

13TH EUROPEAN BIFURCATION CLUB MEETING Porto, 13th & 14th October 2017 Missing studies session



Hospital Central de la Defensa

#### **BIFURCATOR-2** study

#### A study to compare the Standard Approach to treat bifurcation lesions vs a Rotational Atherectomy and Provisional Stenting

Jorge Palazuelos Molinero, MD, PhD, Prof. A

Interventional Unit. Department of Cardiology. Hospital Universitario Central de la Defensa "Gómez Ulla". Madrid. Spain University of Alcalá de Henares. Madrid. Spain

jpalaz@gmail.com





Hospital Central de la Defensa

#### □ I have the following potential conflicts of interest to report:

- I am on the speaker bureau and I am also consultant for Abbott, Boston Scientific, Biotronik, Medtronic, Novartis, Bayer, Daichi-Sankyo
- I am proctor for Rotational Atherectomy with a teaching contract by Boston Scientific. Boston Scientific supports this study with a grant. No other relation with industry with regard to the study.



### Why this study?

- "The cardinal indication for *plaque modification* is the calcific lesion, which, in the absence of plaque modification, confers an increased likelihood of procedural failure, stent underdeployment, restenosis, and major complications"
- "Preparation and debulking of the lesion with *rotational* atherectomy and special balloons, cutting or scoring, may be useful in highly calcified, rigid ostial lesions"
- Coronary bifurcation is a challenging setting for performing PCI.

#### BIFURCATOR



### What were the essential results?

#### ANGIOGRAPHIC AND PCI PROCEDURE DATA II



	BIFUR YES (n = 64)	BIFUR NO (n = 32)	Р
Multivessel disease (n; %)	52 (81.2)	24 (71,8)	NS
B2C (n; %)	82 (98.4)	26 (81,2)	NS
L-Euroscore (media; SD)	21.14 (22.15)	13.7 (18.7)	NS
Syntax Score (media; SD)	34.05 (17.9)	31.57 (17.9)	NS

Medina's Classification for Bifurcation lesions (n; %)	BIFUR YES (n = 64)	BIFUR NO (n = 32)	Ρ	
1.0.0	42 (48.3)	8 (25)	0.04	
0.1.0	16 (18.4)	14 (43.7)	0.03	
1.1.0	29 (33.3)	10 (31.3)	NS	



### What were the essential results?

Bifurcation involved	
LM-LAD	18 (20.6)
LM-LCX	7 (8)
LM-IR	1 (1.1)
pLAD-1 <sup>st</sup> Dg	44 (50.6)
mLAD-2 <sup>nd</sup> Dg	8 (9.2)
pLCX-mLCX	5 (5.8)
RCA-IVP	2 (2.2)

#### ANGIOGRAPHIC AND PCI PROCEDURE DATA III

BIFUR YES





**BIFUR NC** 



(n = 64)	(n = 32)	F
64 (100)	19 (59.3)	0.04
0	13 (40.6)	< 0.001
43 (67.1)	11 (34.3)	< 0.05
1 (1.5)	27 (84.3)	<0.001
18 (1.9)	14 (2)	0.05
2.41 (0.34)	2.89 (0.26)	0.009
3.1 (1.9)	2.95 (0.37)	NS
56 (48)	44 (26.1)	0.005
6 (9.3)	5 (15.6)	NS
	(n = 64) 64 (100) 0 43 (67.1) 1 (1.5) 18 (1.9) 2.41 (0.34) 3.1 (1.9) 56 (48) 6 (9.3)	(n = 64)(n = 32)64 (100)19 (59.3)013 (40.6)43 (67.1)11 (34.3)1 (1.5)27 (84.3)18 (1.9)14 (2)2.41 (0.34)2.89 (0.26)3.1 (1.9)2.95 (0.37)56 (48)44 (26.1)6 (9.3)5 (15.6)



### What were the essential results?

OUTCOMES BEFORE DISCHARGE         RA+ (N=64)         RA- (N=32)         P           Clinical success (%)         98.6         98         NS           Cardiovascul death (hosp) [n (%)]         3 (4.5)         1 (3.1)         NS           2 (3)         1 (3.1)         NS         2 (3)         1 (3.1)           1 (1.5)         0         -         -         OUtcome During Follow-UP         RA+ (N=64)         RA- (N=32)         P           Angiographic success (%)         96.5         1 (3.1)         NS         -         GLOBAL: 27 (28.7%)         16 (25%)         13 (40.6%)         0.03           Angiographic success (%)         96.5         97.5         NS         -         Outcome and the state of the sta								
Clinical success (%)       98.6       98       NS         Cardiovascul death (hosp) [n (%)]       3 (4.5)       1 (3.1)       NS         2 (3)       1 (3.1)       NS         Angiographic success (%)       96.5       97.5       NS         Angiographic complications [n (%)]       1 (3.1)       NS       Hospitalization       3 (3.1%)       1 (3.1%)       NS         • Unable to advance wire/burr       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       30 days       3 (3.1%)       2 (6.2%)       NS         • Unable to deliver stent       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       Cardiac Death       5 (7.8%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Side-branch compromise       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Stroke       1 (1.5%)       3 (9.3%)       0.02       • Stroke       1 (1.5%)       3 (9.3%)       0.02         • Perforation <td>OUTCOMES BEFORE DISCHARGE</td> <td>RA+ (N=64)</td> <td>RA- (N=32)</td> <td>Р</td> <td>OUTCOME DURING FOLLOW-UP</td> <td>RA+ (N=64)</td> <td>RA- (N=32)</td> <td>Р</td>	OUTCOMES BEFORE DISCHARGE	RA+ (N=64)	RA- (N=32)	Р	OUTCOME DURING FOLLOW-UP	RA+ (N=64)	RA- (N=32)	Р
Cardiovascul death (hosp) [n (%)]       3 (4.5)       1 (3.1)       NS         A Related with procedure       2 (3)       1 (3.1)       NS         A Related with rotablation       1 (1.5)       0       0         Angiographic success (%)       96.5       97.5       NS         Angiographic complications [n (%)]       1 (1.5)       1 (3.1)       NS         • Unable to advance wire/burr       1 (1.5)       1 (3.1)       NS         • Burr entrapment       0       N/A       NS         • Coronary dissection       1 (1.1)       1 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       <0.001	Clinical success (%)	98.6	98	NS				
• Related with procedure       2 (3)       1 (3.1)       • GLOBAL: 27 (28.7%)       16 (25%)       13 (40.6%)       0.03         • Angiographic success (%)       96.5       97.5       NS         • Angiographic complications [n (%)]       • Overall death rate       13 (20.3%)       7 (21.8%)       NS         • Unable to advance wire/burr       1 (1.5)       1 (3.1)       NS       30 days       3 (3.1%)       2 (6.2%)       NS         • Unable to deliver stent       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       30 days       3 (3.1%)       2 (6.2%)       NS         • Coronary dissection       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Stide-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       < 0.001	Cardiovascul death (hosp) [n (%)]	3 (4.5)	1 (3.1)	NS	MACCE (3.08y, IQR: 2.38-3.78)			
• Related with rotablation       1 (1.5)       0       • Overall death rate       13 (20.3%)       7 (21.8%)       NS         Angiographic success (%)       96.5       97.5       NS       Hospitalization       3 (3.1%)       1 (3.1%)       NS         Angiographic complications [n (%)]       1 (1.5)       1 (3.1)       NS       30 days       3 (3.1%)       2 (6.2%)       NS         • Unable to advance wire/burr       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       Cardiac Death       5 (7.8%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Unable to deliver stent       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Side-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       <0.001	Related with procedure	2 (3)	1 (3.1)		• GLOBAL: 27 (28.7%)	16 (25%)	13 (40.6%)	0.03
Angiographic success (%)96.597.5NSAngiographic complications [n (%)]I (3.1)NSHospitalization3 (3.1%)1 (3.1%)NS• Unable to advance wire/burr1 (1.5)1 (3.1)NS30 days3 (3.1%)2 (6.2%)NS• Burr entrapment0N/ANSCardiac Death5 (7.8%)3 (9.3%)NS• Unable to deliver stent1 (1.1)1 (2.3)NSCardiac Death5 (7.8%)3 (9.3%)NS• Coronary dissection1 (1.1)3 (6.9)0.024Non-Cardiac Death8 (12.5%)3 (9.3%)NS• Side-branch compromise2 (2.2)19 (44.1)< 0.001	Related with rotablation	1 (1.5)	0		Overall death rate	13 (20.3%)	7 (21.8%)	NS
Angiographic complications [n (%)]Hospitalization3 (3.1%)1 (3.1%)NS• Unable to advance wire/burr1 (1.5)1 (3.1)NS30 days3 (3.1%)2 (6.2%)NS• Burr entrapment0N/ANSCardiac Death5 (7.8%)3 (9.3%)NS• Unable to deliver stent1 (1.1)1 (2.3)NSCardiac Death5 (7.8%)3 (9.3%)NS• Coronary dissection1 (1.1)3 (6.9)0.024Non-Cardiac Death8 (12.5%)3 (9.3%)NS• Side-branch compromise2 (2.2)19 (44.1)< 0.001	Angiographic success (%)	96.5	97.5	NS				
• Unable to advance wire/burr       1 (1.5)       1 (3.1)       NS       30 days       3 (3.1%)       2 (6.2%)       NS         • Burr entrapment       0       N/A       NS       Cardiac Death       5 (7.8%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Unable to deliver stent       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       Cardiac Death       5 (7.8%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Coronary dissection       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Side-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       < 0.001	Angiographic complications [n (%)]				Hospitalization	3 (3.1%)	1 (3.1%)	NS
Burr entrapment         0         N/A         NS           Unable to deliver stent         1 (1.1)         1 (2.3)         NS         Cardiac Death         5 (7.8%)         3 (9.3%)         NS           Coronary dissection         1 (1.1)         3 (6.9)         0.024         Non-Cardiac Death         8 (12.5%)         3 (9.3%)         NS           Side-branch compromise         2 (2.2)         19 (44.1)         <0.001	Unable to advance wire/burr	1 (1.5)	1 (3.1)	NS	30 days	3 (3.1%)	2 (6.2%)	NS
Unable to deliver stent       1 (1.1)       1 (2.3)       NS       Cardiac Death       5 (7.8%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Coronary dissection       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Side-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       < 0.001	Burr entrapment	0	N/A	NS				
• Coronary dissection       1 (1.1)       3 (6.9)       0.024       Non-Cardiac Death       8 (12.5%)       3 (9.3%)       NS         • Side-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       < 0.001	Unable to deliver stent	1 (1.1)	1 (2.3)	NS	Cardiac Death	5 (7.8%)	3 (9.3%)	NS
• Side-branch compromise       2 (2.2)       19 (44.1)       < 0.001	Coronary dissection	1 (1.1)	3 (6.9)	0.024	Non-Cardiac Death	8 (12.5%)	3 (9.3%)	NS
Need for SB treatment         1 (1.1)         14 (32.5)         < 0.001         • Stroke         1 (1.5%)         3 (9.3%)         0.02           • Perforation         0         0         NS         • TLR         2 (2.2%)         6 (13.9%)         0.02           • Cardiac tamponade         0         0         NS         • TVR         2 (2.2%)         6 (13.9%)         0.02           • Acute stent thrombosis         0         0         NS         • TVR         2 (2.2%)         4 (9.3%)         0.03	Side-branch compromise	2 (2.2)	19 (44.1)	< 0.001				
Perforation         0         0         NS         • TLR         2 (2.2%)         6 (13.9%)         0.02           • Cardiac tamponade         0         0         NS         • TVR         2 (2.2%)         4 (9.3%)         0.03           • Acute stent thrombosis         0         0         NS         • TVR         2 (2.2%)         4 (9.3%)         0.03	Need for SB treatment	1 (1.1)	14 (32.5)	< 0.001	Stroke	1 (1.5%)	3 (9.3%)	0.02
<ul> <li>Cardiac tamponade</li> <li>Acute stent thrombosis</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>NS</li> <li>TVR</li> <li>2 (2.2%)</li> <li>4 (9.3%)</li> <li>0.03</li> </ul>	Perforation	0	0	NS	• TLR	2 (2.2%)	6 (13.9%)	0.02
Acute stent thrombosis     0     0     NS	Cardiac tamponade	0	0	NS	• TVR	2 (2.2%)	4 (9.3%)	0.03
	Acute stent thrombosis	0	0	NS			. (	

#### Which is the future? BIFURCATOR-2 EBC Hypothesis: RA+PS vs Standard Treatment for BL

#### Methods: Inclusion criteria

- Patients referred to Cath Lab for suspected or confirmed coronary ischemic disease.
- Patients with coronary artery disease located in native coronary vessels meeting all the following conditions:
  - 1) A Bifurcation "de novo" Lesion (Medina´s classification) should be involved:

1,0,0 / 1,1,0 / 0,1,0 / 1,0,1 / 0,1,1 / 1,1,1

- 2) Age ≥ 18 years
- 3) life-expectancy  $\geq$  1 year
- 4) Signed Informed Consent

#### Methods: Exclusion criteria

- 1) Lesions with thrombus or dissection
- 2) Graft lesions
- 3) In the case of a single main vessel with severe left ventricle dysfunction (EF < 30%)
- 4) Contraindication for dual antiplatelet therapy
- 5) Indication for conservative/surgical treatment
- 6) Haemodynamic or electrical instability
- 7) Age <18 years
- 8) Pregnancy or females of childbearing potential
- 9) An estimated life-expectancy <1 year

10) Patient rejection or inability to provide informed consent

#### Which is the future? BIFURCATOR-2 EBC Methods: PCI procedure

- As EBC and Expert Consensus recommended\* the provisional stenting approach the selected technique suggested. We avoid to pre-treat side-branch (SB) vessels ≥2 mm excluding if one or more very high-risk angiographic conditions are present:
  - 1) severe ostial stenosis
  - 2) severe calcification located in the carina
  - 3) flow compromise in SB (defined by a TIMI flow < 3)
- Final decision on which bifurcation lesions technique should be used in each case is at operators' discretion.



