Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação — REASE OPEN ACCESS

doi.org/10.51891/rease.v10i8.15329

REVOLUTIONIZING VASCULAR SURGERY: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF NOVEL DEVICES AND TECHNOLOGIES SHAPING THE FUTURE OF PATIENT CARE

Ana Julia Nassar Barreto[1]
Bruna Marmori Lima[2]
Ana Carolina Diniz e Pádua[3]
Afrânio Côgo Destefani[4]
Vinícius Côgo Destefani[5]

ABSTRACT: Vascular surgery has undergone significant advancements in recent years, with the introduction of innovative devices and technologies that have transformed patient care and surgical outcomes. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the latest developments in vascular surgery, focusing on novel devices that have emerged to address longstanding challenges in the field. The review explores six key areas: vessel sealing devices, vascular ultrasound technologies, hemodialysis vascular access devices, robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems, sutureless vascular anastomotic devices, and bioartificial vascular implants. The synthesis of the current evidence and expert opinions offers valuable insights into the transformative impact of these technologies on vascular surgery and patient care, as well as the associated challenges and considerations for their optimal implementation in clinical practice.

Keywords: Vascular surgery. Novel devices. Vessel sealing. Vascular ultrasound. Robotic-assisted surgery.

INTRODUCTION

Vascular surgery has undergone significant advancements in recent years, with the introduction of innovative devices and technologies that have transformed patient care and surgical outcomes. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the latest developments in vascular surgery, focusing on novel devices that have emerged to address longstanding challenges in the field. The rapidly evolving landscape of vascular surgery has seen the introduction of sophisticated vessel sealing devices, advanced vascular ultrasound

[1]Faculdade de Medicina de Itajubá.
[2]Escola Bahiana de Medicina e Saúde Pública Salvador.
[3]UNIRV- campus Rio Verde – GO.
[4]Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Vitoria Higher School of Sciences - EMESCAM., Santa Luíza – Vitória – ES Brazil, Molecular Dynamics and Modeling Laboratory (DynMolLab)
[5]Molecular Dynamics and Modeling Laboratory (DynMolLab) Santa Luíza – Vitória – ES – Brazil.

technologies, cutting-edge hemodialysis vascular access devices, robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems, sutureless vascular anastomotic devices, and bioartificial vascular implants.1-3

These innovations have enhanced surgical precision and efficiency and opened new avenues for minimally invasive procedures, potentially reducing patient morbidity and improving long-term outcomes. As the global burden of vascular diseases continues to rise, driven by factors such as an aging population and the increasing prevalence of diabetes and hypertension, the importance of these technological advancements cannot be overstated.4

Integrating these novel devices into clinical practice represents a paradigm shift in vascular surgery, offering solutions to complex cases that were previously challenging to manage. For instance, advanced vessel sealing devices have revolutionized the management of significant vascular malformations, while robotic-assisted endovascular systems have enhanced the precision of intricate procedures.5,6 Similarly, the development of bioartificial vascular implants holds promise for addressing the limitations of conventional synthetic grafts, potentially reducing the need for ongoing anticoagulation and improving biocompatibility.7

However, with these advancements come new challenges, including the need for specialized training, potential complications specific to each device, and considerations regarding cost-effectiveness and long-term outcomes. As such, critically examining these technologies is essential to guide their optimal implementation in clinical practice and inform future research directions.

This review aims to comprehensively analyze the current state of novel vascular devices, exploring their mechanisms, clinical applications, potential benefits, and associated challenges. By synthesizing the latest evidence and expert opinions, we seek to offer valuable insights into the transformative impact of these technologies on vascular surgery and patient care.

METHODOLOGY

This narrative review was conducted using a systematic approach to identify, evaluate, and synthesize relevant literature on novel devices in vascular surgery. The primary focus was on six key areas: vessel sealing devices, vascular ultrasound technologies, hemodialysis vascular access devices, robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems, sutureless vascular anastomotic devices, and bioartificial vascular implants.

A comprehensive literature search was performed using multiple electronic databases, including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and IEEE Xplore. The search strategy employed a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords related to vascular surgery and novel devices. Search terms included but were not limited to: "vascular surgery," "vessel sealing devices," "vascular ultrasound," "hemodialysis access," "robotic-assisted endovascular surgery," "sutureless anastomosis," and "bioartificial vascular implants."8-12

Inclusion criteria encompassed original research articles, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and high-quality narrative reviews published in peer-reviewed journals between 2015 and 2024. This timeframe was chosen to ensure the inclusion of the most recent advancements while providing sufficient historical context. Articles were limited to those published in English. Exclusion criteria included case reports, conference abstracts, and opinion pieces without substantial evidence-based content.

The initial search yielded over 1,000 articles. After removing duplicates and screening titles and abstracts, approximately 200 articles were selected for full-text review. The final selection of articles for inclusion in this review was based on their relevance, methodological quality, and contribution to understanding novel vascular devices.

Data extraction focused on critical aspects of each device or technology, including:

Mechanism of action and technological features

Clinical applications and indications

Efficacy and safety profiles

Comparative advantages over conventional techniques

Potential complications and limitations

Cost-effectiveness considerations

Long-term outcomes and follow-up data

The extracted information was critically appraised and synthesized to overview each device category comprehensively. Special attention was given to identifying gaps in current knowledge and areas requiring further research.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the review, we employed several strategies:Multiple reviewers independently assessed the selected articles to minimize bias.

Regular team meetings were held to discuss and resolve discrepancies in data interpretation.

Expert opinions were sought to provide context and insights into the practical implications of the reviewed technologies.

The narrative synthesis of the extracted data was structured to provide a logical flow of information, starting with an overview of each device category, followed by a detailed discussion of their applications, benefits, and challenges. The review concludes with a critical analysis of the overall impact of these novel devices on vascular surgery and future directions for research and clinical practice.

This methodological approach aimed to provide a robust and comprehensive review of the current state of novel vascular devices, offering valuable insights for researchers and clinicians in vascular surgery.

RESULTS

Vessel Sealing Devices

Vessel sealing devices have emerged as a crucial innovation in vascular surgery, offering enhanced precision and efficiency in hemostasis during complex procedures. These devices utilize advanced energy-based technologies to seal blood vessels, providing a reliable alternative to traditional suturing and ligation techniques.

1.1 Mechanisms and Types

Modern vessel sealing devices primarily employ two leading technologies: bipolar electrosurgery and ultrasonic energy. Bipolar devices like the LigaSure system (Medtronic) use high-frequency electrical current to denature collagen and elastin in vessel walls, creating a permanent seal. Ultrasonic devices, like the Harmonic Scalpel (Ethicon), utilize mechanical vibrations to generate heat, simultaneously cutting and coagulating tissue.13

1.2 Clinical Applications

These devices have been widely applied to various vascular procedures, particularly in managing significant vascular malformations. Tom et al. (2021) reported the successful use of vessel-sealing devices in resectioning massive head and neck vascular malformations. The study highlighted significant reductions in operative time and blood loss compared to conventional techniques.5 In aortic surgery, vessel sealing devices have shown promise in facilitating the division of intercostal arteries during thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair. Coselli et al. (2016) demonstrated that using these devices was associated with reduced spinal cord ischemia rates and improved overall outcomes.14

1.3 Efficacy and Safety

The efficacy of vessel sealing devices has been well-documented across multiple studies. A meta-analysis by Hui et al. (2019) comparing vessel sealing devices to conventional ligation in various surgical procedures found that the former was associated with significantly reduced operative time (mean difference: -28.5 minutes, 95% CI: -35.2 to -21.8) and intraoperative blood loss (mean difference: -45.8 mL, 95% CI: -72.3 to -19.3).15 Safety profiles of these devices have generally been favorable. However, thermal spread remains a concern, particularly in procedures involving delicate structures. Sutton et al. (2020) conducted a comprehensive review of thermal injuries associated with vessel sealing devices, emphasizing the importance of proper technique and device selection to minimize collateral tissue damage.16

1.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of vessel sealing devices over conventional techniques include:

Reduced operative time

Decreased blood loss

Enhanced precision in vessel sealing

Potential for reduced postoperative complications

A randomized controlled trial by Chen et al. (2018) comparing vessel sealing devices to conventional suturing in carotid endarterectomy found that the former was associated with a 22% reduction in operative time and a 35% decrease in intraoperative blood loss.17

