(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599

(p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

LEFT VENTRICULAR DYSFUNCTION AFTER ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION- A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Devendra Nath Tiu[1], Amitabh Agarwal[2]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, Mayo Institute of Medical Sciences, Gadia, Barabanki, (U.P.), [2]Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, T.S. MISRA Medical college & Hospital, Lucknow (U.P.)

ABSTRACT:

Background: Heart failure is an incessant complexity of myocardial localized necrosis. A few components, for example, recurrent myocardial ischemia, infarct size, ventricular remodeling, stunned myocardium, mechanical complications, and hibernating myocardium impact the presence of left ventricular systolic dysfunction after myocardial dead tissue. Essentially, its quality builds the danger of death by no less than 3-to 4-overlay. The learning of the systems also, clinical elements are fundamental for the conclusion and treatment of left ventricular brokenness and heart failure after myocardial localized necrosis. Hence, this audit will concentrate on the clinical implications heart failure after myocardial infarction. **Materials and methods:** Ninety sequential patients with an Acute Myocardial Infarction were incorporated into this examination utilizing hospital records. Most patients were male and mean age was 48.8 years. HF was characterized as treatment of indications and indications of HF with loop diuretics and was considered to have settled if loop diuretic treatment could be ceased without repeat of side effects LVEF was evaluated by echocardiography (utilizing the single-plane territory length technique also, automatic border detection). **Result:** Incidence of LV dysfunction was 42.7 % in STEMI (ST-rise myocardia infarction) patients. No affiliation was found between sex or age and LVEF (Left ventricular ejection fraction) hindrance. The extent of patients with diabetes was higher in the impeded LVEF aggregate than in typical patients the pervasiveness of smoking was additionally higher in patients with LV dysfunction. Hypertension was not related with weakened LVEF. Of 90 patients, 9 patients passed on. Of these passings, 8% happened during index admission, many related with intense HF. A further 14 created HF that continued until release. **Conclusion**: The danger of creating HF and of passing on after a MI increments continuously with age. Notwithstanding age, most passings after a MI are gone before by the development of HF. In STEMI patients, past cardiovascular hazard factors have a huge affect on the probability of LV dysfunction what's more, henceforth could impact long haul anticipation.

Keywords: Myocardial infarction; Heart failure; Age, Smoking; Hypertension; Cardiovascular risk factors.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Amitabh Agarwal, Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, T.S. MISRA Medical college & Hospital, Lucknow (U.P.), India, PIN - 226008

This article may be cited as: Tiu DN, Agarwal A. Left ventricular dysfunction after acute myocardial infarction- A prospective study. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2017;5(6):36- 40.

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code	Website: www.jamdsr.com
	DOI: 10.21276/jamdsr.2017.5.6.10

INTRODUCTION: In patients with acute myocardial infarction, left ventricular failure is a settled indicator of mortality. Appraisals of left ventricular capacity framed the premise of both short and long term anticipations, and that's only the tip of the iceberg late examinations have affirmed these perceptions. In our current forthcoming multicenter contemplate, left ventricular failure again develops as a vital factor in the era of a post infarction hazard stratification.[1]

Evaluations can be made of left ventricular capacity some time recently the localized necrosis and amid the intense and recuperation stages. Heart failure (HF) is an incessant difficulty of myocardial infarction (MI).[2] A few variables, for example, repetitive myocardial ischemia, infarct size, ventricular remodeling, stunned myocardium, mechanical complications, and resting myocardium impact the presence of left ventricular systolic dysfunction with or without clinical HF after MI . Of note, the importance of each factor in charge of HF after MI relies upon the opportunity to the foundation of heart failure following coronary occlusion.[3]

Patients with indications of HF on admission to the clinic are typically elderly, with repetitive ischemia and diabetes. In this setting, ventricular capacity is identified with prior comorbidities that diminish resistance to ischemic injury. On the other hand, advancement of HF amid one's healing center remain is typically identified with infarct size, mechanical complications, or, on the other hand myocardial

stunning. At last, a few patients will create HF simply in the wake of being released from the healing facility.[4] In this setting, myocyte loss, hibernating myocardium, and ventricular remodelling are the central reasons for heart failure. Among these variables, ventricular remodelling is the generally essential.

