

Implementation of guideline-directed medical therapy in patients with heart failure and obesity: *European Journal of Heart Failure* expert consensus document

Luca Monzo ¹, Gianluigi Savarese ², Wilfried Mullens ^{3,4},
Magdy Abdelhamid ⁵, Elena-Laura Antohi^{6,7}, Pardeep S. Jhund⁸,
Massimo Iacoviello ⁹, Matthew M.Y. Lee⁸, Felix Lindberg ², Elke Platz¹⁰,
Marco Metra ¹¹, and Nicolas Girerd ^{1,*}

¹CHRU de Nancy, Centre d'Investigation Clinique Plurithématique 1433, INSERM, Université de Lorraine, INSERM U116-DCAC, and F-CRIN INI-CRCT (Cardiovascular and Renal Clinical Trialists), 4 Rue du Morvan, 54511 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy, France; ²Department of Clinical Science and Education, Södersjukhuset; Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; ³Department of Cardiology, Ziekenhuis Oost-Limburg A.V., Genk, Belgium; ⁴Faculty of Medicine and Life Sciences, Hasselt University, Diepenbeek, Belgium; ⁵Faculty of Medicine, Kasr Al Ainy, Department of Cardiology, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt; ⁶Department of Cardiology, Emergency Institute for Cardiovascular Diseases 'Prof. Dr. C.C. Iliescu', Bucharest, Romania; ⁷University of Medicine and Pharmacy Carol Davila, Bucharest, Romania; ⁸School of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Health, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; ⁹Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Foggia, Foggia, Italy; ¹⁰Cardiovascular Division, Brigham and Women's Hospital, and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA; and ¹¹Clinical Cardiology Division, Vita-Salute San Raffaele University and IRCCS San Raffaele Hospital, Milan, Italy

Received 22 September 2025; revised 8 October 2025; accepted 1 December 2025; online publish-ahead-of-print 4 February 2026

Abstract

Obesity is prevalent among patients with heart failure (HF), especially in those with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), and complicates diagnosis, therapy, and monitoring. It alters haemodynamics, biomarker interpretation, and drug pharmacokinetics, potentially influencing treatment response. Evidence from subgroup analyses of major HF trials suggests that renin–angiotensin system inhibitors (mainly sacubitril–valsartan), mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists, and sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors provide consistent benefits across body mass index (BMI) categories, with no major obesity-specific safety concerns. In contrast, data on beta-blockers in obese HF patients remains limited, largely reflecting the older design of pivotal trials. Management should include careful assessment of congestion, acknowledging the limitations of physical examination, and integrate natriuretic peptides measurement and imaging evaluation to guide individualised diuretic strategies. This expert consensus provides a comprehensive and pragmatic framework for the use of guideline-directed medical therapy in patients with HF and obesity, exploring the available evidence for each drug class and addressing efficacy, patient selection, safety, and monitoring.

Keywords

Heart failure • Guideline-directed medical therapy • Obesity • Outcomes

Introduction

Obesity is common among patients with heart failure (HF), although prevalence estimates vary considerably depending on the definition

and anthropometric measure applied. In those with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), reported prevalence reaches up to ~50%–60% when defined by body mass index (BMI), while alternative indices of adiposity, such as waist-to-height ratio or bioimpedance fat mass, suggest even

* Corresponding author. Tel: +33 383157315, Fax: +33383157324, Email: nicolas.girerd@yahoo.com

© The Author(s) 2026. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society of Cardiology. All rights reserved. For commercial re-use, please contact reprints@oup.com for reprints and translation rights for reprints. All other permissions can be obtained through our RightsLink service via the Permissions link on the article page on our site—for further information please contact journals.permissions@oup.com.

higher estimates, highlighting central adiposity as an almost ubiquitous feature of the syndrome.^{1–3} In patients with HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), prevalence is generally between 25% and 35%.^{2,4} Building on these observations, Packer has recently proposed the ‘adipokine hypothesis’ of HFpEF, which conceptualizes the syndrome as a systemic disorder of adipose tissue. According to this framework, excess adiposity leads to dysregulated adipokine signalling, microvascular inflammation, and impaired cardiac and extracardiac reserve, providing a unifying explanation for the strong association between obesity and HFpEF.⁵

This frequent coexistence introduces complex challenges that span diagnosis, management, and longitudinal care. Obesity alters haemodynamics, promotes low-grade systemic inflammation, and complicates the interpretation of biomarkers, such as natriuretic peptides, and congestion assessment.⁶ From a therapeutic perspective, obesity may attenuate the efficacy or tolerability of standard HF therapies by modifying drug pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics through increased volume of distribution, altered renal and hepatic clearance, and distinctive neurohormonal activation patterns including the renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system, sympathetic nervous system, and natriuretic peptide axis.^{7,8} Historically, landmark trials did not stratify treatment effects by body size, and current clinical guidelines provide little guidance on BMI-specific dosing or management approaches.⁹

This scientific document aims to address these gaps in knowledge by providing a pragmatic, evidence-based review of guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) in patients with HF and obesity. The focus is restricted to GDMT and diuretics, as outlined in the 2021 ESC guidelines and their 2023 update,^{9,10} while Glucagon-Like Peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1 RAs) are discussed separately in a dedicated expert consensus document.¹¹ We examine here HF foundational therapies (i.e. renin–angiotensin system [RAS] inhibitors, beta-blockers, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists [MRA], and sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 [SGLT2] inhibitors), focusing on their efficacy and safety, while also exploring challenges related to volume status assessment, diuretic responsiveness, and congestion monitoring. Given the absence of formal guidance, this document offers a practical framework to support individualized HF care in this growing population.

Differential impact of obesity in patients with HFpEF vs HFrEF

The impact of obesity is different in patients with HFpEF versus those with HFrEF.¹² In HFpEF patients, obesity and specifically adiposity with accumulation of visceral and epicardial fat, may contribute to cardiac dysfunction and worsening HF through adipokine release and inflammation.^{5,13,14} In contrast, obesity does not appear to be the underlying cause of most HFrEF cases and was long thought to confer a survival advantage (the so-called obesity paradox).¹⁵ More recent analyses of randomized clinical trials, however, indicate that this apparent benefit is largely attributable to confounding, as studies using alternative adiposity metrics (i.e. waist-to-hip ratio) no longer support the paradox and instead suggest an association with worse outcomes.¹⁶

Obesity has a larger prevalence in patients with HFpEF, compared with those with HFrEF. In addition, epidemiological data show a relationship between BMI and HFpEF but not HFrEF,^{17,18} epicardial adipose tissue is increased in HFpEF and reduced in HFrEF,^{19,20} while GLP-1 RAs have demonstrated clinical benefit in HFpEF but only heterogeneous evidence in HFrEF.^{21–23} Finally, as discussed in the remainder of this article, the role of GDMT may differ substantially between HFrEF, where it improves outcomes, and HFpEF.

