# **MEETING ABSTRACT**



**Open Access** 

# Is it safe to initiate the minimally invasive aortic valve replacement technique in an institution with experience in cardiovascular surgery?

Rafael Meza<sup>\*</sup>, Alejandro Escobar, Gloria Franco, Alejandra Echeverri, Jose David Serna

*From* World Society of Cardiothoracic Surgeons 25th Anniversary Congress, Edinburgh Edinburgh, UK. 19-22 September 2015

## **Background/Introduction**

The implementation of new surgical techniques in an institution requires the suitable training of an interdisciplinary group (surgeons, anesthesiologists, nurses, doctors, ICU); the initial results, known as learning curve, are those that define the successful continuity of said techniques in the institutions, therefore they are of utmost importance.

### **Aims/Objectives**

Compare the pertaining patients to the learning curve group with the rest, both subjected to aortic valve replacement by the minimally invasive technique (MICS) conducted by the same group of cardiovascular surgeons, evaluating surgery time, postoperative complications, hospital stay and mortality.

### Method

83 consecutive cases were studied, with an age of  $62.54 \pm 12.60$  years between 30 and 84 years, of them 70 (84.30%) were given an implanted Biological prosthesis and 13 (15.70%) a mechanical prosthesis, defined the learning curve as the first 25 procedures (Learning Curve) and compared with the 58 remaining procedures (The Rest).

### Results

The cross clamp time was  $71.84 \pm 10.85$  min in the learning curve and  $79.86 \pm 21.079$  in the Rest p = 0.076 and the perfusion time  $83.32 \pm 12.95$  min in the learning curve and  $95.02 \pm 26.21$  min in the rest p = 0.057 without significant differences. The main complications are shown in table 1 without significant differences.

Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Department of Epidemiology, Centro Cardiovascular Somer Incare, Rionegro, Colombia

### Table 1

	Complication Learning Curve Rest				
		n %		n %	р
Arrhythmias	2	8.00%	9	15.50%	0.354
Mediastinitis	0	0.00%	2	3.40%	0.347
SSI	1	4.00%	1	1.70%	0.535
Reintervention due to bleeding	1	4.00%	3	5.20%	0.819
Death<30 days	0	0.00%	2	3.40%	0.347

Hospital stay  $6.72 \pm 4.04$  days Vs  $7.16 \pm 5.071$  days p = 0.705 did not present statistically significant differences.

### **Discussion/Conclusion**

The learning curve in aortic valve replacement conducted by MICS can be initiated safely with a low morbimortality.

Published: 16 December 2015

doi:10.1186/1749-8090-10-S1-A172 **Cite this article as:** Meza *et al.*: Is it safe to initiate the minimally invasive aortic valve replacement technique in an institution with experience in cardiovascular surgery? *Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery* 2015 **10**(Suppl 1):A172.



© 2015 Meza et al. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/ zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.