Effects of long-term endurance and resistance training on diastolic function, exercise capacity, and quality of life in asymptomatic diastolic dysfunction vs. heart failure with preserved ejection fraction

Kathleen Nolte^{1,†} Silja Schwarz^{2,†} Götz Gelbrich³ Steffen Mensching² Friederike Siegmund² Rolf Wachter^{1,4} Gerd Hasenfuss^{1,4} Hans-Dirk Düngen⁵ Christoph Herrmann-Lingen^{6,4} Martin Halle² Burkert Pieske⁷ Frank Edelmann^{1,4,*}

¹Department of Cardiology, University of Göttingen, Robert-Koch-Str. 40, D-37075, Göttingen, Germany

²Department of Prevention, Rehabilitation and Sports Medicine, Munich & German Centre for Cardiovascular Research (DZHK), Partner Site Munich Heart Alliance, Technische Universität München, Georg-Brauchle-Ring 56 (Campus C), D-80992, Munich, Germany

³Institute for Epidemiology and Biometry, University of Würzburg, Sanderring 2, D-97070, Würzburg, Germany

⁴German Center for Cardiovascular Research Site Göttingen, DZHK, Oudenarder Straße 16, Building D/04 (First Floor), 13347, Berlin, Germany

⁵Campus Virchow-Klinikum, Department of Cardiology, Charité-Universitätsmedizin, Augustenburger Platz 1, D-13353, Berlin, Germany

Received: 14 July 2014 Revised: 5 August 2014 Accepted: 5 August 2014 ⁶Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, German Centre for Cardiovascular Research, University of Göttingen, Wilhelmsplatz 1, 37073, Göttingen, Germany

⁷Department of Cardiology, Medical University of Graz, Auenbrugger Platz15, A-8036, Graz, Austria

*Correspondence to: Frank Edelmann, Department of Cardiology, University of Göttingen Robert-Koch-Str. 40, 37075 Göttingen, Germany. Tel: +49-551-3912100, Fax: +49-551-3913354, Email: fedelmann@med.uni-goettingen.de

[†] The first two authors contributed equally to the study.

Abstract

Background The long-term effects of exercise training (ET) in diastolic dysfunction (DD) and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) are unknown. The present study compared the long-term effects of ET on exercise capacity, diastolic function, and quality of life (QoL) in patients with DD vs. HFpEF.

Methods A total of n = 43 patients with asymptomatic DD (n = 19) or HFpEF [DD and New York Heart Association (NYHA) \geq II, n = 24] and left ventricular ejection fraction \geq 50% performed a combined endurance/resistance training over 6 months (2–3/week) on top of usual care. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing, echocardiography, and QoL were obtained at baseline and follow-up.

Results Patients were 62 ± 8 years old (37% female). In the HFpEF group, 67% of patients were in NYHA class II (33% in NYHA III). Exercise capacity (peak oxygen consumption, peak VO₂) differed at baseline (DD 29.2 ± 8.7 mL/min/kg vs. HFpEF 17.8 ± 4.6 mL/min/kg; P = 0.004). After 6 months, peak VO₂ increased significantly (P < 0.044) to 19.7 ± 5.8 mL/min/kg in the HFpEF group and also in the DD group (to 32.8 ± 8.5 mL/min/kg; P < 0.002) with no overall difference between the groups (P = 0.217). E/e' ratio (left ventricular filling index) decreased from 12.2 ± 3.5 to 10.1 ± 3.0 (P < 0.002) in patients with HFpEF and also in patients with DD (10.7 ± 3.1 vs. 9.5 ± 2.3 ; P = 0.03; difference between groups P = 0.210). In contrast, left atrial volume index decreased in the HFpEF group (P < 0.001) but remained stable within the DD group (difference between groups P = 0.015). After 6 months, physical QoL (Minnesota living with heart failure Questionnaire, 36-item short form health survey), general health perception, and 9-item patient health questionnaire score only improved in HFpEF (P < 0.05). In contrast, vitality improved in both groups (difference between groups P = 0.708).

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

Conclusion A structured 6 months ET programme effectively improves exercise capacity and diastolic function in patients with DD and overt HFpEF. Therefore, controlled lifestyle modification with physical activity is effective both in DD and HFpEF.

Keywords Diastolic dysfunction; Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; Exercise training

Introduction

The prevalence of diastolic dysfunction (DD) is common in elderly subjects and in patients with left ventricular hypertrophy, arterial hypertension, valvular disease, coronary artery disease, and/or diabetes mellitus. For the diagnosis of DD, evidence of slow left ventricular relaxation, abnormal left ventricular filling, reduced diastolic distensibility, or increased left ventricular stiffness is required.¹⁻³ Even in an asymptomatic stage, patients with DD are characterized by reduced exercise capacity and are at risk for the development of heart failure (HF).1 However, despite impaired diastolic function that is also a diagnostic cornerstone for the classification of patients with HF with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), the diagnostic finding of DD does not surely imply the presence of HF symptoms.⁴ HF is continuing to be a major health problem in our society,⁵ and the prevalence of the subgroup with normal or preserved left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), termed HFpEF, accounts for more than 50% within the HF population.⁶⁻⁸ Morbidity and mortality in patients suffering from HFpEF are comparable with HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF).^{6,9-11} However, although the therapy of HFrEF occurs on the basis of evidence, the management of HFpEF is still challenging, because large trials failed to improve morbidity and outcome in this condition.^{4,12,13}

Exercise training (ET) has become an accepted additional therapeutic option for patients suffering from HFrEF. Numerous trials have determined that ET is associated with an improvement of exercise tolerance and quality of life (QoL),¹⁴⁻²⁰ and the large HF-ACTION study could show that ET positively affects morbidity and mortality in patients with adequate long-term adherence to the intervention.²¹ In contrast, only a few single centre trials 14,22,23 and one multi-centre randomized controlled trial (RCT) ¹⁰ investigated an exercise intervention in patients with HFpEF and demonstrated an improvement of exercise capacity, diastolic function or musculoskeletal function, and QoL. In contrast, only a small number of single centre trials demonstrated an improvement of exercise capacity $^{24-26}$ and the potential to reverse a left ventricular DD 25 as a result of ET in patients suffering from asymptomatic DD.

The present ancillary sub-study of the Exercise Training in Diastolic Heart Failure – Pilot Study (Ex-DHF-P)

Methods

We performed a prospective multi-centre controlled, parallelgroup trial in patients suffering from DD or HFpEF, as an ancillary sub-study of the Ex-DHF-P trial, whose results were already published.¹⁰ Structured long-term endurance and resistance training on top of UC was tested.

Patient population

Outpatients with New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional class I (DD), II, or III (HFpEF) at an age of \geq 45 years were prospectively included if they had a preserved left ventricular systolic function (LVEF ≥50%), echocardiographically determined DD (grade ≥ 1), and sinus rhythm. Patients of the Ex-DHF-P study,¹⁰ who were randomized to ET and agreed to perform 6 months of ET, were included as HFpEF group. Exclusion criteria were significant coronary artery disease (current angina pectoris or ischemia on stress test, untreated coronary stenosis >50%, and history of myocardial infarction or bypass surgery), diseases with significant impact on exercise performance, that is, musculoskeletal diseases, peripheral arterial obstructive disease, or pulmonary disease (vital capacity and/or forced expiratory volume in 1s <80% of age-dependent predicted value), diseases limiting the validity of consent (psychiatric diseases, dementia, etc.), changes in concomitant cardiovascular medication within the last 2 weeks prior the randomization, and participation in another study within the last 30 days.

Patients were recruited at three university hospitals in Germany (Goettingen, Munich, and Berlin). The German Health Authorities and the Ethics Committees at each centre approved the study. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients before any study-related procedure was performed.

Exercise training and usual care

Patients with DD and HFpEF participated in a combined endurance and resistance training of 6 months in addition to UC. Throughout the first 3 months, ET was performed in a supervised method. During weeks 1 through 4, endurance training (two times per week) of increasing intensity and duration (from 10 to 20 min) was performed. Training intensity was adapted individually to a target heart rate of 50–60% of peak oxygen uptake (peak VO₂) during baseline spiroergometry. From week 5 onward, weekly training frequencies and duration were increased (three times per week, from 20 to 35 min), and workload was increased to a target heart rate of 60–70% of peak VO₂. Also starting at the fifth week, resistance training was added three times per week. Resistance training was performed for 15 repetitions per exercise per session at a workload corresponding to 60% of the one repetition maximum measured at the end of week 4. During weeks 8 and 12, weekly training duration of endurance training was increased (from 30 to 35 min), and workload was increased to a target heart rate of 65–70% of peak VO₂. Also starting at week 8, resistance training was performed for 2×15 repetitions per exercise per session (60% one repetition maximum).

Safety parameters (blood pressure and heart rate) and training intensity and attendance at training sessions were documented in a patient physical activity diary. All patients were on UC for DD and HFpEF and concomitant diseases, which remained unchanged during the trial.

Clinical assessment

At baseline and at the 3 and 6 months follow-up, patients underwent physical examination, echocardiography, cardiopulmonary exercise testing, blood sampling, and 6-min walk test. QoL was measured by the 36-item short form health survey (SF-36), the Minnesota living with HF Questionnaire (MLWHFQ), and the patients health questionnaire—depression module (PHQ-9).

Patients performed symptom-limited cardiopulmonary exercise testing on a bicycle ergometer, beginning at a workload of 20 W and increasing stepwise at 20 W increments every 2 min. A 12-lead electrocardiogram was used continuously. Blood pressure was recorded at rest and every 2 min throughout exercise testing. Cardiopulmonary variables were acquired in 10-s intervals. Exercise was terminated when patients were physically exhausted (by a RER >1.0) or developed severe dyspnoe, dizziness, or peripheral muscle fatigue.

Echocardiographic parameters including tissue Doppler parameters and calculating left ventricular mass index (LVMI) and left atrial volume index (LAVI) were performed according to the recommendations of the American Society of Echocardiography.^{27,28} A detailed standard operating procedure was used to ensure comparable results in all centres. A reference centre performed staff training prior to the trial and supervision and blinded core data evaluation during the trial.

Normal diastolic function was characterized by mitral valve early-to-late peak filling velocity ratio $(E/A) \ge 1$ and at least two of the following criteria: pulmonary venous peak systolic-to-diastolic velocity ratio $(S/D) \ge 1$, mitral valve peak early filling velocity to mitral annular velocity ratio (E/e') < 10, and preserved $E/A \ge 1$ during performance of a Valsalva manoeuvre. Grade I DD was defined by a delayed relaxation pattern (E/A < 1). Grade II DD was diagnosed if

 $E/A \ge 1$ and <2 and at least two of the following conditions were met: S/D < 1, $E/e' \ge 10$, and $E/A_{Valsalva} < 1$. Grade III DD was defined as $E/A \ge 2$ and $E/e' \ge 15$. For determination of diastolic function and calculation of E/e' ratio, the mitral annular velocity of the medial (septal) mitral annulus velocity was used.²⁹

Endpoints of the study

Endpoints of the study were the change in maximum exercise capacity (peak VO₂) at 3 and 6 months compared with baseline in any group and also between the groups at different time points. Further endpoints included the change in echocardiographic parameters of systolic and diastolic function (E/e', e' medial, S/D, and LVEF) and of left ventricular and atrial remodelling (LVMI, LAVI, and left ventricular volume index). Furthermore, they included changes in additional parameters of exercise capacity (maximum workload, anaerobic threshold, and workload at anaerobic threshold, heart rate during exercise, and systolic blood pressure) and QOL (SF-36, MLWHFQ, and PHQ-9).

Statistical analysis

Data were shown as mean \pm standard deviation. Differences between asymptomatic (NYHA I; DD) and symptomatic patients (NYHA II/III; HFpEF) at different time points were compared by using the *t*-test for continuous data and using the Fisher's exact test for dichotomous data or the χ^2 test for categorical data. Changes within groups from baseline to follow-up were assessed by the *t*-test for paired variables. Analysis of covariance with the follow-up measurement as dependent variable and baseline measurement as covariate was applied for all comparisons between the groups. Analyses were performed according to intent-to-treat principle. SPSS version 17.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was the software used for statistical analyses.

Results

Study sample

A total of n = 43 patients with asymptomatic (NYHA I; n = 19; DD) or with symptomatic (NYHA II/III; n = 24; HFpEF) DD and preserved LVEF (>50%) were prospectively included to perform a combined endurance and resistance training over 6 months in addition to UC.

The baseline data were summarized in *Table 1*. At baseline age, female gender, body mass index, LVEF, blood pressure, heart rate, and medication were not different between patients

	Table 1	Demographic data,	physica	examination and	medical histor	y at baseline
--	---------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	----------------	---------------

Variable	All subjects (n = 43)	DD (<i>n</i> = 19)	HFpEF (<i>n</i> = 24)	Difference between groups (<i>P</i> -value)
Female	16 (37%)	7 (37%)	9 (38%)	0.965
Age (years)	62 ± 8	61 ± 8	62 ± 7	0.526
General examination				
Body mass index (kg/m²)	31 ± 5	31 ± 5	31 ± 6	0.776
Waist/hip ratio	0.95 ± 0.07	0.95 ± 0.08	0.96 ± 0.06	0.755
Heart rate (beats/min)	67 ± 8	69 ± 7	65 ± 9	0.168
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	145 ± 16	143 ± 16	148 ± 15	0.304
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	86 ± 9	89 ± 9	84 ± 9	0.084
Characterization of heart failure				а
	19 (44%)	19 (100%)	0 (0%)	
	16 (37%)	0 (0%)	16 (67%)	
	8 (19%)	0 (0%)	8 (33%)	
Orthopnea	7 (16%)	0 (0%)	7 (29%)	0.012
Paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea	4 (9%)	0 (0%)	4 (17%)	0.118
Peripheral edema	11 (26%)	4 (21%)	7 (29%)	0.728
Nocturia	28 (65%)	14 (74%)	14 (58%)	0.349
Left ventricular ejection fraction (%)	67 ± 6	68 ± 5	67 ± 8	0.695
Medication				
ACE inhibitor and/or AT1 recentor antagonist	27 (63%)	13 (68%)	14 (58%)	0 542
Beta-blocker	15 (35%)	4 (21%)	11 (46%)	0.116
Diuretics	17 (40%)	8 (42%)	9 (38%)	1 000
Dials farstance	17 (1070)	0 (12 /0)	5 (5070)	1.000
RISK factors Overweight (he dy mass index $> 2E \log (m^2)$)	20 (010/)	10 (050/)	21 (000/)	0.619
Diabatas mallitus	29 (91%) 1 (20/)	10 (95%)	21 (00%)	1 000
Diabetes mellitus	T (2%)	17 (0.0%)	1 (470)	0.427
Hypertension	20 (04%) 22 (54%)	0 (47%)	19 (79%)	0.457
Ever smoked	23 (34%)	ラ (47 %) フ (270/)	14 (30%)	0.547
Number of present risk factors	24 (30 %)	7(37/0) 27+09	30 ± 00	0.034
Number of present lisk factors	2.3 ± 0.9	2.7 ± 0.9	J.0 ± 0.9	0.203

Values in bold have reached the significance level 0.05.

DD, diastolic dysfunction; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; AT, angiotensin; NYHA, New York Heart Association.

Values are n, frequency (%), or mean \pm standard deviation.

^aExistence of NYHA class II or III (HFpEF) was a definition criterion.

suffering from HFpEF and patients with asymptomatic DD. Overall, 69% of patients were in DD grade I, 31% in grade II or III. Furthermore, there were no relevant differences with statistical significance between DD and HFpEF group regarding cardiovascular risk factors.

A total of 37% (n = 16) of all patients were female, and the mean age was 62 ± 8 years. A total of 67% of patients suffering from HFpEF were in NYHA class II and 33% of them were in NYHA class III. Peak VO₂ was significantly different (DD: $29.2 \pm 8.7 \text{ mL/kg/min}$ vs. HFpEF: 17.8 ± 4.6 ; P < 0.001), and generally, patients with HFpEF were associated with much lower exercise capacity [maximum work load and exercise duration, anaerobic threshold (ATVO₂), and workload at ATVO₂, VE_{max}, all P < 0.01], lower e' medial (P = 0.005), and higher values of LAVI (P = 0.006), compared with patients with DD. Patients with HFpEF also demonstrated impaired self-reported physical functioning (SF-36 physical functioning and MLWHFQ physical limitation scale, all $P \le 0.01$), impaired MLWHFQ total scale (P = 0.019), and higher values of PHQ-9 (P = 0.036) than those with asymptomatic DD.

Clinical and cardiac effects of exercise training

Exercise training significantly improved exercise capacity, diastolic function, and QoL in patients with DD and HFpEF. The results are shown in detail in *Tables 2, 3*, and *4*.

There was a significant increase in peak VO₂ in the HFpEF group from baseline to the 3 months follow-up. In the DD group, peak VO₂ did not change from baseline to the 3 months follow-up, but there was a significant increase between the 3 months and the 6 months follow-up. Generally, we observed a significant increase in peak VO₂ in both groups after 6 months (*Figure 1*).

Anaerobic threshold increased also in both groups: there was a significant increase in $ATVO_2$ in the HFpEF group from baseline to the 3 months follow-up. There was no increase in $ATVO_2$ in the DD group from baseline to the 3 months follow-up, but we observed a significant change in $ATVO_2$ between the 3 months and the 6 months follow-up and between baseline and the 6 months follow-

Table 2 Cardiopulmonary exercise testing data during follow-up
--

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
Peak VO ₂ (mL/min/kg)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	$\begin{array}{c} 17.8 \pm 4.6 \\ 20.6 \pm 5.5 \\ 19.7 \pm 5.8 \end{array}$	29.2 ± 8.7 29.8 ± 8.3 32.8 ± 8.5	<i>P</i> < 0.001
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	2.8 (1.5 to 4.0) <i>P</i> < 0.001	0.5 (-0.6 to 1.6) P = 0.331	<i>P</i> = 0.009
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-0.9 (-2.9 to 1.1) P = 0.360 1.9 (0.1 to 3.7) P = 0.044	$\begin{array}{l} 3.0 \ (0.7 \ \text{to} \ 5.3) \\ P = 0.013 \\ 3.5 \ (1.5 \ \text{to} \ 5.5) \\ P = 0.002 \end{array}$	P = 0.010
Maximum workload (W)	7 - 0.077	7 - 0.002	7 = 0.217
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	135.2 ± 36 149.5 ± 39 142.9 ± 35	176.7 ± 45 174.4 ± 44 184.4 ± 48	<i>P</i> = 0.004
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	14.3 (5.6 to 23.0) P = 0.003 -6.7 (-18.3 to 5.0) P = 0.246 7.6 (-7.5 to 22.7) P = 0.305	-2.2 (-11.8 to 7.4) P = 0.631 10.0 (1.5 to 18.5) P = 0.024 7.8 (-5.5 to 21.1) P = 0.233	P = 0.011 P = 0.021 P = 0.987
Maximum exercise time (s)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	753 ± 216 823 ± 231 809 ± 209	1037 ± 290 1021 ± 279 1088 ± 288	<i>P</i> = 0.002
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	70 (30 to 109) P = 0.002 -14 (-82 to 53) P = 0.664 55 (-31 to 141) P = 0.195	-16 (-73 to 41) $P = 0.556$ $67 (22 to 112)$ $P = 0.006$ $51 (-29 to 130)$ $P = 0.198$	P = 0.014 P = 0.045 P = 0.934
Anaerobic threshold VO2 (ml/min/kg)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	11.0 ± 3.1 14.3 ± 4.3 12.8 ± 5.3	23.3 ± 7.3 22.7 ± 7.4 27.4 ± 7.9	<i>P</i> < 0.001
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	3.3 (2.1 to 4.6) P < 0.001 -1.5 (-3.8 to 0.7) P = 0.171 1.8 (-0.1 to 3.7) P = 0.065	-0.6 (-2.3 to 1.1) $P = 0.446$ 4.7 (1.5 to 7.9) P = 0.006 4.1 (1.5 to 6.6) P = 0.004	<i>P</i> < 0.001 <i>P</i> = 0.002 <i>P</i> = 0.142
Workload at anaerobic threshold (W)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	73.8 ± 25.4 93.0 ± 32.6 79.7 ± 32.3	$\begin{array}{c} 137.2 \pm 47.9 \\ 125.6 \pm 42.0 \\ 155.4 \pm 45.1 \end{array}$	<i>P</i> < 0.001
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	19.2 (10 to 28) <i>P</i> < 0.001	-11.6 (-23.7 to 0.5) P = 0.059	P<0.001
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	-13.3 (-27 to 1) P = 0.059 5.9 (-7 to 19)	29.9 (15.1 to 44.7) P = 0.001 18.3 (3.7 to 32.9)	<i>P</i> < 0.001

(Continues)

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
	<i>P</i> = 0.351	<i>P</i> = 0.017	<i>P</i> = 0.191
VE (maximal)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	58.1 ± 14.3 62.8 ± 14.1 58.7 ± 13.2	85.1 ± 32.2 96.7 ± 36.0 89.9 ± 25.3	<i>P</i> = 0.001
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	4.7 (0.6 to 8.7)	11.7 (0.8 to 22.5)	0.0046
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.025 -4.1 (-9.7 to 1.4)	P = 0.036 -6.8 (-18.8 to 5.1)	P = 0.216
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.137 0.5 (-4.1 to 5.1)	P = 0.244 4.8 (-3.3 to 13.0) P = 0.228	P = 0.671
VE/VCO ₂ slope	F = 0.815	F = 0.228	P = 0.322
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	28.5 ± 2.7 28.4 ± 3.6 28.0 ± 4.2	27.1 ± 4.0 26.1 ± 2.4 26.4 ± 3.6	<i>P</i> = 0.212
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-0.1 (-1.3 to 1.1)	-1.0 (-2.6 to 0.7)	D 0 200
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.862 -0.4 (-2.3 to 1.5)	P = 0.248 0.3 (-1.7 to 2.3)	P = 0.389
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.663 -0.5 (-2.7 to 1.7) P = 0.633	P = 0.731 -0.6 (-2.7 to 1.5) P = 0.537	P = 0.580 P = 0.932
Heart rate (min) (beats/min)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	70 ± 13 72 ± 12 74 ± 9	81 ± 9 76 ± 8 73 ± 10	<i>P</i> = 0.003
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	2 (-2 to 6)	-5 (-10 to -1)	D 0.047
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.281 2 (-4 to 7) P = 0.560	P = 0.031 -3 (-9 to 3)	P = 0.017
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.569 4 (-1 to 9) P = 0.156	P = 0.285 -8 (-14 to -2) P = 0.009	P = 0.241 P = 0.003
Heart rate (maximal) (beats/min)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	133 ± 19 135 ± 19 133 ± 21	149 ± 22 153 ± 16 152 ± 19	<i>P</i> = 0.019
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	3 (-4 to 9)	4 (-4 to 12)	P - 0 767
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-3 (-10 to 5)	-1 (-6 to 5)	R = 0.705
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.469 0 (-5 to 5) P = 1.000	P = 0.733 3 (-6 to 12) P = 0.480	P = 0.703 P = 0.530
Resting RR sys			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	131.6 ± 23.6 122.8 ± 17.2 115.4 ± 21.1	140.8 ± 20.1 134.2 ± 14.7 130.6 ± 20.4	<i>P</i> = 0.196
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-8.8 (-20.4 to 2.7)	-6.7 (-16.2 to 2.8)	0.0700
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.127 -7.4 (-18.1 to 3.3) P = 0.166	P = 0.157 -3.6 (-10.8 to 3.6) P = 0.303	P = 0.766 $P = 0.545$

(Continues)

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

Table 2. (Continued)

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	−16.2 (−30.7 to −1.7) <i>P</i> = 0.031	-10.3 (-20 to -0.6) P = 0.039	<i>P</i> = 0.499
Maximal RR sys			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	191.6 ± 19.6 190.3 ± 24.3 167.3 ± 33.6	$221.1 \pm 22.5 \\ 221.4 \pm 22.5 \\ 218.9 \pm 24.4$	<i>P</i> < 0.001
Change	1 2 (10 6 to 8 0)	$0.2(0.5 \pm 0.10.1)$	
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.776 -23.0 (-39.2 to -6.8)	P = 0.953 -2.5 (-12.2 to 7.2)	<i>P</i> = 0.809
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	<i>P</i> = 0.008 -24.3 (-38.8 to -9.8) <i>P</i> = 0.002	P = 0.594 -2.2 (-13.7 to 9.3) P = 0.689	P = 0.036 P = 0.017

Values in bold have reached the significance level 0.05. HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; DD, diastolic dysfunction; FU, follow-up; BL, baseline; peak VO2, peak oxygen up-take; VE_{max}, maximal pulmonary ventilation; VE/VCO2 slope, ventilator equivalent ratio for carbon dioxide; RR, blood pressure; SD, stan-dard deviation.

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
E/e' ratio			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	12.2 ± 3.5 10.0 ± 2.4 10.1 ± 3.0	$10.7 \pm 3.1 \\ 9.4 \pm 2.3 \\ 9.5 \pm 2.3$	<i>P</i> = 0.129
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	−2.3 (−3.4 to −1.1) P < 0 001	−1.3 (−2.2 to −0.4) P = 0 009	P = 0.184
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	0.2 (-0.8 to 1.1)	0.2 (-0.6 to 1.0)	, 0.101
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.729 -2.1 (-3.3 to -0.9)	P = 0.638 -1.1 (-2.1 to -0.1)	P = 0.977
	<i>P</i> = 0.002	<i>P</i> = 0.029	<i>P</i> = 0.210
e' medial (cm/s)			
Baseline (mean \pm SD) 3 months FU (mean \pm SD) 6 months FU (mean \pm SD)	5.9 ± 1.3 6.8 ± 1.4 6.8 ± 1.4	6.9 ± 1.0 7.2 ± 1.2 7.4 ± 1.5	<i>P</i> = 0.005
Change			
BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	0.9 (0.5 to 1.3)	0.3 (-0.1 to 0.8)	P = 0.052
3months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	0.0 (-0.3 to 0.3)	0.2 (-0.3 to 0.7)	F = 0.052
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.888 0.9 (0.4 to 1.4)	P = 0.389 0.5 (0.1 to 1.0)	P = 0.516
	<i>P</i> = 0.001	<i>P</i> = 0.030	<i>P</i> = 0.232
S/D ratio			
Baseline (mean \pm SD) 3 months FU (mean \pm SD) 6 months FU (mean \pm SD)	1.42 ± 0.47 1.34 ± 0.28 1.40 ± 0.30	$\begin{array}{c} 1.34 \pm 0.48 \\ 1.45 \pm 0.68 \\ 1.35 \pm 0.38 \end{array}$	<i>P</i> = 0.558
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-0.09 (-0.29 to 0.11) P = 0.375	0.11 (-0.30 to 0.53) P = 0.577	<i>P</i> = 0.373
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	0.06 (-0.07 to 0.19)	-0.10 (-0.44 to 0.25)	0.000
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.357 -0.03 (-0.22 to 0.17)	0.02 (-0.20 to 0.23)	r = 0.385

(Continues)

ESC Heart Failure 2014; 1: 59–74 DOI: 10.1002/2055-5822.12007

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

Table 3. (Continued)

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
	<i>P</i> = 0.777	<i>P</i> = 0.877	<i>P</i> = 0.758
LVEF			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	67 ± 8 68 ± 6 68 ± 6	68 ± 5 67 ± 7 69 ± 5	<i>P</i> = 0.695
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	1 (–4 to 5) P = 0 680	-1 (-4 to 2) P = 0.544	P = 0 526
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	0 (-4 to 4) P = 0.981	P = 0.344 2 (-1 to 5) P = 0.149	P = 0.355
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	1 (-3 to 4) P = 0.610	P = 0.149 1 (-2 to 4) P = 0.449	P = 0.901
Left atrial volume index (ml/m ²)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	30.0 ± 7.9 26.3 ± 6.7 25.1 ± 8.7	23.5 ± 6.2 23.2 ± 6.3 22.8 ± 5.8	<i>P</i> = 0.006
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	−3.7 (−5.5 to −1.9) <i>P</i> < 0.001	-0.4 (-2.3 to 1.6) P = 0.694	<i>P</i> = 0.013
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-1.2 (-3.5 to 1.0) P = 0.273	-0.3 (-2.7 to 2.0) P = 0.764	P = 0.577
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	-4.9 (-6.7 to -3.2) <i>P</i> < 0.001	-0.7 (-4.0 to 2.5) P = 0.651	<i>P</i> = 0.015
Left ventricular volume index (ml/m²)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	41.7 ± 15.5 43.0 ± 13.8 39.7 ± 13.4	53.0 ± 23.9 48.7 ± 18.0 47.9 ± 22.6	<i>P</i> = 0.100
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	1.3 (-4.7 to 7.4) P = 0.646	-4.3 (-12.1 to 3.4) P=0.252	<i>P</i> = 0.231
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-3.3 (-8 to 1.4) P = 0.159	-0.8 (-7.1 to 5.5) P = 0.790	<i>P</i> = 0.511
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	-1.9 (-6 to 2.1) P = 0.333	-5.1 (-13.4 to 3.1) P = 0.206	<i>P</i> = 0.470
LVMI (g/m ²)			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	$\begin{array}{c} 108.8 \pm 21.2 \\ 113.1 \pm 30.2 \\ 116.3 \pm 29.0 \end{array}$	118.3 ± 22.7 108.4 ± 22.1 116.9 ± 20.3	<i>P</i> = 0.169
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	4.3 (-7.5 to 16.2) P = 0.455	−9.9 (−16.5 to −3.2) P = 0.006	<i>P</i> = 0.037
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	3.2 (-9.3 to 15.7) P = 0.603	8.5 (1.9 to 15.1) P = 0.015	P = 0.440
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	7.5 (-4.6 to 19.6) P = 0.211	-1.4 (-10.4 to 7.7) P = 0.755	P = 0.228

Values in bold have reached the significance level 0.05.

HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; DD, diastolic dysfunction; FU, follow-up; BL, baseline; E/e', mitral wave peak early filling velocity to (medial) mitral annular velocity ratio; e' medial, mitral annular velocity of the medial mitral annulus; S/D ratio, pulmonary venous peak systolic-to-diastolic velocity ratio; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVMI, left ventricular mass index.

up. Furthermore, we recognized a significant increase of VE_{max} after 3 months of ET in both groups.

The E/e' ratio improved significantly in the HFpEF and the DD group between baseline and the 3 months follow-up and

between baseline and the 6 months follow-up (*Figure 2*). There was also a significant increase of e' medial in the HFpEF group from baseline to 3 months follow-up. In the DD group, there was only a trend towards higher values

Table 4 Quality of life data during follow-up

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
MLWHFQ Total scale			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	22 ± 20 16 ± 19 18 ± 19	10 ± 9 7 ± 9 7 ± 7	<i>P</i> = 0.019
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-6 (-10 to -1) $P = 0.020$ $1 (-2 to 5)$ $P = 0.457$ $-4 (-8 to 0)$ $P = 0.040$	-3 (-6 to 1) P = 0.166 0 (-3 to 3) P = 0.982 -3 (-5 to 1) P = 0.101	P = 0.300 P = 0.575 P = 0.487
Physical limitation scale			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	$12.8 \pm 10.5 \\ 8.8 \pm 9.0 \\ 8.8 \pm 9.4$	5.4 ± 5.7 3.5 ± 3.8 3.5 ± 4.1	<i>P</i> = 0.008
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-4.0 (-6.7 to -1.4) $P = 0.005$ $0.0 (-1.9 to 2.0)$ $P = 0.966$ $-4.0(-6.5 to -1.5)$ $P = 0.003$	-1.9 (-3.8 to 0.0) P = 0.054 0.0 (-1.6 to 1.6) P = 1.000 -1.9 (-4.0 to 0.2) P = 0.069	P = 0.182 P = 0.973 P = 0.187
Emotional limitation scale			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	3.2 ± 5.2 3.2 ± 5.9 3.5 ± 5.3	2.4 ± 2.6 2.1 ± 3.1 1.8 ± 2.5	<i>P</i> = 0.540
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI)) SF 36	0.0 (-1.3 to 1.2) P = 0.986 0.3 (-0.6 to 1.2) P = 0.491 0.3 (-0.7 to 1.3) P = 0.567	-0.3 (-1.6 to 1.0) P = 0.636 -0.3 (-1.1 to 0.4) P = 0.380 -0.6 (-1.9 to 0.6) P = 0.307	P = 0.739 P = 0.273 P = 0.246
Physical functioning			
Baseline (mean \pm SD) 3 months FU (mean \pm SD) 6 months FU (mean \pm SD)	66 ± 24 77 ± 22 77 ± 21	82 ± 13 88 ± 12 86 ± 15	<i>P</i> = 0.010
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	11 (3 to 19) P = 0.010	5 (2 to 9) P = 0.006	<i>P</i> = 0.228
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	0 (-4 to 4) P = 0.813	-1 (-5 to 2) P = 0.438	P = 0.740
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	11 (4 to 17) P = 0.002	4 (0 to 8) P = 0.074	P = 0.086
Role limitations due to physical problems			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	69 ± 38 71 ± 43 74 ± 40	86 ± 22 91 ± 18 92 ± 15	<i>P</i> = 0.115

(Continues)

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology. ESC Heart Failure 2014; 1: 59–74 DOI: 10.1002/2055-5822.12007

68

Table 4. (Continued)

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	2 (-15 to 19)	5 (-8 to 18)	
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	<i>P</i> = 0.799 3 (-6 to 13)	<i>P</i> = 0.456 2 (-7 to 11)	<i>P</i> = 0.799
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.503 5 (-12 to 22) P = 0.534	P = 0.718 6 (-7 to 20) P = 0.333	P = 0.804 P = 0.920
Bodily pain	7 - 0.554	7 - 0.555	7 - 0.520
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	62 ± 31 69 ± 32 70 ± 30	81 ± 26 80 ± 20 84 ± 23	<i>P</i> = 0.040
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl)) 3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	6 (-3 to 16) P = 0.189 2 (-8 to 11)	-1 (-13 to 10) P = 0.842 4 (-6 to 14)	<i>P</i> = 0.309
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.732 8 (0 to 16) P = 0.055	<i>P</i> = 0.393 3 (-14 to 20) <i>P</i> = 0.721	P = 0.710 P = 0.575
General health perceptions			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	58 ± 20 68 ± 19 65 ± 18	61 ± 21 67 ± 21 64 ± 19	<i>P</i> = 0.583
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	10 (5 to 16) P = 0 001	6 (-4 to 15) P = 0 216	P = 0.361
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-4 (-8 to 0) P = 0.059	-3 (-10 to 4) P = 0.404	P = 0.797
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	7 (2 to 12) P = 0.012	3 (-3 to 8) P = 0.290	<i>P</i> = 0.287
Vitality			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	53 ± 23 56 ± 23 60 ± 22	60 ± 17 64 ± 17 68 ± 14	<i>P</i> = 0.279
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	3 (-3 to 10) P = 0 301	5 (-3 to 13) P = 0.215	P = 0.764
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	4 (0 to 8) P = 0.039	4 (-2 to 9) P = 0.159	P = 0.983
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	7 (1 to 13) P = 0.018	9 (4 to 14) P = 0.002	P = 0.708
Social functioning			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	71 ± 29 81 ± 29 84 ± 27	86 ± 21 85 ± 16 91 ± 12	<i>P</i> = 0.069
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	10 (2 to 18)	-1 (-9 to 8)	R - 0 071
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.023 3 (-4 to 9) P = 0.396	F = 0.871 6 (0 to 12) P = 0.046	F = 0.071
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	13 (5 to 20) P = 0.003	5 (-2 to 12) P = 0.134	P = 0.163
Role limitations due to emotional problems			
Baseline (mean \pm SD)	72 ± 36	88 ± 30	<i>P</i> = 0.153

(Continues)

© 2014 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology.

Exercise training in DD and HFpEF

Table 4. (Continued)

Variable	HFpEF	DD	Difference between groups
3 months FU (mean \pm SD) 6 months FU (mean \pm SD)	79 ± 38 79 ± 39	90 ± 29 92 ± 15	
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))	7 (-8 to 22) P = 0.347	2 (-18 to 22) P = 0.827	<i>P</i> = 0.684
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	0 (-4 to 4) P = 1.000	2 (-14 to 19) P = 0.791	P = 0.759
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	7 (-10 to 24) P = 0.396	4 (-9 to 17) P = 0.497	P = 0.783
General mental health			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	64 ± 20 68 ± 24 69 ± 22	74 ± 16 74 ± 15 76 ± 14	<i>P</i> = 0.101
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% Cl))	4 (-2 to 9) P = 0 160	0 (-5 to 5) P = 1 000	P = 0.283
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	1 (-4 to 6)	3 (0 to 6)	R = 0.580
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	5 (-2 to -12) P = 0.135	P = 0.033 3 (-2 to 7) P = 0.190	P = 0.580 P = 0.587
PHQ-9 Total score			
Baseline (mean ± SD) 3 months FU (mean ± SD) 6 months FU (mean ± SD)	7.2 ± 6.5 5.7 ± 5.9 4.8 ± 4.7	3.7 ± 2.6 4.2 ± 3.5 3.7 ± 2.9	<i>P</i> = 0.036
Change BL to 3 months FU (mean (95% CI))			
3 months FU to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	-1.5 (-3 to 0) P = 0.048 0.8 (1.8 to 0.1)	0.6 (-0.3 to 1.4) P = 0.197 0.6 (-1.4 to 0.3)	<i>P</i> = 0.018
BL to 6 months FU (mean (95% CI))	P = 0.079	P = 0.197	<i>P</i> = 0.653
	-2.3 (-4.0 to -0.6) P = 0.009	P = 1.000	<i>P</i> = 0.023

Values in bold have reached the significance level 0.05.

HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; DD, diastolic dysfunction; FU, follow-up; BL, baseline; SF-36, 36-item short form health survey; MLWHFQ, Minnesota living with heart failure questionnaire; PHQ-9, patient health questionnaire—depression module.

of e' medial from baseline to 3 months follow-up and from 3 to 6 months follow-up, but the differences remained statistically insignificant. Generally, e' medial increased significantly in DD and HFpEF group after 6 months of ET.

Furthermore, LAVI decreased significantly in the HFpEF group from baseline to the 3 months follow-up and from baseline to the 6 months follow-up. No improvement of LAVI occurred in the DD group; however, these patients had LAVI values within the upper normal range at baseline (Lang *et al.* 2005) (*Figure 3*). LVEF and left ventricular volume index did not change in neither group. We could not observe any changes of LVMI from baseline to the 6 months follow-up in neither group.

Exercise training also improved physical, mental, and social dimensions of QoL (scores of MLWHFQ and SF-36) in patients with DD and in patients suffering from HFpEF. The MLWHFQ total scale and the MLWHFQ physical limitation scale improved significantly with ET in patients with HFpEF from baseline to the 3 months follow-up and from baseline to the 6 month follow-up. The improvement of MLWHFQ in patients with DD remained statistically insignificant. Furthermore, there was a significant increase of SF-36 physical functioning score in patients suffering from HFpEF from baseline to the 6 months follow-up and in patients with DD from baseline to the 3 months follow-up (Figure 4). Furthermore, the scores of SF-36 general health perceptions, vitality, and social functioning increased significantly in the HFpEF group after 6 months with ET. In the DD group, there was only a significant increase in SF-36 vitality scores from baseline to the 6 months follow-up and in SF-36 social functioning scores from the 3 months to the 6 months follow-up.



Figure 1 In both groups maximal exercise capacity (peak VO₂) was significantly improved after 6 months of exercise training (*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01).



Figure 2 E/e' decreased significantly in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) and in diastolic dysfunction (DD)(*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01).

Also, the PHQ-9 total score improved with ET in patients suffering from HFpEF from baseline to the 3 months and from baseline to the 6 months follow-up significantly, whereas no relevant change occurred in the DD group.

Discussion

In the growing population of elderly people, DD is a frequent finding. Although a present DD does not necessarily imply the consecutive appearance of HF symptoms, DD is linked to the occurrence of HF, and the positive demonstration of DD in HFpEF is a cornerstone in the diagnosis of HFpEF.³ Because morbidity and mortality in HFpEF are high and pharmacological treatment approaches did not show prognostic effectiveness, an early detection of DD and its treatment might be of favour.

The present study investigated for the first time the long-term effects of ET on exercise capacity, diastolic



Figure 3 LAVI decreased significantly in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) (**P < 0.01), but remained unchanged in diastolic dysfunction (DD).



Figure 4 Change of quality of life (SF-36 physical functioning) after exercise training (changes within groups: P < 0.05, P < 0.01).

function, and QoL in patients with asymptomatic DD compared with patients with HFpEF. The training programme was adopted from successfully conducted studies in HFrEF, where ET improved relevant clinical endpoints.¹⁸ Of particular interest and in contrast to other reports, all patients completed the study that is underpinning the long-term feasibility of our training programme. As a result of the ET programme, diastolic function and

exercise capacity improved in both patients with DD and patients with HFpEF. However, although the HFpEF group already showed significant increases of peak VO₂ and ATVO₂ from baseline to the 3 months follow-up, we could first detect a significant increase of peak VO₂ and ATVO₂ in DD group after the 3 months to the 6 months followup. This suggests that lower baseline exercise capacity is related to a quicker response to ET. Also, a differential contribution of peripheral and central factors to exercise limitation at different stages of DD and HFpEF might contribute to the observed time displacement of peak VO_2 increase or diastolic function improvement after ET in our study.^{10,30}

A large number of studies were performed about ET in patients suffering from HFrEF. They could demonstrate an improvement of exercise capacity and of systolic LV function and morphological parameters.^{14–21} Interestingly, also first reports about the beneficial effects of ET also on LV diastolic function were derived from studies performed in HFrEF. Belardinelli *et al.*³¹ established improved left ventricular diastolic filling patterns in 55 consecutive patients suffering from HFrEF after 2 months of supervised ET.³¹ Additionally, the recent Leipzig exercise intervention in chronic heart failure and aging study demonstrated an improvement of left ventricular diastolic function in HFrEF patients regardless of age as a result of 4 weeks supervised endurance training.³²

There is also increasing evidence from studies investigating ET in patients with HFpEF or with asymptomatic DD. Gary et al. ²² and Gary and Lee ²³ tested the effect of 12 weeks ET in older women suffering from HFpEF. Home-based walking improved functional capacity²² and QoL.^{22,23} However, diastolic function was not measured. The single centre, single-blind randomized controlled trial of Kitzman et al.¹⁴ investigated 16 weeks supervised aerobic ET compared with attention control in 46 elderly outpatients with isolated HFpEF and could demonstrate a significant improvement of exercise performance in the ET group. Although diastolic function was measured, the presence of DD was not required as an inclusion criterion, and the authors did not find significant changes in any resting Doppler echocardiography measure.¹⁴ Haykowsky et al.³⁰ compared 4 months ET with attention control in elderly stable compensated HFpEF patients. After ET, they demonstrated a significant improvement of peak VO₂, but changes in DD were not reported. Therefore, our findings are in line with all studies reporting an improvement of exercise performance and add evidence regarding the beneficial long-term effects and the positive impact of ET also on DD.

The effect of ET on diastolic function and exercise capacity in patients with preexisting asymptomatic DD has only been examined in a few trials.^{33,34,24–26} Overall, ET improved exercise tolerance in patients with DD, but the effects of ET on diastolic function were described inconsistently. Yu *et al.* ³³ examined the effect of 8 weeks cardiac rehabilitation and prevention programme compared with conventional therapy on left ventricular diastolic function in patients with coronary heart disease. They could show a significant improvement of LV diastolic parameters towards less severe delayed relaxation in the CRPP group, especially in those patients with abnormal relaxation patterns or recent acute myocardial infarction.

