# Comparative Outcomes of Contemporary DES: Are there Major Difference?

Alan C. Yeung, MD Li Ka Shing Professor of Medicine Chief, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine Stanford University School of Medicine



#### Disclosure Statement of Financial Interest

Within the past 12 months, I or my spouse/partner have had a financial interest/arrangement or affiliation with the organization(s) listed below.

#### **Affiliation/Financial Relationship**

- Grant/Research Support
- Scientific Advisory Board
- Executive Physician Council

#### Company

- Abbott Vascular, Medtronic
- Medtronic, Abbott Vascular
- Boston Scientific Corp



#### ALL DES ARE THE SAME?

#### No !

- First Gen not as good as Second Gen....
- May require greater than 1 year of DAPT
- Yes !
  - Second Gen similar in TLF (composite and individual endpoints) in the short to medium term
  - Deliverability
- May be not the same?
  - Bioabsorbable Polymer vs Durable Polymer
  - Duration of DAPT



Joner M et al. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2006;48(1):193-202.

#### **Hypersensitivity Reaction to SES**

40F with 2 SES in LAD and RCA, died suddenly 4 days after surgical removal of melanoma. DAPT was discontinued 5 days before surgery.

> (a)-(d) LAD: SES 17months

(e), (f) RCA: SES 17months



*39F SES in LMCA for 5 yrs. The patient recently stopped taking medication due to lack of insurance.* 



*MIH* = *Multiple interstrut hollow* 

OCT: Tada T. AHA2011

Nakazawa G, et al. JACC 2011;57:390-398

#### Pathology of 1st-Generation DES: High Efficacy, Incomplete Healing

- Thick struts
- Thick, durable coating (~15 μm)
- High drug dose
- High polymer load

Uncovered struts

- Hypersensitivity
- <br/>
  <br/>
  Malapposition
- Late stent thrombosis
- ✓ Neoatherosclerosis









Uncovered struts

Hypersensitivity reaction

Malapposition from excessive fibrin deposition

Neoatherosclerosis

# Late and Very Late Stent Thrombosis (LST/VLST) Following 1st-generation DES

**Registry of 18 334 patients** 



Wenaweser P, et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2008;52:1134-40. Kimura T, et al. Circulation 2012;125:584-591.

#### Consistency of Treatment Effect MACCE (12-30 Months)



Factor	N		HR and 95% CI	Interaction
< 75 Years >= 75 Years	N=8929 N=1032	₩1 ₩	0.69 (0.57,0.83) 0.95 (0.59,1.52)	0.22
Male Female	N=7435 N=2526	<b>→</b> +1	0.69 (0.56,0.85) 0.81 (0.56,1.17)	0.46
No diabetes Diabetes	N=6924 N=3037	1441 1441	0.59 (0.46,0.74) 0.95 (0.72,1.25)	0.01
No Risk Factors for ST Risk Factors for ST	N=5162 N=4799	+++ +++	0.78 (0.60,1.03) 0.67 (0.53,0.86)	0.41
Clopidogrel Prasugrel	N=6500 N=3461	+++	0.80 (0.64,1.01) 0.52 (0.38,0.71)	0.03
Sirolimus Zotarolimus Paclitaxel Everolimus	N=1118 N=1264 N=2666 N=4703		0.54 (0.31,0.93) 0.76 (0.44,1.30) 0.52 (0.37,0.71) 0.89 (0.67,1.18)	0.048
Continued		1.0 better Dia	10.0	



# **TWENTE** Trial





Control angiography only if clinically indicated

Primary endpointTarget vessel failure at one yearSecondary endpointsComponents of primary endpoint; stent thrombosis; patient oriented composite endpoint



#### TWENTE 5-Years: CD, TV-MI, CI-TVR, TVF





9tct2015

MI = myocardial infarction; TV = target vessel; TVF = target vessel failure; TVR = target vessel revascularization



Stent Thrombosis Network Meta-analysis Primary EP: ARC Definite ST (FU through 2 years) 49 RCTs, 50,844 pts



Palmerini T et al. Lancet 2012:On-line





Bangalore S et al. Circulation 2012;125:2873-91

## Network Meta-analysis: Median Long-term Event Rates (per 1,000 Pt-Years of Follow-Up) 77 RCTs, 57,138 pts, 117,762 pt-yrs of FU

Stent type	Death rate (95% Crl)	Prob of Being Best, %	MI Rate (95% Crl)	Prob of Being Best, %	Rate of Def/Prob ST (95% Crl)	Prob of Being Best, %	TVR Rate (95% Crl)	Prob of Being Best, %
Bare metal	16.60 (12.87-21.59)	0.25	26.51 (23.4-29.79)	0.00	7.17 (5.54-8.96)	0.03	89.42 (82.88-96)	0.00
SES	15.05 (11.52-19.74)	1.58	21.78 (18.92-24.86)	0.08	5.75 (4.28-7.63)	0.11	35.15 (30.71-39.84)	35.22
PES	14.99 (11.48-19.65)	8.87	27.32 (23.59-31.56)	0.00	7.95 (5.84-10.69)	0.00	54.30 (46.92-62.09)	0.00
EES	13.18 (9.54-18.05)	17.17	16.75 (13.55-21.08)	46.90	3.27 (2.15-4.98)	73.33	34.40 (27.49-42.38)	42.07
E-ZES	15.74 (11.19-21.86)	3.65	18.23 (13.77-23.56)	26.66	4.95 (2.73-8.87)	9.51	54.54 (42.86-68.71)	0.01
R-ZES	11.55 (5.02-19.55)	68.48	18.22 (12.15-27.04)	26.36	4.47 (1.98-10.07)	17.02	39.00 (24.53-61.43)	22.70

Bangalore S et al. Circulation 2012;125:2873-91

100 trials in 93,553 pts with 262,090 pt-yrs follow-up Network of Trials



100 trials in 93,553 pts with 262,090 pt-yrs follow-up

#### All-cause mortality (95 trials, 93,533 pts)

CABG v medical treatment PTCA v medical treatment BMS v medical treatment PES v medical treatment SES v medical treatment E-ZES v medical treatment R-ZES v medical treatment EES v medical treatment

0.1

0.80 (0.70 to 0.91) 0.85 (0.68 to 1.04) 0.92 (0.79 to 1.05) 0.92 (0.75 to 1.12) 0.91 (0.75 to 1.10) 0.88 (0.69 to 1.10) 0.65 (0.42 to 0.91) 0.75 (0.59 to 0.96)

Favors medical treatment

Windecker S et al. *BMJ* 2014:on-line

0.3

Favors revascularization

100 trials in 93,553 pts with 262,090 pt-yrs follow-up

#### Death or MI (88 trials, 89,373 pts)



Windecker S et al. BMJ 2014:on-line

100 trials in 93,553 pts with 262,090 pt-yrs follow-up

#### **Revascularization (94 trials, 90,282 pts)**

CABG v medical treatment PTCA v medical treatment BMS v medical treatment PES v medical treatment SES v medical treatment E-ZES v medical treatment R-ZES v medical treatment EES v medical treatment



0.16 (0.13 to 0.20) 0.97 (0.82 to 1.16) 0.69 (0.59 to 0.82) 0.44 (0.35 to 0.55) 0.29 (0.24 to 0.36) 0.38 (0.29 to 0.51) 0.26 (0.17 to 0.40) 0.27 (0.21 to 0.35)

0.1

# **Pulled hard- IVUS removed**



Both stents severely shortened with 'double layer' visible proximally and distally indicating crushing/concertina effect

> Concertina effect proximally from guiding catheter

Concertina effect distally from IVUS catheter



c/o Antonio Colombo

# MicroCT examples of Iongitudinal stent deformation



c/o John Ormiston

C

# Contemporary DES : Strut Thickness/Coating

	Durable Polymer Coated		<b>Bioabsorbable Polymer Coated</b>					
	Xience CoCr-EES	Resolute	Biomatrix	Nobori	SYNERGY	BioMime	MiStent	Orsiro
	Promus PtCr-EES	CoNi-ZES	316L-BES	316L-BES	PtCr-EES	CoCr-SES	CoCr-SES	CoCr-SES
Strut thickness	81μm 0.0032"	89μm 0.0035"	120μm 0.0046"	125μm 0.0047"	74μm 0.0029"	65μm 0.0026"	64μm 0.0025"	61μm 0.0024"
Polymer	PVDF	BioLINX	PLA	PLA	PLGA	PLLA + PLGA	PLGA	PLLA Probio*
Distribution / thickness	Conformal 7-8µm / side	Conformal 6µm / side	Abluminal 10µm	Abluminal 20μm	Abluminal 4µm	Conformal 2μ / 2μ	Conformal 5μm / 15μm	Conformal 3.5μm / 7.5μm

Slide c/o Boston Scientific Corporation

\*silicon carbide

Bioabsorbable Polymer-based vs. Durable Polymer-based DES and BMS Evidence network: 89 RCTs, 85,490 pts



Palmerini T et al. JACC 2013: on line

Bioabsorbable Polymer-based vs. Durable Polymer-based DES and BMS Evidence network: 89 RCTs, 85,490 pts Long-term Cardiac Death or MI



Palmerini T et al. JACC 2013: on line

#### Long-term TVR



# **Long-term Definite Stent Thrombosis**



Palmerini T et al. JACC 2013: on line

# **EVOLVE II Pivotal Trial Design**



Pivotal, single-blind, 1:1 randomization **Primary Endpoint: TLF** (CD, TV-MI, or TLR) at **12 mo** Follow-up through 5 years

**SYNERGY** N=203

DAPT (ASA + clopidogrel, ticlopidine, prasugrel, ticagrelor)  $\geq$  6 months or longer as tolerated

### EVOLVE II TLF at 3 years



ITT; Patients who did not receive a study stent were censored at 1 year; KM Event Rate; log-rank P values

#### **EVOLVE II TLR at 3 years**



ITT; Patients who did not receive a study stent were censored at 1 year; KM Event Rate; log-rank P values

Presented by Kereiakes ACC 2017

#### Stent Thrombosis at 3 years Definite/Probable: ITT Population



CEC confirmed MI/TLR/ST Day 901 in the SYNERGY arm

Presented by Kereiakes ACC 2017





# The Final 5 Year Results From The COMPARE II trial

#### The first real long-term results between Biodegradable Polymer-BES and Durable Polymer-EES

#### Pieter C. Smits

on behalf of all the COMPARE II Investigators











# **BIO-RESORT (TWENTE III):**

A prospective, randomized, three-arm trial comparing two different biodegradable polymer-based drug-eluting stents and a durable polymer-based drug-eluting stent in all-comers with coronary artery disease



#### Clemens von Birgelen, MD PhD

Thoraxcentrum Twente, MST, Enschede, the Netherlands on behalf of the BIO-RESORT Investigators





# **BIO-RESORT:** Study Devices





tct2016

Data from: Stefanini G. et al. Heart 2014 (doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2012-303522); Garg, S. et al. Nat. Rev. Cardiol. 2013;10:248–60; Meredith I.T., presentation at TCT 2013; Lee Y. et al. Invasive Cardiol. 2014;26(2):41-5; and manufacturers' information (modified, extended). \* Synergy's platinum chromium strut thickness is 74 µm for stent diameters ≤ 2.5 mm, 79 µm for stent diameters 3.0 – 3.5 mm, and 81 µm for stent diameter 4.0 mm. \*\* Orsiro's cobalt chromium strut thickness is 60 µm for stent diameters ≤ 3.0 mm, and 80 µm for stent diameters > 3.0 mm; Orsiro has an asymmetrical, conformal distribution of the PLLA coating (abluminal coating is thicker) on a very thin passive coating of silicon carbide.

# Study Flow Diagram





- 1-year follow-up data were obtained from 99.3% of the study population, which represents 99.9% of the patients who still participated in the trial or had died.
- During the first year of follow-up, 21 patients (0.6%) withdrew consent, while only 3 / 3,514 patients (< 1 ‰) were actually "lost" (i.e., could not be contacted).</li>



\* During active study enrollment, 7,928 patients were treated with DES (no data on the number of eligible patients are available).
 3,545 pts. were initially randomized; 31 pts. were excluded; 3,514 pts. were analyzed and represent the study population.
 \*\* 2 patients lost to follow-up, 8 patients withdrew consent; # 1 patient lost to follow-up, 7 patients withdrew consent;
 § 6 patients withdrew consent. Monitoring and an independent clinical event adjudication (CEC) by CRO Diagram, Zwolle. Analyses were based on intention to treat.





