



The Safety of Long-Term Proton Pump Inhibitor Use on Cardiovascular Health: A Meta-Analysis

Dalel Jeridi ^{1,*}, Anna Pellat ^{1,2}, Claire Ginestet ^{1,2}, Antoine Assaf ^{1,2}, Rachel Hallit ^{1,2}, Felix Corre ^{1,2} and Romain Coriat ^{1,2}

- Department of Gastroenterology, Cochin Hospital, AP-HP Center, 27 Rue du Faubourg Saint-Jacques, 75014 Paris, France; anna.pellat@aphp.fr (A.P.); claire.ginestet@aphp.fr (C.G.); antoine.assaf@aphp.fr (A.A.); rachel.hallit@aphp.fr (R.H.); felix.corre@aphp.fr (F.C.); romain.coriat@aphp.fr (R.C.)
- ² UFR de Médecine, Faculté de Santé, Université de Paris, 75006 Paris, France
- * Correspondence: dalel.jrd@gmail.com; Tel.: +33-1-58-41-19-52; Fax: +33-1-58-41-41-55

Abstract: Introduction: Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) are one of the most prescribed classes of drugs worldwide as a first-line treatment of acid-related disorders. Although adverse effects are rare and rapidly reversible after a short exposure, concerns have been recently raised about a greater toxicity on cardiovascular health after a longer exposure, especially when combined with clopidogrel. We aimed to evaluate the safety of long-term PPI use on cardiovascular health in patients with known atheromatous cardiovascular disease. Methods: A literature search was conducted in the PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library databases and grey literature in April 2022. Articles published between 2014 and 2022 were considered relevant if they were designed as randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that included post hoc analyses or prospective observational studies and if they investigated clinical cardiovascular outcomes associated with PPI use for 6 months or more in patients suffering from cardiovascular disease requiring antiplatelet agent therapy and/or coronary angioplasty. Statistical analyses were performed using RevMan 5.4 software (Computer program, the Cochrane Collaboration, 2020, London, UK). The risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for the RCTs and the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the observational studies. Results: A total of 10 full-text articles involving 53,302 patients were included. Substantial heterogeneity was found among the 10 included studies. The primary analysis showed no significant differences between the PPI group and the control group for the risks of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs), all-cause death (ACD), or target vessel revascularization (TVR) using a random-effects model (OR 1.15, 95% CI 0.98–1.35, p = 0.08, $I^2 = 73\%$; OR 1.24, 95% CI 0.94–1.65, p = 0.13, $I^2 = 63\%$; and OR 1.19, 95% CI 0.76–1.87, p = 0.45, $I^2 = 61\%$, respectively). The primary analysis yielded similar results for the risks of myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, and cardiovascular death (CVD) using a fixed-effects model (OR 0.98, 95% CI 0.88–1.09, *p* = 0.66, I² = 0%; OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.90–1.17, p = 0.73, $I^2 = 0\%$; and OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.94–1.16, p = 0.44, $I^2 = 35\%$, respectively). Likewise, a subgroup analysis based on eight randomized controlled trials failed to identify any association between PPI use and the risks of MACEs, MI, stroke, TVR, ACD, or CVD using a fixed-effects model (overall pooled OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.96–1.06; p = 0.66; $I^2 = 0$ %). The pulled data from the two included observational studies (OS) demonstrated a significantly increased risk of MACEs in the PPI group (OR 1.42, 95% CI [1.29–1.57], p < 0.001; $I^2 = 0$ %). In another subgroup analysis, no evidence of an increased risk of adverse cardiovascular events in the co-therapy PPI/clopidogrel versus clopidogrel alone groups was found with the exception of the risk of ACD (OR 1.50, 95% CI 1.23–1.82, p = 0.001, $I^2 = 0\%$). Nevertheless, after performing a sensitivity analysis reaching heterogeneity $I^2 = 0\%$, the co-prescription of PPIs and clopidogrel was at increased risk of MACEs (p < 0.001), CVD (p = 0.008), and TVR (p < 0.001) but remained statistically non-significant for the risk of MI (p = 0.11). Conclusions: The overall results of this meta-analysis showed that long-term PPI use was not associated with an increased risk of adverse cardiovascular events. However, inconsistent results were found for combined PPI/clopidogrel therapy. These results should be considered with caution in light of the significant heterogeneity, the limited number of included studies, and the lack of adjustment for potential confounders.



Citation: Jeridi, D.; Pellat, A.; Ginestet, C.; Assaf, A.; Hallit, R.; Corre, F.; Coriat, R. The Safety of Long-Term Proton Pump Inhibitor Use on Cardiovascular Health: A Meta-Analysis. J. Clin. Med. 2022, 11, 4096. https://doi.org/10.3390/ jcm11144096

Academic Editor: Nandu Goswami

Received: 3 July 2022 Accepted: 11 July 2022 Published: 15 July 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/).

2 of 17

Keywords: proton pump inhibitors; heart disease risk factors; long term adverse effects; drug-related side effects and adverse reactions; meta-analysis as topic

1. Introduction

Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) are one of the most prescribed classes of drugs worldwide [1]. This phenomenon is largely due to their effectiveness in the management of acid-related diseases such as gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), peptic ulcer, gastrointestinal bleeding, and *Helicobacter pylori* infection and the prevention of gastric ulcers in patients on aspirin or non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [2]. Presumed safe, PPIs have been available over the counter since 2003, and previous data reported a significant amount of off-label PPI use, with up to 65% of prescriptions having no appropriate indication in the United States [3]. Omeprazole alone was dispensed more than 70 million times in 2016 [3], and PPIs account for over \$10 billion in health care costs, with a global cost exceeding \$25 billion per year [4]. Moreover, rebound acid hypersecretion may occur after stopping PPI therapy, leading to the recurrence of gastric symptoms and thus to drug dependency [5]. This PPI overuse raises concerns about the potential risks it could cause, especially in the elderly affected by multiple comorbidities and taking multiple medications [6]. Indeed, recent studies, mostly observational studies, reported various adverse events related to long-term PPI therapy, including the risks of cardiovascular diseases [7], fractures, pneumonia, *Clostridium difficile* infection, impaired absorption of micronutrients, kidney disease, dementia, gastric neoplasia [4,8], and drug-to-drug interactions [3]. Regarding the cardiovascular risk, the concomitant use of clopidogrel and PPIs has been specifically investigated in several studies as clopidogrel and PPIs are both metabolized by the cytochrome P450 isoenzyme 2C19, leading to drug–drug interaction due to competition at the binding site [9].

In this meta-analysis, we aim to evaluate the association between long-term PPI use (defined as exposure ≥ 6 months) and the risk of adverse cardiovascular events in patients with known atheromatous cardiovascular disease using studies with evidence levels I or II according to the evidence-based clinical practice guidelines [10]. The primary endpoint was the overall safety of PPIs. The secondary endpoints were defined as the safety of combined PPI/clopidogrel therapy and the overall safety of PPIs according to study design.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Protocol

This systematic review was conducted in compliance with the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [11] and PRISMA [12] guidelines.

2.2. Search Strategy

The literature search was conducted in PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library in April 2022. In order to reduce publication bias, we also conducted a search of the grey literature through the Data Archiving and Networked Services and Grey Literature Report databases. The following keywords: ("proton pump inhibitor" OR "proton pump inhibitors" OR "PPIS") AND ("cardiovascular disease" OR "anti-platelet therapy" OR "clopidogrel" OR "aspirin") AND ("adverse effect" OR "adverse drug reaction" OR "risk") were searched. Detailed search terms and combinations used for the literature search are available in online Supplementary Table S1. For the grey literature, we only used the keyword "proton pump inhibitors". Hand searching of references lists was performed to find any additional appropriate article.

2.3. Study Selection Criteria

We limited the searches to articles published from January 2014 to April 2022 written in English or French. We selected randomized controlled trials (RCTs) including post hoc analyses and prospective observational studies reported as full text and published by highly influential journals according to the eigenfactor metrics [13].

Articles were included if patients were aged 18 years or older with atheromatous cardiovascular disease at baseline; the experimental intervention was PPI use for 6 months or longer; PPI use was compared with another PPI (established in the study protocol as not at risk of cardiovascular events), another antacid (established in the study protocol as not at risk of cardiovascular events); placebo treatment; or no treatment. All PPIs were assessed as one drug class considering that all PPIs were sufficiently similar to be combined relevantly as one interventional group. Articles were excluded if the study was designed as a retrospective study or a case–control study; the study involved the general population, an isolated case, pediatric population, or animals; or the study consisted of a meta-analysis or a systematic review (references lists were screened to provide additional citations).

The clinical endpoints were major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs), myocardial infarction, stroke, target vessel revascularization (TVR), cardiovascular death (CVD), and all-cause death (ACD). The MACEs included cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, and/or stroke, and/or TVR.

2.4. Data Extraction

Data extraction was performed by one reviewer (DJ), and the correctness of the extracted data was verified multiple times. In cases of uncertainty, a second reviewer could be requested. Study characteristics and patients' characteristics at baseline were collected. The following data were extracted for each included study: study design, first author, year of publication, number of centers, total duration of follow-up, number of patients, mean age, gender, percentage of gender, intervention, comparison, concomitant medications (aspirin, clopidogrel), comorbidities (hypertension, dyslipidemia, overweight/obesity according to body mass index, prior myocardial infarction, prior stroke, smoking status as a major risk factor for cardiovascular diseases), and primary and secondary endpoints in accordance with the clinical endpoints of our meta-analysis (major adverse cardiovascular death, all-cause death) (Table 1).

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Meta-analysis was performed by calculating the pooled odd ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CI) using Revman 5.4 software. Study results were considered statistically significant for *p*-value < 0.05 and CI excluding 1. Heterogeneity among included studies was assessed using the I² statistic and was considered low if I² < 50% and high if I² \geq 50% [22]. The pooled effect size was estimated using a fixed-effects model for I² < 50%, while a random effects model was used for I² \geq 50%. We conducted subgroup analyses to assess the influence of concurrent use of clopidogrel and PPIs on cardiovascular adverse events, as well as the influence of study design on the results obtained. We also performed a post hoc subgroup analysis that investigated the potential adverse effects related to the specific PPI. Sensitivity analyses were also performed to determine the impact of heterogeneity on the original results. Funnel plots were used to investigate potential publication bias.

Study, Year	Country	Study Design	Centers	Total Patients (PPI/C)	Follow up Period	Intervention/ PPI Type	Control	Outcomes	Age (y)PPI/C	Women (%) PPI/C	Body Mass Index (kg/m ²) PPI/C	Hypertension (%) PPI/C	Dyslipidemia (%) PPI/C	Diabetes Mellitus (%)PPI/C	History of Smoking (%) PPI/CPPI/C	Clopidogrel (%) PPI/C	Aspirin (%) PPI/C	Prior My- ocardial Infarction (%) PPI/C	Prior Stroke (%) PPI/C	CRBT (/7) or NOS (/9)
Zhang et al., 2015 [9]	China	RCT	monocentric	53/51	6 months	Lansoprazole	No PPI	MACEs	64.5/61	55/43	21.9/22.1	51/49	40/39	19/27	40/41	100/100	100/100	NA/NA	NA/NA	4/7
Gu et al., 2016 [14]	China	RCT	monocentric	310/310	6 months	Omeprazole	Pantoprazole	MACEs, CVD, ACD, MI, Stroke, TVR	59.2/58.8	31/29.3	25.6/25.5	65.7/61.2	44.6/41.1	27.7/27	56.1/56.3	>98/>98	>98/>98	15.8/15.1	8.9/8.9	4/7
Nicolau et al., 2015 [15]	Multiple coun- tries	RCT- PHA	multicentric	1666/5577	30 months	Ome, panto, other PPIs	No PPI	MACEs, CVD, MI, Stroke,	63/62	36.5/35.7	NA/NA	80,5/80,3	58,8/59	40.3/38.5	42.9/44.4	50.2/50	93.2/94.2	42.9/44.4	0/0	1/7
Gargiulo et al., 2016 [16]	Italy	RCT- PHA	multicentric	738/1232	2 years	Lanso 90.9%; panto 7.6%; ome, rabe, eso 0.5% each	No PPI	MACEs, CVD,ACD, MI	71.2/68.1	27.5/20.8	26.2/26.9	72.5/71.3	53.8/55.3	23.3/24.8	22.6/24.4	99.9/99.8	100/100	27/26.1	NA/NA	1/7
Moayyedi et al., 2019 [17]	33 coun- tries	RCT	multicentric	8791/8807	3 years	Pantoprazole	Placebo	MACEs, CVD, ACD, MI, Stroke	67.6/67.7	22/21	28.3/28.4	75.9/76.1	88.4/88.8	38/38	66.3/66.1	NA/NA	NA/NA	61.5/61	4/4	7/7
Sugano et al., 2014 [18]	Japan, Korea, Taiwan	RCT	multicentric	215/215	72 weeks	Esomeprazole	Placebo	ACD, MI	66.1/68.1	19/21	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	0.5/2	100/100	66.5 */69.2	66.5 */69.2 *	7/7
Vaduganathan et al., 2016 [19]	Multiple coun- tries	RCT	multicentric	1869/1883	6 months	Omeprazole	Placebo	MACEs, CVD, ACD MI, Stroke, TVR	65.9/65.9	33.2/30.6	29.5/29.5	79.7/81	78.8/76.8	31.6/28.5	13.6/15.1	64.6/64.6	100/100	30.2/28.2	7.2/8	6.5/7
Whellan et al., 2014 [23]	USA	RCT	multicentric	524/525	6 months	Omeprazole	No PPI	CVD, ACD, MI,MACEs, Stroke	66.3/65.7	28.4/28.8	31/31.1	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	21.2/21	100/100	40.8/37.9	19.5/21.5	7/7
Jackson et al., 2016 [20]	USA	OS	multicentric	2167/9788	12 months	PPIs	No PPI	MACEs	63/59	34.1/26.6	30/29	76.1/64.8	73,1/63.9	32.4/25.2	NA/NA	75/74	97.9/98.3	24.5/18.4	7.7/4.9	7/9
Weisz et al., 2015 [21]	USA, Ger- many	OS	multicentric	2162/6419	2 years	PPIs	No PPI	CVD, ACD,MACEs, MI, TVR	64.4/63.2	29.9/24.1	29.5/29.5	83.7/77.8	76.9/73.2	34.8/31.4	22.7/22.6	100/100	100/100	28.6/23.7	NA/NA	8/9

Table 1. Study characteristics and patients' characteristics at baseline.

CRBT, Cochrane risk-of-bias tool; Nos, Newcastle–Ottawa scale; PHA, post hoc analysis; RCT, randomized controlled trial; OS, observational study; PPIs, proton pump inhibitors; H2RA, histamine H2 receptor antagonists; NA, not available; MI, myocardial infarction; CVD, cardiovascular death; ACD, all-cause death; MACEs, major adverse cardiovascular events; TVR, target vessel revascularization; C, Control; lanso, lansoprazole; ome, omeprazole; panto, pantorazole; rabe, rabeprazole; eso, esomeprazole. * History of cardiovascular events requiring aspirin in secondary prevention.

3. Results

3.1. Study Selection

The initial search identified 1717 relevant studies. After title and abstract screening, 1665 studies were excluded. Of the 52 studies remaining, all retrieved from PubMed (n = 29), Embase (n = 20), and the Cochrane Library (n = 3), 22 duplicates and 9 articles only available as abstracts were excluded. Of the 21 articles selected for full-text review, 10 studies met all eligibility criteria and were therefore included in this meta-analysis. Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flow diagram for the study selection.



RCT, randomized controlled trial; PHA, post-hoc analysis; OS, observational study

Figure 1. The PRISMA flow diagram for the study selection.

3.2. Study Characteristics

The general study and patient characteristics at baseline are summarized in Table 1. The pooled analysis included a total of 53,302 patients (18,495 patients in the PPI group and 34,807 patients in the control group). The average age was 64.5 years. Both genders were included in all studies, with an average female rate of 29.9%.

Our selected studies numbered eight RCTs [9,14–19,23] (including two post hoc analyses [15,16]) and two prospective observational studies [20,21]. Of the ten included studies, two were exclusively conducted in the United States [20,23], two exclusively in China [9,14], one in Italy [16], and five in multiple countries [15,17–19,21]. A total of seven studies [9,14–16,19–21] assessed the cardiovascular risk specifically associated with the concomitant use of PPIs and clopidogrel. The different PPIs used in the intervention groups were lansoprazole [9], omeprazole [14,19,23], esomeprazole [18], pantoprazole [17], and multiple PPIs in two studies [15,16]; this feature was not reported in two studies [20,21]. The control group included patients taking placebo, pantoprazole (considering no affinity between pantoprazole and clopidogrel in this particular study [14]), or no PPI. Patients receiving PPIs were more likely to be older, with a greater prevalence of comorbidities (hypertension, diabetes mellitus, dyslipidemia, and history of stroke and/or my-ocardial infarction) and polypharmacy (mainly antiplatelet therapy, anticoagulant agents, antihypertensive agents, lipid-lowering drugs, and hypoglycemic agents).

3.3. Study Quality Assessment

The included studies were of moderate to high methodological quality, except for the PHA, which evaluated the RCTs of low methodological quality, as expected (Table 1). The methodological quality assessment was based upon the Cochrane risk-of-bias [25] assessment tool for the included RCTs and post hoc analyses (Figure 2) and the Newcastle–Ottawa scale [26] (NOS) for the observational studies (Table 2). The Cochrane risk-of-bias tool covers six domains of bias: selection bias, performance bias, detection, attrition bias, reporting bias, and other. Each domain can be assessed as low risk, unclear risk, or high risk. We attributed 0 points, 0.5 point, and 1 point for each domain considered as low risk, unclear risk, and high risk, respectively (Table 1). Three RCTs showed no risk of bias, three RCTs showed one to three risks of bias (selection, performance, and detection), and the two post hoc analyses demonstrated a high risk of bias in all domains except for the risks of attrition and selection bias, which remained unclear (Figure 2). The NOS evaluates the risk of bias in three domains: selection, comparability, and outcome. A score of 6 to 9 was regarded as good, 3 to 5 as fair, and 0 to 2 as poor, according to the NOS interpretation established by Wells et al. [26]. The two included observational studies reached scores of 7 and 8 (Table 2).



Figure 2. Risk-of-bias summary for the RCTs. Zhang 2015 [9]; Gu 2016 [14]; Nicolau 2015 [15]; Gargiulo 2016 [16]; Moayeddi 2019 [17]; Sugano 2014 [18]; Vaduganathan 2016 [19]; Whellan 2014 [23].

Table 2. Newcastle–Ottawa scale scores for the observational studies.

Study	Selection (0 to 4 *)	Comparability (0 to 2 *)	Outcome (0 to 3 *)	Total	Quality Assessment
Jackson	3 *	2 *	2 *	7 *	Good
Weisz	3 *	2 *	3 *	8 *	Good

*: stars awarded for each numbered item within the Selection, Comparability and Outcome categories according to the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment form for cohort studies [26].

3.4. Primary Analysis

The results of the primary analysis are presented in Figure 3. We found no significant differences between the PPI group and the control group for the risks of MACEs, ACD, or TVR using a random-effects model (OR 1.15, 95% CI 0.98–1.35, p = 0.08, $I^2 = 73\%$; OR 1.24, 95% CI 0.94–1.65, p = 0.13, $I^2 = 63\%$; and OR 1.19, 95% CI 0.76–1.87, p = 0.45, $I^2 = 61\%$, respectively; Figure 3A). Similar results were found for the risk of myocardial infarction MI, stroke, and CVD using a fixed-effects model (OR 0.98, 95% CI 0.88–1.09, p = 0.66, $I^2 = 0\%$; OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.90–1.17, p = 0.73, $I^2 = 0\%$; and OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.94–1.16, p = 0.44, $I^2 = 35\%$, respectively; Figure 3B).

	PPI		Cont	rol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 MACEs								
Gargiulo 2016	85	738	113	1232	6.9%	1.29 [0.96, 1.74]		
60 2016 Jackson 2016	304	2167	1300	310	11.2%	1.15 [0.41, 3.20]		
Moaveddi 2019	691	8791	668	8807	11.4%	1.04 [0.93, 1.16]		↓- -
Nicolau 2015	171	1666	617	5577	9.6%	0.92 [0.77, 1.10]		+
Vaduganathan 2016	49	1869	52	1883	5.18	0.95 [0.64, 1.41]		+
Weisz 2015	238	2162	531	6419	10.2%	1.37 [1.17, 1.61]		+
Whellan 2014	9	524	13	525	1.6%	0.69 [0.29, 1.62]		
Zhang 2015 Subtotal (05% CI)	7	10200	5	51	0.8%	1.40 [0.41, 4.73]		
Total summer	1652	10200	2206	34392	30.3%	1.15 [0.96, 1.55]		T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Heteropeneity: $Tau^2 = i$	103-Ch	² = 29.6	3304 7 df = f		00021- 12	= 73%		
Test for overall effect: 2	= 1.74	(P = 0.0)	3)					
1.1.2 All cause death								
Gargiulo 2016	53	738	77	1232	5.7%	1.16 [0.81, 1.67]		+-
Gu 2016	610	310	1	310	0.2%	1.00 [0.06, 16.06]		
Susano 2014	030	215	014	215	11.37	1.05 (0.92, 1.10) Not estimable		T
Vaducanathan 2016	š	1869	Ă	1883	0.7%	1.26 [0.34, 4.70]		
Weisz 2015	111	2162	200	6419	8.3%	1.68 [1.33, 2.13]		+
Wheilan 2014	2	524	2	525	0.3%	1.00 [0.14, 7.14]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		14609		19391	26.6%	1.24 [0.94, 1.65]		•
Total events	802		898					
Test for our and a final and a	.05; Chi	= 13.34	o, of = 5	(P = 0)	uz);	03%		
rest for overall effect: 2	- 1.52	v = 0.1;	,					
1.1.3 TVR								
Gu 2016	3	310	1	310	0.3%	3.02 [0.31, 29.19]		
Vaduganathan 2016	37	1869	44	1883	4.5%	0.84 [0.54, 1.31]		-+
Weisz 2015	266	2162	580	6419	10.4%	1.41 [1.21, 1.65]		+
Subtotal (95% CI)		4341		8612	15.1%	1.19 [0.76, 1.87]		•
lotal events	306	3 - E 14	625	(a _ o o	e), iš _ c·			
Test for overall effect 2	- 0 75	P = 0.14	- ui = 2 -	(= 0.0	o), r = q.	17		
rest for overall energy.	- 0.7 5	v - v	,,					
Total (95% CI)		37230		62595	100.0%	1.19 [1.06, 1.33]		•
Total events	2760		4829					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (0.03; Chř	² = 51.7	1, df = 1	l7 (P < I).0001); (² = 67%	0.01	0,1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect: 2	= 2.90	(P = 0.00))4)			~~		Favours [PPI] Favours [Control]
lest for subgroup dime	rences: C	nr = 0.2	3, at =	2 (P = 0	.69), F =	0%		
					- ()	A)		
	PP	1	Cont	rol	(-	Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	PP Events	1 Total	Cont Events	rol Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup	PP Events	1 Total	Cont Events	rol Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016	PP Events 32	1 Total 738	Cont Events 48	rol Total 1232	Weight 1.9%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016	PP Events 32 0	Total 738 310	Cont Events 48 0	Total 1232 310	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Mirolau 2015	PP Events 32 0 252 170	Total 738 310 8791	Cont Events 48 0 267	rol Total 1232 310 8807	Weight 1.9% 14.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 75 1.081		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugang 2014	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.20 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.1.4.15]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webz 2015	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190	rol 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webigan 2014	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7	rol 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayedd 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2014 Wibelian 2014 Subtrotal (95% CI)	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Garglulo 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weitsz 2015 Whellan 2014 Subtotai (95% CI) Total events	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 552	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 - 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5%	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webra 2015 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² Test for ownell affect	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 5 552 5.80, df 5 5.80, df	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = 0.6	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f ² 6)	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0%	Veight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Carglulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Whellan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect:	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 0 14 79 5 5 552 5.80, df - Z = 0.45	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); F 6)	Total 1232 310 8607 5577 215 1863 6419 525 24968 = 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 5 552 5.80, df - z = 0.45	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); ř 6)	Total 1232 310 8807 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 (0.71, 1.77) Not estimable 0.94 (0.79, 1.12) 0.20 (0.01, 4.15) 1.09 (0.51, 2.32) 0.21 (0.01, 4.15) 1.24 (0.95, 1.62) 0.71 (0.22, 2.26) 0.98 (0.88, 1.09)	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Ciu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtrotal (95% CI) Tretal events Heterogenetty: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Ciu 2016	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 5.80, df - z = 0.45	Total 738 310 87911 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0	rol Total 1232 310 8807 55577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 310	Veight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.7% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.72] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.06] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webla 2014 Subtotal (3% CI) Total events Heterogenety: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Meanyeddi 2019	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 5 552 5.80, df - Z = 0.45 1 184	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1669 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6 310 8791	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0 159 0	rol Total 1232 310 8807 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 310 8807 6607	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.59 [0.38, 1.09]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Moayedd1 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 5 552 5.80, df- Z = 0.45 1 184 186 9	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1669 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6 310 8791 1666 1955	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0 159 660	rol 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 310 8807 5577 1873 6419 525 24968 = 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.7% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.34, 1.44] 0.54 [0.79, 1.11]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2016 Webz 2015 Subtroal (95% CI) Total events Historogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Mayaeddi 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Vadugarathan 2014	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 5.80, df- 2 = 0.45 1 184 186 3 0	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6 8791 1666 1869 524	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0 159 660 2 0	Tol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 643 525 24968 = 0% 310 8607 5577 1863 5577 1863 5577	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.2% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1%	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.24 (0.75, 1.27) Not estimable 0.34 (0.75, 1.08) 0.30 (0.75, 1.08) 0.30 (0.75, 1.08) 0.30 (0.75, 1.08) 0.31 (0.22, 2.26) 0.34 (0.35, 1.60) 0.36 (0.34, 1.44) 0.34 (0.34, 1.44) 0.34 (0.79, 1.11) 1.15 (0.34, 1.44) 0.34 (0.79, 1.11) 1.15 (0.25, 0.06) Not estimable	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total evenis Heterogenehy: Ch ² Test for overall effect 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicoluu 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whellan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 5.80, df- Z = 0.45 1 184 184 164 3 0	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = (P = 0.6 310 8791 1666 1869 1869 1869	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0 159 660 2 0	rol 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 525 17102	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0,71, 1,77] Not estimable 0.94 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,01,4,15] 1.09 [0,51,2,32] 1.24 [0,95, 1.62] 0.71 [0,22, 2.26] 0.71 [0,22, 2.26] 0.71 [0,22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0,12, 74.17] 1.16 [0,94, 1.44] 0.94 [0,79, 1.11] 1.51 [0,25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0,90, 0, 1.17]	4	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webra 2015 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenety: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2019 Vaduganathan 2016 Vaduganathan 2016 Vaduganathan 2016 Subganathan 2016 Subga	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 5.80, df- z = 0.45 1 184 184 184 3 0 374	Total 738 310 8791 1669 215 1869 2162 524 16275 -6 (P = (P = 0.6 310 8791 1669 524 13160	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 23 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f ² 6) 0 159 660 2 0 821	Tol Total 1232 310 8607 5577 215 1863 6419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8607 5577 1863 525 17102	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.1% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 (0.71, 1.77) Not estimable 0.94 (0.75, 1.12) 0.90 (0.75, 1.06) 0.20 (0.01, 4.15) 1.09 (0.51, 2.32) 1.24 (0.95, 1.62) 0.71 (0.22, 2.26) 0.71 (0.22, 2.26) 0.71 (0.22, 2.26) 0.98 (0.88, 1.09) 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 (0.94, 1.44) 0.94 (0.79, 1.11) 1.11 (0.94, 1.04) 0.94 (0.79, 1.11) 1.51 (0.25, 9.06) Not estimable 1.02 (0.90, 1.17)		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² – Total oventi 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whellian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² –	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 552 5.80, df - 1 184 186 3 0 374 3.00, df -	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1869 2162 524 16275 -6 (P - (P - 0.6 (P - 0.6 8791 1666 1869 524 13160 -3 (P -	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); ř 6) 0 159 660 2 0 821 0.39); ř	rol Total 1232 310 8807 215 1883 6419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 557 1883 525 17102 - 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.39 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.51 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Vaduganathan 2016 Whellan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect:	PP Events 32 0 252 552 552 5.80, df- Z = 0.45 1 184 184 186 3 0 374 3.00, df- Z = 0.35	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 2162 524 16275 -6 (P - (P - 0.6 310 8791 1666 1869 1869 -3 (P - (P - 0.7	Cont Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 6) 0 159 660 2 0 821 0.39); f 3)	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 55577 1863 525 17102 - 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1, 77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4, 15] 0.20 [0.01, 4, 15] 0.21 [0.22, 24] 0.71 [0.22, 26] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.15 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Cu 2016 Cu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2016 Weblar 2015 Weblar 2015 Metrogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Meanagedid 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meanagedid 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meanagedid 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Tetal events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Meanagedid 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meanagedid 2015 Vadugarathan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Tetal events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 14 79 5 5.80, df- 2 = 0.45 1 184 184 184 3 0 374 3.00, df- 2 = 0.35	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1669 2162 524 16275 16675 167555 167555 167555 167555 167555 167555 1675555 1675555 1675555 16755555 16755555 1675555555555	Control Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 190 0 7 1151 0.45); f ² 0 159 660 2 0 821 0.39); f ² 3)	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 3100 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 = 0%	Weight 1.9N 14.6% 14.5% 0.7N 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8N 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0,71, 1.77] Nor estimable 0.34 [0,75, 1.08] 0.30 [0,75, 1.08] 0.30 [0,75, 1.08] 0.30 [0,71, 1.032, 1.24] 0.30 [0,12, 74, 1.71] 1.51 [0,34, 1.43] 0.54 [0,54, 1.44] 0.54 [0,54, 1.44] 1.02 [0,50, 1.17]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.3 CV Death Garolub 2016	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 4 79 5 5552 5.80, df - 2 = 0.45 1 184 186 3 0 374 3.00, df - 2 = 0.35 29	Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 1669 2162 524 16275 - 6 ($P = 0.6$ 310 8791 1666 1869 1869 1869 1869 - 3 ($P = 0.7$ 738	Control Events 48 0 07 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f ² 66) 0 159 660 2 0 0 8211 0.39); f ³ 44	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 = 0% 1232	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 0.7% 5.2% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 1.09 [0.51, 2.32] 1.24 [0.95, 1.62] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.75 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17]	4	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webra 2015 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Wablan 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016	PP Events 32 0 252 170 0 0 14 79 5 5 552 5 5552 5.80, df -1 184 186 3 3 0 0 374 4 3.00, df -2 2 9 0, 374 2 2 9 1	1 Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 524 16275 - 6 (P = 0.6 3100 8791 1666 8791 1666 1669 524 13160 - 3 (P = 0.7 738 310 252 738 310 738 310 758 758 758 758 758 758 758 758	Continue Events 48 0 0 267 624 2 2 13 190 7 1151 0.45); f 60 0 0 159 660 2 0 0.45); f 60 8211 0.39); f 44 0	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5557 2155 1883 6419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 5577 17102 - 0% 1232 310 - 0%	Veight 1.9× 14.6× 14.5× 0.7× 0.7× 5.2× 0.4× 37.5% 0.0× 8.8× 15.2× 0.1× 24.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.24 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Wheathan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Subardi 2019	PP Events 32 252 1700 0 14 79 9 5 552 5.80, df+ 2 2 = 0.45 1 184 8.00, df+ 2 = 0.35 29 1 343	1 Total 738 310 8791 1669 2162 524 16275 524 13160 8791 1669 524 13160 679 - 0.7 738 310 879 - 0.7 738 310 879 - 0.7 738 738 - 0.7 738 - 0.7 748 - 0.7	Continue of the second	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 2155 5577 1883 6419 525 24988 = 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 5257 1873 24988 = 0% 310 8807 1710 24988 = 0% 310 8807 1710 2498 24988 = 0% 310 8807 1710 2498 24988 = 0% 310 8807 24988 = 0% 310 8807 24988 = 0% 310 8807 24988 = 0% 310 8807 24988 = 0% 310 8807 24988 24988 2577 24988 24988 2577 24988 24988 2577 24988 2577 24988 2577 24988 2577 2577 2577 24988 2577 24988 2577 24988 2577 2577 2577 24988 2577 2577 2577 24988 2577 2577 2577 24988 2577 24988 2577	Use of the second secon	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.99 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.21 [0.22, 2.26] 0.38 [0.38, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.15 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17]	•	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016	PP Events 32 32 0 0 252 552 5.80, df 1 184 186 3 3 0 374 4 8.00, df 4 2 2 9 1 343 3188	1 Total 738 310 8791 1669 2162 524 16275 = 6 (P = - (P = 0.6 310 8791 1669 524 13160 = 3 (P = - (P = 0.7 738 310 8791 1669 524 13160 = 3 (P = - (P = 0.7 738) 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1669 524 1310 669 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 1669 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 679 524 1316 1669 524 1316 679 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 524 1316 1669 1679 11 1669 1679 11 1669 1679 11 1669 1679 1669 1679 1669 1679 1669 1679 1669 1679 1669 1679 1669 1669 1679 1669 1669 1679 1669	Continue Events 48 0 0 267 624 2 13 190 0 7 7 1151 10.45); f 660 0 159 660 0 2 0 821 0.39); f 44 0 333 669	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 527 24968 - 0% 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 5557 17102 - 0%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.7% 0.7% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 0.1% 24.1% 1.8% 0.1% 15.2% 1.5.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1, 77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 74.17] 1.16 [0.34, 1.44] 0.98 [0.88, 1.09] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.51 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Webla 2014 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Meayedd 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whetlan 2014 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 Gr Doath Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Subanathan 2016 Gu 2016 Subanathan 2016 Gu 2016 Subanathan 20	PP Events 32 32 0 0 0 14 79 9 5 552 5.80, df 4 7 8 552 5.80, df 1 184 186 3 0 0 0 29 9 1 1343 3.00, df 2 2 9 1 1 343 3.180 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	1 Total 738 8791 1666 8791 16275 524 16275 524 16275 524 16275 524 16275 524 16275 524 16275 524 1666 18699 524 1310 8791 16666 1869 524 1310 8791 16666 1869 524 1310 8791 16666 1869 524 1310 8791 16666 1869 524 1310 16666 1869 524 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310 16666 1310	Continue Events 48 0 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 0.453); f 4 660 2 0 0 821 0.393; f 4 0 0.393; f 4 4 0 333 3669 3.2	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 525 24968 = 0% 3100 8807 5577 1883 6419 525 24968 = 0% 1232 310 8807 5577 1873 8807 5577 1883 6419 525 17102 = 0% 1232 17102 1	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.1	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 I.12 [0,71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,01, 4.15] 1.09 [0,51, 2.32] 1.24 [0,95, 1.62] 0.77 [0,22, 2.26] 0.59 [0.38, 1.09] 0.71 [0,22, 2.26] 0.59 [0,38, 1.09] 1.16 [0,54, 1.44] 0.24 [0,79, 1.11] 1.15 [0,25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0,66, 1.76] 3.01 [0,12, 74.17] 1.10 [0,66, 1.76]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu	PP Events 32 00252 1700 014 479 5 5522 5.80, df- 7 2 = 0.35 300, df- 1 184 186 3 300, df- 3, 2 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 2 9 1 184 3, 300, df- 184 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186 186	Total Total 738 8 310 8791 1866 215 215 2162 2262 524 16275 = 6 (P = 0.6 8791 1666 8791 1669 524 13160 - 3 (P = 0.7 738 310 8791 1669 2162 252 252	Control Events 48 48 0 0267 624 2 13 1900 7 1151 0.45); f ² 0 159 660 0 159 660 0 821 0.39); f ² 33 34 44 0 333 669 3 111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 1232 1702 - 0% 1232 1702 - 0% 1232 100	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.1	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.09 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 2.22] 0.71 [0.22, 2.22] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.51 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.72, 74.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.72, 74.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.72, 74.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.72, 74.17]	←	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2016 Webz 2015 Whellan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenety: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Media 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Media 2015 Heterogenety: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargulo 2016 Magneddi 2019 Nicolu 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Magneddi 2019 Nicolu 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Magneddi 2019 Nicolu 2015 Vadugarathan 2016	PP Events 32 00 252 1700 0 0 252 5.80, df 1 184 186 3 0 3.74 2 = 0.45 3 0 3.74 2 = 0.35 2 = 0.35 2 = 0.35 3.74 184 184 5 = 5 5 = 0.35 2 =	Total Total 738 8 310 8791 1666 215 2162 2162 2162 2162 2162 2162	Conni Events 48 0 267 624 13 190 0.45); f 0.45); f 0.45); f 0.59); f 0.59); f 0.39); f 0.39); f 44 0.39); f 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 4419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 5577 1875 187	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 5.2% 0.4% 8.5% 0.4	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.12 [0.71, 1.77] Nor estimable 0.34 [0.75, 1.08] 0.30 [0.75, 1.08] 0.30 [0.75, 1.08] 0.30 [0.75, 1.08] 0.30 [0.12, 74, 17] 1.16 [0.34, 1.44] 0.54 [0.54, 1.44] 0.54 [0.54, 1.44] 1.02 [0.50, 1.17] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74, 17] 1.30 [0.8, 1.78] 1.10 [0.68, 1.78] 1.30 [0.32, 74, 17] 1.30 [0.48, 1.78] 1.30 [0.48, 1.78] 1.30 [0.49, 1.16] 1.57 [1.14, 2.16] 0.33 [0.79, 1.11] 1.57 [1.14, 2.16] 0.33 [0.74, 1.17] 1.57 [0.44, 1.16] 0.31 [0.44, 1.16]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Giu 2016 Giu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.2 Stroke Giu 2016 Whealen 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Waayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Giu 2016 Gu 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenetis Gu 2014 Gu	PP Events 32 00 252 550 5 550 5 80, df- 1 184 186 3 0 0 374 4 3.00, df- 2 = 0.45 5 58 8 8 9 9 9 1 343 343 3188 8 5 5 58 8 8 0 0 624	Total Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 215 2162 524 16275 - 6 (P - 0.6 310 8791 1666 524 13160 - 3 (P - 0.7 738 310 8791 1669 2162 2162 2162 2162 1669 1669 16	Conni Events 48 0 267 624 2 13 1900 7 1151 0.45); f 66) 0 159 660 2 0 0 821 0.33); f 44 0 333 3 669 3 111 1 1 1161	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 1863 4419 525 24968 - 0% 310 8807 5577 1863 5577 1863 6419 5577 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 1863 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 0.7% 5.2% 0.4% 0.7% 24.1% 1.8% 0.1% 24.1% 0.1% 0.2% 3.1% 0.2% 3.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0,71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.99 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.38 [0.38, 1.09] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.38 [0.38, 1.09] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.30 [0.68, 1.20] 1.03 [0.68, 1.20] 1.30 [0.97, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.33 [0.01, 8.20] 1.34 [0.94, 1.16]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Cu 2016 Cu 2016 Nicolau 2015 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2016 Webz 2015 Subtroal (95% CI) Total events Hiterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Cu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Whelian 2014 Subtroal (95% CI) Total events Hiterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Cargiulo 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Cu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Hieterogenethy: Ch ² =	PP Events 32 0 0252 5 5 8 0 1 1 184 186 3 0 0 3 7 4 3.00, df - 2 2 9 13 3 43.00, df - 2 2 9 14 3.00, df - 2 5 5 8 8 0 0 6 4 4 3.00, df - 2 5 5 5 5 8 8 0, df - 2 5 5 5 5 8 10 0 0 10 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total Total 738 310 8791 1666 215 524 2162 524 2162 524 7162 738 310 8791 1666 8791 1666 1869 2524 738 310 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1666 0 8791 1667 1667 1667 1667 1667 1667 1667 1	Connection Connectica	rol Total 1232 3100 8807 5577 1883 6419 525 24968 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 1232 3100 8807 5577 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 5577 1715 1715 1715 1715 1715 1715 1715 1715 1715 1883 1715 1715 1715 1883 1715 1715 1715 1883 1715 1883 1715 1883 1715 1883 1715 1883 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1885 1715 1715 1885 1715	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1% 1.8% 0.0% 18.0% 18.5%	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.24 (0.75, 1.02) 0.29 (0.75, 1.08) 0.20 (0.75, 1.08) 0.20 (0.75, 1.08) 0.20 (0.75, 1.08) 0.21 (0.22, 2.22) 0.21 (0.22, 2.22) 0.23 (0.22, 2.22) 0.24 (0.22, 2.22) 0.24 (0.22, 2.22) 0.24 (0.22, 2.22) 0.24 (0.22, 2.22) 0.24 (0.24, 1.23) 0.25 (0.26, 1.26) Not estimable 1.02 (0.90, 1.17) 1.10 (0.66, 1.76) 3.01 (0.12, 74.17) 1.25 (0.90, 1.17) 1.25 (0	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Moayeddi 2019 Nicoluu 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Moayeddi 2019 Nicoluu 2015 Gargulo 2016 Gu 2017 Nicoluu 2017 Nicoluu 2017 Nicoluu 2017 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Nicoluu 2015 Subtotal (93% CI) Total events Heterogenenity: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: Total events Heterogenetity: Ch ² – Total events Heterogenetity: Ch ² – Total events	PP Events 32 0 02522 5552 5552 5552 5552 5552 555	Total To	Control Events 48 8 0 267 624 2 13 190 7 1151 159 660 0 159 660 0 0 2 0 0 821 1 0 3 33 44 40 0 333 111 111 111 0 .059; P 4 0 0 0 267 159 159 159 159 159 159 159 159	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 215 1883 6419 525 24958 - 0% 310 8807 5577 1883 525 24753 - 35%	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.0% 24.1% 1.8% 24.1% 1.8% 0.0% 3.1% 3.5% 0.1% 3.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.08] 0.20 [0.71, 1.07] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.21 [0.22, 2.26] 0.39 [0.38, 1.09] 0.21 [0.22, 2.26] 0.39 [0.38, 1.09] 0.31 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.51 [0.22, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.7] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.30 [0.63, 1.20] 0.33 [0.01, 2, 74]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Gu 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI)	PP Events 32 0 0252 5.80, df - 2 5.80, df - 2 2 5.80, df - 2 2 9 1 184 4.86 6.36 6.00, df - 1 184 8.00, df - 2 2 9 1 3 74 8.00, df - 2 2 9 1 3 74 8.00, df - 2 5 5 2 2 9 1 2 0 0 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1 70 1	Total 738 8 310 8791 1666 215 5 524 1659 9 2162 524 16275 - 6 (P - 0.4 310 8791 1666 - 3 (P - 7 738 310 8791 1666 8791 1669 2162 524 16660 - 6 (P - 0.4 45454	Control Events 48 8 0 267 624 2 2 113 190 7 1151 0.45); P 6 660 0 821 0.45); P 6 660 0 821 10.45); P 7 44 40 333 669 31 111 111 1161 10.6; P 7 1151 1161	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 6619 525 24968 - 0% 3100 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 527 5577 1883 5577 557	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 5.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.1% 24.1% 1.8% 0.0% 38.5% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.90 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.03 [0.89, 1.20] 0.33 [0.01, 1.62] 1.04 [0.94, 1.16]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Cargiulo 2016 Cu 2016 Cu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2016 Webz 2015 Whellan 2014 Subtocal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenetry: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Cu 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Micolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Maayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Nicolau 2015 Vadugarathan 2016 Nicolau 2015 Nicolau 2016 Nicolau 2015 Nicolau 2015 Nicolau 2015 Nico	PP Events 32 0 0252 5.80, df 4 75 5 5.80, df 1 184 186 8.00, df 3 3 0 0 374 4 8.00, df 4 2 9 9 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 343 1 355 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total 738 8 310 8791 1666 215 524 1 16275 - 6 (P - 0 8791 1669 1 16275 - 7 310 8791 1 1666 1 1869 1 1869 1 1866 - 0 738 8 310 8791 1 1666 1 1869 2 162 524 1 16660 - 6 (P - 0, 4 16600 - 6 (P - 0, 4) (P - 0	Continue Con	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 6419 5252 2452 2452 2452 2452 2453 24555 24555 24555 24555 24555 2455577 245557 2455577 2455577 2455577 245557	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 8.8% 0.1% 24.1% 1.8% 0.1% 0	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 I.12 [0,71, 177] Nor estimable 0.94 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,75, 1.08] 0.20 [0,12, 132] 1.24 [0,25, 1.06] 0.59 [0,12, 74, 177] 1.16 [0,94, 1.44] 0.54 [0,79, 1.11] 1.51 [0,25, 5.06] Nor estimable 1.02 [0,50, 1.17] 1.10 [0,68, 1.76] 0.33 [0,04, 1.76] 0.33 [0,04, 1.76] 0.33 [0,04, 1.76] 0.33 [0,04, 1.26] 0.33 [0,04, 1.26] 0.34 [0,05, 1.16]	·	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargiulo 2016 Giu 2016 Giu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2016 Weblar 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Giu 2016 Meayeddi 2019 Nicolau 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whellan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Gargiulo 2016 Weblan 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² = Total (95% CI) Total events	PP Events 32 0 0 252 55 552 552 552 552 552 5 552 1 1 184 186 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 5 5 2 9 1 14 3 43 3 0, d ⁺ 7 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total 7388 310 8791 1666 215 524 16275 = 6 (P = -6 (P = -0.7 3100 8791 16669 524 16275 = 370 738 310 8791 16669 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 2162 524 16699 524 738 8791 1666 1669 524 1669 525 524 1669 525 524 1669 555 524 1669 555 524 1669 555 524 1669 555 524 1669 555 524 1669 555 525 524 1669 555 524 1669 525 524 1669 525 524 1669 525 524 1669 525 524 1669 525 524 1659 525 1659 524 1659 525 1659 525 1659 525 1659 525 1659 525 54 5455 555 555 555 555 555 555 555	Continue Con	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 24968 - 0% 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 8807 5577 1883 525 17102 - 0% 8807 5577 1883 525 525 525 525 525 525 525 52	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 8.8% 15.2% 0.4% 37.5% 0.4% 24.1% 1.8% 0.0% 18.0% 18.0% 18.0% 18.0% 10.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.12 [0,71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.79, 1.12] 0.99 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.38, 1.09] 0.71 [0.22, 2.26] 0.98 [0.38, 1.09] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.51 [0.25, 9.06] Not estimable 1.02 [0.90, 1.7] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 3.01 [0.2, 74.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.78] 1.03 [0.68, 1.20] 1.04 [0.94, 1.16] 1.04 [0.94, 1.16]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vadugarathan 2015 Webra 2015 Webra 2015 Webra 2015 Webra 2015 Magnethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Magnethan 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Magnethan 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Magnethan 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Magnethan 2015 Vaduganathan 2015 Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect: Total events Heterogenethy: Ch ² = Test for overall effect:	pp Events 32 2 0 0 0 14 7 9 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 0 0 374 1 184 184 186 186 3 0 0 374 3.00, df 1 1 8 4 3 1 8 4 8 5 5 5 5 2 9 0 1 7 0 0 14 0 170 0 14 0 170 0 14 0 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 170 0 14 184 184 184 184 184 184 184 184 184	Total 7388 310 8791 16666 215 524 16275 -6 (P - (P - 0.6 (P - 3100 8791 16666 524 16899 524 18699 524 13160 18699 2162 252 1310 16660 -6 (P - (P - 0.4 45495 -6 (P - 0.7) 7388 310 16660 -6 (P - 0.7) 7388 310 16660 -6 (P - 0.7) 7388 738 738 738 738 738 738 738 738 73	Continent Contin	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 1883 6807 5577 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 1710 1232 1710 1232 1710 1232 1710 1232 1710 1232 1710 1232 1710 1715 1715 1710 1715 17	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 5.2% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.7% 0.4% 0.4% 0.4% 0.1% 0.0% 0.	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.04 (0.75), 102 0.04 (0.75), 102 0.05 (0.75), 108 0.05 (0.75), 108 0.05 (0.75), 108 0.071 (0.22, 2.26 0.39 (0.86, 1.09) 3.01 (0.12, 74.17] 1.16 (0.34, 1.44) 0.54 (0.79, 1.11] 1.10 (0.56, 1.78] 1.02 (0.90, 1.17] 1.10 (0.66, 1.78] 1.01 (0.65, 1.78] 1.57 (1.14, 2.16] 0.33 (0.01, 6.20] 1.04 (0.94, 1.16] 1.01 (0.95, 1.08]		Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.1 MI Gargulo 2016 Gu 2016 Gu 2016 Sugano 2014 Vaduganathan 2015 Sugano 2014 Subtotal (93% Cl) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.2 Stroke Gu 2016 Moayedd 2019 Nicolu 2015 Vaduganathan 2016 Whelian 2014 Subtotal (93% Cl) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 CV Death Moayedd 2016 Gu 2016 Subtotal (93% Cl) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogenenity: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogenehy: Ch ² – Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl)	pp Events 32 0 0 252 5.80, df -1 555 5.80, df -1 1 184 186 3 0 0 374 4 3.00, df -1 2 = 0.45 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total 738 310 6791 1666 215 524 16275 = 6 (P = 0.6 310 6791 16666 6791 16666 3310 6791 16666 9524 16699 2162 2524 16699 - 6 (P = 0.7 738 310 6791 1666 6791 16669 - 6 (P = 0.7 738 310 6791 1666 6791 16669 - 6 (P = 0.7 738 310 6791 16669 - 7 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 310 748 748 310 748 748 748 748 748 748 748 748 748 748	Continue Con	rol Total 1232 310 8807 5577 2155 5577 24968 - 0% 310 8807 525 17102 - 0% 1232 310 8807 525 310 8807 525 310 8807 525 310 8807 525 527 527 527 527 527 527 52	Weight 1.9% 14.6% 14.5% 0.1% 5.2% 0.0% 37.5% 0.0% 24.1% 1.8% 24.1% 1.8% 0.2% 3.1% 15.2% 0.1% 15.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% C1 1.12 [0.71, 1.77] Not estimable 0.94 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.75, 1.08] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.20 [0.01, 4.15] 0.21 [0.22, 2.26] 0.39 [0.38, 1.09] 0.30 [0.12, 74.17] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 0.94 [0.79, 1.11] 1.16 [0.94, 1.44] 1.02 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.66, 1.76] 3.01 [0.12, 74.17] 1.10 [0.90, 1.17] 1.10 [0.90, 1.71] 1.10 [0.90, 1.71] 1.10 [0.90, 1.71]	, 	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI

Figure 3. (**A**) Forest plot illustrating the cardiovascular risk associated with long-term PPI use using a random-effects model. (**B**) Forest plot illustrating the cardiovascular risk associated with long-term PPI use using a fixed-effects model. Zhang 2015 [9]; Gu 2016 [14]; Nicolau 2015 [15]; Gargiulo 2016 [16]; Moayeddi 2019 [17]; Sugano 2014 [18]; Vaduganathan 2016 [19]; Whellan 2014 [23]; Jackson 2016 [20]; Weisz 2015 [21].

3.5. Subgroup Analysis

In the first subgroup analysis assessing the cardiovascular risk associated with the concomitant use of clopidogrel and PPIs, we found that this co-therapy heightened the risk of ACD (OR 1.50, 95% CI 1.23–1.82, p < 0.001) but did not raise the risks of MACEs (OR 1.20, 95% CI 0.97–1.48, p = 0.09), MI (OR 1.03, 95% CI 0.80–1.32, p = 0.81), stroke (OR 0.87, 95% CI 0.68–1.11, *p* = 0.26), TVR (OR 1.19, 95% CI 0.76–1.87, *p* = 0.45), or CVD (OR 1.17, 95% CI 0.82–1.66, p = 0.38); (Figure 4). However, heterogeneity I² was moderate to high for four outcomes (MACEs, MI, TVR, CVD), ranging from 44% to 72%, and nil for only two outcomes (stroke, ACD). The subgroup analysis of the RCTs (heterogeneity $I^2 = 0\%$ for each evaluated outcome) did not demonstrate any significant association between PPI use and the risks of MACEs (OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.94–1.11, *p* = 0.63), MI (OR 0.93, 95% CI 0.83–1.05, *p* = 0.25), stroke (OR 1.17 95% CI 0.95–1.45, *p* = 0.14), CVD (OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.89–1.11, *p* = 0.95), or ACD (OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.93–1.16, *p* = 0.46) (Figure 5). These results remained stable after excluding the two post hoc analyses [16,17]. The risk of TVR within the RCTs could not be assessed due to a lack of available data. The pulled data from the two included observational studies (OS) demonstrated a significantly increased risk of MACEs in the PPI group (OR 1.42, 95% CI [1.29–1.57], p < 0.001; $I^2 = 0$ %). The other outcomes could not be assessed due to the lack of available data in OS (unpublished figure). Considering the available data within the included studies, the post hoc subgroup analysis regarding specific PPIs only addressed the influence of omeprazole on the outcomes of interest. This pooled analysis, involving three RCTs, found that omeprazole use was not associated with the occurrence of adverse cardiovascular events (overall pooled OR 0.96, CI 95% 0.76–1.21, p = 0.72; $I^2 = 0\%$; Figure 6).



Figure 4. Forest plot illustrating the risk of cardiovascular events associated with the concomitant use of clopidogrel and PPIs using a random-effects model. Zhang 2015 [9]; Gu 2016 [14]; Nicolau 2015 [15]; Gargiulo 2016 [16]; Vaduganathan 2016 [19]; Jackson 2016 [20]; Weisz 2015 [21].

	PD		Con	rol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 MACEs						,,		
Gargiulo 2016	85	738	113	1232	2.5%	1.29 [0.96, 1.74]		
Gu 2016	6	310	7	310	0.2%	1.15 [0.41, 3.20]		
Moayeddi 2019	691	8791	668	6607	20.4%	1.04 [0.93, 1.16]		Ţ
Nicolau 2015 Vaduenaethen 2016	171	1666	617	1003	5.5%	0.92 [0.77, 1.10]		<u> </u>
Whellon 2014	45	524	13	525	0.4%	0.55 [0.04, 1.41]		
Zhang 2015	7	53	5	51	0.1%	1.40 [0.41, 4.73]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	13951	-	18385	33.9%	1.02 [0.94, 1.11]		•
Total events	1020		1475					
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = \frac{1}{2}$	5.03, df -	= 6 (P =	0.54); l ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.48	$\langle P = 0.6 \rangle$	3)					
1.4.2 MI								
Gargiulo 2016	32	738	48	1232	1.1%	1.12 [0.71, 1.77]		<u> </u>
Gu 2016	0	310	Ó	310	-	Not estimable		
Moayeddi 2019	252	6791	267	6607	6.6%	0.94 [0.79, 1.12]		+
Nicolau 2015	170	1666	624	5577	6.6%	0.90 [0.75, 1.08]		-
Sugano 2014	.0	215	2	215	0.1%	0.20 [0.01, 4.15]	•	
Vaduganathan 2016	14	1869	13	1663	0.4%	1.09 [0.51, 2.32]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	,	14113		18549	19.1%	0.93 [0.83, 1.05]		
Total events	473		961	105.5	10.170	0100 [0100] 1100]		1
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	2.12, df	= 5 (P =	0.83); 12	- 0%				
Test for overall effect:	z = 1.16	(P = 0.2)	5)					
1.4.2.6								
1.4.3 Stroke								
GU 2016 Manurddi 2019	184	31U 8701	150	310	0.0% 5.2%	3.01 [0.12, 74.17]		
Vaducanathan 2016	104	1869	155	1883	0.1%	1 51 [0 25 9 06]		
Wheilan 2014	ő	524	ō	525	4.1/4	Not estimable		
Subtotal (95% CI)		11494		11525	5.2%	1.17 [0.95, 1.45]		•
Total events	166		161					
Heterogeneity: Chi ⁺ = (0.42, df -	= 2 (P =	0.81); ۴	- 0%				
lest for overall effect:	Z = 1.47	(P = 0.1)	4)					
1.4.4 CV death								
Gargiulo 2016	29	738	44	1232	1.1%	1.10 [0.66, 1.76]		<u> </u>
Gu 2016	1	310	0	310	0.0%	3.01 [0.12, 74.17]		
Moayeddi 2019	343	6791	333	6607	10.6%	1.03 [0.89, 1.20]		+
Nicolau 2015	166	1666	669	5577	9.1%	0.93 [0.79, 1.11]		-
Vaduganathan 2016	5	1569	3	1553	0.1%	1.65 [0.40, 7.04]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	v	13898	T	18334	20.9%	1.00 [0.89, 1.11]		
Total events	566		1050					I
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	2.37, df -	- 5 (P -	0.80); l ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect:	z = 0.06	(P = 0.9	5)					
1 4 5 All cause death								
Carolulo 2016	53	730	77	1232	1 84	1 16 10 81 1 671		<u> </u>
Gu 2016		310	1	310	0.0%	1.00 0.06. 16 061		
Moaveddi 2019	630	8791	614	8807	16.9%	1.03 [0.92. 1.16]		+
Sugano 2014	Ő	215	0	215		Not estimable		
Vaduganathan 2016	5	1869	4	1663	0.1%	1.26 [0.34, 4.70]		
Whellan 2014	2	524	2	525	0.1%	1.00 [0.14, 7.14]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	~~ *	12447		12972	20.9%	1.04 [0.93, 1.16]		Ţ
Heteropenetty Chi ² - 4	146 44- 991	- A /P	0.087-15	- 05				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.75	(P = 0.4)		- 1/4				
Total (95% CI)		65903		79765	100.0%	1.01 [0.96, 1.06]		
Total events	2938		4345					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	14.36, df	= 26 (P	= 0.97}	; i* = 0%			0.01	0.1 1 10 100
Test for subgroup diffe	z = 0.45	(r = 0.6 `hF = Λ 4	19 df -	4 (P = 0	39) P -	2.2%		Favours [PPI] Favours [control]
				- v - v				

Figure 5. Forest plot illustrating the risk of cardiovascular events associated with the long-term PPI use within the RCTs using a fixed-effects model. Zhang 2015 [9]; Gu 2016 [14]; Nicolau 2015 [15]; Gargiulo 2016 [16]; Moayeddi 2019 [17]; Sugano 2014 [18]; Vaduganathan 2016 [19]; Whellan 2014 [23].

