

Safety and efficacy of management for intraprocedural rupture during endovascular treatment for intracranial aneurysms

Sakyo Hirai, MD, PhD¹; Ryoichi Hanazawa, MSc²; Masataka Yoshimura, MD, PhD³; Keigo Shigeta, MD, PhD⁴; Yohei Sato, MD, PhD⁵; Naoki Taira, MD⁶; Yoshihisa Kawano, MD, PhD⁷; Jun Karakama, MD, PhD⁸; Yoshiki Obata, MD, PhD⁹; Mutsuya Hara, MD, PhD¹⁰; Kenji Yamada, MD, PhD¹¹; Yosuke Ishii, MD, PhD¹²; Kana Sawada, MD¹³; Shogo Imae, MD, PhD¹⁴; Hikaru Wakabayashi, MD¹; Hirotaka Sagawa, MD¹; Kyohei Fujita, MD, PhD¹; Shoko Fujii, MD¹; Satoru Takahashi, MD, PhD¹; Akihiro Hirakawa, PhD²; Shigeru Nemoto, MD, PhD¹²; Kazutaka Sumita, MD, PhD¹

¹ Department of Endovascular Surgery, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan

² Department of Clinical Biostatistics, Graduate School of Medical and Dental Sciences, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan

³ Department of Neurosurgery, Tsuchiura Kyodo General Hospital, Ibaraki, Japan

⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, National Hospital Organization Disaster Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan

⁵ Department of Neurosurgery, Japanese Red Cross Musashino Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

⁶ Department of Neurosurgery, Shuuwa General Hospital, Saitama, Japan

⁷ Department of Neurosurgery, JA Toride Medical Center, Ibaraki, Japan

⁸ Department of Neurosurgery, Ome Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan

⁹ Department of Neurosurgery, Tokyo kita Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan

¹⁰ Department of Neurosurgery, Tokyo Metropolitan Toshima Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

¹¹ Department of Neurosurgery, Jichi Medical University Saitama Medical Center, Saitama, Japan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

¹² Department of Neurosurgery, Kanto Rosai Hospital, Kanagawa, Japan

¹³ Department of Neurosurgery, Tokyo Bay Urayasu Ichikawa Medical Center, Chiba, Japan

¹⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, Fujiyoshida municipal Hospital, Yamanashi, Japan

Corresponding Author: Kazutaka Sumita

Department of Endovascular Surgery, Tokyo Medical and Dental University 1-5-45 Yushima,
Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8519, Japan

Fax: +81-3-5803-0384, Tel.: +81-3-5803-4088

E-mail: sumita.nsrq@tmd.ac.jp

List: 6 Tables (Supplemental material: 2 Tables)

Short title: Management of intraprocedural rupture

Word Count: 5986 words

Abstract

Background: Although intraprocedural rupture (IPR) is rare, it is a devastating complication of endovascular treatment (EVT) for intracranial aneurysms. Very few studies have been conducted on IPR, and the safety and efficacy of management techniques of IPR have not been investigated.

Methods: Patients who underwent IPR during EVT between 2013 and 2022 were enrolled from the multicenter observational registry. Focusing on the management of IPR, we examined its safety and efficacy using imaging markers, including increased hemorrhage and ischemic lesions evaluated using postoperative computed tomography and diffusion-weighted imaging, respectively.

Results: Of the 3269 EVT for intracranial aneurysms, 74 patients who underwent IPR (2.26%) were analyzed. Fifty-five patients (3.36%) experienced IPR in 1636 EVT cases for ruptured aneurysms. The multivariate analysis revealed that increased hemorrhage was significantly associated with poor outcomes (odds ratio [OR], 6.67 [95% confidence interval (CI), 1.07–41.44], $p=0.042$), whereas ischemic lesions were not. Regarding management techniques of IPR, antihypertensive medication use was significantly associated with increased hemorrhage (OR, 13.17 [95% CI, 2.26–76.69], $p=0.004$). Heparin reversal was an independent factor for ischemic lesions (OR, 4.81 [95% CI, 1.09–21.14], $p=0.038$).

Conclusions: Even though the setting of IPR may be miscellaneous, and optimal management varies depending on individual cases, heparin reversal might be associated with ischemic complications rather than being useful for controlling bleeding in IPR during EVT for ruptured aneurysms.

Non-standard abbreviations and acronyms

BGC, balloon-guiding catheter; CI, confidence interval; CT, computed tomography; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; EVT, endovascular treatment; EVD, external ventricular drainage; HIL, hyperintense lesion; IPR, intraprocedural rupture; IQR, interquartile range; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; mRS, modified Rankin Scale; OR, odds ratio; PAO, parent artery occlusion; SAH, subarachnoid hemorrhage; STROBE, Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology; WFNS, World Federation of Neurological Surgeons

Introduction

Although recent technological advances in endovascular treatment (EVT) for intracranial aneurysms have yielded improved clinical outcomes, intraprocedural rupture (IPR) remains one of the most devastating complications. The incidence of IPR during EVT is 2–6%; however, the IPR-related morbidity and mortality rates account for up to 60%¹⁻⁴. However, some reports suggest that IPR of unruptured aneurysms may lead to significantly favorable outcomes with appropriate management^{5,6}. As IPR can be an uncontrollable event with a certain probability, its appropriate management is crucial in practical clinical settings⁷⁻⁹.

Various management strategies for IPR, including heparin reversal, antihypertensive drug administration, and endovascular procedures using balloon catheters, have been reported^{3,10,11}. Although these conventional methods are theoretically presumed to be effective in daily clinical practice, they have not yet been scientifically verified. Given the priority placed on hemostasis, there may be a lack of consideration of the adverse effects of IPR management, such as thromboembolic complications associated with balloon catheter inflation or heparin reversal. Moreover, very few studies have verified the effect of these management techniques for IPR on clinical outcomes because of its infrequency, and its urgency makes it extremely difficult to examine them in prospective studies.

The primary purpose of the present study was to review our experience with IPR during EVT for intracranial aneurysms and to clarify its clinical characteristics. Second, we investigated the safety and efficacy of conventional management strategies for IPR.

Methods

Patient Selection

This retrospective, multicenter, observational cohort study was conducted at 14 stroke centers in Japan using data from the EVT registry. The registry retrospectively (before 2021) and

prospectively (after 2021) enrolled patients who underwent elective or emergent EVTs at the participating institutions. The ethics committees of the participating institutions approved this registry (Approved number: M2020-102). Written informed consent was waived because the study was retrospective with no additional invasive procedures or costs for the participants, and the information was sufficiently anonymized. The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. This study was conducted in accordance with the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement. Patients who underwent EVT for intracranial aneurysms and experienced IPR between January 2013 and December 2022 were included using data from the EVT registry.

Clinical Data Collection

Before collecting clinical data retrospectively, a uniform definition of each clinical measurement and the protocols of imaging analyses were agreed upon via meetings attended by researchers at the participating stroke centers.

The following data were collected from the medical records: age; sex; pre-morbid modified Rankin scale (mRS) scores; comorbidities including hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and dyslipidemia based on the diagnoses before EVT or medications for these conditions; history of subarachnoid hemorrhage (SAH); periprocedural antiplatelet drug (aspirin, cilostazol, clopidogrel, prasugrel and their combinations) administration; aneurysm morphologies (size which is defined as the largest diameter of the aneurysm, location, type [saccular or dissecting], and status [ruptured or unruptured]); World Federation of Neurological Surgeons (WFNS) grade in patients with ruptured aneurysms¹²; and, external ventricular drainage (EVD) installation before EVT.

Endovascular treatment for intracranial aneurysms and intraprocedural rupture

EVT was performed under general anesthesia and systemic heparinization at any time between sheath insertion and first coil placement using techniques including simple coil embolization, double-catheter technique, and balloon- or stent-assisted coil embolization. Parent artery occlusion (PAO) was performed in the patients with ruptured dissecting aneurysms. IPR was defined as a microguidewire, microcatheter, or coil located beyond the confines of the aneurysm sac with or without angiographic contrast material extravasation, including angiographic extravasation triggered by contrast material injection during EVT ^{6,9}. When IPR was observed, rapid occlusion of the aneurysm was performed using coils, if possible. Data on the management of IPR, including heparin reversal using protamine sulfate and administration of antihypertensive medication for medical management, opening of EVD to maintain intracranial pressure, and hemostasis by inflation of a balloon microcatheter navigated around the aneurysm neck or balloon-guiding catheter (BGC) for endovascular management, were also collected. The causes of perforation, such as the framing coil, filling/finishing coil, microcatheter, microguidewire, injection of contrast agents, and hemodynamic response during IPR (defined as a 10% elevation of systolic blood pressure or heart rate from baseline) were also collected.

Outcomes

The postoperative angiographic occlusion status was assessed using the Raymond–Roy classification: Class I, complete obliteration; Class II, residual neck; and Class III, residual aneurysm ¹³. The imaging outcomes were evaluated for hemorrhagic and ischemic lesions on computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), respectively. We assessed the hemorrhagic state in the subarachnoid, parenchymal, and intraventricular spaces in three stages: no change, increase, and significant increase, based on CT immediately after

EVT compared with preoperative CT. We defined hemorrhage by a significant increase in any of these spaces as "increased hemorrhage." MRI was performed to assess postoperative ischemic lesions, and the size and number of hyperintense lesions (HIL) were measured by diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI). We defined "DWI positive" as more than 10 HILs sized <5 mm, or one or more HILs sized ≥ 10 mm, with reference to previous studies¹⁴⁻¹⁶. Data on aneurysm rebleeding within 2 weeks of EVT were also collected. Neurological outcomes were evaluated at discharge using mRS scores. Patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms were dichotomized into groups as good (mRS ≤ 3) or poor (mRS ≥ 4)¹⁷. In patients with unruptured aneurysms, good outcomes were defined as mRS =0 or the same score as the pre-morbid mRS, and poor outcomes were defined as mRS worsening by 1 or more.

We first analyzed the baseline clinical characteristics of IPR. Second, we assessed the factors associated with poor outcomes in patients who underwent IPR during EVT for ruptured aneurysms and investigated the impact of hemorrhage and ischemic complications due to IPR on patient outcomes. Third, the safety and efficacy of IPR management were evaluated, focusing on controlling hemorrhage and ischemic complications.

Statistical Analysis

We defined the following four analysis sets: (i) patients who underwent IPR; (ii) patients who underwent IPR with ruptured aneurysms; (iii) patients who underwent IPR with unruptured aneurysms; and (iv) patients who underwent IPR with ruptured aneurysms and additionally underwent postoperative MRI.

Baseline characteristics are represented as median and interquartile range (IQR) for continuous variables and frequency and percentage for categorical variables. For the three analysis sets, except for the set of patients who underwent IPR, the distributions of baseline

characteristics were compared between good/poor outcomes using Student t-test for continuous variables and chi-square test for categorical variables.

First, we assessed the effects of these factors on the good/poor outcomes in patients who underwent IPR for ruptured aneurysms. We estimated odds ratios (OR), 95% confidence intervals (CI), and p-values using univariate and multivariate logistic regression models that included age, sex, premorbid mRS, WFNS grade, and increased hemorrhage. Age was dichotomized by the median value in patients who underwent IPR with ruptured aneurysms. We also performed univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses for good/poor outcomes in patients who underwent IPR for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI. The model included age, sex, premorbid mRS score, WFNS grade, increased hemorrhage, and DWI positivity. Second, we evaluated the effects of these factors on increased hemorrhage in patients who underwent IPR for ruptured aneurysms. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed for age, sex, heparin reversal, antihypertensive medication, EVD opening, BGC balloon inflation, and neck balloon inflation. Finally, we investigated the effect of these factors on DWI positivity in patients who underwent IPR for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were also conducted using age, sex, heparin reversal, antihypertensive medication, EVD opening, BGC balloon inflation, and neck balloon inflation as covariates. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. All the analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Patient Characteristics

Based on the EVT registry, we identified 3269 endovascular procedures for intracranial aneurysms (1633 endovascular procedures for unruptured aneurysms and 1636 endovascular

procedures for ruptured aneurysms); IPR was observed in 74 patients, comprising 19 patients (1.16%) with unruptured aneurysms and 55 patients (3.36%) with ruptured aneurysms.

The baseline clinical characteristics of the patients are shown in Table 1. The 74 patients comprised 16 (21.6%) men (median [IQR] age, 62.5 [51.0–73.0]). Sixty patients (81.1%) had premorbid mRS scores of 0. The median (IQR) aneurysm size was 4.9 mm (3.7–7.1 mm), and saccular aneurysm accounted for 79.7% (n=59). Twenty-nine patients (39.2%), including all patients with unruptured aneurysms, were pretreated with antiplatelet drugs. The most common aneurysm location was the anterior communicating artery (n=19; 25.7%), followed by the posterior communicating artery (n=16; 21.6%). The most common endovascular technique used for coil embolization was simple (n=31; 41.9%), followed by the balloon assisted one (n=29; 39.2%). Sixty-nine patients (93.2%) received intravenous heparin infusion during EVT. The most common cause of IPR was filling or finishing the coil (n=26, 35.1%), followed by framing the coil (n=23, 31.1%). The most common management for IPR was heparin reversal in 50 patients (67.6%), followed by antihypertensive medication in 42 patients (56.8%), opening of the EVD in 28 patients (37.8%) among the 30 patients who underwent EVD installation before EVT for ruptured aneurysms, inflation of the BGC in 9 patients (12.2%), and inflation of the neck balloon microcatheter in 41 patients (55.4%). PAO was performed in 12 patients, including 4 who underwent unplanned PAO for bleeding control of IPR. Twenty-six patients (35.1%) showed increased hemorrhage on CT immediately after EVT, including one patient who could not undergo postoperative CT because the patient was in a state of clinical brain death due to massive and uncontrollable IPR. Sixty-six patients underwent postoperative MRI, excluding 8 patients who were in a state of clinically close to brain death, and 32 patients (48.5%) were DWI-positive. All the patients underwent MRI within 7 days of EVT and 29 (90.6%) underwent MRI within 2 days of EVT. Thirty-six (48.6 %) patients had poor outcomes. Rebleeding within 2 weeks of EVT

was observed in 7 patients (9.5%), and their occlusion status was as follows: Raymond–Roy Class I, 2; Class II, 2; Class III, 3; PAO,1.

Factors Associated with Poor Outcomes Following IPR in Patients Who Underwent EVT for Ruptured Aneurysms

The baseline clinical characteristics of 55 patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms, dichotomized according to patient outcomes, are shown in Table 2. Of these, 23 patients (41.8%) had good outcomes (mRS 0–3) and 32 patients (58.2%) had poor outcomes (mRS 4-6). Poor outcomes were significantly associated with older age, a lower percentage of pre-morbid mRS =0, a higher percentage of WFNS grades IV and V, and a higher percentage of pre-embolization EVD installation. Regarding the management of IPR, patients with poor outcomes showed a significantly higher percentage of antihypertensive medication use (65.6% vs. 34.8%, $p=0.031$) and opening of the EVD (68.8% vs. 26.1%, $p=0.003$). Regarding imaging outcomes, there was no statistically significant difference in increased hemorrhage between patients (40.6% vs. 17.4%, $p=0.082$). Postoperative MRI was performed in 49 patients, and DWI positivity was significantly higher in the poor outcome group than that in the good outcome group (73.1% vs. 34.8%, $p=0.01$). The baseline clinical characteristics of the 49 patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI, dichotomized into patient outcomes, are shown in Supplementary Table 1. The baseline clinical characteristics of the 19 patients who underwent EVT for unruptured aneurysms, dichotomized according to patient outcomes, are shown in Supplementary Table 2. All patients with unruptured aneurysms were premedicated with antiplatelet medications, and heparin infusion was administered during EVT. There were no statistically significant differences in the management of IPR and imaging outcomes between patient outcomes.

