

# Multicenter retrospective evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging in pediatric and congenital heart disease patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices *Heart Rhythm 2023*



**David Bradley, MD, FHRS**

- *Pediatric electrophysiologist at CS Mott Children's Hospital and Clinical Professor at University of Michigan*

**Henry Chubb, MBBS, FHRS**

- *Pediatric electrophysiologist at Lucile Packard Children's Hospital and Clinical Assistant Professor at Stanford*

**Peter Aziz, MD, FHRS**

# Article Summary

- *Introduction*

- Current guidelines do not support the use of MRIs in patients with epicardial or abandoned leads
- 2021 PACES guidelines provide a 2b recommendation for MRIs in patients with abandoned, epicardial or fractured leads (\*permitted on individual basis)

- *Objective*

- To evaluate the risk of adverse events among pediatric and ACHD patients undergoing MRI scans

- *Methodology*

- PACES supported study: all pediatric and ACHD patients with epicardial or abandoned leads included
- Primary Outcome:
  - Adverse patient event (death, symptoms, arrhythmia), or
  - Significant changes in lead threshold, impedance or sensing

- *Results*

- 314 patients, 14 institutions, 389 MRIs (CHD 82%)
- 74% of MRIs performed in non-MRI-conditional CIEDs
- Most MRIs (45%) cardiac, followed by brain (33%)
- Symptoms, arrhythmias or CIED changes occurred in 4.9% of scans (6.1% of patients)
  - Warmth (1.3%), tingling and pain (0.8%), pre-syncope and bradycardia (0.3%)
- 4.4% required premature termination, mostly due to artifact
- 3.4% had clinically significant CIED parameter changes (pacing thresholds, impedances changes)



# Discussion Talking Points

- *Major Findings*
  - Largest evaluating MRI use in pediatric and ACHD CIED patients
  - “MRIs can be performed in pediatric and ACHD CIED patients with only rare, minor complications”
- *2021 PACES Recommendation*
  - Does this study change the level of evidence for the PACES consensus recommendation?
- *Definition of Parameter Changes*
  - Authors debate what should constitute a “significant change” - %change in baseline or clinician proposed programming change
- *Limitations*
  - Data availability
  - Duration of MRI scans was not collected
  - Variability in MRI protocols and patient selection
  - Selection bias of “less risky” patients



# Thank you!

Heart Rhythm Journal for publication

Dr. Thomas Pilcher (senior author) and all investigators

Drs. David Bradley and Henry Chubb

Heart Rhythm Society

Digital Education Committee

