

Consider stopping if >3 hours, 3.7 x eGFR ml contrast, Air Kerma > 5 Gy unless procedure well advanced

# Antegrade approach

- Single wire technique
- Parallel wire technique
- Dissection reentry

In conjunction with IVUS-guided approach





# Antegrade wire based strategy



	Visible micro channels	Tapered proximal cap	Blunt proximal cap	
Proximal Cap	Low penetration force	Low penetration	Intermediate penetration	
	wire with polymer	force wire	force wire	
	jacket and tapered tip	Ļ	$\downarrow$	
	Intermediate penetration	Intermediate penetratic	on High penetration	
	force wire	force wire	force wire	
CTO body	Length <20 mm	Reasonable to continue with wire used to cross proximal cap		
	Length >20 mm or ambiguous course	Step down to a low penetration force wire of intermediate non-tapered wire		

**Distal Cap** Escalation from softer more steerable wire to a higher penetration-force wire may be required.

# Single wire technique







# Antegrade wire based strategy





# 60/M, Long CTO with tapered cap Poor distal target with good interventional collateral









# Long CTO with tapered cap

## Cosair with fielder XT

# Wire bending

### Wire bending

CardioVascular Research Foundation

# Long CTO with tapered cap

### Corsair with fielder XT

### Corsair with fielder XT







# 67/M Ambiguous stump Poor distal target







Consider stopping if >3 hours, 3.7 x eGFR ml contrast, Air Kerma > 5 Gy unless procedure well advanced

# Antegrade wire based strategy





### Tip angiography

Corsair with Gaia 2: cap puncture

Corsair with Fielder X : CTO body (Step-down)

Corsair with Caia 2 : distal cap puncture (Step-up)



Wire bending



### Wire confirmation

### Corsair advance

## Final angiography





# LAD CTO with anomalous origin RCA CTO







### Baseline angiography





### **Distal true lumen wiring with fielder XT**

### **Final angiography**

Tip angiography



XB 3.5 RCA guiding

### Retrograde wiring with sion and snaring

2.5 balloon Finecross

Guidzillar



### Antegrade wiring and stenting

### Final angiography

Medical Center





# 56/M, Long RCA CTO with no stump



### HEAVY CALCIFATION IN PROXIMAL CAP

### **IVUS** exam: Soft proximal cap with lumen

RCA









### **IVUS-guided Fielder XT**

### **Corsair advance**













### Fielder XT

### Gaia 2 (step-up escalation)









### Gaia 2 : Adavnce into true lumen









# Final angiography









# 62/M, Prox LAD CTO with no stump

HEAVY CALCIFATION IN PROXIMAL CAP Soft plaque in CTO body and distal cap



IVUS guided puncture With Gaia 2 IVUS guided puncture With Gaia 2: subintimal space

### Calcium in prox cap

### Additional IVUS guided Puncture With conquest





CardioVascular Research Foundation

### **Corsair advance**

### Fielder XT (step down escalation)









### Fielder XT wiring

### **Final result**







ASAN Medical Center

# **Parallel wire technique**







# 67/M, Failed OM CTO x 2 times

# Corsair with fielder XT





### fielder XT --->

### Wire in the false lumen



rdioVascular Research Foundation

## fielder XT --->

## **Parallel wire with Gaia 2**

Gaia 2

## Wire in the true lumen



# 71/M, proximal RCA CTO No proximal stump & Poor distal target

### IVUS guided puncture With Gaia 2 wire







Gaia 2 wire advance Under guidance of multiple projection









## Final angiography









# Antegrade wire escalation Up & down escalation

- Proximal cap: image guidance or morphology
- CTO body: image guidance or resistance
- Distal cap: image guidance or resistance







# **Dissection reentry**







# **Baseline angiography**

Good interventional collateral





# Subintimal wiring with caravel









## Microcatheter advance and wire exchange









# Wire removal and straw technique balloon positioning by angiography

Straw technique again through stingray balloon: Subintimal hematoma suction with 3 way system







## **Reentry using Stingray wire**





Angulation: concern for vessel damage with stingray wire





# Stick and Swab using Fielder XT wire









# Wire position confirmed









# Final angiography









# Antegrade vs. retrograde in Korea

## Asan medical center registry



# Initial wire for antegrade Asan medical center registry









# Final crossing wire for antegrade Asan medical center registry









# Microcatheter for antegrade Asan medical center registry









# Crossing technique for antegrade Asan medical center registry



# **IVUS- guided wiring : 10%**







# Antegrade vs. retrograde in Korea Asan medical center registry

### Figure 2(A). Procedural success rate



### Figure 2(B). Procedure number over time





## Antegrade approach Trends of J-CTO score and technical success rate







# **Lesion and Procedural Characteristics**

Successful CTO-PCI	Antegrade only (N=628)	Retrograde attempted (N=187)	P value	
J CTO score	1.8±1.0	2.5±1.0	<0.001	
Blunt proximal cap	382 (60.8)	135 (72.2)	0.01	
Moderate/severe calcification	306 (48.7)	99 (52.9)	0.35	
Bending > 45°	223 (35.5)	86 (46.0)	0.01	
Occlusion length >20mm	123 (19.6)	85 (45.5)	<0.001	
Retry lesion	71 (11.3)	85 (45.5)	<0.001	
Number of stent per lesion	1.7±0.8	2.2±0.8	<0.001	
Stent length, mm	48.7±22.6	66.9±22.9	<0.001	
Average stent diameter, mm	3.2±0.3	3.2±0.3	0.512	
IVUS use	578 (92.0)	171 (91.4)	0.913	
Contrast media amount, ml	386.9±181.0	538.0±243.9	<0.001	
Total fluoroscopy time, min	34.3±45.7	72.6±42.1	<0.001	

## Relationship between CTO length, Total lesion length, and final stent length







### Hazard Ratios of Clinical Outcomes Medium Follow-up Time: 4.0 years

Outcome	Antegrade only (N=599)	Retrograde attempted (N=129)	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	IPTW adjusted HR (95% CI)	P value
Target lesion failure	34 (7.0)	14 (14.1)	2.27 (1.29–3.99)	0.005	2.55 (1.50–4.36)	<0.001
Target vessel failure	36 (7.4)	15 (15.1)	2.29 (1.32–3.96)	0.003	2.64 (1.57–4.42)	<0.001
Death	27 (5.5)	9 (9.5)	1.36 (0.65–2.83)	0.41	1.36 (0.66–2.84)	0.41
Death or MI	36 (7.2)	11 (11.8)	1.41 (0.74–2.66)	0.29	1.47 (0.79–2.74)	0.22
MACE	50 (10.8)	15 (20.0)	1.98 (1.23–3.19)	0.005	2.20 (1.39–3.48)	<0.001
TLR	18 (3.7)	8 (7.4)	2.94 (1.41–6.12)	0.004	2.59 (1.52–4.42)	<0.001
TVR	20 (4.1)	9 (8.5)	2.91 (1.44–5.86)	0.003	3.38 (1.75–6.52)	<0.001

4-year event rates are shown as Kaplan–Meier estimates (number and percentage of events). Hazard ratios are for patients who underwent retrograde procedure compared with patients with antegrade only procedure.





# Conclusions

- After adoption of retrograde approach, more challenging CTO lesions were tried to open, thereby use of antegrade approach decreased over times.
- Fielder wire, Gaia wire, and Corsair microcatheter are widely used for antegrade approach, such devices improved overall success rate in conjunction with retrograde approach.
- Proper use of antegrade single wire or parallel wire technique with or without IVUS guidance make procedure simple and improve success rate.





# Conclusions

- Antegrade approach usually was done in less complex lesion subset, which was translated into less complex procedural characteristics, shorter stent length, and good long-term outcomes compared to retrograde approach
- Therefore, antegrade approach is still main default strategy for less complex CTO and essential for success after failed retrograde approach
- If wire-based antegrade approach is failed, reentry device could be option instead of retrograde approach to reduce procedural time.

# Thank you for your attention





