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Effect of Contact Force and Catheter Inclination in Cardiac RF Ablation
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Abstract

Radiofrequency ablation is a minimally invasive treatment for cardiac arrhythmias. During the procedure, the catheter is placed at the arrhythmogenic site to deliver electric current. There is uncertainty in the contact force and the catheter orientation, which can be affected by many factors, including the cardiac anatomy and the heartbeat. In this work we explore the impact of the contact force and different catheter inclinations on the resulting lesion. An improved electrical model allows to properly account for the current that flows to the tissue through the blood, a relevant aspect when the catheter is not perpendicular. The lesion size consistently increases with the catheter inclination, regardless of the contact force.

1. Introduction

Radiofrequency ablation is a standard, minimally invasive, treatment for several cardiac arrhythmias. The catheter is placed on the arrhythmogenic tissue delivering electrical current at frequencies of 450–500 kHz to produce thermal lesions. The contact surface between the catheter tip and the cardiac wall (electrode footprint) is a major determinant of the amount of power dissipated into the tissue, but it is not the only one. Increasing the contact force increases the footprint but, if the electrode is placed vertically on the tissue, a large amount of power is dissipated in the blood. On the other hand, when the catheter is tilted, part of the current flowing through the electrode-blood interface actually passes to the tissue (see Figure 1), thus increasing the power delivered to the latter.

In this study we explore the impact of catheter orientation and contact force on the resulting lesion size. We introduce an upgraded version of the model in [1] which accounts for the material properties of the cardiac wall and for the current that flows to the tissue, both from direct contact with the electrode and through the blood.

2. Methods

2.1. Geometry

The computational domain $\Omega$, mimicking an in-vitro experimental setup for a porcine ventricle [2], is a cylin-
der of radius 40 mm and height 80 mm, where blood Ω_b (40 mm), tissue Ω_t (20 mm) and a polymethyl methacrylate board (20 mm) are layered. The tissue slab contains fibers pointing along the x-axis. A catheter is submerged in the blood, featuring a hemispherical tip electrode of diameter 7 Fr, 6 pores connected to a common irrigation channel in the center of the electrode, and a thermistor, as in [1].

2.2. Mathematical model

The mechanical interaction of the electrode tip with the tissue is assumed to be a frictionless contact and follows the mechanical equilibrium equation, solved only on the tissue subdomain. The blood flow and its interaction with the irrigated saline are modelled using the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, which are solved only in the blood subdomain. A modified Penne’s bioheat equation models the temperature changes in the system, with an advection cooling term and an electric heat source. The electrical potential follows a quasi-static elliptic equation along with a power constraint equation and is solved along with the bioheat equation in the entire domain. The full system in the current configuration reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \Phi - \text{div} \mathbf{\sigma} &= 0, & \text{div} \mathbf{v} &= 0, \\
\rho(T) c(T) \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla T \right) - \text{div}(k(T) \nabla T) &= \sigma(T) |\nabla \Phi|^2, \\
\text{div}(\sigma(T) \nabla \Phi) &= 0, \\
\int_{\Omega} \sigma(T) |\nabla \Phi|^2 \, dx + R \int_{\Gamma_{\text{out}}} \mathbf{\sigma}(T) \nabla \Phi \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds &= P.
\end{align*}
\]

In (1), \( \mathbf{\sigma} \) is the Cauchy stress tensor, \( \mathbf{v} \) is the velocity, \( t \) is the time, \( \mathbf{\sigma} \) is the stress tensor, \( p \) is the pressure scaled by the density, \( \rho \) is the density, \( c \) is the specific heat, \( T \) is the temperature, \( k \) and \( \sigma \) are the (temperature-dependent) thermal and electrical conductivities, \( \Phi \) is the electrical potential, \( \Omega \) is the computational domain, \( \Gamma_{\text{out}} \) is the portion of the domain boundary that separates the blood and the tissue from the outside (id est, \( \Gamma_{\text{out}} = \partial \Omega \cap (\partial \Omega_b \cup \partial \Omega_t) \)), \( R \) is the resistance offered by everything that is outside the domain and \( P \) is the power setting from the ablation protocol. More details on the model can be found in [1].

The cardiac muscle is a hyperelastic, nearly-incompressible orthotropic material which is modelled using the strain energy function presented in [3]

\[
\Psi = C(e^Q - 1) + \kappa (\ln J)^2,
\]

\[
Q = b_{ff} E_{ff}^2 + b_{ss} E_{ss}^2 + b_{sn} E_{sn}^2 + 2(b_{fs} E_{fs} + b_{sn} E_{sn} + b_{fn} E_{fn}),
\]

where \( C \) is the material constant, \( \kappa \) is the bulk modulus, \( J \) is the volume ratio and \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{b} \) are the isochoric Green-Lagrange strain tensor and the anisotropic stiffness coefficients in the axial and shear direction respectively (\( f: \) fiber, \( s: \) sheet and \( n: \) normal).

We solve system (1) with a self-developed code that uses the finite element method, implemented on the FEniCSx computing platform (fenicsproject.org). The simulations were run on the in-house HPC cluster of RICAM.

2.3. Boundary conditions

We impose the Signorini-Hertz-Moreau frictionless contact boundary conditions on the tissue’s upper surface, written as

\[ \Sigma_n < 0, \quad g \geq 0, \quad \Sigma_n g = 0, \quad \Sigma_t = \mathbf{0}, \]

where \( \Sigma_n = \mathbf{\Sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Sigma_t = \mathbf{\Sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \Sigma_n \mathbf{n} \) and \( g \) is the selected gap function. The tissue is fixed at the bottom and all the remaining boundaries are equipped with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

We impose an inflow \( \mathbf{v}_b = (v_z, 0, 0) \) on the boundary of the blood chamber that satisfies \( \mathbf{v}_b \cdot \mathbf{n} \leq 0 \) and an outflow zero-pressure condition on the opposite side. The saline inflow is a parabolic velocity profile with a flux of 17 mL/min at the top boundary of the irrigation channel. We apply no-slip conditions on all the remaining boundaries.

