## **ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE**



# Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter-2 Inhibitors and Major Adverse Cardiovascular Outcomes: A SMART-C Collaborative Meta-Analysis

Siddharth M. Patel, MD, MPH; Yu Mi Kang<sup>®</sup>, MD, PhD; KyungAh Im, PhD; Brendon L. Neuen<sup>®</sup>, MBBS, MSc, PhD; Stefan D. Anker<sup>®</sup>, MD, PhD; Deepak L. Bhatt<sup>®</sup>, MD, MPH, MBA; Javed Butler<sup>®</sup>, MD, MPH, MBA; David Z.I. Cherney<sup>®</sup>, MD, PhD; Brian L. Claggett<sup>®</sup>, PhD; Robert A. Fletcher<sup>®</sup>, MSc; William G. Herrington<sup>®</sup>, MD; Silvio E. Inzucchi<sup>®</sup>, MD; Meg J. Jardine<sup>®</sup>, PhD; Kenneth W. Mahaffey<sup>®</sup>, MD; Darren K. McGuire<sup>®</sup>, MD, MHSc; John J.V. McMurray<sup>®</sup>, MD; Bruce Neal<sup>®</sup>, MB ChB, PhD; Milton Packer<sup>®</sup>, MD; Vlado Perkovic<sup>®</sup>, MBBS, PhD; Scott D. Solomon<sup>®</sup>, MD; Natalie Staplin<sup>®</sup>, PhD; Muthiah Vaduganathan<sup>®</sup>, MD, MPH; Christoph Wanner<sup>®</sup>, MD; David C. Wheeler<sup>®</sup>, MD; Faiez Zannad<sup>®</sup>, MD, PhD; Yujie Zhao<sup>®</sup>, PhD; Hiddo J.L. Heerspink<sup>®</sup>, PhD; Marc S. Sabatine<sup>®</sup>, MD, MPH<sup>\*</sup>; Stephen D. Wiviott<sup>®</sup>, MD<sup>\*</sup>

**BACKGROUND:** Sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2i) consistently improve heart failure and kidney-related outcomes; however, effects on major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) across different patient populations are less clear.

**METHODS:** This was a collaborative trial-level meta-analysis from the SGLT2i Meta-analysis Cardio-Renal Trialists Consortium, which includes all phase 3, placebo-controlled, outcomes trials of SGLT2i across 3 patient populations (patients with diabetes at high risk for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, heart failure [HF], or chronic kidney disease). The outcomes of interest were MACE (composite of cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or stroke), individual components of MACE (inclusive of fatal and nonfatal events), all-cause mortality, and death subtypes. Effect estimates for SGLT2i versus placebo were meta-analyzed across trials and examined across key subgroups (established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, previous myocardial infarction, diabetes, previous HF, albuminuria, chronic kidney disease stages, and risk groups).

**RESULTS:** A total of 78607 patients across 11 trials were included: 42568 (54.2%), 20725 (26.4%), and 15314 (19.5%) were included from trials of patients with diabetes at high risk for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, HF, or chronic kidney disease, respectively. SGLT2i reduced the rate of MACE by 9% (hazard ration [HR], 0.91 [95% CI, 0.87–0.96], P<0.0001) with a consistent effect across all 3 patient populations (P=0%) and across all key subgroups. This effect was primarily driven by a reduction in cardiovascular death (HR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.81–0.92], P<0.0001), with no significant effect for myocardial infarction in the overall population (HR, 0.95 [95% CI, 0.87–1.04], P=0.29), and no effect on stroke (HR, 0.99 [95% CI, 0.91–1.07], P=0.77). The benefit for cardiovascular death was driven primarily by reductions in HF death and sudden cardiac death (HR, 0.68 [95% CI, 0.46–1.02] and HR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.78–0.95], respectively) and was generally consistent across subgroups, with the possible exception of being more apparent in those with albuminuria ( $P_{interaction}$ =0.02).

**CONCLUSIONS:** SGLT2i reduce the risk of MACE across a broad range of patients irrespective of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, diabetes, kidney function, or other major clinical characteristics at baseline. This effect is driven primarily by a reduction of cardiovascular death, particularly HF death and sudden cardiac death, without a significant effect on myocardial infarction in the overall population, and no effect on stroke. These data may help inform selection for SGLT2i therapies across the spectrum of cardiovascular-kidney-metabolic disease.

Key Words: diabetes mellitus = heart failure = meta-analysis = metabolic syndrome = renal insufficiency, chronic sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors

For Sources of Funding and Disclosures, see page 1799.

Correspondence to: Siddharth M. Patel, MD, MPH, TIMI Study Group, 60 Fenwood Rd, 7th Floor, Suite 7022, Boston, MA 02115. Email spatel@bwh.harvard.edu This manuscript was sent to Ileana Piña, Guest Editor, for review by expert referees, editorial decision, and final disposition.

<sup>\*</sup>M.S. Sabatine and S.D. Wiviott contributed equally.

Supplemental Material, the podcast, and transcript are available with this article at https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/suppl/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.124.069568. Continuing medical education (CME) credit is available for this article. Go to http://cme.ahajournals.org to take the quiz.

<sup>© 2024</sup> The Authors. *Circulation* is published on behalf of the American Heart Association, Inc., by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is properly cited, the use is noncommercial, and no modifications or adaptations are made.

Circulation is available at www.ahajournals.org/journal/circ

## **Clinical Perspective**

#### What Is New?

- Sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2i) reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events (composite of cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or stroke) across a broad range of patient populations and key subgroups.
- The primary benefit of SGLT2i for major adverse cardiovascular events is driven by a reduction in cardiovascular death, without a clear effect on myocardial infarction or stroke.
- The treatment benefit of SGLT2i for cardiovascular death is mediated primarily by a reduction in the risk of heart failure death and sudden cardiac death.

## What Are the Clinical Implications?

- These data suggest that SGLT2i have beneficial effects on major adverse cardiovascular events that are consistent irrespective of established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease or diabetes status at baseline, and across a wide range of kidney function, including in the subset of patients with advanced stage chronic kidney disease.
- These data may collectively help to inform the selection of SGLT2i therapy across a broad range of patients encountered in clinical practice.

## Nonstandard Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASCVD	atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease
eGFR	estimated glomerular filtration rate
KDIGO	Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes
MACE	major adverse cardiovascular events
MI	myocardial infarction
SGLT2i	sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors
SMART-C	SGLT2 Inhibitor Meta-Analysis Cardio-Renal Trialists Consortium

odium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2i) have been rigorously examined in several large, randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical outcomes trials that have enrolled a broad range of patient populations, including those with type 2 diabetes and established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) or with multiple ASCVD risk factors,<sup>1-4</sup> heart failure across the ejection fraction spectrum,<sup>5-9</sup> and chronic kidney disease across a spectrum of severity.<sup>10-13</sup> Although initially developed as glucose-lowering agents for use in patients with diabetes, data from these trials have demonstrated that SGLT2i provide consistent reductions in adverse heart failure and kidney outcomes across the class, irrespective of diabetes status at baseline.<sup>14,15</sup> However, the effects of SGLT2i on major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) have been more modest, with differences observed between trials. Prior meta-analyses have been relatively underpowered to definitively examine the effects of SGLT2i on individual components of MACE or on subtypes of these components.<sup>16,17</sup> Moreover, ongoing uncertainty exists regarding the effects of SGLT2i on MACE across several important subgroups of patients, including those without ASCVD or diabetes at baseline, and those with more advanced stages of chronic kidney disease.

Accordingly, leveraging data from all large-scale, placebo-controlled, outcomes trials of SGLT2i to date, we conducted a collaborative meta-analysis to examine the effect of SGLT2i on the risk of MACE and its individual components, overall and within clinically relevant subgroups of patients. We also assessed the effect of SGLT2i on death subtypes.

## **METHODS**

#### Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

This study was a collaborative trial-level meta-analysis of SMART-C (SGLT2 Inhibitor Meta-Analysis Cardio-Renal Trialists Consortium). In brief, SMART-C includes investigators of all large, placebo-controlled, phase 3 outcomes trials of SGLT2i, allowing for sharing of trial data across the consortium as previously described.<sup>15</sup> Each of the included trials was approved by the governing institutional review board or ethics committee at each site and written informed consent was obtained from all participants. We encourage parties interested in collaboration and data sharing to contact the corresponding author directly for further discussions. This meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systemic Reviewers and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) reporting guideline. A systematic literature search of randomized, placebo-controlled cardiovascular outcomes trials of SGLT2i between January 1, 2012, and December 28, 2023, was conducted in PubMed (Figure S1). To restrict to studies of sufficient size and follow-up time to support a rigorous examination of the treatment effect of SGLT2i on cardiovascular events, eligible studies included phase 3 placebo-controlled, doubleblind, randomized trials of SGLT2i therapy that enrolled at least 1000 participants in each arm, with median follow-up of at least 6 months. Studies with combination SGLT1/2i were excluded from the present analysis. All eligible studies were reviewed independently by 2 authors (S.M.P., Y.M.K.). Risk of bias assessments were also completed independently by 2 authors (S.M.P., Y.M.K.) using the Cochrane risk-of-bias assessment tool (Table S1). All conflicts were resolved by consensus discussion.

## Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest for this meta-analysis was the 3-point MACE composite of cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction (MI), or stroke (inclusive of all types). The individual components, inclusive of fatal and nonfatal events for MI and stroke, were also assessed. All-cause mortality and subtypes

SGLT2i and Major Adverse Cardiovascular Outcomes

of death (fatal MI, fatal stroke, heart failure death, sudden cardiac death, other cardiovascular death, and non-cardiovascular death), were also examined. All outcomes were reported at the trial level per standard definitions as described within the trialspecific clinical events committee charters.<sup>1–8,10–12</sup> Each outcome was analyzed as time-to-event, and the trial-specific effect estimates used in the meta-analysis were intention-to-treat.

#### Data Analysis

The SMART-C investigators provided the requisite trial-level summary data (hazard ratio and corresponding 95% CI) for each included study in this collaborative meta-analysis. Owing to the possibility that treatment effects for some outcomes may vary across the studied populations, trial effect estimates were first meta-analyzed using a fixed-effects model within each of the 3 primary patient populations (type 2 diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, heart failure, and chronic kidney disease), and then pooled as random effects for calculation of the overall effect estimates. A sensitivity analysis was also performed using fixed effects to calculate overall estimates for the main effects. Heterogeneity of estimated treatment effects across the 3 primary trial populations was assessed using the Cochrane Q statistic and Higgins and Thompson  $l^2$  and was considered to be low if  $l^2$  was <25%, moderate if  $l^2$  was 25 to <75%, and high if  $l^2$  was  $\geq$ 75%.

Effect modification was examined by random-effects meta regression models, including an intercept and the subgroup of interest as a moderator using the method of residual maximum likelihood and Hartung-Knapp adjustment. Predefined subgroups of interest in this study included established ASCVD or not (protocol-defined in some trials, derived post hoc in others; Table S2), diabetes status at baseline, previous MI, history of heart failure (specific predefined criteria in the heart failure trials, simple medical history question in the non-heart failure trials), chronic kidney disease (assessed dichotomously as estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] <60 versus ≥60 mL·min<sup>-1</sup>·1.73 m<sup>-2</sup> and categorically by the Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes [KDIGO] stages),<sup>18</sup> albuminuria at baseline (<30 versus ≥30 mg/g), and KDIGO risk groups defined by a combination of eGFR and albuminuria.18 Specifically for the ordered KDIGO stages and risk groups, a linear test-for-trend was used to examine increases or decreases in treatment effect across groups, whereas effect modification for the nonordinal subgroups was assessed using a Hartung-Knapp test as mentioned earlier. Data availability for subgroups across trials is presented in Table S3.

All reported *P* values were 2-sided, and values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. However, heterogeneity and *P* values were interpreted carefully in the context of multiple hypothesis testing. All analyses were performed using the Metafor package<sup>19</sup> and R Statistical Software (v4.0.4; R Core Team 2021).

#### RESULTS

#### **Analysis Population Characteristics**

A total of 78607 patients were included across 11 randomized trials of SGLT2i versus placebo, with 42568 (54.2%), 20725 (26.4%), and 15314 (19.5%) included from trials that focused on enrolling patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, patients with established heart failure, or patients with chronic kidney disease, respectively (Table). The mean age ranged from 62 to 72 years across trials, with 27702 (34.4%) patients of female sex and 58571 (74.5%) of White race; older age and female sex tended to be more prevalent in the heart failure trial populations. Overall, 62654 (79.7%) patients had diabetes, 28352 (36.0%) had heart failure, and 29237 (37.2%) had an eGFR <60 mL·min<sup>-1</sup>·1.73 m<sup>-2</sup> at baseline. A total of 46305 (58.9%) patients had established ASCVD, and 22414 (28.5%) had previous MI at baseline; both established ASCVD and previous MI were least prevalent among patients enrolled in the chronic kidney disease trials, with otherwise similar prevalence among the patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD and heart failure trial populations (Table).

#### **Treatment Effect in Overall Population**

The median follow-up ranged from 2.4 to 4.2 years, 1.3 to 2.2 years, and 2.0 to 2.6 years for the patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, heart failure, and chronic kidney disease trials, respectively (Table). A total of 7976 (10.1%) patients experienced MACE, with 4148 (5.3%), 2819 (3.6%), and 2220 (2.8%) experiencing cardiovascular death, MI, and stroke, respectively, during follow-up. Stratifying by trial population, incidence rates of MACE and cardiovascular death were highest in the heart failure trials, whereas rates of MI and stroke were highest in the trials of patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD (Figures 1 and 2).

SGLT2i reduced the rate of MACE by 9% overall (hazard ratio [HR], 0.91 [95% CI, 0.87–0.96], P<0.0001), with a consistent effect observed across all 3 trial populations (P = 0; Figure 1). In terms of the individual components, SGLT2i had the clearest effect on cardiovascular death (HR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.81–0.92], P<0.0001; Figure 2). There was no clear effect on MI in the overall population (HR, 0.95 [95% CI, 0.87–1.04], P=0.29), and no effect on stroke (HR, 0.99 [95% CI, 0.91–1.07], P=0.77; Figure 2).

The distribution of cardiovascular death subtypes in the placebo arm across trial types is shown in Figure 3. In the trials of patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, sudden cardiac death accounted for about half of cardiovascular deaths, with fatal MI/stroke accounting for  $\approx 25\%$  and heart failure deaths just >10%. In the heart failure trials, sudden cardiac deaths and heart failure deaths together accounted for >70% of cardiovascular deaths, with fatal MI/stroke accounting for  $\approx 10\%$ . In the chronic kidney disease trials, sudden cardiac deaths accounted for  $\approx 40\%$  of the cardiovascular deaths, with heart failure deaths and fatal MI/stroke each accounting for 20% to 25% of cardiovascular deaths.

#### Table. Baseline Characteristics Across SGLT2 Inhibitor Trials

	Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD			Heart failure				Chronic kidney disease			
	EMPA-										
Characteristics by trial	REG Outcome	CANVAS Program	DECLARE- TIMI 58	VERTIS CV	DAPA-HF	EMPEROR- Reduced	EMPEROR- Preserved	DELIVER	CREDENCE	DAPA-CKD	EMPA- KIDNEY
Participants	7020	10142	17160	8246	4744	3730	5988	6263	4401	4304	6609
Median follow-up, y	3.1	2.4	4.2	3.0	1.5	1.3	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.0
Age, y	63.1±8.7	63.3±8.3	63.9±6.8	64.4±8.1	66.3±10.9	66.9±11.0	71.9±9.5	71.7±9.6	63.0±9.2	61.8±12.1	63.8±13.9
Female sex	2004 (28.5)	3633 (35.8)	6422 (37.4)	2477 (30.0)	1109 (23.4)	893 (23.9)	2676 (44.7)	2747 (43.9)	1494 (33.9)	1425 (33.1)	2192 (33.2)
Race, n (%)				·				·			
White	5081 (72.4)	7944 (78.3)	13653 (79.6)	7240 (87.8)	3333 (70.3)	2629 (70.4)	4542 (75.9)	4439 (70.9)	2931 (66.6)	2920 (67.8)	3859 (58.4)
Asian	1517 (21.6)	1284 (12.7)	2303 (13.4)	498 (6.0)	1116 (23.5)	672 (18.0)	824 (13.8)	1274 (20.3)	877 (19.9)	1467 (34.1)	2393 (36.2)
Black	357 (5.1)	336 (3.3)	603 (3.5)	235 (2.8)	226 (4.7)	257 (6.9)	258 (4.3)	159 (2.5)	224 (5.1)	191 (4.4)	262 (4.0)
Other or missing*	65 (0.9)	578 (5.7)	601 (3.5)	273 (3.3)	69 (1.5)	172 (4.6)	364 (6.1)	391 (6.2)	369 (8.4)	356 (8.2)	95 (1.4)
Medical history											
Established AS- CVD, n (%)	7020 (100.0)	6656 (65.6)	6974 (40.6)	8246 (100.0)	3042 (64.1)	2406 (64.5)	3320 (55.4)	3598 (57.4)	2220 (50.4)	1329 (30.9)	1494 (22.6)
Diabetes, n (%)	7020 (100.0)	10142 (100.0)	17160 (100.0)	8246 (100.0)	2139 (45.1)	1856 (49.8)	2938 (49.1)	2806 (44.8)	4401 (100.0)	2906 (67.5)	3040 (46.0)
Previous MI, n (%)	3273 (46.6)	2956 (29.1)	3584 (20.9)	3931 (47.7)	2092 (44.1)	1623 (43.5)	1780 (29.7)	1639 (26.2)	442 (10.0)	392 (9.1)	702 (10.6)
Previous HF, n (%)	706 (10.1)	1461 (14.4)	1724 (10.0)	1958 (23.7)	4744 (100.0)	3730 (100.0)	5988 (100.0)	6263 (100.0)	652 (15.0)	468 (11.0)	658 (10.0)
eGFR, mL·min <sup>-1</sup> ·1.73 m <sup>-2</sup>	74±21	77±21	85±16	76±21	66±19	62±22	61±20	61±19	56±18	43±12	37±14
eGFR groups, n (%)						1			1		
>90	1538 (21.9)	2476 (24.4)	8162 (47.6)	2048 (24.8)	621 (13.1)	449 (12.0)	468 (7.8)	503 (8.0)	211 (4.8)	0 (0.0)	46 (0.7)
60 to <90	3661 (52.2)	5625 (55.5)	7732 (45.1)	4390 (53.2)	2195 (46.3)	1480 (39.7)	2530 (42.3)	2689 (42.9)	1558 (35.4)	454 (10.5)	465 (7.0)
45 to <60	1249 (17.8)	1485 (14.6)	1076 (6.3)	1319 (16.0)	1207 (25.4)	900 (24.1)	1565 (26.1)	1657 (26.5)	1266 (28.8)	1328 (30.9)	888 (13.4)
30 to <45	543 (7.7)	526 (5.2)	169 (1.0)	457 (5.5)	695 (14.7)	694 (18.6)	1114 (18.6)	1221 (19.5)	1191 (27.1)	1898 (44.1)	2928 (44.3)
<30	27 (0.4)	28 (0.3)	20 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	24 (0.5)	205 (5.5)	309 (5.2)	192 (3.1)	174 (4.0)	624 (14.5)	2282 (34.5)
UACR											
UACR, mg/g	17.7 (7.1–72.5)	12.3 (6.7–42.1)	13.1 (6.0–43.6)	19.0 (6.0–68.0)	NA	22.1 (8.0–81.3)	21.0 (8.0– 71.6)	NA	927 (463– 1833)	949 (477– 1885)	329 (49– 1069)
UACR groups, n (%)											
<30	4171 (60.0)	7007 (69.8)	11644 (69.1)	4783 (58.0)	NA	2078 (56.0)	3474 (58.0)	NA	31 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	1328 (20.1)
30 to <300	2013 (29.0)	2266 (22.6)	4030 (23.9)	2492 (30.2)	NA	1236 (33.3)	1860 (31.1)	NA	495 (11.2)	444 (10.3)	1864 (28.2)
≥300	769 (11.0)	760 (7.6)	1169 (6.9)	755 (9.2)	NA	396 (10.7)	629 (10.5)	NA	3875 (88.0)	3859 (89.7)	3417 (51.7)

All values represent n (%) for categorical variables and mean±SD for continuous variables with the exception of UACR, which is reported as median (25th-75th percentile). ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CANVAS Program, Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study; CREDENCE, Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes With Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation; DAPA-CKD, Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease; DAPA-HF (Study to Evaluate the Effect of Dapagliflozin on the Incidence of Worsening Heart Failure or Cardiovascular Death in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure), DECLARE-TIMI 58, Dapagliflozin Effect on Cardiovascular Events – Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 58; DELIVER, Dapagliflozin Evaluation to Improve the Lives of Patients With Preserved Ejection Fraction Heart Failure; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; EMPA-KIDNEY, The Study of Heart and Kidney Protection With Preserved Ejection Fraction; Improve the Lives of Patients With Chronic Heart Failure; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; EMPA-REG Outcome; EMPEROR-Preserved, Empagliflozin Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients; EMPEROR-Preserved, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure; With Preserved Ejection Fraction; FAPEROR-Reduced, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure; With Preserved Ejection Fraction; NA, not available; UACR, urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio; and VERTIS CV, Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial.

\*Other indicates a race category not listed or combination races.

	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
	no./tota	l no. (%)	no. per 1000 patie	nt years		
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials						
EMPA-REG OUTCOME	490/4687(10.5)	282/2333 (12.1)	37.4	43.9	<b>⊢_</b> ∎`(	0.86 (0.74-0.99)
CANVAS Program	585/5795 (10.1)	426/4347(9.8)	26.9	31.5	┝──╋──┤	0.86 (0.75-0.97)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	756/8582(8.8)	803/8578(9.4)	22.6	24.2	┝╌╋╌┾	0.93 (0.84-1.03)
VERTIS-CV	735/5499(13.4)	368/2747(13.4)	40.0	40.3	⊢ <b>_</b>	0.99 (0.88-1.12)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.32)					♦	0.91 (0.86-0.97)
Heart failure trials						
DAPA-HF	289/2373(12.2)	332/2371 (14)	84.3	98.1		0.86 (0.73-1.01)
EMPEROR-Reduced	228/1863 (12.2)	233/1867(12.5)	94.3	95.9		0.98 (0.81-1.17)
EMPEROR-Preserved	319/2997(10.6)	331/2991 (11.1)	51.7	53.8	⊨∎¦I	0.97 (0.83-1.13)
DELIVER	367/3131 (11.7)	390/3132 (12.5)	54.2	57.7		0.94 (0.81-1.08)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.68)						0.94 (0.86-1.01)
Chronic kidney disease trials						
CREDENCE	217/2202(9.9)	269/2199 (12.2)	38.7	48.7	<b>⊢</b>	0.80 (0.67-0.95)
DAPA-CKD	132/2152 (6.1)	143/2152 (6.6)	28.9	31.5	▶ <b>──■</b>	0.92 (0.72-1.16)
EMPA-KIDNEY	138/3304 (4.2)	143/3305 (4.3)	21.5	22.3		0.96 (0.76-1.21)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.39)						0.87 (0.77-0.98)
Overall (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.65)					•	0.91(0.87-0.96)
Overall (RE; p-heterogeneity=0.62, I-squar	red=0%)				•	0.91(0.87-0.96)
p for treatment effect < 0.0001				0.50		0
				0120	Hazard Patio (95% CI)	•
				-		
					Favors Favors	
					SGLT2 inhibitor placebo	

**Figure 1. Overall effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibition on the major adverse cardiovascular events composite.** The forest plot depicts the treatment effect of SGLT2 inhibitors on major adverse cardiovascular events composite at the level of the individual trials, by trial type, and in the overall study population. ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CANVAS Program, Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study; CREDENCE, Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes With Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation; DAPA-CKD, Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease; DAPA-HF (Study to Evaluate the Effect of Dapagliflozin on the Incidence of Worsening Heart Failure or Cardiovascular Death in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure), DECLARE-TIMI 58, Dapagliflozin Effect on Cardiovascular Events – Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 58; DELIVER, Dapagliflozin Evaluation to Improve the Lives of Patients With Preserved Ejection Fraction Heart Failure; EMPA-KIDNEY, The Study of Heart and Kidney Protection With Empagliflozin; EMPA-REG Outcome; 10773 [Empagliflozin] Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients; EMPEROR-Preserved, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction; EMPEROR-Reduced, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction; FE, fixed effects; RE, random effects; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; and VERTIS CV, Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial.

The reduction in cardiovascular death was driven primarily by a reduction in heart failure death (HR, 0.68 [95% CI, 0.46–1.02]) and sudden cardiac death (HR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.78–0.95]), with no effect on fatal MI or fatal stroke (Figure 4). SGLT2i also reduced all-cause mortality (HR, 0.88 [95% CI, 0.82–0.94], P<0.001; Figure S2), with directional consistency for noncardiovascular death (HR, 0.91 [95% CI, 0.79–1.05]; Figure S3), and with moderate heterogeneity for both across trial types (P= 46% and 65%, respectively). The numerically largest effect on all-cause and non-cardiovascular mortality was observed for patients enrolled in the chronic kidney disease trials (HR, 0.80 [95% CI, 0.71–0.91] and HR, 0.81 [95% CI, 0.66–0.98], respectively).

#### **Treatment Effect Across Subgroups**

The treatment effect of SGLT2i on MACE and cardiovascular death by subgroups is presented in Figure 5A and 5B. Incidence rates for MACE were higher among patients with established ASCVD across all 3 trial types (Figure S4). SGLT2i consistently reduced the risk of MACE in those with versus without established ASCVD at baseline (HR, 0.92 [95% CI, 0.88–0.97] versus 0.90 [95% CI, 0.82–0.99],  $P_{interaction}$ =0.60; Figure 5A; Figures S4 and S5). SGLT2i also reduced cardiovascular death irrespective of established ASCVD at baseline (HR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.80–0.93] versus 0.86 [0.76–0.97],  $P_{interaction}$ =0.94; Figure 5B; Figure S5). For MI, the effect estimates were similar in those with or without established ASCVD (HR, 0.96 [95% CI, 0.85–1.07] versus 0.98 [95% CI, 0.82–1.18], respectively;  $P_{interaction}$ =0.72; Figure S5). Of note, in the dedicated trials of patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD (which had the most rigorous definitions for established ASCVD), in the subset with established ASCVD, the HR for the effect of SGLT2i on MI was 0.91 (95% CI, 0.82–0.998, P=0.046; Figure S5). These results were consistent when stratifying by history of MI (Figure 5; Figure S6).

The effects of SGLT2i on MACE and cardiovascular death were consistent when further stratified by diabetes status, previous heart failure, and eGFR at baseline assessed dichotomously (<60 versus  $\geq$ 60 mL·min<sup>-1</sup>·1.73 m<sup>-2</sup>; Figure 5; Figures S7 through S9). Moreover, the effects of SGLT2i on MACE and cardiovascular death were consistent across a wide range of kidney function, including in participants with eGFR <30 mL·min<sup>-1</sup>·1.73 m<sup>-2</sup> (HR, 0.83 [95% CI, 0.67–1.03]

	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
A Cardiovascular death	no. / tota	l no. (%)	no. per 1000 patie	ent years		
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials						
EMPA-REG OUTCOME	172/4687 (3.7)	137/2333 (5.9)	12.4	20.2	• · · · ·	0.62 (0.49-0.77)
CANVAS Program	268/5795(4.6)	185/4347(4.3)	11.6	12.8		0.87(0.72-1.06)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	245/8582(2.9)	249/85/8(2.9)	/	7.1		0.98(0.82-1.17)
Group estimate (FF: p-heterogeneity=0.01)	541/5499(0.2)	184/2/4/(0.7)	18.0	19.0		0.92(0.77-1.11)
Heart failure trials					$\checkmark$	0.80 (0.78-0.99)
DAPA-HF	227/2373(9.6)	273/2371 (11.5)	65.1	79.1	·	0.82(0.69-0.98)
EMPEROR-Reduced	187/1863(10)	202/1867(10.8)	75.5	81.3		0.92 (0.75-1.12)
EMPEROR-Preserved	219/2997(7.3)	244/2991 (8.2)	34.2	38.1		0.91 (0.76-1.09)
DELIVER	231/3131 (7.4)	261/3132 (8.3)	33.3	37.7	⊧ <b>≣</b> ‡•	0.88 (0.74-1.05)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.81)						0.88 (0.82-0.96)
Chronic kidney disease trials						
CREDENCE	110/2202(5)	140/2199 (6.4)	19.0	24.4		0.78 (0.61-1.00)
	65/2152(3)	80/2152(3.7)	13.9	17.3 ⊢ 10.6	•	0.81 (0.58-1.12)
EMPA-KIDNET	59/3304(1.8)	69/3305(2.1)	9.1	10.6		0.84(0.60-1.19)
Overall (FE: p-heterogeneity=0.25)						0.86(0.81-0.92)
Overall (RE; p-heterogeneity=0.66, I-squa	red=0%)				•	0.86 (0.81-0.92)
p for treatment effect < 0.0001						
_						
B Myocardial infarction						
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	222/14607/140)	126 (2222 (5.4)	16.9	10.2	_	0.87(0.70, 1.00)
CANVAS Program	225/4087(4.8)	120/2555(5.4)	10.8	19.5		0.87(0.70-1.09)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	393/8582(4.6)	441/8578 (51)	11.2	13.2		0.89(0.73-1.09) 0.89(0.77-1.01)
VERTIS-CV	330/5499(6)	158/2747 (5.8)	17.7	17.0		1.04 (0.86-1.26)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.54)	, , , , , ,	, , , ,			$\diamond$	0.92 (0.84-1.00)
Heart failure trials						
DAPA-HF	46/2373(1.9)	41/2371 (1.7)	13.3	12.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.11 (0.73-1.69)
EMPEROR-Reduced	19/1863(1)	20/1867(1.1)	7.8	8.2		0.93 (0.49-1.74)
EMPEROR-Preserved	49/2997(1.6)	40/2991 (1.3)	7.8	6.4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.23 (0.81-1.86)
DELIVER	83/3131 (2.7)	81/3132 (2.6)	12.1	11.8		1.02 (0.75-1.39)
Group estimate (FE; p-neterogeneity=0.86)						1.08 (0.88-1.32)
CREDENCE	83/2202 (3.8)	95/2199 (4.3)	14.6	16.9		0.86(0.64-1.16)
DAPA-CKD	40/2152 (1.9)	37/2152 (1.7)	8.7	8.1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.07(0.69-1.68)
EMPA-KIDNEY	49/3304 (1.5)	44/3305 (1.3)	7.6	6.8	,	1.10 (0.73-1.66)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.56)						0.97(0.78-1.19)
Overall (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.81)					<b>•</b>	0.94 (0.88-1.02)
Overall (RE; p-heterogeneity=0.35; I-squar	ed=15%)					0.95 (0.87-1.04)
p for treatment effect = 0.29				1		
0						
C Stroke						
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials						
EMPA-REGOUTCOME	164/4687(3.5)	69/2333 (3)	12.3	10.5	·	1.18 (0.89-1.56)
CANVAS Program	176/5795(3)	133/4347(3.1)	7.9	9.6		0.87(0.69-1.09)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	255/8582 (3)	263/8578 (3.1)	7.5	7.8		0.96 (0.81-1.14)
VERTIS-CV	87/5499 (1.6)	185/2747 (6.7)	9.3	9.8		1.06 (0.82-1.37)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.37)					$\rightarrow$	0.99 (0.88-1.10)
Heart failure trials	40/0070(1.0)	46/2271 (1 0)	12.2	12 5		0.00(0.50, 1.27)
EMPEROR-Reduced	42/25/5(1.8)	35/1867(1.9)	16.5	14.3		1 13 (0 72-1 78)
EMPEROR-Preserved	92/2997(3.1)	84/2991(2.8)	14.8	13.5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.10 (0.82-1.47)
DELIVER	115/3131 (3.7)	109/3132 (3.5)	16.8	16.0	·	1.05 (0.81-1.37)
Group estimate (FE; p-heterogeneity=0.87)						1.05 (0.89-1.24)
Chronic kidney disease trials						
CREDENCE	62/2202(2.8)	80/2199 (3.6)	10.9	14.2		0.77 (0.55-1.08)
DAPA-CKD	43/2152 (2)	43/2152(2)	9.3	9.4	·	0.99 (0.65-1.51)
EMPA-KIDNEY	48/3304 (1.5)	49/3305 (1.5)	7.4	7.6		0.98 (0.66-1.46)
Overall (FE: p-heterogeneity=0.56)						0.89(0.71-1.10)
Overall (RE: p-heterogeneity=0.48: I-square	red=0%)					0.99(0.91-1.07)
p for treatment effect = 0.77						
-				0.50		0
				←	nazard katio (95% CI)	
					Favors Favors	
					SGLT2 inhibitor placebo	

#### Figure 2. Overall effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibition on individual components.

These forest plots depict the treatment effect of SGLT2 inhibitors on the individual components of the major adverse cardiovascular events composite, at the level of the individual trials, by trial type, and in the overall study population. **A**, The treatment effect on cardiovascular death. **B**, The effect on myocardial infarction. **C**, The effect on stroke. ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CANVAS Program, Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study; CREDENCE, Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes With Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation; DAPA-CKD, Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease; DAPA-HF (Study to Evaluate the Effect of Dapagliflozin on the Incidence of Worsening Heart Failure or Cardiovascular Death in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure), DECLARE-TIMI 58, Dapagliflozin Effect on Cardiovascular Events – Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 58; DELIVER, Dapagliflozin Evaluation to (*Continued*)

**Figure 2 Continued.** Improve the Lives of Patients With Preserved Ejection Fraction Heart Failure; EMPA-KIDNEY, The Study of Heart and Kidney Protection With Empagliflozin; EMPA-REG Outcome; 10773 [Empagliflozin] Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients; EMPEROR-Preserved, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction; EMPEROR-Reduced, Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction; FE – fixed effects; RE, random effects; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; and VERTIS CV, Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial.

and 0.83 [95% CI, 0.63–1.09], respectively; Figures S10 and S11). Stratifying by albuminuria, the effect of SGLT2i on MACE appeared consistent ( $P_{\rm interaction}$ =0.31), whereas for cardiovascular death, there was some evidence that the benefit appeared to be primarily among those with at least some (ie, ≥30 mg/g) albuminuria ( $P_{\rm interaction}$ =0.02; Figure 5; Figures S12 and S13). Assessed across KDIGO risk groups, the benefit for MACE and cardiovascular death was consistent across groups ( $P_{\rm trend}$ =0.35 and 0.31, respectively; Figures S14 and S15).

## DISCUSSION

In this collaborative meta-analysis of ≈78000 patients across 11 randomized trials, we examined the treatment effect of SGLT2i on MACE, the individual MACE components, and subtypes of death. Moreover, by leveraging the large sample size and number of events across a broad range of patient populations afforded by this dataset, we further explored the heterogeneity of treatment effect across several clinically relevant subgroups. Overall, we observed a 9% reduction in the rate of MACE, an effect that was generally consistent across patient populations, including those with or without established ASCVD, diabetes, or heart failure at baseline, and across a wide range of kidney function. With regard to the latter, it is notable that there was no attenuation of the benefit of SGLT2i on MACE even in individuals with an eGFR <30 mL·min<sup>-1</sup>·1.73 m<sup>-2</sup>, a subgroup in whom there was initial doubt regarding the efficacy of this class of medications due to the lesser effect on urinary glucose excretion and thus glycemic control.<sup>20</sup> These data collectively provide a comprehensive overview of the anticipated treatment effects of SGLT2i across a wide range of patient populations and may help inform selection of SGLT2i therapies in patients encountered in clinical practice.

#### Treatment Effect on Individual MACE Components

In terms of the individual MACE components, the benefit of SGLT2i was driven primarily by a reduction in cardiovascular death, specifically heart failure death and sudden cardiac death. There was a nonsignificant 5% lower rate of MI in the overall study populations, suggesting that any benefit of SGLT2i on MI is likely to be small. There was no effect of SGLT2i on the risk of stroke. In addition to helping refine the expected benefit of SGLT2i, these findings also speak to some limitations of a traditional 3-point MACE composite as a clinical trial end point, which is commonly used with the intent of capturing ASCVD-related events. Our findings highlight the heterogeneity in event type that may be captured by such a composite, which becomes particularly relevant when applied across different patient populations where the risk for non–ASCVD-related cardiovascular deaths may be greater (eg, heart failure–related death versus coronary heart disease death). With respect to clinical implications, these data speak to the specific types of MACE events that may be reduced with SGLT2i and may be useful to clinicians to guide decision-making regarding the selection of glucose-lowering therapies in patients with diabetes.

# Treatment Effect on Cardiovascular Death Subtypes

With respect to subtypes of death, the benefit on cardiovascular death appeared driven largely by heart failure and sudden cardiac deaths. It is notable that sudden death is not synonymous with arrhythmia and is often a default adjudication when an unwitnessed out-ofhospital death occurs.<sup>21</sup> Such deaths may encompass both heart failure-related death (including arrhythmia) or fatal ASCVD-related deaths (including fatal MI) that occurred outside of a medical setting. As such, these findings raise the possibility that the salutary effects of SGLT2i on cardiovascular death, and thus MACE, could be driven primarily by modification of heart failure-related events. The benefit for cardiovascular death appeared to be primarily in those with some degree of albuminuria at baseline, who had approximately double the event rate compared with those without albuminuria. It remains unclear whether this is driven by the fact that albuminuria is an independent risk predictor for adverse outcomes or alternatively indicates that the mechanism of benefit may be related to the nephroprotective effects of SGLT2i. Moreover, given the large number of subgroups tested, it is also conceivable that this finding may represent a play of chance. We further found a consistent reduction in allcause mortality with directional consistency also for noncardiovascular death. However, the mechanism of benefit of SGLT2i on noncardiovascular death remains unclear. Although other potential salutary effects of SGLT2i on outcomes beyond conventional cardiovascular and kidney end points have been reported,<sup>22,23</sup> it is important to note that some of the SGLT2i trials, namely all of the



Figure 3. Cardiovascular death subtypes across trial populations (placebo arms only).

The pie charts show the distribution of subtypes of cardiovascular death in the placebo arms of each trial grouped by trial type. ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CV, cardiovascular; and MI, myocardial infarction.

chronic kidney disease trials, were prematurely terminated, which may result in an overestimate of the treatment effect in this regard.

#### Potential Differences by Patient Populations and Mechanisms of Benefit

Although the effect of SGLT2i on MI was not significant in the overall population, these data raise the possibility that there could be a potential benefit among patients clinically felt to be at a high risk of future ASCVD events, particularly the subset with definitively established ASCVD at baseline. These observations may be attributable to differences in the baseline risk of the patient populations or perhaps reflect the heterogeneity of the established ASCVD definition across trial types. For example, in the dedicated trials enrolling patients with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, rigorous definitions for established ASCVD were prospectively applied to ensure selection of a secondary prevention population as necessary to maintain the targeted event rate. In contrast, in the heart failure or chronic kidney disease trials, a retrospective definition was applied to delineate the established ASCVD group, where patients with any indication of coronary, peripheral, or cerebrovascular disease in the medical history (eg, incidentally noted coronary calcification) may have been included. In the case of the latter, these patients would be expected to be lower risk than a traditional secondary prevention population (eg, those with a previous MI), and thus could be expected to derive lower absolute benefit from such therapies. To that end, there was a 9% reduction in the rate of MI in patients with established ASCVD from the dedicated trials that required a rigorous prespecified definition for this group, and this effect was similar in the subset with previous MI from these trials.

The mechanistic underpinnings underlying the cardiovascular benefits of SGLT2i remain unclear. For MI specifically, it is uncertain whether a treatment benefit would be mediated primarily by direct atheroprotective effects, with a resultant reduction in the risk of acute plaque rupture or erosion (ie, type 1 MI), or alternatively, by a reduction in the risk of heart failure or progression in kidney disease from various pleiotropic effects that collectively may have beneficial effects for type 2 MI. We also observed no effect on stroke, which, although acknowledged as a heterogeneous entity reflective of a multitude of possible causes (both ischemic and hemorrhagic, with the former inclusive of atherosclerosis-related, cardioembolic, and small vessel/lacunar subtypes), typically has been shown to benefit from other ASCVDmodifying therapies.<sup>24-27</sup> In addition, in DAPA-MI (Dapagliflozin Effects on Cardiometabolic Outcomes in Patients With an Acute Heart Attack), which enrolled patients presenting with acute MI but excluded those with preexisting heart failure or diabetes (ie, excluding a subset potentially at higher risk for recurrent type 2 MI), there was no effect on the risk of MI.28

## **Contextualizing Findings With Previous Data**

Results from previous meta-analyses have demonstrated a robust reduction in the risk of heart failure and kidney outcomes with SGLT2i, with consistency of treatment effect across a multitude of subgroups.<sup>15,29</sup> However, the effects of SGLT2i on MACE have remained less certain. Among the trials specifically designed to enroll patients

	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
	no./total	no. (%)		
Heart Failure Death				
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	89/24563(0.4)	84/18005(0.5)	►	0.70 (0.52-0.95)
Heart failure trials	240/10364 (2.3)	266/10361(2.6)		0.90 (0.75-1.07)
Chronic kidney disease trials	18/7658 (0.2)	46/7656(0.6) 🔶	<b>_</b>	0.41 (0.23-0.72)
RE Estimate for Overall (p-heteroge	eneity=0.02; I-square	ed=79%)		0.68 (0.46-1.02)
Sudden Cardiac Death				
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	432/24563 (1.8)	336/18005(1.9)	⊢ <b>∎</b>	0.87 (0.75-1.00)
Heart failure trials	371/10364 (3.6)	434/10361(4.2)	<b>⊢</b>	0.85 (0.74-0.98)
Chronic kidney disease trials	80/7658(1)	92/7656 (1.2)	<b>⊢</b>	0.86 (0.64-1.16)
RE Estimate for Overall (p-heteroge	eneity=0.98; I-squar	ed=0%)		0.86 (0.78-0.95)
Other Cardiovascular Death				
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	145/24563(0.6)	100/18005(0.6)	<b>⊢∎</b>	0.83 (0.65-1.08)
Heart failure trials	158/10364 (1.5)	178/10361 (1.7)	⊢ <b></b>	0.89 (0.72-1.11)
Chronic kidney disease trials	22/7658 (0.3)	23/7656 (0.3)	·	0.99 (0.53-1.82)
RE Estimate for Overall (p-heteroge	eneity=0.86; I-squar	ed=0%)		0.88 (0.75-1.03)
Fatal Myocardial Infarction				
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	97/24563(0.4)	68/18005(0.4)	►	0.96 (0.70-1.32)
Heart failure trials	64/10364(0.6)	69/10361 (0.7)		0.93(0.66-1.30)
Chronic kidney disease trials	24/7658(0.3)	25/7656 (0.3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.95 (0.54-1.68)
RE Estimate for Overall (p-heteroge	eneity=0.99; I-squar	ed=0%)		0.95 (0.76-1.17)
Fatal Stroke				
Diabetes at high risk for ASCVD trials	108/24563(0.4)	74/18005(0.4)	·	0.98 (0.72-1.33)
Heart failure trials	31/10364 (0.3)	33/10361 (0.3)	·	0.94 (0.57-1.54)
Chronic kidney disease trials	32/7658(0.4)	30/7656(0.4)	·i•	1.06 (0.64-1.74)
RE Estimate for Overall (p-heteroge	eneity=0.94; I-squar	ed=0%)		0.99 (0.78-1.24)
			0.50 0.75 1.00 1.25 1.50 1.75 2.0	0
			Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	
			Favors Favors	
			SGLT2 inhibitor placebo	

Figure 4. Overall effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibition on subtypes of cardiovascular death. These forest plots depict the treatment effect of SGLT2 inhibitors on subtypes of cardiovascular death. ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; RE, random effects; and SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2.

with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD, a within-trial effect on MACE was seen in 2 of the trials,<sup>1,2</sup> but not in 2 other trials.<sup>3,4</sup> Pooling data from these 4 trials, previous meta-analyses demonstrated a reduction in MACE with SGLT2i versus placebo restricted to the subset of patients with established ASCVD, with an otherwise neutral effect in the subgroup without ASCVD.<sup>16,17</sup> Our study expands on these previous findings, leveraging the totality of randomized data for SGLT2i across a broader range of patient populations with the more nuanced findings noted above.

#### Limitations

Several limitations of our study should be acknowledged. Our results should be interpreted in the context of the differences in eligibility criteria, follow-up duration, and subgroup definitions (in particular, the definition of established ASCVD) across studies. With only 1 or 2 trials of each drug in each disease state, the data do not permit rigorous comparisons of different members of the class. Because all included patients are reflective of those enrolled on the basis of diabetes with high risk for ASCVD, heart failure, or chronic kidney disease at baseline, the absence of 1 characteristic (eg, no diabetes) may select for another (eg, either heart failure or chronic kidney disease), and thus, these findings may not be generalizable to all patients (eg, a patient without diabetes, heart failure, and chronic kidney disease) encountered in clinical practice. Observations regarding possible heterogeneity of treatment effect in subgroups should be interpreted as hypothesis-generating given the multiple outcomes and subgroups tested.

#### Conclusions

SGLT2i consistently reduce the risk of MACE across a broad range of patient populations irrespective of ASCVD, diabetes, or kidney function at baseline. This benefit appears to be driven primarily by a reduction in cardiovascular death, particularly heart failure death and sudden cardiac death, without a significant effect on MI in the overall population and no effect on stroke. These data may help inform the selection of SGLT2i therapies across the spectrum of cardiovascular-kidney-metabolic disease.

A MACE Composite	SGLT2 inhibitor	Placebo		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Interaction P-value
	no. / total	no. (%)			
Overall			•	0.91 (0.87-0.96)	
Established ASCVD				()	0.60
Yes	3325/26443(12.6)	2750/20530 (13.4)		0.92(0.88-0.97)	
No	931/16142 (5.8)	970/15492(6.3)	⊢ <b>∎</b> -1	0.90(0.82-0.99)	
Prior Myocardial Infarction					0.35
Yes	2529/30039 (8.4)	2236/26154 (8.5)	H <b>B</b> -1	0.90(0.84-0.96)	
No	1727/12546 (13.8)	1484/9868(15)	H <b>H</b> H	0.93(0.88-0.98)	
Diabetes		2055 (200 / 0 /10 0)	_	0.01(0.04, 0.05)	0.40
Yes	3624/34614(10.5)	3055/28040(10.9)		0.91(0.86-0.95)	
NO	632/7971(7.9)	665/7982(8.3)	F	0.95(0.85-1.06)	0.20
Prior Heart Failure	1071/1/// 555 (12.9)	1709/12607(121)		0.04 (0.88, 1.00)	0.20
res	18/1/14055(12.8)	1/98/1509/(15.1)		0.94 (0.88-1.00)	
NO Chronic Kidney Disease	2385/27929(8.5)	1922/22324 (8.0)		0.90(0.84-0.95)	0.76
Voc (aCEP < 60 mL/min/1 72 m2)	2597/27205 (0 F)	2122/21006 (0.7)		0.01(0.95_0.09)	0.76
No	2587/27505(9.5)	2155/21990 (9.7)		0.91(0.85-0.98)	
Prosonce of Albuminuria	1009/15272(10.9)	1585/14021(11.5)		0.92(0.87-0.98)	0.21
Voc (UACE > 20 mg/g)	1016/1720/ (11)	1690/1/025 (11.2)		0.00(0.84-0.06)	0.51
No	16/12/10226 (9.5)	1080/14955(11.2)		0.90(0.84-0.90)	
NO	1042/19230 (8.3)	1284/19249 (8.4)		0.94 (0.87-1.02)	
B Cardiovascular Death					
Overall			◆ }	0.86 (0.81-0.92)	
Established ASCVD					0.94
Yes	1621/26443 (6.1)	1470/20530 (7.2)	HE-1	0.86 (0.80-0.93)	
No	503/16142 (3.1)	554/15492 (3.6)	⊢ <b>∎</b> −-i	0.86 (0.76-0.97)	
Prior Myocardial Infarction					0.59
Yes	1254/30039 (4.2)	1209/26154(4.6)	∎	0.85 (0.76-0.94)	
No	870/12546(6.9)	815/9868(8.3)	<b>⊢</b> ∎→	0.88 (0.81-0.95)	
Diabetes					0.62
Yes	1689/34614(4.9)	1531/28040 (5.5)	H <b>B</b> -1	0.86 (0.80-0.92)	
No	435/7971 (5.5)	493/7982(6.2)	┝──╋──┤	0.88 (0.77-1.00)	
Prior Heart Failure					0.32
Yes	1234/14655 (8.4)	1282/13697(9.4)	F-₩-1	0.88 (0.81-0.95)	
No	890/27929 (3.2)	742/22324 (3.3)		0.83(0.74-0.93)	
Chronic Kidney Disease					0.96
Yes (eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m2)	1148/27045 (4.2)	1027/21745 (4.7)	<b>⊢</b> ∎→	0.87(0.79-0.95)	
No	974/15272(6.4)	995/14021 (7.1)	H <b>B</b> -1	0.86 (0.79-0.94)	
Presence of Albuminuria					0.02
Yes (UACR ≥30 mg/g)	945/17394 (5.4)	938/14935 (6.3)		0.80 (0.72-0.88)	
No	711/19236 (3.7)	537/15249 (3.5)		0.99 (0.89-1.11)	
		0	.50 0.75 1.00 1.25 1.50 1.752.00	0	
			Hazard Ratio (95% CI)		
			← →		
			Favors Favors SGLT2 inhibitor placebo		

## Figure 5. Overall effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibition by subgroups for the major adverse cardiovascular events composite and cardiovascular death.

**A**, The treatment effect of SGLT2 inhibitors on the MACE composite across subgroups. **B**, The treatment effect on cardiovascular death across subgroups. ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; and UACR, urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio.

#### **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

Received March 7, 2024; accepted March 30, 2024.

#### Affiliations

TIMI Study Group (S.M.P., Y.M.K., K.I., M.S.S., S.D.W.), Cardiovascular Division, Department of Medicine (S.M.P., K.I., B.L.N., B.L.C., S.D.S., M.V., M.S.S., S.D.W.), Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and Hypertension, Department of Medicine (Y.M.K.), Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA. The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia (B.L.N., R.A.F., M.J.J., B.N., V.P., H.J.L.H.). Department of Renal Medicine, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, Australia (B.L.N.). Berlin Institute of Health Center for Regenerative Therapies (BCRT); German Centre for Cardiovascular Research (DZHK) partner site Berlin; Charité Universitätsmedizin (S.D.A.). Mount Sinai Fuster Heart Hospital, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY (D.L.B.). Baylor Scott and White Research Institute, Dallas, TX (J.B.). Department of Medicine, University of Mississippi School of Medicine, Jackson (J.B.). Department of Medicine, Division of Nephrology, Toronto General Hospital, Ontario, Canada (D.Z.I.C.). Renal Studies Group, Clinical Trial Service Unit and Epidemiological Studies Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, United Kingdom (W.G.H., N.S.). Section of Endocrinology, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT (S.E.I.). Stanford Center for Clinical Research (SCCR), Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, CA (K.W.M.) University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Parkland Health, Dallas (D.K.M.). British Heart Foundation Cardiovascular Research Centre, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom (J.J.V.M.). Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas TX(M.P). Imperial College, London, United Kingdom (M.P). Department of Clinical Research and Epidemiology, Comprehensive Heart Failure Center (CHFC), University Hospital, Würzburg, Germany (C.W.). Department of Renal Medicine, University College London, United Kingdom (D.C.W.). Université de Lorraine, Inserm Centre d'Investigations Cliniques Plurithématique 1433, and CHRU, Nancy, France (F.Z.). Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, NJ (Y.Z.). Department Clinical Pharmacology, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Netherlands (H.J.L.H.).

#### Sources of Funding

Dr Patel is supported by a T32 postdoctoral training grant from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (T32HL007604). Dr Kang is funded by a T32 postdoctoral training grant from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (5T32DK007529). EMPA-REG Outcome (10773 [Empagliflozin] Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients), EMPEROR-Reduced (EMPEROR-Reduced (Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction), EMPEROR-Preserved (Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction), and EMPA-KIDNEY (The Study of Heart and Kidney Protection With Empagliflozin) were funded by Boehringer Ingelheim. The CANVAS Program (Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study) and CREDENCE (Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes With Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation) were funded by Janssen Research & Development, LLC. DECLARE-TIMI 58 (Dapagliflozin Effect on Cardiovascular Events - Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 58), DAPA-HF (Study to Evaluate the Effect of Dapagliflozin on the Incidence of Worsening Heart Failure or Cardiovascular Death in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure), DAPA-CKD (Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease), and DELIVER (Dapagliflozin Evaluation to Improve the Lives of Patients With Preserved Ejection Fraction Heart Failure) were funded by AstraZeneca. VERTIS CV (Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial) was funded by Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp, a subsidiary of Merck & Co, Inc, in collaboration with Pfizer Inc. SMART-C (SGLT2 Inhibitor Meta-Analysis Cardio-Renal Trialists Consortium) is supported in part through an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Emerging Leader Investigator Grant (grant number 2026621) and a Ramaciotti Foundation Health Investment Grant (grant number 2023HIG69), both awarded to Dr Neuen. These funders had no role in the design, interpretation, drafting of the manuscript, or decision to submit for publication.

#### Disclosures

Drs Patel, Kang, Im, Sabatine, and Wiviott are members of the TIMI Study Group, which has received institutional grant support through Brigham and Women's Hospital from Abbott, Abiomed, Inc., Amgen, Anthos Therapeutics, ARCA Biopharma, Inc., AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Daiichi-Sankyo, Ionis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Janssen Research and Development, LLC, Medlmmune, Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Roche, Saghmos Therapeutics, Inc., Softcell Medical Limited, The Medicines Company, Verve Therapeutics, Inc., and Zora Biosciences. Dr Patel reports consulting fees from Janssen. Dr Neuen reports fees for travel support, advisory boards, scientific presentations, and steering committee roles from AstraZeneca, Alexion, Bayer, Boehringer and Ingelheim, Cambridge Healthcare Research, Cornerstone Medical Education, Janssen, the limbic, Medscape, and Travere Therapeutics with all honoraria paid to The George Institute for Global Health. Dr Anker reports grants and personal fees from Vifor and Abbott Vascular, and personal fees for consultancies, trial committee work, or lectures from Actimed, Amgen, Astra Zeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Brahms, Cardiac Dimensions, Cardior, Cordio, CVRx, Cytokinetics, Edwards, Farraday Pharmaceuticals, GSK, HeartKinetics, Impulse Dynamics, Occlutech, Pfizer, Regeneron, Repairon, Scirent, Sensible Medical, Servier, Vectorious, and V-Wave. Named co-inventor of 2 patent applications regarding MRproANP (DE 102007010834 and DE 102007022367), but he does not benefit personally from the related issued patents. Dr Bhatt discloses the following relationships: advisory boards for: Angiowave, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, CellProthera, Cereno Scientific, Elsevier Practice Update Cardiology, High Enroll, Janssen, Level Ex, McKinsey, Medscape Cardiology, Merck, MyoKardia, NirvaMed, Novo Nordisk, PhaseBio, PLx Pharma, and Stasys; boards of directors: American Heart Association New York City, Angiowave (stock options), Bristol Myers Squibb (stock), DRS.LINQ (stock options), and High Enroll (stock); consultant: Broadview Ventures, GlaxoSmithKline, Hims, SFJ, and Youngene; data monitoring committees: Acesion Pharma, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Baim Institute for Clinical Research (formerly Harvard Clinical Research Institute, for the PORTICO trial [Portico Re-sheathable Transcatheter Aortic Valve System US IDE

Trial]), funded by St. Jude Medical, now Abbott), Boston Scientific (chair, PEITHO trial [Pulmonary Embolism International Thrombolysis Trial]), Cleveland Clinic, Contego Medical (chair, PERFORMANCE 2 [Protection Against Emboli During Carotid Arter Stenting Using the Neuroguard IEP System]), Duke Clinical Research Institute, Mayo Clinic, Mount Sinai School of Medicine (for the ENVISAGE trial [Edoxaban Versus Standard of Care and Their Effects on Clinical Outcomes in Patients Having Undergone Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation-Atrial Fibrillation], funded by Daiichi Sankyo; for the ABILITY-DM trial (Randomized Comparison of Abluminus DSE+ Sirolimus-Eluting Stents Versus Everolimus-Eluting Stents in Coronary Artery Disease Patients With Diabetes Mellitus Global), funded by Concept Medical; for ALLAY-HF (Safety and Efficacy of the Alleviant System for No-Implant Interatrial Shunt Creation in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure), funded by Alleviant Medical), Novartis, Population Health Research Institute; Rutgers University (for the National Institutes of Health-funded MINT Trial [Myocardial Ischemia and Transfusion]); Honoraria: American College of Cardiology (senior associate editor, Clinical Trials and News, ACC.org; chair, ACC accreditation oversight committee), Arnold and Porter law firm (work related to Sanofi/Bristol-Myers Squibb clopidogrel litigation), Baim Institute for Clinical Research (formerly Harvard Clinical Research Institute; RE-DUAL PCI clinical trial [Evaluation of Dual Therapy With Dabigatran vs Triple Therapy With Warfarin in Patients With AF That Undergo a PCI With Stenting] steering committee funded by Boehringer Ingelheim; AEGIS-II [Study to Investigate CSL112 in Subjects With Acute Coronary Syndrome] executive committee funded by CSL Behring), Belvoir Publications (editor in chief, Harvard Heart Letter), Canadian Medical and Surgical Knowledge Translation Research Group (clinical trial steering committees), CSL Behring (AHA lecture), Cowen and Company, Duke Clinical Research Institute (clinical trial steering committees, including for the PRONOUNCE trial [A Trial Comparing Cardiovascular Safety of Degarelix Versus Leuprolide in Patients With Advanced Prostate Cancer and Cardiovascular Disease], funded by Ferring Pharmaceuticals), HMP Global (editor in chief, Journal of Invasive Cardiology), Journal of the American College of Cardiology (guest editor; associate editor), K2P (co-chair, interdisciplinary curriculum), Level Ex, Medtelligence/ReachMD (CME steering committees), MJH Life Sciences, Oakstone CME (course director, Comprehensive Review of Interventional Cardiology), Piper Sandler, Population Health Research Institute (for the COMPASS [Cardiovascular Outcomes for People Using Anticoagulation Strategies] operations committee, publications committee, steering committee, and USA national co-leader, funded by Baver), WebMD (CME steering committees), Wiley (steering committee); Other: Clinical Cardiology (deputy editor); Patent: Sotagliflozin (named on a patent for sotagliflozin assigned to Brigham and Women's Hospital who assigned to Lexicon; neither I nor Brigham and Women's Hospital receive any income from this patent); Research Funding: Abbott, Acesion Pharma, Afimmune, Aker Biomarine, Alnylam, Amarin, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Beren, Boehringer Ingelheim, Boston Scientific, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cardax, CellProthera, Cereno Scientific, Chiesi, CinCor, Cleerly, CSL Behring, Eisai, Ethicon, Faraday Pharmaceuticals, Ferring Pharmaceuticals, Forest Laboratories, Fractyl, Garmin, HLS Therapeutics, Idorsia, Ironwood, Ischemix, Janssen, Javelin, Lexicon, Lilly, Medtronic, Merck, Moderna, MyoKardia, NirvaMed, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Otsuka, Owkin, Pfizer, PhaseBio, PLx Pharma, Recardio, Regeneron, Reid Hoffman Foundation, Roche, Sanofi, Stasys, Synaptic, The Medicines Company, Youngene, and 89Bio; Royalties: Elsevier (editor, Braunwald's Heart Disease); site co-investigator: Abbott, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, CSI, Endotronix, St. Jude Medical (now Abbott), Philips, SpectraWAVE, Svelte, Vascular Solutions; trustee: American College of Cardiology; Unfunded Research: FlowCo. Dr Butler reports consulting fees from Abbott, American Regent, Amgen, Applied Therapeutic, AskBio, Astellas, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Boston Scientific, Bristol Myers Squibb, Cardiac Dimension, Cardiocell, Cardior, CSL Bearing, CVRx, Cytokinetics, Daxor, Edwards, Element Science, Faraday, Foundry, G3P, Innolife, Impulse Dynamics, Imbria, Inventiva, Ionis, Lexicon, Lilly, LivaNova, Janssen, Medtronics, Merck, Occlutech, Owkin, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pharmacosmos, Pharmain, Pfizer, Prolaio, Regeneron, Renibus, Roche, Salamandra, Sanofi, SC Pharma, Secretome, Sequana, SO Innovation, Tenex, Tricog, Ultromics, Vifor, and Zoll. Dr Cherney has received honoraria from Boehringer Ingelheim-Lilly, Merck, AstraZeneca, Sanofi, Mitsubishi-Tanabe, Abbvie, Janssen, Bayer, Prometic, BMS, Maze, Gilead, CSL-Behring, Otsuka, Novartis, Youngene, Lexicon and Novo-Nordisk, and received operational funding for clinical trials from Boehringer Ingelheim-Lilly, Merck, Janssen, Sanofi, AstraZeneca, CSL-Behring, and Novo-Nordisk. Dr Claggett has received consulting fees from Amgen, Cardurion, Corvia, and Novartis. Dr Anand reported receiving personal fees from AstraZeneca during the conduct of the study and personal fees from Amgen, ARCA, Boston Scientific Corporation, Boehringer Ingelheim, Liva-Nova, and Zensun outside the submitted work. D. Herrington reports funding from the UK Medical Research Council, Kidney Research UK, and Health Data Research UK; and grants to the University of Oxford from Boehringer Ingelheim and Eli Lilly for the EMPA-KIDNEY trial. Dr Inzucchi reports serving as an advisor or consultant to Boehringer Ingelheim, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Novo Nordisk, Merck,

Pfizer, Lexicon, Abbott, VTV Therapeutics, and Esperion, and delivering lectures sponsored by Boehringer Ingelheim and AstraZeneca. Dr Jardine is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council investigator grant; is responsible for research projects that have received funding from Amgen, Baxter, CSL, Dimerix, Eli Lilly, Gambro, and MSD; has received fees for advisory, steering committee and scientific presentations from Akebia, Amgen, Astra Zeneca, Baxter, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cesas Linx, Chinook, CSL, Janssen, Medscape, MSD, Occuryx, Roche, and Vifor, with any consultancy, honoraria, or travel support paid to her institution. Dr Mahaffey's financial disclosures can be viewed at http:// med.stanford.edu/profiles/kenneth-mahaffey. Dr McGuire has received honoraria for trial leadership from Boehringer Ingelheim, Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Novo Nordisk, Esperion, Lilly USA, CSL Behring, and Eidos and NewAmsterdam; and honoraria for consultancy from Lilly USA, Boehringer Ingelheim, Merck & Co, Novo Nordisk, Applied Therapeutics, CSL Behring, Bayer, Altimmune, Intercept, Alynlam, and Pfizer. Dr McMurray has received payments through Glasgow University from work on clinical trials, consulting, and other activities from Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Cardurion, Cytokinetics, GSK, KBP Biosciences, and Novartis; has received personal consultancy fees from Alnylam Pharma, Bayer, BMS, George Clinical PTY Ltd, Ionis Pharma, Novartis, Regeneron Pharma, and River 2 Renal Corporation; has received personal lecture fees from Abbott, Alkem Metabolics, AstraZeneca, Blue Ocean Scientific Solutions Ltd., Boehringer Ingelheim, Canadian Medical and Surgical Knowledge, Emcure Pharma. Ltd, Eris Lifesciences, European Academy of CME, Hikma Pharmaceuticals, Imagica health, Intas Pharma, J.B. Chemicals & Pharma Ltd, Lupin Pharma, Medscape/Heart.Org, ProAd-Wise Communications, Radcliffe Cardiology, Sun Pharma, The Corpus, Translation Research Group, and Translational Medicine Academy; and is a director of Global Clinical Trial Partners Ltd. Dr Nunez has received personal fees from or is on advisory boards for Alleviant, AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bayer, Cytokinetics, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Rovi, and Vifor Pharma. Dr Neal has received grants for CANVAS and CREDENCE, advisory board, honoraria, travel reimbursement, all from Janssen and all paid to his institution. He has received research support from the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council principal research fellowship and from Janssen, and he has served on advisory boards or has had involvement in continuing medical education programs for Janssen, with any consultancy, honoraria, or travel support paid to his institution. He also notes institutional relationships with AbbVie, Actelion, and Janssen. Dr Packer reports consulting to 89bio, Abbvie, Altimmune, Alnylam, Amarin, Amgen, Ardelyx, Astra-Zeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Caladrius, Casana, CSL Behring, Cytokinetics, Imara, Lilly, Medtronic, Moderna, Novartis, Reata, Relypsa, and Salamandra. Dr Staplin has consulted for and received speaker fees from Abbott Laboratories, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Eli Lilly, Hanmi Pharmaceuticals, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pfizer, Roche Diagnostics, and Sanofi; and received grant support paid to his University from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Novartis, and Roche Diagnostics outside the submitted work. Dr Perkovic has received fees for advisory boards, steering committee roles and travel support from AstraZeneca, Bayer, and Janssen, with all honoraria paid to his employer. Dr Solomon has received research grants from Actelion, Alnylam, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bellerophon, Bayer, Bristol Myers Squibb, Celladon, Cytokinetics, Eidos, Gilead, GlaxoSmithKline, Ionis, Lilly, Mesoblast, MyoKardia, National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Neurotronik, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Respicardia, Sanofi Pasteur, Theracos, and US2.AI; and has consulted for Abbott, Action, Akros, Alnylam, Amgen, Arena, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Cardior, Cardurion, Corvia, Cytokinetics, Daiichi-Sankyo, GlaxoSmithKline, Lilly, Merck, Myokardia, Novartis, Roche, Theracos, Quantum Genomics, Cardurion, Janssen, Cardiac Dimensions, Tenaya, Sanofi-Pasteur, Dinaqor, Tremeau, CellPro-Thera, Moderna, American Regent, and Sarepta. Dr Staplin reports institutional grant support from Boehringer Ingelheim, Lilly, and Novo Nordisk. Dr Vaduganathan has received research grant support, served on advisory boards, or had speaker engagements with American Regent, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer AG, Baxter Healthcare, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi, Cytokinetics, Lexicon Pharmaceuticals, Merck, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pharmacosmos, Relypsa, Roche Diagnostics, Sanofi, and Tricog Health, and participates on clinical trial committees for studies sponsored by AstraZeneca, Galmed, Novartis, Baver AG, Occlutech, and Impulse Dynamics, Dr Wanner reports personal fees from Boehringer Ingelheim, AstraZeneca, Eli Lilly, and Company, MSD, and Bayer, Dr Wheeler reports honoraria and consultancy fees from Amgen, AstraZeneca (ongoing), Astellas, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Gilead, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Mundipharma, Merck Sharp, Napp, and Dohme, Takeda, Vifor Fresenius, and Zydus. Dr Zannad reports personal fees from 89Bio, Abbott, Acceleron, Applied Therapeutics, Bayer, Betagenon, Boehringer, BMS, CVRx, Cambrian, Cardior, Cereno pharmaceutical, Cellprothera, CEVA, Inventiva, KBP, Merck, NovoNordisk, Owkin, Otsuka, Roche Diagnostics, Northsea, USa2, having stock options at G3Pharmaceutical and equities at Cereno, Cardiorenal, Eshmoun Clinical research and being the founder of Cardiovascular Clinical Trialists. Dr Zhao is an employee of Merck & Co, Inc. and holds Merck stock. Dr Heerspink has received grants or contracts from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Janssen, and Novo Nordisk; consulting fees from AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, CSL Behring, Dimerix, Eli Lilly, Gilead, Janssen, Novo Nordisk, Novartis, and Travere Therapeutics; payment or honoraria for speaking from AstraZeneca and Novo Nordisk. Dr Sabatine reports research grant support through Brigham and Women's Hospital from Abbott; Amgen; Anthos Therapeutics, Inc.; AstraZeneca; Boehringer Ingelheim; Daiichi-Sankyo; Ionis; Merck; Novartis; Pfizer; Saghmos Therapeutics; Verve Therapeutics, and consulting for Amgen; Anthos Therapeutics, Inc.; AstraZeneca; Beren Therapeutics; Boehringer Ingelheim; Dr. Reddy's Laboratories; Merck; Moderna; Novo Nordisk; Precision BioSciences; and Silence Therapeutics. Dr Wiviott reports research grants from Amgen, AstraZeneca, Janssen, Merck, and Pfizer, consulting fees or honoraria from Icon Clinical and Novo Nordisk, Varian and Harvard Medical School. Dr Wiviott's spouse, Dr Caroline Fox, is an employee of Vertex, and a former employee of Flagship Pioneering and Merck.

#### **Supplemental Material**

Tables S1-S3 Figures S1-S15

#### REFERENCES

- Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, Fitchett D, Bluhmki E, Hantel S, Mattheus M, Devins T, Johansen OE, Woerle HJ, et al; EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2015;373:2117–2128. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1504720
- Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, de Zeeuw D, Fulcher G, Erondu N, Shaw W, Law G, Desai M, Matthews DR; CANVAS Program Collaborative Group. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal events in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;377:644-657. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1611925
- Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, Mosenzon O, Kato ET, Cahn A, Silverman MG, Zelniker TA, Kuder JF, Murphy SA, et al; DECLARE-TIMI 58 Investigators. Dapagliflozin and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;380:347–357. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1812389
- Cannon CP, Pratley R, Dagogo-Jack S, Mancuso J, Huyck S, Masiukiewicz U, Charbonnel B, Frederich R, Gallo S, Cosentino F, et al; VERTIS CV Investigators. Cardiovascular outcomes with ertugliflozin in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383:1425–1435. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2004967
- Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Pocock SJ, Carson P, Januzzi J, Verma S, Tsutsui H, Brueckmann M, et al; EMPEROR-Reduced Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with empagliflozin in heart failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383:1413–1424. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2022190
- McMurray JJV, Solomon SD, Inzucchi SE, Køber L, Kosiborod MN, Martinez FA, Ponikowski P, Sabatine MS, Anand IS, Bělohlávek J, et al; DAPA-HF Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381:1995–2008. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1911303
- Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, Ferreira JP, Bocchi E, Böhm M, Brunner–La Rocca H-P, Choi D-J, Chopra V, Chuquiure-Valenzuela E, et al. Empagliflozin in heart failure with a preserved ejection fraction. N Engl J Med. 2021;385:1451–1461. doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2107038
- Solomon SD, McMurray JJV, Claggett B, de Boer RA, DeMets D, Hernandez AF, Inzucchi SE, Kosiborod MN, Lam CSP, Martinez F, et al; DELIVER Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in heart failure with mildly reduced or preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;387:1089–1098. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2206286
- Bhatt DL, Szarek M, Steg PG, Cannon CP, Leiter LA, McGuire DK, Lewis JB, Riddle MC, Voors AA, Metra M, et al; SOLOIST-WHF Trial Investigators. Sotagliflozin in patients with diabetes and recent worsening heart failure. N Engl J Med. 2021;384:117–128. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2030183
- Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, Bompoint S, Heerspink HJL, Charytan DM, Edwards R, Agarwal R, Bakris G, Bull S, et al; CREDENCE Trial Investigators. Canagliflozin and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;380:2295–2306. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1811744
- Heerspink HJL, Stefánsson BV, Correa-Rotter R, Chertow GM, Greene T, Hou F-F, Mann JFE, McMurray JJV, Lindberg M, Rossing P, et al; DAPA-CKD Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with chronic kidney disease. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1436–1446. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2024816

- endpoint definitions for clinical trials. Circulation. 2018;137:961-972. doi: **ORIGINAL RESEARCH** 22. Wojeck BS, Inzucchi SE, Neeland IJ, Mancuso JP, Frederich R, Masiukiewicz U, Cater NB, McGuire DK, Cannon CP, Yaggi HK. Ertugliflozin and incident obstructive sleep apnea: an analysis from the VERTIS CV trial. Sleep Breath.
- 2023;27:669-672. doi: 10.1007/s11325-022-02594-2 23. Huang Y-M, Chen W-M, Jao A-T, Chen M, Shia B-C, Wu S-Y. Effects of SGLT2 inhibitors on clinical cancer survival in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Metab. 2024;50:101500. doi: 10.1016/j.diabet.2023.101500

10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.033502

- 24. Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaboration. Efficacy and safety of more intensive lowering of LDL cholesterol: a meta-analysis of data from 170,000 participants in 26 randomised trials. Lancet. 2010;376:1670-1681. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61350-5
- 25. Bohula EA, Wiviott SD, Giugliano RP, Blazing MA, Park J-G, Murphy SA, White JA, Mach F, Van de Werf F, Dalby AJ, et al. Prevention of stroke with the addition of ezetimibe to statin therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome in IMPROVE-IT (Improved Reduction of Outcomes: Vytorin Efficacy International Trial). Circulation. 2017;136:2440-2450. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.029095
- 26. Giugliano RP, Pedersen TR, Saver JL, Sever PS, Keech AC, Bohula EA, Murphy SA, Wasserman SM, Honarpour N, Wang H, et al; FOURIER Investigators. Stroke prevention with the PCSK9 (proprotein convertase subtilisin-kexin type 9) inhibitor evolocumab added to statin in high-risk patients with stable atherosclerosis. Stroke. 2020;51:1546-1554. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027759
- 27. Bonaca MP, Goto S, Bhatt DL, Steg PG, Storey RF, Cohen M, Goodrich E, Mauri L, Ophuis TO, Ruda M, et al. Prevention of stroke with ticagrelor in patients with prior myocardial infarction. *Circulation*. 2016;134:861-871. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.024637
- 28. James S, Erlinge D, Storey RF, McGuire DK, de Belder M, Eriksson N, Andersen K, Austin D, Arefalk G, Carrick D, et al. Dapagliflozin in myocardial infarction without diabetes or heart failure. NEJM Evid. 2024;3:EVI-Doa2300286. doi: 10.1056/EVIDoa2300286
- 29. Usman MS, Siddigi TJ, Anker SD, Bakris GL, Bhatt DL, Filippatos G, Fonarow GC, Greene SJ, Januzzi JL, Khan MS, et al. Effect of SGLT2 inhibitors on cardiovascular outcomes across various patient populations. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2023;81:2377-2387. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2023.04.034

- 12. The EMPA-KIDNEY Collaborative Group. Empagliflozin in patients with chronic kidney disease. N Engl J Med. 2023;388:117-127. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2204233
- 13. Bhatt DL, Szarek M, Pitt B, Cannon CP, Leiter LA, McGuire DK, Lewis JB, Riddle MC, Inzucchi SE, Kosiborod MN, et al; SCORED Investigators. Sotagliflozin in patients with diabetes and chronic kidney disease. N Engl J Med. 2021;384:129-139. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2030186
- 14. Vaduganathan M, Docherty KF, Claggett BL, Jhund PS, de Boer RA, Hernandez AF, Inzucchi SE, Kosiborod MN, Lam CSP, Martinez F, et al. SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with heart failure: a comprehensive metaanalysis of five randomised controlled trials. Lancet. 2022;400:757-767. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01429-5
- 15. Baigent C, Emberson J, Haynes R, Herrington WG, Judge P, Landray MJ, Mayne KJ, Ng SYA, Preiss D, Roddick AJ, et al. Impact of diabetes on the effects of sodium glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors on kidney outcomes: collaborative meta-analysis of large placebo-controlled trials. Lancet. 2022;400:1788-1801. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)02074-8
- 16. Zelniker TA, Wiviott SD, Raz I, Im K, Goodrich EL, Bonaca MP, Mosenzon O, Kato ET, Cahn A, Furtado RHM, et al. SGLT2 inhibitors for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cardiovascular outcome trials. Lancet. 2019;393:31-39. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32590-X
- 17. McGuire DK, Shih WJ, Cosentino F, Charbonnel B, Cherney DZI, Dagogo-Jack S, Pratley R, Greenberg M, Wang S, Huyck S, et al. Association of SGLT2 inhibitors with cardiovascular and kidney outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. JAMA Cardiol. 2021;6:148-158. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2020.4511
- 18. Levin A, Stevens PE. Summary of KDIGO 2012 CKD Guideline: behind the scenes, need for guidance, and a framework for moving forward. Kidney Int. 2014;85:49-61. doi: 10.1038/ki.2013.444
- 19. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the Metafor package. J Stat Softw. 2010;36:1-48.
- 20. Tahrani AA, Barnett AH, Bailey CJ. SGLT inhibitors in management of diabetes. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2013;1:140-151. doi: 10.1016/S2213-8587(13)70050-0
- 21. Hicks KA, Mahaffey KW, Mehran R, Nissen SE, Wiviott SD, Dunn B, Solomon SD. Marler JR. Teerlink JR. Farb A. et al: Standardized Data Collection for Cardiovascular Trials Initiative (SCTI). 2017 cardiovascular and stroke