Drug-eluting balloons (DEBs) coated with the antiproliferative agent paclitaxel may improve primary patency by reducing recurrent luminal stenosis. A proportion of the active drug and excipient coating are known to emulsify distally, but until now, there have been no reports of adverse events resulting from their use. We report an unusual case of a painful nodular, biopsy specimen-proven vasculitic rash that afflicted the ipsilateral lower limb of a patient after superficial femoral artery treatment with a DEB. This adverse event may have implications for the use of DEB in this and other vascular territories. (J Vasc Surg 2014;59:520-3.)

CASE REPORT

A 72-year-old woman presented to our institution with a progressive 1-month history of severely restrictive recurrent left leg claudication. Before presentation, her left leg had been asymptomatic for 9 months after undergoing bare-metal stent revascularization of the midsuperficial femoral artery. Examination revealed palpable bilateral femoral pulses but absent popliteal and pedal pulses on the symptomatic side. Her limbs showed no evidence of venous disease, rash, or ulceration. Arterial duplex ultrasonography revealed a critical in-stent stenosis of the previously placed superficial femoral artery stent (peak systolic velocity, 438 cm/s) with a reduced ankle-brachial pressure index of 0.75. Until now, there have been no reports of target organ vasculitic, allergic, or hypersensitivity reactions with the use of this device.

Vasculitis resulting from a superficial femoral artery angioplasty with a paclitaxel-eluting balloon
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Drug-eluting balloons (DEBs) are effective at reducing intimal hyperplasia after angioplasty of the superficial femoral artery, infrapopliteal circulation, and arteriovenous fistulas.1-4 As a tool to both prevent and treat restenosis, DEBs are being applied to an ever-broader variety of vascular territories, including the carotid and coronary arteries.5-7 Until now, there have been no reports of target organ vasculitic, allergic, or hypersensitivity reactions with the use of this device.

The patient underwent an elective superficial femoral artery angioplasty procedure. The lesion was approached through an atraumatic antegrade left common femoral artery puncture and placement of a 6F Britetip sheath (Cordis, Johnson & Johnson, Warren, NJ). After predilatation with a 6 × 100-mm conventional Fox Cross balloon catheter (Abbott Vascular, Abbott Park, Ill), a 6 × 120-mm In.Pact Admiral DEB, with paclitaxel coating (3 μg/mm²; Invatec, Medtronic, Minn) was inflated according to the manufacturer’s recommendation. Completion angiography demonstrated a pleasing angiographic result, free of dissection, recoil, or thrombus. No evidence of distal embolization was apparent on runoff angiography. There were strong popliteal and pedal pulses after the procedure, and she was discharged the next day with no evidence of rash.

She presented 1 week after the procedure after developing a mildly painful rash, prominent on the distal aspect of her left lower limb from the lower thigh to the ankle but which spared the foot (Fig 1). The rash consisted of nonblanching papules (skin rash) and eczematous (skin rash). She was receiving lipid-lowering (gemfibrozil), antihypertensive (ramipril), and dual-antiplatelet (clopidogrel and aspirin) medications.
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highly lipophilic drug\textsuperscript{8} inhibits the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells that would otherwise accumulate within the neointima and form a hyperplastic restenotic lesion.\textsuperscript{9} A variety of excipient carrier molecules have been used to facilitate paclitaxel delivery to the target lesion, including urea, iopromide, butyryl-tri-hexyl citrate, and shellolic acid.\textsuperscript{10} During balloon inflation, these drugs are liberated, some implanting as drug reservoirs into the blood vessel wall to exert their effect locally, whereas other clumps are released downstream in a phenomena known as “particulate embolization.” This phenomenon was studied by Heilmann et al\textsuperscript{11} in a porcine model, in which they demonstrated that >50\% of the drug coating washes off into the distal circulation. In that study, the type of excipient and method of balloon coating (drug-coated or wrapped) affected the efficiency of drug transfer. In human studies, Freyhardt et al\textsuperscript{12} demonstrated paclitaxel within the systemic circulation after lower limb DEB angioplasty. There is concern about what long-term effect this shower of drug into the end organ may have; however to date, there have been no published reports of allergy or vasculitic reactions. This has been reassuring for all who use these devices and has resulted in their broad application to include vascular territories where the end organ may be less forgiving than the lower limb.\textsuperscript{10,13}

We propose that our patient’s vasculitic rash was related to particulate embolization of the drug coatings on the balloon, of which paclitaxel and urea feature most prominently. In support of this, we note that the rash was present only in the vascular territory fed by the treated superficial femoral artery and appeared 5 days after that treatment. Close physical examination of her skin and
a biochemical analysis of her organ parameters revealed no evidence of allergic or vasculitic reaction in other vascular beds, confirming that the process was isolated to her left leg. It is likely that a reaction to the oral medications, intravenous sedatives, analgesics, and local anesthetics used in the periprocedural period would have resulted in wider evidence of a systemic reaction.

Theoretically, an inflammatory contaminant introduced through the working sheath could have also caused such a vasculitic reaction; however, no such contamination occurred within the sterile operating theater environment where the procedure took place. The patient did not have allergies to docetaxel14 or hazelnuts,15 to which cross-allergenicity to paclitaxel have been described.

Finally, atheroembolism was considered to have been unlikely given that smooth in-stent restenosis was the lesion targeted by angioplasty and the distal limb arteries were patent when examined at the completion of the procedure. Paclitaxel hypersensitivity rashes have been previously described with variable features, at times similar to the rash in this patient.16 Thus, we have a plausible mechanism, a strong temporal relationship, and absence of an alternative cause for her clinical syndrome.

To date, the published experience with DEBs has been limited by small numbers and short follow-up. There are no reports of end-organ or distal vascular bed lesions as a result of deposition of the antiproliferative drug and excipient. Stent hypersensitivities in the coronary literature have been reported and investigated.17 Nebeker et al18 reviewed all drug-eluting stent hypersensitivities reported to the Food and Drug Administration between 2003 and 2004, detecting stents in 17 patients that caused a hypersensitivity reaction resulting in eosinophilic inflammation, thrombosis, or lack of intimal healing. Explanted samples demonstrated stent thrombosis and vascular ectasia due to an eosinophilic inflammation that resulted in a lack of intimal healing. Distal vascular bed lesions, such as the one in our patient, have not been demonstrated.

Generational development of DEBs has seen evolving improvements in target lesion drug delivery determined largely by the carrier excipient molecule used. These carrier molecules are critical in determining the volume of drugs delivered to and retained within the target lesion, as well as the proportion of drugs lost downstream.19 Newer-generation DEBs promise to improve drug delivery and vessel wall retention while reducing particulate embolization. These excipient variations may avoid the distal vascular injuries seen in this patient.

As a first report of vasculitis from a DEB, this is an isolated event by definition. However, in the context of a new technology with little published experience, it may be considered a warning to users at a time when there is uncertainty about the incidence of the event, but many are seeking to broaden the application of DEBs into new vascular territories. Our patient is progressing toward a full recovery; however, if this DEB had been used in her carotid, renal, or mesenteric circulation, such a vasculitis might have resulted in a major serious adverse event.

CONCLUSIONS

We present here a patient with vasculitic rash of the lower limb after treatment with a DEB, thought to be a reaction to particulate embolization of paclitaxel and urea. Although DEBs have been shown to improve patency in the treatment of arterial occlusive disease, hypersensitivity reactions with serious clinical consequences may occur and warrant careful consideration.
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