# **ENDEAVOR 2008**

# Mitchell W. Krucoff MD, FACC



Professor of Medicine / Cardiology Duke University Medical Center Director, Cardiovascular Devices Unit Duke Clinical Research Institute







# **Slide Acknowledgments**

# FDA Panel Presentations 2001-2007

- Marty Leon & Laura Mauri: Endeavor
- Renu Virmani
- Medtronic





# **SIRIUS: 59% Reduction in TVF**



FDA Circulatory Devices Advisory Panel October 2001





# DRUG ELUTING STENTS: More, Bigger Lumens





Lack of re-endothelialization at sites of thrombosis in DES







# "A medical device is the replacement of one disease with another, hopefully a less severe one...."

#### William C. Roberts, MD ca. 1977



Renu Virmani CV Path







DES = drug eluting stent; N = number; pts = patients; ST = stent thrombosis. Adapted from (67)

Popma et al, FDA Advisory Panel Summary





# DRUG ELUTING STENTS: Are Big Lumens Bad?









Learn and Live

#### Second Generation DES:

- **\*** Combination Products: *Platform, Polymer, Drug*
- **\*** Addressing healing/safety as well as restenosis

#### Drug-Eluting Stents "Deliver Heartburn" How Do We Spell Relief Going Forward?

Mitchell W. Krucoff, MD; Ashley Boam, MSBE; Daniel G. Schultz, MD

"B reakthrough" technologies may produce rare or unexpected performance issues in postmarket use, especially when rapid market penetration into large patient populations outpaces the development of clinical knowledge. Although high-profile meetings or news media coverage may help draw attention to such issues, ultimately it is careful scientific

Krucoff et al, Circulation. 2007.



organizations, and academics are to be applauded for collaborative efforts to continue to collect and provide unbiased access to new and extended patient-level data, and several leading peer-reviewed journals have expedited publication to facilitate dissemination of these findings. For example, 7 articles on DES outcomes were included in the March 8



# **Endeavor: DES System Components**

#### **Driver<sup>®</sup> Cobalt Alloy Stent**



#### PC Technology



#### **Stent Delivery System**



#### **Drug: Zotarolimus**







### **Endeavor: Driver Platform**

- Atraumatic delivery
  - Edgeless design
  - Thin struts, 0.0036 in.
- Strength and visibility
  - Cobalt alloy
  - Open-cell design
- Vessel conformability
  - 1-mm elements
  - Modular design









# **Endeavor: PC Technology Polymer**

The PC Technology polymer mimics the outside surface of a red blood cell







The Phosphorylcholine (PC) headgroup

- The PC Technology polymer has a high water affinity (hydrophilic)
- Water acts as a permanent barrier to protein adhesion

Hayward JA et al., Biomaterials. 1984;5:135-142.







## **Endeavor: Zotarolimous Antiproliferative Drug**



#### Non-cytotoxic Blocks entry into S phase

Highly potent Effective antiproliferative limus analog





#### **Highly lipophilic**

Enables rapid arterial tissue loading and drug retention





# **Endeavor Preclinical: 21 Day Endothelialization**





#### Endeavor









## **ENDEAVOR Clinical Program**



**2154** patients followed to 12 months

**1287** patients followed to 2 years

675 patients followed to 3 years





# **ENDEAVOR Clinical Program**

	ENDEAVOR II	ENDEAVOR III	ENDEAVOR IV			
Control	Driver BMS	Cypher	Taxus			
N	E = 598	E = 323	E = 774			
	D = 599	C = 113	T = 775			
Primary Endpoint	TVF (cardiac death, MI, TVR) at 9 months	In-segment late lumen loss by QCA at 8 months	TVF at 9 months			
QCA, IVUS Subset	QCA = 600 (44.7%); IVUS = 300	QCA, IVUS = All	QCA, IVUS = 328 (21.2%)			
DAPT	≥ 3 months	≥ 3 months	≥ 6 months¹			
Inclusion	Single De Novo Native Coronary Artery Lesions					
criteria	Pre-dilatation required					
	Diameters: 2.25–3.5 mm	Stent Diameters	s: 2.5–3.5 mm			
	Lesion Length: 14–27 mm Lesion Length: 14–27					
Key Exclusion Criteria	Left ventricular ejection fraction <30%. Acute MI within 72 hours. Creatinine >2.0 mg/dl. Left main, ostial lesion, or bifurcation lesion					

 $1 \ge 6$  month DAPT regimen in EIV due to 1:1 randomization vs. Taxus.





What the Endeavor Program Tells Us

DES vs. BMS
New DES vs. Approved DES





What the Endeavor Program Tells Us

# DES vs. BMS New DES vs. Approved DES





# **ENDEAVOR II** Patient Flowchart







# Primary Endpoint Result at 9 months

# **Target Vessel Failure**



#### **ENDEAVOR II** Efficacy at 9 months

#### **Target Vessel Revascularization**



#### **ENDEAVOR II** Angiographic Outcomes at 8 Months

#### In-Segment Angiographic Binary Restenosis







# Endeavor DES vs. BMS: Safety

#### **Endeavor Clinical Program** *Baseline Characteristics*

El n=100	Ell n=598	Ell CA n=296	EIII n=323	EIV n=773	EPK n=43	E2 Driver N=599
16.0	18.2	25.8	29.7	31.2	41.9	22.2
2.96	2.73	2.63	2.75	2.73	2.54	2.76
10.94	14.04	16.49	14.96	13.41	15.02	14.38
<u>&gt;</u> 3m	<u>&gt;</u> 3m	<u>&gt;</u> 3m	<u>&gt;</u> 3m	<u>&gt;</u> 6m	<u>&gt;</u> 3m	<u>&gt;</u> 3m
99 99 98	98.7 98.2 96.5	98.6 97.3	99.1 96.9	95.7*	97.7*	98.3 97.8 96.7
	El n=100 16.0 2.96 10.94 <u>&gt;</u> 3m	El n=100Ell n=59816.018.22.962.7310.9414.04 $\geq$ 3m $\geq$ 3m99 99 98.2 98.598.7 96.5	El n=100Ell n=598Ell CA n=29616.018.225.82.962.732.6310.9414.0416.49 $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ 99 99 9898.7 96.598.6 97.3	EI n=100EII n=598EII CA n=296EIII n=32316.018.225.829.72.962.732.632.7510.9414.0416.4914.96 $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ 99 99 98.298.7 96.598.6 97.399.1 96.9	El n=100Ell n=598Ell CA n=296Elli n=323ElV n=77316.018.225.829.731.22.962.732.632.752.7310.9414.0416.4914.9613.41 $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 3m$ $\geq 6m$ 99 99 98.298.7 96.598.6 97.399.1 96.995.7*	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $





# **Endeavor Safety Analysis**

#### Patient Characteristics

	Endeavor (n = 2132)	Driver (n = 596)	p value
RVD (mm)	2.73	2.76	0.128
Lesion length (mm)	14.16	14.38	0.446
Diabetes Mellitus (%)	26.1	22.2	0.054
Insulin Dependent Diabetes	8.3	7.4	0.49
Age – yrs	62.5±10.7	61. <del>9±</del> 10.5	0.23
Male (%)	71.5	75.3	0.06
History of Smoking (%)	49.2	35.2	<0.001
Prior PCI (%)	26.0	18.0	<0.001
Hyperlipidemia (%)	81.2	76.9	0.02
Hypertension (%)	73.0	68.2	0.02





