Clinical Outcomes of Limited Repair And Conservative Approaches In Older Patients With Acute Type A Aortic Dissection

Yasumi Maze (✉ ymze.19651229@gmail.com)

Ise Red Cross Hospital

Toshiya Tokui

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Masahiko Murakami

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Bun Nakamura

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Ryosai Inoue

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Reina Hirano

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Koji Hirano

Ise Red Cross Hospital: Ise Sekijuji Byoin

Research Article

Keywords: acute aortic dissection, surgical outcome, older patients, primary entry

Posted Date: August 5th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-772479/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery on April 15th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13019-022-01819-5>.

**Clinical outcomes of limited repair and conservative approaches in
older patients with acute type A aortic dissection**

Yasumi Maze^{1*}, Toshiya Tokui, Masahiko Murakami, Bun Nakamura,
Ryosai Inoue, Reina Hirano, Koji Hirano

¹ Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Ise Red Cross
Hospital, 1-471-2 Funae, Ise, Mie, 516-8512, Japan

* Correspondence:

Dr. Yasumi Maze, MD, PhD

E-mail: ymze.19651229@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Surgical indication and the selection of surgical procedures for acute type A aortic dissection in older patients are controversial; therefore, we examined the surgical outcomes in older patients.

Methods: From January 2012 through December 2019, 174 patients underwent surgical repair for acute type A aortic dissection. We compared the surgical outcomes between the older (≥ 80 years old) and below-80 (≤ 79 years old) age groups. Additionally, we compared the surgical and conservative treatment groups.

Results: The primary entry was found in the ascending aorta in 51.6% and 32.8% of the older and below-80 groups, respectively ($p = 0.049$). Ascending or hemiarch replacement was performed in all older group cases and 57.3% of the below-80 group cases (total arch replacement was performed in the remaining 42.7%; $p < 0.001$). Hospital mortality rates were similar in both groups. The significant risk factors for hospital mortality were age, preoperative intubation, cardiopulmonary bypass time, and postoperative stroke. The 5-year survival rates were $48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$ (older group) and $86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$ (below-80 group; $p < 0.001$). The

rates of freedom from aortic events at 5 years were $86.9\% \pm 8.7\%$ (older group) and $86.5\% \pm 3.9\%$ (below-80 group; $p = 0.771$). The 5-year survival rate of the conservative treatment group was $19.2\% \pm 8.0\%$ in the older group. There was no significant difference between the surgical treatment groups ($p = 0.103$).

Conclusion: The surgical approach did not achieve a significant survival advantage over conservative treatment and may not always be the reasonable treatment of choice for older patients.

Keywords: acute aortic dissection, surgical outcome, older patients, primary entry

Background

Several problems remain despite recent improvements in surgical outcomes of acute type A aortic dissection. In our aging society, surgical indications and surgical procedure selection are important issues for treating conditions like acute type A aortic dissection in older patients. Surgical treatment is indicated for treating acute type A aortic dissection in both older (≥ 80 years old) and below-80 patients [1-3]. However, older

patients are prone to dementia and are bedridden after surgery, thus increasing the burden on their families [8-10]. Therefore, older patients should carefully decide on the surgical indication [4] and select a partial arch replacement or hemiarch replacement as a surgical procedure [5,6]. Same surgical outcomes have been reported in older and younger patients [7].

For the past few years, we have selected ascending aortic replacement (including hemiarch replacement) as the surgical procedure for acute type A aortic dissection in patients aged 80 years or older, regardless of the primary entry site. This study aimed to examine the adequacy of our strategy.

Materials and methods

All operations and data collection were performed at Ise Red Cross Hospital, Ise, Japan. Clinical outcome data were obtained from the hospital's patient records or information from the patient's family doctor.

From January 2012 through December 2019, 174 patients underwent surgical repair for acute type A aortic dissection at our institution. We divided these patients into the older ($n = 31$, ≥ 80 years

old) and below-80 (n = 143, ≤79 years old) groups and compared their surgical results. Furthermore, patients with acute aortic dissection who chose conservative treatment because of comorbidities or refusal of surgical treatment were also divided into the older and below-80 groups. Within each age group, we compared the outcomes between the surgical and conservative treatment groups. The Institutional Review Board approved the present study, and all participants provided informed consent.

Operative techniques

The operation was performed through median sternotomy in all patients. Arterial cannulation sites (femoral artery alone or combined with right axillary artery) were determined according to the patient's status, preoperative organ malperfusion, and surgeon's preference. A two-stage venous cannula was inserted into the right atrium, and cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) was established. Systemic cooling to 25°C in the pharynx was performed. The left ventricle was vented through the right superior pulmonary vein. After the distal ascending aorta was clamped, the ascending aorta was opened, and cold cardioplegia was delivered directly

into the coronary ostia. Subsequent myocardial protection was performed via retrograde infusion. A hypothermic arrest was obtained at pharynx temperatures less than 25°C, and then the aortic arch was opened and assessed. Cerebral perfusion was achieved by antegrade selective cannulation of the orifices of all arch branches. However, when the right axillary artery was used as a cannulation site for CPB, the right axillary artery cannula was substituted for antegrade cerebral perfusion and the proximal part of the brachiocephalic artery was clamped.

