

Tricuspid Intervention



Treatment options of intervention

- Edge-to-edge repair (Coaptation devices)
 - TriClip
 - PASCAL
- Direct ring-annuloplasty (Repair)
 - Cardioband

Catheter-based valve replacement



2020 AHA/ACC Guideline Indication of Tricuspid intervention

- Severe TR (Stage C, D)
 - undergoing left-sided valve surgery
 - \rightarrow TV surgery is recommended (Class I)
 - combined with signs and symptoms of right-sided HF
 - \rightarrow isolated tricuspid valve surgery (Class IIa)
 - asymptomatic and progressive RV dilation or systolic dysfunction
 → isolated tricuspid valve surgery (Class IIb)



2021 ESC/EACTS Guideline Indication of Transcatheter Tricuspid Valve Intervention

- TTVI are under clinical development
- Early registry and study \rightarrow Coaptation devices, Direct annuloplasty, or Valve replacement can improve symptom and hemodynamics
- Class IIb (LOE C)
 - Transcatheter treatment of symptomatic secondary severe TR may be considered in inoperable patients at a Heart Valve Center





Concept of TEER with TriClip



Repairing a tricuspid valve through a TriClip procedure (Image courtesy of Abbott)





Current Devices of TEER

TriClip (Abbott)

PASCAL (Edwards)









Status of Coaptation Device







Two Types of Tricuspid Regurgitation

CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION: Schematic Drawing of the Different Morphologic Types of Tricuspid Regurgitation

MORPHOLOGIC TYPES OF TRICUSPID REGURGITATION				
A Primary Tricuspid Regurgitation	B Secondary Tricuspid Regurgitation	C Isolated Tricuspid Regurgitation		

Prihadi, E.A. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Img. 2019;12(3):491-9.





Evidence of TEER for Severe TR





TriClip (Abbott Vascular)









Nickenig et al. Circulation 2017;135:1802-1814



64 patients, Single arm study

Baseline characteristics	N = 64
Age	76.6 ± 9.6
Male sex, %	29 (45%)
EuroSCORE, %	27.8 ± 16.7
STS mortality score, %	4.7 ± 4.6
GFR, mL/min	48.7 ± 19.7
AST, U/I	34.5 ± 15.6
ALT, U/I	26.3 ± 20.0
NT-proBNP, ng/l	5528.4 ± 5938.8
NYHA III	47 (73%)
NYHA IV	13 (20%)
Atrial fibrillation / flutter, %	54 (84%)
COPD, %	18 (28%)



Nickenig et al. Circulation. 2017;135:1802-1814.



64 patients, Single arm study

Echo at baseline	N = 64
LV EF, %	46.9 ± 13.9
RA volume, %	117.5 ± 72.4
TAPSE, mm	16.9 ± 5.8
sPAP, mmHg	42.5 ± 15.0
IVC diameter, mm	25.8 ± 8.7
Functional TR, %	56 (88%)
Degenerative TR, %	5 (8%)
Mixed TR	3 (4%)
Moderate TR, %	8 (12%)
Severe TR, %	37 (58%)
Massive TR, %	19 (30%)
TR vena contracta, cm	1.0 ± 0.4
TR EROA, cm ²	0.9 ± 0.4
Septo-lateral diameter, mm	42.4 ± 10.4



Nickenig et al. Circulation. 2017;135:1802-1814.



64 patients, Single arm study

Changes in variables	N	Baseline	Discharge	P value
6MWT, m	21/64	177.4 ± 103.0	193.5 ± 115.9	0.007
GFR, mL/min	64/64	48.7 ± 19.7	49.7 ± 5.4	0.4
NT-proBNP, ng/L	28/64	5528.4 ± 5938.8	5396.8 ± 8191.3	0.9
LV EF, %	50/64	46.6 ± 13.7	48.3 ± 14.1	0.03
RA volume, %	29/64	107.5 ± 61.6	98.1 ± 51.5	0.3
TAPSE, mm	50/64	16.8 ± 5.8	17.1 ± 5.8	0.8
sPAP, mmHg	46/64	44.1 ± 15.4	40.4 ± 12.7	0.02
IVC diameter, mm	23/64	26.1 ± 10.1	24.3 ± 6.9	0.3
TR vena contracta, cm	26/64	1.1 ± 0.5	0.6 ± 0.3	0.001
TR EROA, cm ²	32/64	0.9 ± 0.3	0.4 ± 0.2	< 0.001
Septo-lateral diameter, mm	31/64	41.2 ± 10.6	35.7 ± 16.2	0.04





64 patients, Single arm study





Univariate and Multivariate analysis of procedural failure TriValve Registry

Variables	Univariate		Multivariate	
Variables	OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Pacemaker or ICD lead	1.53 (0.81-2.84	0.18		
LVEF	1.00 (0.98-1.02)	0.95		
TAPSE	1.02 (0.95-1.10)	0.55		
MR grade	1.10 (0.84-1.44)	0.48		
TR vena contracta	1.76 (0.87-3.53)	0.11		
TR coaptation gap > 6.5 mm	6.16 (3.19-12.18)	<0.001	1.23 (1.10-1.38)	<0.001
TR EROA > 0.695 cm ²	4.79 (2.52-9.33)	<0.001	1.21 (1.09-1.35)	<0.001
TR coaptation depth > 9.75 mm	3.17 (1.71-6.04)	<0.001	1.01 (0.90-1.44)	0.83
TR tenting area > 3.15 cm ²	4.78 (2.49-9.30)	<0.001	1.18 (1.01-1.37)	0.035
Noncentral or nonanteroseptal TR jet location	2.38 (0.98-5.52)	0.047	1.21 (1.04-1.41)	0.013
Tricuspid annular diameter	1.03 (0.99-1.08	0.098	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.60
Concomitant mitral valve TEER	0.66 (0.36-1.20)	0.17		
Number of clips	0.81 (0.57-1.12)	0.20		
Mehr, M et al. JACC. 2019;12(15):1451-61				

1-Year Outcomes after TEER with MitraClip TriValve Registry









1-Year Outcomes after TEER with MitraClip TriValve Registry





Mehr, M et al. JACC. 2019;12(15):1451-61



1-Year Outcomes after TEER with MitraClip TriValve Registry

Outcomes at Last F/U	N = 249
Estimated mortality at 1 yr	20.3 (14.6-25.8)
Estimated combined mortality and unplanned rehospitalization for HF at 1 yr	34.7 (27.3-41.0)
Tricuspid surgery	7 (2.8)
Decreased of \geq 1 NYHA functional class (n=175/212)	130 (72.0)
Peripheral edema (n=169/212)	45 (26.6)
Ascites (n=179/212)	37 (20.7)
TAPSE, cm (n=140/212)	15.9 ± 4.3
LVEF, % (n=157/212)	49.6 ± 14.1
sPAP, mmHg (n=141/212)	39.3 ± 14.8
TR severity grade (n=167/212)	
1+, mild	61 (36.5)
2+, moderate	60 (35.9)
3+, severe	35 (21.0)
4+, massive	11 (6.6)



Univariate and Multivariate analysis of 1-year Mortality TriValve Registry

Variables	Univariate		Multivariate	
Valiables	OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Age	1.02 (0.98-1.06)	0.31		
EuroSCORE II	0.99 (0.97-1.02)	0.57		
COPD	0.49 (0.21-1.16)	0.103		
Pacemaker / ICD	1.52 (0.83-2.79)	0.18		
Absence of sinus rhythm	3.85 (1.19-12.43)	0.024	4.40 (1.34-14.49)	0.015
Decrease of 10 ml/min in eGFR	1.29 (1.07-1.55)	0.007	1.25 (1.02-1.51)	0.018
NYHA functional class	2.08 (1.20-3.62)	0.009	1.73 (0.96-3.13)	0.069
Decrease of 10% in LVEF	1.25 (1.02-1.52)	0.028	1.20 (0.98-1.47)	0.084
TAPSE	0.97 (0.90-1.04)	0.42		
TR grade	1.16 (0.67-2.00)	0.59		
MR grade	1.13 (0.86-1.50)	0.39		
Concomitant MV TEER	1.07 (0.59-1.94)	0.83		
Procedure failure	2.43 (1.33-4.46)	0.004	2.12 (1.12-4.02)	0.014
Mehr, M et al. JACC. 2019;12(15):1451-61				

			1 Year (n=70)			
Variables	Baseline (n=85)	30 Days (n=83)	Result	P value (base vs 1 year)	P value (30 days vs 1 year)	
EROA, cm² (SE)	0.65 (0.03)	0.40 (0.03)	0.32 (0.05)	<0.0001	0.1053	
Regurgitant volume, mL/beat (SE)	52.20 (2.35)	34.83 (2.92)	27.68 (3.08	<0.0001	0.0607	
TR jet area, cm ² (SE)	14.28 (0.69)	9.18 (0.64	7.55 (0.56)	<0.0001	0.0007	
TR vena contracta width, cm (SE)	1.73 (0.07)	1.00 (0.06)	0.78 (0.05)	<0.0001	<0.0001	
PISA radius, cm (SE)	0.91 (0.03)	0.68 (0.03)	0.63 (0.04)	<0.0001	0.2092	
IVC diameter, cm (SE)	2.29 (0.06)	2.20 (0.06)	2.06 (0.06)	0.0014	0.0216	
RV end diastolic dimension, cm (SE)	5.28 (0.07)	4.93 (0.08)	4.79 (0.08)	<0.0001	0.0319	
RA volume, mL (SE)	129 (5.84)	117 (6.03)	116 (6.55)	0.0166	0.8536	
RV systolic pressure, mmHg (SE)	42.7 (1.08)	42.0 (1.49)	43.9 (2.30)	0.5727	0.4525	
TAPSE, cm (SE)	1.44 (0.03)	1.49 (0.03)	1.59 (0.04)	0.0002	0.0069	



