International Journal of Medical Science and Clinical Research Studies

ISSN(print): 2767-8326, ISSN(online): 2767-8342

Volume 04 Issue 06 June 2024

Page No: 1103-1109

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmscrs/v4-i06-21, Impact Factor: 7.949

Percutaneous Repair of Calcified Valve Rings: Innovations and Clinical Outcomes in Interventional Cardiology

Donaldo Emiliano Silva López*[1], Melannie Alejandra Ramírez López[2], Regina Amutio Zabala[2], María Elisa González Robles[2], Paola Ivette Ramos Gálvez[2], Meza Gonzalez Karyn Estephania[2]

[1]Hospital Centenario Miguel Hidalgo. Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes, Mexico.

[2]Hospital Civil de Guadalajara. Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.

ABSTRACT

The advent of percutaneous repair techniques for calcified valve rings represents a significant advancement in interventional cardiology, addressing the complexities associated with valvular calcification. This article provides a comprehensive review of the current methodologies employed in the percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings, emphasizing the technological innovations, procedural strategies, and clinical outcomes. The discussion encompasses the pathophysiology of valvular calcification, patient selection criteria, and the evolution of device technology. Furthermore, it critically examines the efficacy and safety profiles of various interventional approaches, with a focus on post-procedural hemodynamic performance, long-term durability, and patient quality of life. By analyzing recent clinical trials and real-world data, this review aims to delineate best practices and future directions in the management of calcified valvular disease.

KEYWORDS: percutaneous, calcified, rings, valvular

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
13 June 2024

Available on:
https://ijmscr.org/

INTRODUCTION

Valvular heart disease, characterized by the progressive calcification of valve structures, presents a significant clinical challenge, particularly in the aging population. The calcification of valve rings, often observed in conditions such as aortic stenosis and mitral annular calcification, leads to impaired valve function, necessitating timely and effective intervention. Traditionally, surgical valve replacement has been the cornerstone of treatment for severe valvular calcification. However, the emergence of percutaneous techniques offers a less invasive alternative, potentially reducing perioperative morbidity and mortality, especially in high-risk surgical candidates.1,2

Percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings involves the use of catheter-based technologies to restore valve function without the need for open-heart surgery. This approach has gained traction due to advancements in imaging, device design, and procedural techniques. The primary objective of percutaneous repair is to alleviate the hemodynamic burden imposed by calcified valve stenosis or regurgitation, thereby improving cardiac output and patient symptomatology.1,2

The pathophysiology of valvular calcification involves complex interactions between mechanical stress, inflammation, and metabolic dysregulation, leading to the deposition of calcium phosphate crystals within the valve tissue. This calcific process not only stiffens the valve leaflets but also distorts the annular geometry, posing significant challenges for both surgical and percutaneous interventions. Understanding these underlying mechanisms is crucial for developing targeted therapies and optimizing procedural outcomes.1,2

In this article, we delve into the intricacies of percutaneous repair techniques for calcified valve rings, exploring the spectrum of available devices and their mechanisms of action. We discuss the procedural steps, including pre-procedural planning with advanced imaging modalities, intraprocedural guidance, and post-procedural care. Additionally, we review the clinical evidence supporting the efficacy and safety of these interventions, highlighting key studies and their contributions to current practice.1,2

By providing a detailed overview of percutaneous repair strategies, this article aims to equip clinicians with the knowledge to make informed decisions in the management of calcified valvular disease. The future of interventional cardiology lies in the continual refinement of these techniques, driven by ongoing research and technological innovation.1,2

EPIDEMIOLOGY

The epidemiology of calcified valvular heart disease (VHD) provides crucial insights into the prevalence, risk factors, and demographic distribution of this condition, which is fundamental for understanding the clinical significance and the need for percutaneous repair techniques. Calcific aortic stenosis (CAS) and mitral annular calcification (MAC) are the most common forms of calcified VHD, with a significant burden on the healthcare system due to their association with increased morbidity and mortality.3,4

Calcific aortic stenosis is the most prevalent form of valvular heart disease in the elderly population, primarily affecting those over 65 years of age. The prevalence of CAS increases with age, with estimates indicating that approximately 2-7% of individuals aged 65 or older are affected, and this prevalence rises to about 10% in those over 75 years of age. This age-dependent increase is attributed to the progressive nature of the disease, characterized by the gradual accumulation of calcific deposits on the aortic valve leaflets, leading to valve thickening, reduced mobility, and eventual obstruction of blood flow from the left ventricle to the aorta.3,4

Mitral annular calcification is also more commonly observed in older adults, with its prevalence similarly rising with advancing age. Studies suggest that the prevalence of MAC ranges from 8-15% in the general population aged 65 years and older, and it can be as high as 40% in those with chronic kidney disease or diabetes mellitus. The pathogenesis of MAC involves the deposition of calcium in the fibrous annulus of the mitral valve, often extending into the leaflets, which can lead to mitral regurgitation or stenosis.3,4

Risk factors for calcific VHD include age, male gender, hypertension, dyslipidemia, chronic kidney disease, and diabetes mellitus. These conditions contribute to the pathophysiological processes underlying valvular calcification, such as lipid infiltration, chronic inflammation, and osteogenic differentiation of valve interstitial cells. Additionally, genetic predispositions, such as mutations in the NOTCH1 gene, have been implicated in the early onset and progression of calcific aortic stenosis.3,4

Geographically, the prevalence of calcified VHD varies, with higher rates observed in developed countries, likely due to the greater longevity and higher prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors in these populations. However, with the global increase in life expectancy and the rising burden of cardiovascular diseases, the incidence of calcific VHD is expected to grow in developing regions as well.3,4

The clinical impact of calcified VHD is profound, with untreated severe aortic stenosis associated with a high mortality rate, often exceeding 50% within two years of symptom onset. Mitral annular calcification, while less directly associated with mortality, can lead to significant cardiac morbidity, including heart failure, atrial fibrillation, and thromboembolic events. Consequently, the need for effective treatment options, including percutaneous repair techniques, is critical to improving patient outcomes.3,4

In recent years, the advent of transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) and other percutaneous interventions has revolutionized the management of calcified VHD, particularly in patients deemed high-risk for surgical valve replacement. The epidemiological trends underscore the importance of these less invasive techniques, which have demonstrated efficacy in reducing symptoms and improving survival in patients with severe calcific aortic stenosis. Similarly, emerging percutaneous approaches for mitral valve repair and replacement are being investigated to address the clinical needs of patients with MAC.5,6

The epidemiology of calcified valvular heart disease highlights the substantial and growing burden of this condition, driven by an aging population and the prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors. The development and implementation of percutaneous repair techniques are poised to play a pivotal role in the management of this disease, offering hope for improved quality of life and survival for affected patients. As the field of interventional cardiology continues to evolve, ongoing epidemiological research will be essential to guide clinical practice and optimize patient care strategies.5,6

INDICATIONS FOR PERCUTANEOUS REPAIR OF CALCIFIED VALVE RINGS IN INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGY

The indications for percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings in interventional cardiology have expanded significantly with the advancement of transcatheter techniques and improved understanding of patient selection criteria. The primary goal of percutaneous intervention is to offer a less invasive treatment option for patients with calcific valvular heart disease (VHD) who are either at high risk for surgical valve replacement or present with specific clinical characteristics that favor a percutaneous approach. Below, we delineate the key indications for this procedure, focusing on patient selection, anatomical considerations, and clinical scenarios.5,6

1. Severe Calcific Aortic Stenosis (CAS):

- **High Surgical Risk Patients:** Patients with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis who are deemed high risk for surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) due to advanced age, significant comorbidities (e.g., severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, severe left ventricular dysfunction, or previous cardiac surgery), and frailty are prime candidates for transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR).5,6

- **Intermediate and Low Surgical Risk Patients:** Emerging data support the use of TAVR in patients with intermediate and even low surgical risk profiles. Clinical trials have demonstrated comparable or superior outcomes in these populations, prompting guideline updates to include broader indications for TAVR.
- **Asymptomatic Severe Aortic Stenosis:** Select asymptomatic patients with severe aortic stenosis and evidence of left ventricular dysfunction, elevated biomarkers (e.g., brain natriuretic peptide), or positive exercise testing may also be considered for percutaneous intervention to prevent the progression to symptomatic stages and potential adverse events.5,6

2. Mitral Annular Calcification (MAC):

- **Symptomatic Mitral Valve Disease:** Patients with severe symptomatic mitral regurgitation or stenosis secondary to mitral annular calcification who are not suitable candidates for open-heart surgery due to comorbid conditions or high operative risk may benefit from percutaneous mitral valve repair or replacement.5,6
- **High Risk for Surgical Mitral Valve Replacement:** Individuals with extensive MAC, which complicates surgical repair, and those with previous radiation therapy or chest surgery are considered for percutaneous options, utilizing techniques such as transcatheter mitral valve replacement (TMVR) or edge-to-edge repair.5,6

3. Bicuspid Aortic Valve with Calcification:

- **Suitability for TAVR:** Patients with bicuspid aortic valves, which historically posed challenges for TAVR due to anatomical variability and increased calcification, are increasingly being considered for percutaneous repair. Advances in imaging, device design, and procedural techniques have improved outcomes in this subset of patients.5,6

4. Valve-in-Valve Procedures:

- **Degenerated Bioprosthetic Valves:** Patients with previously implanted bioprosthetic valves that have degenerated and become calcified can undergo valve-in-valve procedures using percutaneous techniques. This approach is indicated for both aortic and mitral positions, offering a viable alternative to repeat surgical valve replacement.5,6

5. Anatomic Considerations:

- **Calcified Valve Anatomy:** The presence of significant calcification, which can preclude effective surgical repair, is an important consideration. Percutaneous techniques may be favored in patients where calcification is confined to the annulus or valve leaflets without extensive involvement of surrounding structures.
- **Annular Dimensions and Valve Morphology:** Adequate annular size and favorable valve morphology are crucial for the success of percutaneous interventions. Pre-procedural imaging with echocardiography and computed tomography (CT) is essential to assess these parameters and ensure proper device selection and deployment.5,6

6. Hemodynamic and Symptomatic Indications:

- **Hemodynamic Compromise:** Patients exhibiting severe hemodynamic compromise due to valvular stenosis or regurgitation, with evidence of heart failure symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, orthopnea, fatigue) or left ventricular dysfunction, are strong candidates for percutaneous repair to improve hemodynamic stability and alleviate symptoms.8,9
- **Refractory Symptoms:** Individuals with persistent symptoms despite optimal medical therapy, including those with pulmonary hypertension or recurrent hospitalizations for heart failure, may benefit significantly from percutaneous intervention to restore valve function and improve quality of life.8,9

The indications for percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings continue to evolve, driven by advancements in technology, procedural expertise, and growing clinical evidence. Careful patient selection based on surgical risk, anatomical suitability, and symptomatic burden is paramount to optimizing outcomes. As the field of interventional cardiology progresses, ongoing research and guideline updates will further refine these indications, expanding the therapeutic potential of percutaneous valve repair techniques for patients with calcified VHD.8,9,10

CONTRAINDICATIONS FOR PERCUTANEOUS REPAIR OF CALCIFIED VALVE RINGS IN INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGY

The percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings, while revolutionary, is not suitable for all patients with valvular heart disease. Understanding the contraindications is crucial for ensuring patient safety and optimizing clinical outcomes. Contraindications can be broadly categorized into anatomical, clinical, and procedural factors that preclude the safe or effective use of percutaneous interventions. Here, we discuss these contraindications in detail, emphasizing the importance of thorough pre-procedural evaluation.10,11

1. Anatomical Contraindications:

- **Severe Aortic Annulus Calcification Extending into the Ventricular Outflow Tract:** Extensive calcification that extends into the left ventricular outflow tract can impede the proper seating and expansion of transcatheter valves, increasing the risk of paravalvular leak or valve embolization.10,11
- **Inadequate Annula0**
- **r Size or Geometry:** Patients with extremely small or large annuli, or those with irregular or elliptical annular shapes, may not be suitable candidates for percutaneous repair due to challenges in achieving optimal device fit and function.10,11

