

Use of guide extension devices at the University Hospital Merkur: initial experiences

Tomislav Letilović*,
Damir Kozmar

University Hospital Merkur,
Zagreb, Croatia

KEYWORDS: guiding catheter, guide extension, percutaneous coronary intervention.

CITATION: *Cardiol Croat.* 2016;11(3-4):113. | DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15836/ccar2016.113>

***ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE:** Tomislav Letilović, Klinička bolnica Merkur, Zajčeva 19, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia. / Phone: +385-98-782-002 / E-mail: letilovic@yahoo.com

ORCID: Tomislav Letilović, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1229-7983> • Damir Kozmar, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7626-3534>

Background: In complex coronary interventions stent delivery can be extremely challenging. Stent delivery failure is not only surrogate of procedure failure but it can also result in serious complications. Guide extension devices (Guideliner[®] and Guidezilla[®]) are specifically designed to enable stent delivery.¹ The purpose of this report is to present our initial experiences with those devices.

Methods and Results: Guide extension devices are available in our catheterization laboratory since June 2015. Until January 2016 we used them in 7 percutaneous coronary interventions (2 left anterior descending, 4 right coronary artery and 1 circumflex artery intervention). According to the ACC/AHA classification 5 (71%) of lesions were designated as type C lesion by the operator. In total 6 (85%) interventions resulted in procedural success. Guide extension related interventions were done with 1.50±1.74 balloons and 1.8±1.09 stents on average. Mean fluoroscopy time was 23.90±5.82 minutes and average mean contrast use was 231.40±57.67 milliliters. No device related complications were noted. Interestingly we also used, as a support device, Guideliner[®] during one CRT implantation.

Conclusion: Our initial experiences with guide extension devices show that they can enhance procedural success rate in complex coronary interventions. We observed no device related complications in our small group of patients. Those devices could also have a certain role in non-coronary interventions as well.

RECEIVED:
February 6, 2016

ACCEPTED:
February 20, 2016



LITERATURE

1. Waterbury TM, Sorajja P, Bell MR, Lennon RJ, Mathew V, Singh M, et al. Experience and complications associated with use of guide extension catheters in percutaneous coronary intervention. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2015 Dec 23. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ccd.26329>. [Epub ahead of print]