Dobutamine-Stress Echocardiography as a Predictor of Cardiac Function after Surgery for Aortic Valve Regurgitation with Poor Function

Ahmad AbdelAleem ElDerie*, Mohammed Sanad1, Hatem Beshir2, Mohammed Adel3, Amr AboElfotoh4, Gehad Awad1

1Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, 2Department of Anesthesia, Faculty of Medicine, Mansoura University, Egypt. 3Department of Cardiothoracic surgery, Amreya General Hospital, Egyptian Ministry of Health, Alexandria, Egypt. 4Department of Cardiology and Angiology, National Heart Institute, Cairo, Egypt.

*Corresponding author: Ahmad AbdelAleem ElDerie, Mobile: (+2)01026626923, Email: ahmadelderie@mans.edu.eg, ORCID: 0000-0001-6111-0439

ABSTRACT

Background: Patients with aortic valve regurgitation (AR) present at a late stage with impaired function. Some may not show improved function after surgery.

Aim of the work: To evaluate the functional outcome in patients with and without poor left ventricular (LV) function and to evaluate the role of dobutamine echocardiography in predicting persistent dysfunction after surgery.

Patients and Methods: Patients with severe AR (71) who underwent valve replacement (AVR) were divided into 2 groups based on the ejection fraction (EF); Group I: patients with EF <50% and Group II: patients with EF >50%. Group I was subdivided into 2 subgroups according to the response to dobutamine-stress echocardiography (DSE): Group Ia: patients whose EF increased to >50%, and Group Ib: patients whose EF remained <50%. Six months postoperatively, echocardiography was performed to assess the cardiac function and volumes.

Results: Seventy one patients were included in the study: 39(54.9%) in Group I, 32(45.1%) in Group II, 21(29.6%) in Group Ia and 18(25.4%) in Group Ib. Preoperative criteria was not significantly different between the 2 groups apart from the intensive care unit (ICU) stay which was longer in group I (p = 0.006). In group Ia, EF raised on DSE (p < 0.001) and after surgery (p < 0.001). In group II, EF showed significant change on DSE (p < 0.001), but not after surgery (p = 0.203).

Conclusions: Preoperative DSE can predict improvement of LV function after AVR in cases with severe AR with ventricular dysfunction.
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INTRODUCTION

Aortic valve regurgitation (AR) is associated with left ventricular volume overload, which may lead eventually to severe dilatation of the left ventricle, which is usually associated with changes at the cellular level in the form of myocardial fibrosis and contractile dysfunction[6]. Nuclear studies have revealed the presence of perfusion defects in cases with left ventricular dysfunction due to decreased coronary perfusion pressure, which is correlated well with the results of DSE test[2,3].

The resulting dysfunction may persist after surgical correction of the valvular pathology. Hence, patients with chronic valvular lesions must be carefully assessed before surgery to predict such persistent dysfunction[6].

It is reported that all cases who had their aortic valve replaced for regurgitation with good ventricular function showed good prognosis at a 10-year follow-up, while patients with ejection fraction below 30% showed persistent ventricular dysfunction after surgery[5,6].

Symptoms do not necessarily reflect the degree of ventricular dysfunction. Patients with more manifesting symptoms (> Class II New York Heart Association (NYHA)) may show normal ventricular function, and on the other hand, ventricular function may be significantly impaired in patients with milder symptoms (< NYHA class II)[7].

It is reported that preoperative left ventricular end-systolic volume (ESV) and dimensions are independent predictors for persistent dysfunction after operation. It would be more useful to depend on preoperative systolic wall stress and ejection fraction to predict ventricular dysfunction after surgery[8].

This study aims to compare between the 6-month functional outcomes after aortic valve replacement in cases with and without poor ventricular function. Also, to evaluate the role of dobutamine echocardiography in predicting persistent dysfunction after surgery.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

This is a prospective comparative study that included cases with severe aortic regurgitation who underwent aortic valve replacement at Cardiothoracic Surgery Department at Mansoura University during the period from December 2017 to December 2019. All patients with severe aortic regurgitation who underwent aortic valve replacement were included in the study. Patients with less than severe AR, ischemic heart disease, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, ventricular arrhythmia, or dobutamine hypersensitivity were excluded from the study.

A total of 71 patients were included in the study. Patients were divided into 2 groups based on the preoperative LV ejection fraction (LVEF): Group (I)
included patients with EF <50% and Group (II) included patients with EF >50%. Group I was subjected to Dobutamine-stress echocardiography and was further subdivided into two subgroups; group Ia included patients whose EF improved to >50%, and group Ib included whose EF was still <50% (little or no improvement). Six months after surgery, echocardiography was performed to assess the changes of the cardiac function.

