# Aspirin and Reducing Risk of Gastric Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Observational Studies

Thin Thin Win<sup>1</sup>, Saint Nway Aye<sup>1</sup>, Joyce Lau Chui Fern<sup>2</sup>, Cheng Ong Fei<sup>2</sup>

 Pathology Division, School of Medicine, International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur
School of Pharmacy, International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Address for correspondence: Thin Thin Win

Pathology Division, School of Medicine, International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur 126, Jalan Jalil Perkasa 19, Bukit Jalil, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia thinthinwin@imu.edu.my

Received: 01.02.2020 Accepted: 15.04.2020

### ABSTRACT

**Background & Aims**: The latest meta-analysis on the role of aspirin on various cancers was published in early 2018. By including the latest and updated primary observational studies, we aimed to conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis to synthesize stronger evidence on the role of aspirin in reducing gastric cancer (GC) risk.

**Methods**: The PubMed, Scopus, and MEDLINE databases were systematically searched up to December 2019 to identify relevant studies. Random-effects model was used to calculate summary ORs and 95%CI for I<sup>2</sup>>50%. If the heterogeneity is not significant, the fixed-effects model was used. Overall analysis of the studies, inverse variance weighting after transforming the estimates of each study into log OR and its standard error were used. **Results**: 21 studies were included in this meta-analysis. Results showed that aspirin significantly reduced the GC risk (OR=0.64, 95%CI=0.54-0.76) with substantial heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=96%). Effect of GC risk reduction in low dose (OR=0.80, 95%CI=0.59-1.09) is slightly greater than high dose aspirin (OR=1.08, 95%CI=0.77-1.52). Protective effect of aspirin uses >5 years (OR=0.67, 95%CI=0.34-1.31) was greater than <5 years (OR=1.01, 95%CI=0.72-1.43)

**Conclusion**: In conclusion, this meta-analysis showed that low dose aspirin with longer duration of more than 5 years were associated with a statistically significant reduction in GC risk. However, due to possible confounding variables and bias, these results should be cautiously treated.

Key words: aspirin - risk of gastric cancer - systematic review - meta-analysis - observational studies.

Abbreviations: GC: gastric cancer; NSAID: non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug.

# INTRODUCTION

Gastric adenocarcinoma, so called gastric cancer (GC) is the second most common gastrointestinal malignancy and it is the sixth common malignancy worldwide [1]. Although the incidence of GC in western countries has been decreasing, it remains one of the leading causes of cancer mortality worldwide [2]. According to 2019 Cancer Statistics report done by American Cancer Society, new cases of GC in 2019 were 27,510 and estimated deaths due to GC were 11,140 in both sexes [3].

Most of the environmental risk factors of GC are preventable

with measures such as eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* infection, high intake of fresh fruits and vegetables, low-sodium diet, low red meat and sensible alcohol drinking [4-6]. In gastric carcinogenesis, inflammation plays an important role and anti-inflammatory therapy is efficacious towards early neoplastic progression and malignant conversion [7].

Aspirin has been known to have anti-inflammatory and chemo-preventive effect on various cancers including colorectal and gastric cancer [8, 9]. It is one of the effective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) which inhibits the inflammation by suppression of cyclooxygenase (COX)-2 [10, 11].

Many systematic reviews and meta-analyses have assessed the role of aspirin in reducing cancer risk [12, 13]. However, those studies were on various types of cancer. As aspirin has been used for prevention of atherosclerosis and cardiovascular diseases, there were many primary observational studies both cohort and case-control types. Therefore, by including the latest and updated primary observational studies, we conducted this systematic review and meta-analysis to synthesize stronger evidence on the role of aspirin in reducing GC risk.

# **METHODS**

#### Literature search strategy

The systematic literature search was carried out according to "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses" (PRISMA) checklist [14] in three healthrelated databases (PubMed, Scopus, and MEDLINE). Search terms such as "gastric cancer", "stomach cancer", "gastric adenocarcinoma", "aspirin" and "reducing risk" were used to search for relevant studies. Terms from the categories were connected with "OR" within each category and by "AND" between categories. The search was limited to original articles published in the English language up to December 2019. To find out additional studies, reference lists of the original articles were screened through.

#### Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria followed the PICOS format: Population (P), Interventions (I), Comparisons (C), Outcomes (O) and Study design (S) as follow: P: individuals without histologically confirmed GC; I: exposure of aspirin of any dosage and any duration; C: Aspirin user and non-aspirin user, aspirin user and other NSAID or placebo user; O: reduction of GC risk; S: observation studies (both case control and cohort studies.

Studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded. Review articles, case reports, editorials, and studies that used aspirin with combination of NSAIDs were excluded.

#### **Data Extraction**

Two investigators extracted the data independently and any disagreement was resolved by discussion. Data of the primary studies such as name of author, publication year, country, ethnicity, gender, age group, number of controls, number of cases, study design, aspirin dosage, duration of aspirin uses, site of GC, histological types of GC, odds ratio (OR), hazards ratio (HR) or relative risk (RR) with its 95% confidence interval (Cl) and any confounding factors in the analysis were extracted.

#### Assessment of Study Quality

The quality of eligible studies were assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale [15]. Studies were assessed using three categories, selection of study groups (0-4 points), comparability (0-2 points), and exposure (0-3 points). A total score  $\leq$  of 3 was considered low quality, scores between 4-6 moderate quality and scores  $\geq$  7 high quality. These scores were used only to facilitate the interpretation of the meta-analysis results, but not used as a criterion for inclusion or exclusion of the studies. During these processes, any discrepancy or disagreement was resolved by discussion to arrive consensus.

#### Data analysis

The meta-analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of aspirin in reducing the GC risk. PRISMA checklist was employed for extraction data, analysis and reporting of observational studies. I<sup>2</sup> test was used to measure heterogeneity between these individual studies. Significant heterogeneity is indicated if p<0.05 and, or I<sup>2</sup>>50% [15]. Some primary studies indicated raw data and some indicated only OR or RR. Therefore, for overall analysis of the studies, we used inverse variance weighting, after transforming the estimates of each study into log OR and its standard error. For subgroup analysis, as all studies for subgroups provided raw data, raw data of aspirin user and non-user were used.

