COMMIT Comprehensive Obesity and Metabolism Management and Treatment Program



Intragastric Balloons

Tamas A Gonda, MD Division of Digestive and Liver Diseases Columbia University

Outline

- Obesity epidemic and the role of endobariatric solutions
- Efficacy of competing therapies and surgery and measures of efficacy
- Current FDA approved Intragastric Balloons
 - Efficacy
 - Complications

[¶] Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to

prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \geq 30%.

¹ Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \geq 30%.

¹ Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \ge 30%.

[¶] Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \geq 30%.

¹ Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \geq 30%.

¹ Prevalence estimates reflect BRFSS methodological changes started in 2011. These estimates should not be compared to prevalence estimates before 2011.





*Sample size <50 or the relative standard error (dividing the standard error by the prevalence) \ge 30%.

Obesity

- 35 million obese Americans
- 12 million extremely obese (>BMI 40)
- 170,000 bariatric procedures
- 1:~500 obese individuals get intervention
- 98% do not get intervention

Goal of Endobariatrics: Expand the reach of bariatric therapy by offering a less invasive but effective alternative to surgery



Weight loss measures

- BMI=Weight(Kg)/Height(M²)
- TBWL (total body weight loss) = preoperative weightpostoperative weight
- EBWL = (TBWL) / (preop weight ideal weight (at BMI 25)



BMI classifi	cation
Underweight	< 18.5
Normal range	18.5 - 24.9
Overweight	≥ 25.0
Preobese	25.0 - 29.9
Obese	≥ 30.0
Obese class I	30.0 - 34.9
Obese class II	35.0 - 39.9
Obese class III	≥ 40.0

Efficacy of non-invasive treatments

TBWL ≥10% ≥5% Look AHEAD **High-Intensity** Lifestyle DPP Intervention Teixeira, et al. Placebo Orlistat Lorcaserin Pharmacotherapy Intervention Liraglutide Phentermine-topiramate Naltrexone-bupropion Т 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 10 0 **Percentage of Participants**

Heymsfield SB NEJM 2017

Efficacy of bariatric surgeries

	EBWL	TBWL
LapBand	40-50%	15-20%
Sleeve	60%	25%
RYGB	70%	30%
Duo Switch	80%	>30%

OBESITY COMPLICATION	% wt loss for Rx benefit	Notes	References
T2DM Prevention	3-10%	Maximum benefit at 10%	DPP (Lancet, 2009) SEQUEL (Garvey et al, 2013)
T2DM (HbA1c)	3-15%	HA1c still decreasing at >15%	Look AHEAD (Wing, 2011)
Dyslipidemia (TG/HDL)	3-15%	TG still decreasing at >15%	Look AHEAD (Wing, 2011)
HTN	5-15%	BP still decreasing at >15%	Look AHEAD (Wing, 2011)
NAFLD	10%	Improved steatosis, inflammation, mild fibrosis	Assy et al, 2007; Dixon et at, 2004; Anish et al, 2009
Sleep Apnea	10%	e benefit at ≤ 5%	Sleep AHEAD (Foster, 2009) Winslowet al, 2012
Osteoarthritis	5-10%	Improved symptoms and joint stress mechanics	Christensen et al, 2007 Felson et al, 1992; Aaboe et al, 2011
Stress Incontinence	5-10%		Burgio et al, 2007 Leslee et al, 2009
GERD	5-10% (F) 10% (M)		Singh et al, 2013 Tutujian R, 2011
PCOS	10-15%	Lower androgens, improved ovulation, increased insulin sensitivity	Panidis D et al, 2008 Norman et al, 2002 Moran et al, 2013

Endoscopic Interventions What are the goals?/Where is the bar?

- "minimum threshold of efficacy" (ASGE Task Force)
 - 25% EWL or 15% greater EWL then control arm at 12 months
 - Threshold incidence of complications at 5%
- Improvement in comorbid conditions
 - Less data
 - HTN, DM2, Hyperlipidemia

How can endoscopic interventions "mimic" surgery

Space Occupying/Restrictive

- Intragastric Balloons
- Stomach volume reduction
- Outlet obstruction
- Aspiration

Small Bowel Physiology/Bypass

- Small bowel sleeves
- Resurfacing
- Endoscopic anastomoses

FDA approved Intragastric Balloons













Content	Saline	Air mixture	Saline
Volume	450 x2 *	250 x 3	400-700
Placement	EGD	Non-endosocpic/AXR	EGD
Removal	EGD	EGD	EGD
"Published N"	356	387	>2000 (RCT 300s)

Indications and Contraindications

Indications

- Obese patients BMI 30-40 who have failed diet and exercise
- (ReShape only) with one obesity associated comorbidity
- (Obalon/Orbera) enrolled in weight loss program

Contraindications

- Large Hiatal Hernia
- Prior gastric surgery
- Inflammatory Bowel Disease
- Bleeding Risk
- Inability to take PPI
- Pregnancy
- Psychiatric Disease

Orbera balloon



Placement: Endoscopic

Anesthesia: GA, MAC

Inflation Compound: Sterile Water (methylene blue off label)

Inflation Volume: 500-700 ml

Duration of Therapy: 6 months

Removal: Endoscopic



Orbera balloon

Short term efficacy

Reference	No.	Starting BMI, kg/m ²	Fill volume, mL	Weight loss at 3 mo, kg	Weight loss at 6 mo, kg	% of weight loss at 3 mo
Bonazzi et al, ²² 2005	12	38.5	700	12.4	14.4	86
Fuller et al, ³⁷ 2013	31	36.0	450-750	10.5	14,4	73
Mathus-Vliegen and Tytgat, ³⁸ 2005	19	43.3	500	12.9	16.7	77
Mathus-Vliegen and Eichen, ²⁶ 2014	19	43.0	500	13.1	16.4	80
Peker et al, ³⁹ 2010	31	41.8	600	12.17	15.04	81
Stimac et al, ⁴⁰ 2011	171	41.9	600	12.8	16.9	76
Totte et al,41 2001	126	37.7	500	13.7	15.4	89
Total	409					
Weighted mean \pm weighted SD				12.9 ± 0.8	16.0 ± 0.9	80 ± 6

Short term efficacy – prospective RCT

IGB device	IGB treatment time (wks)	Number of	subjects	% EWL	p value	
		N (total)	Study arm			
Orbera*	12	32	16 (IGB + diet arm)	34 ± 4.8	<i>p</i> < 0.001	
Genco et al. [15]			16 (sham + diet arm)	2.1 ± 1		
Orbera*	24	66	31 (IGB + behavioral modification)	50.3	p < 0.001	
Fuller et al. [68]			35 (behavioral modification alone)	16.9		
Orbera*	24	114	60 (IGB)	44.6 ± 23.9	p < 0.01	
Majanovic et al. [69]			54 (cognitive behavioral therapy)	24.3 ± 16.0		
Orbera*	24	32	16 (IGB)	39.3	p = 0.189	
Peker et al. [56]			16 (lap band)	32.3		

Does Orbera balloon meet ASGE PIVI threshold?

Study name	Subgro	up within study	Statistics for each study		r each study			% EWL	
			Mean	Lower limit	t Upper limit	Total			
Sallet 2004		Orbera	50.900	44.777	57.023	85		1	-+
Herve 2005		Orbera	27.000	21.747	32.253	100			
Angrisani 2006		Orbera	27.100	25.001	29.199	82			
Ganesh 2006		Orbera	10.900	5.559	16.241	16	-	e- 1	
Genco 2007		Orbera	21.300	17.900	24.700	129		•	
Crea 2008		Orbera	27.400	26.616	28.184	138			
Genco 2009		Orbera	35.100	33.961	36.239	80			
Ohta 2009		Orbera	14.000	2.913	25.087	8	-	•	
Al Kahtan 2009		Orbera	18.000	13.680	22.320	137		•	
Mui 2010		Orbera	32.900	21.325	44.475	68		+	-
Genco 2010		Orbera	25.100	17.838	32.362	50			
Nikolic 2011_1		Orbera	27.800	15.300	40.300	19			
Nickolic 2011_2		Orbera	37.400	22.437	52.363	24		+-•	
Kotzampassi 20	12	Orbera	43.000	41.127	44.873	384		1	•
Bozkurt_1_2012	2	Orbera	30.900	18.248	43.552	15			_
Bozkurt_2		Orbera	22.500	17.509	27.491	68		-0-	
Bozkurt_3		Orbera	13.500	9.917	17.083	57		•	
Boskurt_4		Orbera	12.300	8.741	15.859	62		•	
Boskurt_5		Orbera	4.700	0.667	8.733	18		- 1 -	
Farina 2012		Orbera	34.900	31.495	38.305	14			
Dogan 2013		Orbera	16.700	9.743	23.657	50	9		
Fuller 2013		Orbera	32.700	23.900	41.500	31		+	
a particular de la caracteria de la cara		Random	25.441	21.457	29.426			•	
							0.00	25.00	50.00
-								%	EWL for IG
name		Statistics for	each st	udy	Sa	mple si	ize		
C	Difference in Mean	Lower limit	U	pper imit	P IGB	Con	trol		
2006	31,900	29.498	34	4.302	0.000 16	1	6		

