

Established and Emerging Differences in DES An Interplay of Clinical Trials, Public

Opinion and Physician Perceptions

David E. Kandzari, MD, FACC, FSCAI

Chief Medical Officer Cordis Corporation, a Johnson & Johnson Company dkandzari@crdus.jnj.com

Does the Interventional Community Adhere to Clinical Trial Results?



Source: BARI Trial Investigators

Does the Interventional Community Adhere to Clinical Trial Results?

Influence of the Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Diabetic Clinical Alert on Practice Patterns Results from the National Cardiovascular Network Database

Darren K. McGuire, MD, MHSc; Kevin J. Anstrom, PhD; Eric D. Peterson, MD, MPH

- Background—In 1995, the Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation (BARI) found that patients with diabetes had a survival benefit when treated with surgical revascularization versus balloon angioplasty, prompting a National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) "Clinical Alert." The influence of the BARI findings and of the Clinical Alert on practice patterns is unknown.
- *Methods and Results*—The practice patterns of coronary revascularization among patients with diabetes and multivessel coronary artery disease (CAD) were analyzed using data collected in 1994 to 1997 from 13 centers participating in the National Cardiovascular Network. The study population included patients with diabetes and multivessel CAD who underwent elective coronary revascularization (n=9619). Over the 4 years of the study, the Clinical Alert had no significant impact on the proportion of diabetic patients undergoing percutaneous revascularization (28.6% before versus 26.8% after the Clinical Alert; P=0.06). Among individual hospitals, the probability of diabetic patients and the proportion of patients version were provided by > 12 fold (4.2% to 56.6%). Adjusting for clinical factors and the

BARI Clinical Alert did not alter this variability. Among the investigators surveyed, although 91% were aware of the Clinical Alert and 76% felt the findings were valid, >50% felt the Clinical Alert had limited or no impact on their personal or institution's care patterns.

Conclusions—Limited consensus exists regarding the most appropriate method of revascularization for diabetic patients with multivessel CAD. The results from a large, randomized, clinical trial and subsequent Clinical Alert had no measurable impact on this practice variability. (*Circulation.* 2003;107:1864-1870.)

Impact of Clinical Trials Often Exceeds Conclusions from the Study Results Alone

- Sheer number of clinical trials
- Market potential of new device approval
- Industry competitive landscape
- Personalities involved
 - Physicians (Non-interventionalists)
 - Professional societies (ACC, SCAI, AHA, ESC)
 - Regulatory bodies (FDA Panel 12/2006, NICE)
 - Political interest groups (Waxman)
 - Pharmaceutical and device industry

"Intent to Treat" Knowing the Evidence but Not Applying It



Coming Full Circle in Understanding DES ESC 2006 \Rightarrow TCT 2007

What a difference a year makes



Do drug-eluting stents increase deaths?

TWO SEPARATE, independent meta-analyses, presented in Hot Line session I, suggest drugeluting stents (DES) may increase death, Qwave myocardial infarction (clinical surrogates of in-stent thrombosis) and cancer deaths, bringing the long-term safety of DES firmly into the spotight. Discussant Salim Yusuf (NcMaster University, Canada) hailed the data as one of the most important presentations to come out of this year's meeting.

"Six million people in the world have been implanted with DES, yet their long-term safety and efficacy is unknown," said Yusuf. "Tve a feeling the data we're seeing today is only the tip of the lobberg. We need to encourage more more across to the choice." obtain this data from the manufacture;" said Nordmann. He speculated that the increase in cancer might be due to a rapid impairment of the immune system. Yusuf widened the debate to include

percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). "The overuse of PCI is an insidious change in the culture of cardiology that needs to be reversed," he said. The use of PCI was established in MI, high-risk unstable anglina and cardiogenic shock. However, its use in stable disease was a totally different question.

"There's no beneficial influence on mortality -PCI does nothing to prevent heart attack. All we are doing is providing short-term relief of chest pain. It's not re-strengts that kills hut the



All-Cause Mortality: All RCTs (8,867 patients, 21 trials)



Kirtane A., Stone G., ACC Oral Presentation; 2008

All-Cause Mortality: All Registries (161,232 patients, 28 registries)

		Estimate (95% CI)	Weight (%)
NHLBI (off label, adjusted)		0.94 (0.64, 1.38)	3.40
NHLBI (on label, adjusted)		1.47 (0.87, 2.48)	2.31
Germany Metabolic Syndrome	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.47 (0.65, 3.35)	1.15
Ontario (matched)	en e	0.71 (0.59, 0.84)	5.98
Mayo FFR Substudy	_	1.00 (0.21, 4.75)	0.36
talian Diabetic Multivessel (adjusted)		1.22 (0.36, 4.10)	0.57
McMaster STEMI (adjusted)		0.17 (0.03, 0.97)	0.29
Rotterdam Off-Label	la de la constante de la const	0.98 (0.85, 1.13)	6.44
Washington Hosp Center (matched)		1.16 (0.78, 1.75)	3.21
Asan Korea (adjusted)	── <mark>──</mark> ─ <mark>─</mark> ──	0.60 (0.46, 0.79)	4.70
CAAR (adjusted)	an a	1.03 (0.94, 1.14)	6.98
Vake Forest (adjusted)	a a secondaria de la companya de la	0.72 (0.55, 0.95)	4.66
Nestern Denmark (adjusted)	a de la companya de l	1.00 (0.86, 1.17)	6.29
NY State (adjusted, unmatched)	and the second secon	0.84 (0.72, 0.97)	6.35
/IIDAS (adjusted)	en e	0.66 (0.59, 0.74)	6.80
Massachusetts (matched)	a da anti-anti-anti-anti-anti-anti-anti-anti-	0.79 (0.71, 0.89)	6.80
STENT (adjusted)	<mark>→</mark>	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)	5.25
Liverpool (matched)	·─── <mark>◆[●]───</mark>	0.45 (0.24, 0.84)	1.78
GHOST (adjusted)		0.55 (0.36, 0.83)	3.09
DEScover (unadjusted)		0.53 (0.35, 0.80)	3.13
Cedars Acute MI		0.82 (0.37, 1.83)	1.20
REAL (adjusted)	en e	0.83 (0.70, 0.98)	6.10
<i>A</i> elbourne	·	0.67 (0.23, 1.94)	0.73
/lulticenter SVG (adjusted)		1.33 (0.47, 3.76)	0.76
CUITY (from RCT)	− <mark>−→−</mark>	0.63 (0.49, 0.82)	4.87
RESTEM	an a	0.73 (0.51, 1.05)	3.63
ARTS II (from RCT)	the second s	0.74 (0.41, 1.35)	1.92
ERACI III (from RCT)		1.18 (0.54, 2.58)	1.25
Random Effects (l ² =70.1 <u>%)</u>	<u> </u>	0.80 (0.72,0.8	8), p<0.0 <u>01</u>
ixed Effects	······································	0.83 (0.79,0.8	6)
	Favors DES Favors Blv	1S 10	Mean f/u

Kirtane A., Stone G., ACC Oral Presentation; 2008

TVR All RCTs (7,291 patients, 16 trials)

	Favors DES	Favors BMS	$\frac{1}{10}$ Mean f/u 3.2 yrs		
	ดารรรม สายมีราว				
Fixed Effects	\frown		0.51 (0.45,0.57)		
*Random Effects (P=53.2	%)		0.45 (0.37,0.54)	, p<0.001	
TAXUS V			0.77 (0.60, 0.98)	11.75	
TAXUS IV			0.57 (0.45, 0.72)	11.94	
TAXUS II			0.61 (0.35, 1.08)	6.44	
E-SIRIUS			0.35 (0.21, 0.56)	7.45	
C-SIRIUS	•	<u> </u>	0.30 (0.10, 0.93)	2.45	
SIRIUS			0.48 (0.37, 0.62)	11.51	
RAVEL			0.51 (0.25, 1.04)	4.83	
SCANDSTENT	←→		0.17 (0.09, 0.33)	5.44	
Ortolani et al			0.58 (0.25, 1.36)	3.78	
Pache et al			0.38 (0.23, 0.64)	7.14	
PRISON II			0.37 (0.19, 0.69)	5.49	
MISSION!		_	0.38 (0.17, 0.85)	4.08	
HAAMU-STENT	<		0.33 (0.09, 1.19)	1.91	
STRATEGY			0.34 (0.16, 0.77)	4.22	
Typhoon	_		0.42 (0.25, 0.69)	7.20	
SESAMI		-	0.36 (0.17, 0.79)	4.36	
		E	stimate (95% CI)	_Weight (%)	

TVR All Registries (73,819 patients, 17 registries)

			Estimate (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Ontario (matched)			0.69 (0.60, 0.80)	9.88
Mayo FFR Substudy	•		0.18 (0.04, 0.78)	0.68
Brazil Large Vessels			0.43 (0.17, 1.10)	1.57
McMaster STEMI (adjusted)			0.32 (0.05, 1.92)	0.46
Washington Hosp Center (matched)	_		0.65 (0.49, 0.85)	7.35
Asan Korea (adjusted)			0.32 (0.24, 0.43)	7.05
Wake Forest (adjusted)	─────────────────────────────────────		0.63 (0.48, 0.83)	7.38
NY State (adjusted, unmatched)			0.54 (0.50, 0.60)	10.70
STENT (adjusted)	→		0.58 (0.47, 0.71)	8.70
GHOST (adjusted)			0.28 (0.20, 0.39)	6.31
Montevergine			0.51 (0.39, 0.68)	7.30
DEScover (adjusted)			0.58 (0.40, 0.83)	5.81
Cedars Acute MI			0.22 (0.08, 0.62)	1.34
REAL (adjusted)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0.67 (0.59, 0.76)	10.17
Multicenter SVG (adjusted)			0.58 (0.28, 1.18)	2.41
RESTEM	∎ _ →_		0.62 (0.47, 0.80)	7.53
ERACI III (from RCT)			0.58 (0.39, 0.86)	5.35
*Random Effects (I ² =71.2%)	\mathbf{A}		0.53 (0.47,0.61)	, p<0.001
Fixed Effects	♦		0.57 (0.54,0.60)	
 	Favors DES 1	Favors BMS	₁₀ Mear	n f/u 2.2 yrs

What Do We Know About DES in 2008?

- Profound, durable reduction in need for repeat revascularization
- From RCTs, no overall differences in D/MI/ST, now entering 6th year of follow-up
- Possibly lower MI and death compared with bare metal stents
- 'Off Label' does not mean 'Unstudied'
 - Majority of data support no difference in off-label safety metrics between DES and BMS
- Emerging differences in efficacy and safety endpoints between DES, no 'class effect'



Outcomes associated with drug-eluting and bare-metal stents: a collaborative network meta-analysis

Christoph Stettler,* Simon Wandel,* Sabin Allemann, Adnan Kastrati, Marie Claude Morice, Albert Schömig, Matthias E Pfisterer, Gregg W Stone, Martin B Leon, José Suarez de Lezo, Jean-Jacques Goy, Seung-Jung Park, Manel Sabaté, Maarten J Suttorp, Henning Kelbaek, Christian Spaulding, Maurizio Menichelli, Paul Vermeersch, Maurits T Dirksen, Pavel Cervinka, Anna Sonia Petronio, Alain J Nordmann, Peter Diem, Bernhard Meier, Marcel Zwahlen, Stephan Reichenbach, Sven Trelle, Stephan Windecker, Peter Jüni

Cumulative Incidence of TLR 38 RCTs, 18,023 patients



* TVR was used as a proxy for 3 studies

Cumulative Incidence of Myocardial Infarction 38 RCTs, 18,023 patients



Cumulative Incidence of All-Cause Mortality 38 RCTs, 18,023 patients



Cumulative Incidence of Overall Death and Death/MI: DM vs. Non-DM (N=3,762)

Diabetics

Non-Diabetics



Target Lesion Revascularization

Non-Diabetic Patients Diabetic Patients BMS BMS ••••• PES PES SES SES SES vs BMS: 0.31 (0.21,0.41) SES vs BMS: 0.29 (0.21,0.38) PES vs BMS: 0.42 (0.25,0.54) PES vs BMS: 0.47 (0.34,0.61) SES vs PES: 0.74 (0.51,1.19) SES vs PES: 0.62 (0.46,0.83) S Years Years **BMS** 1228 **PES** 1161 **SES** 1373

