One-Year Outcomes after Amulet or Watchman/FLX Device for Percutaneous Left Atrial Appendage Closure:

Pre-Specified Analyses of the SWISS-APERO Randomized Clinical Trial

Roberto Galea, MD

Department of Cardiology, Bern University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland on behalf of the SWISSAPERO Trial Investigators



roberto.galea@insel.ch



Disclosure of Relevant Financial Relationships

I, Roberto Galea, DO NOT have any relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Acknowledgements

Images of Amplatzer Amulet device are reproduced with permission of Abbott, © 2021. All rights reserved. Images of Watchman FLX have been provided courtesy of Boston Scientific, ©2021 Boston Scientific Corporation or its affiliates. All rights reserved.



Background and objectives

- Residual LAA patency after LAAC has been associated with higher thromboembolic risk, especially when detected remotely after the procedure.
- Watchman FLX and Amulet devices are the two most frequently used devices for LAAC worldwide and SwissApero Trial is the first randomized comparison between them. The main findings of the study showed a similar LAA sealing performance of the two devices at 45-day CCTA.
- In these pre-specified subanalyses of SwissApero Trial, we compared Watchman FLX and Amulet in terms of LAA patency and DRT at 13-month CCTA, besides clinical outcomes through 13 months.





SWISS-APERO Trial Design



Pre-specified Analyses

Primary Analyses

Comparison of two study groups in terms of:

- Residual LAA patency and related subtypes at 13-month CCTA
- DRT at 13-month CCTA
- 13-month clinical outcomes ٠

- All cause or cardiovascular death All stroke, ischemic or haemorrhagic stroke Systemic or Pulmonary embolism Bleeding according to the BARC classification

Both imaging and clinical endpoints were centrally adjudicated

Secondary Analysis

Comparison of 45-day and 13-month CCTAs with the aim of exploring the evolution of LAA patency and related subtypes during the first year after procedure





LAA Patency subtypes





Baseline characteristics and post-LAAC antithrombotic therapy regimen



• Male: 70.6%

ACRE

- Prior cerebrovascular event: 39.3%
- Mean CHA2DS2-VASc score: 4.3
- Mean HASBLED score 3.1
- Prior relevant bleeding: 87.8%





Patent Appendage rate at 13-month CCTA



AMULET 53.6% (n=45/84)

VS. 1.10 (0.81-1.48); P= 0.537 WATCHMAN FLX 48.8% (n=39/80)



	Amulet N = 84	Watchman/FLX N = 80	Amulet vs Watchman/FLX Risk Ratio (95% Cl)	P value
PDL or MIL, no. (%)	24 (28.6%)	22 (27.5%)	1.04 (0.64-1.70)	0.879
IDL, no. (%)	20 (23.8%)	14 (17.5%)	1.36 (0.74-2.51)	0.319
PANVL, no. (%)	6 (7.1%)	10 (12.5%)	0.57 (0.22-1.50)	0.248

Device Related Thrombus rate at 13-month CCTA



 AMULET
 WATCHMAN FLX

 1.2%
 VS.
 1.3%

 (n=1/84)
 0.95 (0.06-14.97);
 (n=1/80)

 P= 0.972
 (n=1/80)

	Amulet N = 84	Watchman/FLX N = 80	Amulet vs Watchman/FLX Risk Ratio (95% Cl)	P value
Definite or possible DRT, no. (%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.8%)	0.63 (0.11-3.70)	0.610





13-Month Clinical Follow-up

	Amulet N = 111	Watchman/FLX N = 110	Amulet vs Watchman/FLX Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P value
Composite of CV death, stroke or systemic embolism, no. (%)	10 (9.5%)	11 (10.2%)	0.91 (0.39-2.14)	0.829
Death, no. (%)	13 (11.7%)	11 (10.1%)	1.19 (0.53-2.66)	0.671
Cardiovascular death, no. (%)	8 (7.7%)	9 (8.3%)	0.90 (0.35-2.33)	0.823
Stroke, no. (%)	3 (2.7%)	4 (3.7%)	0.75 (0.17-3.35)	0.706
Ischaemic stroke, no. (%)	3 (2.7%)	3 (2.9%)	1.00 (0.20-4.95)	0.999
Haemorrhagic stroke, no. (%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0.33 (0.01-8.01)	0.498
Systemic or Pulmonary embolism, no. (%)	3 (2.9%)	1 (0.9%)	3.00 (0.31-28.88)	0.341
Systemic embolism, no. (%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0.33 (0.01-8.01)	0.498
Pulmonary embolism, no. (%)	3 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6.94 (0.36-132.79)	0.247
Any bleeding, no. (%)	45 (40.8%)	34 (31.4%)	1.46 (0.93-2.28)	0.098
Minor bleeding (BARC 1-2), no. (%)	32 (29.4%)	26 (24.3%)	1.31 (0.78-2.20)	0.302
Major bleeding (BARC 3-5), no. (%)	18 (16.5%)	10 (9.3%)	1.84 (0.85-3.99)	0.122

Evolution of Residual LAA Patency During the First 13 Months After LAAC

(analysis including 158 of 221 randomized patients where LAA patency was assessable by both 45-day and 13-month CCTA)



30.5% of 45-day PA resolved at 13-months after LAAC

CRF'

Only 13.2% of appendages became patent later than 45 days PDL/MIL was the PA subtype <u>more frequently persistent</u> over the 1st year

Study Limitations

- Open label study: the two devices can be easily distinguished during CCTA assessment
- Trial not powered to show differences with regard to clinical endpoints
- Minority yet sizable proportion of Watchman/FLX patients received Watchman 2.5
- A relevant percentage of randomized patients died before undergoing 13-month CCTA follow-up, due to the high-risk population included in
 CRF this study

Conclusions

- Among patients undergoing clinically indicated LAAC and in whom LAA anatomy was deemed suitable for both Amulet and Watchman FLX devices:
 - Rates of <u>PA, its subtypes and DRT</u> at 13-month CCTA were similar between the randomised device groups
 - Rates of <u>clinical outcomes</u> at 13 months did not differ between the study groups.

Two thirds of 45-day PAs and especially those related to side-gap leaks, persisted at 13 months.

