

Polypill for prevention of cardiovascular diseases with focus on non-alcoholic steatohepatitis

Merat, Shahin; Jafari, Elham; Radmard, Amir-Reza; Khoshnia, Masoud; Sharafkhah, Maryam ; Baygi, Alireza Nateghi ; Marshall, Tom; Shiravi Khuzani, Abolfazl; Cheng, KK; Poustchi, Hossein; Malekzadeh, Reza

DOI:

[10.1093/eurheartj/ehab919](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehab919)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Merat, S, Jafari, E, Radmard, A-R, Khoshnia, M, Sharafkhah, M, Baygi, AN, Marshall, T, Shiravi Khuzani, A, Cheng, KK, Poustchi, H & Malekzadeh, R 2022, 'Polypill for prevention of cardiovascular diseases with focus on non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: the PolyIran-Liver Trial', *European Heart Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehab919>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in European Heart Journal following peer review. The version of record Shahin Merat, Elham Jafari, Amir Reza Radmard, Masoud Khoshnia, Maryam Sharafkhah, Alireza Nateghi Baygi, Tom Marshall, Abolfazl Shiravi Khuzani, Kar Keung Cheng, Hossein Poustchi, Reza Malekzadeh, Polypill for prevention of cardiovascular diseases with focus on non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: the PolyIran-Liver trial, European Heart Journal, 2022;, ehab919, is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehab919>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Title page**

2 **Polypill for Prevention of Cardiovascular Diseases with Focus on**
3 **Non-alcoholic Steatohepatitis: the PolyIran-Liver Trial**

4
5 **Authors:**

6 Shahin Merat, MD*^{1,2}

7 Elham Jafari, MD*^{1,3}

8 Amir Reza Radmard, MD⁴

9 Masoud Khoshnia, MD⁵

10 Maryam Sharafkhah¹

11 Alireza Nateghi Baygi, PharmD⁶

12 Tom Marshall, MD⁷

13 Abolfazl Shiravi Khuzani, MD⁴

14 K.K Cheng, MD⁷

15 Hossein Poustchi, MD^{1,2}

16 Reza Malekzadeh, MD^{1,2,3}

17 *Contributed equally

18

1 **Affiliations:**

2 ¹Liver and Pancreatobiliary Diseases Research Center, Digestive Diseases
3 Research Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

4 ²Digestive Disease Research Center, Digestive Disease Research Institute, Tehran
5 University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

6 ³Digestive Oncology Research Center, Digestive Disease Research Institute,
7 Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

8 ⁴Department of Radiology, Shariati Hospital, Tehran University of Medical
9 Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

10 ⁵Golestan Research Center of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Golestan
11 University of Medical Sciences, Gorgan, Iran.

12 ⁶Research and Development Department, Alborz-Darou Pharmaceutical Co.,
13 Ghazvin, Iran.

14 ⁷School of Health and Population Sciences, University of Birmingham,
15 Birmingham, U.K.

16 **Correspondence to:**

17 Reza Malekzadeh M.D.
18 Digestive Disease Research Institute,
19 Tehran University of Medical Sciences,
20 Shariati Hospital, Tehran 1411713135, Iran.
21 Tel: +98 (21) 8241-5000,
22 Fax: +98 (21) 8241-5400,
23 E-mail: malek@tums.ac.ir

24 **And:**

25 Hossein Poustchi M.D.
26 Digestive Disease Research Institute,
27 Tehran University of Medical Sciences,
28 Shariati Hospital, Tehran 1411713135, Iran.
29 Tel: +98 (21) 8241-5000,
30 Fax: +98 (21) 8241-5400,
31 E-mail: h.poustchi@gmail.com

1 **Abstract:**

2 **Background:** Individuals with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis or elevated liver enzymes have
3 increased cardiovascular mortality but are often excluded from prevention trials. We investigated
4 the effectiveness of fixed-dose combination therapy for the prevention of major cardiovascular
5 events (MCVE) among individuals with and without presumed non-alcoholic steatohepatitis
6 (pNASH).

7 **Methods:** 2400 Participants over 50 were randomized into intervention and control groups.
8 Consent was obtained post-randomization. Consenting participants in the intervention group
9 were given a pill containing aspirin, atorvastatin, hydrochlorothiazide, and valsartan (polypill).
10 Participants were followed for 5 years. pNASH was diagnosed by ultrasonography and elevated
11 liver enzymes. The primary outcome was MCVE. ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT01245608.

12 **Results:** Among the originally randomized population, 138/1249 in the intervention group
13 (11.0%) and 137/1017 controls (13.5%) had MCVE during the 5-year follow-up (unadjusted risk
14 ratio [RR] 0.83, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66-1.03). Of the 1508 participants who
15 consented to additional measurements and treatment, 63/787 (8.0%) intervention group
16 participants and 86/721 (11.9%) controls had MCVE (adjusted RR 0.61, 95% CI 0.44-0.83).
17 Although the adjusted relative risk of MCVE in participants with pNASH (0.35, 95% CI 0.17-
18 0.74) was under half that for participants without pNASH (0.73, 95% CI 0.49-1.00), the
19 difference did not reach statistical significance. There was no change in liver enzymes in
20 participants taking polypill but among those with pNASH, there was a significant decrease after
21 60 months of follow-up (intragroup -12.0 IU/L, 95% CI -14.2 to -9.6).

22 **Conclusion:** Among patients consenting to receive fixed-dose combination therapy, polypill is
23 safe and effective for prevention of MCVE, even among participants with fatty liver and
24 increased liver enzymes.

25 **Keywords:** Cardiovascular diseases, primary prevention, secondary prevention, polypill

1 **Introduction:**

2 Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) often simply referred to as “fatty liver”, is a common
3 condition affecting up to one-third of the population in South America, the Middle East, the
4 USA, and Europe, and is an independent risk factor for cardiovascular disease (CVD).^{1,2} CVD
5 and fatty liver also share several behavioral and metabolic risk factors including central obesity,
6 type 2 diabetes mellitus, metabolic syndrome, tobacco use, unhealthy diet, physical inactivity,
7 and dyslipidemia.³ Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) is a subset of fatty liver disease in
8 which hepatic inflammation is also present and is often accompanied by increased liver enzyme
9 levels. Individuals with fatty liver, and especially those with NASH and elevated liver enzymes,
10 have a considerably higher risk of CVD.^{4,5} Therefore, such individuals may enjoy a greater
11 benefit from primary prevention. Unfortunately, many key studies on primary or secondary
12 prevention exclude participants with increased liver enzyme levels and, therefore, there is a
13 paucity of data in this area.⁶

14 Despite concerns about the prescription of statins to subjects with NAFLD or elevated liver
15 enzymes and normal lipid levels, current literature suggests that statins may even have beneficial
16 effects on the liver itself.^{7,8} There is also evidence that aspirin, angiotensin-converting enzyme
17 (ACE) inhibitors, and angiotensin receptor blockers (ARB) might be beneficial for fatty liver.^{9,10}

18 We have previously reported the effectiveness of the intervention on preventing major
19 cardiovascular events (MCVE) of a four-component pill (polypill) that included 81 mg aspirin,
20 20 mg atorvastatin, 12.5 mg hydrochlorothiazide, and either 5 mg enalapril (PolyPill-E) or 40 mg
21 valsartan (PolyPill-V) in a pragmatic cluster-randomized study in a rural population in Iran
22 (PolyIran).¹¹ Unfortunately, this study lacked information on the liver status of participants. The
23 current study is an extension of PolyIran in which we investigate the effects of the same polypill
24 on the risk of MCVE in an urban community (Gonbad city). Instead of excluding them, we
25 separately analyzed the effects on participants with increased liver enzyme levels and
26 participants with fatty liver.

27 **Methods:**

28 **Design and population**

1 The PolyIran-Liver study is an open-label, individually randomized controlled trial nested within
2 the Golestan cohort study (GCS).¹² The GCS is a population-based prospective cohort study run
3 in the Golestan province of Northern Iran. It was launched in 2004 and included 50,045
4 participants aged 40-75 years at enrolment. GCS participants are followed up annually and all
5 major cardiovascular and health events are recorded.

6 GCS participants older than 50 years and resident in Gonbad city were eligible for the PolyIran-
7 Liver study. A random sample of participants over 50 years of age was selected from the GCS
8 database and further randomized into two groups. After randomization, participants were invited
9 for additional measurements and to assess their eligibility for polypill and to obtain consent.
10 Seeking consent after randomization was first described by Marvin Zelen in 1979 and is
11 commonly referred to as the Zelen design. In this design participants are first randomly allocated
12 and then enrolled, allowing separate consent forms for intervention and control groups. A
13 possible shortcoming of this design is that participants' consent may be influenced by their
14 allocation to the intervention or control group, meaning there may be differences between the
15 groups. Despite its shortcomings, this design is easier to implement and generally improves
16 compliance of enrolled participants.¹³

17 In addition to analyzing results among the originally randomized population, we also compared
18 the rate of MCVE among consenting participants who were eligible for polypill. We refer to this
19 group as the consenting population (versus the randomized population). The randomized
20 population includes participants not consenting to the additional measurements, those not
21 meeting the eligibility criteria, and the consenting population. It represents the real-world
22 population that would be offered intervention, many of which will decline or not be eligible.
23 Studying this population will allow us to see whether polypill will help reduce MCVE in a real-
24 world setting where many participants might not consent or not be eligible. It should be noted
25 that all participants of the GCS have previously consented to gathering health and survival data
26 and annual follow-up through the GCS.

27 Participants were followed for MCVE and overall mortality for 5 years. Details of the design,
28 inclusion, and exclusion criteria have been published previously.¹⁴

29 **Randomization and blinding**

1 The urban population enrolled in the GCS and aged 50 years or older on October 2011
2 constituted the sampling frame. Of the 7,351 participants within the sampling frame, 2,400
3 participants were randomly selected using a computer-generated list with a sex ratio of 50:50.

4 The 2400 selected participants were further randomized to receive polypill once a day
5 (intervention group) or no polypill (control group) at a ratio of 55:45. According to our previous
6 experience with this population, we expected approximately 10% of the intervention group not to
7 consent to the intervention. Thus, the randomization ratio of 55:45 was chosen to achieve a 50:50
8 ratio after consent.

9 In this pragmatic trial, allocation was not concealed and participants and the enrolment team
10 were not blind to the allocation. However, the team assessing the primary and secondary
11 outcomes was blind.

