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The Question in This DEBATE....

Does CHEVAR with more than 2 chimneys work well?

Why should Frans and Manish win this debate?

because

... they are a nice persons?
... they are convincing speakers?
... they are highly academic?
... they are excellent vascular surgeons?
... they are expert in the field of aortic diseases?

So - be careful not getting biased

- Authority Bias
- Confirmation Bias
- Group thinking
- many others...
You as an Audience is jeopardized by the „Authority Bias“

You tend to obey an authority (= Frans & Manish) even when it makes no sense instead of being critical and form your own opinion.

The opinion of an expert who talks about evidence level 1 still remains level 5.

---

**Clinical Results of Chimneys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Results of Chimneys</th>
<th>N = 15 studies</th>
<th>N = 93 patients in total</th>
<th>Majority single CG (67)</th>
<th>Mean FU : 9 mths</th>
<th>Technical success 100%</th>
<th>30 d mortality 4.3%</th>
<th>Endoleak 10.7%</th>
<th>Renal Insufficiency 11.8%</th>
<th>Stroke 3.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Proximal Endoleak in Ch-EVAR**

- Moulakakis et al. *J Vasc Surg* 2012 14%
- Antoniou et al. *Vascular* 2012 13%
- Wilson et al. *Br J Surg* 2013 10%
- XiaoHui et al. *EJVES* 2015 19%
- Donas et al. *Ann Surg* 2015 2.9%

---

**The Question in This DEBATE…**

Does CHEVAR with more than 2 chimneys work well?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean No. of Chimneys placed per patient</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1.58</td>
<td>Mean 1.59</td>
<td>Mean 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1.60</td>
<td>Mean 1.60</td>
<td>Mean 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1.46</td>
<td>Mean 1.73</td>
<td>Mean 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 1.73</td>
<td>Mean 1.46</td>
<td>Mean 1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Gutter Endoleak → Rupture → Death

2/9 (22%) Patients

Even Promoters for CHEVAR conclude:

1. Need for conduit placement to left arm
2. Need for right arm access
   - Increasing stroke risk
   - Longer grafts

What about CHEVAS?
(Nellix + Chimneys)

→ 2 Chimneys Maximum!
• Aneurysm Sealing for Complex AAA – Evaluation of Nellix Durability
• Post-market registry of Nellix System with Chimneys
• Open-label, single-arm, no prospective screening
• 200 patients, up to 10 international centers with 5y F/U
• 187 patients (154 primary, 9 rAAA, 25 EVAR, 5 EVAS)
• Endpoints typical of EVAR therapy in complex AAA

Primary CHEVAS Procedures (n=154)

Procedural Details

Stroke Rate at 30 Days

Anatomic Limitations of CHEVAS:
Inner Aortic Diameter

Why should people today in New York vote different than people 6 months ago in London?
Summary

- CHEVAR is an "endo option" for short necks
- CHEVAR is yet an off the shelf solution (CE mark?)
- Gutter endoleaks went down but still of concern
- Mean No. of chimneys per pat. in publ. literature 1.5
- More than 2 chimneys increases stroke risk (1-3%)

Your conclusion must be:

More than 2 Chimneys ?
Don’t do it
because it relates to poor outcome