

*Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

# Guidance for Industry

## Coronary Drug-Eluting Stents — Nonclinical and Clinical Studies

### Companion Document

#### *DRAFT GUIDANCE*

**This guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.**

Comments and suggestions regarding this draft document should be submitted within 90 days of publication in the *Federal Register* of the notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit comments to Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. All comments should be identified with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the *Federal Register*.

For questions regarding this draft document contact (CDRH) Ashley Boam at 240-276-4222 or (CDER) Devi Kozeli at 301-796-2240.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH)  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)  
March 2008  
Combination Products

**FDA-2008-D-0180**

**GDL**

*Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

# **Guidance for Industry**

## **Coronary Drug-Eluting Stents**

### **Companion Document**

*Additional copies are available from:*

*Office of Communication, Education, and Radiation Programs (OCER)  
Division of Small Manufacturers, International and Consumer Assistance (DSMICA)  
Center for Devices and Radiological Health  
Food and Drug Administration  
1350 Piccard Drive (HFZ-220)  
Rockville, MD 20850-4307 U.S.A.  
<http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ggpmain.html>  
Email: [dsmica@cdrh.fda.gov](mailto:dsmica@cdrh.fda.gov)  
Fax: 301.443.8818  
(Tel) Manufacturers Assistance: 800.638.2041 or 301.443.6597  
(Tel) International Staff Phone: 301.827.3993*

*or*

*Office of Training and Communications  
Division of Communications Management  
Drug Information Branch, HFD-210  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857  
(Tel) 301-827-4573  
(Internet) <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm>*

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH)  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)  
March 2008  
Combination Products**

*Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

**Table of Contents**

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR AN IDE APPLICATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR A PMA APPLICATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>MASTER TABLE.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>EXAMPLE DES CLINICAL STUDY SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>EXAMPLE TABLE FOR RESPONSES TO OUTSTANDING DEFICIENCIES .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>GENERAL BIOCOMPATIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>EXAMPLE TEST ARTICLE CERTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>GENERAL GUIDELINES REGARDING GOOD ANIMAL HUSBANDRY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>FACTORS AFFECTING POOLABILITY .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>BETWEEN U.S. AND OUS (OUTSIDE THE U.S.) STUDIES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>GUIDANCE ON LABELING FOR A DES .....</b>	<b>22</b>

*Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

1 **Guidance for Industry<sup>1</sup>**  
2 **Coronary Drug-Eluting Stents — Companion Document**  
3  
4

5  
6 This draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) current  
7 thinking on this topic. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to  
8 bind FDA or the public. An alternative approach may be used if such approach satisfies the requirements  
9 of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative approach, contact the FDA  
10 staff responsible for implementing this guidance. If you cannot identify the appropriate FDA staff, call  
11 the appropriate number listed on the title page of this guidance.  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 **INTRODUCTION**  
17

18 This guidance is intended to be used as a companion document to the guidance *Coronary Drug*  
19 *Eluting Stents — Nonclinical and Clinical Studies*, which provides recommendations to sponsors  
20 or applicants<sup>2</sup> planning to develop, or to submit to FDA, a marketing application for a coronary  
21 drug eluting stent (DES). This companion document provides additional and more detailed  
22 guidance on some of the recommendations in the *Coronary Drug Eluting Stents* guidance,  
23 including details on premarket approvals (PMAs), investigational device exemptions (IDEs),  
24 examples of various tables that may be submitted, and information on labeling a DES.  
25

26 FDA's guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable  
27 responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe the Agency's current thinking on a topic and should  
28 be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are  
29 cited. The use of the word *should* in Agency guidances means that something is suggested or  
30 recommended, but not required.

---

<sup>1</sup> This guidance has been prepared by a working group that included members of the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), and Office of Combination Products (OCP) in the Office of the Commissioner at the Food and Drug Administration.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this guidance, *sponsor* refers to any person who takes the responsibility for and initiates a clinical investigation; *applicant* refers to any person who submits an application, amendment, or supplement to obtain FDA approval of a new medical product or any other person who owns an approved application. *Sponsor* is used primarily in relation to investigational device exemption (IDE) submissions and *applicant* is used primarily in relation to premarket approval (PMA) submissions.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### **SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR AN IDE APPLICATION**

The following elements should be provided within an original investigational device exemption (IDE) application for a DES:

- Executive summary of information provided in submission
- General overview
  - Name of the product (clearly indicate any differences between clinical builds and those used for nonclinical studies)
  - Product description, (identify all components)
  - Matrix of stent sizes intended for clinical study as well as future marketing application (by length and diameter, including drug dosage per size)
  - Description of drug distribution around struts and along length of stent
  - Proposed intended use
  - References to other regulatory submissions (including ‘Right to reference’ or other letters)
  - Prior communications with FDA (e.g., pre-submission meetings or teleconferences)
- Report of prior investigations, including any studies conducted outside the United States (OUS) (21 CFR 812.27)
- Master table(s), cross-referenced to the submission
- If necessary, appropriate ‘bridging’ documents that provide rationale/justification for the acceptability of prior investigations to the currently proposed study
- Supportive safety (and effectiveness) information
  - Drug Substance
    - Nonclinical systemic pharmacology and toxicology
    - Systemic clinical exposure
    - Chemistry, manufacturing and controls (CMC)
  - Finished DES
    - Nonclinical physical, chemical, and mechanical tests
    - Biocompatibility
    - Animal testing for safety and preliminary effectiveness
    - Pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics
    - Chemistry, manufacturing and controls
- Proposed clinical investigation plan (Required elements are described in 21 CFR 812.25. A suggested list, including both the required elements and other important information, follows.)
  - Purpose and objectives of study
  - Protocol synopsis
  - Identification of control group
  - Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria (patient population)
  - Clinical evaluations (including assessment intervals and tests to be performed)
  - Study endpoints and hypotheses
  - Study success criteria
  - Prospectively defined statistical analysis plan, including sample size justification, and randomization scheme (if applicable)

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 78 - Risk/benefit analysis
- 79 - Monitoring procedures
- 80 - Case report forms
- 81 • Informed consent document
- 82 • Investigational labeling, including product handling and storage information
- 83 • Investigator information
- 84 • Institutional review board (IRB) information
- 85 • Sales information
- 86 • Draft labeling (instructions for use, patient guide, and/or implant card)
- 87

88 *For general IDE requirements, sponsors should refer to CDRH's Device Advice<sup>3</sup> and 21 CFR*  
89 *812. Sponsors are also reminded that as described 21 CFR 812, the regulations regarding*  
90 *Design Controls in 21 CFR 820.30 also apply.*

91  
92 *Note: An identical electronic version of the entire IDE application should be provided*  
93 *concurrently with the paper submission.<sup>4</sup>*

94  
95

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to CDRH Device Advice, <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/devadvice/ide/index.shtml>.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/elecsub.html> for more information regarding the submission of electronic copies.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### **SUGGESTED ELEMENTS FOR A PMA APPLICATION**

96  
97  
98

99 To adequately support the safety and effectiveness of the finished DES, an original premarket  
100 approval (PMA) application for a DES should contain the following elements: (Required  
101 elements are described in 21 CFR 814.20. A suggested list, including both the required elements  
102 and other important information, follows.)