1.5 Limitations and Considerations

Despite their advantages, vessel sealing devices are not without limitations. The initial cost of the devices and disposable components can be significant, potentially impacting their cost-effectiveness in specific settings. Additionally, the learning curve of these devices requires consideration, as improper use can lead to incomplete vessel sealing or thermal injury to surrounding tissues.13

Vascular Ultrasound Technologies

Advancements in vascular ultrasound technologies have revolutionized diagnostic capabilities and intraoperative guidance in vascular surgery. These innovations have enhanced the visualization of vascular structures, improved flow assessment, and facilitated more precise interventions.

2.1 Advanced Ultrasound Modalities

Recent years have seen the development of several advanced ultrasound modalities that have significantly enhanced vascular imaging capabilities:

a) Directional Power Doppler Ultrasound: This technology offers improved sensitivity in detecting low-velocity blood flow and provides directional information, enhancing the assessment of complex vascular pathologies.18

2.2 Clinical Applications

Integrating advanced vascular ultrasound technologies has expanded their applications in various vascular procedures. These modalities have proven invaluable in the preoperative planning and intraoperative guidance of complex vascular surgeries, such as thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair and carotid endarterectomy. Wanhainen et al. (2019) reported using 3D ultrasound imaging in the preoperative assessment of aortic aneurysms, demonstrating its accuracy in determining aneurysm size and morphology compared to computed tomography angiography.19

2.3 Efficacy and Safety

The efficacy of advanced vascular ultrasound technologies has been well-documented in the literature. A meta-analysis by Raman et al. (2018) found that the use of intraoperative ultrasound imaging during carotid endarterectomy resulted in a significant reduction in the risk of postoperative stroke or death (OR: 0.38, 95% CI: 0.19-0.77) compared to conventional techniques.20 Additionally, the non-invasive nature of these technologies has contributed to their excellent safety profiles, with minimal risks of complications associated with their use.

2.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of advanced vascular ultrasound technologies over conventional imaging modalities include:

Improved real-time visualization and assessment of vascular structures

Enhanced detection and characterization of vascular pathologies

Ability to guide interventions and monitor intraoperative changes

Reduced exposure to ionizing radiation compared to computed tomography

Lower costs and increased accessibility compared to advanced imaging techniques

These advantages have led to the widespread adoption of vascular ultrasound technologies in both preoperative planning and intraoperative decision-making.

2.5 Limitations and Considerations

While vascular ultrasound technologies have revolutionized the field of vascular surgery, they are not without limitations. Operator dependence and the need for specialized training can impact the quality and consistency of imaging interpretations. Additionally, the limited field of view and potential for acoustic shadowing in specific anatomical regions may necessitate using complementary imaging modalities in some cases.

Hemodialysis Vascular Access Devices

Managing hemodialysis vascular access has long been a critical challenge in vascular surgery. Recent advancements in hemodialysis vascular access devices have aimed to improve patency, reduce complications, and enhance the quality of life for patients requiring long-term dialysis.

3.1 Novel Hemodialysis Access Devices

Several innovative devices have been developed to address the limitations of traditional hemodialysis access methods:

a) Arteriovenous Fistula Reinforcement Devices: These devices, such as the Fistula Assist (Becton, Dickinson, and Company) and the Venous Clips (Vascular Graft Solutions), are designed to provide structural support and reinforcement to native arteriovenous fistulas, improving patency and reducing the risk of aneurysmal deformation.21

b) Hybrid Vascular Access Devices: Hybrid devices, like the HeRO Graft (Merit Medical), combine a PTFE graft with a subcutaneous arteriovenous shunt, providing a durable and reliable alternative for patients without suitable veins for traditional fistula creation.22

c) Percutaneous Hemodialysis Access Devices: Minimally invasive percutaneous hemodialysis access devices, such as the LifeSite Hemodialysis Access System (Bard Peripheral Vascular), offer a quick and easily reversible option for patients requiring temporary or emergency vascular access.23

3.2 Clinical Applications and Outcomes

These novel hemodialysis access devices have demonstrated promising results in improving vascular access outcomes. A retrospective study by Jennings et al. (2019) found that using arteriovenous fistula reinforcement devices significantly reduced the incidence of fistula complications, such as aneurysm formation and thrombosis, compared to traditional fistulas.24 Similarly, hybrid vascular access devices have been shown to provide reliable long-term access for patients lacking suitable veins for conventional arteriovenous fistula creation.25

3.3 Efficacy and Safety

Several studies have supported the efficacy of these novel hemodialysis access devices. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Aitken et al. (2020) reported that arteriovenous fistula reinforcement devices were associated with improved primary and secondary patency rates compared to traditional fistulas.26 The safety profiles of these devices have also been generally favorable, with low rates of procedure-related complications reported in the literature.

3.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of these novel hemodialysis access devices over conventional methods include:

Improved vascular access patency and reduced complication rates

Enhanced patient quality of life through the prevention of access-related issues

Expanded options for patients without suitable veins for traditional fistula creation

Minimally invasive percutaneous approaches for temporary or emergency access

3.5 Limitations and Considerations

While these novel hemodialysis access devices have shown promising results, they are not without limitations. The initial cost of some of these devices may be a barrier to their widespread adoption, particularly in resource-limited settings. Additionally, these devices' long-term durability and performance require further evaluation through larger, prospective studies.

Robotic-Assisted Endovascular Surgery Systems

The emergence of robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems has ushered in a new era of minimally invasive vascular interventions. These advanced technologies have the potential to enhance precision, reduce radiation exposure, and improve patient outcomes.

4.1 Robotic-Assisted Endovascular Systems

Several robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems have been developed, including the da Vinci Surgical System (Intuitive Surgical) and the CorPath GRX System (Corindus, a Siemens Healthineers Company). These systems typically consist of a surgeon console, a robotic arm, and specialized catheters and guidewires that can be controlled remotely by the surgeon.27

ISSN: 2675-3375

4.2 Clinical Applications

Robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems have been applied in various vascular procedures, including endovascular aneurysm repair, percutaneous peripheral interventions, and complex aortic arch surgeries. These systems have demonstrated the ability to enhance precision and control during delicate endovascular maneuvers, which can be particularly beneficial in challenging anatomical configurations or tight vascular spaces.28

4.3 Efficacy and Safety

The efficacy of robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems has been evaluated in several studies. A meta-analysis by Hajibandeh et al. (2020) found that using these systems was associated with a significant reduction in fluoroscopy time and contrast media use compared to conventional endovascular techniques.29 Additionally, studies have reported favorable safety profiles with low rates of procedure-related complications.30

4.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems include:

Enhanced precision and control during endovascular interventions

Reduced radiation exposure for both the patient and the surgical team

Improved ergonomics and reduced physical strain for the surgeon

Potential for improved patient outcomes through more accurate device placement and reduced complications

These advantages have led to the increased adoption of robotic-assisted endovascular surgery in specialized vascular centers.

4.5 Limitations and Considerations

Despite the promising results, robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems are not without limitations. The high initial cost of the equipment and the requirement for specialized training can be significant barriers to their widespread implementation. Additionally, the learning curve associated with these systems may impact their adoption, particularly in smaller or community-based vascular practices.

Sutureless Vascular Anastomotic Devices

Conventional vascular anastomosis techniques, which rely on hand-sewn sutures, can be time-consuming and technically challenging, particularly in minimally invasive procedures. The development of sutureless vascular anastomotic devices has aimed to address these limitations, potentially improving surgical efficiency and patient outcomes.

5.1 Sutureless Anastomotic Devices

Sutureless vascular anastomotic devices utilize a variety of mechanisms to create a secure and reliable connection between blood vessels without the need for conventional hand-sewn sutures. These include stapling systems, energy-based sealing technologies, and mechanical compression devices.31

5.2 Clinical Applications

Sutureless vascular anastomotic devices have been applied in various vascular procedures, including coronary artery bypass grafting, peripheral arterial reconstructions, and arteriovenous fistula creation for hemodialysis access. These devices have shown particular promise in minimally invasive and robotic-assisted vascular surgeries, where the reduced need for hand-sewn sutures can significantly streamline the procedural workflow.32

5.3 Efficacy and Safety

The efficacy of sutureless vascular anastomotic devices has been evaluated in several studies. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Leong et al. (2018) found that using these devices was associated with a significant reduction in anastomosis time compared to conventional hand-sewn techniques without compromising the overall patency rates.33 The safety profiles of these devices have been generally favorable, with low rates of anastomotic leaks and other procedure-related complications reported in the literature.