ŤCTAP2025





Lurz et al. JACC. 2021;77:229-39







Lurz et al. JACC. 2021;77:229-39







Lurz et al. JACC. 2021;77:229-39





Major Adverse Events: 7.1% Cardiovascular Mortality: 4.8%





Lurz et al. JACC. 2021;77:229-39

Safety outcomes	N = 84
MACE through 1 year	6 (7.1%)
CV mortality	4 (4.8%)
Myocardial infarction	1 (1.2%)
Stroke	1 (1.2%)
New onset renal failure	1 (1.2%)
Non-elective CV surgery or Tricuspid valve repair system	0 (0%)
Device-related adverse event	0 (0%)
Other safety endpoints	
All-cause mortality	6 (7.1%)
Major bleeding (BARC type 3a)	10 (11.9%)
New onset AF	1 (1.2%)
Pulmonary thromboembolism	0 (0.0%)
Single leaflet device attachment	5/65 (7.7%)
Mean tricuspid gradient ≥ 5 mmHg	4/64 (6.3%)

Lurz et al. JACC. 2021;77:229-39

Symptomatic Severe TR sPAP < 70 mmHg, ≥ 30 days GDMT, ≥ intermediate Op risk, no other CV diseases in need of intervention or surgery







Baseline Characteristics	TEER Group (N=175)	Control Group (N=175)
Age	78.0 ± 7.4	77.85 ± 7.2
Female sex	98 (56.0%)	94 (53.7%)
NYHA III or IV	104 (59.4%)	97 (55.4%)
Atrial fibrillation	153 (87.4%)	162 (92.6%)
Hypertension	142 (81.1%)	141 (80.6%)
Stroke	11 (6.3%)	19 (10.9%)
Diabetes mellitus	28 (16.0%)	27 (15.4%)
Peripheral vascular disease	16 (9.1%)	18 (10.3%)
Renal disease	62 (35.4%)	62 (35.4%)
Liver disease	11 (6.3%)	16 (9.1%)
Cardiac implantable device	28 (16.0%)	24 (13.7%)
Hospitalization for HF within 1 year	44 (25.1%)	44 (25.1%)
NT-proBNP	382.0 ± 347.5	355.4 ± 283.4



ТСТАР2025

Primary and Secondary End Points	TEER Group (N=175)	Control Group (N=175)	Difference (95% CI)	P value
Primary				
Hierarchical composite of death from any cause or TV surgery; hospitalization for HF; and improvement of \geq 15 points in KCCQ score at 1 yr – no. of wins	11,348	7643	1.48 (1.06 – 2.13)	0.02
Secondary, listed in hierarchical order				
KM estimate of percentage of patients with freedom from major adverse events through 30 days after the procedure (Lower 95% confidence limit)	98.3 (96.3)	—	—	<0.001
Change in KCCQ score	12.3 ±1.8	0.6 ±1.8	11.7 (6.8 – 16.6)	<0.001
TR of no greater than moderate severity at 30-day f/u	140/161 (87.0%)	7/146 (4.8%)	—	<0.001
Change in 6-min walk distance	-8.1 ± 10.5	-25.2 ± 10.3	17.1 (-12.0 – 46.1)	0.25









bRIGHT Study





³⁰ TCTAP2025



PASCAL (Edwards Lifesciences)





PASCAL for Severe TR

Multicenter, Prospective, Observational, First-in-Human study 23 patients, 7 Centers from 5 Countries

Clinical outcomes at 30 day F/U	N = 23
Device success	18 (78.0%)
All cause mortality	3 (13.0%)
CV mortality	3 (13.0%)
Hospital admission for HF	0 (0.0%)
Reintervention for MV dysfunction	0 (0.0%)
Minor access site bleeding	1 (4.0%)
Major access site bleeding	0 (0.0%)
TIA	1 (4.0%)
Stroke	0 (0.0%)
Myocardial infarction	0 (0.0%)
Renal failure requiring dialysis	0 (0.0%)
Thrombus formation on device	0 (0.0%)



PASCAL for Severe TR Multicenter, Prospective, Observational, First-in-Human study 23 patients, 7 Centers from 5 Countries





PASCAL for Severe TR Multicenter, Observational, First-in-Human experience 28 patients, Compassionate-use, 6 Centers

Clinical outcomes at 30 day F/U	N = 28
Mortality	2 (7.1%)
Myocardial infarction	0 (0.0%)
Stroke	0 (0.0%)
Major bleeding	0 (0.0%)
Tamponade	0 (0.0%)
Acute kidney injury	0 (0.0%)
Conversion to surgery	0 (0.0%)
Reintervention	0 (0.0%)
HF hospitalization	1 (3.5%)
Single-leaflet device attachment	2 (7.1%)





PASCAL for Severe TR Symptom and TR grade improvement 28 patients, Single arm study



тстар2025

Fam, N.P. et al. JACC intervention. 2019;12(24):2488-95



PASCAL for Severe TR Symptom and TR grade improvement 28 patients, Single arm study





Fam, N.P. et al. JACC intervention. 2019;12(24):2488-95



PASCAL for Severe TR

Meta-analysis 10 retrospective studies

A. NYHA 3 or greater

	_											
	Post-	PASCAL	. P	re-PAS	CAL		Risk Ratio			Ris	sk Ratio	
study or Subgroup	Event	ts Tot	al E	vents	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year		M-H, Ra	ndom, 95% Cl	
am 2019		3 2	26	27	28	7.2%	0.12 [0.04, 0.35]	2019		•		
Sugiura 2020		1 1	15	21	22	3.1%	0.07 [0.01, 0.46]	2020	÷			
(itamura 2021		2 2	29	27	30	5.3%	0.08 [0.02, 0.29]	2021	1			
ow 2021	1	0 4	10	44	48	13.0%	0.27 [0.16, 0.47]	2021				
wrich 2021		4	11	16	16	10.5%	0.39 [0.19, 0.81]	2021			-	
ottlander 2022		2	14	20	20	6.6%	0.17 [0.05, 0.53]	2022				
olz 2022		4	11	11	11	10.5%	0.39 [0.19, 0.82]	2022			-	
/ild 2022	6	2 18	34	211	235	17.3%	0.38 [0.31, 0.46]	2022				
aldus 2022	2	3 5	52	40	52	15.8%	0.57 [0.41, 0.81]	2022			-	
(odali 2023		7 5	56	46	65	10.8%	0.18 [0.09, 0.36]	2023				
otal (95% CI)		43	88		527	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39]			•		
Fotal (95% CI) Total events	11	43	88	463	527	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39]			•		
Total (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ²	11 = 0.19:	43 .8 Chi ² = 3	0.03	463 . df = 9	527	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70%	-		•		
Total (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6.	43 .8 Chi ² = 3 .96 (P <	0.03 0.000	463 , df = 9 001)	527) (P = 0	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70%	đ	0.01			10
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6.	43 .8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P <	38 0.03 0.000	463 , df = 9 001)	527) (P = 0	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70%	đ).01 Better p	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TER	i ER Worse post-PASC/	10 AL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect 3. 6MWD	111 = 0.19; t: Z = 6.	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P <	38 0.03 0.000	463 , df = 9 001)	527) (P = 0	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70%	đ	0.01 Better p	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TER	i 10 ER Worse post-PASC/	10 NL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect B. 6MWD	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI	0.03 0.000	463 , df = 9 001) Pre-	527) (P = 0 -PASCA	100.0% 0.0004); I	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% Mean Difference	e	.01 Better p	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TER	1 10 ER Worse post-PASC/ ean Difference	10 NL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect B. 6MWD itudy or Subgroup	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post Mean	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI SD	38 0.03, 0.000	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- Mean	527) (P = 0 -PASCA SD	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% Mean Difference IV, Random, 9	e 5% CI Y4	.01 Better p ear	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TEI Mi	1 10 ER Worse post-PASC Pan Difference tandom, 95% CI	10 NL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect B. 6MWD Study or Subgroup Tam 2019	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post <u>Mean</u> 322.9	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 5D 1 104.7	38 0.03 0.000	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- Mean 250.4	527 $P = 0$ $-PASCA$ SD 128.9	100.0% 0.0004); I L Total V 26	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% Mean Difference IV, Random, 9 8.5% 72.50 [8.67, 13	e 5% CI Y4 6.33] 20	ear	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TEI Mi IV, F	1 10 ER Worse post-PASC/ ean Difference Random, 95% CI	10 NL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect B. 6MWD Study or Subgroup Fam 2019 Sugiura 2020	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post <u>Mean</u> 322.9 223.5	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 5D - 104.7 104.1	38 0.03 0.000 Fotal 26 7	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- Mean 250.4 190.6	527 9 (P = 0 -PASCA 5D 128.9 81.2	100.0% 0.0004); I L Total V 26 7	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% <u>Wean Difference</u> 17, Random, 9 8.5% 72.50 [8.67, 13 3.6% 32.90 [-64.90, 13	e 5% CI Y4 6.33] 20 0.70] 20	ear 019 019 020	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TEI Mi IV, F	1 10 ER Worse post-PASC/ ean Difference Random, 95% CI	10 NL T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect B. 6MWD Study or Subgroup Fam 2019 Sugiura 2020 Kitamura 2021	11 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post Mean 322.9 223.5 328	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 5D 1 104.7 104.1 115	38 0.03 0.000 Fotal 26 7 23	463 , df = 9 001) Pre <u>Mean</u> 250.4 190.6 275	527 (P = 0) (P = 0) -PASCA SD 128.9 81.2 122	100.0% 0.0004); 1 L Total V 26 7 23	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% <u>Wean Difference</u> 1V, Random, 9 8.5% 72.50 [8.67, 13 3.6% 32.90 [-64.90, 13 7.4% 53.00 [-15.52, 12	e 5% CI Y4 6.33] 20 0.70] 20 1.52] 20	ear 201 Better p 19 20 221	0.1 0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TER NO. IV. F	I 10 ER Worse post-PASC/ ean Difference Random, 95% CI	L T-TEER
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect B. GMWD Study or Subgroup Sam 2019 Sugiura 2020 Kitamura 2021 .ow 2021	111 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post Mean 322.9 223.5 328 290	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 104.7 104.1 115 122	38 0.03 0.000 Fotal 26 7 23 42	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- <u>Mean</u> 250.4 190.6 275 213	527 9 (P = 0 -PASCA 5D 128.9 81.2 122 115	100.0% 0.0004); 1 L Total V 26 7 23 42	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% Mean Difference IV, Random, 9 8.5% 72.50 [8.67, 13 3.6% 32.90 [-64.90, 13 7.4% 53.00 [-15.52, 12 3.5% 77.00 [26.30, 12	e 5% CI Y 6.33] 20 0.70] 20 7.70] 20	ear	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TEI IV, f	ER Worse post-PASCA	10
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect B. 6MWD Study or Subgroup iam 2019 Sugiura 2020 Citamura 2021 Low 2021 Suldus 2022	111 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post Mean 322.9 223.5 328 290 285.5	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 5D - 104.7 104.1 115 122 105.1	0.03 0.000 Fotal 26 7 23 42 40	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- Mean 250.4 190.6 275 213 247.3	527 9 (P = 0 -PASCA 5D 128.9 81.2 122 115 105.3	100.0% 0.0004); 1 L Total V 26 7 23 42 40	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70% Mean Difference IV, Random, 9 8.5% 72.50 [8.67, 13 7.4% 53.00 [-15.52, 12 13.5% 77.00 [26.30, 12 38.20 [-7.91, 8	e 5% CI Y(6.33] 20 0.70] 20 1.52] 20 7.70] 20 4.31] 20	ear 19 19 121 122 1.01 Better p 19 120 121 122	0.1 ost-PASCAL T-TER Mi IV, F	i 10 ER Worse post-PASC/ ean Difference Random, 95% CI	10
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Fest for overall effect B. 6MWD Study or Subgroup Fam 2019 Sugiura 2020 Kitamura 2021 Saldus 2022 Mid 2022	111 = 0.19; t: Z = 6. Post Mean 322.9 223.5 328 290 285.5 303	43 8 Chi ² = 3 96 (P < -PASCAI 5D 104.7 104.1 115 122 105.1 123	0.03 0.000 Fotal 26 7 23 42 40 114	463 , df = 9 001) Pre- Mean 250.4 190.6 275 213 247.3 264	527 9 (P = 0 -PASCA 5D 128.9 81.2 122 115 105.3 115	100.0% 0.0004); 1 L Total V 26 7 23 42 40 114	0.27 [0.19, 0.39] ² = 70%	e 5% CI Y4 6.33] 20 0.70] 20 1.52] 20 7.70] 20 9.91] 20	ear 119 121 122 122 122	0.1 0st-PASCAL T-TER IV, F	an Difference Random, 95% CI	10 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

 Total (95% Cl)
 303
 317
 100.0%
 50.96 [32.34, 69.59]

 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 2.65, df = 6 (P = 0.85); l² = 0%
 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.36 (P < 0.00001)</td>
 -100 -50 50 100

 Worse post-PASCAL T-TEER
 Better post-PASCAL T-TEER
 Better post-PASCAL T-TEER
 Better post-PASCAL T-TEER
 Better post-PASCAL T-TEER

C. Severe TR or greater

	Post-PA	SCAL	Pre-PA	SCAL	Risk Ratio				Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl	
Fam 2019	4	26	28	28	9.7%	0.17 [0.07, 0.39]	2019				
Sugiura 2020	11	22	22	22	15.2%	0.51 [0.34, 0.77]	2020				
Kitamura 2021	5	28	28	28	10.7%	0.19 [0.09, 0.41]	2021				
Low 2021	2	42	48	48	6.5%	0.06 [0.02, 0.20]	2021	-			
Aurich 2021	1	11	16	16	4.8%	0.13 [0.03, 0.58]	2021	(-	· · ·		
Baldus 2022	4	40	44	54	8.7%	0.12 [0.05, 0.31]	2022				
Rottlander 2022	1	14	20	20	4.7%	0.10 [0.02, 0.47]	2022		• • • • •		
Volz 2022	2	11	11	11	7.2%	0.22 [0.07, 0.66]	2022		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Wild 2022	48	231	213	233	17.2%	0.23 [0.18, 0.29]	2022				
Kodali 2023	17	56	63	65	15.4%	0.31 [0.21, 0.47]	2023				
Total (95% CI)		481		525	100.0%	0.21 [0.14, 0.31]			•		
Total events	95		493								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.20; Ch	$i^2 = 28.$	27. df =	9 (P = 0)	0.0009); 1	$^{2} = 68\%$		-		1	-
Test for overall effect	Z = 8.08	(P < 0.	00001)					0.02	U.1		50
									Better post-PASCAL I-TEEK	worse post-PASCAL I-IEEK	



O. Badwan et al. International Journal of Cardiology. 2023



1-year outcomes of Transcatheter Tricuspid valve repair



The PASCAL system (Edwards Lifesciences) includes the PASCAL and PASCAL Ace implants. Significant frucispid regurgitation (TR) reduction and improved clinical, functional, and quality of life at 1 year with the PASCAL system. Graphs show unpaired data. *Cardiovascular Research Foundation. ^bWilcoxon signed rank test. *Paired Student's t-test. KCCQ = Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; NYHA = New York Heart Association.

TABLE 3 CEC-Adjudicated and Other Events at 30 Days and 1 Year						
	30 Days (n = 65)	1 Year (n = 65)				
CEC-adjudicated MAEs						
Cardiovascular mortality	2 (3.1)	5 (7.7)				
Myocardial infarction	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)				
Stroke	1 (1.5)	3 (4.6)				
Renal complications requiring unplanned dialysis or renal replacement therapy	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)				
Severe bleeding ^a	5 (7.7)	6 (9.2)				
Unplanned or emergency reintervention related to the device	0 (0.0)	1 (1.5)				
Major access site and vascular complications requiring intervention	2 (3.1)	2 (3.1)				
Composite MAE	6 (9.2)	11 (16.9)				
Other events						
All-cause mortality	2 (3.1)	7(10.8)				
Heart failure hospitalization	0 (0.0)	12 (18.5)				
SLDA ^b	3 (4.6)	3 (4.6)				

Values are n (%). ^aSevere bleeding is defined as major, extensive, life-threatening, or fatal bleeding according to Mitral Valve Academic Research Consortium criteria. ^bCore laboratory: Cardiovascular Research Foundation.

CEC = clinical events committee; MAE = major adverse event; SLDA = single-leaflet device attachment.

³⁶СТАР2025

Kodali et al 1-Year Results of the CLASP-TR Study. JACC Vol.81, NO.18.2023.MAY,2023;1766-1776



1-year outcomes of Transcatheter Tricuspid valve repair



Kodali et al 1-Year Results of the CLASP-TR Study. JACC Vol.81, NO.18.2023.MAY, 2023; 1766-1776



1-year outcomes of Transcatheter Tricuspid valve repair



First 34 Patients and Last 31 Patients refer to when patients were treated among the 65 total patients enrolled and are significantly different between subgroups. The *P* value was determined on the basis of the Fisher exact test.

TABLE 5 Paired Echocardiographic Parameters, Baseline to 1 Year	r			
	n	Baseline	1 Year	P Value ^a
2D PISA EROA, cm ²	23	0.7 ± 0.3	0.3 ± 0.1	<0.001
PISA regurgitant volume, mL	23	53.3 ± 16.7	$\textbf{22.6} \pm \textbf{11.0}$	<0.001
Mean TR vena contracta width 2D, cm	33	1.4 ± 0.4	0.5 ± 0.2	<0.001
Tricuspid annulus diameter (end-diastole, apical 4-chamber), cm	36	$\textbf{4.5} \pm \textbf{0.8}$	4.0 ± 0.6	<0.001
CO (LVOT stroke volume × heart rate), L/min	32	4.5 ± 1.2	$\textbf{4.4} \pm \textbf{1.1}$	0.810
LVOT Doppler stroke volume, mL	32	59.6 ± 14.7	61.9 ± 14.4	0.292
Left ventricular stroke volume index (LVSV/BSA), mL/m ²	22	$\textbf{33.3} \pm \textbf{8.5}$	$\textbf{34.5} \pm \textbf{8.4}$	0.385
LVEF, Simpson's method, %	36	56.5 ± 7.1	$\textbf{56.0} \pm \textbf{8.1}$	0.644
RV end-diastolic diameter (mid) (4-chamber), cm	36	$\textbf{4.0} \pm \textbf{0.9}$	$\textbf{3.5} \pm \textbf{0.7}$	<0.001
RV FAC, %	29	$\textbf{36.9} \pm \textbf{9.4}$	$\textbf{36.0} \pm \textbf{8.3}$	0.531
RA volume (single-plane Simpson) (4-chamber), mL	34	148.9 ± 81.7	$\textbf{130.6} \pm \textbf{63.9}$	0.013
RV TAPSE, cm	36	1.4 ± 0.4	$\textbf{1.4} \pm \textbf{0.3}$	0.658
IVC diameter, cm	29	$\textbf{2.5} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	$\textbf{2.1}\pm\textbf{0.6}$	0.002
TR peak velocity, cm/s	36	256.6 ± 41.9	$\textbf{254.5} \pm \textbf{60.7}$	0.843
TR jet area (maximum), cm ²	22	15.1 ± 5.0	$\textbf{6.9} \pm \textbf{3.6}$	<0.001
TV diastolic mean gradient, mm Hg	34	1.3 ± 0.5	2.1 ± 1.5	<0.001

Values are paired mean \pm SD unless otherwise indicated. ^aP values calculated by Student's t-test for paired analysis.

BSA = body surface area; CO = cardiac output; EROA = effective regurgitant orifice area; FAC = fractional area change; IVC = inferior vena cava; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; LVOT = left ventricular outflow tract; LVSV = left ventricular stroke volume; PISA = proximal isovelocity surface area; RA = right atrial; RV = right ventricular; TAPSE = tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion; TR = tricuspid regurgitation; TV = tricuspid valve; 2D = 2-dimensional.





TRI-FR trial

 T-TEER with the TriClip system plus OMT vs OMT alone in patients with severe, symptomatic tricuspid regurgitation





JAMA January 14, 2025 Volume 333, Number 2



TRI-FR trial

T-TEER + OMT reduces tricuspid regurgitation severity and improves the composite clinical outcome comprising NYHA class, PGA, and major cardiovascular events at 12 months



JAMA January 14, 2025 Volume 333, Number 2





Evidence of Direct Annuloplasty for Severe TR





Cardioband (Edwards Lifesciences)



(A) Anchor deployment through implant to the tissue. (B) Adjustment of implant. Image provided by Edwards Lifesciences.





6-Month Outcomes of Cardioband for Severe TR

30 patients, Single arm study, Multicenter, Prospective trial

Baseline Characteristics	N = 30
Age	75.2 ± 6.6
Female	22 (73.3%)
EuroSCORE II	4.1 ± 2.8
STS score	2.6 ± 1.6
NYHA III or IV	25 (83.3%)
Functional TR, %	30 (100%)
Hypertension	24 (80.0%)
Elevated pulmonary pressure (> 30mmHg)	15 (50.0%)
Atrial fibrillation / flutter	28 (93.3%)
Congestive HF	17 (56.7%)
Prior implanted cardiac device	4 (13.3%)
Prior stroke/TIA	5 (16.7%)
Coronary artery disease	11 (36.7%)
Chronic renal disease	16 (53.3%)





6-Month Outcomes of Cardioband for Severe TR

30 patients, Single arm study, Multicenter, Prospective trial

Procedural characteristics	N = 30		
In-hospital death	1		
Length of stay in hospital, days	8.5 ± 5.6		
Length of stay in ICU, days	2.0 ± 1.8		
Procedure time, min	254.5 ± 92.8		
Implant size, mm (89-96)	2		
Implant size, mm (97-104)	4		
Implant size, mm (105-112)	6		
Implant size, mm (113-120)	18		
Adjudicated 30-day events, n			
Death	4 (13.23%)		
Stroke	1		
Myocardial infarction	0		
Bleeding complications	4		
Coronary complications	3		
Device-related cardiac surgery	0		
Renal failure	1		
Conduction system disturbance	1		





6-Month Outcomes of Cardioband for Severe TR 30 patients, Single arm study, Multicenter, Prospective trial







6-Month Outcomes of Cardioband for Severe TR 30 patients, Single arm study, Multicenter, Prospective trial





Nickenig. et al. JACC. 2019;73:1905-15

Evidence of Catheter-based Valve Replacement for Severe TR





Transcatheter Tricuspid Valve Replacement







TRISCEND II Trial



N ENGL J MED 392;2 NEJM.ORG JANUARY 9, 2025





TRISCEND II Trial

	Valve Replacement	34,447 Patient Pairs	Control
	(N=259)	Ties	(N=133)
	Valve replacement wins	% (no. of pairs)	Control wins
Death from Any Cause	14.8	72.7	12.5
(site reported and vital status sweep)	(5,100)	(25,050)	(4,297)
	V	•	•
Right Ventricular Assist Device or Heart Transplant (clinical events committee adjudicated)	0	72.7 (25,050)	0
	V	•	•
Tricuspid-Valve Intervention	3.2	68.9	0.6
(clinical events committee adjudicated)	(1,105)	(23,731)	(214)
	V		•
Annualized Rate of Hospitalization for Heart Failure	9.7	49.2	10.0
(clinical events committee adjudicated)	(3,340)	(16,952)	(3,439)
	V	—	•
KCCQ-OS Improvement	23.1	20.1	6.0
(Δ score ≥10 points)	(7,959)	(6,927)	(2,066)
	V	•	•
NYHA Improvement	10.2	9.1	0.8
(Δ ≥1 class)	(3,502)	(3,148)	(277)
	V	v	•
6-Minute Walk Distance Improvement	1.1	7.1	0.9
(Δ ≥30 m)	(391)	(2,459)	(298)
	62.1 (21,397)		30.7 (10,591)
	Win r	atio=2.02 (95% CI, 1.56-2	62)
	Fink	elstein-Schoenfeld: P<0.0	01





тстар2025

N ENGL J MED 392;2 NEJM.ORG JANUARY 9, 2025



TRISCEND II Trial



Table 2. Safety Outcomes.*							
Safety Event	Early Events (≤30 Days)†		Late Ev (31 to 365	′ents Days)∷	Cumulativ (0 to 365	P Value∬	
	Valve Replacement (N=259)	Control (N=133)	Valve Replacement (N=247)	Control (N=128)	Valve Replacement (N=259)	Control (N=133)	
			number of pati	ients (percent)			
Death from any cause	9 (3.5)	0	21 (8.5)	14 (10.9)	30 (11.6)	14 (10.5)	0.87
Death from cardiovascular cause	8 (3.1)	0	14 (5.7)	10 (7.8)	22 (8.5)	10 (7.5)	0.85
Myocardial infarction	2 (0.8)	0	3 (1.2)	1 (0.8)	5 (1.9)	1 (0.8)	0.67
Stroke	1 (0.4)	0	3 (1.2)	0	4 (1.5)	0	0.30
New renal-replacement therapy∥	4 (1.5)	NA	4 (1.6)	NA	8 (3.1)	NA	NA
Severe bleeding**	27 (10.4)	2 (1.5)	13 (5.3)	6 (4.7)	40 (15.4)	7 (5.3)	0.003
Nonelective tricuspid-valve reintervention††	2 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	0	3 (2.3)	2 (0.8)	4 (3.0)	0.19
Major access-site and vascular complication	8 (3.1)	NA	0	NA	8 (3.1)	NA	NA
Major cardiac structural complication	3 (1.2)	NA	0	NA	3 (1.2)	NA	NA
Device-related pulmonary embolism	2 (0.8)	NA	1 (0.4)	NA	2 (0.8)	NA	NA
Arrhythmia and conduction disorder resulting in permanent pacing	41 (15.8)	0	5 (2.0)	3 (2.3)	46 (17.8)	3 (2.3)	<0.001
New pacemaker or cardiac implantable electronic device‡‡							
In all patients	40 (15.4)	0	5 (2.0)	3 (2.3)	45 (17.4)	3 (2.3)	< 0.001
In patients without pre- existing pacemaker∬	40/162 (24.7)	0/80	5/118 (4.2)¶¶	3/76 (3.9)¶¶	45/162 (27.8)	3/80 (3.8)	<0.001

тстар2025

N ENGL J MED 392;2 NEJM.ORG JANUARY 9, 2025



Interventional Valve Implantion in Caval position (CAVI) for Severe TR First-in-Human application

Hemodynamic parameters	Before implantation	After implantation
HR, (bpm)	60	60
RA pressure, (mmHg)	28/10	38/13
IVC pressure, (mmHg)	29/19	19/12
TV annulus (mm)	46	46 (after 8 wks)
TAPSE (mm)	16	15 (after 8 wks)
TASV (cm/s)	6.3	6.8 (after 8 wks)







Interventional Valve Implantion in Caval position (CAVI) for Severe TR First-in-Human application







A. Lauten et al. EHJ. 2011;32:1207-1213

Novel Vertical Spacer for Tricuspid Regurgitation





Novel vertical spacer for TR

ORIGINAL RESEARCH - PRECLINICAL

A Novel Device for Tricuspid Regurgitation Reduction Featuring 3-Dimensional Leaflet and Atraumatic Anchor

Pivot-TR System

Min-Ku Chon, MD,^a Seung-Whan Lee, MD,^b Joo-Yong Hahn, MD,^c Yong-Hyun Park, MD,^a Hyun-Sook Kim, MD,^d Sang-Hyun Lee, MD,^a Dong-Hoon Shin, MD,^e Pil Hyung Lee, MD,^b Eun Kyoung Kim, MD,^c Jae-Hwan Lee, MD,^f Jae-Hyeong Park, MD,^g Young Jin Choi, MD,^h Markus Reinthaler, MD,ⁱ Fabian Barbieri, MD,ⁱ Jai-Wun Park, MD,^j Junhui Park, PHD,^j June-Hong Kim, MD^a

Chon. et al. JACC Basic to Translational Science. 2022;7(12):1249-1261



Novel vertical spacer for TR





Chon. et al. JACC Basic to Translational Science. 2022;7(12):1249-1261

Thank you for your attention!