Cumulative Incidence of ARC Definite ST 38 RCTs, 18,023 Patients



Definite Stent Thrombosis and Stent Type Bern - Rotterdam Cohort Study



Daemen et al. ESC2007

ASAN: ARC Definite ST up to 3 Years



Western Denmark Heart Registry Definite Stent Thrombosis (ST)



M Maena TCT2007

Lessons Learned From DES Trials 2002 to Today

- 1. Angiographic Endpoints Alone are Insufficient
- 2. There is not one 'end all, be all' trial
- 3. Look for consistency across trial designs
- 4. We never followed patients treated with BMS so systematically and over long-term until DES

Very Late Stent Thrombosis in RAVEL Trial

- 60 year old man with diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidemia, gout and tobacco use presented with angina in 2000
- After angiography, patient randomized in RAVEL trial



ASA, clopidogrel for 2 months upon discharge

Zajarias A, et al., http://www.europcronline.com/eurointervention/12th_issue/case1.

Very Late Stent Thrombosis in RAVEL Trial

- 50% diffuse ISR noted at 6-month angiographic F/U
- Treated medically; annual follow-up with an exercise stress test revealed no symptoms or inducible ischemia for 6 years
- 7 years post-PCI:
 - Patient has an inferior STEMI while still on ASA



Zajarias A, et al., http://www.europcronline.com/eurointervention/12th_issue/case1.

Bare Metal Stent VLST in RAVEL

Fibrinolytic therapy, then emergency rescue PTCA due to persistence of symptoms and lack of ST resolution



Discharged on ASA/Clopidogrel

Zajarias A, et al., http://www.europcronline.com/eurointervention/12th_issue/case1.

Lessons Learned From DES Trials 2002 to Today

- 1. Angiographic Endpoints Alone are Insufficient
- 2. There is not one 'end all, be all' trial
- 3. Look for consistency across trial designs
- 4. We never followed patients treated with BMS so systematically and over long-term until DES
- 5. When low frequency and late-occurring events are of interest, there is no substitute for large trials, diverse patient populations and long-term follow-up
- 6. Avoid indirect, cross trial comparisons—randomized trials represent best opportunity for comparison, but what is standard of comparison?

Dedicated Trials with CYPHER® Stent in Specific Patient/Lesion Types



RAVEL, SIRIUS, REALITY, ENDEAVOR III, Pache, et al., Petronio, et al., Han., et al.

Clinical Trials Experience



Informing Real World Clinical Practice

- 12,824 SES patients
- 41% diabetes, 5% hemodialysis
- 55% MVD, 7% Unprotected LM, 9% CTOs
- Successful SES deployment 99.8% (17,545/17,584)
- IVUS 42%, Max inflation pressure 17.8 ATM

 \rightarrow 3% baseline incomplete apposition

• 3 year ARC def/prob ST 1.36% (0.47% at 30 days, 0.74% at 1 year)



RES-ELUTION Study Design Multi-center, Prospective, Two-arm, Non-Inferiority, Randomized Control Trial using Conor SES



*Primary Endpoint Analysis

Summary Impact of Emerging Comparative DES Data

- Significant differences exist in both DES safety and efficacy
 - Emerging differences in SES/PES safety (ST, MI) against background of disparate efficacy
 - Established superiority of –limus agents
 - Absence of "class effect" between SES and PES (FDA 12/2006)

2008: Attention to late and low frequency events, yet limited information with new DES technologies

- Differences in outcome relate to specific agent, elution rate, dose and ?polymer
- Introduction of several 'novel' DES are outpacing supportive evidence
- Much inferential data (preclinical, etc.) but need trial patient data

What is required for a DES to become the benchmark for safety and efficacy for new comparative DES programs?

- Recent newer DES data leaving us with ore questions than answers
- Systematic, long-term comparative data in large and varied patient population
- Detailed, patient level data represented in all trial designs
- Threshold to improve upon existing data with SES is a challenge for new DES