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Cardiac contractility modulation (CCM) signals are nonexcitatory electrical signals delivered during the cardiac absolute refractory period that enhance the strength of cardiac muscular contraction. Prior research in experimental and human heart failure has shown that CCM signals normalize phosphorylation of key proteins and expression of genes coding for proteins involved in regulation of calcium cycling and contraction. The results of prior clinical studies of CCM have supported its safety and efficacy. A large-scale clinical study, the FIX-HF-5 study, is currently underway to test the safety and efficacy of this treatment. In this article, we provide an overview of the system used to deliver CCM signals, the implant procedure, and the details and rationale of the FIX-HF-5 study design. Baseline characteristics for patients randomized in this trial are also presented. (Am Heart J 2008;156:641-648.e1.)

Cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) enhances pump function, improves quality of life, improves exercise tolerance, and reduces hospitalizations and mortality in the population of patients with chronic heart failure (CHF) for which it is indicated; namely, patients with ejection fraction (EF) <35%, New York Heart Association (NYHA), class III or IV symptoms with QRS duration >120-130 milliseconds.1-3 Nevertheless, <50% of patients with CHF meet QRS duration criteria for CRT; approximately 30% of patients receiving CRT are considered nonresponders because their symptoms do not improve1 and CRT does not improve clinical status in patients with normal QRS duration.4 Moreover, despite major advances in drug and device therapies, heart failure remains a cause of substantial disability, hospitalizations, and mortality. Thus, there is a crucial need for additional safe and effective heart failure therapies.

Cardiac contractility modulation (CCM) is a new electrical device-based approach developed for the treatment of CHF.5,6 Cardiac contractility modulation signals are nonexcitatory electrical signals applied during the cardiac absolute refractory period that enhance the strength of cardiac muscular contraction.7 Cardiac contractility modulation signals are delivered by a device (the OPTIMIZER, IMPULSE Dynamics, Orangeburg, NY) that looks like an implanted cardio-defibrillator (ICD) or pacemaker and attaches to the heart via standard pacing electrodes. Cardiac contractility modulation signal application has been associated with normalization of phosphorylation of key proteins and expression of genes coding for proteins involved in regulation of calcium cycling and contraction.5,8,9 These findings, in both animals and humans, further suggest that the improvements in contractile strength are not associated with increases in myocardial oxygen consumption.8,10

The results of prior clinical studies of CCM have supported its safety and efficacy6 including a recent double-blind, double crossover study in 164 patients.11 This latter study showed that 3 months of CCM treatment improved quality of life and exercise tolerance as judged by peak VO₂. A large-scale clinical study, called the FIX-HF-5 study, is currently underway to further test the safety and efficacy of this form of treatment. The purpose of this
The Optimizer III System consists of (A) an IPG with a rechargeable battery that delivers CCM signals and an atrial and 2 ventricular pacing leads (Alead, Vlead,1, and Vlead,2, respectively); (B) an IPG programmer; (C) a hemodynamic monitoring system; and (D) an IPG charger used by patients in their home.

The Optimizer III System (Figure 1) consists of an implantable pulse generator (IPG) with a rechargeable battery that delivers CCM signals (described below), an atrial and 2 ventricular pacing leads, an IPG programmer (similar to a standard pacer/ICD programmer), a hemodynamic monitoring system that calculates the maximal rate of left ventricular pressure generation (LV dP/dtmax) during the system implant, and an IPG charger used by patients at their home. The procedures for device implantation have been detailed previously. In brief, the atrial lead is used only for sensing and is placed in the same manner as for other standard pacemaker or defibrillator implantations (Figure 2). The ventricular leads, used for both sensing local electrical activity and CCM signal delivery, are pacing leads placed on the right ventricular (RV) septum. The goal is to ensure that electrodes are placed such that when CCM signals are applied they will impact on LV function. Therefore, CCM signals are applied and changes in dP/dtmax are measured (Figure 3). An acute increase of dP/dtmax ≥5% within approximately 10 minutes of signal application is considered adequate. If such a response is not elicited, the leads can be repositioned. If an increase in dP/dtmax is not measured after repositioning leads several times, the OPTIMIZER System is not implanted.

Cardiac contractility modulation signals used in this study consist of 2 biphasic square-wave pulses with peak-to-peak amplitude of ±7.73 V that are applied 20 to 40 milliseconds after detection of electrical activation at the first ventricular lead. Cardiac contractility modulation signal delivery is suspended upon detection of suspected ectopic beats (and during atrial fibrillation) and is reinitiated once the device senses 3 consecutive normal sinus beats. The device is programmed to deliver CCM signals for five 1-hour periods spaced equally throughout the 24 hours of the day.

Finally, the battery of the IPG is a rechargeable lithium-ion battery. Each patient receives a charging unit (Figure 1, D), and they are instructed to charge...
the device once per week. When performed at this frequency, a charging session lasts approximately 90 minutes.

**FIX-HF-5 study overview and objectives**

The FIX-HF-5 study is a prospective, randomized, parallel-controlled, trial of optimal medical therapy (OMT) alone (control group) versus OMT plus CCM (treatment group) (Figure 4). The objectives of the FIX-HF-5 study are to evaluate the safety (event-free survival) and efficacy (exercise tolerance and quality of life) of the OPTIMIZER System in subjects with moderate to severe heart failure despite OMT (including drug therapies and an ICD), ejection fraction ≤35%, and no indication for CRT.

**Study population**

The trial design required randomization of 428 subjects to achieve its prespecified statistical power of 80% to test hypotheses for the safety and efficacy of CCM therapy (detailed below). Subjects were randomized at 50 sites in the United States. Recruitment began in March 2005 and was completed in June 2007.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are summarized in Table 1. In brief, the study recruited patients with EF ≤35% with NYHA class III or IV symptoms despite medical treatment with angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor (ACE-I) and/or angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) and β-blockers for at least 3 months who were in normal sinus rhythm and not indicated for a CRT device. Unless there were extenuating circumstances, patients were required to have an ICD.

The overall study flow is summarized in Figure 4 and Table II. After obtaining informed consent and passing baseline testing (as summarized in Table II), a device implant date was scheduled in the electrophysiology laboratory. Subjects were then randomized 1:1 to either the control group or to the treatment (CCM) group.

Subjects randomized to the treatment group underwent device implantation. For subjects not already having an ICD, one was implanted at the same time as the OPTIMIZER System implant. For determining the dates of follow-up visits, the implant date was used as the start date of study. Subjects randomized to the control group who required ICD implantation underwent that procedure within the same timeframe relative to baseline testing, as the treatment group. In these patients, the date of ICD implantation served as the study start date. Finally, for subjects randomized to the control group already having an ICD, an implant was not performed so the date of putative implant served as a study start date. Subjects in both groups were followed identically (except for interrogation of the investigational device) for 50 weeks as detailed in Table II. The first follow-up visit was at 2 weeks after the start of the study, at which time the OPTIMIZER System was interrogated and activated in those patients randomized to the treatment group.

Major follow-up visits were at weeks 12, 24, and 50, at which time cardiopulmonary stress test (CPX), Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionaire (MLWHFQ), 6-minute walk test (6MW), NYHA class, echocardiograms, and Holter monitor tests were repeated. Additional follow-up visits occurred at weeks 4 and 36; these were for clinical follow-up and device interrogations. At the conclusion of the 50-week follow-up period, patients in the control group completed participation in the study. Patients in the treatment group continue to be followed at 3-month intervals for adverse events and device interrogations.

**Approach to reducing placebo effect and bias**

Although a double-blind trial design using an implanted control as used in some implantable device trials (including the prior studies of the Optimizer11,12) was initially considered, a number of factors made this approach impractical for the present study. To obtain sufficient assurance of device safety, it was deemed necessary to acquire parallel-group controlled safety data over a 1-year period of follow-up. This extended period of follow-up created several challenges. First, the process of battery recharging created numerous opportunities for patient, study coordinator, and investigator unblinding. Second, ethical concerns were raised about subjecting control group patients to implantation of a device that would not be turned on for at least 1 year.
Given the unblinded nature of the study, several measures were taken to minimize the placebo effect and investigator bias. First, as detailed below, the primary efficacy end point of the study is ventilatory anaerobic threshold (VAT). This parameter is measured during CPX testing and is an effort-independent parameter of exercise tolerance that is not known to be subject to the placebo effect. Importantly, neither the patient nor the test preceptor has knowledge of the value of the VAT during the conduct of the test, and its value cannot be manipulated. All CPX tests are sent to a single core laboratory for evaluation by 2 independent readers blinded to treatment group. Second, the primary safety end point of the study is the composite of all-cause mortality and all-cause hospitalization. This objective end point has been used in prior unblinded studies of heart failure treatment. Moreover, an independent Events Adjudication Committee (EAC) evaluates original records of every hospitalization and death. Third, clinical assessments of NYHA are done by a blinded clinician interview. In addition, each patient completes a questionnaire that is specially designed and validated to allow a blinded core laboratory to assign an NYHA classification. Finally, echocardiograms are read at a blinded core laboratory. Core laboratory sites and directors are listed in Appendix C available online.

**Efforts to ensure cardiopulmonary stress test quality**

Several measures were taken to optimize the quality CPX tests at all sites. These measures included the following: (1) on-site training on standardized procedures for conducting CPX tests and electronic transfer of data to the core laboratory; (2) site revalidation every 6 months; and (3) rapid feedback on test quality from the core laboratory (on the day they are performed).

Once obtained, metabolic data are sent to the blinded CPX core laboratory for analysis. Ventilatory anaerobic threshold, peak VO₂, and VE/VCO₂ slope are determined from averaged 30-second gas exchange data from the start of exercise to the end of exercise. Ventilatory anaerobic threshold is determined using the V-slope method. To avoid interobserver bias, the average of VAT determined by 2 independent readers of the core laboratory is reported. If, however, the 2 readings differ by >10% or one or both of the readers is unable to identify the value of VAT, a third independent reading is obtained.
The average of the 2 values falling within 10% of each other is taken as the value to be used in analysis. If, however, all 3 readings disagree by $\geq 10\%$, VAT is considered indeterminate.\cite{16}

Events Adjudication Committee and Data Safety Monitoring Board

An EAC was established to review records of hospitalizations, deaths, and serious adverse events. This committee is composed of 3 independent cardiologists experienced in the adjudication process (Appendix B available online). The committee ensured consistent designation of events constituting a hospitalization. Specifically, protocol-specified hospitalizations include an admission that results in a calendar date change or is related to an adverse event that causes a prolongation of the index hospitalization for device implantation. The committee also adjudicates the cardiac and heart failure relatedness of deaths and hospitalizations.

An independent Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) was established to review aggregate safety data and monitor for the emergence of any significant safety concerns. The DSMB is composed of 5 members with clinical trial experience in heart failure, electrophysiology, and statistics not otherwise participating in the study (Appendix B available online). The DSMB is unblinded to study group assignment.

Statistical considerations and analysis plan

The trial’s primary measure of effectiveness is the change from baseline in the VAT on CPX testing. The primary efficacy analysis is a superiority analysis comparing “responder” rates between the treatment and control groups at the 24-week follow-up visit. An individual subject will be considered a responder if V_{AT} increases by $\geq 20\%$ at 24 weeks compared to their respective baseline value. Responder rates between randomization arms is by a one-sided Fisher exact test with an $\alpha$ of .025. Secondary efficacy end points are peak VO$_2$ and quality of life assessed by MLWHFQ. Each of these parameters will also be assessed by a responder analysis, similar to V_{AT}, with a 20% increase in peak VO$_2$ and a 10-point reduction in MLWHFQ used to define a responder. The type I error rate is maintained across multiple tests of efficacy by employing a closed form hierarchical testing procedure.

The primary safety end point is the composite event rate of all-cause mortality and all-cause hospitalization.

---

### Table I. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age $\geq 18$ y</td>
<td>1. Indicated for CRT (ie, QRS duration $\geq 130$ ms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Baseline EF $\leq 35%$ by echocardiography</td>
<td>2. Potentially correctible cause of heart failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Treated for heart failure for at least 90 d with appropriate, stable medical therapy during the 30 d before enrollment consisting of diuretics, ACE inhibitor, or angiotensin II receptor blocker and $\beta$-blocker unless intolerance; “stable” dosing is defined as not more than a 100% increase or 50% decrease in dose.</td>
<td>3. Clinically significant angina pectoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New York Heart Association class III or IV</td>
<td>4. Hospitalized for heart failure which required the use of inotropic support within 30 d of enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Should have an ICD or agree to undergo implantation (unless there is a compelling reason to the contrary)</td>
<td>5. Clinically significant amount of ambient ectopy ($\geq$ 8900 PVCs per 24 h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For female subjects of childbearing potential, must be using a medically approved method of birth control, must be surgically sterilized and should agree to continue to use birth control throughout the study</td>
<td>6. PR interval $\geq 275$ ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Willing and able to return for all follow-up visits</td>
<td>7. Chronic (permanent or persistent) atrial fibrillation or atrial flutter or cardioverted within 30 d of enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides informed consent to participate in the study</td>
<td>8. Exercise tolerance limited by a condition other than heart failure or unable to participate in a 6-min walk or a cardiopulmonary stress test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Coronary bypass surgery within 90 d or PCI within 30 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Myocardial infarction within 90 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Mechanical tricuspid or aortic valves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Prior heart transplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Participating in another experimental protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Unable to provide informed consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PVC, Premature ventricular contractions; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention.
through 50 weeks. The primary safety analysis is a test of the noninferiority of CCM therapy compared to OMT with respect to the proportion of subjects experiencing death or hospitalization within 50 weeks using the Blackwelder noninferiority test with a prespecified noninferiority margin of 0.125. In addition, the time to the first composite safety event (all-cause mortality and all-cause hospitalization) will be summarized in each group using Kaplan-Meier estimated survival curves, and the equality of the curves between groups will be assessed using the log-rank test.

Justification of sample size

The trial’s sample size was calculated based on the primary safety end point and chosen to ensure adequate power (80%) to declare the safety of CCM therapy was not inferior to OMT. We assumed a conservative event rate (mortality or hospitalization for any cause) of 50%. The noninferiority margin was selected to be 12.5%, and \( \alpha \) was set at .05, which resulted in a sample size of 198 subjects per group. A small percentage of patients (5%-7%) were expected to be lost to follow-up, so that a total sample size of 428 patients (214 per group) was selected.

Additional analyses

A series of additional safety and efficacy analyses will be performed. These analyses, descriptive in nature, will include comparisons between groups of changes from baseline in NYHA, 6MW distance, left ventricular ejection fraction, and left ventricular end-diastolic dimension. Additional safety analyses include all-cause mortality, cardiac mortality, heart failure mortality, all-cause hospitalizations, cardiac-related hospitalizations, heart failure-related hospitalizations, and overall incidence and seriousness of adverse events.

Methods of imputation of missing efficacy data

There are instances when study subjects perform a CPX test but for which a value of VAT cannot be ascertained by the core laboratory. In addition, a number of subjects will miss visits or will withdraw from the study. Preliminary experience in the early stage of this study and data taken from other trials using CPX testing suggest that the rate of missing VAT values for all reasons could be 20% or more. To account for missing data, multiple imputation analyses will be used. When a subject is missing VAT at either baseline or 24 weeks, but has a value of peak VO\(_2\) at the respective visit, a value of VAT can be imputed using stochastic regression based on peak VO\(_2\) and the respiratory exchange ratio. When a subject is missing VAT at both baseline and 24 weeks, the VAT difference can be imputed using stochastic regression based difference in peak VO\(_2\) and the respiratory exchange ratio. Finally, when a subject is missing both peak VO\(_2\) and VAT at 24 weeks, a
propensity matching and random selection method of imputation shall be used.

Baseline characteristics of enrolled study subjects

Between March 2005 and June 2007, 773 potential study subjects provided informed consent to participate in this study. From among these patients, 428 subjects passed baseline screening and were randomized to either the control group (n = 213) or the treatment group (n = 215). The baseline characteristics of these patients are summarized in Table III. Overall, these characteristics are balanced between groups and are consistent with the study inclusion and exclusion criteria. Medication and ICD use at baseline are summarized in Table IV and Table V, respectively. As shown, 91% of subjects were taking ACE-I and/or ARB and 93% were taking β-blockers; less than half were taking digoxin and aldosterone inhibitors. About 80% of subjects had an ICD prior to entry into the study. Another approximately 12% had an ICD placed at the start of the study. A few additional devices were implanted during the follow-up period. Overall, therefore, 95% of study subjects have an ICD.

Discussion

Despite major advances in drugs and devices to treat heart failure, many patients have persistent symptoms and exercise intolerance. A minority of patients are eligible for significant CRT, which is arguably, the most important advance in device-based treatment for heart failure over the past decade, and significant CRT nonresponder rates remain a limitation of this therapy. Preliminary studies with CCM suggest that this may be a viable treatment option for many of these patients. The FIX-HF-5 study is designed to provide additional evidence of safety and efficacy of CCM treatment delivered by the OPTIMIZER System. The cohort enrolled in the study is composed of patients with moderately advanced heart failure despite appropriate medical therapy not indicated for CRT.

There are 2 new and unique aspects of the present study design compared with prior studies of heart failure. First, is the use of VAT as the primary efficacy end point. Ventilatory anaerobic threshold is considered to be an unbiased measure of exercise tolerance not subject to placebo effect. Although VAT offers these potential advantages, it must also be acknowledged that this parameter has not been measured systematically in any prior large-scale study, nor have changes in VAT been correlated directly with changes in functional class or
outcomes. Finally, there is limited information on the impact of proven therapies on VAT.

A second unique aspect of the present study is the use of a responder analysis. In contrast to a comparison of mean changes in VAT between randomized groups, the results of a responder analysis would permit a treating physician to tell a patient his or her odds of showing a clinically significant improvement in exercise tolerance. However, there are no prior studies in which a responder analysis, applied to a continuous variable has been used as the prospective approach in determining the effectiveness of a new heart failure treatment. Therefore, there are no historical data for comparison of response rates in this trial to other trials of effective therapies for heart failure. Because of these 2 untested features of the study, it was considered important to include other more traditional parameters, peak VO₂ and MLWHFQ, as secondary end points.

With enrollment completed in June 2007, 50-week follow-up of the last enrolled patient is expected in June of 2008, with results to be available shortly thereafter. If proven safe and effective in this clinical trial, a new treatment option—CCM—will be available to a large group of patients that currently do not have other treatment options.
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