



# Complication Avoidance and Management Research

# 8

Mithun G. Sattur, Chandan Krishna, Aman Gupta,  
Matthew E. Welz, Rami James N. Aoun, Patrick B. Bolton,  
Brian W. Chong, Bart M. Demaerschalk,  
Pelagia Kouloumberis, Mark K. Lyons, Jamal Mcclendon Jr.,  
Naresh Patel, Ayan Sen, Kristin Swanson,  
Richard S. Zimmerman, and Bernard R. Bendok

---

M.G. Sattur, M.D. • A. Gupta, M.B.B.S. • M.E. Welz, M.S. • R.J.N. Aoun, M.D., M.P.H.  
Department of Neurological Surgery, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Precision Neuro-Therapeutics Innovation Lab, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Neurosurgery Simulation and Innovation Lab, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

e-mail: [sattur.mithun@mayo.edu](mailto:sattur.mithun@mayo.edu); [gupta.aman@mayo.edu](mailto:gupta.aman@mayo.edu); [welz.matt@mayo.edu](mailto:welz.matt@mayo.edu);  
[aoun.rami@mayo.edu](mailto:aoun.rami@mayo.edu)

C. Krishna, M.D. • P. Kouloumberis, M.D. • M.K. Lyons, M.D. • J. Mcclendon Jr., M.D.  
N. Patel, M.D. • R.S. Zimmerman, M.D.

Department of Neurological Surgery, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

e-mail: [Krishna.chandan@mayo.edu](mailto:Krishna.chandan@mayo.edu); [kouloumberis.pelagia@mayo.edu](mailto:kouloumberis.pelagia@mayo.edu); [lyons.mark2@mayo.edu](mailto:lyons.mark2@mayo.edu);  
[mcclendon.jamal@mayo.edu](mailto:mcclendon.jamal@mayo.edu); [patel.naresh@mayo.edu](mailto:patel.naresh@mayo.edu); [Zimmerman.richard@mayo.edu](mailto:Zimmerman.richard@mayo.edu)

P.B. Bolton, M.D.

Department of Anesthesia and Periop Med, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

e-mail: [Bolton.patrick@mayo.edu](mailto:Bolton.patrick@mayo.edu)

B.W. Chong, M.D., F.R.C.P.(C)

Department of Neurological Surgery, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Department of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, 5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA  
e-mail: [chong.brian@mayo.edu](mailto:chong.brian@mayo.edu)

B.M. Demaerschalk, M.D., MSc., F.R.C.P.(C)

Department of Neurology, Mayo Clinic, 5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA  
e-mail: [demaerschalk.bart@mayo.edu](mailto:demaerschalk.bart@mayo.edu)

A. Sen, M.D.  
Department of Critical Care Medicine, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA  
e-mail: [sen.ayan@mayo.edu](mailto:sen.ayan@mayo.edu)

K. Swanson, Ph.D.  
Department of Neurological Surgery, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Precision Neuro-Therapeutics Innovation Lab, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA  
e-mail: [swanson.kristin@mayo.edu](mailto:swanson.kristin@mayo.edu)

B.R. Bendok, M.D., M.S.C.I (✉)  
Department of Neurological Surgery, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Precision Neuro-Therapeutics Innovation Lab, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Neurosurgery Simulation and Innovation Lab, Mayo Clinic,  
5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Department of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, 5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Department of Otolaryngology, Mayo Clinic, 5777 East Mayo Boulevard, Phoenix, AZ, USA  
e-mail: [bendok.bernard@mayo.edu](mailto:bendok.bernard@mayo.edu)

## Abbreviations

ARUBA	A Randomized trial of Unruptured Brain Arteriovenous malformations
COSS	Carotid Occlusion Surgery Study
CTA	Computed tomography angiography
DSA	Digital subtraction angiography
DVT	Deep vein thrombosis
EC-IC	Extracranial-intracranial
EEG	Electroencephalography
ICG	Indocyanine green
ICH	Intracerebral hemorrhage
ISUIA	The International Study of Unruptured Intracranial Aneurysms
MEP	Motor-evoked potential
PE	Pulmonary embolism
PET	Positron emission tomography
SEP	Sensory evoked potentials
TIA	Transient ischemic attack
TPA	Tissue plasminogen activator
VTE	Venous thromboembolism

