

Short- and long-term outcomes following biological pericardium patches versus prosthetic patches for carotid endarterectomy: A retrospective bicentric study

Léonore Freycon-Tardy, Elsa Faure, D Peyre-Costa, Ludovic Canaud, P Branchereau, Ch Marty-Ané, Pierre Alric, Eric Picard

▶ To cite this version:

Léonore Freycon-Tardy, Elsa Faure, D Peyre-Costa, Ludovic Canaud, P Branchereau, et al.. Short- and long-term outcomes following biological pericardium patches versus prosthetic patches for carotid endarterectomy: A retrospective bicentric study. Annals of Vascular Surgery, 2020, 10.1016/j.avsg.2020.04.010. hal-02862265

HAL Id: hal-02862265 https://hal.science/hal-02862265

Submitted on 24 Apr 2023 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

- 1 Title :
- 2 Short- and long-term outcomes following biological pericardium patches
- 3 versus prosthetic patches for carotid endarterectomy: A retrospective
- 4 bicentric study
- 5
- 6 Authors :
- 7 Freycon-Tardy Léonore¹, doctor of general surgery, leonore.freycontardy@chu-nimes.fr
- 8 Faure Elsa¹, doctor of vascular surgery, elsa.faure@chu-nimes.fr
- 9 Peyre-Costa D², d-peyre@chu-montpellier.fr
- 10 Canaud L³, professor in vascular surgery, l-canaud@chu-montpellier.fr
- 11 Branchereau P¹, doctor in vascular surgery, pascal.branchereau@chu-nimes.fr
- 12 Marty-Ané CH³, professor in thoracic and cardio-vascular surgery, ch-marty_ane@chu-
- 13 montpellier.fr
- 14 Alric P³, professor in vascular surgery, p-alric@chu-montpellier.fr
- 15 Picard E¹, doctor in vascular surgery, eric.picard@chu-nimes.fr
- 16
- 17 ¹ Department of Vascular and Thoracic Surgery, CHU Nimes, France
- 18 ² Department of Research and Medical Information, CHU, Montpellier, France
- ³ Department of Thoracic and Vascular Surgery, CHU Arnaud de Villeneuve, Montpellier, France

20

21 Corresponding author: Leonore.FREYCONTARDY@chu-nimes.fr

22

23 ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: Currently, there are various types of patches available on the market for carotid endarterectomy (CEA) with enlargement angioplasty, prosthetic and biological patches including bovine pericardial patches. Despite the increasing use of these biological patches, there is little data in the literature comparing the results of these two types of patch. The purpose of this study was to compare the short- and long-term results of bovine pericardium patches (BPP) with prosthetic patches (PP) in carotid thromboendarterectomy.

30 METHODS: This study presents a retrospective analysis of all CEAs performed at Montpellier 31 and Nîmes University Hospitals (France) in 2014 and 2015. Patients who underwent eversion 32 were excluded. Pre-, per- and post-operative clinical and doppler ultrasound results were 33 collected and analyzed. The primary endpoint was the comparison of the restenosis rate 34 between the BPP and the PP group. Secondary endpoints were the analysis of restenosis risk factors (type of patch, gender, renal failure, smoking, diabetes, arterial hypertension, 35 dyslipidemia and redo surgery were analyzed); the comparison of morbidity-mortality and 36 37 infection between BPP and PP group and the comparison of morbidity-mortality between 38 symptomatic and asymptomatic stenosis.

39 RESULTS: In total, 342 CEAs were performed, of which 168 (49%) with BPP and 174 (51%) 40 with PP. Median follow-up was 30 months (IQR=24). The stroke rate at Day 30 was 3.22% 41 and mortality at Day 30 was 1.86%. There was no significant difference between groups 42 concerning anyone of the variables of interest. At the end of follow-up, the restenosis rate 43 >50% was 7.31% (6.45% BPP group vs 8.22% PP group, p=.55). The severe restenosis rate 44 (>70%) was 4.65% (5.16% BPP group vs 4.11% PP group, p=.79). The univariate analysis 45 identified renal failure (Odds Ratio = 2.69) as the main risk factor. The postoperative 46 infection rate was 1.17% (0.59% BPP group vs 1.75% PP group, p=.62).

47 CONCLUSION: The rates of stroke and post-operative death, bleeding, infection and
48 restenosis are comparable between bovine pericardium patches and prosthetic patches in
49 our study. The use of prosthetic or biological patches seems to deliver comparable
50 outcomes. Further studies on larger samples are required.

- 51
- 52 KEYWORDS: carotid endarterectomy, restenosis, bovine pericardium patch, prosthetic patch53
- 54
- 55

56 **INTRODUCTION**

57 Strokes and their prevention are a major challenge to public health in industrial countries, 58 with more than 140 000 strokes per year in France.¹ Ischemic strokes represent 80% of all 59 strokes, and carotid stenosis is responsible for these in approximately 20% of cases.² Carotid 60 endarterectomy (CEA) in combination with medical therapy is indicated to prevent strokes in 61 asymptomatic carotid stenosis (60-99% of stenosis degree) or recurrence of symptoms in 62 symptomatic carotid stenosis (50-99% of stenosis degree).³ More than 13 000 CEAs are 63 performed annually in France.

CEA can be performed either by the eversion technique or the standard technique with patch closure according to surgeon's preference.³ Over the years, several kind of patches have been used: prosthetic (Dacron or PTFE) and biological including saphenous vein and bovine pericardium. CEA with bovine pericardium patches (BPP) was first described by Biasi in 1996.⁴ Recently, increasing numbers of surgeons have been choosing to use BPP, attracted by its biocompatibility and its low rate of infection, thrombogenicity and operative bleeding.⁵⁻⁶ There is no proven significant difference between the different materials on short- and long-term results.⁷ However literature comparing BPP with prosthetic patches
(PP) on short- and long-term remains fairly limited.⁶⁻⁸⁻⁹

The aim of this study was to retrospectively evaluate the short- and long-term results of CEA
with prosthetic versus biological bovine pericardium patching. In addition, the risk factors for
restenosis were studied.

- 76
- 77

78 METHODS

79 Study group

This retrospective study was conducted from January 1st, 2014 to December 31st, 2015. The 80 81 follow-up was continued until December 31st, 2018. All patients who had undergone a CEA 82 surgery with patch angioplasty at the University Hospitals of Montpellier and Nîmes in 83 France were enrolled. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of 84 Montpellier University Hospital. A consent form (with information and a non-objection to 85 participate in the study clause) was sent to each patient. Patients who underwent eversion CEA were excluded, all eversion were realized without patch. Surgery was performed under 86 87 general anesthesia and a vascular shunt was most often used. Before 2014 PP were 88 exclusively used. From 2014, BPP were introduced and became standard practice at the end 89 of 2015. The choice of type of patch was left to the surgeon's preference. BPP was used for 90 redo operations on a previous CEA with PP closure.

91 For the PP group, Dacron patches: Hemacarotid (Maquet®), Hemacarotid patch
92 (Intervascular®) and polyurethane patches: Vascular patch (B.Braun®) were used. For the
93 BPP group, bovine pericardium patch Xenosure (LeMaitre®) were exclusively used.

Data of the CEA, demographic factors and comorbid conditions were collected from patient
medical files. The Best Medical Therapy (BMT) was defined as an antiplatelet therapy with
statins.

97 Follow up

98 Patients were usually seen at the control visit at 1 or 3 months with a doppler ultra sound 99 (US). General practitioner or angiologist were contacted by telephone following a call 100 questionnaire for patients with less than 30 months of follow-up. Data about clinical status 101 and doppler US were gathered. Velocimetric criteria and percentage stenosis according 102 NASCET methods were coupled for the US study in both centers.¹⁰

103 The short-term outcomes were defined as the first post-operative month outcomes, long-104 term outcomes gathered all outcomes after the first month.

105 The short- and long-term outcomes of the two groups, PP and BPP, were collected and106 compared. The patients lost to follow-up were not included in the outcomes' analysis.

107 The cranial nerve injury was defined as a clinical manifestation of cranial nerve injury108 occurring after the surgery without pre-existing palsy.

109 Statistical analysis

110 The statistical analysis was made using Fischer or Chi2 test for binary qualitative variables.

111 Student and Wilcoxon tests were used to compare qualitative and quantitative variables.

112 The software SAS, 9.2 version, was used for the statistical analysis. The cut-off of significance

113 was p < .05.

The risk factor analysis of restenosis used odds ratio calculation. The analyzed factors have been chosen according the ones previously described in the literature. They are gender, type of patch, diabetes, dyslipidemia, arterial hypertension, smoking, renal failure (define as a glomerular filtration rate of less than 60mL/min/1.73m²) and redo CEA. 118 *Objective*

119 The primary endpoint was the comparison by type of patch of post-operative restenosis > 120 50% rate. Severe restenosis was defined as > 70% at the control ultrasound examination. Early restenosis was defined as restenosis diagnosed before the 18th month. The restenosis 121 122 data was considered as missing if there was no ultrasound checkup examination after a 123 minimum of one month. The secondary endpoints were the analysis of risk factors of restenosis by a univariate method, the comparison by kind of patch of hemorrhagic event, 124 125 morbidity-mortality at one month, infection, and the comparison by stenosis character of 126 morbidity-mortality.

127 Analysis of risk factors for restenosis > 50% was presented by odds ratios.

128

129 The reporting of this study conforms to the STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of130 Observational Studies in Epidemiology) statement.

131

132

133 **RESULTS**

134 Descriptive analysis

During the study period, 345 patients having undergone CEAs with patch angioplasty were treated. Three patients refused to participate to the study and were excluded. Of the 342 included patients: 168 receiving BPP angioplasty and 174 PP angioplasty. Concerning the type of PP, Dacron was used for 122 CEAs, polyurethane for 50 CEAs, and data were missing for 2 CEAs. These two CEAs were included in the PP group for the analysis. Mean age was 73 years at the time of surgery and the majority of patients were male (73%). The population characteristics are described in Table I. 142

143 The BMT, was preoperatively prescribed in 64% of cases. Symptomatic stenosis represented 144 43% of all CEAs performed. A carotid shunt was used in more than 95% of cases (96.4% BPP 145 group vs 94.8% PP group, p=0.47). 146 The two groups were similar regarding pre-operative characteristics apart from the 147 frequency of ACE inhibitor medication, which was greater for the PP group and frequency of 148 a history of ispilateral carotid surgery, which was higher in the BP group. 149 The median duration of clinical follow-up was 30 months (IQR=24) and 22 months (IQR=27) 150 for doppler US follow-up. At one month there were 6 deaths (3 carotid related causes and 3 151 extra neurologic causes) and 20 patients lost to follow-up. At one year there were 19 deaths 152 and 61 patients lost to follow-up. 153 154 Primary endpoint 155 The overall > 50% restenosis rate was 7.31% (22 cases). There was no significant difference 156 between groups (6.45% BPP group vs 8.22% PP group, p=0.56). The restenosis > 70% rate 157 was 4.65% without significant different between groups (5.16% BPP group vs 4.11% PP 158 group, p=0.79). Early restenosis represented the majority of the restenosis observed (90.9%,

159 n=20/22). At Duplex US control follow-up we observed a regression of lesion in 18.2% of

160 cases of restenosis > 50% (n=4/22). All of patients presenting a regression followed the BMT.

161 Severe restenosis treatment per patient is detailed in Table II.

162

163 Secondary endpoints

164 In the univariate analysis, with a Chi2 test, renal failure was the main risk factor for 165 restenosis (5.5% vs 13.6%, p=0.03, OR=2.70, IC 1.09-6.62). We observed a near significant increase of restenosis rate on patients treated by statins in preoperatory (9.0% vs 3.4%,
 p=0.08). The others risk factors studied (gender, smoking status, diabetes, obesity, arterial
 hypertension) had no significant odds ratios.

There were no differences in all the short-term outcomes between the two groups (Table III). The rate of hemorrhagic complications with surgical revision was 4.39% (4.76% BPP vs 4.02% PP, p=0.74). The stroke/mortality rate at postoperative day 30 was not significantly different between groups (2.48% for BPP vs 6.32% for PP, p=0.15). The rate of acute coronary syndromes at Day 30 was 0.88% which correspond to three patients.

Furthermore, there was no significant difference in morbidity-mortality rates between symptomatic versus asymptomatic carotid stenosis (5.52% vs 2.56%, p=0.25), regardless of the type of patch.

177 The global infection rate was 1.17% with only four events during follow-up (PP=3, BPP=1), 178 There was no significant difference between the two groups. The different cases were 179 described in the Table IV.

The overall rate of cranial nerve injuries (CNIs) was 6.73% (n=23). This rate was higher for patients with a medical history of Ear-Nose-Throat neoplasia (22.2%), cervical radiotherapy (20%) and redo CEA for carotid restenosis (16.7%). The majority of these lesions were not permanent (n=15/23, 56.5%).

184

185 **DISCUSSION**

Our study presents the retrospective results of 168 CEAs with BP in comparison to 174 CEAs with PP. It is the second largest retrospective study on this specific topic after the study from the Mayo Clinic based on more than 800 patients.⁹ Two small prospective studies have been described in the medical literature.⁶⁻⁸ At the end of follow-up with Duplex US, the restenosis 190 > 50% rate (7.3%) and the severe restenosis rates (4.6%) were equivalent to those described by a meta-analysis gathered from randomized trials.¹¹ Indeed, in the study of Kumar and al. 191 192 restenosis > 70% rate was 4.1% after patched CEA at a median of 35 months. There was no 193 significant difference in restenosis > 70% rate between the two groups (4.11% PP group vs 194 5.16% BP group, p=.79). These results seem comparable to the those found in the two 195 previous studies describing this outcome : 2% of restenosis >70% rate for the BPP at two years in the study of Stone ; 11.0% of restenosis >50% rate for the BPP at ten years in the 196 study of Oldenburg.⁸⁻⁹ 197

198 Concerning the risk factors for restenosis, we observed that renal failure was the only 199 proved risk factor. This risk factor have already been stressed.¹²

Regarding the evolution of restenosis, we found more than 15% (18.4%) of spontaneous regression under antiplatelet therapy combined with statins. Statins appeared to have a protective or reducing effect on restenosis.¹³ Oldenburg described a better 10-year survival rate for patients following a post-operative therapy with statins.⁸

Although the infection in the two groups was too low to determine statistically significant results, the lower rate seen in the BPP group could warrant preferring this patch to avoid post-operative infection. The infection rate was 0.59% for the BPP group, which is lower than that described for prosthetic patch in the literature.¹⁴ Similar to aortic infection surgery, this pericardium patch clearly seems to have biocompatibility qualities.¹⁵⁻¹⁶

209 The Day 30 morbidity-mortality rate for symptomatic and asymptomatic stenosis (5.52% and

210 2.56%) are in accordance with the recommended guidelines.³

The Texakalidis et al. meta-analysis published in 2018 comparing more than 3 000 patients
did not shown any difference in short- or long-term complications depending on the type of

patch materiel used. However only two of the 18 collated studies included a pericardiumpatch. Our study supports the safety of using the BPP.

215

The main limitation of this work is the small number of participants. Indeed, restenosis is a rare long-term complication. A comparative study on this complication requires a larger sample of patients. Another limitation is the retrospective nature, which defines a lower level of evidence than a prospective design and is responsible for an important number of patients lost at follow-up despite the call questionnaire and for the disparities in the length of follow-up.

222

223

224 CONCLUSION

Our retrospective study does not report any significant differences in morbidity-mortality rates at short- or long-term for using the biological pericardium patch or the prosthetic patch. More particularly, the use of the pericardium patch is not associated with an increase in restenosis. Therefore the choice of the type of patch should be left to the preference of the surgeon as described in guidelines.³ Further research with higher number of patients included must be realized.

231

232 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

233 None

234

235 FUNDING

236 None

237

239 **REFERENCES**

240

238

2411Béjot Y, Daubail B, Giroud M, et al. Epidemiology of stroke and transient ischemic242attacks: Current knowledge and perspectives. Rev Neurol (Paris) 2016;172:59–68.

243 2 Béjot Y, Bailly H, Durier J, et al. Epidemiology of stroke in Europe and trends for the
244 21st century. *Presse Médicale* 2016;45:e391–8.

Naylor AR, Ricco J-B, de Borst GJ, et al. Editor's Choice – Management of
Atherosclerotic Carotid and Vertebral Artery Disease: 2017 Clinical Practice Guidelines of the
European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS). Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2018;55:3–81.

Biasi GM, Mingazzini P, Baronio L, et al. Processed bovine pericardium as patch
angioplasty for carotid endarterectomy: a preliminary report. Cardiovasc Surg Lond Engl
1996;4:848–52.

Li X, Guo Y, Ziegler KR, et al. Current Usage and Future Directions for the Bovine
 Pericardial Patch. Ann Vasc Surg 2011;25:561–8.

Marien BJ, Raffetto JD, Seidman CS, et al. Bovine Pericardium vs Dacron for Patch
Angioplasty After Carotid Endarterectomy: A Prospective Randomized Study. Arch Surg
2002;137.

256 7 Rerkasem K, Rothwell PM. Patches of different types for carotid patch angioplasty.
257 Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2010.

2588Stone PA, AbuRahma AF, Mousa AY, et al. Prospective Randomized Trial of ACUSEAL259Versus Vascu-Guard Patching in Carotid Endarterectomy. Ann Vasc Surg 2014;28:1530–8.

Oldenburg WA, Almerey T, Selim M, et al. Durability of Carotid Endarterectomy with
 Bovine Pericardial Patch. Ann Vasc Surg 2018;50:218–24.

Barnett H, Taylor DW, Haynes RB, et al. Beneficial Effect of Carotid Endarterectomy in
Symptomatic Patients with High-Grade Carotid Stenosis. N Engl J Med 1991;325:445–53.

Kumar R, Batchelder A, Saratzis A, et al. Restenosis after Carotid Interventions and Its
 Relationship with Recurrent Ipsilateral Stroke: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Eur J
 Vasc Endovasc Surg 2017;53:766–75.

267 12 Texakalidis P, Tzoumas A, Giannopoulos S, et al. Risk Factors for Restenosis After
268 Carotid Revascularization: A Meta-Analysis of Hazard Ratios. World Neurosurg
269 2019;125:414–24.

Perler BA. The effect of statin medications on perioperative and long-term outcomes
following carotid endarterectomy or stenting. Semin Vasc Surg 2007;20:252–8.

14 Naylor AR, Payne D, London NJM, et al. Prosthetic Patch Infection After Carotid
273 Endarterectomy. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2002;23:11–6.

Lutz B, Reeps C, Biro G, et al. Bovine Pericardium as New Technical Option for In Situ
 Reconstruction of Aortic Graft Infection. Ann Vasc Surg 2017;41:118–26.

- 276 16 Kreibich M, Siepe M, Morlock J, et al. Surgical Treatment of Native and Prosthetic
- Aortic Infection With Xenopericardial Tube Grafts. Ann Thorac Surg 2018;106:498–504.
- 278
- 279

280 **Table I.** Patient characteristics. Data are presented as average ± standard deviation or number (%)

281

282 Table II. Management of severe restenosis

283

- Table III. Short- and long-term outcomes following CEA. Data are presented as number (%)
 Table IV. Post-CEA infections
- 288

	total (n=342)	BPP (n=168)	PP (n=174)	р
age average in years, SD	73 (±9.7)	71 (±9.3)	73 (±9.9)	.08
male gender, n (%)	250 (73.1)	125 (74.4)	125 (71.8)	.63
Comorbidities	n (%)			
Active smoking	76 (22.2)	102 (60.7)	102 (58.6)	.74
Hypertension	278 (81.3)	135 (80.4)	143 (82.2)	.68
Diabetes mellitus	137 (40.1)	69 (41.1)	68 (39.1)	.74
Coronary artery disease	134 (39.2)	64 (38.1)	70 (40.2)	.74
Dyslipidemia	164 (48.0)	77 (45.8)	87 (50.0	.45
Peripheral artery disease	71 (20.8)	40 (23.8)	31 (17.8)	.18
Obesity	68 (20.0)	32 (19.0)	36 (20.7)	.79
Chronic renal failure	78 (22.8)	39 (23.2)	39 (22.4)	.89
ENT neoplasia	10 (2.92)	4 (2.38)	6 (3.45)	.75
Cervical radiotherapy	6 (1.75)	1 (0.59)	5 (2.87)	.22
Ipsilateral carotid surgery history	14 (4. 09)	12 (7.14)	2 (1.15)	.006
Medical therapy	n (%)			
Antiplatelet therapy	292 (85.4)	143 (85.1)	149 (85.6)	1
Statin	239 (69.9)	115 (68.5)	124 (71.2)	.64
Antiplatelet therapy + statin	217 (63.5)	106 (63.1)	111 (63.8)	.91
Beta-blocker	135 (39.5)	68 (39.1)	67 (39.9)	.91
ACE inhibitor	98 (28.6)	37 (22.0)	61 (35.1)	.01
Stenosis character	n (%)			
Symptomatic < 6 months	146 (42.7)	64 (38.1)	82 (47.1)	.1

 Table I. Patients' characteristics. Data are presented as average ± standard deviation or number (%)

Patie	ent Type of patch	Time until occurrence (months post- operative)	Restenosis percentage by US (velocity)	Clinical status	Kind of treatment	Outcomes after the latest treatment and follow-up delay
I	PU	3 months	70%	NSym	CAS Tigriss	Re-restenosis carotid by- pass at 18 months
II	PU	12 months	90%	NSym	None	Occlusion at 3 years
III	PU	6 months	70%	NSym	Redux CEA PPB	Permeability at 6 months
IV	BP	3 months	80%	NSym	CAS Acculink	Permeability at 1 year
V	BP	12 months	60 then 80%	NSym	CAS Wall stent	Re-Restenosis 60% Stable at 2 years
VI	BP	12 months	80%	NSym	CAS Wall stent	Permeability at 8 months
VI	I BP	12 months	80%		Carotid by-pass (saphenous)	Permeability at 15 months
VII	I BP	12 months	75%	Sym	Redux CEA PPB	Permeability at 8 months
IX	BP	6 months	80%	NSym	CAS Wall stent	Re-restenosis 65% at 1 year. Stable at 18 months
Х	Dac	6 months	70%	NSym	None	Stable at 2 years
XI	Dac	4 months	80%	NSym	Carotid by-pass (PTFE)	Permeability at 3 years
XI	Dac	2 years	70%	NSym	CAS uk stent	Permeability at 6 months
XII	I BP	6 months	70%	Sym	CAS uk stent	Permeability at 1 year
XI	/ BP	12 months	70%	NSym	None	Stable at 3 years

Table II. Management of severe restenosis

PU: polyurethane; Dac: Dacron; Sym: symptomatic; NSym: nonsymptomatic; CAS: carotid artery stenting; uk stent: unknown stent

	Total (n=342)	BPP (n=168)	PP (n=174)	р
Restenosis				
>50%	22 (7.31)	10 (6.45)	12 (8.22)	.56
>70%	14 (4.65)	8 (5.16)	6 (4.11)	.79
Early restenosis	20 (6.64)	9 (5.81)	11 (7.43)	.65
Hemorrhagic complication with surgical revision	15 (4.39)	8 (4.76)	7 (4.02)	.74
Stroke D30	11 (3.22)	3 (1.86)	8 (4.60)	.14
Death D30	6 (1.86)	2 (1.24)	4 (2.48)	.37
Stroke + death D30	14 (4.09)	3 (2.48)	11 (6.32)	.15
Acute Coronary Syndrome D30	3 (0.88)	1 (0.61)	2 (1.15)	1
Infection	4 (1.17)	1 (0.59)	3 (1.75)	.62
Cranial nerve injury	23 (6.73)	13 (7.74)	11 (6.32)	.61

Table III. Short- and long-term outcomes following CEA. Data are presented as number (%)

Table IV. Post-CEA infections

Patient	Kind of patch	Post-operative	Infection agent	Treatment
		delay		
I	BPP	10 months	Staph. epidermidis	Saphenous by-pass
П	РР	3 years	Staph. capitis	CEA with BPP
III	PP	Day 7	Serratia marcescens + Propionibacterium acnes	CEA with BPP
IV	PP	Day 20	Unknown	CEA with BPP