Journal of Cardiology Research and Endovascular Therapy ISSN: 3068-9171

PRIME OPEN ACCESS

Volume 2, Issue 2

Review Article

Date of Submission: 12 Feb, 2026
Date of Acceptance: 25 Mar, 2026
Date of Publication: 14 Apr, 2026

Iatrogenic Complications During Endovascular Cardiac Interventions: Recognition and Management

Muhammet Cihat Çelik[1], Macit Kalçık[2*], Oğuzhan Çelik[3], Osman Karaarslan[1], Mehmet Mustafa Yılmaz[1], Abdullah Sarıhan[4], Abdülmelik Birgün[1], Mucahit Yetim[2], Lütfü Bekar[2] and Yusuf Karavelioğlu[2]

[1]Department of Cardiology, Hitit University Erol Olçok Education and Research Hospital, Turkey

[2]Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Hitit University, Turkey

[3]Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Turkey

[4]Department of Cardiology, Gediz State Hospital, Turkey

***Corresponding Author:** Macit Kalçık, Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Hitit University, Turkey.

Citation: Çelik, M. C., Kalçık, M., Çelik, O., Karaarslan, O., Yılmaz, M. M., et al. (2026). Iatrogenic Complications During Endovascular Cardiac Interventions: Recognition and Management. *J Cardiol Res Endovasc Ther, 2*(2), 01-11.

Abstract
Iatrogenic complications remain an inherent risk of endovascular cardiac procedures despite continuous advancements in device technology and procedural techniques. With the expanding use of percutaneous coronary interventions, transcatheter valve therapies, and catheter-based structural interventions, operators increasingly encounter complications related to vascular access, device manipulation, and structural injury. These events, including coronary perforation, vascular disruption, device embolization, and access-site complications, may lead to significant morbidity if not promptly recognized and managed. Contemporary practice has shifted from reliance on emergent surgical conversion toward catheter-based rescue strategies that enable rapid stabilization in many cases. Early recognition through angiographic assessment, hemodynamic monitoring, and adjunctive imaging plays a central role in successful management. Endovascular techniques such as retrieval systems, covered stents, embolization methods, and flow restoration strategies have become essential tools in addressing procedural complications. Mechanical circulatory support may further assist in stabilizing patients with hemodynamic compromise. Identifying procedural and patient-related risk factors, including vascular calcification, large-bore access, and prior surgical interventions, allows for improved procedural planning and complication prevention. A structured approach integrating prevention, rapid diagnosis, and targeted endovascular intervention is critical for optimizing outcomes. This review provides an overview of the mechanisms, predictors, recognition, and contemporary management strategies of iatrogenic complications encountered during endovascular cardiac procedures.

Keywords: Iatrogenic Complications, Endovascular Cardiac Procedures, Coronary Perforation, Device Embolizationm, Bail-Out Techniques

Abbreviations
PCI: Percutaneous Coronary Intervention
LVOT: Left Ventricular Outflow Tract
CKD: Chronic Kidney Disease

Introduction
The rapid evolution of endovascular cardiac procedures over the past two decades has substantially expanded therapeutic options for patients with complex coronary and structural heart disease. Techniques such as percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), transcatheter valve therapies, and catheter-based management of structural abnormalities have increasingly replaced or complemented surgical approaches due to their minimally invasive nature and favorable

recovery profiles. However, this procedural expansion has been accompanied by a growing spectrum of iatrogenic complications that may arise during device manipulation, vascular access, or deployment of therapeutic systems [1].

Although the overall safety profile of contemporary endovascular interventions remains acceptable, complications such as coronary perforation, vascular injury, device embolization, catheter entrapment, and structural disruption continue to represent significant procedural hazards. These adverse events are not merely technical inconveniences but may rapidly escalate into life-threatening conditions, including hemodynamic collapse, myocardial ischemia, tamponade, or acute valvular dysfunction if not promptly recognized and managed [2].

Importantly, the management paradigm of iatrogenic complications has shifted considerably in the modern era. Historically, emergent surgical conversion was often the only available rescue option in cases of major procedural failure. Advances in catheter technology, imaging guidance, and endovascular tools have now enabled operators to address many of these complications using percutaneous techniques alone, thereby reducing the need for urgent surgical intervention and improving procedural outcomes [3].

Early identification and rapid decision-making are central to successful management. Contemporary interventional practice increasingly emphasizes preparedness for procedural complications through structured algorithms, availability of dedicated rescue devices, and multidisciplinary collaboration. In this context, understanding the mechanisms, presentation, and endovascular management strategies of iatrogenic complications has become an essential component of modern cardiac intervention [4].

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple databases including PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library to identify relevant studies addressing iatrogenic complications during endovascular cardiac procedures. The search strategy incorporated combinations of the following keywords: "endovascular cardiac procedures," "iatrogenic complications," "percutaneous coronary intervention," "structural heart intervention," "coronary perforation," "device embolization," "vascular complications," "bail-out techniques," and "endovascular rescue." Only peer-reviewed studies published in English and indexed in biomedical databases were considered. Additional relevant publications were identified through manual review of reference lists of selected articles. The included literature focused on mechanisms, recognition, prevention, and catheter-based management of procedural complications in contemporary endovascular practice.

This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the underlying mechanisms, early recognition, and contemporary catheter-based management of iatrogenic complications encountered during endovascular cardiac procedures. Particular emphasis is placed on the evolving role of endovascular rescue techniques, procedural decision-making, and the integration of imaging and mechanical support strategies in the acute setting. In addition, the review addresses key procedural and patient-related predictors that may predispose to complications, as well as preventive approaches aimed at minimizing procedural risk. By synthesizing current evidence and practical considerations, this work seeks to offer a clinically relevant framework to assist operators in anticipating, recognizing, and effectively managing complications in modern endovascular practice.

