Trends in mechanical aortic valve replacement surgery in a large, multi-surgeon, single hospital practice
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Abstract

Introduction: In recent decades, new high-performance prostheses have been invented for use with small aortic annuli, and they have helped avoid patient prosthesis mismatch (PPM) without the need for aortic annular enlargement. The purpose of this study is to examine the trends in mechanical aortic valve replacement surgery in a large, multi-surgeon, single hospital practice.

Material and methods: Between January 1999 and January 2008, 1337 consecutive patients underwent aortic valve replacement (AVR) with or without concomitant aortic annulus enlargement. Patients with aortic dissections and patients undergoing Bentall and Ross procedures were excluded from the analysis. Patients were grouped according to the used aortic valve size. The data were collected and analyzed retrospectively.

Results: The mean age of the subjects was 54.37 ± 17.35 (range: 10-84), and 881 of them were men (65.8%). The number of aortic root enlargement procedures decreased over the years (p < 0.05); particularly, the decline of the Nicks procedures was statistically significant (p < 0.05). In 2008, the most frequently used valve size was 23, which stands in contrast with the smaller size preferred in 1999 (p < 0.05). The primary pathophysiology leading to aortic valve replacement, i.e. aortic stenosis, did not change over the years (p > 0.05). Although the use of combined surgery increased in time, there was no statistical relationship with any increase in mortality rates (p > 0.05).

Conclusions: This study showed that avoiding the procedure of aortic root enlargement and implanting high-performance prostheses with larger valves is safe.
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Streszczenie

Wstęp: W ostatnich dekadach wprowadzono do użytku nowe, wysokiej jakości zastawki stosowane w małych pierścieniach aortalnych, które pozwalają na uniknięcie niedopasowania zastawki (patient prosthesis mismatch – PPM). Celem pracy było przeanalizowanie tendencji występujących w operacjach wymiany mechanicznych zastawek aortalnych w pojedynczym, dużym szpitalu zatrudniającym wielu chirurgów.

Materiał i metody: Między styczniem 1999 r. a styczniem 2008 r. 1337 kolejnych pacjentów przeszło operacje wymiany zastawki aortalnej (aortic valve replacement – AVR) z jednoczesnym powiększaniem pierścienia zastawki lub bez jego powiększenia. Pacjenci z rozwarstwieniami aorty oraz poddani operacjom Bentalla i Rossa zostali wyłączeni z badania. Badanych podzielono na grupy na podstawie użytego rozmiaru zastawki aortalnej. Dane zebrano i przeanalizowano retrospektywnie.

Wyniki: Średni wiek pacjentów wyniósł 54.37 ± 17.35 roku (zakres: 10–84 lata); 881 z nich stanowili mężczyźni (65,8%). W badanym okresie liczba wykonywanych operacji powiększenia korzenia aorty zmniejszała się (p < 0,05); istotne stały spadek przede wszystkim z obniżenia zastawek lub bez jej powiększenia. Pacjenci z rozwarstwieniami aorty oraz poddani operacjom Bentalla i Rossa zostali wyłączeni z badania. Badanych podzielono na grupy na podstawie użytego rozmiaru zastawki aortalnej. Dane zebrano i przeanalizowano retrospektywnie.

Conclusions: This study showed that avoiding the procedure of aortic root enlargement and implanting high-performance prostheses with larger valves is safe.

Key words: aortic valve, aortic root, mechanical valve.
Introduction

The main purpose of aortic valve replacement (AVR) is to reduce the pressure or volume load on the left ventricle and thus avoid the progression of left ventricular remodeling. During the last 5 decades, valve prosthetics have evolved, and their usage expanded greatly. However, small aortic root size in comparison to body mass index (BMI) continues to pose a challenge for cardiac surgeons. In recent decades, new high-performance prostheses have been invented for use with small aortic annuli, and these have contributed to the avoidance of patient prosthesis mismatch (PPM) without the need for aortic annular enlargement.

In this study, we report the trends of aortic valvular replacement and root enlargement operations performed in our clinic between 1999 and 2008.

Material and methods

Between 1999 and 2009, we performed open heart surgery on 16,764 patients. Of these operations, 4,687 involved valve surgery. Aortic valve operations were less common than mitral valve repair. During this period, we conducted 1,397 aortic valve operations, including 60 aortic valve reconstructions.

The data of 1,337 consecutive patients who underwent AVR with or without concomitant posterior aortic annulus enlargement between January 1999 and January 2009 were included in the study. Patients with aortic dissections and patients who underwent Bentall and Ross procedures were excluded from the analysis. Patients were grouped according to the employed aortic valve size. The data were collected and analyzed retrospectively.

Tab. I. Study parameters

| Parameter                        | n     | %  |
|----------------------------------|-------|----|
| Age (year)                       | 54.37 ± 17.35 (range 10-84) |    |
| Sex (f)                          | 456   | 34.1 |
| Aortic stenosis                  | 703   | 52.5 |
| Aortic regurgitation             | 435   | 32.5 |
| Regurgitation + stenosis         | 199   | 14.8 |
| Additional disease               |       |    |
| Mitral regurgitation             | 225   | 34.8 |
| Mitral stenosis                  | 90    | 13.9 |
| Ascending aortic aneurysm        | 170   | 26.3 |
| Other                            | 160   | 24.8 |
| Aortic valve size                |       |    |
| 19                               | 106   | 7.9 |
| 21                               | 526   | 39.3 |
| 23                               | 468   | 35.0 |
| 25                               | 223   | 16.7 |
| 27                               | 12    | 0.9 |
| 29                               | 2     | 0.1 |
| Aortic root enlargement          |       |    |
| Nicks                            | 25    | 1.9 |
| Manouguian                       | 6     | 0.4 |
| Additional procedure             |       |    |
| Mitral valve replacement         | 312   | 23.3 |
| Other                            | 333   | 24.9 |
| Mitral valve size                |       |    |
| 25                               | 17    | 5.6 |
| 27                               | 73    | 23.3 |
| 29                               | 121   | 38.9 |
| 31                               | 80    | 25.6 |
| 33                               | 21    | 6.7 |
| Redo                             | 37    | 2.8 |
| Hospital mortality               | 33    | 2.5 |
All patients were operated on using median sternotomy and were placed on cardiopulmonary bypass with high aortic and dual-stage right atrial cannulation. A membrane oxygenator and arterial filter were routinely used. Prostheses were implanted into the intra-annular position with interrupted pledged sutures. Patients who required annular enlargement underwent either the Nicks [1] or the Manouguian procedure [2].

The data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 15, 2006 Statistical Software (USA). Continuous variables were summarized as mean and standard deviation, while categorical variables were described as the number of subjects and percentage. In the study, we classified numeric variables, and we used a χ² test for univariate analysis. The Mann-Whitney test and 1-way ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn’s multiple comparison tests) were used as appropriate. P values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant, and the confidence interval was 95%.

Results

The mean age of the study population was 54.37 ± 17.35 (range: 10-84). Men constituted 65.8% of the study group (n = 881). Seven hundred and three (n = 703) (52.5%) patients were diagnosed with isolated aortic stenosis, 199 (14.8%) with both aortic stenosis and regurgitation. The Nicks procedure was performed in 25 patients (1.9%). Study population properties are summarized in Table I and II.

No relationship was observed between age and preferred valve size (p > 0.05). However, sex did affect the valve size: female patients were implanted mostly with 19 or 21 sized valves, while male patients were more often implanted with size 23 or 25 (p < 0.01).

We observed an absolute increase in the number of aortic valve replacement procedures during the studied period (75 cases in 1999 and 194 cases in 2008). The number of aortic root enlargement procedures decreased over the years (p = 0.0002); particularly, the decline of the Nicks procedure was statistically significant (5 cases in 1999 and 2 cases in 2008) (p < 0.05). It was noteworthy that despite the decrease in the number of aortic root enlargement operations, the preferred valve size increased. In 2008, the most frequently used valve size was 23, whereas size 21 was preferred in 1999 (p < 0.05). The primary pathophysiology leading to aortic valve replacement, aortic stenosis, did not change over the years (p > 0.05). Although the use of combined surgery increased over the years, there was no statistically significant increase in mortality rates (p > 0.05).

Discussion

A population of patients undergoing AVR with or without root enlargement in our clinic from 1999 to 2009 was defined. An absolute increase was observed in the number of aortic valve replacement procedures during the studied period. However, the primary pathology leading to surgery, i.e. aortic stenosis, did not change over the years (Table III, A, B).

Parallel to our results, Northrup et al. described a certain increase in aortic valve operations [3]. The profile of aortic valve disease with dominant aortic stenosis depicted in the present study (n = 703; 52.5%) is similar to other surgical series [3-6]. Consistent with the present data, there appears to be a trend towards more surgical complexity in aortic valve operations. However, in contradiction to our results, there are papers advocating more combined CAB in aortic valve operations [3, 7-9]. In this study, we have observed more combined mitral valve operations in comparison to other procedures (312 and 333, respectively; p > 0.05) (Table IVA, B).

The procedure of anterior or posterior annular enlargement may be performed in a patient with a small aortic root to enable the implantation of a larger valve. The posterior approach is the one most commonly used in adults, and it can increase the annular diameter by 2 to 4 mm. In the Nicks technique of root enlargement, the aortotomy is extended downward through the non-coronary cusp and the aortic annulus to the anterior mitral leaflet [1]. In the Manouguian procedure, the aortotomy incision extends downward through the commissure between the left and non-coronary cusps into the interleaflet triangle and the anterior leaflet of the mitral valve [2]. The anterior approach is generally used in the pediatric population. Described by Konno et al. in 1975, this technique, also known as aortoventriculoplasty, is used when annular enlargement of more than 4 mm is required [10]. Instead of a transverse incision, a longitudinal incision is made in the anterior aorta and extended to the right coronary sinus of Valsalva and then through the anterior wall of the right ventricle to open the right ventricular outflow tract. The ventricular septum is incised, allowing the aortic annulus and left ventricular outflow tract to expand significantly.

Attention needs to be drawn to the fact that the technological development of mechanical valve characteristics has enabled the avoidance of root enlargement and postoperative left ventricular outflow gradient. Over the past

---

Tab. II. Patients’ sex distribution by year

|       | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | P     |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| n (%) | 29 (38.7) | 28 (34.6) | 29 (30.5) | 39 (35.5) | 48 (37.2) | 49 (29.9) | 48 (31.5) | 54 (32.7) | 66 (38.2) | 66 (34.0) | 0.839  |
| Female | 46 (61.3) | 53 (65.4) | 66 (69.5) | 71 (64.5) | 81 (62.8) | 115 (70.1) | 103 (68.2) | 111 (67.3) | 107 (61.8) | 128 (66.0) |        |
| Male   | 46 (61.3) | 53 (65.4) | 66 (69.5) | 71 (64.5) | 81 (62.8) | 115 (70.1) | 103 (68.2) | 111 (67.3) | 107 (61.8) | 128 (66.0) |        |
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Over the 25 years, changes have been made in the design and configuration of bileaflet prostheses. The sewing ring of the SJM valve has changed (SJM HP) to enable larger valve implantation in any given annulus tissue, as has the ATS Medical prosthesis with its AP design. The sewing ring of the Sulzer CarboMedics valve has been modified so that the valve is implanted in a supravalvular position (top hat model). The On-X valve incorporates advanced pyrolytic carbon technology, using a purer, more flexible coating to allow flanging of the inflow portion of the valve housing, mimicking the normal flow pattern [11]. New mechanical valves have good hemodynamic properties and lower root enlargement rates when compared to the older types.

However, the debate on patient-prosthesis mismatch (PPM) continues. We observed a statistically significant decrease in the number of aortic root enlargement procedures ($p < 0.05$, Table VA). Particularly, the number of Nicks procedures declined over the years ($p < 0.010$, Table VB).

Blais et al., Adams et al., and De Paulis et al. reported no difference in overall valve-related mortality between patients who had severe PPM, moderate PPM, or significant PPM [12-14]. On the other hand, Zapolanski et al. and Jamie-son et al. reported that PPM was related to early mortality after aortic valve replacement [15, 16]. Conversely to the decrease in aortic root enlargement operations, this study observed a trend to choose larger aortic valves: size 21 was the one most frequently used in 1999, whereas size 23 was preferred in 2008 ($p < 0.05$, Table VI).

As myocardial protection and prosthetic valve technology improved, hospital mortality declined between the years.

### Table IVA. Relationship between additional operation and the used aortic valve size

| Properties | Aortic valve size | p  |
|------------|-------------------|----|
|            | 19                | 21 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 29 + 31 |
| AVR + MVR  | n (%)            | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | 0.398 |
| Other      | 0 (0.0)           | 102 (30.8) | 154 (46.2) | 77 (23.1) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |

AVR – aortic valve replacement, MVR – mitral valve replacement

### Table IVB. Redo cases by year

| Year | p     |
|------|-------|
| n (%)| n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) |
| 1999 | 2 (2.7)| 2 (2.5)| 3 (3.2)| 4 (3.6)| 3 (2.3)| 5 (3.0)| 6 (4.0)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 6 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2000 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2001 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2002 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2003 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2004 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2005 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2006 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2007 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
| 2008 | 1 (1.7)| 1 (1.7)| 3 (3.7)| 5 (5.5)| 3 (2.3)| 6 (4.5)| 7 (6.4)| 4 (2.4)| 2 (1.2)| 5 (3.1)| 0.957 |
Tab. VA. Aortic root enlargement procedures by year

| Year | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| n (%) | 5 (7.1) | 5 (6.5) | 3 (3.2) | 4 (3.7) | 2 (1.5) | 4 (2.5) | 2 (1.3) | 2 (1.2) | 2 (1.1) | 2 (1.0) |
| p   | 0.000295 |

Tab. VB. Nicks and Manouguian procedures by year

| Year | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| n (%) | 2 (1.2) | 1 (0.7) | 1 (0.7) | 1 (0.6) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (0.5) |
| p   | 0.721 |

Tab. VI. Aortic valve size by year

| Aortic valve size | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 19               | 8 (10.7) | 9 (11.1) | 10 (10.5) | 11 (10.0) | 12 (9.3) | 12 (7.3) | 13 (8.6) | 12 (7.3) | 9 (5.2) | 10 (5.2) |
| 21               | 32 (42.7) | 33 (40.7) | 39 (41.1) | 47 (42.7) | 55 (42.6) | 72 (43.9) | 62 (41.1) | 55 (33.3) | 67 (38.7) | 64 (33.0) |
| 23               | 22 (29.3) | 26 (32.1) | 28 (29.5) | 36 (32.7) | 42 (32.6) | 51 (31.1) | 45 (29.8) | 59 (35.8) | 70 (40.5) | 89 (45.9) |
| 25               | 13 (17.3) | 13 (16.0) | 18 (18.9) | 16 (14.5) | 20 (15.5) | 29 (17.7) | 31 (20.5) | 39 (23.6) | 20 (11.6) | 24 (12.4) |
| 27               | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 6 (3.5) | 6 (3.1) |
| 29               | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (0.6) | 1 (0.5) |

Tab. VIIA. Mortality by year

| Year | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| n (%) | 2 (2.7) | 1 (1.2) | 2 (2.1) | 3 (2.7) | 2 (1.6) | 2 (1.2) | 4 (2.6) | 6 (3.6) | 5 (2.9) | 6 (3.1) |
| p   | 0.940 |

Tab. VIIB. Relationship between hospital mortality and aortic prosthetic valve size

| Aortic valve size | 19 | 21 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 29 + 31 |
|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---------|
| n (%) | 7 (20.0) | 7 (20.0) | 12 (40.0) | 7 (20.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| p   | 0.423 |

Tab. VIIC. Relationship between additional procedures and mortality

| Additional procedure | AVR | AVR-MVR | Other |
|----------------------|-----|---------|-------|
| n (%) | 8 (0.5) | 11 (0.8) | 14 (1.04) |
| p   | 0.808 |

AVR – aortic valve replacement, MVR – mitral valve replacement
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1980s and 1990s; stable hospital mortality was reported during the 1990s [6, 7, 9, 17]. This study has observed stable hospital mortality rates during the studied period (Table VIIA-C, \( p > 0.05 \)).

Other authors have demonstrated surgical complexity to be a risk factor for hospital mortality [3, 8, 9, 18, 19]. In the present study, we have also observed an increase in early mortality after combined surgery (Table VIIA-C), but without statistical significance (\( p > 0.05 \)). The overall short-term outcomes after AVR with or without combined surgery were excellent. The low risk of AVR associated with combined surgery supports the consideration for earlier surgical referral and intervention in patients with a high likelihood of aortic stenosis progression. It is noteworthy that surgical complexity by itself creates only a modest risk and, therefore, should not be a contraindication to aortic valve surgery in the future.

Conclusions

This study showed that avoiding the procedure of aortic root enlargement and implanting larger valves with high-performance prostheses is safe.
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