Washington TCT 2005

Filters versus Occlusion Balloons during CAS Is there a clear preference?

K. Mathias Department of Radiology Teaching Hospital of Dortmund - Germany

Presenter Disclosure Information

Name: Klaus Mathias

Within the past 12 months, the presenter or their spouse/partner have had the financial interest/arrangement or affiliation with the organization listed below.

Nothing to disclose

Why do we use CP?

Stroke is an embolic disese (>95%)

CAS is accompanied by embolization in 100% of the cases

Brain is more than moving arms and legs

Critical Particle Size

pass cerebral circulation

- particles $< 20\mu$
- particles 20 200µ

micro-infarction possible

• particles > 200µ

will cause a stroke

Do we have sufficient evidence for the benefit of CP?

- Single Center Data
- ProCAS
- Global Carotid Stent Survey
- Trials

ProCAS Registry

Comparison CAS with/without CP



5 CAS Trials in the US

CAS with cerebral protection Only different filters were used More than 800 patients included

Virmani: filters contained in 62 - 87% various plaque material

Principles of Cerebral Protection

Distal balloon protection

1984 J. Theron (Caen), S. Bockenheimer (Frankfurt)

Proximal balloon protection

1989 R. Kachel (Erfurt), J. Parodi (St. Louis)

Filter protection

1981 K. Mathias (Dortmund), G. Roubin (NY), N. Hopkins (Buffalo) etc.

Filter Protection

Designs of Filters

symmetrical asymmetrical



safer filtering
better apposition
to vessel wall in
curved segments

bare wire mounted on wire

crossing the lesion
is easier
wire of choice

Angioguard



first filter 3rd generation good trackbility short filter basket









good filter in curved artery segments retrieval catheter will be improved

Emboshield



bare wire 0.014" – 0.018" high capture cpacity

Rubicon



FilterWire EZ



asymmetric filter: one size fits all up to 6 mm

Spider



bare wire – heparin coated – asymmetrical different size of meshes

Balloon Protection

PercuSurge







can be placed in tortuous ICAs no retrieval problems aspiration of 60 -80 cc

PercuSurge



MO.MA Proximal Balloon Protection

DIST

10 F system proximal CCA balloon distal ECA balloon inflation channels working channel

MO.MA Proximal Balloon Protection



placing the balloon in the ECA



balloons inflated in CCA & ECA



stent placement in ICA



balloon dilatation of ICA



recovery of EPD

MO.MA Trial

- Stent implantation successful
- MO.MA system successfully positioned 100 %
- Transient neurological symptoms 7.6 %
 procedure continued successfully in all patients
 intermittent balloon deflation 1.8%
- Diameter stenosis (NASCET) $85 \pm 8 \% \rightarrow 6 \pm 8 \%$
- Duration of flow blockage
- Amount of aspirated blood
- Debris collected



 7.6 ± 5.9 min

100 %

Make your selection

What do Filters Catch?

- filters have a pore size of ~110µm
- smaller particles will pass the filter
- filters may not be well apposed to the arterial wall
- filter retrieval may wash out particles

Filters

- preserve blood flow during CAS
- contrast material injection always possible
- higher precision in stent placement
- correct size selection important
- ACT > 250 s
- crossing of lesion sometimes difficult
- placement of filter in tortuous ICA difficult
- spasm may occur
- recovery of filter difficult: retrieval catheter will not easily cross stents with open cell design

Distal Balloon Protection

- crossing of lesion easy
- tortuosity of ICA does not matter
- incomplete angiogram
- retrieval easy
- efficacy of aspiration questionable
- 5-10% of patients do not tolerate the interruption of blood supply

Proximal Balloon Protection

- ICA lesion not touched
- ICA tortuosity does not matter
- thrombus can be dissolved and aspirated
- incomplete angiogram
- retrieval easy
- efficacy of aspiration high
- large device profile
- 5-10% of patients do not tolerate the interruption of blood supply

ProCAS Registry

Cerebral Protection yes 3,370 72.8% no 1,259 27.2% registered since Oct-1, 2000

Type of CP

filter	2,825	83.8%
distal balloon	244	7.2%
proximal balloon	238	7.1%
unknown	63	1.9%
registered since Oct-1, 2000		

Safety first! For your patient and yourself!

TENDORARY INSU