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Introduction

Helen S. Barold, M.D., M.P.H.
Chief Medical Officer
Indications for Use

The system consists of the CryoCor™ CryoBlator™ Cryoablation Catheters and the Model 2020 Console

The CryoCor Cryoablation System’s intended use is in the Ablation of Isthmus-dependent Atrial Flutter in patients 18 years of age or older
Regulatory Events

- July 15, 2005 - Initial submission
  - Modular submission
- October 12, 2005 - Major Deficiency Letter
- January 26, 2006 - Letter concerning chronic effectiveness
- November 28, 2006 - Resubmission with new core lab
- March 1, 2007 - Amendment
- June 27, 2007 - Panel Date
Data to Support Approval

- Pre-clinical Data
  - CryoCor lesion sizes as large as RF
- US Pivotal Trial
- OUS Confirmatory Clinical Study
- Pain study
  - Demonstrates a unique advantage of Cryoablation over RF

Demonstrates a Reasonable Level of Safety and Effectiveness
Device Description

Eric Ryba
Director, Intellectual Property
CryoCor Console and Catheter System

2020 Console
CryoCor 1200 Catheter Product Line

- **Reach**: 4.5 cm
- **Articulation Length**: 3.2 cm
- **Range of Articulation**: 0° to 180°
- **Diameter**:
  - 6.5 mm
  - 1.3 mm
  - 3 mm
Cryoablation Process

T₂ ≤ -85°C

T₁ = 37°C

Cryo-lesion

Liquid N₂O flow in

Gas N₂O flow out
Internal Tip Temperature

- Turn On Nitrous Oxide Flow
- 4 sec Vacuum Pumpdown
- Start "Freeze Timer" at -30°C

Temperature on Y-axis: °C
Ablation Time on X-axis: sec
## Cryo & RF Catheter Ablation Surface Area Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABLATION SURFACE AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF - 8Fr (4mm)</td>
<td>~34 mm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF - 8Fr (8mm)</td>
<td>~68 mm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryo - 10Fr (6.5mm)</td>
<td>~66 mm²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Standard RF 8Fr (4mm)**
- **Large Tip RF 8Fr (8mm)**
- **Cryoablation 10Fr (6.5mm)**
Surface Area Comparison and Approximate Heat Transfer Values

Surface Area
~29mm²

Surface Area
~66mm²

Approximate Heat Transfer Values

CryoCath - Freezor
7Fr (4mm tip)
~23 Watts

CryoCor Cryoablation Catheter
10Fr (6.5mm tip)
~52 Watts
Pre-Clinical Data

Gregory Feld, M.D.
Professor of Medicine
Director, Cardiac Electrophysiology Program
University of California San Diego
Cryoablation

- Cryosurgery in the 1970’s
- Large volume of published literature characterizing cryoablation
  - Safe
  - Preserves tissue architecture
    - Maintain good tensile strength
  - Limited risk of thrombus
  - No steam pops
  - Clearly demarcated, homogeneous lesion formation
  - No pulmonary vein stenosis, atrio-esophageal fistulas when used on the left side
  - Less painful- several studies
Primary Mechanisms of Cell Injury

- An iceball is formed at the tip of the catheter or along a defined surface.
- Cells within the iceball are irreversibly damaged and eventually replaced with fibrotic tissue.
- There is cell death, but the extracellular matrix remain largely intact.
Factors that Affect Lesion Size

- Contact with tissue
- Electrode size
- Power
- Regional blood flow
- Freeze time (lesions form at 30 seconds)
Cryoablation Lesions at Canine Isthmus
Compare Lesion Size for CryoCor vs. RF

- 10 swine
- Standard thigh muscle preparation
  - constant force of 10gm of pressure on all catheters
- Cryo
  - CryoCor, 6.5 mm tip, 5 minute applications
- Standard RF (SRF)
  - 7F; 4mm tip; 60 sec at 50 watts, temp 50°C
- Irrigated RF (CRF)
  - 7F; 3.5mm tip; 60 sec at 50 watts, saline infusion at 15 ml/min; externally irrigated
- Both vertical and horizontal tip orientations were used
Examples of Lesions Created with Cryo and RF

