

# Secondary prevention of ischaemic cardiac events

Apoor Gami

- [Interventions](#)
- [Key points](#)
- [About this condition](#)
- [Updates \(44\)](#)
- [Guidelines \(23\)](#)
- [References](#)
- [Your responses](#)

## Other drugs

### Beta-blockers

In this section:

[Summary](#) | [Benefits](#) | [Harms](#) | [Comment](#)

[Top](#)

#### Summary

##### Mortality

*Compared with placebo* Beta-blockers reduce mortality at 6 weeks to 3 years after MI compared with placebo ( [moderate-quality evidence](#) ).

##### Mortality from heart failure

*Compared with placebo* Beta-blockers may reduce mortality from heart failure in people with left ventricular dysfunction ( [low-quality evidence](#) ).

For GRADE evaluation of interventions for secondary prevention of ischaemic cardiac events, [see table](#).

[Top](#)

#### Benefits

Survival:

We found one systematic review (search date 1993, 26 RCTs, > 24 000 people), which compared oral beta-blockers versus placebo within days or weeks of an acute MI and continued for between 6 weeks and 3 years. [18] Most RCTs followed people for 1 year. The review found that beta-blockers reduced mortality compared with placebo (RR 0.77, 95% CI 0.70 to 0.86). [18]

### **Anginal symptoms:**

We found no systematic review and no good RCTs assessing the antianginal effects of beta-blockers in people after MI. Beta-blockers have been found to be effective in people with stable angina. [See stable angina.](#)

### **Different types of beta-blockers:**

We found one systematic review [19] and one subsequent RCT. The review (search date not reported, 24 RCTs) found no differences between beta-blockers with and without cardioselectivity or membrane stabilising properties, but it raised concerns about the lack of efficacy of beta-blockers with intrinsic sympathomimetic activity in long term management after MI. [19] The subsequent RCT (607 people after MI) found that acebutolol, a beta-blocker with moderate partial agonist activity, decreased mortality at 1 year compared with placebo (AR of death: 6% with acebutolol v 11% with placebo; RR 0.52, 95% CI 0.29 to 0.91). [20]

### **Effects in different subgroups:**

We found one systematic review (search date 1983, 9 RCTs, 13 679 people), which compared beta-blockers versus placebo started more than 24 hours after onset of symptoms of acute MI and continued for 9–24 months. [21] It found that the survival benefits of beta-blockers were similar in men and women. The highest absolute benefit from beta-blockers was found in people over 50 years of age; with a higher heart rate at study entry; with a history of MI, angina pectoris, hypertension, or treatment with digitalis; and with transient signs or symptoms of mechanical or electrical failure in the early phases of MI. [21]

### **In people with left ventricular dysfunction:**

We found one systematic review (search date 2003, 7 RCTs, 12 727 people), which compared the effects of beta-blockers versus placebo in people with left ventricular dysfunction. [22] It found that beta-blockers reduced the risk of death from heart failure compared with placebo, and that the magnitude of benefit was similar for men and women (men: RR 0.66, 95% CI 0.59 to 0.75; women: RR 0.63, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.91). [22] The relative risk of death from heart failure was similar for people with and without diabetes, though absolute benefit is likely to be greater in people with diabetes (without diabetes: RR 0.65, 95% CI 0.57 to 0.74; with diabetes: RR 0.77, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.96; absolute risks not presented). Pooled analysis of studies examining bisoprolol, metoprolol, or carvedilol found that the magnitude of benefit was similar for black and

white people (black people: RR 0.67, 95% CI 0.38 to 1.16; white people: RR 0.63, 95% CI 0.52 to 0.77). However, pooled analysis that included the one identified RCT of bucindolol found that the magnitude of benefit was greater in white people than black people (black people: RR 0.97, 95% CI 0.68 to 1.37; white people: RR 0.69, 95% CI 0.55 to 0.85). [\[22\]](#)

[Top](#)

## Harms

### Beta-blockers versus placebo:

We found one systematic review (search date 2001, 15 RCTs, > 35 000 people) that examined harms of beta-blockers compared with placebo in people with previous MI, heart failure, or hypertension. [\[23\]](#) It found no significant difference between beta-blockers and placebo in depressive symptoms or sexual dysfunction (depressive symptoms: RR 1.12, 95% CI 0.89 to 1.41; sexual dysfunction 1.10, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.25). However, it found a small but significant increase in fatigue with beta-blockers compared with placebo (RR 1.15, 95% CI 1.05 to 1.25). [\[23\]](#)

[Top](#)

## Comment

None.

## References

18. Teo KK, Yusuf S, Furberg CD. Effects of prophylactic antiarrhythmic drug therapy in acute myocardial infarction. *JAMA* 1993;270:1589–1595. Search date 1993; primary sources Medline, hand searches of reference lists, and details of unpublished trials sought from pharmaceutical industry/other investigators. [\[PubMed\]](#)
19. Yusuf S, Peto R, Lewis J, et al. Beta blockade during and after myocardial infarction: an overview of the randomized trials. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 1985;27:335–371. Search date and primary sources not reported. [\[PubMed\]](#)
20. Boissel JP, Leizerovicz A, Picolet H, et al. Secondary prevention after high-risk acute myocardial infarction with low-dose acebutolol. *Am J Cardiol* 1990;66:251–260. [\[PubMed\]](#)
21. The Beta-Blocker Pooling Project Research Group. The Beta-Blocker Pooling Project (BBPP): subgroup findings from randomized trials in post infarction patients. *Eur Heart J* 1988;9:8–16. Search date 1983; primary sources not reported.

22. Shekelle PG, Rich MW, Morton SC, et al. Efficacy of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and beta-blockers in the management of left ventricular systolic dysfunction according to race, gender, and diabetic status: a meta-analysis of major clinical trials. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;41:1529–1538. [\[PubMed\]](#)
23. Ko DT, Hebert PR, Coffey CS, et al. Beta-blocker therapy and symptoms of depression, fatigue, and sexual dysfunction. *JAMA* 2002;288:351–357. [\[PubMed\]](#)