Long-term Outcomes of Conservative Treatment and Endovascular Treatment in Patients with Symptomatic Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection: A Single-center Experience

Leyin Xu

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Daming Zhang

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Chenyang Qiu

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Jingjing Wang

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Kang Li

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Lijing Fang

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Xin Zhang

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Jinsong Lei

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Zhichao Lai

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Jiangyu Ma

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Yanying Yu

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Xiaoxi Yu

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Fenghe Du

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Wanting Qi

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Junye Chen

Peking Union Medical College Hospital

Bao Liu (✉ liubao72@aliyun.com)

Peking Union Medical College Hospital <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6359-959X>

Research article

Keywords: Isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection, Conservative treatment, Endovascular treatment, Treatment outcome, Long-term follow-up.

Posted Date: November 18th, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.17427/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection (SISMAD) is a rare vascular disorder and the treatment strategies remain controversial. This study aimed to compare outcomes of conservative and endovascular treatments in symptomatic patients with SISMAD.

Methods: Forty-two consecutive SISMAD patients between October 2009 and May 2018 in a single center were enrolled in the study. Based on their symptoms, 15 had conservative treatment and 27 had endovascular treatment. The baseline characteristics, treatments, and follow-up results of the conservative group and endovascular group were analyzed.

Results: The rate of symptom relief was 93.3% in the conservative group and 96.3% in the endovascular group, respectively. The procedure-related complications in the endovascular group included one case of pseudoaneurysm formation in the left brachial artery. During the follow-up period (median 28.5 months), a higher proportion of patients in the conservative group had symptom recurrence (42.9% in the conservative group versus 4.8% in the endovascular group, $p < 0.001$). Four patients in the conservative group and one patient in the endovascular group had additional endovascular intervention during follow-up. Compared with the conservative group, patients in the endovascular group had statistically significantly longer symptom-free survival ($p = 0.014$) and a higher rate of superior mesenteric artery (SMA) remodeling ($p < 0.001$).

Conclusions: For symptomatic SISMAD, endovascularly treated patients had a lower rate of symptom recurrence and a higher rate of SMA remodeling in the long term. Endovascular treatment should be considered as the first-line treatment of SISMAD.

Background

Spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection (SISMAD) is a rare vascular disorder. First reported in a case series by Bauersfeld in 1947,⁽¹⁾ it is increasingly recognized by the imaging techniques. Conservative treatment, endovascular treatment, and open surgical repair are the main treatment strategies. As recommended by the European Society of Vascular Surgery (ESVS) guidelines, conservative treatment is the first-line therapy for symptomatic patients.⁽²⁾ However, conservative treatment as initial treatment had unsatisfactory results in some symptomatic patients. Garrett reported that the failure rate of initial conservative treatment was about 16% in the symptomatic SISMAD patients, and some severe complications occurred.⁽³⁾ During the follow-up period, 20% of the patients with initial conservative treatment ultimately underwent endovascular treatment.⁽²⁾ Follow-up imaging showed only 25% of the patients with conservative treatment achieved complete remodeling, and 12% had morphological progression.⁽⁴⁾ Conservatively treated patients might be at risk of symptom recurrence and disease progression in the long term.

The effectiveness and safety of endovascular treatment have been proved by previous studies.^(5–7) During mid-term follow-up, endovascular treatment were associated with a high primary stent patency rate and a low cumulative event free survival rate.⁽⁸⁾ According to the ESVS guidelines, endovascular treatment could be indicated when patients are not responding to conservative treatment or with suspicion of bowel ischemia.⁽²⁾ However, due to its minimal invasiveness and favorable outcomes in the long term, endovascular treatment might be the first-line treatment as well and further studies are needed.

The long-term outcomes of conservative treatment and endovascular treatment in symptomatic SISMAD patients remain to be compared. In this study, we summarize our experience of both treatments, with the goal of determining the optimal treatment strategy.

Methods

Study Population

This study retrospectively analyzed the data from 42 consecutive SISMAD patients between October 2009 and May 2018 in the study hospital. The diagnoses of SISMAD were based on compute tomography angiography (CTA) or magnetic resonance angiography. Patients were excluded if they 1) were asymptomatic; 2) had aortic dissection, systemic vasculitis, or other autoimmune diseases; or 3) were treated with open surgery.

Patients were divided into a conservative group (15) and endovascular group (27) according to their first treatment in the study hospital. Information including baseline characteristics, treatments, and outcomes was collected from the medical records. Yun's classifications were used for describing the features of dissections (Type I: dissections with patent true lumen and false lumen and revealing both entry and re-entry sites; Type IIa: dissections with patent true lumen but no re-entry site in the false lumen; Type IIb: dissections with patent true lumen and thrombosed false lumen; Type III: dissections with completely occluded superior mesenteric artery (SMA)).⁽⁹⁾ All radiographic findings were based on CTA or digital subtraction angiography.

Treatment strategies

The treatment algorithm was based on the clinical features of each patient. If a patient had a history of symptom recurrence after conservative treatment, a ruptured dissecting aneurysm, or he or she was in suspicion of intestinal ischemia, endovascular treatment was indicated. Other

patients had medical treatment only. If a patient had persistent symptoms or signs after at least 7 days of conservative treatment, endovascular intervention was considered.

Conservative treatment included strict blood pressure control, bowel rest, antiplatelet therapy, and anticoagulation therapy. Fasting was used for patients with severe symptoms or signs, and diets were resumed as soon as the symptoms and signs disappeared. The antiplatelet therapy regimen included aspirin, clopidogrel, or both, and the course was 3 to 6 months. Anticoagulation medications, including warfarin, low-molecular-weight heparin, or rivaroxaban, were used when thrombus existed.

Stent placement (usage of bare metal stents) was the main method of endovascular intervention. The use of a single stent or overlapping stents was depended on the lengths of the lesions. Balloon angioplasty was used for the lesions with severely stenosed or completely occluded true lumens. Patients with successful intervention took 100 mg of aspirin per day for at least 6 months.

Follow-up

Patients were required to attend outpatient clinic visits at 3 months, 6 months, 1 year, and annually thereafter. Both clinical and radiographic evaluations were applied. CTA and Doppler ultrasonography were the main methods used to assess the lesions. Complete remodeling was defined as the complete disappearance of the dissection in the SMA, without arterial stenosis or thrombus. For patients with recurrent symptoms, laboratory and radiographic examinations could help identify the causes. When other causes were excluded, revascularization was considered in these patients if they had severe stenosis or occlusion in the SMA.

Statistics

Student's *t* test, Wilcoxon rank sum test, and Fisher exact test were used to compare the results of the study population. Kaplan-Meier analysis was performed to estimate the event-free survival rate, and a log rank test was applied to compare the two groups. The appearance of any symptoms related to SISMD (relapsing abdominal pain and other abdominal discomfort) was defined as an event. A *p* value <.05 was considered to be statistically significant in all analyses. Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics software, version 22.

Results

Clinical characteristics

Baseline characteristics, including age, sex, comorbidities, clinical manifestations, and laboratory and radiographic results, are summarized in Table 1. The mean age of the patients was 52.3 ± 7.3 years, and only two patients (1 in the conservative group and 1 in the endovascular group) were women. Comorbidities included hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and hyperlipidemia, and smoking had a high prevalence (16/42, 38.1%) in the patients. Abdominal pain was the chief complaint of 38 (90.5%) patients. Intestinal obstruction occurred in 4 patients, and all these patients underwent endovascular treatment. Most patients showed normal results in white blood cell count, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein, and erythrocyte sedimentation rate. However, hyperhomocysteinemia was common in these symptomatic SISMD patients. There were no statistically significant differences in any of these characteristics between the two groups.

The radiographic findings of both groups were compared. Severe stenosis or complete occlusion in the true lumens were common in the patients. Most of the dissections were located closed to the SMA ostium, and the mean distance was 19.3 ± 12.2 mm. The mean lengths of the dissections were similar between the two groups. Dissection aneurysms (at least 1.5 times larger than the normal SMA) and branch involvement were frequently observed. Because of the high prevalence of thrombus, Yun's type IIb (19, 45.2%) was the most common type.

Treatments and outcomes

Treatments and outcomes in both groups are summarized in Table 2. Medical treatment including blood pressure control, bowel rest, anticoagulation therapy, and antiplatelet therapy were indicated in both groups. Of the patients in the conservative group, 93.3% (14/15) experienced symptom relief. Only one patient had no improvement in symptoms after 7 days of treatment, and he received endovascular treatment later.

The technical success rate in the endovascular group was 85.7% (23/27). The procedure failed in four patients because the guide wires could not enter the completely thrombosed true lumens (details were summarized in Table 3). These four patients had medical treatment later as they were not in suspicion of bowel ischemia. The 23 patients with successful intervention were deployed 37 bare metal stents in total, 19 of whom had a single stent and 8 had overlapping stents. Seven patients had balloon angioplasty. Only one patient had abdominal pain 2 days after the intervention. However, the pain continued, and the cause was unclear after all examinations. There was only one case of a procedure-related complication: one patient had pseudoaneurysm formation in the left brachial artery. The patient had a second surgery for repair.

Follow-up

There was a loss of contact in four patients in the follow-up period. Of the 38 patients with successful follow-up, the median time was 28.5 (15.5–48.0) months (Table 2). Six (42.9%) of the patients in the conservative group had recurrent symptoms. Symptoms included abdominal pain, diarrhea, and abdominal discomfort. Four of these symptomatic patients had endovascular intervention within less than 2 months after discharge, and all of them did not have any symptom recurrence after the interventions.

Among the patients who had a successful endovascular procedure, only 1 patient had recurrent symptoms during follow-up. He had a second endovascular intervention because severe in-stent restenosis was observed. One patient in the endovascular group died owing to an unrelated reason. The symptom-free survival rates of both groups are shown in Figure 1. The endovascular group had a significantly longer time of symptom-free survival ($p = 0.014$). The 1-year event free survival percentages were 64.3% in the conservative group and 95.0% in the endovascular group.

Eleven patients in the conservative group and 18 patients in the endovascular group had radiographic examinations during the follow-up period. Figure 2 shows two cases from the different groups. In the conservative group, complete remodeling appeared in only one patient. However, among the patients with successful stent placement, 86.7% (13/15) had complete remodeling in the SMA, which was significantly higher than the conservative group ($p < .001$).

Of the four patients who failed in the endovascular treatment, none had additional invasive treatment during follow-up. Two of them had symptom recurrence and two had morphological progression (Table 3). Because there was no evidence of bowel ischemia, they continued the medical treatment under close surveillance.

Discussion

In this retrospective single-center study, we summarized the outcomes of conservative treatment and endovascular treatment in symptomatic SISMAD patients. Both treatments were effective in symptom resolution. However, patients in the conservative group had significantly higher rate of symptom recurrence in the long term. In addition, some of these patients had endovascular treatment during follow-up. Endovascular treatment showed favorable outcomes, both in the perioperative and follow-up period. Endovascular treatment should be considered as the first-line therapy in symptomatic SISMAD patients.

With the development of imaging techniques, SISMAD is increasingly be recognized. Most patients are middle-aged men, and hypertension is the most common comorbidity.(4) In addition, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, and smoking history are the common conditions. We observed that 60% of our patients had hyperhomocysteinemia, which might be another risk factor of SISMAD. Thus, SISMAD patients need some examinations to confirm if they are combined with other vascular diseases.

Radiographic results are associated with the severity of SISMAD to some extent. Symptomatic patients were longer in the length of dissections, and shorter in the diameter of true lumens.(10) Currently, Sakamoto's and Yun's classifications are proposed to assess SISMAD(9, 11). Yun's classification(9) mainly focus on the patency of SMA, both true lumen and false lumen are included. Studies have shown that Yun's type IIb makes up about half of SISMAD patients,(4) which is the most common type. In addition, stenosis or occlusion in the true lumen, dissection aneurysm, and branch involvement were frequently observed in our patients. These radiographic features could provide guidance on the treatment strategy, which should be further studied.

Initial conservative treatment is safe for asymptomatic SISMAD patients.(4) In symptomatic patients, although it is an effective way to relieve symptoms(10, 12–14), the outcomes is not satisfactory in the long term. About 12.3% to 18.1% of the initial conservatively treated patients had additional treatments (endovascular treatment or open surgery).(15–17) Follow-up radiography also suggests that conservative treatment alone may not be able to cure the disease. As Wang reported, only 25% of the SMAD patients had complete remodeling during follow-up, and 12% had morphologic progression.(4) In our experience, 42.9% of the patients in the conservative group had symptom recurrence during follow-up, and 28.6% had additional endovascular treatment. Therefore, close surveillance was necessary for these patients.

Due to the high rate of symptom recurrence in the conservative group, more evidence is needed to identify the high-risk patients. According to our experience, severe true lumen stenosis or occlusion might be an important risk factor. 66.6%(6/9) of the patients in the conservative group who had severe true lumen stenosis or occlusion had symptom recurrence during follow-up; however, none of the other 5 patients had symptom recurrence ($p = 0.031$). Li and Qiu proposed their modified classifications where dissections with severe true lumen stenosis or occlusion were classified into different subtypes.(8, 18) Severe true lumen stenosis was considered as an important indication of endovascular intervention in some studies.(5, 19, 20) However, there are no robust data about the associations between the radiographic results and prognosis, which remain to be further investigated.

The indications of endovascular treatment include persistent pain, aneurysm progression, and suspicion of bowel ischemia.(4, 14, 21, 22) In our center, endovascular treatment was also indicated in patients who had symptom recurrence after conservative treatment. Endovascular treatment was both safe and effective. Procedure-related complications have been rarely reported in the literature.(23–25) After the intervention, symptoms disappeared in most patients, even in those with extremely severe symptoms.

Endovascular intervention in SISMAAD patients had a relatively high rate of technical success.(18, 26, 27) There were four cases of technical failure, and all of them were associated with the failure of true lumen cannulation. In accordance with the previous studies(24), severe true lumen stenosis or complete occlusion might be the most common reason for technical failure. In the long term, these patients would be at high risk of symptom recurrence, and open bypass surgery might be the next step.(2)

The long-term outcomes of endovascular treatment were reported in several studies in the literature.(6, 24, 28) Long-term complications included stent stenosis, stent occlusion, stent thrombosis.(6, 7, 24) Endothelial injury, neointimal hyperplasia, and chronic inflammation could be the causes.(29, 30) However, the incidence was relatively low and only 2.1% of the endovascularly treated patients had a secondary intervention.(4) In our experience, only one patient had in-stent restenosis and had stent implantation for the second time. None of the remaining 20 patients with successful stenting had recurrent symptoms. These results showed the good prognosis of endovascularly treated patients.

The symptom-free survival of the two groups was significantly different (Figure 1, $p = 0.014$). Although both treatments had a high rate of symptom relief, conservatively treated patients were more likely to have recurrent symptoms during follow-up. Furthermore, patients in the endovascular group had a higher rate of SMA remodeling ($p < 0.001$). These results suggest that endovascularly treated had better outcomes in the long term, and endovascular treatment might be the first-line treatment for symptomatic SISMAAD patients as well.

The limitations of this study are as follows. 1) It was a retrospective study, and all data were collected from a single center. 2) Some patients did not have any imaging examinations during follow-up. 3) The potential associations between the radiographic findings and prognosis were not analysed. Further studies are needed.

Conclusions

To conclude, both conservative treatment and endovascular treatment can effectively relieve the symptoms of SISMAAD patients in the short-term. In the long term, compared with conservative treatment, endovascular treatment had a lower rate of symptom recurrence and a higher rate of complete remodeling. Endovascular treatment should be considered as the first-line treatment in symptomatic patients.

Abbreviations

SISMAAD: spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection;

ESVS: European Society of Vascular Surgery;

CTA: compute tomography angiography;

SMA: superior mesenteric artery.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Peking Union Medical College Hospital. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data and material: The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are all included in the article.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: This study was supported by Beijing Municipal Science and Technology Commission (No. Z161100000516093), who helped with data collection.

Authors' contributions: All authors contributed significantly to this work; all authors revised the manuscript and gave final approval of the manuscript to be submitted. LYX, DMZ, and BL designed the study, JJW, KL, LJF, XZ, JSL, ZCL, JYM, YYY, XXY, FHD, WTQ analyzed and interpreted the data, LYX, DMZ and BL drafted the article.

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

References

1.Bauersfeld SR. Dissecting aneurysm of the aorta; a presentation of 15 cases and a review of the recent literature. *Ann Intern Med.* 1947;26(6):873–89.

