

















Grading severity of PVR











Blanke P et al. JACC: Cardiovasc Img 2019:12(1);1-24

Role of TEE and CT for Follow-up

There was 100% concordance in the assessment of leaflet motion between TEE and 4D VR-CT in 10 out 22 patients with reduced leaflet motion undergoing TEE



- 9/2019 NEW DATA: The PARTNER 3 substudy: the incidence was similar at 1 year (27.5% with TAVR vs 20.2% with surgery; P = 0.19)
- Of the 25 patients with HALT at 30 days, there was resolution of leaflet thickening at 1 year in 14 subjects, none of whom received oral anticoagulation
- Routine 4D CT is not indicated

N Engl J Med 2015;373:2015–2024.





Echocardio	ographic Features	Determining Suitability f	or the MitraClip
	Ideal Echo Features	Challenging Echo Features	Relative Echo Contra- indications
Location of Pathology	• Segment 2	Segments 1 or 3	 Body of leaflet (i.e. perforation or cleft/deep fold)
Calcification	• None	Mild, outside grasping zoneExtensive annular calcification	 Severe calcification at site of grasping zone
Mitral Valve Area/Gradient	• ≥4 cm ² • <4 mmHg	 >3.5 cm² <4 cm² with small BSA or very mobile leaflets ≥4 mmHg 	 <3.5 cm² AND ≥4 mmHg
Grasping Zone Length	• >10 mm	• 7-10 mm	• <7 mm
Functional MR	 Normal thickness and mobility Coaptation depth <11 mm 	 Carpentier IIIB (restricted) Coaptation depth >11 mm 	 Carpentier IIIA (rheumatic thickening and restriction)
Degenerative MR	 Flail width <15 mm Flail gap <10 mm 	 Flail width <15 mm with large valve area and option for >1 MitraClip Flail gap >10 mm with possibility of adjunctive measures 	 Barlow's disease with significant regurgitation segments 1-3
Other Pathology		 Annuloplasty ring with adequate mitral valve area and leaflet length HOCM with Systolic anterior motion 	 Extreme disease (Markedly dilated annulus or EROA ≥ 70.8 mm²)
Hahn RT Cir	c Res. 2016;119:341-3	56.	



Mitra	aClip Procedure	01 devention 02
Easy MitraClip	 Good Imaging Good Anatomy Pre-Procedural Planning 	
Challenging MitraClip	 Poor Anatomy with Good Ima Pre-procedural Planning Adaptability 	aging
Difficult MitraClip	 Poor Imaging Poor Anatomy Failure to Plan Ahead 	





Enhancing the communication in the Cath Lab



Live Fluoro Image and Hemodynamics visible to Echocardiographer



CT-Fluoro Fusion visible to Echocardiographer













Mashari et al Echo Res Pract 2016 Dec;3(4):R57-64





Core Competencies: MINIMUM Procedural Volume

Procedure/Technical Skill	Num	bers*
Echocardiographic guidance of interventional procedures, which includes:	75	
Structural valvular intervention†		30
Transseptal catheterization guidance		10
Percutaneous closure of septal defects/perivalvular leaks		1
Alcohol septal ablation		10
Placement of devices to exclude the left atrial appendage		10
Ventricular assist device placement and assessment	20	
Intraoperative transesophageal echocardiography, † which includes:	75	
surgical valve repair or replacement		5
Intracardiac echocardiography	10	

From Wiegers et al. (7). *Numbers are based on consensus and intended as general guidance based on the educational needs and progress of typical Level III echocardiography trainees. Competency to perform each procedure must be based on evaluation by the supervising echocardiography laboratory director and may exceed or be below the threshold number shown in this table. †The Level III trainee should successfully complete both right-sided procedures if the goal is to obtain competency in the full range of structural heart disease interventions.

Hahn RT et al. JACC Cardiovasc Img 2019;12(12):2560-2570

NOTE:

- There are no robust data that outline the number of procedures that an echocardiographer needs to train before becoming competent in SHD imaging.
- 2. In the absence of learning curve data, arriving at a consensus on the suggested minimum numbers of procedures to achieve SHD competence requires a challenging compromise between what is achievable in centers performing low volumes of structural interventions and what is considered the minimum requirement to achieve a safe level of proficiency and competence in uncomplicated cases.

Novel Procedural Rehearsal

- Enables a hybrid approach
- Operator visualizes 3D/4D view of anatomy at 1:1 scale with product
- Product can be manipulated in open space (in virtual anatomy)
- Multiple viewers/observers possible
- Facilitates case preparation and product selection



Courtesy or Saurabh Sanon





Multi-modality Imaging 1. Quantitation of Valvular Heart Disease Severity 2. Understanding of Disease Pathophysiology 3. Risk Stratification/Prediction of Outcomes

EACVI/ASE CLINICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations on the Echocardiographic Assessment of Aortic Valve Stenosis: A Focused Update from the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging and the American Society

(1) appropriate in all patients with AS (yellow);(2) reasonable when additional information is needed in selected patients (green)

of Echocardiography	Table 2 Measures of A	severity obtaine	d by Doppler-echocardiogra	iphy			
Helmut Baumgartner, MD, FESC, (Chair), Judy Hung, MD, FASE, (Co-Chair), Javier Be		Units	Formula/method	Cut-off for severe	Concept	Advantages	Limitations
John B. Chambers, MB BChir, FESC, Thor Edvandsen, MD, PhD, FESC, Steven Goldst Patrizio Lancellotti, MD, PhD, FESC, Melissa Lel'evre, RDCS, Fletcher Miller Jr., and Catherine M. Otto, MD, FESC, Maenter, Germany, Boston, Masadonsetti, Madrid, Spa Kingdom; Odo, Norway, Wahington, Dizriet of Cahumbia; Liege, Belgium; Bari, Italy; Durh Rechetzer, Minnesota, and Seattle, Wabington	AS jet velocity ¹²⁻¹⁸	m/s	Direct measurement	4.0	Velocity increases as stenosis seventy increases	Direct measurement of velocity. Strongest predictor of clinical outcome	Correct measurement requires parallel alignment of ultrasound beam Flow dependent.
	Mean gradient ^{12/14}	mmHg	$\Delta P = \sum 4 v^2 / N$	40	Pressure gradient calculated from	 Mean gradient is obtained by tracing 	 Accurate pressure gradients depend on
1. Use an integrative approach when grading the severity of AS, combining all Doppler and 2D data as					velocity using the Bernoull equation	 the velocity curve Units comparable to invasive measurements 	accurate velocity data • Flow dependent
well as clinical presentation	Continuity equation valve area ¹⁶⁻¹⁸	cm ²	AVA = (CSA _{LVOT} × VTI _{LVOT})/VTI _W	1.0	Volume flow proximal to and in the stenotic	 Measures effective orifice area 	Requires LVOT diameter and flow
2. Loading conditions influence velocity and pressure gradients					orifice is equal	 Feasible in nearly all patients Relatively flow independent 	velocity data, along with aortic velocity. Measurement error more likely
 Irregular rhythms or tachycardia can make assessment of AS severity challenging. 	Simplified continuity equation ¹⁸⁻¹⁹	cm ²	$\label{eq:AVA} \begin{array}{l} AVA = (CSA_{LVOT} \times \\ V_{LVOT})/V_{AV} \end{array}$	1.0	The ratio of LVOT to aortic velocity is similar to the ratio of VTIs with native aortic valve stenosis	Uses more easily measured velocities instead of VTIs	Less accurate if shape of velocity curves is atypical
Ideally, heart rate, rhythm, and blood pressure should be stated in the echocardiographic report and hemodynamic	Velocity ratio ^{teast}	None	$V R = \frac{v_{ee}}{v_{ee}}$	0.25	Effective AVA expressed as a proportion of the LVOT area	Doppler-only method. No need to measure LVOT size, less variability than continuity equation	Limited longitudinal data. Ignores LVOT size variability beyond patient size dependence
assessment should be performed at heart rates and blood pressures within the normal range.	Planimetry of anatomic valve area ^{21,29}	cm²	TTE, TEE, 3D-echo	1.0	Anatomic (geometric) CSA of the aortic valve orifice as measured by 2D or 3D echo	Useful if Doppler measurements are unavailable	Contraction coefficient (anatomic/effective valve area) may be variable. Difficult with severe valve calcification

Baumgartner H et al. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2017;30:372-92



_	Stages	s of Valvular A	S
Stage	Definition	Valve Anatomy	Valve Hemodynamics
D1	Symptomatic severe high-gradient AS	Severe leaflet calcification or congenital stenosis with severely reduced leaflet opening	 Aortic Vmax ≥4 m/s or mean △P ≥40 mm Hg AVA typically is ≤1.0 cm2 (or AVAi ≤0.6 cm2/m2) but may be larger with mixed AS/AR
D2	Symptomatic severe low-flow/low- gradient AS with reduced LV EF	Severe leaflet calcification with severely reduced leaflet opening	 AVA ≤1.0 cm2 with Aortic Vmax <4 m/s or mean △P <40 mm Hg Dobutamine stress echocardiography shows AVA ≤1.0 cm2 with Vmax ≥4 m/s at any flow rate
D3	Symptomatic severe low-gradient AS with normal LVEF or paradoxical low-flow severe AS	Severe leaflet calcification with severely reduced leaflet opening	 AVA ≤1.0 cm2 with Aortic Vmax <4 m/s or mean ΔP <40 mm Hg AVAi ≤0.6 cm2/m2 and Stroke volume index <35 mL/m2 Measured when patient is normotensive (systolic BP <140 mm Hg)











Barone-Rochette, G. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2014;64:144–54







Meta-analysis of GLS in Asymptomatic, Severe AS

- 10 Studies, n = 1067 asymptomatic patients with LVEF >50%
- The best cutoff value identified was LVGLS of 14.7% (sensitivity, 60%; specificity, 70%).
- Risk of death with LVGLS <14.7% is multiplied by >2.5 (hazard ratio: 2.62; 95% CI: 1.66 to 4.13; p < 0.0001)
- The relationship between LVGLS and mortality remained significant in patients with LVEF ≥60% (p = 0.001).



Magne, J et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2019;12:84–92



Fukui M et al. J Cardiovasc Comput Tomogr 2019 Mar - Apr;13(2):157-162.









5.3. Transcatheter Intervention for VHD TABLE 7A Pre-TAVR Evaluation TEE (With Low-Dose MPI RVG (SPECT/PET) Indication TTE Possible 3D) 3D TTE Ex.-SE DSE DSE CMR CCT ANG Fluoro 72. Assessment for concomitant M (4) M (5) A (9) coronary artery disease R.(1) R.(1) 8 (D R (1) 73. Accurate assessment of R (3) A (7) M (4) 8 (1) A (7) A (9) annular size and shape* R(1) R(1) A (7) 8 (1) 8 (1) 8 (1) 8.01 74. Assessment of number of A (7) M (6) M (4) A (9) R (1) cusps and degree of calcification 75. Measurement of the M (6) R (1) R(1) R(1) 81 (13) B (T) M (5) A (9) M (4) distance between annulus and the coronary ostia R (1) R (1) R (1) R(I) RIT R (T) RCE 76. Precise coaxial alignment of R (2) A (8) the implant within the centerline of the aortic valve M (4) 77. 8 (1) R (1) Assessment of aortic A (7) A (9) dimensions 78. Assessment of aortic R (1) M (5) R-(1) R (1) R (1) 8 (1) 8 (1) R (3) M (4) A (9) M (4) R (1) atherosclerotic burden R (1) R (1) R (1) R (1) R (1) 8 (1) R (1) 79. Assessment of iliofemoral M (5) A (9) M (5) vessels

*Multimodality imaging might improve the accuracy of the measurements (1).

3D = 3-dimensional; A = appropriate; ANG = invasive coronary angiography/ventriculography/aortography; CCT = cardiac computed tomography; CMR = cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging; DSE = dobutamine stress echocardiography; Ex-SE = exercise stress echocardiography; Fluoro = fluoroscopy; M = may be appropriate; MPI = myocardial perfusion imaging; PET = positron emission tomography; R = rarely appropriate; RVG = radionuclide ventriculography; SPECT = single photon emission computed tomography; TAVR = transcatheter aortic valve replacement; TEE = transesophageal echocardiography; and TTE = transtboracic echocardiography.

Doherty J.U. et al. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2018;31:381-404



Moderate Aortic Stenosis



- In this large analysis of survival across the full spectrum of native valve AS severity, we found high rates of mortality associated with both moderate and severe AS during long-term follow-up
- Individuals presenting with a mean AV gradient >20.0 mm Hg or peak AV velocity >3.0 m/s (or DVI 0.25-0.3) had a high risk of dying in the longer term that was similar to the risk in patients presenting with severe AS at baseline.

Strange G et al J Am Coll Cardio. 2019;74(15)1851-63cc



Comprehensive Echocardiographic Assessment of Normal Transcatheter Valve Function

Rebecca T. Hahn, MD,^a Jonathon Leipsic, MD,^b Pamela S. Douglas, MD,^c Wael A. Jaber, MD,^d Neil J. Weissman, MD,^e Philippe Pibarot, DVM, PhD,^f Philipp Blanke, MD,^b Jae K. Oh, MD^g

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES This study aims to establish parameters for identifying normal function for each of the 3 iterations of balloon-expandable valves and 2 iterations of self-expanding valves.

COMPETENCY IN PATIENT CARE AND PROCEDURAL SKILLS:

- 1. Tables of **normal reference values** for mean gradients and EOA for valve type and size provide actual hemodynamic data that may be useful for assessing initial and longitudinal THV function.
- 2. Because transcatheter valve expansion is dependent on native aortic annular anatomy, tables listing the expected EOA for each valve type are also reported by the native annular area or perimeter.

Hahn et al. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2018.04.010

57

			Prosthetic Valve	Size, mm		
Valve Iteration	20	23	26	29	All Sizes	p Value
SAPIEN						
EOA, cm ²	NA	1.56 ± 0.43 (1,212)	1.84 ± 0.52 (1,130)	NA	1.70 ± 0.49 (2,342)	< 0.001
Mean gradient, mm Hg	NA	9.92 ± 4.27 (1,212)	8.76 ± 3.89 (1,130)	NA	9.36 ± 4.13 (2,342)	< 0.001
DVI	NA	0.53 ± 0.13 (1,212)	0.53 ± 0.13 (1,130)	NA	0.53 ± 0.13 (2,342)	0.64
SAPIEN XT						
EOA, cm ²	NA	1.41 ± 0.30 (545)	1.74 ± 0.42 (675)	2.06 ± 0.52 (251)	1.67 ± 0.46 (1471)	< 0.001
Mean gradient, mm Hg	NA	10.41 ± 3.74 (545)	9.24 ± 3.57 (675)	8.36 ± 3.14 (251)	9.52 ± 3.64 (1,471)	< 0.001
DVI	NA	0.52 ± 0.10 (545)	0.54 ± 0.11 (675)	0.53 ± 0.11 (251)	0.53 ± 0.11 (1,471)	0.004
SAPIEN 3						
		Constraint and characteristic	1.74 + 0.25 (525)	1.99 + 0.27 (226)	166 + 0 28 (1 470)	-0.001
EOA, cm ²	1.22 ± 0.22 (47)	1.45 ± 0.26 (471)	1.74 ± 0.35 (626)	1.09 ± 0.37 (320)	1.00 ± 0.30 (1,470)	< 0.001
EOA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg	1.22 ± 0.22 (47) 16.23 ± 5.01 (47)	1.45 ± 0.26 (471) 12.79 ± 4.65 (471)	1.74 ± 0.35 (626) 10.59 ± 3.88 (626)	9.28 ± 3.16 (326)	11.18 ± 4.35 (1,470)	<0.001
EOA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg DVI Values are mean ± SD (n). This were significantly different for	1.22 ± 0.22 (47) 16.23 ± 5.01 (47) 0.42 ± 0.07 (47) table shows the mean g each valve size for a gin	1.45 ± 0.26 (471) 12.79 ± 4.65 (471) 0.43 ± 0.08 (471) gradients and EOA for each value type (range p <	1.74 ± 0.35 (626) 10.59 ± 3.88 (626) 0.43 ± 0.09 (626) h balloon-expandable valv 0.03 to $p < 0.0001$).	9.28 ± 3.16 (326) 0.40 ± 0.09 (326) e iteration by valve size im	1.06 ± 0.38 (1,470) 11.18 ± 4.35 (1,470) 0.43 ± 0.09 (1,470) planted. All mean valve an	<0.001 <0.001 <0.001
EQA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg DVI Values are mean ± SD (n). This were significantly different for DVI = Doppler velocity inde TABLE 3 Normal Refere Enrolled Patients	1.22 ± 0.22 (47) 16.23 ± 5.01 (47) 0.42 ± 0.07 (47) table shows the mean n each valve size for a given is, EOA = effective onfilo mce Values for the 248 to 384 mm ² (n = 189)	1.45 ± 0.26 (471) 12.79 ± 4.65 (471) 0.43 ± 0.08 (471) gradients and EOA for each en valve type (range p -> e area; NA = not available SAPIEN 3 Valve by Pro- 385 to 439 mm ² (n = 191)	1.74 ± 0.55 (626) 10.59 ± 3.88 (626) 0.43 ± 0.09 (626) halton-expandable valv 0.03 to p < 0.0001). e. re-Procedural Native 440 to 488 mm ² 4 (n = 192)	0.39 20.37 (326) 9.28 3.16 (326) 0.40 ± 0.09 (326) e iteration by valve size im (a) (a) Annular Area by Quir (38) (a) 89 to 537 mm² 538	1.05 ± 0.33 (1,470) 11.18 ± 4.35 (1,470) 0.43 ± 0.09 (1,470) planted. All mean valve ar titles of 3D Annular A to 678 mm ² n = 188) p Vals	<0.001 <0.001 <0.001 sas and EOAs
EOA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg DVI Values are mean ± S0 (n). This were significantly different for DVI = Doppler velocity inde TABLE 3 Normal Referent Enrolled Patients EOA, cm ²	1.22 ± 0.22 (47) 16.23 ± 5.01 (47) 0.42 ± 0.07 (47) 0.42 ± 0.07 (47) 1able shows the mean ($ach valve aceh valve ac$	1.45 ± 0.26 (47) 12.79 ± 4.65 (47) 0.43 ± 0.08 (47) gradients and EDA for eac e area: NA = not available SAPIEN 3 Valve by PP 385 to 439 mm ² (n = 19) 1.58 ± 0.33	1.74 ± 0.35 (626) 10.59 ± 3.88 (626) 0.43 ± 0.09 (626) h balloon-expandable valvi 0.03 to p < 0.0001). e. re-Procedural Native 440 to 488 mm ² (n = 192) 1.73 ± 0.36	Annular Area by Quir 92.8 ± 3.16 (326) 0.40 ± 0.09 (326) e iteration by valve size im Annular Area by Quir 89 to \$37 mm ² \$38 (n = 191) 1.79 ± 0.35 1.	tiles of 3D Annular A tiles of 3D Annular A tiles of 3D Annular A to 678 mm ² in - 1889 p Valic	 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001
EOA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg DVI Values are mean ± S0 (n). This were significantly different for DVI = Doppler velocity inde TABLE 3 Normal Reference Enrolled Patients EOA, cm ² EOA, cm ²	1.22 ± 0.22 (47) 16.23 ± 5.01 (47) 0.42 ± 0.07 (47) Liable shows the mean each value size for a gis each value size for a gis each values for the 248 to 384 mm² (n = 189) 1.41 ± 0.27 0.80 ± 0.16	1.45 ± 0.26 (471) 12.79 ± 4.65 (471) 92.66 ± 0.08 (471) 92.66 ± 0.08 (471) 92.66 ± 0.08 (471) 92.66 ± 0.08 ± 0.08 ± 0.08 ± 0.08 ± 0.08 ± 0.03 5.67 ± 0.28 ± 0.03 (n = 191) 1.58 ± 0.03 0.86 ± 0.19	$\begin{array}{l} 1.74 \pm 0.35 \ (0.56) \\ 10.59 \pm 3.88 \ (626) \\ 0.43 \pm 0.09 \ (626) \\ 10.50 \pm 3.88 \ (626) \\ 10.50 \pm 0.0001). \\ e. \end{array}$	1.35 ± 0.37 (326) 9.28 ± 3.16 (326) 9.28 ± 3.16 (326) 0.40 ± 0.09 (326) eiteration by valve size im 3.26 ± 0.26 ± 0.26 Annular Area by Quir 3.28 ± 0.26 ± 0.26 9 to 537 mm² 538 (n = 191) 1.79 ± 0.35 1 0.90 ± 0.20 0	1.02 ± 0.33 (1,470) 11.13 ± 4.35 (1,470) 0.43 ± 0.09 (1,470) planted. All mean valve ar titles of 3D Annular A to 678 mm ² (n = 188) p Valc 91 ± 0.42 <	 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001
EOA, cm ² Mean gradient, mm Hg DVI Values are mean ± SD (n). This were significantly different for DVI = Doppler velocity inde TABLE 3 Normal Refere Enrolled Patients EOA, cm ² EOA, cm ² /m ² Mean gradient, mm Hg	1.22 \pm 0.22 (47) 16.23 \pm 5.01 (47) 0.42 \pm 0.07 (47) 1.12be shows the mean (each valve size for a give the flock – effective orific and the size for a give the siz	1.45 ± 0.26 (47) 12.79 ± 4.65 (47) yadients and EDA for eac en valve type (range p = e area; NA = not availabl SAPIEN 3 Valve by Pr 385 to 439 num ² (n = 191) 1.58 ± 0.33 0.86 ± 0.19 11.94 ± 4.82	$\begin{array}{l} 1.74 \pm 0.35 \ (626)\\ 10.59 \pm 3.88 \ (626)\\ 0.43 \pm 0.09 \ (626)\\ 0.43 \pm 0.09 \ (626)\\ 0.31 \ bp < 0.0001).\\ \text{a.}\\ \end{array}$	1.39 \pm 0.37 (326) 9.28 \pm 3.16 (326) 0.40 \pm 0.09 (326) eiteration by valve size im Annular Area by Quir 69 to 537 mm² 1.79 \pm 0.35 1.79 \pm 0.35 0.90 \pm 0.20 0.95 \pm 4.16	1.00 ± 0.38 (1,470) 11.18 ± 4.35 (1,470) 0.43 ± 0.09 (1,470) planted. All mean valve ar tilles of 3D Annular A to 678 mm ³ (n = 188) p Vals 91 ± 0.42 <	 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.0001

Hahn et al. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2018.04.010

- Use the normal EOA, mean gradient and DVI tables to assess initial and longitudinal THV function.
- Use the EOA, mean gradient and DVI by native annular measurement to get a preprocedural estimate of hemodynamic function

Avoidance of Prosthesispatient mismatch









Current guidelines – PISA (EROA and regurgitant volume)

Typical assumptions are not accurate for Tricuspid Valve

- Assumes flat "surface" or leaflets
 - Leaflets are usually tethered
- Assumes circular orifice
 - Orifice usually crescent shaped
- Assumes a hemispheric proximal flow convergence
 - PISA is usually hemi-elliptical
- Measures single time point
 - TR is frequently dynamic



Hahn RT et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img 2019;12:469–90





160 cases

The PISA method showed better correlation with the 3D-VCA method in less elliptical regurgitant orifices (VCmax/VCmin < 1.6)

- PISA-EROA and 3D VCA (r = 0.87; p = 0.001
- PISA-RegVol and 3D-RegVol (r = 0.75; p = 0.01)

PISA-EROA and PISA-RegVol were significantly lower than quantitative Doppler and 3D methods.

Using Youden's index, the best cutoff value for severe TR

- PISA-EROA was ≥0.34 cm2 (sensitivity: 89%; specificity: 90%)
- 3D-VCA, this cutoff was ≥0.60 cm2 (sensitivity: 92%; specificity: 75%)
- Doppler-EROA cutoff was ≥ 0.65 cm2 (sensitivity: 82%; specificity 94%),
- VC_{avg} cutoff was ≥9 mm (sensitivity: 85%; specificity: 97%).

Dahou A.Hahn RT. Quantifying Tricuspid Regurgitation Severity. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcmg.2018.11.015

Table I Proposed expa	nsion of the 'Severe'	grade			
Variable	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Massive	Torrential
VC (biplane)	<3 mm	3-6.9 mm	7–13 mm	14–20 mm	≥21 mm
EROA (PISA)	<20 mm ²	20-39 mm ²	40–59 mm	60-79 mm ²	≥80 mm ²
A CONTRACTOR		10	A	1 and a	

ESC European Society of Cardiology doi:10.1093/ehjc/ljes024

Mid-term outcome of severe tricuspid regurgitation: are there any differences according to mechanism and severity?

Ciro Santoro^{1,2}, Alvaro Marco del Castillo^{1,2}, Ariana González-Gómez^{1,2}, Juan Manuel Monteagudo^{1,2}, Rocio Hinojar^{1,2}, Alvaro Lorente^{1,2}, Maria Abellás^{1,2}, Jose Maria Vieitez^{1,2}, Ana Garcia Martìn^{1,2}, Eduardo Casas Rojo^{1,2}, Soledad Ruíz^{1,2}, Vivencio Barrios^{1,2}, Jose Luis Moya^{1,2}, Jose Julio Jimenez-Nacher^{1,2}, Jose Luis Zamorano Gomez^{1,2}, and Covadonga Fernández-Golfin^{1,2}*

Santoro C et al. European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular Imaging (2019) 0, 1–8

(A) Kaplan–Meier survival curves for cardiovascular mortality (P< 0.007 for log-rank)

(B) Kaplan–Meier survival curves for the combined endpoint for cardiovascular mortality and rehospitalization (P<0.012 for log rank) Outcomes according to new grading scheme for TR severity assessment.



67



Yogev Peri¹, Ben Sadeh¹, Chen Sherez¹, Aviram Hochstadt¹, Simon Biner¹ Galit Aviram², Meirav Ingbir¹, Ido Nachmany³, Guy Topaz⁴, Nir Flint¹, Gad Keren¹, and Yan Topilsky¹*

European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular Imaging (2019)

- The optimal cut-off value to separation survival between severe vs. lesser degree of TR was 0.35 cm² [*P* < 0.0001, HR =2.0 (1.5–2.7)].
- The optimal threshold to separation survival between severe vs. 'torrential' [massive in the Hahn/Zamorano grading scheme] TR was 0.7 cm² [P = 0.005, HR =2.6 (1.2-5.1)].







Semi-automatic quantification of 4D left ventricular blood flow

Direct Flow: Blood that enters the LV during diastole and leaves the LV during systole in the analyzed heart beat

Retained Inflow: Blood that enters the LV during diastole but does not leave during systole in the analyzed heart beat

Delayed Ejection Flow: Blood that starts and resides inside the LV during diastole and leaves during systole

Residual Volume: Blood that resides within the LV for at least two cardiac cycles

Eriksson J , Carlhall CJ et al. Journal of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance2010**12**:9



Left heart intra cardiac blood flow in a healthy 61 year old male, all four components visualized with pathlines and a semi-transparent 3-chamber image to provide morphological orientation. The pathlines are color coded









