<u>Clinical question posed by this trial:</u> Is rosuvastatin safe and efficacious in patients with systolic heart failure of remote ischemic origin?

Context:

- Patients with heart failure (HF) have been systematically excluded from statin trials.
- Even in patients with HF due to ischemic heart disease, rates
 of myocardial infarction (MI) are low compared to other
 competing causes of death (e.g. pump failure or arrhythmic
 death)
- Statins also reduce synthesis of coenzyme Q10, which may lead to skeletal/cardiac myopathy → statins may be harmful in HF patients
- However, autopsy studies also suggest unrecognized ACS that leads to death are more common than originally thought

 questioning if statins may play a role in HF

Study design RCT; follow-up 32.8months Randomization was based on optimal assignment procedure (minimization method) with a random element included. Optimally balanced allocation was achieved with score that included: • Age, ejection fraction, NYHA class, presence/absence of DM/MI/hypertension, use of beta-blockers, total cholesterol level Allocation concealment **Adequate* (Central randomization by phone) • All investigators blinded, except those on data and safety monitoring board • Matching placebo used Loss to follow-up Population analyzed Modified intention-to-treat (included all who received one bottle of study drug) Intervention **Rosuvastatin 10mg** • A0 patients from rosuvastatin group and 120 patients in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal Stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation Funding AstraZeneca						
Randomization was based on optimal assignment procedure (minimization method) with a random element included. Optimally balanced allocation was achieved with score that included: • Age, ejection fraction, NYHA class, presence/absence of DM/MI/hypertension, use of beta-blockers, total cholesterol level Allocation concealment Adequate (Central randomization by phone) • All investigators blinded, except those on data and safety monitoring board • Matching placebo used Loss to follow-up Population analyzed Modified intention-to-treat (included all who received one bottle of study drug) Intervention • Rosuvastatin 10mg • 60 patients from rosuvastatin group and 120 patients in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	Methodology					
Sequence generation procedure (minimization method) with a random element included. Optimally balanced allocation was achieved with score that included: • Age, ejection fraction, NYHA class, presence/absence of DM/MI/hypertension, use of beta-blockers, total cholesterol level Allocation concealment Adequate (Central randomization by phone) • All investigators blinded, except those on data and safety monitoring board • Matching placebo used Loss to follow-up Population analyzed Modified intention-to-treat (included all who received one bottle of study drug) Intervention • Rosuvastatin 10mg Co- intervention • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects * N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	Study design	RCT; follow-up 32.8months				
Adequate (Central randomization by phone) • All investigators blinded, except those on data and safety monitoring board • Matching placebo used Loss to follow-up Population analyzed Modified intention-to-treat (included all who received one bottle of study drug) Intervention • Rosuvastatin 10mg Co- in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	-	procedure (minimization method) with a random element included. Optimally balanced allocation was achieved with score that included: • Age, ejection fraction, NYHA class, presence/absence of DM/MI/hypertension, use of beta-blockers, total				
Blinding safety monitoring board • Matching placebo used Loss to follow-up Population analyzed Modified intention-to-treat (included all who received one bottle of study drug) Intervention • Rosuvastatin 10mg Co- in follow-up on the following one bottle of study drug) • 60 patients from rosuvastatin group and 120 patients in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal Stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal Stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%		Adequate (Central randomization by phone)				
Not reported	Blinding	safety monitoring board				
analyzed one bottle of study drug) Intervention • Rosuvastatin 10mg Co- intervention • 60 patients from rosuvastatin group and 120 patients in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%		Not reported				
• 60 patients from rosuvastatin group and 120 patients in placebo group also received open-label statin • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	•	· ·				
intervention • All cause mortality • Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	Intervention	• Rosuvastatin 10mg				
• Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) • Nonfatal MI • Nonfatal stroke • Any coronary event • Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular) • Adverse effects Statistical power calculation • N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	00					
• N = 4950 to find 22% RRR assuming hazard rate of 10.4% in placebo group; alpha = 0.05, power = 90%	Outcomes	Composite cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke (time to first event; primary outcome) Nonfatal MI Nonfatal stroke Any coronary event Hospitalization (all-cause, cardiovascular)				
Funding AstraZeneca	power	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Funding	AstraZeneca				

Participants Setting 371 sites (Europe, Russia, South America) Inclusion >60 years old criteria • NYHA II-IV from ischemic causes • EF $\leq 40\%$ ($\leq 35\%$ if class II) • No other indication for cholesterol-lowering drug • Stable optimum treatment for at least 2 weeks prior to randomization • MI within past 6 months Relevant exclusion · Unstable angina or stroke within past 3 months criteria • Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PCI), Coronary-Artery Bypass Graft (CABG), or implantation of cardioverter-defibrillator or biventricular pacemaker within past 3 months, or planning of a device · Decompensated HF • Previous statin-induced myopathy or hypersensitivity • Need for inotropic therapy • Previous/planned heart transplantation • Clinically significant, uncorrected primary valvular heart disease, or malfunctioning prosthetic valve · Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy · Acute endomyocarditis/myocarditis · Pericardial disease Systemic disease · Acute/chronic liver disease • SCr >221umol/L • Chronic muscle disease or unexplained CK level more than 2.5x ULN • Previous tx with cyclosporine • Receipt of less than 80% of dispensed placebo tablets during run-in period Study size • 5459 assessed for eligibility & entered placebo period o 5011 eligible & randomized "Average" Age 73 Comorbidities patient • Female: 24% o Smoker: 9% • EF: 31% o MI: 60% o Angina pectoris: 72% · NYHA class o CABG/PCI: 26% o II: 37%, III: 62%, o Hypertension: 63% IV: ~1.5% o DM: 30% o Stroke: 13% **Medications** • ACEI/ARB: 92% Used • BB: 75% $\bullet\,$ Aldosterone antagonist: 39% • Loop diuretic/thiazide: 89% • Digitalis: ~33%

		Results			
	Placebo	Rosuvastatin 10mg	RR	ARR	p-value
All cause mortality	12.2%	11.6	0.95 (0.86-1.05)	0.6%	NSS
Serious adverse events (% patients)	67.0%	64.7%			
Primary outcome (first event of CV death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke)	12.3%	11.4%	0.92 (0.83-1.02)	0.9%	NSS
Nonfatal MI	2.4%	1.9%			
Nonfatal stroke	1.7%	1.5%			
Any coronary event	10.0%	9.3%	0.92 (0.82-1.04)	0.7%	NSS
Any cause hospitalization	38.0%	35.6%	HR 0.94 (0.88- 1.01)	2.4%	0.09
CV hospitalization	25.0%	22.9%	0.92 (0.85-0.99)	2.1%	0.04
	e patients in placebo dis	continued study drug, more	due to 'adverse event'		

Muscle pain: more incidence in rosuvastatin group

Major Limitations:

Methods

- Although subjects were randomized to placebo or rosuvastatin, a portion of patients from each group (more in placebo group) received non-study statin therapy
 - o This could bring the results closer to null
- Rosuvastatin dose could have been low to show effect
 - o Equivalent to atorvastatin 20mg
 - o Or possible that rosuvastatin doesn't share a beneficial class effect with other statins?

Results

"Negative" trial for major endpoints...but significantly different for hospitalizations

- o Major endpoints were NSS, but there was a "trend" towards lower rates in rosuvastatin arm
 - (ie. Primary outcome NNT = 112)
 - Components of the primary endpoint: nonfatal MI less in rosuvastatin vs placebo (115 vs 141), nonfatal stroke less in rosuva vs placebo (89 vs 104)
- SS differences in any cause hospitalization, cardiovascular causes, and worsening heart failure causes
 - But: how were the hospitalizations significantly different when there were no differences in nonfatal MI, any coronary event, and other endpoints?
 - Hospitalizations is not a 'hard outcome' less objective

Placebo more adverse events than rosuvastatin?

• Nocebo effect? Or was it rosuvastatin 'protective' for some ADRs (ie. Cardiac)?

Generalizability

- o Possibly able to be generalizable to our population in North America
- However, in North America, for patients who have previously had an MI (and thus caused HF due to ischemia), they
 likely would already be on a statin

Conclusions:

• Rosuvastatin 10mg does not seem to reduce cardiovascular death/nonfatal MI/nonfatal stroke in elderly patients with ischemic, systolic heart failure managed with other HF medications

Discussion: On another note, this may support not starting a statin in a simple HF patient if they presented to you without one to begin with. Food for thought!