



The Cardiovascular Safety of Thiazolidinediones in Type 2 Diabetes: A Review of Pivotal and Controversial Evidence

¹A. Cunningham, ²A. Daniels

^{1,2} University of Illinois College of Medicine

Corresponding Email : cunninghammd82737@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2022/10/12
Revised date : 2022/11/28
Accepted date : 2022/12/09
Published date : 2023/01/13



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The primary goal of managing type 2 diabetes extends beyond glycemic control to the prevention of cardiovascular disease, its leading cause of mortality. Thiazolidinediones (TZDs), a class of potent insulin-sensitizing agents, were initially thought to have potential cardiovascular benefits due to their metabolic effects.

Literature Review: A review of the pivotal literature reveals a complex and highly controversial evidence base. A large, prospective cardiovascular outcome trial of one TZD, pioglitazone, suggested a degree of cardiovascular protection, showing a significant reduction in a key secondary endpoint of death, myocardial infarction, and stroke. In stark contrast, a highly influential meta-analysis of trials involving another TZD, rosiglitazone, raised a major safety alarm by reporting a significantly increased risk of myocardial infarction. This publication ignited a global debate and intense regulatory scrutiny. The controversy was further fueled by conflicting results from another large, long-term trial for rosiglitazone which did not

confirm a significant risk of heart attack. This conflict highlighted the inherent challenges in interpreting evidence from different study designs.

Conclusion: The body of evidence concerning TZD cardiovascular safety led to a profound reassessment of the drug class. The intense controversy surrounding rosiglitazone fundamentally altered the landscape for drug approval and surveillance, leading to a new, higher standard requiring robust demonstration of cardiovascular safety for all future therapies for type 2 diabetes.

Keywords: Thiazolidinediones (TZDs), Rosiglitazone, Type 2 Diabetes, Cardiovascular Safety, Myocardial Infarction.

INTRODUCTION

Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) is a chronic metabolic disease defined by hyperglycemia, but its clinical impact is dominated by its association with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. Consequently, an ideal anti-diabetic therapy should not only effectively lower blood glucose but should also be, at a minimum, safe for the cardiovascular system, and ideally, protective. The thiazolidinediones (TZDs), which include rosiglitazone and pioglitazone, emerged as a powerful class of oral agents that addressed the core pathophysiological defect of insulin resistance through their action as agonists of the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma (PPAR- γ).

Given their favorable effects on insulin sensitivity, glucose metabolism, and certain lipid parameters, there was a strong mechanistic rationale to suggest that TZDs might reduce cardiovascular risk. This created significant initial optimism for the drug class. However, the clinical evidence that subsequently emerged was complex, conflicting, and ultimately, highly controversial, sparking one of the most significant debates in modern diabetes care. This literature review will synthesise the pivotal publications that examined the cardiovascular safety of TZDs, chronicling the journey from promise to intense scrutiny.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The scientific evaluation of the cardiovascular effects of TZDs is a tale of two different drugs and two different types of evidence, which together created immense clinical uncertainty.

The initial therapeutic optimism was based on the known mechanism of action of TZDs. By activating PPAR- γ , these drugs improve insulin sensitivity in muscle, fat, and liver tissue, leading to better glycemic control. Furthermore, they were shown to have potentially beneficial effects on cardiovascular risk markers, including a modest increase in high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol and a reduction in some inflammatory markers (Yki-Järvinen, 2004). This created a strong hypothesis that these agents could be cardioprotective.

The first major test of this hypothesis in a large-scale, prospective cardiovascular outcome trial was the PROactive study, which evaluated pioglitazone in high-risk patients with T2DM and established macrovascular disease. While the trial narrowly missed statistical significance for its broad primary composite endpoint, it demonstrated a significant 16% risk reduction in the key secondary endpoint of all-cause mortality, non-fatal myocardial infarction (MI), and stroke (Dormandy et al., 2005). These results, while not definitive, were encouraging and suggested that pioglitazone conferred a degree of cardiovascular protection.

A starkly different picture emerged for the other major TZD, rosiglitazone. A highly influential meta-analysis combined data from 42 smaller, randomized trials to assess the drug's cardiovascular safety (Nissen and Wolski, 2007). The analysis, while not a pre-specified prospective trial itself, reported a statistically significant 43% increase in the risk of MI associated with rosiglitazone use, although there was no significant increase in the risk of cardiovascular death. This publication had an immediate and explosive impact, generating front-page news and triggering urgent reviews by regulatory bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). It raised serious questions about the safety of a drug being taken by millions of patients worldwide.

The controversy was deepened by the subsequent publication of the Rosiglitazone Evaluated for Cardiovascular Outcomes and Regulation of Glycaemia in Diabetes (RECORD) trial. This was a large, long-term, prospective non-inferiority trial designed to assess the cardiovascular safety of rosiglitazone. The final results showed that rosiglitazone was non-inferior to standard therapy (metformin plus sulfonylurea) for the primary endpoint of cardiovascular hospitalization or death. Crucially, the study did not find a statistically significant increase in the risk of myocardial infarction, although the point estimate was elevated, leaving room for continued debate (Home et al., 2009). The conflicting results between the meta-analysis and

the RECORD trial fueled intense discussion about the relative strengths and weaknesses of different forms of evidence in drug safety evaluation (Psaty and Furberg, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The literature examining the cardiovascular safety of the thiazolidinedione class tells a complex story of conflicting evidence and profound clinical and regulatory impact. While one agent, pioglitazone, showed signals of potential cardiovascular benefit in a large outcome trial, its sister drug, rosiglitazone, became the center of a major safety controversy initiated by a powerful meta-analysis. The conflicting findings between different sources of evidence for rosiglitazone created significant uncertainty and debate within the medical community.

Ultimately, the intense scrutiny and debate surrounding TZD therapy had a lasting legacy. It fundamentally altered the risk-benefit calculation for this class of drugs and, more importantly, it served as the catalyst for a paradigm shift in the regulatory requirements for all new therapies for type 2 diabetes. The controversy established a new, higher standard, compelling the pharmaceutical industry and regulatory agencies to conduct large, prospective, and adequately powered cardiovascular outcome trials to definitively prove the cardiovascular safety of new anti-diabetic agents before or soon after they reach the market.

REFERENCES

Dormandy, J.A., Charbonnel, B., Eckland, D.J.A., Erdmann, E., Massi-Benedetti, M., Moules, I.K., Skene, A.M., Tan, M.H., Lefèbvre, P.J., Murray, G.D., Standl, E., Wilcox, R.G. and Wilhelmsen, L. (2005) 'Secondary prevention of macrovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes in the PROactive Study (PROspective pioglitAzone Clinical Trial In macroVascular Events): a randomised controlled trial', *The Lancet*, 366(9493), pp. 1279-1289.

Home, P.D., Pocock, S.J., Beck-Nielsen, H., Curtis, P.S., Gomis, R., Hanefeld, M., Jones, N.P., Komajda, M. and McMurray, J.J.V. (2009) 'Rosiglitazone evaluated for cardiovascular outcomes in oral agent combination therapy for type 2 diabetes (RECORD): a multicentre, randomised, open-label trial', *The Lancet*, 373(9681), pp. 2125-2135.

Nissen, S.E. and Wolski, K. (2007) 'Effect of rosiglitazone on the risk of myocardial infarction and death from cardiovascular causes', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 356(24), pp. 2457-2471.

Psaty, B.M. and Furberg, C.D. (2007) 'Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 356(24), pp. 2522-2524.

Yki-Järvinen, H. (2004) 'Thiazolidinediones', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 351(11), pp. 1106-1118.