

Web extra

Association between industry affiliation and position on rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk: cross sectional systematic review

BMJ 2010;340:c1344

Contents:

- A. Included articles
- B. Search strategy
- C. Disagreements between the two reviewers
- D. Prevalence and disclosures of conflicts of interest
- E. Sensitivity analyses

Main analysis (unique authors n=180)

Analysis using a combined scale (unique authors n=180)

Analysis using article as unit of analysis (n=202)

Analysis of focused studies (n=105)

Analysis of commentaries, letters, and editorials (n=92)

Analysis of articles published before FDA warning (n=27)

Analysis of articles published after FDA warning (n=175)

- F. Analysis of pioglitazone use
- G. PRISMA statement checklist
- H. References

As submitted by authors

A: Included articles

Author	Type	Rosi/ Risk of MI ¹	Rosi Use ²	Pio Use ³	COI	COI stated	COI type ⁴	Industry ⁵	FDA ⁶	Focus ⁷	Google ⁸
Acharya ¹	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Ajjan ²	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Ajjan ³	Review	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	After	Yes	No
Alexander ⁴	Retrospective	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Andraca ⁵	Guidelines	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Anonymous ⁶	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Barnett ⁷	Review	Neutral	Favorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	Pio	After	Yes	No
Barry ⁸	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Baxter ⁹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Betteridge ¹⁰	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	No
Bijl ¹¹	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Bilous ¹²	Editorial	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Blake ¹³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	No	No
Bloomgarden ¹⁴	Review	Favorable	Neutral	Yes	Yes	No	4	All	After	No	Yes
Bloomgarden ¹⁵	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	No	4	All	After	Yes	Yes
Bloomgarden ¹⁶	Commentary	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	4	All	After	No	Yes
Bolen ¹⁷	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Bolusani ¹⁸	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Bouhleh ¹⁹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3	Other	After	No	Yes
Bouhleh ²⁰	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Bourassa ²¹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Boyle ²²	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	No	4	Pio	After	Yes	Yes
Bracken ²³	Letter	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi	Before	Yes	No
Brown ²⁴	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	Pio	After	No	No
Brunton ²⁵	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	No	No
Brunton ²⁶	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Burrill ²⁷	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Calkin ²⁸	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Calvert ²⁹	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Cannon ³⁰	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	3,4	None	Before	No	No
Casscells ³¹	Cross-sectional	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Ceriello ³²	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,3	Pio	After	No	No
Chiarelli ³³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Chieh ³⁴	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Cleland ³⁵	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3	All	After	Yes	No
Cobitz ³⁶	Retrospective	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	2,4	Rosi	After	Yes	No
Crandall ³⁷	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Other	After	No	No
Cubbon ³⁸	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Dagenais ³⁹	RCT	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	Rosi	After	No	No
Dahabreh ⁴⁰	Meta-analyses	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Dandona ⁴¹	Commentary	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	Yes
Davis ⁴²	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2Employee 3Grant 4Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5Assistance **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Author	Type	Rosi/ Risk of MI ¹	Rosi Use ²	Pio Use ³	COI	COI stated	COI type ⁴	Industry ⁵	FDA ⁶	Focus ⁷	Google ⁸
Deeks ⁴³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	5	Rosi	After	Yes	No
DeMaria ⁴⁴	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Diamond ⁴⁵	Meta-analyses	Favorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Diamond ⁴⁶	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Doggrell ⁴⁷	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Drazen ⁴⁸	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Drummond ⁴⁹	Review	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	Before	Yes	
Drzewoski ⁵⁰	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Duan ⁵¹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Edwards ⁵²	Review	Neutral	Favorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Erdmann ⁵³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,4	Pio	After	Yes	No
Eurich ⁵⁴	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Faich ⁵⁵	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Fonseca ⁵⁶	Review	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	2,3,4	All	After	No	No
Fowler ⁵⁷	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	No	No
Fuster ⁵⁸	Editorial	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	2,4	Rosi	Before	Yes	No
Gabor ⁵⁹	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Gerrits ⁶⁰	Cohort	Unfavorable	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	Pio	Before	Yes	No
Gerstein ⁶¹	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	No
Gilbert ⁶²	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Giles ⁶³	RCT	Neutral	Favorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	1-4	Pio	After	No	No
Goldfine ⁶⁴	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Graber ⁶⁵	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Grant ⁶⁶	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	Before	Yes	No
Guay ⁶⁷	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Gunter ⁶⁸	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Gysling ⁶⁹	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Hakansson ⁷⁰	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Halse ⁷¹	Letter	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Hanefeld ⁷²	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Hermansen ⁷³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Hernandez ⁷⁴	Meta-analyses	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Hjelmæsæth ⁷⁵	response	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Hjelmæsæth ⁷⁶	Letter	Neutral	Favorable	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Hjelvin ⁷⁷	Commentary	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	2	Rosi	After	Yes	Yes
Hlatky ⁷⁸	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Hoppe ⁷⁹	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	No	4	Pio	After	Yes	No
Horn ⁸⁰	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Hughes ⁸¹	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Jarvis ⁸²	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	Pio	After	Yes	No
Johnson ⁸³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Kageyama ⁸⁴	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Kahn ⁸⁵	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	Yes
Kalaitzidis ⁸⁶	Review	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	No	3,4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	Yes
Kamalesh ⁸⁷	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2Employee 3Grant 4Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5Assistance **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Author	Type	Rosi/ Risk of MI ¹	Rosi Use ²	Pio Use ³	COI	COI stated	COI type ⁴	Industry ⁵	FDA ⁶	Focus ⁷	Google ⁸
Kapoor ⁸⁸	Letter	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Katz ⁸⁹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Kaul ⁹⁰	Commentary	Neutral	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Kaul ⁹¹	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Kazi ⁹²	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Kenny ⁹³	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Khanderia ⁹⁴	Review	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	No
Khanderia ⁹⁵	Letter	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	No
Kirby ⁹⁶	Review	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	1,4	Rosi,Pio	After	Yes	No
Kiryuk ⁹⁷	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Koro ⁹⁸	Case-control	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	1.2	Rosi	After	No	No
Krall ⁹⁹	Commentary	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	2	Rosi	Before	Yes	No
Krentz ¹⁰⁰	Review	Neutral	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Lago ¹⁰¹	Meta-analysis	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	Rosi,Pio	After	Yes	No
Lancet Editorials ¹⁰²	Editorial	Neutral	Favorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Lee ¹⁰³	Meta-analysis	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Lehmann ¹⁰⁴	Letter	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Lindberg ¹⁰⁵	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Lipscombe ¹⁰⁶	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Lipscombe ¹⁰⁷	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Liu ¹⁰⁸	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Lopez ¹⁰⁹	Letter	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Malesker ¹¹⁰	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	No	No
Mankovsky ¹¹¹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	No	No
Mannucci ¹¹²	Review	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	No	3,4,5	Pio	After	No	No
Mannucci ¹¹³	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	Before	Yes	No
Margolis ¹¹⁴	Cohort	Favorable	Favorable	Yes	Yes	No	4	All	After	No	Yes
Martin ¹¹⁵	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Marx ¹¹⁶	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	Rosi,Pio	After	Yes	No
Marx ¹¹⁷	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	After	Yes	No
Matthaei ¹¹⁸	Guidelines	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	No	3,4	All	After	No	Yes
Matthews ¹¹⁹	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Mazza ¹²⁰	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Mazzone ¹²¹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
McAfee ¹²²	Cohort	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	2	Rosi	After	No	No
McCullough ¹²³	Review	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	No	4	Other	Before	Yes	Yes
McGuire ¹²⁴	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	No
McGuire ¹²⁵	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Medical Letter ¹²⁶	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Mendzelevski ¹²⁷	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	0	Other	After	No	No
Meneghini ¹²⁸	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Merino ¹²⁹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Mikhail ¹³⁰	Letter	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Mikhail ¹³¹	Letter	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2Employee 3Grant 4Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5Assistance **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Author	Type	Rosi/ Risk of MI ¹	Rosi Use ²	Pio Use ³	COI	COI stated	COI type ⁴	Industry ⁵	FDA ⁶	Focus ⁷	Google ⁸
Misbin ¹³²	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Misra ¹³³	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Mizuno ¹³⁴	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Mohan ¹³⁵	Commentary	Neutral	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Monami ¹³⁶	Meta-analyses	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	No
Mulrow ¹³⁷	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Musini ¹³⁸	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Nathan ¹³⁹	Guidelines	Neutral	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	No
Nathan ¹⁴⁰	Guidelines	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	No
Nathan ¹⁴¹	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	Yes	Yes	0	Rosi,Other	Before	Yes	No
Nessim ¹⁴²	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Nilsson ¹⁴³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Odegard ¹⁴⁴	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	No	No
Odom ¹⁴⁵	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Padwal ¹⁴⁶	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Pais ¹⁴⁷	Editorial	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Pasmantier ¹⁴⁸	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Peter ¹⁴⁹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Phillipe ¹⁵⁰	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	Other	After	Yes	No
Pierce ¹⁵¹	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Pignone ¹⁵²	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Psaty ¹⁵³	Editorial	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Psaty ¹⁵⁴	Editorial	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	Before	Yes	No
Remigereau ¹⁵⁵	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Repas ¹⁵⁶	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Riccardi ¹⁵⁷	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Ripsin ¹⁵⁸	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Rizos ¹⁵⁹	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Robinson ¹⁶⁰	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	No	3,4	All	After	No	Yes
Rohatgi ¹⁶¹	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Rosen ¹⁶²	Editorial	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	Before	No	No
Rottlaender ¹⁶³	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	Pio	After	No	No
Rucker ¹⁶⁴	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Ryder ¹⁶⁵	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Sarafidis ¹⁶⁶	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Scheen ¹⁶⁷	Editorial	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Selvin ¹⁶⁸	Review	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	No	No
Shaw ¹⁶⁹	Editorial	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Shenfield ¹⁷⁰	Editorial	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Shuster ¹⁷¹	Meta-analyses	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	Yes	No	4	Other	After	Yes	No
Shuster ¹⁷²	Commentary	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Silverberg ¹⁷³	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Singh ¹⁷⁴	Meta-analyses	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Singh ¹⁷⁵	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Singh ¹⁷⁶	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Author	Type	Rosi/ Risk of MI ¹	Rosi Use ²	Pio Use ³	COI	COI stated	COI type ⁴	Industry ⁵	FDA ⁶	Focus ⁷	Google ⁸
Singh ¹⁷⁷	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Sjoholm ¹⁷⁸	Commentary	Favorable	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	Yes	No
Solomon ¹⁷⁹	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	Yes	No
Stafylas ¹⁸⁰	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Steg ¹⁸¹	Commentary	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Stockl ¹⁸²	case-control	Unfavorable	Neutral	No	No	Yes	0	None	After	Yes	No
Stolar ¹⁸³	Review	Favorable	Favorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,4	Rosi,Pio	After	No	No
Strahlman ¹⁸⁴	Editorial	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	2	Rosi	After	Yes	No
Strohmeier ¹⁸⁵	Editorial	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	2	Rosi	After	Yes	Yes
Strohmeier ¹⁸⁶	Editorial	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	2	Rosi	After	Yes	No
Stulc ¹⁸⁷	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Sulistio ¹⁸⁸	Review	Neutral	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Susman ¹⁸⁹	Editorial	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Takano ¹⁹⁰	Review	Favorable	Neutral	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	Pio	After	No	No
Toth ¹⁹¹	Commentary	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	4	All	Before	Yes	No
Triplitt ¹⁹²	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Unger ¹⁹³	Review	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	No	4	All	After	No	Yes
Vaccaro ¹⁹⁴	Editorial	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Virally ¹⁹⁵	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	Before	No	No
Waksman ¹⁹⁶	Review	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Wick-Urban ¹⁹⁷	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Wolfenbuttel ¹⁹⁸	Commentary	Neutral	Neutral	No	No	No	0	None	After	No	No
Woo ¹⁹⁹	Guidelines	Neutral	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	4	All	After	No	No
Yeap ²⁰⁰	Review	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,4	All	After	Yes	No
Zarowitz ²⁰¹	Commentary	Unfavorable	Unfavorable	No	No	No	0	None	After	Yes	No
Zinn ²⁰²	Review	Favorable	Favorable	No	Yes	Yes	3,4	All	After	No	No