Practical guidance to GDMT use in HF patients with obesity

To guide clinical decision-making, we provide practical guidance for each foundational GDMT, using a structured framework that addresses (Table 1):

- (A) Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity, assessing whether obese patients experience comparable benefits;
- (B) Safety and monitoring, with attention to obesity-specific risks and strategies for their mitigation.

Renin-angiotensin system inhibitors

Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity

Treatment with an angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor (ACEi), angiotensin-receptor blockers (ARB), or angiotensin-receptor neprilysin inhibitor (ARNi) represents a cornerstone of pharmacotherapy in patients with HFrEF.⁹

The RAS and neprilysin activity are both upregulated in obesity,^{24,25} but inhibition of these pathways appears to provide similar benefits in HFrEF patients, regardless of obesity status. Although most landmark trials of ACEi or ARB did not perform formal subgroup analyses based on obesity measures, the PARADIGM-HF (Prospective Comparison of ARNI With ACEi to Determine Impact on Global Mortality and Morbidity in Heart Failure) trial demonstrated that the benefit of ARNi over enalapril on HF hospitalization or cardiovascular (CV) death was consistent across BMI categories (P -interaction = 0.50) and waist-to-height ratio quintiles (P -interaction = 0.72).¹⁶ Real-world data from the Swedish Heart Failure Registry further support these findings, showing that treatment with RAS inhibitors (RASi) was independently associated with lower all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in patients with HFrEF, regardless of obesity status. After adjustments, RASi use was also associated with a reduced risk of HF hospitalization in obese, but not in non-obese patients.²⁶ Interestingly, observational data show that obese patients with HFrEF are more likely to achieve higher doses of ACEi, ARBs, or ARNi in clinical practice.^{26–29} Preclinical data further suggest that neprilysin inhibition may confer additional benefits in obesity-related metabolic heart disease, as sacubitril/valsartan improved diastolic function, reduced interstitial fibrosis, and attenuated oxidative stress in a murine model of diet-induced obesity compared to valsartan alone.³⁰

Beyond their haemodynamic effects, RAS inhibition may also offer metabolic benefit as they have shown to reduce adiposity and body weight. In animal models, inhibition of the RAS can decrease adipocyte size and the secretion of proinflammatory cytokines, thereby improving insulin sensitivity and limiting fat accumulation.³¹ RAS blockade may also modulate energy metabolism by enhancing mitochondrial function and promoting the browning of white adipose tissue, leading to increased energy expenditure. Notably, treatment with ACEi and ARB lowers food intake, body weight, and fat mass in high-fat-fed mice, and these anti-obesity effects persist even when caloric intake is controlled.³¹

Although dedicated data on patients with both HF and obesity are limited, evidence from related populations provides useful mechanistic insights. For instance, a meta-analysis of 15 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating telmisartan in hypertensive patients with overweight/obesity, glucose intolerance, or metabolic syndrome showed a reduction in visceral fat compared with placebo or other antihypertensive agents, without a corresponding change in subcutaneous fat.³² In a *post hoc* analysis of the CHARM (Candesartan in Heart Failure—Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and Morbidity) program, candesartan was associated with a lower risk of new-onset diabetes mellitus.³³ Similar metabolic effects have been reported for ACEi and ARBs in long-term hypertension trials.³⁴ Natriuretic peptides, whose effects

Table 1 Efficacy, safety, and expert advice on guideline-recommended drugs

	Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity	Safety and monitoring	Experts' advice
RASi	ARNI results in consistent benefits in HFrEF regardless of baseline BMI (i.e. PARADIGM-HF) Observational data suggest benefit regardless of obesity Obese patients often achieve higher doses in practice	No unique obesity-specific hazards Monitoring as in general HF population	Use at guideline-recommended target doses, irrespective of BMI.
Beta-blocker	No RCTs post-hoc analyses stratified by BMI Registry data show reduced mortality in HFrEF patients treated with BB irrespective of obesity		Use at guideline-recommended target doses, irrespective of BMI in HFrEF.
MRA	RCT post-hoc analyses suggest greater benefit in obese patients (i.e. EMPHASIS-HF: stronger effect in abdominal obesity; TOPCAT: benefit in obese/low NT-proBNP patients); FINEARTS: consistent benefit across BMI, with a possible greater benefit at higher BMI).		Use at guideline-recommended target doses, irrespective of BMI Potential additional benefit on clinical outcomes in obese patients
SGLT2i	No treatment-by-BMI interaction observed for primary outcome (DAPA-HF, EMPEROR-Reduced, EMPEROR-Preserved, DELIVER) Improvements in symptoms and QoL often greater in obese patients		Use at guideline-recommended target doses, irrespective of BMI Potential additional benefit on symptoms/QoL in obese patients

AF, atrial fibrillation; ARNI, angiotensin receptor-neprilysin inhibitor; BMI, body mass index; HF, heart failure; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; MRA, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide; QoL, quality of life; RASi, renin-angiotensin system inhibitor; RCT, randomized clinical trial; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor.

are enhanced by ARNi therapy, have been shown to promote lipolysis and improve insulin sensitivity.^{25,35} In the PARADIGM-HF trial, treatment with ARNi was associated with better glycaemic control and a slower progression to insulin dependence compared with enalapril in overweight patients (mean BMI 29 kg/m²) with HFrEF and diabetes mellitus.³⁶ These metabolic effects might be particularly relevant in obese patients, who exhibit a markedly higher prevalence of diabetes mellitus.²⁶

Safety and monitoring

From a safety perspective, obesity itself does not appear to introduce unique hazards in the context of ACEi, ARB, or ARNi use. Standard monitoring protocols apply, including regular assessments of renal function, serum potassium, and blood pressure, particularly during initiation and dose titration. However, obesity is strongly associated with a higher prevalence of diabetes mellitus,²⁶ which in turn elevates the risk for hyperkalaemia during RAS inhibition. Clinicians should therefore maintain heightened vigilance when managing obese patients with concomitant diabetes.

Experts' advice: In obese patients with HF, RAS inhibitor doses should be maintained at guideline-recommended target levels, as there is no evidence that obesity necessitates dose modification and full dosing is often well tolerated and optimizes cardiovascular and metabolic benefits.

