COULD STAGED CAROTID STENTING WITH CABG BE NON-INFERIOR TO COMBINED CAROTID ENDARTERECTOMY AND CABG FOR CAROTID AND CORONARY REVASCULARIZATION? A META-ANALYSIS

DANIEL GARCIA, MD





Daniel Garcia, MD¹ Mohammad M Ansari, MD¹ Josef L Toussaint, MD¹ Rhanderson N Cardoso, MD¹ Alan Schob, MD² Carlos E Alfonso, MD¹

1. University Of Miami, Miller School of Medicine/ Jackson Memorial Hospital , Miami, FL, USA

2. The Miami VA Hospital, Miami, FL, USA

Disclosures

* None of the authors have a conflict of interest in relation to this presentation





Background

Carotid stenting (CAS) is considered to be noninferior to carotid endarterectomy (CEA) for treatment of symptomatic carotid disease

Short-term:

- CAS might be associated with more strokes and less MI
- No difference in disabling stroke or death

Long term:

• CAS is associated with higher stroke and death only in elderly population (>68 years)

Ann Vasc Surg 2012;26:576–90 Stroke 2011;42:687–92





Background

Staged CAS followed by CABG

Short-term:

- Stroke: 1 2 %
- All-cause Death: 3 6%
- MI: 3 6 %

Am J Cardiol 2005;96:519–523 European Journal of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (2014) 1–6





Hypothesis/Plan

• We aimed to evaluate the noninferiority of staged CAS compared to combined CEA and CABG

• Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of clinical studies





• PubMed, Scopus and Cochrane Central Register of clinical studies

- 1990 to September 2014
- "Carotid" OR " Stenting" OR "CEA" AND CABG





Inclusion criteria:

1. Cohort studies and randomized clinical studies directly comparing combined CEA and CABG with staged CAS and CABG

2. Primary and secondary outcomes reported





- **Exclusion criteria:**
- **1.** Studies that used only one approach
- 2. Did not specify the used approach
- **3.** Did not report a comparison among approach used
- 4. Did not report the outcomes of interest
- Potential patient overlapping data: the study with the greater number of patients were included





Primary Outcome: 30 day TIA/stroke

2. Secondary Outcome:- 30 day all-cause death





 Pooled treatment effects - odds ratio (OR) -Mantel–Haenszel method

 Heterogeneity: Cochrane Q tests and I² statistic

 Fixed effect analysis when I2 was less than 25% or p value < 0.10





Results







Author	Stenosis Evaluation	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria	CEA + CABG	CAS + CABG
Abassi 2007	- Carotid Doppler - MRA	 - CS > 70% with or without symptoms - ACS requiring CABG 	 Previous major CVA Significant bilateral CS Intracranial lesions 	 Procedures were done at the same time ASA and heparin use 	 CABG done 1 to 2 months after stenting ASA, heparin and Clopidogrel Wall or Precise Stent Filter Protection Device
Micovic 2014	- Carotid Doppler - Multidector row CT (MDCT)	-Asymptomatic CS >80% -Symptomatic CS > 50% - Triple vessel or left main disease	 Urgent carotid/coronary treatment Severe HF with LVEF ≤20 % or NYHA class IV Ischemic CVA 6 months prior 	 Procedures were done at the same time No anti-platelet regimen used 	 CABG done 3 hours after stenting ASA, heparin and clopidogrel XACT stent Angioguard RX distal filter protection
Shishehbor 2013	- Carotid Doppler	 Severe CS with or without symptoms CAD presenting with ACS requiring CABG 	NA	- Procedures were done at the same time - ASA use only	 CABG done 3-4 weeks after stenting ASA, Clopidogrel use Filter Protection Device
Ziada 2005	NA	 Asymptomatic CS >80% Symptomatic CS > 70% No description of CAD presentation 	NA	- Procedures were done at the same time	 CABG done within 3 months of stenting ASA, Clopidogrel use Filter protection was infrequently used

Baseline characteristics

	Abass	Micovic et al. 2012			Shishehbor. 2013			Ziada et al. 2005				
	CEA + CABG	CAS + CABG	р	CEA + CABG	CAS + CABG	р	CEA + CABG	CAS + CABG	р	CEA + CABG	CAS + CABG	р
Age, median ±SD	67 ± 7.09	65 ± 8.13	0.43	70 ± 7	65 ±7	0.19	70 ± 8	71 ± 9	0.11	69 ± 9	70 ± 10	0.48
Male, n (%)	11 (57.9)	13 (46.4)	0.55	5 (50)	8 (80)	0.35	138 (71)	79 (72)	0.8	78 (70.2)	39 (69.6)	0.93
Transient ischemia, stroke, n (%)	3 (15.8)	10 (35.7)	0.18	3 (30)	2 (20)	0.96	64 (33)	51 (47)	0.6	25 (23)	26 (46)	0.002
LVEF, mean ± SD (%)	48.59 ±8.09	51.96 ±10.83	0.3	43.4 ± 13.3	44.3 ± 12.4	0.86	48 ± 12	48 ± 11	0.48	-	-	-
Bilateral carotid stenosis, n (%)	5 (26.3)	6 (21.4)	0.73	5 (50)	4 (40)	0.97	22 (11)	6 (6)	0.13	31 (28)	6 (11)	0.01





30-day TIA/stroke

	CAS+C	ABG	CEA/CABG		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl			
1.2.1 RCT										
Micovic.2014	0	10	1	10	7.4%	0.30 [0.01, 8.33]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		10		10	7.4%	0.30 [0.01, 8.33]				
Total events	0		1							
Heterogeneity: Not applicable										
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.71 (P = 0.48)										
1.2.2 Cohort										
Abassi.2007	3	28	2	19	11.0%	1.02 [0.15, 6.77]				
Shishehbor.2013	2	110	13	195	47.6%	0.26 [0.06, 1.17]				
Ziada.2005	1	56	10	111	34.0%	0.18 [0.02, 1.47]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		194		325	92.6%	0.32 [0.12, 0.85]				
Total events	6		25							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1.79, df = :	2 (P = 0	.41); I² =	0%						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.30 (P	° = 0.02	0							
T-4-1/054/ 00				005	400.00	0.0010.40.0043				
Total (95% CI)		204		335	100.0%	0.32 [0.13, 0.81]	-			
Total events	6		26							
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.79, df = 3 (P = 0.62); I ² = 0%										
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.40 (F	° = 0.02	9				Favors CAS+CABG Favors CEA/CABG			
Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.97), $I2 = 0\%$										





30-day mortality

	CAS + CABG		CEA/CABG		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl			
1.1.1 RCT										
Micovic.2014	0	10	1	10	9.7%	0.30 [0.01, 8.33]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		10		10	9.7%	0.30 [0.01, 8.33]				
Total events	0		1							
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.71 (P = 0.48)										
4400-1										
1.1.2 Cohort										
Abassi.2007	2	28	2	19	14.9%	0.65 [0.08, 5.09]				
Shishehbor.2013	7	110	9	195	41.1%	1.40 [0.51, 3.88]				
Ziada.2005	3	56	8	111	34.3%	0.73 [0.19, 2.86]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		194		325	90.3%	1.02 [0.48, 2.17]	-			
Total events	12		19							
Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.79, df = 2 (P = 0.67); l² = 0%										
Test for overall effect:	Z=0.06(F	P = 0.95	j)							
Total (05% CI)		204		225	100.0%	0.05 (0.46, 4.09)				
Total (95% CI)		204		222	100.0%	0.95 [0.40, 1.96]				
Total events 12 20										
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.30$, $df = 3$ (P = 0.73); $l^2 = 0\%$										
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.13 (P = 0.90) Favors CAS+CABG Favors CEA/CABC										
Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.50, df = 1 (P = 0.48), $l^2 = 0\%$										





Limitations

- Size
- Publication bias
- Lack of randomized clinical studies
- Most studies were Cohort: Selection bias
- Only short-term comparison





Conclusions

- Staged CAS and CABG might not be inferior to combined CEA and CABG
- Lower prevalence of TIA/Stroke
- No difference in short-term mortality
- Randomized studies are warranted





Future

 Hybrid Procedure: Interventional Cardiologists and Cardiothoracic Surgeons

 Study comparing Proximal vs. Distal Protection device for staged CAS and CABG







H. RE. SEL MAL







ALL MARK

Careful and Careful Ca

14



NOVEMBER 8 - 10

COME FEEL THE HEAT IN MIAMI

THANKS



