

TITLE: Diagnostics and prognostic potential of current biomarkers in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Hao Chen^{1,2}, Michael Chhor¹, Benjamin Rayner², Kristine McGrath¹ and Lana McClements¹

¹ School of Life Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney, NSW, Australia

² Heart Research Institute, Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

ABSTRACT

Aims

Circulating biomarkers are commonly used in diagnosis and prognosis of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) in clinical practice. However, the diagnostic and prognostic potential of current biomarkers in HFpEF remain unclear.

Methods and results

We conducted a search of the PubMed, Web of Science, MEDLINE and SCOPUS (1900 to January 2020) databases of all diagnostic (n=1,104) and prognostic (n=53,497) biomarkers investigated in people with HFpEF. B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) displayed satisfactory sensitivity (0.81, 95% CI: 0.76 to 0.85; $I^2=0$) and specificity (0.86, 95% CI: 0.82 to 0.89; $I^2=16.9\%$) for the diagnosis of HFpEF. Natriuretic peptides (NPs), including N-terminal pro BNP (NT-proBNP) and BNP, were associated with over two-fold increased risk of mortality (NT-proBNP: HR=2.27, 95% CI: 1.69 to 3.06, $I^2=87.6\%$; BNP: HR=3.01, 95% CI: 1.27 to 7.21, $I^2=97.2\%$), hospitalisation (NT-proBNP: HR=3.54, 95% CI: 2.83 to 4.43, $I^2=83.4\%$), and a composite event of both (NT-proBNP: HR=2.55, 95% CI: 2.13 to 3.05, $I^2=78.1\%$; BNP: HR=2.28, 95% CI: 1.42 to 3.69, $I^2=75.8\%$) in people with HFpEF. Interestingly, Galectin-3 (Gal-3) (sensitivity: 0.70, 95% CI: 0.63 to 0.75, $I^2=86.7\%$; specificity: 0.78, 95% CI: 0.69 to 0.85, $I^2=68.6\%$) and soluble suppression of tumorigenicity 2 (sST2) (sensitivity: 0.58, 95%

CI: 0.52 to 0.64, $I^2=88.1\%$; specificity: 0.59, 95% CI: 0.49 to 0.68, $I^2=69.5\%$) showed limited diagnostic potential of HFpEF.

Conclusion

Amongst currently available biomarkers, BNP remains the most reliable diagnostic marker of HFpEF. Although there was high heterogeneity between the studies included, BNP or NT-proBNP could also have promising prognostic potential in HFpEF.

KEYWORDS

Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction • Biomarkers • Diagnosis • Prognosis • Mortality • Hospitalisation • NT-proBNP • BNP • galectin-3 • sST2

INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) is becoming an increasingly prominent disease in developed countries, placing a burden on both patients and healthcare systems. HF affects 38 million people worldwide and in Australia alone there are currently 480,000 people diagnosed with this condition, with rising prevalence.¹ HF is a complex syndrome characterised by abnormal cardiac structure and function that impairs the ability of heart to fill and eject blood at normal pressure. In line with this definition, current clinical guidelines classify HF into two subtypes based on left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) of the patients. An LVEF lower than 50% with or without clinical signs of HF is defined as HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), whereas LVEF from 50% and above in the presence of structural heart disease or diastolic dysfunction (DD) is defined as heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF).² HFpEF occurs in approximately 50% of patients with HF, and it is associated with similar mortality as HFrEF.³ HFpEF remains a challenging condition to manage as it is a

phenotypically diverse syndrome, often difficult to diagnose. Whilst currently available treatments such as angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs), angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARBs), mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (MRAs), diuretics, beta-blockers (BBs) are suitable for the management of patients with HFrEF, these are not effective for those with HFpEF.⁴

Circulating biomarkers are employed regularly in diagnosis and prognosis of HF and have additional roles in providing better understanding of the underlying pathophysiology of HFpEF, which could lead to the development of more effective therapies and improved patient outcomes. NPs, including N-terminal pro-b-type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) and b-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), are currently recommended by clinical guidelines for diagnosis^{5,6} and prognosis⁶ of HFpEF. In addition, Gal-3 and sST2 are emerging as reliable biomarkers for risk stratification of HFpEF.⁶ The use of current biomarkers is limited in determining the subtypes of HF and in predicting morbidity and mortality rates. Therefore, we conducted meta-analyses, which for the first time, comprehensively assesses the diagnostic and prognostic potential of the most commonly utilised biomarkers in the context of HFpEF.

METHODS

Data sources and searches

Two separate systematic searches were conducted to assess the diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of biomarkers in HFpEF using the following databases: PubMed, Web of Science, MEDLINE and SCOPUS (1900 to January 2020). Literature searches were performed using the following terms: “HFpEF and biomarker”, “HFpEF and biomarker and mortality”, and

“HFpEF and biomarker and hospitalisation”. Full list of terms used is provided in the Supplementary material online (*Appendix S1*).