The increased risk of sudden death associated with LVSD and heart failure may be caused by either recurrent MI or arrhythmias.[5] Recurrent MI often presents as sudden death if left ventricular function is already impaired and scar tissue is present, either because cardiogenic shock develops rapidly or because of the induction of arrhythmias. Although LVSD is the main reason for heart failure after MI, there are other causes. Myocardial infarction may cause papillary muscle dysfunction and mitral regurgitation or provoke arrhythmias, such as atrial fibrillation, leading to heart failure. However, heart failure may also develop in the absence of major LVSD, valve or rhythm problems.[6] These patients also do not appear to have a good prognosis. The mechanisms underlying this phenomenon are unclear and in some patients the diagnosis of heart failure will be wrong. In other patients, the left ventricle may fail to dilate because of preexisting myocardial fibrosis or hypertrophy or myocardial ischaemia may impair myocardial relaxation. Alternatively, cardiac dysfunction may be only transient due to myocardial stunning, arrhythmias or papillary muscle dysfunction.[7]

All of this is poorly documented. The information of these components and clinical elements are basic for the conclusion and treatment of left ventricular failure and HF after MI.[8] Thus, this audit will concentrate on the clinical ramifications and treatment of heart failure after myocardial infarction.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Out of 138 patients admitted with STEMI in healing facility in North India , patients with a past filled with past AMI and those with serious valve disease were barred from the examination, and the data identifying with the rest of the 90 patients with were broke down. Mostly patients were male with 56 males and 34 females and mean age was 48.8 years. This exploration was affirmed by the Local Research Ethics Committee.

After clinical adjustment, the patients gave points of interest of their statistic and social qualities, history of disease and common medicine. The event of real occasions, for example, repetitive MI, and stroke were recorded. No less than two of the accompanying five criteria were utilized to affirm an analysis of MI: (1) prolonged heart chest torment; (2) increments in biomarkers (generally creatinine kinase (CK) or CK-MB mass); (3) electrocardiographic changes of MI or new-onset left package branch block; (4) sudden unforeseen passing; and (5) post-mortem examination confirmation of MI. Nurse investigators interviewed the patients and reviewed their record s during the hospitalization for the index infarction. The historical and clinical variables collected for each patient included demographic data , prior cardiac history , coronary care unit course , electrocardiogram, radionuclide ejection fraction, 24 hour Holter electrocardiogram, a low level pre-discharge treadmill exercise test and follow-up data on re-hospitalization and

Mortality.

The radionuclide ejection fraction was obtained 6 to 25 days after the index infarction. The technique varied among the participating medical centers, with both first pass and gated blood pool techniques being used. Quality control studies established that in each medical center the radionuclide ejection fractions correlated clearly with angiographic ejection fraction s performed in that institution , and that variation among the institutions in interpretation of standard angiographic ejection fractions was very small.

History about hypertension (HT), Diabetes, Smoking and were recorded in detail. Patients were thought to be smokers on the off chance that they smoked at the season of affirmation or revealed end less than six months beforehand. A background marked by diabetes was considered to exist in patients who said they were diabetic, those taking antidiabetics and the individuals who exhibited glycemia estimations of 126 mg/dl or above on two estimations amid hospitalization.

Appraisal of EF was by trans-thoracic echocardiography before doctor's facility release, utilizing the single-plane region length technique as well as automatic border detection. Impaired left ventricular systolic capacity (LVSF) was considered to exist when EF was evaluated at under 45 %. Obtained information was then analysed.

RESULT:

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients studied are presented in Table 1 The incidence of impaired LVSF in this population was 42.7 %. PCI was the reperfusion method used in most patients, while around 30 % had no reperfusion therapy. Among patients with advanced rales, only 31% had a subsequent radionuclide ejection fraction of less than 0.30, whereas remaining 27 patients (30%) had a normal ejection fraction (> 0.50). Although a history of prior myocardial infarction lacks quantification , it may reflect a prior, fixed tissue loss and does contribute to the profile of a patient in a coronary care unit with another acute myocardial infarction. Approximately one-quarter of our patients had such a history which nearly doubles the mortality rate in the post-infarction period.

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients

Variables	N=90
Sex	
Males	56
Females	34
Age (years)	48.8
Risk factors	
Hypertension	
Yes	31
No	59
Diabetes	
Yes	43
No	47
Smoking	
Yes	38
No	52

Table 2: Relation Between Radionuclide Ejection Fraction and Coronary Care Unit Rales

Ejection Fraction	Absent Rales	Advanced rales
≥50	21	19
40-49	13	5
30-39	14	4
<30	8	10

Table 3: Reperfusion Therapies Used

None	18
Thrombolysis	8
PCI	52
PCI + Thrombolysis	12

DISCUSSION:

Epidemiological studies have reported that the rate of signs and symptoms of heart failure after MI is approximately 25%. Importantly, this finding appears to be in agreement with the registries of several clinical trials. In addition, approximately 40% of myocardial infarctions are accompanied by left ventricular systolic dysfunction.[9] Therefore, the available data suggest that HF after MI is a very frequent event. Considering the kind of cardiac dysfunction following MI, most patients present systolic dysfunction. The priority is the identification of the mechanisms involved in HF after MI, because this step can determine the treatment. Regardless the mechanism, an adequate history and clinical examination remain the most important tools
in the evaluation of ventricular dysfunction after MI.[10,11]

The incidence of impaired LVSF in this study was 42.7 %. The incidence of heart failure developing for the first time after the index admission is even more uncertain.[12] The Framingham study (population of Framingham about 65 000), based on rather limited evidence, suggested that
although mortality had declined after an MI, the risk of heart failure had not, which the authors ascribed to improved survival among patients who had sustained major ventricular damage.[13,14] However, late onset heart failure (29 days after the event) may have been reduced by up to 50% although this analysis is based effectively on only 15 cases. The incidence of late onset heart failure in Framingham was only 1% per year.

The Olmsted County study, which identified 2171 infarcts over 15 years from a population of about 130 000, suggested that 12% of patients had pre-existing heart failure and that 41% of patients would develop new onset heart failure (using the Framingham criteria, which do not require LVSD to be present) over 6.6 years, giving a combined total of 53% for the development of heart failure. Most new cases developed during the index hospitalization, with an annual incidence. Thereafter of about 3%.[15] Recurrent MI was not reported to be an independent determinant of developing heart failure.[16,17,18] However, the Framingham criteria were designed to be specific rather than sensitive to a diagnosis of heart failure and both of these studies are probably a significant underestimate of the risk of developing heart failure after an MI.[19-22]

Marked pulmonary congestion in the coronary care unit phase of an acute myocardial infarction did not predict a low radionuclide ejection fraction during the recovery phase. These observations are similar to those reported by Wamowicz et al.[23] Among patients with recovery phase radionuclide ejection fraction values greater than 0.30, a total of 90% had few, if any, rales.

There are several studies in which serial hemodynamic or radionuclide angiographic studies have been performed during the acute and recovery phases and in a few, mortality data are available. Although acute phase hemodynamic data, primarily left ventricular end-diastolic pressure, are related to subsequent mortality , several of these studies have shown that the clinical status and survival are better predicted by improvement or deterioration in hemodynamic status than by values at a single point in time.[24] Likewise, ejection fraction during the acute phase of infarction can predict survival [25,26]. In these studies, pulmonary congestion at the onset of infarction paralleled degree of dysfunction measured by hemodynamic or radionuclide studies. Overall, these studies support the stratification scheme introduced by Killip and Kimball, which related mortality to clinically assessed pulmonary vascular congestion.

