EVAR decreases perioperative morbidity relative rate, conversion to open repair and AAA rupture. Frequent complications such as 1% early conversion stability or decrease in size of AAA, and infrequent operative mortality, initial 98 to 99% success, formed in patients with suitable anatomy (3-6).

Aneurysmal sac.

a less invasive alternative to conventional open surgery pioneered by Parodi and Volodos in the early 1990s and is current cost-conscious era. EVAR was pioneered become a strain fiscally to many hospitals in the trend of increasing utilization of EVAR even for ruptured AAAs and a corresponding decline in open procedures.

When we look at the adverse events, EVAR carries a 1.4% operative mortality rate and a significant decrease in perioperative morbidity. There is a 2-10% incidence of acute renal failure (ARF) following open repair, which prolongs hospital stay. ARF requiring hemodialysis (0.5-2%) carries an in-hospital mortality rate of 25-66%. When adjusted for covariates, the association between EVAR and the risk of ARF remained significantly low compared to open AAA (OR 0.42; 95% CI 0.33-0.53) (12).

Abnormal but low postoperative troponin elevation is associated with increased mortality and may lead to delayed postoperative myocardial ischemia (13). In a prospective study, Abraham et al. showed that there is a previously underestimated incidence of subclinical myocardial damage associated with surgery for infrarenal AAA, which is lower after endovascular than open repair (14). Pearson et al. found that an attenuated glucocorticoid surge characterizes the reduced stress response experienced by patients undergoing EVAR compared to open repair and suggested that a reduction in the occurrence of Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome is a feature of a more favorable postoperative course after an endovascular approach (15). These factors strongly support the increasing use of EVAR in patients presenting with suitable anatomy.

In the prospective randomized controlled trials, EVAR has been shown to have a significantly better perioperative outcome. There is a lower incidence of intraoperative blood loss, lower pulmonary complications, postoperative mechanical ventilation all reflecting the nature of surgery (DREAM trial, EVAR-1) (16,17). The risk of in-hospital mortality is 5.8% in the open-repair group, compared to 1.9% in the endovascular repair group, resulting in a risk ratio of 3.1 (95% CI 1.7-6.2). Before the EVAR era, operative mortality rates of 8% were reported in the population based series. Current mortality rates of open repairs are approximately 4%. This is probably because EVAR is probably the only option in high-risk patients. A patient’s eligibility for EVAR is dependent on the state of device technology. The introduction of fenestrated and branched endografts is expected to increase the proportion of patients with AAA who can be treated by EVAR in the near future. With improvement in surgical skills and the number of such procedures performed, success is bound to improve. This may ultimately decrease the graft failure rates. As we go along matching the technology growth with patient selection, the failure rates will decrease.

Because of the significant risk reduction, perioperative anesthetic care of such patients is less risky than open surgeries. Although all the patients who undergo EVAR are prepared as though they are having open procedures in many centers, with more experience and patient selection, these procedures can probably be safely done under local or regional anesthesia with less invasive monitoring (18) and significantly reduced preoperative work-ups. They will probably carry less perioperative morbidity and mortality and decreased utilization of operating room and recovery room times.

In younger patients with no other organ dysfunction, the debate sets in as to whether to offer EVAR or open surgery as procedure of choice. Open AAA has shown to be highly successful over the last fifty years with less than 0.5% graft failure rates. Until such long-term data are available in EVAR, it will remain a challenge to convince many. However, in such patient population with a suitable anatomy and surgical expertise, increasing use of EVAR is probably justified based on its better perioperative outcome data. For smaller aneurysms either therapy is not in a stage to be beneficial as the risk of rupture is less than 1% per year, although it would be a great temptation to do EVAR. This is a potential area of interest and may very well prove to be true indication if the long-term outcomes of EVAR are proven.

