Carotid artery stenting compared with endarterectomy in patients with symptomatic carotid stenosis (International Carotid Stenting Study): a randomised controlled trial with cost-effectiveness analysis

Roland L Featherstone, ¹ Joanna Dobson, ² Jörg Ederle, ¹ David Doig, ¹ Leo H Bonati, ^{1,3} Stephen Morris, ⁴ Nishma V Patel ⁴ and Martin M Brown ^{1*}

Declared competing interests of authors: none

Published March 2016 DOI: 10.3310/hta20200

Plain English summary

The International Carotid Stenting Study

Health Technology Assessment 2016; Vol. 20: No. 20

DOI: 10.3310/hta20200

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

¹Department of Brain Repair and Rehabilitation, UCL Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

²Department of Medical Statistics Unit, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

³Department of Neurology and Stroke Centre, University Hospital Basel, Basel University, Basel, Switzerland

⁴Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, UK

^{*}Corresponding author

Plain English summary

arrowing of one of the carotid arteries in the neck by deposits of fat in the artery wall is a major lacklgraps cause of stroke. The International Carotid Stenting Study (ICSS) compared two treatments to prevent stroke resulting from this narrowing. The first was surgical treatment (endarterectomy), which removes the fatty deposits altogether via an incision in the neck. The second was the newer treatment of carotid stenting, in which a wire mesh tube (a stent) is inserted inside the narrowed artery after being threaded up to the neck through the arteries in the leg via a puncture in the groin. The trial included 1713 patients who had recently had a stroke or transient ischaemic attack ('mini stroke') caused by carotid narrowing, at 50 centres in the UK, mainland Europe, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Half the patients were randomly assigned to stenting and half to surgery. ICSS showed that stenting avoids complications of surgical incision in the neck, but caused more minor strokes at the time of the treatment than surgery. The combination of procedural stroke or death was more frequent in the stenting group. During long-term follow-up (median 4.2 years), the proportion of patients with fatal or disabling stroke was essentially the same for both stenting and endarterectomy. Any stroke during follow-up was more frequent in the stenting group. There were no differences in the costs of the two treatments. Therefore, endarterectomy remains the treatment of choice for patients at higher risk with stenting, but stenting is an appropriate treatment choice for patients if the risk of periprocedural stroke is low.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 5.027

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme or, originally commissioned by the Medical Research Council (MRC) and now managed by the Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation programme which is funded by the MRC and NIHR, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

This issue of *Health Technology Assessment* contains a project originally commissioned by the MRC but managed by the Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation Programme. The EME programme was created as part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) and the Medical Research Council (MRC) coordinated strategy for clinical trials. The EME programme is funded by the MRC and NIHR, with contributions from the CSO in Scotland and NISCHR in Wales and the HSC R&D, Public Health Agency in Northern Ireland. It is managed by the NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC) based at the University of Southampton.

The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from the material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the MRC NETSCC, the HTA programme the EME programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme the EME programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Featherstone *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

Professor Hywel Williams Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Elaine McColl Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research and Development Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk