Diagnostic Model of in-Hospital Mortality in Patients with Acute ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction Used Artificial Intelligence Methods

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.ORCID: 0000-0002-2999-8164.

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: We divide non-randomly the American population with acute STEMI into a training set, a test set,and a validation set. We converted the unbalanced data into balanced data. We used artificial intelligence methods to develop and externally validate the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients. 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, gender, cardiogenic shock, atrial fibrillation(AF), ventricular fibrillation(VF),third degree atrioventricular block,in-hospital bleeding, underwent percutaneous coronary intervention(PCI) during hospitalization, underwent coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) during hospitalization, hypertension history, diabetes history, and myocardial infarction history.The F2 score of logistic regression in the training set, the

test set , and the validation data set were 0.81, 0.6, and 0.59 respectively.The AUC of logistic regression in the training set, the test set, and the validation data set were 0.77, 0.78, and 0.8 respectively. The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best.

Conclusion: We had used artificial intelligence methods developed and externally validated the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients.

We registered this study with WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) (registration number: ChiCTR1900027129; registered date: 1 November 2019).

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 had the following problems: People had insufficient understanding of the data set of in-hospital mortality as unbalanced data. The unbalanced data was not converted into balanced data. There was no confusion matrix to be made and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) or C statistic to evaluate the prediction model was not comprehensive. Traditional statistical methods were difficult to deal with the above problems calmly; artificial intelligence methods were 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 44,996 patients with acute STEMI from January 2016 to December 2016 in the United States. The test dataset was 43,581 hospitalized patients with acute STEMI from January 2017 to December 2017 in the United States.The validation data set came from 40,498 hospitalized patients with acute STEMI from January 2018 to December 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 were 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 14 predictor variables according to clinical relevance. Fourteen potential candidate variables were age, gender, cardiogenic shock, atrial fibrillation(AF), ventricular

fibrillation(VF),first degree atrioventricular block,second degree atrioventricular block,third degree atrioventricular block,in-hospital bleeding, underwent percutaneous coronary intervention(PCI)during hospitalization, underwent coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) during hospitalization, hypertension history, diabetes history, and myocardial infarction history . All of them based on the medical record and blinded to the predictor variables. AF was defined as all type of AF during hospitalization. VF was defined as all type of VF during hospitalization. In-hospital bleeding was defined as all type of bleeding during hospitalization.

We kept all continuous data as continuous and retained on the original scale. We used univariable and multivariable logistic regression models to identify the correlates of in-hospital mortality. We entered all variables of Tables 1 into the univariable logistic regression. Based on the variables significantly generated by univariate logistic regression, we constructed a multivariate logistic regression model using the backward variable selection method. We used the Akanke information criterion(AIC)and Bayesian information criterion(BIC)to select predictors; It accounts for model fit while penalizing for the number of parameters being estimated and corresponds to using α =0.157. [8]

In the training dataset, 5,169 out of 44,966 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. 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 . Confusion matrix including Accuracy, Sensitivity, Specificity , Precision, F1 Score, andF2 Score.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, was defined as the harmonic average of precision and recall. In addition to F1 scores, F2 scores and F0.5 scores were also widely used in statistics. Among them, in the F2 score, the weight of the recall was higher than the precision , and in the F 0.5 score, the weight of the precision was higher than the recall .The weight of the recall was higher than the precision for the mortality in STEMI patients .We used F2 scorex combined with AUC to evaluate the pros and cons of the above models.

We performed statistical analyses with STATA version 15.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

We performed artificial intelligence statistical analysis using Python 3.8.5, Pandas 1.2.1, Sklearn 0.0, Numpy 1.19.2 and Keras 2.4.3.

Results

The patients' baseline characteristics of original, and down-sampling were shown in Table 1. Twelve variables (age, gender, cardiogenic shock, AF, VF,third degree atrioventricular block,in-hospital bleeding, underwent PCI during hospitalization, underwent CABG during hospitalization, hypertension history, diabetes history, and myocardial infarction history)were significant differences in the two groups of patient (P < . 157). After application of backward variable selection method, AIC and BIC, all of them remained as significant independent predictors of in-hospital mortality. Results are shown in Table 2 .In the test set, 4,895 out of 43,581 hospitalized patients (11.2%) experienced in-hospital mortality. The baseline characteristics of the patients were shown in Table 1 . In the validation data set, 4,001 out of 40,498 hospitalized patients (9.9%) experienced in-hospital mortality. The baseline characteristics of the patients were shown in Table 1.By comparing F2 score and AUC of Table 3, we can find that diagnostic model built by

dataset of down-sampling was better than those diagnostic model built by dataset of original. By comparing F2 score and AUC of Table 3, we can find that the diagnostic model built by logistic regression was better than those diagnostic model built by decision tree, XGBoost, multi-layer perceptron, and K nearest neighbor .So we used the diagnostic model built by dataset of down-samling and built by logistic regression("modellog.m).

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patient with and without in-hospital mortality

	training data sets								test data sets				validation data sets			
	original				down-sampling											
Characteristic	Total (n=44,966)	In-hospital deaths (n=5,169)	In hospital survivors (n=39,827)	*P* value	Total (n=10,347)	In-hospital deaths (n=5,169)	In hospital survivors (n=5,178)	*P* value	Total (n=43,581)	In-hospital deaths (n=4,895)	In hospital survivors (n=38,686)	*P* value	Total (n=40,498)	In-hospital deaths (n=4,001)	In hospital survivors (n=36,497)	*P* value
Age(year,x±s)[18,90]	65±14	72±14	64±13	<.001	68±14	72±14	64±13	<.001	64±13	71±13	64±13	<.001	64±13	71±13	64±13	<.001
Female sex n(%)	15,109(33.6)	2,245(43.4)	12,864(32.3)	<.001	3,940(38.1)	2,245(43.4)	1,695(32.7)	<.001	14,211(32.6)	2,011(41.1)	12,200(31.5)	<.001	12,827(31.7)	1,608(40.2)	11,219(30.7)	<.001
Medical history n(%)																
Hypertension	32,570(72.4)	3,404(65.9)	29,166(73.3)	<.001	7,201(69.6)	3,404(65.9)	3,797(73.3)	<.001	30,182(69.3)	2,920(59.7)	27,262(70.5)	<.001	28,411(70.2)	2,365(59.1)	26,046(71.3)	<.001
Old myocardial infarction	5,260(11.7)	530(10.3)	4,730(11.9)	0.001	1,121(10.8)	530(10.3)	591(11.4)	0.058	5,088(11.7)	406(8.3)	4,682(12.1)	0.001	5,048(12.5)	391(9.8)	4,657(12.8)	0.001
Diabetes	2,479(5.6)	495(9.6)	1,984(5)	<.001	786(7.6)	495(9.6)	291(5.6)	<.001	3,844(8.9)	751(15.3)	3,093(8)	<.001	3,804(9.4)	705(17.6)	3,099(8.5)	<.001
Cardiogenic shock n (%)	5,632(12.5)	2,077(40.2)	3,555(8.9)	<.001	2,542(24.6)	2,077(40.2)	465 (9)	<.001	5,658(13)	2,012(41.1)	3,646(9.4)	<.001	5,742(14.2)	2,024(50.6)	3,718(10.2)	<.001
AF[a] n(%)	3,173(7.1)	414(8)	2,759(6.9)	0.004	771(7.5)	414(8)	357(6.9)	0.031	3,300(7.6)	436(8.9)	2,864(7.4)	0.004	3,204(7.9)	379(9.5)	2,825(7.8)	0.004
VF[b] n(%)	3,403(7.6)	975(18.9)	2,428(6.1)	<.001	1,266(12.2)	975(18.9)	291(5.6)	<.001	3,431(7.9)	1,010(20.6)	2,421(6.3)	<.001	3,336(8.2)	931(23.3)	2,405(6.6)	<.001
In-hospital bleeding n(%)	1,053(2.3)	343(6.6)	710(1.8)	<.001	429(4.1)	343(6.6)	86(1.6)	<.001	822(1.9)	306(6.3)	516(1.3)	<.001	643(1.6)	296(7.4)	347 (1)	<.001
III AVB[c] n(%)	1,136(2.5)	228(4.4)	908 (2.3)	<.001	357(3.5)	228(4.4)	129(2.5)	<.001	1,158(2.7)	236(4.8)	922(2.4)	<.001	1,187(2.9)	267(6.7)	920(2.5)	<.001
II AVB[c] n(%)	332(0.7)	31(0.6)	301 (0.8)	0.219	68 (0.7)	31(0.6)	37(0.7)	0.470	321(0.7)	31(0.6)	290(0.7)	0.370	313(0.8)	29(0.7)	284(0.8)	0.715
I AVB[c] n(%)	364(0.8)	46(0.9)	318 (0.8)	0.490	87 (0.8)	46(0.9)	41(0.8)	0.585	369(0.8)	40(0.8)	329(0.9)	0.811	369(0.9)	30(0.7)	339(0.9)	0.259
PCI[f] n(%)	29,110(64.7)	1611(31.2)	27,499(69)	<.001	5,158(49.9)	1611(31.2)	3,547(68.5)	<.001	29,364(67.4)	1677(34.3)	27,687(71.6)	<.001	29,246(72.2)	1,595(39.9)	27,651(75.8)	<.001
CABG[e] n(%)	2,397(5.3	148(2.9)	2,249	<.0	442	148(2.9)	294(5.7)	<.0	2,244(5.1	166(3.4)	2,078(5.4	<.0	1,940 129	1,811(5)	<.0	

)	(5.6)	01	(4.3)	01	)	)	01	(4.8)	(3.2)	01

[a] AF: atrial fibrillation. [b] VF: ventricular fibrillation. [c] AVB: atrioventricular block. [d] PCI: underwent percutaneous coronary intervention during hospitalization. [e] CABG:underwent coronary artery bypass grafting during hospitalization.

Table 2. Predictor of in-hospital mortality obtained from multivariable logistic regression models in the training data sets

	Odds ratio					Coef				
In-hospital mortality	Odds ratio	Std. Err.	z	P>z	95% Conf. Interval	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	95% Conf. Interval
Age	1.035432	.0013867	26.00	<.001	1.032718 ~1.038153	.0348187	.0013393	26.00	<.001	.0321938~.0374436
Female sex	1.110608	.0393301	2.96	0.003	1.036136 ~1.190431	.1049072	.0354132	2.96	0.003	.0354987~.1743157
Medical history										
Hypertension	.7176797	.0262568	-9.07	<.001	.668019~ .7710321	-.331732	.0365857	-9.07	<.001	-.4034387~-.2600253
Old myocardial infarction	.8129311	.0448676	-3.75	<.001	.7295817~.9058027	-.2071089	.0551924	-3.75	<.001	-.315284~-.0989338
Diabetes	1.383109	.08354	5.37	<.001	1.228694~1.55693	.3243337	.0604002	5.37	<.001	.2059515~.4427159
Cardiogenic shock	7.635366	.3090266	50.23	<.001	7.053085~8.265718	2.032791	.0404731	50.23	<.001	1.953465~2.112117
AF[a]	.6754272	.0420343	-6.31	<.001	.5978678~ .7630481	-.3924099	.0622336	-6.31	<.001	-.5143855~-.2704342
VF[b]	3.479356	.1777195	24.41	<.001	3.147901~3.845713	1.246847	.0510783	24.41	<.001	1.146736~1.346959
In-hospital bleeding	2.466731	.1898968	11.73	<.001	2.121258~2.868468	.9028937	.0769832	11.73	<.001	.7520094~1.053778
III AVB[c]	1.263896	.1131563	2.62	0.009	1.060483~1.506327	.2341991	.0895297	2.62	0.009	.058724~.4096741
PCI[d]	.1650676	.0063145	-47.09	<.001	.1531441~.1779195	-1.8014	.0382538	-47.09	<.001	-1.876376~-1.726424
CABG[e]	.1784059	.0171668	-17.91	<.001	.1477419~.2154342	-1.723694	.0962234	-17.91	<.001	-1.912288~-1.5351
_cons	.020919	.0020729	-39.02	<.001	.0172263~ .0254033	-3.867096	.0990936	-39.02	<.001	-4.061316~-3.672876

[a]AF: atrial fibrillation. [b]VF: ventricular fibrillation. [c]AVB: atrioventricular block.[d]PCI: underwent percutaneous coronary intervention during hospitalization.[e]CABG:underwent coronary artery bypass grafting during hospitalization.

Table 3. confusion matrix and AUC

		original to original											down-sampling to original										
		TP[a]	TN[b]	FP[c]	FN[d]	Accuracy	Recall	Specificity	Precision	F1 Score	F2 Score	AUC	TP[a]	TN[b]	FP[c]	FN[d]	Accuracy	Recall	Specificity	Precision	F1 Score	F2 Score	AUC
logistic regression	training	1039	39074	753	4130	0.89	0.20	0.98	0.58	0.30	0.23	0.59	424	3775	140	926	0.77	0.82	0.73	0.75	0.78	0.81	0.77
	test	987	37928	758	3908	0.89	0.20	0.98	0.57	0.30	0.23	0.59	397	2894	97	916	0.76	0.81	0.75	0.29	0.43	0.60	0.78
	validation	994	35764	733	3007	0.91	0.25	0.98	0.58	0.35	0.28	0.61	329	2809	84	707	0.78	0.82	0.77	0.28	0.42	0.59	0.80
decision	training	1361	39274	553	3808	0.90	0.26	0.99	0.71	0.38	0.30	0.62	436	4022	115	853	0.81	0.83	0.78	0.79	0.81	0.83	0.81
	test	997	37792	894	3898	0.89	0.20	0.98	0.53	0.29	0.23	0.59	373	2864	100	116	0.74	0.76	0.74	0.27	0.40	0.56	0.75
	validation	892	35570	927	3109	0.90	0.22	0.97	0.49	0.31	0.25	0.60	309	2765	87	907	0.76	0.77	0.76	0.26	0.39	0.56	0.77
Xg	tr	1339	39251	576	3830	0.90	0.26	0.99	0.70	0.38	0.30	0.62	44	3904	12	67	0.81	0.87	0.75	0.78	0.82	0.85	0.81

boost	ning												96		74	3							
	test	1041	37888	798	3854	0.89	0.21	0.98	0.57	0.31	0.24	0.60	4011	28110	10576	884	0.74	0.82	0.73	0.27	0.41	0.59	0.77
	validation	892	35570	927	3109	0.90	0.22	0.97	0.49	0.31	0.25	0.60	3306	27253	9244	695	0.75	0.83	0.75	0.26	0.40	0.58	0.79
Kneareest	training	370	39689	138	4799	0.89	0.07	1.00	0.73	0.13	0.09	0.53	3699	4128	1050	1470	0.76	0.72	0.80	0.78	0.75	0.73	0.76
	test	280	38539	147	4615	0.89	0.06	1.00	0.66	0.11	0.07	0.53	3246	31054	7632	1649	0.79	0.66	0.80	0.30	0.41	0.53	0.73
neighbor	validation	290	36332	165	3711	0.90	0.07	1.00	0.64	0.13	0.09	0.53	2678	29935	6562	1323	0.81	0.67	0.82	0.29	0.40	0.53	0.74
multi-layer	training	1082	39062	765	4087	0.89	0.21	0.98	0.59	0.31	0.24	0.60	4398	3634	1544	771	0.78	0.85	0.70	0.74	0.79	0.83	0.78
	test	1043	37929	757	3852	0.89	0.21	0.98	0.58	0.31	0.24	0.60	4129	28018	10668	766	0.74	0.84	0.72	0.28	0.42	0.60	0.74
perer	validation	804	35996	501	3197	0.91	0.20	0.99	0.62	0.30	0.23	0.59	3477	26476	10021	524	0.74	0.87	0.73	0.26	0.40	0.59	0.74

c n
e
p
t
r
o
n

The code used for using the diagnostic mode can seen in code1.

If we input the following code on the browser:

http://127.0.0.1:8000/ml/predict?

AGE=60&FEMALE=1&HBP=1&VF=0&AF=1&OMI=1&CSHOCK=1&IIIAVB=1&DM=1&PCI=1&CABG=0&BLEEDING=1

The result can show below:

[{"features": {"AF": 1.0, "AGE": -1.0, "BLEEDING": 1.0, "CABG": 0.0, "CSHOCK": 1.0, "DM": 1.0, "FEMALE": 1.0, "HBP": 1.0, "IIIAVB": 1.0, "OMI": 1.0, "PCI": 1.0, "VF": 0.0}, "result": 0}, {"message": "1=death,0=alive"}]

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the predisposing factors of in-hospital mortality in patients with acute STEMI. Age, gender, cardiogenic shock, AF, VF,third degree atrioventricular block,in-hospital bleeding, underwent PCI during hospitalization, underwent CABG during hospitalization, hypertension history, diabetes history, and myocardial infarction history 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 0.8, 0.6, and 0.6 respectively.The AUC of logistic regression in the training set, the test set and the

validation data set were 0.77, 0.78, and 0.8 respectively.The diagnostic model built by logistic regression was the best. So we use the diagnostic model built by logistic regression.

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[9]. Karen S. Pieper et al. generated the updated GRACE risk model and a nomogram.[10]The GRACE risk model has since been upgraded again[11]and simplified. [12]TIMI risk score predicting 30-day mortality at presentation of fibrinolytic-eligible patients with STEMI. [3] C-ACS[13]was simple four-variable scores that have been developed to enable risk stratification at first medical contact. 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]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. [7]

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.

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

We had used artificial intelligence methods developed and externally validated the diagnostic model of in-hospital mortality in acute STEMI patients.

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.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

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;BLEEDING = in-hospital bleeding; CABG =underwent coronary artery bypass grafting during hospitalization;CSHOCK = Cardiogenic shock; DIED= in-hospital mortality; DM= diabetes history; FEMALE = female;HBP = history of hypertension; OMI=history of myocardial infarction;PCI=percutaneous coronary intervention during hospitalization;VF =ventricular fibrillation. 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] 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.

[10] 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.

[11] 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.

[12] 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.

[13] 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.