory efficiency and the selection of patients for heart transplantation. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2010;3:378-86.
13. Guazzi M. Treating exercise oscillatory ventilation in heart failure: the detail that may matter. *Eur Respir J*. 2012;40:1075-7.
14. Arena R, Guazzi M, Cahalin LP and Myers J. Revisiting cardiopulmonary exercise testing applications in heart failure: aligning evidence with clinical practice. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2014;42:153-60.
15. O'Neill JO, Young JB, Pothier CE and Lauer MS. Peak oxygen consumption as a predictor of death in patients with heart failure receiving beta-blockers. *Circulation*. 2005;111:2313-8.
16. Fernandes TM, Alotaibi M, Strozza DM, Stringer WW, Porszasz J, Faulkner GG, Castro CF, Tran DA and Morris TA. Dyspnea Postpulmonary Embolism From Physiological Dead Space Proportion and Stroke Volume Defects During Exercise. *Chest*. 2020;157:936-944.
17. Stringer WW, Hansen JE and Wasserman K. Cardiac output estimated noninvasively from oxygen uptake during exercise. *J Appl Physiol (1985)*. 1997;82:908-12.
18. Detry JM, Rousseau M, Vandenbroucke G, Kusumi F, Brasseur LA and Bruce RA. Increased arteriovenous oxygen difference after physical training in coronary heart disease. *Circulation*. 1971;44:109-18.
19. Higginbotham MB, Morris KG, Williams RS, McHale PA, Coleman RE and Cobb FR. Regulation of stroke volume during submaximal and maximal upright exercise in normal man. *Circ Res*. 1986;58:281-91.
20. Chatterjee NA, Murphy RM, Malhotra R, Dhakal BP, Baggish AL, Pappagianopoulos PP, Hough SS, Semigran MJ and Lewis GD. Prolonged mean VO2 response time in systolic heart failure: an indicator of impaired right ventricular-pulmonary vascular function. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2013;6:499-507.
21. Dhakal BP, Malhotra R, Murphy RM, Pappagianopoulos PP, Baggish AL, Weiner RB, Houstis NE, Eisman AS, Hough SS and Lewis GD. Mechanisms of exercise intolerance in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: the role of abnormal peripheral oxygen extraction. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2015;8:286-94.
22. Metra M, Faggiano P, D'Aloia A, Nodari S, Gualeni A, Raccagni D and Dei Cas L. Use of cardiopulmonary exercise testing with hemodynamic monitoring in the prognostic assessment of ambulatory patients with chronic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1999;33:943-50.
23. Chomsky DB, Lang CC, Rayos GH, Shyr Y, Yeoh TK, Pierson RN, 3rd, Davis SF and Wilson JR. Hemodynamic exercise testing. A valuable tool in the selection of cardiac transplantation candidates. *Circulation*. 1996;94:3176-83.
24. Balady GJ, Arena R, Sietsema K, Myers J, Coke L, Fletcher GF, Forman D, Franklin B, Guazzi M, Gulati M, Keteyian SJ, Lavie CJ, Macko R, Mancini D, Milani RV, American Heart Association Exercise CR, Prevention Committee of the Council on Clinical C, Council on E, Prevention, Council on Peripheral Vascular D, Interdisciplinary Council on Quality of C and Outcomes R. Clinician's Guide to cardiopulmonary exercise testing in adults: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2010;122:191-225.
25. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, Butler J, Casey DE, Jr., Drazner MH, Fonarow GC, Geraci SA, Horwich T, Januzzi JL, Johnson MR, Kasper EK, Levy WC, Masoudi FA, McBride PE, McMurray JJ, Mitchell JE, Peterson PN, Riegel B, Sam F, Stevenson LW, Tang WH, Tsai EJ, Wilkoff BL, American College of Cardiology F and American Heart Association Task Force on Practice G. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;62:e147-239.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

