Contact Force Sensor: Crucial Tool or Nice Toy?

Pasquale Santangeli MD

Assistant Professor of Medicine Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania



Disclosures

- Honoraria and consultant for Biosense Webster
- Honoraria from Boston Scientific



Outline

- Available contact force technologies.
- Clinical studies assessing safety and efficacy.
 - What have we learned
- Development of guidelines for CF including lesion index real-time measurements.
 - What to look forward to



Why Contact Force?



Contact Force (g)



CF is a Major Determinant of Lesion Size



NE MORIBU

Yokoyama et al. Circulation A&E 2008;1:354-362

Real-Time CF Measurement

Tacticath Endosense

- Dedicated interface (Contact Force information)
- 50 Hz sampling rate (real-time highly accurate information)
- Only unidirectional



Real-Time CF Measurement

Thermocool SmartTouch



Transmitter coil in the tip sends location reference signal





Precision spring allows small amount of electrode deflection

Sensors receive transmitter coils location signals and micromovements of the spring



Operators are Different TOCCATA Study



VE MORIBL

Kuck et al. Heart Rhythm 2012;9:1789-95

CF is Site Dependent





Nakagawa et al. Circulation A&E 2013;6:746-753

CF Cannot be Predicted by EGMs Characteristics





Nakagawa et al. Circulation A&E 2013;6:746-753

22% of Lesions Without CF DO NOT Create Lesions

- Ventricular ablations in sheep model, 30W, 60s
- Experienced operator, confirming impression of good contact based on tactile feed-back, fluoroscopy and EGMs.
- 100% of lesions detected if CF > 10g and FTI >500 gs
- FTI most accurate parameter to predict lesion size
- 22% of endocardial RF applications that were thought to have good contact did not result in lesion formation.



Endo Card		Epi Card	
ThermoC (n=80)	TactiCath (n=80)	ThermoC (n=68)	TactiCath (n=72)
78%	98%	90%	100%
p<0.001		p=0.02	
Lesions dete	cted		



Sacher et al. Circulation A&E 2013;6:144-150

SMART-AF Prospective Nonrandomized



Natale et al. JACC 2014;64:647-56

Outcomes Improve With CF TOCCATA Study

There is a significant relationship between AF recurrence at 12-month and Contact Force applied during ablations



Reddy et al. Heart Rhythm 2012;9:1789-95

EFFICAS I – OUTCOME Role of the FTI



Parameter (per segment)	Median NO GAP N=266	Median WITH GAPS N=52	p-value
CF	19.5 g	15.5g	p = 0.022
FTI	708 gs	627 gs	p = 0.090
Total number of ablations	6	9	p < 0.001
Min CF	8.1g	3.6 g	p < 0.001
Min FTI	232 gs	118 gs	p < 0.001



Neuzil et al. Circulation A&E 2013;6:327-333

Contact Force & Optimization of Catheter Contact Matters: EFFICAS II





Kautzner et al. Europace 2015. In Press

Jump Index Quantification

- Methodology to count jump: count the number of positions jumped between 2 consecutive ablations
- Ablation on carina is counted as if catheter was jumping over 2 positions
- Jump index stops incrementing as soon as every position is ablated once







TOCCASTAR RCT



Reddy et al. Circulation 2015;132:907-15

TOCCASTAR vs. TOCCATA Comparison of CF Indicators

Average CF [g] over all ablations



Percent Lesions with Low CF (< 5 g)



Percent Lesions with Low FTI (< 400 gs)



Intra-operator Variability in CF



Integrating Power to CF Information

Lesion Index (LSI[™])

- Parameter to estimate lesion growth in real-time combining CF, ablation duration and RF power
- Models both electrical resistive and conductive thermal heating over time



Still investigational!



Towards Lesion Size Index



- 4. Andrade et al. Heart Rhythm 2014;11:1919-24
- 5. Neuzil P et al. Circ A&E 2013;6:327-33
- 6. Wilber DJ et al. JAMA 2010;303:333-40
- 12. Marijon E et al. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2014;25:130-7
- 14. Park CI et al. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2014;25:701-8.
- 15. Kautzner J et al. *Europace* 2015;17:1229–35
- 12. Marijon E et al. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2014;25:130–7.



Conclusions

- Contact force information has added significant value to the ablation armamentarium, with a potential for increase success rates and safety.
- Contact force guidelines are being developed from <u>retrospective analyses of data from</u> <u>clinical trials</u>
 - Target 20 g (range 10-30 g)
 - Min >10 g for any ablation point
 - Min >400 gs for any ablation point
- Prospective studies needed to better define lesion index guidelines

