

# Endoaortic Versus Transthoracic Clamp for Minimally- invasive Mitral Valve Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

#### Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of the Master Degree in Cardiothoracic Surgery

### By

#### **Seif Eldin Fouad Ghareeb**

M.B.B.Ch, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University Resident of Cardiothoracic Surgery-Ain Shams University Hospitals

### Under Supervisors

# **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Elfiky**

Professor of Cardiothoracic Surgery Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

### Assist. Prof. Dr. Mohamed El-Ghannam

Assistant Professor of Cardiothoracic Surgery Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### Dr. Moustafa Gamal

Lecturer of Cardiothoracic Surgery Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2019



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



First of all, thanks to Allah whose magnificent help was the main factor in completing this work.

I wish to express my deep thanks to Prof. Dr. Mohamed Elfiky, Professor and Head of Cardiothoracic Surgery Department for suggesting the problem, planning, reading, revising the manuscript and significant encouragement and help. His insight, patience on the both professional and personal levels helped in the accomplishment of the present study.

I would like to express my deep thanks to Dr. Mohamed El-Ghannam, Assistant Professor of Cardiothoracic Surgery, who gave me his time, reading, revising the manuscript and support throughout this study.

I would like to express my deep thanks to Dr. Mustafa Gamal, Lecturer of Cardiothoracic Surgery who give me his time, reading, revising the manuscript and significant encouragement and help me throughout this study.

I would like to thank all staff members of Cardiothoracic Surgery Department, Ain Shams University Hospitals for their continuous support and encouragement.

And last but not least, I would like to express my deepest thanks to my precious family for their deep concern, continuous support, endless patience and love.

# **Contents**

<b>Subjects</b> H	Page
List of abbreviations	II
List of figures	
List of tables	
Abstract	
• Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	8
• Review of Literature	
◆ Chapter (1): Minimally Invasive Mitral Valv	'e
Surgery	9
◆ Chapter (2): Aortic Occlusion/Cardioplegia	28
Patients and Methods	32
• Results	39
• Discussion	80
• Conclusion	89
• Summary	90
• References	93
Arabic Summary	

## List of Abbreviations

**COPD** : Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

**CPB** : Cardiopulmonary bypass

**EABO** : Endo-aortic balloon occlusion

**GHL** : Global health library

**LVEF** : Left ventricular ejection fraction

MICS : Minimally invasive cardiac surgery

**MIMVS** : Minimally invasive mitral valve surgery

**MIS** : Minimally invasive surgery

**MMO** : Micro-mitral operation

**NIH** : National institute of health

**RAP** : Retrograde arterial perfusion

**TEE** : Transesophageal echocardiographic

TTC : Transthoracic aortic clamping

**VHL** : POPLINE, Virtual health library

.

No. of	Title	Page
Figure		
1	Cannulating Femoral Artery and Vein	18
2	Transthoracic (Chitwood) aortic clamp	22
3	The endoaortic clamp. And the Transthoracic	20
	clamp.	29
4	Flow diagram of the review process according	
	to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for	40
	Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses)	40
	statement.	
5	Summary analysis of mean differences and	46
	95% CIs for duration of aortic cross-clamp.	40
6	Weighted random-effects meta regression	
	analysis regressing the risk difference (RD) of	47
	primary endpoint against the publication date.	
7	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	48
	interval derived from a review of Cross-clamp	-0
_	time studies.	
8	Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill test for	48
_	publication bias of Cross-clamp time studies	
9	Summary analysis of mean differences and	
	95% CIs for duration of coronary artery bypass	<b>50</b>
10	time.	
10	Sub group analysis according to study types of	
	papers assess Summary duration of coronary	51
- 11	artery bypass time.	
11	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	<b>5</b> 0
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	52
10	interval derived from a review of bypass time.	
12	Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill test for publication bias of coronary artery bypass time	52
	studies.	34
	biddleb.	

13	Summary analysis of mean differences and	<b>5</b> 4
	95% CIs for conversion to sternotomy.	54
14	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	
	interval derived from a review of Conversion	55
	to sternotomy.	
15	Summary analysis of mean differences and	
	95% CIs for intraoperative aortic dissection.	<b>56</b>
16	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	<b>57</b>
	interval derived from a review of	57
	intraoperative aortic dissection.	
<b>17</b>	Summary analysis of mean differences and	58
	95% CIs for Post-operative hospital stay.	30
18	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	59
	interval derived from a review of post-	
10	operative hospital stay.	
19	Summary analysis of mean differences and	60
	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.	60
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect,	60
	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	60
	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-	
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.	
	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and	
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality	61
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect,	61
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	61
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-	61
20	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	61 62 63
20 21 22	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative 30 days mortality.	61
20 21 22	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative 30 days mortality.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for re-exploration for bleeding.  Sensitivity analysis after removal of Barbero et	61 62 63
20 21 22 23	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative 30 days mortality.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for re-exploration for bleeding.  Sensitivity analysis after removal of Barbero et al., 2017. Summary analysis of mean	61 62 63
20 21 22 23	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative 30 days mortality.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for re-exploration for bleeding.  Sensitivity analysis after removal of Barbero et al., 2017. Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative	61 62 63
20 21 22 23	95% CIs for Post-operative ICU stay.  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative ICU stay.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for Post-operative 30 days mortality  Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative 30 days mortality.  Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for re-exploration for bleeding.  Sensitivity analysis after removal of Barbero et al., 2017. Summary analysis of mean	61 62 63

25	Sensitivity analysis after removal of Ius et al.,	
	2009. Summary analysis of mean differences	66
	and 95% CIs for re-exploration for bleeding.	
26	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	
	interval derived from a review of Re-	67
	exploration for bleeding.	
27	Summary analysis of mean differences and	<b>(0</b>
	95% CIs for post-operative wound infection.	68
28	Summary analysis of mean differences and	<i>(</i> 0
	95% CIs for post-operative respiratory failure	69
29	Summary analysis of mean differences and	=0
	95% CIs for post-operative stroke.	<b>70</b>
30	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	
	interval derived from a review of post-	<b>71</b>
	operative stroke.	
31	Summary analysis of mean differences and	
31	95% CIs for post-operative minor neurological	72
	events.	, =
32	Summary analysis of mean differences and	
02	95% CIs for post-operative blood transfusion	<b>73</b>
33	Summary analysis of mean differences and 95%	
33	CIs for post-operative renal failure.	<b>74</b>
34	Summary analysis of mean differences and 95%	
0.	CIs for post-operative groin lymphocele. Size of	
	blue squares is proportional to the statistical	<b>75</b>
	weight of each trial.	
35	Funnel plot including line of no effect,	
	summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence	
	interval derived from a review of post-	<b>76</b>
	operative groin lymphocele.	
36	Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill test for	
	publication bias of post-operative groin	
	lymphocele.	<b>76</b>
	-7	

37	Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for post-operative myocardial infarction. Size of blue squares is proportional to the statistical weight of each trial.	77
38	Funnel plot including line of no effect, summary effect and pseudo 95% confidence interval derived from a review of post-operative myocardial infarction.	78
39	Summary analysis of mean differences and 95% CIs for post-operative mitral valve lesion recurrence. Size of blue squares is proportional to the statistical weight of each trial.	79

# **List of Tables**

Table No.	Title	Page No.
1	Carpentier-Loulmet Classification of Degrees of Surgical Invasiveness	13
2	Demographic characteristics of the patients	42
3	Continue of patient's characteristics	43
4	Quality assessment of the included studies using NIH tool	44
5	Results of sensitivity analysis of studies assess post- operative hospital stay between EABO and TTC.	65

### **Abstract**

#### **Background**

Minimally invasive surgery (MIS) is a rising trend in medicine, having been adopted into nearly every medical field. Rather than single approach, Minimally Invasive Mitral Valve Surgery (MIMVS) refers to a collection of techniques and operation-specific technologies such as modified perfusion and visualization techniques that are directed toward minimizing surgical access and trauma. The aortic occlusion has been extensively reviewed by two techniques in the literature; transthoracic clamp (TTC) and Endo-aortic balloon occlusion (EABO).

#### Methods

Nine electronic databases were screened for published observational studies comparing EndoAortic (EABO) versus Transthoracic (TTC) for aortic occlusion during MIMVS. Furthermore, the titles and abstracts of the studies resulted from the search were screened for the inclusion in the systematic review and the meta-analysis based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Subsequently, the intraoperative data including cross-clamp time, bypass time, conversion, dissection, were extracted. Moreover, the postoperative data including 30 days mortality rate, stroke occurrence, minor neurological events, re-exploration for bleeding, blood transfusion, post hospital ICU stay, post hospital stay, wound infection, recurrence of the mitral valve lesion, respiratory failure, renal failure, myocardial infarction, major vascular complication, and groin lymphocele.

#### **Results**

The current meta-analysis highlights the comparative safety of the two most commonly employed aortic clamping techniques for small thoracotomy Mitral Valve Surgeries, TTC, and Endo-aortic clamp. By inclusion of 23 studies with 8829 patients, it represents the largest database on the direct comparison of these two devices ever analyzed. EABO approach was associated with a trend toward longer cross-clamp, CPB time, postoperative hospital stay and a higher risk of intraoperative aortic dissection.

#### Conclusion

Our meta-analysis demonstrated that patients undergoing EABO may experience slightly more risk of occurrence of intraoperative aortic dissection, longer bypass time and cross clamp time and longer postoperative hospital stay.

**Keywords:** Endoaortic, Transthoracic Clamp, Minimally- invasive, Mitral Valve Surgery

### Introduction

Minimally invasive surgery (MIS) is a rising trend in medicine, and has been adopted into nearly every surgical field. This growth in the type of MISs can largely be attributed to its numerous advantages, which include shorter recovery times, decreases in complication rates, and increases in the functional results of the procedures (*Fuchs*, 2002).

A minimally invasive surgical procedure should be defined as one that is safe and is associated with a lower postoperative patient morbidity compared with a conventional approach for the same operation.

The first procedure, which prevented a previous radical operation, was the use of a cystoscope to look into and treat lesions of the bladder. In 1931, Takagi of Tokyo redesigned the cystoscope and produced an arthroscope 3.5 mm in diameter. Marski Watanable, a pupil of Takagi, tenaciously pursued the development of the arthroscope, and in 1957, based on extensive experience in performing arthroscopy, he published an atlas of arthroscopy. This was the time when the minimally invasive surgery was born(*Jaffray*, 2005).

#### Introduction

At the seat of success of minimally invasive surgery is the constant upgrading of surgical instruments, which have gone from crude, cumbersome gadgets to sophisticated, robotically controlled instruments.

In observing the rapid and successful implementation of these changes, one can only marvel at the accomplishments that lie ahead. Although improved instrumentation makes the procedure easier and more effective for the surgeon, the surgeon must learn to master the new technology. Thus, the procedure involves a learning curve with its risks.

The term minimally invasive surgery has gained widespread acceptance, and indeed it should if there is reduction of operative traumatic insult without compromise of therapeutic benefit. Practically every surgical subspecialty is using some form of minimal invasiveness. However, it appears that for some of those techniques to fulfill their greatest potential, one needs to apply a multidisciplinary approach, forming a coherent team of specialists from various disciplines working in cooperation rather than in separate disciplines (*Ochsner*, 2000).

#### Introduction

Unfortunately, those performing the procedure need to develop the dexterity and skills for proper execution. In the final analysis, safe and efficient execution depends on the skill of the surgeon (*Ochsner*, 2000).

Minimally invasive cardiac surgery (MICS) looks back into 20 years of development starting from increased efforts to perform coronary bypass grafting (CABG)on the beating heart to development of small access surgeries on both the coronary arteries and the heart valves and to application of advanced techniques which include video-scopy, robotic technology, and refined catheter-based interventions (*Bonatti et al.*, 1998).

Throughout the modern era of cardiac surgery, most operations have been performed via median sternotomy with cardiopulmonary bypass. This paradigm is changing, cardiovascular surgery is increasingly however, as adopting minimally invasive techniques. Advances in patient evaluation, instrumentation, and operative technique have allowed surgeons to perform a wide variety of complex operations through smaller incisions (Langer & Argenziano, 2016).

Along with the broader surgical community, cardiovascular surgery is in the midst of an ongoing evolution in technique. What began in the 1990s with the first reports of minimally invasive valve surgery has spread to influence nearly every type of cardiovascular operation performed today, and this evolution is being further spurred by recent developments in percutaneous valve technology. With increasing patient interest in minimally invasive procedures, it is more important than ever for surgeons to be current on the most common minimally invasive techniques in cardiac surgery (*Langer & Argenziano*, 2016).

Less invasive cardiac surgery has emerged as a new and substantially different approach to a variety of cardiovascular surgical procedures. However, the largest experience in this field is related to coronary artery bypass grafting (*Weinschelbaum et al.*, 1998).

In contrast to general surgery, the goal in cardiac surgery should not necessarily be to minimize pain since extracorporeal circulation, not mediastinotomy, is probably the major cause of morbidity. Thus, we might consider minimally invasive cardiac surgery as largely off-pump surgery (*Ochsner*, 2000).