OPEN

A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials on Antiplatelet Agents Versus Placebo/Control for Treating Peripheral Artery Disease

Jun Qian and Xiao Hong Yang

Abstract: Effect of aspirin (antiplatelet agents) in patients with peripheral artery disease (PAD) was still controversial. Varying studies reported varying results. Therefore, we did this meta-analysis to investigate if aspirin could reduce cardiovascular events in patients with PAD.

A comprehensive literature search (PubMed, CCTR, Embase, Web of Science, CNKI, CBM-disc, and relevant websites) was conducted from 1990 to September 2014. The key search terms ("aspirin," "PAD," "peripheral arterial occlusive diseases," and "claudication") produced 9 high-quality randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of aspirin versus placebo/control. Mantel–Haenszel random-effects model was used to analysis of the 9 RCTs. The primary outcome was the cardiovascular events.

Nine RCTs, composed of 9526 patients (4786 aspirin-treated and 4740 placebo or control-treated patients), were meta-analyzed. The results indicated that compared to placebo/control, aspirin could not significantly reduce the cardiovascular events (OR = 0.81, 95% CI = 0.56-1.15). Moreover, aspirin could not produce better effect on prevention of nonfatal myocardial infarction (OR = 0.98, 95% CI = 0.52-1.84), nonfatal stroke (OR = 0.68-1.38), any death (OR = 1.05, 95% CI = 0.85-1.30), and major bleeding (OR = 1.16, 95% CI = 0.82-1.65) than placebo/control. But aspirin, as monotherapy therapy, did significantly reduce the risk of nonfatal stroke (OR = 0.42, 95% CI = 0.21-0.84).

Aspirin, as monotherapy or combination therapy, did not result in a significant decrease in the cardiovascular events. But aspirin, as monotherapy therapy, did significantly reduce the risk of nonfatal stroke. Our conclusion might help clinicians in clinical treating PAD. Future studies are needed to draw firm conclusions about the clinical benefit and risks of aspirin and other antiplatelet agents.

(Medicine 94(31):e1293)

Abbreviations: ABI = ankle-brachial index, CI = confidence interval, CLI = critical limb ischemia, IC = intermittent claudication, IMS = Information Management System, MI = myocardial infarction, OR = odds ratio, PAD = peripheral artery disease, RCTs = randomized controlled trials.

110042, Liaoning Province, China (e-mail: qianjun_qj@126.com). The authors have no funding and conflicts of interest to disclose.

ISSN: 0025-7974

DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000001293

INTRODUCTION

D eripheral artery disease (PAD) refers to chronic narrowing or atherosclerosis of the lower extremities.¹ Symptoms of PAD includes intermittent claudication (IC), critical limb ischemia (CLI) and acute limb ischemia. PAD and coronary artery disease have a similar atherosclerotic process and share similar risk factors: gender, smoking, age, high cholesterol, diabetes, hypertension, and renal insufficiency.² PAD is powerful indicator of systemic atheroma. Patients with this disease have an increased risk of myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, and are 6 times more likely to die from cardiovascular disease within 10 years than patients without PAD.³ On the basis of an anklebrachial index (ABI) < 0.90, there were an average of 5 million adults (>40 years) who were classified as having PAD in 2000.⁴ Previous studies reported that patients with PAD have a 15-year survival rate of \sim 22% compared with 78% in patients without such disease.5,6

Generally, the goals of treatment for patients with PAD include cardiovascular protection, preservation of walking and functional status, relief of symptoms, and prevention of amputation. Among the existed treatment methods, antiplatelet agents have an important role in preventing cardiovascular events, which are widely used to prevent the recurrence of cardiovascular events. These agents act on the platelet activation process while GIIb/IIa inhibitors impede platelet aggregation by blocking activated fibrinogen receptors.⁷ Some studies reported that antiplatelet agents could reduce future secondary cardiovascular events in patients with PAD.⁸⁻¹⁰ Aspirin, as antiplatelet agent, can block thromboxane synthesis by acetylation of platelet cyclooxygenase. Nowadays, aspirin are widely used for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events in patients with PAD.^{11,12} However, this phenomenon might be caused by an incorrectly assumption that the antiplatelet agents studied in PAD was aspirin. Actually, in the population with PAD the results were driven mainly by nonaspirin antiplatelet agents.¹³ Moreover, clinical guidelines have recommended patients with risk factors for coronary heart disease to take aspirin for cardiovascular prevention,¹⁴ although the effect of aspirin on patients with PAD is still controversial.^{15,16} Meanwhile, researchers reported that the use of aspirin was associated with bleeding adverse events.17

To assess the benefit of aspirin in treating PAD, previous systematic reviews have done much work.^{18,19} But one thing should be noticed, many included studies in these reviews were performed more than thirty years ago. Nowadays, the diagnosis and treatment of PAD have changed. Therefore, the applicability of the conclusions to current patients might be limited. Furthermore, recently, several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on aspirin for PAD treatment have been published.^{20,21} Therefore, there is an urgent need for additional systematic review to assess the effect of aspirin on treating PAD. In this

Editor: Anastasios Lymperopoulos.

Received: June 15, 2015; revised: July 8, 2015; accepted: July 9, 2015. From the Department of Tumor Interventional Radiology, Dadong District, Shenyang, Liaoning Province, China.

Correspondence: Jun Qian, Department of Tumor Interventional Radiology, Hospital 463 of PLA, 46 Xiaoheyan Road, Dadong District, Shenyang

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0, where it is permissible to download, share and reproduce the work in any medium, provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially.

meta-analysis, in order to make the conclusion more robust, we only included the studies from 1990 to 2014.