Beta-blockers

Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity

No RCT testing beta-blockers in HF has pre-specified or reported outcomes stratified by BMI-defined obesity. As a result, data on their efficacy in this setting remain limited. In the Swedish Heart Failure Registry, the use of beta-blockers was associated with lower mortality in patients with HFrEF, irrespective of obesity status.²⁶ Interestingly, beta-blocker-induced weight gain has been associated with improved survival,³⁷ possibly due to attenuation of cachexia mechanisms predominantly seen in advanced

HFrEF.^{38,39} The overall evidence on the safety and efficacy of beta-blockers in HFpEF remains conflicting.^{40–43} Currently, no data are available regarding the interaction between beta-blocker effects and obesity in HFpEF, as they are not guideline indicated.⁴⁴

Safety and monitoring

Obese patients may have higher sympathetic activity, which theoretically could increase tolerability to beta-blockers. However, beta-blockers have raised concerns about potential adverse metabolic effects in obese patients, including changes in lipid profiles, reduced insulin sensitivity, and weight gain.^{45,46} These effects are largely attributed to their inhibition of sympathetic nervous system activity, which plays a crucial role in regulating energy expenditure, fat metabolism, and glucose homeostasis.⁴⁷

Despite some theoretical concerns, most of which are minor, anecdotal, or non-specific to obesity, the use of beta-blockers should not be limited in HFrEF patients, given their well-established mortality and morbidity benefit.⁴⁸ In contrast, due to the lack of clear evidence supporting a benefit of beta-blockers in HFpEF population, their use in those with obesity may still be appropriate, particularly in clinical situations where a specific benefit is expected, such as uncontrolled hypertension,⁴⁹ elevated heart rate in atrial fibrillation,⁵⁰ and symptomatic angina or inducible ischaemia.⁵¹

Experts' advice: In obese patients with HF, beta-blockers should be prescribed at guideline-recommended target doses, as their benefits on mortality and morbidity in HFrEF apply irrespective of body size. In HFpEF, where clear evidence of benefit is lacking, their use may be considered in patients with obesity when specific indications are present.

Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists

Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity

Higher BMI has been associated with elevated aldosterone levels through multiple mechanisms, including the direct production of aldosterone-stimulating factors by adipocytes, many of which support a causal link to the development of HF, particularly in HFpEF.^{52,53}

Several of these pathways appear to function independently of the classical RAS, as suggested by evidence that reduced neprilysin levels may impair aldosterone suppression and that leptin can directly stimulate aldosterone production.^{53–55} Taken together, these mechanisms provide a strong rationale for targeting aldosterone signalling as a therapeutic strategy in obesity-related HF.^{25,53} This approach may be particularly beneficial in individuals with excess visceral adiposity (as indicated by high waist circumference [WC]), where mineralocorticoid receptor antagonism may have a greater clinical impact.

In line with this pathophysiological background, analysis from major RCTs suggests that MRAs may provide a potentially greater benefit in HF patients with elevated BMI across both reduced and preserved ejection fraction phenotypes, a finding that has been consistently observed. In the EMPHASIS-HF (Eplerenone in Mild Patients Hospitalization and Survival Study in Heart Failure) trial, eplerenone significantly reduced the primary composite endpoint of CV death or HF hospitalization (and its individual components) in patients with New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II symptoms and an ejection fraction of $\leq 35\%$.⁵⁶ A post-hoc analysis showed that the magnitude of the risk reduction was more than twice as great in patients with abdominal obesity (WC ≥ 102 cm for men and ≥ 88 cm for women) than in those with a normal WC.⁵⁷ Specifically, eplerenone reduced the risk of the primary end point by 52% in patients with abdominal obesity, but by only 22% in those who were not obese (WC by treatment interaction $P = .01$). Moreover, abdominal obesity was associated with a nearly threefold greater reduction in cardiovascular mortality with eplerenone compared to those without abdominal obesity. These patients also tolerated the treatment better, with fewer discontinuations due to adverse effects. In this study, WC proved to be a better predictor of both efficacy and safety than BMI, highlighting abdominal obesity as a marker of a more favourable benefit–risk profile for long-term MRA therapy. Interestingly, in the EMPHASIS-HF trial, around 60% of patients across weight categories successfully achieved the target dose of 50 mg daily of eplerenone, indicating that obesity does not impair dose up-titration or tolerability.⁵⁷ Further evidence comes from a patient-level meta-analysis of the RALES (Randomized Aldactone Evaluation Study) and EMPHASIS-HF trial, which demonstrated a greater benefit of MRAs on the primary composite outcome (CV death or HF hospitalization) and HF hospitalization in HFrEF patients with higher body weight.⁵⁸

In HFpEF, a similar signal was observed in a post-hoc analysis of the TOPCAT (Treatment of Preserved Cardiac Function Heart Failure with an Aldosterone Antagonist) trial, where spironolactone was associated with a reduction in the primary endpoint (composite of cardiovascular death, HF hospitalization, or aborted cardiac arrest) of greater magnitude in obese patients with a BMI above 33 kg/m² or increased WC.⁵⁹ These findings were further supported by a machine-learning analysis of the same trial, showing a more pronounced reduction in the risk of the primary outcome among patients in phenogroup 3, characterized by obesity, diabetes, high renin levels, renal dysfunction, and liver fibrosis (hazard ratio [HR] 0.75, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.59 to 0.95; p for interaction = 0.016).⁶⁰ The obesity-related reduction in natriuretic peptides may also influence the response to MRAs. Indeed, in patients with HF, hyperaldosteronism, plasma volume expansion, and profibrotic processes may be exacerbated by disproportionately low levels of natriuretic peptides, potentially due to increased neprilysin activity in obesity, which is responsible for the degradation of B-type natriuretic peptide.⁶¹ Notably, in the TOPCAT trial, patients with low natriuretic peptide concentrations (likely reflecting abdominal obesity) experienced the greatest benefit from spironolactone, with an approximate 80% reduction in the primary endpoint, although this observation was based on a small number of events.⁶²

A pre-specified analysis of the recent FINEARTS-HF (Finerenone Trial to Investigate Efficacy and Safety Superior to Placebo in Patients with Heart Failure) trial found that the effect of non-steroidal MRA finerenone on clinical events and symptoms was generally consistent across baseline BMI, with a possibly greater benefit on the primary

composite outcome (cardiovascular death or worsening HF events) observed in patients with higher BMI (P for interaction = 0.005). Notably, no significant interaction between adiposity and treatment effect was observed when using waist-to-height ratio (P for interaction = 0.87) or BMI categories (underweight/normal weight, overweight, obesity class I, and obesity class II–III; P for interaction = 0.32).⁶³

Safety and monitoring

The safety profile of MRAs in obese patients appears to be broadly comparable to that in non-obese patients, with no specific obesity-related safety concerns emerging in clinical trials. However, because obese individuals more frequently have diabetes and chronic kidney disease (i.e. two major risk factors for hyperkalaemia), the potential for adverse effects must be carefully monitored. The risk of hyperkalaemia is compounded when MRAs are used concurrently with RAS-modulating agents (i.e. ACEi, ARBs, or ARNi), a common therapeutic combination in HFrEF.

