SOON CHUN HYANG UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL BUCHEON



Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Stable Angina (ORBITA): a Doubleblind, randomized controlled trial

Soonchunhyang University Bucheon Hospital

Hyun Woo Park

The role of PCI in Coronary artery disease

- Symptom relieve
 - The main role in stable angina

Improve prognosis
 The main role in ACS

After ORBITA trial..... There are many stories about PCI

Bloomberg Our Company Professional Anywhere						
HOME QUICK NE	WS OPINION	MARKET DATA	PERSONAL FINANCE	TECH	POLITICS	SUSTA
WATCH LIVE Sebe	elius Faces Que	stions Over Oba	macare Launch		y Tweet	28.3K
Doctors L Needless	Jse Euj Stents	phemis	m for \$2.4	Bill	ion ir	า
Doctors L Needless By Peter Waldman - Oct 29,	Jse Euj Stents 2013 9:01 PM PT	phemis ;	m for \$2.4	Bill	ion iı	n

"It's like asking a barber if you need a hairc ut... to an interventional cardiologist, stents are good for almost everyone."

Quote from R. Redberg, www.bloomberg.com 10/29/13

After ORBITA trial..... There are many stories about PCI



Thousands of heart patients get stents that may do more harm than good

Stents are commonly used for stable chest pain — but the devices may not be helping. Updated by Julia Belluz | @julia.foronto | julia.belluz@voxmedia.com | Nov 6, 2017, 9:01am EST





Previous data showed PCI can inc			
rease exercise duration			
Unblinded PCI	Single drug		
140 -	140 - VS. placebo		

ARTICLES | VOLUME 391, ISSUE 10115, P31-40, JANUARY 06, 2018

Percutaneous coronary intervention in stable angina (ORBITA): a doubleblind, randomised controlled trial

Rasha Al-Lamee, MRCP • David Thompson, MRCPI • Hakim-Moulay Dehbi, PhD • Sayan Sen, MRCP • Kare Tang, FRCP • John Davies, MRCP • et al. Show all authors • Show footnotes

Published: November 02, 2017 • DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32714-9 • 🔲 Check for updates



Error bars are standard errors of the mean

Trial design



ORBITA trial





Baseline demographics

Age (yrs) Male Type II diabetes Hypertension Hyperlipidaemia Current smoker Previous MI **Previous PCI**

PC n = 105 65.9 (SD 9.5) 74 (70%) 15 (14%) 72 (69%) 81 (77%) 11 (10%) 5 (5%) 10 (10%)

Placebo n = 9566.1 (SD 8.4) 72 (76%) 21 (22%) 66 (69%) 62 (65%) 15 (16%) 7 (7%) 15 (16%)

Baseline demographics

	PCI	Placebo
	n = 105	n = 95
LV systolic function		
Normal	98 (93%)	85 (89%)
Mild	3 (3%)	7 (7%)
Moderate	4 (4%)	3 (3%)
CCS Class		
l	2 (2%)	3 (3%)
II	64 (61%)	54 (57%)
III	39 (37%)	38 (40%)
Angina duration (mo)	9.5 (SD 15.7)	8.4 (SD 7.5)

Stenosis severity

	PCI n = 105	Placebo n = 95
Area stenosis by QCA (%)	84.6 (SD 10.2)	84.2 (SD 10.3)
FFR	0.69 (SD 0.16)	0.69 (SD 0.16)
iFR	0.76 (SD 0.22)	0.76 (SD 0.21)

Procedural demographics

PCI n = 105 138 (100%)* Drug eluting stents Stent length (mm) 24 (IQR 18-33) 3.1 (SD 0.5) Stent diameter (mm) **Post-dilatation** 103 (75%)* FFR post-PCI 0.90 (SD 0.06) p<0.0001 0.95 (SD 0.04) iFR post-PCI p<0.0001

> * Calculated out of 138 stents p values are for change in pre to post FFR and iFR

Primary endpoint result Change in total exercise time



Error bars are standard errors of the mean



Error bars are standard errors of the mean

Secondary endpoint results Blinded evaluation of ischaemia reduction

Peak stress wall motion	PCI	Placebo	
index score	n = 80	n = 57	
Pre-randomization	1.11 (0.18)	1.11 (0.18)	
Follow-up	1.03 (0.06)	1.13 (0.19)	
Δ (Pre-randomization to	-0.08	0.02	
follow-up)	(0.17)	(0.16)	
	p<0.0001	p=0.433	
Difference in Δ between	-0.09 (-0.1	15 to -0.04)	
arms	р=0.	0011	

Secondary endpoint results CCS class improved in both groups







Secondary endpoint results No difference in symptom improvement			
Physical limitation score (SAQ)			
Difference in Δ between arms	2.4 (-3.5 to 8.3)		
	p=0.420		
Angina frequency score (SAQ)			
Difference in Δ between arms	4.4 (-3.3 to 12.0)		
	p=0. <u>260</u>		
Quality of life (EQ-5D-5L)			
Difference in Δ between arms	0.00 (-0.04 to 0.04)		
	p=0.994		

Differences are Δ PCI minus Δ placebo

Adverse clinical events

Adverse clinical event	PCI n = 105	Placebo n = 95
All cause death	0	0
Myocardial infarction	0	0
Cerebrovascular event	0	0
Unplanned revascularization	0	5

ORBITA trial conclusions

- ORBITA is the first placebo-controlled rando mized trial of PCI in stable angina
- Area stenosis QCA 84.4%, FFR 0.69, iFR 0.76
- PCI was safe and physiologically effective
- PCI significantly reduced ischemic burden as assessed by stress echo
- In this single vessel, angiographically guided trial there was no difference in exercise time i ncrement between PCI and placebo

limitation

- Small study
- Single vessel disease
- Patients had a good exercise capacity to begin with
- Interaction with investigational team x3 /week
- 25% Class 0-1 angina : need for PCI?
- 33% normal FFR or iFR
- Patients aware 50% chance no treatment yet
- Limit their confidence "reverse placebo effect"

Why were the ORBITA results not as we expected?

"The link between ischaemia an d symptoms is complex?"

ORBITA

"The efficacy of PCI is trul y small?"

"The primary endpoint shoul d have focussed on symptoms?"

> "The anti-anginal therap y was too good?"

"The sample size should have been larger?"

"Patients should have been more symptomatic?"

"Patients should have be en more ischaemic?"

FAME II trial

- More large number
- FFR guided PCI

Five-Year Outcomes with PCI Guided by Fractional Flow Reserve

P. Xaplanteris, S. Fournier, N.H.J. Pijls, W.F. Fearon, E. Barbato, P.A.L. Tonino, T. Engstrøm, S. Kääb, J.-H. Dambrink, G. Rioufol, G.G. Toth 7 Piroth N Witt

O. Fröbert, P. Kala, A. Linke, N. Jagic, M. Mates, K. Mavron A. Irimpen, K. Oldroyd, G. Campo, M. Rothenbühler, P. Jüni for the FAME 2 Investigators*





<mark>Nејм</mark> Journal Watch

HOME SPECIALTIES & TOPICS

NEWS BLOGS

CME SPECIAL FEATURES

SU

MEDICAL NEWS | PHYSICIAN'S FIRST WATCH, CARDIOLOGY, EMERGENCY MEDICINE

November 18, 2019

ISCHEMIA: Invasive Treatment Not Better Than Meds in Patients with Stable Ischemic Heart Disease

By Amy Orciari Herman

Edited by Susan Sadoughi, MD, and André Sofair, MD, MPH

In patients with stable ischemic heart disease, invasive treatment appears no better than optimal medical therapy for preventing cardiovascular (CV) events, according to the international ISCHEMIA trial. The findings were presented on Saturday at the American Heart Association's annual meeting in Philadelphia.

Nearly 5200 adults with stable ischemic heart disease and moderate-to-severe ischemia (usually diagnosed by stress imaging) were randomized to invasive or conservative management. In the invasive group, patients underwent cardiac catheterization followed by percutaneous coronary intervention or coronary artery bypass grafting, when feasible; they also received optimal medical therapy. The conservative group received optimal medical therapy alone. Of note, patients with left main disease were excluded.

At 4 years, incidence of the primary endpoint — a composite of CV death, myocardial infarction (MI), resuscitated cardiac arrest, hospitalization for unstable angina, or heart failure — did not differ significantly between the invasive and conservative groups (13.3% and 15.5%, respectively). A major secondary endpoint comprising CV death or MI also did not differ significantly (11.7% and 13.9%).

Dr. Harlan Krumholz, editor-in-chief of *NEJM Journal Watch Cardiology*, offered his take: "The ISCHEMIA study is a lot to digest — and the results haven't yet been published in a peer-reviewed journal. Yet, what seems clear is that patients with stable ischemic disease are safe with medical therapy, which is consistent with many other studies. A side question is whether stress myocardial perfusion studies are providing much value for these patients."

In current status, conclusion

No trial is without limitations

Placebo is an important part of medical care

The true physical effect of PCI may be increased if we select certain patient subgroups

The medical treatment will be first line treatment option for many patients in stable angina

Thank You for your Attention

