ORIGINAL INVESTIGATIONS

Ischemic Brain Lesions After Carotid Artery Stenting Increase Future Cerebrovascular Risk





Henrik Gensicke, MD,* H. Bart van der Worp, PhD,† Paul J. Nederkoorn, PhD,‡ Sumaira Macdonald, PhD,§ Peter A. Gaines, MBChB,|| Aad van der Lugt, MD,¶ Willem P.Th.M. Mali, MD,# Philippe A. Lyrer, MD,* Nils Peters, MD,* Roland L. Featherstone, PhD,** Gert J. de Borst, MD,†† Stefan T. Engelter, MD,* Martin M. Brown, MD,** Leo H. Bonati, MD,* ** on behalf of the ICSS-MRI Substudy Investigators

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND Brain lesions on diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) are frequently found after carotid artery stenting (CAS), but their clinical relevance remains unclear.

OBJECTIVES This study sought to investigate whether periprocedural ischemic DWI lesions after CAS or carotid endarterectomy (CEA) are associated with an increased risk of recurrent cerebrovascular events.

METHODS In the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) substudy of ICSS (International Carotid Stenting Study), 231 patients with symptomatic carotid stenosis were randomized to undergo CAS (n = 124) or CEA (n = 107). MRIs were performed 1 to 7 days before and 1 to 3 days after treatment. The primary outcome event was stroke or transient ischemic attack in any territory occurring between the post-treatment MRI and the end of follow-up. Time to occurrence of the primary outcome event was compared between patients with (DWI+) and without (DWI-) new DWI lesions on the post-treatment scan in the CAS and CEA groups separately.

RESULTS Median time of follow-up was 4.1 years (interquartile range: 3.0 to 5.2). In the CAS group, recurrent stroke or transient ischemic attack occurred more often among DWI+ patients (12 of 62) than among DWI- patients (6 of 62), with a cumulative 5-year incidence of 22.8% (standard error [SE]: 7.1%) and 8.8% (SE: 3.8%), respectively (unadjusted hazard ratio: 2.85; 95% confidence interval: 1.05 to 7.72; p=0.04). In DWI+ and DWI- patients, 8 and 2 events, respectively, occurred within 6 months after treatment. In the CEA group, there was no difference in recurrent cerebrovascular events between DWI+ and DWI- patients.

CONCLUSIONS Ischemic brain lesions discovered on DWI after CAS seem to be a marker of increased risk for recurrent cerebrovascular events. Patients with periprocedural DWI lesions might benefit from more aggressive and prolonged antiplatelet therapy after CAS. (A Randomised Comparison of the Risks, Benefits and Cost Effectiveness of Primary Carotid Stenting With Carotid Endarterectomy: International Carotid Stenting Study; ISRCTN25337470) (J Am Coll Cardiol 2015;65:521-9) © 2015 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation. Open access under CC BY license.



ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ARWMC = age-related white matter changes

CAS = carotid artery stenting

CEA = carotid endarterectomy

DWI = diffusion-weighted imaging

FLAIR = fluid-attenuated inversion recovery

MRI = magnetic resonance imaging

TIA = transient ischemic attack

he occurrence of periprocedural ischemic brain lesions on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) after revascularization of atherosclerotic stenosis of the internal carotid artery, either with stenting (CAS) or endarterectomy (CEA), has been commonly described (1). The randomized ICSS (International Carotid Stenting Study) compared CAS with CEA in patients with symptomatic carotid stenosis (2). In the MRI substudy of ICSS (ICSS-MRI), 50% of patients treated with CAS and 17% of those undergoing CEA had periprocedural ischemic brain lesions on diffusion-weighted imaging

(DWI) on MRI scans obtained a median of 1 day after treatment (adjusted odds ratio 5.21; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 2.78 to 9.79; p < 0.0001) (3). However, the clinical significance of these lesions remains unclear. Previous research focused mainly on the persistence of lesions on follow-up imaging (4-7) and their effects on neuropsychological function (8-10).

SEE PAGE 530

The goal of the present analysis of the ICSS-MRI substudy was to investigate whether the occurrence of periprocedural DWI lesions altered the risk of future cerebrovascular events during long-term follow-up.

