Imaging

37 TRANSEOESOPHAGEAL ECHOCARDIOGRAPHY UNDERESTIMATES TRANSVALVULAR GRADIENTS FOLLOWING TRANS-CATHETER AORTIC VALVE IMPLANTATION (TAVI) – IMPLICATIONS FOR CLINICAL PRACTICE

Andrea Solcanova*, Sarah Bates, Alison Calver, Nick Curzen, Dhruvo Rakshit, Benoy Shah. University Hospital Southampton; *Presenting Author

10.1136/heartjnl-2016-309890.37

Background Trans-catheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI) is an effective treatment for high risk patients with severe aortic stenosis. As with all prosthetic valves, it is important to document accurate post-procedural gradients for future comparison. This study aimed to determine whether there was a difference between gradients measured immediately post-procedure by trans-oesophageal echocardiography (TOE) compared with the pre-discharge trans-thoracic echocardiogram (TTE). We also compared pre-TAVI gradients obtained by TTE vs. TOE.

Methods We used local and national databases to gather demographics on TAVI patients from our centre and to identify peak and mean aortic gradients measured by TTE and TOE prior to TAVI and also immediately following TAVI deployment (TOE) and prior to discharge (TTE). Data were compared using the paired t-test.

Results We identified 106 TAVI patients with complete echocardiographic data-sets. The mean age was 81+/-8 yrs and 62 (54%) were male. All patients received an Edwards Sapien valve. Pre-TAVI, there were no significant differences between TOE and TTE for both peak (72.2+/-24.8 mmHg vs 71.9+/-24.0 mmHg, $p = 0.83$) and mean (41.4+/-15.0 mmHg vs 42.4+/-14.9 mmHg, $p = 0.22$) gradients. However, following TAVI, the peak trans-valvular gradients by TOE vs. TTE were 12+/-6 mmHg vs 22+/-9 mmHg ($p < 0.001$) and mean trans-valvular gradients were 6+/-3 mmHg vs 11+/-5 mmHg ($p < 0.001$). There were 36 patients with LV dysfunction: the results were unchanged after excluding these patients (peak gradient 12+/-6 mmHg vs. 23+/-9 mmHg, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusions Although TTE and TOE perform similarly prior to TAVI, the immediate post-procedural assessment of trans-aortic gradients by TOE leads to significant under-estimation compared to TTE. Intra-procedural TOE should not be used to define baseline peak and mean aortic gradients after TAVI.

Valve Disease/Pericardial Disease/ Cardiomyopathy

38 MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION FOLLOWING SURGICAL AND TRANS-CATHETER AORTIC VALVE REPLACEMENT – IS PERI-PROCEDURAL REVASCULARISATION FOR TAVI NECESSARY?

¹Laura E Dobson*, ¹Tarique A Musa, ¹Akhlaque Uddin, ¹Timothy A Fairbairn, ¹Peter P Swoboda, ¹David P Ripley, ¹Bara Erhayiem, ¹Adam K McDiarmid, ¹Pankaj Garg, ²Betsy Evans, ²Christopher J Malkin, ²Daniel J Blackman, ¹Sven Plein, ¹John P Greenwood. ¹University of Leeds; ²Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust; *Presenting Author

10.1136/heartjnl-2016-309890.38

Abstract 37 Figure 1 Pre-TAVI TTE (A) vs TOE (B) and post-TAVI TOE (C) vs TTE (D)

Introduction Cardiac biomarker release is ubiquitous following surgical and trans-catheter aortic valve replacement (SAVR and TAVI), preventing accurate discrimination between release due to focal myocardial infarction (MI) and global myocardial injury (Figure 1). Furthermore, the need for peri-procedural revascularisation in TAVI is debated. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance (CMR) late gadolinium enhancement imaging (LGE) is the most sensitive imaging method to detect post-procedural new MI. Our study aimed to compare rates of new MI using CMR LGE before and 6m after TAVI and SAVR.

Methods Ninety six patients with severe aortic stenosis undergoing TAVI (n = 57) and SAVR (n = 39) were prospectively recruited and identical scans performed prior to (median 1 day) and 6m following aortic valve replacement. The presence of significant coronary artery disease (CAD) was determined by the occurrence of a >50% stenosis in any major epicardial vessel. Areas of LGE were quantified with computer-assisted planimetry (2SD; cmr⁴², Circle CVI). Presence of new LGE was determined by direct comparison of pre and post-procedure scans.

Results The SAVR group was younger, less symptomatic, had less 3 vessel CAD and were at lower surgical risk than the TAVI group. Most (87%) SAVR implants were bioprosthetic and most TAVI implants were Medtronic CoreValve (79%) (86% Transfemoral). Thirty-four (60%) patients had non-revascularised CAD at the time of TAVI. MI pattern LGE was present at baseline in 24 TAVI (42%) and 9 SAVR (24%) patients. The rate of new MI was greater in the SAVR group than the TAVI group (SAVR, n = 10 (26%) vs. TAVI, n = 3 (5%), $p = 0.004$). Absolute mean mass of new MI was similar between groups (SAVR 1.1g ± 0.6g vs. TAVI 2.0g ± 1.4g, $p = 0.395$) as was infarct mass as a percentage of left ventricular mass (SAVR 1.0 ± 0.4% vs. TAVI 2.2 ± 1.3%, $p = 0.268$) (Figure 2). None of the SAVR and only one of the TAVI infarcts were detected clinically (Figure 1 – blue dot). 34 patients (60%) in the TAVI group had non-revascularised CAD at the time of TAVI, of whom only 3 (9%) had new MI. In the SAVR group, 16 patients (41%) underwent concurrent coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). Patients undergoing CABG were less likely to have a new MI than those not requiring concurrent revascularisation (CABG 6.3% vs. no CABG 39.1%, $p = 0.021$). There was no difference in mean cardiopulmonary bypass time (New MI 88.5 ± 31.1 vs. No new MI 114.5 ± 47.4min, $p = 0.112$) and aortic cross clamp