- **Bicuspid Aortic Valve with Unfavorable Anatomy:** While TAVR is feasible in many bicuspid valve patients, certain anatomical features, such as raphe calcification or asymmetrical leaflet calcification, can pose significant procedural challenges and increase complication risks.10,11
- **Mitral Valve Disease with Severe Subvalvular Apparatus Calcification:** Extensive calcification of the mitral subvalvular apparatus, including the chordae tendineae and papillary muscles, can hinder the successful deployment of transcatheter mitral valve devices and lead to suboptimal outcomes.10,11
- **Presence of Left Ventricular Thrombus:** The existence of a thrombus in the left ventricle is a contraindication due to the high risk of embolization during catheter manipulation and device deployment, which could result in stroke or systemic embolism.10,11

2. Clinical Contraindications:

- **Severe Untreated Coronary Artery Disease:** Patients with significant, untreated coronary artery disease should undergo revascularization prior to valve intervention to reduce the risk of peri-procedural myocardial ischemia and ensure adequate myocardial perfusion post-procedure.10,11
- **Active Endocarditis:** Active infection of the valve or surrounding cardiac structures is a contraindication due to the risk of seeding the device with bacteria, leading to prosthetic valve endocarditis, which has high morbidity and mortality.
- **Severe Pulmonary Hypertension:** Patients with severe, irreversible pulmonary hypertension may not benefit from valve intervention, as the procedure is unlikely to improve their hemodynamic status and may even exacerbate right ventricular dysfunction.10,11
- **Left Ventricular Ejection Fraction <20%:** Extremely low ejection fraction indicates severe left ventricular dysfunction, and these patients are at higher risk for adverse outcomes. Careful consideration is needed to weigh the potential benefits against the risks.10,11
- **Severe Comorbidities Limiting Life Expectancy:** Patients with limited life expectancy due to severe non-cardiac comorbidities (e.g., advanced malignancy, end-stage liver disease) may not derive meaningful benefit from percutaneous valve intervention, and palliative care may be more appropriate.10,11

3. Procedural Contraindications:

- **Inability to Achieve Vascular Access:** Severe peripheral artery disease or extensive vascular calcification that precludes safe femoral or alternative access routes can be a major impediment to performing percutaneous valve procedures.10,11
- **Unfavorable Aortic Root Anatomy:** Features such as severe aortic root calcification, aneurysms, or significant aortic arch tortuosity can complicate device delivery and positioning, increasing the risk of procedural complications.10,11
- **Patient-Specific Anatomical Variations:** Unique anatomical variations, such as anomalous coronary artery origins or significant aortoiliac tortuosity, can make the transcatheter approach technically challenging and hazardous.10,11

4. Hemodynamic Contraindications:

- **Significant Mitral Regurgitation with Aortic Stenosis:** Patients with severe mitral regurgitation in addition to aortic stenosis may require a combined approach, and isolated TAVR might not sufficiently address the hemodynamic abnormalities, potentially worsening mitral regurgitation post-procedure.11,12
- **Dynamic Left Ventricular Outflow Tract Obstruction:** Conditions such as hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy can cause dynamic obstruction that might be exacerbated by valve intervention, leading to hemodynamic instability.11,12

Recognizing and adhering to the contraindications for percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings is critical for ensuring patient safety and achieving favorable clinical outcomes. Thorough pre-procedural evaluation, including advanced imaging and comprehensive clinical assessment, is essential to identify these contraindications and guide appropriate patient selection. As the field of interventional cardiology evolves, ongoing research and technological advancements may help mitigate some of these contraindications, expanding the therapeutic potential of percutaneous valve interventions.11,12

OUTCOMES OF PERCUTANEOUS REPAIR OF CALCIFIED VALVE RINGS IN INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGY

The outcomes of percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings have been extensively studied, yielding promising results that highlight the effectiveness and safety of these minimally invasive techniques. The primary outcomes of interest include procedural success, hemodynamic improvement, survival rates, complication rates, and quality of life. These outcomes are pivotal in determining the efficacy of percutaneous interventions and their role in the management of calcified valvular heart disease (VHD). 13,14

1. Procedural Success:

- Technical Success Rates: The technical success of percutaneous valve repair procedures, such as transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) and transcatheter mitral valve replacement (TMVR), has shown high rates in clinical trials and real-world registries. Successful deployment and optimal positioning of the valve, without significant residual stenosis or regurgitation, are key indicators of procedural success. Reported technical success rates for TAVR typically exceed 95%, while TMVR, being more complex, shows slightly lower but steadily improving success rates.13,14

- Device Performance: The performance of transcatheter valves, including adequate expansion, secure anchoring, and minimal paravalvular leak, is crucial for procedural success. Innovations in valve design, such as self-expanding and balloon-expandable valves, have contributed to improved device performance and procedural outcomes.13,14

2. Hemodynamic Improvement:

- Reduction in Valve Gradients: One of the primary objectives of percutaneous valve repair is to alleviate the obstructive hemodynamic burden caused by calcified valves. Post-procedural assessments consistently demonstrate significant reductions in transvalvular gradients, with mean aortic valve gradients decreasing from pre-procedural values often greater than 40 mmHg to less than 20 mmHg post-TAVR.13,14
- Improved Valve Area: An increase in the effective orifice area of the valve is another critical measure of hemodynamic improvement. TAVR and TMVR procedures typically result in substantial increases in the valve area, thereby enhancing cardiac output and reducing symptoms of heart failure.13,14
- Normalization of Hemodynamics: Restoration of near-normal hemodynamics, including improved left ventricular ejection fraction and reduction in pulmonary pressures, has been observed in patients undergoing successful percutaneous valve repair. These changes contribute to overall cardiovascular stability and improved functional status.13,14

3. Survival Rates:

- Short-term Survival: Early survival rates following percutaneous valve repair are a key indicator of procedural safety and immediate efficacy. Studies have shown that 30-day survival rates for TAVR procedures in high-risk patients are high, often exceeding 90%. TMVR procedures, while associated with more complexity, also demonstrate favorable early survival rates.13,14
- Long-term Survival: Long-term survival outcomes are crucial for assessing the durability and sustained benefits of percutaneous valve interventions. Data from multiple studies indicate that TAVR provides comparable, if not superior, long-term survival benefits to surgical aortic valve replacement (SAVR) in appropriately selected patients. Five-year survival rates for TAVR patients have been reported to range between 50% and 70%, depending on patient risk profiles and comorbidities.13,14

4. Complication Rates:

- Periprocedural Complications: Common complications associated with percutaneous valve repair include vascular access-related issues, bleeding, stroke, and conduction disturbances requiring permanent pacemaker implantation. Advances in procedural techniques and device design have led to a reduction in the incidence of these complications.15,16
- Valve-related Complications: Paravalvular leak, valve thrombosis, and structural valve deterioration are specific complications that can impact long-term outcomes. While the incidence of significant paravalvular leak has decreased with newer generation valves, ongoing surveillance and management strategies are essential to address these potential issues.15,16

5. Quality of Life:

- Symptomatic Improvement: One of the most immediate and noticeable outcomes of percutaneous valve repair is the improvement in symptoms such as dyspnea, fatigue, and exercise intolerance. Patients often experience marked relief from these symptoms, leading to enhanced functional capacity.15,16
- Functional Status: Assessments using tools such as the New York Heart Association (NYHA) functional classification consistently show significant improvements in functional status post-procedure. Many patients shift from NYHA class III or IV to class I or II within months of undergoing percutaneous valve repair.15,16
- Health-Related Quality of Life: Quality of life improvements are measured using validated instruments like the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ) and the Short Form Health Survey (SF-36). Studies indicate substantial gains in physical, emotional, and social well-being following successful valve interventions, contributing to overall patient satisfaction.15,16

Conclusion

The outcomes of percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings underscore the transformative potential of these interventions in the management of calcified VHD. High procedural success rates, significant hemodynamic improvements, favorable survival outcomes, manageable complication profiles, and profound enhancements in quality of life collectively affirm the value of percutaneous techniques. As interventional cardiology continues to evolve, ongoing research and innovation will further refine these outcomes, expanding the therapeutic reach and optimizing patient care. The integration of multidisciplinary care teams and the continual advancement of device technology will be pivotal in sustaining the momentum of percutaneous valve interventions, ensuring that patients with calcified VHD receive the best possible outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

The percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings represents a transformative advancement in the field of interventional cardiology, providing a viable and often superior alternative to traditional surgical approaches for a significant subset of patients with valvular heart disease (VHD). This minimally invasive technique addresses the challenges posed by valvular calcification, offering substantial benefits in terms of reduced perioperative morbidity and mortality, particularly among high-risk and inoperable patients.

Calcific valvular heart disease, encompassing conditions such as calcific aortic stenosis (CAS) and mitral annular calcification (MAC), has become increasingly prevalent with the aging population. The pathophysiology involves complex mechanisms of calcium deposition, chronic inflammation, and metabolic dysregulation, leading to progressive valve dysfunction. Traditional surgical valve replacement, while effective, poses considerable risks, especially in elderly patients or those with multiple comorbidities. Percutaneous interventions, such as transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR) and transcatheter mitral valve replacement (TMVR), have emerged as crucial therapeutic options that circumvent the need for open-heart surgery, thereby expanding the treatment landscape for these patients.

The indications for percutaneous valve repair are broadening, supported by robust clinical evidence from numerous trials and real-world studies demonstrating the safety and efficacy of these interventions. High-risk patients, including those with severe symptomatic aortic stenosis, severe mitral regurgitation or stenosis due to MAC, and those with degenerated bioprosthetic valves, are prime candidates for these procedures. The ongoing evolution of device technology, imaging techniques, and procedural expertise continues to enhance patient selection and procedural success, facilitating tailored approaches that optimize individual patient outcomes.

Despite these advancements, several contraindications must be meticulously considered to ensure procedural safety and effectiveness. Anatomical challenges, such as severe calcification extending into the ventricular outflow tract or complex subvalvular structures, as well as clinical factors, including active endocarditis, severe pulmonary hypertension, and significant comorbidities, necessitate careful evaluation. Procedural contraindications, such as inability to achieve vascular access and unfavorable aortic root anatomy, further underscore the importance of comprehensive pre-procedural planning and patient assessment.

The future of percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings lies in continuous innovation and refinement. Advances in device design, including the development of more adaptable and durable valve systems, alongside enhanced imaging modalities and procedural techniques, promise to expand the applicability and success rates of these interventions. Furthermore, ongoing research into the underlying mechanisms of valvular calcification and the development of adjunctive pharmacological therapies may offer additional strategies to complement percutaneous approaches.

Percutaneous repair of calcified valve rings has revolutionized the management of valvular heart disease, providing a lifeline for patients who would otherwise face limited treatment options. The integration of multidisciplinary care teams, including interventional cardiologists, cardiac surgeons, imaging specialists, and anesthesiologists, is paramount in delivering optimal patient outcomes. As the field progresses, the commitment to rigorous clinical research, technological innovation, and individualized patient care will continue to drive the success and expansion of percutaneous valve interventions, ultimately improving the quality of life and survival for patients with calcified valvular disease.

REFERENCES

I. Vahanian, A.; Beyersdorf, F.; Praz, F.; Milojevic, M.; Baldus, S.; Bauersachs, J.; Capodanno, D.; Conradi, L.; De Bonis, M.; De Paulis, R.; et al. 2021 ESC/EACTS Guidelines for the management of valvular heart disease: Developed by the Task Force for the management of valvular heart disease of the European Society of Cardiology and the European Association for CardioThoracic Surgery. Eur. Heart J. 2022, 43, 561–632.

II. McInerney, A.; Marroquin-Donday, L.; Tirado-Conte, G.; Hennessey, B.; Espejo, C.; Pozo, E.; de Agustín, A.; Gonzalo, N.; Salinas, P.; Núñez-Gil, I.; et al. Transcatheter Treatment of Mitral Regurgitation. J. Clin. Med. 2022, 11, 2921.

III. Inoue, K.; Owaki, T.; Nakamura, T.; Kitamura, F.; Miyamoto, N. Clinical application of transvenous mitral commissurotomy by a new balloon catheter. J. Thorac. Cardiovasc. Surg. 1984, 87, 394–402.

IV. Iung, B.; Nicoud-Houel, A.; Fondard, O.; Akoudad, H.; Haghighat, T.; Brochet, E.; Garbarz, E.; Cormier, B.; Baron, G.; Luxereau, P.; et al. Temporal trends in percutaneous mitral commissurotomy over a 15-year period. Eur. Heart J. 2004, 25, 701–707.

V. Nowak, B.; Baykut, D.; Kaltenbach, M.; Reifart, N. Usefulness of shock wave lithotripsy as pretreatment for balloon valvuloplasty in calcified mitral stenosis. Am. J. Cardiol. 1989, 63, 996–997.

VI. Forero, M.N.T.; Daemen, J. The Coronary Intravascular Lithotripsy System. Interv. Cardiol. 2019, 14, 174–181.

VII. Kassimis, G.; Didagelos, M.; De Maria, G.L.; Kontogiannis, N.; Karamasis, G.V.; Katsikis, A.; Sularz, A.; Karvounis, H.; Kanonidis, I.; Krokidis, M.; et al. Shockwave Intravascular Lithotripsy for the Treatment of Severe Vascular Calcification. Angiology 2020, 71, 677–688.

VIII. Eng, M.H.; Villablanca, P.; Wang, D.D.; Frisoli, T.; Lee, J.; O'Neill, W.W. Lithotripsy-Facilitated Mitral Balloon Valvuloplasty for Senile Degenerative Mitral Valve Stenosis. JACC Cardiovasc. Interv. 2019, 12, e133–e134.

IX. Sharma, A.; Kelly, R.; Mbai, M.; Chandrashekhar, Y.; Bertog, S. Transcatheter Mitral Valve Lithotripsy as a Pretreatment to Percutaneous Balloon Mitral Valvuloplasty for Heavily Calcified Rheumatic Mitral Stenosis. Circ. Cardiovasc. Interv. 2020, 13, e009357.

X. Sanz-Ruiz, R.; González-Mansilla, A.; Rivera-Juárez, A.; Bermejo, J.; Fernández-Avilés, F. 1-Step Percutaneous Treatment of Heavily Calcified Left-

Heart Valve Stenoses. JACC Cardiovasc. Interv. 2021, 14, e335–e337.

XI. Holtz, J.E.; Upadhyaya, D.S.; Cohen, B.E.; Na, B.; Schiller, N.B.; Whooley, M.A. Mitral annular calcium, inducible myocardial ischemia, and cardiovascular events in outpatients with coronary heart disease (from the Heart and Soul Study). Am. J. Cardiol. 2012, 109, 1092–1096.

XII. Chehab, O.; Roberts-Thomson, R.; Bivona, A.; Gill, H.; Patterson, T.; Pursnani, A.; Grigoryan, K.; Vargas, B.; Bokhary, U.; Blauth, C.; et al. Management of Patients with Severe Mitral Annular Calcification. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 2022, 80, 722–738.

XIII. Cheng, R. How to Manage Mitral Stenosis Due to Mitral Annular Calcification. Curr. Cardiol. Rep. 2021, 23, 148.

XIV. Khan, J.M.; Babaliaros, V.C.; Greenbaum, A.B.; Foerst, J.R.; Yazdani, S.; McCabe, J.M.; Paone, G.; Eng, M.H.; Leshnower, B.G.; Gleason, P.T.; et al. Anterior Leaflet Laceration to Prevent Ventricular Outflow Tract Obstruction During Transcatheter Mitral Valve Replacement. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 2019, 73, 2521–2534.

XV. Wang, D.D.; Guerrero, M.; Eng, M.H.; Eleid, M.F.; Meduri, C.U.; Rajagopal, V.; Yadav, P.K.; Fifer, M.A.; Palacios, I.F.; Rihal, C.S.; et al. Alcohol septal ablation to prevent left ventricular outflow tract obstruction during transcatheter mitral valve replacement: First-in-man study. JACC Cardiovasc. Interv. 2019, 12, 1268–1279.

XVI. Hamid, U.I.; Gregg, A.; Ball, P.; Owens, C.; Manoharan, G.; Spence, M.S.; Jeganathan, R. Open transcatheter valve implantation for mitral annular calcification: One-year outcomes. JTCVS Tech. 2021, 10, 254–261