

1 **Radical Pericardiectomy and Use of Cardiopulmonary Bypass for Constrictive Pericarditis**

2 **Running Title: Radical Pericardiectomy for Constrictive Pericarditis**

3 *Marijan Koprivanac, MD, MS,<sup>a,1</sup> Karolis Bauza, MD,<sup>a</sup> Nicholas Smedira, MD, MBA,<sup>a</sup>*  
4 *Gosta Pettersson, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Shinya Unai, MD,<sup>a</sup> Paola Barrios, MD,<sup>b</sup> Nicholas Oh, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
5 *Filip Stembal, MD,<sup>a</sup> Valentina Lara-Erazo, MD,<sup>a</sup> Edward G. Soltesz, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
6 *Faisal G. Bakaeen, MD,<sup>a</sup> Haytham Elgharably, MD,<sup>a</sup> Milind Desai, MD, MBA,<sup>c</sup>*  
7 *Tom K. Wang, MD,<sup>c</sup> Penny L Houghtaling, MS,<sup>d</sup> Lars G. Svensson, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup>*  
8 *Marc Gillinov, MD,<sup>a</sup> Kenneth McCurry, MD, Douglas R. Johnston, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
9 *Eugene H. Blackstone, MD<sup>a,d</sup> Allan Klein, MD,<sup>c,1</sup> Michael Z. Tong, MD<sup>a</sup>*

10 <sup>a</sup>Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery

11 <sup>c</sup>Department of Cardiovascular Medicine

12 Miller Family Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute

13 <sup>d</sup>Department of Quantitative Health Sciences

14 Lerner Research Institute

15 **Cleveland Clinic**

16 <sup>b</sup>Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine

17 **Case Western Reserve University**

18 Cleveland, Ohio

19 <sup>1</sup> Co-directors, The Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Pericardial Diseases, Miller Family  
20 Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute, Cleveland Clinic

21 **Word count:** 3,499/5,000

22 **Address for correspondence:**

23 Marijan Koprivanac, MD

24 The Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Pericardial Diseases

25 Miller Family Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute, Cleveland Clinic

26 9500 Euclid Ave., Desk J4-477

27 Cleveland, OH 44195

28 Phone: (216) 316-9995; Email: [koprivm@ccf.org](mailto:koprivm@ccf.org)



30 **ABSTRACT**

31 **Background:** Pericardiectomy is definitive treatment for constrictive pericarditis. However,  
32 extent of resection (radical versus partial) and use of cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) are debated.

33 **Objectives:** To determine the association of extent of pericardial resection and use of CPB with  
34 outcomes.

35 **Methods:** From January 2000 to January 2022, 565 patients with constrictive pericarditis  
36 underwent radical (n=445, 314 [71%] on CPB) or partial (n=120, 67 [56%] on CPB)  
37 pericardiectomy at Cleveland Clinic. Outcomes stratified by extent of pericardial resection and  
38 use of CPB were compared after propensity-score matching.

39 **Results:** Both radical pericardiectomy and CPB use (67% [381/565]) increased over time.  
40 Among 88 propensity-matched pairs (73% of possible matches), immediate postoperative  
41 cardiac index increased ( $P<0.001$ ) in both groups by a median of  $1.0 \text{ L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ . There were  
42 no significant differences between radical versus partial resection groups in occurrence of  
43 reoperation for bleeding (2.3%, [2/88] vs. 0,  $P=.50$ ). Median postoperative hospital length of stay  
44 was 10 versus 8.5 days ( $P=.02$ ). Operative mortality was 9.1% (8/88) versus 6.8% (6/88)  
45 ( $P=.58$ ). 10-year survival was 54% versus 41%, with a higher propensity-adjusted hazard ratio  
46 after partial resection (1.9, 95% CI 1.2-3.1).

47 **Conclusions:** When surgical intervention is deemed necessary, radical — rather than partial —  
48 resection for constrictive pericarditis can be performed with low surgical mortality and  
49 morbidity. Radical pericardiectomy can be accomplished on CPB and results in better long-term  
50 survival.

51  
52 **Keywords:** hemodynamics, long-term survival, pericardiectomy, postoperative morbidity,  
53 propensity-score matching, surgical resection

54 **ABBREVIATIONS**

55 COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

56 CPB = cardiopulmonary bypass

57 ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation

58 IABP= intra-aortic balloon pump

59 IVC = inferior vena cava

60 LVAD = left ventricular assist device

61 SVC = superior vena cava

## 62 **CLINICAL PERSPECTIVES**

- 63       • Patients with constrictive pericarditis require a multidisciplinary approach involving  
64       primarily a cardiologist and cardiac surgeon, and other disciplines like gastroenterology  
65       since liver cirrhosis from increased central venous pressure and congestion is common, or  
66       immunology for evaluation of possible autoimmune etiology.
- 67       • Communication is critical in managing patient expectations after pericardiectomy,  
68       especially linking etiology to short- and long-term outcomes in this complex patient  
69       population.
- 70       • Radical pericardiectomy should be the gold standard for treating patients with  
71       constrictive pericarditis.
- 72       • Routine use of cardiopulmonary bypass is safe and enables the radical pericardiectomy  
73       surgery and should be recommended in the guidelines.
- 74

75 **INTRODUCTION**

76 *Constrictive pericarditis is caused by pericardial inflammation, followed by fibrosis,*  
77 *adhesion, and thickening, leading to loss of elasticity.<sup>1,2</sup> Etiology varies from idiopathic*  
78 *to post-cardiotomy to radiation therapy.<sup>3</sup> Untreated, it can lead to important morbidity*  
79 *and mortality.<sup>4,5</sup> (Supplemental Appendix A.1)*

80 Compared to medical treatment, surgical pericardiectomy yields superior survival, greater  
81 functional improvement, and fewer recurrences.<sup>6,7,8</sup> However, surgical approach and extent of  
82 resection varies, in part from absence of a standardized surgical technique and perception of high  
83 surgical risk.<sup>7,9</sup> This leads to hesitancy to operate on mildly symptomatic patients, and those with  
84 advanced disease seem to not benefit from surgery or are deemed too high risk.<sup>1</sup>

85 European guidelines recommend thorough pericardial resection to remove all sites of  
86 inflammation.<sup>10</sup> They suggest using cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) only when necessary.  
87 However, the association of CPB use with higher mortality is not consistent<sup>4</sup>, with recent studies  
88 reporting no association.<sup>7,11,12,13</sup>

89 We therefore have evaluated the association of extent of pericardial resection — radical  
90 or partial — and use of CPB with early postoperative complications and long-term survival  
91 outcomes of patients with constrictive pericarditis who received surgery.

92 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

93 From January 2000 to January 2022, 565 patients with constrictive pericarditis underwent  
94 pericardiectomy, comprising 445 radical and 120 partial resections, at Cleveland Clinic,  
95 Cleveland, Ohio. Patients with recurrent pericarditis, pericardial tamponade or effusion, or tumor  
96 invasion into pericardium were excluded. Mean age was 61±12 years (Table 1). Advanced heart  
97 failure was present in 40% of those undergoing radical resection and 46% undergoing partial  
98 resection. Twelve patients undergoing radical and 10 undergoing partial pericardiectomy had

99 previous pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis, and 212 patients (150 radical and 62  
100 partial pericardiectomy) had prior cardiovascular surgery.

101 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 63% (n=357), post-  
102 cardiectomy in 25% (n=143), radiation in 6% (24), and miscellaneous in 5.1% (n=29) (Table 1).  
103 Its diagnosis was established according to American Society of Echocardiography Clinical  
104 Recommendations for Multimodality Cardiovascular Imaging of Patients with Pericardial  
105 Disease.<sup>14</sup>

## 106 **Pericardiectomy**

### 107 ***Radical Pericardiectomy***

108 We considered radical pericardiectomy as the removal of all pericardium, including a  
109 strip along the phrenic nerves, as previously described.<sup>1</sup>

### 110 ***Partial Pericardiectomy***

111 We considered partial pericardiectomy as one with less than the entire removal of the  
112 pericardium. Partial pericardiectomy included operations that were reported as complete but did  
113 not remove all of the pericardium.

## 114 **Endpoints**

### 115 ***Operative Morbidity and Mortality***

116 Postoperative hospital morbidity was defined in accordance with The Society of Thoracic  
117 Surgeons National Database. Operative mortality included postoperative in-hospital deaths and  
118 deaths after hospital discharge up to 30 days after surgery.

119

120

121 ***Postoperative Cardiac Index***

122 Postoperative cardiac index was measured immediately after surgery in the intensive care unit.  
123 Preoperative and postoperative cardiac index data was summarized and compared between  
124 radical and partial resection groups. Paired t-test was used to test absolute change (postoperative  
125 – preoperative) between groups. Postoperative cardiac index was grouped with the lowest 15th  
126 percentile and highest 85th percentile values to stratify survival curves.

127 ***Long-term Mortality***

128 All-cause, time-related mortality included operative mortality. Survival was estimated  
129 nonparametrically by the Kaplan-Meier method and parametrically by a multiphase hazard  
130 model.<sup>15</sup> Vital status was obtained by systematic follow-up at 6 months and 1, 5, and 10 years.  
131 Median follow-up was 1.5 years with 25% followed >6.3 years and 10% for >11 years. In  
132 matched cohorts, 25% were followed for >7.4 years and 10% for >11 years.

133 **Data**

134 Clinical data were extracted prospectively for quality assurance. Cleveland Clinic's Institutional  
135 Review Board approved use of these data for research, with patient consent waived (IRB #5001;  
136 approved 2/26/2021).

137 ***Data Analysis***

138 Analyses were performed using SAS statistical software (SAS v9.4, SAS, Inc., Cary, NC) and R  
139 software version 4.2.3 (<http://www.R-project.org>). Continuous variables are summarized as  
140 mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, or as equivalent 15th, 50th (median), and 85th percentiles when data  
141 distribution was skewed. Categorical variables are summarized as frequencies and percentages.  
142 Asymmetric 68% confidence limits are consistent with  $\pm 1$  standard error.



143 ***Propensity-Score Rationale, Development, and Matching***

144 Differences in patient and procedural characteristics of those undergoing radical versus partial  
145 pericardiectomy precluded direct comparison of outcomes. Therefore, propensity matching was  
146 used to reduce selection bias (Supplemental Figure S1).<sup>16</sup>

147 Managing missing data Before identifying factors related to extent of resection, we used 5-fold  
148 multiple imputation for missing data values using multivariate imputation by chained equations.  
149 Variable selection used 1 imputed data set. Regression coefficients for final model variables and  
150 their variance–covariance matrix were estimated for each imputed data set and combined using  
151 Rubin’s method.<sup>17</sup>

152 Parsimonious model Multivariable logistic regression was performed to identify factors  
153 associated with partial pericardiectomy from those considered in Supplemental Appendix 1.  
154 Variable selection used machine learning with automated analysis of 1,000 resampled  
155 (bootstrapped) data sets followed by tabulating the frequency of occurrence of variables included  
156 in each model at  $P \leq .05$ . We retained factors that occurred in 50% or more of the bootstrap  
157 models (Supplemental Table S1) ( $C = .77$ ).<sup>18</sup>

158 Propensity model The parsimonious model was augmented with other demographic and  
159 comorbidity variables to account for unrecorded factors to form a semi-saturated model of 67  
160 variables ( $C = .84$ ). Five such models with identical factors were constructed, 1 for each multiple  
161 imputation dataset, and a propensity score for each patient was calculated from each and  
162 averaged. For propensity matching, the maximum allowable difference between patients for the  
163 propensity score was set to 0.2 times the standard deviation (SD) of the logit of the propensity  
164 score ( $0.2 \times \text{SD} [\text{logit}(\text{propensity score})]$ )<sup>19</sup>, yielding 88 matched pairs out of 120 possible pairs  
165 (73% of partial pericardiectomy cases) (Table 1).

166 Comparison Wilcoxon signed-rank and chi-square tests were used to compare continuous and  
167 categorical in-hospital outcome variables in the matched cohorts. Time-related survival was  
168 compared between matched groups and by adjusting for propensity score in the overall cohort.

