medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Pre-morbid use of proton pump inhibitors has no effect on the risk of death or hospitalization in COVID-19 patients: a matched cohort study

Ivan Kodvanj[1], Jan Homolak[2], Vladimir Trkulja[2]

[1] Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University Hospital Centre Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

[2] Department of Pharmacology, Zagreb University School of Medicine, Zagreb, Croatia

Correspondence to: Vladimir Trkulja, MD, PhD
Department of Pharmacology
Zagreb University School of Medicine
Šalata 11, 10000 Zagreb, CROATIA
vladimir.trkulja@mef.hr

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background. Several studies assessed the effect of pre-morbid exposure to proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) on disease course in adult COVID-19 patients with somewhat inconsistent results.

Methods. This population-based matched cohort study embraced first COVID-19 episodes in adults diagnosed up to August 15 2021 in Croatia. Considering over-the-counter (OTC) availability of PPIs, patients were classified based on exposure to PPIs and burden of PPI-requiring conditions as "non-users" (no issued prescriptions, no recorded treatment-requiring conditions between January 1 2019 and COVID-19 diagnosis), "possible users" (no issued prescriptions, recorded treatment-requiring conditions; OTC use possible) and "users" (different intensity of issued prescriptions over 12 months prior to diagnosis, at least one within 3 months). Subsets were mutually exactly matched in respect to a range of pre-COVID-19 characteristics. The contrast between "users" and "possible users" was considered the most informative for the effect of PPIs that is separate of the effect of PPI-requiring conditions.

Results. Among 433609 COVID-19 patients, 332389 were PPI "non-users", 18170 were "possible users", and 55098 were "users". Users and possible users were matched 41195 to 17334 and 33272 to 16434 in the primary and sensitivity analyses. There was no relevant difference between "users" and "possible users" regarding COVID-19-related mortality [RR=0.93 (95%CI 0.85-1.02; RD= -0.34% (-0.73, 0.03) in primary and RR=0.88 (0.78-0.98); RD=-0.45 (-0.80, -0.11) in sensitivity analysis] or COVID-19-related hospitalizations [RR=1.04 (0.97-1.13); RD=0.29% (-0.16, 0.73) in primary and RR=1.05 (0.97-1.15); RD=0.32% (-0.12, 0.75) in sensitivity analysis].

Conclusions. Pre-morbid exposure to PPIs does not affect the risk of death or hospitalization in adult COVID-19 patients.

Key words: proton pump inhibitors; COVID-19; mortality; hospitalization

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) are drugs of choice for acid-peptic disorders. When used rationally, they are well tolerated and safe [1-3], and are (with limitations in unit strength and pack size) available over-the-counter (OTC) for the use in adults across countries with stringent regulatory and drug safety criteria [4]. Some disorders require long-term PPI treatment (continuous or intermittent) [2, 3], but the use of PPIs worldwide has increased manifold since their introduction to medical practice, to the extent clearly indicative of "overprescription" or "overuse" [1-3]. Long-term PPI use has been suggested associated with the risk of worsening or incidence of variety of diseased conditions [5, 6]. Two recent comprehensive evaluations demonstrated that quality of evidence relating PPIs as potential causes to these adverse events was "low" or "very low" predominantly for the following reasons: mostly observational data, modest effects commonly burdened by residual confounding, bias by indication, protopathic bias and data inconsistency [2, 7].

At the advent of COVID-19 pandemic, concerns were raised that PPIs might increase the risk of infection and/or its severe form, based on previously reported associations with the risk of other respiratory virus infections, the fact that SarsCov-2 virus may cause gastrointestinal infection with fecal-oral transmission, and the fact that elderly and comorbid patients commonly use PPIs [8]. On the other hand, antiviral effects of PPIs were also reviewed and discussed [9], and pharmacodynamics rationale for their potential use *against* SarsCov-2 was elaborated [10, 11]. Four recent systematic reviews [12-15] identified a total of 24 primary retrospective cohort or case-control studies aimed to estimate the risk of COVID-19 infection and/or experiencing a severe form (with different indicators of "severe") and/or COVID-19-related mortality associated with PPI use. The settings were variable [12-15]: some studies were community-based, but most enrolled hospitalized COVID-19 patients; a variety of definitions of "PPI use" were employed – in respect to dosing and setting (pre-morbid or pre-hospital or in-hospital, "current" [with different definitions]). Estimates pertaining to any of the posted questions were highly heterogeneous [12-15].

Biological plausibility for the presumed PPI - COVID-19 relationship is based on reduced antiviral resistance due to prolonged gastrointestinal hypochlorhydria and subsequently increased pulmonary colonization [5, 6, 8]. Theoretically, the (presumed) effects on gut microbiome and micronutrient deficiencies [7, 8] might contribute. Two questions about pre-morbid PPI use seem to naturally arise from this mechanistic rationale: one pertaining to the risk of infection and the other one to the risk of severe COVID-19. As recently reviewed [12], 5 low risk of bias community-based case-control studies referring to periods before mass vaccination

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

consistently yielded odds ratios for COVID-19 infection (for PPI "users" vs. "non-users") closely around 1.0 or <1.0: even if some excess risk of infection attributable to PPI use existed, it is minor and unlikely to be relevant [12]. This seems to be particularly so with development of effective vaccines. The question of pre-morbid (or pre-hospital) PPI use and the risk of poor outcomes (e.g., mechanical ventilation/death) was addressed mostly in studies including hospitalized patients [12-15]. Such a setting is prone to [16]: a) selection bias – the presumed effect in unselected patients (i.e., not hospitalized) remains unknown; b) collider bias – if there are factors that affect probability of hospitalization (where PPI use is a presumed, tested factor) and if these factors further promote disease progression, then "hospitalization" is a mediator, and by conditioning on it (by patient selection), collider bias is generated resulting in a spurious link between PPI use and poor outcomes. Three community-based studies referring to earlier periods of pandemics formed matched cohorts (propensity score-based) of "PPI users" and "non-users" among COVID-19 positive patients to evaluate the effect of pre-morbid/on-going PPI use on poor outcomes: a) in a South Korean study [17], the risk of intensive care, invasive ventilation or death was higher in "current users" than in "non-users" (point odds ratios between 1.63 and 1.90; 267 vs. 267 patients); b) in a UK study [18], no difference in mortality between "users" and "non-users" was observed (1516 vs. 1516 patients); c) in a Danish study [12] (3955 vs. 3955 patients), the risk of hospital admission was marginally higher in "current users" vs. "never users" (RR=1.13; 1.03-1.24), but the risk of intensive care, mechanical ventilation or death was practically identical in the two cohorts. Considering these somewhat conflicting reports, we aimed to address the same question in a South-Eastern European country with its own socio-economic, ethnic, cultural and healthcare specifics, based on a nationwide cohort of adults diagnosed with COVID-19 up to August 15 2021.

