The ambitious Dynamit Study try to answer a very important non consensual problem: is it worthwhile to screen asymptomatic high risk diabetic patients for silent ischemia via a national prospective randomized study. More than 600 patients were studied with a follow-up of 3.5 years. Two different tests were used: bicycle exercise test or dipyridamole ECT.

End points are death from all cause, non fatal cardiac or cerebral accidents, hospitalization for heart failure. A meta-analysis including another study, Diad, is also presented.

Patients: traditional high risk patients like those included in clinical trial for drug registration, in fact a rather heterogeneous population

Follow-up: no external independant centralized committee for adjudication of events and mainly, patient-based report of the events by mail.

End-points: main e-d include death of all cause, vascular is preferable and hospitalization for cardiac failure, a clinician dependant and irrelevant criteria for the subject (recently suggested Mace by the FDA is better).

Statistics: optimistic to hope more than 20% of events and to recruit 3 000 patients. The meta-analysis appears essentially as an artificial way to compensate the disappointment of this unfinished study.

Patients characteristics and medications (table 1 and 2): some parameters are may be statistically different? Diabetes duration not known as well as the evolution of the metabolic equilibrium (glycaemia and lipids)

Outcomes: % of events very under the “expected” number, very small, rendering any comments irrelevant including the absence of difference in the 2 groups. It should be wise to avoid quotation of “trends”.

Meta-analysis: very irrelevant, erase, do not compensate for the disappointment

Conclusion: stated as if the study was conducted to an end, as to be rewritten. Do not put the blame on DIAD, very unfair. The weak points quoted could have been anticipated for many to write a better study design and more realistic. If you stress the point that Courage and Bari 2 do not bring final answers to the
question asked (and by the way quite different than the questions asked here), it is much more the case for Dynamit.

If this study was an industry sponsored study to obtain a MAA, it will be of no help at all. I nevertheless suggest to publish this study in your journal with some of the suggested improvements. As stated, the question asked was almost never studied, the study provides useful informations including with its negative aspects and reminds us we still do not know in which subgroups we must detect silent ischemia and what to do when it has been detected.
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