

Randomized, proof of concept clinical trials for therapeutic efficacy and safety of the high intensity focused ultrasound stimulators (RHINOS) in patients with severe nasal congestion by hypertrophy

> Sung-Woo Cho¹, Doo Hee Han², Sung Chan Jo, Chae-Seo Rhee¹ ¹Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital ²Department of Neurosurgery, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital ³KORUST Company Limited, Anyang, Korea `



Introduction

High-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) ablation induced histologic change and volume reduction of inferior turbinate in animal study. In previous study, we have proved the efficacy and safety of HIFU turbinoplasty an animal model.



Protocol summary										
Assessment schedule	Screening	Baseline	1 week	4 weeks	12 weeks					
Nasal congestion symptom score (VAS)	•		٠	•	•					
Nasal obstruction scale evaluation (NOSE)	•		•	•	•					
Acoustic rhinometry (MCA)	•		•	•	•					
Endoscopic exam	•		•	•	•					

Nasal obstruction scale evaluation (NOSE)





Pathologic evaluation interior turbinate of porcine model treated by control, radiofrequency (coblation), HIFUhigh, and HIFU-low groups

(A-C, ×100; D-F, ×400; periodic acid-Schiff staining). This figure demonstrates increased submucosal polymorphonuclear cell count (*) and fibrosis, decreased glandular structure in the HIFU-treated group



Computed tomography evaluation of the control, radiofrequency, and HIFU groups

In this study we tried to evaluate weather HIFU could symptomatically improve nasal obstruction in patients with inferior turbinate hypertrophy (ITH).

Focal depth HIFL	Z-axis J transducer	4 mm			R			
nergy level (X	Focal region size -axis, Z-axis) (mm)	Frequency Focal of (MHz) (mr	depth n)	duro Illuctrati	on: Dotionte y	voro conto	d and tonia	al anasthasia
(High) (Low)	1.08×1.17 0.5×0.75	7.0 3.0	(2% lic	dure mustrati locaine) was	administered	vere seated to each no	a, and topic ostril iust be	al anestnesia
			R	aeul	te			
Bas	eline c	haracte	Re	esul	ts domize	ed pati	ents	
Bas	eline c	haracte	eristics	esul of ran	ts domize	ed pati n (N=9)	ents	-
Bas	eline c	characte	Roentices HIFU Mean or N	esul of ran (N=7) SD or %	ts domize Coblation Mean or N	ed pati n (N=9) SD or %	ents p-value	-
Bas	Sex	eharacte Male Eemale	Roentices Beristics HIFU Mean or N 6 1	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14 3	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11 1	p-value 0.849	-
Bas	Sex	haract Male Female	Pristics HIFU Mean or N 6 1 32.29	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16	p-value 0.849 0.502	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (ka)	haract Male Female	Rean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm)	characte Male Female	Rean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su	haracte Male Female	Rean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir	haracte Male Female	Rean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01	esul of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor	haracte Male Female	Rearistics FIFU Mean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01	esu of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor None	Anale Female	R istics FIFU Mean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01 3 1 3 1 3	esu of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0 33.33	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor None Medication	haracte Male Female	Rean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01 3 3 3	esu of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0 33.33	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor None Medication Allergic rhir	haracte Male Female	Pristics FIFU Mean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01 3 1 3 1 3 1 3	esu of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29 42.86 14.29 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9 1 0 3	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0 33.33 11.11	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor None Medication Allergic rhir Rhinitis	haracte Male Female	R istics FIFU Mean or N 6 1 32.29 70.26 171.01 3 1 3 1 3 2 1 3	esu of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29 42.86 14.29 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9 1 0 3	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0 33.33 11.11 0	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	
Bas	Sex Age (year) Weight (kg) Height (cm) Medical or su Allergic rhir Allergic cor None Medication Allergic rhir Allergic cor	haracte Male Female	Pristics Fistics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebolics Firebo	ESU of ran (N=7) SD or % 85.7 14.3 14.75 12.97 8.24 42.86 14.29 42.86 14.29 42.86 14.29 42.86	ts domize Coblation Mean or N 8 1 38.33 65.71 170.9 1 0 3	ed pati n (N=9) SD or % 88.9 11.1 19.16 9.95 5.99 11.11 0 33.33 11.11 0 33.33	ents p-value 0.849 0.502 0.440 0.975	

A. Significant improvement NOSE scale in both treatment group compared to baseline after 12 weeks of treatment (*,** : p<0.05))

B. There was no significant difference in the degree of improvement between the two groups, suggesting the non-inferiority of HIFU treatment compared to coblation turbinoplasty

Safety and tolerability



Methods and Materials

- A prospective, randomized, single-blinded clinical trial was performed. 16 patients with ITH complaining severe nasal congestion (VAS \geq 4) were recruited.
- After randomization, 7 patients in test group underwent IT surgery with HIFU system('RHINOS'), and 9 in control group underwent conventional high frequency coblator surgery.
- To evaluate subjective and objective improvement, nasal congestion symptom score (10 point VAS scale), NOSE scale, and acoustic rhinometry was evaluated at base line, 1 week, 4 weeks, and 12 weeks. In addition, satisfaction with the procedure (10 point VAS scale) was compared at 12 weeks, respectively.
- Finally, the safety and stability of procedure was compared through evaluation on degree of IT edema, discharge, and crust formation using endoscopic exam

Nasal congestion symptom score



- A. Significant improvement visual analogue scale (VAS) in both treatment group compared to baseline after 12 weeks of treatment (*,** : p<0.05))
- B. There was no significant difference in the degree of improvement between the two groups, suggesting the noninferiority of HIFU treatment compared to coblation turbinoplasty

A. During the procedure, pain was significantly higher in the HIFU treatment group compared to the coblation group. This difference appears to result from the local lidocaine injection (2%, 1cc) administered along the inferior turbinate during coblation turbinoplasty

B. The degree of edema was significantly lower after 12 weeks compared to baseline in both HIFU and coblation treatment group

Nasal discharge and crust formation were significantly lower C and D. among HIFU treatment group compared to coblation treatment group

Summary and Conclusion

HIFU system seems to have benefits in minimizing procedure related morbidity in office-based procedure for turbinoplasty. This warrants a large prospective clinical trial in the future





[name] Chae-Seo Rhee [organization] Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, Seoul National University College of Medicine Seongnam, South Korea

[address] 82, Gumi-ro 173beon-gil, Bundang-gu, Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do 13620, Rep, of KOREA [email] csrhee@snu.ac.kr



• Kim JK, Cho SW, Kim H, Jo SC, Kim HG, Won TB, Kim JW, Lim JH, Rhee CS. Development of High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Therapy for Inferior Turbinate Hypertrophy. Clin Exp Otorhinolaryngol. 2022 May;15(2):160-167.