International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp: (611-616), Month: October 2017 - March 2018, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Roles and Effective of Foramen Ovale Closure to Prevent Recurrent Stroke

[1]Saeed Abdulrahman Alghamdi, [2]Abdullah Abdulrahman Alghamdi,
[3]Saeed Abdulaziz Alghamdi, [4]Eid Hussein Alshahrani, [5]Alwaleed Abdullah Alshahrani,
[6]Abdulmjeed Abdulrhman Alshahrani, [7]Saleh Abdulrahman Alghamdi,
[8]Nasser Abdullah Alshahrani

Abstract: **The aim of this article is to review the background, pathophysiology, epidemiology and current level of evidence for secondary stroke prevention from PFO and highlight some pitfalls in management. We conducted a search of the Cochrane database to evaluate the effective of foramen ovale closure to prevent recurrent stroke that were studied up to 2017. In summary, results of these current trials provide new devices to help curtail danger of recurrent strokes in selected patients with a PFO associated stroke. Nonetheless, closure is not a panacea for all stroke patients who likewise take place to have a PFO. It is essential to keep in mind that the advantage obtained from PFO closure is modest and could quickly be offset if the complications from procedure increase even by small measures in clinical practice. Continued surveillance is necessary to make sure that these tools are being placed for appropriate indications in clinical settings and have low rates of complications so as to not endanger the wellbeing of our patients.**

Keywords: **PFO associated stroke, pathophysiology, epidemiology.**

1. INTRODUCTION

The very first written documents of an organization in between a patent foramen ovale (PFO) and a stroke dates back to 1877, when a German pathologist, Cohnheim, described a young woman with an ischemic stroke at autopsy, who had existing together PFO and deep venous thrombosis (DVT) [1].He hypothesized that the thrombus from her leg took a trip to the right room and crossed over to the left through the PFO before ending its trip in the cerebral artery [1].Similar descriptions of paradoxical embolism from autopsy research studies emerged in the following years. Nevertheless, it was just in the 1980s with the development of echocardiography that the medical diagnosis of PFO in vivo ended up being regular in medical technique.

PFO is extensively prevalent in the population. Information from echocardiography studies reveal a frequency of 15-25% in the adult populace whereas the discovery is a little greater on autopsy research studies ranging in between 15 and 35% [2], [3] In terms of a perspective, these figures reflect a prevalence that is 10-fold more than that of bicuspid aortic valve, which is thought about to be the most common adult congenital heart disease [4].Some observational researches have implied that the frequency of PFO reduces with increasing age recommending that spontaneous closure can take place in later years of life [2], [3].Nonetheless, longitudinal researches on PFOs to either support or refute this case are presently lacking. Both men and females are influenced just as and there are no apparent raceethnic preferences [2].

The aim of this article is to review the background, pathophysiology, epidemiology and current level of evidence for secondary stroke prevention from PFO and highlight some pitfalls in management.

2. METHODOLOGY

We conducted a search of the Cochrane database to evaluate the effective of foramen ovale closure to prevent recurrent stroke that were studied up to 2017. We used this list as MeSH terms or equivalent to compose searches of MEDLINE and

EMBASE. We included search terms for age: foramen ovale closure; and *stroke*. We performed an additional search to identify related references to our studies among the reviewed articles. References identified via the literature search will be screened by the authors, and disagreement will be resolved either by discussion or with the aid of an additional reviewer. our search was limited to English language studies.

3. DISCUSSION

- **Pathophysiology of stroke from a PFO**:

There is considerable variability in size and morphology of PFOs, which could have significant influence on the risk of stroke. Huge sized PFO have been connected with a greater stroke danger in empirical research studies [5].Presumably, a larger aperture could facilitate paradoxical blood clot specifically throughout Valsalva type maneuvers, which boosts ideal atrial and ventricular pressures, relieving the movement of the thrombus from the right to the left side of the heart. However, a thrombus in transit has only been determined in a handful of cases. PFOs are also connected with various other structural abnormalities, such as atrial septal aneurysm (ASA), prominent Chiari network and Eustachian shutoffs. Atrial septal aneurysm refers to hypermobility of the inter-atrial septum from its midline placement throughout the cardiac cycle; generally a tour of 10 mm is considered analysis for an ASA. Visibility of these associated attributes could boost the threat of paradoxical embolism by preferentially guiding flow from the substandard venacava to the foramen ovale. On top of that, ASA could bring about insitu thrombus formation, atriopathy or prompt atrial fibrillation [6].Acquired or gotten prothrombotic states increases the threat of cerebral blood clot in patients with PFO. Studies reveal a raised prevalence of healthy protein C and S, antithrombin III shortages, along with Factor V Leiden and prothrombin genetics mutation in stroke patients with a PFO [7].In a similar way, current surgery, trauma, dehydration or use of contraceptive pills could also elevate stroke dangers in these patients. The most near system operative in a private patient could now and then be difficult to recognize and it is possible that even more compared to one system is accountable.

- **Epidemiology:**

Epidemiological investigations of the relationship between ischemic strokes and PFO can be challenging due to the high frequency of this danger consider the basic population. Statistical organization could be erroneous if they are not meticulously regulated for conventional stroke danger variables. This is specifically real for the senior populace who frequently harbor various other completing problems that individually boost their stroke danger. Existence of a PFO will likely be subordinate in this circumstance. The source of stroke continues to be unknown in regarding a 3rd of patients with an ischemic stroke regardless of an in-depth work-up [8].This group of so called cryptogenic stroke patients have a much greater frequency of a PFO than the basic population and strokes in this sub-population shows a considerable association with the existence of a PFO, as association that is more powerful for the more youthful age team [8], [9].Alternatively, a big meta-analysis of 23 case controlled researches shows that even in a third of patients with cryptogenic infarcts, presence of a PFO is most likely incidental, including to the challenge of clinical care in these patients [10].

- **PFO-incidental or causative?**

The exploration of a PFO in a stroke patient raises the question whether the PFO is original or subordinate. Due to the unsure association in between it and a stroke, strokes attributable to a PFO are thought about "cryptogenic" though the operative meaning of this term has been used variably in method. Based upon the results of the existing observational research studies, a PFO must be taken into consideration as a potential cause in more youthful patients with cryptogenic strokes who have undertaken a comprehensive investigation for their stroke that includes, imaging of intracranial and extracranial vasculature, cardiac surveillance to rule out paroxysmal or consistent atrial fibrillation, a practically good quality echocardiography to search for structural causes for cardioembolism, assessment of various other vascular threat aspects including hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, smoking status and in choose instances, examinations for underlying prothrombotic states. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) could even more help in figuring out the etiology of stroke. Many strokes because of a PFO bring an embolic "trademark" on clinical presentation and imaging and overmuch affect the younger patients who lack recognized threat variables for stroke. Radiological assessment of a big database of strokes in patients with a PFO shows that infarcts attributable to PFO are normally larger (> 10 mm), ostensibly located, than smaller sized, or deep strokes, and those linked by chronic infarcts; strokes because of PFO are regularly solitary lesions and much less most likely accompanied with unintentional chronic infarcts on imaging [11].However, these findings are not outright and ought to be thought about along with the total clinical picture in making this resolution.

Initiatives have been made to develop proof based medical tools to help establishing the PFO-relatedness of a stroke in cryptogenic stroke patients. A detailed analysis of a huge data source with cryptogenic stroke patients, who undertook an organized, detailed assessment shows that the attributable danger from a PFO decreases with boosting age, presence of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, smoking, prior background of a stroke or a TIA and existence of deep infarcts [12].A threat stratification system, called the Risk of Paradoxical Embolism (RoPE) score has been established to stratify patients by the related likelihood that a found PFO is subordinate or stroke-related (Table 1) [12].Clinical scales such as this have been beneficial to address similar issues in analytical analysis and reasonings created by the synergistic results or communications in between several variables, which have an effect on a final outcome of interest. The RoPE score is a 10 factor scoring system, a greater rating indicating a better chance that the stroke is PFO connected. The observed PFO occurrence in the aforementioned database of cryptogenic stroke patients ranged from 12% (in those with 0 or 1 factor) to 82% (in those with 10 points) [12].

- **Risk of stroke recurrence:**

Besides evaluating the PFO relatedness of a stroke, the following vital issue is approximating the threat of stroke reappearance in a specific stroke patient with a PFO. The total danger of reoccurrence in a patient with a stroke pertaining to a PFO is low varying from 0.8- 2% annually [1], [14].Mate from the Patent Foramen Ovale in the Cryptogenic Stroke Study (PICSS) showed an abnormally higher risk of recurrence which might have been because of enrollment of an older mate with various other associated threat variables [15].The figures from the PICSS dataset have not been replicated in other examinations or recent trials. Nevertheless, it is important to birth in mind that the threat of reappearance is heterogeneous. Anatomical features of the PFO and the septum might even more assist in assessing this threat. A big multicenter observational study reveals that the existence of ASA considerably raises the threat of succeeding stroke to 15.2% over 4 years [14].Nevertheless, no clear relationship in between the size of a PFO or level of shunting with reoccurrence has been found. In another investigation, when patients were divided based upon their RoPE scores, those with a high RoPE rating (> 6) in which the PFO was most likely pathogenic, revealed a lower reappearance rate of 5% over 2 years compared to those with lower RoPE ratings, that likely had incidental PFO, with rates of 10%.22 The risk of frequent stroke was lowest in the team with the highest RoPE ratings of 9-10 (2% over 2 years; 95% CI 0- 4) [16].These figures emphasize the low danger of stroke positioned by a PFO though it has been argued that considering that the exposure to this anomaly is life-long, the advancing danger could be substantial. It is vague, nonetheless whether the risk of stroke over the span of a person's life is consistent or front-loaded, i.e., with a higher stroke risk after an index event which lowers gradually. Only a good top quality longitudinal research study could address this issue.

- **PFO closure:**

Recent trials in PFO closure:

Outcomes of 3 open label multicenter tests (with blinded adjudication) of catheter based PFO closure were reported in NEJM lately (Table 1) [17], [18], [19].Two of them, the Gore REDUCE Clinical Trial and RESPECT Trial were market funded and CLOSE was sponsored by the French Ministry of Health. Every one of them utilized extra mindful inclusion requirements compared to previous studies. The upper age limit was 59 years in REDUCE and 60 years in CLOSE and RESPECT tests. CLOSE and REDUCE, only signed up patients with a large PFO and/or an associated ASA, whereas RESPECT stratified their randomization based upon the presence of an ASA. All trials needed conclusion of a detailed examination to rule out other etiology for the qualifying stroke. The comparator medical arms in these trials differed and were appointed various antiplatelets or warfarin, at the investigator or treating physician's discernment. Taken together, the tests results showed superiority of tool closure in very carefully picked patients with cryptogenic strokes and an ASA and/or a large PFO as compared to medical therapy, which in the majority of instances were antiplatelet medicines. These tests do not give any solution to whether closure is premium to anticoagulation, as this contrast was underpowered. These results as soon as again reproduce the low occasion rate of frequent stroke in the medical arm demonstrated in previous observational researches. The total advantage of this intervention was moderate with a number needed-to-treat varying from 20 to 45 to avoid one stroke over the follow-up period [17], [18], [19].It additionally reconfirms the previous monitorings showing that device closure is linked with a notable risk of new start atrial fibrillation. Routine prolonged cardiac tracking was not systematically went after and it is uncertain whether gadget closure puts these patients at a lifelong risk for atrial fibrillation. In previous tests, procedure associated AF was linked with recurrent strokes, which was not reported in these researches. Other significant problems consisted of a greater risk of pulmonary embolism, device dislocation and device associated thrombosis [17], [18], [19].

Table1. Summary of Recent Trials of Device Closure for Secondary Stroke Prevention and Patent Foramen Ovale

	CLOSE	REDUCE	RESPECT
Design	Multicenter RCTa 663 randomly assigned to device closure, antiplatelet therapy or anticoagulation in 1:1:1 ratio.	Multicenter RCT 664 randomly assigned to closure versus antiplatelet therapy in 2:1 ratio	Multicenter RCT randomly assigned 980 patients to closure versus medical therapy in 1:1 ratio
Device	Varied on investigator discretion	Helex Septal Occluder or the Cardioform Septal Occluder	Amplatzer PFO Occluder
Control	Antiplatelet or warfarin	Aspirin, or clopidogrel or aspirin plus dipyridamole at investigator discretion	Aspirin, warfarin, clopidogrel, or aspirin combined with extended-release dipyridamole at investigator discretion
Main	-Age 16–60 years	-Age 18–59 years	-Age18–60 years
Eligibility Criteria	-Ischemic stroke attributable to PFO 6 months of randomization -Associated with an ASAb or large shunt on TEEc	-Cryptogenic stroke <6 months of randomization -Significant right to left shunt on	-Cryptogenic stroke <9 month of index stroke
Duration of Follow-up	Mean (±SD) 5.3±2.0 years	Median follow-up 3.2 years (interquartile range, 2.2 to 4.8)	Median 5.9 years
Main Outcomes	-Primary outcome: Fatal or nonfatal stroke. -Safety outcomes: Major or fatal procedural or hemorrhagic complications	Coprimary endpoints: -Recurrent symptomatic ischemic stroke -Symptomatic or silent brain infarct seen on brain MRI	Recurrent stroke or death
Results	Significant difference: -Primary end point (ITTa analysis) 0% in closure versus 5.9% in antiplatelet group (HR 0.03, 95% CI, 0.00–0.26;p < 0.001) -Ischemic stroke, TIA or systemic embolism in 3.3% closure versus 8.9% in antiplatelet group (HRb 0.39, 95% CI, 0.16–0.82; p = 0.01)	Significant differences: -Symptomatic recurrent ischemic occurred in 1.4% in the closure group versus 5.4% in the antiplatelet-only group (HR, 0.23; 95% CI, 0.09 to 0.62; P = 0.002) -Symptomatic plus asymptomatic stroke occurred in 5.7% in the closure group versus 11.3) in the antiplatelet-only group (RR, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.29 to 0.91; P = 0.04)	-Significant differences: All primary outcomes were recurrent strokes which occurred in 3.6% in closure versus 5.8% in control group (HR 0.55, 95% CI, 0.31–0.999; p = 0.046): -Significant difference, (PPAp), primary end point (0.46 events per 100 patient-years in closure group versus 1.30 events per 100 patient-years in controls HR 0.37, 95% CI 0.14–0.96; p = 0.03)
Adverse Events	5.9% had major or fatal device related complications Significant difference in new onset atrial fibrillation (4.6% in closure versus 0.9% in control group; p < 0.02)	No difference: Serious adverse events (23.1% in closure group versus 27.8% in controls) -Significant Difference: New onset atrial fibrillation (6.6% in closure vs. 0.4% in control group, P < 0.001)	No difference: -Serious adverse events (40.3% in the PFO closure group versus 36.0% in the medical-therapy group (P = 0.17) -Periprocedural atrial fibrillation in closure group versus controls -Significant difference: Pulmonary embolism (0.41 per 100 patient-years in the PFO closure group versus 0.11 per 100 patient-years in controls; p = 0.04)

4. CONCLUSION

In summary, results of these current trials provide new devices to help curtail danger of recurrent strokes in selected patients with a PFO associated stroke. Nonetheless, closure is not a panacea for all stroke patients who likewise take place to have a PFO. It is essential to keep in mind that the advantage obtained from PFO closure is modest and could quickly be offset if the complications from procedure increase even by small measures in clinical practice. Continued surveillance is necessary to make sure that these tools are being placed for appropriate indications in clinical settings and have low rates of complications so as to not endanger the wellbeing of our patients.

REFERENCES

[1] Lippmann H, Rafferty T. Patent foramen ovale and paradoxical embolization: a historical perspective. Yale J Biol Med. 1993;66:11–17.

[2] Hagen PT, Scholz DG, Edwards WD. Incidence and size of patent foramen ovale during the first 10 decades of life: an autopsy study of 965 normal hearts. Mayo. Clin. Proc. 1984;59:17–20.

[3] Penther P. Patent foramen ovale: an anatomical study: apropos of 500 consecutive autopsies. Arch Mal Coeur Vaiss. 1994;87:15–21.

[4] Siu SC, Silversides CK. Bicuspid aortic valve disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2010;55:2789–2800.

[5] Goel SS, Tuzcu EM, Shishehbor MH, et al. Morphology of the patent foramen ovale in asymptomatic versus symptomatic (stroke or transient ischemic attack) patients. Am J Cardiol. 2009;103:124–129.

[6] Rigatelli G, Dell'Avvocata F, Giordan M, Braggion G, Aggio S, Chinaglia M, Roncon L, Cardaioli P, Chen JP. Embolic implications of combined risk factors in patients with patent foramen ovale (the CARPE criteria): consideration for primary prevention closure? J Interv Cardiol. 2009; 22: 398–403.

[7] Karttunen V, Hiltunen L, Rasi V, Vahtera E, Hillbom M. Factor V Leiden and prothrombin gene mutation may predispose to paradoxical embolism in subjects with patent foramen ovale. Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis. 2003;14:261–268.

[8] Messe SR, Silverman IE, Kizer JR, et al. Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Practice parameter: recurrent stroke with patent foramen ovale and atrial septal aneurysm: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology. 2004;62:1042–1050.

[9] Overell JR, Bone I, Lees KR. Interatrial septal abnormalities and stroke: a metaanalysis of case-control studies. Neurology. 2000;55:1172–1179.

[10] Alsheikh-Ali AA, Thaler DE, Kent DM. Patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic stroke: incidental or pathogenic? Stroke. 2009;40(7):2349–2355.

[11] . Thaler DE, Ruthazer R, Di Angelantonio E, et al. Neuroimaging findings in cryptogenic stroke patients with and without patent foramen ovale. Stroke. 2013;44(3):675–680.

[12] Kent DM, Ruthazer R, Weimar C, et al. An index to identify stroke-related vs incidental patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic stroke. Neurology. 2013 13;81 (7):619–625.

[13] Homma S, Sacco RL. Patent foramen ovale and stroke. Circulation. 2005;112:1063–1072.

[14] Mas JL, Arquizan C, Lamy C, et al. Recurrent cerebrovascular events associated with patent foramen ovale, atrial septal aneurysm, or both. N Engl J Med. 2001;345:1740–1746.

[15] Homma S, Sacco RL, Di Tullio MR, Sciacca RR, Mohr JP, for the PICSS study investigators. Effect of medical treatment in stroke patients with patent foramen ovale: patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic stroke study. Circulation. 2002; 105: 2625–2631.

[16] Thaler DE, Ruthazer R, Weimar C, et al. Recurrent stroke predictors differ in medically treated patients with pathogenic vs. other PFOs. Neurology. 2014;83 (3):221–226.

[17] Mas JL, Derumeaux G, Guillon B, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure or anticoagulation vs. antiplatelets after stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(11):1011– 1021.

[18] Søndergaard L, Kasner SE, Rhodes JF, et al. Patent foramen ovale closure or antiplatelet therapy for cryptogenic stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(11):1033– 1042.

[19] Saver JL, Carroll JD, Thaler DE, et al. Long-term outcomes of patent foramen ovale closure or medicaltherapy after stroke. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(11):1022– 1032.