NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

DIAGNOSTICS ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME

Diagnostics consultation document

Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) is producing guidance on using implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke in the NHS in England. The diagnostics advisory committee has considered the evidence and the views of clinical and patient experts.

This document has been prepared for public consultation. It summarises the evidence and views that have been considered, and sets out the recommendations made by the committee. NICE invites comments from registered stakeholders, healthcare professionals and the public. This document should be read along with the evidence (the diagnostics assessment report and the diagnostics assessment report addendum).

The advisory committee is interested in receiving comments on the following:

- Has all of the relevant evidence been taken into account?

- Are the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness reasonable interpretations of the evidence?

- Are the recommendations sound, and a suitable basis for guidance to the NHS?

Equality issues

NICE is committed to promoting equality of opportunity, eliminating unlawful discrimination and fostering good relations between people with particular protected characteristics and others. Please let us know if you think that the recommendations may need changing to meet these aims. In particular, please tell us if the recommendations:

- could have a different effect on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population, for example by making it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 1 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

© NICE 2019. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

- could have any adverse effect on people with a particular disability or disabilities.

Please provide any relevant information or data you have about such effects and how they could be avoided or reduced.

Note that this document is not NICE's final guidance on implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke. The recommendations in section 1 may change after consultation.

After consultation, the committee will meet again to consider the evidence, this document and comments from the consultation. After considering the comments, the committee will prepare its final recommendations, which will be the basis for NICE's guidance on the use of the technology in the NHS in England.

For further details, see the diagnostics assessment programme manual.

Key dates:

Closing date for comments: 8 August 2019

Third diagnostics advisory committee meeting: 26 September 2019

1 Draft recommendations

1.1 Reveal LINQ is not recommended for detecting atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke because it is not cost effective.

1.2 There is currently not enough evidence to recommend the routine adoption of BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx to help to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke. Further research is recommended to assess the diagnostic yield of these devices for atrial fibrillation when used in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke (see section 5.1).

Why the committee made these recommendations

Using Reveal LINQ will increase the detection of atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke (a stroke with no identified cause; including transient ischaemic attack [TIA]). But it's not clear how much it will reduce the number of further strokes or TIAs compared with current practice.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke Page 2 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Because of this, and other uncertainties, such as how many false positive alerts the device produces, the cost effectiveness of the device is uncertain. Even when considering the unmet need for longer-term monitoring for atrial fibrillation after a cryptogenic stroke or TIA, the best cost effectiveness estimate for Reveal LINQ is at the upper limit of what NICE normally considers an acceptable incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). And given the uncertainties in the size of the potential benefits the actual ICER could be higher. Therefore it is not recommended for use in the NHS.

There is no evidence on how many more people with atrial fibrillation Confirm Rx or BioMonitor 2-AF, or any previous versions, detect when used in people with cryptogenic stroke compared with current practice (that is, no use of implantable cardiac monitors). The evidence about Reveal devices cannot be used to make decisions about Confirm Rx or BioMonitor 2-AF. This is because it is not certain that they will show similar performance to the Reveal devices in detecting atrial fibrillation when used in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke. Further research is needed to find out if these devices are clinically and cost effective, so they are not recommended for use in the NHS.

2 The diagnostic tests

Clinical need and practice

Atrial fibrillation

2.1 Atrial fibrillation is a type of arrhythmia that causes an irregular or abnormally fast heart rate. It is the most common arrhythmia. When someone has atrial fibrillation, the upper chambers of their heart (the atria) beat irregularly, which makes the heart less effective at moving blood into the ventricles. This can cause clots to form in the blood, which may cause a stroke. The abnormal electrical impulses in the heart muscle that cause atrial fibrillation can be persistent, permanent or intermittent. Paroxysmal atrial fibrillation involves intermittent episodes that usually last less than 2 days and stop without treatment.

Cryptogenic stroke

2.2   Cryptogenic strokes (including transient ischaemic attack [TIA]) have no identified probable cause after diagnostic assessment, and account for around 15 to 40% of ischaemic strokes. When people are treated for stroke they are tested for atrial fibrillation. However, if they have paroxysmal atrial fibrillation it may not happen during the initial assessment, or during subsequent diagnostic tests. Further longer-term testing can potentially detect it, for example by using heart rhythm monitors that can be worn, or implanted. These continuously monitor the heart's electrical activity while a person goes about their daily routine.

The interventions

2.3   Implantable cardiac monitors are also known as implantable loop recorders or insertable cardiac monitors. They monitor heart rhythm for longer than heart rhythm monitors that are worn externally (for example, Holter monitors). Implantable cardiac monitors can identify atrial fibrillation and could be particularly helpful for identifying paroxysmal atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke. If people are diagnosed with atrial fibrillation, they can then be offered anticoagulant therapy to reduce the risk of having another stroke or TIA.

2.4   The monitors are implanted under the skin of the person's chest using a small incision under local anaesthetic. They can continuously monitor heart rhythm for several years, and they record information if the device detects an arrhythmia. The devices use algorithms based on electrocardiogram (ECG) features to detect potential atrial fibrillation. The algorithm parameters can be varied to adjust the ECG features identified and flagged as potential atrial fibrillation. Recorded ECGs are remotely transmitted to clinicians, who determine if the person has had atrial fibrillation. They then decide to either continue to monitor or to treat.

BioMonitor 2-AF (BIOTRONIK SE & Co KG)

2.5   The BioMonitor 2-AF system consists of:

- a BioMonitor 2-AF insertable cardiac monitor (dimensions 88 x 15 x 6 mm)

- an optional Remote Assistant for patient-activated recordings

- a remote monitoring system (a CardioMessenger Smart transmitter) which sends data to the Biotronik Home Monitoring Service Centre through a cellular phone network

- a Renamic programmer for the insertable cardiac monitor.

2.6   BioMonitor 2-AF is implanted using a Fast Insertion Tool (FIT) accessory kit. First an incision of at least 1.5cm is made. Then the FIT 1 tool is used to form a pocket for the device under the skin and the FIT 2 is used to implant and position the device. The battery life of the device is estimated as 4 years, assuming data being sent from the device once per day. The company says that clinicians should decide whether to remove the device once it is no longer in use.

2.7   The BioMonitor 2-AF continuously monitors heart rhythm and ECGs are automatically recorded when atrial fibrillation is detected. Atrial fibrillation is detected based on irregular RR intervals (the interval between heartbeats), absence of P waves and atrial rate greater than 300 beats per minute. Parameters for sensing settings can be adjusted to vary the sensitivity of atrial fibrillation detection. There are also standard settings for parameters, such as atrial fibrillation sensitivity (described in the product manual). BioMonitor 2-AF can also detect other cardiac arrhythmias such as high ventricular rate, asystole, bradycardia, and sudden ventricular rate drop.

2.8   Recordings made by BioMonitor 2-AF are automatically and wirelessly sent to a transmitter unit every day. Data are encrypted and sent anonymously to the Biotronik Home Monitoring Service Centre over mobile phone networks. Data is stored in Germany and can be accessed by clinicians through an online platform. Automatic alerts are sent to

clinicians when a reading is received which meets pre-defined criteria. Clinicians review readings to make a final diagnosis.

Confirm Rx Insertable Cardiac Monitor (Abbott Medical UK)

2.9   The Confirm Rx system consists of:

- a Confirm Rx Insertable Cardiac Monitor (dimensions 49 x 9.4 x 3.1 mm)
- a remote monitoring system (the myMerlin application installed on a smartphone or tablet) and the Merlin.net Patient Care Network (PCN)
- a Merlin Patient Care System and a magnet (to interrogate and program the insertable cardiac monitor).

2.10   Confirm Rx is implanted using proprietary insertion and incision tools. The device is implanted under local anaesthetic through a small cut made using the incision tool. The insertion tool is then used to implant the device under the skin. The battery life of the device is estimated as 2 years, assuming an average of 1 automatically detected episode a day and 1 patient-activated episode per month.

2.11   Heart rhythm is continuously monitored by Confirm Rx, and ECGs are automatically recorded when atrial fibrillation is detected. Confirm Rx assesses 3 aspects of ECG trace to identify potential atrial fibrillation: regularity of rhythm pattern, variance of RR intervals and how sudden the onset of arrhythmia is. All 3 tests must indicate atrial fibrillation to trigger episode recording. The settings used by the device to detect atrial fibrillation can be varied; for example, to set the length of episode needed to trigger a recording. Confirm Rx also detects bradyarrhythmias, tachyarrhythmias and pauses.

