

## P1470

**Outcome of leadless pacemaker implantation in a referral centre for lead extraction: a comparison with transvenous pacemaker**

Tolve S.; Zucchelli G.; Barletta V.; Parollo M.; Di Cori A.; Della Tommasina V.; De Lucia R.; Giannotti Santoro M.; Mazzocchetti L.; Cellamaro T.; Viani S.; Segreti L.; Paperini L.; Soldati E.; Bongiorno MG.

University Hospital of Pisa, Second Division of Cardiology, Pisa, Italy

**Background:** Leadless cardiac pacing is a promising technology in terms of efficacy and safety.

**Purpose:** The aim of the study was to compare the long-term clinical and electrical performance of Micra leadless pacemaker with ventricular single-chamber transvenous pacemaker (VVI TV-PM) in a high-volume centre for transvenous lead extraction (TLE).

**Methods:** Between May 2014 and April 2019, 100 patients (group 1) underwent Micra implant at our centre. We identified 100 patients (group 2) who underwent VVI TV-PM implant in the same period for a 1:1 comparison matched by age, sex, left ventricular systolic ejection fraction and previous TLE.

**Results:** The implant procedure was successful in all patients. In group 1, the procedure duration was lower than in group 2 ( $43.86 \pm 22.38$  vs  $58.38 \pm 17.85$  min,  $p < 0.001$ ), while the fluoroscopy time was longer ( $12.25 \pm 6.84$  vs  $5.32 \pm 4.42$  min,  $p < 0.001$ ). There was no difference about the rate of septal deployment at the right ventricle (group 1 vs group 2: 76% vs 86%,  $p = 0.10$ ). Patients were followed-up for a median of 12 months. We did not observe any acute and chronic procedure-related complications in group 1, while we reported acute complications in seven patients (0 vs 7%,  $p = 0.02$ ) and long-term complications in three patients (0 vs 3%,  $p = 0.24$ ), needing for a system revisions in 6 cases (0 vs 6%,  $p = 0.038$ ) in group 2. One systemic infection occurred during follow-up in a patient with VVI TV-PM. Electrical measurements were stable during follow-up in both groups, with a longer estimated battery life in group 1 (mean delivered energy at implant group 1 vs group 2:  $0.14 \pm 0.21$  vs  $0.26 \pm 0.22$   $\mu$ J,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Conclusion:** Micra pacemaker implant is a safe and effective procedure, with a lower rate of acute complications and system revisions and a longer estimated battery life compared to VVI TV-PM, even in a real life setting including patients who underwent TLE.