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10-year performance of Durata versus Riata implantable cardioverter defibrillator leads in clinical practice
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Background: Data on long-term durability of Durata implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) leads compared to Riata leads in clinical practice are missing. Objectives: Aim of the study was to analyze the long-term performance of the Durata ICD leads compared to the Riata ICD leads in clinical practice. Methods: A total of 1088 consecutive patients of a prospective single-centre ICD-registry were analyzed who underwent ICD implantation with a Durata (n = 506) or Riata (n = 582) ICD lead between 2002 and 2012. Only suspected or visible structural lead failure was considered as lead failure. Results: The estimated lead defect rates after 5 and 10 years were not different between the Durata and Riata leads (12% and 37% respectively 12% and 35%, p = n.s.). Riata leads more often had an insulation failure (79% versus 57%, p = 0.001), whereas lead fracture was more often present in Durata leads (43% versus 21%, p = 0.001). One third of patients in both groups had a radiological compression of the lead in the clavicular region whereas lead defect due to externalization was a rare cause of lead defect in Riata leads (2%). Durata leads with a DF-4 connector had a lower incidence of lead defects than Durata leads with a DF-1 connector (p = 0.007).

Conclusion: The lead defect rate of Durata leads after 10 years was similar to that of Riata leads. Externalization is a rare cause of lead failure whereas compression of the lead in the clavicular region and type of lead connector play an important role in the mechanism of lead failure.
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