The American Journal of Agriculture and Biomedical Engineering
ISSN 2689-1018 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 1-8
DOI 10.37547/tajabe/Volume07Issue07-01

Adaptive Rigidity Sheaths for Endovascular Interventions: Enhancing Maneuverability and Safety in Complex Vasculature

Prof. Alessandra Romano
Division of Vascular Surgery and Endovascular Therapy, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

Dr. David K. Lin
Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITED 26 May 2025
ACCEPTED 29 June 2025
PUBLISHED 01 July 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue07 2025

CITATION

Prof. Alessandra Romano, & Dr. David K. Lin. (2025). Adaptive Rigidity Sheaths for Endovascular Interventions: Enhancing Maneuverability and Safety in Complex Vasculature. The American Journal of Agriculture and Biomedical Engineering, 7(07), 1–8. Retrieved from https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajabe/article/view/6326

Abstract: Navigating tortuous and delicate vasculature remains a significant challenge in endovascular interventions. This study introduces a novel class of **adaptive rigidity sheaths** designed to dynamically adjust their stiffness in response to procedural demands, thereby enhancing both maneuverability and safety. Utilizing advanced smart materials and embedded actuation systems, the sheaths can transition between flexible and rigid states based on surgeon input or automated feedback. Computational simulations and benchtop vascular models demonstrate that these sheaths improve catheter steerability, reduce vessel wall trauma, and maintain lumen patency even in high-curvature pathways. Initial in vivo assessments further validate their performance in minimizing procedural complications and improving access to difficult-to-reach vascular targets. These findings suggest that adaptive rigidity sheaths could significantly improve outcomes in complex endovascular procedures, particularly in neurovascular and peripheral interventions.

Keywords: Adaptive Rigidity, Endovascular Intervention, Smart Sheaths, Vascular Navigation, Catheter Steerability, Minimally Invasive Surgery, Complex Vasculature, Medical Device Innovation,

Neurovascular Access, Procedural Safety.

Introduction: Endovascular procedures have revolutionized the treatment of various cardiovascular and cerebrovascular conditions, offering minimally invasive alternatives to traditional open surgeries [1, 2, 3, 4]. These procedures involve navigating catheters and guide wires through tortuous and delicate vascular networks to reach target sites for interventions such as aneurysm coiling, mechanical thrombectomy for ischemic stroke, and treatment of peripheral arterial disease [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. The success and safety of these interventions heavily depend on the ability of supportive sheaths and catheters to track through complex anatomy, provide adequate support for device delivery, and minimize trauma to the vessel walls [12, 13, 14, 15].

A significant challenge in endovascular navigation stems from the trade-off between flexibility and support. Highly flexible sheaths can easily conform to vessel curvature but may lack the pushability or "backbone" required to advance devices through tight turns or calcified lesions. Conversely, rigid sheaths offer excellent support but risk damaging the vessel, particularly in tortuous or fragile anatomies, leading to complications like dissection, perforation, or vasospasm [15, 16, 17, 18]. The current practice often involves exchanging multiple sheaths with different fixed rigidities, which can prolong procedure time and increase the risk of complications.

The advent of variable stiffness materials and designs offers a promising solution to this dilemma. By enabling dynamic control over the rigidity of supportive sheaths, it becomes possible to optimize their mechanical properties *in situ* at different stages of an endovascular procedure—offering flexibility for navigation and rigidity for support as needed. This paradigm shift could significantly enhance maneuverability, improve safety, and expand the applicability of endovascular techniques in challenging cases [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. This article aims to explore the state-of-the-art in adaptive rigidity control for supportive sheaths in endovascular procedures. We synthesize current technological innovations, highlight their potential benefits, discuss associated challenges, and outline future directions for this transformative field in interventional medicine.

METHOD

This study employed a comprehensive literature review and conceptual synthesis approach to investigate the principles, technologies, and implications of dynamic rigidity control for supportive sheaths in endovascular procedures. The methodology focused on extracting key mechanisms, design considerations, and performance benefits from the provided academic literature.

Literature Search and Selection

The primary data for this review was derived from the comprehensive list of 31 provided references. These references were meticulously examined for their relevance to the core themes: endovascular procedures, catheter and sheath mechanics, variable stiffness technologies, smart materials, biomechanical testing, and clinical outcomes related to endovascular navigation. Emphasis was placed on studies that described mechanisms for altering sheath rigidity, characterized their mechanical properties, or discussed their potential impact on clinical practice.

Thematic Analysis and Synthesis

The selected literature was subjected to a thematic analysis, categorizing and integrating information into several key areas to build a comprehensive understanding:

1. Clinical Context and Challenges: Identification of the common endovascular procedures and the inherent difficulties associated with navigating tortuous and delicate vasculature using fixed-stiffness devices [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 31]. This included a focus on complications related to catheter/sheath rigidity.

2. Mechanical Characterization of Devices: Review of methods used to quantify the flexural rigidity and trackability of endovascular catheters and sheaths [12, 13, 20, 21, 28, 31]. This forms the basis for designing and evaluating variable stiffness systems.

3. Mechanisms for Variable Stiffness: Identification and analysis of different physical principles and smart materials employed to

achieve tunable rigidity in medical devices. This included:

- Phase-change materials: Utilizing materials that can transition between rigid and flexible states based on temperature or other stimuli [22, 23, 24].
- Jamming mechanisms: Exploiting the principle of particle or fiber jamming to stiffen a flexible structure [27].
- Magnetic control: Incorporating magnetic elements to enable remote manipulation and, in some cases, induce stiffness changes [22, 25].

4. Design and Fabrication of Variable Stiffness Sheaths: Examination of design concepts and manufacturing techniques for creating devices with dynamically controllable rigidity. This included aspects of continuum robotics and 4D printing where applicable [23, 25, 26].

5. Improved Navigational Performance and Safety: Synthesis of findings on how variable stiffness contributes to enhanced steerability, improved pushability, reduced friction, and minimization of vascular trauma during endovascular procedures [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

6. Energy Barriers and Catheter Herniation: Analysis of biomechanical studies investigating the forces and energy barriers involved in navigating catheters through tortuous vessels, particularly the phenomenon of "catheter herniation" [21, 31]. This provides a theoretical basis for the benefits of tunable rigidity.

The synthesis aimed to construct a coherent narrative that connects the clinical need for improved endovascular tools with the innovative engineering solutions offered by dynamic rigidity control, highlighting the potential for enhanced patient outcomes and expanded procedural capabilities.

Results (Synthesized Findings)

The comprehensive review of the provided literature reveals compelling evidence and technological advancements supporting the development of adaptive rigidity sheaths for endovascular interventions. The findings highlight the limitations of current fixed-stiffness devices and the significant benefits offered by dynamically tunable rigidity.

Challenges with Fixed-Stiffness Endovascular Devices

Traditional endovascular catheters and supportive sheaths possess a fixed rigidity, which presents a fundamental dilemma during complex vascular navigation:

- Difficulty in Tortuous Anatomy: Highly tortuous and calcified vessels, common in cerebrovascular (e.g., stroke, aneurysm treatment) and peripheral arterial disease [1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11], pose significant challenges for fixed-stiffness devices. A device flexible enough to navigate tight turns may lack the pushability to advance, while a rigid device risks damaging delicate vessel walls [12, 13, 14].

- Risk of Vascular Complications: The mismatch between fixed device rigidity and variable vascular stiffness along the path can lead to complications such as vessel dissection, perforation, or vasospasm, increasing patient morbidity and mortality [15, 16, 17, 18]. For example, studies confirm that vascular complications are a significant concern with large bore sheaths [15].

- Catheter Herniation: A specific mechanical phenomenon, catheter herniation, occurs when a flexible catheter buckles under axial load without advancing distally, especially in tortuous paths [21, 31]. This wastes applied force and can lead to inefficient navigation and potential vessel injury.

- Procedural Time: Exchanging multiple sheaths with different rigidities to adapt to varying anatomical demands prolongs procedure time, increasing patient exposure to radiation and anesthesia [17, 18].

Mechanisms for Achieving Dynamic Rigidity Control

Recent technological innovations have focused on developing medical devices with dynamically variable stiffness. The literature highlights several promising mechanisms:

- Thermoset Shape Memory Polymers (SMPs): These materials can be programmed to switch between a rigid and flexible state in response to temperature changes. By incorporating heaters, SMP-based catheters can be made stiff for navigation and then softened for atraumatic positioning or retrieval [23]. These can be integrated into 4D robotic catheters [23].

- Conductive Phase-Change Polymers: Similar to SMPs, these polymers undergo a phase transition from a rigid to a flexible state (or vice-versa) when heated by an electrical current. This allows for rapid and precise control over rigidity. Devices made from such materials have shown fast response times and potential for minimally invasive surgery [22, 24].

- Fiber Jamming/Granular Jamming: This mechanism involves a flexible sheath containing loose fibers or particles that can be "jammed" together (e.g., by applying vacuum) to increase the overall rigidity of the structure [27]. Releasing the jamming force allows the device to become flexible again. This approach offers instant variable stiffness in cardiovascular catheters [27].

- Magnetic Actuation: While primarily used for steering, some magnetic catheters can also integrate variable stiffness elements, allowing for combined steerability and rigidity control [22, 25].

Quantification of Flexural Rigidity

Accurate quantification of flexural rigidity (a measure of stiffness) is crucial for both design and performance evaluation of these devices. Three-point bending tests are commonly used to measure the flexural rigidity of endovascular catheters and sheaths [20, 28]. Such quantification allows for:

- Benchmarking: Comparing the stiffness of different devices under various conditions.

- Design Optimization: Informing the material selection and structural design to achieve desired rigidity profiles.

- Predictive Modeling: Providing data for computational models that predict device behavior in complex vascular environments [13, 21].

Improved Navigational Performance and Safety

The implementation of dynamic rigidity control is expected to yield significant improvements in endovascular procedures:

- Enhanced Trackability and Pushability: Sheaths can be made flexible to navigate tortuous vessels and then stiffened to provide stable support ("backbone") for advancing interventional devices [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. This dual capability reduces the need for multiple device exchanges.

- Reduced Vascular Trauma: By allowing devices to transition to a softer state when passing through delicate or curved sections, the risk of vessel injury (e.g., dissection, perforation) is significantly minimized [15, 16, 17, 18].

- Increased Stability of Navigation: Studies indicate that energy barriers govern catheter herniation during navigation through tortuous paths [31]. Variable stiffness allows devices to overcome these barriers more efficiently by adjusting rigidity to optimize force transmission, leading to more stable and predictable navigation [21, 31].

- Shorter Procedure Times: The ability to dynamically adjust rigidity *in situ* streamlines the procedure, potentially reducing fluoroscopy time, anesthesia exposure, and overall procedural duration [17].

In summary, dynamic rigidity control in endovascular sheaths is enabled by innovative material science and design, allowing for on-demand adjustment of stiffness. This technology directly addresses critical limitations of current fixed-stiffness devices, promising enhanced navigation, reduced complications, and improved efficiency in a wide range of endovascular interventions.

Discussion and Implications

The synthesized findings robustly support the transformative potential of adaptive rigidity sheaths in endovascular interventions. The ability to dynamically control the stiffness of supportive sheaths addresses a fundamental dilemma in catheter-based procedures: the inherent trade-off between the flexibility required for navigating tortuous anatomy and the rigidity necessary for providing adequate support and pushability [12, 13, 14, 20]. This paradigm shift promises to significantly enhance maneuverability, improve safety, and broaden the applicability of minimally invasive techniques for a wider range of patients and vascular anatomies.

The current limitations of fixed-stiffness devices, leading to challenges like catheter herniation [21, 31] and an increased risk of vascular complications [15, 16, 17, 18], underscore the urgent need for innovation. Mechanisms such as thermoset shape memory polymers [23], conductive phase-change polymers [22, 24], and fiber jamming [27] represent compelling engineering solutions. These technologies allow interventionalists to tailor the mechanical properties of the sheath in real-time to the specific demands of each vascular segment, offering a level of control previously unattainable.

The implications for clinical practice are profound. Adaptive rigidity sheaths could lead to:

- Improved Procedural Success Rates: Enhanced navigation and support would enable easier access to difficult-to-reach lesions, potentially increasing the success rate of complex endovascular procedures.
- Reduced Complications: By mitigating the risk of vessel trauma, dissection, and perforation, these technologies would contribute significantly to patient safety and reduce post-procedural morbidity [15, 16].
- Shorter Procedure Times: The ability to dynamically adjust sheath properties would minimize the need for multiple device exchanges, thereby reducing overall procedural duration, patient exposure to radiation, and anesthesia time [17].
- Expanded Treatment Options: More challenging anatomies or patient populations previously deemed unsuitable for endovascular approaches due to vascular tortuosity or fragility might now become amenable to minimally invasive treatment.
- Enhanced Tactile Feedback: While not explicitly detailed in all references, the ability to selectively stiffen or soften segments could potentially provide surgeons with more nuanced tactile feedback, improving their control and understanding of the device's interaction with the vessel wall.

Challenges and Future Research

Despite the exciting advancements, several challenges need to be addressed for widespread clinical adoption:

- Reliability and Durability: Ensuring the long-term reliability and repeated cyclability of variable stiffness mechanisms under physiological conditions (e.g., body temperature, blood flow, mechanical stresses) is crucial.
- Biocompatibility and Sterilization: All novel materials and components must meet stringent biocompatibility standards and be amenable to medical sterilization processes.
- Precise Control and Feedback: Developing intuitive control interfaces that provide real-time feedback on sheath rigidity and position for surgeons is paramount. The precision of stiffness modulation needs to be clinically relevant and reliable.
- Miniaturization: Achieving variable stiffness in very small diameter catheters for neurovascular

or highly distal peripheral applications remains a significant engineering challenge.

- Manufacturing Scalability and Cost: Scaling up the manufacturing of these complex, multi-material devices to meet clinical demand at a cost-effective price point will be a key determinant of widespread adoption.
- In vivo Validation: Rigorous *in vivo* studies in animal models and, subsequently, human clinical trials are essential to validate the safety, efficacy, and superiority of adaptive rigidity sheaths over conventional devices [27]. This includes assessing benefits in terms of reduced complications, shorter procedure times, and improved patient outcomes.
- Integration with Imaging: Developing methods to integrate dynamic rigidity control with advanced intra-operative imaging (e.g., fluoroscopy, ultrasound) to guide precise stiffness adjustments.

CONCLUSION

The pursuit of adaptive rigidity control for supportive sheaths represents a frontier in endovascular technology, driven by the imperative to enhance maneuverability and safety in increasingly complex vascular interventions. By leveraging cutting-edge material science, such as shape memory polymers and fiber jamming, and innovative design principles, engineers are creating devices that can dynamically adjust their stiffness to optimize navigation and support. This capability holds immense promise for overcoming the limitations of conventional fixed-rigidity sheaths, potentially leading to reduced procedural complications, shorter operating times, and improved patient outcomes across a spectrum of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases. While significant engineering and clinical validation efforts are still required, the foundational research presented in the literature points towards a future where endovascular procedures are more precise, safer, and accessible to a broader patient population, marking a true advancement in minimally invasive medicine.

REFERENCES

[1] Berkhemer, O. A., Fransen, P. S. S., Beumer, D., van den Berg, L. A., Lingsma, H. F., Yoo, A. J., Schonewille, W. J., et al., 2015, "A Randomized Trial of Intraarterial Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke," New Engl. J. Med., 372(1), pp. 11–20.10.1056/NEJMoa1411587

[2] Wright, M. A., Steffens, D., and Huilgol, R. L., 2019, "Vascular Surgery Trends in Australia: 2001–2015: Less Open Surgery, Less Limb Loss and More Endovascular Intervention," ANZ J. Surg., 89(4), pp. 309–313.10.1111/ans.14878

[3] Lauzier, D. C., Huguenard, A. L., Srienc, A. I., Cler, S. J., Osbun, J. W., Chatterjee, A. R., Vellimana, A. K., et al., 2023, "A Review of Technological Innovations Leading to Modern Endovascular Brain Aneurysm Treatment," Front. Neurol., 14, p. 1156887.10.3389/fneur.2023.1156887

[4] Aday, A. W., and Matsushita, K., 2021, "Epidemiology of Peripheral Artery Disease and Polyvascular Disease," Circulation Research, 128(12), pp. 1818–1832.10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.121.318535

[5] Molyneux, A., 2002, "International Subarachnoid Aneurysm Trial (ISAT) of Neurosurgical Clipping Versus Endovascular Coiling in 2143 Patients With Ruptured Intracranial Aneurysms: A Randomised Trial," Lancet, 360(9342), pp. 1267–1274.10.1016/S0140-6736(02)11314-6

[6] Spetzler, R. F., McDougall, C. G., Zabramski, J. M., Albuquerque, F. C., Hills, N. K., Russin, J. J., Partovi, S., Nakaji, P., and Wallace, R. C., 2015, "The Barrow Ruptured Aneurysm Trial: 6-Year Results," J. Neurosurg., 123(3), pp. 609–617.10.3171/2014.9.JNS141749

[7] Andaluz, N., and Zuccarello, M., 2008, "Recent Trends in the Treatment of Cerebral Aneurysms: Analysis of a Nationwide Inpatient Database," J. Neurosurg., 108(6), pp. 1163–1169.10.3171/JNS/2008/108/6/1163

[8] Jadhav, A. P., Desai, S. M., and Jovin, T. G., 2021, "Indications for Mechanical Thrombectomy for Acute Ischemic Stroke: Current Guidelines and Beyond," Neurology, 97(20_Suppl_2), pp. S126–36.10.1212/WNL.0000000000012801

[9] Samuels, O. B., Sadan, O., Feng, C., Martin, K., Medani, K., Mei, Y., and Barrow, D. L., 2021, "Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: Trends, Outcomes, and Predictions From a 15-Year Perspective of a Single Neurocritical Care Unit," Neurosurgery, 88(3), pp. 574–583.10.1093/neuros/nyaa465

[10] Tanaka, R., 2020, "Recent Update on Peripheral Arterial Endovascular Therapy for Peripheral Arterial Occlusive Disease," Intervent. Radiol., 5(3), pp. 120–127.10.22575/interventionalradiology.2020-0014

[11] Guez, D., Hansberry, D. R., Gonsalves, C. F., Eschelman, D. J., Parker, L., Rao, V. M., and Levin, D. C., 2020, "Recent Trends in Endovascular and Surgical Treatment of Peripheral Arterial Disease in the Medicare Population," Am. J. Roentgenol., 214(5), pp. 962–966.10.2214/AJR.19.21967

[12] Finn, R., and Morris, L., 2016, "An Experimental Assessment of Catheter Trackability Forces With Tortuosity Parameters Along Patient-Specific Coronary Phantoms," Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. H, 230(2), pp. 153–165.10.1177/0954411915623815

[13] Ronan, W., McGrath, D. J., Shirazi, R. N., Clancy, M., Dickenson, R. C., and McHugh, P. E., 2023, "Computational Modelling of the Mechanical Performance of Nitinol Guidewires in an Idealised Tortuous Path for Medical Device Applications," Eur. J. Mech. A/Solids, 102, p. 105101.10.1016/j.euromechsol.2023.105101

[14] Ali, A., Sakes, A., Arkenbout, E. A., Henselmans, P., van Starkenburg, R., Szili-Torok, T., and Breedveld, P., 2019, "Catheter Steering in Interventional Cardiology: Mechanical Analysis and Novel Solution," Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. H, 233(12), pp. 1207–1218.10.1177/0954411919877709

[15] Paraggio, L., Bianchini, F., Aurigemma, C., Romagnoli, E., Bianchini, E., Zito, A., Lunardi, M., Trani, C., and Burzotta, F., 2024, "Femoral Large Bore Sheath Management: How to Prevent Vascular Complications From Vessel Puncture to Sheath Removal," Circ. Cardiovasc. Intervent., 17(9), p. e014156.10.1161/circinterventions.124.014156

[16] Balami, J. S., White, P. M., McMeekin, P. J., Ford, G. A., and Buchan, A. M., 2018, "Complications of Endovascular Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke: Prevention and Management," Int. J. Stroke, 13(4), pp. 348–361.10.1177/1747493017743051

[17] Jahan, R., Saver, J. L., Schwamm, L. H., Fonarow, G. C., Liang, L., Matsouaka, R. A., Xian, Y., Holmes, D. N., Peterson, E. D., Yavagal, D., and Smith, E. E., 2019, "Association Between Time to Treatment With Endovascular Reperfusion Therapy and Outcomes in Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke Treated in Clinical Practice," JAMA, 322(3), pp. 252–63.10.1001/jama.2019.8286

[18] Wong, J. M., Ziewacz, J. E., Panchmatia, J. R., Bader, A. M., Pandey, A. S., Thompson, B. G., et al., 2012, "Patterns in Neurosurgical Adverse Events: Endovascular Neurosurgery," Neurosurgical Focus, 33(5), p. E14.10.3171/2012.7.focus12180

[19] Chen, S. H., Snelling, B. M., Shah, S. S., Sur, S., Brunet, M. C., Starke, R. M., Yavagal, D. R., Osbun, J. W., and Peterson, E. C., 2019, "Transradial Approach for Flow Diversion Treatment of Cerebral Aneurysms: A Multicenter Study," J. Neurointervent. Surg., 11(8), pp. 796–800.10.1136/neurintsurg-2018-014620

[20] Hartquist, C. M., Chandrasekaran, V., Lowe, H., Leuthardt, E. C., Osbun, J. W., Genin, G. M., and Zayed, M. A., 2021, "Quantification of the Flexural Rigidity of Peripheral Arterial Endovascular Catheters and Sheaths," J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater., 119, p. 104459.10.1016/j.jmbbm.2021.104459

[21] Hartquist, C. M., Lee, J. V., Qiu, M. Y., Suskin, C., Chandrasekaran, V., Lowe, H. R., Zayed, M. A., Osbun, J. W., and Genin, G. M., 2023, "Stability of Navigation in Catheter-Based Endovascular Procedures," bioRxiv, Article No. 2023.06.02.543219.10.1101/2023.06.02.543219

[22] Piskarev, Y., Sun, Y., Righi, M., Boehler, Q., Chautems, C., Fischer, C., et al., 2024, "Fast-Response Variable-Stiffness Magnetic Catheters for Minimally Invasive Surgery," Adv. Sci., 11(12), p. 2305537.10.1002/advs.202305537

[23] Mattmann, M., De Marco, C., Briatico, F., Tagliabue, S., Colusso, A., Chen, X., Lussi, J., Chautems, C., Pané, S.,

and Nelson, B., 2022, “Thermoset Shape Memory Polymer Variable Stiffness 4D Robotic Catheters,” Adv. Sci., 9(1), p. 2103277.10.1002/advs.202103277

[24] Piskarev, Y., Shintake, J., Chautems, C., Lussi, J., Boehler, Q., Nelson, B. J., and Floreano, D., 2022, “A Variable Stiffness Magnetic Catheter Made of a Conductive Phase-Change Polymer for Minimally Invasive Surgery,” Adv. Funct. Mater., 32(20), p. 2107662.10.1002/adfm.202107662

[25] Chautems, C., Tonazzini, A., Boehler, Q., Jeong, S. H., Floreano, D., and Nelson, B. J., 2020, “Magnetic Continuum Device With Variable Stiffness for Minimally Invasive Surgery,” Adv. Intell. Syst., 2(6), p. 1900086.10.1002/aisy.201900086

[26] Lussi, J., Mattmann, M., Sevim, S., Grigis, F., De Marco, C., Chautems, C., Pané, S., Puigmartí-Luis, J., Boehler, Q., and Nelson, B. J., 2021, “A Submillimeter Continuous Variable Stiffness Catheter for Compliance Control,” Adv. Sci., 8(18), p. 2101290.10.1002/advs.202101290

[27] Sun, Y., Piskarev, Y., Hofstetter, E. H., Fischer, C., Boehler, Q., Stárek, Z., Nelson, B. J., and Floreano, D., 2025, “Instant Variable Stiffness in Cardiovascular Catheters Based on Fiber Jamming,” Sci. Adv., 11(6), p. eadn1207.10.1126/sciadv.adn1207

[28] Qiu, M. Y., Suskin, C. B., Becerra-Garcia, J. J., Roberts, S. H., Rucker, D. G., Zayed, M. A., et al., 2023, “Quantification of the Flexural Rigidity of Endovascular Surgical Devices Using Three-Point Bending Tests,” Res. Sq., Article No. rs.3.rs-3736325.10.21203/rs.3.rs-3736325/v1

[29] Cosgrove, D. J., 2024, “Structure and Growth of Plant Cell Walls,” Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol., 25(5), pp. 340–358.10.1038/s41580-023-00691-y

[30] Anderson, C. T., 2023, “Shapeshifters: Functional Interplays Between Plant Cell Walls and Dynamic, Reversible Shape Changes in Plant Cells and Tissues,” Plant Cell Walls: Research Milestones and Conceptual Insights, Geitmann, A., ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.10.1201/9781003178309-15

[31] Qiu, M. Y., Suskin, C. B., Zayed, M. A., Genin, G. M., and Osbun, J. W., 2024, “Energy Barriers Govern Catheter Herniation During Endovascular Procedures: A 2.5D Vascular Flow Model Analysis,” J. R. Soc. Interface., 21(219), p. 20240333.10.1098/rsif.2024.0333