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

B. SEARCH STRATEGY (Discussed and approved by Pat Erwin, MLS, medical librarian)

Web of Science and SCOPUS were used to obtain all articles referencing either the Nissen meta-analysis or the RECORD trial. MEDLINE and PubMed were used to find all comments on the Nissen meta-analysis and the RECORD trial to double check the validity of our search strategy. Included studies had to comment on rosiglitazone and risk of myocardial infarction. Guidelines, meta-analyses, reviews, clinical trials, letters, commentaries, and editorials were included. 847 unique articles were initially retrieved. 643 were determined irrelevant by abstract or full text screening. 4 articles could not be obtained and were excluded; 7 articles were written by either Nissen or Home (author of the RECORD trial) and were excluded. 202 articles were included in the final analysis. 18 of the included studies were foreign and were translated prior to analysis.

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

C. DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE TWO REVIEWERS

There were 41 disagreements between the 2 reviewers out of 404 unique assessments. In total there were 36 unique studies with disagreements. 25 disagreements were in the risk of MI with rosiglitazone arm: reviewer A changed 13 assessments and reviewer B changed 12 assessments after discussion and reevaluation. 16 disagreements were in the use of rosiglitazone arm where reviewer A changed 12 assessments and reviewer B changed 4 assessments.

Rosi Risk of MI					Rosi Use			
	RevA Favorable	RevA Neutral	RevA Unfavorable	Total	RevA Favorable	RevA Neutral	RevA Unfavorable	Total
RevB Favorable	26	5	0	31	25	2	0	27
RevB Neutral	11	84	5	100	4	120	8	132
RevB Unfavorable	1	2	68	71	2	0	41	43
Total	38	91	73	202	31	122	49	202
Bolded values represent disagreements RevA, B: reviewer A and reviewer B Using all data, N=202								

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

D. PREVALENCE AND DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

	N	%
Total # of studies with financial conflicts of interest	90	45%
• # with COI disclosed	69	77%
• # with COI not disclosed	21	23%
• # without COI statement	(18)	(20%)
• # with inaccurate COI statement	(3)	(3%)
Total # of studies with COI statement	108	53%

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

E. Sensitivity analyses

Analysis using Stelfox's combined scale (unique authors n=180)

	Favorable (n=42)		Neutral (n=70)		Unfavorable (n=68)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	37	88%	22	31%	20	29%	3.00 (2.04 to 4.40)
Rosi affiliation	33	79%	12	17%	15	22%	3.65 (2.31 to 5.77)
Pio affiliation	28	67%	15	21%	16	24%	3.39 (2.17 to 5.31)
No affiliation	5	12%	48	69%	48	71%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Analysis using article as unit of analysis (n=202)

Risk of MI

	Favorable (n=35)		Neutral (n=95)		Unfavorable (n=72)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	32	91%	40	42%	18	25%	3.66 (2.42 to 5.53)
Rosi affiliation	30	86%	25	26%	13	18%	4.69 (2.84 to 7.72)
Pio affiliation	22	63%	31	33%	13	18%	4.54 (2.73 to 7.55)
No affiliation	3	9%	55	58%	54	75%	—

Rosi use

	Favorable (n=29)		Neutral (n=129)		Unfavorable (n=44)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	26	90%	53	41%	11	25%	3.59 (2.12 to 6.07)
Rosi affiliation	24	83%	34	26%	10	23%	3.82 (2.19 to 6.69)
Pio affiliation	21	72%	35	27%	10	23%	3.76 (2.14 to 6.61)
No affiliation	3	10%	76	59%	33	75%	—

Combined Scale

	Favorable (n=48)		Neutral (n=77)		Unfavorable (n=77)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	42	88%	27	35%	21	27%	3.21 (2.19 to 4.69)
Rosi affiliation	38	79%	14	18%	16	21%	3.88 (2.48 to 6.08)
Pio affiliation	32	67%	18	23%	16	21%	3.79 (2.41 to 5.96)
No affiliation	6	13%	50	65%	56	73%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Analysis of focused studies (n=105)

Prevalence and disclosure of COI

% of studies with industry affiliation 52%

% of studies with COI statement 42%

Risk of MI

	Favorable (n=25)		Neutral (n=29)		Unfavorable (n=51)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any Affiliation	22	88%	12	41%	10	20%	4.49 (2.53 to 7.97)
Rosi Affiliation	21	84%	7	24%	7	14%	6.00 (2.98 to 12.10)
Pio Affiliation	13	52%	17	59%	8	16%	4.98 (2.53 to 9.79)
No Affiliation	3	12%	17	59%	41	80%	—

Rosi Use

	Favorable (n=16)		Neutral (n=58)		Unfavorable (n=31)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	14	88%	25	43%	5	16%	5.43 (2.38 to 12.36)
Rosi affiliation	13	81%	18	31%	4	13%	6.5 (2.56 to 16.53)
Pio affiliation	9	56%	18	31%	4	13%	6.14 (2.36 to 15.93)
No affiliation	2	13%	33	57%	26	84%	—

Combined Scale

	Favorable (n=30)		Neutral (n=22)		Unfavorable (n=53)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	25	83%	9	41%	10	19%	4.42 (2.47 to 7.89)
Rosi affiliation	23	77%	5	23%	7	13%	5.87 (2.89 to 11.91)
Pio affiliation	16	53%	7	32%	8	15%	4.86 (2.46 to 9.58)
No affiliation	5	17%	13	59%	43	81%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance 5:Type of pharmaceutical industry 6:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning 7:Written in response to Nissen/Home? 8:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Analysis of commentaries, letters, and editorials (n=92)

Prevalence and disclosure of COI

% of studies with industry affiliation 40%

% of studies with COI statement 43%

Risk of MI

	Favorable (n=21)		Neutral (n=36)		Unfavorable (n=35)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any Affiliation	19	90%	14	39%	6	12%	5.28 (2.51 to 11.08)
Rosi Affiliation	19	90%	9	25%	5	14%	6.15 (2.71 to 13.99)
Pio Affiliation	12	57%	13	36%	5	14%	5.83 (2.52 to 13.47)
No Affiliation	2	10%	22	61%	29	57%	—

Rosi Use

Manufacturer	Favorable (n=15)		Neutral (n=54)		Unfavorable (n=23)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	13	87%	20	37%	4	17%	4.98 (2.00 to 12.41)
Rosi affiliation	12	80%	18	33%	3	13%	6.29 (2.15 to 18.38)
Pio affiliation	8	53%	19	35%	3	13%	5.87 (1.96 to 17.56)
No affiliation	2	13%	34	63%	19	83%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Analysis of articles published before FDA warning (n=27)

Prevalence and disclosure of COI

% of studies with industry affiliation 41%

% of studies with COI statement 38%

Risk of MI

	Favorable (n=8)		Neutral (n=10)		Unfavorable (n=9)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	7	88%	1	10%	3	33%	2.63 (1.00 to 6.86)
Rosi affiliation	6	75%	1	10%	2	22%	3.43 (0.99 to 11.82)
Pio affiliation	3	38%	1	10%	2	22%	3.00 (0.80 to 11.31)
No affiliation	1	13%	9	90%	6	67%	—

Rosi Use

	Favorable (n=4)		Neutral (n=17)		Unfavorable (n=6)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	3	75%	7	41%	1	17%	4.50 (0.69 to 29.39)
Rosi affiliation	3	75%	5	29%	1	17%	4.50 (0.69 to 29.39)
Pio affiliation	2	50%	4	24%	0	0%	∞
No affiliation	1	25%	10	59%	5	83%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Analysis of articles published after FDA warning (n=175)

Prevalence and disclosure of COI

% of studies with industry affiliation 45%

% of studies with COI statement 55%

Risk of MI

	Favorable (n=27)		Neutral (n=85)		Unfavorable (n=63)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	25	93%	39	46%	15	24%	3.89 (2.47 to 6.13)
Rosi affiliation	24	89%	24	28%	11	17%	4.95 (2.87 to 8.53)
Pio affiliation	19	70%	30	35%	11	17%	4.85 (2.80 to 8.42)
No affiliation	2	7%	46	54%	48	76%	—