CryoCor- 5 minutes
Horizontal Tip Orientation

Irrigated RF- 1 minute
Vertical Tip Orientation
Comparison of Lesion Sizes

Cryoaulation
Irrigated RF
Standard RF

Catheter Orientation/Lesion Dimension Measured
Conclusions

- Cryoablation is able to produce lesions that are larger than standard RF and as large as irrigated RF
- The CryoCor System can make lesions that are large enough to treat atrial flutter
Pre-Clinical Data

Hein Wellens, M.D.
Emeritus Professor of Cardiology
University of Maastricht, The Netherlands
Catheter-Based Cryoablation Produces Permanent Bidirectional Cavotricuspid Isthmus Conduction Block in Dogs


JICE 2002 7, 149-155.
Protocol

- 7 adult mongrel dogs
- 5 Cryo; 2 RF
- All animals had electroanatomical mapping with CARTO at the time of the procedure and 6 weeks later
- Isthmus Ablation
  - RF 4mm tip; 50W, temp 70°C, 90 second lesions
  - CryoCor 6.5 mm tip, 10F, bipolar, 5 minute lesions
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Applications</th>
<th>Temp</th>
<th>Procedure time</th>
<th>Application time</th>
<th>Fluoro time</th>
<th>BDB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cryo</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>-65 to -80°C</td>
<td>354 min</td>
<td>2X5 min</td>
<td>81 min</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50 to 70°C</td>
<td>340 min</td>
<td>90 sec</td>
<td>52 min</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BDB = Bidirectional Block
At 6 weeks all animals had permanent bidirectional isthmus block.

One of the animals who underwent RF had endocardial thrombus formation at the transition of the RA to IVC.
elastica-van Gieson Stain; 6 weeks after ablation of RAI; ENDO – endocardium; EPI – epicardium; RV – right ventricle RA-IVC – right atrium – inferior vena cava transition
Conclusions

- Cryo is able to produce chronic bidirectional block with histologic evidence of full thickness lesions
- Cryo adheres well to endocardial surface
  - May be beneficial with uneven surface
Review of Objective Performance Criteria and Published Literature

Hugh Calkins, M.D.
Professor of Medicine and Director of Electrophysiology
Johns Hopkins Hospital
Cardiac Ablation Catheters Generic Arrhythmia Indications for Use; Draft Guidance for Industry (Objective Performance Criteria)

Table 2: Safety and Effectiveness of RF Ablation Using Conventional RF Ablation Catheters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrhythmia</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Acute Success</th>
<th>Chronic Success</th>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atrial Flutter&lt;sup&gt;1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>72 - 100%</td>
<td>85 – 100%</td>
<td>0 – 6%</td>
<td>Linear lesions across isthmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventricular Tachycardia&lt;sup&gt;10, 11, 16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>66 – 85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2 – 8%</td>
<td>Right and left ventricles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial Tachycardia&lt;sup&gt;4, 16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Right and left atria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2000
### Studies that the OPC are Based on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th># pts</th>
<th>Catheter</th>
<th>Type of F/U</th>
<th>F/U</th>
<th>Chronic Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay JCE 1993</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 mm RF</td>
<td>Clinical only</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>90% (9/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon AJC 1996</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4mm RF</td>
<td>Clinical only</td>
<td>166+57d</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher JCE 1996</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4mm RF</td>
<td>Clinical only</td>
<td>24+9 mo</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai Circ 1999</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8mm/4mm RF</td>
<td>Clinical only</td>
<td>10±5 mo</td>
<td>100% (22% AFib)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hendricks EHJ 1995, Scheinman PACE 1995 and PACE 2000 were surveys that reported complications not success rates.
Atrial Flutter Ablation
Literature Review

- 75 peer-reviewed studies
  - 12 years- Circulation 1994- Circulation 2006
  - 70 using RF
  - 5 using Cryo

- 72 used clinical follow-up at 1,3,6 months with clinic visits and additional visits if symptomatic
  - No event recordings
Long Term Follow-up After RF

Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves (with 95% confidence intervals) for recurrence-free survival from typical atrial flutter following successful radiofrequency ablation of atrial flutter.

Gilligan, PACE 2003
# Long Term Follow-up After RF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Atrial Flutter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosio et al.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calkins et al.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkorian et al.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippson et al.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nath et al.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon et al.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movsowitz et al.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poty et al.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer et al.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai C-T et al.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosio et al.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paydak et al.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselme et al.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabar et al.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumacher et al.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table III.**

Studies of Follow-Up Following Radiofrequency Ablation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Atrial Flutter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosio et al.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calkins et al.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkorian et al.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippson et al.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nath et al.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon et al.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movsowitz et al.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poty et al.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer et al.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai C-T et al.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosio et al.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paydak et al.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselme et al.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabar et al.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumacher et al.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AF** = atrial fibrillation.

Gilligan, PACE 2003
Results of Catheter Ablation of Typical Atrial Flutter
Calkins, Am J Cardiol 2004

- 150 pts, 17 centers
- 7Fr, 8mm electrode, 100 W RF power generator
- Acute success - 88% (95% LCI: 82.7%)
- 6 month chronic success - 87% (95% CI: 81%; 93%)
  - f/u: office visits at 1, 6 months or telephone contact at 1 week, 3, 9, 12 and 24 months
  - Monthly event recordings with a core lab
- 12 month success rate - 79.7%
- Safety at 1 week - 2.7% device/procedure related events
Results of Catheter Ablation of Typical Atrial Flutter
Calkins, Am J Cardiol 2004

- 12 recurrences of typical atrial flutter
- 4 symptomatic
- 8 asymptomatic

**FIGURE 1.** Survival rate from recurrent typical atrial flutter (AFI) and atrial fibrillation (AF).
Conclusions

- 96% of prior studies used clinical endpoints; including all the studies used to develop the OPCs
  - Event recording was not routinely employed
- Because of this, the published literature underestimates the true recurrence rate of atrial flutter following RF catheter ablation
Study Design and Endpoints

Gregory Feld, M.D.
Professor of Medicine
Director, Cardiac Electrophysiology Program
University of California, San Diego
Study Design

- Non-randomized; 24 US sites

Schedule of Clinical Assessments

- Documentation of typical atrial flutter?
  - Yes: Cryoablation
  - No: Screen failure (not enrolled)

- BDB at 30 min?
  - Yes: RF
  - No: 1-month clinic visit

- Symptomatic and Weekly Event Recording transmissions (LifeWatch)

- 3-month clinic visit
- 6-month phone call
Major Inclusion Criteria

- Age between 18 and 75
- Symptomatic atrial flutter with at least one episode within the last six months, documented on ECG
- Documentation of isthmus-dependent right-atrial flutter as evident from pacing and/or mapping (performed in the EP lab just prior to ablation)
- Willingness, ability and commitment to participate in follow-up evaluations
Exclusion Criteria

- Structural heart disease of clinical significance including:
  - Cardiac surgery within six months of screening
  - Unstable symptoms of congestive heart failure (CHF) including NYHA Class III or IV CHF at screening and/or ejection fraction <30% as measured by ECHO or catheterization
  - Right-sided heart valve prosthetics
  - Myocardial infarction (MI) within three months of screening
  - Unstable angina or ongoing myocardial ischemia
  - Corrected or uncorrected atrial septal defect (ASD)
  - Congenital heart disease where either the underlying abnormality or its correction prohibits or increases the risk of cryoablation
Exclusion Criteria (con’t)

- Any prior ablation for atrial flutter
- Any prior ablation (other than atrial flutter) within three months of screening
- Concomitant atrial fibrillation requiring AAD treatment other than Class IC or Class III for conversion to atrial flutter
- Any concomitant ventricular arrhythmia requiring pharmacological treatment that would interfere with the interpretation of the results from this study
- Severe electrolyte abnormalities at the time of treatment
- Pregnancy
- Any contraindication to cardiac catheterization
- Poor general health that, in the opinion of the investigator, will not allow the subject to be a good study candidate (i.e. other disease processes, mental capacity, etc.)
- Enrollment in any other ongoing protocol
Typical Atrial Flutter
Documentation of Isthmus Dependent Atrial Flutter
Prior and Concomitant Therapies Allowed