Classification of Iatrogenic Complications

Iatrogenic complications encountered during endovascular cardiac procedures encompass a heterogeneous group of adverse events that may arise at various stages of the intervention. A structured classification facilitates rapid identification and guides appropriate management strategies, particularly in high-acuity settings where delayed recognition may lead to irreversible clinical deterioration.

Access-related complications represent one of the most frequently encountered categories. These events typically include arterial dissection, perforation, pseudoaneurysm formation, and retroperitoneal hemorrhage. Despite advances in vascular closure devices and imaging-guided puncture techniques, access-site complications continue to occur, particularly in patients with calcified vessels, peripheral vascular disease, or challenging anatomy [5]. Such complications may compromise procedural success or necessitate immediate endovascular salvage to prevent progression to hemodynamic instability.

Device-related complications form another critical group and are closely linked to the increasing complexity of contemporary interventions. Catheter kinking, guidewire fracture, device embolization, and entrapment are increasingly recognized during complex PCI or structural procedures. These events often result from interactions between rigid devices and tortuous or calcified vascular structures and may lead to loss of device control or distal migration [6]. In many cases, prompt recognition allows for percutaneous retrieval, thereby avoiding surgical intervention.

Coronary complications remain among the most feared procedural adverse events. These include coronary dissection, perforation, no-reflow phenomenon, and acute vessel closure. Their occurrence may compromise myocardial perfusion and rapidly result in ischemia or infarction if not immediately addressed. Notably, coronary perforation, although infrequent, carries significant morbidity and mortality, underscoring the need for immediate classification and response [7].

Structural complications are increasingly relevant in the era of transcatheter valve therapies and complex intracardiac interventions. These may include prosthesis malposition, annular injury, worsening paravalvular regurgitation, or leaflet damage. The expanding use of large-profile delivery systems and valve manipulation within fragile anatomical environments increases the potential for structural disruption during deployment [8].

Radial access, although associated with lower bleeding risk compared with femoral access, is not free from complications. Radial artery perforation, avulsion, and catheter entrapment may occur particularly in the presence of severe tortuosity or spasm. These complications, while less frequent, may lead to procedural interruption or limb ischemia if not promptly recognized and managed [9].

Finally, aortic complications such as iatrogenic dissection or root injury represent rare but catastrophic events. These complications may occur during catheter manipulation or device advancement, particularly in the presence of calcified or fragile aortic tissue. Their management often requires rapid endovascular stabilization or escalation to surgical repair depending on clinical severity [10]. A comprehensive understanding of these complication categories is essential for anticipating procedural risks and implementing timely rescue strategies. The classification of iatrogenic complications encountered during endovascular cardiac procedures is summarized in Table 1.

Complication Category	Type of Complication	Typical Mechanism
Access-related	Arterial dissection	Sheath insertion trauma
	Perforation	Large-bore access
	Pseudoaneurysm	Incomplete closure
	Retroperitoneal hemorrhage	High puncture site
	Radial perforation	Tortuosity / spasm
Device-related	Catheter kinking	Excessive torque
	Guidewire fracture	Calcified lesions
	Device embolization	Loss of control
	Device entrapment	Tortuous anatomy
Coronary	Dissection	Aggressive manipulation
	Perforation	Balloon overexpansion
	No-reflow	Distal embolization
	Acute vessel closure	Plaque shift
Structural	Prosthesis malposition	Deployment error
	Annular injury	Oversizing
	Leaflet damage	Device interaction
Aortic	Aortic dissection	Catheter trauma
	Root injury	Device advancement

Table 1: Classification of Iatrogenic Complications During Endovascular Cardiac Procedures

Mechanisms of Complication Development

The occurrence of iatrogenic complications during endovascular cardiac procedures is rarely random and is typically the result of a complex interaction between patient-related anatomical factors and procedural dynamics. Understanding these underlying mechanisms is critical for both prevention and management.

Anatomical complexity remains one of the most significant contributors. Severe vascular calcification, tortuosity, and prior surgical alterations can substantially increase procedural difficulty. Calcified vessels, in particular, reduce compliance and increase resistance to catheter and device advancement, thereby predisposing to dissection, perforation, or device deformation [11]. Similarly, tortuous anatomy may lead to excessive torque transmission, increasing the likelihood of catheter kinking or guidewire-related injury.

Previous surgical interventions or the presence of prosthetic materials further complicate the procedural environment. Surgical grafts, prosthetic valves, or patches may create rigid interfaces that alter normal flow patterns and mechanical behavior. Device interaction with these structures may result in entrapment, malposition, or unintended displacement during manipulation [12].

Access limitations also play a central role in complication development. In patients with compromised upper or lower extremity vascular beds—such as those with dialysis fistulas or diffuse peripheral artery disease—the need to use alternative access routes may introduce unfavorable angles or increased device stress during advancement. These altered trajectories may amplify frictional forces and contribute to structural compromise of devices or vascular injury [13].

Device-related factors are equally important. The use of large-profile delivery systems, stiff guidewires, and high radial force implants has improved procedural success in complex lesions but may simultaneously increase the risk of vascular trauma or structural disruption. Balloon overexpansion in heavily calcified segments, for example, has been directly associated with vessel rupture or annular injury in structural interventions [14].

Procedural technique and operator-driven factors also influence complication risk. Excessive manipulation, repeated attempts at crossing resistant lesions, or aggressive device deployment in borderline anatomical settings may convert manageable resistance into structural damage. In many instances, complications arise from cumulative microtrauma rather than a single catastrophic maneuver [15].

Predictors of Iatrogenic Complications

The development of iatrogenic complications during endovascular cardiac procedures is influenced not only by procedural complexity but also by identifiable patient- and anatomy-related risk factors. Recognition of these predictors before intervention may allow operators to anticipate procedural challenges and adopt preventive strategies.

Severe vascular calcification is one of the most consistently reported predictors of mechanical complications. Rigid, noncompliant vessels increase resistance during device advancement and balloon expansion, thereby predisposing to dissection, perforation, or device deformation [11]. In structural interventions, heavy annular or LVOT calcification has similarly been associated with an increased risk of rupture or prosthesis-related injury.

The use of large-bore access represents another important determinant of complication risk. Procedures requiring large delivery systems, such as transcatheter valve implantation or mechanical circulatory support insertion, place substantial stress on iliofemoral vessels and are associated with higher rates of access-site injury and bleeding [16].

Redo procedures and prior surgical interventions further increase procedural vulnerability. Surgical grafts, prosthetic valves, and scarred vascular pathways alter anatomical compliance and may create zones of resistance that predispose to catheter entrapment, device malposition, or vascular injury during manipulation [17].

Chronic kidney disease, particularly in patients receiving hemodialysis, has also been associated with increased complication rates. These patients frequently exhibit diffuse vascular calcification and limited access options, which may necessitate the use of alternative or suboptimal access routes, thereby increasing procedural complexity [18].
Finally, a history of prior cardiac or vascular surgery may independently contribute to procedural risk by altering native anatomical relationships and introducing rigid prosthetic structures that interact unpredictably with endovascular devices [10].

Identifying these predictors during pre-procedural planning allows for tailored access selection, device optimization, and procedural strategy, which may reduce the likelihood of adverse events. Key procedural and patient-related predictors associated with the development of iatrogenic complications are presented in Table 2.

Risk Factor	Associated Complication
Severe vascular calcification	Perforation, dissection
Large-bore access	Vascular injury
Prior cardiac surgery	Device entrapment
Prosthetic material	Malposition
Chronic kidney disease	Access complications
Hemodialysis	Limited access
Tortuous vessels	Catheter kinking
Structural intervention	Annular rupture
Alternative access routes	Vascular trauma

Table 2: Predictors of Iatrogenic Complications

Early Recognition

Timely recognition of iatrogenic complications during endovascular cardiac procedures is a decisive determinant of clinical outcome. The transition from a manageable technical issue to a life-threatening event often occurs within minutes, making early detection essential for successful percutaneous rescue.

Angiographic assessment remains the primary modality for immediate recognition. Subtle contrast staining, extravasation, vessel haziness, or abrupt flow limitation may represent early indicators of dissection or perforation before overt hemodynamic compromise develops. In structural interventions, malalignment of prosthetic components or abnormal contrast distribution may signal device malposition or annular injury [19]. Continuous vigilance during contrast injection and device deployment is therefore critical.

Hemodynamic monitoring provides an additional layer of detection. Sudden hypotension, loss of arterial waveform fidelity, or unexpected elevation in filling pressures may precede overt angiographic findings. In cases such as coronary perforation or annular rupture, hemodynamic instability may reflect pericardial tamponade or acute valvular dysfunction even before imaging confirmation [20].

Adjunctive imaging modalities have assumed an increasingly important role in early diagnosis. Transesophageal echocardiography enables real-time visualization of pericardial effusion, prosthesis position, or structural disruption during valve interventions. Intravascular imaging tools such as intravascular ultrasound and optical coherence tomography may identify vessel wall injury, stent malapposition, or deep dissections not readily apparent on angiography alone [21].

Electrocardiographic changes may also provide early clues, particularly in coronary complications. Acute ST-segment shifts or new conduction disturbances during device manipulation should prompt immediate reassessment for vessel compromise or mechanical obstruction [22]. Ultimately, early recognition depends on the integration of angiographic findings, hemodynamic signals, and imaging data within a structured procedural awareness framework. Prompt identification enables rapid initiation of endovascular rescue strategies and reduces the likelihood of escalation to surgical intervention.

Endovascular Rescue Strategies

Once an iatrogenic complication is identified, immediate implementation of endovascular rescue strategies becomes essential to prevent clinical deterioration. Contemporary interventional practice increasingly relies on catheter-based solutions that allow stabilization without surgical escalation.

Retrieval techniques constitute a fundamental component of endovascular rescue. Snare systems are widely used to retrieve embolized or entrapped devices, including guidewires, stents, or catheter fragments. Successful percutaneous retrieval has been reported in the majority of cases involving intravascular foreign body loss, thereby avoiding emergent surgical intervention [23]. Alternative tools such as bioptomes or dedicated grasping devices may also be employed depending on device location and accessibility.

Repositioning strategies are frequently required when devices become malaligned or partially deployed. Balloon-assisted repositioning allows controlled redirection of prosthetic components or displaced stents, particularly in structural interventions. Similarly, re-crossing techniques using hydrophilic guidewires may restore procedural control following device-induced obstruction [4].

Sealing techniques are crucial in cases involving vascular disruption. Covered stents provide rapid exclusion of perforations within coronary or peripheral vessels and have become a standard bailout option in severe vessel injury. In smaller branches or distal perforations, coil embolization or vascular plugs may be employed to achieve hemostasis while preserving proximal flow [24].

Flow restoration strategies are particularly relevant in coronary complications associated with vessel closure or embolic obstruction. Emergency stenting may be required to stabilize dissections or seal perforations, while aspiration techniques can remove thrombotic or debris-related obstructions that compromise perfusion [25].

The effectiveness of these endovascular rescue methods depends on rapid selection of an appropriate strategy tailored to the specific complication. In many instances, the availability of multiple bailout tools within the catheterization laboratory has transformed previously catastrophic events into manageable procedural challenges. The selection of endovascular rescue strategies according to complication type is outlined in Table 3.

