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Learning objectives

• Understand the evidence behind thrombectomy eligibility
  – site of vessel occlusion
  – age
  – severity
  – time
• Understand imaging strategies and the prognostic significance of ischemic core volume
• Understand the role of IV thrombolysis before thrombectomy
  – 0-4.5hr versus >4.5h
• Understand the critical importance of Systems of care in maximising patient outcomes
Key messages

• Endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) profoundly reduces disability in a broad range of ischemic stroke patients with large vessel occlusion 0-6h after stroke onset
• EVT also benefits selected patients with favorable perfusion imaging up to 24h after stroke onset
• Currently EVT is combined with IV thrombolysis in eligible patients (with ongoing trials testing EVT alone in patients presenting directly to EVT centers)
• Faster treatment is the most effective way to improve patient outcomes – streamline transfers and minimize re-imaging
Large vessel occlusion - thrombolysis vs thrombectomy

large vessel occlusion (LVO)
• 15% of all stroke *but*
• 39% of acutely presenting stroke
• responsible for 62% of dependency and 96% of mortality (Malhotra Front Neurol 2017)
• IV thrombolysis has limited efficacy

* “LVO” definition may change with device improvements

** planned trials to add IV lysis to thrombectomy >4.5hr

>70% - no reperfusion therapy super-mild, established, very late
EDITORIAL

Endovascular Therapy for Stroke — It’s about Time
Anthony J. Furlan, M.D.

New Eng J Med 2015:
• 5 Positive randomized trials
• 2 Editorials
• Faster, better reperfusion
• More Imaging
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Which sites of vessel occlusion?

- ICA and M1 – benefit
- tandem disease (cervical + intracranial) – benefit
- ?M2
  - less common, highly variable anatomy
  - smaller, more tortuous, less accessible
  - less territory at risk
  - greater response to IV thrombolysis
- HERMES meta-analysis = larger/dominant/more proximal M2 with higher NIHSS benefit – need to individualize decision
- M3/4, ACA, PCA - ??
- Basilar – excluded from most trials, BEST 20% benefit “as treated”, BASICS RCT ongoing. time window: ?24hr from last known well vs ~8hr from onset of coma
Age limits?

Age is prognostic

Age **does not** modify treatment effect

Goyal et al Lancet 2016
Severity limits?

NIHSS is prognostic

NIHSS does not modify treatment effect

Uncertainty in very mild (NIHSS 0-5) → ENDO LOW trial
Thrombectomy – still time critical

MR CLEAN selection (CTA occlusion) with successful reperfusion

Fransen JAMA Neurology 2016
Thrombectomy – still time critical

For every 4 min delay after reaching emergency, 1 in 100 patients will have increased disability

Saver JAMA 2016
Thrombectomy 6 to 24 Hours after Stroke with a Mismatch between Deficit and Infarct


Thrombectomy for Stroke at 6 to 16 Hours with Selection by Perfusion Imaging

Ischemic Penumbra – the reason we can improve outcome after ischaemic stroke

Astrup, Symon 1977
CT perfusion – diagnosis and prognosis

Delayed TTP/Tmax = collateral territory

Low CBV = likely irreversibly damaged

Area under curve $\approx 0$

Area = CBV
Automated CT perfusion processing

“How much blood supply” (severely reduced ≈ dead)
relCBF<30% of normal brain Campbell et al Stroke 2011
* time to reperf & grey vs white matter

“How delayed is the blood supply” (severely delayed ≈ at risk)
Nogueira NEJM 2017

 ordinal NNT 2.0
 mRS 0-2: 49% vs 13%, p<0.0001
 84% mTICI 2b/3
 SICH 5.6% vs 3.0%, p=0.50

 Albers NEJM 2018

 ordinal NNT 2.1
 mRS 0-2 45% vs 17%, p<0.0001
 76% mTICI 2b/3
 SICH 6.5% vs 4.4%, p=0.75
DAWN eligibility effect in DEFUSE 3

DEFUSE 3 criteria
- simpler
- ~60% more patients eligible
- No reduction in treatment effect within age, NIHSS or core volumes included

i.e. 6-24hr with ICA/M1 and <70mL core → thrombectomy

DAWN Ineligible, (OR 2.96, 95% CI 1.26-6.97); DAWN Eligible, (OR 2.66, 95% CI 1.36-5.23) P value for interaction = 0.47

Albers et al NEJM 2018
Is time still brain?  Yes!

- Overall stroke population are very time sensitive – still need to go as fast as possible

- The proportion of patients who remain eligible by imaging criteria decreases over time (~50% of LVO in the 6-24hr time window based on DEFUSE 3 screening)

- However, if an individual patient is unavoidably delayed in presentation AND imaging is still favorable then they are likely to benefit from reperfusion
advanced imaging is not just about “excluding” patients

- including more patients
  - mild NIHSS but significant perfusion abnormality
  - late/unknown time
  - “low ASPECTS” but only moderate volume NCCT changes
  - clinically “marginal” but good imaging

AND

- diagnostic benefits
  - when patients present the first question is “is it stroke”
  - variable levels of experience on ground, in-hours, after-hours, telemedicine
  - improved NCCT interpretation when you know where to scrutinize
  - LVO may be chronic, partial, asymptomatic – perfusion can help

AND

- Maybe in future we will have non-reperfusion-based therapies…
  - glyburide, NA1 etc might benefit from imaging to target those not likely to do well just with reperfusion
Impact of **Core volume**, **Age** and **Time (imaging to reperfusion)** on functional outcome in patients successfully reperfused

- 10ml core mRS 0-2
- 100mL core mRS 0-2
- 100mL core mRS 0-3

For 0-6 hour patients don’t exclude purely on basis of core volume:
Balance core volume and location, expected time to reperfusion, pre-morbid status & tolerance of disability if known

Campbell et al Lancet Neurology 2019
If eligible for both treatments should we still give thrombolysis before thrombectomy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Alteplase</th>
<th>Standard care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Reperfusion TICI 2b/3 [Angio Core lab determined]</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mAOL 2-3 (at 2-8h CTA) [CT Core lab determined]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goyal et al ESCAPE, NEJM 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV-IA bridging</th>
<th>Direct IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>potential benefit if failure/delay in endovascular procedure</td>
<td>potential reduction in symptomatic intracerebral (and systemic) hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential benefit in dissolving distal embolic fragments of thrombus/multi-territory emboli</td>
<td>potential reduction in distal migration/fragmentation of thrombus “out of reach” prior to endovascular procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential for pre-endovascular reperfusion</td>
<td>save cost of alteplase/tenecteplase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Meta-analysis of observational data

### mRS 0-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>mRS 0-2/Total</th>
<th>mRS 0-2/Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio [95% CI] of MT+IVT to MT-IVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>861/1769</td>
<td>520/1174</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.27 [1.05, 1.55]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: $P^2 = 0\%$
Overall heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.02; I^2 = 17\%$
Test for overall summary effect: $Z = 2.41 (P = 0.02)$

### DEATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Death (mRS 6)/Total</th>
<th>Death (mRS 6)/Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio [95% CI] of MT+IVT to MT-IVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263/1774</td>
<td>227/1202</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.71 [0.55, 0.91]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: $P^2 = 24.7\%$
Overall heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.02; I^2 = 13\%$
Test for overall summary effect: $Z = 2.74 (P = 0.006)$

### Recanalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MT+IVT</th>
<th>MT-IVT</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio [95% CI] of MT+IVT to MT-IVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1320/1652</td>
<td>926/1216</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.46 [1.09, 1.96]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.08; I^2 = 37\%$
Test for overall summary effect: $Z = 2.56 (P = 0.01)$

### Recan with $\leq 2$ device passes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MT+IVT</th>
<th>MT-IVT</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio [95% CI] of MT+IVT to MT-IVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159/316</td>
<td>103/231</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.06 [1.37, 3.10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.00; I^2 = 0\%$
Test for overall summary effect: $Z = 3.48 (P = 0.0005)$

NB mostly “direct” patients were lysis-ineligible patients intended for thrombectomy who recanalize prior were not included…

?thrombolysis facilitates thrombectomy even if reperfusion not achieved prior to procedure

Mistry Stroke 2017
Systems of Care – Time is Brain!
Conclusions

Rapid reperfusion remains the proven treatment paradigm in stroke

- Currently thrombolysis + thrombectomy if eligible for both (DIRECT trials ongoing)
- Thrombectomy for ICA, M1, tandem, basilar, selected M2 occlusions
- “Good” premorbid function
- No age or clinical severity limits
- **0-6h**: broad imaging criteria  **6-24h**: DEFUSE 3 imaging selection <70mL core
- CT perfusion is diagnostic and characterizes irreversibly injured core/collaterals - very helpful for prognosis in any time window
- Simply delivering thrombolysis & thrombectomy faster and increasing access to appropriate patients is essential to maximize effectiveness – focus on systems of care

~