## 169 **RESULTS**

### 170 **Overall Experience**

171 The proportion of radical pericardiectomies increased over the study period from 60% in 2001 to  
172 95% in 2021 (Figure 1). Hospital mortality for all patients undergoing pericardiectomy decreased  
173 from 14% in 2000 to 4% in 2021 (Supplemental Figure S2). The trend in CPB use increased  
174 from 37% to 100% of cases from 2000 to 2021 (Figure 2). Unadjusted survival varied according  
175 to etiology of constrictive pericarditis, with lowest survival in the post-radiation patient group  
176 (Supplemental Figure S3). Low postoperative cardiac index was associated with poor survival  
177 (Supplemental Figure S4).

### 178 **Radical Pericardiectomy**

179 Mean age of patients who underwent radical pericardiectomy was  $61 \pm 12$  years. This group  
180 comprised 72 (16%) females, 280 (63%) with hypertension, 90 (21%) with pharmacologically  
181 treated diabetes, 43 (9.8%) insulin-treated, 155 (35%) with chronic obstructive pulmonary  
182 disease (COPD), and 8 (2%) with chronic dialysis (Table 1).

183 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 305 (69%) patients, post-  
184 cardiectomy in 94 (21%), post-radiation in 20 (4.5%), and miscellaneous in 26 (5.7%).

185 Mean left ventricular ejection fraction was  $56 \pm 8.7\%$ . Mean preoperative cardiac index  
186 was  $1.86 \pm 0.62 \text{ L} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$  (Table 2).

187 CPB was used in 314 (71%) (Table 1). Intraoperatively, pericardial calcifications were  
188 observed in 214 (48%) patients (Table 3). Mean postoperative cardiac index was  $2.98 \pm 0.91$   
189  $L \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ .

190 Following radical pericardiectomy, reoperation for bleeding or tamponade was performed  
191 in 0 of 131 of patients whose pericardiectomy was performed without CPB and 13 of 314 (4.1%)  
192 in whom CPB was used (Table 4). Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) was used for postoperative  
193 support in 6 (1.3%). Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) was used in 12 (2.7%) and  
194 left ventricular assist device (LVAD) in 3 (0.7%).

195 Stroke occurred in 5 (1.1%) and postoperative atrial fibrillation in 75 (27%) (Table 4).  
196 Other complications included respiratory failure requiring prolonged intubation (n=72, 17%),  
197 new onset postoperative renal failure requiring dialysis (n=15, 3.8%), sepsis (n=17, 3.8%), and  
198 deep sternal wound infection (n=2, 0.4%).

199 There were 24 operative deaths (Table 4). Survival at 6 months, and 1, 5, and 10 years  
200 was 90%, 88%, 79%, and 61%, respectively (Supplemental Figure S5).

### 201 **Partial Pericardiectomy**

202 Mean age of patients who underwent partial pericardiectomy was  $61 \pm 12$  years, comprised of 18  
203 females (15%), 75 (63%) with hypertension, 38 (32%) with pharmacologically treated diabetes,  
204 16 (14%) insulin-treated, 50 (42%) with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and none with  
205 chronic kidney disease.

206 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 52 (44%), post-cardiotomy  
207 in 49 (41%), post-radiation in 14 (12%), and miscellaneous in 3 (2.5%).

208 Mean left ventricular ejection fraction was  $55 \pm 11\%$ . Mean preoperative cardiac index  
209 was  $1.99 \pm 0.65 L \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$  (Table 2).

210 CPB was used in 67 cases (56%) (Table 1). Intraoperatively, pericardial calcifications  
211 were observed in 48 of 100 (48%) patients (Table 3). Mean postoperative cardiac index was  
212  $3.09 \pm 1.13 \text{ L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ .

213 One patient (0.83%) underwent postoperative reoperation for bleeding (pericardiectomy  
214 had been performed on CPB) and 3 (2.5%) patients had a stroke (Table 4). IABP was used for  
215 postoperative support in 6 (5.0%). ECMO was used in 3 (2.5%) and LVAD in 2 patients (1.7%).

216 New onset atrial fibrillation occurred in 15 patients (20%) (Table 4). In 27 (24%)  
217 patients, respiratory failure required prolonged intubation. Five patients (4.5%) developed new  
218 onset postoperative renal failure requiring dialysis, and sepsis occurred in 6 (5.0%). Deep sternal  
219 wound infection occurred in 1 patient (0.84%).

220 There were 8 (6.7%) operative deaths. Survival at 6 months, and 1, 5, and 10 years was  
221 87%, 84%, 64%, and 42%, respectively (Supplemental Figure S5).

## 222 **Propensity-matched Outcomes Comparison**

223 There was a significant immediate postoperative increase in median cardiac index of 1.0 [0.10,  
224 1.9]  $\text{L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ,  $P < .001$  in both groups (Table 3).

## 225 ***In-Hospital Morbidity***

226 Reoperation for bleeding or tamponade occurred in 2 patients (2.3%) after radical  
227 pericardiectomy (both supported on CPB) and none after partial pericardiectomy (Table 4).  
228 Major postoperative morbidities, such as stroke, atrial fibrillation, or deep sternal wound  
229 infection, were not significantly different between radical and partial pericardiectomy groups nor  
230 was postoperative left ventricular dysfunction treated by IABP, respiratory failure requiring  
231 prolonged intubation, or renal insufficiency requiring dialysis (Table 4). Intensive care unit  
232 length of stay was similar (median: 66 vs. 70 hours;  $P = .96$ ) although postoperative length of stay

233 was longer (median: 10 vs. 8.5 days;  $P=.02$ ) after radical compared to after partial  
234 pericardiectomy.

### 235 ***Early Mortality***

236 Hospital mortality was 8.0% after radical versus 6.8% after partial pericardiectomy ( $P=.77$ )  
237 (Table 4). Operative mortality was 9.1% after radical versus 6.8% after partial pericardiectomy  
238 ( $P=.58$ ).

### 239 ***Long-term Survival***

240 Survival was 83%, 81%, 71%, and 54% after radical pericardiectomy and 85%, 82%, 65%, and  
241 41% after partial pericardiectomy at 6 months and 1, 5, and 10 years (Figure 3A). Before 5 years,  
242 survival was similar, but then diverged with better survival after radical pericardiectomy  
243 ( $P=.008$ ) (propensity-adjusted hazard ratio 1.9 [95% CI 1.2-3.1] (Figure 3B) (Supplemental  
244 Table S2).

### 245 **Cardiopulmonary Bypass Support in Pericardiectomy**

246 In the overall cohort, cases performed on CPB had more reoperations for bleeding (14 of 381  
247 3.7% vs. 0% for off-pump), more transfusions (258 of 381, 68%, vs. 61/184 33%), and more  
248 postoperative atrial fibrillation (31% vs. 16%), but other outcomes were similar. Operative  
249 mortality was 23 of 381 (6.0%) with CPB and 9 of 184 (4.9%) off CPB ( $P=0.58$ ). There was no  
250 statistically significant difference in unadjusted survival after pericardiectomy performed on  
251 versus off CPB ( $P=.49$ ) (Supplemental Figure S6). Likewise, in the hazard model adjusting for  
252 resection type and propensity score, there were no early ( $P=.42$ ) or late ( $P=.65$ ) differences in  
253 survival with or without use of CPB (Table 5).

254

255 **DISCUSSION**

256 **Principal Findings**

257 Both radical and partial pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis provide similar short-term  
258 hemodynamic relief demonstrated by significant postoperative cardiac index increase in both  
259 groups. Performing radical pericardiectomy in patients provides better long-term survival than  
260 partial pericardiectomy, without compromising early outcomes such as perioperative morbidity  
261 or mortality. CPB does not substantially increase the morbidity of the procedure, with exception  
262 of greater number of transfusions and reoperations for bleeding or tamponade.

263 **Cleveland Clinic Historical Perspective**

264 In the 1990s, Lytle and colleagues performed surgical pericardiectomy at Cleveland Clinic.<sup>2</sup> At  
265 that time, it was considered surgical dogma to avoid CPB due to increased risk of postoperative  
266 bleeding. In addition to median sternotomy, bilateral thoracotomies and clamshell incisions were  
267 used to improve exposure and different types of hemodynamic support were used during heart  
268 manipulation. In the 2000s, Smedira and colleagues introduced early CPB initiation. This  
269 provided hemodynamic stability during surgery, thereby enabling more extensive  
270 radical/circumferential pericardial resection that included pericardium around the IVC and  
271 pulmonary veins. This evolved into the current radical pericardiectomy as described in Methods.<sup>1</sup>

272 **Mortality and Morbidity**

273 Early mortality after pericardiectomy is related to era of surgery, and particularly to etiology of  
274 constrictive pericarditis. In a study documenting more than 80 years of experience following  
275 pericardiectomy outcomes at Mayo Clinic, Murashita and colleagues reported a decline in  
276 mortality from 13% in historical patients to 5% since 1990.<sup>20</sup> This trend is consistent with the  
277 findings of the present study, which show an overall mortality of 5.6%, despite a more

278 aggressive approach to operating on patients with prior cardiac surgery requiring concomitant  
279 valve and coronary operations.

280 In our study, reoperation for bleeding was low. Concern for bleeding has been reported as  
281 a reason to limit resection and use of CPB.<sup>21,22</sup> Renal failure of 5.5% may reflect presence of  
282 longstanding right heart failure in this population along with subclinical cirrhosis and deserves  
283 further study.

284 A unique and devastating complication of pericardiectomy is acute over-distension of the  
285 right ventricle following pericardium removal. When this occurs, it can lead to rapid progression  
286 of cardiogenic shock and death or need for mechanical circulatory support.<sup>23</sup> With routine use of  
287 fluid restriction and low-dose inotropes to limit ventricular volume after resection, 2.6% of  
288 patients required IABP and 5.1% were supported temporarily with ECMO.

### 289 **Hemodynamics and Outcomes**

290 Clinical success after pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis depends on a complex  
291 interplay of factors, including presence of coexistent valve, coronary, or myocardial disease.  
292 However, successful release of diastolic restraint can result in immediate improvement in cardiac  
293 index. Patients undergoing radical pericardiectomy compared with those undergoing partial  
294 pericardiectomy had lower preoperative cardiac index, which may indicate that radical resection  
295 was employed in patients with more advanced constriction. At the same time, they had better  
296 survival after 5 years. We hypothesize that the observed survival benefit might be attributed to  
297 recurrent pericarditis on the residual pericardium with possible re-constriction. Low  
298 postoperative cardiac index was strongly correlated with worse survival (Supplemental Figure  
299 S6) and may indicate the presence of restrictive cardiomyopathy, which may be misdiagnosed as  
300 constriction, or other underlying conditions masked by constrictive pericarditis.

301 The ratio of right atrial pressure and pulmonary capillary wedge pressure might be a  
302 useful tool in the assessment of myocardial involvement in constriction and might predict  
303 postoperative outcomes.<sup>24</sup> Further analysis could enhance our ability to predict the patients who  
304 are less likely to benefit from pericardiectomy, as in the case of post-radiation constriction.

305 The major determinant of long-term survival after pericardiectomy for constrictive  
306 pericarditis was etiology, as observed in the previous experience by Bertog and colleagues<sup>2</sup> and  
307 in other large series.<sup>21</sup> Patients with idiopathic constriction, even in the setting of advanced  
308 calcification and unfavorable preoperative hemodynamics, have excellent short- and long-term  
309 survival. Those with post-surgical constriction had worse early and late outcomes, which may be  
310 indicative of multifactorial, mixed pericardial/myocardial disease and not just pericardial  
311 constriction.<sup>7</sup> Patients with radiation-induced constrictive pericarditis had the worst outcomes,  
312 not surprising given coexistence of ventricular fibrosis, valvular and coronary disease, and  
313 radiation-induced pulmonary fibrosis in many of them. These findings support need for a  
314 different approach to timing and operative planning in different patient populations. Patients with  
315 idiopathic pericarditis may benefit from aggressive early surgery given the excellent short- and  
316 long-term survival, whereas patients who have had radiation treatment merit extreme caution.

### 317 **Completeness of Resection**

318 European Society of Cardiology 2015 Guidelines recommend a tailored approach to pericardial  
319 resection, stating debate between radical and partial resection is now unnecessary.<sup>10</sup> However, a  
320 suggestion is made that resection may be limited in the presence of severe calcification.  
321 Advocates of limited resection suggest partial pericardiectomy results in acceptable outcomes.<sup>25</sup>  
322 Although partial resection can result in symptomatic improvement, some patients develop  
323 recurrent symptoms from continued constriction of the posterior pericardium and require redo  
324 pericardiectomy. Cho and colleagues report a series of radical pericardiectomies for recurrent



325 constriction. Partial pericardiectomy performed as initial surgery was the most common reason  
326 for recurrence.<sup>7</sup> Murashita and colleagues recommend as complete a resection as possible,  
327 leaving a strip of pericardium preserved along the phrenic nerve.<sup>20</sup>

328 In concordance, radical versus partial pericardiectomy in matched cohorts did not show  
329 increased hospital mortality or worse survival in this study. In fact, radical resection was  
330 associated with better late long-term survival. Whether radical resection results in better freedom  
331 from recurrent symptoms requires further study. In the interim, these results should inspire  
332 confidence that radical resection does not increase the risk of the procedure. This means there is  
333 no reason not to maximize removal of pericardium, including scar and calcific tissue, as long as  
334 deemed safe — even if this requires CPB.

### 335 **Role of Cardiopulmonary Bypass**

336 Use of CPB remains controversial even among surgeons who advocate radical pericardial  
337 resection. In multiple reports, the use of CPB has been associated with worse outcomes, even in  
338 the hands of experienced surgeons.<sup>9,26</sup> Assessing the incremental risk of CPB in pericardiectomy  
339 is challenging because, at least historically, it has often been employed as a rescue strategy in the  
340 case of catastrophic bleeding to mitigate hemodynamic instability during resection, or to support  
341 concomitant procedures that may increase risk or reflect underlying cardiac disease. If CPB is  
342 used only in more complex cases, it would be expected to be a marker for increased severity and  
343 risk.

344 The range of opinions for using CPB seems to be: 1) avoid it completely; 2) use it when  
345 necessary to repair bleeding or perform concomitant procedures; or 3) use it routinely to  
346 facilitate radical resection. Evolution in our practice started as avoidance of CPB to more liberal  
347 use and now routine use of CPB as almost a condition for radical pericardiectomy, which aids in  
348 avoiding accidental cardiac injury, facilitates maintaining end-organ perfusion during dissection

349 of the lateral left ventricle and diaphragmatic surface, and permits a more controlled resection.  
350 Surgeons who are less comfortable navigating the often-difficult lateral and posterior  
351 pericardium dissection may find CPB beneficial as an adjunct to allow for more complete  
352 resection. Use of bipolar, irrigated hemostatic sealer has made a substantial difference in the  
353 control of bleeding after CPB and in these more extensive radical dissections, minimizing the  
354 bleeding complications.

355 In our study, when all patients were considered, there was an increased and statistically  
356 significant risk for reoperation for bleeding associated with CPB. However, after matching there  
357 was no statistically significant difference in this outcome. This could potentially be explained by  
358 the low bleeding rates we found. As CPB use becomes more prevalent, the low rates of  
359 reoperation for bleeding raise the question about the clinical significance of this finding.

### 360 **Limitations**

361 This clinical study reviews a heterogeneous patient population. The gradual evolution of  
362 approaches and pericardial surgical techniques makes it difficult to determine whether it was the  
363 surgeon's intent to use a particular surgical strategy, such as CPB or radical resection, or whether  
364 this was guided by intraoperative findings. Although the gradual evolution of technique makes  
365 adequate comparison difficult, it is important to note that neither surgical approach was  
366 associated with a difference in early mortality. One important limitation is lack of long-term  
367 functional status data, which is especially relevant for this disease that can produce symptoms  
368 out of proportion to physical findings or imaging.

### 369 **Conclusions**

370 The current surgical approach to pericardiectomy at our institution reflects a gradual, parallel  
371 evolution towards more liberal use of CPB and more aggressive pericardial resection. Regardless

372 of the approach and completeness of resection, pericardiectomy for idiopathic constrictive  
373 pericarditis is associated with low mortality and morbidity, and results in excellent long-term  
374 survival. Among matched patients, better long-term survival with radical versus partial  
375 pericardiectomy suggests that it should be the standard of care in the surgical treatment of  
376 constrictive pericarditis. Similarly, use of CPB is low-risk and beneficial in these difficult  
377 operations.

378

379

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

380

The authors thank Ingrid Schaefer Sprague for her editorial assistance.

381

**Funding:** This study was supported in part by the Drs. Sidney and Becca Fleischer Heart and

382

Vascular Education Chair (EHB).

383

**Disclosures:** Dr. Elgharably receives a speaking honorarium from LifeNet Health, Artivion, and

384

Edwards Lifesciences. Dr. Desai has consultant and research agreements with Bristol Myers

385

Squibb, Tenaya, and Cytokinetic, and is a consultant for Medtronic. Dr. Gillinov has served as a

386

consultant to Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic, Abbott, AtriCure, Artivion, ClearFlow, and

387

Johnson and Johnson. Dr. Klein has received research funding from Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals,

388

Ltd., Pfizer, Inc., and Cardiol Therapeutics; and has served on scientific advisory boards for

389

Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals, Ltd, Cardiol Therapeutics, and Pfizer, Inc.

390

391

392

393

## REFERENCES

- 394 1. Unai S, Johnston DR. Radical pericardiectomy for pericardial diseases. *Curr Cardiol*  
395 *Rep.* 2019;21:6.
- 396 2. Bertog SC, Thambidorai SK, Parakh K, Schoenhagen P, Ozduran V, Houghtaling PL,  
397 Lytle BW, Blackstone EH, Lauer MS, Klein AL. Constrictive pericarditis: etiology and cause-  
398 specific survival after pericardiectomy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2004;43:1445-1452.
- 399 3. Chiabrando JG, Bonaventura A, Vecchié A, Wohlford GF, Mauro AG, Jordan JH,  
400 Grizzard JD, Montecucco F, Berrocal DH, Brucato A, et al. Management of acute and recurrent  
401 pericarditis: JACC state-of-the-art review. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2020;75:76-92.
- 402 4. Liu VC, Fritz AV, Burtoft MA, Martin AK, Greason KL, Ramakrishna H.  
403 Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: Analysis of outcomes. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.*  
404 2021;35:3797-3805.
- 405 5. Oh NA, Hennecken C, Van den Eynde J, Doulamis IP, Avgerinos DV, Kampaktsis PN.  
406 Pericardiectomy and pericardial window for the treatment of pericardial disease in the  
407 contemporary era. *Curr Cardiol Rep.* 2022;24:1619-1631.
- 408 6. Nachum ES, Sternik L, Kassif Y, Raanani E, Hay I, Shalabi A, Buber J. Surgical  
409 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: A single tertiary center experience. *J Thorac*  
410 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2020;68:730-736.
- 411 7. Cho YH, Schaff HV, Dearani JA, Daly RC, Park SJ, Li Z, Oh JK. Completion  
412 pericardiectomy for recurrent constrictive pericarditis: importance of timing of recurrence on late  
413 clinical outcome of operation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2012;93:1236-1240.
- 414 8. Khandaker MH, Schaff HV, Greason KL, Anavekar NS, Espinosa RE, Hayes SN,  
415 Nishimura RA, Oh JK. Pericardiectomy vs medical management in patients with relapsing  
416 pericarditis. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2012;87:1062-70.
- 417 9. Rupperecht L, Putz C, Flörchinger B, Zausig Y, Camboni D, Unsöld B, Schmid C.  
418 Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: An institution's 21 years experience. *Thorac*  
419 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2018;66:645-650.

- 420 10. Adler Y, Charron P, Imazio M, Badano L, Barón-Esquivias G, Bogaert J, Brucato A,  
421 Gueret P, Klingel K, Lionis C, et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of  
422 pericardial diseases: The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Management of Pericardial Diseases  
423 of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Endorsed by: The European Association for  
424 Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J*. 2015;36:2921-2964.
- 425 11. Yunfei LT, Tao L, Yongjun Q. Re-pericardiectomy for recurrent chronic constrictive  
426 pericarditis: Left anterolateral thoracotomy is a better approach. *J Cardiothorac Surg*.  
427 2019;14:152.
- 428 12. Vistarini NC, Chen C, Mazine A, Bouchard D, Hebert Y, Carrier M, Cartier R, Demers  
429 P, Pellerin M, Perrault LP. Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: 20 years of experience  
430 at the Montreal Heart Institute. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2015;100:107-113.
- 431 13. Szabó GS, Schmack B, Bulut C, Soós P, Weymann A, Stadtfeld S, Karck M. Constrictive  
432 pericarditis: risks, aetiologies and outcomes after total pericardiectomy: 24 years of experience.  
433 *European Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery*. 2013;44:1023-1028; discussion 1028.
- 434 14. Klein AL, Abbara S.; Agler DA, Appleton CP, Asher CR, Hoit B, Hung J, Garcia MJ,  
435 Kronzon I, Oh JK, Rodriguez ER, et al. American Society of Echocardiography clinical  
436 recommendations for multimodality cardiovascular imaging of patients with pericardial disease:  
437 endorsed by the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance and Society of Cardiovascular  
438 Computed Tomography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2013;26:965-1012.e15.
- 439 15. Blackstone EH, Naftel DC, Turner ME, Jr. The decomposition of time-varying hazard  
440 into phases, each incorporating a separate stream of concomitant information. *J Am Stat Assoc*.  
441 1986;81:615-624.
- 442 16. Rubin DB. The design versus the analysis of observational studies for causal effects:  
443 parallels with the design of randomized trials. *Stat Med*. 2007;26:20-36.
- 444 17. Rubin DB. *Multiple Imputation for Non-response in Surveys*. New York: Wiley; 1987.
- 445 18. Rajeswaran J, Blackstone EH. Identifying risk factors: challenges of separating signal  
446 from noise. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2017;153:1136-1138.

- 447 19. Austin PC. Optimal caliper widths for propensity-score matching when estimating  
448 differences in means and differences in proportions in observational studies. *Pharm Stat.*  
449 2011;10:150-161.
- 450 20. Murashita T, Schaff HV, Daly RC, Oh JK, Dearani JA, Stulak JM, King KS, Greason  
451 KL. Experience with pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis over eight decades. *Ann*  
452 *Thorac Surg.* 2017;104:742-750.
- 453 21. Busch C, Penov K, Amorim PA, Garbade J, Davierwala P, Schuler GC, Rastan AJ, Mohr  
454 FW. Risk factors for mortality after pericardiectomy for chronic constrictive pericarditis in a  
455 large single-centre cohort. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2015;48:e110-116.
- 456 22. Gillaspie EA, Stulak JM, Daly RC, Greason KL, Joyce LD, Oh J, Schaff HV, Dearani  
457 JA. A 20-year experience with isolated pericardiectomy: Analysis of indications and outcomes. *J*  
458 *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2016;152:448-458.
- 459 23. Beckmann E, Ismail I, Cebotari S, Busse A, Martens A, Shrestha M, Kühn C, Haverich  
460 A, Fegbeutel C. Right-sided heart failure and extracorporeal life support in patients undergoing  
461 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: A risk factor analysis for adverse outcome. *Thorac*  
462 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2017;65:662-670.
- 463 24. Yang JH, Miranda WR, Borlaug BA, Nishimura RA, Schaff HV, Greason KL,  
464 Maleszewski JJ, Oh JK. Right atrial/pulmonary arterial wedge pressure ratio in primary and  
465 mixed constrictive pericarditis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2019;73:3312-3321.
- 466 25. Nishimura S, Izumi C, Amano M, Imamura S, Onishi N, Tamaki Y, Enomoto S, Miyake  
467 M, Tamura T, Kondo H, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes and prognostic factors after  
468 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis in a Japanese population. *Circ J.* 2017;81:206-212.
- 469 26. Tokuda Y, Miyata H, Motomura N, Araki Y, Oshima H, Usui A, Takamoto S, Japan  
470 Adult Cardiovascular Database Organization. Japan Adult Cardiovascular Database  
471 Organization. Outcome of pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis in Japan: a nationwide  
472 outcome study. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2013;96:571-576.

**Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Patients with Constrictive Pericarditis Undergoing Radical and Partial Pericardiectomy, Original and Propensity-Matched Cohorts**

Characteristic	Overall Cohorts			Propensity-Matched Cohorts		
	Radical pericardiectomy (n=445)	Partial pericardiectomy (n=120)	Std. Diff (%)	Radical pericardiectomy (n=88)	Partial pericardiectomy (n=88)	Std. Diff (%)
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or Mean ± SD		n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or Mean ± SD	
<i>Demographics</i>						
Age (y)	445	61 ± 12	2.9	120	61 ± 12	-6.4
Female	445	72 (16)	-3.3	120	18 (15)	14
Body surface area (m <sup>2</sup> )	429	2.13 ± 0.26	7.1	116	2.16 ± 0.30	-8.3
<i>Presentation</i>						
NYHA functional class	349		11	101		9.1
I		40 (11)			11 (11)	
II		169 (48)			44 (44)	
III		129 (37)			40 (40)	
IV		11 (3.2)			6 (5.9)	
Prior myocardial infarction	445	39 (8.8)	30	128	23 (19)	-5.8
History of congestive heart failure	445	294 (66)	6.6	120	83 (69)	4.9



---

***Left heart morphology & function***

LV end-diastolic volume index (mL/m <sup>2</sup> )	375	36 ± 14	40	100	43 ± 22	77	38 ± 17	13	77	40 ± 15
LV ejection fraction (%)	442	56 ± 8.7	-10	119	55 ± 11	86	56 ± 7.9	-2.2	88	56 ± 9.1
<b><i>Other cardiovascular comorbidities</i></b>										
Atrial fibrillation or flutter	409	128 (31)	-3.6	108	32 (30)	73	17 (23)	12	81	23 (28)
Ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation	413	3(0.73)	21	102	4(3.9)	73	1 (1.3)	0.45	75	1 (1.3)
Stroke	445	16 (3.6)	23	120	11 (9.2)	88	5 (5.7)	13	88	8 (9.1)
Hypertension	445	280 (63)	-0.87	120	75 (63)	88	49 (56)	6.9	88	52 (59)
Peripheral artery disease	445	27 (6.1)	27	120	17 (14)	88	10 (11)	-3.7	88	9 (10)
<b><i>Noncardiac comorbidities</i></b>										
Diabetes										
Pharmacologically treated	438	90 (21)	27	118	38 (32)	84	25 (30)	-9.4	86	22 (26)
Insulin-treated	440	43 (9.8)	12	118	16 (14)	85	10 (12)	-0.43	86	10 (12)
COPD	445	155 (35)	14	120	50 (42)	88	38 (43)	-14	88	32 (36)
Renal dialysis	403	8 (2.0)	-20	110	0 (0)	77	2 (2.6)	-23	80	0 (0)
Preop glomerular filtration rate (mL/min/1.73m)	441	71.8 ± 23.6	-5.7	120	70.5 ± 24.2	87	67 ± 21	21	88	71 ± 22
Bilirubin (mg/dL)	432	1.2 ± 0.81	-0.22	108	1.19 ± 0.85	86	1.2 ± 0.77	0.28	83	1.2 ± 0.87

<i>Etiology of constrictive pericarditis</i>										
Idiopathic/viral	445	305 (69)	-52	118	52 (44)	88	40 (45)	-4.6	88	38 (43)
Post-surgery	445	94 (21)	44	118	49 (41)	88	31 (35)	7.1	88	34 (39)
Post-radiation	445	20 (4.5)	25	118	14 (12)	88	12 (14)	-3.5	88	11 (13)
Misc (TB, vasculitis, post-MI, CTD, etc.)	445	26 (5.7)	-17	118	3 (2.5)	88	5 (5.7)	-11	88	3 (3.4)
<i>Surgery</i>										
History of cardiovascular procedure	445	150 (34)	37	120	62 (52)	88	39 (44)	6.8	88	42 (48)
History of cardiovascular procedure (non-pericardiectomy)	430	107 (25)	38	101	43 (43)	85	31 (36)	9.0	71	29 (41)
History of surgery for pericardial constriction	439	12 (2.7)	25	117	10 (8.5)	87	5 (5.7)	5.4	85	6 (7.1)

a. Patients with data available.

b. Data presented as median [15th, 85th percentiles]

*COPD*=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; *CTD*=cor triatriatum dexter; *LV*=left ventricular; *NYHA*=New York Heart Association; *post-MI*=post myocardial infarction; *preop*=preoperative; *SD*=standard deviation; *Std. Diff.*= standardized difference; *y*=years; *TB*=tuberculosis.

Table 2. Cardiac Index

Outcome	Overall				<i>P</i>	Propensity-Matched Cohorts				<i>P</i>
	Radical Pericardiectomy (n=445)		Partial Pericardiectomy (n=120)			Radical Pericardiectomy (n=88)		Partial Pericardiectomy (n=88)		
	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD		n <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	
Preoperative cardiac index	389	1.86±0.62	99	1.99±0.65	.07	77	1.95±0.74	79	1.95±0.64	.99
Postoperative cardiac index	430	2.98±0.91	114	3.09±1.13	.42	84	3.0±0.89	88	3.1±1.2	.84
Cardiac index change	383	1.1±1.0	98	1.07±1.16	.75	77	1.04±0.96	79	1.1±1.17	.89

a. Patients with data available.

SD=standard deviation.

Table 3. Operative Details

Detail	Overall Cohorts					Propensity-Matched Cohorts				
	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Std. Diff. (%)	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Std. Diff. (%)
	(n=445)		(n=120)			(n=88)		(n=88)		
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]		n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	
<i>Pericardial disease observed during surgery</i>										
Pericardial calcification	442	214(48)	100	48(48)	-0.83	88	42 (48)	70	36 (51)	7.4
<i>Concomitant procedures</i>										
CABG	445	60 (13)	120	26 (22)	22	88	16 (18)	88	14 (16)	-6.0
Aortic valve repair	445	1 (0.22)	120	0(0)	-6.7	88	1 (1.1)	88	0 (0)	-15
Aortic valve replacement	445	21 (4.7)	120	18 (15)	35	88	9 (10)	88	12 (14)	11
Ablation procedure for AF	445	52 (12)	119	6 (5.0)	-24	88	5 (5.7)	88	6 (6.8)	4.7
Mitral valve repair	445	23 (5.2)	120	9 (7.5)	9.6	88	6 (6.8)	88	6 (6.8)	0

Mitral valve replacement	445	6 (1.3)	120	8 (6.7)	27	88	3 (3.4)	88	3 (3.4)	0
Tricuspid valve repair	445	26 (5.8)	120	13 (11)	18	88	6 (6.8)	88	6 (6.8)	0
Tricuspid valve replacement	445	2 (0.45)	120	3 (2.5)	17	88	2 (2.3)	88	1 (1.1)	-8.8
Any aortic root, ascending or arch procedure	445	8 (1.8)	119	6 (5.0)	18	88	3 (3.4)	88	2 (2.3)	-6.8
Descending aorta grafting	445	0 (0)	119	1 (0.84)	13	88	0 (0)	88	0 (0)	0
<b>Support</b>										
Cardiopulmonary bypass time (min); median [15th, 85th]	314	97 [61,138]	67	117 [82,201]	56	59	97 [68,144]	44	113 [73,150]	25
Myocardial ischemic time (min); median [15th, 85th]	147	52 [28,93]	49	77 [60,137]	97	30	59 [35,84]	30	72 [48,114]	59
Circulatory arrest time (min) median [15th, 85th percentiles]	2	15 [4, 26]	3	9 [8,16]	0	1	26	1	8.0	-

---

a. Patients with data available

*AF*=atrial fibrillation; *CABG*=coronary artery bypass grafting; *SD*=standard deviation; *Std. Diff.*=standardized difference.

Table 4. In-Hospital Outcomes

Outcome	Overall Cohorts				Propensity-Matched Cohorts				P*
	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	
Reoperation for bleeding	444	13 (2.9)	120	1 (0.83)	88	2 (2.3)	88	0 (0)	.50 <sup>a</sup>
Transfusions									
Red blood cells	438	194(44)	120	61 (51)	88	46 (52)	88	41 (47)	.45 <sup>c</sup>
Platelets	445	161(36)	120	44 (37)	88	39 (44)	88	26 (30)	.04 <sup>c</sup>
Fresh frozen plasma	445	135(30)	120	46 (38)	88	32 (36)	88	28 (32)	.52 <sup>c</sup>
Any transfused product	445	248(56)	120	71(59)	88	59 (67)	88	45 (51)	.03 <sup>c</sup>
Stroke	443	5 (1.1)	120	3 (2.5)	88	1 (1.1)	88	2 (2.3)	>.9 <sup>a</sup>
New-onset atrial fibrillation	279	75(27)	76	15 (20)	55	18 (33)	58	11 (19)	.09 <sup>c</sup>

## Support

Intra-aortic balloon pump	445	6(1.3)	120	6(5.0)	88	2(2.3)	88	3 (3.4)	.65 <sup>a</sup>
ECMO	445	12(2.7)	120	3(2.5)	88	2(2.3)	88	2(2.3)	>.9 <sup>a</sup>
VAD	445	3(0.67)	120	2(1.7)	88	2(2.3)	88	0(0)	.49 <sup>a</sup>
Prolonged ventilation (>24 h)	415	72 (17)	111	27 (24)	81	17 (21)	82	20 (24)	.60 <sup>c</sup>
Renal failure requiring dialysis	394	15 (3.8)	110	5 (4.5)	75	6 (8.0)	80	3 (3.8)	.32 <sup>a</sup>
Sepsis	443	17 (3.8)	120	6 (5.0)	88	7 (8.0)	88	4 (4.5)	.35 <sup>c</sup>
Deep sternal wound infection	443	2(0.45)	119	1(0.84)	88	2 (2.3)	87	0 (0)	.50 <sup>a</sup>
Hospital death	445	22 (4.9)	120	8 (6.7)	88	7 (8.0)	88	6 (6.8)	.77 <sup>c</sup>
Operative mortality	445	24 (5.4)	120	8(6.7)	88	8 (9.1)	88	6 (6.8)	.58 <sup>c</sup>
Length of stay	444		120		88		88		
Intensive care unit (hours)		67 [26,147]		66[26,161]		66 [25, 163]		70 [26,142]	.96 <sup>b</sup>
Postoperative (days)		8 [6.0,16]		9 [5.0,22]		10 [7.0, 21]		8.5 [5.0, 20]	.02 <sup>b</sup>

---

a. Patients with data available

\* Between propensity-matched groups

Statistics presented as Mean $\pm$ SD, Median [P15, P85], Median (min, max) or N (column %). *P*-values: a=Fisher's exact test, b=Wilcoxon signed rank test, c=Pearson's chi-square test.

*ECMO*=extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; *VAD*=ventricular assist device.



**Table 5.****Hazard Model for Death After Propensity Adjustment, Incorporating CPB Use (n=565).**

	<b>Estimate ± SE</b>	<b>Hazard Ratio (95% CI)</b>	<b>P</b>
<i>Early phase</i>			
Partial resection (vs. radical)	-0.48 ± 0.40	0.64 (0.30, 1.4)	.22
Propensity score for partial	2.4 ± 0.62	11 (3.3, 37)	.0001
CPB used	0.21 ± 0.42	1.23(0.54, 2.8)	.42
<i>Late phase</i>			
Partial resection (vs. radical)	0.64 ± 0.29	1.9 (1.2, 3.1)	.03
Propensity score for partial	0.15 ± 0.57	1.2 (0.38, 3.5)	.79
CPB used	-0.10 ± 0.23	0.90 (0.58, 1.4)	.65

*CPB*=cardiopulmonary bypass.

## FIGURE LEGENDS

### **Figure 1. Temporal Trend of Radical Pericardiectomy by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line.

### **Figure 2. Temporal Trend of Pericardiectomy on Cardiopulmonary Bypass by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line. Red- Radical resection;

Black- Partial resection.

### **Figure 3. A. Survival After Pericardiectomy for Constriction in a Matched Cohort**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric

estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red-


Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.

### **Figure 3. B. Hazard Analysis for Pericardiectomy**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric


estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red-

Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.




**Figure 1. Temporal Trend of Radical Pericardiectomy by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line.




**Figure 2. Temporal Trend of Pericardiectomy on Bypass by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percents, with a corresponding same-color smoothing trend line. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.



**Figure 3.A. Survival After Pericardiectomy for Constriction in a Matched Cohort**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.



**Figure 3. B. Hazard Analysis for Pericardiectomy**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.

1 **Radical Pericardiectomy and Use of Cardiopulmonary Bypass for Constrictive Pericarditis**

2 **Running Title: Radical Pericardiectomy for Constrictive Pericarditis**

3 *Marijan Koprivanac, MD, MS,<sup>a,1</sup> Karolis Bauza, MD,<sup>a</sup> Nicholas Smedira, MD, MBA,<sup>a</sup>*  
4 *Gosta Pettersson, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Shinya Unai, MD,<sup>a</sup> Paola Barrios, MD,<sup>b</sup> Nicholas Oh, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
5 *Filip Stembal, MD,<sup>a</sup> Valentina Lara-Erazo, MD,<sup>a</sup> Edward G. Soltesz, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
6 *Faisal G. Bakaeen, MD,<sup>a</sup> Haytham Elgharably, MD,<sup>a</sup> Milind Desai, MD, MBA,<sup>c</sup>*  
7 *Tom K. Wang, MD,<sup>c</sup> Penny L Houghtaling, MS,<sup>d</sup> Lars G. Svensson, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup>*  
8 *Marc Gillinov, MD,<sup>a</sup> Kenneth McCurry, MD, Douglas R. Johnston, MD,<sup>a</sup>*  
9 *Eugene H. Blackstone, MD<sup>a,d</sup> Allan Klein, MD,<sup>c,1</sup> Michael Z. Tong, MD<sup>a</sup>*

10 <sup>a</sup>Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery

11 <sup>c</sup> Department of Cardiovascular Medicine

12 Miller Family Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute

13 <sup>d</sup> Department of Quantitative Health Sciences

14 Lerner Research Institute

15 **Cleveland Clinic**

16 <sup>b</sup>Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine

17 **Case Western Reserve University**

18 Cleveland, Ohio

19 <sup>1</sup> Co-directors, The Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Pericardial Diseases, Miller Family  
20 Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute, Cleveland Clinic

21 **Word count:** 3,499/5,000

22 **Address for correspondence:**

23 Marijan Koprivanac, MD

24 The Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Pericardial Diseases

25 Miller Family Heart, Vascular & Thoracic Institute, Cleveland Clinic

26 9500 Euclid Ave., Desk J4-477

27 Cleveland, OH 44195

28 Phone: (216) 316-9995; Email: [koprivm@ccf.org](mailto:koprivm@ccf.org)

29

30 **ABSTRACT**

31 **Background:** Pericardiectomy is definitive treatment for constrictive pericarditis. However,  
32 extent of resection (radical versus partial) and use of cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) are debated.

33 **Objectives:** To determine the association of extent of pericardial resection and use of CPB with  
34 outcomes.

35 **Methods:** From January 2000 to January 2022, 565 patients with constrictive pericarditis  
36 underwent radical (n=445, 314 [71%] on CPB) or partial (n=120, 67 [56%] on CPB)  
37 pericardiectomy at Cleveland Clinic. Outcomes stratified by extent of pericardial resection and  
38 use of CPB were compared after propensity-score matching.

39 **Results:** Both radical pericardiectomy and CPB use (67% [381/565]) increased over time.  
40 Among 88 propensity-matched pairs (73% of possible matches), immediate postoperative  
41 cardiac index increased ( $P<0.001$ ) in both groups by a median of  $1.0 \text{ L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ . There were  
42 no significant differences between radical versus partial resection groups in occurrence of  
43 reoperation for bleeding (2.3%, [2/88] vs. 0,  $P=.50$ ). Median postoperative hospital length of stay  
44 was 10 versus 8.5 days ( $P=.02$ ). Operative mortality was 9.1% (8/88) versus 6.8% (6/88)  
45 ( $P=.58$ ). 10-year survival was 54% versus 41%, with a higher propensity-adjusted hazard ratio  
46 after partial resection (1.9, 95% CI 1.2-3.1).

47 **Conclusions:** When surgical intervention is deemed necessary, radical — rather than partial —  
48 resection for constrictive pericarditis can be performed with low surgical mortality and  
49 morbidity. Radical pericardiectomy can be accomplished on CPB and results in better long-term  
50 survival.

51  
52 **Keywords:** hemodynamics, long-term survival, pericardiectomy, postoperative morbidity,  
53 propensity-score matching, surgical resection



54 **ABBREVIATIONS**

55 COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

56 CPB = cardiopulmonary bypass

57 ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation

58 IABP= intra-aortic balloon pump

59 IVC = inferior vena cava

60 LVAD = left ventricular assist device

61 SVC = superior vena cava

## 62 CLINICAL PERSPECTIVES

- 63 • Patients with constrictive pericarditis require a multidisciplinary approach involving  
64 primarily a cardiologist and cardiac surgeon, and other disciplines like gastroenterology  
65 since liver cirrhosis from increased central venous pressure and congestion is common, or  
66 immunology for evaluation of possible autoimmune etiology.
- 67 • Communication is critical in managing patient expectations after pericardiectomy,  
68 especially linking etiology to short- and long-term outcomes in this complex patient  
69 population.
- 70 • Radical pericardiectomy should be the gold standard for treating patients with  
71 constrictive pericarditis.
- 72 • Routine use of cardiopulmonary bypass is safe and enables the radical pericardiectomy  
73 surgery and should be recommended in the guidelines.
- 74

75 **INTRODUCTION**

76 *Constrictive pericarditis is caused by pericardial inflammation, followed by fibrosis,*  
77 *adhesion, and thickening, leading to loss of elasticity.<sup>1,2</sup> Etiology varies from idiopathic*  
78 *to post-cardiotomy to radiation therapy.<sup>3</sup> Untreated, it can lead to important morbidity*  
79 *and mortality.<sup>4,5</sup> (Supplemental Appendix A.1)*

80 Compared to medical treatment, surgical pericardiectomy yields superior survival, greater  
81 functional improvement, and fewer recurrences.<sup>6, 7,8</sup> However, surgical approach and extent of  
82 resection varies, in part from absence of a standardized surgical technique and perception of high  
83 surgical risk.<sup>7,9</sup> This leads to hesitancy to operate on mildly symptomatic patients, and those with  
84 advanced disease seem to not benefit from surgery or are deemed too high risk.<sup>1</sup>

85 European guidelines recommend thorough pericardial resection to remove all sites of  
86 inflammation.<sup>10</sup> They suggest using cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) only when necessary.  
87 However, the association of CPB use with higher mortality is not consistent<sup>4</sup>, with recent studies  
88 reporting no association.<sup>7,11,12,13</sup>

89 We therefore have evaluated the association of extent of pericardial resection — radical  
90 or partial — and use of CPB with early postoperative complications and long-term survival  
91 outcomes of patients with constrictive pericarditis who received surgery.

92 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

93 From January 2000 to January 2022, 565 patients with constrictive pericarditis underwent  
94 pericardiectomy, comprising 445 radical and 120 partial resections, at Cleveland Clinic,  
95 Cleveland, Ohio. Patients with recurrent pericarditis, pericardial tamponade or effusion, or tumor  
96 invasion into pericardium were excluded. Mean age was 61±12 years (Table 1). Advanced heart  
97 failure was present in 40% of those undergoing radical resection and 46% undergoing partial  
98 resection. Twelve patients undergoing radical and 10 undergoing partial pericardiectomy had

99 previous pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis, and 212 patients (150 radical and 62  
100 partial pericardiectomy) had prior cardiovascular surgery.

101 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 63% (n=357), post-  
102 cardiectomy in 25% (n=143), radiation in 6% (24), and miscellaneous in 5.1% (n=29) (Table 1).  
103 Its diagnosis was established according to American Society of Echocardiography Clinical  
104 Recommendations for Multimodality Cardiovascular Imaging of Patients with Pericardial  
105 Disease.<sup>14</sup>

## 106 **Pericardiectomy**

### 107 ***Radical Pericardiectomy***

108 We considered radical pericardiectomy as the removal of all pericardium, including a  
109 strip along the phrenic nerves, as previously described.<sup>1</sup>

### 110 ***Partial Pericardiectomy***

111 We considered partial pericardiectomy as one with less than the entire removal of the  
112 pericardium. Partial pericardiectomy included operations that were reported as complete but did  
113 not remove all of the pericardium.

## 114 **Endpoints**

### 115 ***Operative Morbidity and Mortality***

116 Postoperative hospital morbidity was defined in accordance with The Society of Thoracic  
117 Surgeons National Database. Operative mortality included postoperative in-hospital deaths and  
118 deaths after hospital discharge up to 30 days after surgery.

119

120

121 ***Postoperative Cardiac Index***

122 Postoperative cardiac index was measured immediately after surgery in the intensive care unit.  
123 Preoperative and postoperative cardiac index data was summarized and compared between  
124 radical and partial resection groups. Paired t-test was used to test absolute change (postoperative  
125 – preoperative) between groups. Postoperative cardiac index was grouped with the lowest 15th  
126 percentile and highest 85th percentile values to stratify survival curves.

127 ***Long-term Mortality***

128 All-cause, time-related mortality included operative mortality. Survival was estimated  
129 nonparametrically by the Kaplan-Meier method and parametrically by a multiphase hazard  
130 model.<sup>15</sup> Vital status was obtained by systematic follow-up at 6 months and 1, 5, and 10 years.  
131 Median follow-up was 1.5 years with 25% followed >6.3 years and 10% for >11 years. In  
132 matched cohorts, 25% were followed for >7.4 years and 10% for >11 years.

133 **Data**

134 Clinical data were extracted prospectively for quality assurance. Cleveland Clinic's Institutional  
135 Review Board approved use of these data for research, with patient consent waived (IRB #5001;  
136 approved 2/26/2021).

137 ***Data Analysis***

138 Analyses were performed using SAS statistical software (SAS v9.4, SAS, Inc., Cary, NC) and R  
139 software version 4.2.3 (<http://www.R-project.org>). Continuous variables are summarized as  
140 mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, or as equivalent 15th, 50th (median), and 85th percentiles when data  
141 distribution was skewed. Categorical variables are summarized as frequencies and percentages.  
142 Asymmetric 68% confidence limits are consistent with  $\pm 1$  standard error.

143 ***Propensity-Score Rationale, Development, and Matching***

144 Differences in patient and procedural characteristics of those undergoing radical versus partial  
145 pericardiectomy precluded direct comparison of outcomes. Therefore, propensity matching was  
146 used to reduce selection bias (Supplemental Figure S1).<sup>16</sup>

147 Managing missing data Before identifying factors related to extent of resection, we used 5-fold  
148 multiple imputation for missing data values using multivariate imputation by chained equations.  
149 Variable selection used 1 imputed data set. Regression coefficients for final model variables and  
150 their variance–covariance matrix were estimated for each imputed data set and combined using  
151 Rubin’s method.<sup>17</sup>

152 Parsimonious model Multivariable logistic regression was performed to identify factors  
153 associated with partial pericardiectomy from those considered in Supplemental Appendix 1.  
154 Variable selection used machine learning with automated analysis of 1,000 resampled  
155 (bootstrapped) data sets followed by tabulating the frequency of occurrence of variables included  
156 in each model at  $P \leq .05$ . We retained factors that occurred in 50% or more of the bootstrap  
157 models (Supplemental Table S1) ( $C = .77$ ).<sup>18</sup>

158 Propensity model The parsimonious model was augmented with other demographic and  
159 comorbidity variables to account for unrecorded factors to form a semi-saturated model of 67  
160 variables ( $C = .84$ ). Five such models with identical factors were constructed, 1 for each multiple  
161 imputation dataset, and a propensity score for each patient was calculated from each and  
162 averaged. For propensity matching, the maximum allowable difference between patients for the  
163 propensity score was set to 0.2 times the standard deviation (SD) of the logit of the propensity  
164 score ( $0.2 \times \text{SD} [\text{logit}(\text{propensity score})]$ )<sup>19</sup>, yielding 88 matched pairs out of 120 possible pairs  
165 (73% of partial pericardiectomy cases) (Table 1).

166 Comparison Wilcoxon signed-rank and chi-square tests were used to compare continuous and  
167 categorical in-hospital outcome variables in the matched cohorts. Time-related survival was  
168 compared between matched groups and by adjusting for propensity score in the overall cohort.

## 169 **RESULTS**

### 170 **Overall Experience**

171 The proportion of radical pericardiectomies increased over the study period from 60% in 2001 to  
172 95% in 2021 (Figure 1). Hospital mortality for all patients undergoing pericardiectomy decreased  
173 from 14% in 2000 to 4% in 2021 (Supplemental Figure S2). The trend in CPB use increased  
174 from 37% to 100% of cases from 2000 to 2021 (Figure 2). Unadjusted survival varied according  
175 to etiology of constrictive pericarditis, with lowest survival in the post-radiation patient group  
176 (Supplemental Figure S3). Low postoperative cardiac index was associated with poor survival  
177 (Supplemental Figure S4).

### 178 **Radical Pericardiectomy**

179 Mean age of patients who underwent radical pericardiectomy was  $61 \pm 12$  years. This group  
180 comprised 72 (16%) females, 280 (63%) with hypertension, 90 (21%) with pharmacologically  
181 treated diabetes, 43 (9.8%) insulin-treated, 155 (35%) with chronic obstructive pulmonary  
182 disease (COPD), and 8 (2%) with chronic dialysis (Table 1).

183 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 305 (69%) patients, post-  
184 cardiectomy in 94 (21%), post-radiation in 20 (4.5%), and miscellaneous in 26 (5.7%).

185 Mean left ventricular ejection fraction was  $56 \pm 8.7\%$ . Mean preoperative cardiac index  
186 was  $1.86 \pm 0.62 \text{ L} \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$  (Table 2).

187 CPB was used in 314 (71%) (Table 1). Intraoperatively, pericardial calcifications were  
188 observed in 214 (48%) patients (Table 3). Mean postoperative cardiac index was  $2.98 \pm 0.91$   
189  $L \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ .

190 Following radical pericardiectomy, reoperation for bleeding or tamponade was performed  
191 in 0 of 131 of patients whose pericardiectomy was performed without CPB and 13 of 314 (4.1%)  
192 in whom CPB was used (Table 4). Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) was used for postoperative  
193 support in 6 (1.3%). Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) was used in 12 (2.7%) and  
194 left ventricular assist device (LVAD) in 3 (0.7%).

195 Stroke occurred in 5 (1.1%) and postoperative atrial fibrillation in 75 (27%) (Table 4).  
196 Other complications included respiratory failure requiring prolonged intubation (n=72, 17%),  
197 new onset postoperative renal failure requiring dialysis (n=15, 3.8%), sepsis (n=17, 3.8%), and  
198 deep sternal wound infection (n=2, 0.4%).

199 There were 24 operative deaths (Table 4). Survival at 6 months, and 1, 5, and 10 years  
200 was 90%, 88%, 79%, and 61%, respectively (Supplemental Figure S5).

### 201 **Partial Pericardiectomy**

202 Mean age of patients who underwent partial pericardiectomy was  $61 \pm 12$  years, comprised of 18  
203 females (15%), 75 (63%) with hypertension, 38 (32%) with pharmacologically treated diabetes,  
204 16 (14%) insulin-treated, 50 (42%) with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and none with  
205 chronic kidney disease.

206 Etiology of constrictive pericarditis was idiopathic or viral in 52 (44%), post-cardiotomy  
207 in 49 (41%), post-radiation in 14 (12%), and miscellaneous in 3 (2.5%).

208 Mean left ventricular ejection fraction was  $55 \pm 11\%$ . Mean preoperative cardiac index  
209 was  $1.99 \pm 0.65 L \cdot \text{min}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$  (Table 2).



210 CPB was used in 67 cases (56%) (Table 1). Intraoperatively, pericardial calcifications  
211 were observed in 48 of 100 (48%) patients (Table 3). Mean postoperative cardiac index was  
212  $3.09 \pm 1.13 \text{ L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ .

213 One patient (0.83%) underwent postoperative reoperation for bleeding (pericardiectomy  
214 had been performed on CPB) and 3 (2.5%) patients had a stroke (Table 4). IABP was used for  
215 postoperative support in 6 (5.0%). ECMO was used in 3 (2.5%) and LVAD in 2 patients (1.7%).

216 New onset atrial fibrillation occurred in 15 patients (20%) (Table 4). In 27 (24%)  
217 patients, respiratory failure required prolonged intubation. Five patients (4.5%) developed new  
218 onset postoperative renal failure requiring dialysis, and sepsis occurred in 6 (5.0%). Deep sternal  
219 wound infection occurred in 1 patient (0.84%).

220 There were 8 (6.7%) operative deaths. Survival at 6 months, and 1, 5, and 10 years was  
221 87%, 84%, 64%, and 42%, respectively (Supplemental Figure S5).

## 222 **Propensity-matched Outcomes Comparison**

223 There was a significant immediate postoperative increase in median cardiac index of 1.0 [0.10,  
224 1.9]  $\text{L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ ,  $P<.001$  in both groups (Table 3).

## 225 ***In-Hospital Morbidity***

226 Reoperation for bleeding or tamponade occurred in 2 patients (2.3%) after radical  
227 pericardiectomy (both supported on CPB) and none after partial pericardiectomy (Table 4).  
228 Major postoperative morbidities, such as stroke, atrial fibrillation, or deep sternal wound  
229 infection, were not significantly different between radical and partial pericardiectomy groups nor  
230 was postoperative left ventricular dysfunction treated by IABP, respiratory failure requiring  
231 prolonged intubation, or renal insufficiency requiring dialysis (Table 4). Intensive care unit  
232 length of stay was similar (median: 66 vs. 70 hours;  $P=.96$ ) although postoperative length of stay

233 was longer (median: 10 vs. 8.5 days;  $P=.02$ ) after radical compared to after partial  
234 pericardiectomy.

### 235 ***Early Mortality***

236 Hospital mortality was 8.0% after radical versus 6.8% after partial pericardiectomy ( $P=.77$ )  
237 (Table 4). Operative mortality was 9.1% after radical versus 6.8% after partial pericardiectomy  
238 ( $P=.58$ ).

### 239 ***Long-term Survival***

240 Survival was 83%, 81%, 71%, and 54% after radical pericardiectomy and 85%, 82%, 65%, and  
241 41% after partial pericardiectomy at 6 months and 1, 5, and 10 years (Figure 3A). Before 5 years,  
242 survival was similar, but then diverged with better survival after radical pericardiectomy  
243 ( $P=.008$ ) (propensity-adjusted hazard ratio 1.9 [95% CI 1.2-3.1] (Figure 3B) (Supplemental  
244 Table S2).

### 245 **Cardiopulmonary Bypass Support in Pericardiectomy**

246 In the overall cohort, cases performed on CPB had more reoperations for bleeding (14 of 381  
247 3.7% vs. 0% for off-pump), more transfusions (258 of 381, 68%, vs. 61/184 33%), and more  
248 postoperative atrial fibrillation (31% vs. 16%), but other outcomes were similar. Operative  
249 mortality was 23 of 381 (6.0%) with CPB and 9 of 184 (4.9%) off CPB ( $P=0.58$ ). There was no  
250 statistically significant difference in unadjusted survival after pericardiectomy performed on  
251 versus off CPB ( $P=.49$ ) (Supplemental Figure S6). Likewise, in the hazard model adjusting for  
252 resection type and propensity score, there were no early ( $P=.42$ ) or late ( $P=.65$ ) differences in  
253 survival with or without use of CPB (Table 5).

254

255 **DISCUSSION**

256 **Principal Findings**

257 Both radical and partial pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis provide similar short-term  
258 hemodynamic relief demonstrated by significant postoperative cardiac index increase in both  
259 groups. Performing radical pericardiectomy in patients provides better long-term survival than  
260 partial pericardiectomy, without compromising early outcomes such as perioperative morbidity  
261 or mortality. CPB does not substantially increase the morbidity of the procedure, with exception  
262 of greater number of transfusions and reoperations for bleeding or tamponade.

263 **Cleveland Clinic Historical Perspective**

264 In the 1990s, Lytle and colleagues performed surgical pericardiectomy at Cleveland Clinic.<sup>2</sup> At  
265 that time, it was considered surgical dogma to avoid CPB due to increased risk of postoperative  
266 bleeding. In addition to median sternotomy, bilateral thoracotomies and clamshell incisions were  
267 used to improve exposure and different types of hemodynamic support were used during heart  
268 manipulation. In the 2000s, Smedira and colleagues introduced early CPB initiation. This  
269 provided hemodynamic stability during surgery, thereby enabling more extensive  
270 radical/circumferential pericardial resection that included pericardium around the IVC and  
271 pulmonary veins. This evolved into the current radical pericardiectomy as described in Methods.<sup>1</sup>

272 **Mortality and Morbidity**

273 Early mortality after pericardiectomy is related to era of surgery, and particularly to etiology of  
274 constrictive pericarditis. In a study documenting more than 80 years of experience following  
275 pericardiectomy outcomes at Mayo Clinic, Murashita and colleagues reported a decline in  
276 mortality from 13% in historical patients to 5% since 1990.<sup>20</sup> This trend is consistent with the  
277 findings of the present study, which show an overall mortality of 5.6%, despite a more

278 aggressive approach to operating on patients with prior cardiac surgery requiring concomitant  
279 valve and coronary operations.

280 In our study, reoperation for bleeding was low. Concern for bleeding has been reported as  
281 a reason to limit resection and use of CPB.<sup>21,22</sup> Renal failure of 5.5% may reflect presence of  
282 longstanding right heart failure in this population along with subclinical cirrhosis and deserves  
283 further study.

284 A unique and devastating complication of pericardiectomy is acute over-distension of the  
285 right ventricle following pericardium removal. When this occurs, it can lead to rapid progression  
286 of cardiogenic shock and death or need for mechanical circulatory support.<sup>23</sup> With routine use of  
287 fluid restriction and low-dose inotropes to limit ventricular volume after resection, 2.6% of  
288 patients required IABP and 5.1% were supported temporarily with ECMO.

### 289 **Hemodynamics and Outcomes**

290 Clinical success after pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis depends on a complex  
291 interplay of factors, including presence of coexistent valve, coronary, or myocardial disease.  
292 However, successful release of diastolic restraint can result in immediate improvement in cardiac  
293 index. Patients undergoing radical pericardiectomy compared with those undergoing partial  
294 pericardiectomy had lower preoperative cardiac index, which may indicate that radical resection  
295 was employed in patients with more advanced constriction. At the same time, they had better  
296 survival after 5 years. We hypothesize that the observed survival benefit might be attributed to  
297 recurrent pericarditis on the residual pericardium with possible re-constriction. Low  
298 postoperative cardiac index was strongly correlated with worse survival (Supplemental Figure  
299 S6) and may indicate the presence of restrictive cardiomyopathy, which may be misdiagnosed as  
300 constriction, or other underlying conditions masked by constrictive pericarditis.

301 The ratio of right atrial pressure and pulmonary capillary wedge pressure might be a  
302 useful tool in the assessment of myocardial involvement in constriction and might predict  
303 postoperative outcomes.<sup>24</sup> Further analysis could enhance our ability to predict the patients who  
304 are less likely to benefit from pericardiectomy, as in the case of post-radiation constriction.

305 The major determinant of long-term survival after pericardiectomy for constrictive  
306 pericarditis was etiology, as observed in the previous experience by Bertog and colleagues<sup>2</sup> and  
307 in other large series.<sup>21</sup> Patients with idiopathic constriction, even in the setting of advanced  
308 calcification and unfavorable preoperative hemodynamics, have excellent short- and long-term  
309 survival. Those with post-surgical constriction had worse early and late outcomes, which may be  
310 indicative of multifactorial, mixed pericardial/myocardial disease and not just pericardial  
311 constriction.<sup>7</sup> Patients with radiation-induced constrictive pericarditis had the worst outcomes,  
312 not surprising given coexistence of ventricular fibrosis, valvular and coronary disease, and  
313 radiation-induced pulmonary fibrosis in many of them. These findings support need for a  
314 different approach to timing and operative planning in different patient populations. Patients with  
315 idiopathic pericarditis may benefit from aggressive early surgery given the excellent short- and  
316 long-term survival, whereas patients who have had radiation treatment merit extreme caution.

### 317 **Completeness of Resection**

318 European Society of Cardiology 2015 Guidelines recommend a tailored approach to pericardial  
319 resection, stating debate between radical and partial resection is now unnecessary.<sup>10</sup> However, a  
320 suggestion is made that resection may be limited in the presence of severe calcification.  
321 Advocates of limited resection suggest partial pericardiectomy results in acceptable outcomes.<sup>25</sup>  
322 Although partial resection can result in symptomatic improvement, some patients develop  
323 recurrent symptoms from continued constriction of the posterior pericardium and require redo  
324 pericardiectomy. Cho and colleagues report a series of radical pericardiectomies for recurrent

325 constriction. Partial pericardiectomy performed as initial surgery was the most common reason  
326 for recurrence.<sup>7</sup> Murashita and colleagues recommend as complete a resection as possible,  
327 leaving a strip of pericardium preserved along the phrenic nerve.<sup>20</sup>

328 In concordance, radical versus partial pericardiectomy in matched cohorts did not show  
329 increased hospital mortality or worse survival in this study. In fact, radical resection was  
330 associated with better late long-term survival. Whether radical resection results in better freedom  
331 from recurrent symptoms requires further study. In the interim, these results should inspire  
332 confidence that radical resection does not increase the risk of the procedure. This means there is  
333 no reason not to maximize removal of pericardium, including scar and calcific tissue, as long as  
334 deemed safe — even if this requires CPB.