As with all patients on MRA therapy, renal function and serum potassium should be checked within one week of initiation, at dose adjustments, and periodically thereafter.⁹ This is especially important in obese patients, who may experience unrecognized baseline renal dysfunction due to limitations in standard creatinine-based glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) calculations.⁶⁴ More accurate measures, such as cystatin C–based GFR estimates, may improve risk prediction, though this tool is not yet widely adopted in routine clinical settings.

Experts' advice: In obese patients with HF, MRAs should be prescribed at guideline-recommended target doses. Evidence from post-hoc analyses and meta-analyses suggests that MRAs may confer greater benefit (i.e. larger reduction in clinical events) in patients with excess adiposity across both HFrEF and HFpEF.

Sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors

Efficacy and treatment heterogeneity

Foundational RCTs demonstrated the efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors dapagliflozin and empagliflozin in reducing the risk of HF events and cardiovascular death in patients with HFrEF (DAPA-HF and EMPEROR-Reduced) and HFmrEF/HFpEF (EMPEROR-Preserved and DELIVER). Given the high prevalence of overweight and obesity in these populations (DAPA-HF: 36% overweight, 35% obesity; EMPEROR-Reduced: 36% overweight, 31% obesity; EMPEROR-Preserved and DELIVER: both 33% overweight, 45% obesity), understanding the consistency of efficacy and safety across BMI subgroups is clinically relevant.^{65–68}

Across all major trials, there was no evidence of heterogeneity in the treatment efficacy of SGLT2 inhibitors by BMI. In DAPA-HF (Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Heart Failure), the benefit of dapagliflozin on the primary outcome (worsening HF or cardiovascular death) was consistent across baseline BMI categories.⁶⁹ Similarly, in the EMPEROR-Reduced (Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients with Chronic Heart Failure and a Reduced Ejection Fraction), empagliflozin reduced the risk of the primary outcome (HF hospitalization or cardiovascular death) and total HF hospitalization regardless of BMI.⁷⁰ In DELIVER (Dapagliflozin Evaluation to Improve the Lives of Patients with Preserved Ejection Fraction Heart Failure), dapagliflozin consistently reduced the risk of the primary outcome (worsening HF or cardiovascular death) across BMI subgroups, with greater symptom improvement observed in patients with obesity.⁷¹ In EMPEROR-Preserved (Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients with Chronic Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction), empagliflozin showed consistent benefit on the primary outcome (first HF hospitalization or cardiovascular death) across BMI strata, with a trend toward greater absolute improvement in health status among those with higher BMI.⁷² Finally, a study-level meta-analysis of EMPEROR-Preserved and DELIVER confirmed no significant treatment-by-BMI interaction for the primary composite outcome of HF hospitalization or cardiovascular death, total HF hospitalizations, CV

death, or eGFR slope.⁷² These findings support that BMI should not influence the decision to initiate SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with HF.

Safety and monitoring

The safety profiles of SGLT2 inhibitors are generally consistent across BMI categories. Modest weight loss is typically observed (i.e. ~ 0.9 kg at 32 weeks in DAPA-HF and ~ 1.3 kg at 52 weeks in EMPEROR-Preserved), but this does not warrant dose adjustment or special monitoring. Adverse events (AEs), including discontinuations, volume depletion, renal events, and major hypoglycaemia were comparable across BMI subgroups in DAPA-HF and DELIVER.^{69,71} In EMPEROR-Reduced, rates of symptomatic hypotension, acute renal failure, and confirmed hypoglycaemia were similar across BMI strata, though therapy discontinuation rates due to AEs was slightly more frequent in those with BMI <20 kg/m².⁷⁰ In EMPEROR-Preserved, AE rates were generally consistent across BMI categories, although a modest increase in renal failure and genital infections was observed in patients with higher BMI.⁷² No BMI-specific safety precautions or monitoring are recommended. Standard monitoring of volume status, renal function, and glycaemic parameters remains appropriate for all patients, regardless of BMI.

Experts' advice: In obese patients with HF, SGLT2 inhibitors should be prescribed at the standard fixed doses recommended by guidelines, as there is no evidence that obesity modifies efficacy or tolerability. Across all pivotal HFrEF and HFpEF trials, the benefits of dapagliflozin and empagliflozin on HF events, cardiovascular mortality, and symptom improvement were consistent across BMI subgroups, with some signals of greater health status improvement in patients with obesity.

GDMT in obesity: summary of efficacy, dosing, and safety evidence

Across all major classes of GDMT for HFrEF and for SGLT2 inhibitors for HFpEF, there is no consistent evidence of treatment effect

heterogeneity across BMI categories with standard dosing, with the exception of MRAs, which appear to provide greater benefit in patients with HF and obesity. Similarly, no obesity-specific safety concerns have been identified, and monitoring recommendations remain similar to those of the general HF population. Some comorbidities that are more prevalent in individuals with obesity (i.e. diabetes mellitus, chronic kidney disease) may increase the risks of certain AEs, but do not fundamentally alter safety strategies (Figure 1; Table 1).

Volume status assessment and diuretic strategy in obesity

Obesity poses challenges to the assessment of volume status. For example, physical exam findings of congestion are even more difficult to monitor than in non-obese patients.⁷³ Natriuretic peptides and echocardiography are key tools in the evaluation of haemodynamic congestion in individuals with HF.⁹ However, known limitations of natriuretic peptides include inaccurate estimation of the degree of decompensation with demographic variables and certain comorbidities (i.e. age, atrial fibrillation, obesity).^{74–76} Specifically, BMI is inversely related to natriuretic peptide levels,⁷⁶ and with increasing BMI, the association between natriuretic peptides and risk is shifted upward (i.e. at any given natriuretic peptide level, higher BMI confers greater risk of adverse events).⁷⁷ Echocardiographic measures, such as E/e' ratio, may also underestimate haemodynamic congestion in people with obesity and HF.⁷⁸ Lung ultrasound may offer incremental information regarding pulmonary congestion among individuals with obesity and HF beyond natriuretic peptide levels.⁷⁹ Notably, B-lines, like natriuretic peptide levels, decline with increasing BMI in HF patients, which may limit their accuracy for detecting congestion. However, the reduction in B-lines is less pronounced than for natriuretic peptides (i.e. decrease by 18% in chronic HF and by 12% in acute HF for every 5 unit increase in BMI, compared with a 28% decrease in NT-proBNP for the same

	RASi	Beta-blockers	MRAs	SGLT2i
 Efficacy & Treatment Heterogeneity	→ No consistent evidence of obesity-related heterogeneity in treatment response • Possible greater MRA benefit in obese HFpEF population			
 Dosing & Pharmacokinetic	→ Standard dosing used across BMI strata; limited data on obesity specific pharmacokinetic			
 Safety & Monitoring	→ No obesity-specific safety concerns identified across drug classes • Comorbidities prevalent in obese (i.e., T2DM, CKD) may increase AEs risk but do not alter monitoring recommendations			

Figure 1 Summary of key evidence on the efficacy, safety, and dosing of guideline-directed medical therapy in patients with heart failure and obesity. Abbreviations: AEs, adverse events; BMI, body mass index; CKD, chronic kidney disease; HFpEF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; MRA, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist; RASi, renin–angiotensin system inhibitor; SGLT2i, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus. Part of the figure was created with BioRender.com

BMI increase),⁷⁹ making them a more reliable congestion marker in obese patients.⁸⁰

Once congestion is established, loop diuretics remain the primary therapeutic intervention. Diuretics are recommended irrespective of ejection fraction to alleviate symptoms, improve functional status, and reduce hospitalization risk (Class I-C recommendation per European Society of Cardiology).⁹ However, obesity can blunt natriuretic response to diuretics, a phenomenon potentially linked to altered renal handling of sodium, higher neurohormonal activation, and larger distribution volume.⁸ Incorporating acetazolamide into the diuretic regimen may be particularly beneficial for obese HF patients who exhibit inadequate response to standard loop diuretic therapy, addressing the underlying mechanisms of diuretic resistance and facilitating more effective fluid management.⁸¹ In addition, obese individuals often have increased intra-abdominal and/or renal vein pressure, which may specifically contribute to greater resistance to glomerular filtration.⁸² As a result, obese patients may require higher initial diuretic doses or more aggressive up-titration to achieve euvolemia. For example, weight-based furosemide dosing (i.e. ≥ 2 mg/kg intravenous in diuretic-resistant patients) may be more appropriate in select cases, although formal guidelines do not yet differentiate dosing strategies by body weight.

At the same time, patients with obesity may be more vulnerable to renal function deterioration during natriuresis. In a pooled analysis of four RCTs (DOSE, CARRESS, ROSE, and ATHENA) including 332 patients hospitalized with decompensated HFpEF, obese individuals experienced greater renal deterioration during decongestive therapy, despite achieving similar weight loss. Compared to non-obese patients, those with obesity had a more pronounced rise in serum creatinine and greater decline in eGFR, with a twofold higher incidence of mild worsening renal function (creatinine increase ≥ 0.3 mg/dl; 28% vs 14%, $P = .008$) and a markedly higher incidence of severe worsening (creatinine increase > 0.5 mg/dl; 9% vs 0%, $P = .002$).⁸³ However, misinterpretation of kidney function is a leading cause of inadequate decongestion in acute HF and of underdosing GDMT more generally, and should be avoided, particularly in high-risk patients like those with obesity.^{84,85}

In patients treated with anti-obesity medications, especially GLP-1 RAs or dual glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide (GIP)/GLP-1 RAs agents, careful coordination with diuretic therapy is warranted. These agents can induce early-phase gastrointestinal symptoms, reduced oral intake, and modest natriuresis, potentially favouring volume depletion and electrolyte disturbances.^{86,87} In patients with HF, monitoring renal function and electrolytes during initiation and up-titration of these agents is advisable, with corresponding adjustments to diuretic and antihypertensive therapy as needed. Particular vigilance is needed in the presence of nausea, vomiting, or reduced fluid intake, which can exacerbate hypovolemia.⁸⁶

Conclusion

Obesity is highly prevalent among patients with HF, mainly with HFpEF, and introduces unique diagnostic and therapeutic challenges. Available data, largely from subgroup analyses of major HF trials, suggest that RAS inhibitors (especially ARNI) and SGLT2 inhibitors retain efficacy and safety across BMI categories, whereas MRAs appear to provide even greater benefit in patients with obesity. On the contrary, evidence for beta-blockers remains scarce, mainly owing to the older design of the landmark studies. Accurate assessment of volume status is challenging in this setting, and individualized diuretic strategies remain essential.

Acknowledgements

None.

Declarations

Disclosure of Interest

L.M. has received a travel grant from Boehringer Ingelheim. G.S. reports grants and personal fees from CSL Vifor, Boehringer Ingelheim, AstraZeneca, Servier, Novartis, Cytokinetics, Pharmacosmos, Medtronic, Bayer, and personal fees from Rocguidehe, Abbott, Edwards Lifescience, TEVA, Menarini, INTAS, GETZ, Hikma, Laboratori Guidotti, and grants from Boston Scientific, Merck. P.S.J. reports speaker's fees from AstraZeneca, Novartis, Alkem Metabolics, ProAdWise Communications, Sun Pharmaceuticals; advisory board fees from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Novartis; research funding from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Analog Devices Inc. P.S.J.'s employer the University of Glasgow, has been remunerated for clinical trial work from AstraZeneca, Bayer AG, Novartis, and NovoNordisk. Director, Global Clinical Trial Partners (GCTP). M.M.Y.L. has received grant support, through his institution, from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Roche Diagnostics; and is a member of trial steering committees for Amgen and Cytokinetics; and clinical endpoint committees for Bayer and GlaxoSmithKline. F.L. reports personal fees from AstraZeneca. E.P. has received support from Novartis and scPharmaceuticals for consulting work (paid to Brigham and Women's Hospital). She has received research support from the NIH, American Heart Association and AstraZeneca (paid to Brigham and Women's Hospital), and she served on the clinical trial steering committee of clinical trials funded by Boehringer Ingelheim. She reports employment with AstraZeneca R&D, effective October 20, 2025. M.M. received consulting honoraria from AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, NovoNordisk, and Roche Diagnostics in the last three years. N.G. reports honoraria from AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Lilly, Novartis, NovoNordisk, Roche Diagnostics, NP Medical, and Echosens. All conflicts of interest have been declared outside the present work. The other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

Data availability is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Funding

None.

