J-MACS (Japanese registry for mechanically assisted circulatory support) has listed a total of 722 patients between December 2010 and October 2017. Mean age was 43.2 years and mean body surface area was 1.63 m². Aetiology of heart failure was dilated cardiomyopathy in 77% and ischaemic cardiomyopathy in 11%. Pre-operative INTERMACS profile was level 1 in 10%, level 2 in 39%, level 3 in 48%, and level 4 or 5 in 4%. One hundred forty-nine (21%) patients received extracorporeal life support device first for cardiogenic shock or bridge-to-candidacy, and then underwent switch to implantable devices (bridge-to-bridge). Overall survival rate after LVAD implantation was 90% at 1 year and 86% at 2 years. Competing outcome analyses demonstrated that only 10% of patients reached heart transplantation and 60% were still on device therapy at 3 years. Causes of death were cerebrovascular accident in 44%, infection in 18%, bleeding in 6%, and device failure in 6%. Sixty-six per cent of patients required at least 1 hospital admission during an initial 1 year after device implantation.

In conclusion, continuous flow LVAD was effective for bridge-to-transplant. Although the collected data indicate that the improved survival rate is acceptable, there remains potential for major complications which precludes wider application of LVAD.

20 DEVELOPING COMPREHENSIVE MECHANICAL CIRCULATORY SUPPORT IN SINGAPORE

Cumaraswamy Sivathanan. *Mechanical Circulatory Support and Transplantation, National Heart Centre Singapore, Singapore*

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.20

Heart transplantation was initiated in Singapore in 1990. Three to six heart transplants are performed annually. The waiting list mortality was about 30%. Hence, mechanical circulatory support was initiated with HeartMate I in 2001. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) for acute life support became available by 2003. Durable implantable rotary left ventricular assist device (LVAD) with HeartMate IITM (HMII) was introduced in 2007, followed by HeartWareTM HVADTM in 2012 and HeartMate 3TM (HM3) in 2015.

90 consecutive durable implantable devices (58 HMII, 21 HVAD and 11 HM3), were placed from May 2009 to December 2017. Of these, 65 were placed as bridge-to-transplant. Overall perioperative mortality was 7 (7.7%). 26 were INTERMACS level 1 patients, bridged with ECMO without perioperative mortality. Median ICU stay and hospital stay were 8 and 31 days, respectively. Mean duration of support was 907 days. The longest support was 8.6 years. 45 had been on ongoing support, and 23 were transplanted. Late mortality occurred in 13 patients, 5 due to stroke. Driveline infection developed in 28.7%. 57.1% were associated with driveline trauma. Pocket infection developed in 5 patients. In the initial 78 patients, 17 (21.7%) experienced gastrointestinal bleeding (GIB); 11 with recurrent GIB were successfully treated with thalidomide. 6 developed aortic regurgitation, 5 underwent modified Park stitch. Implantable cardioverter defibrillator placement pre-LVAD did not confer mortality benefit. Issues with hardware occurred in 60%. Cardiac recovery occurred in 2 and their LVADs were decommissioned. Overall survival at 5 years was 84.4%, compared with INTERMACS registry data of 48%.

21 SURGICAL CARE AND PERIOPERATIVE NURSING MANAGEMENT OF LVADS

Jesus M Casida. *Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.21

The perioperative management of patients with a left ventricular assist device (LVAD) presents a whole set of challenges to the nurses at the bedside and outpatient settings.¹ Despite the remarkable advancements in technology, the care of patients following LVAD implant remains complex for the multidisciplinary healthcare team. This presentation provides a brief overview of the currently used durable LVAD designs worldwide. These include axial (HeartMate IITM) and magnetic flow levitation (HeartMate 3TM and HeartWare HVAD[®]) LVADs.² Discussion of the nursing management of patients post-LVAD implant in the critical care, progressive care, and in the outpatient care settings will be approached at conceptual level. This approach will equip the participant with a 'thinking framework' guiding his/her actions in caring for LVAD patients. Salient nursing actions include early detection and management of post-surgical complications, device-related complications, heart failure symptom exacerbations, infection, among others. The nurse's role in helping patients attain an optimum level of functioning post-implantation during hospitalisation and the impact of the nurse in supporting patients (and caregivers) to attain an increase in quality of life are highlighted.

REFERENCES

- Chmielinski A, Koons B. Nursing care for the patient with a left ventricular assist device. *Nursing* 2018; 2017;**47**:34–40.
- Montalto A, Loforte A, Musumeci F, Krabatsch T, Slaughter M (Eds.). *Mechanical circulatory support in end-stage heart failure: a practical manual*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-43383-7

22 RENAL COMPLICATIONS IN LVAD AND HEART TRANSPLANT PATIENTS

Michael S Kiernan. *Cardiovascular Center, Tufts Medical Center and Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.22

Renal dysfunction remains a primary determinant of both short- and long-term outcomes following heart transplantation (HTx) and ventricular assist device (VAD) implantation.^{1 2} Challenging to the assessment of candidacy for advanced heart failure (HF) therapies is the ability to distinguish intrinsic parenchymal renal disease from reversible cardiorenal disease. Patients with haemodynamically mediated renal failure may recover kidney function once renal perfusion is restored following HTx or VAD surgery. Chronic hypoperfusion, however, can lead to progressive structural lesions that may not improve despite correction of underlying haemodynamic abnormalities. In patients undergoing kidney biopsy as part of their HTx evaluation, there was poor correlation between eGFR and the extent of tubular atrophy and interstitial fibrosis.³ Prolonged elevation of serum creatinine (SCr) levels suggest but do not prove irreversibility and SCr in isolation is unlikely the best biomarker to determine transplant candidacy in this clinical setting. Reasons for SCr elevation in HF including pharmacotherapies such as renin-angiotensin-

aldosterone system antagonists which lead to SCr elevations unrelated to underlying renal dysfunction. Additionally, patients with HF are frequently malnourished with muscle wasting, in which case SCr levels may be misleading. Baseline proteinuria is associated with poor post-operative outcomes in LVAD recipients and is an easily measurable biomarker that can further help to risk stratify patients in advance of VAD surgery.⁴ While absolute thresholds of risk are difficult to define, if eligible for dual organ transplant, advanced HF patients with GFR <35 mL/min/m² are likely to derive a survival benefit from simultaneous heart-kidney transplantation rather than HTx alone.⁵

REFERENCES

- Kirklin JK, Naftel DC, Pagani FD, Kormos RL, Stevenson LW, Blume ED, Miller MA, Baldwin JT, Young JB. Sixth INTERMACS annual report: a 10,000-patient database. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2014;33:555–564. Erratum in: *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2015;34:1356.
- Hong KN, Merlo A, Chauhan D, Davies RR, Iribarne A, Johnson E, Jeevanandam V, Russo MJ. Evidence supports severe renal insufficiency as a relative contraindication to heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2016;35:893–900.
- Labban B, Arora N, Restaino S, Markowitz G, Valeri A, Radhakrishnan J. The role of kidney biopsy in heart transplant candidates with kidney disease. *Transplantation* 2010;89:887–893.
- Topkara VK, Garan AR, Fine B, Godier-Furnémont AF, Breskin A, Cagliostro B, Yuzefpolskaya M, Takeda K, Takayama H, Mancini DM, Naka Y, Colombo PC. Myocardial recovery in patients receiving contemporary left ventricular assist devices: results from the Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS). *Circ Heart Fail* 2016;9. pii: e003157.
- Kilic A, Grimm JC, Whitman GJ, Shah AS, Mandal K, Conte JV, Sciortino CM. The survival benefit of simultaneous heart-kidney transplantation extends beyond dialysis-dependent patients. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2015;99:1321–1327.

23 STROKE OUTCOMES IN PATIENTS WITH LEFT VENTRICULAR ASSIST DEVICE

¹KL Wong, ²HO Cally, ²Timmy WK Au, ¹FAN Katherine. ¹Cardiac Medicine Unit, Grantham Hospital, Hong Kong SAR; ²Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Queen Mary Hospital, Hong Kong SAR

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.23

Left ventricular assist device (LVAD) has been used for end-stage heart failure both as bridge to transplantation (BTT) and destination therapy (DT) for patients not suitable for heart transplantation. Stroke is a major cause of morbidity and mortality associated with LVAD therapy. We aimed to review the incidence and outcome of stroke during LVAD therapy in Hong Kong.

Patients who had LVAD implantation from August 2010 to August 2018 for end-stage heart failure were reviewed. A total of 65 patients had LVAD implanted for end-stage heart failure (57 as BTT, 87.7%). The majority were male (n=55, 84.6%), with mean age of 49 years. Overall survival rates were 86.2% at 6 months and 79.2% at 12 months. There were 43 HeartMate IITM, 14 HeartWareTM HVADTM and 8 HeartMate 3TM implants. Twenty neurological events occurred in 18 patients with 10 cases of disabling stroke throughout the whole study period. There were 11 haemorrhagic strokes, 7 ischaemic strokes and 2 transient ischaemic attacks. Stroke and disabling stroke rates at 6 months were 20.7% and 12.1%, respectively. Disabling strokes were more common when haemorrhagic in origin (7 out of 10) and were the commonest cause of mortality in 9 out of 15 (60%) patients throughout the study period.

In conclusion, stroke remains an important cause of morbidity and mortality among Hong Kong patients receiving LVAD therapy.

24 MANAGING INFECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH LVADS

Ka Lee Kerk. Mechanical Circulatory Support, Heart and Lung Transplant Unit, Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, National Heart Centre Singapore, Singapore

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.24

Although left ventricular assist devices (LVADs) have revolutionised the treatment of advanced heart failure, LVAD infection (LVADI) remains a significant cause of morbidity and mortality in LVAD patients.

The International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation defines LVADI in three categories: VAD-specific infections (pump/cannula, pocket, driveline); VAD-related infections (infective endocarditis, blood stream infection, mediastinitis); and non-VAD infections.¹

Infection should be excluded or appropriately treated by an infectious disease physician before LVAD implantation when clinically feasible. Surgical techniques such as increasing intra-fascial tunnelling and externalisation of the silicone portion of the driveline may help reduce infections.²

Besides culture tests, additional imaging, such as ultrasonography or computed tomography may be warranted if underlying abscess is suspected.³

The recommended treatment includes antimicrobial therapy, local debridement of the exit sites; surgical drainage, driveline repositioning and instalment of a wound VAC (or vacuum-assisted closure) system in patients with deep infection,⁴ surgical debridement and device exchange in the setting of persistent or relapsing blood stream infection (BSI) despite adequate antimicrobial and surgical therapy; pump exchange should be performed if feasible, in patients with persistent sepsis and instability due to device infection while heart transplant should be considered in haemodynamically stable transplant candidates with BSI.¹

The clinical manifestations and management of LVADI vary based on the type and extent of infection, and the causative pathogens. Understanding these differences is critical in making timely diagnoses and providing appropriate management interventions for LVADI.

REFERENCES

- Kusne S, Mooney M, Danziger-Isakov L, Kaan A, Lund LH, Lyster H, Wieselthaler G, Aslam S, Cagliostro B, Chen J, Combs P, Cochrane A, Conway J, Cowger J, Frigerio M, Gellatly R, Grossi P, Gustafsson F, Hannan M, Lorts A, Martin S, Pinney S, Silveira FP, Schubert S, Schueler S, Strueber M, Uriel N, Wrightson N, Zabner R, Huprikar S. An ISHLT consensus document for prevention and management strategies for mechanical circulatory support infection. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2017;36:1137–1153.
- Trachtenberg BH, Cordero-Reyes A, Elias B, Loebe M. A review of infections in patients with left ventricular assist devices: prevention, diagnosis and management. *Methodist Debaque Cardiovasc J* 2015;11:28–32.
- Slaughter MS, Pagani FD, Rogers JG, Miller LW, Sun B, Russell SD, Starling RC, Chen L, Boyle AJ, Chillcott S, Adamson RM, Blood MS, Camacho MT, Idrissi KA, Petty M, Sobieski M, Wright S, Myers TJ, Farrar DJ; HeartMate II Clinical Investigators. Clinical management of continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices in advanced heart failure. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2010;29(4 Suppl):S1–39.
- Yarboro LT, Bergin JD, Kennedy JL, Ballew CC, Benton EM, Ailawadi G, Kern JA. Technique for minimizing and treating driveline infections. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg* 2014;3:557–562.