Association of proton pump inhibitor use with disease burden and cardiometabolic profile among patients hospitalized for acute myocardial infarction

Admira Bilalić[1],
Josip Anđelo Borovac[2,3]*,
Tina Tičinović Kurir[2],
Marko Kumrić[2],
Andrija Matetić[1],
Joško Božić[2]

[1]University Hospital Centre Split, Split, Croatia

[2]University of Split School of Medicine, Split, Croatia

[3]Institute of Emergency Medicine of Split-Dalmatia County, Split, Croatia

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Introduction: Previous studies showed an increased likelihood and risk of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and hospitalizations for cardiovascular events among patients exposed to chronic use of proton pump inhibitors (PPIs).[1-3] In this study we aimed to compare parameters reflecting disease burden and cardiometabolic profile among patients treated for AMI with respect to the chronic exposure to PPIs.

Patients and Methods: Data of 143 adult consecutive patients hospitalized for ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) or non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) during the 2019-2020 period were analyzed. All continuous variables had a normal distribution.

TABLE 1. Comparison of consecutive patients with acute myocardial infarction exposed to chronic inhibitor of proton pump (IPP) use (IPP+ group) with those not exposed (IPP-group).

Variable	IPP+ group (N=19)	IPP- group (N=124)	p-value
Age, *years*	71.9 ± 9.6	63.3 ± 11.2	0.003*
Body mass index, *kg/m²*	26.2 ± 1.7	27.3 ± 3.4	0.201
Waist-to-hip ratio	1.03 ± 0.07	1.12 ± 0.88	0.644
Male sex	64.7%	81.9%	0.100
NSTEMI as a type of ACS	47.4%	33.1%	0.224
Mean Killip class	1.11 ± 0.33	1.10 ± 0.40	0.890
Mean number of diseased vessels	1.20 ± 0.44	1.17 ± 0.50	0.823
Left ventricular ejection fraction, *%*	50.8 ± 12.7	52.1 ± 9.8	0.656
Δcardiac Troponin I value, *ng/L*¶	4726 ± 5938	2554 ± 3480	0.025*
C-reactive protein, *mg/L*	27.4 ± 48.5	11.7 ± 20.0	0.015*
Glucose, *mmol/L*	9.5 ± 4.8	7.7 ± 3.0	0.037*
Creatinine, *μmol/L*	110 ± 56	89 ± 26	0.012*
Sodium, *mmol/L*	138 ± 2.9	137 ± 3.0	0.146
Potassium, *mmol/L*	4.04 ± 0.43	4.08 ± 0.40	0.724
GRACE score, *points*	132 ± 23	114 ± 26	0.008*

ACS-acute coronary syndrome; AMI-acute myocardial infarction; GRACE-Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; NSTEMI-Non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction.

*result significant at a two-tailed p-value <0.05

¶high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I assay, mean difference from 1st to 2nd measurement

Results: The mean age was 64.8 ± 11.3 years and 79.7% were men. Two-thirds (65.7%) of patients had STEMI while 34.3% had NSTEMI. The mean GRACE score in the whole cohort was 117 ± 26 points while 12.6% of patients were at high risk of in-hospital death, after adjustment for the ACS type. A total of 19 IPP+ patients were identified. Patients in the IPP+ group were significantly older and had a higher prevalence of NSTEMI compared to IPP- group while both groups did not significantly differ in terms of sex, body mass index, waist-to-hip ratio, the mean number of diseased vessels at angiography, and left ventricular ejection fraction. Patient IPP+ group had a significantly higher high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I rise from 1st to 2nd measurement compared to IPP- group (4726 ± 5938 vs. 2554 ± 3480 ng/L, p=0.025, **Table 1**). Furthermore, C-reactive protein, blood glucose, and serum creatinine levels at admission were significantly higher in IPP+ vs. the IPP- group. Finally, patients in the IPP+ group had a significantly higher risk of in-hospital and 6-month post-discharge death compared to IPP- group, as adjudicated by the GRACE score (132 ± 23 vs. 114 ± 26 points, p=0.008).

Conclusions: Our study showed that AMI patients with chronic exposure to IPPs are older, mostly male, and tend to present with NSTEMI. These patients exhibit a larger magnitude of myocardial injury and systemic inflammation accompanied by worse renal function, and also seem to be at an increased risk of poor in-hospital and post-discharge outcomes. However, potential confounding of underlying co-morbidities and age must be taken into account when interpreting these results.

LITERATURE ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

1. Shih CJ, Chen YT, Ou SM, Li SY, Chen TJ, Wang SJ. Proton pump inhibitor use represents an independent risk factor for myocardial infarction. Int J Cardiol. 2014 Nov 15;177(1):292-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2014.09.036

2. Tan JM, Parsons R, Sim TF, Lee YP. The Association between Proton Pump Inhibitors and Myocardial Infarction: What Do Food and Drug Administration Data Tell Us? J Res Pharm Pract. 2019 Oct 16;8(3):123-128. https://doi.org/10.4103/jrpp.JRPP_19_73

3. Casula M, Scotti L, Galimberti F, Mozzanica F, Tragni E, Corrao G, et al. Use of proton pump inhibitors and risk of ischemic events in the general population. Atherosclerosis. 2018 Oct;277:123-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2018.08.035

13. kongres Hrvatskoga kardiološkog društva s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem
Virtualni kongres 10. do 13. 12. 2020. / 21. do 24. 01. 2021.

Cardiologia Croatica
2021;16(1-2):5.