



King's Research Portal

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):

Mehta, V., O'Brien, H., Elliott, M., Sidhu, B., Gould, J., Niederer, S., & Rinaldi, C. A. (in press). Assessing long term survival and hospitalisation following transvenous lead extraction in patients with cardiac resynchronisation therapy devices: A propensity score matched analysis. *Heart Rhythm O2*.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

•Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research. •You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain •You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1	Title: Assessing long term survival and hospitalisation following transvenous lead extraction in
2	patients with cardiac resynchronisation therapy devices: A propensity score matched analysis
3	
4	Short Title: Survival following TLE in CRT patients
5	
6	Authors:
7	Dr Vishal S Mehta MBBS ^{1,2} – corresponding author
8	Mr Hugh O'Brien MRes ²
9	Dr Mark K Elliott MBBS ^{1,2}
10	Dr Baldeep S Sidhu PhD ^{1,2}
11	Dr Justin Gould PhD ^{1,2}
12	Dr Anoop K Shetty MD ^{1,2}
13	Professor Steven Niederer DPhil ²
14	Professor Christopher A Rinaldi MD, FHRS ^{1,2}
15	
16	Institutional Affiliations:
17	¹ Cardiology Department, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
18	² School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences, King's College London, UK
19	
20	Correspondence:
21	Dr Vishal Mehta
22	School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences
23	St Thomas' Hospital
24	London, SE1 7EH, U.K.
25	Email: vishal.mehta@kcl.ac.uk
26	

27 Conflicts of Interest:

28	J. Gould, M. Elliott and V. Mehta have received fellowship funding from Abbott, outside of the
29	submitted work. B. Sidhu is funded by NIHR and has received speaker fees from EBR systems, outside
30	of submitted work. J. Gould and M.Elliott have received project funding from Rosetrees Trust, outside
31	of submitted work. S.A Niederer receive research funding and/or consultation fees from Siemens,
32	Abbott and Pfizer outside of the submitted work. C.A. Rinaldi receives research funding and/or
33	consultation fees from Abbott, Medtronic, Boston Scientific and MicroPort, outside of the submitted
34	work.
35	
36	Acknowledgements:
37	Funding: The work was supported by the Wellcome/EPSRC Centre for Medical Engineering
38	[WT203148/Z/16/Z].
39	
40	Abstract word count: 250
41	Manuscript word count: 3143
42	
43	Keywords
44	Transvenous lead extraction; CRT; Cardiac Resynchronisation Therapy; Mortality; Hospitalisation;
45	Propensity Score Matching
46	

47	Abstract
48	
49	Background:
50	Longer term outcomes of patients post transvenous lead extraction (TLE) is poorly understood in
51	patients with cardiac resynchronisation therapy (CRT) devices.
52	
53	Objectives:
54	A propensity score (PS) matched analysis evaluating outcomes post-TLE in CRT and non-CRT
55	populations was performed.
56	
57	Methods:
58	Data from consecutive patients undergoing TLE between 2000 to 2019 were prospectively collected.
59	Patients surviving to discharge and re-implanted with the same device were included. The cohort was
60	split depending on presence of CRT device. Associations with all-cause mortality and hospitalisation
61	was assessed by Kaplan-Meier estimates. An exploratory endpoint was evaluated whether early (<7
62	days) or late (>7 days) reimplantation was associated with poorer outcomes.
63	
64	Results:
65	Of 1005 patients included, 285 (25%) had a CRT device. Median follow-up was 57.00 [27.00-93.00]
66	months, age at explant was 67.7±12.1 years, 83.3% were male and 54.4% had an infective indication
67	for TLE. PS were calculated using 43 baseline characteristics. After matching, 192 CRT patients
68	were compared with 192 non-CRT patients. In the matched cohort, there was no significant
69	difference with respect to mortality (hazard ratio [HR]=1.01, 95% confidence interval [CI] [0.74-
70	1.39], p=0.093) or hospitalisation risk (HR=1.2[0.87-1.66], p=0.265) was observed. In the matched
71	CRT group, late reimplantation was associated with increased mortality (HR=1.64[1.04-2.57],
72	p=0.032) and hospitalisation risk (HR=1.57[1.00-2.46], p=0.049].
73	

74 Conclusion:

- 75 Outcomes of CRT patients post-TLE is similarly poor to non-CRT patients in matched populations.
- 76 Reimplantation within 7 days was associated with better outcomes in a CRT population but was not
- 77 observed in a non-CRT population, suggesting prolonged periods without biventricular pacing should
- be avoided.

79	Key Findings:	
----	---------------	--

- This is the largest matched analysis of mortality and clinical outcomes of patients with and
 without cardiac resynchronisation therapy (CRT) devices following transvenous lead extraction
 (TLE).
- In an unmatched analysis, patients with CRT devices post TLE were more likely to die and be
 readmitted to hospital for any cardiovascular cause
- In a matched analysis, patients with and without CRT devices post TLE had similar outcomes
 with respect to mortality and hospitalisation.
- Delayed reimplantation following TLE in the CRT group was associated with greater risk of
 mortality and hospitalisation. This was not observed in the non-CRT group. This suggests
 minimising time without biventricular pacing following TLE in a CRT population is desirable.
- 90
- 91

92 Introduction

93

94 The rise in the use of intracardiac implantable electronic devices (CIEDs) has been paralleled by an 95 increase in the number of procedures required for the removal of such devices and their associated 96 leads¹. Transvenous lead extraction (TLE) forms the basis of the management of infected CIEDs, malfunctioning and redundant leads². High procedural success rates with low rates of major in-97 98 hospital complications as achieved in the European Lead Extraction ConTRolled Registry 99 (ELECTRa), demonstrate a complete clinical success at 96.7% and an in-hospital major complication 100 rate at $1.7\%^3$. Overall hospital mortality was low at 1.4% with a procedural related mortality of 0.5%. 101 The outcomes for the subgroup of patients who have TLE procedures with cardiac resynchronization 102 therapy (CRT) devices is less well understood. CRT is an effective therapy to improve symptoms and 103 reduce mortality in patients with dyssynchronous heart failure, however these patients have a higher 104 morbidity and mortality rate related to poorer left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) and co-105 morbidity burden. Similarly, the number of CRT devices implanted with left ventricular (LV) leads 106 has been paralleled by an increased requirement for CRT system extraction⁴. Current evidence 107 suggests that there is no significant difference in acute complications, or 30-day mortality associated 108 with CRT system extraction⁵. Less is understood regarding long term outcomes regarding mortality 109 and morbidity following TLE in this group. In addition, the impact of delayed reimplantation of a 110 CRT device following TLE is poorly understood, despite the theoretical risk of negative reverse 111 remodelling ⁶ or acute haemodynamic compromise⁷ caused by the absence of biventricular pacing. 112 We hypothesised that patients had poorer outcomes who had a CRT device vs non-CRT device, 113 however it was unclear if matching the baseline characteristics would maintain this effect. In 114 addition, we hypothesised that delayed reimplantation post TLE in a CRT population would result in 115 poorer outcomes compared to non-CRT populations. We studied data from a single, high-volume 116 tertiary referral centre for TLE, regarding long-term outcomes in a CRT and non-CRT population. 117

- 118 Methods
- 119

120 Data Collection

121

122 All consecutive patients undergoing TLE in a high-volume centre in the UK were prospectively 123 recorded onto a computer database between October 2000 and November 2019. Multiple parameters 124 were recorded, including demographics, extraction indication, device and lead type, comorbidities, 125 biochemistry and pathology results, procedural success, major complications, and technical extraction 126 information. Patients reimplanted with the same device and surviving to discharge following TLE 127 were included. Only the most recent entry for patients with multiple TLEs during the study period 128 were included. Mortality was recorded retrospectively by linking unique patient registration numbers 129 (National Health Service (NHS) numbers) and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) mortality data 130 updated as of February 2020⁸. Hospital readmission information was obtained from the source data 131 feeding directly to the Hospital Episodes Statistics (HES) national database, which records all NHS 132 hospital-based activity in England and has been validated as an accurate way of recording medical 133 activity and is used for allocating resources based on needs in the NHS⁹. Any cardiovascular cause of 134 inpatient admission was identified as the primary outcome measure of hospitalisation, as defined by 135 the World Health Organisation International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10-CM) coding system 136 (ICD-10-CM codes: Diseases of the circulatory system: ICD I00-199; Heart failure: I50; Complications of cardiac and vascular prosthetic devices: ICD T82)¹⁰. The database collection and 137 138 analysis were approved by the Institutional Review Board of Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital. 139 140 Definitions

141

TLE was defined as per the EHRA and HRS guidelines¹¹. The 2018 EHRA guidelines defined the extraction indication, procedural success and complication rate¹². The extraction procedure undertaken at this centre has been described in detail elsewhere¹³. If there was more than one indication for lead extraction or original implantation indication, this was counted independently. Number of previous device interventions was defined as the number of CIED procedures undertaken on the patient prior to the recorded lead extraction. Lead dwell time was calculated as the oldest targeted lead in situ at time of extraction. Follow-up time and age were calculated from date of TLE.
Major cardiovascular co-morbidities were recorded. Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) was estimated
by the MDRD 4-variable equation¹⁴.

151

152 Statistical Analysis

153

154 Missing data for variables of interest were handled by multiple imputation with chained equations and 155 the multiple imputed data frames were merged into a single data frame by computing the mean or selecting the most likely imputed value (R-packages mice and simisc; 10 imputed datasets)¹⁵. The 156 157 propensity score (PS) for the CRT group was calculated by a logistic regression model using 43 158 clinically relevant covariates. CRT patients were matched 1:1 to non-CRT patients by their PSs, 159 using the nearest neighbour method with a calliper of 0.10 and no replacements. Variables included 160 in either the multiple imputation models or considered for PS calculation are shown in table 1. The 161 ability of the matching to balance baseline characteristics in CRT versus non-CRT group was assessed 162 by absolute standard differences, with a value of <10% considered as not significant¹⁶. 163

164 Baseline variables of the matched cohort were compared by calculating standardised mean differences 165 and the chi-squared test, student's t-test or Mann Whitney U-test when appropriate. Primary 166 outcomes in this analysis were overall survival and time to first cardiovascular hospitalisation at 167 follow-up. Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate survivor functions in the CRT vs non-CRT 168 group, with a secondary outcome analysis dependent on whether patients were reimplanted within or 169 after 7 days of initial TLE. A sub-analysis of the matched CRT and non-CRT groups was undertaken 170 with the same outcomes assessed as above. Univariable cox (proportional hazard) regression was 171 performed, and the results are presented as (Hazard Ratio (HR) [95% Confidence Interval (CI)], p-172 value). 173

174 **Results**

176 Study Cohort

177 Between October 2000 and November 2019, 1171 consecutive patients underwent TLE at the

178 reference centre. After applying the inclusion criteria, 1005 patients were eligible. Of these, 285

179 (28.4%) patients had a CRT device. After PS matching, the analysis was restricted to 384 patients,

- 180 192 in both the CRT and non-CRT groups.
- 181

182 Baseline Characteristics (Table 1)

183 In the overall cohort, mean age was 65.1±14.7 years, 72.7% were male and 51.9% had a TLE for an

184 infective indication. Median lead dwell time was 5.40 [1.80-9.80] years, 28.5% had an ICD, 43.2%

185 had a permanent pacemaker and the remainder had a CRT-D/P device at time of TLE. Most of the

186 baseline characteristics were differently distributed in the CRT versus non-CRT group. CRT patients

187 were older (68±10.7 vs 64±15.6 years, p<0.001), had higher mean number of co-morbidities (3.18 vs

188 1.49, p<0.001), poorer renal function (108.00 [86.00-136.00] vs 89.00 [75.00-110.00] mg/dL,

189 p<0.001), and lower LVEF (35.5±12.4 vs 47.4±12.1, p<0.001). The CRT group also had shorter lead

190 dwell time (4.70 [1.80-8.10] vs 5.90 [1.80-10.50] years, p=0.01), were less likely to have their device

reimplanted within 7 days of TLE procedure (n=159, 55.8% vs n=470, 65.3%, p=0.006), longer time

192 to reimplantation (p=0.029) and have had a previous device intervention (p=0.038). After PS

193 matching, baseline characteristics considered for PS calculation were equally distributed between the

194 2 study groups, with well-matched PS in both groups (supplement figure 1).

195

196 Outcome analysis

197

198 All-Cause Mortality (Figure 1)

199

200 In the overall cohort, during long-term follow-up with a median of 57.00 [27.00-93.00] months, 345

201 (34.3%) patients died. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis demonstrated a survival probability of 93.4% at

202 1 year, 88.4% at 2 years, 73.1% at 5 years and 50.4% at 10 years. At follow-up a higher proportion of

203 patients died in the CRT vs non-CRT group (43.9% vs 30.6%, P<0.001) with survival probability of

- 88.9% vs 97.1% at 1 year; 80.7% vs 91.4% at 2 years; 59.3% vs 78.3% at 5 years, and 27.6% vs
 56.7% at 10 years. Overall unadjusted hazard ratio (HRs) for mortality and 95% CIs in the CRT
 group were [HR = 2.16, 95% CI (1.72-2.70), p<0.001].
- 207

In the matched cohort, during long-term follow-up with a median of 46.00 [25.00-76.25] months, 159

209 (41.4%) patients died. At follow-up a similar proportion of patients died in the matched CRT vs non-

210 CRT group (40.1% vs 42.7%, P=0.68) with survival probability of 91.4% vs 91.5% at 1 year; 83.9%

211 vs 86.9% at 2 years; 65.0% vs 63.6% at 5 years, and 33.5% vs 34.9% at 10 years. Similar unadjusted

HR were observed for the matched CRT group [HR = 1.02, 95% CI (0.74-1.39), p=0.933].

213

214 Cardiovascular Hospitalisation (Figure 2)

215

216 In the overall cohort during long-term follow-up, 371 (36.9%) patients were hospitalised. Kaplan-

217 Meier survival analysis demonstrated a freedom from hospitalisation probability of 76.7% at 1 year,

218 71.0% at 2 years, 62.2% at 5 years and 50.1% at 10 years. At follow-up a higher proportion of

219 patients were hospitalised in the CRT vs non-CRT group (58.9% vs 44.9%, P<0.001) with survival

220 probability of 71.6% vs 78.7% at 1 year; 62.8% vs 74.0% at 2 years; 51.6% vs 65.9% at 5 years, and

42.8% vs 53.1% at 10 years. Overall unadjusted hazard ratio (HR) and 95% CIs for hospitalisation in

the CRT group were greater than in the non-CRT group [HR = 1.46, 95% CI (1.17-1.83), p<0.001].

223

In the matched cohort during long-term follow-up, 147 (38.3%) patients died. At follow-up a similar proportion of patients were hospitalised in the matched CRT vs non-CRT group (41.1% vs 35.4%,

P=0.294), with hospitalisation probability of 72.2% vs 76.3% at 1 year; 63.3% vs 70.6% at 2 years;

54.0% vs 60.4% at 5 years, and 43.7% vs 46.5% at 10 years. Similar unadjusted HR were observed

for the matched CRT group for risk of hospitalisation [HR = 1.20, 95% CI (0.87-1.66), p=0.265].

229

230 Sub-group analysis

234	In the sub-group analysis within the matched cohorts, an analysis of survival probability with respect
235	to mortality and hospitalisation following TLE was performed. There were similar baseline
236	characteristics between the late reimplantation groups in the matched CRT and non-CRT groups, with
237	similar infective indications for TLE (local: 64.1% vs 64.9%; systemic: 26.9% vs 27.0%; any
238	infection: 91.0 vs 91.9%), eGFR (61.6 vs 61.9 ml/min/m ²), LVEF (38.4 vs 40.1%) and age at explant
239	(69.2 vs 70.0 years) (supplement table 1).
240	
241	Within the matched non-CRT group, there was no significant difference with regards to risk if
242	reimplantation occurred late (i.e. 7 days after TLE procedure) with an unadjusted HR for death of [HR
243	= 1.33, 95% CI (0.86-2.05), p=0.208] and for hospitalisation [HR = 1.14, 95% CI (0.69-1.89),
244	p=0.601]. Within the matched CRT group, there was a significant difference with regards to risk
245	associated with late reimplantation with an unadjusted HR for death of [HR = 1.64 , 95% CI (1.04 -
246	2.57), p=0.032] and for hospitalisation [HR = 1.57, 95% CI (1.00-2.46), p=0.0.49]. There was no
247	evidence of differences in risk of mortality (p=0.576) or hospitalisation (p=0.911) between the early
248	reimplantation groups in the CRT and non-CRT groups. There was increased risk of hospitalisation in
249	the late reimplantation group in the CRT group vs non-CRT group [HR=1.71 95% CI (1.01-2.9),
250	p=0.048] (figures 3 and 4).
251	
252	Risk depending on cause of hospitalisation

253

254 There was a greater risk of hospitalisation associated with TLE in the CRT group compared to the

255 non-CRT group with regards to any cardiovascular cause (ICD-10 I00-I99 codes) for hospitalisation

256 [Relative Risk (RR) 3.79, 95% CI (2.04-7.02), p<0.001], or heart failure decompensation (ICD I50-

257 I59 codes) [RR 1.45, 95% CI (1.14-1.86), p=0.004]. No significant difference was identified with

respect to risk of device related complications requiring hospitalisation [RR 1.13, 95% CI (0.79-1.64),

259 p=0.515] (figure 5).

260			
261	Discussion		
262	An understanding of mortality and morbidity at follow-up post TLE in the CRT population is		
263	important to evaluate the longer-term implications of the procedure. To our knowledge, this analysis		
264	is the largest registry analysis to date evaluating mortality and morbidity outcomes following TLE in		
265	patients who survive to discharge and are reimplanted with the same device.		
266			
267	The main findings are that:		
268			
269	1. The baseline characteristics of patients undergoing TLE in the CRT group are significantly		
270	different to the non-CRT group, and this is reflected in a higher risk of mortality and		
271	cardiovascular hospitalisation following TLE.		
272	2. In a matched cohort, CRT and non-CRT patients had similar outcomes with respect to		
273	mortality and hospitalisation risk post TLE.		
274	3. Following TLE, CRT patients had a higher risk of hospitalisation for any cardiovascular		
275	cause or heart failure, however no increased risk of hospitalisation due to a device related		
276	complication.		
277	4. Reimplantation within 7 days was associated with better outcomes in a matched population in		
278	patients with a CRT device compared to a non-CRT population.		
279			
280	Few studies have compared long term outcomes of patients following TLE specifically evaluating		
281	patients with CRT and non-CRT devices. Larger registry analyses have not evaluated outcomes		
282	beyond early complications and mortality in both CRT and non-CRT cohorts, including the		
283	ELECTRa study ¹⁷ and the Cleveland Clinic series of 5000 TLEs ¹⁸ . Data from the same reference		
284	centre by Gould et al utilising a smaller cohort of patients, has demonstrated no significant difference		
285	in 30-day mortality rates between CRT (3.0%, n=7) and non-CRT patients (2.0%, n=14) (p=0.443) ⁵ .		
286	This study also evaluated outcomes using case-control matching, which also demonstrated no		
287	significant difference in 30-day outcomes, however only 185 patients were included in each group,		

288 and were matched only for 4 variables (lead dwell time, age, renal impairment, and systemic 289 infection), whereas the current analysis matched for 43 variables (table 1). Zuchelli et al, demonstrated a 1-year mortality of 5.5% in a CRT population post TLE¹⁹, whereas our study 290 291 demonstrated higher incidence of mortality of 11.1%. In a more recent study, Nishii et al compared the prognosis of patients who had severe LV systolic dysfunction (SLVD) compared to those who did 292 293 not. Whilst not looking specifically at patients with CRT devices, they demonstrated that those with 294 SLVD were not more likely to die at 30 days (97.2% vs 99.4%, p=0.215) or 1 year (80.6% vs 91.5%, 295 p=0.053) post TLE⁷. They also identified that patients with SLVD were more likely to require 296 additional hemodynamic support, such as temporary cardiac resynchronization therapy pacing (27.8% 297 vs 1.2%; p<0.001), which may attest to the findings in our study identifying poorer outcomes for 298 those who had delayed reimplantation. Of note, this study only included 36 patients with SVLD, out 299 of a total cohort of 200 patients, whereas our study utilises data from 1005 patients. Few studies have 300 evaluated cardiovascular hospitalisation as an endpoint in CRT patients post TLE. Regoli et al 301 identifying 37.0% requiring hospitalisation, and 23.9% dying at a median follow-up of 21 months 302 post TLE²⁰, which compared similarly to our study at the same follow-up time (hospitalisation: 303 34.9%; mortality: 16.5%).

304

305 Most published data involving PS matching in patients with cardiac resynchronisation therapy has 306 been to compare outcomes of CRT cohorts with and without defibrillator devices ^{21,22}, with only one 307 study utilising PS matching in patients following TLE²³. This study is the first to match CRT and 308 non-CRT patients post TLE. Matching resulted in an increase in mean age at explant (64.0 to 67.8 309 years), total number of comorbidities (1.49 to 2.78 comorbidities), and reduction in LVEF (47.4 to 310 37.7%) and eGFR (70.5 to 63.9 ml/min/1.73m²) of the non-CRT group. In the unmatched cohort, 311 CRT patients were at significantly increased risk of any cardiovascular hospitalisation and mortality, 312 with an increased relative risk of heart failure hospitalisation, compared to a non-CRT population. 313 Matching resulted in similarly poor outcomes in the CRT and non-CRT group, which suggests that all 314 patients with a greater co-morbidity burden regardless of whether they have a CRT may benefit from

315 closer evaluation following TLE. This could confer significant cost savings for healthcare services,

316 which can tailor services to reduce risk of hospitalisation in these at-risk patients²⁴.

317

318 Notably, the exploratory endpoint demonstrated poorer outcomes in those who had delayed 319 implantation following CRT explant. It is possible that those with CRT devices explanted for an 320 infective indication may have a greater burden of infective material due to the presence of an LV lead, 321 which may contribute to the poorer outcomes associated with delayed reimplantation. It may also be 322 argued that an infective indication, whether this be systemic or local may be an unidentified 323 confounder. However, within each matched cohort there was not a survival difference depending on 324 whether there was an infective indication for TLE, and whether this was a systemic or local infection 325 (Supplement Figure 1). This suggests that the presence of infection was unlikely to be a confounder 326 influencing this observation within the matched cohorts. Additionally all patients had interrupted 327 biventricular pacing from time of TLE procedure to time of reimplantation. Most published work 328 evaluates the acute implications of interrupting continuous biventricular (BiV) pacing. These studies 329 have demonstrated that even brief interruptions in BiV pacing can result in worsening dyssynchrony and mitral regurgitation (MR)²⁵, left atrium and left ventricular dimensions²⁶, and contractile 330 331 reserve²⁷. Changes in cardiac biomarkers have also been associated with 48 hours of BiV interruption 332 of CRT responders, with Rubaj et al identifying a significant increase in proinflammatory cytokines 333 and BNP concentrations²⁸. These findings may be a reason for the observed negative outcomes 334 observed in this study associated with delayed reimplantation seen in the matched CRT cohort, but 335 not observed in the matched non-CRT cohort.

336

337 Limitations

338

Although the database collects many variables and allowed us to perform adjustments by PS

340 matching, residual and unmeasured confounding within the matched and unmatched cohorts cannot

be ruled out. Although our PS models were fitted based on several variables to foster adequate

342 adjustments, we did not consider potential interactions among the covariates. The findings of our

343 study are limited by the inherent issues identified with observational studies. Associations with 344 mortality and hospitalisation for the groups were discussed, however the cause-and-effect relationship 345 remain associative. Causes of death in these patients is unknown. We opted to only include patients 346 who survived to discharge, which may have introduced survival and treatment bias. As our institution 347 is a tertiary care centre, referral bias could have affected the clinical data, thereby limiting 348 generalisation of these findings to other patient populations. The analysis on the impact of delayed 349 reimplantation was performed within the matched cohorts as the baseline characteristics of the CRT 350 and non-CRT groups were similar after matching was performed. Within these constrains, a PS 351 match analysis was considered an appropriate method of evaluating this hypothesis and potentially 352 form the basis of further investigation in the form of a randomised trial which could more effectively 353 reduce the potential number of unidentified confounders which are often unavoidable as part of 354 observational studies. As the baseline characteristics of the matched groups were very balanced, 355 particularly with respect to the proportion of systemic and local infective indications for TLE, we 356 believe there was justification for this comparison.

357

358 Conclusions

359

The prognosis of patients with CRT who undergo TLE demonstrates similar mortality and
hospitalisation risk to non-CRT patients in a matched population. In an unmatched population, CRT
patients had notably poorer outcomes and merit close follow-up post TLE procedures. There was
increased risk of adverse outcomes associated with delayed reimplantation of CRT devices compared
to other devices. This may be due to prolonged periods without continuous BiV pacing following
TLE in patients with CRT devices, and this should be avoided where possible.

References

369	1.	Raatikainen MJP, Arnar DO, Merkely B, et al.: A Decade of Information on the Use of
370		Cardiac Implantable Electronic Devices and Interventional Electrophysiological Procedures in
371		the European Society of Cardiology Countries: 2017 Report from the European Heart Rhythm
372		Association. Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac electrophysiology : journal
373		of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac cellular electrophysiology
374		of the European Society of Cardiology England, 2017; 19:ii1-ii90.
375	2.	Bongiorni MG, Burri H, Deharo JC, et al.: 2018 EHRA expert consensus statement on lead
376		extraction: recommendations on definitions, endpoints, research trial design, and data
377		collection requirements for clinical scientific studies and registries: endorsed by
378		APHRS/HRS/LAHRS. Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac
379		electrophysiology : journal of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac
380		cellular electrophysiology of the European Society of Cardiology England, 2018; 20:1217.
381	3.	Bongiorni MG, Kennergren C, Butter C, et al.: The European Lead Extraction ConTRolled
382		(ELECTRa) study: A European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) Registry of Transvenous
383		Lead Extraction Outcomes. European Heart Journal 2017; 38:2995–3005.
384	4.	Williams SE, Arujuna A, Whitaker J, et al.: Percutaneous lead and system extraction in
385		patients with cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) devices and coronary sinus leads.
386		Pacing and clinical electrophysiology : PACE United States, 2011; 34:1209–1216.
387	5.	Gould J, Klis M, Porter B, et al.: Transvenous lead extraction in patients with cardiac
388		resynchronization therapy devices is not associated with increased 30-day mortality. Europace
389		2019; 21:928–936.
390	6.	Ruwald A-C, Kutyifa V, Ruwald MH, et al.: The association between biventricular pacing and
391		cardiac resynchronization therapy-defibrillator efficacy when compared with implantable
392		cardioverter defibrillator on outcomes and reverse remodelling. European heart journal
393		England, 2015; 36:440–448.
394	7.	Nishii N, Nishimoto T, Mizuno T, et al.: Prognosis of patients with severe left ventricular
395		dysfunction after transvenous lead extraction and the need for additional hemodynamic

396		support in the perioperative period. Heart Rhythm [Internet] Elsevier Inc., 2021; . Available
397		from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2021.01.026
398	8.	Delmestri A, Prieto-Alhambra D: CPRD GOLD and linked ONS mortality records:
399		Reconciling guidelines. International Journal of Medical Informatics [Internet] Elsevier, 2020;
400		136:104038. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.104038
401	9.	Thorn JC, Turner EL, Hounsome L, et al.: Validating the use of Hospital Episode Statistics
402		data and comparison of costing methodologies for economic evaluation : an end-of-life case
403		study from the Cluster randomised triAl of PSA testing for Prostate cancer (CAP). 2016; :1-
404		7.
405	10.	Organization WH: ICD-10 : international statistical classification of diseases and related health
406		problems : tenth revision [Internet]. 2nd ed. Geneva PP - Geneva: World Health
407		Organization,. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/42980
408	11.	Wilkoff BL, Love CJ, Byrd CL, et al.: Transvenous Lead Extraction : Heart Rhythm Society
409		Expert Consensus on Facilities , Training , Indications , and This document was endorsed by
410		the American Heart Association (AHA). HRTHM Heart Rhythm Society, 2009; 6:1085-
411		1104.
412	12.	Bongiorni MG, Burri H, Deharo JC, et al.: 2018 EHRA expert consensus statement on lead
413		extraction: recommendations on definitions, endpoints, research trial design, and data
414		collection requirements for clinical scientific studies and registries: endorsed by
415		APHRS/HRS/LAHRS. Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac
416		electrophysiology : journal of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac
417		cellular electrophysiology of the European Society of Cardiology England, 2018; 20:1217.
418	13.	Gould J, Klis M, Porter B, et al.: Predictors of mortality and outcomes in transvenous lead
419		extraction for systemic and local infection cohorts. PACE - Pacing and Clinical
420		Electrophysiology 2019; 42:73–84.
421	14.	Levey AS, Coresh J, Greene T, et al.: Using standardized serum creatinine values in the
422		modification of diet in renal disease study equation for estimating glomerular filtration rate.
423		Annals of Internal Medicine 2006; 145:247–254.

- 424 15. Lüdecke D: sjmisc: Data and Variable Transformation Functions. Journal of Open Source
 425 Software 2018; 3:754.
- 426 16. Ali MS, Groenwold RH, Klungel OH: Statistical Commentary Best (but oft-forgotten)
- 427 practices : propensity score methods in clinical. Am J Clin Nutri 2018; 104:247–258.
- 428 17. Bongiorni MG, Kennergren C, Butter C, et al.: The European Lead Extraction ConTRolled (
- 429 ELECTRa) study : a European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) Registry of Transvenous
- 430 Lead Extraction Outcomes. 2017; :2995–3005.
- 431 18. Brunner MP, Cronin EM, Wazni O, et al.: Outcomes of patients requiring emergent surgical or
- 432 endovascular intervention for catastrophic complications during transvenous lead extraction.
- 433 Heart Rhythm [Internet] Elsevier, 2014; 11:419–425. Available from:
- 434 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2013.12.004
- 435 19. Zucchelli G, Bongiorni MG, di Cori A, et al.: Cardiac resynchronization therapy after coronary
 436 sinus lead extraction: Feasibility and mid-term outcome of transvenous reimplantation in a
 437 tertiary referral centre. Europace 2012; 14:515–521.
- 438 20. Regoli F, Bongiorni MG, Rordorf R, et al.: High recurrence of device-related adverse events
- 439 following transvenous lead extraction procedure in patients with cardiac resynchronization

440 devices. European Journal of Heart Failure 2016; 18:1270–1277.

- 441 21. Liang Y, Wang J, Yu Z, et al.: Comparison between cardiac resynchronization therapy with
- 442 and without defibrillator on long-term mortality: A propensity score matched analysis. Journal
- 443 of Cardiology [Internet] Japanese College of Cardiology, 2020; 75:432–438. Available from:
- 444 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjcc.2019.08.018
- 445 22. Saba S, McLaughlin T, He M, Althouse A, Mulukutla S, Hernandez I: Cardiac
- 446 resynchronization therapy using pacemakers vs defibrillators in patients with nonischemic
- 447 cardiomyopathy: The United States experience from 2007 to 2014. Heart rhythm United
- 448 States, 2019; 16:1065–1071.
- 44923.Tsang DC, Perez AA, Boyle TA, Carrillo RG: Effect of Prior Sternotomy on Outcomes in
- 450 Transvenous Lead Extraction. Circulation Arrhythmia and electrophysiology United States,
- 451 2019; 12:e007278.

452	24.	Huffman MD, Roth GA, Sliwa K, Yancy CW, Prabhakaran D: Heart Failure. In Prabhakaran
453		D, Anand S, Gaziano TA, Mbanya J-C, Wu Y, Nugent R, eds: Washington (DC), 2017,.
454	25.	Ypenburg C, Lancellotti P, Tops LF, et al.: Acute Effects of Initiation and Withdrawal of
455		Cardiac Resynchronization Therapy on Papillary Muscle Dyssynchrony and Mitral
456		Regurgitation. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2007; 50:2071–2077.
457	26.	Knappe D, Pouleur AC, Shah AM, et al.: Acute effects of withdrawal of cardiac
458		resynchronization therapy on left and right ventricular function, Dyssynchrony, and contractile
459		function in patients with New York heart association functional class I/II heart failure:
460		MADIT-CRT. Journal of Cardiac Failure [Internet] Elsevier Inc, 2013; 19:149–155. Available
461		from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2013.01.004
462	27.	Brandt RR, Reiner C, Arnold R, Sperzel J, Pitschner HF, Hamm CW: Contractile response and
463		mitral regurgitation after temporary interruption of long-term cardiac resynchronization
464		therapy. European Heart Journal 2006; 27:187–192.
465	28.	Rubaj A, Ruciński P, Oleszczak K, et al.: Inflammatory activation following interruption of
466		long-term cardiac resynchronization therapy. Heart and Vessels 2013; 28:583-588.
467		

469 **<u>Figures</u>**

470

- 471 **Figure 1**
- 472 Kaplan-Meier survival probability for mortality in patients depending on type of device explanted.
- 473 Figure 1A unmatched cohort. Figure 1B Matched group. CRT Cardiac Resynchronisation
- 474 Therapy



Type of Device (Un-Matched Group) + Non-CRT + CRT group



Type of Device (Matched Group) + Non-CRT + CRT group

• • •

479 **Figure 2**

480 Kaplan-Meier survival probability for hospitalisation in patients depending on type of device



481 explanted. Figure 2A – unmatched cohort. Figure 2B – Matched group.



Type of Device (Matched Group) + Non-CRT + CRT group

- **Figure 3**
- 488 Kaplan-Meier survival probability for mortality in patients depending on timing for reimplantation
- 489 post TLE in subgroup analysis of matched groups.



Figure 4

Kaplan-Meier survival probability for hospitalisation in patients depending on timing for

reimplantation post TLE in subgroup analysis of matched group.



503 **Figure 5**

504 Cause of hospitalisation analysis.



- 506 Forest plot assessing relative risk of hospitalisation for a specified cause following TLE in patients
- 507 with cardiac resynchronisation therapy (CRT) devices compared to non-CRT devices in the un-
- 508 matched cohorts.