# Perceptions of treatment predict Quality of Life in patients with Implantable Cardioverter defibrillators

ICHIKURA Kanako<sup>1) 2)</sup>, MATSUOKA Shiho<sup>3)</sup>, KOBAYASHI Sayaka<sup>4)</sup>, SUZUKI Tsuyoshi<sup>5)</sup>, NISHIMURA Katsuji<sup>4)</sup>, SHIGA Tsuyoshi<sup>5)</sup>, SUZUKI Shin-ichi<sup>6)</sup>, HAGIWARA Nobuhisa<sup>5)</sup>, ISHIGOOKA Jun<sup>4)</sup>

1) Section of Liaison Psychiatry and Palliative Medicine, Graduate School of Tokyo Medical & Dental University, 2) Research Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 3) Tokyo Women's Medical University, 5 Department of Cardiology, Tokyo Women's Medical University, 6) Faculty of Human Sciences, WASEDA University

CONTACT INFORMATION



### Kanako ICHIKURA

Section of Liaison Psychiatry & Palliative Medicine Tokyo Medical & Dental University (JAPAN) ichikura.lppm@tmd.ac.jp

## Introduction

## Implantable cardioverter defibrillators (ICDs)

- For the prevention of sudden cardiac death in patients with life-threatening ventricular arrhythmias
- > Deliver electrical shocks when arrhythmic event was caused

We also refer to CRT-D (Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy – Defibrillator, pacing machine with defibrillator functioning) recipients as ICD recipients, because they can experience electrical shocks

#### Positive side of ICD treatment

- Improve the rate of survival
- Assist patients' cardiac motion e.t.c.

#### Negative side of ICD treatment

- Cause severe pain when ICD deliver electrical shock
- Be at risk of being infected e.t.c.
- → However, some patients perceive "living with ICD" as positive, other patients perceive it as negative. (Burns et al., 2005; Frizelle et al., 2006)

# Objective

To identify the impact of perceptions about ICD treatment on QOL in Japanese ICD recipients

# Methods

#### **Participants**

221 ICD recipients at Tokyo Women Medical University Hospital between May. 2010 to Mar. 2011. (Cross-sectional study)

#### Measures

 Perceptions of ICD treatment: Perceptions of Implantable cardioverter defibrillators scale (PIS)

(1) Worried about electrical shock
(2) Concerned about limitation of activity or role
(3) Felt released from fear about heart attack or death
(1) Falt it easy to do some activity

★ submitted in Japanese Journal

- QOL: MOS 36-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)
   Subscale PCS(Physical Component Summary) / MCS(Mental Component Summary)
- Patients' Health record: gender, age, family, device, history of ischemic cardiac disease, history of electrical shock, and implanted period

#### Statistic analysis

Hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis were done to rule out the possibility that group differences in out come were due to confounders. Independent variables were chosen based on their hypothetical potential to influence and mediate the relationship between perceptions of ICD treatments and QOL.

# Results

Table1. Patient demographics and clinical characteristics Table2. Relationships between PCS and Perceptions of ICD treatment

