Katetrizační uzávěr PFO

RESPECT studie – prodloužené sledování

Martin Mates Kardiologické oddělení Nemocnice Na Homolce

Key Aspects of RESPECT Trial

- Superiority trial of PFO closure vs. guidelinedirected medications for secondary prevention after cryptogenic stroke
- Largest randomized PFO trial: 980 patients O499 AMPLATZER PFO Occluder; 481 MM
- Assumptions

OParadoxical embolism was cause of initial stroke

ORecurrent strokes would be due to recurrent paradoxical embolism





RESPECT Trial Population

• Included:

OSubjects with a PFO who have had a cryptogenic stroke within the last 270 days

• Excluded:

OSubjects aged <18 years or >60 years

OSubjects with identified stroke etiology

OSubjects who are unable to discontinue anticoagulants





RESPECT Primary Endpoint Results

• Enrollment ended when 25 ischemic stroke events occurred - results were reported in NEJM

Analysis Population	Relative Risk Reduction	P-Value	
Intention-to-Treat	50%	0.089	
Per-Protocol	58%	0.048	
As Treated	67%	0.013	

Carroll et al. NEJM 2012;368:1092-100.

Note: Per Protocol and As Treated analysis modified from NEJM analysis in response to FDA questions.





Extended Follow-up Provides Considerable New Data

	AMPLATZER™ PFO Occluder (N=499)	Medical Management (N=481)*	
Mean Follow-up (years)			
Initial Analysis	3.0	2.7	
Extended Follow-up	5.5	4.9	
Total Patient-Years of Fo			
Initial Analysis	1476	1284	
Extended Follow-up	2769	2376	

*11% of MM pts crossed over to PFO closure or withdrew because of intended XO







ct2015



1 out of 5 Patients Were >60 Years in Extended Follow-up Analysis

- As patients age, increase in noncryptogenic strokes expected
- PFO closure can only reduce risk for recurrent strokes mediated by paradoxical embolism

OAppropriate clinical interpretation of trials requires adjudication for stroke mechanism





Freedom from Recurrent Stroke of Any Mechanism: <60 Yrs 52% Relative Risk Reduction in ITT Sensitivity Analysis



:t2015



Greater Benefit in Substantial Shunt or ASA Subgroup 75% Relative Risk Reduction in Recurrent Cryptogenic Stroke in ITT Population



2015



Freedom from Recurrent Cryptogenic Stroke (ITT)



Ct2015



Freedom from Recurrent Cryptogenic Stroke With Device In Place



tct2015



Summary of Efficacy Findings in Extended Follow-up

Analysis Population (Endpoint)	Relative Risk Reduction	P-Value	Analysis Conclusion
ITT (All-Cause Stroke)	n/a*	0.16	Confounded by strokes of known mechanism
ITT (Cryptogenic Stroke)	54%	0.042	Efficacy for cryptogenic stroke prevention
Device In Place (Cryptogenic Stroke)	70%	0.004	Accounting for device placement increases efficacy
ITT: <60 years old (All-Cause Stroke)	52%	0.035	Supportive sensitivity analysis
ITT: ASA/SS Subgroup (Cryptogenic Stroke)	75%	0.007	Additional benefit in patients with ASA or SS

* non-proportional hazards (not appropriate to estimate)

9tct2015

Procedure or Device Related SAEs SAEs Adjudicated by DSMB

- No intra-procedure strokes
- No device embolizations
- No device thromboses
- No device erosions
- Very low rate of major vascular complications (0.9%) and device explants (0.4%)





Adjudicated SAEs of Interest Favorable SAE Profile for AMPLATZER™ PFO Occluder

	(N=/	' PFO Occluder 499) Pt-Yrs]	Medical Management (N=481) [2376 Pt-Yrs]	
Event Type	Events	Rate*	Events	Rate*
Atrial fibrillation	7	0.25	4	0.17
Major bleeding	17	0.61	14	0.59
Death from any cause	6	0.22	10	0.42
DVT/PE	17	0.61	3	0.12

* Rate expressed as number of events per 100 patient-years

• DVT/PE rate of unclear significance

O Not associated with procedure/access site, thrombophilia evaluation not done in trial, and warfarin was allowed in MM group





Conclusions

 AMPLATZER[™] PFO Occluder is superior to medical management in reducing recurrent cryptogenic ischemic stroke

OTreatment effect is fully manifest in types of strokes for which closure is intended

OSuperiority is substantial and sustained

- Procedure and device are safe
- RESPECT reinforces need for comprehensive risk factor modification









Questions after RESPECT LATE

- 1. Is RESPECT a positive or negative trial?
- 2. In the types of pts enrolled in RESPECT, does PFO closure reduce 'stroke'?
 - All-cause stroke?
 - Cryptogenic stroke, but not all-cause?
 - Only in patients with ASA/large shunt?
 - Only in young pts?
- 3. Should PFO closure be approved to prevent cryptogenic stroke? If so, "write the label".

