

Safety and efficacy of venoplasty in MS

A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled phase II trial

Anthony L. Traboulsee, MD, Lindsay Machan, MD, J. Marc Girard, MD, et al.

Cite as: *Neurology*® 2018;91:e1660-e1668. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000006423

Correspondence

Dr. Traboulsee
t.traboulsee@ubc.ca

Study objective

To evaluate the safety and efficacy of balloon venoplasty for treating patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) through correction of narrowed extracranial jugular and azygos veins.

Summary results

Balloon venoplasty was not superior to sham venoplasty in improving clinical outcomes in patients with MS.

Classification of evidence

Class I.

What is known and what this paper adds

Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency as a result of venous narrowing has been posited as a pathologic mechanism of MS; however, venous narrowing is observed with similar frequency in healthy volunteers and patients, and the utility of venous dilation in patients with MS is unclear. The present study provides clinical trial evidence that extracranial venoplasty is not associated with disease-modifying or subjective patient benefits in MS.

Participants and setting

The study enrolled 104 patients (mean age, 50.5 years; range 33–65 years) diagnosed with relapsing-remitting, secondary, or primary progressive MS from 4 Canadian centers. Participants had >50% narrowing of at least 1 extracranial vein on catheter venography.

Design, size, and duration

The study was a randomized, sham-controlled, double-blind, interventional trial with a follow-up period of 48 weeks after randomization and treatment.

Primary outcome measures

The primary efficacy outcome was change in MS Quality of Life questionnaire (MSQOL-54) scores from baseline to week 48. The primary safety outcome was the number of adverse events during follow-up.

Main results and the role of chance

Forty-nine patients were randomized to receive balloon venoplasty and 55 were assigned to sham. There were no differences in mean improvement from baseline to week 48 in

Table Improvements in patient-reported and clinical outcomes from baseline to week 48

Outcome	Sham	Balloon venoplasty
MSQOL-54 physical	1.3 ± 11.5	1.4 ± 14.0
MSQOL-54 mental	1.2 ± 15.2	-0.8 ± 18.7
NARCOMS	0.1 ± 1.7	-0.2 ± 1.0
MSFC	0.0 ± 0.7	-0.4 ± 1.5
EDSS	0.0 ± 0.9	-0.2 ± 0.8

Abbreviations: MSQOL-45, MS quality of life questionnaire; NARCOMS, North American Research Committee on MS pain scale; MSFC, Multiple Sclerosis Functional Composite score; EDSS, Expanded Disability Status Score.

MSQOL-54 physical (+1.3 vs +1.4, $p = 0.95$) or mental score (+1.2 vs -0.8, $p = 0.55$) or secondary clinical or imaging outcomes between the sham and venoplasty groups.

Harms

Serious adverse events were reported in 1 patient undergoing sham and 5 patients undergoing balloon venoplasty.

Bias, confounding, and other reasons for caution

The study did not evaluate the use of stents due to reports of serious complications.

Generalizability to other populations

The results are generalizable to patients with MS in North America.

Study funding/potential competing interests

This study was funded by the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), MS Society of Canada, Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research, Research Manitoba, and Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux du Québec. Some authors report receiving personal fees and funding from various healthcare companies. Go to Neurology.org/N for full disclosures.

Trial registration number

NCT01864941 (Clinicaltrials.gov).

A draft of the short-form article was written by A. Symons, a writer with Editage, a division of Cactus Communications. The authors of the full-length article and the journal editors edited and approved the final version.

Neurology®

Safety and efficacy of venoplasty in MS: A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled phase II trial

Anthony L. Traboulsee, Lindsay Machan, J. Marc Girard, et al.
Neurology 2018;91:e1660-e1668 Published Online before print September 28, 2018
DOI 10.1212/WNL.0000000000006423

This information is current as of September 28, 2018

Updated Information & Services	including high resolution figures, can be found at: http://n.neurology.org/content/91/18/e1660.full
References	This article cites 32 articles, 3 of which you can access for free at: http://n.neurology.org/content/91/18/e1660.full#ref-list-1
Citations	This article has been cited by 1 HighWire-hosted articles: http://n.neurology.org/content/91/18/e1660.full##otherarticles
Subspecialty Collections	This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s): Class I http://n.neurology.org/cgi/collection/class_1 Clinical trials Randomized controlled (CONSORT agreement) http://n.neurology.org/cgi/collection/clinical_trials_randomized_controlled_consort_agreement Multiple sclerosis http://n.neurology.org/cgi/collection/multiple_sclerosis Patient safety http://n.neurology.org/cgi/collection/patient_safety
Permissions & Licensing	Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at: http://www.neurology.org/about/about_the_journal#permissions
Reprints	Information about ordering reprints can be found online: http://n.neurology.org/subscribers/advertise

Neurology® is the official journal of the American Academy of Neurology. Published continuously since 1951, it is now a weekly with 48 issues per year. Copyright © 2018 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. on behalf of the American Academy of Neurology. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 0028-3878. Online ISSN: 1526-632X.