Study inclusion criteria

The assessment of the biomarkers used in the diagnosis of HFpEF was carried out using the published data from observational studies assessing the diagnostic accuracy of individual biomarkers, which discriminate between cohorts with and without HFpEF. In terms of prognostic assessment of individual biomarkers, studies with primary outcomes defined as overall mortality, hospitalisation, and/or a composite event of both, in patients with HFpEF, were included. For the assessment of diagnostic biomarkers, studies were selected only if sensitivity and specificity of individual biomarker was reported, whereas for prognostic biomarkers, studies had to have reported hazard ratio (HR) associated with a biomarker in predicting the aforementioned primary outcomes. The HRs were required to be obtained based on dichotomous data comparisons between the two sides of biomarkers’ cut-off values. Studies in which HRs were obtained based on continuous data comparisons (e.g. HR per log increase in biomarker level) were excluded.

Data extraction

Two independent investigators (H.C. and M.C.) extracted data from included studies. Disagreements were resolved by consensus with a third investigator (L.M.). The recommendations of PRISMA guidelines⁷ and another relevant guideline⁸ were followed for critical study reviews and data extraction.

For diagnostic biomarker assessment, true positive (TP), true negative (TN), false positive (FP) and false negative (FN) values of individual biomarkers to diagnose HFpEF, were extracted. For prognostic biomarker assessment, the HR values with 95% confidence

intervals (CIs) associated with individual biomarker's ability to predict the pre-specified outcomes, were extracted. The covariate adjustments of HRs were also recorded, if applicable.

Quality assessment

The included studies were assessed for quality independently by three co-authors (M.C., B.R. and K.M.) using validated Quality Assessment for Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-2 (QUADAS-2)⁹ and Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS)¹⁰ tools for diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers, respectively. Results were compared between assessors and, in case of disagreement, individual studies were discussed to achieve consensus. The quality scores based on QUADAS-2 and QUIPS tools for each study are listed in *Appendix S2*, Supplementary material online.

Data analysis

The meta-analyses for diagnostic biomarkers was performed using sensitivity and specificity values of each biomarker, which discriminate between cohorts with and without HFpEF (controls vs. HFpEF). The estimated sensitivity and specificity of the diagnostic biomarkers were calculated using TP, TN, FP and FN values. The sensitivity and specificity of those biomarkers extracted from four or more independent studies, were pooled and analysed using Meta-DiSc 1.4 (Meta-DiSc, Madrid, Spain) and STATA 16.0 (STATA Corporation, College Station, Texas, USA) to generate forest plots and hierarchical summary of receiver operating characteristic (HSROC) curves, respectively. Forest plots were generated only for those diagnostic biomarkers that were investigated in at least three independent studies. For those diagnostic and prognostic markers extracted from less than three studies, we only recorded the sensitivity and specificity, and/or HRs estimates of the original studies without pooling the data.

We also analysed the prognostic accuracy of individual biomarkers by pooling HRs from a minimum of three independent studies. The univariable HRs were preferably selected, when not available, multivariable HRs with the least number of adjustments were used. The HRs with 95% CIs were estimated by random-effect model forest plots by STATA 16.0. Bias was assessed by the Egger's regression test.

RESULTS

Search results

The search for HFpEF diagnostic biomarkers yielded 6,145 articles, of which 18^{s1-s18} were included; the search for HFpEF prognostic biomarkers yielded 2,440 articles, of which 26^{s15, s19-s43} met the inclusion criteria (*Figure 1*) (see Supplementary material online, *Appendix S3* for references). Most selected studies were designed either prospectively (n=20)^{s1-s3, s9-s13, s17-s20, s28, s37-s43} or retrospectively (n=18)^{s4-s8, s14-s16, s25, s26, s29-s36}, whereas five^{s21-s24, s27} were post hoc analyses of randomised controlled trials (RCTs). One study was included in both diagnostic and prognostic biomarker assessment^{s15}. The vast majority of included studies utilised a 50% LVEF as a diagnostic criterium to define HFpEF whereas LVEF cut-off values for diagnosis of HFpEF were lower than 50% in eleven^{s1, s8, s20-s24, s28, s38, s42, s43} of them. In total, 1,104 patients with HFpEF were included in diagnostic biomarkers assessments and 53,497 patients in prognostic biomarkers assessments. Patients were free of valvular diseases in all included studies. Most of the prognostic biomarker studies except four^{s25, s30, s40, s42} reported baseline medications, with ranges across the studies as follows: ACEIs or ARBs (7.6%-88.1%), MRAs (15%-53%), BBs (17%-82.3%), digoxin (10%-88%), statins (27.4%-64%), diuretics (16%-100%).

Overall, selected studies yielded a total of 18 different diagnostic markers and 17 different prognostic markers. Most of the studies evaluated NPs in both diagnosis (n=12)^{s1-s6, s8-s13} and prognosis (n=15)^{s19-s26, s29-s35} of HFpEF. The cut-off values of identical biomarkers were heterogeneous as were the follow-up periods.

NT-proBNP as a biomarker of diagnosis and prognosis in HFpEF

In relation to the studies using NT-proBNP as a diagnostic biomarker of HFpEF (n=6)^{s1-s6}, three studies^{s1, s2, s5} were conducted in Europe, and three studies^{s3, s4, s6} were conducted in Asia. In the primary analysis where all six studies were included, NT-proBNP showed estimated pooled sensitivity of 0.69 (95% CI: 0.65 to 0.73) and specificity of 0.92 (95% CI: 0.89 to 0.94) in the diagnosis of HFpEF (*Figure 2A and 2B*). However, there was significant heterogeneity in the sensitivity ($I^2=83.7%$) and specificity ($I^2=83.5%$) of NT-proBNP between the studies.

In a subgroup analysis including only studies conducted in Europe (n=3),^{s1, s2, s5} the estimated pooled sensitivity was 0.68 (95% CI: 0.63 to 0.73) and specificity was 0.95 (95% CI: 0.93 to 0.98), similar to the primary analysis (Supplementary material online, *Figure S1A*). However, there was no heterogeneity in relation to the sensitivity ($I^2=0%$), with substantial heterogeneity being reported in terms of the specificity ($I^2=60.8%$) in this subgroup analysis. In another subgroup analysis including only patients from Asia (n=3),^{s3, s4, s6} similar sensitivity (0.71, 95% CI: 0.65 to 0.76) and lower specificity (0.83, 95% CI: 0.76 to 0.89) were obtained (Supplementary material online, *Figure S1B*). However, heterogeneity was substantially high in terms of both sensitivity ($I^2=93.1%$) and specificity ($I^2=75.6%$).

Studies investigating NT-proBNP as a prognostic marker to predict the pre-specified primary outcomes in patients with HFpEF (n=8),^{s19-s26} were conducted in Asia (n=1),^{s25} Europe (n=3),^{s19, s20, s26} or other continents (n=4)^{s21-s24}. Cut-off value for NT-proBNP varied across these eight studies (median: 763.77 pg/mL, range: 68.5 pg/mL-3606 pg/mL) as did the follow-up periods (median: 19.62 months, range: 6 months-5 years). Using data from all eight studies, the estimated pooled HRs were significant [mortality (n=7): 2.27, 95% CI: 1.69 to 3.06; hospitalisation (n=2): 3.54, 95% CI: 2.83 to 4.43; a composite event (n=8: 2.55, 95% CI: 2.13 to 3.05)] (*Figure 2C*). Heterogeneity was prominent in studies assessing mortality ($I^2=87.6\%$) or composite event ($I^2=87.6\%$) with no heterogeneity being reported for hospitalisation ($I^2=0\%$). No evidence of systematic bias was present for mortality (Egger $P=0.139$) or composite event ($P=0.182$), however systematic bias was present for hospitalisation (hospitalisation: $P<0.001$).

BNP as a biomarker of diagnosis and prognosis in HFpEF

The diagnostic accuracy of BNP in HFpEF (n=6),^{s8-s13} was assessed using a wide range of cut-off values (31 pg/mL to 353.6 pg/mL). Studies were conducted in Asia (n=3),^{s8-s10} North America (n=2)^{s11, s12} and Europe (n=1)^{s13}. Both estimated sensitivity (0.81, 95% CI: 0.76 to 0.85) and specificity (0.86, 95% CI: 0.82 to 0.89) of BNP to diagnose HFpEF were highly reliable (*Figure 3A and 3B*). Low heterogeneity was reported between these studies (sensitivity: $I^2=0\%$; specificity: $I^2=16.9\%$).

In relation to the studies reporting the prognostic accuracy of BNP in patients with HFpEF (n=7),^{s29-s35} three^{s30, s31, s35} were conducted in North America, three^{s32-s34} in Asia, and one^{s29} in Europe. Cut-off values of BNP used in these studies were varied (median: 287 pg/mL, range: 100 pg/mL to 1000 pg/mL) as did the follow-up periods (median: 21.83 months, range:

6 months-6.5 years). Only one study^{s30} reported the accuracy of BNP to predict hospitalisation in patients with HFpEF. The estimated pooled HRs of BNP to predict mortality, or a composite event were 3.01 (95% CI: 1.27 to 7.11) and 2.28 (95% CI: 1.42 to 3.69), respectively (*Figure 3C*). Heterogeneity and bias were very high in relation to mortality ($I^2=97.2%$, Egger $P=0.607$), whereas substantial heterogeneity and borderline bias were reported in predicting a composite event ($I^2=75.8%$, Egger $P=0.071$).

Galectin-3 and sST2 as biomarkers of HFpEF diagnosis

All studies investigating Gal-3 as diagnostic biomarker (n=3),^{s6-s8} of HFpEF were conducted in Asia. Cut-off values ranged from 9.55 ng/mL to 20.12 ng/mL. Estimated pooled sensitivity and specificity of Gal-3 were 0.70 (95% CI: 0.63 to 0.75) and 0.78 (95% CI: 0.69 to 0.85) respectively (*Figure 4A*). Heterogeneity was large for both sensitivity ($I^2=86.7%$) and specificity ($I^2=68.6%$).

