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In patients with carotid disease, the purpose of carotid artery revascularization is stroke prevention. For >50 years, carotid endarterectomy has been considered the standard treatment for severe asymptomatic and symptomatic carotid stenoses. Carotid artery stenting (CAS) has emerged in the last 15 years as a minimally invasive alternative to surgery. However, the value of the endovascular approach in the management of carotid disease patients remains highly controversial. The aims of this review are to elucidate the current role of CAS, to describe the major technology advancements in the field, and to speculate about the future of this therapy.
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Introduction

Ten to 15% of all ischaemic strokes originate from a stenosis at the level of the internal carotid artery. In patients with carotid disease, the purpose of carotid revascularization is the prevention of recurrent stroke. For >50 years carotid endarterectomy (CEA) has been considered the standard treatment for severe asymptomatic and symptomatic carotid stenoses. Carotid artery stenting (CAS) has emerged in the last 15 years as minimally invasive alternative to surgery. However, its role remains highly controversial. The debate has been fuelled by the multiples medical specialties involved as well as by the disappointing results of CAS in randomized comparisons with CEA. While some have interpreted those findings as clearcut clinical evidence, other have suggested that most of the trials may have compared the two revascularization modalities in an unfair way. Aims of this review are to elucidate the current role of CAS in the management of patients with advanced carotid disease, to describe the major technology advancements in the field, and to speculate about the future of this therapy.

Clinical data

Major randomized trials of carotid artery stenting vs. carotid endarterectomy and meta-analysis

Six major trials have randomized a total of 6780 patients to CAS vs. CEA. While the SAPPHIRE (Stenting and Angioplasty with Protection in Patients at High Risk for Endarterectomy) trial included patients, both symptomatic and asymptomatic, at high risk for surgery, CAVATAS (Carotid and Vertebral Artery Transluminal Angioplasty Study), SPACE (Stent-Protected Percutaneous Angioplasty of the Carotid Artery vs. Endarterectomy), EVA-3S (Endarterectomy Versus Angioplasty in Patients with Symptomatic Severe Carotid Stenosis), and ICSS (International Carotid Stenting Study) enrolled symptomatic patients at standard surgical risk. Finally, the Carotid Revascularization Endarterectomy vs. Stenting Trial (CREST) enrolled both symptomatic and asymptomatic patients at standard surgical risk. The randomized studies were, to different degrees, burdened by several limitations, the most important being the limited endovascular expertise requirements for operators performing CAS.

The CAVATAS trial, performed in the late 1990s, randomized 504 symptomatic patients at low-to-moderate risk for surgery to CEA or carotid angioplasty. The incidence of death or stroke at 30 days was 10.0% in the endovascular group and 9.9% in the surgical group. The study was criticized by the interventional community for the low stenting rate (26%). Accordingly, in the study initially all patients in the endovascular arm were treated with balloon angioplasty, while later the implantation of (balloon expandable) stents was allowed. Embolic protection devices (EPD) were unavailable at the time. At 8 years, no difference in ipsilateral stroke, ipsilateral stroke or transient ischaemic attack, or any stroke between the two arms was observed. The SAPPHIRE study randomized 334 patients at a high
risk for surgery to CAS with the systematic use of EPD or CEA. The trial included asymptomatic (71%) and symptomatic (29%) patients. The primary endpoint, a composite of death, stroke, or myocardial infarction (MI) within 30 days after the intervention or death or ipsilateral stroke between 31 and 1 year showed a trend in favour of CAS, occurring in 12.2% in the CAS group and in 20.1% in the CEA group (P = 0.053). Patients who underwent CAS had significantly fewer MI at 30 days compared with those allocated to CEA (1.9 vs. 6.6%, P = 0.04). At 3-year follow-up, CAS and CEA were equally effective in terms of stroke prevention. The SPACE study, which included 1200 participants and was terminated because of slow enrolment and lack of funding, found no difference in the incidence of ipsilateral stroke or death at 30 days between patients allocated to CAS or CEA, with an event rate of 6.8 and 6.3%, respectively. Embolic protection devices were used in a minority of CAS patients. At 2 years, the outcomes of the two groups were comparable. The EVA-3S trial, which included 527 patients, was stopped prematurely because of a significantly increased event rate among patients allocated to endovascular treatment (death or stroke 9.6% in the CAS arm and 3.9% in the CEA arm). At 6 months, the incidence of any stroke or death was 11.7% in the CAS group and 6.1% in the CEA group (P = 0.02). At 4-year follow-up, the death or stroke rate still favoured CEA, driven by the 30-day events. However, beyond 30 days, no difference in adverse outcomes between CAS and CEA was observed.

The ICSS study randomized 1713 symptomatic patients to CAS or CEA, and the primary endpoint was the long-term rate of any fatal or disabling stroke. The authors reported first an interim safety analysis showing that the 120-day rate of stroke prevention.10 The final results of the study were just published recently. The SPACE study, which included 1200 participants and was terminated because of slow enrolment and lack of funding, found no difference in the incidence of ipsilateral stroke or death at 30 days between patients allocated to CAS or CEA, with an event rate of 6.8 and 6.3%, respectively. Embolic protection devices were used in a minority of CAS patients. At 2 years, the outcomes of the two groups were comparable. The EVA-3S trial, which included 527 patients, was stopped prematurely because of a significantly increased event rate among patients allocated to endovascular treatment (death or stroke 9.6% in the CAS arm and 3.9% in the CEA arm). At 6 months, the incidence of any stroke or death was 11.7% in the CAS group and 6.1% in the CEA group (P = 0.02). At 4-year follow-up, the death or stroke rate still favoured CEA, driven by the 30-day events. However, beyond 30 days, no difference in adverse outcomes between CAS and CEA was observed.

The randomized, controlled, open, multi-centre three-armed SPACE-2 study started in 2009 aiming to compare state-of-the-art medical prevention including lifestyle modification with CEA and CAS in patients with severe asymptomatic carotid stenosis. Due to low recruitment, the steering committee decided in 2012 to modify the protocol and to split this three-arm trial into two separate two-arm clinical trials [SPACE + best medical treatment vs. best medical treatment alone (SPACE-2A) and CAS + best medical treatment vs. best medical treatment alone (SPACE-2B)]. The Asymptomatic Carotid Surgery Trial-2 (ACST-2) is enrolling up to 5000 patients with severe asymptomatic carotid stenosis randomly allocated to CEA or CAS. In an interim safety analysis of the first 691 patients enrolled, the investigators reported a disabling stroke, fatal MI, and death rate of 1.0%.

The Carotid Stenting vs. Surgery of Severe Carotid Artery Disease and Stroke Prevention in Asymptomatic Patients (ACTI) trial randomized asymptomatic patients to CAS vs. CEA in a 3:1 ratio. The study has been prematurely halted after the enrolment of ~1600 patients and the results have not been presented yet. The carotid revascularization for primary prevention of stroke (CREST-2) study is composed of two independent multi-centre, randomized controlled trials of carotid revascularization and best medical management vs. medical management alone in patients with asymptomatic high-grade carotid stenosis. One trial will randomize patients in a 1:1 ratio to CEA vs. no CEA and another will allocate patients in a 1:1 ratio to CAS vs. no CAS. Medical management will be uniform for all groups. The study plans to include 2480 patients and enrollment is supposed to start at the end of 2014.

In summary, no trial is planned to address the most relevant issue, namely the comparative value of CAS and CEA in symptomatic patients. For asymptomatic patients some, but likely non-conclusive...
## Table 1

30-day event rates in carotid artery stenting registries enrolling over 1000 patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Industry sponsored</th>
<th>Surgical high risk</th>
<th>EPD</th>
<th>Sympt patients (%)</th>
<th>Neuro(^a)</th>
<th>CEC adjud.</th>
<th>D/S</th>
<th>D/S/MI</th>
<th>D/S sympt</th>
<th>D/S asymp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPTURE(^{31})</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASES PMS(^{32})</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO-CAS(^{33})</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5341</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.6%(^b)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.3%(^b)</td>
<td>2.7%(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPPHIRE-W(^{34})</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No(^c)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVS(^{35})</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXACT(^{36})</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPTURE-2(^{36})</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4175</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercogliano(^{37})</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandatory(^d)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakow(^{38})</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABANA(^{39})</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1025(^e)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPD, emboli protection device(s); sympt, symptomatic; asymt, asymptomatic; CEC adjud., clinical event committee adjudication; D, death; S, stroke; MI, myocardial infarction; NR, not reported; D, Deutschlands 7 (country); I, Italy; P, Poland.

+ USA and Canada.
\(^a\)Neuro, independent pre- and post-procedural assessment by a neurologist.
\(^b\)In-hospital events.
\(^c\)Neurologic assessment performed by stroke scale certified staff member.
\(^d\)Mo.Ma proximal protection.
\(^e\)1097 patients enrolled and 1025 patients evaluable for 30-day events.
\(^f\)Single-centre study.
data should be soon available from the ACT-I trial, while from the most important trial, namely ACST-2, no data will be available for several years to come. Finally, both SPACE-2 and CREST-2, if completed, will allow due to their design only indirect comparisons between CAS and CEA.

**Large-scale registries**

The results of 10 CAS large-scale registries (i.e. enrolling over 1000 patients) have been published, for a total of 23,511 patients treated (Table 1). The use of EPD was mandatory in the majority of the studies. The highest quality studies came from the United States, with most of the registries being mandated by the FDA and having independent neurologic assessment pre- and post-procedure as well as clinical event committee adjudication of adverse outcomes. The main limitation of the registries is that the proportion of symptomatic patients was modest. Overall, the outcomes can be considered favourable, with a 30-day death, stroke, or MI rate ranging from 1.4 to 6.3%, especially if considered that several registries included only patients at high surgical risk and that the event rates have decreased over the years.

**Technology advancements**

Although the insufficient expertise, both in terms of skills and in patient selection, may be the main factor leading to stroke excess in CAS compared with CEA, CAS as it was performed in the randomized trials carried some intrinsic limitations:

(i) distal EPD (filters) may not adequately protect the brain in all settings, due to incomplete apposition to the vessel wall, lack of protection during placement of the EPD, and the passage of micro-emboli smaller that the pore size of the filter;
(ii) current stent frames may have insufficient lesion scaffolding properties and allow for intra-strut plaque prolapse;
(iii) catheter manipulations at the level of the aortic arch may be an important source of emboli not prevented by current EPD technology.

Some of those limitations have been addressed by recent technology advancements described below.

**Proximal cerebral protection**

Proximal EPD protects the brain by interrupting or reversing the blood flow at the level of the carotid bifurcation at the time of the procedure. This approach as emerged as alternative to distal EPD (filters). The main advantages of proximal protection include crossing of the lesion under protected conditions as well as the blockage of both macro- and micro-emboli. Finally, with proximal protection there is no placement of a device in the distal internal carotid artery, and this may reduce the risk of arterial spasm, dissection, or intimal damage. Drawbacks of this technique include the larger sheath size required, which may be problematic in patients with advanced peripheral arterial disease and may be associated with an increased rate of vascular access complications, as well as the interruption of brain perfusion leading to an intolerance with transient neurologic symptoms in 3–8% of the patients. Proximal protection should not be used in patients with advanced external or common carotid disease and its applicability in patients with contralateral carotid occlusion depend on the extent of the collateralization through the Circle of Willis. Finally, the procedure is somehow less
straightforward than filter-protected CAS and requires additional skills. Two proximal protection EPD systems are available.

**Mo.Ma** (Medtronic-Invatec, Roncadelle, Italy)
The Mo.Ma system consists of an 8F or 9F sheath with an effective working channel of a 5F and 6F sheaths, respectively, and two independently inflatable balloon catheters (Figure 1). The distal balloon is located close to the sheath tips and occludes the external carotid artery. The proximal balloon is positioned in the common carotid artery. When inflated, both balloons prevent flow in the internal carotid artery coming both antegradely from the common carotid artery and retrogradely from the external carotid artery. As a result, the carotid lesion can be crossed and treated under flow blockage, preventing cerebral embolization. After the lesion is treated, three 20 mL syringes of carotid blood are aspirated and checked for debris before deflating the distal and then the proximal balloons, reestablishing cerebral blood flow.

**NeuroProtection System** (WL Gore and Associates, Flagstaff, AZ, USA)
The NeuroProtection System is a distal EPD that promotes passive reverse flow in the internal carotid artery. It is composed of two independent systems: the balloon wire and the 9F sheath which has an effective working channel of a 6F sheath and contains an inflatable balloon at its tip (Figure 2). The sheath is positioned in the common carotid artery and the balloon wire is inserted through the sheath and positioned at the external carotid artery. When both balloons are inflated, the blood flow through the common and external carotids is blocked. The proximal part of the sheath is connected to the contralateral femoral vein, allowing blood flow reversal of blood from the cerebral circulation (i.e. the Circle of Willis) down the internal carotid artery and through the sheath into the venous system. The blood flows through a filter with a pore size of 180 μm which collects debris before the blood re-enters the circulation through the femoral vein. As a consequence, the carotid lesion can be crossed and treated in reverse-flow mode. At the end of the procedure, 10–20 mL of carotid blood are actively aspirated and then the balloons are deflated while active suction is applied to retrieve any particle contiguous to the balloon occluder.

**Clinical data on proximal protected carotid artery stenting**
The available clinical experience consisted of five multi-centre registries and one large-scale single-centre registry and has been summarized in a meta-analysis. Among 2397 patients, 31% of them being symptomatic, the 30-day rate of composite stroke, MI, or death was 2.25%. Stroke, MI, and death were encountered in 1.71, 0.02, and 0.40%, respectively. Age and diabetic status were found to be the only significant independent risk predictors and stroke rates below 2.6% were found in all subgroups, including symptomatic octogenarians. In this analysis, gender, symptomatic status and contralateral carotid occlusion were not associated with adverse events.

**ENROUTE™ neuroprotection system (formerly MICHI™ neuroprotection system, Silk Road Medical, Sunnyvale, CA, US)**
The ENROUTE™ system is a flow reversal circuit consisting of two sheaths, one placed below in the common carotid via a transcervical approach connected to a transfemoral venous line (Figure 3).
The arterial sheath is placed via a surgical incision of around 2 cm in length above the clavicle on the side to be treated while the venous sheath is inserted into the femoral vein and an arterio-venous shunt is created. When the carotid artery is occluded just proximal to the arterial sheath, the resulting pressure gradient induces flow reversal. No blockage of flow in the ipsilateral external carotid is necessary. The main advantage of this approach is the lack of catheter manipulations at the level of the aortic arch. Downsides include the need for a surgical incision as well as for a disease-free portion of common carotid artery at the site of cut-down. Finally, the working length between the access point in the common carotid and the carotid bifurcation needs to be at least five cm.

Clinical data on ENROUTE™ system protected carotid artery stenting
At this stage, the ENROUTE™ system has undergone only limited clinical evaluation and should be considered an experimental device. In a first-in-man single-arm feasibility study including 44 patients, no major stroke, MI, death, or cranial nerve injury was reported. At 30 days, one minor contralateral stroke occurred in a patient who was free of lesions on post-procedural DWMRI.19 A total of 31 patients underwent pre- and post-procedure DWMRI investigations. Five patients (16.1%) had new lesions on the post-procedural scan, representing the lowest DWMRI rate of any carotid stenting strategy reported to date.

Double layer mesh stent technology
While in coronary interventions miniaturization and refinement of stent design has allowed the interventionalists to perform more complex procedures and to solve most of the limitations of stenting, in CAS little research and development efforts have been allocated to improve stent characteristics. Recently, it has been recognized that the stent itself may substantially add to embolic protection in CAS through adequate scaffolding of the plaque once the EPD has been removed. The ideal properties of a carotid stent are a well-balanced mix of high flexibility and conformability, to accommodate tortuous anatomy, as well as high plaque coverage, to prevent late embolization of debris. Stents structure is characterized by sequential aligned annular rings interconnected by bridges and the design may be either open cell or closed cell, depending on the density of the bridges between the rings.
Open-cell design stents present some of the segments free from the adjacent rings allowing greater adaptation to the vessel anatomy at the price of less plaque coverage and higher risk of tissue prolapse. Closed-cell design stents are characterized by higher density of bridge interconnection, which reduces their conformability and increases the probability of malapposition but at the same time offers greater plaque coverage. A hybrid configuration with an open-cell design of the proximal and distal segments combined with a closed-cell design of the central segments has been recently developed. The impact of stent design on clinical outcome following CAS has not been adequately addressed. An observational study found a significant lower rate of post-procedural events in

**Figure 6** Optimal coherence tomography assessment of a RoadSaver™ stent showing no significant prolapse of plaque and good wall apposition.
patients undergoing closed-cell design stent implantation compared with individual allocated to open-cell design stenting, but these results were not confirmed by other registries showing poor correlation between in-hospital and 30 days mortality and stent design.\(^{20–23}\)

A nice insight in the impact of stent design and in the pathophysiology at the lesion level at the time of CAS comes from a prospective single-centre study enrolling 40 consecutive patients and designed to evaluate the rate of stent malapposition, plaque prolapse, and thin cap fibro-atheroma rupture according to stent configuration by optical coherence tomography (OCT) (Figure 4).\(^{24}\) Closed-cell design stents were used in 17 patients (42.5%), open-cell design stents in 13 patients (32.5%), and hybrid design stents in 10 patients (25%). No neurological complications occurred. On OCT analysis, the frequencies of malapposed struts were higher with closed-cell compared with open-cell and hybrid design stents (34.5 vs. 15% and 16.3%, respectively, \(P<0.01\)). Plaque prolapse was more frequent with open cell than closed cell (68.6 vs. 23.3%; \(P<0.01\)) and hybrid stents (30.8%; \(P<0.01\)). Significant differences were also noted in the rates of fibrous cap rupture between closed- and open cell (24.2 vs. 43.8%; \(P<0.01\)), and between closed-cell and hybrid design (39.6%; \(P<0.01\)) stents, but not between open-cell and hybrid design stents (\(P=0.4\)). The authors concluded that micro-defects after stent deployment in CAS are frequent and are related to the design of implanted stents. While stent malapposition was more common following closed-cell design stent implantation, plaque prolapse was more common in patients treated with open-cell design devices. While these results are important, a correlation to clinical events remains to be demonstrated.

The mechanism of delayed cerebral embolization following CAS is unknown but may include tissue prolapsed through the stent struts and thrombus formation around malapposed stent struts. Despite the fact that current guidelines recommend carotid artery revascularization exclusively on the basis of stenosis severity, the importance of plaque characterization in stratifying stroke risk has been increasingly recognized. The weak correlation between the severity of stenosis and the risk of stroke in asymptomatic patients found in several trials together with recently published data that link complex plaques with stroke challenge the ‘degree of stenosis-stroke risk’ paradigm, highlight the importance of the morphology and composition of the carotid plaques beyond the degree of stenosis and of the investigation of the complex stent–plaque interaction after CAS.\(^{24,25}\)

In this respect, calcified lesions may favour stent malapposition while soft plaques may result in greater tissue prolapse through the stent struts.

Recently, a novel carotid stent design has been developed, namely the double layer mesh stent. The design should allow for high flexibility to accommodate tortuous anatomy and at the same time convey scaffold properties for optimal plaque coverage. This technology is characterized by an internal micromesh layer for plaque coverage and an external self-expanding nitinol layer for scaffolding offering the flexibility that characterize open-cell design stents. Currently, the only CE marked and commercially available double layer mesh stent is illustrated in Figure 6. The device is compatible with a 0.014” guide wire and 7F guiding catheter or 6F long sheath. The cell size of the micromesh is extremely small (0.381 mm\(^2\)) allowing for extensive plaque coverage (Figures 5 and 6). It remains to be demonstrated whether this interesting concept will translate into a reduction of neurologic events associated with CAS.

**Transradial approach**

The transradial approach may be a valuable alternative to transfemoral access for CAS in patients with advanced peripheral vascular disease of with complex aortic arches such as the bovine or the type III arches.\(^{26}\) Transradial access for CAS was first reported in 1999, and several case reports and few small case series followed.\(^{27}\) The largest series so far published included 382 patients treated in two high-volume centres and documented an overall success rate of 91% and a stroke rate of 1.3%.\(^{28}\) Recently, a randomized single-centre trial allocating 260 consecutive patients at high risk for CEA to transradial or transfemoral CAS reported excellent outcomes with both strategies with an incidence of procedural major adverse cardiac and cerebral events \(\leq 1.0\%\) in both groups. From a transradial route, technical success was achieved in 90% of cases while 10% of patients required a crossover to a transfemoral access. Major vascular complications were rare (<1% in both groups).\(^{29}\)

**Future directions**

Carotid stenting, although it is a mature technique regularly applied with excellent outcomes in high-volume centres by expert operators, is struggling to find the consensus of the scientific community. The initial enthusiasm for CAS as a valuable and less invasive alternative to CEA has been mitigated by the undisputable gap in outcomes between the two strategies observed in randomized clinical trials. Inadequate requirements in terms of endovascular expertise, potentially leading to an increased event rate related to both insufficient technical skills and inadequate patient selection, has been proposed as the main reason for the unfavourable outcomes related to CAS. Despite the fact that high-quality multi-centre registries and high-volume single-centre experiences have consistently described favourable CAS outcomes, the evidence has not been considered sufficient in the neurologist community to recommend CAS. In addition, in some countries including the United States the procedure has been reimbursed only within research protocols. Overall, the number of procedures performed in recent years is stagnant if not decreasing and industry massively reduced funding for research, development, and clinical trials. Unfortunately, in the next years little additional randomized data comparing CAS and CEA are to be expected. The promising technologies described may reverse the currently unfavourable trend for CAS only if they will be given the chance to be tested in adequately powered clinical trials, which require major funding by either industry or private or public entities.\(^{30}\)
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