Iran J Public Health, Vol. 51, No.8, Aug 2022, pp.1690-1705

Review Article

Association of Obesity with Coronary Artery Disease, Erosive Esophagitis and Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Ting Li¹, Lixin Cong², Jiahui Chen³, *Houbo Deng¹

1. Department of Liver, Spleen and Stomach Diseases, The Affiliated Hospital to Changchun University of Chinese Medicine, Changchun, Jilin, 130021, China

2. Pain Department, The Affiliated Hospital to Changchun University of Chinese Medicine, Changchun, 130021, China

3. Phase I Clinical Trial Laboratory, The Affiliated Hospital to Changchun University of Chinese Medicine, Changchun, Jilin, 130021, China

*Corresponding Author: Email: denghoubo6789@sina.com

(Received 15 Feb 2022; accepted 11 May 2022)

Abstract

Background: We aimed to determine the plausible role of high body mass index (BMI) in the etiopathogenesis of coronary artery disease (CAD), erosive esophagitis (EE) and gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) and their complex associations.

Methods: The published literature was retrieved from Cochrane, Google Scholar, Embase, PubMed and Scopus databases until August 2021 based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale was used for the risk of bias and publication bias with a funnel plot. Heterogeneity between studies underwent evaluation using the *P* statistic and Q-test, and a random and fixed-effect model analysed studies with low to moderate heterogeneity.

Results: Out of 3819 studies extracted, 20 studies were studied based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The study corroborated the direct association of GERD symptoms and EE among obese Odds Ratio (OR) = 4.25) and overweight subjects (OR 9.75). Separate analyses of the link between GERD symptoms and EE was conducted among the overweight (OR 4.11, OR 4.61) and obesity subjects was statistically significant (OR 12.07, OR 9.95). The corresponding adjusted OR was noted for the association of CAD with overweight and obesity amounted to 3.41 and 3.01, respectively. Separate subgroup analysis was analyzed based on different ethnic populations for the association between GERD symptoms and EE in obesity (OR of 9.38) and overweight (OR of 4.21) subjects were statistically significant (P<0.05). For population subgroup analyses the overall OR of 3.32 was noted on the association between CAD and obesity.

Conclusion: Moderate to severe BMI has bene considered as an independent risk factor for GERD symptoms, EE and CAD.

Keywords: Body mass index; Obesity; Acid reflux; Coronary artery disease; Overweight

Background

Obesity has become an increasingly global epidemic, with approximately 1.9 billion adults and 340 million pediatric subjects considered overweight or obese. According to the WHO, the



Copyright © 2022 Li et al. Published by Tehran University of Medical Sciences. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license. (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Non-commercial uses of the work are permitted, provided the original work is properly cited global burden of obesity has increased three-fold since 1975 (1) and the prevalence of obesity could surpass 50% by 2030 (2). Meanwhile, the estimated prevalence among adults with body mass index BMI>30kg/m² was 11.4% in 2010 could increase to 17.5% 2030 (3). Excess adiposity is a key element in persuading the development of various risk factors for cardiovascular diseases: hypertension (4), diabetes (5), dyslipidemia, gastrointestinal (GI) disorders such as inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) (6), GI cancer and pancreatitis (7, 8). Obesity-linked pathological conditions have been identified as the principal cause of mortality among Asian Indians (9). A complex and multifactorial etiopathogenesis of coronary artery disease (CAD) and GI's association is noticed among the subjects with obesity/overweight (10).

Several studies have noted that the impact of obesity on gastrointestinal health may include an increased severity of Crohn's Disease and an elevated risk for cancer and CAD (11). Obesity is considered a risk factor for colorectal cancer and its postoperative recurrence (12). A prospective clinical and endoscopic study by Vaishnav et al. reported increasing frequency, prevalence and severity of symptoms with elevated BMI. The researchers also noted a significant correlation between erosive esophagitis (EE) and dyspeptic symptoms with body mass index (BMI, P < 0.05) (13). Gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) and CAD share metabolic syndrome as a common risk factor (14). Obesity shares a link with a significant increase in the risk of erosive esophagitis, GERD symptoms and esophageal adenocarcinoma (15). The researchers also noted a progressive increase in the risk of these disorders with weight gain (15). Liu et al. noted the common incidence of acid reflux in subjects with CAD and refractory chest pain (16).

The association between obesity and GI can be better explained by the quantitative and qualitative alterations noticed in the gut microbiota of obese patients (17). Currently GERD has been considered as a primarily the disorder of the esophagogastric junction, which is significantly related to esophageal acid exposure (18). To the best of our knowledge, and the literature review shows minimal studies describing the complex associations of GERD, EE and CAD and the common risk factor particularly, obesity.

The present systematic review and meta-analysis explored the plausible role of high BMI, a marker of obesity, in the etiopathogenesis of CAD, EE and GERD and their complex associations. The findings could recognize that obesity is the common risk factor for the development of GERD, EE and CAD.

Methods

This study has proceeded in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (19). Studies underwent extraction from the literature databases based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria for diagnosing CAD comprised health-screening examinations, coronary angiography, Minnesota coded electrocardiogram, and cardiac-gated CT scans for CAC scoring. The inclusion criteria for diagnosis of GERD and EE included gastrointestinal endoscopy, esophagogastroduodenoscopy-validated or telephonic questionnaires and the Los Angeles classification system.

The case-control, cross-sectional or cohort studies with assessment on association of obesity with GERD, EE and CAD were included. In addition, studies that well defined the BMI and outcome of interest with the aforementioned diagnosis were included. The exclusion criteria comprised; abstracts, reviews, *in vitro* animal studies, randomised control trials, literatures with case reports, case-series, and studies with a lack of obesity data and those with insufficient data on BMI, waisthip ratio and waist circumference (WC) categories for obesity, and other than English language studies were excluded from the current study.

Literature search

The published literature studies until August 2021 were retrieved from the Cochrane, Google Scholar, Embase, PubMed and Scopus databases.

The keywords considered for the search were 'obesity', 'coronary artery disease, 'body mass index', 'waist-hip ratio', 'waist circumference', 'gastroesophageal reflux' and 'erosive esophagitis'. The search MESH terms used for the retrieving articles from PubMed has been listed in the supplemental Table 1 (Supplementary data are not published. Readers may contact the corresponding author for more details).

Data extraction

A preliminary search of various databases selected articles with a title and abstract matching the aforementioned criteria. The abstracts retrieved from electronic databases for selected and eligible studies underwent assessment. In addition, we have searched the bibliographies manually of retrieved articles. Only those studies that helped to calculate the odds ratio (OR) or hazard ratio (HR) of exposure to obesity and CAD and GERD as outcomes were included. The first author, year of publication, cut-off values for defining obesity and odds and hazard ratio for GERD and CAD were noted. Outcomes considered for data extraction included BMI, waist-hip ratio, WC and diagnosis of CAD and GERD. Fig. 1 shows the PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection.



