JACC: CASE REPORTS © 2021 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

Leaflet Injuries After Percutaneous Edge-to-Edge Repair



A Challenge to Avoid*

Francesco Maisano, MD

Percutaneous mitral leaflet repair is one of the safest procedures in structural interventions, even when applied to very high-risk patients (1). Blossom et al. (2) report a case of torrential mitral regurgitation (MR) occurring after edge-to-edge transcatheter repair, a rare but important event that has somehow been under-reported in the medical literature for a number of reasons: it is rare, it is difficult to diagnose and handle, and until now, it is not well understood.

DÉJÀ VU

Exactly 10 years ago, in an apparently routine working day, I was first confronted with the unexpected: a massive MR following an apparently successful MitraClip (Abbott Vascular, Santa Clara, California) implantation in a patient with secondary MR with an ejection fraction below 15% and torrential secondary MR at baseline. Following an otherwise uneventful grasping and clip closure, an immediate total resolution of the MR was observed. An echocardiography revealed a smoke effect, a sign with multiple possible interpretations. Mitral stenosis was excluded (the residual valve opening area was above 3 cm²), and the image was interpreted as the consequence of lowcardiac output and the abolition of the washing effect of the regurgitant jet into the left atrium. Soon after, it was realized that the patient had developed severe afterload mismatch with low arterial pressure. For that reason, the anesthesiologist supported the patient with multiple doses of epinephrine. Finally, the patient responded with recovery of left ventricular function, which was shortly associated with severe systemic hypertension. Recurrent severe MR was observed, initially interpreted as the consequence of the increased afterload. Soon after, the systemic pressure decreased, but the pulmonary pressure increased significantly, with persistent severe MR. For the first time, technicians were confronted with the scenario of an intraprocedural leaflet perforation following catheter-based edge-to-edge repair (Figure 1) requiring immediate surgical bailout.

A few months previously, a commissural clip entanglement was encountered in an elderly patient with degenerative MR requiring open heart correction. After an uneventful valve replacement, the patient died a few days later of multiorgan failure due to frailty and comorbidities.

A RARE COMPLICATION THAT TRANSFORMS A LOW-RISK INTO A HIGH-RISK SCENARIO

It was learned that, although the MitraClip is usually safer than surgery, some complications may transform a simple procedure into a nightmare.

The first report of leaflet damage following percutaneous edge-to-edge repair was from the case of a patient who had undergone surgery in the EVEREST (Endovascular Valve Edge-to-Edge Repair Study) trial (3). Few other case reports of leaflet injuries are present in the medical literature (3-8). More recently, data from the core laboratory events of the EXPAND (A Contemporary, Prospective Study Evaluating Realworld Experience of Performance and Safety for the Next Generation of MitraClip Devices) study revealed

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

From the Department of Cardiac Surgery, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

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

that leaflet injuries occurred in a minority of cases: 4 of 1,030 patients (0.04%) (F. Asch et al., EURO PCR online course, personal communication, 2020). It must be noted that the site-reported frequency was slightly higher (11 of 1,030 patients [1%]), but the core laboratory could not confirm the diagnosis. Notably, of those 4 events, 3 were associated with the use of the recently released longer clip arm device (Mitra-Clip XTR). A recent report from Praz et al. (9) described 2 cases of leaflet injury in an early multicenter experience with the XTR system, all requiring conversion to open heart surgery due to hemodynamic instability.

WHAT TO DO?

Leaflet injuries are difficult to diagnose. The initial step is to choose between a leaflet injury or residual MR due to residual lack of leaflet coaptation. Leaflet damage should always be suspected in cases of residual or worsening severe MR and worsening of the hemodynamic status. In the absence of residual primary lesions, residual severe MR is seen in patients with annular dilation (defined as annulus-to-leaflet mismatch [10,11]). To confirm leaflet injury, ad hoc imaging and multiplanar color comparison images could be necessary.

Once leaflet damage has been correctly diagnosed, the most definitive solution for patients experiencing leaflet injuries is open surgical repair or replacement (3), although replacement in some cases could be prohibitive. Conservative treatment is rarely possible unless leaflet injury is minimal. On most occasions, the hemodynamic consequences are not compatible with a delay in treatment. Rarely, an additional clip implantation can solve the issue, due to the lack of available tissue to grasp. However, the Pascal valve repair system (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, California) has solved for a damaged leaflet after a MitraClip XTR implantation attempt (6).

Another option, available only in cases of leaflet perforation, is deployment of vascular plugs (5). Although this solution can be extremely effective for solving the issue acutely, it can be complicated by hemolysis or delayed embolization. Therefore, it should be adopted with careful patient selection and preferably in cases of otherwise inoperable patients.

Finally, as suggested by Blossom et al., inoperable patients can be stabilized with advanced life support and referred to transplantation (2).

HOW TO PREVENT LEAFLET INJURIES

Leaflet injuries can be prevented by patient selection, device selection, and procedural care. In most cases,

leaflet tears occur in patients with extreme anatomies. Tissue fragility can be present, particularly in elderly and frail patients. Special care must be taken in patients with calcified annuli and thin leaflets. Severe tethering of the leaflets is also a possible risk factor for leaflet injuries. In that case, the tension on the tissue imposed by the device can cause a tear. The presence of annulus-to-leaflet-mismatch increases the stress acting on the leaflets. This was early demonstrated for the surgical Alfieri technique (12) and more recently confirmed from studies adapted to percutaneous leaflet repair (13,14).

visible (*), while the anterior arm of the clip is still attached to the A2.

Annuloplasty prior to leaflet repair could mitigate the risk under these conditions. Also, the selection of a shorter arm device (MitraClip NTR) could be preferable in these cases to reduce the longitudinal stress on the leaflets. Due to its nature (a memory alloy device), the Pascal platform could reduce the risk due to its intrinsic flexibility, although this assumption must be confirmed by clinical data.

Finally, leaflet injuries can be prevented by careful manipulation during grasping and closure of the clip arms in MitraClip. A common maneuver for the MitraClip is to push the clip delivery system toward the ventricle during clip closure to reduce the pressure on the leaflets from the tip of the clip arms.

CONCLUSIONS

Leaflet injuries transform a low-risk procedure into a challenging scenario. This complication should be known, prevented, and eventually managed carefully, using all the possible tools available, according

FIGURE 1 Echocardiography Color Comparison of the Perforations

75



to patient presentation and characteristics, ranging from conservative treatments to the most definitive solutions including heart transplantation.

AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

Prof. Maisano has received grants through his institution from Abbott, Medtronic, Edwards Lifesciences, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, NVT Group, Terumo; has received honoraria and is a consultant for Abbott, Medtronic, Edwards Lifesciences, Xeltis, and Cardiovalve; has received royalties from Edwards Lifesciences; and holds shares in Cardiogard, Magenta, SwissVortex, Transseptalsolutions, Occlufit, 4Tech, and Perifect.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Prof. Francesco Maisano, Cardiac Surgery, University of Zurich, Pestalozzistrasse 3/5, CH 8091 Zürich, Switzerland. E-mail: francesco.maisano@uzh.ch.

REFERENCES

1. Maisano F, Franzen O, Baldus S, et al. Percutaneous mitral valve interventions in the real world: early and 1-year 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.

 Blossom J, Lowe C, Ashley KE, et al. Torrential mitral regurgitation after transcatheter edge-toedge mitral valve repair. J Am Coll Cardiol Case Rep 2021;3:69–73.

3. Argenziano M, Skipper E, Heimansohn D, et al. Surgical revision after percutaneous mitral repair with the MitraClip device. Ann Thorac Surg 2010; 89:72-80.

4. Klapyta A, Pregowski J, Chmielak Z, et al. Bailout use of the Amplatzer Septal Occluder for treatment of acute iatrogenic leaflet perforation during the MitraClip procedure in a patient with functional mitral regurgitation. Postepy Kardiol Interwencyjnej 2018;14:304–8.

5. Taramasso M, Alessandrini H, Kuwata S, et al. Multicenter experience with treatment of residual mitral regurgitation after MitraClip implantation using Amplatzer Closure Device: mid-term results. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2017;10:966-70.

6. Sugiura A, Ozturk C, Sinning JM, Nickenig G. Staged clasping with PASCAL device for mitral regurgitation with leaflet laceration. Euro-Intervention 2020;16:e303-4.

7. Sanchis L, Quintana E, Navarro R, et al. Delayed mitral leaflet perforation in a tethered valve after MitraClip XTR implantation. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2020;13:2438-9.

8. Citro R, Baldi C, Mastrogiovanni G, et al. Partial clip detachment and posterior mitral leaflet perforation after MitraClip implantation. Int J Cardiol 2014;171:e113-6.

9. Praz F, Braun D, Unterhuber M, et al. Edgeto-edge mitral valve repair with extended clip arms: early experience from a multicenter observational study. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2019;12:1356-65.

10. Maisano F, La Canna G, Grimaldi A, et al. Annular-to-leaflet mismatch and the need for reductive annuloplasty in patients undergoing mitral repair for chronic mitral regurgitation due to mitral valve prolapse. Am J Cardiol 2007;99: 1434-9.

11. Hirasawa K, Namazi F, Milhorini Pio S, et al. Insufficient mitral leaflet remodeling in relation to annular dilation and risk of residual mitral regurgitation after MitraClip implantation. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2020 Oct 28 [E-pub ahead of print].

12. Votta E, Maisano F, Soncini M, et al. 3-D computational analysis of the stress distribution on the leaflets after edge-to-edge repair of mitral regurgitation. J Heart Valve Dis 2002;11:810-22.

13. Zhang Y, Wang VY, Morgan AE, et al. Mechanical effects of MitraClip on leaflet stress and myocardial strain in functional mitral regurgitation—a finite element modeling study. PLoS One 2019;14:e0223472.

14. Morgan AE, Wozniak CJ, Gulati S, et al. Association of uneven MitraClip application and leaflet stress in a finite element model. JAMA Surg 2017; 152:111-4.

KEY WORDS cardiac assist devices, complication, hemodynamics, leaflet repair, mitral valve, pulmonary hypertension, valve repair

76