Drug eluting balloon in fistuloplasty: Good, bad or ugly?

Advanced Course in Vascular Access 2019 Convenor: Professor Kittipan Rerkasem 2 – 3 May 2019, Chiang Mai, Thailand



Westmead Hospital

Dr John Swinnen Vascular Surgeon Dialysis Access Specialist MSF Trauma Surgeon



University Of Sydney

Disclosures

An independent, clinician driven trial

This study was supported by an

UNCONDITIONAL grant from Medtronic

Chief Researchers



Dr John Swinnen Dialysis Access Specialist Westmead Hospital Sydney Dr David Burgess Interventional Cardiologist Blacktown Hospital Sydney Dr Kerry Hitos Chief Research Officer Associate Professor Surgery Westmead Clinical School University of Sydney





The Native AVF

Western Renal Area Dialysis Service, Sydney, Australia ≈ 1000 patients on Dialysis

 Our philosophy: All fistulas are native (Zero grafts) Create the fistula, \longrightarrow Mature the fistula, Survey all fistulas, ----> Maintain the fistula For as long as needed, ? For life ?

"Complications"

Problem	Cause	Solution/s	Status
Graft Sepsis	Fistula Grafts	Native AVF only	Eliminated
Fistula Occlusion	Fistula GraftsNo Surveillance	 Native AVF only Surveillance all AVF Maintenance of all AVF 	Largely Eliminated
Secondary Fistula	Use of GraftsNo Surveillance	 Native only Surveillance of all AVF Maintenance of all AVF 	Uncommon
Failure to Mature	Poor planningPoor SurgeryNo"Force Mature"	 U/S Planning "Balloon assisted maturation" 	Very uncommon (< 10%)
 * Central Vein stenosis/occlusion * Sepsis & Death 	 Vascaths Delayed Referral Poor AVF Management 	 Early Referral PD first policy "Balloon assisted maturation" Fistula Surveillance Fistula Maintenance 	A problem ! *Late referal (WRA 40%) *Part solution No L Vascath!

Biggest Problem: Stenosis!

Some fistulas never stenose

Some have a single stenotic episode

• ? 25% of fistulas are "Frequent Fliers"

Fistula Stenosis

Due to "NIH", Neo Intimal Hyperplasia

The "healing process" in the blood vessel

Initiated at the time of Angioplasty Injury

Occurs typically between 6 weeks & 6 months

DEB in AVF at Westmead

• First DEB in AVF in September 2010

Expensive technology (\$2000.00)

Intervention Criteria for DEB:

Recurrent stenoses only

Drug Eluting Balloons in the Native Access Fistula: A Retrospective Study

RACS ASC 2014 Singapore Vascular Surgery: Friday, 7thMay 2014



Dr John Swinnen Access Specialist



University Of Sydney

Westmead Hospital

RE-INTERVENTION



KM curve for DEB present versus absent. Statistically significant



A Retrospective Study"

Multicentre Australian RCT

- DEB vs Sham Balloon in recurrent AVF stenosis.
- From 15th January 2015 27th March 2017
- Three centres in New South Wales, Australia: Westmead Hospital, Sydney Blacktown Hospital, Sydney Wollongong Hospital, Wollongong

Methods: Study Inclusion Criteria

Patient has a Native AVF AND The AVF has a Significant Stenosis AND The stenosis is Recurrent AND The Index Trial Area is visible on U/S

Methods: Study Inclusion Criteria

Significant Stenosis

Diameter <2.0mm on U/S*

OR

Diameter 2.0mm - 4.0mm + Other evidence of AVF malfunction

*Fahrtash F, Swinnen J, et al. Defining a significant stenosis in an AVF. Seminars in Dialysis 2011

Methods: Operative Protocol

1. Treat Index Stenosis as normal, including BMS

2. Once GOOD technical result achieved

3. (Stratified) randomisation to DEB or Sham balloon

4. Aspirin + Plavix 1 month and follow-up

Stratified Randomisation

I. Age of Fistula: ≤ 6 months OR >6months

II. Location of Fistula: Forearm OR Other

III. Index Stenosis is an instent stenosis: Yes OR No

IV. Index Stenosis treated with stent placed today: Yes OR No

Methods: Follow up

Primary Endpoint

Late Lumen Loss of Index Trial Area (ITA)

Secondary Endpoints

Qa (Fistula Volume Flow)
 Re-intervention to ITA

Methods: Follow up

- Baseline Diameter of ITA: Narrowest diameter ITA on U/S > 1day < 1 week post op (To eliminate "recoil" & compare f/u U/S with U/S)
- Qa measured in Brachial artery
- Follow up U/S at 6 weeks, 3 months, 6 months, 1 year

Methods: Follow up

- Sonographers, 8 in all, BLINDED to treatment
- U/S probe 12MHZ or higher
- 13 images required:
 x 2 Brachial a diameter
 x 3 Qa
 x 9 Narrowest area: x3 Grey scale, x6 "color mode)

Secondary Reading of U/S

- De-identified Images x13 & Sonographer's report sent
- Reviewed by 2 Physicians from Dept NMUS blinded to Rx

Images judged adequate or not
 Consensus value on Diameter
 Consensus value on Qa

Results

3 Centres:
 Westmead Hospital, Sydney 71
 Blacktown Hospital, Sydney 46
 Wollongong, Wollongong 11

Decision to break trial at 6 months (vs 12 m)
 Issue of timeliness
 NIH is a phenomenon of 6 weeks – 6 mths

Results

144 recurrent stenoses entered into trial

132 recurrent stenoses randomised

129 recurrent stenoses followed up

Patient Characteristics

No Significant Difference

	Sham	DEB	r value
	N= 60 (%)	N = 68(%)	
Age (years), mean (± SD)	64.5 (± 13.9)	65.2 (±13.6)	0.780
Male gender	37 (61.7)	42 (61.8)	0.991
Comorbidities			20
Diabetes mellitus	39 (65.0)	38 (55.9)	0.293
Current smoker	3 (5.0)	7 (10.3)	0.334
Cause of ESRF			0.540
Diabetes mellitus	29 (18.3)	28 (41.2)	
Glomerulonephritis	7 (11.7)	5 (7.4)	
Hypertension	6 (10.0)	12 (17.6)	
Polycystic	2 (3.3)	6 (8.8)	
Reflux Nephropathy	2 (3.3)	3 (4.4)	
Other	14 (23.3)	14 (20.6)	
Current Renal Replacement Therapy	-	-	0.391
CAPD	1 (1.7)	2 (2.9)	
Through Index Fistula	49 (81.7)	62 (91.2)	
Through Other Fistula	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	
Predialysis	5 (8.3)	3 (4.4)	
Transplanted	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	
Through Vascath	2 (3.3)	1 (1.5)	

Fistula Characteristics

No Significant Difference

1 mar		
3 (5.0)	2 (2.9)	0.441
57 (92.0)	66 (97.1)	
-		
31 (53.4)	29 (42.6)	0.226
27 (46.6)	39 (57.4)	
1000		0.861
33 (55.0)	39 (57.4)	
2 (3.30)	5 (7.4)	
11 (18.3)	13 (19.1)	
9 (15.0)	7 (10.3)	
3 (5.0)	2 (2.9)	
2 (3.3)	2 (2.9)	
	3 (5.0) 57 (92.0) 31 (53.4) 27 (46.6) 33 (55.0) 2 (3.30) 11 (18.3) 9 (15.0) 3 (5.0) 3 (5.0) 2 (3.3)	3 (5.0) $2 (2.9)$ $57 (92.0)$ $66 (97.1)$ $31 (53.4)$ $29 (42.6)$ $27 (46.6)$ $39 (57.4)$ $27 (46.6)$ $39 (57.4)$ $2 (3.30)$ $5 (7.4)$ $11 (18.3)$ $13 (19.1)$ $9 (15.0)$ $7 (10.3)$ $3 (5.0)$ $2 (2.9)$ $2 (3.3)$ $2 (2.9)$

Recurrent Stenosis Characteristics

No Significant Difference

Anatomical Segment: Site of Index	Stenosis		0.342
Artery	9 (15.0)	8 (11.8)	10
Anastomosis	9 (15.0)	6 (8.8)	
Swing Vein	23 (38.3)	21 (30.9)	
Useable Segment	10 (16.7)	14 (20.6)	
Outflow Vein	9 (15.0)	19 (27.9)	
Diameter of Index Stenosis (mm), n	nean (±SD)		
	2.2 ± 2.2	1.9 ± 1.33	0.319
Qa on Study Entry (ml/min), mean ((±SD)		
	556.9 ± 350.2	580.3 ± 278.0	0.677
Length of Index Stenosis (mm)	Last to Last	Call Street	0.487
<5	15 (25.0)	15 (22.1)	
<10	21 (35.0)	19 (27.9)	
≤ 20	14 (23.3)	15 (22.1)	
>20	10 (16.7)	19 (27.9)	
Number of Previous ITA Interventio	ns, mean (±SD)	No. of Concession, name	
	2.0 ± 1.3	1.8 ± 1.3	0.567
Number of Previous Non ITA Interv	ventions, mean (±SD)		
	20.122	26121	0 422

Primary Endpoint

Late Lumen Loss

Cumulative Percentage Distribution of Late Lumen Loss DEB vs Sham at 6 months and 12 months

Swinnen et al.

Figure 3. Cumulative percentage distribution for LLL (a) at 6 months and (b) at 12 months.

Rate of Change in Diameter Per Month

Months

© 2015-2017 J.Swinnen – All Rights Reserved

Secondary Endpoint 1

Qa Fistula Volume Flow

Decline in Qa: Fistula Volume Flow

At Six months, using the LMEM:

The rate of Qa decline for the Sham balloon arm was 37 mL/min per month (p = 0.002)

The rate of Qa decline for the DEB balloon arm was 0.40 mL/min per month (p = 0.97)

The difference in decline between the two groups was significant at 37 mL/min (p = 0.02)

At 12 months, using the LMEM:

The rate of Qa decline for the Sham balloon arm was 27 mL/min per month (p = 0.001)

The rate of Qa decline for the DEB balloon arm was 18 mL/ min per month (p = 0.003)

The difference in decline between the two groups was 8 mL/min (p = 0.44)

Secondary Endpoint 2

Re-intervention to Index Trial Area

Freedom from Re-Intervention

Group	29				Xet	5	
DEB	68	66	61	52	47	39	25
Sham	60	56	44	28	23	20	14

Freedom from Re-Intervention Stented vs Unstented Group

Figure 5a: Kaplan-Meier curve for freedom from reintervention

to 12 months follow up in the stented group.

to 12 months follow up in the unstented group.

Patients Free from Re-Intervention at 12 m

If patient receives a sham balloon,
 Mean time to re-intervention is 10 months

If patient receives a DEB balloon,
 Mean time to re-intervention not measured: 42 m

Conclusions

Our study demonstrates that the Medtronic DEB:

- 1. Significantly reduces LLL in the n AVF circuit, in recurrent stenoses
- 2. Significantly reduces the rate of decline in Volume Flow (Qa)
- 3. Dramatically prolongs Freedom of Re-intervention from a mean of 10 months to 42 months

Multicentre, randomised, blinded, control trial of Drug Eluting Balloon vs Sham Balloon in Recurrent Native AV Fistula Stenoses

Available online Journal of Vascular Access Surgery

"https://doi.org/10.1177/1129729818801556"

Participants & Recognition

- Dr David Huber, Chief Investigator Wollongong
- Dr Simon Gruenewald, U/S Physician, Westmead H
- Dr George Larcos, U/S Physician, Westmead H
- Dr David Farlow, U/S Physician, Westmead H
- Kirsty Kedacic, Data Base Manager
- Donna Oomens, Sonographer Norwest Private
- Jacqui Spurway, Sonographer Orange Base H
- Kristie Sweeney, Sonographer Bathurst Base H
- Pauline Byrne, Dialysis CNC, Wollongong H
- Wayne Mulligan, Sonographer, Liverpool Private lab
- Kylee Hoskins, Medtronic Rep for Westmead
- MEDTRONIC Australia for its UNCONDITIONAL contribution

Concern of Paclitaxel Devices and Increased Mortality: Does it apply to HD?

DaSy 2019 Singapore 28 – 30 March 2019

Westmead Hospital

Dr John Swinnen

Vascular Surgeon Dialysis Access Specialist MSF Trauma Surgeon

University Of Sydney

1 October 2018

Westmead Multi-centre RCT DEB in recurrent / VF stenosis

Mean time to re-intervention:

10 Months

* Sham Balloon

42 Months

"https://doi.org/10.1177/1129729818801556"

Re-intervention Sham vs DEB

Original research article

Multicentre, randomised, blinded, control trial of drug-eluting balloon vs Sham in recurrent native dialysis fistula stenoses

Jan "John" Swinnen¹, Kerry Hitos², Lukas Kairaitis^{3,4}, Simon Gruenewald⁵, George Larcos⁵, David Farlow⁵, David Huber⁶, Gabriel Cassorla⁷, Christopher Leo⁸, Laurencia M Villalba⁶, Richard Allen¹, Farshid Niknam⁶ and David Burgess⁹

Abstract

Background: Endovascular treatment of autogenous arteriovenous haemodialysis fistula stenosis has high reintervention rates. We investigate the effect of drug-eluting balloons in the treatment of recurrent haemodialysis fistula stenosis.

The Journal of Vascular Access 1–10 © The Author(s) 2018 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/1129729818801556 journals.sagepub.com/home/jva

The Journal of Vascular Access

8 December 2018

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Risk of Death Following Application of Paclitaxel-Coated Balloons and Stents in the Femoropopliteal Artery of the Leg: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Konstantinos Katsanos, MD, PhD, MSc, EBIR; Stavros Spiliopoulos, MD, PhD; Panagiotis Kitrou, MD, PhD; Miltiadis Krokidis, MD, PhD; Dimitrios Karnabatidis, MD, PhD

Background—Several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have already shown that paclitaxel-coated balloons and stents significantly reduce the rates of vessel restenosis and target lesion revascularization after lower extremity interventions.

Methods and Results—A systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs investigating paclitaxel-coated devices in the femoral and/ or popliteal arteries was performed. The primary safety measure was all-cause patient death. Risk ratios and risk differences were pooled with a random effects model. In all, 28 RCTs with 4663 patients (89% intermittent claudication) were analyzed. All-cause patient death at 1 year (28 RCTs with 4432 cases) was similar between paclitaxel-coated devices and control arms (2.3% versus 2.3% crude risk of death; risk ratio, 1.08; 95% Cl, 0.72–1.61). All-cause death at 2 years (12 RCTs with 2316 cases) was significantly increased in the case of paclitaxel versus control (7.2% versus 3.8% crude risk of death; risk ratio, 1.68; 95% Cl, 1.15– 2.47; —number-needed-to-harm, 29 patients [95% Cl, 19–59]). All-cause death up to 5 years (3 RCTs with 863 cases) increased further in the case of paclitaxel (14.7% versus 8.1% crude risk of death; risk ratio, 1.93; 95% Cl, 1.27–2.93; —number-needed-toharm, 14 patients [95% Cl, 9–32]). Meta-regression showed a significant relationship between exposure to paclitaxel (dose-time product) and absolute risk of death (0.4±0.1% excess risk of death per paclitaxel mg-year; *P*<0.001). Trial sequential analysis excluded false-positive findings with 99% certainty (2-sided α , 1.0%).

Conclusions—There is increased risk of death following application of paclitaxel-coated balloons and stents in the femoropopliteal artery of the lower limbs. Further investigations are urgently warranted.

Clinical Trial Registration—URL: www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO. Unique identifier: CRD42018099447. (J Am Heart Assoc. 2018;7:e011245. DOI: 10.1161/JAHA.118.011245.)

Key Words: balloon angioplasty • paclitaxel • paclitaxel-coated balloon • paclitaxel-eluting stent

The Problem

The meta-analysis on DEB in the femoro-popliteal arterial segment has shown:

- 2-fold increase in all-cause mortality at 1 & 2yrs,
- As well as showing a dose response effect

Impact of DEB Mortality Study on Fistula Management WRA

Risk of Death Following Application of Paclitaxel-Coated Balloons and Stents in the Femoropopliteal Artery of the Leg: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Nephrology & Dialysis Consultants Meeting, Tuesday 18th December 2018 Westmead Hospital

Westmead Hospital

Dr John Swinnen Vascular Surgeon Dialysis Access Specialist MSF Trauma Surgeon

University Of Sydney

Drug Elution Technology

Paclitaxel to target on angioplasty balloon

• Well established in:

- Coronary circuit (15 years+)
- Peripheral Vascular circuit (10 years +)
- In Fistula circuit (2 years +)

NB: Paclitaxel dose in AVF >>>> Coronary a

Frequent Fliers (≈20% of fistulas)

 Frequent fliers have fewer interventions (decrease in Morbidity/Mortality)

Improved fistula flows & better dialysis
 (decrease in Morbidity/Mortality)

Less thromboses / loss of access / new access (decrease in Morbidity/Mortality) Meta-analysis: DEB in femoral circuit <u>Doubling</u> of late deaths1 and 2 years.

1. Is this true?

2. If true, does this apply to AVFs

3. Even if true, AND it applies to AVFs

? Does risk outweigh benefit ?
 ? In Frequent Fliers?

Our Proposal

- Restrict DEB to frequent fliers
 (≥2 interventions to circuit in 1 year or ≥ 4 overall)
- 2. Restrict DEB to "precious fistulas"
- 3. ? Age limit ?
- 4. Patient consent form for DEB

DEMMAS

Drug Eluting Mortality Meta-analysis and AVF Study

Retrospective analysis of Westmead AVF database

- 2000 2019:
 2560 Fistuloplasties (JS team) in1200 Patients
- 2000 2010: 500 patients, NO DEB (Group 1)
- 2010 2019: 300 patients, DEB (Group 2)

Power Calculation

- Hypothesized effect: Doubling 2 year mortality
- Mortality of Study Groups (ANZDATA): 13.3% pa
- Alpha setting at 0.05 and 80% power
- Sample size of 282:141 patients Group 1 and 141 Group 2

Trial Design

All cause mortality

Analysis by <u>cause of mortality</u>

 Dose Effect: All patients receiving DEB will have Paclitaxel dose calculated
 (Length of balloon x Diameter x Paclitaxel/mm²)

Result by August 2019

Is Paclitaxel safe in the AVF?