Growing Evidence to Support Aggressive CTO-PCI

J. Aaron Grantham, MD, FACC Associate Professor of Medicine University of Missouri Kansas City





#### **Disclosure Statement of Financial Interest**

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

#### **Affiliation/Financial Relationship**

- Grant/Research Support
- Consulting Fees/Honoraria
- Major Stock Shareholder/Equity
- Royalty Income
- Ownership/Founder
- Intellectual Property Rights
- Other Financial Benefit

#### Company

- Boston Scientific, Asahi Intecc, Vascular Solutions
- Boston Scientific, Abbott Vascular, Asahi Intecc
- None
- None
- US patent#14/575,977
- None



# Benefits of CV Care

#### **Quality of Life**

#### **Quantity of Life**







#### Outline

- CTOs are common
- Treatment varies
- Barriers to PCI
  - Myths
    - Can't get worse
    - Well collateralized
    - Too Risky/too difficult
  - New data





#### **CTOs are common**

#### 7559 Patients with Coronary Angiography April 2008-July 2009 at 3 centers in Canada



74% had CCS class II or more angina

Fefer et al J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;59:991–7



#### **CTOs are common**

- CCS estimates 1,000,000 Americans with Refractory angina McGillion et al. Can J Cardiol 2012;28:S20-41
- A persistent, painful condition characterized by the presence of angina caused by coronary insufficiency in the presence of coronary artery disease which cannot be controlled by a combination of medical therapy, angioplasty, and

Reason for no revascularization <sup>a</sup>	Number	% (n = 33)
Chronic total occlusion	23	69.7%
Diffuse disease	15	45.5%
Collateral dependent perfusion	14	42.2%
Comorbidities	4	12.1%
Multiple restenoses	2	6.1%
Poor distal targets	1	3.0%

#### Williams et al. Catheter and Cardiovsc Int 2010



#### CTO Treatment Varies: Operator Bias

>34,000 patients in NCDR with CTO, 13.7% attempted

	Point Estimate	95% CI
No Diabetes	1.25	1.17-1.34
No Prior AMI	1.48	1.38-1.59
Creatinine < 2.0	1.93	1.57-2.38
Stress Test Positive vs Negativ	re 1.18	1.07-1.31
Angina vs asymptomatic	1.78	1.63-1.96
LVEF > 40%	1.26	1.15-1.38
SVD vs MVD	3.07	2.87-3.28
Low vs Intermediate Operator	0.59	0.54-0.65
Low vs High Volume Operator	0.50	0.46-0.55

 Likelihood of attempted PCI independently associated with operator volume

Grantham, JA et al JACC: Cl 2009; 2:479-486



#### CTO Treatment Varies: Institutional Bias

#### **Overall 10% of patients with a CTO were treated with PCI**



Fefer et al. JACC 2012



#### **Underuse of Revascularization**



Adjusted hazard for death or ACS with revasc vs medical therapy among "A" group (0.61; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.42 to 0.88) Ko et al JACC 2012;60:1876-84



### Variability can represent underuse

#### Interventional risk treatment paradox

Baseline SYNTAX score	7.5 ± 5.6	9.3 ± 6.1	<b>12.6</b> ± 6.9	<b>21.7</b> ± 8.6	<.001
Residual SYNTAX score	0	$1.5 \pm 0.5$	$5.2 \pm 1.6$	<b>15.8 ± 6.5</b>	<.001
Delta† SYNTAX score	7.3 ± 5.4	7.5 ± 6.1	6.9 ± 6.3	5.7 ± 6.4	.15

#### Untreated lesions

	rSS >0-2 (n = 523)	rSS >2-8 (n = 578)	rSS >8 (n = 501)	p Value All Groups
Severe calcification	0 (0%)	10 (1.7%)	59 (11.8%)	<0.001
Chronic total occlusion	1 (0.2%)	58 (10.0%)	216 (43.1%)	<0.001
Bifurcation/trifurcation	0 (0%)	179 (30.9%)	287 (57.3%)	<0.001
Aorto-ostial lesion	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.7%)	14 (0.3%)	<0.001
Lesion length >20 mm	3 (0.6%)	143 (24.7%)	351 (70.1%)	<0.001
Small vessel/diffuse disease*	409 (78.2%)	303 (52.4%)	264 (52.7%)	<0.001

#### Généreux et al J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;59:2165-74



### **CTO Mythbusters**

- "Can't get any worse"
- "Well collateralized"
- "Too risky"





#### Top 3 Myths: Can't any worse

and the second second second second	PCI suce	cess	PCI fa	ilure		Odds Ratio	outs Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A-H, Randon, 95% Cl
Angioi et al.	3	93	9	108	3.4%	0.37 [0.10, 1.40]	
Aziz et al	9	377	12	166	6.7%	0.31 [0.13, 0.76]	
Drozd et al.	7	280	5	149	4.3%	0.74 [0.23, 2.37]	
Finci et al.	5	100	3	100	2.9%	1.70 [0.40, 7.32]	
Hoye et al.	37	567	36	304	14.4%	0.52 [0.32, 0.84]	
wanhoe et al.	3	317	7	163	3.2%	0.21 (0.05, 0.83)	
Labriolle et al.	7	127	2	45	2.4%	1.25 [0.25, 6.27]	
Noguchi et al.	7	134	15	92	6.1%	0.28 [0.11, 0.72]	
Olivari et al.	2	286	3	83	1.9%	0.19 [0.03, 1.14]	
Prasad et al.	229	914	101	348	21.6%	0.82 (0.62, 1.08)	-+
Suero et al.	395	1491	180	514	23.8%	0.67 [0.54, 0.83]	+
Valenti et al.	17	344	17	142	9.3%	0.38 [0.19, 0.77]	
Warren et al.	0	26	0	18		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)		5056		2232	100.0%	0.56 [0.43, 0.72]	•
Total events	721		390			0. 0.150993779320023203252	0000
Heterogeneity Tau*	= 0.06; Ch	*= 18.	74. df = 1	1 (P=	.07);  *=	41%	
Test for overall effect	t Z = 4.39	P < .0	001)	0.10	0.22.084//-	0.01	0.1 1 10 100
0.000 CC COURSESS	0.1010.0405600	1	0.51001				Favors Success Favors Failure

#### Joyal D, Afilalo J, Rinfret S. Am Heart J, 2010



#### Can't get any worse



% Ischemic Burden

Hachamovitch et al Circulation. 2003; 107:2900-2907



#### Can't Get Any Worse: Double Jeopardy



Van der Schaff RJ et al. Am J Cardiol 2006



#### Well Collateralized

FFR in 59 pts after successful wire crossing of a CTO



Werner GS et al, European Heart Journal 2006



### **Myocyte Doesn't Care**

Propensity matched noninferiority comparison of CTO-PCI to nonCTO-PCI in the 10 center PRISM-OPS registry

TABLE III.	Health Status Assessments at Baseline and 6	
months after	er PCI-Overall Cohort	

Health status measure	e	$\begin{array}{c} \text{CTO} \\ n = 167 \end{array}$	Non-CTO n = 2,521	P-value
SAQ physical	Baseline	73.0 ± 25.9	$77.4 \pm 24.0$	0.039
limitation score	6 month <sup>a</sup>	95.7 ± 13.3	$96.2 \pm 12.2$	0.67
SAQ angina	Baseline	$69.6 \pm 27.6$	$72.6 \pm 23.9$	0.12
frequency score	6 month <sup>a</sup>	91.3 ± 18.3	$93.4 \pm 15.1$	0.17
SAQ quality of	Baseline	$53.2 \pm 26.0$	$56.5 \pm 25.8$	0.11
life score	6 month <sup>a</sup>	$80.3 \pm 20.9$	$80.6\pm20.0$	0.875
Rose dyspnea score	Baseline	$1.9 \pm 1.5$	$1.7 \pm 1.5$	0.16
	6 month <sup>a</sup>	$1.0 \pm 1.3$	$0.9 \pm 1.3$	0.31
EQ5D visual	Baseline	$66.4 \pm 22.1$	$70.8 \pm 19.5$	0.005
analog scale	6 month <sup>a</sup>	$71.9 \pm 18.8$	$75.3 \pm 17.7$	0.026

