First Report from the European Registry for Anomalous Aortic Origin of Coronary Artery (EURO-AAOCA)

Christoph Gräni, MD, PhD[1]; Anselm W. Stark, MD[1]; Mauro Lo Rito[2], MD; Alessandro Frigiola[2], MD;Matthias Siepe[3], MD; Bertrand Tchana[4], MD, Alberto Cipriani[5], MD, PhD, Alessandro Zorzi[5], MD, PhD, FESC; Valeria Pergola[5],MD, Domenico Crea[6], MD, George Sarris[7], MD, PhD; Elephterios Protopapas[7], MD, MSc; Domenico Sirico[8], MD; Giovanni Di Salvo[8], MD; Cinzia Pegoraro[9], MD; Patrizio Sarto[9] MD; Katrien Francois[10], MD; Alessandra Frigiola[11], MD; Alessandra Cristofaletti[12], MD; Ryan E. Accord[13], MD; Alvaro Gonzalez Rocafort[14], MD; Geoffroy Debeco[15], MD; Massimo Padalino, MD, PhD, FESC[6,16]

1 Department of Cardiology, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Switzerland
2 Department of Congenital Cardiac Surgery, IRCCS Policlinico San Donato, San Donato Milanese (MI), Italy
3. Department of Cardiac Surgery, Cardiovascular Center, Inselspital Universitatsspital Bern, Switzerland.
4. Struttura Semplice Dipartimentale di Cardiologia Pediatrica. Dipartimento Materno-Infantile. Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Parma, Italy
5. Cardiology Clinic, Department of Cardiac, Thoracic, Vascular Sciences and Public Health, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
6. Pediatric and Congenital Cardiac Surgery Unit, Department of Cardiac, Thoracic, Vascular Sciences and Public Health, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
7. 2nd Department of Pediatric and Congenital Cardiac Surgery, Mitera Children's Hospital, Athens Heart Surgery Institute, Greece
8. Pediatric Cardiology, Department of Woman and Child's Health, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
9. UOC Medicina dello Sport, Ospedale Ca' Foncello, Treviso, Italy.
10. Department of Cardiac Surgery, University Hospital Ghent, Belgium
11. Guy and St Thomas Hospital, NHS foundation Trust and King's College, London, UK
12. Cardiology Clinic, Azienda Ospedaliera integrata, University of Verona, italy.
13. Pediatric and Congenital Cardiothoracic Surgery, Thoraxcenter / Center for Pediatric and Congenital Heart Disease, Groningen, Netherlands
14. Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain
15. Cliniques universitaires Saint-Luc, Bruxelles, Belgium
16. Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

Word Count: 4936 (main text including references, figures descriptions, tables)
Abstract word count: 292
Funding: None
Disclosures: Dr. Gräni received funding from the Swiss National Science foundation, InnoSuisse, GAMBIT foundation, CAIM foundation and Novartis foundation, outside of the submitted work. All other authors have nothing to disclose.

Corresponding Author:
Massimo Padalino, MD, PhD, FESC
Pediatric and Congenital Cardiac Surgery
Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, University of Bari Aldo Moro,
Bari Italy

Email: massimo.padalino@unipd.it; massimo.padalino@uniba.it

Abstract

Objectives

Anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery (AAOCA) is a group of rare congenital heart defects with various clinical presentations. The lifetime-risk of an individual living with AAOCA is unknown, and data from multicenter registries are urgently needed to adapt current recommendations and guide optimal patient management. The European AAOCA Registry (EURO-AAOCA) aims to assess differences with regard to AAOCA management between centers.

Methods

EURO-AAOCA is a prospective, multicenter registry including 13 european centers. Herein, we evaluated differences in clinical presentations and management, treatment decisions and surgical outcomes across centers from 01/2019 to 06/2023.

Results

262 AAOCA patients were included , with a median age of 33 years (12-53) with a bimodal distribution. 139 (53.1%) were symptomatic, whereas chest pain (n=74, 53.2%) was the most common complaint, followed by syncope (n=21, 15.1%). Seven (5%) patients presented with a myocardial infarction, two (1.4%) with aborted sudden cardiac death. Right-AAOCA (R-AAOCA) was most frequent (150, 57.5%), followed by left-AAOCA (L-AAOCA) in 51 (19.5%), and circumflex-AAOCA (Cx-AAOCA) in 20 (7.7%). There were significant differences regarding diagnostics between age groups and across centers. 74 (28.2%) patients underwent surgery with no operative deaths; minor post-operative complications occurred in 10 (3.8%) cases.

Conclusion

Currently no uniform agreement exists among european centers with regard to diagnostic protocols and clinical management for AAOCA variants. Although surgery is a safe procedure in AAOCA, future longitudinal outcome data will hopefully shed light on how to best decide towards optimal selection of patients undergoing revascularization versus conservative treatment.

Key Words: AAOCA, Europe, Multicenter, prospective, operative outcomes

Abbreviations

AAOCA	Anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery
CAD	Coronary artery disease
CCTA	Coronary computed tomography angiography
CI	Confidence interval
Cx-AAOCA	Circumflex anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery
CMR	cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging
ECG	Electrocardiogram
FFR	Fractional flow reserve
IVUS	Intravascular ultrasound
L-AAOCA	Left anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery
LGE	Late gadolinium enhancement
OR	Odds ratio
R-AAOCA	Right anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery
SCD	Sudden cardiac death
SPECT	Single-positron emission computer tomography

Introduction

Coronary artery anomalies are a rare form of congenital heart disease. Notably, a specific subset, AAOCA, is proven to have the potential to lead to adverse cardiac outcomes (1). Especially AAOCA variants with an interarterial course between the great arteries and an intramural course (proximal coronary segment within the aortic wall of the tunica media) are associated with an anticipated higher risk of SCD (2, 3). In fact, AAOCA contributed to up to one third of the deaths documented in autopsy reports of young athletes and military recruits who died during intense physical exertion (3, 4). Although, autopsy do not accurately reflect the real risk in general population of individuals living with AAOCA (5), traditionally surgical repair was recommended for all patients. Nevertheless, recommendations have recently slightly changed: The European Society of Cardiology (ESC) 2020 guidelines have given a class IC indication for surgery in patients with R-AAOCA or L-AAOCA and typical angina, who present with evidence of stress-induced myocardial ischemia in a matching territory or high-risk anatomy (6). Comparably, the American Heart Association (AHA)/ American College of Cardiology (ACC) 2018 guidelines giving a class IC recommendation for surgery L-AAOCA and R-AAOCA with symptoms or diagnostic evidence consistent with coronary ischemia attributable to the anomalous coronary artery (7).

Diagnostic and treatment approaches are varying across centers, complicating generation of evidence on optimizing the management of AAOCA. Therefore, evaluating the true risk of different AAOCA variants, comparing anatomical and functional evaluation, and selecting patients who need surgery to reduce the burden of AAOCA healthcare costs while not overtreating or unnecessarily restricting AAOCA individuals from competitive sports is a matter of current research. There are several retrospective registries existing for the American (8, 9), European (10-12), and Japanese (13) cohorts. However, there is a lack of data from prospective studies.

The EURO-AAOCA was established to prospectively include all AAOCA cases from different centres in Europe, and to compare the findings across them. In this first analysis we aimed to evaluate findings of clinical presentations, diagnostics, treatment, and immediate surgical outcome across centres.

Methods

Ethical Statement

The overall study was approved by the Ethics Committee "Comitato etico per la sperimentazione clinica della Provincia di Padova" (approval number 4901/AO/20). Individual consent was obtained from the enrolling center. Formal consent was obtained from the patient or if minor, by the patient's parent/guardian

Enrolment

This is a prospective observational multicentre registry study, which includes all patients with a diagnosis of AAOCA who presented at one of the participating centres between January 2019 and June 2023. Patients are followed annually for up to 5 years. Thirteen centres have been enrolled so far to the time of analysis: Athens, Bern, Bruxelles, Gent, Groeningen, London, Madrid, Milan, Padua Pediatric cardiac center, Padua adult cardiology, Parma, Treviso, Verona. All clinical data were de-identified and collected using REDCap platform hosted at the University Hospital of Padova.

Exclusion criteria were coronary anomalies with normal origin, but anomalous course, and coronary artery anomalies in association to major congenital heart disease (i.e. Tetralogy of Fallot, transposition of the great arteries, anomalous origin of a coronary from the pulmonary artery).

All patients with a diagnosis of AAOCA, RCA from LCA, LCA from RCA, high coronary take-off (≥1cm) or other coronary anomalies not fitting the exclusion criteria (either referred to surgery or to medical follow-up) were included in this analysis. Patients' demographics and diagnostic tests performed were described. In particular, the anatomical pattern and morphology of the coronary artery, the appearance of symptoms during stress tests, and the surgical indication were included. Intraoperative and postoperative data were analysed, and immediate post-operative outcomes were reported.

Statistical Analysis

Continuous variables were expressed as mean±standard deviation or median and interquartile range based on normality. We assessed normal distribution using Shapiro-Wilk test. Categorical variables were presented as frequency and percent of the population. Patient characteristics and global findings are reported for the entire cohort. We conducted a sub-analysis by dividing the population, based on literature and on cohort distribution, into patients with an age <30 years and ≥30 years. These groups were compared using a chi-square test with Yates' continuity correction, an independent samples t-test, or a Wilcoxon rank sum test for categorical or continuous variables, respectively. Univariable logistic regression analysis was performed to identify variables that predict referral to surgery. Variables with less than 50 values were excluded. The results were expressed as odds ratios (OR) with a 95% confidence interval (CI). Due to multiple testing and the exploratory nature of the study statistical significance was defined with a 2-sided p-value of <0.005 for comparison between groups. For the logistic regression model a false discovery rate

(FDR) correction was applied. All statistical analysis was performed with the help of R software version 4.2.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna Austria).

Results

Two hundred-sixty-two patients from 13 centres were included (median 22 patients/center, IQR: 6 - 28). The median age was 36 years (IQR: 12-55) with a bimodal distribution (Figures 1 and 2), and 86 (32.8%) were women. The AAOCA age distribution across centres is presented in Figure 2.

1.1 Anatomy and Symptoms

The most commonly diagnosed anomaly was R-AAOCA in 150 (57.5%) patients and the second most common anomaly was L-AAOCA in 51 patients (19.5%), followed by the Cx-AAOCA in 20 subjects (7.6%). The most common course was interarterial (202 77.7%). Other anatomical high-risk features included presence of intramural segment in 142 (55.3%), slit-like ostium in 112 (51.9%) and an acute take-off angle in 129 (61.1%). There were no differences in anatomical high-risk features between patients <30 and ≥30 years. Symptoms were present in 139 (53.1%), with chest pain in 74 (53.2%), followed by syncope in 21 (15.1%). Seven (5%) patients presented with a myocardial infarction at baseline (3 with concomitant coronary artery disease (CAD) and 4 without) and two with an aborted SCD (1.4%). Patients with <30 years presented more frequently with syncope compared to ≥30 years (28.6% vs 7.8%, p= 0.003). There were no differences for myocardial infarction and aborted SCD between the groups (Table 1).

1.2 Diagnostics

The use of invasive coronary angiography, cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR), single-photon emission computer tomography (SPECT), and coronary computed tomography angiography (CCTA) were different between centers (Figure 3). Invasive coronary angiography was performed in 145 patients (55.3%) and more often in patients ≥30 years (80.6% vs. 28.9%, p<0.001). CAD was only present in patients ≥30 years (i.e. 21 [15.7%]). Advanced interventional procedures such as intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) and Fractional Flow Reserve (FFR) measurements were only performed in a portion of all coronary angiographies, (i.e. IVUS in 71 [27.1%], FFR in 49 [18.7%]). CMR was performed in 100 (38.2%) patients and showed late gadolinium enhancement in 24 (9.2%) patients. Late Gadolinium Enhancement (LGE) was present in 17/65 (26.2%) patients with R-AAOCA and 4/16 (25.0%) patients with L-AAOCA. Furthermore, a patient with a high-origin left coronary artery, a patient with a left coronary artery from RCA, and one with an RCA from left coronary artery presented with LGE. An ischemic pattern was present in 11/24 (45.8%). SPECT was performed in 64 (24.4%) patients and was pathologic in 12 of them (18.8%). In 210 (80.2%) patients a CCTA was performed and was less frequent in the <30 years cohort compared to ≥30 years cohort. (68.8% vs. 91.0%, p<0.001). The different diagnostic tests performed in patients <30 and ≥30 years are summarized in Table 2.

1.4 Therapy

Surgery was performed in 74 (28.2%) patients and the most frequent surgical procedure was the unroofing of the intramural segment (55 [74.3%] patients). The median aortic cross clamp time was 54.5 (IQR: 46-69) minutes. Intraoperative complications occurred in seven patients (9.5%), of which three were due to coronary lesions, two with bleeding, one with a change of surgical procedure, and one with perioperative ischemia.

The immediate postoperative outcome was favourable, with no operative deaths. Postoperative complications were observed in 10 (13.9%) patients; two had pericardial effusion necessitating drainage, one had pleural effusion necessitating drainage, three developed postoperative arrhythmia, and one showed persistent neurological deficit upon discharge. In the remaining 3, they were reported, but not further defined. Surgical reintervention was required in three patients and non-surgical reintervention in one. The median hospital stay was 9 days (Table 3).

In the logistic regression the strongest predictors were a slit-like ostium with an OR of 5.5 ($p<0.001$) followed by an intramural course with an OR of 4.66 ($p<0.001$). Age was not a predictor for surgery, but paediatric centres had an OR <1 compared to adult centers >1 (OR 0.16 versus OR 6.26), which was also shown with patients <30 years of age having a lower OR for operation (OR 0.44, $p=0.001$). Further a positive exercise stress-testing ECG was a strong predictor for surgery with an OR of 5.67 ($p=0.009$) (Table 4).

Discussion

Main findings

This research presents the initial findings of the European prospective multicenter cohort study EURO-AAOCA. As there were paediatric and adult centres involved, a bimodal age distribution could be observed. Further, patients were treated significantly differently in different centres, reflecting the heterogeneity in the management of patients with an AAOCA in Europe.

