ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN PERCUTANEOUS CORONARY INTERVENTION: IMPROVED PREDICTION OF PCI-RELATED COMPLICATIONS USING AN ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK.

Hemant Kulkarni MD[1] and Amit P. Amin MD MSc[2,3,4]

---

[1] M&H Research, San Antonio, Texas.

[2] Cardiovascular Division, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO.

[3] Barnes-Jewish Hospital, St. Louis, MO.

[4] Center for Value and Innovation, Washington University School of Medicine.

Short Title: AI for PCI-outcomes

Total Word Count: 4,114 (includes text and legends)

Total tables: 3

Total figures: 2

Corresponding Author:

Hemant Kulkarni, MBBS, MD

Chief Executive Officer, M&H Research, LLC,

12023 Waterway Rdg, San Antonio, TX, 78249, USA

Email: hemant.kulkarni@mnhresearch.com

Tel: (210) 602 5537, **Fax:** (210) 920 4434

AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

Dr. Amit P. Amin – has received funding via a comparative effectiveness research KM1 career development award from the Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) program of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health, Grant Numbers UL1TR000448, KL2TR000450, TL1TR000449 and the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, Grant Number 1KM1CA156708-01; an AHRQ R18 grant award (Grant Number R18HS0224181-01A1), has received an unrestricted grant from Volcano corporation, and MedAxiom Synergistic Healthcare Solutions Austin, TX and is a consultant to Terumo, GE Healthcare and AstraZeneca. Dr. Hemant Kulkarni provides research consultancy to MedAxiom – Synergistic Healthcare Solutions Austin, TX.

Role of any Sponsor: No sponsor participated in the design and conduct of the study, collection, analysis, or interpretation of the data, nor in the preparation, review, nor approval of the manuscript. Funding for this work was obtained from an unrestricted grant from Terumo Medical Corporation.

Data Access and Responsibility: Drs. Amin and Kulkarni had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

ABSTRACT

Importance: Complications after percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) are common and costly. Risk models for predicting the likelihood of acute kidney injury (AKI), bleeding, stroke and death are limited by accuracy and inability to use non-linear relationships among predictors. Additionally, if non-linear relationships among predictors can be leveraged, then the prediction of any adverse event (i.e. "the patient who will not do well with PCI") is perhaps of greater interest to clinicians than prediction of adverse events in isolation.

Objective: To develop and validate a set of artificial neural networks (ANN) models to predict five adverse outcomes after PCI – AKI, bleeding, stroke, death and one or more of these four ('any adverse outcome').

Design: Cross-sectional study, using institutional NCDR CathPCI data.

Setting and participants: 28,005 patients undergoing PCI at five hospitals in the Barnes-Jewish Hospital system.

Main Outcome(s): AKI, bleeding, stroke, death, and one or more of these four ('any adverse outcome'). We divided 28,005 PCI patients into a training cohort of 21,004 (75%) and a test cohort of 7,001 (25%). We used an artificial neural network (ANN) multilayer perceptron (MLP) model to predict each outcome based on a set of 278 encoded and preprocessed variables. Model accuracy was tested using area under the receiver-operating-characteristic curve (AUC). Performance and validation of the MLP model was compared with existing regression models using integrated discrimination improvement (IDI) and continuous net reclassification index (NRI).

Results: The prevalence of AKI, bleeding, stroke and death in the study cohort was 4.6%, 3.6%, 0.3% and 1.1%, respectively. The fully trained MLP model achieved convergence quickly (<10 epochs) and could predict accurately predict AKI (77.9%), bleeding (86.5%), death (90.3%) and any adverse outcome (80.6%) in the independent test set. However, prediction of stroke was not satisfactory (69.9%). Compared to the currently used models for AKI, bleeding and death prediction, our models showed a significantly higher AUC (range 1.6% – 5.6%), IDI (range 4.9% – 7.2%) and NRI (range 0.07 – 0.61).

Conclusions and Relevance: By using neural network-based models, we accurately predict major adverse events after PCI. Larger studies for replicability and longitudinal studies for evidence of impact are needed to establish these artificial intelligence methods in current PCI practice.

INTRODUCTION

Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) is common in the United States, performed in ~600,000 PCI procedures annually.(1) With an increasing pressure on hospitals to improve the quality and value of their services, reducing the costs of elective PCI, is an important opportunity to explore. In fact, alternative payment models such as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) episode payment models (EPMs), commonly known as "bundled payments", are accelerating hospitals to prepare for the shift in reimbursement from 'payment for volume' to 'payment for value'.(2)

In this context, risk prediction models for adverse outcomes in patients undergoing PCI have an important role to play in the practice of 'value-driven PCI'. Complications after PCI such as bleeding, or acute kidney injury (AKI) or stroke or death, after PCI are not considered reliably predictable. Although validated risk-prediction models based on regression methods, can quantify a patient's risk of these adverse events,(3-6) they have not been considered highly accurate. Furthermore, adverse events rarely occur in isolation. The link between bleeding and AKI after PCI is well known.(7) Similarly, the association between bleeding and mortality, and AKI and mortality are also well established.(8,9) Ultimately, as clinicians taking care of patients, the goal of prediction models is not to identify events in isolation, but to accurately predict the entire spectrum of adverse events that are of importance to patients and providers alike.

Conceptually, another challenge that underlies these predictions is the existence of non-linear relationships among traditional risk factors and outcomes, and the impact of these nonlinear associations on mortality, the ultimate adverse event.(10) Traditional regression modelling is unable to handle these complex relationships. Artificial intelligence (AI) methods,

such as artificial neural networks (ANN), are particularly suited to tackle the challenges of scalability and high dimensionality of data with complex relationships among predictors and show promise in the field of PCI outcomes predictions. Our main motivation was to develop an ANN-based system of models that can simultaneously predict the risk of major complications in PCI patients using the same set of pre-procedural and procedural characteristics as predictors. Using a large dataset of PCI patients enrolled at a multi-hospital system, we developed and validated ANN-based risk-stratification system to be used as an aid to decision making during PCI.

METHODS

Study Population

This study used NCDR CathPCI Registry data (1) for the Barnes-Jewish Corporation (BJC) HealthCare hospitals spanning a period from 1 July 2009 to 30 April 2018. The BJC HealthCare hospitals include the following seven hospitals – Alton Memorial Hospital, Alton, IL; Barnes Jewish Hospital, St Louis, MO; Barnes Jewish St. Peters Hospital, St. Peters, MO; Boone Hospital Center, Columbia, MO; Christian Hospital, St Louis, MO; Missouri Baptist Medical Center, St. Louis, MO; and Progress West HealthCare, O'Fallon, MO. During this period a total of 30,520 PCIs conducted at these hospitals from which we included 28,005 (91.8%) in this study. This study was approved by Washington University's institutional review board, and no informed consent was required.

Predictors and Outcomes

This study included five outcomes and 100 predictors. The predictors represented following categories of information: baseline clinical variables (n = 31), admission related variables (n = 9), stress studies (n = 4), cardiac catheterization findings and imaging studies (n = 16), medications (n = 6), laboratory investigations (n = 5), PCI-characteristics at the start of PCI (n = 10) and PCI procedure-related variables (n = 19). The NCDR Cath registry evaluates characteristics, treatments, and outcomes of patients undergoing PCI and/or diagnostic catheterization.(1) Full definitions for all predefined variables are available at the American College of Cardiology's NCDR website (http://cvquality.acc.org/en/NCDR-Home/Registries/Hospital-Registries.aspx). Details of the variables included in the study are also provided in Table 1. Our machine-learning algorithm attempted to predict from these predictors one of the following five outcomes during index hospitalizations – AKI, bleeding, stroke, death and a composite outcome that represented the occurrence of any one of these four outcomes. Our aim was to simultaneously predict a spectrum of four most common and severe PCI-related adverse outcomes using a multiclass prediction. However, since some of the combinations of these four outcomes were very rare (Supplementary Table 1), we did not have adequate representation of such classes. Alternatively, we proceeded with development of different models (using the same set of inputs) to predict each of the four outcomes separately and to predict a fifth composite outcome that represented a combination of the four outcomes (hereinafter referred to as “any adverse outcome”).

