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What is the definition of an Uncomplicated Type B Dissection?

Complicated TBAD

- Traditionally
  1. Rupture
  2. End organ malperfusion
  3. Refractory pain
  4. Refractory HTN
  5. Rapid aortic expansion

Rest are classified ‘Uncomplicated’
Uncomplicated Type B Dissections (uTBAD)

- uTBAD represent 70% of all presentations of TBAD

- A smorgasboard of different pathologies
  - Dissection +/- IMH / penetrating ulcers
  - Different proximal and distal entry tear positions
  - Degree of thrombus
  - Size of false lumen
  - Thickness of dissection flap
  - Etc. etc.

- Which of these uTBAD are at risk?
Data sets showing risk over time for TBAD

  - 12.0% (37) failed medical therapy within 2 weeks.
  - 58.4% (174) had treatment failure over 6 years: 119 deaths (38.3%), 87 interventions (29.2%).
  - 38% of patients develop aneurysmal degeneration

What factors make these uTBAD patients more at risk?

- Genetics
  - Confirmed connective disease (Marfans / Ehlers Danlos)

- Anatomical factors

- Physiological factors

- Treatment received early in the course and onset of the disease
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Higher risk uTBAD anatomical characteristics

- Large native aortic diameter (>40mm),
- Total aortic diameter – true and false lumens >60mm
- Large size of entry tear (>10mm), large FL diameter and thickness, inner curve tear
- Partial false lumen thrombosis
- Ulcer like projections
- Progression of IMH
- Fusiform index >0.64
- Progressive enlargement of total aortic diameter or false lumen diameter
There is clear evidence that uTBAD treated without TEVAR are at risk

  - 12.0% (37) failed medical therapy within 2 weeks.
  - 58.4% (174) had treatment failure over 6 years: 119 deaths (38.3%), 87 interventions (29.2%).
  - 38% of patients develop aneurysmal degeneration

6 Year survival TEVAR vs medical mx

(Durham et al, 2015)
Randomized Investigation of Stent Grafts in Aortic Dissection Trial

INSTEAD XL 5 YEARS FOLLOW-UP¹

**Study Purpose**
Characterize long-term outcomes and vessel morphology of uncomplicated, TBAD patients treated with OMT vs OMT+TEVAR

**Study Design**
RCT
• N = 140 subjects
• 7 European Centers, 2002 – 2005

**Primary Endpoint:** All-cause mortality
**Secondary Endpoints:** Aorta-specific mortality and disease progression

The study was conducted with 1st generation of thoracic devices: Talent CoilTrack

### 5 YEAR RESULTS

¹ Nienaber et al., CIRC 2013 Aug.

**Key Takeaways**
- OMT ONLY showed significant mid and late term aneurysm related mortality
- OMT+TEVAR showed no mid or late term aortic related mortality (long term survival)
- TEVAR for aortic dissection prevents late expansion and encourages aortic remodelling

**Cumulative Clinical Results: Year 0 through Year 5**

- All-Cause Mortality p=0.13
- Aorta-Specific Mortality p=0.04
- Disease Progression p=0.04

- OMT n=68
  - 19.3% Absolute Risk Reduction
  - 11.1% 19.3% 6.9% 46.1% 27.0%

- OMT+TEVAR
“At risk” uTBAD?

• Uncomplicated TBAD is a misnomer

• All TBAD patients have long term risk and need lifelong monitoring and surveillance

• The risk for a uTBAD patient changes over time
  – all are at risk, just some are higher risk than other

• Their ongoing risk is partly dependent on their medical / surgical treatment and how effective it truly is

• We need a lot more data about TBAD
Type B acute aortic syndrome - CLarifying the need for early Endovascular Aortic Repair

The B-CLEAR Registry
Royal North Shore Hospital
Why B-CLEAR?

• Complicated acute aortic syndrome has a definitive treatment algorithm

• Uncomplicated TBAD
  – Need more data regarding natural history, physiological factors involved in outcomes and treatment related outcomes

• Is there a physiological perfusion factor that increases medium- and long-term risk that we are not detecting?

• Does subclinical renal malperfusion in ‘uncomplicated’ dissections contribute to persistent hypertension, impaired remodelling and worse morbidity / mortality outcomes?
At risk patients: who could benefit from TEVAR in uncomplicated type B dissections?

- The majority of patients with uncomplicated TBAD are at risk

- The natural history data of uTBAD treated with OMT alone suggests that these patients will have poor medium term outcomes and remain at risk

- It seems that most will do better with OMT + TEVAR rather than OMT alone

- We need to change our mindset
  - We need to be thinking for reasons why we should not be treating with TEVAR and OMT rather than looking for a reason to use TEVAR

- Part of our problem is an inadequate classification system for TBAD
Royal North Shore Hospital AP Classification System for TBAD

• **Class 1 : Benign Uncomplicated**
  - **A** No at risk anatomical or physiological parameters
    • Treat with OMT and Surveillance for 5 years
  - **B** One anatomical or one physiological risk parameter
    • Physiological risk defined as pain req. *non-opiate* analgesics or HTN needing more than a beta-blocker and 1 other agent
    • Treat with OMT + frequent & lifelong surveillance / a change in parameters is likely and may require TEVAR / Surgery

• **Class 2 : At Risk Uncomplicated (will need TEVAR / timing to be determined)**
  - **A** Patient has multiple anatomical or physiological parameters or unable to surveil
    • Physiological risk defined as pain requiring *opiate* analgesics and /or HTN needing more than a beta-blocker and 1 other agent
    • OMT + TEVAR – wait till subacute phase / Surveillance (if possible)
  - **B** Multiple risk factors esp. aortic diameter / size of entry tear / partial false lumen thrombosis / IMH / PUO
    • OMT + TEVAR after timing determined by clinical status / treatment during initial admission / Life-long Surveillance

• **Class 3 : Complicated**
  • Rupture / End organ malperfusion / Uncontrollable HTN or pain / Rapid aortic expansion
  • Immediate TEVAR / Surgery + OMT + Life-long Surveillance
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