Survival of patients with chronic heart failure in the community: a systematic review and meta-analysis
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Aim

To provide reliable survival estimates for people with chronic heart failure and explain variation in survival by key factors including age at diagnosis, left ventricular ejection fraction, decade of diagnosis, and study setting.

Methods and results

We searched in relevant databases from inception to August 2018 for non-interventional studies reporting survival rates for patients with chronic or stable heart failure in any ambulatory setting. Across the 60 included studies, there was survival data for 1.5 million people with heart failure. In our random effects meta-analyses the pooled survival rates at 1 month, 1, 2, 5, and 10 years were 95.7% (95% confidence interval 94.3–96.9), 86.5% (85.4–87.6), 72.6% (67.0–76.6), 56.7% (54.0–59.4) and 34.9% (24.0–46.8), respectively. The 5-year survival rates improved between 1970–1979 and 2000–2009 across healthcare settings, from 29.1% (25.5–32.7) to 59.7% (54.7–64.6). Increasing age at diagnosis was significantly associated with a reduced survival time. Mortality was lowest in studies conducted in secondary care, where there were higher reported prescribing rates of key heart failure medications. There was significant heterogeneity among the included studies in terms of heart failure diagnostic criteria, participant co-morbidities, and treatment rates.

Conclusion

These results can inform health policy and individual patient advanced care planning. Mortality associated with chronic heart failure remains high despite steady improvements in survival. There remains significant scope to improve prognosis through greater implementation of evidence-based treatments. Further research exploring the barriers and facilitators to treatment is recommended.
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Introduction

One to two in every 100 adults in the general population, and more than one in 10 people aged over 70 years are diagnosed with heart failure (HF).¹² The true prevalence is likely closer to 4%, as HF often goes unrecognised or misdiagnosed, particularly in older people.³⁴ Prevalence has risen by almost 25% since 2002 due to factors such as population ageing, improved survival following coronary events and an increase in the prevalence of HF risk factors, including hypertension and atrial fibrillation.⁵ HF is associated with significant morbidity and mortality equivalent to common forms of cancer.⁶

Much existing research on HF prognosis has focused on survival rates for people with ‘acute’ HF who have been admitted to hospital with a sudden deterioration in symptoms.⁷ An acute decompensation is itself a poor prognostic sign and therefore these survival estimates are not directly applicable to people with ‘chronic’ HF who have had an extended period of symptom
stability. Previous research suggests 1-year survival in acute HF is between 55% and 65%, compared to 80% to 90% in chronic HF.

The majority of patients have chronic HF and are treated in ambulatory settings. This chronic phase should be a time to discuss advanced care planning and anticipated disease progression with patients and their families. These conversations rely on healthcare professionals providing accurate prognostic information, yet survival estimates for chronic HF vary significantly across studies. The pattern of disease progression in HF is also unpredictable and varies considerably between individuals. Uncertainty over disease trajectory is one reason active HF treatment often persists into the terminal phases of illness, resulting in a large increase in resource use in the last 6 months of life. It also explains why some clinicians lack confidence in discussing HF prognosis and so avoid the subject.

Not all patients wish to know or discuss their prognosis, but for those who do, the ambiguity around their future can be distressing and many would welcome more information. Where patients are not informed of their expected prognosis, they tend to significantly overestimate their likely life expectancy.

Reliable prognostic estimates can help to promote advanced care planning, improve shared understanding of treatment goals and facilitate integrated treatment with specialist services, including palliative care. The aim of this systematic review was to assimilate the existing evidence base to provide accurate survival estimates for people with chronic HF. We also aimed to identify key factors which explain the existing variation in prognostic estimates, including age at time of diagnosis, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), decade of diagnosis, and study setting.

**Methods**

The protocol was published on PROSPERO (registration number CRD42017075680) and in *Systematic Reviews*. Reporting adheres to the ‘Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology’ (MOOSE) guidelines (online supplementary Methods S1).

**Search strategy**

We conducted a systematic search of relevant databases from inception to August 2018, incorporating Medical Subject Heading Indexation (MESH) terms and integrated validated search filters from the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (online supplementary Table S1). A hand search of the included papers’ references and relevant review articles was completed to achieve literature saturation.

**Eligibility criteria**

Eligible studies reported survival time for adult patients with a diagnosis of HF in the ‘chronic’ or ‘stable’ phase. Survival times were calculated from diagnosis, or from point of recruitment if this information was unavailable. Studies with under 1-year follow-up were excluded given the lack of information on long-term prognosis. We included studies reporting outcomes for both acute and chronic HF where it was possible to extract survival rates for chronic HF. If the results were combined, we attempted to contact study authors. As our aim was to report survival time in the context of usual care, we excluded interventional studies, service evaluations and studies where participants had been recruited on the basis of another co-morbidity. Conference abstracts were excluded as having insufficient detail for quality assessment.

**Data analysis**

Two authors (N.R.J., I.A.) independently completed two rounds of screening, the first based on titles and abstracts and the second a full text review. Foreign language papers were translated before assessment. Disagreements were checked with a third reviewer (C.J.T.).

Pooled survival rates were calculated at pre-specified time points using a random effects model given the anticipated variability in study methods. We used the *metaprop* command in Stata 14, designed for meta-analysis of binomial data. We calculated the study-specific 95% confidence intervals using the score statistic via the *cimethod(score)* function and used the *fit* command to perform the Freeman–Tukey double arcsine transformation and stabilise variance in our weighted pooled estimates. Heterogeneity and consistency were assessed using Chi-squared and I² statistics respectively. Sources of heterogeneity were explored using pre-specified sensitivity and subgroup analyses.

