Intensive Glucose Lowering: Questions Remain

BY KATE JOHNSON

MONTREAL — Better identification of risk, but lack of explanation for it, continues to frustrate investigators as they search for reasons for the excess mortality associated with intensive glycemic control in the ACCORD trial.

However, complex interactions between baseline characteristics, postrandomization characteristics, and treatment strategy are still being explored.

In the latest set of analyses, "neither rapid reduction of blood glucose nor the achievement of near normal hemoglobin A₁₆ levels led to an excess risk of allcause or CV death with the intensive strategy," said Dr. Matthew Riddle, who presented an update on the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes trial at the World Diabetes Congress.

'We haven't been able to find either

baseline characteristics or obvious events during the course of treatment that strongly predicted which group was at risk for cardiovascular death," he said in

ACCORD compared intensive versus standard glycemic control in 10,251 adults from 77 sites. The hypothesis was that lowering HbA_{1c} levels below 6% would reduce cardiovascular events compared with levels of 7.0%-7.9%. However, the

intensive arm of the trial was stopped early when it showed a 22% increase in allcause mortality compared with standard treatment. There were 257 deaths in the intensive treatment arm, compared with 203 in the standard treatment arm.

Several previous analyses of the data have revealed baseline characteristics such as high HbA_{1c} (8.5% or more), selfreported neuropathy, and aspirin use as predictors for increased mortality risk with intensive treatment, said Dr. Riddle, professor of medicine at Oregon Health and Science University in Portland.

It could be hypothesized that a high HbA_{1c} is a surrogate for relative severity of metabolic control, neuropathy is a surrogate for established and significant microvascular disease, and aspirin use may be a surrogate for cardiovascular disease, he suggested.

However, this still does not explain the excess risk seen with intensive versus standard treatment. "We still do not know the mechanisms involved in this unfavorable finding," he said.

An epidemiologic analysis of the whole study population showed every 1% increase in average HbA_{1c} above normal was associated with a 20% increased risk of all-cause mortality, CV mortality, MI, and stroke. Further investigation into the interaction between this finding and treatment strategy suggests patients who were unable to lower HbA_{1c} levels with intensive treatment were at greatest risk for allcause and cardiovascular mortality. "This supports a lot of people's intuitive idea that the further along in the course of diabetes patients are, the higher their risks from any kind of intensive intervention, and thus the more cautious the approach should be," he said in an interview.

"When should we stop being aggressive?" Dr. Rury Holman of the Diabetes Trials Unit at the University of Oxford (England) asked during the question period. "What is it that tells us that we're not winning, and if we continue to be aggressive the patient will fall into this high-risk category?"

'I can't speak for ACCORD as a whole," answered Dr. Riddle, "but my own opinion is that I think we know within the first 6 months of attempting an intervention whether that person is going to succeed. If they are struggling with it for any reason, whether it's a physiologic reason, a medication-adherence reason, or any recurrent illness reason, I believe that would be a reason to back off."

The investigators are still working on several other hypotheses for the excess risk seen with intensive treatment, including hypoglycemia, "although we've been unable to find a direct relationship," he said. In addition, "weight gain remains on the table as a serious possibility, and certainly, possible unfavorable effects of high doses of the medications."

Dr. Riddle has received lecture fees or research grants from Sanofi-Aventis, Amylin, Eli Lilly & Co., and Glaxo-SmithKline; and has done advisory board work with Amylin, Eli Lilly, Sanofi-Aventis, and Valeritas Inc.

with ambidipline maleate in the diet for up to two years, at concentrations calculated to provide daily dosage levels of 0.5.1.25, and 2.5 mg ambidipline/kg/ day, showed no evidence of a caratnogenic effect of the drug. For the mouse, the highest dose level was, on a mg/m² basis, solutile to the maximum recommended human dose of 10 mg ambidipline/day*. For the rat, the highest dose level was, on a mg/m² basis, about lives the maximum recommended from and ose*. Mutagenicity studies conducted with ambidipline maleate revealed no drug related effects at either the gene or chromosome levels. There was no effect on the fertility of rats treated orally with ambidipline maleate (males for 64 days and females for 1.4 days prior to mating) at doses up to 10 mg ambidipline/kg/d g/m? limites* the maximum recommended human dose of 10 mg/day on a mg/m² basis. Subtive with atomastatin in a 2-year carcinogenicity study with atomastatin calcium in rats at dose levels equivalent to 10, 30, and 100 mg atomastatin/kg/day, 2 are unanswere from in mascel in high-dose females. In one, there was a mabdomysacroma and, in another, there was drug exposure after an 80 mg oral dose, 1, 2-year carcinogenicity study in mice given atomastatin calcium at the design day of the complex of the c

cycle length in girls. See CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Clinical Studies section; ADVERSE REACTIONS, Pediatric Patients; and DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION, Pediatric Patients (10-17 years of age) with Heterozygous Familiar Hypercholesterolemia. Adolescent females should be counseled on appropriate contraceptive methods while on atorvastatin therapy (see CONTRAINDICATIONS and PRECAUTIONS, Pregnancy), Atorvastatin has not been studied in controlled clinical trials involving pre-pubertal patients or patients younger than 10 years of age. Clinical efficacy with doses of atorvastatin up to 80 mg/day for 1 year have been evaluated in an uncontrolled study of patients with homozygous Familial Hypercholesterolemia. Gerlatric Use: There have been no studies conducted to determine the safety or effectiveness of CADUET in geriatric populations. In studies with amilodipine: Clinical studies of amilodipine did not include sufficient numbers of subjects aged 65 and over to determine whether they respond differently from younger subjects. Other reported clinical experience has not identified differences in responses between the elderly and younger patients. In general, dose selection of the amilodipine component of CADUET for an elderly patient should be cautious, usually starting at the low end of the dosing range, reflecting the greater frequency of decreased hepatic, renal, or cardiac function, and of concomitant disease or other drug therapy Elderly and efficacy of decreased hepatic, renal, or cardiac function, and of concomitant disease or other drug therapy Elderly sultents have decreased clearance of amlodipine with a resulting increase of AUC of approximately 40-60%, and a lower initial dose may be required (see DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION). In studies with atorvastatin the ACCESS study, in this 54-week open-label trial 1,958 patients initiated therapy with atorvastatin calcium 10 mg, Of these, 835 were elderly Capsers) and 1,123 were non-elderly. The mean change in LDL from baseline after 6 weeks of treatment with atorvastatin c

hemorrhagic stroke. **ADVERSE REACTIONS: CADUET:** CADUET (amlodipine besylate/atorvastatin calcium) has been evaluated for safety in ADVERSE REACTIONS: CADUET: CADUET (amlodipine besylate/atorvastatin calcium) has been evaluated for safety in 1092 patients in double-blind placebo controlled studies treated for co-morbid hypertension and dyslipidemia general, treatment with CADUET was well tolerated. For the most part, adverse experiences have been mild or moderate in severity. In clinical trials with CADUET, no adverse experiences peculiar to this combination have been observed. Adverse experiences are similar in terms of nature, severity, and frequency to those reported previously with amlodipine and atorvastatin. The following information is based on the clinical experience with amlodipine and atorvastatin. The following information is based on the clinical experience with amlodipine and foreign clinical trials. In general, treatment with amlodipine was well tolerated at doses up to 10 mg adity. Most adverse reactions reported during therapy with amlodipine were of mild or moderate severity. In controlled clinical trials directly comparing amlodipine (N=1730) in doses up to 10 mg to placebo (N=1250), discontinuation of amlodipine due to adverse reactions was required in only about 1.5% of patients and was not significantly different from placebo (about 1%). The most common side effects are headache and edema. The incidence (%) of side effects which occurred in a dose related manner are as follows:

which were not clearly dose related but which were reported with an incidence greater than

1.0% in placebo-controlle	ed clinical trials include the following:		
Placebo-Controlled Stud	lies		
Adverse Event	amlodipine (%)	Placebo (%)	
	(N=1730)	(N=1250)	
Headache	7.3	7.8	
Fatigue	4.5	2.8	
Nausea	2.9	1.9	
Abdominal Pain	1.6	0.3	
Somnolence	1.4	0.6	

For several adverse experiences that appear to be drug and dose related, there was a greater incidence in women than

Adverse Event	amlod	amlodipine		Placebo		
	M=%	F=%	M=%	F=%		
	(N=1218)	(N=512)	(N=914)	(N=336)		
Edema	5.6	14.6	1.4	5.1		
Flushing	1.5	4.5	0.3	0.9		
Palpitations	1.4	3.3	0.9	0.9		
Somnolence	1.3	1.6	0.8	0.3		

			statin		
Body System/ Adverse Event	Placebo N=270	10 mg N=863	20 mg N=36	40 mg N=79	80 mg N=94
BODY AS A WHOLE					
Infection	10.0	10.3	2.8	10.1	7.4
Headache	7.0	5.4	16.7	2.5	6.4
Accidental Injury	3.7	4.2	0.0	1.3	3.2
Flu Syndrome	1.9	2.2	0.0	2.5	3.2
Abdominal Pain	0.7	2.8	0.0	3.8	2.1
Back Pain	3.0	2.8	0.0	3.8	1.1
Allergic Reaction	2.6	0.9	2.8	1.3	0.0
Asthenia	1.9	2.2	0.0	3.8	0.0
DIGESTIVE SYSTEM					
Constipation	1.8	2.1	0.0	2.5	1.1
Diarrhea	1.5	2.7	0.0	3.8	5.3
Dyspepsia	4.1	2.3	2.8	1.3	2.1
Flatulence	3.3	2.1	2.8	1.3	1.1
RESPIRATORY SYSTEM					
Sinusitis	2.6	2.8	0.0	2.5	6.4
Pharyngitis	1.5	2.5	0.0	1.3	2.1
SKIN AND APPENDAGES					
Rash	0.7	3.9	2.8	3.8	1.1
MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTE	M				
Arthralgia	1.5	2.0	0.0	5.1	0.0
Myalgia	1.1	3.2	5.6	1.3	0.0
Anglo-Scandinavian Cardia	c Outcomes Trial (ASCOT): In ASCOT	(see CLINICAL PH	IARMACOLOGY, CI	inical Studies.

MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM
Arthralgia

1.5

2.0

0.0

Myalgia

1.5

3.2

0.0

Myalgia

1.5

3.2

0.0

Myalgia

1.5

3.2

0.0

Myalgia

1.5

0.0

Myalgia

1.6

1.7

Myalgia

1.7

Myalg



Printed in USA/August 2009

© 2009 Pfizer Ireland Pharmaceuticals Revised May 2009



© 2009 Pfizer Inc All rights reserved