

Provided by UCL Discovery



BMJ 2017;357:j2733 doi: 10.1136/bmj.j2733 (Published 2017 June 07)

Page 1 of 1





WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE POLYPILL?

Polypill is not just for cardiovascular disease

Fay H Cafferty senior statistician, Ruth E Langley professor of oncology and clinical trials

MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL, Institute of Clinical Trials Methodology, Aviation House, London WC2B 6NH, UK

Viera's article on the polypill focused exclusively on cardiovascular benefits. Yet several candidates for inclusion in such a formulation, such as aspirin and metformin, have shown anticancer activity in recent years.

Randomised trials show that aspirin prevents the development of colorectal cancer,²³ and long term follow-up from vascular trials indicates that aspirin inhibits development of metastases in a range of cancers.⁴ This latter hypothesis is being evaluated in several randomised trials,⁵ and metformin is being evaluated as a treatment for both breast and prostate cancer.

In 2015, the US Preventive Services Task Force judged the evidence sufficient to recommend daily low dose aspirin for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease and colorectal cancer in people aged 50-59 with a moderate risk of cardiovascular disease and no increased risk of bleeding. This approach factors in potential benefits (cardiovascular and cancer outcomes), as well as age, which is associated with bleeding risk.

Although aspirin increases bleeding risk, events are rarer than generally appreciated: an estimated 3.6 additional serious extracranial bleeding events (fatal or requiring transfusion) per 10 000 people treated for a year with aspirin. Intracranial haemorrhage is rarer still (0.8 additional events).⁷

Instead of asking what happened to the polypill, perhaps we should be asking how we can update our thinking about the polypill. We agree that more evidence, including from the trials mentioned, is needed before aspirin or a polypill containing aspirin is recommended more widely. Evidence of anticancer

effects may shift the risk-benefit balance for some people. A more individualised approach that assesses all possible benefits, as well as risks, is likely to be appropriate and might help the idea to slowly but surely gain ground.

Competing interests: None declared.

Full response at: http://www.bmj.com/content/356/bmj.j1474/rr-1.

- Viera AJ. Whatever happened to the polypill? BMJ 2017;357:j1474. doi:10.1136/bmj. i1474 pmid:28347977.
- 2 Cook NR, Lee IM, Zhang SM, Moorthy MV, Buring JE. Alternate-day, low-dose aspirin and cancer risk: long-term observational follow-up of a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;357:77-85. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-159-2-201307160-00002 pmid:23856681.
- Burn J, Gerdes AM, Macrae F, et al. CAPP2 Investigators. Long-term effect of aspirin on cancer risk in carriers of hereditary colorectal cancer: an analysis from the CAPP2 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2011;357:2081-7. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61049-0 pmid:22036019.
- 4 Rothwell PM, Wilson M, Price JF, Belch JF, Meade TW, Mehta Z. Effect of daily aspirin on risk of cancer metastasis: a study of incident cancers during randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2012;357:1591-601. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60209-8 pmid:22440947.
- 5 Coyle C, Cafferty FH, Rowley S, et al. Add-Aspirin investigators. ADD-ASPIRIN: A phase III, double-blind, placebo controlled, randomised trial assessing the effects of aspirin on disease recurrence and survival after primary therapy in common non-metastatic solid tumours. Contemp Clin Trials 2016;357:56-64. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2016.10.004 pmid: 27777129
- 6 Bibbins-Domingo K. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Aspirin use for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease and colorectal cancer: US preventive services task force recommendation statement. Ann Intern Med 2016;357:836-45. doi:10.7326/M16-0577 pmid:27064677.
- Baigent C, Blackwell L, Collins R, et al. Antithrombotic Trialists' (ATT) Collaboration. Aspirin in the primary and secondary prevention of vascular disease: collaborative meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomised trials. *Lancet* 2009;357:1849-60. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60503-1 pmid:19482214.

Published by the BMJ Publishing Group Limited. For permission to use (where not already granted under a licence) please go to http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions

Subscribe: http://www.bmj.com/subscribe