



Endovascular Acute Ischemic Stroke Therapy The Evolving Landscape

Aman B. Patel, MD Massachusetts General Hospital Harvard Medical School



Within the past 12 months, I have had a financial interest/arrangement or affiliation with the organization(s) listed below.

Affiliation/Financial Relationship

Consulting Fees/Honoraria

Company

- Covidien
- Penumbra





CONCEPTS





The Basis of Acute Stroke Therapy

The "recanalization hypothesis"

- i.e. reopening of occluded vessels improves clinical outcome in acute ischemic stroke through reperfusion and salvage of threatened tissues.
- Several biologic factors weaken the relationship of recanalization to outcome in acute ischemic stroke patients:
 - time
 - collateral circulation
 - reperfusion injury...





Rha/Saver – Recan. Meta Analysis

- Review all 53 published papers (1985-2002) with data regarding vessel recanalization and functional outcome (2066 cases)
- Recanalization was assessed by catheter angiography in 46, TCD/MRA/SPECT in 7
- Clinical outcome by revascularization status was available in 33 papers for 998 patients
- "Formal meta-analysis confirms a strong correlation ^{20.0%} between recanalization and outcome in acute ischemic stroke."





Outcome is Time Dependent

Probability of good clinical outcome over time to technically successful angiographic reperfusion



The typical LVO patient loses 1.9 million neurons/min in which stroke is untreated



NEUROSURGERY

Khatri P et al. Neurology 2009 Saver J, Stroke 2006

Reperfusion Must be Robust



The only statistically significant difference between successive grades was 2A versus 2B (P<0.0001).

(Similar results reported in DEFUSE 2, IMS III)





The Basis of Endovascular Therapy

- 1. Establish hollow lumen from access to target
- 2. Work through that lumen
- For stroke care:
 - Establish a lumen from groin to clot face
 - Dissolve clot
 - IA lytic (tPA or urokinase)
 - Microwire, balloon or catheter disruption
 - Extract clot
 - Mechanical thrombectomy





Background

- In 2015, 5 randomized controlled trials demonstrated superiority of endovascular thrombectomy to IV tPA alone for acute ischemic stroke (AIS) caused by an anterior circulation emergent large vessel occlusion (ELVO)
 - Next-generation devices
 - More effective recanal
 - Faster recanalization
 - Advanced imaging algorithms
 - Better patient selection





Background, cont.

- Stentriever thrombectomy with or without aspiration assistance was the predominant technique employed in all 5 trials
- The 2015 AHA/ASA guidelines specifically recommend endovascular therapy with a stentriever for all patients with ELVOs



| Study | % stentriever |
|-------------|---------------|
| MR CLEAN | 81.5 |
| ESCAPE | 86 |
| REVASCAT | 100 |
| SWIFT PRIME | 100 |
| EXTEND IA | 100 |





Eye-catching Numbers

"2.8 pts treated to improve mRS by a point in 1.3.2 patients treated to produce functional outcome in 1."

EXTEND-IA

"NNT=3 for improved mRS by 1 point. NNT=4 for independent outcome." ESCAPE

"Increase in good outcomes from 1 in 5 to 1 in 3 after endovascular treatment" MR CLEAN

"64 more days at home in the first 90 days after treatment" *EXTEND-IA*





Why Did These Trials Succeed?

1. They all used new devices

• Significantly more efficient at recanalization to a TICI 2b/3 result.

2. They used advanced imaging protocols

- To confirm the presence of an occlusion
- To assess parenchyma or penumbra





Thrombectomy Options







Solitaire



Machi P et al. J NeuroIntervent Surg 2012 Nogueira R G et al. J NeuroIntervent Surg 2012



Stentrievers: Solitaire Platinum



Solitaire[™] 2 device – 4x40





Solitaire[™] Platinum device – 4x40



NEUROSURGERY

Stentrievers: Trevo Provue







Active Push Deployment



Wiesmann et al, JNIS 2016

Active Push Deployment



XE

Haussen et al. Stroke. 2015

Wiesmann et al, JNIS 2016

MEDICAL SCHOOL

Push and Fluff Technique

Associated with: ↑ first pass effect ↑ TICI 3 ↓ number of passes



Stroke Case: Stentriever

64M PMH gout LSW 0630h, developed dizziness, dysarthria, facial droop and left hemiparesis, NIHSS 19, received IV tPA, transferred to MGH for IAT evaluation, CTA confirmed R-MCA M1 occlusion.