We conducted subgroup analyses and meta-regression for study date, setting, age and LVEF. To pool study dates, we categorised each included study or relevant subgroup by the decade of participant recruitment. Mean participant age was used to categorise results as either < 65, 65–74 or ≥ 75 years. Study setting was determined by point of recruitment and majority of management. Where there was evidence of significant input across both primary and secondary care, studies were classified as ‘cross-discipline’. HF was categorised as HF with preserved ejection fraction (HFP EF) if LVEF ≥ 50%, HF with mid-range ejection fraction (HFmrEF) with LVEF in the range 40–49%, and HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) if LVEF < 40%. Some earlier studies did not include a mid-range group and so categorised HFP Ef as LVEF ≥ 40%. Studies reporting pooled outcomes for all three groups or not measuring LVEF were grouped as ‘mixed’ ejection fraction. Data were unavailable to allow all subgroups of interest to be included together as covariates in a meta-regression analysis, therefore each covariate was considered separately in meta-regression models of survival rates at 1 and 5 years.

Two authors (N.R.J., I.A.) independently completed a risk of bias assessment for each study using the Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) tool, recommended by the Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group. We conducted a sensitivity analysis excluding studies at moderate or high risk of bias. We report a Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) score to provide an estimate of confidence in the cumulative outcomes (online supplementary Methods S2).

**Results**

**Study characteristics**

We included 60 studies after screening, 5423 studies at the title and abstract stage and 97 full texts (online supplementary Figure S1). A number of studies reported survival rates from the same dataset. Where these provided relevant information for our pre-specified subgroup analyses, we included both studies in the review but only one in any single meta-analysis. Two studies met the inclusion criteria.
Survival of patients with chronic HF in the community

The majority of included studies were conducted in Europe or North America and recruited participants from primary care (n = 23), cardiology outpatient clinics (n = 20), or both (n = 15). Over half were longitudinal cohort studies (n = 34) but many recent studies have analysed big databases of routinely collected patient information.9 HF diagnosis was most frequently captured using validated database codes (n = 19), though many studies also defined HF using Framingham (n = 12), or European Society of Cardiology (n = 10) criteria (Table 1).3,10,11,25-81 In eight studies the criteria for defining HF was unspecified or relied on a clinical diagnosis. There were insufficient data to conduct a meaningful analysis comparing outcomes by sex.

Demographic and baseline participant characteristics differed significantly between studies (online supplementary Table S2). Reporting of this information was inconsistent with ethnicity and deprivation indices only rarely included. However, co-morbid cardiovascular disease was common, with hypertension the most frequent co-morbidity, followed by diabetes and ischaemic heart disease. Treatment rates of key HF medications including angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors/angiotensin receptor blockers, beta-blockers and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists improved over time. Some recent studies reported treatment rates close to 90%. Detailed prescribing information was lacking, meaning it was not possible to determine how many participants were treated with optimum dosage or the recommended combination of all three agents.

Summary survival rates and causes of death

The pooled survival rates at 1 month, and 1, 2, 5 and 10 years, respectively, were 95.7% (95% confidence interval 94.3–96.9), 86.5% (85.4–87.6), 72.6% (67.0–76.6), 56.7% (54.0–59.4) and 34.9% (34.0–46.8) (Figure 1; online supplementary Figures S2–S6). Only 19 studies reported data on cause of death, but in 14 of these a cardiovascular cause accounted for over 50% of the total deaths (Table 2).25,26,34,45,47,50–53,56,60,61,63,64,67,69,72–74,77 HF tended to be the most frequent cause of death but there was significant variation in the reported proportion of deaths related directly to HF, ranging from 8% to 64%.

Sensitivity analysis

The majority of studies were rated at low (n = 26) or moderate (n = 27) overall risk of bias (Table S3). Excluding the studies at moderate or high risk of bias in a sensitivity analysis did not alter the results. The pooled survival rate at 1 year across the remaining studies was 85.9% (84.1–87.7) and at 5 years 56.9% (52.1–61.7). The GRADE assessment suggests there is ‘high’ certainty in the summary findings (Table S4).

Subgroup analysis by age

Evidence from the forest plots and meta-regression suggests survival rates decreased with increasing age at diagnosis (1-year survival: R² = 15.6%, P_trend = 0.005; 5-year survival: R² = 42.6%, P_trend < 0.001). Pooled survival rates at 1 year for people aged <65 years were 91.5% (88.2–94.3) compared to 83.3% (81.8–84.9) for people aged ≥75 years. By 5 years the respective survival rates were 78.8% (75.5–82.0) and 49.5% (46.3–52.7) (Figure 2; online supplementary Table S5). The trend towards a worse prognosis in relation to age at diagnosis was also reported within individual studies.11,41 In a recent analysis of survival rates within the UK THIN database, 5-year survival rates were 50% amongst participants aged 75–84 years, compared to 81% amongst the youngest participants aged 45–54 years.11 In both cases, survival rates were significantly worse than for age-matched participants of 72% and 98%, respectively.11

Subgroup analysis by study setting

The pooled 1- and 5-year survival rates were significantly better for participants in secondary care studies compared to cross-discipline studies (Figure 3). There was some evidence of improved survival in secondary care studies compared to primary care, with around 5% more participants alive at 1 year and 10% more at 5 years. The association between survival and setting was confirmed by meta-regression (online supplementary Table S5). Individual secondary care studies with the poorest survival rates were those that purposively recruited either elderly frail participants, or those with a significant reduction in LVEF.30,31 The primary care studies reporting the best survival rates used screening to detect incident HF cases.48,63 Rates of key HF medication prescribing were consistently better in secondary care.

The four studies36,45,48,52 conducted in South-East Asia reported better survival rates compared to Europe and North America, despite recruiting participants of comparable age and co-morbid disease burden. One of these studies48 used screening to detect incident cases and the proportion of participants prescribed HF medication was also relatively high, which may explain this survival difference.

Subgroup analysis by left ventricular ejection fraction

The pooled survival rate at 5 years was better for patients with HFrEF than mixed ejection fraction (Figure 4). There was no significant difference in the pooled survival rates for HFrEF compared to HFrEF at either 1 or 5 years (online supplementary Table S5). A number of studies compared the risk of death by LVEF in their individual populations and found a preserved ejection fraction was associated with improved survival. Survival analysis from a community-based screened cohort found patients with a LVEF <40% compared to LVEF >50% had a 1.80 (1.55–2.10) times greater risk of death over the study period, when adjusted for key factors such as age and sex.69 Other studies found the risk of death to be even greater for those with HFrEF, with hazard ratio of 2.62 (1.45–4.75),50 and 3.72 (1.80–7.68) reported.39 In every study reporting cause of death data categorised by LVEF, the proportion of total mortality attributed to cardiovascular disease
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| First author | Year | Study dates | Country | Study setting | Study design | HF definition | Total participants | QuIPS score | HF definition | Total participants | QuIPS score |
|--------------|------|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Cleland | 1993 | 1994–1998 | UK | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Diagnosis based on clinical, radiological and echocardiogram findings | 152 | High | Moderate | 122 | Symptomatically stable, NYHA class II–IV | High | Moderate |
| Ho | 1993 | 1993 | USA | Primary care | Prospective cohort | ‘Slight modification’ of Framingham criteria | 9405 | Moderate | Moderate | 216 | Incident HF cases in Framingham and Framingham offspring studies | Low | Moderate |
| Senini | 1998 | 1991 | USA | Cross-discipline | Routinely collected data | Framingham criteria | 566 | Moderate | Moderate | 99 | Incident HF cases in Framingham studies | Low | Moderate |
| McAlister | 1999 | 1999–1995 | Canada | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Typical symptoms + radiological or clinical evidence of HF. | 566 | Moderate | Moderate | 99 | Consecutive, confirmed cases of HF at a specialist HF clinic | High | Moderate |
| Niebauer | 1999 | 1995–1993 | UK | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | ‘Slight modification’ of Framingham criteria | 99 | Moderate | High | 162 | Symptomatically stable, NYHA class II–IV | High | Moderate |
| Cicoira | 2000 | 1999–1998 | UK | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Framingham criteria | 188 | High | High | 188 | Symptomatically stable, NYHA class II–IV | High | Moderate |
| Mosterd | 2001 | 1990–1993 | Netherlands | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Two-step process involving typical signs, evidence of cardiovascular disease and exclusion of COPD | 5255 | High | High | 181 | Incident HF cases in Rotterdam Study | Low | Moderate |
| Chen | 2002 | 1996–1997 | USA | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Framingham criteria | 83 | Low | Low | 83 | Incident HF cases | Low | Moderate |
| Levy | 2002 | 1990–1999 | USA | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Framingham criteria | 10311 | High | High | 411 | Incident HF cases in Framingham study | Moderate | Moderate |
| Muntwyler | 2002 | 1999–2000 | Switzerland | Primary care | Prospective cohort | ESC and Framingham criteria | 403 | Moderate | Moderate | 403 | Incident HF cases at Northern California Kaiser Medical Centre | Moderate | Moderate |
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| First author | Year | Study dates | Country | Study setting | Study design | HF definition | Total participants | HF sample | Participants | QUIPS score |
|--------------|------|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Koseki36     | 2003 | 2000–2001   | Japan   | Secondary care (mixed) | Registry | LVEF >50%, LVDD >55mm documented history of congestive HF | 721       | 702         | Chronic HF population within regional registry | High        |
| MacCarthy37  | 2003 | 1993–1995   | UK      | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Typical symptoms and objective evidence of cardiac dysfunction | 522       | 522         | Incident, stable, symptomatic HF cases in UK HEART study | Moderate    |
| Nielsen38    | 2004 | 1993–1996   | Denmark | Cross-discipline | Prospective cohort | Typical symptoms or an abnormal chest X-ray and current prescription for a loop diuretic | 2157      | 115         | Incident cases of HF from four general practices | Moderate    |
| Bleumink1    | 2004 | 1989–1993 follow-up to 2000 | Netherlands | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Validated score based on ESC criteria | 7734      | 725         | Incident HF cases in Rotterdam Study | Moderate    |
| Raymond39    | 2004 | 1997–2000   | Denmark | Primary care | Prospective cohort | ESC criteria | 764       | 36          | Volunteer sample from select GPs screened for HF | Low         |
| Roger40      | 2004 | 1979–2000   | USA     | Primary care | Prospective cohort | ICD-9-CM, validated with Framingham criteria | 4537      | 4537        | Incident HF cases in Rochester Epidemiology Project | Low         |
| Cacciatore41 | 2005 | 1992–2003   | Italy   | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Medical note review and physical examination to confirm cases, categorised by NYHA status | 1259      | 120         | Random sample of elderly patients enrolled in the Southern Italy community cohort | Moderate    |
| Senn42       | 2005 | 1995 and 1999 | Italy   | Cardiology outpatient | Routinely collected data | Framingham criteria | 1315      | 1315        | The 'IN-CHF' National Registry of elderly cardiology outpatients with HF | Low         |
