

Protocol

Endovascular Procedures for Intracranial Arterial Disease (Atherosclerosis and Aneurysms)

(20154)

Medical Benefit		Effective Date: 01/01/16	Next Review Date: 11/18
Preauthorization	No	Review Dates: 01/08, 09/08, 09/09, 09/10, 09/11, 07/12, 07/13, 05/14, 11/14, 11/15, 11/16, 11/17	

Preauthorization is not required.

The following protocol contains medical necessity criteria that apply for this service. The criteria are also applicable to services provided in the local Medicare Advantage operating area for those members, unless separate Medicare Advantage criteria are indicated. If the criteria are not met, reimbursement will be denied and the patient cannot be billed. Please note that payment for covered services is subject to eligibility and the limitations noted in the patient's contract at the time the services are rendered.

Populations	Interventions	Comparators	Outcomes
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With acute ischemic stroke due to occlusion of an anterior circulation vessel 	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endovascular mechanical embolectomy 	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard care without endovascular therapy 	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall survival Morbid events Functional outcomes Treatment-related mortality Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With acute ischemic stroke due to basilar artery occlusion 	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endovascular mechanical embolectomy 	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard care without endovascular therapy 	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall survival Morbid events Functional outcomes Treatment-related mortality Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With symptomatic intracranial arterial stenosis 	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intracranial percutaneous transluminal angioplasty with or without stenting 	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard care without endovascular therapy 	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall survival Symptoms Morbid events Functional outcomes Treatment-related mortality Treatment-related morbidity
Individuals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With intracranial aneurysm(s) when surgery is not appropriate and/or standard treatment does not permit aneurysm isolation 	Interventions of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endovascular coiling with intracranial stent placement Intracranial placement of a flow-diverting stent 	Comparators of interest are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endovascular coiling without stent placement Surgical therapy Observation/medical therapy 	Relevant outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall survival Morbid events Functional outcomes Treatment-related mortality Treatment-related morbidity

Description

Intracranial arterial disease includes thromboembolic events, vascular stenoses, and aneurysms. Endovascular techniques have been investigated for treatment of intracranial arterial disease. Endovascular therapy is used as

an alternative or adjunct to intravenous tissue plasminogen activator and supportive care for acute stenosis and as an adjunct to risk-factor modification for chronic stenosis. For cerebral aneurysms, stent-assisted coiling and the use of flow-diverting stents have been evaluated as an alternative to endovascular coiling in patients whose anatomy is not amenable to simple coiling.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals who have acute ischemic stroke due to occlusion of an anterior circulation vessel who receive endovascular mechanical embolectomy, the evidence includes randomized clinical trials (RCTs) comparing endovascular therapy with standard care and systematic reviews of these RCTs. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. From 2013 to 2015, eight RCTs were published comparing endovascular therapies with noninterventional care for acute stroke in patients with anterior circulation occlusions. The five more recent trials (published from 2014 to 2015) all demonstrated a significant benefit in terms of reduced disability at 90 days posttreatment. The trials that demonstrated a benefit to endovascular therapy either exclusively used stent retriever devices or allowed the treating physician to select a device, mostly a stent retriever device, and had high rates of mechanical embolectomy device use in patients randomized to endovascular therapy. All studies that demonstrated a benefit to endovascular therapy required demonstration of a large vessel, anterior circulation occlusion for enrollment. In addition, they were characterized by fast time-to-treatment. To achieve results in real-world settings similar to those in the clinical trials, treatment times, clinical protocols, and patient selection criteria should be similar to those in the RCTs. The evidence is sufficient to determine quantitatively that the technology results in a large improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have acute ischemic stroke due to basilar artery occlusion who receive endovascular mechanical embolectomy, the evidence includes a nonrandomized comparative study and a number of case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. These studies indicate that high rates of recanalization can be achieved with mechanical thrombectomy. However, additional comparative studies are needed to demonstrate that mechanical thrombectomy is superior to standard therapy. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

For individuals who have symptomatic intracranial stenosis who receive intracranial percutaneous transluminal angioplasty with or without stenting, the evidence includes two RCTs and a number of nonrandomized comparative studies and case series. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, symptoms, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. Both available RCTs demonstrated no significant benefit with endovascular therapy. In particular, the SAMMPRIS trial was stopped early due to harms, because the rate of stroke or death at 30 days posttreatment was higher in the endovascular arm, which received percutaneous angioplasty with stenting. Follow-up of SAMMPRIS subjects has demonstrated no long-term benefit from endovascular therapy. Although some nonrandomized studies have suggested a benefit from endovascular therapy, the available evidence from two RCTs does not suggest that intracranial percutaneous transluminal angioplasty with or without stenting improves outcomes for individuals with symptomatic intracranial stenosis. The evidence is sufficient to determine qualitatively that the technology is unlikely to improve the net health outcome.

For individuals who have intracranial aneurysms when surgery is not appropriate and/or standard treatment does not permit aneurysm isolation who receive endovascular coiling with intracranial stent placement or intracranial placement of a flow-diverting stent, the evidence includes several nonrandomized comparative studies and multiple single-arm studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, morbid events, functional outcomes, and treatment-related mortality and morbidity. The available nonrandomized comparative studies report occlusion rates for stent-assisted coiling that are similar to or higher than coiling alone and recurrence rates that

may be lower than for coiling alone. For stent-assisted coiling with self-expanding stents, some evidence also shows that adverse event rates are relatively high, and one nonrandomized comparative trial reported that mortality is higher with stent-assisted coiling than with coiling alone. For placement of flow-diverting stents, one nonrandomized study comparing the flow-diverting stents to endovascular coiling for intracranial aneurysms demonstrated higher rates of aneurysm obliteration in those treated with the Pipeline endovascular device than those treated with coiling, with similar rates of good clinical outcomes. Overall, the available evidence is suggestive of a good efficacy and safety profile for endovascular therapies, however the evidence is insufficient to determine with high certainty whether stent-assisted coiling or placement of a flow-diverting stent improves outcomes for patients with intracranial aneurysms because the risk-benefit ratio cannot be adequately defined. The evidence is insufficient to determine the effects of the technology on health outcomes.

Clinical input indicated strong support for the use of stent-assisted coiling for the treatment of aneurysms that are not amenable to surgery or simple coiling. Similarly, clinical input indicated strong support for the use of flow-diverting stents for certain types of aneurysms when surgical treatment is not appropriate.

Policy

Intracranial stent placement may be considered **medically necessary** as part of the endovascular treatment of intracranial aneurysms for patients when surgical treatment is not appropriate and standard endovascular techniques do not allow for complete isolation of the aneurysm, e.g., wide-neck aneurysm (4 mm or more) or sack-to-neck ratio less than 2:1.

Intracranial flow diverting stents with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for the treatment of intracranial aneurysms may be considered **medically necessary** as part of the endovascular treatment of intracranial aneurysms that meet anatomic criteria (see Policy Guidelines) and are not amenable to surgical treatment or standard endovascular therapy.

Intracranial stent placement is considered **investigational** in the treatment of intracranial aneurysms except as noted above.

Intracranial percutaneous transluminal angioplasty with or without stenting is considered **investigational** in the treatment of atherosclerotic cerebrovascular disease.

The use of endovascular mechanical embolectomy using a device with FDA approval for the treatment of acute ischemic stroke may be considered **medically necessary** as part of the treatment of acute ischemic stroke for patients who meet all of the following criteria:

- Have a demonstrated occlusion within the proximal intracranial anterior circulation (intracranial internal carotid artery, or M1 or M2 segments of the middle cerebral artery, or A1 or A2 segments of the anterior cerebral artery); AND
- Can receive endovascular mechanical embolectomy within 12 hours of symptom onset; AND
- Have evidence of substantial and clinically significant neurological deficits (see Policy Guidelines); AND
- Have evidence of salvageable brain tissue in the affected vascular territory (see Policy Guidelines); AND
- Have no evidence of intracranial hemorrhage or arterial dissection on computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging.

Endovascular interventions are considered **investigational** for the treatment of acute ischemic stroke when the above criteria are not met.

Policy Guidelines*Patient Selection for Endovascular Mechanical Embolectomy for Acute Ischemic Stroke*

The major RCTs demonstrating a benefit to endovascular mechanical embolectomy varied in criteria for selecting patients based on the presence/absence of salvageable brain tissue. Several RCTs use the Alberta Stroke Program Early Computed Tomography Score (ASPECTs) score, which is a 10-point quantitative topographic computed tomography (CT) score to assess the presence of early ischemic changes. MR CLEAN (Berkhemer et al, 2015) did not specify imaging criteria to demonstrate salvageable brain tissue. The following are criteria used by other trials:

- REVASCAT (Jovin et al, 2015). *Exclusion* criteria were as follows: Hypodensity on CT or restricted diffusion demonstrated by:
 - An ASPECTs score of less than seven on CT, CT perfusion cerebral blood volume (CBV), computed tomographic angiography (CTA) source imaging; OR
 - An ASPECTs score of less than six on diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).
- ESCAPE (Goyal et al, 2015). *Exclusion* criteria were as follows:
 - Baseline non-contrast CT with extensive early ischemic changes of ASPECTs of zero to five in the territory of symptomatic intracranial occlusion; OR
 - Other confirmation of a moderate to large core defined one of three ways:
 - On a single phase, multiphase or dynamic CTA: no or minimal collaterals in a region greater than 50% of the MCA territory when compared to pial filling on the contralateral side (multiphase/dynamic CTA preferred); OR
 - On CT perfusion (greater than eight cm coverage): a low CBV and very low cerebral blood flow (CBF) ASPECTs less than six AND in the symptomatic MCA territory; OR
 - On CT perfusion (less than eight cm coverage): a region of low CBV and very low CBF greater than one-third of the CT perfusion-imaged symptomatic MCA territory.
- EXTEND-IA (Campbell et al, 2015). Inclusion criteria were based on CT perfusion imaging using CT or MRI with a Tmax more than six second delay perfusion volume and either CT-regional cerebral blood flow (rCBF) or DWI infarct core volume as follows:
 - Mismatch ratio of greater than 1.2; AND
 - Absolute mismatch volume of greater than 10 ml; AND
 - Infarct core lesion volume of less than 70 ml.
- SWIFT PRIME Trial (Saver et al, 2015). Exclusion criteria related to imaging-demonstrated core infarct and hypoperfusion:
 - MRI-assessed core infarct lesion greater than:
 - 50 cm³ for subjects age 18 to 79 years;
 - 20 cm³ for subjects age 80 to 85 years;
 - CT-assessed core infarct lesion greater than:
 - 40 cm³ for subjects age 18 to 79 years;

- 15 cm³ for subjects age 80 to 85 years;
- For all subjects, severe hypoperfusion lesion (10 sec or more Tmax lesion larger than 100 cm³);
- For all subjects, ischemic penumbra of 15 cm³ or more and mismatch ratio greater than 1.8.

The RCTs demonstrating a benefit to endovascular mechanical embolectomy in acute stroke generally had some inclusion criteria to reflect stroke severity, with the exception of EXTEND-IA trial. The REVASCAT and ESCAPE trials both required a baseline (post-stroke) National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score of six or higher. MR CLEAN specified a clinical diagnosis of acute stroke with a deficit on the NIHSS of two points or more. SWIFT PRIME specified an NIHSS score of eight or above and less than 30 at the time of randomization.

Other Policy Guidelines

Flow-diverting stents are indicated for the treatment of large or giant wide-necked intracranial aneurysms, with a size of 10 mm or more and a neck diameter of four mm or more, in the internal carotid artery from the petrous to the superior hypophyseal segments.

This protocol only addresses endovascular therapies used on intracranial vessels.

These policy statements are not intended to address the use of rescue endovascular therapies, including intra-arterial vasodilator infusion and intracranial percutaneous transluminal angiography, in delayed cerebral ischemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage.

Medicare Advantage

For Medicare Advantage, all indications for percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (PTA) with or without stenting to treat obstructive lesions of the vertebral and cerebral arteries are **investigational**, unless they are provided for the treatment of cerebral artery stenosis greater than or equal to 50% in patients with intracranial atherosclerotic disease when furnished in accordance with the FDA-approved protocols governing FDA-approved Category B IDE clinical trials.

Background

Cerebrovascular Diseases

Cerebrovascular diseases include a range of processes affecting the cerebral vascular system, including arterial thromboembolism, arterial stenosis, and arterial aneurysms, all of which can restrict cerebral blood flow due to ischemia or hemorrhage. Endovascular techniques, including endovascular mechanical embolectomy with various types of devices (i.e., stents), and angioplasty with or without stenting have been investigated for treatment of cerebrovascular diseases.

Acute Stroke

Acute stroke is the third leading cause of death in the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan; it is the leading cause of adult disability in the United States.¹ Eighty-seven percent of strokes are ischemic and 13% hemorrhagic. Differentiation between the two types of stroke is necessary to determine the appropriate treatment. Ischemic stroke occurs when an artery to the brain is blocked by a blood clot, which forms in the artery (thrombotic), or when another substance (i.e., plaque, fatty material) travels to an artery in the brain causing a blockage (embolism). Recanalization of the artery, particularly in the first few hours after occlusion, reduces rates of disability and death.²

Treatment

The prompt use of intravenous (IV) thrombolytic therapy with recombinant tissue plasminogen activator (tPA) to recanalize occluded blood vessels has been associated with improved outcomes in multiple randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses.³ Therefore, use of IV tPA in ischemic stroke patients presenting within three hours (up to 4.5 hours in some cases) of stroke onset in expert centers is recommended.

Despite the potential benefits of IV tPA in eligible patients who present within the appropriate time window, limitations to reperfusion therapy with IV tPA have prompted investigations of alternative acute stroke therapies. These limitations include:

- Requirement for treatment within 4.5 hours of stroke onset. Relatively few patients present for care within the time window in which tPA has shown benefit. In addition, determining the time of onset of symptoms is challenging in patients awakening with symptoms of acute stroke; patients with symptoms on awakening are considered to have symptom onset when they went to sleep. In 2010 to 2011, fewer than 10% of all ischemic stroke patients arrived at the hospital and received IV tPA within the three-hour window.⁴
- Risks associated with IV tPA therapy. tPA is associated with increased risk of intracranial bleeding. It is contraindicated in hemorrhagic stroke and in some ischemic stroke patients for whom the risk of bleeding outweighs the potential benefit, such as those with mild or resolving symptoms, hypocoagulable state, or advanced age.
- Variable recanalization rates. For patients receiving tPA, recanalization rates are around 21% and range from about 4% in the distal internal carotid artery and basilar artery to about 32% in the middle cerebral artery.⁵ The treatment of large vessel strokes with IV tPA may be less successful.

Researchers have studied intra-arterial tPA, transcranial ultrasound energy, and mechanical clot destruction or clot removal as alternatives or second lines to the established intravenous tPA therapy.

Several types of endovascular treatments for ischemic strokes have been used:

- Intra-arterial fibrinolytic therapy (i.e., intra-arterial tPA). Although tPA only has approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for its intravenous route of delivery, intra-arterial tPA has been considered for patients who fail to present within the window of treatment for intravenous tPA or who have failed to show benefit from intravenous tPA. It is also frequently used in conjunction with other endovascular devices.
- Acute angioplasty and/or stent deployment. Balloon angioplasty and balloon-expandable stents have been investigated for acute stroke. Given concern for higher risks of complications in the cerebral vasculature with the use of balloon-expandable stents, self-expanding stents have gained more attention. At present, no balloon- or self-expandable stent has FDA approval for treatment of acute stroke.
- Endovascular mechanical embolectomy. Endovascular embolectomy devices remove or disrupt clots by a number of mechanisms. Four devices have FDA approval for treatment of acute stroke (see Regulatory Status section): the Merci Retriever, Penumbra System, Solitaire Flow Restoration Device and the Trevo Retriever. With the Merci device, a microcatheter is passed through the thrombus from a larger, percutaneous catheter positioned proximal to the occlusion. A helical snare is deployed, and the catheter and clot are withdrawn together. With the Penumbra device, an opening at the tip of the percutaneous catheter uses suction to extract the clot. Both the Solitaire Flow Restoration Device and the Trevo Retriever are retrievable stents, which are positioned to integrate the clot with the stent for removal with the stent's struts.

This protocol focuses on the devices listed above with an indication for endovascular embolectomy for acute stroke. Additional retrievable stent devices are under investigation, such as the Embolus Retriever with Inter-linked Cages (ERIC; MicroVention, Tustin, CA).⁶

An additional clinical situation in which endovascular therapies may be used in the treatment of acute ischemic stroke is in the setting of cerebral vasospasm following intracranial (subarachnoid) hemorrhage. Delayed cerebral ischemia (DCI) occurs about three to 14 days after the acute bleed in about 30% of patients experiencing subarachnoid hemorrhage and is a significant contributor to morbidity and mortality in patients who survive the initial bleed. In cases refractory to medical measures, rescue invasive therapies including intra-arterial vasodilator infusion therapy (e.g., calcium channel blockers) and transluminal balloon angioplasty may be used.^{7,8} The mechanism of disease, patient population, and time course of therapy differ for DCI occurring after subarachnoid hemorrhage compared with ischemic stroke due to atheroembolic disease. Therefore, this indication for endovascular intervention will not be addressed in this protocol.

Intracranial Atherosclerotic Disease

It is estimated that intracranial atherosclerosis causes about 8% of all ischemic strokes. Intracranial stenosis may contribute to stroke in two ways: either due to embolism or low-flow ischemia in the absence of collateral circulation. Recurrent annual stroke rates are estimated at 4% to 12% per year with atherosclerosis of the intracranial anterior circulation and 2.5% to 15% per year with lesions of the posterior (vertebrobasilar) circulation.

Treatment

Medical treatment typically includes either anticoagulant therapy (i.e., warfarin) or antiplatelet therapy (e.g., aspirin). The Warfarin-Aspirin Symptomatic Intracranial Disease (WASID) trial assessed the incidence of stroke brain hemorrhage or death among patients randomized to receive aspirin or warfarin. The trial found that over a mean 1.8 years of follow-up, warfarin provided no benefit over aspirin and was associated with a significantly higher rate of complications. In addition, if symptoms could be attributed to low-flow ischemia, agents to increase mean arterial blood pressure and avoidance of orthostatic hypotension may be recommended. However, medical therapy has been considered less than optimal. For example, in patients with persistent symptoms despite antithrombotic therapy, the subsequent rate of stroke or death has been extremely high, estimated in one study at 45%, with recurrent events within one month of the initial event. Surgical approaches have met with limited success. The widely cited extracranial-intracranial bypass study randomized 1377 patients with symptomatic atherosclerosis of the internal carotid or middle cerebral arteries to medical care or EC/IC bypass. Outcomes in the two groups were similar, suggesting that the extracranial-intracranial bypass is ineffective in preventing cerebral ischemia. Due to inaccessibility, surgical options for the posterior circulation are even more limited.

Percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (PTA) has been approached cautiously for use in intracranial circulation, due to technical difficulties in catheter and stent design and the risk of embolism, which may result in devastating complications if occurring in the posterior fossa or brain stem. However, improvement in the ability to track catheterization, allowing catheterization of tortuous vessels, and the increased use of stents have created ongoing interest in PTA as a minimally invasive treatment of this difficult-to-treat population. Most published studies of intracranial PTA have focused on vertebrobasilar circulation. Two endovascular devices have FDA approval for treatment of symptomatic intracranial stenosis and are considered here (see Regulatory Status section).

Intracranial Aneurysms

Compared with acute ischemic stroke, cerebral aneurysms have a much lower incidence in the United States,

with prevalence between 0.5% and 6% of the population.⁹ However, they are associated with significant morbidity and mortality due to subarachnoid hemorrhage resulting from aneurysm rupture.

Treatment

Surgical clipping of intracranial aneurysms has been used since the 1960s, but the feasibility of clipping for aneurysms depends on the aneurysm location. Intracranial stents are also being used to treat cerebral aneurysms. Stent-assisted coiling began as an approach to treat fusiform or wide-neck aneurysms in which other surgical or endovascular treatment strategies may not be feasible. As experience has grown, stenting has also been used in smaller berry aneurysms as an approach to decrease the rate of retreatment needed in patients who receive coiling. A randomized trial has demonstrated that treatment of ruptured intracranial aneurysms with coiling leads to improved short-term outcome compared with surgical clipping; however, patients who receive coiling need more repeat/follow-up procedures. In 2011, the Pipeline Embolization Device, which falls into a new device category called “intracranial aneurysm flow diverters,” or flow-diverting stent, received FDA premarket approval for endovascular treatment of large or giant wide-necked intracranial aneurysms in the internal carotid artery. The Pipeline device is a braided, wire mesh device that is placed within the parent artery of an aneurysm to redirect blood flow away from the aneurysm, with the goal of preventing aneurysm rupture and possibly decreasing aneurysm size.

Other flow-diverting or flow-disrupting devices are under development or in use outside the United States. Other flow-diverters are the FRED system (MicroVention, Tustin, CA), the Silk device (Balt Extrusion, Montmorency, France), the Surpass Streamline Flow Diverter (Stryker, Kalamazoo, MI), and the p64 Flow Modulation Device (Phenox, Bochum, Germany).

The Woven EndoBridge aneurysm embolization system (Sequent Medical, Aliso Viejo, CA) is an intrasaccular flow disrupter that is designed to bridge the neck of an aneurysm. The device is under evaluation in a U.S. investigational device exemption clinical study (WEB-IT).

In addition to the development of flow-diverting stents, several low-profile self-expandable intracranial stents are in various stages of development: LEO Baby (Balt Extrusion, Montmorency, France) and LVIS Jr (MicroVention, Tustin, CA). At least one retrievable self-expanding stent is available in Europe for the treatment of aneurysms, the Solitaire AB device (Covidien [now Medtronic], Plymouth, MN).

Finally, at least two devices designed to treat aneurysms at vessel bifurcations are CE marked in Europe, but not available in the United States: the pCONus Bifurcation Aneurysm Implant (MicroVention, Tustin, CA) and the PulseRider (Pulsar Vascular, San Jose, CA).

Regulatory Status

Several devices for endovascular treatment of intracranial arterial disease were cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process or the humanitarian device exemption (HDE) process. By indication, approved devices are as follows.

Acute Stroke

Merci® Retriever

In August 2004, the Merci® Retriever was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. This device was judged equivalent to a predicate device, the Concentric Retriever, which was indicated for endovascular foreign body removal. FDA clearance indicated that the Mechanical Embolus Removal in Cerebral Ischemia (MERCI) Clinical Study established that no new issues of safety or effectiveness exist when the Merci Retriever is used for thrombus removal versus foreign body removal from the neurovasculature. In May 2006, a modified

Merci Retriever, also manufactured by Concentric Medical, was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. The clearance notes that the Modified Merci Retriever is intended to restore blood flow in the neurovasculature by removing thrombus in patients experiencing ischemic stroke. Patients who are ineligible for intravenous plasminogen activator (tPA) or who fail intravenous tPA therapy are candidates for treatment. The device also has clearance for retrieval of foreign bodies misplaced during interventional radiologic procedures in the neuro-, peripheral, and coronary vasculature. FDA product code: NRY.

The Penumbra System®

In December 2007, the Penumbra System® was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to existing devices for use in the revascularization of patients with acute ischemic stroke secondary to intracranial large vessel occlusive disease (in the internal carotid, middle cerebral [M1 and M2] segments, basilar, and vertebral arteries) within eight hours of symptom onset. FDA product code: NRY.

Solitaire™ FR

In March 2012, the Solitaire™ FR device was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to the Merci Retriever device, based on a randomized controlled trial (RCT), of 113 patients, submitted to FDA comparing the Merci and Solitaire devices. Indications for the device are patients with ischemic stroke due to large intracranial vessel occlusion who are ineligible for intravenous tPA, or who fail intravenous tPA. FDA product code: NRY.

Trevo Pro Retriever™

In August 2012, the Trevo Pro Retriever™ device was cleared for marketing by FDA through the 510(k) process. FDA determined that this device was substantially equivalent to the Merci Retriever device, based on an RCT of 178 patients from 27 centers in the United States and Europe that compared the Trevo® device with the Merci® device. Indications for the device are patients with acute ischemic stroke due to large intracranial vessel occlusion who are ineligible for or fail intravenous tPA. Later versions of the Trevo® Retriever are called the Modified Trevo® Retriever, the Trevo® ProVue Retriever, and the Modified Trevo® ProVue Retriever; the name Trevo Retriever is used throughout this review. FDA product code: NRY.

Table 1 summarizes the devices with FDA clearance for the endovascular treatment of acute stroke.

Table 1: FDA-Cleared Mechanical Embolectomy Devices for Acute Stroke

Device	Approval Date	Indications
Merci® Retriever (Concentric Medical, Mountain View, CA; acquired by Stryker Neurovascular, Kalamazoo, MI, in 2011)	Aug 2004 (modified device approved May 2006)	Patients with acute ischemic stroke and who are ineligible for or who fail IV tPA therapy
Penumbra System® (Penumbra, Alameda, CA)	Dec 2007	Patients with acute ischemic stroke secondary to intracranial large vessel occlusive disease within eight hours of symptom onset
Stent retrievers		
Solitaire™ FR Revascularization Device (Covidien/ev3 Neurovascular, Irvine, CA)	Mar 2012	Patients with acute ischemic stroke due to large intracranial vessel occlusion who are ineligible for or who fail IV tPA
Trevo® Retriever device (Stryker Neurovascular, Kalamazoo, MI)	Aug 2012	Patients with acute ischemic stroke due to large intracranial vessel occlusion who are ineligible for or who fail IV tPA

FDA: Food and Drug Administration; IV: intravenous; tPA: tissue plasminogen activator.

Intracranial Stenosis

Two devices were approved by FDA through the HDE process for atherosclerotic disease. This form of FDA approval is available for devices used to treat conditions with 4000 or fewer incidents per year; FDA only requires data showing “probable safety and effectiveness.” Devices with their labeled indications are as follows.

Neurolink System®

“The Neurolink system [Guidant, Santa Clara, CA] is indicated for the treatment of patients with recurrent intracranial stroke attributable to atherosclerotic disease refractory to medical therapy in intracranial vessels ranging from 2.5 to 4.5 mm in diameter with $\geq 50\%$ stenosis and that are accessible to the stent system.”

Wingspan™ Stent System

“The Wingspan Stent System [Boston Scientific, Fremont, CA] with Gateway PTA Balloon Catheter is indicated for use in improving cerebral artery lumen diameter in patients with intracranial atherosclerotic disease, refractory to medical therapy, in intracranial vessels with $\geq 50\%$ stenosis that are accessible to the system.”

Intracranial Aneurysms

In 2011, the Pipeline® Embolization Device (Covidien/eV3 Neurovascular, Irvine, CA), an intracranial aneurysm flow diverter, was approved by FDA through the premarket approval process for the endovascular treatment of adults (≥ 22 years) with large or giant wide-necked intracranial aneurysms in the internal carotid artery from the petrous to the superior hypophyseal segments (P100018).¹⁰ Approval was based on the Pipeline for Uncoilable for Failed Aneurysms Study, a single-arm, open-label feasibility study that included 108 patients, ages 30 to 75 years, with unruptured large and giant wide-necked aneurysms.¹¹

Three stents have been approved by FDA through the HDE program process for treatment of intracranial aneurysms.

Neuroform™ Microdelivery Stent System

In 2002, based on a series of approximately 30 patients with six-month follow-up, the Neuroform Microdelivery Stent System (Stryker, Kalamazoo, MI) was approved by FDA through the HDE process for use with embolic coils for treatment of wide-neck intracranial aneurysms that cannot be treated by surgical clipping (H020002).

Enterprise™ Vascular Reconstruction Device and Delivery System

In 2007, based on a series of approximately 30 patients with six-month follow-up, the Enterprise™ Vascular Reconstruction Device and Delivery (Cordis Neurovascular, Miami Lakes, FL) was approved by FDA through the HDE process for use with embolic coils for treatment of wide-neck, intracranial, saccular or fusiform aneurysms (H060001).

The Low-Profile Visualized Intraluminal Support Device

In July 2014, the Low-Profile Visualized Intraluminal Support Device (LVIS™ and LVIS™ Jr.) (MicroVention, Tustin, CA) was approved by FDA through the HDE process (H130005) for use with embolic coils for the treatment of unruptured, wide neck (neck, 4 mm or greater or dome to neck ratio, less than two), intracranial, saccular aneurysms arising from a parent vessel with a diameter of 2.5 mm or greater and 4.5 mm or smaller.

Related Protocol

Extracranial Carotid Artery Stenting

Services that are the subject of a clinical trial do not meet our Technology Assessment Protocol criteria and are considered investigational. *For explanation of experimental and investigational, please refer to the Technology Assessment Protocol.*

It is expected that only appropriate and medically necessary services will be rendered. We reserve the right to conduct prepayment and postpayment reviews to assess the medical appropriateness of the above-referenced procedures. **Some of this protocol may not pertain to the patients you provide care to, as it may relate to products that are not available in your geographic area.**

References

We are not responsible for the continuing viability of web site addresses that may be listed in any references below.

1. Meyers PM, Schumacher HC, Connolly ES, Jr., et al. Current status of endovascular stroke treatment. *Circulation*. Jun 7 2011; 123(22):2591-2601. PMID 21646506
2. Rha JH, Saver JL. The impact of recanalization on ischemic stroke outcome: a meta-analysis. *Stroke*. Mar 2007; 38(3):967-973. PMID 17272772
3. Jauch EC, Saver JL, Adams HP, Jr., et al. Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. Mar 2013; 44(3):870-947. PMID 23370205
4. Schwamm LH, Ali SF, Reeves MJ, et al. Temporal trends in patient characteristics and treatment with intravenous thrombolysis among acute ischemic stroke patients at Get With The Guidelines-Stroke hospitals. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. Sep 1 2013; 6(5):543-549. PMID 24046398
5. Bhatia R, Hill MD, Shobha N, et al. Low rates of acute recanalization with intravenous recombinant tissue plasminogen activator in ischemic stroke: real-world experience and a call for action. *Stroke*. Oct 2010; 41(10):2254-2258. PMID 20829513
6. Kahles T, Garcia-Esperon C, Zeller S, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy using the new ERIC Retrieval device is feasible, efficient, and safe in acute ischemic stroke: A Swiss stroke center experience. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jan 2016; 37(1):114-119. PMID 26294644
7. Abruzzo T, Moran C, Blackham KA, et al. Invasive interventional management of post-hemorrhagic cerebral vasospasm in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. *J Neurointerv Surg*. May 2012; 4(3):169-177. PMID 22374130
8. Diringer MN, Bleck TP, Claude Hemphill J, 3rd, et al. Critical care management of patients following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: recommendations from the Neurocritical Care Society's Multidisciplinary Consensus Conference. *Neurocrit Care*. Sep 2011; 15(2):211-240. PMID 21773873
9. Meyers PM, Schumacher HC, Higashida RT, et al. Indications for the performance of intracranial endovascular neurointerventional procedures: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Radiology and Intervention, Stroke Council, Council on Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia, Interdisciplinary Council on Peripheral Vascular Disease, and Interdisciplinary Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research. *Circulation*. Apr 28 2009; 119(16):2235-2249. PMID 19349327
10. FDA Summary of Safety and Effectiveness. 2011; http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf10/P100018b.pdf. Accessed July 14, 2015.
11. Becske T, Kallmes DF, Saatci I, et al. Pipeline for uncoilable or failed aneurysms: results from a multicenter clinical trial. *Radiology*. Jun 2013; 267(3):858-868. PMID 23418004
12. Badhiwala JH, Nassiri F, Alhazzani W, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*. Nov 3 2015; 314(17):1832-1843. PMID 26529161

13. Ciccone A, Valvassori L, Nichelatti M, et al. Endovascular treatment for acute ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 7 2013; 368(10):904-913. PMID 23387822
14. Kidwell CS, Jahan R, Gornbein J, et al. A trial of imaging selection and endovascular treatment for ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 7 2013; 368(10):914-923. PMID 23394476
15. Broderick JP, Palesch YY, Demchuk AM, et al. Endovascular therapy after intravenous t-PA versus t-PA alone for stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 7 2013; 368(10):893-903. PMID 23390923
16. Berkhemer OA, Fransen PS, Beumer D, et al. A randomized trial of intraarterial treatment for acute ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 1 2015; 372(1):11-20. PMID 25517348
17. Goyal M, Demchuk AM, Menon BK, et al. Randomized assessment of rapid endovascular treatment of ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 12 2015; 372(11):1019-1030. PMID 25671798
18. Campbell BC, Mitchell PJ, Kleinig TJ, et al. Endovascular therapy for ischemic stroke with perfusion-imaging selection. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 12 2015; 372(11):1009-1018. PMID 25671797
19. Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafe A, et al. Stent-retriever thrombectomy after intravenous t-PA vs. t-PA alone in stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 11 2015; 372(24):2285-2295. PMID 25882376
20. Jovin TG, Chamorro A, Cobo E, et al. Thrombectomy within 8 hours after symptom onset in ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 11 2015; 372(24):2296-2306. PMID 25882510
21. Chen CJ, Ding D, Starke RM, et al. Endovascular vs. medical management of acute ischemic stroke. *Neurology*. Dec 1 2015; 85(22):1980-1990. PMID 26537058
22. Hong KS, Ko SB, Lee JS, et al. Endovascular recanalization therapy in acute ischemic stroke: updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Stroke*. Sep 2015; 17(3):268-281. PMID 26437993
23. Kennedy SA, Baerlocher MO, Baerlocher F, et al. Meta-analysis of local endovascular therapy for acute ischemic stroke. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. Mar 2016; 27(3):307-321 e302. PMID 26803573
24. Bush CK, Kurimella D, Cross LJ, et al. Endovascular treatment with stent-retriever devices for acute ischemic stroke: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS One*. 2016; 11(1):e0147287. PMID 26807742
25. Grech R, Schembri M, Thornton J. Stent-based thrombectomy versus intravenous tissue plasminogen activator in acute ischaemic stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Interv Neuroradiol*. Dec 2015; 21(6):684-690. PMID 26490828
26. Marmagiolis K, Hakeem A, Cilingiroglu M, et al. Safety and efficacy of stent retrievers for the management of acute ischemic stroke: comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. Nov 2015; 8(13):1758-1765. PMID 26476611
27. Touma L, Fillion KB, Sterling LH, et al. Stent retrievers for the treatment of acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *JAMA Neurol*. Mar 1 2016; 73(3):275-281. PMID 26810499
28. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association. Endovascular Treatments for Acute Ischemic Stroke in Adults. *TEC Assessments*. 2014; 29: Tab 11. PMID
29. Saver JL, Jahan R, Levy EI, et al. Solitaire flow restoration device versus the Merci Retriever in patients with acute ischaemic stroke (SWIFT): a randomised, parallel-group, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. Oct 6 2012; 380(9849):1241-1249. PMID 22932715
30. Nogueira RG, Lutsep HL, Gupta R, et al. Trevo versus Merci retrievers for thrombectomy revascularisation of large vessel occlusions in acute ischaemic stroke (TREVO 2): a randomised trial. *Lancet*. Oct 6 2012; 380(9849):1231-1240. PMID 22932714
31. Prabhakaran S, Ruff I, Bernstein RA. Acute stroke intervention: a systematic review. *JAMA*. Apr 14 2015; 313(14):1451-1462. PMID 25871671
32. Zheng F, Xie W. Imaging-based patient selection and endovascular therapy of ischemic stroke: a stratified meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Sep 2015; 94(38):e1539. PMID 26402810
33. Fargen KM, Neal D, Fiorella DJ, et al. A meta-analysis of prospective randomized controlled trials evaluating endovascular therapies for acute ischemic stroke. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Feb 2015; 7(2):84-89. PMID 25432979

34. Singh B, Parsaik AK, Prokop LJ, et al. Endovascular therapy for acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Mayo Clin Proc.* Oct 2013; 88(10):1056-1065. PMID 24079677
35. Mokin M, Kass-Hout T, Kass-Hout O, et al. Intravenous thrombolysis and endovascular therapy for acute ischemic stroke with internal carotid artery occlusion: a systematic review of clinical outcomes. *Stroke.* Jul 17 2012; 43(9):2362-2368. PMID 22811456
36. Almekhlafi MA, Menon BK, Freiheit EA, et al. A meta-analysis of observational intra-arterial stroke therapy studies using the Merci Device, Penumbra System, and Retrievable Stents. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Jul 26 2013; 34(1):140-145. PMID 22837311
37. Baker WL, Colby JA, Tongbram V, et al. Neurothrombectomy devices for the treatment of acute ischemic stroke: state of the evidence. *Ann Intern Med.* Feb 15 2011; 154(4):243-252. PMID 21242342
38. Stead LG, Gilmore RM, Bellolio MF, et al. Percutaneous clot removal devices in acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Neurol.* Aug 2008; 65(8):1024-1030. PMID 18695052
39. MacIsaac RL, Khatri P, Bendszus M, et al. A collaborative sequential meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomized trials of endovascular therapy and tPA vs. tPA alone for acute ischemic stroke: ThRombEctomy And tPA (TREAT) analysis: statistical analysis plan for a sequential meta-analysis performed within the VISTA-Endovascular collaboration. *Int J Stroke.* Oct 2015; 10 Suppl A100:136-144. PMID 26352438
40. Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafe A, et al. Solitaire with the Intention for Thrombectomy as Primary Endovascular Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke (SWIFT PRIME) trial: protocol for a randomized, controlled, multicenter study comparing the Solitaire revascularization device with IV tPA with IV tPA alone in acute ischemic stroke. *Int J Stroke.* Apr 2015; 10(3):439-448. PMID 25777831
41. Tomsick TA, Yeatts SD, Liebeskind DS, et al. Endovascular revascularization results in IMS III: intracranial ICA and M1 occlusions. *J Neurointerv Surg.* Nov 2015; 7(11):795-802. PMID 25342652
42. Demchuk AM, Goyal M, Yeatts SD, et al. Recanalization and clinical outcome of occlusion sites at baseline CT angiography in the Interventional Management of Stroke III trial. *Radiology.* Oct 2014; 273(1):202-210. PMID 24895878
43. Akins PT, Amar AP, Pakbaz RS, et al. Complications of endovascular treatment for acute stroke in the SWIFT Trial with Solitaire and Merci Devices. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Sep 12 2014; 35(3):524-528. PMID 24029392
44. Saposnik G, Lebovic G, Demchuk A, et al. Added benefit of stent retriever technology for acute ischemic stroke: a pooled analysis of the NINDS tPA, SWIFT, and STAR Trials. *Neurosurgery.* Sep 2015; 77(3):454-461. PMID 26280825
45. Pereira VM, Gralla J, Davalos A, et al. Prospective, multicenter, single-arm study of mechanical thrombectomy using Solitaire Flow Restoration in acute ischemic stroke. *Stroke.* Oct 2013; 44(10):2802-2807. PMID 23908066
46. Rai AT, Carpenter JS, Raghuram K, et al. Endovascular therapy yields significantly superior outcomes for large vessel occlusions compared with intravenous thrombolysis: is it time to randomize? *J Neurointerv Surg.* Jul 28 2012; 5(5):430-434. PMID 22842210
47. Urra X, San Roman L, Gil F, et al. Endovascular treatment of patients with large vessel occlusion presenting with mild symptoms: an observational multicenter study. *Cerebrovasc Dis.* Dec 3 2014; 38(6):418-424. PMID 25472576
48. Song D, Kim BM, Kim DJ, et al. Comparison of stent retriever and intra-arterial fibrinolysis in patients with acute ischaemic stroke. *Eur J Neurol.* May 2014; 21(5):779-784. PMID 24612359
49. Alexandrov AV, Schellinger PD, Saqqur M, et al. Reperfusion and outcomes in Penumbra vs. systemic tissue plasminogen activator clinical trials. *Int J Stroke.* Apr 2011; 6(2):118-122. PMID 21371272
50. Taschner CA, Treier M, Schumacher M, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy with the Penumbra recanalization device in acute ischemic stroke. *J Neuroradiol.* Mar 2011; 38(1):47-52. PMID 21255841

51. Kappelhof M, Marquering HA, Berkhemer OA, et al. Intra-arterial treatment of patients with acute ischemic stroke and internal carotid artery occlusion: a literature review. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 2015; 7(1):8-15. PMID 24385555
52. Turk AS, Turner R, Spiotta A, et al. Comparison of endovascular treatment approaches for acute ischemic stroke: cost effectiveness, technical success, and clinical outcomes. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Sep 2015; 7(9):666-670. PMID 25028502
53. Kass-Hout T, Kass-Hout O, Sun CH, et al. Clinical, angiographic and radiographic outcome differences among mechanical thrombectomy devices: initial experience of a large-volume center. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Mar 2015; 7(3):176-181. PMID 24658654
54. Broussalis E, Trinka E, Hitzl W, et al. Comparison of stent-retriever devices versus the Merci Retriever for endovascular treatment of acute stroke. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jul 12 2013; 34(2):366-372. PMID 22790249
55. Mendonca N, Flores A, Pagola J, et al. Trevo versus solitaire a head-to-head comparison between two heavy weights of clot retrieval. *J Neuroimaging*. Mar-Apr 2014; 24(2):167-170. PMID 22913726
56. Fesl G, Patzig M, Holtmannspoetter M, et al. Endovascular mechanical recanalisation after intravenous thrombolysis in acute anterior circulation stroke: the impact of a new temporary stent. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. Dec 9 2011; 35(6):1326-1331. PMID 22160095
57. Flint AC, Duckwiler GR, Budzik RF, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy of intracranial internal carotid occlusion: pooled results of the MERCI and Multi MERCI Part I trials. *Stroke*. Apr 2007; 38(4):1274-1280. PMID 17332445
58. Lin R, Vora N, Zaidi S, et al. Mechanical approaches combined with intra-arterial pharmacological therapy are associated with higher recanalization rates than either intervention alone in revascularization of acute carotid terminus occlusion. *Stroke*. Jun 2009; 40(6):2092-2097. PMID 19390066
59. Kim D, Jahan R, Starkman S, et al. Endovascular mechanical clot retrieval in a broad ischemic stroke cohort. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Nov-Dec 2006; 27(10):2048-2052. PMID 17110664
60. Devlin TG, Baxter BW, Feintuch TA, et al. The Merci Retrieval System for acute stroke: the Southeast Regional Stroke Center experience. *Neurocrit Care*. 2007; 6(1):11-21. PMID 17356186
61. Restrepo L, Bang OY, Ovbiagele B, et al. Impact of hyperlipidemia and statins on ischemic stroke outcomes after intra-arterial fibrinolysis and percutaneous mechanical embolectomy. *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2009; 28(4):384-390. PMID 19713698
62. Abou-Chebl A. Endovascular treatment of acute ischemic stroke may be safely performed with no time window limit in appropriately selected patients. *Stroke*. Sep 2010; 41(9):1996-2000. PMID 20651271
63. Castano C, Dorado L, Guerrero C, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy with the Solitaire AB device in large artery occlusions of the anterior circulation: a pilot study. *Stroke*. Aug 2010; 41(8):1836-1840. PMID 20538693
64. Abelson M, Roos J. Mechanical embolectomy for large vessel ischemic strokes: A cardiologist's experience. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. Apr 30 2010; 76(3):309-315. PMID 20506287
65. Zaidat OO, Castonguay AC, Gupta R, et al. North American Solitaire Stent Retriever Acute Stroke registry: post-marketing revascularization and clinical outcome results. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Oct 2014; 6(8):584-588. PMID 24062252
66. Behme D, Kowoll A, Mpotsaris A, et al. Multicenter clinical experience in over 125 patients with the Penumbra Separator 3D for mechanical thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 2016; 8(1):8-12. PMID 25366355
67. Eugene F, Gauvrit JY, Ferre JC, et al. One-year MR angiographic and clinical follow-up after intracranial mechanical thrombectomy using a stent retriever device. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jan 2015; 36(1):126-132. PMID 25125665
68. Gascou G, Lobotesis K, Machi P, et al. Stent retrievers in acute ischemic stroke: complications and failures during the perioperative period. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Apr 2014; 35(4):734-740. PMID 24157734

69. Parrilla G, Carreon E, Zamarro J, et al. Recanalization and mortality rates of thrombectomy with stent-retrievers in octogenarian patients with acute ischemic stroke. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. Jun 13 2015; 38(2):288-294. PMID 24923241
70. Nikoubashman O, Reich A, Pjontek R, et al. Postinterventional subarachnoid haemorrhage after endovascular stroke treatment with stent retrievers. *Neuroradiology*. Dec 2014; 56(12):1087-1096. PMID 25228448
71. Binning MJ, Adel JG, Maxwell CR, et al. Early postmarket experience after US Food and Drug Administration approval with the Trevo device for thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke. *Neurosurgery*. Nov 2014; 75(5):584-589; discussion 589. PMID 25121793
72. Broussalis E, Trinkka E, Wallner A, et al. Thrombectomy in patients with large cerebral artery occlusion: a single-center experience with a new stent retriever. *Vasc Endovascular Surg*. Nov 17 2014; 48(2):144-152. PMID 24249122
73. Cheang MY, Manning N, Churilov L, et al. Recanalisation success is associated with good clinical outcome despite advanced age and stroke severity in patients treated with the Solitaire stentriever. *J Clin Neurosci*. Oct 22 2014; 21(3):401-405. PMID 24161340
74. Cohen JE, Rabinstein AA, Ramirez-de-Noriega F, et al. Excellent rates of recanalization and good functional outcome after stent-based thrombectomy for acute middle cerebral artery occlusion. Is it time for a paradigm shift? *J Clin Neurosci*. Sep 2013; 20(9):1219-1223. PMID 23602573
75. Gratz PP, Jung S, Schroth G, et al. Outcome of standard and high-risk patients with acute anterior circulation stroke after stent retriever thrombectomy. *Stroke*. Nov 21 2014; 45(1):152-158. PMID 24262328
76. Mokin M, Dumont TM, Veznedaroglu E, et al. Solitaire Flow Restoration thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: retrospective multicenter analysis of early postmarket experience after FDA approval. *Neurosurgery*. Jul 2013; 73(1):19-25; discussion 25-16. PMID 23719060
77. Sanak D, Kocher M, Veverka T, et al. Acute combined revascularization in acute ischemic stroke with intracranial arterial occlusion: self-expanding solitaire stent during intravenous thrombolysis. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. Sep 2013; 24(9):1273-1279. PMID 23973019
78. Smith WS, Sung G, Starkman S, et al. Safety and efficacy of mechanical embolectomy in acute ischemic stroke: results of the MERCI trial. *Stroke*. Jul 2005; 36(7):1432-1438. PMID 15961709
79. Smith WS, Sung G, Saver J, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: final results of the Multi MERCI trial. *Stroke*. Apr 2008; 39(4):1205-1212. PMID 18309168
80. Mattle HP, Arnold M, Lindsberg PJ, et al. Basilar artery occlusion. *Lancet Neurol*. Nov 2011; 10(11):1002-1014. PMID 22014435
81. Schonewille WJ, Wijman CA, Michel P, et al. Treatment and outcomes of acute basilar artery occlusion in the Basilar Artery International Cooperation Study (BASICS): a prospective registry study. *Lancet Neurol*. Aug 2009; 8(8):724-730. PMID 19577962
82. Broussalis E, Hitzl W, McCoy M, et al. Comparison of endovascular treatment versus conservative medical treatment in patients with acute basilar artery occlusion. *Vasc Endovascular Surg*. Aug 2013; 47(6):429-437. PMID 23690536
83. Son S, Choi DS, Oh MK, et al. Comparison of Solitaire thrombectomy and Penumbra suction thrombectomy in patients with acute ischemic stroke caused by basilar artery occlusion. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 2016; 8(1):13-18. PMID 25411420
84. Huo X, Gao F, Sun X, et al. Endovascular mechanical thrombectomy with the Solitaire device for the treatment of acute basilar artery occlusion. *World Neurosurg*. Feb 11 2016. PMID 26875658
85. Mohlenbruch M, Stampfl S, Behrens L, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy with stent retrievers in acute basilar artery occlusion. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. May 2014; 35(5):959-964. PMID 24287087
86. Park BS, Kang CW, Kwon HJ, et al. Endovascular mechanical thrombectomy in basilar artery occlusion: initial experience. *J Cerebrovasc Endovasc Neurosurg*. Sep 2013; 15(3):137-144. PMID 24167791
87. FDA Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit. Neurolink System. http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf/H010004b.pdf. Accessed July 14, 2015.

88. Bose A, Hartmann M, Henkes H, et al. A novel, self-expanding, nitinol stent in medically refractory intracranial atherosclerotic stenoses: the Wingspan study. *Stroke*. May 2007; 38(5):1531-1537. PMID 17395864
89. FDA Summary of Safety and Probable Benefit. Wingspan Stent System. http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf5/H050001b.pdf. Accessed July 14, 2015.
90. Tanweer O, Wilson TA, El Helou A, et al. National trends in utilization and outcomes of angioplasty and stenting for revascularization in intracranial stenosis. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. Jan 2014; 116:54-60. PMID 24314879
91. Alexander MD, Meyers PM, English JD, et al. Symptom differences and pretreatment asymptomatic interval affect outcomes of stenting for intracranial atherosclerotic disease. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jun 2014; 35(6):1157-1162. PMID 24676000
92. Miao Z, Song L, Liebeskind DS, et al. Outcomes of tailored angioplasty and/or stenting for symptomatic intracranial atherosclerosis: a prospective cohort study after SAMMPRIS. *J Neurointerv Surg*. May 2015; 7(5):331-335. PMID 24759694
93. Yu SC, Leung TW, Lee KT, et al. Angioplasty and stenting of intracranial atherosclerosis with the Wingspan system: 1-year clinical and radiological outcome in a single Asian center. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Mar 2014; 6(2):96-102. PMID 23512176
94. Zaidat OO, Fitzsimmons BF, Woodward BK, et al. Effect of a balloon-expandable intracranial stent vs. medical therapy on risk of stroke in patients with symptomatic intracranial stenosis: the VISSIT randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. Mar 24-31 2015; 313(12):1240-1248. PMID 25803346
95. Chimowitz MI, Lynn MJ, Derdeyn CP, et al. Stenting versus aggressive medical therapy for intracranial arterial stenosis. *N Engl J Med*. Sep 15 2011; 365(11):993-1003. PMID 21899409
96. Derdeyn CP, Chimowitz MI, Lynn MJ, et al. Aggressive medical treatment with or without stenting in high-risk patients with intracranial artery stenosis (SAMMPRIS): the final results of a randomised trial. *Lancet*. Jan 25 2014; 383(9914):333-341. PMID 24168957
97. Lutsep HL, Barnwell SL, Larsen DT, et al. Outcome in patients previously on antithrombotic therapy in the SAMMPRIS trial: subgroup analysis. *Stroke*. Mar 2015; 46(3):775-779. PMID 25593135
98. Lutsep HL, Lynn MJ, Cotsonis GA, et al. Does the stenting versus aggressive medical therapy trial support stenting for subgroups with intracranial stenosis? *Stroke*. Nov 2015; 46(11):3282-3284. PMID 26382173
99. Coward LJ, McCabe DJ, Ederle J, et al. Long-term outcome after angioplasty and stenting for symptomatic vertebral artery stenosis compared with medical treatment in the Carotid And Vertebral Artery Transluminal Angioplasty Study (CAVATAS): a randomized trial. *Stroke*. May 2007; 38(5):1526-1530. PMID 17395869
100. Qureshi AI, Chaudhry SA, Siddiq F, et al. A randomized trial comparing primary angioplasty versus stent placement for symptomatic intracranial stenosis. *J Vasc Interv Neurol*. Dec 2013; 6(2):34-41. PMID 24358415
101. Coward LJ, Featherstone RL, Brown MM. Percutaneous transluminal angioplasty and stenting for vertebral artery stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005(2):CD000516. PMID 15846607
102. Cruz-Flores S, Diamond AL. Angioplasty for intracranial artery stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2006; 3:CD004133. PMID 16856032
103. Groschel K, Schnaudigel S, Pilgram SM, et al. A systematic review on outcome after stenting for intracranial atherosclerosis. *Stroke*. May 2009; 40(5):e340-347. PMID 19182081
104. Abuzinadah AR, Alanazy MH, Almekhlafi MA, et al. Stroke recurrence rates among patients with symptomatic intracranial vertebrobasilar stenoses: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Feb 2016; 8(2):112-116. PMID 25501448
105. Tang CW, Chang FC, Chern CM, et al. Stenting versus medical treatment for severe symptomatic intracranial stenosis. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. May 2011; 32(5):911-916. PMID 21393399

106. Qureshi AI, Hussein HM, El-Gengaihy A, et al. Concurrent comparison of outcomes of primary angioplasty and of stent placement in high-risk patients with symptomatic intracranial stenosis. *Neurosurgery*. May 2008; 62(5):1053-1060; discussion 1060-1052. PMID 18580803
107. Samaniego EA, Hetzel S, Thirunarayanan S, et al. Outcome of symptomatic intracranial atherosclerotic disease. *Stroke*. Sep 2009; 40(9):2983-2987. PMID 19556534
108. Hong Y, Wang YJ, Deng Z, et al. Stent-assisted coiling versus coiling in treatment of intracranial aneurysm: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2014; 9(1):e82311. PMID 24454690
109. Ryu CW, Park S, Shin HS, et al. Complications in stent-assisted endovascular therapy of ruptured intracranial aneurysms and relevance to antiplatelet administration: a systematic review. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Sep 2015; 36(9):1682-1688. PMID 26138136
110. Piotin M, Blanc R, Spelle L, et al. Stent-assisted coiling of intracranial aneurysms: clinical and angiographic results in 216 consecutive aneurysms. *Stroke*. Jan 2010; 41(1):110-115. PMID 19959540
111. Hetsts SW, Turk A, English JD, et al. Stent-assisted coiling versus coiling alone in unruptured intracranial aneurysms in the matrix and platinum science trial: safety, efficacy, and mid-term outcomes. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Apr 2014; 35(4):698-705. PMID 24184523
112. Consoli A, Vignoli C, Renieri L, et al. Assisted coiling of saccular wide-necked unruptured intracranial aneurysms: stent versus balloon. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 2016; 8(1):52-57. PMID 25428449
113. Hwang G, Park H, Bang JS, et al. Comparison of 2-year angiographic outcomes of stent- and nonstent-assisted coil embolization in unruptured aneurysms with an unfavorable configuration for coiling. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Oct 2011; 32(9):1707-1710. PMID 21852378
114. Liu YQ, Wang QJ, Zheng T, et al. Single-centre comparison of procedural complications, clinical outcome, and angiographic follow-up between coiling and stent-assisted coiling for posterior communicating artery aneurysms. *J Clin Neurosci*. Dec 2014; 21(12):2140-2144. PMID 25037315
115. Colby GP, Paul AR, Radvany MG, et al. A single center comparison of coiling versus stent assisted coiling in 90 consecutive paraophthalmic region aneurysms. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Mar 1 2012; 4(2):116-120. PMID 21990478
116. King B, Vaziri S, Singla A, et al. Clinical and angiographic outcomes after stent-assisted coiling of cerebral aneurysms with Enterprise and Neuroform stents: a comparative analysis of the literature. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Dec 2015; 7(12):905-909. PMID 25352581
117. Shapiro M, Beckske T, Sahlein D, et al. Stent-supported aneurysm coiling: a literature survey of treatment and follow-up. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jan 2012; 33(1):159-163. PMID 22033717
118. Bodily KD, Cloft HJ, Lanzino G, et al. Stent-assisted coiling in acutely ruptured intracranial aneurysms: a qualitative, systematic review of the literature. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Aug 2011; 32(7):1232-1236. PMID 21546464
119. Geyik S, Yavuz K, Yurttutan N, et al. Stent-assisted coiling in endovascular treatment of 500 consecutive cerebral aneurysms with long-term follow-up. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Nov 2013; 34(11):2157-2162. PMID 23886748
120. Lee KM, Jo KI, Jeon P, et al. Predictor and prognosis of procedural rupture during coil embolization for unruptured intracranial aneurysm. *J Korean Neurosurg Soc*. Jan 2016; 59(1):6-10. PMID 26885280
121. Feng Z, Fang Y, Xu Y, et al. The safety and efficacy of low profile visualized intraluminal support (LVIS) stents in assisting coil embolization of intracranial saccular aneurysms: a single center experience. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 8 2016. PMID 26747876
122. Aydin K, Arat A, Sencer S, et al. Stent-assisted coiling of wide-neck intracranial aneurysms using low-profile LEO Baby Stents: initial and midterm results. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Oct 2015; 36(10):1934-1941. PMID 26021624
123. Chalouhi N, Jabbour P, Starke RM, et al. Endovascular treatment of proximal and distal posterior inferior cerebellar artery aneurysms. *J Neurosurg*. May 2013; 118(5):991-999. PMID 23350778

124. Chen Z, Yang Y, Miao H, et al. Endovascular treatment for large and giant fusiform aneurysms of the vertebral basilar arteries. *Clin Imaging*. Mar-Apr 2013; 37(2):227-231. PMID 23465972
125. Gentric JC, Biondi A, Piotin M, et al. Safety and efficacy of neuroform for treatment of intracranial aneurysms: a prospective, consecutive, French multicentric study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jun-Jul 2013; 34(6):1203-1208. PMID 23348764
126. Johnson AK, Heiferman DM, Lopes DK. Stent-assisted embolization of 100 middle cerebral artery aneurysms. *J Neurosurg*. May 2013; 118(5):950-955. PMID 23394339
127. Kulcsar Z, Gorické SL, Gizewski ER, et al. Neuroform stent-assisted treatment of intracranial aneurysms: long-term follow-up study of aneurysm recurrence and in-stent stenosis rates. *Neuroradiology*. Mar 2013; 55(4):459-465. PMID 23358878
128. Zhou G, Zhu YQ, Su M, et al. Flow-diverting devices versus coil embolization for intracranial aneurysms: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *World Neurosurg*. Nov 14 2015. PMID 26585732
129. van Rooij WJ, Bechan RS, Peluso JP, et al. Endovascular treatment of intracranial aneurysms in the flow diverter era: frequency of use and results in a consecutive series of 550 treatments in a single centre. *Interv Neuroradiol*. Sep 15 2014; 20(4):428-435. PMID 25207905
130. Briganti F, Leone G, Marseglia M, et al. Endovascular treatment of cerebral aneurysms using flow-diverter devices: A systematic review. *Neuroradiol J*. Aug 2015; 28(4):365-375. PMID 26314872
131. Brinjikji W, Murad MH, Lanzino G, et al. Endovascular treatment of intracranial aneurysms with flow diverters: a meta-analysis. *Stroke*. Feb 2013; 44(2):442-447. PMID 23321438
132. Arrese I, Sarabia R, Pintado R, et al. Flow-diverter devices for intracranial aneurysms: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosurgery*. Aug 2013; 73(2):193-199; discussion 199-200. PMID 23624409
133. Kallmes DF, Hanel R, Lopes D, et al. International retrospective study of the pipeline embolization device: a multicenter aneurysm treatment study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jan 2015; 36(1):108-115. PMID 25355814
134. Brinjikji W, Lanzino G, Cloft HJ, et al. Risk factors for hemorrhagic complications following Pipeline Embolization Device treatment of intracranial aneurysms: results from the international retrospective study of the Pipeline Embolization Device. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Dec 2015; 36(12):2308-2313. PMID 26251427
135. Brinjikji W, Kallmes DF, Cloft HJ, et al. Age-related outcomes following intracranial aneurysm treatment with the Pipeline Embolization Device: a subgroup analysis of the IntrePED registry. *J Neurosurg*. Nov 6 2015:1-5. PMID 26544776
136. Park MS, Kilburg C, Tausky P, et al. Pipeline Embolization Device with or without Adjunctive Coil Embolization: Analysis of Complications from the IntrePED Registry. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Jan 14 2016. PMID 26767709
137. Chiu AH, Cheung AK, Wenderoth JD, et al. Long-term follow-up results following elective treatment of unruptured intracranial aneurysms with the Pipeline Embolization Device. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Sep 2015; 36(9):1728-1734. PMID 25999412
138. Guedon A, Clarencon F, Di Maria F, et al. Very late ischemic complications in flow-diverter stents: a retrospective analysis of a single-center series. *J Neurosurg*. Jan 29 2016:1-7. PMID 26824382
139. Strauss I, Maimon S. Silk flow diverter in the treatment of complex intracranial aneurysms: a single-center experience with 60 patients. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. Feb 2016; 158(2):247-254. PMID 26630988
140. Fischer S, Aguilar-Perez M, Henkes E, et al. Initial experience with p64: a novel mechanically detachable flow diverter for the treatment of intracranial saccular sidewall aneurysms. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Nov 2015; 36(11):2082-2089. PMID 26272970
141. Brasiliense LB, Stanley MA, Grewal SS, et al. Silent ischemic events after Pipeline embolization device: a prospective evaluation with MR diffusion-weighted imaging. *J Neurointerv Surg*. Jan 8 2016. PMID 26747877
142. Chalouhi N, Zanaty M, Whiting A, et al. Safety and efficacy of the Pipeline Embolization Device in 100 small intracranial aneurysms. *J Neurosurg*. Jun 2015; 122(6):1498-1502. PMID 25635478

143. Lubicz B, Van der Elst O, Collignon L, et al. Silk flow-diverter stent for the treatment of intracranial aneurysms: a series of 58 patients with emphasis on long-term results. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Mar 2015; 36(3):542-546. PMID 25376806
144. Wakhloo AK, Lylyk P, de Vries J, et al. Surpass flow diverter in the treatment of intracranial aneurysms: a prospective multicenter study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Jan 2015; 36(1):98-107. PMID 25125666
145. Kan P, Siddiqui AH, Veznedaroglu E, et al. Early postmarket results after treatment of intracranial aneurysms with the pipeline embolization device: a U.S. multicenter experience. *Neurosurgery.* Dec 2012; 71(6):1080-1087; discussion 1087-1088. PMID 22948199
146. Piano M, Valvassori L, Quilici L, et al. Midterm and long-term follow-up of cerebral aneurysms treated with flow diverter devices: a single-center experience. *J Neurosurg.* Feb 2013; 118(2):408-416. PMID 23176329
147. Toma AK, Robertson F, Wong K, et al. Early single centre experience of flow diverting stents for the treatment of cerebral aneurysms. *Br J Neurosurg.* Oct 2013; 27(5):622-628. PMID 23705577
148. English JD, Yavagal DR, Gupta R, et al. Mechanical Thrombectomy-Ready Comprehensive Stroke Center Requirements and Endovascular Stroke Systems of Care: Recommendations from the Endovascular Stroke Standards Committee of the Society of Vascular and Interventional Neurology (SVIN). *Interv Neurol.* Mar 2016; 4(3-4):138-150. PMID 27051410
149. Higashida RT, Meyers PM, Connors JJ, 3rd, et al. Intracranial angioplasty & stenting for cerebral atherosclerosis: a position statement of the American Society of Interventional and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Society of Interventional Radiology, and the American Society of Neuroradiology. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* Oct 2005; 26(9):2323-2327. PMID 16221663
150. Sacks D, Connors JJ, 3rd, Black CM. Society of interventional radiology position statement on endovascular acute ischemic stroke interventions. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* Sep 2013; 24(9):1263-1266. PMID 23891633
151. Powers WJ, Derdeyn CP, Biller J, et al. American Heart Association/American Stroke Association Focused Update of the 2013 Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke regarding endovascular treatment: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke.* Oct 2015; 46(10):3020-3035. PMID 26123479
152. Decision Memo for Intracranial Stenting and Angioplasty (CAG-00085R5), Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. <http://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-proposed-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=214&fromdb=true>. Accessed July 14, 2015.
153. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Percutaneous Transluminal Angioplasty (PTA) (20.7), 3/11/2013.