12 **Procedures**

13 Following randomization, participants in intervention and control groups were contacted by
14 telephone and invited for participation in the study. For those accepting the invitation and
15 attended the eligibility assessment visit, written consent was obtained and laboratory tests,
16 ultrasonography, and liver stiffness measurements (LSM, FibroScan, Echosense, France) were
17 performed. Ultrasonography and liver stiffness measurements were each performed by a single
18 operator for all participants. Participants were identified as having presumed NAFLD (pNAFLD,
19 fatty liver) if suggested by ultrasound. If in addition to fatty liver, participants had elevated
20 alanine aminotransferase (ALT) levels (over 30 IU/L in men and 20 IU/L in women) they were
21 identified as presumed NASH (pNASH). Participants with alcohol use and active hepatitis B or
22 C were excluded. Other exclusion criteria included contraindications to the constituents of the
23 polypill.

24 Participants in the intervention group who agreed to participate and met eligibility criteria
25 received a once-daily supply of PolyPill V (Alborz Darou Pharmaceutical Company; Tehran,
26 Iran) which includes 81 mg aspirin, 12.5 mg hydrochlorothiazide, 20 mg atorvastatin, and 40 mg
27 valsartan. They were advised to take the pill at bedtime but were free to take it at any other time
28 if they or their physician chose. A one-day supply was provided and they were instructed to
29 return on the following day for evaluation of immediate adverse events (run-in period). One

1 other reason for implementing the run-in period was that based on our previous experience we
2 knew that some participants would consent to the study only because they felt obliged to
3 cooperate with the researchers in return for the free tests they were receiving and did not truly
4 intend to go through with the study. Participants who complied with the run-in period without
5 any immediate adverse events were enrolled in the study and provided with a supply of polypill.
6 Thus, only participants randomized to the intervention group who consented to the study, met
7 eligibility criteria, and completed the run-in period received the polypill. Participants in both
8 groups continued taking medications prescribed before entering the trial. Details of handling
9 participants already on components of the polypill has been previously published.¹⁴

10 Participants in both groups were visited every 6 months for 5 years. In each follow-up visit,
11 anthropometric and blood pressure measurements were performed. The participants were also
12 asked to fill out a short questionnaire about possible adverse events and additional medicine use.
13 Participants who were found to have high blood pressure (systolic blood pressure ≥ 140 mmHg,
14 or diastolic blood pressure ≥ 90 mmHg) in a follow-up visit were referred to their physician for
15 further evaluations. In the case of the intervention arm, there were two additional visits at months
16 one and two to check for important adverse events. Furthermore, a pill count was performed in
17 each follow-up visit to measure compliance. At the end of the 5-year follow-up period,
18 laboratory tests, ultrasonography, and liver stiffness measurements were repeated.

19 The randomized population was followed annually by the routine GCS follow-up team for
20 primary outcome and overall mortality.

21 **Endpoints**

22 The primary endpoint was the occurrence of an MCVE which was defined as fatal myocardial
23 infarction, sudden death, new-onset heart failure, coronary artery revascularization procedures,
24 fatal and non-fatal stroke, or hospitalization for an acute coronary event.

25 Secondary endpoints included all-cause mortality, individual components of the primary
26 outcome, and changes in blood pressure, low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, liver
27 stiffness, liver enzyme levels, compliance, and adverse events.

1 Investigators assessing primary and secondary endpoints were blinded to the allocation group of
2 participants. Details of endpoint assessment have been previously published.^{11,14}

3 **Statistical methods**

4 The justification of sample size has been previously described.¹⁴ We determined that the
5 contributed samples provided 80% power to detect a risk difference of an MCVE of 3.5%. The
6 samples contributed provided more than 95% power to detect a 2 IU/L difference in ALT after
7 30 and 60 months between the intervention and control groups, assuming a standard deviation of
8 changes from baseline of 10 IU/L.

9 Baseline characteristics were compared between study arms using the chi-square test for
10 categorical variables and independent t-test or non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test for
11 quantitative variables. Diabetes was defined as a fasting blood sugar ≥ 126 mg/dL, use of anti-
12 diabetes drugs, or self-report of a physician diagnosis. Hypertension was defined as systolic
13 blood pressure ≥ 140 mmHg, diastolic blood pressure ≥ 90 mmHg, self-report of a physician
14 diagnosis, or use of antihypertensive drugs in participants without a history of CVD.

15 The analysis was done in two parts. The first part was the intention-to-treat analysis of the
16 primary outcomes and overall mortality for the randomized population. This analysis included all
17 randomized participants including those who did not show up for additional measurements or
18 those not eligible or not consenting to treatment. All these participants had previously, on
19 enrollment to the GCS study, consented to collection of data on the primary outcomes and
20 overall mortality. The second part of the analysis was on primary and secondary outcomes in the
21 consenting population, including changes in liver-related variables (ALT, aspartate
22 aminotransferase [AST], and liver stiffness measure [LSM]) and other measurements conducted
23 for these participants.

24 We compared the risks of all MCVE, non-fatal CVD, CVD-related mortality, and overall
25 mortality between the intervention and control groups. We used the Poisson regression model
26 with a robust variance to obtain both adjusted and unadjusted relative risk (RR) and 95%
27 confidence intervals (Cis). Adjusted and unadjusted risk differences (RD) and 95% CIs were
28 obtained using binomial regression with identity link function. Adjustments were made for

1 variables that differed between study groups including smoking status (ever used vs. never used),
2 history of CVD, and baseline cholesterol.

3 To evaluate the effect of the polypill on cardiovascular outcomes in participants with liver
4 problems, we performed pre-specified stratified analyses by three liver-related variables: fatty
5 liver (pNAFLD); pNASH; elevated ALT levels only; and additionally, on LSM ≥ 7 KPa which
6 indicates significant fibrosis. Furthermore, subgroup analyses were performed by sex, body mass
7 index (BMI) category (normal, overweight and obese defined as < 25 , 25 to 29.9, and ≥ 30 kg/m²,
8 respectively), age groups (≤ 65 years and > 65 years), pre-existing CVD, pre-existing
9 hypertension, pre-existing diabetes mellitus, history of smoking (ever used vs. never used) and
10 baseline cholesterol (≤ 198 mg/dL and > 198 mg/dL). The risk of MCVE was also compared
11 between the intervention and control groups stratified by duration of follow-up interval (months
12 0–30, and months 31–60).

13 We also analyzed the adherence to polypill as measured by pill count. Adherence to polypill was
14 calculated by dividing the number of pills used by the participant by the number of pills supplied
15 and was categorized into high ($\geq 70\%$) and medium or low ($< 70\%$). To assess the association of
16 adherence to polypill tablets with baseline covariates we obtained the odds ratios and 95% CIs
17 with multiple logistic regression model.

18 For secondary outcomes, changes in liver function parameters, blood pressure, lipid profiles, and
19 BMI were analyzed using a generalized linear model and log transformations for variables with
20 non-normal distribution. We also evaluated the changes in liver function parameters in
21 participants with pNASH. We analyzed changes from baseline in three models: the first was only
22 adjusted for baseline values of that outcome; the second was further adjusted for age, sex, pre-
23 existing CVD, and diabetes mellitus; and the final model was further adjusted for baseline CVD
24 medication (including lipid-lowering drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, and aspirin).

25 An interim analysis 30 months after enrolment found no serious adverse effects and the
26 monitoring committee agreed to complete the 5-year follow-up. All analyses were done with
27 Stata software (version 12) and p-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

28 The study complies with the Declaration of Helsinki and informed consent was obtained from all
29 participants. The study protocol was approved by the institutional review board of the Digestive

1 Diseases Research Institute of Tehran University of Medical Sciences and ethics committees at
2 Tehran University of Medical Science and the Ministry of Health and Medical Education
3 (Tehran, Iran). The study is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, ID: NCT01245608.

4 **Results:**

5 We randomly selected 2400 participants from the urban population of GCS who resided in
6 Gonbad city. This population was randomly allocated to the intervention or control group with a
7 ratio of 55:45 (1320 individuals in the intervention and 1080 in the control group). Of these, 134
8 individuals had migrated or died and were excluded: 71 (5.4%) in the intervention group and 63
9 (5.8%) in the controls, leaving 2,266 (94.4%) participants available for the study. The socio-
10 economic, demographic, and measurement characteristics were similar between the two groups
11 when they were originally enrolled into the GCS in 2004¹⁴ (Table 1). We invited all 2,266
12 participants for eligibility assessment between October and December 2011.

13
14 Of the 2266 randomized participants invited for the eligibility assessment 404 declined to
15 participate (refused consent): 218 (17.5%) intervention and 186 (18.3%) controls. In addition,
16 156 (15.1%) in the intervention group and 110 (13.2%) in the control group did not meet
17 eligibility criteria. This left 875 (84.9%) in the intervention group and 721 (86.8%) in the control
18 group. Of those in the intervention group, 88 (10.1%) did not continue to take the polypill after
19 the one-day run-in and finally, 787 were enrolled in the intervention group and received polypill
20 (Figure 1). Details of the enrollment process have been published previously¹⁴. The baseline
21 characteristics of enrolled and excluded participants are given in Table 2.

22
23 A total of 1,508 individuals were enrolled in the consenting group; 787 in the polypill arm and
24 721 in the control arm, with a mean age of 58.6 and 59.4 years, respectively. 396 (50.3%) of the
25 participants in the intervention group and 376 (52.2%) in the control group were men (Table 2).
26 All baseline characteristics were similar between the two arms except for smoking, pre-existing
27 CVD, and baseline cholesterol. Individuals in the intervention group were less likely to smoke
28 but more likely to have pre-existing CVD and higher cholesterol levels (Table 2).

29

1 Primary outcome, individual components of the primary outcome, and overall mortality were
2 evaluated for the randomized population. 137 of 1017 in the control group (13.5%) and 138 of
3 1249 in the intervention group (11.0%) had MCVE during the 5-year follow-up (unadjusted RR
4 0.83, 95% CI 0.66-1.03 and RD -0.02, 95% CI -0.05 to 0.00) and the findings changed little and
5 remained non-significant after adjustment for age, sex, and previous history of CVD (Table 3,
6 graphical abstract). It should be noted that since all randomized participants did not consent to
7 additional measurements, some secondary endpoints were only available for the consenting
8 population. For the same reason, subgroup analysis for pNAFLD and pNASH was not possible
9 in the randomized population.

10 In the consenting group, after adjusting for smoking, baseline cholesterol, and pre-existing CVD
11 the preventive effect of polypill was statistically significant (adjusted RR 0.61, 95% CI 0.44-
12 0.83). We also observed a significantly lower risk of fatal MCVE, non-fatal MCVE, and all-
13 cause mortality in the intervention group as compared with controls. In stratified analysis with
14 respect to age, sex, BMI, baseline cholesterol, smoking, and pre-existing CVD, hypertension,
15 and diabetes, there were no statistically significant interactions between study arms and
16 subgroups (supplementary Table S1). After dividing the follow-up time into two intervals
17 (months 0–30, and months 31–60), the results were similar between the intervals (supplementary
18 Table S2).

19
20 In subgroup analysis, the RR of MCVE was less than half in participants with pNASH (adjusted
21 RR 0.35, 95% CI 0.17-0.74) versus those without pNASH (adjusted RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.49-1.00)
22 although this difference did not reach statistical significance. Similarly, the observed larger
23 preventive effect of polypill in participants with pNAFLD, elevated ALT, and LSM ≥ 7 KPa was
24 not statistically significant (Table 4).

25
26 Among subjects who received polypill, adherence was calculated at each follow-up visit and for
27 the entire duration of study. We observed that adherence decreased over time (supplementary
28 Figure S1). The median adherence among participants in the intervention group was 80.4% (Q1-
29 Q3: 31.2-93.1) and 437 (55.5 %) were in the high-adherence group (used more than 70% of
30 provided pills). High adherence was related to male sex, pre-existing hypertension, and presence
31 of fatty liver at baseline (Supplementary Table S3). The risk of MCVE was significantly lower in

1 participants with high adherence as compared with controls (adjusted RR 0.46, 95% CI 0.30-
2 0.71, Supplementary Table S2) as well as when compared with the low adherence group
3 (adjusted RR 0.53, 95% CI 0.33-0.86).

4
5 Secondary outcomes included changes in liver enzymes and liver stiffness. In the consenting
6 group, for whom additional measurement were available, we did not observe any significant
7 difference between changes in ALT, AST, and LSM from baseline to months 30 and 60 between
8 the study arms (Table 5). When only considering participants with pNASH, there was a greater
9 reduction in ALT level in the intervention group versus controls at both months 30 (mean change
10 3.3 IU/L [95% CI 0.1 to 6.6]) and 60 (mean change 1.9 IU/L [95% CI -1.3 to 4.9]). Changes in
11 AST and LSM were similar between the two study arms in months 30 and 60 (Table 5,
12 Supplementary Figure S2).

13
14 In the consenting intervention group, as compared to controls, we observed a significant
15 reduction in systolic but not diastolic blood pressure at month 30 and diastolic but not systolic
16 blood pressure at month 60. All lipid profiles (total cholesterol, LDL, and triglyceride) had a
17 greater reduction from baseline in the intervention group at both months 30 and 60 (Table 6).

18 The incidence of different adverse events was similar between the two arms throughout the
19 study. The frequency of adverse events decreased over time except for dyspepsia and cataract
20 which remained fairly constant after month 18 (Supplementary Figure S3).

21 In Table 7 we compared the results from this study and our previous PolyIran study.¹¹

22 **Discussion:**

23 In this pragmatic individually randomized controlled trial, we observed a statistically
24 insignificant 17% RR reduction in MCVE among the randomized population. However, among
25 subjects who consented to additional measurements and received polypill, our results showed a
26 statistically significant 39% reduction in the risk of MCVE with similar reductions in CVD-
27 related and all-cause mortality. The reduction in the risk of MCVE was greater in the participants
28 with high adherence to polypill. The effects on MCVE in this group were consistent with our
29 previous PolyIran study (adjusted hazard ratio 0.66, 95% CI 0.55-0.80), which had the same

1 entry criteria and used the same fixed-dose combination but was conducted in a rural setting as a
2 cluster-randomized controlled trial.¹¹ These results were also close to other polypill studies, in
3 particular the aspirin containing arm of the TIPS3 study in which the reported hazard ratio for
4 MCVE was 0.69 vs our observation of 0.60.¹⁵

5 After 5 years, we observed a significant decrease of 36% in LDL cholesterol levels of the
6 intervention group which is as expected for the dose of atorvastatin used in our polypill (20 mg)
7 and in line with the suggestion from the literature to decrease LDL by 30-49%.^{16,17} But
8 surprisingly, the decrease in blood pressure of the intervention group was not greater than
9 controls (Table 6). A less than anticipated decrease in blood pressure was also observed in the
10 PolyIran study.¹¹ It is expected that valsartan at the dose of 40 mg would decrease systolic blood
11 pressure by 5.7 and diastolic blood pressure by 2.8 mmHg.¹⁸ The minimal decrease in blood
12 pressure observed in our and the PolyIran study might be due to the fact that most subjects had
13 normal blood pressure at enrollment. Furthermore, it might be related to the high salt intake
14 among Iranians which is almost twice the World Health Organization recommendation.¹⁹ Other
15 possible reasons include development of tolerance to pharmacologic agents and non-adherence
16 happening over the 5-year follow-up period.

17 The analysis of the randomized population is less likely to be attributable to selection bias. In this
18 group we found that those randomized to receive polypill had an 17% reduction of MCVE but
19 the difference was not statistically significant. It should be noted that only 63.0% of the 1249
20 participants in the pre-consent intervention group actually received polypill as many did not
21 consent to the study or had exclusion criteria. This greatly dilutes any true effect of polypill and
22 explains the non-significance we observed in this group. It also indicates that if polypill is to be
23 used effectively as a strategy to reduce MCVE in a real-world setting, steps should be taken to
24 increase acceptance.

25 An important advantage of our study is that we included participants with increased liver enzyme
26 levels. Such participants are often excluded from trials of statins and other prevention studies. In
27 fact, in this group, we observed similar reductions in MCVE as well as a reduction in ALT
28 indicating that it is both safe and effective to use these drugs in individuals with liver enzyme
29 elevations.

1 Another important finding of our study was the effect of polypill on the liver of participants with
2 fatty liver. We observed that within the intervention group, although no overall changes in ALT
3 were observed in consenting participants or in those with fatty liver, those with pNASH had a
4 statistically significant decrease of ALT levels of 10.5 and 12 IU after 30 and 60 months of
5 polypill, respectively (Table 5). The pNASH participants in the control group also had a decrease
6 of ALT but the change was significantly less. This improvement in ALT of pNASH participants
7 with polypill not only further confirms the safety of statins in this subgroup but also
8 demonstrates a beneficial effect on the liver similar to that reported in the literature.^{7,8,20,21} We
9 did observe some reduction in AST and liver stiffness although it did not achieve statistical
10 significance (Supplementary Figure S2). This can be explained by the fact that both AST and
11 liver stiffness are indicators of fibrosis which takes a long time to resolve. A longer study would
12 be required to identify changes in AST or LSM.

13 One of the major benefits of combination therapy is better compliance. It is much easier to take
14 one pill rather than four as confirmed by early polypill studies that used adherence as a primary
15 outcome.²² Adherence to polypill in our study was relatively high. The median of adherence in
16 the intervention group throughout the study was 80% which is slightly higher than those reported
17 by Thom et al²² and Selak et al²³ over the same follow-up interval. This could be due to the trust
18 built up among participants by conducting this trial in the GCS setting with more than 15 years
19 of follow-up.

20 We observed that adherence was associated with male sex, pre-existing hypertension, and fatty
21 liver. We believe better compliance in hypertensive and fatty liver participants was because these
22 individuals, knowing that they had some health problem, were more motivated. We have no
23 explanation as to why male participants were more compliant which is opposite to previous
24 reports.²⁴

25 **Limitations**

26 One of the limitations of our study is the lack of placebo control and allocation concealment.
27 Participants and the enrolment team who assessed the eligibility criteria were not blind to the
28 participant's allocation. Lack of allocation concealment might result in the enrollment team,
29 fearing adverse events, being inclined to exclude more participants on the intervention group

1 than controls. However, the exclusion criteria were defined objectively and there were no
2 significant differences in the baseline characteristics of participants excluded from either of the
3 study arms suggesting that lack of allocation concealment has not significantly affected our
4 results.

5 One other limitation is less participation in the control group as compared to intervention in the
6 final follow-up visit (56% vs. 76%) when laboratory and imaging studies were repeated. It
7 appears that participants not receiving intervention were less inclined to continue with follow-up.
8 As the primary outcome of our study was assessed separately by the GCS follow-up team which
9 had a similar participation rate between groups, the lack of follow-up would have only affected
10 our secondary outcomes.

11 Another limitation of our study is the definition of fatty liver and NASH. These are histologic
12 terms and can only be used with certainty if liver biopsies are performed. Obviously, this is not
13 an option for a study being performed on healthy individuals. Our best option was to “presume”
14 NAFLD or fatty liver when ultrasonographic evidence suggested so knowing that up to 30% of
15 fatty liver cases might be missed.²⁵ This approach has been frequently used in epidemiologic
16 studies on fatty liver as there is no reasonable alternative.²⁶ The definition of NASH in our study
17 is even more “presumed” as it is well known that a single increased ALT level is not a good
18 indicator for NASH.²⁷ Nevertheless, in the lack of better options, increased ALT has been
19 previously used as a marker for NASH.^{28,29}

20 It should also be mentioned that the power of our study was not enough to prove the increased
21 benefit among NASH participants vs non-NASH, although our findings did provide some
22 indication that this may be the case.

23 We should caution that although the analysis of the consenting group is more sensitive as it
24 excludes non-consenting participants from the original randomized population, there is a
25 significant imbalance among baseline characteristics between the arms of this group and there is
26 an increased risk of bias.

27 **Conclusion**

1 This is the first study that reports the effects of a polypill in participants with fatty liver or
2 NASH. The benefits observed among subjects consenting to take polypill are consistent with our
3 previous trial in people with unknown liver state and, taken together, our two trials reinforce
4 each other and indicate that polypill is useful in people with and without fatty liver and NASH. It
5 is not necessary to evaluate the state of the liver by ultrasound, liver stiffness level, or liver
6 enzyme levels before starting polypill. In addition, our study indicates that polypill can reduce
7 ALT levels in individuals with fatty liver and increased ALT.

8 Individuals with fatty liver and NASH are more likely to develop CVD. We do not have an
9 effective medical treatment for the liver but preventing CVD, the main cause of death in this
10 group, is an important management objective.

11 **Funding:**

12 The work was supported by the Barakat Foundation, Alborz Darou, and Tehran University of
13 Medical Sciences. The Golestan Cohort Study is supported by Cancer Research UK [grant no.
14 C20/A5860], Tehran University of Medical Sciences [grant no 81/15], and the International
15 Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). TM is supported by the National Institute for Health
16 Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) West Midlands. The views expressed
17 are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and
18 Social Care. None of the funders were involved in any part of the study including design, data
19 collection, statistical analysis or decision to publish.

20 **Acknowledgements:**

21 We would like to thank Karla Hemming who provided advice about analysis at the early stages
22 of the study (after randomization) and commented on the final draft before submission for
23 publication. We also thank Hamid Reza Jamshidi from the Barakat Foundation, Behrooz Abaie
24 from the Digestive Disease Research Institute of Tehran University of Medical Sciences (Tehran,
25 Iran), Golestan Cohort Study (GCS) center staff, Golestan University of Medical Sciences
26 (Gorgan, Iran), and the chiefs of the Gonbad health districts for their assistance and support. We
27 also thank the GCS participants who participated in this trial.

28 **Data Availability Statement:**

1 Individual de-identified data is available after request through emailing the corresponding author
2 subject to the approval of the trial management team. Researchers might be required to submit a
3 formal request.

4 **Disclosures:**

5 None to declare

6 **Author Contributions:**

7 RM, KKC, TM, and SM helped in designing the study. HP, SM, MK, and EJ helped in study
8 administration and supervision. ARR and ASK performed and interpreted radiologic studies.
9 Statistical analysis was performed by MS and EJ. The first draft was prepared by SM, MS, and
10 EJ. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

1 References

- 2 1. Younossi Z, Anstee QM, Marietti M, Hardy T, Henry L, Eslam M, George J, Bugianesi E. Global
3 burden of NAFLD and NASH: trends, predictions, risk factors and prevention. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol*
4 *Hepatol.* 2018;15(1):11-20.
- 5 2. Targher G, Byrne CD, Lonardo A, Zoppini G, Barbui C. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and risk of
6 incident cardiovascular disease: A meta-analysis. *J Hepatol.* 2016;65(3):589-600.
- 7 3. Younossi Z, Tacke F, Arrese M, Chander Sharma B, Mostafa I, Bugianesi E, Wai-Sun Wong V,
8 Yilmaz Y, George J, Fan J, Vos MB. Global Perspectives on Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and
9 Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis. *Hepatology.* 2019;69(6):2672-82.
- 10 4. Zeb I, Li D, Budoff MJ, Katz R, Lloyd-Jones D, Agatston A, Blumenthal RS, Blaha MJ, Blankstein R,
11 Carr J, Nasir K. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Incident Cardiac Events: The Multi-Ethnic Study of
12 Atherosclerosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016;67(16):1965-6.
- 13 5. Wu S, Wu F, Ding Y, Hou J, Bi J, Zhang Z. Association of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease with
14 major adverse cardiovascular events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:33386.
- 15 6. Soliman EZ, Mendis S, Dissanayake WP, Somasundaram NP, Gunaratne PS, Jayasingne IK,
16 Furberg CD. A Polypill for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: a feasibility study of the World
17 Health Organization. *Trials.* 2011;12:3.
- 18 7. Nascimbeni F, Pellegrini E, Lugari S, Mondelli A, Bursi S, Onfiani G, Carubbi F, Lonardo A. Statins
19 and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in the era of precision medicine: More friends than foes.
20 *Atherosclerosis.* 2019;284:66-74.
- 21 8. Sigler MA, Congdon L, Edwards KL. An Evidence-Based Review of Statin Use in Patients With
22 Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Clin Med Insights Gastroenterol.* 2018;11:1179552218787502.
- 23 9. Simon TG, Henson J, Osganian S, Masia R, Chan AT, Chung RT, Corey KE. Daily Aspirin Use
24 Associated With Reduced Risk For Fibrosis Progression In Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease.
25 *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2019;17(13):2776-84.e4.
- 26 10. Goh GB, Pagadala MR, Dasarathy J, Unalp-Arida A, Sargent R, Hawkins C, Sourianarayanan A,
27 Khiyami A, Yerian L, Pai R, McCullough AJ, Dasarathy S. Renin-angiotensin system and fibrosis in non-
28 alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Liver Int.* 2015;35(3):979-85.
- 29 11. Roshandel G, Khoshnia M, Poustchi H, Hemming K, Kamangar F, Gharavi A, Ostovaneh MR,
30 Nateghi A, Majed M, Navabakhsh B, Merat S, Pourshams A, Nalini M, Malekzadeh F, Sadeghi M,
31 Mohammadifard N, Sarrafzadegan N, Naemi-Tabiei M, Fazel A, Brennan P, Etemadi A, Boffetta P,
32 Thomas N, Marshall T, Cheng KK, Malekzadeh R. Effectiveness of polypill for primary and secondary
33 prevention of cardiovascular diseases (PolyIran): a pragmatic, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet.*
34 2019;394(10199):672-83.
- 35 12. Pourshams A, Saadatian-Elahi M, Nouraie M, Malekshah AF, Rakhshani N, Salahi R, Yoonessi A,
36 Semnani S, Islami F, Sotoudeh M, Fahimi S, Sadjadi AR, Nasrollahzadeh D, Aghcheli K, Kamangar F, Abnet
37 CC, Saidi F, Sewram V, Strickland PT, Dawsey SM, Brennan P, Boffetta P, Malekzadeh R. Golestan cohort
38 study of oesophageal cancer: feasibility and first results. *Br J Cancer.* 2005;92(1):176-81.
- 39 13. Zelen M. A new design for randomized clinical trials. *N Engl J Med.* 1979;300(22):1242-5.
- 40 14. Merat S, Poustchi H, Hemming K, Jafari E, Radmard AR, Nateghi A, Shiravi Khuzani A, Khoshnia
41 M, Marshall T, Malekzadeh R. PolyPill for Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease in an Urban Iranian
42 Population with Special Focus on Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial
43 within a Cohort (PolyIran - Liver) - Study Protocol. *Arch Iran Med.* 2015;18(8):515-23.
- 44 15. Yusuf S, Joseph P, Dans A, Gao P, Teo K, Xavier D, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Yusoff K, Santoso A, Gamra
45 H, Talukder S, Christou C, Girish P, Yeates K, Xavier F, Dagenais G, Rocha C, McCready T, Tyrwhitt J, Bosch
46 J, Pais P, International Polycap Study 3 Investigators. Polypill with or without Aspirin in Persons without
47 Cardiovascular Disease. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(3):216-28.

- 1 16. Nawrocki JW, Weiss SR, Davidson MH, Sprecher DL, Schwartz SL, Lupien PJ, Jones PH, Haber HE,
2 Black DM. Reduction of LDL cholesterol by 25% to 60% in patients with primary hypercholesterolemia by
3 atorvastatin, a new HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol.* 1995;15(5):678-82.
- 4 17. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, Beam C, Birtcher KK, Blumenthal RS, Braun LT, de Ferranti S,
5 Faiella-Tommasino J, Forman DE, Goldberg R, Heidenreich PA, Hlatky MA, Jones DW, Lloyd-Jones D,
6 Lopez-Pajares N, Ndumele CE, Orringer CE, Peralta CA, Saseen JJ, Smith SC, Jr., Sperling L, Virani SS,
7 Yeboah J. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the
8 Management of Blood Cholesterol: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of
9 Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.*
10 2019;73(24):3168-209.
- 11 18. Pool J, Oparil S, Hedner T, Glazer R, Oddou-Stock P, Hester A. Dose-responsive antihypertensive
12 efficacy of valsartan, a new angiotensin II-receptor blocker. *Clin Ther.* 1998;20(6):1106-14.
- 13 19. Rezaei S, Mahmoudi Z, Sheidaei A, Aryan Z, Mahmoudi N, Gohari K, Yoosefi M, Hajipour MJ,
14 Dilmaghani-Marand A, Soleimanzadehkhayat M, Gholami A, Mirab Samiee S, Moradi G, Larijani B,
15 Farzadfar F. Salt intake among Iranian population: the first national report on salt intake in Iran. *J*
16 *Hypertens.* 2018;36(12):2380-9.
- 17 20. Athyros VG, Boutari C, Stavropoulos K, Anagnostis P, Imprialos KP, Doumas M, Karagiannis A.
18 Statins: An Under-Appreciated Asset for the Prevention and the Treatment of NAFLD or NASH and the
19 Related Cardiovascular Risk. *Curr Vasc Pharmacol.* 2018;16(3):246-53.
- 20 21. Doumas M, Imprialos K, Dimakopoulou A, Stavropoulos K, Binas A, Athyros VG. The Role of
21 Statins in the Management of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Curr Pharm Des.* 2018;24(38):4587-92.
- 22 22. Thom S, Poulter N, Field J, Patel A, Prabhakaran D, Stanton A, Grobbee DE, Bots ML, Reddy KS,
23 Cidambi R, Bompont S, Billot L, Rodgers A, UMPIRE Collaborative Group. Effects of a fixed-dose
24 combination strategy on adherence and risk factors in patients with or at high risk of CVD: the UMPIRE
25 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* 2013;310(9):918-29.
- 26 23. Selak V, Elley CR, Bullen C, Crengle S, Wadham A, Rafter N, Parag V, Harwood M, Doughty RN,
27 Arroll B, Milne RJ, Bramley D, Bryant L, Jackson R, Rodgers A. Effect of fixed dose combination treatment
28 on adherence and risk factor control among patients at high risk of cardiovascular disease: randomised
29 controlled trial in primary care. *BMJ.* 2014;348:g3318.
- 30 24. Gast A, Mathes T. Medication adherence influencing factors—an (updated) overview of
31 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2019;8(1):112.
- 32 25. Lee SS, Park SH, Kim HJ, Kim SY, Kim MY, Kim DY, Suh DJ, Kim KM, Bae MH, Lee JY, Lee SG, Yu ES.
33 Non-invasive assessment of hepatic steatosis: prospective comparison of the accuracy of imaging
34 examinations. *J Hepatol.* 2010;52(4):579-85.
- 35 26. Clark JM, Diehl AM. Defining nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: implications for epidemiologic
36 studies. *Gastroenterology.* 2003;124(1):248-50.
- 37 27. Verma S, Jensen D, Hart J, Mohanty SR. Predictive value of ALT levels for non-alcoholic
38 steatohepatitis (NASH) and advanced fibrosis in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). *Liver Int.*
39 2013;33(9):1398-405.
- 40 28. Jamali R, Khonsari M, Merat S, Khoshnia M, Jafari E, Bahram Kalhori A, Abolghasemi H, Amini S,
41 Maghsoudlu M, Deyhim MR, Rezvan H, Pourshams A. Persistent alanine aminotransferase elevation
42 among the general Iranian population: prevalence and causes. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2008;14(18):2867-
43 71.
- 44 29. Sohrabpour A, Rezvan H, Amini-Kafiabad S, Dayhim M, Merat S, Pourshams A. Prevalence of
45 Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis in Iran: A Population based Study. *Middle East J Dig Dis.* 2010;2(1):14-9.

- 1 **Figure Legends:**
- 2 **Figure 1:** Participant flow