### 335 **Role of Cardiopulmonary Bypass**

336 Use of CPB remains controversial even among surgeons who advocate radical pericardial  
337 resection. In multiple reports, the use of CPB has been associated with worse outcomes, even in  
338 the hands of experienced surgeons.<sup>9,26</sup> Assessing the incremental risk of CPB in pericardiectomy  
339 is challenging because, at least historically, it has often been employed as a rescue strategy in the  
340 case of catastrophic bleeding to mitigate hemodynamic instability during resection, or to support  
341 concomitant procedures that may increase risk or reflect underlying cardiac disease. If CPB is  
342 used only in more complex cases, it would be expected to be a marker for increased severity and  
343 risk.

344 The range of opinions for using CPB seems to be: 1) avoid it completely; 2) use it when  
345 necessary to repair bleeding or perform concomitant procedures; or 3) use it routinely to  
346 facilitate radical resection. Evolution in our practice started as avoidance of CPB to more liberal  
347 use and now routine use of CPB as almost a condition for radical pericardiectomy, which aids in  
348 avoiding accidental cardiac injury, facilitates maintaining end-organ perfusion during dissection

349 of the lateral left ventricle and diaphragmatic surface, and permits a more controlled resection.  
350 Surgeons who are less comfortable navigating the often-difficult lateral and posterior  
351 pericardium dissection may find CPB beneficial as an adjunct to allow for more complete  
352 resection. Use of bipolar, irrigated hemostatic sealer has made a substantial difference in the  
353 control of bleeding after CPB and in these more extensive radical dissections, minimizing the  
354 bleeding complications.

355 In our study, when all patients were considered, there was an increased and statistically  
356 significant risk for reoperation for bleeding associated with CPB. However, after matching there  
357 was no statistically significant difference in this outcome. This could potentially be explained by  
358 the low bleeding rates we found. As CPB use becomes more prevalent, the low rates of  
359 reoperation for bleeding raise the question about the clinical significance of this finding.

### 360 **Limitations**

361 This clinical study reviews a heterogeneous patient population. The gradual evolution of  
362 approaches and pericardial surgical techniques makes it difficult to determine whether it was the  
363 surgeon's intent to use a particular surgical strategy, such as CPB or radical resection, or whether  
364 this was guided by intraoperative findings. Although the gradual evolution of technique makes  
365 adequate comparison difficult, it is important to note that neither surgical approach was  
366 associated with a difference in early mortality. One important limitation is lack of long-term  
367 functional status data, which is especially relevant for this disease that can produce symptoms  
368 out of proportion to physical findings or imaging.

### 369 **Conclusions**

370 The current surgical approach to pericardiectomy at our institution reflects a gradual, parallel  
371 evolution towards more liberal use of CPB and more aggressive pericardial resection. Regardless

372 of the approach and completeness of resection, pericardiectomy for idiopathic constrictive  
373 pericarditis is associated with low mortality and morbidity, and results in excellent long-term  
374 survival. Among matched patients, better long-term survival with radical versus partial  
375 pericardiectomy suggests that it should be the standard of care in the surgical treatment of  
376 constrictive pericarditis. Similarly, use of CPB is low-risk and beneficial in these difficult  
377 operations.  
378



379

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

380

The authors thank Ingrid Schaefer Sprague for her editorial assistance.

381

**Funding:** This study was supported in part by the Drs. Sidney and Becca Fleischer Heart and

382

Vascular Education Chair (EHB).

383

**Disclosures:** Dr. Elgharably receives a speaking honorarium from LifeNet Health, Artivion, and

384

Edwards Lifesciences. Dr. Desai has consultant and research agreements with Bristol Myers

385

Squibb, Tenaya, and Cytokinetic, and is a consultant for Medtronic. Dr. Gillinov has served as a

386

consultant to Edwards Lifesciences, Medtronic, Abbott, AtriCure, Artivion, ClearFlow, and

387

Johnson and Johnson. Dr. Klein has received research funding from Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals,

388

Ltd., Pfizer, Inc., and Cardiol Therapeutics; and has served on scientific advisory boards for

389

Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals, Ltd, Cardiol Therapeutics, and Pfizer, Inc.

390

391

392

393

## REFERENCES

- 394 1. Unai S, Johnston DR. Radical pericardiectomy for pericardial diseases. *Curr Cardiol*  
395 *Rep.* 2019;21:6.
- 396 2. Bertog SC, Thambidorai SK, Parakh K, Schoenhagen P, Ozduran V, Houghtaling PL,  
397 Lytle BW, Blackstone EH, Lauer MS, Klein AL. Constrictive pericarditis: etiology and cause-  
398 specific survival after pericardiectomy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2004;43:1445-1452.
- 399 3. Chiabrando JG, Bonaventura A, Vecchié A, Wohlford GF, Mauro AG, Jordan JH,  
400 Grizzard JD, Montecucco F, Berrocal DH, Brucato A, et al. Management of acute and recurrent  
401 pericarditis: JACC state-of-the-art review. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2020;75:76-92.
- 402 4. Liu VC, Fritz AV, Burtoft MA, Martin AK, Greason KL, Ramakrishna H.  
403 Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: Analysis of outcomes. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.*  
404 2021;35:3797-3805.
- 405 5. Oh NA, Hennecken C, Van den Eynde J, Doulamis IP, Avgerinos DV, Kampaktsis PN.  
406 Pericardiectomy and pericardial window for the treatment of pericardial disease in the  
407 contemporary era. *Curr Cardiol Rep.* 2022;24:1619-1631.
- 408 6. Nachum ES, Sternik L, Kassif Y, Raanani E, Hay I, Shalabi A, Buber J. Surgical  
409 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: A single tertiary center experience. *J Thorac*  
410 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2020;68:730-736.
- 411 7. Cho YH, Schaff HV, Dearani JA, Daly RC, Park SJ, Li Z, Oh JK. Completion  
412 pericardiectomy for recurrent constrictive pericarditis: importance of timing of recurrence on late  
413 clinical outcome of operation. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2012;93:1236-1240.
- 414 8. Khandaker MH, Schaff HV, Greason KL, Anavekar NS, Espinosa RE, Hayes SN,  
415 Nishimura RA, Oh JK. Pericardiectomy vs medical management in patients with relapsing  
416 pericarditis. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2012;87:1062-70.
- 417 9. Rupprecht L, Putz C, Flörchinger B, Zausig Y, Camboni D, Unsöld B, Schmid C.  
418 Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: An institution's 21 years experience. *Thorac*  
419 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2018;66:645-650.

- 420 10. Adler Y, Charron P, Imazio M, Badano L, Barón-Esquivias G, Bogaert J, Brucato A,  
421 Gueret P, Klingel K, Lionis C, et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of  
422 pericardial diseases: The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Management of Pericardial Diseases  
423 of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Endorsed by: The European Association for  
424 Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J*. 2015;36:2921-2964.
- 425 11. Yunfei LT, Tao L, Yongjun Q. Re-pericardiectomy for recurrent chronic constrictive  
426 pericarditis: Left anterolateral thoracotomy is a better approach. *J Cardiothorac Surg*.  
427 2019;14:152.
- 428 12. Vistarini NC, Chen C, Mazine A, Bouchard D, Hebert Y, Carrier M, Cartier R, Demers  
429 P, Pellerin M, Perrault LP. Pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: 20 years of experience  
430 at the Montreal Heart Institute. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2015;100:107-113.
- 431 13. Szabó GS, Schmack B, Bulut C, Soós P, Weymann A, Stadtfeld S, Karck M. Constrictive  
432 pericarditis: risks, aetiologies and outcomes after total pericardiectomy: 24 years of experience.  
433 *European Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery*. 2013;44:1023-1028; discussion 1028.
- 434 14. Klein AL, Abbara S.; Agler DA, Appleton CP, Asher CR, Hoit B, Hung J, Garcia MJ,  
435 Kronzon I, Oh JK, Rodriguez ER, et al. American Society of Echocardiography clinical  
436 recommendations for multimodality cardiovascular imaging of patients with pericardial disease:  
437 endorsed by the Society for Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance and Society of Cardiovascular  
438 Computed Tomography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr*. 2013;26:965-1012.e15.
- 439 15. Blackstone EH, Naftel DC, Turner ME, Jr. The decomposition of time-varying hazard  
440 into phases, each incorporating a separate stream of concomitant information. *J Am Stat Assoc*.  
441 1986;81:615-624.
- 442 16. Rubin DB. The design versus the analysis of observational studies for causal effects:  
443 parallels with the design of randomized trials. *Stat Med*. 2007;26:20-36.
- 444 17. Rubin DB. *Multiple Imputation for Non-response in Surveys*. New York: Wiley; 1987.
- 445 18. Rajeswaran J, Blackstone EH. Identifying risk factors: challenges of separating signal  
446 from noise. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2017;153:1136-1138.

- 447 19. Austin PC. Optimal caliper widths for propensity-score matching when estimating  
448 differences in means and differences in proportions in observational studies. *Pharm Stat.*  
449 2011;10:150-161.
- 450 20. Murashita T, Schaff HV, Daly RC, Oh JK, Dearani JA, Stulak JM, King KS, Greason  
451 KL. Experience with pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis over eight decades. *Ann*  
452 *Thorac Surg.* 2017;104:742-750.
- 453 21. Busch C, Penov K, Amorim PA, Garbade J, Davierwala P, Schuler GC, Rastan AJ, Mohr  
454 FW. Risk factors for mortality after pericardiectomy for chronic constrictive pericarditis in a  
455 large single-centre cohort. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2015;48:e110-116.
- 456 22. Gillaspie EA, Stulak JM, Daly RC, Greason KL, Joyce LD, Oh J, Schaff HV, Dearani  
457 JA. A 20-year experience with isolated pericardiectomy: Analysis of indications and outcomes. *J*  
458 *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2016;152:448-458.
- 459 23. Beckmann E, Ismail I, Cebotari S, Busse A, Martens A, Shrestha M, Kühn C, Haverich  
460 A, Fegbeutel C. Right-sided heart failure and extracorporeal life support in patients undergoing  
461 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis: A risk factor analysis for adverse outcome. *Thorac*  
462 *Cardiovasc Surg.* 2017;65:662-670.
- 463 24. Yang JH, Miranda WR, Borlaug BA, Nishimura RA, Schaff HV, Greason KL,  
464 Maleszewski JJ, Oh JK. Right atrial/pulmonary arterial wedge pressure ratio in primary and  
465 mixed constrictive pericarditis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2019;73:3312-3321.
- 466 25. Nishimura S, Izumi C, Amano M, Imamura S, Onishi N, Tamaki Y, Enomoto S, Miyake  
467 M, Tamura T, Kondo H, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes and prognostic factors after  
468 pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis in a Japanese population. *Circ J.* 2017;81:206-212.
- 469 26. Tokuda Y, Miyata H, Motomura N, Araki Y, Oshima H, Usui A, Takamoto S, Japan  
470 Adult Cardiovascular Database Organization. Japan Adult Cardiovascular Database  
471 Organization. Outcome of pericardiectomy for constrictive pericarditis in Japan: a nationwide  
472 outcome study. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2013;96:571-576.