Age distribution

Compared to other registries, (i.e Congenital Heart Surgeons Society (CHSS) (14) AAOCA registry, or Texas Heart Institute (8), where only pediatric patients were included, the EURO-AAOCA registry peculiarity is that it includes patients across all ages from both paediatric and adult centres. Also, while other registries do include middle-aged patients, none are multicenter (12, 13, 15). The bimodal pattern may serve as a representation of various centers contributing with differing weights to the final population. However, it could also indicate the potential for AAOCA to become symptomatic later in life through different mechanisms (e.g. age related changes to the aorta), as suggested by Bigler et al. (17). The higher proportion of men compared to women could be explained by a greater rate of screening for coronary artery disease especially in middle-aged patients, consequently resulting in a higher rate of incidental findings.

Current guidelines recommend CCTA or functional non-invasive imaging tests as the preferred modality for the exclusion of CAD in symptomatic middle-aged patients (16). Thus, it is expected that an increasing number of AAOCA are going to be discovered in this particular age group, in which the question usually is whether it is incidental or the true underlying cause of the patient's symptoms. In the current registries, it is unclear how this middle-aged population differs from the pediatric population and if the same diagnostic and therapeutic approaches are applicable. The risk of AAOCA-related ischemia has been reported to be less relevant in patients older than 30 years (17). In our cohort there was no difference in severe

initial presentations for age groups. However, it has to be noted that in this research we have not analyzed follow up data, which are still being collected.

Demographic data showed that R-AAOCA was three times more common than L-AAOCA and about half of the patients were symptomatic at baseline, which is consistent with what published in the CHSS registry (14). There was a clear difference in the type of symptoms reported between the different age groups. Patients <30 years were four times more likely to have syncope at first presentation, while chest pain was comparable between the two groups. Patients <30 years were found to be more frequently engaged in competitive sports activities. Considering that ischemia in AAOCA represents a dynamic process involving lateral compression during exercise (17), this finding could imply an increased reliability of symptoms in this cohort, potentially elucidating the increased incidence of syncope. However, the existing literature denotes that the dependability of symptoms is, in reality, limited. A study by Basso et al., which included 27 athletes who experienced SCD during or after exertion, showed that almost 50% of these cases did not show symptoms (2).

Diagnostics

Diagnostic approaches may vary between pediatric and adult patients. For middle-aged patients, the presence of concomitant CAD poses a further challenge, and diagnosing a hemodynamically significant AAOCA becomes a diagnosis of exclusion. Significant differences in the use of advanced diagnostic tests were observed between different centers and age groups (figure 3). CCTA was performed more frequently in adult centers, while pediatric centers conducted fewer CCTA scans, preferring usually CMR. This discrepancy is due to persistent concerns about radiation exposure in children and young adults. However in this series, the utilization of the radiation-free alternative (i.e CMR) did not differ between the two age

groups. Although CMR may have limited spatial resolution (18), it can provide additional information, such as the detection of scar tissue, which serves as a substrate for ventricular tachycardia (2), as well as stress tests and evaluation of myocardial perfusion. Among patients who underwent CMR, one quarter presented with late gadolinium enhancement (LGE), half of them exhibited an ischemic pattern. This finding suggests the presence of scar tissue in some of these patients, which may contribute to the risk of ventricular tachycardia. Compared to an autopsy study with cases of SCD and AAOCCA, fibrosis was reported in a third of cases and there mainly subendocardial (19). The higher ratio of deceased patients with subendocardial LGE may suggest the malignancy of this finding in AAOCA patients.

It should be noted that advanced invasive evaluations (i.e. IVUS and FFR assessment) were only performed in a relatively small proportion of patients, although it is the recommended gold standard for hemodynamic evaluation (17). However, due to the invasive nature of FFR and IVUS, its application in the pediatric population has to be considered more carefully and is probably less suitable.

The differences between the centers in approaching diagnosis of AAOCA patients is challenging for comparing the results. Especially the lack of stress tests does not allow for a differentiation between hemodynamically relevant and non-relevant AAOCA. Another problem is that the anatomical high-risk features have been reported but not quantified (e.g. minimal lumen area of the intramural course, angle of the take-off, or the intramural length).

Surgery

According to the guidelines published by ESC in 2020 (6), when AAOCA patients present with symptoms, or evidence of stress induced myocardial ischemia in matching territory, the gold standard treatment is surgical repair. Among the available techniques, the unroofing of the

intramural segment is the most frequent technique reported (20). However, there is no operation that can fit all anatomical variants of AAOCA. Other techniques (such as ostioplasty or translocation of the vessel) that may be selected to treat as best we can the anatomy of the anomalous coronary (20). In our population, surgery was performed in a third of all patients, and coronary unroofing was used in most of them (Table 3). These findings are in accordance with current literature and guidelines, which recommend unroofing as the preferred surgical technique in AAOCA with intramural course (20). In particular, no pulmonary artery translocations were performed, indicating a change in views on the pathological mechanism underlying the malignancy of AAOCA. This more extensive surgery, was previously employed to address the historically suspected scissor-like mechanism. However, since this mechanism could not be demonstrated, the current consensus attributes ischemia to lateral compression of the intramural segment, making that technique obsolete. Unroofing was performed more frequently in patients <30, while CABG was only performed in patients ≥30 years. This can be explained by the higher rate of concomitant CAD in patients ≥30 years, which has been described in other studies (21, 22).

However pediatric centres seemed to be more conservative with referral to surgery (Supplementary Table 1). Most of the centres included in this registry were surgical centres, which could represent a possible selection bias, with mainly potential surgical candidates being referred to surgical centres instead of the full spectrum of AAOCA. Furthermore, the higher number of high-risk anatomical features in the older population could be a reflection of this selection bias, as aforementioned.

In general, surgical repair was safe, as no operative or early deaths were reported. However, it is noticeable that there still exists a certain degree of surgical risk and occurrence of complications. Intraoperative complications occurred in seven patients (2.7%), including coronary lesions, bleeding, and perioperative ischemia. Additionally, postoperative complications were observed in 10 patients (3.8%), encompassing pericardial and

pleural effusion requiring drainage, postoperative arrhythmia and persisting neurological deficits. Surgical reintervention was necessary in one patient only, while non-surgical reintervention was required in three. These events are in line with recent literature (20), and demonstrate the compelling need of clarity in surgical indications when diagnosis of AAOCA is made (as shown in Table 5).. In fact, the biggest challenge that surgical repair of AAOCA currently faces is the selection of appropriate patients .The decision to undergo surgery appeared to primarily depend on anatomical characteristics rather than relevant functional testing results, since functional tests were performed only in a small proportion of patients (Supplemetary Table 2).

Limitations

A limitation of these first results from the EURO-AAOCA registry is, that only baseline, and no subsequent follow-up data has been examined at this stage of analysis. Therefore, we cannot draw any conclusions regarding the long-term outcome in patients who were operated or treated conservatively. Surgical centers mainly contributed to the registry, which could lead to possible selection bias. Importantly, since pediatric as well as adult centers contributed to the final population and mostly surgical facilities were included, it's possible that not the entire spectrum of presentations is represented in this cohort. The image data itself was not available for analysis, but only the reports of the individual centers. Differences in interpretation of the scans could therefor lead to differing results between centers, which holds especially true for anatomical high-risk features.

Conclusion

R-AAOCA confirmed to be the most commonly diagnosed anomaly in this multicenter registry. Currently no uniform agreement exists among centers with regard to diagnostic protocols and clinical management for AAOCA variants. Although surgery is a safe procedure in AAOCA, future longitudinal outcome data will hopefully shed light on how to best decide towards optimal selection of patients undergoing revascularization versus conservative treatment.

Data availability statement: Data are available upon request.

Conflicts of interest: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

1. Cheezum MK, Liberthson RR, Shah NR, Villines TC, O'Gara PT, Landzberg MJ, et al. Anomalous Aortic Origin of a Coronary Artery From the Inappropriate Sinus of Valsalva. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2017;69(12):1592-608.
2. Basso C, Maron BJ, Corrado D, Thiene G. Clinical profile of congenital coronary artery anomalies with origin from the wrong aortic sinus leading to sudden death in young competitive athletes. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2000;35(6):1493-501.
3. Eckart RE, Scoville SL, Campbell CL, Shry EA, Stajduhar KC, Potter RN, et al. Sudden death in young adults: a 25-year review of autopsies in military recruits. Ann Intern Med. 2004;141(11):829-34.
4. Maron BJ, Doerer JJ, Haas TS, Tierney DM, Mueller FO. Sudden deaths in young competitive athletes: analysis of 1866 deaths in the United States, 1980-2006. Circulation. 2009;119(8):1085-92.
5. Brothers JA, Frommelt MA, Jaquiss RDB, Myerburg RJ, Fraser CD, Jr., Tweddell JS. Expert consensus guidelines: Anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2017;153(6):1440-57.
6. Baumgartner H, De Backer J, Babu-Narayan SV, Budts W, Chessa M, Diller GP, et al. 2020 ESC Guidelines for the management of adult congenital heart disease. Eur Heart J. 2021;42(6):563-645.
7. Stout KK, Daniels CJ, Aboulhosn JA, Bozkurt B, Broberg CS, Colman JM, et al. 2018 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of Adults With Congenital Heart Disease: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019;73(12):1494-563.
8. Doan TT, Sachdeva S, Bonilla-Ramirez C, Reaves-O'Neal DL, Masand P, Mery CM, et al. Ischemia in Anomalous Aortic Origin of a Right Coronary Artery: Large Pediatric Cohort Medium-Term Outcomes. Circ Cardiovasc Interv. 2023;16(4):e012631.
9. Brothers JA, Gaynor JW, Jacobs JP, Poynter JA, Jacobs ML. The Congenital Heart Surgeons' Society Registry of Anomalous Aortic Origin of a Coronary Artery: an update. Cardiol Young. 2015;25(8):1567-71.
10. Padalino MA, Franchetti N, Hazekamp M, Sojak V, Carrel T, Frigiola A, et al. Surgery for anomalous aortic origin of coronary arteries: a multicentre study from the European Congenital Heart Surgeons Associationdagger. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2019;56(4):696-703.
11. Padalino MA, Franchetti N, Sarris GE, Hazekamp M, Carrel T, Frigiola A, et al. Anomalous aortic origin of coronary arteries: Early results on clinical management from an international multicenter study. Int J Cardiol. 2019;291:189-93.
12. Pregaldini F, Widenka H, Barghout M, Grani C, Czerny M, Kari FA, et al. Safety and efficacy of surgical correction of anomalous aortic origin of coronary arteries: experiences from 2 tertiary cardiac centres. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2023;63(5).
13. Nagashima K, Hiro T, Fukamachi D, Okumura Y, Watanabe I, Hirayama A, et al. Anomalous origin of the coronary artery coursing between the great vessels presenting with a cardiovascular event (J-CONOMALY Registry). Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020;21(2):222-30.

