Iraqi National Journal of Nursing Specialties, Vol. 31 (2), 2018

Functional Performance For Patients Post Heart's Valves Replacement at Cardiac Surgery Centers in Baghdad City

الأداء الوظيفي للمرضى بعد استبدال صمامات القلب في مر اكزجر احة القلب في مدينة بغداد

Jabbar J. Atiea, MSN* Halima Y. Kadhum, PhD**

*Academic nurse specialist ,Ibn Albetar Specialized Center for Cardiac Surgery,Ministry of Health , jjabbar20@yahoo.com

** Assistant Professor, Adults Nursing Department, College of Nursing, University of Baghdad, HalimaYosf. @yahoo.com.

الخلاصه:

ا**لهدف :** أجريت الدراسه لتقيم ألاداء الوظيفي للمرضى بعد تبديل الصمامات القلبيه ولأيجاد العلاقه بين ألاداء الوظيفي والمعلومات الديمو غرافيه والمعلومات الطبية.

المنهجية: اجريت دراسه وصفيه في مراكز جراحة القلب في مدينة بغداد (مركز ابن البيطار التخصصي لجراحه القلب ومركز العراق التخصصي لأمراض القلب)وللمدة من ٢٨ كانون الاول ٢٠١٣ لغاية ١ ايلول ٢٠١٤حيث اختيرت عينه غير احتماليه (غرضيه) من ٥٠ مريض بالغ يراجعون مراكز جراحة القلب في مدينة بغداد تم تبديل الصمام القلبي لهم،جمعت البيانات من خلال استبانه مكونه من ثلاثة اجزاء (بيانات ديمو غرافيه ،وبيانات طبيه ،مقياس الاداء الوظيفي)بعد ثبوتها ،حيث حددت المصداقيه من خلال ٥٠ خبير والثبوتيه من خلال دراسه مصغرة حيث حللت البيانات احصائيا وصفيا من خلال تطبيق الأجراءات الوصفيه والأستنتاجيه.

النتائج : اظهرت نتائج الدراسه بأن مستوى ألأداء الوظيفي للمرضى (٨٠%)متوسط و (٢٠%) منخفض وان معظم عينة الدراسه (٩٢%)هم منتظمون في تناول علاج مانع التخثر ومعظم العينه(٩٢%) تم تبديل لهم صمام ميكانيكي وأظهرت الدراسة علاقه معنوية بين ألاداء الوظيفي للمرضى وبين العمر *0.042هو مستوى التعليم **0.08هو الحالة الاقتصاديه* *0.004موقوة ضخ القلب *0.044مواللتزام بلمتابعه للمريض*0. =واللتزام بأخذ العلاج بصورة منتظمه *0.004موالصمام الميكانيكي وأطمد بعد العمليه* 91.044م

التوصيات الوصت الدراسه باستخدام لصمام النسيجي بدلاً من الميكانيكي لمرضى كبار السن لتقليل المضاعفات الناتجة من اسنخدام ادويه مانعة التخثروتحسين المعيشة بعد العملية،ستشاريه نفسيه تساعد المرضى على التغلب على المشاكل النفسية والاجتماعية الناتجة من العملية،تصميم برنامج تثقيفي للمرضى لغرض زيادةعناية لمريض لنفسة وزيادة القناعة بالعناية العلاجية ،استخدام برامج تثقيفية وتدريبية للملاكات التمريضية لتحسين الخبرة والمعرفةلديهم للعب دور اكبرفي الخدمة العلاجيه المقدمة للمريض ومنع اصابة لصمام بلعدوى الانتقالية الكلمات المفتاحية : الاداء الوظيفى ، صمامات القلب، المرضى

Abstract

Objectives: The study is carried out to assess functional performance for heart's valve replacement patients and find out relationship with sociodemographic data and clinical data

Methodology: Descriptive design is carried out at cardiac surgery centers in Baghdad ; Ibn -Al Betar Specialized for cardiac surgery center and Al-Iraqi center for cardiac disease. its initiation from December^{28the} 2013 to September ^{1st} 2014, A non- probability (purposive) sample of 50 adults patients are attended cardiac surgery centers at Baghdad city and who have heart valves replacement. The data collection through development of questionnaire which is composed from three parts(socio demographic data, clinical information, functional performance) after validity and reliability , validity has been determined through (15) experts and reliability has been determined through pilot study, The data are descriptive statistical and analysis through application of descriptive and inferential statistical methods.

Results: The result of the study has revealed that level of Functional Performance for the patients post heart's valve replacement were $(\%^{\Lambda})$ moderate and $(\%^{\Upsilon})$ low majority of the study samples $(\%^{\Upsilon})$ have regular up take of the anticoagulation drugs and majority of the samples $(\%^{\Upsilon})$ have mechanical valve implementation, The results of the study represent a significant statistical correlation between the level of Functional Performance for patients post heart's valve replacement group and the age $p=0.042^*$, level education $p=0.008^*$, socio economic status $p=0.004^*$, ejection fraction $p=0.044^*$, follow up of the patients $p=0.042^*$, regular up take of the anticoagulation drugs $p=0.004^*$, mechanical valve used $p=0.05^*$, duration post operation $p=0.044^*$

Recommendations : The study recommended to using biologic valve (tissue valve) for elderly patient instead mechanical valve when valve replacement to reduce complication anticoagulation drugs and enhance survival post operation, establishing Psychological consultation to copy the patients with emotional and social impact which results from the operation, an education program should be designed to increase patients education about self-care and increase satisfaction with care ,use education and training programs (regular lectures for nursing staff) to improving the expertise and knowledge of nurses to play an essential role in fostering patients care and prevent valve infection.

Key Word:- Functional Performance, Heart's valve Replacement, Patients

Introduction:

is Valve replacement the surgical intervention for patient with sever valvular heart disease to replace indicator valve with prosthesis valve (mechanical or biological) or with homografts valve. This an operation that is performed when valvuloplasty is not appropriate (e.g. .when the valve is regurgitation is a condition when valves do not close completely and blood flows backward through the valve or Stenosis is a pathological narrowing square area of valve less than normal area due to leaflets thickening or fibrotic change in the valve that make it don't open completely result impede of blood flow from through chambers the heart^{(1),}The valve replacement or repair surgery remain the treatment of choice for valve disease⁽²⁾.</sup>

The following factors have been increased risk of surgery: older age, associated co gender, morbidities. female emergency left-ventricular dysfunction, operation, pulmonary hypertension, coexisting coronary ⁽³⁾, Many disease, and redo-intervention complications Postoperative of valve replacement that threatens a life and low functional performance and survived of patient such as Complications The Valve Post Replacement it which consist of Four categories of type that are Thrombosis, Prosthetic Valve Infective Endocarditis, Structural Valve Dysfunction and ^{4),}Cardiac Dysfunction.(Nonstructural which complication including early complication (Cardiac rhythm disturbances, Bleeding, Neurologic complications, Impaired cardiac output, Wound infection, Pulmonary Complications, Gastrointestinal Complications, Postoperative Cardiac Tamponade) complication and late (Endocarditis, Sternal problems, Peripheral nerve injuries, Left ventricular failure, Right failure tricuspid ventricular and regurgitation) and at last Complications -Bypass⁽¹¹⁾ Cardiopulmonary .Functional performance is a person's ability to perform a and daily activity ,the nurse function observes the patient performing specific activities and notes the degree of independence; the time taken; the patient's

mobility. The nurse also carefully assesses cardiovascular reserve, and joint motion, neurologic function, because functional ability depends on these factors as well. Observations are recorded on a functional assessment tool. These tools provide a way to standardize assessment parameters and include a scale or score against which improvements may be measured.⁽⁵⁾

Methodology:

Descriptive study is perform at surgical &medical consultancy and cardiac ward pre operative at following cardiac surgery center in Baghdad (Ibn -Al Betar Specialized for cardiac surgery center and Al-Iraqi center for cardiac disease). This study was initiated from December^{28the} 2013 to September^{1st} 2014, a non- probability (purposive) sample of 50 adult patients who have heart valve replacement only without another operation within valve replacement a have been were attending cardiac surgery centers at Baghdad city. The data collection through development of questionnaire which is composed from three parts(socio demographic data, clinical information, functional performance), validity has been determined through (15) experts and reliability has been determined through pilot study which carried out on twenty patients (10 patients with hearts valve replacement according to the same criteria, they were attending to Ibn -Albetar specialized Cardiac surgery centers.

Reliability of the questionnaire:

The reliability of the questionnaire is done throughout the used test –retest method patient response which was R=0.851

Table	1:	It	presents	The	Reliability	Of
The Q	ues	stio	nnaire			

Sour ce	Mea n	SD	R.C
Test	1.08	10.7	0.851
	5	1	*
Retes	1.06	11.9	
t	7	2	

* correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Method of Data Collection:

Data collection period was taken from April ^{25th} to July ^{6th} 2014 The data collected by using two methods which include:-

1-Answer the questionnaire chart by the patient himself which is concerned with demographic data and functional performance scale.

2-Report by myself and structured interview technique used for patient cannot read and write and took some of the data from of chart patient in the cardiac centers such as ejection fraction the heart , operation time(cross clamp time),specific diagnosis of valve problem and degree of impairment .

Rating and scoring:

The score system is applied through giving (1) for the never, (2) for sometimes and (3) for the always answers for each of the domains. Then the score marks are **Results:**

categorized into three level low ,moderate ,high

rating scale was format according lukerd scale as the following¹²

$$= \frac{\text{cut of point}}{\text{no.of scale}} \times 100$$
$$= \frac{2}{2} \times 100 = 66.6$$

So interval had ranged between (66.6-100) that represented the rate of functional performance effects:

$$=\frac{100-66.6}{2}=16.7$$

66.6+16.7=83.3

(66.6-83.3) is moderate functional

(84-100) is high functional performance In addition less than 66.6 is low functional performance .The data are descriptive statistical and analysis through application of descriptive and inferential statistical methods.

1-Sociodemographic data		patients post heart's valve replacement		
		F	%	
1. Age (years)	<40	11	22.0	
	4049	18	36.0	
	5059	10	20.0	
	6069	9	18.0	
	=>70years	2	4.0	
	Mean±SD (Range)	48.7±10.8 (29-70)		
2. Sex	Male	23	46.0	
	Female	27	54.0	
	Total	50	100%	
3. Marital status	Single	6	12.0	
	Married	34	68.0	
	Widowed	7	14.0	
	Divorce	3	6.0	
4. Level of education	Illiterate	9	18.0	
	Read & Write	8	16.0	
	Primary graduate	10	20.0	
	Intermediate graduate	7	14.0	
	Secondary graduate	7	14.0	
	Diploma	4	8.0	
	University	4	8.0	
	Higher education	1	2.0	

Continue.....

Table (2) to be continued

		F	%
5. Employment	Employed	15	30.0
	Business man	7	14.0
	Retired	8	16.0
	Housewife	16	32.0
	Not working	4	8.0
6. Residency	Urban	37	74.0
	Rural	13	26.0
7. Socio-economic status	Low	18	36.0
	Moderate	20	40.0
	High	12	24.0

F: frequency %: percentage

Table(2) Presents the demographic characteristics of (50) patients post heart's valve replacement indicated that the highest percentage of the patients post heart's valve replacement group were female (54.0%) most of them (**36.0**) were (40-49) years old and (68%) married, house wife, the higher percentage of the sample were (**20.0%**) were primary graduate ,(74%) were addressed in the Urban ,In represent to the Socio-economic status the highest percentage of the patients were moderate

2. Clinical information	Patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement		
		F	%
1. Smoking	Yes	3	6.0
	No	37	74.0
	Leave smoking	10	20.0
2. Duration of smoking	<10	4	30.8
	1019	4	30.8
	=>20years	5	38.5
	Mean±SD(Range)	16.8±9.	0(4-33)
3. Alcohol	Yes	-	-
	No	46	92.0
	Leave alcohol	4	8.0
4. Duration of alcohol	<10	3	75.0
	1019	1	25.0
	=>20years	-	-
	Mean±SD (Range)	9.8± (6-	
5. Types of the valve disease (depending on echocardiography)	Aortic	21	42.0
	Mitral	19	38.0
	Aortic & Mitral	2	4.0
	Aortic & Tricuspid	5	10.0
	Mitral & Tricuspid	3	6.0

Continues.....

Table (3)To be continued

		F	%
6. Degree of impairment valve	Mild	-	-
(depending on echocardiography)	Moderate	3	6.0
	Severe	40	80.0
	Sever & Mild	7	14.0
7. Regular uptake	Yes	46	92.0
of anticoagulant agents	No	4	8.0
8.EF%	<40	8	16.0
	4049	12	24.0
	5059	20	40.0
	6069	5	10.0
	=>70	5	10.0
	Mean±SD(Range)	59.2	2±12.7(30-77)
9. Chronic diseases	Hypertension	10	20.0
	Diabetes	4	8.0
	Renal failure	-	-
	HT+DM	6	12.0
	No	30	60.0
10. BMI	Underweight	4	8.0
	Normal	17	34.0
	Overweight	17	34.0
	Obesity I	11	22.0
	Obesity II	1	2.0
11. Follow up	Yes	44	88.0
	No	6	12.0
12. Valve replacement	Mechanical	46	92.0
	Tissue	4	8.0
13. Operation time	(55-63)	4	8.0
	(64-72)	11	22.0
	(73-81)	17	34.0
	(82-90)	6	12.0
	(91-99)	4	8.0
	(100-108)	3	6.0
	(109-117)	5	
	Mean±SD(Range)	79.9	9±17(55-117)
14. Post-operative time	(3-8)	٧	14.0
_	(9-14)	7	14.0
	(15-20)	20	40.0
	(21-26)	10	20.0
	(27-32)	5	10.0
	=>36	1	2.0

Frequency , %: Percentage , BMI: Body Mass Index , EF: Ejection Fraction

F:

Iraqi National Journal of Nursing Specialties, Vol. 31 (2), 2018

The results of table (3) indicate that the highest percentages (74%) of the sample are no smoking , the majority (92.0%) of sample are didn't drink alcohol ,the highest percentage of (42.0%) were aortic valve and (38.0%) were mitral valve, the high percentage of degree of impairment valve (80.0%) were the sever degree , majority of sample regular uptake of anticoagulant agents were (92.0%), Ejection Fraction (EF%) the highest percentage (40.0%) heart ejection(50–59%).

Conferring the casualty to chronic disease the highest percentage (60.0 %) didn't have chronic disease ,In respect of body mass index the results show that the highest percentage (88.0%) were regular follow up ,the majority (92.0 %) of sample used mechanical valve .In touching the operation time (cross clamp time) the highest percentage (34.0 %) of sample was need period from (73-81)min ,with average of operation time 79.9min to complete valve replaced and the post operation time the highest percentage (40.0%) of sample was (15-20) month

Table (4): Mean Of Score, Standard Deviation For And Patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement Group

Functional Performance For Patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement	M.S	S.D	Ass
1. Physical well-being (Q=7)	14.3	±2.9	Μ
2. Family and social well-being (Q=5)	11.0	±2.3	L
3. Emotional well-being (Q=6)	13.3	±2.2	Μ
4. Functional well-being (Q=7)	14.3	±3.0	Μ
TotalFunctionPerformanceAssessment (Q=25)	52.8	±4.1	Μ
Low	No.	%	
	10	20.0	_
Moderate	40	80.0	
High	-	-	

M.S. Mean of Scores, S.D: Standard deviation, Ass: Assessment, M: Moderate, L: Low.

Table (4) deals with assessment Functional Performance main domains towards patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement according to cutoff points that show the total functional performance post hearts valve replacement were moderate.