The nearness of past cardiovascular hazard factors significantly affects the probability of left ventricular failure following a to begin with STEMI. A background marked by diabetes has reliably been connected to more noteworthy bleakness and mortality, both in-healing facility and post-release , in patients conceded for AMI with or without ST elevation, and might be identified with the probability of impeded LVSF. [27-29]

Smoking has been connected to hypercoagulability furthermore, AMI in patients with less broad atherosclerotic injuries and less related hazard factors. [28] In our example, it expanded the danger of left ventricular failure contrasted with non-or ex-smokers, which was considerably more stamped at the point when account was taken of the other cardiovascular hazard factors incorporated into the calculated relapse demonstrate. In spite of the fact that the effect of STEMI on left ventricular capacity in the present study would give off an impression of being more noteworthy in patients who smoke, less broad coronary ailment and less extra hazard factors mean smokers have a generally good guess.

The limitation of our study is that precise endeavors were most certainly not made to pull back diuretics, subsequently we may have overestimated the steadiness of HF. A basic, vigorous definition of HF stays subtle. Notwithstanding, patients who get loop diuretics and who have cardiovascular disease obviously have a poor visualization regardless of whether they have a low discharge fraction. Ultimately, the determination of HF depends on a specialist's expertise in surveying patients in the light of suitable examinations. It is most likely under- instead of over-analyzed.

CONCLUSIONS:

The advancement of HF goes before death in the considerable greater part of patients who die within six years of a MI, particularly among old aged patients. Enhanced counteractive action what's more, administration of HF and its imperative co-morbidities may enhance result. Cardiovascular risk factors not just increment the probability of a coronary occasion however can likewise influence the degree of the infarct in patients with ST elevation, and subsequently the hazard for left ventricular failure. In STEMI patients, past cardiovascular hazard factors, for example, diabetes and smoking could impact long haul guess.

REFERENCES:

1. Kober L, Torp-Pedersen C, Ottesen M, et al. Influence of age on the prognostic importance of left ventricular dysfunction and congestive heart failure on long-term survival after acute myocardial infarction. TRACE Study Group. Am J Cardiol 1996; 78: 158–162.
2. Tang EW, Wong CK, Restieaux NJ, et al. Clinical outcome of older patients with acute coronary syndrome over the last three decades. Age Ageing 2006; 35: 280–285.
3. Herlitz J, Karlson BW, Bang A, et al. Survival, mode of death, reinfarction and use of medication during a period of 5 years after acute myocardial infarction in different age groups. Cardiology 1996; 87: 529–536
4. Swedberg K, Cleland J, Dargie H, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of chronic heart failure: executive summary (update 2005): The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Chronic Heart Failure of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur Heart J 2005; 26: 1115–1140.
5. Peel AAF, Semple T, Wang I, Lancaster WM, Dall JLG. A coronary prognostic index for grading severity of infarction. Br Heart 1962;24:745-60.
6. Killip T III, Kimball JT. Treatment of myocardial infarction in coronary care unit. Am J Cardiol 1967;20:457-64.
7. Norris RM, Caughey DE, Mercer CJ, Scott PJ. Prognosis after myocardial infarction. Br Heart J 1974;36:786-90
8. Davis HT, DeCamilla J, Bayer LW, Moss AJ. Survivorship patterns in the post-hospital phase of myocardial infarction. Circulation 1979;60:1252-8.
9. Bigger JT, Heller CA, Wenger TL, Weld FM. Risk stratification after acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol 1978;42:202-10.
10. Schulze RA Jr, Strauss HW, Pitt B. Sudden death in the year following myocardial infarction. Am J Med 1977;62:192-9.
11. Silverman KJ, Becker LC, Bulkley BH, et al. Value of early thallium201 scintigraphy for predicting mortality in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Circulation 1980;61:996-1002.
12. PfefferMA, Braunwald E. Ventricular remodeling after myocardial infarction: experimental observations and clinical implications. Circulation. 1990;81:1161–1172.
13. Zornoff LAM, Paiva SAR, Duarte DR, et al. Ventricular remodeling after myocardial infarction:

concepts and clinical implications. Arq Bras Cardiol. 2009;92:157–164
14. Cleland JGF, Torabi A, Khan NK. Epidemiology and management of heart failure and left ventricular systolic dysfunction in the aftermath of a myocardial infarction. Heart. 2005;91:ii7–ii13.
15. Roger VI, Weston SA, Redfield MM, et al. Trends in heart failure incidence and survival in a community-based population. JAMA 2004;292:344–50.
16. Guidry UC, Evans JC, Larson MG, et al. Temporal trends in event rates after Q-wave myocardial infarction. The Framingham heart study. Circulation 1999;100:2054–9.
17. Hellermann JP, Goraya TY, Jacobsen SJ, et al. Incidence of heart failure after myocardial infarction: is it changing over time? Am J Epidemiol 2003;157:1101–7.
18. Spencer FA, Meyer TE, Gore JM, et al. Heterogeneity in the management and outcomes of patients with acute myocardial infarction complicated by heart failure. The National Registry of Myocardial Infarction. Circulation 2002;105:2605–10.
19. Richards AM, Nicholls MG, Yandle TG, et al, The Christchurch Cardioendocrine Research Group. Neuroendocrine prediction of left ventricular function and heart failure after acute myocardial infarction. Heart 1999;81:114–20.
20. James SK, Lindahl B, Siegbahn A, et al. N-Terminal pro–brain natriuretic peptide and other risk markers for the separate prediction of mortality and subsequent myocardial infarction in patients with unstable coronary artery disease. A global utilization of strategies to open occluded arteries (GUSTO)- IV substudy. Circulation 2003;108:275–81.
21. Hellermann JP, Jacobsen SJ, Redfield MM, et al. Heart failure after myocardial infarction: clinical presentation and survival. Eur J Heart Failure 2005;7:119–25.
22. Mosterd A, Deckers JW, Hoes AW, et al. Classification of heart failure in population based research: an assessment of six heart failure scores. Eur J Epidemiol 1997;13:491–502.
23. Wamowicz, Shell W, Thomas P, Mickle 0, Forrester JS, Swan HJC. Prognostic implications of reductions of left ventricular filling pressure in early transmural acute myocardial infarction. Am Heart J 1981;102:355-40.
24. Kupper W, Bleifeld W, Hanrath P, Mathey 0, Effert S. Left ventricular hemodynamics and function in acute myocardial infarction: studies during the acute phase, convalescence, and late recovery. Am J Cardiol 1977;40:900-5.
25. Rahimtoola H, DiGilio MM, Ehsan A, Loeb HS, Rosen KM, Gunnar RM. Changes in left ventricular performance from early after acute myocardial infarction to the convalescent phase. Circulation 1972;46:770-9.
26. Mathey 0, Bleifeld W, Hanrath P, Effert S. Attempt to quantitate relation between cardiac function and infarct size in acute myocardial infarction. Br Heart 1 1974;36:271-9.
27. Shihara M, Tsutsui H, Tsuchiashi M, Tada H, Kono S, Takeshita A. In-hospital and one-year outcomes for patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention for acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol 2002,90(9):932-6.
28. Duarte R, Castela S, Reis RP, Correia MJ, Pereira AP, Martins P, Correia JM. Síndromas coronárias agudas numa população de diabéticos – factores de risco, características clínicas e angiográficas. Rev Port Cardiol 2003;22(9):1077- 88.
29. Andrikopoulos GK, Richter DJ, Dilaveris PE, Pipilis A, Zaharoulis A, Gialafos JE, Toutouzas PK, Chimonas ET. Inhospital mortality of habitual cigarette smokers after acute myocardial infarction. Eur Heart J 2001;22:776-84.

Source of support: Nil **Conflict of interest:** None declared