Triple versus guideline antiplatelet therapy to prevent recurrence after acute ischaemic stroke or transient ischaemic attack: the TARDIS RCT
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Background

Stroke is devastating to patients, carers and society through high mortality, morbidity and cost. Both stroke incidence and prevalence will increase as the UK population ages. Following stroke or transient ischaemic attack (TIA), the risk of recurrence is high, especially immediately after the event after which it falls. Typically, recurrent strokes are more severe than earlier events.

The archetypal antiplatelet, aspirin, reduces recurrence by 17% in patients with prior stroke or TIA. Clopidogrel is slightly more efficacious than aspirin, especially in high-risk patients. Dipyridamole reduces recurrence with comparable efficacy to aspirin. The combination of aspirin and dipyridamole is more effective than either drug alone.


The Triple Antiplatelets for Reducing Dependency after Ischaemic Stroke (TARDIS) trial was designed to extend this observation by investigating the safety and efficacy of intensive antiplatelet treatment with three drugs as compared with guideline therapy.

Objectives

The main objective was to compare the safety and efficacy of intensive versus guideline antiplatelet therapy for participants with acute ischaemic stroke and TIA. A second objective was to test and demonstrate the use of ordinal trial outcomes, including recurrent stroke and TIA, bleeding, and adverse events.

Methods

The TARDIS trial was an international prospective randomised open-label blinded end-point superiority clinical trial.

Setting

The trial enrolled patients from 106 hospitals in the UK, Denmark, Georgia and New Zealand.

Participants

Participants were > 50 years of age with acute non-cardioembolic ischaemic stroke or TIA within 48 hours of ictus (or 24–48 hours if they had received thrombolysis). Participants with a TIA had to score ≥ 4 on the ABCD2 scale [which takes account of age (A), blood pressure (B), clinical symptomology (C), duration of symptoms (D), and presence of diabetes (D)], already be on two antiplatelet agents, or have a crescendo TIA. Those with an ischaemic stroke had to have one or more of limb weakness, dysphasia or hemianopia. Patients were excluded if they had isolated sensory or vertiginous symptoms (or only facial weakness), intracranial haemorrhage or presumed cardioembolic cerebral ischaemia.
**Randomisation**
Participants were allocated at random to 1 month of antiplatelet agents comparing intensive (combined aspirin, clopidogrel and dipyridamole) versus guideline therapy.

**Interventions**
Originally, the guideline therapy comprised the combination of aspirin and dipyridamole, but clopidogrel alone was added following a change in National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance in 2010 [NICE. Clopidogrel and Modified Release Dipyridamole for the Prevention of Occlusive Vascular Events. Technology Appraisal Guidance (TA210). London: NICE; 2010]. Aspirin and clopidogrel were each given as a loading dose (300 mg) followed by maintenance doses (75 mg daily). Modified-release dipyridamole was recommended (200 mg twice daily). Gastroprotection was recommended.

**Outcomes**
The primary efficacy outcome was the incidence and severity of any recurrent stroke [ischaemic, haemorrhagic; severity determined using the modified Rankin Scale (mRS)] or TIA at 90 days, and assessed using a six-level ordered categorical scale: fatal stroke, severe stroke (mRS score of 4–5), moderate stroke (mRS score of 2–3), mild stroke (mRS score of 0–1), TIA or no cerebral ischaemic event. Analysis used ordinal logistic regression and was by intention to treat. Secondary efficacy outcomes included disability, cognition, health-related quality of life, mood and discharge disposition. The main safety outcome was bleeding comprising a five-level ordered categorical scale: fatal, major, moderate, minor and no bleeding. Additional safety outcomes included all-cause and cause-specific case fatality, early neurological deterioration and serious adverse events. The net balance between efficacy and hazard was assessed as the composite end points of any stroke or major (including fatal) bleeding and death, stroke, myocardial infarction (MI) or major bleeding.

**Sample size**
Using an ordinal rather than binary outcome, and including TIA along with stroke, meant that the sample size could be reduced from >8000 participants to 4100, assuming an overall type I error rate of 5% with two-sided significance test, power 90%, odds ratio of 0.68, treatment crossovers 5%, losses to follow-up 2% and a reduction of 20% for baseline covariate adjustment.

