Patients with a ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm are better informed in hospitals with an "EVAR-preferred'' strategy: an instrumental variable analysis of the Dutch surgical aneurysm audit

Karthaus, E.G.; Lijftogt, N.; Vahl, A.; Willik, E.M. van der; Amodio, S.; Zwet, E.W. van; ... ; Dutch Inst Clinical Auditing

Patients with a Ruptured Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Are Better Informed in Hospitals with an ''EVAR-preferred'' Strategy: An Instrumental Variable Analysis of the Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit

Eleonora G. Karthaus,[1,2] Niki Lijftogt,[1,2] Anco Vahl,[3,4] Esmee M. van der Willik,[2,5] Sonia Amodio,[6] Erik W. van Zwet,[6] and Jaap F. Hamming,[1] In collaboration with the Dutch Society for Vascular Surgery, the Steering Committee of the Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit and the Dutch Institute for Clinical Auditing Leiden and Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and ZA, Leiden, The Netherlands

Background: While several observational studies suggested a lower postoperative mortality after minimal invasive endovascular aneurysm repair (EVAR) in patients with a ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm (RAAA) compared to conventional open surgical repair (OSR), landmark randomized controlled trials have not been able to prove the superiority of EVAR over OSR. Randomized controlled trials contain a selected, homogeneous population, influencing external validity. Observational studies are biased and adjustment of confounders can be incomplete. Instrumental variable (IV) analysis (pseudorandomization) may help to answer the question if patients with an RAAA have lower postoperative mortality when undergoing EVAR compared to OSR.

Methods: This is an observational study including all patients with an RAAA, registered in the Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit between 2013 and 2017. The risk difference (RD) in postoperative mortality (30 days/in-hospital) between patients undergoing EVAR and OSR was estimated, in which adjustment for confounding was performed in 3 ways: linear model adjusted for observed confounders, propensity score model (multivariable logistic regression analysis), and IV analysis (two-stage least square regression), adjusting for observed and unobserved confounders, with the variation in percentage of EVAR per hospital as the IV instrument.

Results: 2419 patients with an RAAA (1489 OSR and 930 EVAR) were included. Unadjusted postoperative mortality was 34.9% after OSR and 22.6% after EVAR (RD 12.3%, 95% CI 8.5−16%). The RD adjusted for observed confounders using linear regression analysis and propensity score analysis was, respectively, 12.3% (95% CI 9.6−16.7%) and 13.2% (95%CI 9.3−17.1%) in favor of EVAR. Using IV analysis, adjusting for observed and unobserved confounders, RD was 8.9% (95% CI -1.1−18.9%) in favor of EVAR.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Funding: This research received no specific funding.

Reprints: Reprints will not be available from the authors.

[1]Department of Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands.

[2]Dutch Institute for Clinical Auditing, Leiden, The Netherlands.

[3]Department of Surgery, OLVG, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

[4]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, OLVG, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

[5]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands.

[6]Department of Medical Statistics and Bioinformatics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Correspondence to: Eleonora G. Karthaus, Department of Surgery (Zone K6-R), Leiden University Medical Center, Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA Leiden, The Netherlands; E-mails: e.g.karthaus@gmail.com or e.g.karthaus@lumc.nl

Ann Vasc Surg 2020; 69: 332–344

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avsg.2020.06.015

Manuscript received: April 17, 2020; manuscript accepted: June 1, 2020; published online: 15 June 2020

Conclusions: Adjusting for observed confounders, patients with an RAAA undergoing EVAR had a significant better survival than OSR in a consecutive large cohort. Adjustment for unobserved confounders resulted in a clinical relevant RD. An "EVAR preference strategy" in patients with an RAAA could result in lower postoperative mortality.

INTRODUCTION

In the elective treatment of abdominal aortic aneurysms, minimal invasive endovascular aneurysm repair (EVAR) has proven to be superior to conventional open surgical repair (OSR) in the short-term/midterm, with a lower postoperative mortality and morbidity.[1] Several randomized controlled trials, however, failed to establish superiority of EVAR in patients with a life-threatening ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm (RAAA), and no significant differences in immediate postoperative survival were found.[2–5] A drawback of these trials is that they might contain only a selected population of patients with an RAAA, which hampers the external validity (generalizability) of the results.[6] In addition, randomization methods were different between these trials and some were underpowered, affecting the internal validity.[6] Large observational studies, adjusting for known confounders, suggested a lower postoperative mortality in patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR.[7–9] However, observational studies suffer from indication bias by important prognostic baseline differences between patients and the adjustment of confounders can be incomplete as clinical and social interactions in the diagnostic-treatment pathway are often not measured.[10] For example, anatomic characteristics of the aneurysm or the surgeon's preference for one or the other surgical procedure may influence the choice of treatment in patients with an RAAA. Using large databases with consecutive patients and different treatment preferences of hospitals, treatments, as applied in daily practice, can be compared with pseudorandomization techniques. Instrumental variable (IV) analysis is such a technique, as it is developed to control the unobserved and/or unmeasured bias between different treatment groups and tries to find a randomized experiment embedded in an observational study, to subsequently estimate the difference in the treatment effect.[11]

The aim of this study was to investigate if patients with an RAAA registered in the nationwide and compulsory Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit (DSAA) have a better postoperative survival when treated with EVAR than with OSR, correcting for observed confounders with standard statistical methods and unobserved confounders with IV analysis (pseudorandomization). Second, the postoperative mortality between hospitals with a high and low preference for EVAR was compared.

METHODS

Study Design

This is a prospective observational study, which examines if patients with an RAAA have a lower postoperative mortality after EVAR than OSR, adjusting for observed and unobserved confounders.

Data Source, Participants, and Setting

The data set was retrieved from the Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit (DSAA). This nationwide and compulsory audit started in 2013 and registers all patients, including patient and treatment characteristics, with an aortic aneurysm and/or dissection undergoing surgical treatment in the Netherlands. We included all patients with a primary RAAA registered in the DSAA between January 2013 and December 2017. All patients with a thoracic aortic aneurysm/dissection, undefined aneurysm/dissection, and all patients with a secondary reintervention of a previous aortic aneurysm repair were excluded.

Verification of the DSAA data was carried out in 2015 by a third trusted party, through a random sample of hospitals.[12,13]

Primary Outcome

The primary outcome of this study was postoperative mortality, which was defined as mortality within 30 days after surgery or during admission (30 days/in-hospital).

Statistical Analysis

Patients were divided in 2 groups, EVAR or OSR, based on "start of treatment". Patient characteristics and hospital-related factors were compared between the groups, using T-tests and chi-square tests.

Crude postoperative mortality rates between patients treated with EVAR and OSR were compared, using a linear regression model. When considering

a binary outcome, it is standard practice to use logistic regression. The effect of EVAR versus OSR will then be estimated as a (log) odds ratio. As we prefer to estimate the effect as a risk difference (RD), we used linear regression.

Subsequently, we used 3 different methods to adjust for confounding when estimating the RD: a linear model adjusted for confounders, a propensity score (PS), that is the probability of getting a certain treatment, adjusted for observed confounders, and an IV analysis adjusted for observed and unobserved confounders.

Adjusted linear regression analysis. To correct for observed confounders, we used a linear regression model to compare adjusted mortality rates between patients treated with EVAR and OSR. Patient characteristics based on V(p)-POSSUM variables, year of surgery, and hospital volume of patients with an RAAA, were entered as covariables in this model.[14,15]

Propensity score analysis. The propensity score analysis was carried out in 2 successive steps. In the first Step, a multivariable logistic regression analysis (ENTER model with a *P*-value at 0.05) for the ''choice of treatment'' was performed. The same patient and hospital characteristics as used in the adjusted linear regression analysis were entered as covariables in this model.

In the second step, an RD was estimated, using a multivariable linear regression analysis for the primary outcome ''postoperative mortality'', adjusted for the PS obtained in step 1 and the choice of treatment as covariables.

Instrumental variable analysis. First, we divided all hospitals in 2 groups with the median %EVAR per hospital as a cutoff point: those with a low % EVAR in patients with an RAAA (0−37% EVAR) and those with a high %EVAR (38−100% EVAR). We demonstrate the distribution of measured possible confounders between these 2 groups.

An IV analysis can be used to estimate the effect of a treatment in observational data, corrected for unobserved confounders. The IV is a factor that highly influences the choice of treatment but has no independent influence on patient outcome. The IV is thus not related to the prognosis of the patient. An IV analysis behaves as a pseudorandomization, in which patients are weighed based on the probability of getting a certain treatment. When using an IV analysis, one does not compare individual patients with different treatments, but one compares the outcomes of patients with a different chance of getting a certain treatment. The methods of IV analysis have also been described in detail elsewhere.[11]

When using an IV analysis to compare postoperative mortality after OSR and EVAR in patients with an RAAA, we had to make 2 assumptions:

1. There is no association between patient characteristics and the hospital where patients are treated. In the Netherlands, patients with an RAAA are admitted to nearest hospital performing acute AAA surgery.
2. As the Netherlands has a homogeneous care landscape with an overall high quality standard, quality of care is comparable between hospitals performing acute AAA surgery.

Based on these assumptions the following analysis was performed. The percentage of patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR per hospital (% EVAR) (i.e. treatment preference of the hospital) was chosen as the IV. The strength of the IV was tested with a partial F-statistic. Subsequently, the IV analysis was performed with a two-Stage least square model. The covariables used in this model were the same as in the first step of the PS analysis. Outcome was reported in an RD between EVAR and OSR. Finally, the IV model itself was tested with a ''test for weak instruments'' and a ''Wu-Hausman test''.

All statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software (version 3.4.0). When data were missing for continues variables used in the regression analyses, the mean was imputed. Data were most frequently missing for preoperative heart rate (13%) and systolic blood pressure (9.0%).

