


Please cite the Published Version

Maher, C and Littlewood, C  (2020) Unanswered questions from the Evoke trial. The Lancet Neurology, 19 (5). p. 380. ISSN 1474-4422

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(20\)30110-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(20)30110-1)

Publisher: Elsevier

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/625657/>

Usage rights:  In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of a paper accepted for publication in The Lancet Neurology, published by and copyright Elsevier.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

EVOKE Letter

The EVOKE trial¹ comes at an interesting time with a 2020 systematic review² reporting that spinal cord stimulation typically provides 1 point greater pain reduction on a 0-10 pain scale than placebo. By any measure a treatment benefit of 1 point is quite modest, and the benefit is also uncertain as the systematic review only found 8 trials with a total of 185 participants.

EVOKE is therefore a significant trial as it enrolled 134 patients; but unfortunately the current publication leaves important questions unanswered. While the title suggests answers to questions about long term safety and efficacy it answers neither question sufficiently. As there was no placebo group it cannot establish efficacy and because outcomes were confined to 12 months it is unclear if this treatment is effective and safe in the long term. Some caution with spinal cord stimulators is wise given a recent report from Australia's Therapeutic Goods Administration.³ The report catalogues over 500 incidents associated with spinal cord stimulators in Australia. These include health problems such as infection, wound breakdown, seizure and pulmonary embolus as well hardware issues such as lead and device failure. In a number of cases devices needed to be revised or replaced and sometimes removed completely due to lack of efficacy. So understanding how the participants in EVOKE fared in the long term is an important issue not addressed in the current publication.

There are also some concerns about aspects of the conduct and reporting of EVOKE. The claim for blinding of participants is questionable because the instructions given to participants during consent clearly outlined the nature of the two different stimulation modes and the results on page 8 and Figure S4 show that participants in the two groups behaved differently in adjusting the stimulation. It is important to recognise this because Duarte et al², in their systematic review, suggest that the magnitude of treatment effect varies across trials and, in part, depends on the quality of patient blinding. There is also some concern about the accuracy of the reporting of the results. For example, the authors report that for secondary outcomes the improvements were generally greater in the closed loop group but if you check the online appendix that benefit was only statistically significant for the minority (4 of 16 – derived from Table S1).

EVOKE is a welcome trial but it does not tell us sufficiently about efficacy, in the short or long term and safety in the long term of evoked compound action potential (ECAP) controlled closed-loop spinal cord stimulation. A further important factor is that of cost-effectiveness which is not reported in the publication. So, as the authors conclude, further investigation is warranted but conclusions about efficacy and long term safety should not be drawn at this stage.

References

1. Mekhail N, Levy RM, Deer TR, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of closed-loop spinal cord stimulation to treat chronic back and leg pain (Evoke): a double-blind, randomised, controlled trial. *The Lancet Neurology* 2019; Published online December 20, 2019 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(19\)30414-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30414-4).
2. Duarte RV, Nevitt S, McNicol E, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of placebo/sham controlled randomised trials of spinal cord stimulation for neuropathic pain. *Pain* 2020; **161**(1): 24-35.

3. Therapeutic Goods Administration (Australia). A document relating to the registration and adverse events for spinal cord stimulators
<https://www.tga.gov.au/documents-released-under-section-11c-freedom-information-act-1982-jul-2018-jun-2019>. 2019.

Chris Maher DMedSc
Director, Institute for Musculoskeletal Health;
Professor School of Public Health
The University of Sydney
PO Box M179,
Missenden Road NSW 2050
AUSTRALIA
Email: christopher.maher@sydney.edu.au

Chris Littlewood PhD
Professor of Musculoskeletal Research
Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Manchester Metropolitan University
Brooks Building
53 Bonsall Street
M15 6GX
UNITED KINGDOM
Email: c.littlewood@mmu.ac.uk