103

- 104 • Name and address of applicant
- 105 • Table of contents
- 106 • Draft summary of safety and effectiveness data (SSED)<sup>5</sup>
  - 107 - Indications for use
  - 108 - Contraindications
  - 109 - Product description, with identification of critical active and inactive ingredients
  - 110 - Alternative practices
  - 111 - Warnings and precautions
  - 112 - Marketing history (in the United States as well as OUS)
  - 113 - Summary of studies (nonclinical and clinical)
  - 114 - Potential adverse events
  - 115 - Gender and/or other biases
  - 116 - Conclusions drawn from studies
- 117 • Executive summary with Master Table(s), which is cross-referenced to submission
- 118 • If necessary, appropriate ‘bridging’ documents to provide rationale/justification for  
119 the acceptability of prior investigations to currently proposed study
- 120 • Complete descriptions
  - 121 - Product, with all components identified
  - 122 - Chemical structures and engineering drawings
  - 123 - Matrix of stent sizes requested for marketing approval (clearly indicate the stents  
124 clinically studied in both the United States and OUS)
  - 125 - Principles of operation (mechanical and pharmacological)
- 126 • Chemistry, manufacturing, and controls for both drug substance and finished  
127 product
- 128 • Full description of the manufacturing methods, facilities, and controls in the context  
129 of the Quality System regulation (21 CFR 814.20) or the current Good  
130 Manufacturing Practice regulation (21 CFR 210, 211)<sup>6</sup>
- 131 • Conformance with any applicable standards
- 132 • Product evaluation (including executive summary, protocol, report, and supportive  
133 data for each test)
  - 134 - Nonclinical
  - 135 - Clinical, including any studies conducted OUS (21 CFR 814.20(b)(8)(iii))
- 136 • Bibliography
- 137 • Proposed labeling (instructions for use, patient guide, and implant card)
- 138 • Environmental assessment, unless the product qualified for a categorical exemption

---

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to the publicly available SSEDs for procode NIQ (coronary drug-eluting stents) on FDA’s Web site for additional insight on the appropriate level of information to include within the proposed SSED.

<sup>6</sup> Please see Section VIII.A. of the main guidance document for further discussion.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 139 • Financial disclosure
- 140 • Postapproval study protocol

141  
142 *For general PMA requirements, sponsors and applicants should refer to CDRH's Device Advice,*  
143 *Premarket Approval Manual, and CFR 814.20.*  
144

145 *Note:* Although pertinent information contained in applications previously submitted to FDA  
146 may be incorporated into a PMA application by reference, for ease of FDA review, the prior  
147 submission should be appropriately cross-referenced (including page numbers) within the current  
148 application. The sponsor should clearly indicate whether this information is the same as  
149 previously provided. If there are any changes, these modifications should be explicitly identified  
150 and an appropriate justification provided to the applicability of the information. FDA also  
151 requests an identical electronic version of the entire PMA application be provided concurrently  
152 with the paper submission.<sup>8</sup>  
153

### **MASTER TABLE**

154  
155  
156 Sponsors/applicants should provide a summary listing in tabular form (referred to as a 'Master  
157 Table') of the nonclinical and clinical testing performed on a DES. For ease of review, for each  
158 test report listed in the master table, the sponsor/applicant should provide a cross-reference to the  
159 location of the test reports in either the IDE or PMA application.  
160

161 As part of the test article column, the sponsor/applicant should disclose any differences between the  
162 DES tested and the DES intended for use within the proposed clinical studies (for IDE) or intended for  
163 commercialization (for PMA). Such differences might include different delivery systems, modifications  
164 to the stent substrate, or differences in manufacturing methods (e.g., processing aids, coating deposition  
165 method, sterilization parameters). The sponsor should also provide a rationale for the amount of drug  
166 per stent to be studied as part of the clinical study.  
167

168 The sponsor should use these tables to support the position that sufficient nonclinical safety  
169 information has been collected before requesting to initiate human exposure to the DES. If there  
170 are clinical data from studies conducted outside the United States (OUS) at the time of  
171 submission of a U.S. IDE application, this information should also be included in the table. In  
172 addition, the table should be updated to include up-to-date clinical information with the PMA  
173 application. When summarizing clinical information, the applicant should clearly differentiate  
174 which studies are considered feasibility, supportive, or pivotal study cohorts for the PMA  
175 application.  
176

177 Please see the next page for an example of a Master Table.

---

<sup>7</sup> Refer to CDRH Device Advice, <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/devadvice/pma/> and CDRH Premarket Approval Manual, <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/devadvice/pma/printer.html>.

<sup>8</sup> See Footnote 4.



***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228

**EXAMPLE DES CLINICAL STUDY SUMMARY**

In addition to study protocols and final study reports, as appropriate, the sponsor/applicant should provide a summary for each of the clinical studies conducted in support of the IDE or PMA application. This information can be presented using a one- to two-page summary for each study conducted or proposed. PMA applicants should clearly differentiate which studies are considered to be feasibility, supportive, or pivotal study cohorts for the PMA application. The summary should address the following study parameters. A suggested format is also provided below.

- Design of the study, including any randomization, blinding, and the control or controls used
- Number of patients enrolled
- Number of investigational sites, identifying whether study is solely conducted outside the United States
- Significant inclusion/exclusion criteria, including lesion characteristics
- Safety and efficacy endpoints and hypotheses
- Amount of follow-up currently available and total planned follow-up
- Other relevant issues that differentiate feasibility or supportive studies from the proposed pivotal study cohort.

Proposed DES Name  
Study name

**Product Description/Indications for Use:**

- Intended Use Statement
- Brief description of product (1 or 2 sentences) including delivery system(s) used
- Drug name and supplier (if applicable, reference IND/NDA/DMF)
- Carrier name and supplier (if applicable, reference MAF)
- Matrix of DES stent sizes available in study, including the drug and carrier dose per stent size
- Maximum number of stents per patient

**Patient Population:**

Significant inclusion and exclusion criteria should be described. For example:

- De novo target lesion located within one or two native coronary vessels
- Reference vessel diameter (RVD) is  $\geq 2.5\text{mm}$  and  $\leq 3.5\text{mm}$
- Cumulative target lesion length is 28mm

**Study Design:**

Important elements of the study design should be provided. For example:

- Number of study arms: 1 / 2 / 3
- Type of control: None / Concurrent / Historical / Patient-as-own / Performance goal
- Control arm, if applicable
- Randomized? Yes / No (1:1, 2:1, etc.)

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 229     ▪ Randomization stratified by?
- 230     • Blinded? Patient only/ Physician only/ Both / None
- 231     • Sample size/Number of sites/Location of sites (US/OUS)
- 232     • Length and type of follow-up
- 233     • Duration for which patients were consented
- 234     • Is there a pre-specified interim analysis plan? Yes / No
- 235     • Dual anti-platelet regimen
  - 236         ▪ Peri-procedure
  - 237         ▪ Post-procedure

238

### **Primary Endpoints and Sample Size:**

- 240     • Primary Safety Endpoint(s)
- 241     • Primary Effectiveness Endpoint(s)
- 242     • Study success defined by multiple endpoints? If yes, please describe.
- 243     • Null Hypotheses – please specify alpha, power (1-beta), and null hypothesis stated using
- 244         standard mathematical notation

245     Definitions for outcomes specified in the primary study endpoints should be provided.

246

### **Secondary Endpoints:**

248     Endpoints for which a hypothesis has been prespecified or that may provide important additional  
249     information about the investigational treatment should be outlined.

250

### **Status/Other Comments:**

252     Other important information about the study should be provided. For example:

- 253     • Dates of enrollment or initiation of enrollment or current number of patients enrolled
- 254     • Major adverse event update with clinical narratives

255

256

**Contains Nonbinding Recommendations**

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

**EXAMPLE TABLE FOR RESPONSES TO OUTSTANDING DEFICIENCIES**

257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279

Following the review of a DES submission, a letter to the study sponsor may include a substantial number of deficiencies or questions, even if adequate preliminary evidence of safety to initiate the clinical study has been provided. Given the wide variety of issues that may be identified, we recognize that certain tests or information may take longer to develop and provide in response to such a letter. To allow the clinical study to progress in a timely manner and to encourage the submission of information as it is available without losing track of pieces of information requested by FDA, we suggest the use of a tabular format to summarize all of the deficiencies and the status of the response to such deficiencies.

The sample table below includes reference to the submission number in addition to the date of FDA’s deficiency letter. FDA recommends including a column outlining the “current supplement” that indicates the issues that are being addressed in a particular submission. Deficiencies resulting from responses to deficiencies from previous submissions should be tracked in the same rows across the table. Sponsors may also want to include a column with a rationale for any delay in answering a particular deficiency. The sponsor should track deficiencies starting from the original submission and reference subsequent submissions to track which deficiencies are outstanding or were only partially addressed in the responses. This deficiency tracking document should be inclusive and provided with every submission.

<b>Original IDE (letter date)</b>	<b>S1 (letter date) Response to S0</b>	<b>S2 (letter date) Response to S1 &amp; New Issue (ex. Change in materials)</b>	<b>Current Supplement Response to Sxx</b>	<b>Justification for any delayed submissions (to include reason &amp; expected date of submission)</b>
Q1				
Q2	Q1	Q1	Delayed	Submission expected: x/xx/xx Ex: Animal data not available until x/xx/xx
Q3				
Q4	Q2	Q2a-c	Addressed here	
Q5	Q3	Q2d	Addressed here	
		New Q3	Addressed here	
		New Q4	Delayed	Future PMA Concern to be addressed in marketing application

For deficiencies that have been fully addressed, and where no questions remain from the Agency, it is helpful to shade subsequent boxes across a specific row, so it is clear that this deficiency is no longer open.

280  
281 **GENERAL BIOCOMPATIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS**  
282

283 The following are common biocompatibility issues that should be considered when conducting  
284 biocompatibility testing for a DES and delivery systems.  
285

- 286 • It is important to understand how the test samples compare to the final sterilized product  
287 (including the drug substance). The test article certification (the stand alone document)  
288 could be used to detail how any differences may or may not affect biocompatibility of the  
289 final product. If a coated coupon is to be used as the test sample, data should be provided  
290 to demonstrate that the drug, carrier, and substrate materials elute drug and chemical  
291 leachants (from both the carrier and substrate materials) of the same type and quantity  
292 using exhaustive extraction techniques. For example, FDA has not accepted the use of  
293 coupons for biocompatibility testing for drug-eluting stents where the stent is  
294 manufactured from Nitinol. This is because changes in manufacturing of a Nitinol  
295 product could change the final surface properties of the Nitinol substrate material thereby  
296 potentially affecting the amount of nickel (a known sensitizer) released from the stent.
- 297 • Sponsors should consider whether carrier-only samples should be tested (e.g., if the drug  
298 has the potential to mask a toxic response to the drug-eluted carrier system).
- 299 • For bioabsorbable materials, test sample preparation should take into consideration  
300 starting, intermediate, and final degradation products so that the toxicity of all can be  
301 assessed.
- 302 • For extraction testing, sponsors should consider the following.
  - 303 - It is important to conduct short-term extraction tests on the stent and the delivery  
304 system separately. If the delivery system and the stent are combined into a single test  
305 sample, this will dilute the amount of implanted stent materials being presented to the  
306 test system and may not identify potentially toxic agents that would have been found  
307 if the stent was tested separately from the delivery system. We think this is especially  
308 important to consider as a DES is a permanent implant that typically incorporates  
309 novel polymer/drug combinations where biocompatibility should be assessed  
310 carefully. The extensive vascular implantation testing that is conducted for these  
311 types of products is either unable to determine some of the toxicity issues assessed by  
312 these extraction screening tests or is not as sensitive as some of the extraction  
313 screening tests. The stent and delivery system should be evaluated separately in the  
314 following tests, if performed:
    - 315 + cytotoxicity
    - 316 + sensitization
    - 317 + intracutaneous reactivity
    - 318 + acute systemic toxicity
    - 319 + material mediated pyrogenicity
    - 320 + hemolysis (extract test only; the direct contact test may be performed on the stent  
321 alone)

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 322 + complement activation
- 323 + subchronic and chronic toxicity (stent alone)
- 324 + traditional muscle implant (stent alone)
- 325 + genotoxicity (stent alone; delivery system should be tested separately if new  
326 materials are included that have never been previously used in blood-contacting  
327 devices or implants)
- 328 + carcinogenicity (stent alone)
- 329 - Final, sterilized stents that include any coating and/or carrier materials and the drug  
330 should be used for extraction testing.
- 331 - Surface area to extract volume, according to ISO 10993-12, should be used to  
332 calculate the amount of product being sampled. Weight per extract volume  
333 calculations should only be used in the event that the surface area cannot be  
334 calculated (which likely will not be the case for the stent). Where there are concerns  
335 about numbers of samples needed for extractions, one can consider using  
336 concentrated extraction techniques to meet surface area recommendations.
- 337 - Both polar and nonpolar extracts should be used.
- 338 - If extraction samples are not used immediately, they should be stored according to  
339 ISO 10993-12.
- 340 - Test reports should include information on the condition of the extraction vehicle  
341 (e.g., color, presence of any particles) and any changes in the postextraction vehicle  
342 from pre-extraction should be explained. Details regarding storage conditions should  
343 be described. If the samples are stored prior to use, the sponsor should discuss why  
344 storage would not affect the test results.
- 345 - For cytotoxicity testing, extraction vehicles should include MEM and 5 percent serum  
346 as these materials will allow for extraction of both polar and nonpolar constituents  
347 from the test sample.
- 348 • For material-mediated pyrogenicity testing, methods such as those outlined in the current  
349 USP <151> Rabbit Pyrogen Test can be used, except that traditional biocompatibility  
350 extraction methods should be used, (e.g., 50°C for 72 hours; 70°C for 24 hours; or 120°C  
351 for 2 hours) or an equivalent method.
- 352 • If overlapping stents could be used clinically, should be explained why biocompatibility  
353 testing will provide information on toxicity at the overlapped stent segment.
- 354 • For cytotoxicity testing, both direct contact and elution methods should be considered.
- 355 • For guinea pig maximization sensitization testing, historical positive control testing is not  
356 sufficient to determine whether the animal model continues to be capable of detecting a  
357 positive sensitization response. We recommend running either concurrent controls, or  
358 periodic test laboratory controls within 3 months of the evaluation of the test samples.  
359 Protocols and results from positive control testing with a minimum of 5 animals should

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 360 be provided with the application to confirm that the same methods were used for both the  
361 positive control testing and the test samples.
- 362 • For guinea pig maximization sensitization testing, test reports should confirm that none  
363 of the female animals used in the testing is pregnant, as pregnancy can reduce the ability  
364 of a female animal to detect a sensitization response.
  - 365 • For sensitization testing, FDA will also accept local lymph node assay (LLNA) testing as  
366 an alternative to guinea pig maximization testing, if appropriate methods are used.
  - 367 • For hemocompatibility testing, hemolysis, complement activation, and in vivo  
368 thromboresistance should be considered. Complement activation should be addressed  
369 either by testing with both C3a and SC5b-9, or with a scientific justification for the  
370 omission of testing. Sponsors may also assess in vivo thrombogenicity in the vascular  
371 animal implantation testing in lieu of a separate canine in vivo thrombogenicity test.
  - 372 • Muscle implant studies should be performed even when vascular implant studies are  
373 performed. When new materials/chemicals are used in a medical device, FDA  
374 traditionally requests both the muscle implant study as well as studies of the device  
375 implanted at the proposed anatomical site. The muscle implant study is used as a  
376 screening test to look at local toxicities. Because the muscle implants tend to form a  
377 fibrous capsule around the implant, any materials eluted over time from the test article  
378 will be contained within the capsule, and therefore might result in an exaggerated  
379 response that might not necessarily be observed in the vascular implant study. We  
380 believe that both tests are informative to the overall toxicity assessment of both the  
381 material components of the product and the final product when used in its intended  
382 anatomical location.
  - 383 • For implantation testing of products including biodegradable materials, tests should be  
384 conducted to determine the length of degradation and/or absorption time (i.e., until the  
385 material has completely disappeared) and to assess whether tissue healing occurs once the  
386 material is gone.
  - 387 • For materials that have not been used previously as implant materials (e.g., new base  
388 materials and/or materials with altered formulations), additional toxicity testing (e.g.,  
389 reproductive toxicity, additional immunotoxicity) not normally performed for products in  
390 contact with cardiovascular tissue and circulating blood may be called for.
  - 391 • An assessment should be conducted to determine the necessity of carcinogenicity testing.  
392 This assessment should include the following elements:  
393
    - 394 – The complete chemical formulations for all components of the DES (drug, coating  
395 materials, metals, additives, and processing agents). The sponsor should identify how  
396 much would theoretically be present in an individual stent (assume worst case, i.e.,  
397 largest stent) as well as per patient (assume a worst case situation where a patient  
398 might receive multiple stents).
    - 399 – The potential breakdown products and descriptions of the mechanism by which the  
400 breakdown products, drug, and/or other compounds of concern are formed during the  
401 degradation process should be evaluated. Because certain constituents may be

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 402 present upon degradation that were not included as original materials or processing  
403 agents, these constituents should be evaluated as well. Assessments should also  
404 include the effects of all processing agents (e.g., adhesives, mold cleaning agents,  
405 mold releasing agents, sterilization chemicals) that come into contact with the stent  
406 and delivery system materials during processing (including contact with other  
407 material components of the final product).
- 408 – A thorough literature review should be provided to include search terms and an  
409 analysis of the toxicity of the materials and breakdown products. If potential  
410 carcinogens exist in the materials and/or in the intermediate or breakdown products,  
411 the sponsor should identify and quantify these components and determine how much  
412 of the potential carcinogen would be available in a single product (i.e., assume all  
413 breakdown product precursors are converted into the potential chemical of concern,  
414 and that all of this material is available to the tissue environment). An assessment  
415 should also be provided with literature evidence to demonstrate that the amount of the  
416 potential carcinogen available in one stent does not pose a carcinogenic risk. This  
417 analysis should also be provided assuming a maximum number of stents likely to be  
418 implanted in a single patient. This overall carcinogenicity assessment should be  
419 considered in conjunction with genotoxicity testing on the final product.

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### EXAMPLE TEST ARTICLE CERTIFICATION

420

421

422 In certain instances, a sponsor may choose not to perform certain tests, based on the fact that the current  
423 product is the same as a previously tested product. If such a device is made, the following example  
424 statements may be helpful to demonstrate that the test article is identical to the final, sterilized product,

425

#### **Component Certification**

426

427  
428 For each component and any joining processes/materials (e.g., adhesives, sintering processes, etc.), the  
429 following statement can be provided:

430

431 "The [**polymer/metal/ceramic/composite name**] [**component name**] of the test article is  
432 identical to the [**component name**] of the final sterilized product in formulation, processing,  
433 sterilization, and geometry, and no other chemicals have been added (e.g., plasticizers, fillers,  
434 color additives, cleaning agents, mold release agents, etc.)."

435

#### **Product Certification**

436

437  
438 If the above statement is true for all of the fabrication material formulations, processes, and sterilization  
439 methods, the following general statement can be provided:

440

441 "The test article is identical to the final sterilized product in formulation, processing,  
442 sterilization, and geometry and no other chemicals have been added (e.g., plasticizers, fillers,  
443 color additives, cleaning agents, mold release agents, etc.)."

444

#### **New Processing/Sterilization Changes**

445

446  
447 If there are any processing or sterilization changes that the sponsor believe will *not* alter the  
448 performance of the final, sterilized product, the sponsor should use the component certification, and  
449 include the following qualifier:

450

451 "...with the exception of [**identify change**]. Exhibit [#], page [#], submitted on [**date**], provides  
452 scientifically valid information to demonstrate that the [**processing/sterilization**] change does  
453 not alter the chemical or physical properties of the final sterilized product, and therefore, results  
454 from the test article can be applied to the final sterilized product."

455

456 NOTE: The information provided to support a claim that processing and sterilization changes  
457 will not affect chemical or physical properties of the final sterilized product should be provided  
458 in sufficient detail for FDA to make an independent assessment, and arrive at the same  
459 conclusion.

460

461 NOTE: Surface alterations due to nanotechnology processing could result in "nanogeometries"  
462 or chemical changes at the surface that could result in a toxic response (even if the base material  
463 has a long history of safe use in similar applications).

464

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### 465 New Formulation Changes

466  
467 If there are any formulation changes the sponsor believes will *not* alter the performance of the final,  
468 sterilized product, you should use the component certification, and include the following qualifier:

469  
470 "...with the exception of [**identify change**]. Exhibit [#], page [#], submitted on [**date**], provides  
471 scientifically valid information to demonstrate that the formulation change does not alter the  
472 chemical or physical properties of the final sterilized product, and therefore, testing on the test  
473 article can be applied to the final sterilized product."

474  
475 NOTE: The information provided to support a claim that formulation changes will not affect  
476 performance should be in sufficient detail for FDA to make an independent assessment and  
477 arrive at the same conclusion. FDA requests that the following be included:

- 478  
479 a. formulation of the test article  
480 b. formulation of the final sterilized product

481 AND

- 482 c. a discussion of why the differences would not require additional testing  
483

## Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

### GENERAL GUIDELINES REGARDING GOOD ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

**Issue:** When lesions appear in histological samples, the FDA must determine the device causality of potentially confounding variables. It is important to control for all factors that might contribute to the presence of unexplained lesions when conducting animal studies. This section includes study controls that may be used to rule out contributing factors to foci of infectious and noninfectious etiology. Unless we minimize the possibility of contributing influences to the development of such lesions, interpretation of etiologic cause becomes more difficult. Animal husbandry processes should be sound and ensure that procedures for the monitoring of infectious agents or the effects of infectious background agents on normal tissue are in place whenever possible.

**Background:** Swine are commonly used for preclinical research to illustrate the safety of a device in the cardiovascular system. This species has well-documented similarities to the human and represents the standard of preclinical evidence due to this similarity. Little has been mentioned to date regarding the expectations that we have related to GLP work associated with the use of swine. However, the FDA wishes to reduce the number of study-related confounders that can come from infection and to encourage the detailing of methods used during studies so that infection can be monitored and minimized.

Regrettably, domestic-reared pigs often carry enzootic diseases that may confound the interpretation of contributors to lesion formation. Most commonly in adult pigs, these are agents associated with enzootic pneumonia (*Actinobacillus pluropneumonia*, *Pasturella multocida*, *Mycoplasma hypopneumoniae*, *Haemophilus parasuis*, and *Bordetella bronchiseptica*). Diseases spread through ulceration of the feet are also not uncommon in domestic pigs and can be carried into the research setting if modern housing practices are not followed. The FDA seeks to articulate practices that may reduce these confounders. Such confounders can be associated with the source herd, husbandry practices, technical procedures, and necropsy method.

**Source:** Animals used for nonclinical studies must be free of any disease or condition that might interfere with the purpose or conduct of the study (21 CFR 58.90(c)). Swine can be purchased as purpose-bred research animals; either specific pathogen free, minimally pathogen loaded, or farm-raised domestic stock. It is widely accepted that conventionally derived swine stock often have enzootic bacterial pneumonia. However, it is also the standard of care at reputable research facilities that this incidence is minimized either through source-controls or active clean-up procedures. The latter is less likely to produce a clean result than starting with a clean source. This is important because background infectious processes can elevate circulating fibrinogen and other acute phase proteins that can contribute indirectly to granulomatous formations or in rarer cases can embolize to form niduses of inflammation on implanted devices.

Sponsors should consider purchasing or generating pigs from SPF-accredited sources to mitigate subclinical infectious processes. SPF or axenic pigs may be produced free of specific enzootic agents by derivation from cesarean followed by routine conventional rearing or they may be maintained as a secondary closed SPF herd that originally came from a cesarean derivation but

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

530 has been bred and maintained as a closed herd with no introduction of pigs from non-SPF stock.  
531 There are also true gnotobiotic pigs that are injected with known flora. The latter are generally  
532 custom-generated and not practical for the studies of devices. SPF-conventionally reared pigs  
533 can be purchased by contacting an accredited vendor through the National SPF agency. The  
534 National Academies of Science Institute for Laboratory Animal Resources has formerly  
535 discussed the differences between conventionally reared and germ-free of Axenic pigs.<sup>9</sup> The  
536 National Pork Producers may be able to help identify SPF Swine Herds (515-223-2600).

537  
538 **Husbandry:** The FDA has observed the following issues as contributors to poor outcomes or  
539 research unknowns, which may be considered as husbandry related.

- 540
- 541 • No description of shipping methods and whether or not the animals are in air conditioned
  - 542 trucks, single or group containers, and whether any national policies or regulations were
  - 543 followed to minimize transportation stress
  - 544 • A shipping experience that is within the first week following surgery
  - 545 • No description of housing or a description of housing that indicates crowding, lack of
  - 546 raised floor surfaces, possible sore feet
  - 547 • No description of diet (note that FDA is interested in whether the vendors and sponsors
  - 548 have included screening for unacceptable feed additives such as melamine and other
  - 549 more recently discovered contaminants of swine food)
  - 550 • No description of, or an overly short acclimation period
  - 551 • No description of socialization or companionship
  - 552 • Description of crowding or isolation in the research facility
  - 553 • No description of bedding and bedding changes
- 554

555 Shipping and housing stress can elevate endogenous steroid release, slow healing, and can  
556 decrease host defenses. Similarly, insufficient bedding or uncomfortable flooring in ungulates  
557 has been associated with foot-borne or decubital ulceration leading to bacterial migration.  
558 Efforts should be made to keep pigs as clean and comfortable as possible. These efforts should  
559 be described in the study protocol so that the FDA can reasonably exclude these possible  
560 contributions to unexplained lesions. If pigs originated at one source, were shipped to the  
561 operative location and were shipped again, their shipping details should be provided. Likewise,  
562 if the diet was one type at the vendor site and different at the study location, this should also be  
563 discussed. The standard of care at GLP research facilities is housing for at least the first  
564 postoperative week on raised polyvinyl-coated flooring to minimize contact of the incision with  
565 feces and urine. We would prefer to know the flooring conditions were and the sanitization  
566 schedule for the pig studies we review.

567  
568 **Procedural Confounders:** The sources of stress or contamination in procedures related to  
569 swine handling, husbandry, and study include but are not limited to:

- 570
- 571 • Vaccination stress; usually vaccinating too closely in time to the study implant

---

<sup>9</sup> Safron, Joe, Gonder, Jan. 1997. "The SPF Pig in Research," ILAR Journal V38(1)1997.

## Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

- 572 • Bleeding stress: this can be minimized by chemical restraint and sling acclimation for  
573 scheduled bleeding procedures
- 574 • Lack of baseline and serial clinical chemistry and hemogram
- 575 • Lack of baseline and serial fibrinogen measurement
- 576 • Lack of baseline and serial weight monitoring
- 577 • No description of aseptic technique for bleeding procedures or surgical preparation.
- 578 • Indwelling catheters left in more than 24 hours. Such use should be avoided in DES  
579 studies or should be supported with an adequate justification due to the risk of infection  
580 or the need for long-term antibiotics. Use of indwelling catheters for longer than 24  
581 hours or non-periprocedural antibiotic use should be noted in the study report.
- 582 • Hypothermia or lack of controls describing homeostasis
- 583 • Oversizing of the stent (initial placement in swine with vessels that are subject to high  
584 radial stress)
- 585 • Undersizing of the stent (placement in rapidly growing domestic swine or already overly  
586 large swine)
- 587 • No description in the study protocol of surgical recovery monitoring and controls  
588

589 Procedural stress and procedural contamination can significantly contribute to unexplained  
590 lesions due to circulating endogenous steroids that can cause immunosuppression and lead to  
591 opportunistic infections. Once a remote infection is established, fibrinogen and other acute phase  
592 proteins may increase in circulation, and bacteria can seed implanted devices. Routine  
593 monitoring of clinical chemistry values, serum fibrinogen and hemograms should be conducted  
594 to rule out these possible contributors. At the same time, body temperature should be recorded in  
595 conjunction with these observations. Additionally, sponsors should identify the aseptic  
596 techniques used for phlebotomy and surgical procedures as well as incisional care and inspection  
597 following surgery. Any prophylactic antibiotics used and any antibiotic use required to mitigate  
598 infections during the chronic study period should also be detailed (e.g., dose, frequency). Since  
599 bleeding sites are relatively limited in swine, we would encourage the use of immobilizing  
600 agents such as ketamine and xylazine for bleeding procedures to minimize handling stress and  
601 facilitate accurate placement of needles for venipuncture. We do not consider the frequency of  
602 tranquilization by intramuscular routes a significant confounder in device-associated studies.  
603

604 Study confounders associated with the collection of samples following animal death (either  
605 planned or unplanned):  
606

- 607 • Source animal incidence of opportunistic or enzootic flora not identified (*what is the*  
608 *baseline pathogen status?*). A cytological and microbiological evaluation of a tracheal  
609 wash (perimortem) may be good practice to rule out subclinical respiratory infections.  
610 Bacterial count and differential cytology are acceptable tools for this purpose.
- 611 • Failure to identify or characterize lung lesions
- 612 • Failure to describe normal or abnormal findings in other organs than the organ or tissue  
613 of study

614 A pathologist should evaluate gross and histologic findings. Digital photos should be taken at  
615 time of necropsy under GLP defined conditions. A thorough postmortem examination should be  
616 carried out on study animals; this examination is particularly useful in the evaluation of potential

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

617 study confounders. Lesions should be fully characterized and there should be an explanation as  
618 to why the lesion is or is not device related. Statements regarding normal background incidence  
619 of pathogens should be supported by baseline data as well as data collected during the in-life  
620 period to demonstrate that confounders related to infection were excluded as possibilities. We  
621 encourage a description of the necropsy procedure. We would also encourage practices at  
622 harvest that rule out blood-borne bacterial processes as opposed to pre-existing processes.  
623 Lesions can be aseptically cultured before fixation.

624  
625 The bullets below are summary suggestions that have aided in the minimization of infectious  
626 processes in swine cardiovascular research:

- 627
- 628 • Acquire swine from an SPF-accredited source
- 629 • Reduce the possibility for vaccination and shipping stress
- 630 • Use raised flooring for research swine housing to minimize contact with feces. (Cleaning  
631 frequency should be defined.)
- 632 • Document changes in housing
- 633 • Screen baseline hemograms, serum fibrinogen, weight general exam at baseline and other  
634 key time points during the study
- 635 • Document operative and postoperative conditions
- 636 • Pay attention to the feet and legs for sores or lameness. (Please note that lameness or  
637 sores should be recorded in the animal records. Treatment plans for changes in health  
638 status should be considered protocol deviations that require appropriate reporting to the  
639 IACUC.)
- 640 • Use chemical restraint and humane swine slings to minimize handling stress (for  
641 example, Panepento slings)
- 642 • Use a sterile approach at necropsy: Cultures of gross lesions along with cultures taken of  
643 the device area would be helpful. If the device area cannot be accessed without physical  
644 disruption of the area, then left ventricle blood cultures could be used to assess infection  
645 in cardiac tissue.
- 646 • Bacterial Cultures: Infections of *Staph. aureus* would indicate infections of animal origin;  
647 *Staph. epidermidis* would indicate infection of human origin.
- 648 • Choice of surgical scrub: Betadine scrub followed by alcohol is preferable over  
649 chlorhexidine. Do not dip in and out of the same moist gauze container. (*Chlorhexadine*  
650 *scrubs have occasionally been contaminated this way.*)
- 651 • Pay attention to necropsy technique: The use of a tranquilization, anesthesia, and  
652 termination process that allows for the minimization of thrombi and opportunity to  
653 cleanly collect blood and tissue.
- 654 • Manipulation of the device: Document any manipulation of the devices during surgery  
655 that could influence the study due to the introduction of either contaminants or  
656 microorganisms, that may be present confounding issues.
- 657 • Collection of the device post-euthanasia. Storage conditions and tissue fixation methods  
658 should be clearly defined.

*Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

**FACTORS AFFECTING POOLABILITY  
BETWEEN U.S. AND OUS (Outside the U.S.) STUDIES**

659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686

**Patient Demographics/Clinical Characteristics**

- Race/ethnicity
- Diabetes
- Smoking
- Hyperlipidemia
- Hypertension
- Obesity
- Age
- Sex

**Procedural/System Related Differences**

- Concomitant medication use/availability (clopidogrel, IIb/IIIa inhibitors, direct thrombin inhibitors)
- Adherence to study protocols
- Regional differences in standard of care
- Patient educational level, ability to understand informed consent, follow-up instructions
- Cultural differences in symptom manifestation

**Protocol Factors**

- Inclusion/exclusion criteria
- Procedural characteristics
- Lesion characteristics
- Test material used (products with different coating process, different source materials, delivery systems, etc.)

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### **GUIDANCE ON LABELING FOR A DES**

687  
688  
689 General labeling requirements for medical devices are described in 21 CFR Part 801.  
690 Additional information can be obtained from “Device Advice.”<sup>10</sup> All proposed labeling (e.g.,  
691 instructions for use (IFU), patient guide and stent implant card) should be provided in the IDE  
692 and PMA application (21 CFR 814.20(b)(10)).  
693

#### **Investigational Labeling**

694  
695  
696 FDA acknowledges that it may not be appropriate at the time of the IDE submission to disclose  
697 certain aspects of the DES (e.g., polymer components); however, the purpose of the labeling at  
698 the IDE stage is to provide the reader with an appropriate level of information to make an  
699 informed decision about participation/inclusion within a clinical study using an investigational  
700 product. According to 21 CFR 812.5, an investigational product or its immediate package must  
701 bear a label with the following minimal information:

702 • The name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor

703 • The quantity of contents

704 and

705 • As appropriate, the statement “CAUTION – Investigational Product (drug and device).  
706 Limited by Federal (or United States) law to investigational use.”