Rosi Use

	Favorable (n=25)		Neutral (n=112)		Unfavorable (n=38)		Rate ratio (95% CI)
Any affiliation	23	92%	46	41%	10	26%	3.50 (2.03 to 6.03)
Rosi affiliation	21	84%	29	26%	9	24%	3.75 (2.10 to 6.72)
Pio affiliation	19	76%	31	28%	10	26%	3.44 (1.98 to 5.96)
No affiliation	2	8%	66	59%	28	74%	—

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

F. Pioglitazone analysis

PIOGLITAZONE	Tot al	Pio Affiliati on	Rosi and Pio Affiliation	No affiliations
# of articles strongly recommending pio	29	25 (86%)	14 (48%)	4 (14%)

83% 55/66 of Pio affiliates also had affiliations with rosi
 43/53 of manufacturers of other antihyperglycemic agents
 81% also had affiliations with rosi

G. PRISMA statement checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	4
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	A6
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	A6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	A6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4-6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	6

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2Employee 3Grant 4Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5Assistance 5:Type of pharmaceutical industry 6:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning 7:Written in response to Nissen/Home? 8:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	6-7
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	A6
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	7
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	9-10
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	11
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	11-12
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	13
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	1

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance 5:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest 18

H. REFERENCES

1. Acharya D, Falik R. Cardiovascular Effects of Thiazolidinediones: A Review of the Literature. *Southern Medical Journal* 2009;102(1):51-56.
2. Ajjan R. Cardiovascular disease and heritability of the prothrombotic state. *Blood Reviews* 2009;23(2):67-78.
3. Ajjan RA, Grant PJ. The cardiovascular safety of rosiglitazone. *Expert Opinion on Drug Safety* 2008;7(4):367-376.
4. Alexander GC, Sehgal NL, Moloney RM, Stafford RS. National Trends in Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, 1994-2007. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2008;168(19):2088-2094.
5. Andraca R. Prescription of oral agents to type 2 diabetes mellitus patients. Treatment guide. *Medicina Interna de Mexico* 2008;24(1):52-58.
6. Anon. Glitazones in type 2 diabetes: An update. *Drug and Therapeutics Bulletin* 2008;46(4):25-29.
7. Barnett AH. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular outcomes. *British Journal of Diabetes and Vascular Disease* 2008;8(1):45-49.
8. Barry P. Inappropriate prescribing in geriatric patients. *Current Psychiatry Reports* 2008;10(1):37-43.
9. Baxter M. Treatment of type 2 diabetes: a structured management plan. *Advances in Therapy* 2008;25(2):106-114.
10. Betteridge DJ, DeFronzo RA, Chilton RJ. PROactive: time for a critical appraisal. *European Heart Journal* 2008;29(8):969-983.
11. Bijl D. Thiazolidinedione derivatives: Heart failure and death from cardiovascular causes. *Geneesmiddelenbulletin* 2007;41(11):121-122.
12. Bilous RW. Rosiglitazone and myocardial infarction: cause for concern or misleading meta-analysis? *Diabetic Medicine* 2007;24(9):931-933.
13. Blake E. Effect of diabetes medications on cardiovascular risk and surrogate markers in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Pharmacy Technology* 2009;25(1):24-36.
14. Bloomgarden ZT. The Avandia debate. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30(9):2401-2408.
15. Bloomgarden ZT. Approaches to treatment of type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(8):1697-1703.
16. Bloomgarden ZT. Cardiovascular disease in diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(6):1260-1266.
17. Bolen S, Feldman L, Vassy J, Wilson L, Yeh HC, Marinopoulos S, et al. Systematic review: Comparative effectiveness and safety of oral medications for type 2 diabetes Mellitus. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2007;147(6):386-399.
18. Bolusani H, Peter R, Rees A. Therapy and clinical trials: glycaemia and prevention of macroangiopathy in type 2 diabetes. *Current Opinion in Lipidology* 2008;19(6):629-630.
19. Bouhlef MA, Chinetti-Gbaguidi G, Staels B. Glitazones in the treatment of cardiovascular risk factors. *Fundamental & Clinical Pharmacology* 2007;21:7-13.
20. Bouhlef MA, Staels B, Chinetti-Gbaguidi G. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors - from active regulators of macrophage biology to pharmacological

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2:** See Table 1 for scale criteria **3:** Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4:**Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance 5: Type of pharmaceutical industry 6: Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning 7: Written in response to Nissen/Home? 8: Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest

- targets in the treatment of cardiovascular disease. *Journal of Internal Medicine* 2008;263(1):28-42.
21. Bourassa MG, Berry C. Prevention and Noninvasive Management of Coronary Atherosclerosis in Patients with Diabetes. *Current Atherosclerosis Reports* 2008;10(2):106-116.
 22. Boyle PJ. Thiazolidinediones and clinical diabetes management: New challenges for the fall of 2007 - Response. *Southern Medical Journal* 2007;100(11):1063-1064.
 23. Bracken MB. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;357(9):937-938.
 24. Brown D. A review of cardiovascular comorbidities of diabetes. *Pharmacy Times* 2007;73(10 SUPPL.):3-9.
 25. Brunton J. Available agents for glycemic control. *Journal of Family Practice* 2007;56(11).
 26. Brunton S. The changing shape of type 2 diabetes CME. *MedGenMed Medscape General Medicine* 2008;10(6):43.
 27. Burrill P. Rational treatment and monitoring in type 2 diabetes. *Pharmacy in Practice* 2007;17(5):180-182.
 28. Calkin A. PPAR agonists and cardiovascular disease in diabetes. *PPAR Research* 2008:245410.
 29. Calvert Ma, Shankar, A.a , McManus, R.a , Freemantle, N. Achieving glycaemic control: Current and future management opportunities. *Diabetes and Primary Care* 2008;10(3):143-144+146+148+150-151+154-155
 30. Cannon C. Cardiovascular disease and modifiable cardiometabolic risk factors. *Clinical Cornerstone* 2007;8(3):11-28.
 31. Casscells SW, Granger E, Swedorske J, Goldhammer R, Shaheen M, Dorris J, et al. A comparison of select cardiovascular outcomes by antidiabetic prescription drug classes used to treat type 2 diabetes among Military Health System beneficiaries, fiscal year 2003-2006. *American Journal of Therapeutics* 2008;15(3):198-205.
 32. Ceriello A. Thiazolidinediones as anti-inflammatory and anti-atherogenic agents. *Diabetes-Metabolism Research and Reviews* 2008;24(1):14-26.
 33. Chiarelli F. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma agonists and diabetes: Current evidence and future perspectives. *Vascular Health and Risk Management* 2008;4(2):297-304.
 34. Chieh K, Tasy PY, Tang CC. The effect of PPARs on coronary heart disease. *Acta Cardiologica Sinica* 2007;23(3):135-141.
 35. Cleland JGF, Atkin SL. Thiazolidinediones, deadly sins, surrogates, and elephants. *Lancet* 2007;370(9593):1103-1104.
 36. Cobitz A, Zambanini A, Sowell M, Heise M, Louridas B, McMorn S, et al. A retrospective evaluation of congestive heart failure and myocardial ischemia events in 14 237 patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus enrolled in 42 short-term, double-blind, randomized clinical studies with rosiglitazone. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2008;17(8):769-781.

37. Crandall JP, Knowler WC, Kahn SE, Marrero D, Florez JC, Bray GA, et al. The prevention of type 2 diabetes. *Nature Clinical Practice Endocrinology & Metabolism* 2008;4(7):382-393.
38. Cubbon R, Kahn M, Kearney MT. Secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes and prediabetes: a cardiologist's perspective. *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 2008;62(2):287-299.
39. Dagenais GR, Gerstein HC, Holman R, Budaj A, Escalante A, Hedner T, et al. Effects of ramipril and rosiglitazone on cardiovascular and renal outcomes in people with impaired glucose tolerance or impaired fasting glucose - Results of the Diabetes Reduction Assessment with ramipril and rosiglitazone Medication (DREAM) trial. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(5):1007-1014.
40. Dahabreh IJ. Meta-analysis of rare events: an update and sensitivity analysis of cardiovascular events in randomized trials of rosiglitazone. *Clinical Trials* 2008;5(2):116-120.
41. Dandona P, Chaudhuri A. Are thiazolidinediones associated with an increased risk of heart failure and cardiovascular death? *Nature Clinical Practice Cardiovascular Medicine* 2008;5(5):244-245.
42. Davis TME. Contemporary management of type 2 diabetes: blood glucose-lowering therapies and glycaemic targets. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2008;189(5):246-248.
43. Deeks ED, Keam SJ. Rosiglitazone - A review of its use in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Drugs* 2007;67(18):2747-2779.
44. DeMaria A. Journals, Competition, and the Media. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2007;50(3):286-287.
45. Diamond GA, Bax L, Kaul S. Uncertain effects of rosiglitazone on the risk for myocardial infarction and cardiovascular death. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2007;147(8):578-581.
46. Diamond GA, Kaul S. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357(9):938-9; author reply 939-40.
47. Doggrell SA. Clinical trials with thiazolidinediones in subjects with Type 2 diabetes - is pioglitazone any different from rosiglitazone? *Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy* 2008;9(3):405-420.
48. Drazen JM, Morrissey S, Curfman GD. Rosiglitazone - Continued uncertainty about safety. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;357(1):63-64.
49. Drummond R. Fractures, heart failure and fears of myocardial ischaemia: Has the RECORD stuck for rosiglitazone and the thiazolidinediones? *Practical Diabetes International* 2007;24(6):324-327.
50. Drzewoski J, Grzeszczak W. Rosiglitazone - under fire. *Kardiologia Polska* 2007;65(7):831-835.
51. Duan SZ, Usher MG, Mortensen RM. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma-mediated effects in the vasculature. *Circulation Research* 2008;102(3):283-294.

52. Edwards KL, Alvarez C, Irons BK, Fields J. Third-line agent selection for patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus uncontrolled with sulfonylureas and metformin. *Pharmacotherapy* 2008;28(4):506-521.
53. Erdmann E, Wilcox RG. Weighing up the cardiovascular benefits of thiazolidinedione therapy: the impact of increased risk of heart failure. *European Heart Journal* 2008;29(1):12-20.
54. Eurich DT, McAlister FA, Blackburn DF, Majumdar SR, Tsuyuki RT, Varney J, et al. Benefits and harms of antidiabetic agents in patients with diabetes and heart failure: systematic review. *British Medical Journal* 2007;335(7618):497-501.
55. Faich GA, Stemhagen A. Cardiac safety of diabetes therapies and postmarketing requirements. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2008;17(8):787-789.
56. Fonseca VA, Kulkarni KD. Management of type 2 diabetes: Oral agents, insulin, and injectables. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 2008;108(4):S29-S33.
57. Fowler M. Diabetes treatment, Part 2: Oral agents for glycemic management. *Clinical Diabetes* 2007;25(4):131-134.
58. Fuster V, Farkouh ME. Faster publication isn't always better. *Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med* 2007;4(7):345.
59. Gabor P. Rosiglitazone in the heat of the debate. *Lege Artis Medicinae* 2008;18(12):875-881.
60. Gerrits CM, Bhattacharya M, Manthena S, Baran R, Perez A, Kupfer S. A comparison of pioglitazone and rosiglitazone for hospitalization for acute myocardial infarction in type 2 diabetes. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2007;16(10):1065-1071.
61. Gerstein HC, Yusuf S. Does treatment with rosiglitazone increase cardiovascular risk of patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus? *Nature Clinical Practice Endocrinology & Metabolism* 2007;3(12):798-799.
62. Gilbert RE. Rosiglitazone: Opening Pandora's black box? *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology* 2007;2(6):1329-1331.
63. Giles TD, Miller AB, Elkayam U, Bhattacharya M, Perez A. Pioglitazone and heart failure: Results from a controlled study in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and systolic dysfunction. *Journal of Cardiac Failure* 2008;14(6):445-452.
64. Goldfine A. The rough road for rosiglitazone. *Current Opinion in Endocrinology, Diabetes and Obesity* 2008;15(2):113-117.
65. Graber MA, Darby-Stewart A, Dachs R. Choosing first-line therapy for management of type 2 diabetes. *American Family Physician* 2008;77(1):16-17.
66. Grant P. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular disease: A diabetologist's perspective. *Diabetes and Vascular Disease Research* 2007;4(2):75-76.
67. Guay DRP. Geriatric pharmacotherapy updates. *American Journal Geriatric Pharmacotherapy* 2007;5(4):363-375.
68. Gunter K. A heart to heart on Avandia®. *Evidence-Based Practice* 2007;10(12):10-12.
69. Gysling E. Nothing but the truth? *Pharma-Kritik* 2007;28(20):77-78.