NEUROSURGERY























Outcome

Immediate post procedure improvement to NIHSS 5 By hospital day 3, NIHSS 0





NEUROSURGERY

GENERAL HOSPITAL

MGH

Aspiration Systems

ADAPT: A Direct Aspiration first Pass Technique



Aspiration Systems



NEUROSURGERY

ADAPT Technique







Stroke, ADAPT Case

- 48M LSW 11:30am with NIHSS 4 L MCA syndrome (no IV tPA), followed by an acute neurological decline 3am the following day; groin puncture 5:12am
- TICI 2b recanalization s/p 1 pass ADAPT; 20 mins groin puncture to recanalization









NEUROSURGERY

So what is important?

- Patient selection YES
- Time YES
- Imaging YES
- Recanalization YES!!!!
- Method of Recanalization ????
- Complications YES





Direct aspiration first-pass technique (ADAPT) versus stentriever thrombectomy in emergent large vessel intracranial occlusions

 Methods: To compare the angiographic and clinical outcomes of ADAPT versus stentriever thrombectomy in patients with emergent large vessel occlusions (ELVO) of the anterior intracranial circulation, the records of 129 patients from June 2012 to October 2015 were retrospectively reviewed.





Results

| PATIENT DATA | ADAPT, No. (%) | Stentriever, No. (%) | <i>P</i> value |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Total patients | 47 | 70 | |
| Age* | 63.5 | 69.4 | 0.04 |
| Male | 27 (57.4) | 34 (48.6) | 0.45 |
| NIHSS* | 16.5 | 16.5 | 0.94 |
| Baseline mRS >1 • Pa | atients were slight | y younger in the A | ADAPT cohort |
| Hypertension | 37 (78.7) | 50 (71.4) | 0.40 |
| • NC Diabetes mellitus | o differences in oth | ner baseline facto | rs _{0.83} |
| Smoking (current or past) | 11 (23.4) | 10 (14.3) | 0.23 |
| Atrial fibrillation | 16 (34.0) | 35 (50) | 0.13 |
| Coronary artery disease | 12 (25.5) | 22 (31.4) | 0.30 |
| Previous stroke | 8 (17.0) | 14 (20) | 0.81 |

*mean





| PRE-PROCEDURAL DATA | ADAPT, No. (%) | Stentriever, No. (%) | <i>P</i> value | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Total patients | 47 | 70 | | | | |
| Intravenous tPA | 34 (72.3) | 40 (57.1) | 0.56 | | | |
| Onset to intravenous tPA (mins)* | 128.9 | 132.1 | 0.78 | | | |
| ASPECTS* | 8 | 8.3 | 0.34 | | | |
| Location of intracranial occlusion • No differences in any pre-procedural factors | | | | | | |
| ICA | 12 (25.5) | 13 (18.6) | 0.15 | | | |
| M1 MCA | 33 (70.2) | 43 (61.4) | | | | |
| M2 MCA | 2 (4.3) | 14 (20) | | | | |
| Left side | 24 (51.1) | 35 (50) | >0.99 | | | |

*mean





| | No statis | sticent differ | ence in | rates%of | | P value ² | P value ³ |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| AL DATA | | ZationAPT failure/Stentri ever rescue | Total | | | | |
| Total patients | 57.4% (2 | 27/472) of p | atients i | | group h | ad | |
| Onset to groin puncture (mins)* | SUCCESS | ful recanal | ization v | vith _{284.7} spi | rati <u>on</u> alor | ne _{-0.01} | 0.58 |
| ADAPT attempts* | recahaliz | zatioh ³ and | shortes | t proced | ure times | nes lo | |
| Stentriever attempts* | compare | ed to all gro | oups. | 1.9 | | | 0.27 |
| CASPER | Nood to i | 20 (100) Stoptric | wor adiur | 39(55.7) | ADTdid no | t affact | <0.01 |
| TICI 2b/3 recanalization | | anlization o | r procedi | | | Stentrieve | 0.26 Pr |
| Onset to TICI 2b/3 recanalization (mins)* | alone | 345.5 | 294.3 | 346.7 | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.74 |
| Procedural time (mins)* | 41.8 | 70.4 | 54.0 | 77.1 | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.33 |
| Procedural complication | 2 (7.4) | 1 (5) | 3 (6.4) | 5 (7.1) | >0.99 | >0.99 | >0.99 |



*mean ¹ADAPT versus Stentriever

²ADAPT success versus Stentriever

³ADAPT failure/Stentriever rescue versus Stentriever



| OUTCOME DATA | ADAPT, No. (%) | | Stentriever, No. (%) | P value ¹ | P value ² | P value ³ | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|
| | ADAPT success | ADAPT failure/Stentr iever rescue | Total | | | | |
| Total patients | 27 | 20 | 47 | 70 | | | |
| Any intracranial hemorrhage | 6 (22.2) | 11 (55) | 17 (36.2) | 22 (31.4) | >0.99 | 0.46 | 0.07 |
| Symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage | 1 (3.7) | 5 (25) | 6 (12.8) | 7 (10) | 0.77 | 0.44 | 0.13 |
| Disposition • No Home SC | o differ ores | ences ir | 7-day 5 (10.6) | NIHSS 14 (20) | or 90-da | ay mRS | 0.07 |
| Rehabilitation | 22 (81.5) | 14 (70) | 36 (76.6) | 47 (67.1) | | | |
| ≯7-day NIHSS* | 6.4 | 9.3 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 0.81 | 0.55 | 0.24 |
| 90-day mRS* | 2.2 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 0.83 | 0.23 | 0.53 |
| 90-day mRS 0-2 | 14 (51.9) | 9 (45) | 23 (48.9) | 29 (41.4) | 0.45 | 0.37 | 0.80 |
| Death | 1(3.7) | 5 (25) | 6 (12.8) | 13 (18.6) | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.54 |

*mean ¹ADAPT versus Stentriever ²ADAPT success versus Stentriever ³ADAPT failure/Stentriever rescue versus Stentriever





| FACTORS PREDICTIVE of | Odds ratio | Coefficient | P value | | |
|---|------------------|-------------|---------|--|--|
| <u>90-day mRS 0-2</u> | | | | | |
| Endovascular thrombectomy | | | 0.47 | | |
| technique | | | | | |
| Age | 0.95 | -0.05 | < 0.01 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Previous stroke | 0.11 | -2.22 | < 0.01 | | |
| | 0.05 | 0.40 | 0.04 | | |
| NIHSS | 0.85 | -0.16 | 0.01 | | |
| TICI 2b/3 reconsideration | 1 1 23 37 | . 315 | 40.01 4 | | |
| 90-day functional outcomes were not dependent | | | | | |
| | - | • | | | |

Time to groin puncture (mine) pon endovascular thrombectiony technique 0.03





| FACTORS PREDICTIVE of | Odds ratio | Coefficient | P value | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|---------|--|--|
| <u>90-day mRS 0-2</u> | | | | | |
| Endovascular thrombectomy technique | 0.47 | | | | |
| Age • 90 day | mRS was highly o | dependent | < 0.01 | | |
| Previous stroke – ability to achieve recanalization (OR=23.37) $^{<0.01}$ | | | | | |
| NIHSS | 0.85 | -0.16 | 0.01 | | |
| TICI 2b/3 recanalization time | to groin puncture | 9. 3.15 | < 0.01 | | |
| Time to groin puncture (mins) | 0.1 | -0.005 | 0.03 | | |







REVASCULARIZATION in the **SHORTEST TIME PERIOD** is the key to **GOOD OUTCOME**





Thank you





NEUROSURGERY