| Barker43     | 2006 | 1970–1974 and 1990–1994 | USA     | Cross-discipline | Routinely collected data | Framingham criteria | 40671     | 1942        | Incident HF cases amongst Kaiser Northwest Region health-plan members | Moderate    |
| van Jaarsveld44 | 2006 | 1993–1998 | Netherlands | Primary care | Prospective cohort | International classification of primary care criteria | 5279      | 293         | Incident HF cases in Groningen Longitudinal Aging Study (GLAS) | Moderate    |
| First author | Year | Study dates | Country | Study setting  | Study design            | HF definition                        | Total participants | HF sample | Participants | QUIPS score |
|--------------|------|-------------|---------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Tsutsui55    | 2007 | 2004–2005   | Japan   | Cross-discipline | Registry               | Framingham criteria                  | 2685              | 2685      | Prospective multicentre JCARE-GENERAL HF registry, including primary care and outpatient data | Low          |
| Ammar46      | 2007 | 1997–2000   | USA     | Cross-discipline | Prospective cohort     | American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association definitions | 2029              | 244       | Incident HF cases in Rochester Epidemiology Project | Moderate     |
| Hobbs57      | 2007 | 1995–1999 follow-up to 2004 | UK     | Primary care    | Prospective cohort     | ESC criteria                         | 6162              | 449       | Randomly sampled from four discrete primary care populations and screened for LVSD and HF | Low          |
| Huang48      | 2007 | 1991–1993   | Taiwan  | Primary care    | Prospective cohort     | Framingham criteria                  | 2660              | 147       | Incident HF cases amongst volunteer community sample | Moderate     |
| Curtis49     | 2008 | 1994–2003   | USA     | Cross-discipline | Routinely collected data | ICD-9-CM                            | 622 786           | 622 786   | Incident HF cases amongst Medicare patients | Moderate     |
| Henkel50     | 2008 | 1979–2002   | USA     | Cross-discipline | Prospective cohort     | ICD-9 CM                             | 1063              | 1063      | Incident HF cases in Rochester Epidemiology Project | Low          |
| Castillo51   | 2009 | 1999–2003   | Spain   | Cardiology outpatient | Registry               | Clinician decided. No stated diagnostic criteria | 4720              | 1416      | Patients with confirmed HFpEF within the BADA PIC registry | Low          |
| God52        | 2009 | 2004–2005   | Japan   | Secondary care (mixed) | Prospective cohort     | Diagnosis based on clinical, radiological and echocardiogram findings. No stated diagnostic criteria | 4255              | 597       | Incident HF cases, NYHA class II–IV, at The Cardiovascular Institute Hospital, Tokyo | Moderate     |
| Parashar53   | 2009 | 1989–1993   | USA     | Primary care    | Prospective cohort     | Individual clinician diagnosis and on active HF treatment | 5888              | 1264      | Incident cases of HF within the Cardiovascular Health Study | Low          |
| Jimenez-Navarro54 | 2010 | 2000–2003   | Spain   | Cardiology outpatient | Registry               | ESC criteria                         | 4720              | 4720      | BADA PIC registry across 62 centres with HF specific unit | Moderate     |
| Devroey55    | 2010 | 2005–2006   | Belgium | Primary care    | Prospective cohort     | Individual clinician diagnosis       | 754               | 557       | Incident HF cases from 178 sentinel GPs | High         |
| First author | Year | Study dates | Country | Study setting | Study design | HF definition | Total participants | HF sample | Participants | QUIPS score |
|-------------|------|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Pons⁵⁶      | 2010 | 2001–2008   | Spain   | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Not stated | 960               | 960       | Consecutive referrals to specialist HF unit | High        |
| Gomez-Soto⁵⁷| 2011 | 2000–2007   | Spain   | Cross-discipline     | Prospective cohort | Framingham criteria | 4793             | 4793       | Incident HF cases amongst all residents in region of Southern Spain | Low         |
| Grundtvig⁵⁸ | 2011 | 2000–2006   | Norway  | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Typical symptoms + radiological or clinical evidence of HF | 3632             | 3632       | Incident cases of HF from 24 outpatient clinics | Low         |
| Yeung⁵⁹     | 2012 | 1997–2007   | Canada  | Cross-discipline     | Routinely collected data | ICD-9/ICD-10 code | 5 175 179         | 203 361   | Incident cases of HF within the Ontario Health Insurance Plan database | Low         |
| Taylor⁶⁰    | 2012 | 1995–1999 follow-up to 2009 | UK Primary care | Prospective cohort | ESC criteria | 6162             | 449       | Random sample from 16 socio-economically diverse GPs screened for HF | Low         |
| Fragasso⁶¹  | 2013 | 1992–2005   | Italy   | Cardiology outpatient | Routinely collected data | ESC criteria | 372               | 372       | Consecutive HF outpatient clinic patients with LVEF <45% | Moderate    |
| Frigola-Capell⁶² | 2013 | 2005–2007 | Spain | Primary care | Retrospective cohort | ICD-10-GM | 13 008            | 5659      | Combined data from urban and rural primary care units in Catalonia, Spain | Low         |
| Gupta⁶³     | 2013 | 1993–1995   | USA     | Primary care | Prospective cohort | Gothenburg criteria or ICD-9 code | 1962             | 116       | Incident HF cases amongst middle-aged African American people within ARIC study | Low         |
| Maggioni⁶⁴  | 2013 | 2009–2010   | 12 European countries | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Clinical diagnosis by individual clinicians | 5118             | 4118      | Incident HF cases in EURObservational Programme | Moderate    |
| Zarrinkoub⁶⁵| 2013 | 2006–2010   | Sweden  | Cross-discipline     | Routinely collected data | ICD-10 code | 88 038            | 88 038    | Incident HF cases within Stockholm Health Registry | Low         |
Table 1 Continued