14. Poynter JA, Williams WG, McIntyre S, Brothers JA, Jacobs ML, Congenital Heart Surgeons Society AWG. Anomalous aortic origin of a coronary artery: a report from the Congenital Heart Surgeons Society Registry. World J Pediatr Congenit Heart Surg. 2014;5(1):22-30.
15. Jiang MX, Blackstone EH, Karamlou T, Ghobrial J, Brinza EK, Haupt MJ, et al. Anomalous Aortic Origin of a Coronary Artery in Adults. Ann Thorac Surg. 2021;112(4):1299-305.
16. Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, Capodanno D, Barbato E, Funck-Brentano C, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of chronic coronary syndromes. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(3):407-77.
17. Bigler MR, Ashraf A, Seiler C, Praz F, Ueki Y, Windecker S, et al. Hemodynamic Relevance of Anomalous Coronary Arteries Originating From the Opposite Sinus of Valsalva-In Search of the Evidence. Front Cardiovasc Med. 2020;7:591326.
18. Grani C, Buechel RR, Kaufmann PA, Kwong RY. Multimodality Imaging in Individuals With Anomalous Coronary Arteries. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging. 2017;10(4):471-81.
19. Finocchiaro G, Behr ER, Tanzarella G, Papadakis M, Malhotra A, Dhutia H, et al. Anomalous Coronary Artery Origin and Sudden Cardiac Death: Clinical and Pathological Insights From a National Pathology Registry. JACC Clin Electrophysiol. 2019;5(4):516-22.
20. Bigler MR, Kadner A, Raber L, Ashraf A, Windecker S, Siepe M, et al. Therapeutic Management of Anomalous Coronary Arteries Originating From the Opposite Sinus of Valsalva: Current Evidence, Proposed Approach, and the Unknowing. J Am Heart Assoc. 2022;11(20):e027098.
21. Grani C, Benz DC, Possner M, Clerc OF, Mikulicic F, Vontobel J, et al. Fused cardiac hybrid imaging with coronary computed tomography angiography and positron emission tomography in patients with complex coronary artery anomalies. Congenit Heart Dis. 2017;12(1):49-57.
22. Grani C, Benz DC, Schmied C, Vontobel J, Mikulicic F, Possner M, et al. Hybrid CCTA/SPECT myocardial perfusion imaging findings in patients with anomalous origin of coronary arteries from the opposite sinus and suspected concomitant coronary artery disease. J Nucl Cardiol. 2017;24(1):226-34.

Figure 1: Age distribution of all patients: The age distribution of all patients, showing a clear bimodal pattern.

Figure 2: Age distribution of all centers: The different age distributions displayed for the different participating centers.

Figure 3: Diagnostics at different centers: Different Diagnostic tests done at different centers. On the left in blue are the pediatric centers and on the right in red are the adult or mixed centers.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics anatomy and symptoms:

	All (n=262)	≥30 years (n=134)	<30 years (n=128)	P value
Age	36 (12-55)	54.2 ± 12.5	12 (7-16)	**<0.001**
Female Sex	86 (32.8%)	46 (34.3%)	40 (31.3%)	0.69
BMI	22.8 (18.7-26.9)	26.3 ± 4.1	19 (16.3-21.8)	**<0.001**
Type of Coronary Anomaly	261 (99.6%)	134 (100%)	127 (99.2%)	
R-AAOCA	150 (57.5%)	86 (64.2%)	64 (50.4%)	0.033
L-AAOCA	51 (19.5%)	24 (17.9%)	27 (21.3%)	0.60
LCA from RCA	7 (2.7%)	5 (3.7%)	2 (1.6%)	0.49
RCA from LCA	2 (0.8%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0.50
high origin LCA	5 (1.9%)	2 (1.5%)	3 (2.4%)	0.95
high origin RCA	16 (6.1%)	1 (0.7%)	15 (11.8%)	**0.001**