### **Endeavor Safety Analysis** *Cumulative Incidence of Cardiac Death and MI to 1080 Days*







## **Endeavor Safety Analysis** *Cumulative Incidence of Stent Thrombosis (Protocol) to 1080 Days*







## **Endeavor Safety Analysis** *Cumulative Incidence of ARC Definite/Probable ST to 1080 Days*







What the Endeavor Program Tells Us

DES vs. BMS
New DES vs. Approved DES





#### ENDEAVOR III 3:1 RCT vs Cypher PI: Martin B. Leon and David Kandzari







# **ENDEAVOR III** *Primary Endpoint Result at 8 months*

#### In-segment Late Loss

P for Non-Inferiority 0.791







# **ENDEAVOR III: DES vs DES**

Angiographic and IVUS Results at 8 Months

		Endeavor	Cypher	p-	
		n=282	n=94	value	
Angiograp	ohic f/u % (N)	87.3 (323)	83.2 (113)	0.27	
RVD (mm)		2.74	2.84	0.07	
MLD (mm)	) In-Stent	2.08	2.52	<0.001	
	In-Segment	1.92	2.16	<0.001	
DS (%)	In-Stent	24.3	11.0	<0.001	
	In-Segment	29.9	23.9	<0.001	
BAR (%)	In-Stent	9.2	2.1	0.02	
	In-Segment	11.7	4.3	0.04	
Late Loss	(mm) In-Stent	0.60	0.15	<0.001	
	in-Segment	0.34	<b>U.13</b>	<0.001	





### **ENDEAVOR III** Clinical Events to 24 months

	Endeavor n=313	Cypher n=112	Difference [95% CI]
Death (all) -% (#)	1.6 (5)	4.5 (5)	-2.9%[-6.9%,1.2%]
Cardiac	0	0.9 (1)	-0.9%[-2.6%,0.8%]
MI (all) - % (#)	0.6 (2)	3.6 (4)	-2.9%[-6.5%,0.6%]
Q Wave	0	o	
Non Q wave	0.6 (2)	3.6 (4)	-2.9%[-6.5%,0.6%]
Death (cardiac) + MI (all) - % (#)	0.6 (2)	3.6 (4)	-2.9%[-6.5%,0.6%]
Stent Thrombosis (all) - % (#)	0	0	
0-30 days	0	0	
31-720 days	0	0	
TLR - % (#)	7.0 (22)	4.5 (5)	2.6%[-2.2%,7.3%]
TVR (non-TL) - % (#)	8.3 (26)	6.3 (7)	2.1%[-3.4%,7.5%]
TVR - % (#)	13.7 (43)	9.8 (11)	3.9%[-2.8%,10.6%]
MACE - % (#)	9.3 (29)	11.6 (13)	-2.3%[-9.1%,4.4%]
TVF - % (#)	14.4 (45)	13.4 (15)	1.0%[-6.4%,8.4%]











# ENDEAVOR IV Primary Endpoint Result at 9 months Target Vessel Failure

P for Non-Inferiority < 0.001 △=3.8%







# **ENDEAVOR IV** Angiographic and IVUS Results at 8 months

	Endeavor n = 144	Taxus n = 135	Difference [95% C ]
RVD – mm	2.65	2.68	-0.03 [-0.14, 0.08]
In-stent			
DS - %	26.41	16.09	10.02 [5:35, 14 79]
LL - mm	0.67	0.42	0.25 [0.13, 0.37]
ABR - %	42.2	<u>6.7</u>	0.0% [-0.4%, 13.6%]
In-segment			
DS - %	32.28	26.61	5.68 [1.83, 9.52]
LL - mm	0.36	0.23	0.13 [0.02, 0.23]
ABR - %	15.3	10.4	4.9% [-2.9%, 12.7%]
IVUS			
Neointimal Volume - mm³ (n)	24.14 (74)	14.88 (77)	9.26 [3.46, 15.06]
Vol Obstruction - % (n)	15.72 (74)	9.88 (77)	5.84 [2.68, 9.00]
Late Incomplete Apposition - % (#/n)	0.9 (1/106)	3.2 (3/95)	-2.2% [-6.2%, 1.8%]







# **ENDEAVOR IV** *Clinical Events at 30 days*

	Endeavor n=770	Taxus n=771	Difference [95% CI]
Death (all) - % (#)	0.3 (2)	0	0.3%[-0.1%,0.6%]
Cardiac	0.1 (1)	0	0.1%[-0.1%,0.4%]
MI (all) - % (#)	0.8 (6)	2.3 (18)	-1.6%[-2.8%,-0.3%]
Q Wave	0.3 (2)	0.1 (1)	0.1%[-0.3%,0.6%]
Non Q wave	0.5 (4)	2.2 (17)	-1.7%[ <mark>-2.8%,⇒</mark> 5%]
Death (cardiac) + MI (all) - % (#)	U.9 (7)	2.3 (18)	-1.4%[-2.7%,-0.2%]
Stent Thrombosis (all) - % (#)	0.4 (3)	0.1 (1)	0.3%[-0.2%,0.8%]
TLR - % (#)	0.4 (3)	0.8 (6)	-0.4%[-1.1%,0.4%]
TVR (non-TL) - % (#)	0	0.3 (2)	-0.3%[-0.6%,0.1%]
TVR - % (#)	0.4 (3)	0.9 (7)	-0.5%[-1.3%,0.3%]
MACE - % (#)	1.2 (9)	3.0 (23)	-1.8%[-3.2%,-0.4%]
TVF - % (#)	1.0 (8)	3.0 (23)	-1.9%[-3.3%,-0.5%]





# **ENDEAVOR IV** TVF Event Free Survival to 270 Days



Error bars represent ±1.5SE estimated by Peto formula





# ENDEAVOR IV TLR Free Survival to 270 Days



Error bars represent +1.5SE estimated by Peto formula





# ENDEAVOR IV Cardiac Death/MI Free Survival to 270 Days



Error bars represent +1.5SE estimated by Peto formula





#### **ENDEAVOR II-IV: Late Loss at 8 Months**







#### **11 RCTs with Cypher, Taxus, Endeavor, and BMS (5381 pts)** *Surrogate Angiographic Endpoints for Clinical Outcomes*

#### LL vs. TLR - A monotonic but curvilinear relationship



Pocock et al., JACC, Vol. 51, No. 1, 2008





# **Endeavor: "Complete" NIH**

#### Smooth Lumen, Even Neointimal Distribution



## **ENDEAVOR Clinical Program Overview**

Study	Comparator	Angio	Clinical	Safety
E-II	BMS	+++	++	=
E-III	DES		=	??
E-IV	DES		=	??

Are smaller lumens safer DES vs. DES?





# **Endeavor 2008: Conclusions**

# Second Generation Design:

- Cobalt chromium platform
- Biocompatible polymer
- New molecular entity

# Consistent results:

- Highly deliverable
- High rate of procedural success
- Late loss > 0.6 mm





# **Endeavor 2008: Conclusions**

# vs. BMS:

- Superior efficacy
- Equivalent safety

# vs. CYPHER:

- Not non-inferior late loss
- Safety: ??

# vs. TAXUS:

- Non-inferior TVF
- Safety: ??





# Circulatory Devices Advisory Panel Vote: 10-0 Approval w/Conditions

Medtronic Receives FDA Approval for Endeavor® Zotarolimus-Eluting Coronary Stent System

New Drug-Coated Stent Offers Excellent Combination of Safety, Effectiveness and Deliverability

MINNEAPOLIS – Feb. 1, 2008 –Marking a major development in the field of interventional cardiology, Medtronic, Inc. (NYSE: MDT), announced today that it has received approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the Endeavor® Zotarolimus-Eluting Coronary Stent System to be used in the treatment of coronary artery disease, which affects an estimated 13 million people in the United States and is the country's leading cause of death.





# **ENDEAVOR 2008**

# Mitchell W. Krucoff MD, FACC



Professor of Medicine / Cardiology Duke University Medical Center Director, Cardiovascular Devices Unit Duke Clinical Research Institute