Dobutamine-stress echocardiography

The test was conducted in a left lateral position with ECG monitored and recorded. Then, dobutamine was infused at an initial dose of 5 mcg/kg/min increased every 3 min to 10 mcg/kg/min, then to 15 mcg/kg/min then to 20 mcg/kg/min. Echocardiographic measurements were obtained at this stage.

The surgical technique

All cases were performed by the same surgical team using the standard procedure. On supine position, general anesthesia was induced, central intravascular lines were placed followed by median sternotomy and heparin was given at a dose of 3 mg/kg body weight targeting Activated Clotting Time (ACT) more than 400 seconds then cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) was initiated.

After cooling down to 32°C, aortic cross clamping was placed followed by oblique incomplete aortotomy of the ascending aorta, then cardioplegia was infused sequentially into both coronary arteries at a total dose of 20 ml/kg. The native aortic valve was resected, and the prosthetic valve was implanted and fixed down by interrupted mattress sutures

Removal of the aortic clamping was done after closure of the aortotomy incision and careful de-airing. Patient was then rewarmed and weaned off CPB. Wound was then closed in layers after placing the necessary drains.

Ethical Consideration

This work was carried out following The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki) for studies involving humans and has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Faculty of Medicine, Mansoura University, Egypt. All patients provided informed written consents before enrollment. The study was conducted after approval of the IRB of and patients provided consents.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were expressed as numbers and percentages were used to express categorical variables, while mean and median were used to express continuous variables. Paired (t) test, Chi square and independent t-test were used to compare variables. P value of 0.05 or less was required to be considered significant. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS release 22, Chicago, IL) was used for the analysis.

RESULTS

A total of 71 patients were included in the study: 39 patients in group I (54.9%) and 32 patients in group II (45.1%). Group Ia included 21 patients (29.6%) and group Ib included 18 patients (25.4%).

Table (1): Comparison of group I and group II regarding demographic characteristics and operative details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group I (n=39)</th>
<th>Group II (n=32)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Year)</td>
<td>34.59 ± 7.184</td>
<td>33.53 ± 8.621</td>
<td>0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32 (82.1%)</td>
<td>22 (68.8%)</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7 (17.9%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>22 (56.4%)</td>
<td>24 (75.0%)</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17 (43.6%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>2 (5.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrotic ring</td>
<td>26 (66.7%)</td>
<td>18 (56.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild calcification</td>
<td>12 (30.8%)</td>
<td>13 (40.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe calcification</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 mm</td>
<td>10 (25.6%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 mm</td>
<td>11 (28.2%)</td>
<td>13 (40.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mm</td>
<td>14 (35.9%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 mm</td>
<td>4 (10.3%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass time (min)</td>
<td>50.13 ± 14.577</td>
<td>51.09 ± 13.839</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross clamp time (min)</td>
<td>39.62 ± 14.929</td>
<td>40.47 ± 14.445</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation time (hour)</td>
<td>9.46 ± 3.755</td>
<td>10.81 ± 3.297</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU stay (hour)</td>
<td>49.54 ± 14.871</td>
<td>40.50 ± 10.884</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age of the patients was 34.59 and 33.53 years in groups I and II respectively. Males represented 82.1% and 68.8% of cases in both groups respectively. The rest of the demographic and operative data were not significantly different between the two groups apart from the duration of the ICU stay, which was significantly prolonged in the first group (49.54 vs 40.50 hours for group II, p = 0.006). These data are illustrated at Table (1). Table (2) compares echocardiographic parameters between the groups I and II.

Table (2): Comparison of group I and group II regarding studied ECHO parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group I (n = 39)</th>
<th>Group II (n = 32)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>120.85 ± 35.220</td>
<td>57.31 ± 16.009</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>196.49 ± 56.433</td>
<td>143.09 ± 47.836</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>40.64 ± 6.276</td>
<td>60.81 ± 6.698</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVi</td>
<td>50.33 ± 7.318</td>
<td>74.34 ± 4.539</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dobutamine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>103.51 ± 40.380</td>
<td>61.50 ± 17.126</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>194.46 ± 52.225</td>
<td>149.19 ± 50.269</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>52.05 ± 8.482</td>
<td>65.38 ± 7.504</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVi</td>
<td>62.79 ± 6.388</td>
<td>81.75 ± 4.412</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postoperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>72.03 ± 28.521</td>
<td>33.66 ± 10.748</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>125.23 ± 39.267</td>
<td>72.47 ± 26.349</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>46.41 ± 8.958</td>
<td>61.56 ± 6.420</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVi</td>
<td>41.95 ± 5.568</td>
<td>38.84 ± 3.693</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESVi: indexed end-systolic volume, EDVi: indexed end-diastolic volume, EF: ejection fraction, SV: Stroke volume

In group I, when comparing dobutamine to rest echocardiography findings, both EF and SV showed a significant increase, EDVi did not show a significant change. After surgery, all echocardiographic parameters decreased significantly compared to rest values but in favor of a significant increase of EF (p < 0.001). In group II, EF was not significantly changed (p = 0.128) after surgery. Table (3) illustrates these data.

Table (3): Within-group comparison of the echocardiographic parameters of dobutamine-stress and postoperative values compared to resting values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group I (n = 39)</th>
<th>Group II (n = 32)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dobutamine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>103.51 ± 40.380</td>
<td>61.50 ± 17.126</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>194.46 ± 52.225</td>
<td>149.19 ± 50.269</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>52.05 ± 8.482</td>
<td>65.38 ± 7.504</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVi</td>
<td>62.79 ± 6.388</td>
<td>81.75 ± 4.412</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postoperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>72.03 ± 28.521</td>
<td>33.66 ± 10.748</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>125.23 ± 39.267</td>
<td>72.47 ± 26.349</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>46.41 ± 8.958</td>
<td>61.56 ± 6.420</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVi</td>
<td>41.95 ± 5.568</td>
<td>38.84 ± 3.693</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESVi: indexed end-systolic volume, EDVi: indexed end-diastolic volume, EF: ejection fraction, SV: Stroke volume
When group I was subdivided into two subgroups, no significant difference was detected between the two subgroups regarding demographic or operative characteristics. Table (4) compares the different echocardiographic parameters between groups Ia and Ib.

Table (4): Comparison of group Ia and group Ib regarding studied ECHO parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group Ia (n = 21)</th>
<th>Group Ib (n = 18)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>102.81 ± 31.152</td>
<td>141.89 ± 27.574</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>164.14 ± 43.548</td>
<td>234.22 ± 45.691</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>42.81 ± 5.335</td>
<td>38.11 ± 6.480</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>40.14 ± 3.762</td>
<td>63.56 ± 5.375</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dobutamine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>87.52 ± 45.236</td>
<td>122.17 ± 23.520</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>161.90 ± 45.149</td>
<td>225.44 ± 42.555</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>57.14 ± 6.872</td>
<td>40.44 ± 8.926</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>68.19 ± 5.643</td>
<td>66.33 ± 3.235</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-operative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>95.10 ± 16.568</td>
<td>131.28 ± 20.790</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>100.71 ± 29.355</td>
<td>153.83 ± 28.706</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>51.57 ± 6.867</td>
<td>40.39 ± 7.253</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>41.67 ± 4.844</td>
<td>42.44 ± 5.039</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is expressed as mean and standard deviation. 95% CI: 95% confidence interval of the mean difference between both groups. P is significant when < 0.05.

Table (5): Within-subject comparison of group Ia and group Ib regarding studied ECHO parameters compared to resting value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Ia (n = 21)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dobutamine</strong></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>87.52 ± 45.236</td>
<td>102.81 ± 31.152</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>161.90 ± 45.149</td>
<td>164.14 ± 43.548</td>
<td>0.0762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>57.14 ± 6.872</td>
<td>42.81 ± 5.335</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>68.19 ± 5.643</td>
<td>40.14 ± 3.762</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postoperative</strong></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>95.10 ± 16.568</td>
<td>102.81 ± 31.152</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>100.71 ± 29.355</td>
<td>164.14 ± 43.548</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>51.57 ± 6.867</td>
<td>42.81 ± 5.335</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>41.67 ± 4.844</td>
<td>40.14 ± 3.762</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Ib (n = 18)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dobutamine</strong></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>122.17 ± 23.520</td>
<td>141.89 ± 27.574</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>225.44 ± 42.555</td>
<td>234.22 ± 45.691</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>41.44 ± 8.926</td>
<td>38.11 ± 6.480</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>66.33 ± 3.235</td>
<td>63.56 ± 5.375</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postoperative</strong></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESVi</td>
<td>131.28 ± 20.790</td>
<td>141.89 ± 27.574</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDVi</td>
<td>153.83 ± 28.706</td>
<td>234.22 ± 45.691</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>40.39 ± 7.253</td>
<td>38.11 ± 6.480</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svi</td>
<td>67.42 ± 5.039</td>
<td>63.56 ± 5.375</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In group Ia, dobutamine echocardiographic findings showed an insignificant change compared to the rest values except for iEDV (p = 0.0762). After surgery, all echo parameters changed significantly apart from the SV (p = 0.430). In group Ib, dobutamine-stress readings significantly changed compared to the rest values, apart from EF and Svi (p = 0.128, p = 0.094 respectively). After operation, ESVi and EDVi were reduced significantly compared to the rest values, while EF and Svi did not show significant changes (p = 0.110, p = 0.081 respectively). Table (5) illustrates these data.
DISCUSSION

Chronic regurgitation of the aortic valve is naturally characterized by prolonged reservation of the systolic function of the LV, progression of asymptomatic patients with severe degree of regurgitation to valve replacement is estimated to be 3% annually. Replacement or repair of the aortic valve would reverse the myocardial dysfunction in its early stage. Surgery is performed in symptomatic patients with moderate/severe aortic regurgitation, or asymptomatic patients with myocardial dysfunction. Detection of residual myocardial reserve in this subgroup of patients is important in predicting the postoperative outcome. The excessive preload reduction after valve replacement in aortic regurgitation explains the improved ventricular function in early and late follow-up.

Practically, dobutamine improves the systolic function of the myocardium due to enhanced contractility which explains the decrease of the ESV, however, dobutamine may have a lesser effect on the EDV that may be attributed to the increased heart rate, which shortens the diastolic time and hence the regurgitant volume and as a sequence of reduced ESV as well. Cardiac stress testing can unmask the myocardial dysfunction in asymptomatic patients and assess the degree of reversibility of this dysfunction, which has a significant mortality benefit from early intervention compared to delayed surgery.

Dobutamine-stress echocardiography is now widely available, cheap, safe and easily applicable, and at the same time is more preferred to the exercise-stress test since it avoids the pulmonary and physical limitations. It was also reported that DSE was able to reduce both ESV and EDV for >25% which was not achieved in the physical exercise testing.

Many parameters were investigated in order to predict the postoperative systolic function in patients with severe aortic regurgitation. Gouda et al. used the early diastolic driving force (DF), global longitudinal strain (GLS) and ejection fraction (EF) parameters in their study, which revealed strong relation to the postoperative function, however, they stated that LVEF would be inaccurate in detecting the subtle changes in myocardial function since it is augmented by the degree of EDV.

In our study, mean EDVi dropped after replacement of the aortic valve significantly decreased from 196.5 to 125.2 ml/m² for group I, and from 143.1 to 72.5 ml/m² (p < 0.001 for both groups), with statistically significant improvement of EF for group I (46.41 ± 8.96 to 40.64 ± 6.28, p = < 0.001), but not for group II (61.56 ± 6.42 to 60.81 ± 6.69, p = 0.128) since this group had already better LV function before surgery. Bonov et al. reported significant reduction of the EDV and wall stress, and improvement of EF between preoperative and early postoperative readings (p < 0.001), but only EF continued to show improvement between early and late postoperative follow-up which may be attributed to insidious improvement of ESV over time.

Our results showed that group Ia, which demonstrated improved LV EF on dobutamine-stress test (p < 0.001), also showed a statistically significant increase of the EF between the preoperative and postoperative readings (p < 0.001), while group Ib did not show a significant change of EF for either dobutamine-stress (p = 0.128) or postoperative (p = 0.102) readings compared to the preoperative data. Similar findings were reported by Abo El-Fotoh et al. who stated that dobutamine-stress testing is a good predictor of postoperative LV function in this group of patients.

Espinola-Zavaleta et al. studied a total of 11 patients with aortic regurgitation and decreased systolic function. Although dobutamine caused a significant elevation of EF from 37 ± 9 up to 43 ± 12%, both systolic wall stress and systolic pulmonary pressure did not show significant changes. One patient who showed no response to dobutamine test had passed away. It was concluded that in cases with aortic regurgitation and decreased EF, dobutamine-stress echocardiography is a good indicator for the contractile reserve.

El-Fiky et al. reported that EF was significantly increased in the group with better systolic response to dobutamine-stress test (62.43 vs. 8% increase in the other group, p = 0.001). Moreover, ESV showed a more significant improvement in the same group (43 vs. 29% decrease in group Ib, p = 0.036). However, EDV changes did not differ significantly between the two groups (p > 0.05).

Tam et al. stated that dobutamine-stress EF before operation is highly predictive of postoperative EF, which predicts the clinical outcome of patients following aortic valve replacement for aortic regurgitation. They also reported that dobutamine-stress echocardiography high-lightens the small changes in LV size and function between cases with and without complete recovery after valve replacement which may predict the LV function behavior after surgery.

Barbosa et al. investigated the relation between the preoperative EF to the postoperative events, death or need for surgery, in patients with severe aortic regurgitation, the authors stated that percent of increase in EF on low-dobutamine doses did not correlate with the postoperative events. We did not have mortality in our group of patients, so we could not correlate death to any preoperative parameter.

CONCLUSIONS

Preoperative dobutamine-stress echocardiography is a significant predictor for left ventricular systolic function after aortic valve replacement in cases with severe aortic valve regurgitation associated with left ventricular dysfunction.
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