Percutaneous Aortic Valve Replacement In The Cath Lab

CoreValve ReValvingTM System

Maurice Buchbinder, M.D

Foundation for Cardiovascular Medicine La Jolla, CA

On behalf of the CoreValve Investigators: Grube, Gerckens, Schuler, Linke, Bonan, Serruys, De Jaegere, Kovacs, Den Heijer, Labinaz, Ruel, Mullen, Moat, Tymchak, Bosmans, Benit, Laborde

พ. ธนตามเกตer, พบ Foundation for Cardiovascular Medicine

*ReValving is a trademark of CoreValve Inc, USA

CoreValve ReValving System for PAVR Components

- Self-expanding multi-level support frame
- Tri-leaflet porcine pericardial tissue valve
- Presently 18F catheter delivery system

Self-Expanding Multi-level Support Frame

Diamond cell configuration

Nitinol: memory shaped/no recoil

Multi-level design incorporates three *different* areas of radial and hoop strength

•Low radial force area orients the system

•Constrained area avoids coronaries and features supra-annular valve leaflets

•High radial force provides secure anchoring and constant force mitigates paravalvular leak

Radiopaque

Porcine Pericardial Tissue Valve

- Specifically designed for transcatheter delivery
- Single layer porcine pericardium
- Tri-leaflet configuration
- Tissue valve sutured to frame
- Standard tissue fixation techniques
- 400M cycle AWT testing completed
- Intra-annular implantation and sealing skirt





18F Delivery Catheter System



Aortic Valve

Aorta \leq 40 mm for 26 mm device Aorta \leq 43 mm for 29 mm device



Sinus of Valsalva:≥ 15 mm height≥ 30 mm width

Annulus: 20 - 23 mm for 26 mm device Annulus: 24 - 27 mm for 29 mm device

Optimal Implantation



Catheter Size Reduction



18 French System Procedural Progress

Nov. 2006

Evolution to a « true percutaneous cath lab procedure » within the first 40 Patients of 18 Fr study

Pre-closing with ProStar[™]

Local Anesthesia

Dec. 2006

- Beating heart in normal sinus rhythm
- Valve delivery without rapid pacing
- No cardiac assistance

General anesthesia
 Surgical cutdown/repair
 Ventricular assistance

M. Buchbinder, MD Foundation for Cardiovascular Medicine

Oct. 2006



CoreValve PAVR *ReValving* System Total Experience

Time Period	Implant Phase	Device Used	Number of Patients
July 2004-July 2005	First in Man	25 French	14
May2005-August2006	21F Intl Trial Includes 2 ReDo	21 French	65
May 2006-Ongoing	18F Intl Trial	18 French	112
May 2007-Ongoing	Expanded Evaluation	CE 0050 18 French	598
Total Worldwide PAVR ReValving Patients Treated			789

Updated March 22, 2008

Procedural and 30 Day Results

Reporting 18F safety & efficacy study results

Reporting post CE Mark 18F registry results

Patient Demographics

		18F S&E (N=112)	I8F Registry (N=478)
Age (years) Female		$81.7 \pm 6.7 [58-92] 62 (55%) 23 5 \pm 13 9 [3-69]$	80.6 ±7.0 [46-95] 225 (54%) 24 1 ±14 0 [3-85]
High Risk Co-m	orbidities		Z - 1 1 <u>1</u> 4.0 [3-03]
	Diabetes CAD	78% 26% 61%	58% 27% 57%
	Prior MI Prior PCI Prior CABG	19% 33% 28%	14% 31% 23%
	AFib Prior CVA PVD	41% 19% 21%	31% 8% 26%

Patient Demographics (continued)

Pre-procedure	18F S&E (N=112)	18F Registry (N=478)
AVA (cm ²)	0.59 ±0.18 [0.2-1.0]	0.64 ±0.20 [0.2-1.7]
Mean Gradient (mm Hg)	47.2 ±17.9 [15-97]	49.8 ±17.8 [15-114]
Peak Gradient (mm нg)	71.5 ±27.0 [24-150]	78.3 ±26.8 [22-169]
% in NYHA Class III/IV	75%	86%
LVEF	51% ±15 [32-78]	51% ±14 [10-85]

Procedural Results

	18 F S&E (N=112)	18F Registry (N=478)
Procedural Success	102 (91%)	465 (97%)
Mean Procedure Time	151	130 ± 49 Min
Discharged alive & well with CoreValve	<mark>96 (86%)</mark>	449 (94%)

Peak Gradient (mm Hg)

 18F S&E

 (N=112)

 Pre:
 71.46 ±27.03 [24-150]

 Discharge:
 7.42 ±6.81 [0-23]

18F Registry (N=478) Pre: 78.27 ±26.77 [22-169] Discharge: 4.79 ±8.31 [0-60]



Foundation for Cardiovascular Medicine

	18F S&E (N=112)	18F Registry (N=478)
Procedural Failures	10 (9%)	13 (3%)
Inability to access vessel	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Inability to navigate vasculature	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Inability to cross native valve	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Malplacement	6 (5%)	1 (<1%)
Aortic Root Perforation	1 (<1%)	2 (<1%)
Aortic Dissection	2 (2%)	1 (<1%)
Access Vessel Bleeding	4 (4%)	2 (<1%)
LV Perforation, guidewire	1 (<1%)	2 (<1%)
RV Perforation, temp pacemaker wire	0 (0%)	2 (<1%)
Difficulty with BAV	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)
Conversion to Surgery	4 (4%)	2 (<1%)

multiple events in same patients = data not cumulative

M. E

Complications (0–30 Days)*	18F S&E (112)	18F Registry (478)
MI*	4 (4%)	3 (<1%)
Aortic dissection*	3 (3%)	2 (<1%)
Coronary impairment	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
Acute Vascular complications	4 (4%)	7 (2%)
Stroke/TIA*	6 (5%)	8 (2%)
Pacemaker	28 (25%) **	34 (7%)
Re-op for valve failure	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)

* multiple events in same patients = data not cumulative

** >1/3 prophylactic

Regurgitation at Discharge



30 Day Outcomes

	18F S&E (N-112)	18F Registry (N=478)
Logistic EuroSCORE:	<mark>24%</mark>	25%
All cause 30-Day Mortality	<mark>15% (</mark> 17	<mark>) 8% (</mark> 36)
Procedure Related Non-Procedure/Non-valve Rel Unknown	11 (10% ated 6 (5% 0 (0%	6) 15 (3%) 6) 18 (4%) 6) 3 (<1%)
	No va No va	alve dysfunction alve migration

Medium Term Outcomes

Reporting 21F & 18F Safety & Efficacy Studies Follow-up

Note: Registry medium term follow-up not yet available

Medium term patient and valve follow-up 21F + 18F Safety Studies Pooled – N=175

Patient days with CoreValve: 368 ±256 [261-929]



Quality of Life at Follow-up 21F + 18F Safety Studies Pooled – N=175

Mean Gradient (mm Hg)

Ejection Fraction (%)





Last Follow-up NYHA		
1	42%	
Ш	43%	
III	14%	
IV	1%	

M. Buchbinder, MD

Foundation for Cardiovascular Medicine

Conclusions

Percutaneous Aortic Valve Replacement with the CoreValve System

Is a relatively safe and effective procedure in high risk aortic stenosis patients.

≻Has evolved as a true percutaneous procedure.

As with many novel technologies PAVR has a definite learning curve which requires an in-depth understanding of patient selection and various anatomical criteria

Long term efficacy and durability of PAVR in patients with aortic stenosis remains to be determined in future carefully conducted prospective trials.