2.12   Recordings made by Confirm Rx are transmitted using Bluetooth to a smartphone or tablet with the myMerlin app. The app can be downloaded from the company's website. The company says that the app automatically reads data from the implanted device and sends it to a

database using a cellular or Wi-fi network during the night, and recommend that a smartphone or tablet with the app installed is kept by the person's bedside at night to allow data transmission. Confirm Rx encrypts its wireless communications and only transmits to a single authenticated and paired myMerlin app at any given time. Emails or SMS notifications can be sent to alert that a recording has been sent. Clinicians can then access transmitted ECG recordings on the Merlin.net PCN by logging on with a User ID and password. Access to the Merlin.net PCN is restricted to authorised users set by the clinic administrator.

Reveal LINQ Insertable Cardiac Monitoring System (Medtronic Limited)

2.13   The Reveal LINQ Insertable Cardiac Monitoring System consists of:

- a Reveal LINQ Insertable Cardiac Monitor device (dimensions 45 x 7 x 4 mm)
- an optional Reveal Patient Assistant handheld device which is held over the implanted Reveal LINQ monitor by the user to start an ECG recording or mark an event on the ECG record
- a remote monitoring system (a bedside MyCareLink Patient Monitor) which sends data to the MyCareLink network cloud storage facility
- a MyCareLink Programmer, which is a portable computer system used by a healthcare professional to program the devices.

2.14   Reveal LINQ is implanted using proprietary incision and insertion tools. The incision tool makes a small opening in the skin (less than 1 cm) and the insertion tool is used to make a small pocket for the device and to implant it under the skin.

2.15   Reveal LINQ continuously monitors heart rhythm and identifies potential atrial fibrillation episodes from the person's ECG trace using an algorithm. An ECG trace is assessed in 2-minute windows which are considered positive if atrial fibrillation is present for longer than a programmable threshold. If the algorithm detects a potential episode of atrial fibrillation, the ECG trace is stored. The device can also be programmed to only

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 7 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

store episodes that persist for a set period of time (6, 10, 20, 30 or 60 minutes). Total atrial fibrillation is also calculated, consisting of all 2-minute windows in which atrial fibrillation was present for longer than threshold value. Reveal LINQ can also detect tachyarrhythmia, bradyarrhythmia or pause episodes. The device contains an accelerometer to allow changes in patient activity over time to be monitored.

2.16   Rhythm abnormalities recorded by Reveal LINQ are wirelessly transmitted to the MyCareLink Patient Monitor and then sent to a CareLink server in the Netherlands. Transmitted and stored data are encrypted. A care alert is sent to clinicians when the device detects a rhythm abnormality. They can access the data through the CareLink website using a password protected log-in. Alternatively, daily notifications of cardiac activity can be sent. The device also sends alerts if the battery is low. If the device is unable to communicate with CareLink it registers as disconnected.

2.17   The company also offers a triage and monitoring service (FOCUSON) to review ECG recordings made by Reveal LINQ. ECGs are reviewed by cardiologists and ECG technicians at a Monitoring and Triaging Service Centre. Any clinically relevant cases requiring clinical action or escalation are notified to the NHS clinician by phone or email. Detected episodes are categorised by colour (red, amber or green). The company says that red events are notified on the same working day and within 1 hour from when the transmission reaches the CareLink Network service. Amber events are notified by email on the next working day, and green events are aggregated and notified in a weekly email.

The comparator

No further testing after outpatient external ambulatory ECG monitoring

2.18   The clinical experts said that if no atrial fibrillation is detected by an external ambulatory ECG monitor, the person is unlikely to have any further monitoring for atrial fibrillation, unless an implantable cardiac

monitor is available. Undetected atrial fibrillation may be later identified if it causes symptoms (for example, palpitations), incidentally when someone's pulse is checked (for example, when blood pressure is taken), or on investigation after a recurrent stroke or TIA. Therefore the comparator is no further monitoring.

3 Evidence

The diagnostics advisory committee (section 8) considered evidence from several sources on implantable cardiac monitors (BioMonitor 2-AF, Confirm Rx and Reveal LINQ) to assess for suspected paroxysmal atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke. Full details of all the evidence are in the committee papers.

Clinical effectiveness

3.1 The external assessment group (EAG) did a systematic review to identify evidence on the clinical effectiveness and diagnostic accuracy of the implantable cardiac monitors to detect suspected atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke. The devices reviewed were:

- BioMonitor 2-AF
- Confirm Rx
- Reveal LINQ.

3.2 Studies were included if they assessed the devices in people who had had a cryptogenic stroke or cryptogenic transient ischaemic attack (TIA) and paroxysmal atrial fibrillation was suspected. Because of the small number of studies identified, the requirement for at least 24 hours of outpatient external ambulatory electrocardiogram (ECG) monitoring without atrial fibrillation detection before the devices were implanted (as per current practice) was not applied. Also, data from earlier versions of the devices were considered.

3.3 Because only 1 study (the CRYSTAL-AF randomised controlled trial) met the EAG's initial eligibility criteria, the EAG relaxed the study inclusion

criteria to consider single-arm observational studies. The EAG chose not to change the population inclusion criteria because it considered that data from non-cryptogenic stroke populations would not represent the device's performance in people with cryptogenic stroke or TIA. This is because non-cryptogenic stroke populations have different incidence rates of atrial fibrillation. However, the EAG provided a summary of studies highlighted by the device manufacturers that were not done in a cryptogenic stroke population. The EAG further highlighted that the patient population, duration of monitoring and the type of atrial fibrillation would affect estimates of device performance.

Comparative studies

3.4   One study (reported in 6 publications) compared the effectiveness of using 1 of the devices with conventional follow up: the CRYSTAL-AF study. This was an open-label, parallel group randomised controlled trial that used Reveal XT (an earlier version of Reveal LINQ). The XT model is larger. The EAG said that evidence from diagnostic accuracy studies (see sections 3.47 and 3.48) suggests that Reveal LINQ has better specificity and sensitivity than the XT, is easier to implant and causes fewer complications.

3.5   People 40 years or older who had a recent episode of cryptogenic symptomatic TIA or recent episode of cryptogenic ischaemic stroke had Reveal XT (n=221) or conventional follow-up care (n=220). Follow up in the control group was ECG monitoring at the discretion of the site investigator. The study was done in 55 centres across 14 countries in Europe (none in the UK), Canada and the USA. The EAG said that there were similar numbers of withdrawals between the 2 arms (except for crossovers, see section 3.12). Data were collected for up to 36 months of follow up, but relatively few people reached this point (24 in each arm). Mean duration of follow up was 20.3 months for Reveal XT and 19.2 months for conventional follow-up care.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 10 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

3.6 The EAG noted that although there were no significant differences in baseline characteristics between study arms, there were differences in the numbers of people with patent foramen ovale and history of prior stroke. However these were small and unlikely to be because of systematic issues with randomisation. The clinical experts said that the population was slightly younger than people expected to be eligible for an implantable cardiac monitor in the UK. Also, a higher proportion of TIA (rather than stroke) would be expected in clinical practice (closer to 20%, instead of about 9% seen in each of the study arms). All patients would be expected to be taking an antiplatelet agent (about 96% in each arm were using an antiplatelet agent at baseline).

3.7 The EAG's clinical experts said that the tests used in the trial to define a stroke as cryptogenic were broadly the same as what would be done in the NHS. Pre-enrolment screening for atrial fibrillation was Holter monitoring for 71.2% of people (median duration of 23 hours, interquartile range 21 to 24 hours), and the remaining people had inpatient telemetry monitoring only. The EAG said that this meant almost 30% of people did not have any outpatient ECG monitoring (as specified in the scope) and that not all patients who did have outpatient ECG monitoring had it for at least 24 hours.

3.8 This trial was sponsored by Medtronic, manufacturers of the device used in the study. The EAG said that the authors of publications for this study reported employment, grants and personal fees from this company. The EAG considered that this was the most robust clinical evidence for Reveal LINQ, even though it relates to an earlier version of the device.

Non-comparative studies

3.9 Comparative data were not identified for BioMonitor 2-AF, Confirm Rx or the current Reveal LINQ version. Therefore, the EAG reviewed single-arm observational studies in cryptogenic stroke (including TIA) populations to identify available data on these devices.

3.10   Twenty six observational studies (reported in 60 publications) were found. All but 1 study assessed either Reveal LINQ or Reveal XT. In 1 study (Israel et al. 2017), 13% of people used the BioMonitor (an earlier version of BioMonitor 2-AF), but results were not reported by device. The EAG said that these studies therefore do not provide any data for BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx, but that they did supplement data from the CRYSTAL-AF study.

3.11   Sample sizes in the studies ranged from 14 to 1,247. Only 1 study (Cotter et al. 2013) was done in the UK. Most studies (17) were prospective single-arm observational studies. There were 5 retrospective studies (Asaithambi et al. 2018, Chalfoun et al. 2016, Heckle et al. 2018, Li et al. 2018 and Salahuddin et al. 2015). One did not report a clear methodology (Cotter et al. 2013). Ritter et al. (2013) did a within-patient comparison of Reveal XT and 7-day Holter ECG monitoring. Choe et al. (2015) used the CRYSTAL-AF data set to predict how many cases of atrial fibrillation detected by Reveal XT would have been detected by shorter length intermittent ECG monitoring strategies using simulations. Ziegler et al. 2017 presented data from a registry of people who had Reveal LINQ and used simulations to predict how many people with atrial fibrillation detected by the device would have been identified by shorter (non-continuous) ECG monitoring.

Quality assessment of studies

Randomised controlled trials

3.12   The CRYSTAL-AF study was assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias 2.0 tool. The full quality assessment is in the diagnostics assessment report starting from page 28. There was some concern about risk of bias because the trial was open-label and not all people had the randomised intervention required by the study protocol (5.4% of people assigned to Reveal XT got conventional follow up; 2.7% of people assigned conventional follow up got Reveal XT). Also, device implantation was

delayed for 11.5% of people who had Reveal XT (median length of delay was 6 days, interquartile range 1 to 32 days). The EAG noted that results were analysed by intention-to-treat population which includes patients who did not have Reveal XT, received it late, or crossed over to conventional follow up. This means the estimated benefit of having the device may be underestimated. Delays in implanting Reveal XT were mostly short and unlikely to affect outcomes. The EAG said that the lack of blinding was unlikely to affect relative atrial fibrillation detection rates between groups. It noted that only a small number of people were followed up after 12 months, so the 24 and 36-month results are likely to be less reliable than results from 6 and 12 months, but the direction of this bias is unclear.

Observational studies

3.13   The EAG said that it was not able to formally quality assess the 26 additional studies that were not randomised controlled trials that had been identified. However, it considered them all to be at high risk of bias because of their single-arm designs. Because of heterogeneity between the studies the EAG did not consider it appropriate to pool results from these studies. This included the model of device used, detection settings, patient characteristics, rigour of stroke assessment, severity of index stroke, definition and adjudication of atrial fibrillation, and length of follow up.

Evidence on ability to detect atrial fibrillation

Diagnostic yield (atrial fibrillation detection rate)

3.14   Atrial fibrillation detection rate at 6 months was the CRYSTAL-AF's study's primary outcome (episodes had to last more than 30 seconds). At 6 months, 19 people were diagnosed with atrial fibrillation in the Reveal XT arm and 3 people in the conventional follow-up arm. More atrial fibrillation was detected with Reveal XT at all time points (see table 1). Reveal XT increased atrial fibrillation detection across all pre-

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 13 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

specified subgroups (age, sex, race or ethnic group, index event, presence or absence of patent foramen ovale, and CHADS2 score), with no significant interactions. Most people who had atrial fibrillation detected by Reveal XT were asymptomatic (34 out of the 42 detected by 36 months).

Table 1 Atrial fibrillation detection in CRYSTAL-AF

Months	Number of patients with atrial fibrillation detected (cumulative)	
	Reveal XT [n (% ITT)]	Conventional follow up [n (% ITT)]
1	8 (3.6%)	1 (0.5%)
6	19 (8.6%)	3 (1.4%)
12	29 (13.1%)	4 (1.8%)
24	38 (17.2%)	5 (2.3%)
36	42 (19.0%[a])	5 (2.3%)[a]
Abbreviation: ITT: intention to treat		
[a] Proportions are based on the intention-to-treat population. Estimated detection rates are higher in the 36-month Kaplan–Meier analysis because of the non-informative censoring (that is, people who dropped out for reasons unrelated to the study) of patients lost to follow up (atrial fibrillation detection rate estimated as 30% with Reveal XT and 3% with conventional follow up).		

3.15 All 26 observational studies reported atrial fibrillation detection rate. Detection rates varied widely, ranging from 6.7% to 40.9% (length of monitoring varied between studies). Several studies reported atrial fibrillation detection rates over multiple time points. The EAG said that the studies generally show that a minority of patients are diagnosed in the first month (about 10% of those detected by 1 year). Around 70 to 80% (of the total number of people with atrial fibrillation detected in a study) are diagnosed by 6 months, and a small number after a year of monitoring. All or most of the detected atrial fibrillation in the observational studies (when stated) was asymptomatic, as in CRYSTAL-AF.

3.16 Two observational studies estimated how many atrial fibrillation episodes would have been detected by intermittent ECG monitoring. These used

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke Page 14 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

data sets generated by Reveal XT (in CRYSTAL-AF; Choe et al. 2015) or Reveal LINQ (from a large registry of patients with the device [n=1,247]; Ziegler et al. 2017). The studies assumed Reveal devices had 100% sensitivity. The studies estimated that even the best intermittent ECG monitoring strategies would detect less than a third of atrial fibrillation detected by Reveal devices.

Diagnostic yield: other (non-atrial fibrillation) cardiac pathologies

3.17   CRYSTAL-AF did not report any results for the detection of other cardiac pathologies.

3.18   Five non-comparative observational studies reported incidental detection of other arrhythmias. The EAG said that the proportion of patients detected with other arrhythmias is about 10% of the total number of people in a study. This mainly consists of bigeminy, pause and bradycardia. Two studies reported the breakdown of arrhythmias and gave rates of 1% (atrial flutter, cardiac arrest, sick sinus node, bigeminy, ventricular tachycardia) to 7% to 8% (atrioventricular block and ventricular extra systole). Full details are on page 51 of the diagnostics assessment report. The studies did not say if the other detected arrhythmias were treated, or if outcomes were improved because these arrhythmias were identified. Also, because these were non-comparative studies, the extent of any increase in detection compared with conventional follow up couldn't be determined.

Diagnostic accuracy

3.19   No data relevant to this outcome were reported in CRYSTAL-AF.

3.20   Two non-comparative observational studies reported the proportion of episodes detected by the devices that were not verified as atrial fibrillation by a clinician. Li et al. (2018) reported 79.7% for Reveal LINQ and Israel et al. (2017) reported that over 90% of detected episodes were not confirmed by review (Reveal XT and BioMonitor). The EAG noted that Medtronic had said that the number of false positive alerts varies

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 15 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

depending on the device model used, and the configuration for detection (including episode duration) that is programmed by the operator. Data on device accuracy (for all devices) in non-cryptogenic stroke populations from studies identified by manufacturers is presented later (see section 3.40).

Evidence on clinical outcomes

Time to diagnosis of atrial fibrillation

3.21   The EAG said that atrial fibrillation was detected in only 5 people in the conventional follow-up arm of CRYSTAL-AF (and none after 24 months; see table 1). This means it is difficult to make any conclusions about the effect of using Reveal XT from the median time to atrial fibrillation detection data. Atrial fibrillation was detected in more people with longer follow up, and therefore the median time to detection also increased. There was a greater increase in the median time to atrial fibrillation detection with Reveal XT compared with conventional follow up across all time points. The EAG said that the low detection rate of atrial fibrillation in the conventional follow-up arm was the likely cause of this difference.

3.22   There were 18 observational studies that reported time from device insertion to atrial fibrillation detection. Average follow up ranged from 7 to 20 months, and median time to first atrial fibrillation detection had a wide range, from 21 to 217 days. When reported, interquartile ranges also showed high variability within studies.

Atrial fibrillation-related hospitalisation

3.23   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Incidence of outpatient monitoring

3.24   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 16 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Uptake of anticoagulants

3.25   Most people diagnosed with atrial fibrillation using Reveal XT started having an oral anticoagulant (more than 90%) in the CRYSTAL-AF study. The reasons people did not start on anticoagulants after being diagnosed with atrial fibrillation were not clear. The EAG noted that some people who were not diagnosed with atrial fibrillation in the trial were also started on anticoagulants. Reasons for this were not provided.

3.26   Seven observational studies (Asaithambi et al. 2018, Carrazco et al. 2018, Christensen et al. 2014, Etgen et al. 2013, Li et al. 2018, Merce et al. 2013 and Seow et al. 2018) reported that uptake of anticoagulants for people with atrial fibrillation detected by Reveal XT or LINQ was high: between 83.3% and 100%.

Time to start of anticoagulants

3.27   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Incidences of device failure and removal

3.28   No incidence of Reveal XT failure was reported in CRYSTAL-AF. The device had to be removed early because of infection or pocket erosion from 5 out of 208 (2.4%) people by 36 months.

