

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/158015>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

## How to Establish the “Outer Limits” of Reperfusion Therapy

Lawrence R. Wechsler M.D<sup>1</sup>, Ashutosh P. Jadhav, M.D. PH.D<sup>2</sup>, Tudor G. Jovin, M.D<sup>3</sup>., on behalf of  
the XIth Stroke Treatment Academic Industry Roundtable

1. Department of Neurology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania
2. Department of Neurosurgery, Barrow Neurological Institute, St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center
3. Department of Neurology, Cooper Medical School of Rowan University

Corresponding Author:

Lawrence R. Wechsler

Department of Neurology

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia PA

330 S. 9<sup>th</sup> St.

Philadelphia PA 19106

Telephone: 215-829-3024

[lawrence.wechsler@penmedicine.upenn.edu](mailto:lawrence.wechsler@penmedicine.upenn.edu)

Word count: 3554

Tables: 2

Figures: 0

Cover Title: Outer Limits of Reperfusion Therapy

## **Abstract**

Reperfusion therapy with intravenous alteplase (IVT) and endovascular therapy (EVT) are effective treatments for selected patients with acute ischemic stroke. Guidelines for applying these treatments are based on randomized controlled trials, however patients not included in these trials may still benefit from reperfusion therapy. The STAIR XI meeting convened a workgroup to consider the “outer limits” of reperfusion therapy by defining the current boundaries, and exploring optimal parameters and methodology for determining the outer limits.

## **Introduction**

Since the publication of the landmark trials in 2015 and 2018, EVT has become standard treatment for ischemic stroke related to large vessel occlusion up to 24 hours after onset. IVT is an established therapy worldwide for selected stroke patients within 4.5 hours of stroke onset and recent studies suggest a longer time window for those with specific imaging findings. Patients participating in prior trials of IVT or EVT (which included IVT in eligible patients) were selected based on time from onset and/or imaging criteria with significant treatment effects and in some trials, dramatic increases in favorable outcomes. However, patients that did not meet inclusion criteria for the trials might have also benefited from EVT with a lesser but still significant effect. At the STAIR XI meeting, a workshop addressed the issue of establishing the “outer limits” of benefit from reperfusion therapy with the hope of expanding treatment to as many stroke patients as possible. The participants included representatives from academia, industry and government. The discussion focused on both EVT and IVT reperfusion and addressed 3 major topics: 1) What are the current limits for reperfusion therapy and how are these limits determined. 2) What is the minimum clinically significant difference (MCID) that defines the limit and 3) What methodologies are optimal for measuring the limits. Understanding that reperfusion and recanalization are not identical, for the purposes of this discussion the term reperfusion will be used acknowledging that in many cases there is considerable overlap between the two terms.

### **What are the current limits for reperfusion therapy?**

To explore the boundaries of benefit for reperfusion therapies it is necessary to define the current limits based on evidence and practice. Local standards are mostly determined by consensus guidelines published by professional societies and approved indications for drugs and devices regulated

by the FDA. The American Heart Association 2019 updated guidelines recommend administration of IV alteplase for selected patients within 4.5 hours of stroke onset and suggest it may be beneficial in patients awakening with stroke symptoms or with unclear time of onset beyond 4.5 hours if diffusion MRI demonstrates an abnormality smaller than 1/3 of the MCA territory without FLAIR signal change <sup>1</sup>. These guidelines recommend mechanical thrombectomy for stroke due to occlusion of the internal carotid artery or M1 segment of the MCA within 6 hours of onset. Thrombectomy was also recommended for patients with stroke due to large vessel occlusion 6-16 hours from onset meeting eligibility criteria for the DAWN and DEFUSE 3 studies and judged eligible based on DAWN criteria between 16-24 hours <sup>1</sup>. The European Stroke Organization consensus statement from the ESO-Karolinska Stroke Update in 2018 specifies IVT may be considered for patients with stroke of unknown time of onset or between 4.5 -9 hours with penumbral mismatch identified by CT or MRI perfusion studies <sup>2</sup>. The recommendations are supported by high quality randomized controlled trials as outlined in the guidelines. For both IVT and EVT the trials demonstrate a large treatment effect with NNT of 10-19 for IVT <sup>3,4</sup> and 3-4 for EVT <sup>5-7</sup>. The highly significant benefit of reperfusion therapy applies to patients fitting the eligibility criteria for the trials. Although patients not meeting inclusion criteria for the trials might not benefit as much, even a lesser effect size could justify applying either IVT or EVT in additional populations. Current recommendations are based on factors such as time from stroke onset, stroke severity, imaging characteristics, premorbid functional status, site of occlusion and contraindications. Only 10-15% of ischemic stroke patients receive IV alteplase <sup>8,9</sup> and 3% undergo thrombectomy <sup>10</sup>. Expansion of indications for treatment to include a wider spectrum of stroke patients would potentially improve outcomes from stroke and reduce disability for a disorder that is the leading cause of adult disability. Other aspects of reperfusion therapy such as type of anesthesia, technical approach, device or thrombolytic agent also might warrant further exploration to expand the limits of current therapies. For

areas of uncertainty, equipoise must be sufficient to justify enrollment of patients into randomized trials to provide high quality data on which to base new treatment recommendations.

Recommendations:

1. Existing guidelines recommend reperfusion therapies (IVT and EVT) in selected acute stroke patients based on RCTs demonstrating highly significant treatment effects. Subgroups of acute stroke patients not included in the trials to date may benefit to a lesser but still clinically significant degree and should be explored with additional studies.

**What is the minimally clinically important difference (MCID) to define the limits?**

The expansion of the limits of reperfusion therapy must consider the goals of treatment and the minimal effectiveness that balances risk and cost. Statistical significance based on p values is often tested in clinical trials to establish treatment effect, however important differences between groups may be present but not reach statistical significance due to small sample sizes. When the number of participants is large, small clinically unimportant differences may reach statistical significance. Another approach is to establish a minimally clinically important difference based upon the distribution of outcomes and compare to a reference baseline or consensus of a panel of experts<sup>11</sup>. MCID may contribute to calculation of power and sample size when designing trials. Lin and Saver<sup>12</sup> recently used the latter methodology to estimate an MCID for reperfusion by mechanical thrombectomy devices for acute ischemic stroke. A difference between devices of 3.1-5% for TICI 2b/3 reperfusion within 3 passes was considered a minimal threshold. A similar approach might be appropriate for establishing the MCID for defining the limits of reperfusion therapy for acute stroke. The consideration should be the minimally important difference in outcomes between treatment and control groups. Studies have found that for a simply delivered treatment, the MCID for functional independence (modified Rankin scale

(mRS) 0-2) at 3 months post-stroke is as low as 1.1-1.5%<sup>13,14</sup>. However, for a labor and capital intensive intervention like EVT, the MCID for functional outcome might be higher. The randomized trials of IVT and EVT to date demonstrate large treatment effects well above what many would consider a minimal acceptable benefit. Both IVT and EVT increase the risk of intracerebral hemorrhage, a potentially devastating result often leading to clinical worsening. Angioedema is an occasional side effect of IVT and access site complications, dissection or vessel perforation may occur with EVT. The possibility of adverse events with clinical consequences must be considered in determining MCID. In addition, there are significant costs to the health care system in establishing capabilities for reperfusion therapies and dealing with any adverse events. In estimating a MCID, these issues should become part of the calculation with a larger MCID necessary for treatments with greater risk and healthcare costs.

Several factors should be considered in determining MCID. The value of specific outcomes may differ across populations, ethnic groups and geographical areas. The utility weighted mRS is an example of an outcome measure that adjusts for community assessment of outcomes but may not be consistent in all settings<sup>15,16</sup>. The opinions of patients and families regarding stroke outcomes are additional elements that clinicians should consider. Quality of life data is another method of incorporating societal norms into outcomes and could contribute to determination of MCID. Cultural values also vary across populations. For example, in some cultures mRS 4 or 5 might be considered acceptable while others believe that is an unacceptable outcome. In addition, up to 50% of adults view the prospect of a severe disabling stroke as “worse than death” which may motivate opting for acute treatments with low chance of success despite high risk of death<sup>17</sup>.

