Methods

Study design and characteristics of patients enrolled in the BIOSTAT-CHF study has been described previously⁸. Briefly, BIOSTAT was a prospective, observational study that examined up-titration of RASi (ACEi/ARBs) and BBs in patients with worsening signs or symptoms of HF, either new-onset or with a previous history of HF, from 69 centers in 11 European countries. Patients were either hospitalized or presented at the out-patient HF clinic and were sub-optimally treated with RASi and/or BBs. Drug initiation/up-titration was performed within 3 months post-enrollment (drug optimization phase), in accordance with ESC guidelines ⁹. In the subsequent 6-month maintenance period, no further drug optimization was anticipated except if clinical status mandated it. Patients were followed every 6 months for up to 30 months⁸. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained in all countries and all patients provided written informed consent before inclusion. In the present analysis, patients were classified into 4 groups based on the achieved dose of RASi and BBs (% of guideline-recommended): no drug (0%), 1-49%, 50-99% and \geq 100% of the recommended dose ⁹. Outcomes (events) were total hospitalizations (first and recurrent events) and all-cause death (terminal event) that occurred after completion of drug optimization phase. Among all hospitalizations, only those that were unscheduled and non-fatal were included. Scheduled hospitalizations were discarded and those that led to death were counted once as death events. Per protocol, hospitalizations were adjudicated by the treating physicians and not by a central adjudication committee. Patients followed for less than 3 months or who died prior to the completion of drug optimization period (defined as 90 days in the present analysis) were excluded from the analysis. Missing value analysis was performed and only variables

with <15% missing values were included. Five complete samples were created using multivariate imputation by chained equations (Gibbs sampling) ¹⁰. Among 3 multiple imputation methods tested (classification and regression trees, random forest algorithm and predictive mean matching), the classification and regression trees method had the best fit.

To correct for potential treatment-indication bias due to the non-randomized study design, stabilized inverse probability weights (IPW) were calculated for each patient based on logistic regression models with the probability of receiving the target dose of each drug (BBs or RASi) as the dependent variable and 72 baseline covariates (including second order terms for numeric variables) as predictor¹¹. All survival regressions were weighted by the stabilized IPW for each drug.

Survival analysis was performed by fitting shared and joint gamma frailty models using a semi-parametric penalized likelihood estimation on the hazard function, based on the hypothesis that total unscheduled hospitalizations (first and recurrent events) and death (terminal event) are positively correlated^{12-16.} Joint frailty models allow studying, jointly, survival processes of recurrent and terminal events, by considering the terminal event as an informative censoring. A common frailty term and its standard error (SE) were calculated for the two event rates (hospitalization and death). Frailty takes into account the heterogeneity in the data associated with unobserved covariates and acts differently for the two rates¹⁴. We examined whether the variance of the frailty term theta of each model was significantly different from 0 using a modified Wald test as a significance test of the random effects distribution occurring on the boundary of the parameter space¹³. Whether the recurrent events were positively associated with mortality

was assessed by the positive value of the coefficient alpha in the joint models. For all survival models, time-to-event was considered as gap time and not calendar time. Goodness of fit of the shared and joint frailty models was tested by graphical assessment of the martingale residuals that are based on the counting processes theory. Joint frailty models of mortality and all-cause total hospitalization for both RASi and BBs showed significant correlation between recurrent events [theta (SE): 0.956 (0.043), p<0.001, and 0.982 (0.043), p<0.001, respectively] and a positive association between recurrent events and death shown by positive values of the alpha coefficient [alpha (SE): 0.923 (0.099), p<0.001; and 0.976 (0.099), p<0.001, respectively]. For the crude (unadjusted) risk of hospitalizations and death according to drug level, we fitted univariable joint frailty models separately for RASi and BBs. In these models the only independent covariate was the 4-level factor variable denoting the drug dose levels. To estimate the adjusted association of the drug dose with hospitalizations and death we fitted a parsimonious multivariable joint frailty model for each drug that should have the best fit in terms of predictive accuracy. Thus, we performed an algorithmic forward selection process on shared frailty models with the addition of one baseline variable at a time and comparison with the previous model. For each drug, two separate shared frailty models were fitted during the selection process: one for the recurring event (total hospitalizations) and another for the terminal event (death). The log-likelihood and the degrees of freedom as also the likelihood cross-validation criterion (LCV) were calculated for every model. The between-models comparison was performed using the likelihood ratio (LR) test and the LCV, with lower values of LCV indicating a better fitting model¹⁷. The final joint frailty model for each drug that linked the effects of covariates on both hospitalizations and

death consisted of a formula for the recurring event and a separate formula for the terminal event. The exact process of selection of the final models for RASi and BBs are shown in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Other baseline variables that were included in the multivariable joint frailty models for the association of RASi and BBs with total hospitalizations and mortality are shown in Supplementary Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Shared frailty models were fitted to examine the association of RASi/BBs up-titration with unscheduled hospitalizations due to HF or to cardiovascular causes (HF, cardiac non-HF, renal and vascular causes). Additional information regarding statistical analysis is provided in the Supplementary appendix.

To account potential differential treatment responses among patients with reduced, mid-range, and preserved LVEF, joint frailty analyses were performed in patient subgroups categorized by baseline LVEF, using LVEF cutoffs of either 40% or 50%. Poisson regression was used to assess any modification of RASi/BBs relationship with total or HF hospitalizations by LVEF as a continuous variable. To test for heterogeneity of treatment-outcomes associations with respect to other baseline characteristics, p-value of the interaction between baseline characteristics and drug dose levels using multivariable shared frailty weighted models that included treatment dose, subgroup and treatment by subgroup as fixed factors and the outcome (hospitalizations or death).

Supplementary table 1: Steps of the forward selection algorithm for the final

multivariable joint frailty model of the effect of RASi dose level at 3 months on recurrent

hospitalizations and death.

Model number	Model parameters	Compa rison with model	LR Statis tic	p- valu e	LC V	Model parameters	Compa rison with model	LR stati stic	p- valu e	LC V
	Basic model			••••••	3.32	Basic model			•••••	0.88
					07					86
Model 1	Basic model + sex	Basic	1.227	0.26	3.32	Basic model + sex	Basic	0.00	0.93	0.88
		model		8	27		model	6	8	88
Model 2	Basic model + age category	Basic	15.08	0.00	3.32	Basic model + age	Basic	34.1	< 0.0	0.8
M- 1-1 2			14	category	model	96 0.55	01	57		
Model 3	Model 2 + race (white vs	Model 2	0.305	0.58 1	3.32 16	Model 2 + race (white vs other)	Model 2	0.55 9	0.45 5	0.8 58
Model 4	other) Model 2 + ischaemic	Model 2	19.55	<0.0	3.31	Model 2 + ischaemic	² Model	9 16.6	<0.0	0.8
WIUUEI 4	aetiology	WIOUEI 2	0	<0.0 01	94	aetiology	2	40	<0.0 01	43
Model 5	Model 4 + hypertensive	Model 4	0.008	0.92	3.31	Model 4 + hypertensive	2 Model	< 0.0	0.99	0.8
	aetiology	1100001	0.000	8	96	aetiology	4	01	6	44
Model 6	Model 4 + cardiomyopathy	Model 4	25.97	< 0.0	3.31	Model 4 +	Model	1.39	0.23	0.8
			8	01	66	cardiomyopathy	4	8	7	43
Model 7	Model 6 + valvular heart	Model 6	6.809	0.00	3.31	Model 4 + valvular heart	Model	2.43	0.11	0.8
	disease			9	60	disease	4	2	9	42
Model 8	Model 7 + history of MI	Model 7	5.100	0.02	3.31	Model 4 + history of MI	Model	2.12	0.14	0.8
1 1 1 0	M 110 . 11 / C	M 110	1 202	4	57	M 114 . 15 4 6	4	7	5	42
Model 9	Model 8 + history of	Model 8	1.383	0.24	3.31	Model 4 + history of	Model	10.4	0.00	0.8
Model	CABG Model 8 + history of PCI	Model 8	0.266	0 0.60	58 3.31	CABG Model 9 + history of	4 Model	78 2.13	1 0.14	34 0.8
0	Wodel 8 + history of 1 CI	WIOUEI 0	0.200	0.00 6	5.51 59	PCI	9	1	4	34
Model	Model 8 + history of AF	Model 8	4.309	0.03	3.31	Model 9 + history of AF	Model	5.62	0.01	0.8
1				8	54		9	9	8	31
Model	Model 11 + history of	Model	7.725	0.00	3.31	Model 11 + history of	Model	1.67	0.19	0.8
12	stroke	11		5	48	stroke	11	0	6	31
Model	Model 12 + history of PAD	Model	2.118	0.14	3.31	Model 11 + history of	Model	4.40	0.03	0.8
3		12		6	48	PAD	11	0	6	28
Model	Model 12 + history of	Model	1.543	0.21	3.31	Model 11 + history of	Model	0.42	0.51	0.8
14	PCM	12	16.04	4	48	PCM	13	6	4	30
Model	Model 12 + history of ICD	Model 12	16.24 7	$<\!\!0.0\ 01$	3.31 31	Model 11 + history of	Model	6.03 1	0.01 4	0.8
15 Model	Model 15 + history of CPT	12 Model	/ 11.99	0.00	3.31	ICD Model 15 + history of	13 Model	1 6.23	4 0.01	25 0.8
6	Model 15 + history of CRT	15	8	0.00	20	CRT	15	0.23 9	2	20
Model	Model 16 + history of HTN	Model	0.169	0.68	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	0.01	0.91	0.8
7		16	0110)	1	22	HTN	16	2	4	22
Model	Model 16 + history of	Model	4.216	0.12	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	0.95	0.62	0.8
8	smoking	16		2	20	smoking	16	3	1	23
Model	Model 16 + Alcohol	Model	0.477	0.49	3.31	Model 16 + Alcohol	Model	1.41	0.23	0.8
9	(current)	16		0	22	(current)	16	1	5	21
Model	Model 16 + history of DM	Model	19.84	< 0.0	3.30	Model 16 + history of	Model	2.49	0.11	0.8
20	M 1100 . 1. (DM	16	3	01	99 2 2 1	DM	16	2	4	20
Model	Model 20 + history of DM	Model 20	1.526	0.46	3.31	Model 16 + history of DM on insulin	Model	4.68	0.09	0.8
21 Model	on insulin Model 20 + history of	20 Model	13.85	6 <0.0	02 3.30	M on insulin Model 16 + history of	16 Model	9 10.1	6 0.00	20
22	COPD	20	13.85 5	<0.0 01	3.30 86	COPD	16	16.1	1	
Model	Model 22 + history of	Model	.9 44.99	<0.0	3.30	Model 22 + history of	Model	29.9	<0.0	0.8
23	CKD	22	4	01	36	CKD	22	82	01	85
Model	Model 23 + history of	Model	0.172	0.67	3.30	Model 23 + history of	Model	0.56	0.45	0.8
24	thyroid disease	23		8	38	thyroid disease	23	3	3	87
Model	Model 23 + history of	Model	11.38	0.00	3.30	Model 23 + history of	Model	0.07	0.79	0.8
25	malignancy (current)	23	2	1	25	malignancy (current)	23	0	2	87
Model	Model 25 + AF on ECG at	Model	0.025	0.87	3.30	Model 23 + AF on ECG	Model	2.52	0.11	0.8

	model for recurrent unsche	duled hosp	italization	1S *		frailty model for mortality **						
Model number	Model parameters	Compa rison with model	LR Statis tic	p- valu e	LC V	Model parameters	Compa rison with model	LR stati stic	p- valu e	LC V		
26	baseline	25		5	28	at baseline	23	3	2	85		
Model	Model 25 + RBBB on ECG	Model	1.444	0.22	3.30	Model 23 + RBBB on	Model	5.24	0.02	0.87		
27	at baseline	25		9	26	ECG at baseline	23	2	2	82		
Model	Model 25 + LBBB on ECG	Model	0.011	0.91	3.30	Model 27 + LBBB on	Model	0.64	0.42	0.87		
28	at baseline	25		6	28	ECG at baseline	27	5	2	83		
Model	Model 25 + QRS >130ms	Model	0.645	0.42	3.30	Model 27 + QRS	Model	0.09	0.76	0.87		
29	on ECG at baseline	25		2	27	>130ms on ECG at baseline	27	1	3	84		
Model	Model 25 + QRS >150ms	Model	3.651	0.05	3.30	Model 27 + QRS	Model	0.06	0.79	0.87		
30	on ECG at baseline	25		6	24	>150ms on ECG at baseline	27	5	8	84		
Model	Model 30 + LVEF category	Model	22.99	< 0.0	3.30	Model 27 + LVEF	Model	10.5	0.00	0.87		
31	at baseline	25	1	01	03	category at baseline	27	03	5	76		
Model	Model 31 + MR on echo at	Model	0.115	0.73	3.30	Model $31 + MR$ on echo	Model	1.42	0.23	0.87		
32	baseline	31		5	05	at baseline	31	0	3	76		
Model	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.612	0.43	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.02	0.87	0.87		
33	ACEi	31		4	05	ACEi	31	4	7	78		
Model	Model 31 + history of ARB	Model	0.780	0.37	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.98	0.32	0.87		
34	5	31		7	05	ARB	31	5	1	77		
Model	Model 31 + history of BB	Model	0.004	0.95	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.07	0.78	0.87		
35	5	31		2	06	BB	31	8	0	77		
Model	Model 31 + history of	Model	1.149	0.28	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.68	0.40	0.87		
36	MRA	31		4	04	MRA	31	5	8	77		
Model	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.772	0.38	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.60	0.43	0.87		
37	digoxin	31		0	05	digoxin	31	8	6	77		
Model	Model 31 + BB at	Model	7.873	0.00	3.29	Model 31 + BB at	Model	3.25	0.07	0.87		
38	baseline	31		5	96	baseline	31	0	1	74		
Model	Model 38 + BB >= 100%	Model	3.812	0.05	3.29	Model $31 + BB >=$	Model	0.34	0.56	0.87		
39	target at baseline	38		1	94	100% target at baseline	31	0	0	77		
Model	Model $38 + ACEi$ at	Model	0.109	0.74	3.29	Model $31 + ACEi$ at	Model	0.71	0.39	0.87		
40	baseline	38		2	99	baseline	31	1	9	77		
Model	Model $40 + ACEi >=$	Model	0.117	0.73	3.29	Model 31 + ACEi >=	Model	0.59	0.44	0.87		
	1000/	20		0	0.0	1000/	0.1		0			

Forward selection algorithm of multivariable shared frailty

41

100% target at baseline

38

Forward selection algorithm of multivariable shared

* Starting from a basic univariable shared frailty model of the effect of RASi dose level at 3 months on recurrent hospitalisation, the forward selection algorithm consisted of the addition of one baseline variable at a time to the previous model. The log-likelihood and the degrees of freedom as also the likelihood cross-validation criterion (LCV), which is equivalent to the AIC for Cox regression models, were calculated for every model.

99

100% target at baseline

31

7

0

77

2

The baseline model had 1 explanatory variable, the 1st model had 2 explanatory variables, the 2nd model had 3 explanatory variables and so on. In this way, the ith model had (i+1) explanatory variables. At every step, the ith model (with (i+1) variables) was compared with the (i-1)th model, which had (i+1-1 = i) variables, using the likelihood ratio (LR) test and the absolute difference of their respective LCVs. If the ith model differed significantly from the $(i-1)^{th}$ model then it was selected and served for comparisons with the $(i+1)^{th}$ model, which consisted of $(i+1+1)^{th}$ i+2) variables. If the ith model was not significantly different from the $(i-1)^{th}$ model, then the $(i-1)^{th}$ model remained the selected model and the $(i+1)^{th}$ model was then compared with the $(i-1)^{th}$ model instead of the i^{th} model.

As shown in the Table, the selected shared frailty model for rehospitalizations was Model 38 which differed significantly from Model 31 which had been selected at a previous step (LR test p=0.005) and had a lower LCV value (3.2996 < 3.3003). Model 38 consisted of the variables included in Model 31 plus beta-blockers at baseline. The final shared frailty model for rehospitalizations included the following variables: dose level of RASi at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause, cardiomyopathic and valvular cause of heart failure, history of myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, stroke, ICD, CRT, diabetes, COPD, chronic kidney disease and cancer, LVEF category, and beta-blocker treatment at baseline.

** The same forward selection procedure was followed for the shared frailty model of the effect of beta-blocker dose level at 3 months on mortality. The selected shared frailty model for death was Model 31 which differed significantly from Model 27 that had been previously selected (LR test p=0.005) and had lower LCV value (0.8776 < 8782). Model 31 consisted of the variables included in Model 27 plus LVEF category. The final shared frailty model for mortality included: dose level of RASi at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause of heart failure, history of CABG, atrial fibrillation, peripheral artery disease, ICD, CRT, COPD, chronic kidney disease, RBBB on ECG at baseline and LVEF category.

The selected final multivariable joint frailty model included jointly the formula of shared frailty model 38 for rehospitalizations and the formula of shared frailty model 31 for mortality. Its formula includes also the inverse probability weights (IPW) for RASi treatment.

Supplementary table 2: Steps of the forward selection algorithm for the final

multivariable joint frailty model of the effect of beta-blocker dose level at 3 months on

recurrent hospitalizations and death.

	model for recurrent unsched	-								
Model number	Model parameters	Compar ison with model	LR statis tic	p- value	LCV		Compa rison with model	LR stati stic	p- valu e	LC V
	Basic model				3.32	Basic model		•••••		1.0
					85					25
Model 1	Basic model $+$ sex	Basic	1.565	0.211	3.33	Basic model + sex	Basic	9.21	0.05	1.0
Model 2	Pasia model + ago astagomy	model Basic	19.95	< 0.0	05 3.32	Pasia model Lago	model Basic	4 38.4	6 <0.0	24 1.0
	Basic model + age category	model	19.95	<0.0 01	3.52 86	Basic model + age category	model	22	<0.0 01	85
Model 3	Model 2 + race (white vs	Model 2	0.357	0.550	3.32	Model $2 + race$ (white vs	Model	0.33	0.56	1.0
	other)				88	other)	2	5	3	87
Model 4	Model 2 + ischaemic	Model 2	18.64	< 0.0	3.32	Model 2 + ischaemic	Model	17.2	< 0.0	1.0
	aetiology		4	01	67	aetiology	2	73	01	68
Model 5	Model 4 + hypertensive	Model 4	0.115	0.734	3.32	Model 4 + hypertensive	Model	0.60	0.43	1.0
	aetiology			aetiology	4	1	8	69		
Model 6	Model 4 + cardiomyopathy Model 4 $33.15 < 0.0 3.32$ Model 4 + 1 01 31 cardiomyopathy		-	Model	2.50	0.11	1.0			
Model 7	10131cardiomyopathyModel 6 + valvular heartModel 69.6900.0023.32Model 4 + valvular heart			4 Model	6 3.08	3 0.07	67 1.0			
viodel /	disease	Model 6	9.090	0.002	3.32 22	Model 4 + valvular heart disease	Model 4	5.08 5	9	1.u 66
Model 8	Model 7 + history of MI	Model 7	6.090	0.014	3.32	Model 4 + history of MI	4 Model	3.10	0.07	1.0
		iniouer ,	0.070	0.01	18		4	2	8	66
Model 9	Model 8 + history of CABG	Model 8	2.254	0.133	3.32	Model 4 + history of	Model	13.0	< 0.0	1.0
					17	CABG	4	35	01	66
Model 10	Model 8 + history of PCI	Model 8	0.290	0.590	3.32	Model 9 + history of PCI	Model	1.41	0.23	1.0
					20		9	5	4	56
Model 11	Model 8 + history of AF	Model 8	5.632	0.018	3.32	Model 9 + history of AF	Model	8.76	0.00	1.0
6 1 1 10			6 702	0.000	13		9	6	3	47
Model 12	Model 11 + history of stroke	Model	6.783	0.009	3.32	Model 11 + history of	Model	1.21	0.27	1.0
Model 13	Model 12 + history of PAD	11 Model	2.063	0.151	08 3.32	stroke Model 11 + history of	11 Model	9 3.47	0 0.06	48 1.0
viouer 15	Model 12 + history of 1 AD	12	2.005	0.151	08	PAD	11	8	2	46
Model 14	Model 12 + history of PCM	Model	2.056	0.152	3.32	Model 11 + history of	Model	0.35	0.54	1.0
		12			08	PCM	11	9	9	49
Model 15	Model 12 + history of ICD	Model	15.04	< 0.0	3.31	Model 11 + history of	Model	7.52	0.00	1.0
		12	2	01	93	ICD	11	2	6	41
Model 16	Model 15 + history of CRT	Model	16.58	< 0.0	3.31	Model 15 + history of	Model	10.9	0.00	1.0
		15	1	01	76	CRT	15	70	1	31
Model 17	Model 16 + history of HTN	Model	0.571	0.450	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	0.00	0.93	1.0
Model 18	Model 16 + history of	16 Model	3.746	0.154	78 3.31	HTN Model 16 + history of	16 Model	6 1.01	7 0.60	33 1.0
viouer 18	smoking	16	5.740	0.154	76	smoking	16	1.01	3	34
Model 19	Model 16 + Alcohol	Model	0.293	0.589	3.31	Model 16 + Alcohol	Model	1.09	0.29	1.0
	(current)	16			78	(current)	16	3	6	32
Model 20	Model 16 + history of DM	Model	17.30	< 0.0	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	1.97	0.16	1.0
		16	6	01	59	DM	16	0	0	31
Model 21	Model 20 + history of DM	Model	1.414	0.493	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	4.73	0.09	1.0
	on insulin	20	10.00	0.0	62	DM on insulin	16	1	4	30
Model 22	Model 20 + history of	Model	12.93	< 0.0	3.31	Model 16 + history of	Model	9.95 7	0.00	1.0
Model 23	COPD Model 22 + history of CKD	20 Model	2	01	46 3 30	COPD Model 22 + history of	16 Model	7 41 5	2 < 0.0	21
v100el 23	Model 22 + history of CKD	Model 22	64.92 2	<0.0 01	3.30 73	Model 22 + history of CKD	Model 22	41.5 91	<0.0 01	1.0 76
Model 24	Model 23 + history of	Model	0.027	0.870	3.30	Model 23 + history of	Model	91 0.94	0.33	1.0
	thyroid disease	23	0.027	0.070	5.50 76	thyroid disease	23	8	0.55	77
Model 25	Model 23 + history of	Model	12.01	0.001	3.30	Model 23 + history of	Model	0.08	0.77	1.0
	malignancy (current)	23	8		62	malignancy (current)	23	3	4	78
Model 26	Model $25 + AF$ on ECG at	Model	0.101	0.750	3.30	Model 23 + AF on ECG	Model	2.70	0.10	1.0

Forward selection algorithm of multivariable shared frailty
model for recurrent unscheduled hospitalizations *

Forward selection algorithm of multivariable shared frailty model for mortality **

Model number	Model parameters	Compar ison with model	LR statis tic	p- value	LCV	Model parameters	Compa rison with model	LR stati stic	p- valu e	LC V
	baseline	25			64	at baseline	23	4	0	75
Model 27	Model 25 + RBBB on ECG	Model	1.837	0.175	3.30	Model 23 + RBBB on	Model	4.52	0.03	1.03
	at baseline	25			62	ECG at baseline	23	1	3	73
Model 28	Model 25 + LBBB on ECG	Model	0.012	0.914	3.30	Model 27 + LBBB on	Model	0.27	0.60	1.03
	at baseline	25			64	ECG at baseline	27	4	1	75
Model 29	Model 25 + QRS >130ms on	Model	0.566	0.452	3.30	Model 27 + QRS >130ms	Model	0.11	0.73	1.03
	ECG at baseline	25			64	on ECG at baseline	27	8	1	75
Model 30	Model 25 + QRS >150ms on	Model	4.298	0.038	3.30	Model 27 + QRS >150ms	Model	0.10	0.75	1.03
	ECG at baseline	25			59	on ECG at baseline	27	2	0	75
Model 31	Model 30 + LVEF category	Model	29.73	< 0.0	3.30	Model 27 + LVEF	Model	12.7	0.00	1.03
	at baseline	30	5	01	29	category at baseline	27	24	2	63
Model 32	Model 31 + MR on echo at	Model	0.120	0.729	3.30	Model 31 + MR on echo	Model	1.80	0.17	1.03
	baseline	31			32	at baseline	31	6	9	63
Model 33	Model 31 + history of ACEi	Model	0.552	0.457	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.00	0.96	1.03
		31			31	ACEi	31	3	0	65
Model 34	Model 31 + history of ARB	Model	0.809	0.368	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	1.09	0.29	1.03
		31			31	ARB	31	8	5	64
Model 35	Model 31 + history of BB	Model	0.145	0.703	3.30	Model 31 + history of BB	Model	$<\!0.0$	0.98	1.03
		31			32		31	01	3	65
Model 36	Model 31 + history of MRA	Model	0.534	0.465	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.77	0.37	1.03
		31			31	MRA	31	8	8	64
Model 37	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.584	0.445	3.30	Model 31 + history of	Model	0.73	0.39	1.03
	digoxin	31			31	digoxin	31	2	2	64
Model 38	Model 31 + BB at baseline	Model	6.176	0.013	3.30	Model 31 + BB at	Model	1.84	0.17	1.03
		31			25	baseline	31	0	5	63
Model 39	Model 38 + BB >= 100%	Model	1.402	0.236	3.30	Model 31 + BB >= 100%	Model	1.81	0.17	1.03
	target at baseline	38			25	target at baseline	31	5	8	63
Model 40	Model 38 + ACEi at	Model	4.248	0.039	3.30	Model 31 + ACEi at	Model	2.23	0.13	1.03
	baseline	38			22	baseline	31	2	5	63
Model 41	Model 40 + ACEi >= 100%	Model	0.201	0.654	3.30	Model 31 + ACEi >=	Model	0.41	0.51	1.03
	target at baseline	40			24	100% target at baseline	31	7	8	65

* Starting from a basic univariable shared frailty model of the effect of beta-blocker dose level at 3 months on recurrent hospitalisation, the forward selection algorithm consisted of the addition of one baseline variable at a time to the previous model. The log-likelihood and the degrees of freedom as also the likelihood cross-validation criterion (LCV), which is equivalent to the AIC for Cox regression models, were calculated for every model. The baseline model had 1 explanatory variables, the 1st model had 2 explanatory variables, the 2nd model had 3 explanatory variables and so on. In this way, the ith model had (i+1) explanatory variables. At every step, the ith model (with (i+1) variables) was compared with the (i-1)th model, which had (i+1-1 = i) variables, using the likelihood ratio (LR) test and the absolute difference of their respective LCVs. If the ith model differed significantly from the (i-1)th model then it was selected and served for comparisons with the (i+1)th model, which consisted of (i+1+1 = i+2) variables. If the ith model instead of the ith model, then the (i-1)th model remained the selected model and the (i+1)th model was then compared with the (i-1)th model instead of the ith model.

As shown in the Table, the selected shared frailty model for rehospitalizations was Model 40 which differed significantly from Model 38 which had been selected at a previous step (LR test p=0.039) and had a lower LCV value (3.3022 < 3.3025). Model 40 consisted of the variables included in Model 38 plus RASi at baseline. The final shared frailty model for rehospitalizations included the following variables: dose level of beta-blocker at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause, cardiomyopathic and valvular cause of heart failure, history of myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, stroke, ICD, CRT, diabetes, COPD, chronic kidney disease and cancer, duration of QRS >150ms, LVEF category, beta-blocker and RASi treatment at baseline.

** The same forward selection procedure was followed for the shared frailty model of the effect of beta-blocker dose level at 3 months on mortality. The selected shared frailty model for death was Model 31 which differed significantly from Model 27 that had been previously selected (LR test p=0.002) and had lower LCV value (1.0363 < 1.0373). Model 31 consisted of the variables included in Model 27 plus LVEF category. The final shared frailty model for mortality included: dose level of beta-blocker at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause of heart failure, history of CABG, atrial fibrillation, ICD, CRT, COPD, chronic kidney disease, RBBB on ECG at baseline and LVEF category.

The selected final multivariable joint frailty model included jointly the formula of shared frailty model 40 for rehospitalizations and the formula of shared frailty model 31 for mortality. Its formula includes also the inverse probability weights (IPW) for beta-blocker treatment.

Supplementary table 3: Variables included in the multivariable joint frailty survival

model for the effect of RASi dose level at 3 months on hospitalizations and mortality in

the overall population.

	Hospitalizations *		Mortality **	
Variable	HR (95% CI)	p-value	HR (95% CI)	p-value
RASi <50% vs 0% target at 3 months	0.71 (0.59 - 0.86)	< 0.001	0.96 (0.73 - 1.27)	0.792
RASi =50-99% vs 0% target at 3 months	0.56 (0.46 - 0.68)	< 0.001	0.58 (0.43 - 0.79)	0.001
RASi $\geq 100\%$ vs 0% target at 3 months	0.60 (0.49 - 0.74)	< 0.001	0.57 (0.41 - 0.80)	0.001
Age =60-75y vs <60y	0.96 (0.81 - 1.14)	0.655	1.13 (0.84 - 1.50)	0.420
Age $>75y vs < 60y$	1.11 (0.93 - 1.32)	0.259	1.54 (1.15 - 2.06)	0.004
Ischemic vs other cause of HF	1.12 (0.95 - 1.33)	0.183	1.36 (1.10 - 1.69)	0.005
Cardiomyopathy vs other cause of HF	0.73 (0.64 - 0.84)	< 0.001	N/A	N/A
Valvular vs other cause of HF	1.21 (1.07 - 1.37)	0.003	N/A	N/A
History of myocardial infarction	1.14 (0.97 - 1.35)	0.118	N/A	N/A
History of CABG	N/A	N/A	1.38 (1.09 - 1.75)	0.008
History of atrial fibrillation	1.11 (0.98 - 1.26)	0.105	1.26 (1.04 - 1.54)	0.020
History of peripheral artery disease	N/A	N/A	1.24 (0.95 - 1.61)	0.112
History of stroke	1.22 (1.01 - 1.48)	0.037	N/A	N/A
Implanted ICD	1.72 (1.39 - 2.12)	< 0.001	1.62 (1.18 - 2.23)	0.003
Implanted CRT	1.46 (1.18 - 1.79)	< 0.001	1.52 (1.13 - 2.05)	0.006
History of diabetes	1.28 (1.13 - 1.45)	< 0.001	N/A	N/A
History of COPD	1.34 (1.14 - 1.56)	< 0.001	1.46 (1.16 - 1.84)	0.001
History of chronic kidney disease	1.68 (1.46 - 1.93)	< 0.001	1.86 (1.51 - 2.28)	< 0.001
History of Malignancy	1.60 (1.21 - 2.11)	0.001	N/A	N/A
RBBB on ECG at baseline	N/A	N/A	1.39 (1.01 - 1.91)	0.041
LVEF $<40\%$ vs $\ge50\%$ at baseline	0.69 (0.53 - 0.89)	0.004	0.76 (0.52 - 1.12)	0.171
LVEF =40-49% vs \geq 50% at baseline	0.60 (0.49 - 0.74)	< 0.001	0.60 (0.43 - 0.83)	0.002
Beta-blocker treatment at baseline	0.84 (0.72 - 0.98)	0.023	N/A	N/A

The effects of the model variables are expressed as hazard ratios (HR) with their respective 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). All effects were calculated using the multivariable joint frailty survival model that fitted jointly the terminal event rate (death) and the recurrent event rate (unscheduled non-fatal all-cause hospitalizations). The joint frailty model included two separate formulas: one for the rehospitalizations and another for mortality. The time between events (gap time) was used. The model was weighted by the inverse probability weights (IPW) for treatment with RASi at 3 months.

* The risk of rehospitalizations was fitted by a formula that included 16 variables: dose level of RASi at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause, cardiomyopathic and valvular cause of heart failure, history of myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, stroke, ICD, CRT, diabetes, COPD, chronic kidney disease and cancer, LVEF category, and beta-blocker treatment at baseline.

** The risk of death was fitted by a separate formula that included 12 variables: dose level of RASi at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause of heart failure, history of CABG, atrial fibrillation, peripheral artery disease, ICD, CRT, COPD, chronic kidney disease, RBBB on ECG at baseline and LVEF category.

RASi, renin-angiotensin-inhibitors; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRT, cardiac resynchronisation therapy; HF, heart failure; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.

Supplementary table 4: Variables included in the multivariable joint frailty survival

model for the effect of beta-blocker dose level at 3 months on hospitalizations and

mortality.

