

Totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass grafting

Interventional procedure guidance

Published: 22 June 2005

[nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg128](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg128)

1 Guidance

- 1.1 Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass grafting does not appear adequate for this procedure to be used without special arrangements for consent and for audit or research.
- 1.2 Clinicians wishing to undertake totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass grafting should take the following actions.
 - Inform the clinical governance leads in their Trusts.
 - Ensure that patients understand the uncertainty about the procedure's safety and efficacy and provide them with clear written information. Use of the Institute's [information for the public](#) is recommended.
 - Enter all patients having totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass grafting onto the [UK Central Cardiac Audit Database](#).
- 1.3 Publication of safety and efficacy outcomes will be useful. The Institute may review the procedure upon publication of further evidence.

2 The procedure

2.1 *Indications*

- 2.1.1 In coronary artery disease, plaque deposits on the inner walls of the coronary arteries lead to narrowing or occlusion, and subsequently decreased oxygen supply to the heart. This may cause angina or myocardial infarction, and long-term weakening of the heart muscle leading to heart failure or arrhythmia.
- 2.1.2 The aim of a coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) is to increase the flow of blood to the heart by inserting grafts to bypass narrowed or obstructed coronary arteries.
- 2.1.3 CABG is usually performed with open surgery through a sternotomy. Less invasive approaches avoiding sternotomy, cardiopulmonary bypass and general anaesthesia have been developed, using either left anterior small thoracotomy (LAST), regional anaesthesia or catheter-based intervention.

2.2 *Outline of the procedure*

- 2.2.1 Totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass (TECAB) systems vary, but they generally include a surgeon's viewing and control console with display system. Remote-control handles control robotic arms that position and precisely manoeuvre an endoscope and endoscopic instruments within the patient. Some equipment uses voice-controlled robotic arms.
- 2.2.2 Following deflation of the lung, small port incisions are made in three intercostal spaces through which one robotic arm carrying the endoscope and two arms with surgical implement attachments are introduced. Grafts are harvested from suitable donor sites, and are used to bypass one or more diseased coronary arteries.
- 2.2.3 TECAB treatment of the beating heart is carried out using a stabilisation device consisting of two branches that immobilise the site for anastomosis while the heart continues to beat. This removes the need for cardiopulmonary bypass. The stabilisation device is introduced into the chest through an additional port incision.

2.3 *Efficacy*

- 2.3.1 Fully patent grafts were achieved in 95% (21/22) of patients when assessed at 3 months by postoperative angiography, together with good functional results.
- 2.3.2 Most case series used duration of operation as a measure and this varied according to the type of procedure undertaken and the number of vessels bypassed. In 45 consecutive patients undergoing TECAB, the mean operating time was 4 hours 12 minutes for single vessel surgery and 6 hours 18 minutes for multiple vessel surgery. In 35 patients, including eight in whom the procedure was performed on the beating heart, the operating time ranged from 3 hours 30 minutes to 8 hours (mean 5 hours 47 minutes). In a further 37 patients (29 of whom had the beating heart procedure), the mean operating time for the early cases in the series was 4 hours 40 minutes, but this was reduced to 3 hours 6 minutes following the introduction of endoscopic stabilisation. The mean length of stay in an intensive care unit varied from 14 hours to 74 hours, and the mean total length of hospital stay ranged from 5.0 to 15.4 days. The upper limits for length of stay were following multiple vessel surgery. For more details, refer to the Sources of evidence.
- 2.3.3 The Specialist Advisors noted that bleeding could potentially make vessel identification difficult. They also noted that patency rates of coronary bypass grafts were not sufficiently well documented.

2.4 *Safety*

- 2.4.1 Conversion rates to open procedures (either mini-thoracotomy or full sternotomy) were reported in all case series and ranged from 19% (5/27) to 51% (19/37) of procedures initiated as TECAB.
- 2.4.2 There were no cases of operative mortality associated with the TECAB procedure (n = 142).
- 2.4.3 In a case series of 45 patients, operative complications included port access failure in 7% (3/45) of patients, prolonged cross clamp time in 9% (4/45), myocardial infarction in 2% (1/45), hypoxic brain damage in 2% (1/45) and internal thoracic artery injury in 2% (1/45) of patients.

- 2.4.4 In a series of 45 patients, 4% (2/45) needed secondary intervention because of bleeding from the site of anastomosis. There were no cases of wound infection at the port site throughout the series. For more details, refer to the Sources of evidence.
- 2.4.5 The Specialist Advisors noted theoretical complications as myocardial infarction, pneumothorax, cardiac tamponade and fatal haemorrhage. They also noted that there is potential for stenosis or occlusion at the site of anastomosis.

2.5 *Other comments*

- 2.5.1 There are a number of other procedures for treating patients with coronary artery disease but no good studies have been found that compare these with TECAB.

Andrew Dillon
Chief Executive
June 2005

3 Further information

Sources of evidence

The evidence considered by the Interventional Procedures Advisory Committee is described in the following document.

['Interventional procedure overview of totally endoscopic robotically assisted coronary artery bypass grafting'](#), August 2004.

Information for patients

NICE has produced [information on this procedure for patients and carers](#). It explains the nature of the procedure and the guidance issued by NICE, and has been written with patient consent in mind.

4 Changes since publication

The guidance was considered for reassessment in June 2008 and it was concluded that NICE will not be updating this guidance at this stage. However, if you believe there is new evidence which should warrant a review of our guidance, please [contact us](#).

8 May 2012: minor maintenance.

About this guidance

NICE interventional procedure guidance makes recommendations on the safety and efficacy of the procedure. It does not cover whether or not the NHS should fund a procedure. Funding decisions are taken by local NHS bodies after considering the clinical effectiveness of the procedure and whether it represents value for money for the NHS. It is for healthcare professionals and people using the NHS in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and is endorsed by Healthcare Improvement Scotland for implementation by NHSScotland.

This guidance was developed using the NICE [interventional procedure guidance](#) process.

We have produced a [summary of this guidance for patients and carers](#). Information about the evidence it is based on is also [available](#).

Your responsibility

This guidance represents the views of NICE and was arrived at after careful consideration of the available evidence. Healthcare professionals are expected to take it fully into account when exercising their clinical judgement. This guidance does not, however, override the individual responsibility of healthcare professionals to make appropriate decisions in the circumstances of the individual patient, in consultation with the patient and/or guardian or carer.

Implementation of this guidance is the responsibility of local commissioners and/or providers. Commissioners and providers are reminded that it is their responsibility to implement the guidance, in their local context, in light of their duties to avoid unlawful discrimination and to have regard to promoting equality of opportunity. Nothing in this guidance should be interpreted in a way which would be inconsistent with compliance with those duties.

Copyright

© National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 2005. All rights reserved. NICE copyright material can be downloaded for private research and study, and may be reproduced for educational and not-for-profit purposes. No reproduction by or for commercial organisations, or for commercial purposes, is allowed without the written permission of NICE.

Contact NICE

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence
Level 1A, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester M1 4BT

www.nice.org.uk

nice@nice.org.uk

0845 033 7780

Endorsing organisation

This guidance has been endorsed by [Healthcare Improvement Scotland](#).