



# Background

- Current guidelines for carotid endarterectomy (CEA) based on robust but old evidence (trials 20-30 years ago)\*
- · Medical treatment has improved significantly, risk of stroke roughly halved
- Decision on CEA still largely based on degree of stenosis and symptom-status
- Plaque ulceration, patient characteristics and comorbidities might influence risk-benefit ratio of revascularisation

\*NASCET, ECST, ACST, ACAS, pooled analyses



ECST-2

# **Hypothesis**

Patients with carotid stenosis ≥50% with a low to intermediate risk of stroke will not benefit from additional carotid revascularisation when treated with optimised medical therapy (OMT)

ECST-2

- PVD - HT - Ulcerated plaque

ECST-2

# Methods

- Multicentre, randomised, controlled, prospective, open clinical trial with blinded outcome adjudication
- Randomisation (1:1 ratio): revascularisation plus OMT vs OMT alone
- Suitable patients:

  - Atherosclerotic carotid stenosis ≥50%
    Low to intermediate 5-year risk of stroke: Carotid Artery Risk (CAR)-score < 20%</li>
    Both symptomatic and asymptomatic

Protocol paper: Cheng et al, Trials 2022

Carotid Artery Risk (CAR) score • Prediction score to estimate 5-year risk of ipsilateral stroke Data originally derived from ECST and NASCET Age - Stenosis % - Type of event Risk under OMT has strongly declined since trials - Time since event - DM - MI

- Score was recalibrated for likely benefit OMT to date
- Asymptomatic stenosis = CAR ≤ 5%

Rothwell et al, Stroke 2003, Cheng et al, Trials 2022





		OMT	REVASC + OMT
N Patients		215	214
Symptomatic		86/215 (40.0%)	85/214 (39.7%)
Age (years)		72 (64 to 78), n=215	71 (65 to 77), n=214
Sex	Female	66/215 (30.7%)	67/214 (31.3%)
	Male	149/215 (69.3%)	147/214 (68.7%)
Smoking			
	Never Smoked	36/214 (16.8%)	44/214 (20.6%)
	Ex smoker	131/214 (61.2%)	132/214 (61.7%)
	Currently Smoking	47/214 (22.0%)	38/214 (17.8%)
Diabetes			
	No	151/215 (70.2%)	160/214 (74.8%)
	Yes - type I	2/215 (0.9%)	2/214 (0.9%)
	Yes - type II	62/215 (28.8%)	52/214 (24.3%)
Hypertension		163/215 (75.8%)	164/214 (76.6%)

		OMT	REVASC + OMT
N Patients		215	214
Symptomatic		86/215 (40.0%)	85/214 (39.7%)
Age (years)		72 (64 to 78), n=215	71 (65 to 77), n=214
Sex	Female	66/215 (30.7%)	67/214 (31.3%)
	Male	149/215 (69.3%)	147/214 (68.7%)
Smoking			
	Never Smoked	36/214 (16.8%)	44/214 (20.6%)
	Ex smoker	131/214 (61.2%)	132/214 (61.7%)
	Currently Smoking	47/214 (22.0%)	38/214 (17.8%)
Diabetes			
	No	151/215 (70.2%)	160/214 (74.8%)
	Yes - type I	2/215 (0.9%)	2/214 (0.9%)
	Yes - type II	62/215 (28.8%)	52/214 (24.3%)
Hypertension		163/215 (75.8%)	164/214 (76.6%)

		OMT	REVASC + OMT
N Patients		215	214
Symptomatic		86/215 (40.0%)	85/214 (39.7%)
Age (years)		72 (64 to 78), n=215	71 (65 to 77), n=214
Sex	Female	66/215 (30.7%)	67/214 (31.3%)
	Male	149/215 (69.3%)	147/214 (68.7%)
Smoking			
	Never Smoked	36/214 (16.8%)	44/214 (20.6%)
	Ex smoker	131/214 (61.2%)	132/214 (61.7%)
	Currently Smoking	47/214 (22.0%)	38/214 (17.8%)
Diabetes			
	No	151/215 (70.2%)	160/214 (74.8%)
	Yes - type I	2/215 (0.9%)	2/214 (0.9%)
	Yes - type II	62/215 (28.8%)	52/214 (24.3%)
Hypertension		163/215 (75.8%)	164/214 (76.6%)

		OMT	REVASC + OMT
N Patients		215	214
Symptomatic		86/215 (40.0%)	85/214 (39.7%)
Age (years)		72 (64 to 78), n=215	71 (65 to 77), n=214
Sex	Female	66/215 (30.7%)	67/214 (31.3%)
	Male	149/215 (69.3%)	147/214 (68.7%)
Smoking			
	Never Smoked	36/214 (16.8%)	44/214 (20.6%)
	Ex smoker	131/214 (61.2%)	132/214 (61.7%)
	Currently Smoking	47/214 (22.0%)	38/214 (17.8%)
Diabetes			
	No	151/215 (70.2%)	160/214 (74.8%)
	Yes - type I	2/215 (0.9%)	2/214 (0.9%)
	Yes - type II	62/215 (28.8%)	52/214 (24.3%)
Hypertension		163/215 (75.8%)	164/214 (76.6%)







ECST-2

Outcome	No. of events (%) at 2 years		Difference at 2 years (95% CI)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	P-value
	омт	Revasc + OMT			
Composite	21 (10.3%)	21 (10.0%)	0.3% (-5.5%, 6.1%)	0.96 (0.53, 1.76)	0.90
Procedural death	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	-	-	-
Stroke	12 (6.0%)	17 (8.1%)	-2.2% (-7.1%, 2.8%)	0.68 (0.32, 1.42)	0.30
Myocardial infarction	10 (4.9%)	5 (2.5%)	2.4% (-1.3%, 6.0%)	2.00 (0.68, 5.84)	0.21



- · Numbers very small, precluding valid conclusions
- No differences in any of the predefined subgroups
- No difference between symptomatic and asymptomatic stenosis
- If any, trend towards more effect in higher CAR score group (>10%), OMT only

ECST-2

ECST-2

### **Conclusions interim results**

- In patients with carotid stenosis ≥50% and a low to intermediate predicted risk of stroke treated with optimised medical therapy, there was no evidence of benefit at 2 years from additional carotid revascularisation
- · Complete 2-year results will include analysis of silent infarcts on MRI
- Longer clinical follow-up needed (and planned up-to 5-years)

# 



- Design and validate novel stroke risk prediction rule including MRI plaque imaging
  Individualised (high risk) patient-selection for revascularisation
- Individualised (flight fisk) patient-selection for revascularisatio
- Cost-effectiveness analysis

# <section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>

# Acknowledgements

- Participants and caregivers
- ECST-2 investigators, trial nurses, TMC, TSC, DSMB
- Funders

  - National Institute for Health and Care Research
    Swiss National Science Foundation
    The Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research
    Leeds Neurology Foundation
- ECST-2