Table (5)	: Association Of Total Functional Performance Assessment	Among Patients Post Heart's Valve
	Replacement Group Related To Socio- Demographic Character	eristics

Socio- Dem		patients post heart's valve replacement Total Functional Performance				DF	P value	
	То							
			Assessm			_		
		Low		Moder		_		
		F	%	F	%		-	
1. Age	<40	1	10.0	10	25.0	- 5.870	1	0.042*
(years)	4049	2	20.0	16	40.0	_		S
	5059	2	20.0	8	20.0	_		
	6069	3	30.0	6	15.0	_		
	=>70years	2	20.0	-				
2. Sex	Male	6	60.0	17	42.5	3.023	3	0.321
	Female	4	40.0	23	57.5			NS
3.Marital	Single	-	-	6	15.0	- 0.803	1	0.524
status	Married	8	80.0	26	65.0	- 0.005		NS
	Widowed	1	10.0	6	15.0			
	divorce	1	10.0	2	5.0	-		
4.Level of	Illiterate	6	60.0	3	7.5	0.276	1	0.008**
Education	Read & Write	1	10.0	7	17.5	-		HS
	Primary	3	30.0	7	17.5	-		
	graduate							
	Intermediate graduate	-	-	7	17.5	-		
	Secondary graduate	-	-	7	17.5	-		
	Diploma	-	-	4	10.0	_		
	University&	_	_	5	12.5	-		
	Higher education			C	1210			
5.	Employed	4	40.0	11	27.5	3.43	1	0.077
Employme	Business man	1	10.0	6	15.0	-		NS
nt	Retired	1	10.0	7	17.5	-		
	Housewife	3	30.0	13	32.5	-		
	Not working	1	10.0	3	7.5	-		
6. Resident	Urban	7	70.0	30	75.0	2.19	2	0.747
	Rural	3	30.0	10	25.0	-		NS
7. Socio-	Low	8	80.0	10	25.0	0.12	2	0.004
economic	Middle	2	20.0	18	45.0	-		**
status level	High	-		12	30.0	-		HS

F: frequency , %: percentage , **: significant at p value ≤ 0.05 , DF : Degree of freedom, HS: High significant , NS :Non significant

The Table (5) shows that there is no statistically significant different association between Total Functional Performance among patients post heart's valve replacement group and Socio-Demographic Characteristics. at p value ≤ 0.05 except age, Level of education, Socio-economic status level there was statistically significant difference p-value was p ≤ 0.05 .

 Table (6)
 : Association Of Total Functional Performance Assessment Among Patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement Group Related To Clinical Information

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline $\mathbf{keystement}$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{rotal Functional Performance} \\ $\mathbf{Assessment}(Q=25)$ \\ \hline \mathbf{F} & $\mathbf{\%}$ & \mathbf{F} & $\mathbf{\%}$ \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 7 & 7.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{Lave smoking}$ & 3 & 0.0 & 7 & 1.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{Lave smoking}$ & 3 & 0.0 & 7 & 1.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{Lave smoking}$ & 3 & 0.0 & 7 & 1.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{Lave smoking}$ & 3 & 0.0 & 7 & 92.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $\mathbf{leave alcohol}$ & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{lotic} & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Mitral} & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Mitral} & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Mitral} & 2 & 20.0 & 5 & 12.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Mitral} & 2 & 20.0 & 5 & 12.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Mitral} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 5 & 12.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Mild} & 2 & 20.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{No} & 6 & 60.0 & $-$ $-$ \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 5 & 70.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{Nis} & \mathbf{Svevc} \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 6 & 60.0 & $-$ $-$ \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 5 & 70.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{Svevc} & \mathbf{No} & 6 & 60.0 & $-$ $-$ \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 5 & 70.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline \mathbf{No} & 5 & 70.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline $$	Clinical	Pat	ients Post	Heart's	Valve	Chi- square	DF	P value	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline Assessment (Q=25) & Assessmen$							_		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Low & Moderate \\ \hline F & \% & F & \% \\ \hline P & \% & F & \% \\ \hline R & 7 & 70.0 & 30 & 75.0 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave smoking & 3 & 30.0 & 7 & 17.5 \\ \hline Lave salcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Lave alcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Lave alcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Lave alcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Lave alcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Lave alcohol & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Aortic & 4 & 40.0 & 17 & 42.5 \\ \hline Aortic & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Aortic & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Aortic & - & - & - & - \\ \hline Mitral & 2 & 20.0 & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & Mild & 2 & 20.0 & 5 & 12.5 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 80.0 \\ \hline Sever & Mild & 2 & 20.0 & 5 & 12.5 \\ \hline Sever & 8 & 80.0 & 32 & 7.5 \\ \hline Gelee & 1 & 10.0 & 100 & 0.927 & 1 & 0.044^* \\ \ uptake & of No & 4 & 40.0 & - & - \\ \hline Rationgula & Ves & 6 & 60.0 & 40 & 100 \\ \hline uptake & 0 & No & 6 & 60.0 & - & - \\ \hline Sever & No & 6 & 60.0 & - & - \\ \hline Sever & No & 6 & 60.0 & - & - \\ \hline Tollow up & Yes & 4 & 40.0 & 40 & 100. \\ \hline Babetes & 3 & 10.0 & 2 & 7.5 \\ \hline Renal failure & - & - & - & - \\ \hline H^+ DM & - & - & - & - \\ \hline H^+ DM & - & - & - & - \\ \hline No & 5 & 70.0 & 35 & 52.5 \\ \hline 9.BMI & Underweight & 1 & 10.0 & 3 & 7.5 \\ \hline Doesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & 1 & 10.0 & 10 & 25.0 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & 1 & 10.0 & 10 & 25.0 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & 1 & 10.0 & 10 & 25.0 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I & - & - & 1 & 2.5 \\ \hline Obesity I$			Tota						
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			x				_		
I. Smoking Yes - - 3 7.5 4.870 2 0.496 NS 2. Alcohol Yes - - - - - - NS 2. Alcohol Yes - - - - - - NS 3.Valve Aortic 4 40.0 17 42.5 - - - - NS NS 3.Valve Mitral 2 20.0 17 42.5 - 0.803 1 0.141 NS Mitral 2 20.0 3 7.5 - - - 0.803 1 0.141 NS Mitral 2 20.0 3 7.5 - NS NS - - - 0.237 2 0.723 NS impairment Moderate - - - 3 7.5 S NS - S - S - NS - S - S - S - S -		-					-		
$ \frac{N_0}{Leave smoking} \frac{7}{3} \frac{70.0}{30.0} \frac{30}{75.0} \frac{75.0}{17.5} \frac{4.870}{17.5} NS $ $ \frac{Vcs}{Vcs} \frac{-}{-} -$	1 6	Var						2	0.406
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	I. Smoking						4.870	2	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							-		115
$ \frac{No}{ eave a coho } = \frac{9}{90.0} \frac{37}{37} \frac{92.5}{92.5} \\ \frac{No}{ eave a coho } = \frac{1}{10.0} \frac{37}{3} \frac{92.5}{7.5} \\ \frac{No}{ eave a coho } = \frac{1}{10.0} \frac{37}{7.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{Mitral} \frac{4}{2} \frac{40.0}{17} \frac{17}{42.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{Aortic} \frac{4}{2} \frac{40.0}{17} \frac{17}{42.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{Mitral} \frac{2}{2} \frac{20.0}{17} \frac{17}{42.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{Mitral} \frac{2}{2} \frac{20.0}{17} \frac{3}{7.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{KTricuspid} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{2.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{KTricuspid} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{2.5} \\ \frac{Notic}{KTricuspid} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{2.5} \\ \frac{No}{Severe} \frac{8}{8} \frac{80.0}{32} \frac{32}{80.0} \\ \frac{Severe}{No} \frac{4}{40.0} \frac{40.0}{40} \frac{100}{5} \frac{0.237}{12.5} \\ \frac{1}{5} \frac{C}{Sever} \frac{4}{Nild} \frac{2}{2} \frac{20.0}{5} \frac{3}{12.5} \\ \frac{1}{5} \frac{C}{Sever} \frac{4}{Nild} \frac{1}{2} \frac{20.0}{20.0} \frac{3}{5} \frac{7.5}{12.5} \\ \frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{No} \frac{4049}{3} \frac{3}{30.0} \frac{9}{9} \frac{22.5}{12.5} \\ \frac{1}{6069} \frac{1}{10.0} \frac{1}{4} \frac{10.0}{100} \\ \frac{1}{=>70} - \frac{5}{5} \frac{12.5}{12.5} \\ \frac{1}{7.60low up} \frac{1}{Yes} \frac{4}{40.0} \frac{40.0}{100} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1.13}{2} \frac{0.044^*}{8} \\ \frac{No}{6} \frac{6}{60.0} - \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{No}{5} \frac{1}{10.0} \frac{1}{10.0} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{10.0} \\ \frac{1}{=>70} - \frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{10.5} \\ \frac{NS}{NS} \\ \frac{NS}{N$	2 Alcohol	*						3	0 79/
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	2 . Alconor						3.023	5	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							_		112
Mitral 2 20.0 17 42.5 0.005 NS Aortic & - - 2 5.0	2							1	0.1.41
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							- 0.803	1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	replacement		2	20.0			-		113
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			-	-	Z	3.0			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			2	20.0	3	75	-		
Mitral &Tricuspid 2 20.0 1 2.5 4. Degree of impairment Mild - - - - - - - - - 0.237 2 0.723 NS Severe 8 80.0 32 80.0 32 80.0 32 80.0 Severe 8 80.0 32 80.0 32 80.0 0.927 1 0.044* uptake of anticoagula nt Yes 6 60.0 40 100 0.927 1 0.044* fraction (EF%) 5 50.0 3 7.5. 2.43 1 0.004 fraction (EF%) Yes 4 40.0 40.0 10.0 1.13 2 0.042* 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 No 5 70.0 35 37.5 9.82 1 0.362 No<			2	20.0	5	1.5			
			2	20.0	1	2.5	-		
4. Degree of impairment Mild - - - - 0.237 2 0.723 NS Severe 8 80.0 32 80.0 32 80.0 0.927 1 0.044* sever & Mild 2 20.0 5 12.5 0.723 NS 5. Regular yes 6 60.0 40 100 0.927 1 0.044* uptake of anticoagula nt No 4 40.0 - - S S 6. Ejection (EF%) $\frac{<40}{5059}$ 1 10.0 19 47.5 ${6069}$ 1 10.0 4 10.0 $=>70$ - - 5 12.5 ${8}$ HS ${8}$ NS 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ ${8}$ $$			-		-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4. Degree of	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-	-	-	0.237	2	0.723
		Moderate	-	-	3	7.5	-		NS
5. Regular uptake of anticoagula nt Yes 6 60.0 40 100 0.927 1 0.044* 8. Effection (EF%) <40 5 50.0 3 7.5. 2.43 1 0.004 8. Chronic diseases 9.8 MI Yes 4 40.0 - - 2.43 1 0.004 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - 5 1.13 2 0.042* 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 4 10.0 1 27.5 0.82 2 0.362 10.0 2.0.0 3 - 0.82 2 0.042* 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - 0.82 2 0.362 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 No 5 70.0 35 72.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 10 25.0 5.870 <th< td=""><td></td><td>Severe</td><td>8</td><td>80.0</td><td>32</td><td>80.0</td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td></th<>		Severe	8	80.0	32	80.0	-		
uptake of anticoagula nt No 4 40.0 - - S 6. Ejection Fraction (EF%) <40 5 50.0 3 $7.5.$ 2.43 1 0.004 Fraction (EF%) 4049 3 30.0 9 22.5 2.43 1 0.004 5059 1 10.0 19 47.5 2.43 1 0.004 5069 1 10.0 4 10.0 22.5 2.43 1 0.004 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 13.2 0.042^* 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 1.13 2 0.042^* 7.6 Hypertension 2 20.0 3 $ 0.82$ 2 0.362 No 5 70.0 35 $^{2}.5$ 9.82 1 0.362 NS $Pointal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 9.BMI Underweight $		Sever & Mild	2	20.0	5	12.5	-		
anticoagula nt -40 5 50.0 3 7.5. 2.43 1 0.004 Fraction (EF%) 4049 3 30.0 9 22.5 2.43 1 0.004 5059 1 10.0 19 47.5 45 HS HS 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 - - HS 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 - - HS 7.5 7.6 7.5 </td <td>5. Regular</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>6</td> <td>60.0</td> <td>40</td> <td>100</td> <td>0.927</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.044*</td>	5. Regular	Yes	6	60.0	40	100	0.927	1	0.044*
6. Ejection Fraction (EF%) <40 5 50.0 3 $7.5.$ 2.43 24.3 1 $0.004*** (EF%) \frac{4049}{5059} 1 10.0 19 47.56069$ 22.5 24.3 1 $0.004*** 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 4 10.0 4 10.0 =>70 5 12.5 11.3 2 0.042* No 6 60.0 0.82 2 0.362 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 0.82 2 0.362 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 \epsilon \cdot 100.0 5.870 3 $		No	4	40.0	-	-	-		S
Fraction (EF%) 4049 3 30.0 9 22.5 *** HS 6069 1 10.0 19 47.5 HS HS 6069 1 10.0 4 10.0 11.3 2 0.042^* 7.60 $ 5$ 12.5 1.13 2 0.042^* No 6 60.0 $ 8.5$ 8.6 1.13 2 0.042^* No 6 60.0 $ 0.82$ 2 0.362 $Renal failure$ $ -$									
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							2.43	1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							-		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	(EF%)						_		HS
7.follow up No Yes 4 40.0 40. 100. 1.13 2 0.042* S 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - 0.82 2 0.362 Benal failure - - - - - - NS Renal failure - - - - - - NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 Nommal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS Obesity I 1 10.0 10 25.0 9.82 1 0.362 NS Io. valve replacement Mechanical 7 60.0 £+ 100.0 5.870 3 0.05* Io. value (55-63) - - </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10.0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>				10.0			_		
No 6 60.0 - - S 8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - 0.82 2 0.362 Diabetes 3 10.0 2 7.5 NS NS Renal failure - - - - - NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 0.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 0.82 1 0.362 Overweight 2 20.0 15 37.5 0.82 1 0.362 Io.valve Mechanical 1 10.0 10 25.0 0.05* S 11. (55-63) - - 4 10.0									
8. Chronic diseases Hypertension 2 20.0 3 - 0.82 2 0.362 NS Being failure - - - - - - - NS NS Renal failure - - - - - - - - NS No 5 70.0 35 92.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS Overweight 2 20.0 15 37.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS 10. valve Mechanical 7 60.0 $\epsilon \cdot$ 100.0 5.870 3 0.05* S 11. (55-63) - - 4 10.0 0.803 2 0.222 S 12 (64-72) Y Y0.0 9 22.5 S <	7.follow up					100.	1.13	2	
diseases Diabetes 3 10.0 2 7.5 NS Renal failure - 0.362 NS NS </td <td>0 (1)</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>2</td> <td></td>	0 (1)		-			-	0.02	2	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							0.82	2	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	uiseases						-		CN1
No 5 70.0 35 $^{4}2.5$ 9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 Overweight 2 20.0 15 37.5 9.82 1 0.362 Obesity I 1 10.0 10 25.0 0 10 25.0 Obesity II - - 1 2.5 100.0 5.870 3 0.05* S 11. (55-63) - - 4 10.0 0.803 2 0.222 S 11. (64-72) Y Y0.0 9 22.5 S S					-	-	-		
9. BMI Underweight 1 10.0 3 7.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS Normal 6 60.0 11 27.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS Overweight 2 20.0 15 37.5 9.82 1 0.362 NS Obesity I 1 10.0 10 25.0 9.82 1 0.362 NS Io. valve replacement Mechanical 7 60.0 $\varepsilon \cdot$ 100.0 5.870 3 0.05* S 11. (55-63) - - 4 10.0 9 22.5 0.803 2 0.222 S 11. (64-72) Y Y0.0 9 22.5 0.803 2 0.222 S	•				-	925	-		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0 BMI						0.82	1	0 362
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	7. DIVII						9.02	1	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							-		110
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							-		
10. valve replacementMechanical 7 60.0 ϵ 100.0 ϵ 5.870 3 0.05^* S11. Operation time $(55-63)$ $ 4$ 10.0 ϵ 0.803 2 0.222 S17. $(64-72)$ 7 70.0 9 22.5 0.803 2 0.222 S							-		
replacement Tissue 4 40.0 - - 5.870 S 11. (55-63) - - 4 10.0 0.803 2 0.222 Operation time (64-72) Y Y0.0 9 22.5 0.803 S S	10. valve						- 0-0	3	0.05*
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						-	- 5.870	5	
Operation time (35-63) (0.803) (0.803) S 17 42.5 17 42.5 17	=					10.0	0.000	2	
17 42.5	Operation						0.803	-	
	ume	(73-81)	-	_	17	42.5	-		

