International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp: (387-392), Month: October 2016 - March 2017, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Overview of Endovascular and Open Surgical Techniques for Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm (AAA) Repair

[1]Abdullah Hamed Algethami, [2]Turki Sulaiman Alghuraybi,
[3]Hussam Abdulrazaq Alnemari, [4]Abdulateef Ibrahim Alsulaimany,
[5]Mohammed Sameer Aljehani, [6]Meshari Abed Algethami

Abstract: **The main objective of conducting this review was to obtain difference in between two important procedures in treatment of AAA and evaluate the procedures EVAR and OSR in different aspect such as mortality rate and suitability of patients and complication that follows each procedure. we conducted a systematic review of all published triales throughdifferent database such MEDLINE (pubmed) and EMBASE. The following search terms strategies were used on each database:'Aortic aneurysm, abdominal *and* open procedure *and* endovascular'. search was sequentially performed using the following keywords and phrases: "open" *vs.* "endovascular aneurysm repair". AAA are connected with significant morbidity, death and health-care expenses. Patients with AAA <5.5 cm have a yearly threat of rupture of around 1 percent. For AAA <5.5 cm in size top quality RCT outcomes show that active monitoring with ultrasound and postponed OSR (if AAA obtains a size of ≥ 5.5 cm or the patient establishes aneurysm associated signs) leads to similar long-lasting survival and lifestyle, less OSR, and lower expenses than instant OSR no matter age or gender. Many formerly released research studies of OSRs of AAA done by cosmetic surgeons and healthcare facilities recommend that there is an inverted relationship in between volume and short-term death.**

Keywords: **EVAR and OSR, abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA).**

1. INTRODUCTION

Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) is identified in 5%-- 10% of males above the age of 65 [(1)]. The frequency of AAA discovered in population-based ultrasound screening research studies varies from 4.2- 8.8 percent in guys and 0.6-- 1.4 percent in ladies [(2)]. Threat aspects for AAA consist of age, history of routine cigarette smoking, household history of AAA, coronary artery disease, high blood pressure, hypercholesterolemia, and cerebrovascular disease. The general occurrence of AAA higher than 3.0 cm in "never ever cigarette smokers" varies from less than 0.2 percent in ages 50-- 54 to almost 3 percent in ages 75-79. For "ever cigarette smokers" the frequency varies from around 1 percent to 7 percent throughout these age. Smoking cigarettes status is likewise a danger element for AAA death [(2)]. Endovascular stomach aortic aneurysm repair work (EVAR) makes up a minimally intrusive option to open repair work connected with substantially less operating time and blood loss and exceptional peri-operative outcomes inning accordance with information from big EVAR computer registries and randomized regulated trials [(3)]. As an outcome, EVAR is an attractive option to open surgical repair work (OSR) for the senior, who have substantially more co-morbidity and would be at increased danger for post-operative problems. There is installing proof that the population aged above 80 years will considerably increase over the next 20 years [(3)]. As an outcome, the senior population going through vascular interventions will most certainly increase in the years to come. Numerous reports have actually recommended that EVAR is safe in octogenarians and it transcends over open repair work throughout numerous age spectrums in regards to post-operative early and medium term morbidity [(4,5,6,)]. In addition, modern proof recommends that EVAR is equivalent to open repair work even in the long term and it might be more suitable in older and frailer patients, [(7,8,9,10)] The bulk of AAAs stay asymptomatic for several years, though the danger of rupture boosts with AAA size. Immediate death can

result and death stays in between 40 and 60 percent, even when emergency situation care and repair work are carried out. Management choices are mainly based upon patient's life span and AAA size and include no treatment, active surveillance and delayed repair, immediate open surgical repair (OSR), and endovascular repair (EVAR) [7,8,9,10].

The main objective of conducting this review was to obtain difference in between two important procedures in treatment of AAA and evaluate these procedures EVAR and OSR in different aspect such as mortality rate and suitability of patients and complication that follows each procedure.

2. METHODOLOGY

Search strategy:

we conducted a systematic review of all published triales throughdifferent database such MEDLINE (pubmed) and EMBASE. The following search terms strategies were used on each database:'Aortic aneurysm, abdominal ***and*** open procedure ***and*** endovascular'. search was sequentially performed using the following keywords and phrases: "open" *vs.* "endovascular aneurysm repair"

The search was restricted to articles published in English and to studies in humans. Where possible, abstracts were reviewed online and suitable articles selected for data extraction. All articles were obtained electronically, and the reference lists from retrieved articles were searched manually as was the reference list of several book chapters previously written by some of the co-authors.

Study selection:

The main criterion that was sought for inclusion into the study was the availability of data on EVAR for AAA. Articles were not restricted due to design of study (retrospective, prospective, observational, etc.), operative techniques, or stent-graft design. Any article that did not define AAA surgical managment was excluded. Case reports, review articles, letters, editorials, series of less than 5 patients and articles that focused on one group of patients (e.g. octogenarians) were also excluded.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to one one study carried out by Meenan et al [16] and it was consisted of in our evaluation, specified that since the danger of rupture is highly associated to AAA size, management choices are usually based upon AAA size (small <5.5 cm vs. big ≥ 5.5 cm) and patient's personnel threat (clinically suitable for OSR versus clinically unsuited) figured out by age and comorbidities. OSR has actually been thought about the gold-standard for avoidance of AAA rupture and death. It has the death danger of significant vascular surgery with perioperative issues of about 32 percent consisting of myocardial anemia, breathing failure, kidney failure, ischemic colitis, back cable anemia and prosthetic graft infection, as well as the expense of this treatment. Management choices that would be similarly efficient in avoiding AAA rupture and extending survival, with lower morbidity and comparable or minimized health care expenses, have actually been looked for [16].

We have actually consisted of 2 randomized trials which was carried out in the United Kingdom, comparing EVAR to open repair work and EVAR to no intervention for patients at high danger for open repair work, respectively [11,12]. Patients registered in EVAR were older than 60 years and had an AAA of a minimum of 5.5 cm in size. The patients needed to ready prospects for EVAR and open repair work. If patients were thought unsuited for open repair work, they were consisted of in the EVAR-2 trial, comparing EVAR without any intervention. An overall 1,082 were randomised to go through open repair work (539) or EVAR (543). In general, EVAR was related to a much better 30-day death rate (P = 0.0001) and enhanced aneurysm-related survival at 4 years (P = 0.04). The EVAR-2 trial concentrated on "unsuited" patients identified with an AAA. The "unsuited" meaning was based upon a subjective decision made at standard by the clinician who assessed the patient. An overall of 338 patients (166 EVARs vs. 172 going through no intervention) were consisted of. There was no analytical distinction in survival at 4 years (34% for no intervention vs. 38% for EVAR) or aneurysm-related death at 4 years (19% for no intervention vs. 14% for EVAR). There was likewise no distinction in health-related lifestyle; expense was significantly increased in the EVAR group. There is a series of considerable downsides with concerns to the style and analysis of the research study. There was a great deal of deaths (19%) in patients who were randomised to go through EVAR however never ever made it to the intervention; in truth, 12% of patients randomised to go through EVAR never ever went through EVAR [11,12].

We consisted of research study by Brown et al.[13] which evaluated 404 patients from the EVAR-2 population (197 EVARs vs. 207 going through no intervention, suggest age 77 ± 6 years) to figure out whether EVAR changes the rate of cardiovascular occasions in those "unsuited" patients. A big percentage of patients had a history of previous heart disease with a non-significantly greater portion in the no intervention group (74% vs. 67% in the EVAR group, P = 0.128). Patients were followed for approximately 6.8 years after their recruitment. An overall of 70 cardiovascular occasions happened throughout approximately 2.8 years in 67 patients; the unrefined general rate was 6.1 [95% self-confidence period (95% CI)] occasions per 100 individual years. In the EVAR group, 10 occasions took place within Thirty Days of the EVAR, with the staying 23 taking place more than 30 days after EVAR. In the no intervention group, 9 occasions took place after AAA repair work in the 63 patients having aneurysm repair work versus procedure (none within 30 days). For the 319 patients adhering to their randomised allowance, 33 (19%) patients in the EVAR group and 22 (15%) patients in the no intervention group experienced a cardiovascular occasion throughout follow-up; changed Cox threat ratio 1.07 (95% CI: 0.60-- 1.91) [13].

The ACE trial [14] is a multi-centre randomised regulated trial comparing EVAR with open repair work in patients with a low to moderate surgical danger. The geriatric population is not likely to suit this classification, for that reason, arises from this trial will not be evaluated.

The Open vs. Endovascular Repair (OVER) is a multi-centre randomised regulated trial [15] comparing EVAR with open repair work in 881 veterans (USA) aged above 49 years over a mean follow-up of 1.8 years. The research study showed that the EVAR group had actually considerably decreased treatment time, length of mechanical ventilation, blood loss and transfusion requirement [15].

Mortality rate in OSR procedures in management of AAA:

we included in our review two large studies UKSAT [17] and ADAM [18] The mean duration of followup was 4.9 years for ADAM [18] and 4.6 years for the initial report of the UKSAT [17]. In the active security group, 62 percent of patients in the monitoring group had actually gone through AAA OSR by the end of the trial, and 9 percent were carried out in spite of the reality that individuals did not fulfill research study requirements for OSR. 4 years after randomization, 27 percent of AAA that had actually determined 4.0 to 4.4 cm at standard had actually OSR as compared with 81 percent of those with standard AAA 5.0 to 5.4 cm.

In ADAM, [18] 0.4 percent in the instant OSR group and 1.9 percent in the security group had AAA rupture. 4 percent of patients (8 percent of all deaths) in the monitoring group research study passed away due to burst AAA compared to 1.8 percent (4 percent of all deaths) in the early OSR group after 8 years of follow up.

Aneurysm associated death in UKSAT [17], specified as deaths due to burst AAA, secondary AAA rupture, or AAA repair work accounted for 19.3 percent vs. 15.3 percent of all deaths in the monitoring and early OSR groups respectively.

Extra analysis of the UKSAT supplied outcomes at a mean follow up period of 8 years (variety 6-- 10). In both trials around 60 percent of patients randomized to active security went through OSR at some point throughout the trial. Due to the fact that AAA accomplished established requirements; generally AAA size > 5.5 cm, the large bulk of postponed OSR were. In ADAM, AAA repair work was carried out in 93 percent of patients in the instant OSR group, 72 percent within 6 weeks after randomization. In the active monitoring group, 62 percent of patients in the security group had actually gone through AAA OSR by the end of the trial, and 9 percent were carried out regardless of the reality that individuals did not satisfy research study requirements for OSR. Rate of repair work in the monitoring group increased with the size of the aneurysm at standard. 4 years after randomization, 27 percent of AAA that had actually determined 4.0 to 4.4 cm at standard had actually OSR as compared to 81 percent of those with standard AAA 5.0 to 5.4 cm.

In UKSAT [17], 92 percent designated to early repair work had actually gone through OSR by the end of the trial and 87 percent within 5 months of randomization. Within the monitoring group, 62 percent had actually gone through repair work, (82 percent of all postponed OSR were done inning accordance with procedure). The mean time to surgery was 2.9 years. At the 8 year mean followup duration, an extra 1 percent in the early repair work group and 12 percent in the security group had AAA repair work. Treatment in between the preliminary and longer followup report did not always comply with procedure. Around among 5 patients in the monitoring group (105 of 527) passed away without going through AAA repair work.

In UKSAT [17] death within the very first 6 months of randomization was substantially greater in the early repair work group compared to patients in the monitoring group (HR of 2.52 [95 percent CI 1.20 to 5.33] and outright threat

distinction of 3 percent). The 30-day death rate was roughly 6 percent for patients who went through optional OSR and did not differ by time of repair work. After 3 years, death was greater in the security group in UKSAT however not ADAM. At the 8 year followup duration, the mean period of survival in the early OSR group was 6.7 years compared with 6.5 years for the security group. In spite of a death of 2.7 percent within 30 days of surgery or throughout hospitalization, the instant OSR group of ADAM had lower cumulative survival compared with the security and postponed OSR throughout the followup duration. Independent predictors of death consisted of greater serum creatinine level, lower weight, diagnosis of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) or diabetes, bigger AAA size, lower forced expiratory volume in one 2nd, and nonuse of a beta-blocker.

In ADAM, [18] 0.4 percent in the instant OSR group and 1.9 percent in the security group had AAA rupture. UKSAT evaluated AAA rupture and death from OSR. The latter was specified as happening within 14 days of OSR. The overall rupture rate was 1.6 percent annually in the very first 5 years of followup and 3.2 percent each year in the subsequent 3 years. 4 percent of patients (8 percent of all deaths) in the security group research study passed away due to burst AAA compared with 1.8 percent (4 percent of all deaths) in the early OSR group after 8 years of followup.

Aneurysm associated death in UKSAT [17], specified as deaths due to burst AAA, secondary AAA rupture, or AAA repair work represented 19.3 percent vs. 15.3 percent of all deaths in the monitoring and early OSR groups respectively. Death connected with aneurysm-related conditions following OSR happened in 19 patients, 15 in the monitoring group compared with 4 in the early repair work group ($p < 0.001$). Of these 19 deaths, 3 arised from secondary AAA rupture, 4 from aortoduodenal fistula, and 12 from a burst thoracic aortic aneurysm. The danger of rupture was 4 times as high amongst ladies as amongst guys. Furthermore, deadly ruptures were more typical in females than guys; leading to 14 percent of deaths for females versus 5 percent of deaths for males ($p = 0.001$). Deaths for females from any cause were comparable in the 2 treatment groups (8.4 percent versus 7.3 percent respectively; $p = 0.99$).

Complication of OSR:

AAA-related hospitalizations (besides those for the optional OSR) happened more than two times as frequently for patients going through instant OSR (44.8 percent) versus those randomized to monitoring (22.7 percent). Significant issues of OSR without any personnel death of unruptured AAA took place in 4.5 percent of instant repair work patients and 7.6 percent of patients in security who went through postponed OSR (**Table1**). More than 50 percent of patients in either group who went through OSR experienced "any issue." Rehospitalizations for problems were a little greater for early OSR versus security (20.5 percent versus 16.5 percent). Late graft failure took place in less than 0.5 percent of patients in either arm (18).

Table1: Outcomes and complications for the ADAM, an early/immediate elective repair versus surveillance of abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) randomized controlled trial [18]

Outcome	Early/Immediate Repair, n / N (%)	Surveillance Events, n / N (%)
Rupture, repair, and hospitalization outcomes		
Repair of AAA, ruptured and unruptured	527 / 569 (92.6)	349 / 567 (61.6)
Rupture of AAA	2 / 569 (<1)	11 / 567 (1.9)
Other AAA hospitalizations, no.	255	129
Complications of repair or unruptured AAA: mean followup 4.9 years		
Operative death within 30 days	11 / 526 (2.1)	6 / 340 (1.8)
Operative death within 30 days or hospitalization	14 / 526 (2.7)	7 / 340 (2.1)
Number of patients with any complication	275 / 526 (52.3)	193 / 340 (56.8)
Rehospitalization for complications	108 / 526 (20.5)	56 / 340 (16.5)
Late graft failure	2 / 526 (0.4)	1 / 340 (0.3)
Reoperation required	9 / 526 (1.7)	4 / 340 (1.2)

EVAR versus OSR which one is suitable for different Patients:

We included three trials [19,20,21] comparing EVAR with OSR randomized an overall of 1,489 patients. In the biggest of the 3 trials (21), EVAR-1, 2,068 patients were anatomically qualified for EVAR, which 52 percent offered permission and were randomized. Factors for exemption consisted of: 1) rejection of additional evaluation following preliminary screen (n= 327); 2) considered unsuited for OSR after regional physical fitness evaluation and provided EVAR-2 (n= 399); and 3) rejection to take part (n= 260).

Qualified patients needed to be prospects for either OSR or EVAR based upon aneurysm size (a minimum of 5.0 cm) and anatomy in addition to surgical danger. Over 90 percent of enrollees were male with a typical age of roughly 70 years. Mean AAA size varied from 5.4 cm in the small research study by Cuypers to 6.5 cm in EVAR-1. More than 40 percent had a history of heart disease; 10-16 percent had diabetes, and the bulk a history of tobacco usage. All research studies reported analyses comparing groups by intention-to-treat. EVAR-1 reported "per protocol" results [19,20,21].

4. CONCLUSION

AAA are connected with significant morbidity, death and health-care expenses. Patients with AAA <5.5 cm have a yearly threat of rupture of around 1 percent. For AAA <5.5 cm in size top quality RCT outcomes show that active monitoring with ultrasound and postponed OSR (if AAA obtains a size of ≥ 5.5 cm or the patient establishes aneurysm associated signs) leads to similar long-lasting survival and lifestyle, less OSR, and lower expenses than instant OSR no matter age or gender. Many formerly released research studies of OSRs of AAA done by cosmetic surgeons and healthcare facilities recommend that there is an inverted relationship in between volume and short-term death. Whether a comparable inverted relationship exists in between the volume of EVAR treatments done by physicians or medical facilities and death or other result has actually not been developed. The improperly specified relationship in between the volume of OSR and short-term death need to not be theorized to EVAR.

REFERENCES

[1] Cosford PA, Leng GC. Screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.2007:CD002945.

[2] Fleming C, Whitlock EP, Beil TL. et al. Screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm: a best-evidence systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Ann Intern Med.2005 Feb 1;142(3):203–11.

[3] Lovegrove RE, Javid M, Magee TR, et al. A meta-analysis of 21,178 patients undergoing open or endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. Br J Surg. 2008;95:677–684.

[4] Greenhalgh RM, Brown LC, Kwong GP, et al. Comparison of endovascular aneurysm repair with open repair in patients with abdominal aortic aneurysm (EVAR trial 1), 30-day operative mortality results: randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2004;364:843–848.

[5] Greenhalgh RM. Commentary: impact of EVAR and DREAM trials on clinical practice. J Endovasc Ther. 2007; 14:541–543.

[6] De Bruin JL, Baas AF, Buth J, et al. Long-term outcome of open or endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. N Engl J Med. 2010;362:1881–1889.

[7] Prinssen M, Verhoeven EL, Buth J, et al. A randomized trial comparing conventional and endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms. N Engl J Med. 2004;351:1607–1618.

[8] Upchurch GR., Jr Open versus endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair: which offers the best long-term outcome? Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med. 2005;2:562–563.

[9] Upchurch GR, Jr, Eliason JL, Rectenwald JE, et al. Endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair versus open repair: why and why not? Perspect Vasc Surg Endovasc Ther. 2009;21:48–53.

[10] Ren S, Fan X, Ye Z, et al. Long-term outcomes of endovascular repair versus open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2012;18:222–227.

[11] Brown LC, Epstein D, Manca A, et al. The UK Endovascular Aneurysm Repair (EVAR) trials: design, methodology and progress. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. 2004;27:372–381.

[12] Greenhalgh RM, Brown LC, Powell JT, et al. Endovascular repair of aortic aneurysm in patients physically ineligible for open repair. N Engl J Med. 2010;362:1872–1880.

[13] Brown LC, Greenhalgh RM, Thompson SG, et al. Does EVAR alter the rate of cardiovascular events in patients with abdominal aortic aneurysm considered unfit for open repair? Results from the randomised EVAR trial 2. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. 2010;39:396–402.

[14] Becquemin JP, Pillet JC, Lescalie F, et al. A randomized controlled trial of endovascular aneurysm repair versus open surgery for abdominal aortic aneurysms in low- to moderate- risk patients. J Vasc Surg.2011;53:1167–1173 e1.

[15] Lederle FA, Freischlag JA, Kyriakides TC, et al. Outcomes following endovascular *vs*. open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm: a randomized trial. JAMA. 2009;302:1535–1542.

[16] Meenan RT, Fleming C, Whitlock EP, et al. Cost-effectiveness analyses of population-based screening for abdominal aortic Aneurysm. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. 2005 Feb.

[17] Lederle FA, Wilson SE, Johnson GR. et al. Immediate repair compared with surveillance of small abdominal aortic aneurysms. N Engl J Med. 2002 May 9;346(19):1437–44.

[18] United Kingdom Small Aneurysm Trial Participants. Long-term outcomes of immediate repair compared with surveillance of small abdominal aortic aneurysms. N Engl J Med.2002;346(19):1445–52.

[19] Cuypers PW, Gardien M, Buth J. et al. Randomized study comparing cardiac response in endovascular and open abdominal aortic aneurysm repair. Br J Surg. 2001 Aug;88(8):1059–65.

[20] Prinssen M, Verhoeven EL, Buth J. et al. A randomized trial comparing conventional and endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms. N Engl J Med. 2004 Oct 14;351(16):1607–18.

[21] EVAR trial participants. Endovascular aneurysm repair versus open repair in patients with abdominal aortic aneurysm (EVAR trial 1): randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2005 Jun 25–Jul 1;365(9478):2179–86.