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Cardiovascular Implantable Electronic Device (CIED)

- CIED
  - Permanent Pacemaker (PPM)
  - Implantable Cardioverter-Defibrillator (ICD)
  - Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy (CRT)
CIED Leads & AV Access

1. Are transvenous CIED leads really that bad?
   – Central vein stenosis or occlusion
   – Infection

2. Are epicardial leads really the answer?
   – Evidence
   – Alternatives
CIED Leads & AV Access

- Hemodialysis as “Palliative” Therapy for ESRD in Patients with Cardiovascular Disease
  - Myocardial Infarction
  - CHF
  - ICD
Two-year cumulative probability of death in dialysis patients following an AMI
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Period prevalent dialysis patients with first AMI in the year, unadjusted.
Cumulative incidence of death or CVD hospitalization in ESRD patients following diagnosis of CHF, 2007–2010
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January 1 point prevalent ESRD patients with Medicare Parts A, B, & D enrollment, with a first diagnosis of CHF in 2007.
All-cause survival following implantation of first ICD/CRT-D, by modality, 1999–2010
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Dialysis & transplant patients receiving their first ICDs/CRT-Ds in 1999–2010.
## Colon Cancer 5-year Survival by Stage at Diagnosis*: 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage at Diagnosis</th>
<th>5-year Survival (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0-I-II Localized</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III Regional</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV Metastatic</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nephrology Associates Hemodialysis
Patient Access & CIED Study

• Survey of CIED in prevalent HD patients
  – 1235 patients receiving HD Q1 (Jan-Mar) 2011
  – CIED present in 129 patients (10.5%)
    • 54 Pacemakers (4.4%)
    • 75 ICD (6.1%)
      – Primary Prevention 42
      – Secondary Prevention 14
      – Undetermined 19
  – All Subclavian or cephalic
    • No jugular, femoral, epicardial

• Patients
  – Mean age 70.3
  – 80 Male, 49 Female

• Access Type
  – AV Fistula 76 (59%)
  – AV Graft 37 (29%)
  – Venous catheter 16 (12%)
Nephrology Associates Hemodialysis Patient Access & CIED Study

1235 prevalent chronic HD patients Q1 2011

129 with CIED (10.5%)
- 75 ICD (6.1%)
- 54 Pacemaker (4.4%)

113 AV Access

16 with venous catheter

66 contralateral AVA & CIED

47 ipsilateral AVA & CIED

137 distinct AVA-CIED instances over lifetime on dialysis

78 instances contralateral AVA & CIED

59 instances ipsilateral AVA & CIED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Contralateral</th>
<th>Ipsilateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIED left-sided</td>
<td>101 (74%)</td>
<td>45 (58%)</td>
<td>56 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIED right-sided</td>
<td>36 (26%)</td>
<td>33 (42%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIED prior to AV Access</td>
<td>82 (60%)</td>
<td>34 (44%)</td>
<td>48 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Access prior to CIED</td>
<td>54 (39%)</td>
<td>44 (56%)</td>
<td>10 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Access Circuit Interventions (Rate per AY)</td>
<td>506 (1.48)</td>
<td>261 (1.44†)</td>
<td>245 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Venous Interventions (Rate per AY)</td>
<td>145 (0.43)</td>
<td>50 (0.28*)</td>
<td>95 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions for superior vena cava stenosis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†P=0.26 versus Ipsilateral Access Circuit Interventions
*P<0.0001 versus Ipsilateral Central Venous Interventions
Ipsilateral CIED-AVA

- 59 instances
  - 34 (58%) with NO clinically evident venous hypertension and NO central venous interventions
  - 20 required <2 interventions per access-year
  - 5 required >2 interventions per access-year
- 6 resulted in loss of AV access due to intractable venous hypertension
  - Ligation of ipsilateral AVA
  - Creation of contralateral AVA
SCV Stenosis: Non-Problem
CIED Leads & AV Access

- Are transvenous CIED leads really that bad?
- NO
Nephrology Associates HD Patient CIED Study: Indications for ICD

- ESRD Patients with ICD: 75/1235 (6.1%)
  - Primary Prevention: 42 (56%)
  - Secondary Prevention: 14 (19%)
  - Unable to Determine: 19 (25%)
Poor Outcomes in Patients with CKD Treated with ICD for Primary Prevention

Cuculich, et al: Poor Prognosis for Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease Despite ICD Therapy for the Primary Prevention of Sudden Death. PACE 2007
Cumulative number & percent of dialysis patients receiving ICDs/CRT-Ds

All-cause survival in dialysis patients using first wearable cardioverter defibrillator (WCD), 2005–2010
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CIED Leads & AV Access

• Are epicardial leads safe & effective for PPM or ICD therapy in patients with CKD or ESRD?
  – Probably
    All major studies of ICD therapy have excluded patients with advanced CKD or ESRD
  – Very limited case reports & series describing epicardial leads in ESRD patients
    • Asif et al:
      – 9 patients with infected transvenous CIED leads
      – Leads removed by laser extraction & replaced with epicardial leads
      – No complications reported
    • Lacking larger comparative study, outcomes, complications

Asif et al., Epicardial Cardiac Rhythm Devices for Dialysis Patients: Minimizing the Risk of Infection and Preserving Central Veins. Seminars in Dialysis, 2010
Transvenous CIED Leads and Bloodstream Infection

• Hemodialysis patient are at higher risk for bloodstream infection
  – Patients with AV access 10x greater than general population
  – Patients with chronic venous access 7.6x greater than those with AV access

• Venous catheter access and transvenous CIED leads are a toxic combination
Transvenous CIED Leads and Bloodstream Infection

- Avoid CIED & venous catheter whenever possible
  - Use wearable defibrillator
  - Create early-use AV access
  - Delay initiation of hemodialysis
  - Utilize peritoneal dialysis, permanent or as bridge
  - Rethink use of ICD for primary prevention VT/VF

- Epicardial leads indeed may be optimal choice when indication for CIED & is absolute and venous hemodialysis access cannot be avoided
Epicardial Leads: Not the Answer

• Transvenous leads not that bad
  – Patient selection & planning can avoid ipsilateral
  – Even ipsilateral AVA & CIED may be acceptable
• Infections minimized by avoiding venous catheter
• ESRD patient survival with ICD very poor
  – What is accomplished by increasing use of ICDs with unproven benefit?
• Alternatives to ICD
  – Wearable defibrillator: Available NOW
  – Subcutaneous defibrillator: Coming
• Logistical or institutional barriers
  – Are cardiac electrophysiologists persuaded?
  – Is there expert & available CT surgery support?