Time patterns of repeat non-fatal events and death in heart failure trials:

Implications for improving future research

Audinga-Dea Hazewinkel, John Gregson & Stuart Pocock



PSI CONFERENCE JUNE 2024, AMSTERDAM



Disclosures



- Audinga-Dea Hazewinkel is a Post-Doc Research Fellow funded by AstraZeneca (AZ supervisor Ulrica Wilderäng)
- This presentation is based on research using data from Boehringer-Ingelheim that has been made available by a VIVLI DATA USE AGREEMENT. Vivli has not contributed to or approved, and is not in any way responsible for, the contents of this publication.

Background



- In heart failure trials, common choices for primary outcomes are
 - Heart failure hospitalisation (HFH)
 - Composite of HFH and cardiovascular (CV) death
- First event or repeat events (including recurrent HFHs)
- Common presumptions:
 - 1. Analysing all events instead of only first will enhance statistical power (e.g., in analysis using Anderson-Gill, Negative Binomial)
 - 2. Repeat events are independent within-patient

Objectives



- Study patterns of heart failure hospitalisations (HFHs) over time
 - Relationship between first HFH and subsequent HFHs
 - Time clustering of HFHs for patients with >1 HFH
- Estimate treatment effects
 - Use assumption-free methods: win ratio and Area Under the Curve
 - Use first event only versus total events
 - Use number of HFHs versus total days spent in hospital



- EMPEROR-Reduced and EMPEROR-Preserved trials in chronic heart failure with reduced/preserved ejection fraction
- **3730** randomised to empagliflozin vs placebo
- Primary outcome: first HFH/CVD
- Median follow-up time **15.7 months**
- 389 (10%) experienced CV death
- **588 (16%)** with 1 or more HFHs
- **941** in total

Data



- EMPEROR-Reduced
- Number of HFHs per patient
- 588 patients with ≥ 1 HFHs
- 3142 patients with no HFHs



Relationship between first HFH and subsequent HFHs



- Increased HFH rate in the first three months following first HFH discharge
- HFH rate remains significantly elevated over time
- Incidence of a first HFH is much lower

HFH rates after first HFH discharge





- We developed a method that compares observed time between consecutive HFHs to the expected time if
 - HFHs were truly independent within-patient
 - i.e. they occur randomly over time (Poisson process, constant event rate)
- Is this a plausible assumption?

Relationship between HFH and CV death



- Amongst patients with CV death
 - acceleration in HFH incidence over time as death approache
 - Partly due to in-hospital CV death (72/389)
- Amongst patients who stay alive (or non-CV death)
 - lower incidence of HFH, constant over time

HFH rates leading up to time of CV death or censoring



* Adjusted for 8 risk factors



- We developed a method that compares observed time between consecutive HFHs to the expected time if
 - HFHs were truly independent within-patient
 - i.e. they occur randomly over time (Poisson process, constant event rate)
- Restrict focus to censored patients (i.e. no acceleration of events near end of follow-up)
- Estimate clustering in patients with specific number of events (e.g., 2 events, 3 events, 4 events, etc.)
- Then pool results

Time clustering of HFHs for patients with >1 HFH



- Example: 2 events
- Cumulative distribution plot of observed and expected times between consecutive HFHs
- Scaled as a proportion of follow-up



The time between consecutive HFHs is on average 23.5% shorter (p<0.00001) than would be expected if within-patient HFHs were distributed randomly over time

Estimating treatment effects: win ratio



- Need an assumption-free method
- Choose a hierarchical composite outcome \rightarrow win ratio analysis
- Three alternative hierarchical composites:
 - (1) CV death, (2) Time to 1st HFH
 - (1) CV death, (2) Number of HFHs
 - (1) CV death, (2) Cumulative days spent in hospital due to HF



- Example: (1) CV death, (2) Time to 1st HFH
- All patient pairs (one empagliflozin, one placebo: 1863 × 1867 = 3 478 221 pairs) are compared first on level (1) CV death:
 - <u>win</u> if placebo patient experiences CV death and empagliflozin patient does not, or if placebo patient experiences CV death earlier
 - loss if the converse is true
 - tie if neither patient experiences CV death
- If tied for (1) CV death, patients are compared on the same basis for level (2) Time to 1st HFH
- Win ratio = total wins / total losses

Estimating treatment effects: win ratio



Outcome	win ratio (95% CI)	Z	P-value
(1) CV death; (2) Time to 1 st HFH	1.340 (1.160 to 1.547	3.99	<0.0001
(1) CV death; (2) Number of HFHs	1.335 (1.156 to 1.541)	3.94	<0.0001
(1) CV death; (2) Cumulative days in hospital due to HF	1.330 (1.153 to 1.534)	3.91	<0.0001

- Comparable win ratios and Z-scores
- No advantage in using repeat HFHs over first HFH
- No advantage in using cumulative HFH duration over number of HFHs

Estimating treatment effects: Area Under The Curve

- Average amount of time between primary outcome occurring and fixed milestone time
- For first events: restricted mean event time lost (RMLT); area under the cumulative incidence curve
- For repeat events: area under the mean cumulative function (AUC)
- Ratio of RMLT/AUC: relative measure of treatment benefit (<1 indicates benefit)



- first events (first of HFH/CVD)
- repeat events (all HFHs and CVD)



Estimating treatment effects: Area Under The Curve



- RMLT: Composite outcome of first HFH or CV death
- AUC: Composite outcome of all HFHs and CV death
- Milestone time of 24 months (an arbitrary choice)

Outcome	RMLT/AUC (95% CI)	Z	P-value
First HFH or CV death	0.764 (0.674 to 0.866)	4.23	<0.00001
All HFHs and CV death	0.739 (0.628 to 0.867)	3.64	<0.0001

- Stronger evidence (greater Z-score) when using time-to-first
- No advantage in using repeat HFHs over first HFH

Key findings



- Clear evidence of time-clustering of repeat HFHs
- After a first HFH, risk of subsequent HFH is markedly elevated, especially early on
- No apparent gain in power by analysing repeat HFHs instead of just time to first
- No advantage from using cumulative days in hospital instead of number of HFHs
- Win ratio and Area Under the Curve method give similar results
- Comparable results in EMPEROR-Preserved (not shown)

Conclusions



- Commonly used repeat events methods such as Anderson-Gill and Negative Binomial unrealistically assume in-patient events are independent
 - Implications of this require further work
 - Win ratio and Area Under the Curve are assumption-free
- 2. Time for a rethink on how to best make use of recurrent events in heart failure trials?
- 3. Need to study how these findings relate to other diseases with recurrent events

References



EMPEROR TRIALS:

- Packer M et al. (2020). EMPEROR-Reduced Trial. N Engl J Med. 383:1413-1424.
- Anker SD *et al.* (2021). EMPEROR-Preserved. *N Engl J Med*. 385:1451-1461.

EMPEROR-Reduced CVD/HFH risk score:

• Pocock SJ et al. (2021). Eur Heart J. 42:4455-4464.

Win ratio:

• Pocock SJ et al. (2012). Eur Heart J, 33:176-182.

Area Under the Curve:

• Claggett BL et al. (2022). NEJM Evid, 1(10)

Recurrent versus first events in heart failure trials:

- Gregson J *et al.* (2023). J Am Coll Cardiol. 82:1445-1463.
- Claggett B et al. (2018). Circulation. 138:570-577.



EXTRA SLIDES

Relationship between HFH and CV death



- Increased risk of CV death in the first three months following HFH discharge
- Risk of CV death remains significantly elevated over time
- Risk of CV death much lower in patients without any HFH

Risk of CV death following first HFH discharge



* Adjusted for 8 risk factors

Prognostic impact of length and number of HFHs



1. Risk of CV death by duration of first HFH

- HRs of CV death by
 - 1. Duration of first HFH
 - 2. Cumulative time spent in hospital
 - 3. Number of hospitalisations
- Relative to risk of CV death not preceded by an HFH



* Adjusted for 8 risk factors

Prognostic impact of length and number of HFHs



2. Risk of CV death by cumulative days spent in hospital due to HF