| First author       | Year | Study dates | Country   | Study setting | Study design      | HF definition               | Total participants | HF sample | Participants | QUIPS score |
|--------------------|------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Singh25,66         | 2014 | 2002–2007   | UK        | Cardiology outpatient | Retrospective cohort | Modified ESC criteria      | 1041              | 513       | Consecutive patients referred to HF assessment clinic - the Darlington Retrospective outpatient study (DROPSY) | Moderate    |
| Stalhammar66       | 2014 | 2005–2006   | Sweden    | Primary care   | Retrospective cohort | ICD-10 codes               | 137               | 137       | Incident cases of HF with LVEF >50% in 31 primary care centres | Moderate    |
| James67            | 2015 | 2002–2012   | Ireland   | Cardiology outpatient | Routinely collected data | Typical symptoms, raised BNP and echocardiogram changes | 733               | 285       | Consecutive primary care referrals to Rapid Access Clinic for suspected HF (NYHA class II–III) | Moderate    |
| Sarria-Santam68a   | 2015 | 2006–2010   | Spain     | Primary care   | Retrospective cohort | ICD-10 codes               | 227 984            | 3061      | HF codes on primary care database | Low         |
| Crespo-Leiro69     | 2016 | 2011–2013   | 12 European countries | Cardiology outpatient | Registry             | ESC criteria               | 12 440            | 12 440    | Long-term HF prospective registry across 21 European countries | Moderate    |
| Akwo70             | 2017 | 2002–2010   | USA       | Primary care   | Prospective cohort | ICD-9 codes               | 27 078             | 4341      | Incident HF cases in Southern Community Cohort Study | Low         |
| Al-Khateeb71       | 2017 | 2000–2015   | Saudi Arabia | Cardiology outpatient | Retrospective cohort | Clinical diagnosis + LVEF <45% | 2298              | 2298      | Consecutive patients seen in HF clinic, with LVEF <45% | Moderate    |
| Dokainish72        | 2017 | 2012–2014   | International | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | Clinical diagnosis by individual clinicians | 5823              | 5823      | Consecutive sample of outpatients and inpatients with HF across six regions | High        |
| Farre73            | 2017 | 2012        | Spain     | Cross-discipline Registry | ICD-9-CM             | 88 195                    | 88 195            |           | Longitudinal study of all prevalent cases of HF within Catalanian public health database | Low         |
| Farre74            | 2017 | 2001–2015   | Spain     | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | ESC criteria               | 3580              | 3580      | Consecutive sample from four HF units | Low         |
| First author | Year | Study dates | Country | Study setting | Study design | HF definition | Total participants | HF sample | Participants | QUIPS score |
|--------------|------|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Koudstaal75  | 2017 | 1997–2010   | UK      | Primary care  | Routinely-collected data | ICD-9 and 10 | 2,130,000         | 89,554    | CALIBER linked data from CPRD, MINAP, HES & ONS to identify newly recorded HF cases from 674 GP surgeries | Moderate    |
| Mamas76      | 2017 | 2002–2011   | UK      | Primary care  | Routinely-collected data | Database HF code | 1,750,000          | 56,658    | Incident HF cases using Scottish Primary Care Clinical Informatics Unit data | Low         |
| Pascual-Figal77 | 2017 | MUSIC 2003–2004, REDINSCOR 2007–2011 | Spain | Cardiology outpatient | Prospective cohort | HF diagnostic criteria of local institutions | 3,446 | 3,446 | Data from MUSIC registry (8 specialist HF clinics with chronic symptomatic HF NYHA class II–III) and REDINSCOR registry (consecutive patients with HF NYHA class II–IV from 18 outpatient clinics) | Low         |
| Taylor11     | 2017 | 1998–2012   | UK      | Primary care  | Routinely-collected data | Database codes based on NHS Clinical Terminology Browser and QOF guidelines | 2,728,841 | 54,313 | Incident HF cases in UK primary care from The Health Improvement Network (THIN) | Low         |
| Sahle78      | 2017 | 1995–2001   | Australia | Primary care  | Prospective cohort | Defined as: 'significant dyspnoea with or without peripheral oedema together with definite physical signs of either left-sided or congestive cardiac failure and/or the characteristic chest X-ray appearance of left ventricular failure’ | 6,083 | 145   | Incident cases of HF within Australian National BP study – open-label study of people with hypertension aged 65–84 years | Moderate |
| Stork79      | 2017 | 2009–2013   | Germany | Cross-discipline | Routinely-collected data | ICD-10-GM | 3,132,337 | 123,925 | Patients with two HF-related diagnoses within the German Health Risk Institute database | Moderate |
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and HF-related mortality was greater for people with HFrEF than HFpEF (Table 2).

Change in survival rates over time

Survival rates within each decade had high levels of heterogeneity (Figure 5), however over time and across the included studies there was a trend towards improvement in 1- and 5-year survival rates (1-year survival: \( R^2 = 36.3\%, \ P_{\text{trend}} < 0.0001\); 5-year survival: \( R^2 = 33.2\%, \ P_{\text{trend}} = 0.013 \)). Each decade since the 1970s has seen improving survival rates. The 1- and 5-year pooled survival rates were 70.8\% (64.7–76.3) and 35.2\% (29.3–41.5) from the earliest reported time period, 1950–1969.33 By 2010–2019, 1- and 5-year survival rates had reached 89.3\% (84.3–93.4) and 59.7\% (54.7–64.6).