- Subjects with a history of AFib who converted to AFL when placed on anti-arrhythmic drugs were allowed
  - Class 1C and III agents were allowed as treatment for AFib
- Medications changes were at the discretion of the investigator
Acute Endpoints

- **Acute Safety-** Serious Adverse Events within 7 days of the index procedure
  - Goal: Cryoablation should meet the OPC for safety - upper confidence bound of $\leq 7\%$

- **Acute Effectiveness-** Bidirectional Block after a waiting period (30 or 60 min)
  - Goal: Cryoablation should meet the OPC for acute effectiveness - lower confidence bound of $\geq 80\%$
Chronic Endpoints

- Chronic Safety at 6 months
- Chronic Effectiveness - no recurrence of atrial flutter at 6 months, based on OPCs and strict event recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Endpoint</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>95% Confidence Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute Success</td>
<td>&gt; 95%</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Success</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Day SAEs</td>
<td>&lt; 2.5%</td>
<td>≤ 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Size

- Calculated based on primary safety endpoint
- Determined to be 160 patients
Censored Patients

- Compliance was defined as completing at least 3 event recordings per month for at least 5 of the 6 months of observation
- Patients were censored at the point where they became non-compliant with their event recordings
Significant Protocol Changes

- **60 to 30 minute wait time for BDB**
  - Jan 29, 2004 – involved 109 patients
  - Based on current practice and a review of the literature, the wait to recheck bidirectional block was decreased from 60 minutes to 30 minutes

- **Catheter model change from 1100 to 1200**
  - May 04, 2004 -- involved 71 patients
  - Change made for ease of manufacturing
  - Extensive testing was performed to demonstrate that the lesion sizes were equivalent
Cryoablation Procedure

- Standard atrial flutter ablation procedure
- Freezes up to 5 minutes - majority were 2 minutes
- Confirmation of bidirectional block
Example of Bidirectional Block

CS Pacing

LRA Pacing
Initial Submission Issues

Albert Waldo, M.D.
The Walter H. Pritchard Professor of Cardiology, Professor of Medicine, and Professor of Biomedical Engineering
Case Western Reserve University
School of Medicine
Initial Submission Issues

- Scientific Advisory Board was asked to review the process and make recommendations
Introduction of an Expert Core Lab

- In the initial analysis, the event recordings were not interpreted by an experienced electrophysiologist, but by a technician.
- Overall, 41% of patients had atrial fibrillation at some point after the AFL ablation.
  - This was one factor that may have led to misinterpretation of the data.
- An unbiased and blinded expert core lab was recommended (Dr. Scheinman at UCSF) to accurately interpret the event recordings.
Representative Misinterpreted Event Recording
Success to Failure

EXPERT CORE LAB: AFL-PRESENT, A. TACH VS. AFLUTTER WITH 2:1 AV BLOCK

LIFEWATCH: SINUS TACHYCARDIA

MD Signature: 

Measurements:
- Rate: 117.6 - 119.4 (bpm)
- PR: 0.10 - 0.13 (s)

Tech / RN: sandra steiner, ms
Conclusions

- A careful and rigorous approach to have an unbiased, blinded expert core lab evaluate the event recordings
Event Recordings- Core Lab

Melvin Scheinman, M.D.
Professor of Medicine, Emeritus
University of California San Francisco
Walter H. Shorenstein
Endowed Chair in Cardiology
Process

- All event recordings were read independently by Dr. Scheinman and Dr. Yanfei Yang
  - Discrepancies were adjudicated but final decision made by Dr. Scheinman
- Read individual event recordings per patient
- No other ancillary information
- Blinded to the study protocol
- Blinded to original LifeWatch reading
Form Used

ECG CORE LAB CASE REPORT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT ID</th>
<th>PT INITIAL</th>
<th>DATE TRANSMISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Atrial Fibrillation
- [ ] Absent
- [ ] Present
- [ ] Cannot be determined

Atrial Flutter
- [ ] Absent
- [ ] Present
- [ ] Cannot be determined

Comments:

---

CRYOCOR, Inc.
Difficulties of Interpreting Without all the Clinical Information

- Artifacts
- Coarse atrial fibrillation mimicking atrial flutter
- Slow atrial flutter vs. atrial tachycardia
Artifact/Indeterminate
Sinus Rhythm- Artifact
Sinus Rhythm with Artifact
Coarse Atrial Fibrillation
Transient Atrial Flutter
Only seen on one event recording
AT vs Slow Flutter
Conclusions

- Event recordings alone can be difficult to interpret.
- Sometimes more information is available to make the appropriate clinical evaluation:
  - Unable to tell if AFL is CTI dependent.
  - If there was only one episode where AFL was unable to be excluded, it was considered a failure.
  - Atrial tachycardias- the clinician has pre-ablation data to differentiate AT from AFL.
Study Results

James Daubert, M.D.
Associate Professor of Medicine
Director of Electrophysiology Service
University of Rochester Medical Center
Patient Accountability

Enrolled 189 Patients

- 26 pts did not have isthmus dependent AFL
- 1 pt withdrew consent

Isthmus Dependent AFL 162 Patients

- 1 patient developed AAx resistant AFib
- 1 device failure

CryoCor Catheter Inserted 160 Patients

AAx= antiarrhythmic medication
Patient Enrollment by Site

# subjects = 160
# sites = 24
Avg enrollment per site = 6.7 pts
## Subject Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subject No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>122/38 (77% male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean ± SD)</td>
<td>63.03 ± 9.25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF History</td>
<td>94 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiomyopathy</td>
<td>16 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive Heart Failure</td>
<td>27 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>27 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>84 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic Heart Disease</td>
<td>30 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>44 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous MI</td>
<td>26 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Hypertension</td>
<td>98 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Abuse</td>
<td>18 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejection Fraction &lt;= 40</td>
<td>25 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 patients had prior ablations: Afib (PVI) and WPW
Antiarrhythmic Drug Use

- 57 (36%) were on AAx for Afib at time of ablation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMIODARONE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLECAINIDE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPafenone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTALOL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOFETILIDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCAINAMIDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cavo-Tricuspid Isthmus Dependent Atrial Flutter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterclockwise</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>(78.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clockwise</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acute Procedural Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Freezes</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Effective Freezes</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Freeze Time (min)</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Temp °C</td>
<td>-81.52</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Temp °C</td>
<td>-85.56</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoroscopy Time (min)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure Time (hrs)*</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 30 or 60 minute wait time
Acute Safety (7 day SAE rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>95% One-Sided CL</th>
<th>95% Two-Sided CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Day SAEs</td>
<td>9/160</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>UCL: 9.61%</td>
<td>(3.02%; 10.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Day SAEs (D&amp;P)</td>
<td>4/160*</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>UCL: 5.63%</td>
<td>(0.69%; 6.28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Device and Procedure Related SAEs
- Post Procedural hematoma
- AV block requiring permanent pacemaker
- Tamponade 6 days after procedure
- Acute respiratory failure

All SAEs were adjudicated by the DSMB
## Chronic Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Endpoint</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>95% One-Sided CL</th>
<th>95% Two-Sided CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAEs post-7 days</td>
<td>28/160</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>UCL: 23.06%</td>
<td>(12.41%; 24.14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no device or procedure related events

There were 3 deaths during the study – 2 suicides and a pulmonary embolus that was unrelated to the procedure
Acute Procedural Success-Bidirectional Cavo-tricuspid Isthmus Block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>95% One-Sided CL</th>
<th>95% Two-Sided CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140/160</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>82.36%</td>
<td>(81.36%; 92.19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 19 pts crossed over to RF
- 1 pt had heart block and received pacemaker
Chronic Effectiveness Analysis
Definition: Freedom from atrial flutter recurrence at 6 months

