bolsters patient-centered decision making in early-phase oncology trials. Moreover, by accentuating crucial decision problems faced by early-phase cancer trial participants and their oncologists, this model should help trial methodologists to propose useful adjunctive formal decision supports.

David C. Norris, MD
Precision Methodologies, LLC
Wayland, MA

Shiraj Sen, MD, PhD
Sarah Cannon Research Institute at HealthONE
Denver, CO

Roman Groisberg, MD
Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey
New Brunswick

Vivek Subbiah, MD
The University of Texas MD
Anderson Cancer Center
Houston, TX

ORCID
David C. Norris: https://orcid.org/JMCP3112_0000-0001-9593-6343

1. Daugherty CK, Siegler M, Ratain MJ, Zimmer G. Learning from our patients: one participant's impact on clinical trial research and informed consent. *Ann Intern Med.* 1997;126(11):892-897.
2. Norris DC. Comment on Wages et al, Coherence principles in interval-based dose finding. Pharmaceutical Statistics 2019, doi:10.1002/pst.1974 [published online ahead of print March 29, 2020]. *Pharm Stat,* https://doi.org/10.1002/pst.2016.
3. Norris DC. Dose titration algorithm tuning (DTAT) should supersede 'the' maximum tolerated dose (MTD) in oncology dose-finding trials. *F1000Res.* 2017;6:112.
4. Norris DC. Precautionary coherence unravels dose escalation designs. *bioRxiv,* https://doi.org/10.1101/240846.
5. Phillips SD. Swimmer plot: tell a graphical story of your time to response data using PROC SGPLOT. In: PharmaSUG 2014 Conference Proceedings; June 1-4, 2014; San Diego, CA. Paper DG07. https://www.pharmasug.org/proceedings/2014/DG/PharmaSUG-2014-DG07.pdf. Accessed October 19, 2019.

Risk Framing in Cardiovascular Medicine I

To the Editor: We applaud the work of Drs Alkhouli and Rihal[1] in examining the important topic of risk/benefit framing in patient-centered decision making. However, we disagree with the choice of a sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor (SGLT2i), canagliflozin, as an example in their arguments and that "the other 98% [of treated patients] would see no incremental benefit from the treatment."[(p.1316)] First, to clarify, the primary outcome in Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes with Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation was not a composite major adverse cardiovascular event outcome as stated, but rather a composite of end-stage kidney disease, doubling of the serum creatinine level from baseline sustained for at least 30 days, or death from renal or cardiovascular disease. Patients who

received canagliflozin 100 mg/d had a 30% relative risk reduction (4.3% absolute risk reduction) for this primary outcome.[2] Reduction of hospitalization for heart failure (a secondary end point) was profound, with a 39% relative risk reduction (2.4% absolute risk reduction) seen in patients receiving canagliflozin. This is in addition to the major adverse cardiovascular event outcome data quoted by the authors.[3]

Sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors continue to show promise as one of the most important and pluripotent cardiovascular medications of a generation, recently exhibiting groundbreaking efficacy in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction with and without diabetes[4,5] and dramatic renoprotective effects in patients with chronic kidney disease with and without diabetes, including markedly lowering mortality.[6] Many of these effects are thought to be classwide, and the use of these agents often targets multiple cardiovascular protective end points in an individual patient. Studies have also reported the cost-effectiveness of this class.[7] Therefore, although again we agree with the central message of the commentary, we disagree with the authors' selection of an SGLT2i as an example and recommend against limiting SGLT2i benefit to a single end point.

Taher Modarressi, MD
Diabetes & Endocrine Associates of Hunterdon
Hunterdon Medical Center
Flemington, NJ

Arsalan Derakhshan, MD
Division of General Internal Medicine
University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center
Cleveland, OH

ORCID

Taher Modarressi: ⓘD https://orcid.org/
JMCP3111_0000-0002-2066-5750

1. Alkhouli M, Rihal CS. The odyssey of risk framing in cardiovascular medicine: a patient-centered perspective. Mayo Clin Proc. 2020;95(7):1315-1317.
2. Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, et al; CREDENCE Trial Investigators. Canagliflozin and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(24):2295-2306.
3. Mahaffey KW, Jardine MJ, Bompoint S, et al. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease in primary and secondary cardiovascular prevention groups. Circulation. 2019;140(9):739-750.
4. McMurray JJV, Solomon SD, Inzucchi SE, et al; DAPA-HF Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction. N Engl J Med. 2019; 381(21):1995-2008.
5. Milton Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, et al. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with empagliflozin in heart failure. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(15):1413-1424.
6. Heerspink HJL, Stefánsson BV, Correa-Rotter R. Dapagliflozin in patients with chronic kidney disease. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(15):1436-1446.
7. Hong D, Si L, Jiang M, et al. Cost effectiveness of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists, and dipeptidyl peptidase-4 (DPP-4) inhibitors: a systematic review [published correction appears in Pharmacoeconomics. 2019; 37(12):1553]. Pharmacoeconomics. 2019;37(6): 777-818.

Risk Framing in Cardiovascular Medicine II

To the Editor: We read with interest the commentary by Alkhouli and Rihal.[1] The authors accurately remark about the need of easily understood tools, available to clinicians and patients at point of care, that could simplify the assessment of individual patient risk benefit and harm of an intervention. In particular, they observed the paucity of intervention-specific, individualized risk/benefit scores that facilitate the identification of higher risk individuals that benefit the most from an intervention, with acceptable probability of harm. Such an example is provided by the TIMI Risk Score for Secondary Prevention,[2] a risk score that identifies those patients who benefit from the addition of ezetimibe to statin therapy after acute coronary syndrome. Although those patients who have 2 or more risk indicators derive some benefit, those who have 0 or 1 do not. In contrast, it could be interpreted from their statement on the Table that the likelihood of no benefit from an intervention, which they calculated as 1 minus the absolute risk reduction, means that most (>97 %) patients are not likely to benefit on the trials exemplified. It has been observed that the absolute risk reduction (or any other measure of risk reduction) represents the average risk reduction in the study group, and given the logarithmic distribution of risk in a disease with overall outcome rate < 50%, it translates that approximately one-third of patients in a randomized clinical trial benefit from an intervention, the so-called Lake Wobegon effect.[3] It is important then to distinguish between the magnitude of risk reduction and the percentage of individuals in a population likely to benefit. We completely agree with the authors that we need the tools to identify with ease and clarity those patients who lie in that area of risk to communicate effectively with patients and share the decision whether to apply a given intervention.

Jorge F. Trejo-Gutiérrez, MD, MHS
Mayo Clinic
Jacksonville, FL

Luis Eng-Ceceña, MD
Hospital Fátima
Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico

ORCID

Jorge F. Trejo-Gutiérrez: ⓘD https://orcid.org/
JMCP3110_0000-0001-9654-7833

1. Alkhouli M, Rihal CS. The odyssey of risk framing in cardiovascular medicine: a patient-centered perspective. Mayo Clin Proc. 2020;95(7):1315-1317.
2. Bohula EA, Morrow DA, Giugliano RP, et al. Atherothrombotic risk stratification and ezetimibe for secondary prevention. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2017; 69(8):911-921.
3. Vickers AJ, Kent DM. The Lake Wobegon effect: why most patients are at below-average risk. Ann Intern Med. 2015;162(12):866-867.

In reply—Risk Framing in Cardiovascular Medicine I and II

We thank the authors for their insightful comments on our perspective published in the journal.[1] We agree with Dr Modarressi[1] that sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors indeed represent an important new treatment for patients with heart failure. Although we used the trial definition of major adverse cardiovascular events (cardiovascular death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, or stroke) in the text and in the table's footnote, we acknowledge that this was a secondary and not a primary end point.[1,2] The purpose of our viewpoint was to illustrate the issue of risk in absolute vs relative terms. We agree that a 4.3% absolute risk reduction of the composite end point of end-stage kidney disease, doubling of the creatinine level for ≥30 days, and death due to cardiovascular or renal disease is substantial from a population health view; however, it may be less substantial to the individual patient, especially considering the marked out-of-