49.173

24.040

38.246

0.000

0.000

0.000

31

84

Abu Dayyeh et al GIE 2015

Mohammed 2014

33.400

17.300

17.627

10.560

Fuller 2013

0.00 25.00 50.00

15%

35

44

Orbera – benefits in comorbid conditions

• HTN, DM, hyperlipidemia

Comparison	Odds ratio	95% CI	No. of studies (subjects)	1 2	P-value
Diabetes resolved	1.4	1.3, 1.6	9 (4,232)	0%	<0.001
Diabetes improved or resolved	9.3	7.6, 11.4	6 (3,556)	0%	<0.001
Hypertension resolved	2.0	1.8, 2.2	8 (3,961)	0%	<0.001
Hypertension improved or resolved	9.1	5.5, 15.2	6 (3,556)	71%	<0.001
Dyslipidemia resolved	1.7	1.2, 2.6	6 (3,101)	84%	<0.001

Non-alcoholic
 fatty liver disease (NAFLD)



Popov VB et al Am J Gastro 2017 Popov VB Dig Dis Sci 2016

Orbera – benefits in comorbid conditions

Lung function

	Baseline	After 6 months	p value ^a
Weight (kg)	111 (95.5-119.8)	93.8 (80.2-108.7)	0.0001
BMI (kg/m ²)	39.1 (35.7-44.2)	34.5 (30.2-40)	0.0001
FVC (L)	3.21 (2.86-3.83)	3.38 (3.06-4.02)	0.0001
FEV ₁ (L)	2.75 (2.35-3.14)	2.88 (2.57-3.26)	0.0001
FEV1/FVC (%)	85 (82.5-88.8)	81 (79-84)	0.0001
MIP (cm H ₂ O)	68 (51.3-114.5)	68.5 (38.8-116.0)	0.21
MEP (cm H ₂ O)	85.5 (70.5-102.8)	74.5 (65-121)	0.91
TLC (L)	4.42 (3.83-4.87)	4.68 (4.17-5.60)	0.0001



A C.

Obstructive Sleep apnea

	Before	After
Sleep study	(BIB x 6	months)
Obstructive apneas, No.	277 ± 105	90 ± 120 §
Central apneas, No.	7 ± 17	1 ± 1
Mixed apneas, No.	16 ± 17	1 ± 1
Hypopnea, No.	116 ± 83	36 ± 551
AHI, events/h	59.3 ± 18.1	$14.0\pm12.4\S$
ESS score	11.2 ± 5.2	$4.7 \pm 2.3 t$

Busetto L et al Chest 2005

Matort TT et al Obes surg 2014

Real life US experience w/ Orbera

- Multicenter, registry study
- 6, 9 and 12 months follow up
- 316 patients
- Average BMI 37.9
 - 16% diabetics
 - 19% dyslipidemia
- Procedural issues at placement: 4/316 failures
- Complications:
 - <2% early removal rate</p>
 - Ulcers 0.3% pre and 0.5% post placement
 - Esophagitis 3 pre and 8% post placement

Real life US experience w/ Orbera

- Weight loss
 - 7,10,13% TBWL at 3,6,9 mos
 - 84% achieved >5% TBWL
 - 56% achieved >10%TBWL
- A1C declined from 6.1 to 6.9 % (although therapy may have changed in interval)
- SSRI use had an inverse association with weight loss

Benefits beyond 12 months

- Observation study of 224 patients up to 5 years after IGB placement
- 6 months outcomes: 66% EWL
- Between 2 and 5 years 67% of patients regained weight
- 79% of patients regained less then 20% of weight

Benefits beyond 12 months



Vargas E et al DDW 2017

Benefits beyond 12 months



AbuDayyeh GIE 2016

Extended IGB treatment beyond 6 months

Repeated balloon placement (N=19)

Lower EWL with second balloon (30 vs 49%)
(Dumencau et al)

- Orbera balloon for 12 months
 - Compared to LapBand greater EWL at 12 mos (70% vs 53 %)
 - Additional EWL between 6 and 12 months was 12%

ReShape balloon



ReShape Balloon

Placement: Endoscopic

Anesthesia: GA

Inflation Compound: Saline

Inflation Volume: 750-900 ml (reduced for small stature)

Removal: Endoscopic

REDUCE trial



REDUCE trial

Baseline subject characteristics

Physical parameter	DUO (N = 187)	DIET (N = 139)
	Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD
Age (years)	43.8 ± 9.5	44.0 ± 10.2
Weight (lb)	209.2 ± 25.8	213.2 ± 25.5
BMI (kg/m ²)	35.3 ± 2.8	35.4 ± 2.6
Waist circumference (in)	43.4 ± 4.4	43.2 ± 4.4
Hip circumference (in)	47.1 ± 3.5	47.7 ± 2.9
Systolic BP (mm/Hg)	130.4 ± 13.9	133.2 ± 14.0
Diastolic BP (mm/Hg)	81.8 ± 10.1	82.8 ± 10.2
Heart rate (beats/min)	78 ± 11.2	79 ± 12.7
Hemoglobin A1 c (%)	$5.7 \pm .7$	$5.7 \pm .88$
Cholesterol	200 ± 38	196 ± 40
Triglycerides (mg / dL)	141 ± 87	137 ± 88

