Appendix 1 Table M. On-Label Comparative Study Functional Outcomes

| Investigator (yr, country, ref #) | Study design | Comparisons No. pts (BMP dose) | Patient diagnosis | Surgical intervention | Outcome measure mean score (n-value) | Outcome measure % improved or success | Comment |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Boden et al., 2000 USA (71) Lumbar Spine | Multicenter, nonblinded RCT | rhBMP2 (4.2-8.4 mg/pt) n=11 ICBG n=3 | single-level lumbar DDD | single-level primary anterior lumbar fusion with interbody fusion cages plus rhBMP2 or ICBG | SF-36 physical function subscale Mean score improvement (points) 3, 6, 12. 24 mos rhBMP2 10, 18, 27, 38 ICBG 13, 27, 37, 37 | Work status at 24 mos rhBMP2 10 of 11 (91%) pts working ICBG 2 of 3 (67%) | No significant differences between groups |
| Burkus et al., 2002 USA (72) Lumbar Spine | Multicenter, nonblinded RCT | rhBMP2 (4.2-8.4 mg/pt) n=143 | single-level lumbar DDD | single-level primary anterior lumbar fusion with interbody fusion cages plus rhBMP2 or ICBG | Median days return to work rhBMP2 64 | Neurological status 1.5, 3, 6, 12, 24 mos rhBMP2 80, 84, 78, 82, 83 Work status 3, 6, 12, 24 mos rhBMP2 38, 51, 55, 66 working | No significant differences between groups |
| | | ICBG n=136 | | | ICBG 65 | Neurological status 1.5, 3, 6, 12, 24 mos ICBG 84, 77, 81, 85, 84 Work status 3, 6, 12, 24 mos ICBG 28, 46, 50, 56 working | |

| Burkus et al., 2003 USA (182) Lumbar Spine Note: may include pts in Burkus et al., 2003, (80) | Retrospective combined comparative analysis | rhBMP2 n=277 (dose NR) ICBG n=402 | single-level lumbar DDD | single-level primary anterior lumbar fusion with interbody fusion cages | SF-36 physical component subscale Mean score improvement (points) pre, 3, 6, 12, 24 mos rhBMP2 9, 12, 14, 16 ICBG 5, 8, 10, 12 (p=0.0015, 0.0004, 0.0003, 0.0007) | Work status at 24 mos rhBMP2 103 (75%) who were working presurgery returned to work ICBG 109 (65%) who were working presurgery returned to work (p NSD) | rhBMP recipients returned to work a median 55 days sooner than ICBG graft recipients (adjusted p=0.0156) |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Dawson et al., 2009 USA (73) Lumbar Spine | Multicenter nonblinded RCT | rhBMP2/CRM n=25 (12 mg/pt) | single-level lumbar DDD | single-level primary instrumented posterolateral lumbar fusion plus rhBMP2 or ICBG | SF-36 physical component subscale Mean score improvement (points) 24 mos rhBMP2/CRM 13 SF-36 physical function subscale Mean score improvement (points) 24 mos rhBMP2/CRM 36 | Work status at 24 mos rhBMP2/CRM 8 of 23 (3%5) working | The rhBMP2/CRM group appeared to improve faster than the ICBG group, but this impression was not statistically supported |
| | | ICBG n=21 | | | SF-36 physical component subscale Mean score improvement (points) 24 mos ICBG 10 | ICBG 6 of 20 (30%) working | |

| | | | | | SF-36 physical function subscale Mean score improvement (points) 24 mos ICBG 18 | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|----|--|
| Govender et al. for the BESTT study group 2002 South Africa (74) Open Tibial Fractures | Multi-center, single blind, RCT | rhBMP2 (1) n=151 (6 mg/patient) rhBMP2 (2) n=149 (12 mg/patient) (3) n=150 | Open tibial fracture where the major component was diaphyseal | IM nail fixation and soft tissue management | NR | NR | |
| | | (IM nail fixation and soft tissue management) | | | | | |
| Swiontkowski et al., 2006 USA (81) Open Tibial Fractures Note: This paper reports | Subgroup analysis of combined data from two prospective randomized trials with identical designs | rhBMP2 (1) n=169 (12 mg/patient) | Acute open tibial fracture | IM nail fixation and soft tissue management | NR | NR | |

| on 131 of the same patients included in Govender et al., 2002 (74) Boyne et al., 2005 USA (75) | Multicenter randomized dose- comparison | (2) n=169 Standard care (IM nail fixation and soft tissue management) rhBMP2/ACS (6-24 mg/pt) n=18 | < 6 mm alveolar bone height in the | staged bilateral or unilateral maxillary sinus floor | NR | Prosthesis implantation into newly induced bone rhBMP2/ACS 0.75 mg/ml | Patient success was defined as having an |
|--|--|---|---|---|----|--|---|
| (75) Maxillofacial and Dental | efficacy study | | n the posterior maxilla | augmentation | | Successful prosthetic functional loading at 36 mos. (% patients) rhBMP2/ACS 0.75 mg/mL 100/67 (12 of 12 observed/12 of 18 enrolled) | augmentation procedure with at least one implant placed into newly formed bone without additional augmentation, achieved osseointegration of sufficient number of implants to allow prosthetic device implant, and maintained prosthetic use for |
| | | | | | | Bone quality at dental implant placement (Branemark criteria) I, >I-II, >II-III, >III-IV (%) rhBMP7/ACS 0.75 mg/mL (n=15) 0, 7, 53, 40 | 36 mos. following functional loading |

| | | | | |
|------|----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | rhBMP2/ACS | | Prosthesis implantation | |
| | (15-48 mg/pt) | | into newly induced bone | |
| | (10 10 11g/pt) | | | |
| | n= 17 | | INBINP2/ACS | |
| | | | 1.50 mg/mL | |
| | | | 88 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Successful prosthetic | |
| | | | functional loading at 36 | |
| | | | mos (% patients) | |
| | | | | |
| | | | IIIBIVIP2/ACS | |
| | | | 1.50 mg/mL | |
| | | | 100/76 | |
| | | | (13 of 13 observed/13 of | |
| | | | 17 oprolled) | |
| | | | r enoled) | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Dense weekte denstel | |
| | | | Bone quality at dental | |
| | | | implant placement | |
| | | | (Branemark criteria) | |
| | | | , > - , > - , > - ∨ (%) | |
| | | | rbBMD7/ACS | |
| | | | | |
| | | | 1.50 mg/mL (n=15) | |
| | | | 0, 20, 60, 20 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | AGB | | Prosthesis implantation | |
| | n-13 | | into newly induced hono | |
| | 11-13 | | | |
| | | | INBMP2/ACS | |
| | | | AGB | |
| | | | 100 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | | | Successful prosthetic functional loading at 36 mos. (% patients) AGB 100/62 (8 of 8 observed/8 of 13 enrolled) | |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|----|---|--|
| | | | | | | Bone quality at dental implant placement (Branemark criteria) I, >I-II, >II-III, >III-IV (%) rhBMP7/ACS AGB (n=12) 0, 8, 58, 33 | |
| Fiorellini et al., 2005 USA (76) Maxillofacial and Dental | Double-blind, multicenter randomized, placebo- control dose- comparison, safety and efficacy study | rhBMP2/ACS (mn dose 0.9 mg/pt) n=22 rhBMP2/ACS (mn dose 1.9 mg/pt) n=21 Placebo n=17 | ≥ 50% buccal bone loss of the extraction socket(s) | extraction socket augmentation | NR | Dental implant placement without secondary augmentation rhBMP2/ACS 0.75 mg/mL 55 1.50 mg/mL 86 Placebo 59 | |
| | | No Tx n=20 | | | | No tx 45 (p=0.009 vs no tx) | |

| Triplett et al., 2009 USA (77) Maxillofacial and Dental | Multicenter, nonblinded RCT | rhBMP2/ACS n=80 (12-24 mg/pt) AGB n=80 | < 6 mm alveolar bone height in the posterior maxilla | staged bilateral or unilateral maxillary sinus floor augmentation | NR | Prosthesis implantation into newly induced bone rhBMP2/ACS 82 Successful prosthetic functional loading at 24 mos. (% patients) rhBMP2/ACS 76 Prosthesis implantation into newly induced bone AGB 95 Successful prosthetic functional loading at 24 mos. (% patients) AGB 91 (p=0.0166) | Patient success was defined as having an augmentation procedure with at least one implant placed into newly formed bone without additional augmentation, achieved osseointegration of sufficient number of implants to allow prosthetic device implant, and maintained prosthetic use for 24 mos. following functional loading |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| van den Bergh et al., 2000 Netherlands (82) | Retrospective cohort study | rhBMP7/ACS n=3 (2.5 mg/pt) | partly edentulous | maxillary sinus floor augmentation | NR | Implant placement at 6 mos rhBMP7/ACS 33 | Statistical analysis not done, too few observations |

| Maxillofacial and Dental | | ICBG n=3 | | | | ICBG 100 | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|----|-------------|--|
| Calori et al., 2008 Italy (78) Long Bone Nonunion | Single-center, nonblinded RCT | rhBMP7/ACS n=60 (3.5-7.0 mg/pt) PRP n=60 | post- traumatic atrophic nonunion for ≥ 9 mos, with no signs of healing over the last 3 mos | open reduction internal fixation (ORIF), external fixation (EF), or reamed intramedullary nailing (IM) with rhBMP7 or PRP | NR | NR | |
| Dahabreh et al., 2008 (83) Long Bone Nonunion | Retrospective cohort study | rhBMP7/ACS n=15 (3.5 mg/pt) ICBG n=12 | tibial fracture nonunion with clinical and radiographi c failure to progress to union for ≥ 9 mos. following initial fracture stabilization | open reduction internal fixation (ORIF), exchange intramedullary nailing (IM), or Ilizarov, with rhBMP7 or ICBG | NR | NR | |

| Friedlaender | Multicenter, | rhBMP7/ACS | tibial | IM rod fixation | NR | Weight-bearing | |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|----|----------------|--|
| et al., | partially | n=61 | nonunion | with | | 9 mos | |
| 2001 | blinded RCT | (3.5-7.0 mg/pt) | for ≥ 9 mos, | rhBMP7/ACS | | rhBMP7/ACS | |
| (79) | | | with no | or AGB | | 86 | |
| Long Bone | | | signs of | | | | |
| Nonunion | | AGB | healing | | | AGB | |
| | | n=61 | over the | | | 85 | |
| | | | last 3 mos | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |