Cite this article as: Takayuki G, Sören S, Kristin R, Harnath A, Grimmig O, Sören J *et al.* Surgical revision of failed percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair: lessons learned. Interact CardioVasc Thorac Surg 2019;28:900-7.

# Surgical revision of failed percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair: lessons learned

Gyoten Takayuki<sup>a,\*</sup>, Schenk Sören<sup>a</sup>, Rochor Kristin<sup>b</sup>, Axel Harnath<sup>b</sup>, Oliver Grimmig<sup>a</sup>,

Just Sören<sup>a</sup> and Fritzsche Dirk<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Sana-Herzzentrum Cottbus, Cottbus, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Department of Cardiology, Sana-Herzzentrum Cottbus, Cottbus, Germany

\* Corresponding author. Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Sana-Herzzentrum Cottbus, Leipziger Strasse 50, 03048 Cottbus, Germany. Tel: +49-355-4800; fax: +49-355-4801001; e-mail: t.gyoten29@gmail.com (G. Takayuki).

Received 30 August 2018; received in revised form 4 December 2018; accepted 6 December 2018



# Abstract

**OBJECTIVES:** Although percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair with the MitraClip system is becoming widely adopted in clinical practice, surgical experience on how to correct failed MitraClip therapy is limited. We aimed to analyse the surgical and pathological outcomes after surgical revision of the failed MitraClip therapy.

**METHODS:** Between January 2011 and January 2018, 25 patients (age  $73 \pm 9$  years; men 48%; New York Heart Association class  $3.4 \pm 0.49$ ) were admitted for severe mitral regurgitation at a median of 54 days (range 1–1496 days) after MitraClip edge-to-edge repair. Perioperative variables were analysed for their association with surgical outcomes.

**RESULTS:** All patients underwent explantation of the MitraClip system and subsequent mitral valve replacement. Perioperative mortality was as high as 28%, mainly due to pre-existing cardiogenic or septic shock. The Kaplan-Meier analysis revealed a 53% overall 1-year survival. Among preoperative variables, the logistic European System for Cardiac Operative Risk Evaluation score, left ventricular ejection fraction and liver dysfunction had a significant influence on in-hospital survival. Intraoperatively, the predominant pathology included mitral

© The Author(s) 2019. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery. All rights reserved.

901

valve leaflet damage due to tear, degeneration or infection. Although leaflet tears or MitraClip detachment mainly occurred within the first 6 months after MitraClip therapy, leaflet infections and degeneration mainly occurred later during follow-up.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The surgical revision of failed MitraClip therapy is feasible but has high perioperative mortality, especially among patients with cardiogenic shock, septic shock or liver failure. Mitral regurgitation after the MitraClip therapy is mainly caused by mitral valve leaflet damage due to tear, degeneration or infection, all related to the MitraClip itself.

**Keywords:** Percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair • MitraClip • Revision surgery • Mitral valve replacement • Mortality • Mitral regurgitation

# INTRODUCTION

Percutaneous edge-to-edge mitral valve repair with the MitraClip system (Abbott Vascular, Santa Clara, CA, USA) is becoming widely adopted in clinical practice due to its reported safety in elderly and other high-risk patients, providing an acute success rate of 92% [1], acceptable in-hospital mortality of 2.5-2.7% [2-5] and acceptable 1-year survival free from cardiac depression of 14-23% [6-8]. Meanwhile, ~2.3-6.3% of patients require surgical repair and mitral valve replacement (MVR) due to various complications within 1 year after MitraClip therapy [6]. As few studies have described the outcomes of patients with surgical revision after failed MitraClip implantation [9, 10], the optimal surgical strategy for open-heart operations after failed MitraClip therapy is not well defined. In this study, we evaluated the postoperative clinical outcomes and intraoperative pathological findings of patients who underwent surgical revision for failed MitraClip therapy. We believe that this analysis will contribute immensely to future practice involving the MitraClip system and to the development of a suitable surgical strategy for open-heart operations after failed MitraClip therapy.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### Study design

With approval from the Institutional Review Board of the Sana Heart Center, we retrospectively reviewed the records of consecutive patients who, between January 2011 and January 2018, underwent MVR for recurrent or uncontrolled mitral regurgitation (MR) despite adequate medical therapy after percutaneous MitraClip therapy. Clinical data were collected. Information about the follow-up status was obtained by phone and fax from the treating general physician or from the patients themselves. The study end points were death and cardiac-related death. A heart team consisting of a cardiologist, cardiac surgeon, perfusionist and cardioanaesthesiologist discussed the surgical revision. All patients provided written informed consent for undergoing the revision operation.

#### Surgical procedures

MVR was performed to reduce the duration of aortic crossclamping and cardiopulmonary bypass. All procedures were performed via the median sternotomy or right thoracotomy approach, at the discretion of the surgical team. Full sternotomy was chosen for critically ill patients and for those undergoing redo surgery. After sternotomy, cardiopulmonary bypass was established through direct cannulation of the ascending aorta and right atrium vein (20 patients, 80%). Following right anterolateral thoracotomy at the fourth intercostal space, cardiopulmonary bypass was established through cannulation of the femoral artery and vein (5 patients, 20%). After transthoracic aortic cross-clamping, myocardial arrest was obtained with antegrade warm blood cardioplegia (18 patients, 72%) or Bretschneider cardioplegia (7 patients, 28%). The mitral valve was exposed via the standard left atriotomy or the transseptal approach, depending on the need for tricuspid valve repair and atrial septal defect closure. The failure characteristics of the implanted clips and the degree of tissue damage to the mitral valve were assessed. The clips were cut using scissors and removed, and standard MVR was performed.

# Follow-up

We evaluated data collected at 48 h, 30 days, 6 months and up to 5 years postoperatively. Follow-up data were complete in all patients.

# Statistical analysis

Data are expressed as mean±standard deviation or median [range and/or interquartile range (IQR)] for continuous variables, and as frequency (%) for categorical variables. Univariable comparisons were performed using the Student's unpaired *t*-test for continuous, normally distributed data, the Mann–Whitney *U*-test for non-parametric continuous data and the Fisher's exact test for categorical data. The Kaplan–Meier analysis was used to compute 1-year survival. The statistical significance was set at a *P*-value <0.05. All reported *P*-values are 2-sided. The statistical analysis was performed by a statistician using SPSS for Windows, version 22.0 (IBM Japan, Tokyo, Japan).

# RESULTS

# Study population

Between January 2011 and January 2018, 25 patients (age  $73 \pm 9$  years; age range 52-85 years; men 48%) underwent MVR for severe MR at a median of 54 days (range 1–1496 days) after MitraClip edge-to-edge repair. During the study period, MVR was conducted in 8 (3.21%) of 249 patients who underwent the original intervention at our hospital and in 17 patients who underwent the original intervention at another hospital. Among the 8 patients originally treated at our hospital, the average MR grade after the MitraClip procedure was 2.

 Table 1:
 Preoperative characteristics of 25 patients who underwent surgical revision for failed MitraClip therapy

Characteristics	Values	
Age (years)	73±9	
Male gender	12 (48)	
Body mass index (kg/m²)	28 ± 5	
Hypertension	23 (92)	
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	12 (48)	
Diabetes mellitus with insulin dependence	5 (20)	
NYHA functional class	3.4 ± 0.5	
Aetiology of mitral valve disease		
Degenerative	2 (8)	
Functional	22 (88)	
Combined	1 (4)	
Implanted MitraClips	2.2 ± 0.9	
Previous open cardiac surgery	7 (28)	
Prior percutaneous coronary intervention	11 (44)	
Atrial fibrillation	20 (80)	
Coronary artery disease	15 (60)	
Dilated cardiomyopathy	6 (24)	
Ischaemic cardiomyopathy	4 (16)	
CRTD implantation	7 (28)	
Left ventricular ejection fraction (%)	0.44 ± 0.12 (range 0.17-0.55)	
MR grade at surgery	3.0 ± 0.5	
Systolic pulmonary artery pressure (mmHg)	50 ± 14	
Time since clipping (days)	54 (IQR 13-257; range 1-1496)	
Shock	6 (24)	
Sepsis	2 (8)	
Preintubation	3 (12)	
Emergent MVR	3 (12)	
Urgent MVR	8 (32)	
Elective MVR	14 (56)	
EuroSCORE II (%)	12.9 (IQR 6.7-24.3; range 1.9-81.6)	
Logistic EuroSCORE (%)	35.2 (IQR 15.7-57.9; range 4.5-96.6)	

Data are shown as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation or frequency (%), unless otherwise specified.

CRTD: cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator; EuroSCORE: Euro pean System for Cardiac Operative Risk Evaluation; IQR: interquartile range; MR: mitral regurgitation; MVR: mitral valve replacement; NYHA: New York Heart Association.

#### Preoperative characteristics

The preoperative New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional class was III or IV (mean 3.4 ± 0.49) in all patients. An average of 2.2 ± 0.93 clips had been implanted per patient (IQR 1.5-3; range 1-4). Disease aetiology at the time of MitraClip implant included primarily functional MR (n = 22, 88%), followed by degenerative MR (n = 2, 8%) and combined degenerative and functional MR (n=1, 4%). No echocardiographic indication of leaflet calcification or mitral annular calcification was noted at the time of MitraClip implantation. One patient had undergone redo clipping after unsatisfactory results of the original MitraClip procedure. Nine patients (36%) received some preoperative treatment including placement of an implantable defibrillator or cardiac resynchronization therapy defibrillator. Six patients (24%) had previous cardiac surgery including aortic valve replacement and coronary artery bypass grafting. Six patients were admitted with cardiogenic shock, and an intra-aortic balloon pump was implanted in 2 patients. Three patients (16%) were operated on

#### **Operative data**

Most patients (24/25, 96%) received a biological valve, whereas 1 patient (4%) received a mechanical valve. The duration of cardiopulmonary bypass and aortic cross-clamping was  $117\pm57$  and  $61\pm24$  min, respectively. Concomitant procedures included tricuspid valve repair in 7 patients, aortic valve replacement in 2 patients, coronary artery bypass grafting in 1 patient and cryoablation of atrial fibrillation in 4 patients. In 11 patients, the artificial atrial septal defect created due to the transseptal approach for the MitraClip therapy was closed with a suture from the right atrium side. According to the guidelines, 2 patients received an intra-aortic balloon pump and 2 received extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Nitric oxide gas was used in 1 patient (Table 2).

#### Early clinical outcomes

One patient died during surgery because of severe low cardiac output. There were 7 in-hospital deaths (28%), all among patients at very high surgical risk (logistic EuroSCORE: median 58.8%; IQR 34.6-92.3%; range 21.2-96.6%) (Table 2). In 6 of 7 cases, death occurred mainly because of the pre-existing cardiogenic shock or septic shock within 30 days after surgery. Among the 8 patients undergoing urgent surgery, 1 with logistic EuroSCORE 56.9% died due to multiorgan failure (MOF) within 48 h postoperatively despite intraoperative implantation of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Among the 3 patients undergoing emergent surgery, 2 patients died because of MOF caused by systemic inflammatory response syndrome resulting in septic shock, renal failure or liver failure. All 3 patients with liver complications died because of MOF within 48 h after surgery. One patient received a left ventricular assist device at 3 days postoperatively but died because of sepsis and MOF at 33 days postoperatively.

Among the 18 survivors, 2 required re-exploration for bleeding, 1 required reintubation for pulmonary pneumonia and 1 developed new atrioventricular block requiring pacemaker implantation. Two patients were transferred to the neurology department due to a transient cerebrovascular event. All other patients were discharged to rehabilitation homes or home at a median of 12.5 days (IQR 8.8–28.8; range 1–80 days), with no residual MR or endocarditis noted on thoracic echocardiography at discharge.

#### Variables related to in-hospital survival

There was a significant association with in-hospital survival for several preoperative variables including logistic EuroSCORE at surgery, left ventricular ejection fraction and liver dysfunction. No such association was noted for age, sex, acute or chronic renal failure, MR grade, cardiogenic shock, NYHA functional class, operative situation (emergent versus urgent versus elective) and time between MitraClip therapy and revision cardiac surgery (Table 3).

therapy
$\underline{\circ}$
$\geq$
g
÷
fa
۲
9
revision for f
٦
eived surgical revis
σ
receive
who
s of patients
ati
പ
ð
ndings
÷
tive data and
da
rative
Intraope
Table 2:

Time to MVR (days)     No.     Indication for surgery     Mitral value surgery       ifox     argery     surgery     windit       1454     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       ifox     2     MR III, MS II     MVR       ifox     2     MR III, MS II     Redo-urgent MVR       145     3     MR III, MS II, TR III     Redo-urgent MVR       122     2     MR III, MS II, TR III     Urgent MVR       1496     1     B     MR III, MS II     MVR       122     2     MR III, MS II     MVR     MVR       123     2     MR III, MS II     MVR     MVR       1     1     3     MR III, MS II     MVR       1     1     MVR     MVR     MVR       2     MR III, MS II     MVR     MVR       2     MR III     MVR     MVR       2     MVR     MVR     MVR       2     MVR     MVR <th>alve</th> <th>Intraoperative findings of valve lesion</th> <th>ACC duration (min)</th> <th>CPB duration</th>	alve	Intraoperative findings of valve lesion	ACC duration (min)	CPB duration
MR II, MS II     MR II, MS II       1454     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       1145     4     MR III, MS II     MVR       1122     2     MR III, MS II     Redo-urgent MVR       1146     1     4     MR III, MS II     Redo-urgent MVR       11496     1     1     Redo-urgent MVR       122     2     MR III     NVR       1496     1     E, MR III     NVR       123     2     MR III, MS II     NVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     NVR       375     2     MR II, MS II     NVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     NVR       37     3     MR II     NVR       38     3     MR III     NVR       39     3     MR III     NVR       31     MR IV, posterior     Emergent MVR       32     3     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       33     3     ASIII, MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       34     1     MVR     MVR       35     3     MR III     MVR       36     1     MVR     MVR       37     3     ASIII, MS II     MVR       38     3     MI III     MVR	1			(min)
14543MR II, MS IIMVR412MR IIIRedo-urgent MVR614MR III, MSII, TR IIIRedo-urgent MVR1222MR IIIRedo-urgent MVR14561E. MR IIIRedo-urgent MVR542MR IIINMR542MR IIINMR613MR IIINMR7552MR III, TR IVUrgent MVR363MR IIINMR373MR IIINMR383MR IIINMR513MR IIINMR531MR IIINMR543MR IIINMR553MR IIINMR6031MR IIINMR753MR IIINMR754MR IINMR763MI IIAGO-MVR7734MR II784MR IIMAR794MR IIMR71 </td <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>6</td> <td><i>()</i></td>	1		6	<i>()</i>
41     2     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       51     4     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       52     2     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       54     2     MR III     NVR with RAMT       54     2     IE. MR III     Urgent MVR       55     2     MR II, MS II     Urgent MVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     NVR with RAMT       36     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       37     2     MR III, MS II     MVR       38     3     MR III     NVR       39     3     MR III     MVR       41     1     MVR     MVR       42     MR III     MVR     MVR       43     3     AS III, MR III     MVR       44     1     MR II     MVR       45     3     MI II     MVR       46     MR IV     MVR       47     MVR     MVR       48     2     MI II       49     3     MI II       40     MV MS II, TR II     MVR       41     Acute IE, MR III,     Redo-MVR <td></td> <td>Myxomatous mitral valve, MC <i>in situ</i>, mod- erate MS</td> <td>57</td> <td>87</td>		Myxomatous mitral valve, MC <i>in situ</i> , mod- erate MS	57	87
61     4     MR III, MSII, TR III     Redo-urgent MVR       22     2     MR III     Redo-MVR       64     3     MR III     MVR       64     2     MR III, MS II, TR III     Urgent MVR       65     3     MR III, MS II     Urgent MVR       75     2     MR III, MS II     Urgent MVR       76     3     MR II     Urgent MVR       75     3     MR II     MVR       76     3     MR III     MVR       77     3     MR III     MVR       78     3     MR III     MVR       79     3     MR III     MVR       71     3     MR III     MVR       71     3     MR III     MVR       73     AS III, MS II     MVR       74     1     MR III     MVR       75     3     MI II     MVR       76     3     MI II     MVR       71     1     MR III     MVR       75     3     MI II     MVR       76     3     MI II     MVR       77     3     MI II     MVR       78     4     MVR     MVR       79     4     MVR		Partial MC detachment from the AML	30	42
22     MRII     Redo-MVR       96     1     IE, MRIII     MVR       8     MRIII     Urgent MVR       8     MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       34     2     IE, MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR II     MVR       36     3     MR II     MVR       36     3     MR II     MVR       37     MR IV, posterior     Emergent MVR       38     AS III, MS II     MVR with RAMT       39     AS III, MS II     MVR       41     MR II     Redo-Urgent MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR       44     MR II     Redo-Urgent MVR       45     MI II     MVR       46     MR II     MVR       47     MR II     MVR       48     2     MI II       49     3     MI II       40     MK IV, MS III, TI II       41     Acute IE, MR III       42     MR III       44     MVR III, MS III, TI II       45     MI III, AS III, TI II       46     MK IV, MS III, TI II       47     MR IV, MS III, TI II       48     MR IV, MS IIII		Pronounced annular dilation, MC <i>in situ</i> , moderate MS	65	111
96     1     IE, MR III     MVR       8     3     MR III     Urgent MVR       8     2     MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     MVR       37     3     MR II     MVR       38     3     MR II     MVR       39     MR III     MVR with RAMT       31     3     AS III, MS II     MVR       32     AS III, MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR     MVR       41     1     MIR     MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR     MVR       34     MI II     Redo-urgent MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR       34     MI II     Redo-urgent MVR       35     MI II     MVR     MVR       36     MI II     MVR     MVR       33     MR II     MVR     MVR       34     MI II     MVR     MVR       35     MI II     MVR     MVR       36     MI III     MVR     MVR <td></td> <td>Pronounced annular dilation, MC in situ</td> <td>31</td> <td>45</td>		Pronounced annular dilation, MC in situ	31	45
8     3     MR II     Urgent MVR       54     2     IE, MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       34     2     IE, MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       35     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR II, MS II     MVR       37     3     MR II     MVR       38     3     MR II     MVR       39     MR III     MVR with RAMT       31     MR III     MVR       33     AS III, MR III     MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR       34     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       35     MR II     MVR       36     MI II     NVR       37     MI II     MVR       38     MI II     MVR       39     4     MI III, AS III, TI II       39     4     MI II, AS III, TR II       39     4     MR II, MS III, TR II       39     4     MR II, MS III, TR II       30     3     MI II, AS III, TR II       31     Acute IE, MR III, Eedo-MVR		Vegetation around MC	88	116
54     2     MR IV, MS II, TR III     MVR with RAMT       35     2     IE, MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     Urgent MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     Urgent MVR       37     3     MR III     Urgent MVR       38     3     MR III     NVR with RAMT       39     AS III, MS II     MVR     MVR       31     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR       34     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       33     AS III, MS II     MVR       34     MI II     Redo-urgent MVR       35     MI II     NVR     MVR       36     MI II     NVR     MVR       37     MI II     NVR     MVR       38     MI II     NVR     MVR       39     4     MI II, AS III, TI II     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       30     3     MI III     Redo-MVR		Tear of the chordae tendineae, MC in situ	42	61
34     2     IE, MR III, TR IV     Urgent MVR       75     2     MR III, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR III     Urgent MVR with RAMT       1     3     MR III     Urgent MVR       87     2     MR III     NVR with RAMT       51     3     AS III, MS II     MVR       61     3     AS III, MS II     MVR       61     3     AS III, MS II     MVR       63     1     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       63     1     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       63     1     MI III     Redo-Urgent MVR       64     MR III     MVR with RAMT       7     MR III     MVR       7     MR III     MVR       7     MR III     MVR       8     3     MI III       8     2     MI III       8     2     MI III       8     2     MI III       8     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II       8     2     MI III, AS III, TR II       8     2     MI III       10     Acute IE, MR III, Redo-MVR		Endothelialized MC <i>in situ</i> , severe MR, mod- erate MS	44	105
75     2     MR III, MS II     MVR       36     3     MR III, MS II     Urgent MVR with       1     3     MR IV, posterior     Emergent MVR       87     2     MR III     MVR with RAMT       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR with RAMT       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR with RAMT       61     3     MR III     MVR with RAMT       03     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       11     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       12     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       13     MR III     MVR WITH RAMT       14     1     MR III     MVR       22     MI III     Redo-MVR       33     MI III     Redo-MVR       34     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II       35     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II       36Ptic shock     Emergent MVR		Vegetation around MC	73	149
36     3     MR III     Urgent MVR with RAMT       1     3     MR IV, posterior     Emergent MVR       87     2     MR III     RAMT       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR with RAMT       53     AS III, MS II     MVR with RAMT       03     1     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       11     1     MVR with RAMT     MVR       22     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       23     3     MI II     MVR       24     1     MR II     MVR       23     3     MI II     MVR       48     2     MI II     Redo-MVR       39     4     MR II, TR II     MVR       12     1     Acute IF, MR III, Redo-MVR       12     1     Redo-MVR		Partial detachment from the PML with leaflet tear, calcification (AML and PML)	23	33
1     3     MR IV, posterior     Emergent MVR       87     2     MR III     MVR with RAMT       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR       63     AS III, MR III     MVR       11     1     MVR with RAMT       12     1     MR III     MVR       22     MI II     MVR     MVR       23     MI II     MR II     MVR       24     1     MR II     MVR       25     MI III     Acute IF, MR II     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       12     1     Acute IF, MR III, Emergent MVR	MVR with	Pronounced annular dilation, MC <i>in situ</i> , PML with tear	58	85
87     2     MR III     MVR with RAMT       51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR       63     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       03     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       11     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       12     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       22     1     MR III     MVR       23     3     MI II     MVR       24     1     MR II     MVR       25     MI III     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II       12     1     Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR		AML and PML with tear, MC in situ	41	61
51     3     AS III, MR III     MVR       5     3     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       03     1     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       11     1     MVR with RAMT       12     1     MR III     MVR       13     MR III     MVR     MVR       14     1     MR III     MVR       22     MI III     MVR       48     2     MI III       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II       12     1     Acute IE, MR III,       12     1     Acute IE, MR III,	with RAMT	One MC <i>in situ</i> (A3-P3) with leaflet tear (PML), second MC only with A2 attachment	48	124
5     3     MR III     Redo-urgent MVR       03     1     MR III, MS II     MVR with RAMT       11     1     MR III     MVR       12     1     MR IV     MVR       14     1     MR IV     MVR       15     1     MR IV     MVR       16     1     MI II     MVR       17     1     MI III     MVR       18     2     MI III, AS III, TI II     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       12     1     Acute IE, MR III,     Energent MVR		Pronounced annular dilation, MC in situ	72	88
03     1     MR III, MS II     MVR with RAMT       11     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       22     1     MR III     MVR with RAMT       14     1     MR II     MVR       9     3     MI III     Redo-MVR       48     2     MI III, AS III, TI III     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       12     1     Acute IF, MR III,     Emergent MVR		Pronounced annular dilation, MC <i>in situ</i> , with leaflet tear	108	156
<ul> <li>1 MR IV MR IN MVR</li> <li>14 1 MR II MR II</li> <li>9 3 MI III</li> <li>88 2 MI III, AS III, TI III MVR</li> <li>39 4 MR IV, MS III, TR II Redo-MVR</li> <li>12 1 Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR</li> </ul>		Severe degenerative changes of the AML and PML, MC <i>in situ</i> , severe MR, moderate MS Partial detachment from the PMI (P2-3)	52 64	128 137
14     1     MR III     Urgent MVR       9     3     MI III     Redo-MVR       48     2     MI III, AS III, TI III     MVR       39     4     MR IV, MS III, TR II     Redo-MVR       12     1     Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR		Partial detachment from the PML	91	133
9 3 MI III Redo-MVR 48 2 MI III, AS III, TI III MVR 39 4 MR IV, MS III, TR II Redo-MVR 12 1 Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR septic shock		AML (A2-3) with tear, MC <i>in situ</i> , pro- nounced annular dilation	51	103
48 2 MI III, AS III, TI III MVR 239 4 MR IV, MS III, TR II Redo-MVR 12 1 Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR		MC related MM morformation MMC in city.	70	107
48         2         MI III, AS III, TI II         MVR           239         4         MR IV, MS III, TR II         Redo-MVR           12         1         Acute IE, MR III,         Emergent MVR	NVN-	INC-FEIALED INV PERIORALION, INC. IN SILU	0/	/01
239 4 MR IV, MS III, TR II Redo-MVR 12 1 Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR septic shock		Severe MR, MC <i>in situ</i>	06	259
12 1 Acute IE, MR III, Emergent MVR septic shock		Pronounced annular dilation, MC in situ, se- vere MR, moderate MS	63	146
	gent MVR	Vegetation around MC with leaflet tear, an- nular dilation	115	167
3 MR III, TR III MVR	MVR TAP, IABP implantation	Pronounced annular dilation, MC in situ	39	85
358 2 MR III, MS II Urgent MVR	Urgent MVR	Pronounced annular dilation, MC <i>in situ</i> , se- vere MR, severe MS	62	265
7 83 2 MR III, TR III, cardio- Emergent MVR TAP, IABP implantation genic shock, MOF	Emergent MVR	One MC completely detached from the PML, attached only to the AML	47	111
ACC: aortic cross-clamping; AML: anterior mitral valve leaflet; AMR: anterior mitral leaflet; AS: aortic stenosis; AsAo: ascending aorta; ASD: atrial septal defect; AVR: aortic valve replacement; CABG: coronary artery by assess graft; CFB: cardiooulmonary by by set ECMO: extracorooreal membrane oxveenation; IABP: intra-aortic balloon pump; IE: infective endocarditis; IAA: left atrial appendage; MC; MitraClip; MI; myocardial infarc-	AMR: anterior mitral leaflet; AS: aortic stenosis; AsAo: ascending ao real membrane oxveenation: (ABP: intra-aortic balloon pump: IE: infe	orta; ASD: atrial septal defect; AVR: aortic valve repl fective endocarditis: LAA: left atrial appendage: MC:	lacement; CABG: MitraClip: MI: m	coronary artery vocardial infarc-

ADULT CARDIAC

<b>Table 3:</b> Factors associated with perioperative mortality after surgical revision for failed MitraClip therapy
--

Risk factor	Survivors (n = 18)	Non-survivors $(n = 7)$	P-value
Preoperative characteristics			
Age (years)	73.0 ± 8.6	73.1 ± 11.1	0.97
Sex			>0.10
Female	9 (50)	4 (57)	
Male	9 (50)	3 (43)	
Body mass index (kg/m²)	28.6 ± 4.9	26.6 ± 6.1	0.40
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	8 (44)	4 (57)	0.67
Acute renal failure	2 (11)	1 (14)	>0.10
Chronic renal failure	9 (50)	5 (71)	0.41
Liver failure	0 (0)	3 (43)	0.015
Ischaemic heart disease	11 (61)	4 (57)	>0.10
Previous cardiac surgery	4 (22)	2 (29)	>0.10
Sepsis	1 (6)	1 (14)	0.49
Cardiogenic shock	3 (17)	3 (43)	0.30
Emergent MVR	1 (6)	2 (29)	0.18
Urgent MVR	7 (39)	1 (14)	0.36
Elective MVR	10 (56)	4 (57)	>0.10
MR grade	3.1 ± 0.5	2.9 ± 0.4	0.37
Tricuspid regurgitation grade	1.8 ± 0.73	2.3 ± 0.29	0.13
Left ventricular ejection fraction (%)	50 (44–55)	37 (20–50)	0.012
Systolic pulmonary artery pressure (mmHg)	48 (40-63)	50 (35–60)	0.47
EuroSCORE II at surgery (%)	8 (5.8–21.5)	24 (13.8-62.1)	0.013
Logistic EuroSCORE at surgery (%)	28.7 (9.7-47.8)	58.8 (34.6-92.5)	0.015
Time after MitraClip (days)	53 (13-315)	76 (12–239)	>0.10
Aortic cross-clamping time (min)	58 ± 23	71 ± 26	0.23
Cardiopulmonary bypass time (min)	98 ± 38	167 ± 70	0.0038
Pathology			
Partial clip detachment	5	1	0.64
Leaflet tear without clip detachment	4	0	>0.10
Leaflet infection	1	2	>0.10
Leaflet degeneration	1	2	0.53

Data shown as mean ± standard deviation, median (IQR), number or frequency (%).

EuroSCORE: European System for Cardiac Operative Risk Evaluation; IQR: interquartile range; MR: mitral regurgitation; MVR: mitral valve replacement.

# Late clinical outcomes and survival

The median follow-up was 13 months (IQR 7-32; range 2-76 months). During follow-up, 8 patients died. One patient died after 10 months due to bladder cancer, whereas another patient died of sepsis within 6 months after surgery. The cause of death was unknown in 6 patients. On Kaplan-Meier overall survival analysis, the 6-month, 1- and 2-year survival rates were 68%, 53% and 47%, respectively. There was no stroke, prosthesis dysfunction or endocarditis. No patients received redo surgery.

# Intraoperative pathological and microbiological findings associated with the MitraClip system

Recurrent MR was caused by mitral valve leaflet damage due to tear (n = 10), degeneration (n = 3) or infection (n = 3) associated with the MitraClip system and by uncontrolled mitral annulus dilation (n = 7) (Fig. 1, Table 2). Although complete detachment of the clip did not occur, partial detachment (defined as detachment of the clip from a single leaflet) occurred in 6 of 10 patients with mitral leaflet tear. In 5 patients (83%) with partial detachment, the posterior mitral valve leaflet was torn and the MitraClip had partially migrated onto the anterior mitral valve leaflet. MR due to leaflet tear or clip detachment occurred within 6 months of MitraClip therapy in 9 patients (90%) and later in 1 patient (10%) (Fig. 2).

In 3 patients, vegetation was noted near the MitraClip (Table 2). Blood cultures were positive for *Staphylococcus aureus* (acute phase), *Enterococcus faecalis* (chronic phase) and *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (subacute phase), respectively. In 2 patients, the infection-related tissue damage had led to tears in the mitral valve leaflet. These patients did not have chordae rupture, and the infection did not reach the mitral annulus or the other valves.

Mitral valve degeneration included myxomatous and endothelialization changes around the MitraClip implantation areas (fibrous encapsulation of the clip, with extension over adjacent mitral leaflets and tissue bridge formation), which were noted in 3 patients at 2, 17 and 49 months, respectively. Perioperative mortality was not influenced by the time interval between MitraClip therapy and revision surgery or by pathological findings noted intraoperatively (Table 3).

#### DISCUSSION

#### **Overview of findings**

In the past 7 years, 25 patients including those with sepsis and cardiogenic shock state received the bail-out therapy for patients at our centre for recurrent severe MR after MitraClip therapy. In this series, the 30-day mortality was 24%, which we consider acceptable in a population with high surgical risk. Geidel *et al.* [10] reported a 30-day mortality of 9.1% in a case series that did not include patients presenting with sepsis or undergoing cardiopulmonary resuscitation.



Complications involving the mitral valve leaflets

Figure 1: Intraoperative pathological findings in patients with MR after MitraClip therapy. MR: mitral regurgitation.

The most important findings of this study were as follows: (i) surgical revision after failed MitraClip therapy is a feasible option even in high-risk patients; (ii) patients presenting with liver failure, cardiogenic shock or septic shock are at extremely high risk for in-hospital mortality; and (iii) the predominant pathology underlying MR after failed MitraClip therapy is mostly related to mitral valve leaflet damage due to tear, degeneration or infection associated with the clip itself.

# Survival predictors

Variables predicting postoperative survival (in particular, inhospital survival) are used for risk stratification and represent important factors in the decision to perform surgery. In the present series, 6 patients (24%) died within the first 48 h due to MOF. All non-survivors had a logistic EuroSCORE >35% plus one or more risk factors including shock of either aetiology, age >80 years or severe left ventricular dysfunction. Elhmidi et al. [11] also suggested that the combination of preoperative cardiogenic shock with severe left ventricular dysfunction represents a high risk for in-hospital death. A recent study reported that the conservative therapy is advisable in patients with logistic EuroSCORE >30% [10]. In our present series, the average logistic EuroSCORE at the time of surgery was 62% among patients who died before discharge; however, 8 patients (44%) who survived until discharge also had a logistic EuroSCORE >30% at surgery. In addition, all patients with severe liver dysfunction died within 48 h after surgery. In 2 such patients, liver failure occurred due to shock. Of the patients requiring mechanical support with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation or intra-aortic balloon pump implantation, none survived (survivor versus non-survivor, P < 0.0001). Taken together, our findings suggest that the decision to perform surgery should take into consideration not only the value of the logistic EuroSCORE but also other factors reflecting MOF (in particular, liver failure).

# Leaflet tears

Leaflet tears typically occurred within 6 months after MitraClip therapy. Clip detachment likely occurred due to substantial tension in the repaired leaflet, causing leaflet tear secondary to progressive mitral annulus dilation or valve disruption due to hypertension or atrial fibrillation. In 1 patient, leaflet tear occurred later than 6 months after MitraClip therapy and echocardiography revealed mild mitral stenosis. Partial clip detachment may have been caused by pressure overload of the MitraClipimplanted valve in the chronic phase. Therefore, mild mitral valve stenosis during follow-up after MitraClip therapy represents a very important clinical finding.

In all cases, partial detachment was caused by posterior leaflet tears. In functional MR due to left atrial dilation and mitral annulus dilation, the posterior wall of the left atrium expands posteriorly, whereas the posterior wall of the left ventricle bends anteriorly, causing the posterior leaflet to bend and expand according to the movement of the posterior wall of the left ventricle. The anterior leaflet flattens out during valve opening. Thus, as posterior leaflets that shift posteriorly tend to be shorter, MitraClip therapy increases the risk of tear at this location.

#### Leaflet infection

In this study, infective endocarditis was found in 3 patients (mean MR grade 3), of whom 2 had clip-related leaflet tear. Infective endocarditis with *S. aureus* occurred in the acute phase (12 days) after MitraClip therapy in a patient with severe progressive MR (EuroSCORE II, 81.6%) who underwent emergent MVR



Figure 2: Leaflet damage in patients with recurrent mitral regurgitation after MitraClip therapy. The patients were stratified according to whether revision surgery was performed within 6 months of MitraClip therapy or later.

but died due to septic shock. Meanwhile, infective endocarditis with *S. epidermidis* and *E. faecalis*, respectively, occurred in the subacute (13 months) and chronic phase (49 months) after clip implantation and these patients had progressive MR (EuroSCORE II: 6.2% and 21.1%, respectively) but survived.

Prosthetic valve endocarditis, mostly due to S. aureus infection, has been reported for up to 30% of all patients with infective endocarditis [12]. However, the incidence of MitraClip-related endocarditis is unknown. Frerker et al. [13] were the first to report a case of S. aureus-related endocarditis after MitraClip therapy. In our hospital, none of the other  $\sim$ 250 patients implanted with MitraClips developed endocarditis over a follow-up of 5 years, suggesting that infective endocarditis in MitraClip-implanted patients is extremely rare. However, patients with severe circulatory compromise preoperatively have extremely high risk of postoperative mortality, especially if the causal agent is S. aureus. MitraClip implantation may increase the risk of infective endocarditis because residual MR is common after MitraClip therapy and the clip itself is a foreign object that can serve as a suitable habitat for bacteria. Therefore, although the risk of prosthetic valve endocarditis is low, the patients should be carefully monitored for signs of infective endocarditis in both the acute and late phase after MitraClip therapy.

A recent review reported a 42% rate of postoperative mortality associated with MitraClip-related infection, with *S. aureus* as the most frequent (60%) causal micro-organism [14]. We believe that acute infective endocarditis with *S. aureus*, and the subacute or chronic infective endocarditis may follow acute haemodynamic alteration due to tear or deterioration of the mitral valve. The rate of infective endocarditis following MitraClip therapy appears to be lower than that associated with the implantation of mechanic or bioprosthetic valves.

#### Leaflet degeneration

In our series, 3 patients (12%) had degenerative changes in the leaflet region around the MitraClip. The healing response to the MitraClip device in humans is currently not well understood. According to Stephens *et al.* [15], regurgitation alone can result in leaflet remodelling characterized by increased matrix degeneration, collagen synthesis and abundance of elastin in the spongiosa and fibrosa layers following mitral valve deterioration. We hypothesize that the MitraClip system may trigger aggressive inflammatory reactions leading to formation of fibrotic tissue around the implanted clip, which sometimes results in mitral stenosis.

Interestingly, 2 of 3 patients with MitraClip-related degeneration had mediastinal radiation therapy due to mammary carcinoma before MitraClip therapy. Cardiac valve disease associated with mediastinal radiation therapy is characterized by valve fibrosis and calcification, often with progression to heart failure and death. Our 2 patients presented obvious mitral leaflet degeneration at 1454 and 503 days after MitraClip therapy, respectively. The MitraClip itself may have stimulated the progress of degeneration caused by mediastinal radiation therapy. In another patient, progressive endothelialization around the MitraClip was noted at 54 days after MitraClip therapy. The reason for this acute healing reaction around the clip is unknown. Although the pathology associated with leaflet remodelling appeared to differ according to the time after the MitraClip procedure, the type of pathological findings had no significant influence on perioperative mortality (Table 3). Further studies are warranted to clarify the characteristics and clinical relevance of leaflet remodelling in response to MitraClip implantation in humans.

#### Limitations

The baseline characteristics in this case series were heterogeneous, the sample size was small, and our experience relates only to a single institution. Moreover, 60% of patients were transferred from other interventional hospitals, suggesting that not all patients with failed MitraClip therapy may have been referred for surgical revision. Therefore, selection bias could not be excluded. Multicentre studies with large sample size and long follow-up are required to confirm the mitral valve alterations associated with the MitraClip therapy.

# CONCLUSION

Open-heart surgery after unsuccessful MitraClip treatment is acceptable at any time in patients with high surgical risk. However, it may be too late to operate in patients with established MOF due to shock. Based on our experience of 7 years, we recommend the following: (i) MitraClip-implanted patients should be regularly followed-up by a heart team to monitor for MitraClipassociated infection or degenerative alterations of mitral valve leaflets, even if no partial detachment is noted in the early phase; and (ii) patients with recurrent MR after MitraClip therapy should be operated before MOF establishment, with shock-induced liver failure carrying a very high risk of perioperative mortality.

#### Conflict of interest: none declared.

#### REFERENCES

- Sorajja P, Vemulapalli S, Feldman T, Mack M, Holmes DR Jr, Stebbins A et al. Outcomes with transcatheter mitral valve repair in the United States: an STS/ACC TVT Registry report. J Am Coll Cardiol 2017;70: 2315–27.
- [2] Sorajja P, Mack M, Vemulapalli S, Holmes DR Jr, Stebbins A, Kar S et al. Initial experience with commercial transcatheter mitral valve repair in the United States. J Am Coll Cardiol 2016;67:1129–40.
- [3] Grover FL, Vemulapalli S, Carroll JD, Edwards FH, Mack MJ, Thourani VH et al. 2016 annual report of the Society of Thoracic Surgeons/American College of Cardiology Transcatheter Valve Therapy Registry. J Am Coll Cardiol 2017;69:1215–30.
- [4] Maisano F, Franzen O, Baldus S, Schäfer U, Hausleiter J, Butter C et al. Percutaneous mitral valve interventions in the real world: early and 1year results from the ACCESS-EU, a prospective, multicenter, nonrandomized post-approval study of the MitraClip therapy in Europe. J Am Coll Cardiol 2013;62:1052-61.

- [5] Baldus S, Schillinger W, Franzen O, Bekeredjian R, Sievert H, Schofer J et al. MitraClip therapy in daily clinical practice: initial results from the German Transcatheter Mitral Valve Interventions (TRAMI) registry. Eur J Heart Fail 2012;14:1050–5.
- [6] Puls M, Lubos E, Boekstegers P, von Bardeleben RS, Ouarrak T, Butter C et al. One-year outcomes and predictors of mortality after MitraClip therapy in contemporary clinical practice: results from the German Transcatheter Mitral Valve Interventions registry. Eur Heart J 2016;37: 703–12.
- [7] Nickenig G, Estevez-Loureiro R, Franzen O, Tamburino C, Vanderheyden M, Lüscher TF *et al.* Percutaneous mitral valve edgeto-edge repair: in-hospital results and 1-year follow-up of 628 patients of the 2011–2012 Pilot European Sentinel Registry. J Am Coll Cardiol 2014;64:875–84.
- [8] Stone GW, Lindenfeld J, Abraham WT, Kar S, Lim DS, Mishell JM et al. Transcatheter mitral-valve repair in patients with heart failure. N Engl J Med 2018;379:2307–18.
- [9] Alozie A, Westphal B, Kische S, Kaminski A, Paranskaya L, Bozdag-Turan I et al. Surgical revision after percutaneous mitral valve repair by edgeto-edge device: when the strategy fails in the highest risk surgical population. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2014;46:55–60.
- [10] Geidel S, Wohlmuth P, Schmoeckel M. Survival prediction in patients undergoing open-heart mitral valve operation after previous failed MitraClip procedures. Ann Thorac Surg 2016;101:952–8.
- [11] Elhmidi Y, Voss B, Lange R. Surgical mitral valve intervention following a failed MitraClip procedure. EuroIntervention 2016;12:Y102-6.
- [12] Wang A, Athan E, Pappas PA, Fowler VG Jr, Olaison L, Paré C et al. Contemporary clinical profile and outcome of prosthetic valve endocarditis. JAMA 2007;297:1354-61.
- [13] Frerker C, Kuck KH, Schmidt T, Kreidel F, Bader R, Schmoeckel M et al. Severe infective endocarditis after MitraClip implantation treated by cardiac surgery. EuroIntervention 2015;11:351–4.
- [14] Asmarats L, Rodriguez-Gabella T, Chamandi C, Bernier M, Beaudoin J, O'Connor K *et al.* Infective endocarditis following transcatheter edge-toedge mitral valve repair: a systematic review. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv 2018;92:583–91.
- [15] Stephens EH, Nguyen TC, Itoh A, Ingels NB Jr, Miller DC, Grande-Allen KJ. The effects of mitral regurgitation alone are sufficient for leaflet remodeling. Circulation 2008;118:S243–9.

ADULT CARDIAC