

Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials: a meta-research study

Lum Kastrati, MD,^{1,2,3,4} Hamidreza Raeisi-Dehkordi, MSc⁵, Erand Llanaj, PhD,^{6,7,8},
Hugo G. Quezada-Pinedo, MD, PhD,⁹, Farnaz Khatami, MD,^{2,3,10}, Noushin Sadat
Ahanchi, MSc,^{2,3,11}, Adea Llana, MSc,⁶, Renald Meçani, MD,^{6,12}, Taulant Muka, MD,
PhD, PD,^{1,6}, John P.A. Ioannidis, MD, DSc^{1,13,14,15,16}

1. *Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA*
2. *Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland*
3. *Graduate School for Health Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland*
4. *Department of Diabetes, Endocrinology, Nutritional Medicine and Metabolism, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Switzerland.*
5. *Department of Global Public Health and Bioethics, Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands*
6. *Epistudia, Bern, Switzerland*
7. *Department of Molecular Epidemiology, German Institute of Human Nutrition Potsdam-Rehbrücke, Arthur-Scheunert-Allee 114-116, Nuthetal, 14558, Germany*
8. *German Centre for Diabetes Research (DZD), München-Neuherberg, Germany*
9. *Department of Population Health Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA.*
10. *Community Medicine Department, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran 1417613151, Iran*
11. *Department of Internal Medicine, Internal Medicine, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland*
12. *Division of Endocrinology and Diabetology, Department of Internal Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria*
13. *Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA*
14. *Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA*
15. *Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA*
16. *Department of Statistics, Stanford University School of Humanities and Sciences, Stanford, California, USA*

Word count: 3422; **Abstract:** 348

Conflicts of interest: None

Data sharing: All data are available from the authors upon request

Corresponding Author: John P.A. Ioannidis jioannid@stanford.edu, (650) 725-5465 (office), (650) 725-6247 (fax).

Funding: The work of John Ioannidis is supported by an unrestricted gift from Sue and Bob O'Donnell to Stanford University. The work of Lum Kastrati is supported by Swiss Government Scholarship for Excellence and funding from University of Bern and Insel Spital.

Keywords: mega-trial, randomized controlled trials, meta-research, mortality, outcomes, bias

ABSTRACT

Importance: Mega-trials can provide large-scale evidence on important questions.

Objective: To explore how the results of mega-trials compare to the meta-analysis results of trials with smaller sample sizes.

Data Sources: Clinicaltrials.gov was searched for mega-trials until 10.01.2023. PubMed was searched until June 2023 for meta-analyses incorporating the results of the eligible mega-trials.

Study Selection: Mega-trials were eligible if they were non-cluster non-vaccine randomized control trials (RCTs); had a sample size over 10,000; and had a peer-reviewed meta-analysis publication presenting results for the primary outcome of the mega-trials and/or all-cause mortality.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: For each selected meta-analysis, we extracted results of smaller trials and mega-trials included in the summary effect estimate, and combined them separately using random effects. These estimates were used to calculate the ratio of odds ratios (ROR) between mega-trials and smaller trials in each meta-analysis. Next, the ROR were combined using random-effects. Risk of bias was extracted for each trial included in our analyses (or when not available, assessed only for mega-trials).

Main Outcomes and Measures: The main outcomes were the summary ROR for the primary outcome and all-cause mortality between mega-trials and smaller trials. Sensitivity analyses were performed with respect to the time of publishing, masking, weight, type of intervention, and specialty.

Results Of 120 mega-trials identified, 39 (33%) had significant benefits for the primary outcome and 18 (15%) had significant benefits for all-cause mortality for the intervention. In 35 comparisons of primary outcomes (including 85 point estimates from 69 unique mega-trials and 272 point estimates from smaller trials) and 26 comparisons of all-cause mortality (including 70 point estimates from 65 unique mega-trials and 267 point estimates from smaller trials), ROR was 1.00 (95% CI, 0.97-1.04) and 1.00 (95% CI, 0.97-1.04), respectively. For the primary outcomes, smaller trials published before the mega-trials had more favorable results than the mega-trials (ROR 1.05, 95% CI, 1.01- 1.10), and than the subsequent smaller trials (ROR 0.91, 95% CI, 0.85-0.96).

Conclusions and Relevance: Meta-analyses of smaller studies show in general comparable results with mega-trials, but smaller trials published before the mega-trials give more favorable results than the mega-trials.

INTRODUCTION

Most randomized comparisons of interventions in medicine use small to modest sample sizes. The need to conduct more “mega-trials” (also called large simple trials) with over 10,000 participants has been long proposed [1, 2]. Mega-trials have been rare in the past, but there has been a renewed interest recently. Several mega-trials have found that certain interventions, like vitamin D supplementation, may not be as effective as previously thought [3, 4]. Conversely, some other mega-trials, such as the ISIS-2 trial on streptokinase and aspirin after myocardial infarction [5] have found favorable results with a major impact on clinical practice. The conduct of mega-trials may be facilitated by the growth of interest in pragmatic research [6, 7], new platforms that facilitate the recruitment of participants [8], and the wide recognition of the limitations of small trials. Therefore, it is important to understand and compare the results of mega-trials to those of smaller trials on the same topic.

Meta-analyses rarely include large trials and small trials have traditionally been considered more susceptible to biases, including more prominent selective reporting biases [9, 10]. Previous literature comparing results of meta-analyses of small trials with subsequent large trials has shown considerable variation in the extent of agreement or disagreement [11-14]. Several factors may contribute to this variation, including different methods used to define agreement, different event rates in the control group of the considered trials (baseline risk), differences in trial quality, and variable susceptibility to bias of the health outcomes under investigation [11]. In previous work, there was also no clear consensus on what constitutes a "large trial". Some [15] have considered the amount of evidence in each trial (inverse of variance or sample size) as a continuum, some have tried to separate trials that have sufficient (e.g., 80%) power to detect plausible effects [16], and some have used arbitrary sample size thresholds to separate large trials, e.g. 1,000 participants [12, 14].

There has been no comprehensive empirical examination that systematically compares the results of mega-trials with sample sizes exceeding 10,000 participants to those of smaller trials.

Here, we aimed to systematically identify such completed registered mega-trials. We then determined whether and which of these mega-trials have been included in meta-analyses for their primary outcomes and/or for mortality outcomes, compared the results of these mega-trials against the combined results of smaller trials, and tried to identify potential factors associated with discrepancies.

METHODS

Design and eligibility criteria for mega-trials

This was a meta-research project and the original protocol was registered in OSF (<https://osf.io/trsd7>). We analysed meta-analyses of clinical trials that have included the mega-trial results in their analysis for calculations of a summary effect for the primary endpoint of the mega-trial. Additionally, we considered data on all-cause mortality as a secondary outcome since it is the most severe and objective outcome.

Mega-trials were considered for analysis if they were non-cluster non-vaccine randomized controlled trials regardless of masking and degree of their design; had sample size exceeding 10,000 participants; and had a peer-reviewed publication presenting the results of the primary endpoint included in a meta-analysis. We excluded cluster trials because the effective sample size is much smaller than the number of participants. We excluded vaccine trials since very large vaccine trials usually have different considerations (e.g., targeting large populations rather than specific sets/types of patients/diseases) and types of outcomes (e.g., often surrogate outcomes of immune response rather than hard clinical outcomes) than mega-trials of other interventions.

For a meta-analysis to be included in the analysis, it had to have a systematic review design and include the results of the mega-trial for the primary outcome along with any number of other trials in obtaining summary effect estimates with the effect size and variance data available (or possible to calculate) for each trial from presented information.

Search strategy

We performed a search in clinicaltrials.gov for registered completed randomized controlled trials that were characterized as phase 3 or 4 and not have the status of recruitment as “Not yet recruiting” or “Recruiting”. After identifying the clinical trials that fulfilled our eligibility criteria, we searched the first primary publication for these trials that included any primary outcome(s) registered in clinicaltrials.gov. If no primary publication was registered in clinicaltrials.gov, we searched PubMed using the mega-trial name and/or registration number.

