

April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014 CIAT@TCTAP 2014

#### "You Did It, You Fixed It"

# How to Deal with Thrombus and No Reflow

#### Wacin Buddhari, MD

King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital Bangkok, Thailand



### **Mechanisms of No Reflow**



- **1.** Mechanical obstruction of distal embolization and /or atherosclerotic debris
- 2. Vascular auto-regulation. Severe micro-vascular dystunction due to alphaadrenergic macro-and micro-vascular constriction and vasospasm
- 3. Extrinsic coagulation pathway. Endothelial cell dysfunction/vasoconstriction induces exposure of TF leading to thrombosis
- 4. Leukocyte adherence, platelet thrombi and free radicals. Oxygen free radical-medicated endothelial injury. Capillary plugging by red cells and activated neutrophils

Galasso G et al. ANGIOLOGY 2014 65: 180



# Clinical and Procedural Settings Frequently Associated with No Reflow

Thrombus related

– ACS, esp STEMI

- Non-thrombus related (debris embolization)
  - Rotational atherectomy
  - SVG intervention



#### the whole story



Niccoli et al. JACC 2009;54:281-291







#### **Mechanical Thrombectomy Devices**











30

20

10-

0

Thrombus

Aspiration

Conventional

PCI

### TAPAS



**Myocardial Blush** Resolution of Persistent ST-Segment ST-Segment Grade Elevation (%) Deviation (mm)

Svilaas T et al. N Engl J Med 2008; 358;6





#### All cause mortality

#### **Cardiac death**



#### Meta-analysis of Manual Aspiration versus Conventional Primary PCI in STEMI

		No. of events/ Total No. of participants	
MACE		Aspiration	Conventional
Study	RR (95%CI)	Thrombectomy	Primary PCI
Chao	0.50 (0.19, 1.32)	5/37	10/37
DeLuca	0.75 (0.18, 3.13)	3/38	4/38
EXPIRA	0.44 (0.14, 1.37)	4/88	9/87
INFUSE AMI	0.62 (0.24, 1.57)	7/229	11/23
Kaltoft	0.99 (0.14, 6.91)	2/108	2/107
Liistro	1.16 (0.45 2.99)	8/55	7/56
MUSTELA	0.83 (0.27. 2.52)	4/50	10/104
Noel	0.54 (0.05, 5.60)	1/24	2/26
REMEDIA	0.98 (0.30, 3.17)	5/50	5/49
TAPAS	0.82 (0.64 1.05)	89/535	109/536
VAMPIRE	0.65 (0.39, 1.07)	22/180	33/175
Overall (I-squared=0.0%, p=0.962)	0.76 (0.63, 0.92)	150/1394	202/1438
O.1 1.0 10.0 All-cause Mortality Chao Ciszewski DeLuca EXPIRA Export INFUSE AMI Kaltoft Liistro MUSTELA NONSTOP Noel PIHRATE REMEDIA TAPAS VAMPIRE DEAR-MI Lipiecki Overall (I-squared=0.0%, p=0.934)	- 3.00 (0.13, 71.34 0.70 (0.12, 4.04) 0.20 (0.01, 4.03) 0.11 (0.01, 2.01) 0.64 (0.16, 2.64) 1.14 (0.39, 3.33) 0.33 (0.01, 8.02) - 3.05 (0.13, 73.38 0.83 (0.17, 4.14) 1.00 (0.14, 6.99) 0.36 (0.02, 8.43) 1.28 (0.29, 5.57) 0.98 (0.21, 4.62) 0.61 (0.38, 0.99) 1.94 (0.18, 21.25 (Excluded) (Excluded) 0.71 (0.51, 1.00)	<ul> <li>1/37</li> <li>2/67</li> <li>0/38</li> <li>0/88</li> <li>3/20</li> <li>7/229</li> <li>0/108</li> <li>1/55</li> <li>2/50</li> <li>2/129</li> <li>0/24</li> <li>4/100</li> <li>3/50</li> <li>25/535</li> <li>2/180</li> <li>0/74</li> <li>0/20</li> <li>52/1944</li> </ul>	0/37 3/70 2/38 4/87 5/129 6/223 1/107 0/56 5/104 2/129 1/26 3/96 3/49 41/536 1/75 0/74 0/24 77/1992
0.1 1.0 10.0	0.77 (0.91, 1.00)	JZ/1944	(111992



#### Kumbhani et al. JACC Vol. 62, No. 16, 2013

#### **Meta-analysis of Mechanical Thrombectomy** versus Conventional Primary PCI in STEMI



Carlie Lores



#### Kumbhani et al. JACC Vol. 62, No. 16, 2013

### **TASTE: 30-day All Cause Mortality**



Froebert et al. NEJM 2013; 369: 1587-1597



### **TASTE: Re-infarction**



Froebert et al. NEJM 2013; 369: 1587-1597



- Distal embolic protection in native artery Primary PCI in STEMI DOES NOT work
- Mechanical thrombectomy failed to show any meaningful benefits
- Manual aspiration, in a "meta-analysis fashion", appears to show benefits in improving TIMI flow, MPBS, STS resolution, reduction in infarct size and MACE
- Unanswered questions: how to aspirate, how many passes, routine versus selective (clot burden driven?) – more data is needed



# **Limitations of Manual Aspiration**

- 10% of the time, they can not pass the lesions
- 30% of the time, no thrombus retrieved
- They can not remove all the thrombus
- They can cause distal embolization
- There was a trend for increase stroke in metaanalysis



- GP IIbIIIa inhibitor
  - IC, IV, intra-lesional
- Vasodilator (after manual aspiration)
- Direct stenting (vs pre-dilatation)
- Mesh covered stent
- Deferred stenting
- Others: chronic statin Rx, P2Y12 inhibitors

### **INFUSE-AMI Trial**



### INFUSE-AMI: Infarct Size at 30 days

#### Effect of IC abciximab via Clearway Rx



Stone GW et al. JAMA 2012: 307



#### AIDA STEMI: Combined Clinical Endpoint



Thiele et al. Lancet 2012; 379: 923-931



### AIDA STEMI: CMR sub study Reperfusion Injury

#### **Microvascular obstruction**

Hemorrhage



Eitel et al. JACC 2013;61: 1447-1454

## **REOPEN-AMI Study**



**Conclusions** In STEMI patients treated by PCI and TA, the additional intracoronary administration of adenosine, but not that of nitroprusside, results in a significant improvement of MVO, as assessed by STR.

Niccoli G et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:580-9



Stone GW et al. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2012;60:1975-1984

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### A Randomized Trial of Deferred Stenting versus Immediate Stenting to Prevent No-or Slow Reflow in Acute ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (DEFER-STEMI)

#### Abstract

**Objectives:** To assess whether deferred stenting might reduce no-reflow and salvage myocardium in primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) for ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI).

Background: No-reflow is associated with adverse outcomes in STEMI.

**Methods:** A prospective single center randomized controlled proof-of-concept trial in reperfused STEMI patients with  $\geq 1$  risk factors for no-reflow. Randomization was to deferred stenting with an intention-to-stent 4-16 hours later or conventional treatment with immediate stenting. The primary outcome was the incidence of no/slow-reflow (TIMI  $\leq 2$ ). Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was performed 2 days and 6 months post-MI. Myocardial salvage was the final infarct size indexed to the initial area-at-risk. **Results:** Of 411 STEMI patients (11 March 2012 - 21 November 2012), 101 patients (mean age 60 years, 69% male) were randomized (n=52 deferred group, n=49 immediate stenting). The median (IQR) time to the second procedure in the deferred group was 9 (6, 12) hours. Fewer patients in the deferred stenting group had no/slow-reflow [14 (29%) vs. 3 (6%); p=0.006], no-reflow [7 (14%) vs. 1 (2%); p=0.052] and intra-procedural thrombotic events [16 (33%) vs. 5 (10%); p=0.010]. TIMI coronary flow grades at the end of PCI were higher in the deferred stenting group (p=0.018). Recurrent STEMI occurred in 2 patients in the deferred group before the second procedure. Myocardial salvage index at 6 months was greater in the deferred group [68 (54, 82%) vs. 56 (31, 72%); p=0.031].

**Conclusion:** In high risk STEMI patients, deferred stenting in primary PCI reduced noreflow and increased myocardial salvage.

Carrick D et al. Journal of the American College of Cardiology (2014), doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2014.02.530

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Conclusions

- No reflow carries high mortality rate, both short- and long-term
- Clot burden is one main cause of no-reflow in the setting of STEMI primary PCI
- Prevention, rather than treatment (after it already happened) is the KEY!
- Manual aspiration of thrombus, probably helps, in situation with large clot burden, but not in a routine fashion
- GP IIbIIIa inhibitors, IV or IC is probably useful