

SHOULDN'T WE FIRST FOLLOW THE GUIDELINES BEFORE IMPLEMENTING ALTERNATIVE



## MECHANICAL CIRCULATORY SUPPORT MODALITIES? To the Editor:

With interest we have read the recent article by Sommer and colleagues<sup>1</sup> on their experience using the Impella 5.0 or 5.5 microaxial pump in patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting surgery. However, we were astonished not to read that any of these patients was treated with an intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP). Despite the fact that the majority of patients presented with an acute myocardial infarction, almost 35% of the patients were classified either as elective or as urgent cases, typically leaving time for preoperative implantation of an IABP as the least-invasive and most widely used mechanical circulatory support system. Moreover, also in the patients classified as emergent, the early application of an IABP might have been a reasonable choice to immediately improve hemodynamics.

The authors cite the German S3-guideline on the use of the IABP in cardiac surgery recommending the use of this device in stable, high-risk patients undergoing cardiac surgery as well as patients presenting with cardiac decompensation with a grades of recommendation B.<sup>2</sup> In line with this, a more recent expert consensus document of the American Association for Thoracic Surgery gives a class I recommendation to consider an IABP in patients with active/ decompensated heart failure and anticipated need for postoperative mechanical support.<sup>3</sup> Of note also the 2020 Euro-Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery/ pean Extracorporeal Life Support Organization/Society of Thoracic Surgeons/American Association for Thoracic Surgery expert consensus cited by the authors clearly states that the "IABP remains the mainstay for and first approach to postcardiotomy shock management..." and restricts the class I recommendation for early use of extracorporeal life support for failure to wean from cardiopulmonary bypass and marginal hemodynamics after cardiac surgery to patients "with an IABP in place" and optimal medical therapy!<sup>4</sup> Recent multicenter data highlight the appropriateness of these recommendations, especially if the IABP is inserted preoperatively and a sheathless IABP is used.<sup>5</sup>

Consequently, it remains unclear why the authors did not start aortic counterpulsation preoperatively or immediately after induction of anesthesia in at least some of these patients with a substantial risk for failure to wean from

cardiopulmonary bypass and/or postoperative low cardiac output syndrome. We completely agree that extracorporeal life support for treating postoperative low cardiac output syndrome should be avoided due to the excessive mortality associated with this treatment modality, and we of course acknowledge the beneficial effects of improving hemodynamics and unloading the left ventricle early, if a lowoutput state develops. However, while adequately powered prospective randomized data showing a beneficial effect of microaxial pumps are lacking, an overwhelming number of observational and register data point to increased mortality and morbidity of these devices in comparison with the IABP (Figure 1).<sup>E2-E6</sup> Thus, until robust evidence from adequately powered randomized controlled trials comparing the IABP and large microaxial pumps in high-risk cardiac surgical patients is available, we feel that it might be more appropriate to base mechanical circulatory support in such vulnerable patients primarily on the established and recommended treatment modality IABP and to restrict the use of new technologies to well-defined experimental conditions.

> Maximillian Vondran, MD<sup>a</sup> Alexander Kaminski, MD<sup>a</sup> Simon Schemke, MD<sup>b</sup> Matthias Heringlake, MD<sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>Department of Cardiac and Vascular Surgery Heart- and Diabetes Center Mecklenburg–Western Pomerania Karlsburg, Germany <sup>b</sup>Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine Heart- and Diabetes Center Mecklenburg–Western Pomerania Karlsburg Hospital Karlsburg Hospital

## **Conflict of Interest Statement**

M.V. reported honoraria for lectures on atrial fibrillation by AtriCure. M.H. reported honoraria for lectures and scientific advice by Edwards Lifesciences, Orion Pharma, AOP Health, and Medtronic. A.K. reported honoraria for lectures with Getinge regarding endoscopic vein harvesting (not intra-aortic balloon pump use) and regarding atrial fibrillation with AtriCure. S.S. reported no conflicts of interest.

The *Journal* policy requires editors and reviewers to disclose conflicts of interest and to decline handling or reviewing manuscripts for which they may have a conflict of interest. The editors and reviewers of this article have no conflicts of interest.

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of The American Association for Thoracic Surgery. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



**FIGURE 1.** Hospital mortality rates from recent studies<sup>E2-E5</sup> analyzing the effects of mechanical circulatory support with an intra-aortic ballon pump (*IABP*) or a microaxial pump (Impella). Data are given as mean an 95% confidence interval (*CI*) of the mean. "Multiple indications" include 46.7% patients undergoing percutaneous coronary interventions and 32.7% patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting.

## References

- Sommer W, Arif R, Kremer J, et al. Temporary circulatory support with surgically implanted microaxial pumps in postcardiotomy cardiogenic shock following coronary artery bypass surgery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg Open. 2023;15:252-260.
- Pilarczyk K, Bauer A, Boening A, et al. S3-Guideline: recommendations for intraaortic balloon pumping in cardiac surgery. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2015; 63(Suppl 2):S131-S196.
- Bakaeen FG, Gaudino M, Whitman G, et al. 2021: the American Association for Thoracic Surgery Expert Consensus Document: coronary artery bypass grafting in

patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy and heart failure. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2021;162:829-850.

- 4. Lorusso R, Whitman G, Milojevic M, et al. 2020 EACTS/ELSO/STS/AATS expert consensus on post-cardiotomy extracorporeal life support in adult patients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2021;59:12-53.
- Heuts S, Lorusso R, di Mauro M, et al. Sheathless versus sheathed intra-aortic balloon pump implantation in patients undergoing cardiac surgery. *Am J Cardiol.* 2023;189:86-92.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xjon.2024.01.001

## **E-References**

- E1. Kralev A, Kalisnik JM, Bauer A, Sirch J, Fittkau M, Fischlein T. Impact of prophylactic intra-aortic balloon pump on early outcomes in patients with severe left ventricular dysfunction undergoing elective coronary artery bypass grafting with cardiopulmonary bypass. *Int J Cardiol.* 2023;385:8-15.
- E2. Lang CN, Kaier K, Zotzmann V, et al. Cardiogenic shock: incidence, survival and mechanical circulatory support usage 2007-2017—insights from a national registry. *Clin Res Cardiol*. 2021;110:1421-1430.
- E3. Dhruva SS, Ross JS, Mortazavi BJ, et al. Association of use of an intravascular microaxial left ventricular assist device vs intra-aortic balloon pump with inhospital mortality and major bleeding among patients with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. *JAMA*. 2020;323:734-745.
- E4. Miller PE, Bromfield SG, Ma Q, et al. Clinical outcomes and cost associated with an intravascular microaxial left ventricular assist device vs intra-aortic balloon

pump in patients presenting with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2022;182:926-933.

- E5. Lemor A, Dabbagh MF, Cohen D, et al. Rates and impact of vascular complications in mechanical circulatory support. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2022;99: 1702-1711.
- E6. David CH, Quessard A, Mastroianni C, et al. Mechanical circulatory support with the Impella 5.0 and the Impella left direct pumps for postcardiotomy cardiogenic shock at La Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2020;57: 183-188.
- **E7.** Osswald A, Shehada SE, Zubarevich A, et al. Short-term mechanical support with the Impella 5.x for mitral valve surgery in advanced heart failureprotected cardiac surgery. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2023;10:1229336.
- E8. Griffith BG, Anderson MB, Samuels LE, Pae WE Jr, Naka Y, Frazier OH. The RECOVER I: a multicenter prospective study of Impella 5.0/LD for postcardiotomy circulatory support. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2013;145:548-554.