Diagnostic Model of in-Hospital Mortality in Patients with Acute ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction Used Artificial Intelligence Methods : Algorithm Development and Validation

Yong Li, MD

No.2 Clinic, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China.

Datun Community Health Service Center, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China.

Corresponding Author:Yong Li, MD, No.2 Clinic, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, No. 405,Building No. 5 Madian Nancun, Xicheng District Beijing, 100088 China. Phone: 8613910227262,Email: liyongdoctor@sina.com.

Abstract

Background: Preventing in-hospital mortality in Patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) is a crucial step.

Objectives: The objective of our research was to to develop and externally validate the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients used artificial intelligence methods.

Methods: As our datasets were highly imbalanced, we evaluated the effect of down-sampling methods. Therefore, down-sampling techniques was additionally implemented on the original dataset to create 1 balanced datasets. This ultimately yielded 2 datasets; original, and down-sampling. We divide non-randomly the American population into a training set and a test set , and anther American population as the validation set. We used artificial intelligence methods to develop and externally validate the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients, including logistic regression, decision tree, extreme gradient boosting (XGBoost), K nearest neighbor classification model ,and multi-layer perceptron.We used confusion matrix combined with the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) to evaluate the pros and cons of the above models.

Results:The strongest predictors of in-hospital mortality were age, female, cardiogenic shock, atrial fibrillation(AF), ventricular fibrillation(VF),in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction.The F2 score of logistic regression in the training set, the test set , and the validation data set were 0.7, 0.7, and 0.54 respectively.The F2 score of XGBoost were 0.74, 0.52, and 0.54 respectively. The F2 score of decision tree were 0.72, 0.51,and 0.52 respectively. The F2 score of K nearest neighbor classification model were 0.64,0.47, and 0.49 respectively. The F2 score of multi-layer perceptron were 0.71, 0.54, and 0.54 respectively.

The AUC of logistic regression in the training set, the test set, and the validation data set were 0.72, 0.73, and 0.76 respectively. The AUC of XGoBost were 0.75, 0.73, and 0.75 respectively. The AUC of decision tree were 0.75, 0.71,and 0.74 respectively. The AUC of K nearest neighbor classification model were 0.71,0.69, and 0.72 respectively. The AUC of multi-layer perceptron were 0.73, 0.74, and 0.75 respectively. The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best.

Conclusion: The strongest predictors of in-hospital mortality were age, female, cardiogenic shock, AF, VF,in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction.

We had used artificial intelligence methods developed and externally validated the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients.The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best.

Key Words: coronary disease; ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; in-hospital mortality; artificial intelligence

Introduction

In the United States, an estimated 605,000 acute myocardial infarction (AMI) events occur each year .[1]In Europe, the in-hospital mortality of patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) is between 4% and 12%. [2]Coronary heart disease including STEMI remains the main cause of death. [1]Preventing in-hospital mortality of STEMI is a crucial step. A tool is needed

to help early detection of patients with increased in-hospital mortality. The Global Registration Risk Score for Acute Coronary Events (GRACE) can be accessed via mobile devices, so it enjoyed a high reputation among users. Myocardial infarction thrombolysis (TIMI) risk score can predict the clinical manifestations of 30-day mortality in patients with fibrinolytic-eligible STEMI.[3]The ACTION (Acute Coronary Treatment and Intervention Outcomes Network) score[4]was established in 2011 using 65,668 AMI patients, and 16,336 AMI patients were used to validate as a model for predicting in-hospital mortality. The ACTION model updated in 2016 used more patients and added cardiac arrest as a risk factor.[5]Xiang Li used the machine learning method to make a prediction model of in-hospital mortality for STEMI patients . [6]Kwon JM used deep learning to establish a prediction model of in-hospital mortality in STEMI patients, which is better than GRACE score and TIMI score. [7]

The current prediction models have the following problems: People have insufficient understanding of the data set of in-hospital mortality as unbalanced data. The unbalanced data is not converted into balanced data. There is no confusion matrix to be made and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) or C statistic to evaluate the prediction model is not comprehensive. Traditional statistical methods are difficult to deal with the above problems calmly; artificial intelligence methods are needed.

The objective of our research was to develop and externally validate the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients used artificial intelligence methods.

Methods

The training dataset was 44,975 patients with acute STEMI from January 2016 to December 2016 in the United States. The test dataset was 43,562 hospitalized patients with acute STEMI from January 2017 to December 2017 in the United States.The validation data set came from 40,484 hospitalized patients with acute STEMI from January 2018 to Decemb

er 2018 in the United States. Data from the National (Nationwide) Inpatient Sample (NIS) were used for this study. Inclusion criteria: 1. all those STEMI patients who are hospitalized; 2. all those STEMI patients over 18 years of age. Exclusion criteria: none. It was a retrospective analysis and informed consent was waived by Ethics Committee of Beijing Anzhen Hospital Capital Medical University. Outcome of interest was in-hospital mortality. All in-hospital mortality was defined as cardiogenic or non-cardiogenic death during hospitalization. The presence or absence of in-hospital mortality was decided blinded to the predictor variables and based on the medical record.

We selected 8 predictors based on clinical relevance and baseline descriptive statistics.The potential candidate variables were age, female, cardiogenic shock, atrial fibrillation(AF), ventricular fibrillation(VF),in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction. All of them based on the medical record and blinded to the predictor variables. AF was defined as all type of AF during hospitalization. In-hospital bleeding was defined as all type of bleeding during hospitalization.

In the development dataset, 5,163 out of 44,975 hospitalized patients (11.5%) experienced in-hospital mortality which represented an imbalanced dataset. We evaluated the effect of common sampling methods including down-sampling methods. Therefore, down-sampling techniques was additionally implemented on the original dataset to create 1 balanced datasets. We randomly selected 13 percent in the survival data as the control group. This ultimately yielded 2 datasets; original, and down-sampling.

To ensure reliability of data, we excluded patient who had missing information on predictors. We kept all continuous data as continuous and retained on the original scale. Discrimination was the ability of the diagnostic model to differentiate between patient with and without in-hospital mortality. This measure was quantified by calculating the AUC[8].

Predictive classifiers were developed based on data from the training set using 5 supervised artificial intelligence methods: (1)Logistic Regression ,(2) Random Forest, (3)Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) ,(4) K nearest neighbor classification model , and (5)multilayer perceptron . We performed artificial intelligence statistical analysis using Python 3.8.5, Sklearn 0.0, Pandas 1.2.1, Numpy 1.19.2 and Keras 2.4.3.

We used confusion matrix combined with AUC to evaluate the pros and cons of the above models.True Positive=TP,False Negative=FN,False Positive=FP,True Negative=TN.Accuracy = (TP + TN)/(TP + TN + FP + FN), Sensitivity = Recall = TP/(TP + FN), Specificity = TN/(TN + FP), Precision = TP/(TP + FP), F1 Score = 2* Precision * Recall/(Precision + Recall), F2 Score = 5*Precision* Recall/(4*Precision + Recall).F1 Score, is defined as the harmonic average of precision and recall. In addition to F1 scores, F2 scores and F0.5 scores are also widely used in statistics. Among them, in the F2 score, the weight of the recall is higher than the precision , and in the F 0.5 score, the weight of the precision is higher than the recall .The weight of the recall is higher than the precision for the mortality in STEMI patients .We use F2 scorex combined with AUC to evaluate the pros and cons of the above models.

Results

The study was approved by the ethics committee on October 25, 2019. Data collection started on November 6 , 2019. As of submission of the manuscript, 129,021 people had been recruited for the study.

In the training dataset, 5,163 out of 44,975 hospitalized patients (11.5%) experienced in-hospital mortality. The patients' baseline characteristics of original, and down-sampling were shown in Table 1,2. Eight variables (age ,female , history of old myocardial infarction, history of hypertension, cardiogenic shock,VF, in-hospital bleeding , and AF) were significantly different of patient.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patient with and without in-hospital mortality in the training data sets(original)

Characteristic	Total (n=44,975)	In-hospital deaths (n =5,163)	In hospital survivors (n= 39,812)	*P* value
Age(year,x±s)[21,90]	65±14	72±14	64±13	<.001
Female sex n(%)	15,103 (33.6)	2,243(43.4)	12,860(32.3)	<.001
Medical history n (%)				
Hypertension	32,567 (72.4)	3,404(65.9)	29,163(73.3)	<.001
Old myocardial infarction	5,260(11.7)	530 (10.3)	4,730 (11.9)	0.001
Cardiogenic shock n (%)	5,632 (12.5)	2,077 (40.2)	3,555 (8.9)	<.001
AF[a] n(%)	3,173(7.1)	414 (8)	2,759 (6.9)	0.004
VF[b] n(%)	3,400(7.6)	973(18.8)	2,427(6.1)	<.001
In-hospital bleeding n(%)	1,052 (2.3)	342(6.6)	710 (1.8)	<.001

[a]AF: atrial fibrillation. [b]VF: ventricular fibrillation.

Table 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patient with and without in-hospital mortality in the training data sets(down-sampling)

Characteristic	Total (n=10,339)	In-hospital deaths (n =5,163)	In hospital survivors (n= 5,176)	*P* value
Age(year,x±s)[21,90]	68±14	72±14	64±13	<.001
Female sex n(%)	3,961 (38.3)	2,243(43.4)	1,718 (33.2)	<.001
Medical history n (%)				

Hypertension	7,155 (69.2)	3,404(65.9)	3,751 (72.5)	<.001
Old myocardial infarction	1,094 (10.6)	530 (10.3)	564 (10.9)	0.297
Cardiogenic shock n (%)	2,553 (24.7)	2,077 (40.2)	476 (9.2)	<.001
AF[a] n(%)	736 (7.1)	414 (8)	322 (6.2)	<.001
VF[b] n(%)	1,280 (12.4)	973(18.8)	307(5.9)	<.001
In-hospital bleeding n(%)	445 (4.3)	342(6.6)	103 (2)	<.001

[a]AF: atrial fibrillation. [b]VF: ventricular fibrillation.

In the test set, 4,893 out of 43,562 hospitalized patients (11.2%) experienced in-hospital mortality. The baseline characteristics of the patients were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patient with and without in-hospital mortality in the test data sets

Characteristic	Total (n=43,562)	In-hospital deaths (n=4,893)	In hospital survivors (n= 38,669)	*P* value
Age(year,x±s)[21,91]	64±13	71±13	64±13	<.001
Female sex n(%)	14,207 (32.6)	2,011(41.1)	12,196 (31.5)	<.001
Medical history n (%)				
Hypertension	30,178(69.3)	2,920(59.7)	27,258(70.5)	<.001
Old myocardial infarction	5,086 (11.7)	406 (8.3)	4,680(12.1)	<.001

Cardiogenic shock n (%)	5,657(13)	2,012(41.1)	3,645 (9.4)	<.001
AF[a] n(%)	3,300(7.6)	436(8.9)	2,864 (7.4)	<.001
VF[b] n(%)	3,429 (7.9)	1,010(20.6)	2,419 (6.3)	<.001
In-hospital bleeding n(%)	822 (1.9)	306(6.3)	516 (1.3)	<.001

[a]AF: atrial fibrillation. [b]VF: ventricular fibrillation.

In the validation data set, 4,001 out of 40,484 hospitalized patients (9.9%) experienced in-hospital mortality. The baseline characteristics of the patients were shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patient with and without in-hospital mortality in the validation data sets

Characteristic	Total (n=40,484)	In-hospital deaths (n = 4,001)	In hospital survivors (n= 36,483)	*P* value
Age(year,x±s)[21,90]	64±13	71±13	63±13	<.001
Female sex n(%)	12,823(31.7)	1,608(40.2)	11,215 (30.7)	<.001
Medical history n (%)				
Hypertension	28,409(70.2)	2,365 (59.1)	26,044 (71.4)	<.001

Old myocardial infarction	5,048(12.5)	391 (9.8)	4,657 (12.8)	<.001
Cardiogenic shock n (%)	5,741(14.2)	2,024 (50.6)	3,717 (10.2)	<.001
AF[a] n(%)	3,204(7.9)	379 (9.5)	2,825 (7.7)	<.001
VF[b] n(%)	3,335(8.2)	931(23.3)	2,404 (6.6)	<.001
In-hospital bleeding n(%)	643 (1.6)	296 (7.4)	347 (1)	<.001

[a]AF: atrial fibrillation. [b]VF: ventricular fibrillation.

