

Randomised controlled trial of Antiglucocorticoid augmentation (metyrapone) of antiDepressants in Depression (ADD Study)

I Nicol Ferrier,^{1,2} Ian M Anderson,³ Jane Barnes,⁴ Peter Gallagher,¹ Heinz CR Grunze,^{1,2} Peter M Haddad,³ Allan O House,⁵ Tom Hughes,⁶ Adrian J Lloyd,^{1,2} Chrysovalanto Mamasoula,⁴ Elaine McColl,⁴ Simon Pearce,⁷ Najma Siddiqi,⁸ Baxi Sinha,⁹ Chris Speed,⁴ Nick Steen,⁴ June Wainwright,⁹ Stuart Watson,^{1,2} Fiona H Winter,⁹ R Hamish McAllister-Williams^{1,2*} and the ADD Study Team

¹Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

²Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

³Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust and Neuroscience and Psychiatry Unit, Manchester University, Manchester, UK

⁴Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

⁵Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

⁶Leeds and York Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Leeds, UK

⁷Institute of Genetic Medicine, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

⁸Bradford District NHS Care Trust, Saltaire, West Yorkshire, UK

⁹Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust, Darlington, County Durham, UK

*Corresponding author

Declared competing interests of authors: Dr McA-W reports grants from the Northumberland, Tyne and Wear Comprehensive Local Research Network, and Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust (Research Capacity Funding) during the conduct of the study. INF reports grants from the Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust (Research Capacity Funding) during the conduct of the study. EMcC is a member of the National Institute for Health Research Journal Editorial Group. HG reports personal fees from Bristol-Myers Squibb (BMS), Desitin, Lundbeck, Hoffmann-La Roche, Servier, Sanofi-aventis, and Richter Gedeon, outside the submitted work. IA reports personal fees from Lundbeck and Alberta Psychiatric Association, and royalties from Springer, outside the submitted work. He also reports fees paid to his institution from Servier, Alkermes, AstraZeneca and Medicine Publishing (Elsevier) during the conduct of the study. PMH reports personal fees and non-financial support from Janssen, Eli Lilly and Company, Otsuka and Servier, and personal fees from Sunovion, Lundbeck, BMS and AstraZeneca, outside the submitted work. SW reports grants from the Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation board of the Medical Research Council during the conduct of the study.

Published June 2015

DOI: 10.3310/eme02040

Scientific summary

The ADD Study

Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation 2015; Vol. 2: No. 4

DOI: 10.3310/eme02040

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

Many patients (approximately 30–50%) with depression do not respond to first-line antidepressant drugs. Responses to a second antidepressant are also disappointingly low (approximately 30%). Such non-responding patients are characterised as suffering from treatment-refractory depression (TRD). Chronic psychosocial stress and dysfunction of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis are both common in depression, and are associated with an attenuated clinical response to antidepressants. In preclinical studies, co-administration of corticosteroids leads to a reduction in the ability of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) to increase forebrain 5-hydroxytryptamine, whereas co-administration of antiglucocorticoids has the opposite effect. A Cochrane review suggested efficacy of antiglucocorticoid augmentation of antidepressants in patients with depression, with the largest effect size seen with metyrapone, a cortisol synthesis inhibitor that crosses the blood–brain barrier (Gallagher P, Malik N, Newham J, Young AH, Ferrier IN, Mackin P. Antigluco-corticoid treatments for mood disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;**1**:CD005168). A positive double-blind, placebo-controlled randomised trial of metyrapone was conducted in a centre in Germany, with 63 depressed inpatients.

Objectives

The Antigluco-corticoid augmentation of antiDepressants in Depression (ADD Study) was a multicentre, patient-randomised, double-blind placebo-controlled trial of metyrapone augmentation of serotonergic antidepressants in patients with TRD in the UK NHS. The primary objective was to determine whether or not metyrapone (500 mg twice a day) for 21 days is efficacious in augmenting ongoing treatment with conventional serotonergic antidepressants in TRD. The primary outcome by which this objective was assessed was the Montgomery–Åsberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) scored at baseline and 2 weeks post treatment (week +5 from randomisation) in a representative sample of depressed patients who had failed to respond to at least two courses of antidepressants, drawn from primary care and psychiatric outpatient clinics in the UK. Treatment with metyrapone was compared with treatment with placebo, using analysis of covariance. Secondary clinical objectives were to (1) determine the clinical effect size at 2 weeks post completion of treatment (5 weeks post randomisation) of a 3-week course of metyrapone (vs. placebo) augmentation of antidepressants; (2) assess whether or not any observed response was sustained for up to 21 weeks post cessation of metyrapone; (3) assess whether or not metyrapone augmentation improves patients' quality of life (QoL) using the self-completed EuroQol EQ-5D instrument (European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions); (4) assess the tolerability and safety of metyrapone augmentation in this study population; and (5) assess the mechanism of action of metyrapone in mechanistic substudies using neuropsychological, neuroendocrine and neuroimaging outcomes.

Assessment of additional secondary outcome measures of symptomatology [Clinical Anxiety Scale (CAS), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), State–Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) and Young Mania Rating Scale (YMRS)] were conducted at the same time points as described for the MADRS.

Methods

A total of 165 patients with moderate to severe TRD, aged 18–65 years, were randomised to metyrapone 500 mg twice daily or placebo for 3 weeks, in addition to ongoing treatment with serotonergic antidepressants. Treatment occurred between weeks 0 (randomisation) and week +3 relative to randomisation. Patients were assessed on the above outcomes at –2, 0, +3, +5, +8, +16 and +24 weeks. Inclusion criteria were that the patient had (1) a major depressive episode assessed using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM (SCID) (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-Fourth Edition, DSM-IV*); (2) a Hamilton Depression Rating Scale-17 item (HDRS17) score of ≥ 18 at weeks –2 and 0; (3) a Massachusetts General Hospital Treatment Resistant Depression (MGH-TRD) staging score of 2–10 at week –2 as a measure of treatment refractoriness; and (4) current treatment with a single agent or combination antidepressant treatment [which included a serotonergic drug (a SSRI), a tertiary amine tricyclic, venlafaxine, duloxetine or mirtazapine]. At the point of randomisation, patients were required to have been on their current antidepressant medication, at the current dose, for a minimum of 4 weeks, and this medication needed to be continued unchanged during the trial. Exclusion criteria included any other DSM-IV axis 1 diagnosis other than an anxiety disorder; a physical comorbidity that would make metyrapone inappropriate; pregnancy or breastfeeding; use of medication that would interfere with metyrapone; and dependence on alcohol or other drug(s) in the past 12 months and/or current harmful use of such substances. Metyrapone treatment potentially engenders hypocortisolaemia, with manifestations including a risk of postural hypotension, hyperkalaemia and hyponatraemia. Therefore, safety assessments included serum cortisol measures at week +1, as well as measuring sitting and standing blood pressure and urea and electrolytes at weeks +1 and +5. Serious adverse events (SAEs) and adverse events (AEs) were routinely enquired for and recorded. Tolerability was further assessed using the Toronto Side Effects Scale (TSES). Metyrapone administration has previously been shown to cause an increase in levels of 11-deoxycortisol, and the increase in 11-deoxycortisol between weeks –2 and +1 was to be used, when available, as a measure of adherence to medication, as this has been shown to be highly sensitive to treatment with metyrapone. The study also investigated a number of mechanistic objectives, including whether or not the patients had evidence of baseline hypercortisolaemia and, if present, whether or not this had any impact on clinical and neuropsychological outcomes. A comparator group was also recruited to support these mechanistic investigations.

Results

Overall, 877 patients were referred to the study team: 237 from primary care, 320 from secondary care and 310 as self-referrals following media exposure of the study or seeing posters. The origin of 10 patients was unclear. A total of 284 underwent detailed screening for eligibility. The remainder were either deemed to be ineligible on the basis of a brief telephone screen or did not follow up contact, and 173 were deemed to be eligible. Of the 111 who did not meet inclusion criteria, 10 did not meet the criteria for a major depressive episode using the SCID, 52 had HDRS17 item scores of <18 , 17 had axis 1 disorders other than anxiety, nine were on an inappropriate antidepressant, three had MGH-TRD staging scores outside the range of 2–10, 18 had physical disorders that excluded them, and five had other miscellaneous exclusion criteria (three patients were excluded for more than one reason).

Eight patients subsequently dropped out before randomisation (i.e. between weeks –2 and 0) and so 165 patients were randomised (82 to placebo and 83 to metyrapone). Of these, 143 (86.7%) completed the primary outcome at +5 weeks (74 on placebo and 69 on metyrapone). A further 39 dropped out between week +5 and week +24, so that 104 (63%) completed the study (58 on placebo and 46 on metyrapone). The groups were well balanced at randomisation in terms of demographics and key clinical variables. The mean MADRS score for the groups indicated moderate to severe depression, with MGH scores well in the range of treatment resistance. The group showed evidence of high Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) scores. There was evidence of high scores on measures of anxiety, and comorbid anxiety conditions were frequent.

The estimated mean difference for each of our study outcomes between randomised groups 5 weeks post randomisation (adjusting for variation between centres, whether or not patients originate from primary or secondary care and baseline score) was MADRS (the primary outcome measure) -0.51 (95% CI -3.48 to 2.46); BDI -2.65 (95% CI -6.41 to 1.10); Clinical Anxiety Scale (CAS) 0.46 (95% CI -1.20 to 2.12); STAI 1.2 (95% CI -0.6 to 3.0); European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions 0.015 (95% CI -0.069 to 0.099); EuroQol visual analogue scale 5.6 (95% CI -0.7 to 12.0); Young Mania Rating Scale -0.04 (95% CI -0.52 to 0.45). The differences were not statistically significant for any measure and tended to be small in relation to the change in both groups observed at week +5. Response rates were low and almost identical in both groups (21.6% in the placebo group and 20.3% in the metyrapone group). Remission rates were similarly low and almost identical in the two groups at this time point.

Endocrinological data required for compliance assessment are not yet available. HPA axis function, similar in patients and control subjects, was not associated with differing clinical responses. A wide range of neuropsychological impairments were found, along with changes in brain structure and function, but no differential effect of metyrapone was seen on these measures.

Metyrapone was generally well tolerated. There were 14 SAEs reported for 11 of the patients randomised to study medication (five in the group randomised to metyrapone and six in the group randomised to placebo) but none was attributed to metyrapone and most occurred well after the period of active drug treatment. Non-serious AEs were more common and broadly similar in type and frequency between the two groups, but we cannot exclude the possibility that treating patients with metyrapone may increase the risk of AEs. Of particular note, however, is that metyrapone did not increase the risk of suicidal ideation or suicide attempts. Scores on the TSES were broadly similar between the two groups, with no evidence of a difference in the frequency of postural hypotension or dizziness.

Conclusions

The broad inclusion criteria led to the sample being broadly representative of patients with TRD who are treated within the NHS. The sample had high anxiety and BDI scores and frequent comorbid anxiety. No evidence was found that metyrapone augmentation of serotonergic antidepressants is efficacious for patients with moderate to severe depression – managed in NHS secondary care outpatient clinics or by general practitioners in primary care – who have failed to respond to at least two antidepressants. There was no obvious benefit to its use either on the primary outcome or over the period of follow-up, and this negative result extended to other secondary outcomes, such as the CAS, BDI and quality-of-life measures. Metyrapone was well tolerated by this group and there were no serious AEs attributable to it. AEs were as common in patients treated with placebo. Clinical outcomes have not yet been analysed with respect to the measure of adherence utilised.

A wide range of neuropsychological impairments were found along with changes in brain structure and function, but no differential effect of metyrapone was seen on these measures. This population with TRD was characterised by increased exposure to childhood adversity (compared with the control subjects) and normal HPA axis function. These findings accord with the existing literature in chronic populations; the former predicts non-response to treatment. However, baseline HPA axis function, change in cortisol awakening response in response to drug treatment or severity of childhood trauma did not predict clinical response to metyrapone.

There are very few data specifically on the neuropsychology of treatment-resistant depressed groups. Those studies that have been conducted suggest that deficits are restricted to tests of processing speed. In this TRD sample we see broad deficits in verbal and visuospatial working memory and emotion processing compared with healthy control subjects. Deficits in attention were not general and, instead, were restricted to the executive control of attention. These findings are indicative of an impairment in effortful processing in TRD. No differential effects of metyrapone were seen on these measures.

Trial registration

This study is registered as ISRCTN45338259.

Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation

ISSN 2050-4365 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4373 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full EME archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/eme. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation* journal

Reports are published in *Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation* (EME) if (1) they have resulted from work for the EME programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

EME programme

The Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation (EME) programme was set up in 2008 as part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) and the Medical Research Council (MRC) coordinated strategy for clinical trials. The EME programme is broadly aimed at supporting 'science driven' studies with an expectation of substantial health gain and aims to support excellent clinical science with an ultimate view to improving health or patient care.

Its remit includes evaluations of new treatments, including therapeutics (small molecule and biologic), psychological interventions, public health, diagnostics and medical devices. Treatments or interventions intended to prevent disease are also included.

The EME programme supports laboratory based or similar studies that are embedded within the main study if relevant to the remit of the EME programme. Studies that use validated surrogate markers as indicators of health outcome are also considered.

For more information about the EME programme please visit the website: <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/eme>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the EME programme as project number 08/43/39. The contractual start date was in May 2010. The final report began editorial review in June 2014 and was accepted for publication in January 2015. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The EME editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research. The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, MRC, NETSCC, the EME programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the EME programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2015. This work was produced by Ferrier *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation Editor-in-Chief

Professor Raj Thakker May Professor of Medicine, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Elaine McColl Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Faculty of Education, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board:
www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk