WHY DOES THE GUIDEWIRE CHOICE MATTER?

Research on the potential clinical workflow and cost benefits across Europe of Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M

Purpose: The survey explored the attributes of the Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M that clinicians find most beneficial and how these benefits translate into potential workflow enhancements, improved success rates, reduced failure rates and cost savings for procurement.

Description: An online survey of 252 European interventional specialists was conducted by IPSOS in February 2021. The interventional specialists were selected based on their level of experience and other criteria listed below (Figure 1) to reflect the typical real-world use of guidewires and ensures the capture of expert input from experienced clinicians.



Figure 1. Characteristics of the clinical sample group¹

Respondents believe that atraumatic navigation through the vessels, high trackability and good crossability are highly relevant to their procedural success and efficiency¹

The respondents clearly linked the benefits of atraumatic navigation through the vessels, high trackability and good crossability to the characteristics of the Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M. More importantly, specialists identify that these are relevant to safety, procedural efficiency and wire use (Figure 2).



INTERVENTIONAL

SYSTEMS

* Respondents were asked to agree with the association using a 5-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. The percentage shows proportion of respondents selecting ratings 4 and 5.

WHAT DOES THAT MEAN FOR THE HOSPITAL, THE PATIENT AND THE CLINICIAN?¹



RADIFOCUS[™] GUIDE WIRE M CLINICAL STUDIES - DATA IN PERSPECTIVE

Three studies below compared the guidewires used in endovascular procedures. The Radifocus™ Guide Wire M** showed superior results for several features:

The Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M^{**} is independently rated as having **significant superior characteristics compared to the ZipWire and HiWire** in various vascular beds and in a broad range of patients as shown in the table² Based on the significant differences in crossability, accessibility, and excellent shape retention, we believe **the Terumo Radifocus™ Guide Wire** M** should be the access wire of choice³ In addition to the highest-rated **overall balance of properties**, the Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M** had significantly higher-rated **lubricity** (3.3 ± 0.6; P<.01) and **radiopacity characteristics** compared with the ZIPwire⁴

Guidewire Characteristics ²	Radifocus [™] Guide Wire M (N=37)	ZipWire (N=32)	HiWire (N=31)	Overall
Torque*	2.86 ± 0.35	2.19 ± 0.82	1.87 ± 0.85	18.4 (<0.0001)
Trackability*	2.97 ± 0.16	2.09 ± 0.86	1.84 ± 0.82	27.1 (<0.0001)
Crossing*	2.97 ± 0.16	2.09 ± 0.89	1.77 ± 0.81	28.7 (<0.0001)
Radiopacity*	3.00 ± 0.00	2.53 ± 0.72	2.45 ± 0.81	8.3 (<0.0001)
Lubricity*	2.97 ± 0.16	2.03 ± 0.86	1.77 ± 0.81	29.6 (<0.0001)
Retention*	2.86 ± 0.35	1.97 ± 0.90	1.65 ± 0.83	27.7 (<0.0001)
Shape*	3.00 ± 0.00	2.47 ± 0.80	2.32 ± 0.83	10.5 (<0.0001)
Feel*	2.95 ± 0.28	2.09 ± 0.89	1.84 ± 0.78	25.2 (<0.0001)
Support*	2.92 ± 0.28	2.03 ± 0.74	1.94 ± 0.73	27.9 (<0.0001)
Time*	3.00 ± 0.00	2.22 ± 0.87	2.03 ± 0.84	19.9 (<0.0001)

Further information is available in the Radifocus[™] Guide Wire M **White Paper**



*Significant difference between Glidewire vs. ZipWire and Radifocus™ Guidewire M vs. HiWire.

- ** The studies mention Glidewire name of Radifocus™ Guide Wire M in the U.S.A -, the wire is the same.
- 1. Terumo Europe. Data on file. GW-MCT202012-REP
- 2. Niazi K, Farooqui F, Devireddy C, Robertson G, Shaw RE. Comparison of hydrophilic guidewires used in endovascular procedures. J Invasive Cardiol. 2009;21(8):397-400.

3. Ohki T and Huang J. Comparing Interventional Guidewires in an Ex Vivo Model. Endovascular Today. July 2006.

 Shah A, Lau C, Stavropoulos SW, et al. Comparison of physician-rated performance characteristics of hydrophilic-coated guide wires. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2008;19(3):400-405.