Definitions of these outcomes were the same as that used in the NCDR CathPCI registry as follows: AKI: Acute Kidney Injury Network (AKIN) stage 1 or greater or a new requirement for dialysis following PCI (11) ; Bleeding: any ONE of the following: 1. Bleeding event w/in 72 hours

; OR 2. Hemorrhagic stroke; OR 3. Tamponade ; OR 4. Post-PCI transfusion for patients with a pre-procedure hemoglobin >8 g/dL and pre-procedure hemoglobin not missing; OR 5. Absolute hemoglobin decrease from pre-PCI to post-PCI of ≥3 g/dl AND pre-procedure hemoglobin ≤16 g/dL AND pre-procedure hemoglobin not missing (12); Stroke: transient ischemic attack, hemorrhagic stroke OR ischemic stroke; Death: death during index hospitalization.

Machine-learning modeling approach

We used a feed-forward, artificial neural network framework designed as a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) for all predictive modeling in this study. The detailed approach to data preparation, preprocessing, model specification, training and validation are depicted in Figure 1. The first step in data preparation included the splitting of a randomly shuffled dataset into a derivation set (n = 21,004 – 75% of the entire dataset) and a validation dataset (n = 7,001 – 25% of the entire dataset). This split was conducted only once and all training for machine-learning algorithms used data from the derivation set while all models were validated on data from the validation set.

The second step included data preprocessing using variable encoding. We aimed to maximize the information contained within a variable and therefore did not discard any records with missing values. Rather, we coded all missing values for all variables as -1 to include missing information as a separate category. Categorical variables (whether nominal or ordinal) were coded using a one-hot (13) encoding approach such that a vector (instead of a single scalar value) was used to denote the categorical value for each patient. The one-hot vector was encoded as 1 (for the category observed) or 0 (otherwise).(13) Continuous variables were

standard-normalized as $(x_i - \bar{x})/_{\sigma}$, where x_i is the ith observation, $\bar{x}$ is the mean and σ is the standard-deviation.

Our third step in the analytical pipeline included a generation of two datasets that were used as inputs to two different learning models for each outcome. From a clinical standpoint, the estimation of pre-PCI probability of an outcome is important and valuable for the PCI operator to make decisions about the PCI procedure. Therefore, we constructed Model 1 that incorporated all the baseline and pre-PCI variables (205 encoded variables) while Model 2 was constructed to include variables directly related to the PCI procedure (73 encoded variables). Predictions from these two models were then finally combined into a single prediction using logistic regression.

Model architecture, specification and tuning

All the models contained an input layer (the encoded dataset, hereafter referred to as the training set), a variable number of hidden layers and an output layer (represented by the dichotomous outcome in question). As shown in Figure 1, the MLP model included estimations of the weights (indicated by gray arrows) and biases (indicated by magenta dashed line that is common to all neurons within a single hidden layer) using the standard back-propagation gradient estimation algorithm. All neurons in the hidden function used the sigmoid activation function. Final output of the MLP was the predicted probability for the adverse outcome in each patient. The number of hidden layers, the number of neurons within each hidden layer, the learning rate and the number of training epochs required for convergence were treated as hyperparameters and tuned using a grid search that provided optimum model performance.

The cost function used to optimize the model was cross-categorical entropy. Avoidance of overfitting was ensured using the following approach. For each training epoch, the estimated best fitting model was independently applied to the test set (the encoded dataset obtained from the validation set) to trace the classification accuracy. Model training continued as long as there was improvement in the classification accuracy for both the training and the independently assessed test set. If the model only showed accuracy improvement in the training set but showed a decreased accuracy for the test set, then a potential overfitting was interpreted, and model training was stopped.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics included mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and percentages for categorical variables. Significant difference in the distribution of the study variables across the Derivation and Validation sets was tested using Student's t test (for continuous variables) or chi-square test (for categorical variables). Correction for multiple testing was done using the Bonferroni method. Importance of each variable used in the final MLP model was estimated using Olden's algorithm.(14) Calibration plots were used to examine the overall predictive performance of the MLP by plotting the observed and expected risk deciles and fitting a lowess smoother to the data. Accuracy of classification was assessed by plotting a receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) and estimating the area under the ROC curve (AUC). Improvement in discrimination and reclassification was assessed using the Integrated Discrimination Improvement (IDI) and the net reclassification index (NRI). Statistical significance was tested at a type I error rate of 0.05.

All analyses were carried out using R (CRAN) or Stata (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas). Following programs were used for specific aspects of analyses: one-hot encoding (R package onehot (13)), normalization of continuous variables and MLP implementation (R package RSNNS (15)), variable importance estimation (R package NeuralNetTools (16)), calibration plots (pmcalplot (17) package in Stata), AUC comparison (roccomp command in Stata that uses the DeLong test to compare AUCs (18)), and IDI and NRI estimation (idi and nri packages, Michael Lunt, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom).

RESULTS

Study population

This study was based on 28,005 PCIs on 26,784 patients, most of whom (n=25,589 , 95.5%) underwent one PCI, 1,169 (4.4%) had two PCIs and 26 (0.1%) had three PCIs during the study period. The average age of the patients was 65.6 years. Obesity (body mass index >30 kg/m^2, 46.6%), diabetes mellitus (40.4%), dyslipidemia (84.5%), and hypertension (83.8%) chronic renal (26.4%) and chronic lung (17.6%) disease were the commonest comorbidities. The average pre-PCI left ventricular ejection fraction was 52.1%, and a large proportion (varying between 21%-47%) patients had a significant history of heart failure, coronary artery disease, myocardial infarction, peripheral artery disease, or previous cardiac interventions (PCI and/or coronary artery bypass graft(CABG)). This full dataset was randomly split into a derivation set (n = 21,004) and a validation set (n= 7,001) which were statistically comparable with respect to the 100 predictor variables included in the study (Table 1).

Classification using multi-layer perceptron models

Using hyperparameter grid search, we found that an MLP with two hidden layers provided optimum classification performance for Model 1 with respect to all the outcomes. The optimum number of neurons in the first and second hidden layers was 70 and 27, respectively. The results of model performance are described in Table 2, Figure 1 and Supplementary Figure 1.

Prediction of outcomes using pre-PCI variables

As shown in Table 2, Model 1 (pre-PCI probability of outcome) predicted AKI with an accuracy of 82% and 77% accuracy in the training and test sets, respectively. Similarly, high predictive accuracy was observed for bleeding (85% and 85%, respectively), death (92% and 91%, respectively) and any adverse outcome (83% and 80%, respectively). However, Model 1 had a suboptimal performance to predict stroke (73% and 72%, respectively). Concomitantly, the learning was quick for AKI, bleeding, death and any adverse outcome (optimum number of training epochs needed were only 8-9) as compared to that for stroke (65 epochs). The full model optimization and the mean squared error of prediction for all outcomes is shown in Supplementary Figure 1.

Prediction of outcomes using PCI variables

The predictive performance of Model 2 (PCI-related probability of outcome) was, in general, less impressive than that of Model 1. This model provided optimum performance with one hidden layer containing 13 neurons. As shown in Table 2, the best predictions from Model 2 were for death (84% in training set, 81% in test set), bleeding (77% and 73%, respectively), any adverse outcome (71% and 68%, respectively) and AKI (66% and 63%, respectively).

Learning took between 9 and 18 epochs for these outcomes. Consistently, the prediction of stroke was both poorer (57% and 47%, respectively) and slower (49 epochs).

Prediction of outcomes using pre-PCI and PCI variables

The accuracy of the final model that combined predictions from both Model 1 and Model 2 is described in Table 2 and depicted in Figure 2 (in the test set only). In general, the predictive performance of the final model was marginally superior to that of Model 1 for all outcomes. In the training and test sets the predictive performance of the final model was best for death (92% and 90%, respectively), bleeding (88% and 86%, respectively), any adverse outcome (84% and 81%, respectively) and AKI (82% and 78%, respectively). Stroke could be predicted with accuracy of 73% and 70% in these datasets, respectively. Considering that the final predictive accuracy was primarily obtained from the pre-PCI probability (Model 1), we examined if specific subsets of patients with high or low likelihood of the event can be identified based on the probability estimates from Models 1 and 2. For this, we generated deciles of the predictions from Model 1 and 2, separately and estimated the likelihood ratio of the outcome for combinations of these deciles. The results are shown in Supplementary Figure 2. We found that higher deciles of the pre-PCI probability were associated with very high LRs for all outcomes. The association of the PCI-related probability (Model 2) deciles was, however, not linear for all outcomes. For instance, the LR for AKI was high (11.63) for patients in the highest decile of pre-PCI probability but in the lowest decile for PCI-related probability. Likewise, the LR for any adverse outcome was high (11.68) for patients in the 9th decile for pre-PCI probability but the lowest decile for PCI-related probability. Also, the LR for death was highest (62.1) for patients in the highest decile for pre-PCI probability but 6th decile for PCI-related probability.