RESULTS

Participants and Descriptive Analysis

We identified 2660 patients with an RAAA operated between January 2013 and December 2017. All patients with a thoracic aneurysm (76, 2.8%), undefined aneurysm (45, 1.7%), revision of a previous aortic aneurysm repair (80, 3.0%), or incomplete data (40, 1.5%) were excluded. A total of 2419 patients were included for analyses, of which 1489 (61.6%) were treated with OSR and 930 (38.4%) with EVAR. Twenty-seven (1.1%) EVAR patients were converted to OSR and remained in the EVAR group for analysis. The EVAR group consisted of 86% men, compared with 84% of men in the OSR group ($P = 0.075$). Patients who underwent EVAR were significantly older than patients who underwent OSR (75.3 SD 8.8 versus 73.6 SD 7.8, $P < 0.001$) and had significantly more often a normal Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) (72% vs. 63%,

Table I. Patient characteristics per surgical treatment

	EVAR		OSR		
Patient characteristics	*n*	%	*n*	%	*P*
Number of patients	930		1489		
Age (mean, years)	75.3 SD 8.8		73.6 SD 7.8		0.000
Sex					0.075
Male	802	86.2%	1244	83.5%	
Female	128	13.8%	245	16.5%	
Year of surgery					0.000
2013	122	13.1%	301	13.1%	
2014	198	21.3%	325	21.3%	
2015	192	20.6%	321	20.6%	
2016	205	22.0%	293	22.0%	
2017	213	22.9%	249	16.7%	
Cardiac state					0.039
No abnormalities	385	41.4%	659	44.3%	
Peripheral edema, cardiomegaly	68	7.3%	82	5.5%	
Raised CVP, use of coumarin, borderline cardiomyopathy	15	1.5%	18	1.2%	
Medication for hypertension, angina pectoris, diuretics, or digoxin	324	34.8%	465	31.2%	
Unknown	138	14.8%	265	17.8%	
Pulmonary state					0.002
No dyspnea	580	62.4%	904	60.7%	
Dyspnea	141	15.2%	205	13.8%	
Severe dyspnea	48	5.2%	45	3.0%	
Unknown	161	17.3%	335	22.5%	
Malignancy					0.002
None	816	87.7%	1367	91.8%	
Current	40	4.3%	33	2.2%	
History of malignancy	74	8.0%	89	6.0%	
Last preoperative ECG					0.001
No abnormalities	274	29.5%	421	28.3%	
Atrial fibrillation	59	6.3%	68	4.6%	
Ischemia	33	3.5%	43	2.9%	
Other abnormalities	222	23.9%	292	19.6%	
Unknown/no ECG performed	342	36.8%	665	44.7%	
Diameter (mean, mm)	76 SD 16.0	80 SD 16.6	0.000		
Hart rate (mean, BPM)	87 SD 21	87 SD 22	0.852		
Systolic blood pressure (mean, mm Hg)	112 SD 33	109 SD 34	0.007		
Glasgow Coma Scale					0.000
GCS 15	673	72.4%	931	62.5%	
GCS 12−14	127	14%	206	13.8%	
GCS 9−11	24	2.6%	56	3.8%	
GCS <9	26	2.6%	114	7.7%	
Unknown	80	9.3%	182	12.2%	
Preoperative laboratory results					
Hemoglobin (mmol/L)	7.2 SD 1.4	7.3 SD 1.4	0.613		
Leukocytes (109/L)	14.2 SD 5.5	13.6 SD 5.4	0.013		
Creatinine (mmol/L)	112 IQR 91−133	111 IQR 88−131.5	0.195		
Sodium					0.077
Normal sodium	725	78.0%	1205	80.9%	
Hyponatremia/hypernatremia	205	22.0%	284	19.1%	
Potassium					0.493
Normal potassium	763	82.0%	1205	80.9%	
Hypopotassemia/hyperpotassemia	167	18.0%	284	19.1%	

$P < 0.001$). Other differences in comorbidity and clinical presentation are displayed in Table I. Over the years 2013−2017 there was an increase in the EVAR use from 29% to 46%.

Outcome Data and Main Results

The unadjusted postoperative mortality after OSR was 34.9% ($n = 519$) and 22.6% ($n = 210$) after EVAR. Using an unadjusted linear regression, the RD in postoperative mortality after OSR and EVAR was 12.3%, with a 95% confidence interval (CI) of 8.5−16%.

Case mix−adjusted linear regression analysis. The mortality difference, adjusted for measured confounders was 12.3% (95%CI 9.6−16.7%), in favor of patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR (Table II.).

Propensity score analysis. Step 1: Patient characteristics of patients with an RAAA associated with receiving EVAR were increased age (odds ratio (OR) 1.03, 95% CI 1.02−1.04), leukocytes between 10.0×10^9/L−14.9×10^9/L (OR 1.26, 95% CI 1.00−1.59) or more than 20×10^9/L (OR 1.55, 95% CI 1.23−2.14), and current malignancy (OR 1.67, 95% CI 1.02−2.74) (Table III.). Patients with female gender (OR 0.64, 95% CI 0.49−0.83), GCS of 9−11 (OR 0.59, 95% CI 0.35−0.98), GCS <9 (OR 0.34, 95% CI 0.21−0.54) or an unknown GCS (OR 0.67, 95% CI 0.50−0.91), increased aneurysm diameter (OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.98−0.99), systolic blood pressure of <80 mm Hg (OR 0.73, 95% CI 0.55−0.96), and/or unknown pulmonary status (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.59−0.97) were less likely to receive EVAR. In addition, patients operated in hospitals with a higher volume and patients operated in later years of the study were significantly more likely to receive EVAR.

Step 2: In patients with an RAAA, the RD, adjusted for the probability of treatment with EVAR (PS for EVAR calculated in step 1), was 13.2% (95% CI 9.3−17.1%) in favor of treatment with EVAR (Table IV).