Next, in PubMed, we used the option “cited by” and selected further the option “meta-analysis” to identify meta-analyses that had cited the papers of interest. If more than one meta-analysis was identified, we screened them starting with the most recently indexed one and moving backward until a suitable meta-analysis was found that included the mega-trial results in calculations of a summary effect for a primary endpoint of the mega-trial. If summary effect calculations for multiple primary endpoints of the mega-trial were presented in an eligible meta-analysis, we prioritized binary over continuous outcomes; and the primary outcome with the largest number of events in the mega-trial (or the smallest variance if all the endpoints were continuous).

To identify a meta-analysis that included the mega-trial for mortality effect summary estimate calculations, we similarly screened meta-analyses that had cited the earliest main publication of the mega-trials backward in time until the 10th meta-analysis. The same process in PubMed was used to identify citing meta-analyses. If 10 citing meta-analyses

did not evaluate the outcome of mortality with eligible, usable data, we excluded that mega-trial from the mortality analysis.

Whenever a mega-trial included more than one active arm versus control, e.g. in a three-arm trial, or two or more different comparisons, e.g. in factorial design, we considered each eligible comparison separately and tried to identify respective meta-analyses.

Clinicaltrials.gov searches were last updated on 10/01/2023. PubMed searches were last updated on June 2023 by independent screeners and were done in duplicate.

Data extraction

For each selected meta-analysis, we extracted the results of RCTs included in the summary effect estimate that incorporated the effect estimate of the mega-trial. For each selected meta-analysis, we recorded the first author's name, publication year, eligible endpoint, comparison of intervention versus control, type of masking, topic, and type of intervention. For each trial in each eligible meta-analysis, we recorded the first author's name or acronym, publication year, total sample size, 2x2 table (or log (odds ratio) and variance thereof, if 2x2 table was not provided) for dichotomized outcomes and standardized mean difference (and variance thereof) for continuous outcomes. We also extracted information, whenever available, on the risk of bias assessments for each included trial based on Cochrane risk of bias tools (original, revised, and version 2).

All data extractions were performed in duplicate, and differences were settled by discussion. For any unsettled discrepancies, a third senior reviewer was invited to arbitrate.

Mega-trials (and their corresponding meta-analyses) that compare two active and overlapping interventions were analyzed as follows: if one intervention is a subset of the other, the subset intervention was considered as the control arm (e.g. in a trial comparing X+Y+Z to X+Y, X+Y was the control arm). If the interventions were not subsets of each other (e.g., X versus Y), the intervention that was approved by the FDA first was

considered as the control arm.

Statistical analysis

In each eligible meta-analysis, we combined the results from non-mega-trials using random effects (and fixed effects as sensitivity analysis) and compared them against the results of the mega-trial. In meta-analyses where several mega-trials were available, the results of the mega-trials were combined using random effects first before being compared against the results of smaller trials. Any cluster trials included in the meta-analysis were considered to be non-mega-trials.

The odds ratio (OR) was used as the metric of choice. Standardized mean differences (for any eligible continuous outcomes) were also converted to ORs [17]. Between-trial heterogeneity in each group of trials (mega-trials and other trials) and for all trials considered together were assessed using τ^2 between-study variance estimator, Q test, and I^2 statistics[18].

We obtained the log(relative odds ratio) (logROR) and its variance (the sum of the variances of the logOR in the two groups) between the mega-trial(s) and the smaller trials for each eligible outcome. The logROR estimates were combined then across each outcome using the DerSimonian and Laird random effects calculations.

In all calculations, treatment effects in single trials and meta-analyses thereof were coined consistently in such a way that $OR < 1$ means a more favorable outcome for the intervention than the control arm. In all analyses, heterogeneity was assessed using the τ^2 between-study variance estimator, Q test, and I^2 statistics [18].

A sensitivity analysis was performed to assess whether the results were different when non-mega-trials were included in the calculations only if they were published up until (and including) the year of publication of any mega-trials. This analysis more specifically targets the research question whether mega-trials corroborate the results of smaller trials

that have been performed before them. A separate analysis also compared the results of non-mega-trials published up until the year of publication of the mega-trial versus those published subsequently.

Separate subgroup analyses were performed for the comparison of results in mega-trials versus other trials according to masking (open-label vs masked); intervention type; specialty (cardiovascular, others); and per heterogeneity (low vs non-low) of the mega-trials. We also performed exploratory meta-regressions considering the same variables (masking, type of outcome, type of intervention, specialty) and also risk of bias in the mega-trials (high versus other), risk of bias in the other trials (proportion at high risk), median number of participants in non-mega-trials, and total number of participants in non-mega-trials.

We also performed exploratory tests for small study effects (Egger's test) [19], (when there were more than 10 trials).

Amendments to the original protocol

We extracted information for all mega-trials on whether they found statistically significant or nonsignificant results, and whether they were designed to show noninferiority. In several meta-analyses, some trials that did not pass the 10,000 threshold, but were substantially large to blur the effects. Therefore, we compared the results of mega-trials versus only the smaller trials that weighted less than $1/5^{\text{th}}$ of the least weighted mega-trial; and another sensitivity analysis versus those that weighted less than $1/10^{\text{th}}$ of the least weighted mega-trial. We then further restricted these trials to those published only before or up to the first trial.

Finally, we also assessed the risk of bias for the mega-trials that had not been assessed (or had been assessed using various non-Cochrane tools e.g. Jadad scale) using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool [20].

RESULTS

Identification of mega-trials and the respective meta-analyses

A total of 180 registered completed phase 3 or 4 trials that did not involve vaccines and that had 10,000 or more participants were identified through our search. Among these, 91 were randomized, non-cluster, non-vaccine mega-trials; but 38/91 lacked an appropriate meta-analysis and 2/91 had no published results, leaving 51 mega-trials with an eligible meta-analysis for either primary outcome and/or mortality. Results were compared to smaller trials across 58 meta-analyses for primary outcome (n=35 comparisons) and/or all-cause mortality (n=26 comparisons). In 3 topics, all-cause mortality was the mega-trial's primary outcome. For 19 mega-trials that had a composite primary outcome, no eligible meta-analysis was identified for the complete composite outcome, therefore the meta-analysis of one of the subsets of the composite outcome with the highest number of events was analysed.

The eligible meta-analyses included estimates from another 30 mega-trials that had randomized, non-cluster design and >10,000 participants but had not been identified in our searches. 26/30 were not registered in clinicaltrials.gov, while the other 2/30 had no listed location (we had identified mega-trials by screening trials registered at clinicaltrials.gov by extracting the trials listed for every country), 1/30 had listed no results in clinicaltrials.gov, and for 1/30 no reason for missingness was identified. These 30 trials with their estimates for primary outcomes (n=20) and all-cause mortality (n=22) were considered in the mega-trials group in all calculations. The meta-analyses included an additional 1 mega-trial that had initially been identified by our search but had no eligible meta-analysis for the primary outcome and/or all-cause mortality but was meta-analyzed for another outcome.

In total, 82 mega-trials estimates were included across all meta-analyses for the primary outcome (n=69) and all-cause mortality (n=65). Detailed information regarding the selection of mega-trials is in Figure 1.

Characteristics of mega-trials

64/82 mega-trials included in our analyses (Table 1, Supplementary Table 1&2) investigated cardiovascular outcomes. 17/82 mega-trials were centered around nutritional interventions, while the remaining covered various other medical interventions intervention types, such as pharmacological treatment (Table 1). Moreover, 15/82 mega-trials were

open-label, while the remaining were double-blinded (n=65) or employed varying degrees of masking (n=2) (Table 1). 14/82 mega-trials were judged at high risk of bias. 32/82 had statistically significant results at $p < 0.05$ for the primary outcome (30 favoring the intervention arm) and only 17/82 had statistically significant results at $p < 0.05$ for all-cause mortality (13 favoring the intervention arm) (Table 1, Supplementary Table 1&2).

Comparisons of mega-trials versus smaller trials: primary outcome

35 comparisons of mega-trials versus other trials were available. 85 estimates coming from 69 unique mega-trials were considered in these comparisons.

