medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Comparative Effectiveness of Second-line Antihyperglycemic Agents for Cardiovascular Outcomes: A Large-scale, Multinational, Federated Analysis of the LEGEND-T2DM Study

Rohan Khera MD[1,2,3], Arya Aminorroaya MD[1], Lovedeep Singh Dhingra MBBS[1], Phyllis M Thangaraj MD[1], Aline Pedroso Camargos MS[1], Fan Bu PhD[4], Xiyu Ding MS[5], Akihiko Nishimura PhD[5], Tara V Anand BS[6], Faaizah Arshad BS[7], Clair Blacketer MPH[8], Yi Chai PhD[9], Shounak Chattopadhyay PhD[7], Michael Cook BSc[5], David A Dorr MD[10], Talita Duarte-Salles PhD[11,12], Scott L DuVall PhD[13,14], Thomas Falconer MS[6], Tina E French RN[15,16], Elizabeth E Hanchrow MSN[15,16], Guneet Kaur[17], Wallis CY Lau PhD[18,19,20,21], Jing Li MS[22], Kelly Li BS[7], Yuntian Liu MPH[1,2], Yuan Lu ScD[1], Kenneth KC Man PhD[18,19,20,21], Michael E Matheny MD[15,16], Nestoras Mathioudakis MD[23], Jody-Ann McLeggon MPH[6], Michael F McLemore RN[15,16], Evan Minty MD[24], Daniel R Morales MD[17], Paul Nagy PhD[23], Anna Ostropolets PhD[8], Andrea Pistillo MSc[11], Thanh-Phuc Phan MBA[25], Nicole Pratt PhD[26], Carlen Reyes MD[11], Lauren Richter MD[6], Joseph Ross MD[27,2], Elise Ruan MD[6], Sarah L Seager BS[28], Katherine R Simon AA[15,16], Benjamin Viernes PhD[13,14], Jianxiao Yang MS[29], Can Yin MS[30], Seng Chan You MD[31,32], Jin J Zhou PhD[7,33], Patrick B Ryan PhD[6], Martijn J Schuemie PhD[34], Harlan M Krumholz MD[2,1,35], George Hripcsak MD[6], Marc A Suchard PhD[7,36,37,13]

[1]Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 06510, USA
[2]Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation (CORE), Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT, 06510, USA
[3]Section of Health Informatics, Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, 06520, USA
[4]Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, Ann Arbor, MI, 48105, USA
[5]Department of Biostatistics, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA
[6]Department of Biomedical Informatics, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, NY, 10027, USA
[7]Department of Biostatistics, Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 90095, USA
[8]Observational Health Data Analytics, Janssen Research and Development, LLC, Titusville, NJ, 8560, USA
[9]Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong
[10]Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA
[11]Fundació Institut Universitari per a la recerca a l'Atenció Primària de Salut Jordi Gol i Gurina (IDIAPJGol), Barcelona, 8007, Spain
[12]Department of Medical Informatics, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
[13]Veterans Affairs Informatics and Computing Infrastructure, United States Department of Veterans Affairs, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

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/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[14]Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
[15]Tennessee Valley Healthcare System, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA
[16]Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA
[17]Division of Population Health and Genomics, School of Medicine, University of Dundee, Dundee, DD1 9SY, United Kingdom
[18]Research Department of Practice and Policy, School of Pharmacy, University College London, London, WC1H 9JP, United Kingdom
[19]Centre for Medicines Optimisation Research and Education, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
[20]Centre for Safe Medication Practice and Research, Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong
[21]Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health (D24H), Hong Kong Science Park, Hong Kong, Hong Kong
[22]Data Transformation, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence, Real World Solutions, IQVIA, Durham, NC, USA
[23]Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and Metabolism, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
[24]Faculty of Medicine, O'Brien Institute for Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, T2N4N1, Canada
[25]School of Pharmacy, Taipei Medical University
[26]Quality Use of Medicines and Pharmacy Research Centre, UniSA Clinical and Health Sciences, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia
[27]Section of General Medicine and National Clinician Scholars Program, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
[28]Data Transformation, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence, Real World Solutions, IQVIA, London, UK
[29]Department of Computational Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 90095, USA
[30]Data Transformation, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence, Real World Solutions, IQVIA, Shanghai, China
[31]Department of Biomedical Systems Informatics, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea
[32]Institute for Innovation in Digital Healthcare, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea
[33]Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 90024, USA
[34]Epidemiology, Office of the Chief Medical Officer, Johnson & Johnson, Titusville, NJ, 8560, USA
[35]Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, 06510, USA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[36]Department of Biomathematics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
[37]Department of Human Genetics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Correspondence to:
Marc A Suchard, MD, PhD
Departments of Biomathematics, Biostatistics and Human Genetics
6558 Gonda Building, 695 Charles E. Young Drive, South Los Angeles, CA 90095-1766
(310) 825-7442; msuchard@ucla.edu; @suchard_group

Word count: 3499
Number of references: 69
Number of figures/tables: 5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background: SGLT2 inhibitors (SGLT2is) and GLP-1 receptor agonists (GLP1-RAs) reduce major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). However, their effectiveness relative to each other and other second-line antihyperglycemic agents is unknown, without any major ongoing head-to-head trials.

Methods: Across the LEGEND-T2DM network, we included ten federated international data sources, spanning 1992-2021. We identified 1,492,855 patients with T2DM and established cardiovascular disease (CVD) on metformin monotherapy who initiated one of four second-line agents (SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor [DPP4is], sulfonylureas [SUs]). We used large-scale propensity score models to conduct an active comparator, target trial emulation for pairwise comparisons. After evaluating empirical equipoise and population generalizability, we fit on-treatment Cox proportional hazard models for 3-point MACE (myocardial infarction, stroke, death) and 4-point MACE (3-point MACE + heart failure hospitalization) risk, and combined hazard ratio (HR) estimates in a random-effects meta-analysis.

Findings: Across cohorts, 16·4%, 8·3%, 27·7%, and 47·6% of individuals with T2DM initiated SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, and SUs, respectively. Over 5·2 million patient-years of follow-up and 489 million patient-days of time at-risk, there were 25,982 3-point MACE and 41,447 4-point MACE events. SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with a lower risk for 3-point MACE compared with DPP4is (HR 0·89 [95% CI, 0·79-1·00] and 0·83 [0·70-0·98]), and SUs (HR 0·76 [0·65-0·89] and 0·71 [0·59-0·86]). DPP4is were associated with a lower 3-point MACE risk versus SUs (HR 0·87 [0·79-0·95]). The pattern was consistent for 4-point MACE for the comparisons above. There were no significant differences between SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs for 3-point or 4-point MACE (HR 1·06 [0·96-1·17] and 1·05 [0·97-1·13]).

Interpretation: In patients with T2DM and established CVD, we found comparable cardiovascular risk reduction with SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs, with both agents more effective than

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DPP4is, which in turn were more effective than SUs. These findings suggest that the use of GLP1-RAs and SGLT2is should be prioritized as second-line agents in those with established CVD.

Funding: National Institutes of Health, United States Department of Veterans Affairs

Keywords: Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2; Hypoglycemic Agents; Glucagon-Like Peptide-1 Receptor Agonists; Sodium-Glucose Transporter 2 Inhibitors; Comparative Effectiveness Research; Cardiovascular Diseases

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

Evidence before this study

Sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2is) and glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP1-RAs) exert cardiovascular benefits beyond blood glucose control, transforming the landscape of treating type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) over the past decade. Large randomized clinical trials have substantiated the cardiovascular benefits of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs in decreasing major adverse cardiovascular events. However, trials of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs have not been designed as head-to-head comparisons with each other or older antihyperglycemic agents such as dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors (DPP4is) and sulfonylureas (SUs). Therefore, the comparative cardiovascular effectiveness of these antihyperglycemic agents is not established. Recent work also shows a substantial proportion of patients with T2DM are often initiated on DPP4is and SUs in the absence of information on their cardiovascular effectiveness. These knowledge gaps in evidence challenge the development of treatment recommendations based on cardiovascular risk profiles in T2DM.

Added value of this study

The Large-scale Evidence Generation and Evaluation across a Network of Databases for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (LEGEND-T2DM) initiative is a large-scale, systematic, federated evaluation of individuals with T2DM across multiple international observational data sources, where we leveraged robust state-of-the-art methodological and analytic strategies to minimize residual confounding, publication bias, and p-hacking. In this largest study of 1·5 million patients with T2DM and established cardiovascular disease (CVD) across ten cohorts from four countries initiating a second-line antihyperglycemic agent — SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, or SUs — after metformin monotherapy, SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with an 11% and 17% lower risk of cardiovascular events compared with DPP4is, respectively. All three agents were associated with lower cardiovascular events than SUs, with 24% and 28% lower risk with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs, and 12% lower risk with DPP4is. These patterns were consistent across both ischemic events, such as MI and stroke, as well as for heart failure.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our study defines strong empirical evidence in support of contemporary clinical practice guidelines that suggest SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs are used for those with T2DM and CVD. Our observations also provide support for exclusive second-line use of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs among those with CVD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the therapeutic options for type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) have undergone a significant transformation.[1,2] Sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2is) and glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP1-RAs) have expanded the role of antihyperglycemic agents from managing high blood glucose to addressing the elevated cardiovascular risk in patients with T2DM.[3–6] In several large randomized clinical trials (RCTs), SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs reduced major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), such as myocardial infarction (MI), hospitalization for heart failure, and cardiovascular mortality.[7–14] While older antihyperglycemic agents, like sulfonylureas (SUs), have not undergone similarly comprehensive trials to evaluate their cardiovascular efficacy or safety, some studies suggested their neutral effect on cardiovascular outcomes and risk of hypoglycemia.[15–17] Furthermore, direct comparisons of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs with dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors (DPP4is), which are antihyperglycemic agents with neutral effects on MACE, have not been conducted and no major trials are in progress. Nevertheless, DPP4is and SUs continue to be used in clinical practice and are recommended as second-line T2DM agents in national clinical practice guidelines.[18–22]

Despite the availability of evidence from SGLT2i and GLP1-RA trials, several gaps in evidence challenge the development of treatment recommendations in T2DM.[18,23,24] Specifically, trials of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were not designed as head-to-head comparisons with older agents but rather as additive treatments on top of commonly used T2DM agents.[8,9,25] As a result, the relative cardiovascular efficacy of newer versus older agents is not known. Moreover, the comparative cardiovascular efficacy of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs have not been evaluated. Thus far, comparative effectiveness assessments have been based on indirect estimates from clinical trials or comparative effectiveness drawn from a limited number of data sources.[26–28] The findings from observational studies using single data sources are challenged by our observations that the uptake of these agents, and therefore, the selective pressures on the use

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of these agents, varies considerably across sites,[21] with the potential to introduce bias in the evaluation of comparative effectiveness. These evidence gaps pose a significant challenge in designing treatment algorithms that rely on the comparative effectiveness and safety of drugs.[24] As a result, there is a large variation in clinical practice guidelines and clinical practice with regard to these medications, with many patients initiated on the newer therapies and many others treated with older regimens.[21,29]

To address this, we conducted the Large-scale Evidence Generation and Evaluation across a Network of Databases for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (LEGEND-T2DM) initiative,[30] a large-scale, systematic, federated evaluation of 4·7 million patients with T2DM across multiple international observational data sources, where we leveraged robust state-of-the-art methodological and analytic strategies to minimize residual confounding, publication bias, and p-hacking. Here, we compared the cardiovascular effectiveness of four second-line antihyperglycemic agents — SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, or SUs — when initiated on the background of metformin therapy in T2DM.

METHODS

Data Sources

In this study, we included ten real-world data sources from the LEGEND-T2DM network, including six administrative claims and four EHR databases across four countries during 1992-2021 (**figure 1**). These represent data from six national-level and four health-system datasets from the US, as well as data sources from Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom. The vast majority of patient records span from the mid-2000s to today, covering two decades of T2DM treatment as well as the introduction of many second-line antihyperglycemic agents. All LEGEND-T2DM data sources were previously standardized to the Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics (OHDSI)'s Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership (OMOP) common data model (CDM) version 5,[31] which mapped international coding systems into

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

standard vocabulary concepts. The use of the OMOP CDM allows a federated analysis of data, without patient-level data sharing, using consistent cohort definitions and study design. All data partners received institutional approval or exemption for their participation. Details of data sources are presented in **appendix pp 17-19**.

Study Design

We identified patients with T2DM and established cardiovascular disease (CVD) on metformin monotherapy who initiated on any of the drug ingredients within one of the SGLT2i, GLP1-RA, DPP4i, or SU drug classes (**appendix pp 2-10**, **20**).[21] Each exposure cohort thus consists of new users of each drug class. We require patients with T2DM and CVD to have at least one year of prior observation in the database, with at least 3 months of prior metformin use before initiating a second-line agent, and no prior exposure to a comparator second-line or other antihyperglycemic agent or more than 30 days of insulin exposure (**appendix pp 2-10**). To ensure statistical power, we executed analyses for comparisons and data sources with at least 1,000 patients in each arm. To evaluate the comparative effectiveness of antihyperglycemic agents, we constructed target–comparator–database combinations, where we compared one antihyperglycemic agent (target) with another agent (comparator) across data sources.
For this, we employed a new-user cohort design for target and comparator agents within each data source in order to emulate the hypothetical target trial.[32,33] Methodological principles in the study design have been carefully constructed based on the evidence by experts and were leveraged previously to minimize bias and improve reproducibility.[30,34]

Study Outcomes

Across all data sources and pairwise exposure cohorts, we assess the relative risks of two primary and four secondary cardiovascular outcomes. The two primary outcomes of interest are (1) 3-point MACE, including acute MI, stroke, and sudden cardiac death, and (2) 4-point MACE,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

which additionally includes hospitalization for heart failure. Secondary outcomes of interest include the four individual MACE components. We construct outcome cohorts based on previously developed phenotypes validated and tested in prior work (**appendix pp 11-14**).[34–39]

For each outcome cohort, we included patients with no events prior to treatment initiation and defined continuous drug exposure as consecutive drug prescriptions with less than 30-day prescription gaps. We considered an on-treatment time-at-risk (TAR) definition that follows a patient from treatment initiation to treatment discontinuation, which captures direct treatment effects while allowing for escalation with additional T2DM agents.

Statistical Analysis

We employed a systematic federated analytic framework to address residual confounding, publication bias, and p-hacking.[30,40] This framework uses data-driven, large-scale propensity score (PS) adjustment for measured confounding,[41] a large set of negative control outcome experiments to address unmeasured confounding and systematic bias,[42–44] study diagnostics to ensure validity and generalizability,[44,45] and a principled meta-analysis approach to aggregate evidence across data sources. We used standardized vocabularies to construct consistent computable definitions of all study cohorts, covariates, and outcomes. We provide full disclosure of all hypotheses investigated and pre-specify and report all analytical procedures in the published protocol of LEGEND-T2DM.[30] To promote open science and avoid publication bias, we have disseminated all results in a publicly available R ShinyApp (https://data.ohdsi.org/LegendT2dmClassEvidenceExplorer/), and all analytic code is publicly available on GitHub (https://github.com/ohdsi-studies/LegendT2dm).

Within each data source, we estimated the relative risks of all six outcomes between each pair of new-user cohorts, taking one exposure cohort as the target and the other as a comparator. For each pairwise comparison and each data source, we adjusted for measured confounding and improved balance between cohorts through both matching and stratifying on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PS.[46] We estimated the PS by a data-driven approach that adjusts for a broad range of predefined baseline patient characteristics through regularized regression.[41] These characteristics included demographics, comorbidities, concomitant medication use, and healthcare utilization in the period before the initiation of the second-line antihyperglycemic agent. The choice of PS stratification vs. matching was based on the approach that achieves a standardized mean difference (SMD) <0·15 across all covariates.[47] When both stratification and matching provide sufficient balance, we preferred stratification over matching and thus reported results based on stratification when available, as the former improves patient inclusion and, therefore, generalizability. We then used Cox proportional hazards models to estimate hazard ratios (HRs) of each outcome for each comparison, conditional on PS stratification or variable-ratio patient matching.

We also sought to address residual bias, which may persist in observational studies even after PS adjustment that controls for measured confounding.[42,43] For this, we conducted negative control (falsification) outcome experiments for each comparison and outcome, where the null hypothesis of no differential effect (i.e., HR = 1) is believed to be true for each outcome. We selected 100 negative controls through a data-driven algorithm that identifies OMOP condition concept occurrences with similar prevalence to the outcomes of interest that lack evidence of association with exposures in published literature, drug–product labels, and spontaneous reports, which we then confirmed by expert review (**appendix p 15**).[48] We list these negative controls in **appendix pp 21-22**. From these negative control experiments, we learn an empirical null distribution that informs residual study bias, i.e., a deviation from the empirical null across all outcomes represents a quantitative surrogate for the residual bias. We calibrate each original HR estimate to compute a calibrated HR estimate and 95% confidence interval (CI).[42] We declare an HR as significantly different from the null if the calibrated p-value is <0·05 without considering multiple testing corrections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We assessed, while blinded to the results, study diagnostics to ensure reliability and generalizability for all comparisons and only report estimates that pass the diagnostics.[44,45] These study diagnostics included (1) minimum detectable risk ratio (MDRR) as a metric for statistical power, (2) preference score distributions between the target and comparator cohorts to evaluate empirical equipoise and population generalizability, and (3) cohort balance before and after propensity score (PS) adjustment, defined by the absolute SMDs on extensive patient characteristics. A study passed diagnostics if MDRR was less than 4, and >25% of patients had a preference score between 0·3 and 0·7 on both arms and maximum SMD <0·15 after PS adjustment. Additional diagnostics for visual examination included (4) calibration plots on negative control outcomes to examine residual bias, and (5) Kaplan-Meier plots to check proportionality assumptions for the Cox models.

We reported all HR estimates, their 95% CIs, and p-values post-calibration for studies that passed diagnostics. To aggregate evidence across non-overlapping data sources, we combined all calibrated HR estimates for each comparison using a random effects meta-analysis approach.[49]

RESULTS

Cohort Characteristics

Across ten federated longitudinal data sources from four countries, we identified 4,730,887 patients with T2DM. This included 1,492,855 patients with T2DM and established CVD on metformin monotherapy who initiated one of the four second-line antihyperglycemic agents and had no prior use of any other antihyperglycemic agents (**figure 1**, **appendix p 17**). Among these patients, 244,694 (16·4%) initiated SGLT2is, 123,991 (8·3%) GLP1-RAs, 413,236 (27·7%) DPP4is, and 710,934 (47·6%) SUs (**table 1**). US Open Claims (USOC) with 1,163,413 patients with T2DM and established CVD, followed by Optum Clinformatics Extended Data Mart - Date of Death (OCEDM) (N=80,159) and Optum de-identified Electronic Health Record Dataset

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(OEHR) (N=66,417) contributed the most patients to the study population. Median on-treatment time-at-risk for patients varied by drug class and database between 2·0 and 23·2 months. At least 25% of the patients were exposed to their first drug class for more than 12 months across a majority of databases (**table 1**).

Addressing Confounding Across Target-Comparator-Database Combinations

PS adjustment achieved pre-specified covariate balance in patient baseline characteristics for pairwise class comparisons across all databases (**figure 2**, **appendix pp 23-108**). The maximum SMD across target–comparator–database combinations consistently decreased after PS stratification (**figure 2**). For example, in comparison of patients initiating SGLT2is (target) with patients initiating DPP4is (comparator) in the IBM MarketScan Commercial Claims and Encounters (CCAE) database, before PS adjustment, patients initiating SGLT2is were more frequently men and had obesity and heart failure relative to patients initiating DPP4is. However, after PS adjustment, the SGLT2is or DPP4is populations were well balanced on all demographic and clinical patient characteristics (**appendix pp 33-34**).

Empirical Equipoise Across Target-Comparator-Database Combinations

For most data sources, all executed class comparisons were in empirical equipoise (>25% of patients had preference scores between 0·3 and 0·7 on both arms) (**appendix pp 146-155**). GDA, SIDIAP, and VA databases showed less equipoise for comparisons involving SGLT2is and DPP4is. However, in general, PS adjustment achieved sufficient covariate balance in terms of preference score distribution to reduce concerns that measured the estimated effects of baseline confounding biases (**appendix pp 156-175**). Furthermore, the study had limited residual systematic error, where calibration of effect estimates using negative control outcomes resulted in an increase in the proportion of nominal 95% CIs that included 1 for control outcomes across a majority of comparisons and databases (**appendix pp 176-195**). For

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

example, for SGLT2is vs DPP4is comparison in SIDIAP using PS matching, before calibration, the nominal CIs covered 75·0% of control estimates; after calibration, they covered 91·7% (**appendix p 192**).

Comparative Effectiveness for Primary Endpoints

During 1,337,809 patient-years of follow-up, there were 25,982 3-point MACE and 41,447 4-point MACE events. SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with a lower hazard of 3-point MACE compared with DPP4is (HR 0·89 [95% CI, 0·79-1·00] and 0·83 [0·70-0·98], respectively), and with even lower HRs of 0·76 (95% CI, 0·65-0·89) and 0·72 (95% CI, 0·58-0·88) versus SUs, respectively. DPP4is were associated with a lower risk of 3-point MACE risk versus SUs (0·87 [0·79-0·95]). A consistent pattern was observed for 4-point MACE across the above-mentioned comparisons. In direct comparisons of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs, there were no differences in either 3-point or 4-point MACE (1·06 [0·96-1·17], and 1·05 [0·97-1·13], respectively) (**appendix pp 109-121, figure 3**).

Comparative Effectiveness for Secondary Endpoints

Acute MI

There were 13,536 episodes of acute MI across data sources during the follow-up. SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, and DPP4is were associated with a lower hazard of acute MI compared with SUs (0·81 [0·69-0·95], 0·70 [0·56-0·87], and 0·86 [0·77-0·95], respectively). While GLP1-RAs were associated with a lower risk of acute MI compared with DPP4is (0·85 [0·73-0·99]), the hazard of acute MI was comparable for SGLT2is vs DPP4is (0·95 [0·83-1·08]). Compared with GLP1-RAs, SGLT2is were associated with a higher hazard of acute MI (1·19 [1·05-1·35]) (**appendix pp 109, 122-127, figure 3**).

Stroke

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

There were 13,999 episodes of stroke events across data sources during the follow-up. SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, and DPP4is were associated with a lower hazard of stroke compared with SUs (0·77 [0·65-0·92], 0·79 [0·63-0·98], and 0·90 [0·81-0·99], respectively). Compared with DPP4is, SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs had a comparable hazard of stroke (0·89 [0·74-1·07] and 0·89 [0·77-1·03], respectively). There was no significant difference between SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs (0·93 [0·82-1·05]) regarding the hazard of stroke (**appendix pp 109, 128-133, figure 3**).

SCD

Over follow-up, 3,789 SCD occurred across data sources. SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with a lower hazard of SCD compared with DPP4is (0·62 (0·51-0·75), and 0·65 [0·44-0·96], respectively) and SUs (0·60 [0·48-0·73], and 0·57 [0·42-0·78], respectively). DPP4is versus SUs and SGLT2is versus GLP1-RAs had comparable hazards of SCD (0·96 [0·81-1·13], and 1·11 [0·84-1·45], respectively) (**appendix pp 109, 134-139, figure 3**).

HF Hospitalization

During the follow-up, 30,743 HF hospitalizations were recorded across all databases. SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with a lower risk of HF hospitalization compared with DPP4is (0·80 [0·68-0·95] and 0·76 [0·67-0·86], respectively) and SUs (0·68 [0·58-0·80] and 0·64 [0·52-0·78], respectively). DPP4is were associated with a lower hazard of HF hospitalization compared with SUs (0·90 [0·82-0·99]). Compared with GLP1-RAs, SGLT2is had a comparable hazard for HF hospitalization (1·02 [0·93-1·12]) (**appendix pp 109, 140-145, figure 3**).

Sensitivity Analyses

Across all outcomes, 98·4% (690/701) of calibrated relative risk estimates remained within the confidence intervals of the primary meta-analysis when systematically removing each data source from the leave-one-out meta-analysis. Within the primary endpoints of 3-point MACE

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and 4-point MACE and secondary endpoints of acute MI and hospitalization for heart failure, none of the leave-one-out analyses were outside of the confidence intervals of the meta-analysis (**figure 4, appendix pp 196-201**).

DISCUSSION

In this largest, multinational, federated study of 1·5 million patients with T2DM and established CVD across ten cohorts initiating a second-line antihyperglycemic agent after metformin monotherapy, SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs were associated with an 11% and 17% lower risk of cardiovascular events compared with DPP4is, respectively, the class of drugs approved before the US FDA-mandated cardiovascular outcomes trials for antihyperglycemic agents.[50,51] All three agents were associated with lower cardiovascular events than SUs, with 24% and 28% lower risk with SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs and 12% lower risk with DPP4is. These patterns were consistent across both ischemic events, such as MI and stroke, as well as for heart failure. Between SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs, there was no difference in composite cardiovascular effectiveness outcomes – both 3-point and 4-point MACE, but there was a lower risk of acute MI with GLP1-RAs compared with SGLT2is. The study accounted for multiple null control outcomes and calibrated all estimates for residual bias on null control outcomes, with multiple sensitivity analyses confirming the findings of the primary analysis.

This builds on the evidence of comparative cardiovascular effectiveness of currently used antihyperglycemic therapies, especially in the absence of head-to-head RCTs of any of these agents. There are no ongoing or future trials expected to fill this knowledge gap. A few observational studies have used single data sources to evaluate the cardiovascular outcomes associated with these drugs.[52–56] Moreover, some associations observed in the present study, such as those with DPP4i, contrast with others where the smaller study population may have necessitated studying a combination of drugs directly against SU but challenges isolating an effect.[57] These analyses are limited by local patterns of treatment use and challenges with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

exposure and outcome ascertainment in individual sources that may confound the observed association of these agents with outcomes. Our recent work shows that the use of antihyperglycemic agents varies substantially in populations across the world.[21] In the present study, we developed the target trial for head-to-head of these agents, focusing explicitly on the same disease stage, i.e. when escalation to a second-line agent is being initiated. We conducted the same study across ten different data sources, ensuring that the effects of the intervention were not limited to the selective pressures or outcome differences in a single population. We ensured the empirical equipoise by comparing SMDs before and after PS stratification. Finally, we ensured that unmeasured confounding, potentially manifesting as directional effects across several negative control outcomes, were used to calibrate the PS stratified effect estimates.

The findings have important implications for clinical practice. Current clinical practice guidelines offer the use of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs as suggested agents to be used among those with existing cardiovascular risk.[18,23,58] We find strong evidence supportive of that suggestion. However, our recent work shows a substantial proportion of patients with T2DM are often initiated on DPP4is and SUs despite their limited cardiovascular effectiveness or known superiority on other glycemic or other diabetes-related outcomes.[59–61] Our observations would favor stronger support for exclusive second-line use of SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs among individuals with established CVD. There is also evidence that suggests a potentially larger reduction in risk of acute MI with GLP1-RAs compared with SGLT2is, which were not replicated for stroke, questioning whether the current guideline recommendation for preferential use of GLP1-RAs in ASCVD is appropriate. Moreover, we did not observe an exclusive role of decreased HF risk with SGLT2i, as suggested in current guidelines, as there was no observed difference in HF risk among those receiving SGLT2i or GLP1-RA. The original recommendations for HF were based on inference from RCTs of individual agents and emerging evidence, such as from the STEP2-HFpEF trial that found improvements in heart

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

failure outcomes with semaglutide support the potential role of GLP1-RAs on HF outcomes as well.[62] Our study favors the continued evaluation of GLP1-RA as a therapy to reduce HF risk and improve outcomes of those with HF.[63,64]

There are limitations that merit consideration. First, to enable the ability to capture information across data sources spanning administrative and EHR data sources necessitated the use of administrative definitions of both exposures and outcomes. However, to ensure the information is accurately captured, we used definitions that have been validated in prior studies.[65–67] Second, we expect the identification of the exposure and outcomes to vary across data sources. However, the consistency of effect estimates across data sources further confirms the validity of the observations. Third, capturing outcomes for EHR-based datasets, such as for recurrent hospitalizations and deaths, differs from administrative sources that track events across institutions and capture out-of-hospital death events.[68,69] However, we find that sources that capture cross-institution out-of-hospital information did not differ and had similar outcomes as those that focused on institutionally captured death events, further supporting the robustness of the drug association with outcomes. Fourth, we do not have information on adherence to therapies and whether differential adherence of agents would confound the observations. However, these agents are widely used without substantial adverse effects.[18,19] Moreover, lack of adherence will likely bias these observations to the null, and the observed positive association across agents with known cardiovascular benefits suggests that it is not driving the observed associations. Finally, inference on all outcomes can still be subject to residual confounding. However, our use of calibrated estimates explicitly addresses the identification of residual confounding across a series of null control outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS

Our large, rigorous multinational network study of patients with T2DM and established CVD found cardiovascular risk reduction with SGLT2is and GLP1-RAs, with both agents more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

effective than DPP4is, which in turn were more effective than SUs. These findings suggest that the use of GLP1-RAs and SGLT2is should be prioritized as second-line agents in those with established CVD.

Declaration of interests

RK is an Associate Editor at JAMA and received support from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (under award K23 HL153775) and the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (under award, 2022060). He also receives research support, through Yale, from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Novo Nordisk, and BridgeBio. He is a coinventor of U.S. Provisional Patent Applications 63/619,241, 63/606,203, 63/177,117, 63/346,610, 63/428,569, and 63/484,426, unrelated to current work. He is also a co-founder of Evidence2Health and Ensight-AI, both representing precision health platforms to improve evidence-based cardiovascular care. SLD reports grants from Alnylam Pharmaceuticals, Inc., AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Biodesix, Inc, Celgene Corporation, Cerner Enviza, GSK PLC, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Novartis International AG, Parexel International Corporation through the University of Utah or Western Institute for Veteran Research outside the submitted work. KKCM receives support from C W Maplethorpe Fellowship, National Institute of Health Research, UK, European Commission Framwork Horizon 2020, Hong Kong Research Grant Council, Innovation and Technology Commission of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region Government, outside the submitted work. DRM was supported by a Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Fellowship (214588/Z/18/Z). In the past three years, HMK received expenses and/or personal fees from UnitedHealth, Element Science, Aetna, Reality Labs, Tesseract/4Catalyst, F-Prime, the Siegfried and Jensen Law Firm, Arnold and Porter Law Firm, and Martin/Baughman Law Firm. He is a co-founder of Refactor Health and HugoHealth, and is associated with contracts, through Yale New Haven Hospital, from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and through Yale University from Johnson & Johnson. SCY

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

reports being a Chief Technology Officer of PHI Digital Healthcare. JRT currently receives research support through Yale University from Johnson and Johnson to develop methods of clinical trial data sharing, from the Food and Drug Administration for the Yale-Mayo Clinic Center for Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) program (U01 FD005938), from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (R01 HS022882), and from Arnold Ventures; formerly received research support from the Medical Device Innovation Consortium as part of the National Evaluation System for Health Technology (NEST) and from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) (R01 HS025164, R01 HL144644); and in addition, JRT was an expert witness at the request of Relator's attorneys, the Greene Law Firm, in a qui tam suit alleging violations of the False Claims Act and Anti-Kickback Statute against Biogen Inc. that was settled September 2022. PMT is a coinventor of a provisional patent 63/606,203 unrelated to the current work and is funded by 5T32 HL155000-03. CB, AO, and PBR are employees of Johnson & Johnson and MJS is an employee and shareholder of Johnson & Johnson. Other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

This study was partially funded through the National Institutes of Health grants K23 HL153775, R01 LM006910, R01 HG006139 and R01 HL169954, and the US Department of Veterans Affairs under the research priority to "Put VA Data to Work for Veterans" (VA ORD 22-D4V). The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the protocol; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1 Prattichizzo F, La Sala L, Rydén L, *et al.* Glucose-lowering therapies in patients with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular diseases. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2019; **26**: 73–80.

2 Ansari MA, Chauhan W, Shoaib S, *et al.* Emerging therapeutic options in the management of diabetes: recent trends, challenges and future directions. *Int J Obes* 2023; : 1–21.

3 Pablo A, Evelyn B, Claudia F, Yanina MA. GLP-1RA and SGLT2i: Cardiovascular Impact on Diabetic Patients. *Curr Hypertens Rev* 2021; **17**: 149–58.

4 Andrikou E, Tsioufis C, Andrikou I, Leontsinis I, Tousoulis D, Papanas N. GLP-1 receptor agonists and cardiovascular outcome trials: An update. *Hellenic J Cardiol* 2019; **60**: 347–51.

5 Hernandez AF, Green JB, Janmohamed S, *et al.* Albiglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease (Harmony Outcomes): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018; **392**: 1519–29·

6 Solomon SD, McMurray JJV, Claggett B, *et al.* Dapagliflozin in Heart Failure with Mildly Reduced or Preserved Ejection Fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **387**: 1089–98.

7 Pfeffer MA, Claggett B, Diaz R, *et al.* Lixisenatide in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes and Acute Coronary Syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **373**: 2247–57.

8 Marso SP, Daniels GH, Brown-Frandsen K, *et al.* Liraglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016; **375**: 311–22.

9 Marso SP, Bain SC, Consoli A, *et al.* Semaglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. N. Engl. J. Med. 2016; **375**: 1834–44.

10 Holman RR, Bethel MA, Mentz RJ, *et al.* Effects of Once-Weekly Exenatide on Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **377**: 1228–39.

11 Gerstein HC, Colhoun HM, Dagenais GR, *et al.* Dulaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes (REWIND): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2019; **394**: 121–30.

12 Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, *et al.* Dapagliflozin and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019; **380**: 347–57.

13 Zinman B, Bhosekar V, Busch R, *et al.* Semaglutide once weekly as add-on to SGLT-2 inhibitor therapy in type 2 diabetes (SUSTAIN 9): a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019; **7**: 356–67.

14 Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, *et al.* Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular and Renal Events in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **377**: 644–57.

15 Leiter LA. Latest Evidence on Sulfonylureas: What's New? *Diabetes Ther* 2020; **11**: 15–22.

16 Vaccaro O, Masulli M, Nicolucci A, *et al.* Effects on the incidence of cardiovascular events of the addition of pioglitazone versus sulfonylureas in patients with type 2 diabetes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

inadequately controlled with metformin (TOSCA.IT): a randomised, multicentre trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017; **5**: 887–97.

17 Rosenstock J, Kahn SE, Johansen OE, *et al.* Effect of Linagliptin vs Glimepiride on Major Adverse Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: The CAROLINA Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2019; **322**: 1155–66.

18 American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 9. Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment: Standards of Care in Diabetes-2024. *Diabetes Care* 2024; **47**: S158–78.

19 Cosentino F, Grant PJ, Aboyans V, *et al.* 2019 ESC Guidelines on diabetes, pre-diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases developed in collaboration with the EASD. *Eur Heart J* 2020; **41**: 255–323.

20 Buse JB, Wexler DJ, Tsapas A, *et al.* 2019 Update to: Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes, 2018. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2020; **43**: 487–93.

21 Khera R, Dhingra LS, Aminorroaya A, *et al.* Multinational patterns of second line antihyperglycaemic drug initiation across cardiovascular risk groups: federated pharmacoepidemiological evaluation in LEGEND-T2DM. *BMJ Med* 2023; **2**: e000651.

22 Garber AJ, Handelsman Y, Grunberger G, *et al.* Consensus Statement by the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and American College of Endocrinology on the Comprehensive Type 2 Diabetes Management Algorithm – 2020 Executive Summary. *Endocr Pract* 2020; **26**: 107–39.

23 Blonde L, Umpierrez GE, Reddy SS, *et al.* American Association of Clinical Endocrinology Clinical Practice Guideline: Developing a Diabetes Mellitus Comprehensive Care Plan-2022 Update. *Endocr Pract* 2022; **28**: 923–1049.

24 Tobias DK, Merino J, Ahmad A, *et al.* Second international consensus report on gaps and opportunities for the clinical translation of precision diabetes medicine. *Nat Med* 2023; **29**: 2438–57.

25 Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, *et al.* Empagliflozin, Cardiovascular Outcomes, and Mortality in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **373**: 2117–28.

26 Fu EL, Clase CM, Janse RJ, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of SGLT2i versus GLP1-RA on cardiovascular outcomes in routine clinical practice. *Int J Cardiol* 2022; **352**: 172–9.

27 Giugliano D, Longo M, Signoriello S, *et al.* The effect of DPP-4 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists and SGLT-2 inhibitors on cardiorenal outcomes: a network meta-analysis of 23 CVOTs. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2022; **21**: 42.

28 Gilbert MP, Pratley RE. GLP-1 Analogs and DPP-4 Inhibitors in Type 2 Diabetes Therapy: Review of Head-to-Head Clinical Trials. *Front Endocrinol* 2020; **11**: 178.

29 Nargesi AA, Jeyashanmugaraja GP, Desai N, Lipska K, Krumholz H, Khera R. Contemporary National Patterns of Eligibility and Use of Novel Cardioprotective

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Antihyperglycemic Agents in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2021; **10**: e021084.

30 Khera R, Schuemie MJ, Lu Y, *et al.* Large-scale evidence generation and evaluation across a network of databases for type 2 diabetes mellitus (LEGEND-T2DM): a protocol for a series of multinational, real-world comparative cardiovascular effectiveness and safety studies. *BMJ Open* 2022; **12**: e057977.

31 Overhage JM, Ryan PB, Reich CG, Hartzema AG, Stang PE. Validation of a common data model for active safety surveillance research. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2012; **19**: 54–60.

32 Dickerman BA, García-Albéniz X, Logan RW, Denaxas S, Hernán MA. Avoidable flaws in observational analyses: an application to statins and cancer. *Nat Med* 2019; **25**: 1601–6.

33 Hernán MA, Robins JM. Using Big Data to Emulate a Target Trial When a Randomized Trial Is Not Available. *Am J Epidemiol* 2016; **183**: 758–64.

34 Suchard MA, Schuemie MJ, Krumholz HM, *et al.* Comprehensive comparative effectiveness and safety of first-line antihypertensive drug classes: a systematic, multinational, large-scale analysis. *Lancet* 2019; **394**: 1816–26.

35 Ryan PB, Buse JB, Schuemie MJ, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of canagliflozin, SGLT2 inhibitors and non-SGLT2 inhibitors on the risk of hospitalization for heart failure and amputation in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A real-world meta-analysis of 4 observational databases (OBSERVE-4D). *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2018; **20**: 2585–97.

36 You SC, Rho Y, Bikdeli B, *et al.* Association of Ticagrelor vs Clopidogrel With Net Adverse Clinical Events in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome Undergoing Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. *JAMA* 2020; **324**: 1640–50.

37 Wang Y, Desai M, Ryan PB, *et al.* Incidence of diabetic ketoacidosis among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus treated with SGLT2 inhibitors and other antihyperglycemic agents. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2017; **128**: 83–90.

38 Weinstein RB, Ryan PB, Berlin JA, Schuemie MJ, Swerdel J, Fife D. Channeling Bias in the Analysis of Risk of Myocardial Infarction, Stroke, Gastrointestinal Bleeding, and Acute Renal Failure with the Use of Paracetamol Compared with Ibuprofen. *Drug Saf* 2020; **43**: 927–42.

39 Yuan Z, DeFalco FJ, Ryan PB, *et al.* Risk of lower extremity amputations in people with type 2 diabetes mellitus treated with sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors in the USA: A retrospective cohort study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2018; **20**: 582–9.

40 Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Pratt N, *et al.* Principles of Large-scale Evidence Generation and Evaluation across a Network of Databases (LEGEND). *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2020; **27**: 1331–7.

41 Tian Y, Schuemie MJ, Suchard MA. Evaluating large-scale propensity score performance through real-world and synthetic data experiments. *Int J Epidemiol* 2018; **47**: 2005–14.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

42 Schuemie MJ, Hripcsak G, Ryan PB, Madigan D, Suchard MA. Empirical confidence interval calibration for population-level effect estimation studies in observational healthcare data. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018; **115**: 2571–7.

43 Schuemie MJ, Hripcsak G, Ryan PB, Madigan D, Suchard MA. Robust empirical calibration of p-values using observational data. Stat. Med. 2016; **35**: 3883–8.

44 Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Hripcsak G, Madigan D, Suchard MA. Improving reproducibility by using high-throughput observational studies with empirical calibration. *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci* 2018; **376**. DOI:10.1098/rsta.2017.0356.

45 Schuemie MJ, Cepeda MS, Suchard MA, *et al.* How confident are we about observational findings in healthcare: A benchmark study. *Harv Data Sci Rev* 2020; **2**. DOI:10.1162/99608f92.147cc28e.

46 Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 1983; **70**: 41–55.

47 Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Stat Med* 2009; **28**: 3083–107.

48 Voss EA, Boyce RD, Ryan PB, van der Lei J, Rijnbeek PR, Schuemie MJ. Accuracy of an automated knowledge base for identifying drug adverse reactions. *J Biomed Inform* 2017; **66**: 72–81.

49 DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 1986; **7**: 177–88.

50 Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, *et al.* Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes, 2018. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018; **41**: 2669–701.

51 Inzucchi SE, Bergenstal RM, Buse JB, *et al.* Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes: A Patient-Centered Approach: Position Statement of the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2012; **35**: 1364–79.

52 Richardson TL Jr, Halvorson AE, Hackstadt AJ, *et al.* Primary occurrence of cardiovascular events after adding sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors or glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists compared with dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors: A cohort study in veterans with diabetes. *Ann Intern Med* 2023; **176**: 751–60.

53 Kutz A, Kim DH, Wexler DJ, *et al.* Comparative Cardiovascular Effectiveness and Safety of SGLT-2 Inhibitors, GLP-1 Receptor Agonists, and DPP-4 Inhibitors According to Frailty in Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2023; **46**: 2004–14.

54 Thein D, Christiansen MN, Mogensen UM, *et al.* Add-on therapy in metformin-treated patients with type 2 diabetes at moderate cardiovascular risk: a nationwide study. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2020; **19**: 107.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

55 Vashisht R, Patel A, Dahm L, *et al.* Second-Line Pharmaceutical Treatments for Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *JAMA Netw Open* 2023; **6**: e2336613.

56 Xie Y, Bowe B, Xian H, Loux T, McGill JB, Al-Aly Z. Comparative effectiveness of SGLT2 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists, DPP-4 inhibitors, and sulfonylureas on risk of major adverse cardiovascular events: emulation of a randomised target trial using electronic health records. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2023; **11**: 644–56.

57 Wang H, Cordiner RLM, Huang Y, *et al.* Cardiovascular Safety in Type 2 Diabetes With Sulfonylureas as Second-line Drugs: A Nationwide Population-Based Comparative Safety Study. *Diabetes Care* 2023; **46**: 967–77.

58 Samson SL, Vellanki P, Blonde L, *et al.* American Association of Clinical Endocrinology Consensus Statement: Comprehensive Type 2 Diabetes Management Algorithm - 2023 Update. *Endocr Pract* 2023; **29**: 305–40.

59 Khera R, Dhingra LS, Aminorroaya A, *et al.* Multinational patterns of second-line anti-hyperglycemic drug initiation across cardiovascular risk groups: A federated pharmacoepidemiologic evaluation in LEGEND-T2DM. bioRxiv. 2022; published online Dec 30. DOI:10.1101/2022.12.27.22283968.

60 McGuire DK, Alexander JH, Johansen OE, *et al.* Linagliptin Effects on Heart Failure and Related Outcomes in Individuals With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus at High Cardiovascular and Renal Risk in CARMELINA. *Circulation* 2019; **139**: 351–61.

61 Rehman MB, Tudrej BV, Soustre J, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of DPP-4 inhibitors in patients with type 2 diabetes: Meta-analysis of placebo-controlled randomized clinical trials. *Diabetes Metab* 2017; **43**: 48–58.

62 Kosiborod MN, Abildstrøm SZ, Borlaug BA, *et al.* Semaglutide in Patients with Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction and Obesity. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **389**: 1069–84.

63 A Study of Tirzepatide (LY3298176) in Participants With Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction and Obesity (SUMMIT). Clinicaltrials.gov. https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04847557 (accessed Jan 12, 2024).

64 Cardiac and Metabolic Effects of Semaglutide in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction. Clinicaltrials.gov. https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05371496 (accessed Jan 12, 2024).

65 Rubbo B, Fitzpatrick NK, Denaxas S, *et al.* Use of electronic health records to ascertain, validate and phenotype acute myocardial infarction: A systematic review and recommendations. *Int J Cardiol* 2015; **187**: 705–11.

66 Floyd JS, Blondon M, Moore KP, Boyko EJ, Smith NL. Validation of methods for assessing cardiovascular disease using electronic health data in a cohort of Veterans with diabetes. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2016; **25**: 467–71.

67 Singh S, Fouayzi H, Anzuoni K, *et al.* Diagnostic Algorithms for Cardiovascular Death in Administrative Claims Databases: A Systematic Review. *Drug Saf* 2019; **42**: 515–27.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

68 Gliklich RE, Dreyer NA, Leavy MB, editors. Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US).

69 Gliklich RE, Leavy MB, Dreyer NA. Tools and Technologies for Registry Interoperability, Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide, 3rd Edition, Addendum 2. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Population Size and Follow-up Time for Initiators of SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, and SUs Across Databases.

Drug/Data Source	Patients, No.	On-treatment Follow-up Time (days), Median [IQR]
SGLT2i		
CCAE	10,135	161 [62 - 537]
GDA	4,337	181 [97 - 537]
MDCD	1,314	114 [30 - 383]
MDCR	2,013	112 [34 - 541]
OCEDM	11,597	118 [55 - 423]
OEHR	8,996	71 [29 - 181]
SIDIAP	2,281	322 [103 - 895]
USOC	196,710	143 [61 - 525]
VA	7,311	135 [71 - 443]
Total	**244,694**	
GLP1-RA		
CCAE	7,446	116 [45 - 441]
MDCR	1,120	94 [29 - 443]
OCEDM	6,546	98 [36 - 368]
OEHR	4,525	60 [29 - 173]
USOC	104,354	112 [52 - 432]
Total	**123,991**	
DPP4i		
CCAE	22,801	159 [63 - 597]
GDA	10,428	221 [97 - 741]
IMRD	4,024	354 [122 - 1,174]
MDCD	4,449	142 [56 - 555]
MDCR	10,541	187 [81 - 713]
OCEDM	23,918	150 [59 - 569]
OEHR	18,145	95 [89 - 312]
SIDIAP	8,126	695 [204 - 1,916]
USOC	299,835	157 [59 - 657]
VA	10,969	220 [90 - 707]
Total	**413,236**	
SU		
CCAE	18,093	148 [59 - 559]
GDA	1,235	216 [119 - 684]
IMRD	846	350 [106 - 1312]
MDCD	6,758	124 [33 - 503]
MDCR	8,887	159 [59 - 632]
OCEDM	38,098	177 [85 - 652]
OEHR	34,751	110 [89 - 386]
SIDIAP	619	600 [158 - 1,809]
USOC	562,514	183 [89 - 752]
VA	39,133	186 [90 - 689]
Total	**710,934**	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abbreviations: CCAE, IBM MarketScan® Commercial Claims and Encounters Data; DPP4i, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor; GDA, Germany Disease Analyzer; GLP1-RA, glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; IMRD, UK-IQVIA Medical Research Data; MDCD, IBM Health MarketScan® Multi-State Medicaid Database; IQR, interquartile range; MDCR, IBM Health MarketScan® Medicare Supplemental and Coordination of Benefits Database; OCEDM, Optum© Clinformatics Extended Data Mart - Date of Death; OEHR, Optum© de-identified Electronic Health Record Dataset; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor; SIDIAP, Information System for Research in Primary Care; SU, Sulfonylurea; USOC, United States Open Claims; VA, Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1: Study Design and Analytical Methodology to Evaluate the Comparative Effectiveness of SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, and SUs for Cardiovascular Outcomes.



Abbreviations: CCAE, IBM MarketScan® Commercial Claims and Encounters Data; CVD, cardiovascular disease; GDA, Germany Disease Analyser; IMRD, UK-IQVIA Medical Research Data; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MDCD, IBM Health MarketScan® Multi-State Medicaid Database; MDCR, IBM Health MarketScan® Medicare Supplemental and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Coordination of Benefits Database; OCEDM, Optum© Clinformatics Extended Data Mart - Date of Death; OEHR, Optum© de-identified Electronic Health Record Dataset; OMOP-CDM, Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership-common data model; SIDIAP, Information System for Research in Primary Care; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus; USOC, United States Open Claims; VA, Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2: Maximum Standardized Mean Difference Before and After Propensity Score Stratification for All Covariates Across Target-Comparator-Database Combinations.



Abbreviations: CCAE, IBM MarketScan® Commercial Claims and Encounters Data; DPP4i, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor; GDA, Germany Disease Analyzer; GLP1-RA, glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; IMRD, UK-IQVIA Medical Research Data; MDCD, IBM Health MarketScan® Multi-State Medicaid Database; IQR, interquartile range; MDCR, IBM Health MarketScan® Medicare Supplemental and Coordination of Benefits Database; OCEDM, Optum© Clinformatics Extended Data Mart - Date of Death; OEHR, Optum© de-identified Electronic Health Record Dataset; PS, propensity score; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor; SIDIAP, Information System for Research in Primary Care; SMD, standardized mean difference; SU, Sulfonylurea; USOC, United States Open Claims; VA, Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3: Meta-analytic Calibrated Hazard Ratio Estimates for Comparative Effectiveness of SGLT2is, GLP1-RAs, DPP4is, and SUs for Cardiovascular Outcomes.



Abbreviations: DPP4i, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor; GLP1-RA, glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; HF, heart failure; HR, hazard ratio; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor; SU, Sulfonylurea.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302354; this version posted February 8, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4: Swarm Plot of Calibrated Hazard Ratio Estimates of Major Outcome Meta-analysis and Leave-one-out Meta-analysis. Circles depict the calibrated relative risk of each leave-one-out study in which one original data source is removed from the meta-analysis. Diamonds depict the original meta-analysis with all sources. Points are color-coded by major outcomes, y-axis includes the medication comparators, and x-axis on log-scale measures the calibrated relative risk of each outcome-comparator combination.



Abbreviations: DPP4i, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor; GLP1-RA, glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; HF, heart failure; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor; SU, Sulfonylurea.