Enrolment criteria for diabetes cardiovascular outcome trials do not inform on generalizability to clinical practice: The case of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists

14 July 2024

Enrolment criteria for diabetes cardiovascular outcome trials do not inform on transferability to clinical practice: The case of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists

Veronica Sciannameo[1], Paola Berchialla[2], Emanuela Orsi[3], Olga Lamacchia[4], Susanna Morano[5], Fabrizio Querci[6], Agostino Consoli[7], Angelo Avogaro[8], Gian Paolo Fadini[8]

on behalf of the DARWIN-T2D study

[1] Unit of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Public Health. Department of Cardiac, Thoracic, Vascular Sciences and Public Health. University of Padova, 35128 Padova, Italy.

[2] Department of Clinical and Biological Sciences, University of Turin, 10043 Turin, Italy.

[3] Unit of Endocrinology and Metabolic Diseases, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda-Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico di Milano, 20122 Milan, Italy.

[4] Unit of Endocrinology, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University Hospital of Foggia, 71122 Foggia, Italy.

[5] Unit of Diabetes Complications, Internal Medicine V, Department of Experimental Medicine, University of Rome "La Sapienza", 00161 Rome, Italy.

[6] Unit of Diabetology, ASST Bergamo Est, 24022 Alzano Lombardo, Italy.

[7] Department of Medicine and Aging Science, "G. D'Annunzio" University of Chieti, 68100 Chieti, Italy.

[8] Department of Medicine, University of Padova, 35128 Padova, Italy.

Correspondence

Gian Paolo Fadini, MD PhD

Associate Professor of Endocrinology

Department of Medicine, University of Padova

Via Giustiniani 2, 35128 Padova, Italy.

Phone: +39 049 8214318

Fax: +39 049 8212184

Email: gianpaolofadini@hotmail.com

Abstract

Aims. To evaluate transferability of cardiovascular outcome trials (CVOTs) on GLP-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RA) to the real-world population of type 2 diabetic (T2D) patients. We assessed which proportion of real-world patients constitute CVOT-like populations.

Materials and methods. We applied inclusion/exclusion (I/E) criteria of each GLP-1RA CVOT on a cross-sectional database of 281,380 T2D patients from Italian diabetes outpatient clinics. We calculated the proportion of patients eligible for each CVOT and compared their clinical characteristics with those of trial patients. In addition, we used a Bayesian network-based method to sample the greatest subsets of real-world patients yielding true CVOT-like populations.

Results. Between 98,725 and 124,164 T2D patients could be evaluated for CVOT eligibility. After excluding patients who already where on GLP-1RA and applying I/E criteria, 35.8% of patients would be eligible for REWIND, 34.1% for PIONEER-6, 13.4% for EXSCEL, 10.1% for SUSTAIN-6, 9.5% for HARMONY and 9.4% for LEADER. 45.4% of patients could be eligible for at least one of the CVOTs. These patients, however, were extremely different from trial patients for most clinical characteristics. The greatest CVOT-like subset of real-world patients was 0.5% for SUSTAIN-6, 1.0% for EXSCEL, 1.2% for LEADER, 1.8% for PIONEER-6, and 7.9% for REWIND.

Conclusions. A very small proportion of real-world patients constitute true CVOT-like populations. These findings question whether any meaningful information can be drawn from applying trial I/E criteria to real-world T2D patients. Transferability of CVOT findings to clinical practice should rather rely on observational effectiveness studies.

Introduction

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) provide the highest level of evidence to guide therapeutic decisions. By means of randomization, blinding, and appropriate controls, RCTs establish causal relationships between treatments and effects. In the field of diabetes pharmacotherapy, cardiovascular outcome trials (CVOTs) are a form of RCTs primarily designed to address cardiovascular safety of new glucose lowering medications (GLMs). To satisfy regulatory requirements on drug safety, CVOTs evaluate specific GLM against placebo (1). Although designed primarily to demonstrate non-inferiority, some recent CVOTs have shown that active treatment was superior to placebo in reducing the rates of major adverse cardiovascular outcome events (MACE) and other adverse outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes (T2D). In addition, in post-hoc analyses, some molecules also showed capacity to reduce the rate of adverse renal endpoints. Results of these CVOTs have been incorporated into consensus algorithms for the treatment of T2D, which now prioritize certain GLM for the prevention of cardio-renal complications (2).

This is the case for glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RA) and sodium glucose contransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT-2i). Dedicated CVOTs showed superiority of liraglutide (LEADER), semaglutide (SUSTAIN-6), albiglutide (HARMONY), and dulaglutide (REWIND) versus placebo in reducing the rates of the classical 3-point MACE (cardiovascular death, non-fatal myocardial infarction or stroke) (3-6). The CVOT (EXSCEL) on exenatide once weekly (exeOW) showed nearly significant reductions in MACE and nominally significant reduction in mortality rates (7), while oral semaglutide (PIONEER-6) nominally reduced total and cardiovascular risk (8). Therefore, there is general agreement that GLP-1RA as a class are able to prevent or delay adverse cardiovascular outcomes in T2D (9).

However, transferability of CVOT findings to clinical practice may not be immediate because of the many differences between the trial setting and routine care. Specifically, CVOTs recruited patients based on rigorous inclusion / exclusion (I/E) criteria and closely followed them at regular intervals within strict trial experimental protocols. Since the CVOT framework is mostly event-driven, I/E criteria have been designed to allow collection of the desired number of events in a relatively short time. To this end, T2D patients at baseline high cardiovascular risk had to be enrolled, such as those with a prior history of cardiovascular disease and/or multiple risk factors. Since only about 30% of T2D patients in routine care show signs of macroangiopathy, to what extent results of CVOTs can be translated to T2D patients at lower cardiovascular risk is a matter of debate. While the vast majority of patients in LEADER, SUSTAIN-6, and HARMONY had established cardiovascular disease (4-6), almost 70% of patients in the REWIND study had no prior history of cardiovascular events, revascularization, or cardiac ischemia (3). Although there are some differences among the various GLP-1RA, positive results of the REWIND study suggest that this class of GLM can prevent cardiovascular events irrespectively of the baseline cardiovascular risk (9; 10).

A few studies have recently evaluated what proportion of T2D patients from various clinical care settings would satisfy I/E criteria to be enrolled in specific CVOTs. Expectedly, such proportion was inversely related to the pre-specified trial baseline cardiovascular risk (11-14). However, applying CVOT I/E criteria to real-

world T2D populations may yield patients subgroups that are substantially different from the actual CVOT populations, thereby leaving the question of transferability unanswered.

In this study, we applied I/E criteria for GLP-1RA CVOTs to a specialist care population of T2D patients from the DARWIN-T2D (DAta for Real World evIdeNce in Type 2 Diabetes) study of the Italian Diabetes Society. In addition to providing proportion of patients satisfying I/E criteria for each CVOTs, we show how much the eligible population of patients actually differs from those of CVOTs and calculate what proportion of patients from routine care would generate a true CVOT-like population.

Methods

Data source. The DARWIN-T2D study was conducted by the Italian Diabetes Society and was initially designed to evaluate dapagliflozin in the real world. Protocol details and primary analysis have been published before (15; 16). The DARWIN-T2D database contains cross-sectional information on about 281k T2D patients from 46 diabetes outpatient clinics from all over Italy. Data were collected at each center at the last available visit in 2015-2016. All clinics used the same electronic chart system to store patients' data (MyStar Connect / Smart Digital Clinic, Meteda Srl, San Benedetto del Tronto, Italy). Relevant data were extracted by a dedicated software without manual intervention.

We recorded the following information: demographics (age, sex, diabetes duration), anthropometrics (height, weight, BMI, waist circumference), cardiovascular risk factors (smoke, blood pressure values, lipid profile), estimated glomerular filtration rate (CKD-EPI equation) and other laboratory data (including urinary albumin excretion rate and liver enzymes), and medications for the treatment of diabetes and other cardiovascular risk factors or conditions. In addition, detailed information were collected on diabetic complications from ICD-9 codes in the electronic chart, including: presence and stage of retinopathy and diabetic macular oedema; presence or absence of somatic or autonomic diabetic neuropathy; history of stroke, transient ischemic attack, or carotid endoarterectomy / stenting; history of angina, myocardial infarction, or coronary revascularization; presence / absence of left ventricular hypertrophy and history of heart failure; history of claudication, limb ischemia or amputation; presence of asymptomatic atherosclerosis of coronary, carotid, or leg arteries.

Not all records were complete for all patients: degree and distribution of missing variables has been shown before (15).

Data analysis. We retrieved, from the respective publications, I/E criteria of the following CVOTs on GLP-1RA: LEADER (liraglutide) (6), SUSTAIN-6 (semaglutide) (5), EXSCEL (exeOW) (7), REWIND (dulaglutide) (3), PIONEER-6 (oral semaglutide) (8), HARMONY (albglutide) (4). Specific I/E criteria had to be adapted to the available data in the DARWIN-T2D database with some modifications (Table S1). For instance, the following information used for CVOT I/E criteria were not available: myocardial ischemia stress test or imaging; diastolic dysfunction; ankle-brachial index; calcitonin levels, history of cancer and

pancreatitis. Timing of prior cardiovascular events and revascularization was not available to exclude patients with recent events. Since no information on contraception was available, women of childbearing potential were excluded. Patients with missing information for key I/E variables were excluded from the analysis.

We thus identified T2D patients who would be eligible into each of the considered CVOTs and calculated the respective proportion over the total background population of patients with available data. Then, we compared the average clinical characteristics of eligible patients with average clinical characteristics of patients in the database who were already on GLP-1RA and with those of patients actually enrolled in CVOTs (from the respective publications).

Finally, we extracted from the DARWIN-T2D database the largest subgroup of patients who had average clinical characteristics superimposable to those of CVOTs. Since, no specific tool is available for this case sampling procedure, we devised an analytical strategy as described below.

Statistical analysis. For descriptive purposes, continuous variables are expressed as mean and standard deviation, whereas categorical variables are expressed as percentage. To evaluate to what extent two groups of patients were similar, we computed the absolute standardized mean difference (SMD) for each variable. Conventionally, a SMD value of 0.1 or less is considered indicative of a good balance. For example, for continuous variables, a SMD <0.1 means that the difference between means of the two groups is <10% of the pooled standard deviation. Due to the very large sample size in each comparison, p-values were not calculated, as several minor and clinically-irrelevant differences would yield p-values<0.05.

Sampling RCT-like populations. Continuous variables in the database were categorized into five classes, on the basis of each RCT summary statistics and assuming a normal distribution. Observations with at least one missing value were removed. A Bayesian network (BN) was constructed on the case complete dataset to obtain the conditional probability distributions, which reflect the dependencies among variables. Then, conditional probability distributions were used to get the joint distribution of variables from which a final probability of inclusion in the RCT of each patients in the database was computed (17). The PC (Peter-Clark) stable algorithm with a 100-fold bootstrap was employed for the structural learning of the BN (i.e. for identifying the relationships among variables). A more robust BN was obtained by averaging the 100 BNs learned, considering only the relationships among variables present in at least 95% of times (18) Finally, we assigned to each variable category appropriate weights to reflect the same proportion of patients included in the RCT. Patients of the DARWIN-T2D database to be included in the RCT were randomly sampled according to the final probability computed on basis of the BN joint distribution. Balancing between the patients sampled and the RCT's patients was evaluated through SMD. To get SMD smaller than 0.1 we proceeded in the following way: first, we balanced the two groups according to a SMD smaller than 0.2 for each variable. To obtain this result, for each variable with SMD greater than 0.2, patients with values in the tails of the distribution were removed. The group of patients selected in this way was removed by the DARWIN-T2D dataset and the procedure was repeated to get a new random sample of patients balanced according to SMD smaller than 0.2. Finally, all the

balanced groups obtained were joint together, and again to obtain for each variable SMD smaller than 0.1 the same procedure was applied. A sensitivity analysis on different thresholds of SMD was carried out, and the choice of the double threshold 0.2 and 0.1 turned out to get the greatest balanced group. All the analyses were performed using R version 3.5.0.

Results

The original dataset was composed of 281,380 patients. Since the minimum requirement to enter the database was T2D diagnosis, many patients had missing values for several of the variables needed to evaluate CVOT I/E criteria. Among 130,380 patients with available information on GLM, 6699 (5.1%) were being treated with a GLP-1RA (73.8% liraglutide; 23.5% exeOW; 2.7% lixisenatide). The number of patients who could be evaluated for CVOT eligibility was 124,164 for EXSCEL, 116,553 for PIONEER-6, 107,040 for HARMONY, 106,606 for LEADER, 105,074 for REWIND, and 98,725 for SUSTAIN-6.

After excluding patients who already where on GLP-1RA and applying I/E criteria as outlined Table S1, we calculated that the percentage of patients who would be eligible for CVOTs was 35.8% for REWIND, 34.1% for PIONEER-6, 13.4% for EXSCEL, 10.1% for SUSTAIN-6, 9.5% for HARMONY and 9.4% for LEADER. 45.4% of patients could be eligible for at least one of the CVOTs considered.

Clinical characteristics of patients treated with GLP-1RA and of those who could be eligible for CVOTs are illustrated in Table 1.

We observed that the average clinical characteristics of patients who could be eligible for CVOTs were substantially different from the average clinical characteristics of patients who composed each CVOT population (Figure 1A). For instance, patients selected from the real-world database were older than in CVOTs. In addition, despite 80-100% of patients in the LEADER and SUSTAIN-6 had established cardiovascular disease, application of I/E criteria to the real-world population yielded patients with a 70-80% prevalence of microangiopathy (mostly chronic kidney disease) and a lower prevalence of macroangiopathy (40-50%). Most other clinical characteristics were imbalanced between patients enrolled in CVOTs and real-world patients eligible for the same CVOTs (Table 2). Out of 11 key clinical variables, eligible patients matched trial characteristics for just 2 or 3 variables, with the notable exception of REWIND. Real-world patients eligible for REWIND were matched with the REWIND population for 6/11 variables.

We then evaluated which proportion of real-world patients would constitute a population of individuals with key average characteristics similar to those enrolled in CVOTs. The largest dataset of real-world patients yielding CVOT-like populations was 0.5% for SUSTAIN-6, 1.0% for EXSCEL, 1.2% for LEADER, 1.8% for PIONEER-6, and 7.9% for REWIND. We were unable to obtain a meaningful dataset of real-word patients who would match the population of the HARMONY study (Figure 1B).

Discussion

Although 10-35% of real-world T2D patients could be enrolled in GLP-1RA CVOTs, their clinical characteristics were substantially dissimilar from those of CVOT populations and from those of typical patients who are treated with GLP-1RA. The proportion of real-world patients who have true average CVOT-like characteristics is much smaller, ranging from 0.5% to 7.9%.

CVOTs have shown notable capacity of some GLP-1RA to reduce the rate of adverse cardiovascular outcomes in patients with T2D (9), but transferability of such findings from the trial setting to clinical practice is challenging. CVOTs are designed to assess non-inferiority or superiority compared to placebo in the best possible experimental conditions. To this end, CVOTs enrol highly selected patients, whose characteristics are intended to maximize the probability of trial success. Consequently, some CVOT populations have very high prevalence of established cardiovascular disease, while representativeness of the real-world population of T2D is rarely an issue considered in CVOT design. Thus, to what extent clinical benefits observed in GLP-1RA CVOTs can be transferred to T2D patients in everyday clinical practice remains unclear.

Prior studies have examined what proportion of patients from clinical practice databases would be eligible for CVOTs on GLP-1RA or SGLT-2i. By analysing an U.S. adult T2D database, Boye et al. reported proportions of patients eligible for the LEADER, SUSTAIN-6, EXSCEL, and REWIND that were quite similar to those shown in our study (13). Small different were likely due to geographical differences, e.g. being Italian T2D patients less obese than North American ones. The high proportion of patients eligible for PIONEER-6 (8) in our study reflects enrolment criteria that, differently from those of EXSCEL (7), lacked constrains on the ratio between patients with established cardiovascular disease or multiple cardiovascular risk factors.

Similar analyses have been performed on CVOTs for SGLT-2i (12; 14). Nicolucci et al. used an Italian database of diabetes outpatient clinics similar to ours and showed that real-world T2D patients eligible for CVOTs on SGLT-2i were different from trial populations in many instances (11).

By analysing GLP-1RA CVOTs, we found substantial differences between the eligible real-world populations and trial populations. For instance, the resulting PIONEER-6 eligible subsets, although relatively large, was greatly imbalanced compared to the true PIONEER-6 population (8). We thus examined which proportion of patients from the real-world database would generate CVOT-like populations. To this end, we used a Bayesian method to sample patients from a large dataset based on given average clinical characteristics. We found that the greatest subset of patients with CVOT-like characteristics was much smaller than the proportion of eligible patients. Interestingly, we found no subset of real-world patients matching the HARMONY trial population, possibly because all HARMONY patients had established cardiovascular disease at a relatively young age (4). This important finding highlights that CVOT populations are extremely specific and that they are poorly represented by real-world T2D patients. Notably, however, REWIND confirmed as the CVOT mostly represented within the T2D population, although only 7.9% of real-world patients are truly REWIND-like. On the contrary, the apparently large generalizability of PIONEER-6 based on I/E criteria was not confirmed.

Our results question whether any conclusion can be drawn from applying trial I/E criteria to real-world T2D patients. In fact, the resulting subsets of T2D patients were more aged, with HbA1c closer to target, and with a prevalence of chronic kidney disease often exceeding that of cardiovascular diseases. That the benefits observed in CVOTs automatically apply to these real-world populations seems questionable. That all these patients should receive a GLP-1RA only because they were potentially eligible in successful CVOTs is also hardly arguable.

We acknowledge that, in view of the potentially wide cardiovascular benefits of GLP-1RA, this class of GLM is far underutilized among T2D patients (19). However, transferability of trial findings to clinical practice should not be based on trial I/E criteria, but on the results of observational studies evaluating real-world effectiveness of GLP-1RA. Several real-world studies on glycaemic and extra-glycaemic effectiveness of GLP-1RA have confirmed findings from phase III RCTs (20-22). While many observational studies on SGLT-2i have largely confirmed CVOT results in lower-risk populations (23-25), there is still a striking scarcity of cardiovascular effectiveness studies on GLP-1RA (26). In a small study from The Health Improvement Network database (UK), intensification of oral therapy by adding GLP-1RA was associated with lower cardiovascular events rate than intensification with insulin (27). We advocate that future larger cardiovascular effectiveness studies on GLP-1RA will shed light on transferability of CVOT findings to clinical practice.

Conflict of interest disclosure

GPF received grant support, lecture or advisory board fees from AstraZeneca, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Eli Lilly, Mundipharma, NovoNordisk, Sanofi, Genzyme, Servier, Abbott, Novartis, Merck Sharp & Dohme.

EO…

OL…

FQ…

SM…

AC has received consultancy or speaker fees from Abbott, AstraZeneca, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Bruno Farmaceutici, Janssen, Eli-Lilly, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, NovoNordisk, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Servier, Takeda. He Also Received Research Grants From Eli-Lilly and NovoNordisk.

Author contribution

Study design: VS, PB, AC, AA, GPF. Data collection and analysis: VS, PB, EO, OL, SM, FQ, GPF. Manuscript writing: VS, PB, AC, AA, GPF. Manuscript revision: EO, OL, SM, FQ. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Composition of the DARWIN-T2D database

Agostino Consoli and Gloria Formoso (Dipartimento di Medicina e Scienze dell'Invecchiamento - Università Degli studi G. D'Annunzio di Chieti-Pescara); Giovanni Grossi (Ospedale San Francesco di Paola - Azienda Sanitaria Provinciale di Cosenza); Achiropita Pucci (Azienda Sanitaria Provinciale di Cosenza); Giorgio Sesti and Francesco Andreozzi (Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria di Catanzaro); Giuseppe Capobianco (Azienda Sanitaria Locale Napoli 2 Nord); Adriano Gatti (Ospedale San Gennaro dei Poveri - Azienda Sanitaria Locale Napoli 1 Centro); Riccardo Bonadonna, Ivana Zavaroni and Alessandra Dei Cas (Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria di Parma); Giuseppe Felace (Ospedale di Spilimbergo - Azienda per l'Assistenza Sanitaria n.5 Friuli Occidentale); Patrizia Li Volsi (Ospedale di Pordenone - Azienda per l'Assistenza Sanitaria n.5 Friuli Occidentale); Raffaella Buzzetti and Gaetano Leto (Ospedale Santa Maria Goretti - Azienda Sanitaria Locale di Latina); Gian Pio Sorice (Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli, Roma); Paola D'Angelo (Ospedale Sandro Pertini - Azienda Sanitaria Locale Roma 2); Susanna Morano (Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Policlinico Umberto I, Roma); Antonio Carlo Bossi (Ospedale di Treviglio - Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale Bergamo Ovest); Edoardo Duratorre (Ospedale Luini Confalonieri di Luino - Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale Sette Laghi); Ivano Franzetti (Ospedale Sant'Antonio Abate di Gallarate - Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale Valle Olona); Paola Silvia Morpurgo (Ospedale Fatebenefratelli - Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale Fatebenefratelli Sacco); Emanuela Orsi (Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda - Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico di Milano); Fabrizio Querci (Ospedale Pesenti Fenaroli di Alzano Lombardo - Azienda Socio Sanitaria Territoriale Bergamo Est); Massimo Boemi† and Federica D'Angelo (Presidio Ospedaliero di Ricerca INRCA-IRCCS di Ancona); Massimiliano Petrelli (Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria Ospedali Riuniti di Ancona); Gianluca Aimaretti and Ioannis Karamouzis (Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria Maggiore della Carità di Novara); Franco Cavalot (Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria San Luigi Gonzaga, Orbassano); Giuseppe Saglietti† (Ospedale Madonna del Popolo di Omegna - Azienda Sanitaria Locale Verbano Cusio Ossola); Giuliana Cazzetta (Casa della Salute, Ugento - Distretto Socio Sanitario Gagliano del Capo - Azienda Sanitaria Locale di Lecce); Silvestre Cervone (Presidio ospedaliero San Marco in Lamis - Distretto Socio Sanitario San Marco in Lamis - Azienda Sanitaria Locale di Foggia); Eleonora Devangelio (Distretto Socio Sanitario di Massafra - Azienda Sanitaria Locale di Taranto); Olga Lamacchia (Azienda Ospedaliero