26. Corra U, Piepoli MF, Adamopoulos S, Agostoni P, Coats AJ, Conraads V, Lambrinou E, Pieske B, Piotrowicz E, Schmid JP, Seferovic PM, Anker SD, Filippatos G and Ponikowski PP. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing in systolic heart failure in 2014: the evolving prognostic role: a position paper from the committee on exercise physiology and training of the heart failure association of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2014;16:929-41.
27. Cohen-Solal A, Benessiano J, Himbert D, Paillole C and Gourgon R. Ventilatory threshold during exercise in patients with mild to moderate chronic heart failure: determination, relation with lactate threshold and reproducibility. *Int J Cardiol*. 1991;30:321-7.
28. Nery LE, Wasserman K, French W, Oren A and Davis JA. Contrasting cardiovascular and respiratory responses to exercise in mitral valve and chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases. *Chest*. 1983;83:446-53.
29. Aaronson KD, Schwartz JS, Chen TM, Wong KL, Goin JE and Mancini DM. Development and prospective validation of a clinical index to predict survival in ambulatory patients referred for cardiac transplant evaluation. *Circulation*. 1997;95:2660-7.
30. Kalogeropoulos AP, Georgiopoulou VV, Giamouzis G, Smith AL, Agha SA, Waheed S, Laskar S, Puskas J, Dunbar S, Vega D, Levy WC and Butler J. Utility of the Seattle Heart Failure Model in patients with advanced heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;53:334-42.
31. Kato TS, Stevens GR, Jiang J, Schulze PC, Gukasyan N, Lippel M, Levin A, Homma S, Mancini D and Farr M. Risk stratification of ambulatory patients with advanced heart failure undergoing evaluation for heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2013;32:333-40.
32. Agostoni P, Corra U, Cattadori G, Veglia F, Battaia E, La Gioia R, Scardovi AB, Emdin M, Metra M, Sinagra G, Limongelli G, Raimondo R, Re F, Guazzi M, Belardinelli R, Parati G, Magri D, Fiorentini C, Cicoira M, Salvioni E, Giovannardi M, Mezzani A, Scrutinio D, Di Lenarda A, Mantegazza V, Ricci R, Apostolo A, Iorio A, Paolillo S, Palermo P, Contini M, Vassanelli C, Passino C, Piepoli MF and Group MSR. Prognostic value of indeterminable anaerobic threshold in heart failure. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2013;6:977-87.
33. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S and Sturdivant RX. *Applied logistic regression.* Third edition. ed. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley; 2013.
34. Gmada N. A-HB, Haj Sassi R., Abdel Samia B., Bouhlel E. Relationship between oxygen pulse and arteriovenous oxygen difference in healthy subjects: Effect of exercise intensity. *Science & Sports*. 2019:10.
35. Mancini DM, Eisen H, Kussmaul W, Mull R, Edmunds LH, Jr. and Wilson JR. Value of peak exercise oxygen consumption for optimal timing of cardiac transplantation in ambulatory patients with heart failure. *Circulation*. 1991;83:778-86.
36. Arena R, Myers J, Abella J, Peberdy MA, Bensimhon D, Chase P and Guazzi M. Development of a ventilatory classification system in patients with heart failure. *Circulation*. 2007;115:2410-7.
37. Wilson JR, Rayos G, Yeoh TK and Gothard P. Dissociation between peak exercise oxygen consumption and hemodynamic dysfunction in potential heart transplant candidates. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1995;26:429-35.
38. Williams SG, Cooke GA, Wright DJ, Parsons WJ, Riley RL, Marshall P and Tan LB. Peak exercise cardiac power output; a direct indicator of cardiac function strongly predictive of prognosis in chronic heart failure. *Eur Heart J*. 2001;22:1496-503.
39. Lang CC, Agostoni P and Mancini DM. Prognostic significance and measurement of exercise-derived hemodynamic variables in patients with heart failure. *J Card Fail*. 2007;13:672-9.
40. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, Bueno H, Cleland JG, Coats AJ, Falk V, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, Harjola VP, Jankowska EA, Jessup M, Linde C, Nihoyannopoulos P, Parissis JT, Pieske B, Riley JP, Rosano GM, Ruilope LM, Ruschitzka F, Rutten FH, van der Meer P, Authors/Task Force M and Document R. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2016;18:891-975.

41. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, Butler J, Casey DE, Jr., Drazner MH, Fonarow GC, Geraci SA, Horwich T, Januzzi JL, Johnson MR, Kasper EK, Levy WC, Masoudi FA, McBride PE, McMurray JJ, Mitchell JE, Peterson PN, Riegel B, Sam F, Stevenson LW, Tang WH, Tsai EJ and Wilkoff BL. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines. *Circulation*. 2013;128:1810-52.

42. Ouwerkerk W, Voors AA and Zwinderman AH. Factors influencing the predictive power of models for predicting mortality and/or heart failure hospitalization in patients with heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2014;2:429-36.

43. Guazzi M, Tumminello G, Di Marco F, Fiorentini C and Guazzi MD. The effects of phosphodiesterase-5 inhibition with sildenafil on pulmonary hemodynamics and diffusion capacity, exercise ventilatory efficiency, and oxygen uptake kinetics in chronic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2004;44:2339-48.

44. Agostoni P, Guazzi M, Bussotti M, De Vita S and Palermo P. Carvedilol reduces the inappropriate increase of ventilation during exercise in heart failure patients. *Chest*. 2002;122:2062-7.

45. Lewis GD, Murphy RM, Shah RV, Pappagianopoulos PP, Malhotra R, Bloch KD, Systrom DM and Semigran MJ. Pulmonary vascular response patterns during exercise in left ventricular systolic dysfunction predict exercise capacity and outcomes. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2011;4:276-85.

46. Stevenson LW, Steimle AE, Fonarow G, Kermani M, Kermani D, Hamilton MA, Moriguchi JD, Walden J, Tillisch JH, Drinkwater DC and et al. Improvement in exercise capacity of candidates awaiting heart transplantation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1995;25:163-70.

47. Agostoni P, Paolillo S, Mapelli M, Gentile P, Salvioni E, Veglia F, Bonomi A, Corra U, Lagioia R, Limongelli G, Sinagra G, Cattadori G, Scardovi AB, Metra M, Carubelli V, Scrutinio D, Raimondo R, Emdin M, Piepoli M, Magri D, Parati G, Caravita S, Re F, Cicoira M, Mina C, Correale M, Frigerio M, Bussotti M, Oliva F, Battaia E, Belardinelli R, Mezzani A, Pastormerlo L, Guazzi M, Badagliacca R, Di Lenarda A, Passino C, Sciomer S, Zambon E, Pacileo G, Ricci R, Apostolo A, Palermo P, Contini M, Clemenza F, Marchese G, Gargiulo P, Binno S, Lombardi C, Passantino A and Filardi PP. Multiparametric prognostic scores in chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a long-term comparison. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2018;20:700-710.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier curves of heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction patients after CPET classified as low SVRI (SVRI≤128%) and normal SVRI (SVRI>128%). The primary composite end-point was set as death, urgent left ventricular assist device implantation, or heart-transplantation. Patients with normal SVRI showed significantly higher 1-year event free survival compared to low SVRI patients. This difference in event free survival is seen as early as 100 days after the CPET (double sided arrow). CPET, cardiopulmonary exercise testing; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index.

Figure 2. ROC curves for AT VO_2, peak VO_2, SVRI, and PCWP. The C-statistic was highest for SVRI compared to other single-predictors. AUC (C-statistic) and the respective 95% CI are listed. VO_2, oxygen consumption; AT VO_2, VO_2 at anaerobic threshold; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; AUC, area under the curve; CI, confidence interval.

Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier survival curves showing the cross-classification of the patient population into four groups based on the peak VO_2 below/above ISHLT cut-off and SVRI below/above 128%. Patients with normal SVRI showed the best event free survival regardless of their peak VO_2. Within the HFrEF patients with a peak VO_2 above the ISHLT cut-off, patients with an low SVRI showed a significantly worse 1-year event free survival compared to patients with normal SVRI. The separation of event free survival is again seen early at 100 days. SVRI≤128% and peak VO_2 below the ISHLT

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

cut-off were analyzed in a multi-predictor Cox proportional hazards model to derive the hazard ratios listed in the figure and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals—the reference group was SVRI>128% and peak VO_2 above the ISHLT cut-off. VO_2, oxygen consumption; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; HFrEF, heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction.

Figure 4. ROC curves for the SVRI risk score, HFSS, Kato model, and SHFM scores. The C-statistic was highest for the SVRI risk score compared to other risk score models. AUC (C-statistic) and the respective 95% CI are listed. ROC, receiver-operating-characteristic; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; HFSS, Heart Failure Survival Score; SHFM, Seattle Heart Failure Model; AUC, area under the curve; CI, confidence interval.

Figure 5. Schematic using cross-classification of heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction patients by SVRI below/above 128% threshold and peak VO_2 below/above 2016 ISHLT cut-off. SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; VO_2, oxygen consumption; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation.

Figure S1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves of heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction patients with peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off (solid line) in comparison to patients with peak VO_2 above the ISHLT cut-off and with low SVRI (gray line). No significant differences were present in the event free survival between the two groups. VO_2,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

oxygen consumption; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation.

Figure S2. Kaplan-Meier survival curves of heart-failure with reduced ejection fraction patients with peak VO_2 greater than the ISHLT cut-off (solid black line) in comparison to patients with peak VO_2 below the ISHLT cut-off and with normal SVRI (dotted black line). No significant differences were present in the event free survival between the two groups. VO_2, oxygen consumption; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Clinical Characteristics of Patients at Time of CPET

Clinical Characteristics	All Patients (n=104)	Normal SVRI (n=47)	Low SVRI (n=57)	*p*-value
Age, years, mean (SD)	59.2 (10.8)	57.3 (10.7)	60.7 (10.1)	0.09
Male, n (%)	93 (89.4)	41 (87.2)	52 (91.2)	0.84
Body mass index, kg/m^2, mean (SD)	28.9 (5.5)	29.0 (6.5)	28.8 (5.0)	0.89
NYHA class, mean (SD)	2.8 (0.6)	2.8 (0.6)	2.8 (0.5)	0.96
Ischemic etiology, n (%)	51 (49.0)	22 (46.8)	29 (50.9)	0.62
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	36 (34.6)	17 (36.2)	19 (33.3)	0.71
Chronic kidney disease, Stage III or greater, n (%)	48 (46.2)	21 (44.7)	27 (47.4)	0.56
Pulmonary disease, n (%)	13 (12.5)	6 (12.8)	7 (12.3)	0.89
HFSS, mean (SD)	8.0 (0.9)	8.5 (1.1)	7.6 (0.8)	0.01
Kato Model Score, mean (SD)	1.93 (1.5)	1.7 (1.6)	2.1 (1.5)	0.07
Medications				
Diuretics, n (%)	92 (88.5)	37 (78.7)	55 (96.5)	0.02
Digoxin, n (%)	17 (16.3)	6 (12.8)	11 (19.3)	0.39
β-blockers, n (%)	92 (88.5)	42 (89.4)	50 (87.7)	0.85
Ivabradine, n (%)	8 (7.7)	3 (6.4)	5 (8.8)	0.72
Aldosterone antagonist, n (%)	74 (71.2)	33 (70)	41 (71)	0.60
ACEI/ARB or isosorbide dinitrate/hydralazine, n (%)	40 (38.5)	17 (36)	23 (40)	0.75
ARNI, n (%)	58 (55.8)	24 (51)	34 (60)	0.61
Pacing Devices				
CRT, n (%)	62 (59.6)	25 (53.2)	37 (64.9)	0.38
ICD, n (%)	87 (83.7)	36 (76.6)	51 (89.5)	0.22
Hemodynamic Data				
Mean RAP, mean (SD), mmHg	8.9 (5.4)	7.8 (4.4)	9.5 (5.9)	0.13
Mean PA, mean (SD), mmHg	29.3 (13.8)	27.2 (10.5)	31.0 (12.8)	0.28
PCWP, mean (SD), mmHg	18.2 (8.8)	17.4 (7.9)	19.2 (9.4)	0.32
TPG, mean (SD), mmHg	11.1 (4.8)	10.1 (4.6)	11.7 (5.1)	0.31
RVSWI, mean (SD), g-m^2/beat	7.6 (3.4)	7.6 (3.7)	7.4 (3.2)	0.92
PVR, mean (SD), Wood units	2.8 (1.9)	2.4 (1.8)	3.1 (2.0)	0.29
Cardiac index, mean (SD), liters/min/m^2	2.2 (0.6)	2.4 (0.7)	2.1 (0.5)	0.13
Mixed venous oxygen saturation, mean (SD), %	63.6 (10.2)	67.9 (9.7)	63.3 (9.9)	0.10
CPET Parameters				
SVRI, mean (SD)	1.2 (0.3)	1.6 (0.3)	1.1 (0.2)	<0.001
Exercise time, mean (SD), s	496.9 (179.8)	587.4 (184.2)	422.2 (169.5)	<0.001
Rest SV, mean (SD), ml/beat	71.9 (23.1)	68.1 (20.4)	75.1 (27.0)	0.06
AT SV, mean (SD), ml/beat	86.7 (30.1)	107.9 (37.2)	69.3 (27.9)	<0.001
AT VO_2, mean (SD), ml/kg/min	10.6 (3.4)	13.6 (4.6)	8.2 (2.2)	<0.001
Peak Oxygen Pulse, mean (SD), ml/beat	11.2 (4.2)	12.6 (5.2)	10.1 (3.7)	0.10
Peak VO_2, mean (SD), ml/kg/min	15.5 (4.8)	18.8 (6.0)	12.8 (4.1)	<0.001
VE/VCO_2 slope, mean (SD)	33.7 (6.2)	28.6 (5.5)	37.9 (6.9)	<0.001
Peak HR, mean (SD), bpm	120.4 (23.7)	125.4 (25.3)	116.3 (22.9)	0.07
Peak SBP, mean (SD), mmHg	124.6 (19.9)	128.7 (20.8)	121.3 (19.4)	0.06

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Peak RER, mean (SD)	1.1 (0.1)	1.1 (0.1)	1.1 (0.1)	0.92
Echocardiographic data				
LVEF, mean (SD), %	22.6 (7.2)	24.2 (8.1)	21.3 (7.0)	0.07
LV end-diastolic dimension in mm, mean (SD)	63.3 (10.0)	61.3 (9.3)	64.9 (10.4)	0.14
Mitral regurgitation, 2+ or greater, n (%)	30 (28.8)	11 (23.4)	19 (33.3)	0.31
Laboratory Data				
Creatinine, mean (SD), μmol/L	115.4 (48.1)	118.8 (49.8)	112.6 (59.4)	0.91
BUN, mean (SD), mmol/L	9.5 (5.6)	9.3 (7.0)	9.7 (4.5)	0.68
Sodium, mean (SD), mEq/liter	137.9 (3.7)	137.4 (3.3)	138.3 (3.8)	0.34
Hemoglobin, mean (SD), mmol/L	8.7 (1.1)	9.0 (1.0)	8.5 (1.1)	0.03
Total bilirubin, mean (SD), μmol/L	16.5 (15.4)	15.5 (14.8)	17.4 (15.5)	0.36
AST, mean (SD), U/liter	28.1 (16.7)	27.1 (15.6)	28.9 (18.7)	0.81
ALT, mean (SD), U/liter	30.7 (30.9)	36.1 (33.1)	27.7 (21.4)	0.59

