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Background

• Stroke is the third leading cause of death in US
• Carotid disease causes 12-20% of strokes
• Stroke risk in carotid artery stenosis
  – Degree of stenosis
  – History of neurological symptom

• Carotid endarterectomy (CEA) has been shown to decrease the long term risk of stroke in extracranial carotid artery stenosis compared with medical therapy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Population Studied</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Stroke Rate BMT</th>
<th>Stroke Rate BMT + CEA</th>
<th>Study Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASCET</td>
<td>Symptomatic patients with carotid stenosis ≥70%</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>26% (2 yr)</td>
<td>9% (2 yr)</td>
<td>CEA is beneficial for symptomatic patients with ≥70% carotid stenosis ($P &lt; .001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASCET</td>
<td>Symptomatic patients with carotid stenosis ≥50%-69%</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>15% (2 yr)</td>
<td>9% (2 yr)</td>
<td>CEA is beneficial for symptomatic patients with ≥50% carotid stenosis ($P = .045$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECST</td>
<td>Symptomatic patients with carotid stenosis 80%-99% ECST (60%-99% by NASCET)</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>20.6% (3 yr)</td>
<td>6.8% (3 yr)</td>
<td>CEA is beneficial for symptomatic patients with 60% carotid stenosis (NASCET) ($P &lt; .0001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAS</td>
<td>Asymptomatic patients with carotid stenosis ≥60%</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>11% (5 yr)</td>
<td>5.1% (5 yr)</td>
<td>CEA is beneficial for asymptomatic patients with ≥60% carotid stenosis ($P = .004$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACST</td>
<td>Asymptomatic patients with carotid stenosis ≥60%</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>11.8% (5 yr)</td>
<td>6.4% (5 yr)</td>
<td>CEA is beneficial for asymptomatic patients with ≥60% carotid stenosis ($P ≥ .0001$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

- Carotid artery angioplasty with stenting (CAS)
  - Less invasive and a viable option for treatment of carotid artery stenosis
  - Transfemoral approach
  - Distal embolic protection (filter, flow reversal)
  - Periprocedural antiplatelet therapy
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The increased of CAS has been questioned, mainly by surgical community.

No consensus on whether there is equipoise between both treatment approaches despite multiple randomized trials and registries.
Background

Fig 2. Regional variation in utilization of carotid artery stenting (CAS). Variation reflects the proportion of all carotid revascularization procedures that are CAS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Symptomatic</th>
<th>Asymptomatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>- CEA for 50%-99% stenosis</td>
<td>- CEA for 60%-99%,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CAS as an alternative in patients at low risk of CAS associated complications or when CEA is high</td>
<td>- CAS in selected patients, but its effectiveness is not well established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>risk if complication rates are 4%-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVS</td>
<td>- CEA preferred in patients 50%-99%</td>
<td>- CEA in good risk patients with 60%-99% stenosis and 3-5 yr life expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CAS in hostile neck and severe uncorrectable cardiac conditions</td>
<td>with complication rates &gt;3%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Insufficient data to support CAS outside trials, may be used by selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interventionalists with established complication rates &lt;3%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High risk patients should have BMT alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>CEA for 70%-99% Stenosis</td>
<td>- CEA for 60%-99% stenosis with complications &lt;3% and 5-year survival,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAS for high surgical risk</td>
<td>- CAS as an alternative in high volume centers with complications &lt;3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasian</td>
<td>- CEA for 50%-99%</td>
<td>- CEA for 60%-99%, no evidence to support CAS, consider BMT as primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CAS for patients at high surgical risk</td>
<td>treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAS versus CEA

- Randomized control trials in US and Europe
- SAPPHIRE
- EVA-3S, SPACE trial and ICSS trial
- The CREST study
- Meta-analysis
SAPPHIRE Study

- Stenting and angioplasty with protection for patients at **high risk** for CEA (SAPPHIRE)

- >50% symptomatic patients
- >80% asymptomatic patients
- 334 patients enrolled: CEA (n=167), CAS (n=167)

- Clinically significant heart disease, severe pulmonary disease, contralateral carotid occlusion, contralateral laryngeal nerve palsy, previous neck surgery or radiation, recurrent stenosis after CEA
- Age >80 years
SAPPHIRE Study

- cumulative death/MI/Stroke lower in CAS
  - 30 days: CAS 9.8% vs CEA 4.4%
  - 1 year: CAS 12.2 vs CEA 20.1%, p=.004)

- Differences more evidence in asymptomatic patients (9.9 vs 21.5% in CEA)

- Poor outcome in CEA was mainly cardiac morbidity

- At three years (2008): primary end point plus death or ipsilateral stroke no difference in long-term outcome
- CAS (24.6%) versus CEA (26.9%)
**EVA-3S, SPACE, ICSS**

- Conducted in France, Germany and Great Britain
- Published between 2006 to 2010
- Included patients with symptomatic carotid artery stenosis and average surgical risk

- Technical inexperience of most interventionists
EVA-3S

- **Endarterectomy Versus Angioplasty in patients with Symptomatic Severe Carotid Stenosis**

- 527 patients symptomatic patients >60% stenosis
- Trial ended prematurely due to high risk of stroke and death in CAS
- Cumulative probability of procedural stroke or death, and non procedural stroke was higher in CAS (11.1 vs. 6.2%, p=.03)
- Stroke derived mainly from periprocedural complication rate.
• 1196 patients with symptomatic carotid artery stenosis (>70% stenosis)

• At 2 years follow up

• No significant different in the incidence of the composite endpoint stroke/death (9.5% vs 8.8%, \(p=.31\))

• Recurrent stenosis (>70% stenosis) was significantly higher in CAS (10.7% vs 4.6%, \(p=.0007\))
SPACE

- Trial stopped due to futility and cost
- Conclusion: failed to prove non-inferiority of CAS with CEA for higher periprocedural complication rate
ICSS Trial

• **International Carotid Stenting Study**

• 1713 symptomatic patients (>50% stenosis)
• Higher incidence of combined stroke, death and MI at 4 months in the CAS group (8.5% vs 5.2%, p=.006)
• No different in MI and cardiac death in two treatment groups.

• Conclusion: CEA should remain treatment of choice
CREST Study

- **Carotid Revascularization Endarterectomy vs Stent Trial (CREST)**

- Randomized trial to compare efficiency of CAS in patients with average risk
- Strict accreditation phase to eliminate the learning curve

- 2502 patients with carotid artery stenosis
  - Trial concluded in 2008
  - 53% symptomatic patients
  - Median follow up of 2.5 years
CREST Study

- Composite end point of death/MI/Stroke was no different between CAS and CEA (7.2% vs 6.8%, HR 1.11, p=.51)
- Higher MI in CEA (1.1% vs 2.3%, p=.03)
- Higher 30-days stroke in CAS (4.1% vs 2.3%, p=.01)
- No different in incidence of major stroke (0.9% in CAS and 0.7% in CEA)
CREST Study

• At 1-year: impact quality of life was greater reduced in patients with major or minor stroke but not those in MI

• Age appeared to influence treatment outcomes
  – Age >70 years better with CEA
  Age <70 years better with CAS

• CREST II study
Meta-analysis

- EVA-3S, SPACE, ICSS trials
- Early results (120 days from inclusion)
- Total of 3433 patients
- Incidence of any stroke or death in CAS was significantly higher than CEA (8.9% vs 5.8%, \( p=.0006 \))
  - Twofold higher rate of complications for CAS in patients >70 years (12% vs 6%, \( p=.053 \))
  - No difference in risk of stroke or death in patients younger than 70 years
## Meta Analyses

### CEA vs. CAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>No. of Trials</th>
<th>No. of Patients</th>
<th>Stroke OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Death OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>MI OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>S/D OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonati et al[119]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7572</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.81 (1.40-2.34)</td>
<td>No difference 1.59 (0.94-2.70)</td>
<td>Favors CAS 0.44 (0.28-0.87)</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.75 (1.29-1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu et al[117]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7501</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.87 (1.40-2.40)</td>
<td>No difference 1.43 (0.85-2.40)</td>
<td>Favors CAS 0.43 (0.26-0.71)</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.59 (1.30-1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economopoulos et al[118]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7477</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.23 (1.23-1.91)</td>
<td>No difference 1.49 (0.93-2.37)</td>
<td>Favors CAS 0.49</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.54 (1.25-1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavin et al[120]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6973</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.72 (1.20-2.47)</td>
<td>No difference 1.11 (0.56-2.18)</td>
<td>Favors CAS OR 0.47 (0.29-0.78)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangalore et al[91]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7477</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.31 (1.08-1.59)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Favors CAS OR 0.45 (0.28-0.71)</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.65 (1.34-2.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guay[118]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6950</td>
<td>Favors CEA 0.50 (0.38-0.67)</td>
<td>No difference 0.72 (0.42-1.24)</td>
<td>Favors CAS 2.16 (1.32-3.54)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad et al[97]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Favors CEA 1.45 (1.06-1.99)</td>
<td>No difference 1.40 (0.85-2.33)</td>
<td>Favors CAS 0.43 (0.26-0.71)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CEA vs CAS

- SAPPHIRE: equivalent in high risk patients
- Average risk patients in symptomatic patients
- EVA-3S: stopped due to poor CAS outcomes
- SPACE: failed to showed non-inferiority of CAS with CEA
- ICSS: CEA should be choice of treatment
- CREST: outcomes equivalent, CEA had more MI, CAS more stroke
Symptomatic Carotid Artery Stenosis

- Risk of death or stroke for CAS is higher than CEA, especially in patients >70 years
- CAS is acceptable in symptomatic patients with high surgical risk
- Major anatomical risk for CEA
- Most symptomatic carotid artery stenosis is better treated with CEA
Asymptomatic Carotid Artery Stenosis

- Medical therapy
- Asymptomatic patients younger than 70 years can be treated equally with CEA or CAS
- CAS should be avoided in elderly patient
- Higher surgical risk with severe degree of stenosis
- CAS and CABG/heart surgery
- ? Contralateral carotid occlusion
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