Perception and acceptability of open vs endovascular treatment of common femoral artery disease: barriers and facilitators for randomised controlled trials
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Background

- Endovascular as 1st line for other territories
  - Minimally invasive
  - Low perioperative complications
  - Patient preference
- RCT – issues
  - Underpowered for hard clinical outcomes
  - Low recruitment rates and limited f/u
- High quality large scales RCTs required

Objective

To use established qualitative methodology to understand issues surrounding RCT delivery in the context of comparing the effectiveness of surgical vs. endovascular CFA revascularization.
Methods

- Systematic literature review
- REC approval 20/LO/0059
- Survey content and interview topic guides reviewed by specialist
- Online survey
  - March – May 2020
  - Members of RCPAD and VERN
- Semi-structured interviews
  - January – September 2021
  - Recruited via online survey or directly
- Iterative design
- Thematic analysis
## Results

- **94%** regularly performs endovascular procedures
- **66%** has access to hybrid theatre
- **74%** RCT needed
- **51%** would take part

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant vascular surgeon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular surgery trainee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant radiologist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training fellow (vascular surgery)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainees</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post training completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 121 participants

### F2F interviews

- **15** participants
- 6 surgeons, 6 IR consultants, 3 specialist nurses
Conclusion

- Majority believes RCT is necessary and would take part
- Key barriers & enablers identified
- Patients’ views

**Factors limiting patient recruitment (barriers)**
- Local resource limitations
- Gatekeeping of patients
- Narrow trial eligibility criteria

**Attitudes towards equipoise between treatments (arms)**
- Bias towards non randomised studies
- Lack of training
- Availability

**Attitudes towards endovascular therapies**
- Engagement
- Research nurse
- Easily accessible training tools
- Compensation or discount for devices