SERBIAN ARCHIVES OF MEDICINE Est.1872

Address: 1 Kraljice Natalije Street, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
☏ +381 11 4092 776, Fax: +381 11 3348 653
E-mail: srparhiv@bvcom.net, Web address: www.srpskiarhiv.rs

Paper Accepted* **ISSN Online 2406-0895**

Original Article / Оригинални рад

Dragutin Savić[1,2], Svetozar Putnik[2,3,†], Miloš Matković[3]

Minithoracotomy as a primary alternative for left ventricular lead implantation during cardiac resynchronization therapy: can the cardiac surgeon reduce the number of nonresponders?

Миниторакотомија као примарна алтернатива за уградњу електрода за леву комору код срчане ресинхронизационе терапије – може ли кардиохирург смањити број нонреспондера?

[1] Pacemaker Centre, Clinical Centre of Serbia, Belgrade Serbia
[2] Faculty of medicine, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
[3] Departement of Cardiac Surgery, Clinical Centre of Serbia, Belgrade,Serbia

Received: April 12, 2016
Revised: May 4, 2016
Accepted: June 1, 2016
Online First: February 28, 2017
DOI: 10.2298/SARH160923077S

* **Accepted papers** are articles in press that have gone through due peer review process and have been accepted for publication by the Editorial Board of the *Serbian Archives of Medicine*. They have not yet been copy edited and/or formatted in the publication house style, and the text may be changed before the final publication.
Although accepted papers do not yet have all the accompanying bibliographic details available, they can already be cited using the year of online publication and the DOI, as follows: the author's last name and initial of the first name, article title, journal title, online first publication month and year, and the DOI; e.g.: Petrović P, Jovanović J. The title of the article. Srp Arh Celok Lek. Online First, February 2017.
When the final article is assigned to volumes/issues of the journal, the Article in Press version will be removed and the final version will appear in the associated published volumes/issues of the journal. The date the article was made available online first will be carried over.

† **Correspondence to:**
Svetozar PUTNIK
Departement of Cardiac surgery, Cinical Centre of Serbia,
Koste Todorovića 8, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
E-mail: **svetozar073@yahoo.com**

Paper accepted

Minithoracotomy as a primary alternative for left ventricular lead implantation during cardiac resynchronization therapy: can the cardiac surgeon reduce the number of nonresponders?

Миниторакотомија као примарна алтернатива за уградњу електрода за леву комору код срчане ресинхронизационе терапије – може ли кардиохирург смањити број нонреспондера?

SUMMARY

Introduction/Objective Numerous anomalies of the cardiac venous system prevent the optimal endovascular implantation of the left ventricular (LV) lead in more than 15% of patients with indication for cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT). The endovenous approach in these patients can be one of the potential reasons for the large number of nonresponders reported in the literature.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the results of an alternative myoepicardial approach to the stimulation of the left ventricle in CRT.

Methods From June 2014 to December 2015, 15 myoepicardial LV leads for CRT were implanted. Coronary sinus venography revealed thrombosis of the coronary sinus in nine and unfavourable anatomy of the coronary venous system in six patients. In all patients limited left thoracotomy was used as an approach to the lateral wall of the heart.

Results There were no major surgical complications and no lethal hospital outcomes. In a six-month follow-up period we registered a significant increase in the length of the six-minute walk test (for an average of 57.9 m), reduction of the QRS complex width (to 26.25 msec), increase in left ventricular ejection fraction (12.2%), and reduction of MR for 1+. Based on all the parameters, it was concluded that all patients responded favourably to the applied CRT.

Conclusion Closer cooperation between cardiologists and cardiac surgeons in identifying a group of patients who would benefit the most from a myoepicardial approach for LV stimulation is necessary in order to attempt to reduce the nonresponder rate.

Keywords: CRT; minithoracotomy; surgically placed LV leads

САЖЕТАК

Увод/Циљ Бројне аномалије срчаног венског система спречавају оптималну ендоваскуларну имплантацију електрода за леву комору у више од 15% пацијената са индикацијом за срчану ресинхронизациону терапију (СРТ). Ендовенски приступ у ових болесника може бити један од потенцијалних разлога великог броја нонреспондера пријављених у литератури.

