1 The Use of Carotid Web Angioarchitecture in Stratification of Stroke Risk

2

<u> </u>					
<u>۲</u>	Allfnors, Buick Neoasu	KS ¹ Daniel D Wylooan	BS ¹ Fric A Grin	BS' Karli Sanowon BS'	•
0	Authors: Druck Negusti	,,	,,,	, DO, Rart E. Ourigwon, DO	,

- 4 Charlotte Chung, MD, PhD¹; Eleanor Gutstadt¹; Vera Sharashidze, MD^{1,2,3}; Eytan Raz MD,
- 5 PhD^{1,2}; Maksim Shapiro, MD^{1,2,3}; Koto Ishida, MD²; Jose L Torres, MD²; Cen Zhang, MD²;
- 6 Michelle A Nakatsuka, BS¹; Sara K Rostanski, MD²; Melissa J. Rethana, MD²; Alexandra
- 7 Kvernland, MD²; Matthew Sanger, MD²; Kaitlyn Lillemoe, MD²; Alexander Allen, MD; Sean
- 8 Kelly, MD²; Jacob Baranoski, MD¹; Caleb Rutledge, MD¹; Howard A. Riina, MD¹; Peter Kim
- 9 Nelson, MD¹; Erez Nossek, MD¹
- 10

11 Affiliations:

- 12 Department of Neurosurgery, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York,
- 13 USA
- 14 Department of Neurology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York, USA
- 15 Department of Radiology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York, USA
- 16

17 Abstract

- 18 **Objective:** To validate the carotid web (CW) risk stratification assessment described in our
- 19 previous work with a larger cohort of patients with incidentally found asymptomatic
- 20 CWs.
- 21 Methods: A retrospective analysis of our electronic medical record database identified all
- 22 patients with a diagnosis of CW from 2017-2024 at our institution. We included
- 23 symptomatic patients and those with asymptomatic carotid webs, meaning patients with
- 24 incidentally found webs and no history of stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA). Patient
- 25 charts were reviewed for demographics, imaging, comorbidities, hospital course, and

incidence of stroke after diagnosis of an asymptomatic carotid web. All angles were
measured as described in our previous work on a sagittal reconstruction of CTA imaging of
the neck in which the common carotid artery (CCA), external carotid artery (ECA), and ICA
could be well visualized, along with the CW itself. A standard logistic regression was
performed to evaluate the association between the number of high-risk angles and stroke
risk.

32

33 **Results:** 26 asymptomatic and nine symptomatic patients were identified. Patients were categorized as having 0, 1, or 2+ high-risk angle values. Patients with more high-risk angles 34 had a markedly higher risk of stroke (OR = 5.91, 95% CI: [4.25, 8.24]). The probability of 35 36 stroke increased with the number of high-risk angles: patients with 2+ high-risk angles 37 (83.4%) had the highest stroke probability compared to those with 0 (2.8%) or 1 (27.7%) high-risk angles. In the asymptomatic cohort, mean angles all fell below the high-risk 38 39 threshold values. In the symptomatic cohort, mean angles were above the high-risk 40 threshold values, whereas the mean CPT (53.6°) angle fell below the cut-off value for 41 designation as a high-risk angle. **Conclusions:** Given the successful stratification of CWs into high and low-risk groups in 42 43 this study, the utilization of geometric CW parameters may play a crucial role in improvement of patient selection for intervention in patients with an incidental diagnosis of 44 45 CW.

46 MeSH Keywords: Stroke, Neuroimaging, Risk assessment

47

48 Introduction:

49 Carotid webs (CWs) are endoluminal bands of fibrous tissue extending from the posterior

50 margin of the internal carotid artery (ICA) just distal to the carotid bulb.¹ Notably, CWs have

51 been implicated as a cause of thromboembolic stroke, particularly in younger patients

52 lacking other identifiable stroke risk factors.^{2,3} While CWs themselves are rare, with a

reported prevalence of 2.3%, as awareness of CWs rises, increasing numbers of patients
are being incidentally diagnosed.⁴ This number will likely continue to rise considering the
steadily increasing rate of medical imaging in healthcare.⁵

56 CWs can be categorized as symptomatic, causing a stroke or transient ischemic attack 57 (TIA), or asymptomatic, presenting as an incidental finding.⁶ To date, no prior research has 58 determined whether a pathophysiological or structural difference exists between symptomatic and asymptomatic webs. In this manner, physicians currently have no way to 59 60 assess whether a patient with an incidentally discovered CW is at risk of having a future 61 stroke. Given the relatively high incidence of incidentally discovered asymptomatic ACWs, 62 determining future stroke in patients with asymptomatic CWs would be of great aid to 63 clinicians in determining the optimal course of management. 64 Our previous work proposed a new method by which to stratify stroke risk in CW patients according to anatomic data on the ICA, common carotid artery (CCA), and CW (Table 1).⁷ 65

66 This is accomplished by considering the web's key structural features and relationship to

the carotid bifurcation, a collection of findings we name the carotid web angioarchitecture.

In this current study, we aimed to validate this CW angioarchitecture-based risk

69 stratification assessment within a new population of patients including a larger cohort with

70 incidentally found, asymptomatic CWs.

71

72 Methods:

A single-institution study was performed. Patient consent was waived per the institutional
review board (IRB s22-00111). Our electronic medical record database was queried for all
imaging impressions containing the word "carotid web" over the seven-year period from
2017-2024. Patients were identified to have CWs based on classic findings on CTA,
including a radiographic "shelf-like" filling defect at the posterior wall of the proximal
internal carotid artery (ICA) and description by the diagnosing neuroradiologist.

79 Patient files were then further reviewed for ischemic signs and symptoms. Symptomatic 80 patients were defined as patients with a diagnosis of CW and a history of ipsilateral stroke 81 or TIA. Diagnoses of stroke or TIA were based on neurologic symptoms, neuroimaging using 82 CT or MRI, and vessel imaging using CTA or angiography. All diagnoses of stroke or TIA were 83 made by a board-certified vascular neurologist. Further, all strokes occurred ipsilateral to 84 the identified carotid web, and in each case, the carotid web was determined by the 85 vascular neurology team to be the most likely cause of stroke after a thorough assessment 86 ruling out other causes of ischemic events. Asymptomatic patients were defined as 87 patients with CWs on CTA imaging who had no history of stroke or TIA. These patients were 88 incidentally found to have CWs while undergoing imaging for unrelated conditions or 89 circumstances.

90 Patient charts were then reviewed for demographics, imaging findings, clinical course, and 91 outcomes after CW diagnosis. Angioarchitectural parameters, including the ICA - web 92 pouch angle (IWP), CCA -- web pouch angle (CWP), ICA -- pouch tip angle (IPT), and CCA --93 pouch tip angle (CPT), were measured as described in our previous work and serve as 94 proxies for flow dynamics around the CW (Figure 1).⁷ These features were measured 95 consistently by the same two investigators. All angles were measured on a sagittal 96 reconstruction of CTA imaging of the neck in which the CCA, external carotid artery (ECA), 97 and ICA could be well visualized, along with the CW itself.

98 For statistical analysis, each patient, and thus each CW, was then categorized as 99 having either 0, 1, or 2+ high-risk angle values, meaning values above the predetermined thresholds for each parameter. We performed a standard logistic regression to evaluate the 100 101 association between the number of high-risk angles and stroke risk. The number of high-102 risk angles was grouped into three categories: 0, 1, and 2+. The outcome was binary (stroke 103 occurrence), where 1 represented stroke and 0 represented no stroke. The predictor 104 variable was standardized prior to modeling to improve convergence. Odds ratios (OR) and 105 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated to quantify the relationship between high-106 risk angles and stroke risk. The predicted probability of stroke was plotted for each 107 group. STROBE reporting guidelines were adhered to throughout our study.⁸

108

109 Results:

- 110 Twenty six asymptomatic and nine symptomatic patients with a mean age at diagnosis of
- 111 57.4 years (range 28 80 years) and 60.8 years (range 32 89 years) respectively. No
- significant differences in age, sex, history of hypertension, history of hyperlipidemia or
- smoking status were observed between the two cohorts (Table 2).
- 114 Logistic regression revealed a significant positive association between the number of high-
- risk angles and stroke risk (Figure 2). Patients with more high-risk angles had a markedly
- 116 higher risk of stroke, with each additional high-risk angle associated with a significant
- 117 increase in the odds of stroke (OR = 5.91, 95% CI: [4.25, 8.24]).
- 118 The predicted probability of stroke increased progressively with the number of high-risk
- angles, with patients in the 2+ group showing the highest predicted stroke probability
- 120 compared to those with 0 or 1 high-risk angles. Specifically, patients without any high-risk
- 121 angles had a stroke probability of only 2.8%. This increased to 27.7% for one high risk angle
- 122 and then markedly increased to 83.4% for two or more high risk angles. The number of
- 123 patients in each cohort and the concordance of their angle values with corresponding
- 124 cutoffs are shown in Table 3. The positive and negative predictive values for each
- 125 angioarchitectural parameter were calculated and are included in Table 4. No patients in
- 126 the asymptomatic group had suffered a stroke at a mean follow-up of 47.2 months (range
- 127 24 77 months).
- 128 In the asymptomatic cohort, mean IWP (90.5°), CWP (40.8°), IPT (78.1°), and CPT (59.1°)
- 129 angles all fell below the high-risk threshold values determined from our previous work. In
- 130 the symptomatic cohort, mean IWP (96.9°), CWP (56.2°), and IPT (97.1°) angles were above
- 131 the high-risk threshold values, whereas the mean CPT (53.6°) angle fell below the cut-off
- 132 value of 89.4° for designation as a high-risk angle.

133 Discussion:

Our previous work used eleven symptomatic and eleven asymptomatic patients, to
determine several parameters of CW angioarchitecture predictive of higher risk for
experiencing future stroke. In this study, we validate this model within a significantly larger
cohort of asymptomatic patients with incidentally discovered CWs and a fresh
symptomatic cohort.

139 Our study found that within the group of asymptomatic patients with incidentally 140 discovered CWs, the mean values for all four angles fell below the predetermined 141 threshold values. Our results in this study, and in our previous work, have suggested that 142 CPT and IWP angles are particularly useful for delineating high versus low stroke risk. Thus, 143 these values may merit particular attention. However, while the mean angle values of the 144 asymptomatic cohort fell below each cutoff value, outlier angle values above the threshold 145 value were regularly seen. Similarly, symptomatic patients often have individual angle 146 measurements that fall within the low stroke risk category. Thus, angioarchitectural 147 parameters are more informative when considered as a group rather than when focusing on 148 the value of a singular parameter.

For instance, if two or more of the four angle parameters for a given patient fall above their respective cutoff values, this is much more likely to indicate a significant risk of stroke than does having only a single high-risk value. In this manner, it may be more useful to consider how many angle values out of the four total fall above or below the threshold. Patients may be stratified into 0, 1, or 2+ high-risk angle categories, allowing for more distinct risk assignment. However, these values must also be interpreted within the unique clinical context of each patient, and the clinician must use their best judgment in management.

CWs remain an underrecognized etiology of ischemic stroke.⁹ This is in part due to their rarity, considering they are present in only 1.0-1.2% of all stroke patients.² Additionally, in contrast to more common stroke etiologies like large atherosclerotic plaques, CWs are not traditionally associated with significant carotid stenosis and appear much more subtly on vascular imaging.¹⁰ Nonetheless, they have been demonstrated to significantly disrupt blood flow and can serve as a nidus for thrombus formation.¹¹ For this reason, CWs have

been said to increase the risk of stroke by a factor of 8.¹² However, no previous studies have
differentiated between symptomatic and asymptomatic CWs and their relative stroke
risks.

One significant challenge in research investigating CW stroke risk is that the cause of CWs
remains unknown. Thus, it is unclear if the difference between symptomatic and
asymptomatic CWs is one solely of structure, as in the case of different geometric features
("angioarchitecture"), or if other factors, such as accumulated time with a CW, may also
contribute to stroke. This is especially difficult considering it is undetermined whether CWs
are present from birth or if they develop later in life.

Regardless, the differentiation between symptomatic and asymptomatic webs is crucial,
as symptomaticity affects the next steps in clinical management and the determination of
whether intervention is indicated. In the case of symptomatic webs, current evidence
suggests that intervention is superior to conservative management, with one systematic
review of 158 patients with CWs demonstrating a 56% recurrent stroke rate in patients
receiving purely medical management versus a 0% recurrent stroke rate in those receiving
surgical intervention.¹³

178 Carotid endarterectomy (CEA) is one intervention that may reduce the risk of stroke

179 recurrence by resecting the carotid web, thereby clearing the ICA lumen.^{14,15} Therefore,

180 continuing to develop and validate a model to grade stroke risk of incidentally discovered

181 carotid webs may help identify high-risk patients who would benefit from intervention,

182 such as CEA or carotid artery stenting (CAS), as opposed to conservative management.

183 Similarly, patients with incidentally determined webs determined to have a low stroke risk

184 may then avoid the morbidity associated with unnecessary surgery.

185 While this study's results are encouraging and further validate this model of risk

186 assessment, there are several limitations. First, all angle measurements are measured by

187 hand, which makes this method prone to error from inter-user variability. While two

188 investigators made all measurements in this study, there may still be some variability

189 between them. A potential solution to this problem is the development of a machine

learning image segmentation program that can measure these angles on CTA imaging in a
consistent, standardized manner. This would also allow this method to be consistently

192 applied by different providers and across different institutions.

193 This study is also limited by its small sample size; this model of risk assessment will 194 require further validation and refinement within larger populations. Additionally, while our 195 angioarchitectural parameters are meant to serve as proxies for flow dynamics around the 196 CW, quantitative research is needed to determine if there are measurable flow dynamic 197 differences between symptomatic and asymptomatic webs. Lastly, while the 198 asymptomatic patients experienced no cerebrovascular events throughout their clinical 199 follow-up, this period ranged from two to just over six years, and follow-up over a longer 200 period may be necessary to definitively categorize patients as asymptomatic.

201

202 Conclusions:

Carotid webs with more high-risk angioarchitectural parameters on CTA, as defined by our 203 204 previous work, can be used to identify a heightened risk for stroke. These angle values are 205 most meaningful when assessed collectively for a patient. Having two or more high-risk 206 angles is associated with a high probability of stroke. The carotid web stroke risk 207 assessment strategy described in our previous work accurately categorized all 208 asymptomatic patients with incidentally discovered carotid webs as low stroke risk across 209 all four previously described parameters of carotid web angioarchitecture. Assessing 210 geometrical carotid web parameters may guide risk stratification of patients 211 with incidentally discovered webs, thereby improving the fidelity of surgical patient 212 selection.

213

Acknowledgments: The authors wish to thank Karl L. Sangwon for the illustrations
included in this article.

- 216 Data Statement: The data are not publicly available to preserve patient confidentiality and
- 217 due to institutional data sharing policies. However, the data are available from the
- 218 corresponding author on reasonable request and with appropriate institutional
- 219 approvals.
- 220 **Disclosures:** No relevant financial disclosures.
- 221

222 References:

- 2231. Esparza R, Schneider JR, Grory BM, Nossek E. How I do it: endarterectomy for224carotid web. Acta Neurochir (Wien). 2021;163(6):1763-1766. doi:10.1007/s00701-
- 225 021-04841-z
- <u>Choi PMC, Singh D, Trivedi A, et al. Carotid Webs and Recurrent Ischemic Strokes in</u>
 <u>the Era of CT Angiography. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2015;36(11):2134-2139.</u>
 <u>doi:10.3174/ajnr.A4431</u>
- Wojcik K, Milburn J, Vidal G, Steven A. Carotid Webs: Radiographic Appearance and
 Significance. *Ochsner J*. 2018;18(2):115-120. doi:10.31486/toj.18.0001
- Mei J, Chen D, Esenwa C, et al. Carotid web prevalence in a large hospital-based
 cohort and its association with ischemic stroke. *Clin Anat N Y N*. 2021;34(6):867 871. doi:10.1002/ca.23735
- 5. Smith-Bindman R, Kwan ML, Marlow EC, et al. Trends in Use of Medical Imaging in
- US Health Care Systems and in Ontario, Canada, 2000-2016. *JAMA*.
- 236 2019;322(9):843-856. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.11456
- 237 6. Yang T, Yoshida K, Maki T, et al. Prevalence and site of predilection of carotid webs
 238 focusing on symptomatic and asymptomatic Japanese patients. *J Neurosurg*.
- 239 2021;135(5):1370-1376. Published 2021 Mar 5. doi:10.3171/2020.8.JNS201727

240	7.	von Oiste GG, Sangwon KL, Chung C, et al. Use of Carotid Web Angioarchitecture for
241		Stroke Risk Assessment. World Neurosurg. 2024;182:e245-e252.
242		doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2023.11.091
243	8.	Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of
244		Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration.
245		<i>Epidemiology</i> . 2007;18(6):805-835. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181577511.
246	9.	Mac Grory B, Nossek E, Reznik ME, et al. Ipsilateral internal carotid artery web and
247		acute ischemic stroke: A cohort study, systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>PLoS</i>
248		One. 2021;16(9):e0257697. Published 2021 Sep 17.
249		doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0257697
250	10	. Park CC, El Sayed R, Risk BB, et al. Carotid webs produce greater hemodynamic
251		disturbances than atherosclerotic disease: a DSA time-density curve study. J
252		Neurointerv Surg. 2022;14(7):729-733. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2021-017588
253	11	. Mac Grory B, Emmer BJ, Roosendaal SD, Zagzag D, Yaghi S, Nossek E. Carotid web:
254		an occult mechanism of embolic stroke. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry.
255		2020;91(12):1283-1289. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2020-323938
256	12	. Coutinho JM, Derkatch S, Potvin AR, et al. Carotid artery web and ischemic stroke: A
257		case-control study [published correction appears in Neurology. 2017 Aug
258		1;89(5):521. doi: 10.1212/WNL.000000000004167]. <i>Neurology</i> . 2017;88(1):65-69.
259		doi:10.1212/WNL.00000000003464
260	13	. Zhang AJ, Dhruv P, Choi P, et al. A Systematic Literature Review of Patients With
261		Carotid Web and Acute Ischemic Stroke. Stroke. 2018;49(12):2872-2876.
262		doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.021907
263	14	. Haynes J, Raz E, Tanweer O, et al. Endarterectomy for symptomatic internal carotid
264		artery web. J Neurosurg. 2020;135(1):1-8. Published 2020 Aug 28.
265		doi:10.3171/2020.5.JNS201107

266	15. Brinster CJ, O'Leary J, Hayson A, et al. Symptomatic carotid webs require aggressive
267	intervention. J Vasc Surg. 2024;79(1):62-70. doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2023.09.002
268	
269	
270	
271	
272	
273	
274	
275	
276	
277	
278	
279	
280	
281	
282	
283	
284	
285	
286	
287	

288 Table 1. Angioarchitectural parameters and risk thresholds.

Angle	Angle Description	Risk Threshold
IWP	Angle between the Superior	≥92.4°
	Pouch-Wall line and the	
	Longitudinal Internal Carotid	
	Artery line	
CWP	Angle between the Superior	≥41.7°
	Pouch-Wall line and the	
	Longitudinal Common	
	Carotid Artery line	
IPT	Angle between the Pouch-	≥85.7°
	Bifurcation line and the	
	Longitudinal Internal Carotid	
	Artery line	
СРТ	Angle between the Pouch-	≥89.4°
	Bifurcation line and the	
	Longitudinal Common	
	Carotid Artery line	

289

290

292 Table 2. Demographics of patient population

	Symptomatic n (%)	Asymptomatic n (%)
Comorbidities		
Hypertension	9(75)	14(51
Hyperlipidemia	11(92)	12(44)
Smoking History	5(42)	13(48)
Race		
Black	2(17)	4(15
White	6(50)	15(56)
Asian	3(25)	2(7)
Hispanic	1(8)	1(4)
Unknown	0(0)	5(18)
Sex		
Male	4(33)	12(44)
Female	8(66)	15(56)

299

300

301 Table 3. Angle risk categorization for symptomatic and asymptomatic patients

	Symptomatic Col	nort (n=9)	Asymptomatic Cohort (n=26)	
Angle	n, high risk (%)	n, low risk (%)	n, high risk (%)	n, low risk (%)
IPT	6 (66.7)	3 (33.3)	2 (7.7)	24 (92.3)
CPT	0 (0.0)	9 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	26 (100.0)
IWP	4 (44.4)	5 (55.5)	5 (19.2)	21 (80.1)
CWP	5 (55.5)	4 (44.4)	5 (19.2)	21 (80.1)

Abbreviations: CPT, common carotid artery – pouch-tip; CWP, common carotid artery – web-pouch; IPT, internal carotid artery – pouch-tip; IWP, internal carotid artery – web pouch

302

303

304

305 Table 4. Positive and Negative Predictive Values of Angioarchitectural Parameters.

PPV (%)	NPV (%)
75.0	88.9
0.0	74.2
44.4	80.8
50.0	84.0
	PPV (%) 75.0 0.0 44.4 50.0

Abbreviations: CPT, common carotid artery – pouch-tip;

CWP, common carotid artery – web-pouch; IPT, internal

carotid artery - pouch-tip; IWP, internal carotid artery - web

pouch; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive

predictive value

306

Figure 1. Illustrations demonstrating the (A) ICA Web-Pouch (IWP) angle, CCA Web-Pouch (CWP) angle, (B) ICA Pouch-Tip (IPT) angle, and CCA Pouch-Tip (CPT) angle.





Figure 2. Stroke probability by the number of above-threshold angle values.