Drug-Eluting Stents in the SFA (Zilver PTX or Eluvia)

Why Not Now? What is Needed for the Future?

Mark W. Burket, MD University of Toledo Medical Center Toledo, Ohio





Controversies in Cardiovascular Medicine



Are Drug-Eluting Stents Now the Default Strategy for Superficial Femoral Artery Intervention?

Drug-Eluting Stents Are the Default Strategy for Superficial Femoral Artery Intervention Now

Mark W. Burket, MD

Drug-eluting stents (DES) are the default strategy for superficial femoral artery (SFA) intervention in 2015 because they have been evaluated in a large number of patients over a long follow-up period with outcomes superior to other treatment options. No other therapy can make that claim.

Response by Garcia on p 329

the femoropopliteal (FP) segment, which is among the human

The SFA and the contiguous popliteal artery constitute

between these extremes lies a seemingly endless variety of endovascular options.

Less Is Less

Perhaps the most universally available and cheapest treatment strategy for symptomatic lower extremity vascular disease is exercise therapy. Supervised exercise programs are more effective than unsupervised and have received a class I recommendation from the American College of Cardiology

Drug-Eluting Stents Are the Default Strategy for Superficial Femoral Artery Intervention Now

intrusive option, to bypass surgery as the most intrusive.4 In

day for occupational or recreational pursuits.

Correspondence to Mark W. Burket, MD, University of Toledo Medical Center, 3000 Arlington Ave, Toledo, OH 43614. E-mail mark.burket@utoledo.edu (Circulation. 2016;133:320-329. DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULA TIONAHA.115.018034.)

© 2016 American Heart Association, Inc.

Circulation is available at http://circ.ahajournals.org

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.018034

Circulation. 2016;133:320-329.

Downloaded from http://circ.ahajournals.org/ at Mulfor#26/brary Medical University of Ohio on January 19, 2016

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the editors or of the American Heart Association.

From the University of Toledo Medical Center, Toledo, OH.

This article is Part I of a 2-part article. Part II appears on pp 330-336.

Drug-Eluting Stents

- Randomized controlled trial data with 5 year follow-up
- High patient enrollment numbers
- Randomized comparison to:
 - Balloon angioplasty
 - Bare nitinol stents
 - Provisional stenting

No Longer in the Race

- Simple balloon angioplasty
- Bare metal nitinol stents







Appealing...But Unproven Atherectomy

- "Nothing left behind"
- Randomized trial data lacking
- Initial equipment cost 3X DES





Appealing...And Proven Drug-Eluting Stents

- Zilver PTX
 - Cook Medical
 - US and CE approval (> 50 countries)
- Eluvia
 - Boston Scientific
 - CE approval 2016





Multiple Zilver PTX® Clinical Studies



5-year Freedom from TLR

Zilver PTX vs. Standard Care



At 5 years, Zilver PTX demonstrates a 48% reduction in reintervention compared to standard care

Freedom from TLR

5-year Freedom from TLR



At 5 years, Zilver PTX demonstrates a 47% reduction in reintervention compared to BMS

Zilver PTX

- Paclitaxel bound directly to stent without polymer
- Rationale: short-term exposure leads to long-term anti-restenotic effect



Eluvia

- Primer Layer (PBMA): Promotes Adhesion of Active Layer
- Active Layer (PTx, PVDF-HFP)— Controls Release of Paclitaxel
 - 0.167μg PTx/mm² stent surface area
- Over 10 million coronary implants



Sustained Drug Release

DRUG RELEASE OVER TIME



- Drug release from the Eluvia system is sustained over time
 - >90% of drug is released at 1 year
 - Drug release coincides with the restenotic cascade

Based on pre-clinical PK analysis. Data on file at Boston Scientific. *Dake MD, et al. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2011;22(5):603-610.

Eluvia is an investigational device. Limited under U.S. law for investigational use only.

Eluvia™ Clinical Studies



Eluvia is an investigational device. Limited under U.S. law for investigational use only.



MAJESTIC Clinical Study

Study Design	Prospective, multicentre, single-arm, open label
Subjects	57 patients with femoropopliteal artery lesions
Investigational Centers	14 sites (Europe, Australia, New Zealand)
Follow-up	Baseline, Procedure 1 month, 9 months, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years
Primary Endpoint	Primary patency of target lesion at 9 months by duplex ultrasound

Core Lab Clinical Events Committee

Primary Patency*: 12 Months



- 12-month primary patency was **96.1%** (49/51)
- Kaplan-Meier estimate: 96.4%



*Primary patency defined as duplex ultrasound peak systolic velocity ratio ≤2.5 and absence of TLR or bypass Müller-Hülsbeck, S. VIVA 2015.



	First Patient Enrolled Dec 2015
Title	A random <u>I</u> zed trial co <u>MP</u> aring the <u>E</u> LUVIA d <u>R</u> ug-elut <u>I</u> ng stent versus Zilver PTX stent for treatment of superfici <u>AL</u> femoral and/or proximal popliteal arteries
Primary Investigators	Global: William A. Gray, MD European: Prof. Dr. med Stefan Müller-Hülsbeck
Target Vessel	Superficial Femoral Artery and/or Proximal Popliteal Artery lesions up to 140 mm in length.
Study Design	Prospective, multicenter, 2:1 randomized (Eluvia vs Zilver PTX), controlled, single-blind, non-inferiority trial (RCT)



Clinical Study Overview: IMPERIAL	
Subjects	 465 subjects treated with Eluvia (N=310) or Zilver PTX (N=155)
Investigational Centers	 Up to 75 study centers worldwide: US, Canada, New Zealand, Belgium, Germany, Austria, and Japan
Primary Efficacy Endpoint	Primary vessel patency as assessed by duplex ultrasound (DUS) at 12 months post- procedure and adjudicated by an independent core laboratory.
Primary Safety Endpoint	 Major Adverse Event (MAE) rate defined as All cause death through 1 month Target limb major amputation through 12 months Target lesion revascularization (TLR) through 12 months

The Real Race in 2016 DES vs DCB



- DCB results consistently superior to plain angioplasty
- Strong appeal of "nothing left behind"
- Retrospective review** of 228 patients treated with DCB or DES
 - No significant difference in restenosis (12 months)
 - No significant difference in TLR
- Still lacking: long-term data for DCB

*Daytona 500, 21 February 2016, won by 0.011 sec **Zeller. J Endovasc Ther. 2014;21:359-368

What We Need



- 5 year results with DCB
- Randomized results: DCB vs DES (Real PTX, etc)
- Comparative DES results (IMPERIAL)
- Appropriate reimbursement for DES

*Daytona 500, 21 February 2016, won by 0.011 sec

What Winning Looks Like in the Future



- Resolution of the in-stent restenosis problem
 - Avoidance:
 - very low TLR rates
 - bioabsorbable stents
 - proven non-stent strategies
 - Durable, economical, user-friendly treatment of ISR

Reimbursement that rewards best clinical outcomes

Summary

- In 2016, DES are the best option for many patients
- We know a lot...
- but we need to know a whole lot more!