- Expert Core Lab (Primary Analysis)
  - Blinded interpretation by Dr. Scheinman
Chronic Effectiveness Based on Expert Core Lab Outcomes

- Survival Estimate: 81.60% LCI: 74.70% (Peto)
- Simple Proportion: 106/132 = 80.30% LCI: 72.39%
- OPC > 80%
Management of Patients with Recurrence
N=26

- 10 subjects underwent re-treatment for atrial flutter
  - 5 with cryoablation
  - 5 with RF
- One electrical Cardioversion for AFL
- 2 started on Amiodarone for AFL
- 13 were as a treated as a “clinical” success
Clinical Determination

- 30-15- one tracing interpreted by Scheinman as AFL. Clinically felt to be PAF. No changes in medication as a result. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 31-07- Scheinman interpretation- AFL with variable AV block, coarse AFib possible. Only one tracing. Other tracings were all afib. Treating clinician reviewed all tracings and interpreted as atrial fibrillation and not atrial flutter. Propafenone was stopped as a result with no further AAx started. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 36-04- only one tracing interpreted as atrial flutter by Scheinman. Clinical interpretation was atrial fibrillation. No AAx changed. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 37-03 only one event recording that was read as Atach vs atrial flutter with 2:1 AV block. According to treating clinician this was non-sustained atrial tachycardia and not atrial flutter. Started the subject on Rhythmol at 6 mo visit. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 37-06- only one tracing with Aflutter. Clinically felt to have PAF and not atrial flutter. Treated with AAx for PAF. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 38-11 only one tracing with atrial flutter. No medication changes. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 39-03 Scheinman interpretations could not rule out atrial tachycardia. Clinically felt to be a success with no recurrence of atrial flutter. No medication changes.
- 40-01 only one tracing with interpretation of atrial flutter. Clinician did not feel it was atrial flutter. No medication changes. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 44-04 only one tracing with atrial flutter. Clinically felt not to be flutter. No medication changes. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 50-02 Scheinman interpretation was ? on AFL, probably not in view of other tracing could be fortuitous relationship of biphasic T and P wave. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 51-03 only one tracing interpreted by Scheinman as atrial flutter. Clinician interpreted tracings as AFib and not atrial flutter with ECGs. Clinically felt to be a success.
- 52-02 Scheinman interpretations as Atrial flutter or atrial tachycardia. Clinically felt to be a success and AAx were stopped.
- 52-05 Clinically felt to be a success and there were no medication changes.
Chronic Effectiveness Analysis
Definition: Freedom from atrial flutter recurrence at 6 months

- Clinical Determination (Post Hoc Analysis)
  - All patients were re-evaluated by Dr. Barold
  - Based on clinical interpretation of patient’s entire file taking into account treating physician’s opinion
Clinical Determination

Sinus Rhythm

AFL - considered a failure “could be fortuitous relationship of biphasic T and P wave”

Asymptomatic during all event recording, only one tracing was called potentially AFL
• Expert Core Lab interpretation- AFL with variable AV block, coarse AFib possible. Only one tracing. Other tracings were all afib.

• Treating clinician reviewed all tracings and interpreted as atrial fibrillation and not atrial flutter.

• Propafenone was stopped as a result with no further AAx started. Clinically felt to be a success.
Clinical Determination

5. Additional comments not addressed in previous sections:

Patient has symptomatic atrial tachycardia (non-sustained), not atrial flutter. We will begin treatment with Rhythmol SR 25mg BID.
Chronic Effectiveness Based on Clinical Determination

| Survival Estimate | 90.50% | 85.70% (Peto) | 95.60% |
## Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Endpoint</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>95% Two-Sided CL</th>
<th>OPC 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute Safety</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>(3.02%; 10.35%)</td>
<td>&lt;7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Safety (D/P)*</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>(0.69%; 6.28%)</td>
<td>&lt;7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Effectiveness</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>(81.36%; 92.19%)</td>
<td>≥80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Effectiveness**</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
<td>(74.70%; 88.40%)</td>
<td>≥80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Effectiveness ***</td>
<td>90.50%</td>
<td>(85.70%; 95.60%)</td>
<td>≥80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Device and Procedure Related  
**As per strict electrogram interpretation (primary analysis)  
***As per clinical analysis
Maastricht Cryoablation Atrial Flutter Clinical Study

Hein Wellens, M.D.
Emeritus Professor of Cardiology
University of Maastricht, The Netherlands
Methods

- All patients who underwent cryoablation with the CryoCor System at the Academic Hospital of Maastricht were prospectively placed into a database from June 2001 to January 2006.
- Those patients with isthmus dependent atrial flutter who would have met the inclusion criteria for the US study were evaluated.
- Exclusions—
  - underwent second EP study/ablation (PVI) during f/u
  - <3 months follow-up
Methods (con’t)

- Procedures performed by 2 experienced electrophysiologists
- Patients did not receive sedation for the ablation
- There was a 30 minute waiting period after the last ablation with the addition of isoproterenol.
- Follow-up: all patients came back to the outpatient clinic at 1, 3, 6 months and yearly or if symptoms developed
  - 24 hour Holter at 1, 3 and 6 months
Catheter-Based Cryoablation Permanently Cures Patients With Common Atrial Flutter

Randy Manusama, MD; Carl Timmermans, MD; Froylan Limon, MD; Suzanne Philippens, RN; Harry J.G.M. Crijns, MD; Luz-Maria Rodriguez, MD

Background—Cryoablation (cryo) has a high success rate in the short-term treatment of atrial flutter (AFL), but evidence of long-term efficacy is lacking. The present study reports the long-term effect of cryo of the cavo-tricuspid isthmus (CTI) in patients with common AFL.

Methods and Results—Thirty-five consecutive patients (28 men; mean age, 53 years) underwent cryo of the CTI. In 34 patients, the AFL had a counterclockwise rotation (cycle length, 242±43 ms). Eleven patients had structural heart disease. Cryo was performed with a 10F catheter with a 6-mm-tip electrode (CryoCor). Applications (3 to 5 minutes each) were delivered by use of a point-by-point technique to create the ablation line. The acute endpoint of the procedure was creation of bidirectional isthmus conduction block and noninducibility of AFL. A median of 14 applications (range, 4 to 30) at 10 sites (range, 4 to 19) was given along the CTI with a mean temperature of −80.0±5.0°C. Mean fluoroscopy and procedure times were 40±26 minutes and 3.2±1.3 hours, respectively. Of the 35 patients, 34 were acutely successfully ablated (97%). After a mean follow-up of 17.6±6.2 months (range, 9.6 to 26.1 months), 31 patients (89%) did not have recurrence of AFL. Three of the 4 patients with recurrence had a second successful procedure. One patient had transient ST elevation in the inferior leads during cryoapplication.

Conclusions—Cryo produces permanent bidirectional isthmus conduction block of the CTI. Short- and long-term success rates are comparable to those for radiofrequency ablation. (Circulation. 2004;109:1636-1639.)
111 consecutive patients

- 77.5% male (86/25)
- Average age was 56.5 +/- 13.3 years
- 78.4% had history of AF (87)

Similar demographics as US pivotal study
### Maastricht Cryoablation Atrial Flutter Clinical Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute effectiveness</td>
<td>104/111= <strong>93.69%</strong></td>
<td>(87.44%; 97.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Effectiveness at 6 months</td>
<td>91/97  = <strong>93.81%</strong></td>
<td>(87.02%; 97.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 patients did not have 6 month follow-up
Maastricht Cryoablation Atrial Flutter Clinical Study

- Survival Function
- 95% CI (with Peto Lower Bound)

Days

Survival
Conclusions

- CryoCor System has excellent clinical effectiveness
- A similar clinical outcome as the US Clinical Analysis
- Sedation was not necessary during the ablation
Randomized Study Comparing Radiofrequency Ablation With Cryoablation for the Treatment of Atrial Flutter With Emphasis on Pain Perception

Carl Timmermans, MD; Gregory M. Ayers, MD; Harry J.G.M. Crijns, MD; Luz-Maria Rodriguez, MD

Background—Radiofrequency ablation (RF) of atrial flutter (AFL) has a high procedural efficacy, a low recurrence rate, and reports of procedure-related pain. The aim of the present study was to compare RF with cryoablation (cryo) for the treatment of AFL, with emphasis on pain perception during application of energy.

Methods and Results—Fourteen patients (55 ± 11 years, 11 males) with AFL were randomized to receive ablation of the cavotricuspid isthmus (CTI) by either RF or cryo. Cryothermia was delivered with the CryoCor Cryoablation System (10F, 6-mm tip), and radiofrequency energy was delivered with the use of an 8-mm-tip catheter. Pain was evaluated according to a visual analogue scale (VAS; 0 to 100). All patients in the cryo group were successfully ablated with a mean of 18 applications (9 sites), and RF was successful in 6 of 7 patients (not significant) with 13 applications (not significant). The mean temperature was −82°C and 55°C for cryo and RF, respectively. One patient in the cryo group perceived pain, versus all 7 patients in the RF group (P < 0.05). The proportion of painful applications averaged 75.3% in the RF group and 2.0% in the cryo group (P < 0.05), whereas the corresponding VAS for pain was 38.3 ± 25.3 and 0.32 ± 0.86, respectively (P < 0.05). At 6-month follow-up, there were no recurrences of atrial flutter.

Conclusion—Cryo, as compared with RF, produces significantly less pain during application. Although in the present study there was no significant difference in efficacy, larger studies will be needed to definitively compare efficacy. (Circulation. 2003;107:1248-1250.)

Key Words: atrial flutter ■ catheter ablation ■ arrhythmia
Methods

- 14 consecutive patients with isthmus dependent atrial flutter
- Randomized to RF or Cryo (CryoCor System)
  - Patients were blinded to the energy source
- Pain was evaluated using a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) from 0 to 100 at the end of each application
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RF</th>
<th>Cryo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># applications</td>
<td>94 (13 ± 11)</td>
<td>125 (18 ± 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Temp.</td>
<td>55±4°C (50-60°C)</td>
<td>-82±5°C (-69 to -89°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmus block</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># patients who experienced pain</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Time</td>
<td>90 sec</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

**% of Painful Applications**
- RF: 71/94 (75%)
- Cryo: 2/125 (2%)

**Mean Pain Score (1-100)**
- RF: 38.3
- Cryo: 0.32

*p value <0.0001*
Conclusions

- Cryoenergy was significantly less painful than RF
- Cryoenergy is more patient friendly than RF
- Avoids the complications of sedation
  - Especially in certain patient populations- i.e.: COPD; sleep apnea; morbid obesity
- Less patient movement due to pain
Conclusions

Albert Waldo, M.D.
The Walter H. Pritchard Professor of Cardiology, Professor of Medicine, and Professor of Biomedical Engineering
Case Western Reserve University
School of Medicine
Data to Support Approval

- Pre-clinical Data
  - Lesion sizes as large as RF
- US Pivotal Trial
  - Provided data demonstrating a reasonable level of safety and effectiveness
- Maastricht Confirmatory Clinical Study
- Pain study
  - Demonstrated a unique advantage of Cryoablation over RF
Summary

- Results with the CryoCor System are comparable to published RF ablation literature
- Objective Performance Criteria were based on 4 studies using RF ablation where chronic success was determined by routine clinical follow-up alone without the use of event recordings
- Using event recordings can lead to an increased detection of atrial flutter, but may also pick up other atrial arrhythmias that are not endpoints of the study
  - Atrial fibrillation
  - Non-isthmus dependent atrial flutter
  - Clinically insignificant atrial arrhythmias
Summary

- There may be important populations where Cryoablation provides a distinct advantage
- There is no other approved cryoablation device for the treatment of atrial flutter

Conclusion

We Believe this Study Demonstrated a Reasonable Level of Safety and Effectiveness