#### Methods: PCI procedure

 For avoiding complications related with RA we strongly recommend to perform it following the recently standardized protocol for RA

**"European expert consensus on rotational atherectomy"** EuroIntervention 2015;11:30-36

• OCT/IVUS support is highly recommended.



#### **Primary Endpoint**

- A. Procedural endpoint: Need for side-branch treatment
- B. Clinical endpoint: TLR
- "Side-branch compromise" will be established if any worsening on stenosis percentage or TIMI flow is observed from the baseline angiography after PCI (rotablation or standard approach)
- "Need for side branch treatment" will be assessed if "side-branch compromise" is observed and: 1) ostial side-branch stenosis is >70%; 2) flow compromise in SB (defined by a TIMI flow < 3) or 3) Unsuccessful despite an initial decision to treat SB

#### Secondary Endpoint

- A. <u>Patient-oriented endpoint</u>: death of any cause, non-fatal myocardial infarction and any revascularization.
- B. <u>Angiographic outcomes</u>:
  - A. a. Success rate periprocedural and at the 1-y check-up.
  - B. b. Angiographic complications rate: dissection, occlusion, perforation, no-reflow.
- C. As well the incidence of stroke, haemorrhages, need for transfusion, renal insufficiency, vascular complications

- Sample Size (Based on BIFURCATOR data) (ArcoSinus formula)
- Primary "procedural" endpoint: <u>Need for SB treatment</u>
  - Expected in the standard arm: 32.5%

EBC

- Expected in the rotablation arm: 1.1%
- Estimated sample size = 56 patients
  - $\cdot$  Normal with Fleiss' correction /  $\alpha = 0.05$  /  $\beta = 0.20$
- Final sample size (+10% loss at FU) = <u>62 patients</u>
- Primary "clinical" endpoint: <u>TLR</u>
  - Expected in the standard arm:13.9%
  - Expected in the rotablation arm: 2.2%
  - Estimated sample size = 202 patients
    - $\cdot$  Normal with Fleiss' correction /  $\alpha {=} 0.05$  /  $\beta {=} 0.20$
  - Final sample size (+10% loss at FU) = <u>223 patients</u>



#### "Primary" Endpoint

- A. Procedural endpoint: Need for side-branch treatment
- B. Clinical endpoint: TLR

#### C. Target vessel failure (TVF):

composite of cardiac death, vessel related myocardial infarction, target vessel revascularization.

#### "Secondary" Endpoint

included the individual components of the primary endpoint, all-cause death, stent thrombosis, target lesion revascularization (TLR), and target bifurcation revascularization (TBR) at follow-up

- Sample Size (Based on BIFURCATOR data) (ArcoSinus formula)
- "Standard clinical" endpoint: <u>TVF</u>

(Target vessel failure: Cardiac death, vessel-related MI, TVR)

- Expected in the standard arm:24.8%
- Expected in the rotablation arm: 13.1%
- Estimated sample size = 386 patients
  - $\cdot$  Normal with Fleiss' correction /  $\alpha = 0.05$  /  $\beta = 0.20$
- Final sample size (+10% loss at FU) = <u>425 patients</u>

#### Methods: Follow-up

• <u>Clinical follow-up</u>:

FBC

- Before discharge / At the 30<sup>th</sup> day / At 1-y
- The following clinical variables will be registered:
  - <u>Mortality</u>: All-cause mortality / Cardiac death
  - Non-fatal myocardial infarction:
    - Vessel-related / Non-vessel related
  - (Need for) <u>Revascularisation</u>:
    - Any revascularisation / TVR / TLR (of the treated lesion/s)
- <u>Angiographic follow-up</u>: clinically driven

#### EXPECTED/PROPOSED TIMELINES

- Initial enrolment: 1<sup>st</sup> QT 2018
- Last enrolment: 1<sup>st</sup> QT 2019
- Recruitment period: 12 months. Until February 2019
- Analysis period: 2 months. Until May, 2019 ??
- Preliminary results presentation: Euro PCR 2019 ??
- Paper draft: June 2019 ??
- Final results presentation: TCT 2019 ??

# $\bigcup_{EBC}$ Which is the future? BIFURCATOR-2

#### Involved / Interested Centers (at the moment)

- 1) Hospital U. Central de la Defensa Gómez Ulla, Madrid, ES
- 2) Hospital del Mar, Barcelona, ES
- 3) ICTRA, Berlin, DE
- 4) Medical University Hospital of Wroclaw, PL
- 5) Coimbra University Hospital, Coimbra, PO
- 6) Hospital U. La Paz, Madrid, ES
- 7) Hospital Virgen Arrixaca, Murcia, ES
- 8) ...
- 9) EBC members ??
- 10) Euro-Rota Club members ??





Hospital Central de la Defensa





### Thank you!!

