Protocols

Statistical analysis plan for the 'Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke' (ENOS) trial

Philip M. W. Bath¹*, Aimee Houlton¹, Lisa Woodhouse¹, Nikola Sprigg¹, Joanna Wardlaw², Stuart Pocock³, on behalf of the ENOS Trialists

High blood pressure is common during the acute phase of stroke and is associated with a poor outcome. However, the management of high blood pressure remains unclear. The 'Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke' trial tested whether transdermal glyceryl trinitrate, a nitric oxide donor that lowers blood pressure, is safe and effective in improving outcome after acute stroke. Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke is an international multicenter, prospective, randomized, single-blind, blinded endpoint trial, with funding from the UK Medical Research Council. Patients with acute ischemic stroke or intracerebral hemorrhage and systolic blood pressure 140-220 mmHg were randomized to glyceryl trinitrate or no glyceryl trinitrate and, where relevant, to continue or stop prestroke antihypertensive therapy. The primary outcome is shift in modified Rankin Scale at three-months. Patients or relatives gave written informed (proxy) consent, and all sites had research ethics approval. Analyses will be done by intention to treat. This paper and attachment describe the trial's statistical analysis plan, developed prior to unblinding of date. The statistical analysis plan contains design and methods for analyses, and unpopulated tables and figures for the two primary publications and some secondary publications. The database will be locked in late February 2014 in preparation for presentation of the results in May 2014. The data from the trial will improve the precision of the estimates of the overall treatment effects (efficacy and safety) of results from completed trials of blood pressure management in acute stroke, and provide the first large-scale randomized evidence on transdermal glyceryl trinitrate, and of continuing (vs. stopping) prestroke antihypertensive medications, in acute stroke.

Key words: acute stroke trial, blood pressure, glyceryl trinitrate, intracerebral hemorrhage, ischemic stroke, statistical analysis plan

High blood pressure (BP) is present in 70% or more of patients with acute ischemic stroke and intracerebral hemorrhage (ICH) (1). Affected patients have a worse outcome, whether judged as early recurrence, death within a few weeks, or combined death and dependency after several months (1–4). Lowering BP might therefore reduce these events and improve functional outcome

Correspondence: Philip Bath*, Stroke Trials Unit, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Nottingham, City Hospital Campus, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK.

E-mail: philip.bath@nottingham.ac.uk

Twitter: @enostrial

¹Stroke Trials Unit, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

²Neuroimaging Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
³Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

Received: 12 August 2013; Accepted: 14 October 2013; Published online 03 March 2014

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Trial registration: ISRCTN99414122

DOI: 10.1111/ijs.12235

372 Vol 9, April 2014, 372–374

providing that cerebral perfusion is not reduced in the presence of dysfunctional cerebral autoregulation. However, recent large trials have been inconsistent and inconclusive in their results (5,6).

Nitric oxide (NO) donors are candidate treatments for acute stroke: NO is a cerebral and systemic vasodilator, modulates vascular and neuronal function, and inhibits apoptosis (7).

Preclinical studies of cerebral ischemia found that NO donors reduce stroke lesion size and improve regional cerebral blood flow (CBF) and functional outcome (8). Five small clinical studies of NO donors have been performed, these involving a total of 208 patients with recent stroke.

Intravenous sodium nitroprusside reduced BP without altering CBF and exhibited antiplatelet effects (thereby precluding its use in ICH) (9). Four pilot trials of transdermal glyceryl trinitrate (GTN) found that it lowered BP by approximately 8%; did not alter platelet function (and so could be given in ICH); did not alter middle cerebral artery blood flow velocity or regional CBF; improved aortic vascular compliance; and could be given to patients with dysphagia (10–13). No safety concerns were present in these studies, and in one small trial, ultra-acute treatment with GTN was associated with an improved functional outcome (13,14).

On the basis of these preclinical and clinical data showing feasibility, tolerability and apparent safety of GTN, and the potential for efficacy, the large 'Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke' (ENOS) trial was started and is ongoing. ENOS is assessing, in a partial, factorial, prospective, randomized, single-blind, blindedoutcome design, whether to lower BP with GTN (vs. no GTN) and whether to continue (vs. stop) prestroke antihypertensive therapy. The trial commenced in 2001, and protocols for the main trial and an outline on the management of neuroimaging were published in 2006 and 2007, respectively (15,16). Several nontreatment-related and blinded analyses of the ENOS database have been published since the start of the trial (17–22). The independent Data Monitoring Committee have assessed the trial every six-months and on each occasion recommended that the trial should continue.

Prior to presentation of the primary analyses in 2014, two further publications are planned, the statistical analysis plan (SAP) and a detailed listing of baseline characteristics. The accompanying Supporting Information Appendix S1 details the SAP and is presented prior to locking of the trial database (expected in late February) so that analyses are not data driven or selectively reported (23). Unusually, this SAP includes not just information on the two primary publications (GTN vs. no GTN, and continue vs. stop prestroke antihypertensive medication) but also provides detailed information on the intended baseline characteristics publication and the first set of secondary publications. The SAP also informs much of the content of the final trial report

© 2014 The Authors. International Journal of Stroke published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of World Stroke Organization

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

P. M. W. Bath et al.

to be submitted to the Medical Research Council/Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation Programme (EME); the final report will be submitted in the third quarter of 2014 for publication in the *EME Journal*, part of the National Institute for Health research collection of peer-reviewed open access journals.

Importantly, the ENOS Trial Steering Committee have changed the original plan for the analysis of the primary outcome, as reported in the protocol (published in IJS) (15), from using an unadjusted binary 'cut' of the modified Rankin Scale (mRS (24), unadjusted comparison of mRS >2 between the treatment groups) to an adjusted ordinal analysis utilizing all seven levels of the mRS with adjustment for minimization variables. The change meant that the sample size could be reduced from 5000 patients to a minimum of 3500 patients assuming power of 90% and significance of 5%. The decision to change from dichotomous to polytomous analysis was not based on any interim analysis of the ENOS dataset; rather, it reflects the recognition that ordinal analyses are more efficient statistically (i.e. they provide improved statistical power for a given sample size) (25,26) as also shown for head injury trials (27). (The importance of this change is highlighted by recent trials that were technically neutral on their primary outcome when using a binary analysis but positive when analyzed secondarily using an ordinal analysis. (6,28)) Similarly, adjusted analyses provide additional statistical power (29), are important if minimization is used during the process of randomization (30), and help address any minor imbalances present at baseline because of chance. As a result, these statistical approaches are likely to be more sensitive to any treatment effect and, as such, are recommended by the European Stroke Organization (31). The collection of all baseline data needed for covariate adjustment of the primary outcome should mean there is no need for imputation for missing data.

In the future, data from ENOS will be integrated into individual patient data meta-analyses of NO donors, and BP lowering, for acute stroke (the latter through the 'Blood pressure in Acute Stroke Collaboration'), and made available to participating countries and the 'Virtual International Stroke Trials Archive' (32).

Ultimately, a subset of the data will be made available over the web, as with the International Stroke Trial (33). Similarly, anonymized baseline and on-treatment neuroimaging data will be published (16).

References

- Leonardi-Bee J, Bath PMW, Phillips SJ, Sandercock PAG, for the IST Collaborative Group. Blood pressure and clinical outcomes in the International Stroke Trial. *Stroke* 2002; 33:1315–20.
- 2 Willmot M, Leonardi-Bee J, Bath PM. High blood pressure in acute stroke and subsequent outcome: a systematic review. *Hypertension* 2004; **43**:18–24.
- 3 Sprigg N, Gray LJ, Bath PM *et al.* Relationship between outcome and baseline blood pressure and other haemodynamic measures in acute ischaemic stroke: data from the TAIST trial. *J Hypertens* 2006; **24:**1413–7.
- ⁴ Geeganage C, Tracy M, England T *et al.* Relationship between baseline blood pressure parameters (including mean pressure, pulse pressure, and variability) and early outcome after stroke: data from the Tinzaparin in Acute Ischaemic Stroke Trial (TAIST). *Stroke* 2011; **42**:491–3.

- 5 Sandset EC, Bath PM, Boysen G et al. The angiotensin-receptor blocker candesartan for treatment of acute stroke (SCAST): a randomised, placebo-controlled double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2011; **377:**741– 50.
- 6 Anderson CS, Heeley E, Huang Y *et al.* Rapid blood-pressure lowering in patients with acute intracerebral hemorrhage. *N Engl J Med* 2013; 368:2355–65.
- 7 Willmot MR, Bath PMW. The potential of nitric oxide therapeutics in stroke Expert Opinion Investigational. *Drugs* 2003; **12**:455–70.
- 8 Willmot M, Murphy S, Leonardi-Bee J, Bath P. Systematic review of nitric oxide donors and L-arginine in experimental stroke: effects on infarct size and cerebral blood flow. *CerebrovascDis* 2003; 16:S3–66 (abstract).
- 9 Butterworth RJ, Cluckie A, Jackson SHD, Buxton-Thomas M, Bath PMW. Pathophysiological assessment of nitric oxide (given as sodium nitroprusside) in acute ischaemic stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 1998; 8:158– 65.
- 10 Bath PMW, Pathansali R, Iddenden R, Bath FJ. The effect of transdermal glyceryl trinitrate, anitric oxide donor, on blood pressure and platelet function in acute stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2001; **11**:265–72.
- 11 Rashid P, Weaver C, Leonardi-Bee JA, Fletcher S, Bath FJ, Bath PMW. The effects of transdermal glyceryl trinitrate, a nitric oxide donor on blood pressure, cerebral and cardiac haemodynamics and plasma nitric oxide levels in acute stroke. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2003; 13:143–51.
- 12 Willmot M, Ghadami A, Whysall B, Clarke W, Wardlaw J, Bath PM. Transdermal glyceryl trinitrate lowers blood pressure and maintains cerebral blood flow in recent stroke. *Hypertension* 2006; **47:**1209– 15.
- 13 Ankolekar SFM, Renton C, Cox P, Sprigg N, Siriwardena AN, Bath PM. Feasibility of an ambulance-based stroke trial and safety of glyceryl trinitrate in ultra acute stroke: the 'Rapid Intervention with Glyceryl Trinitrate in Hypertensive Stroke Trial' (RIGHT, ISRCTN66434824). *Stroke* 2013; **44**:3120–8.
- 14 Ankolekar S, Sare G, Geeganage C *et al.* Determining the Feasibility of Ambulance-Based Randomised Controlled Trials in Patients with Ultra-Acute Stroke: study Protocol for the 'Rapid Intervention with GTN in Hypertensive Stroke Trial' (RIGHT, ISRCTN66434824). *Stroke Res Treat* 2012; **2012**:385753. doi: 10.1155/2012/385753
- 15 The ENOS Trial Investigators. Glyceryl trinitrate vs. control, and continuing vs. stopping temporarily prior antihypertensive therapy, in acute stroke: rationale and design of the Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke (ENOS) trial (ISRCTN99414122). *Int J Stroke* 2006; 1:245–9.
- 16 Wardlaw J, Bath P, Sandercock P et al. The NeuroGrid stroke examplar clinical trial protocol. Int J Stroke 2007; 2:63–9.
- 17 Kobayashi A, Grabska K, Czlonkowska A, Gray LJ, Bath PMW. Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke – ENOS – a randomized trial – characteristics of patients recruited in Poland. *Neurol Neurochir Pol* 2008; 42:99– 104.
- 18 Sare GM, Gray LJ, Wardlaw J, Chen C, Bath PMW, Investigators FtET. Is lowering blood pressure hazardous in patients with significant ipsilateral carotid stenosis and acute ischaemic stroke? Interim assessment in the 'Efficacy of Nitric Oxide in Stroke' Trial. *Blood Press Monit* 2009; 14:20–5.
- 19 Ildiko SSS, Jurcau A, Simion A *et al*. The efficacy of nitric oxide in stroke (ENOS) Trial – where do we stand in Romania? *Rom J Neurol* 2012; XI:68–74.
- 20 Ankolekar S, Renton C, Bereczki D *et al.* Effect of the neutral CLOTS 1 trial on the use of graduated compression stockings in the Efficacy of Nitric Oxide Stroke (ENOS) trial. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2012; 84:342–7.
- 21 Whynes DK, Sprigg N, Selby J, Berge E, Bath PM. Testing for differential item functioning within the EQ-5D. *Med Decis Making* 2013; 33:252–60.
- 22 De Silva DA, Omar E, Manzano JJ *et al.* Comparison of small volume infarcts of lacunar and non-lacunar etiologies. *Int J Stroke* 2013; **8:**E24–5.

Protocols

Protocols

- 23 Collins R, MacMahon S. Reliable assessment of the effects of treatment on mortality and major morbidity, I: clinical trials. *Lancet* 2001; 357:373–80.
- 24 Lees KR, Bath PMW, Schellinger PD *et al.* Contemporary outcome measures in acute stroke research: choice of primary outcome measure. *Stroke* 2012; **43**:1163–70.
- 25 The Optimising Analysis of Stroke Trials (OAST) Collaboration. Can we improve the statistical analysis of stroke trials? Statistical re-analysis of functional outcomes in stroke trials. *Stroke* 2007; **38**:1911–5.
- 26 The Optimising Analysis of Stroke Trials (OAST) Collaboration. Calculation of sample size for stroke trials assessing functional outcome: comparison of binary and ordinal approaches. *Int J Stroke* 2008; 3:78– 84.
- 27 McHugh GS, Butcher I, Steyerberg EW *et al.* A simulation study evaluating approaches to the analysis of ordinal outcome data in randomized controlled trials in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT Project. *Clin Trials* 2010; **7**:44–57.
- 28 Sandercock P, Wardlaw JM, Lindley RI *et al.* The benefits and harms of intravenous thrombolysis with recombinant tissue plasminogen activator within 6 h of acute ischaemic stroke (the third international stroke trial [IST-3]): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2012; 379:2352–63.

- 29 The Optimising Analysis of Stroke Trials (OAST) Collaboration. Should stroke trials adjust functional outcome for baseline prognostic factors? *Stroke* 2009; **40**:888–94.
- 30 Weir CJ, Lees KR. Comparison of stratification and adaptive methods for treatment allocation in an acute stroke clinical trial. *StatMed* 2003; 22:705–26.
- 31 Bath PM, Lees KR, Schellinger PD *et al.* Statistical analysis of the primary outcome in acute stroke trials. *Stroke* 2012; **43**:1171–8.
- 32 Ali M, Bath PMB, Davis SM *et al.* The virtual international stroke trials archive (VISTA). *Stroke* 2007; **38**:1905–10.
- 33 Sandercock PA, Niewada M, Czlonkowska A. The International Stroke Trial database. *Trials* 2011; 12:101. doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-12-101

Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's web-site:

Appendix S1. Statistical Analysis Plan (ENOS).