

## 8. Literaturverzeichnis:

---

- 1 Bruckenberger E. Herzbericht 2004 mit Transplantationschirurgie. 17. Bericht der AG Krankenhauswesen der AOLG 2004; S.55
- 2 David TE. Surgery of the aortic valve. Curr problems surg 1999;36: 426-501
- 3 Harken DF, Taylor WJ, LeFemine AA. Aortic valve replacement with caged ball valve. Am J Cardiol 1962;9: 292- 299
- 4 ISO 5840. Cardiovascular implants - Cardiac valve prostheses. Fourth Edition, 3/2005
- 5 Butany J, Fayet C, Ahluwalia MS. Biological replacement heart valves- identification and evaluation. Cardiovasc Path 12; 2003: 119-139
- 6 Gummert JF, Funkat A, Krian A. Cardiac surgery in Germany during 2004: A Report on Behalf of the German Society for Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery. Thorac Cardiovasc Surg, 2005; 53: 391-399
- 7 Jamieson SW, Madani MM. The Choice of Valve Prostheses. J Am College of Cardiol, 2004; 44: Nr.2
- 8 Rahimtoola SH. Choice of Prosthetic Heart Valve for Adult Patient. JACC 2003; 41: 893-904

- 
- 9 Bach DS. Choice of Prosthetic Heart Valves: Update for the Next Generation. JACC 2003;42: 1717-9
  - 10 Bloomfield P. Choice of Prosthetic Heart Valves: 20-Year Results of the Edinburgh Heart Valve Trial. JACC; 2004; 44
  - 11 Horstkotte D, Piper C, Wiemer M et al. Management von Patienten mit Aortenklappenstenosen. Herz 1998; 23: 434-40
  - 12 Franke FWU, Wahlers T. Patientenadaptierte chirurgische Therapie von Aortenklappenfehlern. Dt. Ärzteblatt 2004;101: A1092-1098
  - 13 Leitlinie der Dt. Gesellschaft für Thorax-, Herz- und Gefäßchirurgie. AWMF online, Nr.011/004
  - 14 Urbaszek W, Eichstädt H, Modersohn D. Kardiovaskuläre Funktionsdiagnostik. Gustav Fisher Verlag Jena, Stuttgart, New York 1992
  - 15 Brogan WC III, Lange RA; Hillis LD. Accuracy of various methods of measuring the transvalvular pressure gradient in aortic stenosis. Am Heart J 1992; 123: 948- 943
  - 16 Gorlin R, Gorlin SG. Hydraulic formula for calculation of the area of the stenotic Mitral valve, other cardiac valves, and central circulatory shunts. Am Heart J 1951;41, 1 – 29

- 
- 17 Schoephoerster RT, Yearwood T, Chandran KB. Prediction of Stenotic Valve Orifice Area: An in vitro study on a Bioprostheses. *Cath cardiovasc Diagn* 1989; 18: 36 – 47
  - 18 Dow JW, Levine HD et. al. Studies of congenital heart disease, IV: uncomplicated pulmonic stenosis. *Circulation* 1950; 1: 267-82
  - 19 Otto M. Valvular aortic stenosis: Which measure of severity is best?. *Am Heart J* 1998; 136: 940-942
  - 20 Voelker W, Reul H et al. Comparison of Valvular Resistance, Stroke Work Loss, and Gorlin Valve Area for Quantification of Aortic Stenosis. *Circulation* 1995; 91: 1196-1204
  - 21 Blais C, Pibarot P et al. Comparison of Valve Resistance with Effective Orifice Area Regarding Flow Dependence. *Am J Cardiol* 2001; 88: 4545 – 52
  - 22 Burwash IG, Hay KM et al. Hemodynamic Stability of Valve Area, Valve Resistance, and Stroke Work Loss in Aortic Stenosis: A Comparative Analysis. *J Am Soc Echocard* 2002; 15: 814-22
  - 23 Ford LE, Feldman T, Carroll JD. Hemodynamic resistance as a measure of functional impairment in aortic valvular stenosis. *Circulation Res.* 1990; 66: 1-7

- 
- 24 Mascherbauer J, Schima H, Rosenhek R. Value and limitations of aortic valve resistance with particular consideration of low flow-low gradient aortic stenosis:an in vitro study. *Eur Heart J* 2004; 25: 787-793
- 25 Shively BK, Charlton GA et al. Flow Dependence of Valve Area in Aortic Stenosis: Relation to Valve Morphology. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1998; 31: 654-60
- 26 Wendt MO, Pohl M, Werner S, Kühnel R. Differenzierte Bewertung von Herzklappenstenosen durch die erweiterte Bernoulli-Gleichung- In vitro- Untersuchungen an Modellstenosen. *Z Kard* 1995; 84: 686- 693
- 27 Pohl M, Meyer R, Kühnel R, Talukder NK, Wendt MO. Different types of aortic stenosis and simulation of their morphological- hydrodynamic interdependence- in vitro- study with allografts and stenotic valve models. *Int J Artif Organs* 2001; 24: 870-7
- 28 Hufnagel CA, Harvey WP. The surgical correction of aortic regurgitation. *Bull Georgetown Univ. Med. Center* 1953; 6: 60-61
- 29 Korossis SA, Fisher J, Ingham E. Cardiac valve replacement: A bioengineering approach. *Bio-Med Mater Engn* 2000; 10: 83-124
- 30 Bechtel JFM, Sievers HH. Aortenklappenoperationen bei jungen Erwachsenen. *Dt Med Wochenschr* 2005; 130: 669-674

- 
- 31 O'Brien MF, Harrocks S et al. The Homograft Aortic Valve: A 29-Year, 99,3 % Follow Up of 1,022 Valve Replacements. *J Heart Valve Dis* 2001; 10:334-345
- 32 Bloomfield P, Wheatley DJ, Prescott RJ, Miller HC. Twelve- year comparison of a Bjork-Shiley mechanical heart valve with porcine bioprotheses. *N Engl J Med* 1991; 32: 573-579
- 33 Hammermeister et al. Outcomes 15 years after valve replacement with a mechanical vs a bioprotthetic valve: final report of the Veterans Affairs Randomized Trial. *J Am Coll Card* 2000; 36: 1152-1158
- 34 Jamieson W.R.E., Lichtenstein S.V. Cardiac Valvular Replacement Devices: Residual Problems and Innovative Investigative Technologies. Reprint from *Surg Tech International* 7
- 35 Brose S., Autschbach R, Rauch T. Patientenadaptierte Klappenselektion: Biologischer vs. Mechanischer Herzklappenersatz bei Aortenklappenvitien. *Z Kard* 2001; 90: Sup 6
- 36 Jamieson WR, Fradet GJ, Miyagishima RT. CarboMedics mechanical prothesis: performance at 8 years. *J Heart Valve Dis* 2000; 9: 678-687
- 37 Butany J, Manmeet AS, Craig M. Mechanical heart valve protheses: identification and evaluation (erratum). *Cardiovasc Path* 2003; 12: 322-344

- 
- 38 J.Fisher; T J Spyt; D J Wheatley. Failure and hydrodynamic function testing of explanted pericardial and porcine valves. Proc Inst Mech Eng 1989; 203: 65- 70
- 39 Khan SS et al.. Twenty year comparison of tissue and mechanical valve replacement. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2001; 122: 257- 69
- 40 Birkmeyer NJO, Birkmeyer JD et al. Prosthetic Valve Type for Patients Undergoing Aortic Valve Replacement: A Decision Analysis. Ann Thorac Surg 2000; 70: 1946-52
- 41 Chandran KB, Cabell GN, Khalighi B, Chen CJ. Pulsatile Flow Past Aortic Valve Bioprotheses In A Model Human Aorta. J.Biomech.1984; 8: 609-619
- 42 Rashtian MY, Stevenson DM, Allen DT. Flow Characteristics of Bioprothetic Heart Valves. Chest 1990; 98: 365-75
- 43 Marquez A, Hon RT, Yoganathan AP. Comparative Hydrodynamic Evaluation of Bioprothetic Heart Valves. J Heart Valve Dis 2001; 10: 802-811
- 44 Walker DK, Scotten LN, Modi VJ, Brownlee RT. In vitro assessment of mitral valve prostheses. J.Thorac Cardiovasc. Surg. 1980, 79: 680-688
- 45 Gao G, Wu Y, Grunkemeier GL. Durability of pericardial versus porcine aortic valves. J Am Col Card , 2004; 44: 384-388

- 
- 46 McDonald ML, Daly RC, Schaff HV. Hemodynamic Performance of Small Aortic Valve Bioprotheses: Is there a difference?. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1997; 63: 362-0
- 47 Cosgrove DM, Lytle BW, Taylor PC. The Carpentier Edwards pericardial aortic valve: Ten-year results. *J.Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1995; 110: 651- 662
- 48 Aupart M, Babuty D, Neville P. Influence on age on valve related events with Carpentier Edwards pericardial bioprothesis. *Eur J Cardio-thorac Surg* 1997; 11: 929-93
- 49 Jamieson WR, Munro AI, Miyagishima RT. Carpentier Edwards standard porcine prosthesis: Clinical performance to seventeen years. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1995; 60: 999-1006
- 50 Chaudry MA, Raco L, Muriithi EW. Porcine versus Pericardial Bioprotheses: Eleven-Year Follow Up of a Prospective Randomized Trial. *J Heart Valve Disease* 2000; 9: 429-438
- 51 Jamieson WRE, Janusz MT, Macnab J, Henderson C. Hemodynamic Comparison of Second- and Third-Generation Stented Bioprotheses in Aortic Valve Replacement. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001; 71: S282-4
- 52 Steenhoven AA, Verlaan CWJ, Veenstra PC, Reneman RS. In vivo cinematographic analysis of behavior of the aortic valve. *Am J Physiol* 1981; 240: H286-H292

- 
- 53 Weerasena N, Lockie KJ, Butterfield M. The hydrodynamic function and leaflet dynamics of aortic and pulmonary roots and valves: an in vitro study. *Eur J Cardio-thorac Surg* 1992; 6: 350-356
- 54 Revanna P, Fisher J, Watterson KG. The influence of free hand suturing technique and zero pressure fixation on the hydrodynamic function of aortic root and aortic valve leaflets. *Eur J Cardio-thorac Surg* 1997; 11: 280-286
- 55 Thubrikar MJ, Konstantinov IE, Selim GA et al. The Influence of Sizing on the dynamic Function of the Free-hand Implanted Porcine Aortic Homograft: An in-vitro Study. *J Heart Valve Disease* 1999; 8: 242-253
- 56 Po-Chien L, Jia-Shing L, Ren-Hong H et al. The Closing behaviour of Mechanical Aortic Heart Valve Protheses. *ASAIO J* 2004; 50: 294-300
- 57 Thubrikar MJ, Heckman JL, Nolan SP. Highspeed Cine-Radiographic Study of Aortic Valve Leaflet Motion. *The J of Heart Valve Disease* 1993; 2: 653-61
- 58 Pang DC, Choo SJ et al. Significant Increase of Aortic Root Volume and Commissural Area Occurs prior to Aortic Valve Opening. *J Heart Valve Dis* 2000; 9: 9-15
- 59 Da Vinci L. Anatomical drawings from the Royal collections. London: The Royal Academy of Arts 1977: 35



- 
- 60 Arsenault M, Masani N, Magni G. Variation of Anatomic Valve Area During Ejection in Patients With Valvular Aortic Stenosis Evaluated by Two- dimensional Echokardiografic Planimetry: Comparison With Traditional Doppler Data. J Am Coll Cardiol 1998; 32: 1931-7
- 61 Handke M, Heinrichs G, Beyersdorf F. In vivo analysis of aortic valve dynamics by transesophageal 3-dimensional echocardiography with high temporal resolution. J Thorac and Cardiovasc Surg 2003; 125: 1412-1419
- 62 Werner S, Wendt MO, Schichl K, Pohl M, Koch B. Testung hydrodynamischer Eigenschaften von Herzklappenprothesen mit einem neuen Prüfstand. Biomed Tech 1994; 39: 204- 210
- 63 Medtronic USA Inc.. Technical Support, 2003
- 64 Lerche D, Vlastos G, Koch B, Pohl M, Affeld K. Viscoelastic behavior of human blood and polycrylamide model fluids of heart valve testing. J Phys III France 1993; 3: 1283-9
- 65 Pohl M, Wendt MO, Werner S. In Vitro Testing of Artificial Heart Valves: Comparison Between Newtonian and Non-Newtonian Fluids. Art. Organs 1996; 20: 37-46
- 66 Christakis GT, Butth KJ, Goldman BS, Femes SE, Rao V. Inaccurate and Misleading Valve Sizing: A Proposed Standard for Valve Size Nomenclature. Ann Thorac Surg 1998; 66: 1198-1203

- 
- 67 Seitelberger R, Bialy J, Gottardi R, Seebacher G. Relation between size of valve gradient: comparison of two aortic bioprothesis. *J Cardio-Thorac Surg* 2004; 25: 358- 363
- 68 Woo YR, Williams FP, Yoganathan AP. In-Vitro Fluid Dynamic Characteristics of the Abiomed Trileaflet Heart Valve Prothesis. *Transact ASME* 1983;105: 338-345
- 69 Bove EL, Marvasti MA, Potts JL. Rest and exercise hemodynamic following aortic valve replacement. A comparison between 19 and 21mm Ionescu-Shiley pericardial and Carpentier- Edwards porcine valves *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1985; 90: 750-5
- 70 Rashtian MY, Stevenson DM, Allen DT. Flow Characteristics of Bioprothetic Heart Valves. *Chest* 1990; 98: 365-75
- 71 Eichinger WB, Botzenhardt F, Keithahn A, Guenzinger R. Exercise hemodynamics of bovine versus porcine bioprotheses: A prospective randomized comparison of the Mosaic and Perimount aortic valves. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2005; 129: 1056-63
- 72 Hurle A, Ibanez A. A comparative study of the follow-up and hemodynamics in vivo of 21 mm Carpentier- Edwards supra-annular and Perimount bioprotheses. *Rev Esp Cardiol* 2002; 55: 733-37
- 73 Le Tourneau T, Vincentelli et al. Ten-Year Echocardiographic and Clinical Follow-Up of Aortic Carpentier-Edwards Pericardial and Supraannular Prosthesis: A Case-Match Study. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2002; 74: 2010-5

- 
- 74 Botzenhardt F, Gansers B et al. Klinische und hämodynamische Ergebnisse der Mosaic-Bioprothese in Aortenposition. *Z Kard* 2003, 92: 407-14
- 75 Botzenhardt F, Eichinger WB, Bleiziffer S. Hemodynamic comparison of bioprotheses for complete supra-annular position in patients with small aortic annulus. *JACC* 2005; 45: 2054-60
- 76 Scotten LN, Walker DK. New Laboratory Technique Measures Projected Dynamic Area of Prothetic Heart Valves. *J Heart Valve Disease* 2004; 13: 120-133
- 77 Hasenkam JM, Nygaard H, Pedersen EM. Turbulent stresses downstream of porcine and perikardial aortic valves implanted in pigs. *J Card Surg* 1989; 4: 74-8
- 78 Yoganathan AP, Zhaoming H, Jones SC. Fluid Mechanics of Heart Valve. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. England* 2004; 6: 331-62
- 79 Antonini-Canterin F, Zanuttini D, Faggiano P. Is aortic valve resistance more clinically meaningful than valve area in aortic stenosis. *Heart* 1999; 82: 9-10
- 80 Cannon SR, Richards KL, Crawford M. Hydraulic estimation of stenotic orifice area: a correction of the Gorlin formula. *Circ* 1985; 71: 1170- 1178
- 81 Burwash IG, Hay KM, Chan KL. Hemodynamic Stability of Valve Area, Valve Resistance and Stroke Work Loss in Aortic Stenosis: A Comparative Analysis. *J Am Soc Echocard* 2002; 15: 814-22