These results indicated that the likelihood of study outcomes was primarily predicted by the pre-PCI probability and had complex, non-linear associations with the PCI-related probability of the event.

Predictive importance of input variables

In Supplementary Table 2, we list the top 20 important variables from Model 1 and top 10 important variables from Model 2 for each outcome. In general, the importance metrics for the variables included in Model 2 were lower than for those in Model 1 corroborating the observations that pre-PCI probability was a stronger predictor (than PCI-related probability) of the study outcomes. Of note, even though same set of inputs were provided to the MLP for each outcome, the set of important predictors varied by outcome. For AKI, not being on dialysis, having CKD, undergoing emergent PCI as an inpatient and the pre-PCI troponin T were the top five pre-PCI predictors. For bleeding, the top five pre-PCI predictors were history of other major surgery, anemia, cardiogenic shock and emergent or salvage PCI. For death, the top five pre-PCI predictors were pre-PCI cardiogenic shock (within 24 hours or 2 weeks), cardiac arrest, heart failure within two weeks and stenosis in the circumflex artery. For stroke, the importance metrics were not impressive but the top five pre-PCI variables included history of heart failure, stenosed ramus or proximal LAD in the absence of dyslipidemia and chronic lung disease. For any adverse outcome, the top five pre-PCI variables were a conglomerate of the above-mentioned variables for each outcome and included cardiogenic shock, history of major surgery, anemia, currently not on dialysis and an emergent PCI. Interestingly, across the outcomes, the important PCI-related variables primarily included insertion of intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) or other mechanical ventricular support (MVS) before, during or after the

PCI. Notably, nonuse of bleeding avoidance strategies (trans radial access, bivalirudin use and vascular closure device) was an important predictor of bleeding.

Validation of the MLP classifier in the test set

The ROC curves for prediction of each outcome in the independent test set are shown in Figure 2 and the AUC for these curves is shown separately for each model in Table 2 (column titled "Accuracy in Test Set"). As mentioned above and shown in these ROC curves, the predictive performance in the test set was excellent for all outcomes except for stroke. The learning difficulty posed by the outcome of stroke was also exemplified further when we examined the calibration of the predicted probabilities from the final model (calibration plots in Figure 2). While all other outcomes had calibration slopes close to unity, the outcome of stroke had a low value for slope and a low range of predicted probabilities as indicated by a truncated calibration plot. The calibration slopes for death and bleeding were closest to unity, followed by any adverse outcome and AKI.

The predictive performance of the final model in the test set was typified by the appropriate risk stratification across tertiles of predicted probabilities for each study outcome. For example, the observed event rate of AKI in the low-, middle- and upper tertile of the predicted probability was 1%, 2.7% and 10.8%, respectively. Similar stratification was observed for the outcomes of bleeding (0.4%, 1.5% and 11%, respectively), death (0%, 0.3% and 3.5%, respectively), any adverse outcome (1.4%, 4.2% and 18.9%, respectively) and stroke (0.04%, 0.4% and 0.5%). Together, these results indicated, excellent accuracy, calibration and stratification provided by the final model for all outcomes other than stroke.

Improvement in PCI risk-stratification by MLP model

Currently, the NCDR CathPCI models based on regression methods are used to encourage informed PCI decisions by providing pre-PCI estimates of predicted probability for death (19), bleeding (12) and AKI (20). We therefore compared the predicted probabilities obtained from the MLP models with these existing models to investigate whether the proposed method improves the predictive performance. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 3. We observed that for all three outcomes, the MLP based models provided significantly improved predictive accuracy (1.6%, 5.3% and 5.6% for death, bleeding and AKI, respectively), discrimination (6.0%, 7.2% and 4.9%, respectively) and reclassification (continuous NRI 0.61, 0.18, 0.07, respectively). Together, these results demonstrate the improved predictive performance using the perceptron-based models over the existing methods.

DISCUSSION

We have developed a system of models using the ANN framework and MLP structure to simultaneously predict three PCI-related adverse outcomes – bleeding, AKI and death. A comparison of our predictive models with the current standard-of-care predicting models showed a significant improvement in accuracy, discrimination and reclassification. Recently, