PFO device closure for elderly patients with cryptogenic stroke: Is it really clinically relevant procedure?

> Jae-Kwan Song, MD, PhD Professor of Medicine University of Ulsan College of Medicine Asan Medical Center Seoul, South Korea

Trial (Year)	F/U years	Age limitation	PFO	Comparator	Result
CLOSURE (2012)	2	Yes, ≤60 yrs	All	Antiplatelet or anticoagulation	Negative
PC (2013)	4.1	Yes, <60 yrs	All	Antiplatelet or anticoagulation	Negative
RESPECT (2013)	2.1	Yes, ≤60 yrs	All	Antiplatelet or anticoagulation	Negative
REDUCE (2017)	3.2	Yes, <60 yrs	All	Antiplatelet	Positive
CLOSE (2017)	5.3	Yes, ≤60 yrs	High risk	Antiplatelet	Positive
RESPECT (2017)	5.9	Yes, ≤60 yrs	All	Antiplatelet or anticoagulation	Positive
DEFENSE -PFO (2018)	2.8	Νο	High risk	Antiplatelet or anticoagulation	Positive

# Age Limitation in the Current Guidelines

COR	LOE	Recommendations
2a	B-R	2. In patients <u>18 to 60 years of age</u> with a nonla- cunar ischemic stroke of undetermined cause despite a thorough evaluation and a PFO with high-risk anatomic features,* it is reasonable to choose closure with a transcatheter device and long-term antiplatelet therapy over anti- platelet therapy alone for preventing recurrent stroke. <sup>552–557</sup>

Population	Secondary prevention of stroke, TIA, or other left circulation thromboembolism
Intervention	Percutaneous closure of PFO
Comparison	Medical therapy
Main outcomes	Stroke, TIA, death, bleedings, atrial arrhythmias
TYPE OF STATEMENT	Strong statement for the intervention
POSITION	The position of our societies is to perform percutaneous closure of a PFO in carefully selected patients aged from 18 to
STATEMENTS	65 years with a confirmed cryptogenic stroke, TIA, or systemic embolism and an estimated high probability of a causal
	role of the PFO as assessed by clinical, anatomical and imaging features.

American Heart Association/American Stroke Association, Stroke 2021;52:e364

ESC Position Paper, Eur Heart J 2019;40:3182

Statement 2a
In patients younger than 60 years with a PFO and an embolic-
appearing infarct and no other mechanism of stroke identi-
fied, clinicians may recommend closure following a discussion
of potential benefits (reduction of stroke recurrence) and
risks (procedural complication and atrial fibrillation)
(level C).

American Academy of Neurology, Neurology 2020;94:876

# Age Limitation: Why Do You Bother Me?

**Intricacy of Adult Interventional Cardiology Procedures** 



#### Courtesy of Dr. Bernhard Meier



#### **Unresolved Issues: Age Limitation**

#### Annual Incidence of Venous Thrombotic Events

(Population of Worcester, Massachusetts)