References

1. Peikert A, Vaduganathan M, Claggett BL, Kulac IJ, Litwin S, Zile M, et al. Near-universal prevalence of central adiposity in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: the PARAGON-HF trial. *Eur Heart J* 2025;**46**:2372–90. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehaf057>
2. Savarese G, Schiattarella GG, Lindberg F, Anker MS, Bayes-Genis A, Back M, et al. Heart failure and obesity: translational approaches and therapeutic perspectives. A scientific statement of the Heart Failure Association of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2025;**27**: 1273–93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehjhf.3676>
3. Reddy YNV, Frantz RP, Hemnes AR, Hassoun PM, Horn E, Leopold JA, et al. Disentangling the impact of adiposity from insulin resistance in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2025;**85**:1774–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2025.03.530>
4. Walli-Attai M, Joseph P, Johansson I, Sliwa K, Lonn E, Maggioni AP, et al. Characteristics, management, and outcomes in women and men with congestive heart failure in 40 countries at different economic levels: an analysis from the Global Congestive Heart Failure (G-CHF) registry. *Lancet Glob Health* 2024;**12**:e396–405. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(23\)00557-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00557-0)
5. Packer M. The adipokine hypothesis of heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction: a novel framework to explain pathogenesis and guide treatment. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2025;**86**:1269–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2025.06.055>

6. Borlaug BA, Jensen MD, Kitzman DW, Lam CSP, Obokata M, Rider OJ. Obesity and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: new insights and pathophysiological targets. *Cardiovasc Res* 2023;**118**:3434–50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cvr/cvac120>
7. Gouju J, Legeay S. Pharmacokinetics of obese adults: not only an increase in weight. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2023;**166**:115281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2023.115281>
8. Hanley MJ, Abernethy DR, Greenblatt DJ. Effect of obesity on the pharmacokinetics of drugs in humans. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2010;**49**:71–87. <https://doi.org/10.2165/11318100-000000000-00000>
9. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, Gardner RS, Baumbach A, Bohm M, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: developed by the Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). With the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;**24**:4–131. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2333>
10. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, Gardner RS, Baumbach A, Bohm M, et al. 2023 Focused Update of the 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 2023;**44**:3627–39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehad195>
11. Monzo L, Savarese G, Mullens W, Abdin A, Bozkurt B, Chioncel O, et al. Pharmacological treatment for patients with obesity and heart failure: focus on glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2025;**27**:2465–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.70082>
12. Packer M. Do obesity and visceral adiposity promote heart failure with reduced ejection fraction? *Eur Heart J* 2026;**47**:12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehaf645>
13. van Woerden G, van Veldhuisen DJ, Westenbrink BD, de Boer RA, Rienstra M, Gorter TM. Connecting epicardial adipose tissue and heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: mechanisms, management and modern perspectives. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;**24**:2238–50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2741>
14. Venkateshvaran A, Faxen UL, Hage C, Michaelsson E, Svedlund S, Saraste A, et al. Association of epicardial adipose tissue with proteomics, coronary flow reserve, cardiac structure and function, and quality of life in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: insights from the PROMIS-HFpEF study. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;**24**:2251–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2709>
15. Padwal R, McAlister FA, McMurray JJ, Cowie MR, Rich M, Pocock S, et al. The obesity paradox in heart failure patients with preserved versus reduced ejection fraction: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2014;**38**:1110–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2013.203>
16. Butt JH, Petrie MC, Jhund PS, Sattar N, Desai AS, Kober L, et al. Anthropometric measures and adverse outcomes in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: revisiting the obesity paradox. *Eur Heart J* 2023;**44**:1136–53. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehad083>
17. Morgen CS, Haase CL, Oral TK, Schnecke V, Varbo A, Borlaug BA. Obesity, cardiorenal comorbidities, and risk of hospitalization in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2023;**98**:1458–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2023.07.008>
18. Pandey A, LaMonte M, Klein L, Ayers C, Psaty BM, Eaton CB, et al. Relationship between physical activity, body mass index, and risk of heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;**69**:1129–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2016.11.081>
19. Rossi VA, Gruebler M, Monzo L, Galluzzo A, Beltrami M. The different pathways of epicardial adipose tissue across the heart failure phenotypes: from pathophysiology to therapeutic target. *Int J Mol Sci* 2023;**24**:6838. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms24076838>
20. Pugliese NR, Paneni F, Mazzola M, De Biase N, Del Punta L, Gargani L, et al. Impact of epicardial adipose tissue on cardiovascular haemodynamics, metabolic profile, and prognosis in heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2021;**23**:1858–71. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2337>
21. Jorsal A, Kistorp C, Holmager P, Tougaard RS, Nielsen R, Hanselmann A, et al. Effect of liraglutide, a glucagon-like peptide-1 analogue, on left ventricular function in stable chronic heart failure patients with and without diabetes (LIVE)-a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2017;**19**:69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.657>
22. Neves JS, Vasques-Novoa F, Borges-Canha M, Leite AR, Sharma A, Carvalho D, et al. Risk of adverse events with liraglutide in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a post hoc analysis of the FIGHT trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2023;**25**:18997. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.14862>
23. Deanfield J, Verma S, Scirica BM, Kahn SE, Emerson SS, Ryan D, et al. Semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with obesity and prevalent heart failure: a prespecified analysis of the SELECT trial. *Lancet* 2024;**404**:773–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(24\)01498-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)01498-3)
24. Sharma AM, Engeli S. Obesity and the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system. *Expert Rev Endocrinol Metab* 2006;**1**:255–64. <https://doi.org/10.1586/17446651.1.2.255>
25. Packer M, Kitzman DW. Obesity-related heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction: the mechanistic rationale for combining inhibitors of aldosterone, neprilysin, and sodium-glucose cotransporter-2. *JACC Heart Fail* 2018;**6**:633–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2018.01.009>
26. Cappelletto C, Stolfo D, Orsini N, Benson L, Rodolico D, Rosano GMC, et al. Use of and association between heart failure pharmacological treatments and outcomes in obese versus non-obese patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: data from the Swedish Heart Failure Registry. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2023;**25**:698–710. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2795>
27. Ouwkerk W, Voors AA, Anker SD, Cleland JG, Dickstein K, Filippatos G, et al. Determinants and clinical outcome of uptitration of ACE-inhibitors and beta-blockers in patients with heart failure: a prospective European study. *Eur Heart J* 2017;**38**:1883–90. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehx026>
28. Brunner-La Rocca HP, Linssen GC, Smele FJ, van Drimmelen AA, Schaafsma HJ, Westendorp PH, et al. Contemporary drug treatment of chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: the CHECK-HF registry. *JACC Heart Fail* 2019;**7**:13–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2018.10.010>
29. Greene SJ, Butler J, Albert NM, DeVore AD, Sharma PP, Duffy CI, et al. Medical therapy for heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: the CHAMP-HF registry. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;**72**:351–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2018.04.070>
30. Croteau D, Qin F, Chambers JM, Kallick E, Luptak I, Panagia M, et al. Differential effects of sacubitril/valsartan on diastolic function in mice with obesity-related metabolic heart disease. *JACC Basic Transl Sci* 2020;**5**:916–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacbs.2020.07.006>
31. Mitchell CS, Premaratna SD, Bennett G, Lambrou M, Stahl LA, Jois M, et al. Inhibition of the renin-angiotensin system reduces gene expression of inflammatory mediators in adipose tissue independent of energy balance. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2021;**12**:682726. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2021.682726>
32. Choi GJ, Kim HM, Kang H, Kim J. Effects of telmisartan on fat distribution: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2016;**32**:1303–9. <https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2016.1171204>
33. Yusuf S, Ostergren JB, Gerstein HC, Pfeffer MA, Swedberg K, Granger CB, et al. Effects of candesartan on the development of a new diagnosis of diabetes mellitus in patients with heart failure. *Circulation* 2005;**112**:48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.104.528166>
34. Mancia G, Grassi G, Zanchetti A. New-onset diabetes and antihypertensive drugs. *J Hypertens* 2006;**24**:3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.hjh.0000194119.42722.21>
35. Polak J, Kotrc M, Wedellova Z, Jabor A, Malek I, Kautzner J, et al. Lipolytic effects of B-type natriuretic peptide 1–32 in adipose tissue of heart failure patients compared with healthy controls. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2011;**58**:1119–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2011.05.042>
36. Seferovic JP, Claggett B, Seidelmann SB, Seely EW, Packer M, Zile MR, et al. Effect of sacubitril/valsartan versus enalapril on glycaemic control in patients with heart failure and diabetes: a post-hoc analysis from the PARADIGM-HF trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;**5**:333–40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(17\)30087-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(17)30087-6)
37. Sze S, Pellicori P, Kamzi S, Anton A, Clark AL. Effect of beta-adrenergic blockade on weight changes in patients with chronic heart failure. *Int J Cardiol* 2018;**264**:104–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2018.03.089>
38. Podbregar M, Voga G. Effect of selective and nonselective beta-blockers on resting energy production rate and total body substrate utilization in chronic heart failure. *J Card Fail* 2002;**8**:369–78. <https://doi.org/10.1054/jcaf.2002.130238>
39. Monzo L, Jarolim P, Borlaug BA, Benes J, Jurcova I, Jenca D, et al. Growth differentiation factor-15 is associated with congestion-related anorexia and weight loss in advanced heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail* 2025;**13**:315–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2024.10.023>
40. Arnold SV, Silverman DN, Gosch K, Nassif ME, Infeld M, Litwin S, et al. Beta-blocker use and heart failure outcomes in mildly reduced and preserved ejection fraction. *JACC Heart Fail* 2023;**11**:893–900. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2023.03.017>
41. Silverman DN, Plante TB, Infeld M, Callas PW, Juraschek SP, Dougherty GB, et al. Association of beta-blocker use with heart failure hospitalizations and cardiovascular disease mortality among patients with heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction: a secondary analysis of the TOPCAT trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2019;**2**:e191598. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.16598>
42. Peikert A, Bart BA, Vaduganathan M, Claggett BL, Kulac IJ, Kosiborod MN, et al. Contemporary use and implications of beta-blockers in patients with HFmrEF or HFpEF: the DELIVER trial. *JACC Heart Fail* 2024;**12**:631–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2023.09.007>
43. Ibrahim J, Fabrizio C, Sezer A, Thoma F, Boyle B, Mulukutla SR, et al. Beta blockers are associated with lower all-cause mortality among HFpEF patients. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2024;**113**:951–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00392-024-02451-0>
44. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, Gardner RS, Baumbach A, Bohm M, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 2021;**42**:3599–726. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehab368>
45. Fonseca VA. Effects of beta-blockers on glucose and lipid metabolism. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2010;**26**:615–29. <https://doi.org/10.1185/03007990903533681>
46. Sharma AM, Pischon T, Hardt S, Kunz I, Luft FC. Hypothesis: beta-adrenergic receptor blockers and weight gain: a systematic analysis. *Hypertension* 2001;**37**:250–4. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.HYP.37.2.250>
47. Greenfield JR, Campbell LV. Role of the autonomic nervous system and neuropeptides in the development of obesity in humans: targets for therapy? *Curr Pharm Des* 2008;**14**:1815–20. <https://doi.org/10.2174/138161208784746716>

48. Gheorghiadu M, Colucci WS, Swedberg K. Beta-blockers in chronic heart failure. *Circulation* 2003;**107**:1570–5. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.0000065187.80707.18>
49. McEvoy JW, McCarthy CP, Bruno RM, Brouwers S, Canavan MD, Ceconi C, et al. 2024 ESC Guidelines for the management of elevated blood pressure and hypertension. *Eur Heart J* 2024;**45**:3912–4018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehae178>
50. Van Gelder IC, Rienstra M, Bunting KV, Casado-Arroyo R, Caso V, Crijns H, et al. 2024 ESC Guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation developed in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J* 2024;**45**:3314–414. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehae176>
51. Vrints C, Andreotti F, Koskinas KC, Rossello X, Adamo M, Ainslie J, et al. 2024 ESC Guidelines for the management of chronic coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J* 2024;**45**:3415–537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehae177>
52. Bentley-Lewis R, Adler GK, Perlstein T, Seely EW, Hopkins PN, Williams GH, et al. Body mass index predicts aldosterone production in normotensive adults on a high-salt diet. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2007;**92**:4472–5. <https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2007-1088>
53. Packer M. Derangements in adrenergic-adipokine signalling establish a neurohormonal basis for obesity-related heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2018;**20**:873–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.1167>
54. Huby AC, Antonova G, Groenendyk J, Gomez-Sanchez CE, Bollag WB, Filosa JA, et al. Adipocyte-derived hormone leptin is a direct regulator of aldosterone secretion, which promotes endothelial dysfunction and cardiac fibrosis. *Circulation* 2015;**132**:2134–45. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.018226>
55. Miura SI, Suematsu Y, Matsuo Y, Tomita S, Nakayama A, Goto M, et al. The angiotensin II type 1 receptor-neprilysin inhibitor LCZ696 blocked aldosterone synthesis in a human adrenocortical cell line. *Hypertens Res* 2016;**39**:758–63. <https://doi.org/10.1038/hr.2016.72>
56. Zannad F, McMurray JJ, Krum H, van Veldhuisen DJ, Swedberg K, Shi H, et al. Eplerenone in patients with systolic heart failure and mild symptoms. *N Engl J Med* 2011;**364**:11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1009492>
57. Olivier A, Pitt B, Giererd N, Lamiral Z, Machu JL, McMurray JJV, et al. Effect of eplerenone in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction: potential effect modification by abdominal obesity. Insight from the EMPHASIS-HF trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2017;**19**:1186–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.792>
58. Butt JH, Solomon SD, Vaduganathan M, van Veldhuisen DJ, Kober L, Pitt B, et al. Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction according to body weight. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2025;**27**:2810–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.3665>
59. Elkholey K, Papadimitriou L, Butler J, Thadani U, Stavrakis S. Effect of obesity on response to spironolactone in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Am J Cardiol* 2021;**146**:36–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2021.01.018>
60. Cohen JB, Schrauben SJ, Zhao L, Basso MD, Cvijic ME, Li Z, et al. Clinical phenogroups in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: detailed phenotypes, prognosis, and response to spironolactone. *JACC Heart Fail* 2020;**8**:172–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2019.09.009>
61. Standeven KF, Hess K, Carter AM, Rice GI, Cordell PA, Balmforth AJ, et al. Neprilysin, obesity and the metabolic syndrome. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2011;**35**:1031–40. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2010.227>
62. Anand IS, Claggett B, Liu J, Shah AM, Rector TS, Shah SJ, et al. Interaction between spironolactone and natriuretic peptides in patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction: from the TOPCAT trial. *JACC Heart Fail* 2017;**5**:241–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2016.11.015>
63. Butt JH, Henderson AD, Jhund PS, Claggett BL, Desai AS, Lay-Flurrie J, et al. Finerenone, obesity, and heart failure with mildly reduced/preserved ejection fraction: prespecified analysis of FINEARTS-HF. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2025;**85**:140–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2024.10.111>
64. Guebre-Egziabher F, Brunelle C, Thomas J, Pelletier CC, Normand G, Juillard L, et al. Estimated glomerular filtration rate bias in participants with severe obesity regardless of deindoxation. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2019;**27**:2011–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.22574>
65. Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Ferreira JP, Bocchi E, Bohm M, et al. Empagliflozin in heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2021;**385**:1451–61. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2107038>
66. McMurray JJV, Solomon SD, Inzucchi SE, Kober L, Kosiborod MN, Martinez FA, et al. Dapagliflozin in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2019;**381**:1995–2008. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1911303>
67. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Pocock SJ, Carson P, et al. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with empagliflozin in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2020;**383**:1413–24. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2022190>
68. Solomon SD, McMurray JJV, Claggett B, de Boer RA, DeMets D, Hernandez AF, et al. Dapagliflozin in heart failure with mildly reduced or preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2022;**387**:1089–98. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2206286>
69. Adamson C, Jhund PS, Docherty KF, Belohlavek J, Chiang CE, Diez M, et al. Efficacy of dapagliflozin in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction according to body mass index. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2021;**23**:1662–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2308>
70. Anker SD, Khan MS, Butler J, Ofstad AP, Peil B, Pfarr E, et al. Weight change and clinical outcomes in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: insights from EMPEROR-reduced. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2023;**25**:117–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2728>
71. Adamson C, Kondo T, Jhund PS, de Boer RA, Cabrera Honorio JW, Claggett B, et al. Dapagliflozin for heart failure according to body mass index: the DELIVER trial. *Eur Heart J* 2022;**43**:4406–17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehac481>
72. Sattar N, Butler J, Lee MMY, Harrington J, Sharma A, Zannad F, et al. Body mass index and cardiorenal outcomes in the EMPEROR-preserved trial: principal findings and meta-analysis with the DELIVER trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2024;**26**:900–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.3221>
73. Breidhardt T, Moreno-Weidmann Z, Uthoff H, Sabti Z, Aeppli S, Puelacher C, et al. How accurate is clinical assessment of neck veins in the estimation of central venous pressure in acute heart failure? Insights from a prospective study. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2018;**20**:1160–2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.1111>
74. Redfield MM, Rodeheffer RJ, Jacobsen SJ, Mahoney DW, Bailey KR, Burnett JC Jr. Plasma brain natriuretic peptide concentration: impact of age and gender. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2002;**40**:976–82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0735-1097\(02\)02059-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0735-1097(02)02059-4)
75. McCullough PA, Duc P, Omland T, McCord J, Nowak RM, Hollander JE, et al. B-type natriuretic peptide and renal function in the diagnosis of heart failure: an analysis from the Breathing Not Properly Multinational Study. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2003;**41**:571–9. <https://doi.org/10.1053/ajkd.2003.50118>
76. Horwich TB, Hamilton MA, Fonarow GC. B-type natriuretic peptide levels in obese patients with advanced heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2006;**47**:85–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2005.08.050>
77. Ostrominski JW, Neuen BL, Claggett BL, Anand IS, Desai AS, Jhund PS, et al. Natriuretic peptides, body mass index, and clinical outcomes in heart failure with mildly reduced or preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2025;**86**:1823–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2025.08.028>
78. Obokata M, Reddy YNV, Melenovsky V, Sorimachi H, Jarolim P, Borlaug BA. Uncoupling between intravascular and distending pressures leads to underestimation of circulatory congestion in obesity. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;**24**:353–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2377>
79. Brainin P, Claggett B, Lewis EF, Dwyer KH, Merz AA, Silverman MB, et al. Body mass index and B-lines on lung ultrasonography in chronic and acute heart failure. *ESC Heart Fail* 2020;**7**:1201–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf2.12640>
80. Campora A, Beltrami M, Di Renzo A, Petrini A, Palazzuoli A. The role of lung ultrasound scan in different heart failure scenarios: current applications and lacks of evidences. *Diagnostics (Basel)* 2024;**15**:45. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics15010045>
81. Mullens W, Dauw J, Martens P, Verbrugge FH, Nijst P, Meekers E, et al. Acetazolamide in acute decompensated heart failure with volume overload. *N Engl J Med* 2022;**387**:1185–95. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2203094>
82. Mullens W, Abrahams Z, Skouri HN, Francis GS, Taylor DO, Starling RC, et al. Elevated intra-abdominal pressure in acute decompensated heart failure: a potential contributor to worsening renal function? *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008;**51**:300–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2007.09.043>
83. Reddy YNV, Obokata M, Testani JM, Felker GM, Tang WHW, Abou-Ezzeddine OF, et al. Adverse renal response to decongestion in the obese phenotype of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *J Card Fail* 2020;**26**:101–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2019.09.015>
84. Mullens W, Damman K, Testani JM, Martens P, Mueller C, Lassus J, et al. Evaluation of kidney function throughout the heart failure trajectory—a position statement from the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2020;**22**:584–603. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.1697>
85. Mullens W, Martens P, Testani JM, Tang WHW, Skouri H, Verbrugge FH, et al. Renal effects of guideline-directed medical therapies in heart failure: a consensus document from the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;**24**:603–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf.2471>
86. Gorgojo-Martinez JJ, Mezquita-Raya P, Carretero-Gomez J, Castro A, Cebrán-Cuenca A, de Torres-Sanchez A, et al. Clinical recommendations to manage gastrointestinal adverse events in patients treated with Glp-1 receptor agonists: a multidisciplinary expert consensus. *J Clin Med* 2022;**12**:145. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12010145>
87. Gutzwiller JP, Tschopp S, Bock A, Zehnder CE, Huber AR, Kreyenbuehl M, et al. Glucagon-like peptide 1 induces natriuresis in healthy subjects and in insulin-resistant obese men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2004;**89**:3055–61. <https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2003-031403>