References

1. Kieffer CM, Robertson AS: Impact of FDA-Required Cardiovascular Outcome Trials on Type 2 Diabetes Clinical Study Initiation From 2008 to 2017. Ther Innov Regul Sci 2019:2168479019860122

2. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, Kernan WN, Mathieu C, Mingrone G, Rossing P, Tsapas A, Wexler DJ, Buse JB: Management of hyperglycaemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). Diabetologia 2018;61:2461-2498

3. Gerstein HC, Colhoun HM, Dagenais GR, Diaz R, Lakshmanan M, Pais P, Probstfield J, Riesmeyer JS, Riddle MC, Ryden L, Xavier D, Atisso CM, Dyal L, Hall S, Rao-Melacini P, Wong G, Avezum A, Basile J, Chung N, Conget I, Cushman WC, Franek E, Hancu N, Hanefeld M, Holt S, Jansky P, Keltai M, Lanas F, Leiter LA, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Cardona Munoz EG, Pirags V, Pogosova N, Raubenheimer PJ, Shaw JE, Sheu WH, Temelkova-Kurktschiev T: Dulaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes (REWIND): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2019;394:121-130

4. Hernandez AF, Green JB, Janmohamed S, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Granger CB, Jones NP, Leiter LA, Rosenberg AE, Sigmon KN, Somerville MC, Thorpe KM, McMurray JJV, Del Prato S: Albiglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease (Harmony Outcomes): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2018;392:1519-1529

5. Marso SP, Bain SC, Consoli A, Eliaschewitz FG, Jodar E, Leiter LA, Lingvay I, Rosenstock J, Seufert J, Warren ML, Woo V, Hansen O, Holst AG, Pettersson J, Vilsboll T: Semaglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med 2016;375:1834-1844

6. Marso SP, Daniels GH, Brown-Frandsen K, Kristensen P, Mann JF, Nauck MA, Nissen SE, Pocock S, Poulter NR, Ravn LS, Steinberg WM, Stockner M, Zinman B, Bergenstal RM, Buse JB: Liraglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med 2016;375:311-322

7. Holman RR, Bethel MA, Mentz RJ, Thompson VP, Lokhnygina Y, Buse JB, Chan JC, Choi J, Gustavson SM, Iqbal N, Maggioni AP, Marso SP, Ohman P, Pagidipati NJ, Poulter N, Ramachandran A, Zinman B, Hernandez AF: Effects of Once-Weekly Exenatide on Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med 2017;377:1228-1239

8. Husain M, Birkenfeld AL, Donsmark M, Dungan K, Eliaschewitz FG, Franco DR, Jeppesen OK, Lingvay I, Mosenzon O, Pedersen SD, Tack CJ, Thomsen M, Vilsboll T, Warren ML, Bain SC: Oral Semaglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med 2019;381:841-851

9. Kristensen SL, Rorth R, Jhund PS, Docherty KF, Sattar N, Preiss D, Kober L, Petrie MC, McMurray JJV: Cardiovascular, mortality, and kidney outcomes with GLP-1 receptor agonists in patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cardiovascular outcome trials. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2019;7:776-785

10. Mannucci E, Dicembrini I, Nreu B, Monami M: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with and without prior cardiovascular events: An updated meta-analysis and subgroup analysis of randomized controlled trials. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;

11. Nicolucci A, Candido R, Cucinotta D, Graziano G, Rocca A, Rossi MC, Tuccinardi F, Manicardi V: Generalizability of Cardiovascular Safety Trials on SGLT2 Inhibitors to the Real World: Implications for Clinical Practice. Adv Ther 2019;36:2895-2909

12. Birkeland KI, Bodegard J, Norhammar A, Kuiper JG, Georgiado E, Beekman-Hendriks WL, Thuresson M, Pignot M, Herings RMC, Kooy A: How representative of a general type 2 diabetes population are patients included in cardiovascular outcome trials with SGLT2 inhibitors? A large European observational study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;

13. Boye KS, Riddle MC, Gerstein HC, Mody R, Garcia-Perez LE, Karanikas CA, Lage MJ, Riesmeyer JS, Lakshmanan MC: Generalizability of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist cardiovascular outcome trials to the overall type 2 diabetes population in the United States. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:1299-1304

14. Wittbrodt E, Chamberlain D, Arnold SV, Tang F, Kosiborod M: Eligibility of patients with type 2 diabetes for sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor cardiovascular outcomes trials: An assessment using the Diabetes Collaborative Registry. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:1985-1989

15. Fadini GP, Zatti G, Consoli A, Bonora E, Sesti G, Avogaro A: Rationale and design of the DARWIN-T2D (DApagliflozin Real World evIdeNce in Type 2 Diabetes): A multicenter retrospective nationwide Italian study and crowdsourcing opportunity. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis 2017;27:1089-1097

16. Fadini GP, Zatti G, Baldi I, Bottigliengo D, Consoli A, Giaccari A, Sesti G, Avogaro A: Use and effectiveness of dapagliflozin in routine clinical practice: An Italian multicentre retrospective study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20:1781-1786

17. Lauritzen SL: Graphical Models. Oxford Statistical Science Series 1996;Clarendon Press, Oxford.

18. Scutari M: Bayesian Network Constraint-Based Structure Learning Algorithms: Parallel and Optimized Implementations in the bnlearn R Package. Journal of statistical software 2017;77

19. Fadini GP, Frison V, Rigato M, Morieri ML, Simioni N, Tadiotto F, D'Ambrosio M, Paccagnella A, Lapolla A, Avogaro A: Trend 2010-2018 in the clinical use of GLP-1 receptor agonists for the treatment of type 2 diabetes in routine clinical practice: an observational study from Northeast Italy. Acta Diabetol 2019;

20. Morieri ML, Rigato M, Frison V, Simioni N, D'Ambrosio M, Tadiotto F, Paccagnella A, Lapolla A, Avogaro A, Fadini GP: Fixed versus flexible combination of GLP-1 receptor agonists with basal insulin in type 2 diabetes: A retrospective multicentre comparative effectiveness study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:2542-2552

21. Fadini GP, Sciannameo V, Franzetti I, Bottigliengo D, D'Angelo P, Vinci C, Berchialla P, Arena S, Buzzetti R, Avogaro A: Similar effectiveness of dapagliflozin and GLP-1 receptor agonists concerning combined endpoints in routine clinical practice: A multicentre retrospective study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:1886-1894

22. Mody R, Huang Q, Yu M, Zhao R, Patel H, Grabner M, Lando LF: Adherence, persistence, glycaemic control and costs among patients with type 2 diabetes initiating dulaglutide compared with liraglutide or exenatide once weekly at 12-month follow-up in a real-world setting in the United States. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;

23. Patorno E, Pawar A, Franklin JM, Najafzadeh M, Deruaz-Luyet A, Brodovicz KG, Sambevski S, Bessette LG, Santiago Ortiz AJ, Kulldorff M, Schneeweiss S: Empagliflozin and the Risk of Heart Failure Hospitalization in Routine Clinical Care. Circulation 2019;139:2822-2830

24. Kosiborod M, Birkeland KI, Cavender MA, Fu AZ, Wilding JP, Khunti K, Holl RW, Norhammar A, Jorgensen ME, Wittbrodt ET, Thuresson M, Bodegard J, Hammar N, Fenici P: Rates of myocardial infarction and stroke in patients initiating treatment with SGLT2-inhibitors versus other glucose-lowering agents in real-world clinical practice: Results from the CVD-REAL study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20:1983-1987

25. Udell JA, Yuan Z, Rush T, Sicignano NM, Galitz M, Rosenthal N: Cardiovascular Outcomes and Risks After Initiation of a Sodium Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitor: Results From the EASEL Population-Based Cohort Study (Evidence for Cardiovascular Outcomes With Sodium Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors in the Real World). Circulation 2018;137:1450-1459

26. Chatterjee S, Davies MJ, Khunti K: What have we learnt from "real world" data, observational studies and meta-analyses. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20 Suppl 1:47-58

27. Anyanwagu U, Mamza J, Mehta R, Donnelly R, Idris I: Cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality with insulin versus glucagon-like peptide-1 analogue in type 2 diabetes. Heart 2016;102:1581-1587

Table 1. Clinical characteristics of patients treated with GLP-1RA and of those eligible for CVOTs.

	GLP-1RA	LEADER	SUSTAIN-6	EXSCEL	REWIND	PIONEER-6	HARMONY
Number	6699	10061	9942	16544	37574	39726	10208
Percentage	5.1	9.4	10.1	13.4	35.8	34.1	9.5
Age, years	61.7±9.5	74.2±8.4	74.2±8.5	70.8±8.6	70.8±7.1	73.7±8.3	73.6±9.1
Sex male, %	54.9	56.5	55.8	67.3	59.0	57.6	68.4
Diabetes duration, years	11.3±7.5	13.6±9.1	13.6±9.1	15.4±9.8	10.7±8.2	14.3±10.0	17.9±10.2
Active smoke, %	19.8	13.5	13.6	17.1	14.3	14.0	16.1
Body mass index, kg/m^2	34.8±6.2	29.1±5.1	29.2±5.2	29.1±4.9	29.8±4.7	29.3±5.2	29.1±4.9
Waist circumference, cm	114.7±13.6	103.9±12.2	104.1±12.4	104.2±11.9	104.5±11.3	104.5±12.6	104.6±11.9
Systolic blood pressure, mm Hg	138.3±18.3	139.1±18.6	139.2±18.7	137.5±18.4	138.4±17.9	138.1±18.7	137.5±18.6
Diastolic blood pressure, mm Hg	80.3±9.9	76.9±9.3	77.0±9.4	76.5±9.2	77.8±9.1	76.3±9.5	75.8±9.2
Heart rate, bpm	78.8±11.9	73.3±11.9	73.5±11.8	71.7±11.6	73.3±11.8	72.8±11.8	70.2±11.0
Fasting plasma glucose, mg/dl	151.2±42.7	151.3±36.9	155.6±42.1	150.2±42.2	136.8±33.7	146.4±47.7	160.4±50.5
HbA1c, %	7.5±1.1	7.8±0.6	8.0±1.0	7.6±0.8	6.9±0.9	7.4±1.3	8.1±1.0
Total cholesterol, mg/dl	169.3±37.5	168.2±38.2	169.0±38.8	160.5±38.3	170.0±37.4	166.8±38.8	158.2±39.6
HDL cholesterol, mg/dl	45.9±12.6	48.7±13.6	48.4±13.5	47.1±13.6	49.8±13.8	49.0±14.5	45.7±13.4
Triglycerides, mg/dl	160.2±87.5	141.5±74.2	144.2±76.5	140.9±85.3	134.6±71.7	137.4±77.6	146.9±88.5
LDL cholesterol, mg/dl	91.9±32.3	91.4±32.2	91.9±32.7	85.3±31.7	93.3±32.1	90.5±32.6	83.1±32.2
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	87.7±24.1	68.3±21.5	68.5±21.9	73.3±21.6	76.2±19.4	66.7±20.5	68.9±22.1
Albumin excretion rate, mg/g	51.5±147.7	59.5±98.7	61.2±109.5	42.5±108.7	45.3±66.0	57.1±155.0	43.4±132.1
Glucose lowering medications, %							
Insulin	24.9	25.7	27.8	41.0	14.6	43.3	56.4
Metformin	85.9	75.2	73.8	67.8	83.4	62.1	59.5
Sulphonylurea / repaglinide	26.4	52.9	52.0	28.7	32.1	28.0	30.9
Acarbose	2.0	3.5	2.7	1.8	2.2	2.6	2.4
Pioglitazione	9.0	5.8	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.1
DPP-4 inhibitors	0.2	0.0	0.0	27.6	0.0	0.0	28.0
GLP-1RA	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SGLT-2 inhibitors	0.7	5.7	5.4	4.5	3.4	3.6	5.4
Other therapies, %							
Anti-platelet agents	46.4	58.5	58.5	74.6	51.3	60.9	84.0
Statin	62.9	64.3	63.9	76.1	63.4	64.8	79.4
Renin-angiotensin system blockers	74.5	71.2	71.3	74.0	70.7	72.1	75.9
Calcium channel blockers	25.6	27.0	27.1	28.6	25.7	27.4	29.4
Beta-blockers	31.5	36.4	36.6	44.5	32.7	36.9	49.7
Diuretics	15.8	21.4	21.6	23.7	15.0	25.2	30.5
Complications, %							
Chronic kidney disease	10.0	40.7	40.7	29.1	20.9	44.9	37.4
Albuminuria >30 mg/g	37.3	59.0	59.7	33.5	40.7	57.6	32.1
Retinopathy	15.6	16.1	16.6	24.9	11.4	17.9	31.2
Peripheral neuropathy	14.8	21.2	21.8	25.9	17.2	23.5	30.4
Atherosclerosis obliterans	12.4	27.2	27.7	48.3	13.8	26.1	60.9
Peripheral revascularization	1.2	3.0	3.0	5.2	1.3	2.8	6.4
Diabetic foot	7.6	13.0	13.6	15.9	10.0	12.4	19.3
Stroke / Transient ischemic attack	2.2	9.5	9.8	11.3	4.8	9.3	14.4
Carotid atherosclerosis	39.1	47.5	47.6	51.4	42.1	45.3	54.7
Ischemic heart disease	8.2	20.9	20.9	44.2	11.7	21.0	56.7
Coronary revascularization	6.0	13.5	13.5	29.9	7.5	13.6	37.9
Microangiopathy	43.1	85.4	85.6	61.6	56.5	87.1	69.0
Macroangiopathy	30.4	52.3	52.5	79.8	37.2	50.3	98.2

Table 2. Key clinical characteristics of real-world patients compared to CVOT patients. For each CVOT, we show the average clinical characteristics extracted from the respective publications, the characteristics of real-world patients who would be recruited into the CVOT based on inclusion / exclusion (I/E) criteria, and the characteristics of real-world patients sampled for being CVOT-like (Like). For both subgroups of real-world patients, we calculated the standardized mean difference (SMD) as a measure of balance between groups. a SMD≤0.10 is conventionally considered indicative of a good balance.

Variable	LEADER	I/E	SMD	Like	SMD
Number	9340	10061		1132	
Age, years	64.3 (7.2)	74.2 (8.4)	1.26	64.6 (7.6)	0.05
Sex male, %	64.2	56.5	0.16	65.0	0.02
Diabetes duration	12.8 (8.0)	13.6 (9.1)	0.09	13.5 (8.4)	0.09
HbA1c, %	8.7 (1.5)	7.8 (0.6)	0.80	8.5 (0.8)	0.10
BMI, kg/m^2	32.5 (6.3)	29.1 (5.1)	0.60	32.7 (5.8)	0.03
SBP, mm Hg	135.9 (17.7)	139.1 (18.6)	0.18	137.8 (18.7)	0.10
DBP, mm Hg	77.1 (10.2)	76.9 (9.3)	0.02	78.2 (9.3)	0.10
Heart failure, %	17.9	2.5	0.53	16.0	0.05
Established CVD, %	81.4	55.7	0.58	81.4	0.001
CVD risk factors, %	18.7	28.7	0.24	22.3	0.09
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	80.4 (21.0)	68.3 (21.5)	0.57	78.0 (26.5)	0.10
Variable	**REWIND**	**I/E**	**SMD**	**Like**	**SMD**
Number	9901	37574		7280	
Age, years	66.2 (6.5)	70.8 (7.1)	0.66	66.7 (6.2)	0.08
Sex male, %	53.9	59.0	0.10	59.3	0.10
Diabetes duration	10.5 (7.2)	10.7 (8.2)	0.02	10.8 (7.1)	0.05
HbA1c, %	7.3 (1.1)	6.9 (0.9)	0.42	7.4 (1.2)	0.06
BMI, kg/m^2	32.3 (5.7)	29.8 (4.7)	0.51	31.9 (5.3)	0.10
SBP, mm Hg	137.0 (17.0)	138.4 (18.0)	0.08	137.2 (15.5)	0.01
DBP, mm Hg	78.0 (9.9)	77.8 (9.1)	0.02	78.7 (8.1)	0.08
Heart failure, %	8.7	1.0	0.36	7.3	0.05
Established CVD, %	31.4	28.2	0.07	30.6	0.02
CV risk factors, %	68.6	19.9	1.12	63.8	0.10
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	75.0 (22.1)	75.2 (21.2)	0.009	77.4 (22.2)	0.10
Variable	**SUSTAIN-6**	**I/E**	**SMD**	**Like**	**SMD**
Number	3297	9942		476	
Age, years	64.6 (7.4)	74.2 (8.5)	1.16	65.1 (6.7)	0.07
Sex male, %	60.7	55.8	0.10	64.1	0.07
Diabetes duration	13.9 (8.1)	13.6 (9.1)	0.00	14.5 (6.8)	0.07
HbA1c, %	8.7 (1.5)	8.0 (1.0)	0.61	8.6 (0.7)	0.08
BMI, kg/m^2	32.8 (6.2)	29.2 (5.2)	0.66	32.8 (5.9)	0.004
SBP, mm Hg	135.6 (17.2)	139.2 (18.7)	0.20	136.8 (17.5)	0.07
DBP, mm Hg	77.0 (10.0)	77.0 (9.4)	0.00	77.8 (9.7)	0.08
Heart failure, %	23.6	2.6	0.65	19.5	0.10
Established CVD, %	83.0	55.7	0.62	80.5	0.07
CV risk factors, %	17.0	29.0	0.29	14.1	0.08

eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Variable	**PIONEER-6**	**I/E**	**SMD**	**Like**	**SMD**
Number	3183	39726		1663	
Age, years	66.0 (7.0)	73.7 (8.3)	0.94	66.6 (7.2)	0.09
Sex male, %	68.4	57.6	0.23	72.9	0.10
Diabetes duration	14.9 (8.5)	14.3 (10.0)	0.06	14.0 (8.6)	0.10
HbA1c, %	8.2 (1.6)	7.4 (1.3)	0.60	8.2 (0.7)	0.01
BMI, kg/m^2	32.3 (6.5)	29.3 (5.2)	0.57	32.0 (3.7)	0.05
SBP, mm Hg	136.0 (18.0)	138.1 (18.7)	0.11	135.7 (14.0)	0.01
DBP, mm Hg	74.0 (21.0)	76.3 (9.5)	0.21	77.0 (8.0)	0.10
Heart failure, %	12.2	2.7	0.37	8.7	0.10
Established CVD, %	84.7	58.1	0.62	80.7	0.10
CV risk factors, %	15.3	27.8	0.31	19.1	0.10
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	76.0 (10.0)	66.2 (21.3)	0.47	71.6 (26.0)	0.10
Variable	**EXSCEL**	**I/E**	**SMD**	**Like**	**SMD**
Number	14752	16544		915	
Age, years	62.0 (16.3)	70.8 (8.6)	0.69	62.3 (5.6)	0.02
Sex male, %	62.0	67.3	0.11	62.4	0.008
Diabetes duration	12.0 (7.4)	15.4 (9.8)	0.39	11.5 (6.9)	0.06
HbA1c, %	8.0 (1.2)	7.6 (0.8)	0.40	7.9 (0.7)	0.10
BMI, kg/m^2	31.8 (5.9)	29.1 (4.9)	0.50	31.8 (5.9)	0.006
SBP, mm Hg	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DBP, mm Hg	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Heart failure, %	16.2	2.9	0.46	12.6	0.10
Established CVD, %	73.1	64.5	0.19	72.3	0.02
CV risk factors, %	26.9	27.9	0.02	22.3	0.10
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	76.3 (22.9)	70.5 (25.5)	0.24	78.4 (31.5)	0.09
Variable	**HARMONY**	**I/E**	**SMD**	**Like**	**SMD**
Number	9463	10208			
Age, years	64.1 (8.7)	73.6 (9.1)	1.07	N/A	N/A
Sex male, %	69.0	68.4	0.01	N/A	N/A
Diabetes duration	14.1 (8.7)	17.9 (10.3)	0.40	N/A	N/A
HbA1c, %	8.7 (1.5)	8.1 (1.0)	0.47	N/A	N/A
BMI, kg/m^2	32.3 (5.9)	29.1 (4.9)	0.59	N/A	N/A
SBP, mm Hg	79.0 (25.5)	75.8 (9.2)	0.17	N/A	N/A
DBP, mm Hg	134.7 (16.5)	137.5 (18.6)	0.16	N/A	N/A
Heart failure, %	20.0	4.3	0.50	N/A	N/A
Established CVD, %	100.0	85.4	0.58	N/A	N/A
CV risk factors, %	0.0	33.6	1.00	N/A	N/A
eGFR, ml/min/1.73 m^2	76.8 (10.1)	66.1 (25.6)	0.54	N/A	N/A

BMI, body mass index. SBP, systolic blood pressure. DBP, diastolic blood pressure. CVD, cardiovascular disease. eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate. N/A, not available.

Figure 1. Real-world patients and CVOTs. A) For each CVOT, the panels show standardized mean difference (SMD) between the actual trial population (retrieved from respective publications) and real-world patients selected based on inclusion/exclusion criteria (I/E) or for being CVOT-like (Like). In each plot, a dashed line indicates the SMD threshold of 0.1, indicating good balance. Fractions in brackets refer to the number of key clinical characteristics that are matched between real-world patients selected by I/E and trial characteristics. By design, all characteristics were balanced between CVOT-like patients and the respective CVOT population. B) Proportion of real-wold patients eligible for each CVOT based on I/E or sampled for being CVOT-like.