473

**Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Patients with Constrictive Pericarditis Undergoing Radical and Partial Pericardiectomy, Original and Propensity-Matched Cohorts**

Characteristic	Overall Cohorts			Propensity-Matched Cohorts		
	Radical pericardiectomy (n=445)	Partial pericardiectomy (n=120)	Std. Diff (%)	Radical pericardiectomy (n=88)	Partial pericardiectomy (n=88)	Std. Diff (%)
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or Mean ± SD		n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or Mean ± SD	
<b>Demographics</b>						
Age (y)	445	61 ± 12	2.9	120	61 ± 12	-6.4
Female	445	72 (16)	-3.3	120	18 (15)	14
Body surface area (m <sup>2</sup> )	429	2.13 ± 0.26	7.1	116	2.16 ± 0.30	-8.3
<b>Presentation</b>						
NYHA functional class	349		11	101		9.1
I		40 (11)			11 (11)	
II		169 (48)			44 (44)	
III		129 (37)			40 (40)	
IV		11 (3.2)			6 (5.9)	
Prior myocardial infarction	445	39 (8.8)	30	128	23 (19)	-5.8
History of congestive heart failure	445	294 (66)	6.6	120	83 (69)	4.9

---

***Left heart morphology & function***

LV end-diastolic volume index (mL/m <sup>2</sup> )	375	36 ± 14	40	100	43 ± 22	77	38 ± 17	13	77	40 ± 15
LV ejection fraction (%)	442	56 ± 8.7	-10	119	55 ± 11	86	56 ± 7.9	-2.2	88	56 ± 9.1
<b><i>Other cardiovascular comorbidities</i></b>										
Atrial fibrillation or flutter	409	128 (31)	-3.6	108	32 (30)	73	17 (23)	12	81	23 (28)
Ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation	413	3(0.73)	21	102	4(3.9)	73	1 (1.3)	0.45	75	1 (1.3)
Stroke	445	16 (3.6)	23	120	11 (9.2)	88	5 (5.7)	13	88	8 (9.1)
Hypertension	445	280 (63)	-0.87	120	75 (63)	88	49 (56)	6.9	88	52 (59)
Peripheral artery disease	445	27 (6.1)	27	120	17 (14)	88	10 (11)	-3.7	88	9 (10)
<b><i>Noncardiac comorbidities</i></b>										
Diabetes										
Pharmacologically treated	438	90 (21)	27	118	38 (32)	84	25 (30)	-9.4	86	22 (26)
Insulin-treated	440	43 (9.8)	12	118	16 (14)	85	10 (12)	-0.43	86	10 (12)
COPD	445	155 (35)	14	120	50 (42)	88	38 (43)	-14	88	32 (36)
Renal dialysis	403	8 (2.0)	-20	110	0 (0)	77	2 (2.6)	-23	80	0 (0)
Preop glomerular filtration rate (mL/min/1.73m)	441	71.8 ± 23.6	-5.7	120	70.5 ± 24.2	87	67 ± 21	21	88	71 ± 22
Bilirubin (mg/dL)	432	1.2 ± 0.81	-0.22	108	1.19 ± 0.85	86	1.2 ± 0.77	0.28	83	1.2 ± 0.87

***Etiology of constrictive pericarditis***

Idiopathic/viral	445	305 (69)	-52	118	52 (44)	88	40 (45)	-4.6	88	38 (43)
Post-surgery	445	94 (21)	44	118	49 (41)	88	31 (35)	7.1	88	34 (39)
Post-radiation	445	20 (4.5)	25	118	14 (12)	88	12 (14)	-3.5	88	11 (13)
Misc (TB, vasculitis, post-MI, CTD, etc.)	445	26 (5.7)	-17	118	3 (2.5)	88	5 (5.7)	-11	88	3 (3.4)
<b><i>Surgery</i></b>										
History of cardiovascular procedure	445	150 (34)	37	120	62 (52)	88	39 (44)	6.8	88	42 (48)
History of cardiovascular procedure (non-pericardiectomy)	430	107 (25)	38	101	43 (43)	85	31 (36)	9.0	71	29 (41)
History of surgery for pericardial constriction	439	12 (2.7)	25	117	10 (8.5)	87	5 (5.7)	5.4	85	6 (7.1)

a. Patients with data available.

b. Data presented as median [15th, 85th percentiles]

*COPD*=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; *CTD*=cor triatriatum dexter; *LV*=left ventricular; *NYHA*=New York Heart Association; *post-MI*=post myocardial infarction; *preop*=preoperative; *SD*=standard deviation; *Std. Diff.*= standardized difference; *y*=years; *TB*=tuberculosis.

Table 2. Cardiac Index

Outcome	Overall					Propensity-Matched Cohorts				
	Radical Pericardiectomy (n=445)		Partial Pericardiectomy (n=120)		<i>P</i>	Radical Pericardiectomy (n=88)		Partial Pericardiectomy (n=88)		<i>P</i>
<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>		Mean±SD	<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>	Mean±SD	<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>	
Preoperative cardiac index	389	1.86±0.62	99	1.99±0.65	.07	77	1.95±0.74	79	1.95±0.64	.99
Postoperative cardiac index	430	2.98±0.91	114	3.09±1.13	.42	84	3.0±0.89	88	3.1±1.2	.84
Cardiac index change	383	1.1±1.0	98	1.07±1.16	.75	77	1.04±0.96	79	1.1±1.17	.89

a. Patients with data available.

*SD*=standard deviation.



Table 3. Operative Details

Detail	Overall Cohorts					Propensity-Matched Cohorts				
	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Std. Diff. (%)	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Std. Diff. (%)
	(n=445)		(n=120)			(n=88)		(n=88)		
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]		n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or median [15th, 85th percentiles]	
<i>Pericardial disease observed during surgery</i>										
Pericardial calcification	442	214(48)	100	48(48)	-0.83	88	42 (48)	70	36 (51)	7.4
<i>Concomitant procedures</i>										
CABG	445	60 (13)	120	26 (22)	22	88	16 (18)	88	14 (16)	-6.0
Aortic valve repair	445	1 (0.22)	120	0(0)	-6.7	88	1 (1.1)	88	0 (0)	-15
Aortic valve replacement	445	21 (4.7)	120	18 (15)	35	88	9 (10)	88	12 (14)	11
Ablation procedure for AF	445	52 (12)	119	6 (5.0)	-24	88	5 (5.7)	88	6 (6.8)	4.7
Mitral valve repair	445	23 (5.2)	120	9 (7.5)	9.6	88	6 (6.8)	88	6 (6.8)	0

Mitral valve replacement	445	6 (1.3)	120	8 (6.7)	27	88	3 (3.4)	88	3 (3.4)	0
Tricuspid valve repair	445	26 (5.8)	120	13 (11)	18	88	6 (6.8)	88	6 (6.8)	0
Tricuspid valve replacement	445	2 (0.45)	120	3 (2.5)	17	88	2 (2.3)	88	1 (1.1)	-8.8
Any aortic root, ascending or arch procedure	445	8 (1.8)	119	6 (5.0)	18	88	3 (3.4)	88	2 (2.3)	-6.8
Descending aorta grafting	445	0 (0)	119	1 (0.84)	13	88	0 (0)	88	0 (0)	0
<b>Support</b>										
Cardiopulmonary bypass time (min); median [15th, 85th]	314	97 [61,138]	67	117 [82,201]	56	59	97 [68,144]	44	113 [73,150]	25
Myocardial ischemic time (min); median [15th, 85th]	147	52 [28,93]	49	77 [60,137]	97	30	59 [35,84]	30	72 [48,114]	59
Circulatory arrest time (min) median [15th, 85th percentiles]	2	15 [4, 26]	3	9 [8,16]	0	1	26	1	8.0	-

---

a. Patients with data available

*AF*=atrial fibrillation; *CABG*=coronary artery bypass grafting; *SD*=standard deviation; *Std. Diff.*=standardized difference.

Table 4. In-Hospital Outcomes

Outcome	Overall Cohorts				Propensity-Matched Cohorts				P*
	Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		Radical pericardiectomy		Partial pericardiectomy		
	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	n <sup>a</sup>	No. (%) or 15th/50th/85th Percentiles	
Reoperation for bleeding	444	13 (2.9)	120	1 (0.83)	88	2 (2.3)	88	0 (0)	.50 <sup>a</sup>
Transfusions									
Red blood cells	438	194(44)	120	61 (51)	88	46 (52)	88	41 (47)	.45 <sup>c</sup>
Platelets	445	161(36)	120	44 (37)	88	39 (44)	88	26 (30)	.04 <sup>c</sup>
Fresh frozen plasma	445	135(30)	120	46 (38)	88	32 (36)	88	28 (32)	.52 <sup>c</sup>
Any transfused product	445	248(56)	120	71(59)	88	59 (67)	88	45 (51)	.03 <sup>c</sup>
Stroke	443	5 (1.1)	120	3 (2.5)	88	1 (1.1)	88	2 (2.3)	>.9 <sup>a</sup>
New-onset atrial fibrillation	279	75(27)	76	15 (20)	55	18 (33)	58	11 (19)	.09 <sup>c</sup>

## Support

Intra-aortic balloon pump	445	6(1.3)	120	6(5.0)	88	2(2.3)	88	3 (3.4)	.65 <sup>a</sup>
ECMO	445	12(2.7)	120	3(2.5)	88	2(2.3)	88	2(2.3)	>.9 <sup>a</sup>
VAD	445	3(0.67)	120	2(1.7)	88	2(2.3)	88	0(0)	.49 <sup>a</sup>
Prolonged ventilation (>24 h)	415	72 (17)	111	27 (24)	81	17 (21)	82	20 (24)	.60 <sup>c</sup>
Renal failure requiring dialysis	394	15 (3.8)	110	5 (4.5)	75	6 (8.0)	80	3 (3.8)	.32 <sup>a</sup>
Sepsis	443	17 (3.8)	120	6 (5.0)	88	7 (8.0)	88	4 (4.5)	.35 <sup>c</sup>
Deep sternal wound infection	443	2(0.45)	119	1(0.84)	88	2 (2.3)	87	0 (0)	.50 <sup>a</sup>
Hospital death	445	22 (4.9)	120	8 (6.7)	88	7 (8.0)	88	6 (6.8)	.77 <sup>c</sup>
Operative mortality	445	24 (5.4)	120	8(6.7)	88	8 (9.1)	88	6 (6.8)	.58 <sup>c</sup>
Length of stay	444		120		88		88		
Intensive care unit (hours)		67 [26,147]		66[26,161]		66 [25, 163]		70 [26,142]	.96 <sup>b</sup>
Postoperative (days)		8 [6.0,16]		9 [5.0,22]		10 [7.0, 21]		8.5 [5.0, 20]	.02 <sup>b</sup>

---

a. Patients with data available

\* Between propensity-matched groups

Statistics presented as Mean±SD, Median [P15, P85], Median (min, max) or N (column %). *P*-values: a=Fisher's exact test, b=Wilcoxon signed rank test, c=Pearson's chi-square test.

*ECMO*=extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; *VAD*=ventricular assist device.

Table 5.

## Hazard Model for Death After Propensity Adjustment, Incorporating CPB Use (n=565).

	Estimate $\pm$ SE	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P
<i>Early phase</i>			
Partial resection (vs. radical)	-0.48 $\pm$ 0.40	0.64 (0.30, 1.4)	.22
Propensity score for partial	2.4 $\pm$ 0.62	11 (3.3, 37)	.0001
CPB used	0.21 $\pm$ 0.42	1.23(0.54, 2.8)	.42
<i>Late phase</i>			
Partial resection (vs. radical)	0.64 $\pm$ 0.29	1.9 (1.2, 3.1)	.03
Propensity score for partial	0.15 $\pm$ 0.57	1.2 (0.38, 3.5)	.79
CPB used	-0.10 $\pm$ 0.23	0.90 (0.58, 1.4)	.65

CPB=cardiopulmonary bypass.

## FIGURE LEGENDS

### **Figure 1. Temporal Trend of Radical Pericardiectomy by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line.

### **Figure 2. Temporal Trend of Pericardiectomy on Cardiopulmonary Bypass by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line. Red- Radical resection;


Black- Partial resection.

### **Figure 3. A. Survival After Pericardiectomy for Constriction in a Matched Cohort**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.

### **Figure 3. B. Hazard Analysis for Pericardiectomy**


Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.



**Figure 1. Temporal Trend of Radical Pericardiectomy by Year**


Symbols represent yearly percentages, with a smoothing trend line.






**Figure 2. Temporal Trend of Pericardiectomy on Bypass by Year**

Symbols represent yearly percents, with a corresponding same-color smoothing trend line. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.



**Figure 3.A. Survival After Pericardiectomy for Constriction in a Matched Cohort**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.



**Figure 3. B. Hazard Analysis for Pericardiectomy**

Each symbol represents a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the event. Solid lines represent parametric estimates enclosed within dashed 68% confidence bands equivalent to 1 standard error. Red- Radical resection; Black- Partial resection.