



Petersen, E. A. et al. (2022) Durability of high-frequency 10-kHz spinal cord stimulation for patients with painful diabetic neuropathy refractory to conventional treatments: 12-month results from a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*, 45(1), e3-e6.

(doi: [10.2337/dc21-1813](https://doi.org/10.2337/dc21-1813))

This is the Author Accepted Manuscript.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/260606/>

Deposited on: 7 January 2021

Durability of high-frequency 10 kHz spinal cord stimulation for patients with painful diabetic neuropathy refractory to conventional treatments: 12-month results from a randomized controlled trial

Short running title: 10 kHz SCS for refractory PDN

Erika A. Petersen MD¹, Thomas G. Stauss MD², James A. Scowcroft MD³, Elizabeth S. Brooks PhD⁴, Judith L. White MD⁵, Shawn M. Sills MD⁶, Kasra Amirdelfan MD⁷, Maged N. Guirguis MD⁸, Jijun Xu MD PhD⁹, Cong Yu MD¹⁰, Ali Nairizi MD¹¹, Denis G. Patterson DO¹¹, Kostandinos C. Tsoulfas MD², Michael J. Creamer DO¹², Vincent Galan MD¹³, Richard H. Bundschu MD¹⁴, Neel D. Mehta MD¹⁵, Dawood Sayed MD¹⁶, Shivanand P. Lad MD PhD¹⁷, David J. DiBenedetto MD¹⁸, Khalid A. Sethi MD¹⁹, Johnathan H. Goree MD²⁰, Matthew T. Bennett MD¹⁹, Nathan J. Harrison MD⁸, Atef F. Israel MD³, Paul Chang MD¹³, Paul W. Wu MD²¹, Charles E. Argoff MD²², Christian E. Nasr MD²³, Rod S. Taylor PhD²⁴, David L. Caraway MD PhD⁴, and Nagy A. Mekhail MD PhD⁹

¹Department of Neurosurgery, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, 4301 W Markham St, Little Rock, AR 72205 USA; ²Advanced Pain Management, 4131 W Loomis Rd Ste 300, Greenfield, WI 53221 USA; ³Pain Management Associates, 200 NE Missouri Rd Ste 103, Lee's Summit, MO 64086 USA; ⁴Nevro Corp., 1800 Bridge Pkwy, Redwood City, CA 94065 USA; ⁵AES Compass Orlando, 100 W Gore St Ste 102, Orlando, FL 32806 USA; ⁶Touchstone Interventional Pain Center, 2925 Siskiyou Blvd, Medford, OR 97504 USA; ⁷IPM Medical Group, 450 Wiget Lane, Walnut Creek, CA 94598 USA; ⁸Ochsner Health System, 2820 Napoleon Ave, New Orleans, LA 70115 USA; ⁹Department of Pain Management, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, 9500 Euclid Ave, Cleveland, OH 44195 USA; ¹⁰Swedish Medical Center, 600 Broadway Ste 530, Seattle, WA 98122 USA; ¹¹Nevada Advanced Pain Specialists, 5578 Longley Lane, Reno, NV 89511 USA; ¹²Central Florida Pain Relief Centers, 100 W Gore St Ste 500, Orlando, FL 32806 USA; ¹³Pain Care, 1365 Rock Quarry Rd Ste 202, Stockbridge, GA 30281 USA; ¹⁴Coastal Orthopedics and Sports Medicine, 6015 Pointe West Blvd, Bradenton, FL 34209 USA; ¹⁵Department of Anesthesiology, Weill Cornell Medical College, 2315 Broadway 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10024 USA; ¹⁶Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center, 3901 Rainbow Blvd Mail Stop 1034, Kansas City, KS 66160 USA; ¹⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Duke University, 40 Duke Medicine Circle, Durham, NC 27710 USA; ¹⁸Boston PainCare, 85 1st Ave, Waltham, MA 02451 USA; ¹⁹Department of Neurosurgery, United Health Services, 46 Harrison St, Johnson City, NY 13790 USA; ²⁰Department of Anesthesiology, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, 4301 W Markham St, Little Rock, AR 72205 USA; ²¹Holy Cross Hospital, 4725 N Federal Hwy, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 USA; ²²Department of Neurology, Albany Medical Center, 47 New Scotland Ave, Albany, NY 12208 USA; ²³Department of Endocrinology, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, 9500 Euclid Ave, Cleveland, OH 44195 USA; ²⁴Institute of Health and Well Being, University of Glasgow, Top Floor 200 Renfield St, Glasgow G2 3AX, Scotland UK

Corresponding author:

Dr. Erika Petersen
Department of Neurosurgery
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
4301 W Markham St
Little Rock, AR 72205 USA
epetersen@uams.edu
501-686-5270

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov - NCT03228420 (registered July 24, 2017). URL-
<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03228420>

Word count: 750

Figures: 1

Diabetic sensorimotor peripheral neuropathy is the most common complication of diabetes and results in potentially debilitating symptoms, including numbness, tingling, and frequently neuropathic pain. Approximately 20% of persons with diabetes will develop painful diabetic neuropathy (PDN) with paresthesia, burning, and shooting pain (1).

Currently, there are no disease-modifying treatments for PDN. Therapeutic goals include symptom management along with behavioral modifications to mitigate further damage (2). Neuropathic pain medications are recommended, including gabapentinoids, serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, tricyclic antidepressants, and opioids. Adherence to commonly prescribed PDN medications is poor due to inadequate pain relief or intolerable side effects.

Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) involves a surgically implanted device delivering mild electrical pulses to modulate chronic pain pathways. High-frequency (10 kHz) SCS provides superior pain relief for chronic back and leg pain, and recent data demonstrate it also results in substantial pain relief for PDN patients (3,4). This RCT evaluated the long-term impact of 10 kHz SCS for PDN patients with refractory symptoms.

Methods have been described previously (4). Participants had symptoms for at least 12 months that were refractory to medications, lower limb pain ≥ 5 on 10 cm visual analog scale (VAS), HbA1c $\leq 10\%$, BMI ≤ 45 kg/m². Participants were eligible to crossover at 6 months if they had $< 50\%$ pain relief, were dissatisfied with treatment, and the investigator deemed it medically appropriate. Temporary trial SCS evaluated eligibility for permanent device implant (Nevro Corp., Redwood City, CA) with success defined as $\geq 50\%$ pain relief. Neurologists trained investigators to perform comprehensive neurological examinations assessing lower limb motor strength, reflexes, and sensation, including pinprick and 10g monofilament. Paired t-tests assessed mean

percent change from baseline within treatment groups. Categorical variables were compared between treatment groups using Fisher's Exact test.

In total, 216 patients were randomized 1:1 to continued conventional medical management (CMM, n=103) or the addition of 10 kHz SCS to CMM (n=113). Treatment groups were well matched for baseline characteristics (4). Among participants assigned 10 kHz SCS+CMM, 104 proceeded to temporary trial SCS, and 90 received permanent device implants. In the CMM group, 95 completed 6-month follow-up and 81% (77/95) crossed to 10 kHz SCS, compared to none from the 10 kHz SCS+CMM arm ($p < .001$). Sixty-four participants received permanent device implants after crossover.

Mean lower limb pain VAS was 7.6 cm (95% CI: 7.2-7.9) for 10 kHz SCS+CMM patients at baseline, 1.7 cm (95% CI: 1.3-2.1) at 6 months and maintained at 1.7 cm (95% CI: 1.3-2.1) to 12 months, representing 77.1% mean pain relief (95% CI: 71.8-82.3, $p < .001$, Figure A). At both 6 and 12 months, 86% (72/84) were treatment responders, defined as those with at least 50% pain relief from baseline (Figure B). For the crossover group, mean baseline lower limb pain VAS was 7.2 cm (95% CI: 6.8-7.6) with no change at 6 months but improvement after crossover similar to the originally assigned 10 kHz SCS group: mean 70.3% pain relief (95% CI: 63.4-77.1, $p < .001$), lower limb pain VAS score of 2.0 cm (95% CI: 1.6-2.4, Figure A) and 84% responders (49/58, Figure B).

Investigators reported neurological improvements, particularly improved sensory function, maintained over 12 months for majority of patients with 10 kHz SCS: 68% (52/76) of participants originally assigned to SCS and 62% (32/52) of participants after crossover (Figure C). Insensate feet limit activities of daily living and may result in debilitating sequelae, including injury from falling, foot ulceration, and lower limb amputation.

There were 8 procedure-related infections (5.2%): 3 resolved with conservative treatments and patients continued in the study, while 5 (3.2%) required surgical explant of the device. There were no explants for loss of efficacy. Two participants (1.3%) had the location of the implantable pulse generator revised and 1 (0.6%) participant experienced lead migration that required a revision procedure; all 3 continued in the study.

The crossover group replicates the findings from the original implant group, providing a cumulative sample of 154 implanted patients with long-term data. In addition to a higher proportion of pain responders compared with pharmacotherapy or low-frequency SCS (5), 10 kHz SCS does not induce paresthesia, an advantage for PDN patients with uncomfortable paresthesia at baseline. Additionally, sleep disturbance due to pain, a common ailment for PDN patients, markedly improved by mean 61.7% (95% CI: 55.9-67.5) with 10 kHz SCS. This study, the largest RCT conducted for SCS treatment of PDN, demonstrates substantial, durable pain relief and potentially disease-modifying neurological improvements over 12 months, providing high-quality evidence in support of 10 kHz SCS for PDN patients with refractory symptoms.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Joe Massaro, PhD, professor of biostatistics, mathematics, and statistics at Boston University and director of biostatistics and data management at Harvard Clinical Research Institute for his independent statistical analyses for this publication. The authors are also indebted to Brian Levy, MD, for his thoughtful review and expert feedback on the manuscript. This study was funded by Nevro Corp.

Author contributions: ESB, KA, MNG, VG, RHB, CEA, CEN, RST, DLC, and NAM contributed to the conception and design of the study. EAP, TGS, JAS, JLW, SMS, KA, MNG, JX, CY, AN, DGP, KCT, MJC, VG, RHB, NDM, DS, SPL, DJD, KAS, JHG, MTB, NJH, AFI, PC, and PWW recruited subjects and acquired data. EAP, ESB, CEA, CEN, RST, DLC, and NAM were involved in the analysis and interpretation of the data along with an independent biostatistician. All authors reviewed the manuscript critically and approved of its content. EAP had full access to the study data and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and accuracy of analysis.

Disclosures: EAP has received consulting fees from Abbott, Medtronic, Neuros Medical, Nevro, Saluda, Vertos and research support from Medtronic, Neuros Medical, Nevro, ReNeuron, Saluda. JAS has received research support from Boston Scientific, Nevro, Saluda, Vertiflex. JLW has received consulting fees from Lilly, CALIBR. SMS has received research support from Nevro. KA has received consulting fees from Nevro, Nalu, Saluda, Biotronik, Medtronic and research support from Nevro, Biotronik, Vivex, Saluda, SPR Therapeutics. MNG has received consulting fees from Nevro, Saluda, Avanos and research support from Abbott, Saluda, Neuros, Nevro, Nalu, Avanos. JX has received research support from Nevro, NIH K08 Grant CA228039. CY has received research support from Nevro. AN has received consulting fees from Flowonix, Nevro and research support from Nevro. DGP has received consulting fees from Abbott, AIS, Allergan, Amgen, CornerLoc and research support from Abbott, Biotronik, Flowonix, Nevro, Nuvectra, Vertiflex. NDM has received consulting fees from Nevro, Salix Pharma, Biodelivery Sciences, Averitas and research support from Boston Scientific, Medtronic, Nevro. DS has received consulting fees from Abbott, Boston Scientific, Nevro, Vertos, Vertiflex and research support from Abbott, Biotronik, Nevro, Vertos, Vertiflex. SPL has received consulting fees from Nevro. JHG has received consulting fees from Stratus Medical and Abbott, and research support from SPR Therapeutics and Mainstay Medical. CEA has received consulting fees from Nevro, Vertex, Lilly, Pfizer, Teva and research support from Allergan, Amgen, DSI, Lilly, Novartis, Teva. CEN has received consulting fees from Siemens Healthineers, Horizon Therapeutics, Nevro, Neurogastrx, Exelixis. RST has received consulting fees from Medtronic, Nevro, Saluda. NAM has received consulting fees from Boston Scientific, Sollis Therapeutics, Saluda Medical, Nevro, Abbott (formerly Spinal Modulation), Vertos Medical, Nuvectra, Relieva Medsystems, is a Medical Monitor for Mainstay's RESTORE clinical trial, and has received research support from Avanos "Halyard," Mallinckrodt, Mesoblast, Neuros Medical. ESB and DLC are employees of Nevro Corp. TGS, VG, KCT, MJC, RHB, DJD, KAS, MTB, NJH, AFI, PC, and PWW have no conflicts to disclose.

References

1. Abbott CA, Malik RA, van Ross ER, Kulkarni J, Boulton AJ: Prevalence and characteristics of painful diabetic neuropathy in a large community-based diabetic population in the U.K. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:2220-2224
2. Pop-Busui R, Boulton AJ, Feldman EL, Bril V, Freeman R, Malik RA, Sosenko JM, Ziegler D: Diabetic Neuropathy: A Position Statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:136-154
3. Kapural L, Yu C, Doust MW, Gliner BE, Vallejo R, Sitzman BT, Amirdelfan K, Morgan DM, Yearwood TL, Bundschu R, Yang T, Benyamin R, Burgher AH: Comparison of 10-kHz High-Frequency and Traditional Low-Frequency Spinal Cord Stimulation for the Treatment of Chronic Back and Leg Pain: 24-Month Results From a Multicenter, Randomized, Controlled Pivotal Trial. *Neurosurgery* 2016;79:667-677
4. Petersen EA, Stauss TG, Scowcroft JA, Brooks ES, White JL, Sills SM, Amirdelfan K, Guirguis MN, Xu J, Yu C, Nairizi A, Patterson DG, Tsoufas KC, Creamer MJ, Galan V, Bundschu RH, Paul CA, Mehta ND, Choi H, Sayed D, Lad SP, DiBenedetto DJ, Sethi KA, Goree JH, Bennett MT, Harrison NJ, Israel AF, Chang P, Wu PW, Gekht G, Argoff CE, Nasr CE, Taylor RS, Subbaroyan J, Gliner BE, Caraway DL, Mekhail NA: Effect of High-frequency (10-kHz) Spinal Cord Stimulation in Patients With Painful Diabetic Neuropathy: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Neurol* 2021;78:687-698
5. Gupta M, Knezevic NN, Abd-Elseyed A, Ray M, Patel K, Chowdhury B: Treatment of Painful Diabetic Neuropathy-A Narrative Review of Pharmacological and Interventional Approaches. *Biomedicines* 2021;9

Figure legend

Pain and Neurological Results Over 12 Months

A) Average lower limb pain scores over time for 10 kHz SCS+CMM participants (n=84, left) and CMM participants who crossover after 6 months (n=58, right). Participants rated pain on a 10 cm visual analog scale with 0 representing “no pain” and 10 being the “worst pain imaginable”. Left and right lower limbs were each rated separately and the scores were averaged together for each participant. Error bars: 95% CI. **B)** Proportion of pain responders, defined as those with at least 50% pain relief from baseline, at 3, 6, 9, and 12 months for 10 kHz SCS+CMM participants (n=84, left) and CMM participants who crossover after 6 months (n=58, right). **C)** Proportion of participants over time who investigators reported to have improvement on neurological examination for 10 kHz SCS+CMM participants (n=76, left) and CMM participants who crossover after 6 months (n=52, right). Assessment included motor strength and reflex testing as well as sensory testing for light touch, pinprick, and 10g monofilament. All follow-up assessments were compared to baseline and the investigator categorized motor, reflex, and sensory separately as an “improvement”, “no change”, or a “deficit”. Overall neurological improvement was defined as an improvement in motor, reflex, or sensory function without a deficit in any category.