

The Biomarker Utility in Risk Stratification in an Ambulatory Heart Failure: ST2 or Galectin-3?

Alexander Berezin

Alexander Berezin, Internal Medicine Department, State Medical University, 26, Mayakovsky Av., Zaporozhye, Postcode 69035, Ukraine

Correspondence to: Alexander Berezin, Professor, MD, PhD, Internal Medicine Department, State Medical University, 26, Mayakovsky Av., Zaporozhye, Postcode 69035, Ukraine.

Email: dr_berezin@mail.ru

Telephone: +380612894585

Received: November 15, 2015 Revised: December 12, 2015

Accepted: December 15, 2015

Published online: February 14, 2016

Berezin A. The Biomarker Utility in Risk Stratification in an Ambulatory Heart Failure: ST2 or Galectin-3? *Journal of Cardiology and Therapy* 2016; 3(1): 483-494 Available from: URL: <http://www.ghrnet.org/index.php/jct/article/view/1600>

Abbreviations

BNP: brain natriuretic peptide;

CAD: coronary artery disease;

CV: cardiovascular;

HF: heart failure;

HFpEF: heart failure with preserved ejection fraction;

HFrEF: heart failure with reduced ejection fraction;

LV: left ventricle.

ABSTRACT

Heart failure (HF) is multi factorial syndrome with high cardiovascular (CV) morbidity and mortality rates associated with an increasingly prevalence worldwide. Measuring plasma levels of cardiac biomarkers may assist in prognostication of HF. However, the role of biomarker models in prediction of death and re-admission in ambulatory HF patients is not still understood. This editorial comment explores the knowledge regarding head-to-head comparison of galectin-3 and ST2 in risk stratification among ambulatory HF individuals. The comment is indicated sST2 and galectin-3 are recommended as alternate biomarkers with defined predictive value in HF and in generally patient population at high risk of HF manifestation. Recent clinical studies do not allow solving whether sST2 is superior then galectin-3 in ambulatory patient with stable HF because the received results are not obvious, although sST2 appears to be more attractive. Probably, more investigations are required to explain the role of each alternate biomarker in HF prognostication.

© 2016 ACT. All rights reserved.

Key words: Heart Failure; Biomarkers; Galectin-3; ST2; Prognostication; Risk Stratification

INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) remains an important clinical cause that leads to an increased CV mortality and morbidity worldwide^[1]. The prevalence of HF gradually increases in developed countries due to improved survival after HF diagnosis^[2]. Cardiac biomarkers are considered indispensable tools for diagnosis, risk stratification, and prognostication in acute, acutely decompensated and chronic HF^[3-5], while the use of several biomarkers may now present different information in HF with preserved and reduced left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction (EF) especially in persons with various ages, sex and several co-morbidity including renal disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and coronary artery disease^[6-9]. The current clinical guidelines underline that serum natriuretic peptides (NPs) and cardiac troponins may demonstrate a limited predictive value for stable HF patients at discharge or at ambulatory and now recommend measurement of galectin-3 and ST2 for additive risk stratification in these settings^[10-13]. Moreover, it has been suggested that galectin-3 and ST2 as alternative biomarkers might give insight into the different pathways of HF pathophysiology, and they probably could help to identify generally population individuals at higher risk of HF developing and HF patients with poor outcomes

beyond traditional limitations that are suitable for NPs and cardiac troponins^[14-18]. The aim of the editorial comment is head-to-head comparison of galectin-3 and ST2 in risk stratification among ambulatory HF individuals.

GALECTIN-3

Galectin-3 is a soluble beta galactoside-binding lectin produced by activated macrophages which binds and activates the fibroblasts^[19]. Results of recent studies have reported that galectin-3 is a biomarker that mediates an important link between inflammation and fibrosis, which play a pivotal role in CV remodeling^[20]. The pathogenetic role of galectin-3 in the several setting of pressure overload, neuro-endocrine activation, hypertension, coronary artery disease/myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, and HF has strongly established^[21-23].

Galectin-3 has emerged a predictive value for the onset of HF in apparently healthy patients and has been found being surrogate marker of a worse prognosis, mortality and re-admission in HF^[24]. The results of the sub-study of COACH (The Coordinating Study Evaluating Outcomes of Advising and Counselling in Heart Failure) trial have shown that only galectin-3 was significantly associated with the absence of CV events at 180 days in patients with HF at low risk for death or HF re-hospitalization^[25]. Therefore, authors indicated that this biomarker demonstrated an incremental value when added to the clinical risk model without NT-proBNP^[25]. In fact, there are not irresistible evidences regarding being of clinically significant advantages of galectin-3 in prediction in HFpEF compared with HFrEF^[26]. Interestingly, changes of galectin-3 levels within post discharge 6 months did not add prognostic information to the base-line value in stable HF subjects^[27]. In this context, serial measurements of galectin-3 level in ambulatory HF patients might not be of benefit. Overall, galectin-3 is obviously powerful prognosticator of death and re-hospitalization in HF patients at discharge from the hospital and in generally population individuals at higher risk of HF development.

ST2

Soluble suppression of tumorigenicity 2 (sST2), a peptide belonging to the interleukin-1 receptor family, is secreted cardiomyocytes and cardiac fibroblasts under mechanical strain and thus it is concerned a biomarker of myocardial fibrosis, cardiac stretch and CV remodeling^[28, 29]. Measurement of sST2 is useful for death risk stratification and prognosis prediction in HF patients beyond other CV risk factors, NYHA functional class, LFEF, and renal function^[30, 31]. Importantly that the addition of ST2 to a model that includes established mortality risk factors, including NPs, substantially improves the risk stratification for death and HF admission in HF patients^[32]. Thus, sST2 appears to be a reliable prognosticator of advice outcomes in HF subjects irrespective of comorbidity, fluid retention state, and CV risk factors.

HEAD-TO-HEAD COMPARISON OF GALECTIN-3 AND ST2

Although galectin-3 and sST2 represent equal physiopathological pathways in failing heart, recent studies have shown that sST2 may have a special superiority as a risk predictor in HFpEF and HFrEF compared with NPs and galectin-3 among stable patients at discharge from a hospital admission for acute HF^[33-35]. Zhang et al^[36] reported that

sST2 improved prediction for death beyond risk factors without being influenced by renal function, whereas the prognostic value of galectin-3 is less clear below an eGFR of 60 ml/min/1.73 m². Miller et al^[37] have assessed the value of serial measurements of sST2 and galectin-3 to identify risk for adverse pathophysiologic processes among highest-risk HF outpatients. The results of the study have clarified that both biomarkers might be valuable to guide ambulatory HF patient tailored therapy during follow-up evaluations, whereas sST2 was superior then galectin-3 in this setting. Zhou et al^[38] believed that sST2 may possess special superiority as a risk predictor in HF patients when compared with other biomarkers. In generally, it may agree with issue mentioned above, while direct head-to-head comparisons of both biomarkers are limited and statistical power of these studies is not so much high as it is required to keeping in mind possible differences between predictive value of sST2 and galectin-3 in stable HF.

In conclusion, sST2 and galectin-3 are recommended as alternate biomarkers with defined predictive value in HF and in generally patient population at high risk of HF manifestation. Recent clinical studies do not allow solving whether sST2 is superior then galectin-3 in ambulatory patient with stable HF because the received results are not obvious, although sST2 appears to be more attractive. However, more investigations are required to explain the role of each alternate biomarker in HF prognostication.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

There are no conflicts of interest with regard to the present study.

REFERENCES

1. Go AS, Mozaffarian D, Roger VL, Benjamin EJ, Berry JD, Blaha MJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2014 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2014;129(3):e28–e292
2. Dunlay SM, Roger VL. Understanding the epidemic of heart failure: past, present, and future. *Curr Heart Fail Rep* 2014; 11(4):404-15.
3. Meta-analysis Global Group in Chronic Heart Failure (MAGGIC). The survival of patients with heart failure with preserved or reduced left ventricular ejection fraction: an individual patient data meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2012; 33(14): 1750–7.
4. Borlaug BA, Paulus WJ. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: pathophysiology, diagnosis, and treatment. *Eur Heart J* 2011; 32(6):670–9.
5. Lekavich CL, Barksdale DJ, Neelon V, Wu JR. Heart failure preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF): an integrated and strategic review. *Heart Fail Rev* 2015; 20(6): 643-53.
6. Mavrea AM, Dragomir T, Bordejevic DA, Tomescu MC, Ancusa O, Marincu I. Causes and predictors of hospital readmissions in patients older than 65 years hospitalized for heart failure with preserved left ventricular ejection fraction in western Romania. *Clin Interv Aging* 2015; 10: 979-90.
7. Ueda T, Kawakami R, Nishida T, Onoue K, Soeda T, Okayama S, et al. Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction (EF) of 55% as Cutoff for Late Transition From Heart Failure (HF) With Preserved EF to HF With Mildly Reduced EF. *Circ J* 2015; 79(10): 2209-15.
8. Beltrami M, Palazzuoli A, Ruocco G, Aspromonte N. The predictive value of plasma biomarkers in discharged heart failure patients: the role of plasma BNP. *Minerva Cardioangiol* 2015 [Epub ahead of print]
9. Kenchaiah S, Vasan RS. Heart Failure in Women - Insights from the Framingham Heart Study. *Cardiovasc Drugs Ther* 2015; 29(4): 377-90.

10. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, Butler J, Casey DE Jr., Drazner MH, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;62(16):e147–e239
11. Dworzynski K, Roberts E, Ludman A, Mant J; Guideline Development Group of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Diagnosing and managing acute heart failure in adults: summary of NICE guidance. BMJ* 2014; 349: g5695.
12. McMurray JJ, Adamopoulos S, Anker SD, Auricchio A, Böhm M, Dickstein K, et al. ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012: The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure 2012 of the European Society of Cardiology. Developed in collaboration with the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2012; 14(8):803-69.
13. Moe GW, Ezekowitz JA, O'Meara E, Lepage S, Howlett JG, Fremes S, et al. The 2014 Canadian Cardiovascular Society Heart Failure Management Guidelines Focus Update: anemia, biomarkers, and recent therapeutic trial implications. *Can J Cardiol* 2015; 31(1):3-16.
14. Zile MR, Baicu CF. Biomarkers of diastolic dysfunction and myocardial fibrosis: application to heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction. *J Cardiovasc Transl Res* 2013; 6(4):501–15.
15. D'Elia E, Vaduganathan M, Gori M, Gavazzi A, Butler J, Senni M. Role of biomarkers in cardiac structure phenotyping in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: critical appraisal and practical use. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2015. doi: 10.1002/ehf.430. [Epub ahead of print]
16. Wilcox JE, Fonarow GC, Ardehali H, Bonow RO, Butler J, Sauer AJ, et al. "Targeting the Heart" in Heart Failure: Myocardial Recovery in Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction. *JACC Heart Fail* 2015; 3(9): 661-9.
17. Katz AM, Rolett EL. Heart failure: when form fails to follow function. *Eur Heart J* 2015 pii: ehv548. [Epub ahead of print]
18. Sherwi N, Pellicori P, Joseph AC, Buga L. Old and newer biomarkers in heart failure: from pathophysiology to clinical significance. *J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown)* 2013; 14(10): 690-7.
19. Lala RI, Puschita M, Darabantiu D, Pilat L. Galectin-3 in heart failure pathology--"another brick in the wall"? *Acta Cardiol* 2015; 70(3): 323-31.
20. Shah KS, Maisel AS. Novel biomarkers in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Heart Fail Clin* 2014; 10(3): 471-9.
21. Lepojärvi ES, Piira OP, Pääkkö E, Lammintausta E, Risteli J, Miettinen JA, et al. Serum PINP, PIIINP, galectin-3, and ST2 as surrogates of myocardial fibrosis and echocardiographic left ventricular diastolic filling properties. *Front Physiol* 2015; 6:200.
22. de Boer RA, Daniels LB, Maisel AS, Januzzi JL Jr. State of the Art: Newer biomarkers in heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2015; 17(6): 559-69.
23. Gurel OM, Yilmaz H, Celik TH, Cakmak M, Namuslu M, Bilgiç AM, et al. Galectin-3 as a new biomarker of diastolic dysfunction in hemodialysis patients. *Herz* 2015; 40(5): 788-94.
24. Leone M, Iacoviello M. The predictive value of plasma biomarkers in discharged heart failure patients: role of galectin-3. *Minerva Cardioangiol* 2015 [Epub ahead of print]
25. Meijers WC, de Boer RA, van Veldhuisen DJ, Jaarsma T, Hillege HL, Maisel AS, et al. Biomarkers and low risk in heart failure. Data from COACH and TRIUMPH. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2015 [Epub ahead of print]
26. Yu X, Sun Y, Zhao Y, Zhang W, Yang Z, Gao Y, et al. Prognostic value of plasma galectin-3 levels in patients with coronary heart disease and chronic heart failure. *Int Heart J* 2015; 56(3):314-8
27. de Boer RA, Lok DJ, Jaarsma T, van der Meer P, Voors AA, Hillege HL, van Veldhuisen DJ. Predictive value of plasma galectin-3 levels in heart failure with reduced and preserved ejection fraction. *Ann Med* 2011; 43(1): 60-8.
28. Lupu S, Agoston-Coldea L. Soluble ST2 in Ventricular Dysfunction. *Adv Clin Chem* 2015; 69: 139-59.
29. Quick S, Waessnig NK, Kandler N, Poitz DM, Schoen S, Ibrahim K, et al. Soluble ST2 and myocardial fibrosis in 3T cardiac magnetic resonance. *Scand Cardiovasc J* 2015; 49(6):361-6.
30. Yao HC, Li XY, Han QF, Wang LH, Liu T, Zhou YH, et al. Elevated serum soluble ST2 levels may predict the fatal outcomes in patients with chronic heart failure. *Int J Cardiol* 2015; 186: 303-4.
31. Bayes-Genis A, Januzzi JL, Gaggin HK, de Antonio M, Motiwala SR, Zamora E, et al. ST2 pathogenetic profile in ambulatory heart failure patients. *J Card Fail* 2015; 21(4): 355-61.
32. Bayes-Genis A, Zhang Y, Ky B. ST2 and patient prognosis in chronic heart failure. *Am J Cardiol* 2015; 115(7 Suppl): 64B-9B.
33. Friões F, Lourenço P, Laszczynska O, Almeida PB, Guimarães JT, Januzzi JL, Azevedo A, Bettencourt P. Prognostic value of sST2 added to BNP in acute heart failure with preserved or reduced ejection fraction. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2015; 104(6):491-9.
34. Gruson D, Ferracin B, Ahn SA, Rousseau MF. Comparison of fibroblast growth factor 23, soluble ST2 and Galectin-3 for prognostication of cardiovascular death in heart failure patients. *Int J Cardiol* 2015; 189: 185-7.
35. Kim MS, Jeong TD, Han SB, Min WK, Kim JJ. Role of Soluble ST2 as a Prognostic Marker in Patients with Acute Heart Failure and Renal Insufficiency. *J Korean Med Sci* 2015; 30(5):569-75.
36. Zhang R, Zhang Y, An T, Guo X, Yin S, Wang Y, et al. Prognostic value of sST2 and galectin-3 for death relative to renal function in patients hospitalized for heart failure. *Biomark Med* 2015; 9(5): 433-41.
37. Miller WL, Saenger AK, Grill DE, Slusser JP, Bayes-Genis A, Jaffe AS. Prognostic Value of Serial Measurements of Soluble Suppression of Tumorigenicity 2 and Galectin-3 in Ambulatory Patients With Chronic Heart Failure. *J Card Fail* 2015 doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2015.07.017. [Epub ahead of print]
38. Zhou H, Ni J, Yuan Y, Deng W, Bian ZY, Tang QZ. Soluble ST2 may possess special superiority as a risk predictor in heart failure patients. *Int J Cardiol* 2015; 186: 146-7.

Peer reviewer: Peifeng Li, Professor, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, BeiCheng Xi Lu No. 1, Beijing 100111, China