Aspirin use is associated with increased risk for incident heart failure: a patient-level pooled analysis
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Aims Recent trials evaluating the effect of aspirin in the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease showed little or no benefit. However, the role of aspirin on the risk of incident heart failure (HF) remains elusive. This study aimed to evaluate the role of aspirin use on HF incidence in primary and secondary prevention and whether aspirin use increases the risk of incident HF in patients at risk.

Methods and results Data from 30,827 patients at risk for HF enrolled in six observational studies were analysed [women 33.9%, mean age (standard deviation) 66.8 ± 9.2 years]. Cardiovascular risk factors and aspirin use were recorded at baseline, and patients were followed up for the first incident of fatal or non-fatal HF. The association of incident HF with aspirin use was assessed using multivariable-adjusted proportional hazard regression, which accounted for study and cardiovascular risk factors. Over 5.3 years (median; 5th–95th percentile interval, 2.1–11.7 years), 1330 patients experienced HF. The fully adjusted hazard ratio (HR) associated with aspirin use was 1.26 [95% confidence interval (CI) 1.12–1.41; P ≤ 0.001]. Further, in a propensity-score-matched analysis, the HR was 1.26 (95% CI 1.10–1.44; P ≤ 0.001). In 22,690 patients (73.6%) without history of cardiovascular disease, the HR was 1.27 (95% CI 1.10–1.46; P = 0.001).

Conclusions In patients, at risk, aspirin use was associated with incident HF, independent of other risk factors. In the absence of conclusive trial evidence, our observations suggest that aspirins should be prescribed with caution in patients at risk of HF or having HF.
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Introduction

Heart failure (HF) is a clinical syndrome with abnormal cardiac function and structure.1,2 Due to comorbidities and diminished cardiac output, HF is qualified as a pro-thrombotic condition, which might indicate the initiation of antithrombotic treatment.3 On the other hand, antithrombotic treatment, particularly aspirin, is prescribed in the prevention of cardiovascular events [cardiovascular disease (CVD)],4 which may consequently lead to HF. Recent trials showed a little benefit of aspirin use in primary prevention,5–7 and the effect of aspirin in the secondary prevention of CVD events8 has been well established. However, the use of aspirin in HF is still controversial. Earlier prospective randomized trials WATCH9 and WARCEF3 reported no beneficial effect of aspirin in HF patients compared with other antithrombotic therapy. The
WASH trial, which did not include an antithrombotic arm, found no evidence that aspirin is effective or safe in patients with HF. In contrast, a retrospective HF patients cohort study reported that low-dose aspirin of 75 mg/day was associated with reduced mortality risk. Also, a more recent study reported that low-dose aspirin of 75 mg/day was associated with HF. In contrast, a retrospective HF patients cohort study found no evidence that aspirin is effective or safe in patients with a history of HF. We excluded 3 HF studies that did not use and the incidence of fatal and/or non-fatal HF was available for inclusion in this analysis if the information on aspirin use at baseline was associated with an increased risk of re-admissions for HF. Again, in context to recent trials, the effect of aspirin on the HF remained understudied and generated uncertainty. To address these knowledge gaps, we investigated the association between aspirin use and incident HF in a large sample of participants free of HF enrolled in the HOMAGE study.

Methods

Heart ‘Oomics’ in AGEing (HOMAGE) database is constructed and stored at the Studies Coordinating Centre in Leuven, Belgium. The HOMAGE partners contributed with anonymized data and confirmed that their studies complied with the Helsinki Declaration, and all participants provided written informed consent. The HOMAGE database has been described in detail elsewhere, and the data were locked on 14 March 2017.

Study population

The HOMAGE database consisted of subject-level data of 46,437 participants from 21 studies. Studies were eligible for inclusion in this analysis if the information on aspirin use and the incidence of fatal and/or non-fatal HF was available, with at least 20 HF events. We excluded 3 HF studies (n = 1073) and 12 studies (n = 11,160) without information on HF incidence. We included the participants that were enrolled in six studies: The Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial (ASCOT), The Flemish Study on Environment, Genes and Health Outcome (FLEMENGHO), The Health Aging and Body Composition study (HEALTH ABC), HULL LIFELAB patient study, FLEMENGHO, and PROSPER.

Ascertainment of heart failure

At baseline, all participants were free of HF. The diagnosis of first incident HF required hospitalization. Hospital records were examined, and HF was defined based on a combination of signs and symptoms, including chest radiography with fluid congestion or echocardiogram. Further confirmation was made by reviewing medical records. More detailed information on each study is provided in the supporting information. Figure S1.