**Results**
The trial was stopped early on the recommendation of the Data Monitoring Committee after recruitment of 3096 participants (intensive, n = 1556; guideline, n = 1540) from 106 hospitals in four countries between April 2009 and March 2016. The advice to stop was based on three observations: (1) the presence of a significant increase in major bleeding in participants randomised to intensive antiplatelet therapy, (2) the absence of a significant reduction in the primary outcome and (3) a conditional power analysis suggested that the trial was highly unlikely to demonstrate a significant difference in the primary outcome. Baseline characteristics were well balanced between the two treatment groups.

**Primary outcome**
The incidence and severity of recurrent stroke or TIA did not differ between intensive and guideline therapy [adjusted common odds ratio (acOR) 0.90, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.67 to 1.20; p = 0.47].

**Safety outcomes**
Major (encompassing fatal) bleeding increased with intensive as compared with guideline therapy (adjusted hazard ratio (aHR) 2.23, 95% CI 1.25 to 3.96; p = 0.006) and the difference only developed during the active treatment phase. Headache, by day 35, was more common in participants receiving intensive antiplatelets (aHR 4.13, 95% CI 2.09 to 8.15; p < 0.001).
Secondary outcomes
Length of stay in hospital, discharge disposition, dependency, disability, cognition, quality of life and mood did not differ between the treatment groups.

Net benefit: risk
There were no differences between treatment groups in all-cause mortality (aHR 0.89, 95% CI 0.51 to 1.55; \( p = 0.69 \)), number and severity of adverse events (acOR 1.02, 95% CI 0.86 to 1.22; \( p = 0.80 \)), combined stroke and major/fatal bleeding (aHR 1.24, 95% CI 0.90 to 1.70; \( p = 0.19 \)) or the composite of death, stroke, MI and major bleeding (aHR 1.02, 95% CI 0.77 to 1.35; \( p = 0.88 \)).

Meta-analysis of antiplatelet intensity trials
In a meta-analysis, heterogeneity was present between the group of trials of dual antiplatelet therapy and the TARDIS trial when compared with guideline therapy in respect of preventing stroke. No heterogeneity was present for major bleeding.

Conclusions

Implications for health care
- The TARDIS trial found that there was no significant reduction in the recurrence of stroke or TIA, or their severity, with intensive antiplatelet therapy based on three agents as compared with guideline therapy. However, triple antiplatelet therapy was associated with increased major bleeding. Overall, there was no effect on the net balance between harm and benefit confirming the overall neutral finding of the trial.
- In the context of the patients studied in the TARDIS trial, there is no evidence to support the use of intensive treatment based on three standard antiplatelets (aspirin, clopidogrel, dipyridamole).

Future research implications
- There is no obvious reason to further study the use of intensive antiplatelet therapy with three agents in patients with acute stroke or TIA.
- Future trials examining potent antiplatelet agents should consider whether it would be safe to use them with existing antiplatelets in patients with acute cerebral ischaemia.

Trial registration
This trial is registered as ISRCTN47823388.

Funding
Funding for this study was provided by the Health Technology Assessment programme of the National Institute for Health Research. The TARDIS vanguard phase was funded by the British Heart Foundation (grant PG/08/083/25779, 1 April 2009 to 30 September 2012) and indirect funding was provided by the Stroke Association through its funding of the Stroke Trials Unit, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. There was no commercial support for the trial and antiplatelet drugs were sourced locally at each site. The trial was sponsored by the University of Nottingham.

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Rath et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.
Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in Health Technology Assessment (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in Health Technology Assessment are termed ‘systematic’ when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. ‘Health technologies’ are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 10/104/24. The contractual start date was in October 2012. The draft report began editorial review in November 2017 and was accepted for publication in May 2018. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors’ report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Bath et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).
NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley  Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein  Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andrée Le May  Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key  Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck  Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly  Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin  Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson  Director of the NIHR Dissemination Centre, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont  Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid  Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire  Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads  Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie  Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell  Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery  Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsmma  Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts  Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross  Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks  Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton  Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood  Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact:  journals.library@nihr.ac.uk