The possibility of harm is an important aspect of probing the limits of reperfusion therapy. A greater probability of harm should raise the threshold for determining a clinically important treatment benefit. Both the number needed to treat (NNT) and number needed to harm (NNH) should be part of the formula and some outcome measures incorporate both benefit and harm. Higher NNTs are more

acceptable for treatments with low NNH. The treatment effect must be sufficient to convince society that it should be applied on a population scale. Weighing the risks and benefits for individual patients depending on age, comorbid conditions or other factors requires an understanding and acceptance of the importance of treatment effects.

Whether cost should be included in determining treatment limits is less clear. From a societal and health care policy perspective, overall cost and cost per beneficial outcome are important factors. However, if the issue is whether treatment benefits patients and improves outcomes, cost might be factored in separately. The opinion of experts asked to reach a consensus on MCID likely consciously or subconsciously reflect harm and cost, but other methods for determining MCID do not. A critical consideration must be the acceptance of the determined MCID by the medical and non-medical community including payers. The treatment effect must be sufficient to convince society that it should be applied on a population scale. Weighing the risks and benefits for individual patients depending on age, comorbid conditions or other factors requires an understanding and acceptance of the importance of treatment effects.

The MCID concerns for industry differ in some ways from the academic community. An MCID sufficient for the medical and patient community to consider a treatment beneficial may not be sufficient to achieve FDA approval for drugs or devices. Historically a 10% difference between groups or devices has been a good rule of thumb justifying decisions regarding substantial business investments. Recently proposed ongoing EVT and thrombolysis trials use a lower MCID of 5%. While not necessarily relevant to the biological limits of treatment, industry views must be considered in translating trial findings into practice.

#### Recommendations:

1. MCID is an important consideration in determining the limits of reperfusion therapies.

2. In addition to expert opinion, societal factors, patient and family opinions and quality of life assessments should be factored into outcome measures and the determination of MCID, and may vary across populations.
3. Acceptance in the medical community and FDA approval may require different thresholds of significance and MCID. Trials exploring the limits of reperfusion therapies should consider both of these goals in designing protocols and choosing outcome measures.

### **What methodologies are optimal for measuring the limits?**

Results from randomized controlled trials (RCT) remain the highest level of evidence and previous results have demonstrated the benefit of both IVT and EVT in acute ischemic stroke. The pooled analysis of IVT and EVT studies establishes the current indications based on the characteristics of patients included in the trials. IVT improves outcomes for selected patients up to 4.5 hours from stroke onset with CT imaging and up to 9 hours with favorable MRI or perfusion imaging parameters. EVT trials show improved outcomes in selected patients up to 24 hours from onset. These completed studies include only patients with specific core size, CT or perfusion findings, site of occlusion, collateral adequacy, baseline disability, age or comorbidities. Exploring patients excluded from these trials with individual RCTs for each category would require an enormous effort. A platform trial has been proposed to probe all eligibility limits of EVT through a common mechanism maximizing the utility of each patients' data and minimizing cost and organizational effort. The platform design has worked well in other areas such as cancer, glioblastoma and Alzheimer's disease<sup>18</sup>. Whether sufficient qualified sites are available to recruit adequate patients for EVT trials is unclear. Given the likelihood of smaller treatment effects, large patient numbers will be needed. Including smaller centers with fewer patients and less resources as well as international sites in the platform design is challenging. International barriers include transfer of data, privacy laws and regulatory differences. A possible solution is to partner with other international networks using the same study design sharing common data elements

and potentially a single data repository. If successful, the platform concept might be extended to IVT. The same efficiencies of patient data and organization would apply to IVT. Until these research tools mature, other sources of data on patients not represented in RCTs include registries and large pragmatic trials.

A registry component is integrated into the platform proposal for EVT evaluation providing a means of exploring outcomes in subgroups of EVT patients treated outside of guidelines and including results of best medical therapy without EVT. These data would allow generation of hypotheses for extending the limits of therapy and increase the likelihood of demonstrating benefit. If the comparator for EVT or IVT is optimal medical management, the elements of such management should be documented in the registry entries. Adequate oversight and quality control are crucial to the validity of such a database. Centralized review of imaging and adjudication of endpoints while challenging, would further enhance the value of a registry component.

Pragmatic therapeutic trials have contributed to knowledge in other fields<sup>19</sup>. There are clear drawbacks to such trials, but the large number of patients and minimal exclusions reduce bias and improves generalizability outside of specialized centers that are typically included in RCTs. Given the widespread acceptance of reperfusion therapies, this approach should be viable and potentially informative. An aspirational goal would be to generate algorithms that predict an individual's probability of experiencing various functional outcomes by incorporating multiple patient, stroke and treatment associated factors. Both registries and large pragmatic trials could contribute to databases amenable to analytics using AI and machine learning sufficient to accomplish this goal.

Partnering with industry to explore the limits of reperfusion therapies and potential innovations has tangible advantages. Industry experience with and funding for navigating FDA approval pathways is invaluable for bringing new drugs and devices to market. Although there are considerable barriers to

such collaboration including data sharing, conflicting goals and speed of completion, under the right circumstances, both parties should benefit from such collaboration. International industry entities introduce additional complications such as regulatory oversight and country specific regulations. The stroke community should continue to explore ways to bring all academic and industry partners to work together toward common goals.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Innovative methodologies such as platform trials to explore the limits of reperfusion therapies are encouraged to increase efficiency and make best use of individual patient outcomes.
2. Registry data should supplement RCTs to generate additional hypotheses and extend limits but must apply standardized protocols and include adequate quality controls.
3. Large pragmatic trials have a role in addressing generalizability and expected results in routine practice.
4. Large databases incorporating results of registries and pragmatic trials should be explored to create algorithms to predict outcomes
5. Industry/academic partnerships are critical to bringing new approaches and indications to fruition through the FDA approval process.

### **Conclusions**

The current limits of IVT and EVT are based on multiple RCTs and defined by consensus guidelines published by major US and international societies. It is likely that many patients outside the existing guidelines benefit from reperfusion therapy but possibly with less robust treatment effect. Exploring the “outer limits” of reperfusion therapy should consider cultural, regional and patient specific norms. Cost is an important consideration that ultimately must be factored into treatment selection but

differs from biological efficacy. Beyond statistical significance, the MCID should drive exploration of reperfusion benefit. A platform design for evaluation of multiple aspects of EVT has been proposed and offers advantages in maximizing the value of each entered patient and increasing efficiencies. In addition to RCTs, registries and pragmatic designs hold the prospect of contributing valuable data supporting and supplementing results of RCTs. Industry partners should be incorporated into the process of expanding indications for reperfusion therapies to facilitate translation of results into clinical practice.

TABLE 1: Considerations in Treatment Limitations

Determinants of Current Limits	Defining Limits	Measuring Limits
<b>Published Data</b>	Minimal Clinical Determinants	Conventional Clinical Trials
<b>Societal Guidelines</b>	Goals of Treatment	Platform Trial Design
<b>FDA approval</b>	Balancing Risks versus Benefit	Registry Data
	Social Values	Role of Industry
	Resource Allocation	Role of Payers

TABLE 2: Opportunities to Expand Current Limits

Areas of Uncertainty	Opportunities
<b>Type of Window</b>	Beyond 4.5 or 9 hours for thrombolysis and beyond 24 hours for thrombectomy
<b>Baseline Functional Status</b>	Baseline mRS of 3 and higher
<b>Baseline Clinical Deficit</b>	Baseline clinical deficit of NIHSS 5 or lower
<b>Infarct Burden</b>	Baseline ASPECTS of 5 or less or ischemic core > 70 ml
<b>Site of Occlusion</b>	Occlusions in the middle cerebral artery segment 2 or 3, anterior cerebral artery or posterior circulation

## References:

1. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, Biller J, Brown M, Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, et al. Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: 2019 update to the 2018 guidelines for the early management of acute ischemic stroke a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. 2019.
2. Ahmed N, Audebert H, Turc G, Cordonnier C, Christensen H, Sacco S, Sandset EC, Ntaios G, Charidimou A, Toni D, et al. Consensus statements and recommendations from the ESO-Karolinska Stroke Update Conference, Stockholm 11–13 November 2018. *Eur. Stroke J.* 2019;4:307–317.
3. Emberson J, Lees KR, Lyden P, Blackwell L, Albers G, Bluhmki E, Brott T, Cohen G, Davis S, Donnan G, et al. Effect of treatment delay, age, and stroke severity on the effects of intravenous thrombolysis with alteplase for acute ischaemic stroke: A meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomised trials. *Lancet.* 2014;384:1929–1935.
4. Hacke W, Kaste M, Bluhmki E, Brozman M, Davalos A, Guidetti D, Larrue V, Lees KR, Medeghri Z, Machnig T, Schneider D, von Kummer R, Wahlgren N TD for the EI. Thrombolysis with Alteplase 3-4.5 Hours after Acute Ischemic Stroke. *NEJM.* 2008;359:1317–1329.
5. Al Banna M, Streib CD. Early Endovascular Thrombectomy for Large-vessel Ischemic Stroke Reduces Disability at 90 Days. *Acad. Emerg. Med.* 2019;26:953–955.
6. Nogueira RG, Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, Bonafe A, Budzik RF, Bhuva P, Yavagal DR, Ribo M, Cognard C, Hanel RA, et al. Thrombectomy 6 to 24 Hours after Stroke with a Mismatch between Deficit and Infarct. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2018;378:11–21.
7. Albers GW, Marks MP, Kemp S, Christensen S, Tsai JP, Ortega-Gutierrez S, McTaggart RA, Torbey MT, Kim-Tenser M, Leslie-Mazwi T, et al. Thrombectomy for Stroke at 6 to 16 Hours with Selection by Perfusion Imaging. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2018;378:708–718.
8. Fang MC, Cutler DM, Rosen AB. Trends in thrombolytic use for ischemic stroke in the United States. *J. Hosp. Med.* 2010;5:406–409.
9. Grotta JC, Burgin WS, El-Mitwalli A, Long M, Campbell M, Morgenstern LB, Malkoff M, Alexandrov A V. Intravenous Tissue-Type Plasminogen Activator Therapy for Ischemic Stroke. *Arch. Neurol.* 2001;58:2009.
10. MacKenzie IER, Moeini-Naghani I, Sigounas D. Trends in Endovascular Mechanical Thrombectomy in Treatment of Acute Ischemic Stroke in the United States. *World Neurosurg.* [Internet]. 2020;138:e839–e846. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2020.03.105>
11. Man-Son-Hing M, Laupacis A, O'Rourke K, Molnar FJ, Mahon J, Chan KBY, Wells G. Determination of the clinical importance of study results: A review. *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* 2002;17:469–476.
12. Lin CJ, Saver JL. The Minimal Clinically Important Difference for Achievement of Substantial Reperfusion With Endovascular Thrombectomy Devices in Acute Ischemic Stroke Treatment. *Front. Neurol.* 2020;11:1–7.

13. Savitz SI, Benatar M, Saver JL, Fisher M. Outcome analysis in clinical trial design for acute stroke: Physicians' attitudes and choices. *Cerebrovasc. Dis.* 2008;
14. Cranston JS, Kaplan BD, Saver JL. Minimal clinically important difference for safe and simple novel acute ischemic stroke therapies. *Stroke.* 2017;
15. Wang X, Moullaali TJ, Li Q, Berge E, Robinson TG, Lindley R, Zheng D, Delcourt C, Arima H, Song L, et al. Utility-Weighted Modified Rankin Scale Scores for the Assessment of Stroke Outcome: Pooled Analysis of 20 000+ Patients. *Stroke.* 2020;51:2411–2417.
16. Chaisinanunkul N, Adeoye O, Lewis RJ, Grotta JC, Broderick J, Jovin TG, Nogueira RG, Elm JJ, Graves T, Berry S, et al. Adopting a Patient-Centered Approach to Primary Outcome Analysis of Acute Stroke Trials Using a Utility-Weighted Modified Rankin Scale. *Stroke.* 2015;46:2238–2243.
17. Holloway RG, Benesch CG, Burgin WS, Zentner JB. Prognosis and decision making in severe stroke. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 2005;
18. Angus DC, Alexander BM, Berry S, Buxton M, Lewis R, Paoloni M, Webb SAR, Arnold S, Barker A, Berry DA, et al. Adaptive platform trials: definition, design, conduct and reporting considerations. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 2019;18:797–807.
19. Ford I, Norrie J. Pragmatic Trials. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2016;375:454–463.