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Fate of the distal aorta after surgical repair of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection: A review
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Summary
Operated acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection has to be considered as a chronic aortic disease with the potential of late distal dilatation with aneurysm formation and need for reoperation. Several intraoperative strategies have been devised to prevent late complications. However, the increased operative risk associated with a more aggressive initial approach in an emergent setting has to be balanced against the relatively low incidence of late reoperations. Further studies will have to identify preoperative risk factors for late distal aortic complications more precisely in order to select patients who might benefit the most from these newer surgical strategies.
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Résumé
Le traitement chirurgical des dissections aortique de type I de DeBakey reste palliatif. L’aorte distale reste le plus souvent disséquée en postopératoire et peut évoluer ultérieurement vers une dilatation anévrismale et nécessiter une ré-intervention. Différentes stratégies chirurgicales ont été développées afin de limiter l’incidence de ces complications tardives. Toutefois, le risque opératoire plus élevé d’une intervention chirurgicale initiale plus agressive doit être pesé par rapport à l’incidence relativement faible des ré-interventions tardives. L’identification de facteurs de risques préopératoires prédictifs de complications tardives...
Background

Surgery has drastically improved the outcome of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection. Immediate surgical intervention aims to prevent ascending aortic rupture, redirect blood flow into the true vessel lumen, and correct aortic valve insufficiency. However, surgical treatment remains essentially palliative, as most operative survivors have a residual dissected aorta, often with a patent false lumen. This exposes patients to distal aortic dilatation and subsequent aneurysm formation, with its inherent risks of aortic rupture or reoperation.

The precise natural history of operated acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection remains largely unknown. The objective of the present review is to summarize existing evidence regarding the fate of the distal aorta after surgical repair of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection. Surgical strategies aimed at preventing distal aortic complications are also reviewed.

Natural history of distal aorta after operated type A aortic dissection

The fate of the distal aorta after surgical repair of acute type A aortic dissection has been addressed using three interrelated endpoints: (1) the persistent patency of the distal false lumen; (2) distal aortic dilatation with aneurysm formation; and (3) actual reoperations on the distal aorta or its branches.

Distal false lumen patency

The main objective of the distal surgical repair is obliteration of the false lumen in order to redirect blood flow into the true lumen. However, distal repair fails to achieve this objective in the majority of cases. Indeed, the incidence of partial or complete distal false lumen patency is reported to lie between 31% and 89% [1–8].

Persistent postoperative perfusion of the distal false lumen can be related to: (1) the presence of unresected or secondary entry sites in the distal aorta; (2) aortic clamp trauma that may injure the friable dissected aorta and create a new intimal tear immediately distal to the surgical repair; or (3) a leak at the level distal aortic anastomosis (Fig. 1). Sakaguchi et al. have shown that preoperative hypertension (requiring aggressive use of antihypertensive drugs) and preoperative size of the descending thoracic aorta \( \geq 35 \text{ mm} \) were significant and independent risk factors of postoperative false lumen patency [2]. Very recently, Zhao et al. have shown that complete distal false lumen thrombosis 1 year after operation was significantly lower in patients who required postoperative anticoagulation than in those who did not (87% vs 98%, \( p = 0.005 \)) [9]. Thus, in patients in whom the native aortic valve cannot be preserved, the choice of the heart valve substitute should be made with caution, and the long-term risk of distal aortic complications should be balanced against the risk of bioprosthetic structural deterioration.

The clinical consequences of distal false lumen patency remain controversial. Several studies have evaluated the association of distal false lumen patency with distal aortic dilatation or growth rates, and long-term clinical outcomes.

Aortic dilatation

Postoperative distal false lumen patency is an independent predictor for distal aortic dilatation. Moreover, a large area of the patent false lumen (> 70% of the total area of the transsectional diameter of the aorta) is a strong predictor.
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for secondary dilatation of the diseased downstream aorta [10].

Aortic growth rate

Several studies have shown that distal aortic growth rate is greater in patients with patent than with thrombosed distal false lumen [4,5,8,11]. For example, Fattouche et al. found yearly aortic growth rates of $2.8 \pm 0.4$ mm and $1.1 \pm 0.2$ mm in patients with patent and occluded false lumen, respectively ($p=0.001$) [4]. Similarly, distal anastomotic leak after ascending aortic replacement for acute type A aortic dissection contributes to greater distal aortic growth rates [12].

Clinical outcomes (reoperation, rupture, death)

Myrmel et al. applied criteria of evidence-based medicine on all clinical series published between 1980 and 2003, but could not find a consistent relationship between persistence of a patent distal false lumen and increased risk of reoperation, aortic rupture or death [13]. Similarly, more recent studies have failed to show significant differences in freedom from distal aortic reoperation or survival between patients with and without a patent false lumen [2,5]. In contrast, the recently published experience of the Palermo group showed significantly lower freedom from reoperation and survival rates in patients with patent false lumen [4].

Partial thrombosis

Some of this discrepancy might be related to the fact that most studies do not differentiate between completely patent, partially thrombosed and completely thrombosed false aortic lumen (Fig. 2). Partial thrombosis can be defined as the concurrent presence of both flow and thrombus in the false lumen [14]. Fattori et al. have shown that partial thrombosis of the false lumen is protective against dilatation as suggested by an aortic growth rate of $0.34$ cm/year in patients with partial thrombosis of the false lumen versus an increase of $0.56$ cm/year in patients without thrombus in the false lumen [8]. Furthermore, the number of late postoperative events was lower in patients with partial thrombosis compared to patients with no thrombosis. In contrast, Tsai et al. have shown that partial thrombosis of the false lumen is a particularly grave sign in patients with acute DeBakey type III aortic dissection [14]. Similar findings have very recently been reported by Song et al., who show that partial thrombosis of the false lumen after repair of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection, compared with complete patency or complete thrombosis, is a significant and independent predictor of aortic enlargement, aorta-related reoperations and poor long-term survival [15]. However, the mechanisms by which partial thrombosis of the false lumen compromises long-term outcome remain speculative. In patients with a completely patent false lumen, the latter may be perfused by an entry tear and decompressed through another re-entry tear. In case of partial thrombosis, however, the thrombus may occlude the re-entry tear, thus impeding outflow. This may result in increased false lumen pressure and wall tension, favouring subsequent dilatation. Alternatively, aortic wall hypoxia at the level of the thrombus might lead to increased local inflammation and neovascularization, resulting in local aortic wall weakening.

Distal aortic dilatation

Dilatation of the distal aorta occurs preferentially in the aortic arch and upper descending thoracic aorta (Fig. 3). Immer et al. have reported that 86% of late dilatations were found at the level of the aortic arch and/or descending thoracic aorta [10]. Aortic growth rates vary among aortic segments, and the highest rates are reported for the descending thoracic aorta ($1–3.7$ mm/year) [8,16]. The expansion of the distal aorta is caused mainly by dilatation of the false lumen [6]. This is probably related to mechanical instability of the dissected aortic wall, reduced to a thin layer of media with adventitia. Of note, the time of onset of aortic enlargement seems to be unpredictable, and can occur after several years of apparent stability [17]. This observation justifies long-term surveillance by repeated imaging studies.

Several studies have determined risk factors for late distal aortic enlargement after surgical correction of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection. Patient-related variables include younger age [6,18], male sex [6] and connective tissue disorders such as Marfan syndrome [6,19]. The involvement of supra-aortic vessels and/or the presence of preoperative malperfusion syndrome indicating a more distal extent of the dissection are also associated with late distal aortic dilatation [18]. Different surgical repair techniques, however, do not seem to have an influence on late aortic dilatation [17,20]. After surgical correction, a greater diameter of the distal aorta is associated with late aneurysm.
of dissection at presentation [25]. The only identified dissection-related factors include a more distal extent of aortic replacement [17, 25].

In survivors [4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23]. In our experience, actuarial estimates of freedom from reoperation on the distal aorta are 98, 93, 77, and 56% at 1, 5, 10, and 15 years, respectively, after initial operation [24]. Other groups report very similar results, with actuarial estimates of freedom from distal reoperation at 10 years ranging from 69% to 90% [5, 17, 23, 25]. The variability between studies is related, at least in part, to different definitions of reoperation (whether one includes only aortic procedures or procedures performed on the aorta and its side branches) and different aortic size criteria to perform reoperation. However, because an unknown number of patients die of aortic complications before they can undergo reoperation or refuse reoperation, the real incidence of patients needing reoperation is probably underestimated.

Patient-related risk factors for reoperation on the distal aorta include younger patient age [24, 25] and connective tissue disorders such as Marfan syndrome [17, 25]. Dissection-related factors include a more distal extent of dissection at presentation [25]. The only identified procedure-related factor seems to be non-resection of the primary entry site [17], while the extent of aortic replacement does not seem to have a significant impact. Postoperatively, persistent false lumen patency [20], elevated systolic blood pressure [17] and the absence of beta-blocker therapy at follow-up [17] have been identified as independent risk factors for late reoperation on the distal aorta.

Surgical strategies to prevent distal aortic aneurysm formation

Several surgical strategies have been devised to prevent persistent false lumen patency, aortic dilatation, and reoperation. However, none have been adequately evaluated by randomized controlled trials and, therefore, no definite recommendation can be made.

Circulatory arrest with open distal technique

Systematic use of circulatory arrest with “open-distal” repair in patients undergoing surgery for acute type A aortic dissection has been advocated by a number of surgeons [26–28]. This “no touch” found no significant differences [29]. Myrme et al. applied criteria of evidence-based medicine to all clinical series published between 1980 and 2003, but could not find conclusive evidence favouring the use of an open distal anastomosis in patients with acute DeBakey type I dissection [13].

We retrospectively compared early postoperative outcomes in 64 patients undergoing surgical repair of acute type A aortic dissection using the no-touch technique with those of 36 patients undergoing conventional repair with aortic cross-clamping and no hypothermic circulatory arrest (unpublished results). Although operative and 1-year mortality rates were similar in both groups, and no increase in neurological complications was noted, the no-touch technique was associated with significantly longer cardiopulmonary bypass times, a higher incidence of postoperative pulmonary and renal complications, and prolonged mechanical ventilation and intensive care unit durations. Whether this increased postoperative morbidity is the price to pay to reduce the incidence of long-term distal aortic complications remains to be determined.

Distal extent of aortic replacement

There is now general agreement that the distal repair should be extended sufficiently in order to excise the segment of aorta containing the intimal entry tear [30]. Some studies have shown that extension of the distal resection into the arch can be performed without a significant increase in postoperative mortality [31, 32]. Thus, a systematically extended or total aortic arch resection has been proposed for the initial surgical management of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection, irrespective of the location of the intimal tear [33–35]. Although satisfying results have been reported (low mortality and reoperation rates), the use of systematic extensive or total aortic replacement performed as an emergent procedure will necessarily increase an already high operative risk. Accordingly, Campbell-Lloyd...
et al. have shown that total aortic arch replacement was the only univariate risk factor for poor neurological outcome in a contemporary series of patients undergoing surgery for acute type A aortic dissection [36]. Similarly, Kim et al. have very recently reported that total arch replacement was associated with greater morbidity and mortality, without decreasing the reoperation rate, compared with hemiarch repair in acute type I aortic dissection [37]. We believe that the risk of systematic arch replacement largely outweighs the relatively low incidence of reoperation (> 70% freedom from distal reoperation at 10 years) and risk of reoperation.

**Open stent-graft procedures**

More recently, hybrid approaches, combining surgical and endovascular techniques, have been used for the initial treatment of acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection in order to prevent aneurysmal dilatation of the distal aorta and the need for late reoperations [38]. Thus, the stented (or frozen) elephant trunk technique combines conventional surgical replacement of the ascending aorta and the aortic arch with endovascular repair of the descending aorta. The latter is performed during the period of circulatory arrest by deploying a homemade or commercially available stent-graft in the descending thoracic aorta [39]. The expected benefit of this hybrid approach is immediate exclusion of additional intimal tears in the descending thoracic aorta. A recent best-evidence topic reviewing all the published series up to March 2010 concluded that this technique can be used without increasing operative mortality and morbidity, but at the price of longer cardiopulmonary bypass and circulatory arrest times. Spinal cord ischaemia and bowel ischaemia represent the main serious complications associated with this technique [40]. However, some series suggest that this procedure allows early thrombosis of the false channel [7,41,42], and a reduction of late thoracoabdominal aneurysm formation and reoperation rates [43,44].

Very recently, Chen et al. have reported a series of 30 patients operated on for acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection in whom they performed ascending aortic replacement combined with open placement of a triple-branched stent-graft into the true lumen of the arch, arch vessels, and descending thoracic aorta [45]. This approach allows extensive repair of the dissected thoracic aorta and appears simpler and faster than the previously described stented elephant trunk technique. Although the theoretical foundations of these hybrid approaches are sound, and initial results are encouraging, the precise indications of these techniques remain to be determined.

**Conclusions**

Operated acute DeBakey type I aortic dissection has to be considered as a chronic aortic disease with the potential of late distal dilatation, aneurysm formation and the need for reoperation. As such, this affection requires life-long surveillance of the residual dissected aorta. Furthermore, aggressive blood pressure control using beta-blocker therapy is mandatory for these patients.

Several intraoperative strategies have been devised to prevent late complications. However, the increased operative risk associated with a more aggressive initial approach in an emergent setting has to be balanced against the relatively low incidence of late reoperations. Further studies will have to identify more precisely preoperative risk factors for late distal aortic complications in order to select patients who might benefit the most from these newer strategies.
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