70. Hakansson J. Replik: Varnings- signaler mÅ¥ste tas pÅ¥ allvar! *Lakartidningen* 2007;104(43):3204.
71. Halse J. Glitazoner - Igjen [4]. *Tidsskrift for den Norske Laegeforening* 2007;127(20):2707.
72. Hanefeld M. Is rosiglitazone associated with increased risk for cardiovascular events? . *Nature Clinical Practice Cardiovascular Medicine* 2007;4(12):648-649.
73. Hermansen K. Combining insulins with oral antidiabetic agents: Effect on hyperglycemic control, markers of cardiovascular risk and disease. *Vascular Health and Risk Management* 2008;4(3):561-574.
74. Hernandez AV, Walker E, Ioannidis JPA, Kattan MW. Challenges in meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials for rare harmful cardiovascular events: The case of rosiglitazone. *American Heart Journal* 2008;156(1):23-30.
75. Hjelmæsæth J. J. Hjelmæsæth svarer [5]. *Tidsskrift for den Norske Laegeforening* 2007;127(20):2707.
76. Hjelmæsæth J. Provides rosiglitazon increased risk for heart attack? Gir rosiglitazon økt risiko for hjerteinfarkt? *Tidsskr Nor Lægeforen* 2007;127:1809.
77. Hjelvin E. Antidiabetikum med Å¥kt risiko for karsykdom [3]. *Tidsskrift for den Norske Laegeforening* 2007;127(22):2971-2972.
78. Hlatky MA, Bravata DM. Rosiglitazone increased heart failure but did not differ from metformin plus sulfonylurea for other CV outcomes at interim analysis. *ACP J Club* 2007;147(3):67.
79. Hoppe U. Reply. *Erwiderung* 2008;133(6):262-263.
80. Horng M. The conundrum of rosiglitazone. *Journal of Clinical Outcomes Management* 2007;14(7):378-379.
81. Hughes B. Of medicine and meta-analysis. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* 2008;7(5):376-377.
82. Jarvis S. Rosiglitazone and pioglitazone - Where do we go from here? *British Journal of Cardiology* 2008;15(2):65-66.
83. Johnson EL. Treatment of diabetes in long-term care facilities: A primary care approach. *Clinical Diabetes* 2008;26(4):152-156.
84. Kageyama S. Thiazolidinedione Derivatives. *Japanese Journal of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2009;40(1):35-39.
85. Kahn SE, Cefalu WT. Glucose control, macro- and microvascular disease, and the food and drug administration: Let's keep our eye on the ball. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism* 2008;93(10):3727-3729.
86. Kalaitzidis RG, Sarafidis PA, Bakris GL. Effects of Thiazolidinediones Beyond Glycaemic Control. *Current Pharmaceutical Design* 2009;15(5):529-536.
87. Kamalesh M. Heart failure in diabetes and related conditions. *Journal of Cardiac Failure* 2007;13(10):861-873.
88. Kapoor JR. Controversy over the cardiovascular effects of thiazolidinediones. *American Journal of Medicine* 2008;121(4):E7-E7.
89. Katz P. Diabetes and cardiovascular disease among older adults: An update on the evidence. *Geriatrics and Aging* 2008;11(9):509-514.

90. Kaul SD, GA. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk. *Current Atherosclerosis Reports* 2008;10(5):398-404.
91. Kaul SD, GA. Have the risks of rosiglitazone been exaggerated? *Future Cardiology* 2008;4(1):9-13.
92. Kazi D. Rosiglitazone and implications for pharmacovigilance. *British Medical Journal* 2007;334(7606):1233-1234.
93. Kenny C. Rosiglitazone and the thiazolidinediones: A changing context. *Primary Care Diabetes* 2007;1(4):185-186.
94. Khanderia U, Pop-Busui R, Eagle K. Comment: Thiazolidinediones in Type 2 Diabetes: A Cardiology Perspective REPLY. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 2009;43(2):392-393.
95. Khanderia U, Pop-Busui R, Eagle KA. Thiazolidinediones in type 2 diabetes: A cardiology perspective. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 2008;42(10):1466-1474.
96. Kirby M. Glitazones: Evidence to inform daily practice. *Diabetes and Primary Care* 2007;9(4):195-196+200+202.
97. Kiryluk K. Thiazolidinediones and fluid retention. *Kidney International* 2007;72(6):762-768.
98. Koro CE, Fu QG, Stender M. An assessment of the effect of thiazolidinedione exposure on the risk of myocardial infarction in type 2 diabetic patients. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2008;17(10):989-996.
99. Krall R. Cardiovascular safety of rosiglitazone. *Lancet* 2007;369(9578):1995-1996.
100. Krentz A. Thiazolidinediones: effects on the development and progression of type 2 diabetes and associated vascular complications. *Diabetes-Metabolism Research and Reviews* 2009;25(2):112-126.
101. Lago RM, Singh PP, Nesto RW. Congestive heart failure and cardiovascular death in patients with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes given thiazolidinediones: a meta-analysis of randomised clinical trials. *Lancet* 2007;370(9593):1129-1136.
102. Lancet EB. Rosiglitazone: seeking a balanced perspective. *Lancet* 2007;369(9576):1834.
103. Lee J. Evaluation of Thiazolidinediones on Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review. *Journal for Nurse Practitioners* 2009;5(3):176-184.
104. Lehmann DF, Lohray BB. A lesson in moderation: Applying pharmacodynamics to clarify the relationship between thiazolidinediones and adverse vascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 2008;48(8):999-1002.
105. Lindberg M, Astrup A. The role of glitazones in management of type 2 diabetes. A DREAM or a nightmare? *Obesity Reviews* 2007;8(5):381-384.
106. Lipscombe LL. Thiazolidinediones: Do harms outweigh benefits? *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 2009;180(1):16-17.
107. Lipscombe LL, Gomes T, Levesque LE, Hux JE, Juurlink DN, Alter DA. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular outcomes in older patients with diabetes. *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2007;298(22):2634-2643.
108. Liu JP. Rethinking statistical approaches to evaluating drug safety. *Yonsei Medical Journal* 2007;48(6):895-900.

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest 24

109. Lopez CA, Kanna B. Low-dose rosiglitazone in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus requiring insulin therapy. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2008;168(5):548-548.
110. Malesker M. Optimizing antidiabetic treatment options for patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular comorbidities. *Pharmacotherapy* 2008;28(2):193-206.
111. Mankovsky B. Glitazones: Beyond glucose lowering! *Diabetes and Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research and Reviews* 2007;1(3):197-207.
112. Mannucci E. Pioglitazone and cardiovascular risk. A comprehensive meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism* 2008;10(12):1221-1238.
113. Mannucci E, Monami M, Marchionni N. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357(9):938; author reply 939-40.
114. Margolis DJ, Hoffstad O, Strom BL. Association between serious ischemic cardiac outcomes and medications used to treat diabetes. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2008;17(8):753-759.
115. Martin S. Cardiovascular effects of glitazones: An exciting pharmaceutical drama with many acts. *MMW-Fortschritte der Medizin* 2007;149(46):26-27.
116. Marx N. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular disease: A cardiologist's perspective. *Diabetes and Vascular Disease Research* 2007;4(2):80-81.
117. Marx N. Cardiovascular effects of glitazones. *Medizinische Welt* 2008;59(11):464-467.
118. Matthaehi S, Bierwirth R, Fritsche A, Gallwitz B, Haring HU, Joost HG, et al. Pharmacological Antihyperglycemic Therapy of Type 2 Diabetes mellitus Update of the Evidence-Based Guidelines of the German Diabetes Association. *Diabetologie Und Stoffwechsel* 2009;4(1):32-64.
119. Matthews DR, Tsapas A. Four decades of uncertainty: landmark trials in glycaemic control and cardiovascular outcome in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes & Vascular Disease Research* 2008;5(3):216-218.
120. Mazza A. Update on Diabetes in the Elderly and the Application of Current Therapeutics. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 2007;8(8):489-492.
121. Mazzone T. Prevention of macrovascular disease in patients with diabetes mellitus: Opportunities for intervention. *American Journal of Medicine* 2007;120(9):S26-S32.
122. McAfee ATa. Coronary heart disease outcomes in patients receiving antidiabetic agents. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2007;16(7):711-725.
123. McCullough P. The rosiglitazone meta-analysis. *Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine* 2007;8(2):123-126.
124. McGuire D. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular disease: An epidemiologist's perspective. *Diabetes and Vascular Disease Research* 2007;4(2):77-79.
125. McGuire DK, Inzucchi SE. New drugs for the treatment of diabetes mellitus - Part I: Thiazolidinediones and their evolving cardiovascular implications. *Circulation* 2008;117(3):440-449.

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 *Funded* 2 *Employee* 3 *Grant* 4 *Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock* 5 *Assistance* **5**:Type of pharmaceutical industry **6**:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning **7**:Written in response to Nissen/Home? **8**:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest 25

126. Medical Letter oDaT. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular disease. *Medical Letter on Drugs and Therapeutics* 2007;49(1265):57-58.
127. Mendzelevski B. No supplement for safety. *European Pharmaceutical Contractor* 2008(47):85-86+88.
128. Meneghini LF, Florez H, Tamariz L. The Avandia debacle: Methodology and practical importance of the findings - Response. *Southern Medical Journal* 2007;100(11):1062-1063.
129. Merino Torres J. What every cardiologist should know about oral antidiabetics and insulin. *Lo que el cardiólogo debe conocer sobre antidiabéticos orales e insulinas Rev Esp Cardiol Suppl* 2007;7(H):49H-57H.
130. Mikhail N. Why should we avoid the use of rosiglitazone? *Southern Medical Journal* 2008;101(3):329-331.
131. Mikhail N. Cardiovascular safety of low-dose rosiglitazone. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2008;168(1):109-109.
132. Misbin R. Lessons from the avandia controversy: A new paradigm for the development of drugs to treat type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30(12):3141-3144.
133. Misra AKL. The rosiglitazone riddle: DREAMs and nightmares. *Diabetes and Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research and Reviews* 2007;1(3):193-195.
134. Mizuno CS, Chittiboyina AG, Kurtz TW, Pershadsingh HA, Avery MA. Type 2 diabetes and oral antihyperglycemic drugs. *Current Medicinal Chemistry* 2008;15(1):61-74.
135. Mohan V. The rosiglitazone controversy: The Indian perspective. *Journal of Association of Physicians of India* 2007;55(JULY):477-480.
136. Monami M, Marchionni N, Mannucci E. Winners and losers at the rosiglitazone gamble A meta-analytical approach at the definition of the cardiovascular risk profile of rosiglitazone. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice* 2008;82(1):48-57.
137. Mulrow CD, Cornell JE, Localio AR. Rosiglitazone: A thunderstorm from scarce and fragile data. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2007;147(8):585-587.
138. Musini VM, Bassett KL, Tejani AM. Comment: Thiazolidinediones in type 2 diabetes: a cardiology perspective. *Ann Pharmacother* 2009;43(2):391-2; author reply 392-3.
139. Nathan DM. Rosiglitazone and cardiotoxicity - Weighing the evidence. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;357(1):64-66.
140. Nathan DM, Buse JB, Davidson MB, Ferrannini E, Holman RR, Sherwin R, et al. Management of Hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: A consensus algorithm for the initiation and adjustment of therapy - Update regarding thiazolidinediones: A consensus statement from the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(1):173-175.
141. Nathan DM, Buse JB, Davidson MB, Ferrannini E, Holman RR, Sherwin R, et al. Medical Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes: A Consensus Algorithm for the Initiation and Adjustment of Therapy A consensus statement of the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32(1):193-203.

142. Nessim F, Loney-Hutchinson L, McFarlane SI. What are the long-term cardiovascular effects of treatment with rosiglitazone? *Curr Diab Rep* 2008;8(3):201-2.
143. Nilsson PM. Thiazolidinediones for elderly patients with type 2 diabetes: Safe or not? *Aging Health* 2008;4(2):131-135.
144. Odegard P. Considerations for the pharmacological treatment of diabetes in older adults. *Diabetes Spectrum* 2007;20(4):239-247.
145. Odom J, Williamson B, Carter L. Rosiglitazone and pioglitazone in the treatment of diabetes mellitus. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2008;65(19):1846-1850.
146. Padwal R. Thiazolidinediones increased risk for heart failure, myocardial infarction, and death in older patients with type 2 diabetes. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2008;148(12).
147. Pais P. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular disease - Recent controversy. *Indian Heart Journal* 2008;60(3):241-244.
148. Pasmantier R. Weighing the benefits and risks of thiazolidinediones. *Cardiology Review* 2008;25(1):27-28.
149. Peter R, Cox A, Evans M. Management of diabetes in cardiovascular patients. *Heart* 2008;94(3):369-375.
150. Philippe J, Raccah D. Treating type 2 diabetes: how safe are current therapeutic agents? *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 2009;63(2):321-332.
151. Pierce S. A tale of two glitazones. *Canadian Pharmacists Journal* 2007;140(6):410.
152. Pignone M. Rosiglitazone appears to be associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular events. *Clinical Diabetes* 2007;25(4):123-124.
153. Psaty BM, Furberg CD. The record on rosiglitazone and the risk of myocardial infarction. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;357(1):67-69.
154. Psaty BM, Furberg CD. Rosiglitazone and cardiovascular risk. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;356(24):2522-2524.
155. Remigereau J, Bouquiaux, B., Siriwardana, M., Pautas, E. . Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular outcomes in older patients with diabetes. *Revue de Geriatrie* 2009;34(1):61-63.
156. Repas TB. Think beyond the numbers, don't forget the patient. *Journal of the American Osteopathic Association* 2008;108(5 SUPPL 3):ii-S4.
157. Riccardi Ga. Glitazones and cardiovascular risk: Evidence-based evaluation. *Giornale Italiano di Diabetologia e Metabolismo* 2007;27(3):121-123.
158. Ripsin CM, Kang H, Urban RJ. Management of Blood Glucose in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *American Family Physician* 2009;79(1):29-36.
159. Rizos CV, Elisaf MS, Mikhailidis DP, Liberopoulos EN. How safe is the use of thiazolidinediones in clinical practice? *Expert Opinion on Drug Safety* 2009;8(1):15-32.
160. Robinson J. Should we use PPAR agonists to reduce cardiovascular risk? *PPAR Research* 2008;891425

161. Rohatgi A, McGuire DK. Effects of the thiazolidinedione medications on micro- and macrovascular complications in patients with diabetes - Update 2008. *Cardiovascular Drugs and Therapy* 2008;22(3):233-240.
162. Rosen CJ. The rosiglitazone story - Lessons from an FDA advisory committee meeting. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2007;357(9):844-846.
163. Rottlaender D, Michels G, Erdmann E, Hoppe UC. Thiazolidinedione derivatives - a risk for cardiovascular disease? *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 2007;132(49):2629-2632.
164. Rucker G, Schumacher M. Simpson's paradox visualized: The example of the Rosiglitazone meta-analysis. *Bmc Medical Research Methodology* 2008;8.
165. Ryder REJ. Rosiglitazone versus pioglitazone in relation to cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes: Primum non nocere. *Practical Diabetes International* 2007;24(8):422-425.
166. Sarafidis PA. Thiazolidinedione derivatives in diabetes and cardiovascular disease: an update. *Fundamental & Clinical Pharmacology* 2008;22(3):247-264.
167. Scheen AJ. Do thiazolidinediones increase the risk of congestive heart failure and cardiovascular death? *Nature Clinical Practice Endocrinology & Metabolism* 2008;4(5):260-261.
168. Selvin E, Bolen S, Yeh HC, Wiley C, Wilson LM, Marinopoulos SS, et al. Cardiovascular Outcomes in Trials of Oral Diabetes Medications - A Systematic Review. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2008;168(19):2070-2080.
169. Shaw K. Rosiglitazone: The prescribing dilemma continues. *Practical Diabetes International* 2007;24(8):392.
170. Shenfield GM. Have glitazones lost their sparkle? *Australian Prescriber* 2008;31(3):58-59.
171. Shuster J. The rosiglitazone meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(3):e10.
172. Shuster JJ, Jones LS, Salmon DA. Fixed vs random effects meta-analysis in rare event studies: The Rosiglitazone link with myocardial infarction and cardiac death. *Statistics in Medicine* 2007;26(24):4375-4385.
173. Silverberg AB, Ligaray KPL. Oral diabetic medications and the geriatric patient. *Clinics in Geriatric Medicine* 2008;24(3):541-+.
174. Singh S. The safety of rosiglitazone in the treatment of Type 2 diabetes. *Expert Opinion on Drug Safety* 2008;7(5):579-585.
175. Singh S. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular disease: Balancing benefit and harm. *Geriatrics and Aging* 2008;11(3):179-183.
176. Singh S. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *Heart* 2009;95(1):1-2.
177. Singh S, Loke YK, Furberg CD. Long-term risk of cardiovascular events with rosiglitazone - A meta-analysis. *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2007;298(10):1189-1195.
178. Sjöholm A. Glitazoner är mer än bara blodsocker- Sänkare vid typ 2-diabetes. *Lakartidningen* 2007;104(43):3201-3203.

179. Solomon DH, Winkelmayr WC. Cardiovascular risk and the thiazolidinediones - Deja vu all over again? *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2007;298(10):1216-1218.
180. Stafylas PC, Sarafidis PA, Lasaridis AN. The controversial effects of thiazolidinediones on cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. *International Journal of Cardiology* 2009;131(3):298-304.
181. Steg PG, Marre M. Does PERISCOPE provide a new perspective on diabetic treatment? *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2008;299(13):1603-1604.
182. Stockl KM, Le L, Zhang SA, Harada ASM. Risk of acute myocardial infarction in patients treated with thiazolidinediones or other antidiabetic medications. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2009;18(2):166-174.
183. Stolar MW, Hoogwerf BJ, Gorshow SM, Boyle PJ, Wales DO. Managing type 2 diabetes: Going beyond glycemic control. *Journal of Managed Care Pharmacy* 2008;14(5):S2-S19.
184. Strahlman E. Response to "Rosiglitazone no longer recommended". *Lancet* 2009;373(9663):544-544.
185. Strohmeyer T. Thiazolidinediones - On the contribution in DMW 49/2007 - Mail no. 4. *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 2008;133(6):262-262.
186. Strohmeyer T. Glitazones. *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 2008;133(6):262.
187. Stulc T, Ceska R. Rosiglitazone in the prevention of diabetes and cardiovascular disease: Dream or reality? *Medical Science Monitor* 2008;14(4):RA45-RA47.
188. Sulistio MS, Zion A, Thukral N, Chilton R. PPAR gamma Agonists and Coronary Atherosclerosis. *Current Atherosclerosis Reports* 2008;10(2):134-141.
189. Susman J. Rosiglitazone: Failure of oversight or demons imagined? *Journal of Family Practice* 2007;56(9):696-+.
190. Takano H, Komuro I. Peroxisome Proliferator-Activated Receptor gamma and Cardiovascular Diseases. *Circulation Journal* 2009;73(2):214-220.
191. Toth P. Avandia and risk for acute cardiovascular events: Science or sabotage? *Journal of Applied Research* 2007;7(2):147-149.
192. Triplitt C. Best practices for lowering the risk of cardiovascular disease in diabetes. *Diabetes Spectrum* 2008;21(3):177-189.
193. Unger J. Diagnosis and management of type 2 diabetes and prediabetes. *Primary Care* 2007;34(4):731-+.
194. Vaccaro O, Riccardi G. Thiazolidinediones and cardiovascular risk: Will the evidence so far available modify treatment strategies for type 2 diabetes? *Nutrition Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases* 2008;18(2):85-87.
195. Virally M, Guillausseau PJ. Controversy : rosiglitazone increases myocardial infarction risk. *Sang Thrombose Vaisseaux* 2007;19(7):345-346.
196. Waksman JC. Cardiovascular risk of rosiglitazone: another perspective. *Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology* 2008;60(12):1573-1582.
197. Wick-Urban B. Rosiglitazone increases the risk of cardiovascular diseases. *Rosiglitazon: Diabetikerherz in gefahr. Pharmazeutische Zeitung* 2008;153(8):26-27.

Rosi= Rosiglitazone; **Pio**= Pioglitazone; **COI**= Conflict of interest; **Other**= other antihyperglycemic agent other than Rosi/Pio **1,2**: See Table 1 for scale criteria **3**: Did author strongly recommend use of Pio? **4**:Nature of COI: 1 Funded 2 Employee 3 Grant 4 Consulting Advisory Board Honoraria Speaker Lecture Awards Travel Expenses Stock 5 Assistance 5:Type of pharmaceutical industry 6:Date of publication: before or after FDA black box warning 7:Written in response to Nissen/Home? 8:Google/PubMed/Scopus found additional conflict of interest 29

198. Wolffenbuttel BHR. Doubts as to the cardiovascular safety of rosiglitazone [3]. *Twijfels aan de cardiovasculaire veiligheid van rosiglitazon Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 2007;151(40):2236-2237.
199. Woo V. Important differences: Canadian Diabetes Association 2008 clinical practice guidelines and the consensus statement of the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2009;52(3):552-553.
200. Yeap BB. Controversies in type 2 diabetes An update. *Australian Family Physician* 2009;38(1-2):22-25.
201. Zarowitz BJ. The value equation for rosiglitazone and pioglitazone in older persons. *Geriatric Nursing* 2008;29(1):9-11.
202. Zinn A, Felson S, Fisher E, Schwartzbard A. Reassessing the cardiovascular risks and benefits of thiazolidinediones. *Clinical Cardiology* 2008;31(9):397-403.