EVAR carries an important postoperative long-term follow-up surveillance costs. EVAR is a new art which mandates such follow-ups. The endovascular stents are undergoing constant improvement and so are the surgeons and interventionalists. Follow-up costs and the reoperation rates for leaks are primary factors pointed against routine EVAR for all aneurysms. These are likely to decrease as we are bound to identify
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Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) carries a significant risk of rupture when it grows beyond 5 cm. Ruptured aneurysms have >50% mortality rate. Hence prophylactic surgery at this stage prevents such a catastrophe. AAA can be repaired either by open or endovascular aneurysm repair (EVAR). Open repairs carry a 5 to 10% operative mortality and a major complications rate of 15 to 30%. The morbidity and mortality increase substantially in elderly patients and in those with pulmonary, cardiac, or renal co-morbidities. Many elderly or frail patients never quite return to baseline function. Traditional open repair can lead to prolonged intensive care stays, extended hospitalizations, and other excessive resource use, which can become a strain fiscally to many hospitals in the current cost-conscious era. EVAR was pioneered by Parodi and Volodos in the early 1990s and is a less invasive alternative to conventional open repair (1, 2). EVAR involves small incisions in the groin to access femoral arteries and to place endograft under fluoroscopic guidance to exclude aneurysmal sac.

EVAR is safe and can be successfully performed in patients with suitable anatomy (3-6). The advantages of this technique are low perioperative mortality, initial 98 to 99% success, stability or decrease in size of AAA, and infrequent complications such as 1% early conversion rate, conversion to open repair and AAA rupture. EVAR decreases perioperative morbidity relative to standard open repair and decreases intensive care unit and total hospital stay (7) with increased quality of life in the perioperative period and a more rapid recovery time (8). Anatomic selection and warding off technical difficulties should be the key while doing EVAR.

With these significant advantages EVAR was primarily started as a treatment option and continues to be an attractive and often the only option for patients with multiple organ dysfunctions and in very elderly patients (9). Ruptured AAA carries a 50%-70% mortality following conventional open repairs. EVAR is a viable option for ruptured AAAs (40%). A significant reduction in mortality and complication rates was seen for patients receiving EVAR that correlates with the volume of procedures carried at by a hospital (10). There is a decreased rate of pulmonary, renal and bleeding complications following EVAR (11). As a result, there is a trend of increasing utilization of EVAR even for ruptured AAAs and a corresponding decline in open procedures.

When we look at the adverse events, EVAR carries a 1.4% operative mortality rate and a significant decrease in perioperative morbidity. There is a 2-10% incidence of acute renal failure (ARF) following open repair, which prolongs hospital stay. ARF requiring hemodialysis (0.5-2%) carries an in-hospital mortality rate of 25-66%. When adjusted for covariates, the association between EVAR and the risk of ARF remained significantly low compared to open AAA (OR 0.42; 95% CI 0.33-0.53) (12).

Abnormal but low postoperative troponin elevation is associated with increased mortality and may lead to delayed postoperative myocardial ischemia (13). In a prospective study, Abraham et al. showed that there is a previously underestimated incidence of subclinical myocardial damage associated with surgery for infrarenal AAA, which is lower after endovascular than open repair (14). Pearson et al. found that an attenuated glucocorticoid surge characterizes the reduced stress response experienced by patients undergoing EVAR compared to open repair and suggested that a reduction in the occurrence of Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome is a feature of a more favorable postoperative course after an endovascular approach (15). These factors strongly support the increasing use of EVAR in patients presenting with suitable anatomy.

In the prospective randomized controlled trials, EVAR has been shown to have a significantly better perioperative outcome. There is a lower incidence of intraoperative blood loss, lower pulmonary complications, postoperative mechanical ventilation all reflecting the nature of surgery (DREAM trial, EVAR-1) (16,17). The risk of in-hospital mortality is 5.8% in the open-repair group, compared to 1.9% in the endovascular repair group, resulting in a risk ratio of 3.1 (95% CI 1.7-6.2). Before the EVAR era,
Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) is much more common in men than in women and its incidence increases rapidly with age.1 The prevalence of AAA is around 5% in men over the age of 65 years.1 In contrast to other cardiovascular diseases where rates of hospital admission and deaths have fallen over the last decades,4 the rates for AAA have risen.2

Patients with AAA are at risk for vascular rupture and subsequent death. Standard treatment for AAA with a diameter > 5.5 cm is open surgical repair with the aim to prevent rupture.5,6 Despite advances in the perioperative care of patients with AAA, the complication rate remains high. The perioperative mortality after elective open repair is 3 to 5% and perioperative mortality after emergent open repair of a ruptured AAA is 40 to 50%.2 Endovascular aneurysm repair (EVAR) was introduced into clinical practice in the 1990s.7 The AAA is excluded from the circulation by placing an endograft, using a transfemoral or transiliac route. Compared with open repair, EVAR causes less surgical trauma and does not require cross clamping of the aorta. Accordingly, EVAR is expected to diminish perioperative morbidity and mortality by causing less hemodynamic instability and by minimizing the stress response and physiologic disruption. EVAR can be performed under local anesthesia.9 EVAR attenuates respiratory interventions (beta-receptor blockers, anti-platelet drugs, and statins) could be the important components needed to reach this end.
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Long-term outcome after EVAR

Unfortunately and unexpectedly for many periprofessional physicians, there is no evidence that the advantages of EVAR in short-term mortality16–18 result in a better long-term outcome. Both of the recent randomized trials with a total of 1433 patients failed to show lower mortality after EVAR; two and four years after randomization, mortalities were 10% and 28% respectively, and similar in the EVAR and the open repair groups. In addition, EVAR was more expensive13,14 and was not associated with a better quality of life than open repair.13,23 Within four years of follow-up, 40% of the EVAR patients had postoperative complications compared with 9% of the open-repair patients.13 Similarly, secondary interventions were necessary in 20% of the EVAR patients but in only 6% of the open-repair patients.13 The excess rate of secondary interventions was also seen in observational studies24 and occurred mainly within the first year after the primary procedure.13,22 The high rate of late complications has important implications for surveillance (a CT scan at 1, 6, and 12 months after EVAR and annually thereafter is recommended),11 whereas long-term surveillance is not necessary after open repair.13

In patients considered unfit for open AAA repair, randomized to EVAR or no intervention in the EVAR-2 trial, EVAR was not associated with improvement in long-term mortality or quality of life but caused much higher expenses.19 However, this conclusion has been criticized because nearly half of the aneurysm-related deaths in the EVAR group occurred after randomization but before EVAR was performed.12,19 One long-term study of EVAR for treatment of ruptured AAA is promising,25 but results need to be verified with a larger sample size.

Conclusion: EVAR for AAA repair is a promising technique with favorable a short-term outcome. However, no benefit from EVAR has been proven on long-term outcome and quality of life, and EVAR is associated with a high rate of expensive re-intervention. Further research is needed to characterize patients who will receive long-term benefits from EVAR. As for now, EVAR is best used in patients with a high perioperative risk.6,9,11,12,26 In younger patients with low perioperative risk, the decision to perform EVAR or open repair should be based on very careful evaluation of the anatomical suitability as well as taking into account the experience of the periprofessional physicians involved and the patient’s preference.12

More efforts need to be made to evaluate strategies that will transform the early survival advantage of EVAR into long-term benefit. Optimum risk factor management and medications (beta-receptor blockers, anti-platelet drugs, and statins) may be the ones who would be subjected for routine surveillance. With more manufacturers entering the stents arena, the cost of stents may very well go down. Importantly, when factoring in costs, one must also include the perioperative morbidity and their costs, such as blood transfusions, renal failure managements, ICU costs, etc. incurred by open procedures.

With increasing expertise, improvement in grafts types and efficacy, EVAR will remain as the procedure of first choice for patients coming with AAA. There will be a few patients where this may be contraindicated but their proportion can only be getting smaller and smaller. A comparison can be made with coronary stents, which are similar, and a number of patients may totally dodge the operating rooms because of the increasing efficacy of endo AAA stents.

While long-term data in these prospective trials are awaited, current state of technology and the available outcome data on endo AAA stenting procedures give a compelling evidence for increasing utility of EVAR in appropriate patients.
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