

Risk of Statin-Induced Hypertransaminasemia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Rosanna Villani, MD, PhD; Eliano Pio Navarese, MD, PhD; Francesco Cavallone, MD; Jacek Kubica, MD, PhD; Francesco Bellanti, MD, PhD; Antonio Facciorusso, MD; Gianluigi Vendemiale, MD; and Gaetano Serviddio, MD

Abstract

Objective: To assess the effect of statins compared with placebo on the risk of developing hypertransaminasemia.

Patients and Methods: We performed a systematic review of electronic databases and included articles published between January 1, 1965, and April 10, 2017. Randomized clinical trials (RCTs) comparing statins vs placebo were included. Odds ratios (ORs) were pooled in random-effect meta-analyses according to established methods recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration.

Results: Seventy-three eligible RCTs, comprising 123,051 patients, were identified. Statins associated with a significantly risk of hypertransaminasemia (OR 1.45; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.24-1.69; P<.001). Atorvastatin showed the highest odds (OR 2.66; 95% CI, 1.74-4.06; P<.001) followed by rosuvastatin (OR 1.35; 95% CI, 1.06-1.70; P=.01) and lovastatin (OR 1.53; 95% CI, 1.03-2.28; P=.04). Pravastatin, fluvastatin, and simvastatin yielded no statistically different odds compared with placebo.

Conclusions: A dose-dependent risk of developing hypertransaminasemia occurs in patients taking atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, and lovastatin.

© 2019 Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) = Mayo Clin Proc Inn Qual Out 2019;3(2):131-140

tatins are the most common therapy used in the treatment of hypercholesterolemia and among the most used drugs in clinical practice. They have been shown to reduce cardiovascular events significantly compared with placebo.^{1,2} Statins can lead to meaningless increased concentrations of liver-associated enzymes³ but a very low incidence of serious liver injury.⁴ However, these reports have generated controversy as to whether or not to recommend the monitoring of liver enzymes under statin treatment, as reflected by the contrasting indications promulgated by such international tasks forces or agencies as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).⁵

It has been estimated that, in the United States, 1% to 10% of those taking statins (ie, 300,000 to 3,000,000) have been denied the benefit of statins as a result of unwarranted

concern,⁶ and the annual cost of semiannual liver-test monitoring is estimated to be 3 billion a year.^{6,7}

Current statins package inserts prescribe liver-function tests before (all statins), at 12 weeks after initiation of therapy (rosuvastatin and fluvastatin), and when otherwise clinically indicated (all statins).^{8,9} Given the established cardiovascular benefits of statins, and the likely increasing use of intensive statin regimens even in patients suffering with chronic liver diseases, it is pivotal to estimate the associated liver risks precisely, ultimately enabling physicians and patients to make informed choices.

To date, appropriately powered comparisons among statins with regard to the risk of developing hypertransaminasemia are lacking. The only comparative analysis was not designed to analyze the risk of elevation of



From C.U.R.E. (Centro per la Ricerca e la Cura delle Epatopatie), Institute of Internal Medicine, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Foggia, Italy (R.V., F.C., F.B., A.F., G.V., G.S.); Inova Heart and Vascular Institute, Fairfax, Virginia (E.P.N.); and Department of Cardiology and Internal Medicine. Nicolaus Copernicus University, Bydgoszcz, Poland (E.P.N., J.K.).

transaminase during statin treatment and had significant limitations due to high heterogeneity that mitigated the clinical applicability of the result.¹⁰

One of the most relevant limits in the analysis of trials has been the different definition of liver toxicity, the different dose used, and the low frequency of events that makes any attempt of network analysis inconsistent. Accordingly, only a comprehensive metaanalysis of all randomized controlled trials (RCTs) may provide reliable conclusions in this debated scenario. Accordingly, we performed an updated meta-analysis of randomized and placebo-controlled clinical trials to investigate the potential risk of hypertransaminasemia after administration of statins.

METHODS

We compared the risk of developing hypertransaminasemia in patients assuming statins vs placebo treatment and enrolled in RCTs. The following statins were included: atorvastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, rosuvastatin, and simvastatin. We conducted the meta-analysis according to established methods recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration and reported our findings according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement.^{11,12}

Data Sources and Searches

We conducted systematic search in Pubmed Central, Scopus, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, ClinicalTrials.gov, and major congress proceedings until April 10, 2017. The following key words were used: statins, liver, atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, simvastatin, pravastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, placebo, hepatotoxicity, transaminases, AST, ALT, aspartate aminotransferase, alanine aminotransferase, safety, and randomized controlled trial. For each RCT, the most updated or most inclusive data were used. Titles and abstracts were screened, and full-text articles were assessed if they were considered to be relevant.

Study Selection

The main inclusion criteria were (1) RCTs conducted in humans, (2) RCTs conducted in adults, (3) studies reporting data of hepatic safety, (4) duration of statin treatment of at

least 4 weeks, (5) English language. Exclusion criteria were (1) non-RCTs, (2) RCTs conducted in patients with liver diseases, (3) concurrent administration of potentially hepatotoxic drugs, (4) crossover RCTs, (5) duration of statin treatment of less than 4 weeks, (6) RCTs not reporting safety data, (7) RCTs reporting hepatic adverse events but not criteria for severity. Internal validity was appraised according to the proper allocation sequence/concealment, patient blinding, investigator blinding, and complete outcome/ full reporting. Primary clinical end point was significant serum liver enzyme alterations during statin treatment. Supplemental Table 1 summarizes the included RCTs and the criteria for the definition of significant liver injury.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two investigators not involved in any of the selected studies independently abstracted data by using prespecified forms. Two investigators then independently appraised the accuracy of the abstractions and resolved any discrepancies by consensus after discussion with a third investigator. High-dose statin therapy was defined as daily use of atorvastatin, 20 mg or more; rosuvastatin, 20 mg or more; simvastatin, 40 mg or more; fluvastatin 80 mg¹³; lovastatin and pravastatin 80 mg. Other treatment regimens were defined as low-dose or standard-dose statin treatment. Two unblinded investigators independently appraised the potential risk of bias of the RCTs by using methods described in the Cochrane Collaboration.¹

The Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system for rating the quality of evidence was also used to evaluate the strength of evidence.¹⁴ Accordingly, the absolute effect was also calculated for each statin.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed according to the intentionto-treat principle. Odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were used as summary statistics. Heterogeneity was assessed by the Cochran Q test and summarized by I² statistic, which quantifies the percentage of variation in study results due to heterogeneity rather than chance.^{15,16} Pooled ORs were calculated by using the more conservative random effect model with the Mantel-Haenszel method. The fixed effect model was applied when no or low-to-moderate heterogeneity (<50%) or not significant inconsistency (P>.05) was found.^{11,16} The test for subgroup differences was performed to show interaction among subgroups and investigate potential different degrees of risk in different statin subgroups.

Results were considered statistically significant at 2-sided $P \le .05$. Analyses have been conducted using Review Manager 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark).

RESULTS

Study Selection and Patient Population

Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flow diagram of study selection. Seventy-three trials comprising

a total of 123,051 patients were included in our final analysis. Study characteristics are shown in Supplemental Table 2. The longest follow-up was up to 5.3 years. Fifty-three trials were funded by industry. Most trials were performed after the year 2000.