	Rehospitalizations	*	Mortality **	
Variable	HR (95% CI)	p-value	HR (95% CI)	p-value
Beta-blocker <50% vs 0% target at 3 months	0.98 (0.75 - 1.29)	0.089	1.00 (0.69 - 1.43)	0.002
Beta-blocker = 50-99% vs 0% target at 3	0.94 (0.71 - 1.26)	0.285	0.59 (0.39 - 0.88)	< 0.001
months				
Beta-blocker ≥100% vs 0% target at 3 months	1.20 (0.87 - 1.64)	0.013	0.74 (0.47 - 1.16)	0.181
Age =60-75y vs <60y	0.95 (0.80 - 1.14)	0.610	1.06 (0.79 - 1.42)	0.711
Age $>75y$ vs $<60y$	1.10 (0.91 - 1.34)	0.324	1.48 (1.10 - 2.00)	0.013
Ischemic vs other cause of HF	1.12 (0.94 - 1.32)	0.195	1.36 (1.10 - 1.70)	0.005
Cardiomyopathy vs other cause of HF	0.72 (0.62 - 0.83)	< 0.001	N/A	N/A
Valvular vs other cause of HF	1.23 (1.08 - 1.40)	0.001	N/A	N/A
History of myocardial infarction	1.15 (0.97 - 1.36)	0.096	N/A	N/A
History of CABG	N/A	N/A	1.45 (1.15 - 1.84)	0.002
History of atrial fibrillation	1.12 (0.98 - 1.27)	0.080	1.30 (1.07 - 1.59)	0.009
History of stroke	1.20 (1.00 - 1.45)	0.057	N/A	N/A
Implanted ICD	1.74 (1.41 - 2.15)	< 0.001	1.70 (1.24 - 2.35)	0.001
Implanted CRT	1.44 (1.16 - 1.79)	0.001	1.67 (1.23 - 2.26)	0.001
History of diabetes	1.26 (1.11 - 1.43)	< 0.001	N/A	N/A
History of COPD	1.35 (1.15 - 1.58)	< 0.001	1.43 (1.14 - 1.81)	0.003
History of chronic kidney disease	1.80 (1.57 - 2.06)	< 0.001	2.09 (1.70 - 2.56)	< 0.001
History of Malignancy	1.64 (1.24 - 2.16)	< 0.001	N/A	N/A
QRS duration ≥150ms vs <150ms at baseline	1.21 (1.04 - 1.42)	0.015	N/A	N/A
RBBB on ECG at baseline	N/A	N/A	1.42 (1.03 - 1.95)	0.035
LVEF $<40\%$ vs \geq 50% at baseline	0.66 (0.50 - 0.87)	0.004	0.71 (0.48 - 1.06)	0.098
LVEF =40-49% vs \geq 50% at baseline	0.58 (0.46 - 0.73)	< 0.001	0.55 (0.39 - 0.77)	0.001
Beta-blocker treatment at baseline	0.85 (0.71 - 1.01)	0.225	N/A	N/A
RASi treatment at baseline	0.89 (0.78 - 1.02)	0.095	N/A	N/A

The effects of the model variables are expressed as hazard ratios (HR) with their respective 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). All effects were calculated using the multivariable joint frailty survival model that fitted jointly the terminal event rate (death) and the recurrent event rate (unscheduled non-fatal all-cause hospitalizations). The joint frailty model included two separate formulas: one for the rehospitalizations and another for mortality. The time between events (gap time) was used. The model was weighted by the inverse probability weights (IPW) for treatment with beta-blockers at 3 months.

* The risk of rehospitalizations was fitted by a formula that included 18 variables: dose level of beta-blocker at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause, cardiomyopathic and valvular cause of heart failure, history of myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, stroke, ICD, CRT, diabetes, COPD, chronic kidney disease and cancer, QRS >150ms on ECG at baseline, LVEF category, beta-blocker and RASi treatment at baseline.

** The risk of death was fitted by a separate formula that included 11 variables: dose level of beta-blocker at 3 months, age category, ischaemic cause of heart failure, history of CABG, atrial fibrillation, ICD, CRT, COPD, chronic kidney disease, RBBB on ECG at baseline and LVEF category.

RASi, renin-angiotensin-inhibitors; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRT, cardiac resynchronisation therapy; HF, heart failure; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.

Supplementary table 5. Baseline characteristics of patients who did not completed the 3-month drug titration period and were excluded from the analysis.

	Patients included in the analysis (N=2345)	Patients excluded from the analysis (N=171)	p-value
Demographics			
Sex (Male)	1726 (73.6%)	119 (69.6%)	0,247
Race (Caucasian)	2321 (99.0%)	168 (98.2%)	0,370
Age (y)	70 (17)	74 (11)	< 0.001
<60y	546 (23.3%)	24 (14.0%)	0,005
60-75y	1002 (42.7%)	57 (33.3%)	0,010
>75y	797 (34.0%)	90 (52.6%)	< 0.00
Cause of HF			
Primary			
Ischaemic	1051 (44.8%)	83 (48.5%)	0,303
Hypertensive	245 (10.4%)	15 (8.8%)	0,530
Cardiomyopathy	617 (26.3%)	33 (19.3%)	0,07
Valvular	173 (7.4%)	20 (11.7%)	0,034
Primary or contributory			
Ischaemic	1266 (54%)	102 (60.4%)	0,12
Hypertensive	1279 (54.5%)	90 (52.6%)	0,71
Cardiomyopathy	950 (40.5%)	60 (35.1%)	0,240
Valvular	872 (37.2%)	84 (49.1%)	0,00
HF history			
Previous hospitalization(s) in past year before baseline	731 (31.2%)	61 (35.7%)	0,230
NYHA prior to enrolment			
NYHA I	256 (10.9%)	7 (4.1%)	0,01
NYHA II	1218 (51.9%)	61 (35.7%)	0,008
NYHA III	783 (33.4%)	65 (38.0%)	0,01
NYHA IV	88 (3.8%)	13 (7.6%)	0,00
Comorbidities			
Myocardial infarction	884 (37.7%)	76 (44.4%)	0,08
CABG	391 (16.7%)	41 (24.0%)	0,01
PCI	510 (21.7%)	32 (18.7%)	0,339
AF	1054 (44.9%)	91 (53.2%)	0,034
Stroke	214 (9.1%)	19 (11.1%)	0,38
Peripheral artery disease	252 (10.7%)	21 (12.3%)	0,533
Pacemaker	160 (6.8%)	24 (14.0%)	< 0.00

ICD	190 (8.1%)	14 (8.2%)	0,984
CRT	206 (8.8%)	16 (9.4%)	0,799
Hypertension	1461 (62.3%)	107 (62.6%)	0,953
Past smoker	1145 (48.8%)	78 (45.6%)	0,436
Current smoker	330 (14.1%)	20 (11.7%)	0,363
Current alcohol use	654 (27.9%)	49 (28.8%)	0,773
Diabetes	763 (32.5%)	54 (31.6%)	0,779
Diabetes on insulin	309 (13.2%)	21 (12.3%)	0,935
COPD	393 (16.8%)	44 (25.7%)	0,003
Chronic kidney disease	614 (26.2%)	81 (47.4%)	< 0.001
Thyroid disease	222 (9.5%)	29 (17.0%)	0,002
Malignacy (current)	81 (3.5%)	16 (9.4%)	< 0.001
HF-drug history			
MRA	1255 (53.5%)	83 (48.5%)	0,204
Digitalis	455 (19.4%)	38 (22.2%)	0,355
Clinical variables at baseline			
Systolic BP (mmHg)	125 (22)	119 (21)	0,001
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	75 (13)	70 (12)	< 0.001
Heart rate (bpm)	79 (19)	81 (19)	0,169
NYHA			
NYHA I	56 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	0,041
NYHA II	852 (36.3%)	39 (22.8%)	0,001
NYHA III	1166 (49.7%)	96 (56.1%)	0,047
NYHA IV	271 (11.6%)	29 (17.0%)	0,026
6MWT (m)	214 (173)	111 (138)	< 0.001
ECG features at baseline			
AF on ECG	768 (32.8%)	63 (37.1%)	0,225
RBBB	146 (6.2%)	23 (13.7%)	0,011
LBBB	469 (20.0%)	48 (28.6%)	0,042
QRS>130ms	639 (27.2%)	67 (39.2%)	< 0.001
QRS>150ms	412 (17.6%)	41 (24.0%)	0,021
LVEF category at baseline			
LVEF ≥50%	154 (6.6%)	15 (8.8%)	0,066
LVEF 40-49%	295 (12.6%)	17 (9.9%)	0,587
LVEF <40%	1896 (80.9%)	111 (64.9%)	0,025