Anderson FA, et al. Arch Intern Med. 1991:151:933-938

#### PFO and Cryptogenic Stroke in Older Patients (NEJM 2007;357:2262)



#### Age- & Sex-specific Analysis of Patients with ESUS Pooled Data of 11 Stroke Registries (1,095 patients/68 years)



Neurology 2017;89:532

## PFO in Elderly Patients with Cryptogenic Stroke & TIA Population-based Study (Oxford Vascular Study, OXVASC)

A Overall						<b>B</b> Older patients*					
	Cryptogenic (events/patients)	Known cause (events/patients)		OR (95% CI)			Cryptogenic (events/patients	Known cause 5) (events/patients	)	OR (95% CI)	
Screening modality						Screening modality					
Transthoracic echocardi	ography					Transthoracic echocardie	ography				
Di Tullio et al (1992) <sup>25</sup>	19/45	7/101	<b></b>	9.81 (3.72–25.87)	p<0.0001	Di Tullio et al (1992) <sup>25</sup>	9/24	6/77		7·10 (2·20–22·96)	p=0.001
Transoesophageal echo	cardiography					Transoesophageal echoo	ardiography				
Hausman et al (1992) <sup>2</sup>	<sup>26</sup> 14/65	9/38 —	_	0.88 (0.34-2.30)		Hausman et al (1992) <sup>2</sup>	<sup>6</sup> 5/36	9/36	+	0·48 (0·14-1·62)	
lones et al $(1994)^{27}$	14/71	21/1/10 -	<b></b>	1.50 (0.71-3.15)		Jones et al (1994) <sup>27</sup>	10/57	18/137 -	╆╋╌╴	1.41 (0.61–3.27)	
Handke et al $(2007)^7$	17/)1 77/227	34/276		3.65 (2.32-5.74)		Handke et al (2007) <sup>7</sup>	41/145	27/227		2·92 (1·70–5·01)	
De Castro et al $(2007)$	2 68/402	22/257		2.17(1.20-2.61)		Force et al (2008) <sup>8</sup>	17/62	4/70	_ <b></b>	6-23 (1-97-19-75)	
Total	172/766	22/23/	$\bigtriangleup$	2.17 (1.50-5.01)		De Castro et al (2010) <sup>11</sup>	<sup>2</sup> 41/300	10/210		3·17 (1·55–6·47)	
TOTAL	1/3//00	80//20	$\sim$	1.99 (1.15-3.45)	n=0.01	Total	114/600	68/680	$\Diamond$	2·20 (1·15-4·22)	
					p=0.01				Ť.		p=0·02
Bubble-TCD					Pheterogeneity 000	Bubble-TCD					p <sub>heterogeneity</sub> =0.02
Yeung et al (1996) <sup>28</sup>	43/116	17/94		2.67 (1.40–5.09)		Yeung et al (1996) <sup>28</sup>	27/89	17/82	┼═╾	1.67 (0.83–3.35)	
Serena et al (1998) <sup>29</sup>	24/53	16/150		6.93 (3.28–14.66)		Serena et al (1998) <sup>29</sup>	15/39	16/134	│₋∎₋	4.61 (2.01-10.57)	
OXVASC (2017)	97/264	60/259		1.93 (1.32–2.82)		OXVASC (2017)	68/190	44/207		2.06 (1.32-3.23)	
Total	164/433	93/503	$\Leftrightarrow$	3·11 (1·53-6·34)		Total	110/318	77/423	$\ominus$	2.35 (1.42-3.90)	
					p=0.002				$\sim$		p=0.0009
All modalities					$p_{heterogeneity}$ =0.01	All modalities					p <sub>heterogeneity</sub> =0.15
Total	356/1244	186/1324	$\Diamond$	2·74 (1·80-4·17)	p<0.0001	Total	233/942	151/1180	$\Diamond$	2.51 (1.69-3.74)	p<0.0001
		0.1	1 10	100	$p_{heterogeneity}{=}0{\cdot}0005$			0.1	1 10	100	$p_{\text{heterogeneity}}{=}0{\cdot}01$

#### Lancet Neurol 2018;17:609

## **Prognosis of Cryptogenic Stroke with PFO at Older Ages** (9 Trials & 14 Observational Studies)

Figure 2. Meta-Regression Analysis Between Recurrent Ischemic Stroke Risk and Mean Study Age



in Patients With Patent Foramen Ovale (PFO) vs Patients Without PFO **Events/patients** Odds ratio Decreased Increased PFO No PFO (95% CI) risk risk Study Age <65 y Homma et al,<sup>9</sup> 2004 0.3 (0.1-1.2) 2/69 9/90 Weimar et al,<sup>24</sup> 2009 8/161 16/325 1.0 (0.4-2.4) Nezu et al,23 2018 1/14 6/69 0.8 (0.1-6.4) OxVasc 2020 2/55 1/83 3.1 (0.3-31.9) 0.8 (0.4-1.5) Total 13/299 32/567 Significance: P = .49Heterogeneity: P = .32

Figure 3. Risk of Ischemic Stroke Recurrence After Cryptogenic Transient Ischemic Attack/Stroke



Age is a determinant of risk of ischemic stroke after cryptogenic TIA/stroke in patients with PFO!

JAMA Neurol 2020;77:1279

#### Atrial Fibrillation: a leading stroke risk in old patients



Go et al. JAMA 2001;285:2370-2375.

Lee SR et al. Int J Cardiol. 2017;236:226-231.

#### Extended Monitoring for AF in Elderly Patients



ICM (insertable cardiac monitors) = implantable loop recorder

ESC position paper

### Clinical Case (1): F/67, TEE for cardiac source of embolism







Insertable Cardiac Monitor (Implantable Loop Recorder)



	Episode List	
Device: REVEAL LINQ LNQ11	Serial Number: RLA156633G	Date of Visit: 14-Apr-2020 15:16:30
Patient: .		Physician: CHO, MIN SOO

Arrhythmia Episode List: 13-Jan-2020 15:45:11 to 14-Apr-2020 15:16:30 All collected episodes.

ID#	Туре	Date	Time hh:mm	Duration hh:mm:ss	Max V. Rate	Median V. Rate	
16	AF	12-Apr-2020	16:48	:04:00	158 bpm (380 ms)	105 bpm (570 ms)	
15	AF	12-Apr-2020	15:48		162 bpm (370 ms)	146 bpm (410 ms)	
14	AF	07-Apr-2020	01:44	01:22:00	95 bpm (630 ms)	63 bpm (950 ms)	
13	AF	26-Mar-2020	01:12	01:44:00	133 bpm (450 ms)	59 bpm (1020 ms)	
12	AF	26-Mar-2020	00:52	:12:00	86 bpm (700 ms)	55 bpm (1100 ms)	
11	AF	23-Mar-2020	22:08	:02:00	76 bpm (790 ms)	67 bpm (900 ms)	
10	AF	13-Mar-2020	06:12	01:10:00	154 bpm (390 ms)	49 bpm (1230 ms)	-
9	Tachy	01-Mar-2020	07:15	:02:24	162 bpm (370 ms)	154 bpm (390 ms)	
8	AF	13-Feb-2020	22:52	01:24:00	140 bpm (430 ms)	73 bpm (820 ms)	٨
7	AF	27-Jan-2020	03:28	:44:00	125 bpm (480 ms)	67 bpm (890 ms)	
6	AF	14-Jan-2020	04:24	03:54:00	154 bpm (390 ms)	87 bpm (690 ms)	
		Last Programme	r Session 13	3-Jan-2020	Dec 2010		
(Data	nriar to loof	Last weatronic C		nitor Session 1/-	Dec-2018		
Data	prior to last	session has no	been Interr	ogaled.)			/

	: :	: : :		: : :		: :		1 1 1				
Aria	~	pur			\						- America	
		Į					~			·····		
 (		Į.		Į.		ţ		ţ	Ţ		ý.	Į.
	6		1210	•	9		1080		9		9	
				····					· · · · · ·			
	: :		: :			: :						
												Δ
 :						~	June - J				p	
 				\		<u></u>	Jur V			<b>`</b> (	ŗ	
·····		~~~~		·			Jun S					
····· ····· ·····		1230	V V	1230	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	7	juins j	1420	, in the second		x x y y	V 1030
····	~~~~	1230	<u> </u>	1230	↓ ↓ ↓		V	1420	ý S		V S S 0	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ 1030

How Often is Occult AF Causally-Related to Cryptogenic Ischemic Ct



# **Unresolved Issues: Age Limitation**



DEFENSE-PFO subgroup analysis

J Stroke 2021

#### High- vs Low-risk PFO: PFO size (>2 mm), Atrial septal aneurysm or hypermobility (>10 mm)



# Hypermobile atrial septum with a large PFO







# Device Closure or Antithrombotic Therapy after Cryptogenic Stroke in Elderly Patients with a High-risk PFO

- 10 hospitals in South Korea retrospective analysis
- 437 elderly patients with PFO-associated stroke (mean age, 68.1 years):
- 303 patients (69%) had a high-risk PFO: PFO closure was done in 161 patients (37%)
- Recurrent stroke or TIA in 64 patients (14.6%) during median F/U of 3.9 years



J Stroke 2024, accepted

# Any RCTs?

NCT01018355

The Effect of Device Closure of **Patent Foramen Ovale** in Elderly Patients With Crytogenic Stoke/TCI

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01018355

Recruitment Status ① : Terminated (Dissatisfactory enrollment rate) First Posted ① : November 23, 2009 Last Update Posted ① : May 6, 2010



PFO is associated with cryptogenic stroke

Risk of stroke recurrence in PFO-associated stroke: additive risk of atrial septal aneurysm

CLOSE trial – beneficial effect of device closure in patients with a high-risk PFO

CLOSE II trial for elderly cryptogenic stroke patients with a high-risk PFO

**Professor Jean-Louis Mas** 

Conclusion: PFO Closure in the Elderly Cryptogenic Stroke Patients with PFO

- Underestimated clinical significance of PFO in elderly cryptogenic stroke patients
- Retrospective analysis showed beneficial effect of device closure in elderly patients with a high-risk PFO
- RCT is ongoing CLOSE II