Complication	First-Line Strategy	Alternative Strategy
Coronary perforation	Balloon tamponade	Covered stent
Distal perforation	Coil embolization	Vascular plug
Device embolization	Snare retrieval	Stent fixation
Device entrapment	Gentle traction	Dual access retrieval
Catheter kinking	Wire exchange	Retrieval system
Access bleeding	Compression	Endovascular stent graft
Pseudoaneurysm	Thrombin injection	Surgical repair
No-reflow	Aspiration	Vasodilators
Dissection	Stenting	Surgical conversion

Table 3: Endovascular Rescue Techniques According to Complication Type

Management of Specific Complications

The clinical impact of iatrogenic complications varies according to the nature and location of the injury, necessitating tailored management strategies for each scenario.

Coronary perforation represents one of the most critical complications encountered during percutaneous interventions. Management is typically guided by the severity of vessel injury and hemodynamic status. Immediate balloon inflation at the site of perforation may provide temporary hemostasis, while definitive management often involves implantation of covered stents in proximal vessels. In distal or small branch perforations, embolization using coils or other occlusive materials may be required to control extravasation and prevent tamponade [26].

Catheter or device entrapment is another challenging situation that may occur in tortuous or calcified anatomy. Percutaneous snare retrieval remains the most widely used method for resolving these events. In cases where simple retrieval is not feasible, counter-traction techniques using dual access routes can provide additional control and facilitate release of the trapped device [27].

Device embolization, including stent loss or prosthesis migration, demands rapid localization and decision-making. If the embolized component remains accessible, percutaneous retrieval is generally preferred. However, in certain situations where retrieval carries excessive risk, fixation of the embolized device against the vessel wall using an additional stent may represent a safer alternative [28].

Annular or aortic root injury during structural interventions constitutes a rare but potentially catastrophic complication. Endovascular stabilization through rapid hemodynamic support and sealing strategies may be attempted in selected cases, although severe injuries may ultimately require surgical correction. Early detection remains critical for preventing progression to circulatory collapse [29].

These complication-specific approaches underscore the importance of procedural adaptability. The ability to rapidly transition from standard intervention to targeted rescue strategy significantly influences both procedural success and patient survival.

Role of Mechanical Circulatory Support

In certain iatrogenic complications encountered during endovascular cardiac procedures, hemodynamic deterioration may occur despite rapid technical correction. In these situations, Mechanical Circulatory Support (MCS) can provide a critical bridge to stabilization, allowing time for definitive endovascular or surgical management.

Intra-Aortic Balloon Pump (IABP) remains one of the most readily available support devices and may be employed to augment coronary perfusion and reduce afterload in cases of acute ischemia resulting from vessel closure or severe dissection. Although its hemodynamic support is modest, its rapid deployability makes it useful in the acute procedural setting [30].

More advanced support systems, such as percutaneous ventricular assist devices, provide greater circulatory stabilization by directly unloading the left ventricle and maintaining systemic perfusion. These devices are particularly valuable in scenarios involving profound myocardial ischemia, acute valvular dysfunction, or procedural complications leading to cardiogenic shock [31].

In extreme cases characterized by severe hemodynamic collapse or refractory instability, Extra Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation (ECMO) may be required. ECMO offers full cardiopulmonary support and can be lifesaving in situations such as annular rupture, catastrophic perforation, or massive embolic events when conventional support measures are insufficient [32].

Importantly, the use of mechanical support should not be viewed solely as a rescue intervention but also as a stabilizing adjunct that facilitates controlled management of the underlying complication. Early deployment in selected high-risk scenarios may improve procedural outcomes by preventing progression to irreversible organ hypoperfusion.

Access Site Salvage Techniques

Access-site complications remain among the most common iatrogenic problems in endovascular cardiac procedures and range from self-limited bleeding to limb- or life-threatening vascular injury. Contemporary practice increasingly favors prompt endovascular "salvage" over open repair when anatomy and hemodynamics permit, because rapid percutaneous control of bleeding or flow-limiting injury can stabilize the patient while minimizing procedural delay and physiological stress. A practical salvage mindset begins with immediate recognition that access complications often evolve quickly and may present initially with subtle groin swelling, persistent oozing around the sheath, loss of distal pulses, or otherwise unexplained hypotension.

When a femoral pseudoaneurysm develops after sheath removal, ultrasound confirmation is typically straightforward, and percutaneous ultrasound-guided thrombin injection has become a standard first-line therapy in many centers due to high technical success and rapid hemostasis [33]. Comparative evidence also supports thrombin injection over ultrasound-guided compression in terms of procedural efficacy and patient tolerance, making it the preferred minimally invasive option in most post-catheterization pseudoaneurysms when morphology is suitable and there is no infected field [34]. In the subset of patients with complex pseudoaneurysm anatomy, large necks, multiloculation, or failed thrombin injection, escalation to endovascular exclusion with stent-grafting or, less commonly, surgery may be required, but the decision is usually individualized based on bleeding risk, limb perfusion, and feasibility of maintaining arterial patency.

Retroperitoneal hemorrhage is a distinct and particularly dangerous access-site complication, classically related to high femoral puncture and anticoagulation. Because external compression is often ineffective, management hinges on early suspicion, aggressive resuscitation, and rapid localization of bleeding. If the patient does not stabilize or continues to require transfusion, an anatomic, catheter-based approach is often emphasized, including selective angiography to identify the bleeding source and endovascular measures to control it [35]. Large registries and contemporary analyses confirm that retroperitoneal bleeding, although uncommon, is associated with major morbidity and adverse outcomes after PCI, reinforcing the need for a low threshold to escalate from conservative measures to invasive control when instability persists [36].

For overt iliofemoral arterial injury—such as perforation or rupture during large-bore access or challenging sheath advancement—immediate endovascular temporization can be lifesaving. A commonly described strategy is rapid balloon tamponade across the injury to obtain immediate hemostatic control, followed by definitive therapy with covered stent implantation when anatomically appropriate [37]. This approach is also embedded in broader guidance documents on access management, which highlight prolonged balloon inflation, stent implantation (including covered stents), and surgery as the main options when percutaneous closure fails or when major vascular injury occurs [38]. The practical implication for cath lab readiness is that salvage requires not only technique, but also logistics: rapid availability of appropriately sized balloons, covered stents, contralateral or alternative access capability, and a clear escalation pathway involving vascular surgery and interventional radiology.

When Endovascular Rescue Fails

Despite significant advances in catheter-based rescue techniques, there remain situations in which endovascular management cannot fully resolve iatrogenic complications. In such cases, timely recognition of procedural failure and appropriate escalation are essential to prevent irreversible clinical deterioration.

Persistent hemodynamic instability despite successful technical correction is one of the clearest indicators that endovascular rescue may be insufficient. Ongoing hypotension, progressive pericardial effusion, or refractory ischemia may signal underlying structural disruption that cannot be stabilized with percutaneous tools alone [39]. Delayed escalation in these settings may worsen outcomes by prolonging myocardial or systemic hypoperfusion.

In cases of extensive vascular injury or uncontrolled bleeding, surgical conversion may become unavoidable. For example, large annular rupture, extensive aortic dissection, or failure to control perforation despite covered stent implantation often necessitates open repair. Observational data from transcatheter valve procedures indicate that although emergent surgical conversion is uncommon, it carries substantial risk and therefore requires early coordination with surgical teams when suspected [4].

Device-related complications may also mandate escalation when retrieval or repositioning fails. Entrapped or embolized components that cannot be safely accessed through percutaneous routes may pose ongoing risks of embolization, obstruction, or infection. In these circumstances, surgical removal may represent the most definitive solution [40].

Another critical consideration is the presence of progressive end-organ compromise. Persistent myocardial ischemia, limb-threatening ischemia from access-site injury, or ongoing tamponade despite drainage should prompt reassessment of the procedural strategy and early involvement of surgical support [41].

Ultimately, the transition from endovascular rescue to surgical intervention should not be viewed as a procedural failure but as a continuation of the rescue pathway. A structured approach that emphasizes early identification of unsuccessful percutaneous stabilization can reduce delays and improve survival in high-risk complications.

Prevention Strategies

While effective rescue techniques have significantly improved the management of iatrogenic complications, prevention remains the most reliable means of reducing procedural morbidity. A structured preventive approach begins before vascular access and continues throughout device selection and deployment.

Pre-procedural imaging plays a central role in risk stratification. Computed tomography, vascular ultrasound, and echocardiographic assessment provide valuable information regarding vessel caliber, calcification, tortuosity, and structural anatomy. Such imaging allows operators to anticipate mechanical challenges and tailor procedural strategy accordingly [42]. In structural interventions, annular sizing and evaluation of surrounding tissue integrity are particularly important for minimizing the risk of rupture or malposition.

Access planning is another critical component of complication prevention. The selection of an appropriate vascular entry site based on anatomical suitability can reduce the likelihood of bleeding, dissection, or closure failure. Real-time ultrasound guidance has been shown to improve puncture accuracy and reduce access-site complications by ensuring entry into the optimal arterial segment [13].

Device selection must also be individualized according to anatomical and procedural demands. Oversized balloons, excessively stiff guidewires, or inappropriate delivery systems may increase the risk of vascular trauma or structural disruption. Contemporary practice increasingly emphasizes matching device characteristics to lesion morphology and vessel compliance to minimize mechanical stress [43].

Procedural technique further influences complication risk. Controlled advancement of catheters and avoidance of excessive force during lesion crossing are essential to prevent dissection or perforation. Similarly, careful monitoring during balloon inflation and device deployment can reduce the likelihood of sudden structural injury [44].

Finally, operator awareness and preparedness remain fundamental. The presence of bailout equipment and predefined management strategies within the catheterization laboratory allows immediate response when unexpected resistance or anatomical limitations are encountered.

Proposed Management Algorithm

A structured approach to the management of iatrogenic complications during endovascular cardiac procedures can significantly improve procedural outcomes by enabling rapid decision-making under pressure. Rather than relying solely on operator experience or improvisation, the use of a stepwise response framework facilitates timely stabilization and targeted intervention.

The first step involves immediate detection. Recognition of abnormal angiographic findings, hemodynamic instability, or unexpected resistance during device manipulation should prompt procedural reassessment. Early identification allows intervention before complications evolve into irreversible clinical deterioration [2].

Following detection, stabilization becomes the priority. Initial measures may include balloon tamponade in cases of perforation, rapid volume resuscitation, pericardial drainage when tamponade is suspected, or initiation of mechanical support in the presence of circulatory collapse [45].

Once the patient is stabilized, classification of the complication is essential to guide management strategy. Distinguishing between access-related injury, coronary disruption, device-related failure, or structural damage helps determine whether retrieval, sealing, or flow restoration techniques are most appropriate [46].

The next phase involves targeted endovascular rescue. Depending on the nature of the complication, this may include snare retrieval, covered stent deployment, coil embolization, or repositioning of displaced devices. Prompt selection of the appropriate technique is critical to restoring procedural control and preventing escalation [6].

Finally, reassessment is required to determine whether stabilization has been achieved or whether escalation to surgical management is necessary. Persistent instability, uncontrolled bleeding, or unresolved structural injury should prompt early involvement of surgical teams rather than prolonged attempts at percutaneous correction [47]. The implementation of such an algorithm promotes consistency in response and reduces delays that may adversely affect patient outcomes.

Future Directions

As endovascular cardiac interventions continue to expand in complexity, the landscape of complication management is also evolving. Emerging technologies and procedural innovations are expected to reshape both prevention and rescue strategies in the coming years.

One important direction involves the development of dedicated retrieval and sealing devices specifically designed for intraprocedural complications. Current tools are largely adapted from peripheral or non-cardiac applications, and purpose-built systems may improve efficiency and safety in managing device embolization, perforation, or structural injury [48].

Advances in imaging integration are also likely to enhance procedural precision. The increasing use of fusion imaging, combining fluoroscopy with echocardiographic or computed tomography data, allows more accurate navigation within complex anatomy. This improved spatial awareness may reduce the risk of mechanical injury during device deployment and facilitate early detection of complications when they arise [49].

Artificial intelligence-assisted procedural planning represents another emerging field. Predictive modeling based on pre-procedural imaging and patient-specific anatomy may help identify high-risk scenarios before intervention. Such tools could assist in selecting optimal access routes, device sizes, and deployment strategies, thereby minimizing procedural stress on vulnerable structures [50].

Finally, simulation-based training is gaining importance as a method for preparing operators to manage rare but high-impact complications. Structured simulation environments allow rehearsal of bailout techniques in controlled settings, which may translate into faster and more coordinated responses in real-world procedures [51].

Conclusion

Iatrogenic complications remain an inherent risk of endovascular cardiac procedures despite ongoing technological and procedural advancements. As interventions become more complex and are increasingly performed in anatomically challenging or high-risk patients, the likelihood of encountering procedural complications persists. The contemporary management paradigm has shifted from reliance on emergent surgical bailout toward a structured, catheter-based response supported by advanced imaging, specialized devices, and mechanical circulatory support when necessary. Early recognition, rapid stabilization, and targeted endovascular intervention are the central determinants of successful outcomes.

Equally important is the recognition that effective management begins before the complication occurs. Careful pre-procedural planning, appropriate access selection, and device optimization significantly reduce procedural risk. When complications do arise, a systematic and prepared response allows many adverse events to be resolved without escalation to surgery.

Ultimately, improving outcomes in the setting of iatrogenic complications depends on a comprehensive strategy that integrates prevention, rapid diagnosis, and adaptable endovascular rescue techniques. As procedural complexity continues to evolve, maintaining readiness for these events will remain a fundamental component of modern endovascular cardiac practice.

Contributorship: All of the authors contributed planning, conduct, and reporting of the work. All authors had full access to all data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Funding: No financial funding was received for this study.

Competing Interests: All of the authors have no conflict of interest.

Artificial Intelligence Disclosure: The authors confirm that no artificial intelligence or AI-assisted tools were used for interpreting the referenced article or for generating scientific content. Limited assistance was obtained solely for language editing and grammatical refinement, without any involvement in data interpretation, analysis, or conceptual input.

References

1. Tavris, D. R., Gallauresi, B. A., Lin, B., Rich, S. E., Shaw, R. E., Weintraub, W. S., ... & Hewitt, K. (2004). Risk of local adverse events following cardiac catheterization by hemostasis device use and gender. The Journal of invasive cardiology, 16(9), 459-464.
2. Ellis, S. G., Ajluni, S., Arnold, A. Z., Popma, J. J., Bittl, J. A., Eigler, N. L., ... & Whitlow, P. L. (1994). Increased coronary perforation in the new device era. Incidence, classification, management, and outcome. Circulation, 90(6), 2725-2730.
3. Shimony, A., Joseph, L., Mottillo, S., & Eisenberg, M. J. (2011). Coronary artery perforation during percutaneous coronary intervention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Canadian Journal of Cardiology, 27(6), 843-850.
4. Eggebrecht, H., Mehta, R. H., Kahlert, P., Schymik, G., Lefèvre, T., Lange, R., ... & Thomas, M. (2014). Emergent cardiac surgery during transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI): insights from the Edwards SAPIEN Aortic Bioprosthesis European Outcome (SOURCE) registry. EuroIntervention, 10(8), 975-81.
5. Doyle, B. J., Rihal, C. S., Gastineau, D. A., & Holmes, D. R. (2009). Bleeding, blood transfusion, and increased mortality after percutaneous coronary intervention: implications for contemporary practice. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 53(22), 2019-2027.
6. Brilakis, E. S., Best, P. J., Elesber, A. A., Barsness, G. W., Lennon, R. J., Holmes Jr, D. R., ... & Garratt, K. N. (2005). Incidence, retrieval methods, and outcomes of stent loss during percutaneous coronary intervention: a large single-center experience. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 66(3), 333-340.
7. Javaid, A., Buch, A. N., Satler, L. F., Kent, K. M., Suddath, W. O., Lindsay Jr, J., ... & Waksman, R. (2006). Management and outcomes of coronary artery perforation during percutaneous coronary intervention. The American journal of cardiology, 98(7), 911-914.
8. Pasic, M., Unbehaun, A., Buz, S., Drews, T., & Hetzer, R. (2015). Annular rupture during transcatheter aortic valve replacement: classification, pathophysiology, diagnostics, treatment approaches, and prevention. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 8(1 Part A), 1-9.
9. Rao, S. V., Tremmel, J. A., Gilchrist, I. C., Shah, P. B., Gulati, R., Shroff, A. R., ... & Pancholy, S. B. (2014). Best practices for transradial angiography and intervention: a consensus statement from the society for cardiovascular angiography and intervention's transradial working group. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 83(2), 228-236.
10. Dunning, D. W., Kahn, J. K., Hawkins, E. T., & O'Neill, W. W. (2000). Iatrogenic coronary artery dissections extending

into and involving the aortic root. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 51(4), 387-393.
11. Fujino, A., Mintz, G. S., Matsumura, M., Lee, T., Kim, S. Y., Hoshino, M., ... & Maehara, A. (2018). A new optical coherence tomography-based calcium scoring system to predict stent underexpansion. EuroIntervention, 13(18), e2182-e2189.
12. Alkhouli, M., Sarraf, M., Zack, C. J., Holmes, D. R., & Rihal, C. S. (2016). Iatrogenic atrial septal defect following transseptal cardiac interventions. International journal of cardiology, 209, 142-148.
13. Seto, A. H., Abu-Fadel, M. S., Sparling, J. M., Zacharias, S. J., Daly, T. S., Harrison, A. T., ... & Kern, M. J. (2010). Real-time ultrasound guidance facilitates femoral arterial access and reduces vascular complications: FAUST (Femoral Arterial Access With Ultrasound Trial). JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 3(7), 751-758.
14. Barbanti, M., Yang, T. H., Rodès Cabau, J., Tamburino, C., Wood, D. A., Jilaihawi, H., ... & Leipsic, J. (2013). Anatomical and procedural features associated with aortic root rupture during balloon-expandable transcatheter aortic valve replacement. Circulation, 128(3), 244-253.
15. Waksman, R., & Pakala, R. (2009). Drug-eluting balloon: the comeback kid?. Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2(4), 352-358.
16. Hayashida, K., Lefèvre, T., Chevalier, B., Hovasse, T., Romano, M., Garot, P., ... & Morice, M. C. (2011). Transfemoral aortic valve implantation: new criteria to predict vascular complications. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 4(8), 851-858.
17. Alkhouli, M., Alqahtani, F., Alreshidan, M., & Cook, C. C. (2019). Incidence, predictors, and outcomes of early acute myocardial infarction following coronary artery bypass grafting. The American journal of cardiology, 124(7), 1027-1030.
18. Herzog, C. A., Asinger, R. W., Berger, A. K., Charytan, D. M., Díez, J., Hart, R. G., ... & Ritz, E. (2011). Cardiovascular disease in chronic kidney disease. A clinical update from Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO). Kidney international, 80(6), 572-586.
19. Storz, C., Geisler, T., Notohamiprodjo, M., Nikolaou, K., & Bamberg, F. (2016). Role of imaging in transcatheter aortic valve replacement. Current treatment options in cardiovascular medicine, 18(10), 59.
20. Généreux, P., Webb, J. G., Svensson, L. G., Kodali, S. K., Satler, L. F., Fearon, W. F., ... & PARTNER Trial Investigators. (2012). Vascular complications after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: insights from the PARTNER (Placement of AoRTic TraNscathetER Valve) trial. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 60(12), 1043-1052.
21. Prati, F., Romagnoli, E., Burzotta, F., Limbruno, U., Gatto, L., La Manna, A., ... & Mintz, G. S. (2015). Clinical impact of OCT findings during PCI: the CLI-OPCI II study. Cardiovascular Imaging, 8(11), 1297-1305.
22. Drew, B., Pelter, M. M., & Adams, M. G. (2002). Frequency, characteristics, and clinical significance of transient ST segment elevation in patients with acute coronary syndromes. European heart journal, 23(12), 941-947.
23. Schechter, M. A., O'Brien, P. J., & Cox, M. W. (2013). Retrieval of iatrogenic intravascular foreign bodies. Journal of vascular surgery, 57(1), 276-281.
24. Briguori, C., Nishida, T., Anzuini, A., Di Mario, C., Grube, E., & Colombo, A. (2000). Emergency polytetrafluoroethylene-covered stent implantation to treat coronary ruptures. Circulation, 102(25), 3028-3031.
25. Henriques, J. P. S., Zijlstra, F., Ottervanger, J. P., De Boer, M. J., Van'T Hof, A. W. J., Hoorntje, J. C. A., & Suryapranata, H. (2002). Incidence and clinical significance of distal embolization during primary angioplasty for acute myocardial infarction. European heart journal, 23(14), 1112-1117.
26. Al-Lamee, R., Ielasi, A., Latib, A., Godino, C., Ferraro, M., Mussardo, M., ... & Colombo, A. (2011). Incidence, predictors, management, immediate and long-term outcomes following grade III coronary perforation. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 4(1), 87-95.
27. Iturbe, J. M., Abdel-Karim, A. R. R., Papayannis, A., Mahmood, A., Rangan, B. V., Banerjee, S., & Brilakis, E. S. (2012). Frequency, treatment, and consequences of device loss and entrapment in contemporary percutaneous coronary interventions. The Journal of invasive cardiology, 24(5), 215-221.
28. Bolte, J., Neumann, U., Pfafferott, C., Vogt, A., Engel, H. J., Mehmel, H. C., & von Olshausen, K. E. (2001). Incidence, management, and outcome of stent loss during intracoronary stenting. American Journal of Cardiology, 88(5), 565-567.
29. Hayashida, K., Bouvier, E., Lefèvre, T., Hovasse, T., Morice, M. C., Chevalier, B., ... & Cormier, B. (2013). Potential mechanism of annulus rupture during transcatheter aortic valve implantation. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 82(5), E742-E746.
30. Thiele, H., Zeymer, U., Neumann, F. J., Ferenc, M., Olbrich, H. G., Hausleiter, J., ... & Werdan, K. (2012). Intraaortic balloon support for myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock. New England journal of medicine, 367(14), 1287-1296.
31. O'NEILL, W. W., Schreiber, T., Wohns, D. H., Rihal, C., Naidu, S. S., Civitello, A. B., ... & Ohman, E. M. (2014). The current use of Impella 2.5 in acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: results from the USpella Registry. Journal of interventional cardiology, 27(1), 1-11.
32. De Chambrun, M. P., Bréchot, N., Lebreton, G., Schmidt, M., Hekimian, G., Demondion, P., ... & Luyt, C. E. (2016). Venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory cardiogenic shock post-cardiac arrest. Intensive care medicine, 42(12), 1999-2007.
33. Wendy R, S., Spence M, T., Coffey, C. B., Viers, K. D., Langan III, E. M., Bruce A, S., & Timothy M, S. (2000). Ultrasound-guided thrombin injection of iatrogenic femoral pseudoaneurysms: a prospective analysis. The American Surgeon, 66(10), 937-942.
34. Kontopodis, N., Tsetis, D., Tavlas, E., Dedes, A., & Ioannou, C. V. (2016). Ultrasound guided compression versus

ultrasound guided thrombin injection for the treatment of post-catheterization femoral pseudoaneurysms: systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative studies. European Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, 51(6), 815-823.

