

The authors observed that the area where they found the ring dehiscences corresponded to the end of the annular section that was most prone to dilatation. Taking into account the systolic-diastolic dynamics of tricuspid annular motion and the rigidity of the annuloplasty device, they concluded that greater forces might exist on the sutures attached to a rigid ring than on those attached to a flexible band, which might follow the natural motion of the tricuspid annulus more easily [2]. Zhu *et al.* in their review, concluded that although there was less risk of ring dehiscence or ring fracture in the flexible group, the rigid ring, particularly the new three-dimensional MC3 ring, was inclined to be better than the flexible band in terms of a sustained effect for maintaining stable postoperative grade of regurgitation according to the current available evidences [3].

Izutani *et al.*, in their analysis of tricuspid ring annuloplasty using a flexible band or the MC3 rigid ring, showed that rigid ring annuloplasty might be more effective for decreasing functional TR in immediate and mid-term postoperative periods [4].

Both tricuspid valve annuloplasty methods are feasible and durable for correcting functional TR. The ring of choice though (rigid enough to reduce the size of the tricuspid annulus adequately and flexible enough to conserve the motion of the ring and the action of the sphincter) is yet to be found.

Prospective studies, with a large number of patients and new ring designs, are needed for confirming the best choice.

Conflict of interest: none declared.

References

- [1] Gatti G, Dell'Angela L, Morosin M, Maschiero L, Pinamonti B, Benussi B *et al.* Flexible band versus rigid ring annuloplasty for functional tricuspid regurgitation: two different patterns of right heart reverse remodeling. *Interact CardioVasc Thorac Surg* 2016;23:79-89.
- [2] Pfannmuller B, Doenst T, Eberhardt K, Seeburger J, Borger M, Mohr F. Increased risk of dehiscence after tricuspid valve repair with rigid annuloplasty rings. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2012;143:1050-5.
- [3] Zhu TY, Wang JG, Meng X. Is a rigid tricuspid annuloplasty ring superior to a flexible band when correcting secondary tricuspid regurgitation? *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2013;17:1009-1014.
- [4] Izutani H, Nakamura T, Kawachi K. Flexible band versus ring annuloplasty for functional tricuspid regurgitation. *Heart International* 2010;5:e13.

eReply to eComment: Is flexible band or rigid ring the best choice for functional tricuspid regurgitation?

Authors: Giuseppe Gatti

Department of Cardio-Vascular Surgery, Ospedali Riuniti and University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy

doi: 10.1093/icvts/iww183

© The Author 2016. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery. All rights reserved.

I sincerely thank Tourmousoglou and colleagues for their interest and for the constructive and complementary comments [1] to our article [2] where early and late outcomes of tricuspid valve annuloplasty with a flexible band (B-TVA) or a rigid ring (R-TVA) were compared. The most important conclusion of our analysis was that, although flexible band and rigid ring annuloplasty seem to be equally effective in the long-term treatment of functional tricuspid regurgitation, there are two different patterns of right heart reverse remodelling, which is more complete (see RV involvement) when a ring has been used - at least that is what we think.

As stated in the Discussion section of our paper, annuloplasty bands could offer specific benefits (over rings) due to the inherent flexibility and the simpler design and technique of implantation, at least on a speculative basis. There is a lower risk of device dehiscence or fracture and tricuspid stenosis, even after undersized annuloplasty. There is virtually no risk of injuring the conduction tissue and the right coronary artery, or the aortic box during implantation within a beating heart. Finally, flexible bands could best preserve RV function and help RV functional recovery after surgery. Nevertheless, despite all these benefits, there is no evidence of the superiority of B-TVA over R-TVA. If anything, the opposite is true. However, we did not explore the specific mechanisms of late failure of TVA. As we performed no comparison between two- and three-dimensional rings. In effect, in the reported experience, the two types of rigid rings were used during two very different periods: the Carpentier-Edwards classic (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, CA, USA) two-dimensional ring has been used until 2003 whilst both the Edwards MC3 and the Carpentier-Edwards Physio rings have been adopted since 2010. Thus, any interpretation of the results could be very difficult and not conclusive. I absolutely agree with Tourmousoglou *et al.* that prospective studies involving a large number of patients and new ring designs are needed for confirming the best annuloplasty device that has to be used to repair functional tricuspid regurgitation. In the meantime, we would stress the concept that the right heart reverse remodelling should be considered in every future study.

Conflict of interest: none declared.

References

- [1] Tourmousoglou C, Pitsis A, Nikoloudakis N, Dougenis D. eComment. Is flexible band or rigid ring the best choice for functional tricuspid regurgitation? *Interact CardioVasc Thorac Surg* 2016;23:88.
- [2] Gatti G, Dell'Angela L, Morosin M, Maschietto L, Pinamonti B, Benussi B *et al.* Flexible band versus rigid ring annuloplasty for functional tricuspid regurgitation: two different patterns of right heart reverse remodelling. *Interact CardioVasc Thorac Surg* 2016;23:79-89.