With regard to the possible resistance by surgeons to adopt these interventions, we think the availability of compelling evidence in support of these interventions to prevent lung injury will eliminate any practical concerns.

Dr Macedo and colleagues refer to a trial that will assess the effect of lung perfusion/ventilation during CPB. We look forward to their results, which will hopefully add further knowledge to face the continued challenge of lung injury during cardiac surgery.

Hajime Imura, MD^a
Gianni D. Angelini, FRCS^b
Saadeh M. Suleiman, DSc^b
Raimondo Ascione, FRCS^b
^aNippon Medical School
Tokyo, Japan
^bBristol Heart Institute Bristol,
United Kingdom

References

1. Imura H, Caputo M, Lim K, Ochi M, Suleiman M-S, Shimizu K, et al. Pulmonary injury after cardiopulmonary bypass: beneficial effects of low frequency mechanical ventilation. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2009;137:1530-7.
2. Miranda DR, Gommers D, Papadakis PJ, Lachmann B. Mechanical ventilation affects pulmonary inflammation in cardiac surgery patients: the role of the open-lung concept. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* 2007;21:279-84.
3. Dodd-o JM, Welsh LE, Salazar JD, Walinsky PL, Peck EA, Shake JG, et al. Effect of bronchial artery blood flow on cardiopulmonary bypass-induced lung injury. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol.* 2004;286:H693-700.
4. Schelensak C, Doenst T, Preußner S, Wunderlich M, Kleinschmidt M, Beyersdorf F. Cardiopulmonary bypass reduction of bronchial blood flow: a potential mechanism for lung injury in a neonatal pig model. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2002;123:1199-205.
5. Suzuki T, Ito T, Kashima I, Teruya K, Fukuda T. Continuous perfusion of pulmonary arteries during total cardiopulmonary bypass favorably affects levels of circulating adhesion molecules and lung function. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2001;122:242-8.

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.09.002

PULMONARY AUTOGRAFT FOR MITRAL VALVE REPLACEMENT: MAKING A SIMPLE PROCEDURE COMPLEX?

To the Editor:

I read with interest the article by Kumar and colleagues¹ about the use

of pulmonary autografts for mitral valve replacement. I agree with the authors that cardiac surgeons working in Third World countries are faced with a major problem in the management of large numbers of patients with valvular disease. Most of those patients are of low socioeconomic and educational class, living in remote villages and mountains. There is no family practice or general practitioner system to provide early diagnosis and referral, postoperative follow-up, and anticoagulation control. Patients usually present late with advanced disease that makes repair impossible. The magnitude of the problem is escalated in children and women of childbearing age because we have no ideal valve substitute.

The pulmonary autograft concept is attractive but still has its drawbacks and complications. The procedure is complex and technically demanding, requiring at least double the usual crossclamp and bypass times. The procedure is not free of charge because there is a price for the homografts or preparation of the autografts, plus the added cost of complications. The mortality of approximately 15% reported by the authors is still high compared with single mitral valve replacement. Kabbani and colleagues² reported 5% early mortality and 6% late mortality, but as they stated, it is "clearly related to the procedure," which entails higher overall mortality. The issue of converting a single-valve into a double-valve disease is irritating because we have to expect long-term sequelae of pulmonary and mitral valve failures. The main concern with pulmonary autografts or homografts is early calcification. The removal of calcified grafts, as experienced in aortic homografts, is usually disastrous and has a high complication rate, including left ventricular rupture. The same complications are associated with the use of aortic or mitral homografts for mitral valve replacement. All of these autografts and homo-

grafts have to compete with the standard stented bioprostheses, which are improving and technically easier to insert, and require no anticoagulation. At the present time, bioprosthetic valves remain the standard in these patients, and manufacturers have shown us better preservation and longer durability.³

Khaled E. Al-Ebrahim, FRCS
Department of Cardiothoracic
Surgery
King Abdulaziz University
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

References

1. Kumar AS, Talwar S, Gupta A. Mitral valve replacement with the pulmonary autograft: midterm results. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2009;138:359-64.
2. Kabbani SS, Jamil H, Hammoud A, Hatab JA, Nabhani F, Hariri R, et al. The mitral pulmonary autograft: assessment at midterm. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2004;78:60-5.
3. Totaro P, Degno N, Zaidi A, Youhana A, Argano V. Carpentier Edwards Perimount Magna bioprostheses: a stented valve with stentless performance? *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2005;130:1668-74.

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.08.049

Reply to the Editor:

We are thankful to Dr Khaled E. Al-Ebrahim for his comments and critique. These were the same arguments raised when the Ross procedure for aortic valve replacement was first reported by Donald Ross in 1967.

The patients undergoing operation are young and clearly unsuitable for tissue valves. The surgery is indeed complex but provides superior hemodynamic results with a higher valve area. In addition, these patients only require an echocardiogram at yearly intervals, receive no medication 1 year after surgery, and do not require blood tests. The most important advantage is that it is a living valve, and we now have more than a 15-year follow-up of our own results for the Ross (aortic valve replacement) procedure. There has been no reoperation in the adults with a pulmonary homograft.

We believe these early results will translate into superior outcomes in

the long term compared with other options for these patients.

A. Sampath Kumar, MCh
All India Institute of Medical Sciences
Department of Cardiothoracic/
Vascular Surgery
Ansari Nagar
New Delhi, India

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.09.001

OPTIMAL SURGICAL APPROACH FOR REPAIR OF AORTOPULMONARY WINDOW WITH AORTIC ORIGIN OF THE RIGHT PULMONARY ARTERY To the Editor:

We read with great interest the article titled "Single-Stage Repair of Aortopulmonary Window With Interrupted Aortic Arch by Transection of the Aorta and Direct Reconstruction" by Yoshida and associates.¹

The authors describe a repair technique using autologous arterial wall tissue without artificial material for a patient with aortopulmonary window (APW), right pulmonary artery (RPA) originating from the ascending aorta, and interrupted aortic arch. However, the repair technique for APW and RPA originating from the ascending aorta totally coincides with our previously reported technique.² Inasmuch as APW is a relatively uncommon congenital heart defect, to establish the universality of these kinds of procedures expecting the future growth potential of both the pulmonary artery and the aorta, it is necessary to accumulate widespread data related to the applicability and the late follow-up results.

Taking every step into consideration, the reconstruction of the pulmonary bifurcation is the most critical step in the procedure. Where on the ascending aorta of authors' patients did the RPA arise? As more dorsal and unequal partitioning of the aortopulmonary trunk by the conotruncal ridges is the embryogenesis of the APW associated with origin of the

RPA from the ascending aorta,³ the RPA commonly arises from the right posterolateral aspect of the ascending aorta, and the geometry would be better preserved by our technique with an extensive mobilization of both the aortic arch and the pulmonary arteries. Therefore, our technique seems to be impartially applicable to this combination. Consequently, as the authors noted in the article, we also agree that it can allow not only sufficient enlargement but also growth of the reconstructed arteries (Figure 1).²

We appreciate that our technique using only autologous arterial wall tissue was valid for a large APW extending to the proximal site of the pulmonary artery trunk from the pulmonary bifurcation and with the interrupted aortic arch.¹ However, there are a few useful modifications of our technique: appropriately augmenting one of the reconstructed arteries with autologous pericardium is a good practical alternative to avoid a tense anastomosis of the reconstructed arteries in the individual geometry and associated lesions.^{4,5}

We think that our technique using autologous arterial wall tissue is valid for any APW with aortic origin of the RPA, with some practical modifications, and good late results were also certified by this article.

FIGURE 1. Right ventriculography 15 years after complete repair. These findings show sufficient growth and geometry of the reconstructed right pulmonary artery. Simultaneous cardiac catheterization exhibited that main pulmonary artery pressure is 25/7 (12) mm Hg, and peripheral right pulmonary artery pressure 15/8 (10) mm Hg. A, Anteroposterior view. B, Lateral view.

Tetsuya Kitagawa, MD, PhD
Takashi Kitaichi, MD, PhD
Homare Yoshida, MD, PhD
Department of Cardiovascular
Surgery
Institute of Health Biosciences
The University of Tokushima
Graduate School
Tokushima, Japan

References

1. Yoshida M, Yamaguchi M, Oshima Y, Oka S, Higuma T, Okita Y. Single-stage repair of aortopulmonary window with interrupted aortic arch by transection of the aorta and direct reconstruction. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2009;138:781-3.
2. Kitagawa T, Katoh I, Taki H, Wakisaka Y, Egawa Y, Takahashi Y, et al. New operative method for distal aortopulmonary septal defect. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1991;51:680-2.
3. Richardson JV, Doty DB, Rossi NP, Ehrenhaft JL. The spectrum of anomalies of aortopulmonary septation. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 1979;78:21-7.
4. Abbruzzese PA, Merlo M, Chiappa E, Bianco R, Ferrero F, Cappone CM. Berry syndrome, a complex aortopulmonary malformation: one-stage repair in a neonate. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1997;64:1167-9.
5. Codispoti M, Mankad PS. One-stage repair of interrupted aortic arch, aortopulmonary window, and anomalous origin of right pulmonary artery with autologous tissues. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1998;66:264-7.

doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.08.053

Reply to the Editor:

We thank Dr Kitagawa for his thoughtful and informative comments