3.29   Three non-comparative observational studies reported how many devices were removed during follow up. In Christensen et al. (2014), Reveal XT was removed prematurely in 5.7% people because of skin reactions and discomfort. A further 3.4% of people chose to have the device removed after more than 1 year without atrial fibrillation being detected. In Asaithambi et al. (2018) 2.6% of people chose to have Reveal LINQ removed, and for 0.9% of people the devices migrated or fell out. In Ritter et al. (2013) study participants were offered removal of Reveal XT once atrial fibrillation was detected. But they did not report how many of the 30% of removals were because of this, or for other reasons such as discomfort.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 17 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Ease of use of devices for clinicians

3.30   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Mortality

3.31   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Further strokes or TIAs

3.32   In CRYSTAL-AF, a non-significant trend of fewer recurrent events (stroke or TIA) in the Reveal XT arm was reported (see table 2). The study was not powered for this outcome. It is not clear if the recurrent stroke or TIA events occurred in people who were diagnosed with atrial fibrillation or not.

Table 2 Cumulative incidence of further strokes or TIAs in CRYSTAL-AF

Months	Number of people having a further stroke or TIA		Hazard ratio (95% CI)
	Reveal XT (n=221)	**Conventional follow up** (n=220)	
6	11 (5.0%)	18 (8.2%)	Not reported
12	15 (6.8%)	19 (8.6%)	0.63 (0.22 to 1.80)
36	20 (9.1%)	24 (10.9%)	0.77 (0.30 to 1.97)
TIA: transient ischaemic attack; CI: confidence interval			

3.33   Of the studies, 6 non-comparative observational studies reported variable incidences of secondary stroke or TIA in people with an implantable cardiac monitor: from 0% to 14.6%.

Other thromboembolisms

3.34   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Device-related adverse events

3.35   The EAG said that that the incidence of device-related adverse effects (such as pain and infection) was relatively low for people who had Reveal XT implanted in CRYSTAL-AF. However, adverse events did lead

to the device being removed in 2.4% of patients. The proportion of people with serious adverse events was slightly higher for Reveal XT (30.8%) than conventional follow up (27.9%). More people had non-serious adverse events in the Reveal XT arm (18.6%) than in the conventional follow-up arm (4.1%). No details of these events were reported, and the EAG said that it was unclear why there was a difference between the study arms. Reveal XT is larger than Reveal LINQ.

3.36   For 5 non-comparative observational studies there were no complications from the procedure or insertion site reported at follow up (length of follow up was not specified). These were Merce et al. (2013), Reinke et al. (2018) and Ritter et al. (2013) for Reveal XT; Poli et al. (2016) for Reveal LINQ and XT; and Israel et al. (2017) for Reveal XT and BioMonitor.

Anticoagulant-related adverse events

3.37   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Evidence on patient-reported outcomes

Health-related quality of life

3.38   Health-related quality of life data were collected in CRYSTAL-AF using the EuroQol 5-Dimensions (EQ-5D) tool. Unpublished data were provided by the company as academic in confidence so they cannot be reported here.

Acceptability of the devices to patients

3.39   No data were reported in CRYSTAL-AF or the observational studies.

Evidence from non-cryptogenic stroke populations

3.40   The EAG provided a narrative summary of studies in non-cryptogenic stroke populations identified by manufacturers of the devices. These studies were not done in populations who had exclusively had a cryptogenic stroke or TIA although some were in a 'mixed population' (less than 50% of the study population had a cryptogenic stroke or TIA

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 19 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

and subgroup analysis was not provided). All studies were either single-arm observational studies or assessed the diagnostic accuracy of the devices compared with Holter monitoring. The EAG highlighted that the performance of the devices depends on the patient population, atrial fibrillation incidence rate, and the type of atrial fibrillation. Therefore, the results from these studies do not necessarily represent the devices' performance in people with cryptogenic stroke.

3.41   The EAG did not do a full systematic literature search to validate the inclusion of the studies. This was because of time constraints and concerns about the applicability of results to the cryptogenic stroke population. The EAG said that the data may have study selection bias as well as clinical heterogeneity caused by the variation in the patient populations of each of the studies.

Abbott Medical

3.42   The company said the Detect AF study (Nölker et al. 2016) was potentially relevant for assessing Confirm Rx. The EAG noted that the device used in Detect AF was the Confirm model DM2102. This is an older and larger model of Confirm Rx. The EAG was unsure how the software in this earlier version compared with the current Confirm Rx.

3.43   Detect AF was a prospective observational study. It assessed the diagnostic accuracy of the Confirm system in detecting atrial fibrillation compared with Holter monitoring (reference standard) with simultaneous use of the devices. In per-patient analysis, sensitivity of the Confirm system was 100%, positive predictive value was 64.0%, specificity was 85.7% and negative predictive value was 100%. Most of the episodes of atrial fibrillation detected by the Confirm system but not confirmed by the Holter monitor were because of irregular sinus rhythms. No adverse events associated with the device were reported.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 20 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Biotronik SE & Co

3.44   The EAG discussed 5 single-arm prospective observational studies (in 8 publications) provided by Biotronik. Three of these studies (which included data on diagnostic accuracy) were unpublished and were provided as academic or commercial in confidence so details cannot be reported here.

3.45   Reinsch et al. (2018) reported that the BioMonitor 2 was successfully implanted in a catheterisation laboratory with a median time from first cut to final suture of 8 minutes (interquartile range 7 to 10 minutes). Ooi et al. (2017) reported that all insertions of the device were made on first attempt in a catheterisation laboratory with a median time of 9 minutes (interquartile range 5 to 14 minutes). Ooi et al. reported that 1 pocket infection occurred when using the device. Reinsch et al. reported that no devices implanted in the study migrated, and 1 person needed the device removing because of device-related pocket infection. Another patient complained of slight discomfort.

3.46   Reinsch et al. reported results from patient satisfaction surveys. Of the respondents, 7% reported moderate to severe pain and 20% reported mild pain within 24 hours of device insertion. One person reported a moderate impairment in daily life. Of the respondents, 63% said that the cosmetic result was 'very satisfying' and 30% said 'satisfying'.

Medtronic Limited

3.47   The EAG discussed 5 studies highlighted by the company. Two compared the diagnostic accuracy of Reveal devices (per-patient analysis) with Holter monitoring for detecting atrial fibrillation (Hindricks et al. 2010 and Sanders et al. 2016). In Hindricks et al. (2010), Reveal XT was used (the XPECT trial). Another study (Puerefellner et al. 2014) used data from this trial and recalculated accuracy estimates when changes were made to the atrial fibrillation detection algorithm. This incorporated data on P waves when classifying patients, and this algorithm change was applied in Reveal LINQ. Sanders et al. (2016) used Reveal LINQ. A subsequent

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 21 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

study (Puerefellner et al. 2018) was published using this data set (and the XPECT data) to calculate the accuracy of a modified algorithm for detecting atrial fibrillation (using the TruRhythm algorithm that has now been incorporated in the device). Data on the diagnostic accuracy reported in these studies are shown in table 3.

Table 3 Diagnostic accuracy estimates for Reveal XT and Reveal LINQ

	Study			
	XPECT study Hindricks et al. 2010	**XPECT dataset** Puerefellner et al. 2014	**LINQ usability study** Sanders et al. 2016	**LINQ usability dataset** Puerefellner et al. 2018
Device	Reveal XT	Reveal XT with P-sense enhancement	Reveal LINQ	Reveal LINQ with adaptive P-sense (TruRhythm)
Sensitivity (%)	96.1	96.1	97.4	100
Specificity (%)	85.4	90.0	97.0	99.0
Positive predictive value (%)	79.3	84.9[a]	92.5	97.4
Negative predictive value (%)	97.4	97.5[a]	99.0	100
Accuracy (%)	89.3	92.2[a]	97.1	99.3
[a] Calculated by the external assessment group using data in Puerefellner et al. 2014				

3.48   The EAG said that the studies showed improved detection of atrial fibrillation by Reveal LINQ compared with Reveal XT. Changes made to the algorithm also improved detection. But the results should be interpreted with caution because these studies were not done in people who had had a cryptogenic stroke. However, the EAG said that these data suggest that Reveal LINQ is likely to be as effective as Reveal XT, if not better, at detecting atrial fibrillation. Therefore, the clinical data from CRYSTAL-AF (which uses the XT) could be a conservative estimate of the clinical effectiveness of the device.

3.49   Mittal et al. (2015) reported adverse event data from 2 observational studies that used Reveal LINQ. An infection occurred in 1.5% of people, an adverse event in 4.0% and a serious adverse event in 1.1%.

