



**HAL**  
open science

## Intraoperative cone beam computed tomography to improve outcomes after infra-renal endovascular aortic repair.

Erol Lerisson, Benjamin O. Patterson, Adrien Hertault, Cédric Klein, Francois Pontana, Ibrahim Sediri, Stephan Haulon, Jonathan Sobocinski

### ► To cite this version:

Erol Lerisson, Benjamin O. Patterson, Adrien Hertault, Cédric Klein, Francois Pontana, et al.. Intraoperative cone beam computed tomography to improve outcomes after infra-renal endovascular aortic repair.. J Vasc Surg, 2021, Journal of vascular surgery, 75 (3), pp.1021-1029. 10.1016/j.jvs.2021.08.057 . hal-03999978

**HAL Id: hal-03999978**

**<https://hal.univ-lille.fr/hal-03999978>**

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Intraoperative cone beam computed tomography to improve outcomes after infra-renal**  
2 **endovascular aortic repair**

3 **R2 WC: 299/3491**

4

5 Erol Lerisson, MD, MS<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin O Patterson MD, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Adrien Hertault MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Cedric  
6 Klein MD, MS<sup>4</sup>, François Pontana MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Ibrahim Sediri MD<sup>6</sup>, Stephan Haulon MD, PhD<sup>7</sup>,  
7 Jonathan Sobocinski MD, PhD<sup>1,8</sup>

8

- 9 1. Vascular Surgery, Aortic centre, Univ Lille, CHU Lille, F-59000 Lille, France  
10 2. Department of Vascular Surgery, University Hospital Southampton, United Kingdom  
11 3. Vascular Surgery, CH Valenciennes, France  
12 4. Cardiology department, CHU Lille, France  
13 5. Radiology & Cardio-vascular Imaging department, CHU Lille, France  
14 6. Cardiovascular Functional investigations, CHU Lille, France  
15 7. Aortic centre, Groupe Hospitalier Paris Saint Joseph, Hôpital Marie-Lannelongue, Université  
16 Paris Saclay, France  
17 8. Univ Lille, INSERM, CHU Lille, U1008 - Controlled Drug Delivery Systems and  
18 Biomaterials, F-59000 Lille, France

19

20 Corresponding author:

21 Prof J SOBOCINSKI,

22 Aortic Centre, CHU Lille,

- 1 Univ Lille, INSERM, CHU Lille, U1008 - Controlled Drug Delivery Systems and Biomaterials,
- 2 F-59000 Lille, email-to: jonathan.sobocinski@chru-lille.fr
- 3 phone: +33 3 20 44 58 11
- 4 mail-to: jonathan.sobocinski@univ-lille.fr
- 5
- 6 Keywords: Aortic aneurysms, Endovascular Aortic repair, intraoperative imaging control

## 1 **ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS**

2 **Type of Research:** Single-center retrospective cohort study

3 **Key Findings:** Completion contrast-enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT)  
4 reduced the rate of late stent-graft related complications in 100 EVAR patients (HR=0.39, 95%  
5 CI 0.16-0.95, p=.038) compared to standard 2D angiogram with a postoperative computed  
6 tomography angiography (CTA). At 5 years, the freedom from late stent-graft related  
7 complications was higher in the ceCBCT strategy group at 81.7% [95 % CI (70.1-95.2)] vs  
8 61.6% [95 % CI (47.0-80.6)] (p=.033).

9 **Take home Message:** A workflow including routine intraoperative contrast-enhanced cone  
10 beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) to assess the technical success after EVAR reduces the  
11 late stent-graft related complications rate.

12

## 13 **Table of Contents Summary:**

14 In this retrospective single-center study including 100 consecutive patients undergoing EVAR in  
15 a hybrid room, completion contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT)  
16 reduces the rate of late stentgraft-related complications compared to a 2D-angiogram and  
17 postoperative computed tomography angiography. Intraoperative CBCT may help to improve  
18 long term outcomes after EVAR.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objective:**

3 To evaluate whether a combination of intraoperative ceCBCT and postoperative contrast  
4 enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) assessment after infra-renal endovascular aortic repair (EVAR)  
5 could reduce late stent-graft related complications and consequently re-interventions.

6

7 **Methods:**

8 All consecutive patients receiving infra-renal bifurcated stent-grafts in our hybrid room (IGS  
9 730, GE Healthcare) during two discrete periods were included in this study: i) from November  
10 2012 to September 2013, a 2D completion angiogram was performed after each EVAR, followed  
11 by computed tomography angiography (CTA) before discharge (group 1), ii) from October 2013  
12 to January 2015, an intraoperative ceCBCT was performed, followed by CEUS within the first  
13 postoperative days (group 2). Comparative analyses of outcomes were undertaken.  
14 The primary endpoint was late stent-graft related complications, a composite factor incorporating  
15 aneurysm-related death, type 1 or 3 endoleaks, kink or occlusion of iliac limb and aortic sac  
16 enlargement beyond the first 30 postoperative days. The secondary endpoint was all stent-graft  
17 related re-interventions. All-cause and aneurysm related deaths were also reported.

18

19 **Results:**

20 Overall, 100 consecutive patients (50 in group 1 and 50 in group 2) were enrolled with a median  
21 follow up of 60 months [IQR 41-69]. At 60 months from the index procedure, freedom from late

1 stent-graft related complications in each group was 61.6% (95 % CI [47.0-80.6]) for group 1 and  
2 81.7% (95 % CI [70.1-95.2]) for group 2 (p=.033).

3 Intraoperative CBCT was independently associated with a reduced rate of late stent-graft related  
4 complications after multivariate analysis (HR = 0.39, 95% CI 0.16-0.95, p=.038), but did not  
5 appear to significantly protect against stent-graft related re-interventions (HR=0.53; 95% CI  
6 0.20-1.39, p=.198) or all cause death (p=.47).

7

8 **Conclusion:**

9 This study is the first to report the influence of routine ceCBCT on late outcomes after EVAR  
10 and shows a potential reduction in late stent-graft related complications associated with its use.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Endovascular aortic repair (EVAR) has become the primary treatment option for aortic  
3 aneurysms with suitable anatomy. Early experience of EVAR was marred by relatively high rates  
4 of complications and re-interventions for various reasons, including the construction of the  
5 device implanted, adherence to anatomical criteria set out by manufactures and relatively  
6 primitive planning facilities. It has been reported that 15 % of patients underwent  $\geq 1$   
7 reintervention during follow-up <sup>1</sup>, with up to 1/3 of them occurring within the 30 postoperative  
8 days <sup>2</sup>. Type 1 and 3 endoleaks, stent-graft migration, thrombosis and accidental renal artery  
9 coverage were the most common reasons for re-intervention during the early proliferation of  
10 EVAR<sup>3-6</sup>.

11 It is possible that some stent-graft related complications might be caused by technical issues not  
12 identified on the final 2D-angiogram. Completion uniplanar angiography (usually  
13 anteroposterior) is recommended for evaluating technical success after EVAR although it has  
14 been shown to be insufficient to detect all procedural issues, with both sensitivity and specificity  
15 to detect endoleaks estimated respectively at 63% [IC95=60-70%] and 77% [IC95=58-100%];  
16 while for CTA (Computed Tomography Angiogram) it is 92% [IC95=80-100%] and 90%  
17 [IC95=85-92%] respectively <sup>7,8,9</sup>.

18 Potential technical failures may therefore only be detected on the postoperative CTA,  
19 necessitating early re-intervention and incurring additional cost and potential morbidity that  
20 could impact on quality of life. In addition, the cost-effectiveness of EVAR is diminished by  
21 secondary interventions, which is a subject of ongoing debate regarding the validity of the  
22 technique as a whole. There is a need for post-operative imaging strategies that are able to

1 accurately detect of high flow endoleaks and other more subtle correctable issues with stent-graft  
2 integrity.<sup>10,11,12</sup>

3 Completion contrast-enhanced Cone Beam Computed Tomography (ceCBCT) is an  
4 intraoperative 3D-imaging modality offering high-spatial resolution and volumetric data which  
5 can be reconstructed and processed at a workstation during a procedure. Several studies have  
6 established the short-term benefits of ceCBCT<sup>13-16</sup> in EVAR. Postoperative contrast-enhanced  
7 ultrasound (CEUS) is highly sensitive method of depicting and classifying endoleaks and is  
8 routinely performed before patient' discharge at our institution.<sup>17</sup>

9         In a previous work ceCBCT has shown to reduce both radiation exposure and contrast  
10 media volume after infrarenal and complex EVAR compared to a strategy incorporating 2D  
11 angiography and postoperative CTA<sup>18</sup>. Moreover, higher rates of high-flow endoleaks and limb  
12 kinks were detected with ceCBCT intraoperatively enabling immediate correction during the  
13 initial procedure.

14 The present study evaluates whether intraoperative completion of ceCBCT combined with early  
15 postoperative CEUS could reduce late stent-graft related complications and reinterventions after  
16 EVAR.

## 1 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2 Patients' selection

3 100 consecutive patients treated with infrarenal bifurcated stent-grafts in our hybrid room  
4 (IGS 730, GE Healthcare, France) during two different periods were retrospectively included in  
5 this study from a prospective database: i) from November 2012 to September 2013, a **2D**  
6 **completion angiogram** (25cc of iodine, at 15cc/sec, (Omnipaque 350, GE Healthcare)) was  
7 performed at the end of the procedure for each patient to assess the technical success; and a  
8 **computed tomography angiography** (CTA) was then performed before discharge (**group 1,**  
9 **n=50**); ii) from October 2013 to January 2015, an intraoperative **ceCBCT** (40°/sec – 35cc of  
10 iodine (Omnipaque 350, GE Healthcare) at 10cc/sec) was performed to assess technical success,  
11 followed by contrast enhanced ultrasound (**CEUS**) within the 30-day post-operative period  
12 (**group 2, n=50**).

13 Patients with renal insufficiency (DFG < 60 mL/min) or requiring emergency treatment were  
14 excluded from the study.

### 16 Procedures

17 All procedures were performed under fusion imaging guidance, according to the ALARA  
18 principles<sup>19,20</sup>. All patients received CookMedical bifurcated infrarenal stentgrafts including  
19 standard profile (Zenith Flex platform) and low-profile (Zenith Alpha platform) bifurcated main  
20 body, and Spiral-z iliac legs (CookMedical, IN, USA).

21 The primary technical success of the procedure was defined according to the reporting standards  
22 <sup>21</sup>.

23

## 1 **Technical details**

### 2 **ceCBCT**

3 ceCBCT acquisition (40°/sec) was performed at the end of the procedure. A spin test was run  
4 before the acquisition to ensure the absence of collision between the patient, the table and the  
5 gantry, and to check whether the acquisition volume is properly centered on the stent-graft.

6 An automatic power injector (Medrad) was used for contrast media injection with the following  
7 parameters: injection of 35 mL of iodine (Omnipaque 350, GE Healthcare), at a flow rate of 10  
8 mL/second with 2 seconds of delay.

9 The 31x31cm flat panel robotic gantry was rotated over 200 degrees; 150 angiographic  
10 projections were acquired during 5 seconds with 1.33 degrees increment. The images acquired  
11 during the run were automatically transferred to a dedicated workstation and automatically  
12 reconstructed (Advantage Window; GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, USA). The resulting volume  
13 was an 18.3 cm diameter cylinder. Reconstructed data were displayed using cross-sectional axial  
14 reconstruction, multiplanar (MPR), maximum intensity projection (MIP) and 3D volume  
15 rendering (3DVR) views.

16

### 17 **2D completion Angiography**

18 Completion angiography was performed using an automatic power injector with the following  
19 parameters: injection of 25cc of pure contrast medium (Omnipaque 350, GE Healthcare), with a  
20 flow rate at 10 mL/second.

1 Two experienced endovascular therapists reviewed final control imaging, aiming at depicting  
2 any high-flow endoleak (type I or III), limb kinks and evaluating the general integrity of the  
3 stentgraft.

