

1 **Comparison of Rupture Risk Between Saccular and Fusiform Abdominal Aortic**

2 **Aneurysms Using a National Clinical Database in Japan**

3

4 Hirotsugu Ozawa, MD ^{a), b)}; Arata Takahashi, PhD ^{c), d)}; Ryuzo Bessho, MD, PhD ^{e)};

5 Katsuyuki Hoshina, MD, PhD ^{f), g)}; Kota Shukuzawa, MD, PhD ^{a)}; Takao Ohki, MD, PhD ^{a)}

6 **Affiliation:**

7 a) Division of Vascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, The Jikei University School of

8 Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

9 b) Japanese Society for Vascular Surgery, Tokyo, Japan

10 c) Department of Health Policy and Management, School of Medicine, Keio University,

11 Tokyo, Japan

12 d) Department of Healthcare Quality Assessment, Graduate School of Medicine, The

13 University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

14 e) Department of Cardiovascular Surgery, Nippon Medical School, Chiba Hokusoh Hospital,

15 Chiba, Japan

16 f) Department of Vascular Surgery, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo,

17 Tokyo, Japan

18 g) Japanese Committee for Stentgraft Management, Tokyo, Japan

19 **Corresponding author:**

- 1 Takao Ohki MD, PhD
- 2 Division of Vascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, The Jikei University School of
- 3 Medicine, 3-25-8, Nishi-shinbashi, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 105-8461, Japan
- 4 Tel: 81-3-3433-1111
- 5 Fax: 81-3-5472-4140
- 6 Email: takohki@msn.com
- 7 **Article types:** original study
- 8 **Author contributions:**
- 9 Conception and design: HO, KS.
- 10 Analysis and interpretation: HO, KS.
- 11 Data collection: AT.
- 12 Writing the article: HO.
- 13 Critical revision of the article: RB, KH, TO.
- 14 Final approval of the article: HO, AT, RB, KH, KS, TO.
- 15 Statistical analysis: AT.
- 16 Overall responsibility: TO.
- 17 **Sources of funding for research and/or publication:** None.
- 18 **Key words:** abdominal aortic aneurysm; saccular aneurysm; rupture; size threshold; National
- 19 Clinical Database

1 **Disclosure statement:**

2 Takao Ohki received advisory fees from W.L. Gore and Boston Scientific Corp. Katsuyuki

3 Hoshina received consigned research fund from Japan Lifeline Co., Ltd. Arata Takahashi is

4 affiliated with the Department of Healthcare Quality Assessment at the University of Tokyo,

5 which is a social collaboration department supported by grants from the National Clinical

6 Database, Johnson & Johnson K.K., Nipro Co., and Intuitive Surgical Sàrl. The other authors

7 have no conflict of interest regarding this paper.

8 **Running title:** Risk of Rupture in Saccular AAAs

9

1 **Clinical Perspective**

2 **What Is New?**

- 3 • Saccular abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs) ruptured at smaller diameters than fusiform
4 AAAs (median, 55.6 mm vs 68.0 mm, $p < 0.001$), and receiver-operating characteristic
5 analysis revealed that the cut-off diameter to predict rupture was smaller in saccular
6 AAAs than in fusiform AAAs (50.5 mm and 59.5 mm, respectively).
- 7 • In AAAs with a diameter of 40-54 mm, saccular morphology turned out to be an
8 independent risk factor for rupture by adjusting for gender and aneurysm diameter (odds
9 ratio, 2.54, 95% confidence interval, 1.75-3.69).

10 **What Are the Clinical Implications?**

- 11 • Saccular AAAs are more prone to rupture than fusiform AAAs in the 40-54 mm diameter
12 range, which supports the current idea that saccular AAAs should be treated at smaller
13 diameters.
- 14 • The 9.0 mm difference in the predicted diameters for the rupture between fusiform and
15 saccular AAAs suggests that the threshold diameter for intervention of saccular AAAs
16 can be set approximately 1 cm smaller than that of fusiform AAAs.

17

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background:** Saccular AAAs are thought to pose an elevated risk of rupture, but not much is
3 known about the extent of this risk. Therefore, we aimed to conduct a survey of saccular
4 abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs) and to compare the risk of rupture between fusiform and
5 saccular AAAs.

6 **Methods:** We performed a retrospective cohort study on patients who underwent primary
7 endovascular repair for a degenerative AAA between 2016 and 2019, and who were
8 registered in the National Clinical Database in Japan.

9 **Results:** A total of 27,290 patients were included in the study. Of these, 7.8 % (n=2142) had
10 saccular AAAs and the remaining 92.2% (n = 25,148) were fusiform. In addition, 4.3% (n =
11 92) of saccular AAAs and 5.4% (n = 1351) of fusiform AAAs were ruptured. Saccular AAAs
12 ruptured at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs (median, 55.6 mm vs 68.0 mm, $p < 0.001$),
13 and were operated on at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs in non-ruptured cases
14 (median, 44.0 mm vs 51.0 mm, $p < 0.001$). The rupture rate was significantly higher in
15 saccular AAAs than in fusiform AAAs in the 40-54 mm diameter range, in which saccular
16 morphology was found to be an independent risk factor for rupture by adjusting for gender
17 and aneurysm diameter (odds ratio, 2.54, 95% confidence interval, 1.75-3.69). In addition,
18 receiver-operating characteristic analysis revealed that the cut-off diameter to predict rupture
19 was smaller in saccular AAAs than in fusiform AAAs (50.5 mm and 59.5 mm, respectively).

1 **Conclusion:**

2 Saccular AAAs are more prone to rupture than fusiform AAAs in the 40-54 mm diameter

3 range, which supports the idea that saccular AAAs should be treated at smaller diameters.

4 The 9.0 mm difference in the predicted diameters for the rupture between fusiform and

5 saccular AAAs suggests that the threshold diameter for intervention of saccular AAAs can be

6 set approximately 1 cm smaller than that of fusiform AAAs.

7

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Saccular abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs), defined as asymmetric enlargement of the
3 aorta, account for only about 5% of all AAAs, with the majority being fusiform AAAs.¹⁻³ It
4 has long been believed that saccular aneurysms are more prone to rupture.^{2, 4-7} However, to
5 date, not much is known about the natural history and the risk of rupture in saccular AAAs.

6 Current international guidelines recommend elective repair for AAAs with a diameter \geq
7 55 mm in men and \geq 50 mm in women, but this statement is limited to fusiform AAAs.^{8, 9} For
8 saccular AAAs, however, these guidelines suggest elective repair at a smaller diameter, but
9 fail to provide a size threshold for intervention. Thus, the optimal management of saccular
10 AAAs is unclear, and surgeons assess the risk of rupture and determine the indications for
11 elective repair on a case-by-case basis.

12 Cohort studies reporting on the clinical management of saccular AAA has been
13 limited.^{10, 11} According to a recent cohort study of saccular AAAs from the Netherlands,¹¹
14 saccular AAAs were operated on at smaller diameters in the elective setting and became
15 symptomatic/ruptured at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs. The authors also added that
16 a diameter of 45 mm seems to be an acceptable threshold. However, the number of
17 symptomatic/ruptured cases of saccular AAAs with a diameter $<$ 45 mm in this study was
18 insufficient for a powerful statistical analysis.

19 In the current study, we conducted a survey of saccular AAAs that were treated with

- 1 endovascular aortic repair (EVAR) in Japan, and we sought to compare the risk of rupture
- 2 between fusiform and saccular AAAs, using data registered in the National Clinical Database
- 3 (NCD) in Japan.
- 4

1 **METHODS**

2 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at The Jikei University School of
3 Medicine (33-189[10806]). Informed consent was waived for this study. The study protocol
4 was registered with the University Hospital Medical Information Network Clinical Trials
5 Registry (UMIN-CTR; UMIN000050383).

6

7 **Database**

8 The NCD in Japan, which was launched in 2010 and commenced patient registration in 2011,
9 is a nationwide prospective registry that can collect data on surgical procedures from more
10 than 5000 institutions throughout Japan and has very high coverage because of its link with
11 the surgeon/hospital certification system.¹² In addition, previous studies have verified the data
12 quality of the NCD.¹³⁻¹⁵ Regarding EVAR procedures for AAAs, the Japanese Committee for
13 Stentgraft Management (JACSM), established in December 2006 to ensure safe and
14 appropriate use of commercial stent grafts, has started a nationwide EVAR registry from 2007,
15 using a web-based case-registry form.¹⁶ Participating institutions were obligated to register
16 detailed data, including preoperative findings on AAAs, operative findings and postoperative
17 outcomes of EVAR. Since 2016, through the collaboration between the JACSM and the NCD,
18 the data registration is now done on the NCD website.

19

1 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Data**

2 Patients undergoing primary EVAR for a degenerative AAA in Japan between January 2016
3 and December 2019 were included in the study. Cases of AAA with concomitant iliac artery
4 aneurysm, dissecting/inflammatory/mycotic AAA, or AAA with vasculitis/connective tissue
5 disease were not included in the study. Additionally, cases were not included if the AAA was
6 treated with snorkel/chimney, fenestrated/branched, or debranching EVAR. Patients with
7 AAA who underwent open surgical repair (OSR) were not included because it was not
8 required to register AAA morphology in the NCD for such cases. Those with an aneurysm
9 diameter < 25 mm were also excluded because the suggested reporting standard in the
10 guidelines states that the definition of AAA, which is ≥ 30 mm in diameter in men, should be
11 lower in women and in the Asian population and therefore suggests an exceptional situation.⁹

12

13 **Collected Data**

14 Data registered into the NCD for each patient included age, sex, comorbidities, and the
15 etiology, anatomical factors and clinical status of the AAA. Comorbidities registered included
16 hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease, cerebrovascular disease, renal
17 dysfunction (estimated glomerular filtration rate < 60 ml/min/1.73m²), and respiratory
18 disorder. Anatomical factors included the shape of the AAA (fusiform or saccular), and
19 aneurysm diameter; maximum minor-axis diameter chosen if fusiform and maximum

1 transaortic diameter if saccular. Status of the AAA was described according to the existence
2 of rupture (non-ruptured or ruptured). These data were confirmed by each surgeon.

3

4 **Outcomes**

5 The primary outcome was the aneurysm diameter at which saccular AAAs were operated on
6 by EVAR in the non-ruptured and ruptured cases. The secondary outcomes included the odds
7 ratio (OR) of saccular morphology for becoming ruptured and a cut-off value of aneurysm
8 diameter for predicting the rupture of a saccular AAA.

9

10 **Statistical Analyses**

11 Patients were stratified according to the shape of the AAA (fusiform versus saccular), and
12 according to the clinical status (non-ruptured versus ruptured). We obtained data on the
13 aneurysm diameter at which saccular AAAs were operated on by EVAR in the non-ruptured
14 and ruptured cases. Then, we compared the rupture rate by aneurysm diameters of fusiform
15 and saccular AAAs utilizing categorical variables for each 5 mm diameter. The rupture rate in
16 this study was the likelihood of repair for rupture, defined as the number of ruptured cases
17 over the total number of cases. The OR for rupture was determined by adjusting for all
18 variables included in the guidelines as indications for repair, namely, sex, aneurysm diameter,
19 and aneurysm morphology, except for growth rate that was not captured in the NCD.

1 Furthermore, receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) analysis was performed to evaluate the
2 predicting power of rupture for saccular AAAs to rupture as well as that for fusiform AAAs.

3 Categorical variables are presented as numbers and percentages, and continuous
4 variables are presented as mean and standard deviations or median and interquartile ranges
5 (IQR). Categorical variables were compared with a chi-square test, and continuous variables
6 were compared using a *t* test or Mann-Whitney *U* test when appropriate. To compare the risk
7 of rupture between fusiform and saccular AAAs, an OR was determined per diameter
8 category using logistic regression analysis. All statistical analyses were performed using
9 SPSS Statistics version 27 (IBM, Armonk, NY), and $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically
10 significant.

11

1 **RESULTS**

2 From January 2016 to December 2019, all 27,418 patients who underwent primary standard
3 EVAR for degenerative AAAs were registered in the NCD. Those with AAA diameter < 25
4 mm (n = 128) were excluded from the study. Finally, a total of 27,290 patients were included
5 in the study.

6

7 **Patient Characteristics**

8 Patient characteristics including the morphology and the clinical status of AAA at treatment
9 are shown in Table 1. Among the 27,290 cases that were included in this study, 7.8% (n =
10 2142) of AAAs were saccular and the remaining 92.2% (n = 25,148) were fusiform, while
11 5.3% (n = 1443) were ruptured and the remaining 94.7% (n = 25,847) were non-ruptured.
12 Specifically, 4.3% (n = 92) of saccular AAAs and 5.4% (n = 1351) of fusiform AAAs were
13 ruptured. At operation for non-ruptured case, the aneurysm diameter was significantly smaller
14 in saccular AAAs than in fusiform AAAs (median, 44.0 mm vs 51.0 mm, $p < 0.001$). Similarly,
15 aneurysm diameter at rupture was significantly smaller in saccular AAAs than in fusiform
16 AAAs (median, 55.6 mm vs 68.0 mm, $p < 0.001$). Comparing the non-ruptured and ruptured
17 cases, sex, coronary artery disease, renal dysfunction, and respiratory disorder were
18 significantly different in the fusiform AAAs, while renal dysfunction and respiratory disorder
19 were significantly different in the saccular AAAs. Ratio of women tended to be higher in

1 ruptured cases than in non-ruptured cases in fusiform AAAs, but not in saccular AAAs.

2

3 **Comparison of the Rupture Risk Between Fusiform and Saccular AAAs**

4 In Table 2, comparison of the rupture rate was made by aneurysm diameter between fusiform

5 and saccular AAAs using categories of 5-mm diameter increments. In AAAs with aneurysm

6 diameter of 40-54 mm, each category was significantly more likely to rupture in saccular

7 AAAs than in fusiform AAAs. On the other hand, in AAAs with aneurysm diameters of

8 30-39 mm and 55-69 mm, there was no statistically significant difference in the rupture rates

9 between fusiform and saccular AAAs.

10 In addition, focusing on ruptured cases, Figure 1 shows the distribution of ruptured

11 cases by diameter category in fusiform and saccular AAAs, suggesting that saccular AAAs

12 may rupture at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs.

13 As shown in Table 3, risk analysis of rupture was performed for small (30-39 mm in

14 diameter), medium (40-54 mm in diameter), and large (55-69 mm in diameter) AAAs,

15 adjusted for sex, aneurysm shape, and diameter category. As a result, saccular shape turned

16 out to be an independent risk factor for rupture in medium AAAs (OR, 2.54, 95% confidence

17 interval [CI], 1.75-3.69), but not in small and large AAAs (OR 0.62, 95% CI, 0.26-1.47 and

18 OR 1.28, 95% CI, 0.81-2.02, respectively). In addition, female sex was identified as an

19 independent risk factor for rupture in all AAAs except small AAAs, and diameter category

1 was identified as an independent risk factor for rupture only in large AAAs.

2

3 **ROC Analysis to Predict Rupture of Fusiform and Saccular AAAs**

4 Diameters that predict rupture in fusiform and saccular AAAs were analyzed using ROC

5 analysis and are shown in Figure 2 and Table 4. The area under the curve of the diameter that

6 predicts rupture of fusiform and saccular AAAs was 0.830 and 0.752, respectively. A cut-off

7 diameter with the highest predictive power for rupture was 59.5 mm in fusiform AAAs

8 (sensitivity 73.4%, specificity 82.5%) and 50.5 mm in saccular AAAs (sensitivity 63.0%,

9 specificity 77.7%). If the cut-off diameter was set at 55 mm in fusiform AAAs, the sensitivity

10 and specificity for predicting rupture were 79.8% and 73.7%, respectively. As for saccular

11 AAAs, if the cut-off diameter was set at 45 mm, the sensitivity and specificity were 71.7%

12 and 58.1%, respectively. Furthermore, the sensitivity of the cut-off diameter of 55 mm in

13 fusiform AAAs (79.8%) was comparable with that of 43 mm in saccular AAAs (78.3%).

14

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 In this retrospective cohort study, among patients who underwent primary EVAR for
3 degenerative AAA between 2016 and 2019, 7.8% had a saccular AAA. Saccular AAAs
4 ruptured at smaller diameter than fusiform AAAs and were operated on at smaller diameters
5 than fusiform AAAs in non-ruptured cases, which supports the current treatment guidelines
6 for AAAs.^{8,9} The rupture rate was significantly higher in saccular AAAs than in fusiform
7 AAAs in the medium-size category, in which saccular morphology turned out to be an
8 independent risk factor for rupture by adjusting for gender and aneurysm diameter. In
9 addition, the cut-off diameter for predicting rupture was 9.0 mm smaller in saccular AAAs
10 than in fusiform AAAs in the ROC analysis.

11 The majority of AAAs are fusiform AAAs and often occur as a result of degeneration
12 of the aortic wall. On the other hand, saccular AAAs are rare and seem to be mainly caused
13 by degeneration, followed by a variety of etiologies such as dissection, trauma, infection, and
14 vasculitis.¹⁰ Whereas aneurysm diameter and growth rate have been widely accepted as major
15 indications for repair of an AAA, a saccular morphology has also been considered as an
16 indication for repair. Despite the common perception that saccular aneurysms are at high risk
17 of rupture, not much has been known about the natural history and the risk of rupture in
18 saccular AAAs. Furthermore, there are limited data on what diameter saccular AAAs are
19 treated with surgery in clinical practice.

1 According to a previous large cohort study of saccular AAAs conducted in the
2 Netherlands,¹¹ saccular AAAs were operated on at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs in
3 the elective setting (mean, 53.0 mm vs 61.0 mm, $p < 0.001$) and became symptomatic and/or
4 ruptured at smaller diameters than fusiform AAAs (mean, 70.7 mm vs 76.5 mm, $p = 0.033$).
5 The authors also added that a diameter of 45 mm seems to be an acceptable threshold for
6 surgery, based on the finding that the proportion of symptomatic/ruptured patients was
7 similar between saccular AAAs with diameters < 45 mm and fusiform AAAs with diameters
8 < 55 mm. However, the number of symptomatic/ruptured cases of saccular AAAs ($n = 83$),
9 especially those with a diameter < 45 mm ($n = 7$), was insufficient for a powerful statistical
10 analysis. In the present study, we decided to focus on the rupture of AAAs, since patients
11 could be described as symptomatic if the aneurysm caused a pulsing sensation or local
12 compression symptoms, and such symptomatic patients should be differentiated from patients
13 presenting with abdominal or back pain. Furthermore, the primary goal of the physician
14 taking care of AAA patient is to predict the risk of rupture, not the development of symptoms.

15 In the present study, the percentage of saccular AAAs out of all treated AAAs was
16 7.8%, which is similar to previous reports (approximately 5%). The median aneurysm
17 diameter at rupture was smaller in saccular AAAs than fusiform AAAs (fusiform AAAs: 68.0
18 mm; saccular AAAs: 55.6 mm), suggesting that saccular AAAs are more prone to rupture.
19 The median diameters at rupture in our study were smaller than those at symptom/rupture in

1 the previous study from the Netherlands (fusiform AAAs: 75.0 mm; saccular AAAs: 68.0
2 mm). However, this may be due to the smaller aortic diameter in the Asian populations,¹⁷ and
3 also due to the predisposition to symptomatic/ruptured presentation at smaller diameters in
4 the Asian population.¹⁸

5 The present study suggests that if AAAs are classified by size, each size range has its
6 own unique characteristics: small AAAs might rupture regardless of sac morphology or sex,
7 although this is very rare, while the rupture risk of medium AAAs can be greatly affected by
8 saccular morphology rather than sac diameter, and the rupture risk of large AAAs can be
9 affected by sac diameter rather than sac morphology. Regarding small AAAs, surveillance at
10 intervals of several years is clinically acceptable for men with AAAs in the range of 30 to 40
11 mm.¹⁹ Thus, conservative management is generally recommended for patients with small
12 AAAs.²⁰ Consistent with this approach, our data showed that there was a small number of
13 non-ruptured fusiform AAAs with diameters < 40 mm, hence the numbers of fusiform and
14 saccular non-ruptured AAAs in these categories were similar. Therefore, the rupture rate in
15 small fusiform AAAs must have been much lower. On the other hand, large AAAs are
16 uncontroversially indicated for repair. Perhaps the most controversial category is medium
17 AAAs, particularly when taking into consideration the contribution of sac morphology to the
18 risk of rupture. At least, since the percentage of saccular AAAs in the 45-49 mm and 50-54
19 mm categories in this study (6.3% and 3.8%, respectively) was similar to the percentage that

1 was previously reported in AAAs of all sizes, we believe that the statistical analysis for
2 medium AAAs is reasonable.

3 ROC analysis of our data indicates that aneurysm diameter has an acceptable predictive
4 power for assessing the risk of rupture in both fusiform and saccular AAAs, but it was better
5 in fusiform AAAs. This finding suggests that aneurysm diameter may contribute less to the
6 risk of rupture in saccular AAAs. When considering the size threshold for intervention in
7 AAAs, sensitivity is more important than predictive power itself, because we must avoid
8 false negatives, that is, unexpected rupture. Based on our data, the sensitivity of a cut-off
9 diameter of 55 mm in fusiform AAAs, which is widely accepted as an indication for repair
10 and is reasonable to adopt as a historical control, was comparable with that of a cut-off
11 diameter of 43 mm in saccular AAAs, i.e., 12 mm smaller in saccular AAAs than in fusiform
12 AAAs. Furthermore, the cut-off diameter to predict rupture was 9.0 mm smaller in saccular
13 AAAs than in fusiform AAAs. Therefore, we suggest that the threshold diameter for
14 intervention of saccular AAAs can be set 1 cm smaller than that of fusiform AAAs, although
15 it goes without saying that a size threshold cannot be definitively determined based solely on
16 the findings of the present study.

17 From a biomechanical perspective, the role of aneurysm geometry in rupture potential
18 has been investigated in the last two decades. The results of previous reports on the effect of
19 aneurysm geometry on mechanical wall stress using finite element analysis were

1 controversial.^{6,21,22} Subsequently, using computational fluid dynamics analysis, Boyd et al.
2 reported that aneurysms tended to rupture at the site of low wall shear stress (WSS),²³ and
3 Natsume et al. proposed that saccular aneurysms with sac depth/neck width > 0.8 had low
4 WSS regardless of diameter, while in fusiform aneurysms WSS was lower as diameter
5 increased.²⁴ This may be reflected in our finding that aneurysm diameter may contribute less
6 to the risk of rupture than aneurysm morphology in medium AAAs, and also our finding that
7 the proportion of women was similar between ruptured and non-ruptured cases in saccular
8 AAAs. Akai et al. attempted to identify the subgroup of saccular aneurysms which were truly
9 at high risk of rupture and then defined horizontally long aortic aneurysms with an aspect
10 ratio (neck width/horizontal diameter) < 1.0 as true “saccular” aneurysms.²⁵ This study was
11 conducted on thoracic aortic aneurysms, followed by a study on AAAs which revealed that
12 ruptured AAAs had a horizontally longer shape with a smaller fillet radius than non-ruptured
13 AAAs.²⁶ In addition, aneurysm shape in the NCD was confirmed by each vascular surgeon,
14 and their judgements were subjective and lacked a detailed definition, except for focal or
15 asymmetric enlargement of the aorta. Hanada et al. reported that a discrepancy existed
16 between a vascular surgeon’s subjective diagnosis and an objective diagnosis using a
17 mechanical structural analysis for AAAs.²⁷ As mentioned above, the present study revealed
18 that the diameter of fusiform AAAs has more predictive power for rupture than the diameter
19 of saccular AAAs. We believe that further research using biomechanical approaches will

1 provide a more detailed understanding of the rupture potential of the saccular morphology.

2 The present study had several limitations. This is not a prospective study that followed
3 preoperative AAA patients from the time when their AAA diameters were small. Therefore,
4 all AAA patients being managed by surveillance or who died before arriving at the operating
5 room have been excluded. In addition, our study only focused on EVAR cases because the
6 NCD did not capture AAA morphology in patients who underwent OSR. Thus, the natural
7 history of saccular AAAs is still unclear. The rupture rate described in our study was the
8 proportion of rupture cases to all EVAR cases performed for AAAs, and this cannot be
9 extrapolated to the true rupture rate of AAAs, especially those with smaller diameters.

10 Growth rate is commonly considered to be a risk for rupture, but was not captured in the
11 NCD, and therefore was not included in the multivariable analysis. There were no specific
12 criteria for the diagnosis of saccular configuration of AAA, so saccular AAAs in our data
13 could be morphologically heterogeneous as mentioned above. This study focused on
14 degenerative AAA, but the etiology of saccular AAAs is sometimes difficult to discern.
15 Finally, although the overall sample size was quite large, rupture cases were very rare in
16 small diameter categories and the statistical analysis might not have had sufficient power.

17

18 **CONCLUSIONS**

19 Saccular AAAs are more prone to rupture than fusiform AAA in the 40-54 mm diameter

1 range, which supports the current idea that saccular AAAs should be treated at smaller
2 diameters. The 9.0 mm difference in the predicted diameters for the rupture between fusiform
3 and saccular AAAs suggests that the threshold diameter for intervention of saccular AAAs
4 can be set approximately 1 cm smaller than that of fusiform AAAs.

5

6 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

7 The study was supported by the Japanese Society of Vascular Surgery (JSVS). The authors
8 would like to express their gratitude to Dr. Kimihiro Komori (Chief Director of the JSVS), Dr.
9 Yoshikatsu Saiki (Chief of the Clinical Research Promotion Committee of the JSVS), Dr.
10 Hideaki Obara (Chief of the Database Management Committee of the JSVS), and the staff of
11 the NCD. We would also like to thank all the hospitals participating in this NCD project for
12 their continued efforts concerning data entry.

13

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Iwai T, Sato S, Muraoka Y, Inoue Y, Sugano N and Endo M. Atherosclerotic
3 abdominal aorta saccular protrusion. *Int Surg*. 1996;81:189-94.
- 4 2. Taylor BV and Kalman PG. Saccular aortic aneurysms. *Ann Vasc Surg*.
5 1999;13:555-9.
- 6 3. Kristmundsson T, Dias N, Resch T and Sonesson B. Morphology of Small
7 Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms Should be Considered before Continued Ultrasound
8 Surveillance. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2016;31:18-22.
- 9 4. Szilagyi DE, Smith RF, DeRusso FJ, Elliott JP and Sherrin FW. Contribution of
10 abdominal aortic aneurysmectomy to prolongation of life. *Ann Surg*. 1966;164:678-99.
- 11 5. Sterpetti AV, Cavallaro A, Cavallari N, Allegrucci P, Tamburelli A, Agosta F and
12 Bartoli S. Factors influencing the rupture of abdominal aortic aneurysms. *Surg Gynecol*
13 *Obstet*. 1991;173:175-8.
- 14 6. Vorp DA, Raghavan ML and Webster MW. Mechanical wall stress in abdominal
15 aortic aneurysm: influence of diameter and asymmetry. *J Vasc Surg*. 1998;27:632-9.
- 16 7. Nathan DP, Xu C, Pouch AM, Chandran KB, Desjardins B, Gorman JH, 3rd,
17 Fairman RM, Gorman RC and Jackson BM. Increased wall stress of saccular versus fusiform
18 aneurysms of the descending thoracic aorta. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2011;25:1129-37.
- 19 8. Chaikof EL, Dalman RL, Eskandari MK, Jackson BM, Lee WA, Mansour MA,
20 Mastracci TM, Mell M, Murad MH, Nguyen LL, Oderich GS, Patel MS, Schermerhorn ML
21 and Starnes BW. The Society for Vascular Surgery practice guidelines on the care of patients
22 with an abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc Surg*. 2018;67:2-77 e2.
- 23 9. Wanhainen A, Verzini F, Van Herzelee I, Allaire E, Bown M, Cohnert T, Dick F, van
24 Herwaarden J, Karkos C, Koelemay M, Kolbel T, Loftus I, Mani K, Melissano G, Powell J,
25 Szeberin Z, Esvs Guidelines C, de Borst GJ, Chakfe N, Debus S, Hinchliffe R, Kakkos S,
26 Koncar I, Kolh P, Lindholt JS, de Vega M, Vermassen F, Document R, Bjorck M, Cheng S,
27 Dalman R, Davidovic L, Donas K, Earnshaw J, Eckstein HH, Golledge J, Haulon S,
28 Mastracci T, Naylor R, Ricco JB and Verhagen H. Editor's Choice - European Society for
29 Vascular Surgery (ESVS) 2019 Clinical Practice Guidelines on the Management of
30 Abdominal Aorto-iliac Artery Aneurysms. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2019;57:8-93.
- 31 10. Shang EK, Nathan DP, Boonn WW, Lys-Dobradin IA, Fairman RM, Woo EY, Wang

- 1 GJ and Jackson BM. A modern experience with saccular aortic aneurysms. *J Vasc Surg.*
2 2013;57:84-8.
- 3 11. Karthaus EG, Tong TML, Vahl A, Hamming JF, Dutch Society of Vascular Surgery
4 tSCotDSAA and the Dutch Institute for Clinical A. Saccular Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms:
5 Patient Characteristics, Clinical Presentation, Treatment, and Outcomes in the Netherlands.
6 *Ann Surg.* 2019;270:852-858.
- 7 12. Ban D, Tanabe M, Kumamaru H, Nitta H, Otsuka Y, Miyata H, Kakeji Y, Kitagawa Y,
8 Kaneko H, Wakabayashi G, Yamaue H and Yamamoto M. Safe Dissemination of
9 Laparoscopic Liver Resection in 27,146 Cases Between 2011 and 2017 From the National
10 Clinical Database of Japan. *Ann Surg.* 2021;274:1043-1050.
- 11 13. Tomotaki A, Kumamaru H, Hashimoto H, Takahashi A, Ono M, Iwanaka T and
12 Miyata H. Evaluating the quality of data from the Japanese National Clinical Database 2011
13 via a comparison with regional government report data and medical charts. *Surg Today.*
14 2019;49:65-71.
- 15 14. Takahashi A, Kumamaru H, Tomotaki A, Matsumura G, Fukuchi E, Hirata Y,
16 Murakami A, Hashimoto H, Ono M and Miyata H. Verification of Data Accuracy in Japan
17 Congenital Cardiovascular Surgery Database Including Its Postprocedural Complication
18 Reports. *World J Pediatr Congenit Heart Surg.* 2018;9:150-156.
- 19 15. Hasegawa H, Takahashi A, Kanaji S, Kakeji Y, Marubashi S, Konno H, Gotoh M,
20 Miyata H, Kitagawa Y and Seto Y. Validation of data quality in a nationwide
21 gastroenterological surgical database: The National Clinical Database site-visit and remote
22 audits, 2016-2018. *Ann Gastroenterol Surg.* 2021;5:296-303.
- 23 16. Hoshina K, Ishimaru S, Sasabuchi Y, Yasunaga H, Komori K and Japan Committee
24 for Stentgraft Management. Outcomes of Endovascular Repair for Abdominal Aortic
25 Aneurysms: A Nationwide Survey in Japan. *Ann Surg.* 2019;269:564-573.
- 26 17. Li K, Zhang K, Li T and Zhai S. Primary results of abdominal aortic aneurysm
27 screening in the at-risk residents in middle China. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord.* 2018;18:60.
- 28 18. Wang H, Ou J, Gong W, Wang H and Freebody J. Morphologic Features of
29 Symptomatic and Ruptured Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm in Asian Patients. *Ann Vasc Surg.*
30 2021;72:445-453.
- 31 19. Badger SA, Jones C, McClements J, Lau LL, Young IS and Patterson CC.
32 Surveillance strategies according to the rate of growth of small abdominal aortic aneurysms.

- 1 *Vasc Med.* 2011;16:415-21.
- 2 20. Galyfos G, Sigala F, Mpananis K, Vouros D, Kimpizi D, Theodoropoulos C,
3 Zografos G and Filis K. Small abdominal aortic aneurysms: Has anything changed so far?
4 *Trends Cardiovasc Med.* 2020;30:500-504.
- 5 21. Fillinger MF, Racusin J, Baker RK, Cronenwett JL, Teutelink A, Schermerhorn ML,
6 Zwolak RM, Powell RJ, Walsh DB and Rzucidlo EM. Anatomic characteristics of ruptured
7 abdominal aortic aneurysm on conventional CT scans: Implications for rupture risk. *J Vasc*
8 *Surg.* 2004;39:1243-52.
- 9 22. Shang EK, Nathan DP, Sprinkle SR, Fairman RM, Bavaria JE, Gorman RC, Gorman
10 JH, 3rd and Jackson BM. Impact of wall thickness and saccular geometry on the
11 computational wall stress of descending thoracic aortic aneurysms. *Circulation.*
12 2013;128:S157-62.
- 13 23. Boyd AJ, Kuhn DC, Lozowy RJ and Kulbisky GP. Low wall shear stress
14 predominates at sites of abdominal aortic aneurysm rupture. *J Vasc Surg.* 2016;63:1613-9.
- 15 24. Natsume K, Shiiya N, Takehara Y, Sugiyama M, Satoh H, Yamashita K and
16 Washiyama N. Characterizing saccular aortic arch aneurysms from the geometry-flow
17 dynamics relationship. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2017;153:1413-1420 e1.
- 18 25. Akai T, Hoshina K, Yamamoto S, Takeuchi H, Nemoto Y, Ohshima M, Shigematsu
19 K, Miyata T, Yamauchi H, Ono M and Watanabe T. Biomechanical analysis of an aortic
20 aneurysm model and its clinical application to thoracic aortic aneurysms for defining
21 "saccular" aneurysms. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2015;4:e001547.
- 22 26. Kimura M, Hoshina K, Miyahara K, Nitta J, Kobayashi M, Yamamoto S and
23 Ohshima M. Geometric analysis of ruptured and nonruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms. *J*
24 *Vasc Surg.* 2019;69:86-91.
- 25 27. Hanada K, Hoshina K, Iwakiri T, Akai T, Miyahara K, Isaji T, Takayama T and
26 Yamamoto S. A comparison of subjective clinical and objective judgement of abdominal
27 aortic aneurysm morphology. *Int Angiol.* 2021;40:138-142.

28

29

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2 Figure 1. Distribution of ruptured aneurysms by diameter category in fusiform and saccular
3 abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs). The numbers next to the bars represent the percentages
4 of rupture cases in each diameter category among all rupture cases of fusiform or saccular
5 AAAs.

6

7 Figure 2. Receiver-operating characteristic analysis of rupture for (A) fusiform and (B)
8 saccular abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAAs). The area under the curve of the diameter that
9 predicts rupture of fusiform and saccular AAAs was 0.830 and 0.752, respectively. A cut-off
10 diameter with the highest predictive power for rupture was 59.5 mm in fusiform AAAs and
11 50.5 mm in saccular AAAs.

12

13 Table 1. Patient characteristics and data of abdominal aortic aneurysms.

14

15 Table 2. Comparison of rupture rate between fusiform and saccular abdominal aortic
16 aneurysms.

17

18 Table 3. Adjusted odds ratio for rupture in small, medium, and large abdominal aortic
19 aneurysms.

1

2 Table 4. Cut-off values, sensitivity and specificity of aneurysm diameter for predicting

3 rupture in fusiform and saccular abdominal aortic aneurysms.

4

5

1 **Table 1.**

| | Fusiform AAA (N=25,148) | | | | | Saccular AAA (N=2,142) | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|--------------------|------|----------|-------|
| | Non-ruptured (N=23,797) | | Ruptured (N=1,351) | | <i>p</i> | Non-ruptured (N=2,050) | | Ruptured (N=92) | | <i>p</i> | |
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % | N | % | | |
| Median age, years (IQR) | 78 (72-83) | | 78 (70-85) | | 0.440 | 76 (71-82) | | 77.5 (69.5-86.0) | | 0.285 | |
| Female sex | 4,483 | 18.8 | 352 | 26.1 | 0.000 | 369 | 18.0 | 18 | 19.6 | 0.703 | |
| Respiratory disorder | 3,680 | 15.5 | 157 | 11.6 | 0.000 | 306 | 14.9 | 25 | 27.2 | 0.001 | |
| Stroke | 2,891 | 12.1 | 160 | 11.8 | 0.738 | 300 | 14.6 | 17 | 18.5 | 0.310 | |
| Coronary artery disease | 5,234 | 22 | 145 | 10.7 | 0.000 | 370 | 18.0 | 15 | 16.3 | 0.670 | |
| Hypertension | 15,883 | 66.7 | 873 | 64.6 | 0.107 | 1,450 | 70.7 | 64 | 69.6 | 0.810 | |
| Diabetes mellitus | 3,478 | 14.6 | 168 | 12.4 | 0.027 | 342 | 16.7 | 9 | 9.8 | 0.080 | |
| Chronic kidney disease | 12,928 | 54.3 | 1,011 | 74.8 | 0.000 | 1,086 | 53.0 | 68 | 73.9 | 0.000 | |
| Dialysis dependence | 952 | 4.0 | 60 | 4.4 | 0.423 | 98 | 4.8 | 8 | 8.7 | 0.090 | |
| Median aneurysm diameter, mm (IQR) | 51.0 (47.0-56.0) | | 68.0 (58.0-80.0) | | 0.000 | 44.0 (37.0-50.0) | | 55.6 (45.0-71.0) | | 0.000 | |
| Aneurysm diameter categories | <30 | 52 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.2 | 0.000 | 113 | 5.5 | 1 | 1.1 | 0.000 |
| | 30-34 | 243 | 1.0 | 7 | 0.5 | | 245 | 12.0 | 3 | 3.3 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|----|------|
| 35-39 | 413 | 1.7 | 11 | 0.8 | 332 | 16.2 | 5 | 5.4 |
| 40-44 | 1972 | 8.3 | 26 | 1.9 | 379 | 18.5 | 13 | 14.1 |
| 45-49 | 5784 | 24.3 | 66 | 4.9 | 381 | 18.6 | 11 | 12.0 |
| 50-54 | 7942 | 33.4 | 122 | 9.0 | 311 | 15.2 | 11 | 12.0 |
| 55-59 | 3242 | 13.6 | 129 | 9.5 | 119 | 5.8 | 6 | 6.5 |
| 60-64 | 1906 | 8.0 | 184 | 13.6 | 78 | 3.8 | 9 | 9.8 |
| 65-69 | 885 | 3.7 | 156 | 11.5 | 31 | 1.5 | 7 | 7.6 |
| 70-74 | 640 | 2.7 | 185 | 13.7 | 25 | 1.2 | 10 | 10.9 |
| 75-79 | 302 | 1.3 | 118 | 8.7 | 13 | 0.6 | 3 | 3.3 |
| ≥80 | 416 | 1.7 | 347 | 25.7 | 23 | 1.1 | 13 | 14.1 |

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm.

1

2

1 **Table 2.**

| Aneurysm diameter | Fusiform AAA | | | Saccular AAA | | | OR | 95% CI | | <i>p</i> |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|------|--------------|---------|------|-------|--------|-------|----------|
| | Total | Rupture | % | Total | Rupture | % | | Lower | Upper | |
| 30-34 | 247 | 4 | 1.6 | 248 | 3 | 1.2 | 0.744 | 0.165 | 3.359 | 0.700 |
| 35-39 | 424 | 11 | 2.6 | 337 | 5 | 1.5 | 0.565 | 0.195 | 1.643 | 0.295 |
| 40-44 | 1998 | 26 | 1.3 | 392 | 13 | 3.3 | 2.602 | 1.325 | 5.108 | 0.005 |
| 45-49 | 5850 | 66 | 1.1 | 392 | 11 | 2.8 | 2.530 | 1.325 | 4.831 | 0.005 |
| 50-54 | 8064 | 122 | 1.5 | 322 | 11 | 3.4 | 2.303 | 1.230 | 4.312 | 0.009 |
| 55-59 | 3371 | 129 | 3.8 | 125 | 6 | 4.8 | 1.267 | 0.548 | 2.931 | 0.580 |
| 60-64 | 2090 | 184 | 8.8 | 87 | 9 | 10.3 | 1.195 | 0.590 | 2.422 | 0.621 |
| 65-69 | 1041 | 156 | 15.0 | 38 | 7 | 18.4 | 1.281 | 0.554 | 2.960 | 0.562 |

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

2

3

1 **Table 3.**

| Small AAA (30-39mm) | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|----------|-------|
| Variables | OR | 95% CI | | <i>p</i> | |
| | | Lower | Upper | | |
| Female sex | 0.942 | 0.317 | 2.798 | 0.914 | |
| Saccular morphology | 0.619 | 0.260 | 1.472 | 0.278 | |
| Aneurysm diameter | 30-34 (Ref.) | | | | |
| | 35-39 | 1.458 | 0.595 | 3.576 | 0.410 |
| Medium AAA (40-54mm) | | | | | |
| Variables | OR | 95% CI | | <i>p</i> | |
| | | Lower | Upper | | |
| Female sex | 2.155 | 1.650 | 2.816 | 0.000 | |
| Saccular morphology | 2.538 | 1.747 | 3.686 | 0.000 | |
| Aneurysm diameter | 40-44 (Ref.) | | | | |
| | 45-49 | 0.881 | 0.594 | 1.308 | 0.530 |
| | 50-54 | 1.208 | 0.833 | 1.751 | 0.318 |

| Large AAA (55-69mm) | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|-------|----------|-------|
| Variables | OR | 95% CI | | <i>p</i> | |
| | | Lower | Upper | | |
| Female sex | 1.593 | 1.285 | 1.974 | 0.000 | |
| Saccular morphology | 1.281 | 0.813 | 2.018 | 0.286 | |
| Aneurysm diameter | 55-59 (Ref.) | | | | |
| | 60-64 | 2.396 | 1.910 | 3.007 | 0.000 |
| | 65-69 | 4.388 | 3.452 | 5.577 | 0.000 |

AAA, abdominal aortic aneurysm; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

1

2

Figure 1.





Figure 2.

(A)



(B)