Means (SD) reported for continuous variables, and n (%) for binary variables. *p*-values calculated in comparison of normal vs low SVRI patient groups using Student's t-test or Fisher's exact test when appropriate. NYHA, New York Heart Association; HFSS, Heart Failure Survival Score; ACEI, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin II receptor blocker; ARNI, angiotensin receptor-neprolysin inhibitor; CRT, cardiac resynchronization therapy; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; RAP, right atrial pressure; PA, pulmonary artery pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; RVSWI, right ventricular stroke work index; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; VO_2, oxygen consumption; VE/VCO_2, minute ventilation/carbon dioxide output; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ALT, alanine aminotransferase.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Factors Associated With 1-Year Composite Events in Single-Predictor Logistic Regression

Variables	OR (95% CI)	*p*-value
Age (years)	1.022 (0.976, 1.071)	0.35
NYHA class	4.552 (1.713, 12.098)	0.002
SVRI	0.0173 (0.002, 0.143)	<0.001
Peak VO_2 (ml/kg/min)	0.736 (0.627, 0.863)	<0.001
AT VO_2 (ml/kg/min)	0.801 (0.672, 0.954)	0.013
VE/VCO_2 slope	1.116 (1.030, 1.188)	0.006
Peak oxygen pulse (ml/beat)	0.781 (0.683, 0.920)	0.003
Mean RAP (mmHg)	1.115 (1.023, 1.217)	0.013
Mean PA (mmHg)	1.045 (1.003, 1.088)	0.034
PCWP (mmHg)	1.066 (1.010, 1.125)	0.020
RVSWI (g-m^2/beat)	0.911 (0.796, 1.042)	0.17
PVR (Wood units)	0.977 (0.893, 1.070)	0.62
TPG (mmHg)	1.041 (0.938, 1.155)	0.45
Mixed venous oxygen saturation (%)	0.890 (0.833, 0.948)	<0.001
Cardiac index (liters/min/m^2)	0.207 (0.072, 0.594)	0.003
Hemoglobin (mmol/L)	0.583 (0.384, 0.884)	0.011
Sodium (mmol/L)	0.900 (0.794, 1.018)	0.095
Creatinine (μmol/L)	1.004 (0.996, 1.012)	0.317
HFSS	0.298 (0.155, 0.587)	0.005
SHFM*	1.68 (0.572, 4.921)	0.35
Kato model score*	8.438 (1.686, 42.223)	0.009

NYHA, New York Heart Association; SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; VO_2, oxygen consumption; AT VO_2, VO_2 at anaerobic threshold; VE/VCO_2, minute ventilation/carbon dioxide output; RAP, right atrial pressure; PA, pulmonary artery pressure; PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; RVSWI, right ventricular stroke work index; PVR, pulmonary vascular resistance; TPG, transpulmonary pressure gradient; HFSS, Heart Failure Survival Score; SHFM, Seattle Heart Failure Model; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

* Indicates a categorical variable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Multi-predictor Logistic Regression of Factors Associated with 1-Year Events. Covariates were dichotomized using published or data-based cut-offs.

Predictors	OR (95% CI)	*p*-value
SVRI≤128%	6.690 (2.08, 21.49)	0.001
Cardiac Index≤2.0	3.176 (1.26,10.92)	0.017
Peak VO_2 below 2016 ISHLT cut-off	4.152 (1.35,12.75)	0.013

SVRI, stroke volume reserve index; VO_2, oxygen consumption; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.
Model contains the covariates from Table 2 that were found to be significant with backward logistic regression, specifically SVRI, cardiac index, and peak VO_2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3.



Cox Proportional Hazard Ratio

SVRI≤1.28: 6.27 (2.19, 17.94), p<0.001

Peak VO_2<ISHLT cut-off: 2.45 (1.22, 4.92), p=0.012

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 4.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 5.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure S1.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.21.19015610; this version posted June 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure S2.