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Independant Assessment and Comparison of F - Bevar vs Open Surgery

F and Bevar

- High risk patients
- Anatomically suitable for f/b evar
- Treated in selected centers

Open Surgery

- All patients included in the mandatory national data base coding system during the same period of time
Analysis: Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>F and Bevar</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mortality: Group 1

- F and Bevar: 4.5%
- Open: 5%

Mortality: Group 2

- F and Bevar: 12%
- Open: 4%

Mortality: Group 3

- F and Bevar: 12%
- Open: 20%

Costs (including rehospitalisation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F Bevar</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>F Bevar vs Open (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>34,425 (+22,021)</td>
<td>14,987 (+12,399)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>37,927 (+11,984)</td>
<td>17,310 (+12,951)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>54,710 (+28,919)</td>
<td>45,380 (+40,904)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.0001
Costs

- F Bevar: 38,212 € (±23,252)
- Open: 16,497 € (±16,695)
- p<0.0001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Mean (±ET)</th>
<th>Mean (±ET)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Bevar</td>
<td>34,425 (±22,021)</td>
<td>16,997 (±12,889)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17,530 (±12,953)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-year Results

- Survival
- Causes of death (related vs non related)
- Aneurysm exclusion
- Fenestration, Bridge stents and Target Vessels behavior

Causes of Death

- Aneurysm, trt related: 35 (27%)
- (only 1 rupture)
- Unrelated: 33 (41%)
- Unspecified: 11 (13%)

Aneurysm Exclusion

- Primarily obtained: 60%
- Secondary obtained: 84%
- Excluding type 2: 96%

Type 1a EL: 2%
Type 3 EL: 2%

The Fate of Unsuccessful Target Vessel Stenting n=37 (13%)
- SMA: n=18
  18 fenestrations = one EL 3
- Celiac Trunk: n=12
  11 fenestrations, one branch = no EL 3
- Renal artery: n=7
  6 Fenestrations = no EL 3
  1 Branch = one persisting EL 3

Bridge stent and TV patency

Occlusion n = 23 (2.6%)
SMA = 6  RA = 15

Stenosis and/or disconnection (1.3%)
- Stenosis n = 10
- Disconnection n= 3

Reintervention n = 40 in 31 patients (11%)
- Endoleaks: 3%
- Target vessels: 8%
- Limb reintervention: 2%

Conclusion
- F and Bevar are efficient to prevent rupture
- Inability to stent target vessels through fenestration is rarely associated with type 3 endoleak
- TAAA patients treated by F and B evar have a poor life expectancy (patients selection)
- Stents and Target vessels issues are not rare and justify regular surveillance
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