

# Ablation Modality Comparison

	Microwave Ablation by NEUWAVE™	Radiofrequency Ablation	Cryoablation
Energy Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy readily propagates regardless of tissue type or desiccation</li> <li>• <math>\geq 60^{\circ}\text{C}</math> causes instantaneous cell death<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy requires a circuit to propagate heat</li> <li>• Tissue desiccation causes impedance which breaks the electrical circuit and limits current flow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freeze / Thaw / Freeze cycle</li> <li>• Cycle is required as cell death is not instantaneous<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>
Probes	<p>Versatile portfolio with the availability of minimally invasive 17 gauge probes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>PR Probe</b> – Distal energy control to help protect non-target tissue</li> <li>• <b>LK/LN Probes</b> – Tissue-tuned for large single probe ablations</li> <li>• <b>PR XT/LK XT (15 ga.) Probes</b> – Stiffer probe shaft for difficult probe placements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conventional and multi-tined probes only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger diameter probes increasing invasiveness<sup>5</sup></li> <li>• Conventional probes only</li> </ul>
Ablation Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 – 4 cm with a single probe<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Multi-probe capability with synchronized energy delivery for larger ablations<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 – 3 cm with a single probe<sup>9</sup></li> <li>• Smaller ablation zones due to desiccation and impedance</li> <li>• No synchronous multiple probe systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 – 2 cm with a single probe<sup>13</sup></li> <li>• No synchronous multiple probe systems</li> </ul>
Ablation Time	5 – 10 minutes <sup>4</sup>	10 – 45 minutes <sup>9</sup>	25 – 30 minutes <sup>13</sup>

# Ablation Modality Comparison

	Microwave Ablation by NEUWAVE	Radiofrequency Ablation	Cryoablation
Clinical Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Faster heating to &gt;160°C temperatures<sup>5</sup></li><li>• ≥ 30% tissue contraction<sup>6</sup></li><li>• Less susceptible to heat-sink in vascular tissue<sup>7</sup></li><li>• Larger ablation zones in the lung vs radiofrequency<sup>8</sup></li><li>• Ablation Confirmation Software to confirm the technical success of procedures</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inability to reach high temperatures &gt; 100°C<sup>5</sup></li><li>• Significantly less tissue contraction in the liver<sup>6</sup></li><li>• More susceptible to heat-sink in vascular tissue<sup>7,10</sup></li><li>• Smaller ablation zones in the aerated lung tissue<sup>5</sup></li><li>• No integrated software to confirm the technical success of procedures</li><li>• Risk of skin burns with grounding pads<sup>11</sup></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complication risks – cryoshock and inability to coagulate tissue decreases utility in patients with cirrhosis, poor liver function and clotting disorders<sup>13</sup></li><li>• Larger ablations increase the risk of hematomas<sup>14</sup></li><li>• Highly visible ice ball, however the ice ball does not represent to the lethal isotherm<sup>13</sup></li></ul>

# References

1. M.W. Dewhirst, et al. Basic principles of thermal dosimetry and thermal thresholds for tissue damage from hyperthermia. *IJH* 19:267, 2003. A.R. Mortiz, et al. Studies of Thermal Injury: II. The Relative Importance of Time and Surface Temperature in the Causation of Cutaneous Burns. *Am J Pathol* 1947.
2. NeuWave Medical bovine liver, lung and kidney ex-vivo data
3. P. Laeseke, et al. Multiple Antenna Microwave Ablation: Spatially Distributing Power Improves Thermal Profiles and Reduces Invasiveness. *Journal of Interventional Oncology* 2009;2(2). C.M. Harari, et al. Microwave Ablation: Comparison of Simultaneous and Sequential Activation of Multiple Antennas in Liver Model Systems. *Radiology*. 2015 Jul 2:142-151.
4. T. Ziembiewicz, et al. Percutaneous Microwave Ablation of Hepatocellular Carcinoma with a Gas-Cooled System: Initial Clinical Results with 107 Tumors. *JVIR* 2015. M. Lubner, et al. Microwave Tumor Ablation: Mechanism of Action, Clinical Results and Devices. *JVIR* 2010
5. C. Brace, et al. Radiofrequency and Microwave Ablation of the Liver, Lung, Kidney, and Bone: What Are the Differences? *Curr Probl Diagn Radiol* 2009.
6. C. Sommer, et al. Quantification of Tissue Shrinkage and Dehydration Caused by Microwave Ablation: Experimental Study in Kidneys for the Estimation of Effective Coagulation Volume. *JVIR* 2013.
7. A. Wright, et al. Radiofrequency versus Microwave Ablation in a Hepatic Porcine Model. *Radiology* July 2015.
8. C. Brace, et al. Pulmonary Thermal Ablation: Comparison of Radiofrequency and Microwave Devices by Using Gross Pathologic and CT Findings in a Swine Model. *Radiology: Volume 251: Number 3—June 2009*
9. E. Knavel, et al. Tumor Ablation: Common Modalities and General Practices. *Techniques in Vascular and Interventional Radiology* 2013.
10. D. Lu, et al. Influence of Large Peritumoral Vessels on Outcome of Radiofrequency Ablation of Liver Tumors. *JVIR* 2003.
11. S. Huffman, et al. Radiofrequency Ablation Complicated by Skin Burn. *Semin Intervent Radiol*. 2011.
12. B. Rubinsky, et al. Cryosurgery. *Annu Rev Biomed Engineering*. 2002;2:157-187.
13. H. Bang, et al. Percutaneous cryoablation of metastatic lesions from non-small cell lung carcinoma: Initial survival, local control, and cost observations. *JVIR* 2012.
14. Sidana, et al. Complications of renal cryoablation: A single center experience. *Journal of Urology* 2010.