JACC: ADVANCES © 2022 THE AUTHOR. PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION. THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CC BY-NC-ND LICENSE (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Is the Debate Finally Over?*



Carl L. Backer, MD

early 10 years ago I was asked to write an editorial comment regarding the Melbourne experience comparing surgical aortic valvotomy and transcatheter balloon dilatation for congenital aortic valve stenosis.¹ The authors of that manuscript had concluded that surgical valvotomy achieved a better result than balloon dilatation.² I opined that although it was possible that in *selected cases* this might be true, there are clearly many patients who would be better served by an initial balloon dilatation.

Interventional cardiologists have the advantage in this "competition" in that there have been steady incremental improvements in the catheterization lab: smaller French catheters, higher pressure balloons, lower profile balloons, and improved imaging modalities. The strategy has also changed to serial dilations over time, using initially smaller balloons. These refinements have all contributed to improved outcomes.

The transcatheter results presented by the Toronto group in this issue of *JACC: Advances* confirm the improved and now truly excellent outcomes from these advances.³ Over a 15-year period, 139 infants underwent transcatheter balloon dilatation of aortic valve stenosis. Half of these patients were neonates. The mean peak-to-peak gradient dropped from 52 to 18 mmHg. There were no deaths directly related to the transcatheter intervention. Only 26 patients had a repeat balloon aortic valvotomy. On long-term follow-up, only 25 of the 139 patients have required a surgical intervention. This means that fully 80% of their patients have not required surgical intervention. The freedom from aortic valve replacement at 10 years is 86%. In the patients who did require surgery, the procedure was not a repeat sternotomy!

We must remember that both surgical aortic valvotomy and transcatheter balloon dilatation are only palliative in nature. We know that some of these patients will require another intervention. There is an advantage to avoiding a sternotomy and cardiopulmonary bypass in a patient who is going to eventually require multiple operations culminating in aortic valve replacement or a Ross procedure. Reintervention after a balloon dilatation is much different than reintervention after a sternotomy! In addition, the physiologic stress of a cardiopulmonary bypass run in a neonate versus a balloon dilatation is an important factor not to be downplayed.

I am confident that there will continue to be technical advances within the world of interventional cardiology. The improvement in equipment for the actual imaging during the intervention has dramatically improved over the past 10 years and will continue to improve. I am also confident that cooperation of clinicians with industry will keep improving the catheters that are used.

Given the outstanding results from the Toronto group, I believe that the procedure of choice for the majority of neonates and infants with critical congenital aortic valve stenosis is now balloon aortic valvotomy. In my personal surgical experience, the last time that I performed an aortic valvotomy on a neonate was well over 15 years ago. In fact, we may now be able to stop debating about which approach (surgical versus transcatheter) is better for neonatal and infant aortic valve stenosis.⁴

Since writing that editorial in 2013, it is clear to me that interventional cardiologists have demonstrated

^{*}Editorials published in *JACC: Advances* reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of *JACC: Advances* or the American College of Cardiology.

From the Section of Pediatric Cardiothoracic Surgery, UK HealthCare Kentucky Children's Hospital, Lexington, Kentucky, USA; and the Cardiothoracic Surgery, Heart Institute, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

The author attests they are in compliance with human studies committees and animal welfare regulations of the author's institution and Food and Drug Administration guidelines, including patient consent where appropriate. For more information, visit the Author Center.

2

that balloon aortic valvotomy is the clear winner in the competition between surgical and transcatheter techniques. The various surgical versus transcatheter reviews were like a pendulum going back and forth. The pendulum between surgical and balloon valvotomy has swung and now appears to be tilting toward better outcomes with balloons. In fact, the pendulum may now be fixed in the balloon dilatation camp! The 40 years of experience and the steady incremental improvements in technology and strategy have made this possible. These advances clearly have made lives better for thousands of children with aortic valve stenosis. For this surgeon, transcatheter balloon aortic valvotomy is the procedure of choice for infants with aortic valve stenosis.

FUNDING SUPPORT AND AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

The author has reported that he has no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Dr Carl L. Backer, Section of Pediatric Cardiothoracic Surgery, UK HealthCare Kentucky Children's Hospital, 800 Rose Street, C-259, Lexington, Kentucky 40536-0293, USA. E-mail: Carl.Backer@uky.edu.

REFERENCES

1. Backer CL. Infant congenital aortic valve stenosis: the pendulum swings. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;62(22):2141–2143.

2. Siddiqui J, Brizard CP, Galati JC, et al. Surgical valvotomy and repair for neonatal and infant congenital aortic stenosis achieves better results than interventional catheterization. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;62(22):2134–2140.

3. Christensen AH, Chaturvedi RR, Callahan CP, et al. Current-era outcomes of balloon aortic valvotomy in neonates and infants. *JACC Adv.* 2022;1(1):100004.

4. Hill GD, Ginde S, Rios R, Frommelt PC, Hill KD. Surgical valvotomy versus balloon valvuloplasty for congenital aortic valve stenosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Am Heart Assoc. 2016;5(8):e003931. Published online August 8, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.116.003931

KEY WORDS aortic valve replacement, aortic valve stenosis, balloon aortic valvotomy, congenital heart disease, reintervention, surgical aortic valvotomy