An open distal anastomosis was performed regularly under moderate hypothermic circulatory arrest (25°C) and antegrade selective cerebral perfusion. The extent of graft replacement was decided as follows: In the older group, ascending or hemiarch replacement was performed regardless of the primary entry site. In the below-80 group, ascending or hemiarch replacement was selected if the primary entry was located on the ascending aorta or the lesser curvature of the aortic arch, and total arch replacement (TAR) was performed if the primary entry was located beyond the left subclavian artery or greater curvature of the aorta. In patients undergoing TAR, all distal anastomoses were performed using either a conventional elephant trunk (ET) or frozen

elephant trunk (FET) [11], depending on the age and patient situation.

In patients undergoing ascending or hemiarch replacement, reinforcement of the distal anastomosis was performed by improving the conventional adventitial inversion technique [12]. In brief, after BioGlue® was applied to obliterate the false lumen, the redundant adventitia was inverted into the aortic lumen, and the Teflon felt that TachoSil® (fibrinogen/thrombin-based collagen fleece) was attached to the outer wall of the aorta and tacked to the luminal surface of the intima using polypropylene mattress sutures. As described above, an anastomotic site of the aorta was performed.

After the distal anastomosis, whole-body circulation was resumed through the branch of the prosthesis, and the patient was fully rewarmed to 35°C. The ascending aorta was transected at a level of 1–2 cm distal to the sinotubular junction. Proximal reinforcement and anastomosis were performed using the modified adventitial inversion technique as described above.

A single-branch prosthesis (J Shield Neo, Japan Lifeline Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) was used in the ascending aortic or hemiarch replacement, and a four-branch prosthesis (J Shield Neo; Japan Lifeline Co. Ltd., Tokyo,

134 Japan) was used in TAR. FET prosthesis (J graft Frozenix®, Japan Lifeline
135 Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) was used in the FET technique.

136

137 **Definitions**

138 *Preoperative shock* was defined as systolic blood pressure <80 mmHg,
139 *cardiac tamponade* was defined as a shock caused by the cardiac effusion
140 observed on a preoperative echocardiogram, and *malperfusion* was
141 defined as a symptom indicating the disruption of blood flow to the
142 end-organ systems (classified as a central nervous system, coronary,
143 viscera, or extremities). The central nervous system disorders caused by
144 malperfusion were classified as transient or persistent according to the
145 duration of the clinical presentation. *Stroke* was defined as a central
146 neurological deficit after surgery and was confirmed by computed
147 tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging. Death occurring within
148 the hospital was defined as *hospital mortality*.

149 We defined the location of the primary entry using the
150 intraoperative findings. The entry sites were classified as follows: the
151 *ascending aorta* was defined up to the bifurcation of the brachiocephalic
152 artery. The *proximal arch* extended from the bifurcation of the

brachiocephalic artery to the bifurcation of the left common carotid artery, and the *distal arch* from the bifurcation of the left common carotid artery to the bifurcation of the left subclavian artery. The *descending aorta* was defined from the bifurcation of the left subclavian artery. In addition, if the entry could not be identified from the intraoperative findings, it was set as unknown.

At the time of discharge, the activities of daily living (ADL) status was evaluated and was defined according to the Japan National Clinical Database as ‘severely compromised,’ ‘moderately compromised,’ and ‘not affected, corresponding to Modified Rankin Scale [13] grade 5, grade 4, and grade 0–3, respectively.

Postoperative false lumen patency rate was evaluated within six months after surgery using contrast-enhanced CT and classified as ‘fully thrombosed,’ ‘thoracic aorta patent,’ ‘thoracic and abdominal aorta patent,’ ‘abdominal aorta patent,’ and ‘unknown.’

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the statistical software EZR (Easy R) on the R commander [14]. The continuous variables were

expressed as mean values $\pm$ standard deviation and compared using the Student's t-test, whereas categorical variables were expressed as counts and percentages and compared using the χ^2 test. Hospital mortality was evaluated using multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression analysis. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were constructed to assess differences in survival between the older and below-80 patient groups and between the surgical and conservative treatment groups. Lastly, the survival distributions were compared using log-rank tests. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

The preoperative patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. DeBakey type II aortic dissection was significantly more common in the older group, whereas type I was significantly more common in the below-80 group. Complete thrombosis of the false lumen was significantly more common in the older group. However, the 30-day operative mortality of the Japan score did not differ between the two groups.

The intra-operative data are summarized in Table 2. Primary entry

was found in the ascending aorta in 51.6% and 32.8% of the older and below-80 group patients, respectively ($p = 0.049$); however, the primary entry resection rates did not differ between the two groups (87.0% vs. 82.5%, $p = 0.535$). Ascending or hemiarch replacement was performed in all cases in the older group, but only in 57.3% of patients in the below-80 group ($p < 0.001$). The operation time, CPB time, and selective cerebral perfusion time were significantly longer in the below-80 group than in the older group; the intraoperative blood loss was significantly lower in the older group ($p = 0.023$).

The postoperative data are summarized in Table 3. Stroke was found in 25.8% and 27.2% of the older and below-80 group patients, respectively. There were five in-hospital deaths in the older group (mortality, 16.1%). The causes of death were stroke ($n = 3$), sepsis ($n = 1$), and rupture of the residual aorta ($n = 1$). There were 11 in-hospital deaths in the below-80 group (mortality, 7.6%). The causes of death were stroke ($n = 8$), postoperative bleeding ($n = 2$), and rupture of the residual aorta ($n = 1$). The discharge rates were 41.9% and 63.6% in the older and below-80 groups, respectively ($p = 0.025$). Regarding the ADL status at discharge, the non-affected group was significantly more common in

210 the below-80 group ($p = 0.002$), and the severely compromised group
211 was significantly more common in the older group ($p = 0.010$). Regarding
212 postoperative false lumen patency, complete thrombosis of the false
213 lumen was significantly more common in the older group ($p = 0.021$),
214 whereas thoracic and abdominal aorta patency of the false lumen was
215 significantly more common in the below-80 group ($p < 0.001$). The late
216 aortic events were identified, including thoracic endovascular aortic
217 repair (TEVAR), descending aorta rupture, descending aorta replacement,
218 and anastomotic pseudoaneurysm (Table 3).

219 Surgical and conservative treatment sub-groups of the older group
220 are compared in Table 4. Forty-five cases in the older group chose
221 conservative therapy because of comorbidities (decreased ADL [12 cases],
222 thrombosis and reduction of the false lumen [7 cases], and advanced
223 dementia [5 cases]) or refusal of surgical treatment by patients or their
224 families (21 cases). Dementia and decreased ADL (inability to walk
225 without assistance) cases were significantly higher in the conservative
226 treatment group. However, the length of hospital stay was significantly
227 shorter in the conservative treatment group. The ADL status at discharge
228 and the dissection-related status did not significantly differ between the

two treatment groups.

Hospital mortality

The multivariate logistic regression analysis identified significant risk factors associated with hospital mortality, namely age, preoperative intubation, CPB time, and postoperative stroke (Table 5).

Long-term mortality

The overall mean follow-up period was 30.3 ± 28.3 months (median, 21 months; range, 0.03–93 months). The mean follow-up period was 19.3 ± 25.6 months (median, 6 months; range, 0.03–86 months) in the older surgical group, 17.0 ± 23.4 months (median, 10 months; range, 0.03–93 months) in the older conservative group, 36.8 ± 27.9 months (median 32 months, range 0.03–93 months) in the below-80 surgical group, and 30.8 ± 28.7 months (median, 24 months; range, 0.03–91 months) in the below-80 conservative group. The 5-year survival rates were $48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$ and $86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$ in the older and below-80 groups, respectively ($p < 0.001$, Figure 1A). The rates of freedom from aortic events at 5 years were $86.9\% \pm 8.7\%$ and $86.5\% \pm 3.9\%$ in the older and below-80

groups, respectively ($p = 0.771$, Figure 1B). The 5-year survival rate of the conservative treatment sub-group was $19.2\% \pm 8.0\%$ in the older group. There was no significant difference between the surgical treatment groups ($p = 0.103$, Figure 2A). Similarly, we compared the 5-year survival rates of the surgical ($86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$) and conservative ($63.5\% \pm 9.6\%$) sub-groups in the below-80 group; the prognosis was significantly better in the surgical group ($p = 0.024$, Figure 2B).

Discussion

Japan has one of the highest life expectancy rates in the world, and the likelihood of an acute type A aortic dissection in older patients is particularly high in an aging society.

Acute type A aortic dissection remains a fatal disease despite recent improvements in surgical outcomes, and the patients experience various post-surgical complications. Based on several reports on surgical outcomes in older patients with acute type A aortic dissection, the surgical mortality rate is $3.7\%–35\%$ [2-4,9,10,15-18]. TAR has higher mortality and morbidity rates than ascending or hemiarch replacement [19]. Another study reported that despite longer CPB, aortic clamp, and

267 circulatory arrest times, there was no difference in mortality and
268 morbidity between hemiarch replacement and TAR [20]. Some studies
269 reported that the surgical procedure in all older patients with acute type
270 A aortic dissection was either ascending or hemiarch replacement [2,9],
271 whereas others reported ascending or hemiarch replacement in 90% of
272 patients [3,10,17,19]. These reports indicate that older patients with
273 acute type A aortic dissection avoid TAR as a surgical procedure. We
274 selected ascending or hemiarch replacement as the surgical procedure
275 for acute type A aortic dissection in patients over 80 years of age,
276 regardless of the primary entry site. It is important to evaluate whether
277 the inability to resect the primary entry affects the prognosis because
278 non-resection of the primary entry is a predictor of survival and distal
279 aortic events [21]. Furthermore, aggressive primary entry resection can
280 enhance false lumen thrombosis and reduce aortic reoperation [22]. In
281 contrast, a report suggests that aortic events do not change even if the
282 entry is not resected and the patient is followed up carefully [23]. In our
283 study, all older group patients had selected ascending or hemiarch
284 replacement as the surgical procedure. The entry resection rate in the
285 older group was 87%; however, the entry resection rate and long-term

286 aortic events did not differ between the older and below-80 group
287 patients. Descending aorta replacement, TEVAR, and rupture of the
288 descending aorta as late aortic events occurred in two cases in the older
289 group and eight cases in the below-80 group (Table 3); both cases in the
290 older group and five cases in the below-80 group were able to undergo
291 entry resection. Therefore, even if the entry can be resected, aortic
292 remodeling may proceed if there is a reentry in the residual aorta, and
293 careful follow-up is required. Our multivariate analysis identified
294 advanced age and longer CPB time as risk factors of postoperative
295 hospital mortality. The CPB time can be shortened by selecting an
296 ascending or hemiarch replacement for older patients.

297 Selecting ascending or hemiarch replacement without sticking to
298 the entry resection and shortening the operation time may contribute to
299 the surgical outcomes in the older patients with acute type A aortic
300 dissection; the location of the primary entry tear significantly influences
301 early outcomes and short-and long-term survival of patients [24]. In
302 general, intimal tears are frequently found in the segments exposed to
303 the greatest shear stress, namely the ascending aorta's right lateral wall
304 (opposite the main pulmonary artery) or descending aorta's proximal

305 segment [25]. In our study, the primary entry was likely to occur in the
306 ascending aorta, and DeBakey type II dissection was likely to occur in the
307 older patients. There are other reports such as this [3,4]. Older patients
308 may be more likely to be stressed by the ascending aorta due to the
309 prognosis of arteriosclerosis. Therefore, primary entry is common in the
310 ascending aorta of older patients.

311 Next, we would like to discuss the indications for surgery and the
312 postoperative course in older patients. Although the general condition
313 before surgery affects the outcome, advanced age alone should not be
314 considered a contraindication to acute type A aortic dissection repair
315 [2,3,6]. An age of ≥ 80 years was a risk factor for in-hospital mortality
316 during operation for acute type A aortic dissection [4]. Hata and
317 colleagues [9] described that older patients had post-surgical
318 complications, such as cerebral damage, depression, pneumonia, or renal
319 failure and ultimately became bedridden, causing significant mental,
320 physical, and economic stress. Aoyama and colleagues [19] reported that
321 the discharge rate was significantly higher in the conservative treatment
322 group (52.8%) than the surgical treatment group (42.8%, $p < 0.01$) of
323 older (≥ 80 years) patients with acute type A aortic dissection.

Furthermore, the durations of hospital and ICU stay were significantly longer, and medical expenses were significantly higher in the surgical treatment group than in the conservative treatment group. In our study, the older group had a significantly worse ADL status at discharge and a significantly lower discharge rate (41.9%) than the below-80 group (63.6%). Moreover, 12 older group patients were transferred to the rehabilitation hospital after surgery, and four of them died due to pneumonia or heart failure within 1 year after surgery.

The 5-year survival rates did not differ between the surgical and conservative treatment sub-groups of the older patients; however, even if the life of the older patients can be saved through surgical treatment, it may lead to a decrease in quality of life and based on the long-term prognosis, the patient may not benefit from surgical treatment. Therefore, surgical indications should be carefully considered for older patients with acute type A aortic dissection. Older patients are likely to experience irreversible physical deterioration after surgery and may progress to dementia or be bedridden, thus increasing burden and stress on the family. Post-intensive care syndrome [26,27] should be considered, and cardiac surgeons should work together for the patient's postoperative

rehabilitation to maximize the possibility of discharging the patient.

In our study, postoperative stroke was more frequent in both the older and below-80 groups. Four of eight postoperative stroke cases in the older group and 14 of 39 postoperative stroke cases in the below-80 group had persistent CNS malperfusion before surgery. Therefore, postoperative stroke cases may include preoperative stroke cases. In our study, stroke was the most common cause of postoperative death in both the older and below-80 patients and a major risk factor affecting hospital mortality. Therefore, stroke reduction is the most important factor for improving surgical results. Effective axillary artery cannulation could prevent stroke after aortic arch replacement [28-30]. In addition, we are currently trying to actively introduce and improve cannulation of the right axillary artery in CPB to reduce postoperative neurological damage. Furthermore, we have recently collected data to assess pre-and postoperative ADL using the Barthel index, which may help predict postoperative outcomes in older patients in our subsequent study.

Limitations

The present study was limited by its retrospective, single-center design.

Furthermore, the small number of cases makes it difficult to draw a clear conclusion. For instance, the hospital mortality and long-term survival did not significantly differ between the surgical and conservative treatment groups of the older patients. In the future, as the number of cases increases, it may be possible to obtain results that indicate that hospital death is significantly reduced in the surgical treatment group. Therefore, the superiority of surgical treatment for acute type A aortic dissection may increase, even in older patients.

Conclusion

In older patients, primary entry due to acute type A aortic dissection is likely to occur in the ascending aorta. Furthermore, DeBakey type II dissection is significantly more common in the older patients than the below-80 group patients, which is consistent with the selection of ascending or hemiarch replacement as the surgical procedure. Older patients are prone to irreversible physical deterioration after surgery; therefore, it may not be possible to take advantage of surgical treatment. Moreover, surgical treatment could not achieve a significant survival advantage over the conservative approach; thus, it may not always be the

381 reasonable treatment of choice for older patients. This point should be
382 explained to the patient's family while deciding about whether to adopt
383 the surgical approach.

384

385

386 **Abbreviations**

387 TAR: total arch replacement

388 ET: elephant trunk

389 FET: frozen elephant trunk

390 CT: computed tomography

391 ICU: intensive care unit

392 AVR: aortic valve replacement

393 CABG: coronary artery bypass grafting

394 CNS: central nervous system

395 CPB: cardiopulmonary bypass

396 ADL: activities of daily living

397 TEVAR: thoracic endovascular aortic repair

398

399

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was approved by the ‘Institutional Review Board for Observation and Epidemiological Study’ of Ise Red Cross Hospital, and all participants provided informed consent.

Consent for publication

The patients gave permission for the publication of this study.

Availability of data and materials

Please contact the corresponding author regarding any data requests.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Authors’ contributions

YM designed the study and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. YM and TT contributed to the analysis and interpretation of the data and assisted in the preparation of the manuscript. MM, BN, RI, RH, and KH contributed to the clinical management of the patients. YM and TT performed the surgery of patients. YM and TT revised the manuscript critically and approved the modified text. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Figure legends

Figure 1. A: The 5-year survival rate was significantly lower in the older group ($48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$) than the below-80 group ($86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$) of patients. **B:** The rate of freedom from aortic events at 5 years did not significantly differ between the older group ($86.9\% \pm 8.7\%$) and the below-80 group ($86.5\% \pm 3.9\%$) of patients.

Figure 2. A: In the older group of patients, the 5-year survival rate did

not significantly differ between the surgical ($48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$) and conservative ($19.2\% \pm 8.0\%$) treatment groups. **B:** In the below-80 group of patients, the 5-year survival rate in the surgical treatment group ($86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$) was significantly higher than the conservative treatment group ($63.5\% \pm 9.6\%$).

References

- 1) Minatoya K, Ogino H, Matsuda H, Sasaki H, Tanaka H, Kobayashi J, et al. Is conventional aortic arch surgery justifiable in octogenarians? J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2010;139:641-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.11.008>
- 2) Malvindi PG, Modi A, Miskolczi M, Kaarne M, Barlow C, Ohri SK, et al. Acute type A aortic dissection repair in elderly patients. Euro J Cardiothoracic Surg. 2015;48:664-70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejcts/ezu543>
- 3) Suzuki T, Asai T, Kinoshita T. Emergency surgery for acute type A aortic dissection in octogenarians without patient selection. Ann Thorac Surg 2019;107:1146-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2018.10.010>

- 457 4) Omura A, Matsuda H, Minami H, Nakai H, Henmi S, Murakami H, et al.
458 Early and late outcome of operation for acute type A aortic dissection in
459 patients aged 80 years and older. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2017;103:131-8.
460 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2016.05.046>
- 461 5) Komatsu K, Takano T, Terasaki T, Wada Y, Seto T, Fukui D, et al.
462 Surgical outcomes of acute type A aortic dissection in elderly patients.
463 *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2014;97:1576-81.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2014.01.045>
- 465 6) Kreibich M, MHBA, Rylski B, Czerny M, Siepe M, Beyersdorf F, Chen Z,
466 et al. Influence of age and the burden of ischemic injury on the outcome
467 of type A aortic dissection repair. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2019;108:1391-7.
468 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2019.04.047>
- 469 7) Bruno VD, Chivasso P, Guida G, Vohra HA. Surgical repair of Stanford
470 type A aortic dissection in elderly patients: a contemporary systematic
471 review and meta-analysis. *Ann Cardiothoracic Surg.* 2016;5(4):257-64.
472 doi: 10.21037/acs.2016.06.03
- 473 8) Hata M, Sezai A, Yoshitake I, Wakui S, Minami K, Shiono M. Midterm
474 outcomes of rapid, minimally invasive resection of acute type A aortic
475 dissection in octogenarians. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2010;89:1860-5.

476 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2010.01.050>

477 9) Hata M, Sezai A, Niino T, Yoda M, Unosawa S, Furukawa N, et al.

478 Should emergency surgical intervention be performed for an

479 octogenarian with type A acute aortic dissection? J Thorac Cardiovasc

480 Surg. 2008;135:1042-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2007.08.078>

481 10) Matsushita A, Tabata M, Fukui T, Sato Y, Matsuyama S, Shimokawa T,

482 et al. Outcomes of contemporary emergency open surgery for type A

483 acute aortic dissection in elderly patients. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.

484 2014; 147:290-4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012.11.007>

485 11) Hirano K, Tokui T, Nakamura B, Inoue R, Inagaki M, Hirano R, et al.

486 Impact of frozen elephant trunk technique on total aortic arch

487 replacement. Ann Vasc Surg. 2019;65:206-16.

488 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avsg.2019.10.075>06-16.

489 12) Tanaka K, Morioka K, Li W, Yamada N, Takamori A, Handa M, et al.

490 Adventitial inversion technique without the aid of biologic glue or Teflon

491 buttress for acute type A aortic dissection. Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg.

492 2005;28:864-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcts.2005.08.029>

493

494 13) van Swieten JC, Koudstaal PJ, Visser MC, Schouten HJA, van Gijn J.

495 Interobserver agreement for assessment of handicap in stroke patients.
 496 Stroke. 1988;19:604-607. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.STR.19.5.604>

497 14) Kanda Y. Investigation of the free available easy-to-use software ‘EZR’
 498 for medical statistics. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2013;48:452-8.
 499 <https://doi.org/10.1038/bmt.2012.244>

500 15) Santini F, Montalbano G, Messina A, D’Onofrio A, Casali G, Viscardi F,
 501 et al. Survival and quality of life after repair of acute type A aortic
 502 dissection in patients aged 75 years and older justify intervention. Eur J
 503 Cardio Thorac Surg. 2006;29:386-91.
 504 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcts.2005.12.016>

505 16) Rylski B, Suedkamp M, Beyersdorf F, Nitsch B, Hoffmann I, Blettner
 506 M, et al. Outcome after surgery for acute aortic dissection type A in
 507 patients over 70 years: data analysis from the German Registry for acute
 508 aortic dissection type A (GERAADA). Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg.
 509 2011;40:435-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcts.2010.11.073>

510 17) Melchers JJ, Panholzer B, Friedrich C, Broch O, Renner J, Schottler J,
 511 et al. Long-term outcome and quality of life following emergency surgery
 512 for acute aortic dissection type A: a comparison between young and
 513 elderly adults. Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg. 2017;51:465-71.

514 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejcts/ezw408>

515 18) Aoyama T, Kunisawa S, Fushimi K, Sawa T, Imanaka Y. Comparison
516 of surgical and conservative treatment outcomes for type A aortic
517 dissection in elderly patients. J Cardio Thorac Surg. 2018;13:129-36.

518 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13019-018-0814-6>

519 19) Kim JB, Chung CH, Moon DH, Ha GJ, Lee TY, Jung SH, et al. Total
520 arch repair versus hemiarch repair in the management of acute DeBakey
521 type I aortic dissection. Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg. 2011;40:881-9.

522 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcts.2010.12.035>

523 20) Poon SS, Theologou T, Harrington D, Kuduvalli M, Oo A, Field M.
524 Hemiarch versus total aortic arch replacement in acute type A dissection:
525 a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Cardiothoracic
526 Surg.2016;5(3):156-73. doi: 10.21037/acs.2016.05.06

527 21) Kimura N, Itoh S, Yuri K, Adachi K, Matsumoto H, Yamaguchi A, et al.
528 Reoperation for enlargement of the distal aorta after initial surgery for
529 acute type A aortic dissection. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2015;149:S91-8.

530 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2014.08.008>

531 22) Inoue Y, Minatoya K, Oda T, Itonaga T, Seike Y, Tanaka H, et al.
532 Surgical outcomes for acute type A aortic dissection with aggressive

533 primary entry resection. Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg. 2016;50:567-73.
 534 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejcts/ezw111>

535 23) Unosawa S, Hata M, Niino T, Shimura K, Shiono M. Prognosis of
 536 patients undergoing emergency surgery for type A acute aortic dissection
 537 without exclusion of the intimal tear. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.
 538 2013;146:67-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012.05.067>

539 24) Merkle J, Sabashnikov A, Deppe AC, Weber S, Mader N, Choi YH, et
 540 al. Impact of different aortic entry tear sites on early outcomes and
 541 long-term survival in patients with Stanford A acute aortic dissection.
 542 Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2019;67:363-71. DOI: 10.1055/s-0038-1649511
 543

544 25) Joanna G, Felix S, Arnold E. Acute aortic dissection: pathogenesis,
 545 risk factors and diagnosis. Swiss Med Wkly.2017;147:w14489-95.
 546 <https://doi.org/10.4414/smw.2017.14489>

547 26) Needham D, Davidson J, Cohen H, Hopkins RO, Weinert C, Wunsch H,
 548 et al. Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care
 549 unit: Report from a stakeholders' conference. Crit Care
 550 Med.2012;40(2):502-9. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e318232da75

551 27) Elliott D, Davidson JE, Harvey MA, Dougherty AB, Hopkins RO,

552 Iwashyna TJ, et al. Exploring the scope of post-intensive care syndrome
 553 therapy and care: Engagement of non-critical care providers and
 554 survivors in a second stakeholders meeting. Crit Care
 555 Med.2014;42(12):2518-26. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000525
 556 28) Benedetto U, Mohamed H, Vitulli P, Petrou M. Axillary versus
 557 femoral arterial cannulation in type A acute aortic dissection: evidence
 558 from a meta-analysis of comparative studies and adjusted risk estimates.
 559 Eur J Cardio Thorac Surg. 2015 ;48:953-9.
 560 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejcts/ezv035>
 561 29) Rylski B, Czerny M, Beyersdorf F, Kari FA, Siepe M, Adachi H, et al.
 562 Is right axillary artery cannulation safe in type A aortic dissection with
 563 involvement of the innominate artery? J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2016;
 564 152: 801-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2016.04.092>
 565 30) Kim JH, Lee SH, Lee S, Youn YN, Yoo KJ, Joo HC. Axillary artery
 566 cannulation reduces early embolic stroke and mortality after open arch
 567 repair with circulatory arrest. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2020; 159:
 568 772-778. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2019.02.112>
 569

Table 1: Preoperative characteristics

	Elderly group (n= 31)	Non-elderly group (n= 143)	p value
Age	83.6±2.8	64.0±10.4	< 0.001
Male sex	10(32.2)	74(51.7)	0.073
Hypertension	19(61.2)	88(61.5)	0.979
Hemodialysis	0	2(1.3)	0.507
Coronary artery disease	0	4(2.7)	0.346
Cerebrovascular disease	2(6.4)	14(9.7)	0.559
Dissection related status			
DeBakey			
I	16(51.6)	108(75.5)	0.007
II	15(48.4)	32(22.3)	0.003
III	0	3(2.1)	0.415
Fully thrombosed false lumen	14(45.1)	33(23.0)	0.012
Preoperative shock	8(25.8)	36(25.1)	0.941
Tracheal intubation	2(6.4)	15(10.4)	0.492
Cardiac tamponade	9(29.0)	33(23.0)	0.482
Pericardial drainage	8(25.8)	20(13.9)	0.104
Organ malperfusion	6(19.3)	48(33.5)	0.121
CNS	6(19.3)	37(25.8)	0.445
Transient	1(3.2)	15(10.4)	0.204
Persistent	5(16.1)	22(15.3)	0.917
Japan Score			
30 days operative mortality	9.6±6.7	10.9±13.7	0.296

CNS: central nervous system

Table 2 : The intra-operative data are summarized in Table

Intra-operative data			
	Elderly group (n= 31)	Non-elderly group (n= 143)	p value
Entry site			
Ascending aorta	16(51.6)	47(32.8)	0.049
Proximal arch	8(25.8)	33(23.0)	0.745
Distal arch	5(16.1)	40(27.9)	0.172
Descending aorta	0	10(6.9)	0.129
Unknown	2(6.4)	13(9.0)	0.635
Entry resection	27(87.0)	118(82.5)	0.535
Procedures			
Ascending / Hemiarch replacement	31(100)	82(57.3)	< 0.001
Total arch replacement	0	61(42.7)	< 0.001
Concomitant procedures			
AVR	0	4	
CABG	2	7	
Root replacement	1	3	
Operative data			
Duration, minutes			
Operation	347.1±92.2	425.1±123.6	< 0.001
Cardiopulmonary bypass	206.8±52.0	245.2±69.3	0.002
Circulatory arrest	58.0±9.4	55.2±14.5	0.151
Cardiac arrest	153.7±33.0	160.5±39.1	0.184
Selective cerebral perfusion	57.5±16.4	99.8±58.5	< 0.001
Blood loss, mL	1489.7±686.4	2046.7±1517.5	0.023

AVR: aortic valve replacement

CABG: coronary artery bypass grafting

Table 3 : The postoperative data are summarized in Table.

Postoperative data			
	Elderly group (n= 31)	Non-elderly group (n= 143)	p value
Mechanical ventilation time $\geq$ 48 hours	9(25.0)	35(24.4)	0.596
Renal replacement therapy	3(9.6)	10(6.9)	0.606
Stroke	8(25.8)	39(27.2)	0.867
Length of ICU stay, days	8.0 $\pm$ 8.6	6.5 $\pm$ 6.6	0.170
Length of hospital stay, days	25.3 $\pm$ 23.3	27.2 $\pm$ 22.1	0.332
ADL status at discharge			
not affected	12(38.7)	97(67.8)	0.002
moderately compromised	8(25.8)	27(18.8)	0.383
severely compromised	6(19.3)	8(5.5)	0.010
Discharge to home	13(41.9)	91(63.6)	0.025
Hospital death	5(16.1)	11(7.6)	0.140
Postoperative false lumen patency			
Fully thrombosed	16(51.6)	43(30.0)	0.021
Thoracic aorta patent	2(6.4)	5(3.4)	0.447
Thoracic and abdominal aorta patent	4(12.9)	67(46.8)	p<0.001
Abdominal aorta patent	1(3.2)	13(9.0)	0.276
Unknown	8(25.8)	15(10.4)	0.022
Late aortic events			
TEVAR	1	5	
Descending aorta rupture	1	1	
Descending aorta replacement		2	
Anastomotic pseudoaneurysm		2	
Others		2	

ICU: intensive care unit ADL: activities of daily living TEVAR: thoracic endovascular aortic repair

Table 4 : Characteristics of surgical group and conservative group in elderly patients

	All patients over 80 years of age		p value
	Surgical group (n= 31)	Conservative group (n= 45)	
Age	83.6±2.8	85.4±3.5	0.013
Male sex	10(32.2)	14(31.1)	0.915
Preoperative status			
Dementia	1(3.2)	10(22.2)	0.020
Cerebrovascular disease	2(6.4)	4(8.8)	0.698
ADL decline	0	13(28.8)	0.001
Dissection related status			
DeBakey			
I	16(51.6)	28(62.2)	0.357
II	15(48.4)	14(31.1)	0.127
III	0	1(2.2)	0.403
unknown	0	2(4.4)	0.234
Fully thrombosed false lumen	14(45.1)	23(51.1)	0.610
Pericardial drainage	8(25.8)	7(15.5)	0.269
ADL status at discharge			
not affected	12(38.7)	11(24.4)	0.183
moderately compromised	8(25.8)	13(28.8)	0.767
severely compromised	6(19.3)	7(15.5)	0.665
Hospital death	5(16.1)	14(31.1)	0.138
Length of hospital stay, days	25.3±23.3	14.9±12.0	0.006
Discharge home	13(41.9)	11(24.4)	0.106

ADL: activities of daily living

Table 5: Multivariate logistic regression analysis for risk factors associated with hospital mortality

variable	Odds ratio	95% Confidence interval	p value
Age	9.38	1.64-53.6	0.01
Malperfusion	1.07	0.28-4.09	0.91
CNS (transient)	0.52	0.06-4.34	0.55
CNS (persistent)	0.67	0.13-3.54	0.64
Preoperative intubation	14.0	2.47-79.0	p<0.01
CPB long ($\geq$ 240 minutes)	6.40	1.12-36.5	0.03
TAR	1.98	0.32-12.0	0.45
Postoperative stroke	10.8	2.62-44.6	p<0.01
CNS: central nervous system	CPB: cardiopulmonary bypass	TAR: total arch replacement	

Figures

Figure 1

A: The 5-year survival rate was significantly lower in the older group ($48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$) than the below-80 group ($86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$) of patients. B: The rate of freedom from aortic events at 5 years did not significantly differ between the older group ($86.9\% \pm 8.7\%$) and the below-80 group ($86.5\% \pm 3.9\%$) of patients.

Figure 2

A: In the older group of patients, the 5-year survival rate did not significantly differ between the surgical ($48.4\% \pm 10.3\%$) and conservative ($19.2\% \pm 8.0\%$) treatment groups. B: In the below-80 group of patients, the 5-year survival rate in the surgical treatment group ($86.7\% \pm 2.9\%$) was significantly higher than the conservative treatment group ($63.5\% \pm 9.6\%$).