Derivation set

The ASCOT, a prospective, randomized, open, blinded endpoint trial with high-risk hypertensive patients, recruited in Scandinavian countries, the UK, and Ireland (1998–2000), was used as the derivation set.

Validation set

The validation set consisted of the FLEMENGHO, HEALTH ABC, HULL LIFELAB, PREDICTOR, and PROSPER studies.

The FLEMENGHO is a population study of a random sample of households living in Northern Belgium, recruited between 1985 and 1999. From 2005 until 2010, participants were invited for a follow-up examination at the field centre, including echocardiography. The HEALTH ABC is a cohort of women and men (aged ≥70 years), randomly recruited among Medicare beneficiaries residing in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and Memphis, Tennessee, USA, between April 1997 and June 1998. The HULL LIFE LAB patient cohort consists of consecutive patients referred to a community HF clinic at the Hull Royal Infirmary Hospital, UK, for investigation of suspected HF between 2001 and 2014. The PREDICTOR is a population study in older participants (65–84 years) randomly selected from the regional population registry of four cities in the Lazio region in central Italy between 2007 and 2010. The PROSPER is a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial of women and men older than 70 years, with a history of vascular disease or at high risk for developing vascular disease. From 1997 until 1999, patients were enrolled in Scotland, Ireland, and the Netherlands.
Assessment of aspirin use

The information for the use of aspirin [acetylsalicylic acid (ATC code B01AC06)] at baseline was recorded from all participants. At the time of the enrolment, participants were either aspirin users or non-users and had no other antithrombotic treatment. Among the aspirin users, we registered the main therapeutic indications, such as a history of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, myocardial infarction, coronary heart disease, atrial fibrillation, or a history of cerebrovascular events.

Other information

Other baseline information included smoking status, alcohol use, anthropometric characteristics, co-medication use, routine haematological and biochemical measurements including total cholesterol, high-density cholesterol (HDL), and creatinine. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in metres squared. Diabetes mellitus was a fasting glucose concentration of \( \geq 7.0 \) mmol/L or non-fasting blood glucose concentration of \( \geq 11.1 \) mmol/L or the use of anti-diabetic medication. Hypertension was an office blood pressure \( \geq 140/90 \) mmHg or the use of antihypertensive treatment. The previous history of CVDs was verified based on medical records.

Statistical analysis

SAS software Version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary; NC, USA) was used for database management and statistical analysis. Continuous variables were presented as mean ± standard deviation and categorical variables as proportions. For comparison of means and proportions, we applied the large-sample z-test and \( \chi^2 \) test, respectively. Missing values for the covariates such as BMI (n = 14), systolic (n = 9) and diastolic (n = 10) blood pressure, heart rate (n = 136), total cholesterol (n = 236), HDL-cholesterol (n = 277), and creatinine (n = 6392) were interpolated from the regression slope on age after stratification for study and sex. To compute 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of rates, we applied the formula as \( R \pm 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{R \times (1-R)}{n}} \), where R and T are the rates and the number of individuals used to compute the rate. A two-sided \( P \)-value of <0.05 was used as statistical significance.

We assessed the aspirin use in multivariable-adjusted Cox proportional hazards regression. The proportional hazards assumption was checked by the Kolmogorov-type supremum test and by testing the interaction between follow-up duration and aspirin treatment. We implemented four levels of adjustment. The first model adjusted for sex and age. In the second model, we additionally adjusted for BMI, smoking and alcohol drinking, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, heart rate, total cholesterol/HDL ratio, and creatinine. In the third model, we added treatment with renin-angiotensin-aldosterone-system (RAAS) inhibitors, calcium channel blockers, diuretics, beta-blockers, and lipid-lowering treatment. And finally, in the fourth model, we additionally adjusted for history of hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and history of CVD. In all models, we accounted for the clustering of participants within studies by including cohorts as a random effect.

The consistencies of the results were assessed in a four-step approach. First, we used the propensity-score matching method\(^{21} \) to match aspirin users with non-users. Using logistic regression, we calculated the propensity of aspirin use using all covariables as listed in Supporting Information, Table S3. Second, we performed sensitivity analyses by excluding all participants with a known history of CVD. Third, to minimize the influence of the reverse causation, we excluded the participants who developed HF within the first 2 years of the follow-up. Finally, we performed stratified analyses to check the consistency of the results according to sex, study-specific medians for age and body weight,\(^{22} \) and categories of systolic and diastolic blood pressure. Furthermore, using stratified analyses, we also investigated drug interactions.

Results

Baseline characteristics

The baseline characteristics of the participants in the derivation and validation sets, and in the HOMAGE set, are summarized in Table 1. The total study population (n = 30 827) included 10 451 (33.9%) women, 6640 (21.5%) diabetics, 8144 (26.4%) current smokers, and 20 561 (66.7%) participants reporting alcohol consumption. Age averaged 66.8 (standard deviation 9.2) years. Of the 26 453 (85.5%) hypertensive patients, 21 633 (81.7%) were taking antihypertensive drugs. The number of participants reporting a history of myocardial infarction, coronary heart disease, stroke, or atrial fibrillation was 874 (2.8%), 8137 (26.4%), 2987 (9.6%), and 343 (1.1%), respectively. At baseline, a total of 7698 (24.9%) participants were treated with aspirin.

Incidence of heart failure in aspirin users and non-users

Median follow-up was 5.3 years (5th to 95th percentile interval, 2.1 to 11.7 years). In the HOMAGE set during 164 913 person-years of follow-up, 1330 participants experienced fatal or non-fatal HF with an incident rate of 14.5 (95% CI 13.4–15.7) per 1000 person-years in the aspirin group versus 5.9 (95% CI 5.5–6.4) per 1000 person-years in the non-aspirin group.
group. In the discovery set during 105 623 person-years of follow-up, 293 incident cases of HF occurred, with a rate of 4.3 (95% CI 3.5–5.3) per 1000 person-years in the aspirin group versus 2.4 (95% CI 2.1–2.7) per 1000 person-years in the non-aspirin group. In the validation set (Figure 2), during 59 289 person-years of follow-up, 1037 incident HF occurred, an incident rate of 24.4 (95% CI 22.4–26.7) per 1000 person-years in the aspirin group versus 13.8 (95% CI 12.7–15.0) per 1000 person-years in the non-aspirin group. Supporting Information, Table S6 lists the number of events per individual study.

### Association between incident heart failure and aspirin use

Table 2 shows the hazard ratios (HRs) associated with aspirin intake in the derivation and validation sets, as well as in the whole analysis data. The proportional hazard assumption was met for all models. Irrespective of the data set used and the level of adjustment, the risk of HF was consistently and positively associated with aspirin use. As expected, the HRs tended to weaken with tighter adjustment ranging from 1.43 (P = 0.006) to 1.32 (P = 0.03) in the derivation cohort, from 1.52 (P < 0.001) to 1.17 (P = 0.02) for the validation cohort, and from 1.52 (P < 0.001) to 1.26 (P < 0.001) in all study participants (Table 2).

### Sensitivity analyses

As shown in Table 3, sensitivity analyses produced confirmatory results, if participants were matched based on a propensity score including all covariables (HR 1.26; P < 0.001), if analyses were limited to participants without a history of CVD at baseline (HRs in Model 3, 1.27; P = 0.001), and if participants with incident HF within 2 years of enrolment were excluded (HR in Model 4, 1.23; P = 0.004).

The association between the HF risk and aspirin use was consistent across strata of systolic (Figure 2A) and diastolic (Figure 2B) blood pressure at entry. Interaction analyses (Figure 2C) suggested that the HF risk was associated with slightly greater in patients not taking diuretics versus those on diuretics at entry (multivariable-adjusted HRs, 1.38 vs. 1.14; P-value for interaction, 0.02) and in patients taking statins versus those not on statin treatment (multivariable-adjusted HRs, 1.50 vs. 1.19; P-value for interaction, 0.04).

### Stratified analyses

Stratified analyses were conducted to assess the differences between the categories of sex, age, and body weight in three sets, using a study-specific median. In the HOMAGE set, we found an association of increased risk for incident HF in men (HR 1.37, 95% CI 1.17–1.59; P-interaction = 0.04) and an association of increased risk for incident HF among
the participants aged >69 years (P-interaction = 0.03) (Supporting Information, Table S2.2).

**Discussion**

In this large-scale study with participants free of HF at enrolment, aspirin use was associated with a higher risk of HF. The results of the present study with aspirin use are the first to report an increased risk of HF, among participants at risk for HF.