707 The label must also describe all relevant contraindications, hazards, adverse effects, interfering  
708 substances or products, warnings, and precautions. Claims that have not been substantiated by  
709 clinical evidence should not be included in labeling for an investigational DES as part of an IDE  
710 submission. For example, the labeling should not state that the investigational product is safe  
711 and effective. The FDA strongly recommends working with the appropriate review division to  
712 reach consensus on an acceptable version of the labeling prior to trial initiation.  
713

714 It is also critical that the patient guide capture fairly and at an appropriate reader comprehension  
715 level the potential risks and/or benefits associated with implantation of a DES system.  
716

#### **Labeling for a Marketed Product**

717  
718  
719 As part of the final labeling for a DES, the following statement should be included:  
720

721 **Caution: Federal (USA) law restricts this product to sale by or on the**  
722 **order of a physician.**  
723

724 If an applicant intends to use electronic labeling for a DES, the most up-to-date version of the  
725 labeling must be available for physicians, patients, and FDA review.  
726

---

<sup>10</sup> See CDRH Device Advice, <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/devadvice/ide/index.shtml>.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771

### **Recommendations for Coronary DES Labeling**

Labeling for a coronary DES should include the sections described below. These recommendations reflect the information that the Agency considers appropriate for inclusion and is consistent with labeling of currently marketed coronary DESs. The appropriate divisions in the Agency are available to discuss specific labeling questions for DESs and their indications.

#### *1. Product description*

The components of the product, such as the stent, stent delivery catheter, drug substance, and inactive ingredients (polymers) should be briefly described. For the drug substance and inactive ingredients, the chemical structures and names should be included. A table with the following attributes, as appropriate should also be included:

- Available stent diameters and lengths
- Stent material and geometry
- Drug component
- Guiding catheter compatibility
- Deployment and rated burst pressure(s)

#### *2. Indications for use*

Proposed labeling should reflect the precise indications for use statement that is the subject of the application. The general statement of the “Indications for Use” identifies the target population in which sufficient valid scientific evidence demonstrating that the product, used as labeled, will provide clinically beneficial results and at the same time does not present an unreasonable risk of illness or injury.

#### *3. Contraindications*

Contraindications specific to DES implantation as well as to coronary artery stenting in general should be included. Contraindications describe situations in which the product should not be used because the risk of use clearly outweighs any possible benefit. For example, inclusion of the following contraindication should be considered:

- Patients who cannot receive recommended antiplatelet and/or anticoagulation therapy.

#### *4. Warnings*

An appropriate warning should be included if there is reasonable evidence of an association of a serious hazard with the use of the DES. A causal relationship need not have been proved. We believe a warning is also appropriate when the DES is commonly used for a disease or condition for which there is a lack of valid scientific evidence of effectiveness for that disease or condition,

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

772 and use of the DES is associated with a serious risk or hazard. For example, the following  
773 warnings should be considered:

- 774
- 775 • “Patients who are unlikely to comply with recommended antiplatelet therapy should not  
776 receive this product.”
  - 777 • “The inner package should not be opened or damaged prior to use to maintain sterility.”
  - 778 • “The use of this DES carries the risks associated with coronary artery stenting, including  
779 subacute thrombosis, vascular complications, and/or bleeding events.”
  - 780 • “Patients with known hypersensitivity to the product components (stent substrate,  
781 polymer(s), drug substance) may suffer an allergic reaction to this implant.”

### 5. *Precautions*

782

783

784

785 Precautions information should include any special care physicians or others should exercise for  
786 the safe and effective use of the DES. In addition, labeling should include any limitations on the  
787 use of a product for reasons including, but not limited to:

- 788
- 789 • Lack of long-term safety and effectiveness data
  - 790 • Lack of safety and effectiveness data for special patient populations
  - 791 • Need for appropriate physician training
  - 792 • Anatomical or physiological limitations on the effectiveness of the DES

793

794 Inclusion of precautions that fall into the following categories should also be considered.

- 795
- 796 • General precautions
  - 797 • Pre- and postprocedure antiplatelet therapy recommendations
  - 798 • Use of multiple stents
  - 799 • Use in conjunction with other procedures (e.g., brachytherapy, atherectomy)
  - 800 • Use in special populations, such as:
    - 801 - Pregnancy
    - 802 - Lactation
    - 803 - Gender
    - 804 - Ethnicity
    - 805 - Pediatric
    - 806 - Geriatric
  - 807 • Lesion/vessel characteristics
  - 808 • Drug interaction
  - 809 • MRI (see Note below)
  - 810 • Stent handling
  - 811 • Stent placement
  - 812 • Stent system removal
  - 813 • Postprocedure precautions
- 814

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

815 *Note:* FDA strongly recommends that a DES be tested using the methods described in the  
816 guidance *Non-Clinical Tests and Recommended Labeling for Intravascular Stents and*  
817 *Associated Delivery Systems*<sup>11</sup> for MRI compatibility rather than assessing compatibility based  
818 on a literature review. Also, see the guidance for additional recommendations for language to be  
819 included in the labeling.

820

### 821 6. *Drug information*

822

823 Labeling should include pertinent information about the action and potential toxicities of the  
824 drug substance as incorporated in the DES. The following items should be addressed:

825

- 826 • Mechanism of Action
- 827 • Pharmacokinetics
- 828 • Drug Interactions
- 829 • Mutagenesis, Carcinogenicity and Reproductive Toxicity
- 830 • Pregnancy and Lactation

831

### 832 7. *Overview of clinical studies*

833

834 A narrative description of the pivotal study or studies and any supporting or feasibility studies  
835 relevant to the DES should be provided. The narrative should be concise and include the  
836 following information for each study followed by results in a tabular format:

837

- 838 • Whether the study was a pivotal, supporting, or feasibility study
- 839 • The design of the study, including any randomization, blinding, and the control or  
840 controls used
- 841 • The number of patients enrolled
- 842 • The specific lesion criteria
- 843 • The products used
- 844 • The primary study endpoint or endpoints
- 845 • The number of investigational sites both inside the U.S. and OUS (outside the U.S.)
- 846 • The antiplatelet therapy used
- 847 • The amount of available follow-up
- 848 • The total planned follow-up.

849

### 850 8. *Adverse events*

851

#### 852 a. *Observed adverse events*

853

854 A brief narrative statement about the source or sources of the adverse event experience should be  
855 provided, followed by results in a tabular format. In the table, adverse events should be  
856 presented using a *completed case*, or *evaluable* approach, specifically defined as follows:

857

858 In this approach, the numerator consists of:

---

<sup>11</sup> Available at <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ode/guidance/1545.pdf>.

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 859  
860       • The number of patients who experienced an adverse event during or before the analysis  
861       window

862  
863 The denominator consists of:

- 864       • The number of patients evaluated during the analysis window, plus  
865  
866       • Any patients not evaluated during the analysis window, but that had the specified  
867       adverse event between treatment and the analysis window  
868

869  
870 An adverse events table that captures data through the longest available follow-up for the study  
871 should be included. Protocol definitions for adverse events should be provided as footnotes, or a  
872 reference to definitions included with the Principal Safety and Effectiveness Table.

873  
874 We have provided a list of suggested elements for inclusion, below. Additional elements may  
875 also be appropriate given the outcomes from the study(ies).

876  
877 In-hospital events should be separated from out-of-hospital events (through X days or months),  
878 for categories such as:

- 879  
880       • Target Lesion Failure (TLF), which includes:  
881       – Cardiac death  
882       – Target vessel Q-wave or non-Q wave Myocardial Infarction (MI) (i.e., Q-wave MI  
883       that cannot be attributed to a non-target vessel)  
884       – Emergent Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting (CABG)  
885       – Target Lesion Revascularization (TLR)  
886  
887       • All death  
888       • All MI  
889       • Target vessel failure (TVF)  
890       • Target vessel revascularization (TVR)  
891       • TVR, non-TLR  
892       • Stent thrombosis (acute, subacute, late, very late)  
893       • Cerebro-vascular accident (CVA)  
894       • Bleeding complications  
895       • Vascular complications

896  
897           b. Potential adverse events with the stent placement and drug component

898  
899 Potential adverse events associated with stenting of the intended coronary vessel or vessels and  
900 potential adverse events associated with the drug substance should be included.

901  
902           9. *Clinical Studies*

903

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

904 Additional specific information about the clinical studies described in the section titled  
905 “Overview of Clinical Studies,” above should be included. We suggest the following format:

906

907 c. Study name

908

909 The name of the study should be given and whether it was a pivotal or a supportive study should  
910 be stated.

911

912 d. Purpose/objective

913

914 The intent of the study, including the primary endpoint or endpoints should be given.

915

916 e. Conclusions

917

918 The study outcome or outcomes should be briefly stated.

919

920 f. Design

921

922 The study design should be described. The following is a partial list of elements that may be  
923 appropriate to the design:

924

- 925 • Whether the design is randomized or nonrandomized
- 926 • Which type of controls were used
- 927 • If the study results were compared to a performance goal
- 928 • How any performance goals were derived

929

930 The success criteria for the trial should be described (i.e., superiority or noninferiority when  
931 compared to the control).

932

933 A brief description of patient entry criteria should be included, such as:

934

- 935 • Vessel location
- 936 • Vessel size
- 937 • Vessel type, (i.e., *de novo* or restenotic)
- 938 • Type of evaluations (clinical, telephone, angiographic/intravascular ultrasound  
939 follow-up).

940

941 g. Demographics

942

943 For the treated patient population, demographic information and rates of important risk factors  
944 that could affect the results of the study should be included, including:

945

- 946 • Age
- 947 • Race
- 948 • Sex
- 949 • Smokers

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 950 • Dyslipidemia
- 951 • Previous MI
- 952 • Previous coronary revascularization
- 953 • Hypertension
- 954 • Diabetes
- 955 • Any other important covariates.

956  
957 h. Methods

958  
959 Any use of a Clinical Events Committee, a Data and Safety Monitoring Board, and/or a core  
960 laboratory for adverse event adjudication should be described, as appropriate.

961  
962 i. Results

963  
964 The results of the study, including whether the primary endpoint or endpoints were met should  
965 be described, for example:

966  
967 The X stent demonstrated a lower rate of TLF as compared to the control group  
968 (X% vs. Y%,  $P < 0.001$ ).

969  
970 The Principal Safety and Effectiveness Table, described below, should be used.

971  
972 10. *Principal safety and effectiveness table*

973  
974 The clinical outcomes should be presented in a tabular format as “effectiveness measures” and  
975 “safety measures,” separately or combined. Your data presentation should follow the same  
976 approach used for adverse event reporting, discussed earlier. Protocol definitions for terms used  
977 in the table should be included.

978  
979 Kaplan-Meier estimates for relevant endpoints in safety and effectiveness table should be  
980 provided. These may include, but are not limited to:

- 981 • TLF-free survival
- 982 • TVF-free survival
- 983 • TVR-free survival
- 984 • TLR-free survival

985  
986  
987 In some instances, it may be appropriate to provide a graphical presentation of the most  
988 appropriate Kaplan-Meier survival endpoints (see examples of these endpoints below) and  
989 accompanying life tables. We believe that statistical comparisons between groups are only  
990 appropriate for randomized trials. The Interventional Cardiology Devices Branch is available to  
991 advise you on this issue.

992  
993 a. Examples of Kaplan-Meier survival endpoints

994

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

995 If a survival graph is provided, it should include confidence intervals that estimate a standard  
996 error (SE) of  $\pm 1.5$ . The scale should either begin on the y-axis at a value greater than zero – we  
997 recommend using a value around 50 to 60 percent – or indicating a break in the scale to illustrate  
998 the differences in survival curves, if applicable.  
999

1000 b. Updates to principal safety and effectiveness table

1001  
1002 For a coronary DES, updating the Principal Safety and Effectiveness Table to reflect additional  
1003 clinical follow-up beyond the primary follow-up interval has been identified as a condition of  
1004 PMA approval. Once information is available, the updated labeling should be submitted as a  
1005 PMA supplement.  
1006

1007 In the event an update is not listed as a condition of approval, the updated labeling can be  
1008 provided in the annual report, as long as the updated information is based on the endpoints and  
1009 follow-up schedule prospectively defined in the clinical study protocol. For updates that relate to  
1010 new indications, see 21 CFR 814.39.  
1011

1012 If clinical results in the updates raise a safety or effectiveness concern when compared to the  
1013 initial results of your study, the labeling should be updated to reflect this new information.  
1014

1015 12. *Patient selection and treatment*

1016  
1017 This section should provide information related to individualization of treatment.  
1018

1019 13. *Patient counseling information*

1020  
1021 This section should include any particular issues the treating physician should consider in  
1022 counseling the patient prior to the procedure.  
1023

1024 14. *Directions for use (Operator's Manual)*

1025  
1026 Directions for proper preparation and use of the DES should be included in this section of the  
1027 labeling. If multiple delivery systems are available, differences specific to the stent delivery  
1028 system should be clearly indicated. An example would be to indicate the difference(s) between  
1029 an over-the-wire (OTW) and a rapid exchange (RX) stent delivery system.  
1030

1031 15. *Compliance chart (Balloon Expandable Stents Only)*

1032  
1033 A compliance chart that provides the average stent inner diameter following deployment at  
1034 various pressures derived from engineering testing should be provided, displaying the data as  
1035 determined from testing. However, if the data are rounded, this should be indicated in a footnote  
1036 to the chart. We recommend the format presented in Table 5 in *Section VII.C.4.* of the guidance  
1037 entitled *Non-Clinical Tests And Recommended Labeling For Intravascular Stents And*  
1038 *Associated Delivery Systems.*<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Available at <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ode/guidance/1545.pdf>.

***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044

*16. Patient materials*

Examples of patient materials, such as the patient guide and implant card should be provided.  
See also *Guidance on Medical Device Patient Labeling*.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ohip/guidance/1128.pdf>.