

VEITH
 Tuesday - Saturday, November 19-23, 2024
 Virtual Endovascular and Thoracic Section

Comparison Of The Cook t-Branch OTS Endograft Device With The E-nside (Artivion) Multibranched Device For Juxta- And Pararenal AAAs And TAAAs: Advantages And Limitations Of Each

Symposium Chairman: **David S. Greiner, MD**
 Executive Co-Chairman: **Ernesto Sforzini, MD**
 Symposium Co-Chairman: **Christopher D'Amico, MD, MBA** and **Steven P. Lyden, MD**

Cleveland Clinic
 Hillion

M Orrico, MD
 San Camillo-Forlanini Hospital,
 Rome

Editor's Choice Outcomes of Off the Shelf Outer Branched Versus Inner Branched Endografts in the Treatment of Thoraco-Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm in the B.R.I.O. (Branched Inner – Outer) Study Group

Michael Piazza et al. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg (2024) 48, 30–39

Outcomes of off-the-shelf preloaded inner branch device for urgent endovascular thoraco-abdominal aortic repair in the Italian Branched Registry of E-nside Endograft

Michael Piazza MD*, Gianluigi Sforzini MD*, Michela Di Gregorio MD*, Giuseppe Frattini MD*, Emanuele Galati MD*, Matteo Ortolini MD*, Rocco Guadice MD, and Michele Antonello MD PhD* on behalf of the INBESSE Investigators. *Endovasc Technol Interv*. 2024;18(1):1-10

Urgent and emergent repair of complex aortic aneurysms using an off-the-shelf branched device

03388/Corr/2023/0749

Outcome	Overall	Inner 1st BVA		Inner 2nd BVA		Inner 3rd BVA	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
30-day mortality	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)
30-day morbidity	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)
30-day mortality + morbidity	24 (24%)	24 (24%)	24 (24%)	24 (24%)	24 (24%)	24 (24%)	24 (24%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention	30 (30%)	30 (30%)	30 (30%)	30 (30%)	30 (30%)	30 (30%)	30 (30%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization	36 (36%)	36 (36%)	36 (36%)	36 (36%)	36 (36%)	36 (36%)	36 (36%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	42 (42%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention	48 (48%)	48 (48%)	48 (48%)	48 (48%)	48 (48%)	48 (48%)	48 (48%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization	54 (54%)	54 (54%)	54 (54%)	54 (54%)	54 (54%)	54 (54%)	54 (54%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation	60 (60%)	60 (60%)	60 (60%)	60 (60%)	60 (60%)	60 (60%)	60 (60%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization	66 (66%)	66 (66%)	66 (66%)	66 (66%)	66 (66%)	66 (66%)	66 (66%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation	72 (72%)	72 (72%)	72 (72%)	72 (72%)	72 (72%)	72 (72%)	72 (72%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization	78 (78%)	78 (78%)	78 (78%)	78 (78%)	78 (78%)	78 (78%)	78 (78%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation	84 (84%)	84 (84%)	84 (84%)	84 (84%)	84 (84%)	84 (84%)	84 (84%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization	90 (90%)	90 (90%)	90 (90%)	90 (90%)	90 (90%)	90 (90%)	90 (90%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation	96 (96%)	96 (96%)	96 (96%)	96 (96%)	96 (96%)	96 (96%)	96 (96%)
30-day mortality + morbidity + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-intervention + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization + re-operation + re-hospitalization	102 (102%)	102 (102%)	102 (102%)	102 (102%)	102 (102%)	102 (102%)	102 (102%)

t-Branch	E-nside
Advantages	Advantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer Follow Up Outer Branches → support in large aortas Precision in Release Trackability of delivery system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different Prox/Dist Diameters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less prox coverage Land in abdominal aorta Preloaded inner branches + partial release allow to exit the graft in narrow aortas Inner Branches → FEVAR-like release
Limitations	Limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One measure available for Proximal Landing (34 mm) Outer branches → needs at least 1/1.5 cm distance from the Target Vessel Almost always needs bifurcated body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OL with bifurcated body can be insufficient in tortuous Abdominal Aortas Jump in release No active fixation

t-Branch VS **E-nside**

Agenda

#1 Branches technology

#2 Main graft Characteristics

#3 Delivery System and release mechanism

t-Branch VS **E-nside**

#1 Branches technology

OUTER BRANCHES VS INNER BRANCHES (preloaded)

Hostile Aortic renovisceral anatomy/contraindicating FEVAR

E-nside inner branch release @ level of Target Vessel

Hostile aortic renovisceral anatomy/contraindicating FEVAR

PAA repair with **t-branch** → hostile angle of pararenal aorta

Hostile Aortic renovisceral anatomy/contraindicating FEVAR

t-branch → Catheterization of Right Renal Artery from Below and balloon assisted delivery

t-Branch & **E-nside**

#2 Main graft Characteristics

Urgent/Emergent J-PAAAs

10 cm PAA repair with **t-branch** → shrinkage @ 3 months

3 Months CTA

10 cm TIVTAAA repair with **E-nside**

Impending rupture of JAAA excluded with E-nside

Aortic Diameter @ Proximal Landing 35 mm → 38 mm graft with less thoracic Coverage

Catalog Number	Proximal @ (cm)	Distal @ (cm)	Distal @ (cm)
ESMA133021-488816-00	33	24	28
ESMA133022-488816-00	33	24	26
ESMA133023-488816-00	38	24	28
ESMA133024-488816-00	38	24	26

E-nside aortic repair with landing in distal abdominal aorta

Catalog Number	Proximal @ (cm)	Distal @ (cm)	Distal @ (cm)
ESMA133021-488816-00	33	24	28
ESMA133022-488816-00	33	24	26
ESMA133023-488816-00	38	24	28
ESMA133024-488816-00	38	24	26

E-nside Lack of Active Fixation

t-branch hooks

TAAA
↓
OS/OL

Urgent/Emergent J-PAAs

E-nside overlapping with bifurcated body → insufficient in tortuosities

t-Branch & **E-nside**

3 Delivery System and release mechanism

Editor's Choice – Outcomes of Off the Shelf Outer Branched Versus Inner Branched Endografts in the Treatment of Thoraco-Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm in the B.R.I.O. (Branched Inner – Outer) Study Group

Mikael Prazin et al. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2020; 46, 50-58

E-nside
The graft design and step by step operative technique have been described previously.^{15,17} The device is a nitinol inner branched endograft with a 24 Fr outer diameter delivery system, available in four different sizes (proximal diameter 38/33 mm; distal diameter 30/26 mm). All inner branches are pre-cannulated with a polyimide tube that can be loaded with a 0.018" wire from the handle system and snared from above the top of the graft using an upper limb or contralateral femoral approach. According to the manufacturer's instructions for use, the device should land on a thoracic endograft, but in clinical practice it has also been safely used without TEVAR.¹⁵ Potential advantages are conformability to different aortic diameters, easy cannulation of the pre-loaded branches, and adaptation to a narrow aortic diameter.

t-Branch
The t-Branch is a stainless steel graft with a single version (34 mm proximal diameter, 18 mm distal diameter, and four outer branches), in a 22 Fr internal (24 Fr external) delivery system. The endovascular procedure is intended to be completed by distal deployment of a bifurcated Zenith Universal Distal Body Endovascular Graft (UniBody, Cook Medical) landing in the iliac arteries. The potential advantages are easier advancement in challenging iliac access and a traditional pull back deployment mechanism.

Previous distal surgical repair

t-branch for evolution after surgical aortic repair

No short Custom Grafts with Inverted Limb

Late failure of a Zenith endoprosthesis treated with the t-Branch off the shelf branched distal graft

Antonio Lumbra, MD, Marco Ortolano, MD, Marco Marini, MD, Alessio Vitale, MD, Simona Bonifazi, MD, PhD, and Marco Montagnuolo, MD, Rome, Italy

Fig 3. Postoperative three-dimensional volume rendered image showing the correct chronic position with the t-branch. Iliac axis patency and aneurysm exclusion.

Conclusions

- t-branch and E-nside are **both valuable options** also in J-PAAAs
- **Knowledge and experience** with both devices allow to address each particular TAAA/J-PAAAs to the **best treatment choice**
- In **emergent J-PAAAs** multibranched devices should be considered
- Some **anatomical conditions** like an angulated paravisceral aorta/hostile target vessel take off could be **better treated** with **multibranched devices** rather than **challenging FEVAR**
- **SCI is a major concern** when treating J-PAAAs with a multibranched device
- **Hindrance between components** may result in **anti-anatomical result** after J-PAAAs multibranch repair with **issues** in the long run