Uncertainty on aspirin use has been reflected in current guideline recommendations and aspirin use for primary prevention has been controversial even when compared with aspirin use in patients with established atherosclerotic CVD. Considering the evidence on the risk of HF, the current study demonstrates that cardiovascular benefits associated with aspirin use on HF events require further clarity. Further, recent published clinical trials assessed the effect of aspirin in primary prevention, ASPREE reported 88 HF hospitalizations (excluding fatal HF) with an HR 1.07 (95% CI 0.79–1.44), ASCEND reported 95 HF incidents with a rate ratio of 0.84 (95% CI 0.64–1.10), and ARRIVE did not report HF. Similar HF incidents among aspirin-treated patients were observed also in ASCOT and PROSPER trials with 86 and 113, respectively. When we focused on participants with low cardiovascular risk in primary prevention, similar to recent trials with few CVD risk factors, aspirin use was associated with increased risk for HF and the results were confirmatory. Although the differences between studies exist, as trials with primary prevention recruited the healthier participants with

---

**FIGURE 1** Panels (A), (B), (C), and (D) show study, sex-standardized, and age-standardized cumulative incidence of heart failure in participants using aspirin use (red line) and non-using aspirin (blue line). The tabulated numbers represent the participants at risk with intervals in years. P-value is for the significance of the difference between aspirin use and non-use.
fewer risk factors and lower cardiovascular risk in general, yet in ASPREE, a positive trend between aspirin use and HF hospitalizations was present. Given that ASCOT and PROSPER primarily tested the effect of statins, we have observed a significant interaction between aspirin and statins in concomitant use. Therefore, the observed trend in ASPREE might be explained based on the interaction between these drugs. Alternatively, in ASCEND, 19% of aspirin users were on concomitant use of diuretics. When we assessed the role of the diuretics, we found that the use of diuretics is associated with a reduced risk of HF in aspirin users, which might influence into lower rate ratio within ASCEND.

Aspirin use remains controversial in secondary prevention. In this regard, we elaborated on the role of aspirin in secondary prevention, among patients with overt CVD, and findings showed a similar trend with primary prevention, where aspirin was associated with increased risk for HF. Previous studies have assessed the effects of aspirin use in cardiovascular events or secondary endpoints among HF patients including HF hospitalizations as well. An observational retrospective study investigated aspirin use in 1476 HF patients and reported that low-dose aspirin of 75 mg/day was associated with a reduction of deaths in HF patients but did not reduce HF hospitalizations. Another recent study that included 12 277 patients with new-onset of HF, using propensity-matched analysis, reported no association between low-dose aspirin and composite outcomes of all-cause mortality, myocardial infarction, or stroke. This study also reported that aspirin use was associated with an increased risk of re-hospitalizations for HF. Earlier, the WASH trial randomized 279 HF patients using aspirin versus warfarin or no antithrombotic treatment, and the trial reported an increased risk for HF hospitalizations in the aspirin arm. In Addition, the WATCH trial compared aspirin versus warfarin.

Table 2 Association between heart failure and aspirin use

| Aspirin use | Yes | No | Hazard ratio (95% CI) | P-value |
|------------|-----|----|----------------------|---------|
| Derivation |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 86/3688 | 207/15 569 | 1.40 (1.09–1.81) | 0.009   |
| Model 2    | 86/3688 | 207/15 569 | 1.43 (1.11–1.84) | 0.006   |
| Model 3    | 86/3688 | 207/15 569 | 1.32 (1.02–1.71) | 0.03    |
| Model 4    | 86/3688 | 207/15 569 | 1.33 (1.03–1.72) | 0.03    |
| Validation |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 497/4010 | 540/7560 | 1.47 (1.31–1.68) | <0.001  |
| Model 2    | 497/4010 | 540/7560 | 1.52 (1.34–1.72) | <0.001  |
| Model 3    | 497/4010 | 540/7560 | 1.39 (1.22–1.57) | <0.001  |
| Model 4    | 497/4010 | 540/7560 | 1.17 (1.03–1.34) | 0.02    |

HOMAGE

| Derivation |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 583/7698 | 747/23 129 | 1.47 (1.32–1.65) | <0.001  |
| Model 2    | 583/7698 | 747/23 129 | 1.52 (1.36–1.69) | <0.001  |
| Model 3    | 583/7698 | 747/23 129 | 1.39 (1.24–1.55) | <0.001  |
| Model 4    | 583/7698 | 747/23 129 | 1.26 (1.12–1.41) | <0.001  |

| Aspirin use | Yes | No | Hazard ratio (95% CI) | P-value |
|------------|-----|----|----------------------|---------|
| Propensity score |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 496/7186 | 396/7186 | 1.26 (1.10–1.44) | <0.001  |
| Free of CVD |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 283/5074 | 577/17 616 | 1.29 (1.12–1.49) | <0.001  |
| Model 2    | 283/5074 | 577/17 616 | 1.33 (1.15–1.53) | <0.001  |
| Model 3    | 283/5074 | 577/17 616 | 1.27 (1.10–1.46) | 0.001   |
| 2 years excluded |     |    |                      |         |
| Model 1    | 371/7486 | 515/22 897 | 1.40 (1.22–1.61) | <0.001  |
| Model 2    | 371/7486 | 515/22 897 | 1.44 (1.25–1.65) | <0.001  |
| Model 3    | 371/7486 | 515/22 897 | 1.33 (1.16–1.53) | <0.001  |
| Model 4    | 371/7486 | 515/22 897 | 1.23 (1.06–1.41) | 0.004   |
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in terms of safety and effectiveness in patients with chronic HF, and the trial was prematurely terminated due to a non-significant difference between tested drugs, yet the trial reported significantly higher hospitalization events in aspirin arm (218 vs. 155 in warfarin arm ($P<0.001$)). Therefore, both studies suggested that an increased risk for HF hospitalization was observed among patients receiving aspirin. Also, the WARCEF trial included 2305 HF patients and reported no significant difference in HF hospitalization between the warfarin group and the aspirin group, but yet comparable event rates for HF hospitalizations (warfarin 6.7 vs. aspirin 5.6). And more recently, a COMPASS trial, compared with aspirin alone vs. rivaroxaban-plus-aspirin in patients with a history of stable atherosclerotic vascular disease and reported 192 incident HF in the aspirin-alone arm versus 197 in the rivaroxaban-plus-aspirin arm compared and 191 in the rivaroxaban-alone arm.

Accounting for the risk factors, given that hypertension is a major risk factor for cardiovascular outcomes, including HF, we investigated the interaction of systolic and diastolic blood pressure and the association of aspirin use with the risk of HF. In participants with a systolic blood pressure of 131 mmHg or higher, aspirin use was associated with increased risk of HF; likewise, diastolic blood pressure of 71 mmHg or higher was significantly associated with increased risk of HF. There was no significant interaction between systolic or diastolic blood pressure with aspirin use. In the context of blood pressure, patients on diuretic use potentially benefited from diuretics that contribute to better control of blood pressure while non-users were harmed due to renal function impairment, caused by aspirin. Aspirin acts in kidneys through water and salt retention mechanisms while our data show that aspirin interacts with diuretics in concomitant use. Diuretics provide a beneficial role and may attenuate risk for incident HF in effect-modification fashion, through accelerated diuresis and increased excretion of aspirin. Another biological plausible explanation is aspirin has been reported to induce angiogenesis and neovascularization within atherosclerotic plaque and promote the presence of intraplaque haemorrhage. Further, plaque progression mechanisms are involved in coronary ischaemia, given that intraplaque haemorrhage is the driver of atherosclerotic plaque progression and worsening of ischaemia in coronaries, which at a later stage might translate into a higher incident of HF. Alternatively, other mechanisms linking the aspirin effect with kidney function and iron deficiency may indirectly elucidate HF incidents. In addition, aspirin interacted with statins, and this interaction may contribute to improved platelet responsiveness to aspirin and further reduced platelet adhesion, which may contribute to extended leakage from neovascular vessels.

**Strength and limitations**

The strengths of the current study include the large sample size with free HF participants with long follow-ups. To our knowledge, this is the first large study to investigate the role of aspirin on the risk of HF in primary prevention as well as secondary prevention. Also, replication of the findings in discovery and replication set along with corroboration or results through sensitivity analysis should be mentioned. Moreover, taking into account the combination of individual data of a large number of participants from 6 studies in 12 countries and 2 continents simplifies the generalizability of findings on a large scale. Nevertheless, our study has also limitations. First, we had information on the use of aspirin and other drugs at enrolment but could not analyse the intake of medication as a time-dependent covariable. Second, because of
dichotomous information on aspirin use, we could not assess the dose effect. Third, we have no information on adherence to prescribed medications and non-hospitalized HF incidents. Fourth, although the ejection fraction (EF) is considered an HF diagnostic parameter and guidance for HF treatment after diagnosis, we lacked the data on EF to better characterize the incident HF according to EF subgroups of HF and lacked data to distinguish HF between ischaemic and non-ischaemic. Although we performed a sensitivity analysis to minimize the effect of reverse causality, yet we cannot exclude reverse causality with absolute certainty. Finally, the study suffers residual confounding that cannot be ruled out due to observational design; however, in the absence of a conclusive trial, our data provide important scientific evidence that may contribute to clinical practice.

Conclusions

Aspirin use is associated with an increased risk of HF in patients receiving aspirin with or without a previous history of CVDs. In the absence of conclusive trial evidence, our observations suggest that aspirin should be prescribed with caution in patients at risk of HF or having HF.
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