At the top surface of the electrode we set a potential ensuring that the system satisfies the constant-power constraint and a resistance of \( R_{\text{sys}} = 121 \Omega \). A zero-voltage condition is set at the bottom of the methacrylate board. No-flux boundary conditions are applied on the sides of the board and on the catheter shaft, while we impose Robin boundary conditions on the top and lateral sides of the blood boundary as well as on the lateral tissue boundary

\[ -\mathbf{\sigma}(T) \nabla \Phi \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{\Phi}{R}. \]

The saline flows in at 28 °C [4] and no-thermal-flux conditions are imposed on the surface of the catheter shaft. The remaining boundaries of the computational domain are at a constant body temperature of 37 °C.
2.4. Model parameters

Our model includes a porcine cardiac tissue slab submerged in porcine blood. The model parameters are drawn from the literature [1, 3–8]. Table 1 summarizes the values of the density $\rho$ in kg/m$^3$, the specific heat $c$ in J kg$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$, the electrical conductivity $\sigma$ in S/m and the thermal conductivity $k$ in W m$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ for the different subdomains of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blood</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Electrode</th>
<th>Thermistor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>21500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>20 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_b(T)$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_b(T)$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_e(T)$</td>
<td>10$^{-10}$</td>
<td>4.6 $\times$ 10$^6$</td>
<td>10$^{-5}$</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tissue specific heat and thermal conductivity depend on the temperature exponentially while the tissue and blood electrical conductivity do so linearly:

$$\rho(T)c(T) = \left(3.643 - 0.003533e^{0.06263T}\right) \times 10^6,$$

$$k(T) = 0.5655 + 5.034 \times 10^{-12}e^{0.263T},$$

$$\sigma_b(T) = 0.54\left(1 + 0.015(T - T_b)\right),$$

$$\sigma_b(T) = 1.2\left(1 + 0.011(T - T_b)\right),$$

where $T_b = 37^\circ$C is the body temperature.

We tune the passive material stiffness to match the tissue-electrode contact area and the contact force at 10 g in [1]. The identified value is $C = 10.3$ kPa.

Finally, the resistance $R$ is tuned to match the power $P = 30$ W and the resistance $R_{sys} = 121$ $\Omega$ at 10 g and is kept constant for all different simulated scenarios.

2.5. Lesion estimation

We use a three-state cell-death model calibrated for cardiomyocytes [9] to identify the resulting lesion. The measured dimensions are the lesion volume (V), maximum width (W) and depth (D), as measured from the undeformed tissue surface.

2.6. Ablation protocol

We simulate a standard protocol of 30 W for 30 s, followed by a long thermal relaxation (see [9] for details). We consider two different contact force profiles, 10 g and 20 g, and different orientation angles, starting from perpendicular orientation (0°) and tilting the catheter by 30°, 45° and 60° from the vertical axis. The saline irrigation rate is set to 17 mL/min during the ablation, to the standby mode of 2 mL/min during the first 30 s of thermal relaxation and to zero afterwards. The blood velocity is 0.5 m/s as in [1].

3. Results

Table 2 collects lesion width, depth and volume for all inclinations and contact forces.

As already observed for a perpendicular electrode in our previous work [10], the contact force has a significant impact on the lesion size for all tilting angles.

Catheter orientation does not seem to significantly affect the lesion depth, but it has a clear impact on width and volume. Both are consistently increasing as the inclination angle increases, with 60° having a larger lesion volume by 29% for 10 g and 39% in the case of 20 g.
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We simulate a standard protocol of 30 W for 30 s, followed by a long thermal relaxation (see [9] for details). We consider two different contact force profiles, 10 g and 20 g, and different orientation angles, starting from perpendicular orientation (0°) and tilting the catheter by 30°, 45° and 60° from the vertical axis. The saline irrigation rate is set to 17 mL/min during the ablation, to the standby mode of 2 mL/min during the first 30 s of thermal relaxation and to zero afterwards. The blood velocity is 0.5 m/s as in [1].
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Table 2 collects lesion width, depth and volume for all inclinations and contact forces.
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Table 2. Depth from the undeformed surface (D in mm), width (W in mm) and volume (V in mm$^3$) of the lesion for different contact forces and inclination angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>10 g</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>20 g</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0°</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>130.6</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>168.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>176.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45°</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>199.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>233.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows the resulting lesions for all the considered contact forces and inclinations. Observe that the irreversible surface lesion becomes larger as the catheter angle increases, with the largest ones at 60°. In terms of shape, more skewed lesions are obtained for higher catheter inclinations.

It is worth noticing that tilting the catheter to 60° with a contact force of 10 g produces a lesion comparable in volume to a perpendicular catheter with 20 g. However, the resulting lesion shape is much different, since the lesion is 0.35 mm shallower and 0.2 mm wider.

4. Conclusions

The catheter inclination plays an important role in determining the lesion size and shape. For thin tissues like that of the atrium, a large inclination might be the preferred approach to achieve a wider lesion to completely eliminate the arrhythmogenic substrate with fewer point-by-point ablations. On the other hand, the contact force plays a dominant role on the lesion depth, which might be necessary to achieve transmurality in thicker tissues like the ventricle.
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Figure 3. Temperature distribution after 30 s of ablation for 10 g (left column) and 20 g (right) and different orientation angles (from top to bottom: 0°, 30°, 45° and 60°). The lesion identified by the three-state model is shown in white, the irreversible superficial damage in green. The irrigation saline streamlines are shown in blue.
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