

**Guided antiplatelet therapy with P2Y12 antagonists in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: 3 systematic reviews with meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials with homogeneous design**

Simone Birocchi<sup>1</sup>, Matteo Rocchetti<sup>2</sup>, Alessandro Minardi<sup>2</sup>,  
Gian Marco Podda<sup>1</sup>, Alessandro Squizzato<sup>3</sup> and Marco Cattaneo<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Divisione di Medicina Generale II, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, Dipartimento di Scienze della Salute, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy;

<sup>2</sup> Divisione di Cardiologia, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, Dipartimento di Scienze della Salute, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy;

<sup>3</sup> Research Center on Thromboembolic Disorders and Antithrombotic Therapies, ASST Lariana, University of Insubria, Como, Italy

<sup>4</sup> Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy.

**Running title:** Guided therapy with P2Y12 antagonists in PCI

**Abstract word count: 300**

**Text word count (main text, figure legends, references): 6,917**

**Correspondence:**

Professor Marco Cattaneo, MD

<sup>4</sup> Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy Milano, Italy

Email: [marco.natale.cattaneo@gmail.com](mailto:marco.natale.cattaneo@gmail.com), marco.cattaneo@unimi.it

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Conflicting results were reported by randomized controlled trials (RCTs) exploring guided therapy (GT) with anti-P2Y12 drugs in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). Meta-analyses of RCTs failed to clearly identify what GT strategy, if any, is effective, because they lumped together RCTs with heterogeneous designs, comparing either genotype-GT or platelet function test (PFT)-GT with unguided standard therapy. Some meta-analysis also included RCTs that did not actually explore GT, but tested the effects of switching patients with high on-treatment platelet reactivity (HTPR) to alternative therapies (HTPR-Therapy), rather than comparing GT with unguided standard therapy. We performed 3 distinct systematic reviews with meta-analyses, each exploring only RCTs with homogeneous design.

**Methods.** MEDLINE, Embase and Central databases were searched for RCTs testing genotype-GT, PFT-GT or HTPR-Therapy in PCI-treated patients, through October 1<sup>st</sup> 2022. Two reviewers extracted the data. Risk ratios (RR) (95% confidence intervals) were calculated. Primary outcomes were major bleedings (MB) and major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE).

**Results:** In 7 genotype-GT RCTs, RR were: MB, 1.06 (0.73–1.54; p=0.76); MACE, 0.64 (0.45–0.91; p=0.01), but significant risk reduction was observed only in RCTs performed in China (0.30, 0.16–0.54; p<0.0001) and not elsewhere (0.74, 0.46–1.18; p=0.21). In 6 PFT-GT RCTs, RR were: MB, 0.91 (0.64–1.28, p=0.58); MACE, 0.82 (0.5 –1.19; p=0.30): 0.62 (0.42–0.93; p=0.02) in China, 1.08 (0.82–1.41; p=0.53) elsewhere. In 8 HTPR-Therapy RCTs, RR were: MB, 0.71 (0.41–1.23; p=0.22); MACE, 0.57 (0.44–0.75; p<0.0001): 0.56 (0.43–0.74, p<0.0001) in China, 0.58 (0.27–1.23, p=0.16) elsewhere.

**Conclusion:** No GT strategy affected MB. Genotype-GT but not PFT-GT reduced MACE; subgroup analysis revealed that genotype-GT and PFT-GT reduced MACE in China, but not elsewhere. PFT-GT (which analyzed both patients with and without HTPR) performed poorly compared to HTPR-Therapy (which analyzed HTPR patients only), likely due to inaccurate identification of HTPR patients by PFTs. PROSPERO registration: CRD42022362739.

**Key words:** Antiplatelet therapy; P2Y12 antagonists; Genotype; Platelet function tests; Percutaneous Coronary Intervention

## INTRODUCTION

Patients treated by percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) are treated with dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) with aspirin plus an antagonist of the P2Y<sub>12</sub> platelet receptor for adenosine diphosphate (ADP), to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) (1-4). Clopidogrel, the most commonly used anti-P2Y<sub>12</sub> drug, does not adequately inhibit platelet function in about 1/3 of treated patients, who display high on-treatment platelet reactivity (HTPR) (5-8). Variability in the generation of the active metabolite of clopidogrel, which is a pro-drug, is the main cause of inter-individual variability of pharmacological response (6,8). Loss of function (LOF) and gain of function (GOF) mutations of cytochrome-P450 (CYP) and the homozygous 3435C→T mutation of ABCB1, a gene encoding for the efflux pump P-glycoprotein (8-12), are associated with response variability to clopidogrel, in combination with other variables, some of which are yet unknown (13). Meta-analyses of observational studies demonstrated that HTPR in clopidogrel-treated patients is associated with inadequate protection from thrombotic events (14-18). Two alternative oral anti-P2Y<sub>12</sub> drugs, prasugrel and ticagrelor, display more favorable pharmacokinetics than clopidogrel, which confers more consistent and efficient inhibition of platelet function and thrombosis, resulting in net clinical benefit compared to clopidogrel (19-21). Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have been designed to test whether tailoring anti-P2Y<sub>12</sub> treatment to individual patients would increase the clinical benefit. Therapy was guided based on either the patients' genotypes (genotype-GT) or the results of platelet function tests (PFT-GT) performed after the start of standard therapy (Table 1). In most published RCTs, patients on clopidogrel who had been randomized to the testing arm at enrolment were escalated to potentially more effective therapies when they displayed LOF mutations or HTPR. Few RCTs explored the efficacy and safety of guided de-escalation to clopidogrel of patients on prasugrel or

ticagrelor displaying normal genotypes or very low on-treatment platelet reactivity (LTPR) (24,33). In these RCTs, patients were randomized to guided therapy (GT) or unguided standard therapy and the safety and efficacy of the two strategies were compared. It must be noted, however, that some published RCTs based on PFT in clopidogrel-treated patients had a different design from the above: all patients underwent testing and only those with HTPR were randomized to continue on clopidogrel or switch to potentially more effective drugs (35-42). This last group of RCTs, therefore, does not actually test the safety and efficacy of GT (which should be compared to those of unguided therapy), but evaluates the safety and efficacy of alternative therapies for patients with HTPR on clopidogrel (HTPR-Therapy) (Table 1).

Meta-analyses of published studies gave contrasting results, likely due to the heterogeneity of the included studies. Some meta-analyses lumped together RCTs, non-randomized intervention studies and observational studies (43-47). Meta-analyses that considered RCTs only, or analyzed the results of RCTs separately from those of observational studies, lumped together RCTs with heterogeneous designs, testing genotype-GT or PFT-GT (46), PFT-GT or HTPR-Therapy (48), genotype-GT, PFT-GT or HTPR-Therapy (49). Therefore, these meta-analyses are unable to provide the necessary information of what GT strategy, if any, improves the clinical benefit of anti-P2Y12 therapy. Two meta-analyses included genotype-GT RCTs only (50, 51), while none analyzed PFT-GT RCTs only.

It is potentially misleading to combine in a single meta-analysis RCTs testing GT and testing alternative therapies for HTPR, or RCTs exploring genotype-based tests and exploring PFT-based tests, which have different accuracy and precision in the identification of the patients' features that influence the selection of treatment strategies. Therefore, we elected to perform 3 separate systematic reviews and meta-analyses, each one for each of the 3 different study designs of RCTs.