- 
- 82 Vesely I. The evolution of bioprosthetic heart valve design and its impact on durability. *Cardiovasc Path* 2003; 12: 277- 86
- 83 Boughner DR, Haldenby M. The Pericardial Bioprosthesis: Altered Tissue Shear Properties following Glutaraldehyde Fixation. *J Heart Valve Dis* 2000; 9: 752-60
- 84 Schoen FJ, Levy RJ. Tissue heart valves: current challenges and future research perspectives. *J Biomed Mater Res* 1999; 47: 439-65
- 85 Steenhoven AA, Duppen JAG, Cauwenberg JWG. In vitro closing behavior of Björk-Shiley, St. Jude and Hancock heart valve prostheses in relation to the in vivo recorded aortic valve closure. *J Biomech* 1982; 15: 841-848
- 86 Gao BZ, Pandya S, Arana C, Hwang HC. Bioprothetic heart valve leaflet deformation monitored by double- puls stereo photogrammetry. *Ann Biomech Eng* 2002; 30: 11-18
- 87 Heiliger R, Richter H, Mittermayer C. Hydrodynamische Untersuchung normaler und pathologisch veränderter Bioprothesen in Aortenposition. *Biomed Techn* 1985; 30: 209-14
- 88 Willshaw P, Biagetti M, Pichel RH. A comparative in vitro study of the closing characteristics of Björk- Shiley and Bicer-Val tilting disc mitral valve prostheses. *J Biomed Eng* 1986; 8: 43-48

- 
- 89 Reul H, VanSon JAM, Steinseifer U, et al. In vitro comparison of bileaflet aortic heart valve prostheses. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1993 ;106: 412- 20
- 90 Paulis R, Schmitz C, Scaffa R, et al. In vitro evaluation of aortic valve prosthesis in a novel valved conduit with pseudosinuses of Valsalva. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2005 ;130: 1016-21
- 91 Pohl M, Wendt MO, Werner S, Koch B, Lerche D. In vitro testing artificial heart valves: Comparison between newtonian and non- newtonian fluids. *Artificial Organs* 1996;69: 37- 46
- 92 Dohmen PM, Scheckel M, Affeld K, Konertz W., et al. In vitro hydrodynamics of decellularized pulmonary porcine valve, compared with glutaraldehyde and polyurethane heart valve. *J Artif Org*, 2002 ; 25: 1089- 1094
- 93 Wright JTM. Hydrodynamic Evaluation of Tissue Valves. In Ionescu MI ed. *Tissue Heart Valves*. London: Butterworth 1979 ; 30-87
- 94 Thubrikar MJ, Heckman JL, Nolan SP. Highspeed-Cineradiographic Study of Aortic Valve Leaflet Motion. *J Heart Valve Disease* 1993; 2: 653- 661
- 95 Higashidate M, Tamiya K, Beppu T. Regulation of the aortic valve opening. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1995 ;110: 496- 503

- 
- 96 Leyh RG, Schmidtke C, Sievers HH, Yacoub M. Opening and Closing Characteristics of the Aortic Valve After Different Types of Valve Preserving Surgery. *Circulation* 1999; 100: 2153
- 97 Paulis R, Matteis GM, Nardi P. Opening and Closing Characteristics of the Aortic Valve After Valve- Sparing Procedures Using New Aortic Root Conduit. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001; 72: 487-494
- 98 Robicsek F, Thubrikar MJ. Role of Sinus Wall Compliance in Aortic Leaflet Function. *Am J Cardiol* 1999; 84: 944- 46
- 99 Carey RF, Herman BA. The effects of a Glycerin- based blood analog on the testing of bioprosthetic heart valves. *J Biomech* 1989; 22: 1185 – 92
- 100 Rainer WG, Christopher RA, Sadler TR Hilgenberg AD. Dynamic behavior of prosthetic aortic tissue valves as viewed by high-speed cinematography. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1979; 28: 274-80