We have now gone one step further and use the method of active retroperfusion, using the driving pressure and oxygen of the aortic blood to perfuse areas of pre-existing acute ischemia. In grossly unstable patients with critical left anterior descending or left main stenosis, we have observed that retrograde coronary sinus perfusion reverses electrocardiographic changes, reduces pulmonary artery pressures, immediately improves cardiac contractility, and improves cardiac output (unpublished data). This gives time to harvest appropriate conduits, to perform any concomitant extracardiac procedure, and avoids "crashing" on cardiopulmonary bypass. One 75-year-old patient with vascular disease and cardiogenic shock was on preoperative intra-aortic balloon counterpulsation and preoperative ventilation, with associated critical bilateral extracranial symptomatic internal carotid artery disease. Retrograde coronary sinus perfusion allowed stabilization of the cardiac status and gave time to perform a carotid endarterectomy (Figure 1) followed by an OPCABG, with a good outcome.⁴

My technique is a combination of pressure-controlled intermittent coronary sinus occlusion and arterial retroperfusion of the coronary sinus. Possibly a better method physiologically may well be a combination of synchronized retroperfusion and pressure-controlled intermittent coronary sinus occlusion. There is a great potential for developing catheters that could be inflated in the coronary sinus 6 times per minute,⁵ but while that happens I would recommend my simple technique of retrograde perfusion as a useful tool in the armamentarium of the cardiac surgeon for elective OPCABG as also for the acutely ischemic patient, in whom one gains some time and possibly avoids the institution of cardiopulmonary bypass. I would wholeheartedly agree with Lazar⁵ that a backward technique can still achieve forward progress.

Harinder Singh Bedi, MCh
Executive Director and Chairman,
Cardiac Sciences
Sigma New Life Heart Institute
562, Phase 1
Mohali—160055
Punjab, India

References

1. Castella M, Buckberg GD. Reduction of systolic and diastolic dysfunction by retrograde

coronary sinus perfusion during off-pump coronary surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2004;127:1018-25.

2. Bedi HS, Suri A, Kalkat MS, Sengar BS, Mahajan V, Chawla R, et al. Global myocardial revascularization without cardiopulmonary bypass using innovative techniques for myocardial stabilization and perfusion. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2000;69:156-64.
3. Bedi HS. Beating heart coronary artery bypass with continuous perfusion through the coronary sinus. In: Salerno TA, Ricci M, editors. *Myocardial protection*. New York: Blackwell Publishing; 2004. p. 152-9.
4. Bedi HS, Singh RP, Kalra GS. Retrograde coronary sinus perfusion for management of coexistent critical unstable carotid and coronary artery disease. *Ind Heart J.* 2002;54:717-9.
5. Lazar HL. Coronary sinus retroperfusion: can forward progress still be achieved by using a backward technique? *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2004;127:1549-52.

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2004.11.005

What is the true (unbiased) percentage freedom from atrial fibrillation at 6 months after the modified Cox maze procedure using bipolar radiofrequency energy?

To the Editor:

We read with interest the article by Gaynor and associates¹ concerning the results of their prospective study of a consecutive group of 40 patients with 100% follow-up in which they reported a 91% freedom from atrial fibrillation (AF) at 6 months.

However, the denominator of patients at 6 months was only 23; therefore, 43% (17 patients) remained unaccounted for at that time point (presumably because they had not yet reached the 6-month interval). The authors used "at last follow-up" analysis to declare 100% follow-up, but usually the percentage follow-up is reported as the number of patients at the last time point (in studies with a pre-planned stopping point). In this case, some would consider the result of reporting only 23 of the 40 potential patients to have the same degree of inaccuracy as a loss to follow-up of 17 of 40 (43%).

A 91% freedom from AF at 6 months is based on the assumption that the remaining 17 patients will not alter this percentage when followed up to 6 months (note the 71% freedom from AF in the first month with 38 patients). However, in an extremely pessimistic situation (should AF subsequently develop in all 17 patients), the results could potentially be 21/40 (53%) freedom from AF at 6 months and

11/40 (28%) freedom from AF and antiarrhythmic medication at 6 months. We do acknowledge, however, that the true estimate would probably lie somewhere between the best- and worst-case scenarios.

Moreover, 10 (43%) of the 23 patients were receiving antiarrhythmic medication at 6 months. Unless the authors prescribed prophylactic antiarrhythmic therapy, it seems natural to assume that the 10 patients were having AF up to and including the 6-month interval. The authors also included 5 patients (13%) who were in paroxysmal AF at the start of the study, and 6 patients (15%) required pacemakers postoperatively due to sick sinus syndrome. Should freedom from AF be attributed to surgery in these patients?

A Kaplan-Meier analysis would have been more suitable to account for the unavailable/censored numbers that increased from 2 to 7 to 17 by 6 months if (any) AF was counted as evidence of an event (regardless of subsequent rhythm). We note that in this study, patients had different AF status at different follow-up times (evident from the increasing numerator between the first and third months), and perhaps more sophisticated methods needed to be employed (recurring time-to-event analysis) to quantify the uncertainty in the estimation of the time-dependent results.

In the same vein, Figure 6 in the manuscript is somewhat misleading. The denominator at the 4 time points decreased from 38 to 33 to 23; therefore, the apparent improvement could still be distorted by the yet-to-be completed follow-up.

Bearing in mind the lower limit of the confidence interval of 21/23 (95% confidence interval, 72% to 99%), we respectfully express our reservations to the conclusions of this otherwise novel and exciting modification of the Cox procedure.

Eric Lim
Stephen Large
Papworth Hospital
Cambridge, United Kingdom

Reference

1. Gaynor SL, Diodato MD, Prasad SM, Ishii Y, Schuessler RB, Bailey MS, et al. A prospective, single-center clinical trial of a modified Cox maze procedure with bipolar radiofrequency ablation. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2004;128:535-42.

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2004.11.013