

Ablation Versus Amiodarone for Treatment of Persistent Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure and an Implanted Device

Results From the AATAC Multicenter Randomized Trial

Luigi Di Biase, MD, PhD; Prasant Mohanty, MBBS, MPH; Sanghamitra Mohanty, MD; Pasquale Santangeli, MD; Chintan Trivedi, MD, MPH; Dhanunjaya Lakkireddy, MD; Madhu Reddy, MD; Pierre Jais, MD; Sakis Themistoclakis, MD; Antonio Dello Russo, MD; Michela Casella, MD; Gemma Pelargonio, MD; Maria Lucia Narducci, MD; Robert Schweikert, MD; Petr Neuzil, MD; Javier Sanchez, MD; Rodney Horton, MD; Salwa Beheiry, RN; Richard Hongo, MD; Steven Hao, MD; Antonio Rossillo, MD; Giovanni Forleo, MD; Claudio Tondo, MD; J. David Burkhardt, MD; Michel Haissaguerre, MD; Andrea Natale, MD

Background—Whether catheter ablation (CA) is superior to amiodarone (AMIO) for the treatment of persistent atrial fibrillation (AF) in patients with heart failure is unknown.

Methods and Results—This was an open-label, randomized, parallel-group, multicenter study. Patients with persistent AF, dual-chamber implantable cardioverter defibrillator or cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator, New York Heart Association II to III, and left ventricular ejection fraction <40% within the past 6 months were randomly assigned (1:1 ratio) to undergo CA for AF (group 1, n=102) or receive AMIO (group 2, n=101). Recurrence of AF was the primary end point. All-cause mortality and unplanned hospitalization were the secondary end points. Patients were followed up for a minimum of 24 months. At the end of follow-up, 71 (70%; 95% confidence interval, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free after an average of 1.4±0.6 procedures in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% confidence interval, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank $P<0.001$). The success rate of CA in the different centers after a single procedure ranged from 29% to 61%. After adjusting for covariates in the multivariable model, AMIO therapy was found to be significantly more likely to fail (hazard ratio, 2.5; 95% confidence interval, 1.5–4.3; $P<0.001$) than CA. Over the 2-year follow-up, the unplanned hospitalization rate was (32 [31%] in group 1 and 58 [57%] in group 2; $P<0.001$), showing 45% relative risk reduction (relative risk, 0.55; 95% confidence interval, 0.39–0.76). A significantly lower mortality was observed in CA (8 [8%] versus AMIO (18 [18%]; $P=0.037$).

Conclusions—This multicenter randomized study shows that CA of AF is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at long-term follow-up and reducing unplanned hospitalization and mortality in patients with heart failure and persistent AF.

Clinical Trial Registration—URL: <http://www.clinicaltrials.gov>. Unique identifier: NCT00729911.

(*Circulation*. 2016;133:1637-1644. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406.)

Key Words: amiodarone ■ atrial fibrillation ■ catheter ablation ■ heart failure

Transcatheter ablation represents a valid treatment option in patients with drug-refractory symptomatic atrial fibrillation (AF).¹ The majority of catheter ablation trials have mainly enrolled patients with preserved left ventricular (LV) systolic function. In these patients, the ablative treatment has been

Editorial, see p 1631 Clinical Perspective on p 1644

shown to be effective in reducing morbidity,²⁻⁴ improving the quality of life (QoL),³⁻⁶ and improving functional capacity.⁵⁻⁷

Continuing medical education (CME) credit is available for this article. Go to <http://cme.ahajournals.org> to take the quiz.

Received July 29, 2015; accepted February 25, 2016.

From Texas Cardiac Arrhythmia Institute at St. David's Medical Center, Austin (L.D.B., P.M., S.M., P.S., C.T., J.S., R.H., J.D.B., A.N.); Albert Einstein College of Medicine, at Montefiore Hospital, New York, NY (L.D.B.); Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Texas, Austin (L.D.B., A.N.); Department of Cardiology, University of Foggia, Italy (L.D.B.); University of Kansas, Kansas City (D.L., M.R.); Hôpital Cardiologique du Haut Lévêque, Université Victor-Segalen Bordeaux, France (P.J., M.H.); Ospedale dell'Angelo, Mestre Venice, Italy (S.T., A.R.); Cardiac Arrhythmia Research Centre, Centro Cardiologico Monzino IRCCS, Milan, Italy (A.D.R., M.C., C.T.); University of Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy (G.P., M.L.N.); Akron General Hospital, OH (R.S.); Department of Cardiology, Na Homolce Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic (P.N.); California Pacific Medical Center, San Francisco (S.B., R.H., S.H., A.N.); University of Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy (G.F.); Division of Cardiology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA (A.N.); Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH (A.N.); Scripps Clinic, San Diego, CA (A.N.); and Dell Medical School, Austin, TX (A.N.).

Presented at the ACC (American College of Cardiology) Annual Meeting, March 14-16, 2015, San Diego, CA.

Correspondence to Andrea Natale, MD, FACC, FHRS, FESC, Texas Cardiac Arrhythmia Institute at St. David's Medical Center, 3000 N I-35, Suite 720, Austin, TX 78705. E-mail dr.natale@gmail.com

© 2016 American Heart Association, Inc.

Circulation is available at <http://circ.ahajournals.org>

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406

However, a significant number of patients with AF also have LV systolic dysfunction. AF and heart failure (HF) frequently coexist and are often associated with several common predisposing risk factors such as hypertension, coronary artery disease, structural heart disease (nonischemic, valvular), diabetes mellitus, obesity, and obstructive sleep apnea.^{8,9} Importantly, the prevalence of AF increases with HF severity, ranging from 5% in functional class I patients to ≈50% in class IV patients.

Also, the prevalence of HF in patients with AF has been estimated at 42%.⁸ The combination of HF and AF leads to deleterious hemodynamic and symptomatic consequences. Rhythm control with antiarrhythmic drugs (AADs) has not shown satisfactory results in randomized trials both in patients with or without HF.^{9–12}

The Comparison of Pulmonary Vein Isolation Versus AV Nodal Ablation With Biventricular Pacing for Patients With Atrial Fibrillation With Congestive Heart Failure (PABA CHF) trial showed that pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) was superior to atrioventricular node ablation with biventricular pacing¹³ in patients with AF and HF, improving their cardiac function, exercise capacity, and QoL; however, Jones et al¹⁴ showed that this benefit was achieved after more than a single procedure.

We sought to evaluate whether catheter ablation is superior to amiodarone (AMIO) for the treatment of persistent AF in patients with HF in a randomized controlled trial.

Methods

Study Design

Ablation vs Amiodarone for Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure and an Implanted ICD/CRTD (AATAC) was a randomized study assessing whether catheter ablation is superior to AMIO for the treatment of AF. Patients ≥18 years of age with persistent AF, dual-chamber implantable cardioverter defibrillator or cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator, New York Heart Association functional class II to III, and LV ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤40% within the past 6 months were enrolled at multiple centers. Patients were excluded if AF was caused by a reversible etiology, and if they had valvular or coronary heart disease requiring surgical intervention, early postoperative AF (within 3 months of surgery), or a life expectancy ≤2 years. Other exclusions included prolonged QT interval, hypothyroidism, history of severe pulmonary disease, and liver failure. Patients receiving a regular dose of AMIO (≥200 mg/d) were also excluded. The follow-up period of the study was 24 months. A flow chart showing the study design is presented in Figure 1.

Sample Size and Power

With the use of a log-rank test, the study was designed to detect at least 20% increase in success rate (30%–50% null hazard rate, 0.6; hazard ratio, 0.575) at 24 months follow-up at a 2-sided type I error (α) of 0.05, and 80% power. With 30% oversampling for attrition, a total of 200 patients (100 per group) were required to provide the power.

Randomization Procedure

Eligible subjects were enrolled after signing informed consent approved by the institutional review boards of the respective institutions, and were randomly assigned (1:1 ratio) to undergo catheter ablation for AF (group 1) or to receive AMIO (group 2).

A computerized central randomization scheme was generated using block randomization, and sets of randomly selected blocks were provided to the investigating sites.

Primary End Point

Long-term procedural success was the primary end point for this study. Procedural success was defined as freedom from AF, atrial

flutter, or atrial tachycardia of >30 seconds duration off AADs at follow-up.

In the ablation arm, a second ablation procedure could be performed during the blanking period (3 months). After the blanking period, any atrial arrhythmia was considered a recurrence.

Secondary end points included complications, all-cause mortality, AF- and HF-related unplanned hospitalizations during the postablation follow-up, change in LVEF, 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), and QoL measured by Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ). Unplanned hospitalization was defined as a hospital admission during the postindex procedure follow-up for arrhythmia-related causes or symptoms, signs, or complications of HF. Planned readmissions, such as hospitalization for repeat ablation procedures, were not counted as outcomes in this measure.

Ablation

In brief, dofetilide was discontinued 4 to 5 days before ablation, whereas patients on low-dose AMIO (up to 200 mg daily) were allowed to discontinue the drug after the blanking period.

In all patients, a double transeptal puncture was performed. Intravenous heparin was given with a target activated clotting time of 300 to 400 seconds. A circular mapping catheter (Lasso, Biosense Webster, Diamond Bar, CA) was used to guide the ablation. Intracardiac echocardiography could be used to guide transeptal catheterization and for anatomic orientation. An open-irrigation tip catheter (Thermocool, Biosense Webster) was used for ablation.

The main goal of the ablation procedure was pulmonary vein antrum isolation. Pulmonary vein antrum isolation was extended down to the coronary sinus and to the left side of the interatrial septum, along with extensive ablations on the left atrial posterior wall with the aim to achieve isolation of the entire left atrial posterior wall, which was defined as complete electric silence on the left atrial posterior wall confirmed by the absence of near-field atrial activity on the circular mapping catheter that was placed on the left atrial posterior wall. In addition, the superior vena cava was empirically isolated when pulmonary vein (PV)-like potentials were found. Additional linear lesion ablation of complex fractionated electrograms and elimination of non-PV triggers were advised but performed according to the preference of the center or the operator. Antiarrhythmic medications could be restarted at the discretion of the treating physician during the blanking period. A redo procedure within the first 3 months follow-up (blanking period) was not considered recurrence.

AMIO Treatment

Treatment with AMIO was initiated in the ambulatory setting.

AMIO therapy was initiated with a loading dose of ≈10 g in the first 2 weeks after randomization. This loading dose was given in divided doses: 400 mg given orally twice a day for 2 weeks followed by 400 mg each day for the next 2 weeks. Once the loading phase was completed, the maintenance dose of AMIO was 200 mg a day. However, 27 patients (12 in the ablation group and 15 in the AMIO group) receiving low-dose AMIO (<200 mg/d) were also included in the study. Digoxin was discontinued if possible, or the dose was at least reduced by 50%.

Screening pulmonary function tests and chest radiography were performed at baseline, and pulmonary function tests were performed yearly thereafter. Liver and thyroid function tests were assessed at baseline and every 6 months thereafter.

Congestive Heart Failure Management

All patients were on the optimal tolerated medical therapy for congestive heart failure. Optimal therapy included angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers in angiotensin-converting enzyme-intolerant patients along with β -blockers, diuretics, and digoxin when appropriate.

For those patients intolerant to angiotensin-converting enzyme / angiotensin receptor blockers, a combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate was recommended. New York Heart Association class




Figure 1. Flow chart of the study design showing enrollment, randomization, and evaluation time points for outcome measures. AF indicates atrial fibrillation; CRTD, cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator; ICD, implantable cardioverter defibrillator; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire; 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

III patients were considered for treatment with spironolactone, whereas New York Heart Association class IV patients were excluded.

Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction

In all patients standard 2D and Doppler echocardiography was performed. LVEF was quantified by using a modified biplane Simpson rule in 2- and 4-chamber apical views. The LVEF measurements were performed by operators blinded to the randomization group and to the study end points.

Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire

QoL was measured at baseline and 24 months of follow-up by using the MLHFQ survey. It is a 21-item, self-administered, validated questionnaire that measures the effects of HF and its treatment on an individual's QoL. The MLHFQ produces a total score ranging from 0 to 105. Lower scores indicate better QoL.^{15,16}

6-Minute Walk Distance

Following the same schedule as the MLHFQ survey, 6MWD was obtained at baseline and 24 months, for objective evaluation of improvement in functional exercise capacity. It is a widely accepted test with good reliability in patients with congestive heart failure.¹⁷ It measures the distance that a patient can quickly walk on a flat, hard surface in a period of 6 minutes.¹⁸

Time Course

The time course for the trial was divided into a treatment period followed by the trial period.

The treatment period included the first 3 months postenrollment or postprocedure during which outcome data were not collected, repeat ablation could be performed and titration of AMIO dosages could be considered. The trial period started at the end of the treatment period and continued for 21 months (the total study duration was 24 months). For patients undergoing repeat ablation, cardioversion, or AMIO titration within the first 3 months, the treatment period started after the repeat procedure or AMIO dosage optimization. All outcome data were collected during this 21-month trial period.

Follow-Up

ECG, echocardiogram, clinical assessment with determination of New York Heart Association class, MLHFQ, and 6MWD were obtained at baseline and at 24 months follow-up. Clinic visit at 3 months postprocedure or post-AMIO initiation included echocardiogram, ECG, and assessment of adverse and serious adverse events.

Arrhythmia recurrence was evaluated by using remote monitoring capabilities on implanted devices, with device interrogation at 3, 6, 12, and 24 months follow-up. Adverse events were further collected at the end of the study.

Statistical Analysis

Demographic Baseline Characteristics

Descriptive analysis was performed summarizing the age, sex, comorbidities, procedural parameters, and other relevant baseline risk factors. The continuous variables were reported as mean±standard deviation. The categorical variables were reported as number of cases (n) and percentage. Normality of the analysis variables were tested using Shapiro-Wilk test. If the normality assumption was found to be violated, then appropriate nonparametric tests were used.

Efficacy Evaluation

The efficacy analysis was conducted for the intent-to-treat population. The intent-to-treat population consisted of all randomly assigned patients.

Primary End Point

Subjects who were recurrence-free at the end of follow-up were censored at the analysis time point, and AF-free time was defined as time from randomization to censor date. Survival curves were constructed by using the Kaplan–Meier method, and the primary null hypothesis was tested using the log-rank test; a 2-sided *P* value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Secondary End Points

The mortality and unplanned hospitalization rates were summarized across study groups. Patients requiring at least 1 rehospitalization were counted for this end point; time to first such hospitalization was analyzed by using the survival analysis technique. Death from any cause within the follow-up period was considered for mortality analysis and was compared between the groups using the log-rank test. Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ were assessed by using analysis of covariance model (SAS GLM procedure) with grouping variable as factor and baseline value as covariate.

Multivariable Analysis

Multivariable Cox regression model was used for assessing independent predictors of AF-free survival and overall survival after adjusting for potential confounders.

Apart from covariates showing significant univariate association, potential confounders of known or expected clinical relevance, regardless of their statistical significance at univariate analysis were considered for entering into the multivariable model.

Confounders adjusted in the multivariable model included age, sex, diabetes mellitus, and hypertension. The proportional-hazard assumption was tested by Schoenfeld residual analysis. The hazard ratio and 95% confidence interval (CI) were computed and presented in the results.

All tests were 2-sided and a *P* value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed by using SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

Results

Patient Characteristics

In total, 866 patients were screened, 331 were eligible for inclusion, and 203 consented and were included in the study and randomly assigned to receive catheter ablation (group 1, *n*=102, left atrial diameter 47±4.2 mm, LVEF 29±5%) or AMIO (group 2, *n*=101, left atrial diameter 48±4.9 mm, LVEF 30±8%). Baseline characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1.

In the 102 patients undergoing catheter ablation, PVI was performed in 22 patients, and PVI plus posterior wall isolation was done in 80 patients. The total procedure time and radio-frequency time were 168±72 and 66±34 minutes, respectively.

Arrhythmia Recurrence

During the blanking period 52 (51%) in the AMIO group and 3 (3%) in the ablation group underwent cardioversion. After the blanking period, 25 (25%) and 15 (15%) patients had cardioversion in the AMIO and ablation group, respectively. All randomized patients were included in the survival analysis.

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Study Population

	Group 1 (Catheter Ablation, <i>n</i> =102)	Group 2 (Amiodarone, <i>n</i> =101)
Age, y	62±10	60±11
Male, <i>n</i> (%)	77 (75)	74 (73)
AF duration, mo	8.6±3.2	8.4±4.1
BMI, kg/m ²	30±8	29±4
Hypertension, <i>n</i> (%)	46 (45)	48 (48)
Diabetes mellitus, <i>n</i> (%)	22 (22)	24 (24)
Coronary artery disease, <i>n</i> (%)	63 (62)	66 (65)
LA diameter, mm	47±4.2	48±4.9
LVEF, %	29±5	30±8
6MWD, meters	348±111	350±130
MLHFQ Score	52±24	50±27
OSA, <i>n</i> (%)	46 (45)	48 (48)
ACEI or ARB, <i>n</i> (%)	94 (92)	89 (88)
Aldosterone antagonists, <i>n</i> (%)	46 (45)	51 (50)
β-Blockers, <i>n</i> (%)	78 (76)	81 (80)

Continuous variables are summarized as mean±standard deviation, and categorical variables are reported as number of cases (*n*) and percentage. ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BMI, body mass index; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance; and OSA, obstructive sleep apnea.

At the end of the study, 71 (70%; 95% CI, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free after average 1.4±0.6 procedures in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% CI, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank *P*<0.001). Of the 67 patients having recurrence in group 2, treatment failed in 7 (10.4%) after withdrawal of AMIO because of adverse effects (4 had thyroid toxicity, 2 pulmonary toxicity, and 1 patient developed liver dysfunction).

Because repeat interventions were allowed during the blanking period, and followed up for 24 months after such intervention, these patients accrued a maximum 27 months of follow-up. We performed a sensitivity analysis at the 24-month cutoff. At this time point, 73 (72%; 95% CI, 62%–79%) in group 1 and 37 (37%; 95% CI, 28%–47%) in group 2 were arrhythmia free (log-rank *P*<0.001).

In group 1, higher success was reported in patients undergoing PVI and posterior wall isolation in comparison with PVI alone (63 [79%; 95% CI, 68%–86%] and 8 [36%; 95% CI, 17%–56%], respectively; *P*<0.001). Success rate of ablation in the different centers after a single procedure ranged from 29% to 61%. No patient was lost to follow-up during the study period. The Kaplan–Meier curve comparing recurrence across the study groups is presented in Figure 2.

Predictor of Arrhythmia Recurrence

We first investigated the association of AF recurrence in an unadjusted Cox model. In the univariate model, treatment with AMIO, LVEF, and diabetes mellitus showed significant association. The results of univariate analysis are presented in Table 2.

After adjusting for covariates in multivariable Cox model, the treatment of patients on AMIO therapy was found to be significantly more likely to fail (hazard ratio, 2.5; 95% CI, 1.5–4.3; *P*<0.001) in comparison with catheter ablation. Besides that, diabetes mellitus showed a statistically significant association with higher recurrence (hazard ratio, 1.1; 95% CI, 1.07–1.26; *P*=0.01).

Unplanned Hospitalization and Death

Over the 2-year follow-up, the unplanned hospitalization rate was substantially lower in group 1 (32 [31%; 95% CI, 20%–41%] and 58 [57%; 95% CI, 51%–69%] in group 2, log-rank *P*<0.001), showing 45% relative risk reduction (relative risk, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.39–0.76). The NNT to avoid 1 unplanned hospitalization was 3.8 patients. In addition, there were significantly fewer deaths (from all causes) in group 1 (8 [8%] group 1 and 18 [18%] group 2; log-rank *P*=0.037), with 56% relative risk reduction for mortality in patients receiving catheter ablation (relative risk, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.20 to 0.96; NNT 10 patients).

Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ

At baseline, the LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ scores were not different between the catheter ablation and AMIO groups (Table 1).

With the exception of the 26 patients who died during the study period, end-of-study measurements were available for all 177 (94 in group 1 and 83 in group 2). In comparison with group 2, better improvement in terms of change in

LVEF (8.1 ± 4 [median, 8.3%] versus 6.2 ± 5.0 [median, 5.0%], $P=0.02$), 6MWD (22 ± 41 [median, 19 m] versus 10 ± 37 [median, 6 m], $P=0.02$), and reduction in MLFHQ score (11 ± 19 [median, 10] versus 6 ± 17 [median, 5.0]; $P=0.04$) was observed in the group 1 population. When stratifying the population by recurrence status, recurrence-free patients ($n=91$) experienced significantly better improvement in all parameters than those who experienced recurrence ($n=86$; Table 3).

Procedural Complications

In group 1, 2 (1.96%) patients had groin hematoma, and 1 patient (0.98%) had pericardial effusion that was conservatively managed with fresh-frozen plasma and protamine.

Discussion

Main Findings

This is the first multicenter randomized study showing that in patients with HF and persistent AF, catheter ablation is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at the long-term follow-up. Importantly, ablation improved QoL and exercise capacity and reduced unplanned hospitalization and overall mortality. These findings are clinically relevant, especially in light of the socioeconomic advantages that arise from the reduced rehospitalization and mortality in HF patients.

HF and AF are the most common cardiac conditions in Western countries and often coexist. Pharmacological rate versus rhythm control is a controversial topic in the literature for the treatment of AF especially in light of the main results of the Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) and Rate Control versus Electrical Cardioversion (RACE) trials.^{11,12}

A subanalysis of the AFFIRM trial, however, clearly showing the association of sinus rhythm but not AADs with improved

survival may reflect the fact that currently available AADs are neither highly efficacious nor completely safe. In addition, the results suggested that an effective and safe method to maintain sinus rhythm may improve survival. The rationale for a rhythm-control approach includes the possibility of fewer symptoms, improved exercise tolerance, lower risk of stroke, superior QoL, and better survival, if sinus rhythm can be maintained.^{11,12}

In patients with HF and AF, the available AADs to maintain sinus rhythm recommended by the international guidelines are limited to AMIO and dofetilide. These drugs are associated with significant adverse side effects and drug interaction that often lead to drug discontinuation.¹⁹⁻²⁴ The long-term use of AMIO is associated with significant pulmonary, hepatic, and thyroid toxicity, in addition to severe bradycardia.²⁴ Dofetilide requires hospitalization for careful monitoring because of severe QT-interval prolongation and torsades de pointes in up to 3% of patients, and its use is limited in patients with renal dysfunction, which is a common finding in HF patients.²²

AF ablation might represent the ideal therapy that restores sinus rhythm without the adverse effects of AADs. Successful AF ablation results in significant improvements of left ventricular function, exercise tolerance, symptoms, and QoL⁴ irrespective of the level of preprocedural rate control, suggesting that factors other than rate control (eg, loss of atrial contraction, atrioventricular dyssynchrony) drive the deterioration of cardiac function.

AF ablation has shown superior outcome achieving freedom from AF in comparison with AADs in several randomized controlled trials that enrolled paroxysmal AF patients with a normal heart. The success rate in patients who have persistent and long-standing persistent AF is variable in the literature. The variation in procedural outcome depends on different factors such as age, sex, AF types, structural heart disease, ablation technique, and operator experience.²⁵⁻²⁹




Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier curve comparing AF-free survival between patients undergoing catheter ablation (group 1) and those receiving amiodarone therapy (group 2). At end of the study, 71 (70%; 95% CI, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% CI, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank $P<0.001$). AF indicates atrial fibrillation; AT, atrial tachycardia; and CI, confidence interval.

Table 2. Variables Showing Univariate Association With AF Recurrence: Results From Cox Model

Variables	Hazard Ratio	95% Confidence Intervals	P Value
Amiodarone treatment	3.00	(1.96–4.61)	<0.0001
Sex	1.14	(0.92–1.41)	0.22
Age, y	0.99	(0.98–1.019)	0.94
BMI	0.99	(0.94–1.03)	0.59
LVEF, %	0.96	(0.93–0.99)	0.01
Hypertension	1.12	(0.93–1.36)	0.24
Left atrial size	1.02	(0.99–1.05)	0.18
Diabetes mellitus	2.22	(1.31–3.75)	0.003

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; BMI, body mass index; and LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.

Overall, a higher recurrence rate has been shown in HF patients,^{3–6} and this might explain why AF ablation is not widely used as a rhythm control strategy in this subset of the patient population.

In agreement with these reports, we observed substantial improvement in 6MWD, LVEF, and MLHFQ scores in recurrence-free patients. The pathophysiology underlying HF and AF resulting in compromised stroke volume is the likely basis of altered exercise tolerance.^{15–18,30} Thus, the significant improvement in 6MWD could reflect betterment in cardiac contractility and rhythm resulting in restoration of a more efficient cardiac contraction following successful ablation. Our results further corroborated the correlation between ablation success and improvement in QoL. This observation can be attributed to reinstatement of stable sinus rhythm, lesser burden of symptoms, and reduction in the use of health care resources and better well-being.^{31–33} Results from a randomized trial conducted by MacDonald et al⁷ comparing ablation versus rate-control medications in patients with persistent AF and LVEF <35% reported no significant differences between groups in terms of improvement in ejection fraction measured by magnetic resonance (MR), exercise tolerance, or QoL. However, it is difficult to compare our findings with their results for several reasons: (1) different study design: ablation versus rhythm control medication in our trial and ablation versus rate-control measures in their study; (2) small sample size (n=41); and (3) different ablation approach: majority (78%) of our patients received PVI and posterior wall isolation plus ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms and non-PV triggers as needed, which was the most likely reason behind the

higher success rate than their patients who underwent PVI with a roof line and ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms. Recently published randomized trials have demonstrated suboptimal outcomes and no added advantage when linear lesions are performed in conjunction with PVI.^{34,35} Other factors responsible for the higher success rate in our study population could be the operator experience and the improved mapping and ablation technology in recent years that resulted in better PV encirclement. The results from this early study also contrast with more recent findings from the Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Rate Control for Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Heart Failure (ARC-HF) and Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure (CAMTAF) trials, which both showed significant improvement in exercise capacity and QoL with AF ablation in comparison with pharmacological rate control.^{14,36}

The CAMTAF trial also showed a significant improvement of LVEF after 6 months of follow-up with AF ablation in comparison with pharmacological rate control (+8.1 [95% CI, 3.0–13.1] versus –3 [95% CI, –7.7 to 0.5]; $P<0.001$).³⁶

Similarly, the ARC-HF trial reported a trend toward a higher LVEF improvement with AF ablation (mean difference, +5.6% [95% CI, –0.1 to +11.3; $P=0.055$]) after 12 months of follow-up.¹⁴

Our trial shows that, after an average of 1.4 procedures, a clinically relevant freedom from AF can be achieved in these patients. Of interest is the finding that, when sorting the results by ablation technique, a poor success was observed in patients who underwent PV ablation alone in comparison with patients undergoing a more extensive ablation approach.

The coexistence of AF and HF increases the risk of unplanned hospitalization and significantly impacts health-care costs.³⁷ Therefore, the reduction of unplanned hospitalization and mortality are relevant potential benefits of the ablation strategy.

Study Limitation

We acknowledge certain limitations in our trial. (1) Although no formal comparison with a rate control strategy was performed in this study, we would like to emphasize that AMIO is also considered in the guidelines as a rate control drug. In addition, 76% of the ablation group and 80% of the AMIO group received β -blockers at the tolerated dosage. (2) The 2 other alternative AADs available for these patients, sotalol and dofetilide, were not tested in this trial, because dofetilide is not available in countries other than the United States and the patients were already on different β -blockers that they could tolerate. Moreover, AMIO is the most effective antiarrhythmic drug; therefore, these results could be extended to dofetilide

Table 3. Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ Score by Recurrence Status

	No Recurrence (n=91)		Recurrence (n=86)		P (Comparing Change Between Groups)
	Baseline	Change (Median)	Baseline	Change (Median)	
LVEF, %	28.8±10	9.6±7.4 (9.4)	30.2±9	4.2±6.2 (4.0)	<0.001
6MWD, meters	347±113	27±38 (24)	352±128	8±42 (2)	<0.001
MLHFQ	53±24	–14±18 (–12)	49±26	–2.9±15 (–2.2)	<0.001

Data are summarized as mean±standard deviation. LVEF indicates left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; and 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance.

and sotalol. (3) Finally, our patients were followed up for 24 months. Although a longer follow-up would be desirable, the follow-up duration in our study was longer than many other studies in the field of ablation. In addition, all patients had an implanted device, and success/failure was obtained by device interrogation.

Conclusion

This multicenter randomized study shows that catheter ablation of AF is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at long-term follow-up and reducing unplanned hospitalization and mortality in patients with HF and persistent AF. The potential socioeconomic repercussion of these results will require further investigation.

Disclosures

Dr Di Biase is a consultant for Biosense Webster, Stereotaxis and St Jude Medical. Dr Di Biase received speaker honoraria/travel from Medtronic, EPIEP, Janssen, Pfizer, Bristol Meyers, Boston Scientific, and Biotronik. Dr Natale received speaker honoraria from Boston Scientific, Biosense Webster, St. Jude Medical, Biotronik, and Medtronic. Dr Natale is a consultant for Biosense Webster, St Jude Medical, and Janssen. Dr Burkhardt is a consultant for Biosense Webster and Stereotaxis. The other authors report no conflicts.

References

- Calkins H, Reynolds MR, Spector P, Sondhi M, Xu Y, Martin A, Williams CJ, Sledge I. Treatment of atrial fibrillation with antiarrhythmic drugs or radiofrequency ablation: two systematic literature reviews and meta-analyses. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. 2009;2:349–361. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.108.824789.
- Choi AD, Hematpour K, Kukin M, Mittal S, Steinberg JS. Ablation vs medical therapy in the setting of symptomatic atrial fibrillation and left ventricular dysfunction. *Congest Heart Fail*. 2010;16:10–14. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-7133.2009.00116.x.
- Gentlesk PJ, Sauer WH, Gerstenfeld EP, Lin D, Dixit S, Zado E, Callans D, Marchlinski FE. Reversal of left ventricular dysfunction following ablation of atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2007;18:9–14. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8167.2006.00653.x.
- Hsu LF, Jaïs P, Sanders P, Garrigue S, Hocini M, Sacher F, Takahashi Y, Rotter M, Pasquie JL, Scavée C, Bordachar P, Clémenty J, Haïssaguerre M. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351:2373–2383. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa041018.
- Tondo C, Mantica M, Russo G, Avella A, De Luca L, Pappalardo A, Fagundes RL, Picchio E, Laurenzi F, Piazza V, Bisceglia I. Pulmonary vein vestibule ablation for the control of atrial fibrillation in patients with impaired left ventricular function. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. 2006;29:962–970. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8159.2006.00471.x.
- Chen MS, Marrouche NF, Khaykin Y, Gillinov AM, Wazni O, Martin DO, Rossillo A, Verma A, Cummings J, Erciyes D, Saad E, Bhargava M, Bash D, Schweikert R, Burkhardt D, Williams-Andrews M, Perez-Lugones A, Abdul-Karim A, Saliba W, Natale A. Pulmonary vein isolation for the treatment of atrial fibrillation in patients with impaired systolic function. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2004;43:1004–1009. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2003.09.056.
- MacDonald MR, Connelly DT, Hawkins NM, Steedman T, Payne J, Shaw M, Denvir M, Bhagra S, Small S, Martin W, McMurray JJ, Petrie MC. Radiofrequency ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation in patients with advanced heart failure and severe left ventricular systolic dysfunction: a randomised controlled trial. *Heart*. 2011;97:740–747. doi: 10.1136/hrt.2010.207340.
- Maisel WH, Stevenson LW. Atrial fibrillation in heart failure: epidemiology, pathophysiology, and rationale for therapy. *Am J Cardiol*. 2003;91(6A):2D–8D.
- Khan MA, Ahmed F, Neyses L, Mamas MA. Atrial fibrillation in heart failure: The sword of Damocles revisited. *World J Cardiol*. 2013;5:215–227. doi: 10.4330/wjc.v5.i7.215.
- Roy D, Talajic M, Nattel S, Wyse DG, Dorian P, Lee KL, Bourassa MG, Arnold JM, Buxton AE, Camm AJ, Connolly SJ, Dubuc M, Ducharme A, Guerra PG, Hohnloser SH, Lambert J, Le Heuzey JY, O'Hara G, Pedersen OD, Rouleau JL, Singh BN, Stevenson LW, Stevenson WG, Thibault B, Waldo AL; Atrial Fibrillation and Congestive Heart Failure Investigators. Rhythm control versus rate control for atrial fibrillation and heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358:2667–2677. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708789.
- Wyse DG, Waldo AL, DiMarco JP, Domanski MJ, Rosenberg Y, Schron EB, Kellen JC, Greene HL, Mickel MC, Dalquist JE, Corley SD; Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) Investigators. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1825–1833. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa021328.
- Van Gelder IC, Hagens VE, Bosker HA, Kingma JH, Kamp O, Kingma T, Said SA, Darmanata JI, Timmermans AJ, Tijssen JG, Crijns HJ; Rate Control versus Electrical Cardioversion for Persistent Atrial Fibrillation Study Group. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with recurrent persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1834–1840. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa021375.
- Khan MN, Jaïs P, Cummings J, Di Biase L, Sanders P, Martin DO, Kautzner J, Hao S, Themistoclakis S, Fanelli R, Potenza D, Massaro R, Wazni O, Schweikert R, Saliba W, Wang P, Al-Ahmad A, Beheiry S, Santarelli P, Starling RC, Dello Russo A, Pelargonio G, Brachmann J, Schibgilla V, Bonso A, Casella M, Raviele A, Haïssaguerre M, Natale A; PABA-CHF Investigators. Pulmonary-vein isolation for atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359:1778–1785. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708234.
- Jones DG, Haldar SK, Hussain W, Sharma R, Francis DP, Rahman-Haley SL, McDonagh TA, Underwood SR, Markides V, Wong T. A randomized trial to assess catheter ablation versus rate control in the management of persistent atrial fibrillation in heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:1894–1903. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2013.01.069.
- Supino PG, Borer JS, Franciosa JA, Preibisz JJ, Hochreiter C, Isom OW, Krieger KH, Girardi LN, Bouraad D, Forur L. Acceptability and psychometric properties of the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire among patients undergoing heart valve surgery: validation and comparison with SF-36. *J Card Fail*. 2009;15:267–277. doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2008.10.003.
- Rector TS, Kubo SH, Cohn JN. Patients' self-assessment of their congestive heart failure part 2: content, reliability and validity of a new measure, the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire. *Heart Failure*. 1987;3:198–209.
- Shoemaker MJ, Curtis AB, Vangsnes E, Dickinson MG. Clinically meaningful change estimates for the six-minute walk test and daily activity in individuals with chronic heart failure. *Cardiopulm Phys Ther J*. 2013;24:21–29.
- American Thoracic Society. ATS Statement: Guidelines for the Six-Minute Walk Test. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2002;166:111–117.
- Flaker GC, Blackshear JL, McBride R, Kronmal RA, Halperin JL, Hart RG. Antiarrhythmic drug therapy and cardiac mortality in atrial fibrillation. The Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Investigators. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1992;20:527–532.
- Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW, Middlekauff HR, Fonarow GC, Hamilton MA, Woo MA, Saxon LA, Natterson PD, Steimle A, Walden JA, Tillisch JH. Improving survival for patients with atrial fibrillation and advanced heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1996;28:1458–1463.
- Wann LS, Curtis AB, January CT, Ellenbogen KA, Lowe JE, Estes NA 3rd, Page RL, Ezekowitz MD, Slotwiner DJ, Jackman WM, Stevenson WG, Tracy CM, Fuster V, Rydén LE, Cannon DS, Le Heuzey JY, Crijns HJ, Lowe JE, Curtis AB, Olsson SB, Ellenbogen KA, Prystowsky EN, Halperin JL, Tamargo JL, Kay GN, Wann LS, Jacobs AK, Anderson JL, Albert N, Hochman JS, Buller CE, Kushner FG, Creager MA, Ohman EM, Eittinger SM, Stevenson WG, Guyton RA, Tarkington LG, Halperin JL, Yancy CW; ACCF/AHA/HRS. 2011 ACCF/AHA/HRS focused update on the management of patients with atrial fibrillation (Updating the 2006 Guideline): a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57:223–242. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2010.10.001.
- Singla S, Karam P, Deshmukh AJ, Mehta J, Paydak H. Review of contemporary antiarrhythmic drug therapy for maintenance of sinus rhythm in atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol Ther*. 2012;17:12–20. doi: 10.1177/1074248410397195.
- Weinfeld MS, Drazner MH, Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW. Early outcome of initiating amiodarone for atrial fibrillation in advanced heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2000;19:638–643.
- Santangeli P, Di Biase L, Pelargonio G, Burkhardt JD, Natale A. The pharmaceutical pipeline for atrial fibrillation. *Ann Med*. 2011;43:13–32. doi: 10.3109/07853890.2010.538431.

25. Wilton SB, Fundytus A, Ghali WA, Veenhuyzen GD, Quinn FR, Mitchell LB, Hill MD, Faris P, Exner DV. Meta-analysis of the effectiveness and safety of catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in patients with versus without left ventricular systolic dysfunction. *Am J Cardiol*. 2010;106:1284–1291. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2010.06.053.
26. Dagues N, Varounis C, Gaspar T, Piorkowski C, Eitel C, Iliodromitis EK, Lekakis JP, Flevari P, Simeonidou E, Rallidis LS, Tsougos E, Hindricks G, Sommer P, Anastasiou-Nana M. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Card Fail*. 2011;17:964–970. doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2011.07.009.
27. Hayward RM, Upadhyay GA, Mela T, Ellinor PT, Barrett CD, Heist EK, Verma A, Choudhry NK, Singh JP. Pulmonary vein isolation with complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation for paroxysmal and nonparoxysmal atrial fibrillation: A meta-analysis. *Heart Rhythm*. 2011;8:994–1000. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2011.02.033.
28. Li WJ, Bai YY, Zhang HY, Tang RB, Miao CL, Sang CH, Yin XD, Dong JZ, Ma CS. Additional ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms after pulmonary vein isolation in patients with atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. 2011;4:143–148. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.110.958405.
29. Deshmukh A, Patel NJ, Pant S, Shah N, Chothani A, Mehta K, Grover P, Singh V, Vallurupalli S, Savani GT, Badheka A, Tuliani T, Dabhadkar K, Dibu G, Reddy YM, Sewani A, Kowalski M, Mitrani R, Paydak H, Viles-Gonzalez JF. In-hospital complications associated with catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in the United States between 2000 and 2010: analysis of 93801 procedures. *Circulation*. 2013;128:2104–2112. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.113.003862.
30. Mohanty S, Santangeli P, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, Holcomb S, Trivedi C, Bai R, Burkhardt D, Hongo R, Hao S, Beheiry S, Santoro F, Forleo G, Gallinhouse JG, Horton R, Sanchez JE, Bailey S, Hranitzky PM, Zagrodzky J, Natale A. Catheter ablation of asymptomatic longstanding persistent atrial fibrillation: impact on quality of life, exercise performance, arrhythmia perception, and arrhythmia-free survival. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2014;25:1057–1064. doi: 10.1111/jce.12467.
31. Fichtner S, Deisenhofer I, Kindsmüller S, Dzijan-Horn M, Tzeis S, Reents T, Wu J, Luise Estner H, Jilek C, Ammar S, Kathan S, Hessling G, Ladwig KH. Prospective assessment of short- and long-term quality of life after ablation for atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2012;23:121–127. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8167.2011.02165.x.
32. Mohanty S, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, Bai R, Pump A, Santangeli P, Burkhardt D, Gallinhouse JG, Horton R, Sanchez JE, Bailey S, Zagrodzky J, Natale A. Impact of metabolic syndrome on procedural outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation undergoing catheter ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;59:1295–1301. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2011.11.051.
33. Kucukdurmaz Z, Kato R, Erdem A, Golcuk E, Tobiume T, Nagase T, Ikeda Y, Nakajima Y, Matsumura M, Komiya N, Nishimura S, Matsumoto K. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation results in greater improvement in cardiac function in patients with low versus normal left ventricular ejection fraction. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2013;37:179–187. doi: 10.1007/s10840-013-9794-6.
34. Arbelo E, Guiu E, Ramos P, Bisbal F, Borrás R, Andreu D, Tolosana JM, Berruzo A, Brugada J, Mont L. Benefit of left atrial roof linear ablation in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a prospective, randomized study. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2014;3:e000877. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.114.000877.
35. Verma A, Jiang CY, Betts TR, Chen J, Deisenhofer I, Mantovan R, Macle L, Morillo CA, Haverkamp W, Weerasooriya R, Albenque JP, Nardi S, Menardi E, Novak P, Sanders P; STAR AF II Investigators. Approaches to catheter ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372:1812–1822. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1408288.
36. Hunter RJ, Berriman TJ, Diab I, Kamdar R, Richmond L, Baker V, Goromonzi F, Sawhney V, Duncan E, Page SP, Ullah W, Unsworth B, Mayet J, Dhinoja M, Earley MJ, Sporton S, Schilling RJ. A randomized controlled trial of Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure (the CAMTAF trial). *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. 2014;7:31–38. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.113.000806.
37. Bleumink GS, Knetsch AM, Sturkenboom MC, Straus SM, Hofman A, Deckers JW, Witteman JC, Stricker BH. Quantifying the heart failure epidemic: prevalence, incidence rate, lifetime risk and prognosis of heart failure: The Rotterdam Study. *Eur Heart J*. 2004;25:1614–1619. doi: 10.1016/j.ehj.2004.06.038.

CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE

Heart failure and atrial fibrillation are common cardiac conditions that often coexist. This is the first randomized study to show that, in patients with heart failure and persistent atrial fibrillation, catheter ablation is superior to amiodarone (the most used drug in these patients) in achieving freedom from atrial fibrillation at long-term follow-up. Importantly, ablation reduced rehospitalization and overall mortality and improved quality of life and exercise capacity. This study suggests that clinicians should consider catheter ablation sooner in this patient population.

Go to <http://cme.ahajournals.org> to take the CME quiz for this article.

Ablation Versus Amiodarone for Treatment of Persistent Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure and an Implanted Device: Results From the AATAC Multicenter Randomized Trial

Luigi Di Biase, Prasant Mohanty, Sanghamitra Mohanty, Pasquale Santangeli, Chintan Trivedi, Dhanunjaya Lakkireddy, Madhu Reddy, Pierre Jais, Sakis Themistoclakis, Antonio Dello Russo, Michela Casella, Gemma Pelargonio, Maria Lucia Narducci, Robert Schweikert, Petr Neuzil, Javier Sanchez, Rodney Horton, Salwa Beheiry, Richard Hongo, Steven Hao, Antonio Rossillo, Giovanni Forleo, Claudio Tondo, J. David Burkhardt, Michel Haissaguerre and Andrea Natale

Circulation. 2016;133:1637-1644; originally published online March 30, 2016;
doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406

Circulation is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231
Copyright © 2016 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved.
Print ISSN: 0009-7322. Online ISSN: 1524-4539

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the World Wide Web at:

<http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/133/17/1637>

Data Supplement (unedited) at:

<http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/suppl/2017/07/10/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406.DC1>

Permissions: Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in *Circulation* can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the [Permissions and Rights Question and Answer](#) document.

Reprints: Information about reprints can be found online at:
<http://www.lww.com/reprints>

Subscriptions: Information about subscribing to *Circulation* is online at:
<http://circ.ahajournals.org/subscriptions/>

심부전이 동반된 심방세동 환자에서는 Amiodarone보다 도자절제술이 우수하다: AATAC 연구

오 세 일 교수 서울대학교병원 순환기내과

초록

배경

심부전이 동반된 지속성(persistent) 심방세동 환자에서 도자절제술(catheter ablation, CA)이 amiodarone(AMIO)보다 우수한지는 알려져 있지 않다.

방법 및 결과

본 연구는 라벨 공개, 무작위 배정, 평행군, 다기관 연구이다. 양방 이식형 제세동기(dual-chamber implantable cardioverter defibrillator) 또는 심장재동기화 치료기기(cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator)를 가지면서, NYHA(New York Heart Association) 등급 II-III이고, 최근 6개월 내에 좌심실 구혈률 <40%인 지속성 심방세동 환자들을 대상으로 CA를 시행한 군(그룹 1, 102명)과 AMIO를 투여한 군(그룹 2, 101명)으로 1:1 무작위 배정하였다. 심방세동의 재발이 일차 종료점이며, 모든 원인의 사망과 계획되지 않은 입원이 이차 종료점이었다. 환자들은 적어도 24개월간 추적 관찰되었는데, 추적의 마지막 시점에서 그룹 1 환자 중 71명(70%; 95% CI, 60-78%)이 평균 1.4 ± 0.6 회의 시술 후에도 재발을 겪지 않았다. 반면, 그룹 2에서는 34명(34%; 95% CI, 25-44%)의 환자가 재발을 겪지 않았다(log-rank $P < 0.001$). 서로 다른 각 기관들의 1회 시술 후 CA 성

공률은 29-61%의 분포를 보였으며, 다변량 모델에서 보정 후 AMIO 치료는 CA보다 실패할 가능성이 유의하게 높음을 알 수 있었다(HR, 2.5; 95% CI, 1.5-4.3; $P < 0.001$). 2년 이상의 추적 관찰에서 계획되지 않은 입원율[그룹 1에서 32명(31%), 그룹 2에서 58명(57%); $P < 0.001$]은 45%의 상대 위험 감소를 보였다(relative risk, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.39-0.76). 사망률은 CA에서 유의하게 낮았다[8명(8%) vs. AMIO 18명(18%); $P = 0.037$].

결론

본 다기관 무작위 배정 연구는 장기간의 추적 관찰을 통해, 심부전이 동반된 지속성 심방세동 환자에서 CA가 AMIO보다 심방세동의 재발 방지와 계획되지 않은 입원 및 사망률 감소에 더 우수함을 입증하였다.

Ablation Versus Amiodarone for Treatment of Persistent Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure and an Implanted Device

Results From the AATAC Multicenter Randomized Trial

Luigi Di Biase, MD, PhD; Prasant Mohanty, MBBS, MPH; Sanghamitra Mohanty, MD; Pasquale Santangeli, MD; Chintan Trivedi, MD, MPH; Dhanunjaya Lakkireddy, MD; Madhu Reddy, MD; Pierre Jais, MD; Sakis Themistoclakis, MD; Antonio Dello Russo, MD; Michela Casella, MD; Gemma Pelargonio, MD; Maria Lucia Narducci, MD; Robert Schweikert, MD; Petr Neuzil, MD; Javier Sanchez, MD; Rodney Horton, MD; Salwa Beheiry, RN; Richard Hongo, MD; Steven Hao, MD; Antonio Rossillo, MD; Giovanni Forleo, MD; Claudio Tondo, MD; J. David Burkhardt, MD; Michel Haissaguerre, MD; Andrea Natale, MD

Background—Whether catheter ablation (CA) is superior to amiodarone (AMIO) for the treatment of persistent atrial fibrillation (AF) in patients with heart failure is unknown.

Methods and Results—This was an open-label, randomized, parallel-group, multicenter study. Patients with persistent AF, dual-chamber implantable cardioverter defibrillator or cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator, New York Heart Association II to III, and left ventricular ejection fraction <40% within the past 6 months were randomly assigned (1:1 ratio) to undergo CA for AF (group 1, n=102) or receive AMIO (group 2, n=101). Recurrence of AF was the primary end point. All-cause mortality and unplanned hospitalization were the secondary end points. Patients were followed up for a minimum of 24 months. At the end of follow-up, 71 (70%; 95% confidence interval, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free after an average of 1.4±0.6 procedures in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% confidence interval, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank $P<0.001$). The success rate of CA in the different centers after a single procedure ranged from 29% to 61%. After adjusting for covariates in the multivariable model, AMIO therapy was found to be significantly more likely to fail (hazard ratio, 2.5; 95% confidence interval, 1.5–4.3; $P<0.001$) than CA. Over the 2-year follow-up, the unplanned hospitalization rate was (32 [31%] in group 1 and 58 [57%] in group 2; $P<0.001$), showing 45% relative risk reduction (relative risk, 0.55; 95% confidence interval, 0.39–0.76). A significantly lower mortality was observed in CA (8 [8%] versus AMIO (18 [18%]; $P=0.037$).

Conclusions—This multicenter randomized study shows that CA of AF is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at long-term follow-up and reducing unplanned hospitalization and mortality in patients with heart failure and persistent AF.

Clinical Trial Registration—URL: <http://www.clinicaltrials.gov>. Unique identifier: NCT00729911.

(*Circulation*. 2016;133:1637-1644. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406.)

Key Words: amiodarone ■ atrial fibrillation ■ catheter ablation ■ heart failure

Transcatheter ablation represents a valid treatment option in patients with drug-refractory symptomatic atrial fibrillation (AF).¹ The majority of catheter ablation trials have mainly enrolled patients with preserved left ventricular (LV) systolic function. In these patients, the ablative treatment has been

Clinical Perspective on p 51

shown to be effective in reducing morbidity,²⁻⁴ improving the quality of life (QoL),³⁻⁶ and improving functional capacity.⁵⁻⁷

Continuing medical education (CME) credit is available for this article. Go to <http://cme.ahajournals.org> to take the quiz.

Received July 29, 2015; accepted February 25, 2016.

From Texas Cardiac Arrhythmia Institute at St. David's Medical Center, Austin (L.D.B., P.M., S.M., P.S., C.T., J.S., R.H., J.D.B., A.N.); Albert Einstein College of Medicine, at Montefiore Hospital, New York, NY (L.D.B.); Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Texas, Austin (L.D.B., A.N.); Department of Cardiology, University of Foggia, Italy (L.D.B.); University of Kansas, Kansas City (D.L., M.R.); Hôpital Cardiologique du Haut Lévêque, Université Victor-Segalen Bordeaux, France (P.J., M.H.); Ospedale dell'Angelo, Mestre Venice, Italy (S.T., A.R.); Cardiac Arrhythmia Research Centre, Centro Cardiologico Monzino IRCCS, Milan, Italy (A.D.R., M.C., C.T.); University of Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy (G.P., M.L.N.); Akron General Hospital, OH (R.S.); Department of Cardiology, Na Homolce Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic (P.N.); California Pacific Medical Center, San Francisco (S.B., R.H., S.H., A.N.); University of Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy (G.F.); Division of Cardiology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA (A.N.); Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH (A.N.); Scripps Clinic, San Diego, CA (A.N.); and Dell Medical School, Austin, TX (A.N.).

Presented at the ACC (American College of Cardiology) Annual Meeting, March 14-16, 2015, San Diego, CA.

Correspondence to Andrea Natale, MD, FACC, FHRS, FESC, Texas Cardiac Arrhythmia Institute at St. David's Medical Center, 3000 N I-35, Suite 720, Austin, TX 78705. E-mail dr.natale@gmail.com

© 2016 American Heart Association, Inc.

Circulation is available at <http://circ.ahajournals.org>

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.019406

However, a significant number of patients with AF also have LV systolic dysfunction. AF and heart failure (HF) frequently coexist and are often associated with several common predisposing risk factors such as hypertension, coronary artery disease, structural heart disease (nonischemic, valvular), diabetes mellitus, obesity, and obstructive sleep apnea.^{8,9} Importantly, the prevalence of AF increases with HF severity, ranging from 5% in functional class I patients to ≈50% in class IV patients.

Also, the prevalence of HF in patients with AF has been estimated at 42%.⁸ The combination of HF and AF leads to deleterious hemodynamic and symptomatic consequences. Rhythm control with antiarrhythmic drugs (AADs) has not shown satisfactory results in randomized trials both in patients with or without HF.⁹⁻¹²

The Comparison of Pulmonary Vein Isolation Versus AV Nodal Ablation With Biventricular Pacing for Patients With Atrial Fibrillation With Congestive Heart Failure (PABA CHF) trial showed that pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) was superior to atrioventricular node ablation with biventricular pacing¹³ in patients with AF and HF, improving their cardiac function, exercise capacity, and QoL; however, Jones et al¹⁴ showed that this benefit was achieved after more than a single procedure.

We sought to evaluate whether catheter ablation is superior to amiodarone (AMIO) for the treatment of persistent AF in patients with HF in a randomized controlled trial.

Methods

Study Design

Ablation vs Amiodarone for Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Congestive Heart Failure and an Implanted ICD/CRTD (AATAC) was a randomized study assessing whether catheter ablation is superior to AMIO for the treatment of AF. Patients ≥18 years of age with persistent AF, dual-chamber implantable cardioverter defibrillator or cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator, New York Heart Association functional class II to III, and LV ejection fraction (LVEF) ≤40% within the past 6 months were enrolled at multiple centers. Patients were excluded if AF was caused by a reversible etiology, and if they had valvular or coronary heart disease requiring surgical intervention, early postoperative AF (within 3 months of surgery), or a life expectancy ≤2 years. Other exclusions included prolonged QT interval, hypothyroidism, history of severe pulmonary disease, and liver failure. Patients receiving a regular dose of AMIO (≥200 mg/d) were also excluded. The follow-up period of the study was 24 months. A flow chart showing the study design is presented in Figure 1.

Sample Size and Power

With the use of a log-rank test, the study was designed to detect at least 20% increase in success rate (30%–50% null hazard rate, 0.6; hazard ratio, 0.575) at 24 months follow-up at a 2-sided type I error (α) of 0.05, and 80% power. With 30% oversampling for attrition, a total of 200 patients (100 per group) were required to provide the power.

Randomization Procedure

Eligible subjects were enrolled after signing informed consent approved by the institutional review boards of the respective institutions, and were randomly assigned (1:1 ratio) to undergo catheter ablation for AF (group 1) or to receive AMIO (group 2).

A computerized central randomization scheme was generated using block randomization, and sets of randomly selected blocks were provided to the investigating sites.

Primary End Point

Long-term procedural success was the primary end point for this study. Procedural success was defined as freedom from AF, atrial

flutter, or atrial tachycardia of >30 seconds duration off AADs at follow-up.

In the ablation arm, a second ablation procedure could be performed during the blanking period (3 months). After the blanking period, any atrial arrhythmia was considered a recurrence.

Secondary end points included complications, all-cause mortality, AF- and HF-related unplanned hospitalizations during the postablation follow-up, change in LVEF, 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), and QoL measured by Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ). Unplanned hospitalization was defined as a hospital admission during the postindex procedure follow-up for arrhythmia-related causes or symptoms, signs, or complications of HF. Planned readmissions, such as hospitalization for repeat ablation procedures, were not counted as outcomes in this measure.

Ablation

In brief, dofetilide was discontinued 4 to 5 days before ablation, whereas patients on low-dose AMIO (up to 200 mg daily) were allowed to discontinue the drug after the blanking period.

In all patients, a double transseptal puncture was performed. Intravenous heparin was given with a target activated clotting time of 300 to 400 seconds. A circular mapping catheter (Lasso, Biosense Webster, Diamond Bar, CA) was used to guide the ablation. Intracardiac echocardiography could be used to guide transseptal catheterization and for anatomic orientation. An open-irrigation tip catheter (Thermocool, Biosense Webster) was used for ablation.

The main goal of the ablation procedure was pulmonary vein antrum isolation. Pulmonary vein antrum isolation was extended down to the coronary sinus and to the left side of the interatrial septum, along with extensive ablations on the left atrial posterior wall with the aim to achieve isolation of the entire left atrial posterior wall, which was defined as complete electric silence on the left atrial posterior wall confirmed by the absence of near-field atrial activity on the circular mapping catheter that was placed on the left atrial posterior wall. In addition, the superior vena cava was empirically isolated when pulmonary vein (PV)-like potentials were found. Additional linear lesion ablation of complex fractionated electrograms and elimination of non-PV triggers were advised but performed according to the preference of the center or the operator. Antiarrhythmic medications could be restarted at the discretion of the treating physician during the blanking period. A redo procedure within the first 3 months follow-up (blinking period) was not considered recurrence.

AMIO Treatment

Treatment with AMIO was initiated in the ambulatory setting.

AMIO therapy was initiated with a loading dose of ≈10 g in the first 2 weeks after randomization. This loading dose was given in divided doses: 400 mg given orally twice a day for 2 weeks followed by 400 mg each day for the next 2 weeks. Once the loading phase was completed, the maintenance dose of AMIO was 200 mg a day. However, 27 patients (12 in the ablation group and 15 in the AMIO group) receiving low-dose AMIO (<200 mg/d) were also included in the study. Digoxin was discontinued if possible, or the dose was at least reduced by 50%.

Screening pulmonary function tests and chest radiography were performed at baseline, and pulmonary function tests were performed yearly thereafter. Liver and thyroid function tests were assessed at baseline and every 6 months thereafter.

Congestive Heart Failure Management

All patients were on the optimal tolerated medical therapy for congestive heart failure. Optimal therapy included angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers in angiotensin-converting enzyme-intolerant patients along with β -blockers, diuretics, and digoxin when appropriate.

For those patients intolerant to angiotensin-converting enzyme / angiotensin receptor blockers, a combination of hydralazine and isosorbide dinitrate was recommended. New York Heart Association class




Figure 1. Flow chart of the study design showing enrollment, randomization, and evaluation time points for outcome measures. AF indicates atrial fibrillation; CRTD, cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator; ICD, implantable cardioverter defibrillator; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire; 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance; and NYHA, New York Heart Association.

III patients were considered for treatment with spironolactone, whereas New York Heart Association class IV patients were excluded.

Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction

In all patients standard 2D and Doppler echocardiography was performed. LVEF was quantified by using a modified biplane Simpson rule in 2- and 4-chamber apical views. The LVEF measurements were performed by operators blinded to the randomization group and to the study end points.

Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire

QoL was measured at baseline and 24 months of follow-up by using the MLHFQ survey. It is a 21-item, self-administered, validated questionnaire that measures the effects of HF and its treatment on an individual's QoL. The MLHFQ produces a total score ranging from 0 to 105. Lower scores indicate better QoL.^{15,16}

6-Minute Walk Distance

Following the same schedule as the MLHFQ survey, 6MWD was obtained at baseline and 24 months, for objective evaluation of improvement in functional exercise capacity. It is a widely accepted test with good reliability in patients with congestive heart failure.¹⁷ It measures the distance that a patient can quickly walk on a flat, hard surface in a period of 6 minutes.¹⁸

Time Course

The time course for the trial was divided into a treatment period followed by the trial period.

The treatment period included the first 3 months postenrollment or postprocedure during which outcome data were not collected, repeat ablation could be performed and titration of AMIO dosages could be considered. The trial period started at the end of the treatment period and continued for 21 months (the total study duration was 24 months). For patients undergoing repeat ablation, cardioversion, or AMIO titration within the first 3 months, the treatment period started after the repeat procedure or AMIO dosage optimization. All outcome data were collected during this 21-month trial period.

Follow-Up

ECG, echocardiogram, clinical assessment with determination of New York Heart Association class, MLHFQ, and 6MWD were obtained at baseline and at 24 months follow-up. Clinic visit at 3 months postprocedure or post-AMIO initiation included echocardiogram, ECG, and assessment of adverse and serious adverse events.

Arrhythmia recurrence was evaluated by using remote monitoring capabilities on implanted devices, with device interrogation at 3, 6, 12, and 24 months follow-up. Adverse events were further collected at the end of the study.

Statistical Analysis

Demographic Baseline Characteristics

Descriptive analysis was performed summarizing the age, sex, comorbidities, procedural parameters, and other relevant baseline risk factors. The continuous variables were reported as mean±standard deviation. The categorical variables were reported as number of cases (n) and percentage. Normality of the analysis variables were tested using Shapiro-Wilk test. If the normality assumption was found to be violated, then appropriate nonparametric tests were used.

Efficacy Evaluation

The efficacy analysis was conducted for the intent-to-treat population. The intent-to-treat population consisted of all randomly assigned patients.

Primary End Point

Subjects who were recurrence-free at the end of follow-up were censored at the analysis time point, and AF-free time was defined as time from randomization to censor date. Survival curves were constructed by using the Kaplan–Meier method, and the primary null hypothesis was tested using the log-rank test; a 2-sided *P* value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Secondary End Points

The mortality and unplanned hospitalization rates were summarized across study groups. Patients requiring at least 1 rehospitalization were counted for this end point; time to first such hospitalization was analyzed by using the survival analysis technique. Death from any cause within the follow-up period was considered for mortality analysis and was compared between the groups using the log-rank test. Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ were assessed by using analysis of covariance model (SAS GLM procedure) with grouping variable as factor and baseline value as covariate.

Multivariable Analysis

Multivariable Cox regression model was used for assessing independent predictors of AF-free survival and overall survival after adjusting for potential confounders.

Apart from covariates showing significant univariate association, potential confounders of known or expected clinical relevance, regardless of their statistical significance at univariate analysis were considered for entering into the multivariable model.

Confounders adjusted in the multivariable model included age, sex, diabetes mellitus, and hypertension. The proportional-hazard assumption was tested by Schoenfeld residual analysis. The hazard ratio and 95% confidence interval (CI) were computed and presented in the results.

All tests were 2-sided and a P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed by using SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

Results

Patient Characteristics

In total, 866 patients were screened, 331 were eligible for inclusion, and 203 consented and were included in the study and randomly assigned to receive catheter ablation (group 1, $n=102$, left atrial diameter 47 ± 4.2 mm, LVEF $29\pm 5\%$) or AMIO (group 2, $n=101$, left atrial diameter 48 ± 4.9 mm, LVEF $30\pm 8\%$). Baseline characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1.

In the 102 patients undergoing catheter ablation, PVI was performed in 22 patients, and PVI plus posterior wall isolation was done in 80 patients. The total procedure time and radio-frequency time were 168 ± 72 and 66 ± 34 minutes, respectively.

Arrhythmia Recurrence

During the blanking period 52 (51%) in the AMIO group and 3 (3%) in the ablation group underwent cardioversion. After the blanking period, 25 (25%) and 15 (15%) patients had cardioversion in the AMIO and ablation group, respectively. All randomized patients were included in the survival analysis.

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Study Population

	Group 1 (Catheter Ablation, $n=102$)	Group 2 (Amiodarone, $n=101$)
Age, y	62 ± 10	60 ± 11
Male, n (%)	77 (75)	74 (73)
AF duration, mo	8.6 ± 3.2	8.4 ± 4.1
BMI, kg/m ²	30 ± 8	29 ± 4
Hypertension, n (%)	46 (45)	48 (48)
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	22 (22)	24 (24)
Coronary artery disease, n (%)	63 (62)	66 (65)
LA diameter, mm	47 ± 4.2	48 ± 4.9
LVEF, %	29 ± 5	30 ± 8
6MWD, meters	348 ± 111	350 ± 130
MLHFQ Score	52 ± 24	50 ± 27
OSA, n (%)	46 (45)	48 (48)
ACEI or ARB, n (%)	94 (92)	89 (88)
Aldosterone antagonists, n (%)	46 (45)	51 (50)
β -Blockers, n (%)	78 (76)	81 (80)

Continuous variables are summarized as mean \pm standard deviation, and categorical variables are reported as number of cases (n) and percentage. ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BMI, body mass index; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance; and OSA, obstructive sleep apnea,

At the end of the study, 71 (70%; 95% CI, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free after average 1.4 ± 0.6 procedures in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% CI, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank $P<0.001$). Of the 67 patients having recurrence in group 2, treatment failed in 7 (10.4%) after withdrawal of AMIO because of adverse effects (4 had thyroid toxicity, 2 pulmonary toxicity, and 1 patient developed liver dysfunction).

Because repeat interventions were allowed during the blanking period, and followed up for 24 months after such intervention, these patients accrued a maximum 27 months of follow-up. We performed a sensitivity analysis at the 24-month cutoff. At this time point, 73 (72%; 95% CI, 62%–79%) in group 1 and 37 (37%; 95% CI, 28%–47%) in group 2 were arrhythmia free (log-rank $P<0.001$).

In group 1, higher success was reported in patients undergoing PVI and posterior wall isolation in comparison with PVI alone (63 [79%; 95% CI, 68%–86%] and 8 [36%; 95% CI, 17%–56%], respectively; $P<0.001$). Success rate of ablation in the different centers after a single procedure ranged from 29% to 61%. No patient was lost to follow-up during the study period. The Kaplan–Meier curve comparing recurrence across the study groups is presented in Figure 2.

Predictor of Arrhythmia Recurrence

We first investigated the association of AF recurrence in an unadjusted Cox model. In the univariate model, treatment with AMIO, LVEF, and diabetes mellitus showed significant association. The results of univariate analysis are presented in Table 2.

After adjusting for covariates in multivariable Cox model, the treatment of patients on AMIO therapy was found to be significantly more likely to fail (hazard ratio, 2.5; 95% CI, 1.5–4.3; $P<0.001$) in comparison with catheter ablation. Besides that, diabetes mellitus showed a statistically significant association with higher recurrence (hazard ratio, 1.1; 95% CI, 1.07–1.26; $P=0.01$).

Unplanned Hospitalization and Death

Over the 2-year follow-up, the unplanned hospitalization rate was substantially lower in group 1 (32 [31%; 95% CI, 20%–41%] and 58 [57%; 95% CI, 51%–69%] in group 2, log-rank $P<0.001$), showing 45% relative risk reduction (relative risk, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.39–0.76). The NNT to avoid 1 unplanned hospitalization was 3.8 patients. In addition, there were significantly fewer deaths (from all causes) in group 1 (8 [8%] group 1 and 18 [18%] group 2; log-rank $P=0.037$), with 56% relative risk reduction for mortality in patients receiving catheter ablation (relative risk, 0.44; 95% CI, –0.20 to 0.96; NNT 10 patients).

Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ

At baseline, the LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ scores were not different between the catheter ablation and AMIO groups (Table 1).

With the exception of the 26 patients who died during the study period, end-of-study measurements were available for all 177 (94 in group 1 and 83 in group 2). In comparison with group 2, better improvement in terms of change in

LVEF (8.1 ± 4 [median, 8.3%] versus 6.2 ± 5.0 [median, 5.0%], $P=0.02$), 6MWD (22 ± 41 [median, 19 m] versus 10 ± 37 [median, 6 m], $P=0.02$), and reduction in MLFHQ score (11 ± 19 [median, 10] versus 6 ± 17 [median, 5.0]; $P=0.04$) was observed in the group 1 population. When stratifying the population by recurrence status, recurrence-free patients ($n=91$) experienced significantly better improvement in all parameters than those who experienced recurrence ($n=86$; Table 3).

Procedural Complications

In group 1, 2 (1.96%) patients had groin hematoma, and 1 patient (0.98%) had pericardial effusion that was conservatively managed with fresh-frozen plasma and protamine.

Discussion

Main Findings

This is the first multicenter randomized study showing that in patients with HF and persistent AF, catheter ablation is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at the long-term follow-up. Importantly, ablation improved QoL and exercise capacity and reduced unplanned hospitalization and overall mortality. These findings are clinically relevant, especially in light of the socioeconomic advantages that arise from the reduced rehospitalization and mortality in HF patients.

HF and AF are the most common cardiac conditions in Western countries and often coexist. Pharmacological rate versus rhythm control is a controversial topic in the literature for the treatment of AF especially in light of the main results of the Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) and Rate Control versus Electrical Cardioversion (RACE) trials.^{11,12}

A subanalysis of the AFFIRM trial, however, clearly showing the association of sinus rhythm but not AADs with improved

survival may reflect the fact that currently available AADs are neither highly efficacious nor completely safe. In addition, the results suggested that an effective and safe method to maintain sinus rhythm may improve survival. The rationale for a rhythm-control approach includes the possibility of fewer symptoms, improved exercise tolerance, lower risk of stroke, superior QoL, and better survival, if sinus rhythm can be maintained.^{11,12}

In patients with HF and AF, the available AADs to maintain sinus rhythm recommended by the international guidelines are limited to AMIO and dofetilide. These drugs are associated with significant adverse side effects and drug interaction that often lead to drug discontinuation.^{19–24} The long-term use of AMIO is associated with significant pulmonary, hepatic, and thyroid toxicity, in addition to severe bradycardia.²⁴ Dofetilide requires hospitalization for careful monitoring because of severe QT-interval prolongation and torsades de pointes in up to 3% of patients, and its use is limited in patients with renal dysfunction, which is a common finding in HF patients.²²

AF ablation might represent the ideal therapy that restores sinus rhythm without the adverse effects of AADs. Successful AF ablation results in significant improvements of left ventricular function, exercise tolerance, symptoms, and QoL⁴ irrespective of the level of preprocedural rate control, suggesting that factors other than rate control (eg, loss of atrial contraction, atrioventricular dyssynchrony) drive the deterioration of cardiac function.

AF ablation has shown superior outcome achieving freedom from AF in comparison with AADs in several randomized controlled trials that enrolled paroxysmal AF patients with a normal heart. The success rate in patients who have persistent and long-standing persistent AF is variable in the literature. The variation in procedural outcome depends on different factors such as age, sex, AF types, structural heart disease, ablation technique, and operator experience.^{25–29}




Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier curve comparing AF-free survival between patients undergoing catheter ablation (group 1) and those receiving amiodarone therapy (group 2). At end of the study, 71 (70%; 95% CI, 60%–78%) patients in group 1 were recurrence free in comparison with 34 (34%; 95% CI, 25%–44%) in group 2 (log-rank $P < 0.001$). AF indicates atrial fibrillation; AT, atrial tachycardia; and CI, confidence interval.

Table 2. Variables Showing Univariate Association With AF Recurrence: Results From Cox Model

Variables	Hazard Ratio	95% Confidence Intervals	P Value
Amiodarone treatment	3.00	(1.96–4.61)	<0.0001
Sex	1.14	(0.92–1.41)	0.22
Age, y	0.99	(0.98–1.019)	0.94
BMI	0.99	(0.94–1.03)	0.59
LVEF, %	0.96	(0.93–0.99)	0.01
Hypertension	1.12	(0.93–1.36)	0.24
Left atrial size	1.02	(0.99–1.05)	0.18
Diabetes mellitus	2.22	(1.31–3.75)	0.003

AF indicates atrial fibrillation; BMI, body mass index; and LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.

Overall, a higher recurrence rate has been shown in HF patients,^{3–6} and this might explain why AF ablation is not widely used as a rhythm control strategy in this subset of the patient population.

In agreement with these reports, we observed substantial improvement in 6MWD, LVEF, and MLHFQ scores in recurrence-free patients. The pathophysiology underlying HF and AF resulting in compromised stroke volume is the likely basis of altered exercise tolerance.^{15–18,30} Thus, the significant improvement in 6MWD could reflect betterment in cardiac contractility and rhythm resulting in restoration of a more efficient cardiac contraction following successful ablation. Our results further corroborated the correlation between ablation success and improvement in QoL. This observation can be attributed to reinstatement of stable sinus rhythm, lesser burden of symptoms, and reduction in the use of health care resources and better well-being.^{31–33} Results from a randomized trial conducted by MacDonald et al⁷ comparing ablation versus rate-control medications in patients with persistent AF and LVEF <35% reported no significant differences between groups in terms of improvement in ejection fraction measured by magnetic resonance (MR), exercise tolerance, or QoL. However, it is difficult to compare our findings with their results for several reasons: (1) different study design: ablation versus rhythm control medication in our trial and ablation versus rate-control measures in their study; (2) small sample size (n=41); and (3) different ablation approach: majority (78%) of our patients received PVI and posterior wall isolation plus ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms and non-PV triggers as needed, which was the most likely reason behind the

higher success rate than their patients who underwent PVI with a roof line and ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms. Recently published randomized trials have demonstrated suboptimal outcomes and no added advantage when linear lesions are performed in conjunction with PVI.^{34,35} Other factors responsible for the higher success rate in our study population could be the operator experience and the improved mapping and ablation technology in recent years that resulted in better PV encirclement. The results from this early study also contrast with more recent findings from the Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Rate Control for Atrial Fibrillation in Patients With Heart Failure (ARC-HF) and Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure (CAMTAF) trials, which both showed significant improvement in exercise capacity and QoL with AF ablation in comparison with pharmacological rate control.^{14,36}

The CAMTAF trial also showed a significant improvement of LVEF after 6 months of follow-up with AF ablation in comparison with pharmacological rate control (+8.1 [95% CI, 3.0–13.1] versus –3 [95% CI, –7.7 to 0.5]; $P<0.001$).³⁶

Similarly, the ARC-HF trial reported a trend toward a higher LVEF improvement with AF ablation (mean difference, +5.6% (95% CI, –0.1 to +11.3; $P=0.055$) after 12 months of follow-up.¹⁴

Our trial shows that, after an average of 1.4 procedures, a clinically relevant freedom from AF can be achieved in these patients. Of interest is the finding that, when sorting the results by ablation technique, a poor success was observed in patients who underwent PV ablation alone in comparison with patients undergoing a more extensive ablation approach.

The coexistence of AF and HF increases the risk of unplanned hospitalization and significantly impacts health-care costs.³⁷ Therefore, the reduction of unplanned hospitalization and mortality are relevant potential benefits of the ablation strategy.

Study Limitation

We acknowledge certain limitations in our trial. (1) Although no formal comparison with a rate control strategy was performed in this study, we would like to emphasize that AMIO is also considered in the guidelines as a rate control drug. In addition, 76% of the ablation group and 80% of the AMIO group received β -blockers at the tolerated dosage. (2) The 2 other alternative AADs available for these patients, sotalol and dofetilide, were not tested in this trial, because dofetilide is not available in countries other than the United States and the patients were already on different β -blockers that they could tolerate. Moreover, AMIO is the most effective antiarrhythmic drug; therefore, these results could be extended to dofetilide

Table 3. Change in LVEF, 6MWD, and MLHFQ Score by Recurrence Status

	No Recurrence (n=91)		Recurrence (n=86)		P (Comparing Change Between Groups)
	Baseline	Change (Median)	Baseline	Change (Median)	
LVEF, %	28.8±10	9.6±7.4 (9.4)	30.2±9	4.2±6.2 (4.0)	<0.001
6MWD, meters	347±113	27±38 (24)	352±128	8±42 (2)	<0.001
MLHFQ	53±24	–14±18 (–12)	49±26	–2.9±15 (–2.2)	<0.001

Data are summarized as mean±standard deviation. LVEF indicates left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; and 6MWD, 6-minute walk distance.

and sotalol. (3) Finally, our patients were followed up for 24 months. Although a longer follow-up would be desirable, the follow-up duration in our study was longer than many other studies in the field of ablation. In addition, all patients had an implanted device, and success/failure was obtained by device interrogation.

Conclusion

This multicenter randomized study shows that catheter ablation of AF is superior to AMIO in achieving freedom from AF at long-term follow-up and reducing unplanned hospitalization and mortality in patients with HF and persistent AF. The potential socioeconomic repercussion of these results will require further investigation.

Disclosures

Dr Di Biase is a consultant for Biosense Webster, Stereotaxis and St Jude Medical. Dr Di Biase received speaker honoraria/travel from Medtronic, EpiEP, Janssen, Bristol Meyers, Boston Scientific, and Biotronik. Dr Natale received speaker honoraria from Boston Scientific, Biosense Webster, St. Jude Medical, Biotronik, and Medtronic. Dr Natale is a consultant for Biosense Webster, St Jude Medical, and Janssen. Dr Burkhardt is a consultant for Biosense Webster and Stereotaxis. The other authors report no conflicts.

References

- Calkins H, Reynolds MR, Spector P, Sondhi M, Xu Y, Martin A, Williams CJ, Sledge I. Treatment of atrial fibrillation with antiarrhythmic drugs or radiofrequency ablation: two systematic literature reviews and meta-analyses. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. 2009;2:349–361. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.108.824789.
- Choi AD, Hematpour K, Kukin M, Mittal S, Steinberg JS. Ablation vs medical therapy in the setting of symptomatic atrial fibrillation and left ventricular dysfunction. *Congest Heart Fail*. 2010;16:10–14. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-7133.2009.00116.x.
- Gentlesk PJ, Sauer WH, Gerstenfeld EP, Lin D, Dixit S, Zado E, Callans D, Marchlinski FE. Reversal of left ventricular dysfunction following ablation of atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2007;18:9–14. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8167.2006.00653.x.
- Hsu LF, Jais P, Sanders P, Garrigue S, Hocini M, Sacher F, Takahashi Y, Rotter M, Pasquie JL, Scavée C, Bordachar P, Clémenty J, Haïssaguerre M. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351:2373–2383. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa041018.
- Tondo C, Mantica M, Russo G, Avella A, De Luca L, Pappalardo A, Fagundes RL, Picchio E, Laurenzi F, Piazza V, Bisceglia I. Pulmonary vein vestibule ablation for the control of atrial fibrillation in patients with impaired left ventricular function. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. 2006;29:962–970. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8159.2006.00471.x.
- Chen MS, Marrouche NF, Khaykin Y, Gillinov AM, Wazni O, Martin DO, Rossillo A, Verma A, Cummings J, Erciyes D, Saad E, Bhargava M, Bash D, Schweikert R, Burkhardt D, Williams-Andrews M, Perez-Lugones A, Abdul-Karim A, Saliba W, Natale A. Pulmonary vein isolation for the treatment of atrial fibrillation in patients with impaired systolic function. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2004;43:1004–1009. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2003.09.056.
- MacDonald MR, Connelly DT, Hawkins NM, Steedman T, Payne J, Shaw M, Denvir M, Bhagra S, Small S, Martin W, McMurray JJ, Petrie MC. Radiofrequency ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation in patients with advanced heart failure and severe left ventricular systolic dysfunction: a randomised controlled trial. *Heart*. 2011;97:740–747. doi: 10.1136/hrt.2010.207340.
- Maisel WH, Stevenson LW. Atrial fibrillation in heart failure: epidemiology, pathophysiology, and rationale for therapy. *Am J Cardiol*. 2003;91(6A):2D–8D.
- Khan MA, Ahmed F, Neyses L, Mamas MA. Atrial fibrillation in heart failure: The sword of Damocles revisited. *World J Cardiol*. 2013;5:215–227. doi: 10.4330/wjc.v5.i7.215.
- Roy D, Talajic M, Nattel S, Wyse DG, Dorian P, Lee KL, Bourassa MG, Arnold JM, Buxton AE, Camm AJ, Connolly SJ, Dubuc M, Ducharme A, Guerra PG, Hohnloser SH, Lambert J, Le Heuzey JY, O'Hara G, Pedersen OD, Rouleau JL, Singh BN, Stevenson LW, Stevenson WG, Thibault B, Waldo AL; Atrial Fibrillation and Congestive Heart Failure Investigators. Rhythm control versus rate control for atrial fibrillation and heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358:2667–2677. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708789.
- Wyse DG, Waldo AL, DiMarco JP, Domanski MJ, Rosenberg Y, Schron EB, Kellen JC, Greene HL, Mickel MC, Dalquist JE, Corley SD; Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) Investigators. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1825–1833. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa021328.
- Van Gelder IC, Hagens VE, Bosker HA, Kingma JH, Kamp O, Kingma T, Said SA, Darmanata JI, Timmermans AJ, Tijssen JG, Crijns HJ; Rate Control versus Electrical Cardioversion for Persistent Atrial Fibrillation Study Group. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with recurrent persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1834–1840. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa021375.
- Khan MN, Jais P, Cummings J, Di Biase L, Sanders P, Martin DO, Kautzner J, Hao S, Themistoclakis S, Fanelli R, Potenza D, Massaro R, Wazni O, Schweikert R, Saliba W, Wang P, Al-Ahmad A, Beheiry S, Santarelli P, Starling RC, Dello Russo A, Pelargonio G, Brachmann J, Schibgilla V, Bonso A, Casella M, Raviele A, Haïssaguerre M, Natale A; PABA-CHF Investigators. Pulmonary-vein isolation for atrial fibrillation in patients with heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359:1778–1785. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708234.
- Jones DG, Haldar SK, Hussain W, Sharma R, Francis DP, Rahman-Haley SL, McDonagh TA, Underwood SR, Markides V, Wong T. A randomized trial to assess catheter ablation versus rate control in the management of persistent atrial fibrillation in heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:1894–1903. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2013.01.069.
- Supino PG, Borer JS, Franciosa JA, Preibisz JJ, Hochreiter C, Isom OW, Krieger KH, Girardi LN, Bouraad D, Forur L. Acceptability and psychometric properties of the Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Questionnaire among patients undergoing heart valve surgery: validation and comparison with SF-36. *J Card Fail*. 2009;15:267–277. doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2008.10.003.
- Rector TS, Kubo SH, Cohn JN. Patients' self-assessment of their congestive heart failure part 2: content, reliability and validity of a new measure, the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire. *Heart Failure*. 1987;3:198–209.
- Shoemaker MJ, Curtis AB, Vangnes E, Dickinson MG. Clinically meaningful change estimates for the six-minute walk test and daily activity in individuals with chronic heart failure. *Cardiopulm Phys Ther J*. 2013;24:21–29.
- American Thoracic Society. ATS Statement: Guidelines for the Six-Minute Walk Test. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2002;166:111–117.
- Flaker GC, Blackshear JL, McBride R, Kronmal RA, Halperin JL, Hart RG. Antiarrhythmic drug therapy and cardiac mortality in atrial fibrillation. The Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Investigators. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1992;20:527–532.
- Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW, Middlekauff HR, Fonarow GC, Hamilton MA, Woo MA, Saxon LA, Natterson PD, Steimle A, Walden JA, Tillisch JH. Improving survival for patients with atrial fibrillation and advanced heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1996;28:1458–1463.
- Wann LS, Curtis AB, January CT, Ellenbogen KA, Lowe JE, Estes NA 3rd, Page RL, Ezekowitz MD, Slotwiner DJ, Jackman WM, Stevenson WG, Tracy CM, Fuster V, Rydén LE, Cannom DS, Le Heuzey JY, Crijns HJ, Lowe JE, Curtis AB, Olsson SB, Ellenbogen KA, Prystowsky EN, Halperin JL, Tamargo JL, Kay GN, Wann LS, Jacobs AK, Anderson JL, Albert N, Hochman JS, Buller CE, Kushner FG, Creager MA, Ohman EM, Ettinger SM, Stevenson WG, Guyton RA, Tarkington LG, Halperin JL, Yancy CW; ACCF/AHA/HRS. 2011 ACCF/AHA/HRS focused update on the management of patients with atrial fibrillation (Updating the 2006 Guideline): a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57:223–242. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2010.10.001.
- Singla S, Karam P, Deshmukh AJ, Mehta J, Paydak H. Review of contemporary antiarrhythmic drug therapy for maintenance of sinus rhythm in atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol Ther*. 2012;17:12–20. doi: 10.1177/1074248410397195.
- Weinfeld MS, Drazner MH, Stevenson WG, Stevenson LW. Early outcome of initiating amiodarone for atrial fibrillation in advanced heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2000;19:638–643.
- Santangeli P, Di Biase L, Pelargonio G, Burkhardt JD, Natale A. The pharmaceutical pipeline for atrial fibrillation. *Ann Med*. 2011;43:13–32. doi: 10.3109/07853890.2010.538431.

25. Wilton SB, Fundytus A, Ghali WA, Veenhuyzen GD, Quinn FR, Mitchell LB, Hill MD, Faris P, Exner DV. Meta-analysis of the effectiveness and safety of catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in patients with versus without left ventricular systolic dysfunction. *Am J Cardiol.* 2010;106:1284–1291. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2010.06.053.
26. Dagres N, Varounis C, Gaspar T, Piorkowski C, Eitel C, Iliodromitis EK, Lekakis JP, Flevari P, Simeonidou E, Rallidis LS, Tsougos E, Hindricks G, Sommer P, Anastasiou-Nana M. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Card Fail.* 2011;17:964–970. doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2011.07.009.
27. Hayward RM, Upadhyay GA, Mela T, Ellinor PT, Barrett CD, Heist EK, Verma A, Choudhry NK, Singh JP. Pulmonary vein isolation with complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation for paroxysmal and nonparoxysmal atrial fibrillation: A meta-analysis. *Heart Rhythm.* 2011;8:994–1000. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2011.02.033.
28. Li WJ, Bai YY, Zhang HY, Tang RB, Miao CL, Sang CH, Yin XD, Dong JZ, Ma CS. Additional ablation of complex fractionated atrial electrograms after pulmonary vein isolation in patients with atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* 2011;4:143–148. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.110.958405.
29. Deshmukh A, Patel NJ, Pant S, Shah N, Chothani A, Mehta K, Grover P, Singh V, Vallurupalli S, Savani GT, Badheka A, Tuliani T, Dabhadkar K, Dibu G, Reddy YM, Sewani A, Kowalski M, Mitrani R, Paydak H, Viles-Gonzalez JF. In-hospital complications associated with catheter ablation of atrial fibrillation in the United States between 2000 and 2010: analysis of 93 801 procedures. *Circulation.* 2013;128:2104–2112. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.113.003862.
30. Mohanty S, Santangeli P, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, Holcomb S, Trivedi C, Bai R, Burkhardt D, Hongo R, Hao S, Beheiry S, Santoro F, Forleo G, Gallinhouse JG, Horton R, Sanchez JE, Bailey S, Hranitzky PM, Zagrodzky J, Natale A. Catheter ablation of asymptomatic longstanding persistent atrial fibrillation: impact on quality of life, exercise performance, arrhythmia perception, and arrhythmia-free survival. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* 2014;25:1057–1064. doi: 10.1111/jce.12467.
31. Fichtner S, Deisenhofer I, Kindsmüller S, Dzijan-Horn M, Tzeis S, Reents T, Wu J, Luise Estner H, Jilek C, Ammar S, Kathan S, Hessling G, Ladwig KH. Prospective assessment of short- and long-term quality of life after ablation for atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* 2012;23:121–127. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8167.2011.02165.x.
32. Mohanty S, Mohanty P, Di Biase L, Bai R, Pump A, Santangeli P, Burkhardt D, Gallinhouse JG, Horton R, Sanchez JE, Bailey S, Zagrodzky J, Natale A. Impact of metabolic syndrome on procedural outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation undergoing catheter ablation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;59:1295–1301. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2011.11.051.
33. Kucukdurmaz Z, Kato R, Erdem A, Golcuk E, Tobiume T, Nagase T, Ikeda Y, Nakajima Y, Matsumura M, Komiyama N, Nishimura S, Matsumoto K. Catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation results in greater improvement in cardiac function in patients with low versus normal left ventricular ejection fraction. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol.* 2013;37:179–187. doi: 10.1007/s10840-013-9794-6.
34. Arbelo E, Guiu E, Ramos P, Bisbal F, Borrás R, Andreu D, Tolosana JM, Berrueto A, Brugada J, Mont L. Benefit of left atrial roof linear ablation in paroxysmal atrial fibrillation: a prospective, randomized study. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2014;3:e000877. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.114.000877.
35. Verma A, Jiang CY, Betts TR, Chen J, Deisenhofer I, Mantovan R, Macle L, Morillo CA, Haverkamp W, Weerasooriya R, Albenque JP, Nardi S, Menardi E, Novak P, Sanders P; STAR AF II Investigators. Approaches to catheter ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.* 2015;372:1812–1822. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1408288.
36. Hunter RJ, Berriman TJ, Diab I, Kamdar R, Richmond L, Baker V, Goromonzi F, Sawhney V, Duncan E, Page SP, Ullah W, Unsworth B, Mayet J, Dhinoja M, Earley MJ, Sporton S, Schilling RJ. A randomized controlled trial of Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure (the CAMTAF trial). *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol.* 2014;7:31–38. doi: 10.1161/CIRCEP.113.000806.
37. Bleumink GS, Knetsch AM, Sturkenboom MC, Straus SM, Hofman A, Deckers JW, Wittteman JC, Stricker BH. Quantifying the heart failure epidemic: prevalence, incidence rate, lifetime risk and prognosis of heart failure: The Rotterdam Study. *Eur Heart J.* 2004;25:1614–1619. doi: 10.1016/j.ehj.2004.06.038.

CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE

Heart failure and atrial fibrillation are common cardiac conditions that often coexist. This is the first randomized study to show that, in patients with heart failure and persistent atrial fibrillation, catheter ablation is superior to amiodarone (the most used drug in these patients) in achieving freedom from atrial fibrillation at long-term follow-up. Importantly, ablation reduced rehospitalization and overall mortality and improved quality of life and exercise capacity. This study suggests that clinicians should consider catheter ablation sooner in this patient population.