CRPP prevented the progression of resting LV DD.33 Another study investigated the effect of 12 months ET in 48 men with newly onset of type 2 diabetes mellitus. Although peak VO₂ increased significantly, myocardial diastolic tissue velocities did not change.³⁴ In a small nonrandomized pre-post-study, Smart et al. observed the influence of 16 weeks ET on diastolic function, exercise capacity, and QoL in 18 patients with DD and in 22 patients with systolic dysfunction (SD). They demonstrated a similar improvement of peak VO₂ and QoL in patients with DD and those with SD after ET, but they reported no significant effect of ET on left ventricular DD.24 Also, Korzeniowska-Kubacka et al. ²⁶ performed a single centre, nonrandomized study of 48 post-myocardial infarction men with preserved LV function and mild DD (E/e' > 8) could find significantly increased maximal oxygen consumption after 4.5 months of ET. Diastolic function did not change significantly after the training programme (TDI values of the E', A', E/e', and E/A' ratios of all parts of the mitral annulus); only the deceleration time was significantly shorter in the training group. However, the improvement of exercise capacity was greater in patients with a more preserved diastolic function.²⁶ Only one small study of 23 sedentary patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and DD established an improvement of left ventricular diastolic function after 3 months of ET programme compared with a control group. Their results demonstrated that, along with an improvement of VO_{2max}, aerobic ET could potentially reverse left ventricular DD in patients with well-controlled uncomplicated type 2 diabetes mellitus.²⁵ These findings were only in part supported by studies performed in obese persons with DD.35,36 In summary, the evidence regarding the effects of ET on DD is conflicting, and our study adds evidence that ET in both DD and HFpEF can improve diastolic function properties of the left ventricle. Because the impairment of diastolic function is related to the inability to increase cardiac output during exercise, such improvement might be related to the observed exercise capacity.³⁷ In fact, in the Ex-DHF-P study, more than one third of the improvement of peak VO2 was directly explained by the improvement of diastolic function.¹⁰ Improved diastolic function might therefore indicate an improvement of exercise capacity and of subjective well-being and mental and physical aspects of QoL.

Study limitations

We investigated a small number of middle-aged patients; therefore, no assumption could be made about the effects of ET in older and more affected patients. The strict exclusion of relevant co-morbidities may contribute to a limited generalizability of our findings. Although the follow-up period of 6 months is longer than reported in the majority of

Exercise training in DD and HFpEF

former ET trials in DD and HFpEF, no general assumptions about long-term effects can be derived from our trial. Because all of included patients took part in supervised endurance and resistance training sessions on top of UC, no control group with UC alone could be reported.

The associations between changes in outcome parameters, body weight, blood pressure, and other peripheral parameters remain to be addressed. As reported by others, also the potential important contribution of peripheral factors to changes in exercise capacity needs to be investigated in further studies.

Conclusion

A structured long-term combined endurance and resistance ET programme is feasible and effectively improves exercise

References

- 1. Barmeyer A, Müllerleile K, Mortensen K, Meinertz T. Diastolic dysfunction in exercise and its role for exercise capacity. *Heart Fail Rev* 2009;**14**:125–34
- European Study Group on Diastolic Heart Failure. How to diagnose diastolic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 1998;19:990–1003.
- 3. Paulus WJ, Tschöpe C, Sanderson JE, Rusconi C, Flachskampf FA, Rademakers FE, Marino P, Smiseth OA, De Keulenaer G, Leite-Moreira AF, Borbély A, Edes I, Handoko ML, Heymans S, Pezzali N, Pieske B, Dickstein K, Fraser AG, Brutsaert DL. How to diagnose diastolic heart failure: a consensus statement on the diagnosis of heart failure with normal left ventricular ejection fraction by the Heart Failure and Echocardiography Associations of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur Heart J 2007;28:2539–50.
- 4. Edelmann F, Wachter R, Schmidt AG, Kraigher-Krainer E, Colantonio C, Kamke W, Duvinage A, Stahrenberg R, Durstewitz K, Löffler M, Düngen HD, Tschöpe C, Herrmann-Lingen C, Halle M, Hasenfuss G, Gelbrich G, Pieske B, Aldo-DHF Investigators. Effect of spironolactone on diastolic function and exercise capacity in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: the Aldo-DHF randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2013;309:781–91.
- Senni M, Tribouilloy CM, Rodeheffer RJ, Jacobsen SJ, Evans JM, Bailey KR, Redfield MM. Congestive heart failure in the community: trends in incidence and survival in a 10-year period. *Arch Intern Med* 1999;159:29–34.
- Owan TE, Hodge DO, Herges RM, Jacobsen SJ, Roger VL, Redfield MM. Trends in prevalence and outcome of heart failure with

preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2006;**355**:251–259.

- Bhatia RS, Tu JV, Lee DS, Austin PC, Fang J, Haouzi A, Gong Y, Liu PP. Outcome of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in a population-based study. N Engl J Med 2006;355:260–269.
- Bursi F, Weston SA, Redfield MM, Jacobsen SJ, Pakhomov S, Nkomo VT, Meverden RA, Roger VL. Systolic and diastolic heart failure in the community. *JAMA* 2006;**296**:2209–2216.
- Edelmann F, Stahrenberg R, Gelbrich G, Durstewitz K, Angermann CE, Düngen HD, Scheffold T, Zugck C, Maisch B, Regitz-Zagrosek V, Hasenfuss G, Pieske BM, Wachter R. Contribution of comorbidities to functional impairment is higher in heart failure with preserved than with reduced ejection fraction. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2011;100:755–64.
- Edelmann F, Gelbrich G, Düngen HD, Fröhling S, Wachter R, Stahrenberg R, Binder L, Töpper A, Lashki DJ, Schwarz S, Herrmann-Lingen C, Löffler M, Hasenfuss G, Halle M, Pieske B. Exercise training improves exercise capacity and diastolic function in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: results of the Ex-DHF (exercise training in diastolic heart failure) pilot study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;58:1780–91.
- Zile MR, Brutsaert DL. New concepts in diastolic dysfunction and diastolic heart failure: part II: causal mechanisms and treatment. *Circulation* 2002;105:1503– 8.
- Holland DJ, Kumbhani DJ, Ahmed SH, Marwick TH. Effects of treatment on exercise tolerance, cardiac function, and mortality in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. A meta-analysis. J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;57:1676–86.

capacity and diastolic function in patients with DD and manifest HFpEF. Therefore, controlled lifestyle modification with physical activity should be considered as therapeutic option both in DD and HF with preserved ejection.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of interest

None declared.

- Pitt B, Pfeffer MA, Assmann SF, Boineau R, Anand IS, Claggett B, Clausell N, Desai AS, Diaz R, Fleg JL, Gordeev I, Harty B, Heitner JF, Kenwood CT, Lewis EF, O'Meara E, Probstfield JL, Shaburishvili T, Shah SJ, Solomon SD, Sweitzer NK, Yang S, McKinlay SM, TOPCAT Investigators. Spironolactone for heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. N Engl J Med 2014;370:1383–92.
- 14. Kitzman DW, Brubaker PH, Morgan TM, Stewart KP, Little WC. Exercise training in older patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction: a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial. *Circ Heart Fail* 2010;**3**:659–67.
- Smart N. Exercise training for heart failure patients with and without systolic dysfunction: an evidence-based analysis of how patients benefit. *Cardiol Res Pract* 2011. pii: 837238. doi: 10.4061/2011/ 837238.
- 16. Karapolat H, Demir E, Bozkaya YT, Eyigor S, Nalbantgil S, Durmaz B, Zoghi M. Comparison of hospital-based versus home-based exercise training in patients with heart failure: effects on functional capacity, quality of life, psychological symptoms, and hemodynamic parameters. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2009;**98**:635–42.
- 17. Giannuzzi P, Temporelli PL, Corrà U, Tavazzi L, ELVD-CHF Study Group. Antiremodeling effect of long-term exercise training in patients with stable chronic heart failure: results of the exercise in left ventricular dysfunction and chronic heart failure (ELVD-CHF) trial. *Circulation* 2003;**108**:554–9.
- Van Tol BA, Huijsmans RJ, Kroon DW, Schothorst M, Kwakkel G. Effects of exercise training on cardiac performance, exercise capacity and quality of life in patients

with heart failure: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2006;**8**:841–50.

- Bocalini DS, dos Santos L, Serra AJ. Physical exercise improves the functional capacity and quality of life in patients with heart failure. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)* 2008;63:437–42.
- Brubaker PH, Moore JB, Stewart KP, Wesley DJ, Kitzman DW. Endurance exercise training in older patients with heart failure: results from a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial. J Am Geriatr Soc 2009;57:1982–9.
- O'Connor CM, Whellan DJ, Lee KL, Keteyian SJ, Cooper LS, Ellis SJ, Leifer ES, Kraus WE, Kitzman DW, Blumenthal JA, Rendall DS, Miller NH, Fleg JL, Schulman KA, McKelvie RS, Zannad F, Piña IL, HF-ACTION Investigators. Efficacy and safety of exercise training in patients with chronic heart failure: HF-ACTION randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2009;301:1439–50.
- 22. Gary RA, Sueta CA, Dougherty M, Rosenberg B, Cheek D, Preisser J, Neelon V, McMurray R. Home-based exercise improves functional performance and quality of life in women with diastolic heart failure. *Heart Lung* 2004;**33**:210–8.
- Gary R, Lee SY. Physical function and quality of life in older women with diastolic heart failure: effects of a progressive walking program on sleep patterns. *Prog Cardiovasc Nurs* 2007;22:72–80.
- 24. Smart N, Haluska B, Jeffriess L, Marwick TH. Exercise training in systolic and diastolic dysfunction: effects on cardiac function, functional capacity, and quality of life. Am Heart J 2007;153:530–6.
- Brassard P, Legault S, Garneau C, Bogaty P, Dumesnil JG, Poirier P. Normalization of diastolic dysfunction in type 2 diabetics after exercise training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2007;39:1896–901.
- 26. Korzeniowska-Kubacka I, Bilińska M, Michalak E, Kuśmierczyk-Droszcz B, Dobraszkiewicz-Wasilewska B, Piotrowicz R. Influence of exercise training on left ventricular diastolic function and its relationship to exercise capacity in patients after myocardial infarction. *Cardiol J* 2010;17:136–42.
- Cheitlin MD, Armstrong WF, Aurigemma GP, Beller GA, Bierman FZ, Davis JL, Douglas PS, Faxon DP, Gillam LD,

Kimball TR, Kussmaul WG, Pearlman AS, Philbrick JT, Rakowski H, Thys DM, Antman EM, Smith SC Jr, Alpert JS, Gregoratos G, Anderson JL, Hiratzka LF, Hunt SA, Fuster V, Jacobs AK, Gibbons RJ, Russell RO. ACC; AHA; ASE ACC/AHA/ASE 2003 guideline update for the clinical application of echocardiography--summary article: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (ACC/AHA/ASE Committee to Update the 1997 Guidelines for the Clinical Application of Echocar-diography). J Am Coll Cardiol 2003;42:954-70.

- 28. Lang RM, Bierig M, Devereux RB, Flachskampf FA, Foster E, Pellikka PA, Picard MH, Roman MJ, Seward J, Shanewise JS, Solomon SD, Spencer KT, Sutton MS, Stewart WJ, Chamber Quantification Writing Group, American Society of Echocardiography's Guidelines and Standards Committee, European Association of Echocardio graphy. Recommendations for chamber quantification: a report from the American Society of Echocardiography's Guidelines and Standards Committee and the Chamber Quantification Writing Group, developed in conjunction with the European Association of Echocardiography, a branch of the European Society of Cardiology. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2005;18:1440-63.
- 29. Edelmann F, Schmidt AG, Gelbrich G, Binder L, Herrmann-Lingen C, Halle M, Hasenfuss G, Wachter R, Pieske B. Rationale and design of the 'aldosterone receptor blockade in diastolic heart failure' trial: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallel group study to determine the effects of spironolactone on exercise capacity and diastolic function in patients with symptomatic diastolic heart failure (Aldo-DHF). *Eur J Heart Fail* 2010;**12**:874–82.
- 30. Haykowsky MJ, Brubaker PH, Stewart KP, Morgan TM, Eggebeen J, Kitzman DW. Effect of endurance training on the determinants of peak exercise oxygen consumption in elderly patients with stable compensated heart failure

and preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;**60**:120–8.

- Belardinelli R, Georgiou D, Cianci G, Berman N, Ginzton L, Purcaro A. Exercise training improves left ventricular diastolic filling in patients with dilated cardiomyopathy. *Clinical and prognostic implications Circulation* 1995;91:2775–84.
- 32. Sandri M, Kozarez I, Adams V, Mangner N, Höllriegel R, Erbs S, Linke A, Möbius-Winkler S, Thiery J, Kratzsch J, Teupser D, Mende M, Hambrecht R, Schuler G, Gielen S. Age-related effects of exercise training on diastolic function in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: the Leipzig exercise intervention in chronic heart failure and aging (LEICA) diastolic dys-function study. Eur Heart J 2012;33:1758–68.
- 33. Yu CM, Li LS, Lam MF, Siu DC, Miu RK, Lau CP. Effect of a cardiac rehabilitation program on left ventricular diastolic function and its relationship to exercise capacity in patients with coronary heart disease: experience from a randomized, controlled study. Am Heart J 2004;147:e24.
- 34. Loimaala A, Groundstroem K, Rinne M, Nenonen A, Huhtala H, Vuori I. Exercise training does not improve myocardial diastolic tissue velocities in type 2 diabetes. *Cardiovasc Ultrasound* 2007;5:32.
- 35. Baynard T, Carhart RL Jr, Ploutz-Snyder LL, Weinstock RS, Kanaley JA. Shortterm training effects on diastolic function in obese persons with the metabolic syndrome. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;**16**:1277–83.
- 36. Schuster I, Vinet A, Karpoff L, Startun A, Jourdan N, Dauzat M, Nottin S, Perez-Martin A. Diastolic dysfunction and intraventricular dyssynchrony are restored by low intensity exercise training in obese men. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2012;20:134–40.
- 37. Kitzman DW, Higginbotham MB, Cobb FR, Sheikh KH, Sullivan MJ. Exercise intolerance in patients with heart failure and preserved left ventricular systolic function: failure of the Frank-Starling mechanism. J Am Coll Cardiol 1991;17:1065–72.