

LONDON
SCHOOL of
HYGIENE
& TROPICAL
MEDICINE



LSHTM Research Online

Macaya, F; Ryan, N; Salinas, P; Pocock, SJ; (2017) Challenges in the Design and Interpretation of Noninferiority Trials: Insights From Recent Stent Trials. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 70 (7). pp. 894-903. ISSN 0735-1097 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.06.039>

Downloaded from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/4224342/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.06.039>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk.

Available under license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

<https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk>

TABLE 1. Key points to bear in mind when choosing a non-inferiority margin

Considerations when choosing the non-inferiority margin

1. Accurately estimate the efficacy of the active control (over placebo or previous controls)
2. Nature and clinical relevance of events (misleading composite outcomes)
3. Implications of choosing an absolute or relative difference
4. Weight of the new treatment's ancillary benefit
5. Achievable sample size

TABLE 2. Summary of key findings from 9 non-inferiority trials of new stent vs. 2nd generation stent comparator. Relative risk margins (RR) have been calculated. Asterisk: reference provided for value. A: Absorb; B: Biomatrix; N: Nobori; O: Orsiro; P: Promus; PE: Promus Element; R: Resolute; U: Ultimaster; X: Xience

Study name	% Expected event rate	% MNI (RR)	Beta	Alpha (one-sided)	Control arm			Experimental arm		
					stent	n	% Observed event rate	stent	n	% Observed event rate
RESOLUTE AC	8	3.5 (1.44)*	0.1	0.05	X	1126	8.3	RE	1119	8.2
PLATINUM	5.5	3.5 (1.64)*	0.11	0.05	X/P	737	3.1	P	742	3.5
COMPARE II	9.5	4 (1.42)	0.1	0.05	X/P	912	4.8	N	1795	5.2
CENTURY II	10	5.5 (1.55)*	0.1	0.05	X	557	5	U	562	4.6
BIOSCIENCE	8	3.5 (1.44)*	0.2	0.05	X	1056	6.6	O	1063	6.5
DUTCH PEERS	10	3.6 (1.36)*	0.2	0.05	P	905	5.2	RI	905	6.1
SORT OUT VI	6.5	2.5 (1.38)*	0.2	0.05	RI	1497	5	B	1502	5.3
ABSORB III	7*	4.5 (1.64)	0.04	0.025	X	677	6.1	A	1313	7.8
ABSORB Japan	9*	8.6 (1.96)*	0.1	0.05	X	133	3.8	A	265	4.2

TABLE 3. Intention-to-treat and per-protocol or as-treated analyses from the stent trials. The pre-defined absolute NI margin used in the designs and their relative proportion to the expected event rate. 95% and 97.5% upper CI limit for the difference and for the RR in brackets, derived from ITT or PP/AT analyses. Asterisks indicate the values used for testing non-inferiority by each study.

Study name	% NI margin (RR)	One-sided CI for ITT analysis %(RR)		One-sided CI for PP/AT analysis %(RR)	
		95% CI	97.5% CI	95% CI	97.5% CI
RESOLUTE AC	3.5 (1.44)	1.8 (1.24) *	2.2 (1.30)	2.0 (1.29)	2.3 (1.35)
PLATINUM	3.5 (1.64)	1.9 (1.78) *	2.2 (1.95)	2.0 (1.88)	2.3 (2.06)
COMPARE II	4.0 (1.42)	1.8 (1.44) *	2.1 (1.52)	1.9 (1.52)	2.2 (1.62)
CENTURY II	5.5 (1.55)	1.7 (1.42) *	2.1 (1.55)	1.5 (1.39)	1.9 (1.52)
BIOSCIENCE	3.5 (1.44)	1.6 (1.28) *	2.0 (1.35)	1.2 (1.21)	1.6 (1.27)
DUTCH PEERS	3.6 (1.36)	2.7 (1.61) *	3.0 (1.71)	2.7 (1.63)	3.0 (1.74)
SORT OUT VI	2.5 (1.38)	1.6 (1.36) *	1.8 (1.43)	not presented	not presented
ABSORB III	4.5 (1.64)	3.6 (1.72)	4.0 (1.82) *	3.8 (1.75)	4.2 (1.85)
ABSORB Japan	8.6 (1.96)	3.8 (2.63) *	4.4 (3.11)	not presented	not presented