2. Björck M, Koelemay M, Acosta S, Bastos Goncalves F, Kolbel T, Kolkman JJ, et al. Editor's Choice - Management of the Diseases of Mesenteric Arteries and Veins: Clinical Practice Guidelines of the European Society of Vascular Surgery (ESVS). *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2017;53(4):460–510.
3. Garrett HE, Jr. Options for treatment of spontaneous mesenteric artery dissection. *J Vasc Surg.* 2014;59(5):1433–9.e1–2.
4. Wang J, He Y, Zhao J, Yuan D, Xu H, Ma Y, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of current evidence in spontaneous isolated celiac and superior mesenteric artery dissection. *J Vasc Surg.* 2018.
5. Jia ZZ, Zhao JW, Tian F, Li SQ, Wang K, Wang Y, et al. Initial and middle-term results of treatment for symptomatic spontaneous isolated dissection of superior mesenteric artery. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2013;45(5):502–8.
6. Kim J, Yoon CJ, Seong N, Lee H, Kim YJ. Spontaneous Dissection of Superior Mesenteric Artery: Long-Term Outcome of Stent Placement. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* 2017;28(12):1722–6.
7. Wen D, Wang Z, Yu J, Zhang W, Yang X, He H, et al. Endovascular Stent-Graft Repair of Spontaneous Isolated Dissection of the Superior Mesenteric Artery. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol.* 2018;41(5):692–8.
8. Qiu C, He Y, Li D, Shang T, Wang X, Wu Z, et al. Mid-Term Results of Endovascular Treatment for Spontaneous Isolated Dissection of the Superior Mesenteric Artery. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2019.
9. Yun WS, Kim YW, Park KB, Cho SK, Do YS, Lee KB, et al. Clinical and angiographic follow-up of spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2009;37(5):572–7.
10. Zhang X, Xiang P, Yang Y, Chen J, Guan J, Liu M, et al. Correlation Between Computed Tomography Features and Clinical Presentation and Management of Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2018;56(6):911–7.
11. Sakamoto I, Ogawa Y, Sueyoshi E, Fukui K, Murakami T, Uetani M. Imaging appearances and management of isolated spontaneous dissection of the superior mesenteric artery. *European journal of radiology.* 2007;64(1):103–10.
12. Tomita K, Obara H, Sekimoto Y, Matsubara K, Watada S, Fujimura N, et al. Evolution of Computed Tomographic Characteristics of Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection During Conservative Management. *Circ J.* 2016;80(6):1452–9.
13. Heo SH, Kim YW, Woo SY, Park YJ, Park KB, Kim DK. Treatment strategy based on the natural course for patients with spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection. *J Vasc Surg.* 2017;65(4):1142–51.
14. Kim H, Park H, Park SJ, Park BW, Hwang JC, Seo YW, et al. Outcomes of Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection Without Antithrombotic Use. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2018;55(1):132–7.
15. Kimura Y, Kato T, Inoko M. Outcomes of Treatment Strategies for Isolated Spontaneous Dissection of the Superior Mesenteric Artery: A Systematic Review. *Annals of Vascular Surgery.* 2018;47:284–90.
16. Zhu Y, Peng Y, Xu M, Wei Y, Wu S, Guo W, et al. Treatment Strategies and Outcomes of Symptomatic Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of endovascular therapy: an official journal of the International Society of Endovascular Specialists.* 2018;25(5):640–8.
17. Karaolanis G, Antonopoulos C, Tsilimigras DI, Moris D, Moulakakis K. Spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vascular.* 2019;1708538118818625.
18. Li DL, He YY, Alkalei AM, Chen XD, Jin W, Li M, et al. Management strategy for spontaneous isolated dissection of the superior mesenteric artery based on morphologic classification. *J Vasc Surg.* 2014;59(1):165–72.
19. Cho BS, Lee MS, Lee MK, Choi YJ, Kim CN, Kang YJ, et al. Treatment guidelines for isolated dissection of the superior mesenteric artery based on follow-up CT findings. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2011;41(6):780–5.
20. Min SI, Yoon KC, Min SK, Ahn SH, Jae HJ, Chung JW, et al. Current strategy for the treatment of symptomatic spontaneous isolated dissection of superior mesenteric artery. *J Vasc Surg.* 2011;54(2):461–6.
21. Loeffler JW, Obara H, Fujimura N, Bove P, Newton DH, Zettervall SL, et al. Medical therapy and intervention do not improve uncomplicated isolated mesenteric artery dissection outcomes over observation alone. *J Vasc Surg.* 2017;66(1):202–8.

22.Kimura Y, Kato T, Nagao K, Izumi T, Haruna T, Ueyama K, et al. Outcomes and Radiographic Findings of Isolated Spontaneous Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2017;53(2):276–81.

23.Jia Z, Su H, Chen W, Ni G, Qi C, Gu J. Endovascular Treatment of Patients with Isolated Mesenteric Artery Dissection Aneurysm: Bare Stents Alone Versus Stent Assisted Coiling. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2018.

24.Dong Z, Ning J, Fu W, Guo D, Xu X, Chen B, et al. Failures and Lessons in the Endovascular Treatment of Symptomatic Isolated Dissection of the Superior Mesenteric Artery. *Ann Vasc Surg.* 2016;31:152–62.

25.Pang P, Jiang Z, Huang M, Zhou B, Zhu K, Shan H. Value of endovascular stent placement for symptomatic spontaneous isolated superior mesenteric artery dissection. *European journal of radiology.* 2013;82(3):490–6.

26.Luan JY, Li X. Computed tomography imaging features and classification of isolated dissection of the superior mesenteric artery. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2013;46(2):232–5.

27.Li N, Lu QS, Zhou J, Bao JM, Zhao ZQ, Jing ZP. Endovascular stent placement for treatment of spontaneous isolated dissection of the superior mesenteric artery. *Ann Vasc Surg.* 2014;28(2):445–51.

28.Dong Z, Fu W, Chen B, Guo D, Xu X, Wang Y. Treatment of symptomatic isolated dissection of superior mesenteric artery. *J Vasc Surg.* 2013;57(2 Suppl):69s–76s.

29.Scott RA, Panitch A. Macromolecular approaches to prevent thrombosis and intimal hyperplasia following percutaneous coronary intervention. *Biomacromolecules.* 2014;15(8):2825–32.

30.Brancati MF, Burzotta F, Trani C, Leonzi O, Cuccia C, Crea F. Coronary stents and vascular response to implantation: literature review. Pragmatic and observational research. 2017;8:137–48.

Tables

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients with SISMAAD.

	Total (N = 42)	Conservative group (n = 15)	Endovascular group (n = 27)	p value
Age, mean±SD, years	52.3±7.3	51.4±6.6	52.8±7.7	0.563
Men, n (%)	40 (95.2)	14 (93.3)	26 (96.3)	1.000
Comorbidities, n (%)				
Hypertension	23 (54.8)	10 (66.7)	13 (48.1)	0.337
Diabetes mellitus	6 (14.3)	2 (13.3)	4 (14.8)	1.000
Hyperlipidemia	19 (45.2)	7 (46.7)	12 (44.4)	1.000
Smoking	16 (38.1)	5 (33.3)	11 (40.7)	0.746
Clinical manifestations, n (%)				
Abdominal pain	38 (90.5)	14 (93.3)	24 (88.9)	1.000
Nausea and vomiting	11 (26.2)	5 (33.3)	6 (22.2)	0.481
Diarrhea	2 (4.8)	1 (6.7)	1 (3.7)	1.000
Abdominal distention	7 (16.7)	1 (6.7)	6 (22.2)	0.390
Hematochezia	3 (7.1)	1 (6.7)	2 (7.4)	1.000
Intestinal obstruction	4 (9.5)	0	4 (14.8)	0.279
Laboratory findings				
WBC, mean±SD, 10 ⁹ /L	6.4±2.3	6.2±1.6	6.6±2.7	0.579
hsCRP, median(IQR), mg/L	1.17 (0.48, 6.72)	0.69 (0.48, 8.47)	1.17 (0.47, 6.41)	0.983
ESR, median(IQR), mm/h	11.0 (2.5, 21.0)	8.0 (2.0, 12.0)	12.5 (5.8, 22.25)	0.525
HCY >15 µmol/L, n (%)	12 (60.0)	6 (75.0)	6 (50.0)	0.373
Radiographic findings				
True lumen stenosis (>70%), n (%)	17 (40.5)	6 (40.0)	11 (40.7)	1.000
Occlusion in the true lumen, n (%)	9 (21.4)	3(20.0)	6(22.2)	1.000
The distance from the SMA ostium to the beginning of the dissection, mean±SD, mm	19.3±12.2	14.0±6.3	21.2±13.2	0.184
Length of the dissection, mean±SD, mm	43.0±21.1	42.6±19.3	43.2±22.2	0.948
Dissection aneurysm, n (%)	26 (60.5)	10 (66.7)	15 (55.6)	0.531
Branch involvement, n (%)	24 (57.1)	5 (33.3)	19 (70.4)	0.027
Yun's classification I, n (%)	1 (2.4)	0 (0)	1 (3.7)	
Yun's classification IIa, n (%)	15 (35.7)	5 (33.3)	10 (37.0)	
Yun's classification IIb, n (%)	19 (45.2)	7 (46.7)	12 (44.4)	
Yun's classification III, n (%)	7 (16.7)	3 (20.0)	4 (14.8)	

WBC: white blood cell; hsCRP: high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; ESR: erythrocyte sedimentation rate; HCY: homocysteine; IQR: interquartile range.

Table 2. Summary of treatments and outcomes in symptomatic SISMD patients.

	Conservative group (n = 15)	Endovascular group (n = 27)	p value
Median hospital stay (IQR), days	9 (3, 15)	9 (7, 11)	0.813
Blood pressure control, n (%)	10 (66.7)	13 (48.1)	0.337
Bowel rest, n (%)	8 (53.3)	18 (66.7)	0.511
Median fasting time (IQR), days	1 (0, 6)	1 (0, 5)	0.818
Anticoagulation therapy, n (%)	9 (60.0)	20 (74.1)	0.488
Antiplatelet therapy, n (%)	9 (60.0)	23 (85.2)	0.128
Technical success, n (%)	NA	23 (85.2)	/
Stent placement, n (%)	NA	23 (85.2)	/
Balloon angioplasty, n (%)	NA	7 (25.9)	/
Outcomes			
Symptom resolution, n (%)	14 (93.3)	26 (96.3)	1.000
^a Complications, n (%)	0	1 (3.7)	1.000
Mortality, n (%)	0	0	1.000
^b Follow-up			
Median time (IQR), months	25 (8, 55)	29 (17, 48)	0.333
Symptomatic, n (%)	6 (42.9)	1 (4.8)	<0.001
Intestinal necrosis, n (%)	0	0	1.000
Underwent endovascular intervention, n (%)	4 (28.6)	NA	/
Secondary endovascular intervention, n (%)	NA	1	/
Disease unrelated mortality, n (%)	0	1	1.000
Complete remodeling in the SMA, n (%)	1 (9.1)	^c 13 (86.7)	<0.001
IQR: interquartile range; NA, Not applicable.			
^a Includes one case of pseudoaneurysm formation in the left brachial artery.			
^b The results of 14 patients in the conservative group and 21 patients in the endovascular group (Patients who had a failed endovascular intervention were excluded).			
^c One patients had in-stent restenosis and one patient had occlusion in the distal SMA.			

No.	Age-ranges	Sex	Comorbidity	Indication	Yun's classification	Reason for failure	Treatment	Follow-up		
								Duration, months	Symptoms	Radiography
1	60-64	Male	Hypertension	Symptom recurrence after conservative treatment	IIb	Failure in true lumen cannulation	Endovascular→Conservative	12	None	Absent
2	60-64	Male	Diabetes mellitus	Persistent pain after conservative treatment	III	Failure in true lumen cannulation	Endovascular→Conservative	16	Intermittent abdominal pain	Newly appeared aneurysm
3	45-49	Male	None	Persistent pain after conservative treatment	III	Failure in true lumen cannulation	Endovascular→Conservative	16	Intermittent abdominal pain	Enriched collateral branches
4	45-49	Male	Hypertension	Persistent pain after conservative treatment	III	Failure in true lumen cannulation	Endovascular→Conservative	37	None	Increasing diameter in SMA

Table 3. Summary of the four patients who had a failed endovascular intervention.

Figures

Follow-up months		6	12	24	36	48	60	72	84
Patients at risk	Conservative group	8	5	4	4	3	3	3	2
	Endovascular group	19	18	12	9	4	4	3	2

Figure 1

Kaplan-Meier curve for symptom-free survival in SISMA.

Figure 2

Two cases of SISMAAD patients. A&B: A patient of Yun's type IIa who had incomplete remodeling after 1 year of conservative treatment (A: before treatment; B: 1 year after discharge). C, D, E, and F: A patient of Yun's type IIa who had successful endovascular treatment and showed good stent patency during follow-up (C&D: CTA and digital subtraction angiography [DSA] before the intervention; E: DSA after stent implantation; F: follow-up CTA after 2 years).