## Introduction

Research into complication avoidance and management begins with a clear definition of what constitutes a complication. This proves to be surprisingly difficult. An example is interpretation of the results of the CREST trial [1] for carotid stenosis in comparing the periprocedural stroke and myocardial infarction (MI) risk between the two treatment modalities studied—carotid endarterectomy (CEA) and carotid artery stenting (CAS). The trial reported higher stroke risk with CAS (4.1 vs. 2.3%;  $p = 0.01$ ), which led proponents of CEA to propose that CEA was the preferable procedure of the two for stroke prevention. However, proponents of CAS argued that the vast majority of strokes were minor and non-disabling (81%) and pointed to the increased risk of MI with CEA (1.1 vs. 2.3%;  $p = 0.03$ ). Counterarguments were that stroke was more impactful than MI on quality of life measures, while again pro-CAS experts noted that cranial neuropathy and/or MI were important enough to be considered as major complications of CEA. This preceding brief discussion is illustrative of the conundrum of defining a complication: what constitutes a complication to one group may be an acceptable side effect to the other and vice versa. Indeed this difference may be more disparate from the perspective of the patient. For instance, temporal muscle atrophy following pterional craniotomy for a complex incidental unruptured middle cerebral artery aneurysm requiring innovative clip reconstruction with bypass may be considered a minor expected trade-off for a highly involved procedure by the surgeon, whereas for the index patient, this may prove to be so irksome that it impacts daily social interactions. The latter may well be considered a complication of surgery in the patient's eyes. Similarly, aneurysm recurrence following coiling which necessitates further angiography, radiation, anesthesia, and intracranial arterial catheterization with its attendant risks may be considered expected "aneurysm maintenance" by the surgeon but a complication by the patient.

The elusiveness in defining a complication is expertly discussed in a thought-provoking paper by Sokol and Wilson in 2008. Through a stepwise development, they propose defining a surgical complication as "any undesirable, unintended, and direct result of an operation affecting the patient, which would not have occurred had the operation gone as well as could reasonably be hoped." This implies an error of *commission*. We however believe that there is also a distinct category of adverse health outcomes that result from errors of *omission* (Table 8.1). For example, the inability to detect an aneurysm that ultimately presents with fatal rupture could be construed as a complication resulting from non-diagnosis. Therefore research into complication avoidance could be organized into the following categories/phases of patient care:

1. Screening for disease detection and patient selection for treatment
2. Perioperative morbidity
3. Follow-up

**Table 8.1** Illustrative examples of the role of research in aspects of neurovascular disease management

Disease	Challenge	Type of complication	Research focus	Proposed study method
Intracranial aneurysm	Fatal rupture after detection where treatment was withheld per ISUIA criteria	Omission	Hemodynamic and morphologic factors predicting rupture (beyond size)	Natural history studies, prospective disease registry, prospective observational cohort studies incorporating flow dynamics at different time points
	Intraoperative rupture	Commission	Safer anesthetic and surgical technique in operating room and endovascular suite	Patient-specific simulation
	Incomplete coil occlusion of wide-necked aneurysm or residual after clip reconstruction	Omission	Novel devices for aneurysm occlusion	Prospective device registry with long-term follow-up
Arteriovenous malformation (AVM)	Debilitating seizures from withholding definitive microsurgery for grade 1 AVM per ARUBA	Omission	Better assessment of treatment risks	Characterizing AVM hemodynamics with novel imaging such as NOVA at different time points in natural history and treatment
Carotid stenosis	Stroke during stent	Commission	Enhanced distal protection devices	Healthy collaboration with industry for innovation in device development
	Recurrent stenosis after CEA from progressive atherosclerosis	Omission	Optimization of risk factor management	Community-based behavioral intervention care paths
	Progressive cognitive decline due to hypoperfusion from carotid occlusion and withholding bypass per COSS	Omission	Cognitive assessment at different time points, with and without intervention	Randomized protocol-based study incorporating robust and reproducible scales

**Table 8.1** (continued)

Disease	Challenge	Type of complication	Research focus	Proposed study method
Acute stroke	Hemorrhage from TPA in a patient who also underwent mechanical thrombectomy	Commission	Optimizing outcomes of endovascular recanalization independent of TPA	High-quality multicenter prospective cohort design compared to simultaneously collected controls matched as best as possible (randomization impossible given TPA is a standard of care currently)
	Continued aphasia from dominant M2 occlusion	Omission	Demonstration of feasibility of endovascular intervention	Prospective randomized trial design of outcomes after M2 recanalization
ICH	Progressive hematoma expansion and perihematoma brain injury	Omission	Minimally invasive clot evacuation and drugs delivered locally or systematically	Rapid phase 1/2 trials of novel clot stabilizing/dissolution agents

Each in turn can focus on errors of omission or commission. In this chapter, we shall consider some relevant examples and scenarios where research on complications can improve patient outcomes in neurovascular surgery (defined as any technique involved in treating neurovascular diseases).

## Types of Research

Several methods exist to study the above components:

1. Case reports
2. Case series
3. Epidemiologic studies
4. Database analysis or registry studies
5. Prospective observational studies
6. Clinical trials (matched cohorts and randomized)
7. Simulation studies and modeling
8. Surgical procedural protocol standardization studies [2]

Prospective clinical trials typically progress through Phases I to IV with Phase III trials constituting the benchmark randomized controlled trials (RCT) (with blinding) [2]. Data proven in RCTs are most robust since data is gathered prospectively in comparison with a control group and with well-defined endpoints while accounting and controlling for variability and bias. It must be realized that these are

very expensive, time consuming, and involve vast resources at each stage. Clinical trials may examine screening, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and quality of life. Behavioral interventional studies that introduce and modify operational procedures in the operating room and angiography suite hold great promise toward quality initiatives [3]. A limitation of clinical trials is they are best suited for homogenous diseases where equipoise is clearly established for two treatments. This is problematic in neurosurgery where diseases are often highly heterogenous and equipoise is often lacking or controversial.

---

## Screening and Patient Selection

Efficient screening that detects asymptomatic/preclinical disease can potentially reduce “omission”-related complications. General screening of entire populations has the best chance of detecting asymptomatic disease but has not been well defined for cerebrovascular diseases. Targeted screening has a role but defining the target population is not straightforward. A growing body of literature on familial aneurysms has made it easier to justify familial screening.

### Intracranial Aneurysm

For cerebral aneurysms, screening of persons with two or more first-degree relatives has demonstrated increased incidence of aneurysms [4], but the perception on cost-effectiveness or impact on outcomes has not been uniform [5–7]. Even in diseases such as polycystic kidney disease, screening is deemed to be of utility if performed selectively [8]. Once detected, there is the issue of selecting appropriate patients for treatment since benefits despite therapy-related morbidity should outweigh the risks. The ISUIA trial, in two parts, attempted to answer this question for aneurysms, but several significant study limitations preclude blanket recommendations—the study had inherent serious selection bias, overestimates the prevalence of aneurysms, about 1/3 of patients in the prospective second part (2003) switched to treatment arms and were excluded from follow-up, and includes cavernous carotid aneurysms [7, 9]. The trials do highlight the relative lower rupture risks for small aneurysms less than 7 mm (during 5 years of follow-up) for anterior circulation but lend no credence to aneurysm morphology or hemodynamics which has been shown to potentially influence rupture risk [10–13]. The latter are ripe areas for research into enabling better patient selection for treating unruptured aneurysms detected following screening (or as an incidental finding). Selection bias related to enrolling low-risk aneurysms undoubtedly influenced results. A number of studies since ISUIA have suggested a higher rupture risk for small aneurysms [14].

### AVM

The management of unruptured AVMs is challenging because of their variable hemorrhage risk and highly diverse morphologies and brain locations. Attempts have been

made to characterize this risk by incorporating individual AVM-related factors [15]. There are however pertinent AVM factors that are still inconsistently characterized in AVM scores. Comprehensive hemodynamic characterization of an AVM including the venous component coupled with prospective collaborative database analysis is an exciting possibility toward consistent and accurate prediction of rupture risk [16]. Patient selection for treatment of brain arteriovenous malformations (AVMs) is also not straightforward since similar issues plague the few available published trials. The best known (on some counts, infamous) AVM trial is ARUBA, but the study is markedly inadequate in that included were low-grade, surgically curable AVMs randomized to conservative management alone vs. any procedural therapy and studied for a short follow-up duration of 33 months (mean) [17]. This presents another exciting area of research—application of the knowledge gained from multiple studies of AVM treatment modalities (with surgery, embolization, radiosurgery, and combinations) into formulating a trial that combines AVM flow assessment (as opposed to only static morphological parameters) and comprehensive multidisciplinary team-based randomization with recognition of true equipoise. Machine learning algorithms hold promise in this area [18].

## Carotid Stenosis

The utility of carotid endarterectomy in symptomatic (>50%) and asymptomatic (>60%) carotid stenosis was demonstrated by NASCET [19], ACAS [20], and ECAS studies [21]. However the increasing application of carotid artery stenting (CAS) has added an element of decision making that has been studied in RCT settings [22]. The concerns with increased periprocedural stroke in CAS are an area of research focus. Possible study designs include incorporating enhanced distal embolic protection devices and longer clinical follow-up to ascertain long-term benefit. Another area of research is the frequent argument that medical management of vascular risk factors has become more aggressive and standardized over the years to the degree that the number of asymptomatic patients with carotid stenosis needed to treat (NNT) with CEA/CAS in order to prevent one stroke may be increasingly higher [23] though improvements have occurred in parallel in surgical technique [24]. A direct comparison between CAS vs. best medical management *and* CEA vs. best medical treatment is being undertaken in the CREST-2 trial that should address this issue. There are also opportunities to incorporate physiological parameters such as carotid plaque morphology and/or flow velocities into similar studies [25, 26].

## Occlusive Disease

Treatment for carotid occlusion by EC-IC bypass was deemed to be of no benefit in the recent COSS trial that selected patients based on PET determined hemodynamic (qualitative) flow reduction and randomized them to medical vs. bypass treatment [27]. Yet many flaws noted in that trial need to be addressed with further research [28]. Important among these is the application of rigorous cognitive assessment measures in patients with carotid occlusion given the known effect of hemispheric hypoperfusion in carotid stenosis and occlusion [29–31].

Cognitive status per standardized tools and stratification according to flow reduction (e.g., quantitative rather than qualitative, with use of NOVA measurements) and, thenceforth, comparison of best medical management vs. surgical treatment is a good research focus. Identifying and selecting appropriate candidates for treatment in patients with moyamoya disease based on cognitive assessment and cerebral blood flow measurements is a similar area for potential research [32, 33].

## Acute Stroke

Acute ischemic stroke management was revolutionized by the demonstration in multiple randomized trials of the efficacy of endovascular thrombectomy in large intracranial artery occlusion after IV TPA administration [34]. Expanding the pool of eligible patients for IV thrombolysis can also impact the results of stroke therapy if exclusion criteria are narrowed. An example would be the inclusion of patients on novel anticoagulants and accumulating high-quality evidence supporting this [35]. On the other hand, there is an accumulating body of evidence that demonstrates similar outcomes in patients who are TPA ineligible that undergo endovascular clot retrieval [36, 37]. This is a fertile area of investigation because if demonstrated with level 1 evidence, intravenous thrombolysis-related complications might be eliminated in this patient population.

The benefit of endovascular recanalization in occlusion at the level of the M2 vessels remains to be demonstrated. Recanalization of a dominant M2 has the obvious potential of improving speech outcomes, for example, and should be aggressively evaluated [38].

---

## Perioperative Morbidity Reduction

Periprocedural complications can be reduced with attention to pre-, intra-, and post-operative management. Interventions for reducing surgical complications begin in the preoperative phase. An example is smoking cessation before general anesthesia to reduce lung complications and improve wound healing [39]. Another area of research into periprocedural complications is VTE prophylaxis—a recent meta-analysis noted the relative risks and benefits of prophylactic anticoagulation in terms of number needed to treat to prevent DVT/PE/VTE at the expense of increased risk of ICH [40]. The specific indication for craniotomy has not been found to have any correlation with VTE risk [41] but research into the role of prophylactic anticoagulation in procedures such as aneurysm clipping and AVM resection will help understand risk-benefit ratios in vascular neurosurgery which are likely different from tumor or trauma surgery.

Prevention of ischemic complications in aneurysm clipping has relied on intraoperative monitoring with evoked potentials and/or EEG and vessel imaging with ICG [42]. However, no randomized study has established the utility of combined modalities and the stage of surgery when a particular modality may be more applicable. This lends itself to a potential multicenter study of how to best utilize SEP, MEP, ICG,



microvascular Doppler, EEG, and other simpler modalities such as near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS). Another important facet of improving safety of aneurysm clipping is improved visualization of arterial anatomy. Incorporating smaller and more flexible endoscopes is an area of research to minimize morbidity [43]. Another area of research is studying ways of broadening the indications for novel minimally invasive approaches for aneurysm occlusion such as endonasal endoscopic techniques [44].

Wide-necked aneurysms are traditionally treated with clip reconstruction or flow diversion. Newer devices such as the WEB (Sequent Medical, Aliso Viejo, California) or pCONUS device (Phenox, Bochum, Germany) are being introduced for treatment of wide-necked bifurcation aneurysms. Despite promising early results, sound long-term studies are paramount in ensuring continued aneurysm occlusion.

An area often relegated to the background in the “heat of battle” is intraoperative radiation exposure to the surgical team and the patient. This is of immediate relevance to the neurovascular team. Typical exposures vary from diagnostic angiography, Dose Area Product (DAP) 102.4/Kerma-Area Product (KAP) 142.10/0.8–19.6 (5.0) mSv, to higher doses for interventional procedures, DAP 160–172/KAP 382.80 [45]. Reduction of radiation doses requires appropriate use of protective equipment and change in machine settings [46]. Research into better and less cumbersome protection equipment with newer materials is required [47]. Another interesting avenue is the investigation and application of MR angiography as a substitute for diagnosis [48, 49] and ultimately for endovascular therapy [50].

---

## Follow-Up

An important shortcoming of some recent trials has been the lack of adequate data both in terms of length and quality. When such studies end up denouncing therapy altogether or recommend one preferentially over the other, potentially fatal errors of omission and commission occur. The ARUBA trial followed AVMs for a mean duration of less than 3 years for a lifelong disease in patients whose mean age was only in the mid-40s [51]. The implication is denial of potentially curative therapy for seizure patients with grade 1 and 2 AVMs, some of whom may be battling toxic side effects of multiple drugs for seizure control. This clearly demonstrates the need for longer follow-up in studies and disease registries. The COSS trial also followed patients only for 2 years, while there have been reports of progressive hemodynamic insufficiency leading to poor outcomes [52]. In addition, cognitive outcomes were not documented as diligently as stroke/TIA events [53].

For the individual neurovascular patient, research into ensuring close and continued follow-up through behavioral intervention is important. For example, there is roughly 6–10% risk of restenosis 2–5 years after carotid intervention and an elevated stroke risk in these patients compared to those without restenosis [54, 55]. Similarly, there is a definite risk of long-term (10 years) recurrence of aneurysms after coiling requiring retreatment which mandates diligent follow-up [56, 57].

## Complication Avoidance Through Simulation

A clear understanding of the positional relationship between various cerebral structures, cranial nerves, and blood vessels is difficult to appreciate on two-dimensional radiographic imaging. For example, the complexity of cerebral vasculature around an aneurysm requires both extensive and exhaustive mental visualization by the treating neurosurgeon. Any error in navigating this complex anatomy may result in potentially fatal consequences for the patient [58]. Also, some neurosurgical cases allow for only one neurosurgeon to operate at a given moment. This is especially true for skull base procedures which have a very small and narrow surgical field of access [58]. Therefore, it would be prudent to practice on anatomically tailored models using 3D printing technology to better understand the anatomic relationships between the lesion and the surrounding normal structures. Many reports on simulation have emerged which have evaluated the utility of 3D printing and virtual reality (VR) in the field of neurosurgery [59]. The use of 3D printer to construct patient-specific three-dimensional models based on actual surgical brain pathology is called rapid prototyping [60]. This technology uses processed 3D images (e.g., 3D-CTA, 3D-DSA) to fabricate patient-specific 3D models. This has been further possible with the digitalization of radiographic images which converts a normal two-dimensional image into 3D [60].

Simulation helps surgeons rehearse delicate surgical maneuvers prior to the actual surgery. In addition, simulation can enhance the training opportunities for neurosurgical trainees as the former have declined due to various factors. Recently, several reports have been published which have evaluated the role of a virtual reality (VR) neurosurgical simulator with haptic feedback in practicing and perfecting techniques [61]. Yet cost can be a barrier to widespread adoption of VR technology, at least at present. Consequently physical models in combination with pre- and posttest objective assessment hold great potential in technique simulation in vascular neurosurgery. Such simulation modules have been developed by the Congress of Neurological Surgeons (CNS) along with scales to assess the performance of students in different types of neurosurgical procedures. The NOMAT (Northwestern Objective Assessment Tool) is a practical example of such a scale that accompanies the CNS Microanastomosis module [62]. Validation studies of NOMAT scale have documented that the scale can reliably distinguish between various levels of performance exhibited by residents at different levels of training [62]. Limitations do exist. For example, it is difficult to 3D print the consistency of different types of aneurysms such as calcified, mycotic, or thrombotic components. Secondly, real-time complications like aneurysm rupture or tearing of friable tissues cannot be simulated effectively. Additionally, it is challenging to recreate the haptics and feedback of different microsurgical techniques. Progressive technological improvements in augmented reality and computing, including via high-end gaming platforms, is an area for active research.

## Conclusion

Most complications can be viewed as errors of omission or commission that can impact a patient during disease screening, selection for treatment, surgical intervention, or follow-up. Multiple avenues may be exploited in the study of complications occurring in different stages of disease management in the cerebrovascular patient. Although no single research technique can guarantee a 100% avoidance in complications, the cumulative results of various techniques can provide trainees and surgeons a road map or a blueprint for improving patient outcomes in the field of neurovascular surgery.

## References

1. Brott TG, Hobson RW, Howard G, Roubin GS, Clark WM, Brooks W, Mackey A, Hill MD, Leimgruber PP, Sheffet AJ. Stenting versus endarterectomy for treatment of carotid-artery stenosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363:11–23.
2. Piantadosi S. Crossover designs. In: *Clinical trials: a methodologic perspective*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: Wiley; 2005. p. 515–27.
3. McCulloch P, Morgan L, Flynn L, Rivero-Arias O, Martin G, Collins G, New S. Safer delivery of surgical services: a programme of controlled before-and-after intervention studies with pre-planned pooled data analysis. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2016.
4. Schievink WI. Intracranial aneurysms. *N Engl J Med*. 1997;336:28–40.
5. Bor ASE, Koffijberg H, Wermer MJ, Rinkel GJ. Optimal screening strategy for familial intracranial aneurysms a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Neurology*. 2010;74:1671–9.
6. Crawley F, Clifton A, Brown MM. Should we screen for familial intracranial aneurysm? *Stroke*. 1999;30:312–6.
7. International Study of Unruptured Intracranial Aneurysms Investigators. Unruptured intracranial aneurysms—risk of rupture and risks of surgical intervention. *N Engl J Med*. 1998;339:972–9.
8. Rozenfeld M, Ansari S, Shaibani A, Russell E, Mohan P, Hurley M. Should patients with autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease be screened for cerebral aneurysms? *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2014;35:3–9.
9. Wiebers DO, International Study of Unruptured Intracranial Aneurysms Investigators. Unruptured intracranial aneurysms: natural history, clinical outcome, and risks of surgical and endovascular treatment. *Lancet*. 2003;362:103–10.
10. Dhar S, Tremmel M, Mocco J, Kim M, Yamamoto J, Siddiqui AH, Hopkins LN, Meng H. Morphology parameters for intracranial aneurysm rupture risk assessment. *Neurosurgery*. 2008;63:185.
11. Hasan D, Chalouhi N, Jabbour P, Dumont AS, Kung DK, Magnotta VA, Young WL, Hashimoto T, Winn HR, Heistad D. Early change in ferumoxytol-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging signal suggests unstable human cerebral aneurysm. *Stroke*. 2012;43:3258–65.
12. Kashiwazaki D, Kuroda S. Size ratio can highly predict rupture risk in intracranial small (<5 mm) aneurysms. *Stroke*. 2013;44:2169–73.
13. Xiang J, Tutino V, Snyder K, Meng H. CFD: computational fluid dynamics or confounding factor dissemination? The role of hemodynamics in intracranial aneurysm rupture risk assessment. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2014;35:1849–57.
14. Chmayssani M, Rebeiz JG, Rebeiz TJ, Batjer HH, Bendok BR. Relationship of growth to aneurysm rupture in asymptomatic aneurysms  $\leq 7$  mm: a systematic analysis of the literature. *Neurosurgery*. 2011;68:1164–71; discussion 1171.
15. Rutledge WC, Ko NU, Lawton MT, Kim H. Hemorrhage rates and risk factors in the natural history course of brain arteriovenous malformations. *Transl Stroke Res*. 2014;5:538–42.

16. Wu C, Ansari S, Honarmand A, Vakil P, Hurley M, Bendok B, Carr J, Carroll T, Markl M. Evaluation of 4D vascular flow and tissue perfusion in cerebral arteriovenous malformations: influence of Spetzler-Martin grade, clinical presentation, and AVM risk factors. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2015;36:1142–9.
17. Mohr J, Moskowitz AJ, Stapf C, Hartmann A, Lord K, Marshall SM, Mast H, Moquete E, Moy CS, Parides M. The ARUBA trial. *Stroke*. 2010;41:e537–40.
18. Ansari S, Schnell S, Carroll T, Vakil P, Hurley M, Wu C, Carr J, Bendok B, Batjer H, Markl M. Intracranial 4D flow MRI: toward individualized assessment of arteriovenous malformation hemodynamics and treatment-induced changes. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2013;34:1922–8.
19. Williams L. North American symptomatic carotid endarterectomy trial. Methods, patient characteristics, and progress. *Stroke*. 1991;22:711–20.
20. Baker WH, Howard VJ, Howard G, Toole JF, ACAS Investigators. Effect of contralateral occlusion on long-term efficacy of endarterectomy in the asymptomatic carotid atherosclerosis study (ACAS). *Stroke*. 2000;31:2330–4.
21. Pujia A, Rubba P, Spencer M. Prevalence of extracranial carotid artery disease detectable by echo-Doppler in an elderly population. *Stroke*. 1992;23:818–22.
22. Mantese VA, Timaran CH, Chiu D, Begg RJ, Brott TG. The carotid revascularization endarterectomy versus stenting trial (CREST). *Stroke*. 2010;41:S31–4.
23. Abbott AL. Medical (nonsurgical) intervention alone is now best for prevention of stroke associated with asymptomatic severe carotid stenosis. *Stroke*. 2009;40:e573–83.
24. Munster AB, Franchini AJ, Qureshi MI, Thapar A, Davies AH. Temporal trends in safety of carotid endarterectomy in asymptomatic patients systematic review. *Neurology*. 2015;85:365–72.
25. Madani A, Beletsky V, Tamayo A, Munoz C, Spence J. High-risk asymptomatic carotid stenosis ulceration on 3D ultrasound vs. TCD microemboli. *Neurology*. 2011;77:744–50.
26. Singh N, Moody AR, Gladstone DJ, Leung G, Ravikummar R, Zhan J, Maggisano R. Moderate carotid artery stenosis: mr imaging–depicted intraplaque hemorrhage predicts risk of cerebrovascular ischemic events in asymptomatic men 1. *Radiology*. 2009;252:502–8.
27. Powers WJ, Clarke WR, Grubb RL, Videen TO, Adams HP, Derdeyn CP, Investigators C. Extracranial-intracranial bypass surgery for stroke prevention in hemodynamic cerebral ischemia: the carotid occlusion surgery study randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2011;306:1983–92.
28. Amin-Hanjani S, Barker FG, Charbel FT, Connolly ES Jr, Morcos JJ, Thompson BG, Cerebrovascular Section of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons; Congress of Neurological Surgeons. Extracranial-intracranial bypass for stroke—is this the end of the line or a bump in the road? *Neurosurgery*. 2012;71:557–61.
29. Fiedler J, Přibáň V, Škoda O, Schenk I, Schenková V, Poláková S. Cognitive outcome after EC-IC bypass surgery in hemodynamic cerebral ischemia. *Acta Neurochir*. 2011;153:1303–12.
30. Fierstra J, Maclean DB, Fisher JA, Han JS, Mandell DM, Conklin J, Poublanc J, Crawley AP, Regli L, Mikulis DJ. Surgical revascularization reverses cerebral cortical thinning in patients with severe cerebrovascular steno-occlusive disease. *Stroke*. 2011;42(6):1631–7.
31. Inoue T, Jinnouchi J. Changes in brain volume after EC-IC bypass surgery. London: Springer; 2008.
32. Kazumata K, Tha KK, Narita H, Kusumi I, Shichinohe H, Ito M, Nakayama N, Houkin K. Chronic ischemia alters brain microstructural integrity and cognitive performance in adult moyamoya disease. *Stroke*. 2015;46(2):354–60.
33. Weinberg DG, Rahme RJ, Aoun SG, Batjer HH, Bendok BR. Moyamoya disease: functional and neurocognitive outcomes in the pediatric and adult populations. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2011;30:E21.
34. Hemphill JC 3rd, Greenberg SM, Anderson CS, Becker K, Bendok BR, Cushman M, Fung GL, Goldstein JN, Macdonald RL, Mitchell PH, Scott PA, Selim MH, Woo D. Guidelines for the management of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 2015;46:2032–60.
35. Kepplinger J, Prakapenia A, Barlind K, Siegert G, Gehrisch S, Zerna C, Beyer-Westendorf J, Puetz V, Reichmann H, Siepmann T. Standardized use of novel oral anticoagulants plasma

- level thresholds in a new thrombolysis decision making protocol. *J Thromb Thrombolysis*. 2016;41:293–300.
36. Kass-Hout T, Kass-Hout O, Mokin M, Thesier DM, Yashar P, Orion D, Jahshan S, Hopkins LN, Siddiqui AH, Snyder KV. Is bridging with intravenous thrombolysis of any benefit in endovascular therapy for acute ischemic stroke? *World Neurosurg*. 2014;82:e453–8.
  37. Rebello LC, Haussen DC, Grossberg JA, Belagaje S, Lima A, Anderson A, Frankel MR, Nogueira RG. Early endovascular treatment in intravenous tissue plasminogen activator–ineligible patients. *Stroke*. 2016;47:1131–4.
  38. Sheth SA, Yoo B, Saver JL, Starkman S, Ali LK, Kim D, Gonzalez NR, Jahan R, Tateshima S, Duckwiler G. M2 occlusions as targets for endovascular therapy: comprehensive analysis of diffusion/perfusion MRI, angiography, and clinical outcomes. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2015;7:478–83.
  39. Thomsen T, Tønnesen H, Møller A. Effect of preoperative smoking cessation interventions on postoperative complications and smoking cessation. *Br J Surg*. 2009;96:451–61.
  40. Hamilton MG, Yee WH, Hull RD, Ghali WA. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in patients undergoing cranial neurosurgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosurgery*. 2011;68:571–81.
  41. Kimmell KT, Jahromi BS. Clinical factors associated with venous thromboembolism risk in patients undergoing craniotomy. *J Neurosurg*. 2015;122:1004–11.
  42. Bacigaluppi S, Fontanella M, Manninen P, Ducati A, Tredici G, Gentili F. Monitoring techniques for prevention of procedure-related ischemic damage in aneurysm surgery. *World Neurosurg*. 2012;78:276–88.
  43. Zhao J, Wang Y, Zhao Y, Wang S. Neuroendoscope-assisted minimally invasive microsurgery for clipping intracranial aneurysms. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg*. 2006;49:335–41.
  44. Gardner PA, Vaz-Guimaraes F, Jankowitz B, Koutourousiou M, Fernandez-Miranda JC, Wang EW, Snyderman CH. Endoscopic endonasal clipping of intracranial aneurysms: surgical technique and results. *World Neurosurg*. 2015;84:1380–93.
  45. D’ercole L, Thyriion FZ, Bocchiola M, Mantovani L, Klersy C. Proposed local diagnostic reference levels in angiography and interventional neuroradiology and a preliminary analysis according to the complexity of the procedures. *Phys Med*. 2012;28:61–70.
  46. Kahn EN, Gemmete JJ, Chaudhary N, Thompson BG, Chen K, Christodoulou EG, Pandey AS. Radiation dose reduction during neurointerventional procedures by modification of default settings on biplane angiography equipment. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2016;8:819–23.
  47. Mccaffrey J, Tessier F, Shen H. Radiation shielding materials and radiation scatter effects for interventional radiology (IR) physicians. *Med Phys*. 2012;39:4537–46.
  48. Amarouche M, Hart J, Siddiqui A, Hampton T, Walsh D. Time-resolved contrast-enhanced MR angiography of spinal vascular malformations. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2015;36:417–22.
  49. Lindenholz A, Terbrugge KG, Van Dijk JMC, Farb RI. The accuracy and utility of contrast-enhanced MR angiography for localization of spinal dural arteriovenous fistulas: the Toronto experience. *Eur Radiol*. 2014;24:2885–94.
  50. Appelbaum PS. Clarifying the ethics of clinical research: a path toward avoiding the therapeutic misconception. *Am J Bioeth*. 2002;2:22–3.
  51. Bambakidis NC, Cockroft K, Connolly ES, Amin-Hanjani S, Morcos J, Meyers PM, Alexander MJ, Friedlander RM. Preliminary results of the ARUBA study. *Neurosurgery*. 2013;73:E379–81.
  52. Bauer AM, Bain MD, Rasmussen PA. Chronic cerebral ischemia: where “evidence-based medicine” fails patients. *World Neurosurg*. 2015;84:714–8.
  53. Esposito G, Amin-Hanjani S, Regli L. Role of and indications for bypass surgery after Carotid Occlusion Surgery Study (COSS)? *Stroke*. 2016;47:282–90.
  54. Lal BK, Beach KW, Roubin GS, Lutsep HL, Moore WS, Malas MB, Chiu D, Gonzales NR, Burke JL, Rinaldi M, Elmore JR, Weaver FA, Narins CR, Foster M, Hodgson KJ, Shepard AD, Meschia JF, Bergelin RO, Voeks JH, Howard G, Brott TG. Restenosis after carotid artery stenting and endarterectomy: a secondary analysis of CREST, a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol*. 2012;11:755–63.

55. Zapata-Arriaza E, Moniche F, Gonzalez A, Bustamante A, Escudero-Martinez I, De La Torre Laviana FJ, Prieto M, Mancha F, Montaner J. Predictors of restenosis following carotid angioplasty and stenting. *Stroke*. 2016;47:2144–7.
56. Chalouhi N, Bovenzi CD, Thakkar V, Dressler J, Jabbour P, Starke RM, Teufack S, Gonzalez LF, Dalyai R, Dumont AS, Rosenwasser R, Tjoumakaris S. Long-term catheter angiography after aneurysm coil therapy: results of 209 patients and predictors of delayed recurrence and retreatment. *J Neurosurg*. 2014;121:1102–6.
57. Lecler A, Raymond J, Rodriguez-Regent C, Al Shareef F, Trystram D, Godon-Hardy S, Ben Hassen W, Meder JF, Oppenheim C, Naggara ON. Intracranial aneurysms: recurrences more than 10 years after endovascular treatment—a prospective cohort study, systematic review, and meta-analysis. *Radiology*. 2015;277:173–80.
58. Klein GT, Lu Y, Wang MY. 3D printing and neurosurgery—ready for prime time? *World Neurosurg*. 2013;80:233–5.
59. Wurm G, Lehner M, Tomancok B, Kleiser R, Nussbaumer K. Cerebrovascular biomodeling for aneurysm surgery: simulation-based training by means of rapid prototyping technologies. *Surg Innov*. 2011;18:294–306.
60. Mashiko T, Otani K, Kawano R, Konno T, Kaneko N, Ito Y, Watanabe E. Development of three-dimensional hollow elastic model for cerebral aneurysm clipping simulation enabling rapid and low cost prototyping. *World Neurosurg*. 2015;83:351–61.
61. Rosseau G, Bailes J, Del Maestro R, Cabral A, Choudhury N, Comas O, Debergue P, De Luca G, Hovdebo J, Jiang D. The development of a virtual simulator for training neurosurgeons to perform and perfect endoscopic endonasal transsphenoidal surgery. *Neurosurgery*. 2013;73:S85–93.
62. Zamar SG, Hamade YJ, Aoun RJN, El Tecle NE, El Ahmadieh TY, Adelson PD, Kurpad SN, Harrop JS, Hodge H, Mishra RC. The cognitive and technical skills impact of the congress of neurological surgeons simulation curriculum on neurosurgical trainees at the 2013 Neurological Society of India meeting. *World Neurosurg*. 2015;83:419–23.