3.6. Heterogeneity and Sensitivity Analyses

In order to evaluate the influence of high heterogeneity on the results obtained, we performed sensitivity analyses by excluding each study successively until $I^2 = 0$. No sensitivity analyses were performed for the randomized controlled trial subgroup, the observational study subgroup, or the omeprazole subgroup as original heterogeneity I^2 was nil for these three analyses. PPI use became significantly at risk for TVR in the primary analysis (p < 0.001) after excluding one study. All other results remained stable (Table 3). After the exclusion of one to two studies for each outcome, combined PPI/clopidogrel therapy was at increased risk of MACEs (p < 0.001), TVR (p < 0.001), and CVD (p = 0.008). The risk of MI remained insignificant (p = 0.29) (Table 3).

	Omepr	azole	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.13.1 MACEs							
Gu 2016	8	310	7	310	4.6%	1.15 [0.41, 3.20]	
Vaduganathan 2016	49	1869	52	1663	34.0%	0.95 [0.64, 1.41]	+
Whellan 2014	9	524	13	525	8.6%	0.69 [0.29, 1.62]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2703		2718	47.3%	0.92 [0.66, 1.29]	•
Total events	66	• /=	72				
Heterogeneity: Chr =	0.64, dt -	- 2 (P =	0.73); F	= 0%			
lest for overall effect:	Z = V.46	(r = 0.0	(3)				
1.13.2 MI							
Gu 2016	0	310	0	310		Not estimable	
Vaduganathan 2016	14	1869	13	1883	8.7%	1.09 [0.51, 2.32]	
Whellan 2014	5	524	7	525	4.7%	0.71 [0.22, 2.26]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2703		2718	13.3%	0.96 [0.51, 1.79]	•
Total events	19		20				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.36, df -	= 1 (P =	0.55); P	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.14	$\langle P = 0.6 \rangle$	19)				
1 12 2 6							
1.13.3 Stroke					· ···		
Gu 2016	1	310	0	310	0.3%	3.01 [0.12, 74.17]	
Vaduganathan 2016	3	1669	2	1553	1.37	1.51 [0.25, 9.06]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	v	2703	v	2718	1.7%	1.81 (0.39.8.51)	
Total events		2705	2	2710	1.770	1.01 [0.55, 0.51]	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 =$	0.14. df -	= 1 (P =	0.71): P	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.75	(P = 0.4)	(5)	- •/•			
1.13.4 TVR							
Gu 2016	3	310	1	310	0.7%	3.02 [0.31, 29.19]	
Vaduganathan 2016	37	1869	44	1663	29.0%	0.84 [0.54, 1.31]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2179		2193	29.7%	0.89 [0.58, 1.37]	•
Total events	40		45				
Heterogeneity: Chi* =	1.17, df	= 1 (P =	0.26); *	= 15%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.51	(P = 0.6	11}				
1.13.5 CV death							
Gu 2016	1	310	0	310	0.3%	3 01 0 12 74 171	
Vaducanathan 2016	ŝ	1869	3	1883	2.0%	1.68 (0.40, 7.04)	
Wheilan 2014	ō	524	1	525	1.0%	0.33 [0.01, 8.20]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	•	2703	_	2718	3.4%	1.41 [0.45, 4.44]	
Total events	6		4				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.05, df •	= 2 (P =	0.59); f ²	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.58	(P = 0.5	6)				
1 12 6 411							
1.13.6 All cause deal	(n		_		A		
GU 2016	1	310	1	310	0.7%	1.00 [0.06, 16.06]	
vaquganathan 2016 Whallan 2014	>	1003	4	1003	1.21	1.20 [0.34, 4.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	2	2703	2	2718	4.7%	1.15 [0.42, 3.17]	
Total events	P	2103	,	2710	-117/0	113 [0.76, 3.17]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.05. df -	= 2 (P =	0.981: 14	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.27	(P = 0.7)	(9)	~/-			
			-7				
Total (95% CI)		15694		15783	100.0%	0.96 [0.76, 1.21]	
Total events	143		150				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.75, df •	= 14 (P -	= 0.99);	² = 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.36	$\langle \mathbf{P} = 0.7$	2)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subgroup diff	erences: (Chl² = 1.	36. df =	5 (P = 0)).93). I ² =	0%	receive texperimental introdus teamoil

Figure 6. Forest plot illustrating the cardiovascular risk associated with long-term omeprazole use. Gu 2016 [14]; Vaduganathan 2016 [19]; Whellan 2014 [23].

3.7. Publication Bias

Visual inspection of the funnel plots performed for the primary analysis and RCT subgroup analysis found no evidence of publication bias (Figure 7A,B,D). Conversely, the funnel plot of the clopidogrel/PPI subgroup analysis suggested the existence of publication bias as the PPI effects estimated in each included study scatter asymmetrically around the summary effect (Figure 7C). The number of studies involved in the omeprazole subgroup analysis was too small to expect relevant interpretation of a funnel plot. Therefore, we did not calculate a funnel plot for this specific analysis.

Meta-Analysis	Outcome	Removed Studies	Results
	MACEs	[20,21]	OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.94–1.11, <i>p</i> = 0.62
Primary Analysis	TVR	[19]	OR 1.42, 95% CI 1.22–1.65, <i>p</i> < 0.01
T finitury T final yold	CVD	[21]	OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.89–1.11, <i>p</i> = 0.95
	ACD	[21]	OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.93–1.16, <i>p</i> = 0.45
	MACEs	[15,19]	OR 1.45, 95% CI 1.31–1.60, <i>p</i> < 0.001
Clopidogrel Analysis	MI	[21]	OR 0.89, 95% CI 0.72–1.11, <i>p</i> = 0.29
Clopidogiel Analysis	TVR	[19]	OR 1.42, 95% CI 1.22–1.65, <i>p</i> < 0.001
	CVD	[15]	OR 1.42, 95% CI 1.09–1.84, <i>p</i> = 0.008

Table 3. Sensitivity analysis summary ($I^2 = 0\%$).

MACEs, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; TVR, target vessel revascularization; CVD, cardiovascular death; ACD, all cause death.



Figure 7. (**A**) Funnel plot of the publication bias within the studies assessed in the primary analysis using a random-effects model. (**B**) Funnel plot of the publication bias within the studies assessed in the primary analysis using a fixed-effects model. (**C**) Funnel plot of the publication bias within studies analyzing the combination of clopidogrel and PPIs. (**D**) Funnel plot of the publication bias within the RCTs.

4. Discussion

We conducted this meta-analysis with the aim of assessing the risks of various cardiovascular events associated with long-term PPI use among patients with known atheromatous cardiovascular disease. Overall, the main results of our meta-analysis demonstrated no evidence that PPIs as a drug class were associated with an increased risk of adverse cardiovascular events. However, conflicting results were found for the combined use of PPIs and clopidogrel. Overall, the subgroup analysis involving high I² found that this combined therapy was safe, while the sensitivity analysis that controlled for I² found opposite results. Nevertheless, the PPI/clopidogrel co-therapy subgroup analysis was susceptible to potential publication bias according to the visual interpretation of the funnel plot, which entails a greater risk of publication bias in the sensitivity analysis that included a smaller number of studies. When considering specific PPIs, the independent assessment of omeprazole's effects on cardiovascular health found it to be safe.

The potential cardiovascular risk associated with PPI use has been studied by several authors, mostly in retrospective observational studies, a study design most likely to lead to selection, confusion, and information bias. It seems that a causal link between PPI exposure and adverse events can hardly be established if there are uncertainties in the measurement of the exposure to PPIs. Moreover, target populations differ from one study to another, which might have resulted in considerable meta-analytic heterogeneity in patients' baseline characteristics (patients with chronic heart disease +/- acute coronary syndrome +/- post-percutaneous coronary intervention +/- dual antiplatelet therapy including clopidogrel and/or aspirin +/- heart failure; overall population). Several pathophysiological mechanisms have also been put forward to support and justify the study of this risk. However, it must be noted that these articles report conflicting results for both clinical and biological outcomes. Furthermore, we could observe that performing randomized controlled trials versus cohort studies led to diametrically opposite results in most published studies. While cohort studies, prospective or retrospective, tend to support the hypothesis of an increased cardiovascular risk during long-term PPI exposure, randomized controlled trials tend to refute this hypothesis. The same is true for meta-analyses including mostly cohort studies and those including exclusively or almost exclusively randomized controlled trials. Therefore, a significant association between PPI use and cardiovascular events could be more likely related to unmeasured potential confounders than related to a PPI's proven toxicity.

Finally, most published meta-analyses pulled data from different study designs, which is expected to lead to differences in the observed intervention effects, increasing heterogeneity and weakening the accuracy of the results. [22]

The potential drug–drug interaction between PPIs and clopidogrel that may increase the incidence of cardiovascular ischemic events was the hypothetical case most studied. The increased cardiovascular risk associated with the combined use of clopidogrel and PPIs could result from a competitive interaction between clopidogrel and PPIs with cytochrome P450 isoenzyme 2C19 (CYP2C19), affecting the clopidogrel-specific inhibition of ADP-induced platelet aggregation. Moreover, the conversion of clopidogrel to its active metabolite varied depending on CYP2C19 genetic polymorphisms [27], with 4% to 30% of people being low metabolizers or non-metabolizers, while the others are described as rapid metabolizers [9]. An affinity to CYP2C19 also differed from one PPI to another, with the highest affinity found for omeprazole and the lowest affinity or no affinity found for pantoprazole depending on the study [24,27–30].

In a meta-analysis of 31 observational studies and 4 RCTs assessing PPI/clopidogrel cardiovascular risk within patients in the post-discharge treatment of unstable angina/non-ST segment elevation myocardial infarction, Melloni et al. [31] found an increased risk of cardiovascular outcomes and stroke in observational studies, while no differences between omeprazole and placebo were found in four RCTs, despite reducing upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Another meta-analysis involving 18 cohort studies (Shi et al. [32]) reflected a higher risk of MACEs and cerebrovascular events (p < 0.001), ACD (p < 0.001), cardiac death (p < 0.001), myocardial infarction (p < 0.001), stent thrombosis (p < 0.001), TVR (p = 0.005), and stroke (p = 0.003), with moderate to high I², within patients taking clopidogrel and PPI after stent implantation. In a pooled analysis of 39 studies (31 cohort studies, 8 RCTs and propensity-matched studies), Cardoso et al. [33] found that the concomitant use of PPIs and clopidogrel heightened the risks of ACD (p < 0.001), MI (p < 0.001), stent thrombosis (p = 0.02), acute coronary syndrome (p = 0.004), and cerebrovascular accident (p < 0.001). Similar results were found in an analysis restricted to cohort studies. However, in a separate pooled analysis of eight RCTs and propensity-matched studies, Cardoso et al. found that combined PPIs and clopidogrel use had no impact on the occurrence of cardiovascular outcomes (ACD *p* = 0.66; ACS *p* = 0.35; MI *p* = 0.65; CVA *p* = 0.34; TVR OR 0.88; *p* = 0.01)

while significantly reducing the risk of gastrointestinal bleeding (OR 0.24, p = 0.003). After pulling data from 22 cohort studies and 6 RCTs, Lee et al. [34] found that the concomitant use of PPIs and clopidogrel increased the risk of MACEs (p < 0.001), CVD (p < 0.001), and MI (p < 0.001), with high heterogeneity for most analyses up to 90%. Nevertheless, the pulled data from the six RCTs showed no significant association between PPI/clopidogrel co-therapy and the risk of MACEs (p = 0.96, $I^2 = 90\%$). When considering each specific PPI separately in adjusted analyses (I² ranging from 0% to 85%), omeprazole, pantoprazole, and lansoprazole were at increased risk for MACEs, while esomeprazole and rabeprazole were not (p = 0.19 and p = 0.40, respectively). PPI use was found to be a protective factor against gastrointestinal bleeding (RR = 0.29, p < 0.001; $I^2 = 0\%$). The meta-analysis by Bundhun et al. [35] including nine cohort studies and two RCTs showed that the combination of clopidogrel and PPIs increased the risks of MACEs, MI, stent thrombosis, and TVR but not the risk of mortality for a PPI exposure greater than one year. In a meta-analysis of seven observational studies, Kwok et al. [36] found an elevated risk of MACEs independent of clopidogrel use. Kwok et al. also found an increased risk of MACEs in association with lansoprazole, omeprazole, esomeprazole, and pantoprazole individually when used with clopidogrel.

With regard to biological investigations, Gu et al. [14], Zhang et al. [9], and Lin et al. [37] did not find a significant risk of higher platelet reactivity (p = 0.17; p > 0.05; p = 0.4315respectively) after measuring platelet reactivity in the blood samples of patients receiving clopidogrel, while Weisz et al. [21] found an opposite result (OR 1.38, 95% CI 1.25–1.52, p = 0.001). Sibbing et al. [38] found that omeprazole was significantly associated with a higher platelet aggregation when combined with clopidogrel, while pantoprazole and esomeprazole were not. In relation to CYP2C19 polymorphisms, Furuta et al. [29] reported that omeprazole and rabeprazole significantly lowered the mean inhibition of platelet aggregation (IPA) induced by clopidogrel in rapid metabolizers, while the decreased metabolizers (low and non-metabolizers) were more likely to convert from "responders" (IPA \geq 30%) to "non-responders" (IPA < 30%) when using a concomitant PPI. They also found that taking PPIs and clopidogrel at two separate times of the day did not prevent the drug-drug interaction between clopidogrel and a PPI. Furuta et al. [29] did not bring to light any difference between omeprazole, rabeprazole, and lansoprazole combined with clopidogrel versus clopidogrel alone regardless of CYP2C19 polymorphisms. In a study enrolling 174 patients, Hokimoto et al. [39] found significantly lower platelet reactivity in patients on clopidogrel and carrying CYP2C19 normal function alleles (extensive metabolizers, EM) compared with patients carrying one (intermediate metabolizers, IM) or two (poor metabolizers, PM) loss-of-function alleles. In line with these results, the cardiovascular event rate was higher in the IM and PM groups than in the EM group. The specific assessment of rabeprazole, a PPI known for having less affinity for CYP2C19, demonstrated no significant differences in residual platelet aggregation or in cardiovascular event rate when combined with clopidogrel versus clopidogrel alone. In a meta-analysis involving four cohort studies and one RCT, Biswas et al. [40] claimed that patients bearing the dual burdens of carrying CYP2C19 loss-of-function alleles and taking PPIs and clopidogrel concomitantly faced a higher risk of major adverse cardiovascular events. However, in studies assessing the influence of CYP2C19 polymorphisms on cardiovascular outcomes, sample sizes appear to be too small for detecting a reliable difference in biological and clinical outcomes.

Independent of clopidogrel use, Dahal et al. [41] demonstrated that PPI use alone was not at increased risk for cardiovascular mortality, all-cause mortality, myocardial infarction, or stroke in a meta-analysis of nine RCTs including patients taking aspirin for the prevention of cardiovascular diseases and stroke. Zhai et al. [42] sought to examine the safety of PPIs for cardiac and vascular health using the Food and Drug Administration Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS). PPIs were not associated with more cardiac and vascular events compared with the whole database. However, the authors reported a wide range of vascular signals and to a lesser extent cardiac signals. Pantoprazole and

esomeprazole showed the broadest spectrums of signals. However, there is no certainty that the reported adverse events are due to the PPIs involved.

Another hypothetical biological mechanism advanced by some authors involves a dysfunction of the vascular endothelium. Endothelial nitric oxide synthase (NOS) is an enzyme that produces the vasoprotective and vasodilator molecule nitric oxide (NO) [43]. Plasma asymmetrical dimethylarginine (ADMA) is an endogenous inhibitor of nitric oxide synthase. Thus, elevated plasma ADMA levels might increase the occurrence of cardio-vascular events. In 2013, Ghebremariam et al. [7] published a paper explaining that PPIs elevated plasma ADMA levels by inhibiting an enzyme (dimethylarginine dimethylamino-hydrolase) that degrades ADMA. They also found that PPIs reduced nitric oxide levels and endothelium-dependent vasodilatation in a murine model and in ex vivo human tissue. In a cross-over pilot study of 21 adults published in 2015, Ghebremariam et al. [44] found increased plasma ADMA levels in vivo in patients on lansoprazole versus placebo and in patients with a history of cardiovascular disease versus healthy patients. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Strengths and Limitations

Our meta-analysis has various strengths. One, unlike most published meta-analyses, we selected studies with evidence levels I or II according to the evidence-based clinical practice guidelines, which aim to reduce methodological heterogeneity as well as ensure data accuracy, internal validity, and relevant results. Two, all included studies were recently published and retrieved from journals of high scientific influence. Three, of the ten studies included, eight were conducted in numerous centers, reinforcing external validity. Four, of the ten included studies, six were randomized controlled trials, of which four were doubleblind. Five, the unbalanced distribution of patients' baseline cardiovascular risk factors did not disserve the main results of our study, as we found an insignificant association between PPI use and the occurrence of adverse cardiovascular events in most conducted analyses. However, heterogeneity within the cardiovascular risk factors could have caused confusion in the sensitivity analysis of the influence of clopidogrel associated with PPIs, which showed evidence of a statistically significant higher risk of cardiovascular outcomes. Our meta-analysis also has several limitations that may have resulted in information, selection, and publication bias. One, the selection criteria that defined the eligible articles favored the quality and the relevance of the included studies but also involved the exclusion of a significant number of references. Two, the number of included studies was small, and the overall heterogeneity between combined studies proved to be substantial. Three, the included studies presented notable differences in terms of patients' characteristics, followup duration, and PPI used. We did not perform adjusted analyses for patients' baseline characteristics that were not comparable between two groups. Four, in one study [14], the control group took a PPI (pantoprazole), while the control groups in other included studies were given a placebo or called "no PPI". However, the exclusion of this study from the performed pooled analyses did not change the results obtained. Five, we did not assess the potential dose-related and time-related effects due to the lacks of available data on dosage, frequency, and indication for PPI therapy. Six, we did not corroborate the results of clinical outcomes with the biological mechanisms argued in previous studies. Seven, we did not investigate the potential difference in the rate of gastrointestinal bleeding between PPI use and no-PPI use due to the lack of available data. Eight, the definition of MACEs was different among studies, which may partly explain the high heterogeneity and conflicting results across the analyses we performed for this particular outcome. Nine, we cannot exclude residual confounding variables, mainly in the non-randomized studies, that could affect the comparability between the two groups. Ten, the included post hoc analyses and observational studies collected information on PPI use and outcomes of interest via interviews at baseline and follow-up visits or via medical records, which entails information and confusion bias to varying degrees. Eleven, the visual inspection of the funnel plots alone may lead to the misevaluation of the publication bias of a meta-analysis, especially

when combining a small number of studies [33]. Given the aforementioned limitations, the results of this meta-analysis should be taken with caution.

5. Conclusions

The overall results of this meta-analysis support the hypothesis that there is no significantly increased risk of cardiovascular events in association with PPI use alone, suggesting that PPIs can be safely used in appropriate clinical settings. The association between the combined use of PPI/clopidogrel and adverse cardiovascular events remained unclear due to substantial bias and inconsistent results across the analyses of the pulled data. These results must be interpreted with caution given the lack of adjustment for known confounders, unmeasured confounders, high heterogeneity, and small number of included studies. Further large-scale randomized controlled trials are required to provide a reliable statement on the safety of PPIs regarding cardiovascular events in association with clopidogrel or not.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at: https://www. mdpi.com/article/10.3390/jcm11144096/s1, Table S1: Results of literature research for each database.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: D.J., A.P. and R.C.; methodology: D.J. and R.C.; validation: D.J., A.P., C.G., A.A., R.H., F.C. and R.C.; investigation: D.J.; resources: D.J. and R.C.; data curation: D.J. and R.C.; writing—original draft preparation, D.J. and R.C.; writing—review and editing: D.J., A.P., C.G., A.A., R.H., F.C. and R.C.; visualization: D.J.; supervision: R.C.; project administration: R.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- 1. Imhann, F.; Bonder, M.J.; Vich Vila, A.; Fu, J.; Mujagic, Z.; Vork, L.; Tigchelaar, E.F.; Jankipersadsing, S.A.; Cenit, M.C.; Harmsen, H.J.M.; et al. Proton pump inhibitors affect the gut microbiome. *Gut* **2016**, *65*, 740–748. [CrossRef]
- Liu, Y.; Zhu, X.; Li, R.; Zhang, J.; Zhang, F. Proton pump inhibitor utilisation and potentially inappropriate prescribing analysis: Insights from a single-centred retrospective study. *BMJ Open* 2020, *10*, e040473. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hayes, K.N.; Nakhla, N.R.; Tadrous, M. Further Evidence to Monitor Long-term Proton Pump Inhibitor Use. JAMA Netw. Open 2019, 2, e1916184. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Jaynes, M.; Kumar, A.B. The risks of long-term use of proton pump inhibitors: A critical review. *Ther. Adv. Drug Saf.* 2018, 10, 2042098618809927. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hunfeld, N.G.M.; Geus, W.P.; Kuipers, E.J. Systematic review: Rebound acid hypersecretion after therapy with proton pump inhib-itors. *Aliment Pharmacol. Ther.* 2007, 25, 39–46. [CrossRef]
- Scarpignato, C.; Gatta, L.; Zullo, A.; Blandizzi, C. SIF-AIGO-FIMMG Group, Italian Society of Pharmacology, the Italian Association of Hospital Gastroenterologists, and the Italian Federation of General Practitioners. Effective and safe proton pump inhibitor therapy in acid-related diseases-A position paper addressing benefits and potential harms of acid suppression. *BMC Med.* 2016, 14, 179.
- Ghebremariam, Y.T.; LePendu, P.; Lee, J.C.; Erlanson, D.A.; Slaviero, A.; Shah, N.H.; Leiper, J.; Cooke, J.P. Unexpected Effect of Proton Pump Inhibitors: Elevation of the Cardiovascular Risk Factor Asymmetric Dimethylarginine. *Circulation* 2013, 128, 845–853. [CrossRef]
- 8. Fossmark, R.; Martinsen, T.C.; Waldum, H.L. Adverse Effects of Proton Pump Inhibitors—Evidence and Plausibility. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2019, *20*, 5203. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Zhang, J.; Wang, D.; Du, J.; Qu, G.; Du, J.; Deng, S.; Liu, Y.; Cai, J.; She, Q. Efficacy of Clopidogrel and Clinical Outcome When Clopidogrel is Coad-ministered with Atorvastatin and Lansoprazole. *Medicine* 2015, 94. Available online: https://www.ncbi.nlm. nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5058921/ (accessed on 21 October 2020).
- Chung, K.C.; Swanson, J.A.; Schmitz, D.; Sullivan, D.; Rohrich, R.J. Introducing Evidence-Based Medicine to Plastic and Recon-structive Surgery. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* 2009, 123, 1385–1389. [CrossRef]
- 11. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Available online: https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current (accessed on 31 July 2021).
- Page, M.J.; McKenzie, J.E.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; Larissa Shamseer, J.M.T. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021, 29, 372:n71.
- 13. Eigenfactor: The Eigenfactor Metrics. Available online: http://www.eigenfactor.org/projects/journalRank/journalsearch.php (accessed on 20 January 2022).

- 14. Gu, R.-X.; Wang, X.-Z.; Li, J.; Deng, J.; Li, X.-X.; Wang, J. Effects of omeprazole or pantoprazole on platelet function in non-ST-segment elevation acute coronary syndrome patients receiving clopidogrel. *Mil. Med. Res.* **2016**, *3*. Available online: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5159972/ (accessed on 20 October 2020). [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 15. Nicolau, J.C.; Bhatt, D.L.; Roe, M.T.; Lokhnygina, Y.; Neely, B.; Corbalán, R.; Leiva-Pons, O.L.; Martinez, F.; Goodman, S.G.; Winters, K.J.; et al. Concomitant proton-pump inhibitor use, platelet activity, and clinical outcomes in patients with acute coronary syndromes treated with prasugrel versus clopidogrel and managed without revascularization: Insights from the Targeted Platelet Inhibition to Clarify the Optimal Strategy to Medically Manage Acute Coronary Syndromes trial. *Am. Heart J.* 2015, 170, 683–694. [PubMed]
- 16. Gargiulo, G.; Costa, F.; Ariotti, S.; Biscaglia, S.; Campo, G.; Esposito, G.; Leonardi, S.; Vranckx, P.; Windecker, S.W.; Valgimigli, M. Impact of proton pump inhibitors on clinical outcomes in patients treated with a 6- or 24-month dual-antiplatelet therapy duration: Insights from the PROlonging Dual-antiplatelet treatment after Grading stent-induced Intimal hyperplasia ando trial. *Am. Heart J.* 2016, *174*, 95–102. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 17. Moayyedi, P.; Eikelboom, J.W.; Bosch, J.; Connolly, S.J.; Dyal, L.; Shestakovska, O.; Leong, D.; Anand, S.S.; Störk, S.; Branch, K.R.; et al. Safety of Proton Pump Inhibitors Based on a Large, Multi-Year, Randomized Trial of Patients Receiving Rivaroxaban or Aspirin. *Gastroenterology* **2019**, *157*, 682–691. [CrossRef]
- Sugano, K.; Choi, M.G.; Lin, J.T.; Goto, S.; Okada, Y.; Kinoshita, Y.; Miwa, H.; Chiang, C.E.; Chiba, T.; Hori, M.; et al. Multinational, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, prospective study of esomeprazole in the prevention of recurrent peptic ulcer in low-dose acetylsalicylic acid users: The LAVENDER study. *Gut* 2014, 63, 1061–1068. [CrossRef]
- Vaduganathan, M.; Bhatt, D.L.; Cryer, B.L.; Liu, Y.; Hsieh, W.H.; Doros, G.; Cohen, M.; Lanas, A.; Schnitzer, T.J.; Shook, T.L.; et al. Proton-Pump Inhibitors Reduce Gastrointestinal Events Regardless of Aspirin Dose in Patients Requiring Dual Antiplatelet Therapy. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 2016, 67, 1661–1671. [CrossRef]
- 20. Jackson, L.R.; Peterson, E.D.; McCoy, L.A.; Ju, C.; Zettler, M.; Baker, B.A.; Messenger, J.C.; Faries, D.E.; Effron, M.B.; Cohen, D.J.; et al. Impact of Proton Pump Inhibitor Use on the Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of Prasugrel Versus Clopidogrel: Insights From the Treatment With Adenosine Diphosphate Receptor Inhibitors: Longitudinal Assessment of Treatment Patterns and Events After Acute Coronary Syndrome (TRANSLATE-ACS) Study. J. Am. Heart Assoc. 2016, 5, e003824.
- Weisz, G.; Smilowitz, N.R.; Kirtane, A.J.; Rinaldi, M.J.; Parvataneni, R.; Xu, K.; Stuckey, T.D.; Maehara, A.; Witzenbichler, B.; Neumann, F.-J.; et al. Proton Pump Inhibitors, Platelet Reactivity, and Cardiovascular Outcomes After Drug-Eluting Stents in Clopidogrel-Treated Patients: The ADAPT-DES Study. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Interv.* 2015, 8, e001952. [CrossRef]
- Deeks, J.J.; Higgins, J.P.T.; Altman, D.G. Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, version 6.3 (updated February 2022); Higgins, J.P.T., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M.J., Welch, V.A., Eds.; Cochrane: London, UK, 2022. Available online: www.training.cochrane.org/handbook (accessed on 4 December 2021).
- 23. Whellan, D.J.; Goldstein, J.L.; Cryer, B.L.; Eisen, G.M.; Lanas, A.; Miller, A.B.; Scheiman, J.M.; Fort, J.G.; Zhang, Y.; O'Connor, C. PA32540 (a coordinated-delivery tablet of enter-ic-coated aspirin 325 mg and immediate-release omeprazole 40 mg) versus enteric-coated aspirin 325 mg alone in subjects at risk for aspirin-associated gastric ulcers: Results of two 6-month, phase 3 studies. *Am. Heart J.* 2014, 168, 495–502. [CrossRef]
- 24. Lu, M. Report: Impact of drug combination of clopidogrel and pantoprazole In the prognosis of patients with transient ischemic attack. *Pak. J. Pharm. Sci.* 2017, 30, 217–221.
- Higgins, J.P.T.; Altman, D.G.; Gøtzsche, P.C.; Jüni, P.; Moher, D.; Oxman, A.D.; Savović, J.; Schulz, K.F.; Weeks, L.; Sterne, J.A.C.; et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011, 343, d5928. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Wells, G.; Shea, B.; O'Connell, D.; Robertson, J.; Peterson, J.; Welch, V. *The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Nonrandomized Studies in Meta-Analysis*; The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute: Ottawa, ON, Canada, 2000. Available online: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp (accessed on 1 May 2022).
- 27. Kenngott, S.; Olze, R.; Kollmer, M.; Bottheim, H.; Laner, A.; Holinski-Feder, E. Clopidogrel and proton pump inhibitor (PPI) interaction: Separate intake and a non-omeprazole PPI the solution? *Eur. J. Med. Res.* **2010**, *15*, 220–224. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Harvey, A.; Modak, A.; Déry, U.; Roy, M.; Rinfret, S.; Bertrand, O.F.; Larose, É.; Rodés-Cabau, J.; Barbeau, G.; Gleeton, O.; et al. Changes in CYP2C19 enzyme activity evaluated by the [(13)C]-pantoprazole breath test after co-administration of clopidogrel and proton pump inhibitors following percutaneous coronary intervention and correlation to platelet reactivity. *J. Breath Res.* 2016, 10, 017104. [CrossRef]
- 29. Furuta, T.; Iwaki, T.; Umemura, K. Influences of different proton pump inhibitors on the anti-platelet function of clopidogrel in relation to CYP2C19 genotypes. *Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* **2010**, *70*, 383–392. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Blume, H.; Donath, F.; Warnke, A.; Schug, B.S. Pharmacokinetic drug interaction profiles of proton pump inhibitors. *Drug Saf.* 2006, 29, 769–784. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Melloni, C.; Washam, J.B.; Jones, W.S.; Halim, S.; Hasselblad, V.; Mayer, S.B.; Heidenfelder, B.L.; Dolor, R.J. Conflicting Results Between Randomized Trials and Observational Studies on the Impact of Proton Pump Inhibitors on Cardiovascular Events When Coadministered With Dual Antiplatelet Therapy: A Systematic Review. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes* 2015, *8*, 47–55. [CrossRef]
- 32. Shi, W.; Yan, L.; Yang, J.; Yu, M. Ethnic variance on long term clinical outcomes of concomitant use of proton pump inhibitors and clopidogrel in patients with stent implantation. *Medicine* **2021**, *100*, e24366. [CrossRef]

- Cardoso, R.N.; Benjo, A.M.; DiNicolantonio, J.J.; Garcia, D.C.; Macedo, F.Y.B.; El-Hayek, G.; Nadkarni, G.N.; Gili, S.; Iannaccone, M.; Konstantinidis, I.; et al. Incidence of cardiovascular events and gastrointestinal bleeding in patients receiving clopidogrel with and without proton pump inhibitors: An updated meta-analysis. *Open Heart* 2015, 2, e000248. [CrossRef]
- 34. Lee, D.; Kim, J.S.; Kim, B.J.; Shin, S.Y.; Kim, D.B.; Ahn, H.S. Influence of individual proton pump inhibitors on clinical outcomes in patients receiving clopidogrel following percutaneous coronary intervention. *Medicine* **2021**, *100*, e27411. [CrossRef]
- 35. Bundhun, P.K.; Teeluck, A.R.; Bhurtu, A.; Huang, W.-Q. Is the concomitant use of clopidogrel and Proton Pump Inhibitors still associated with increased adverse cardiovascular outcomes following coronary angioplasty?: A systematic review and me-ta-analysis of recently published studies (2012–2016). BMC Cardiovasc. Disord. 2017, 17, 3. [CrossRef]
- 36. Kwok, C.S.; Jeevanantham, V.; Dawn, B.; Loke, Y.K. No consistent evidence of differential cardiovascular risk amongst protonpump inhibitors when used with clopidogrel: Meta-analysis. *Int. J. Cardiol.* **2013**, *167*, 965–974. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 37. Lin, S.-F.; Lin, P.-C.; Chang, C.-C.; Chang, W.-L.; Chu, F.-Y. Investigation of the interaction between proton pump inhibitors and clopidogrel using VerifyNow P2Y12 assay. *Medicine* **2020**, *99*, e23695. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Morath, T.; Stegherr, J.; Braun, S.; Vogt, W.; Hadamitzky, M.; Schömig, A.; Kastrati, A.; Von Beckerath, N.; Sibbing, D. Impact of proton pump inhibitors on the antiplatelet effects of clopidogrel. *Thromb. Haemost.* 2009, 101, 714–719. [CrossRef]
- Hokimoto, S.; Mizobe, M.; Akasaka, T.; Arima, Y.; Kaikita, K.; Nakagawa, K.; Ogawa, H. Impact of CYP2C19 polymorphism and proton pump inhibitors on platelet reactivity to clopidogrel and clinical outcomes following stent implantation. *Thromb. Res.* 2014, 133, 599–605. [CrossRef]
- 40. Biswas, M.; Rahaman, S.; Biswas, T.K.; Ibrahim, B. Risk of major adverse cardiovascular events for concomitant use of clopidogrel and proton pump inhibitors in patients inheriting CYP2C19 loss-of-function alleles: Meta-analysis. *Int. J. Clin. Pharm.* **2021**, 43, 1360–1369. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 41. Dahal, K.; Sharma, S.P.; Kaur, J.; Anderson, B.J.; Singh, G. Efficacy and Safety of Proton Pump Inhibitors in the Long-Term Aspirin Users: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am. J. Ther.* **2017**, 24, e559–e569. [CrossRef]
- 42. Zhai, Y.; Ye, X.; Hu, F.; Xu, J.; Guo, X.; Lin, Z.; Zhou, X.; Guo, Z.; Cao, Y.; He, J. Insights on Cardiac and Vascular Risks of Proton Pump Inhibitors: A Real-World Pharmacovigilance Study. *Front. Cardiovasc. Med.* **2022**, *9*, 767987. [CrossRef]
- Förstermann, U.; Münzel, T. Endothelial Nitric Oxide Synthase in Vascular Disease: From Marvel to Menace. *Circulation* 2006, 113, 1708–1714. [CrossRef]
- Ghebremariam, Y.T.; Cooke, J.P.; Khan, F.; Thakker, R.N.; Chang, P.; Shah, N.H.; Nead, K.T.; Leeper, N.J. Proton pump inhibitors and vascular function: A prospective cross-over pilot study: Vascular Medicine. Available online: http://journals.sagepub.com/ doi/10.1177/1358863X14568444 (accessed on 1 May 2022).