The reason why we analyzed also RCTs on HTPR-Therapy, in addition to genotype-GT and PFT-GT, is that, although they did not actually explore GT, their results could help interpreting the results of PFT-GT RCTs, considering that both types of RCTs are based on PFTs, but in a different experimental setting.

## **METHODS**

The development of the study protocol, the conduct of the systematic reviews and meta-analyses, the reporting of results are in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The study protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022362739).

### *Data Sources and Searches*

We searched on MEDLINE, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) and Embase using the following key concepts: anti-P2Y12 therapy, platelet function test and genetic test. For each key concept, appropriate free-text words and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) were developed.

### *Study selection*

RCTs on adult patients requiring DAPT after PCI for acute coronary syndrome (ACS) or chronic coronary disease (CCD), comparing guided versus standard anti-P2Y12 therapy or alternative versus standard therapy for patients with HTPR on clopidogrel and published until October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022 were eligible. The records identified with our search were screened by two independent reviewers (MR and AM) at first by title and abstract and then by reading the full texts. A hand

search was performed on the reference lists of selected articles to include studies that had not been identified by the search strategy. Duplicate publications and studies non reporting relevant data for the pre-specified outcomes were excluded. In case of disagreements, a third reviewer (MC) was responsible for the final decision. Exclusion criteria were the concomitant use of platelet function testing and genetic testing for guiding anti-P2Y12 therapy, duration of treatment and follow-up  $\leq 30$  days.

#### *Data collection/extraction process and analysis*

Data were extracted by two independent reviewers using a standardized data abstraction form, developed according to the sequence of variables required from the primary studies.

Disagreements in data abstraction between the two reviewers were solved by a third independent reviewer (MC). Risk ratios (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for each outcome. Heterogeneity among studies was quantified using  $I^2$  statistic and statistical significance was assessed using  $\chi^2$  test ( $I^2 > 50\%$  or  $p < 0.10$  indicating the presence of significant heterogeneity among studies). Meta-analyses of RR were conducted using the DerSimonian and Laird random effects models, irrespective of the presence of clinical and methodological heterogeneity. For all the analyses, a value of  $p < 0.05$ , two sided, was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager 5.3.

#### *Outcomes*

The main safety outcome was major bleeding, defined as BARC 3 and 5. The main efficacy outcome was MACE, as defined by each RCT. The secondary efficacy outcomes were myocardial infarction, cardiovascular death, stent thrombosis and ischemic stroke, while the secondary safety outcome was all bleedings.

We performed the following predefined sub-analyses when at least 2 RCTs provided the necessary data: type of alternative therapy in the guided arm, escalation RCTs, de-escalation RCTs, tertiles of prevalence of patients with ACS (0-33%; 34-66%; 67-100%), sample size <200 or >200 per arm, type of PFT used, countries in which RCTs had been performed.

#### *Quality assessment*

Two reviewers assessed the quality of data in included studies with the Cochrane tool for quality assessment. Funnel plots were generated to investigate the risk of publication bias.

#### *Registration*

The study was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42022362739).



## RESULTS

Our systematic literature search identified 3,835 articles, which were reduced to 2695 after duplicates removal; 16 additional records were then retrieved by manual search of the references of relevant articles, for a total of 2,711 records. After screening by title, abstract and full text, we identified 21 RCTs that fulfilled the criteria for inclusion in our analysis (Figure 1): 7 on genotype-GT (22-28), 6 on PFT-GT (29-34), 8 on HTPR-Therapy (35-42). Descriptions of their characteristics are summarized in Table 1. In all included RCTs, the percentage of patients who underwent PCI was 100%, with the only exception of one RCT (23) in which 62.2% underwent PCI: thus, the frequency of PCI was 98.5% in the overall patient populations enrolled in the included RCTs. The majority of PFT-GT and genotype-GT RCTs aimed at escalating patients in the guided arm with (or at risk of) HTPR on clopidogrel to more efficient antiplatelet treatments. Two RCTs (24, 33) aimed at de-escalating to clopidogrel ACS patients in the guided arm with (or at risk of) LTPR on ticagrelor or prasugrel. Two additional genotype-guided RCT escalated or de-escalated anti-P2Y12 treatment based on the presence of LOF or GOF CYP genotypes in patients who had been assigned to clopidogrel, prasugrel or ticagrelor before randomization, based on physicians' choice (23, 26). We excluded the TROPICAL-ACS RCT (53), which is considered a PFT-guided de-escalation study and was included in some previous meta-analyses (46, 48). The reason for our choice is that TROPICAL-ACS did not compare a guided de-escalation arm with a non-guided de-escalation arm, but re-escalated to the initial treatment with prasugrel patients with HTPR after de-escalation to clopidogrel. However, with the aim of rendering our meta-analysis comparable to others from this point of view, we included the TROPICAL-ACS study in a sub-analysis.

Most included studies were of high quality, with only 4 presenting at least 2 items with high risk of bias (23, 26-28) (Supplementary Figure 1). Funnel plot analysis revealed that the risk of publication

bias was low for PFT-GT studies and genotype-GT studies, but potentially significant for HTPR-Therapy studies (Figure 2)

## **GENOTYPE-GT**

### **Primary Outcomes**

Data on major bleeding were available for 4 studies and a total of 8,955 patients. There was no statistically significant difference in the risk of major bleeding between the genotype-guided group (71 events in 4507 patients, 1.58%) and the standard treatment group (68 events in 4448 patients, 1.53%), RR=1.06 (0.73–1.54; p=0.76) (Figure 3).

Data on MACE were available for 7 studies and a total of 10,744 patients. The risk of MACE was significantly lower in the genotype-guided group (297 events in 5,457 patients, 5.44%) than in the standard treatment group (398 events in 5,287 patients, 7.52%), RR=0.64 (95% CI, 0.45–0.91; p=0.01) (Figure 4).

### *Subgroups analyses*

The risk of MACE was lower in the genotype-GT group in escalation studies (there were no enough de-escalation studies to be analyzed), in studies that used prasugrel or ticagrelor in genotype-guided arms, in studies with >66% ACS patients (there were not enough studies with lower ACS percentages), and in studies performed in China, while it was similar to non-guided group in RCTs performed in other countries (Table 2), even after exclusion of the study with de-escalation strategy (24) (Supplementary Figures 2,3). All genotype-GT RCTs enrolled >200 patients in each arm.

### **Secondary Outcomes**

The risk of myocardial infarction (RR=0.55, 0.42-0.71,  $p<0.0001$ ) and stent thrombosis (RR=0.67, 0.46-0.96,  $p=0.03$ ) was significantly lower in genotype-GT, compared to standard therapy. There was no statistically significant difference in the risk of cardiovascular death, ischemic stroke and all bleedings (Supplementary Figure 4).

## **PFT-GT**

### **Primary Outcomes**

Data on major bleeding were available for 5 studies and a total of 6,099 patients. There was no statistically significant difference in the risk of major bleeding between the PFT-guided group (64 events in 3,045 patients, 2.1%) and in the standard treatment group (71 events in 3,054 patients, 2.32%), RR=0.91 (0.64-1.28;  $p=0.58$ ) (Figure 3).

Data on MACE were available for 6 studies, and a total of 6,483 patients. There was no statistically significant difference in the risk of MACE between the PFT-guided group (524 events in 3,238 patients, 16.18%) and the standard treatment group (531 events in 3,245 patients, 16.36%), RR=0.82 (0.5 –1.19;  $p=0.30$ ) (Figure 4).

