Selecting the Collateral and Recognizing the Risks

Scott Harding, MD Wellington Hospital





Disclosure Statement of Financial Interest

I, (Scott Harding) DO NOT have a financial interest/arrangement or affiliation with one or more organizations that could be perceived as a real or apparent conflict of interest in the context of the subject of this presentation.





The Hybrid Algorithm for CTO PCI







Brilakis E, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2012



Collateral Crossing and Retrograde Success





93.4% procedural success was achieved after successful collateral cross.



Japanese Registry Data from Retrograde Summit. Courtesy of Dr Tsuchikane



Collateral Channels



Septal

Epicardial

Graft







Collateral Channels



Channel	Advantages	Disadvantages
Septal	Perforation is less likely to lead to tamponade Septal dominance is often less pronounced	Marked tortuosity can lead to failure of collateral crossing Perforation can lead to septal hematoma
Epicardial	Often only connections in lateral wall circulation Can be larger than septal collaterals	Perforation is more likely to lead to tamponade Often have a longer course
Grafts	Usually easiest to cross	Often not available





Assessment of collaterals





- Bilateral injections
- Have a field size large enough so you don't miss epicardial collaterals
- Don't pan
- Take optimal / multiple views
- Rotational angiography and tip injection may be required.



Assessment of collaterals

WELLINGTON CARDIOLOGY

Selective collateral injection

Rotational angiography







Selection of Collateral Channels Size matters



Werner classification of septal collaterals

- > CC0 = no visible connection between donor and recipient artery
- > CC1 = continuous, thread-like connection
- > CC2 = small side branch-like size of the channel





Werner GS et al, Circulation. 2003;107(15):1972-7.



Selection of Collateral Channels Invisible (CCO) doesn't always mean impossible









Selection of Collateral Channels *Size matters*









Selection of Collateral Channels Straighter is better









Predictors of Retrograde Failure



Variables	Odds Ratio	95% C.I	P value
Channel used (epicardial)	0.515	0.28-9.57	0.656
CC angle with donor vessel			0.867
CC-Recipient vessel angle not visible	47.09	1.65-1340.42	0.024
Tortuosity of CC-corkscrew	8.31	1.63-42.36	0.011
CC TYPE 1	2.16	0.43-10.74	0.346
Bridging Collaterals	1.09	0.29-4.00	0.896
Significant Side Branch	1.51	0.33-6.72	0.588
Severe tortuosity	.757	0.11-4.94	0.771
Severe Calcification	2.67	0.51-13.93	0.243
CTO Length>20mm	0.971	0.93-1.01	0.138
Ostial location	1.34	0.22-7.98	0.744



Rathore et al, Circ Cardiovasc Intervent. 2009;2:124-132



Selection of Collateral Channels Angle of attack is important









































What are the risks? Septal perforation is not always benign









What are the risks? Septal perforation is not always benign









What are the risks? Beware of ischemia









What are the risks? Epicardial perforation









What are the risks? Epicardial perforation









Conclusions



- Optimal imaging is important
- Septal, epicardial collaterals and grafts need to be considered as options for the retrograde approach.
- Size and tortuosity are the most important determinants of success
- The angle of attack is important
- Beware of acute angulation and the potential for perforation and ischemia







