(Figures showing the prompts fed to ChatGPT for analysis and pooled results generated by the ChatGPT)

1. Sreenivasan 2024 (12)

1.1. MACE

In the pooled analysis of fourteen studies for MACE named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M and N
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 11/105 and events/ total of control are 12/105
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 24/142 and events/ total of control are 33/142
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 12/297 and events/ total of control are 20/246
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 25/115 and events/ total of control are 29/115
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 5/201 and events/ total of control are 14/201
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 8/61 and events/ total of control are 17/62
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/40 and events/ total of control are 2/45
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/58 and events/ total of control are 3/59
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/120 and events/ total of control are 2/120
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/105 and events/ total of control are 1/96
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 22/167 and events/ total of control are 37/169
In study L, the events/ total of intervention group are 36/700 and events/ total of control are 70/700
In study M, the events/ total of intervention group are 27/289 and events/ total of control are 11/142
In study N, the events/ total of intervention group are 6/101 and events/ total of control are 3/49

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model yielded the following results for MACE:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.67
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.56 to 0.81
- **p-value:** 0.000033

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of events in the intervention group compared to the control group.

2. Cardiac Death

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for cardiac death named as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K

In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/142 and events/ total of control are 2/142
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/297 and events/ total of control are 1/246
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/115 and events/ total of control are 5/115
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/201 and events/ total of control are 2/201
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/61 and events/ total of control are 3/62
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/40 and events/ total of control are 1/45
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/167 and events/ total of control are 10/169
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 6/700 and events/ total of control are 14/700
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/289 and events/ total of control are 0/142
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/101 and events/ total of control are 1/49
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 16/1092 and events/ total of control are 17/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for cardiac death yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.46
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.29 to 0.72
- **p-value:** 0.000738

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of cardiac death in the intervention group compared to the control group.

3. All cause Death

In the pooled analysis of twelve studies for all cause death named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K and L
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/105 and events/ total of control are 2/105
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/142 and events/ total of control are 4/142
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/297 and events/ total of control are 2/246
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 6/115 and events/ total of control are 7/115
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/201 and events/ total of control are 3/201
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/120 and events/ total of control are 0/120
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/105 and events/ total of control are 0/96
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 6/700 and events/ total of control are 15/700
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 31/714 and events/ total of control are 31/709
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/289 and events/ total of control are 0/142
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/101 and events/ total of control are 1/49
In study L, the events/ total of intervention group are 42/1092 and events/ total of control are 28/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for all-cause death yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.80
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.60 to 1.06
- **p-value:** 0.124

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of all-cause death between the intervention group and the control group.

4. Myocardial Infarction

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for myocardial infarction named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/105 and events/ total of control are 4/105
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 10/142 and events/ total of control are 12/142
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/297 and events/ total of control are 2/246
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 20/115 and events/ total of control are 15/115
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/201 and events/ total of control are 2/201
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/61 and events/ total of control are 2/62
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/120 and events/ total of control are 1/120
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/105 and events/ total of control are 0/96
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 19/167 and events/ total of control are 23/169
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 7/289 and events/ total of control are 3/142
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 43/1092 and events/ total of control are 32/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for myocardial infarction yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.84
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.64 to 1.10
- **p-value:** 0.197

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of myocardial infarction between the intervention group and the control group.

1.5 Target vessel MI

In the pooled analysis of five studies for target vessel myocardial infarction named A, B, C, D and E

In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 4/700 and events/ total of control are 6/700
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 7/714 and events/ total of control are 15/709
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/289 and events/ total of control are 1/142
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/101 and events/ total of control are 2/49
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 38/1092 and events/ total of control are 30/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for target vessel myocardial infarction yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.61
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.42 to 0.90
- **p-value:** 0.011

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of target vessel myocardial infarction in the intervention group compared to the control group.

6. Target lesion revascularization

In the pooled analysis of ten studies for target lesion revascularization named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 6/105 and events/ total of control are 6/105
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 13/142 and events/ total of control are 17/142
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 8/115 and events/ total of control are 12/115
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 5/201 and events/ total of control are 8/201
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 5/61 and events/ total of control are 12/62
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/58 and events/ total of control are 2/59
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/105 and events/ total of control are 1/96
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/167 and events/ total of control are 5/169
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/101 and events/ total of control are 0/49
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 24/1092 and events/ total of control are 20/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for target lesion revascularization yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.66
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.48 to 0.91
- **p-value:** 0.010

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of target lesion revascularization in the intervention group compared to the control group. [>-]

1.7 Target vessel revascularization

In the pooled analysis of seven studies for target vessel revascularization named A, B, C, D, E, F and G

In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 14/142 and events/ total of control are 22/142
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 12/297 and events/ total of control are 18/246
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 9/115 and events/ total of control are 14/115
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 5/201 and events/ total of control are 10/201
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/120 and events/ total of control are 1/120
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 7/167 and events/ total of control are 15/169
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 32/1092 and events/ total of control are 25/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for target vessel revascularization yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.60
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.45 to 0.80
- **p-value:** 0.00053

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of target vessel revascularization in the intervention group compared to the control group.

1.8 Stent Thrombosis

In the pooled analysis of fourteen studies for stent thrombosis named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M and N
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 4/105 and events/ total of control are 6/105
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/297 and events/ total of control are 1/246
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/115 and events/ total of control are 8/115
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/201 and events/ total of control are 3/201
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/40 and events/ total of control are 1/45
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/58 and events/ total of control are 1/59
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/120 and events/ total of control are 0/120
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/167 and events/ total of control are 5/169
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 2/700 and events/ total of control are 2/700
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/714 and events/ total of control are 8/709
In study L, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/289 and events/ total of control are 0/142
In study M, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/101 and events/ total of control are 0/49
In study N, the events/ total of intervention group are 26/1092 and events/ total of control are 14/547
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled risk ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for stent thrombosis yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.67
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.42 to 1.06
- **p-value:** 0.090

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of stent thrombosis between the intervention group and the control group.

2. Patel 2024 (13)

2.1 MACE

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for MACE named as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 490/4687 and events/ total of control are 282/2333
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 585/5795 and events/ total of control are 426/4347
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 756/8582 and events/ total of control are 803/8578
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 735/5499 and events/ total of control are 368/2747
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 289/2373 and events/ total of control are 332/2371
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 228/1863 and events/ total of control are 233/1867
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 319/2997 and events/ total of control are 331/2991
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group [illegible] 367/3131 and events/ total of control are 390/3132
In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 217/2202 and events/ total of control are 269/2199
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 132/2152 and events/ total of control are 143/2152
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 138/3304 and events/ total of control are 143/3305

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for MACE yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 0.94
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.90 to 0.98
- **p-value:** 0.005

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of MACE in the intervention group compared to the control group.

2.2 Cardiovascular related death

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for cardiovascular death named as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 172/4687 and events/ total of control are 137/2333
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 268/5795 and events/ total of control are 185/4347
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 245/8582 and events/ total of control are 249/8578
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 341/5499 and events/ total of control are 184/2747
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 227/2373 and events/ total of control are 273/2371
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 187/1863 and events/ total of control are 202/1867
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 219/2997 and events/ total of control are 244/2991
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 231/3131 and events/ total of control are 261/3132

In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 110/2202 and events/ total of control are 140/2199
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 65/2152 and events/ total of control are 80/2152
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 59/3304 and events/ total of control are 69/3305

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for cardiovascular death yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 0.88
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.81 to 0.96
- **p-value:** 0.0037

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the risk of cardiovascular death in the intervention group compared to the control group.

2.3 Myocardial Infarction

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for MI named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I andJ
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 223/4687 and events/ total of control are 126/2333
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 248/5795 and events/ total of control are 173/4347
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 393/8582 and events/ total of control are 441/8578
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 330/5499 and events/ total of control are 158/2747
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 46/2373 and events/ total of control are 41/2371
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 19/1863 and events/ total of control are 20/1867
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 49/2997 and events/ total of control are 40/2991
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 83/3131 and events/ total of control are 81/3132

In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 83/2202 and events/ total of control are 95/2199
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 40/2152 and events/ total of control are 37/2152
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 49/3304 and events/ total of control are 44/3305

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for myocardial infarction (MI) yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 0.97
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.90 to 1.05
- **p-value:** 0.429

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of myocardial infarction between the intervention group and the control group.

2.4 Stroke

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for stroke named as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I , J and K
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 164/4687 and events/ total of control are 69/2333
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 176/5795 and events/ total of control are 133/4347
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 255/8582 and events/ total of control are 263/8578
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 87/5499 and events/ total of control are 185/2747
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 42/2373 and events/ total of control are 46/2371
In study F, the events/ total of intervention group are 40/1863 and events/ total of control are 35/1867
In study G, the events/ total of intervention group are 92/2997 and events/ total of control are 84/2991
In study H, the events/ total of intervention group are 115/3131 and events/ total of control are 109/3132

In study I, the events/ total of intervention group are 62/2202 and events/ total of control are 80/2199
In study J, the events/ total of intervention group are 43/2152 and events/ total of control are 43/2152
In study K, the events/ total of intervention group are 48/3304 and events/ total of control are 49/3305

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of pooled hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for stroke yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 0.87
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.65 to 1.18
- **p-value:** 0.380

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of stroke between the intervention group and the control group.

3. Sacoransky 2024 (14)

3.1 Thrombus formation

In the pooled analysis of four studies for thrombus formation named as A, B, C and D
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/64 and events/ total of control are 1/108
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 4/168 and events/ total of control are 21/258
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/44 and events/ total of control are 2/80
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/139 and events/ total of control are 12/140

Perform the pooled analysis using fixed effect model and give calculated values of odds ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the fixed effect model for thrombus formation yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Odds Ratio (OR):** 0.37
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.16 to 0.86
- **p-value:** 0.021

This indicates a statistically significant reduction in the odds of thrombus formation in the intervention group compared to the control group.

3.2 Bleeding

In the pooled analysis of five studies named A, B, C, D and E
In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 4/64 and events/ total of control are 0/108
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 5/168 and events/ total of control are 6/258
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/44 and events/ total of control are 1/80
In study D, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/139 and events/ total of control are 0/140
In study E, the events/ total of intervention group are 11/131 and events/ total of control are 6/329

Perform the pooled analysis using fixed effect model and give calculated values of odds ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the fixed effect model for the given studies yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Odds Ratio (OR):** 2.82
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.30 to 6.13
- **p-value:** 0.009

This indicates a statistically significant increase in the odds of events in the intervention group compared to the control group.

3.3 Systemic embolism

In the pooled analysis of three studies for systemic embolism named as A, B and C

In study A, the events/ total of intervention group are 3/168 and events/ total of control are 9/258
In study B, the events/ total of intervention group are 0/44 and events/ total of control are 2/80
In study C, the events/ total of intervention group are 1/139 and events/ total of control are 4/140

Perform the pooled analysis using fixed effect model and give calculated values of odds ratio, 95% confidence interval and p-value

The pooled analysis using the fixed effect model for systemic embolism yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Odds Ratio (OR):** 0.42
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.13 to 1.29
- **p-value:** 0.130

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the odds of systemic embolism between the intervention group and the control group.

4. Paolucci 2024 (15)

4.1 Relationship between PMI (UDMI and UDMI-like definitions) and mortality

In the pooled analysis of fourteen studies named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M and N
In study A, the log hazard ratio 0.4886 and SE value is 0.2648
In study B, the log hazard ratio 0.5988 and SE value is 0.2432
In study C, the log hazard ratio 1.5326 and SE value is 0.3682
In study D, the log hazard ratio 0.2311 and SE value is 0.4229
In study E, the log hazard ratio -0.0408 and SE value is 0.398
In study F, the log hazard ratio 1.1663 and SE value is 0.4161
In study G, the log hazard ratio 0.4121 and SE value is 0.2258
In study H, the log hazard ratio 0.5188 and SE value is 0.2069
In study I, the log hazard ratio 0.8459 and SE value is 0.3692
In study J, the log hazard ratio 0.0583 and SE value is 0.551
In study K, the log hazard ratio 0.3365 and SE value is 0.6023
In study L, the log hazard ratio 0.0198 and SE value is 0.4776
In study M, the log hazard ratio 0.27 and SE value is 0.1227
In study N, the log hazard ratio -0.0943 and SE value is 0.5175
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for the given studies yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 1.61
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.32 to 1.97
- **p-value:** 3.19×10^{-6}

This indicates a highly statistically significant increase in the hazard ratio for the intervention group compared to the control group.

4.2 Relationship between PMI (ARC-2 definition) and mortality

In the pooled analysis of five studies named A, B , C, D and E
In study A, the log hazard ratio 0.9322 and SE value is 0.4556
In study B, the log hazard ratio 0.2231 and SE value is 0.4282
In study C, the log hazard ratio 1.0225 and SE value is 0.3762
In study D, the log hazard ratio 0.0296 and SE value is 0.6294
In study E, the log hazard ratio 1.0367 and SE value is 0.4576

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for the given studies yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 2.07
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.40 to 3.08
- **p-value:** 0.0003

This indicates a statistically significant increase in the hazard ratio for the intervention group compared to the control group.

4.3 Relationship between PMI (SCAI and SCAI-like definitions) and mortality

In the pooled analysis of fourteen studies named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M and N
In study A, the log hazard ratio 0.4574 and SE value is 0.2085
In study B, the log hazard ratio 1.5644 and SE value is 0.2276
In study C, the log hazard ratio 1.075 and SE value is 0.2718
In study D, the log hazard ratio 1.1663 and SE value is 0.2784
In study E, the log hazard ratio 0.7129 and SE value is 0.3689
In study F, the log hazard ratio 1.4586 and SE value is 0.2337
In study G, the log hazard ratio 1.1346 and SE value is 0.4334
In study H, the log hazard ratio 1.6974 and SE value is 0.413
In study I, the log hazard ratio 1.556 and SE value is 0.3143
In study J, the log hazard ratio 1.4996 and SE value is 0.4244
In study K, the log hazard ratio 1.905 and SE value is 0.6261
In study L, the log hazard ratio 0.2852 and SE value is 0.1304
In study M, the log hazard ratio 1.411 and SE value is 0.2504
In study N, the log hazard ratio 1.2326 and SE value is 0.3261
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of hazard ratio, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for the given studies yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Hazard Ratio (HR):** 3.24
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 2.36 to 4.44
- **p-value:** 2.68×10^{-13}

This indicates a highly statistically significant increase in the hazard ratio for the intervention group compared to the control group.

5. Ang 2024(16)

5.1 Major vascular complications

In the pooled analysis of eleven studies for major vascular complications named A, B, C, D, and E
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 8 and did not occur in:40 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 93 and did not occur in:1158
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 4 and did not occur in:95 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 18 and did not occur in:974
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 9 and did not occur in:58 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 72 and did not occur in:1174
In study D, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 0 and did not occur in:25 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 0 and did not occur in:195
In study E, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 20 and did not occur in:69 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 205 and did not occur in:1919

Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for major vascular complications yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 2.30
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.72 to 3.09
- **p-value:** 2.67×10^{-8}

This indicates a highly statistically significant increase in the risk of major vascular complications in the intervention group compared to the control group.

5.2 Major bleeding

In the pooled analysis of studies for major bleeding named A, B, C, D, and E
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 11 and did not occur in:37 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 155 and did not occur in:1096
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:98 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 8 and did not occur in:984
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 19 and did not occur in:48 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 186 and did not occur in:1060
In study D, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:24 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 11 and did not occur in:184
In study E, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 23 and did not occur in:66 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 399 and did not occur in:1725
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for major bleeding yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 1.61
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.27 to 2.05
- **p-value:** 8.09×10^{-5}

This indicates a statistically significant increase in the risk of major bleeding in the intervention group compared to the control group.

5.3 Aortic annulus rupture

In the pooled analysis of studies for aortic annulus rupture named A, B, and C
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:47 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 5 and did not occur in:1246
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:97 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:990
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:65 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 13 and did not occur in:1233
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for aortic annulus rupture yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 4.66
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.67 to 13.01
- **p-value:** 0.0033

This indicates a statistically significant increase in the risk of aortic annulus rupture in the intervention group compared to the control group.

5.4 Cardiac Tamponade

In the pooled analysis of studies for cardiac tamponade named A, B, and C
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 4 and did not occur in:44 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 27 and did not occur in:1224
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:24 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 5 and did not occur in:190
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:88 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 12 and did not occur in:2112
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for cardiac tamponade yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 3.00
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.31 to 6.89
- **p-value:** 0.0095

This indicates a statistically significant increase in the risk of cardiac tamponade in the intervention group compared to the control group.

5.5 Minor vascular complications

In the pooled analysis of studies for minor vascular complications named A, B, C, and D
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 5 and did not occur in:94 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 50 and did not occur in:942
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 7 and did not occur in:60 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 76 and did not occur in:1170
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 11 and did not occur in:14 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 45 and did not occur in:150
In study D, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 8 and did not occur in:81 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 200 and did not occur in:1924
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for minor vascular complications yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 1.43
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 1.00 to 2.04
- **p-value:** 0.052

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of minor vascular complications between the intervention group and the control group, although the result is very close to the threshold for statistical significance.

5.6 Stroke

In the pooled analysis of studies for stroke named A, B, C, D, and E
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 4 and did not occur in:44 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 65 and did not occur in:1168
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 5 and did not occur in:94 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 25 and did not occur in:967
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:65 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 32 and did not occur in:1214
In study D, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 0 and did not occur in:25 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 6 and did not occur in:189
In study E, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 3 and did not occur in:86 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 88 and did not occur in:2036
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for stroke yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 1.41
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.82 to 2.40
- **p-value:** 0.210

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of stroke between the intervention group and the control group.

5.7 In hospital mortality

In the pooled analysis of studies for inhospital mortality named A, B, and C
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 1 and did not occur in:47 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 16 and did not occur in:1235
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:97 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 8 and did not occur in:984
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 2 and did not occur in:65 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 24 and did not occur in:1222
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for in-hospital mortality yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 1.86
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.74 to 4.70
- **p-value:** 0.187

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of in-hospital mortality between the intervention group and the control group.

5.8 30 days mortality

In the pooled analysis of studies for 30 days mortality named A, B, and C
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 3 and did not occur in:45 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 54 and did not occur in:1197
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 0 and did not occur in:67 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 18 and did not occur in:1228
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 3 and did not occur in:86 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 70 and did not occur in:2054
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for 30-day mortality yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 1.22
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.55 to 2.71
- **p-value:** 0.628

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of 30-day mortality between the intervention group and the cont group.

5.9 Pacemaker implantation

In the pooled analysis of studies for pacemaker implantation named A, B, C and D
In study A, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 8 and did not occur in:40 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 287 and did not occur in:964
In study B, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 17 and did not occur in:82 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 163 and did not occur in:829
In study C, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 3 and did not occur in:64 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 110 and did not occur in:1136
In study D, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 4 and did not occur in:21 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 52 and did not occur in:434
In study E, the events of intervention group occurred in; yes: 19 and did not occur in:70 and events of control group occurred in; yes: 434 and did not occur in:1690
Perform the pooled analysis using random effect model and give calculated values of risk ratio using random effect model, 95% confidence interval and p value.

The pooled analysis using the random effects model for pacemaker implantation yielded the following results:

- **Pooled Risk Ratio (RR):** 0.98
- **95% Confidence Interval (CI):** 0.75 to 1.26
- **p-value:** 0.848

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the risk of pacemaker implantation between the intervention group and the control group.