

· 老年动脉粥样硬化性疾病专栏 ·

药物涂层球囊治疗老年患者下肢动脉硬化闭塞症长段病变的疗效观察

贺彦龙,任补元,梁越*

(内蒙古自治区人民医院血管外科,呼和浩特 010000)

【摘要】目的 观察药物涂层球囊(DCB)治疗老年下肢动脉硬化闭塞症(ASO)长段闭塞或狭窄的疗效。**方法** 选取2018年8月至2019年8月内蒙古自治区人民医院血管外科接受介入治疗的老年下肢ASO患者21例,共32条患肢(病变长度 ≥ 10 cm)。每条患肢在选择合适的手术入路后使用普通球囊预扩张,然后选取符合靶病变的DCB或金属裸支架(BMS)植入,其中接受DCB治疗的有12条患肢(DCB组),接受BMS治疗的有20条患肢(BMS组)。观察术后6、12个月患肢主要症状的改善情况(皮温、肤色、患肢疼痛和患者的自我感觉,后两者为患者口述)、骑行距离及卢瑟福血管外科学Rutherford分级,以及12个月后患肢的血运重建率。采用SPSS 22.0软件进行统计分析。根据数据类型,组间比较采用t检验或 χ^2 检验。**结果** 32条患肢均获得技术成功,且随访率为100%。随访期间患者均未进行再次手术治疗,未发生与手术或器械相关的出血、死亡、截肢等不良临床事件。术后6及12个月,2组患肢主要症状改善情况、骑行距离及Rutherford分级比较差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$)。与DCB组比较,BMS组术后12个月血运重建率显著降低,差异有统计学意义[35.0%(7/20)和58.3%(7/12); $P<0.05$]。**结论** DCB在治疗老年下肢ASO长段病变中的近、中期疗效不劣于BMS,前者血运重建率更低。

【关键词】 老年人;动脉硬化;闭塞性;药物涂层球囊;金属裸支架;疗效

【中图分类号】 R654.4

【文献标志码】 A

【DOI】 10.11915/j.issn.1671-5403.2020.01.005

Efficacy of drug-coated balloon in long-term lesions of lower extremity arteriosclerosis obliterans in elderly patients

HE Yan-Long, REN Bu-Yuan, LIANG Yue*

(Department of Vascular Surgery, Inner Mongolia People's Hospital, Hohhot 010000, China)

【Abstract】 Objective To observe efficacy of drug-coated balloon (DCB) in the treatment of long-term occlusion or stenosis of lower limb arteriosclerosis obliterans (ASO) in the elderly patients. **Methods** A total of 21 elderly patients (32 limbs of lower limb ASO ≥ 10 cm) were selected from Department of Vascular Surgery of Inner Mongolia People's Hospital, who received interventional therapy from August 2018 to August 2019. After an appropriate surgical approach was decided, each limb was pre-expanded with a common balloon, and depending on the target lesion, DCB ($n=12$) or bare metal stent (BMS; $n=20$) was implanted. At 6 and 12 months after intervention, the patients were assessed for the alleviation in the main symptoms (skin temperature, skin color, and oral report of pain in the affected limb and the patients' self-feeling), riding distance, and Rutherford classification. The rate of blood reconstruction of the affected limb was observed at 12 months after intervention. SPSS statistics 22.0 was used for data analysis. Depending on the data type, t -test or χ^2 test was used for the comparison between groups. **Results** The intervention in all affected limbs was successful with a follow-up rate of 100%. During the follow-up period, no reoperation was performed, and no bleeding, death, amputation and other adverse clinical events occurred. There was no significant difference in the alleviation of main symptoms, riding distance and Rutherford grade between the two groups ($P>0.05$ for all). The revascularization rate of BMS group was significantly lower than that of DCB group [35.0%(7/20) vs 58.3%(7/12); $P<0.05$]. **Conclusion** DCB is as effective as BMS in the treatment of ASO in the elderly in the near and medium term, the former having a lower revascularization rate.

【Key words】 aged; arteriosclerosis; obliterans; drug-coated balloon; bare metal stent; curative effect

This work was supported by Natural Science Foundation of Inner Mongolia (2017MS0842) and One Million Project (Joint) of Inner Mongolia Medical University [KD2016KJBW(LH)033].

Corresponding author: LIANG Yue, E-mail: nmgliangyue@126.com

收稿日期: 2019-09-07; 接受日期: 2019-11-13

基金项目: 内蒙古自然科学基金(2017MS0842); 内蒙古医科大学百万工程(联合)项目[KD2016KJBW(LH)033]

通信作者: 梁越, E-mail: nmgliangyue@126.com

下肢动脉硬化闭塞症(arteriosclerosis obliterans, ASO)是由动脉粥样硬化引起的慢性下肢缺血性疾病,严重者最终导致截肢甚至死亡。近年来,ASO的发病率逐渐增高,已严重危害了老年患者的肢体活动甚至生命。外周动脉硬化闭塞症的腔内血管成形术能达到较好的患肢血运重建效果,得到越来越多临床医师的认可^[1]。与以往采用的下肢动脉疾病外科旁路术相比,腔内治疗因随诊治疗方式的改进,以及较低并发症发生率和死亡率,逐渐被临床医师接受。然而,支架内再狭窄(in-stent restenosis, ISR)是血管腔内支架术后常见并发症,严重影响了患者的疗效及预后。近年来发展起来的药物涂层球囊(drug-coated balloon, DCB)技术将抗血管内膜增生的药物涂于球囊表面,从而达到抑制内膜增生而减少再狭窄的目的^[2,3]。国外有研究表明^[4],DCB治疗下肢动脉长段病变1年一期通畅率为83.2%,但在国内关于下肢动脉长段病变病例治疗效果的报道较少,本研究中选取内蒙古自治区人民医院血管外科行DCB或传统金属裸支架(bare metal stent, BMS)治疗的ASO患者,拟评估DCB治疗的临床效果,报告如下。

1 对象与方法

1.1 研究对象

选取2018年8月至2019年8月我院收治的21例ASO患者,男性14例,女性7例,年龄60~80岁。ASO由CT血管造影确诊,卢瑟福血管外科学Rutherford分级2~4级,所有患者无手术治疗史。21例患者中有11例双下肢ASO,10例单侧ASO,共32条患肢。其中12条患肢(5例双下肢ASO,1例单侧ASO及1例双侧ASO中的1条患肢)接受DCB治疗(DCB组,紫杉醇),20条患肢(5例双下肢ASO,9例单侧ASO及1例双侧ASO中的另1条患肢)接受BMS治疗(BMS组)。所有患肢均为长段病变(病变长度≥10 cm^[5])。

1.2 方法

所有患者术前行常规生化检验,确定无严重心、肺、肝及肾功能不全等不能耐受手术情况。患者术前2 d予以阿司匹林抗凝。选择合适的手术入路(同侧或对侧股动脉,如效果欠佳则选择肱动脉穿刺),穿刺点常规消毒铺巾,以2%的利多卡因于拟穿刺点局部麻醉;穿刺成功后,静脉滴注低分子肝素4 000 U(必要时术中追加3 000 U),造影确认病变部位、范围、长度及流出道情况,再次造影确认导丝、导管远端在血管真腔内,退出导管后,先选用合适的普

通球囊预扩张(扩张时间2~3 min),当治疗需要多个球囊连续扩张时,每2个球囊之间需要有10 mm重叠。预扩张完成后,选取符合靶病变的DCB或BMS植入,为避免目标区域的丢失,DCB选取时一般超过病变近远端各10 mm。而BMS组患者选取的具体支架类型及型号由术者决定,其支架长度一般大于闭塞动脉20 mm,支架两端一般各超出病变范围10 mm左右。如果病变范围较长,一枚支架无法完全覆盖靶病变,需置入多枚支架,支架植入顺序为先置入距穿刺点相对较远处、再置入距穿刺点相对较近处。如果术中出现支架膨胀不良(<50%),则再次进行2次扩张,直至对比剂显影良好。手术完成后,穿刺点予以局部压迫止血30 min后,予以加压包扎。术后当日再次予以皮下注射低分子肝素5 000 U,口服阿司匹林100 mg。术后住院期间予以预防量低分子肝素抗凝(5 000 U,1次/d)。出院后继续长期口服阿司匹林(100 mg,1次/d)并嘱托患者逐渐增加其每日下肢活动量。

1.3 术后随访

对所有患者术后6、12个月进行门诊随访。(1)记录患肢皮温、肤色、患肢的疼痛情况及患者的自我感觉是否明显改善(后两者为患者口述)。(2)记录患肢的骑行距离(记录方式同术前一致,所有患者均使用同一辆动感单车且设置均一致的情况下,分别测量每一患肢的骑行距离并予以记录)及Rutherford分级情况。(3)记录12个月时患者门诊复查血管通畅及血运情况。

1.4 统计学处理

采用SPSS 22.0软件进行统计分析。计量资料用均数±标准差($\bar{x}\pm s$)表示,组间比较采用t检验。计数资料用例数(百分率)表示,组间比较采用 χ^2 检验。 $P<0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

2 结 果

2.1 2组患肢一般资料比较

2组患肢一般资料及病变血管特点方面比较,差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$;表1)。

2.2 2组患肢手术效果比较

2组患肢手术成功率均为100%。2组患肢随访率为100%。随访期间患者均未进行再次手术治疗,未发生与手术或器械相关的出血、死亡、截肢等不良临床事件。于术后6及12个月,2组患肢主要症状改善情况、骑行距离及Rutherford分级比较差异无统计学意义($P>0.05$)。与DCB组比较,BMS组术后12个月血运重建率显著降低,差异有统计学意义($P<0.05$;表2)。

表1 2组患肢术前血管造影及术中一般情况比较

Table 1 Comparison of preoperative angiography and intraoperative general conditions between two groups

Group	n	Rutherford classification (2/3/4, n)	Riding distance (m, $\bar{x} \pm s$)	Total occlusion [n (%)]	Severe calcification [n (%)]	Lumen diameter (mm, $\bar{x} \pm s$)	Balloon preexpansion [n (%)]	Balloon pressure (atm, $\bar{x} \pm s$)
DCB	12	2/9/1	170±60	4(33.3)	5(41.7)	5.10±0.86	12(100)	9.2±3.3
BMS	20	3/15/2	145±40	7(35.0)	9(45.0)	5.20±0.73	20(100)	9.1±3.8
P value		>0.05	>0.05	>0.05	>0.05	>0.05	>0.05	>0.05

DCB: drug-coated balloon; BMS: bare metal stent. 1 atm = 101.325 kPa.

表2 2组患肢手术效果比较

Table 2 Comparison of surgical results between 2 groups

Item	DCB group (n=12)	BMS group (n=20)	P value
Riding distance(m, $\bar{x} \pm s$)			
6 months after operation	840±53	790±60	>0.05
12 months after operation	670±65	640±70	>0.05
Rutherford classification(2/3/4, n)			
6 months after operation	3/2/0	4/3/0	>0.05
12 months after operation	3/3/1	4/3/1	>0.05
Alleviation of main symptoms 6 months after operation[n (%)]			
Normal skin temperature	10(83.3)	16(80.0)	>0.05
Normal skin color	11(91.7)	18(90.0)	>0.05
Pain alleviation	10(83.3)	17(85.0)	>0.05
Feel better about oneself	8(66.7)	14(70.0)	>0.05
Alleviation of main symptoms 12 months after operation[n (%)]			
Normal skin temperature	10(83.3)	17(85.0)	>0.05
Normal skin color	9(75.0)	15(75.0)	>0.05
Pain alleviation	9(75.0)	16(80.0)	>0.05
Feel better about oneself	8(66.7)	15(75.0)	>0.05
Revascularization 12 months after operation[n (%)]	7(58.3)	7(35.0)	<0.05

DCB: drug-coated balloon; BMS: bare metal stent.

3 讨论

有研究显示,老年患者外周血管疾病发病率呈逐年增加趋势^[6],而ASO增加趋势尤为明显。老年ASO患者多合并全身多个系统的疾病,对手术及麻醉风险的耐受性较小,因此选择创伤小、麻醉要求低及术后恢复快等术式显得尤为重要^[7]。近年来介入治疗ASO越来越受到临床医师的重视,并逐渐成为重要的治疗手段。目前,血管腔内的微创介入结合手术是治疗ASO的主要方法。关于ASO的治疗,除了DCB术式外,也有研究提出了许多其他的治疗方式,包括支架、切割球囊、冷冻球囊以及药物洗脱支架等。Anderson等^[8]研究发现,近30年来采用介入技术治疗ASO等下肢动脉疾病较之前增加了500倍。其中,DCB和BMS是目前国内治疗ASO的主要介入手段。尽管DCB技术的发展晚于BMS,但发展迅速。一项来自德国的多中心研究显示,相比BMS,DCB(紫杉醇)治疗ASO的6和

24个月后,血管的管腔丢失率降低,靶病变血管再重建减少^[9]。

DCB作为治疗ASO的新介入治疗方式,近年来在老年ASO患者长段病变方面得到了广泛应用,其表面涂有对血管内膜具有抗增生作用的药物,通过球囊扩张使具有抗增殖的涂层药物快速释放到病变血管内膜处,达到抑制内膜增生目的,以减少血管的再狭窄。本研究中DCB技术是目前国内广泛使用的紫杉醇涂层球囊,具有以下3个优点^[10]。(1)高度的亲脂性使涂层药物能够迅速被血管壁组织吸收并利用,避免了因血流冲刷造成的药物损失。(2)涂层药物的吸收及利用时间较短,减少了因药物持续抗血管内皮增生作用导致的血管内皮化延迟,从而降低了血栓事件的发生率。(3)涂层药物能够在靶病变血管壁的平滑肌细胞层及成纤维细胞层持续保持较高的药物浓度,从而持续地作用于血管内皮细胞,有效地抑制靶病变血管内膜的增生。有研究显示^[11-13],使用药物洗脱支架及DCB能有

效减少再狭窄率,但再狭窄的发生率在1~2年内将超过70%。而使用DCB治疗避免了支架永久性的植入,且不限制今后再次治疗方案的选择。因此,DCB对于慢性和渐进性的老年ASO患者,特别是对于下肢动脉长段病变患肢的治疗是一个重要而有效的选择。另外,有研究指出^[14,15],DCB在治疗长段病变及支架内再狭窄等复杂病变中也表现出很好的疗效。Tepe等^[16]通过多中心研究,对DCB治疗的ASO患者进行12个月随访发现,患者一期通畅率高达82.2%。本研究结果显示,DCB治疗老年患者下肢ASO长段病变的疗效不劣于BMS,且相较于BMS,DCB可降低术后12个月再次血运重建的风险,这与上述文献结论是相似的。但值得注意的是,2组患者血运重建率均较低(DCB:58.3%;BMS:35.0%),考虑可能与本研究样本量较小有关。总之,DCB在治疗老年患者ASO长段病变方面是一个重要而可靠的治疗选择。

本研究存在以下不足。首先,主要症状的描述均来自患者口述,同时样本量较小、随访时间较短,这可能导致研究结果的偏倚。其次,药物治疗、康复训练、并发症的治疗及饮食等诸多因素也可能会对最终研究结果产生一定的影响。将来我们会进一步增加样本量,并充分考虑及纳入上述因素的影响,获得更有意义的结果。

【参考文献】

- [1] Tendera M, Aboyans V, Bartelink ML, et al. ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines. ESC guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of peripheral artery diseases: document covering atherosclerotic disease of extracranial carotid and vertebral, mesenteric, renal, upper and lower extremity arteries: the Task Force on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Peripheral Artery Diseases of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) [J]. Eur Heart J, 2011, 32(22): 2851–2906. DOI: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehr211.
- [2] Stabile E, Virga V, Salemme L. Drug-eluting balloon for treatment of superficial femoral artery in-stent restenosis [J]. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2012, 60(18): 1739–1742. DOI: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012.07.033.
- [3] Uhlemann M, Möbius-Winkler S, Adam J. The Leipzig prospective drug-eluting balloon-registry: outcome of 484 consecutive patients treated for coronary in-stent restenosis and de novo lesions using paclitaxel-coated balloons [J]. Circ J, 2016, 80(2): 379–386. DOI: 10.1253/circj.CJ-14-1352.
- [4] Micari A, Vadala G, Castriota F, et al. 1-year results of paclitaxel-coated balloons for long femoropopliteal artery disease: evidence from the SFA-long study [J]. JACC Cardiovasc Interv, 2016, 9(9): 950–956. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcin.2016.02.014.
- [5] Cortese B, Granada JF, Scheller B, et al. Drug-coated balloon treatment for lower extremity vascular disease intervention: an international positioning document [J]. Eur Heart J, 2016, 37(14): 1096–1103. DOI: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehv204.
- [6] Himch AT, Haskal ZJ, Hertzler NR, et al. ACC/AHA 2005 practice guidelines for the management of patients with peripheral arterial disease [J]. Circulation, 2006, 113(11): e463–e654. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.174526.
- [7] 刘昌伟. 股腘动脉硬化闭塞症治疗方法的合理选择及评价[J]. 中国实用外科杂志, 2008, 28(11): 923–924.
- [8] Liu CW. The reasonable choice and evaluation of the treatment of femoral popliteal arteriosclerosis obliterans [J]. Chin J Pract Surg, 2008, 28(11): 923–924.
- [9] Anderson PL, Gelijns A, Moskowitz A, et al. Understanding trends in inpatient surgical volume: vascular interventions, 1980–2000 [J]. J Vasc Surg, 2004, 39(6): 1200–1208. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvs.2004.02.039.
- [10] Colleran R, Harada Y, Cassese S, et al. Drug coated balloon angioplasty in the treatment of peripheral artery disease [J]. Expert Rev Med Devices, 2016, 13(6): 569–582. DOI: 10.1080/17434440.2016.1184969.
- [11] Zeller T, Dake MD, Tepe G, et al. Treatment of femoropopliteal in-stent restenosis with paclitaxel-eluting stents [J]. JACC Cardiovasc Interv, 2013, 6(3): 274–281. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcin.2012.12.118.
- [12] Virga V, Stabile E, Biamino G, et al. Drug-eluting balloons for the treatment of the superficial femoral artery in-stent restenosis: 2-year follow-up [J]. JACC Cardiovasc Interv, 2014, 7(4): 411–415. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcin.2013.11.020.
- [13] Liistro F, Angioli P, Porto I, et al. Paclitaxel-eluting balloon vs standard angioplasty to reduce recurrent restenosis in diabetic patients with in-stent restenosis of the superficial femoral and proximal popliteal arteries: the DEBATE-ISR study [J]. J Endovasc Ther, 2014, 21(1): 1–8. DOI: 10.1583/13-4420R.1.
- [14] Tepe G, Zeller T, Schnorr B, et al. High-grade, non-flow-limiting dissections do not negatively impact long-term outcome after paclitaxel-coated balloon angioplasty: an additional analysis from the THUNDER study [J]. J Endovasc Ther, 2013, 20(6): 792–800. DOI: 10.1583/13-4392r.1.
- [15] Micari A, Cioppa A, Vadala G, et al. Clinical evaluation of a paclitaxel-eluting balloon for treatment of femoropopliteal arterial disease: 12-month results from a multicenter Italian registry [J]. JACC Cardiovasc Interv, 2012, 5(3): 331–338. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcin.2011.11.010.
- [16] Tepe G, Laird J, Schneider P. Drug-coated balloon versus standard percutaneous transluminal angioplasty for the treatment of superficial femoral and popliteal peripheral artery disease: 12-month results from the IN.PACT SFA randomized trial [J]. Circulation, 2015, 131(5): 495–502. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.011004.