TABLE 1. EMBOLIC PROTECTION DEVICES IN SFG INTERVENTION: MAJOR CLINICAL TRIALS

Trial Name	Device	No. of Patients	Trial Design	Follow-Up and Endpoints	Results (EPD vs Control)
SAFE	GuardWire	105	Registry	(1°) In-hospital MACE	5%
				(2°) Final TIMI-3 flow	99%
				(2°) No reflow	0%
SAFER	GuardWire	801	Randomized: GuardWire vs no EPD	(1°) 30-day MACE	9.6% vs 16.5%, *P*=.004
				(2°) No reflow	3% vs 9%, *P*=.02
FIRE	FilterWire EX	651	Randomized: FilterWire EX vs GuardWire	(1°) 30-day MACE	9.9% vs 11.6%, *P*=NS
				(1°) 6-month MACE	19.3% vs 21.9%, *P*=NS
BLAZE I, BLAZE II	FilterWire EZ	221	Combined registry	(1°) 30-day MACE	5% (vs 9.9% in FIRE, *P*=.03)
SPIDER	Spider/SpideRX	747	Randomized: SpideRX vs FilterWire EX/EZ or GuardWire	(1°) 30-day MACE	9.2% vs 8.7%, *P*=NS
PRIDE	TriActiv System	631	Randomized: TriActiv System vs FilterWire EX or GuardWire	(1°) 30-day MACE	11.2% vs 10.1%, *P*=NS
				(2°) Vascular complications	10.9% vs 5.4%, *P*=.01
CAPTIVE	CardioShield	652	Randomized: CardioShield vs GuardWire	(1°) 30-day MACE	10% vs 12%, *P*=NS
TRAP	Trap Vascular Filtration System (VFS)	358 (incomplete enrollment)	Randomized: Trap VFS vs no EPD	(1°) 30-day MACE	12.7% vs 17.3%, *P*=.24
PROXIMAL	Proxis	594	Randomized: Proxis vs FilterWire or GuardWire	(1°) 30-day MACE	9.2% vs 10%, *P*=NS