# Tricuspid regurgitation is a predictor of mortality after percutaneous mitral valve edge-to-edge repair



**Ermela Yzeiraj**<sup>1</sup>, MD; Klaudija Bijuklic<sup>1</sup>, MD; Claudia Tiburtius<sup>2</sup>, MD; Julian Witt<sup>2</sup>, MD; Korff Krause<sup>2</sup>, MD; Jana Steude<sup>2</sup>, MD; Lorenz Hansen<sup>2</sup>, MD; Friedrich-Christian Rieß<sup>2</sup>, MD, PhD; Joachim Schofer<sup>1,2\*</sup>, MD, PhD

1. Medical Care Center Prof. Mathey, Prof. Schofer, Hamburg, Germany; 2. Albertinen Cardiovascular Center, Hamburg, Germany

E. Yzeiraj and K. Bijuklic contributed equally to the manuscript.

# **KEYWORDS**

#### • death

- mitral regurgitation
- mitral valve repair
- tricuspid disease

# Abstract

**Aims:** The aim of this study was to determine the impact of tricuspid regurgitation (TR) on mortality after edge-to-edge percutaneous mitral valve repair (PMVR), and also to analyse whether there is a difference in outcome between patients with improvement of TR after PMVR compared to patients without.

**Methods and results:** Out of 197 consecutive patients who underwent PMVR, 139 patients with available follow-up (mean  $428\pm386$  days) were included in the study. Concomitant moderate/severe TR was present in 58.3% of patients. Kaplan-Meier analysis showed significantly reduced overall survival for patients with moderate/severe TR, compared to patients with none/mild TR (p=0.003). Cox multivariate regression analysis revealed severe TR at baseline as the strongest independent predictor of mortality (HR 4.367, p=0.003). An improvement of the baseline moderate/severe TR was observed in 45.5% of patients at 30-day follow-up. Patients with no improvement of TR after PMVR had a higher midterm mortality compared to patients in whom TR improved (40.5% versus 11.4%, p=0.005).

**Conclusions:** More than half of patients undergoing PMVR have concomitant moderate/severe TR, which is associated with a worse outcome. Among predictors of mortality after edge-to-edge PMVR, severe TR at baseline is the most important. Patients with no improvement of TR at 30 days after PMVR have a significantly higher mortality at follow-up.

\*Corresponding author: Medical Care Center Prof. Mathey, Prof. Schofer and Albertinen Cardiovascular Center; Wördemannsweg 25-27, 22527 Hamburg, Germany. E-mail: schofer@herz-hh.de

## **Abbreviations**

| AF    | atrial fibrillation                        |
|-------|--|
| CKD   | chronic kidney disease                     |
| GFR   | glomerular filtration rate                 |
| LV    | left ventricle                             |
| LVEDD | left ventricular end-diastolic diameter    |
| LVEF  | left ventricular ejection fraction         |
| MR    | mitral regurgitation                       |
| PMVR  | percutaneous mitral valve repair           |
| RV    | right ventricle                            |
| RVEDD | right ventricular end-diastolic diameter   |
| sPAP  | systolic pulmonary artery pressure         |
| TAPSE | tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion |
| TEE   | transoesophageal echocardiography          |
| TR    | tricuspid regurgitation                    |
| TTE   | transthoracic echocardiography             |
|       |  |

### Introduction

Untreated severe tricuspid regurgitation (TR) is associated with worse survival independent of right ventricular (RV) function with a mortality rate of up to 36% at one-year follow-up<sup>1,2</sup>. In patients undergoing mitral valve surgery, the prevalence of TR is  $>30\%^3$  and, left untreated, significant TR impairs long-term survival<sup>4</sup>. There is increasing evidence that a surgical approach with tricuspid valve repair in patients undergoing left-sided valve surgery improves outcome<sup>5.8</sup>, which is reflected by current guidelines<sup>9,10</sup>.

Edge-to-edge percutaneous mitral valve repair (PMVR) is an effective therapeutic option for inoperable or high surgical risk patients with symptomatic mitral regurgitation (MR)<sup>11-13</sup>. Compared to surgical candidates, most of these patients are suffering from a more advanced heart failure. As a consequence, the prevalence of TR is higher<sup>14</sup>. Only a few studies have aimed to identify predictors of long-term outcome after edge-to-edge PMVR<sup>14-17</sup>. Significant TR was one of the predictors<sup>14</sup> for the combined endpoint death and rehospitalisation, whereas data on mortality are limited.

The aim of the present study was to determine the impact of TR on mortality after successful edge-to-edge PMVR and to analyse the proportion of patients who show an improvement of TR severity and whether there is a difference in outcome between patients with and without improvement of TR after PMVR.

Editorial, see page 1799

# Methods STUDY POPULATION

Between October 2011 and June 2015, 197 consecutive patients underwent a MitraClip<sup>®</sup> procedure (Abbott Vascular, Santa Clara, CA, USA) in one institution by the same chief operator (Joachim Schofer) and 139 patients with available follow-up data were included in the study.

All patients were discussed by an interdisciplinary Heart Team and deemed to be at high surgical risk, which was defined as a logistic EuroSCORE I mortality rate  $\geq 15\%$  or specific risk factors associated with high perioperative morbidity and mortality.

#### PROCEDURAL TECHNIQUE

PMVR was performed under general anaesthesia with fluoroscopic, 2D and 3D transoesophageal guidance. The procedural steps are as previously described<sup>18,19</sup>. Procedural success was defined as implantation of at least one clip with MR reduction of at least one degree and/or residual MR  $\leq 2$ . Residual MR grade was assessed by post-procedural transoesophageal echocardiography (TEE), under the same blood pressure as pre-procedural. A serious event was defined as the occurrence of death, stroke, myocardial infarction, cardiac tamponade or clip embolisation.

#### ECHOCARDIOGRAPHY

All patients underwent transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) and TEE at baseline, and TTE at 30 days. MR was defined as degenerative in the presence of primary pathologies of the leaflets and/or apparatus of the mitral valve, and as functional if MR developed in the context of ischaemic heart disease, dilated cardiomyopathy or severe LA dilatation, despite a structurally normal mitral valve<sup>10,20</sup>. The severity of MR and TR was classified as none/trace, mild, moderate or severe based on current recommendations<sup>9,20</sup>. MR severity was graded using vena contracta (VC) width and effective regurgitant orifice area (EROA) and regurgitant volume measured by the proximal isovelocity surface area (PISA) method<sup>20</sup>.

TR severity was assessed using the semi-quantitative parameters VC width and systolic hepatic flow reversal. A VC width  $\geq$ 7 mm defined severe TR. Qualitative parameters such as colour flow TR jet and continuous wave Doppler signal of the TR jet were used to distinguish between none/trivial, mild and moderate TR<sup>20</sup>.

Systolic pulmonary artery pressure (sPAP) was calculated from peak TR jet velocity, using the simplified Bernoulli equation and adding an assumed right atrial pressure<sup>20,21</sup>.

#### FOLLOW-UP

Clinical follow-up was obtained according to our routine clinical practice by clinical visits or phone consultations. Thirtyday echocardiographic follow-up, defined as "early follow-up", was obtained in 95.7% of patients. Six patients died before the echocardiographic control could be performed. Cardiovascular death was defined as death due to heart failure, myocardial infarction, stroke or any procedure-related death.

#### **STATISTICS**

Continuous variables are presented as mean±standard deviation and compared using the unpaired Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate. Categorical data are presented as counts (percentages) and compared by the Pearson chi-square or Fisher's exact test. All p-values reported are two-tailed and p<0.05 was considered statistically significant. Survival curves were generated with the use of the Kaplan-Meier method, and log-rank tests were used to evaluate differences between groups. A multivariable analysis for mortality was performed using a Cox regression analysis with stepwise forward selection, which incorporated baseline clinical variables with a significance level of p<0.05 at univariate analysis. Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism version 7 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA) and SPSS software, Version 20.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

# Results

# PATIENT CHARACTERISTICS

Baseline characteristics are shown in **Table 1** and **Table 2**. Mean age was  $76.4\pm7.5$  years, 61.2% were male, mean logistic EuroSCORE I was  $22.5\pm13.9\%$  and the majority of patients were in NYHA Class III or IV (84.9%, n=118); 138/139 patients had moderate or severe MR, and the aetiology was functional in 84.2% of patients. Moderate or severe TR was present in 58.3% of patients (n=81) (Figure 1).

Compared to patients with none/mild TR (n=58), patients with moderate/severe TR (n=81) were significantly older (77.8 $\pm$ 6.9 versus 74.4 $\pm$ 7.9 years, p=0.008), had a higher EuroSCORE I (25 $\pm$ 15.3 versus 19 $\pm$ 10.6%, p=0.01) and a higher prevalence of AF (80.2% versus 50%, p<0.001) (Table 1).

Echocardiography revealed that patients with moderate/severe TR had a larger RV diameter and higher sPAP compared to patients with none/mild TR. MR severity and LV dimension and function were comparable between the groups **(Table 2)**.

#### **30-DAY OUTCOME**

Significant improvement of MR was achieved in most patients with a procedural success rate of 97.8%. The mortality rate at 30 days was 5% (7/139): this was due to heart failure in six patients (86%), while one patient died because of acute renal failure. No other serious events were observed. Thirty-day echocardiographic follow-up was obtained in 96.6% (56/58) of patients with none/ mild TR and 95% (77/81) of patients with moderate/severe TR

#### Table 1. Clinical characteristics at baseline.

| Variables                     | All patients<br>(N=139) | None/mild<br>TR (N=58) | Moderate/<br>severe TR<br>(N=81) | <i>p</i> -value |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Age (years)                   | 76.4±7.5                | 74.4±7.9               | 77.8±6.9                         | 0.008           |
| Male sex                      | 85 (61.2)               | 37 (63.8)              | 48 (59.3)                        | 0.602           |
| EuroSCORE I (%)               | 22.5±13.9               | 19±10.6                | 25±15.3                          | 0.010           |
| NYHA I                        | 0 (0)                   | 0 (0)                  | 0 (0)                            | 0.471           |
| 11                            | 6 (4.3)                 | 2 (3.4)                | 4 (4.9)                          |                 |
| III                           | 102 (73.4)              | 47 (81)                | 55 (67.9)                        |                 |
| IV                            | 16 (11.5)               | 5 (8.6)                | 11 (13.6)                        |                 |
| Hypertension                  | 107 (77)                | 44 (75.9)              | 73 (90.1)                        | 0.832           |
| Dyslipidaemia                 | 78 (56.1)               | 34 (58.6)              | 44 (54.3)                        | 0.723           |
| Diabetes mellitus             | 45 (32.4)               | 18 (31)                | 27 (33.3)                        | 0.855           |
| CAD                           | 85 (61.2)               | 36 (62.1)              | 49 (60.5)                        | 0.860           |
| Extracardiac arteriopathy     | 38 (27.3)               | 17 (29.3)              | 21 (25.9)                        | 0.680           |
| Stroke                        | 14 (10.1)               | 7 (12.1)               | 7 (8.6)                          | 0.573           |
| MI                            | 63 (45.3)               | 28 (48.3)              | 35 (43.2)                        | 0.605           |
| PCI                           | 66 (47.5)               | 28 (48.3)              | 38 (46.9)                        | 0.864           |
| CABG                          | 29 (20.9)               | 11 (19)                | 18 (22.2)                        | 0.678           |
| AF                            | 94 (67.6)               | 29 (50)                | 65 (80.2)                        | < 0.001         |
| COPD                          | 24 (17.3)               | 13 (22.4)              | 11 (13.6)                        | 0.180           |
| Pacemaker                     | 50 (36)                 | 20 (34.5)              | 30 (37)                          | 0.703           |
| Intracardiac<br>defibrillator | 35 (25.2)               | 19 (32.8)              | 16 (19.8)                        | 0.103           |
| CKD (GFR <60)                 | 72 (51.8)               | 28 (48.3)              | 44 (54.3)                        | 0.383           |
| Dialysis                      | 5 (3.6)                 | 0 (0)                  | 5 (6.2)                          | 0.074           |
| Functional MR                 | 117 (84.2)              | 49 (84.5)              | 68 (84)                          | 1.000           |

Values are expressed as mean±SD or n (%). AF: atrial fibrillation; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; CAD: coronary artery disease; CKD: chronic kidney disease; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GFR: glomerular filtration rate; MI: myocardial infarction; MR: mitral regurgitation; NYHA: New York Heart Association; PCI: percutaneous coronary intervention; TR: tricuspid regurgitation

#### Table 2. Echocardiographic characteristics at baseline and at 30-day follow-up.

|               | Baseline               |                              |                 | 30-day follow-up       |                              |                 |  |
|---------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Variables     | None/mild TR<br>(N=58) | Moderate/severe<br>TR (N=81) | <i>p</i> -value | None/mild TR<br>(N=56) | Moderate/severe<br>TR (N=77) | <i>p</i> -value |  |
| MR None/trace | 0 (0)                  | 0 (0)                        | 0.239           | 11 (19.6)              | 5 (6.5)                      | 0.006           |  |
| Mild          | 1 (1.7)                | 0 (0)                        |                 | 38 (67.9)              | 45 (58.4)                    |                 |  |
| Moderate      | 21 (36.2)              | 22 (27.2)                    |                 | 7 (12.5)               | 23 (29.9)                    |                 |  |
| Severe        | 36 (62.1)              | 59 (72.8)                    |                 | 0 (0)                  | 4 (5.2)                      |                 |  |
| TR None/trace | 6 (10.3)               | 0 (0)                        | <0.001          | 12 (21.8)              | 3 (3.9)                      | <0.001          |  |
| Mild          | 52 (89.7)              | 0 (0)                        |                 | 37 (67.3)              | 28 (36.4)                    |                 |  |
| Moderate      | 0 (0)                  | 70 (86.4)                    |                 | 5 (9.1)                | 36 (46.8)                    |                 |  |
| Severe        | 0 (0)                  | 11 (13.6)                    |                 | 1 (1.8)                | 10 (13)                      |                 |  |
| LVEF (%)      | 43±14                  | 45±16                        | 0.504           | 41±15                  | 43±15                        | 0.499           |  |
| sPAP (mmHg)   | 49±13                  | 57±13                        | 0.001           | 41±11                  | 46±15                        | 0.026           |  |
| LVEDD (mm)    | 60±8                   | 59±9                         | 0.483           | 61±8                   | 58±9                         | 0.048           |  |
| RVEDD (mm)    | 37±6                   | 41±6                         | 0.001           | -                      | -                            |                 |  |
| TAPSE (mm)    | 19±3                   | 19±4                         | 0.577           | -                      | -                            |                 |  |
|               |                        |                              |                 |                        |                              |                 |  |

Values are expressed as mean±SD or n (%). LVEDD: left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; MR: mitral regurgitation; RVEDD: right ventricular end-diastolic diameter; sPAP: systolic pulmonary artery pressure; TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; TR: tricuspid regurgitation

at baseline **(Table 2)**. The incidence of moderate/severe MR at 30-day follow-up was significantly higher in patients with moderate/severe TR at baseline (p=0.006).

Although sPAP at 30 days was improved in both groups, it was significantly higher in patients with moderate/severe TR at baseline ( $46\pm15$  versus  $41\pm11$  mmHg, p=0.026). At 30 days, we did not observe reverse remodelling of the LV (**Table 2**).

#### **MIDTERM OUTCOME**

At a mean follow-up of  $428\pm386$  days, the cumulative mortality rate was 25.2% (35/139 patients) (Figure 1): 26/35 patients (74%) experienced cardiovascular death (due to heart failure in 22 patients, myocardial infarction in three and stroke in one patient), 2/35 patients died because of renal failure, 3/35 patients because of cancer and in 4/35 patients the cause of death was unknown.



**Figure 1.** *Flow chart showing 139 patients included in the study. Mean follow-up 428 days.* 

Kaplan-Meier analysis at 24 months showed a significantly reduced overall survival in patients with moderate/severe TR, compared to patients with none/mild TR (p=0.003) (Figure 2).

#### PREDICTORS OF MORTALITY

Univariate analysis revealed EuroSCORE I  $\geq$ 20%, NYHA functional Class IV, AF, chronic kidney disease (CKD), severe TR at baseline, sPAP  $\geq$ 60 mmHg and moderate/severe residual MR grade as significant predictors of mortality **(Table 3)**.



**Figure 2.** *Kaplan-Meier survival curves stratified by TR severity at baseline.* 

Multivariate Cox regression analyses showed severe TR at baseline as the strongest independent predictor of midterm mortality (HR 4.367, p=0.003). In addition, sPAP  $\geq$ 60 mmHg (HR 3.835, p<0.001), residual moderate/severe MR (HR 3.400, p=0.007), NYHA Class IV (HR 3.057, p=0.015) and CKD (HR 2.785, p=0.020) were significantly associated with mortality (**Table 3**).

#### TR IMPROVEMENT AND IMPACT ON OUTCOME

An early improvement at 30 days of TR (at least one grade) was observed in 45.5% of patients with moderate/severe TR at baseline (35/77 patients). At a mean follow-up of  $428\pm386$  days, patients without early improvement of moderate/severe TR had a significantly higher mortality rate compared to patients in whom TR improved (40.5% versus 11.4%, p=0.005) (Table 4).

Kaplan-Meier survival at 24 months was significantly reduced in patients without early improvement of the moderate/severe TR (p=0.033) (Figure 3).

The absence of TR improvement was associated with a higher EuroSCORE I ( $29\pm15.4$  versus  $19.8\pm13.8\%$ , p=0.008), a higher incidence of extracardiac arteriopathy (35.7% versus 17.1%, p=0.007) and CKD (67% versus 40%, p=0.010). LV diameter and function were not different between the two groups, but there was a trend for larger right ventricular end-diastolic diameter (RVEDD) at baseline in patients without TR improvement ( $42\pm6$ 

| Table 3. Univariate and multivariate and | alysis for predictors | of mortality at r | nidterm follow-up. |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|

| Veriables   | Univariate analysis  |                 | Multivariate analysis |                 |  |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| valiables   | Odds ratio (95% CI)  | <i>p</i> -value | Hazard ratio (95% CI) | <i>p</i> -value |  |
| Logistic EuroSCORE I ≥20%   | 5.186 (2.148-12.522) | <0.001          |                       |                 |  |
| NYHA Class IV   | 3.128 (1.101-8.883)  | 0.037           | 3.057 (1.247-7.494)   | 0.015           |  |
| Atrial fibrillation   | 2.751 (1.046-7.238)  | 0.037           |                       |                 |  |
| CKD (GFR <60)   | 4.280 (1.700-10.774) | 0.001           | 2.785 (1.177-6.588)   | 0.020           |  |
| Severe TR at baseline   | 9.975 (2.477-40.177) | 0.001           | 4.367 (1.678-11.362)  | 0.003           |  |
| Moderate/severe post-procedural MR  | 3.760 (1.409-10.031) | 0.011           | 3.400 (1.404-8.232)   | 0.007           |  |
| sPAP ≥60 mmHg   | 3.375 (1.525-7.468)  | 0.003           | 3.835 (1.814-8.109)   | < 0.001         |  |
| CKD: chronic kidney disease; GFR: glomerular filtration rate; MR: mitral regurgitation; NYHA: New York Heart Association; sPAP: systolic pulmonary artery pressure; TR: tricuspid regurgitation |                      |                 |                       |                 |  |

|        | (N=42)    | (N=35)    |       |                       |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------------------|
|        | 17 (40.5) | 4 (11.4)  | 0.005 |                       |
|        | 78±6      | 77±7      | 0.609 |                       |
|        | 25 (59.5) | 21 (60)   | 1.000 |                       |
|        | 29±15.4   | 19.8±13.8 | 0.008 |                       |
|        | 34 (81)   | 26 (74.3) | 0.265 |                       |
|        | 24 (57.1) | 17 (48.6) | 0.483 | #Patients at risk     |
|        | 15 (35.7) | 11 (31.4) | 0.809 | None/mild TR          |
|        | 24 (57.1) | 23 (65.7) | 0.637 |                       |
|        | 7 (16.7)  | 4 (11.4)  | 0.533 | Figure 3. Kaplan-Me   |
|        | 33 (78.6) | 28 (80)   | 1.000 | improvement.          |
| opathy | 15 (35.7) | 6 (17.1)  | 0.007 |                       |
|        | 28 (67)   | 14 (40)   | 0.010 |                       |
|        | 5 (11.9)  | 0 (0)     | 0.058 | 4. Patients with no e |
|        | 45±17     | 45±14     | 0.954 | ficantly higher me    |
|        | 50.10     | C1 7      | 0 400 |                       |

TR

improvement

*p*-value

 Table 4. Differences between patients with and without improvement

 at 30-day follow-up of the moderate/severe TR at baseline.

No TR

improvement

Variables

Midterm mortality

EuroSCORE I (%)

Hypertension

Age (years) Male sex

| Dyslipidaemia      |              | 24 (57.1)          | 17 (48.6) | 0.483  |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|--------|
| Diabetes mellitus  |              | 15 (35.7)          | 11 (31.4) | 0.809  |
| CAD                |              | 24 (57.1)          | 23 (65.7) | 0.637  |
| COPD               |              | 7 (16.7)           | 4 (11.4)  | 0.533  |
| AF                 |              | 33 (78.6)          | 28 (80)   | 1.000  |
| Extracardiac       | arteriopathy | 15 (35.7) 6 (17.1) |           | 0.007  |
| CKD (GFR <6        | 50)          | 28 (67)            | 14 (40)   | 0.010  |
| Dialysis           |              | 5 (11.9)           | 0 (0)     | 0.058  |
| LVEF (%)           |              | 45±17              | 45±14     | 0.954  |
| LVEDD (mm)         |              | 59±10              | 61±7      | 0.480  |
| TAPSE (mm)         |              | 19±4               | 19±3      | 0.755  |
| RVEDD (mm)         | RVEDD (mm)   |                    | 40±5      | 0.083  |
| sPAP (mmHg         | <u>;</u> )   | 56±12              | 56±13     | 0.926  |
| MR baseline        | None/trace   | 0 (0)              | 0 (0)     | 0.079  |
|                    | Mild         | 0 (0)              | 0 (0)     |        |
|                    | Moderate     | 15 (35.7)          | 6 (17.1)  |        |
|                    | Severe       | 27 (64.3)          | 29 (82.9) |        |
| 30-day sPAP (mmHg) |              | 53±14              | 37±10     | <0.001 |
| 30-day MR          | None/trace   | 1 (2.4)            | 4 (11.4)  | 0.011  |
|                    | Mild         | 20 (47.6)          | 25 (71.4) |        |
|                    | Moderate     | 17 (40.5)          | 6 (17.1)  |        |
|                    | Severe       | 4 (9.5)            | 0 (0)     |        |

Values are expressed as mean±SD or n (%). AF: atrial fibrillation; CAD: coronary artery disease; CKD: chronic kidney disease; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; GFR: glomerular filtration rate; LVEDD: left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction; MR: mitral regurgitation; RVEDD: right ventricular end-diastolic diameter; sPAP: systolic pulmonary artery pressure; TAPSE: tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; TR: tricuspid regurgitation

versus  $40\pm5$  mm, p=0.083). sPAP at baseline was not significantly different between patients with and without TR improvement (56±13 mmHg versus 56±12 mmHg, p=926); however, at 30-day follow-up it was significantly lower in patients with TR improvement (37±10 versus 53±14 mmHg, p<0.001) (Table 4).

# Discussion

The main findings of the present study are:

- 1. More than half of patients undergoing PMVR have concomitant moderate or severe TR (58.3%), which is associated with worse outcome.
- 2. The strongest predictor for mortality at follow-up is severe TR at baseline.
- 3. TR improves in 45.5% of patients with moderate/severe TR at baseline after successful PMVR and this improvement is observed early.



**Figure 3.** *Kaplan-Meier survival curves stratified by TR improvement.* 

4. Patients with no early improvement of TR severity have a significantly higher mortality.

## INCIDENCE OF TR IN PATIENTS UNDERGOING EDGE-TO-EDGE PMVR

TR is a common finding in patients undergoing surgical intervention for MR. The presence of moderate/severe compared to none/ mild TR at baseline negatively impacts on the outcome after surgery<sup>4</sup>, and correction of concomitant TR in these patients exerts beneficial effects<sup>5-8</sup>.

In the present study, the prevalence of TR in patients undergoing PMVR was as high as 95.7% (133/139), with 58.3% suffering from moderate or severe TR. This is higher than that described by Ohno et al, who found a moderate or severe TR in 32.2% of patients<sup>14</sup>. This difference may be explained by differences in patient baseline characteristics. In particular, patients in our study were older, with higher sPAP and a higher prevalence of AF, which are known risk factors for functional TR by causing tricuspid annular dilatation<sup>22-24</sup>. TR severity in our study was associated with larger RV basal diameter and higher sPAP. This could be the cause of more TR, but on the other hand also the consequence of severe TR, which results in RV dilatation with restricted LV diastolic filling, which increases RV afterload and thereby closes a vicious cycle.

# CLINICAL OUTCOME AND PREDICTORS OF MORTALITY AT FOLLOW-UP

In the present study, all-cause midterm mortality at a mean followup of 428±386 days was 25.2%, the majority (74.3%) experiencing a cardiovascular death. In the TRAMI registry<sup>17</sup>, with almost identical patient demographic characteristics, cardiovascular mortality was only 37%. However, the cause of death was unknown in 35.5% of the patients in the TRAMI registry.

In line with other studies, including the TRAMI<sup>17</sup> and GRASP registry<sup>14</sup>, we found a prognostic benefit of MR reduction, suggesting that a maximal MR reduction should be attempted to optimise the outcome<sup>14,16,17</sup>. However, even in the presence of successful

reduction of MR, two-year mortality among patients with moderate/severe TR was significantly higher (Figure 2).

In a study comprising 5,223 patients undergoing echocardiography for different reasons<sup>1</sup>, TR was associated with worse survival, independently of age, biventricular systolic function, RV size and dilatation of the inferior vena cava (IVC). After mitral valve surgery, severe TR, even if not present at the time of surgery, develops in more than 50% of patients over time, if the tricuspid annulus is >40 mm<sup>25</sup>, and significant TR is a predictor for worse survival after mitral valve surgery<sup>4</sup>.

Few studies have aimed to identify predictors of long-term outcome after edge-to-edge PMVR<sup>15,16</sup>. In our study, Cox regression analysis revealed that severe baseline TR was the strongest predictor of mortality (HR 4.367, p=0.003).

In the GRASP registry<sup>14</sup>, only the combined endpoint of death and re-hospitalisation was significantly associated with severe TR, whereas no association was found between baseline TR and mortality alone. Other studies have also found that TR severity, among several other predictors, is a predictor of mortality after PMVR<sup>16,17</sup>. However, in none of those studies was the proportion of patients who showed an improvement in TR severity after successful PMVR analysed. In addition, no data existed on the outcome of patients with improvement of TR after PMVR compared to patients without.

# TR IMPROVEMENT AT EARLY FOLLOW-UP AND IMPACT ON OUTCOME

Successful edge-to-edge PMVR was associated with a 30-day improvement of TR in 45.5% of patients with moderate or severe TR at baseline. This finding is in line with other studies<sup>14,26</sup>.

In our study, patients with no improvement of TR had a trend for a larger basal diameter of the RV at baseline and a higher sPAP at 30-day follow-up (**Table 4**). These might be either the cause or the consequence of persistent significant TR, as discussed earlier. Mortality at midterm follow-up was significantly higher among patients with no improvement of moderate/severe TR (40.5% versus 11.4%, p=0.005). Kaplan-Meier survival curves stratified by TR improvement diverge significantly. Whereas patients with improvement of TR have a quite stable survival over two years of follow-up, in patients with no improvement mortality increases over time (**Figure 3**).

In future studies, it would be important to identify predictors of TR improvement after PMVR. For those patients without improvement, percutaneous interventions to reduce TR, which are currently under development, should be considered<sup>27,28</sup>.

#### Limitations

This is a single-centre registry with its inherent limitations. The sample size is relatively small; however, it comprises all-comer patients who underwent edge-to-edge PMVR with available follow-up. The criteria for quantification of TR was semi-quantitative based on VC, and qualitative to differentiate between none/trace, mild and moderate TR. However, these analyses were conducted

by dedicated, highly experienced physicians using validated methods following current guidelines. Because follow-up data were obtained from routine echocardiography, we do not have the exact data for RV function and dimension in most of the patients.

#### Conclusions

More than half of patients undergoing PMVR have a concomitant moderate or severe TR, which is associated with worse outcome. Among the predictors for mortality after edge-to-edge PMVR, severe TR at baseline is the most important. Patients with moderate or severe TR without an improvement at 30 days have a worse outcome compared to patients in whom TR improves. An early indication for PMVR before the onset of severe TR might be considered, and for patients with moderate/severe TR it remains to be shown whether percutaneous approaches to reduce TR could improve patient outcome.

#### Impact on daily practice

Patients with severe MR, if accompanied by moderate/severe TR, have a higher mortality after edge-to-edge PMVR compared to patients without significant TR. Patients with no improvement of moderate or severe TR 30 days after PMVR have a significantly higher mortality compared to patients with improvement. This should be taken into consideration by the Heart Team. Because there is a 45% chance of TR improvement at 30 days after PMVR, we would not recommend a combined percutaneous MR and TR repair in one session but may consider a percutaneous TR repair if severe TR is persisting.

#### Conflict of interest statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

#### References

1. Nath J, Foster E, Heidenreich PA. Impact of tricuspid regurgitation on long-term survival. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2004;43:405-9.

2. Topilsky Y, Nkomo VT, Vatury O, Michelena HI, Letourneau T, Suri RM, Pislaru S, Park S, Mahoney DW, Biner S, Enriquez-Sarano M. Clinical outcome of isolated tricuspid regurgitation. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2014;7:1185-94.

3. Cohen SR, Sell JE, McIntosh CL, Clark RE. Tricuspid regurgitation in patients with acquired, chronic, pure mitral regurgitation. I. Prevalence, diagnosis, and comparison of preoperative clinical and hemodynamic features in patients with and without tricuspid regurgitation. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 1987;94:481-7.

4. Di Mauro M, Bivona A, Iacò AL, Contini M, Gagliardi M, Varone E, Gallina S, Calafiore AM. Mitral valve surgery for functional mitral regurgitation: prognostic role of tricuspid regurgitation. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2009;35:635-9.

5. Taramasso M, Vanermen H, Maisano F, Guidotti A, La Canna G, Alfieri O. The growing clinical importance of secondary tricuspid regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;59:703-10.

6. Dreyfus GD, Corbi PJ, Chan KM, Bahrami T. Secondary tricuspid regurgitation or dilatation: which should be the criteria for surgical repair? *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2005;79:127-32.

7. Lee JW, Song JM, Park JP, Lee JW, Kang DH, Song JK. Long-term prognosis of isolated significant tricuspid regurgitation. *Circ J.* 2010;74:375-80.

8. Calafiore AM, Gallina S, Iacò AL, Contini M, Bivona A, Gagliardi M, Bosco P, Di Mauro M. Mitral valve surgery for functional mitral regurgitation: should moderate-or-more tricuspid regurgitation be treated? a propensity score analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2009;87:698-703.

9. Joint Task Force on the Management of Valvular Heart Disease of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC); European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS), Vahanian A, Alfieri O, Andreotti F, Antunes MJ, Barón-Esquivias G, Baumgartner H, Borger MA, Carrel TP, De Bonis M, Evangelista A, Falk V, Iung B, Lancellotti P, Pierard L, Price S, Schäfers HJ, Schuler G, Stepinska J, Swedberg K, Takkenberg J, Oppell UO Von, Windecker S, Zamorano JL, Zembala M. Guidelines on the management of valvular heart disease (version 2012). *Eur Heart J.* 2012;33:2451-96.

10. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP 3rd, Guyton RA, O'Gara PT, Ruiz CE, Skubas NJ, Sorajja P, Sundt TM 3rd, Thomas JD; American College of Cardiology/ American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2014;63: 2438-88.

11. Mauri L, Foster E, Glower DD, Apruzzese P, Massaro JM, Herrmann HC, Hermiller J, Gray W, Wang A, Pedersen WR, Bajwa T, Lasala J, Low R, Grayburn P, Feldman T; EVEREST II Investigators. 4-year results of a randomized controlled trial of percutaneous repair versus surgery for mitral regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;62:317-28.

12. Maisano F, Franzen O, Baldus S, Schäfer U, Hausleiter J, Butter C, Ussia GP, Sievert H, Richardt G, Widder JD, Moccetti T, Schillinger W. 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.

13. Nickenig G, Estevez-Loureiro R, Franzen O, Tamburino C, Vanderheyden M, Lüscher TF, Moat N, Price S, Dall'Ara G, Winter R, Corti R, Grasso C, Snow TM, Jeger R, Blankenberg S, Settergren M, Tiroch K, Balzer J, Petronio AS, Büttner HJ, Ettori F, Sievert H, Fiorino MG, Claeys M, Ussia GP, Baumgartner H, Scandura S, Alamgir F, Keshavarzi F, Colombo A, Maisano F, Ebelt H, Aruta P, Lubos E, Plicht B, Schueler R, Pighi M, Di Mario C; Transcatheter Valve Treatment Sentinel Registry Investigators of the EURObservational Research Programme of the European Society of Cardiology. 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.

