

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

2

3 Authors: Bruck Negash, BS¹; Daniel D. Wiggan, BS¹; Eric A. Grin, BS¹; Karl L. Sangwon, BS¹;
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

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

32

33 **Results:** 26 asymptomatic and nine symptomatic patients were identified. Patients were
34 categorized as having 0, 1, or 2+ high-risk angle values. Patients with more high-risk angles
35 had a markedly higher risk of stroke (OR = 5.91, 95% CI: [4.25, 8.24]). The probability of
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%)
38 high-risk angles. In the asymptomatic cohort, mean angles all fell below the high-risk
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.

42 **Conclusions:** Given the successful stratification of CWs into high and low-risk groups in
43 this study, the utilization of geometric CW parameters may play a crucial role in
44 improvement of patient selection for intervention in patients with an incidental diagnosis of
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

53 reported prevalence of 2.3%, as awareness of CWs rises, increasing numbers of patients
54 are being incidentally diagnosed.⁴ This number will likely continue to rise considering the
55 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
59 symptomatic and asymptomatic webs. In this manner, physicians currently have no way to
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
65 according to anatomic data on the ICA, common carotid artery (CCA), and CW (Table 1).⁷
66 This is accomplished by considering the web's key structural features and relationship to
67 the carotid bifurcation, a collection of findings we name the carotid web angioarchitecture.
68 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:**

73 A single-institution study was performed. Patient consent was waived per the institutional
74 review board (IRB s22-00111). Our electronic medical record database was queried for all
75 imaging impressions containing the word "carotid web" over the seven-year period from
76 2017-2024. Patients were identified to have CWs based on classic findings on CTA,
77 including a radiographic "shelf-like" filling defect at the posterior wall of the proximal
78 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
100 thresholds for each parameter. We performed a standard logistic regression to evaluate the
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
112 significant differences in age, sex, history of hypertension, history of hyperlipidemia or
113 smoking status were observed between the two cohorts (Table 2).

114 Logistic regression revealed a significant positive association between the number of high-
115 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
119 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:**

134 Our previous work used eleven symptomatic and eleven asymptomatic patients, to
135 determine several parameters of CW angioarchitecture predictive of higher risk for
136 experiencing future stroke. In this study, we validate this model within a significantly larger
137 cohort of asymptomatic patients with incidentally discovered CWs and a fresh
138 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.

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

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

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

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

171 Regardless, the differentiation between symptomatic and asymptomatic webs is crucial,
172 as symptomaticity affects the next steps in clinical management and the determination of
173 whether intervention is indicated. In the case of symptomatic webs, current evidence
174 suggests that intervention is superior to conservative management, with one systematic
175 review of 158 patients with CWs demonstrating a 56% recurrent stroke rate in patients
176 receiving purely medical management versus a 0% recurrent stroke rate in those receiving
177 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

190 learning image segmentation program that can measure these angles on CTA imaging in a
191 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:**

203 Carotid webs with more high-risk angioarchitectural parameters on CTA, as defined by our
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

214 **Acknowledgments:** The authors wish to thank Karl L. Sangwon for the illustrations
215 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:

- 223 1. Esparza R, Schneider JR, Groy BM, Nossek E. How I do it: endarterectomy for
224 carotid web. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2021;163(6):1763-1766. doi:10.1007/s00701-
225 021-04841-z
- 226 2. [Choi PMC, Singh D, Trivedi A, et al. Carotid Webs and Recurrent Ischemic Strokes in
227 the Era of CT Angiography. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2015;36\(11\):2134-2139.
228 doi:10.3174/ajnr.A4431](#)
- 229 3. Wojcik K, Milburn J, Vidal G, Steven A. Carotid Webs: Radiographic Appearance and
230 Significance. *Ochsner J*. 2018;18(2):115-120. doi:10.31486/toj.18.0001
- 231 4. Mei J, Chen D, Esenwa C, et al. Carotid web prevalence in a large hospital-based
232 cohort and its association with ischemic stroke. *Clin Anat N Y N*. 2021;34(6):867-
233 871. doi:10.1002/ca.23735
- 234 5. Smith-Bindman R, Kwan ML, Marlow EC, et al. Trends in Use of Medical Imaging in
235 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. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of
244 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration.
245 *Epidemiology.* 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. *PLoS*
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.0000000000004167]. *Neurology.* 2017;88(1):65-69.
259 doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000003464
- 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 Pouch-Wall line and the Longitudinal Internal Carotid Artery line	$\geq 92.4^\circ$
CWP	Angle between the Superior Pouch-Wall line and the Longitudinal Common Carotid Artery line	$\geq 41.7^\circ$
IPT	Angle between the Pouch-Bifurcation line and the Longitudinal Internal Carotid Artery line	$\geq 85.7^\circ$
CPT	Angle between the Pouch-Bifurcation line and the Longitudinal Common Carotid Artery line	$\geq 89.4^\circ$

289

290

291

292 Table 2. Demographics of patient population

	Symptomatic n (%)	Asymptomatic n (%)
<hr/>		
Comorbidities		
Hypertension	9(75)	14(51)
Hyperlipidemia	11(92)	12(44)
Smoking History	5(42)	13(48)
<hr/>		
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)
<hr/>		
Sex		
Male	4(33)	12(44)
Female	8(66)	15(56)

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

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

Angle	Symptomatic Cohort (n=9)		Asymptomatic Cohort (n=26)	
	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.

Angle	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
IPT	75.0	88.9
CPT	0.0	74.2
IWP	44.4	80.8
CWP	50.0	84.0

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

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.