N/M (%)/±SD		-			
Male       85       (73.9)         Female       30       (26.1)         Age (years old)       60.8       ±14.1         Family       60.8       ±14.1         Family       93       (80.9)         Living with their family       93       (80.9)         Living alone       22       (19.1)         Background heart disease       30       (26.1)         Myocardial disease       59       (51.3)         Heart failure       43       (37.4)         Device       78       (67.2)         CRT-D       38       (32.8)         History of ICD electrical shock       No       75       (65.2)         Yes       40       (34.8)         Implanted period (years)		n/M	(%)/±SD		
Female       30 (26.1)         Age (years old)       60.8 ±14.1         Family       60.8 ±14.1         Living with their family       93 (80.9)         Living alone       22 (19.1)         Background heart disease       30 (26.1)         Myocardial disease       59 (51.3)         Heart failure       43 (37.4)         Device       1CD         ICD       78 (67.2)         CRT-D       38 (32.8)         History of ICD electrical shock       No         No       75 (65.2)         Yes       40 (34.8)         Implanted period (years)	Gender				
Age (years old)       60.8       ±14.1         Family       93       (80.9)         Living with their family       93       (80.9)         Living alone       22       (19.1)         Background heart disease       30       (26.1)         Myocardial disease       59       (51.3)         Heart failure       43       (37.4)         Device       1CD       78       (67.2)         CRT-D       38       (32.8)         History of ICD electrical shock       No       75       (65.2)         Yes       40       (34.8)         Implanted period (years)       1       1	Male	85	(73.9)		
Family Living with their family 93 (80.9) Living alone 22 (19.1)  Background heart disease Ischemic cardiac disease 30 (26.1) Myocardial disease 59 (51.3) Heart failure 43 (37.4)  Device ICD 78 (67.2) CRT-D 38 (32.8)  History of ICD electrical shock No 75 (65.2) Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	Female	30	(26.1)		
Family Living with their family 93 (80.9) Living alone 22 (19.1)  Background heart disease Ischemic cardiac disease 30 (26.1) Myocardial disease 59 (51.3) Heart failure 43 (37.4)  Device ICD 78 (67.2) CRT-D 38 (32.8)  History of ICD electrical shock No 75 (65.2) Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	Age (years old)				
Living with their family Living alone  Background heart disease Ischemic cardiac disease Ischemic cardiac disease Ischemic family Myocardial disease ICD ICD ICD ICRT-D ICRT-D ISTAN (67.2) CRT-D ISTAN (65.2) Yes IMPlanted period (years)		60.8	±14.1		
Living alone  Background heart disease Ischemic cardiac disease Ischemi	Family				
Background heart disease Ischemic cardiac disease Myocardial disease Heart failure  ICD T8 CRT-D T8 G67.2) CRT-D T8 G65.2) Yes UD T9	Living with their family	93	(80.9)		
Ischemic cardiac disease 30 (26.1) Myocardial disease 59 (51.3) Heart failure 43 (37.4)  Device ICD 78 (67.2) CRT-D 38 (32.8)  History of ICD electrical shock No 75 (65.2) Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	Living alone	22	(19.1)		
Myocardial disease Heart failure  Jevice ICD T8 CRT-D 38 (37.4)  History of ICD electrical shock No Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	Background heart disease				
Heart failure 43 (37.4)  Device  ICD 78 (67.2)  CRT-D 38 (32.8)  History of ICD electrical shock  No 75 (65.2)  Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	Ischemic cardiac disease	30	(26.1)		
Device       78       (67.2)         ICD       78       (67.2)         CRT-D       38       (32.8)         History of ICD electrical shock       75       (65.2)         Yes       40       (34.8)         Implanted period (years)	Myocardial disease	59	(51.3)		
ICD       78       (67.2)         CRT-D       38       (32.8)         History of ICD electrical shock         No       75       (65.2)         Yes       40       (34.8)         Implanted period (years)	Heart failure	43	(37.4)		
CRT-D  History of ICD electrical shock  No  Yes  Implanted period (years)  38 (32.8)  (32.8)  (40.032.8)	Device				
History of ICD electrical shock  No 75 (65.2)  Yes 40 (34.8)  Implanted period (years)	ICD	78	(67.2)		
No 75 (65.2) Yes 40 (34.8) Implanted period (years)	CRT-D	38	(32.8)		
Yes 40 (34.8) Implanted period (years)	History of ICD electrical shock				
Implanted period (years)	No	75	(65.2)		
	Yes	40	(34.8)		
10.9 ±5.29	Implanted period (years)				
		10.9	±5.29		

Tablez. Itelationships between PCS and Perceptions of ICD freatment					
	standardized	95% CI			
Characteristics	<b>6</b>	lower	upper	p	
STEP 1 $\triangle R^2 = .01$					
Gender	.04	-3.02	4.74	.66	
Family	.10	-1.93	6.70	.28	
History of ICD electrical shock	.00	-3.56	3.61	.99	
STEP 2 $\triangle R^2 = .06$					
Gender	.05	-3.03	4.90	.64	
Family	.11	-1.89	6.92	.26	
History of ICD electrical shock	.01	-3.54	3.84	.94	
Worried about electrical shock or error	.21	05	.85	.08	
Concerned about limitation of activity or role	20	-1.51	.07	.07	
Felt released from fear about heart attack or death	16	99	.19	.18	
Felt it easy to do some activity	.01	81	.92	.99	

Table3. Relationships between MCS and Perceptions of ICD treatment

Characteristics	standardized <i>B</i>	95% CI		
		lower	upper	p
STEP 1 $\triangle R^2 = .03$				
Gender	17	-6.01	.27	.07
Family	01	-3.74	3.25	.89
History of ICD electrical shock	09	-4.24	1.57	.37
STEP 2 $\triangle R^2 = .13$				
Gender	13	-5.33	.94	.17
Family	05	-4.40	2.57	.60
History of ICD electrical shock	05	-3.66	2.18	.62
Worried about electrical shock or error	26	77	06	.02
Concerned about limitation of activity or role	.16	15	1.10	.14
Felt released from fear about heart attack or death	.17	10	.83	.13
Felt it easy to do some activity	26	-1.52	15	.02

MCS(Mental-side of QOL) is predicted by both negative perceptions (Worried about electrical shock or error) and positive perceptions (Felt easy to do some activity) about ICD treatment.

## Discussion

- In previous study, negative perceptions associated with patients' poor QOL. (Burns et al., 2005)
- Our results indicated that positive perceptions also may decrease patients' QOL (especially in mental function)

Overconscious about having ICDs in their body may trigger poor QOL of patients with ICD.

→We have to develop alternative psychological care in a new way such as attention.