14. Ohno Y, Attizzani GF, Capodanno D, Cannata S, Dipasqua F, Immé S, Barbanti M, Ministeri M, Caggegi A, Pistritto AM, Chiarandà M, Ronsivalle G, Giaquinta S, Farruggio S, Mangiafico S, Scandura S, Tamburino C, Capranzano P, Grasso C. Association of tricuspid regurgitation with clinical and echocardiographic outcomes after percutaneous mitral valve repair with the MitraClip System: 30-day and 12-month follow-up from the GRASP Registry. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2014;15:1246-55.

15. Capodanno D, Adamo M, Barbanti M, Giannini C, Laudisa ML, Cannata S, Curello S, Immè S, Maffeo D, Bedogni F, Petronio AS, Ettori F, Tamburino C, Grasso C; GRASP-IT Investigators. Predictors of clinical outcomes after edge-to-edge percutaneous mitral valve repair. *Am Heart J.* 2015;170:187-95.

16. Boerlage-vanDijk K, Wiegerinck EM, Araki M, Meregalli PG, Bindraban NR, Koch KT, Vis MM, Piek JJ, Tijssen JG, Bouma BJ, Baan J Jr. Predictors of outcome in patients undergoing MitraClip implantation: An aid to improve patient selection. *Int J Cardiol.* 2015;189:238-43.

17. Puls M, Lubos E, Boekstegers P, von Bardeleben RS, Ouarrak T, Butter C, Zuern CS, Bekeredjian R, Sievert H, Nickenig G, Eggebrecht H, Senges J, Schillinger W. 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.

18. Van den Branden BJ, Post MC, Swaans MJ, Rensing BJ, Eefting FD, Plokker HW, Jaarsma W, Van der Heyden JA. Percutaneous mitral valve repair using the edge-to-edge technique in a high-risk population. *Neth Heart J.* 2010;18:437-43.

19. Feldman T, Kar S, Rinaldi M, Fail P, Hermiller J, Smalling R, Whitlow PL, Gray W, Low R, Herrmann HC, Lim S, Foster E, Glower D; EVEREST Investigators. Percutaneous mitral repair with the MitraClip system: safety and midterm durability in the initial EVEREST (Endovascular Valve Edge-to-Edge REpair Study) cohort. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2009;54:686-94.

20. Lancellotti P, Tribouilloy C, Hagendorff A, Popescu BA, Edvardsen T, Pierard LA, Badano L, Zamorano JL; Scientific Document Committee of the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. Recommendations for the echocardiographic assessment of native valvular regurgitation: an executive summary from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2013;14:611-44.

21. Rudski LG, Lai WW, Afilalo J, Hua L, Handschumacher MD, Chandrasekaran K, Solomon SD, Louie EK, Schiller NB. Guidelines for the echocardiographic assessment of the right heart in adults: a report from the American Society of Echocardiography endorsed by the European Association of Echocardiography, a registered branch of the European Society of Cardiology, and the Canadian Society of Echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2010;23:685-713. 22. Najib MQ, Vinales KL, Vittala SS, Challa S, Lee HR, Chaliki HP. Predictors for the development of severe tricuspid regurgitation with anatomically normal valve in patients with atrial fibrillation. *Echocardiography.* 2012;29:140-6.

23. Hung J. The pathogenesis of functional tricuspid regurgitation. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2010;22:76-8.

24. Di Mauro M, Bezante GP, Di Baldassarre A, Clemente D, Cardinali A, Acitelli A, Salerni S, Penco M, Calafiore AM, Gallina S; Italian Study Group on Valvular Heart Disease Italian Society of Cardiology. Functional tricuspid regurgitation: an underestimated issue. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;168:707-15.

25. Van de Veire NR, Braun J, Delgado V, Versteegh MI, Dion RA, Klautz RJ, Bax JJ. Tricuspid annuloplasty prevents right ventricular dilatation and progression of tricuspid regurgitation in

patients with tricuspid annular dilatation undergoing mitral valve repair. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2011;141:1431-9.

26. Godino C, Salerno A, Cera M, Agricola E, Fragasso G, Rosa I, Oppizzi M, Monello A, Scotti A, Magni V, Montorfano M, Cappelletti A, Margonato A, Colombo A. Impact and evolution of right ventricular dysfunction after successful MitraClip implantation in patients with functional mitral regurgitation. *IJC Heart & Vasculature*. 2016;11:90-98.

27. Schofer J. Transcatheter interventions for tricuspid regurgitation: Trialign and Mitralign. *EuroIntervention*. 2016;12:Y119-20.

28. Rodés-Cabau J, Hahn RT, Latib A, Laule M, Lauten A, Maisano F, Schofer J, Campelo-Parada F, Puri R, Vahanian A. Transcatheter Therapies for Treating Tricuspid Regurgitation. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016;67:1829-45.