35. Sajnani, N., & Bogart, D. B. (2013). Retroperitoneal hemorrhage as a complication of percutaneous intervention: report of 2 cases and review of the literature. The Open Cardiovascular Medicine Journal, 7, 16.
36. Kwok, C. S., Kontopantelis, E., Kinnaird, T., Potts, J., Rashid, M., Shoaib, A., ... & Mamas, M. A. (2018). Retroperitoneal hemorrhage after percutaneous coronary intervention: incidence, determinants, and outcomes as recorded by the British Cardiovascular Intervention Society. Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions, 11(2), e005866.
37. Marimuthu, V., Rao, S. K. S., Jadhav, S., Nayak, M. H., & Alur, N. (2022). Management of Iatrogenic External Iliac Artery Perforation With a Self-Made Covered Stent. Cureus, 14(8).
38. Toggweiler, S., et al. (2013). Management of vascular access in transcatheter aortic valve replacement: part 2: Vascular complications. JACC. Cardiovascular interventions, 6(8), 767–776.
39. Smith, C. R., Leon, M. B., Mack, M. J., Miller, D. C., Moses, J. W., Svensson, L. G., ... & Pocock, S. J. (2011). Transcatheter versus surgical aortic-valve replacement in high-risk patients. New England Journal of Medicine, 364(23), 2187-2198.
40. Hartzler, G. O., Rutherford, B. D., & McConahay, D. R. (1987). Retained percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty equipment components and their management. The American journal of cardiology, 60(16), 1260-1264.
41. Patel, V. G., Brayton, K. M., Tamayo, A., Mogabgab, O., Michael, T. T., Lo, N., ... & Brilakis, E. S. (2013). Angiographic success and procedural complications in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary chronic total occlusion interventions: a weighted meta-analysis of 18,061 patients from 65 studies. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 6(2), 128-136.
42. Achenbach, S., Delgado, V., Hausleiter, J., Schoenhagen, P., Min, J. K., & Leipsic, J. A. (2012). SCCT expert consensus document on computed tomography imaging before transcatheter aortic valve implantation (TAVI)/transcatheter aortic valve replacement (TAVR). Journal of cardiovascular computed tomography, 6(6), 366-380.
43. Mintz, G. S. (2020). Back to the future: Intravascular imaging to assess and guide CTO PCI procedures. Cardiovascular Interventions, 13(12), 1458-1459.
44. Moussa, I. D., Klein, L. W., Shah, B., Mehran, R., Mack, M. J., Brilakis, E. S., ... & Stone, G. W. (2013). Consideration of a new definition of clinically relevant myocardial infarction after coronary revascularization: an expert consensus document from the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (SCAI). Journal of the American college of cardiology, 62(17), 1563-1570.
45. Rihal, C. S., Naidu, S. S., Givertz, M. M., Szeto, W. Y., Burke, J. A., Kapur, N. K., ... & American Heart Association (AHA), and American College of Cardiology (ACC). (2015). 2015 SCAI/ACC/HFSA/STS clinical expert consensus statement on the use of percutaneous mechanical circulatory support devices in cardiovascular care: endorsed by the American Heart Assocation, the Cardiological Society of India, and Sociedad Latino Americana de Cardiologia Intervencion; Affirmation of Value by the Canadian Association of Interventional Cardiology-Association Canadienne de Cardiologie d'intervention. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 65(19), e7-e26.
46. Dangas, G. D., Tijssen, J. G., Wöhrle, J., Søndergaard, L., Gilard, M., Möllmann, H., ... & Windecker, S. (2020). A controlled trial of rivaroxaban after transcatheter aortic-valve replacement. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(2), 120-129.
47. Généreux, P., Head, S. J., Hahn, R., Daneault, B., Kodali, S., Williams, M. R., ... & Leon, M. B. (2013). Paravalvular leak after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: the new Achilles' heel? A comprehensive review of the literature. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 61(11), 1125-1136.
48. Pradegan, N., Lena, T., Tessari, C., Gallo, M., Tarzia, V., Guariento, A., ... & Gerosa, G. (2024). Current understanding and future directions of transcatheter devices to assist failing Fontan. Journal of the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography & Interventions, 3(4), 101334.
49. Lang, R. M., et al. (2012). EAE/ASE recommendations for image acquisition and display using three-dimensional echocardiography. Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography: official publication of the American Society of Echocardiography, 25(1), 3–46.
50. Dey, D., Slomka, P. J., Leeson, P., Comaniciu, D., Shrestha, S., Sengupta, P. P., & Marwick, T. H. (2019). Artificial intelligence in cardiovascular imaging: JACC state-of-the-art review. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 73(11), 1317-1335.
51. Fann, J. I., Caffarelli, A. D., Georgette, G., Howard, S. K., Gaba, D. M., Youngblood, P., ... & Burdon, T. A. (2008). Improvement in coronary anastomosis with cardiac surgery simulation. The Journal of thoracic and cardiovascular surgery, 136(6), 1486-1491.