A random-effects model was used to calculate summary ORs and 95%CI for I<sup>2</sup>>50%. However, if the heterogeneity was not significant, the fixed effects model was employed. Subgroup analysis were further administered based on cancer sites, dosage, gender, duration, ethnicity and histological types. In subgroup analysis, raw data were used as some primary studies indicated separate data for separate subgroups. In addition, funnel plots were carried out for evaluating bias risk of publication. For all the tests, two tailed p values were calculated, and it was considered as significant if p value was less than 0.05. All the meta-analysis tests were carried out by using RevMan 5.3 [16].

#### RESULTS

#### Literature search and study characteristic

A total of 5,675 studies were identified from three databases (3,529 from PubMed; 154 from Scopus; 1992 from Ebsco). A four-phase flow chart of the study selection process is illustrated in Fig. 1. PubMed Search string was Search ((((gastric cancer) OR stomach cancer) OR gastric adenocarcinoma) AND aspirin) AND reducing risk.

After excluding duplicate studies, animal studies, in vitro studies, case reports, reviews and other non-relevant studies, 563 studies were screened. After the title and abstract screening, 520 studies were excluded as those were studies on aspirin in treating GC cases and effects of aspirin on the progression, recurrence and survival of GC. Forty-six full-text papers were reviewed for eligibility and a final of 21 primary studies met the pre-specified inclusion criteria. A summary of the 25 excluded studies is provided in Supplementary Table I [17-41]. Table I indicates the characteristics of the included studies. Out of 21 included primary studies, 11 studies were case-control studies [42-52] and 10 were cohort studies [53-62]. Seven studies included in this meta-analysis were from the United States [44-47, 53, 55, 61], 5 were from Europe (one each from the United Kingdom, Sweden, Italy, Denmark and Russia) [42, 43, 50, 52, 56] and 9 from Asia countries (2 from Hong Kong, 4 from Korea, one from Taiwan, Japan and China) [39, 48, 49, 51, 57-60, 62]. The quality assessment of 25 included studies by using Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale is shown in Supplementary Table II.

#### Aspirin Use and GC

Twenty-one studies were included to evaluate the overall protective effect of aspirin. There was a significant inverse association between the case-control studies which seemed to have contributed to this significant overall effect compared to the cohort studies. However, there was a high heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =96%) (Fig. 2). The funnel plot (Fig. 3) showed some degree of publication bias. To overcome the heterogeneity, subgroup analyses (gender, ethnicity, duration of use, aspirin dosage, histological types and sites of GC) were carried out.



Fig. 1. PRISMA flow chart indicating study selection [14]

#### Subgroup analyses

The effect of gender on the use of aspirin and the risk of GC was examined in stratified analyses. Only three studies provided gender specific estimates. Inverse association between use of aspirin and GC risk was more in female (OR=0.66, 95%CI=0.45-0.97) than male (OR=0.86, 95%CI=0.62-1.20). However, there was substantial unexplained heterogeneity in the male group with I<sup>2</sup>=59% and the differences in these subgroups were not statistically significant (p=0.31) (Fig 4A). The effect of ethnicity on the use of aspirin and risk of GC was examined in stratified analyses. Inverse association between aspirin use and the risk of GC was seen in the Caucasian

population (OR=0.82, 95%CI=0.67-1.00). However, the differences in different ethnic subgroups were not statistically significant (p=0.11) (Fig. 4B).

In this study, two subgroups for the duration of aspirin use (<5 years and  $\geq$ 5 years) were defined and the effect of these subgroups were stratified. Six studies provided duration specific estimates. Protective effect of GC by use of aspirin $\geq$  5 years (OR=0.67, 95%CI=0.34-1.31) was more than that of the duration <5 years (OR=1.01, 95%CI=0.72-1.43). However, duration subgroup differences were not statistically significant (p=0.29) although there was an overall heterogeneity of I<sup>2</sup>=84% with p=<0.00001 (Fig. 5A).

				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 Case control st	udies				
Akre 2001	-0.3363	0.1341	5.1%	0.71 [0.55, 0.93]	
Bertuccio 2010	-1.9641	0.2464	4.0%	0.14 [0.09, 0.23]	+
Duan 2008	-0.4717	0.1292	5.1%	0.62 [0.48, 0.80]	
Farrow 1998	-0.2674	0.1235	5.2%	0.77 [0.60, 0.97]	
Figueroa 2009	-1.8169	0.164	4.8%	0.16 [0.12, 0.22]	+
Fortuny 2007	-0.891	0.1026	5.3%	0.41 [0.34, 0.50]	
Gong 2014	-1.1907	0.2789	3.6%	0.30 [0.18, 0.53]	<u>← .                                     </u>
Iqbal 2017	-0.045	0.0198	5.7%	0.96 [0.92, 0.99]	*
Lindblad 2005	0.1398	0.0816	5.5%	1.15 [0.98, 1.35]	
Wang 2015	0.0146	0.2091	4.3%	1.01 [0.67, 1.53]	
Zaridze 1999	-0.3266	0.1917	4.5%	0.72 [0.50, 1.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			53.1%	0.54 [0.39, 0.74]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.27; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 271.77	, df = 10	(P < 0.00	001); l <sup>2</sup> = 96%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.80 (P = 0.000	1)			
2.1.2 Cohort studies					
Abnet 2009	-0.24	0.1131	5.2%	0.79 [0.63, 0.98]	
Cheung 2018	0.0463	0.217	4.3%	1.05 [0.68, 1.60]	
Epplein 2009	-0.5451	0.1154	5.2%	0.58 [0.46, 0.73]	
Friis 2003	0.0196	0.1239	5.2%	1.02 [0.80, 1.30]	<u>+</u>
Kim 2016	-0.3311	0.2104	4.3%	0.72 [0.48, 1.08]	
Kim 2018	0.1612	0.0327	5.7%	1.17 [1.10, 1.25]	-
Lee 2012	-0.8723	0.1099	5.3%	0.42 [0.34, 0.52]	
Niikura 2018	0.7268	0.4299	2.4%	2.07 [0.89, 4.80]	<u> </u>
Ratnasinghe 2004	-0.7032	0.2893	3.5%	0.49 [0.28, 0.87]	
Tsoi 2019	-0.4764	0.0309	5.7%	0.62 [0.58, 0.66]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			46.9%	0.77 [0.58, 1.02]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.17; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 260.82	, df = 9 (	P < 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.84 (P = 0.07)				
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.64 [0.54, 0.76]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.14; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 543.48	, df = 20	(P < 0.00	001); l <sup>2</sup> = 96%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.03 (P < 0.000	01)	2	10.	0.2 0.5 1 2 5
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2.81	. df = 1 (	P = 0.09).	<sup>2</sup> = 64.4%	aspinn Non-aspinn

Fig. 2. Forest plot for the association between aspirin use and gastric cancer risk.



Fig. 3. Funnel plot showing the risk of bias publication.

Most of the included studies did not specifically report the dose; only three studies provided dose specific estimates. Less than 200 mg was considered as a low dose and more than 200 mg as high dose. There was no statistically significant difference between low dose and high dose aspirin in reducing the GC risk (p=0.21). However, it showed an inverse association between the effect of low dose aspirin and GC risk (OR=0.80, 95%CI=0.59-1.09) (Fig. 5B).

The possible association of GC risk in different histological type and use of aspirin was reported by three studies. There were no statistically significant association between aspirin use and histological types of GC (p=0.86). However, a slight inverse association between aspirin use and reduced risk of diffuse types of GC (OR=0.96, 95%CI=0.67-1.37) was seen (Fig. 6A). Five studies provided site (cardia and non-cardia) specific estimates of GC risk by the use of aspirin. These subgroup differences were not statistically significant (p=0.10). However, there was a significant inverse association between aspirin use and non-cardia GC risk (OR=0.88, 95%CI=0.79-0.99) with heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=68%) (Fig. 6B).

#### DISCUSSION

The first report on the role of aspirin in cancer prevention was on colorectal cancer [63]. Since then, the cancer preventive role of aspirin has been evaluated. Several meta-analyses were performed on the association between the risk of GC and aspirin. Latest published meta-analysis studied the effect of aspirin on various cancers without any subgroup analysis [12]. Another meta-analysis published in 2017 investigated the role of aspirin together with other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs on GC [64]. In the current study, the overall analysis showed that aspirin significantly reduced the GC risk. As this study was done on observational studies there were some degree of publication bias noted. Results of this study were similar with some previous metaanalyses [12, 13, 64-66]. Our results are discordant with one study [67] which claimed that aspirin decreased the chance of getting non-cardia GC only.

	Aspirin	user	Non-u	ISEL		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
5.1.1 Male							
Ratnasinghe 2004	14	14838	15	7996	13.8%	0 50 10 24 1 041	
Wang 2015	31	86	47	160	14.9%	1.36 [0.78, 2.36]	
Zaridze 1999	28	70	220	470	24.3%	0 76 10 45 1 261	
Subtotal (95% CI)		14994		8626	53.0%	0.86 [0.62, 1.20]	-
Total events	73		282				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	4.89. df=	2(P = 0)	.09): I <sup>2</sup> =	59%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.89	(P = 0.37	0				
			·				
5.1.2 Female							
Ratnasinghe 2004	9	14838	10	7996	9.2%	0.48 (0.20, 1.19) -	
Wang 2015	16	54	81	225	15.6%	0.75 [0.39, 1.43]	
Zaridze 1999	20	65	180	453	22.2%	0.67 [0.39, 1.18]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		14957		8674	47.0%	0.66 [0.45, 0.97]	-
Total events	45		271				
Heterogeneity: Chi# =	0.60. df=	2 (P = 0	.74): 12 =	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.11	(P = 0.04)	0				
			·				
Total (95% CI)		29951		17300	100.0%	0.77 [0.60, 0.99]	•
Total events	118		553				
Heterogeneity: Chi2=	6.52, df=	5 (P = 0	.26);  2=	23%		t	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.08	(P = 0.04)	)			0.	2 0.5 1 2 5
Test for subaroup diff	erences:	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	01. df = 1	(P = 0.3)	31), I <sup>2</sup> = 1,	2%	Aspinn user Non-user
Chudu an Culturar	Aspirin	user	Non-u	iser	Walaba	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Aspirin Events	user Total	Non-u Events	iser Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian	Aspirin Events	user Total	Non-u Events	Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018	Aspirin Events 25	user Total 9045	Non-u Events	54560	Weight 14.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 (0.68, 1.60)	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015	Aspirin Events 25 17	user Total 9045 2082	Non-u Events	54560 48026	Weight 14.1% 10.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI)	Aspirin Events 25 17 47	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267	Non-u Events 144 8 128	54560 48026 385 102971	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Aspirin Events 25 17 47	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267	Non-u Events 144 8 128	54560 48026 385 102971	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterconcenter Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2 43: Chi2	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P	54560 48026 385 102971	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53]	Oddis Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> 7 = 1 39 (	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (i	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 9;	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53]	Oddis Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Nilkura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (I	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306	ser Total 54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>z</sup> = 9; 15.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI →
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: . 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (I 103 714	user <u>Total</u> 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 930 2287	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (I 103 714 159	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 930 2287 924	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 9; 15.4% 16.0% 15.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 61.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect. 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (f 103 714 159 48	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.000 930 2287 924 923	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% D1); I <sup>2</sup> = 9; 15.4% 16.0% 15.5%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% CI)	Aspirin <u>Events</u> 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (f 103 714 159 48	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135 3195	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 930 2287 924 923 5064	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% D1); I <sup>z</sup> = 9; 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21:30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B C
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (I 103 714 159 48 1024	user <u>Total</u> 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135 3195	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873	54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 930 2287 924 923 5064	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 9; 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30.114.63] 1.01 [0.67.1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B C
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (i 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup>	9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 3195 = 8.68, c	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P	Total 54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 2287 924 923 5064 = 0.03); F	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4% P = 65%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: :	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 () 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> 2 = 1.98 ()	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135 3195 = 8.68, c P = 0.05)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P	Total 54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 2287 924 923 5064 = 0.03); F	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4% <sup>2</sup> = 65%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total avents Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total avents Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect :	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (l 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.98 (l	9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 3195 = 8.68, c P = 0.05)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P =	Total       54560       48026       3855       102971       < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 9; 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4% Call 14.5% Call 14.5% Call 14.5% Call 14.5% Call 14.5% Call 14.2% Call 14.2% Cal	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Wang 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect : Total (95% Cl)	Aspirin Events 25 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (f 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.98 (f	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135 3195 = 8.68, c P = 0.05) 14462	Non-u Events 144 8 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P =	Total       54560       48026       385       102971       < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4% <sup>2</sup> = 65% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21:30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00] 1.30 [0.84, 2.03]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B C
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Hoterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (i 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.98 (i 1113	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 135 3195 = 8.68, 6 P = 0.05) 14462	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 4f = 3 (P 2153	Ser     Total       54560     48026       385     102971       < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 61.4% <sup>2</sup> = 65% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00] 1.30 [0.84, 2.03]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect. 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (j 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.98 (j 1113 0.31; Chi <sup>2</sup>	user Total 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08, P = 0.16) 397 2288 375 1355 3195 = 8.68, c P = 0.05) 14462 = 95.36,	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 306 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P = 2153 df = 6 (P	Total       54560       48026       385       102971       < 0.0000	Weight 14.1% 10.2% 14.2% 38.6% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 97 15.4% 16.0% 15.5% 14.5% 61.4% <sup>2</sup> = 65% 100.0% 01); I <sup>2</sup> = 92	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00] 1.30 [0.84, 2.03]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B Odds Ratio D Odds Ratio B Odds Ratio D Odds Ratio D Odds Ratio D Odds Ratio D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D
Study or Subgroup 6.1.1 Asian Cheung 2018 Niikura 2018 Wang 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: : 6.1.2 Caucasian Akre 2001 Duan 2008 Farrow 1998 Zaridze 1999 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: :	Aspirin Events 25 17 47 89 2.43; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.39 (l 103 714 159 48 1024 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.98 (l 1113 0.31; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.18 (l	user <u>Total</u> 9045 2082 140 11267 = 73.08,8 397 2288 375 3195 = 8.68, 6 P = 0.05) 14462 = 95.36,6 P = 0.24)	Non-u Events 144 8 128 280 df = 2 (P 3066 714 453 400 1873 df = 3 (P = 2153 df = 6 (P	ser Total 54560 48026 385 102971 < 0.0000 2287 930 2287 924 933 5064 = 0.03); I <sup>1</sup>	Weight       14.1%       10.2%       14.2%       38.6%       01); I² = 9;       15.4%       16.0%       15.5%       14.5%       61.4%       ² = 65%       100.0%       01); I² = 9;	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 1.05 [0.68, 1.60] 49.41 [21.30, 114.63] 1.01 [0.67, 1.53] 3.57 [0.59, 21.53] 7% 0.71 [0.55, 0.93] 1.00 [0.88, 1.13] 0.77 [0.60, 0.97] 0.72 [0.50, 1.05] 0.82 [0.67, 1.00] 1.30 [0.84, 2.03]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI B Odds Ratio B D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D

**Fig. 4.** (A) Forest plot for the association between aspirin use and GC risk in different sexes; (B) Forest plot for the association between aspirin use and different ethnicity.

	Experimental		Control			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H, Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 >5 years							
Bertuccio 2010	8	229	16	543	7.2%	1.19 [0.50, 2.83]	
Cheung 2018	2	2888	129	47991	4.3%	0.26 [0.06, 1.04]	·
Duan 2008	60	255	20	80	9.2%	0.92 [0.52, 1.65]	
Farrow 1998	45	695	119	687	10.7%	0.33 [0.23, 0.47]	
Wang 2015	13	35	128	385	8.2%	1.19 [0.58, 2.43]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		4102		49686	39.5%	0.67 [0.34, 1.31]	
Total events	128		412				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.43; Chi2	= 19.41,	df = 4 (P	= 0.0007	); l <sup>2</sup> = 79%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.17 (P	= 0.24)					
2.1.2 <5 years							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Bertuccio 2010	12	229	25	543	8.3%	1.15 [0.57, 2.32]	
Cheung 2018	20	6365	129	47991	10.0%	1.17 [0.73, 1.87]	-
Duan 2008	79	253	58	238	10.5%	1.41 [0.95, 2.10]	
Farrow 1998	30	695	65	687	10.2%	0.43 [0.28, 0.67]	
Lindblad 2005	114	1007	806	9057	11.5%	1.31 [1.06, 1.61]	
Wang 2015	34	105	128	385	10.1%	0.96 [0.61, 1.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		8654		58901	60.5%	1.01 [0.72, 1.43]	-
Total events	289		1211				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.14; Chi2	= 21.44,	df = 5 (P	= 0.0007	); l <sup>2</sup> = 77%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.07 (P	e = 0.94)					
T		10750			100 00/		
Total (95% CI)	10000	12756		108587	100.0%	0.86 [0.60, 1.23]	
Total events	417	1011111	1623		0.0 (s. 100)	101	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 63.14,	df = 10 (F	< 0.000	01); l <sup>2</sup> = 84	1%	0.2 0.5 1 2 5
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.83 (P	= 0.41)	100 0.00	e forder	de la contra		Aspirin user Non-aspirin user
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Ch	i <sup>z</sup> = 1.14	. df = 1 (P	e = 0.29).	I <sup>2</sup> = 12.2%	, ,	
1	Europia		<b>C</b>			Odda Datia	Odda Batta
Study or Subaroup	Experin	Total	Evente	Toto	Weight	M H Eixed 05% Cl	M H Eixed 05% CI
3 1 1 Low doce copie	Events	Total	Events	Tota	weight	MI-II, FIXED, 95% CI	m-n, rixed, 55% ci
Star 2010	10	1007	400		44 70/	0 70 10 10 1 541	
Cheung 2018	10	4607	139	50911	14.7%	0.79 [0.42, 1.51]	-
Duan 2008	39	138	13	51	8.7%	1.15 [0.55, 2.39]	
Kim 2016	31	3907	86	7808	36.5%	0.72 [0.48, 1.08]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	10.0	8652	10.00	58770	59.9%	0.80 [0.59, 1.09]	· •
Total events	80	landers for	238				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	1.22, df = 1	2 (P = 0.	.54); I <sup>2</sup> = 0	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.41 (	P = 0.16	)				
2 1 2 High doce seni	rin						
Star ngn uose aspi		4705	100		E 00/	0 10 10 10 1 741	
Cneung 2018	2	1725	139	50911	5.8%	0.42 [0.10, 1.71]	
Duan 2008	100	368	63	264	34.2%	1.19 [0.83, 1.71]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2093		511/5	40.1%	1.08 [0.77, 1.52]	T
Total events	102		202				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	2.00, df =	1 (P = 0.	16); l <sup>2</sup> = 5	60%			1
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.43 (	P = 0.66	)				
Tetel (05% CI)		10745		100045	100.0%	0.04 10 72 4 461	4
Total (95% CI)		10/45		109945	100.0%	0.91 [0.73, 1.15]	٦
Total events							
	182		440				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	182 5.07, df =	4 (P = 0.	28); I <sup>2</sup> = 2	21%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	5.07, df = Z = 0.79 (l	4 (P = 0. P = 0.43	28); I <sup>2</sup> = 2	21%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Aspirin user Non-aspirin user

**Fig. 5.** (A) Forest plot for the association between duration of aspirin use and gastric cancer risk; (B) Forest plot for the association between dose of aspirin use and gastric cancer risk.

As the observational studies are more prone to publication bias [68, 69], there was some degree of publication bias noted in this meta-analysis. A study showed that the decreased risk of GC with aspirin was observed in the case-control studies, but not in the cohort studies [12]. However, a study indicated that both case-control studies (RR=0.84; 95%CI=0.70-1.00) and cohort studies (RR=0.81; 95%CI=0.67-0.98) showed an inversed relationship between the aspirin use and the risk of GC [65]. Some meta-analyses on aspirin and GC reported an inverse association [13, 64, 66] while another meta-analysis found no significant association [67] between the use of aspirin and GC risk.

As included studies were observational studies in this metaanalysis, the duration of observation was variable. Therefore, two groups for duration of aspirin use were defined: <5 years, and  $\geq$ 5 years. Our results showed that the longer duration of aspirin use ( $\geq$ 5 years) has significantly reduced the risk of GC. However, pool estimate of duration subgroup differences was not statistically significant. Huang et al. [64] also reported that there were insignificant non-linear relationships between the duration of any NSAIDs use or aspirin use and GC risk. However, Kong et al [65] reported short or middle-term use ( $\leq$ 5 years) of aspirin was more effective in reducing GC risk.

In term of dose of aspirin use in this study, it showed that there is no statistically significant difference between low dose and high dose aspirin use in reducing GC risk (p=0.21). However, the inverse association between low dose aspirin use and reduced GC risk was noted. Most of the included primary studies did not specifically identify the dose and only a few studies identified it. However, we assumed that most studies on GC cases with follow up questioning on aspirin use were found to be of a low dose (1 to < 7 tablets per week). Kim et al [58] reported that defined daily dose (DDD)-year and cumulative dose >3 DDD-year has a reduced risk of GC. Huang et al. [64] reported there was a non-linear relationship between the frequency (dose) of aspirin use and GC risk. Low dose aspirin use is also associated with a reduced risk of other cancers such as colorectal, oesophagus and prostate cancer [12]. In general, as the definition of aspirin use and dosage varied among the included primary studies, statistically significant results on dose response was not found in this study.

Although gender subgroup analysis was not statistically significant in this study (p=0.31), significant inverse association between aspirin use and female GC risk was detected. Qiao et al. [12] reported no significant association with gender. Regarding ethnicity, there was an inverse association between the Caucasian population and a risk of GC compared to the Asian population. However, there was no statistically significant subgroup effect and most of the included studies are of Caucasian in this meta-analysis. Yang et al. [67] also reported that regular aspirin use was associated with a reduced risk of non-cardia GC among Caucasians.

There was no significant association of GC risk based on site and histological type with aspirin use in this study. However, an inverse association between aspirin use and non-cardia GC risk (OR=0.88, 95%CI=0.79-0.99) was noted. This finding is

	Aspirin u	Iser	Non-us	er		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total 1	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI		M-H, Random, 95% CI	
7.1.1 Intestinal type									
Akre 2001	74	423	143	631	24.8%	0.72 [0.53, 0.99]			_
Epplein 2009	84	643	101	643	24.8%	0.81 [0.59, 1.10]			
Niikura 2018	16	2082	3	2082	5.7%	5.37 [1.56, 18.45]			
Subtotal (95% CI)		3148		3356	55.2%	1.02 [0.58, 1.82]			
Total events	174		247						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.18; Chi*	= 9.59,	df = 2 (P	= 0.008	); I <sup>2</sup> = 799	%			
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.08 (F	= 0.94	)						
7.4.2 Diffuse tupe									
7.1.2 Diffuse type		100		0.04		1 00 10 70 1 55		-	
Akre 2001	62	423	86	631	23.3%	1.09 [0.76, 1.55]			
Epplein 2009	36	643	40	643	19.4%	0.89 [0.56, 1.42]			
Niikura 2018	1	2082	5	2082	2.1%	0.20 [0.02, 1.71]	-		
Subtotal (95% CI)		3148		3356	44.8%	0.96 [0.67, 1.37]			
Total events	99		131						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 2.61,	df = 2 (P	= 0.27);	If = 23%	0			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.22 (P	° = 0.82	)						
Total (95% CI)		6296		6712	100.0%	0.93 [0.67, 1.28]		-	
Total events	273		378						
Heterogeneity Tau <sup>2</sup> -	0 00 Chi2	- 13 20	df = 5.0	P - 0.02	1- 12 - 629	x	+		
Tact for overall effect:	7 - 0.45 /8	- 0.65	), ui – 5 (i	- 0.02	), I = 02	<i>x</i>	0.2	0.5 1 2	5
Test for eubgroup dif	Z = 0.45 (F	biz - 0	/ 02 df = 1	(P = 0.9	0 - 51 (89	96		Aspirin user Non-user	
restion subdroub dir	lefences. C	-m = 0.	03. ui = 1	(F = 0.0	50). 1 = 0	70			
	Experim	ental	Cor	ntrol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	R
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Tot	al Weig	ht M-H, Fixed, 95% C	3	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
4.1.1 Cardia									
Akre 2001	25	170	53	30	6 3.3	% 0.82 [0.49, 1.38]			-
Cheung 2018	7	9027	34	5444	3 1.0	% 1.24 [0.55, 2.80]			
Duan 2008	275	2288	275	228	7 24.5	% 1.00 [0.84, 1.19]			
Farrow 1998	77	375	178	92	4 8.3	% 1.08 [0.80, 1.46]			
Zaridze 1999	16	135	76	92	3 1.7	% 1.50 [0.85, 2.66]			_
Subtotal (95% CI)		11995		5888	3 38.7	% 1.03 [0.90, 1.19]		+	
Total events	400		616						
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	2.79, df = 4	(P = 0.	.59); l <sup>2</sup> = 1	0%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.42 (P	= 0.67	)						
4.1.2 Non-cardia									
4.1.2 Non-Cardia		470	0.50						
Akre 2001	145	1/0	253	30	0 2.7	76 1.22 [0.72, 2.04]			
Cheung 2018	18	9038	135	5453	3 3.9	% 0.80 [0.49, 1.32]			
Duan 2008	439	2288	439	228	35.9	% 1.00 [0.86, 1.16]		T	
Farrow 1998	82	375	275	92	4 12.5	% 0.66 [0.50, 0.88]			
Zaridze 1999	32	135	324	92	3 6.4	% 0.57 [0.38, 0.87]			
Subtotal (95% CI)		12006		5897	3 61.3	0.88 [0.79, 0.99]		-	
Total events	716		1426						
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	12.42, df =	4 (P = (	0.01); I <sup>2</sup> =	: 68%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.09 (P	e = 0.04	)						
Total (95% CI)		24001		11785	6 100.0	% 0.94 [0.86, 1.03]			
Total events	1116		2042			the forest mool			
Heterogeneity: Chi2 -	17 87 44-	0 /P -	2042	50%					
Test for everall effects	7 = 1 25 /0	- 0 10		30 76			0.2	0.5 1 2	5
Test for overall effect:	2 - 1.33 (P	- 0.10	0 -4 - 4	0-04	0) 12 - 01	0.00/		Aspirin user Non-aspirin	



similar to some studies where it was reported that aspirin use was associated with only non-cardia GC but not with cardia GC [64, 67]. Niikura et al. [60] reported chemo preventive effect of aspirin is greater in diffuse types than intestinal types. In general, all the subgroup analyses in this study showed no statistically significant subgroup effects as all subgroup differences showed p-value > 0.1.

There were some limitations in this study especially in the subgroup analyses. Many studies did not specifically provide the duration of aspirin use. Duration and dose of aspirin use were not uniform in the included studies. Hence, more studies should be included and a larger sample size of population are required for better evidence towards the protective effect of aspirin on GC. However, many of the excluded studies reported on the combined effect of NSAIDs and aspirin rather than the effect of aspirin only.

# CONCLUSION

This meta-analysis evidenced that low dose aspirin with a longer duration of more than 5 years was inversely associated with a significant reduction in GC risk. However, due to possible confounding variables and bias such as smoking and *Helicobater pylori* infection, these results should be cautiously treated.

Conflicts of interest: None to declare.

**Authors' contribution**: T.T.W. and S.N.A. conceived and designed the study. T.T.W., S.N.A., J.L.C.F., C.O.F. data analysis and interpretation. T.T.W drafted and revised the paper.

Acknowledgements: The authors are grateful to the participants and researchers of the primary studies in this meta-analysis and to the International Medical University (IMU) Malaysia for allowing us to perform this study [ID: BP1-01/2019(06)]. This research work of systematic review has been registered on PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42019135003)

**Supplementary material**: To access the supplementary material visit the online version of the *J Gastrointestin Liver Dis* at http://dx.doi. org/10.15403/jgld-818

## REFERENCES

- Khazaei Z, Sohrabivafa M, Momenabadi V, Moayed L, Goodarzi E. Global cancer statistics 2018: Globocan estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide prostate cancers and their relationship with the human development index. Adv Hum Biol 2019;9:245-250. doi:10.4103/2321-8568.262891
- Cancer Gernome Atlas Research Network. Comprehensive molecular characterization of gastric adenocarcinoma. Nature 2014;513:202–209. doi:10.1038/nature13480

- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin 2019;69:7-34. doi:10.3322/caac.21551
- Buckland G, Travier N, Huerta JM, et al. Healthy lifestyle index and risk of gastric adenocarcinoma in the EPIC cohort study. Int J Cancer 2015;137:598–606. doi:10.1002/ijc.29411
- Lin SH, Li YH, Leung K, Huang CY, Wang XR. Salt processed food and gastric cancer in a Chinese population. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2014;15:5293–5298. doi:10.7314/apjcp.2014.15.13.5293
- Massarrat S, Stolte M. Development of gastric cancer and its prevention. Arch Iran Med. 2014;17:514–520.
- Coussens LM, Werb Z. Inflammation and cancer. Nature 2002;420:860-867. doi:10.1038/nature01322
- Cuzick J, Otto F, Baron JA, et al. Aspirin and non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs for cancer prevention: an international consensus statement. Lancet Oncol 2009;10:501–507. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(09)70035-X
- Elwood PC, Gallagher AM, Duthie GG, Mur LA, Morgan G. Aspirin, salicylates, and cancer. Lancet 2009;373:1301–1309. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60243-9
- Lim HY, Joo HJ, Choi JH, et al. Increased expression of cyclooxygenase-2 protein in human gastric carcinoma. Clin Cancer Res 2000; 6:519-525.
- Wang Z, Chen JQ, Liu JL. COX-2 Inhibitors and Gastric Cancer. Gastroenterol Res Pract. 2014;2014:132320. doi:10.1155/2014/132320
- Qiao Y, Yang T, Gan Y, et al. Associations between aspirin use and the risk of cancers: a meta-analysis of observational studies. BMC Cancer 2018;18:288. doi:10.1186/s12885-018-4156-5
- Bosetti C, Rosato V, Gallus S, Cuzick J, La Vecchia C. Aspirin and cancer risk: a quantitative review to 2011. Ann Oncol 2012;23:1403-1415. doi:10.1093/annonc/mds113
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis: The PRISMA Statement. PloS Med. 2009;6:e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal. pmed.1000097
- Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. Eur J Epidemiol 2010;25:603–605. doi:10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z
- Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.
- Thun MJ, Namboodiri MM, Calle EE, Flanders WD, Heath CW Jr. Aspirin use and risk of fatal cancer. Cancer Res 1993;53:1322-1327.
- Schreinemachers DM, Everson RB. Aspirin use and lung, colon, and breast cancer incidence in a prospective study. Epidemiology 1994;5:138-146. doi:10.1097/00001648-199403000-00003
- Wong BC, Zhu GH, Lam SK. Aspirin induced apoptosis in gastric cancer cells. Biomed Pharmacother 1999;53:315-318. doi:10.1016/ S0753-3322(00)88503-0
- Coogan PF, Rosenberg L, Palmer JR, et al. Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and risk of digestive cancers at sites other than the large bowel. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2000;9:119-123.
- Langman MJ, Cheng KK, Gilman EA, Lancashire RJ. Effect of antiinflammatory drugs on overall risk of common cancer: case-control study in general practice research database. BMJ 2000;320:1642–1646. doi:10.1136/bmj.320.7250.1642
- Nomura AM, Hankin JH, Kolonel LN, Wilkens LR, Goodman MT, Stemmermann GN. Case-control study of diet and other risk factors for gastric cancer in Hawaii (United States). Cancer Causes Control 2003;14:547-558. doi:10.1023/a:1024887411846

- Sørensen HT, Friis S, Nørgård B, et al. Risk of cancer in a large cohort of nonaspirin NSAID users: a population-based study. Br J Cancer 2003;88:1687-1692. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6600945
- 24. Gammon MD, Terry MB, Arber N, et al. Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drug use associated with reduced incidence of adenocarcinomas of the esophagus and gastric cardia that overexpress cyclin D1: a population-based study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2004;13:34-39. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.epi-03-0198
- 25. Trivers KF, De Roos AJ, Gammon MD, Vaughan TL, Risch HA, Olshan AF, et al. Demographic and lifestyle predictors of survival in patients with esophageal or gastric cancers. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2005;3:225-230. doi:10.1016/s1542-3565(04)00613-5
- Hwang HJ, Youn YH, Kim JH, Chung JB, Lee YC. Low-dose aspirin affects the clinicopathological features of gastric cancer. Digestion 2006;73:54-59. doi:10.1159/000092248
- Wu CY, Wu MS, Kuo KN, Wang CB, Chen YJ, Lin JT. Effective reduction of gastric cancer risk with regular use of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs in Helicobacter pylori-infected patients. J Clin Oncol 2010;20;28:2952-2957. doi:10.1200/JCO.2009.26.0695
- Rothwell PM, Fowkes FG, Belch JF, Ogawa H, Warlow CP, Meade TW. Effect of daily aspirin on long-term risk of death due to cancer: analysis of individual patient data from randomised trials. Lancet 2011;377:31-41. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)62110-1
- Yang L, Zhu H, Liu D, et al. Aspirin suppresses growth of human gastric carcinoma cell by inhibiting survivin expression. J Biomed Res 2011;25,246–253. doi:10.1016/S1674-8301(11)60033-X
- Jacobs EJ, Newton CC, Gapstur SM, Thun MJ. Daily aspirin use and cancer mortality in a large US cohort. J Natl Cancer Inst 2012;104:1208-1217. doi:10.1093/jnci/djs318
- Cook NR, Lee IM, Zhang SM, Moorthy MV, Buring JE. Alternate-day, low-dose aspirin and cancer risk: long-term observational follow-up of a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2013;159:77-85. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-159-2-201307160-00002
- 32. Shebl FM, Hsing AW, Park Y, et al. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs use is associated with reduced risk of inflammation-associated cancers: NIH-AARP study. PLoS One 2014;9,e114633. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0114633
- 33. Coyle C, Cafferty FH, Rowley S, et al. ADD-ASPIRIN: A phase III, double-blind, placebo controlled, randomised trial assessing the effects of aspirin on disease recurrence and survival after primary therapy in common non-metastatic solid tumours. Contemp Clin Trials 2016;51:56–64. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2016.10.004
- Mikami J, Kurokawa Y, Takahashi T, et al. Antitumor effect of antiplatelet agents in gastric cancer cells: an in vivo and in vitro study. Gastric Cancer 2016;19:817-826. doi:10.1007/s10120-015-0556-2
- Li XF, Xu BZ, Wang SZ. Aspirin inhibits the proliferation and migration of gastric cancer cells in p53-knockout mice. Oncol Lett 2016;12:3183-3186. doi:10.3892/ol.2016.5067
- 36. Michigami Y, Watari J, Ito C, et al. Effects of long-term aspirin use on molecular alterations in precancerous gastric mucosa in patients with and without gastric cancer. Sci Rep 2017;7:13384. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-13842-x
- Zhang W, Tan Y, Ma H. Combined aspirin and apatinib treatment suppresses gastric cancer cell proliferation. Oncol Lett 2017;14:5409-5417. doi:10.3892/ol.2017.6858
- Spence AD, Busby J, Johnston BT, et al. Low-Dose Aspirin Use Does Not Increase Survival in 2 Independent Population-Based Cohorts of Patients with Esophageal or Gastric Cancer. Gastroenterology 2018;154:849-860.e1. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2017.10.044

- Cheung KS, Leung WK. Long-term use of proton-pump inhibitors and risk of gastric cancer: a review of the current evidence. Therap Adv Gastroenterol 2019;11;12:1756284819834511. doi:10.1177/1756284819834511
- 40. Watari J, Ito C, Shimoda T, et al. DNA methylation silencing of microRNA gene methylator in the precancerous background mucosa with and without gastric cancer: Analysis of the effects of H. pylori eradication and long-term aspirin use. Sci Rep 2019;9:12559. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-49069-1
- Watari J, Tomita T, Tozawa K, Oshima T, Fukui H, Miwa H. Preventing Metachronous Gastric Cancer after the Endoscopic Resection of Gastric Epithelial Neoplasia: Roles of Helicobacter pylori Eradication and Aspirin. Gut Liver 2019 Sep 25. doi:10.5009/gnl19079
- Akre K, Ekström A, Signorello L, Hansson L, Nyrén O. Aspirin and risk for gastric cancer: a population-based case-control study in Sweden. Br J Cancer 2001;84:965-968. doi:10.1054/bjoc.2001.1702
- Bertuccio P, Bravi F, Bosetti C, Negri E, La Vecchia C. Aspirin and gastric cancer risk. Eur J Cancer Prev 2010;19:426–427. doi:10.1097/ CEJ.0b013e32833ecbdc
- Duan L, Wu AH, Sullivan-Halley J, Bernstein L. Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and risk of esophageal and gastric adenocarcinomas in Los Angeles County. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2008;17:126–134. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-07-0664
- Farrow DC, Vaughan TL, Hansten PD, et al. Use of aspirin and other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and risk of esophageal and gastric cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 1998;7:97–102.
- 46. Figueroa JD, Terry MB, Gammon MD, et al. Cigarette smoking, body mass index, gastro-esophageal reflux disease, and non-steroidal antiinflammatory drug use and risk of subtypes of esophageal and gastric cancers by P53 overexpression. Cancer Causes Control 2009;20:361– 368. doi:10.1007/s10552-008-9250-6
- Fortuny J, Johnson CC, Bohlke K, et al. Use of Anti-Inflammatory Drugs and Lower Esophageal Sphincter–Relaxing Drugs and Risk of Esophageal and Gastric Cancers. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;5:1154-1159.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2007.05.022
- Gong EJ, Ahn JY, Jung HY, et al. Risk factors and clinical outcomes of gastric cancer identified by screening endoscopy: a case-control study. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2014;29:301-309. doi:10.1111/jgh.12387
- 49. Iqbal U, Yang H, Jian W, Yen Y, Li Y. Does aspirin use reduce the risk for cancer? J Investig Med 2016;65:391-392. doi:10.1136/jim-2016-000275
- Lindblad M, Lagergren J, García Rodríguez LA. Nonsteroidal Antiinflammatory Drugs and Risk of Esophageal and Gastric Cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14:444–450. doi:10.1158/1055-9965. EPI-04-0467
- Wang Y, Shen C, Ge J, Duan H. Regular aspirin use and stomach cancer risk in China. Eur J Surg Oncol 2015;41:801–804. doi:10.1016/j. ejso.2015.02.006
- Zaridze D, Borisova E, Maximovitch D, Chkhikvadze V. Aspirin protects against gastric cancer: Results of a case-control study from Moscow, Russia. Int J Cancer 1999;82:473–476. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0215(19990812)82:4<473::aid-ijc1>3.0.co;2-k
- 53. Abnet CC, Freedman ND, Kamangar F, Leitzmann MF, Hollenbeck AR, Schatzkin A. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and risk of gastric and oesophageal adenocarcinomas: Results from a cohort

study and a meta-analysis. Br J Cancer 2009;100:551–557. doi:10.1038/ sj.bjc.6604880

- Cheung KS, Chan EW, Wong AYS, et al. Aspirin and Risk of Gastric Cancer After Helicobacter pylori Eradication: A Territory-Wide Study. J Natl Cancer Inst 2018;110:743–749. doi:10.1093/jnci/djx267
- Epplein M, Nomura AM, Wilkens LR, Henderson BE, Kolonel LN. Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and risk of gastric adenocarcinoma: the multiethnic cohort study. Am J Epidemiol 2009;170:507–514. doi:10.1093/aje/kwp162
- Friis S, Sørensen HT, McLaughlin JK, Johnsen SP, Blot WJ, Olsen JH. A population-based cohort study of the risk of colorectal and other cancers among users of low-dose aspirin. Br J Cancer 2003;88:684–688. doi.10.1038/sj.bjc.6600760
- Kim YI, Kim SY, Kim JH, et al. Long-Term Low-Dose Aspirin Use Reduces Gastric Cancer Incidence: A Nationwide Cohort Study. Cancer Res Treat 2016;48:798–805. doi:10.4143/crt.2015.117
- Kim MH, Chang J, Kim WJ, Banerjee S, Park SM. Cumulative Dose Threshold for the Chemopreventive Effect of Aspirin Against Gastric Cancer. Am J Gastroenterol 2018;113:845–854.
- Lee J, Lee SH, Hur KY, Woo SY, Kim SW, Kang WK. Statins and the risk of gastric cancer in diabetes patients. BMC Cancer 2012;12:596. doi:10.1186/1471-2407-12-596
- Niikura R, Hayakawa Y, Hirata Y, et al. Distinct Chemopreventive Effects of Aspirin in Diffuse and Intestinal-Type Gastric Cancer. Cancer Prev Res 2018;11:279–286. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-17-0276
- Ratnasinghe LD, Abnet C, Qiao YL, et al. Polymorphisms of XRCC1 and risk of esophageal and gastric cardia cancer. Cancer Lett 2004;216:157– 164. doi:10.1016/j.canlet.2004.03.012
- Tsoi KKF, Ho JMW, Chan FCH, Sung JJY. Long-term use of low-dose aspirin for cancer prevention: A 10-year population cohort study in Hong Kong. Int J Cancer 2019;145:267-273. doi:10.1002/ijc.32083
- Kune GA, Kune S, Watson LF. Colorectal cancer risk, chronic illnesses, operations, and medications: case control results from the Melbourne Colorectal Cancer Study. Cancer Res 1988;48:4399-4404.
- Huang XZ, Chen Y, Wu J, et al. Aspirin and non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs use reduce gastric cancer risk: A dose-response metaanalysis. Oncotarget 2017;8:4781-4795. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.13591
- Kong P, Wu R, Liu X, et al. The Effects of Anti-inflammatory Drug Treatment in Gastric Cancer Prevention: An Update of a Metaanalysis. J Cancer 2016;7:2247-2257. doi:10.7150/jca.16524
- 66. Ye X, Fu J, Yang Y, Gao Y, Liu L, Chen S. Frequency-risk and durationrisk relationships between aspirin use and gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One 2013;8:e71522. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0071522
- Yang P, Zhou Y, Chen B, et al. Aspirin use and the risk of gastric cancer: a meta-analysis. Dig Dis Sci 2010;55:1533–1539. doi:10.1007/s10620-009-0915-0
- Mueller M, D'Addario M, Egger M, et al. Methods to systematically review and meta-analyse observational studies: a systematic scoping review of recommendations. BMC Med Res Methodol 2018;18:44. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0495-9
- Palma S, Delgado-Rodriguez M. Assessment of publication bias in meta-analyses of cardiovascular diseases. J Epidemiol Community Health 2005;59:864–869. doi:10.1136/jech.2005.033027