### *Subgroups analyses*

There were no statistically significant difference in the risk of both MACE and major bleeding between the 2 treatment arms independently of the type of alternative therapy used (higher doses of clopidogrel or other alternative therapies), in escalation strategy studies (there were no enough de-escalation studies to be analyzed), in studies that used VerifyNow as PFT (there were no enough studies using other PFT to be analyzed) and independently of the prevalence of ACS patients (<33% or >66%: there were no enough studies with ACS prevalence 33-66% to be analyzed) (Supplementary Figures 5,6). In contrast, the risk of MACE was significantly lower in the

PFT-guided group compared to standard treatment in RCTs performed in China, RR=0.62 (0.42-0.93, p=0.02), while it was similar to that of standard therapy group in RCTs performed in other countries, RR=1.08 (0.82-1.41; p=0.53) (Table 2). There was no statistically significant difference between the 2 treatment arms in the risk of major bleeding both in studies performed in China (RR=1.33, 0.72-2.43; p=0.91) and in other countries (RR=0.76, 0.51-1.14; p=0.19) (Supplementary Figures 5,6). Inclusion of the TROPICAL RCT (53) in our analysis did not substantially change the primary outcome analyses for MACE (RR=0.81, 0.59-1.12, p=0.21) and MB (RR=0.69, 0.66-1.20, p=0.45).

### **Secondary outcomes**

There was no statistically significant difference in the risk of myocardial infarction, cardiovascular death, stent thrombosis, ischemic stroke and all bleedings between the two treatment arms (Supplementary Figure 7).

### **HTPR-THERAPY**

#### **Primary outcomes**

Data on major bleeding were available for 6 studies, for a total of 4092 patients. There was a non-significant difference in the risk of major bleeding among patients who were given alternative treatments (23 events in 2295 patients, 1.00%) and among patients who continued on clopidogrel (29 events in 1797 patients, 2.62%), RR=0.71 (0.41-1.23; p=0.22) (Figure 3).

Data on MACE were available for 8 studies, for a total of 5113 patients. The risk of MACE was significantly lower among patients who were given alternative treatments (138 events in 2719

patients, 5.08%) compared to patients who continued on clopidogrel (189 events in 2354 patients, 8.03%), RR=0.57 (0.44–0.75;  $p<0.0001$ ) (Figure 4).

### *Subgroups analysis*

Alternative treatments significantly decreased the risk of MACE in RCTs that used LTA as PFT (RR=0.49, 0.34-0.71;  $p=0.0002$ ), but not in those that used VerifyNow (RR=0.55, 0.21-1.43;  $p=0.22$ ). Compared with standard dose clopidogrel-treated patients, the risk of MACE in patients treated with clopidogrel+cilostazol, prasugrel or ticagrelor was significantly lower (RR=0.47, 0.34-0.65;  $p<0.00001$ ), while it was non-significantly different in patients treated with higher doses of clopidogrel (RR=0.68, 0.45-1.03;  $p=0.07$ ). The alternative treatments used decreased the risk of MACE independently of the sample size of the studies ( $<200$  or  $>200$ ) or the prevalence of ACS  $<33\%$  or  $>66\%$ , while they were not effective in RCTs including 33%-66% HPR patients with ACS. MACE were similarly lower in the experimental groups in RCTs performed in China (RR=0.56, 0.43-0.74,  $p<0.00001$ ) and in other countries (RR=0.58, 0.27-1.23,  $p=0.16$ ), but statistical significance was observed only for RCTs performed in China (Table 2, Supplementary Figures 8,9). The risk of major bleedings was similar in the two treatment arms in all subgroup analyses (Supplementary Figures 8,9).

### **Secondary outcomes**

The risk of cardiovascular death was significantly lower (RR=0.36, 0.19-0.66,  $p=0.001$ ) and that of all bleedings was significantly higher (RR=1.23, 1.01-1.50,  $p=0.04$ ) in the alternative therapies arm, compared to the standard clopidogrel arm. No statistically significant differences were observed in the incidence of myocardial infarction, stent thrombosis and ischemic stroke between the two arms (Supplementary Figure 10).

## DISCUSSION

The value of guiding DAPT with laboratory tests that measure platelet function or identify mutant genotypes that influence the pharmacological response to anti-P2Y12 drugs has long been studied and debated (8,21,54-61). RCTs comparing unguided standard therapy with genotype-GT or PFT-GT have been published together with RCTs that did not actually compare the efficacy and safety of guided therapy, but tested the effects of alternative therapies of patients displaying HTPR on clopidogrel. The results of published RCTs are controversial, partly as a consequence of the small sample size of many of them. Systematic reviews with meta-analyses of RCTs (combined with non-randomized intervention studies and observational studies in some cases) have been performed, which, however, usually lumped together studies with different designs and addressing different questions. Therefore, we elected to perform 3 distinct systematic reviews with meta-analyses, each one being strictly focused on RCTs with homogeneous study question and design.

### ***Genotype-GT***

Genotype-GT did not affect the risk ratio for major bleeding. Although this analysis was restricted to the results of studies performed in western countries, which evaluated this end point, they are compatible with the findings of the 2 RCTs that had been performed in China, in which genotype guidance did not affect the incidence of “any significant bleeding events”.

In contrast, genotype-GT reduced the incidence of MACE. The low RR for MACE (0.57, 0.44-0.75) indicates that the effect of genotype testing is not only statistically significant, but also clinically significant. It must be noted, however, that most of the evidence of protective effects of genotyping stemmed from the two RCTs that had been performed in China (RR=0.30, 0.16-0.54). RCTs performed in other parts of the world failed to show a statistically significant benefit of

genotyping (RR=0.74, 0.46-1.18), although they enrolled 10x more patients than RCTs performed in China.

The observation that genotype-GT was efficacious in patients enrolled in China, but not in other countries, is compatible with the marginal role of CYP2C19 mutations in the response to clopidogrel among non-asiatic populations (8,13,57,62), while they could bear greater influence among patients from East/South Asia, in whom the prevalence of CYP2C19 LOF mutations is much higher (63-66). In our systematic review, the prevalence of intermediate (carrying one LOF allele) plus poor metabolizers (carrying two LOF alleles) was 52.5% (22) and 57.3% (28) in RCTs performed in China and 27.0-34.2% in RCTs performed elsewhere, comparably to estimates that were previously reported in large epidemiological studies worldwide (63-66). In addition, it is noteworthy that two meta-analyses showed that the RR for MACE among clopidogrel-treated ACS patients carrying LOF CYP2C19 mutations was higher among patients from East/South Asia, compared to patients from western countries: RR=1.91, 1.61-2.26 vs RR=1.23, 1.07-1.40 (67), and RR=2.02, 1.67-2.44 vs 1.35, 1.20-1.52 (68). These observations, which suggest that additional factors influence the risk for MACE in chinese carriers of LOF CYP2C19 mutations treated with anti-P2Y12 drugs, contribute to account for the greater benefit of genotype-GT among Chinese patients, compared to other patients.

The choice of alternative treatments to clopidogrel 75 mg od for patients with CYP2C19 LOF mutations varied among different RCTs, including ticagrelor, prasugrel, high-doses clopidogrel alone or in combination with cilostazol. Based on the limited data available, we could not identify the most effective alternative treatment in these patients.