Ongoing studies

3.50   The EAG identified 8 potentially relevant ongoing studies from searches of trial registries and electronic databases, in addition to company submissions. There are 3 ongoing randomised controlled trials assessing Reveal LINQ. Of these, 1 is in people with cryptogenic stroke. This is a Canadian randomised trial comparing the clinical and cost effectiveness of Reveal LINQ with external loop recording in 300 people who have had cryptogenic stroke. It is estimated to complete in December 2019 (PERDIEM; NCT02428140). One ongoing study identified is assessing Confirm Rx: the SMART registry (NCT03505801). This is a post-approval study planned for at least 2,000 patients with Confirm Rx across multiple indications, with a planned subgroup analysis for cryptogenic stroke. Completion is expected during 2019.

Cost effectiveness

Systematic review of cost-effectiveness evidence

3.51   The EAG did a systematic review to identify any published economic evaluations of implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation in people with cryptogenic stroke. There were 5 studies that met the EAG inclusion criteria. Of these, 2 assessed the cost effectiveness of Reveal XT compared with standard care monitoring (DeAngelis et al. 2016 and Diamantopoulos et al. 2016). Another study assessed BioMonitor 2-AF (Maervoet et al. 2017; further details provided as unpublished report and model by the device manufacturer as commercial in confidence), and 2 studies did not indicate which implantable cardiac monitor was being assessed (Quiroz et al. 2017 and Thijs et al. 2018). Only 1 study (Diamantopoulos et al. 2016) was based on an NHS payer perspective and was discussed in the diagnostics assessment report.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 23 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Diamantopoulos et al. (2016)

3.52   This study was a cost-utility analysis. It compared use of Reveal XT in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke or TIA with conventional follow up, as assessed in the CRYSTAL-AF study. A Markov model structure was used with 3 main health states for atrial fibrillation status: free, detected and undetected. The deterministic base case produced an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of £17,175 per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained for Reveal XT compared with standard care (£2,587 higher costs, 0.151 additional QALYs). The probabilistic ICER was lower.

3.53   The EAG considered that results from this model were potentially unreliable because there was uncertainty about how parameters in the model had been estimated. The estimation of treatment effects by indirect comparison, atrial fibrillation incidence and detection rates used in the analysis were particularly unclear. The study authors used indirect comparisons to estimate hazard ratios for the benefit of anticoagulants on the occurrence of ischaemic stroke, bleeding events, intracranial haemorrhages, extracranial haemorrhages and mortality. The EAG tried to verify these figures but was unable to because there were insufficient details in the publication about how the indirect comparisons were done and how publications that informed the analysis were identified. The EAG also considered that estimation of some of the hazard ratios could be flawed. For example, the authors estimated a hazard ratio to adjust mortality in the model, but the source data used are based on standardised mortality ratios. Furthermore, people without atrial fibrillation detected were assumed to be offered aspirin, but the EAG's clinical experts said that clopidogrel would be used as an antiplatelet treatment.

Modelling approach

3.54   The EAG developed a de novo economic model to assess the cost effectiveness of using implantable cardiac monitors (BioMonitor 2-AF,

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 24 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

© NICE 2019. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

Confirm Rx or Reveal LINQ) to assess for suspected paroxysmal atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke (including TIA).

Model structure

3.55   The EAG developed a 2-stage economic model. The first stage (an Excel model developed by the EAG) modelled people either having monitoring for suspected paroxysmal atrial fibrillation after a cryptogenic stroke (including TIA) with the implantable cardiac monitors or conventional follow up. Everyone starts the model having antiplatelet therapy (clopidogrel) for stroke prevention. At every 3-month cycle in the model a proportion of people have atrial fibrillation. For people with an implantable cardiac monitor, all cases of atrial fibrillation are detected, and treatment is switched to anticoagulants (atrial fibrillation detected). For people with conventional follow up, a proportion of people with atrial fibrillation are detected (and switch to anticoagulants) but most are not (atrial fibrillation undetected) and remain on antiplatelet therapy.

3.56   For the subsequent long-term anticoagulation model, the EAG adapted a published economic model to model the long-term effect of people with detected atrial fibrillation (anticoagulant treatment) or undetected atrial fibrillation (remain on antiplatelet therapy with clopidogrel). This is the 'adapted direct oral anticoagulant (DOAC) model' (Sterne et al. 2017 and Welton et al. 2017). People enter the model after having atrial fibrillation in an 'atrial fibrillation well' state. After this, clinical events can occur. These are TIA, ischaemic stroke, intracranial haemorrhage, myocardial infarction, clinically relevant (extracranial) bleed or systemic embolism (multiple events can happen to one person over the course of the model). The risks of these events happening in the model were based on a population with a history of ischaemic stroke and paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. The model structure is the same for people with detected and undetected atrial fibrillation. However, the probability of the events happening depends on the treatment used (anticoagulants or antiplatelet therapy).

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 25 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Model population

3.57   The population in the model was people who had had a cryptogenic stroke (including TIA), when there was suspected paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. These people had had at least 24 hours of outpatient external ambulatory ECG monitoring that had not detected atrial fibrillation. Characteristics were based on the population in the CRYSTAL-AF study, with a mean age of 61 years and about 65% people assumed to be men.

Comparator

3.58   In the model, the EAG used data from the control arm of CRYSTAL-AF for the comparator. People in the study were assessed at scheduled visits (every 3 months) and unscheduled visits if they were having symptoms of atrial fibrillation. Tests included ECGs and Holter monitoring (for 24 hours, 48 hours or 7 days).

Model inputs

3.59   Diagnostic yield data from CRYSTAL-AF were used for the number of people with atrial fibrillation detected by an implantable cardiac monitor or by conventional follow up. No equivalent data were identified for BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx (or the current Reveal LINQ version). Therefore, the EAG assumed equal efficacy for all devices. A published model (Sterne et al. 2017 and Welton et al. 2017; the 'adapted DOAC' model) was used to model longer-term clinical outcomes for people with atrial fibrillation that is detected (treatment with an anticoagulant) or not detected (treatment with an antiplatelet drug). Outcomes included were ischaemic stroke, myocardial infarction, TIA, systemic embolism, clinically relevant extracranial bleed, intracranial haemorrhage and all-cause mortality.

Costs

3.60   All costs in the model were valued in 2018, in UK pounds sterling.

Table 4 Cost of the implantable cardiac monitors

Device	Unit cost (£ excluding VAT)
BioMonitor 2-AF	1,030
Confirm Rx	1,600
Reveal LINQ	1,800

3.61   Medtronic also offer an optional triage service for use with Reveal LINQ (FOCUSON) that was included in scenario analyses. There were 2 cost options included: £187 per patient per year or £374 per patient per device. The EAG did not include the cost of reviewing alerts generated by the devices in the base case.

Implantation and device removal costs

3.62   In the base case, the EAG estimated the cost of implanting the devices as £24.17. This was based on advice from the clinical experts about the staff involved (cardiologist and nurse) and time taken for the procedure (10 minutes). The cost of removing the devices was assumed to be £238, based on NHS reference costs schedule 2017/18 (EY13Z – removal of electrocardiography loop recorder, outpatient setting, treatment function code 320). Costs associated with adverse events from implanting the devices were not included in the EAG's analysis.

Comparator arm and follow-up costs

3.63   The EAG based costs for the comparator on the conventional follow-up arm of CRYSTAL-AF. Costs per cycle in the model were calculated based on the proportion of people having testing every 3 months or no testing in the study. The unit cost of monitoring was £141, based on the NHS reference costs schedule 2017/18 (HRG code EY51Z – ECG monitoring or stress testing [outpatient procedures, service code 320]). The EAG assumed that people with an implantable cardiac monitor will have one face-to-face follow up a month after the procedure and then will be remotely monitored. For people in the conventional follow-up arm who do not have atrial fibrillation detected, follow-up appointments are assumed

to happen after 1, 3, 6 and 12 months, based on clinical expert advice. If atrial fibrillation is detected, a follow-up appointment is assumed to discuss treatment. The cost of an initial follow up (£163.36) and subsequent follow up (£128.05) were taken from NHS reference costs.

Treatment and clinical event costs

3.64   The costs of DOACs and clopidogrel were taken from the BNF September 2018 to March 2019 edition. Costs of acute and chronic health events were taken from NHS reference costs or Luengo-Fernandez et al. (2013).

Health-related quality of life and QALY decrements

3.65   The EAG did a systematic review to identify relevant utility values to update the adapted DOAC model. There were 2 papers (Berg et al. 2010 and Luengo-Fernandez et al. 2013) with relevant utility values for ischaemic stroke, intracranial haemorrhage, myocardial infarction and TIA events. These were included in the model and were used to update the adapted DOAC model. The utility value used for people with atrial fibrillation in a 'well' health state (that is, when no clinical events such as stroke have occurred) was 0.78 (Berg et al. 2010). The duration of disutility for an acute event was assumed to be 3 months (1 model cycle).

Base case assumptions

3.66   The following assumptions (in addition to those described in previous sections) were applied in the base case analysis:

- The prevalence of atrial fibrillation in this population was equal to the detection rate in CRYSTAL-AF.
- Reveal LINQ was as good as Reveal XT for detecting atrial fibrillation (the device used in CRYSTAL-AF).
- BioMonitor 2-AF and Confirm Rx were equivalent to Reveal XT or Reveal LINQ for detecting atrial fibrillation.
- The detection of atrial fibrillation was capped at 3 years for BioMonitor 2-AF even though the manufacturer said the battery life is expected to

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 28 of 45

be 4 years. This was because atrial fibrillation detection data were only available for 3 years of follow up.

- Atrial fibrillation detection was capped at 2 years for Confirm Rx because this is the expected battery life of the device, and the clinical experts advised that devices are unlikely to be replaced once a battery expires.

- After 3 years, detection rates of atrial fibrillation are the same in both the implantable cardiac monitors and conventional follow-up arms.

- Once atrial fibrillation was detected, all patients accepted anticoagulation.

- DOACs were the only anticoagulation therapies offered (use of warfarin was investigated in a scenario analysis).

Base case results

3.67   At the first committee meeting for this topic, the committee requested that the EAG do some further analysis to help with their decision making. While doing this analysis, the EAG identified some errors in the model code. These were corrected, and updated cost effectiveness results were provided for the second committee meeting.

Table 5 Base case deterministic pairwise cost-effectiveness analysis (compared with conventional follow up)

	Total costs (£)	Total QALYs	Incremental costs (£)	Incremental QALYs	ICER (£)
Conventional follow up	£7,672	1.66	-	-	-
Reveal LINQ	£9,359	1.73	£1,687	0.07	£24,875
BioMonitor 2-AF	£8,589	1.73	£917	0.07	£13,519
Confirm Rx	£9,076	1.71	£1,404	0.05	£30,277
Abbreviations: QALY, quality-adjusted life year; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio					

3.68   The ICERs in table 5 were produced by separate comparisons of each of the 3 implantable cardiac monitors with conventional follow up. The lower

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 29 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

number of QALYs generated by Confirm Rx is because the battery is assumed to last 2 years, rather than 3 years. The EAG noted that if BioMonitor 2-AF battery life was 4 years, rather than 3 years, as assumed in the model, the device might detect more cases of atrial fibrillation than are captured in the analyses.

3.69   The fully incremental analysis is shown in table 6. The EAG advised that the BioMonitor 2-AF and Confirm Rx results should be viewed with caution because they are based on a strong assumption of equivalence with Reveal LINQ. The difference in costs between BioMonitor 2-AF and Reveal LINQ is because of the difference in costs of the devices alone.

Table 6 Base case deterministic incremental cost-effectiveness analysis

	Total costs (£)	Total QALYs	Incremental costs (£)	Incremental QALYs	ICER (£)
Conventional follow up	£7,672	1.66	–	–	–
BioMonitor 2-AF	£8,589	1.73	£917	0.07	£13,519
Confirm Rx	£9,076	1.71	£487	-0.02	Dominated
Reveal LINQ	£9,359	1.73	£770	0.00	Dominated
Abbreviations: QALY, quality-adjusted life year; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio					
Dominated means that using the device costs more but produced fewer, or the same number of, QALYs than the comparator					

Scenario analyses

3.70   The EAG did some scenario analysis to assess the effect of some of the assumptions made in the model. Selected results are shown in table 7.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 30 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Table 7 Selected scenario analyses

Scenario		ICER (£, compared with conventional follow up)		
		Reveal LINQ	BioMonitor 2-AF	Confirm Rx
Base case		**£24,875**	**£13,519**	**£30,277**
Addition of FOCUSON triage service [a] Option 1: £187 per patient per year		£32,872	NA	NA
Addition of FOCUSON triage service [a] Option 2: one-off fee of £374 per patient per device		£30,391	NA	NA
Time horizon for device monitoring [b]	1 year	£55,935	£27,424	£48,530
	2 years	£34,591	£17,981	NA
Long-term DOAC outcomes based on:	Apixaban	£33,677	£20,041	£40,753
	Dabigatran	£17,775	£6,716	£22,589
Inclusion of warfarin as a treatment option for patients diagnosed with atrial fibrillation		£86,218	£49,845	£104,956
No removal of devices		£21,704	£10,348	£25,477
No monitoring in conventional follow-up arm [c]		£27,592	£17,391	£33,304
Abbreviations: ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; NA: not applicable [a] Service provided by Medtronic for Reveal LINQ [b] Assumption that the implantable cardiac monitors only detect atrial fibrillation for 1 or 2 years (any cases after this time in CRYSTAL-AF were assumed to be missed) [c] Monitoring costs and cases of atrial fibrillation detected in the conventional follow-up arm removed				

Sensitivity analyses

One- and two-way sensitivity analysis

3.71   The EAG did several analyses varying 1 or 2 parameters at a time in the model between upper and lower values. Most changes had little effect on the ICERs of the 3 devices. To vary the outcomes from the adapted DOAC model, the EAG took the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles from the 10,000 outputs for costs and QALYs from this model. These changes had the largest effect on ICERs.

Probabilistic sensitivity analysis

3.72   The EAG provided updated probabilistic sensitivity analysis for the second committee meeting. The ICERs in table 8 were produced by separate comparisons of each of the 3 implantable cardiac monitors with conventional follow up.

Table 8 Probabilistic pairwise cost-effectiveness analysis (compared with conventional follow up)

	Total costs (£)	Total QALYs	Incremental costs (£)	Incremental QALYs	ICER (£)
Conventional follow up	£7,672	1.66	-	-	-
Reveal LINQ	£9,359	1.73	£1,687	0.07	£24,866
BioMonitor 2-AF	£8,589	1.73	£917	0.07	£13,516
Confirm Rx	£9,076	1.71	£1,404	0.05	£30,269
Abbreviations: QALY, quality-adjusted life year; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio					

3.73   From cost effectiveness acceptability curves (each device was compared independently with conventional follow up), up to a maximum acceptable ICER of £30,000 per QALY gained only BioMonitor 2-AF had a probability of being cost effective of over 50%. As above, this is based on assuming that data from the CRYSTAL-AF study (which uses a Reveal device) is generalisable to BioMonitor 2-AF.

4   Committee discussion

Technologies that improve the detection of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke or transient ischaemic attack (TIA) could have substantial benefits for people who have had a cryptogenic stroke

4.1   The patient expert told the committee how, when someone has a stroke or TIA with no identifiable cause, they can live in fear of having another stroke. This is because they know that the cause of the stroke is not being

treated. This can make them anxious and want to visit the GP often for reassurance. Paroxysmal atrial fibrillation is often a cause of cryptogenic stroke. But it's often not detected because it's not present when someone has their initial assessment. If atrial fibrillation is detected, the clinical experts highlighted the importance of offering anticoagulants, rather than antiplatelet therapy, to reduce the risk of a further stroke or TIA. The patient expert explained that people who have had a cryptogenic stroke tend to be younger than people who have had a stroke with a known cause. Therefore they're more likely to be working and have dependants, such as elderly parents or children. They pointed out the benefits of preventing further strokes, including reducing post-stroke dementia and the psychological impact of sudden illness. The clinical experts said that current practice is to monitor for suspected atrial fibrillation for up to about 14 days at most using Holter monitors if implantable cardiac monitors are not available. A patient expert said that at the moment monitoring often misses atrial fibrillation in people who have had a stroke, who could benefit from treatment. The committee concluded that identifying the cause of a cryptogenic stroke is important to reduce risk of a further stroke or TIA. Technologies that can identify paroxysmal atrial fibrillation missed by current post-stroke follow-up testing could have substantial benefits for people who have had a cryptogenic stroke.

Implantable cardiac monitors can reassure people who have had a cryptogenic stroke or TIA, and their carers

4.2   The patient expert said that, if atrial fibrillation is suspected after a stroke or TIA, people can often be anxious that new symptoms may be related to the condition, and that they should report them to their doctor. A continuous electrocardiogram (ECG) monitor can reassure people that, if they have symptoms, the monitor will detect any atrial fibrillation that caused them, and can be used to confirm or rule out the condition. Because the devices can remotely monitor people, they many need fewer follow-up appointments after a cryptogenic stroke. This could particularly benefit people living in remote areas far from a hospital. The patient

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 33 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

expert said that after a stroke people are fatigued for a long time. Travelling to follow-up appointments can be tiring, costly and time-consuming. People may also need to go with a carer to help them and describe symptoms. The committee concluded that implantable cardiac monitors could have quality of life benefits beyond preventing another stroke.

Clinical effectiveness

The CRYSTAL-AF study population broadly represents people with cryptogenic stroke in the NHS

4.3　　　The only study identified by the external assessment group (EAG) that compared the effectiveness of using an implantable cardiac monitor with conventional follow up after a cryptogenic stroke was the CRYSTAL-AF study. The clinical experts said that it's important that non-invasive ECG monitoring is done before an implantable cardiac monitor is considered. They also said that the length of monitoring in the NHS can vary. Holter monitors are typically used for 24 hours to 7 days. Not everyone in CRYSTAL-AF had outpatient ECG monitoring before having an implantable cardiac monitor fitted. Those who did were monitored for a median of 23 hours. The committee also considered that participants in CRYSTAL-AF were younger than would be expected for people who have had a stroke (mean age about 61.5 years). However, the clinical experts explained that people with cryptogenic stroke are usually younger than the overall stroke population. The committee concluded that the population in the CRYSTAL-AF study broadly represented people with cryptogenic stroke who would have an implantable cardiac monitor fitted in the NHS.

Participants in the control arm of CRYSTAL-AF may have been tested more for atrial fibrillation than they would be in the NHS

4.4　　　Some people in the control arm of the CRYSTAL-AF study, who did not have a cardiac monitor implanted, were tested for atrial fibrillation every 3 months using ECG, including Holter monitoring. The clinical experts said

that in current practice the amount of testing for atrial fibrillation varies if an implantable cardiac monitor is not used, but it is likely to be less than in CRYSTAL-AF. They also said that people may only be tested again for atrial fibrillation if they have another stroke. The committee concluded that testing for atrial fibrillation in the control arm of CRYSTAL-AF may be more than is done in the NHS, which may underestimate the increased yield of people with atrial fibrillation reported for the intervention arm.

Reveal XT increases atrial fibrillation detection, but the effect on reducing further stroke or TIA is uncertain

4.5   In the CRYSTAL-AF study Reveal XT detected more people with atrial fibrillation than conventional follow up (see table 1). There were also fewer strokes or TIAs in the Reveal XT arm of the study (see table 2). However, because of the length of follow up and sample size the true effect of the device on reducing stroke or TIA incidence is uncertain; the 95% confidence interval for the hazard ratio at 12 months was 0.22 to 1.80. The committee concluded that there was good evidence that Reveal XT detected more people with atrial fibrillation than conventional follow up, and that this was likely to be seen in clinical practice. However, the extent of a subsequent reduction in stroke or TIA occurrence is uncertain.

CRYSTAL-AF data can be used to assess how well Reveal LINQ detects atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke, but not BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx

4.6   The CRYSTAL-AF study used Reveal XT, a predecessor model of Reveal LINQ. Changes have been made to the atrial fibrillation detection algorithm that is now used in Reveal LINQ. There was some evidence to suggest that this had improved its ability to detect atrial fibrillation. The clinical experts said that the atrial fibrillation detection algorithms in other manufacturers' devices may use the same features of an ECG to detect potential atrial fibrillation. But how these features are used to determine if atrial fibrillation is likely to be present, or to classify an arrythmia as atrial fibrillation or another type of arrythmia, is likely to differ between devices.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 35 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Also, there were no direct comparisons of the performance of the devices or their atrial fibrillation detection algorithms. The committee concluded that it is feasible that data from Reveal XT is likely to apply to the updated version from the same manufacturer, Reveal LINQ. But there is too much uncertainty over whether the data can be used to show the performance of the BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx to detect atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke. Therefore, the committee did not accept that evidence from the CRYSTAL-AF study could be applied to these devices.

Cost effectiveness

It is not appropriate to use data from CRYSTAL-AF to model the performance of BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx

4.7 The EAG used diagnostic yield data (a measure of how many people with atrial fibrillation were diagnosed) from the CRYSTAL-AF study in the economic model for all 3 devices. The committee considered data from this study to be appropriate to assess how well Reveal LINQ detected atrial fibrillation in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke. But it did not think it was appropriate to use it for BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx (see section 4.6). In the absence of clinical or comparative data for these devices in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke, the committee decided that it was not appropriate to consider the cost effectiveness estimates for BioMonitor 2-AF or Confirm Rx.

It is appropriate to use a linked evidence approach to estimate the impact of implantable cardiac monitors on the incidence of stroke or TIA

4.8 Based on data from the CRYSTAL-AF study, the extent of any reduction in further stroke or TIA as a result of using an implantable cardiac monitor is uncertain (see section 4.5). The EAG used diagnostic yield data from CRYSTAL-AF to estimate the increase in cases of atrial fibrillation detected by implantable cardiac monitors (compared with conventional follow up). It then used an existing model (Sterne et al. 2017 and Welton

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 36 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

© NICE 2019. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

et al. 2017) to estimate the effect of subsequent anticoagulant or antiplatelet treatment on the incidence of clinical events such as stroke. The committee considered that the absolute risk of stroke may differ between people with permanent or persistent atrial fibrillation and people with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. The clinical experts said that people with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation do benefit from anticoagulant treatment. The EAG ran the model with the risks of events adjusted to reflect a secondary stroke population with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. The committee concluded that there is uncertainty about the impact of using implantable cardiac monitors on the reduction of further strokes or TIAs. But it agreed that, in the absence of long-term data on this, the EAG's approach of linking evidence on the extent of atrial fibrillation detection, the impact of diagnosis on treatment choice, and the effect of treatment on the incidence of subsequent clinical events such as stroke and TIA in the economic model was suitable for decision making.

Not including adverse events caused by implanting Reveal LINQ is unlikely to have a large impact on cost effectiveness estimates

4.9   The EAG's economic model did not include the effect of any adverse events caused by implanting the devices. The EAG explained that the proportions of people who had non-serious adverse events was reported in CRYSTAL-AF, but there were no details on what these events were. Therefore, the EAG could not include any costs or disutilities caused by these events in the model. The clinical and patient experts said that there are some minor issues caused by the devices, such as irritation and pain when they are fitted or removed, or if someone unintentionally exposes the device through the skin, but that these are not common and do not have severe consequences. The committee concluded that not including any adverse events caused by implanting the devices was unlikely to have had a large effect on cost effectiveness estimates.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 37 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

There may be some uncaptured benefit of detecting non-atrial fibrillation arrythmia, but the impact of this on patient outcomes is uncertain

4.10   The model did not include detection of non-atrial fibrillation arrythmias. There was not much evidence on the number of these arrhythmias detected by the devices, and what evidence there was, was from non-comparative observational studies. The clinical experts explained that most asymptomatic non-atrial fibrillation arrythmia detected by the implantable cardiac monitors would not lead to any change in care. The committee concluded that using the devices may increase detection of non-atrial fibrillation arrythmias, but that the extent of this increase, and the clinical significance of these arrythmias and consequent impact on patient outcomes, is highly uncertain.

The base case may overestimate how much monitoring for atrial fibrillation is done in current practice, which lowers the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER)

4.11   The EAG used the control arm of the CRYSTAL-AF study to model current practice ('conventional follow up'). The committee had earlier concluded that this may include more monitoring for suspected atrial fibrillation than would be done in the NHS (see section 4.4). This may make the increased diagnostic yield of atrial fibrillation for Reveal LINQ in the model a conservative estimate. But it may also mean that the model overestimates the cost of monitoring for atrial fibrillation in current practice. The EAG did a scenario analysis in which no further monitoring for atrial fibrillation was done in current practice (that is, no people with atrial fibrillation were detected or cost of monitoring included). This increased the ICER for Reveal LINQ by about £2,700 per QALY (quality-adjusted life year) gained. The committee concluded that this may be too extreme, in that some monitoring is likely to be done in the NHS for people with no implantable cardiac monitor fitted. However, the amount of assessment for atrial fibrillation in current practice is likely to have been

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 38 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

© NICE 2019. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

overestimated in the base case model, which lowered the base case ICER.

The number of false positive alerts from Reveal LINQ is uncertain, and including this in the economic model increases the base case ICER

4.12   The base case model did not include the cost of interpreting alerts produced by Reveal LINQ. The EAG explained that this was because of a lack of data on the number of alerts produced by the device. The clinical experts said that the device would produce false positive alerts. Anecdotal evidence differed on the impact of false positive alerts on workload. One clinical expert said that alerts from the devices can generate several hours of work per day for electrophysiologists to review, although this was based largely on alerts from people with syncope. However, another clinical expert said that it takes minimal time to review alerts generated for possible atrial fibrillation (less than 10 seconds), and that the increase in workload for technicians would be minimal. The clinical experts highlighted that the number of alerts can vary widely between people and noted that cardiac physiologists need to triage the alerts. The EAG did 2 scenario analyses that included the costs of an optional triage service for alerts offered by Medtronic for Reveal LINQ. This increased the ICER by about £5,500 to £8,000 per QALY gained, depending on the cost option used. The clinical experts said that the costs used (£187 per patient per year or £374 per patient) are likely to be a realistic estimate and could be considered a reasonable proxy for the costs of triaging alerts in the NHS. The committee concluded that there is uncertainty about the likely number of false alerts that Reveal LINQ generates in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke if used in routine clinical practice, and the impact on services. Including costs for reviewing alerts in the economic model would increase the ICER for Reveal LINQ, although it is uncertain by how much.

The EAG's model is suitable for decision making

4.13   At the first committee meeting, the committee was concerned by the difference between the deterministic and probabilistic base case results

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 39 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

provided by the EAG. There was a large difference in the incremental costs and QALYs generated for the devices (compared with conventional follow up) between these analyses. For the second committee meeting, the EAG provided updated analyses in which an error in the model code used to run the probabilistic sensitivity analysis was corrected. The updated base case probabilistic sensitivity analysis results were now very similar to the deterministic results (see tables 5 and 8). At the first committee meeting the committee was concerned that the model results may not be realistic (lacking face validity) because of the small number of total QALYs generated in the model. At the second committee meeting, the EAG explained that this was because QALYs in the model were only generated by people who had episodes of atrial fibrillation, which was 30% of the total population. No QALYs were considered for the remaining 70% because there would be no difference in the number of QALYs generated between people with implantable cardiac monitors fitted and conventional follow up (and therefore no impact on ICERs). The EAG further explained that the cohort modelled had a starting age of 62, had all had a stroke or TIA, and all had atrial fibrillation. Therefore, they did not consider that the number of QALYs generated was unrealistic. The committee concluded that, considering the correction made to the model and the explanations provided, the EAG's model was suitable for decision making.

The base case ICER is likely to be between the EAG's and Diamantopoulos et al. model estimates

4.14   The updated cost effectiveness results provided by the EAG for the second meeting differed from the results of a previous economic model that also used data from CRYSTAL-AF (Diamantopoulos et al. 2016; see sections 3.52 and 3.53). The EAG's updated base case ICER was higher than Diamantopoulos et al. (£24,875 compared with £17,175 per QALY gained) and incremental QALYs were lower (0.07 compared with 0.15). The EAG explained that the difference between the results of the models was driven by differences in how the impact of anticoagulant treatment

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 40 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

© NICE 2019. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

was modelled. Because of differences in model structure, the outcomes included, and the mechanisms used to estimate outcomes, the EAG considered a direct comparison of the parameters used in each model to be difficult and potentially not very informative. It highlighted that the number of strokes that its model estimated would be avoided by using an implantable cardiac monitor (16 per 1,000 people with atrial fibrillation) was less than estimated by the Diamantopoulos et al. model (40 per 1,000 people with atrial fibrillation), which contributed to the difference in incremental QALYs. The committee recalled that the size of any reduction in further stroke or TIA caused by using the devices was uncertain (see section 4.5). The acute and post-stroke utilities were lower in the Diamantopoulos et al. model, which would also have contributed to the difference in incremental QALYs between models. The committee concluded that there was uncertainty about which was the most appropriate approach to modelling the impact of anticoagulant treatment. It concluded that the base case ICER was therefore likely to be between the EAG's and Diamantopoulos et al. estimates.

The cost of Reveal LINQ is a large driver of cost effectiveness results

4.15   The committee considered which factors had a large impact on the cost effectiveness estimate of the Reveal LINQ. It noted that varying the direct oral anticoagulant (DOAC) treatment used (to use treatment effects and cost from just 1 DOAC or including warfarin) in the EAG's scenario analyses changed the ICER substantially (see table 7). The Reveal LINQ was the most expensive of the 3 implantable cardiac monitors in the assessment (see table 4). The EAG used the same data for the effectiveness of BioMonitor 2-AF and Reveal LINQ to detect atrial fibrillation in their base case analysis. However, the lower cost of BioMonitor 2-AF meant that its ICER compared with conventional follow up was substantially lower than Reveal LINQ (£13,519 rather than £24,875 per QALY gained; see table 5). The committee concluded that the cost of Reveal LINQ was a large driver of its ICER.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 41 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

There is uncertainty about the most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ: it may be about £30,000 per QALY gained but could be higher

4.16   The committee only considered cost effectiveness estimates for Reveal LINQ (see section 4.7). The probabilistic ICER for Reveal LINQ in the EAG's model was almost identical to the deterministic value (see section 4.13). The deterministic base case for Reveal LINQ compared with conventional follow up was £24,875 per QALY gained. A previously published model (Diamantopoulos et al. 2016) estimated a lower base case ICER. The committee had previously concluded that the base case ICER was likely to be between the EAG's and Diamantopoulos et al. estimates (see section 4.14). However, if assessment for atrial fibrillation in the conventional follow-up arm is removed from the EAG's base case model, the ICER increases by about £2,700 per QALY gained (see section 4.11). In addition, costs of reviewing alerts produced by Reveal LINQ were not included in the base case model. If the cost of a triage service was included, the EAG's base case ICER increased by about £5,500 to £8,000 per QALY gained (see section 4.12). The committee concluded that there was uncertainty about the most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ. Including its preferences in the EAG's model would increase the ICER to over £30,000 per QALY gained. But using an alternative approach to modelling the impact of anticoagulant treatment (as in Diamantopoulos et al.) would lower the ICER. The committee concluded that the most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ is about £30,000 per QALY gained, but that there was uncertainty about this estimate and the actual value could be higher.

The most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ, taking into account uncertainty about the estimated value, is too high for the committee to recommend routine adoption

4.17   The committee agreed that Reveal LINQ was likely to be clinically effective because it identifies more people who have atrial fibrillation after a cryptogenic stroke or TIA than current practice. The committee recalled

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke   Page 42 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

its conclusion that technologies that improve the detection of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke or TIA could have substantial benefits for patients. In addition, there is an unmet need for longer-term monitoring for atrial fibrillation after a cryptogenic stroke or TIA (see sections 4.1 and 4.2). The committee considered that, even when taking into account the unmet need, the most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ is at the upper limit that NICE normally considers acceptable. And, given the uncertainties in the size of the potential benefits, the actual ICER could be higher (see section 4.16). The cost of Reveal LINQ was a key driver of its ICER (see section 4.15). The committee concluded that, taking into account the uncertainties, the most plausible ICER for Reveal LINQ is too high for the committee to recommend routine adoption.

5 Recommendations for further research

5.1 Further research is recommended to assess the diagnostic yield of the BioMonitor 2-AF and Confirm Rx for atrial fibrillation when used in people who have had a cryptogenic stroke.

6 Implementation

NICE intends to develop tools, in association with relevant stakeholders, to help organisations put this guidance into practice.

In addition NICE will support this guidance through a range of activities to promote the recommendations for further research. The research proposed will be considered by the NICE Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme research facilitation team for the developing specific research study protocols as appropriate. NICE will also incorporate the research recommendations in section 5 into its guidance research recommendations database and highlight these recommendations to public research bodies.

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke Page 43 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

7 Review

NICE reviews the evidence 3 years after publication to ensure that any relevant new evidence is identified. However, NICE may review and update the guidance at any time if significant new evidence becomes available.

Mark Kroese

Chair, diagnostics advisory committee

July 2019

8 Diagnostics advisory committee members and NICE project team

Committee members

This topic was considered by the diagnostics advisory committee, which is a standing advisory committee of NICE.

Committee members are asked to declare any interests in the test to be assessed. If it is considered there is a conflict of interest, the member is excluded from participating further in that assessment.

The minutes of each committee meeting, which include the names of the members who attended and their declarations of interests, are posted on the NICE website.

Additional specialist committee members took part in the discussions for this topic:

Specialist committee members

Dr Sreeman Andole

Consultant in Stroke, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

Mrs Joanne Denman

Lead Cardiology Advanced Clinical Practitioner, United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust

Diagnostics consultation document – Implantable cardiac monitors to detect atrial fibrillation after cryptogenic stroke Page 44 of 45

Issue date: July 2019

Dr Anand Dixit

Consultant Stroke Physician, Newcastle upon Tyne NHS Foundation Trust

Dr David Fox

Consultant Cardiologist/Cardiac Electrophysiologist, North West Regional Cardiac Centre, Wythenshawe Hospital, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

Mrs Jo Jerrome

Lay Specialist Committee Member

Dr Justin Lee

Consultant Cardiac Electrophysiologist, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

Miss Cara Mercer

Chief Cardiac Physiologist, United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust

NICE project team

Each diagnostics assessment is assigned to a team consisting of a technical analyst (who acts as the topic lead), a technical adviser and a project manager.

Thomas Walker

Topic lead

Rebecca Albrow

Technical adviser

Donna Barnes

Project manager

ISBN: