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ABSTRACT

Background Volume coils were developed to improve occlusion rates of intracranial aneurysms. Previous studies have shown increased packing density and comparable occlusion rates, but subgroup analyses of aneurysm size have not been carried out.

Objective To evaluate the safety and efficacy of the Penumbra Coil 400 (PC400) system in treating intracranial aneurysms compared with standard diameter coils.

Methods A monocentric retrospective case review of 260 aneurysms in 233 patients was carried out. In 37 aneurysms the PC400 system was used, while 223 aneurysms were treated with conventional coils. Previously treated aneurysms and aneurysms treated with flow diverters were excluded. Aneurysm and procedure characteristics, packing density, postprocedural and follow-up occlusion grades as well as coil compaction were evaluated.

Results Aneurysms treated with PC400 coils had higher volume (218.9 vs 47.1 mm³, p=0.001), wider necks (3.0 vs 2.5 mm, p=0.005), and greater dome/noeck ratio (2.0 vs 1.6, p=0.001) in comparison with aneurysms treated with conventional coils. Compared with controls, in the PC400 group we achieved higher packing densities (43.2% vs 34.4%, p<0.001; in aneurysms ≥7 mm 42.2% vs 27.8%, p<0.001). On follow-up angiography we observed less coil compaction (23.8% vs 64.3%, p=0.003) and less aneurysm recurrence (14.3% vs 40.5%, p=0.046) in aneurysms ≥7 mm when using the PC400 system.

Conclusions Use of the PC400 system as opposed to conventional coils suggests that the PC400 system is safe and effective in treating intracranial aneurysms. Despite having been applied in a potentially more difficult-to-treat group, the use of PC400 was associated with less coil compaction and aneurysm recurrence in aneurysms ≥7 mm.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades endovascular coil embolization has developed into a safe and effective technique in treating intracranial aneurysms.1–4 A major problem of coil embolization is the recanalization of the aneurysms’ lumen over time, which occurs in around 20%–30%.5–9 coil Compaction is regarded as one of the major factors which have been implicated in aneurysm recanalization and its occurrence is influenced by the initial packing density.10–11 Aneurysm recurrence is a risk factor for rebleeding.12 In large aneurysms, in particular, it remains difficult to achieve adequate packing densities.7,13 Early studies in the mid-2000s suggested that thicker or more complex shaped coils can achieve higher packing densities.14–16 The Penumbra Coil 400 (PC400, Penumbra, Inc, Alameda, California, USA) was introduced in early 2011, and promoted as a ‘volume coil’. It is considered to be an alternative coil device, which is especially useful when treating large aneurysms.

The PC400 coil has a ‘coil within coil’ design, resulting in an intrinsically softness and providing greater volume per unit length owing to its 0.020 inch diameter.17 The complex structure consists of a stretch-resistant nitinol wire, an inner structural coil, and an outer thin filament. It is thought to be more resistant to mechanical stress and may enhance coil stability, thus preventing coil compaction. To place PC400 coils a special, wider-diameter delivery microcatheter (PX Slim; distal/proximal outer diameter: 0.867 mm=2.6F/0.983 mm=2.95F) is required. Initial reported experiences with the PC400 coil were positive and showed higher packing densities, better cost-effectiveness, reduced procedure time, and comparable short-term occlusion rates.18–21 We hypothesize that large cerebral aneurysms, which are particularly difficult to treat, can be safely occluded using PC400 coils, since better packing can be expected to prevent recurrence of aneurysms and coil compaction.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patient selection

We present a monocentric retrospective case series of 260 endovascularly treated ruptured and unruptured cerebral aneurysms in 233 patients. We included all subjects with saccular aneurysms treated by coil embolization between January 2010 and May 2015. Criteria for exclusion were the use of flow diverters, incomplete information about the coils used, inadequately calibrated angiography system for volume calculation, and previously treated aneurysms. The study group consisted of 37 aneurysms treated with unique large-diameter coils, whereas the control group included 223 aneurysms treated with different widely used standard coils. Approval from our institutional review board was obtained for this study.

Endovascular treatment

In the study group we used PC400 coils alone, or mixed with standard diameter coils, whereas a

A variety of standard diameter coils were used in the control group (Orbit Galaxy, TriVill: Codman & Shurtleff, Inc, Ranyham, Massachusetts, USA; HyperSoft 3D, HydroCoil, Cosmos, Complex, Compass: Microvention, Inc., Tustin, California, USA; Axium: Covidien, Irvine, California, USA; Target, GDC; Stryker, Fremont, California, USA; diameter range 0.0095–0.015 inch). When mixing coil materials in the study group the conventional coils were used only for neck finishing. The choice of which coil type to use was mainly influenced by aneurysm characteristics, such as volume, neck width, and maximum diameter. An indication for endovascular intervention versus surgical clipping was established based on consensus in our institutional vascular board consisting of experienced interventional neuroradiologists and neurosurgeons. Endovascular coil embolization was performed under general anesthesia and with systemic administration of heparin. The aim of coil placement was defined as packing aneurysms as densely as possible, with coils being incorporated into the aneurysm sac until no more material could be inserted.

**Analysis and outcome definitions**

Aneurysmal characteristics were analyzed by reviewing angiographic data. The review was blinded and performed by two experienced neurointerventionalists (TB-B, SP), who were not involved in the treatment of the reviewed case. Aneurysm volume and packing density were calculated using the recently evaluated software, ‘AngioSuite’.22 Packing density was also qualitatively analyzed using packing density ranges (0–10%, 10–20%, 20–30%, 30–40%, and >40%). Aneurysms were further divided into diameter categories using the cut-off values proposed by the authors of the ISUIA (International Study of Unruptured Intracranial Aneurysms) trial: small <7 mm, medium 7–12 mm, large >12–25 mm.23 Dome/neck ratio was defined as the dome diameter divided by the aneurysm neck. To determine procedure success we evaluated grade of occlusion using the modified Raymond–Roy occlusion classification (MRRC) after the initial procedure and based on follow-up images.24 Follow-up angiograms were further dichotomized into present or absent compaction, where coil compaction was defined as shrinkage of the coil mesh or increased contrast filling within the coil interstices compared with the postinterventional angiogram. Aneurysm recurrence was defined as deterioration of the MRRC to grade IIIa or IIIb on follow-up images. Overall treatment failure was defined as MRRC grade IIIa or IIIb on follow-up images as well as a MRRC grade IIIb after the procedure when no follow-up data were available. Although we are aware that this definition may be controversial, we adopted it based on evidence showing that an aneurysm with an initial occlusion grade of IIIb has very low chances of having a better occlusion rate grade at follow-up control.25 We did not include MRRC grade II as treatment failure because a recent study suggested that grade II aneurysms are comparable to grade I aneurysms in their recanalization and re-treatment rates.15 Procedure time was defined as the time between first image acquisition and the first control image. We also classified aneurysms as ‘high risk’ if they shared at least one of the previously reported shape characteristics associated with an increased risk of aneurysm recurrence: neck width >4 mm, maximum diameter >10 mm, mean volume >600 mm³.8 9 13 26 27

**Statistical analysis**

Analysis was performed on all aneurysms, and also after excluding aneurysms with a diameter <7 mm to increase comparability of both groups. Continuous variables with a normal distribution were compared using Welch’s t test for independent samples, whereas the Mann–Whitney U test was used for non-normally distributed data. Categorical variables and frequency counts were compared using Fisher’s exact test. All noted p values are two sided. If not otherwise specified, normally distributed variables are shown as mean±SD, and other data are reported as median and IQR. To determine the best cut-off values we performed receiver operating characteristic analysis and determined the highest Youden index (sensitivity+specificity–1). Multiple aneurysms seen in the same patient were treated as independent observations. All data management and statistical analyses were performed using SPSS statistics (V23.0; IBM Co/riporation, Armonk, New York, USA).

**RESULTS**

**Patient and aneurysm characteristics**

Most patient and aneurysm characteristics of our patients are comparable to those of published large aneurysm series (table 1). The majority of patients were women (70.4%) and the average age was 55.9±14.0. About two-thirds of patients were diagnosed with subarachnoid hemorrhage (68.2%). On average PC400 coils were used in the larger aneurysms (218.9 vs 47.1 mm³, p<0.001) with greater dome/neck ratio (2.0 vs 1.6, p=0.001), wider necks (3.0 vs 2.5 mm, p=0.005) and in an aneurysm population with a higher percentage of high-risk aneurysms (40.5% vs 15.2%, p=0.001). When using the volume coil system we embo-lized fewer anterior communicating artery (ACOM) aneurysms (18.9% vs 40.8%, p=0.011) and more posterior communicating artery (PCOM) aneurysms (32.4% vs 17.5%, p=0.044) compared with the control group. Exclusion of aneurysms with a diameter <7 mm increased the homogeneity of groups but we still report significant differences for aneurysm volume (246.7 vs 154.3 mm³, p=0.001), maximum diameter (10.0 vs 8.8 mm, p=0.023), and anterior communicating location (16.1% vs 38.1%, p=0.026). In summary, even after excluding small aneurysms, volume coils were used in a potentially more difficult-to-treat group. Other baseline characteristics did not differ significantly between the groups.

**Procedure characteristics**

There was a difference in procedure time with increased procedure duration in the study group (173.0 min vs 118.0 min, p=0.032; ≥7 mm: 179 vs 112 min, p=0.032) (table 2). This difference became less prominent when mixed coil cases in the study group were excluded (123.5 vs 118.0 min, p=0.454; ≥7 mm: 161.5 vs 112.0 min, p=0.238). We therefore believe that this observation may be due to a higher frequency of required catheter exchanges. In 29.7% of PC400 cases we additionally used standard diameter coils for neck finishing. However, these coils accounted for a very small volume fraction of the overall inserted coil mesh volume (11.5%±8.4%). Aneurysms in the volume coil group were treated with fewer coils per cubic millimeter than those in the control group (0.028 vs 0.120, p<0.001). We did not observe any significant differences in either group for the frequency of stent or balloon assistance, which was around 15% each (all p>0.5). For wide-neck aneurysms in our aneurysm population (neck width ≥4 mm; n=61) we observed less stent assistance in the volume coil group than in the conventionally treated group (16.7% vs 40.8%, p=0.182). However, this difference was not statistically significant. Overall we achieved higher packing density with the use of PC400 coils compared with the control group (42.2% vs 34.4%, p<0.001). This difference was also more pronounced when analyzing aneurysms ≥7 mm (42.2% vs 27.8%, 0.015 inch).
were fewer aneurysms with a packing density <30% in the volume coil group (10.8% vs 39.0%, p=0.001; ≥7 mm: 9.7% vs 56.0%, p=0.001), while the portion of densely packed aneurysms >40% was higher (54.1% vs 30.9%, p<0.001; ≥7 mm: 54.8% vs 13.1%, p<0.001). We also observed a previously reported general tendency towards lower packing densities in larger aneurysms. The downturn was comparable in both groups but on a higher baseline level when using the PC400 coil (see figure 1). Although we did not find any significant difference in occlusion grade after procedure in both groups, there was a tendency towards more grade I occlusion grades in the PC400 group in medium and large aneurysms (54.8% vs 38.1%, p=0.138). Overall procedure-related complications (10.8% vs 18.4%, p=0.350; ≥7 mm: 12.9% vs 19.0%, p=0.583) and detailed subgroup complication analysis did not differ significantly between the groups (all p>0.25). Two out of four complications in the volume group occurred in mixed-coil cases.

