

The Japanese SPINCAH Registry Confirms That Open Bypass are Superior to Endovascular Treatment in CLTI Patients When Ischemia and Infection are Advanced

VEITHsymposium2024

Nobuyoshi Azuma, M.D.

Dept. Vascular Surgery, Asahikawa Medical University Asahikawa, Japan.





Study Name	BASIL trial	PREVENT	CRITISCH	SPINACH	BEST CLI	BASIL II
Study Hume	Dittority trian	ш	registry	registry	beer cor	DADIE II
Country (Year)	UK (2005)	USA (2005)	Germany (2015)	JAPAN (2017)	2022	2023
Type of study	multicenter	multicenter	multicenter	multicenter	multicenter	multicenter
	RCT	RCT	registry	registry	RCT	RCT
Revascularization	Bypass vs EVT	Bypass	Bypass vs EVT	Bypass vs EVT	Bypass vs EVT	Bypass vs EVT
Subject	SLI	CLI	CLI	CLI	CLTI	CLTI with Infrapopliteal
No. Pts	452	1404	1200	548	1830	345
Comorbidities						
Diabetes	42%	64%	47%	74%	72%	69%
CAD	36%	48%	45%	45%	43%	
CVD	21%	20%	12%	12%	13%	17%
On dialysis	0%	12%	9%	53%	11%	4%
Infrapopliteal	259/	(70/	208/	Bypass 77%	Bypass 56%	100%









	5							
-Interactio	n analysis	-	Hazar Fa 0.25	d ratio wors EV 0.5	of EVT /T ← → 1	versus sur Favors sur 2	gery gery 4	Interaction effect (fold difference and 95% CI)
Rutherford:	Category 4	(n=67)	-	-	-	-	-	1.00 (Ref)
	Category 5	(n=359)						1.31 [0.54-3.16]
	Category 6	(n=94)			-+-			1.15 [0.42-3.14]
WifI:	W-0	(n=67)		-	-	_		1.00 (Ref)
	W-1/2	(n=369)						1.18 [0.49-2.85]
	W-3	(n=84)				(*)		2.33 [0.84-6.42]
WifI:	1-2	(n=85)						1.00 (Ref)
	1-3	(n=435)	_					1.31 [0.51-3.36]
WifI:	fl-0/1	(n=410)		-		\rightarrow		1.00 (Ref)
	fl-2/3	(n=110)	_		-	(*)	4	2.35 [1.29-4.27]

Classificatio	n by favorability score
for surgica	al revascularization
-Interaction analysis-	Hazard ratio of EVT versus surgery Interaction effect Favors EVT $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ Favors surgery (fold difference 0.25 0.5 1 2 4 and 95% CI)
Age: < 75 years (n=	78) 1.00 (Ref)
≥ 75 years (n=2	42) 1.04 [0.61-1.77]
Sex: Female (n=)	70)
Male (n=	50]
Ambulatory before CLI onset: (+) {n=4	00) 1.00 (Ref)
(-) (n=1	20)
History of non-adherence (-) (n=	91) 1.00 (Ref)
to CV risk management: (+) (n=	29) 0.56 [0.30-1.06]
Hemoglobin: ≥ 10 g/dl (n=	72) 1.00 (Ref)
< 10 g/dl (n=:	48) 0.66 [0.38-1.14]
Diabetes mellitus: (-) (n=	34) 1.00 (Ref)
(+) (n=	86) 0.62 [0.34-1.13]
Renal function: eGFR ≥ 30 (n=	13) 1.00 (Ref)
eGFR < 30 (n=	0) 0.57 [0.16-2.08]
on dialysis (n=	77) <u>0.55 [0.30-1.02]</u>



















i Takahara ^a , Yoshimitsu Soga ^a , Akio Kodama ^a , Hiroto Ter whalt of the SPINACH investigators	ashi* and		
Table 6. Sensitivity analysis for associations betwe	en baseline characteristics and reir	atervention risk (comp	lete case analysis)
	Interaction of EVT versus surgical reconstruction (fold difference)	Unadjusted hazard ratio for reintervention	Adjusted hazard ratio for reintervention
EVT (versus surgical reconstruction)		1.52 [1.15-2.01]*	1.83 [1.25-2.68]
Hemoglobin (per 1 g/dl) Benal function	0.96 [0.81-1.13]	0.92 [0.85-1.00]*	0.95 [0.87-1.05]
eGFR 30-60 ml/min/1.73 m2	0.59 [0.23-1.51]	1.61 [1.02-2.54]*	1.48 [0.86-2.56]
eGFR < 30 ml/min/1.73 m ² / on dialysis	0.92 [0.43-1.96]	1.94 [1.35-2.78]*	1.63 [1.06-2.52]*
Heart failure	1.06 [0.52-2.14]	1.42 [1.04-1.95]*	1.37 [0.95-1.98]
WIfI classification: Wound	0.80 [0.58-1.09]	1.01 [0.88-1.16]	N/I
WIfI classification: Ischemia	1.17 [0.43-3.15]	1.02 [0.71-1.47]	N/I
WIfI classification: Foot infection	1.16 [0.83-1.63]	1.11 [0.95-1.30]	1.26 [1.04-1.53]*
History of revascularization after CLTI onset	0.68 [0.26-1.73]	1.65 [1.05-2.57]*	2.19 [1.21-3.97]*
Bilateral CLTI	0.89 [0.42-1.87]	2.01 [1.42-2.85]*	2.01 [1.31-3.09]*
TASC II aorto-iliac classification	0.88 [0.70-1.12]	0.95 [0.85-1.07]	N/I
TASC II femoro-popliteal classification	1.04 [0.87-1.24]	0.95 [0.88-1.03]	N/I
TASC infra-popliteal classification	1.27 [0.94-1.71]	1.01 [0.87-1.17]	N/I
Pedal artery lesion	1.60 [0.66-3.83]	1.49 [1.01-2.20]*	1.41 [0.93-2.14]

mi7, Shinsuke Mii8, Kimihiro Komori1 and Nobuyo		rerasili , Daizo Kav
	shi Azuma ⁹ on behalf	of the SPINACH inv
Table 2. Associations of baseline characteristics with ambulation loss		
	Crude odds ratio	Adjusted odds ratio
Ambulatory with aid before CLI onset (vs. ambulatory without aid)		
At 3 months	2.2 [1.3 to 3.6] (P=.002)*	2.1 [0.9 to 4.6] (P=.068)
At 12 months	3.1 [1.8 to 5.3] (P<.001)*	3.1 [1.3 to 7.1] (P=.009)*
At 24 months	3.1 [1.7 to 5.5] (P<.001)*	2.9 [1.1 to 7.2] (P=.025)*
At 36 months	2.1 [1.0 to 4.2] (P=.040)*	2.2 [0.9 to 5.3] (P=.084)
Ambulatory with aid at revascularization (vs. ambulatory without aid)		
At 3 months	1.2 [0.6 to 2.3] (P=.65)	0.6 [0.2 to 1.6] (P=.34)
At 12 months	1.8 [1.0 to 3.3] (P=.045)*	0.8 [0.3 to 1.9] (P=.61)
At 24 months	1.8 [1.0 to 3.2] (P=.048)*	0.9 [0.4 to 2.2] (P=.90)
At 36 months	1.3 [0.7 to 2.6] (P=.43)	0.9 [0.4 to 2.1] (P=.82)
Wifi clinical stage 4 (vs. Wifi clinical stage 2/3)		
At 3 months	2.0 [1.3 to 3.1] (P=.003)*	2.1 [1.2 to 3.7] (P=.010)*
At 12 months	2.1 [1.4 to 3.2] (P=.001)*	2.9 [1.6 to 5.0] (P<.001)*
At 24 months	1.4 [0.9 to 2.2] (P=.15)	1.6 [0.9 to 2.8] (P=.085)
At 36 months	1.3 [0.8 to 2.1] (P=.21)	1.2 [0.7 to 1.9] (P=.54)
Surgical reconstruction (vs. EVT alone)		
At 3 months	0.9 [0.6 to 1.4] (P=.65)	0.9 [0.5 to 1.5] (P=.59)
At 12 months	0.7 [0.4 to 1.0] (P=.067)	0.6 [0.3 to 1.0] (P=.038)*
At 24 months	0.5 [0.3 to 0.8] (P=.007)*	0.5 [0.3 to 0.8] (P=.006)*
At 36 months	0.8 [0.5 to 1.4] (P=.42)	0.810.5 to 1.4 (P=.46)





	Take Home Message
>	SPINACH study tried to find out patient model suitable for surgical revascularization and also patient model suitable for EVT.
>	SPINACH study showed superiority of bypass surgery over EVT in CLTI patients with advanced ischemic wounds with/without advanced infection.
>	Surgical reconstruction was superior to the EVT in terms of the following outcome measures: initial success rate, ulcer healing, low reintervention rate, and ambulatory function a

revascularization.