Safley, Grantham et al, ePub ahead of print CCI DOI: 10.1002/ccd.25303, 2013



### **QoL after CTO-PCI**

125 pts completed the Seattle Angina Questionnaire (SAQ) before and one month after PCI. 69 procedural success (55%), 56 failures (45%)



Grantham JA. et al, Circulation: QCOR 2010;3:284-90



### **CTO-PCI** is too risky

#### A weighted meta-analysis from 18,061 patients in 65 CTO PCI studies



Patel, JACC: Cardiovasc Int, 2013



### **Appropriateness of CTO-PCI**

	Single	vessel	No	med Rx		Single v	vessei	O Max	Med Rx
	-		Angina					Angina	
		Class 0	Class I/II	Class III/IV			Class 0	Class I/II	Class III/IV
VCIV	High Risk No Rx	I	U	U	Risk	High Risk Max Rx	U	A	A
	Int Risk No Rx	I	U	U		Int Risk Max Rx	U	U	A
	Low Risk No Rx	I	I	I		Low Risk Max Rx	U	U	A

Modified from Patel et al J Am Coll Cardiol 2009;53:530-553



#### **Indications for CTO-PCI**

#### **Chronic Total Occlusions**



PCI of a CTO in patients with appropriate clinical indications and suitable anatomy is reasonable when performed by operators with <u>appropriate</u> expertise.



## The Hybrid Approach to CTO-PCI increasing success and efficiency

- Systematic
- Adoption of four strategies
- Sequence based on probability of success
- Rapid decision making



Brilakis et al J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2012;5:367-79

### CTO-PCI adoption in NA

**DÎD** Saint Luke's



2011

2012

2013

ile The state in the second second second state in the second second second second second second second second



### **Contemporary Case Example**

- 70 yr old man
- CTO RCA 2011
- EECP- no better
- Carvedilol, Isosorbide, Ranolazine
- CCS 3 angina
- RCA ischemia 12% myocardium



### Impenetrable proximal cap

Lossy compression - not intended for diagnosis



Corsair BAM Laser Rotoblator Go around



### Septal surfing failed



Lossy compression - not intended for diagnosis





### Go around "move the cap"







#### **Knuckle around**





### **Finish with crossboss**





### Stingray re entry balloon





### Stick then swap for Pilot 200





### **Final result**

Lossy compression - not intended for diagnosis



67 minutes 1.2Gy 135 cc contrast



### **Indications and Appropriateness**







#### **Hybrid Approach**



#### Success rate 58%

Success rate 55%





### **OPEN CTO Results**



119 ± 72 min



**89%** 



2.5  $\pm$  1.9 Gy



265 ± 194 ml





### Early Health Status Changes in CTO-PCI

#### **Patient Reported Health Status**







### **Complications in OPEN CTO**

Procedural	Frequency	30 Day	Frequency
MACE	4.4%	Death	1.3%
Death	0.9%	Rehospitalization	14.7%
MI	2.6%	Unplanned	12.1%
Emergent surgery	0.6%	Revascularization	2.6%
Stroke	0.0%	Planned	2.6%
Perforation	6.0%	PCI	2.3%
Clinical perforation	3.9%	CABG	0.3%
Bleeding Access	4.0%	Skin change	2.9%

Procedural MACE includes Death, MI, Emergent Surgery, Stroke and Clinical Perforation



Unpublished Data from OPEN CTO



#### Conclusions

- CTOs are common
- CTO treatment is variable
- Patients with CTOs report significant health status impairment
- Hybrid CTO-PCI
  - High Success
  - Efficiency
  - Significant health status improvement
- Appropriately aggressive CTO-PCI should be the goal
- Ask yourself, "if it was 80% occluded would I do it?"