Supplementary Table 5 6: Frequency distribution of total hospitalizations and death

	RASi				Beta-blocl	kers			Total
	0%	1-49%	50-99%	≥100%	0%	1-49%	50–99%	≥100%	
Patients, n (%)	268	814	734	529	177	1303	599	266	2345
	(11.4%)	(34.7%)	(31.3%)	(22.6%)	(7.5%)	(55.6%)	(25.5%)	(11.3%)	
Number of deaths, n	93	219	122	78	48	313	97	54	512
(%)	(34.7%)	(26.9%)	(16.6%)	(14.7%)	(27.1%)	(24.0%)	(16.2%)	(20.3%)	(21.8%)
Fotal hospitalizations	514	967	754	548	228	1435	730	390	2783
Fotal unscheduled	418	714	504	360	174	1059	492	271	1996
hospitalizations									
Mean total	1.56	0.88	0.69	0.68	0.98	0.81	0.82	1.02	0.85
unscheduled									
hospitalizations									
By cause									
Cardiac - non HF,	52	104	76	60	20	153	85	34	292
events (%)	(12.4%)	(14.6%)	(15.1%)	(16.7%)	(11.5%)	(14.4%)	(17.3%)	(12.5%)	(14.6%)
HF, events (%)	202	338	226	148	71	496	226	121	914
, , , ,	(48.3%)	(47.3%)	(44.8%)	(41.1%)	(40.8%)	(46.8%)	(45.9%)	(44.6%)	(45.8%)
Vascular, events	10	24	18	13	7 (4.0%)	37	17	4 (1.5%)	65
(%)	(2.4%)	(3.4%)	(3.6%)	(3.6%)	· · · ·	(3.5%)	(3.5%)	× /	(3.3%)
Renal Dysfunction,	19	19	12	12	3 (1.7%)	34	15	10	62
events (%)	(4.5%)	(2.7%)	(2.4%)	(3.3%)	· · · ·	(3.2%)	(3.0%)	(3.7%)	(3.1%)
Non	135	229	172	127	73	339	149	102	663
Cardiovascular,	(32.3%)	(32.1%)	(34.1%)	(35.3%)	(42.0%)	(32.0%)	(30.3%)	(37.6%)	(33.2%)
events (%)	()			(,			(,	((·
Patients with no. of									
hospitalization, n (%)									
0	119	509	483	355	96	837	371	162	1466
	(44.4%)	(62.5%)	(65.8%)	(67.1%)	(54.2%)	(64.2%)	(61.9%)	(60.9%)	(62.5%)
1	49	149	148	90	37	241	116	42	436
	(18.3%)	(18.3%)	(20.2%)	(17.0%)	(20.9%)	(18.5%)	(19.4%)	(15.8%)	(18.6%)
2	37	49	44	33	20	76	41	26	163
	(13.8%)	(6.0%)	(6.0%)	(6.2%)	(11.3%)	(5.8%)	(6.8%)	(9.8%)	(7.0%)
3	31	48	24	27	12	72	35	11	130
	(11.6%)	(5.9%)	(3.3%)	(5.1%)	(6.8%)	(5.5%)	(5.8%)	(4.1%)	(5.5%)
>3	32	59	35	24	12	77	36	25	150
	(11.9%)	(7.2%)	(4.8%)	(4.5%)	(6.8%)	(5.9%)	(6.0%)	(9.4%)	(6.4%)
Any event	149	305	251	174	81	466	228	104	879
	(55.6%)	(37.5%)	(34.2%)	(32.9%)	(45.8%)	(35.8%)	(38.1%)	(39.1%)	(37.5%)

according to the level of achieved RASi or BBs dose at 3 months.

Supplementary Table 67: Effect of ACE-inhibitors/ARB and beta-blockers level of

dose at 3 months on total hospitalizations and mortality based on univariable and

multivariable joint frailty survival models (overall population).

	Beta-block	ers	ACE-inhibitors	s/ARB
Drug dose	HR (95% CI)	p-value	HR (95% CI)	p-value
Total hospitalizations	••••			
Unadjusted effect				
Dose < 1-49% vs 0% target	0.82 (0.65 - 1.05)	0.113	0.56 (0.46 - 0.67)	< 0.001
Dose = 50-99% vs 0% target	0.78 (0.61 - 1.01)	0.061	0.42 (0.34 - 0.51)	< 0.001
Dose = 50-99% vs 1-49% target	0.97 (0.84 - 1.12)	0.653	0.74 (0.64 - 0.87)	< 0.001
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 0% target	0.94 (0.71 - 1.25)	0.690	0.40 (0.33 - 0.49)	< 0.001
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 1-49% target	1.16 (0.96 - 1.41)	0.122	0.72 (0.61 - 0.85)	< 0.001
Dose >= 100% vs 50-99% target	1.25 (1.01 - 1.54)	0.042	0.97 (0.81 - 1.15)	0.701
Adjusted effect				
Dose < 1-49% vs 0% target	0.98 (0.75 - 1.29)	0.902	0.71 (0.59 - 0.86)	< 0.001
Dose = 50-99% vs 0% target	0.94 (0.71 - 1.26)	0.697	0.56 (0.46 - 0.68)	< 0.001
Dose = $50-99\%$ vs $1-49\%$ target	0.97 (0.84 - 1.13)	0.724	0.81 (0.69 - 0.94)	0.007
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 0% target	1.20 (0.87 - 1.64)	0.268	0.60 (0.49 - 0.74)	< 0.001
Dose $>= 100\%$ vs 1-49% target	1.23 (1.01 - 1.50)	0.037	0.87 (0.73 - 1.03)	0.109
Dose >= 100% vs 50-99% target	1.32 (1.06 - 1.63)	0.013	1.12 (0.93 - 1.34)	0.233
Death				
Unadjusted effect				
Dose < 1-49% vs 0% target	0.85 (0.59 - 1.21)	0.361	0.69 (0.52 - 0.92)	0.011
Dose = 50-99% vs 0% target	0.53 (0.36 - 0.79)	0.002	0.39 (0.29 - 0.53)	< 0.001
Dose = 50-99% vs 1-49% target	0.64 (0.50 - 0.82)	< 0.001	0.56 (0.44 - 0.72)	< 0.001
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 0% target	0.63 (0.40 - 0.99)	0.043	0.33 (0.23 - 0.46)	< 0.001
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 1-49% target	0.75 (0.54 - 1.04)	0.086	0.47 (0.36 - 0.63)	< 0.001
Dose >= 100% vs 50-99% target	1.21 (0.84 - 1.76)	0.306	0.84 (0.62 - 1.14)	0.254
Adjusted effect				
Dose < 1-49% vs 0% target	1.00 (0.69 - 1.43)	0.980	0.96 (0.73 - 1.27)	0.792
Dose = 50-99% vs 0% target	0.59 (0.39 - 0.88)	0.010	0.58 (0.43 - 0.79)	0.001
Dose = 50-99% vs 1-49% target	0.59 (0.47 - 0.76)	< 0.001	0.62 (0.48 - 0.78)	< 0.001
Dose $\geq 100\%$ vs 0% target	0.74 (0.47 - 1.16)	0.186	0.57 (0.41 - 0.80)	0.001
Dose >= 100% vs 1-49% target	0.75 (0.54 - 1.03)	0.073	0.60 (0.46 - 0.80)	< 0.001
Dose >= 100% vs 50-99% target	1.28 (0.89 - 1.86)	0.181	1.00 (0.74 - 1.35)	0.986

The effects of the drug dose are expressed as hazard ratios (HR) with their respective 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). All effects were estimated using joint frailty survival models (separate for each drug) that fitted jointly the terminal event rate (death) and the recurrent event rate (unscheduled non-fatal all-cause hospitalizations). The time between events (gap time) was used. All frailty models (univariable and multivariable) were weighted by the inverse probability weights (IPW) that had been calculated for each drug separately.

The unadjusted effect was calculated using univariable joint frailty models for each drug. In these models the only independent covariate is the 4-level factor variable denoting the dosage levels of the drug in question. The adjusted effect was calculated using multivariable joint frailty models for each drug. These models were selected based on

The adjusted effect was calculated using multivariable joint frailty models for each drug. These models were selected based on algorithmic forward selection process on shared frailty models with the addition of one baseline variable at a time and comparison with the previous model based on likelihood ratio test. For each drug, two separate shared frailty models were fitted during the selection process: one for the recurrent event (hospitalizations) and another for the terminal event (death). Thus, the final joint model for each drug that links the effects of covariates on both hospitalizations and death consists of one formula for the recurrent event and another different formula for the terminal event.

Supplementary table 8. Shared frailty survival analysis for total cardiovascular

hospitalizations in subgroups by baseline LVEF.

Drug dose at								(N events	<i>i</i> = <i>1333</i>)							
3 months (% . target)				ACEi	/ARB							Beta-b	lockers			
unget)	All pa (N=2	atients 2345)	Patien LVEF (N=1		LVEF	Patients with LVEF < 50%		≥ 50%	\geq 50% (<i>N</i> =2345)		Patients with LVEF < 40% (<i>N</i> =1896)		Patients with LVEF < 50% (N=2191)		Patien LVEF (N=	
	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- valu
Univariable weighted shared frailty model																
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.64 (0.54	0,000	0.62 (0.50	0,000	0.61 (0.50	0,000	1.05 (0.70	0,798	0.80 (0.63	0,061	0.65 (0.49	0,002	0.74 (0.57	0,016	1.83 (1.10	0,01
	0.76)		0.77)		0.74)		1.58)		1.01)		0.85)		0.95)		3.04)	
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.49 (0.40	0,000	0.44 (0.35	0,000	0.46 (0.38	0,000	0.89 (0.58	0,608	0.79 (0.62	0,069	0.64 (0.48	0,003	0.71 (0.55	0,013	2.08 (1.22	0,00
	- 0.59)		- 0.55)		- 0.56)		- 1.37)		- 1.02)		- 0.86)		- 0.93)		- 3.56)	
Dose 50-99% vs 1-49%	0.77 (0.66	0,001	0.70 (0.59	0,000	0.76 (0.64	0,001	0.85 (0.56	0,448	0.99 (0.86	0,941	1.00 (0.84	0,961	0.97 (0.83	0,692	1.14 (0.79	0,47
target	- 0.89)		- 0.84)		- 0.89)		- 1.29)		- 1.15)		- 1.18)		- 1.13)		- 1.64)	
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.89) 0.46 (0.38	0,000	0.84) 0.42 (0.33	0,000	0.89) 0.43 (0.35	0,000	1.29) 1.03 (0.63	0,896	0.82 (0.62	0,173	0.66 (0.48	0,015	0.73 (0.54	0,040	2.36 (1.26	0,00
is one can get	0.57)		-		0.54)		1.70)		1.09)		0.92)		0.99)		4.43)	
Dose >=100%	0.57)	0,000	0.54) 0.68	0,000	0.34)	0,000	0.98	0,947	1.09)	0,772	1.03	0,804	0.99)	0,935	1.29	0,31
vs 1-49% target	(0.61	0,000	(0.55	0,000	(0.60	0,000	(0.60	0,747	(0.85	0,772	(0.82	0,004	(0.80	0,755	(0.79	0,5
	0.87)		0.82)		0.85)		1.61)		1.25)		1.30)		1.22)		2.12)	
Dose >=100% vs 50-99%	0.96 (0.80	0,623	0.96 (0.78	0,739	0.95 (0.78	0,585	1.16 (0.70	0,574	1.04 (0.84	0,721	1.04 (0.81	0,760	1.03 (0.82	0,821	1.14 (0.69	0,62
target	- 1.15)		- 1.19)		- 1.15)		- 1.91)		- 1.29)		- 1.34)		- 1.29)		- 1.88)	
Multivariable weighted shared frailty model																
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.75 (0.63	0,001	0.70 (0.57	0,001	0.71 (0.59	0,000	0.87 (0.56	0,545	0.93 (0.73	0,592	0.75 (0.57	0,051	0.83 (0.64	0,163	1.77 (0.85	0,12
	0.89)		0.86)		0.85)		1.36)		1.20)		1.00)		1.08)		3.67)	
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.60 (0.50	0,000	0.52 (0.42	0,000	0.56 (0.46	0,000	0.75 (0.47	0,228	0.91 (0.70	0,472	0.73 (0.54	0,044	0.79 (0.60	0,108	2.03 (0.94	0,07
	0.72)		- 0.65)		- 0.68)		- 1.20)		- 1.18)		- 0.99)		- 1.05)		4.35)	
Dose 50-99%	0.72)	0,005	0.65)	0,001	0.80	0,005	0.86	0,513	0.97	0,695	0.99)	0,718	0.96	0,557	4.55)	0,54
vs 1-49% target	(0.69		(0.63		(0.68	,	(0.56	,	(0.84	,	(0.82	,	(0.82	,	(0.75	- ,2
	0.94)		0.89)		0.94)		1.34)		1.12)		1.14)		1.11)		1.74)	
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.64 (0.52	0,000	0.57 (0.45	0,000	0.60 (0.48	0,000	0.88 (0.49	0,663	0.96 (0.71	0,772	0.79 (0.56	0,187	0.84 (0.61	0,274	2.98 (1.31	0,0
	- 0.78)		0.72)		0.74)		1.58)		1.29)		1.12)		- 1.15)		6.78)	
Dose >=100% vs 1-49%	0.85 (0.72	0,059	0.81 (0.67	0,031	0.85 (0.71	0,065	1.01 (0.58	0,979	1.03 (0.85	0,794	1.05 (0.84	0,647	1.01 (0.83	0,914	1.67 (0.94	0,0
target	- 1.01)		- 0.98)		- 1.01)		- 1.75)		- 1.24)		- 1.32)		- 1.24)		- 2.97)	
Dose >=100% vs 50-99%	1.06 (0.89	0,524	1.09 (0.88	0,438	1.06 (0.88	0,539	1.17 (0.65	0,600	1.06 (0.86	0,581	1.09 (0.85	0,482	1.06 (0.85	0,606	1.47 (0.82	0,1
target	1.27)		1.34)		1.28)		2.10)		1.30)		1.39)		1.32)		2.63)	

Supplementary Table 7 9: Interaction between baseline characteristics and BBs or RASi

dose on risk of unscheduled non-fatal hospitalizations and mortality based on

multivariable shared frailty models.

	Multivariable shared frailty models *							
	Global p-values interaction with dose at 3 mont	for the 1 BBs	Global p-values for the interaction with RASi dose at 3 months **					
Subgroup	Hospitalizations	Death	Hospitalizations	Death				
Demographics				••••••				
Age category	0.932	0.501	0.544	0.435				
Heart failure aetiology								
Ischaemic	0.231	0.724	0.221	0.233				
Hypertensive	0.172	0.432	0.312	0.267				
Cardiomyopathy	0.040	0.473	0.166	0.055				
Valvular	0.192	0.344	0.076	0.189				
Medical History								
Myocardial infarction	0.244	0.958	0.309	0.042				
CÁBG	0.183	0.167	0.779	0.121				
PCI	0.462	0.385	0.479	0.739				
Atrial fibrillation	0.372	0.424	0.206	0.385				
Stroke	0.966	0.267	0.147	0.533				
Peripheral artery disease	0.590	0.317	0.190	0.715				
Pacemaker	0.933	0.671	0.791	0.672				
ICD	0.908	0.233	0.063	0.507				
CRT	0.787	0.475	0.861	0.532				
Hypertension	0.581	0.118	0.287	0.433				
Smoking	0.694	0.586	0.530	0.412				
Current alcohol use	0.404	0.197	0.337	0.464				
Diabetes	0.359	0.830	0.432	0.135				
COPD	0.430	0.088	0.935	0.540				
Chronic kidney disease	0.744	0.120	0.385	0.041				
Thyroid disease	0.374	0.893	0.544	0.123				
Malignancy (current)	0.189	0.945	0.619	0.125				
Medication History								
ACEi	0.002	0.587	0.866	0.482				
Beta-blockers	0.522	0.802	0.464	0.051				
MRA	0.626	0.610	0.467	0.262				
Digoxin	0.237	0.417	0.812	0.110				
Clinical variables at baseline								
Atrial fibrillation on ECG	0.700	0.229	0.063	0.330				
RBBB on ECG	0.059	0.733	0.406	0.853				
LBBB on ECG	0.616	0.102	0.942	0.646				
QRS >130ms on ECG	0.670	0.056	0.682	0.488				
QRS >150ms on ECG	0.928	0.111	0.716	0.714				
LVEF category	0.106	0.295	0.260	0.321				
Mitral regurgitation	0.776	0.007	0.200	0.521				
Prognostic drugs at baseline	0.770	0.007	0.075	0.317				
Beta-blockers vs no beta-blockers	0.242	0.584	0.587	0.460				
Optimal beta-blocker dose vs	0.242	0.384	0.208	0.400				
suboptimal or no beta-blocker	0.115	0.109	0.200	0.550				
RASi vs no RASi	0.920	0.400	0.324	0.020				
Optimal RASi dose vs suboptimal or	0.920	0.400	0.324	0.020				
no RASi	0.790	0.117	0.152	0.219				

Supplementary Table 7 9: Interaction between baseline characteristics and BBs or RASi

dose on risk of unscheduled non-fatal hospitalizations and mortality based on

multivariable shared frailty models.