Cx-AAOCA	20 (7.7%)	13 (9.7%)	7 (5.5%)	0.30
Other	10 (3.8%)	1 (0.7%)	9 (7%)	0.019
Anomalous Course	260 (99.2%)	134 (100%)	126 (98.4%)	
Interarterial Course	202 (77.7%)	110 (82.1%)	92 (73%)	0.108
Retroaortic Course	27 (10.4%)	16 (11.9%)	11 (8.7%)	0.52
Subpulmonic Course	12 (4.6%)	5 (3.7%)	7 (5.6%)	0.69
Prepulmonic	7 (2.7%)	2 (1.5%)	5 (4%)	0.40
Other	12 (4.6%)	1 (0.7%)	11 (8.7%)	0.005
Anatomical high risk features	257 (98.1%)	131 (97.8%)	126 (98.4%)	
Intramural Course	142 (55.3%)	80 (61.1%)	62 (49.2%)	0.074
Slit like Ostium	112 (43.6%)	69 (52.7%)	43 (34.1%)	0.46

Acute Take-off Angle	129 (50.2%)	72 (55%)	57 (45.2%)	0.81
R-AAOCA with all high risk features	71 (27.1%)	49 (36.6%)	22 (17.2%)	**0.001**
L-AAOCA with all high risk features	7 (2.7%)	2 (1.5%)	5 (3.9%)	0.40
Symptoms type	139 (53.1%)	90 (67.2%)	49 (38.3%)	**<0.001**
Chest Pain	74 (53.2%)	52 (57.8%)	22 (44.9%)	0.20
Syncope	21 (15.1%)	7 (7.8%)	14 (28.6%)	**0.003**
Dyspnea	11 (7.9%)	9 (10.0%)	2 (4.1%)	0.37
Myocardial Infarction	7 (5.0%)	6 (6.7%)	1 (2.0%)	0.43
Palpitations	7 (5.0%)	4 (4.4%)	3 (6.1%)	0.98
Presyncope	5 (3.6%)	2 (2.2%)	3 (6.1%)	0.48

Aborted SCD	2 (1.4%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (2.0%)	1.00
Fatigue	2 (1.4%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (2.0%)	1.00
Arrhythmias	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.0%)	0.76
SCD	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	NA
Unspecified	4 (2.9%)	4 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	0.33
Other	5 (3.6%)	4 (4.4%)	1 (2.0%)	0.80
Recreational Sport	126 (48.1%)	49 (36.6%)	77 (60.2%)	0.005
Competitive Sport	54 (20.6%)	10 (7.5%)	44 (34.4%)	**<0.001**

327 **Table 2 Diagnostics**

	All (n=262)	≥30 years (n=134)	<30 years (n=128)	P value
ECG peformed	239 (91.2%)	118 (88.1%)	121 (94.5%)	0.10
Pathologic ECG	55 (21%)	38 (28.4%)	17 (13.3%)	**0.001**
Holter ECG peformed	50 (19.1%)	22 (16.4%)	28 (21.9%)	0.33
Echocardiography peformed	223 (85.1%)	107 (79.9%)	116 (90.6%)	0.023
LVEF [%]	64 (59.4-67.5)	60 (55-65)	66 (62-70)	**<0.001**
LV wall motion abnormalities Echo	27 (10.3%)	23 (17.2%)	4 (3.1%)	**<0.001**
Echocardiography stress peformed	22 (8.4%)	11 (8.2%)	11 (8.6%)	1.00
Echostress positive	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00

CMR peformed	100 (38.2%)	53 (39.6%)	47 (36.7%)	0.73
LGE	24 (9.2%)	19 (14.2%)	5 (3.9%)	0.015
LGE ischemic pattern	11 (4.2%)	8 (6%)	3 (2.3%)	0.83
Coronary Angiography peformed	145 (55.3%)	108 (80.6%)	37 (28.9%)	**<0.001**
Critical Coronary Artery Disease	21 (8%)	21 (15.7%)	0 (0%)	0.81
IVUS peformed	71 (27.1%)	48 (35.8%)	23 (18%)	0.012
FFR (n=49)	0.91 (0.87-0.94)	0.91 (0.87-0.94)	0.83 ± 0.11	0.12
FFR <0.8	7 (2.7%)	3 (2.2%)	4 (3.1%)	0.045
SPECT peformed	64 (24.4%)	39 (29.1%)	25 (19.5%)	0.097

SPECT maximum heartrate predicted [%]	92 (%)	99 (%)	88.2 ± 7.9 (%)	0.055
SPECT result positive	12 (4.6%)	8 (6%)	4 (3.1%)	0.25
Exercise stress-testing ECG peformed	106 (40.5%)	53 (39.6%)	53 (41.4%)	0.86
Exercise stress-testing ECG positive	17 (6.5%)	16 (11.9%)	1 (0.8%)	**<0.001**
Exercise stress-testing ECG maximum heartrate predicted [%]	90 (85-96)	91 (85-99)	90 (85-93)	0.24
CCTA peformed	210 (80.2%)	122 (91%)	88 (68.8%)	**<0.001**

328
329

330 **Table 3 Surgery**

	All (n=262)	≥30 years (n=134)	<30 years (n=128)	P value
Surgery performed	74 (28.2%)	43 (32.1%)	31 (24.2%)	0.097
Unroofing	55 (21%)	30 (22.4%)	25 (19.5%)	0.43
Reimplantation	7 (2.7%)	4 (3%)	3 (2.3%)	1.00
CABG	5 (1.9%)	5 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	0.13
Pulmonary Artery Translocation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	NA
Vouhes Procedure	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.6%)	0.34
Ostioplasty	4 (1.5%)	3 (2.2%)	1 (0.8%)	0.86
Other	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Aortic cross clamp time [min]	54.5 (46-69.2)	54 (48-67)	57.9 ± 21.7	0.86
Intraoperative Complications	7 (2.7%)	6 (4.5%)	1 (0.8%)	**<0.001**

Coronary Lesion	3 (1.1%)	3 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	0.26
Bleeding	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.8%)	1.00
Change of Surgical Strategy	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Perioperative Ischemia	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Commissure reimplantation after unroofing	7 (2.7%)	2 (1.5%)	5 (3.9%)	0.19
Intimal tacking down	39 (14.9%)	25 (18.7%)	14 (10.9%)	0.42
Trapdoor Reimplantation technique	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.8%)	1.00
Aortic valve repair	4 (1.5%)	2 (1.5%)	2 (1.6%)	1.00
Postoperative Complications	10 (3.8%)	7 (5.2%)	3 (2.3%)	0.65
Pericardial effusion requiring drainage	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.8%)	1.00
Pleural effusion requiring drainage	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	0.98

Postoperative arrhythmia	3 (1.1%)	3 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	0.26
Postoperative neurological deficit persisting at discharge	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Other	9 (3.4%)	6 (4.5%)	3 (2.3%)	0.54
Death after Surgery	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	NA
Non-surgical reintervention after Surgery	3 (1.1%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.8%)	1.00
Surgical reintervention after Surgery	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1.00
Hospital Stay after Surgery	9 (6-14)	10 (7-15)	8 (6-10.2)	0.072

333 **Table 4 Univariable logistic regression for referral to surgery**
334

	n	OR	P value adjusted (FDR)
R-AAOCA	150	2.0 (1.14-3.57)	**0.040**
L-AAOCA	51	1.56 (0.81-2.94)	0.23
Intramural Course	142	4.66 (2.55-8.93)	**<0.001**
Slit-like Ostium	112	5.50 (2.96-10.65)	**<0.001**
Acute Take-off Angle	129	1.57 (0.87-2.89)	0.19
R-AAOCA with all high-risk features	71	2.15 (1.2-3.84)	**0.028**
Symptomatic	146	3.7 (2.04-6.67)	**<0.001**
Age at diagnosis	262	1.01 (1.00-1.02)	0.14
Pediatric Centers	70	0.16 (0.06-0.36)	**<0.001**
Adult Centers	192	6.26 (2.77-16.83)	**<0.001**

Age <30 years	128	0.61 (0.35-1.04)	0.12
Recreational sport	126	1.84 (1.05-3.28)	0.069
Competitive sport	54	1.52 (0.79-2.85)	0.23
LGE	93	1.20 (0.44-3.13	0.71
SPECT positive	55	1.45 (0.33-5.74)	0.65
Exercise stress-testing ECG	102	5.67 (1.87-19.65)	**0.009**
Pathologic ECG	239	1.02 (0.52-1.94)	0.95

335
336
337 **Table 5 Symptoms and Surgery by Anomalous Type**

	n	Symptoms	Surgery
R-AAOCA	150 (58%)	54 (36%)	53 (35%)
R-AAOCA with all high-risk features	84 (32%)	65 (77%)	41 (49%)

L-AAOCA	51 (20%)	26 (51%)	19 (37%)
L-AAOCA with all high-risk features	10 (4%)	5 (50%)	9 (90%)
LCA from RCA	7 (3%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)
RCA from LCA	2 (1%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
high origin LCA	5 (2%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)
high origin RCA	16 (6%)	10 (63%)	1 (6%)
Cx-AAOCA	20 (8%)	9 (45%)	0 (0%)
Other	10 (4%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)

338

339

Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3



First Results from the European Registry for Anomalous Aortic Origin of Coronary Artery (EURO-AAOCA)

Summary

In a prospective study across 13 European centers between January 2019 and June 2023 we included 262 patients with an anomalous aortic origin (AAOCA). We evaluated differences in clinical presentation, diagnostic evaluation and treatment decision. We found that right AAOCA was the most common and currently no agreement regarding diagnostic- and clinical management exists.



Legend: Distribution of surgery and symptoms for patients with AAOCA.