Fig. 1: PRISMA flowchart for the selected studies

Quality assessment of selected studies

The risk of bias was assessed using NOS by broadly categorising the studies as case-control and cohort studies. The NOS instrument evaluates the risk of bias by granting a star for each answer that meets the criteria. In keeping with the instrument, each study can obtain a maximum of nine stars: four for selection, two for comparability and three for the outcome.

Publication bias

The chance of publication bias underwent evaluation through a visual demonstration using a funnel plot with standard error (SE) and mean of each study on the y-axis and x-axis, respectively.

Statistical analysis

The summary OR was estimated using either relative risks or ORs as we considered that OR was a valid estimation of the risk ratio. Heterogeneity between studies was examined using the I^2 statistic and Q-test, whereby P < 0.10 and $I^2 > 50\%$ indicated high heterogeneity. A random-effect model was applied by calculating pooled HRs and their CIs for meta-analysis. However, a fixedeffect model was also analyzed studies with low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$). Further analysis took place by categorising the studies based on ethnicity and BMI. Publication bias was visually identified using funnel plots, where the log SE of log HR was plotted against HR and any asymmetric plot suggested a possible publication bias. To determine the statistical significance difference, Egger's and Begg's linear regression tests were conducted. All data analysis occurred using the Open Meta software [Analyst] (http://www.cebm.brown.edu/openmeta) and Review Manager (RevMan) [computer programme] (Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). Statistical significance was considered as P-value <0.05.

Results

Study selection

The literature search of various databases until August 2021 yielded 3819 studies. Out of these studies, 620 were removed due to duplicate records. Among the 3199 records screened, 3126 did not make the final list, as they existed outside the field of interest, and the studies lacked data on the association of obesity with CAD and GERD. Out of 73 studies assessed for eligibility, 21 were excluded due to lack of obesity data and 32 due to insufficient data on BMI, waist-hip ratio and waist circumference categories for obesity. The inclusion/exclusion criteria meant that 20 studies (20-39) could form part of the meta-analysis.

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the characteristics of the selected obesity and GERD studies. Among the selected studies, six were case-control, and the remaining were cohort studies. The age group of participants ranged from 32 to 74.1 years. In studies with GERD as the outcome, the exposure underwent assessment-using BMI in 11 studies (20-30). For the studies involving CAD as an outcome of interest, the corresponding number of studies using BMI amounted to nine (31-39). In studies with GERD as an outcome and obesity as exposure, out of 11 studies, eight came from the Asian region (20-24, 26-28), two from the European region (25, 29) and one from the American region (30). In studies with CAD as an outcome and obesity as exposure, out of nine from the Asian region studies. six 31,32,34,35,38,39), one study from the European region (33), and two from the American region (36,37).

Author	Year	Study	Sample	Age	Gender (M - E)	Country	Obesity	GRED
		aesign	size	(Mean/ Median/ Range)	(M : F)		measurements	спіспа
Kang et al [20]	2007	Cohort	161	45.3	145:6	South Korea	BMI ≥ 30, waist circum- ference: ≥80 cm in women or ≥90 cm in men	Esophago gastroduodenoscopy and self- administered vali- dated questionnaire
Chung et al [21]	2008	Case- control	3539/3539	47.6	M: 2810/ 2810	South Korea	BMI ≥25	endoscopy
Chua et al [22]	2009	Case- control	427/427	48.3	365:62/ 365:62	Taiwan	BMI >25 waist circumference: ≥80 cm in women or ≥90 cm in men	Esophagogastro duodenoscopy and Los Angeles classifi- cation system
Lee et al [23]	2009	Case- control	100/100	52.73/ 50.65	76:24/ 76:24	South Korea	BMI ≥ 30 Waist hip ratio: >0.90 cm	endoscopy and Los Angeles classifica- tion system
Nam et al [24]	2010	cohort	495	50.3	M: 432	South Korea	BMI ≥30.0 Waist circum- ference _≥100.0, Waist-to-hip ratio _≥100.0	Questionnaire and Esophagogastro duodenoscopy
Rubio et al [25]	2004	cohort	2500	40–79	1185: 1315	Spain	BMI ≥30.0	Telephone ques- tionnaire
Hung et al [26]	2014	cohort	1922	49.6	M:1438	Taiwan	BMI ≥27 kg/m2 waist circum- ference: ≥80 cm in women or ≥90 cm in men	Oesophagogastro duodenoscopy
Moki et al [27]	2007	cohort	5159	47.1	3599:1560	Japan	BMI ≥ 25.0	gastrointestinal en- doscopy
Nam et al [28]	2009	cohort	552	48.8	M: 552	South Korea	BMI ≥30.0 Waist circum- ference ≥100.0	Esophagogastro duodenoscopy
Nilsson et al [29]	2003	case- control	M: 1555/ 18814 F: 1598/ 21396	M: 58/48 F: 53/47	Case: 1555: 1598 Control: 18814: 21396	Sweden	BMI ≥30.0	Questionnaire
Locke et al [30]	1999	cohort	1562	50.5	1524	USA	BMI ≥30.0	Questionnaire

Table 1: Basic characteristics of selected obesity and GERD studies

Author	Year	Study design	Sample size	Age(Mean/ Median/ Range)	Gender (M : F)	Country	Obesity Measurements	CAD Criteria
Choi et al [31]	2018	Cohort	2 611 450	34.3	1 802 408: 809 042	South Korea	BMI ≥30.0	Health screening
Azab et al [32]	2018	Cohort	556	55	M: 395	Jordan	BMI ≥30.0	Coronary angiography
Bechlioulis et al [33]	2013	Cohort	207	62	M: 178	Greece	BMI \geq 30.0 Moderate central obesity: WC \geq 102 and <110 cm in men and \geq 88 and <105 cm in 4women; severe central obesity, WC \geq 110 cm in men and \geq 105 cm in women.	Coronary angiography
Tseng et al [34]	2008	Cohort	M: 233 F: 267	M: 66.6 F: 66.8	233/267	Taiwan	BMI \geq 30.0 Waist-to-hip ratio: \geq 102 cm in males and \geq 88 cm in females WC: \geq 80 cm in women or \geq 90 cm in men	Minnesota coded electrocardiogram
Lin et al [35]	2015	Cohort	N: 93 O: 218 Mi: 145 M to S: 61	N: 74.1 O: 72.6 Mi: 73.1 M to S: 72.2	M: N: 72 O: 158 Mi: 106 M to S: 33	Taiwan	Mild obesity: BMI: 27.0-29.9 M to S: BMI ≥30.0	Coronary angiography
Zen et al [36]	2012	Case- control	155/221	59.7/ 57.3	M: 114/128	Brazil	BMI \geq 30.0 Waist-to-hip ratio: \geq 102 cm in males and \geq 88 cm in females WC: \geq 80 cm in women or \geq 90 cm in men	Coronary angiography
Jensen et al [37]	2020	Cohort	36509	54.1	M: 23954 F: 12555	New York	BMI ≥30.0	Cardiac-gated CT scans for CAC scoring
Hsu et al [38]	2007	Cohort	48	50.5	37:11	Taiwan	Mi: 27.0–29.9	CAC Score
Park et al [39]	2017	Cohort	1342	59.7	M: 728	South Korea	Obesity: BMI: >30 BMI≥27.5	Coronary angiography

Table 2: Basic characteristics of selected obesity and CAD studies

M: Male, F: Female, N: Normal, O: Overweight, Mi: Mild obesity, M to S: Moderate to severe obesity, WC: Waist circumference.