Studies investigating sST2 to diagnose HFpEF (study n=3),^{s3, s6, s14} were all also conducted in Asia. Cut-off values were highly varied across the studies and ranged from 68.6 pg/mL to 26.47 ng/mL. Limited diagnostic sensitivity (0.58, 95% CI: 0.52 to 0.64) and specificity (0.59, 95% CI: 0.49 to 0.68) of sST2 to diagnose HFpEF were observed (*Figure 4B*). Heterogeneity was also significant in terms of both sensitivity ($I^2=88.1%$) and specificity ($I^2=69.5%$).

Emerging biomarkers of HFpEF diagnosis and prognosis

Other diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers were also appraised in this study, however, meta-analysis was not conducted on these markers due to the granularity of data (n<3). As such, we presented the original sensitivity and specificity from each paper in relation to the following diagnostic biomarkers: tissue inhibitor matrix metalloproteinase 1 (TIMP1), adiponectin, angiogenin, soluble glycoprotein 130 (sgp130), heat shock protein 27 (hsp27),

cardiac bridging integrator 1 (cBIN1), troponin-T (TnT), and growth differentiator factor 15 (GDF15); and also directly extracted HRs of the following prognostic biomarkers: midregional pro-A-type natriuretic peptide (MR-proANP), midregional proadrenomedullin (MR-proADM), Gal-3, sST2, cystatin C (CysC), tumour necrosis factor α (TNF- α), carbohydrate antigen-125 (CA-125), cBIN1, parathyroid hormone (PTH), troponin-I (TnI), TnT, C-reactive protein (CRP), thrombospondin-2 (TSP-2), copeptin, and migration inhibitory factor (MIF) (Supplementary material online, *Figure S2A and B*). In terms of diagnosis, adiponectin appears to have the highest sensitivity and specificity,^{S18} with varied prognostic potential compared to the rest of the biomarkers.

DISCUSSION

This meta-analysis is the first systematic synthesis of available clinical observational studies evaluating diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of circulating biomarkers in HFpEF. The main findings of this study are: (i) NPs are the most reported biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis of HFpEF, (ii) NT-proBNP is the biomarker with the highest diagnostic specificity, whereas BNP is the most reliable in diagnosing HFpEF in terms of both sensitivity and specificity, and (iii) NPs could also be used for predicting mortality, hospitalisation or a composite event of both events in HFpEF patients, however the heterogeneity was very high between the studies.

Although consensus guidelines have acknowledged the incremental value of NPs in diagnosis^{5,6} and prognosis⁶ of HFpEF, the diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of NPs in HFpEF have never been systematically reviewed in the context of both diagnosis and prognosis. We found that NT-proBNP has the highest specificity but modest sensitivity to diagnose HFpEF. This modest sensitivity was also confirmed by a retrospective study in which low (below cut-off)

NT-proBNP levels were reported in about a half of the HFpEF cohort.¹¹ According to our meta-analysis results, BNP may be the most reliable biomarker in HFpEF diagnosis due to its satisfactory sensitivity and specificity, as well as the reliability of its diagnostic potential over a large spectrum of cut-off values.

With respect to the predictive potential of NPs in HFpEF prognosis, both NT-proBNP and BNP were associated with increased risk of mortality, hospitalisation or a composite event, by over 2-fold. However, we are unable to determine which one is superior due to inconsistency in the results. In terms of NT-proBNP, three studies^{s22, s25, s26} showed substantial variability in the results, demonstrated by substantial heterogeneity. There were inconsistencies in either patient characteristics, LVEF, follow-up periods or cut-off values in these three studies (Table 2). For BNP, the heterogeneity appears to be dependent on the study design resulting in variable mortality rates of HFpEF. Mortality rates of HFpEF patients in RCTs has been found to be significantly lower than that of non-RCTs, which may affect the HRs.

In a previous study comparing biomarkers in HFpEF and HFrEF using a novel heatmap method, NPs demonstrated a strong association with HFrEF, whereas biomarkers of inflammation and angiogenesis were predominantly associated with HFpEF.¹² The latter was also confirmed in a recent study.¹³ Gal-3, a well-characterised inflammatory marker, has shown potential as a promising biomarker of HFpEF in pre-clinical models¹⁴⁻¹⁵ and according to the epidemiological evidences^{16, 17}. Nevertheless, in this meta-analysis a limited diagnostic value of Gal-3 was demonstrated in HFpEF, based on observational clinical studies. High heterogeneity was present between studies investigating the diagnostic potential of Gal-3, which could have been caused by the wider range of LVEF (>45%) used to recruit patients in

one included study,⁵⁸ that may have resulted in the inclusion of patients with HF with mid-range ejection fraction as part of this small HFpEF cohort (n=35). In addition, unlike NPs, which show differentially elevated concentrations in HFpEF and HFrEF,¹⁸⁻²⁰ Gal-3 concentrations are unable to distinguish HFpEF from HFrEF,¹⁹ suggesting lower diagnostic value of Gal-3 than that of NPs. Despite its limited diagnostic value, Gal-3 could represent a promising prognostic marker in HFpEF. Although we did not find a sufficient number of studies to conduct a meta-analysis in relation to Gal-3's prognostic potential using our inclusion criteria, a number of other studies have reported potent prognostic value of Gal-3 in HFpEF.²¹⁻²⁵ However, more studies are needed to validate this hypothesis, given the fact that Gal-3 level is a confounder of NT-proBNP and renal function.^{25, 26}

Similarly, although promising results have been reported with sST2 in HFpEF,^{27, 28} in our meta-analysis limited diagnostic and prognostic values of sST2 have been demonstrated. Our results revealed that the diagnostic accuracy of sST2 in HFpEF is highly dependent on its cut-off values, hence heterogeneity was substantial when we pooled sensitivities and specificities from different studies. In addition, sST2 is unable to distinguish HFpEF cohorts from healthy individuals after adjusting for age, sex and other clinical covariates,²⁹ which may be caused by the lack of association of sST2 with LV function and structure.³⁰ We suggest that the utility of NPs appears currently superior to Gal-3 and sST2, in terms of HFpEF diagnosis.

Study limitations

Due to the granularity of data, we were unable to assess the diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of other emerging biomarkers, which should be investigated in the future through meta-analysis when there are sufficient number of studies investigating these biomarkers in diagnosis and prognosis of HFpEF. We also acknowledged that there is high heterogeneity in

most of the meta-analyses performed except for the diagnostic potential of BNP in HFpEF, which should be addressed in future meta-analyses incorporating further and more homogeneous studies. This is likely caused by the variability in study designs, biomarker cut-off values and follow-up periods.

CONCLUSION

HFpEF comprises approximately half of all patients with HF, with similar morbidity and mortality incidence, yet it is poorly understood and pharmacologically managed. Due to the lack of understanding of the pathogenesis of HFpEF, and diagnostic challenges, a delay in diagnosis and treatment is common, which can lead to worse outcomes for patients with HFpEF. Accurate biomarkers are clinically important to improve both diagnosis and prognosis of HFpEF, emphasising urgent need for biomarker discovery and validation. Nevertheless, the status of biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis of HFpEF, demonstrated in this meta-analysis, suggests that NPs, particularly BNP, remain the most reliable biomarkers in diagnosing HFpEF, with some potential for HFpEF prognosis.

FUNDING

This project was funded through the Honour's student fund provided by the Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Chan YK, Tuttle C, Ball J, Teng TK, Ahamed Y, Carrington MJ, Stewart S. Current and projected burden of heart failure in the Australian adult population: a substantive but still ill-defined major health issue. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;**16**:501.
2. NHFA CSANZ Heart Failure Guidelines Working Group, Atherton JJ, Sindone A, de Pasquale CG, Driscoll A, MacDonald PS, Hopper I, Kistler PM, Briffa T, Wong J, Abhayaratna W, Thomas L, Audehm R, Newtown P, O'Loughlin J, Branagan M, Connell C. National Heart Foundation of Australia and Cardiac Society of Australia and New Zealand: guidelines for the prevention, detection, and management of heart failure in Australia 2018. *Heart Lung Circ* 2018;**27**:1123-1208.
3. Owan TE, Hodge DO, Herges RM, Jacobsen SJ, Roger VL, Redfield MM. Trends in prevalence and outcome of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *N Eng J Med* 2006;**355**:251-259.
4. Zheng SL, Chan FT, Nabeebaccus AA, Shah AM, McDonagh T, Okonko DO, Ayis S. Drug treatment effects on outcomes in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart* 2018;**104**:407-415.
5. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, Bueno H, Cleland JGF, Coats AJS, Falk V, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, Hariola VP, Jankowska EA, Jessup M, Linde C, Nihoyannopoulos P, Parissis JT, Pieske B, Riley JP, Rosano GMC, Ruilope LM, Ruschitzka F, Rutten FH, van der Meer P, ESC Scientific Document. 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) developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart J* 2016;**37**:2129-2200.
6. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, Butler J, Casey DEJ, Colvin MM, Drazner MH, Filippatos GS, Fonarow GC, Givertz MM, Hollenberg SM, Lindenfeld J, Masoudi FA, McBride PE, Peterson PN, Stevenson LW, Westlake C. 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA focused update of the 2013 ACC/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Failure Society of America. *Circulation* 2017;**136**:e137-161.
7. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA GROUP. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b2535.
8. Liu Z, Yao Z, Li C, Liu X, Chen H, Gao C. A step-by-step guide to the systemic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic and prognostic test accuracy evaluations. *Br J Cancer* 2013;**108**:2299-2303.
9. Whiting PF, Rutjes AWS, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, Leeflang MMG, Sterne JAC, Bossuyt PMM, QUADAS-2 GROUP. QUADAS-2: A revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;**155**:529-536.
10. Hayden JA, van Der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Cote P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic factors. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;**158**:280-286.
11. Buckley LF, Canada JM, Del Buono MG, Carbone S, Trankle CR, Billingsley H, Kadariya D, Arena R, van Tassell BW, Abbate A. Low NT-proBNP levels in overweight and obese patients do not rule out a diagnosis of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *ESC Heart Fail* 2018;**5**:372-378.
12. Tromp J, Khan MA, Klip IT, Meyer S, de Boer RA, Jaarsma T, Hillege H, van Veldhuisen DJ, van der Meer P, Voors AA. Biomarker profiles in heart failure patients with preserved and reduced ejection fraction. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2017;**6**:e003989.

13. Lazar S, Rayner B, Lopez Campos G, McGrath K, McClements L. Mechanisms of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in the presence of diabetes mellitus. *Translational Metabolic Syndrome Research*. 2020 (in-press); doi.org/10.1016/j.tmsr.2020.04.002.
14. Calvier L, Miana M, Reboul P, Cachofeiro V, Martinez-Martinez E, de Boer RA, Poirier F, Lacolley P, Zannad F, Rossignol P, Lopez-Andres N. Galectin-3 mediates aldosterone-induced vascular fibrosis. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 2013;**33**:67-75.
15. Yu L, Ruifrok WP, Meissner M, Bos EM, van Goor H, Sanjabi B, van der Harst P, Pitt B, Goldstein IJ, Koerts JA, van Veldhuisen DJ, Bank RA, van Gilst WH, Sillje HH, de Boer RA. Genetic and pharmacological inhibition of galectin-3 prevents cardiac remodeling by interfering with myocardial fibrogenesis. *Circ Heart Fail* 2013;**6**:107-117.
16. Ho JE, Liu C, Lyass A, Courchesne P, Pencina MJ, Vasani RS, Larson MG, Levy D. Galectin-3, a marker of cardiac fibrosis, predicts incident heart failure in the community. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;**60**:1249-1256.
17. de Boer RA, van Veldhuisen DJ, Gansevoort RT, Muller Kobold AC, van Gilst WH, Hillege HL, Bakker SJ, van der Harst P. The fibrosis marker galectin-3 and outcome in the general population. *J Intern Med* 2012;**272**:55-64.
18. van Veldhuisen DJ, Linssen GC, Jaarsma T, van Gilst WH, Hoes AW, Tijssen JG, Paulus WJ, Voors AA, Hillege HL. B-type natriuretic peptide and prognosis in heart failure patients with preserved and reduced ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;**61**:1498-1506.
19. Maisel AS, McCord J, Nowak RM, Hollander JE, Wu AH, Duc P, Omland T, Storrow AB, Krishnaswamy P, Abraham WT, Clopton P, Steg G, Aumont MC, Westheim A, Knudsen CW, Perez A, Kamin R, Kazanegra R, Herrmann HC, McCullough PA, Breathing Not Properly Multinational Study Investigators. Bedside B-type natriuretic peptide in the emergency diagnosis of heart failure with reduced or preserved ejection fraction. Results from the Breathing Not Properly Multinational Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;**41**:2010-2017.
20. Bursi F, Weston SA, Redfield MM, Jacobsen SJ, Pakhomov S, Nkomo VT, Meverden RA, Roger VL. Systolic and diastolic heart failure in community. *JAMA* 2006;**296**:2209-2216.
21. Beltrami M, Ruocco G, Dastidar AG, Franci B, Lucani B, Aloia E, Nuti R, Palazzuoli A. Additional value of galectin-3 to BNP in acute heart failure patients with preserved ejection fraction. *Clin Chim Acta* 2016;**457**:99-105.
22. Cui Y, Qi X, Huang A, Li J, Hou W, Liu K. Differential and predictive value of galectin-3 and soluble suppression of tumorigenicity-2 (sST2) in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Med Sci Monit* 2018;**24**:5139-5146.
23. Carrasco-Sanchez FJ, Aramburu-Bodas O, Salamanca-Bautista P, Morales-Rull JL, Galisteo-Almeda L, Paez-Rubio MI, Arias-Jimenez JL, Aguayo-Canela M, Perez-Calvo JJ. Predictive value of serum galectin-3 levels in patients with acute heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Int J Cardiol* 2013;**169**:177-182.
24. Edelmann F, Holzendorf V, Wachter R, Nolte K, Schmidt AG, Kraigher-Krainer E, Duvinage A, Unkelbach I, Dungen HD, Tschöpe C, Herrmann-Lingen C, Halle M, Hasenfuss G, Gelbrich G, Stough WG, Pieske BM. Galectin-3 in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: results from the Aldo-DHF trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2015;**17**:214-223.
25. Coburn E, Frishman W. Comprehensive review of the prognostic value of galectin-3 in heart failure. *Cardiol Rev* 2014;**22**:171-175.

26. Zhang R, Zhang Y, An T, Guo X, Yin S, Wang Y, Januzzi JL, Cappola TP, Zhang J. Prognostic value of sST2 and galectin-3 for death relative to renal function in patients hospitalized for heart failure. *Biomark Med* 2015;**9**:433-441.
27. Bartunek J, Delrue L, van Durme F, Muller O, Casselman F, de Wiest B, Croes R, Verstreken S, Goethals M, de Raedt H, Sarma J, Joseph L, Vanderheijden M, Weinberg EO. Nonmyocardial production of ST2 protein in human hypertrophy and failure is related to diastolic load. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008;**52**:2166-2174.
28. Wang YC, Yu CC, Chiu FC, Tsai CT, Lai LP, Hwang JJ, Lin JL. Soluble ST2 as a biomarker for detecting stable heart failure with a normal ejection fraction in hypertensive patients. *J Card Fail* 2013;**19**:163-168.
29. Santhanakrishnan R, Chong JP, Ng TP, Ling LH, Sim D, Leong KR, Yeo PS, Ong HY, Jaufeerally F, Wong R, Chai P, Low AF, Richards AM, Lam CS. Growth differentiation factor 15, ST2, high-sensitivity troponin T, and N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide in heart failure with preserved vs. reduced ejection fraction. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2012;**14**:1338-1348.
30. AbouEzzeddine OF, McKie PM, Dunlay SM, Stevens SR, Felker GM, Borlaug BA, Chen HH, Tracy RP, Braunwald E, Redfield MM. Suppression of tumorigenicity 2 in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Heart Association* 2017;**6**:e004382

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines flow diagram

Figure 2. Sensitivity, specificity, and hazard ratio, of NT-proBNP extracted from all studies using NT-proBNP for diagnosis or prognosis of HFpEF. Forest plot of NT-proBNP with estimated pooled sensitivity and specificity (A) and HSROC curve (B). (C) Random-effect model forest plot of hazard ratios for NT-proBNP to predict mortality, hospitalisation or composite event of both. CI, confidence interval; df, degree of freedom; HSROC, hierarchical summary receiver-operating characteristic.

Figure 3. Sensitivity, specificity and hazard ratio of BNP extracted from all studies using BNP to diagnose HFpEF. Forest plot of BNP with estimated pooled sensitivity and specificity (A) and HSROC curve (B). (C) Random-effect model forest plot of hazard ratios for BNP to predict mortality, hospitalisation or composite event of both. CI, confidence interval; df, degree of freedom; HSROC, hierarchical summary receiver-operating characteristic.

Figure 4. Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of Gal-3 and sST2 extracted from all studies using Gal-3 to diagnose HFpEF. Forest plot of Gal-3 (A) and sST2 (B) with estimated pooled sensitivity and specificity. CI, confidence interval; df, degree of freedom.

Table 1 Study characteristics of included studies in relation to HFpEF diagnostic biomarkers

Author & Year of Publication	Study Design	Location	(HFpEF) Number of cohort	(Control) Number of cohort	LVEF (%)	Biomarker (cut-off value)
Kasner et al. 2011 ^{s1}	Prospective study	Germany	107	73	>55	NT-proBNP (125 pg/mL)
Tschope et al. 2005 ^{s2}	Prospective study	Germany	68	50	≥50	NT-proBNP (110 pg/mL)
Santhanakrishnan et al. 2012 ^{s3}	Prospective study	Singapore	50	50	≥50	NT-proBNP (247.6 pg/mL); GDF15 (879.13 pg/mL); sST2 (26.47 ng/mL); TnT (9.77 pg/mL)
Liu et al. 2016 ^{s4}	Retrospective study	China	50	50	≥50	NT-proBNP (424.31 pg/mL); sgp130 (253.617 pg/mL); hsp27 (1245.861 pg/mL)
Stahrenberg et al. 2010 ^{s5}	Retrospective study	Germany	142	188	>50	NT-proBNP (220 pg/mL); GDF15 (1200 pg/mL)
Cui et al. 2018 ^{s6}	Retrospective study	China	172	30	≥50	NT-proBNP (295.85 pg/mL); Gal-3 (9.55 ng/mL); sST2 (68.6 pg/mL)

Gurel et al. 2015 ^{s7}	Retrospective study	Turkey	37	45	≥50	Gal-3 (20.12 ng/mL)
Yin et al. 2014 ^{s8}	Retrospective study	China	35	43	>45	BNP (100 pg/mL); Gal-3 (17.8 ng/mL)
Wei et al. 2005 ^{s9}	Prospective study	China	61	74	>50	BNP (40 pg/mL)
Liu et al. 2010 ^{s10}	Prospective study	China	39	20	>50	BNP (353.6 pg/mL)
Lubien et al. 2002 ^{s11}	Prospective study	USA	119	175	>50	BNP (62 pg/mL)
Dokainish et al. 2004 ^{s12}	Prospective study	USA	19	27	≥50	BNP (150 pg/mL)
Arques et al. 2010 ^{s13}	Prospective study	France	15	11	>50	BNP (31 pg/mL)
Wang et al. 2013 ^{s14}	Retrospective study	China	68	39	>50	sST2 (13.5 ng/mL)
Nikolova et al. 2018 ^{s15}	Retrospective study	USA	52	52	≥50	cBIN1 (1.653 ng/mL)
Ahmed et al. 2006 ^{s16}	Retrospective study	USA	26	23	≥50	TIMP1 (1200 ng/mL)
Jiang et al. 2014 ^{s17}	Prospective study	China	9	16	≥50	Angiogenin (426 ng/mL)
Bazaeva et al. 2017 ^{s18}	Prospective study	Russia	35	35	>50	Adiponectin (8.3 ng/mL)

Abbreviations of biomarkers (Supplementary material online, *Appendix S2*).

HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.

