





## **Treatment of perianal Crohn's fistulas:** Seton vs. Anti-TNF vs. Surgical closure

Christianne Buskens, Colorectal surgeon, AMC





#### Up to 30% perianal fistula in Crohn's disease

#### **Decreased QoL**

- Pain
- Production
- Abscess

High use of medical resources



#### High costs



Hellers et al. Gut 1980

#### Complex fistula (involvement upper 2/3 sphincter):

- Seton drainage
- Anti-TNF
- Surgical closure

Advancement plasty

#### Ligation intersphincteric tract







6.2.6. ECCO Statement 9G Seton placement after surgical treatment of sepsis is recommended for complex fistulas [EL2]. The timing of removal depends on subsequent therapy.

#### 6.2.10. ECCO Statement 9L

Thiopurines [EL2], infliximab [EL1], or adalimumab [EL2], seton drainage, or a combination of drainage and medical therapy [EL3] should be used as maintenance therapy.

#### 6.3.1. ECCO-ESCP Statement 5A

The indications for surgery aiming to close a fistula-inano in CD include a symptomatic patient, with no concomitant abscess, with medically controlled proctitis, and a preferably anatomically defined fistula tract [EL3]





# am C

#### Seton drainage

- Cheap, prevention of abscesses and recurrent tracts
- Low re-intervention rates (10-20%)
- Fistula will not close with seton in situ: QoL?
- Closure rates after removal?

Studies	No patients	No patients seton + removal	FU months (range)	Fistula closure (%)	Recurrence (%)	Applicability study
Morrison 1989	35	6	120 (ns)	6 (100)	1 (17)	low
Williams 1991	55	22	54 (6-120)	3 (14)	0	low
Scott 1996	59	27	20 (12-35)	23 (85)	4 (15)	low
Takesue 2002	32	9	62 (25-133)	0 (0)	3 (33)	low
Chung 2010	51	32	3 (endpoint)	10 (31)	ns	low



#### Anti-TNF

- Expensive (25.000/year)
- Reduces production (increase QoL)
- External opening heals first -> increased risk abscess/ reintervention

				Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	<b>Risk Difference</b>	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Ye	ear IV, Random, 95% Cl
Present 1999	0.4194	0.1078	25.0%	0.42 [0.21, 0.63] 19	999
Hanauer 2006	-0.1667	0.164	19.4%	-0.17 [-0.49, 0.15] 20	002
Colombel 2007	0.1723	0.0873	27.1%	0.17 [0.00, 0.34] 20	007
Sandborn 2007	-0.03	0.0729	28.5%	-0.03 [-0.17, 0.11] 20	007
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.11 [-0.11, 0.33]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.04; Chi² = 15.27, df = 3 (P = 0.002); l² = 80%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.97 (P = 0.33)			Placebo Anti-TNF therapy		

Complete fistula closure

- Placebo: 13/109 (12%)
- anti-TNF: 32/109 (29%)
- 44% re-interventions





#### **Treatment Crohn's perianal fistula**



	Brea	ıkdown etiology			Success rates (%)		
Author	Cryptoglandular	Crohn	Unknown	Overall	Cryptoglandular	Crohn	
Oh⁵	15	х		86.7	86.7	х	
Aguilar et al <sup>7</sup>	189	Х		98.5	98.5	Х	
Jones et al <sup>8</sup>	6	6		66.7	100.0	33.3	
Wedell et al <sup>9</sup>	27	х		96.7	96.7	х	
Shemesh et al <sup>10</sup>	4	4		87.5	← 87.5	$\rightarrow$	
Lewis and Bartolo <sup>11</sup>	2	6		75.0	50.0	83.3	
Kodner et al <sup>12</sup>			36	80.0	(87.1)	(70.8)	
Makowiec et al <sup>13</sup>	Х	20		75.0	х	75.0	
Lewis et al <sup>14</sup>	11	х		90.9	90.9	х	
Ozuner et al <sup>15</sup>			46	69.8	(74.1)	(68.1)	
Golub et al <sup>16</sup>	164	х		96.7	96.7	Х	
Joo et al <sup>17</sup>	Х	8		73.1	х	73.1	
Kreis et al <sup>18</sup>			6	62.5	(75.0)	(56.3)	
Marchesa et al <sup>19</sup>	Х	9		61.5	x	61.5	
Miller and Finan <sup>20</sup>	18	X		83.3	83.3	X	
Hyman <sup>21</sup>	6	14		75.0	83.3	71.4	
Schouten et al <sup>22</sup>	44	X		75.0	75.0	X	
Ortiz and Marzo <sup>23</sup>	103	x		93.0	93.0	X	
Mizrahi et al <sup>24</sup>	100		53	57.0	(66.7)	(42.9)	
Sonoda et al <sup>25</sup>			62	75.8	(77.1)	(50.0)	
Zimmerman et al <sup>26</sup>	105	х	ŬL.	69.0	69.0	X	
Dixon et al <sup>27</sup>	29	x		69.0	69.0	x	
Koehler et al <sup>28</sup>	42	x		73.8	0510	~	
Van der Hagen et al <sup>29</sup>	73	7		76.7 R	esults Crohn	's fistul	а
Ellis and Clark <sup>30</sup>	35	×		62.9		i 5 listui	u
Gustafsson and Graf <sup>31</sup>	82	x		57.0	Initial cure		0//170/
Perez et al $32$	27	x		92.6	IIIItial Suc	cess. or	ͻʹʹ៰ͺϫϫʹͽ
Van der Hagen et al <sup>33</sup>	20	12		36.6	P		
Uribe et al <sup>34</sup>	51	5		92.0	Kecurrend	ce rate:	50%
7bar at al <sup>35</sup>	11	> V		92.9			
2001 et al $36$	97	Ŷ		66.7			
$\frac{1}{37}$	67 E <i>4</i>	~		75.0			
Dubsky et al	54	~		/5.9	Polintony	ontion r	-10.500
Van Konoron et al <sup>39</sup>	90	~		02.4			ate. 50/
Appendent al	80	Ā	25	/ 3.8	. 76 0		
Abbas et al			25	76.0	← /6.0	$\rightarrow$	
	0.0.1.2014			76.2	78.1	67.5	
ni et al. Dis Colon	& Rect 2011			79.2	80.8	64.0	IRN



AMC



#### Current treatment: up to discretion of treating physician



Hypothesis:

- All treatment interventions comparable closure rates
- Seton less re-interventions and most cost-effective

<b>Group I</b>	<b>Group II</b>	Group III
Seton for 1 yr	Anti-TNF for 1 yr	Surgical closure
		anti-TNF for 4 mnths



#### Primary endpoint:

• Re-interventions

#### Secondary endpoints:

- Closed fistulas (based on MRI)
- Perianal disease activity (PDAI)
- Quality of life
- Costs

Sample size re-intervention50%anti-TNFsurg. closure20%seton

42 patients per group (total n=126)





#### In- and exclusion criteria

#### **Inclusion**

- Age ≥ 18 year
- Crohn's disease
- New or reactive fistula
- High fistula (>2/3 externe sfincter)
- 1 internal opening (MRI)

#### **Exclusion**

- Proctitis or anorectale stenosis
- Submucosal, low intersfincteric fistulas or rectovaginal fistulas
- Seton in situ > 3 months
- Anti-TNF use during past 3 months or prior anti-TNF use without any effect on fistula (failure)
- Patients with stomy







The work of many of the greatest men, inspired by duty, has been done amidst suffering and trial and difficulty. They have struggled against the tide, and reached the shore exhausted.

(Samuel Smiles)

izquotes.com



# PISA

#### Jan 2014 – Nov 2018:

• 44 inclusions (slow inclusion rate!)

DSMB: interim analysis (AE = re-intervention)

Arm	Re-interventions, n (%)	
Seton (n=15)	7/15 (47%)	
Anti-TNF (n=15)	1/15 (7%)	<b>Re-interventions</b> Significantly higher in
Surgery (n=14)	2/14 (14%)	seton-arm <i>p=0.046</i>
Total	10/44 (24%)	





Arm	Cross-over (without reintervention)
Seton (n=15)	6/15 (40%)
Anti-TNF (n=15)	0
Surgery (n=14)	0

#### Secondary outcome parameter: PDAI [scale 25 points]

- Seton 20 → 15
- Anti-TNF  $21 \rightarrow 11$
- Surgical closure  $21 \rightarrow 9$

### **PDAI** Significantly higher in seton group



# am C

#### Recommendations

• Safety: stop randomisation seton-arm



• Futility: Incidence re-intervention in remaining two arms too low to reveal significant differences

 $\rightarrow$  clinically relevant primary outcome parameter?



### **RCT vs patient and doctor's preference**

am	C

	RCT (n=44)	Patient preference	Doctor's preference
		(n=47)	(n=35)
Age (mean (SD))	33 (10)	39 (11)	33 (21)
Gender (M:F)	16:28	18:29	18:17
Previous anti-TNF use	13 (28%)	14 (30%)	27 (77%)
Disease duration	7 (9)	6 (14)	7 (10)
No previous interventions	0.7 (0.4)	1.0 (0.3)	2.2 (0.3)
PDAI (total 42 points)	21 (5)	22 (6)	21 (5)
No of external openings	1.3 (0.6)	1.2 (0.4)	2.5 (0.5)





	Seton	Anti-TNF	Surgery
Reinterventions			
RCT	7/15	1/15	2/14
Patient preference	4/16 (25%)	7/21 (33%)	1/10 (10%)
Cross-overs			
RCT	6		0
Patient preference	1		1



am C

RCT best design for trials comparing medication to surgery?

- Randomisation bias: low inclusion rate
- Preference bias: influencing subjective outcomes

Re-intervention objective outcome parameter?

• Compromising external and internal validity



### **Comprehensive cohort design**



Systematic review, Wasmann et al., submitted



an



Figure 2. Net Effect Sizes for Preference vs Randomization Comparisons, by Study and Intervention Group

Study, y	Intervention	Favors Randomization Group	Favors Preference Group
Reddihough et al, <sup>36</sup> 1998	Experimental		
	Control	•	
Bakker et al, <sup>10</sup> 1999	Experimental		-
McKay et al, <sup>28</sup> 1995	Experimental		
	Control		•
McKay et al, <sup>29</sup> 1998	Experimental	•	
	Control	•	
Bedi et al, <sup>11</sup> 2000	Experimental		•
	Control		•
King et al, <sup>25</sup> 2000	Experimental		
	Control	•	
Henshaw et al, <sup>16</sup> 1993	Experimental		-
	Control	•	
Kitchener et al, <sup>46</sup> 2004	Experimental	•	
Kerry et al, <sup>21</sup> 2000	Experimental		
	Control		
Jensen et al, <sup>19</sup> 2003*	Experimental		•
	Control		•
Net Effect Size	7	-08 -06 -04 -02 (	02 04 06 08
Experimental Contro	l I	Net Effect Size (Outo	orme Minus Baseline)
	_		

#### Systematic review:

- Baseline characteristics
  usually comparable
- Allocating patients to treatments that do not accord with their preferences influences internal and external validity of RCTs











DSMB recommendation:

- Continue as a two-armed trial [anti-TNF & surgical closure]
- Choose more relevant primary outcome parameter





P426 Meta-analysis of endorectal advancement flap vs. ligation of the intersphincteric fistula tract for Crohn's and cryptoglandular high perianal fistulas

January 2018 · Journal of Crohn s and Colitis 12(supplement\_1):S320-S320 DOI · 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjx180.553

🍥 Merle Stellingwerf · E M van Praag · 🔘 Willem A Bemelman · 🔘 Christianne J Buskens

# Efficacy of Medical Therapies for Fistulizing Crohn's Disease: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

MJ Lee et al. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2018 Jan 25. more

Surgical closure 60-70% closure rate

Anti-TNF 40% remission





#### Design:

• Comprehensive cohort design

Hypothesis:

• Surgical closure most successful

#### Sample size

Fistula closure 50% surg. closure 25% anti-TNF

70 patients per group (total n=140)

#### Primary endpoint:

• Fistula closure after 18 months (MRI based)





• Every trial gives new and unexpected insights!

• RCT not optimal design for trials comparing surgery to medical treatment [in case of subjective outcome parameter]?

• Chronic seton drainage inferior for Crohn's fistulas [acceptable if patient prefers]

• Results of PISA II should be awaited....



# Thank you, PISA collaboration group