Risk of Bias

The risks of bias of the included studies are shown in Supplemental Table 3. Funnel plots or Egger regression test did not reveal publication bias (Supplemental Figures 1 and 2). The RCTs were similar in that their risk of bias was low for most of the items in the majority of the included studies. Sixty-one RCTs were multicenter trials, and all studies included reported data according to the intention-to-treat principle, except for one. The certainty of evidence was also calculated according to grade profile



and was reported for all statins in Supplemental Table 4.

Primary Clinical End Point: Overall Risk of Hypertransaminasemia

Seventy-three trials contributed to the final analysis. Two RCTs ^{17,18} included data on more than one statin and were considered more than once during statistical analysis vs placebo.

Overall, there was a statistically significant increase in hypertransaminasemia with statin treatment compared with placebo (OR 1.45; 95% CI, 1.24-1.69; P<.001; heterogeneity P=.21; I^2 =14%) (Figure 2).

Pravastatin, simvastatin, and fluvastatin did not increase the odds of developing high transaminase levels compared with placebo. Rosuvastatin and lovastatin treatment was significantly associated with a 35% and 53% odds increase of developing hypertransaminasemia, respectively.

Among all statins, atorvastatin yielded the highest odds (OR 2.66; 95% CI, 1.74-4.06; P < .001; absolute effect of 10 more per 1000 patients), followed by rosuvastatin (OR=1.35; 95% CI, 1.06-1.70; P<.01; 3 more per 1000 patients), and lovastatin (OR=1.53; 95% CI, 1.03-2.28; P<.04; absolute effect of 3 more per 1000 patients). Howthe subgroup analysis showed ever. heterogeneity ($\chi^2 = 12.72$, P=.03; $I^2 =$ 60.7%) that was fully resolved ($\chi^2 = 2.48$, P=.78, $I^2 = 0\%$) by excluding 3 studies of 73 that included patients with complicated conditions including stroke and acute coronary syndrome (ACS).

It is interesting that high doses of atorvastatin had an absolute effect of 48 more events per 1000 patients. Fluvastatin increased the absolute effect of developing hypertransaminases; however, the OR was not statistically significant, and the certainty of evidence was low (Supplemental Table 5).

Sensitivity Analysis of High Doses vs Standard Doses of Statins and Risk of Hypertransaminasemia

The overall class analysis was stratified by comparing high-dose statins and standard doses of statins vs placebo, according to the definition of a board of experts from the European Atherosclerosis Society.¹³

Forty-four RCTs, comprising 71,060 patients, were included, and treatment with high-dose statins resulted in a statistically significant increase in development of hypertransaminasemia compared with placebo (OR 1.64; 95% CI, 1.30-2.06; P<.001) (Figure 3). The odds did not differ significantly from placebo for fluvastatin, pravastatin, or simvastatin. The odds of developing hypertransaminasemia increased by 78%, 47%, and 53% during treatment with high doses of atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, and lovastatin, respectively.

The same analysis was performed with standard doses of statins by comparing 34 RCTs including 52,265 patients, and results showed no difference compared with placebo (OR 1.19; 95% CI, 0.98-1.46; P=.08; heterogeneity P=.85; I²=0%) (Figure 4). Subgroup analysis of single statins confirmed these data.

In trials exploring standard doses of lovastatin, pravastatin, and fluvastatin, hypertransaminasemia was not observed. Sensitivity analysis of atorvastatin showed that all subgroup analyses had increased risk to develop liver toxicity; the subgroups that developed the highest rates had ACS and acute cerebrovascular events (Supplemental Table 5).

A sensitivity analysis for atorvastatin was performed and showed that diabetes, hypercholesterolemia, or renal failure have no effects on the comparison (Supplemental Information Table 5). On the other hand, including only studies with ACS or cerebrovascular events significantly influences the overall risk (OR 4.49; 95% CI, 2.79-7.22; P < .001; $I^2 = 0\%$).

DISCUSSION

The current study is the largest analysis of hypertransaminasemia developing in patients treated with statins. Data on whether—and to what extent—treatment with statins is associated with an increased risk of liver abnormalities remains an issue of debate.

Our systematic review and results of metaanalysis investigating the relationship between use of statins and occurrence of hypertransaminasemia is the most comprehensive overview on the liver safety of all commercialized statins from 1990. The main findings of our meta-analysis are as follows: (1) Irrespective of clinical significance, there is an increase in serum transaminases with statin treatment

Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, random, 95% Cl	M-H, random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 Rosuvastatin	_	_		_			
Barreto 2008 Burmeister 2009	0	30	1	30	0.2%	0.32 [0.01, 8.24] 3.44 f0 13 97 951	
Chan 2010	5	134	3	135	1.1%	1.71 [0.40, 7.28]	
Crouse 2007	4	702	ī	282	0.5%	1.61 [0.18, 14.47]	— <u></u>
Everett 2014	122	8154	84	8150	11.8%	1.46 [1.10, 1.93]	
Fellstrom 2009	5	1389	6	1384	1.6%	0.83 [0.25, 2.73]	
Kjekshus 2007	25	2514	24	2497	5.4%	1.03 [0.59, 1.821	
Krum 2007	2	40	0	45	0.3%	5.91 [0.28, 126.85]	>
Olsson 2001	0	147	0	31		Not estimable	
Saito 2003	0	97	0	15	0.29/	Not estimable	
Shepherd 2004	2	92	0	35	0.376	Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	13546	-	12707	21.8%	1.35 [1.06, 1.70]	 Image: A set of the set of the
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =4.43, df=9 (P=	169 =.88); l ² =0%	5	120				
Test for overall effect: Z=2.47 (P=.01)							
1.1.2 Atorvastatin							
Amarenco 2006	51	2365	11	2366	4.3%	4.72 [2.45, 9.08]	
Bays 2011 Bloomfield 2009	0	59	0	59		Not estimable	
Bone 2007	2	485	0	119	0.3%	1.24 [0.06, 25.91]	
Colhoun 2004	23	1428	18	1410	4.7%	1.27 [0.68, 2.36]	+
DALI study group 2001	0	145	0	72		Not estimable	
Harris 2000	I	82	1	94	0.3%	1 15 f0.07 18.651	
Hunninghake 2001	0	39	0	19		Not estimable	
J-CLAS group 1997	0	81	0	27		Not estimable	
Lawrence 2004	1	20	0	20	0.2%	3.15 [0.12, 82.16]	
Mandal 2014	3	78	1	83	0.4%	3.28 [U.33, 32.22] 3 10 [0 12 79 221	
Nawrocki 1995	i i	69	0	12	0.2%	0.55 [0.02, 14.22]	
Olsson 2001	0	28	0	31		Not estimable	
Paiva 2005	0	16	0	16		Not estimable	
Preston 2007 Schwartz 2001	6 20	443	1	1540	0.5%	1.51 [0.18, 12.67]	
Wang 2001	38	1538 24	0	1598	2.676	Not estimable	
Wanner 2005	5	619	Ĩ	636	0.5%	5.17 [0.60, 44.39]	
Zeng 2012	2	112	1	108	0.4%	1.95 [0.17, 21.77]	
Total events	134	7778	43	6906	15.8%	2.66 [1.74, 4.06]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.06; Chi ² =12.54, df=11 ((P=.32); I ² =	12%					
rescion overan enecc. z=4.54 (P<.00001)							
1.1.3 Simvastatin		100.10					
Armitage 2009 Baigent 2005	77	10269	65	10267	10.2%	1.19 [0.85, 1.65]	
Bays 2004	7	622	-	148	0.5%	1.67 [0.20, 13.70]	
Davidson 2002	2	263	Ó	70	0.3%	1.35 [0.06, 28.40]	
Gentile 2000	0	78	0	86		Not estimable	
isaacsonn 2003 Keech 1994	17	140 414	0	49	3.09/	Not estimable	
Lewin 2004	0	123	0	130	3.076	Not estimable	
Mok 2009	0	113	0	114		Not estimable	
Paiva 2005	1	16	0	16	0.2%	3.19 [0.12, 84.43]	
redersen 1996 Sano 2011	46 4	2221	32	2223	/.2%	1.45 [0.92, 2.28]	
SHARP group 2010	0	1054	5	4191	0.3%	0.36 [0.02, 6.53]	
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	150	15627	100	17815	24.0%	1.20 [0.94, 1.53]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =4.52, df=8 (P=	81); I ² =09	5	122				
1.1.4 Lovastatin							
Blackenhorn 1993	3	123	2	124	0.7%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29]	
Bradford 1994	95	6582	15	1663	5.7%	1.61 [0.93, 2.78]	———
Davidson 2001	0	26	0	26	9 501	Not estimable	
Fong 1997	18	3304 22	11	1088 91	3.5%	1.64 [U./7, 3.47] Not estimable	+
Furberg 1994	6	231	6	230	1.7%	1.00 [0.32, 3.13]	
Gentile 2000	0	80	0	86		Not estimable	
Kerzner 2003	0	220	0	64	0.20/	Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	2	10877	U	5655	11.8%	1.53 [1.03, 2.28]	
Total events	124		34				_
Heterogeneity:Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P= Test for overall effect: Z=2.10 (P=.04)	=.95); I ² =0%	5					
1.1.5 Fluvastatin							
Bruckert 2003	9	607	1	622	0.5%	9.35 [1.18, 74.00]	
Knopp 1994	0	25 34	0	23		Not estimable	
Ostadal 2010	ő	78	ő	78		Not estimable	
Serruys 1999	9	526	4	528	1.6%	2.28 [0.70, 7.45]	+
Serruys 2002 Shoutan 2009	10	844	3	833	1.3%	3.32 [0.91, 12.10]	<u> </u>
Winkler 2002	8 0	250 42	13	47	2.6%	и.ви [U.24, 1.46] Not estimable	— — —
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	2406	-	2410	6.0%	2.09 [0.68, 6.40]	
Iotal events Heterogeneity Tau ² =0.94: Chi ² =0.15, 46-3, 70-	36 : 03): 1 ² -77	%	21				
Test for overall effect: Z=1.30 (P=20)	/6= ۱ ;ردن	/0					
1.1.6 Pravastatin							
Davignon 1994	0	39	0	40		Not estimable	
Gentile 2000	0	81	0	86		Not estimable	
Hunninghake 1990 (1)	0	180	0	88		Not estimable	
Hunninghake 1990 (2)	0	138	0	46		Not estimable	
Jacobson 1995 Jones 1991	0	182	0	63 42		Not estimable	
LIPID study group 1998	95	4512	86	4502	11.3%	1.10 [0.82, 1.48]	
Pravastatin multinational study group 1993	6	530	1	532	0.5%	6.08 [0.73, 50.68]	+
Rubenfire 1991	2	57	0	25	0.3%	2.30 [0.11, 49.60]	
Salonen 1995 Shenherd 1995	4 24	224	3	223	1.0%	1.33 [0.29, 6.03]	
Shepherd 2002	1	2891	10	2913	1.7% 0.3%	1.01 [0.06, 16,12]	
Thompson 2004	7	1710	5	1698	1.7%	1.39 [0.44, 4.39]	_ _
Wiklund 1993 Subtotal (95% CI)	2	64 13993	7	69 13620	0.9% 20.6%	0.29 [0.06, 1.43]	
Total events	143	13773	119	13820	2U.0%	1.17 [0.93, 1.52]	₽
Heterogeneity Tau ² =0.00 Chi ² =6.78 df=7 (P=	=.45); I ² =09	Ś					
Test for overall effect: Z=1.35 (P=.18)		64227		59113	100.0%	1.45 [1.24, 1.69]	•
Test for overall effect: Z=1.35 (P=.18) Total (95% CI)			459				1.
Test for overall effect: Z=1.35 (P=.18) Total (95% CI) Total events	764		-157				
Test for overall effect: Z=1.35 (P=.18) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.03; Ch ² =54.66, df=47 (Test for overall effect: Z=4 70 (Inc. 00001)	764 (P=.21); I ² =	14%	-117				
Test for overall effect: Z=1.35 (P=.18) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity:Tau ² =0.03; Chi ² =54.66, df=47 (Test for overall effect: Z=4.70 (P<.00001) Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² =12.77 eff=1	764 (P=.21); I ² = 5 (P=.03). I	14% ² =60.7%	-157				0.01 0.1 1 10 10

Mayo Clin Proc Inn Qual Out = June 2019;3(2):131-140 = https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2019.01.003 www.mcpiqojournal.org

tudy or subgroup	Events	Statin Total	Place Events	bo Total	Weight	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% Cl	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% Cl
2.1 Rosuvastatin							
han 2010	5	134	3	135	1.4%	1.71 [0.40, 7.28]	
rouse 2007	4	702	1	282	0.6%	1.61 [0.18, 14.47]	
verett 2014 Juppingbake 2004	122	8154	84	8150	0.6%	0.59 [0.06 5.91]	
rum 2007	2	40	Ó	45	0.3%	5.91 [0.28, 126.85]	>
Disson 2001	0	147	0	31		Not estimable	
aito 2003	0	97	0	15		Not estimable	
arto 2007	2	92	0	35 9710	0.3%	1.96 [0.09, 41.88]	
ubiolai (95% CI) otal events	138	7470	89	8/19	15.3%	1.47 [1.12, 1.72]	•
leterogeneity:Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =1.48, df=5 (P est for overall effect: Z=2.81 (P=.005)	=.92); I ² =I	0%					
2.2 Atorvastatin							
marenco 2006	51	2365	11	2366	5.2%	4.72 [2.45, 9.08]	
loomfield 2009	0	59	0	59		Not estimable	
one 2007	2	485	0	119	0.3%	1.24 [0.06, 25.91]	
ALI study group 2001 Jarris 2002	0	145	0	94	0.4%	INOT ESTIMADIE	
lunninghake 2001	Ó	39	ò	19	0.170	Not estimable	
CLAS group 1997	Ō	81	0	27		Not estimable	
awrence 2004	1	20	0	20	0.3%	3.15 [0.12, 82.16]	
2012	3	78	1	83	0.6%	3.28 [0.33, 32.22]	
landal 2014		30	0	30	0.3%	3.10 [0.12, 79.23]	
Iawrocki 1995	0	69 79	0	12	0.3%	U.SS [U.UZ, 14.ZZ]	
aiva 2005	0	16	0	16		Not estimable	
reston 2007	6	443	ī	111	0.7%	1.51 [0.18, 12.67]	
chwartz 2001	38	1538	9	1548	4.5%	4.33 [2.09, 8.99]	
Vanner 2005	5	619	1	636	0.7%	5.17 [0.60, 44.39]	+
eng 2012	2	112	1	108	0.5%	1.95 [0.17, 21.77]	
ubtotoal (95% CI)		6209	25	5351	13.8%	3.78 [2.47, 5.79]	-
leterogeneity Tau2=0.00; Chi2=4.29; df=10.0	$P = 93 \cdot 1^2$	=0%	25				
est for overall effect: $Z=6.14$ ($P<.00001$)		-070					
23 Simvastatin							
rmitage 2009	77	10269	65	10267	10.7%	1 19 [0.85 1.65]	L
ays 2004	7	622	1	148	0.7%	1.67 [0.20, 13.70]	
avidson 2002	2	263	0	70	0.3%	1.35 [0.06, 28.40]	
aacsohn 2003	0	140	0	49		Not estimable	
eech 1994	17	414	9	208	3.7%	0.95 [0.41, 2.16]	
ewin 2004	0	123	0	130	0.2%	2 10 0 12 94 421	
alva 2005	46	2221	32	2223	8.1%	1.45 [0.92, 2.28]	·
EGELSELL 1220	1.0				1.00/	0.40 00 10 1 (01	
ano 2011	4	202	8	202	1.9%	0.49 [0.15, 1.65]	
ubtotal (95% Cl) btal events	4	202 14270	8	202 13313	1.9% 25.8%	1.20 [0.94, 1.54]	•
euersen 1776 ubtotal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity-Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect: Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin	4 154 =.74); I ² =I	202 14270 0%	8	202 13313	1.9% 25.8%	0.49 [0.15, 1.65] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54]	
sud sel 1778 ano 2011 ubtotal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn [993	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1	202 14270	8 115 2	202 13313	0.9%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29]	
scuerser 1776 ano 2011 ubtolat (95X CI) btal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 24. Lovastatin lackenhom 1993 radford 1994	4 54 =.74); ² = 3 95	202 14270 0%	8 115 2 15	202 13313	0.9% 6.6%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78]	
scuersen 1776 ano 2011 ubtotal (95X CI) otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect: Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorm 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18	202 14270 0% 123 6582 3304	8 115 2 15 11	202 13313 124 1663 3301	0.9% 0.9% 6.6% 2.3%	1.52 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.94, 1.54] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47]	
scuersen 17778 ano 2011 ubtotal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 Jurberg 1994 errorer 2003	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0	202 14270 0% 123 6582 3304 231 220	8 115 2 15 11 6 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13]	
scuersen 17776 ano 2011 ubtotal (95X CI) btal events teterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin ackenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2	202 14270 0% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 0.3%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.97, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96]	
scuersen 17776 ubtolat (95X CL) otal events eterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect: Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 lowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolat (95X CL)	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2	202 14270 0% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749	8 115 15 11 6 0 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 0.3% 14.3%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51,96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28]	
scuersen 17778 ano 2011 ubtotal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 overs 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtotal (95% CI) total events	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2	202 14270 0% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524	0.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 9.6] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28]	
teurs en 17776 ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) val events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin ackenhom 1993 radford 1994 vowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect. Z=2.10 (P=.04)	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1	202 14270)% 23 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 1.76] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28]	
Sub Sel 1976 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 othorus 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1	202 14270)% 23 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749)%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34	202 13313 124 166 3301 230 64 142 5524	0.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51,96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28]	
Sub Sel 17778 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errarer 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749)%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	0.49 [0.15, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00]	
scuersen 17776 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) ubtola (95X CI) val events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtola (95X CI) val events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluwstatin ruckert 2003 lerosa 2003 lerosa 2003 lerosa 2003	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749)%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 70	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	9.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P st for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 bradal 2010 errurus 1999		202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 230 289 10749)% 607 24 78 576	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 622 23 78	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.65] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7451] 	
Sud Sel 17778 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 owns 1998 urberg 1994 errore 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastin ruckert 2003 lerosa 2003 batadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 0	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 230 289 10749)% 607 24 78 526 844	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 528 833	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7%	0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210]	
scuersen 17776 ano 2011 ubtotal (95X CI) total events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhom 1993 aradford 1994 borvms 1998 urberg 1994 urberg 1994 borvms 1998 arberg 1994 borvms 1998 urberg 1994 ubtotal (95X CI) ubtotal (95X CI) ubtotal (95X CI) est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 lerosa 2003 brotadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 8	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 526 844 250	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 13	202 13313 124 1663 3301 644 142 5524 622 23 78 622 23 78 528 833 247	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2%	9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.94, 1.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46]	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) stal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 othorus 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P esrosa 2003 Vatada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2002 err	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 8 0	202 14270)% 23 6582 3304 23] 20 289 10749)% (607 24 78 526 844 23 26 844 24 20 289 10749	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 8 528 833 247 47	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Note stimable 	
Sud Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P set for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errore 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P set for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 Verosa 2003 Verosa 2003 Verstadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2002 ubtolal (95% CI)	154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 8 0	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749 0% (607 24 78 526 844 250 644 2371	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 47 2378	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 0.49 [0.15, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51,96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] 	
sud sen 17776 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 ubtola (95X CI) ubtola (95X CI)	$ \begin{array}{c} $	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 526 844 250 42 2371	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 622 23 78 247 47 2378	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.22 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40]	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 browns 1998 urberg 1994 erramer 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 Persosa 2003 Vistada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Winkler 2009 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P et for overall effect 7=2.10 (P=.20)		202 14270)% (5304 23304 23304 2331 220 289 10749)% (607 24 78 526 844 2371 2371 557%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 528 833 247 47 2378	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.48, 6.40] 	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P set for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P set for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 lotadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 vinkler 2002 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chu ² =9.15, df=3 (P set for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 21 Converted	4 154 =.74);1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.955);1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 8 0 36 =.03);1 ² =1	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 239 10749)% 607 24 78 526 844 257 8 526 844 2371	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 528 833 247 47 2378	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51,96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] 	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin alckenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 bitola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=1.00 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin Truckert 2003 houten 2003 houten 2003 houten 2003 bitola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Pravastatin	4 154 =,74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 18 6 0 2 124 =,95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 0 0 9 0 0 0 9 0 36 8 0 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	202 14270)% (522 3304 231 233 (687 289 10749 20% (607 24 78 526 844 250 42 2371 57%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 3 0 13 0 21	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 47 2378	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] 1.53 [1.03, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40]	
Sub Sel 17778 and 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) stal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 othorus 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 Persosa 2003 Valada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2003 Utal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.4 Pravastin Valagong 1994 Letrogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20)	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 0 8 0 36 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	202 14270 3% 123 6582 3304 231 230 289 10749 3% 607 24 78 526 844 2371 557% 39	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 0 21	202 13313 124 1633 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 7 7 8 833 247 7 7 8 8 837 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable	
Sud Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P set for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 overs 1994 urberg 1994 errore 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) total events set for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 versos 2003 votadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 vinkler 2002 ubtolal (95% CI) total events teterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chu ² =9.15, df=3 (P set for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Pravastatin turninghake 1990 (1) luminghake 1990 (2)	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 526 844 257% 57%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 3 13 0 21 0 0 0 21	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 7 2378 40 88 846	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51,96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable 	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95X CI) ubtolal (95X CI) teterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin alckenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errore 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95X CI) total events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 houten 2003 brotsa 2003 brotada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2002 ubtolal (95X CI) total events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Pravastatin kavignon 1994 lurninghake 1990 (1) lurninghake 1990 (2) ones 1991	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 9 10 8 0 9 10 8 0 0 9 10 8 0 0 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	202 14270)% (123 6582 3304 231 2304 231 239 10749)% (607 24 78 526 844 250 422 2371 57%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 2 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 233 78 5524 422 2378 833 78 528 833 247 47 2378	0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 9.120 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable 	
Sud Sel 17776 sud Sel 17776 sud control (95X CI) stal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P est for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin alckenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 subset 1994 ubtold (95X CI) stal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruruser 2003 perosa 2003 brosa 2004 brosa 2005 brose for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Pravastatin tavignon 1994 lumninghake 1990 (1) lumninghake 1990 (2) ones 1991 IPID study group 1998		202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 57%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 3 0 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 86	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 823 823 78 823 824 652 77 828 823 827 828 823 827 828 828	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable 2.08 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P st for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorm 1993 radford 1994 olivowns 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2003 Vinkler 2003 ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal (95% CI) ubtolal		202 14270)% 123 6582 3304 231 239 10749)% 607 24 78 526 844 250 42 2371 57%	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 13 0 21 0 21 0 0 0 86 1	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 7 2378 40 88 46 40 88 46 42 2378	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 14.3% 0.7% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	1.52 [0.25, 9.29] 1.61 [0.93, 1.54] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable	
Sub Sel 1775 ano 2011 ubtolal (95X CI) ubtolal (95X CI) stal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P st for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errore 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95X CI) total events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P est for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 terosa 2003 brotada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 botatal (95% CI) total events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Fravastatin tarignon 1994 lunninghake 1990 (1) lunninghake 1990 (2) nes 1991 IPD study group 1998 ravastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenofine 1991	4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 0 0 9 0 0 9 0 36 0 0 0 9 5 0 0 0 9 5 0 0 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	202 14270)% (123 6582 3304 231 239 10749 289 10749 289 10749 20% (607 24 78 524 78 524 2371 57%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 0 21 0 0 0 86 6 1 0 0 0 86 1 0 0 2	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 233 78 5524 47 2378 833 78 528 833 78 528 833 833 78 528 833 833 78 528 833 833 78 528 833 833 78 528 83 78 528 83 78 528 83 78 528 83 78 528 83 78 528 83 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 3.2% 7.7% 11.6% 0.7% 0.7%	 0.49 [0.13, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.00 [0.82, 1.48] 6.08 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.11, 49,60] 2.42 [0.4, 260] 	
Sud Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=1.46 (<i>P</i> =.14) 2.4 Lovastatin ladkenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=2.10 (<i>P</i> =.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 leterosa 2003 brotada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2002 Ubtola (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=1.30 (<i>P</i> =.20) 2.6 Pravastatin lavingnake 1990 (1) lunninghake 1990 (2) ones 1991 IPID study group 1998 araastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenfire 1995	$\frac{1}{4}$ $=,74$; $ ^{2}=$ $\frac{3}{95}$ 18 6 0 2 124 9 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 3 2 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 6 0 2 3 6 0 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 3 6 6 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 2 2 3 6 2 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 3 6 2 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	202 14270 3% 123 6582 3304 231 220 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 607 24 78 526 844 2371 557% 39 80 138 83 4512 557 224 3307	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21 0 0 0 0 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 3 4 6	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 622 23 78 833 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 (0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.05 [0.74, 745] 3.32 [0.91, 1.20] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.51 [1.02, 1.48] 6.08 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.1, 4.96] 1.33 [0.29, 6.03] 1.63 [0.72, 2.04] 	
Sub Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95X CI) ubtolal (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (<i>P</i> set for overall effect Z=1.46 (<i>P</i> =.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorm 1993 radford 1994 olivowns 1998 urberg 1994 erraner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95X CI) tal events 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (<i>P</i> errosa 2003 lotal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 1099 erruys 1099 erruys 2002 houten 2009 Vinkler 2002 ubtolal (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (<i>P</i> 2.4 Pravastatin Nariginon 1994 luminghake 1990 (1) luminghake 1990 (2) ones 1991 IPID study group 1998 ravastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenfire 1991 alonen 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995		202 14270 3% 123 6582 3304 231 239 10749 0% 607 24 78 526 844 250 42 2371 57% 57%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 13 0 21 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 3 16 1	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 7 7 8 833 247 4 7 2378 40 88 846 42 2378 5 24 4 5 5 4 5 5 6 4 5 5 5 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 5 5 6 6 6 5 5 6 6 6 5 5 6 6 6 5 5 6 6 6 5 5 6 6 6 6 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 14.3% 7.7% 7.7%	1.20 [0.94, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.06 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimab	
Sud Sel 17776 ano 2011 ubtolal (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P set for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errarer 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P set for overall effect: Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2003 berosa 2003 berosa 2003 berosa 2003 berosa 2003 berosa 2003 vorkada 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 botatal (95X CI) tatal events leterogeneity: Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P est for overall effect: Z=1.30 (P=.20) 2.6 Pravastatin lunninghake 1990 (2) ness 1991 IPID study group 1998 ravastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenfine 1991 alonen 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 2002		202 14270)% (23 6582 3304 231 239 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10759 289 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 299 10769 297 207 297 10769 2077 2077 2077 2077 2077 2077 2077 207	8 115 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 3 3 0 21 0 0 0 86 1 0 0 86 1 5 16 1 5	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 233 78 5524 47 2378 833 78 528 833 247 47 2378 833 247 47 2378 832 247 257 257 257 257 257 257 257 25	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 3.2% 7.7% 3.2% 7.7% 0.3% 5.6% 0.4% 2.1%	 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.00 [0.82, 1.48] 6.08 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.11, 49,60] 1.33 [0.87, 3.04] 1.01 [0.06, 16.12] 1.39 [0.44, 4.39] 	
scale self 1976 and 2011 ubtolal (95X CI) tall events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=1.46 (<i>P</i> =.14) 2.4 Lovastatin alckenhom 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 erzner 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95X CI) tall events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=2.10 (<i>P</i> =.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin truckert 2003 houten 2003 brosa 2003 brosa 2003 brosa 2003 brosa 2003 brosa 2003 brosa 2004 broukent 2002 ubtolal (95X CI) tal events leterogeneity. Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (<i>P</i> est for overall effect Z=1.30 (<i>P</i> =.20) 2.6 Fravastatin kavignon 1994 luminghake 1990 (1) luminghake 1990 (2) ones 1991 IPID study group 1998 araastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenfire 1991 alonen 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 2002		202 14270 1/23 30% 123 3304 231 220 229 289 10749 0% 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 57% 844 42 2371 55% 80 138 88 83 4512 530 57 224 3305 57 6542 2891 170 6542 2891 10749 54 20 2891 10749 10749 2891 289 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 299 10749 200 10749 200 10749 200 10749 200 10749 10749 200 10749 10749 10749 200 10749 1000 10000000000000000000000000000000	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 3 0 21 0 0 0 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 3 16 1 5 7	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 642 233 78 83 78 83 78 83 78 83 78 78 83 78 78 85 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.51 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 (0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.070, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable<td></td>	
Sub Sel 17776 sub Sel 17776 sub Sel 2011 sub Sel 2011 Sel 2011 Sel 2017 Sel 2007 Sel 200		202 14270 3% 123 6582 3304 231 239 10749 0% 607 24 78 526 844 250 42 2371 57% 57%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 0 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 0 0 86 1 5 7 7	202 13313 124 1633 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 2378 40 88 846 42 2378 845 247 2378 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 2478 845 845 2478 845 845 845 845 845 845 845 84	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	1.20 [0.94, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.06 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estima	
Sub Sel 17776 and 2011 ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =3.50, df=6 (P set for overall effect Z=1.46 (P=.14) 2.4 Lovastatin lackenhorn 1993 radford 1994 bowns 1998 urberg 1994 errorer 2003 a Rosa 1994 ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =0.70, df=4 (P set for overall effect Z=2.10 (P=.04) 2.5 Fluvastatin ruckert 2.003 lotadal 2010 erruys 1999 erruys 1999 erruys 1999 erruys 2002 ubtolal (95% CI) tal events leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P leterogeneity, Tau ² =0.84; Chi ² =9.15, df=3 (P lunninghake 1990 (1) lunninghake 1990 (2) orses 1991 IPD study group 1998 ravastatin multinational study group 1993 ubenfine 1991 alonen 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 hepherd 1995 teterogeneity, Tau ² =0.00; Chi ² =6.78, df=7 (P st for overall effect Z=1.35 (P=.18)		202 14270 1/270 2/2 3304 231 230 289 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 207 207 207 207 207 207 207 207 207 207	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 3 16 1 5 7 7 119	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 47 2378 40 88 84 40 88 84 40 88 86 9 13471 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1697 1698 1698 1698 1698 1698 1698 1698 1698 1697 1698	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 3.2% 7.7% 3.2% 7.7% 11.6% 0.7% 0.3% 1.3% 5.6% 0.4% 1.2% 23.2%	 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.210] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.10 [0.82, 1.48] 6.08 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.11, 49.60] 1.33 [0.27, 50.61] 2.30 [0.11, 49.60] 1.33 [0.27, 50.61] 2.30 [0.14, 4.39] 0.29 [0.06, 1.43] 1.19 [0.93, 1.52] 	
Subject 1975 Subject 1975 S	4 54 $=,74$; $1^2 = 1$ 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 $=,95$; $1^2 = 1$ 9 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 36 $=,03$; $1^2 = 1$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	202 14270 1/4270 2% 123 6582 3304 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 289 10749 2371 55%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21 0 0 0 0 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 3 16 1 5 7 7	202 13313 124 1663 3301 442 5524 622 233 747 2378 628 8333 442 25524 440 88 833 47 2378 40 833 47 2378 40 232 233 2914 2915 291	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 2.0% 14.3% 7.7% 7.7% 11.6% 0.7% 0.3% 1.3% 5.3% 2.3% 2.1% 2.2% 23.2%	1.20 [0.94, 1.86] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 1.21, 51.96] 3.32 [0.91, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.60 [0.24, 1.46] 0.60 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.11, 49.60] 1.33 [0.29, 60.3] 1.63 [0.87, 3.04] 1.01 [0.06, 16.12] 1.39 [0.44, 4.39] 0.29 [0.06, 14.43] 1.19 [0.93, 1.52]	
Sub Set 17776 sub Set 17776 sub Set 17776 sub Set 17776 sub Set 17776 Set 17777 Set 177777 Set 177777 Set 177777 Set 1777777 Set 177777 Set 177777 Set 1777777 Set	 4 154 =.74); 1 ² =1 3 95 18 6 0 2 124 =.95); 1 ² =1 9 0 0 9 10 8 0 9 10 8 0 9 10 8 0 9 10 8 0 9 10 9 10 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	202 14270 3% 123 6582 3304 231 289 10749 30% 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 607 24 78 57% 844 2371 309 138 832 4512 537 537 224 3305 2891 1710 644 13730 30%	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 3 13 0 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 0 0 86 1 5 7 119	202 13313 124 163 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 78 828 833 747 2378 40 88 46 47 2378 40 88 46 47 2378 47 2378 48 46 46 46 47 23 24 23 24 23 25 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 0.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7%	1.20 [0.94, 1.63] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.20 [0.94, 1.54] 1.64 [0.77, 3.47] 1.60 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51, 96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.28 [0.70, 7.45] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.46] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estima	
Sub Sel 17776 sub Sel 17776 sub Sel 2011 sub Sel 2011 Sel 2015 Sel 201		202 14270 14270 2% 123 6582 3304 231 289 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 297 10749 207 10749	8 115 2 15 11 6 0 0 34 1 0 0 4 3 13 0 21 21 0 0 0 0 86 1 0 0 86 1 0 3 16 1 5 7 7 119	202 13313 124 1663 3301 230 64 142 5524 622 23 78 833 247 47 2378 40 88 833 247 47 2378 40 88 80 23 23 142 5524 40 80 80 142 142 5524 40 80 80 142 142 142 142 142 142 142 142	1.9% 25.8% 0.9% 6.6% 4.3% 2.1% 0.3% 14.3% 14.3% 7.7% 2.0% 1.7% 3.2% 7.7% 1.6% 0.7% 1.3% 5.6% 0.4% 2.1% 1.3% 5.6% 2.3%	1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.20 [0.94, 1.56] 1.61 [0.93, 2.78] 1.64 [0.77, 347] 1.00 [0.32, 3.13] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 1.53 [1.03, 2.28] 9.35 [1.18, 74.00] Not estimable 2.48 [0.12, 51.96] 3.32 [0.91, 12.10] 0.60 [0.24, 1.16] Not estimable 2.09 [0.68, 6.40] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 1.01 [0.82, 1.48] 6.08 [0.73, 50.68] 2.30 [0.11, 49.60] 1.33 [0.27, 50.64] 2.30 [0.11, 49.60] 1.33 [0.27, 50.64] 2.30 [0.14, 4.39] 0.29 [0.06, 1.42] 1.19 [0.93, 1.52] 1.53 [1.28, 1.83]	

FIGURE 3. Analysis of odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for hypertransaminasemia during highdose statin therapy.

Study or subgroup	Sta Events	itin Total	Pla Events	cebo Total	Weight	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% C	Odds ratio I M-H, random, 95% Cl
1.3.1 Rosuvastatin							
Barreto 2008	0	30	1	30	13%	032[00] 824]	
Burmeister 2009	i i	28	0	31	1.3%	3 44 [0 3 87 85]	
Fellstrom 2009	5	1389	6	1384	10.0%	0.83 [0.25 2.73]	
Kiekshus 2007	25	2514	24	2497	44.4%		
Shepherd 2004	0	89	0	46	11.170	Not estimable	T
Subtotal (95% CI)	0	4050	0	3988	57.1%		<u> </u>
Total events	31	4000	31	0,00	07.178	1.00 [0.01, 1.04]	
Heterogeneity:Tau ² =0.	00; Chi ² =1	.13, df=3	(P=.77); I ²	=0%			
1 3 2 Atorvastatin	_=0.01 (P=	=.99)					
Colhour 2004	23	1428	18	1410	36.5%	1 27 [0 68 2 36]	
Contile 2000	25	94	0	86	0.070	Not estimable	-
Wang 2001	0	26	0	28		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	0	1538	0	1526	36 5%	1 27 [0 48 2 34]	
Total events	23	1000	18	1524	50.5%	1.27 [0.00, 2.00]	
	- 1-1-1-		10				
Test for overall effect: 2	511cable Z=0.74 (P=	=.46)					
1.3.3 Simvastatin							
Baigent 2005	4	112	2		4.8%	2.02 [0.36, 11.25]	
Gentile 2000	0	78	0	86		Not estimable	
Mok 2009	0	113	0	4		Not estimable	
SHARP group 2010	0	1054	5	4191	1.7%	0.36 [0.02, 6.53]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1357		4502	6.4%	1.27 [0.28, 5.79]	
Total events	4		7				
Heterogeneity: Iau ⁺ =0. Test for overall effect: 2	05; Chi ^z =1 Z=0.31 (P=	.03, dt=1 =.76)	(P=.31); I [_]	=3%			
	0	27	0	27		NL C LL	
Davidson 2001	0	26	0	26		Not estimable	
Contile 2000	0	22	0	17		Not estimable	
Subtatal (95% CI)	0	120	0	121		Not estimable	
	0	128	0	131		Not estimable	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	olicable		0				
Test for overall effect: N	Vot applica	ıble					
1.3.5 Fluvastatin Huble 1999	0	25	0	23		Not estimable	
Knopp 1994	0	34	Õ	32		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	Ū	59	0	55		Not estimable	
Total events	0	•/	0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	olicable	ble					
1.3.6 Pravastatin	.se appilo						
Gentile 2000	0	RI	0	86		Not estimable	
lacobson 1995	0	187	0	63		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	v	262	0	1/9		Not estimable	
Total events	0	205	0	147		Not countable	
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: N	olicable Not applica	ible	Ū				
Total (95% CI)		7395		10349	100.0%	1.11 [0.76, 1.61]	•
Total events	58		56				
	00. Chi ² -2	53 df-4	(P= 84), 12	=0%			
Heterogeneity Tau-	00, CHI - 2	= 60)	(,00), I	-070			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.	() 5) (P-						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0. Test for overall effect: 2 Test for subgroup differ	2=0.52 (P= rences: Chi	i ² =0,38. df	=2 (P=.83	3), $ ^2 = 0\%$			Favours statins Favours placebo

compared with placebo; (2) high-doses of atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, and lovastatin are associated with significant increase of odds of developing hypertransaminasemia compared with placebo; and (3) all analyzed low-dose statins showed a similar and nonsignificant risk compared with placebo.

The data from this large-scale analysis provide, for the first time, robust evidence of a gradient across statins in the induction of hypertransaminasemia with atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, and lovastatin—particularly at high doses—associated with the highest odds of liver-function test (LFT) abnormalities. Of note, a gradient across statins was found for all patients treated with statins. Patients affected by ACS or stroke greatly show the highest risk, but populations are heterogeneous. Probably, in such patients, the higher risk of developing hypertransaminasemia depends on assumption of atorvastatin 80 mg together with critical clinical conditions.

Our results support previous observations that pravastatin and simvastatin—both at standard and at high doses—do not induce hypertransaminasemia, and, accordingly, routine monitoring should be avoided for these statins. A previous meta-analysis on pravastatin, pooling 5 RCTs,¹⁹⁻²² has shown no difference in the risk of developing hypertransaminasemia compared with placebo.²³ Our analysis, which included 14 trials, confirmed such reports.

Simvastatin has, so far, not been analyzed in a meta-analysis study. We included 13 trials with 15,627 patients, and no difference was observed in terms of hypertransaminasemia when compared with placebo at any doses.

De Denus et al. showed that fluvastatin yielded an increase in the odds of hypertransaminasemia compared with placebo; however, the authors explained the observed increased risk as a consequence of the extremely low rate in the overall placebo group.²³ In the current analysis, we considered 8 trials and 4816 patients (2406 treated with the statin), and the final results show no increased risk of hyper-transaminasemia at any doses compared with placebo.

With high-dose atorvastatin (including 17 studies and 11,560 patients) the odds of hypertransaminasemia rises almost 3-fold

compared with placebo, with an absolute effect of 48 more per 1000 patients, compared with placebo. In the analysis of rosuvastatin, 12 trials were included for a total of 26,253 patients. The overall risk of developing hyper-transaminasemia was 1.35, which reaches 1.47 in the intensive regimen. There are several underlying mechanisms that might explain the highest degree of hypertransaminasemia found with certain types of statins vs others.

Atorvastatin is a synthetic hydroxymethylglutaryl coenzyme A (HMG-CoA) reductase inhibitor, approved for use in the United States in 1996, and become one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States, with more than 50 million prescriptions yearly.²⁴ Atorvastatin is largely metabolized in the liver via CYP 3A4, excreted in bile, and usually induces a transient elevation of serum transaminase levels.²⁵ The pathogenesis of atorvastatin-associated liver dysfunction is unclear. Some authors suggest that the induction of the CYP 450 system may be involved in the liver injury, and, indeed, genetic polymorphisms in CYP 3A4 may reflect differences in drug reactions.²⁶ Idiosyncratic and clinically apparent liver injury has many features of autoimmunity and may be immune mediated.

In comparison with other statins, atorvastatin is significantly longer acting. It has been proposed that the longer exposure with atorvastatin could explain an increased risk of liver injury.²⁷

Dujovne hypothesized that, as atorvastatin has more pronounced activity in lowering serum low-density lipoprotein, this, in turn, could influence the structure of cellular membranes, leading to greater leakage of cellular enzymes and increased incidence of LFT abnormalities without direct hepatotoxicity.²⁸

Rosuvastatin was approved for use in the United States in 2003 and, at present, is one of the more potent available statins. The cause of hepatic injury from rosuvastatin is unknown because it is minimally (\sim 10%) metabolized in the liver (via CYP2C9), but, as with atorvastatin, rosuvastatin has been linked to hepatitis with autoimmune features²⁹ including elevated immunoglobulin levels, ANA positivity, and a clinical response to corticosteroids.²⁴

The study by Koh et al.³⁰ showed that rosuvastatin is more potent and less hydrophilic than pravastatin and is associated with significant adverse metabolic effects such as insulin resistance.

Finally, lovastatin was approved for use in the United States in 1987, the first of this class of drugs to be commercially available. It is largely metabolized in the liver (via CYP 3A4), and metabolites are excreted in bile.

The pattern of injury is typically cholestatic, as described by several case reports,³¹⁻³³ but can be also hepatocellular. Eosinophilia and autoimmune features are uncommon, and the idiosyncratic and clinically apparent liver injury associated with lovastatin may be due to failure of adaptation.²⁴

Remarkably, our results indicate that the elevation of liver enzymes associated with administration of statins is not a homogeneous class-effect phenomenon dependent on the statin type and dose. The observations of the current report are pivotal in demonstrating that high-dose atorvastatin and rosuvastatin increase, to a greater extent, levels of LFTs when compared with low-dose statins or high doses of less potent statins (simvastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, or pravastatin). Therefore, hypertransaminasemia appears to occur mostly with the 2 most potent regimens now available for serum lipid lowering. Based on this article, it might be conceivable that the more drastic low-density lipoprotein-reduction levels-and then the effects of serum lipid lowering on the structure of cellular membranes-may be involved in the potential risk of the highest doses.

Sensitivity analysis of atorvastatin showed that all subgroup analyses had increased odds to develop hypertransaminasemia; however, the subgroups that developed the highest and most statistically significant rates of hypertransaminasemia included patients with ACS, acute cerebrovascular events, or persistent hypertransaminasemia (Supplemental Table 5).

Limitations

Our study has several limitations to be acknowledged. As with all meta-analyses of aggregated data, the availability of individual patient data would have further improved our findings. The results of this article, however, are robust and corroborated in several sensitivity analyses.

Another limitation is the use of different criteria for the definition of hypertransaminasemia used for study selection. However, sensitivity analyses conducted by removing one study at time did not reveal any differences with the overall findings, suggesting that the effect is stable and justified.

CONCLUSION

Different types and doses of statins display different potential to increase the incidence of hypertransaminasemia. High-dose atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, and lovastatin yielded higher risks of LFT abnormalities. These findings can have an impact on public health, particularly on management with statins of the population at risk, such as patients with ACS, acute cerebrovascular events, and persistent liver abnormalities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr Serviddio was responsible for the conception and design of the work; Drs Villani, Serviddio, Cavallone, Bellanti, and Facciorusso for the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data.

Drs Villani Serviddio, Navarese, and Kubica did the statistical analysis. Drs Villani, Serviddio, Navarese, and Vendemiale drafted the article. All authors contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. Drs Serviddio and Vendemiale approved the version to be published.

SUPPLEMENTAL ONLINE MATERIAL

Supplemental material can be found online at http://mcpiqojournal.org. Supplemental material attached to journal articles has not been edited, and the authors take responsibility for the accuracy of all data.

Abbreviations and Acronyms: **ORs** = odds ratios; **RCTs** = randomized controlled trials

Grant support: No funding has been received to conduct this meta-analysis.

Potential Competing Interests: Eliano Pio Navarese reports research funding from Amgen. The other authors report no competing interests. Publication dates: Received for publication November 30, 2018; revisions received January 16, 2019; accepted for publication January 19, 2019.

Correspondence: Address to Gaetano Serviddio, MD, C.U.R.E. (Centro per la Ricerca e la Cura delle Epatopatie), Institute of Internal Medicine, Viale Pinto I, 71122 Foggia, Italy (gaetano.serviddio@unifg.it).

REFERENCES

- Griffin SJ, Borch-Johnsen K, Davies MJ, et al. Effect of early intensive multifactorial therapy on 5-year cardiovascular outcomes in individuals with type 2 diabetes detected by screening (ADDITION-Europe): a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet.* 2011; 378(9786):156-167.
- Seshasai SR, Kaptoge S, Thompson A, et al; Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration. Diabetes mellitus, fasting glucose, and risk of cause-specific death. N Engl J Med. 2011;364(9):829-841.
- Cohen DE, Anania FA, Chalasani N. An assessment of statin safety by hepatologists. Am J Cardiol. 2006;97(8):S77-S81.
- Bjornsson E, Jacobsen El, Kalaitzakis E. Hepatotoxicity associated with statins: reports of idiosyncratic liver injury post-marketing. J Hepatol. 2012;56(2):374-380.
- Bays H, Cohen DE, Chalasani N, Harrison SA; The National Lipid Association's Statin Safety Task Force. An assessment by the Statin Liver Safety Task Force: 2014 update. J Clin Lipidol. 2014;8(3 suppl):S47-S57.
- Stagnitti M. Trends in Utilization and Expenditures for the US Civilian Nonistitutionalized Population, 2000-2005. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Statistical Brief; 2008.
- 7. Fallon Community Health Plan. Making More Cost-Effective Health Care Choices Starts Here. Worcester, MA 2009.
- U.S. Food & Drug Administration. Drugs@FDA: FDA Approved Drug Products. U.S. Food & drug Administration website. http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/drugsatfda/ index.cfm. Accessed April 26, 2019.
- Bader T. The myth of statin-induced hepatotoxicity. Am J Gastroenterol. 2010;105(5):978-980.
- Naci H, Brugts J, Ades T. Comparative tolerability and harms of individual statins: a study-level network meta-analysis of 246 955 participants from 135 randomized, controlled trials. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2013;6(4):390-399.
- Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Review of Interventions. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Version 5.1.0. [updated March 2011]. Available from, http:// handbook.cochrane.org.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. J Clin Epidemiol. 2009;62(10): 1006-1012.
- Laforest L, Moulin P, Souchet T, et al. Correlates of LDLcholesterol goal attainment in patients under lipid lowering therapy. *Atherosclerosis*. 2008;199(2):368-377.
- Murad MH. Clinical practice guidelines: a primer on development and dissemination. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2017;92(3):423-433.

- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003;327(7414):557-560.
- Fleiss JL. Analysis of data from multiclinic trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986;7(4):267-275.
- Gentile S, Turco S, Guarino G, et al. Comparative efficacy study of atorvastatin vs simvastatin, pravastatin, lovastatin and placebo in type 2 diabetic patients with hypercholesterolaemia. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* 2000;2(6):355-362.
- Olsson AG, Pears J, McKellar J, Mizan J, Raza A. Effect of rosuvastatin on low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in patients with hypercholesterolemia. Am J Cardiol. 2001;88(5):504-508.
- Shepherd J, Cobbe SM, Ford I, et al; West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study Group. Prevention of coronary heart disease with pravastatin in men with hypercholesterolemia. N Engl | Med. 1995;333(20):1301-1307.
- 20. The Long-Term Intervention with Pravastatin in Ischaemic Disease (LIPID) Study Group. Prevention of cardiovascular events and death with pravastatin in patients with coronary heart disease and a broad range of initial cholesterol levels. N Engl J Med. 1998;339(19):1349-1357.
- Sacks FM, Pfeffer MA, Moye LA, et al; Cholesterol and Recurrent Events Levels Trial investigators. The effect of pravastatin on coronary events after myocardial infarction in patients with average cholesterol. N Engl | Med. 1996;335(14):1001-1009.
- Shepherd J, Blauw GJ, Murphy MB, et al. Pravastatin in elderly individuals at risk of vascular disease (PROSPER): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2002;360(9346):1623-1630.
- de Denus S, Spinler SA, Miller K, Peterson AM. Statins and liver toxicity: a meta-analysis. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2004;24(5):584-591.
- National Institutes of Health. Search the LiverTox Database. LIVERTOX website. https://livertox.nih.gov/. Accessed April 26, 2019.
- Perger L, Kohler M, Fattinger K, Flury R, Meier PJ, Pauli-Magnus C. Fatal liver failure with atorvastatin. J Hepatol. 2003; 39(6):1095-1097.
- Bernini F, Poli A, Paoletti R. Safety of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors: focus on atorvastatin. *Cardiovasc Drugs Ther.* 2001; 15(3):211-218.
- Malinowski JM. Atorvastatin: a hydroxymethylglutarylcoenzyme A reductase inhibitor. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 1998;55(21):2253-2267; quiz 2302-2253.
- Dujovne CA. Side effects of statins: hepatitis versus "transaminitis": myositis versus "CPKitis". Am J Cardiol. 2002;89(12):1411-1413.
- Wolters LM, Van Buuren HR. Rosuvastatin-associated hepatitis with autoimmune features. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2005; 17(5):589-590.
- Koh KK, Quon MJ, Sakuma I, et al. Differential metabolic effects of rosuvastatin and pravastatin in hypercholesterolemic patients. Int J Cardiol. 2013;166(2):509-515.
- Grimbert S, Pessayre D, Degott C, Benhamou JP. Acute hepatitis induced by HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor, lovastatin. *Dig Dis Sci.* 1994;39(9):2032-2033.
- McQueen MJ. Cholestatic jaundice associated with lovastatin (Mevacor) therapy. CMAJ. 1990;142(8):841-842.
- **33.** Geddes JA. Cholestatic jaundice associated with lovastatin (mevacor) therapy. *CMAJ.* 1990;143(1):13-14.