Target Vessel Failure is a composite of cardiac death, target vessel-related MI, or clinically driven target vessel revascularization. Events displayed in the graph were calculated by Kaplan-Meier methods and compared with the log-rank test.

Research Foundation

# Definite or Probable Stent Thrombosis











TRANSFORM-OCT\*: A Prospective, Randomized Trial Using OCT Imaging to Evaluate Strut Coverage at 3 Months and Neoatherosclerosis at 18 Months in Bioresorbable Polymer-Based and Durable Polymer-Based Drug-Eluting Stents

\*TRiple Assessment of Neointima Stent FOrmation to Reabsorbable polyMer with OCT

<u>Giulio Guagliumi</u><sup>1</sup>, Kunihiro Shimamura<sup>2</sup>, Vasile Sirbu<sup>1</sup>, Roberto Garbo<sup>3</sup>, Luigi Fiocca<sup>1</sup>, Angelina Vassileva<sup>1</sup>, Francesco Colombo<sup>3</sup>, Daisuke Nakamura<sup>4</sup>, Gabriel Tensor Rodriguez Pereira<sup>4</sup>, Guilherme F Attizzani<sup>4</sup>, Giuseppe Musumeci<sup>1</sup>, Orazio Valsecchi<sup>1</sup>, Irene Pescetelli<sup>1</sup>, Leonardo De Luca<sup>6</sup>, Francesco Saia<sup>7</sup>, Davide Capodanno<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ASST Papa Giovanni XXIII, Bergamo, Italy	<sup>6</sup> Ospedale S. Giovanni Evangelista, Tivoli, Italy
<sup>2</sup> Wakayama Medical University, Wakayama, Japan	<sup>7</sup> Cardiothoracic Vascular Department, University Hospital,
<sup>3</sup> Ospedale San Giovanni Bosco, Torino, Italy	Bologna, Italy
<sup>4</sup> Cardiovascular Imaging Core Laboratory, Cleveland, OH, US	<sup>8</sup> Ferrarotto Hospital, University of Catania, Catania, Italy



ClinicalTrial.gov NCT01972022

#### **Study Flow**





#### **Quantitative OCT Analysis- 3 Months**

#### 90 patients - 100% OCT FU - 43.607 struts





#### **Primary Endpoint:** In-stent NA by OCT at 18 months

87/88 patients (98.9% of all the eligible), 42.262 struts





#### **SYNERGY: BSC Clinical Trials**



	EVOLVE	<b>First Human Use Trial.</b> 291 patients. PROMUS Element vs. SYNERGY vs. SYNERGY Half-Dose (1:1:1). Primary Endpoint: 6 month Late Loss + Composite Safety @ 30 days
	EVOLVE II RCT	<b>Global IDE Trial.</b> 1684 patients, 125 sites, 16 countries . PROMUS Element Plus vs. SYNERGY (1:1) single-blind trial. Primary Endpoint: 12 month TLF
	EVOLVE II QCA	Quantitative Angiography. 100 Patient Registry, 12 sites (Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore). Primary Endpoint: 9 month in-stent Late Loss
	EVOLVE China	China regulatory approval trial (SFDA). 400 patients, up to 15 sites. PROMUS Element Plus vs. SYNERGY (1:1) Primary Endpoint: 9 month Late Loss
Enrolling	EVOLVE Short DAPT	<b>3/12 Month DAPT.</b> Prospective, Multi-center, Global,~1500 patients. Primary Endpoint: Cardiac Death/ MI

IC-296208-AN DEC 2016 Page 39

## From TAXUS to XIENCE to Ideal



TLF = cardiac death, target vessel MI, or ischemic-driven TLR



Spirit III: Gada H et al. J Am Coll Cardiol Intv 2013;6:1263-6

COLUMBLA UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER