



This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the article published originally by BMJ Publishing Group Ltd accepted for publication in the journal:

Journal of NeuroInterventional Surgery

This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details. When using, please cite the original.

AUTHOR(S)

Schulze-Zachau, V., Brehm, A., Ntoulas, N., Krug, N., Tsogkas, I., Blackham, K. A., Möhlenbruch, M. A., Jesser, J., Cervo, A., Kreiser, K., Althaus, K., Maslias, E., Michel, P., Saliou, G., Riegler, C., Nolte, C. H., Maier, I., Jamous, A., Rautio, R., ... Psychogios, M.-N.

TITLE

Incidence and Outcome of Perforations During Medium Vessel Occlusion Compared with Large Vessel Occlusion Thrombectomy

YEAR

2024

DOI

10.1136/jnis-2023-020531

CITATION

Schulze-Zachau, V., Brehm, A., Ntoulas, N., Krug, N., Tsogkas, I., Blackham, K. A., Möhlenbruch, M. A., Jesser, J., Cervo, A., Kreiser, K., Althaus, K., Maslias, E., Michel, P., Saliou, G., Riegler, C., Nolte, C. H., Maier, I., Jamous, A., Rautio, R., ... Psychogios, M.-N. (2024). *Incidence and Outcome of Perforations During Medium Vessel Occlusion Compared with Large Vessel Occlusion Thrombectomy*. *Journal of NeuroInterventional Surgery*, 16(8), 775–780. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnis-2023-020531>

VERSION

Accepted Manuscript

LICENSE

In Copyright © 2024 BMJ Publishing Group Ltd

Title Page

“Incidence and outcome of perforations during Medium-Vessel Occlusion compared to Large-Vessel occlusion thrombectomy“

Original Research

Victor Schulze-Zachau¹, MD, Alex Brehm¹, MD, PhD,
Nikolaos Ntoulas¹, Nadja Krug¹, MD, Ioannis Tsogkas¹, MD, Kristine Ann Blackham¹, MD
Markus Möhlenbruch², MD, Jessica Jesser², MD,
Amedeo Cervo³, MD,
Kornelia Kreiser⁴, MD, Katharina Althaus⁵, MD,
Errikos Maslias⁶, MD, Patrik Michel⁶, MD, Guillaume Saliou⁷, MD, PhD,
Christoph Riegler^{8,9}, MD, Christian H. Nolte^{8,9}, MD,
Ilko L. Maier¹⁰, MD, Ala Jamous¹¹, MD,
Riitta Rautio¹², MD, PhD, Pauli Ylikotila¹³, MD,
Kyle M Fargen¹⁴, MD, Stacey Q Wolfe¹⁴, MD,
Davide Castellano¹⁵, MD, Andrea Boghi¹⁵, MD,
Daniel P. O. Kaiser¹⁶, MD, Ani Cuberi¹⁷, MD,
Jan S Kirschke¹⁸, MD, Julian Schwarting¹⁸, MD,
Nicola Limbucci¹⁹, MD, Leonardo Renieri¹⁹, MD,
Sami Al Kasab²⁰, MD, Alejandro M Spiotta²⁰, MD,
Isabel Fragata^{21, 22}, MD, PhD, Tania Rodriguez-Ares²², MD,
Christoph J Maurer²³, MD, Ansgar Berlis²³, MD,
Manuel Moreu²⁴, MD, PhD, Alfonso López-Frías²⁴, MD, Carlos Pérez-García²⁴, MD, PhD,
Christian Commodaro²⁵, MD, Marco Pileggi²⁵, MD,
Justin Mascitelli²⁶, MD,
Flavio Giordano²⁷, MD,
Walter Casagrande²⁸, MD, Cynthia P Purves²⁸, MD,
Maxim Bester²⁹, MD, Fabian Flottmann²⁹, MD,
Peter T Kan³⁰, MD, Gautam Edhayan³¹, MD,
Jeremy Hofmeister³², MD, Paolo Machi³², MD,
Marius Kaschner³³, MD, Daniel Weiss³³, MD,
Mira Katan³⁴, MD, Urs Fischer³⁴, MD,

Marios-Nikos Psychogios¹, MD

- 1) Department of Diagnostic & Interventional Neuroradiology, Radiology & Nuclear Medicine Clinic, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland
- 2) Vascular & Interventional Neuroradiology Section, Minimal Invasive NeuroTherapy Center, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany
- 3) Neuroradiology Department, Niguarda Hospital, Milano, Italy
- 4) Radiology and Neuroradiology Clinic, University and Rehabilitation Clinic Ulm, Ulm, Germany
- 5) Neurology Clinic, University Hospital Ulm, Ulm, Germany
- 6) Stroke Center, Service of Neurology, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Switzerland
- 7) Interventional Neuroradiological Unit, Service of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, Department of Medical Radiology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Switzerland
- 8) Department of Neurology with Experimental Neurology, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Campus Benjamin Franklin, Berlin, Germany
- 9) Center for Stroke Research Berlin (CSB) and Berlin Institute of Healths (BIH), Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin, Germany
- 10) Department of Neurology, University Medicine Göttingen, Germany
- 11) Department of Diagnostic & Interventional Neuroradiology, University Medicine Göttingen, Germany
- 12) Department of Interventional Radiology, Turku University Hospital, Finland
- 13) Clinical Neurosciences, University of Turku, Turku, Finland. Neurocenter Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland
- 14) Neurological Surgery and Radiology, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, USA
- 15) Department of Interventional Radiology and Neuroradiology, S. Giovanni Bosco Hospital, Azienda Sanitaria Locale Città di Torino, Turin, Italy
- 16) Department of Neuroradiology, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany
- 17) Department of Radiology, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany
- 18) Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, Klinikum rechts der Isar, TUM School of Medicine, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany
- 19) Department of Neurovascular Intervention, Ospedale Careggi di Firenze, Florence, Italy
- 20) Department of Neurosurgery, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, USA
- 21) NOVA Medical School, Lisbon, Portugal
- 22) Department of Neuroradiology, Centro Hospitalar Universitário de Lisboa Central, Lisbon, Portugal
- 23) Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, University hospital Augsburg, Germany
- 24) Neurointerventional Unit, Radiology Department, Hospital Clínico Universitario San Carlos, Madrid, Spain

- ²⁵⁾ Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland, EOC, Lugano, Switzerland
- ²⁶⁾ Department of Neurosurgery, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas
- ²⁷⁾ Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology Unit, Dipartimento delle Tecnologie Avanzate Diagnostico-Terapeutiche e dei Servizi sanitari, A.O.R.N. Cardarelli, Naples, Italy
- ²⁸⁾ Hospital General de Agudos "Juan A. Fernández", Buenos Aires, Argentina
- ²⁹⁾ Department of Neuroradiology, University Hospital Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
- ³⁰⁾ Department of Neurosurgery, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas, USA
- ³¹⁾ Department of Radiology, Division of Neuroradiology, The University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas, USA
- ³²⁾ Service of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, Geneva University Hospital, Geneva, Switzerland
- ³³⁾ Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany
- ³⁴⁾ Neurology Clinic, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland

Corresponding author:

Victor Schulze-Zachau
Department of Diagnostic & Interventional Neuroradiology
Radiology & Nuclear Medicine Clinic
University Hospital Basel
Petersgraben 4
4031 Basel, Switzerland
Phone: 0041-6132-85632
E-Mail: victor.schulze-zachau@usb.ch

ABSTRACT

Background: Vessel perforation during thrombectomy is a severe complication and is hypothesized to be more frequent during MeVO thrombectomy. The aim of this study was to compare the incidence and outcome of patients with perforation during MeVO and LVO thrombectomy and to report on the procedural steps that led to perforation.

Methods: In this multicenter retrospective cohort study, data of consecutive patients with vessel perforation during thrombectomy between January 01, 2015 and September 30, 2022 were collected. The primary outcomes were independent functional outcome (i.e. modified Rankin Scale 0-2) and all-cause mortality at 90 days. Binomial test, chi-squared test and t-test for unpaired samples were used for statistical analysis.

Results: During 25,769 thrombectomies (5,124 MeVO, 20,645 LVO) in 25 stroke centers, perforation occurred in 335 patients (1.3%; mean age 72 years, 62% female). Perforation occurred more often in MeVO thrombectomy (2.4%) than in LVO thrombectomy (1.0%, $p < 0.001$). More MeVO than LVO patients with perforation achieved functional independence at three months (25.7% vs 10.9%; $p=0.001$). All-cause mortality did not differ between groups (overall 51.6%). Navigation beyond the occlusion and retraction of stent-retriever/aspiration catheter were the two most common procedural steps that led to perforation.

Conclusions: In our cohort, perforation was approximately twice as frequent in MeVO than in LVO thrombectomy. Efforts to optimize the procedure may focus on navigation beyond the occlusion site and retraction of stent-retriever/aspiration catheter. Further research is necessary in order to identify thrombectomy candidates at high risk of intraprocedural perforation and to provide data on the effectiveness of endovascular countermeasures.

KEY MESSAGES

What is already known on this topic:

Perforation of an intracranial artery during thrombectomy is a serious adverse event and is associated with poor outcome and death. It is assumed to be more frequent during MeVO (medium-vessel occlusion) thrombectomy compared to LVO (large-vessel occlusion) thrombectomy, but large studies are missing.

What this study adds:

In a retrospective cohort of 25,769 thrombectomies (5,124 MeVO; 20,645 LVO), the frequency of vessel perforation in MeVO thrombectomy was approximately twice the frequency observed in LVO thrombectomy and mortality was approximately 50% for both groups.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy:

Interventionalists performing MeVO thrombectomy should make every effort in order to avoid vessel perforation including the further development and application of safety techniques. The risk of vessel perforation during MeVO thrombectomy should be considered in ongoing randomized trials and in subsequent guidelines.

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACA	Anterior Cerebral Artery
DISTAL	EnDovascular Therapy Plus Best Medical Treatment (BMT) Versus BMT Alone for Medlum VeSsel Occlusion sTroke
DISTALS	Distal Ischemic Stroke Treatment With Adjustable Low-profile Stentriever
DISCOUNT	Evaluation of Mechanical Thrombectomy in Acute Ischemic Stroke Related to a Distal Arterial Occlusion
ESCAPE-MEVO	EndovaSCular TreAtment to imProve outcomEs for Medium Vessel Occlusions
ICA	Internal Carotid Artery
ICAD	Intracranial Arteriosclerotic Disease
LV	Large vessel
LVO	Large-vessel occlusion
MCA	Middle Cerebral Artery
MeV	Medium vessel
MeVO	Medium-vessel occlusion
mRS	Modified Rankin Scale
NIHSS	National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
PCA	Posterior Cerebral Artery

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

In 2015, five randomized clinical trials showed an overwhelming benefit of thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke patients with large-vessel occlusion (LVO)[1]. Since then, indications for thrombectomy are continuously expanding[2]. However, there is a lack of evidence whether patients with acute ischemic stroke due to medium-vessel occlusion (MeVO) profit from thrombectomy. Several randomized trials have been initiated to answer this question, such as DISTAL (EnDovascular Therapy Plus Best Medical Treatment (BMT) Versus BMT Alone for Medlum VeSsel Occlusion sTroke, ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05029414), DISTALS (Distal Ischemic Stroke Treatment With Adjustable Low-profile Stentriever, NCT05152524), DISCOUNT (Evaluation of Mechanical Thrombectomy in Acute Ischemic Stroke Related to a Distal Arterial Occlusion, NCT05030142) and ESCAPE-MEVO (EndovaSCular TreAtment to imProve outcomEs for Medium Vessel Occlusions, NCT05151172). Arguments against thrombectomy in MeVO include a possibly lower clinical benefit compared to LVO thrombectomy as well as a possibly higher risk of hemorrhage due to (a) thinner vessel walls, (b) higher tortuosity[3] and (c) partial lack of dedicated devices explicitly designed for medium vessels[4].

Perforation during thrombectomy represents a severe complication and is associated with poor functional outcome or death[5]. However, available data are limited[6]. In medium vessel (MeV) perforation, the maximum flow rate during active extravasation might be lower compared to large vessel (LV) perforation. Therefore, less extravasation might occur until countermeasures are in place. Furthermore, if intentional occlusion of the perforated vessel is deemed necessary, the volume of brain parenchyma which will subsequently suffer from

ischemia/infarction is smaller in MeV perforation compared to vessel sacrifice in LV perforation.

The aim of this quality assurance project was to describe the frequency and outcomes of patients with a perforation during MeVO thrombectomy and to compare them to patients with a perforation during LVO thrombectomy.

Methods

Data of consecutive patients with vessel perforation during thrombectomy (confirmed by extravasation during an angiographic series) were retrospectively collected from multiple stroke centers.

Patient selection

Consecutive patients were included if the corresponding perforation occurred between January 01, 2015 and September 30, 2022 and was confirmed by extravasation during an angiographic series. No other formal in- and exclusion criteria were applied. For patients with intracranial perforations, collected data included baseline characteristics of the patients, neurovascular risk factors, site of occlusion, site of perforation. The procedural step during which perforation occurred was evaluated (multiple choice, options: 1 - access to occlusion, 2 - probing beyond the occlusion, 3 - deployment of stent-retriever, 4 - advancement of aspiration catheter, 5 - retraction of stent-retriever / aspiration catheter, 6 - contrast injection, 7. other (specify)). Modified Rankin Scale (mRS) at 90 days was collected as outcome measure. Independent functional outcome was defined as mRS = 0-

2. Furthermore, increase of NIHSS (National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale) ≥ 2 points or death within 24 hours after admission was evaluated, too¹.

Ethical commission approval and patient consent were not required according to current local legislation as all data were anonymized before analysis and the project involved assessing safety and quality of routine acute ischemic stroke management in the participating institutions.

Definitions

Following the definitions of the DISTAL trial, LVs were defined as the ICA (internal carotid artery), M1-segment and dominant M2-segment of the MCA (middle cerebral artery, i.e., the M2 branch perfusing more than 50% of the MCA territory), the vertebral arteries and the basilar artery. LVO was defined as occlusion of one or several of the above mentioned LVs. MVs were defined to encompass co-dominant or non-dominant M2-segments, M3- and M4-segments of the MCA as well as the ACA (anterior cerebral artery) and PCA (posterior cerebral artery) and their branches, respectively. MeVO was defined as occlusion of one or several of the above mentioned MVs.

Patients were deemed to belong to the MeVO group, if an initial LVO developed to one or several MeVOs before the beginning of thrombectomy. If both LVO and MeVO was present, the patient was assigned to the LVO group if perforation happened during LVO thrombectomy and to the MeVO group, if perforation happened during MeVO thrombectomy.

¹ If a patient deceased during hospital stay or was comatose, NIHSS at discharge was defined as 42.

Statistics

We compared the incidence of perforation between MeVO and LVO thrombectomy with the binomial test. Dichotomized variables (Incidence of MeV and LV perforation; mRS 0-2, NIHSS increase > 2 or death) were compared using the chi-squared test. Ordinal variables (NIHSS at baseline) were compared using the Mann-Whitney *U* test. The frequencies of the procedural steps during which perforation occurred were compared between MeVO and LVO patients by using the t-test for unpaired samples. All statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS v28.0.1.0 (IBM SPSS statistics, Armonk, New York, US). We deemed p-values < 0.05 to be significant.

Results

During 25,769 thrombectomies in 25 stroke centers, perforation with active extravasation occurred in 335 patients (mean age 72.1 ± 13.9 years, range 16-98 years, 61.5% female), corresponding to a perforation rate of 1.3%.

MeVO patients had a lower NIHSS at admission compared to LVO patients (13.2 ± 6.3 vs. 14.8 ± 7.3 , $p = 0.049$; for details of baseline characteristics see table 1).

	All patients (n=335)	MeVO (n=124)	LVO (n=211)
Age (years, mean \pm standard deviation)	72.1 ± 13.9	72.6 ± 13.4	71.7 ± 14.3
Gender (female patients)	206/335 (61.5%)	74/124 (59.7%)	132/211 (62.6%)
Arterial hypertension	236/332 (71.1%)	90/123 (73.2%)	146/209 (69.9%)

Obesity	47/265 (17.7%)	13/85 (15.3%)	34/180 (18.9%)
Hyperlipidemia	124/328 (37.8%)	46/121 (38%)	78/207 (37.7%)
Diabetes	75/328 (23.0%)	32/119 (26.9%)	43/207 (20.8%)
Atrial fibrillation			
Treated	84/327 (25.7%)	38/120 (31.7%)	46/207 (22.2%)
Untreated	45/327 (13.8%)	13/120 (10.8%)	32/207 (15.5%)
None	198/327 (60.6%)	69/120 (57.5%)	129/207 (62.3%)
Smoking status			
Active smoker	40/236 (16.9%)	12/82 (14.6%)	28/154 (18.2%)
Former smoker	46/236 (19.5%)	16/82 (19.5%)	30/154 (19.5%)
Non-smoker	150/236 (63.6%)	54/82 (65.9%)	96/154 (62.3%)
ICAD at any location	52/321 (16.2%)	11/116 (9.5%)	41/205 (20.0%)
Pre-Stroke mRS			
0	209/327 (63.9%)	73/122 (59.8%)	136/211 (66.3%)
1	45/327 (13.8%)	16/122 (13.1%)	29/211 (14.1%)
2	33/327 (10.1%)	16/122 (13.1%)	17/211 (8.3%)
3	30/327 (9.2%)	14/122 (11.5%)	16/211 (7.8%)
4	10/327 (3.1%)	3/122 (2.5%)	7/211 (3.4%)
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
NIHSS at admission (mean \pm standard deviation)	14.2 \pm 6.9 (n=326)	13.2 \pm 6.3 (n=122)	14.8 \pm 7.3 (n=204)

Table 1: baseline characteristics. MeVO: medium-vessel occlusion. LVO: large-vessel occlusion. ICAD: intracranial arteriosclerotic disease. mRS: modified Rankin Scale.

In 174 cases, thrombectomy was carried out in general anesthesia, in 134 cases in conscious sedation and 26 cases have been performed with local anesthesia only. In one case, no information about the anesthesiologic management was available. A total of 774 endovascular maneuvers were reported including 462 maneuvers with combined aspiration and stent-retriever thrombectomy, 204 maneuvers with aspiration thrombectomy alone, 92 maneuvers with stent retriever thrombectomy alone, 6 applications of intraarterial thrombolysis, 9 angioplasties and 1 stenting.

Perforation occurred significantly more often in MeVO thrombectomies (124 perforations in 5,124 MeVO thrombectomies, 2.4%) compared to LVO thrombectomies (211 perforations in

20,645 LVO thrombectomies, 1.0%; $p < 0.001$). Perforation during MeVO thrombectomy was significantly more often perforation of a MeV (87.9% MeV perforation, 12.1% LV perforation) compared to perforations during LVO thrombectomy (46.0% MeV perforation, 54.0% LV perforation; $p < 0.001$, details see tables 2 and 3). In 149 patients with vessel perforation (87 LVO, 62 MeVO) the vessel perforation was treated by specific endovascular means. These procedures comprised temporary inflation of a balloon guide catheter (n=21), temporary inflation of an intracranial balloon catheter (n=71), temporary coil placement without detachment (n=19), permanent coil occlusion of the perforated vessel (n=67) and other endovascular approaches such as permanent vessel occlusion using a liquid embolic (n=29), or a combination of these methods.

Occlusion site	n
ICA	53
Vertebral artery	9
Basilar artery	28
MCA	
M1-segment	128
M2-segment	121
M3-segment	14
M4-segment	1
ACA	
A1-segment	3
A2-segment	10
A3-segment	1
PCA	
P1-segment	13

Table 2: Occlusion site (381 occlusions in 335 patients). ICA: internal carotid artery. MCA: middle cerebral artery. ACA: anterior cerebral artery. PCA: posterior cerebral artery.

Perforation site	All patients (n=334)	MeVO (n=124)	LVO (n=210)
ICA	23 (6.9%)	3	20
Vertebral artery	2 (0.6%)	0	2
Basilar artery	12 (3.6%)	0	12
MCA			
M1-segment	61 (18.2%)	6	55
M2-segment	135 (40.3%)	61	74

M3-segment	61 (18.2%)	38	23
Perforator from M1-segment	5 (1.5%)	1	4
ACA			
A1-segment	1 (0.3%)	1	0
A2-segment	3 (0.9%)	2	1
A3-segment	2 (0.6%)	1	1
ACOM	1 (0.3%)	1	0
PCA			
P1-segment	18 (5.4%)	6	12
P2-segment	2 (0.6%)	1	1
P3-segment	1 (0.3%)	1	0
PCOM	1 (0.3%)	0	1
Perforator from PCA or basilar artery	3 (0.9%)	1	2
Anterior choroidal artery	2 (0.6%)	0	2
PICA	1 (0.3%)	1	0

Table 3: Perforation site (n=334). MeVO: medium-vessel occlusion. LVO: large-vessel occlusion. ICA: internal carotid artery. MCA: middle cerebral artery. ACA: anterior cerebral artery. ACOM: anterior communicating artery. PCA: posterior cerebral artery. PCOM: posterior communicating artery. PICA: posterior inferior cerebellar artery.

Overall functional outcome after perforation was poor with a independent functional outcome at 90 days in 16.1% of all patients and a mortality rate at 90 days of 51.6% (figure 1, details see supplement table S1). MeVO patients achieved an independent functional outcome at 90 days significantly more often compared to LVO patients (25.7% in MeVO patients, 10.9% in LVO patients, $p = 0.001$). However, mortality at 90 days did not differ between both groups (50.5% versus 53.0%, $p = 0.68$). In MeVO patients, NIHSS increase ≥ 2 points or death within 24 hours after admission occurred significantly less often (52.4% of MeVO patients, 65.4% of LVO patients, $p = 0.03$).

For both MeVO and LVO thrombectomies, the two most common procedural steps leading to perforation were navigation beyond the occlusion (30.7% of all perforations) and retraction of stent-retriever/aspiration catheter (35.5% of all perforations, details see

supplement table S2). No significant difference was found between MeVO and LVO thrombectomies regarding the frequency of the different procedural steps that led to perforation.

Discussion

In this large retrospective, multi-center analysis, perforation with active extravasation during thrombectomy was a rare, but severe complication in both MeVO and LVO thrombectomy. Perforation in MeVO thrombectomy occurred approximately twice as frequent compared to LVO thrombectomy. Functional outcome was poor for both patient groups and independent functional outcome was achieved only by 16.1% of patients. In comparison, in a large prospective registry, patients with LVO receiving thrombectomy overall achieved independent functional outcome in 37% [7]. A different registry-based study reported independent functional outcome after thrombectomy in 36% of all LVO patients and in 45% of all MeVO patients [8].

Patients with perforation during MeVO thrombectomy achieved an independent functional outcome more often compared to patients with perforation during LVO thrombectomy. This maybe explained in part by lesser stroke severity at stroke onset. Navigation beyond the occlusion and retraction of stent-retriever/aspiration catheter were the two procedural steps leading to most perforations in both MeVO and LVO thrombectomies. Our results are well in line with smaller previous studies as they reported a frequency of perforations during thrombectomy between 0.7% and 6.9%[6,9–12].

This study substantiates the hypothesis that MeVO thrombectomy might be characterized by a higher frequency of perforations[6]. In the majority of MeVO patients, the natural course of disease is less severe than in patients with LVO[13]. This might contribute to the finding that patients who survived the perforation more often had an independent functional outcome if the initial occlusion was a MeVO compared to LVO. However, the impact of perforation during thrombectomy can be considered even greater in MeVO patients since their chances of independent functional outcome without thrombectomy are higher compared to LVO patients[13].

Perforation during thrombectomy is known to be associated with poor functional outcome and death[6,9–11]. In our study, the frequency of good functional outcome at 90 days for patients with perforation during LVO thrombectomy of 10.9% is lower compared to previous studies. This discrepancy may partially be explained by a less rigorous definition of perforation. Previous studies did not always differentiate between perforations with extravasation on an angiography series as opposed to the finding of subarachnoid blood on postinterventional imaging[10]. We included only cases with a visible extravasation in our study. There are multiple studies showing that subarachnoid hemorrhage on follow-up imaging cannot be directly compared to vessel perforation since it is characterized by a rather benign course[6,14]. Furthermore, previous reports did not systematically differentiate between LVO and MeVO patients[6,9].

Our study confirms previous work[12] reporting that the two procedural steps harboring the highest risk of perforation are navigation beyond the occlusion and retrieval of stent-retriever/aspiration catheter. Figure 2 and Figure 3 illustrate possible mechanisms of vessel perforation during navigation beyond the occlusion and during retrieval of the stent-retriever/aspiration catheter. J-configuration of the microwire, soft-tip microcatheters and

appropriately sized stent-retrievers and aspiration catheters might help to decrease the risk of perforation[5]. Applying intense aspiration within a non-occluded segment on an intracranial artery might lead to luminal collapse and consecutively inadvertent shear forces at the vessel wall, which might increase the risk of vessel perforation[15]. Patient motion might not only lead to perforation but might also affect the detection of contrast extravasation if movement artifacts are encountered during an angiographic run. Performing thrombectomy in general anesthesia might therefore lower the risk of perforation and help in detection and treatment of perforation. One major meta-analysis of patients in randomized trials described a tendency to support this hypothesis[16], but further studies are needed to answer this question.

Our study has several limitations: (a) its retrospective design and (b) selection of contributing centers based on their willingness to participate, which might limit the study's validity. Outcome data of patients without perforation were not collected. Therefore, direct comparison between the outcome of patients with perforation and the outcome of those without perforation was not feasible. Strengths of our study are (a) the high number of patients and (b) the international multicenter design including centers with different experience in MeVO thrombectomy increasing the generalizability of our results.

In conclusion, perforation with active extravasation during thrombectomy represents a severe complication which frequently results in poor functional outcome or death.

Perforation occurred more frequently in MeVO thrombectomy. Mortality at 90 days was similar for MeVO and LVO patients. However, patients with perforation during MeVO thrombectomies more frequently had an independent functional outcome compared to LVO thrombectomy. Navigation beyond the occlusion and retraction of stent-retriever and/or aspiration catheter are the most dangerous procedural steps during thrombectomy

according to our data. Further studies with a direct comparison between patients with perforation during thrombectomy and those without perforation might aid in the detection of risk factors for perforation and in the appreciation of the relevance of an intracranial perforation for the patients' outcome.

Acknowledgments

We thank Eleftherios Remoundos for help with preparation of the figures.

Sources of Funding

None.

Disclosures

None of the authors reported relevant financial relations with regard to this study.

Data availability statement:

Deidentified participant data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author for purposeful quality improvement projects.

Contributorship statement:

V S-Z had the idea for the study, monitored data collection, collected data, designed the analysis plan, cleaned, analyzed and interpreted the data, and drafted and revised the paper. He is guarantor.

A B designed the analysis plan, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published.

N N and N K collected data, cleaned the data, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published.

I T and K AB cleaned the data, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published.

M M, J J, A C, K K, K A, E M, P M, G S, C R, C H N, I L M, A J, R R, P Y, K M F, S Q W, D C, A B, D P O K, A C, J S K, J S, N L, L R, S A K, A M S, I F, T R-A, C J M, A B, M M, A L-F, C P-G, C C, M P, J M, F G, W C, C P P, M B, F F, P T K, G E, J H, P M, M K and D W collected data, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published.

M K and U F interpreted the data, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published.

M-N P had the idea for the study, designed the analysis plan, interpreted the data, revised the paper and approved the final version to be published. He is guarantor.

References

- 1 Goyal M, Menon BK, van Zwam WH, *et al.* Endovascular thrombectomy after large-vessel ischaemic stroke: a meta-analysis of individual patient data from five randomised trials. *The Lancet* 2016;**387**:1723–31.
- 2 Sporns PB, Fiehler J, Ospel J, *et al.* Expanding indications for endovascular thrombectomy-how to leave no patient behind. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord* 2021;**14**:1756286421998905.
- 3 Saver JL, Chapot R, Agid R, *et al.* Thrombectomy for Distal, Medium Vessel Occlusions. *Stroke* 2020;**51**:2872–84.
- 4 Ospel JM, Goyal M. A review of endovascular treatment for medium vessel occlusion stroke. *J NeuroInterventional Surg* 2021;**13**:623.
- 5 Pilgram-Pastor SM, Piechowiak EI, Dobrocky T, *et al.* Stroke thrombectomy complication management. *J NeuroInterventional Surg* 2021;**13**:912.
- 6 Mokin M, Fargen KM, Primiani CT, *et al.* Vessel perforation during stent retriever thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: technical details and clinical outcomes. *J NeuroInterventional Surg* 2017;**9**:922.
- 7 Wollenweber FA, Tiedt S, Alegiani A, *et al.* Functional Outcome Following Stroke Thrombectomy in Clinical Practice. *Stroke* 2019;**50**:2500–6. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.026005
- 8 Anadani M, Alawieh A, Chalhoub R, *et al.* Mechanical Thrombectomy for Distal Occlusions: Efficacy, Functional and Safety Outcomes: Insight from the STAR Collaboration. *World Neurosurg* 2021;**151**:e871–9. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2021.04.136
- 9 Ducroux C, Boisseau W, Poppe A, *et al.* Successful Reperfusion is Associated with Favorable Functional Outcome despite Vessel Perforation during Thrombectomy: A Case Series and Systematic Review. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2022;**43**:1633–8.
- 10 Salsano G, Pracucci G, Mavilio N, *et al.* Complications of mechanical thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: Incidence, risk factors, and clinical relevance in the Italian Registry of Endovascular Treatment in acute stroke. *Int J Stroke* 2021;**16**:818–27.
- 11 Happi Ngankou E, Gory B, Marnat G, *et al.* Thrombectomy Complications in Large Vessel Occlusions: Incidence, Predictors, and Clinical Impact in the ETIS Registry. *Stroke* 2021;**52**:e764–8.
- 12 Balami JS, White PM, McMeekin PJ, *et al.* Complications of endovascular treatment for acute ischemic stroke: Prevention and management. *Int J Stroke* 2018;**13**:348–61.
- 13 Ospel JM, Menon BK, Demchuk AM, *et al.* Clinical Course of Acute Ischemic Stroke Due to Medium Vessel Occlusion With and Without Intravenous Alteplase Treatment. *Stroke* 2020;**51**:3232–40.

- 14 Rikhtegar R, Mosimann PJ, Weber R, *et al.* Effectiveness of very low profile thrombectomy device in primary distal medium vessel occlusion, as rescue therapy after incomplete proximal recanalization or following iatrogenic thromboembolic events. *J NeuroInterventional Surg* 2021;**13**:1067.
- 15 Liu Y, Gebrezgiabhier D, Zheng Y, *et al.* Arterial Collapse during Thrombectomy for Stroke: Clinical Evidence and Experimental Findings in Human Brains and In Vivo Models. *Am J Neuroradiol* 2022;**43**:251.
- 16 Campbell BCV, van Zwam WH, Goyal M, *et al.* Effect of general anaesthesia on functional outcome in patients with anterior circulation ischaemic stroke having endovascular thrombectomy versus standard care: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet Neurol* 2018;**17**:47–53.

Figures and Legends

Figure 1: Modified Rankin Scale (mRS) at 90 days in patients experiencing perforation during thrombectomy.

MeVO: medium-vessel occlusion. LVO: large-vessel occlusion.

Figure 2: Possible mechanisms of vessel perforation during retraction of stent-retriever / aspiration catheter.

2A: rupture of perforator branches due to mechanical shear stress during the retrieval.

2B: rupture of the main vessel due to a pre-existing atherosclerotic lesion, leading to vulnerability.

2C: In a patient with acute occlusion of the terminal internal carotid artery at the location of a wall abnormality presumed to be an atherosclerotic plaque (not shown), a microcatheter has been navigated beyond the occlusion. Microcatheter injection in lateral projection confirms the microcatheter position in the middle cerebral artery. Subsequently, a stent-retriever has been deployed and a combined thrombectomy maneuver has been performed.

2D: Contrast injection after the thrombectomy maneuver shows active extravasation from the terminal internal carotid artery.

Figure 3: Possible mechanisms of vessel perforation while probing beyond the occlusion.

3A: Inadvertent probing in a small caliber branch with the microwire leading to vessel perforation.

3B: After passing the occlusion with the microwire, the microcatheter gets stuck at the level of the occlusion, leading to resistance and pushback (light blue). The forward pressure suddenly releases, leading to a sudden antegrade jump of the microcatheter (purple). During this movement, the tip of the microwire perforates the vessel wall.

3C: A J-shaped tip of the microwire, enough distance between microwire tip and microcatheter tip and microcatheter navigation without excessive forward pressure might decrease the risk of vessel perforation during probing beyond the occlusion.

3D: In a patient with an M2-occlusion, the microcatheter has been navigated beyond the occlusion. Digital subtraction angiography in lateral projection with microcatheter injection shows contrast extravasation close to the tip of the microcatheter.