Циљ ове студије је да анализира резултате алтернативног миоепикардиалног приступа стимулације леве коморе у СРТ.

Методе Од јуна 2014. до децембра 2015. уграђено је 15 миоепикардиалних електрода за СРТ. Венографијом коронарног синуса откривена је тромбоза коронарног синуса у девет и неповољна анатомија коронарне венског система у шест болесника. Код свих лева мини торакотомија је коришћена као хируршки приступ бочном зида срца.

Резултати Није било већих хируршких компликација ни интрахоспиталних смртних исхода. У периоду праћења од шест месеци регистровали смо значајно повећање у дужини теста хода од шест минута (у просеку 57,9 м), смањење QRS комплекса ширине (до 26,25 msec), повећање ејекционе фракције леве коморе (12,2%), и смањење митралне инсуфицијенције за 1+. На основу свих параметара закључено је да су сви пацијенти одговорили позитивно на примењену СРТ.

Закључак Ближа сарадња између кардиолога и кардиохирурга у идентификацији група пацијената је неопходна у покушају смањивања броја нонреспондера у СРТ и групе болесника која би имала највише користи од овог приступа .

Кључне речи: СРТ; миниторакотомија; хируршки постављање миоепикардијалних електрода

Paper accepted

INTRODUCTION

Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) restores the synchronicity of the atrioventricular, interventricular, and intraventricular contractions [1]. Comprehensive trials have shown that CRT improves symptoms of congestive heart failure, improves ejection fraction and survival, increases exercise tolerance, and decreases hospital readmission [2]. Today, widely used is the less invasive transvenous approach of placing the left ventricular (LV) lead via the coronary sinus (CS) [3, 4]. However 30 – 40 % of patients fail to show an improvement in clinical symptoms or cardiac function, and are considered nonresponders to this method [5].

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society

Favorable response to CRT depends mostly of positioning the LV pacing lead coincident with the lattermost activated areas of the left ventricle so as to achieve the maximum hemodynamic effect. Therefore, the optimal LV lead placement is one of the most important aspects of CRT implantation [6]. Restrictions to achieve the maximum response are related to unfavorable coronary sinus anatomy, non-optimal position of the LV pacing lead, high-myocardial scar burden and unintended stimulation of the left phrenic nerve [7]. Several studies showed that not all CS tributaries give the same response to CRT leading to the group of lateral or posterolateral wall of the left ventricle to be the most suitable. Limited availability of suitable tributaries due to thrombosis of CS or the unfavorable coronary venous anatomy is one of the crucial factors that lead to the lack of the optimal hemodynamic effect of CRT [8,9].

As an alternative to endovenous placement of LV lead in these patients, a surgical approach via mini-thoracotomy, video-assisted thoracoscopy (VATS), or with robotic assistance, should be considered [10].

The purpose of this study was to analyze the results of a myoepicardial approach to the stimulation of the left ventricle in CRT.

METHODS

Patient selection

Patient selection criteria were standard indications for CRT implantation [11]: severe congestive heart failure rated as NYHA class III or IV despite the optimized pharmacologic heart failure treatment; dilated ischemic or non-ischemic cardiomyopathy with left ventricular systolic dysfunction defined as LVEF $\leq$35% and left ventricular end-diastolic diameter $\geq$60 mm; and LBBB as reflected on the surface electrocardiogram by a QRS duration of $\geq$120 ms in spontaneous rhythm. The indiciation for the surgical approach was the failure of transvenous approach to LV lead implantation, as well as limited availability of suitable CS tributaries.

Operative course

Left sided operative approach was used in all patients. Right atrium and right ventricle leads were placed in standard pacing sites. The device pocket was made in upper left pre-pectoral area. The thrombosis of CS and unfavorable CS anatomy were the main criteria for the failure of transvenous approach for the LV lead implantation.

Immediately after the failed transvenous approach, the LV lead connector was temporarily protected with a cap and the operating site was secured, while the patient was transferred to the operating theatre of the Cardiac surgery department, located on the same level, for the myoepicardial LV lead implantation. The surgery was done under general endotracheal anesthesia with single right-lung ventilation, using double lumen endotracheal tube, while standard invasive hemodynamics monitoring was performed. Left antero-lateral minithoracotomy through the fourth intercostal space was used to access the left ventricle wall. Next, the pericardium was partially opened for 2–3 cm

Paper accepted

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society

anterior to the phrenic nerve while ensuring sufficient distance. The pericardium was then fixed with traction sutures to the skin rotating the heart to the right and creating the optimal exposure to the LV lateral wall. The LV lead was then placed between the left anterior descendent branch of left coronary artery and the obtuse margin branch of the circumflex artery. We used the 5-0 or 6-0 polyprolene to secure the steroid eluting epicardial lead to avoid the trauma of the heart.

After completing the threshold measurements, the connector of the lead was brought through the third intercostal space and tunneled submuscularly to the previously made device pocket and the device itself. Minithoractomy was then closed by a standard wound closure and a small pleural drain was inserted.

CRT response criteria and follow up

We recorded QRS complex width, left ventricle ejection fraction (LVEF), six-minute walk test, mitral regurgitation grade and NYHA class prior to the intervention and six months after. Also, all patients were observed for complications during their hospital stay.

Patients who had a significant enhancement of one or more observed hemodynamic parameters (NYHA class reduction by one grade or more, LVEF + > 5%) after six months, were designated as responders to CRT therapy [11].

RESULTS

The study involved 15 patients with myoepicardial LV leads for CRT implanted in the Departement of Cardiac Surgery in Clinical Centre of Serbia between June 2014 and December 2015. The venography revealed the thrombosis of CS in 9 patients and unfavorable CS anatomy (non accessible lateral or posterolateral group) in 6 patients. The haemodynamic characteristics of our patients before the surgery and after six months are shown in Table 1. There were 10 patients in NYHA class III and 5 of them were in NYHA class IV before the surgery, while after six months there were no patients in NYHA class IV, 6 in NYHA I, 8 in NYHA II and just one patient in NYHA III. The QRS complex width has decreased by the mean of 26.5 ms after the surgery. Also, at six months follow up an encrease in LVEF was recorded by the mean of 12.2 %.

Table 1. Haemodynamic parameters before the surgery and after six months follow up.

Characteristics	Baseline	After 6 months
NYHA class (n)		
I	–	6
II	–	8
III	10	1
IV	5	–
QRS complex (msec) (x□±SD)	165.3±10.5	138.8±15.6
LVEF (%) (x□±SD)	25.1±5.8	37.3±7.3
MR (grade) (x□±SD)	2.38±0.9	1.25±0.5
Six minutes walk test (m) (x□±SD)	273.4±22	331.3±17

In adition, the value of six minutes walk test has increased by the mean of 57.9 m. The grade of mitral regurgitation (MR) has decreased by the mean of 1.13. During the hospital stay we have not recorded any major surgical complications or lethal outcomes.

Paper accepted

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society

DISCUSSION

To maximize the hemodynamic effect of and the number of responders to CRT, the LV lead must be placed near the lattermost activated areas of the heart. [9] The lateral and the posterolateral groups of CS tributaries have proven to be the most suitable ones and have the largest number of responders to CRT via transvenous approach [8,12]. In the InSync Study the optimal LV lead position was achieved only in 71% of patients [13,14]. Also, in the Easytrack pre-CE Mark clinical trial [15], only 50% of the implanted LV leads were in lateral group, while 36% were in the anterior group, which, according to Naegele et al.[8], should be avoided. Ailawadi et al. showed even greater percentage of transvenous approach failure, due to the fact that their centre accepts only the implantation in these CS tributary groups [16]. The percentage of optimal LV lead position goes up to 80% in Mustic trial [17], which was similar to the results in one of our previous studies [18]. The overall success rate of the transvenous approach ranges from 88-92% [12,17].

The surgical approach gives an alternative solution to the patients who cannot have the LV lead placed or the suitable tributaries group could not be reached by transvenous approach. Shaw et al. [10] pointed out in their research that the major determinant for transvenous procedure failure is the inability to place the LV lead in an adequate location in the coronary venous system. The thrombosis of CS or the unsuitable CS anatomy that leads to inability to implant the LV lead in the optimal CS tributaries were the main reasons for the surgical approach in our study. In addition to this, the coronary sinus perforation and dissection, cardiac tamponade, ventricular arrhythmia, as well as the LV lead dislodgement, could also be the indications for the shift to surgical approach [10]. The MIRACLE study showed that 8 % of their patients had a failed transvenous approach due to technical failure, 6% due to CS perforation and another 6% due to LV lead dislodgement [4].

In our study we showed a significant improvement of all observed hemodynamic parameters of each patient, which showed that all of them responded to CRT. Similar results were presented by Puglisi et al. in their study [19]. Mair et al. [20], as well as Puglisi et al.[20] also compared the successful transvenous LV lead implantation in the optimal sites to the surgical approach. They showed similar results between these two groups in response to CRT. Mair et al. even showed better long-term results in the thoracotomy group and emphasized the more stable threshold capture in the thoracotomy group.

During the postoperative follow up, we had no major surgical complications and no lethal outcomes, which is in concordance to the studies mentioned above. The result of mortality outcome appears favorable with no obvious excess occurrence during the follow up.

However, Ailawadi et al. reported a higher tendency for developing kidney failure in the thoracotomy group [21]. They also report a higher number of urinary tract infections which may the result of a longer hospital stay that can be prolonged due to intubation and of general anesthesia. In our study, we did not observe any of these complications.

Paper accepted

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society

The thoracotomy approach gives a lower percentage of lead dislodgement due to less traumatic fixation mechanism and steroid eluting lead tips vs. screw-in leads used in the transvenous approach. Procedure duration is similar, even favorably shorter in the thoractomy approach. The absence of the X-ray exposure is a great benefit for the patient as well as for his physician. Also, the X-ray exposure during the prolonged transvenous approach may present an indication to conversion to thoracotomy. This approach gives a surgeon a clear and vast possibility to place the LV lead closest to the desired site on the LV wall.

VATS and robotics surgery give another advantage to surgical approach, reducing the invasive nature of thoracotomic procedure. Several studies have shown that they are an equal alternative regarding the hemodynamic effect [22,23]. They also showed no mortality or increase in hospital stay or procedure duration. Jansen et al. showed conversion to thoracotomy in less than 0,1 % of patients due to adhesions of previous operations or bleeding [24].

CONCLUSION

The surgical approach showed a high percentage of responders to CRT and a high hemodynamic effect. In addition, low mortality and complications of this procedure emphasize that it cannot be used only in patients with transvenous approach failure due to technical issues or complications. This approach gives a clear advantage for LV lead placement in patients with non accessible optimal CS tributaries. Closer cooperation between cardiologists and cardiac surgeons in identifying the group of patients who would benefit most from a myoepicardial approach for LV stimulation is necessary, in order to attempt to reduce the nonresponder rate.

REFERENCES

1. Abraham WT, Hayes DL. Cardiac resynchronization therapy for heart failure. Circulation 2003; 108: 2596–603.
2. Cesario DA, Turner JW, Dec GW. Biventricular pacing and defibrillator use in chronic heart failure. Cardiol Clin 2007; 25(4): 595–603.
3. Cazeau S, Leclercq C, Lavergne T, Walker S, Varma C, Linde Cet al. Effects of multisite biventricular pacing in patients with heart failure and intraventricular conduction delay. N Engl J Med 2001; 344: 873–80.
4. Abraham WT1, Fisher WG, Smith AL, Delurgio DB, Leon AR, Loh E,et al. Cardiac resynchronization in chronic heart failure. N Engl J Med 2002; 346: 1845–53.
5. Bleeker GB, Bax JJ, Fung JW, van der Wall EE, Zhang Q, Schalij MJ et al. Clinical versus echocardiographic parameters to assess response to cardiac resynchronization therapy. Am J Cardiol 2006; 97: 260–3.
6. Ansalone G, Giannantoni P, Ricci R, Trambaiolo P, Fedele F, Santini M. Doppler myocardial imaging to evaluate the effectiveness of pacing sites in patients receiving biventricular pacing. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002; 39: 489–99.
7. Fung JW, Yu CM, Yip G, Zhang Y, Chan H, Kum CC et al. Variable left ventricular activation pattern in patients with heart failure and left bundle branch block. Heart 2004; 90: 17–9.
8. Nägele H, Hashagen S, Azizi M, Behrens S, Castel MA. Long-term hemodynamic benefit of biventricular pacing depending on coronary sinus lead position. Herzschrittmacherther Elektrophysiol. 2006; 17(4): 185–90.
9. Morgan JM, Delgado V. Lead positioning for cardiac resynchronization therapy: techniques and priorities. Europace. 2009 Nov;11 Suppl 5: v22–8.