METHODS

This study is a meta-analysis, so the ethical statement is not required.

Study Selection

The first step of the meta-analysis was a selective literature search for potential studies. Scientific and medical databases, including 4 international databases (PubMed, Web of Science, CCTR, Embase), 2 Chinese databases (CNKI and CBM-disc), and relevant websites from 1990 to September 2014, were searched for potential RCTs on aspirin in the treatment of patients with PAD. The key search terms were aspirin, PAD, peripheral arterial diseases, peripheral arterial occlusive diseases and claudication, as well as the different combinations of these key words. No language was imposed to mitigate potential bias. Meanwhile, to avoid overlooking potential studies, the conference summaries and reference documents listed in the studies were also researched.

Inclusion Criteria

Among the studies identified in the initial search, only those meeting the following criteria were used for subsequent analysis: studies about aspirin treatment versus placebo or control group; patients over 18 years of age with PAD; informed consent provided; outcomes included cardiovascular death, or nonfatal myocardial infarction (MI), or nonfatal stroke, or allcause mortality, or major bleeding. Meanwhile, studies with no events in any of the study groups were excluded; studies with nonrandom allocation, case reports, and reviews were also excluded.

Outcome Definition

The effect of aspirin on the prevention of composite cardiovascular end points was chosen as the primary outcome. Each component of the primary end point (cardiovascular death, or nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke) and all-cause mortality were chosen as the secondary outcome. The occurrence of major bleeding as defined by each study was chosen as the safety outcome. The treatment endpoint was preferentially viewed as the study endpoint.

Bias Risk Measures

Two primary authors of this study served as reviewers to independently assess the quality of each potential study according to the Cochrane Collaboration criteria. Bias risk was determined by the following points: randomization quality, allocation concealment, outcome blinding assessment, similarity in baseline clinical characteristics and incomplete data reported. Studies with 3 or more bias risks were not included in this meta-analysis.

Data Extraction

Two reviewers independently completed the following works: verified all potentially suitable studies by the aforementioned criteria; assessed the quality of the identified studies; completed a standardized data extraction form. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion. Data retrieved from the studies included the first author, year of publication, country of origin, participant characteristics, the number of patients,

Statistical Analysis

RevMan5.0 software (Cochrane Information Management System [IMS]) and STATA software 8.0 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX) were used to perform statistical analyses. This analysis was conducted according to the recommendations of Sacks et al.²² Dichotomous data were chosen for clinical reasons. In order to make the interpretation of results easier for clinicians,²³ the odds ratio (OR) reduction of aspirin therapy was used as an efficacy measure in lieu of the continuous symptom score. Therefore, in this meta-analysis, we used the summary OR and 95% confidence intervals (CI) as the effect parameters. The Mantel-Haenszel random-effects model was used here, as it was assumed that the included studies probably had varying true treatment effects.²⁴ If needed, sensitivity and subgroup analysis were conducted. We assessed heterogeneity using the Chi-square based Q test and I squared index (I^2) for each analysis.^{25,26} Both Egger test and inverted funnel plots were used to assess the potential publication bias. All tests were 2-sided with statistical significance set to a P < 0.05 unless otherwise stated.

RESULTS

Literature Search

The initial Internet search yielded 257 potentially relevant studies. In order to obtain the studies that met our inclusion criteria, we did the following steps: 103 studies were excluded because their titles did not meet the aforementioned inclusion criteria; 124 studies from the rest of studies were excluded by reviewing the abstracts; a total of 21 studies from the rest of



FIGURE 1. Workflow of literature search.

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

TABLE 1. Demogr	aphic and Clinical Chai	racteristics of	f Included Stuc	lies				
Refs.	Patient	Number	Mean Age	M/F	Experiment	Control	Follow-Up	Country
Chen et al ³¹ Fu et al ³²	PAD PAD, ABI < 0.9	38 126	51–91 years 59 years	21/17 105/21	100 mg aspirin 100 mg aspirin	100 mg cilostazol 1. Molecular heparin 2. Placebo	8–30 months Not available	China China
Katakami et al ²¹	Diabetes with PAD	297	63 years	155/142	81–100 mg aspirin	100-200 mg cilostazol	2 years	Japan/Korea/China/ Philinnines
Belch et al ¹³	Diabetes with PAD, ABI ≤ 0.99	1276	60 years	561/715	1. 100 mg aspirin	1. Placebo	6.7 years	United Kingdom
					2. 100 mg aspirin + antioxidant	2. Antioxidant		
Catalano et al ²⁷	Outpatients with stage I–II PAD	366	66 years	282/84	1. 100 mg aspirin	1. Placebo	21 months	Italy
					2. 100 mg aspirin + antioxidant	2. Antioxidant		
CAPRIE Steering Committee ¹⁰	Symptomatic PAD	6452	64 years	4678/1774	325 mg aspirin	75 mg clopidogrel	1.91 years	Canada
Study group on pharmacological treatment after PTA ²⁸	PAD	223	66 years	143/80	50 mg aspirin + 400 mg dipyridamole	Placebo	30 days	Sweden
McCollum et al ³⁰	PAD	549	67 years	412/137	600 mg aspirin + 300 mg dipyridamole	Placebo	35 months	United Kingdom
Heiss et al ²⁹	PAD	199	62 years	133/66	1. 990 mg aspirin + 225 mg dipyridamole	Placebo	6 months	Germany
					2. 300 mg aspirin			
ABI = ankle-brachi	al index, $F =$ female, $M =$	male, $PAD = 1$	peripheral artery	disease.				

