other 3 patients who were not admitted to the hospital and were managed as outpatients had wound dehiscence of less than 0.5 cm and the risk of a pocket infection was low. Therefore, we decided to treat them empirically with oral antibiotics without the full septic workup. Incision and drainage was not indicated, as none of the patients had any abscess to incise, and patients with abscesses necessitate aggressive treatment, up to device explantation.

Patients in our study received oral antibiotics for a mean of 3 weeks. The termination date was determined by observing complete healing without any residual openings. Only 2 patients required a prolonged antibiotic course due to some residual dehiscence that required more time for skin integrity to be repaired.

We agree that the wounds were healing by secondary intention, but we believe that the staples provided support to the tissue and helped with edge approximation without adding significant tension. This enabled any secretions to leave the site while at the same time prevented further dehiscence in weak tissue. Other factors may also play a role in wound healing, including any excessive arm movement, showering, or inappropriate care and hygiene, which can lead to tissue separation and delay in healing. Such factors are difficult to control, as they are patient-related and frequent wound clinic visits might not be feasible in certain healthcare systems. We recognize the fact that staples can be a nidus for infection and that is why we removed them as soon as the wound was completely healed.

The stapling technique mentioned in our article was used only in patients who had a superficial incisional surgical site infection with wound dehiscence. Stapling helped with tissue approximation and provided support. Patients who have any worrisome features of pocket or device infection should have their device explanted per the guidelines and were not part of our study.

Fuad Habash, M.D., Ozan Paydak, M.D., Naga Venkata Pothineni, M.D., Peyton Card, M.D., Asif Sewani, M.D.

Department of Cardiology, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas, USA

e-mail: fuadhabash@hotmail.com

Conflict of interest: None declared.

No-touch method: New devices need new approaches

Dear Editor,

I would like to congratulate Çöteli et al.,[1] who successfully performed the procedure described in the article "Left atrial appendage closure using Amulet device in a patient with prior percutaneous atrial septal defect closure," published in the Archives of the Turkish Society of Cardiology. A 79-year-old woman who was treated with a 18-mm atrial septal defect (ASD) device 2 years earlier was considered to have atrial fibrillation (AF) and a high risk of bleeding and ischemic stroke. Left atrial appendage (LAA) closure was planned due to an oral anticoagulation contraindication. Inferoposterior puncture of the interatrial septum (IAS) was performed without touching the ASD device during LAA occlusion using fluoroscopy and transesophageal echocardiography. An inferoposterior location is the preferred site for puncture and transesophageal echocardiography can provide life-saving guidance. In some case reports, it has been observed that the LAA closure device can be implanted in the same IAS setting and dilated with a balloon.[2,3] However, the sufficiency of the IAS rims can change the strategy of the approach.

The number of cardiac intervention methods is growing. However, there is often not enough information yet about the optimal technique and approaches for the interventions when reintervention is needed (transcatheter aortic valve implantation [TAVI], ASD closure, percutaneous mitral procedures, LAA closure, etc.). It is not known whether the time required for endothelialization of the device should be considered in such cases. Device placement with the "no-touch method" provides an advantage in terms of independent installation and it looks safer. When considering old age, the indication for ASD closure should be clarified clearly due to the risk of AF.

Using new percutaneous devices increases the need for new approaches. For example, there is no accepted optimal strategy for new approaches such as coronary intervention after TAVI, mitral clipping, mitral valvu-

loplasty, paravalvular leak closure, or LAA closure after ASD closure. In this context, the increasing use of mechanical devices can frequently solve the initial, primary pathology, but may create a new mechanical problem that must be overcome in the late period. This kind of case presentation is important to show how we can deal with these problems. It makes more sense to me to implant a new device without ever touching a previously placed mechanical device. It will be important to use this "no-touch method" carefully to achieve a successful reintervention procedure.

Halil İbrahim Kurt, M.D.,
Abdullah Orhan Demirtaş, M.D.

Department of Cardiology, University of Health Sciences Adana City Training and Research Hospital, Adana, Turkey

e-mail: aorhandemirtas@gmail.com

doi: 10.5543/tkda.2018.02073

Conflict of interest: None declared.

References

1. Çöteli C, Canpolat U, Kaya EB, Şahiner ML, Aytemir K. Left atrial appendage closure using Amulet device in a patient with prior percutaneous atrial septal defect closure. Turk Kardiyol Dern Ars 2018;46:306–8. [CrossRef]
2. Gafoor S, Franke J, Boehm P, Lam S, Bertog S, Vaskelyte L, et al. Leaving no hole unclosed: left atrial appendage occlusion in patients having closure of patent foramen ovale or atrial septal defect. J Interv Cardiol 2014;27:414–22. [CrossRef]
3. Gloekler S, Shakir S, Meier B. Transseptal Puncture Through Amplatzer Atrial Septal Occluder for Left Atrial Appendage Closure. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2017;10:2222–3. [CrossRef]