the global endothelial function. However, a development of new (alternative) strategies for the diagnostics and treatment of endothelial dysfunction in various diseases is required.

Declaration of interest

None declared.

References

- 1 Galley HF, Webster NR. Physiology of the endothelium. *Br J Anaesth* 2004; **93**: 105–13
- 2 Davignon J, Ganz P. Role of endothelial dysfunction in atherosclerosis. *Circulation* 2004; **109**: III27–32
- 3 Johnstone MT, Creager SJ, Scales KM, Cusco JA, Lee BK, Creager MA. Impaired endothelium-dependent vasodilation in patients with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 1993; **88**: 2510–6
- 4 Boulanger CM. Secondary endothelial dysfunction: hypertension and heart failure. J Mol Cell Cardiol 1999; **31**: 39–49
- 5 Peters N, Freilinger T, Opherk C, Pfefferkorn T, Dichgans M. Enhanced L-arginine-induced vasoreactivity suggests endothelial dysfunction in CADASIL. J Neurol 2008; 255: 1203–8, doi: 10.1007/ s00415-008-0876-9. Epub June 13, 2008
- 6 Knottnerus IL, Ten Cate H, Lodder J, Kessels F, van Oostenbrugge RJ. Endothelial dysfunction in lacunar stroke: a systematic review. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2009; **27**: 519–26
- 7 Scherbakov N, Sandek A, Martens-Lobenhoffer J, *et al.* Endothelial dysfunction of the peripheral vascular bed in the acute phase after ischemic stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2012; **33**: 37–46
- 8 Poredos P, Jezovnik MK. Testing endothelial function and its clinical relevance. J Atheroscler Thromb 2013; 20: 1–8

- 9 Celermajer DS, Sorensen KE, Gooch VM, et al. Non-invasive detection of endothelial dysfunction in children and adults at risk of atherosclerosis. Lancet 1992; 340: 1111–5
- 10 Laurent S, Lacolley P, Brunel P, Laloux B, Pannier B, Safar M. Flowdependent vasodilation of brachial artery in essential hypertension. *Am J Physiol* 1990; **258** (4 Pt 2): H1004–11
- 11 Corretti MC, Anderson TJ, Benjamin EJ, *et al.* International Brachial Artery Reactivity Task Force. Guidelines for the ultrasound assessment of endothelial-dependent flow-mediated vasodilation of the brachial artery: a report of the International Brachial Artery Reactivity Task Force. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002; **39**: 257–65
- 12 Kuvin JT, Patel AR, Karas RH. Need for standardization of noninvasive assessment of vascular endothelial function. *Am Heart J* 2001; **141**: 327–8
- 13 Kuvin JT, Patel AR, Sliney KA, *et al.* Assessment of peripheral vascular endothelial function with finger arterial pulse wave amplitude. *Am Heart J* 2003; **146**: 168–74
- 14 Bonetti PO, Pumper GM, Higano ST, Holmes DR Jr, Kuvin JT, Lerman A. Noninvasive identification of patients with early coronary atherosclerosis by assessment of digital reactive hyperemia. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004; **44**: 2137–41
- 15 Hamburg NM, Keyes MJ, Larson MG, et al. Cross-sectional relations of digital vascular function to cardiovascular risk factors in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation* 2008; **117**: 2467–74
- 16 Bergström A, Staalsø JM, Romner B, Olsen NV. Impaired endothelial function after aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage correlates to the arginine:asymmetric dimethylarginine ratio. *Br J Anaesth* 2014; **112**: 311–18
- 17 Bode-Böger SM, Scalera F, Ignarro LJ. The L-arginine paradox: importance of the L-arginine/asymmetrical dimethylarginine ratio. *Pharmacol Ther* 2007; **114**: 295–306
- 18 Staalsø JM, Bergström A, Edsen T, Weikop P, Romner B, Olsen NV. Low plasma arginine:asymmetric dimethyl arginine ratios predict mortality after intracranial aneurysm rupture. *Stroke* 2013; 44: 1273–81

British Journal of Anaesthesia 112 (2): 206–10 (2014) Advance Access publication December 15, 2013 · doi:10.1093/bja/aet437

EDITORIAL II

β -Blockers and cardiac protection: 5 yr on from POISE

P. Foex and J. W. Sear*

Nuffield Department of Anaesthetics, University of Oxford, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford OX3 9DU, UK

* E-mail: john.sear@gtc.ox.ac.uk

For many years, β -blockers have been regarded as the best drugs to protect patients with, or at risk for, coronary heart disease, from perioperative major adverse cardiac events (MACE). This was based on observational studies, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), experts' opinions, and guidelines. The strongest support was expressed in the 1997 guidelines of the American College of Physicians,¹ after very encouraging results after administration of atenolol before non-cardiac surgery by Mangano and colleagues.² The guideline advocated the administration of atenolol to all patients with, or at risk for, coronary disease undergoing surgery. In the USA, initiation of perioperative β -blockade was regarded as having the greatest strength of evidence in its favour.³ However, a less supportive view was expressed in the American College of

Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) guideline 2007.⁴ β -Blockers were considered to protect against myocardial ischaemia (as we had found in an RCT 20 yr earlier),⁵ they may reduce the risk of myocardial infarction and cardiac death in patients with known coronary artery disease. This followed the realization that some RCTs did not show statistically significant cardiac protection. Indeed, several studies did not show a statistically significant reduction in cardiac mortality,⁶⁻¹⁰ or non-fatal myocardial infarction.¹¹⁻¹⁵

A meta-analysis by Devereaux and colleagues¹⁶ of all RCTs of perioperative β -blockade failed to show statistically significant protection. These data were the justification for the POISE trial.

In 2008, the POISE study,¹⁷ the largest RCT in perioperative medicine ever undertaken, showed statistically and clinically significant cardiac protection but revealed an increase in allcause mortality, disabling strokes, and hypotension. Because of the much smaller size of all previous RCTs, these risks may have been present but had never reached statistical significance. Subsequent meta-analysis confirmed both cardiac protection and significant risks associated with the initiation of β -blockade shortly before surgery.¹⁸ The result of POISE was criticized, especially the potential for high doses of metoprolol to be administered, and the choice of slow-release metoprolol.¹⁹

In 2009, new guidelines on the management of patients with heart disease undergoing non-cardiac surgery were published on both sides of the Atlantic by the ACCF/AHA²⁰ and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) endorsed by the European Society of Anaesthesiology (ESA),²¹ respectively. Both sets of guidelines recommended to continue long-term treatment with β -blockers, to avoid high-dose β -blockade, and to consider the introduction of β -blockers in patients with known coronary artery disease, patients with reversible ischaemia on stress test, and in those at risk for coronary artery disease undergoing high-risk surgery, especially vascular surgery.²⁰ The European guideline regarded the above recommendations as Class I (as opposed to Class IIa for the American guidelines) and was more liberal suggesting that β -blockade could be initiated in patients undergoing intermediate-risk surgery (Class IIa).²¹ Both groups of experts advocated titration of β -blockade to slow heart rates (ESC 60-70 beats min⁻¹; ACCF/AHA 60-80 beats min⁻¹) with the limit of at least 100 mm Hg systolic arterial pressure before administration of the next dose of β -blocker (ESC), or no hypotension (ACCF/AHA). Both advocated starting *B*-blockade at least 7 days, preferably 30 days before surgery. However, there is only limited supporting evidence for this approach.

In respect of the recommendation to continue chronic β -blockade perioperatively, there is good evidence from observational studies²²⁻²⁴ and one RCT²⁵ to support the continuing of chronic β -blockade during anaesthesia and surgery. The case for discontinuing therapy was first put forward by Crandell²⁶ who stated that 'antihypertensive drugs interfered with haemodynamic adjustments and could cause profound cardiovascular collapse in patients subjected to the stress of anaesthesia and surgery'. This approach was extended to β -blockers.²⁷ However, more recent studies have shown that

discontinuing therapy is associated with significant increases in perioperative morbidity and mortality.^{22–24} Indeed, maintaining chronic therapy has been shown by Wallace and colleagues²⁴ to be associated with a similarly improved outcome when compared with patients receiving acute perioperative β -blockade. In contrast, Ellenberger and colleagues²⁸ found that chronic therapy was superior to the introduction of β -blockers within the first 2 days of surgery.

We are now in 2013. The interpretation of existing data, coupled with new research, needs to be reconsidered. First, there is the problem of the alleged intellectual misconduct relating to the studies from Poldermans and colleagues at the Erasmus Medical Center. However, the correspondence between Poldermans and the Editor of the American Journal of Medicine²⁹ in response to the commentary by Chopra and Eagle³⁰ does nothing to throw a clearer light on the overall picture.

New meta-analysis

The second new development is the publication of a new meta-analysis by Bouri and colleagues³¹ which excludes what they regard as 'insecure' studies—namely, DECREASE³² and DECREASE IV³³ trials from the Erasmus Medical Center. Based on data from nine other clinical trials (10 529 patients), the investigators report that the treatment of patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery and receiving β -blockers according to the existing recommendations of the AACF/AHA or ESC quidelines was subject to a significant 27% increase in the allcause mortality risk. Translated into figures relevant to the UK, this would imply that the drugs could have resulted in >10000surgical deaths per year had guidelines been strictly followed! In addition, their use may be associated with a 73% increase in the incidence of non-fatal stroke, and 51% increased incidence of hypotension. On the benefit side, there was a 27% reduction in non-fatal myocardial infarction. If we return to the analysis of Bangalore and colleagues,¹⁸ they show similar outcomes, where any benefit of β -blockade is driven by trials with a high intrinsic risk for bias-namely, DECREASE and DECREASE IV.

When should we start β -blockers

In respect of the early start of β -blockade advocated by the current guidelines,²⁰ ²¹ only four studies have used this approach,⁸ ¹³ ³² ³³ and in two of them, β -blockade was not shown to be beneficial. In contrast, in two studies from Poldermans' group, early administration (at least 7 days before surgery) was beneficial. All the other RCTs started β -blockade the day of surgery. While an early start is logical, new data do not support this. Wallace and colleagues²⁴ collated observation in more than 37 000 non-cardiac operations. A protocol for perioperative β -blockade was available in their institution but was not mandatory. Patients were followed for 1 yr. Survival was best for those who had been given a β -blockade. Poorer survival was noted for those not on a β -blockate, worst outcome (unsurprisingly) was in those in

whom β -blockade had been withdrawn. Thus, in the groups of patients in whom β -blockade is supported by the current guidelines, late start, if early start was not possible should not preclude the introduction of β -blockade.

Another indication for perioperative β -blockade may be to obtund the adrenergic responses to noxious stimuli or to reduce myocardial ischaemia. Our analysis of 14 studies (n=1298 patients) shows this single-dose treatment to be effective in reducing perioperative myocardial infarction [odds ratio (OR) 0.17 (0.044–0.203), seven studies] and myocardial ischaemia [0.22 (0.135–0.353), eight studies]. These treatments were not associated with significant hypotension or bradycardia.

β -Blocker formulation

There has been controversy in respect of the choice of slow-release metoprolol in POISE. A large observational study by Wallace and colleagues³⁴ has shown in 3789 patients on continuing β -blockade that atenolol was associated with better protection in terms of 30 day and 1 yr mortality than metoprolol. Today, bisoprolol is used increasingly frequently and may also prove to be more protective than metoprolol.

Existing guidelines

Guidelines^{20 21} underline that initiating β -blockade perioperatively should be limited to high-risk patients. This was largely based on the data from a very large cohort study by Lindenauer and colleagues.³⁵ The revised cardiac risk index (RCRI) was used to categorize cardiac risk. As the data concerned the years 2000 and 2001 and the management of patients with coronary artery disease have changed with the introduction of coronary stenting, especially in patients with acute coronary syndromes, it is interesting to see that observational data collected between 2005 and 2010 by London and colleagues³⁶ confirm that the benefits of β -blockade are only significant in patients with an RCRI of more than 1. The ACCF/AHA guideline²⁰ recommended perioperative β-blockade in patients undergoing high-risk surgery, especially vascular surgery. However, the observational study of London and colleagues³⁶ did not confirm benefits of exposure to B-blockade in vascular surgical patients irrespective of the RCRI. This is surprising and more research is needed in this group of patients.

β -Blocker titration

The recommendation of close titration of β -blockade with the goal of a heart rate of 60–70 beats min⁻¹ is in principle desirable because of the need to maintain a long diastolic period to maximize flow in narrowed coronary arteries. However, there is the risk of severe bradycardia and cardiac failure as observed in a meta-analysis by Beattie and colleagues.³⁷ As hypotension was found in POISE to be an important contributor to perioperative strokes, the suggestion that 100 mm Hg systolic arterial pressure is sufficient before giving the next dose of the β -blocker is at least questionable. The current recommendation of the ACCF/AHA to withhold the β -blocker if there is hypotension (undefined) seems more logical as even moderately

hypertensive patients presenting for surgery may suffer complications if their arterial pressure decreases to and remains at 100 mm Hg for a prolonged period.

Anaemia and β -blockade

An observational study by Beattie and collagues³⁸ has shown that as the <u>nadir</u> of <u>haemoglobin</u> decreases, the <u>risk</u> of <u>MACE</u> increases as the reduction reaches <u>60</u>% of control and is much <u>higher</u> in <u>B-blocked</u> than in <u>non-</u>B-blocked patients. Similarly, Le Manach and colleagues³⁹ found that perioperative <u>B-blockade</u> was associated with an overall reduction in postoperative cardiac events. Hence, while cardiac protection was observed in those patients with low perioperative bleeding, patients receiving <u>B-blockers who experienced severe bleeding</u> had higher mortality and an increased frequency of multiorgan dysfunction syndrome. These important observations require confirmation in future studies because they may indicate a need to <u>revise</u> the <u>threshold</u> for <u>blood transfusion</u> in patients on <u>B-blockers</u>.

What for the future?

On August 5, <u>2013</u>, a joint statement by the <u>ACCF/AHA</u> and <u>ESC⁴⁰</u> stated: 'Our respective committees are undertaking a careful analysis of all relevant *validated* studies and always incorporate new trials and meta-analyses into our evidence review. In the interim, our current joint position is that the initiation of beta-blockers in patients who will undergo non-cardiac surgery should not be considered routine, but should be considered carefully by each patient's treating physician on a case-by-case basis'.

Before new guidelines are published, what may be a reasonable approach to perioperative β -blockade?

- Current β-blockade should be maintained, with the previously mentioned caveat of a potential risk in patients developing severe perioperative anaemia.
- Initiating β-blockade should be limited to high-risk patients undergoing high-risk surgery, especially in those who would be given β-blockade for co-existing medical reasons, that is, known coronary artery disease, reversible ischaemia on stress test.
- High-dose β -blockade should be avoided.
- Titration is recommended, but the ACCF/AHA guideline for heart rate (60-80 beats min⁻¹) is probably more appropriate owing to the risk of bradycardia with higher doses of β -blockade that can occur with the lower limit (60-70 beats min⁻¹) advocated by the ESC guideline.
- Titration should include clear instruction for each patient as to the level of arterial pressure required before the next dose of the β-blocker is given, as a function of preoperative arterial pressure, as avoidance of hypotension is important.
- Starting β-blockade and titrating its effects over at least 7 days is logical. However, starting β-blockade on the day of surgery may still be legitimate where there is a clear

indication, such as the administration of a single premedicant dose to prevent exaggerated haemodynamic responses to laryngoscopy and intubation; or provide anxiolysis by reducing adrenergic responses; or prevent perioperative myocardial ischaemia.

- Metoprolol appears to be inferior to <u>atenolol</u> and in the future, <u>bisoprolol</u> is <u>likely</u> to become the <u>drug</u> of <u>choice</u> once more research has been carried out.
- As anaemia has been shown to markedly increase the risk of adverse cardiac events and mortality in the face of β -blockade, consideration should be given to increase the threshold for blood transfusion in these patients.

Declaration of interest

None declared.

References

- 1 Palda VA, Detsky AS. Perioperative assessment and management of risk from coronary artery disease. *Ann Intern Med* 1997; **127**: 313–28
- 2 Mangano DT, Layug EL, Wallace A, Tateo I. Effect of atenolol on mortality and cardiovascular morbidity after noncardiac surgery. Multicenter Study of Perioperative Ischemia Research Group. N Engl J Med 1996; 335: 1713–20
- 3 Making Health Care Safer: A Critical Analysis of Patient Safety Practices. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment. Number 43. Chapter 57. Practices rated by strength of evidence, Table 57.1, 622. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available from http://archive. ahrq.gov/clinic/ptsafety/pdf/ptsafety.pdf (accessed 22 August 2013)
- 4 Fleisher LA, Beckman JA, Brown KA, et al. ACC/AHA 2007 guidelines on perioperative cardiovascular evaluation and care for noncardiac surgery: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2002 Guidelines on Perioperative Cardiovascular Evaluation for Noncardiac Surgery): developed in collaboration with the American Society of Echocardiography, American Society of Nuclear Cardiology, Heart Rhythm Society, Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, Society for Vascular Medicine and Biology, and Society for Vascular Surgery. *Circulation* 2007; **116**: 1971–96
- 5 Stone JG, Foex P, Sear JW, Johnson LL, Khambatta HJ, Triner L. Risk of myocardial ischaemia during anaesthesia in treated and untreated hypertensive patients. *Br J Anaesth* 1988; **61**: 675–9
- 6 Brady AR, Gibbs JS, Greenhalgh RM, Powell JT, Sydes MR. Perioperative beta-blockade (POBBLE) for patients undergoing infrarenal vascular surgery: results of a randomized double-blind controlled trial. J Vasc Surg 2005; 41: 602–9
- 7 Zaugg M, Bestmann L, Wacker J, et al. Adrenergic receptor genotype but not perioperative bisoprolol therapy may determine cardiovascular outcome in at-risk patients undergoing surgery with spinal block: the Swiss Beta Blocker in Spinal Anesthesia (BBSA) study: a double-blinded, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial with 1-year follow-up. Anesthesiology 2007; 107: 33–44
- 8 Bayliff CD, Massel DR, Inculet RI, *et al.* Propranolol for the prevention of postoperative arrhythmias in general thoracic surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1999; **67**: 182–6
- 9 Juul AB, Wetterslev J, Kofoed Enevoldsen A, Callesen T, Jensen G, Gluud C. The Diabetic Postoperative Mortality and Morbidity

(DIPOM) trial: Rationale and design of a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical trial of metoprolol for patients with diabetes mellitus who are undergoing major noncardiac surgery. *Am Heart J* 2004; **147**: 677–83

- 10 Yang H, Raymer K, Butler R, Parlow J, Roberts R. The effects of perioperative beta-blockade: results of the Metoprolol after Vascular Surgery (MaVS) study, a randomized controlled trial. *Am Heart J* 2006; **152**: 983–90
- 11 Lai RC, Xu MX, Huang WQ, Wang XD, Zeng WA, Lin WQ. Beneficial effects of metoprolol on perioperative cardiac function of elderly esophageal cancer patients. *Ai Zheng* 2006; **25**: 609–13
- 12 Liu Y, Huang CL, He M, Zhang LN, Cai HW, Guo QL. Influences of perioperative metoprolol on hemodynamics and myocardial ischaemia in elderly patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. *Zhong Nan Da Xue Xue Bao Yi Xue Ban* 2006; **31**: 249–53
- 13 Magnusson J, Thulin T, Werner O, Jarhult J, Thomson D. Haemodynamic effects of pretreatment with metoprolol in hypertensive patients undergoing surgery. Br J Anaesth 1986; 58: 251–60
- 14 Urban MK, Markowitz SM, Gordon MA, Urquhart BL, Kligfield P. Postoperative prophylactic administration of beta-adrenergic blockers in patients at risk for myocardial ischemia. *Anesth Analg* 2000; 90: 1257–61
- 15 Jakobsen CJ, Blom L. Effect of pre-operative metoprolol on cardiovascular and catecholamine response and bleeding during hysterectomy. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 1992; **9**: 209–15
- 16 Devereaux PJ, Beattie WS, Choi PT, *et al.* How strong is the evidence for the use of perioperative beta blockers in non-cardiac surgery? Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Br Med J* 2005; **331**: 313–21
- 17 Devereaux PJ, Yang H, Yusuf S, *et al.* Effects of extended-release metoprolol succinate in patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery (POISE trial): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008; **371**: 1839–47
- 18 Bangalore S, Wetterslev J, Pranesh S, Sawhney S, Gluud C, Messerli FH. Perioperative beta blockers in patients having noncardiac surgery: a meta-analysis. Lancet 2008; 372: 1962–76
- 19 Poldermans D, Devereaux PJ. The experts debate: perioperative beta-blockade for noncardiac surgery—proven safe or not? *Clev Clin J Med* 2009; **76**: S84–92
- 20 Fleisher LA, Beckman JA, Brown KA, et al. 2009 ACCF/AHA focused update on perioperative beta blockade incorporated into the ACC/AHA 2007 guidelines on perioperative cardiovascular evaluation and care for noncardiac surgery: a report of the American college of cardiology foundation/American heart association task force on practice guidelines. *Circulation* 2009; **120**(Suppl. 4): e169–276
- 21 Poldermans D, Bax JJ, Boersma E, *et al.* Guidelines for pre-operative cardiac risk assessment and perioperative cardiac management in non-cardiac surgery: the Task Force for Preoperative Cardiac Risk Assessment and Perioperative Cardiac Management in Non-cardiac Surgery of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and endorsed by the European Society of Anaesthesiology (ESA). *Eur Heart J* 2009; **30**: 2769–812
- 22 Shammash JB, Trost JC, Gold JM, Berlin JA, Golden MA, Kimmel SE. Perioperative beta-blocker withdrawal and mortality in vascular surgical patients. *Am Heart J* 2001; **141**: 148–53
- 23 Hoeks SE, Scholte Op, Reimer WJ, van Urk H, et al. Increase of 1-year mortality after perioperative beta-blocker withdrawal in endovascular and vascular surgery patients. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2007; 33: 13-9
- 24 Wallace AW, Au S, Cason BA. Association of the pattern of use of perioperative beta-blockade and postoperative mortality. *Anesthe*siology 2010; **113**: 794–805

- 25 Ponten J, Biber B, Bjuro T, Henriksson BA, Hjalmarson A. Betareceptor blocker withdrawal. A preoperative problem in general surgery? Acta Anaesthesiol Scand Suppl 1982; 76: 32–7
- 26 Crandell DL. The anesthetic hazards in patients on antihypertensive therapy. J Am Med Assoc 1962; **179**: 495–500
- 27 Viljoen JF, Estafanous FG, Kellner GA. Propranolol and cardiac surgery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 1972; 64: 826–30
- 28 Ellenberger C, Tait G, Beattie WS. Chronic beta blockade is associated with a better outcome after elective noncardiac surgery than acute beta blockade: a single-center propensity-matched cohort study. Anesthesiology 2011; 114: 817–23
- 29 Poldermans D. Scientific fraud or a rush to judgment? Am J Med 2013; **126**: e5-6
- 30 Chopra V, Eagle KA. Perioperative mischief: the price of academic misconduct. *Am J Med* 2012; **125**: 953–5
- 31 Bouri S, Shun-Shin MJ, Cole GD, Mayet J, Francis DP. Meta-analysis of secure randomised controlled trials of β -blockade to prevent perioperative death in non-cardiac surgery. *Heart Online* 2013 Advance Access published on 31 July 2013, doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304262
- 32 Poldermans D, Boersma E, Bax JJ, et al. The effect of bisoprolol on perioperative mortality and myocardial infarction in high-risk patients undergoing vascular surgery. Dutch Echocardiographic Cardiac Risk Evaluation Applying Stress Echocardiography Study Group. N Engl J Med 1999; **341**: 1789–94
- 33 Dunkelgrun M, Boersma E, Schouten O, et al. Bisoprolol and fluvastatin for the reduction of perioperative cardiac mortality and myocardial infarction in intermediate-risk patients

British Journal of Anaesthesia 112 (2): 210–12 (2014) doi:10.1093/bja/aet431

EDITORIAL III

undergoingnoncardiovascular surgery: a randomized controlled trial (DECREASE-IV). *Ann Surg* 2009; **249**: 921–6

- 34 Wallace AW, Au S, Cason BA. Perioperative beta-blockade: atenolol is associated with reduced mortality when compared to metoprolol. Anesthesiology 2011; 114: 824–36
- 35 Lindenauer PK, Pekow P, Wang K, Mamidi DK, Gutierrez B, Benjamin EM. Perioperative beta-blocker therapy and mortality after major noncardiac surgery. N Engl J Med 2005; 353: 349–61
- 36 London MJ, Hur K, Schwartz GG, Henderson WG. Association of perioperative beta-blockade with mortality and cardiovascular morbidity following major noncardiac surgery. J Am Med Assoc 2013; 309: 1704–13
- 37 Beattie WS, Wijeysundera DN, Karkouti K, McCluskey S, Tait G. Does tight heart rate control improve beta-blocker efficacy? An updated analysis of the noncardiac surgical randomized trials. *Anesth Analg* 2008; **106**: 1039–48
- 38 Beattie WS, Wijeysundera DN, Karkouti K, et al. Acute surgical anemia influences the cardioprotective effects of beta-blockade: a single-center, propensity-matched cohort study. Anesthesiology 2010; 112: 25–33
- 39 Le Manach Y, Collins GS, Ibanez C, et al. Impact of perioperative bleeding on the protective effect of beta-blockers during infrarenal aortic reconstruction. Anesthesiology 2012; 117: 1203–11
- 40 ACCF/AHA, ESC. Joint Statement: issued by the American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association and the European Society of Cardiology. 2013. Available from www.escardio.org.about/ press/press-releases/pr-13/Pages/joint-statement-perioperativeguidelines.aspx (accessed 10 August 2013)

Perioperative immunity: is there an anaesthetic hangover?

R. D. Sanders^{1,2,3}

¹ Department of Anaesthesia and ² Surgical Outcomes Research Centre, National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, University College London Hospital, Queen Square, London WC1N 3BG, UK

³ Wellcome Department of Imaging Neuroscience, University College London, London, UK

E-mail: r.sanders@ucl.ac.uk

While the cross-talk between the nervous and immune systems is slowly being unravelled,¹ important commonalities between the two systems suggest that anaesthetics may impact profoundly on the immunity,² similar to the nervous system.³ For example, many immune cells are 'excitable cells', have plasma membranes that depolarize (e.g. the macrophage membrane after phagocytosis),⁴ and express neurotransmitter receptors like neurones.^{1 2 5} Immune cells express γ -amino butyric type A (GABA_A) receptors, an anaesthetic target for benzodiazepines, propofol and the volatile anaesthetics.^{2 5} An important target of ketamine, nitrous oxide, xenon, the *N*-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor

may also be expressed.⁶ Expression of these receptors may explain accumulating data suggesting that many anaesthetic drugs exert important functional effects on immune cells² (although the reader is recommended to read the article on opioids by Al-Hashimi and colleagues⁷ reviewing evidence for immune cell opioid receptor expression). The diffuse nature of receptor expression of neurotransmitter receptors^{1 2 5} mean that anaesthetic effects on immunity may include altered innate and acquired inflammatory responses.² It is possible that the functional consequences of these effects may include increased vulnerability to infection⁸⁻¹⁰ and cancer.¹¹ However, reducing intraoperative inflammation may be a Downloaded from http://bja.oxfordjournals.org/ by John Vogel on January 25, 2014

Review



Meta-analysis of secure randomised controlled trials of β -blockade to prevent perioperative death in non-cardiac surgery

Sonia Bouri, Matthew James Shun-Shin, Graham D Cole, Jamil Mayet, Darrel P Francis

ABSTRACT

► Additional material is published online only. To view please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ heartjnl-2013-304262).

International Centre for Circulatory Health, National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, UK

Correspondence to

Dr Sonia Bouri, International Centre for Circulatory Health, National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, St Mary's Hospital, 59-61 North Wharf Road, London W2 1LA, UK; soniabouri@nhs.net

Received 11 May 2013 Revised 11 July 2013 Accepted 12 July 2013 **Background** Current European and American guidelines recommend the perioperative initiation of a course of β -blockers in those at risk of cardiac events undergoing high- or intermediate-risk surgery or vascular surgery. The Dutch Echocardiographic Cardiac Risk Evaluation Applying Stress Echocardiography (DECREASE) family of trials, the bedrock of evidence for this, are no longer secure. We therefore conducted a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of β -blockade on perioperative mortality, non-fatal myocardial infarction, stroke and hypotension in non-cardiac surgery using the secure data.

Methods The randomised controlled trials of initiation of β -blockers before non-cardiac surgery were examined. Primary outcome was all-cause mortality at 30 days or at discharge. The DECREASE trials were separately analysed.

Results Nine secure trials totalling 10 529 patients, 291 of whom died, met the criteria. Initiation of a course of β -blockers before surgery caused a 27% risk increase in 30-day all-cause mortality (p=0.04). The DECREASE family of studies substantially contradict the meta-analysis of the secure trials on the effect of mortality (p=0.05 for divergence). In the secure trials, β -blockade reduced non-fatal myocardial infarction (RR 0.73, p=0.001) but increased stroke (RR 1.73, p=0.05) and hypotension (RR 1.51, p<0.00001). These results were dominated by one large trial.

Conclusions Guideline bodies should retract their recommendations based on fictitious data without further delay. This should not be blocked by dispute over allocation of blame. The well-conducted trials indicate a statistically significant 27% increase in mortality from the initiation of perioperative β -blockade that guidelines currently recommend. Any remaining enthusiasts might best channel their energy into a further randomised trial which should be designed carefully and conducted honestly.

INTRODUCTION

Physicians across Europe are still advocated by guidelines to initiate a course of perioperative β -blockade in three classes of patients:

'... [those] who have known IHD or myocardial ischaemia according to pre-operative stress testing',

'... [those] scheduled for high-risk surgery' and '... [those] scheduled for intermediate-risk surgery'. The joint guidelines produced by the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association (ACCF/AHA) also endorse perioperative β-blockade in patients undergoing vascular or intermediate-risk surgery with coronary artery disease (CAD), or with more than one risk factor for CAD, or with pre-existing β -blockade (table 1).

The principal evidence for mortality benefit has been the Dutch Echocardiographic Cardiac Risk Evaluation Applying Stress Echocardiography (DECREASE)² family of studies which were discredited almost 2 years ago³ and subsequently underwent lengthy internal investigation, the results of which have been public for some time.⁴ Nevertheless, neither the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) nor the AHA guidelines have been retracted.

All studies investigated in the DECREASE family for which data had not been lost were found to be insecure because of serious flaws (table 2). In one case it was clear that the entire study dataset had been fabricated. DECREASE I,⁵ published in 1999, escaped investigation as the terms of the investigation only reached back 10 years.

Individual clinicians may feel powerless to act independently in contravention of guidelines. The ESC has recently reiterated that its guideline was 'based on the contributions of many European experts and on available evidence-based medicine including many studies from different nations. They are, therefore, the result of a group discussion and not of an individual position'.⁶

We therefore conducted a meta-analysis of the remaining secure intention-to-treat randomised controlled trial (RCT) data on the initiation of a course of β -blockade for the prevention of all-cause mortality and other secondary endpoints in the perioperative period for patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery.

METHODS

We included published RCTs that compared the initiation of a course of β-blocker therapy in the preoperative period with placebo in adults undergoing non-cardiac surgery. There were no language restrictions. We searched Medline (1966 to 1 April 2013), the Cochrane Central Register of Randomised Controlled Trials, the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform Search Portal (http://apps. who.int/trialsearch/), Excerpta Medica Database (EMBASE) and the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) using the search terms available in the online supplement on 23 March 2013 (see online supplementary appendix 1). We also hand-searched previous reviews and meta-analyses for other studies. We excluded non-

Copyright/Anticle1author (or their employer) 2013. Produced by BMJ Publishing Group Ltd (& BCS) under licence.

To cite: Bouri S, Shun-Shin MJ, Cole GD, et al. Heart Published Online First: [please include Day Month Year] doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304262

lable 1 Guideline recommendation	is for	initiation of	of peric	perative	B-blockade
----------------------------------	--------	---------------	----------	----------	------------

Patient group	2007	2009
ACCF/AHA guidelines		
Vascular surgery and ischaemia on preoperative testing	Class I	Class IIa with dose titration
Vascular surgery and established coronary artery disease	Class IIa	Class IIa with dose titration
Vascular surgery and more than one risk factor	Class IIa	Class IIa with dose titration
Intermediate-risk surgery and coronary artery disease or more than one risk factor	Class IIa	Class IIa with dose titration
ESC guidelines		
Established coronary artery disease or ischaemia on preoperative stress testing		Class I, with dose titration
High-risk surgery		Class I, with dose titration
Intermediate-risk surgery	Class IIa, with dose titration	

randomised studies, studies comparing β -blockers with another treatment, studies using a one-off dose preoperatively rather than a course of β -blockers extending into the postoperative period and studies which did not report intention-to-treat data.

All-cause mortality on intention-to-treat-basis

The primary endpoint was all-cause mortality from the date of randomisation without excluding the in-hospital postoperative window. The time point was 30 days or, if this was not available, until hospital discharge. The secondary endpoints were non-fatal myocardial infarction (MI), stroke and hypotension.

Data extraction was performed in duplicate by MJS and SB with any disagreements resolved by DPF.

We performed the meta-analysis excluding studies from the DECREASE family because every study in it that had enough documentation to be investigated was found to be insecure (table 2).

We used the I² statistic to measure the level of heterogeneity.⁷ A random effects model was used to synthesise the data with Mantel–Haenszel risk ratios calculated. Review Manager V.5.2.1 was used to perform the meta-analysis.⁸

Assessment of quality of trials

All studies were assessed for quality using the Cochrane 'risk of bias' tool⁹ which considers the risk of selection, performance, detection, attrition and reporting bias. Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot.

RESULTS

Identification of trials

We identified 300 publications; 265 were initially found on PubMed (see online supplementary appendix 2), 3 from the Cochrane Central Register of Randomised Controlled Trials, 19 from the CINAHL, 1 from EMBASE and 12 via hand searching of references. A total of 282 were excluded after reading the abstract (of which 39 received premedication only) and a further seven were excluded after reading the full text for the following reasons: two were duplicates of other studies.¹⁰ ¹¹ one could not be included because 10 patients were excluded after randomisation including one who had pulmonary oedema in the metoprolol arm,¹² three did not meet the time point criteria of 30 days or until discharge,¹³⁻¹⁵ and one initiated the β -blockade postoperatively¹⁶ (see online supplementary appendix 2). A total of 11 RCTs met the eligibility criteria (figure 1), of which two were from the DECREASE family (DECREASE I and DECREASE IV⁵¹⁷).

Included studies

The β -blocker administered varied between studies. Three trials used bisoprolol, 5 14 17 five metoprolol, $^{18-22}$ two atenolol 23 24 and one propranolol. 25 β -Blockers were initiated between 37 days 5 and 30 min 23 before surgery and continued between 5^{25} and 30 days 21 after surgery (table 3). Nine studies had 30-day all-cause mortality available. One of these studies 23 separated post-discharge from in-hospital mortality and therefore it was

DECREASE VI	No consent forms
	Falsified description of method of outcome adjudication
	Fictitious database.
DECREASE V	Falsified methods of patient assessment (myocardial infarction and renal failure)
	Fictitious adjudication committee
	No record of the stress echo images or of the '5-member panel' said to have evaluated them
	No research patient records
	No evidence of written informed consent
DECREASE IV	Fictitious 'adjudication committee' of cardiologist, anaesthiologist and surgeon (in reality
	adjudications made by surgeon alone).
	Fictitious events that did not match hospital records or clinical discharge reports
DECREASE III	Not investigated in detail because:
	No source data could be found to investigate
	No written consent forms.
	No contemporaneous documentation, only current verbal assurances
DECREASE II	Fictitious method of establishing outcome
(DECREASE I	Not investigated as it was more than 10 years old)

Table 2 Grounds on which the DECREASE family of trials are considered discredited



necessary to sum the two time windows to obtain events from the time of randomisation (see online supplementary appendix 3). In two studies all-cause mortality data were only available to discharge.^{24 25}

Assessment of quality of trials

The risk of bias is shown in table 4. Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot (see online supplementary appendix 4) which did not show significant asymmetry, but this cannot definitively exclude publication bias.

All-cause mortality

In total there were 10 529 patients in nine secure trials, with 162 deaths in 5264 patients randomised to β -blockers and 129 deaths in 5265 patients randomised to placebo. In the nine secure studies, β -blockers caused a statistically and clinically significant increase in mortality of 27% (RR 1.27, 95% CI 1.01% to 1.60%, p=0.04). There was little heterogeneity between studies (I²=0%, p=0.68; figure 2).

We conducted a separate meta-analysis of the two insecure studies (figure 3). These show a consensus effect of a non-statistically significant decrease in mortality by more than half (RR 0.42, 95% CI 0.15 to 1.23, p=0.11). There was moderate heterogeneity between the two studies (I^2 =44%, p=0.18).

The contrast between the secure and the DECREASE studies was statistically significant (p=0.05, figure 4).

Secondary endpoints

Six secure trials provided data for MI; β -blockade was reported to reduce non-fatal MI (RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.88, p=0.001). The DECREASE studies also reported a reduction (RR 0.21, 95% CI 0.03 to 1.61, p=0.13), with no significant contrast between the secure and the DECREASE studies (p=0.23, figure 5).

Six secure studies provided data for stroke; β -blockers significantly increased stroke (RR 1.73, 95% CI 1.00 to 2.99, p=0.05). DECREASE I reported stroke (RR 1.33, 95% CI 0.30 to 5.93, p=0.71), which was not significantly different from the secure studies (p=0.75, figure 6).

Six secure studies reported hypotension, which occurred more frequently in the β -blocker group than in the control group (15.2% vs 10.0%, RR 1.51, 95% CI 1.37 to 1.67, p<0.00001, figure 7).

DISCUSSION

(meta-analysis) (n = 11)

The initiation of a course of β -blockers preoperatively in patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery increases mortality by 27%, which is both statistically and clinically significant. DECREASE trials I and IV report findings inconsistent with the intention-to-treat results of secure RCTs on the initiation of β -blockers on perioperative all-cause mortality.

Although β -blockers reduce non-fatal MI, they also increase hypotension and stroke. It is conceivable that an increase in death due to hypotension or stroke was overcoming a reduction in death from MI, leaving a net increase in deaths. However, there are insufficient quantitative data on the subclasses of death to be certain: deaths are relatively few and difficult to classify reliably by cause.

Residual uncertainty

Cardiologists might be tempted to hope that careful uptitration of β blockade (rather than initiation directly to a standard maintenance dose as in the POISE trial) might give benefits without inducing harm. However, the principal grounds for this hope are the DECREASE trials. The investigation committee established that there was no evidence that the published β -blocker uptitration was really done.^{3 4}

Cardiologists might also hope that the 100 mg dose that increased mortality in the POISE trial might have been excessive and that commoner dosages such as metoprolol 25 mg three times a day instead might be beneficial rather than harmful. However, the higher headline value of 100 mg in the POISE trial is of metoprolol CR/XL which is a slow-release once-daily preparation with a bioavailability 25–30% lower than that of standard metoprolol.²⁶ ²⁷ Thus, the dosage of 100 mg CR/XL in the POISE trial is equivalent to the 75 mg/day that accrues with 25 mg three times a day of immediate-release metoprolol, whose initiation cardiologists might consider conventional. The POISE trial was therefore not high-dose.

Clinical implications

Within the ESC guidelines and associated meta-analysis, the inclusion of non-secure data caused them to reach a conclusion that β -blockers had a neutral effect on mortality and allowed them to focus on the reduction of non-fatal MI as a surrogate endpoint. This resulted in β -blockers receiving a class I/IIa

Table 3 Characteristics of the 11 included randomised controlled trials

4

Bouri S, et al. Heart 2013;0:1–9. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304262

Study (intervention/ control)	Date	Methods	Participants	Type of surgeries	Interventions	Follow-up
Mangano (99/ 101)	1996	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: previous myocardial infarction (MI), typical angina or atypical angina with a positive stress test, or at risk of coronary artery disease (CAD) as indicated by two of: age >65, hypertension, current smoking, cholesterol concentration >6.2 mmol/L and diabetes	Major vascular, intra-abdominal, orthopaedic, neurosurgical or other surgery	5–10 mg intravenous (IV) or 50–100 mg oral atenolol 30 min pre surgery and continued until discharge, or a maximum of 7 days post surgery	6-month, 1-year and 2-year outcomes
Bayliff (49/50)	1999	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: age >18. Exclusion: asthma, congestive heart failure (CHF), second or third degree heart block, history of supraventricular tacchyarrythmias, on a β-blocker, diltiazem, digoxin, quinidine, procainamide, amiodarone, verapamil, or sensitivity to β-blockers	Lobectomies, pneumonectomies, oesophagectomies.	Propanolol 10 mg four times 1 day pre surgery, and continued for 5 days post surgery	Outcomes at hospital discharge
DECREASE I (59/ 53)	1999	Randomised controlled study	Inclusion: at least one cardiac risk factor (age >70 years, prior MI, CHF, ventricular arrhythmia, diabetes, limited exercise capacity), who had a positive dobutamine echocardiogram (DSE). Exclusion: already on β-blockers, extensive wall motion abnormalities, asthma	Elective vascular surgery	5–10 mg oral bisoprolol from an average of 37 (at least 7) days pre surgery and continued for 30 days post surgery	30-day outcomes
POBBLE (55/48)	2005	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: all patients not excluded. Exclusion: already taking or intolerant to β-blockers, asthma, aortic stenosis, bradycardia, hypotension, previous MI in the past 2 years, unstable angina or angina with a positive DSE	Vascular surgery	Oral or intravenous metoprolol day before surgery, then 25–50 mg oral metoprolol twice a day until 7 days after surgery	30-day outcomes
DIPOM (462/459)	2006	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: age >39 years, with diabetes. Exclusion: on or allergic to β -blockers, NYHA class IV, third degree atrioventricular block, pregnant, breast feeding or in previous DIPOM trial	Orthopedic, intra-abdominal, neurological, vascular, gynaecological or other surgery	50–100 mg oral metoprolol 1 day before surgery and continued until hospital discharge, or a maximum of 8 days post surgery	Median follow-up of 18 months (range 6– 30 months)
MaVS (246/250)	2006	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: ASA class ≤3. Exclusion: current or recent β-blocker use, amiodarone, airflow obstruction requiring treatment, history of CHF or atrioventricular (AV) block, previous adverse reaction, previous participation in MaVS study	Vascular surgery	25–100 mg oral metoprolol within 2 h pre surgery, then oral or IV metoprolol until hospital discharge or 5 days post surgery	30-day and 6-month outcomes
Neary (18/20)	2006	Randomised placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: one of previous MI or ischaemia on ECG, history of angina, history of stroke or transient ischaemic attack; or two of age >65 years, hypertension, current smoking, cholesterol > 6.2 mmol/L, diabetes. Exclusion: already on or intolerant to β -blockers, bradycardia, COPD or asthma, second or third degree heart block, cardiovascular collapse or hypovolaemia, anaesthetist feels patient not fit for β -blockers	Emergency general or orthopaedic surgery	1.25 mg IV atenolol in the anaesthetic room, then every 30 min during surgery, then oral or IV atenolol daily for 7 days post surgery	Mortality to hospital discharge and at 1 year
BBSA (110/109)	2007	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: CAD indicated by previous MI, angina, atypical angina with a positive stress test or previous coronary procedure or the presence of at least two of: hypertension, diabetes, hypercholesterolaemia, age >65 years and active smoking, Exclusion: chronic β-blockade, CHF, high degree AV block active asthma, left bundle branch block	Orthopaedic, urological, abdominal, gynaecological, plastic or vascular surgery	5–10 mg oral bisoprolol 3 h before surgery and continued until hospital discharge or a maximum of 10 days post surgery	30-day and 1-year outcomes
POISE (4174/ 4177)	2008	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: age >45 years, with a history of CAD, peripheral vascular disease, stroke, hospitalisation for CHF within the last 3 years, or with 3 of the following: intrathoracic or intraperitoneal surgery, CHF, transient ischaemic attack, creatinine >175 μ mol/L, >70 years old, diabetes or undergoing emergent or urgent surgery	Vascular, intraperitoneal, orthopaedic surgery	100 mg oral extended-release metoprolol 2–4 h pre surgery and then 200 mg once a day for 30 days post surgery	30-day outcomes
Yang (51/51)	2008	Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial	Inclusion: age >45 years and a history of CAD or peripheral vascular disease, stroke or hospitalisation for CHF in the last 3 years or any three of the following: high-risk surgery, CHF, diabetes, age >65 years, hypertensive, smoker or high cholesterol. Exclusion: heart rate <50, pacemaker, high degree AV block, active recent asthma, bronchospasm,	Intrathoracic or intra-abdominal surgery	Oral or IV metoprolol from 2 h before surgery to 30 days after surgery	30-day outcomes

Continued

	Follow-up	dian 30-day outcomes or		
	Interventions	2.5-10 mg oral bisoprolol started a me of 34 days pre surgery and continued fo 30 days post surgery		
	Type of surgeries	General, urological, orthopaedic, ear nose and throat, gynaecological, plastic or other surgery		
	Participants	COPD, adverse reaction to β-blockers, low-risk surgery, taking verapamil, liver or kidney dysfunction, emergency surgery Inclusion: age >40 years with an estimated risk of perioperative cardiovascular event of 1–6% Exclusion: already on or contraindication to a β-blocker or statin, previous participation in the trial, inability to consent, emergency surgery	iic obstructive pulmonary disease.	
	Methods	Randomised open-label placebo-controlled trial	nesthesiologists; COPD, chron	
nuea	Date	2009	ciety of A	
	Study (intervention/ control)	DECREASE IV (533/533)	ASA, American So	

recommendation, despite secure trials indicating that they increase mortality.

The β -blocker section of the 2009 ESC Guidelines for Perioperative Cardiac Risk Assessment and Management¹ requires reconsideration; without the DECREASE studies the profound adverse findings of the large POISE trial are the dominant contributor.

The POISE trial had a protocol of initiating a dose considered by some to be high (100 mg extended-release metoprolol) shortly (2–4 h) before surgery. This has been argued to be unrepresentative of clinical practice, but not been borne out by surveys of practice²⁸ and is similar to the total daily metoprolol dose from other regimens such as 25 mg three times a day which might not be considered dramatic. Nevertheless, POISE-like regimes now have no reason for continuance.

If the appropriateness of the POISE protocol is doubted, then the remaining secure data are not sufficient to guide physicians either way.

Although there is a retrospective study reporting that β -blockade is associated with lower mortality in high-risk but not in low-risk patients,²⁹ the lead author of the most reliable prospective RCT stated that 'the groups at highest risk looked like they benefited the least, not the most. The notion of targeting high-risk people is not supported by POISE'.³⁰

Opportunity to prevent perioperative deaths

In the present analysis the RR of mortality from randomisation to β -blockade for non-cardiac surgery is 1.27 (95% CI 1.01 to 1.60) or, conversely, randomisation to not having β -blockade has a RR of 0.79 (95% CI 0.63 to 0.99), indicating a 21% reduction. In the UK,³¹ for example, almost 2.5 million high- or intermediate-risk procedures are performed per year, with deaths at 30 days totalling 47 286.

Refraining from this ESC guideline¹ would therefore be expected³² to prevent up to 10 000 iatrogenic deaths each year in the UK.

Could we have found this earlier?

Any one of three considerations might have opened this opportunity earlier. First, with a strong pointer in 2008 that the introduction of β -blockers before surgery increases mortality, we could have avoided the siren call of reduction in non-fatal MI. If a patient succumbs after intervention, knowing that he or she was prevented from having a MI is no consolation.

Second, we could have realised that not all trial data are of equal reliability. The POISE²¹ investigators prominently carried out anti-bias steps including record-keeping and scrutiny for anomalies which were acted on. For example, they flew to Colombia and Iran to investigate suspicious returns, resulting in invalidation of data from one centre in Colombia and the entire dataset for Iran.

Third, we could have acted on a 2008 meta-analysis³³ flagging DECREASE I to be at high risk of bias 4 years before the DECREASE family was formally declared insecure.

Could DECREASE I have been valid?

There is no proof that the DECREASE I^5 study was unreliable.³⁴ ³⁵ No investigation has been conducted, nor is one on the horizon.

Data storage appeared to be haphazard for the DECREASE family of studies.⁴ Of the five investigated DECREASE studies, the only one for which raw data existed was DECREASE VI, but the investigation concluded that this was 'fictitious data'.

Review

	Table 4	Risk of bias of the 11	I included randomised controlled trial	ŝ
--	---------	------------------------	--	---

Study	Sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other biases
Mangano (1996)	Computer generated randomised list	Only pharmacy held the list	All blinded, list held by pharmacy	2 patients did not complete the study protocol but were analysed as ITT	Only post discharge deaths are mentioned in the primary endpoint.	No
Bayliff (1999)	Blocks of 4	Only one investigator knew the code kept on the patient's health record in a sealed envelope.	Blinded	1 patient did not undergo major resection and was not continued. 8 patients were withdrawn but were analysed as ITT	No	No
POBBLE (2005)	Centrally at Sealedenvelope.com. Blocks of size 2, 4 and 6 within 4 stratification factors (centre, age, sex and planned use of aortic cross clamping)	4 digit trial number assigned	Anaesthetists were unblinded. All other clinicians and trial coordinators were blinded	1 death occurred after randomisation in a patient who was too ill to tolerate surgery which is not included	No	No
DIPOM (2006)	Computer generated. Blocks of 8 stratified for sex, age, perioperative stress, history of coronary artery disease and malignant disease	Telephone voice response	Blinded	188 patients did not receive the allocated intervention but were analysed as ITT	No	No
MaVS (2006)	Blocks of 4	Not specified	Blinded	117 did not complete the study protocol but were analysed as ITT	No	No
Neary (2006)	Packs containing medication or placebo were selected at random by the study investigator	Sealed envelope	Allocation was available to the anaesthetic team in an emergency	19 patients withdrew their consent and were excluded	No	No
BBSA (2007)	Block randomisation in a 1 : 1 ratio	Not specified	Blinded design but β-blocker was titrated to heart rate, so likely effective unblinding	5 patients who could not undergo spinal anaesthesia were excluded	No	No
POISE (2008)	Computerised randomisation using block randomisation stratified by centre. Randomisation in a 1 : 1 ratio.	Central phone randomisation	Participants, healthcare providers, data collectors and outcome adjudicators were blinded but analysts were not	20 patients were lost to follow-up but were analysed as ITT	No	No
Yang (2008)	Computer generated random table	Not specified	Yes	No	No	No
DECREASE IV (2009)	Non-secure					
DECREASE I (1999)	Non-secure					

Even for recent studies such as DECREASE V, not a single case record form (CRF) could be found in any location for the 101 patients. In DECREASE IV the key data required to judge outcomes were missing and the adjudication committee was

fabricated. A review of the hospital computer information system found that 'in a large number of cases a myocardial infarct which the researchers had recorded could not be confirmed' in the hospital records. DECREASE III could not be

	Beta-ble	ocker	Conti	rol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Secure trials							
Mangano 1996	4	99	5	101	7.7%	0.82 [0.23, 2.95]	
Bayliff 1999	2	49	1	50	2.6%	2.04 [0.19, 21.79]	
POBBLE 2005	3	55	1	48	3.0%	2.62 [0.28, 24.34]	
MAVS 2006	0	246	4	250	1.8%	0.11 [0.01, 2.09]	←
DIPOM 2006	20	462	15	459	19.0%	1.32 [0.69, 2.55]	
Neary 2006	3	18	5	20	7.7%	0.67 [0.19, 2.40]	
BBSA 2007	1	110	0	109	1.5%	2.97 [0.12, 72.19]	
POISE 2008	129	4174	97	4177	33.5%	1.33 [1.03, 1.73]	
YANG XY 2008	0	51	1	51	1.5%	0.33 [0.01, 8.00]	· · · ·
Subtotal (95% CI)		5264		5265	78.3%	1.27 [1.01, 1.60]	◆
Total events	162		129				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Ch	$i^2 = 5.7$	4, df = 8	(P = 0)	.68); I ² =	0%	0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 2.06	(P = 0.	04)		1	Favours Beta-blocker Favours control	

Figure 2 Meta-analysis of nine secure randomised controlled trials showing a significant increase in mortality with perioperative β-blockade.

Review



Figure 3 Studies in the DECREASE family have been shown to have been composed of fictitious data, have fabricated endpoints, missing data and patient records and are now discredited.

investigated as all the source documentation was lacking. For DECREASE II only half the CRFs were found and study outcomes were again realised not to have been assessed as described in the publication. The investigation did not attempt to evaluate the distant DECREASE I.

All we know is that the later DECREASE family of studies fell far short of the standards assumed by clinical readers. There are two hypotheses. The first is that standards started high in the uninvestigated DECREASE I and then declined subsequently as more experience was gained as an international perioperative clinical research centre, ultimately reaching the depths of the entirely fictitious DECREASE VI. The alternative hypothesis is that that honesty was low throughout.

Study limitations

This meta-analysis can only include data of which we are aware. There may be further unreported trials. Our group has no direct knowledge of the process that went on in the DECREASE family other than what has been reported by the two investigations conducted by the Board of the Erasmus Medical Centre.^{3 4}

While there was minimal evidence that heterogeneity was assessed by Cochrane's I^2 among the secure trials, this measure may be low powered to detect such a difference. In addition to vascular surgery, the studies included a wide range of surgeries including abdominal, orthopaedic, urological, gynaecological and plastic surgery, among others. It may therefore be difficult





	Beta-blo	ocker	Conti	rol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Secure trials							
Bayliff 1999	0	49	0	50		Not estimable	
POBBLE 2005	3	55	5	48	6.0%	0.52 [0.13, 2.08]	
MAVS 2006	19	246	21	250	22.0%	0.92 [0.51, 1.67]	
DIPOM 2006	3	462	2	459	3.8%	1.49 [0.25, 8.88]	
BBSA 2007	1	110	0	109	1.2%	2.97 [0.12, 72.19]	
POISE 2008	152	4174	215	4177	47.2%	0.71 [0.58, 0.87]	=
Subtotal (95% CI)		5096		5093	80.2%	0.73 [0.61, 0.88]	\bullet
Total events	178		243				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Ch	$i^2 = 2.2$	5, df = 4	(P = 0)	69); I ² =	0%	
Test for overall effect	: Z = 3.23	(P = 0.0)	001)				
Non-secure trials							
DECREASE 1999	0	59	9	53	1.6%	0.05 [0.00, 0.79]	← ,
DECREASE IV 2009	11	533	27	533	18.2%	0.41 [0.20, 0.81]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		592		586	19.8%	0.21 [0.03, 1.61]	
Total events	11		36				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 1.43; Ch	$i^2 = 2.3$	1, df = 1	(P = 0)	13); I ² =	57%	
Test for overall effect	: Z = 1.50	(P = 0.1)	13)				
Total (95% CI)		5688		5679	100.0%	0.67 [0.47, 0.96]	\bullet
Total events	189		279				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.06; Ch	$i^2 = 8.40$	0, df = 6	(P = 0)	21); $I^2 =$	29%	
Test for overall effect	: Z = 2.20	(P = 0.0))3)				Favours beta-blocker Favours control
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 1.43$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.23), $I^2 = 30.2\%$							

Figure 5 Comparison of effect of perioperative β-blockade on non-fatal myocardial infarction in secure and non-secure trials.

	Beta-blo	ocker	Conti	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Secure trials							
POBBLE 2005	1	53	0	44	2.6%	2.50 [0.10, 59.88]	
DIPOM 2006	2	462	0	459	2.9%	4.97 [0.24, 103.19]	
MAVS 2006	5	246	4	250	15.6%	1.27 [0.35, 4.67]	
BBSA 2007	0	110	0	109		Not estimable	
YANG XY 2008	0	51	2	51	2.9%	0.20 [0.01, 4.07]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
POISE 2008	27	4174	14	4177	64.0%	1.93 [1.01, 3.68]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		5096		5090	88.1%	1.73 [1.00, 2.99]	•
Total events	35		20				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.00$; $Chi^2 = 2.82$, $df = 4$ (P = 0.59); $I^2 = 0\%$							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.95	(P = 0.0)	05)				
Non-Secure trials							
DECREASE IV 2009	4	533	3	533	11.9%	1.33 [0.30, 5.93]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		533		533	11.9%	1.33 [0.30, 5.93]	
Total events	4		3				
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.38	(P = 0.1)	71)				
Total (95% CI)		5629		5623	100.0%	1.67 [1.00, 2.80]	◆
Total events	39		23				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	$^{2} = 2.9$	2, df = 5	(P = 0.	.71); $I^2 =$	0%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.96	(P = 0.0)	05)				Favours beta-blocker Favours control
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 0.10$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.75), $I^2 = 0\%$							

Figure 6 Comparison of effect of perioperative β-blockade on non-fatal strokes in secure and non-secure trials.





to see if the initiation of a course of β -blockers before surgery in certain patient groups is beneficial.

The meta-analysis is heavily influenced by the POISE trial.²¹ However, this is appropriate because the POISE trial is by far the largest study and it was well conducted. Without it there is little remaining evidence base.

A statistically significant increase in all-cause mortality has overwhelming clinical significance which cannot be compensated for by a simultaneous reduction in non-fatal events. The use non-fatal MI as a surrogate for death therefore may not be valid for perioperative β -blockade.

CONCLUSION

Perioperative initiation of a course of β -blockers appears to increase postoperative mortality by 27%. This has emerged because the DECREASE family of studies has been discredited.^{3 4}

Patient safety being paramount, guidelines for perioperative β -blocker initiation should be retracted without further delay. Future guidelines should be accompanied by a commitment from named individuals to retract them immediately if the advice given is later revealed to be harmful.

Routine initiation of β -blockers for this indication should not be recommended, except in the context of RCTs which should be designed carefully, conducted honestly and reported truthfully.

Contributors SB, MJS and DPF conceived the study, had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of

the data analysis. SB is the guarantor. SB, MJS, GC, JM and DPF drafted and revised the manuscript.

Funding DPF is supported by the British Heart Foundation (FS/10/038).

Competing interests None.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Open Access This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 3.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by-nc/3.0/

REFERENCES

- 1 Task Force for Preoperative Cardiac Risk Assessment and Perioperative Cardiac Management in Non-cardiac Surgery, European Society of Cardiology (ESC); Poldermans D, Bax JJ, Boersma E, *et al*. Guidelines for pre-operative cardiac risk assessment and perioperative cardiac management in non-cardiac surgery: . *Eur Heart J* 2009;30:2769–812.
- 2 Poldermans D, Schouten O, Bax J, et al. Reducing cardiac risk in non-cardiac surgery: evidence from the DECREASE studies. Eur Heart J Suppl 2009; 11:A9–A14.
- 3 Erasmus Medical Centre. Investigation into possible violation of scientific integrity. 2011. http://www.erasmusmc.nl/5663/135857/3664573/3397899/report_ summary_investigation_integrity (accessed 10 Jul 2013).
- 4 Erasmus Medical Centre. Report on the 2012 follow-up investigation of possible breaches of academic integrity. 2012. http://cardiobrief.files.wordpress.com/2012/ 10/integrity-report-2012-10-english-translation.pdf (accessed 10 Jul 2013).
- 5 Poldermans D, Boersma E, Bax JJ, et al. The effect of bisoprolol on perioperative mortality and myocardial infarction in high-risk patients undergoing vascular

surgery. Dutch Echocardiographic Cardiac Risk Evaluation Applying Stress Echocardiography Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1999;341:1789–94.

- 6 European Society of Cardiology. Dismissal of Professor Don Poldermans from the Erasmus Medical Center (NL). http://www.escardio.org/about/press/press-releases/ pr-11/Pages/Dismissal-Don-Poldermans.aspx (accessed 10 Jul 2013).
- 7 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557–60.
- 8 Review Manager (RevMan). Version 5.0. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008.
- 9 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 2011;343:d5928.
- 10 Wallace A, Layug B, Tateo I, *et al*. Prophylactic atenolol reduces postoperative myocardial ischemia. McSPI Research Group. *Anesthesiology* 1998;88:7–17.
- 11 Mastracci TM, Aarts M-A, Cassivi SD, *et al*. CAGS and ACS Evidence Based Reviews in Surgery. 34: Effects of β-blockers in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. *Can J Surg* 2010;53:342–4.
- 12 Jakobsen CJ, Bille S, Ahlburg P, et al. Perioperative metoprolol reduces the frequency of atrial fibrillation after thoracotomy for lung resection. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 1997;11:746–51.
- 13 Lai R-C, Xu M-X, Huang W-Q, *et al.* [Beneficial effects of metoprolol on perioperative cardiac function of elderly esophageal cancer patients]. *Ai Zheng* 2006;25:609–13.
- 14 Zaugg M, Tagliente T, Lucchinetti E, et al. Beneficial effects from beta-adrenergic blockade in elderly patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. Anesthesiology 1999;91:1674–86.
- 15 Raby KE, Brull SJ, Timimi F, et al. The effect of heart rate control on myocardial ischemia among high-risk patients after vascular surgery. Anesth Analg 1999:88:477–82.
- 16 Urban MK, Markowitz SM, Gordon MA, et al. Postoperative prophylactic administration of beta-adrenergic blockers in patients at risk for myocardial ischemia. Anesth Analg 2000;90:1257–61.
- 17 Dunkelgrun M, Boersma E, Schouten O, et al. Bisoprolol and fluvastatin for the reduction of perioperative cardiac mortality and myocardial infarction in intermediate-risk patients undergoing noncardiovascular surgery. Ann Surg 2009;249:921–6.
- 18 POBBLE Trial Investigators. Perioperative β-blockade (Pobble) for patients undergoing infrarenal vascular surgery: results of a randomized double-blind controlled trial. J Vasc Surg 2005;41:602–9.
- 19 Juul AB, Wetterslev J, Gluud C, et al. Effect of perioperative beta blockade in patients with diabetes undergoing major non-cardiac surgery: randomised placebo controlled, blinded multicentre trial. BMJ 2006;332:1482.

- 20 Yang H, Raymer K, Butler R, *et al.* The effects of perioperative β-blockade: results of the Metoprolol after Vascular Surgery (MaVS) study, a randomized controlled trial. *Am Heart J* 2006;152:983–90.
- 21 Devereaux PJ, Group PS. Effects of extended-release metoprolol succinate in patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery (POISE trial): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008;371:1839–47.
- 22 Yang X-Y, Wu X-M, Wang S, *et al.* [Effects of metoprolol on perioperative cardiovascular events in patients with risk or at high risk for coronary artery disease undergoing non-cardiac surgery]. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi* 2008;88:1476–80.
- 23 Mangano DT, Layug EL, Wallace A, et al. Effect of atenolol on mortality and cardiovascular morbidity after noncardiac surgery. Multicenter Study of Perioperative Ischemia Research Group. N Engl J Med 1996;335:1713–20.
- 24 Neary WD, McCrirrick A, Foy C, et al. Lessons learned from a randomised controlled study of perioperative beta blockade in high risk patients undergoing emergency surgery. The Surgeon 2006;4:139–43.
- 25 Bayliff CD, Massel DR, Inculet RI, et al. Propranolol for the prevention of postoperative arrhythmias in general thoracic surgery. Ann Thorac Surg 1999;67:182–6.
- 26 Sandberg A, Abrahamsson B, Regårdh CG, et al. Pharmacokinetic and biopharmaceutic aspects of once daily treatment with metoprolol CR/ZOK: a review article. J Clin Pharmacol 1990;30:S2–16.
- 27 Sandberg A, Abrahamsson B, Svenheden A, et al. Steady-state bioavailability and day-to-day variability of a multiple-unit (CR/ZOK) and a single-unit (OROS) delivery system of metoprolol after once-daily dosing. *Pharm Res* 1993;10:28–34.
- 28 VanDenKerkhof EG, Milne B, Parlow JL. Knowledge and practice regarding prophylactic perioperative beta blockade in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: a survey of Canadian anesthesiologists. *Anesth Analg* 2003;96:1558–65.
- 29 Lindenauer PK, Pekow P, Wang K, et al. Perioperative beta-blocker therapy and mortality after major noncardiac surgery. N Engl J Med 2005;353:349–61.
- 30 Poldermans D, Devereaux PJ. The experts debate: perioperative beta-blockade for noncardiac surgery—proven safe or not? *Cleve Clin J Med* 2009;76(Suppl 4):S84–92.
- 31 http://www.hscic.gov.uk/article/2677/Linked-HES-ONS-mortality-data. (Access date 20th July 2013).
- 32 Schouten O, Poldermans D, Visser L, *et al.* Fluvastatin and bisoprolol for the reduction of perioperative cardiac mortality and morbidity in high-risk patients undergoing non-cardiac surgery: rationale and design of the DECREASE-IV study. *Am Heart J* 2004;148:1047–52.
- 33 Bangalore S, Wetterslev J, Pranesh S, et al. Perioperative β blockers in patients having non-cardiac surgery: a meta-analysis. Lancet 2008;372:1962–76.
- 34 Chopra V, Eagle KA. Perioperative mischief: the price of academic misconduct. Am J Med 2012;125:953–5.
- 35 Poldermans D. Scientific fraud or a rush to judgment? Am J Med 2013;126:e5–6.



Sonia Bouri, Matthew James Shun-Shin, Graham D Cole, et al.

Heart published online July 31, 2013 doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304262

Updated information and services can be found at: http://heart.bmj.com/content/early/2013/07/30/heartjnl-2013-304262.full.html

These include:

Heart

Data Supplement	"Supplementary Data" http://heart.bmj.com/content/suppl/2013/07/30/heartjnl-2013-304262.DC1.html
References	This article cites 30 articles, 6 of which can be accessed free at: http://heart.bmj.com/content/early/2013/07/30/heartjnl-2013-304262.full.html#ref-list-1
Open Access	This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 3.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/
P <p< th=""><th>Published online July 31, 2013 in advance of the print journal.</th></p<>	Published online July 31, 2013 in advance of the print journal.
Email alerting service	Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Advance online articles have been peer reviewed, accepted for publication, edited and typeset, but have not not yet appeared in the paper journal. Advance online articles are citable and establish publication priority; they are indexed by PubMed from initial publication. Citations to Advance online articles must include the digital object identifier (DOIs) and date of initial publication.

To request permissions go to: http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions

To order reprints go to: http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to BMJ go to: http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/ Topic Collections Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections Open access (92 articles)

Notes

Advance online articles have been peer reviewed, accepted for publication, edited and typeset, but have not not yet appeared in the paper journal. Advance online articles are citable and establish publication priority; they are indexed by PubMed from initial publication. Citations to Advance online articles must include the digital object identifier (DOIs) and date of initial publication.

To request permissions go to: http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions

To order reprints go to: http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to BMJ go to: http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/