Instrumental variable analysis. The percentage of treatment with EVAR in patients with an RAAA ranged from 0% to 100% (median: 37% EVAR) between 61 hospitals. 1220 patients were operated in hospitals with a low %EVAR and 1199 patients in hospitals with a high %EVAR. The mean %EVAR in hospitals with a low %EVAR was 25.2% (0−37%) compared with a mean of 52.0% (38−100%) in hospitals with a high %EVAR in patients with a RAAA ($P < 0.001$).

Table V shows the distribution of observed possible confounders between the 2 groups of hospitals. The crude mortality in hospitals with a low %EVAR was 31.1% (380 of 1220) vs. 29.1% (349 of 1199) in hospitals with a high %EVAR, RD 2.0% (95% CI −1.6 to 5.7%).

To adjust also for unobserved confounders, we used the %EVAR per hospital as an IV (partial F-statistic >10). The estimated RD in patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR, using an IV analysis (2SLS model), was 8.9% (95% CI −1.1 to 18.9%) compared with patients with an RAAA treated with OSR.

Finally, the test for weak instrument was not rejected, which suggests that the %EVAR per hospital is not a weak instrument. The Wu-Hausman test was rejected, from which we can conclude that the IV analysis can be used additional to a standard linear regression.

DISCUSSION

Between 2013 and 2017, 2419 patients underwent RAAA surgery in the Netherlands, of which 62% was treated with OSR and 38% with EVAR. Patients were treated in 61 hospitals, and percentage of treatment with EVAR varied from 0% to 100%. The crude postoperative mortality after OSR was 34.9% and 22.6% after EVAR. With standard linear regression analysis and PS analysis adjusting for observed confounders, a significant 30 days/in-hospital survival benefit of 12.3% and 13.2%, respectively, could been demonstrated for patients with an RAAA undergoing EVAR, compared with patients with an RAAA undergoing OSR. Using IV analysis (pseudorandomization) to adjust for observed and unobserved confounders, a postoperative survival benefit of approximately 8.9% was seen in EVAR patients. In addition, patients operated in hospitals with a high %EVAR in patients with an RAAA had a 2.0% lower crude postoperative mortality than patients operated in hospitals with a low %EVAR in patients with an RAAA.

The landmark trials evaluating treatment strategies in patients with an RAAA could not show a significant survival benefit after treatment with EVAR compared with OSR.[2−5] Respectively, for the AJAX, ECAR, and IMPROVE trial, mortality differences of 4.0% (OSR 25% versus EVAR 21%, $P = 0.66$), 6.0% (OSR 25% vs. EVAR 18%, $P =$ ns), and 2.0% (OSR 37.4% vs. EVAR 35.4%, $P = 0.62$) were found. The inclusion of patients and randomization methods turned out to be obstacles in these trials. The AJAX and ECAR trial only included patients with an RAAA suitable for both surgical techniques, which led to the exclusion of, respectively,

Table II. Linear regression analysis for postoperative mortality in patients with an RAAA

Patient characteristics	Estimate	SE	*P*-value
Procedure			
OSR			
EVAR	−0.131	0.018	<0.001
Gender			
Male			
Female	0.025	0.025	0.313
Age			
Age	0.010	0.001	<0.001
Glasgow Coma Scale			
GCS 15			
GCS 12−14	0.089	0.026	0.001
GCS 9−11	0.232	0.049	<0.001
GCS <9	0.190	0.038	<0.001
GCS unknown	0.168	0.029	<0.001
Year of surgery			
2013			
2014	−0.068	0.028	0.013
2015	0.000	0.028	0.990
2016	0.010	0.028	0.724
2017	0.042	0.029	0.148
Volume of ruptured patients in hospital of treatment			
<25			
25−40	−0.005	0.036	0.881
40−55	0.016	0.027	0.546
55−70	−0.021	0.031	0.477
>70	−0.975	0.001	0.014
Aneurysm diameter			
Diameter	−0.001	0.001	0.061
Preoperative systolic blood pressure			
110−139			
>140	−0.035	0.025	0.156
80−109	0.025	0.022	0.258
<80	0.078	0.027	0.004
Preoperative heart rate			
70−79			
80−99	0.010	0.027	0.713
>100	0.013	0.029	0.655
<70	−0.016	0.030	0.596
Creatinine			
<90			
90−109	0.007	0.025	0.790
110−139	0.083	0.024	0.001
>140	0.101	0.028	<0.001
Hemoglobin			
>8.50			
7.5−8.49	−0.038	0.026	0.148
6.0−7.49	−0.022	0.025	0.386
<6	0.026	0.031	0.404
Leukocytes			
<10.0			
10.0−14.9	−0.001	0.022	0.978
15.0−19.9	−0.024	0.027	0.375
>20.0	−0.014	0.032	0.673

(*Continued*)