Quality assessment

The quality assessment conducted using NOS scores (Table 3) revealed that six studies had obtained the maximum score of 9. The number of studies with scores 8 and 7 amounted to nine and seven, respectively, whereas only one study had yielded a total score of 6 (25).

Table 3: Newcastle-Ottawa-Scale scores for the quality assessment of including studies

S.No	Author Year	Selection	Comparability	Exposure	Total
Case-control	studies				
	Chung et al 2008(21)	****	**	**	8
,	Chua et al 2009(22)	***	**	**	7
•	Lee et al 2009(23)	****	*	**	7
4	Nilsson et al 2003(29)	****	*	***	8
	Zen et al 2012(36)	***	**	**	7
Cohort stud	ies				
(Nam et al 2010(24)	****	*	***	8
,	Rubio et al 2004(25)	**	**	**	6
1	Hung et al 2014(26)	****	**	***	9
!	Moki et al 2007(27)	***	**	***	8
	Nam et al 2009(28)	****	**	***	9
	Locke et al 1999(30)	***	**	**	7
	Choi et al 2018 (31)	***	**	***	8
	Azab et al 2018 (32)	****	**	**	8
	Bechlioulis et al 2013(33)	****	**	***	9
	Kang et al 2007 (20)	****	*	**	7
	Tseng et al 2008 (34)	****	*	***	8
	Lin et al 2015 (35)	***	*	***	7
	Jensen et al 2020(37)	***	*	***	7
	Hsu et al 2007 (38)	***	**	***	8
	Park 2017 (39)	***	**	***	8

Meta-analysis results

Nine studies, considered for the evaluation of the association between GERD symptoms and EE in overweight subjects (BMI \geq 25), proved significant (OR = 4.25, 95%CI: 3.16-5.71, I2 81%, *P* <0.00001, Fig. 2A). Four studies that evaluated the relation between GERD symptoms and

overweight subjects showed OR 4.11 (95%CI: 3.04-5.56). The I2 statistic noted was 36% (P < 0.0001, Fig. 2B). The meta-analysis of five studies, which evaluated the association between EE and being overweight based on BMI \geq 25, yielded an OR of 4.61 (95%CI: 2.57-8.28, I2=86%, P < 0.00001, Fig. 2C).