Continue

Table(6) To be continue

		F	%	F	%	Chi	DF	Р
						square		value
-	(82-90)	-	-	6	15.0			
	(91-99)	2	20.0	2	5.0			
	(100-108)	1	10.0	2	5.0			
	(109-117)	0	٥.,.	-	-			
12. Post- operative – time	(3-8)	٦	۰ _. ٦٠	1	2.50	5.333	1	0.04* S
	(9-14)	٣	30.0	4	10.0			3
	(15-20)	-	-	20	50.0			
	(21-26)	-	-	10	۲0,.			
	(27-32)	-	-	5	12.5			
	=>36	١	۱۰,۰	-	-			

F: frequency , %: percentage , **: significant at p value ≤ 0.05 , **DF** : Degree of freedom ,**HS**: High significant , **NS** :Non significant **BMI**: Body Mass Index , **EF**: Ejection Fraction .

Table (6) shows that there is no statistically significant different association between total functional performance among patients post heart's valve replacement group and clinical information. at p value ≤ 0.05 except regular uptake of anticoagulant agents, ejection fraction, operation time, follow up mechanical valve and post operation time.

Discussion:

1. Discussion Distribution of the patients post heart's valve replacement by Socio- Demographic Characteristics:

Throughout the course of data analysis table number (2) indicates that the highest percentage of the patients post heart's valve replacement group were female (54%) most of them(36.0) were (40-49)years old and(68%) married, house wife, the higher percentage of the sample were (20%) were primary graduate .(74%)were addressed in the Urban ,In relative to the Socioeconomic status the highest percentage of the patients were middle. This finding agrees with the literature, the Socio-Demographic of a total of 414 patients underwent surgery for AVR alone or in combination with mitral valve replacement a women as a group had a greater mean age (69.9 \pm 7.8 years) than men $(64.5 \pm 11.1 \text{ years})$ (p <0.001) and a higher frequency of isolated aortic stenosis were 86.6%) female than men $(73.1\%)^{(6)}$

2. Distribution of the patients post heart's valve replacement by clinical information. The results of table (3) reveal highest percentages (74%) of the sample are no smoking, the majority (92.0%) of sample are didn't drink alcohol ,the highest percentage of (42.0%) were a ortic valve and (38.0%) were mitral valve, This finding agrees with the literature for 389 patients with artificial valve replacement that highest percentage with aortic valve disease at (61.0%) and (35,7%)were mitral valve disease and the remaining is mixed valve¹⁴. the high percentage degree of impairment valve of (80.0%)were the sever degree majority of sample regular uptake of anticoagulant agents were (92.0%), Ejection Fraction (EF%) the highest percentage (40.0 %) heart ejection(50-59%), This finding agrees with the literature, in which mean of left ventricular ejection fraction were

(55) with rang (45-64) and highest percentage with chronic disease with hypertension (76%) and diabetic (26%)for 389 patients with artificial valve replacement.⁽¹³⁾

Touching the casualty to chronic disease the highest percentage (60.0 %) didn't have chronic disease , This finding is consistent with the literature that (35%) a ortic valve stenosis patients were smoking and have history of hypertension $(20\%)^{(7)}$

In respect of body mass index the that the highest results show percentage (34.0 %) were overweight .Anent to the follow up that indicated highest percentage (88.0%) were regular follow up ,the majority (92.0 %) of sample used mechanical valve .In touching the operation time (cross clamp time)the the highest percentage (34.0 %) of sample was need period from (73-81)min ,with average of operation time 79.9min to complete valve replaced and the post operation time the highest percentage (40.0%) of sample was (15-20) month ,This finding disagree with the literature about determine late outcome result patients post aortic valve for replacement in elderly patient he finding the majority used to replaced valve was biological valve at (92.0%) and remain were mechanical valve (8.0%) for 2890 patients >70 years of (mean. 78±5 years) who age underwent AVR.(8)

Relationship between of 3. Total Functional Performance for Patients Post Heart's Valve Replacement with Their Socio-Demographic: table (5)show there is no statistically significant difference association between total functional performance among patients with heart's valve replacement group and Socio-Demographic characteristics. at р value ≤ 0.05 except age, Level of education, Socio-economic status level there was statistically significant

difference p-value was $p \le 0.05$, the result for age agree with literature but disagree with gender, the significant relationship between post operative quality of life { age (p = 0.029) and female gender (p = 0.002) for 1675 patients who perform cardiac surgery⁽¹⁶⁾. that factors such as education patient play important factor identify the role of anticoagulation drug, side effects, interaction with the digested food, and simultaneous use of other drugs and also lifestyle influenced⁽¹⁷⁾

4.Discussion Association of Total Functional Performance Assessment among patients post heart's valve replacement group related to clinical information.

Table (6) reveals that no statistically significant different association between total functional performance among patients post heart's valve replacement group and clinical information. at p value≤ 0.05 except regular uptake of anticoagulant agents, ejection Fraction, operation time, follow up mechanical valve and post operation time. This finding agrees with the literature about long-term survival of patients undergoing mitral valve replacement for 10 years post operative he find the longterm survival post operation is lowers with long period post operative ,he find the in first period the high level at 82.6% and second period were moderate at 64.7%, but third period were low at 37.2%.⁽⁹⁾, This finding agrees with the literature for patient post aortic valve replacement had a better survival and less mortality with a mechanical valve(79%,) than a bioprosthetic valve(66%) with (p = 0.02) and he found that no statistical significant different about appearance of complication between two type but found Primary valve failure occurred mainly in patients <65 years of age (bioprosthesis vs. mechanical, 26% vs. 0%, (p < 0.001) for AVR and 44% vs. 4%, p = 0.0001 for MVR), and in patients \geq 65 years after AVR, primary valve failure in bioprosthesis versus mechanical valve was 9 ± 6% versus 0%, p = 0.16^{.(10)}, This finding agrees with the literature for 2890 patients \geq 70 years of age who underwent aortic valve replacement from ,the survival rate were lower gradually ,the first period were 68%, moderate 34%, and third 8%.⁽⁸⁾, The functional status after the aortic valve replacement and follow-up was significantly improved for the total group of surviving patients at (78.9%)at 360-days^{(15).}

Recommendations:

According to the results of the study the researcher, recommends the following:-

1.Recomendating that to replace valve disease with biologic valve (tissue

References:

1.Basavthappa B.: Medical Surgical Nursing Second Edition 2009 jaypee Brother Medical Publishers ,Pp 653.