Table II. Continued

Patient characteristics	Estimate	SE	*P*-value
Sodium			
Normal sodium			
Hyponatremia	0.023	0.022	0.301
Hypernatremia	0.231	0.071	0.001
Potassium			
Normal potassium			
Hypokalemia	−0.019	0.027	0.489
Hyperkalemia	0.027	0.034	0.418
Malignancy			
None			
Current malignancy	0.095	0.050	0.059
History of malignancy, curatively treated	0.065	0.034	0.058
Preoperative ECG			
No abnormalities			
Atrial fibrillation (60−90 bpm)	0.084	0.042	0.045
Ischemia (ST depression >2 mm at rest)	0.209	0.051	<0.001
Other abnormalities	0.029	0.025	0.252
No preoperative ECG performed	0.080	0.022	<0.001
Cardiac status			
None			
Peripheral edema, cardiomegaly	0.069	0.038	0.070
Raised CVP, use of coumarin, borderline cardiomyopathy	0.050	0.075	0.502
Medication for hypertension, angina pectoris, diuretics, or digoxin	0.058	0.020	0.004
Unknown	0.081	0.027	0.003
Pulmonary status			
No dyspnea			
Dyspnea	0.050	0.026	0.038
Severe dyspnea	0.198	0.046	<0.001
Unknown	0.061	0.024	0.013

61% and 80% of all presented patients with an RAAA.[2−5] In addition, the inclusion seemed to be rather conservative. The IMPROVE trial, on the other hand, included all patients with an RAAA and randomized patients by treatment strategy, which led to many crossovers especially from the EVAR to OSR group.[3]

Some observational studies, using standard statistical methods, comparing mortality between both techniques in patients with an RAAA, demonstrated significant survival benefits after treatment EVAR, varying from 6% to 33%.[7−9,16,17] These results are in line with the 12.3%-adjusted mortality difference in our study. However, other observational studies did not establish a significant mortality difference between OSR and EVAR.[18−20] The results of observational studies can be biased due to missing or incomplete adjustment for confounding. PS methods are previously used to control for the selection bias in patients with an RAAA, which confirmed a postoperative survival benefit for patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR.[21,22] Gunnarsson et al. suggested that besides differences in baseline characteristics, the primary treatment strategy of a hospital in patients with an RAAA could influence the results of the comparison between EVAR and OSR.[23] However, they found no association between outcome and EVAR preference, but

Table III. Propensity score for treatment with EVAR

Patient characteristics	Odds	95% CI
Gender		
Male	Ref	
Female	0.64	0.49–0.83
Age		
Age	1.03	1.02–1.04
Glasgow Coma Scale		
GCS 15	Ref.	
GCS 12–14	0.83	0.64–1.08
GCS 9–11	0.59	0.35–0.98
GCS <9	0.34	0.21–0.54
GCS unknown	0.67	0.50–0.91
Year of surgery		
2013	Ref.	
2014	1.48	1.11–1.97
2015	1.45	1.09–1.95
2016	1.61	1.20–2.15
2017	2.15	1.60–2.90
Volume of ruptured patients in hospital of treatment		
<25	Ref.	
25–40	1.26	0.86–1.84
40–55	1.64	1.23–2.18
55–70	1.81	1.32–2.50
>70	1.48	1.08–2.04
Aneurysm diameter		
Diameter	0.99	0.98–0.99
Preoperative systolic blood pressure		
110–139	Ref.	
>140	0.94	0.73–1.20
80–109	0.93	0.75–1.15
<80	0.73	0.55–0.96
Preoperative heart rate		
80–99	Ref.	
>100	0.89	0.68–1.18
70–79	0.99	0.74–1.32
<70	0.98	0.72–1.32
Creatinine		
<90	Ref.	
90–109	1.08	0.84–1.40
110–139	1.13	0.89–1.44
>140	1.12	0.85–1.48
Hemoglobin		
>8.50	Ref.	
7.5–8.49	0.89	0.70–1.26
6.0–7.49	0.88	0.61–1.10
<6	1.05	0.64–1.30
Leukocytes		
<10.0	Ref.	
10.0–14.9	1.26	1.00–1.59
15.0–19.9	1.08	0.82–1.41
>20.0	1.55	1.23–2.14
Sodium		
Normal sodium	Ref.	
Hyponatremia/ hypernatremia	1.14	0.94–1.39
Potassium		
Normal potassium	Ref.	
Hypokalemia/ hyperkalemia	0.99	0.85–1.15
Malignancy		
None	Ref.	
Current malignancy	1.67	1.02–2.74
History of malignancy, curatively treated	1.15	0.82–1.61
Preoperative ECG		
No abnormalities	Ref.	
Atrial fibrillation (60–90 bpm)	1.21	0.80–1.83
Ischemia (ST depression >2 mm at rest)	1.23	0.74–2.05
Other abnormalities	1.05	0.82–1.34
No preoperative ECG performed	0.86	0.69–1.07
Cardiac status		
None	Ref.	
Peripheral edema, cardiomegaly	1.24	0.85–1.82
Raised CVP, use of coumarin, borderline cardiomyopathy	1.22	0.58–2.57
Medication for hypertension, angina pectoris, diuretics, or digoxin	1.07	0.87–1.31
Unknown	1.11	0.84–1.47
Pulmonary status		
No dyspnea	Ref.	
Dyspnea	0.86	0.67–1.11
Severe dyspnea	1.51	0.96–2.37
Unknown	0.75	0.59–0.97

they only used conventional logistic regression analysis adjusting for observed confounders.

IV methods have long been used in economic studies and are being increasingly used in health studies.[11] In studies of various medical specialties, this technique has been used to control for unobserved confounders, such as treatment preference of a physician, when comparing treatments.[10,24–27] IV analysis is particularly useful when large differences in treatment strategy exists. This applies for instance to RAAA care in the Netherlands, where the percentage of treatment with EVAR varied from 0% to 100% between hospitals.

With the use of IV analysis in patients with an RAAA undergoing surgical treatment in the Netherlands, a survival benefit of 8.9% in patients

Table IV. Comparison of mortality in the patient treated with OSR and EVAR, corrected for the propensity score

Treatment	Beta	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
Surgical procedure			
OSR	Ref.		
EVAR	−0.13	−0.17	−0.09
Propensity score for treatment with EVAR	−0.11	−0.03	0.24

who underwent EVAR compared with patients who underwent OSR was established. However, the CIs were wide (−1.1−18.9%) resulting in a nonsignificant RD. Wide CIs are inherent to IV analysis, as it compares the outcome of patients with a different chance of getting a certain treatment, instead of comparing the outcome of individual patients. In our study, we used the %EVAR per hospital as the IV, by which data were aggregated on the level of the 61 RAAA hospitals in the Netherlands and therefore resulted in an RD with broad CIs. IV analyses are particularly useful in larger cohorts, in which more patients with a different chance of receiving a certain treatment (i.e. hospitals) can be identified. International collaboration and the merging of national data sets might be useful for repeating this analysis and could possibly result in a more precise estimation.

The mortality difference resulting from our IV analysis represents the difference in mortality between the situation when all patients were treated with EVAR compared with the situation where all patients were treated with OSR. The daily practice is obviously more differentiated, as not all RAAAs are anatomically suitable for treatment with EVAR.

The current mean treatment ratio in patients with an RAAA in the Dutch population is 37% EVAR versus 63% OSR. The EVAR percentage is relatively high compared with Denmark (8.2%) and Norway (21%), and more comparable to Sweden (30%) and the United Kingdom (41%).[28,29] Moreover, the VASCUNET collaboration reported that 23% of patients with an RAAA was treated with EVAR in the 11 participating countries between 2010−2013.[30] Over time, the percentage of EVAR increased from 29% in 2013 to 46% in 2017. These numbers give the impression that experience with EVAR in RAAAs and adaptation of the care system to be able to use EVAR in an acute setting could play a role in the choice for EVAR in these patients.

As OSR is less and less performed in the elective setting, there are concerns that experience with the OSR declines. The survival benefit we found in patients with an RAAA treated with EVAR could therefore also be the result of the loss of experience with OSR. However, when comparing mortality rates of OSR in patients with an RAAA of the DSAA, SWEDVASC, and the Cochrane review of the trials, respectively, 30%, 34%, and 37%, the outcome of OSR did not decline over time.[6,23] Moreover, the lower mortality of EVAR in the DSAA (22%) and SWEDVASC (22%) than the trials (34%) indicates a possible improvement of EVAR results in patients with an RAAA. One can speculate that the trials came to early, where the EVAR technique for RAAA was still in development.

When comparing surgical procedures, it is also important to evaluate long-term survival. A meta-analysis of the 3 randomized trials showed a nonsignificant trend to lower mortality in patients who underwent EVAR after 1-year follow-up.[31] In addition, the IMPROVE trial investigators reported a lower overall mortality in EVAR patients at 3-year follow-up (EVAR 48% versus OSR 56%, hazard ratio 0.92, 95% CI 0.75−1.13) and a comparable overall mortality of approximately 60% at 7-years follow-up.[32] Unfortunately, the DSAA cannot provide information on long-term survival. In the future, this may be possible through a link with other population databases.

As the DSAA only registers patients who received surgical intervention, it does not provide information on the number of patients presented with an RAAA who were denied for surgery or died before surgical intervention could take place. When evaluating the outcomes of RAAA care, it would be useful to have this information, as the decision for surgical intervention can differ between hospitals and might be associated with EVAR preference, or not. Hospitals could potentially influence their outcomes by selecting patients for surgical treatment.

To use an IV analysis, 2 assumptions were made. When comparing 2 pharmaceutical treatments, you can safely state that the quality of the treatment is equal in all hospitals. When comparing surgical treatments, this is more uncertain, as surgeon's

Table V. Distribution of measured confounders between hospitals with a low and high percentage of treatment with EVAR, divided by the median of 37% as cutoff point

	Hospitals with low % EVAR (0–37%)		Hospitals with high % EVAR (38–100%)		
Patient characteristics	*n* = 1220	%	*n* = 1199	%	*P*
Surgical procedure					0.000
OSR	913	74.8%	576	48%	
EVAR	307	25.2%	623	52%	
Year of surgery					0.143
2013	218	17.9%	205	17.1%	
2014	259	21.2%	264	22.0%	
2015	277	22.7%	236	19.7%	
2016	254	20.8%	244	20.4%	
2017	212	17.4%	250	20.9%	
Volume of ruptured patients in hospital of treatment					0.000
<25	192	15.7%	147	12.3%	
25–40	124	10.2%	100	8.3%	
40–55	518	42.5%	426	35.5%	
55–70	124	10.2%	301	25.1%	
>70	262	21.5%	225	18.8%	
Gender					0.375
Male	1024	83.9%	1022	85.2%	
Female	196	16.1%	177	14.8%	
Age					0.466
Age	74.1 SD 7.9	74.4 SD 8.6			
Pulmonary status					0.140
No dyspnea	743	60.9%	741	61.8%	
Dyspnea	168	13.8%	178	14.8%	
Severe dyspnea	40	3.3%	53	4.4%	
Unknown	269	22.0%	227	18.9%	
Cardiac status					0.001
None	520	42.6%	524	43.7%	
Peripheral edema, cardiomegaly	62	5.1%	88	7.3%	
Raised CVP, use of coumarin, borderline cardiomyopathy	16	1.3%	17	1.4%	
Medication for hypertension, angina pectoris, diuretics, or digoxin	384	31.5%	405	33.8%	
Unknown	238	19.5%	165	13.8%	
Preoperative ECG					0.000
No abnormalities	341	28.0%	354	29.5%	
Atrial fibrillation (60–90 bpm)	58	4.8%	69	5.8%	
Ischemia (ST depression >2 mm at rest)	34	2.8%	42	3.5%	
Other abnormalities	224	18.4%	290	24.2%	
No preoperative ECG performed	563	46.1%	444	37.0%	
Malignancy					0.477
None	1108	90.8%	1075	89.7%	
Current malignancy	32	2.6%	41	3.4%	
History of malignancy, curatively treated	80	6.6%	83	6.9%	
Aneurysm diameter (mm)					0.253
Diameter	78,7 SD 16,3	78,0 SD 16,4			
Glasgow Coma Scale					0.157
GCS 15	789	65.4%	806	67.2%	
GCS 12–14	158	13.0%	175	14.6%	
GCS 9–11	39	3.2%	41	3.4%	

(*Continued*)

Table V. Continued

Patient characteristics	Hospitals with low % EVAR (0–37%)		Hospitals with high % EVAR (38–100%)		
	n = 1220	%	*n* = 1199	%	*P*
GCS <9	80	6.6%	60	5.0%	
GCS unknown	145	11.9%	117	9.8%	
Preoperative systolic blood pressure (mm Hg)					0.253
110–139	396	32.5%	387	32.3%	
>140	260	21.3%	225	18.8%	
	385	31.6%	383	31.9%	
<80	179	14.7%	204	17.0%	
Preoperative heart rate (BPM)					0.751
70–79	158	13.0%	165	13.8%	
80–99	498	40.8%	466	38.9%	
≥100	327	26.8%	336	28.0%	
<70	327	19.4%	232	19.3%	
Hemoglobin (mmol/L)					0.541
>8.50	240	19.7%	215	17.9%	
7.5–8.49	310	25.4%	328	27.4%	
6.0–7.49	469	38.4%	450	37.5%	
<6	201	16.5%	206	17.2%	
Leukocytes (10^9/L)					0.955
<10.0	273	22.4%	259	21.6%	
10.0–14.9	561	46.0%	558	46.5%	
15.0–19.9	254	20.8%	247	20.6%	
>20.0	132	10.8%	135	11.3%	
Creatinine (mmol/L)					0.359
<90	306	25.1%	305	25.4%	
90–109	280	23.0%	256	21.4%	
110–139	401	32.9%	377	31.4%	
>140	233	19.1%	261	21.8%	
Sodium					0.894
Normal sodium	969	79.4%	961	80.2%	
Low sodium	233	19.1%	220	18.3%	
High sodium	18	1.5%	18	1.5%	
Potassium					0.347
Normal potassium	983	80.6%	985	82.2%	
Low potassium	150	12.3%	125	10.4%	
High potassium	87	7.1%	89	7.4%	

skills affects the quality of the treatment. The broad CIs around the RD, which are previously mentioned and inherent to the use of IV methods, are another limitation. Randomization remains the golden standard but has other obstacles in comparing results in patients with an RAAA. Therefore, the IV method can be a good alternative for this research question, as it tries to find a randomized experiment embedded in an observational study.

Our findings suggest that an EVAR-first strategy in patients with an RAAA may improve postoperative survival. An EVAR team must then be available 24/7. This has substantial implications for the organization of RAAA care. Currently, there are 61 hospitals in the Netherlands that perform RAAA surgery and improvement of care necessitates further concentration of RAAA care. A new volume standard of at least 40 interventions (elective and/or acute) yearly is set by our National Healthcare Institute and Inspectorate of Healthcare, which will contribute to concentration of RAAA care with 24/7 availability of an EVAR team.

CONCLUSION

Using standard statistical methods, the postoperative 30-day/in-hospital survival of patients with an RAAA undergoing EVAR was approximately

12% lower than in those undergoing OSR in a large consecutive series of unselected patients in the DSAA. In addition, an IV analysis showed a clinical relevant mortality difference in favor of patients who underwent EVAR. By taking both results into account, it is plausible to think that a strategy with a preference for EVAR in patients with an RAAA will result in a decreased postoperative mortality.

The authors would like to thank all surgeons, registrars, physician assistants, and administrative nurses who registered all patients in the DSAA and in the Dutch Surgical Aneurysm Audit group.

REFERENCES

1. Lijftogt N, Vahl AC, Wilschut ED, et al. Adjusted hospital outcomes of abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery reported in the Dutch surgical aneurysm audit. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2017;53:520–32.
2. Reimerink JJ, Hoornweg LL, Vahl AC, et al. Endovascular repair versus open repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. Ann Surg 2013;258:248–56.
3. Investigators IT, Powell JT, Sweeting MJ, et al. Endovascular or open repair strategy for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm: 30 day outcomes from IMPROVE randomised trial. BMJ 2014;348:f7661.
4. Hinchliffe RJ, Bruijstens L, MacSweeney ST, et al. A randomised trial of endovascular and open surgery for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm - results of a pilot study and lessons learned for future studies. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2006;32:506–13. discussion 14-5.
5. Desgranges P, Kobeiter H, Katsahian S, et al. Editor's choice - ECAR (Endovasculaire ou Chirurgie dans les Anevrysmes aorto-iliaques Rompus): a French randomized controlled trial of endovascular versus open surgical repair of ruptured aorto-iliac aneurysms. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2015;50:303–10.
6. Badger S, Forster R, Blair PH, et al. Endovascular treatment for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;5:CD005261.
7. Giles KA, Hamdan AD, Pomposelli FB, et al. Population-based outcomes following endovascular and open repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms. J Endovasc Ther 2009;16:554–64.
8. Giles KA, Pomposelli FB, Hamdan AD, et al. Comparison of open and endovascular repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms from the ACS-NSQIP 2005-07. J Endovasc Ther 2009;16:365–72.
9. McPhee J, Eslami MH, Arous EJ, et al. Endovascular treatment of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms in the United States (2001-2006): a significant survival benefit over open repair is independently associated with increased institutional volume. J Vasc Surg 2009;49:817–26.
10. Stukel TA, Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, et al. Analysis of observational studies in the presence of treatment selection bias: effects of invasive cardiac management on AMI survival using propensity score and instrumental variable methods. JAMA 2007;297:278–85.
11. Baiocchi M, Cheng J, Small DS. Instrumental variable methods for causal inference. Stat Med 2014;33:2297–340.
12. Dataverification Dutch surgical aneurysm audit 2015 [PDF]. DICA. Available from: http://dica.nl/media/660/Eindrapport_dataverificatie_DSAA_2016.pdf. Accessed March 1, 2019.
13. van der Werf LR, Voeten SC, van Loe CMM, et al. Data verification of nationwide clinical quality registries. BJS Open 2019;3:857–64.
14. Copeland GP, Jones D, Walters M. POSSUM: a scoring system for surgical audit. Br J Surg 1991;78:355–60.
15. Available from: http://www.riskprediction.org.uk/vasc-index.php. Accessed April 4, 2020.
16. Mehta M, Byrne J, Darling RC 3rd, et al. Endovascular repair of ruptured infrarenal abdominal aortic aneurysm is associated with lower 30-day mortality and better 5-year survival rates than open surgical repair. J Vasc Surg 2013;57:368–75.
17. Nedeau AE, Pomposelli FB, Hamdan AD, et al. Endovascular vs open repair for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. J Vasc Surg 2012;56:15–20.
18. Ockert S, Schumacher H, Bockler D, et al. Early and midterm results after open and endovascular repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms in a comparative analysis. J Endovasc Ther 2007;14:324–32.
19. Visser JJ, Bosch JL, Hunink MG, et al. Endovascular repair versus open surgery in patients with ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms: clinical outcomes with 1-year follow-up. J Vasc Surg 2006;44:1148–55.
20. Saqib N, Park SC, Park T, et al. Endovascular repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm does not confer survival benefits over open repair. J Vasc Surg 2012;56:614–9.
21. Holt PJ, Karthikesalingam A, Poloniecki JD, et al. Propensity scored analysis of outcomes after ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. Br J Surg 2010;97:496–503.
22. Edwards ST, Schermerhorn ML, O'Malley AJ, et al. Comparative effectiveness of endovascular versus open repair of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm in the Medicare population. J Vasc Surg 2014;59:575–82.
23. Gunnarsson K, Wanhainen A, Djavani Gidlund K, et al. Endovascular versus open repair as primary strategy for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm: a national population-based study. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2016;51:22–8.
24. Johnston SC. Combining ecological and individual variables to reduce confounding by indication: case study–subarachnoid hemorrhage treatment. J Clin Epidemiol 2000;53:1236–41.
25. Sheetz KH, Norton EC, Regenbogen SE, et al. An instrumental variable analysis comparing Medicare Expenditures for Laparoscopic vs open Colectomy. JAMA Surg 2017;152:921–9.
26. Tsuchiya A, Yasunaga H, Tsutsumi Y, et al. Mortality and morbidity after Hartmann's procedure versus primary Anastomosis without a Diverting stoma for Colorectal Perforation: a nationwide observational study. World J Surg 2018;42:866–75.
27. Brooke BS, Goodney PP, Kraiss LW, et al. Readmission destination and risk of mortality after major surgery: an observational cohort study. Lancet 2015;386:884–95.
28. NVR-VSQIP. Available from: https://www.vsqip.org.uk/reports/2017-annual-report/. Accessed April 4, 2020.
29. Swedvasc, Available from: Accessed April 4, 2020.

30. Budtz-Lilly J, Bjorck M, Venermo M, et al. The Impact of Centralisation and endovascular aneurysm repair on treatment of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysms based on International registries. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2018;56:181−8.
31. Sweeting MJ, Ulug P, Powell JT, et al. Ruptured aneurysm trials: the importance of Longer-term outcomes and meta-analysis for 1-year mortality. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2015;50:297−302.
32. Investigators IT. Comparative clinical effectiveness and cost effectiveness of endovascular strategy v open repair for ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm: three year results of the IMPROVE randomised trial. BMJ 2017;359:j4859.