OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 2329-6925
Journal of Vascular Medicine & Surgery

Short Communication

Diabetic Vascular Disease: A Distinct Entity Requiring Specialized Approaches

Dianxiang Lu*

Department of Vascular Surgery, Chengdu University, Chengdu, China

DESCRIPTION

Diabetes mellitus profoundly alters the natural history, clinical presentation, and treatment outcomes of vascular disease across all territories. As the global prevalence of diabetes continues to rise-projected to affect over 700 million individuals by 2045-vascular specialists increasingly encounter its distinctive vascular manifestations. This commentary examines the unique pathophysiology of diabetic vascular disease, its clinical implications, and evolving management strategies across different vascular beds [1,2].

The vasculopathy associated with diabetes extends well beyond accelerated atherosclerosis, involving complex microvascular and macrovascular changes with distinct characteristics compared to non-diabetic vascular disease. At the cellular level, chronic hyperglycemia triggers multiple pathological pathways including advanced glycation end-product formation, oxidative stress, protein kinase C activation, and inflammatory cascades. These processes collectively damage endothelial cells, promote vascular smooth muscle cell proliferation, enhance platelet aggregation, and impair fibrinolysis [3,4].

In coronary and peripheral arteries, diabetic atherosclerotic lesions demonstrate several distinguishing features: more diffuse distribution, preferential involvement of distal vessels, greater plaque burden, higher calcium content, and accelerated progression compared to non-diabetic counterparts. The extensive calcification frequently observed in diabetic vessels presents particular challenges for both open and endovascular interventions, often necessitating specialized techniques and devices [5,6].

Microvascular dysfunction in diabetes contributes significantly to end-organ damage even in the absence of obstructive macrovascular disease. Impaired vasodilation, increased vascular permeability, basement membrane thickening, and capillary rarefaction collectively compromise tissue perfusion and nutrient exchange. This microvascular component helps explain why some diabetic patients develop critical tissue loss despite relatively preserved large vessel flow, challenging conventional hemodynamic assessment paradigms [7,8].

The clinical implications of these pathophysiological differences manifest uniquely across different vascular territories. In carotid artery disease, diabetes is associated with higher stroke risk at any given degree of stenosis compared to non-diabetic patients, likely reflecting both vulnerable plaque characteristics and impaired cerebral microvascular compensation. The optimal management approach remains debated, with some evidence suggesting greater benefit from early intervention in diabetic patients with even moderate stenosis [9].

For lower extremity arterial disease, diabetes dramatically alters both presentation and prognosis. Diabetic patients often present with tissue loss as their first manifestation rather than claudication, reflecting concomitant neuropathy that masks typical ischemic symptoms. The predilection for tibial and pedal vessel involvement-with relative sparing of the femoropopliteal segment in many cases-creates unique revascularization challenges. The BASIL trial subgroup analysis demonstrated poorer outcomes for diabetic patients regardless of revascularization strategy, highlighting the need for specialized approaches [10].

Venous disease in diabetes also demonstrates distinct characteristics, with impaired endothelial function and hypercoagulability contributing to increased venous thromboembolism risk. Post-thrombotic syndrome develops more frequently and with greater severity in diabetic patients following deep vein thrombosis, potentially reflecting impaired venous remodeling and microvascular dysfunction. These observations suggest that diabetic patients may benefit from more aggressive initial anticoagulation and closer surveillance.

Assessment of vascular disease in diabetes requires recognition of these unique features. Traditional non-invasive studies may underestimate disease severity, particularly when microvascular dysfunction contributes significantly to symptoms. Ankle-brachial indices can be falsely elevated due to medial calcification, necessitating toe pressures or alternative perfusion assessment methods. Advanced imaging modalities including

Correspondence to: Dianxiang Lu, Department of Vascular Surgery, Chengdu University, Chengdu, China, E-mail: ludianxiang@12.com

Received: 28-Jan-2025, Manuscript No. JVMS-25-28754; **Editor assigned:** 31-Jan-2025, Pre QC No. JVMS-25-28754 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 14-Feb-2025, QC No. JVMS-25-28754; **Revised:** 21-Feb-2025, Manuscript No. JVMS-25-28754 (R); **Published:** 28-Feb-2025, DOI: 10.35248/2329-6925.25.13.581.

Citation: Lu D (2025). Diabetic Vascular Disease: A Distinct Entity Requiring Specialized Approaches. J Vasc Surg. 13:581.

CT angiography with specialized reconstruction protocols for heavily calcified vessels and magnetic resonance angiography with nephrogenic systemic fibrosis precautions are frequently required for comprehensive evaluation.

Medical management forms the foundation of diabetic vascular disease treatment, with several important considerations specific to this population. Glycemic control represents a complex balance-while poor control clearly accelerates vascular damage, overly aggressive targets may increase hypoglycemic events and cardiovascular risk in patients with established disease. The cardiovascular benefits demonstrated with newer antidiabetic agents, particularly SGLT2 inhibitors and GLP-1 receptor agonists, have transformed our approach to diabetes management in patients with vascular disease. These agents have shown reductions in major adverse cardiovascular events and hospitalizations for heart failure beyond their glycemic effects, leading to their incorporation into contemporary treatment algorithms.