**Follow-up analysis**

Angiographic follow-up was available in 57.7% of all aneurysms (table 3). Median time to follow-up was in line with our institutional recommendation of a 6 month control (6.0 months; ≥7 mm: 6.0 months) and did not differ between the groups. We report a tendency towards more MRRC grade I (61.9% vs 35.7%, p=0.067), which did not reach statistical significance and fewer grade IIIa/b (23.8% vs 32.3%, p=0.033) on follow-up images in the study group when focusing on aneurysms ≥7 mm. In this diameter subgroup we also noted less coil compaction (23.8% vs 64.3%, p=0.003) and less aneurysm recurrence (14.3% vs 40.5%, p=0.046) as well as a lower frequency of overall treatment failure (16.1% vs 38.1%, p=0.026) when using volume coils (see figure 2 for an illustrative case). In all recurrent aneurysms, coil compaction was reported (33/33), whereas only 58.9% (33/56) of coil compaction cases resulted in aneurysm recurrence. This is mainly explained by the fact that recurrence was not defined as any worsening compared with postprocedural occlusion grade, but as an occlusion grade of IIIb/IIIa on follow-up with better occlusion rates on postinterventional control images. So cases with occlusion grade worsening from MRRC grade I to MRRC grade II and cases, both with postprocedural and follow-up MRRC grade IIIb, did not count as aneurysm recurrence, but we report coil compaction. We also did not observe any statistically significant difference of compaction frequency within the packing density groups when comparing volume coils with those of the control group (20–30%, p=1.000, 30–40%, p=0.694, >40%, p=0.694), which suggests that outcome differences between the groups are mainly due to a greater frequency of densely packed aneurysms in the volume coil group, rather than other material property differences. The best cut-off packing density value for overall treatment failure in all 260 analyzed aneurysms was determined as 25.5% (area under the curve=0.702; highest Youden index=0.34).

**Catheter-placement difficulties**

We also observed six cases with an intention-to-treat with PC400 coils, but applied coiling technique was changed during procedure (table 4). All six aneurysms were in the anterior circulation while four of the six had a distal location (two ACOM, one M1, one A1). In five of the six cases it was possible to safely change the catheter type to a smaller one (Echelon 10, Covidien, Irvine, California, USA or Excelsior SL10, Stryker, Fremont, California, USA) and successfully finish endovascular treatment using standard diameter coils (see figure 3 for an example).
The largest PC400 case series (n=76) by Mascitelli et al reported higher packing density (31.7% vs 24.8%, p<0.05), shorter procedure time (48 vs 64 min, p<0.05), and a smaller number of coils used for each aneurysm (3.53 vs 5.44, p=0.002), but no difference in the frequency rates of stent and balloon occlusion using the PC400 in aneurysms ≥7 mm results in the PC400-treated group (51.3% vs 22.8%, p=0.837), which is explained by a higher rate of device-related adverse events when using PC400 coils in a small study group (n=7). Baxter and Quarfordt reported a packing density of 48.9% and the use of fewer coils for each aneurysm, with their follow-up data suggesting durable occlusion rates when using the PC400 system in 34 small, medium, and large aneurysms. Villwock et al found that wide-neck aneurysms treated with either PC400 or conventional coils required a lower frequency of stent assistance when using the volume coil system.

In this study we have shown that endovascular aneurysm occlusion using the PC400 in aneurysms ≥7 mm results in the PC400-treated group (51.3% vs 22.8%, p=0.837), which is explained by a higher rate of device-related adverse events when using PC400 coils in a small study group (n=7). Baxter and Quarfordt reported a packing density of 48.9% and the use of fewer coils for each aneurysm, with their follow-up data suggesting durable occlusion rates when using the PC400 system in 34 small, medium, and large aneurysms. Villwock et al found that wide-neck aneurysms treated with either PC400 or conventional coils required a lower frequency of stent assistance when using the volume coil system.

We report higher mean packing densities when PC400 coils are used compared with previously published data. In the PC400 group our average packing density was 43.2%, while we calculated the average of previously published data to be 36.3% (n=135). Our rate of postinterventional fully occluded aneurysms, less coil compaction, less aneurysm recurrence, and less overall treatment failure compared with standard coil treatment. We also found six intention-to-treat cases, in which it was not possible to use the PC400 system owing to the required use of a catheter with a larger diameter.

We report higher mean packing densities when PC400 coils are used compared with previously published data. In the PC400 group our average packing density was 43.2%, while we calculated the average of previously published data to be 36.3% (n=135). Our rate of postinterventional fully occluded aneurysms, less coil compaction, less aneurysm recurrence, and less overall treatment failure compared with standard coil treatment. We also found six intention-to-treat cases, in which it was not possible to use the PC400 system owing to the required use of a catheter with a larger diameter.

Table 2 Procedure information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure time (min)</th>
<th>CC (n=223)</th>
<th>VC (n=37)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>CC ≥7 mm (n=84)</th>
<th>VC ≥7 mm (n=31)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedure time w/o mixed coil cases (min)</td>
<td>139.2/118.0 (17–464)</td>
<td>163.2/173.0 (52–366)</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
<td>139.8/112.0 (41–350)</td>
<td>167.2/179.0 (52–366)</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Stand-alone coiling</td>
<td>66.4% (148)</td>
<td>70.3% (26)</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>66.7% (56)</td>
<td>71.0% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stent-assisted coiling</td>
<td>13.9% (31)</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>14.3% (12)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balloon-assisted coiling</td>
<td>18.8% (42)</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>24.6% (17)</td>
<td>44.1% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing density</td>
<td>34.4±14.9</td>
<td>43.2±12.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>27.8±10.7</td>
<td>42.2±10.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRRC grade after procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>52.0% (116)</td>
<td>54.1% (20)</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>38.1% (32)</td>
<td>54.8% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>16.6% (37)</td>
<td>16.2% (6)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>21.4% (18)</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td>19.3% (43)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>22.6% (19)</td>
<td>25.8% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td>12.1% (27)</td>
<td>17.1% (6)</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>17.9% (15)</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure-related complication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.4% (41)</td>
<td>10.8% (4)</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>19.0% (16)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aneurysm rupture</td>
<td>2.7% (6)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coil malposition</td>
<td>2.7% (6)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vasospasm</td>
<td>4.0% (9)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrombois</td>
<td>7.6% (17)</td>
<td>5.4% (2)</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>8.3% (7)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent artery occlusion</td>
<td>0.4% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embolic event</td>
<td>1.3% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.6% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05, **p<0.01; normally distributed variables shown as mean±SD, non-normally distributed as median (IQR); procedure time (non-normally distributed) is displayed as mean, median (IQR). CC, conventional coils; MRRC, modified Raymond–Roy occlusion classification; PC400, Penumbra Coil 400; VC, volume coils; w/o, without.


discussion

To the best of our knowledge, six case reviews have evaluated the properties, efficacy, and safety of the PC400 coil system. The largest PC400 case series (n=76) by Mascitelli et al reported higher packing density (31.7% vs 24.8%, p<0.05), shorter procedure time (48 vs 64 min, p<0.05), and a smaller number of coils used for each aneurysm (3.53 vs 5.44, p=0.002), but no difference in the frequency rates of stent and balloon assists, in comparison with conventional treatment. They report a frequency of Raymond–Roy occlusion classification grade III aneurysms after coil placement of 71.1% in the study (PC400 coils) group and 38.2% in their control group using conventional coils (p<0.001). Contrary to their postprocedural findings they report comparable grade III occlusion rate on follow-up images (p<0.001). On follow-up we calculated the average of previously published data to be 36.3% (n=135). Our rate of postinterventional fully occluded aneurysms, less coil compaction, less aneurysm recurrence, and less overall treatment failure compared with standard coil treatment. We also found six intention-to-treat cases, in which it was not possible to use the PC400 system owing to the required use of a catheter with a larger diameter.

In one case catheter placement was insufficient even after changing the catheter to a smaller one, and here surgical clipping was performed.
report 28.0% grade IIIa/IIIb aneurysms, which is slightly higher than the 20.5% reported by Mascitelli et al. On the other hand, we observed more grade I (60.0%) aneurysms than in their study group (40.6%). The overall higher recurrence rate might be explained by the overall risk factor distribution described below. Compared with our PC400-treated aneurysms, their study group consisted of aneurysms with smaller volume (median 110.8 vs 218.9 mm$^3$), smaller aneurysm diameter (mean 6.5 vs 10.2 mm), and a lower percentage of ruptured aneurysms (44.2% vs 62.2%). Owing to these attributes, their patients had a lower risk of increased recurrence rates.

Contrary to previous studies we did not note a shortening of procedure time but a tendency towards an increased procedure duration in the volume coil group as well as an overall prolonged intervention time compared with other reports. Those findings might be explained by the use of different procedure time definitions. Previous studies defined procedure time as the time between the first working view image and the first control image, whereas we set procedure time as the difference between the first angiographic image and the first control image. Taking into account that one has to use a larger catheter we hypothesize that a suggested shorter coil insertion time, might be compensated by a longer probing time and a more difficult catheter placement. In addition, as previously mentioned, we report a higher frequency of neck finishing with standard coils in the PC400 group, thus requiring catheter exchange, which may take

**Figure 1** Volume and packing density of aneurysms treated with either Penumbra Coil 400 (PC400) coils or standard diameter coils. ▲, standard diameter coils with linear regression model (---); ○, PC400 coils with linear regression model (---); x axis, logarithmic volume in mm$^3$; y axis packing density in %; y axis reference line (--- --- --- ---), 25.5% indicates calculated best cut-off packing density from our study data.

---

**Table 3** Follow-up outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CC (n=223)</th>
<th>VC (n=37)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>CC ≥ 7 mm (n=84)</th>
<th>VC ≥ 7 mm (n=31)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FU available</td>
<td>56.1% (125)</td>
<td>67.6% (25)</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>50.0% (42)</td>
<td>67.7% (21)</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to FU</td>
<td>5.9 (4.4–6.8)</td>
<td>6 (4.7–7.1)</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>6.0 (5.0–7.3)</td>
<td>5.9 (5.3–6.8)</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRRC grade at FU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIa/IIIb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coil compaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aneurysm recurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall treatment failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05, **p<0.01; normally distributed variables shown as mean±SD, non-normally distributed as median (IQR).

CC, conventional coils; FU, follow-up; MRRC, modified Raymond–Roy occlusion classification; VC, volume coils.
several minutes. We are aware that a long procedure duration is generally associated with an increased complication rate, but we did not observe more procedure-related adverse events in the study group.31

We also reported a lower percentage of treated ACOM aneurysms when using the volume coil system, which is well in line with aneurysm location characteristics treated with PC400 coils reported by Mascitelli et al.28 ACOM aneurysms often exhibit complex parent vessel relationships and are frequently associated with anomalies of the ACOM. They are associated with a smaller A1–A2 angle junction and hypoplastic or aplastic A1 segments.32 Considering the tortuosity and length, it is more complicated to control and safely place coils and possible assistance devices. We think that those factors led interventionalists to favor smaller microcatheters and thereby the use of standard diameter coils when treating ACOM aneurysms.

A further observation in the study of Mascitelli et al.28 and in our study is an overall increased frequency of PCOM aneurysms treated with the PC400. Usually the fundus of PCOM aneurysms is in line with the communicating segment of the internal carotid artery (ICA) and does not require a second catheter turn shortly after the cavernous segment of the ICA. Additionally, the incidence of unilateral or bilateral fetal PCOM variants is around 25%,33–36 and this variant often results in a vessel anatomy that is relatively conducive to catheter placement. For these reasons we believe that interventionalists felt comfortable using the larger catheter, which is necessary for implementing volume coils, when encountering aneurysms of the PCOM.

Overall, we also believe that localization bias should not affect outcome parameters as we are not aware of any study which has shown a statistically significant association between localization and angiographic aneurysm recurrence after coil embolization.

As mentioned above we observed six cases in which it was not possible to use the PC400 coil system. Five of the six aneurysms in the intention-to-treat group could be safely occluded using conventional embolization techniques. This affects the relative superiority of the PC400 system by demonstrating device-specific technical limitations. We suggest that the PC400 coil system may not be the ideal choice for all cases, especially those with complex parent vessel relationships and aneurysm location characteristics reported by Mascitelli et al.28

Table 4 Probing or catheter placement failure when using the PC400 system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PC400 catheter</th>
<th>Catheter change to</th>
<th>Successfully treated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>90° tip PX Slim</td>
<td>Echelon 10</td>
<td>Coiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACOM</td>
<td>45° tip PX Slim</td>
<td>Excelsior SL10</td>
<td>Coiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>45° tip PX Slim</td>
<td>Echelon 10, 90° tip shape</td>
<td>Coiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>45° tip PX Slim</td>
<td>Excelsior SL10</td>
<td>Coiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PCOM</td>
<td>45° tip PX Slim</td>
<td>Excelsior SL10</td>
<td>Coiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ACOM</td>
<td>45° PX400</td>
<td>Echelon 14, 45° tip shape</td>
<td>Clipping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1, segment 1 of the anterior cerebral artery; ACOM, anterior communicating artery; Echelon 10, Covidien, Irvine, California, USA; Excelsior SL10, Stryker, Fremont, California, USA; ICA, internal carotid artery; M1, segment 1 of the middle cerebral artery; PC400, Penumbra Coil 400, Penumbra, Inc., Alameda, California, USA; PCOM, posterior communicating artery; PX400/ PX Slim, Penumbra, Inc., Alameda, California, USA.
system is not ideal for treating small and distal aneurysms, mainly because of the need for a bigger and more rigid catheter. We also advocate a change in the technical treatment regimen to a smaller catheter during intervention whenever placement of the PX Slim is not feasible.

Several studies suggested that increased packing density might prevent aneurysm recanalization by decreasing coil compaction and increasing flow stasis.7 10 13 25 37–40. In addition to the effect of the overall packing density itself, there is also some evidence that the homogeneity of coil distribution is an important cofactor.31 42 Although Goddard et al found that packing density was predictive of recurrence only for medium and large aneurysms, there is still debate about which subgroups are most influenced by packing density variations and their effect on aneurysm recanalization.43 A variety of best cut-off values for recurrence and treatment failure have been proposed. Kawanabe et al10 and Leng et al14 both found a packing density of 20% to be the best cut-off point in preventing recurrence. Shluzewski et al17 reported no coil compaction when an aneurysm is packed ≥25%. A recent study by Mascielli et al23 proposed a packing density of 31% as the best-fit cut-off point. In our study we identified 25.5% to be the most significant cut-off point for overall treatment failure, which is consistent with the results of other institutions. It should be kept in mind that our results are based on a retrospective study and that clinical outcome parameters are not addressed.

The decision about which coil type to use for a given patient was made by interventionalists based on the aneurysm characteristics rather than randomly, which might have resulted in a selection bias and unobserved heterogeneity in the sample. Most of the PC400 aneurysms were treated more recently than those treated with standard diameter coils, which might have affected the results owing to an overall skill progression.

CONCLUSION The results of our monocentric retrospective case series study on the administration of the PC400 volume coil system as opposed to conventional diameter coils suggest that the PC400 volume coil system is safe and effective in treating intracranial aneurysms. Despite having been applied in a potentially more difficult-to-treat group, the use of PC400 was associated with less coil compaction and aneurysm recurrence in aneurysms ≥7 mm, probably owing to the higher packing density achieved with PC400 coils.
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