	Aspir	in	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random. 95% Cl	M-H. Random. 95% Cl
Belch 2008	105	638	108	638	25.0%	0.97 [0.72, 1.30]	
Catalono 2007	100	185	19	181	10.5%	0.34 [0.14, 0.82]	-
CAPRIE 1996	190	3223	149	3229	27.0%	1.29 [1.04, 1.61]	IT I
Chen 2014	1	20	16	18	2 70/	Not estimable	
Fu 2014	5	120	15	82	2.1%	0.10 [0.01, 0.82]	
Heiss 1990 Ketekomi 2010	2	150	4	145	5.7%	0.05 [0.17, 2.50]	
McCollum 1001	52	152	61	145	4.7%	0.71 [0.16, 3.23]	
DTA 1004	33	200	2	203	21.5%	0.75 [0.50, 1.14]	
FTA 1994	2	108	2	115	2.9%	1.07 [0.15, 7.70]	
Total (95% CI)		4786		4740	100.0%	0.81 [0.56, 1.15]	•
Total events	366	1100	362	41.40	100.070	0.01 [0.00, 1110]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (0 11 · Chi ²	= 18 1	1 df = 7 (P = 0.0	$ 1\rangle ^2 = 61$	%	F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F
Test for overall effect: 2	7 = 1.18 (P = 0.2	4)	. 0.0	,,	70	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Λ		0.2	•,				Favours Aspirin Favours control
A			C	3			
Chudu an Culumanu	Aspir	IN Total	Contr	OI	Mainha	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Iotal	Events	Iotal	weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Belch 2008	55	638	56	638	30.0%	0.98 [0.66, 1.45]	Ī
Catalono 2007	0	185	9	181	4.3%	0.05 [0.00, 0.85]	· · ·
CAPRIE 1996	81	3223	50	3229	30.6%	1.64 [1.15, 2.34]	1-
Chen 2014	0	20	0	18		Not estimable	
Fu 2014	1	44	15	82	7.4%	0.10 [0.01, 0.82]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Heiss 1990	3	130	2	69	8.9%	0.79 [0.13, 4.85]	
Katakami 2010	0	152	0	145		Not estimable	
McCollum 1991	14	286	6	263	18.8%	2.20 [0.83, 5.82]	
PTA 1994	0	108	0	115		Not estimable	
		4700		4740	100.09/	0.00 [0 52 4 94]	
Total events	154	4/00	138	4/40	100.076	0.56 [0.52, 1.64]	T
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1	0 31 · Chi2	= 16 3	4 df = 5/	P = 0.0	$(06) \cdot 1^2 = 6$	0%	
Test for overall effect: 2	7 = 0.07 (P = 0.9	4)	1 - 0.0	100), 1 = 0	570	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
rest for overall check.	L 0.07 (0.0)				Favours Aspirin Favours control
В	A	-	0	3		Odda Datia	Odda Datia
B	Aspir	in Total	Contr	ol	18/-1-64	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
B Study or Subgroup	Aspir Events	in Total	Contr Events	ol Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008	Aspir Events 29	in <u>Total</u> 638	Contr Events 41	ol <u>Total</u> 638	Weight 26.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 Ot DDT 1000	Aspir Events 29 2	in <u>Total</u> 638 185	Contr Events 41 6	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181	Weight 26.5% 2.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996	Aspir Events 29 2 74	in Total 638 185 3223	Contr Events 41 6 70	ol Total 638 181 3229	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Chen 2014	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20	Contr Events 41 6 70 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 18	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 100	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 0 1 0 16	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.8% 11.6%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 0 16 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl)	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 0 16 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 16 0 134	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121 2.00: Chi ²	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 0 1 1 0 16 0 16 0 134 . df = 5 (F	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect; 2	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0,91 (l	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 16 0 16 0 134 , df = 5 (F 7)	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 16 0 16 0 134 , df = 5 (F 7)	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 9 = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 1 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I	in Total 638 185 3223 200 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in	Contr <u>Events</u> 41 6 70 0 1 0 16 0 134 df = 5 (F 7) Contr	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 185 263 115 4740 P = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 5 0.00; Chi ² 2 5 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in Total	Contr <u>Events</u> 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 16 0 134 off = 5 (F 7) Contr Events	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 182 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.50 Total	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); l ² = 0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H Random 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Bolch 2009	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 0 0 2 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 121 0.00; Chi ² 2 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 7 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3 in Total 628	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 1 1 6 0 1 1 6 0 1 34 , df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 2 2 5	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.50 col <u>Total</u> 629	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); I² = 0% Weight	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.07]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 43	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in <u>Total</u> 638 195	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 6 0 1 6 0 1 34 , df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 35	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 • = 0.50 ol Total 638	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); ² = 0% Weight 32.3% 2%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.25 [0.79, 1.97]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 OADRC 1000	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 0 0 2 2 2 9 0 9 1 (I 2 9 0 9 1 1 1 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 0 0 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 2 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3: in <u>Total</u> 638 185 290 200 44 286 108 286 286 286 286 286 286 286 28	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 1 6 0 1 6 0 1 1 4 4 5 (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 200	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 • = 0.50 rol <u>Total</u> 638 181 125 	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); 2 = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 0.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.074 [0.74, 4.00]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 2 2 2 0.00; Chi ² 2 = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3 [°] in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 1 6 0 1 1 4 , df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 3 4 29	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 • = 0.50 ol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 0 = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); I² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Ev 2014	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 0 0 0	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 200 	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 1 1 6 0 1 1 6 0 1 34 , df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 4 29 0 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 9145 263 115 4740 • = 0.50 • ol Total 638 181 3229 • 145 263 115 • 4740 • 15 • 15 • 16 • 17 • 17 • 17 • 18 • 18 • 19 • 18 • 18 • 19 • 18 • 18 • 18 • 19 • 18 • 19 • 145 • 263 • 115 • 10 • 10	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0% i); I² = 0% 32.3% 6.3% 29.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Fu 2014	Aspir <u>Events</u> 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 4 0 0 0 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 200 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, 7786 = 4.38, 85 3223 3223 20 44	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 1 6 0 1 6 0 1 6 4 0 7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 • = 0.50 • ol Total 638 181 3229 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 18 223 223 18 223 223 223 223 223 223 223 22	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); l² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 0 0 2 2 74 0 0 0 1 2 2 9 2 74 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 35 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 2 7 4 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 3223 3220 44	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 16 0 134 of $= 5$ (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0 1 1 1 2 2 9 0 0 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 263 115 263 115 4740 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); ² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, 8 P = 0.3 in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 4 4 130 152	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 1 1 0 16 0 134 cdf = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0 1 1 0	ol Total 638 181 3229 145 263 115 4740 = 0.500 ol Total 638 181 3229 18 822 69 145	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); I² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 14 0.00; Chi ² 2 = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 35 0 0 0 1 1 0.25	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 200 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3 3223 320 44 130 20 44 130 223 20 44 130 223	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 16 0 134 df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0 0 1 1 0 39	ol Total 638 181 3229 188 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.50 ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 18 82 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 19 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0% i); l² = 0% 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 286 286 4786 = 4.38, 785 3223 3223 3223 3223 20 44 130 0 44 130 0 152 286 108	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 1 6 0 1 1 4 0 5 (F7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2 2	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 0 0 Total 638 181 3229 0 0 15 15 15 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); l² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1% 3.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.55 [0.32, 0.94] 1.07 [0.15, 7.70]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI)	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 14 0 0 121 0.00; Chi ² 2 = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 0 0 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.3 ² in Total 638 185 3223 3223 in 28 638 185 3223 20 44 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 4786 108 108 4786 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 0 16 0 16 0 134 of $= 5$ (F 7) Contr Events 35 4 29 0 0 1 1 0 0 35 2	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 0 Total 638 181 3229 0 Total 638 181 3229 145 263 115 4740 0 16 263 115 4740 0 16 263 115 4740 16 26 115 115 115 115 115 115 115 11	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); l² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1% 3.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.55 [0.32, 0.94] 1.07 [0.15, 7.70] 0.97 [0.68, 1.38]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Totst for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events	Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² 2 = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 0 0 1 0 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, P = 0.33 in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 4786	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 6 0 1 1 0 1 1 4 2 9 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 2 9 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 1 0 1 1 4 1 0 1 1 4 1 0 1 1 4 1 0 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 5 (F 7) Contr Events 3 5 4 2 9 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 1 2 9 0 0 1 1 1 4 1 2 9 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); ² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1% 3.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.55 [0.32, 0.94] 1.07 [0.15, 7.70] 0.97 [0.68, 1.38]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Aspir Events 29 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in Total Total 1638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 1 0 16 0 134 off = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 355 4 29 0 0 1 0 1 4 29 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 29 0 0 1 0 1 4 29 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 4 29 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 4 1 2 1 1 4 1 2 1 1 4 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ol Total 638 181 3229 145 263 115 4740 = 0.50 ol Total 638 181 3229 145 263 115 4740 * = 0.50	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0%); I² = 0% Weight 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1% 3.0% 100.0% i); I² = 24%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.55 [0.32, 0.94] 1.07 [0.15, 7.70] 0.97 [0.68, 1.38]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 C Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	Aspir Events 299 2 74 0 0 1 1 1 14 0 121 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.91 (I Aspir Events 43 5 35 0 0 1 1 0 25 2 111 0.04; Chi ² 2 2 111 0.04; Chi ² 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 4.38, 7 20 108 4786 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 6.56, P = 0.8	Contr Events 41 6 70 0 1 1 0 16 0 134 df = 5 (F 7) Contr Events 34 29 0 0 1 0 39 2 110 , df = 5 (F 7)	ol Total 1638 181 3229 145 263 115 4740 = 0.500 0l Total 638 181 3229 18 82 263 115 263 115 263 115 263 115	Weight 26.5% 2.4% 58.0% 0.8% 0.6% 11.6% 100.0% 1); I² = 0% 32.3% 6.3% 29.7% 1.5% 27.1% 3.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.69 [0.43, 1.13] 0.32 [0.06, 1.60] 1.06 [0.76, 1.48] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] 2.88 [0.12, 71.30] 0.79 [0.38, 1.66] Not estimable 0.89 [0.69, 1.14] Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 1.25 [0.79, 1.97] 1.23 [0.32, 4.65] 1.21 [0.74, 1.99] Not estimable 0.53 [0.03, 8.56] Not estimable 0.55 [0.32, 0.94] 1.07 [0.15, 7.70] 0.97 [0.68, 1.38]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI

FIGURE 2. Meta-analysis of any aspirin on composite cardiovascular end points (A), nonfatal myocardial infarction (B), nonfatal stroke (C), and cardiovascular death (D).

studies were excluded after 2 reviewers independently read the full texts. Finally, 9 RCTs met all inclusion criteria.^{10,13,21,27–32} Detailed procedures were described in Figure 1. These studies contained 9526 patients with PAD in the aggregate, including 4786 aspirin-treated and 4740 placebo- or control-treated patients. The references listed in these studies were also researched for possibly overlooked studies. All steps were

independently performed by 2 reviewers, and any disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Main Characteristics

Overall, 9 RCTs were included in our analysis. The mean follow-up time ranged from 1 month to 6.7 years. Some of the

	Aspir	in	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Belch 2008	94	638	101	638	35.3%	0.92 [0.68, 1.25]	+
Catalono 2007	7	185	4	181	2.8%	1.74 [0.50, 6.05]	
CAPRIE 1996	122	3223	95	3229	41.5%	1.30 [0.99, 1.70]	=
Chen 2014	0	20	0	18		Not estimable	
Fu 2014	0	44	0	82		Not estimable	
Heiss 1990	1	130	1	69	0.6%	0.53 [0.03, 8.56]	
Katakami 2010	2	152	0	145	0.5%	4.83 [0.23, 101.55]	
McCollum 1991	40	286	46	263	18.2%	0.77 [0.48, 1.22]	
PTA 1994	2	108	2	115	1.1%	1.07 [0.15, 7.70]	
T					100 001		1
Total (95% CI)		4786		4740	100.0%	1.05 [0.85, 1.30]	Ť
Total events	268		249				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (0.01; Chi ²	= 6.65	df = 6 (F	P = 0.35	5); $ ^2 = 10\%$	6	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.47 (1	P = 0.6	4)				Favours Aspirin Favours control
Α							10
	Aspir	in	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Aspir Events	in Total	Contr Events	ol Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008	Aspir Events 28	in <u>Total</u> 638	Contr Events 31	ol <u>Total</u> 638	Weight 45.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007	Aspir Events 28 4	in <u>Total</u> 638 185	Contr Events 31 0	ol <u>Total</u> 638 181	Weight 45.5% 1.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996	Aspir Events 28 4 17	in Total 638 185 3223	Contr Events 31 0 12	rol Total 638 181 3229	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6	in Total 638 185 3223 20	Contr Events 31 0 12 6	rol Total 638 181 3229 18	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6 4	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6 4 4	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6% 2.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6 4 4 4 0	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1 0	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6% 2.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6 4 4 4 0 4	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994	Aspir <u>Events</u> 28 4 17 6 4 4 0 4 7	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3 5	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5% 9.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54] 1.52 [0.47, 4.96]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% Cl)	Aspir Events 28 4 17 6 4 4 0 4 7	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3 5	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5% 9.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54] 1.52 [0.47, 4.96] 1.16 [0.82, 1.65]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events	Aspir <u>Events</u> 28 4 17 6 4 4 0 4 7 74	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786	Contr Events 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3 5 5 63	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5% 9.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54] 1.52 [0.47, 4.96] 1.16 [0.82, 1.65]	Odds Ratio M-H. Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	Aspir <u>Events</u> 28 4 17 6 4 4 0 4 7 7 74 0.00; Chi ²	in <u>Total</u> 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 3.98	Contr <u>Events</u> 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3 5 6 6 6 3 5 6 3 5 6 3 5 7 (F) 6 6 6 7 (F) 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	rol <u>Total</u> 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.78	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5% 9.0% 100.0% 3): 2 = 0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54] 1.52 [0.47, 4.96] 1.16 [0.82, 1.65]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Belch 2008 Catalono 2007 CAPRIE 1996 Chen 2014 Fu 2014 Heiss 1990 Katakami 2010 McCollum 1991 PTA 1994 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2	Aspir <u>Events</u> 28 4 17 6 4 0 0 4 7 74 0.00; Chi ² Z = 0.84 (l	in Total 638 185 3223 20 44 130 152 286 108 4786 = 3.98 P = 0.4	Contr <u>Events</u> 31 0 12 6 5 1 0 3 5 6 6 3 5 6 3 6 3 5 0 0 12 0 0 12 0 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 12 12 6 6 5 1 0 0 3 5 5 1 0 0 3 5 5 1 0 0 3 5 5 6 6 6 5 1 0 0 3 5 5 6 6 6 7 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	rol Total 638 181 3229 18 82 69 145 263 115 4740 P = 0.78	Weight 45.5% 1.5% 22.7% 6.6% 2.5% 5.5% 9.0% 100.0% 8); I² = 0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.90 [0.53, 1.52] 9.00 [0.48, 168.38] 1.42 [0.68, 2.98] 0.86 [0.22, 3.37] 1.54 [0.39, 6.06] 2.16 [0.24, 19.70] Not estimable 1.23 [0.27, 5.54] 1.52 [0.47, 4.96] 1.16 [0.82, 1.65]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI

FIGURE 3. Meta-analysis of any aspirin on all-cause mortality (A) and major bleeding (B).

included patients had diabetes. The dose of aspirin ranged from 75 to 990 mg daily. The combination of aspirin plus antioxidant or dipyridamole was used to treat PAD in 5 RCTs, and the aspirin was used as monotherapy strategy for PAD in 7 RCTs (6 RCTs about aspirin vs. placebo, 1 RCT about aspirin vs. cilostazol). Three RCTs had multiple arms (aspirin monotherapy, aspirin plus antioxidant or dipyridamole, antioxidant and placebo). The detailed characteristics of the included RCTs were described in Table 1.

Cardiovascular End Points

Data on composite cardiovascular end points were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 2A). Overall, 366 (out of 4786, 7.6%) and 362 (out of 4740, 7.6%) patients experienced cardiovascular events, respectively. The pooled OR was 0.81 (95% CI = 0.56-1.15, z = 1.18, P = 0.24), indicating a 19% reduction in cardiovascular event rates in aspirin group, but not statistically significant. Heterogeneity was existed ($I^2 = 61\%$, P = 0.01). Additionally, the inverted funnel plots of these RCTs appeared to be approximately symmetrical. As the total number of RCTs was too small to show clear asymmetry, Egger test was performed and the result showed this outcome was not influenced by publication bias.

Nonfatal Myocardial Infarction

Data on this outcome were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 2B). Overall, 154 (out of 4786, 4.1%) and 138 (out of 4740, 2.9%) patients experienced nonfatal MI, respectively. The pooled OR was 0.98 (95% CI=0.52-1.84, z=0.07, P=0.94), indicating a comparable nonfatal MI occurrence

rates between aspirin group and placebo/control group. Heterogeneity was existed ($I^2 = 69\%$, P = 0.006).

Nonfatal Stroke

Data on this outcome were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 2C). Overall, 121 (out of 4786, 2.5%) and 134 (out of 4740, 2.8%) patients had nonfatal stroke, respectively. The pooled OR was 0.89 (95% CI = 0.69-1.14, z = 0.91, P = 0.37), indicating an 11% reduction in nonfatal stroke occurrence rates in aspirin group, but not statistically significant. Heterogeneity was not existed ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.50).

Cardiovascular Death

Data on this outcome were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 2D). Overall, 111 (out of 4786, 2.3%) and 110 (out of 4740, 2.3%) patients experienced cardiovascular death, respectively. The pooled OR was 0.97 (95% CI=0.68–1.38, z=0.16, P=0.87), indicating a comparable cardiovascular death occurrence rates between aspirin group and placebo/ control group. Heterogeneity was not existed ($I^2=24\%$, P=0.26).

All-Cause Mortality

Data on this outcome were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 3A). Overall, 268 (out of 4786, 5.6%) and 249 (out of 4740, 5.3%) patients experienced this events, respectively. The pooled OR was 1.05 (95% CI=0.85-1.30, z=0.47, P=0.64), indicating a comparable occurrence rates of this events between aspirin group and placebo/control group. Heterogeneity was not existed ($I^2 = 10\%$, P = 0.35).



FIGURE 4. Effect of aspirin combination versus placebo on composite cardiovascular end points (A), nonfatal myocardial infarction (B), nonfatal stroke (C), and cardiovascular death (D).

Major Bleeding

Data on this outcome were available for 9 RCTs (Figure 3B). Overall, 74 (out of 4786, 1.5%) and 63 (out of 4740, 1.3%) patients experienced major bleeding, respectively. The pooled OR was 1.16 (95% CI=0.82-1.65, z=0.84, P=0.40), indicating a nonstatistically significant increase (11%) in major bleeding occurrence rates in aspirin group. Heterogeneity was not existed (I²=0%, P=0.78).

Aspirin Combination

Five RCTs studied the combination of aspirin with antioxidant or dipyridamole versus placebo for PAD treatment (Figure 4). The results showed that the 2 treatment methods had no significantly different effects on reducing composite cardiovascular end points (OR = 0.83, 95% CI = 0.61–1.12) (Figure 4A), nonfatal MI events (OR = 0.86, 95% CI = 0.35–2.12) (Figure 4B), nonfatal stroke events (OR = 0.71, 95% CI = 0.45–1.13) (Figure 4C) and cardiovascular death events (OR = 0.91, 95% CI = 0.47–1.77) (Figure 4D). Heterogeneity was not existed (P > 0.10).

Aspirin Monotherapy

Aspirin Versus Placebo

Four RCTs studied the aspirin monotherapy versus placebo for PAD treatment (Figure 5). The results showed that the 2 treatment methods had no significantly different effects on reducing composite cardiovascular end points (OR = 0.37, 95% CI = 0.11-1.25) (Figure 5A), nonfatal MI events (OR = 0.47, 95% CI = 0.13-1.74) (Figure 5B) and cardiovascular death events (OR = 1.13, 95% CI = 0.60-2.14) (Figure 5D); the pooled OR of nonfatal stroke events was 0.42 (95% CI = 0.21-0.84), indicating a significant reduction in aspirin group (z = 2.45, P = 0.01) (Figure 5C).

Aspirin Versus Control

Six RCTs studied the aspirin monotherapy versus control for PAD (Figure 6). The results showed that the 2 treatment methods had no significantly different effects on reducing composite cardiovascular end points (OR = 0.79, 95% CI = 0.44-1.41)

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.



FIGURE 5. Effect of aspirin monotherapy versus placebo on composite cardiovascular end points (A), nonfatal myocardial infarction (B), nonfatal stroke (C), and cardiovascular death (D).

(Figure 6A), nonfatal MI events (OR = 0.86, 95% CI = 0.37– 1.98) (Figure 6B), nonfatal stroke events (OR = 0.97, 95% CI = 0.72–1.31) (Figure 6C) and cardiovascular death events (OR = 1.13, 95% CI = 0.77–1.67) (Figure 6D).

DISCUSSION

This meta-analysis was based on 9 RCTs composed of 9526 patients randomly assigned to either aspirin treatment group or placebo/control treatment group. We found no evidence of benefit from aspirin treatment on the significantly decrease the primary end point of cardiovascular events. The pooled OR was 0.81 (95% CI = 0.56-1.15) for cardiovascular event rates, 0.98 (95% CI = 0.52-1.84) for nonfatal MI occurrence rates, 0.89 (95% CI = 0.68-1.38) for cardiovascular death occurrence rates, 1.05 (95% CI = 0.85-1.30) all-cause mortality occurrence rates and 1.16 (95% CI = 0.82-1.65) for major bleeding occurrence rates. Subgroup analysis showed that the effects of aspirin plus antioxidant or dipyridamole versus placebo were not significantly different; the effects of aspirin

monotherapy versus placebo were not significantly different on cardiovascular events, nonfatal MI events and cardiovascular death events, but there was a significant reduction in aspirin group on nonfatal stroke events; the effects of aspirin versus control (antioxidant, clopidogrel, low molecular heparin) were not significantly different. These results might aid clinicians to make optimal treating strategy for patients with PAD. However, this conclusion should be interpreted with caution owing to the limited number of RCTs.

Many studies reported that antiplatelet agents were effective in preventing the recurrence of cardiovascular events. But, in this work, we found that aspirin could not significantly reduce the cardiovascular events compared to placebo/control. Some previous studies suggested that 100 mg daily favored the efficacy of aspirin,^{27,31,32} but the results of another study did not support the use of 100 mg daily aspirin or in primary prevention of cardiovascular events in patients with PAD. Campbell and colleagues³³ reported that low dose was at least as effective as high dose of aspirin in treating symptomatic coronary heart disease and had less harm, which made the low dose to be a recommendation for secondary prevention of cardiovascular



FIGURE 6. Effect of aspirin monotherapy versus control on composite cardiovascular end points (A), nonfatal myocardial infarction (B), nonfatal stroke (C), and cardiovascular death (D).

disease. But 1 study reported that 50 mg daily (low dose) did not favor the efficacy of aspirin,²⁸ whereas Heiss et al²⁹ found that the combination use of 225 mg dipyridamole with 990 mg daily (high dose) aspirin could yield better efficacy in PAD. Additionally, other clinical settings supports that varying antiplatelet medications have varying efficacy in distinct patient populations. For example, the combination of warfarin with aspirin could prevent cardiovascular events among patients with coronary heart disease,³⁴ but this method was not efficacious for patients with PAD.³⁵ Therefore, future studies were needed to find out how the aspirin used was the best choice for patients with PAD.

This meta-analysis had several limitations. First, the dose of aspirin was different across studies. Second, a relatively small number of studies included. Third, the patient phenotype was varying in the included studies. However, these limitations were the general problems for meta-studies to solve. Fourth, the follow-up time was also different in the included studies, with a range from 1 month to 6.7 years. The short-term and long-term outcomes of aspirin compared to placebo should be further investigated by future studies. Fifth, definitions of major bleed-ing varied across the trials, which made it difficult to determine accurate measure of bleeding and approximate risk. Sixth, the genetic background was not considered. For example, many studies suggested that the PIA2 polymorphism was a genetic determinant of ischemic stroke in high-risk hypertensive population.^{36,37} Santulli et al³⁸ reported that of the 7 mammalian G-protein-coupled receptor kinases (GRKs), GRK2 seems to be the most relevant isoform at the cardiovascular level.

Notwithstanding these limitations, this study found that aspirin might not be more effective than placebo/control on reducing cardiovascular events. But aspirin, as monotherapy therapy, did significantly reduce the risk of nonfatal stroke. Limited by the included studies, this conclusion should be interpreted with caution. Meanwhile, further lager prospective RCTs of aspirin and other antiplatelet agents for PAD are needed to draw firm conclusions about clinical benefit and risks. Also, researchers should use novel strategies to treat vascular disorders, such as used micro-RNA-based approaches to preserve endothelial function and prevent thrombosis.³⁹

REFERENCES

- Adam DJ, Beard JD, Cleveland T, et al. Bypass versus angioplasty in severe ischaemia of the leg (BASIL): multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2005;366:1925–1934.
- Fowkes FG, Price JF, Stewart MC, et al. Aspirin for prevention of cardiovascular events in a general population screened for a low ankle brachial index: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2010;303:841–848.
- Criqui MH1, Langer RD, Fronek A, et al. Mortality over a period of 10 years in patients with peripheral arterial disease. N Engl J Med. 1992;326:381–386.
- Selvin E, Erlinger TP. Prevalence of and risk factors for peripheral arterial disease in the United States: results from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1999–2000. *Circulation*. 2004;110:738–743.
- Dormandy JA, Rutherford RB. Management of peripheral arterial disease (PAD). TASC Working Group. TransAtlantic Inter-Society Consensus (TASC). J Vasc Surg. 2000;31:S1–296.
- Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, et al. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment: prospective meta-analysis of data from 90056 participants in 14 randomized trials of statins. *Lancet*. 2005;366:1267–1278.
- Jagroop IA, Matsagas MI, Geroulakos G, et al. The effect of clopidogrel, aspirin and both antiplatelet drugs on platelet function in patients with peripheral arterial disease. *Platelets*. 2004;15:117– 125.
- Antithrombotic Trialists' Collaboration. Collaborative meta-analysis of randomised trials of antiplatelet therapy for prevention of death, myocardial infarction, and stroke in high risk patients. *BMJ*. 2002;324:71–86.
- Sivenius J, Laakso M, Riekkinen P Sr et al. European stroke prevention study: effectiveness of antiplatelet therapy in diabetic patients in secondary prevention of stroke. *Stroke*. 1992;23:851–854.
- CAPRIE Steering Committee. A randomised, blinded, trial of clopidogrel versus aspirin in patients at risk of ischaemic events (CAPRIE). *Lancet.* 1996;348:1329–1339.
- Costache IL, Rusu C, Ivanov I, et al. A clopidogrel resistance-risk factor in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi*. 2012;116:383–388.
- ISIS-2 (Second International Study of Infarct Survival) Collaborative Group. Randomized trial of intravenous streptokinase, oral aspirin, both, or neither among 17,187 cases of suspected acute myocardial infarction: ISIS-2. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1988;12(Suppl A):3A–13A.
- Belch J, MacCuish A, Campbell I, et al. The prevention of progression of arterial disease and diabetes (POPADAD) trial: factorial randomised placebo controlled trial of aspirin and antioxidants in patients with diabetes and asymptomatic peripheral arterial disease. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a1840.
- American Diabetes Association. Standards of medical care in diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2007;30:S4–S41.
- Hiatt WR, Krantz MJ. The efficacy of aspirin in peripheral arterial disease: an unresolved question. J Mal Vasc. 2007;32:71–72.

- Hankey GJ, Norman PE, Eikelboom JW. Medical treatment of peripheral arterial disease. JAMA. 2006;295:547–553.
- Bhatt DL, Fox KA, Hacke W, et al. Clopidogrel and aspirin versus aspirin alone for the prevention of atherothrombotic events. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354:1706–1717.
- Berger JS, Krantz MJ, Kittelson JM, et al. Aspirin for the prevention of cardiovascular events in patients with peripheral artery disease: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *JAMA*. 2009;301:1909–1919.
- Robless P, Mikhailidis D, Stansby G. Systematic review of antiplatelet therapy for the prevention of myocardial infarction, stroke, or vascular death in patients with peripheral vascular disease. *Br J Surg.* 2001;88:787–800.
- Connolly SJ, Eikelboom J, Joyner C, et al. Apixaban in patients with atrial fibrillation. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:806–817.
- 21. Katakami N, Kim YS, Kawamori R, et al. The phosphodiesterase inhibitor cilostazol induces regression of carotid atherosclerosis in subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: principal results of the Diabetic Atherosclerosis Prevention by Cilostazol (DAPC) study: a randomized trial. *Circulation.* 2010;121:2584–2591.
- Sacks HS, Berrier J, Reitman D, et al. Meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials. N Engl J Med. 1987;316:450–455.
- Guyatt GH, Juniper EF, Walter SD, et al. Interpreting treatment effects in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 1998;316:690–693.
- Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2011;342:d549.
- Mulrow C, Cook MSD. Quantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med.* 1997;127:820–826.
- Higgins J, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327:557–560.
- Catalano M, Born G, Peto R. Prevention of serious vascular events by aspirin amongst patients with peripheral arterial disease: randomized, double-blind trial. *J Intern Med.* 2007;261:276– 284.
- Platelet inhibition with ASA/dipyridamole after percutaneous balloon angioplasty in patients with symptomatic lower limb arterial disease. A prospective double-blind trial. Study group on pharmacological treatment after PTA. *Eur J Vasc Surg.* 1994;8:83–88.
- Heiss HW, Just H, Middleton D, et al. Reocclusion prophylaxis with dipyridamole combined with acetylsalicylic acid following PTA. *Angiology*. 1990;41:263–269.
- McCollum C, Alexander C, Kenchington G, et al. Antiplatelet drugs in femoropopliteal vein bypasses: a multicenter trial. *J Vasc Surg.* 1991;13:150–162.
- Chen D, Hou WN, Zhong HJ. Arteriosclerosis obliterans randomized parallel-group study in combination with aspirin therapy Maixuekang. J Pract Tradit Chin Intern Med. 2014;29:100–102.
- Fu QG, Ren W, Zhang Y. Effect of anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapy before the intracavitary therapy of lower limb atherosclerosis occlusion on clinical outcomes. *Chin J Arterioscler*. 2014;22:168– 172.
- Campbell CL, Smyth S, Montalescot G, et al. Aspirin dose for the prevention of cardiovascular disease: a systematic review. *JAMA*. 2007;297:2018–2024.
- 34. Andreotti F, Testa L, Biondi-Zoccai GG, et al. Aspirin plus warfarin compared to aspirin alone after acute coronary syndromes: an updated and comprehensive meta-analysis of 25,307 patients. *Eur Heart J.* 2006;27:519–526.
- Warfarin Antiplatelet Vascular Evaluation Trial InvestigatorsAnand S, Yusuf S, et al. . Oral anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapy and peripheral arterial disease. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;357:217– 227.

- Lanni F, Santulli G, Izzo R, et al. The Pl(A1/A2) polymorphism of glycoprotein IIIa and cerebrovascular events in hypertension: increased risk of ischemic stroke in high-risk patients. *J Hypertens*. 2007;25:551–556.
- Galasso G, Santulli G, Piscione F, et al. The GPIIIA PIA2 polymorphism is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular adverse events. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. 2010;10:41.
- Santulli G, Trimarco B, Iaccarino G. G-protein-coupled receptor kinase 2 and hypertension: molecular insights and pathophysiological mechanisms. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev.* 2013;20: 5–12.
- Santulli G, Wronska A, Uryu K, et al. A selective microRNA-based strategy inhibits restenosis while preserving endothelial function. *J Clin Invest.* 2014;124:4102–4114.