Methods

Study outline

We aimed to estimate whether pre-morbid/on-going use of PPI in adults and adolescents ≥16 years of age diagnosed with COVID-19 disease affected the risk of adverse COVID-19 outcomes defined as *COVID-related mortality* and *COVID-related hospitalization*. Anonymized routinely collected data from different sources were linked into a database including all subjects in the country diagnosed with COVID-19 between start of the pandemic (first case on February 25 2020) and August 15 2021. Linked were data on: date and mode of COVID-19 diagnosis;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

demographics and COVID-19 vaccination status at diagnosis; medical histories throughout 2019 up to October 31 2021, including information on comorbidities (with International Classification of Diseases [ICD-10] codes), all issued prescriptions (with Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical codes, ATC) and other medical care, hospital admissions and diagnoses and dates and causes of death. In Croatia: i) PPIs are available mainly as prescription-only drugs, but pantoprazole 20 mg (20 tablets pack) is available OTC, as well [19]; ii) histamine H_2 receptor antagonists are available as both OTC (unit strength and pack size limits) and prescriptions drugs [19], but are extremely rarely prescribed (<3000 prescriptions issued during 2019, 2020 and up to October 31, 2021 in the present cohort of □500 000 adults [□15.0% of total population aged ≥16 years]); iii) all classical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) (mono-compound or fixed combinations in e.g., "cold" preparations) are available as both OTC (unit strength and pack size limits) and prescription drugs [19]; iv) OTC purchases, unfortunately, cannot be linked to a particular individual. Some forms of acid peptic disorders, like milder forms of gastrointestinal reflux disease or functional dyspepsia, or milder difficulties associated with the use of NSAIDs are likely underdiagnosed [20], and it seems reasonable to assume that they might be self-medicated (OTC anti-secretory drugs). Under such circumstances, we considered it impossible to directly discern risks attributable specifically to PPI exposure (as a contrast to complete non-exposure) from the risks attributable to conditions (or their causes) that require PPI treatment. Therefore, we defined patient subsets differently burdened with conditions requiring PPI treatment and with different levels of exposure to PPIs directly preceding the diagnosis of COVID-19 (details in Table 1): i) PPI non-users - patients not burdened by anti-secretory treatment-requiring morbidities or exposure to NSAIDs (based on ICD-10 entries and ATC codes) between January 1 2019 and the date of the index COVID-19 diagnosis, who received no PPI or H_2 receptor antagonist prescriptions over 12 months preceding the COVID-19 diagnosis; ii) Possible PPI users – patients who were issued no PPI / H_2 receptor antagonist prescriptions at any time between January 1 2019 and the date of the index COVID-19 diagnosis, but were burdened by anti-secretory treatment-requiring morbidities or exposure to NSAIDs (≥3 prescriptions issued within 6 months before COVID-19 diagnosis), hence some PPI exposure through e.g., self-medication, could not be excluded; iii) PPI users – patients burdened with respective morbidities/exposure to NSAIDs who were issued PPI prescriptions during a relevant period preceding the COVID-19 diagnosis (with different "intensity" of prescriptions). We used exact matching procedures to generate contrasts between *possible users* and *non-users*, between *users* (different intensities) and *non-users*, and between *users* and *possible users* in respect to COVID-19-related mortality and hospitalizations (Table 1). Considering the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

characteristics of these subsets (Table 1), unfavorable effect of PPI exposure would be illustrated primarily by a higher risk of COVID-related mortality/hospitalization in *users* than in *possible users*. For patients diagnosed with COVID-19 on the cut-off date (August 15 2021) follow-up period lasted up to October 31 2021, which we considered a sufficient period for outcomes (as defined below) to occur.

Data sources and curation

Raw data were prepared by the Croatian Institute for Public Health (CIPH) from several from several nationwide databases that contain information about: (i) COVID-19 laboratory test results (polymerase chain reaction [PCR]-based or rapid antigen tests [RAT]) and COVID-19 patients diagnosed on clinical/epidemiological criteria (without laboratory tests); (ii) COVID-19 vaccinations; (iii) all hospitalizations; (iv) the deceased individuals; (v) Central Health Information System (CEZIH) - primary healthcare database maintained by the Ministry of Health.

All subjects diagnosed with COVID-19 (by any means) between February 25 2020 (first confirmed case in the country) and October 31 2021 were identified, and data were linked to the hospitalizations database (data from January 1 2019 to October 31 2021) and database of deceased persons (up to October 31 2021). Finally, data on COVID-19 patients were linked with their primary healthcare data (from January 1 2019 to October 31, 2021) within CEZIH database (Figure 1A). Anonymized merged database was received for further processing and data analysis (Figure 1B). We excluded patients younger than 16 years of age, those for whom data on sex, date of birth, COVID-19 testing date/result (PCT or RAT) or date of diagnosis by other means, or vaccination status/dates were missing or were erroneously entered. Next, we identified subjects with more than one COVID-19 episode: we considered that positive PCR/RAT tests or ICD-10 code U07.1 or U07.2 entries or hospitalizations related to COVID-19 that were ≥30 days apart indicated two separate COVID-19 episodes. Only the 1st documented COVID-19 episode for each subject was included in the analysis. Finally, we set the cut-off date for COVID-19 at August 15 2021, to allow for a follow-up period long-enough for outcomes to occur (until October 31). Patient subsets in respect to exposure to PPIs (as defined in Table 1) were identified, as well as the outcomes of interest, and comorbidities (based on ICD-10 codes) and issued prescriptions (based on ATC codes) up to the date of COVID-19 diagnosis (Figure 1B).

Identification of anti-secretory and other treatments, of anti-secretory treatment-requiring and other comorbidities, and of vaccination status

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Exposure to PPIs, H_2 receptor antagonists and to NSAIDs was identified based on their respective ATC codes (A02BC, A02BA, M01A). All treatments identified for the purpose of the present analysis are listed in Supplementary material 1. Subjects were considered burdened with anti-secretory treatment-requiring morbidities based on any of the following ICD-10 entries between January 1 2019 and date of COVID-19 diagnosis: R12, K20, K21, K22, K23, K24, K25, K26, K27, K28, K29, K30, K31. All other comorbidities (ICD-10 codes) identified between January 1 2019 and date of COVID-19 diagnosis and used for covariate matching are listed in Supplementary material 1. Regarding vaccination status, patients were classified as "not vaccinated", or as: a) vaccinated with a single-dose vaccine (Janssen COVID-19 vaccine); b) received 1st dose of a two-dose vaccine (Spikevax by Moderna; Vaxzervria by AstraZeneca or Cominatry by BioNTech/Pfizer); c) received 2nd (full) dose of a two-dose vaccine – and sub-classified based on time elapsed between the the last vaccine administration and the index COVID-19 diagnosis (i) <14 days, (ii) 14-90 days, and (iii) >90 days.

Outcomes

We specified three differently defined outcomes pertaining to COVID-19-related death: i) Death 1 - patient died after the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1 or U07.2 was specified as a cause of death; ii) Death 2 - patient died in hospital after being hospitalized within 45 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 was the leading discharge diagnosis, or was hospitalized within 30 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 were listed among discharge diagnoses; iii) Death 3 - patient died within 14 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis.

We defined two outcomes related to hospitalizations: i) Hospitalization 1 – patient was hospitalized within 45 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 is the leading discharge diagnosis, or hospitalization followed within 30 days since the index diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 are listed among discharge diagnoses; ii) Hospitalization 2 – patient was hospitalized within 14 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis.

We considered the composite outcome of *COVID-19-related death* (Death 1 or Death 2 or Death 3) and *Hospitalization 1* (further addressed as *COVID-19-related hospitalization*) as primary outcomes. We considered the three differently defined mortality outcomes (elements of the composite outcome) and hospitalization within 14 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis as secondary outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Matching and data analysis

We used exact matching implemented in package *MatchIt* (21) in R (22) to evaluate contrasts between PPI exposure patient subsets with average treatment effect (in the population) (ATE) as the estimand. Two matched sets were generated for each contrast – one for *primary analysis* and one for a *sensitivity analysis* with some shared and some different covariates used for matching (detailed in Table 2). Differences were in that for the primary analysis, Charlson Comorbidity Index and additional individual comorbidities were used, while in the sensitivity analysis, individual comorbidities and a wider range of co-administered pharmacological treatments were used (Table 2) (see Supplementary material 1 for detailed lists; in particular, criteria for definition of "immunocompromised patients" used in the primary analysis, and criteria for identifying diabetic patients). Matched data were analyzed by fitting weighted generalized linear models (distribution=binary) with robust sandwich variance estimator to generate relative risks (RR) (link=log) and risk differences (link=identity) (in *MatchIt*). For primary outcomes, we also generated unadjusted relative risks (percentile bootstrap confidence interval) and risk differences (Miettinen-Nurminen confidence intervals) based on raw data. To assess susceptibility of (potential) effects of PPI exposure to unmeasured confounding, we calculated E-values (package *Evalue* in R) (23).

All estimates are reported with 95% CIs – we did not adjust confidence intervals for multiplicity, since we considered this to be a more conservative approach in order not to miss possible untoward effects of exposure to PPIs.

Additional sensitivity analysis to account for potential misclassification of "possible users"

Combined criteria of PPI prescriptions (issuance/timing) and history of / presence of conditions requiring anti-secretory treatment (Table 1) were defined in order to reasonably reliably ascertain no burden of either ("non-users") or presence of both ("users") at the critical period of time preceding the index COVID-19 diagnosis, as well as absence of PPI prescriptions but presence of respective morbidity ("possible users"). We were aware that not all identified COVID-19 patients would be classifiable into these categories and deemed it reasonable to assume that at least some of those not meeting criteria for any of the three categories might have suffered – at certain periods of time between January 1 2019 and the index COVID-19 diagnosis – milder forms of acid peptic disorders that remain underdiagnosed. By this virtue, these conditions would remain unregistered, and even if such patients were issued (occasional) PPI prescriptions (by which virtue they would not meet criteria for "non-users"), they would not qualify for the "possible users" subset – although, in fact, they could bear the (potential) risks that such conditions could

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

represent, and thus be similar to the "role" assigned to the category of "possible users". Having this in mind, by not including them into the "possible users" subset, misclassification regarding exposure (to PPIs and PPI-requiring treatments) might have occurred. We therefore applied exact matching (as for the primary analysis – see Table 2) between "unclassified" and other patient subsets. Differences between "users" and "unclassified" patients were then meta-analytically pooled with the differences between "users" and "possible users" to illustrate the effect of exposure to PPI. We used random-effects pooling (inverse variance weights, restricted maximum likelihood variance estimator) in package *meta* (24) in R.

Results

Patients

Raw data (Figure 1A) pertained to 526806 COVID-19 diagnoses (U07.1 or U07.2) verified between February 25 2020 and October 31 2021. After exclusion of patients <16 years of age, those with missing/erroneous entries on key variables, exclusion of repeated COVID-19 episodes and restriction of the cut-off date for COVID-19 diagnosis at August 15 2021, the entire data set included first COVID-19 episodes in 433609 adult patients (Figure 1B). Of those, 332389 met the criteria of PPI "non-users", 18170 met the criteria of "possible users" and 55098 met the criteria of "users", while 27952 (6.4%) could not be classified based on criteria (Table 1) of exposure to PPIs (prescription issuance/timing) and burden of anti-secretory treatment-requiring morbidities (Figure 1B). Considering raw data, incidence of primary outcomes was the lowest in "non-users" (1.7% for COVID-19 related death, composite; 3.3% for COVID-19 related hospitalization, hospitalization 1) (Figure 2A), and was higher in "possible users" and furthermore in "users" (with increasing incidence across the intensity of issued prescriptions) (Figure 2A). Incidence in unclassified patients was between that in "non-users" and "possible users" (Figure 2A). Identical patterns were observed regarding secondary outcomes (Figure 2B). Table 3 summarizes numbers of patients in contrasted subsets before and after exact matching for the primary and sensitivity analyses. Supplementary material 2 provides tabulated data on all covariates used in matching by subset contrasts before and after matching, as well as data on all the outcomes.

Primary outcome: COVID-19 related mortality (composite)

Raw data indicated considerably higher risks of this outcome in "possible users" and "users" (with increasing difference with increasing number of issued PPI prescriptions) vs. "non-users" (RRs from around 2.62 to around 6.10; RDs from around 2.7% to around 8.6%) (Figure 3), and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

also (although less so) in "users" vs. "possible users" (Figure 3). However, in both primary and sensitivity matched analyses all differences were minor (e.g., absolute percentage differences <0.5%) with no indication of "dose-effect" relationship (Figure 3), and for the comparisons between "users" and "possible users" all RRs and RDs were tightly around 1.0/0.0 or were < 1.0/0.0 (Figure 3) thus indicating no obvious effect of exposure to PPIs.

Primary outcome: COVID-19 related hospitalization (Hospitalization 1)

Raw data indicated considerably higher risks of this outcome in "possible users" and "users" (with increasing difference with increasing number of issued PPI prescriptions) vs. "non-users" (RRs from around 1.95 to around 3.89; RDs from around 3.1% to around 9.5%) (Figure 4), and also (although less so) in "users" vs. "possible users" (Figure 4). However, in both primary and sensitivity matched analyses all differences were minor (e.g., absolute RDs ≤2.0%) with no indication of "dose-effect" relationship (Figure 4), and for the comparisons between "users" and "possible users" all RRs and RDs were tightly around 1.0/0.0 (Figure 4) thus indicating no obvious effect of exposure to PPIs.

Secondary outcomes

Raw incidence proportions (Figure 2B) clearly indicated that relative and absolute differences between "possible users" or "users" vs. "non-users" regarding raw data showed closely similar patterns as in the case of primary outcomes. However, in both primary and sensitivity matched analysis these differences were minor (e.g., RDs <0.40% for all "death" outcomes, and between 1.4% and 2.8% for hospitalization within 14 days) (Figure 5). For the comparisons between "users" and "possible users" all RRs and RDs were tightly around or below 1.0/0.0(Figure 5) thus indicating no obvious effect of exposure to PPIs. Numerically, there appeared a mild tendency towards a higher risk of hospitalization within 14 days since COVID-19 diagnosis in "users" vs. "possible users" – relatively by 4% (RR=1.04, 0.99-1.08) and absolutely by around 0.6% (-0.03, 1.28) (Figure 5), however already a mild effect (RR=1.24) of unmeasured confounding (we are not aware of any known but not measured/adjusted for confounder, hence "unmeasured" here also implies "unknown") would have shifted the point estimates to 1.0/0.0.

Additional sensitivity analysis to account for a potential misclassification of "possible users"

Supplementary material 3 provides tabulated data before and after matching (as in the primary analysis) for "unclassified" patients vs. "non-users", "possible users" and "users". For the contrast vs. "users", 43637 "users" (out of 55089) were matched to 26320 "unclassified" (out of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

27952) and yielded RRs for the primary and secondary outcomes that somewhat differed from those in the "users" vs. "possible users" contrasts (Table 4). Due to this heterogeneity, (random-effects) pooled estimates of the "users" vs. "unclassified" and "users" vs. "possible users" RRs were somewhat imprecise (wide CIs), but also did not indicate any obvious/relevant effect of exposure to PPIs regarding any of the primary or secondary outcomes (Table 4).

Discussion

As recently reviewed [12-15], a number of observational studies addressed the issue of a potential effect of pre-morbid exposure to proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) on the risk of unfavorable outcomes in COVID-19 patients (e.g, death, hospitalizations, intensive care treatment/assisted ventilation). However, only three of them were population-based [12, 17, 18] and as such were devoid of biases common to studies restricted to hospitalized patients [16]. The present population-based analysis was motivated by several factors. First, the results of these three studies [12, 17, 18] were somewhat discrepant: exposure to PPIs (directly preceding COVID-19 diagnosis) did not appear related to COVID-19 severity/outcomes in the Danish [12] and UK populations [18], but was associated with a higher risk of death/severe form of the disease in the Korean population [17]. Next, all three studies [12, 17, 18] pertained to the period before vaccination became available, and vaccination should be viewed as a factor that could modify relationship between any potential risk factor and course of the COVID-19 disease. Finally, in line with classical epidemiological criteria [25], we reasoned that observations from different geographical and cultural settings, with specifics in healthcare organization and functioning (e.g., OTC-availability of PPIs, availability and accessibility of services) should contribute to the overall body of evidence on the topic. The present study has also certain methodological particulars. The three published studies [12, 17, 18] shared common methodological approaches: (i) subjects exposed to PPIs over a critical pre-COVID-19 period (i.e., prescriptions issued within 30 or 90 days) were designated as "current users". Prescription issuance also meant presence of a PPI-requiring condition (required to be entered on the issued prescription); subjects with PPIs prescription issued at some previous times (typically in the period >30 or 90 days up to 1 year before the index COVID-19 diagnosis) were considered as "past users" (i.e., exposure to PPIs over a "non-critical" pre-COVID-19 period) and "never users" was a designation of subjects not issued any prescriptions over a period of 1 year or longer before the index COVID-19 diagnosis [12, 17, 18]. By this virtue, subjects who did not qualify as "current users" might have – over a "critical pre-COVID-19" period – suffered from conditions which required anti-secretory treatment (and which on their own could have been relevant for the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 disease course), whether recorded or not, and might have self-medicated PPIs or other anti-secretory treatments; (ii) In the next step [12, 17, 18], "current users" were matched (1:1) to their "contrasts" based on propensity scores (nearest neighbor matching) [12, 17, 18] that were based on a range of demographics, pre-existing morbidities – including those requiring anti-secretory treatments – and co-medication. While such an approach is by all means legitimate and commonly used [26], it has been shown that individuals in a matched pair with closely similar propensity scores might actually differ diametrically in some relevant individual covariate [26]: e.g., a "current PPI users" (who also suffers a condition that requires PPI treatment) might be paired to a "past" or "never user" who does not suffer from such a condition, i.e., the contrast within the pair is not a contrast between "PPI exposure" and "non-exposure" (at a critical period of time), but between "PPI exposure + underlying condition" vs. "non-exposure and no condition that requires a PPI". In other words, in the context of emulating a randomized trial, matching (nearest neighbor) based on a propensity score might (if done adequately) resemble "complete randomization", but not "stratified randomization" [26]. Having this in mind, together with the fact that milder forms of peptic ulcer disease indeed might be underdiagnosed [20] and the fact that in our setting PPIs are widely available OTC (but OTC purchases could not be linked to an individual), we classified COVID-19 patients based on both PPI exposure and burden of PPI-requiring morbidities (as depicted in Table 1); and we used exact matching on two extensive sets of relevant covariates (as depicted in Table 2). Hence, although this might not seem intuitive on the first glance, the present contrast between "users" and "non-users" does not inform on the effect of PPI exposure, but on the effect of PPI exposure + underlying morbidity, and regarding the effect of PPI exposure, the informative contrasts are those between "users" (overall and with different "burden" of issued prescriptions) and "possible users" – lack of differences in any of the evaluated outcomes in both the primary and sensitivity analyses supports a view of no effect of exposure to PPIs directly preceding COVID-19 diagnosis on the risk of COVID-19-related mortality or hospitalizations. In this respect, present data are in agreement with observations in the Danish [12] and UK [18] populations. Additional support to such a conclusion comes from (i) similarity of differences between "users" vs. "non-users" and "possible users" vs. "non-users"; (ii) no apparent increase in differences between "users" and "non-users" with increasing "burden" of prescriptions in "users".

The present analysis suffers from several potential limitations. First, it used a database generated for this particular purpose using routinely collected administrative data, and not a dedicated prospectively planned database. It was re-checked systematically and (Figure 1) only 0.47% of the originally included entries had erroneous/missing data on key variables like

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 diagnosis and dates, age, vaccination status. Also, we allowed for a long-enough follow-up for outcomes to occur in all COVID-19-diagnosed subjects, and all issued prescriptions (for PPIs or any other) or individual subject ICD-10 codes were automatically included into the national Central Health Information System. Still, one cannot completely exclude a possibility of minor inaccuracies – e.g., that some ICD-10 code should have been - and was not - entered into the system for a particular individual. We believe, however, that the risk of such inaccuracies was minimized by the fact that we left a period of a minimum one year + 2 months (data date back to January 1 2019; first COVID-19 case in February 2020) before COVID-19 diagnosis for comorbidities to be registered, and no relevant comorbidity was likely to be missed. Next, as it is common in pharmacoepiedmiology, exposure (to PPIs) is defined based on issued prescriptions without a direct insight into actual consumption (compliance). This is an unavoidable fact and a potential source of bias. In the present setting, however, this might be of a limited relevance (unlike in studies dealing with chronic exposures over prolonged periods of time) - having in mind the proposed mechanism of (assumed) PPI effect [8], the key is exposure over a certain time-window directly preceding COVID-19 infection. Here, this was defined as 3 months with "use" indicated by at least one issued prescription, as reported by others [12]. Since for some conditions (e.g., milder esophageal reflux disease) PPIs do not necessarily need to be used on daily basis, but could be used intermittently/on-demand [27], it seems plausible to think that (presumed usage) of a 30-tablet pack could result in reduced gastric acidity over this period. Similarly, as in any observational study, one should *a priori* accept that (some) residual confounding is practically inevitable. In this respect, it should be noted that both covariate sets used for matching (see Table 2) were exhaustive with regard to variables so far known (or suspected) to affect either exposure to PPIs or the (unfavorable) COVID-19 course, or both. Since none was a "post-exposure" variable, both covariate sets – together with the additional sensitivity analysis to account for a potential misclassification (not inclusion) of subjects that might have been similar to "possible users" - were likely to remove and not to introduce bias [28]. Finally, we did not account for treatment measures provided to hospitalized patients. Although, at a first glance, this might seem as a major source of bias – it is not. In respect to the evaluated treatment of interest (pre-morbid exposure to PPI), all in-hospital treatments are "post-treatment" and should not be adjusted for (unless mediation analysis is performed) in order to estimate an unbiased total effect of treatment [28]. Consistency of present effects regarding COVID-19-related hospitalizations and COVID-19-related deaths, regardless of how defined, support a view that the estimates were not tainted by any major post-diagnosis bias. In this respect, it is also informative to note that: (i) all children and employed and unemployed (if registered at the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

national Employment Service) adults are insured by the Croatian Health Insurance Fund and have free access to all health services; (ii) when medically indicated, all COVID-19 testing and treatments were free of charge for all; (iii) dedicated COVID-19 testing points are widely available through regional CIPH subsidiaries and testing is also accessible through a network of university and county hospitals and primary health centers; (iv) the Ministry of Health has been continuously updating COVID-19 treatment guidelines applied at all treatment centers (dedicated departments at each university or county hospital) across the country. Overall, it is plausible to state that the present estimates are reasonably accurate.

In conclusion, in the present population-based matched cohort study we found no indication that pre-morbid/on-going PPI use in COVID-19 patients has any untoward effect on the risk of COVID-19-related mortality or hospitalization.

Disclosures and Declarations

Ethics

This is an observational study that used anonymized administrative data standardly collected on routine procedures, hence ethical approval was waived by the Ethics Committee of the Zagreb University School of Medicine and Croatian Institute for Public Health.

Funding

Study was funded by the University of Zagreb School of Medicine.

Conflicts of interest

Authors declare that they have no financial or non-financial conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Ivan Kodvanj, Jan Homolak and Vladimir Trkulja conceived and designed the study. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Ivan Kodvanj and Vladimir Trkulja. The first draft was written by Ivan Kodvanj and Vladimir Trkulja. All authors commented on previous versions of the manuscripts, read and approved the final version.

Acknowledgments

Computing was done on high-throughput computing resources (HTC Cloud) provided by the University of Zagreb Computing Centre (SRCE). We are thankful to all the personnel at the Croatian Institute for Public Health (CIPH) for preparing the raw data, and especially for the kind support of Tamara Poljičanin MD, PhD, who supervised the data preparation process at CIPH.

