NHS Research Ethics Committee APPLICATION FORM

This form should be completed by the Chief Investigator, after reading the guidance notes. See Glossary for clarification of different terms in the application form.

Short title and ver ACST-2 version	rsion number (maximum 70	characters - this v	vill be inserted as	header on all forms):
	search ethics committee to w	which application f	or ethical review	is being made:
Hertfordshire 1	scarch canes committee to v	unen appneation i	or current teview	is being made.
Laurenna de la companya de la compan				····
	number from above REC:	05/Q0201/66		
Submission Date:		16/09/2005		
PARTA				
A1. Title of Resear	ch			
Full title:	ACST -2: Asymptomatic Carotic	d Surgery Trial-2: surg	gery vs stenting	
	•			
Key words:	Randomised controlled trial; clin angioplasty and stenting; carotid		gery; carotid artery of	lisease; carotid
	angiopiasty and stoneing, varotic	Chidanter Ceronny		
A2. Chief Investiga	itor			
Title:	Miss First Name/Initials: A		Last Name: Hallid	ay
Post:	Consultant Vascular Surgeon &	Reader		
Qualifications	Consultant Vascular Surgeon			
Organisation:	St George's University of London	on		·
Address:	ACST Office, Department of C	ardiological Sciences		
	St George's University of London	on		
Dentedde	Cranmer Terrace, London			
Postcode: Email:	SW17 ORE			
Telephone:	acst@sghms.ac.uk 020 8725 3746		l	
Fax:	020 8725 3782			
A copy of a current (V (maximum 2 pages of A4) far	the Chief Investigator	must be submitted w	ith application
1	y Dates and Duration			
Start date:	01/09/2005			
End date:	01/09/2015			
Duration	Years 10 Mo	onths		
i				

A4. Pri	mary purpose of the research: (Tick as appropriate)		
	Commercial product development and/or licensing		
	Publicly funded trial or scientific investigation Educational qualification		
	Establishing a database/data storage facility		
	Other		
A E Tial	Ab a bassiff reason and b		
	the box if your research:		
	involves testing a medicinal product involves investigating a medical device		
	involves additional radiation above that required for clinical care		
	involves using stored samples of human biological material (e.g. blood, tissue)		
	involves taking new samples of human biological material involves only patient records or data, with no direct patient contact		
	involves prisoners or others in custodial care		
8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	involves adults with incapacity	_	
	has the primary aim of being educational (eg student research, a project necessar postgraduate degree or diploma, other than an MD or PhD)	y for a	
	posigraduate degree or diploma, other than an WD or They		
A6 Dox	ou consider that this research falls within the category where there is no local	linvestigator?	
/A0. D0 y	ou consider that this research hans within the category where there is no local	YES 🗆	NO 🗹
]		1 DO 🗀	110 🖭
	42		
	, 7		
	U F		
	\mathcal{O} \mathcal{V}		
	\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim		
	decrease.		
Advice	can be found in the Guidance Notes on this topic. Some studies do not require fur	her consideration	$of_{k} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$
site-spe	cific issues by NHS Research Ethics Committees, but will still require approval to	proceed from the	hosts == ==
organis	ation(s).		

A7. What is the principal research question/objective? (Must be in language comprehensible to a lay person.)

Patients with substantial narrowing (stenosis) of the carotid artery, a main blood supply to the brain, have increased stroke risk. Strokes happen when the brain's blood supply is disrupted. A recent trial has shown that surgical removal of the narrowing (carotid endarterectomy) in patients who have had no stroke like symptoms in the previous 6 months (asymptomatic) can substantially reduce the risk of stroke compared to those that had medical treatment alone. Carotid artery stenting (placing a wire mesh which holds the artery open) is a new method of treating carotid narrowing which is rapidly gaining popularity. However, there is very little evidence that it is safer or even equivalent to treating with carotid surgery. A multicentre randomised trial comparing carotid stenting with carotid endarterectomy (CEA) in patients with tight asymptomatic carotid artery narrowing is therefore needed. The principal research questions are:

- 1) What are the differences in clinical myocardial infarction (heart attack) rates and in stroke and death within 30 days of carotid stenting compared with carotid endarterectomy?
- 2) What is the difference in the long-term (5-year) survival, free of disabling or fatal stroke for carotid stenting versus carotid endarterectomy?

A8. What are the secondary research questions/objectives? (If applicable. Must be in language comprehensible to a lay person.)

- 3) What is the rate of re-narrowing of the carotid artery after stenting compared with surgery, causing symptoms of stroke?
- 4) What is the cost-effectiveness of carotid stenting compared with surgery?

A9. What is the scientific justification for the research? What is the background? Why is this an area of importance? (Must be in language comprehensible to a lay person.)

In the UK stroke is responsible for 12% of all deaths. Carotid artery stenosis is a well recognised cause of stroke. At least one million people in Europe alone have severe narrowing of one or both of their carotid arteries (60-99% stenosis). Appropriate medical treatment including blood thinning and cholesterol-lowering therapy is standard for patients at high risk of both heart attack and stroke. However, patients with carotid stenosis have a higher stroke risk which cannot be reduced by these medical treatments alone.

Since the publication in 1991 of two large trials comparing surgery with non-surgical care (ECST and NASCET), CEA has become an effective, well-recognised treatment for stroke prevention in symptomatic patients (stroke-like symptoms <6 months previously). In 2004, the Asymptomatic Carotid Surgery Trial (ACST) looked at "asymptomatic" patients with similar carotid stenoses but no stroke or stroke-like warning symptoms within the previous 6 months. Patients (aged less than 75 years and with a stenosis of 70% or more) had their overall 5-year stroke risk halved from about 12% to about 6%. Therefore, there is now large scale randomised controlled trial evidence supporting surgery in appropriate asymptomatic patients and these findings are expected to change future practice. Carotid artery stenting is a new method of treating carotid stenosis. A wire and catheter is introduced through a groin artery, and by X-ray monitoring is passed into the carotid artery. The narrow portion is ballooned, then a cylindrical wiremesh is placed across the stenosis and pushed open to hold the narrow artery sides apart. Advantages of carotid artery stenting may include shortened hospital stay, fewer wound related complications (discomfort, nerve damage, bruising and infection) and fewer heart attacks within the first 30 days following surgery. However, stenting may pose increased risks as stent expansion does not remove the compressed narrowing during stent placement, and so a diseased portion of artery may crumble and cause a stroke by blocking the blood supply to the brain. There may also be an increased risk of re-narrowing with carotid stenting as compared to CEA. The concept and comfort of stenting may be more acceptable to the patient than surgery, but the 'track record' of CEA is well established and, with experienced surgeons, risks and overall benefit are clear and reliable.

There is very little recent evidence that stenting is safer, or even equivalent to CEA in early efficacy and long-term (5-year) stroke prevention. Nevertheless, the procedure, often performed under local anaesthetic, is rapidly gaining popularity amongst doctors, especially cardiologists, and is expected to continue increasing in popularity. Current randomised trials comparing carotid stenting with endarterectomy' are being undertaken in mainly symptomatic patients (ICSS, SPACE, EVA-3S, CREST). The only recent trial with a proportion of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised 334 patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They concluded that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the results of SAPPHIRE have been questioned and much larger trials are now needed. No trial has yet been undertaken specifically for asymptomatic patients. A new multicentre trial, ACST-2, is therefore being set up to answer this clinically important question so that patients and doctors are better informed before chosing surgery or stenting for asymptomatic carotid stenosis.

A10. Give a brief synopsis/summary of methods and overview of the planned research. This should include a brief description of how prospective research participants and concerned communities (not necessarily geographical) from which they are drawn have been consulted over the design and details of the research. (Where appropriate a flow chart or diagram should be submitted separately. It should be clear exactly what will happen to the research participant, how many times and in what order.)

An overview of the planned research is given below:

The "uncertainty" principle (whereby individual physicians are uncertain about which treatment is best for a patient, rather than collective professional uncertainty) will be used to enable the patient population to be as heterogeneous as possible - as all doctors have differences, however small, in choosing whether patients are suitable for a randomised study, each doctors' 'area of uncertainty' would be used to enable ethical decisions to be made by doctor and patient before entering the trial. If the doctor or the patient felt that one treatment would be more appropriate, the patient would not be entered.

- 1.Identification and assessment of potentially eligible participants: Patients will generally be identified from surgical or medical clinics. As the carotid stenosis is asymptomatic, patients will normally have presented with other vascular problems. ALL patients with uni- or bilateral carotid stenosis for whom the collaborating doctor is uncertain whether to treat with carotid surgery or carotid stenting will be considered. Patients in the trial will not undergo any extra examinations other than those routinely performed. Prior to randomisation, the percentage of stenosis in both carotid arteries will be estimated using non-invasive duplex ultrasound examination. Assessment and treatment of risk factors (such as diabetes, hypertension, hypercholesterolaemia) is extremely important for all patients. Neurological examination and, if indicated, a brain scan will be undertaken. If coronary artery bypass/grafting (or angioplasty) is needed, this should be done before entering the trial.
- 2. Randomisation and treatment: If the carotid artery under consideration is asymptomatic for 6 months or more, the doctor and the patient feel that the patient is fit and willing for operation OR stenting and follow-up, and the patient has given written informed consent to take part in the trial, the patient will be entered into the trial and randomised either to carotid surgery or carotid stenting. Allocated treatment will be carried out as soon as routinely possible. A procedural follow-up form will be completed 30 days after the operation or stenting. This will require neurological re-examination of the patient including non-invasive duplex ultrasound of both carotids. A major event follow-up form will also be completed if there have been any strokes, deaths or procedural heart attacks in the 30 days since the treatment.
- 3. Further follow-up: will be by yearly telephone call for at least 5 years ideally by a neurologist or physician with an interest in stroke. Information collected will include whether they have had a stroke or stroke-like symptoms, any other carotid surgery or stenting, and details of current medication. If the patient has had any neurological symtoms (not stroke) they should be seen and assessed promptly by neurologist / stroke physician (or other appropriately trained clinical staff). If the patient has a stroke, they should again be seen promptly by neurologist / stroke physician and a major event form should be completed and sent to the ACST-2 office. If the patient has any further carotid stents or carotid surgery a procedural follow-up form should be completed 30 days after the intervention. Any patient deaths should be reported to the ACST-2 office via a major event form.
- 4. Patients GP details will be collected at the time of the randomisation and GPs will be informed that the patient is taking part in the trial. To minimise loss to follow-up, GPs may also be contacted for follow-up information if the collaborator loses contact with the patient (e.g. patient moves). Patients will be 'flagged' with the Office of National Statistics. The central co-ordinating office will thus be informed directly of any patient deaths and of patients that have moved, therefore the trial co-ordinating centre will be able to trace their new GP without the patient having to directly contact their trial collaborator.

All patients will be given a patient information sheet and be asked to provide written informed consent to all the above.

This randomised controlled trial will not be blinded as both the patient and the observers will be aware of the patient's treatment. The study methodology has been developed with a statistician. Inconvenience to patients and doctors taking part in this trial has been kept to a minimum. After treatment and 1 month procedural follow-up, patients will only be contacted once a year by telephone unless they have a stroke or stroke-like symptoms and therefore need to attend hospital to see a neurologist/stroke physician (as is normal practice). Both carotid stenting and carotid surgery carry risks of stroke and death. In the case of carotid surgery, these risks are well documented. However, to minimise risks for those undergoing carotid stenting and carotid surgery, collaborators carrying out these procedures will have to meet certain criteria proving their competancy before they can join the study. An independent Data Monitoring Committee will be set up to confidentially review interim analyses. Concerned communities such as vascular surgeons, radiologists and cardiologists have been consulted during the design of this research. Research results will be fed back to participants via the trial collaborators. The trial is expected to start recruitment in late 2005. The recruitment period will last 5-8 years with final analysis of results in 2010-2013.

11. Will any intervent	ention or procedure, which would normally be co the research participants?		
with meaning	ene research participants:	YES 🗆	ИО Б
human biologica	n participants receive any clinical intervention(s) I material over and above that which would norn	or procedure(s) including taking nally be considered a part of rou	g samples itine clinic
care?		YES 🗆	NO E
	•		

Additional intervention	patient time taken proce		YES ☑ NO [Details of additional intervention or procedure, who will undertake it, and	
	what training they have received.			
elephone interview		1 per year	10 mins	Telephone interview with patient ideally by the collaborating neurologist or physician with an interest in stroke, all of whom have experience interacting with patients. Information collected will include whether they have had a stroke or stroke-like symptoms, had any other carotid surgery or stenting and details of current medication. Patients may also be asked to up-date their GP contact details.
Please give details for any oti	her(s):			
embarrassing or upsetting	g, or is it po	ssible that c	riminal or	any topics or issues that might be sensitive, other disclosures requiring action could take sions, or use of screening tests for drugs)?
- 5 , (**)		0 *		YES \(\sqrt{NO} \sqrt{\omega}

A15. What is the expected total duration of participation in the study for each participant?

Up to 10 years (to give overall 5-year results).

A16. What are the potential adverse effects, risks or hazards for research participants either from giving or withholding medications, medical devices, ionising radiation, or from other interventions (including non-clinical):

Myocardial infarction, stroke and death within 30 days of stent or operation. To minimise these risks, collaborators carrying out these procedures will have to meet certain criteria proving their competancy before they can join the study. The surgeons will already have experience in undertaking CEA. The surgeon collaborators will submit a track record of their results to the ACST-2 office. This will consist of the results of their last 50 CEAs, which should ensure they are performing CEAwithin accepted trial guidelines (<8% stroke and death risk for symptomatic patients and ~3% risk for asymptomatic patients). They should be performing at least 10 CEAs per year. Interventionalists carrying out carotid stenting will also be asked to submit a 'track record' prior to participation in ACST-2 which will be reviewed by a technical management sub-committee. They must recently have carried out at least 50 stenting procedures involving aortic arch access; most should be in the carotid territory with an acceptable outcome. Centres that do not yet have enough experience to become a participating centre in the trial will be asked to undergo further training. Participating centres will be asked to provide yearly logs of surgical and stenting activity with clinical (30 day) outcomes.

A17. What is the potential for pain, discomfort, distress, inconvenience or changes to lifestyle for research participants?

Carotid artery stenting and operation may involve some pain, discomfort, distress and inconvenience for the patient, as would any similar procedure. However, in order to take part in the study, the collaborator and patient must have already made the decision to carry out a procedure on the patient for their asymptomatic carotid narrowing (rather than continuing with medical treatment alone), despite their risks. The collaborator should therefore only be 'uncertain' whether to carry out an operation or stenting to clear the narrowing.

After the procedure, further pain, discomfort, distress and inconvenience to the patient has been kept to a minimum. Apart from a neurological follow-up 30 days after the procedure including a non-invasive duplex ultrasound, the patient will only be contacted once a year by telephone for follow-up information.

A18. What is the potential for benefit for research participants?

There are no direct benefits to be gained by the research participant through taking part in the research, except perhaps monitoring over a longer than normal period (yearly telephone interview for at least 5 years).

A19. What is the potential for adverse effects, risks or hazards, pain, discomfort, distress or inconvenience for the researchers themselves? (if any)

None apart from monitoring of patients over a longer than normal period (yearly telephone interview for at least 5 years) - but this is minimal inconvenience.

A20.	0. How will potential research participants in the study be (i) identified, (ii) approached an Give details for cases and controls separately if appropriate:	d (iii) recruited?
i) n	i) Patients will be identified from surgical or medical clinics. As the carotid stenosis is asympto normally have presented with other vascular problems such as peripheral vascular disease and control of the carotid stenosis is asymptotic to the carotid stenosis is asymptotic.	matic, patients will liabetes.
id di iii ti v v a a	ii) During the surgical/medical clinics, the collaborating surgeon, neurologist, stroke physician identify any patients matching the study entry criteria. The collaborator (or designated research designated member of the clinical team) will then approach the patient and discuss the study with them with a patient information sheet (see attached) which contains information on all aspects of including background information and rationale for the study, all procedures that may be involved the anticipated follow-up about the study. It will be stressed that the patient's participation in the voluntary and they can withdraw at anytime. The patient will be encouraged to discuss participate with family as well as medical staff. If the patient agrees to take part they will be given a conseafter having unlimited time to decide whether to take part in the study, they will be asked to sig agreeing to take part. The patient will be given a copy of the signed agreement and the patient take home.	nurse or other th them and provide of the study red and details of the trial is entirely ation in the study ont form to read and, on the consent form
C F	iii) If the patient decides to enter the study they will then be randomised (by telephone randomicarotid artery operation or stenting. Allocated treatment will take place as soon as routinely pos Randomisation will take place at the computerised central randomisation service at the Clinical (CTSU) in Oxford.	sible.
		· ·
:		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
A21 .	1. Will research participants be recruited via advertisement?	
	YES 🗆	ИО 🖸

Patients eligible if in the view of the responsible collaborator: 1) Patients have unilateral or bilateral carotid artery stenosis appropriate for surgery or stenting. The severity of stenosis is not defined specifically - some will have stenoses >90% and some may have stenosis of ~50% with soft plaque; patients with contralateral occlusion may be randomised. The patient may be entered into the trial if the collaborator is satisfied that the lesion is clinically and technically appropriate for carotid surgery or stenting. 2) Patients' carotid stenosis has not caused symptoms for at least 6 months, they have no past history of disabling or severe contralateral stroke, and have no contra-indications to carotid endarterectomy or carotid stenting. 3) The patient is fit for, and willing to have carotid surgery or stenting and accessible for follow-up, with no known illness preventing long-term follow-up. 4) There is substantial uncertainty about whether the patient is better treated by surgery or stenting.

A23. What are the principal exclusion criteria? (Please justify.)

Reasons for not entering patients into the trial are specified by the responsible collaborator, not by the protocol, but include:

- 1) a small likelihood of worthwhile benefit such as low risk of cerebral infarction from a smooth calcified carotid plaque not causing significant stenosis or some major life-threatening disease other than stroke.
- 2) a high risk of adverse effects of trial treatment such as recent acute myocardial infarction or intracerebral neoplasia or aneurysm.
- 3) those found unsuitable for stenting or surgery after angiography (e.g. because the lesion is surgically inaccessible or because the aortic arch anatomy is difficult for stenting access).
- 4) re-narrowing of the artery following previous CEA or stent.
- 5) patients with a likely cardiac source of emboli.
- 6) patients unable or unwilling to give informed consent.

What steps will you take to find out?	YES 🗖	ИО □	Not Known 🗹
			A
		•	
6. Will informed consent be obtained from the resear	•	YES 🗹	NO E
Give details of who will take consent and how it will be d Information (in addition to a written information sheet) e.	one. Give details of any po	articular steps to	NO □ provide
f participants are to be recruited from any of the potentic teps taken to assure their protection. Describe the arran epresentative.			
The collaborator (or designated research nurse or other deterson that discusses the study with the patient, provides ttached) and, in due course obtains written informed control is entirely voluntary and they can withdraw at anyting will be encouraged to discuss their participation with the will have unlimited time to decide whether to enter the state patient's notes and a copy sent to the ACST-2 office. It website containing other background material will also there will be no participants from potentially vulnerable	them with a patient informusent. It will be stressed the ne. The patient can keep the local collaborator, their Gudy. A copy of the signed be available to those with	nation sheet abo at the patient's patient inforn P and family as consent form sh	ut the study (see participation in the nation sheet and appropriate. The nould be kept in
•			
	4		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	******************************	
Copies of the written information and all other explanate	ory material should accom	pany this applic	ation
Copies of the written information and all other explanate 7. Will a signed record of consent be obtained?	ory material should accom		
7. Will a signed record of consent be obtained?		pany this applic	ation i
7. Will a signed record of consent be obtained?			
7. Will a signed record of consent be obtained?			

	g part in this research?	
	YES 🗆	NO 🖸
34. Will individual research participants receive reimbursement of expen.	ses or any other incentive	es or
benefits for taking part in this research?		
	YES 🗆	NO 🖸
5. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or cor by, or on behalf of, participants for <u>negligent</u> harm?	npensation in the event of	of a claim
As this is University sponsored non-commercial research the provisions with	thin HSG(96) 48, referen	ce 2. apply to
this project. The clinical researcher involved in this project (Miss Alison H	(alliday) has a contract wit	h St. George's
University of London as a clinical researcher.		
ii		
ease forward copies of the relevant documents.		
	A28 20 2 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or coby, or on behalf of, participants for <i>non-negligent</i> harm?		
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or coby, or on behalf of, participants for <i>non-negligent</i> harm?		
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or coby, or on behalf of, participants for <u>non-negligent</u> harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions exi	ist for non-negligent harm	to participant
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or coby, or on behalf of, participants for <i>non-negligent</i> harm?	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or constant by, or on behalf of, participants for non-negligent harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions existence and participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or constant by, or on behalf of, participants for non-negligent harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions existence and participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or constant by, or on behalf of, participants for non-negligent harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions existence and participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or constant by, or on behalf of, participants for non-negligent harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions existence and participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions exiparticipants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions exi Participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants
36. What arrangements have been made to provide indemnity and/or constant by, or on behalf of, participants for non-negligent harm? As this is University sponsored non-commercial research, no provisions existence and participants suffering injury as a result of having taken part in this research	ist for non-negligent harm	to participants

A37. How is it intended the results of the study will be reported and disseminated? (Tick as appropriate)
 ✓ Peer reviewed scientific journals ☐ Internal report ✓ Conference presentation ☐ Other publication ☐ Submission to regulatory authorities
Access to raw data and right to publish freely by all investigators in study or by Independent Steering Committee on behalf of all investigators
 □ Written feedback to research participants □ Presentation to participants or relevant community groups □ Other/none e.g. Cochrane Review, University Library
Outermone e.g. Cochrane Review, Oniversity Library
A38. How will the results of the research be made available to research participants and communities from which they are drawn?
Collaborators will inform participants of the main results of the study at its close and the results will also be disseminated by peer reviewed publication and will be available on the trial website.
A39. Will the research involve any of the following activities at any stage (including identification of potential
research participants)? (Tick as appropriate)
 ✓ Examination of medical records by those outside the NHS, or within the NHS by those who would not normally have access ✓ Electronic transfer by magnetic or optical media, email, or computer networks
☐ Sharing of data with other organisations
 ☐ Export of data outside the European Union ☐ Use of personal addresses, postcodes, faxes, emails or telephone numbers
☐ Publication of direct quotations from respondents ☐ Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals
☐ Use of audio/visual recording devices ☐ Storage of personal data on any of the following:
☐ Manual files including X-rays
☐ NHS computers ☐ Home or other personal computers
☐ University computers ☐ Private company computers
Laptop computer
Further details:
Occasionally, it will be necessary to provide the central co-ordinating centre (based at a medical school)
with copies of information from the patient's medical record so that major events can be properly audited e.g. copy of CT scan if patient has had a stroke.
The co-ordinating centre will also keep a record of personal addresses, postcodes, telephone numbers and NHS numbers of the participants. This information is necessary to 'flag' patients with the Office of
National Statistics. The patients will not be contacted by the central co-ordinating centre at any time.
These personal data and any manual patient files will be kept in locked cupboards. Similarly, the patient
Latiabase on the Medical School computer system will be secure and most Data Protoction Act
database on the Medical School computer system will be secure and meet Data Protection Act regulations.

A40.	What measures will be put in place to ensure confidentiality of personal data? Give details of whether
	any encryption or other anonymisation procedures will be used, and at what stage:

Randomisation of patients will take place either by telephone or by fax to the randomisation unit in the Clinical Trial Services Unit, Oxford. Transfer of randomisation data from Oxford to the central co-ordinating centre in St George's hospital will take place by secure transfer, either by encrypted email or by directly downloading to the trial database by secure FTP transfer. The data will be held on a secure password protected database which will be stored on a secure password protected server on the medical school computing system. Patient data will be entered using initials, date of birth and trial number so that they cannot be identified. Due to the nature of the work it would be extremeley difficult to completely anonymise the database. However, trial staff will only have access to data appropriate to their role. All ACST staff agree to maintain confidentiality at all times as part of their employment contract with University of London. All manual patient files will be kept in locked cupboards and the office will meet all Data Protection Act regulations as directed by the Data Protection Officer at SGUL, John Duffy.

Δ	41. Where will the analysis of the data from the study take place and by whom will it be undertaken?
41	The analysis of the data will take place at the Clinical Trial Services Unit, Richard Doll Building, Old Road Campus, Roosevelt Drive, Oxford, OX3 7LF. The analysis will be supervised by Professor Rory Collins (statistician).
	to completely anonymise the database. However, trial staff will only have access to data appropriate to their role. All ACST staff agree to maintain confidentiality at all times as part of their employment contract with University of London. All manual patient files will be kept in locked cupboards and the office will meet all Data Protection Act regulations as directed by the Data Protection Officer John Duffy, Director of Administration at SGUL.
A	42. Who will have control of, and act as the custodian for, the data generated by the study?
	The principal investigator, Miss Alison Halliday, and co-investigator, Professor Richard Peto.
A	43. Who will have access to the data generated by the study?
	The research staff at the central co-ordinating centre and involved staff at the Clinical Trial Services Unit, Oxford. Collaborators in the study will have access to data from their own centres, if requested. Any other requests for data will be discussed by the Trial Steering Committee on a case by case basis but in no circumstances will patient identifiable information be provided to those outside the immediate research team.
	44. For how long will data from the study be stored? Give details of where they will be stored, who will have access, and of the custodial arrangements for the data: Manual patient files will be kept in the co-ordinating centre (Medical School) in locked storage. The database will be kept on the University computer server (see above). A copy of the database will also be downloaded and kept in a safe in the co-ordinating centre. Only the immediate research team will have access to the data. Any other requests for data will be discussed by the Trial Steering Committee on a case by case basis but in no circumstances will patient identifiable information be provided to those outside the immediate research team

A45. How has the scientific quality of the research been assessed? (Tick as appropriate)	
☐ Independent external review	
☐ Review within a company	
Review within a multi-centre research group	
☐ Internal review (e.g. involving colleagues, academic supervisor)	
☐ None external to the investigator	
Other, e.g. methodological guidelines	
If you are not in possession of any referees' or other scientific critique reports relevant to your proposed study,	
justify and describe the review process and outcome. If review has been undertaken but not seen by the research	er.
give the details of the body which has undertaken the review:	•,
	,
The protocol has been designed with the aid of the Clinical Trial Sevice Unit, University of Oxford. Its scientific	•
quality has been thoroughly assessed by the Unit who have many years experience of planning and carrying ou	t
such studies. The protocol will undergo independent review as the full funding application has now been submitted.	
Subinited.	
I copy of any referees' comments or other scientific critique reports relevant to the proposed research must be enclo	sed
a copy of any referees' comments or other scientific critique reports relevant to the proposed research, must be enclo- with the application form.	sed
with the application form.	sed.
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before?	sed .
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? YES ☑ NO □	sed - All
With the application form. A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? YES ☑ NO ☐	sed :
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high	
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the resulting the statistical analysis and relevance of the resulting was 'not inferior'.	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? YES NO Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? YES NO Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease.	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered?	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: YES NO NO	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: NO Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane	d
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: NO Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: NO Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd
A46. Has similar research on this topic been done before? Why should it be repeated? A trial with a small number of asymptomatic patients, SAPPHIRE, randomised patients at so called surgical 'high risk' between CEA and stenting. This trial had very small numbers and a skewed patient population. They conclude that carotid stenting was 'not inferior' to CEA in these patients but the statistical analysis and relevance of the result of SAPPHIRE have been questioned. The question of the potential benefit of carotid stenting compared to surgery remains unanswered. A large and more streamlined trial is required both to reliably assess the superiority of either CEA or carotid stenting and to ensure these results are generalisable to the population at large with asymptomatic carotid artery disease. A47. Have all existing sources of evidence, especially systematic reviews, been fully considered? Please give details of search strategy used: Online databases such as Medline, Embase, Web of Science were searched for relevant articles. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence website were also searched. Relevant meeting abstract books were inspected for the latest research. Discussion also took place with researchers.	dd

A48. What is the primary outcome measure for the study?
1) What are the differences in clinical myocardial infarction rates and in stroke and death within 30 days of carotid stenting compared with carotid endarterectomy?
2) What is the difference in the long-term (5-year) survival free of disabling or fatal stroke for carotid stenting versus carotid endarterectomy?
voidus du out du
A49. What are the secondary outcome measures? (If any)
3) What is the rate of re-narrowing of the carotid artery after stenting compared with surgery causing symptoms of
stroke?
4) What is the cost-effectiveness of carotid stenting compared with surgery?
A50. How many participants will be recruited? How many of these participants will be in a control group?
The recruitment target is 4000+ patients. 50% of patients will be in the 'control' group (the CEA group).
A51. Has the size of the study been informed by a formal statistical power calculation?
YES 🖸 NO 🗖
Indicate the basis upon which this was done and give sufficient information to allow the replication of the calculation:
The calculation below has informed the size of the study and this shows that 4000+ patients will be required to provide this.
An increase of about 60% in the stroke rate with stenting versus surgery (e.g. 5% vs 3%, respectively), and a decrease of about 60% in the myocardial infarction rate with stenting versus surgery (e.g. 0.8% vs 2%, respectively), could both be detected with 90% statistical power at 2P<0.05.
A52. Has a statistician given an opinion about the statistical aspects of the research?
YES ☑ NO □
Give the name and contact details:
Professor Richard Peto, Clinical Trials Service Unit, Richard Doll Building, Old Road Campus, Oxford OX3 7LF Tel: 01865 743743 Fax: 01865 743985
Give a brief summary of advice offered and attach a copy of the comments if available:
The sample size was based on discussions with the statisticians and other relevant investigators.
Enclose a copy of comments. If the comments are not available then please enclose a summary of the opinion.

NHS REC Application Form - Version 3.0, Jan 2004

A53. Describe the statistical methods and/or other relevant methodological approaches (e.g. for qualitative research) to be used in the analysis of the results. Give details of the methods of randomisation process to be used if applicable:
Statistical analysis of results: the results will be analysed using Kaplan-Meier life-table analyses. Logrank analyses will compare event rate between all those allocated carotid stenting and all those allocated CEA (irrespective of treatment given i.e. intention to treat analysis) at specified time periods.
Randomisation: minimised randomisation and stratified for gender, age, centre, degree of stenosis and experience of collaborator (assessed by track record). Randomisation will be by telephone and will take place at the computerised central randomisation service at the Clinical Trials Service Unit (CTSU) in Oxford. Data will then be downloaded to the ACST-2 database by secure encrypted email or FTP transfer.
A54. Where will the research take place? (Tick as appropriate)
□ UK
 ☑ Other States in the European Union ☑ Other States in the European Economic Area
☐ Other States in the European Economic Area
Give details:
This will be a worldwide multi-centre study. However, the majority of centres are expected to be in Europe.
All participating centres will have to provide written evidence of appropriate ethical approval before they can take part in the study.
ASS The this are similar and in the last of the last o
A55. Has this or a similar application been previously rejected by a Research Ethics Committee in the UK, the European Union or in the European Economic Area? YES □ NO ☑

	w many and what type of host organisations (NHS oy will take place?	r other) in the UK is it intended that the proposed		
Indicate the type of organisation by ticking the box and give approximate numbers if known:				
		Number of organisations		
×	Acute teaching NHS Trusts			
\boxtimes	Acute NHS Trusts			
	NHS Community and/or Primary Care Trusts			
	NHS Trusts providing mental healthcare			
	NHS Care Trusts			
	Social Care Organisations			
	Prisons			
\boxtimes	Independent hospitals			
	Educational establishments			
	Independent research units	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
	Other (give details)			
		100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
:				
A57. What a	arrangements are in place for monitoring and auditi	ng the conduct of the research?		
The trial	will be managed by a trial steering committee which wi	Il include the principal investigators, independent		
data perio	ofessionals in relevant fields and patient representatives odically through interim analyses. Regular progress rep	The Data Monitoring Committee will look at the		
If patient	s are recruited from St George's Hospital the Trust will	conduct monitoring and auditing exercises.		
Otherwis	e central monitoring for completion, plausibility outcon	es and other aspects of data integrity will be		
	d by the Trial Co-ordinating Centre at SGUL in liaison	with the Trial Steering Committee and the Data		
MOHROTH	ng Committee.			
Will a d:	ata monitoring committee be convened?	YES ☑ NO □		
	e the criteria for electively stopping the trial or othe			
		2		
	Monitoring Committee will look at major event data a			
particular	ee whether there is an unacceptably high morbidity asso centres), or if there is clear evidence that for all or som	crated with surgery or stenting (either overall or in		
reasonabl	le doubt that one or the other procedure is preferable.	e particular types of patient, there is proof beyond an		
	•			
Details of me	mbership of the Data Monitoring Committee, their stan	dard operating procedures and summaries of reports		
of interim an	alyses to the Data Monitoring Committee must be forwe	rded to the NHS research ethics committee approving		
tha couls				

A58. Has funding for the research been secured?	ΟØ
What arrangements are being made to cover any costs of the research? If no external funding is being sought, please say so:	
Funding has been secured for 1 year for the Senior ProgrammerData Manager.	
External funding is being sought to cover the following:	
Staff: Trial Co-ordinator (full-time) - Total for 5 years is £214,961 (inc. NI, Superannuation and London Allowance Assistant Administrator (full-time) - Total for 5 years £164,202 (inc. NI, Superannuation and London Allowance) - Total for 5 years is £214,961 (inc. NI, Superannuation and Lon Allowance)	nce)
Other costs: Total cost for 5 years is £416,910 for items listed below: Administration (printing, stationary, telephone and fax charges, photocopying) Equipment (fax machine, telephones, computers, printer) Travel (to visit collaborating centres)	
A59. Has the funder of the research agreed to act as sponsor as set out in the Research Governance Frame	work?
YES □ NO □ Not yet known ☑	
Has the employer of the Chief Investigator agreed to act as sponsor of the research?	
YES ☑ NO ☐ Not yet known ☐ Give details of the organisation who will act as the sponsor of the research:	
Organisation: St Georges University of London	
Address: Cranmer Terrace London	
Postcode: SW17 0RE	
UK Contact: Mary Anne Tourette	
Telephone: 020 8725 1012 Fax: 020 8725 3426	
Email: mtourett@sgul.ac.uk	
A copy of documentation indicating that the organisation has accepted the role of sponsor should be enclosed if	t the

NHS REC Application Form - Version 3.0, Jan 2004

A60. Has any responsibility for the research been delegated to a subcontractor?	YES 🗆	NO 🗹
	i ro []	NOM
A61. Will individual researchers receive any personal payment over and above nundertaking this research?	ormal salary for	
	YES 🗆	NO 🖸
	•	
A62 Will individual research are reactive any other hands and in active service.	retairing this	avah?
A62. Will individual researchers receive any other benefits or incentives for unde	a taking this rese	ai CH í
	YES 🗆	NO ☑
<u> </u>		
A63. Will the host organisation or the researcher's department(s) or institution(s or benefits in excess of the costs of undertaking the research?) receive any pay	ment
	YES 🗆	NO 🖾
A64. Does the Chief Investigator or any other key investigator/collaborator have involvement (e.g. financial, share-holding, personal relationship etc.) in th or funding the research that may give rise to a possible conflict of interest?	e organisation sp	
·	YES 🗆	NO 🗹
	- ~~ L	1.0 <u>C</u>

A6:	5. Other relevan	t reference numbers if known (give details and version numbers as appropriate):					
	Applicant's/org	ganisation's own reference number, e.g. R&D (if available):					
	Sponsor's/prote	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Funder's refere	**************************************					
		Standard Randomized Controlled Trial Number (ISRCTN):					
		nical Trials Database (EUDRACT) Number:					
		No. and the state of the state					
	Project website	www.acst.org.uk (initially)					
		estigators/collaborators (all grant co-applicants should be listed)					
i	Title:	Prof First Name/Initials: Richard Last Name: Peto					
	Post:	Co Director of CTSU and Professor of Medical Statistics and Epidemiology at Univ. of Osford					
	Qualifications:	BA MSc (Statistics)					
	Organisation:	Clincal Trial Services Unit (CTSU)					
	Address:	CTSU, Richard Doll Building, Old Road Drive Telephone: 01865 743743					
		Oxford Fax: 01865 743985					
	Postcode:	OX3 7LF Email: secretary@ctsu.ox.ac.uk					
ii	Title:	Dr First Name/Initials: Dafydd Last Name: Thomas					
	Post:	Consultant Neurologist					
	Qualifications:	MD					
	Organisation:	St Mary's Hospital, London					
	Address:	Praed Street Telephone: 020 7725 1389					
		London Fax: 020 7725 6200					
	Postcode:	W2 1NY Email: dafydd.thomas@ic.ac.uk					
iii	Title:	Prof First Name/Initials: Jean-Pierre Last Name: Becquemin					
ш	Post:	Professor of Vascular Surgery					
	Qualifications:	MD					
	Organisation:						
	Address:	Hospital Henri Mondor					
	Address.	51 Avenue du Mal de Lattre de Tassigny 94010 Creteil Cedex Telephone: 33 1 49812433					
		France 33 149812435					
	Postcode:	Email: jpbecquemin@hotmail.com					
iv	Title:	First Name/Initials: Last Name:					
	Post:						
	Qualifications:						
	Organisation:						
	Address:	Telephone:					
		Fax:					
	Postcode:	Email:					
ν	Title:	First Name/Initials: Last Name:					
	Post:						
	Qualifications:						
	Organisation:						
	Address:	Talanhana					
		Telephone:					
	Postcode:						
	i ostcode.	Email:					

If there are more than 5 collaborators, please enter at end of section or attach a further sheet.

N/A	//////////////////////////////////////
mmary of Ethical Issues	
May of Demont 185008	
What do you consider to be the main ethical issues or problems which may arise w and what steps will be taken to address these?	ith the proposed study
There are no ethical problems arising from the proposed study.	
	•
Do you need to add further information about certain questions in Part A?	

PART B: Section 2 - Investigation of Medical Devices

1. Give details of the me	dical device(s) to be used in the study		The second secon	
<i>i.</i> Device description:	Carotid Wallstent			
Manufacturer:	Boston Scientific			
Use:	To hold open a narrowed carotid artery.			
Length of use:	Does the device have a CE mark?*	YES 🖸	№□	
ii. Device description:	Smart			
Manufacturer:	CORDIS			
Use:	To hold open a narrowed carotid artery.			
Length of use:	Does the device have a CE mark?*	YES 🔁	NO 🗆	4
iii. Device description:	Acculink			
Manufacturer:	Guidant			
Use:	To hold open a narrowed carotid artery.			
Length of use:	Does the device have a CE mark?*	YES 🗹	№□	•
*For all products with	a CE mark please attach instructions for use.			
2. Does the study involve existing product outside	the use of a <i>new</i> medical device or <i>new</i> implantable de the terms of its CE marked intended purpose?	material or the us	e of an	
	•	YES 🗖	NO ☑	

N/A		
4. Is a medical device company or other commercial company arranging this to	rial? YES □	NO 🖸
a) Is this trial a clinical investigation requiring notification to the MHRA?	YES 🗆	NO 🛮
b) Does the company have a Notice of No Objection from the MHRA?	YES 🗆	№□
c) Has MHRA approval been applied for but not yet received?	YES 🗖	ио □
Note: An application can be made prior to receipt of a valid Notice of No Objection issued subject to the sponsor subsequently receiving a favourable opinion. There is No Objection to be provided to the relevant ethics committee before the research ca	no requirement for a v	alid Notice of
5. Have any of the medical devices been transferred from one organisation (legapurpose of this trial?	al entity) to another fo	or the
parpose of this trial.	YES 🗆	NO 🗹
6. In cases of equipment or medical devices, what arrangements have been made provide indemnity?		irer to
None, as all devices are approved and not experimental normal clinical negligence r	egulations apply.	

PART B: Section 7 - Declaration

- The information in this form is accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief and I take full responsibility for it.
- I undertake to abide by the ethical principles underlying the Declaration of Helsinki, and Good Practice Guidelines on the proper conduct of research.
- If the research is approved I undertake to adhere to the study protocol without unagreed deviation and to comply with any conditions set out in the letter sent by the NHS Research Ethics Committee notifying me of this.
- I undertake to inform the NHS Research Ethics Committee of any changes in the protocol, and to submit annual reports setting out the progress of the research.
- I am aware of my responsibility to be up to date and comply with the requirements of the law and relevant guidelines relating to security and confidentiality of patient or other personal data, including the need to register when necessary with the appropriate Data Protection Officer.
- I understand that research records/data may be subject to inspection for audit purposes if required in future.

•	I understand that personal data	about me	as a resear	cher in t	his applicati	on will be h	eld by the Res	earch Ethics
	Committee and its operational	managers,	and that tl	nis will b	e managed	according to	the principles	established
	in the Data Protection Act.	7	11	10	4			

Committee and its opera	ational managers, and that this will be managed according to the principles established
in the Data Protection A	Act.
Signature of the Chief	Elesan W Hearday
Investigator:	
Date:	17/08/2005
Print Name:	Alison Halliday

1. Do you need to add further information about certain questions in Part B?		
	YES ⋈	ΝОП

ENSURE THAT YOU COMPLETE AND SIGN THE FORM, AND ENCLOSE ALL RELEVANT ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS.

BI-1. Further information for Part B

(Please specify the question number to which the information applies)

Q1 - Give details of the medical device(s) to be used in the study:

i. Device description: Mednova Neuroshield

Manufacturer: Abbott

Use: To prevent emboli getting to brain Does the device have a CE mark: YES

Device description: Angioguard

Manufacturer: CORDIS

Use: To prevent emboli getting to brain Does the device have a CE mark: YES

Device description: EPI

Manufacturer: Boston Scientific

Use: To prevent emboli getting to brain Does the device have a CE mark: YES

Device description: PercuSurge

Manufacturer: Medtronic

Use: To prevent emboli getting to brain Does the device have a CE mark: YES

Device description: Parodi Anti-Emboli System Manufacturer: ArteriA Medical Science Inc. Use: To prevent emboli getting to brain Does the device have a CE mark: YES