Guidance for Industry
Diabetes Mellitus — Evaluating Cardiovascular Risk in New Antidiabetic Therapies to Treat Type 2 Diabetes

Guidance for Industry
Diabetes Mellitus — Evaluating Cardiovascular Risk in New Antidiabetic Therapies to Treat Type 2 Diabetes

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)

December 2008
Clinical/Medical

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Guidance for Industry[1]
Diabetes Mellitus — Evaluating Cardiovascular Risk in
New Antidiabetic Therapies to Treat Type 2 Diabetes

This guidance represents the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) current thinking on this topic. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to bind FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if the approach satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative approach, contact the FDA staff responsible for implementing this guidance. If you cannot identify the appropriate FDA staff, call the appropriate number listed on the title page of this guidance.

I.   INTRODUCTION

This guidance provides recommendations for the development of drugs and therapeutic biologics regulated within the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of diabetes mellitus.[2] Specifically, this guidance makes recommendations about how to demonstrate that a new antidiabetic therapy to treat type 2 diabetes is not associated with an unacceptable increase in cardiovascular risk.

In March 2008, the FDA issued the draft guidance for industry *Diabetes Mellitus: Developing Drugs and Therapeutic Biologics for Treatment and Prevention*.[3] Concerns related to cardiovascular risk will be addressed in the final version of that guidance. In the meantime, we are issuing this final guidance for immediate implementation to ensure that relevant issues related to minimizing cardiovascular risk are considered in ongoing drug development programs. We will address cardiovascular risk assessment for currently marketed antidiabetic therapies in a separate guidance.

FDA's guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe the Agency's current thinking on a topic and should be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are

---

[1] This guidance has been prepared by the Division of Metabolism and Endocrinology Products in the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) at the Food and Drug Administration.

[2] For discussion of general issues of clinical trial design or statistical analysis, see the ICH guidances for industry *E8 General Considerations for Clinical Trials* and *E9 Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials*. We update guidances periodically. To make sure you have the most recent version of a guidance, check the CDER guidance Web page at http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm.

[3] When final, this guidance will represent the FDA's current thinking on this topic. For the most recent version of a guidance, check the CDER guidance Web page at http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm.

cited. The use of the word *should* in Agency guidances means that something is suggested or recommended, but not required.

II. BACKGROUND

Diabetes mellitus has reached epidemic proportions in the United States and more recently worldwide. The morbidity and mortality associated with diabetes is anticipated to account for a substantial proportion of health care expenditures. Although several drug treatments currently are available, we recognize the need for new agents for the prevention and treatment of diabetes (e.g., development of drugs and therapeutic biologics).

Diabetes mellitus is a chronic metabolic disorder characterized by hyperglycemia caused by defective insulin secretion, resistance to insulin action, or a combination of both. Alterations of lipid and protein metabolism also are important manifestations of these defects in insulin secretion or action.

Most patients with diabetes mellitus have either type 1 diabetes (which is immune-mediated or idiopathic) or type 2 diabetes (with a complex pathophysiology that combines progressive insulin resistance and beta-cell failure). Both type 1 and type 2 diabetes have a heritable basis. Diabetes also can be related to the gestational hormonal environment, genetic defects, other endocrinopathies, infections, and certain drugs.

The treatment goals for patients with diabetes have evolved significantly over the last 80 years, from preventing imminent mortality, to alleviating symptoms, to the now recognized objective of normalization or near normalization of glucose levels with the intent of forestalling diabetic complications. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial has conclusively demonstrated that tight glucose control in patients with type 1 diabetes significantly reduces the development and progression of chronic diabetic complications, such as retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy.[4] Long-term follow-up of these patients demonstrated beneficial effects on macrovascular outcomes in the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study.[5]

There are also compelling data in patients with type 2 diabetes supporting a reduced risk of microvascular complications with improved long-term glycemic control. Glycemic control in these studies has been based on changes in HbA1c. This endpoint reflects a beneficial effect on the immediate clinical consequences of diabetes (hyperglycemia and its associated symptoms) and lowering of HbA1c is reasonably expected to reduce the long-term risk of microvascular complications. Therefore, reliance on HbA1c remains an acceptable primary efficacy endpoint for approval of drugs seeking an indication to treat hyperglycemia secondary to diabetes mellitus. However, diabetes mellitus is associated with an elevated risk of cardiovascular disease, which is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this patient population. Although this excess cardiovascular risk is present in both type 1 and type 2 diabetes, the

---

[4] See N Engl J Med, 1993, 329:977-986.

[5] See Diabetes, 2006, 55:3556-3565.

absolute deficiency of insulin in patients with type 1 diabetes dictates the need for insulin therapy as an immediate lifesaving treatment for which evaluation of long-term cardiovascular risk may not be practical. For type 2 diabetes, the wider range of therapies available before insulin therapy is considered for controlling hyperglycemia allows for an opportunity to evaluate the effect of these therapies on cardiovascular risk, enabling a more informed decision on the management of type 2 diabetes.

On July 1 and 2, 2008, the Endocrinologic and Metabolic Drugs Advisory Committee met to discuss the role of cardiovascular assessment in the premarketing and postmarketing settings. After considering the discussion at this meeting as well as other available data and information,[6] we have determined that concerns about cardiovascular risk should be more thoroughly addressed during drug development.

III.   RECOMMENDATIONS

To establish the safety of a new antidiabetic therapy to treat type 2 diabetes, sponsors should demonstrate that the therapy will not result in an unacceptable increase in cardiovascular risk. To ensure that a new therapy does not increase cardiovascular risk to an unacceptable extent, the development program for a new type 2 antidiabetic therapy should include the following.

For new clinical studies in the planning stage:

- Sponsors should establish an independent cardiovascular endpoints committee to prospectively adjudicate, in a blinded fashion, cardiovascular events during all phase 2 and phase 3 trials. These events should include cardiovascular mortality, myocardial infarction, and stroke, and can include hospitalization for acute coronary syndrome, urgent revascularization procedures, and possibly other endpoints.

- Sponsors should ensure that phase 2 and phase 3 clinical trials are appropriately designed and conducted so that a meta-analysis can be performed at the time of completion of these studies that appropriately accounts for important study design features and patient or study level covariates. To obtain sufficient endpoints to allow a meaningful estimate of risk, the phase 2 and phase 3 programs should include patients at higher risk of cardiovascular events, such as patients with relatively advanced disease, elderly patients, and patients with some degree of renal impairment. Because these types of patients are likely to be treated with the antidiabetic agent, if approved, this population is more appropriate than a younger and healthier population for assessment of other aspects of the test drug's safety.

- Sponsors also should provide a protocol describing the statistical methods for the proposed meta-analysis, including the endpoints that will be assessed. At this time, we believe it would be reasonable to include in a meta-analysis all placebo-controlled trials, add-on trials (i.e., drug versus placebo, each added to standard therapy), and active-

---

[6] See Lancet, 1998, 352:837-853 and 854-865.

controlled trials, and to preserve the study level randomized comparison but include, when possible in the meta-analysis, important identifiers of study differences or other factors (e.g., dose, duration of exposure, add-on drugs). It is likely that the controlled trials will need to last more than the typical 3 to 6 months duration to obtain enough events and to provide data on longer-term cardiovascular risk (e.g., minimum 2 years) for these chronically used therapies.

- Sponsors should perform a meta-analysis of the important cardiovascular events across phase 2 and phase 3 controlled clinical trials and explore similarities and/or differences in subgroups (e.g., age, sex, race), if possible.

For completed studies, before submission of the new drug application (NDA)/biologics license application (BLA):

- Sponsors should compare the incidence of important cardiovascular events occurring with the investigational agent to the incidence of the same types of events occurring with the control group to show that the upper bound of the two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated risk ratio is less than 1.8. This can be accomplished in several ways. The integrated analysis (meta-analysis) of the phase 2 and phase 3 clinical trials described above can be used. Or, if the data from all the studies that are part of the meta-analysis will not by itself be able to show that the upper bound of the two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated risk ratio is less than 1.8, then an additional single, large safety trial should be conducted that alone, or added to other trials, would be able to satisfy this upper bound before NDA/BLA submission. Regardless of the method used, sponsors should consider the entire range of possible increased risk consistent with the confidence interval and the point estimate of the risk increase. For example, it would not be reassuring to find a point estimate of 1.5 (a nominally significant increase) even if the 95 percent upper bound was less than 1.8.

- If the premarketing application contains clinical data that show that the upper bound of the two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated increased risk (i.e., risk ratio) is between 1.3 and 1.8, and the overall risk-benefit analysis supports approval, a postmarketing trial generally will be necessary to definitively show that the upper bound of the two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated risk ratio is less than 1.3. This can be achieved by conducting a single trial that is adequately powered or by combining the results from a premarketing safety trial with a similarly designed postmarketing safety trial. This clinical trial will be a required postmarketing safety trial.[7]

- If the premarketing application contains clinical data that show that the upper bound of the two-sided 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated increased risk (i.e., risk ratio) is less than 1.3 and the overall risk-benefit analysis supports approval, a postmarketing cardiovascular trial generally may not be necessary.

---

[7] See the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007, Title IX, subtitle A, section 901. This section will become section 505(o)(3)(A), 21 U.S.C. 355(o)(3)(A).

- The report of this meta-analysis should contain sufficient detail for all the analyses; conventional graphical plots for meta-analysis finding by study, subgroup, and overall risk ratio; and all the analysis data sets that would allow a verification of the findings.

Sponsors are encouraged to contact the division to discuss specific issues that arise during the development of a new antidiabetic therapy to treat type 2 diabetes.