

1 **Cost-Effectiveness of Platelet Function Testing in Dual Antiplatelet Therapy Decision-**
2 **Making after Intracranial Aneurysm Treatment with Flow Diversion**

3 Aryan Wadhwa, B.A.¹, Felipe Ramirez-Velandia, M.D.^{1,2}, Emmanuel Mensah M.D.^{1,2}, Mira Salih, M.D.¹,
4 Alejandro Enriquez-Marulanda, M.D.^{1,2}, Michael Young, D.O.^{1,2}, Philipp Taussky, M.D.^{1,2}, Christopher
5 S. Ogilvy, M.D.^{1,2}

6 ¹ Neurosurgical Service, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, United States

7 ² Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States.

8

9 Corresponding Author:

10 Christopher S. Ogilvy, M.D.

11 BIDMC Brain Aneurysm Institute, Department of Neurosurgery, Harvard Medical School,

12 110 Francis St,

13 Boston, MA 02215, USA.

14 Email: cogilvy@bidmc.harvard.edu

15

16 Abstract Word Count: 296

17 Text Word Count: 2483

18 Number of tables: 3

19 Number of figures: 3

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 **Abstract**

33 **Introduction:**

34 Dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) use is the standard of practice after flow diversion (FD) for intracranial
35 aneurysms (IAs). Yet, no consensus exists in the literature regarding the optimal regimen. Certain
36 institutions utilize various platelet function testing (PFT) to assess patient responsiveness to DAPT.
37 Clopidogrel is the most commonly prescribed drug during DAPT, yet up to 52% of patients can be non-
38 responders justifying PFT. Additionally, prices vary significantly among antiplatelet drugs, often further
39 complicated by insurance restrictions. We aimed to determine the most cost-effective strategy for
40 deciding DAPT regimens for patients after ICA treatment.

41 **Methods:**

42 A decision tree with Monte Carlo simulations was performed to simulate patients undergoing various
43 three-month postoperative DAPT regimens. Patients were either universally administered aspirin
44 alongside Clopidogrel, Ticagrelor, or Prasugrel without PFT, or administered one of the former
45 thienopyridine medications based on platelet reactivity unit (PRU) results after Clopidogrel. Input data for
46 the model were extracted from the current literature, and the willingness-to-pay threshold (WTP) was
47 defined as \$100,000 per QALY as per standard practice in the US. The baseline comparison was with
48 universal Clopidogrel DAPT without any PFT. Probabilistic and deterministic sensitivity analyses were
49 performed to evaluate the robustness of the model.

50 **Results:**

51 PFT-Prasugrel was the most cost-effective regimen compared to universal Clopidogrel, with a base-case
52 incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of \$-35,255 (cost \$2336.67, effectiveness 0.85). PFT-
53 Ticagrelor (ICER \$-4,671; cost \$2,995.06, effectiveness 0.84), universal Prasugrel (ICER \$5,553; cost
54 \$3,097.30, effectiveness 0.84), and universal Ticagrelor (ICER \$75,969; cost \$3,801.36, effectiveness
55 0.84) were all more cost-effective than treating patients with universal Clopidogrel (cost \$3,041.77,
56 effectiveness 0.83). These conclusions remain robust in probabilistic and deterministic sensitivity
57 analyses.

58 **Conclusion:**

59 The most cost-effective strategy for DAPT after FD for intracranial aneurysms is administering PFT-
60 Prasugrel alongside aspirin. The cost of PFT is strongly justified and recommended when deciding
61 patient-specific DAPT regimens.

62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the adoption of Flow Diversion (FD) for the management of intracranial aneurysms (IAs) has shown consistent expansion.¹ Flow diverters' elevated metal coverage ratio necessitates the post-procedural application of dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) to mitigate the risk of thromboembolic complications (TECs) after stent placement. However, there is no consensus in the literature as to what the optimal postoperative DAPT regimen should be.

Across the US, the combination of Clopidogrel and aspirin represents the predominant choice for DAPT following FD.² However, 16 to 52% of patients exhibit Clopidogrel resistance, potentially elevating their risk of TECs to as much as 17%.³⁻⁵ To address those concerns, up to 90% of US institutions now implement various platelet function testing (PFT) to determine patients' responsiveness to Clopidogrel before FD stent placement.² Currently, the VerifyNow test, which quantifies platelet reactivity units (PRU), stands as the prevailing PFT in neurointervention due to its practicality, allowing for bedside implementation.³

However, not only does PFT bear a cost, but alternative antiplatelet medications such as Prasugrel or Ticagrelor, which may be prescribed in cases of Clopidogrel resistance, are often more expensive for patients, potentially affecting compliance to DAPT.⁶ In some cases, health insurance companies are reluctant to approve higher costs for these alternative antiplatelet therapies unless PFT has been done.

This study aims to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of various strategies for determining the most appropriate postoperative DAPT regimen following FD intervention for unruptured IAs, focusing on comparing universally applied DAPT protocols and those guided by VerifyNow PFT outcomes.

92

93

94

METHODS

95

96 *Setting*

97 All data and information were obtained from literature sources. Due to the nature of these sources,
98 approval from an institutional review board (IRB) was deemed unnecessary. This study did not receive
99 any financial support for its conduct.

100

101 *Decision Tree*

102 A decision tree model was built using TreeAge Pro 2024 (TreeAge Software, Inc.) to estimate the cost-
103 effectiveness (measured by quality-adjusted life-years [QALYs]) of universal or PRU-driven use of
104 DAPT in patients post-endovascular treatment for unruptured IAs. Post-procedural DAPT regimens
105 reported in the included studies were analyzed, assuming all patients received appropriate preoperative
106 loading doses of Clopidogrel. Our model assessed five different strategies, comprising: (1) universal and
107 affordably priced Clopidogrel, control; (2) universal Ticagrelor; (3) universal Prasugrel; (4) PRU-guided
108 Ticagrelor; and (5) PRU-guided Prasugrel. Double-dose Clopidogrel (150 mg/day) was omitted due to a
109 lack of efficacy support from clinical trials.⁷ The universal strategies were created, utilizing reference data
110 from cohorts with upfront use of thienopyridines without PFTs.^{8,9} In the Ticagrelor and Prasugrel PRU-
111 guided treatment strategies, data was retrieved from meta-analyses and large cohorts, including patients
112 undergoing VerifyNow P2Y12 prior to the procedure, guiding the need and change in therapy where
113 appropriate.¹⁰⁻¹² Patients included in these cohorts received Clopidogrel if documented to have adequate
114 platelet inhibition or were switched to Ticagrelor or Prasugrel, depending on the clinician criteria.
115 Maintenance dosages included in the studies were Clopidogrel 75 mg/day, Ticagrelor 90 mg twice daily,
116 and Prasugrel 10 mg/day, each combined with aspirin (dose ranging from 75 to 325 mg/day, as
117 appropriate).

118

119 The outcomes of the model were three different health states: (1) well after a thromboembolic or
120 hemorrhagic complication (mRS of 0-2); (2) disabled after a thromboembolic or hemorrhagic
121 complication (mRS 3-5); and (3) deceased after a thromboembolic or hemorrhagic complication. Utilizing
122 a Monte Carlo simulation, parallel cohorts of 10,000 individual patients receiving DAPT after
123 endovascular treatment for IAs were tracked across various regimens. The model started with the decision
124 to initiate 1 of the 5 previously mentioned DAPT regimens. Each patient's clinical pathway was simulated
125 by sampling the probability distribution of relevant clinical parameters, including transition probabilities,
126 utilities, and costs sourced from the literature. Costs, denominated in United States dollars (USD), and
127 effectiveness, measured in QALYs, were then computed for comparison. The overall cost-effectiveness
128 was assessed using net monetary benefit (NMB), which integrates cost, effectiveness, and the incremental
129 cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) to determine the optimal strategy. The ICER is defined as (cost of strategy
130 1 – cost of reference strategy)/(utility of strategy 1 – utility of reference strategy).

131

132 *Clinical Parameters*

133 According to prior cost analyses, VerifyNow costs \$30, and the yearly cost of a DAPT regimen with
134 Clopidogrel is \$639, Ticagrelor is \$3,348, and Prasugrel is \$2,496.⁶ Costs from disability, hemorrhage,
135 and rates of thromboembolic complications (TECs) were retrieved from past cost analyses literature
136 (**Table 1**).¹³

137

138 All probability parameters were taken from the most up-to-date meta-analysis and large cohort studies
139 (**Table 2**).⁷⁻¹² Since the model was simulated over a short period of time (3 months), a discount rate and
140 half-cycle correction was not deemed necessary to be applied to all the competing strategies. The
141 willingness-to-pay (WTP) threshold was set at \$100,000 per QALY gained as per the standard practice of
142 cost-effectiveness analysis in the United States.

