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Jennelle Jeffrey, with son Jose, has decided the defibrillator implant is not worth the risk and has had it removed. Pic: Jamie Hanson
Medtronic settles suits for $268M

The cases stem from a 2007 recall of a heart defibrillator wire that shocked some patients.
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Man claims defibrillator fitted in heart is defective

Court has heard doctors believe removing ICD poses greater risk than leaving it there.

FDA says recalled Medtronic guidewires are potentially deadly, deems Class I: Food and Drug recalls
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Regulatory Principles

- Data Transparency and Accessibility
- High quality data, according to risk of device
  - Randomized clinical trial
  - Double-blinded (sham control)
  - Clinically meaningful endpoints
  - Reasonable duration of follow up
- Safety and effectiveness
- Post market data collection – registry, etc.
Systematic review for premarket approval (PMAs) for high-risk cardiovascular devices

- Included 123 studies of 78 devices
- 27% of studies were randomized.
- 14% were blinded.
- Majority of PMAs (65%) were based on a single study.
- Populations not representative of actual patients

Dhruva SS, Bero LA, Redberg RF. *JAMA*; 2009; 302 (24); 2679-2685.
It’s not often that a few doctors ensconced in the ivy towers of academia can get a lumbering dinosaur like the Food & Drug Administration to turn on a dime, let alone during the week between Christmas and the new year.

But that’s exactly what University of California at San Francisco researchers Sanket S. Dhruba, Lisa Bero and Rita Redberg did after the Journal of the American Medical Assn. published their paper “Strength of Study Evidence Examined by the FDA in Premarket Approval of Cardiovascular Devices.”

FDA Should Take Steps to Ensure That High-Risk Device Types Are Approved through the Most Stringent Premarket Review Process

- 2009 General Accountability Office report
  - highest-risk devices are approved, marketed, and used in patients without any clinical trial data
  - may increase the risk that unsafe medical devices could remain on the market
Selective reporting in trials of high risk cardiovascular devices: cross sectional comparison between premarket approval summaries and published reports

Lee Chang, Sanket S Dhruva, Janet Chu, Lisa A Bero, Rita F Redberg

- Review of clinical studies of novel high risk cardiovascular devices receiving PMA
- About half (51%) of studies remain unpublished 2+ years after FDA approval
  - When published, studies sometimes (26%) differ substantially from FDA summaries
  - Discrepancies in patient population compositions

High-risk devices are not classified according to their risk for adverse events

- Devices not approved through high risk process subject to high-risk recalls
- Most common category for cardiovascular devices
Postapproval Studies – Small and Slow

- Postapproval studies (PAS)
  - Small sample size
  - Mostly prospective cohort studies
  - Only 26% completed
  - Avg 3 years to complete


WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?
Regulatory oversight has not kept pace with increasing complexity of medical device technology

21st Century Cures Act (Dec 2016)

- Allows companies to submit anecdotal instead of scientific evidence
- Shifts burden of evidence to postmarketing
- Subjects millions of Americans to unsafe or untested medical devices
Needed Reforms

- Tainted medical duodenoscopes
- Fixing FDA’s postmarketing hampered by lack of government funding
- Medical devices should be monitored similar to prescription drugs:
  - Data-driven approach should be based on insurance claims rather than industry reports
  - Bar codes on devices need to be included on those claims (unique device identifiers)

Recommendations

- FDA approval of high-risk devices should be based on
  - high-quality clinical trial data
  - effective postmarketing evaluation plan

- Quality of studies needs to be improved
  - Blinded and randomized controls (shams)
  - End points evaluated need to be clinically significant
  - Study population needs to represent real patients
Recommendations (continued)

- Postmarket assessment & surveillance
  - Data should be publicly available
  - Unique device identifier required
  - Registries needed to assess device performance in subgroups
  - Analyze in real time
  - Need longitudinal and long term follow up

- Balance innovation and safety
  - Need actual clinical data
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