METHODS

The prospective multicenter ICSS-MRI substudy included 124 patients randomly assigned to CAS and 107 patients randomly assigned to CEA in ICSS. The study design and the main short- and long-term results of ICSS and the ICSS-MRI substudy have been reported

previously (2,3,11). Briefly, ICSS patients with recently symptomatic moderate or severe carotid stenosis (defined by a luminal narrowing of ≥50% according to the measurement of degree of stenosis used in the North American Symptomatic Carotid Endarterectomy Trial [12]) were randomized in a 1:1 ratio to receive CAS or CEA. Baseline imaging of the target artery was specified to require consistent findings on at least 2 noninvasive imaging modalities, including computed tomography angiography, magnetic resonance angiography, and duplex ultrasound; or intra-arterial digital subtraction angiography. Eight patients in the CAS group and 7 patients in the CEA group underwent digital subtraction angiography before the randomly allocated procedure, and the remainder received noninvasive imaging. The protocol recommended the use of a cerebral protection device during CAS whenever such a device could be safely deployed, but this action was not mandatory. The combination of aspirin and clopidogrel was recommended to cover the period of stenting and to be continued for a minimum of 4 weeks after the procedure.

If no contraindications to MRI were present, all patients included at 7 ICSS centers had the option of participating in the ICSS-MRI substudy (Figure 1). MRI scans at field strengths of 1.5- or 3-T (including DWI and fluid-attenuated inversion recovery [FLAIR] sequences) were specified to be conducted 1 to 7 days before treatment (pre-treatment MRI) and 1 to 3 days after treatment (post-treatment MRI). Assessment of MRI scans was performed through consensus reading by a neurologist (L.H.B.) and a neuroradiologist (L.M.J.) who were blinded to treatment allocation and clinical outcome. In cases of disagreement between

Center Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands. ICSS (International Carotid Stenting Study) was funded by grants from the Medical Research Council (MRC), the Stroke Association, Sanofi-Synthelabo, and the European Commission. The funding from the MRC was managed by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) on behalf of the MRC-NIHR partnership. Funding for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans performed as part of the ICSS-MRI substudy was provided by grants from the Mach-Gaensslen Foundation, the Netherlands Heart Foundation, and the Stroke Association. Dr. Gensicke's work for this research was supported by the Stroke-(Hirnschlag)-Fund/Basel; and by grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation (33CM30-124119) and the University of Basel. Dr. van der Worp was supported by a grant from the Dutch Heart Foundation (2010T075); has received speaker fees from Servier, GlaxoSmithKline, and Sanofi; and has served as a consultant to Bristol-Myers Squibb. Dr. Brown's Chair in Stroke Medicine is supported by The Reta Lila Weston Trust for Medical Research. Dr. Bonati was supported by grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation (PBBSB-116873 and 33CM30-124119) and the University of Basel; and has served on scientific advisory boards for Bayer. Mr. Gaines holds a research grant from Gore Medical; and has a consultant and proctorship agreement with Boston Scientific, Dr. Macdonald holds consultancy agreements with C.R. Bard and W.L. Gore. Dr. van der Lugt has received speaker fees from GE Healthcare. Dr. Lyrer has served as an advisor to Bayer AG, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Pfizer AG; and has received remuneration for acting on advisory boards concerning novel oral anticoagulants. Dr. Engelter has received funding for travel or speaker honoraria from Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Pfizer Inc., Sanofi, and Shire plc.; and has served on scientific advisory boards for Bayer and $Boehringer Ingelheim and on the editorial board of {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported that they have no {\it Stroke.} \ All other have reported the {\it Stroke.} \ All other have repo$ the contents of this paper to disclose. This work was partly conducted at University College London Hospital and University College London, who received a proportion of funding from the Department of Health's NIHR Biomedical Research Centres funding scheme. Listen to this manuscript's audio summary by JACC Editor-in-Chief Dr. Valentin Fuster.

You can also listen to this issue's audio summary by JACC Editor-in-Chief Dr. Valentin Fuster.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5982409

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5982409

Daneshyari.com