REDUCE



ReShape – comorbid conditions and longer term outcomes

DUO Patients Laboratory Values	Value at Baseline	Change from Baseline at:			
		Week 12	Week 24	Week 36	Week 48
		During DBS Tre	After DBS Trea	S Treatment	
Glucose	93.2	-1.0	0.3	-1.5	0.9
Insulin	17.8	-4.8	-3.8	-0.7	-1.0
HbA1 c	5.7	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.2
TG	140.9	-17.9	-15.7	-6.7	-9.0
HDL	52.0	-0.9	1.0	1.6	1.9
LDL	121.0	-3.0	-4.1	-6.8	-4.6
Systolic BP	130.4	-8.2	-8.3	-9.3	-6.6
Diastolic BP	81.8	-2.7	-4.3	-4.3	-4.4

Procedural Notes for Endoscopic Placement and Removal

- Pre-procedural Preparations
 - PPI x 7 days and pre-procedural instructions and prescriptions
- Placement (Orbera, ReShape)
 - Preplacement endoscopy
 - MAC
 - Post-procedural hydration, antiemetics
- Removal
 - Liquid diet 24 hours before
 - MAC vs GA (perhaps depending on initial assessment by EGD) – GA capable setting???

Obalon Balloon

Obalon Balloon & Inflation System

(Obalon, San Diego, CA)

Swallowable Capsule EzFill Inflation System

Gas-Filled Balloon









Obalon outcomes



Pryor AD et al DDW 2017/Obesity 2016

Balloon side effects

	Orbera (BIB)	ReShape Duo	Obalon
Minor complications			
Abdominal pain	12.6-57.5	3.9–11.6%	60.8%—mild
			11.6%-moderate
			0.1%—severe
Nausea and vomiting	32.8-86.9	14.9–34%	56% nausea
			17.3% vomiting
Reflux symptoms/erosive esophagitis	1.27-30	6.8%	1.8% (esophagitis)
Eructation	4.8-24.9	16.7%	9.2%
Dyspepsia	4.4-21.3	17.8%	16.9%
Major complications			
Gastrointestinal ulceration	0.02-2.6	10%*	0.9%
Dehydration	0.2-1.25	1.5%	NR
Luminal obstruction	0.2–76	NR	0%
Esophageal or gastric perforation	0.19-1.25	1.6%	0%
Deflation	0.9–4.5	6%	0.1%
Early removal	7.6–18.75	7.7%*	1.8%
	Laing P et		

Balloon side effects and complications



FDA warning regarding deaths following IGB placement – Aug 2017

BALLOON	LOCATION	YEAR	CAUSE OF DEATH	TIME AFTER PLACEMEMNT	DEVICE MALFUNCTION
Orbera	Brazil	2016	MI	10 days	Not suspected/known
Orbera	USA	2016	Unknown	1 month	Not suspected/known
Orbera	Brazil	2016	Gastric perforation	3 days	Gastric wall ischemia, perforation, intact balloon
Orbera	GB	2016	Sepsis, aspiration?	3 days	Second balloon, no known malfunction
Orbera	Mexico2015	2017	Cardiogenic shock	3 days	NO evidence of balloon malfunction
ReShape	US	2017	Shock, ?aspiration	2 days	Not known

Number of Orbera balloon placed to date (2016): 270,000+; reported incident rate <0.01%

Other Balloons

- Adjustable Balloon
 - <u>Spatz</u>
- Procedure- free balloons
 - Allurion Technologies
 - Intragastric balloon
 - Requires no procedure for implantation or explantation; self passing
 - PlenSat Digestible Balloon
 - Balloon swallowed in
 - a capsule and broken down by stomach



Summary

- Intragastric Balloons
 - Consistent efficacy for short term weight loss
 - Possible benefits in comorbid conditions
 - Possible durable benefits
 - Studies to look out for
 - Long term data (weight loss , comorbid conditions)
 - Sequential IGBs
 - Less invasive placement and removal strategies
 - Cost effectiveness
 - Personalized approach to choosing balloons
 - Best done as part of a comprehensive obesity management program

CoMMiT

Comprehensive Obesity and Metabolism Management and Treatment Program

Your Health, Our CoMMiTment