Study or Subgroup log[0dds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI W, Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 12.7% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] + Chua 2009 1.13 0.1071 14.4% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] + Diaz Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1327 13.8% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] + Lae 2009 1.78 0.2653 10.5% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] + + Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 10.3% 6.66 [3.94, 11.36] + + Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] + + Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] + + Test for overall effect Z = 9.58 (P < 0.00001) P 800 Non-obese Obese Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup tog[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI N, Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 3.10 [2.1, 3.82] + + + </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Odds Ratio</th> <th></th> <th>Odds</th> <th>Ratio</th> <th></th>						Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 12.7% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 14.4% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 13.4% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 13.8% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 10.5% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 12.1% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] + Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); P = 81% 0.01 0.1 0.1 Test for overall effect: Z = 9.58 (P < 0.00001) SE Weight N.Random, 95% CI N.Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] + + Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 2.76% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] + + + + Total (95% CI) <	Study or Subg	roup log[Odd	s Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Randoi	m, 95% Cl	
Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 14.4% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 13.4% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 13.8% 1.96 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 10.5% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 12.1% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001)	Chua 2009		1.4	0.1786	12.7%	4.06 [2.86, 5.75]				
Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.63 0.1631 13.4% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 13.8% 1.96 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2663 10.5% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 12.1% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 10.3% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] Heterogeneiky: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); P = 81%	Chung 2008		1.13	0.1071	14.4%	3.10 [2.51, 3.82]			-	
Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 13.8% 1.95 (1.51, 2.53) Lee 2008 1.78 0.2663 10.5% 5.93 (3.53, 9.97) Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 10.3% 6.69 (3.94, 11.36) Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 (3.94, 30.88) Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 (2.97, 14.15) Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] Heterogeneity: Tau"= 0.15; Chi"= 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); P = 81%	Diaz-Rubio 20	04	1.53	0.1531	13.4%	4.62 [3.42, 6.23]				
Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 10.5% 5.93 3.53, 9.97] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 12.1% 3.67 12.46, 5.47] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71]	Kang 2007		0.67	0.1327	13.8%	1.95 [1.51, 2.53]			-	
Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 12.1% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 10.3% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] Metrogeneity: Tau² = 0.15; Chi² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); I² = 81% Test for overall effect Z = 9.58 (P < 0.00001) SE Veight N, Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 100 100 Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] 0.01 0.1 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] 0.01 0.1 1.0 0.01 0.1 1.0 0.01 0.1 1.0 0.01 0.1 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.01 0.1 1.0 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01<	Lee 2009		1.78	0.2653	10.5%	5.93 [3.53, 9.97]				
Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 10.3% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] 0.01 0.1 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); P = 81%	Locke 1999		1.3	0.2041	12.1%	3.67 [2.46, 5.47]				
Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 5.4% 11.02 $(3.94, 30.88)$ Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 $(2.97, 14.15)$ Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.25 $(3.64, 57.71)$ 0.01 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect Z = 9.58 (P < 0.00001) SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 $(2.51, 3.82)$ $$ Diaz Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.62 $(3.24, 6.23)$ $$ Locke 1999 1.3 0.2014 22.8% 3.67 $(2.4, 6.5.47)$ $$	Moki 2007		1.9	0.2704	10.3%	6.69 [3.94, 11.36]				
Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 7.5% 6.49 (2.97, 14.15) Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.25 (3.6, 5.71) \bullet Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); P = 81% 0.01 0.1 10 10 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Non-obese Obese Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] \bullet \bullet Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] \bullet \bullet Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] \bullet \bullet \bullet Total (95% Cl) 19.0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% Cl \bullet	Nam 2009		2.4	0.5255	5.4%	11.02 [3.94, 30.88]				
Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.25 [3.16, 5.71] \bullet Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 81% 0.01 0.1 10 10 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio VV, Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] \bullet \bullet Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1631 27.6% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] \bullet \bullet Locke 1999 1.3 0.2011 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] \bullet \bullet \bullet Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] \bullet </td <td>Nam 2010</td> <td></td> <td>1.87</td> <td>0.398</td> <td>7.5%</td> <td>6.49 [2.97, 14.15]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Nam 2010		1.87	0.398	7.5%	6.49 [2.97, 14.15]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; Chi ² = 41.45, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 81% Test for overall effect: $Z = 9.58$ (P < 0.00001) Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Iog[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.65 (3.42, 6.23] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); I ² = 69% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); I ² = 69% Odds Ratio Cods Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Chua 2009	Total (95% CI)				100.0%	4.25 [3.16, 5.71]			+	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 9.58$ (P < 0.00001) 10 10 10 Non-obese Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.101 Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.101 0.11 100.0241 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); P = 69% 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.02 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio Vdds Ratio <	Heterogeneity	Tau ² = 0.15; Chi	² = 41.45,	df = 8 (F	<pre>< 0.000</pre>	01); I ^z = 81%	L			100
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Image: constraint of the state	Test for overal	effect: Z = 9.58 ((P < 0.000	001)			0.01	Non-obese	Obese	100
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] • Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] • Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] • Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] • Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] • • Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); I ² = 69% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV Non-obese Obese 0.01 0.1 10 100 100 Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI IV Non-obese Obese IV Non-obese Obese IV Non-obese Obese IV Nod obese						Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Chung 2008 1.13 0.1071 32.1% 3.10 [2.51, 3.82] Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); P = 69% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI V, Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] V, Random, 95% CI Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] $$	Study or Subg	roup log[Odd	s Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Randoi	m, 95% Cl	
Diaz-Rubio 2004 1.53 0.1531 27.6% 4.62 [3.42, 6.23] Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); P = 69% 0.01 0.1 100 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight V. Random, 95% Cl V. Random, 95% Cl Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75]	Chung 2008		1.13	0.1071	32.1%	3.10 [2.51, 3.82]			-	
Locke 1999 1.3 0.2041 22.8% 3.67 [2.46, 5.47] Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [3.94, 11.36] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); P = 69% 0.01 0.1 100 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 9.19 (P < 0.00001) SE Weight N. Random, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N. Random, 95% Cl Non-obese Obese Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] \bullet \bullet \bullet Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet Nam 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] \bullet	Diaz-Rubio 20	04	1.53	0.1531	27.6%	4.62 [3.42, 6.23]				
Moki 2007 1.9 0.2704 17.5% 6.69 [$\overline{3}.94$, 11.36] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04 , 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); I ² = 69% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect: $Z = 9.19$ (P < 0.00001) Visit (Signature 1) Visit (Signature 1) 0.01 0.1 10 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N. Random, 95% Cl V. Random, 95% Cl Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [$2.86, 5.75$] $$ Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [$1.51, 2.53$] $$ Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [$3.94, 30.88$] $$ Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [$2.97, 14.15$] $$ $$ $$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 100 Not overweight 0.00001 $1.67 < 0.00001$; I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 1000	Locke 1999		1.3	0.2041	22.8%	3.67 [2.46, 5.47]				
Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.11 [3.04, 5.56] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); l ² = 69% 0.01 0.1 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 9.19 (P < 0.00001) Odds Ratio 0.01 0.1 100 Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight V, Random, 95% CI V. Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] V. Random, 95% CI V. Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97]	Moki 2007		1.9	0.2704	17.5%	6.69 [3.94, 11.36]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06; Chi ² = 9.64, df = 3 (P = 0.02); i ² = 69% Odds Ratio Test for overall effect: Z = 9.19 (P < 0.00001) Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup Iog[Odds Ratio] SE Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); i ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Not overage digits of colspan="4">Not overage digits of colspan="4">Not overage digits of colspan="4">Not overage digits of colspan="4">10	Total (95% CI)				100.0%	4.11 [3.04, 5.56]			•	
Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Non-obese Obese Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Nam 2010 1.86% 0.01 0.1 100 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 Not overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity	Tau ² = 0.06; Chi	² = 9.64, 0	df = 3 (P	= 0.02); P	²= 69%	0.01	01	10	100
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight N, Random, 95% CI Odds Ratio N, Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] • • Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] • • Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] • • Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] • • • Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] • • • • Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Test for overal	effect: Z = 9.19 ((P < 0.000	001)			0.01	Non-obese	Obese	100
Study or Subgroup log[Odds Ratio] SE Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] + Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] + Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] + + Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] + + + Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] + + + + Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] +						Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Chua 2009 1.4 0.1786 23.2% 4.06 [2.86, 5.75] Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 [1.51, 2.53] Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 [3.53, 9.97] Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001) Volume rescription Volume rescription 100 100	Study or Subg	roup log[Odd	s Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Randor	m, 95% Cl	
Kang 2007 0.67 0.1327 24.1% 1.95 $[1.51, 2.53]$ Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 $[3.53, 9.97]$ Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 $[3.94, 30.88]$ Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 $[2.97, 14.15]$ Total (95% CI) 100.0% 4.61 $[2.57, 8.28]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35 ; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.12$ (P < 0.00001)	Chua 2009		1.4	0.1786	23.2%	4.06 [2.86, 5.75]			-	
Lee 2009 1.78 0.2653 21.1% 5.93 $[3.53, 9.97]$ Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 $[3.94, 30.88]$ Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 $[2.97, 14.15]$ Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.61 $[2.57, 8.28]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Kang 2007		0.67	0.1327	24.1%	1.95 [1.51, 2.53]			-	
Nam 2009 2.4 0.5255 14.2% 11.02 [3.94, 30.88] Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 100 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Lee 2009		1.78	0.2653	21.1%	5.93 [3.53, 9.97]				
Nam 2010 1.87 0.398 17.5% 6.49 [2.97, 14.15] Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] Image: comparison of the state of the sta	Nam 2009		2.4	0.5255	14.2%	11.02 [3.94, 30.88]				
Total (95% Cl) 100.0% 4.61 [2.57, 8.28] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Nam 2010		1.87	0.398	17.5%	6.49 [2.97, 14.15]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.35; Chi ² = 29.60, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.1 10 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Total (95% CI)				100.0%	4.61 [2.57, 8.28]			+	
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity	Tau ² = 0.35; Chi	² = 29.60,	df = 4 (F	< 0.000	01); I² = 86%	0.01		10	400
	Test for overal	effect: Z = 5.12 (P < 0.000	001)			0.01	U.I 1 Not overweight	Overweight	100

Fig. 2: (A) shows the adjusted odds ratio for the association between GERD symptoms and EE in overweight, (B) association between GERD symptoms and overweight and (C) association between EE and overweight based on $BMI \ge 25$

The association between GERD symptoms and EE in obesity (BMI \geq 30), analyzed using six studies, had high significance (OR 9.75, 95%CI: 4.59-20.71, I2=81%, *P* <0.0001, Fig. 3A). Similarly, the association between GERD symptoms and obesity was highly significant upon evaluation of two studies (OR 12.07, 95%CI: 2.39-60.92, I2=87%, *P*-0.006, Fig. 3B). Studies also found that the association between EE and obesity proved substantially significant (OR 9.95, 95%CI: 3.12-31.71, I2=83%, *P*=0.0001, Fig. 3C).

Adjusted OR for the association between CAD and obesity (BMI \geq 30) noted amounted to 3.41 (95% CI: 2.13-5.48, I2=98%, *P*<0.00001, Fig. 4A). The funnel plot for the analysis showed that out of five studies, three were outliers (Fig. 4B). Adjusted OR for the association between CAD and overweight subjects (BMI \geq 25) amounted to 3.01 (95% CI: 2.89-3.13, I2=0%, *P*<0.00001, Fig. 5A). The funnel plot indicated no publication bias for the studies considered, as all the studies' dispersion fell within the funnel (Fig. 5B).

				Odds Ratio		Odds Rat	io	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 9	95% CI	
Diaz-Rubio 2004	1.74	0.2245	22.6%	5.70 [3.67, 8.85]				
Kang 2007	0.94	0.2908	21.5%	2.56 [1.45, 4.53]		-	-	
Lee 2009	2.12	0.2806	21.7%	8.33 [4.81, 14.44]			-	
Locke 1999	3.4	0.5612	16.1%	29.96 [9.97, 90.01]				•
Nam 2009	4.67	1.1633	7.6%	106.70 [10.91, 1043.18]			-	
Nam 2010	3.05	0.8929	10.6%	21.12 [3.67, 121.52]				•
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	9.75 [4.59, 20.71]			•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.60; Chi ² = 26.25.	df = 5 (F	< 0.0001); I ² = 81%	-		1	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.92 (P < 0.000	01)			0.01	U.1 1 Non choose Ok	10	100
Study or Subgroup Diaz-Rubio 2004 Locke 1999 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	log[Odds Ratio] 1.74 3.4 2= 1.20; Chi ² = 7.54	1 0.224 0.561	E Weigh 5 54.89 2 45.29 100.09 P = 0.006	t IV, Random, 95% Cl 5.70 [3.67, 8.85] 29.96 [9.97, 90.01] 12.07 [2.39, 60.92]); I* = 87%		IV, Random, 9		
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 3.01 (P = 0.0)	03)			0.01	U.1 1 Non-obese Ob	1U ese	100
				Odds Ratio		Odds Rat	tio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random,	95% CI	
Kang 2007	0.94	0.2908	32.6%	2.56 [1.45, 4.53]		-	-	
Lee 2009	2.12	0.2806	32.8%	8.33 [4.81, 14.44]				
Nam 2009	4 67	1.1633	14.9%	106 70 [10.91 1043 18]				*
Nam 2010	3.05	0.8929	19.6%	21.12 [3.67, 121.52]				
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	9.95 [3.12, 31.71]			-	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	= 0.99; Chi ^z = 17.87 t: Z = 3.89 (P = 0.00)	', df = 3 (l 01)	P = 0.000	5); I² = 83%	0.01	0.1 1 Non-obese Ot	10 Dese	100

Fig. 3: (A) Adjusted odd ratios for the association between GERD symptom and EE in obesity, (B) association between GERD symptom and obesity and (C) association between EE and obesity based on BMI ≥30







Fig. 5: Adjusted odds ratio for the association between CAD and overweight and (B) Funnel plot for publication bias in the meta-analysis between CAD and overweight based on BMI ≥25

Subgroup analysis

The subgroup analysis based on different ethnic populations for the association between GERD symptoms and EE in obesity (BMI \geq 30) showed an adjusted OR of 9.38 (95% CI: 5.73-15.35, I2=79%, *P*<0.00001, Fig. 6A). Meta-analysis of two studies considered for the non-Asian group demonstrated that the association proved significantly high with an OR of 12.07 (95% CI: 2.39-60.92, I2=87%, *P*=0.006, Fig. 6A). The meta-analysis involving four studies showed that the association also proved significant in the Asian population (OR 9.95, 95% CI: 3.12-31.71, I2=83%, *P*<0.00001). The analysis of all populations showed an adjusted OR of 9.75 (95% CI: 4.59-20.71, I2=81%, *P*<0.00001, Fig. 6A).

Population subgroup analyses on the association between GERD symptom and EE in overweight subjects (BMI \geq 25) was found to be significant with an OR of 4.21 (95% CI: 3.45-5.15, I2=79%, P=0.37, Fig. 6B). The association was substantially significant for the non-Asian group with an OR of 4.25 (95% CI: 3.34-5.40, I2=0%, P<0.00001, Fig. 6B). The meta-analysis involving two studies showed a significant association in the Asian population (OR 4.38, 95% CI: 2.98-6.44, I2=84%, P=0.06, Fig. 6B). The analysis of all populations indicated an adjusted OR of 4.25 (95% CI: 3.16-5.71, I2=81%, P <0.00001, Fig. 6B).

А

				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE Weight		IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 All population					
Diaz-Rubio 2004	1.74	0.2245	11.7%	5.70 [3.67, 8.85]	
Kang 2007	0.94	0.2908	11.0%	2.56 [1.45, 4.53]	
Lee 2009	2.12	0.2806	11.1%	8.33 [4.81, 14.44]	
Locke 1999	3.4	0.5612	7.9%	29.96 [9.97, 90.01]	
Nam 2009	4.67	1.1633	3.4%	106.70 [10.91, 1043.18]	
Nam 2010	3.05	0.8929	4.9%	21.12 [3.67, 121.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			50.0%	9.75 [4.59, 20.71]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ^a =	0.60; Chi# = 26.25	, df = 5 ()	P < 0.000	1); I ² = 81%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 5.92 (P < 0.00	001)			
1.1.2 Asians					
Kang 2007	0.94	0.2908	11.0%	2.56 [1.45, 4.53]	
Lee 2009	2.12	0.2806	11.1%	8.33 [4.81, 14.44]	
Nam 2009	4.67	1.1633	3.4%	106.70 [10.91, 1043.18]	
Nam 2010	3.05	0.8929	4.9%	21.12 [3.67, 121.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			30.5%	9.95 [3.12, 31.71]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.99; Chi ² = 17.87	, df = 3 (P = 0.000	5); I ² = 83%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.89 (P = 0.00	01)			
1.1.3 Non-Asians					
Diaz-Rubio 2004	1.74	0.2245	11.7%	5,70 [3,67, 8,85]	
Locke 1999	3.4	0.5612	7.9%	29.96 [9.97, 90.01]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			19.5%	12.07 [2.39, 60.92]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 1.20; Chi ² = 7.54,	df = 1 (P	= 0.006);	I ² = 87%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.01 (P = 0.00	3)			
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	9.38 [5.73, 15.35]	•
Heterogeneity Tau*=	0 49 Chi#= 52 50	df= 11	(P < 0.00	001): P= 79%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 8.91 (P < 0.00	001)			0.01 0.1 1 10 10
Test for subaroun diff	ferences: Chi# = 0.1	16 df= 2	(P = 0.97)	7) P= 0%	Non-opese Obese

в

				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 All population					
Chua 2009	1.4	0.1786	6.4%	4.06 [2.86, 5.75]	
Chung 2008	1.13	0.1071	7.3%	3.10 [2.51, 3.82]	+
Diaz-Rubio 2004	1.53	0.1531	6.8%	4.62 [3.42, 6.23]	-
Kang 2007	0.67	0.1327	7.0%	1.95 [1.51, 2.53]	
Lee 2009	1.78	0.2653	5.2%	5.93 [3.53, 9.97]	
Locke 1999	1.3	0.2041	6.0%	3.67 [2.46, 5.47]	
Moki 2007	1.9	0.2704	5.1%	6.69 [3.94, 11.36]	
Nam 2009	2.4	0.5255	2.6%	11.02 [3.94, 30.88]	
Nam 2010	1.87	0.398	3.6%	6.49 [2.97, 14.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			50.0%	4.25 [3.16, 5.71]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau*=	0.15; Chi ² = 41.45	, df = 8 (i	P < 0.000	01); I* = 81%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 9.58 (P < 0.00)	001)			
2.1.2 Asians					
Chua 2009	1.4	0.1786	6.4%	4.06 [2.86, 5.75]	-
Chung 2008	1.13	0.1071	7.3%	3.10 [2.51, 3.82]	+
Kang 2007	0.67	0.1327	7.0%	1.95 [1.51, 2.53]	-
Lee 2009	1.78	0.2653	5.2%	5.93 [3.53, 9.97]	
Moki 2007	1.9	0.2704	5.1%	6.69 [3.94, 11.36]	
Nam 2009	2.4	0.5255	2.6%	11.02 [3.94, 30.88]	
Nam 2010	1.87	0.398	3.6%	6.49 [2.97, 14.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			37.2%	4.38 [2.98, 6.44]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau*=	0.20; Chi*= 37.10	, df = 6 (f	P < 0.000	01); P= 84%	
Test for overall effect	Z = 7.52 (P < 0.00	001)			
2.1.3 Non-Asians					
Diaz-Rubio 2004	1.53	0.1531	6.8%	4.62 [3.42, 6.23]	
Locke 1999	1.3	0.2041	6.0%	3.67 [2.46, 5.47]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			12.8%	4.25 [3.34, 5.40]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² = 0.81,	df = 1 (P	= 0.37); P	° = 0%	N2.92
Test for overall effect	Z = 11.82 (P < 0.0	0001)			
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	4.21 [3.45, 5.15]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau* =	0.13; Chi ² = 82.90	, df = 17	(P < 0.00	001); I* = 79%	they also be used
Test for overall effect	Z=14.13 (P < 0.0	0001)			0.01 0.1 1 10 10
Test for subgroup diff	ferences: Chi# = 0.1	02. df = 2	(P = 0.99)	0) $I^{\mu} = 0.96$	wor overweight Overweight

Fig. 6: (A) Population subgroup analyses on the association between GERD symptom and EE in obesity based on BMI≥30, and (B) Population subgroup analyses on the association between GERD symptom and EE in overweight based on BMI ≥25

Population subgroup analyses on the association between CAD and obesity (BMI \geq 30) proved significant with an OR of 3.32 (95% CI: 2.52-4.38, I2=97%, *P* <0.00001, Fig. 7A). The association was substantially significant for the non-Asian group with an OR of 3.19 (95% CI: 1.24-8.17, I2=98%, *P* <0.00001, Fig. 7A). The metaanalysis involving two studies showed a significant association in the Asian population (OR 4.84, 95% CI: 1.25-18.74, I2=72%, *P*=0.06, Fig. 7A). The analysis of all populations indicated an adjusted OR of 3.41 (95% CI: 2.13-5.48, I2=98%, *P* < 0.00001, Fig. 7A).

The funnel plot for publication bias in the population subgroup meta-analysis between CAD and obesity (BMI \geq 30) showed three outliers (one Asian and two all population studies) out of four studies considered (Fig. 7B). Substantial heterogeneity among the study estimates was noted for all the aforementioned meta-analyses with significant *P*-values and/or high I² statistics.



Fig. 7: (A) Population subgroup analyses on the association between CAD and obesity and (B) Funnel plot for publication bias in the population subgroup meta-analysis between CAD and obesity based on BMI ≥30

Publication bias

According to the funnel plot for publication bias in the meta-analysis between GERD symptoms and EE among overweight subjects out of nine studies; three were outliers. For GERD symptoms and overweight, it was one out of four outliers (Suppl. Fig. 1A and 1B) (Supplementary data are not published. Readers may contact the corresponding author for more details). For the meta-analysis between EE and overweight (BMI \geq 25), out of five studies, three were outliers (Suppl. Fig. 1C). The funnel plot for studies on the association between GERD symptoms and EE in obesity showed three outliers out of six studies and for GERD symptoms and obesity, it was one out of two outliers (Suppl. Fig. 1D and 1E). The funnel plot for the meta-analysis between EE and obesity (BMI \geq 30) demonstrated two studies with publication bias out of four (Suppl. Fig. 1F). The funnel plot for publication bias in the population subgroup meta-analysis between GERD symptom and EE in obesity showed that two Asian studies and one non-Asian study were outliers, whereas the plot for GERD symptom and EE in overweight (BMI \geq 25) showed three Asian studies as outliers. The small number of studies considered for the evaluation of specific associations also potentially contributed to publication bias.

Discussion

The study has corroborated the direct association between GERD symptoms and EE in obese (OR

= 4.25) and overweight subjects (OR 9.75). Obesity has gained recognition as a major health hazard resulting in gastrointestinal or cardiovascular complications (40).

The current study has also validated previous literature findings suggesting the increased likelihood of GERD and EE in obese and overweight subjects. Another meta-analysis by Corley et al. reported a positive association between GERD and increased BMI. In concurrence with the current study results, the studies from the US also demonstrated a direct association between elevated BMI and GERD (95% CI: 1.36-1.80, P= 0.10). However, research revealed significant heterogeneity in Europe-based studies despite the stratification for several factors (41). In alignment with the present study results, retrospective cross-sectional research by Baeg et al. (10,338 subjects) noted obesity's connection to the elevated risk of erosive esophagitis, irrespective of the metabolic status of the subjects. The corresponding prevalence of EE noted in metabolically healthy non-obese, healthy obese, unhealthy non-obese and unhealthy obese amounted to 6.5%, 12.6%, 9.3% and 14.3%, respectively (42).

A meta-analysis by Hampel et al. noted the positive association between obesity and GERD symptoms, esophageal adenocarcinoma and erosive esophagitis. The corresponding increase in the pooled adjusted odds ratios noted for BMI of 25-30 kg/m² and BMI >30 kg/m² amounted to 1.43 (95% CI, 1.158 to 1.774) and 1.94 (CI, 1.468 to 2.566). Based on the findings, the researchers underscored the need to conduct counselling for overweight subjects presenting with GERDrelated symptoms regarding weight loss to ease symptoms (15).

Literature studies also corroborate the role of obesity as an independent factor and its interaction with related multiple risk factors for developing CAD (43). Such a development concurs with current study findings (44). The largest meta-analysis on obesity and CVD end-points concluded the association between obesity and CAD, emphasising the significance of weight loss to prevent cardiac sequelae (45). Central obesity, measured by waist circumference and waist-hip ratio, also bears an association with CAD. Central obesity had an association with mortality (HR: 1.70, 95% confidence interval CI: 1.58 to 1.83), whereas BMI had an inverse association in patients with CAD (HR: 0.64, 95% CI: 0.59 to 0.69) (46). A prospective study involving 3275 white and black adults aged 18-30 noted that subclinical coronary heart disease and its progression shares a link with the duration of abdominal and obesity. This association is noted throughout midlife, irrespective of the degree of adiposity. Researchers have observed more rates of coronary artery calcification per 1000 person-years in subjects who had > 20 years as opposed to zero years of overall obesity (16.0 vs 11.0, respectively) (47).

In this study, the association between CAD and obesity proved significant for Asian and non-Asian groups. The findings by the Asia Pacific Cohort Studies Collaboration corroborated the growing burden of overweight and obesity in the Asia–Pacific region. In this region, the attributable population fractions of mortality due to overweight and obesity amounted to the following: 0.2% to 2.9% for hemorrhagic stroke mortality, 0.8% to 9.2% for coronary heart disease mortality and 0.9% to 10.2% for ischemic stroke mortality (48).

The current subgroup analysis based on different ethnic populations showed that in Asian and non-Asian populations, the association between GERD symptoms and EE in obesity proved significantly high. Wu et al. reported the compatibility of GERD's risk factors and pathophysiological mechanisms in the Asian GERD subjects and their Western counterparts (49).

The main strength of this present study is that it has carried out the first investigation of the risk of erosive esophagitis, GERD and CAD among obesity and overweight subjects through metaanalysis. The study adds to the literature evidence suggesting the progressive increase in the risk of these disorders with increased BMI. Moreover, none of the studies considered has reported a negative association. However, the heterogeneity tests also indicated statistically significant degrees of heterogeneity among studies. Another notable limitation of the study is the lack of evaluation regarding the effect of metabolic health status or amount and type of dietary intake on the risk of developing these diseases. Based on the scores obtained in the NOS, the quality of the majority of the studies could be considered reasonable. However, substantial heterogeneity among the study estimates appeared in each meta-analysis, and funnel plot analyses revealed that some studies had publication bias.

Conclusion

The present meta-analysis has corroborated the role of obesity and being overweight in developing GERD, EE and CAD. Even a moderate to a significant increase in BMI can cause or exacerbate reflux symptoms. Future studies should explore the underlying complex mechanisms linked to the elevated risk and the possible benefits of weight loss. The study has also underscored the significance of counselling overweight and obese subjects regarding the elevated risks of these diseases and the potential benefits of weight loss in improving the associated symptoms.

Abbreviations

BMI: Body Mass Index; CAD: Coronary artery Disease; CI: Confidence Interval; CVD: Cardiovascular Disease; GERD: Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease; GI: Gastrointestinal Disease; HR: Hazardous Ratio; NOS: Newcastle-Ottawa Score; WC: waist circumference

Ethics Journalism considerations

Ethical issues (Including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, redundancy, etc.) have been completely observed by the authors.

Acknowledgements

The authors declare that they have no financial sponsor/grant for this study.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest

References

- Overweight and obesity. World Health Organization. (2020). https://www.who.int/news-room/factsheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight
- Sørensen TI, Martinez AR, Jørgensen TS (2022). Epidemiology of Obesity. In: *Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg; 1-25.
- GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators (2020). Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2019. *Lancet*, 396:1223–49.
- 4. Lee WC, Wu PY, Huang JC, et al (2022). Sex Difference in the Associations among Obesity-Related Indices with Incident Hypertension in a Large Taiwanese Population Follow-Up Study. J Pers Med, 12:972.
- Peters A, Hartwig M, Spiller T (2022). Obesity and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Explained by the Free Energy Principle. *Front Psychol*, 13:931701.
- Jiang K, Chen B, Lou D, et al (2022). Systematic review and meta-analysis: association between obesity/overweight and surgical complications in IBD. *Int J Colorectal Dis*, 37:1485-1496.
- Eisa M, Sandhu A, Prakash R, et al (2020). The Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction in Patients with Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease. J Neurogastroenterol Motil, 26:471-76.
- Lam BCC, Koh GCH, Chen C, Wong MTK, Fallows SJ (2015). Comparison of Body Mass Index (BMI), Body Adiposity Index (BAI), Waist Circumference (WC), Waist-To-Hip Ratio (WHR) and Waist-To-Height Ratio (WHR) as Predictors of Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors in an Adult Population in Singapore. PLoS ONE, 10: e0122985.

- Prasad DS, Kabir Z, Dash AK, Das BC (2012). Prevalence and risk factors for metabolic syndrome in Asian Indians: A community study from urban Eastern India. J Cardiovasc Dis Res, 3: 204-11.
- Song JH, Kim YS, Choi SY, Yang SY (2022). Association between gastroesophageal reflux disease and coronary atherosclerosis. *PLoS One*, 17:e0267053.
- Gandhi S, Narula N, Marshall JK, Farkouh M (2012). Are patients with inflammatory bowel disease at increased risk of coronary artery disease? *Am J Med*, 125: 956-62.
- 12. Scarpa M, Ruffolo C, Erroi F, et al (2014). Obesity is a Risk Factor for Multifocal Disease and Recurrence after Colorectal Cancer Surgery: A Case-Control Study. *Anticancer Res.*; 34:5735-41.
- Vaishnav B, Bamanikar A, Maske P, Reddy A, Dasgupta S (2017). Gastroesophageal reflux disease and its association with body mass index: clinical and endoscopic study. *J Clin Diagn Res*, 11: OC01-OC04.
- 14. Min YW, Song BG, Kim HS, et al (2017). Associations between reflux esophagitis and the progression of coronary artery calcification: A cohort study. *PLoS One*, 12: e0184996.
- 15. Hampel H, Abraham NS, El-Serag HB (2005). Meta-analysis: obesity and the risk for gastroesophageal reflux disease and its complications. *Ann Intern Med*,143: 199–11.
- Liu Y, He S, Chen Y, et al (2013). Acid reflux in patients with coronary artery disease and refractory chest pain. *Intern Med*, 52: 1165–1171.
- Xu Z, Jiang W, Huang W, Lin Y, Chan FK, Ng SC (2022). Gut microbiota in patients with obesity and metabolic disorders—a systematic review. *Genes & Nutrition*, 17:1-8.
- El-Serag HB, Sweet S, Winchester CC, Dent J (2014). Update on the epidemiology of gastro-oesophageal reflux disease: a systematic review. *Gut*, 63:871–880. .
- 19. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*, 339: b2535.

- 20. Kang MS, Park DI, Oh SY, et al (2007). Abdominal obesity is an independent risk factor for erosive esophagitis in a Korean population. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 22: 1656-61.
- Chung SJ, Kim D, Park MJ, et al (2008). Metabolic syndrome and visceral obesity as risk factors for reflux oesophagitis: a cross-sectional case-control study of 7078 Koreans undergoing health check-ups. *Gut*, 57: 1360-65.
- Chua CS, Lin YM, Yu FC, et al (2009). Metabolic risk factors associated with erosive esophagitis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 24: 1375-79.
- Lee H, Eun C, Lee O, et al (2009). Association between Erosive Esophagitis and Visceral Fat Accumulation Quantified by Abdominal CT Scan. J Clin Gastroenterol, 43: 240-43.
- 24. Nam SY, Choi IJ, Ryu KH, Park BJ, Kim HB et al (2010). Abdominal visceral adipose tissue volume is associated with increased risk of erosive esophagitis in men and women. *Gastroenterology*, 139: 1902-1911.e2.
- 25. Diaz-Rubio M, Moreno-Elola-Olaso C, Rey E, Locke GR, Rodriguez-Artalejo F (2004). Symptoms of gastro-oesophageal reflux: prevalence, severity, duration and associated factors in a Spanish population. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*, 19: 95-105.
- 26. Hung WC, Wu JS, Yang YC, Sun ZJ, Lu FH et al (2014). Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease vs. obesity on the risk of erosive oesophagitis. *Eur J Clin Invest*, 44: 1143-1149.
- 27. Moki F, Kusano M, Mizuide M, et al (2007). Association between reflux oesophagitis and features of the metabolic syndrome in Japan. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*, 26: 1069-75.
- Nam SY, Choi IJ, Nam BH, Park KW, Kim CG (2009). Obesity and weight gain as risk factors for erosive oesophagitis in men. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*, 29: 1042-52.
- 29. Nilsson M, Johnsen R, Ye W, Hveem K, Lagergren J (2003). Obesity and estrogen as risk factors for gastroesophageal reflux symptoms. JAMA, 290: 66-72.
- Locke GR, Talley NJ, Fett SL, Zinsmeister AR, Melton LJ (1999). Risk factors associated with symptoms of gastroesophageal reflux. *Am J Med*, 106: 642-49.

- Choi S, Kim K, Kim SM, et al (2018). Association of obesity or weight change with coronary heart disease among young adults in South Korea. JAMA Internal Med, 178: 1060-68.
- 32. Azab M, Al-Shudifat AE, Johannessen A, Al-Shdaifat A, Agraib LM et al (2018). Are Risk Factors for Coronary Artery Disease Different in Persons With and Without Obesity? *Metab Syndr Relat Disord*, 16: 440-45.
- 33. Bechlioulis A, Vakalis K, Naka KK, et al (2013). Paradoxical protective effect of central obesity in patients with suspected stable coronary artery disease. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 21(3):E314-21.
- Tseng CH (2008). Waist-to-height ratio and CAD in Taiwanese type 2 diabetic patients. Obesity, 16: 2754-59.
- 35. Lin GM, Li YH, Lai CP, Lin CL, Wang JH (2015). The obesity-mortality paradox in elderly patients with angiographic coronary artery disease: a report from the ET-CHD registry. *Acta Cardiol*, 70: 479-86.
- 36. Zen V, Fuchs FD, Wainstein MV et al (2012). Neck circumference and central obesity are independent predictors of coronary artery disease in patients undergoing coronary angiography. *Am J Cardiovasc Dis*, 2: 323-30.
- 37. Jensen JC, Dardari ZA, Blaha MJ, et al (2020). Association of Body Mass Index With Coronary Artery Calcium and Subsequent Cardiovascular Mortality: The Coronary Artery Calcium Consortium. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging*, 13: e009495.
- Hsu CH, Chang SGN, Hwang KC, Chou P (2007). Impact of obesity on coronary artery calcification examined by electron beam computed tomographic scan. *Diabetes Obes Metab*, 9: 354-59.
- 39. Park HW, Kim KH, Song IG, et al (2017). Body mass index, carotid plaque, and clinical outcomes in patients with coronary artery disease. *Coron Artery Dis*, 28: 278–86.

- 40. Sui Y, Zhao HL, Wong VCW et al (2012). A systematic review on use of Chinese medicine and acupuncture for treatment of obesity. Obes Rev, 13: 409–30.
- 41. Corley DA, Kubo A (2006). Body mass index and GERD: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Am J Gastroenterol, 101: 2619–28.
- 42. Baeg MK, Ko SH, Ko SY, Jung HS, Choi MG (2018). Obesity increases the risk of EE but metabolic unhealthiness alone does not: a large-scale cross-sectional study. *BMC Gastroenterol*, 18: 82.
- Duggan JP, Peters AS, Trachiotis GD, Antevil JL (2022). Epidemiology of Coronary Artery Disease. Surg Clin North Am, 102:499-16.
- 44. Jahangir E, De Schutter A, Lavie CJ (2014). The relationship between obesity and coronary artery disease. *Transl Res*, 164: 336-44.
- 45. Riaz H, Khan MS, Siddiqi TJ et al (2018). Association Between Obesity and Cardiovascular Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Mendelian Randomization Studies. JAMA Network Open, 1:e183788.
- 46. Coutinho T, Goel K, Corrêa de Sá D et al (2011). Central obesity and survival in subjects with coronary artery disease: a systematic review of the literature and collaborative analysis with individual subject data. J Am Coll Cardiol, 57: 1877-86.
- 47. Reis JP, Loria CM, Lewis CE et al (2013). Association between Duration of Overall and Abdominal Obesity Beginning in Young Adulthood and Coronary Artery Calcification in Middle Age. JAMA, 310: 280-8.
- Collaboration APCS (2007). The burden of overweight and obesity in the Asia–Pacific region. Obes Rev, 8: 191-6.
- 49. Wu JCY (2008). Gastroesophageal reflux disease: an Asian perspective. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 23: 1785-93.