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Sir

Del Mar et al. assert that their recent Cochrane review was based on full clinical study reports of all manufacturer-sponsored randomized trials. In fact, only a subset (46 of the 107 Clinical Study Reports obtained) were formally analysed. The study undertaken by Muthuri et al. was indeed funded by Roche, but its design, conduct, interpretation and manuscript preparation were conducted independently of the funder. Exhaustive attempts were made to obtain datasets suitable for analysis from around the world. Compared with the 80 datasets received, relatively few (n=15) were not shared due to review board or governmental restrictions (n=3) or inability to meet project timelines (n=12). None of the contributors of data declared industry funding for the acquisition or assembly of their dataset.

We do not dismiss the findings in the Cochrane review. Indeed, the finding that there was no signal suggesting that neuraminidase inhibitors (NIs) reduced serious complications is not unexpected given that the clinical trials reviewed were conducted in community settings, were based on mostly healthy patients suffering from mild influenza-like illness, and were not designed or powered to assess impact on severe illness. Indeed, their assessment of effectiveness of oseltamivir against hospital admission was based on 4 394 adults and 1 359 children; pneumonia – 4 452 subjects; and serious complications – 3 675. Mortality, a hallmark of pandemics and seasonal outbreaks, could not be assessed due to the absence of deaths in the oseltamivir trials. The same limitations apply to the pooled analysis of 3 564 subjects in 10 RCTs of oseltamivir treatment by Kaiser et al., which unlike the Cochrane review, showed that treatment was associated with reductions in influenza-related lower respiratory complications and hospitalisation from any cause.

In contrast, the observational data assembled and analysed by Muthuri et al. used individual participant data (an approach not pursued in the Cochrane review) and focused on patients hospitalised with severe pandemic influenza A/H1N1 2009 infection (86% laboratory confirmed). Many patients had risk-factors for severe illness; the dataset was extremely large (n=29 234), and compared with no treatment, NI treatment was associated with a reduction in mortality risk.

While we agree with Del Mar et al that randomised trials are less prone to error from bias than observational studies, we do not accept that meta-analysis of existing RCTs, conducted in community patients with “relatively benign influenza”, and which suffer “problems in the design of many of the studies that were included”, can resolve pressing questions about the role of NIs in the treatment or prevention of life-threatening influenza.

Thus, we reassert that the findings of the Cochrane Collaboration do not conflict with those of the recent large observational study by Muthuri et al.; rather, both studies reveal beneficial effects of NIs in completely different scenarios (settings, severity, comorbidity and background immunity).

Public outcry would indeed be justified if pandemic planners relied only on the available RCTs when making decisions about how to prevent and treat severe influenza.

Jonathan S. Nguyen-Van-Tam
Peter J.M. Openshaw
Karl G. Nicholson

Conflicts of interest: unchanged since original Commentary was written
References


