# Stent vs. Non-Stent strategies for Peripheral Interventions

### **Dallas Cardiovascular Innovations 2015**

Nicolas W Shammas, MD, MS, FACC, FSCAI President and Research Director, Midwest Cardiovascular Research Foundation Adjunct Clinical Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics Consultant and Interventional Cardiologist Cardiovascular Medicine, PC Dr. Nicolas Shammas receives relevant educational and research grants from Covidien, Boston Scientific, CSI, Spectranetics, Cordis, Medtronic, Abbott and Bard. Full disclosure at www.mcrfmd.com

What is the Strategy in Question? Stent vs no stent strategy? **STENT STRATEGY:**  Primary stenting •BMS DES-nonpolymer based DES-polymer based\* DES-bioabsorbable scaffolds\* \*Not available.

Non Stent Strategy: (Provisional stenting strategy)

After POBA After DCB After Atherectomy+ adjunctive POBA <u>After Atherectomy + adjunctive DCB</u> After Scoring + Adjunctive DCB After Chocolate + Adjunctive DCB

After Drug Coated Scoring balloons\* After Drug Coated Chocolate balloon\* \* not available

### **Current Device Application in Treating FP lesions**



### Treatment strategy distribution in the XLPAD registry



Banerjee S et al. JIC 2014 (in Print)



### **One-Year Restenosis Rate in Randomized Femoropopliteal trials**



**Restenosis Rate (Percent)** 

# Restenosis rate vs TLR rate



### **One-Year TLR/TVR in Randomized Femoropopliteal trials**



Percent TVR/TLR

### **RESILIENT Trial QOL and walking scores (Stent vs Provisional Stent)**



#### Clinical Outcomes and Posttreatment Clinical Benefit Index Results

Moscuromont	ΡΤΑ	Group	DES Group		
Measurement	Baseline	12 Months	Baseline	12 Months	
ABI	$0.68{\pm}0.2$	0.89±0.20=	$0.67{\pm}0.2$	0.91±0.23±	
Rutherford classification,±% o	f				
patients					
0	0%	<mark>45.4%</mark>	0%	<mark>44.7%</mark>	
1	0.8%	<mark>21.7%</mark>	0.9%	<mark>20.9%</mark>	
2	46.2%	<mark>20.3%</mark>	52.5%	<mark>23.3%</mark>	
3	44.5%	<mark>10.1%</mark>	37.7%	<mark>9.2%</mark>	
4	4.7%	<mark>1%</mark>	5.9%	<mark>1.9%</mark>	
5	3.4%	<mark>1.5%</mark>	3%	<mark>0%</mark>	
6	0.4%	<mark>0%</mark>	0%	0%	
Walking scores, maximum					
possible=100%					
Walking distance	$26.3 \pm 28.69$	% <mark>57.7±36.9%</mark>	25.0±27.69	6 <mark>57.8±37.9%</mark>	
Walking speed	29.7±30.39	% <mark>58.2±35.7%</mark>	27.5±27.19	6 <mark>55.7±37.1%</mark>	
Climbing	38.7±32.59	% <mark>61.5±34.0%</mark>	35.9±32.29	6 <mark>55.6±37.3%</mark>	
Sustained posttreatment					
clinical benefit index,§ % of patients	N/A	75.8%	N/A	88.3%2	

? § Posttreatment clinical benefit was defined as freedom from persistent or worsening claudication, rest pain, ulcer, or tissue loss after the initial study treatment.

? P<0.001 compared with PTA group; paired t test.

# Revisit what is important...

- Is Patency the endpoint that should be guiding our clinical trials?
- OR should we think about TLR/TVR and QOL as the ultimate goal???
- "Déjà vu" questions from coronary trials:
  - Coronary Trial has now clinical outcome endpoints before angiographic endpoints
  - Avoiding the "Occulo-stenotic reflex"
  - Patency or TLF? TLF for PAD=Vasc Death, Amputation and TLR





# ISR treatment

- Long diffuse lesions
- High rate of embolizations
- Restenotic-thrombotic lesions
- Recurs very frequently
- No good way to treat it effectively
- More layers of stents may be needed
- Fracture rate 1-3% in newer generation stents
- May impede effectiveness of upcoming anti-restenotic treatment
- My impair future surgical targets

# Stenting the FemPop Segment: Facts from Randomized Trials

- Stenting has lower restenosis at 1 year than PTA particularly in longer lesions. Longer lesions have a high rate of restenosis with both PTA and stent
- No difference in TLR with primary stenting vs provisional stenting using BMS
- Primary DES or provisional DES has lower TLR than PTA or PTA with provisional BMS stenting. Randomized data available for shorter lesions
- QOL, Walking distance, claudication are not consistently altered at 1 year by primary stenting vs provisional stenting
- FP stenting has its inherent problems relating to the nature of ISR lesions and stent fractures

# How to avoid stent related problems?



# Avoid Routine Primary Stenting

**Consider Stenting :** 

- Provisional preferably with DES
- DES in Short lesions in proximal to mid SFA
- DES Stenting in advanced limb ischemia when feasible to maximize chance for wound healing
- Otherwise: our strategy is to reduce stenting and add adjunctive DCB

### Optimal Strategy in Peripheral Arterial Revascularization



Figure 1. The triad of an optimal peripheral vascular revascularization strategy addresses vessel mechanics and biological responses and optimizes procedural variables to ensure distal vessel protection and operator and patient safety.

Shammas NW, Vascular Disease Management, 2009;6:36-40

### **Atherectomy Devices**

### **Specialized Balloon**



## Angioplasty versus SilverHawk Atherectomy





distal macroembolization in 64.7% treated with atherectomy versus none of 10 in the PTA group (P < .001).

1.No change in TLR2.Reduction in stenting by > 50%3.Very high rate of distal embolization

Shammas et al. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2011; 22(9):1223-8. Epub 2011 Jul 14.



### CALCIUM 360° STUDY **OAS Outperforms Balloon Angioplasty in BTK Lesions**

- Prospective, multi-center
- Randomized
- 95% severe and moderate calcium
- Below the Knee lesions

**Max Balloon Pressure** 

Average Max Balloon Pressure (atm)



N=50





# CALCIUM 360° Study

#### Dissection, Bailout stenting, TLR

	Diamond- back 360°	Balloon Angioplasty
Dissections*	3.3%	11.4%
Bail-out stenting*	2 (6.9%)	5 (14.3%)

- Trend toward lower TLR
- Lower dissection rate and bail out stenting
- Higher freedom from major adverse events



### **COMPLIANCE 360° Study<sup>1</sup> OAS Outperforms Balloon Angioplasty in ATK Lesions**

80%

40%

0%

- Prospective
- Multi-center
- Randomized (1:1)
- Calcified ATK Lesions

#### Max. Balloon Pressure





1. COMPLIANCE 360 Clinical Study. Data on File.

Case 1: 73 year-old male with Severe claudication and ABI of 0.55 at rest (LLE) treated with SilverHawk atherectomy



95% heavily calcified left distal SFA



40% residual post atherectomy with LX-C Turbohawk & 6 mm Spider Wire



Postdilate with 6 mm balloon showed less than 10% residual

Case TurboHawk Atherectomy: Shammas NW





Case JetStream Atherectomy: Shammas NW

# Case 2 IVUS





#### Pre treatment IVUS

#### Post treatment IVUS

Case IVUS pre and post Jetstream Atherectomy: Shammas NW





# Case 4



### Optimal Strategy in Peripheral Arterial Revascularization

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

Shammas NW, Vascular Disease Management, 2009;6:36-40

#### **TLR in Drug Coated Balloons Randomized trials**

TRIAL	YEAR	DCB	Drug-Excipient	µg/mm2	Design	Location	FU duration	PTA	DCB	Р
THUNDER	2008	Paccocath	Paclitaxel- Iopromide	3	PTA vs Paccocath	FP	24 mo	52.00	15.00	<0.001
FEM-PAC	2008	Paccocath	Paclitaxel- Iopromide	3	PTA vs Paccocath	FP	24 mo	50.00	13.00	<0.001
LEVANT-I	2010	Lutonix Moxy	Paclitaxel- Polysorbate/Sorbitol	2	PTA vs Lutonix	FP	24 mo	38.00	30.00	NS
PACIFIER	2012	In.PACT PACIFIC	Paclitaxel-urea	3	PTA vs In.PACT	FP	12 mo	28	7	0.02
DEBATE-SFA	2013	In.PACT Admiral	Paclitaxel-urea	3	PTA+BMS vs DCB+BMS	FP	12 mo	33.3	17	0.07
In.PACT SFA	2014	In.PACT Admiral	Paclitaxel-urea	3	PTA vs DCB	FP	12 mo	20.6	2.4	<0.001
		60.00	D1 <0.001 NS	5 0.02 4	0.07 < 0.001					
			PT	A DCB						

#### From: Drug-Eluting Stents for Revascularization of Infrapopliteal Arteries: Updated Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials

Target lesion revascularization – Sensitivity analysis

	Subgroups	Trials	Patients, n	Favors DES Favors control	р	P <sup>int</sup>
Overall	•	5	554		<0.001	
Trial size	≤140 patients	3	228		<0.001	0.41
	>140 patients	2	326		0.03	
Follow-up length	≤12 months	3	355		0.003	0.75
	>12 months	2	199		0.04	
Follow-up . angiography	Yes	4	393		<0.001	0.82
	No	1	161		0.06	
Lesion length	≤26.8 mm	2	190		<0.001	0.29
	>26.8 mm	3	364		0.02	
Vessel diameter	≤2.86 mm	2	215		0.11	0.87
	>2.86 mm	3	339		<0.001	
DAPT . prescription	≤6 months	4	414		0.002	0.73
	>6 months	1	140		0.001	
				0.1 1	10	
				OR [95% CI]		

Copyright © The American College of Cardiology.

All rights reserved.

#### Drug-eluting balloon versus standard balloon angioplasty for infrapopliteal arterial revascularization in critical limb ischemia: 12-month results from the IN.PACT DEEP randomized trial

Prospective, multicenter, randomized, controlled trial 358 CLI patients were randomized 2:1 to IA-DEB or PTA.

2 co-primary efficacy endpoints at 12 months:

- 1. clinically driven target lesion revascularization (CD-TLR) and
- 2. late lumen loss (LLL).

Primary efficacy results of DEB versus PTA were CD-TLR of 9.2% versus 13.1% (p = 0.291)

Primary safety endpoint through 6 months was a composite of all-cause mortality, major amputation, and CD-TLR.

Primary safety endpoints were 17.7% versus 15.8% (p = 0.021) and met the noninferiority hypothesis. Major amputations through 12 months was observed in the DEB arm versus the PTA arm (8.8% vs. 3.6%; p = 0.080).

Significant baseline differences between the DEB and PTA arms impaired inflow (40.7% vs. 28.8%; p = 0.035), previous target limb revascularization (32.2% vs. 21.8%; p = 0.047).

Zeller T et al. IN.PACT DEEP Trial Investigators. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2014 Oct 14;64(15):1568-76.

#### **Drug Coated Balloons versus Drug Coated Stents**

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Summary

Provisional stenting with BMS has same TLR and QOL when compared to Primary stenting of the FP segment

Provisional stenting or primary stenting with DES has improved clinical outcomes compared to primary stenting with BMS or Provisional stenting with BMS. Data available for shorter lesions

Atherectomy reduces dissection and stent rate and improves vessel compliance

DCB are superior to POBA in reducing TLR and improves clinical outcomes Combining Atherectomy with DCB likely reduces stent rate and reduces TLR

Potential disruptive technology on the horizon may include scoring drug coated balloons or drug coated Chocolate balloon (reduces both stent and TLR)

The optimal strategy in infrainguinal intervention will be a combination of reducing stenting, altering biology (antirestenotic drugs) and protecting distal vascular bed

# THANK YOU