4 Where significant issues were detected, immediate intraoperative correction was provided and  
5 are referred later in the manuscript as additional unplanned procedures at the index EVAR.

6

### 7 **CTA**

8 In group 1, the postoperative three-phase CTA was performed within 7 days after EVAR on a  
9 64-slice multi-detector CT system (Brilliance 64, Philips Healthcare, Best, The Netherlands). The  
10 injection protocol included the administration of 120 mL of a contrast agent with 350 mg of  
11 iodine per milliliter (Ioversol, Optiject; Guerbet, Roissy, France) at a flow rate of 4 mL/second.  
12 The acquisition was initiated by bolus tracking within the aorta at the level of the thoraco-  
13 abdominal junction. The triphasic acquisitions (unenhanced, arterial, and delayed phases) were  
14 systematically obtained with a maximum tube current of 150-250 mAs, dependent on automatic  
15 selection, and a longitudinal dose modulation (ACS & Z-DOM; Philips Healthcare).

16

### 17 **Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

18 CEUS is an imaging modality used routinely in our centre to follow EVAR results. Three  
19 experienced vascular therapists in the department with a combined experience of more than  
20 1,000 examinations lead this service <sup>17,22</sup>.

21 US examinations include a standard morphological examination in B-mode followed by a blood  
22 flow analysis in pulse wave modality. CEUS was performed after the administration of an

1 intravenous bolus of 2.5 mL of SonoVue (Bracco, Milan, Italy), flushed with a 5 mL bolus of  
2 isotonic saline solution. Endoleak detection was performed at a low mechanical index (0.2e0.3)  
3 and with the focus positioned behind the aorta to delay bubble destruction. For all the patients in  
4 group 2, CEUS was performed within the first 30 postoperative days after EVAR.

#### 5 **Data collection**

6 All patients provided informed consent, and the study was registered at the CNIL under the  
7 number DEC20-224 (commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés).

8  
9 Data were collected in a prospective database with retrospective analyses. Patients' demographic  
10 characteristics, medical history, pre and postoperative anatomical measurements and procedural  
11 data were collected.

12  
13 Intra-operative findings (such as limb kink or thrombosis, type 1/3 endoleak, renal artery  
14 coverage) were collected; endoleaks present at the completion imaging were classified as  
15 primary endoleaks. Resulting intra-operative revisions required were recorded.

16

#### 17 **Follow-up**

18 Follow-up visits were routinely scheduled at 6 and 12 months after the procedure and yearly  
19 thereafter. All patients underwent a physical examination at each follow-up visit and had  
20 standard blood tests. A three-phase CTA was performed at 12 months after EVAR and every two  
21 years thereafter. When iodine injection was contraindicated, a CT scan without contrast media  
22 injection was performed. Patient's vascular therapist performed colour duplex ultrasonography

1 yearly. Additional CTA and/or CEUS were subsequently completed when a significant aortic sac  
2 enlargement or high-flow endoleak was reported with the colour duplex US, CTA and/or CEUS  
3 were completed.

4 All available CTA and CT images were analysed on a dedicated 3D-workstation (Aquarius,  
5 Terarecon). Aortic sac diameter was measured and collected after centreline reconstruction and  
6 endoleaks, stengraft/limb integrity and/or patency were reported.

7 Overall complications, stent-graft related complications and/or reinterventions occurring within  
8 the first 30 postoperative days or during the initial hospitalisation were deemed as early  
9 reinterventions and were reported; beyond that initial period, all complications and/or  
10 reinterventions were deemed as late complications and/or reinterventions.

11

12 Outcomes were assessed in accordance with the SVS reporting standards for EVAR <sup>21,23</sup>.

13 An endoleak observed 30 days after the index EVAR was considered as a secondary endoleak <sup>24</sup>.

14 The reappearance of an endoleak after spontaneous resolution or reintervention was classified as  
15 a recurrent endoleak. Mid-term results referred to outcomes measures within the first 5 years of  
16 follow-up <sup>23</sup>.

## 1 **Objectives**

2           The primary endpoint was late stent graft related complications, a composite criterion  
3 defined as aneurysm-related deaths, secondary high-flow endoleaks including type 1 and 3  
4 endoleaks, secondary kink or occlusion of iliac limb, and aortic sac enlargement ( $\geq 5$ mm)  
5 occurring at any time during follow-up after the first 30 postoperative days.

6           The secondary endpoint was stent graft related reinterventions defined as all stent-graft  
7 related procedures occurring after the index EVAR.

8           The overall mortality of the population was also reported.

9

## 10 **Statistical Analysis**

11 All statistical analyses were performed using R 2018 (Vienna, Austria). Descriptive study of the  
12 cohort was performed. Continuous variables were expressed as median with inter-quartile range  
13 (IQR=[Q1-Q3]) or mean with standard deviation. Categorical variables are presented as a  
14 percentage and 95% of confidence interval.

15 Comparisons between categorical variables were performed with the chi-square test (or Fisher  
16 exact test) and between continuous variables with the Student-t test, or with the Mann-Whitney  
17 test.

18 Survival analyses were performed according to the Kaplan-Meier model. Curves were compared  
19 with a log-rank test, and then results were adjusted with a hazard ratio cox model according to  
20 non-comparable preoperative variables.

21 When the relationship between the composite criterion and a quantitative covariate was not  
22 linear, the covariate was recoded into a binary variable. Recoding threshold was determined by

- 1 minimizing the Bayesian information criterion of the model. Multivariate models were
- 2 constructed by including all variables with p-value  $<.05$  in univariate analyses or considered
- 3 clinically relevant. A p value  $<.05$  was considered significant.

## 1 **RESULTS**

2 Overall, 100 consecutive patients were included during the two different study periods. Baseline  
3 characteristics are presented in Table 1 and are similar in both groups, with a mean maximum  
4 diameter of the aneurysm sac on the preoperative CTA of  $54.5 \pm 8.4$  mm. 80 % of the stent-  
5 grafts implanted were low-profile devices (Cook Zenith alpha platform).

6

### 7 **Intraoperative findings and immediate revisions**

8 Intra-operative problems were detected in 10% (n=5) and 28% (n=14) of patients in group 1 and  
9 2 (p=.041). The most common findings in group 1 included type 1B endoleak in 3 procedures,  
10 type 1A endoleak in 1 procedure and partial renal artery coverage in 1 procedure. ceCBCT  
11 identified 5 type 1 A endoleak and 5 type 1b endoleak that required prompt immediate revision.  
12 Other findings in group 2 included limb kink in 3 cases and partial renal artery coverage in 1  
13 patient. Additionally, Type 2 endoleaks detection rate during procedures were similar in both  
14 groups; 15 patients (30.0%) in group 1 vs. 13 patients (26%) in group 2 (p=.824).  
15 Immediate revision at the index EVAR was performed in 4 patients (8%) in group 1 versus 14  
16 (28%) in group 2 (p=.024). Details of intra-operative findings and immediate revisions are  
17 reported in **Table II (a&b)**.

18

### 19 **Late stent-graft related complications**

20 The median time of follow-up was equivalent in both groups (60 months [IQR 40-75] in group 1  
21 versus 60 months [IQR 41,3-62,8] in group 2; p=.419). 26 late complications occurred in 17  
22 patients of group 1 (34%), 9 complications occurred in 7 patients of group 2 (14%), with a

1 median time from the index procedure at 24 months [IQR 12-60] and 38 months [IQR 24.5-42.5]  
2 respectively in group 1 & 2. Late stent-graft related complications are reported in **Table III**.

3 At 60 months from the index procedure, according to the Kaplan Meier method, the freedom  
4 from late stent-graft related complications estimates were 61.6% (95 % CI [47.0-80.6]) in group  
5 1 and 81.7% (95 % CI [70.1-95.2]) in group 2 (log-rank,  $p=.033$ ) (**Figure 1a**).

6  
7 Late high-flow endoleaks rates were respectively 18% in group 1 ( $n=9$ ) and 4% in the group 2  
8 ( $n=2$ ) ( $p=.055$ ). Six late type 1A endoleaks were detected in group 1 (12%), whereas only 1 late  
9 type 1A endoleak was detected in group 2 (2%). Two late Type 1B endoleaks were detected in  
10 group 1 whereas none occurred in group 2. One late Type III endoleak was recorded in both  
11 groups. At 60 months from the index procedure the freedom from secondary high flow endoleaks  
12 estimates were 77.7% (95 % CI [64.7-93.5]) in group 1 and 93.8% (95 % CI [85.8-100]) in group  
13 2 (log-rank,  $p=.021$ ) (**Figure 1b**) according to the Kaplan Meier method.

14 At the end of the follow up, 12 (24%) patients experienced an aortic sac enlargement in group 1  
15 and 4 patients (8%) in group 2 ( $p=.056$ ).

16 In a multivariate analysis, ceCBCT appeared to independently protect from late stent-graft  
17 related complications HR =0.39 (CI95, 0.16-0.95,  $p=.038$ ).

18

### 19 **Stent-graft related reinterventions**

20 At the end of follow-up, a total of 13 reinterventions were performed in 11 patients in group 1  
21 (22 %), and 7 reinterventions were performed in 7 patients in group 2 (14%) with a median time

1 from the index procedure at 14 months [IQR 12.0-31.5] in group 1 and 45 months [IQR 22.5-  
2 50.5] in group 2 (p=.435).

3 Only one early reintervention was performed in each group. Sixty months after the initial  
4 procedure, the freedom-from-reintervention rates were 77.6% (95% CI, 66.2-91.0) in group 1  
5 and 80.8% (95 % CI, 68.7-95.1) in group 2 (p=.27) (**Figure 2**).

6 The main indication for reintervention in group 1 was high-flow endoleaks (n=7/13, 53.8%);  
7 while it was equally high-flow endoleaks (n=2/7, 28.6%), and limb graft thrombosis (n=2/7,  
8 28.7%) in group 2 (**supplemental table 1**). Among the 14 revised patients during initial  
9 procedure in group 2, three patients presented a late stentgraft-related complication and  
10 necessitated a reintervention.

11

12

### 13 **Survival**

14 A total of 24 deaths were reported during the study period. At 60 months, the estimated  
15 survival rates were 83.2% (95% CI, 73.3-94.6) in group 1 and 71.0 % (95% CI, 58.7-85.8) in  
16 group 2. There was no significant difference between groups in terms of death from any cause  
17 (p=.47). Aneurysm-related mortality occurred in 1 patient in group 1 (late rupture 64 months  
18 after the index EVAR). No aneurysm-related death was reported in group 2. Overall estimated  
19 survival is reported in **Supplemental Figure I**.

20

## 1 **DISCUSSION**

2 This study is the first to report the influence of routine ceCBCT on mid-term outcomes after  
3 standard infrarenal EVAR. The analysis suggests a reduction in late stent-graft related  
4 complications and also a trend toward reduced stent-graft related reinterventions during follow-  
5 up. The incidence of late stent-graft related complications was twice as high in the 2D angiogram  
6 group compared to the ceCBCT group after 60 months. The use of ceCBCT appeared to be an  
7 independent protective factor in protecting against late stent-graft related complications  
8 (OR=0.39, 0.16-0.95, p=.033) during follow-up in the Cox models.

9 Amongst these late complications, secondary high-flow endoleaks, especially type 1A (12%,  
10 n=6) and type 1B endoleak (4%, n=2), were the most prevalent complications when a completion  
11 angiogram was performed whereas no type 1B and only one type 1A endoleak was observed in  
12 the ceCBCT group (log-rank p=.021).

13 Primary high-flow endoleaks were the most common finding during the initial procedure when  
14 completion ceCBCT was performed, and were also the main indication for immediate revision  
15 (n=10/50, 20%). At the end of follow-up, neither of these patients had a recurrent endoleak nor  
16 exhibited aortic sac enlargement. Similarly, the proportion of aneurysms exhibiting post-  
17 operative expansion appeared to be higher in group 1 (24% vs 8%, p=.056).

18

19 These data suggested that prompt correction of primary high flow endoleaks detected with  
20 ceCBCT in the initial stage resulted in less sac enlargement and therefore better outcomes at  
21 mid-term, but this did not translate into an appreciable survival benefit at 6 years. In line with  
22 this finding ceCBCT did not significantly protect against stent-graft related reinterventions in our

1 study. It is of note that in our survival analysis model patients rated similar whatever the number  
2 of late stentgraft-related complication(s) presented and those latter can have been corrected  
3 within the same reintervention. This element could explain the discrepancies reported between  
4 the number of reinterventions and number of complications.

5  
6 Reinterventions after EVAR are still relatively common, and the risk is persistent even  
7 after six years of the initial procedure <sup>25</sup>. Longer term follow-up of the EVAR 1 trial reported a  
8 secondary reinterventions rate approaching 20% at 5 years <sup>26</sup>. A recent meta-analysis of 14 trials  
9 estimated the combined re-intervention-free survival after EVAR was 94%, 89.9%, 86.9%,  
10 84.9% at 1, 2, 3 and 4 years respectively <sup>27</sup>. In the cohort presented here, 18% of the patients  
11 needed at least one reintervention at the end of the follow up, which is in line with the reported  
12 literature.

13  
14 In our study, the freedom from stent-graft related reintervention estimates did not significantly  
15 differ between groups at 5 years; progression of the disease itself remains a potential independent  
16 factor of late failure by affecting the sealing zones of the stentgraft.

17  
18 However, two main differences in the groups can be underlined.

19 Firstly, the most common indication for reintervention in group 1 was secondary high-  
20 flow endoleaks (7/13, 53.8%) when only two high-flow endoleaks required reintervention in  
21 group 2 (2/7, 28.6%).

1           Secondly, the median time from index procedure to reintervention was tripled when  
2 ceCBCT was performed (45 months in group 2 compared to 14 months in group 1), which could  
3 suggest that late reinterventions in group 1 would be related to small technical failures  
4 potentially missed by standard 2D completion angiogram during the index procedure,  
5 responsible for earlier adverse outcomes. Average mean time to reintervention when angiogram  
6 was performed is similar to those described in literature for EVAR cases <sup>3,28</sup>.

7  
8           Despite these potential advantages, the volume acquired with a ceCBCT is limited and  
9 smaller than the fluoroscopic field of view. The size of the flat panel in vascular hybrid rooms  
10 usually is up to 41x41cm (CBCT volume=25x25cm) and although the whole stentgraft is  
11 generally enclosed in the final volume in EVAR cases, it is generally too small in complex aortic  
12 reconstructions. Consequently, two or more acquisitions have to be made to properly evaluate  
13 the integrity of the stent-graft and evaluate the technical success, and the spatial resolution is  
14 lower than CTA so the images can be altered by artefact <sup>29,30</sup>.

15 Our ceCBCT protocol has a single-phase acquisition and a 2 second delay with the injection of a  
16 moderate volume of contrast agent (35 cc of iodine) in order to properly identify endoleaks. The  
17 31x31cm flat panel robotic gantry is rotated over 200 degrees and 150 frames are acquired  
18 during a 5-second spin.

19 There is a great heterogeneity in literature regarding CBCT protocols, and the optimal setup with  
20 a compromise between image quality and the lowest radiation exposure has yet to be defined. In  
21 our previous study<sup>18</sup>, the median radiation exposure of the final CBCT was 7 Gy.cm<sup>2</sup> (5.25-8)

1 (i.e. 36% of the total procedure exposure) which is low compared to the range reported in current  
2 literature i.e.  $43.7 \text{ Gy.cm}^2$  (32,9-54,5) to  $71 \text{ Gy.cm}^2$  (35-127) <sup>14,15,16</sup>.

3  
4 The main advantage of the intraoperative CBCT relies on its immediate availability without  
5 additional hardware although hybrid rooms come at a hefty price and not every hospital can  
6 afford such an investment. Other solutions exist and may offer fusion guidance with a mobile flat  
7 panel C-arm in a conventional operating theatre, but these currently lack CBCT completion  
8 imaging. Kaladji and al. <sup>31</sup> evaluated the feasibility of one such software package (Endonaut  
9 station and the Endozise software (Therenva, Rennes, France)) with a mobile imaging system.  
10 The absence of communication between the table and the software remains the main issue,  
11 requiring the repetition of the registration process after each table movements, and 3D  
12 reconstructions are not possible.

13  
14 Our study is limited by a retrospective design, although the cohort represents a consecutive series  
15 of patients that underwent EVAR. In addition, there was no reasonable way to directly compare  
16 and evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of the 3 imaging modalities (angiogram, ceCBCT and  
17 CTA) at the same time in a single patient. Indeed, such a comparison would require performing  
18 the three exams in a single patient and would increase the radiation and contrast media burden.  
19 As expressed in our initial report, a strict comparison between CBCT and CTA would involve  
20 not intervening on some abnormalities found with the intraoperative control in order to analyse  
21 them with the postoperative CTA which would not be possible.

- 1 Last limitation of our study is that latter enclosed exclusively patients having received cook
- 2 zenith platform (either standard or low profile). Thus, our findings may not be potentially
- 3 extrapolated to other brands of aortic stentgrafts.

## 1 **CONCLUSION**

2 This study suggests that contrast enhanced CBCT to assess technical success after EVAR is  
3 valuable. This would reduce the late stent-graft related complications compared to a control  
4 strategy that only includes a 2D angiogram, while also delaying the term of potential stentgraft-  
5 related reinterventions. A systematic use in routine is encouraged when available since no  
6 additional radiation/contrast burden has been reported.

## 1 REFERENCES

- 2 1 Sampram ESK, Karafa MT, Mascha EJ, Clair DG, Greenberg RK, Lyden SP, et al.  
3 Nature, frequency, and predictors of secondary procedures after endovascular repair of  
4 abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc Surg* 2003;37:930–7.
- 5 2 Greenhalgh RM, Brown LC, Kwong GPS, Powell JT, Thompson SG, EVAR trial  
6 participants. Comparison of endovascular aneurysm repair with open repair in patients with  
7 abdominal aortic aneurysm (EVAR trial 1), 30-day operative mortality results: randomised  
8 controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004;364:843–8.
- 9 3 Hobo R, Buth J, EUROSTAR collaborators. Secondary interventions following  
10 endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair using current endografts. A EUROSTAR report.  
11 *J Vasc Surg* 2006;43:896–902.
- 12 4 Stather PW, Sidloff D, Dattani N, Choke E, Bown MJ, Sayers RD. Systematic review and  
13 meta-analysis of the early and late outcomes of open and endovascular repair of abdominal aortic  
14 aneurysm. *Br J Surg* 2013;100:863–72.
- 15 5 Lederle FA, Freischlag JA, Kyriakides TC, Matsumura JS, Padberg FT, Kohler TR, et al.  
16 Long-term comparison of endovascular and open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. *N Engl J*  
17 *Med* 2012;367:1988–97.
- 18 6 Brewster DC, Jones JE, Chung TK, Lamuraglia GM, Kwolek CJ, Watkins MT, et al.  
19 Long-term outcomes after endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair: the first decade. *Ann*  
20 *Surg* 2006;244:426–38.

- 1 7 Sandford RM, Batchelder AJ, Bown MJ, Sayers RD. Pre-discharge duplex ultrasound  
2 scans detect endoleaks not seen on completion angiography after endovascular aneurysm repair.  
3 *J Endovasc Ther* 2010;17:349–53.
- 4 8 AbuRahma AF. Fate of endoleaks detected by CT angiography and missed by color  
5 duplex ultrasound in endovascular grafts for abdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Endovasc Ther*  
6 2006;13:490–5.
- 7 9 Armerding MD, Rubin GD, Beaulieu CF, Slonim SM, Olcott EW, Samuels SL, et al.  
8 Aortic aneurysmal disease: assessment of stent-graft treatment-CT versus conventional  
9 angiography. *Radiology* 2000;215:138–46.
- 10 10 van Bochove CA, Burgers LT, Vahl AC, Birnie E, van Schothorst MG, Redekop WK.  
11 Cost-effectiveness of open versus endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc*  
12 *Surg* 2016;63:827-838.e2.
- 13 11 Stone DH, Horvath AJ, Goodney PP, Rzucidlo EM, Nolan BW, Walsh DB, et al. The  
14 financial implications of endovascular aneurysm repair in the cost containment era. *J Vasc Surg*  
15 2014;59:283–90, 290.e1.
- 16 12 Epstein D, Sculpher MJ, Powell JT, Thompson SG, Brown LC, Greenhalgh RM. Long-  
17 term cost-effectiveness analysis of endovascular versus open repair for abdominal aortic  
18 aneurysm based on four randomized clinical trials. *Br J Surg* 2014;101:623–31.
- 19 13 Biasi L, Ali T, Ratnam LA, Morgan R, Loftus I, Thompson M. Intra-operative DynaCT  
20 improves technical success of endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Vasc Surg*

- 1 2009;49:288–95.
- 2 14 Schulz CJ, Schmitt M, Böckler D, Geisbüsch P. Intraoperative contrast-enhanced cone  
3 beam computed tomography to assess technical success during endovascular aneurysm repair. *J*  
4 *Vasc Surg* 2016;64:577–84.
- 5 15 Törnqvist P, Dias N, Sonesson B, Kristmundsson T, Resch T. Intra-operative cone beam  
6 computed tomography can help avoid reinterventions and reduce CT follow up after infrarenal  
7 EVAR. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2015;49:390–5.
- 8 16 Tenorio ER, Oderich GS, Sandri GA, Ozbek P, Kärkkäinen JM, Vrtiska T, et al.  
9 Prospective nonrandomized study to evaluate cone beam computed tomography for technical  
10 assessment of standard and complex endovascular aortic repair. *J Vasc Surg* 2020;71:1982-  
11 1993.
- 12 17 Perini P, Sediri I, Midulla M, Delsart P, Mouton S, Gautier C, et al. Single-centre  
13 prospective comparison between contrast-enhanced ultrasound and computed tomography  
14 angiography after EVAR. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2011;42:797–802.
- 15 18 Hertault A, Maurel B, Pontana F, Martin-Gonzalez T, Spear R, Sobocinski J, et al.  
16 Benefits of Completion 3D Angiography Associated with Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound to  
17 Assess Technical Success after EVAR. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2015;49:541–8.
- 18 19 Bevelacqua JJ. Practical and Effective ALARA. *Health Physics* 2010;98 Suppl 2:S39-47.
- 19 20 Hertault A, Maurel B, Midulla M, Bordier C, Desponds L, Saeed Kilani M, et al. Editor's  
20 Choice - Minimizing Radiation Exposure During Endovascular Procedures: Basic Knowledge,

- 1 Literature Review, and Reporting Standards. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2015;50:21–36.
- 2 21 Chaikof EL, Blankensteijn JD, Harris PL, White GH, Zarins CK, Bernhard VM, et al.  
3 Reporting standards for endovascular aortic aneurysm repair. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*  
4 2002;35:1048–60.
- 5 22 Perini P, Sediri I, Midulla M, Delsart P, Gautier C, Haulon S. Contrast-enhanced  
6 ultrasound vs. CT angiography in fenestrated EVAR surveillance: a single-center comparison. *J*  
7 *Endovasc Ther* 2012;19:648–55.
- 8 23 Oderich GS, Forbes TL, Chaer R, Davies MG, Lindsay TF, Mastracci T, et al. Reporting  
9 standards for endovascular aortic repair of aneurysms involving the renal-mesenteric arteries. *J*  
10 *Vasc Surg* 2021;73:4S-52S.
- 11 24 White GH, Yu W, May J, Chaufour X, Stephen MS. Endoleak as a complication of  
12 endoluminal grafting of abdominal aortic aneurysms: classification, incidence, diagnosis, and  
13 management. *J Endovasc Surg* 1997;4:152–68.
- 14 25 Zaiem F, Almasri J, Tello M, Prokop LJ, Chaikof EL, Murad MH. A systematic review  
15 of surveillance after endovascular aortic repair. *Journal of Vascular Surgery* 2018; 67:320-  
16 331.e37.
- 17 26 EVAR trial participants. Endovascular aneurysm repair versus open repair in patients  
18 with abdominal aortic aneurysm (EVAR trial 1): randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*  
19 2005;365:2179–86.
- 20 27 Nordon IM, Karthikesalingam A, Hinchliffe RJ, Holt PJ, Loftus IM, Thompson MM.