Given the changes in treatment recommendations in the late 1990s, we conducted a subgroup analysis of pooled survival rates amongst all studies recruiting participants from the year 2000 onwards. The 1-month, and 1-, 2-, and 5-year survival rates for these groups were 95.2\% (92.1–97.6), 89.3\% (87.9–90.6), 78.9\% (74.2–83.2) and 59.7\% (54.7–64.6), respectively, slightly better than the overall pooled survival. Only one study reported 10-year follow-up data for participants post-2000 with a survival rate of 29.5\% (28.9–30.2).11

A number of studies have also demonstrated improving survival rates over time within their individual population. Framingham data show an improvement in 5-year survival between 1950–1969 to 1990–1999 from 30\% to 41\% for men and from 43\% to 55\% for women.33 This trend is also seen in the Rochester Epidemiology Project.40 Recently, there have been more modest improvements in survival. A database study of over 400 000 people with HF in Ontario, found 1-year mortality fell amongst outpatients with HF from 17.7\% in 1997 to 16.2\% in 2007.39 A study of 600 000 Medicare patients with incident HF reported a reduction in mortality from 67.5\% to 64.9\% for men and from 61.7\% to 60.2\% for women between 1994 and 2003.49

![Figure 1](image-url) Combined survival rates for people with heart failure over time.
Table 2 Causes of mortality reported in included studies

| First author | Year | Study subgroup | Cardiovascular mortality | Subgroups of cardiovascular mortality | Non-cardiac mortality | Subgroups of non-cardiovascular mortality | Unknown cause |
|--------------|------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Cleland26    | 1987 | Overall        | 8                        | 1.3                                   | 75\(^a\)              | 8                                       | 1.3           |
| Tsutsui45    | 2007 | Overall        | 36                       | 32                                    |                       | 32                                       |               |
| Henkel50     | 2008 | Overall        | 57                       | 36                                    | 43                    | 12                                      | 10.8          |
|              |      | HFrEF          | 51                       | 29                                    | 49                    | 14.2                                    | 11.3          |
|              |      | HFrEF          | 64                       | 43                                    | 36                    | 10.1                                    | 9.7           |
|             |      | HFpEF          |                          |                                       |                       | 5.4                                     |               |
|             |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 11.3                                    |               |
|             |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 6.9 (CNS disease)                        |               |
|             |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 5.4 (CNS disease)                        |               |
|             |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 3.6 (CNS disease)                        |               |
| Crespo-Leiro69 | 2016 | Overall        | 49.8                     | 23.2                                  |                       | 16                                       | 27            |
| Dokainish72  | 2017 | Overall        | 46                       | 27                                    |                       | 16                                       | 38            |
| Gupta83      | 2013 | HFrEF          | 56                       | 44                                    |                       | 26                                       |               |
|              |      | HFrEF          | 74                       |                                       |                       |                                          |               |
| Fragasso61   | 2013 | Overall        | 63                       | 24.6                                  | 7.6                   | 15.8                                    | 13.9          |
| James57      | 2015 | Overall        | 52.4                     | 22.6                                  | Cardiovascular non-HF 29.8 | 20.2                                   | 9.5           |
|              |      | HFrEF          | 58.5                     | 26.8                                  | Cardiovascular non-HF 31.7 | 17.1                                   | 12.2          |
|              |      | HFpEF          | 46.5                     | 18.6                                  | Cardiovascular non-HF 27.9 | 23.3                                   | 7             |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 9.3                                     | 14            |
| Maggioni64   | 2013 | Across regions | 54.5                     | 22                                    | 16.3                  |                                          | 29.2          |
| Pons56       | 2010 | Overall        | 65.5                     | 32.2                                  | 2.6                   | 16                                      | 8.3           |
| Muntywyler34 | 2002 | Overall        | 79                       | 32.2                                  | 2.6                   | 16                                      | 8.3           |
| Castillo51   | 2009 | Total          | 95                       | 64                                    | 24\(^a\)              | 7                                       | 5             |
| Gods52       | 2009 | Overall        | 85                       | 47.5                                  | 22.5                  | 15                                      | 15            |
| Hobbs47      | 2007 | HF, no LVSD    | 44.8                     | 17.2, definite, 23 probable            | 8                     | 1.1\(^a\)                               | 13.8          |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 55.2                                    | 5.7 (renal)   |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 55.2                                    |               |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 5.7 (renal)                             |               |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 5.7 (renal)                             |               |
| Taylor40     | 2012 | HF, LVSD       | 72                       | 32.1, definite, 12.5 probable ±      | 22.6                  | 28                                      | 13.7          |
|              |      | HF, no LVSD    | 48.4                     | 32.1, definite, 19 definite ±        | 22.6                  | 28                                      | 13.7          |
|              |      |                |                          |                                       |                       | 13.7                                    | 7.1           |

\(^a\) Adjusted for age, gender, and other factors
| First author | Year | Study subgroup | Cardiovascular mortality | Subgroups of cardiovascular mortality | Non-cardiac mortality | Subgroups of non-cardiovascular mortality | Unknown cause |
|-------------|------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------|
|             |      |               |                          | Subgroups                    |                       |                                          |               |
|             |      |               |                          | HF                          | Stroke                | Sudden cardiac death | Coronary heart disease | Pulmonary disease | Cancer | Gl or GU | Other |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |
|             |      |               |                          |                            |                        |                           |                            |                  |         |          |       |               |

Table 2 Continued

Only studies reporting cause of mortality included. Blank cells indicate data were not reported in the original study. All figures refer to proportion of total mortality within the study. Selected subgroups of both cardiovascular and non-cardiovascular mortality were reported in some studies, meaning in some cases the sum of the subgroup results are not equal to the combined mortality result.

CNS, central nervous system; GI, gastrointestinal; GU, genitourinary; HF, heart failure; HFmrEF, heart failure with mid-range ejection fraction; HFrEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; MI, myocardial infarction.

± HF cases recorded as either ‘definite’ or ‘probable’. In Taylor, ‘probable’ HF mortality results not reported.

Not specified that all cases of sudden death attributable to cardiac causes.
Survival of patients with chronic HF in the community

Discussion

This is the first systematic review of prognosis in chronic HF and provides contemporary survival estimates applicable across high-income countries. The analyses draw on survival data from 1.5 million people with chronic HF across 60 studies.

Survival rates have improved over time and 20% more people survive at both 1- and 5-year follow-up today compared to between 1950 and 1969. Survival rates improved sharply from the 1970s to 1990s, but there has been only a modest reduction in mortality in the past two decades. Increasing age at diagnosis is one key factor associated with a poor prognosis. Survival rates amongst people aged ≤ 65 years were almost 10% better at 1 year and over 30% better at 5 years, when compared to people aged ≥ 75 years.

Survival rates were higher in studies recruiting participants from cardiology outpatient settings compared to cross-discipline or primary care.

There was no significant difference in survival between HFrEF and HfP EF in our pooled analysis, though individual studies reported improved survival rates and lower rates of hospital admission and cardiovascular mortality for people with HfP EF. Both survival rates and prescribing of HF medication were significantly lower for patients where LVEF was not reported or analysed. This may be due to older trials with worse survival rates not reporting LVEF. It may also reflect certain populations, such as nursing home residents or older patients, are less likely to have LVEF measured.
individual meta-analysis. This included variations in participant
diversity in study design and setting captured by the inclusive
healthcare settings. Source data from developing countries were
patients who are not categorised by LVEF have a poorer outlook
despite having a worse prognosis. Nevertheless, recognising that
may have important implications for future assessment and treat-
the search strategy and eligibility criteria were designed to be
inclusion, drawing studies from a wide range of geographical and
characteristics that are likely to impact on prognosis. Screening
was used to detect early HF in a small number of studies. Not
all studies reported HF survival from time of diagnosis.
Whilst primary care studies generally used routinely collected data
sources to identify a first coded episode of HF, secondary care
tended to calculate survival from first clinic visit, which may
have been several years after diagnosis. Studies were categorised
by setting to account for this potential time lag, though this was
not apparent in our results. In practice, most patients with a
certified diagnosis of HF will have input at some point from a
cardiologist, except for some very frail patients who may be limited
by cognitive or mobility issues. It is possible the differences seen
in survival between settings reflect such variation in participant
characteristics, though secondary care studies also reported higher
rates of prescribing for key HF treatment. We plan to report more
detail on prescribing rates in a separate paper. The definitions

Limitations
The diversity in study design and setting captured by the inclusive
search strategy resulted in high levels of heterogeneity in each
individual meta-analysis. This included variations in participant
characteristics.
of cardiovascular and non-cardiovascular death varied between studies as did the categories used in the cause of death subgroup analyses, making it difficult to compare these outcomes directly.

Outcome data are pooled from across a wide time period to capture changing survival rates over time. However, survival rates may not be directly comparable across these studies given there have been significant changes in HF management in the past 70 years, including the introduction of medications proven to improve prognosis for people with HFrEF. The statistical heterogeneity also reflects the large sample sizes of the included studies, which resulted in narrow confidence intervals. Even small differences in survival rates resulted in non-overlapping confidence intervals and high $I^2$ scores, a recognised limitation of this statistical measure in observational meta-analysis.

The review included observational studies to present the real-world outcomes for people with HF, outside of trial settings. Confounding is a recognised problem in these non-randomised trials and reporting of important covariates was inconsistent. Missing data were a particular problem in earlier studies and those drawing on data from large primary care databases. Some meta-regression results rely on data from a small number of studies, such as for HFmrEF and general secondary care clinics. However, similar results were observed when these small subgroups were combined with adjacent categories. Few studies reported echocardiogram
findings or categorisation of HF by LVEF, despite the prognostic
significance of this information. Accurate coding of HF is also a
recognised limitation in routinely collected datasets. However,
this approach has been improving in line with performance payments
and better access to diagnostic tests in primary care. Comparison with existing literature
A recent European secondary care study reported 1-year mortal-
ty rates for people with acute and chronic HF of 23% and 6%,
respectively, compared to 3% for matched controls. In our pooled
analysis, 1-year mortality in chronic HF was above 10%. This may be
because some people with a very poor prognosis are never admit-
ted to hospital or referred to secondary care. Categorisation of HF
has changed over time to recognise the importance of LVEF when
considering treatment options and prognosis. Survival rates are
better for people with HfPEF compared to HFrEF, once adjusted
for key covariates including age, sex, and aetiology of HF. However,
people with HfPEF are more likely to be older and have signif-
icient co-morbid disease, meaning the unadjusted HFrEF and HfPEF
survival rates are similar. This may explain why there was no signif-
icance of this information. Accurate coding of HF is also a

![Figure 5](image-url) Survival of people with heart failure (HF) at 5 years by study decade. CI, confidence interval; ES, effect size.

### 1950-1969

| Author | Year | nHF | nAlive | ES (95% CI) |
|--------|------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Levy D | 2002 | 233 | 82     | 0.382 (0.293, 0.415) |

- Inestimable predictive distribution with <3 studies

### 1970-1979

| Author | Year | nHF | nAlive | ES (95% CI) |
|--------|------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Barker WH | 2006 | 387 | 109    | 0.282 (0.239, 0.328) |
| Levy D | 2002 | 222 | 68     | 0.396 (0.249, 0.370) |

- Inestimable predictive distribution with <3 studies

### 1980-1989

| Author | Year | nHF | nAlive | ES (95% CI) |
|--------|------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Levy D | 2002 | 307 | 123    | 0.401 (0.347, 0.456) |
| Roger VL | 2004 | 2265 | 1011 | 0.446 (0.426, 0.467) |
| Henrik DM | 2008 | 1063 | 478   | 0.400 (0.420, 0.480) |

- Inestimable predictive distribution with <3 studies

### 1990-1999

| Author | Year | nHF | nAlive | ES (95% CI) |
|--------|------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Barker WH | 2006 | 1555 | 502   | 0.323 (0.300, 0.346) |
| Bleumink GS | 2004 | 725 | 254   | 0.350 (0.316, 0.386) |
| Senni M | 1998 | 216 | 76    | 0.382 (0.289, 0.481) |
| Sahle BW | 2017 | 145 | 65    | 0.448 (0.370, 0.530) |
| van Jaarsveld CHM | 2006 | 293 | 132   | 0.451 (0.385, 0.518) |
| Levy D | 2002 | 323 | 149   | 0.461 (0.408, 0.516) |
| Curtis LH | 2008 | 218558 | 102264 | 0.472 (0.470, 0.475) |
| Roger VL | 2004 | 2272 | 1114  | 0.490 (0.470, 0.511) |
| Cacciator | 2005 | 120 | 61    | 0.508 (0.420, 0.596) |
| Nielsen DW | 2003 | 115 | 62    | 0.539 (0.448, 0.627) |
| Hobbs FD | 2007 | 449 | 259   | 0.577 (0.531, 0.623) |
| MacCarthy PA | 2003 | 532 | 331   | 0.634 (0.592, 0.674) |
| Gomez-Soito FM | 2010 | 1131 | 728   | 0.644 (0.615, 0.671) |
| Ammar KA | 2007 | 244 | 180   | 0.738 (0.678, 0.789) |
| Frasasso G | 2013 | 372 | 301   | 0.808 (0.766, 0.846) |
| Huang CH | 2007 | 147 | 123   | 0.837 (0.769, 0.888) |
| Gupta DK | 2013 | 116 | 101   | 0.871 (0.798, 0.920) |

- Subtotal (I^2 = 98.157%, p = 0.000) with estimated predictive interval . (0.320, 0.789)

### 2000-2009

| Author | Year | nHF | nAlive | ES (95% CI) |
|--------|------|-----|--------|-------------|
| Koudsaita S | 2017 | 47228 | 19762 | 0.418 (0.414, 0.423) |
| Avila HR | 2018 | 28014 | 13502 | 0.467 (0.461, 0.473) |
| Zarrinkoub R | 2013 | 88038 | 42205 | 0.479 (0.478, 0.483) |
| Taylor CJ | 2017 | 54313 | 27971 | 0.515 (0.511, 0.519) |
| Mamas MA | 2017 | 19440 | 10272 | 0.528 (0.521, 0.535) |
| Fars N(2) | 2017 | 3850 | 2035 | 0.529 (0.513, 0.544) |
| Pons F | 2010 | 960 | 568 | 0.592 (0.560, 0.622) |
| James S | 2014 | 285 | 182 | 0.639 (0.621, 0.657) |
| Sarra-Santamera A | 2013 | 3061 | 1590 | 0.650 (0.635, 0.667) |
| Jimenez-Nararro MF | 2008 | 4720 | 3418 | 0.724 (0.711, 0.737) |
| Eriksson B | 2018 | 9654 | 7327 | 0.759 (0.750, 0.767) |
| Al-Khateeb M | 2017 | 1275 | 889 | 0.837 (0.803, 0.848) |

- Subtotal (I^2 = 99.829%, p = 0.000) with estimated predictive interval . (0.394, 0.784)

Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.000
Overall (I^2 = 99.560%, p = 0.000); with estimated predictive interval . (0.392, 0.687)
Research implications

Our results provide a reference source for clinicians, patients and policy makers, to inform population prognostic estimates. The subgroup analyses help to provide adjusted survival estimates based on key variables, such as age at time of diagnosis. Further work is needed to refine prognostic models for individuals with chronic HF. Existing tools, such as the Seattle Heart Failure Model and MAGGIC HF risk tool, lack specificity and sensitivity data that are applicable to clinical practice.\textsuperscript{66,87} Reducing uncertainty and confusion about the outcomes in HF could lead to improvements in advance care planning, treatment adherence and integration with wider healthcare teams such as palliative care.\textsuperscript{16,88}

Survival rates in HF remain poor despite modest improvements over time. Investment in healthcare infrastructure and public health initiatives for conditions with similar outcomes such as cancer and stroke have seen improvements in morbidity and mortality.\textsuperscript{89,90} This review suggests that targeted allocation of resources towards improving early diagnosis, prescribing and treatment adherence and multi-disciplinary models of care may lead to further reductions in mortality for people with HF.

Conclusion

There have been modest improvements in survival rates for people with chronic HF over the past 70 years. Despite this, the 5-year survival rate is close to 50% and many people will die directly from HF or from related cardiovascular disease. Older populations are at the greatest risk of death, presenting a looming challenge to health-care systems given changing global demographics. Our results draw from very heterogeneous data sources and when applying survival estimates to any individual, consideration should be given to factors such as their age, co-morbid disease, treatment, and LVEF. Further research is needed to develop the evidence base around key prognostic indicators for patients with chronic HF that will enable population estimates to be refined for individuals. Greater understanding and awareness of chronic HF survival rates can facilitate better multi-disciplinary team working and inform advanced care planning between patients and healthcare professionals.
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