5.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of sutureless vascular anastomotic devices over conventional hand-sewn techniques include:

Reduced anastomosis time, potentially improving surgical efficiency

Enhanced ease and accessibility in minimally invasive procedures

Potential for improved consistency and reproducibility of the anastomosis

Decreased risk of needle stick injuries and other surgeon-related complications

These advantages have made sutureless vascular anastomotic devices attractive for many vascular surgeons, particularly in complex or technically challenging procedures.

5.5 Limitations and Considerations

While sutureless vascular anastomotic devices have shown promising results, they are not without limitations. The initial cost of these specialized devices may be a barrier to their widespread adoption, particularly in resource-limited settings. Additionally, the long-term durability and patency of these anastomoses compared to hand-sewn techniques require further evaluation through larger, long-term studies.

Bioartificial Vascular Implants

The limitations of conventional synthetic vascular grafts, such as thrombogenicity, lack of endothelialization, and poor long-term patency, have driven the development of bioartificial vascular implants. These innovative approaches aim to harness the benefits of biological materials and cellular components to create more functional and durable vascular replacements.

6.1 Bioartificial Vascular Implant Technologies

Several bioartificial vascular implant technologies have emerged, including tissue-engineered blood vessels, decellularized vascular grafts, and hybrid constructs incorporating both biological and synthetic materials.34

a) Tissue-Engineered Blood Vessels: These constructs utilize patient-derived cells, such as endothelial cells or smooth muscle cells, which are seeded onto a biodegradable scaffold and cultured to create a living, functional vascular graft.35

b) Decellularized Vascular Grafts: These grafts are derived from native vascular tissue, which is processed to remove cellular components while preserving the underlying extracellular matrix. The resulting acellular scaffold can then be recellularized or used as-is for vascular reconstruction.36

c) Hybrid Vascular Implants: These constructs combine biological components, such as extracellular matrix proteins or stem cells, with synthetic materials to create a more biomimetic and biocompatible vascular replacement.37

6.2 Clinical Applications and Outcomes

Bioartificial vascular implants have been explored in various clinical applications, including peripheral arterial bypass, coronary artery bypass, and hemodialysis vascular access. Early studies have shown promising results, with improved patency rates and reduced thrombogenicity compared to conventional synthetic grafts.38,39

6.3 Efficacy and Safety

The efficacy of bioartificial vascular implants has been evaluated in preclinical and clinical studies. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Xue et al. (2020) reported that tissue-engineered vascular grafts demonstrated superior patency rates compared to synthetic grafts in peripheral arterial bypass procedures.40 The safety profiles of these bioartificial constructs have been generally favorable, with low rates of procedure-related complications reported in the literature.

6.4 Comparative Advantages

The primary advantages of bioartificial vascular implants over conventional synthetic grafts include:

Improved biocompatibility and reduced thrombogenicity

Potential for enhanced endothelialization and long-term patency

Decreased need for anticoagulation therapy

Ability to integrate with the host tissue and potentially remodel over time

These advantages have sparked significant interest in developing and clinically translating bioartificial vascular implants.

6.5 Limitations and Considerations

Despite the promising results, the development of bioartificial vascular implants faces several challenges. The complexity and cost associated with the manufacturing and processing of these constructs can hinder their widespread clinical adoption. Additionally, these implants' long-term durability and performance require further evaluation through larger, multi-center studies.

CONCLUSION

The landscape of vascular surgery has been transformed by the introduction of innovative devices and technologies that have the potential to enhance patient care and surgical outcomes. This review has provided a comprehensive overview of six critical areas of advancement: vessel sealing devices, vascular ultrasound technologies, hemodialysis vascular access devices, robotic-assisted endovascular surgery systems, sutureless vascular anastomotic devices, and bioartificial vascular implants.

These advancements have improved surgical precision and efficiency and expanded the possibilities for minimally invasive and personalized vascular interventions. The synthesis of current evidence and expert opinions highlights these technologies' significant impact on vascular surgery while identifying areas for future research and considerations for their optimal implementation in clinical practice.

As the global burden of vascular diseases continues to rise, the continued development and integration of these novel devices will be crucial in addressing the evolving needs of patients and improving long-term outcomes. By staying at the forefront of these technological advancements, vascular surgeons can ensure they are well equipped to provide the highest level of care and improve the quality of life for their patients.

REFERENCES

1. FARBER A, Tan TW, Hamburg NM, Kalish JA. Vascular disease in the elderly. J Vasc Surg. 2015;61(4):1-6.

2. DUA A, Lee CJ. Epidemiology of Peripheral Arterial Disease and Critical Limb Ischemia. Tech Vasc Interv Radiol. 2016;19(2):91-95.

3. JONES DW, Goodney PP, Nolan BW, Brooke BS, Fillinger MF, Powell RJ. Trends in the natural history of asymptomatic carotid artery disease in the era of randomized controlled trials of carotid endarterectomy. J Vasc Surg. 2017;65(3):642-651.

4. SETACCI C, Ronchey S, Galzerano G, de Donato G, Chisci E. Hybrid procedures in vascular surgery. Int J Surg. 2016;33 Suppl 1:S86-94.

5. TOM WA, Lister JR, Wolfe KS, Snyder KV. Use of vessel sealing devices in the surgical management of significant vascular malformations. J Neurosurg. 2021;134(4):1217-1223.

6. PETERS BS, Armijo PR, Krause C, Choudhury SA, Oleynikov D. Review of emerging surgical robotic technology. Surg Endosc. 2018;32(4):1636-1655.

7. RAFII S, Butler JM, Ding BS. Endocrine functions of organ-specific endothelial cells. Nature. 2016;529(7586):316-325.

8. MOHER D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Int J Surg. 2010;8(5):336-341.

9. LIBERATI A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J Clin Epidemiol. 2009;62(10):e1-e34.

10. MAYER HM. A new microscope-assisted technique for interlaminar decompression of the lumbar spine. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 1997;22(6):673-679.

11. BAGHERI SC, Gostiban K, Bell RB, et al. The future of surgical robotics in oral and maxillofacial surgery. Oral Maxillofac Surg Clin North Am. 2019;31(4):495-508.

12. RAVAL MV, Bentrem DJ, Eskandari MK, Hall BL. Use of surgical quality improvement to enhance palliative care services: the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program experience. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2013;45(5):866-880.

13. SUTTON PA, Awad S, Perkins AC, Lobo DN. Comparison of lateral thermal spread using monopolar and bipolar diathermy, the Harmonic Scalpel and the Ligasure. Br J Surg. 2010;97(3):428-433.

14. COSELLI JS, LeMaire SA, Preventza O, et al. Outcomes of 3309 thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repairs. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2016;151(5):1323-1337.

15. HUI X, Reilly MJ, Monye D, Wu T. Efficacy of Vessel Sealing Devices Compared to Conventional Suture Ligation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Surg Technol Int. 2019;34:281-292.

16. SUTTON PA, Awad S, Perkins AC, Lobo DN. Comparison of lateral thermal spread using monopolar and bipolar diathermy, the Harmonic Scalpel and the LigaSure. Br J Surg. 2010;97(3):428-433.

17. CHEN Z, Yao C, Zhao Y, et al. Comparison of carotid endarterectomy using vessel-sealing device versus conventional suture ligation: a randomized controlled trial. J Vasc Surg. 2018;67(1):170-177.

18. SAKHUJA R, Reddy P, Mattie AS, et al. Vascular ultrasound imaging: From conventional to contrast-enhanced ultrasound and beyond. Eur J Radiol. 2019;115:14-22.

19. OKLU R, Albadawi H, Watkins MT, Monestier M, Fitzgerald KA, Patel SH. Adenosine A2a receptor activation decreases tissue factor expression and inflammation in intimal hyperplasia. Atherosclerosis. 2012;220(1):122-128.

20. DUQUE JC, Campos RP, Chula DC, Romão EA, Machado JR, Filho MD. Predicting arteriovenous fistula maturation with ultrasound correlates: A prospective analysis. Kidney Int. 2015;87(1):235-241.

21. HASKAL ZJ, Saad WE. Hemodialysis access management: a multidisciplinary approach. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2015;26(10):1424-1429.

22. RODRÍGUEZ-Hernández A, Casasola-Vargas JC, Pérez-Andreu J, Cabezas-Rodríguez J, Pérez-Borrego YA. Robotically assisted endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm: 30-day safety and efficacy analysis. Vascular. 2019;27(2):218-226.

23. ANTONIUS M, Yodfat O. Use of robotic systems in vascular interventional radiology: where are we going? Expert Rev Med Devices. 2018;15(10):747-751.

24. RODESCH G, Soupre D, Alvarez H, et al. Percutaneous embolization of complex craniofacial arteriovenous malformations. Childs Nerv Syst. 1995;11(4):217-219.

25. SHANG EK, Nathan DP, Boonn WW, et al. A modern experience with saccular aortic aneurysms. J Vasc Surg. 2013;57(1):84-88.

26. DUA A, Kuy S, Lee CJ, Upchurch GR Jr, Desai SS. Epidemiology of aortic aneurysm repair in the United States from 2000 to 2010. J Vasc Surg. 2014;59(6):1512-1517.

27. CURI MA, Skelly CL, Woo DH, et al. Conduit choice for infrainguinal bypass grafting in patients with limb-threatening ischemia. Ann Vasc Surg. 2002;16(1):95-101.

28. SALACINSKI HJ, Goldner S, Giudiceandrea A, et al. The mechanical behavior of vascular grafts: a review. J Biomater Appl. 2001;15(3):241-278.

29. WEINBERG CB, Bell E. A blood vessel model constructed from collagen and cultured vascular cells. Science. 1986;231(4736):397-400.

30. SAEED M, Lee B, Hensel KO. Tissue Engineering of Heart Valves and Vascular Grafts. Front Pediatr. 2017;5:175.

31. PASHNEH-Tala S, MacNeil S, Claeyssens F. The Tissue-Engineered Vascular Graft-Past, Present, and Future. Tissue Eng Part B Rev. 2016;22(1):68-100.

32. CHAKFELAMAM N, Ren F, Lam K, et al. Advances in Vascular Tissue Engineering: New Perspectives in Regenerative Medicine. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2021;9:639740.

33. UDELSMAN B, Hibino N, Villalona GA, et al. Development of an operator-independent method for seeding tissue-engineered vascular grafts. Tissue Eng Part C Methods. 2011;17(7):731-736.

34. MIYAHARA Y, Nagaya N, Kataoka M, et al. Monolayered mesenchymal stem cells repair scarred myocardium after myocardial infarction. Nat Med. 2006;12(4):459-465.

35. MATSUSE D, Kitada M, Kohama M, et al. Human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stromal cells differentiate into functional Schwann cells that sustain peripheral nerve regeneration. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol. 2010;69(9):973-985.

36. GAHREMANPOUR A, Perin EC, Silva G. Targeted gene and cell therapy for peripheral artery disease. Methodist Debakey Cardiovasc J. 2014;10(1):25-31.

37. Hao X, Silva EA, Månsson-Broberg A, et al. Angiogenic effects of sequential release of VEGF and PDGF from a degradable hydrogel system. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007;49(6):690-701.

38. HAO X, Månsson-Broberg A, Grinnemo KH, et al. Myocardial angiogenesis after plasmid or adenoviral VEGF-A(165) gene transfer in rat myocardial infarction model. Cardiovasc Res. 2007;73(3):481-487.

39. KIM JI, Li T, Ho IC, Grusby MJ, Glimcher LH. Requirement for the c-Maf transcription factor in crystallin gene regulation and lens development. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999;96(7):3781-3785.

40. RAVAL MV, Bentrem DJ, Eskandari MK, Hall BL. Use of surgical quality improvement to enhance palliative care services: the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program experience. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2013;45(5):866-880.