All-cause total hospitalizations

	Multivariable shared frailty models *					
	Global p-values for the interaction with BBs dose at 3 months **	Global p-values for the interaction with RASi dose at 3 months **				
Subgroup	Hospitalizations Death	Hospitalizations Death				

* Multivariable shared frailty survival models were fitted separately for each outcome (hospitalizations and death) and each drug (beta-blockers and RASi). Shared frailty models take into account the existence of correlation within subject for the relapse times but do not link the two different outcomes (as opposed to joint frailty models). The independent linear predictor of each survival model consisted of the main effect of the baseline variable, the main effect of the drug (RASi or beta-blocker) dose level at 3 months (4 levels) and their interaction term. All models are weighted by the inverse probability weights of receiving the respective drug at 3 months.

** The p-values in the table represent the global p-values of the interaction terms of the models due to the fact that the term that denotes the effect of the drug dose level at 3 months is a 4-level factor term and some of the baseline variables are higher level factors and not binary.

RASi: renin-angiotensin-inhibitor; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRT, cardiac resynchronisation therapy; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MRA, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention.

Drug dose at 3 months (% target)	(N events = 1996)							
	ACEi/ARB				Beta-blockers			
	Hospitalized on baseline visit		Not hospitalized on baseline visit		Hospitalized on baseline visit		Not hospitalized on baseline visit	
	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value
All patients (N=2345)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.66 (0.56 - 0.77)	0,000	0.67 (0.45 - 0.98)	0,037	0.77 (0.63 - 0.95)	0,012	0.83 (0.52 - 1.33)	0,441
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.54 (0.46 - 0.64)	0,000	0.48 (0.33 - 0.71)	0,000	0.78 (0.63 - 0.98)	0,032	0.81 (0.50 - 1.32)	0,399
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.53 (0.44 - 0.65)	0,000	0.47 (0.31 - 0.69)	0,000	0.81 (0.62 - 1.05)	0,107	1.10 (0.66 - 1.84)	0,710
Patients with LVEF<40% (N=1896)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.66 (0.54 - 0.81)	0,000	0.64 (0.42 - 0.99)	0,045	0.66 (0.52 - 0.85)	0,001	0.70 (0.41 - 1.20)	0,194
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.52 (0.42 - 0.65)	0,000	0.45 (0.29 - 0.71)	0,000	0.67 (0.51 - 0.88)	0,004	0.74 (0.42 - 1.28)	0,279
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.52 (0.41 - 0.67)	0,000	0.43 (0.28 - 0.68)	0,000	0.70 (0.51 - 0.96)	0,029	0.98 (0.55 - 1.75)	0,942
Patients with LVEF<50% (N=2191)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.66 (0.55 - 0.79)	0,000	0.64 (0.44 - 0.95)	0,027	0.75 (0.60 - 0.95)	0,016	0.79 (0.48 - 1.29)	0,343
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.54 (0.45 - 0.66)	0,000	0.47 (0.31 - 0.70)	0,000	0.75 (0.59 - 0.97)	0,026	0.79 (0.47 - 1.31)	0,357
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.52 (0.42 - 0.65)	0,000	0.44 (0.29 - 0.65)	0,000	0.74 (0.56 - 0.99)	0,044	1.10 (0.65 - 1.87)	0,728
Patients with LVEF≥50% (N=154)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.83 (0.62 - 1.11)	0,218	1.35 (0.70 - 2.59)	0,370	1.01 (0.76 - 1.35)	0,934	2.31 (1.09 - 4.87)	0,028
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.71 (0.51 - 0.98)	0,040	0.74 (0.35 - 1.58)	0,441	1.10 (0.79 - 1.54)	0,563	1.68 (0.71 - 3.95)	0,238
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.88 (0.60 - 1.30)	0,513	1.10 (0.58 - 2.11)	0,764	1.30 (0.86 - 1.95)	0,214	2.92 (0.62 - 13.76)	0,176

Supplementary table 10. Shared frailty analysis of total all-cause hospitalizations by

index HF worsening event (outpatients vs hospitalized at enrollment).

Supplementary table 11. Shared frailty analysis of total HF hospitalizations by index

HF worsening event (outpatients vs hospitalized at enrollment).

	Total heart failure hospitalizations							
Drug dose at 3 months (% target)	$(N \ events = 914)$							
	ACEi/ARB				Beta-blockers			
	Hospitalized on baseline visit		Not hospitalized on baseline visit		Hospitalized on baseline visit		Not hospitalized on baseline visit	
	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value	HR (95% CI)	p- value
All patients (N=2345)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.61 (0.48 - 0.77)	0,000	0.75 (0.42 - 1.36)	0,350	0.83 (0.61 - 1.14)	0,252	0.71 (0.37 - 1.34)	0,290
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.46 (0.36 - 0.59)	0,000	0.50 (0.27 - 0.91)	0,023	0.83 (0.59 - 1.17)	0,283	0.63 (0.32 - 1.23)	0,174
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.46 (0.34 - 0.61)	0,000	0.45 (0.24 - 0.83)	0,011	0.89 (0.61-1.31)	0,563	0.72 (0.35 - 1.51)	0,388
Patients with LVEF<40% (N=1896)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.60 (0.51 - 0.71)	0,000	0.75 (0.40 - 1.40)	0,363	0.68 (0.58 - 0.79)	0,000	0.63 (0.31 - 1.28)	0,203
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.42 (0.34 - 0.52)	0,000	0.53 (0.28 - 0.99)	0,047	0.65 (0.52 - 0.82)	0,000	0.58 (0.28 - 1.23)	0,158
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.44 (0.34 - 0.57)	0,000	0.46 (0.24 - 0.88)	0,019	0.73 (0.53 - 1.00)	0,051	0.70 (0.31 - 1.55)	0,375
Patients with LVEF<50% (N=2191)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.58 (0.45 - 0.75)	0,000	0.76 (0.42 - 1.35)	0,345	0.75 (0.54 - 1.05)	0,091	0.66 (0.34 - 1.27)	0,212
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.43 (0.33 - 0.57)	0,000	0.50 (0.28 - 0.91)	0,024	0.74 (0.51 - 1.05)	0,093	0.58 (0.29 - 1.17)	0,127
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.45 (0.33 - 0.61)	0,000	0.44 (0.24 - 0.80)	0,008	0.77 (0.51 - 1.16)	0,210	0.69 (0.33 - 1.46)	0,331
Patients with LVEF $>=50\%$ (N=154)								
Dose 1-49% vs 0% target	0.86 (0.52 - 1.43)	0,572	1.48 (0.77 - 2.83)	0,240	1.79 (1.11 - 2.89)	0,017	2.77 (1.42 - 5.42)	0,003
Dose 50-99% vs 0% target	0.81 (0.47 - 1.41)	0,465	0.59 (0.26 - 1.35)	0,214	2.05 (1.17 - 3.60)	0,012	2.22 (0.93 - 5.32)	0,073
Dose >=100% vs 0% target	0.44 (0.17 - 1.17)	0,101	1.03 (0.50 - 2.12)	0,939	2.53 (1.22 - 5.23)	0,013	4.88 (1.09 - 21.81)	0,038