average regurgitant fraction greater than 50%. One cannot extrapolate that a severely regurgitant valve can be successfully repaired with the same techniques as a moderately regurgitant valve. An additional constraint of the study is the lack of long-term hemodynamic analysis; in fact, analysis was limited to 10 cycles only. This study design does little to allay concerns regarding durability of repair techniques for aortic regurgitation.

Despite these limitations, the work presented by Zhu and colleagues³ still remains an important step forward in the development of a reproducible model of BAV-related regurgitation for future study of repair techniques.

References

1. Arnaoutakis GJ, Sultan I, Siki M, Bavaria JE. Bicuspid aortic valve repair: systematic review on long-term outcomes. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg*. 2019;8:302-12.
2. Wong CHM, Chan JSK, Sanli D, Rahimli R, Harky A. Aortic valve repair or replacement in patients with aortic regurgitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Card Surg*. 2019;34:377-84.
3. Zhu Y, Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Priromprintr B, Wang H, Lucian HJ, et al. Novel bicuspid aortic valve model with aortic regurgitation for hemodynamics status analysis using an ex vivo simulator. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2022;163:e161-71.
4. Sievers HH, Schmidtke C. A classification system for the bicuspid aortic valve from 304 surgical specimens. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2007;133:1226-33.
5. Zhu Y, Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Priromprintr B, Park MH, Wang H, et al. A novel aortic regurgitation model from cusp prolapse with hemodynamic validation using an ex vivo left heart simulator. *J Cardiovasc Transl Res*. 2021;14:283-9.
6. Al-Atassi T, Toeg HD, Jafar R, Sohmer B, Labrosse M, Boodhwani M. Impact of aortic annular geometry on aortic valve insufficiency: insights from a preclinical, ex vivo, porcine model. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2015;150:656-64.e1.
7. Toeg HD, Abessi O, Al-Atassi T, de Kerchove L, El-Khoury G, Labrosse M, et al. Finding the ideal biomaterial for aortic valve repair with ex vivo porcine left heart simulator and finite element modeling. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2014;148:1739-45.e1.
8. Labrosse MR, Boodhwani M, Sohmer B, Beller CJ. Modeling leaflet correction techniques in aortic valve repair: a finite element study. *J Biomech*. 2011;44:2292-8.
9. Nishimura RA, Otto CM, Bonow RO, Carabello BA, Erwin JP, Guyton RA, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association task force on practice guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2014;63:2438-88.

See Article page e161.

Commentary: Valvular mimicry in simulation—espice, adspice, prospice

Thomas G. Gleason, MD, and Sari Aranki, MD

In their article in this issue of the *Journal*, Zhu and colleagues¹ have identified another role for their ex vivo cardiac simulator, previously developed and reported on by Dr Woo's research team.¹⁻⁸ Their simulator includes a pulsatile piston pump with an impedance adapter, compliance chambers ("ventricular" and "aortic" chambers), and an adjustable peripheral resistance. It is

Note degree of sclerosis and fibrosis of this type 1 R/N bicuspid aortic valve.

CENTRAL MESSAGE

Cardiac simulators with tunable morphologic valve phenotype and pathophysiologic lesion capability may be a platform for testing valve repair strategies. Validation for clinical relevance remains.

equipped with high-speed videographic and echocardiographic capability, thus allowing for both visual and hemodynamic "aortic" or "mitral" valvular assessments within the simulator.²⁻⁸ In this latest article from Zhu and

From the Division of Cardiac Surgery, Brigham & Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Disclosures: Dr Gleason serves on a Medical Advisory Board for Abbott. Aranki has reported no conflicts of interest.

The *Journal* policy requires editors and reviewers to disclose conflicts of interest and to decline handling or reviewing manuscripts for which they may have a conflict of interest. The editors and reviewers of this article have no conflicts of interest.

Received for publication July 19, 2020; revisions received July 19, 2020; accepted for publication July 21, 2020; available ahead of print July 24, 2020.

Address for reprints: Thomas G. Gleason, MD, Division of Cardiac Surgery, Brigham & Women's Hospital, 75 Francis St, Boston, MA 02481 (E-mail: tgleason@bwh.harvard.edu).

J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2022;163:e174-6
0022-5223/\$36.00

Copyright © 2020 by The American Association for Thoracic Surgery
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.07.063>

colleagues,¹ the group reports on the development of a moderately regurgitant “bicuspid” aortic valve model. They have mimicked the most common bicuspid aortic valve (BAV) morphotype, the Sievers type 1 L/R morphotype,⁹ by sewing the apposing leading edges of the right and left coronary cusps of a bovine aortic valve to one another and reducing the R/L commissural height by detaching and repositioning it 10 mm below its original height. The bovine valve was then implanted into a porcine-sized outflow tract mounted within their simulator between its “ventricular” and “aortic” chambers. This valve construct rendered a moderately insufficient valve with demonstrated R/L cusp prolapse. The group then showed that this modified bovine valve could be successfully “repaired” by shortening the free margin of their conjoined R/L cusp with David’s free margin reinforcement technique.¹⁰

The current state-of-the-art of bicuspid aortic valve repair (and aortic valve repair in general) is fraught with inadequacies. The degree of nuance often required to determine what cusp repair maneuvers are most appropriate for use with a given construct and pathology can be baffling, even futile. Despite many advances in the field, the reality is that we still have a long way to go toward packaging a consistently durable and reproducible repair paradigm that can be broadly applied. Consequently, the concept of developing a tunable aortic valve repair simulator to study valve constructs and repair techniques could be helpful to our community. Zhu and colleagues¹ have demonstrated proof of concept toward development of such a simulator, albeit with several limitations related specifically to aortic valve repair that may limit its overall impact.

Notably, Zhu and colleagues¹ appropriately recognize that both cusp prolapse and cusp restriction play important roles in development of regurgitation in the context of type 1 L/R BAV—the most common form of BAV. The difficulty in truly mimicking these pathologic human valves with a normal bovine tricuspid aortic valve cannot be overemphasized. Leading edge fibrosis and cusp sclerosis are very important components of type 1 BAVs that impart restriction and dysfunction that are not easily reproduced ex vivo from normal animal valve constructs—as they are not in this current study of Zhu and colleagues.¹ Similarly, the R/L cusp depth (the cusp excursion distance between the leading edge at the raphe to its basilar attachment) in type 1 BAV is foreshortened and markedly thickened relative to the opposing “nonraphe’d” cusps, further imparting restriction in addition to the variable commissural height (Figure 1)—this is another difficult pathoanatomy to mimic accurately ex vivo.¹¹ In addition to refining pathologic valve mimicry to be more clinically relevant, expanding the capability of interrogating flow characteristics across the valve within their simulator (eg, quantifying

FIGURE 1. Note the degree of sclerosis and fibrosis of this type 1 R/N bicuspid aortic valve rendering the raphe’d cusp both restricted and prolapsing below the coaptation plane. This valve was severely regurgitant.

and localizing laminar, turbulent, and vortical flow¹²) to allow for more detailed analyses of cusp biomechanical stress maps could further broaden its utility. Finally, some validation of durability indices will be necessary when evaluating valve repair techniques for distinct pathoanatomic findings. Notwithstanding these limitations, this simulator may provide a practical means of studying valve repair paradigms.

References

1. Zhu Y, Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Priomprintr B, Wang H, Lucian HJ, et al. Novel bicuspid aortic valve model with aortic regurgitation for hemodynamics analysis using an ex vivo simulator. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2022;163: e161-71.
2. Imbrie-Moore AM, Paullin CC, Paulsen MJ, Grady F, Wang H, Hironaka CE, et al. A novel 3D-printed preferential posterior mitral annular dilation device delineates regurgitation onset threshold in an ex vivo heart simulator. *Med Eng Phys.* 2020;77:10-8.
3. Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Thakore AD, Wang H, Hironaka CE, Lucian HJ, et al. Ex vivo biomechanical study of apical versus papillary neochoord anchoring for mitral regurgitation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2019;108:90-7.
4. Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Zhu Y, Wang H, Lucian HJ, Farry JM, et al. A novel cross-species model of Barlow’s disease to biomechanically analyze repair techniques in an ex vivo left heart simulator. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2021; 161:1776-83.
5. Paulsen MJ, Bae JH, Imbrie-Moore A, Wang H, Hironaka C, Farry JM, et al. Development and ex vivo validation of novel force-sensing neochoordae for measuring chordae tendineae tension in the mitral valve apparatus using optical fibers with embedded Bragg gratings. *J Biomech Eng.* 2019;142: 0145011-9.
6. Paulsen MJ, Imbrie-Moore AM, Wang H, Bae JH, Hironaka CE, Farry JM, et al. Mitral chordae tendineae force profile characterization using a posterior ventricular anchoring neochoordal repair model for mitral regurgitation in a three-dimensional-printed ex vivo left heart simulator. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2020;57:535-44.
7. Paulsen MJ, Kasinpila P, Imbrie-Moore AM, Wang H, Hironaka CE, Koyano TK, et al. Modeling conduit choice for valve-sparing aortic root replacement on biomechanics with a 3-dimensional-printed heart simulator. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2019;158:392-403.
8. Zhu Y, Imbrie-Moore AM, Paulsen MJ, Priomprintr B, Park MH, Wang H, et al. A novel aortic regurgitation model from cusp prolapse with hemodynamic validation using an ex vivo left heart simulator. *J Cardiovasc Transl Res.* 2021;14: 283-9.

9. Sievers HH, Schmidtke C. A classification system for the bicuspid aortic valve from 304 surgical specimens. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2007;133:1226-33.
10. Alsoufi B, Borger MA, Armstrong S, Maganti M, David TE. Results of valve preservation and repair for bicuspid aortic valve insufficiency. *J Heart Valve Dis.* 2005;14:752-8; discussion 758-9.
11. Gleason TG. Bicuspid aortic valve repair by complete conversion from “raphe’d” (type 1) to “symmetric” (type 0) morphology. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2014;148:2862-8.e1-2.
12. Liu X, Weale P, Reiter G, Kino A, Dill K, Gleason T, et al. Breathhold time-resolved three-directional MR velocity mapping of aortic flow in patients after aortic valve-sparing surgery. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2009;29:569-75.