7th Advances in Heart Failure 2024

10 e 11 de Outubro

FACULDADE DE MEDICINA DA UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

ZAÇÃO

FM UP



GËI DONE EVENIS

th Advances in Heart Failure 2024

10 e 11 de Outubro

FACULDADE DE MEDICINA DA UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

Fração de Ejeção

Origem do conceito e razão da sua utilização na IC

José Silva Cardoso



Left Ventricular (LV) Ejection Fraction (EF) Definition

(LV Ejection Volume / End-diastolic LV Volume) x 100

Folse R. and Branwald E. Circulation, 1962



LVEF Concept origin

• The development of left ventriculography and

indicator dilution techniques in the early 1960s

enabled the determination of LVEF

Marwick TH. et al. JACC, 2018



LVEF Evaluation First Published Paper - 1962

Determination of Fraction of Left Ventricular Volume Ejected per Beat and of Ventricular End-Diastolic and Residual Volumes

Experimental and Clinical Observations with a Precordial Dilution Technic

By Roland Folse, M.D., and Eugene Braunwald, M.D.

Folse RF, Braunwald E. Circulation. 1962





- Reflects both cardiac function and remodelling
- Is a valuable diagnostic and prognostic tool





LVEF Determinants

- LV contractility
- Preload
- Afterload





LVEF Is different from Cardiac Output

• In compensated HFrEF, despite LVEF is reduced,

both systolic and diastolic LV volumes are

increased, allowing for preserved stroke volume

and cardiac output.





LVEF Limitations as a marker of HF

• In HFpEF, although LVEF is normal, LV dysfunction

may be identified by markers of LV deformation





LVEF Other Limitations

It does not account for speed of LV contraction, a sensitive marker of LV dysfunction

• This is addressed by strain rate

It does not account for intra-ventricular synchrony

It does not reflect twist and untwist features, relevant for systole and diastole

Marwick TH. JACC, 2018



HF pharmachological and non-pharmachological (devices) decision making based on EF,

usually neglects that EF measurement was not standardized in RCTs.





A major limitation of EF is that it is sometimes a source of

disproportionate focus, to the exclusion of other features.





The limitations of EF measurement accuracy can be of a

physiological, technical and clinical nature.





Clinical decisions made on the basis of EF need to be

contextualized by the hemodynamic setting.





LV hypertrophy, shape, synchrony, and filling pressure are

prognostically important LV parameters that risk being neglected

with too much focus on EF.





In circumstances in which the EF is challenging to measure with

echocardiography, other systolic indices are potentially important

(These include dP/dt, the myocardial performance index, and GLS).







A focus on EF also risks the exclusion of a number of cardiac

function parameters that provide useful physiological and

prognostic information.

(RV) size and function, quantification of atrial size, and diastolic filling patterns.

Marwick TH. JACC, 2018



The classification of patients with symptomatic HF into HFrEF and HFpEF also has

important therapeutic implications.

The 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of <u>repeated measures of EF are >0.10</u>,

so it is inevitable that a substantial number of patients move into and out of this group

on subsequent echocardiograms, without implying any change of underlying pathology.