Paper accepted

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society

10. Shaw SM, Williams SG, Fox DJ. Surgical aspects of cardiac resynchronisation therapy. Scand J Surg. 2007; 96(2): 159–63.
11. Gregoratos G, Abrams J, Epstein AE, Freedman AR, Hayes DL, Hlatky MA et al. ACC/AHA/NASPE 2002 guideline update for implantation of cardiac pacemakers and antiarrhythmia devices: summary article: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation 2002; 106: 2145–61.
12. Butter C, Auricchio A, Stellbrink C, Fleck E, Ding J, Yu Y, et al. Effect of resynchronization therapy stimulation site on the systolic function of heart failure patients. Circulation 2001; 104: 3026–9.
13. Gras D, Leclercq C, Tang AS Bucknall C, Luttikhuis HO, Kirstein-Pedersen A . Cardiac resynchronization therapy in advanced heart failure the multicenter InSync clinical study. Eur J Heart Fail 2002; 4: 311–20.
14. Ricci R, Ansalone G, Toscano S, Pignolberi C, Lunoti M, Gaspenini Met al. Cardiac resynchronization: materials, technique and results. The InSync Italian Registry. Eur Heart J Suppl 2000; 2(Suppl J): J6–J15.
15. Purerfellner H, Nesser HJ, Winter S et al. Transvenous left ventricular lead implantation with the EASYTRAK lead system: the European experience. Am J Cardiol 2000; 86(9 Suppl 1): K157–64.
16. Ailawadi G, Lapar DJ, Swenson BR, Maxwell CD, Girotti ME, Bergin JD, et al.Surgically placed left ventricular leads provide similar outcomes to percutaneous leads in patients with failed coronary sinus lead placement.Heart Rhythm. 2010; 7(5): 619–25.
17. Cazeau S, Leclercq C, Lavergne T, Walker S, Varma C, Linde C, et al. Effects of multisite biventricular pacing in patients with heart failure and intraventricular conduction delay. N Engl J Med 2001; 344: 873–80.
18. Putnik S, Savic D, Matkovic M, Gluvic Z, Lackovic M, Ilic G, et al. Is cardiac venous anatomy a crucial factor in maximizing the response to CRT? Arch Biol Sci Belgrade 2011; 63(3): 635–40.
19. Mair H, Sachweh J, Meuris B, Nollert G, Schmoeckel M, Schuetz A, Reichart B, Daebritz S. Surgical epicardial left ventricular lead versus coronary sinus lead placement in biventricular pacing. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2005; 27(2): 235–42.
20. Puglisi A, Lunati M, Marullo AG, Bianchi S, Feccia M, Sgreccia F, et al. Limited thoracotomy as a second choice alternative to transvenous implant for cardiac resynchronisation therapy delivery. Eur Heart J. 2004; 25(12): 1063-9.
21. Ailawadi G, Lapar DJ, Swenson BR, Maxwell CD, Girotti ME, Bergin JD, et al. Surgically placed left ventricular leads provide similar outcomes to percutaneous leads in patients with failed coronary sinus lead placement. Heart Rhythm. 2010; 7(5): 619–25.
22. Fernandez AL, Garcia-Bengochea JB, Ledo R, Vega M, Amaro A, Alvarez J, et al: Minimally invasive surgical implantation of left ventricular epicardial leads forventricular resynchronization using video-assisted thoracoscopy. Rev Esp Cardiol 2004; 57: 313–9.
23. Gabor S, Prenner G, Wasler A, Schweiger M, Tscheliessnigg KH, Smolle-Juttner FM: A simplified technique for implantation of left ventricular epicardial leads for biventricular resynchronization using video-assisted thoracoscopy (VATS). Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2005; 28: 797–800.
24. Jansens JL, Jottrand M, preumont N, Stoupel E, de Canniere D: Robotic-enhanced biventricular resynchronization: an alternative to endovenous cardiac resynchronization therapy in chronic heart failure. Ann Thorac Surg 2003; 76: 413–7.

Paper accepted

 Copyright © Serbian Medical Society