Table 3 shows the results of the univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of poor outcomes among patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms. In the univariate analyses, age ≥ 62 years, pre-morbid mRS >0 , and WFNS grades IV and V were significantly associated with poor outcomes (OR, 5.84 [95% CI, 1.80–18.93], $p=0.003$ for age ≥ 62 ; OR, 8.61 [95% CI, 1.01–73.69], $p=0.049$ for pre-morbid mRS >0 ; OR, 4.72 [95% CI, 1.45–15.28], $p=0.010$ for WFNS grades IV and V). In the multivariate analyses, age ≥ 62 years, WFNS grades IV and V, and increased hemorrhage were significantly associated with poor outcomes (OR, 8.53 [95% CI, 1.74–41.73], $p=0.008$ for age ≥ 62 years; OR, 12.73 [95% CI, 2.27–71.34], $p=0.004$ for WFNS grades IV and V; OR, 6.67 [95% CI, 1.07–41.44], $p=0.042$).

The results of univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of poor outcomes among patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI are shown in Table 4. In the univariate analyses, age ≥ 62 years, WFNS grades IV and V, and DWI positivity were significantly associated with poor outcomes (OR, 6.20 [95% CI, 1.79–21.46], $p=0.004$ for age ≥ 62 years; OR, 4.53 [95% CI, 1.34–15.37], $p=0.015$ for WFNS grades IV and V; OR, 5.09 [95% CI, 1.50–17.23], $p=0.009$ for DWI positivity). In the multivariate analyses, age ≥ 62 years, pre-morbid mRS >0 , and WFNS grades IV and V were significantly associated with poor outcomes (OR, 8.97 [95% CI, 1.41–57.15], $p=0.020$ for age ≥ 62 ; OR, 19.18 [95% CI, 1.11–332.81], $p=0.042$ for pre-morbid mRS >0 ; OR, 10.78 [1.61–72.31], $p=0.014$ for WFNS grades IV and V).

Safety and Efficacy of Management Techniques of IPR

Table 5 shows the results of the univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of increased hemorrhage for each variable. In the univariate analyses, antihypertensive medication use was significantly associated with increased hemorrhage (OR, 12.86 [95% CI,

2.55–64.70], $p=0.002$). Similar results were also observed in the multivariate analysis (OR, 13.17 [95% CI, 2.26–76.69], $p=0.004$ for antihypertensive medication).

The results of the univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses with DWI positivity for each variable among patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI are shown in Table 6. In the univariate analyses, age ≥ 62 years and heparin reversal were significantly associated with DWI positivity (OR, 5.09 [95% CI, 1.50–17.23], $p=0.009$ for age ≥ 62 years; OR, 5.06 [95% CI, 1.46–17.53], $p=0.011$ for heparin reversal). Similar results were also observed in the multivariate analysis (OR, 7.39 [95% CI, 1.43–38.32], $p=0.017$ for age ≥ 62 ; OR, 4.81 [95% CI, 1.09–21.14], $p=0.038$ for heparin reversal).

Discussion

The present study provides real-world clinical data on IPR during EVT for intracranial aneurysms. Increased hemorrhage is associated with poor outcomes in patients who undergo EVT for ruptured aneurysms. In the management of IPR, heparin reversal was not associated with increased hemorrhage but was associated with the DWI positivity rate on MRI. In these cases, heparin reversal had no impact on clinical outcomes; however, the univariate analysis showed a significant difference in heparin reversal and DWI positivity, suggesting a potential association with the increase in the number of cases.

The overall IPR rate in the present study was 2.26%, which was more likely to occur during EVT of ruptured aneurysms than that of unruptured aneurysms. This is similar to the findings of previous studies on the prevalence of IPR⁴. In patients with IPR, morbidity and mortality (mRS 4–6) occurred in 32 patients (58.2%) with ruptured aneurysms and four patients (21.1%) with unruptured aneurysms, representing the severe consequences of IPR, which are similar to those reported previously². The median size and common location were similar to

those previously reported^{6,18}. Although we suspected that complex endovascular techniques causing device friction or complicated procedures were more likely to cause IPR, adjunctive techniques were not significantly different between the two groups dichotomized by patient outcomes. Regarding the cause of perforation, coils were the most common cause of IPR, and the proportion of IPR related to the framing coil and microcatheter, which may be considered to be related to fatal bleeding, did not differ between the two groups dichotomized by patient outcome³. These results suggest that IPR is not caused by a single factor but by various factors, including the endovascular techniques and devices used. In addition, rupture due to contrast agent injection alone was observed in six cases (8.1%). In 5 of the 6 cases, IPR occurred during diagnostic angiography prior to approaching the aneurysm. They were all WFNS grade V, and their clinical outcomes were mRS scores of 5 or 6, similar to that reported in a previous study¹⁹. While performing EVT for severe SAH, careful procedures such as the gentle injection of contrast media are required. Postoperative aneurysm re-rupture occurred in 12% of patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms and experienced IPR, which was higher than the frequency of postoperative re-rupture among patients without IPR²⁰. This occurred regardless of the aneurysmal occlusion status. This may be attributable to the instability of the aneurysm and acceleration of hypercoagulation due to IPR, suggesting the possibility of further ischemic complications^{21,22}. In patients with IPR in ruptured aneurysms, older age and the higher percentage of pre-morbid mRS =1 or more and WFNS grades IV and V were related to poor outcomes. This might be because preoperative conditions have a significant influence on outcomes, even in the IPR population. EVD may be more common in patients with poor outcomes because EVD installation is performed before EVT tended to involve severe pre-EVT conditions.

In the present study, among patients who underwent postoperative MRI, the univariate analyses revealed that DWI positivity was significantly associated with poor outcomes. The

incidence of DWI abnormalities following EVT in patients with SAH, which is also associated with patient outcomes, is reported to be 42–75%^{14,23}. SAH may promote hypercoagulability as a systemic response; therefore, ischemic complications occur more frequently in EVT for ruptured aneurysms than that for unruptured aneurysms^{4,24,25}. Moreover, managing IPR through heparin reversal and hemostasis using a balloon in a hypercoagulable state may induce ischemic complications and compromise IPR control.

In the management of IPR, patients with poor outcomes showed a higher percentage of those with antihypertensive medication use. A hemodynamic response was observed in 23 of the 29 patients who used antihypertensive medication for the management of IPR. Rather than interpreting that the outcome was worse due to the use of antihypertensive medication, it is more reasonable to interpret that the patients who presented a hemodynamic response that required antihypertensive medication as a result of IPR tended to have poor outcomes. Therefore, none of the management strategies for IPR examined in this study were useful for bleeding control.

Among patients with IPR with ruptured aneurysms, older age and heparin reversal were associated with DWI positivity on postoperative MRI. Older age was significantly associated with multiple HIL owing to a higher prevalence of atherosclerotic risk factors, and the same trend was observed in the present study^{15,26}. One of the optimal management strategies for IPR is rapid occlusion of the aneurysm^{1,5}. Empirically, temporary hemostasis can be achieved using a balloon catheter; therefore, the use of a balloon is not meaningless³. Although the presence or absence of a balloon did not affect the outcomes in this study, thromboembolic complications should be considered especially when heparin is neutralized^{5,8}. The use of heparin during IPR had no effect on mortality and morbidity¹. Although protamine sulfate has a rapid onset of action to neutralize the effect of heparin, it causes hypotension due to vasodilation when administered rapidly; therefore, slow administration

over 5 min is recommended^{27,28}. If IPR can be controlled in a short time, heparin reversal may be avoided; if it seems difficult to control, heparin reversal can be considered, and heparinization can be restarted after hemostasis is achieved. Implementing these measures may suppress IPR-related ischemic complications. Optimal management varies depending on the case; therefore, implementing a uniform response should be reconsidered.

This study had several limitations. First, it had an observational retrospective design. To our knowledge, this is the largest study to investigate IPR during EVT for intracranial aneurysms. However, the sample size was small, and we did not have sufficient power to demonstrate the appropriateness of our results. Given the frequency and iatrogenic nature of IPR, prospective interventional studies are difficult to perform. Second, a uniform statistical analysis is challenging because of significant variations in patient backgrounds, such as unruptured and ruptured conditions. Third, there were no data on activated clotting time before and after IPR, and the effects of heparin and its reversal could not be investigated in detail. Finally, imaging outcomes, including hemorrhage and ischemia, were evaluated using qualitative indicators. In particular, there are no reports on the DWI findings after IPR in patients with SAH. The validity of these criteria requires further investigation.

The present study showed real-world data on intraprocedural rupture during the EVT of intracranial aneurysms. Although rare, it can become a devastating complication. Conventional management of IPR may not be useful for controlling bleeding. Heparin reversal may be associated with ischemic complications rather than being useful for controlling bleeding during intraprocedural rupture. The situation of intraprocedural rupture is miscellaneous, and optimal management varies depending on the individual case; therefore, a uniform response should be avoided.

Acknowledgments: None

Sources of funding: The authors did not receive a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosures: None declared.

References

1. Cloft HJ, Kallmes DF. Cerebral aneurysm perforations complicating therapy with Guglielmi detachable coils: a meta-analysis. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2002;23:1706–1709.
2. Elijovich L, Higashida RT, Lawton MT, Duckwiler G, Giannotta S, Johnston SC. Predictors and outcomes of intraprocedural rupture in patients treated for ruptured intracranial aneurysms: the CARAT study. *Stroke.* 2008;39:1501–1506. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.107.504670
3. Santillan A, Gobin YP, Greenberg ED, Leng LZ, Riina HA, Stieg PE, Patsalides A. Intraprocedural aneurysmal rupture during coil embolization of brain aneurysms: role of balloon-assisted coiling. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2012;33:2017–2021. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A3061
4. Zheng Y, Liu Y, Leng B, Xu F, Tian Y. Periprocedural complications associated with endovascular treatment of intracranial aneurysms in 1764 cases. *J Neurointerv Surg.* 2016;8:152–157. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2014-011459
5. Cho SH, Denewer M, Park W, Ahn JS, Kwun BD, Lee DH, Park JC. Intraprocedural Rupture of Unruptured Cerebral Aneurysms During Coil Embolization: A Single-Center Experience. *World Neurosurg.* 2017;105:177–183. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2017.05.147
6. Yamagami K, Hatano T, Nakahara I, Ishii A, Ando M, Chihara H, Ogura T, Suzuki K, Kondo D, Kamata T, et al. Long-term Outcomes After Intraprocedural Aneurysm Rupture During Coil Embolization of Unruptured Intracranial Aneurysms. *World Neurosurg.* 2020;134:e289–e297. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.10.038
7. Fan L, Lin B, Xu T, Xia N, Shao X, Tan X, Zhong M, Yang Y, Zhao B. Predicting intraprocedural rupture and thrombus formation during coiling of ruptured anterior communicating artery aneurysms. *J Neurointerv Surg.* 2017;9:370–375. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2016-012335
8. Kunz M, Bakhshai Y, Zausinger S, Fesl G, Janssen H, Brückmann H, Tonn JC, Schichor C. Interdisciplinary treatment of unruptured intracranial aneurysms: impact of intraprocedural rupture and ischemia in 563 aneurysms. *J Neurol.* 2013;260:1304–1313. doi: 10.1007/s00415-012-6795-9
9. Sluzewski M, Bosch JA, van Rooij WJ, Nijssen PC, Wijnalda D. Rupture of intracranial aneurysms during treatment with Guglielmi detachable coils: incidence, outcome, and risk factors. *J Neurosurg.* 2001;94:238–240. doi: 10.3171/jns.2001.94.2.0238
10. Li MH, Gao BL, Fang C, Cheng YS, Li YD, Wang J, Xu GP. Prevention and management of intraprocedural rupture of intracranial aneurysm with detachable coils during embolization. *Neuroradiology.* 2006;48:907–915. doi: 10.1007/s00234-006-0147-3
11. Doerfler A, Wanke I, Egelhof T, Dietrich U, Asgari S, Stolke D, Forsting M. Aneurysmal rupture during embolization with Guglielmi detachable coils: causes, management, and outcome. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2001;22:1825–1832.

12. Report of World Federation of Neurological Surgeons Committee on a Universal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage Grading Scale. *J Neurosurg*. 1988;68:985–986. doi: 10.3171/jns.1988.68.6.0985
13. Raymond J, Guilbert F, Weill A, Georganos SA, Juravsky L, Lambert A, Lamoureux J, Chagnon M, Roy D. Long-term angiographic recurrences after selective endovascular treatment of aneurysms with detachable coils. *Stroke*. 2003;34:1398–1403. doi: 10.1161/01.Str.0000073841.88563.E9
14. Lowe SR, Bhalla T, Tillman H, Chaudry MI, Turk AS, Turner RD, Spiotta AM. A Comparison of Diffusion-Weighted Imaging Abnormalities Following Balloon Remodeling for Aneurysm Coil Embolization in the Ruptured vs Unruptured Setting. *Neurosurgery*. 2018;82:516–524. doi: 10.1093/neuros/nyx240
15. Park JC, Lee DH, Kim JK, Ahn JS, Kwun BD, Kim DY, Choi CG. Microembolism after endovascular coiling of unruptured cerebral aneurysms: incidence and risk factors. *J Neurosurg*. 2016;124:777–783. doi: 10.3171/2015.3.Jns142835
16. Lim Fat MJ, Al-Hazzaa M, Bussi ere M, dos Santos MP, Lesiuk H, Lum C. Heparin dosing is associated with diffusion weighted imaging lesion load following aneurysm coiling. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2013;5:366–370. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2011-010225
17. Wilson DA, Nakaji P, Albuquerque FC, McDougall CG, Zabramski JM, Spetzler RF. Time course of recovery following poor-grade SAH: the incidence of delayed improvement and implications for SAH outcome study design. *J Neurosurg*. 2013;119:606–612. doi: 10.3171/2013.4.Jns121287
18. Stapleton CJ, Walcott BP, Butler WE, Ogilvy CS. Neurological outcomes following intraprocedural rerupture during coil embolization of ruptured intracranial aneurysms. *J Neurosurg*. 2015;122:128–135. doi: 10.3171/2014.9.Jns14616
19. Komiyama M, Tamura K, Nagata Y, Fu Y, Yagura H, Yasui T. Aneurysmal rupture during angiography. *Neurosurgery*. 1993;33:798–803. doi: 10.1227/00006123-199311000-00002
20. Sluzewski M, van Rooij WJ. Early rebleeding after coiling of ruptured cerebral aneurysms: incidence, morbidity, and risk factors. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2005;26:1739–1743.
21. Lauridsen SV, Hvas CL, Sandgaard E, Gyldenholm T, Mikkelsen R, Obbekj er T, Sunde N, T nnesen EK, Hvas AM. Thromboelastometry Shows Early Hypercoagulation in Patients with Spontaneous Subarachnoid Hemorrhage. *World Neurosurg*. 2019;130:e140–e149. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.06.019
22. Li K, Guo Y, Zhao Y, Xu B, Xu K, Yu J. Acute rerupture after coil embolization of ruptured intracranial saccular aneurysms: A literature review. *Interv Neuroradiol*. 2018;24:117–124. doi: 10.1177/1591019917747245
23. Bond KM, Brinjikji W, Murad MH, Kallmes DF, Cloft HJ, Lanzino G. Diffusion-Weighted Imaging-Detected Ischemic Lesions following Endovascular Treatment of Cerebral Aneurysms: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2017;38:304–309. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A4989
24. Fukuda H, Handa A, Koyanagi M, Lo B, Yamagata S. Association of plasma D-dimer level with thromboembolic events after endovascular coil treatment of ruptured cerebral aneurysms. *J Neurosurg*. 2018:1–8. doi: 10.3171/2017.7.Jns171129

25. Juvela S, Siironen J. D-dimer as an independent predictor for poor outcome after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. *Stroke*. 2006;37:1451–1456. doi: 10.1161/01.Str.0000221710.55467.33
26. Kang DH, Kim BM, Kim DJ, Suh SH, Kim DI, Kim YS, Huh SK, Park J, Lee JW, Kim YB. MR-DWI-positive lesions and symptomatic ischemic complications after coiling of unruptured intracranial aneurysms. *Stroke*. 2013;44:789–791. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.112.669853
27. Dhakal P, Rayamajhi S, Verma V, Gundabolu K, Bhatt VR. Reversal of Anticoagulation and Management of Bleeding in Patients on Anticoagulants. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost*. 2017;23:410–415. doi: 10.1177/1076029616675970
28. Horrow JC. Protamine: a review of its toxicity. *Anesth Analg*. 1985;64:348–361.

Table 1 Patient characteristics of those who experienced IPR during EVT for intracranial aneurysms

	Overall (N=74)
Age	62.5 (51.0, 73.0)
Male sex	16 (21.6%)
Pre-morbid mRS =0	60 (81.1%)
Comorbidities and pre-medication	
Hypertension	36 (48.6%)
Diabetes mellitus	5 (6.8%)
Dyslipidemia	14 (18.9%)
SAH	8 (10.8%)
Antiplatelet drugs	29 (39.2%)
Aneurysm morphology	
Size (mm)	4.9 (3.7, 7.1)
Location	
Anterior communicating artery	19 (25.7%)
Posterior communicating artery	16 (21.6%)
Basilar artery	10 (13.5%)
Vertebral artery	8 (10.8%)
Other anterior circulation aneurysm	14 (18.9%)
Other posterior circulation aneurysm	7 (9.5%)
Saccular aneurysm	59 (79.7%)
Status of ruptured aneurysm	55 (74.3%)
Endovascular technique	
Simple coil embolization	31 (41.9%)
Double-catheter technique	7 (9.5%)
Balloon-assisted coil embolization	29 (39.2%)
Stent-assisted coil embolization	4 (5.4%)
Others	3 (4.1%)
Heparin use	69 (93.2%)
Cause of perforation	
Framing coil	23 (31.1%)
Filling/finishing coil	26 (35.1%)

Microcatheter	12 (16.2%)
Microguidewire	4 (5.4%)
Injection of contrast agents	6 (8.1%)
Others	3 (4.1%)
Management for intraoperative rupture	
Heparin reversal	50 (67.6%)
Antihypertensive medication	42 (56.8%)
Opening of EVD	28 (37.8%)
BGC balloon inflation	9 (12.2%)
Neck balloon inflation	41 (55.4%)
Hemodynamic response	37 (50.0%)
Angiographic occlusion status	
Raymond–Roy Class 1	34 (45.9%)
Raymond–Roy Class 2	21 (28.4%)
Raymond–Roy Class 3	7 (9.5%)
Parent artery occlusion	12 (16.2%)
Imaging outcomes	
Increased hemorrhage	26 (35.1%)
DWI positive*	32 (48.5%)
Rebleeding within 2 weeks from EVT	7 (9.5%)
mRS at discharge	
0	16 (21.6%)
1	12 (16.2%)
2	6 (8.1%)
3	4 (5.4%)
4	8 (10.8%)
5	15 (20.3%)
6	13 (17.6%)

*; Data are available for 66 participants who underwent MRI after EVT.

Abbreviations: BGC, balloon-guiding catheter; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; EVD, external ventricular drainage; mRS, modified Rankin Scale; SAH, subarachnoid hemorrhage

Table 2 The baseline clinical characteristics of the 55 patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysm dichotomized by patient outcomes

Variable	Overall (N=55)	Good outcome (N=23)	Poor outcome (N=32)	P*
Age	62.0 (50.0, 75.0)	52.0 (47.0, 62.0)	71.5 (59.0, 80.0)	<.001
Male sex	12 (21.8%)	6 (26.1%)	6 (18.8%)	0.530
Pre-morbid mRS =0	45 (81.8%)	22 (95.7%)	23 (71.9%)	0.034
Antiplatelet drugs	10 (18.2%)	4 (17.4%)	6 (18.8%)	1.000
Aneurysm size (mm)	4.8 (3.7, 7.1)	5.9 (3.8, 6.7)	4.7 (3.6, 7.2)	0.810
Saccular aneurysm	42 (76.4%)	18 (78.3%)	24 (75.0%)	1.000
WFNS grade IV-V	26 (47.3%)	6 (26.1%)	20 (62.5%)	0.013
Pre-embolization EVD installation	30 (54.5%)	7 (30.4%)	23 (71.9%)	0.003
Endovascular technique (simple coil embolization + Others)	23 (41.8%)	10 (43.5%)	13 (40.6%)	1.000
Heparin use	50 (90.9%)	21 (91.3%)	29 (90.6%)	1.000
Cause of perforation (Framing coil + Microcatheter)	25 (45.5%)	9 (39.1%)	16 (50.0%)	0.584
Management for IPR				
Heparin reversal	33 (60.0%)	11 (47.8%)	22 (68.8%)	0.165
Antihypertensive medication	29 (52.7%)	8 (34.8%)	21 (65.6%)	0.031
Opening of EVD	28 (50.9%)	6 (26.1%)	22 (68.8%)	0.003
BGC balloon inflation	8 (14.6%)	3 (13.0%)	5 (15.6%)	1.000
Neck balloon inflation	28 (50.9%)	9 (39.1%)	19 (59.4%)	0.176
Hemodynamic response	25 (45.5)	9 (39.1%)	16 (50.0%)	0.584
Imaging outcomes				
Increased hemorrhage	17 (30.9%)	4 (17.4%)	13 (40.6%)	0.082
DWI positive†	27 (55.1%)	8 (34.8%)	19 (73.1%)	0.010
Rebleeding within 2 weeks from EVT	7 (12.7%)	1 (4.4%)	6 (18.8%)	0.219

*; The P values were calculated using the t-test for continuous variables and the chi-square test for categorical variables.

†; Data were available for 49 participants who underwent an MRI after EVT.

Abbreviations: BGC, balloon-guiding catheter; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; EVD, external ventricular drainage; EVT, endovascular treatment; IPR, intraprocedural rupture; mRS, modified Rankin Scale; WFNS, World Federation of Neurological Surgeons

Table 3 Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of poor outcomes among patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms

Variable	Univariate (N=55)		Multivariate (N=55)	
	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
Age \geq 62 years	5.84 (1.80, 18.93)	0.003	8.53 (1.74,41.73)	0.008
Male sex	0.65 (0.18, 2.37)	0.517	1.01 (0.20, 5.01)	0.989
Pre-morbid mRS>0	8.61 (1.01, 73.69)	0.049	11.94 (0.85, 167.78)	0.066
WFNS grade IV and V	4.72 (1.45, 15.28)	0.010	12.73 (2.27, 71.34)	0.004
Increased hemorrhage	3.25 (0.90, 11.79)	0.073	6.67 (1.07, 41.44)	0.042

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; mRS, modified

Rankin Scale; OR, odds ratio; WFNS, World Federation of Neurological Surgeons

Table 4 Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses showed poor outcomes among patients who underwent EVT for ruptured aneurysms and postoperative MRI

Variable	Univariate (N=49)		Multivariate (N=49)	
	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
Age \geq 62 years	6.20 (1.79, 21.46)	0.004	8.97 (1.41, 57.15)	0.020
Male sex	0.85 (0.23, 3.13)	0.807	1.47 (0.26, 8.37)	0.664
Pre-morbid mRS>0	6.60 (0.73, 59.62)	0.093	19.18 (1.11, 332.81)	0.042
WFNS grade IV and V	4.53 (1.34, 15.37)	0.015	10.78 (1.61, 72.31)	0.014
Increased hemorrhage	2.51 (0.65, 9.67)	0.180	3.74 (0.52, 26.85)	0.190
DWI positive	5.09 (1.50, 17.23)	0.009	2.87 (0.54, 15.18)	0.215

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; mRS, modified

Rankin Scale; OR, odds ratio; WFNS, World Federation of Neurological Surgeons

Table 5 Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of increased hemorrhage

Variable	Univariate (N=55)		Multivariate (N=55)	
	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
Age \geq 62 years	1.83 (0.56, 5.97)	0.314	1.00 (0.20, 5.16)	0.997
Male sex	0.37 (0.07, 1.93)	0.240	0.35 (0.04, 2.81)	0.325
Management for IPR				
Heparin reversal	0.66 (0.21, 2.09)	0.476	0.43 (0.09, 1.94)	0.273
Antihypertensive medication	12.86 (2.55, 64.70)	0.002	13.17 (2.26, 76.69)	0.004
Opening of EVD	1.12 (0.36, 3.54)	0.840	0.97 (0.23, 4.09)	0.965
BGC balloon inflation	1.41 (0.30, 6.74)	0.664	0.71 (0.10, 5.02)	0.735
Neck balloon inflation	1.59 (0.50, 5.05)	0.434	1.33 (0.32, 5.60)	0.694

Abbreviations: BGC, balloon-guiding catheter; EVD, external ventricular drainage; IPR, intraprocedural rupture

Table 6. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses of DWI positivity.

	Univariate (N=49)		Multivariate (N=49)	
	OR (95% CI)	P	OR (95% CI)	P
Age \geq 62 years	5.09 (1.50, 17.23)	0.009	7.39 (1.43, 38.32)	0.017
Male sex	0.49 (0.13, 1.83)	0.286	1.18 (0.20, 6.96)	0.853
Management for IPR				
Heparin reversal	5.06 (1.46, 17.53)	0.011	4.81 (1.09, 21.14)	0.038
Antihypertensive medication	0.93 (0.30, 2.86)	0.897	0.49 (0.10, 2.32)	0.369
Opening of EVD	1.56 (0.50, 4.85)	0.446	1.17 (0.30, 4.62)	0.821
BGC balloon inflation	0.56 (0.11, 2.83)	0.486	2.63 (0.26, 26.54)	0.411
Neck balloon inflation	2.10 (0.67, 6.60)	0.204	2.19 (0.56, 8.58)	0.263

Abbreviations: BGC, balloon-guiding catheter; EVD, external ventricular drainage; IPR, intraprocedural rupture