Importance of Event Ajudication (Clinical Events Committee) and Core Laboratories

Donald E. Cutlip, MD Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center

Harvard Clinical Research Institute Harvard Medical School





Clinical Trials

Seek the truth about a population of interest based on a study of a limited sample –

- Study hypothesis/question endpoints >> data collection requirements
- Selection of control group endpoint rate assumptions >> sample size, power, significance
- Data Quality
 - Accuracy
 - Limit variability
 - Limit bias





Standardized Definitions (and process)

- Improves accuracy of endpoint reporting
 - Within trial
 - Standard definitions assure reporting of same event criteria across centers and treatment groups
 - Accuracy confirmed by central application of standard definitions for adjudication by independent committee (CEC)
 - Across trials and treatments





Objective for market approval: Demonstrate reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness

Historical Stent Trial Endpoints

- MACE safety
- Target vessel failure effectiveness

Issues

- MACE and TVF composite = "average" of safety and effectiveness but driven by TLR
- Some suggest bleeding be added for endpoint of net clinical benefit





- **FDA Guidance for DES Trials**
- Effectiveness
 - Target lesion failure (composite of cardiac death, TV MI and TLR)
 - Target lesion revascularization
- Safety
 - Cardiac death or MI
 - Stent thrombosis (including after 1 year)





Standardized Definitions - Examples

- Myocardial infarction
 - Disagreement among operators/centers based on MI criteria – symptoms, ECG, type and level of biomarker
 - Potential for over- and underreporting of events
 - Standardized definition from Global Task Force and Academic Research Consortium specifies criteria depending on presentation, timing etc.





Standardized Definitions – Examples

- Stent Thrombosis
 - Different definitions across early DES trials for defining and reporting
 - Misrepresentation of possible device differences
 - Standardized definition from Academic Research Consortium specifies criteria depending on level of certainty





Standardized Definitions – Examples

- Clinically Driven TLR
 - Revascularization decision affected by operator tendencies
 - Routine angiographic follow-up leads to increased risk for both clinically-driven and non-clinically driven TLR





Impact of Routine Angiography PES vs. BMS – TAXUS IV Trial



Clinical F/U Only

Routine Angiography

Pinto, D. S. et al. J Am Coll Cardiol 2006;48:32-36

Clinical Effectiveness EES vs. PES

SPIRIT III Results - TLR



EES PES

EES vs. PES

- 8M in-stent late loss (0.16 vs 0.30, p= 0.002)
- ? effect of routine angio

G Stone et al. Circulation 2009; 119:680

Standardized Definitions – Examples

- Clinically Driven TLR
 - Evidence of ischemia (symptoms, + functional study)
 - Severity of stenosis (>50% diameter stenosis)

- **Standardized Definitions Examples**
- Clinically Driven TLR
 - What if % diameter stenosis severe but no symptoms or + functional study?
 - Options
 - No event = no endpoint met
 - Censor at time of TLR = lose power for endpoint assessment at later time point
 - Determine level of severity for which clinically indicated

Standardized Definitions Role of Core Laboratories

- Improve standardization of endpoint criteria by central measures
- Assures definition criteria applied by the adjudication committee are attained uniformly
- Examples
 - MLD measures by angiographic core laboratory (late loss, clinically driven TLR)
 - Cardiac biomarkers (CKMB, troponin)
 - Normalizing to site URL impacts application of truly standardized definition





Standardized Definitions Role of Core Laboratories

• Limits variability

 Example: single central lab for measures of biomarkers or laboratory measures reduces standard error (variance) compared with multiple laboratories performing the test

- Result is increased statistical power and narrow confidence intervals (better estimate of result)
- Reduces bias
 - Example: Central core lab for assessing angiography (% diameter stenosis) removes potential for bias on part of investigator





Importance of the CEC Process

- Allows for reporting of endpoint events using standard criteria across multiple centers
- Establishes data requirements that allow for determination of endpoint events
- Limits variability and bias
 - Specific criteria > specified data requirements
 > adjudication by blinded, independent experts
 - Especially important in unblinded trials
 - "Consistency is more important than accuracy for a given case"





Importance of the CEC Process Complete Reporting of Events

- Endpoints frequently misreported or underreported by site investigators
- CEC adjudication corrects for misreporting and can query for missing data elements as needed
- Specified uniform criteria for endpoint definitions allow capture of data elements upfront for detection also of unreported events





Data Triggers







Examples

MI – DES trial

- 55 yo man; 2nd stent for dissection
- DC home after 13 hours
- No events reported
- CKMB at discharge = 13 ng/dl (URL = 4)
- Data query = suspect MI based on CKMB >3 * URL

Major Bleed– DES trial

- 81 yo woman
- Large hematoma post PCI
- Transfusion and DC
 next day
- DC Hgb 8.3; baseline = 10.6.
- Major bleed not reported
- Data query based on transfusion and labs





Summary

Clinical events committees and core laboratories are important components of endpoint assessment –

- Standardized definitions for suspected endpoint events
- Capture of all required data elements in CRF design increases completeness of event reporting
- Reduces variability in data measurements
- Reduces bias in reporting of events as well as supporting data elements
- Improved data quality > ↑ probability of meeting endpoint rate assumptions > ↑ probability of detecting true treatment effect