Data availability

Data can be obtained upon a reasonable request directly from the CIPH.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Schubert ML. Proton pump inhibitors: misconceptions and proper prescribing practice. Curr Opin Gastroeneterol 2020; 36:493-500.
2. Freedberg DE, Kim LS, Yang YX. The risks and benefits of long-term use of proton pump inhibitors: expert review and best practice advice from the American Gastroenerological Association. Gastroenterology 2017; 152:706-715.
3. Dharmarajan TS. The use and misuses of proton pump inhibitors: an opportunity for deprescribing. JAMDA 2021; 22:15-22.
4. Association of the European Self-care Industry. AESGP OTC ingredients directory. (available at: Databases | AESGP, accessed March 5, 2022).
5. Haastrup PF, Thompson W, Sondergaard J, Jarbol DE. Side effects of long-term proton pump inhibitor use: a review. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 2018; 123:114-121.
6. Yubrub N, De Oliveira D, Valera R, Plitt AE, Lutgen S. Adverse effects associated with proton pump inhibitor use. Cureus 2021; 13:e12759. Doi: 10.7759/cureus.12759.
7. Salvo EM, Ferko NC, Cash SB, Gonzales A, Kahrilas PJ. Umbrella review of 42 systematic reviews with meta-analyses: the safety of proton pump inhibitors.
8. Charpiat B, Belyzac N, Tod M. Proton pump inhibitors are risk factors for viral infections: even for COVID-19? Clin Drug Investig 2020; 40:897-899.
9. Homolak J, Kodvanj I, Trkulja V. An additional perspective on proton pump inhibitors as risk factors for COVID-19. Clin Drug Investig 2021; 41:287-289.
10. Homolak J, Kodvanj I. Widely available lysosome targeting agents should be considered as potential therapy for COVID-19. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020; 56:106044. Doi: 10.1016/i.
11. Tastemur S, Atasevan H. Is it possible to use proton pump inhibitors in COVID-19 treatment and prophylaxis? Med Hypotheses 2020; 143:1100118.Doi: 10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110018.
12. Israelsen SB, Ernst MT, Lundh A, Lundbo LF, Sandholdt H, Hallas J, Benfield T. Proton pump inhibitor use is not strongly associated with Sars-Cov-2 related outcomes: a nationwide study and meta-analysis. Clin Gastrenterol Hepatol 2021; 19:1845-1854.
13. Pranata R, Huang I, Lawrensia S, Henrina J, Lim MA, Lukito AA, Kuswardhani RAT, Wibawa IDN. Proton pump inhibitor on susceptibility to COVID-19 and severity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pharmacol Rep 2021; 73:1642-1649.
14. Yan C, Hen Y, Sun C, Ahmed MA, Bhan C, Guo Z, Yang H, Zuo Y, Yan Y, Hu L, Sun Y, Li Y, Zhou Q. Does proton pump inhibitor use lead to a higher risk of coronavirus diease 2019

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

infection and progression to severe disease? A meta-analysis. Jpn J Infect Dis 2022; 75:10-15.

15. Kim HB, Kim JH, Wolf BJ. Acid suppressant use in association with incidence and severe outcomes of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2022; 78:383-391.
16. Griffith GJ, Morris TT, Tudball MJ, Herbert A, Manacano G, Pike L et al. Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. Nat Commun 2020; 11:5749. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-19478-2.
17. Lee SW, Ha EK, Yeniova AO, Moon SY, Kim SY, Koh HY et al. Severe clinical outcomes of COVID-19 associated with proton pump inhibitors: a nationwide cohort study with propensity score matching. Gut 2021; 70:76-84.
18. Fan Y, Liu Z, Miyata T, Dasarathy S, Rotroff DM, Nagy LE. Effect of acid suppressants on the risk of COVID-19: A propensity score-matched study using UK Biobank. Gastroenterology 2021; 160:455-458.
19. Medicinal products database. Agency for Medicinal Products and Medical Devices of Croatia. Available at: Baza lijekova | Lijekovi .: HALMED, accessed January 15, 2022.
20. Richter JE. Rubenstein JH. Presentation and epidemiology of gastroesophageal reflux disease. Gastroenetrol 2018; 154:267-276.
21. Ho DE, Imai K, King G, Stuart EA. MatchIt: nonparametric preprocessing for parametric causal inference. J Stat Software 2011; 42:1-28.
22. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020. URL https://www.R-project.org/.
23. VanderWeele TJ, Ding P. Sensitivity analysis in observational research: introducing the E-value. Ann Intern Med 2017; 167: 268-274.
24. Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. Hot to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health 2019; 22:153-160.
25. Hill AB. The environment and disease: association or causation? Proc R Soc Med 1965; 58:295-300.
26. King G, Nielsen R. Why propensity scores should not be used for matching. Political Analysis 2019; 27:435-454.
27. Kang SJ, Jung HK, Tae CH, Kim SY, Lee SJ. On-demand versus continuous maintenance treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease with proton pump inhibitors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurogastroenterol Motil 2022; 28:5-14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

28. VanderWeele TJ. Principles of confounder selection. Eur J Epidemiol 2019; 34:211-219.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Subsets of patients diagnosed with COVID-19 (up to August 15, 2021) in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors (PPI) directly preceding the diagnosis, and contrasts between exactly matched subsets (see Supplementary material 1 for details)

- Patients not exposed to PPIs or **"non-users"**: no prescriptions for PPIs or H_2 receptor antagonists issued during the period of 12 months prior to diagnosis of COVID-19 + no International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) code entries for conditions requiring anti-secretory treatment in electronic medical histories between January 1 2019 and the date of the index COVID-19 diagnosis + no prescriptions issued for non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) within 6 months prior to COVID-19 diagnosis.
- Patients possibly exposed to PPIs (e.g. OTC self-medication cannot be excluded) or **"possible users"**: have no PPI or H_2 receptor antagonist prescriptions issued between January 1 2019 and the date of the index COVID-19 diagnosis, but have (i) ICD-10 entries for conditions requiring anti-secretory treatment at any time between January 1 2019 and the date of diagnosis or (ii) ≥3 prescriptions for NSAIDs issued within 6 months prior to COVID-19 diagnosis.
- Patients exposed to PPIs or **"users"** with different levels of exposure: have (i) ICD-10 entries for conditions requiring anti-secretory treatment at any time between January 1 2019 and the date of COVID-19 diagnosis or (ii) ≥3 prescriptions for NSAIDs issued within 6 months prior to COVID-19 diagnosis, and received 1-3, 4-7 or ≥8 prescriptions for PPIs over 12 months prior to COVID-19 diagnosis, with at least one issued within 3 months before the diagnosis.

- **Possible users** vs. **non-users**: the two subsets differ primarily regarding the burden of conditions requiring anti-secretory treatments, and to minor extent (if at all) in the extent of pre-COVID exposure to PPIs. The contrast primarily quantifies effect of conditions that require anti-secretory treatments.
- **Users** vs. **non-users**: the two subsets differ regarding the burden of conditions requiring anti-secretory treatments and regarding pre-COVID exposure to PPIs ["users" were considered as *all*, and also as those receiving low (1-3), medium (4-7) and high (≥8) number of PPI prescriptions]. The contrasts quantify a joint effect of conditions requiring anti-secretory treatments and of PPIs (possibly, with exposure intensity-effect relationship).
- **Users** vs. **possible users**: the two subsets differ primarily in respect to pre-COVID exposure to PPIs (it is certain for "users" [with different intensity] and some minor exposure cannot be completely excluded for "possible users"), while burden of conditions requiring anti-secretory treatments may be reasonably considered as generally similar. The contrast(s) quantify primarily the effect of exposure to PPIs.

OTC – over-the-counter; PPI – proton pump inhibitor

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Covariates used for exact matching in primary and sensitivity analysis (see Supplementary material 1 for ICD-10/ATC codes, i.e., identification of comorbidities and co-treatments).

Matching variables common for primary and sensitivity analysis		
Age	As 5-year bins between 16 and 111 years	
Sex	Male or female	
Vaccination status	Not vaccinated; received a single-dose vaccine (i) <14 days before diagnosis; ii) 14-90 days before or (iii) >90 days before; received the 1st dose of a two-dose vaccine (i) <14 days before; (ii) 14-90 days before or (iii) >90 days before; received the 2nd dose of a two-dose vaccine (i) <14 days before; (ii) 14-90 days before or (iii) >90 days before.	
Time period	Up to January 9 2020 (including) – still no vaccination, Alpha strain(s) prevailing; January 10 – July 15 2021 – Alpha strain(s) prevailing, mass vaccination in progress; after July 15 2021 – Delta strain starts to prevail, mass vaccination in progress.	
Comorbidities	Congestive heart failure; malignant disease; renal disease	
Matching variables specific for primary and sensitivity analysis		
	Primary analysis	Sensitivity analysis
Comorbidities	Charlson comorbidity index with 4 levels: 0, 1-2, 3-4 or ≥5; and additionally: atrial fibrillation; autoimmune disease; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ischemic heart disease or cerebrovascular disease; immunocompromised status (by disease or pharmacologically).	Acute myocardial infarction; peripheral vascular disease; cerebrovascular disease; Alzheimer dementia; other dementia; mild liver disease; moderate to severe liver disease; diabetes without complications; diabetes with complications; metastatic cancer; human immunodeficiency virus infection/AIDS.
Co-treatments	Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors	Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, beta-blockers, diuretics, systemic corticosteroids, other immunosuppressants, antineoplastic drugs, antivirals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Number of subjects in contrasted patient subsets – before matching (raw data), and after matching for the primary and sensitivity analyses.

Contrasts	Before matching	Primary analysis	Sensitivity analysis
Possible users vs. non-users	18170 vs. 332389	17466 vs. 316168	16795 vs. 307785
Users (all) vs. non-users	55098 vs. 332389	48453 vs. 325005	40653 vs. 317678
Users 1-3 prescriptions vs. non-users	18996 vs. 332389	17734 vs. 318312	16157 vs. 308555
Users 4-7 prescriptions vs. non-users	17730 vs. 332389	15569 vs. 316577	12812 vs. 306627
Users ≥8 prescriptions vs. non-users	18372 vs. 332389	15150 vs. 313399	11684 vs. 303530
Users (all) vs. possible users	55098 vs. 18170	41195 vs. 17334	33272 vs. 16434
Users 1-3 prescriptions vs. possible users	18996 vs. 18170	15998 vs. 16517	14205 vs. 15405
Users 4-7 prescriptions vs. possible users	17730 vs. 18170	13115 vs. 16594	10315 vs. 15414
Users ≥8 prescriptions vs. possible users	18372 vs. 18170	12082 vs. 16564	8752 vs. 15337

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Differences (as relative risks, 95%CI) between "users" and "unclassified" patients in exactly matched subsets (as for the primary analysis, see Table 2 for covariates) along with differences between "users" and "possible users" (from Figures 3-5) in respect to primary and secondary outcomes. Pooled estimates were generated by random-effects pooling (inverse variance weight, restricted maximum likelihood variance estimator) of the two estimates.

Outcomes	Users vs. Unclassified	Users vs. Possible users	Pooled
Number of subjects in matched sets	43637 vs. 26320	41195 vs. 17334	---
Primary outcomes			
COVID-related death (composite)	1.28 (1.18-1.39)	0.93 (0.85-1.02)	1.09 (0.80-1.49)
COVID-related hospitalization (hospitalization 1)	1.28 (1.20-1.37)	1.04 (0.97-1.13)	1.15 (0.94-1.41)
Secondary outcomes			
Death 1	1.22 (1.13-1.32)	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	1.08 (0.85-1.37)
Death 2	1.23 (1.13-1.35)	0.94 (0.84-1.04)	1.08 (0.83-1.40)
Death 3	1.32 (1.22-1.44)	0.93 (0.86-1.02)	1.11 (0.79-1.56)
Hospitalization within 14 days since diagnosis	1.14 (1.09-1.19)	1.04 (0.99-1.08)	1.09 (0.99-1.19)*

Death 1 – death occurred after the index COVID-19 diagnosis with U07.1/U07.2 as a cause of death; Death 2 – patient died in hospital after being hospitalized within 45 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 was the leading discharge diagnosis, or was hospitalized within 30 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 were listed among discharge diagnoses;

Death 3 - patient died within 14 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis

*Numerically, this estimate indicated a trend towards a mildly higher risk in "users", but already a mild effect (RR=1.25) of unmeasured (and, actually, unknown) confounding would suffice to push the point estimate to 1.04 and lower limit of the CI to 0.95.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Data sources and curation (see text for details). **A.** Raw data was prepared by the Croatian Institute for Public Health from several databases that it maintains. COVID-19 patients were identified based on positive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) or rapid antigen testing (RAT) performed at dedicated public testing points or hospitals (ICD-10 code U07.1), or based on epidemiological/clinical criteria (ICD-10 code U07.2) and individual data were linked to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

databases on vaccination, deceased persons, hospitalizations and Central Heath Information System. **B**. Anonymized data were "tidied-up" by exclusion of subjects younger than 16 years and those with missing/erroneous entries on key variables. Also, repeated COVID-19 episodes were excluded and cut-off date for index COVID-19 diagnosis was set at August 15, 2021. Based on International Classification of Disease version 10 (ICD-10) code entries, Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) code entries and COVID-19 vaccination status between January 1 2019 and date of COVID-19 diagnosis, subsets of patients in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) and health/treatment data relevant for covariate matching were identified. Data on hospitalizations and registry of deceased persons up to October 31 2021 were used to identify outcomes of interest for each subject.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Raw data – occurrence (as percentages) of the primary (A) and secondary (B) outcomes across the patient subsets in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors. Data are point estimates (depicted numerically) and 95% confidence intervals (Agresti-Coull) (see Methods for outcome definitions).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Analysis of the primary outcome: COVID-19 related death (composite) (see Methods). Contrasts between different patient subsets defined in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors and burden of diseases requiring anti-secretory treatments [“non-users”, “possible users”, and “users” with different numbers of issued prescriptions (1-3, 4-7 or ≥8)] inform on different effects (elaborated in Table 1). Data are counts (for raw data) or weighted counts (%) from matched sets in primary and sensitivity analysis (matching variables are elaborated in Table 2; Table 3 lists numbers of subjects in raw comparisons and matched sets). Differences are expressed as relative risks (RR) and as absolute risk (percentage) differences (RD). Estimates (confidence intervals, CI) based on matched data were generated in generalized linear models with robust sandwich variance estimation. Estimates based on raw data are simple risk ratios with percentile bootstrap CIs or risk differences with Miettinen-Nurminen CIs. All CIs are 95%CIs without multiplicity adjustment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Analysis of the primary outcome: COVID-19 related hospitalization (patient hospitalized within 45 days since COVID-19 diagnosis, with U07.1 or U07.2 as lead diagnosis; or within 30 days since COVID-19 diagnosis, with U07.1 or U07.2 listed among discharge diagnoses). Contrasts between different patient subsets defined in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors and burden of diseases requiring anti-secretory treatments [“non-users”, “possible users”, and “users” with different numbers of issued prescriptions (1-3, 4-7 or ≥8)] inform on different effects (elaborated in Table 1). Data are counts (for raw data) or weighted counts (%) from matched sets in primary and sensitivity analysis (matching variables are elaborated in Table 2; Table 3 lists numbers of subjects in raw comparisons and matched sets). Differences are expressed as relative risks (RR) and as absolute risk (percentage) differences (RD). Estimates (confidence intervals, CI) based on matched data were generated in generalized linear models with robust sandwich variance estimation. Estimates based on raw data are simple risk ratios with percentile bootstrap CIs or risk differences with Miettinen-Nurminen CIs. All CIs are 95%CIs without multiplicity adjustment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.22274526; this version posted May 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Analysis of the secondary outcomes: elements of the composite COVID-19-related death (Death 1 – death occurs after the index COVID-19 diagnosis with U07.1 or U07.2 as a cause of death; Death 2 – patient dies in hospital after being hospitalized within 45 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 was the leading discharge diagnosis, or was hospitalized within 30 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis and U07.1/U07.2 were listed among discharge diagnoses; Death 3 - patient died within 14 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis) and Hospitalization within 14 days after the index COVID-19 diagnosis. Contrasts between different patient subsets defined in respect to exposure to proton pump inhibitors and burden of diseases requiring anti-secretory treatments ("non-users", "possible users", and "users") inform on different effects (elaborated in Table 1). Data are weighted counts (%) from matched sets in primary (upper panel) and sensitivity analysis (lower panel) (matching variables are elaborated in Table 2; Table 3 lists numbers of subjects in the matched sets). Effects are expressed as relative risks (RR) and as absolute risk (percentage) differences (RD) generated in generalized linear models with robust sandwich variance estimation. All CIs are 95%CIs without multiplicity adjustment.


A
Identification of COVID-19 patients & set-up of raw data
Databases managed by Croatian Institute for Public Health (CIPH) (up to October 31 2021)
Public mass testing points
2453426 PCR & 671031 RAT
test results in 1696877 subjects
492192 positive tests (ICD10 U07.1)
Subjects diagnosed by family physicians (no laboratory testing, clinical and epidmiological criteria)
42390 subjects (ICD10 U07.2)
Subjects diagnosed by PCR test first performed when seeking hospital services (any reason)
23959 subjects (ICD10 U07.1)
530616 ICD10 U07.1 or U07.2 diagnoses
Central Health Information System (all comorbidities - ICD10 codes, issued prescriptions and other care January 1 2019 - October 31 2021)
Link
CIPH-managed database on hospitalizations (January 1 2019 to October 31 2021)
Link
Linked data on 526806 entries
Link
CIPH-managed Vaccination database (up to October 31 2021)
Link
CIPH-managed database on deceased persons (January 1 2019 to October 31 2021)
B
Tidy-up database
Exclude subjects <16 years of age n=48965
Exclude subjects with missing/ erroneous data (birth, testing or vaccination date/status, sex) n=3954
475328 patients with 478849 COVID-19 episodes
Exclude repeated episodes in the same patients. Episodes are separate if ≥30 days between any two of the following: U07.1/ U0.72 entry or hospitalization due to COVID-19 n=3521 episodes excluded
Restrict cut-off time of COVID-19 diagnosis at August 15 2021 to allow for outcomes to occur (till October 31)
Prepare data for analysis
First COVID-19 episodes in 433609 adult patients
Identify "PPI subsets" (see Table 1)
Non-users n=332389
Possible users n= 18170
Users (all) n= 55098
Users 1-3 prescriptions n= 18996
Users 4-7 prescriptions n= 17730
Users ≥8 prescriptions n= 18372
Could not be classified n= 27952
Identify outcomes (to October 31)
Primary
COVID-related death (composite)
COVID-related hospitalization
Secondary
Elements of the composite death
Hospitalization within 14 days of the index COVID-19 diagnosis
Prepare matching covariates
Identify ICD-10 codes up to date of COVID-19 diagnosis.
Identify vaccination status at the time of COVID-19 diagnosis.
Identify prescriptions issued up to date of COVID-19 diagnosis.
(see Table 2)


A Primary outcomes
COVID-19 related death (composite)
COVID-19 related hospitalization (hospitalization 1)
Percent of patients with the outcome
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
1.7
3.3
4.4
6.4
7.9
10.6
5.6
8.7
7.9
10.3
10.3
12.8
3.2
5.5
Non-users n=332389
Possible users n=18170
Users (all) n=55098
Users 1-3 n=18996
Users 4-7 n=17730
Users ≥8 n=18372
Unclassified n=27952
B Secondary outcomes
Death 1
Death 2
Death 3
Hospitalized within 14 days since the index COVID-19 diagnosis (hospitalization 2)
0
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
1.3
1.1
1.4
8.1
3.2
2.9
3.7
14.7
5.8
5.2
6.7
23.1
4.0
3.7
4.7
19.1
5.8
5.2
6.6
23.1
7.7
6.6
8.7
27.3
2.5
2.2
2.6
13.5
Non-users n=332389
Possible users n=18170
Users (all) n=55098
Users 1-3 n=18996
Users 4-7 n=17730
Users ≥8 n=18372
Unclassified n=27952

Treated vs. Control	Analysis	Treated n (%)	Control n (%)	Relative risk RR (95%CI)	Risk difference (%) RD (%) (95%CI)
Possible vs. Non-users	Raw data	803 (4.4)	5599 (1.7)	2.62 (2.45-2.81)	2.73 (2.44, 3.05)
	Primary	295.1 (1.7)	4304.0 (1.4)	1.24 (1.13-1.37)	0.33 (0.14, 0.53)
	Sensitivity	228.1 (1.4)	3429.1 (1.1)	1.22 (1.10-1.36)	0.24 (0.07, 0.43)
Users (all) vs. Non-users	Raw data	4356 (7.9)	5599 (1.7)	4.69 (4.53-4.88)	6.22 (5.99, 6.45)
	Primary	1187.6 (2.5)	6488.4 (2.0)	1.23 (1.16-1.30)	0.45 (0.31, 0.60)
	Sensitivity	747.4 (1.8)	5063.8 (1.6)	1.15 (1.08-1.23)	0.24 (0.11, 0.39)
Users 1-3 vs. Non-users	Raw data	1070 (5.6)	5599 (1.7)	3.34 (3.13-3.57)	3.95 (3.63, 4.29)
	Primary	324.1 (1.8)	4448.5 (1.4)	1.31 (1.19-1.44)	0.43 (0.23, 0.50)
	Sensitivity	225.7 (1.4)	3369.8 (1.1)	1.28 (1.13-1.44)	0.30 (0.13, 0.50)
Users 4-7 vs. Non-users	Raw data	1397 (7.9)	5599 (1.7)	4.68 (4.40-4.94)	6.19 (5.80, 6.60)
	Primary	284.3 (1.8)	4930.8 (1.6)	1.17 (1.06-1.29)	0.26 (0.06, 0.49)
	Sensitivity	169.7 (1.3)	3681.6 (1.2)	1.10 (0.97-1.26)	0.12 (-0.06, 0.34)
Users >=8 vs. Non-users	Raw data	1889 (10.3)	5599 (1.7)	6.10 (5.81-6.41)	8.60 (8.17, 9.05)
	Primary	318.9 (2.1)	5380.0 (1.7)	1.23 (1.09-1.38)	0.38 (0.17, 0.63)
	Sensitivity	164.5 (1.4)	3929.9 (1.3)	1.09 (0.95-1.25)	0.11 (-0.09, 0.35)
Users (all) vs. Possible users	Raw data	4356 (7.9)	803 (4.4)	1.79 (1.67-1.93)	3.48 (3.10, 3.85)
	Primary	1904.4 (4.6)	860.4 (5.0)	0.93 (0.85-1.02)	-0.34 (-0.73, 0.03)
	Sensitivity	1082.8 (3.3)	609.8 (3.7)	0.88 (0.78-0.98)	-0.45 (-0.80, -0.11)
Users 1-3 vs. Possible users	Raw data	1070 (5.6)	803 (4.4)	1.27 (1.17-1.39)	1.21 (0.77, 1.66)
	Primary	566.1 (3.5)	561.3 (3.4)	1.04 (0.92-1.17)	0.14 (-0.26, 0.54)
	Sensitivity	363.2 (2.6)	386.9 (2.5)	1.02 (0.88-1.18)	0.04 (-0.31, 0.41)
Users 4-7 vs. Possible users	Raw data	1397 (7.9)	803 (4.4)	1.78 (1.66-1.94)	3.46 (2.96, 3.96)
	Primary	516.4 (3.9)	744.4 (4.5)	0.88 (0.78-0.99)	-0.55 (-1.00, -0.09)
	Sensitivity	282.6 (2.7)	519.7 (3.4)	0.81 (0.70-0.94)	-0.63 (-1.05, -0.20)
Users >=8 vs. Possible users	Raw data	1889 (10.3)	803 (4.4)	2.33 (2.16-2.53)	5.86 (5.33, 6.40)
	Primary	591.2 (4.9)	897.6 (5.4)	0.90 (0.81-1.01)	-0.53 (-1.04, -0.01)
	Sensitivity	294.1 (3.4)	626.1 (4.1)	0.82 (0.71-0.95)	-0.72 (-1.21, -0.22)



Treated vs. Control	Analysis	Treated n (%)	Control n (%)	Relative risk RR (95%CI)	Risk difference (%) RD (%) (95%CI)
Possible vs. Non-users	Raw data	1160 (6.4)	10905 (3.3)	1.95 (1.83-2.06)	3.10 (2.75, 3.47)
	Primary	630.3 (3.6)	9051.2 (2.9)	1.26 (1.16-1.37)	0.75 (0.41, 0.96)
	Sensitivity	557.7 (3.3)	8146.0 (2.6)	1.25 (1.15-1.37)	0.67 (0.41, 0.96)
Users (all) vs. Non-users	Raw data	5824 (10.6)	10905 (3.3)	3.22 (3.12-3.32)	7.29 (7.03, 7.55)
	Primary	2456.6 (5.1)	11301.8 (3.5)	1.46 (1.38-1.54)	1.59 (1.39, 1.80)
	Sensitivity	1842.0 (4.5)	9831.0 (3.1)	1.46 (1.37-1.56)	1.44 (1.23, 1.65)
Users 1-3 vs. Non-users	Raw data	1646 (8.7)	10905 (3.3)	2.64 (2.51-2.78)	5.38 (4.99, 5.80)
	Primary	844.4 (4.8)	9305.2 (2.9)	1.63 (1.50-1.77)	1.83 (1.53, 2.16)
	Sensitivity	706.8 (4.4)	8214.3 (2.7)	1.64 (1.50-1.80)	1.71 (1.40, 2.04)
Users 4-7 vs. Non-users	Raw data	1830 (10.3)	10905 (3.3)	3.15 (3.01-3.29)	7.04 (6.60, 7.50)
	Primary	615.7 (4.0)	9654.8 (3.0)	1.30 (1.13-1.49)	0.84 (0.54, 1.16)
	Sensitivity	424.0 (3.3)	8374.5 (2.7)	1.21 (1.04-1.42)	0.58 (0.28, 0.91)
Users >=8 vs. Non-users	Raw data	2348 (12.8)	10905 (3.3)	3.89 (3.74-4.06)	9.50 (9.02, 9.99)
	Primary	781.9 (5.2)	9815.0 (3.1)	1.65 (1.36-2.00)	2.02 (1.68, 2.39)
	Sensitivity	539.3 (4.6)	8339.3 (2.7)	1.68 (1.33-2.12)	1.87 (1.50, 2.27)
Users(all) vs. Possible users	Raw data	5824 (10.6)	1160 (6.4)	1.65 (1.56-1.76)	4.19 (3.74, 4.62)
	Primary	2900.0 (7.0)	1169.8 (6.7)	1.04 (0.97-1.13)	0.29 (-0.16, 0.73)
	Sensitivity	1943.7 (5.8)	910.2 (5.5)	1.05 (0.97-1.15)	0.32 (-0.12, 0.75)
Users 1-3 vs. Possible users	Raw data	1646 (8.7)	1160 (6.4)	1.36 (1.27-1.47)	2.28 (1.75, 2.82)
	Primary	1027.7 (6.4)	884.3 (5.4)	1.20 (1.09-1.32)	1.07 (0.56, 1.58)
	Sensitivity	803.4 (5.7)	701.2 (4.6)	1.24 (1.12-1.38)	1.10 (0.60, 1.61)
Users 4-7 vs. Possible users	Raw data	1830 (10.3)	1160 (6.4)	1.62 (1.52-1.75)	3.94 (3.37, 4.51)
	Primary	801.4 (6.1)	1047.5 (6.3)	0.97 (0.87-1.07)	-0.20 (-0.75, 0.35)
	Sensitivity	501.9 (4.9)	812.1 (5.3)	0.92 (0.82-1.04)	-0.40 (-0.94, 0.15)
Users >=8 vs. Possible users	Raw data	2348 (12.8)	1160 (6.4)	2.00 (1.88-2.14)	6.40 (5.80, 7.00)
	Primary	872.1 (7.2)	1141.0 (6.9)	1.05 (0.95-1.16)	0.32 (-0.27, 0.93)
	Sensitivity	516.4 (5.9)	866.4 (5.6)	1.04 (0.92-1.18)	0.25 (-0.35, 0.87)



Primary analysis

Treated vs. Control	Outcome	Treated n (%)	Control n (%)	Relative risk RR (95%CI)	Risk difference (%) RD (%) (95%CI)
Possible vs. Non-users	Death 1	225.7 (1.3)	3443.7 (1.1)	1.19 (1.02-1.35)	0.20 (0.04, 0.38)
	Death 2	194.6 (1.1)	2825.5 (0.9)	1.25 (1.07-1.43)	0.22 (0.07, 0.39)
	Death 3	239.4 (1.4)	3442.9 (1.1)	1.26 (1.09-1.41)	0.28 (0.11, 0.47)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	1537.4 (8.8)	23314.6 (7.4)	1.19 (1.13-1.25)	1.43 (1.00, 1.87)
Users (all) vs. Non-users	Death 1	908.4 (1.9)	5080.8 (1.6)	1.20 (1.11-1.29)	0.31 (0.19, 0.44)
	Death 2	779.3 (1.6)	4250.8 (1.3)	1.23 (1.13-1.32)	0.30 (0.18, 0.42)
	Death 3	976.1 (2.0)	5285.9 (1.6)	1.24 (1.15-1.32)	0.39 (0.26, 0.52)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	5657.7 (11.7)	28764.4 (8.9)	1.32 (1.28-1.36)	2.83 (2.53, 3.13)
Users (all) vs. Possible users	Death 1	1446.9 (3.5)	633.7 (3.7)	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	-0.14 (-0.48, 0.18)
	Death 2	1233.5 (3.0)	552.2 (3.2)	0.94 (0.86-1.04)	-0.19 (-0.51, 0.11)
	Death 3	1566.0 (3.8)	705.8 (4.1)	0.93 (0.86-1.02)	-0.27 (-0.62, 0.07)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	6913.2 (16.8)	2799.2 (16.1)	1.04 (0.99-1.08)	0.63 (-0.03, 1.28)



Sensitivity analysis

Treated vs. Control	Outcome	Treated n (%)	Control n (%)	Relative risk RR (95%CI)	Risk difference (%) RD (%) (95%CI)
Possible vs. Non-users	Death 1	176.7 (1.1)	2762.8 (0.9)	1.16 (0.99-1.33)	0.14 (-0.01, 0.31)
	Death 2	153.4 (0.9)	2237.9 (0.7)	1.24 (1.05-1.45)	0.18 (0.04, 0.33)
	Death 3	183.0 (1.1)	2681.0 (0.9)	1.24 (1.05-1.42)	0.21 (0.06, 0.38)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	1396.5 (8.3)	21199.4 (6.9)	1.19 (1.13-1.25)	1.34 (0.93, 1.77)
Users (all) vs. Non-users	Death 1	588.8 (1.4)	4008.6 (1.3)	1.15 (1.05-1.25)	0.19 (0.07, 0.31)
	Death 2	487.1 (1.2)	3296.7 (1.0)	1.15 (1.05-1.27)	0.16 (0.05, 0.27)
	Death 3	613.6 (1.5)	4063.6 (1.3)	1.18 (1.08-1.28)	0.23 (0.11, 0.36)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	4343.4 (10.7)	25487.1 (8.0)	1.33 (1.29-1.37)	2.66 (2.34, 2.98)
Users (all) vs. Possible users	Death 1	854.1 (2.6)	458.4 (2.8)	0.92 (0.82-1.03)	-0.22 (-0.53, 0.08)
	Death 2	708.2 (2.1)	395.1 (2.4)	0.89 (0.78-0.99)	-0.28 (-0.56, 0.00)
	Death 3	885.2 (2.7)	498.2 (3.0)	0.88 (0.79-0.98)	-0.37 (-0.69, -0.06)
	Hospitalized within 14 days	4821.5 (14.5)	2280.9 (13.9)	1.04 (0.99-1.09)	0.61 (-0.04, 1.26)