- 1 Secondary Interventions Following Endovascular Aneurysm Repair (EVAR) and the Enduring  
2 Value of Graft Surveillance. *European Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery*  
3 2010;39:547–54.
- 4 28 Laheij RJF, Buth J, Harris PL, Moll FL, Stelter WJ, Verhoeven ELG. Need for secondary  
5 interventions after endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms. Intermediate-term follow-  
6 up results of a European collaborative registry (EUROSTAR). *BJS* 2000;87:1666–73.
- 7 29 Nagarajappa AK, Dwivedi N, Tiwari R. Artifacts: The downturn of CBCT image. *J Int*  
8 *Soc Prev Community Dent* 2015;5:440–5.
- 9 30 Zhao Z, Gang GJ, Siewerdsen JH. Noise, sampling, and the number of projections in  
10 cone-beam CT with a flat-panel detector. *Med Phys* 2014;41:061909.
- 11 31 Kaladji A, Villena A, Pascot R, Lalys F, Daoudal A, Clochard E, et al. Fusion Imaging  
12 for EVAR with Mobile C-arm. *Ann Vasc Surg* 2019;55:166.
- 13

## Figure Table Legends

**Figure Ia: Kaplan Meier estimates of late stentgraft-related complications probabilities in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS).**

Time (months)	12	24	36	48	60
<b>Group 1 (2DA + CTA)</b>					
Survival (%)	89.6%	76.6%	76.6%	73.9%	61.6
[CI95%]	[81.4-98.7]	[65.4-89.8]	[65.4-89.8]	[62.1-87.9]	[47.0-80.6]
Late complications (n)	5	6	0	1	3
Patients at risk (n)	44	38	29	23	18
<b>Group 2 (ceCBCT + CEUS)</b>					
Survival %	100%	95.5%	93.2%	85.0%	81.7%
[CI95%]	[100-100]	[89.7-100]	[86.1-100]	[74.5-96.9]	[70.1-95.2]
Late complications (n)	0	2	1	3	1
Patients at risk (n)	48	42	35	28	22

**Figure 1b: Kaplan Meier estimates of secondary high flow endoleaks (type I/III) probabilities in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<b>Time (months)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Group 1 (2DA + CTA)</b>					
Survival (%)	95.7%	91.4%	88.9%	88.9%	77.7
[CI95%]	[90.1-100]	[83.8-99.8]	[80.1-98.6]	[80.1-98.6]	[64.7-93.5]
Secondary high-flow endoleaks (n)	2	2	1	0	3
Patients at risk (n)	47	42	36	28	21
<b>Group 2 (ceCBCT + CEUS)</b>					
Survival %	100%	100%	100%	97.3%	93.8%
[CI95%]	[100-100]	[100-100]	[100-100]	[92.2-100]	[85.8-100]
Secondary high-flow endoleaks (n)	0	0	0	1	1
Patients at risk (n)	48	44	39	33	16

**Figure II. Kaplan Meier estimates of stentgraft-related reintervention probabilities in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<b>Time (months)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Group 1 (2DA+CTA)</b>					
Survival (%)	93.9 %	85.3%	80.3%	77.6%	77.6%
[CI95%]	[87.5-100]	[75.8-96.0]	[69.5-92.8]	[66.2-91.0]	[66.2-91.0]
Reintervention (n)	3	4	2	1	0
Patients at risk (n)	44	39	31	24	19
<b>Group 2 (ceCBCT+CEUS)</b>					
Survival %	98.0%	95.8%	93.5%	87.6%	80.8%
[CI95%]	[94.2-100]	[90.3-100]	[86.7-100]	[77.8-98.6]	[68.7-95.1]
Reintervention (n)	1	1	1	2	2
Patients at risk (n)	47	42	36	30	24

**Table I. Baseline characteristics and procedural data of 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

**Table IIa. Intraoperative findings in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

**Table IIb. Nature of the immediate revision in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

**Table III. Description of late stentgraft complications and stentgraft related reinterventions in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

## Tables

**Table I. Baseline characteristics and procedural data of 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<i>Characteristics</i>	Overall (n = 100)	Group 1 (n = 50)	Group 2 (n = 50)	<i>P</i> value
<b>Male sex</b>	96 (96%)	47 (94%)	49 (98%)	.425
<b>Age, years</b>	71.6 ( $\pm$ 8.4)	72.3 ( $\pm$ 8.1)	71.0 ( $\pm$ 8.6)	.610
<b>Body mass index, kg/m<sup>2</sup></b>	27.6 ( $\pm$ 4.7)	27.05 ( $\pm$ 4.3)	28.2 ( $\pm$ 5)	.255
<b>Tobacco use</b>	89 (89%)	46 (92%)	43 (86%)	.338
<b>Hypertension</b>	89 (89%)	46 (92%)	43 (86.0%)	.523
<b>Coronary artery disease</b>	46 (46%)	22 (44%)	24 (48%)	.841
<b>Cerebrovascular disease</b>	15 (15%)	9 (18%)	6 (12%)	.575
<b>eGFR (ml/min)</b>	83.2 ( $\pm$ 21.9)	79.2 ( $\pm$ 21.1)	87.2 ( $\pm$ 22.2)	.075
<b>Diabetes mellitus</b>	24 (24%)	14 (28%)	10 (20%)	.482

<b>COPD</b>	32 (32%)	16 (32%)	16 (32%)	1
<b>Aneurysm Sac maximum diameter (in mm, mean, SD)</b>	54.5 ( $\pm$ 8.4)	54.4 ( $\pm$ 5.8)	54.5 ( $\pm$ 10.5)	.972
<b>Intervention duration time (min, mean, SD)</b>	97.22 ( $\pm$ 41.58)	99.00 ( $\pm$ 49.54)	95.51 ( $\pm$ 32.62)	.683
<b>Fluoroscopy time (min, mean, SD)</b>	14.78 ( $\pm$ 15.37)	15.15 ( $\pm$ 20.69)	14.42 ( $\pm$ 7.00)	.814

*Group 1: 2D angiogram + Computed tomography angiography;*

*Group 2: Contrast enhanced cone-beam computed tomography + Contrast enhanced Ultra-Sound.*

*COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR: Estimated glomerular filtration rate (MDRD). Categorical variables are presented as number of patients (%). Continuous variables are presented as mean ( $\pm$ standard deviation).*

**Table IIa. Intraoperative findings in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<i>Variable</i>	Overall (n=100)	Group 1 (n=50)	Group 2 (n=50)	<i>P</i> value
<b>Positive Findings</b>	19 (19%)	5 (10%)	14 (28%)	.041
<b>High-flow endoleak</b>	13 (13%)	4 (8%)	10 (20%)	.150
<b>Type 1A endoleak</b>	6 (6%)	1 (2%)	5 (10%)	.207
<b>Type 1B endoleak</b>	8 (8%)	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	.712
<b>Type 3 endoleak</b>	0	0	0	NA
<b>Iliac Limb Kink</b>	4 (4%)	0	5 (10%)	.066
<b>Renal artery coverage</b>	2 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1
<b>Immediate correction</b>	18 (18%)	4 (8%)	14 (28%)	.024
<b>Type 2 Endoleak</b>	28 (28%)	15 (30%)	13 (26%)	.824
<i>Group 1: 2D angiogram + Computed tomography angiography;</i>				
<i>Group 2: Contrast enhanced cone-beam computed tomography + Contrast enhanced Ultra-Sound. NA: not applicable</i>				

**Table IIb. Nature of the immediate revision in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<b><i>Group</i></b>	<b><i>Cas number</i></b>	<b><i>Positive finding</i></b>	<b><i>Type of immediate revision</i></b>
<b>Group 1</b>	1	Type 1B Endoleak	Left iliac limb extension
	2	LRA partial coverage	Stenting of LRA
	3	Type 1B Endoleak	No revision – conservative approach
	4	Type 1B Endoleak	Right limb angioplasty
	5	Type 1A Endoleak	Coda balloon
<b>Group 2</b>	1	Type 1A Endoleak + Limb kink	Coda balloon + kissing balloon
	2	Type 1B Endoleak	Left iliac limb extension
	3	Type 1B Endoleak	Left iliac limb extension
	4	Type 1A Endoleak + Limb kink	Coda balloon + Left iliac limb stenting (nitinol)
	5	Type 1A Endoleak	Coda balloon

	6	Limb kink	Right iliac limb stenting (nitinol)
	7	Limb Kink	Left iliac limb stenting (nitinol)
	8	Type 1B Endoleak	Right iliac limb extension + HA embolization
	9	Type 1A Endoleak	Coda balloon
	10	Type 1B Endoleak	Right Limb extension
	11	Type 1B Endoleak	Right Limb extension
	12	Limb kink	Right iliac limb stenting (nitinol)
	13	RRA partial coverage	Stenting of RRA
	14	Type 1A Endoleak	Coda balloon

*Group 1: 2D angiogram + Computed tomography angiography;*

*Group 2: Contrast enhanced cone-beam computed tomography + Contrast enhanced Ultra-Sound.*

*LRA: Left renal artery, HA: Hypogastric artery, RRA: Right renal artery.*

**Table III. Description of late stentgraft complications and stentgraft related reinterventions in 100 EVAR patients with a strategy including either an intraoperative 2D-angiogram (2DA) and a postoperative computed tomography angiography (CTA) or a contrast enhanced cone beam computed tomography (ceCBCT) with an early Contrast-Enhanced Ultra-Sound (CEUS)**

<u>Follow Up</u>	Total (n = 100)	Group 1 (n=50)	Group 2 (n = 50)	P value
<b>Mean follow-up, months (SD)</b>	53.7 (±20.8)	55.4 (±22.4)	52.0 (±19.1)	<b>.419</b>
<b>Late High-Flow Endoleaks</b>	11 (11%)	9 (18%)	2 (4%)	<b>.055</b>
<b>Ia</b>	7 (7%)	6 (12%)	1 (2%)	
<b>Ib</b>	2 (2%)	2 (4%)	0	
<b>III</b>	2 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	
<b>Secondary Limb kink</b>	3(3%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	<b>1</b>
<b>Secondary Limb thrombosis</b>	4(4%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	<b>1</b>
<b>Aortic sac enlargement &gt;5mm</b>	16 (16%)	12 (24%)	4(8%)	<b>.056</b>
<b>Aortic death</b>	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean Maximum sac diameter at the end of FU (mm)</b>	48.0 (±16.5)	49.8 (±17.5)	46.1 (± 15.2)	<b>.281</b>

<b>(SD)</b>				
<b>Stentgraft-related reinterventions</b>	18 (18%)	11 (22%)	7 (14%)	<b>.435</b>
<b><i>Secondary type II Endoleak</i></b>	22 (22%)	16 (32%)	6 (12%)	<b>.030</b>
<p><i>Group 1: 2D angiogram + Computed tomography angiography;</i></p> <p><i>Group 2: Contrast enhanced cone-beam computed tomography + Contrast enhanced Ultra-Sound.</i></p> <p><i>CI: Confidence Interval. SD: Standard Deviation, FU: follow-up.</i></p>				