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## 1- Vascular Injury

## Major Vascular Complications and Mortality

\author{

- Major Vascular Complications <br> No Major Vascular Complications
}



## Aortoiliofemoral Complications

|  | SFAR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables | $\geq 1.05$ ( $\mathrm{n}=55$ ) | <1.05 ( $\mathrm{n}=72$ ) | P Value |
| Any vascular complication | 41.8\% | 16.7\% | <0.001 |
| VARC Major | 30.9\% | 6.9\% | 0.001 |
| VARC Minor | 10.9\% | 9.7\% | 0.827 |
| Femoral artery complication | 27.3\% | 12.5\% | 0.035 |
| Iliac artery complication | 20.0\% | 2.8\% | 0.002 |
| In-hospital mortality | 20.0\% | 6.9\% | 0.033 |
| 30-daymortality | 18.2\% | 4.2\% | 0.016 |
|  | Occlusion balloon catheter |  |  |

Hayashida et al. JACC Interventions 2011

## Contemporary Re-appraisal of SFAR

## Contrast-CT cohort



| Contrast CT $(P<0.001)$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SRC | No SRC | Total |
| SIFAR $\geq 1.12$ | $33(27.7 \%)$ | $86(72.3 \%)$ | 119 |
| SIFAR $<1.12$ | $2(1.2 \%)$ | $162(98.8 \%)$ | 164 |

Source: Okuyama et al Circ Imaging 2014

# 2- Pre-procedural co-planar 

 angle prediction
## Fluoroscopic co-planar angle prediction

## Line of perpendicularity

| Identificatio |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | Adjusting to <br> LAO $0^{\circ}$ | Adjusting to <br> CAU $0^{\circ}$ |
| LAO $30^{\circ}$ |  |  |

of annulus


## MDCT vs 3-D Angio CT for Angle Prediction



Source: Binder et al. TCT 2011, Circ Interventions April 2012

# 3- Ancillary root measurements essential for planning 

## CT Provides Additional Important Data Regarding the Aortic Root - Coronary Ostial Height



IFU - Minimum 10/11 mm
Limitations : Measurements not standardized, „bulky calcifications"

## Ancillary root measurements \& Coronary height

Coronary artery occlusion


- displacement of the calcified native cusp over the coronary ostia
- < $1 \%$ of cases
- 0.66\% (Ribiero et al, JACC 2013)
- More common in
- Women
- Balloon-expandable TAVI
- Valve-in-Valve


## Anatomical Predictors of Coronary occlusion

## 
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- 44/6688 (0.66\%)
- Predominantly LM
- More common in
- Women
- Balloon-expandable TAVI
- Valve-in-Valve

Heart Valve Innovation
St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver

- LMH:
- $10.6 \pm 2.1 \mathrm{~mm}$ vs. $13.4 \pm 2.1 \mathrm{~mm}$
- <12mm - in obstruction 86\%
- <12mm - controls $26 \%$
- SOV:
- $28.1 \pm 3.8 \mathrm{~mm}$ vs. $31.9 \pm 4.1 \mathrm{~mm}$
- $<30 \mathrm{~mm}$ - in obstruction 71\%
- <30mm - controls 33\%
- LMH < 12 mm and SOV <30mm
- obstruction 68\%
- controls 13\%


## Ancillary root measurements \& Coronary height



Bulky calcifications \& Low LMH \& Shallow sinus

## 4- Help adjudicate Valve morphology in difficult cases

Tricuspid or not tricuspid?

## Valve anatomy

Bicuspid


## Valve anatomy

## Bicuspid

## Type 1

1 raphe


# 5- MDCT for Annular Sizing and THV Selection 

## The Annulus is Elliptical

The annulus is commonly oval-shaped Renortad in annravimatalu 500 of nationts

Any single diameter cannot adequately characterize the annulus "size" due to its elliptical non-circular configuration

Tops LF, Wood DA, Delgado V, et al. Noninvasive evaluation of the aortic root
with multislice computed tomography: implications for transcatheter aortic valve replacement. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging 2008; 3:25-32

## The Virtual Basal Ring



Sinotubular junction
Aortic leaflets

## Aortic Annular Diamete

Aortic Annulus
RC = Right coronary cusp; NC = Non-coronary cusp;
LC = Left coronary cusp

## CT Annular Measures Can Predict PV Leak



* Valve stent diameter Mean annular diameter ${ }_{\text {MDCT }}$ AUC 0.84
* Valve stent diameter -Area-derived annular diameter $_{\text {MDCT }}$ AUC 0.86
* Valve stent area/ Annular $\operatorname{area}_{\text {MDCT }}$ AUC 0.87


Willson et al. JACC 2012

MDCT Can Provide Reproducible and Robust Sizing Recommendations

## Vancouver MDCT Sizing Guidelines



## Self Expanding Valve Sizing Recommendations Based on MDCT

|  | Diameter Range $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Perimeter Range $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Area Range $\left(\mathrm{mm}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | $18-20$ | $56.5-62.8$ | $254.5-314.2$ |
| 26 | $20-23$ | $62.8-72.3$ | $314.2-415.5$ |
| 29 | $23-27$ | $72.3-84.8$ | $415.5-572.6$ |
| 31 | $26-29$ | $81.7-91.1$ | $530.9-660.5$ |

## Recent evidence supports

Area/Perimeter as the recommended method for TAVI sizing

## Different Sizing Algorithms for Different Valves




## From Theoretical to Practical

## Impact of CT sizing on TAVR outcomes

The Impact of Integration of a Multidetector Computed Tomography Annulus Area Sizing Algorithm on Outcomes of Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement: A Prospective, Multicenter, Controlled Trial

Short Title: Computed Tomography Area Sizing for TAVR
Ronald K. Binder ${ }^{1}$, MD; John G. Webb ${ }^{1}$, MD; Alexander B. Willson ${ }^{1}$, MBBS; Marina Urena $^{2}$, MD; Nicolaj C. Hansson ${ }^{3}$, MD; Bjarne L. Norgaard ${ }^{3}$, MD; Philippe Pibarot ${ }^{2}$, MD; Marco Barbanti ${ }^{1}$, MD; Eric Larose ${ }^{2}$, MD; Melanie Freeman $^{1}$, MBBS; Eric Dumont ${ }^{2}$, MD; Chris Thompson ${ }^{1}$, MD; Miriam Wheeler ${ }^{1}$, MBChB; Robert R. Moss ${ }^{1}$, MD; Tae-hyun Yang ${ }^{1}$, MD; Sergio Pasian ${ }^{2}$, MD; Cameron Hague ${ }^{1}$, MD; Giang Nguyen ${ }^{1}$, MD; Rekha Raju ${ }^{1}$, MD $_{3}$ Stefan Toggweiler ${ }^{1}$, MD; James K. Min, MD ${ }^{5}$; David A. Wood ${ }^{4}$, MD; Josep Rodés-Cabau ${ }^{2}$, MD; Jonathon Leipsic ${ }^{1}$, MD.

- 266 patients in the trial
- 133 patients underwent TAVR with the MDCT sizing algorithm recommendation and 133 patients without the algorithm
- PVL> mild was present in $5.3 \%$ in the MDCT group and in $12.8 \%$ in the control group ( $\mathrm{p}=0.032$ )
- Composite of in-hospital death, aortic annulus rupture and PVL> moderate 3.8\% in the MDCT group and in $11.3 \%$ in the control group ( $\mathrm{p}=0.020$ )


## CT Sizing helps optimize outcomes with Self Expanding Prosthesis



Source : Adams et al NEJM 2014

## 6- Preventing Annular Injury with MDCT

## Annular rupture

## Anatomical and Procedural Features Associated with Aortic Root Rupture During Balloon-Expandable Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement

Marco Barbanti, Tae-Hyun Yang, Josep Rodés-Cabau, Corrado Tamburino, David A. Wood, Hasan Jilaihawi, Philipp Blanke, Raj R. Makkar, Azeem Latib, Antonio Colombo, Giuseppe Tarantini, Rekha Raju, Ronald K. Binder, Giang Nguyen, Melanie Freeman, Henrique B. Ribeiro, Samir Kapadia, James Min, Gudrun Feuchtner, Ronen Gurtvich, Faisal Alqoofi, Marc Pelletier, Gian Paolo Ussia, Massimo Napodano, Fabio Sandoli de Brito, Jr., Susheel Kodali, Bjarne L. Norgaard, Nicolaj
C. Hansson, Gregor Pache, Sergio J. Canovas, Hongbin Zhang, Martin B. Leon, John G. Webb and Jonathon Leipsic

|  | Study group <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{3 1 )}$ | Uncontained rupture <br> $\mathbf{( n = 2 0 )}$ <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 1 )}$ | Contained rupture |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mortality | $48.4 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $<0.001$ |
| Cardiovascular mortality | $45.2 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $<0.001$ |
| Disabling stroke | $12.9 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | 0.447 |
| Life-threatening bleeding | $45.2 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | 0.049 |

Source: Barbanti et al. Circulation July 2013

# Annular Rupture May not Be RandomInsights from MDCT 

Univariate

Predictors of aortic root rupture

LVOT calcifications moderate/severe

Prosthesis oversizing $\geq \mathbf{2 0 \%}$

Odds Ratio (95\%CI) P value
$10.92(3.23-36.91)<0.001$
$8.38(2.67-26.33)<0.001$

## Preventing extreme annular oversizing particularly in the setting of LVOT calcification

## Case examples

Significant oversizing (>20\%) is possible ...Just do it in the right patient!


## Case example \#1

- 26-mm SAPIEN XT
- $38.5 \%$ oversizing
$\square$ No LVOT calcification
- Uneventful TAVR!


Case example \#2

- 26-mm SAPIEN XT
- 27.9\% oversizing
- Severe LVOT calcification
- Annular rupture!


## Does calcium distribution matter?



Source: Leipsic RSNA 2014, Hansson et al in press JCCT

## Sub-annular calcium below the non-coronary cusp is most predictive of rupture




## 7- Coronary occlusion in Valve-in-Valve Procedures

## Complications Remain- Ostial Coronary Obstruction



Center \#30, case\#3
Mitroflow 25mm (ID 21mm)
Tranapical Edwards-SAPIEN 23mm


Center \#34, case\#6
Mitroflow 21mm (ID 17.3 mm )
Tranfemoral CoreValve 26 mm


Center \#29, case\#7
Sorin Freedom Stentless 21mm (ID 19mm)
Balloon Valvuloplasty
before attempted CoreValve implantation


Center \#13, case\#4
Sorin Freedom Stentless 23mm (ID 21mm)
Transfemoral CoreValve 26 mm


Center \#27, case\#3
CryoLife O'Brien (stentless) 25mm (ID 23mm) Transfemoral CoreValve 29mm


Center \#11, case\#11
Mosaic 21mm (ID 18.5mm)
Transapical Edwards-SAPIEN 23mm

## Coronary obstruction in Valve-in-Valve Procedures

## Valve design

Mitroflow \#27 in an aortic root model


Valve-in-Valve with SAPIEN 29mm


## Assessment for Valve-in-Valve Procedures

Anatomical issues and potential measurements

1. Root anatomy

- Coronary artery height
- Sinus of Valsalva with
- Sinus height

2. Distortion of Anatomy

- Tilting of the surgical prosthesis
- Lower coronary height


## Prediction of the the

 proximity of the coronary ostia to the anticipated final position of the displaced bioprosthetic leaflets after THVimplantation

## Assessment for Valve-in-Valve Procedures

Virtual THV to Coronary (VTC) distance


Non-coaxial (tilted) bioprosthesis in capacious aortic root


Coaxial aligned bloprosthesis in noncapacious aortic root with narrow ST]


High risk: <3 mm, intermediate: 3 to 6 mm , low: >6 mm.

## Assessment for Valve-in-Valve Procedures

Example


## Conclusions

- MDCT is now well established as an important tool for annular sizing
- Allows for the discrimination of those patients historically at risk for annular rupture, coronary occlusion and PAR
- Field is moving from historical device selection based on sex or 2 D measurements to a truly individualized approach to THV selection
- Growing role in the assessment of risk of coronary occlusion in valve in valve procedures