2. Sibilitz K, Berg S, Hansen T, Risom S, Rasmussen T, Hassager C, Kober L, Steinbrchel D, Gluud C, Winkel, P, Hansen J, Schmid J, Conraads V, Brocki B and Zwisler F,: Effect of Comprehensive Cardiac Rehabilitation After Heart Valve Surgery (Open Heart): Study Protocol For A Randomised Clinical Trial, 2013, Vol 14: Pp104.

3. Carrel T, Englberger L and Stalder M .;Recent Developments for Surgical Aortic Valve Replacement: The Suture Valve Concept of less Technology ,open Journal Of Cardiology,2013 Vol 1pp 1-21

W 4. Little А And Merrill .;Complications In Cardiothoracic Surgery: Avoidance and Treatment Second Edition:2010 Blackwell Publishing. Chapter 18 Pp375,387

5. Smeltzer S, Bare B, Hinkle J, Cheever K.:Brunner & Suddarth's valve) for elderly patient to reduce complication anticoagulation drugs and enhance survival post operation.

2.Establishing Psychological consultation to copy the patients with emotional and social impact which results from the operation.

3.An education program should be designed to increase patient's education about self-care and, increase satisfaction with care

4. Using education and training programs (regular lectures for nursing staff) to improving the expertise and knowledge of nurses to play an essential role in fostering patients care and prevent valve infection.

5. Further study that can assess nurse's knowledge about how to deals with functional performance patients

Textbook Of Medical-Surgical Nursing Twelve Edition 2010 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Health Philadelphia ,Pp170: 804.

6. Henning T, Baberg L, Dirlich M, Laczkovics A, Grewel P.; Bojara W, Zeeuw J, Torsten T, Kugler J, Mugge A.;Determinants of Health-Related Quality of Life After Aortic Valve Replacement In Six-Month Survivors of Intervention ICR Publishers, Journal Heart Valve Disease 2004 Vol. 13. No. 6 Pp 914-920.

7. Stewart B, Siscovic K, Lind B, Gardin J, Gottdiener J, Smith V, Kitzman D, Catherine .: Clinical Factors Associated with calcific Aortic Valve Disease , J Am Coll Cardiol. 1997;Vol(3)Pp 630-634

8. Lampropulos J, Bikdeli B, Gupta A, Mody P, Kulkarni V, Chen R, Darmarajan K. ; Most Important outcomes research Papers on Valvular Heart Disease, 2012e circulation american heart association pp 95-103 9. Christina M, Vassileva M, Mishkel G, McNeely C, Hazelrigg S, Boley T, Markwell S, Scaife S, Long-Term Survival of Patients undergoing Mitral Valve Repair and Replacement, Circulation American Heart Association,2013, pp 127:1841-1842.

10. Sethi G , Hammermeister K, Henderson W, Grover F, Oprian C, Rahimtoola M.; Outcomes 15 Years After Valve Replacement with a mechanical versus a bioprosthetic valve: Final Report of The Veterans Affairs Randomized Trial , J Am Coll Cardiol. 2000vol36(4)Pp1152-1158

11. Giovanni B, Pedrazzini D. Francesco F, Vassalli F, Demertzis S, Moccetti Mitral Valve T.: Regurgitation, SWISS Medical Journal WKLY 2 010 ;No 14 0 Vol 4 Pp38 S. 12. Hussein Assessment of psychosocial outcome for patients undergoing cardiac surgery at Baghdad city ,2007,Nursing theory ,chap 3,pp53

13. Berg S, Zwisler A, Pedersen B, Haase K, Sibilitz K ;. Patient experiences of recovery after heart valve replacement: suffering weakness, struggling to resume normality;. BMC Nursing 2013,PP 2.8

14. Koertke H, Minami K, Bairaktaris A, Wagner O, and Koerfer R, INR Self-Management Following Mechanical Heart ValveReplacement, Journal of Thrombosis and Thrombolysis 2006, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in The Netherlands, Pp 9,41±45.

15. Kalaa P, Tretinab M, Poloczeka M, Ondrasekb J, Malikb P, Pokornyb P, Parenicaa J, Spinara J, Jarkovskyc J, Littnerovac S, Nemecb P.:Quality of Life After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation and Surgical replacement in high-risk Elderly Patients biomed Pap Med Fac univ Palacky olomouc Czech Repub. 2013 Mar; Vol 157 Issue 1Pp75–80

16. Normand S.: Missing Data and Convenient Assumptions. Circ

Cardiovasc qual outcomes 2010, Pp 3:2–3.

17. Taghadosi M, Memarianr F, Ahmadi F.: Experiences of Warfarin Use Among Cardiac Valve-Replaced Patients In Iran: A Qualitive Study .Iran J Critcal Care Nurs. 2013,Vol 4 Pp213– 222