Table 2 Study characteristics of included studies in relation to HFpEF prognostic biomarkers

Author & year of publication	Study design	Location	(HFpEF) Number of cohort	LVEF (%)	Biomarker (cut-off value)	Follow-up period
Eriksson et al. 2019 ^{s19}	Prospective study	Sweden	564	≥50	NT-proBNP (2529 pg/mL)	1100±687 days
Carrasco-Sanchez et al. 2011 ^{s20}	Prospective study	Spain	218	≥45	CysC (2060 ng/mL); CysC (2060 ng/mL); NT-proBNP (3606 pg/mL); NT-proBNP (3606 pg/mL)	1 year
Anand et al. 2011 ^{s21}	RCT post hoc analysis	International	3,480	≥45	NT-proBNP (339 pg/mL); NT-proBNP (339 pg/mL)	49.5 months
Cleland et al. 2012 ^{s22}	RCT post hoc analysis	International	375	>40	NT-proBNP (1036 pg/mL)	1 year
^a Jhund et al. 2015 ^{s23}	RCT post hoc analysis	International	2,612	≥45	NT-proBNP (1947 pg/mL); NT-proBNP (1947 pg/mL)	6 months
^b Kristensen et al. 2015 ^{s24}	RCT post hoc analysis	International	2,767	≥45	NT-proBNP (360 pg/mL); NT-proBNP (360 pg/mL); NT-proBNP (360 pg/mL)	6 months
^c Hung et al. 2012 ^{s25}	Retrospective study	China	35	≥50	CA-125 (17.29 U/mL); NT-proBNP (68.50 pg/mL)	828.1 days
^d Alehagen et al. 2013 ^{s26}	Retrospective study	Sweden	345	>50	NT-proBNP (491.53 pg/mL); MR-proANP (171 pmol/L); MR-proADM (757 pmol/L)	5 years
Edelmann et al. 2015 ^{s27}	RCT post hoc analysis	International	377	≥50	Gal-3 (12.11 ng/mL)	1 year
Carrasco-Sanchez et al. 2013 ^{s28}	Prospective study	Spain	419	≥45	Gal-3 (13.8 ng/mL); Gal-3 (13.8 ng/mL)	1 year

Beltrami et al. 2016 ^{s29}	Retrospective study	Italy	45	>50	Gal-3 (19.95 ng/mL); BNP (1000 pg/mL)	6 months
Anjan et al. 2012 ^{s30}	Retrospective study	USA	159	>50	BNP (100 pg/mL); BNP (100 pg/mL)	14 months
^e Greenberg et al. 2019 ^{s31}	Retrospective study	USA	1,439	≥50	BNP (321 pg/mL)	1 year
Hamatani et al. 2018 ^{s32}	Retrospective study	Japan	614	≥50	BNP (202 pg/mL); BNP (202 pg/mL)	664 days
Kasahara et al. 2018 ^{s33}	Retrospective study	Japan	2,893	≥50	BNP (300 pg/ml)	6.3 years
Kimura et al. 2016 ^{s34}	Retrospective study	Japan	150	≥50	BNP (100 pg/mL); TSP-2 (19.2 ng/mL)	727 days
Thawabi et al. 2017 ^{s35}	Retrospective study	USA	363	≥50	BNP (287 pg/mL); TnI (40 pg/mL)	1 year/2 years
^f Pandey et al. 2017 ^{s36}	Retrospective study	USA	34,233	≥50	TnI (110 pg/mL); TnI (110 pg/mL); TnT (70 pg/mL); TnT (70 pg/mL)	30 days/1 year
^g Nikolova et al. 2018 ^{s15}	Retrospective study	USA	52	≥50	cBIN1 (1.653 ng/mL)	1 year
Sugano et al. 2019 ^{s37}	Prospective study	Japan	191	≥50	sST2 (23.1 pg/mL); sST2 (36.6 pg/mL); sST2 (20.0 pg/mL)	445 days
Hage et al. 2015 ^{s38}	Prospective study	Sweden	86	≥45	Copeptin (13.56 pmol/L)	579 days
Luedike et al. 2018 ^{s39}	Prospective study	Germany	62	>50	MIF (51.58 ng/mL)	180 days
Dunlay et al. 2008 ^{s40}	Prospective study	USA	486	≥50	TNF-α (3.1 pg/mL)	17 months
^h Sugimoto et al. 2009 ^{s41}	Prospective study	Japan	88	≥50	PTH (47 pg/mL)	138 days
Williams et al. 2008 ^{s42}	Prospective study	USA	985	Mean:62±9; 61±10	CRP (3000 ng/mL)	3 years
Koller et al. 2014 ^{s43}	Prospective study	Germany	459	>45	CRP (13800 ng/mL)	9.7 years

Abbreviations of biomarkers (Supplementary material online, *Appendix S2*).

^{a-h}Covariate adjustments for the multivariable hazard ratios (Supplementary material online, *Table S1*).

Red colour represents the prognostic biomarkers to predict mortality; Blue colour represents hospitalisation; Green colour represents a composite event of mortality and hospitalisation. RCT, randomised controlled trial; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.