Table 6. confusion matrix and AUC(original to original)

		TP[a]	TN[b]	FP[c]	FN[d]	accuracy	recall	specificity	precision	F1 Score	F2 Score	AUC
logistic regression	**training**	**706**	**39196**	**616**	**4457**	**0.89**	**0.14**	**0.98**	**0.53**	**0.22**	**0.16**	**0.56**
	test	**612**	**38107**	**562**	**4281**	**0.89**	**0.13**	**0.99**	**0.52**	**0.2**	**0.15**	**0.56**

	validation	**663**	**35853**	**630**	**3338**	**0.9**	**0.17**	**0.98**	**0.51**	**0.25**	**0.19**	**0.57**
decision tree	**training**	**843**	**39387**	**425**	**4320**	**0.89**	**0.16**	**0.99**	**0.66**	**0.26**	**0.19**	**0.58**
	test	**595**	**38038**	**631**	**4298**	**0.89**	**0.12**	**0.98**	**0.49**	**0.19**	**0.14**	**0.55**
	validation	**563**	**35817**	**666**	**3438**	**0.9**	**0.14**	**0.98**	**0.46**	**0.22**	**0.16**	**0.56**
Xgboost	**training**	**768**	**39452**	**360**	**4395**	**0.89**	**0.15**	**0.99**	**0.68**	**0.24**	**0.17**	**0.57**
	test	**542**	**38161**	**508**	**4351**	**0.89**	**0.11**	**0.99**	**0.52**	**0.18**	**0.13**	**0.55**
	validation	**517**	**35975**	**508**	**3484**	**0.9**	**0.13**	**0.99**	**0.5**	**0.21**	**0.15**	**0.56**
K nearest neighbo	**training**	**408**	**39610**	**202**	**4755**	**0.89**	**0.08**	**0.99**	**0.67**	**0.14**	**0.1**	**0.54**

r												
	test	**276**	**38440**	**229**	**4617**	**0.89**	**0.06**	**0.99**	**0.55**	**0.1**	**0.07**	**0.53**
	validation	**289**	**36221**	**262**	**3712**	**0.9**	**0.07**	**0.99**	**0.52**	**0.13**	**0.09**	**0.53**
multi-layer perceptron	**training**	**155**	**39654**	**158**	**5008**	**0.89**	**0.03**	**1**	**0.5**	**0.06**	**0.04**	**0.51**
	test	**140**	**38534**	**135**	**4753**	**0.89**	**0.03**	**1**	**0.51**	**0.05**	**0.04**	**0.51**
	validation	**245**	**36275**	**208**	**3756**	**0.9**	**0.06**	**0.99**	**0.54**	**0.11**	**0.07**	**0.53**

[a]TP:True Positive.[b]FN:False Negative.[c]FP:False Positive.[d]TN:True Negative.[e]AUC:the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve.

Table 7. confusion matrix and AUC（(down-sampling to original)）

		TP a	TN b	FP c	FN d	accuracy	recall	specificity	precision	F1 Score	F2 Score	AUC
logistic regression	training	3594	3895	1281	1569	0.72	0.7	0.75	0.74	0.72	0.7	0.72
	test	3473	29381	9288	1420	0.75	0.71	0.76	0.27	0.39	0.54	0.73
	validation	2985	27937	8546	1016	0.76	0.75	0.77	0.26	0.38	0.54	0.76
decision tree	training	3635	4114	1062	1528	0.75	0.7	0.79	0.77	0.74	0.72	0.75
	test	3256	29404	9265	1637	0.75	0.67	0.76	0.26	0.37	0.51	0.71
	validation	2855	27976	8507	1146	0.76	0.71	0.76	0.25	0.37	0.52	0.74
Xgboost	training	3797	3979	1197	1366	0.75	0.74	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.75
	test	3500	28556	10113	1393	0.74	0.72	0.74	0.26	0.38	0.52	0.73
	validation	3044	27292	9191	957	0.75	0.76	0.75	0.25	0.37	0.54	0.75
K nearest neighbor	training	3148	4237	939	2015	0.71	0.61	0.82	0.77	0.68	0.64	0.71

	test	**2814**	**31108**	**7561**	**2079**	**0.78**	**0.58**	**0.8**	**0.27**	**0.37**	**0.47**	**0.69**
	validation	**2494**	**29508**	**6975**	**1507**	**0.79**	**0.62**	**0.81**	**0.26**	**0.37**	**0.49**	**0.72**
multi-layer perceptron	**training**	**3654**	**3895**	**1281**	**1509**	**0.73**	**0.71**	**0.75**	**0.74**	**0.72**	**0.71**	**0.73**
	test	**3489**	**29311**	**9358**	**1404**	**0.75**	**0.71**	**0.76**	**0.27**	**0.39**	**0.54**	**0.74**
	validation	**3044**	**27292**	**9191**	**957**	**0.75**	**0.76**	**0.75**	**0.25**	**0.37**	**0.54**	**0.75**

[a]TP:True Positive.[b]FN:False Negative.[c]FP:False Positive.[d]TN:True Negative.[e]AUC:the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve.

By comparing F2 score and AUC of Table 6 and Table 7, we can find that diagnostic model built by dataset of down-sampling is better than those diagnostic model built by dataset of original. By comparing F2 score and AUC of Table 7, we can find that the diagnostic model built by logistic regression is better than those diagnostic model built by decision tree, XGBoost, and K nearest neighbor .The diagnostic model built by logistic regression is as good as the one built by multi-layer perceptron, but it is simpler .So we use the diagnostic model built by logistic regression("modellog.m).

The code used for using the diagnostic mode can seen below.

```
# coding=utf-8

import joblib

import flask

from flask import Flask, request, url_for, Response

app = Flask(__name__)

model2 = joblib.load("modellog.m")

@app.route("/", methods=["GET"])

def index():

    with app.test_request_context():

        result = {"predict": {"url": url_for("predict"),

          "params": ["AGE", "FEMALE", "HBP", "VF", "AF", "OMI", "CSHOCK", " BLEEDING"]}}

        result_body = flask.json.dumps(result)

        return Response(result_body, mimetype="application/json")

@app.route("/ml/predict", methods=["GET"])

def predict():

    request_args = request.args

    if not request_args:

        result = {"message": "Please write down the features like as

http://127.0.0.1:8000/ml/predict?AGE=80&FEMALE=1&HBP=1&VF=1&AF=1&OMI=1&CSHOCK=0&

BLEEDING=0"}

        result_body = flask.json.dumps(result, ensure_ascii=False)
```

```
        return Response(result_body, mimetype="application/json")

AGE = float(request_args.get("AGE", "-1"))

FEMALE = float(request_args.get("FEMALE", "-1"))

HBP = float(request_args.get("HBP", "-1"))

VF = float(request_args.get("VF", -1))

AF = float(request_args.get("AF", -1))

OMI = float(request_args.get("OMI", -1))

CSHOCK = float(request_args.get("CSHOCK", -1))

BLEEDING = float(request_args.get("BLEEDING", -1))

vec = [[AGE,FEMALE,HBP, VF,AF,OMI,CSHOCK,BLEEDING]]

print("vec: {0}".format(vec))

predict_result = int(model2.predict(vec)[0])

print("predict_result: {0}".format(predict_result))

result = {

        "features": {

        "AGE": AGE,

          "FEMALE": FEMALE,

          "HBP": HBP,

          "VF": VF,

          "AF": AF,

          "OMI": OMI,

          "CSHOCK": CSHOCK,

          "BLEEDING": BLEEDING
```

```
            },
            "result": predict_result },{"message": "1=death,0=alive"}
    result_body = flask.json.dumps(result, ensure_ascii=False)
    return Response(result_body,    mimetype="application/json")
if __name__ == "__main__":
app.run(port=8000)
```

If we input the following code on the browser:

http://127.0.0.1:8000/ml/predict?AGE=30&FEMALE=1&HBP=1&VF=1&AF=1&OMI=1&VF=1&CSHOCK=1&BLEEDING=1

The result can show below:

[{"features": {"AF": 1.0, "AGE": -1.0, "BLEEDING": 1.0, "CSHOCK": 1.0, "FEMALE": 1.0, "HBP": 1.0, "OMI": 1.0, "VF": 1.0}, "result": 1}, {"message": "1=death,0=alive"}]

Discussion

The mortality in STEMI patients was affected by many factors, including advanced age and Killip class, and so on . [9]In this study, we investigated the predisposing factors of in-hospital mortality in patients with acute STEMI. Age, female ,ventricular fibrillation, atrial fibrillation, cardiogenic shock , in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction were significant independent predictors of in-hospital mortality.

The F2 score of logistic regression in the training set, the test set and the validation data set were 0.7, 0.7, and 0.54 respectively.The AUC of logistic regression in the training set, the test set and the validation data set were 0.72, 0.73, and 0.76 respectively.The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best.So we use the diagnostic model built by logistic regression.

Adanged age has been reported to be an independent risk factor of in-hospital mortality. Elder patients had a higher risk of mechanical complications. [9]Elder patients had more comorbidities and were less likely to receive reperfusion therapy. [10-12]

Cardiogenic shock has been associated with increased risk of in-hospital mortality.[13-22] Cardiogenic shock is common and highly morbid. Cardiogenic shock is a clinical condition defined as the inability of the heart, generally as a result of impairment of its pumping function,to deliver an adequate amount of blood to the tissues to meet resting metabolic demands.[13][23, 24]Mounting evidence mandates a more nuanced view of cardiogenic shock that factors in the complex interactions between the ventricles and the systemic or pulmonary vasculature, the interdependence between the left and right ventricles, and the molecular and inflammatory milieu that often accompanies cardiogenic shock.[25]

Granger CB et al.observed that age, Killip class, systolic blood pressure, ST-segment deviation, cardiac arrest during presentation, serum creatinine level, positive initial cardiac enzyme findings, and heart rate were independent predictors of in-hospital mortality among 11,389 patients in the GRACE[26]. Karen S. Pieper et al. generated the updated GRACE risk model and a nomogram.[27]The GRACE risk model has since been upgraded again[28]and simplified. [29]TIMI risk score predicting 30-day mortality at presentation of fibrinolytic-eligible patients with STEMI. [3] C-ACS[30]was simple four-variable scores that have been developed to enable risk stratification at first medical contact. Acute coronary treatment and intervention outcomes network (ACTION) score[4]used 65,668 patients to develop and 16,336 patients to validate a model to predict in-hospital mortality . The ACTION model updated in 2016 used more patients (243,440) and added cardiac arrest as a risk factor.[5]This was a form of internal validation because their cohorts were randomly created . [8]

So far, clinicians and researchers usually use GRACE or TIMI scores to guide treatment decisions. Our diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality build upon these studies in several ways. We

converted the unbalanced data into balanced data. We used confusion matrix combined with AUC to evaluate the pros and cons of the above models. It can be easily calculated at patient presentation. It includes only baseline factors, namely age, female, ventricular fibrillation, atrial fibrillation, cardiogenic shock , in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction .

Our study has several important limitations including its retrospective nature. The F2 score and AUC of logistic regression in the training set, the test set and the validation data set were modest.

Conclusion

The strongest predictors of in-hospital mortality were age, female, cardiogenic shock, AF, VF,in-hospital bleeding and medical history such as hypertension, old myocardial infarction. We had used artificial intelligence methods developed and externally validated the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients.The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best.

List of abbreviations.

AF =atrial fibrillation; AMI=acute myocardial infarction; AUC=area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; FN=False Negative; FP=False Positive; MI= myocardial infarction; NIS=National (Nationwide) Inpatient Sample; ROC=receiver operating characteristic; STEMI=ST elevation myocardial infarction; TN=True Negative; TP=True Positive.

Declarations

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Funding Sources

This research received no external funding.

Disclosure

None.

Statement of Ethics

Ethic committee approved the study. Approved No. of ethic committee: 2019039X.

Name of the ethic committee:Ethics committee of Beijing Anzhen Hospital Capital Medical University. We registered this study with WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) (registration number: ChiCTR1900027129; registered date: 1 November 2019). http://www.chictr.org.cn/edit.aspx?pid=44888&htm=4.It was a retrospective analysis and informed consent was waived by Ethics Committee of Beijing Anzhen Hospital Capital Medical University.

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study was not conducted with animals.

Consent to publish

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

Supplementary materials

The data are demographic, and clinical characteristics of patients with acute STEMI. AGE= age; AF =atrial fibrillation;DIED= in-hospital mortality; VF =ventricular fibrillation; FEMALE = female;HBP = history of hypertension; BLEEDING = in-hospital bleeding; CSHOCK = Cardiogenic shock; OMI=history of myocardial infarction. Data from the National (Nationwide) Inpatient Sample (NIS) data from January 2016 to December 2018 in the United States were used for this study.https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/.

Author Contributions

YL contributed to the generation of the study data, analyzed and interpreted the study data, drafted the manuscript, and revised the manuscript. YL was responsible for the overall content as guarantor. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

References

[1] Benjamin EJ, Muntner P, Alonso A, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2019 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2019. 139(10): e56-e528.

[2] Kristensen SD, Laut KG, Fajadet J, et al. Reperfusion therapy for ST elevation acute myocardial infarction 2010/2011: current status in 37 ESC countries. Eur Heart J. 2014. 35(29): 1957-70.

[3] Morrow DA, Antman EM, Charlesworth A, et al. TIMI risk score for ST-elevation myocardial infarction: A convenient, bedside, clinical score for risk assessment at presentation: An intravenous nPA for treatment of infarcting myocardium early II trial substudy. Circulation. 2000. 102(17): 2031-7.

[4] Chin CT, Chen AY, Wang TY, et al. Risk adjustment for in-hospital mortality of contemporary patients with acute myocardial infarction: the acute coronary treatment and intervention outcomes network (ACTION) registry-get with the guidelines (GWTG) acute myocardial infarction mortality model and risk score. Am Heart J. 2011. 161(1): 113-122.e2.

[5] McNamara RL, Kennedy KF, Cohen DJ, et al. Predicting In-Hospital Mortality in Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol, 2016,68(6):626-635.

[6] Li X, Liu H, Yang J, et al. Using Machine Learning Models to Predict In-Hospital Mortality for ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients. Stud Health Technol Inform, 2017,245:476-480.

[7] Kwon JM, Jeon KH, Kim HM, et al. Deep-learning-based risk stratification for mortality of patients with acute myocardial infarction. PLoS One, 2019,14(10):e0224502.

[8] Moons KG, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, et al. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. Ann Intern Med. 2015. 162(1): W1-73.

[9] Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, et al. 2017 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Eur Heart J. 2018. 39(2): 119-177.

[10] Toleva O, Ibrahim Q, Brass N, Sookram S, Welsh R. Treatment choices in elderly patients with ST: elevation myocardial infarction-insights from the Vital Heart Response registry. Open Heart. 2015. 2(1): e000235.

[11] Malkin CJ, Prakash R, Chew DP. The impact of increased age on outcome from a strategy of early invasive management and revascularisation in patients with acute coronary syndromes: retrospective analysis study from the ACACIA registry. BMJ Open. 2012. 2(1): e000540.

[12] Alabas OA, Allan V, McLenachan JM, Feltbower R, Gale CP. Age-dependent improvements in survival after hospitalisation with acute myocardial infarction: an analysis of the Myocardial Ischemia National Audit Project (MINAP). Age Ageing. 2014;43(6):779-85 .

[13] Zeymer U, Bueno H, Granger CB, et al. Acute Cardiovascular Care Association position statement for the diagnosis and treatment of patients with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: A document of the Acute Cardiovascular Care Association of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care. 2020. 9(2):

183-197.
[14] Killip T 3rd, Kimball JT. Treatment of myocardial infarction in a coronary care unit. A two year experience with 250 patients. Am J Cardiol. 1967. 20(4): 457-64.
[15] Becker RC, Burns M, Gore JM, et al. Early assessment and in-hospital management of patients with acute myocardial infarction at increased risk for adverse outcomes: a nationwide perspective of current clinical practice. The National Registry of Myocardial Infarction (NRMI-2) Participants. Am Heart J. 1998. 135(5 Pt 1): 786-96.
[16] Wu AH, Parsons L, Every NR, Bates ER, Second National Registry of Myocardial Infarction. Hospital outcomes in patients presenting with congestive heart failure complicating acute myocardial infarction: a report from the Second National Registry of Myocardial Infarction (NRMI-2). J Am Coll Cardiol. 2002. 40(8): 1389-94.
[17] Steg PG, Dabbous OH, Feldman LJ, et al. Determinants and prognostic impact of heart failure complicating acute coronary syndromes: observations from the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events (GRACE). Circulation. 2004. 109(4): 494-9.
[18] De Luca G, Suryapranata H, van 't Hof AW, et al. Prognostic assessment of patients with acute myocardial infarction treated with primary angioplasty: implications for early discharge. Circulation. 2004. 109(22): 2737-43.
[19] Halkin A, Singh M, Nikolsky E, et al. Prediction of mortality after primary percutaneous coronary intervention for acute myocardial infarction: the CADILLAC risk score. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2005. 45(9): 1397-405.
[20] DeGeare VS, Boura JA, Grines LL, O'Neill WW, Grines CL. Predictive value of the Killip classification in patients undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention for acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol. 2001. 87(9): 1035-8.
[21] El-Menyar A, Zubaid M, AlMahmeed W, et al. Killip classification in patients with acute coronary syndrome: insight from a multicenter registry. Am J Emerg Med. 2012. 30(1): 97-103.
[22] Taguchi E, Konami Y, Inoue M, et al. Impact of Killip classification on acute myocardial infarction: data from the SAIKUMA registry. Heart Vessels. 2017. 32(12): 1439-1447.
[23] van Diepen S, Katz JN, Albert NM, et al. Contemporary Management of Cardiogenic Shock: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2017. 136(16): e232-e268.
[24] Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, et al. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure. Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed). 2016. 69(12): 1167.
[25] Brener MI, Rosenblum HR, Burkhoff D. Pathophysiology and Advanced Hemodynamic Assessment of Cardiogenic Shock. Methodist Debakey Cardiovasc J. 2020. 16(1): 7-15.
[26] Granger CB, Goldberg RJ, Dabbous O, et al. Predictors of hospital mortality in the global registry of acute coronary events. Arch Intern Med. 2003. 163(19): 2345-53.
[27] Pieper KS, Gore JM, FitzGerald G, et al. Validity of a risk-prediction tool for hospital mortality: the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events. Am Heart J. 2009. 157(6): 1097-105.
[28] Fox KA, Fitzgerald G, Puymirat E, et al. Should patients with acute coronary disease be stratified for management according to their risk? Derivation, external validation and outcomes using the updated GRACE risk score. BMJ Open. 2014. 4(2): e004425.
[29] Huang W, FitzGerald G, Goldberg RJ, et al. Performance of the GRACE Risk Score 2.0 Simplified Algorithm for Predicting 1-Year Death After Hospitalization for an Acute Coronary Syndrome in a Contemporary Multiracial Cohort. Am J Cardiol. 2016. 118(8): 1105-1110.
[30] Huynh T, Kouz S, Yan AT, et al. Canada Acute Coronary Syndrome Risk Score: a new risk score for early prognostication in acute coronary syndromes. Am Heart J. 2013. 166(1): 58-63.