Antithrombotic therapy requires careful consideration of both heightened thrombotic risk and potential bleeding complications in diabetic patients. Aspirin resistance appears more prevalent in diabetes, potentially warranting higher maintenance doses or alternative antiplatelet strategies. The optimal intensity and duration of dual antiplatelet therapy following vascular intervention remains unclear, with some evidence suggesting greater benefit from prolonged treatment in diabetic cohorts despite increased bleeding risk.

Revascularization strategies for diabetic vascular disease continue to evolve rapidly. For coronary intervention, evidence increasingly supports complete revascularization rather than culprit-vessel-only approaches in multivessel disease. Drug-eluting stents have substantially improved outcomes compared to bare metal platforms, with newer generation devices demonstrating acceptable results even in complex diabetic lesions.

For lower extremity revascularization, several considerations specific to diabetes merit attention. First, the angiosome concept-targeting revascularization to the specific arterial territory supplying a wound-may hold particular relevance in diabetes due to impaired collateralization, though conclusive evidence is lacking. Second, heavily calcified vessels may require specialized preparation with atherectomy, lithoplasty, or scoring balloon technologies before definitive intervention. Third, wound healing endpoints rather than patency alone should guide procedural planning, recognizing that temporary restoration of flow may suffice for healing in some cases.

Bypass surgery in diabetic patients faces unique technical challenges but remains an important option for extensive disease not amenable to endovascular approaches. Careful attention to conduit quality, distal target selection, and meticulous tissue handling becomes particularly important in this population. Autologous vein remains the preferred conduit when available, with distal origin grafts sometimes necessary to avoid heavily diseased inflow vessels.

The multidisciplinary team approach holds particular importance for diabetic vascular disease. Collaboration between vascular specialists, endocrinologists, podiatrists, wound care experts, and rehabilitation professionals allows comprehensive management addressing both mechanical flow limitations and the metabolic milieu affecting healing potential. Structured care pathways incorporating risk factor modification, surveillance protocols, and patient education have demonstrated improved limb salvage rates compared to fragmented approaches.

CONCLUSION

Prevention and early intervention represent critical priorities for diabetic vascular disease management. Screening programs identifying peripheral arterial disease before tissue loss occurs can facilitate timely intervention and risk factor modification. Simple preventive measures including regular foot examinations, appropriate footwear, and prompt attention to minor injuries can dramatically reduce ulceration risk. Patient education regarding symptoms warranting urgent evaluation helps prevent delays in treatment that can mean the difference between limb salvage and major amputation. Diabetic vascular disease represents far more than simply accelerated atherosclerosis, encompassing distinctive pathophysiological mechanisms with important clinical implications. Successful management requires recognition of these unique characteristics, specialized assessment techniques, and tailored treatment strategies across medical, endovascular, and surgical domains. By developing dedicated approaches to this growing patient population, we can improve outcomes across all vascular territories affected by this challenging systemic disease.

REFERENCES

1. Christoforou P, Kapoulas K, Bekos C. Open surgical repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm and horseshoe kidney: A strange relationship. Int J Surg Case Rep. 2022;93:106971.
2. Melmer PD, Patel A, Biswas S, Borowicz MR. Horseshoe kidney isthmus infarction after percutaneous endovascular aortic aneurysm repair. Cureus. 2020;12(3):7279.
3. Bowden S, Nagle G R. Fenestrated endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair with concomitant horseshoe kidney. BMJ Case Rep. 2021;14(1):236755.
4. Hajibandeh S, Hajibandeh S, Johnpulle M, Perricone V. Transperitoneal repair of a juxtarenal abdominal aortic aneurysm and co-existent horseshoe kidney with division of the renal isthmus. J Surg Case Rep. 2015;2015(10):134.
5. Kin K, Takano H, Nakagawa T, Shirakawa Y. Hybrid repair of an abdominal aortic aneurysm: debranching with endovascular aneurysm repair in a patient with horseshoe kidney. Ann Vasc Dis. 2017;10(1): 41-43.
6. Handa K, Sakamoto T, Kakizawa Y, Kitahara M, Fukui S, Shirakawa Y, et al. Endovascular aneurysm repair for a patient with horseshoe kidney and the importance of watershed sign and volumetry by preoperative contrast-enhanced computed tomography. Ann Vasc Dis. 2021;14(4):396-399.
7. Taghavi K, Kirkpatrick J, Mirjalili SA. The horseshoe kidney: Surgical anatomy and embryology. J Pediatr Urol. 2016;12(5): 275-280.
8. Sachsamanis G, Charisis N, Maltezos K, Galyfos G, Papapetrou A, Tsiliggiris V, et al. Management and therapeutic options for abdominal aortic aneurysm coexistent with horseshoe kidney. J Vasc Surg. 2019;69(4):1257-1267.