143

144 **Results**

145 *Base Case Analysis*

146 In the base case calculation, where mean values of the clinical parameters are utilized, PFT-Prasugrel
147 yielded the highest cost-effectiveness of 0.85 QALYs with a total cost of \$2,336.67 (ICER \$-35,255;
148 NMB \$82,700). All other strategies were considered cost-effective compared to universal Clopidogrel,
149 given that their ICERs were lower than the WTP, and all had higher net monetary benefits than universal
150 Clopidogrel. The total costs and quality-adjusted life-years for each strategy during the 3-month simulated
151 period are listed in **Table 3**.

152

153 *Deterministic Sensitivity Analysis*

154 The deterministic sensitivity analysis involves adjusting the values of specific variables that may be
155 relevant to the outcome, conducting this adjustment individually for one-way sensitivity analysis and in
156 pairs for two-way sensitivity analysis, while maintaining the constancy of other variables. This process
157 evaluates if the preferred strategy shifts when these variable ranges are altered. The variables noted to
158 have the most considerable impact on incremental NMB were TEC and bleed mortality rates, along with
159 disability rates after a TEC or bleed (**Figure 2A**). Given that variation in complication rates is the primary
160 differentiating factor between regimens, other than cost, this comes as no surprise. An additional variable
161 that we considered for a sensitivity analysis was the cost of platelet function testing itself, given that this
162 would be a determining factor at many institutions (**Figure 2B**). Key parameters, such as treatment costs,
163 effectiveness, and discount rates, were individually altered within plausible limits to evaluate their impact
164 on the ICER. Threshold analyses identified the critical points at which parameter changes would alter the
165 preferred strategy.

166 *Probabilistic Sensitivity Analyses*

167 A probabilistic sensitivity analysis was conducted, simulating a cohort of 10,000 patients across various
168 iterations. Within this framework, five distinct follow-up strategies were evaluated using the Monte Carlo
169 simulation method. This analysis revealed that PFT-PSG continued to be the most economically viable

170 option, demonstrating the greatest NMB for any WTP threshold, as depicted in the cost-effectiveness
171 acceptability curve (**Figure 3**). Further, Monte Carlo acceptability analysis indicated that PFT-PSG was
172 identified as the most cost-effective strategy in approximately 70% of iterations, considering the standard
173 WTP threshold of \$100,000 per QALY (**Figure 3**).

174

175 **Discussion**

176 Cost-effective analyses, like our study utilizing a decision tree model, help understand the value of
177 medical interventions in terms of cost per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained. Our study
178 demonstrated that PFT-Prasugrel (Clopidogrel for responders and Prasugrel for non-responders detected
179 on PFT) is the most cost-effective DAPT strategy for post-FD treatment of UIAs. Universal Prasugrel,
180 PFT-Ticagrelor, and universal Ticagrelor were also considered cost-effective compared to universal
181 Clopidogrel, assuming a WTP threshold of \$100,000/QALY. Prasugrel and Ticagrelor are associated with
182 higher annual drug costs, compared to Clopidogrel. However, these higher costs were offset in
183 corresponding regimens by their better effectiveness in improving thromboembolic complications, which
184 is critical in patients treated with FD. These findings conclude that the use of PFT to guide the choice of
185 DAPT regimen following FD is not only clinically effective but also cost-effective.

186 Our study is the first of its kind in evaluating the cost-effectiveness of PFT to guide DAPT regimen
187 choice for patients post-FD treatment for unruptured IAs. Previous studies in cardiovascular literature,
188 however, have studied the cost-effectiveness of DAPT. Coleman et al. compared similar DAPT strategies
189 in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS), demonstrating that platelet reactivity assay (PRA) (e.g.,
190 VerifyNow) driven Prasugrel and Ticagrelor were cost-effective to universal Clopidogrel.⁶ In this study,
191 universal Ticagrelor and Prasugrel were also found to be cost-effective compared to their respective PRA-
192 driven regimens. These results were most sensitive to differences in drug costs and drug-specific relative
193 risks of death. It should be noted that whilst our study did not focus on a specific age group, Coleman et
194 al. focused on a defined cohort of 65-year-old ACS patients.⁶ Additionally, the group's economic analysis

195 was primarily based on model assumptions and hypothetical cohorts, which might limit the
196 generalizability of the results. Other cardiovascular studies have considered cost-effectiveness via
197 genotype testing-driven DAPT regimens, checking for loss-of-function (LOF) alleles, after ACS and
198 percutaneous coronary intervention. Limdi et al. found that utilizing both universal Ticagrelor and
199 genotype-guided escalation of Ticagrelor was more cost-effective than universal Clopidogrel.¹⁵ A
200 secondary analysis in this study, which evaluated genotype-guided de-escalation, showed higher
201 effectiveness compared to nonguided de-escalation but was not cost-effective under most WTP
202 thresholds. In addition to drug prices, the cost-effectiveness of genotype-guided strategies in this study
203 could be sensitive to the prevalence of LOF genes. A second genotype-guided economic evaluation model
204 by Kazi et al. showed genotype-guided therapy using Ticagrelor or Prasugrel for patients with LOF alleles
205 is cost-effective compared to universal application of these drugs.¹⁶ In this study, genotype-guided
206 Ticagrelor had an ICER of \$30,200 per QALY compared to Clopidogrel. Temporal differences exist
207 between our study and the evaluation by Kazi et al., who discuss lifetime costs and outcomes, compared
208 to the shorter 3-month focus we used which is the typical amount of time that DAPT regimens are
209 required post-FD.¹⁶ These studies evaluating the cost-effectiveness of DAPT regimens emphasize that
210 personalized approaches to managing DAPT, whether through genetic testing or PFT, can lead to better
211 economic and clinical outcomes. However, the specific focus on different patient populations,
212 interventions, and biomarkers for personalization suggests that findings from each study are best applied
213 within their respective contexts.

214 Despite our findings' clear benefit of PFT, there is no consensus on the cut-off point for defining
215 Clopidogrel hyporesponsiveness. Cut-off values of P2Y12 reaction units (PRU) of 85–208 have been
216 described in cardiac literature as adequate Clopidogrel response, with PRU < 85 reported to be associated
217 with a higher risk of bleeding events and PRU > 230 associated with significant morbidity and
218 mortality.^{6,17} PRU studies in neurosurgery literature report adequate Clopidogrel response to fall between
219 the ranges of PRU 60–240, with dose changes required at either end of the scale: for PRU < 60, lower

220 doses are advised; for PRU >240, increasing Clopidogrel dose or switching to either Prasugrel or
221 Ticagrelor is advised. To further reduce complication risk, additional Clopidogrel stratification has been
222 employed, with Clopidogrel response defined as extreme response (PRU \leq 15) and hyperresponse (PRU
223 16 – 60).¹⁸ In addition to Clopidogrel responsiveness, PRU responsiveness to Prasugrel has also been
224 studied, with dose changes effected according to cut-off values. Higashiguchi et al. and Suyama et al.
225 reported three different Prasugrel doses in patients post-FD treatment, with a 20 mg loading dose and
226 daily 3.75mg for PRU > 210, daily 3.75mg for PRU 60 – 210, and daily 1.875 mg for PRU < 60.^{8,19}
227 Variability in pharmacodynamic response to antiplatelets is also seen with Ticagrelor, where the
228 established twice-daily 90 mg dose can lead to PRU values < 40, converting Clopidogrel hyporesponders
229 to extreme responders.^{18,20}

230 Additionally, universal Prasugrel was a cost-effective strategy and commonly preferred regimen at
231 several institutions.² Resistance to Prasugrel, which has been reported in other cohorts, has been more
232 linked to medication adherence and pharmacological interactions, rather than genetic variants.²¹ In
233 contrast to Clopidogrel, Prasugrel is a prodrug that requires activation through intestinal esterase and, to a
234 lesser extent, CYP2C19 and CYP2C9.²² Additionally, unlike Clopidogrel, studies evaluating genetic
235 polymorphisms have not revealed any effects on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamic effects of
236 Prasugrel.²³ Possible explanations for this phenomenon include alternative activation through different
237 hepatic CYP enzymes and higher potency as an irreversible ADP P2Y₁₂ receptor antagonist.^{3,24,25} Due to
238 Prasugrel's high potency, some initial concerns arose regarding the heightened risk of intracranial
239 hemorrhage in patients with a history of ischemic stroke.^{26,27} For outpatient neurovascular procedures, as
240 unruptured IAs treated with FD, various cohorts have demonstrated a favorable safety profile for
241 Prasugrel.^{28–31} In the meta-analysis by Podlasek et al., comprising 49 studies and 2,526 patients
242 undergoing FD treatment for unruptured IAs, hemorrhagic events were negligible for Prasugrel.¹²
243 Similarly, in the cohort reported by Souyama et al., in which there was routine use of Prasugrel post-FD
244 for 3-6 months, out of the 110 patients, only one had a hemorrhage after treatment.⁸ Overall, these

245 findings underscore Prasugrel's promising safety and efficacy profile in the context of FD, warranting
246 further exploration in prospective clinical trials.

247 While insightful, our study is not without limitations. The reliance on retrospective cohorts and model-
248 based simulations may not capture the full complexity of individual patient responses in a real-world
249 setting. The heterogeneity of included studies also limits our retrospective approach in determining
250 thromboembolic and hemorrhagic rates. The paucity of data from meta-analyses also led to our reliance
251 on the best available retrospective cohorts, which has limitations. Retrospective analyses are subject to
252 selection bias and confounding. This, along with the heterogeneity in the sample set and variation in the
253 duration of DAPT, may produce findings that are not always generalizable. Moreover, we also omitted
254 double-dose Clopidogrel as a DAPT regimen, which may be efficacious in a subset of individuals with
255 Clopidogrel hyporesponsiveness.³² An additional limitation that was difficult to circumvent due to the
256 lack of stratified reporting in the literature was the difference in the rates of various types of bleeding
257 events and the mortality rates of each of those types, which also varies by type of regimen. There were
258 not enough studies considering all these possible variations and elucidating each of these individual rates.
259 Finally, our use of the decision tree model for economic valuations, which is contingent on the accuracy
260 of the cost data and assumptions we embedded in the model, might not reflect the dynamic nature of
261 healthcare economics and patient management. Notably, our decision tree model did not account for the
262 influence of age, gender, or specific patient comorbidities. It also assumed that rates of thromboembolic
263 and hemorrhagic events would remain constant over the three-month study period. Thus, future studies
264 should aim to incorporate more diverse patient data and real-world outcomes, where available, to validate
265 and refine the proposed cost-effectiveness framework.

266

267 **Conclusion**

268 We have demonstrated that PFT-guided therapy, using Prasugrel for Clopidogrel hyporesponsiveness,
269 was the most cost-effective strategy guiding DAPT post-FD treatment of unruptured IAs. Furthermore,

270 prescribing universal Prasugrel, PFT-guided Ticagrelor, or universal Ticagrelor were also cost-effective
271 compared to prescribing universal Clopidogrel. Although this sheds light on the potential cost benefits of
272 initiating Prasugrel DAPT upfront, future prospective, and ideally randomized clinical trials are necessary
273 to evaluate the safety of this intervention post-FD.

274

275 **Declarations:**

276 *Funding:* The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work. No funding
277 was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript. No funding was received for conducting
278 this study.

279 *Conflicts of interest:* All authors have declared that they have no financial relationships at present or
280 within the previous three years with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work.
281 All authors have declared that there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have
282 influenced the submitted work.

283 *Availability of data and material:* All information in the study is publicly available

284 *Code Availability:* No code were used in this study

285 *Ethics approval:* Due to the nature of this study being a retrospective analysis of publicly available data,
286 IRB approval was not deemed necessary for this study.

287 *Consent to participate:* Informed consent not required due to the nature of this study.

288 *Consent for publication:* Authors provide consent for publication of all materials

289

290

291 **Acknowledgements:** The study team would like to thank the Brain Aneurysm Institute. Their invaluable
292 support has been crucial in providing comprehensive care to aneurysm patients and contributing to the
293 research of intracranial aneurysms.

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301 **References**

302

- 303 1. Mirpuri P, Khalid SI, McGuire LS, Alaraj A. Trends in Ruptured and Unruptured Aneurysmal
304 Treatment from 2010 to 2020: A Focus on Flow Diversion. *World Neurosurg.* 2023;178:e48-e56.
305 doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2023.06.093
- 306 2. Gupta R, Moore JM, Griessenauer CJ, et al. Assessment of Dual-Antiplatelet Regimen for Pipeline
307 Embolization Device Placement: A Survey of Major Academic Neurovascular Centers in the United
308 States. *World Neurosurg.* 2016;96:285-292. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2016.09.013
- 309 3. Taylor LI, Dickerson JC, Dambrino RJ, et al. Platelet testing in flow diversion: a review of the
310 evidence. *Neurosurg Focus.* 2017;42(6):E5. doi:10.3171/2017.3.FOCUS1746
- 311 4. Lim ST, Thijs V, Murphy SJX, et al. Platelet function/reactivity testing and prediction of risk of
312 recurrent vascular events and outcomes after TIA or ischaemic stroke: systematic review and meta-
313 analysis. *J Neurol.* 2020;267(10):3021-3037. doi:10.1007/s00415-020-09932-y
- 314 5. Adeeb N, Griessenauer CJ, Foreman PM, et al. Use of Platelet Function Testing Before Pipeline
315 Embolization Device Placement: A Multicenter Cohort Study. *Stroke.* 2017;48(5):1322-1330.
316 doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.015308
- 317 6. Coleman CI, Limone BL. Cost-Effectiveness of Universal and Platelet Reactivity Assay-Driven
318 Antiplatelet Therapy in Acute Coronary Syndrome. *The American Journal of Cardiology.*
319 2013;112(3):355-362. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2013.03.036
- 320 7. Mehta SR, Tanguay JF, Eikelboom JW, et al. Double-dose versus standard-dose clopidogrel and high-
321 dose versus low-dose aspirin in individuals undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention for acute
322 coronary syndromes (CURRENT-OASIS 7): a randomised factorial trial. *Lancet.*
323 2010;376(9748):1233-1243. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61088-4
- 324 8. Suyama K, Nakahara I, Matsumoto S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy with the
325 Routine Use of Prasugrel for Flow Diversion of Cerebral Unruptured Aneurysms. *Clin Neuroradiol.*
326 2024;34(1):201-208. doi:10.1007/s00062-023-01355-2
- 327 9. Papaxanthos J, Cagnazzo F, Collemiche FL, et al. Ticagrelor versus clopidogrel dual antiplatelet
328 therapy for unruptured intracranial aneurysms treated with flowdiverter. *J Neuroradiol.*
329 2023;50(3):346-351. doi:10.1016/j.neurad.2022.11.010

- 330 10. Flynn LM, Mohamed E, Dobbs N, et al. Safety of dual antiplatelet therapy using aspirin and low-
331 dose Prasugrel with platelet reactivity testing in flow diverter treatment of intracranial aneurysms.
332 *Interv Neuroradiol*. Published online November 29, 2023:15910199231217142.
333 doi:10.1177/15910199231217142
- 334 11. Neyens R, Donaldson C, Andrews C, Kellogg R, Spiotta A. Platelet Function Testing with a
335 VerifyNow-Directed Personalized Antiplatelet Strategy and Associated Rates of Thromboembolic
336 Complications After Pipeline Embolization for Complex Cerebral Aneurysms. *World Neurosurg*.
337 2020;138:e674-e682. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2020.03.046
- 338 12. Podlasek A, Al Sultan AA, Assis Z, Kashani N, Goyal M, Almekhlafi MA. Outcome of
339 intracranial flow diversion according to the antiplatelet regimen used: a systematic review and meta-
340 analysis. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2020;12(2):148-155. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2019-014996
- 341 13. Salem MM, Salih M, Nwajei F, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analytic Comparison of Neuroimaging
342 Follow-Up Strategies After Pipeline Embolization Device Treatment of Unruptured Intracranial
343 Aneurysms. *World Neurosurg*. 2022;158:e206-e213. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2021.10.154
- 344 14. Arias E, Xu J, Kochanek K. United States Life Tables, 2021. *Natl Vital Stat Rep*. 2023;72(12):1-
345 64.
- 346 15. Limdi NA, Cavallari LH, Lee CR, et al. Cost-effectiveness of CYP2C19-guided antiplatelet
347 therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome and percutaneous coronary intervention informed by
348 real-world data. *Pharmacogenomics J*. 2020;20(5):724-735. doi:10.1038/s41397-020-0162-5
- 349 16. Kazi DS, Garber AM, Shah RU, et al. Cost-effectiveness of genotype-guided and dual antiplatelet
350 therapies in acute coronary syndrome. *Ann Intern Med*. 2014;160(4):221-232. doi:10.7326/M13-1999
- 351 17. Sibbing D, Aradi D, Alexopoulos D, et al. Updated Expert Consensus Statement on Platelet
352 Function and Genetic Testing for Guiding P2Y12 Receptor Inhibitor Treatment in Percutaneous
353 Coronary Intervention. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2019;12(16):1521-1537.
354 doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2019.03.034
- 355 18. Young CC, Bass DI, Cruz MJ, et al. Clopidogrel hyper-response increases peripheral
356 hemorrhagic complications without increasing intracranial complications in endovascular aneurysm
357 treatments requiring dual antiplatelet therapy. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2022;105:66-72.
358 doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2022.09.005
- 359 19. Higashiguchi S, Sadato A, Nakahara I, et al. Reduction of thromboembolic complications during
360 the endovascular treatment of unruptured aneurysms by employing a tailored dual antiplatelet regimen
361 using aspirin and prasugrel. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2021;13(11):1044-1048. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-
362 2020-016994
- 363 20. Kim KS, Fraser JF, Grupke S, Cook AM. Management of antiplatelet therapy in patients
364 undergoing neuroendovascular procedures. *J Neurosurg*. 2018;129(4):890-905.
365 doi:10.3171/2017.5.JNS162307
- 366 21. Lhermusier T, Lipinski MJ, Tantry US, et al. Meta-analysis of direct and indirect comparison of
367 ticagrelor and prasugrel effects on platelet reactivity. *Am J Cardiol*. 2015;115(6):716-723.
368 doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2014.12.029

- 369 22. Krishnan K, Nguyen TN, Appleton JP, et al. Antiplatelet Resistance: A Review of Concepts,
370 Mechanisms, and Implications for Management in Acute Ischemic Stroke and Transient Ischemic
371 Attack. *Stroke: Vascular and Interventional Neurology*. 2023;3(3):e000576.
372 doi:10.1161/SVIN.122.000576
- 373 23. Brandt JT, Close SL, Iturria SJ, et al. Common polymorphisms of CYP2C19 and CYP2C9 affect
374 the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic response to clopidogrel but not prasugrel. *J Thromb*
375 *Haemost*. 2007;5(12):2429-2436. doi:10.1111/j.1538-7836.2007.02775.x
- 376 24. Mega JL, Close SL, Wiviott SD, et al. Cytochrome P450 genetic polymorphisms and the response
377 to prasugrel: relationship to pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, and clinical outcomes. *Circulation*.
378 2009;119(19):2553-2560. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.109.851949
- 379 25. Flechtenmacher N, Kämmerer F, Dittmer R, et al. Clopidogrel Resistance in Neurovascular
380 Stenting: Correlations between Light Transmission Aggregometry, VerifyNow, and the Multiplate.
381 *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2015;36(10):1953-1958. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A4388
- 382 26. Akbari SH, Reynolds MR, Kadkhodayan Y, Cross DT, Moran CJ. Hemorrhagic complications
383 after prasugrel (Effient) therapy for vascular neurointerventional procedures. *J Neurointerv Surg*.
384 2013;5(4):337-343. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2012-010334
- 385 27. Kitazono T, Toyoda K, Kitagawa K, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Prasugrel by Stroke Subtype: A
386 Sub-Analysis of the PRASTRO-I Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Atheroscler Thromb*.
387 2021;28(2):169-180. doi:10.5551/jat.56093
- 388 28. Chalouhi N, Tjoumakaris S, Phillips JLH, et al. A single pipeline embolization device is
389 sufficient for treatment of intracranial aneurysms. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2014;35(8):1562-1566.
390 doi:10.3174/ajnr.A3957
- 391 29. Stetler WR, Chaudhary N, Thompson BG, Gemmete JJ, Maher CO, Pandey AS. Prasugrel is
392 effective and safe for neurointerventional procedures. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2013;5(4):332-336.
393 doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2012-010302
- 394 30. Daou B, Starke RM, Chalouhi N, et al. P2Y12 Reaction Units: Effect on Hemorrhagic and
395 Thromboembolic Complications in Patients With Cerebral Aneurysms Treated With the Pipeline
396 Embolization Device. *Neurosurgery*. 2016;78(1):27. doi:10.1227/NEU.0000000000000978
- 397 31. Guédon A, Clarençon F, Maria FD, et al. Very late ischemic complications in flow-diverter
398 stents: a retrospective analysis of a single-center series. *Journal of Neurosurgery*. 2016;125(4):929-
399 935. doi:10.3171/2015.10.JNS15703
- 400 32. Sardella G, Calcagno S, Mancone M, et al. Pharmacodynamic effect of switching therapy in
401 patients with high on-treatment platelet reactivity and genotype variation with high clopidogrel Dose
402 versus prasugrel: the RESET GENE trial. *Circ Cardiovasc Interv*. 2012;5(5):698-704.
403 doi:10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.112.972463
- 404 33. Wali AR, Park CC, Santiago-Dieppa DR, Vaida F, Murphy JD, Khalessi AA. Pipeline
405 embolization device versus coiling for the treatment of large and giant unruptured intracranial
406 aneurysms: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2017;42(6):E6.
407 doi:10.3171/2017.3.FOCUS1749

- 408 34. Brinjikji W, Lanzino G, Cloft HJ, Siddiqui AH, Kallmes DF. Risk Factors for Hemorrhagic
409 Complications following Pipeline Embolization Device Treatment of Intracranial Aneurysms: Results
410 from the International Retrospective Study of the Pipeline Embolization Device. *AJNR Am J*
411 *Neuroradiol.* 2015;36(12):2308-2313. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A4443
- 412 35. Brinjikji W, Lanzino G, Cloft HJ, et al. Risk Factors for Ischemic Complications following
413 Pipeline Embolization Device Treatment of Intracranial Aneurysms: Results from the IntrePED Study.
414 *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2016;37(9):1673-1678. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A4807
- 415 36. Zhou Y, He S, Hu Y. One year clinical outcome of dual anti-platelet therapy with the Novel
416 Ticagrelor plus Aspirin versus Clopidogrel plus Aspirin for Endovascular Intervention of patients with
417 Intracranial Aneurysm: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases.*
418 2024;33(1):107491. doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2023.107491

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463

Figure Legends

Figure 1 – Simplified decision tree used to model five different DAPT regimens after FD. TEC, thromboembolic complications. mRS, modified Rankin Scale.

Figure 2A – Two-way sensitivity analysis varying the rate of mortality after a hemorrhagic complication (x-axis) and the rate of mortality after an ischemic complication (y-axis).

Figure 2B – One-way sensitivity analysis varying the cost of platelet function testing. A higher NMB is more cost-effective. The values on the x-axis and y-axis are USD.

Figure 3 – Probabilistic sensitivity analysis: cost-effectiveness acceptability curve at various WTP values.

464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471

Table 1. Clinical Parameters and Their Distribution

Variable	Value	Distribution Type	References
Start age, yrs	60 years	Gamma	ref
<u>Costs, \$</u>			
Clopidogrel, yearly	\$639 (48–1,160)	Gamma	⁶ 5/26/2024 7:32:00 PM
Prasugrel, yearly	\$2,496 (1,583–3,408)	Gamma	⁶
Ticagrelor, yearly	\$3,348 (1,982–4,014)	Gamma	⁶
VerifyNow testing	\$30 (14–60)	Gamma	⁶
Bleeding	\$7,970 (3,045–20,861)	Gamma	⁶
Chronic care for mRS 0-2	\$1,251.43 (751–1752)	Gamma	¹³
Chronic care for mRS 3-5	\$14,405.76 (8,643–20,168)	Gamma	¹³
<u>Utilities</u>			
mRS 0-2	0.851 ± 0.18	Triangular	³³
mRS 3-5	0.478 ± 0.24	Triangular	³³
Death	0	Fixed	¹³
<u>Probabilities</u>			
Death after bleed	0.45	Beta	³⁴
Death after TEC	0.01215	Beta	³⁵
Disabled after bleed	0.5	Beta	³⁴

Disabled after TEC	0.033	Beta	³⁵

472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483

Table 2. Rates of outcomes documented in the literature and used for the creation of the Decision Model

Probability	CPG	PFT PSG	PSG	PFT TCG	TCG	Distributions
TEC	0.073	0.028	0.064	0.043	0.105	Beta
Bleed	0.039	0	0.018	0.016	0.009	Beta
Reference	³⁶	^{10,12}	⁸	³⁶	⁹	

484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497

498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506


Table 3. Base-case estimates of treatment costs and QALYs

Regimen	Costs	QALYs	ICER vs Universal Clopidogrel	NMB
Universal Clopidogrel	\$3,041.77	0.83	NA	\$79,834.57
PFT-Prasugrel	\$2,336.67	0.85	-35,255	\$82,700.07
Universal Prasugrel	\$3,097.30	0.84	5,553	\$80,898.70
PFT-Ticagrelor	\$2,995.06	0.84	-4,671	\$81,135.85
Universal Ticagrelor	\$3,801.36	0.84	75,969	\$80,602.73

507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518

519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527


Figure 1.



528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536

537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544


Figure 2A



545
546
547
548
549
550

551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558


Figure 2B



559
560
561
562
563
564

565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572

Figure 3



573