The total number of participants in the mega-trials had a median (IQR) of 15715 (12530-20114) across the 35 topics (Table 2). The total number of smaller trials across these 35 topics was 272 (median 6, range 1-45) (Table 2). The total number of participants in the smaller trials had a median (IQR) of 1639 (297-4128) across the 35 topics. 133/272 smaller trials were published before or up to the year of the first mega-trial of the respective topic. In 7 meta-analyses, the cumulative sample size of all the other, smaller trials exceeded the cumulative sample size of the mega-trials (Table 2).

Detailed information with forest plots on all of the 35 meta-analyses appears in Supplementary Material 1. In the summary analysis, there was no noteworthy discrepancy observed between the results of the mega-trials and those of smaller trials (summary ROR 1.00, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.97-1.04; $I^2=0.0$, P-value for heterogeneity=0.478; Figure 2). In two instances when comparing ivabradine to placebo and new adenosine diphosphate receptor agonist versus clopidogrel, the disagreement between the mega-trials and the respective smaller trials was beyond chance (ROR 1.21, 95% CI, 1.0-1.47 and ROR 0.83, 95% CI, 0.73, 0.95, respectively) [21, 22].

Comparisons of mega-trials versus smaller trials: all-cause mortality

26 comparisons of mega-trials versus other trials were available. 70 estimates coming from 65 unique mega-trials were considered in these comparisons (Table 3). The total number of participants in all of the mega-trials had a median of 15919 (IQR, 12524-18857).

The total number of smaller trials in these 26 meta-analyses was 267 (median per meta-analysis was 6, range 1-47). The cumulative number of participants from smaller trials was 1132 (IQR, 250-4038). 117/268 smaller trials were published before or up to the year of the first mega-trial of the respective topic. In 5 meta-analyses the cumulative number of participants in the other, smaller trials exceeded the total number of participants in the mega-trials (Table 3).

Comprehensive details and forest plots about the 26 meta-analyses appear in Supplementary Material 2.

In the summary analysis, no difference existed between the outcomes of the mega-trials and those of the smaller trials (summary ROR 1.00, 95% CI: 0.97-1.04; $I^2=0$, P-value for heterogeneity=0.60; Figure 3). In one instance testing effects of anti-inflammatory versus placebo in patients with coronary artery diseases the results differed beyond chance between

mega-trials and the other, smaller trials (ROR, 0.79, 95% CI, 0.65-0.97), with mega-trial showing no effect while meta-analysis of smaller trials an increased risk [23].

Sensitivity analyses

Smaller trials showed a significant trend for larger effects when compared to mega-trials when they were published before the first megatrial (ROR 1.05, 95% CI, 1.01-1.10) for the primary outcome and a non-significant trend for all-cause mortality 1.03 (95% CI, 0.98-1.09) (Figure 4a & 4b). Results of smaller trials published before the mega-trial showed significantly higher benefits as compared to smaller trials published subsequently (ROR 0.91, 95% CI, 0.85-0.96) for primary outcome and similar trend (ROR 0.94, 95% CI, 0.87-1.02) for all-cause mortality (Supplementary Figure S1).

No difference was seen when results were pooled using fixed effects and other subgroup analyses and meta-regressions were also non-revealing (Supplementary Figures S2-S8).

No small-study effects were found for the meta-analyses for the primary outcome and one meta-analysis had a significant result for all-cause mortality [24].

Mega-trials not included in meta-analyses

Of the 38 mega-trials that were otherwise eligible but for which we could not retrieve any meta-analysis that included them (Supplementary Table 4), 9/38 had a statistically significant benefit at $p < 0.05$ for the primary outcome (all favoring the intervention) and 5/38 had significant results for all-cause mortality (all favoring intervention).

Significance and non-inferiority across all mega-trials

In total, we analysed and/or described the results from 120 mega-trials. 41/120 showed a significant result for the primary outcome and 22/120 for all-cause mortality (33/120 (28%) and 18/120 (15%), respectively favoring the intervention over control). For studies with non-inferiority designs (n=17/120), 15/17 had reached noninferiority and 2/18 had significantly

better results in the experimental arm versus the control for the primary outcome (Table 1, Supplementary Table 1&2).

DISCUSSION

Overall, outcomes from meta-analyses of other, smaller clinical trials aligned on average with those of mega-trials in the clinical topics that we examined. However, mega-trials tended to have less favorable results than the smaller trials that preceded them timewise; and smaller trials published after the mega-trials tended to have less favorable results than the smaller trials published before the mega-trials and aligned with the mega-trials. Most mega-trials do not show statistically significant benefits for the primary outcome of interest, and statistically significant benefits for mortality are rare. Mega-trials are not available for most medical topics. Given that small trials and their meta-analyses may give unreliable, inflated estimates of benefit, mega-trials, or at least substantially large trials with sufficient power, may need to be considered and performed more frequently.

The diminished benefits in late smaller trials versus early small trials are consistent also with prior meta-research studies that have shown that the reported effects of interventions change over time, with wider oscillations of results in early studies [25]. It has been observed that it is more frequent for treatment effects to decrease rather than increase over time [26-28]. In our examined topics, the mega-trials may have corrected some inflated effects seen in the earlier trials that preceded them. Then, the subsequent trials might have been more aligned with what mega-trials had shown since the mega-trials are likely to have been considered very influential.

Previous meta-research assessments have shown different levels of agreement between the results of meta-analyses of smaller trials and large clinical trials. For example, Cappelleri et al. reported compatible results of meta-analysis of smaller studies with the results of large trials, although discrepancies in their results were found in up to 10% of the cases [11]. However, other meta-studies on this topic showed larger differences with a discrepancy rate of up to 39% [13]. These previous studies used a definition of a large trial having enrolled 1,000 participants or more. In contrast, we used a sample size of 10,000 participants to define a mega-trial, and therefore having a larger power to detect effects.

A limitation of our study is that several early mega-trials are not included in the clinicaltrials.gov registry. Nevertheless, by screening the eligible meta-analysis we were able to identify several of these trials, and they were considered in our calculations. No differences in significance for primary outcome and mortality were found between mega-trials registered in clinicaltrials.gov and not, which suggests that if other meta-trials were missed, this would likely not affect our findings. Our comparative results versus smaller trials still do not include all mega-trials, since for some mega-trials retrieved in clinicaltrials.gov we found no relevant meta-analysis where they had been included. However, we did examine the main conclusions of these mega-trials and they also had low rates of statistically significant results. Therefore, we can conclude that mega-trials in general tend to give “negative” results for tested interventions. Mega-trials are unlikely to be launched unless there is genuine equipoise. Nevertheless, the low rate of significant benefits, as opposed to the much higher rates of favorable results seen in typical phase 3 trials is remarkable [29]. For example, one assessment found superiority results for 80% of industry-funded and 44% of publicly-funded phase 3 trials in oncology [29].

Results from smaller and larger trials are needed as they both contribute to the generation of evidence. Confirmatory – well-designed and well-powered large studies are needed for

common clinical questions. Mega-trials are done very sparingly to date, but it would be beneficial to add more such trials to the clinical research armamentarium.

References

1. Yusuf, S., R. Collins, and R. Peto, *Why do we need some large, simple randomized trials?* Stat Med, 1984. **3**(4): p. 409-22.
2. Peto, R., R. Collins, and R. Gray, *Large-scale randomized evidence: large, simple trials and overviews of trials.* J Clin Epidemiol, 1995. **48**(1): p. 23-40.
3. Cummings, S.R. and C. Rosen, *VITAL Findings - A Decisive Verdict on Vitamin D Supplementation.* N Engl J Med, 2022. **387**(4): p. 368-370.
4. LeBoff, M.S., et al., *Supplemental Vitamin D and Incident Fractures in Midlife and Older Adults.* N Engl J Med, 2022. **387**(4): p. 299-309.
5. *Randomised trial of intravenous streptokinase, oral aspirin, both, or neither among 17,187 cases of suspected acute myocardial infarction: ISIS-2. ISIS-2 (Second International Study of Infarct Survival) Collaborative Group.* Lancet, 1988. **2**(8607): p. 349-60.
6. Janiaud, P., R. Dal-Re, and J.P.A. Ioannidis, *Assessment of Pragmatism in Recently Published Randomized Clinical Trials.* JAMA Intern Med, 2018. **178**(9): p. 1278-1280.
7. Zuidegeest, M.G., et al., *PRECIS-2 in perspective: what is next for pragmatic trials?* J Clin Epidemiol, 2017. **84**: p. 22-24.
8. Peto, L., P. Horby, and M. Landray, *Establishing COVID-19 trials at scale and pace: Experience from the RECOVERY trial.* Adv Biol Regul, 2022. **86**: p. 100901.
9. Dwan, K., et al., *Evidence for the selective reporting of analyses and discrepancies in clinical trials: a systematic review of cohort studies of clinical trials.* PLoS Med, 2014. **11**(6): p. e1001666.
10. Dwan, K., et al., *Systematic review of the empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias.* PLoS One, 2008. **3**(8): p. e3081.
11. Cappelleri, J.C., et al., *Large trials vs meta-analysis of smaller trials: how do their results compare?* JAMA, 1996. **276**(16): p. 1332-8.
12. LeLorier, J., et al., *Discrepancies between meta-analyses and subsequent large randomized, controlled trials.* N Engl J Med, 1997. **337**(8): p. 536-42.
13. Contopoulos-Ioannidis, D.G., et al., *Comparison of large versus smaller randomized trials for mental health-related interventions.* Am J Psychiatry, 2005. **162**(3): p. 578-84.
14. Sivakumar, H. and P.J. Peyton, *Poor agreement in significant findings between meta-analyses and subsequent large randomized trials in perioperative medicine.* Br J Anaesth, 2016. **117**(4): p. 431-441.
15. Sterne, J.A., et al., *Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials.* Bmj, 2011. **343**: p. d4002.
16. Stanley, T.D., H. Doucouliagos, and J.P. Ioannidis, *Finding the power to reduce publication bias.* Stat Med, 2017. **36**(10): p. 1580-1598.

17. Chinn, S., *A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in meta-analysis*. Stat Med, 2000. **19**(22): p. 3127-31.
18. Higgins, J.P., et al., *Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses*. BMJ, 2003. **327**(7414): p. 557-60.
19. Egger, M., et al., *Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test*. Bmj, 1997. **315**(7109): p. 629-34.
20. Sterne, J.A.C., et al., *RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials*. Bmj, 2019. **366**: p. l4898.
21. Maagaard, M., et al., *Ivabradine added to usual care in patients with heart failure: a systematic review with meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis*. BMJ Evid Based Med, 2022. **27**(4): p. 224-234.
22. Bae, J.S. and J.S. Jang, *Comparison of new adenosine diphosphate receptor antagonists with clopidogrel in patients with coronary artery disease: a meta-analysis*. Heart Vessels, 2016. **31**(3): p. 275-87.
23. Niu, Y., et al., *Safety and efficacy of anti-inflammatory therapy in patients with coronary artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. BMC Cardiovasc Disord, 2022. **22**(1): p. 84.
24. Ennezat, P.V., et al., *Extent of Low-density Lipoprotein Cholesterol Reduction and All-cause and Cardiovascular Mortality Benefit: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol, 2023. **81**(1): p. 35-44.
25. Ioannidis, J. and J. Lau, *Evolution of treatment effects over time: empirical insight from recursive cumulative metaanalyses*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2001. **98**(3): p. 831-6.
26. Parish, A.J., et al., *An umbrella review of effect size, bias, and power across meta-analyses in emergency medicine*. Acad Emerg Med, 2021. **28**(12): p. 1379-1388.
27. Pereira, T.V., R.I. Horwitz, and J.P. Ioannidis, *Empirical evaluation of very large treatment effects of medical interventions*. Jama, 2012. **308**(16): p. 1676-84.
28. Trikalinos, T.A., et al., *Effect sizes in cumulative meta-analyses of mental health randomized trials evolved over time*. J Clin Epidemiol, 2004. **57**(11): p. 1124-30.
29. Djulbegovic, B., et al., *Treatment success in cancer: industry compared to publicly sponsored randomized controlled trials*. PLoS One, 2013. **8**(3): p. e58711.
30. Aberle, D.R., et al., *Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening*. N Engl J Med, 2011. **365**(5): p. 395-409.
31. Jamerson, K., et al., *Benazepril plus amlodipine or hydrochlorothiazide for hypertension in high-risk patients*. N Engl J Med, 2008. **359**(23): p. 2417-28.
32. Huo, Y., et al., *Efficacy of folic acid therapy in primary prevention of stroke among adults with hypertension in China: the CSPPT randomized clinical trial*. Jama, 2015. **313**(13): p. 1325-35.
33. Bosch, J., et al., *n-3 fatty acids and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with dysglycemia*. N Engl J Med, 2012. **367**(4): p. 309-18.
34. Vranckx, P., et al., *Ticagrelor plus aspirin for 1 month, followed by ticagrelor monotherapy for 23 months vs aspirin plus clopidogrel or ticagrelor for 12 months, followed by aspirin monotherapy for 12 months after implantation of a drug-eluting stent: a multicentre, open-label, randomised superiority trial*. Lancet, 2018. **392**(10151): p. 940-949.
35. Gerstein, H.C., et al., *Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes*. N Engl J Med, 2008. **358**(24): p. 2545-59.
36. Pepine, C.J., et al., *A calcium antagonist vs a non-calcium antagonist hypertension treatment strategy for patients with coronary artery disease. The International Verapamil-Trandolapril Study (INVEST): a randomized controlled trial*. Jama, 2003. **290**(21): p. 2805-16.
37. Yokoyama, M., et al., *Effects of eicosapentaenoic acid on major coronary events in hypercholesterolaemic patients (JELIS): a randomised open-label, blinded endpoint analysis*. Lancet, 2007. **369**(9567): p. 1090-8.

38. Ikeda, Y., et al., *Low-dose aspirin for primary prevention of cardiovascular events in Japanese patients 60 years or older with atherosclerotic risk factors: a randomized clinical trial.* *Jama*, 2014. **312**(23): p. 2510-20.
39. Manson, J.E., et al., *Vitamin D Supplements and Prevention of Cancer and Cardiovascular Disease.* *N Engl J Med*, 2019. **380**(1): p. 33-44.
40. Albert, C.M., et al., *Effect of Marine Omega-3 Fatty Acid and Vitamin D Supplementation on Incident Atrial Fibrillation: A Randomized Clinical Trial.* *Jama*, 2021. **325**(11): p. 1061-1073.
41. Nissen, S.E., et al., *Cardiovascular Safety of Celecoxib, Naproxen, or Ibuprofen for Arthritis.* *N Engl J Med*, 2016. **375**(26): p. 2519-29.
42. Yusuf, S., et al., *Telmisartan to prevent recurrent stroke and cardiovascular events.* *N Engl J Med*, 2008. **359**(12): p. 1225-37.
43. Antman, E.M., et al., *Enoxaparin versus unfractionated heparin with fibrinolysis for ST-elevation myocardial infarction.* *N Engl J Med*, 2006. **354**(14): p. 1477-88.
44. Jukema, J.W., et al., *Alirocumab in Patients With Polyvascular Disease and Recent Acute Coronary Syndrome: ODYSSEY OUTCOMES Trial.* *J Am Coll Cardiol*, 2019. **74**(9): p. 1167-1176.
45. Zampieri, F.G., et al., *Effect of Intravenous Fluid Treatment With a Balanced Solution vs 0.9% Saline Solution on Mortality in Critically Ill Patients: The BaSICS Randomized Clinical Trial.* *Jama*, 2021. **326**(9): p. 1-12.
46. Fox, K., et al., *Ivabradine for patients with stable coronary artery disease and left-ventricular systolic dysfunction (BEAUTIFUL): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial.* *Lancet*, 2008. **372**(9641): p. 807-16.
47. Hercberg, S., et al., *The SU.VI.MAX Study: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial of the health effects of antioxidant vitamins and minerals.* *Arch Intern Med*, 2004. **164**(21): p. 2335-42.
48. Landray, M.J., et al., *Effects of extended-release niacin with laropiprant in high-risk patients.* *N Engl J Med*, 2014. **371**(3): p. 203-12.
49. Ridker, P.M., et al., *Cardiovascular Efficacy and Safety of Bococizumab in High-Risk Patients.* *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **376**(16): p. 1527-1539.
50. Barter, P.J., et al., *Effects of torcetrapib in patients at high risk for coronary events.* *N Engl J Med*, 2007. **357**(21): p. 2109-22.
51. Wallentin, L., et al., *Ticagrelor versus clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes.* *N Engl J Med*, 2009. **361**(11): p. 1045-57.
52. Scirica, B.M., et al., *Saxagliptin and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus.* *N Engl J Med*, 2013. **369**(14): p. 1317-26.
53. Bhatt, D.L., et al., *Sotagliflozin in Patients with Diabetes and Chronic Kidney Disease.* *N Engl J Med*, 2021. **384**(2): p. 129-139.
54. White, H.D., et al., *Darapladib for preventing ischemic events in stable coronary heart disease.* *N Engl J Med*, 2014. **370**(18): p. 1702-11.
55. Holman, R.R., et al., *Effects of Once-Weekly Exenatide on Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes.* *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **377**(13): p. 1228-1239.
56. Mehta, S.R., et al., *Double-dose versus standard-dose clopidogrel and high-dose versus low-dose aspirin in individuals undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention for acute coronary syndromes (CURRENT-OASIS 7): a randomised factorial trial.* *Lancet*, 2010. **376**(9748): p. 1233-43.
57. Devereaux, P.J., et al., *Clonidine in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery.* *N Engl J Med*, 2014. **370**(16): p. 1504-13.
58. Bhatt, D.L., et al., *Clopidogrel and aspirin versus aspirin alone for the prevention of atherothrombotic events.* *N Engl J Med*, 2006. **354**(16): p. 1706-17.
59. Giugliano, R.P., et al., *Edoxaban versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation.* *N Engl J Med*, 2013. **369**(22): p. 2093-104.

60. Mega, J.L., et al., *Rivaroxaban in patients with a recent acute coronary syndrome*. *N Engl J Med*, 2012. **366**(1): p. 9-19.
61. Bohula, E.A., et al., *Cardiovascular Safety of Lorcaserin in Overweight or Obese Patients*. *N Engl J Med*, 2018. **379**(12): p. 1107-1117.
62. O'Donoghue, M.L., et al., *Effect of darapladib on major coronary events after an acute coronary syndrome: the SOLID-TIMI 52 randomized clinical trial*. *Jama*, 2014. **312**(10): p. 1006-15.
63. Yusuf, S., et al., *Telmisartan, ramipril, or both in patients at high risk for vascular events*. *N Engl J Med*, 2008. **358**(15): p. 1547-59.
64. Fox, K., et al., *Ivabradine in stable coronary artery disease without clinical heart failure*. *N Engl J Med*, 2014. **371**(12): p. 1091-9.
65. Chen, Z.M., et al., *Early intravenous then oral metoprolol in 45,852 patients with acute myocardial infarction: randomised placebo-controlled trial*. *Lancet*, 2005. **366**(9497): p. 1622-32.
66. Bowman, L., et al., *Effects of Anacetrapib in Patients with Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease*. *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **377**(13): p. 1217-1227.
67. Ridker, P.M., et al., *Rosuvastatin to prevent vascular events in men and women with elevated C-reactive protein*. *N Engl J Med*, 2008. **359**(21): p. 2195-207.
68. Gaziano, J.M., et al., *Use of aspirin to reduce risk of initial vascular events in patients at moderate risk of cardiovascular disease (ARRIVE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial*. *Lancet*, 2018. **392**(10152): p. 1036-1046.
69. Lincoff, A.M., et al., *Evacetrapib and Cardiovascular Outcomes in High-Risk Vascular Disease*. *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **376**(20): p. 1933-1942.
70. Schwartz, G.G., et al., *Effects of dalcetrapib in patients with a recent acute coronary syndrome*. *N Engl J Med*, 2012. **367**(22): p. 2089-99.
71. Wiviott, S.D., et al., *Dapagliflozin and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes*. *N Engl J Med*, 2019. **380**(4): p. 347-357.
72. Neal, B., et al., *Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular and Renal Events in Type 2 Diabetes*. *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **377**(7): p. 644-657.
73. Ridker, P.M., et al., *Antiinflammatory Therapy with Canakinumab for Atherosclerotic Disease*. *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **377**(12): p. 1119-1131.
74. Roncaglioni, M.C., et al., *n-3 fatty acids in patients with multiple cardiovascular risk factors*. *N Engl J Med*, 2013. **368**(19): p. 1800-8.
75. Bonaca, M.P., et al., *Long-term use of ticagrelor in patients with prior myocardial infarction*. *N Engl J Med*, 2015. **372**(19): p. 1791-800.
76. Eikelboom, J.W., et al., *Rivaroxaban with or without Aspirin in Stable Cardiovascular Disease*. *N Engl J Med*, 2017. **377**(14): p. 1319-1330.
77. Wiviott, S.D., et al., *Prasugrel versus clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes*. *N Engl J Med*, 2007. **357**(20): p. 2001-15.
78. Yusuf, S., et al., *Cholesterol Lowering in Intermediate-Risk Persons without Cardiovascular Disease*. *N Engl J Med*, 2016. **374**(21): p. 2021-31.
79. Bowman, L., et al., *Effects of Aspirin for Primary Prevention in Persons with Diabetes Mellitus*. *N Engl J Med*, 2018. **379**(16): p. 1529-1539.
80. Abtan, J., et al., *Efficacy and Safety of Cangrelor in Preventing Periprocedural Complications in Patients With Stable Angina and Acute Coronary Syndromes Undergoing Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: The CHAMPION PHOENIX Trial*. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*, 2016. **9**(18): p. 1905-13.
81. Bonney, A., et al., *Impact of low-dose computed tomography (LDCT) screening on lung cancer-related mortality*. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2022. **8**(8): p. Cd013829.
82. Chi, C., et al., *Angiotensin System Blockade Combined With Calcium Channel Blockers Is Superior to Other Combinations in Cardiovascular Protection With Similar Blood Pressure*

- Reduction: A Meta-Analysis in 20,451 Hypertensive Patients.* J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich), 2016. **18**(8): p. 801-8.
83. Li, Y., et al., *Folic Acid Supplementation and the Risk of Cardiovascular Diseases: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials.* J Am Heart Assoc, 2016. **5**(8).
84. Yu, F., et al., *Effects of omega-3 fatty acid on major cardiovascular outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis.* Medicine (Baltimore), 2022. **101**(30): p. e29556.
85. Tsigkas, G., et al., *Very Short Versus Longer Dual Antiplatelet Treatment After Coronary Interventions: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.* Am J Cardiovasc Drugs, 2023. **23**(1): p. 35-46.
86. Hasebe, M., et al., *Efficacy of antihyperglycemic therapies on cardiovascular and heart failure outcomes: an updated meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis of 35 randomized cardiovascular outcome trials.* Cardiovasc Diabetol, 2023. **22**(1): p. 62.
87. Khan, N. and F.A. McAlister, *Re-examining the efficacy of beta-blockers for the treatment of hypertension: a meta-analysis.* Cmaj, 2006. **174**(12): p. 1737-42.
88. Wang, M., et al., *Benefits and Risks Associated with Low-Dose Aspirin Use for the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Control Trials and Trial Sequential Analysis.* Am J Cardiovasc Drugs, 2022. **22**(6): p. 657-675.
89. Keum, N., et al., *Vitamin D supplementation and total cancer incidence and mortality by daily vs. infrequent large-bolus dosing strategies: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials.* Br J Cancer, 2022. **127**(5): p. 872-878.
90. Gencer, B., et al., *Effect of Long-Term Marine ω -3 Fatty Acids Supplementation on the Risk of Atrial Fibrillation in Randomized Controlled Trials of Cardiovascular Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.* Circulation, 2021. **144**(25): p. 1981-1990.
91. Cheng, B.R., et al., *Cardiovascular safety of celecoxib in rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis.* PLoS One, 2021. **16**(12): p. e0261239.
92. Tharmaratnam, D., et al., *Is Blood Pressure Lowering in the Very Elderly With Previous Stroke Associated With a Higher Risk of Adverse Events?* J Am Heart Assoc, 2021. **10**(24): p. e022240.
93. Singh, S., et al., *Adjunctive low molecular weight heparin during fibrinolytic therapy in acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis of randomized control trials.* Clin Cardiol, 2009. **32**(7): p. 358-64.
94. Alkhalil, M., et al., *Meta-Analysis of Intensive Lipid-Lowering Therapy in Patients With Polyvascular Disease.* J Am Heart Assoc, 2021. **10**(5): p. e017948.
95. Dong, W.H., et al., *Fluid resuscitation with balanced crystalloids versus normal saline in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med, 2022. **30**(1): p. 28.
96. Yang, J., et al., *β -Carotene Supplementation and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials.* Nutrients, 2022. **14**(6).
97. Schandelmaier, S., et al., *Niacin for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular events.* Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2017. **6**(6): p. Cd009744.
98. Chiavaroli, L., et al., *Effect of low glycaemic index or load dietary patterns on glycaemic control and cardiometabolic risk factors in diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials.* Bmj, 2021. **374**: p. n1651.
99. Zhuo, X., et al., *Adverse clinical outcomes associated with double dose clopidogrel compared to the other antiplatelet regimens in patients with coronary artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* BMC Pharmacol Toxicol, 2018. **19**(1): p. 54.
100. Duncan, D., et al., *Alpha-2 adrenergic agonists for the prevention of cardiac complications among adults undergoing surgery.* Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2018. **3**(3): p. Cd004126.

101. Fanari, Z., et al., *Long-term use of dual antiplatelet therapy for the secondary prevention of atherothrombotic events: Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med*, 2017. **18**(1): p. 10-15.
102. Liang, X., et al., *The efficacy and safety of edoxaban versus warfarin in preventing clinical events in atrial fibrillation: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Anatol J Cardiol*, 2021. **25**(2): p. 77-88.
103. Yuan, J., *Efficacy and safety of adding rivaroxaban to the anti-platelet regimen in patients with coronary artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. *BMC Pharmacol Toxicol*, 2018. **19**(1): p. 19.
104. Zhang, L., et al., *Cardiovascular safety of long-term anti-obesity drugs in subjects with overweight or obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*, 2021. **77**(11): p. 1611-1621.
105. Albasri, A., et al., *Association between antihypertensive treatment and adverse events: systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Bmj*, 2021. **372**: p. n189.
106. Maagaard, M., et al., *Effects of adding ivabradine to usual care in patients with angina pectoris: a systematic review of randomised clinical trials with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis*. *Open Heart*, 2020. **7**(2).
107. Safi, S., et al., *Beta-blockers for suspected or diagnosed acute myocardial infarction*. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2019. **12**(12): p. Cd012484.
108. Wang, Y., et al., *The effect of folic acid in patients with cardiovascular disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, 2019. **98**(37): p. e17095.
109. Sardar, P., et al., *Effect of Intensive Versus Standard Blood Glucose Control in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Different Regions of the World: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials*. *J Am Heart Assoc*, 2015. **4**(5).
110. Riaz, H., et al., *Effects of high-density lipoprotein targeting treatments on cardiovascular outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*, 2019. **26**(5): p. 533-543.
111. Rados, D.V., et al., *Metabolic effects of antihyperglycemic agents and mortality: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. *Sci Rep*, 2020. **10**(1): p. 12837.
112. Wanas, Y., et al., *Assessing the risk of angiotensin receptor blockers on major cardiovascular events: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*, 2020. **20**(1): p. 188.
113. Ali, M.U., et al., *The effectiveness of sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitors on cardiorenal outcomes: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Cardiovasc Diabetol*, 2024. **23**(1): p. 72.

PO	ACM	INTERVENTION	INTERVENTION	CONTROL	OUTCOME	PO OR (95% CI)	ACM OR (95% CI)	
1	1#	Aberle 2011 [30]*	Low dose CT	Usual care/X-ray	Lung cancer incidence	0.80 (0.70-0.92)	0.94 (0.87-0.99)	High
2†	2#	ACCOMPLISH 2008 [31]	ACEi/ARBs+CCB	Other combinations	Fatal and non-fatal stroke	0.83 (0.65–1.08)	0.89 (0.75–1.07)	Low
3	3#	CSPPT 2015 [32]	Enalapril + Folic Acid	Enalapril	Stroke	0.79 (0.67-0.92)	0.94 (0.8-1.11)	Low
4	4#	ORIGIN 2012 [33]	Omega 3	Placebo	Cardiovascular mortality	0.98 (0.87-1.1)	0.98 (0.88-1.08)	Low
5†	5	GLOBAL LEADERS 2018 [34]*	Very short duration of antiplatelet therapy	>3 months antiplatelet therapy	All-Cause Mortality	0.82 (0.64–1.06)	0.82 (0.64–1.06)	High
6	6#	ACCORD 2008 [35]*	Intensive glucose-lowering treatment	Conventional treatment	MACE	0.94 (0.81-1.1)	1.28 (1.06-1.54)	High
7	NA	INVEST 2003 [36]	Beta blockers	Other drugs	MACE	1.02 (0.94 –1.11)	0.96 (0.09-1.00)	Low
8	4#	JELIS 2007 [37]*	Omega 3 + statin	Omega 6/ placebo or usual care	MACE	0.8 (0.68-0.94)	1.08 (0.91-1.28)	High
9	7#	JPPP 2014 [38]	Low dose aspirin	Placebo or no aspirin	MACE	0.93 (0.76-1.14)	0.98 (0.83-1.15)	High
10	8#	VITAL 2019 [39]*	Vitamin D	Control (placebo, other supplements)	Total Cancer Incidence	0.96 (0.87- 1.06)	0.98 (0.86-1.11)	Low
11	NA	Albert 2021 [40]	Omega-3 and Vitamin D supplementation	Placebo	Atrial Fibrillation	1.09 (0.96-1.25)	No Data	Low
12	9#	NISSEN 2016 [41]\$	Celocoxib	Other NSAID	Myocardial Infarction	0.89 (0.65-1.2)	0.69 (0.5-0.94)	Low
13	10#	PROFESS 2008 [42]\$	Blood pressure lowering treatment	Placebo or alternative regimen	Stroke	0.94 (0.85-1.04)	1.02 (0.92-1.14)	Low
14 †	14	EXTRACT TIMI 2006 [43]	Enoxaparin	Unfractionated Heparin	All-Cause Mortality	0.92 (0.82-1.01)	0.92 (0.82-1.01)	Low
15	11#	ODYSSEY OUTCOMES 2019 [44]	Intensive lipid lowering therapy	Less intensive lipid lowering therapy	MACE	0.85 (0.78-0.94)	0.91 (0.82-1.02)	Low
16	NA	BaSICS 2021 [45]	IV fluid treatment with balanced solution	IV normal solution	90 days survival	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	No Data	Low
17 †	12#	BEAUTIFUL 2008 [46]	Ivabradine	Placebo	MACE	0.87 (0.80-0.95)	1.04 (0.82-1.18)	Low
18	13#	SU.VLMAX 2007 [47]	β-carotene supplementation	Placebo	MACE	0.96 (0.76-1.24)	0.77 (0.57-1.04)	Low
19 †	NA	HPS2-THRIVE 2004 [48]	Extended-release niacin with laropiprant	Laropiprant or matching placebo	Any revascularization procedure	0.9 (0.82-0.99)	1.09 (0.99-1.21)	Low
NA	11#	SPIRE 2017 [49]	Bococizumab	Placebo	MACE	0.83 (0.67-1.01)	1.02 (0.79-1.31)	Low
20 †	14#	ILLUMINATE 2007 [50]	HDL modifiers	CETP	Myocardial Infarction	1.2 (0.94-1.54)	1.58 (1.14-2.19)	Low
21 †	15#	PLATO 2009 [51]	Ticagrelor	Clopidogrel	Myocardial Infarction	0.82 (0.75-0.91)	0.77 (0.68-0.89)	Low
22	16#	SAVOR-TIMI 2013 [52]\$	DPP-4i	Placebo	MACE	0.99 (0.88-1.12)	1.11 (0.96-1.27)	Low
23	17#	SCORED 2021 [53]\$	SGLT2-I	Placebo	MACE	0.76 (0.65-0.88)	1.00 (0.83-1.2)	Low
24	18#	STABILITY 2017 [54]	Anti-inflammatory drugs	Placebo	MACE	0.93 (0.84-1.03)	1.00 (0.9-1.13)	Low

25	19#	EXSCEL 2017 [55]§	GLP-1 RA	Placebo	MACE	0.92 (0.84-1.02)	0.84 (0.74-0.95)	Low
26 †	20#	CURRENT-OASIS 7 2010 [56]	Double dose clopidogrel	Other Antiplatelet regimens	Cardiac Mortality	0.96 (0.77-1.20)	0.94 (0.76-1.16)	Low
27 †	21#	POISE-2 2014 [57]	Clonidine	Placebo or non- α -2 adrenergic agonists.	Myocardial Infarction	1.12 (0.95-1.32)	1.01 (0.71-1.43)	Low
28	22#	CHARISMA 2006[58]	Dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT; \geq 12 mo)	Dual antiplatelet therapy (6–12 mo)	MACE	0.92 (0.82-1.04)	0.99 (0.85-1.14)	Low
29 †	NA	ENGAGE TIMI AF 2003 [59]§	Edoxaban	Warfarin	Stroke	0.88 (0.75-1.04)	0.87 (0.79-0.96)	Low
30	23#	ATLAS 2012 [60]	Rivaroxaban	Placebo	MACE	0.82 (0.72-0.94)	0.79 (0.65-0.98)	Low
31	NA	CAMELLIA-TIMI 2018 [61]§	Anti-obesity drugs	Placebo	MACE	0.99 (0.86-1.14)	1.08 (0.89-1.31)	Low
32 †	18#	SOLID TIMI-52 2014 [62]	Antiinflammatory drugs	Placebo	Myocardial Infarction	0.97 (0.86-1.10)	0.93 (0.81-1.08)	Low
33 †	10#	ONTARGET 2008 [63]§	Angiotensin Receptor Blocker	Placebo/Standard Care	Cardiovascular mortality	1.03 (0.92-1.16)	0.97 (0.89-1.07)	High
34	12#	SIGNIFY 2014 [64]	Ivabradine	Placebo	Myocardial infarction	1.05 (0.91-1.22)	1.06 (0.93-1.21)	High
35	35	COMMIT 2005[65]	Beta Blockers	Placebo	All-Cause Mortality	0.98 (0.92-1.05)	0.98 (0.92-1.05)	Low
20 †	14#	REVEAL 2017 [66]	HDL Cholesterol modifiers	Placebo	Myocardial infarction	0.86 (0.77-0.96)	0.97 (0.89-1.05)	Low
NA	24#	JUPITER 2008 [67]	Intensive LDL-c reducing therapy	Less Intensive LDL-c reducing therapy	MACE	0.56 (0.46-0.69)	0.80 (0.66-0.96)	Low
9†	7#	ARRIVE 2018 [68]	Low dose aspirin	Placebo or no aspirin	MACE	0.95 (0.78-1.15)	0.99 (0.8-1.25)	Low
20 †	14#	ACCELERATE 2017 [69]	HDL modifiers	Placebo	Myocardial Infarction	1.00 (0.84-1.2)	0.84 (0.7-1.00)	Low
20 †	14#	Dal-OUTCOME 2012 [70]	HDL modifiers	Placebo	Myocardial Infarction	1.01 (0.88-1.17)	0.98 (0.82-1.12)	Low
23	17#	DECLARE TIMI 2019 [71]§	SGLT2i	Placebo	MACE	0.94 (0.84-1.04)	0.92 (0.82-1.04)	High
23	17#	CANVAS 2017 [72]§	SGLT2-i	Placebo	MACE	0.85 (0.74-0.97)	0.89 (0.75-1.04)	Low
24	18#	CANTOS 2017 [73]	Anti-inflammatory drugs	Placebo	MACE	0.87 (0.77-0.98)	0.92 (0.81-1.06)	Low
8	4#	Risk & Prevention trial 2013[74]	Omega 3 + statin	Omega 6/ placebo or usual care	MACE	0.99 (0.89-1.1)	1.03 (0.89-1.21)	Low
28	22#	PEGASUS-TIMI 54 2015 [75]*	Dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT; \geq 12 mo)	Dual antiplatelet therapy (6–12 mo)	MACE	0.83 (0.75-0.93)	0.94 (0.82-1.08)	Low
30	23#	COMPASS 2017[76]	Rivaroxaban +Aspirin	Aspirin	MACE	0.75 (0.65-0.86)	0.82 (0.7-0.95)	Low
21 †	NA	TRITON-TIMI 2007 [77]	Prasugrel	Clopidogrel	Myocardial Infarction	0.75 (0.66-0.84)	0.94 (0.78-1.15)	Low
NA	10#	HOPE-3 2016 [78]	Rosuvastatin	Placebo	MACE	0.76 (0.65-0.9)	0.93 (0.8-1.08)	Low
9	7#	ASCEND 2018[79]	Aspirin	Placebo	MACE	0.87 (0.78-0.98)	0.93 (0.84-1.04)	Low
21 †	NA	CHAMPION PHOENIX 2016	Cangrelor	Clopidogrel	MACE	0.80 (0.67-0.97)	0.72 (0.35-1.48)	Low

[80]

Table 1. General characteristics of the included mega-trials

MA ID- The numbers listed for PO and MA, represent the respective meta-analyses that the respective mega-trials are included and are references for table 2 and 3. **MA-** Meta-analysis, **PO-** Primary Outcome, **ACM-** All-Cause Mortality, **OR-** Odds Ratio, **CI-** Confidence Interval, **ROB-** Risk of Bias, **ACEi-** Angiotensin Converting Enzyme inhibitor, **ARBs-** Angiotensin Receptor Blockers, **GPI-** Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibitors, **DDP-14-** Dipeptidyl Peptidase 4 inhibitors, **SGLT2-I,** Sodium Glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors, **GLP-1 RA-** Glucagon-like Peptide-1, **LDL-** Low Density Lipoprotein **HDL-** High Density Lipoprotein, **NSAID-** Nonsteroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs, **MACE-** Major Adverse Cardiovascular Event, **CETP-** Cholesteryl ester transfer protein.
 Trials denoted by * were open label. All the other trials were blinded.
 Trials denoted by † have had a composite primary outcome but have been meta-analyzed for only one subset of it. Information on the composite outcome results can be found on Supplementary Table S1.
 Trials denoted by \$ had been designed for proving non-inferiority.

Mega-trials

Other smaller trials

Mega-trials

Other smaller trials

N

Range

N

Range

MA Results

MA Results

Meta-analysis ID	N	(Total)	(Per trial)	N	(Total)	(Per trial)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
1 [81]	2	53454	15789-53454	6	21879	2450-4104	0.78 (0.70-0.87)	0.80 (0.67-0.95)
2 [82]	1	11394	11394	2	7260	2182-5078	0.84 (0.65-1.08)	0.82 (0.55-1.24)
3 [83]	2	32766	12064-20702	19	46035	88-8164	0.89 (0.70-1.14)	0.83 (0.73-0.94)
4 [84]	6	96361	11324-25871	13	31321	102-8179	0.92 (0.85-1.00)	0.89 (0.76-1.04)
5 [85]	1	15968	15968	7	25236	1460-7119	0.82 (0.64-1.06)	0.92 (0.73-1.16)
6 [86]	2	21391	10251-11140	2	5658	1791-3867	0.94 (0.85-1.03)	0.84 (0.71-0.99)
7 [87]	5	140693	10881-79775	7	36351	758-9193	0.99 (0.95-1.02)	1.10 (0.99-1.22)
8 [84]	6	96361	12505-25871	16	35237	101-8179	0.94 (0.89-1.00)	0.92 (0.82-1.04)
9 [88]	6	119670	12546-39876	4	15287	2539-5713	0.89 (0.84-0.95)	0.82 (0.71-0.94)
10 [89]	2	62223	25871-36352	10	27503	511-5292	0.98 (0.92-1.04)	0.99 (0.89-1.10)
11 [90]	4	66182	12505-25119	3	14773	759-8179	1.27 (1.06-1.52)	1.27 (1.02-1.58)
12 [91]	1	23895	23895	5	24359	213-8065	0.89 (0.65-1.22)	1.29 (0.96-1.73)
13 [92]	1	20332	20332	6	18264	1022-6105	0.94 (0.85-1.04)	0.90 (0.76-1.08)
14 [93]	1	20479	20479	6	7093	242-4078	0.92 (0.82-1.02)	0.94 (0.77-1.15)
15 [94]	3	52687	16204-19113	4	29155	5401-9395	0.90 (0.84-0.96)	0.83 (0.73-0.96)
16[95]*	1	10520	10520	6	23997	46-15802*	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	0.95 (0.88-1.02)
17 [21]§	1	10917	10917	14	7826	19-6505	1.08 (0.94-1.23)	0.89 (0.78-1.01)
18 [96]	5	109438	12741-39876	5	10970	181-8171	1.02 (0.96-1.08)	1.07 (0.97-1.18)
19 [97]	1	25673	25673	6	3841	64-3365	0.89 (0.81-0.99)	0.99 (0.79-1.23)
20 [98]	4	73479	12092-30449	5	4805	472-1612	0.99 (0.87-1.12)	0.86 (0.50-1.50)
21 [22]§	3	43163	10929-18624	6	36097	612-7754	0.79 (0.73-0.86)	0.95 (0.86-1.06)
22 [86]	2	131163	14671-16492	3	16551	4192-6979	1.00 (0.92-1.08)	1.00 (0.90-1.11)
23 [86]	3	37886	10142-17160	3	19659	4401-8238	0.91 (0.77-1.06)	0.88 (0.77-1.01)
24 [23]	3	38915	10061-15828	2	10308	4786-5522	0.93 (0.87- 1.00)	0.86 (0.61-1.21)
25 [86]	1	14752	14752	8	49484	3183-9901	0.92 (0.84-1.02)	0.87 (0.78-0.96)
26 [99]	1	17263	17263	3	4015	106-3755	0.96 (0.77-1.20)	1.15 (0.49-2.65)
27 [100]	1	10010	10010	8	3898	24-1897	1.12 (0.95- 1.35)	0.71 (0.40-1.26)
28 [101]	2	36765	15603-21162	4	18826	1850-9961	0.88 (0.8-0.97)	0.84 (0.69-1.01)
29 [102]	2	28141	14070-14071	4	3612	484-2149	1.01 (0.78-1.30)	0.43 (0.16-1.13)
30 [103]	2	33620	15342-18278	2	6428	3391-3037	0.79 (0.72-0.87)	0.92 (0.73-1.17)
31 [104]**	1	12000	11988	10	18396	422-8910	0.99 (0.86-1.14)	1.00 (0.78-1.26)
32 [23]	3	38915	10061-15828	6	16721	249-5522	0.91 (0.83-0.98)	0.81 (0.64-1.02)
33 [105]	2	29823	12705-17118	19	93337	530-9794	1.00 (0.90-1.12)	0.90 (0.82-0.98)
34 [106]	2	30009	10907-19102	3	1801	98-1277	1.03 (0.90-1.17)	0.98 (0.23-4.20)
35 [107]	2	61879	16027-45852	45	19202	39-5778	0.85 (0.74-0.97)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)

Table 2. Comparison of results of meta-analyses of mega-trials and other, smaller trials for primary outcome.

MA- Meta-analysis

** No info on the sample size of one of the smaller trials

*One megatrial was clustered therefore was accounted for as a smaller trial

§ Comparisons with significant differences between mega-trials and smaller trial

Mega-trials	Smaller trials	Mega-trials MA Results	Smaller MA Results
-------------	----------------	------------------------	--------------------

MA ID	N			N			OR (LC-IUCi)	OR (LC-IUCi)
	N	(Total)	Range (Per trial)	N	(Total)	Range (Per trial)		
24# [24]	2	30573	12705-17802	14	51672	505-9270	0.80 (0.75-1.01)	0.90 (0.82-0.99)
2# [82]	1	11506	11506	2	7340	2199-5141	0.89 (0.75-1.07)	0.89 (0.67-1.19)
3# [108]	1	20702	20702	3	5351	553-3090	0.94 (0.80-1.11)	1.03 (0.74-1.42)
4# [84]	5	80889	12513-25871	18	35548	101-8179	0.97 (0.92-1.03)	0.96 (0.86-1.07)
1# [81]	2	43501	15970-27531	6	22119	2509-4143	0.95 (0.90-1.00)	0.93 (0.85-1.02)
7# [88]	6	120270	12546-39876	4	15287	2539-5713	0.99 (0.92-1.06)	0.90 (0.78-1.04)
6# [109]	2	21391	10251-11140	10	13576	43-5238	1.08 (0.79-1.48)	0.99 (0.89-1.11)
8# [89]	2	31105	18177-12928	4	6488	1015-2650	0.94 (0.87-1.02)	0.94 (0.84-1.04)
14# [110]	4	72479	11092-30449	4	3834	130-1612	1.02 (0.91-1.14)	1.25 (0.65-2.39)
9# [91]	1	239553	239553	4	24248	916-8067	0.69 (0.50-0.94)	0.90 (0.61-1.35)
15[93]*	1	20479	20479	6	7093	242-4078	0.92 (0.82-1.02)	0.94 (0.77-1.15)
11# [24]	12	181434	10001-27564	47	140831	250-9270	0.93 (0.88-0.98)	0.90 (0.85-0.95)
12#[106]	2	30019	10917-19102	13	3408	19-1277	1.05 (0.96-1.15)	0.68 (0.35-1.34)
37 [107]*	2	61879	16027-45852	45	19202	39-5778	0.85 (0.74-0.97)	0.87 (0.77-0.99)
22# [101]	3	46726	9961-21162	3	8837	1822-5045	1.02 (0.88-1.17)	1.12 (0.86-1.47)
18# [23]§	3	38915	10061-15828	7	21476	249-5522	0.96 (0.89-1.04)	1.21 (1.02-1.45)
19#[111]	1	14932	14932	8	41963	355-9901	0.84 (0.74-0.95)	0.89 (0.82-0.96)
21# [100]	1	10010	10010	12	4071	20-1897	1.01 (0.72-1.44)	0.80 (0.56-1.13)
20#[99]	1	17263	17263	2	4831	1076-3755	0.94 (0.76-1.17)	1.06 (0.49-2.30)
10# [112]	4	65400	12705-20332	32	94942	80-9794	1.00 (0.95-1.06)	1.01 (0.95-1.07)
15#[22]	1	18624	18624	1	661	661	0.77 (0.67-0.88)	1.72 (0.50-5.96)
16#[111]	2	31163	14671-16492	5	17119	91-6979	1.08 (0.97-1.19)	0.95 (0.84-1.07)
17#[113]	3	37886	10142-17160	8	42188	1222-8246	0.93 (0.85-1.01)	0.84(0.76-0.93)
13# [96]	5	81816	11550-22071	1	840	840	1.08 (0.99-1.18)	1.11 (0.79-1.58)
23#[103]	2	33602	15342-18278	1	3037	3037	0.81 (0.72-0.92)	0.96 (0.53-1.72)
5 [85]*	1	15968	15698	7	25236	1460-7119	0.82 (0.64-1.06)	0.92 (0.73-1.16)

Table 3. Comparison of results of meta-analyses of mega-trials and smaller trials for all-cause mortality

MA- Meta-analysis

*All-Cause Mortality was the Primary Outcome

§ Comparison with significant differences between mega-trials and smaller trial

Figure 1. Flow chart of mega-trial selection.





Figure 2. Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials on the primary outcome and all-cause mortality.



- A- Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials on the primary outcome.
- B- Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials on all-cause mortality.
- C- Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials published up until the first megatrial on the field – Primary outcome.
- D- Agreement between mega-trials and smaller trials published up until the first megatrial on the field – All-cause mortality.