### ***PFT-GT***

Our analysis of RCTs of PFT-GT revealed that it had no statistically significant effect on the incidence of both major bleedings and MACE. However, a sub-analysis showed that PFT-GT significantly reduced the incidence of MACE in Chinese patients but not in non-asiatic patients. The explanation for this difference is the same already given for the discrepancy observed in these populations for genotype-GT. Similarly to the prevalence of LOF mutations of the CYP2C19 gene, which was higher among Chinese patients, the prevalence of HPR was higher among clopidogrel-treated Chinese patients (26.6-62.8%) (31,32,34) compared to non-asiatic patients (15.6% and 18.5%) (29,30) (Table 1). It is noteworthy that the statistically non-significant effect of PFT-GT in our global analysis, as opposed to the statistically significant effects of genotype-GT, was observed despite the fact that the relative proportion of enrolled Chinese patients in RCTs of PFT-GT was much higher (45.8%) than in genotype-GT RCTs (8.4%). Although this is an indirect evidence, these data suggest that PFT-GT is less effective than genotype-GT both among Chinese patients (RR=0.63 vs 0.30) and among patients from other countries (RR=1.08 vs 0.74).

The lower efficacy of PFT-GT compared with genotype-GT is to be found in the unsatisfactory diagnostic accuracy of PFT and the lability of the platelet reactivity phenotype, which may switch from HPR to normal platelet reactivity or LPR and back to HTPR over time in a high proportion of patients (69-74), which contrasts with the stability of the CYP2C19 genotype. The lability of the platelet reactivity phenotype reflects the physiological variability of platelet function with time, but is also due to the lack of standardization of pre-analytical variables, including the time of the day of blood sampling [platelet function follows a circadian rhythm (75,76)], the time elapsed since the acute event and since the last drug intake (8). Moreover, the agreement among different PFT evaluating the response to anti-P2Y12 therapy is very low (77-81), thus implying that the diagnostic accuracy of the tests is poor. The inaccuracy of PFT in identifying HTPR patients accounts for their failure to improve the clinical outcomes of clopidogrel-treated patients in RCTs,



despite their ability to document the association of HTPR with poor clinical outcomes in observational studies of high number of patients (14-18). Indeed, the analysis of data in observational studies is based on the association of clinical outcomes with mean values of measurements in several patients, which compensate for the inaccuracy of their individual results. On the other hand, the success of RCTs depends on the accuracy of the results obtained in each singular patient, whose therapy is tailored based on PFT. Misclassification of patients in terms of platelet reactivity on clopidogrel will lead to unnecessary and useless switch to more efficient drugs in unrecognized good responders and to persistency of ineffective treatment with clopidogrel in unrecognized poor responders, both contributing to the failure of PFT-guided therapy.

Our meta-analysis also shows that the results of PFT-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy do not change as a function of the number of treated patients with ACS, thus discrediting the hypothesis that the failure of the early published large-scale RCTs on PFT-guided therapy was to be ascribed to the enrolment of <50% of ACS patients (58). It is noteworthy in this respect that, in a large non-randomized intervention study of 1789 ACS patients, potentiation of antiplatelet therapy corrected HTPR, but did not improve the clinical outcomes of clopidogrel-treated patients (82).

### ***HTPR-Therapy***

RCTs of therapies for patients displaying HTPR on clopidogrel showed that alternative antiplatelet regimens significantly decreased the risk of MACE, compared with clopidogrel. This observation contrasts with the negative results of RCTs of PFT-GT, in which the same PFTs had been used to test platelet reactivity and the same alternative therapies (prasugrel, ticagrelor, high-dose clopidogrel alone or in combination with cilostazol) had been implemented for patients with HTPR (Table 1). If the superiority of prasugrel and ticagrelor over standard dose clopidogrel is well

established (19,20,83), high-dose clopidogrel (150 mg od) were considered ineffective and potentially responsible for the failure of the early, large-scale RCTs of PFT-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy (58). However, a meta-analysis of 9 RCTs and 3 observational studies demonstrated that 150 mg od clopidogrel significantly decreases MACE, compared to 75 mg od (RR=0.67, 0.48-0.94;  $p=0.02$ ) (84).

The contrasting results of PFT-GT RCTs and of HTPR-Therapy RCTs further support our interpretation that the most plausible reason for the failure of PFT-guided therapy is to be found in the inadequate diagnostic accuracy of PFTs for the identification of patients with HTPR. RCTs based on HTPR-Therapy enrolled only patients with HTPR, who were randomized to alternative antiplatelet regimens or standard therapy with 75 mg od clopidogrel. The observed efficacy of prasugrel, ticagrelor or high-dose clopidogrel in reducing the risk of MACE in these RCTs actually mirrors the results of RCTs that compared the same regimens in unselected patients at risk for MACE (19,20,83,84). In contrast to RCTs of HTPR-Therapy, in RCTs of PFT-GT, only a minority of enrolled patients in the experimental arm (patients with HTPR) were treated with alternative regimens. Failure of PFTs to recognize patients with HTPR in the experimental arm would preclude them from being treated with alternative, more efficient regimens and, consequently, lead to underestimation of the clinical benefit for the overall patient population in the experimental arm. Our interpretation is also supported by the observation that, at variance with genotype-GT and PFT-GT RCTs which showed selective advantages for patients enrolled in China, the point estimates for RR of MACE were similar in HTPR-Therapy RCTs performed in China (RR=0.56, 0.43-0.74,  $p<0.00001$ ) and elsewhere (RR=0.58, 0.27-1.23,  $p=0.16$ ) (Table 2). Statistical significance was reached only in RCTs performed in China, due to the higher percentage of HTPR patients on standard therapy experiencing MACE (14.1% vs 3.9%) (Figure 3).

### ***Limitations***

Some heterogeneity was detected in the included RCTs. Definition of MACE varied in different RCTs: only myocardial infarction/acute coronary syndrome and cardiovascular/total deaths were considered by all RCTs (Table 1). Few RCTs used the BARC definition for major bleeding; some RCTs used the TIMI, GUSTO or STEEPLE criteria (Table 1).

### ***Novelties of our systematic reviews with meta-analyses***

Our results confirm those of 2 previously published meta-analyses which showed that genotype-GT improves the outcomes of patients undergoing PCI compared with unguided standard therapy, which, however included also some RCTs that based therapeutic decisions on both genotype-GT and PFT-GT and had a short follow-up ( $\leq 30$  days) (50,51). In contrast, we analyzed only RCTs that were solely based on the results of genotyping and had a follow-up of at least 1 month, which we consider more adequate to assess differences in the incidence of clinical endpoints. To the best of our knowledge, our meta-analyses are the first to report the results of relative risks for clinical endpoints in RCTs of PFT-GT and HTPR-therapy, selected based on strict, pre-defined criteria.

### ***Conclusions***

The 2022 Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium Guideline for CYP2C19 Genotype and Clopidogrel recommends CYP2C19 genotyping of patients undergoing PCI (85), principally based on the results of a meta-analysis (46) that, however, analyzed together genotype-GT and PFT-GT, and did not differentiate between studies performed in China and those performed elsewhere. Based on the results of our meta-analysis, we emphasize that most of the evidence of genotyping efficacy stems from RCTs in Chinese patients, in whom PFT guidance also proved effective. Evidence from our meta-analysis indicates that, in patients from countries outside

East/South Asia, genotype guidance is of dubious efficacy and PFT guidance is ineffective and should therefore be discouraged.

**SOURCE OF FUNDING: none**

**DISCOLSURES:** Cattaneo M., Rocchetti M. and Minardi A. have no disclosures to declare. Birocchi S. has received honoraria from Boehringer Ingelheim; Podda GM has received consulting fees from Bayer, Sanofi, Novartis, Boehringer Ingelheim; Squizzato A. has received honoraria from Daiichi Sankyo, Bayer, Pfizer, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, Sanofi, Werfen, Alexion, Roche, Viatrix.

## REFERENCES

- 1 – Lawton JS, Tamis-Holland JE, Bangalore S, et al. 2021 ACC/AHA/SCAI Guideline for Coronary Artery Revascularization: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2022 Jan 18;145(3):e18-e114.
- 2 - Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, et al. 2017 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2018;39:119-177.
- 3 - Collet JP, Thiele H, Barbato E, et al. 2020 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation. *Eur Heart J*. 2021;42(14):1289-1367.
- 4 - Alkhalil M, Džavík V, Bhatt DL, et al. Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients Undergoing Elective Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. 2022;24(3):277-293.
- 5 - Gurbel PA, Bliden KP, Hiatt BL, et al Clopidogrel for coronary stenting: response variability, drug resistance, and the effect of pretreatment platelet reactivity. *Circulation*. 2003;107(23):2908-13.
- 6 - Cattaneo M. The platelet P2Y receptors as targets for new antithrombotic drugs. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2003;1(6):1133-5.
- 7 - Cattaneo M. Aspirin and clopidogrel: efficacy, safety, and the issue of drug resistance. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2004;24(11):1980-7.
- 8 - Cattaneo M. Response variability to clopidogrel: is tailored treatment, based on laboratory testing, the right solution? *J Thromb Haemost*. 2012;10(3):327-36.

- 9 - Taubert D, von Beckerath N, Grimberg G, et al. Impact of P-glycoprotein on clopidogrel absorption. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2006;80(5):486-501.
- 10 - Mega JL, Close SL, Wiviott SD, et al. Cytochrome p-450 polymorphisms and response to clopidogrel. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;360(4):354-62.
- 11 - Mega JL, Close SL, Wiviott SD, Shen L, et al. Genetic variants in ABCB1 and CYP2C19 and cardiovascular outcomes after treatment with clopidogrel and prasugrel in the TRITON-TIMI 38 trial: a pharmacogenetic analysis. *Lancet.* 2010;376(9749):1312-9.
- 12 - Sibbing D, Koch W, Gebhard D, et al. Cytochrome 2C19\*17 allelic variant, platelet aggregation, bleeding events, and stent thrombosis in clopidogrel-treated patients with coronary stent placement. *Circulation.* 2010;121(4):512-8.
- 13- Frelinger AL 3rd, Bhatt DL, Lee RD, et al. Clopidogrel pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics vary widely despite exclusion or control of polymorphisms (CYP2C19, ABCB1, PON1), noncompliance, diet, smoking, co-medications (including proton pump inhibitors), and pre-existent variability in platelet function. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;61(8):872-9.
- 14 - Snoep JD, Hovens MM, Eikenboom JC, et al. Clopidogrel nonresponsiveness in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with stenting: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am Heart J.* 2007;154(2):221-31.
- 15 - Sofi F, Marcucci R, Gori AM, et al. Clopidogrel non- responsiveness and risk of cardiovascular morbidity. An updated meta-analysis. *Thromb Haemost.* 2010;103(4):841-8.
- 16 - Aradi D, Komócsi A, Vorobcsuk A, et al. Prognostic significance of high on-clopidogrel platelet reactivity after percutaneous coronary intervention: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am Heart J.* 2010;160(3):543-51.

- 17- Brar SS, ten Berg J, Marcucci R, et al. Impact of platelet reactivity on clinical outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention. A collaborative meta-analysis of individual participant data. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;58(19):1945-54.
- 18 - Yamaguchi Y, Abe T, Sato Y, et al. Effects of VerifyNow P2Y12 test and CYP2C19\*2 testing on clinical outcomes of patients with cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Platelets.* 2013;24(5):352-61.
- 19 - Wiviott SD, Braunwald E, McCabe CH, et al. Prasugrel versus clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;357(20):2001-15.
- 20 - Wallentin L, Becker RC, Budaj A, et al. Ticagrelor versus clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;361(11):1045-57.
- 21 - Cattaneo M. New P2Y(12) inhibitors. *Circulation.* 2010;121(1):171-9.
- 22 - Xie X, Ma YT, Yang YN, Li XM, et al. Personalized antiplatelet therapy according to CYP2C19 genotype after percutaneous coronary intervention: a randomized control trial. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;168(4):3736-40.
- 23 - Notarangelo FM, Maglietta G, Bevilacqua P, et al. Pharmacogenomic Approach to Selecting Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndromes: The PHARMCLO Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018;71(17):1869-1877.
- 24 - Claassens DMF, Vos GJA, Bergmeijer TO, et al. A Genotype-Guided Strategy for Oral P2Y12 Inhibitors in Primary PCI. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381(17):1621-1631.
- 25 - Pereira NL, Farkouh ME, So D, et al. Effect of Genotype-Guided Oral P2Y12 Inhibitor Selection vs Conventional Clopidogrel Therapy on Ischemic Outcomes After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: The TAILOR-PCI Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2020;324(8):761-771.



- 26 - Tuteja S, Glick H, Matthai W, et al. Prospective CYP2C19 Genotyping to Guide Antiplatelet Therapy Following Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: A Pragmatic Randomized Clinical Trial. *Circ Genom Precis Med.* 2020;13(1):e002640.
- 27 - Al-Rubaish AM, Al-Muhanna FA, Alshehri AM, et al. Bedside testing of CYP2C19 vs. conventional clopidogrel treatment to guide antiplatelet therapy in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction patients. *Int J Cardiol.* 2021;343:15-20.
- 28 - Shi X, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, et al. Personalized Antiplatelet Therapy Based on CYP2C19 Genotypes in Chinese ACS Patients Undergoing PCI: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2021;8:676954.
- 29 - Collet JP, Cuisset T, Rangé G, et al. Bedside monitoring to adjust antiplatelet therapy for coronary stenting. *N Engl J Med.* 2012;367(22):2100-9.
- 30 - Hazarbasanov D, Velchev V, Finkov B, et al. Tailoring clopidogrel dose according to multiple electrode aggregometry decreases the rate of ischemic complications after percutaneous coronary intervention. *J Thromb Thrombolysis.* 2012;34(1):85-90.
- 31 - Li X, Wang L, Yang X, et al. Platelet function monitoring guided antiplatelet therapy in patients receiving high-risk coronary interventions. *Chin Med J (Engl).* 2014;127(19):3364-70.
- 32 - Zhu HC, Li Y, Guan SY, et al. Efficacy and safety of individually tailored antiplatelet therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome after coronary stenting: a single center, randomized, feasibility study. *J Geriatr Cardiol.* 2015;12(1):23-9.
- 33 - Cayla G, Cuisset T, Silvain J, et al. Platelet function monitoring to adjust antiplatelet therapy in elderly patients stented for an acute coronary syndrome (ANTARCTIC): an open-label, blinded-endpoint, randomised controlled superiority trial. *Lancet.* 2016;388(10055):2015-2022.
- 34 - Zheng YY, Wu TT, Yang Y, et al. Personalized antiplatelet therapy guided by a novel detection of platelet aggregation function in stable coronary artery disease patients undergoing

- percutaneous coronary intervention: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Pharmacother.* 2020;6(4):211-221.
- 35 - Price MJ, Berger PB, Teirstein PS, et al. Standard- vs high-dose clopidogrel based on platelet function testing after percutaneous coronary intervention: the GRAVITAS randomized trial. *JAMA.* 2011;305(11):1097-105.
- 36 - Ari H, Ozkan H, Karacinar A, et al. The Effect of high-dose Clopidogrel treatment in patients with clopidogrel resistance (the EFFICIENT trial). *Int J Cardiol.* 2012;157(3):374-80.
- 37 - Trenk D, Stone GW, Gawaz M, et al. A randomized trial of prasugrel versus clopidogrel in patients with high platelet reactivity on clopidogrel after elective percutaneous coronary intervention with implantation of drug-eluting stents: results of the TRIGGER-PCI (Testing Platelet Reactivity In Patients Undergoing Elective Stent Placement on Clopidogrel to Guide Alternative Therapy With Prasugrel) study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2012;59(24):2159-64.
- 38 - Samardzic J, Krpan M, Skoric B, et al. Serial clopidogrel dose adjustment after platelet function testing improves outcome of acute coronary syndrome patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with high on-treatment platelet reactivity. *J Thromb Thrombolysis.* 2014;38(4):459-69.
- 39 - Li Y, Han Y, Guan S, et al. Optimal- vs. standard-antiplatelet therapy on platelet function and long-term clinical outcomes in patients with high on-treatment platelet reactivity: 2-year outcomes of the multicentre, randomized Optimal-antiPlatelet Therapy (OPT) trial. *European Heart Journal Supplements.* 2015;17, B23–B31.
- 40 - Tang YD, Wang W, Yang M, et al. Randomized Comparisons of Double-Dose Clopidogrel or Adjunctive Cilostazol Versus Standard Dual Antiplatelet in Patients With High Posttreatment Platelet Reactivity: Results of the CREATIVE Trial. *Circulation.* 2018;137(21):2231-2245.

- 41 - You J, Li H, Guo W, et al. Platelet function testing guided antiplatelet therapy reduces cardiovascular events in Chinese patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: The PATROL study. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2020;95 Suppl 1:598-605.
- 42 - Ying L, Wang J, Li J, et al. Intensified antiplatelet therapy in patients after percutaneous coronary intervention with high on-treatment platelet reactivity: the OPTImal Management of Antithrombotic Agents (OPTIMA)-2 Trial. *Br J Haematol.* 2022;196(2):424-432.
- 43 - Zheng L, Yang C, Xiang L, et al. Genotype-guided antiplatelet therapy compared with conventional therapy for patients with acute coronary syndromes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biomarkers.* 2019;24(6):517-523.
- 44 - Zhang H, Xiang Q, Liu Z, et al. Genotype-guided antiplatelet treatment versus conventional therapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Clin Pharmacol.* 2021;87(5):2199-2215. doi: 10.1111/bcp.14637.
- 45 - Liu J, Qin L, Xi S, et al. Genotype-guided personalization of antiplatelet treatment: A meta-analysis of patients with ACS or undergoing PCI. *Thromb Res.* 2019;179:87-94.
- 46 - Galli M, Benenati S, Capodanno D, et al. Guided versus standard antiplatelet therapy in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet.* 2021;397(10283):1470-1483.
- 47 - Peng W, Zhang Y, Lin B, et al. Clinical outcomes of individualized antiplatelet therapy based on platelet function test in patients after percutaneous coronary intervention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol.* 2022 Dec 21. doi: 10.1097/FJC.0000000000001393. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 36651931.
- 48 - Aluvilu A, Ferro A. Role of platelet function testing in acute coronary syndromes: a meta-analysis. *Open Heart.* 2022;9(2):e002129.

- 49 - Yamani N, Unzek S, Mankani MH, et al. Does individualized guided selection of antiplatelet therapy improve outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2022;79:103964.
- 50 - Wang X, Wang S, Yang J, et al. Genotype-guided antiplatelet therapy compared with standard therapy for patients with acute coronary syndromes or undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thromb Res*. 2020;193:130-138.
- 51 - Tang B, Wang X, Wang X, et al. Genotype-Guided Antiplatelet Therapy Versus Standard Therapy for Patients with Coronary Artery Disease: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Pharm Pharm Sci*. 2022;25:9-23.
- 52 - Xu L, Hu XW, Zhang SH, et al. Intensified Antiplatelet Treatment Reduces Major Cardiac Events in Patients with Clopidogrel Low Response: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2016;129(8):984-91.
- 53 - Sibbing D, Aradi D, Jacobshagen C, et al. Guided de-escalation of antiplatelet treatment in patients with acute coronary syndrome undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (TROPICAL-ACS): a randomised, open-label, multicentre trial. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10104):1747-1757.
- 54 - Braunwald E, Angiolillo D, Bates E, et al. Assessing the current role of platelet function testing. *Clin Cardiol*. 2008;31(3 Suppl 1):110-6.
- 55 - Price MJ. Monitoring platelet function to reduce the risk of ischemic and bleeding complications. *Am J Cardiol*. 2009;103(3 Suppl):35A-39A.
- 56 - Gurbel PA, Mahla E, Tantry US. Peri-operative platelet function testing: the potential for reducing ischaemic and bleeding risks. *Thromb Haemost*. 2011;106(2):248-52.
- 57 - Fontana P, Cattaneo M, Combescure C, et al. Tailored Thienopyridine therapy: no urgency for CYP2C19 genotyping. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2013;2(2):e000131.

58 - Siller-Matula JM, Jilma B. Why have studies of tailored anti-platelet therapy failed so far?

Thromb Haemost. 2013;110(4):628-31.

59 - Gross L, Aradi D, Sibbing D. Platelet Function Testing in Patients on Antiplatelet Medications.

Semin Thromb Hemost. 2016;42(3):306-20.

60 - Michelson AD, Bhatt DL. How I use laboratory monitoring of antiplatelet therapy. Blood.

2017;130(6):713-721.

61 - Price DJ, Levy MS. CYP2C19 pharmacogenetics in patients undergoing coronary stent

placement: Is it time to test everyone? Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2019;93(7):1253-1254.

62 - Bauer T, Bouman HJ, van Werkum JW, et al. Impact of CYP2C19 variant genotypes on clinical

efficacy of antiplatelet treatment with clopidogrel: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ.

2011;343:d4588.

63 - Fricke-Galindo I, Céspedes-Garro C, Rodrigues-Soares F, et al. Interethnic variation of CYP2C19

alleles, 'predicted' phenotypes and 'measured' metabolic phenotypes across world

populations. Pharmacogenomics J. 2016;16(2):113-23.

64 - Klein MD, Williams AK, Lee CR, et al. Clinical Utility of CYP2C19 Genotyping to Guide

Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With an Acute Coronary Syndrome or Undergoing

Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol. 2019 ;39(4):647-652.

65 - Nguyen AB, Cavallari LH, Rossi JS, et al. Evaluation of race and ethnicity disparities in outcome

studies of CYP2C19 genotype-guided antiplatelet therapy. Front Cardiovasc Med.

2022;9:991646.

66 - Biswas M, Jinda P, Sukasem C. Pharmacogenomics in Asians: differences and similarities with

other human populations. Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol. 2023 Feb 8.

doi:10.1080/17425255.2023.2178895. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 36755439.

- 67 - Sorich MJ, Rowland A, McKinnon RA, et al. CYP2C19 genotype has a greater effect on adverse cardiovascular outcomes following percutaneous coronary intervention and in Asian populations treated with clopidogrel: a meta-analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet.* 2014;7(6):895-902.
- 68 - Biswas M, Sukasem C, Khatun Kali MS, et al. Effects of the CYP2C19 LoF allele on major adverse cardiovascular events associated with clopidogrel in acute coronary syndrome patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: a meta-analysis. *Pharmacogenomics.* 2022;23(3):207-220.
- 69 - Aleil B, Jacquemin L, De Poli F, et al. Clopidogrel 150 mg/day to overcome low responsiveness in patients undergoing elective percutaneous coronary intervention: results from the VASP-02 (Vasodilator-Stimulated Phosphoprotein-02) randomized study. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2008;1(6):631-8.
- 70 - Refaai MA, Frenkel E, Sarode R. Platelet aggregation responses vary over a period of time in healthy controls. *Platelets.* 2010;21(6):460-3.
- 71 - Campo G, Parrinello G, Ferraresi P, et al. Prospective evaluation of on-clopidogrel platelet reactivity over time in patients treated with percutaneous coronary intervention relationship with gene polymorphisms and clinical outcome. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;57(25):2474-83.
- 72 - Freynhofer MK, Bruno V, Brozovic I, et al. Variability of on-treatment platelet reactivity in patients on clopidogrel. *Platelets.* 2014;25(5):328-36.
- 73 - Hochholzer W, Ruff CT, Mesa RA, et al. Variability of individual platelet reactivity over time in patients treated with clopidogrel: insights from the ELEVATE-TIMI 56 trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2014;64(4):361-8.
- 74 - Podda GM, Grossi E, Palmerini T, et al. Prediction of high on-treatment platelet reactivity in clopidogrel-treated patients with acute coronary syndromes. *Int J Cardiol.* 2017;240:60-65.

- 75 - Kozinski M, Bielis L, Wisniewska-Szmyt J, et al. Diurnal variation in platelet inhibition by clopidogrel. *Platelets*. 2011;22(8):579-87.
- 76 - Freynhofer MK, Hein-Rothweiler R, Haller PM, et al. Diurnal Variability of On-Treatment Platelet Reactivity in Clopidogrel versus Prasugrel Treated Acute Coronary Syndrome Patients: A Pre-Specified TROPICAL-ACS Sub-Study. *Thromb Haemost*. 2019;119(4):660-667.
- 77 - Paniccia R, Antonucci E, Gori AM, et al. Different methodologies for evaluating the effect of clopidogrel on platelet function in high-risk coronary artery disease patients. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2007;5(9):1839-47.
- 78 - Gaglia MA, Torguson R, Pakala R, et al. Correlation between light transmission aggregometry, VerifyNow P2Y<sub>12</sub>, and VASP-P platelet reactivity assays following percutaneous coronary intervention. *J Interv Cardiol*. 2011;24(6):529-34.
- 79 - Lemesle G, Landel JB, Bauters A, et al. Poor agreement between light transmission aggregometry, Verify Now P2Y<sub>12</sub> and vasodilator-stimulated phosphoprotein for clopidogrel low-response assessment: a potential explanation of negative results of recent randomized trials. *Platelets*. 2014;25(7):499-505.
- 80 - Wadowski PP, Pultar J, Weikert C, et al. Comparison of Light Transmission Aggregometry With Impedance Aggregometry in Patients on Potent P2Y<sub>12</sub> Inhibitors. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol Ther*. 2021;26(3):260-268.
- 81 - Nakahara H, Sarker T, Dean CL, et al. A Sticky Situation: Variable Agreement Between Platelet Function Tests Used to Assess Anti-platelet Therapy Response. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2022;9:899594.
- 82 - Parodi G, Marcucci R, Valenti R, et al. High residual platelet reactivity after clopidogrel loading and long-term cardiovascular events among patients with acute coronary syndromes undergoing PCI. *JAMA*. 2011;306(11):1215-23.

- 83 - Cattaneo M, Podda GM. State of the art of new P2Y12 antagonists. Intern Emerg Med. 2010;5(5):385-91.
- 84 - Hao PP, Zhang MX, Li RJ, et al. Clopidogrel 150 vs. 75 mg day<sup>-1</sup> in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: a meta-analysis. J Thromb Haemost. 2011;9(4):627-37.
- 85 - Lee CR, Luzum JA, Sangkuhl K, et al. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium Guideline for CYP2C19 Genotype and Clopidogrel Therapy: 2022 Update. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2022;112(5):959-967.



Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the systematic research





Figure 2. Funnel plots based on the primary efficacy outcome MACE






**Figure 3. Pooled analysis for the primary safety outcome of Major Bleeding (BARC 3 or 5).**

Genotype-guided and platelet function tests-guided versus standard anti-P2Y12 therapy;




alternative antiplatelet therapies for patients with high platelet reactivity on clopidogrel.

PFT= platelet function tests; HTPR= high on-treatment platelet reactivity.



**Figure 4. Pooled analysis for the primary efficacy outcome of MACE. Genotype-guided and platelet function tests-guided versus standard anti-P2Y12 therapy; alternative antiplatelet therapies for patients with high platelet reactivity on clopidogrel.**

PFT= platelet function tests; HTPR= high on-treatment platelet reactivity.



**Table 1** – Main characteristics of the randomized controlled trials included in the 3 systematic reviews and meta-analyses

STUDY	NUMBER OF PATIENTS (MEN)	COUNTRIES	ACS / PCI (%)	GENE VARIANT / TYPE OF TEST (HPR threshold)	PATIENTS WITH MUTANT GENOTYPE / HTPR or LTPR †	STANDARD ANTIPLATELET THERAPY ‡	ALTERNATIVE ANTIPLATELET THERAPY ‡	DURATION OF THERAPY / FOLLOW-UP (months)	Definition of MACE	Definition of MAJOR BLEEDING
<b>1 - RCTs EVALUATING GUIDED ANTI-P2Y12 THERAPY</b>										
<b>1a - Genotype-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy</b>										
<b>Xie (22)</b>	600 (468)	China	100 / 100	CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*3	LOF 52.5%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg (42.5%); Clopidogrel 150mg + Cilostazol 100 mg bid (10%)	6 / 6	Death from any cause; MI; stroke; ischemia-driven TVR	NA
<b>Notarangelo (23)</b>	888 (605)	Italy	96.8 / 62.2	ABCB1 3435T CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*17	3435 TT 26.4 % LOF 33.5% GOF 39.1%	Clopidogrel 75 mg (50.7%); Prasugrel 5 mg (8.4%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (32.7%)	Clopidogrel 75 mg (43.3%); Prasugrel 5 mg (7.6%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (42.6%)	12 / 12	CV death; first occurrence of non-fatal MI; non-fatal stroke; ST	NA
<b>Claassens (24)</b>	2488 (1862)	Netherland Belgium Italy	100 / 100	CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*3	LOF 31.3%	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid, or Prasugrel 5 mg (92.1%); Clopidogrel 75 mg (7%)	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid or Prasugrel 5 mg (39.1%); Clopidogrel 75 mg (60.6%)	12 / 12	CV death; ACS; definite ST; stroke; urgent TVR	BARC 3 or 5
<b>Pereira (25)</b>	5302 (3983)	USA Canada Mexico South Korea	82 / 100	CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*3	LOF 34.2%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid	12 / 12	CV death, MI, stroke, definite or probable ST, severe recurrent ischemia	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Tuteja (26)</b>	504 (307)	USA	51 / 100	CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*17	LOF 27.0% GOF 36.0%	Clopidogrel 75 mg (78.8%); Prasugrel 5 mg (11%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (10%)	Clopidogrel 75 mg (70.1%); Prasugrel 5 mg (16.1%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (13.3%)	NA / 16	First MI, ischemic CV death, stroke, ST, urgent TVR	BARC 3 or 5
<b>Al-Rubaish (27)</b>	687 (555)	Saudi Arabia	100 / 100	CYP2C19*2	LOF 31.5%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid	12 / 12	Death; MI; ST	PLATO bleeding criteria

<b>Shi (28)</b>	301 (226)	China	100 / 100	CYP2C19*2 CYP2C19*3	LOF 57.3%	Clopidogrel 75 mg (75.5%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (25%)	Clopidogrel 75 mg (42,8%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (57,2%)	NA / 12	All-cause death; MI; stroke; urgent TVR; ST	NA
<b>1b - PFT-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy</b>										
<b>Collet (29)</b>	2440 (1970)	France	26.6 / 100	VerifyNow (>235 PRU)	HPR 15,6%	Clopidogrel 75 mg (93.5%); Prasugrel 5 mg (5.8%)	Clopidogrel 75 mg (47%) ≥150 mg (43%); Prasugrel 5/10 mg (9.3%)	12 / 12	Death from any cause; MI; ST; stroke; TIA; TVR	STEEPLE bleeding criteria
<b>Hazarbasanov (30)</b>	192 (126)	Bulgaria	54 / 100	Multiplate analyzer (>46 U)	HPR 18.5%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg	6 / 6	Cardiac death; MI; ST; ischemic stroke	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Li X (31)</b>	384 (289)	China	100 / 100	TEG (IPA<30%)	HPR 40,4%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg	6 / 6	MI; ST; death; emergency TVR	NA
<b>Zhu (32)</b>	305 (201)	China	100 / 100	LTA (IPA<10%)	HPR 26,6%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 75 mg + Cilostazol 100 mg bid	12 / 12	CV death; MI; TVR; stroke	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Cayla (33)</b>	877 (533)	France	100 / 100	VerifyNow (>207 PRU)	HPR 4% LPR 42%	Prasugrel 5 mg (93%) 10 mg (1%); Clopidogrel 75 mg (4%)	Prasugrel 5 mg (55%) 10 mg (4%); Clopidogrel 75 mg (39%)	12 / 12	CV death; MI; ST; urgent TVR	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Zheng (34)</b>	2285 (1904)	China	0 / 100	PL-12 § (>55% MAR)	HPR 62,8%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid	6 / 6	CV death; MI; ST; urgent TVR; stroke	BARC 3 or 5
<b>2 - RCTs EVALUATING THERAPY OF HTPR ON CLOPIDOGREL</b>										
<b>Price (35)</b>	2214 (1441)	USA Canada	39.8 / 100	VerifyNow (>230 PRU)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg	6 / 6	CV death; non-fatal MI; ST	GUSTO bleeding criteria
<b>Ari (36)</b>	94 (72)	Turkey	0 / 100	VerifyNow (<40% IPRU)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg	1 / 6	CV death; MI; ACS; TVR; ST	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Trenk (37)</b>	423 (307)	Germany USA	0 / 100	VerifyNow (>208 PRU)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Prasugrel 10 mg	6 / 6	CV death; MI; stroke; cardiac re- admission	TIMI bleeding criteria
<b>Samardzic (38)</b>	87 (49)	Croatia	100 / 100	Multiplate analyzer (>46 U)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel ≥150 mg	12 / 12	Death; non-fatal MI; TVR; ischemic stroke	BARC 3 or 5
<b>Li Y (39)</b>	840 (555)	China	100 / 100	LTA (PA>55%)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 75/150 mg + Cilostazol 50/100 mg bid	12 / 12	All-cause death; non-fatal MI; TVR; stroke	TIMI bleeding criteria

<b>Tang (40)</b>	721 (433)	China	59.7 / 100	TEG (MA <sub>ADP</sub> >47mm + ADP-IPIR<50%)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg	12 / 18	All-cause death; MI; TVR; stroke	NA
<b>You (41)</b>	300 (195)	China	100 / 100	Platelet VASP-P (≥50% PRI)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Ticagrelor 90 mg bid	12 / 12	All-cause death; CV death; recurrent MI; TVR; ischemic stroke	NA
<b>Ying (42)</b>	434 (156)	China	84.5 / 100	LTA (PA>40%)	100%	Clopidogrel 75 mg	Clopidogrel 150 mg (33.6%); Clopidogrel 75 mg + Cilostazol 100 mg bid (32.7%); Ticagrelor 90 mg bid (33.6%)	12 / 12	CV death; non-fatal MI; ischemic stroke; TVR; ST; cardiac readmission	TIMI bleeding criteria

† Guided Therapy Group only. Percentages of prevalence of mutant CYP genotype include both heterozygous and homozygous variants CYP2C19\*2/CYP2C19\*3 (LOF) and CYP2C19\*17 (GOF).

‡ For studies (23-25, 29, 33) in which standard and/or alternative treatments were chosen by treating physicians (based on clinical, PFT and genotype criteria) the relative percentages of patients assigned to each treatment in each arm are indicated, when available on the original report. Drugs were administered were once daily, unless otherwise specified.

§ PL-12 measures platelet aggregation in whole blood, based on changes in platelet count of the sample after the addition of the platelet agonist (ADP in this study).

**Abbreviations:** ABCB1=ATP Binding Cassette Subfamily B Member 1; ACS=acute coronary syndromes; ADP-IPIR=ADP-induced platelet inhibition rate; bid=bis in die; CV=cardiovascular; CYP=cytochrome 450; GOF=gain of function; HTPR=high on-treatment platelet reactivity; HR=hazard ratio; IPA=inhibition of platelet aggregation; IPRU=inhibition of P2Y<sub>12</sub> reactions units; LOF=loss of function; LTPR=low on-treatment platelet activity; LTA=light transmission aggregometry; MA<sub>ADP</sub>=maximal amplitude induced by ADP; MACE=major adverse cardiovascular events; MAR=maximum aggregation rate; MI=myocardial infarction; NA=not available; PA=platelet aggregation; PFT=platelet function test; PRI=P2Y<sub>12</sub> reactivity index; PRU= P2Y<sub>12</sub> reactions units; RCT=randomized controlled trial; RR=relative risk; ST=stent thrombosis; TEG= thromboelastography; TVR=target-vessel revascularization; U=units; VASP-P=vasodilator-stimulated phosphoprotein phosphorylation.

Table 2 – Point estimates of Risk Ratios for MACE in the 3 types of randomized controlled trials as a function of the geographical regions in which they had been performed

Strategy explored in RCTs	RCTs performed in China*		RCTs performed outside China*	
	RR, 95% CI (n. of patients)	P value	RR, 95% CI (n. of patients)	P value
<b>Genotype-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy</b>	<b>0.30</b> , 0.16-0.54 (901)	<0.0001	<b>0.74</b> , 0.46-1.18 (9,869)	0.21
<b>PFT-guided anti-P2Y12 therapy</b>	<b>0.62</b> , 0.42-0.93 (2,974)	0.02	<b>1.08</b> , 0.82-1.41 (3,509)	0.53
<b>Alternative therapies for HTPR on clopidogrel</b>	<b>0.56</b> , 0.43-0.74 (2,295)	<0.00001	<b>0.58</b> , 0.27-1.23 (2,818)	0.16

\*see Table 1 for details

Abbreviations: MACE=major adverse cardiovascular events; RR= risk ratio; CI= confidence intervals; RCTs= randomized controlled trials; HTPR= high on-treatment platelet reactivity.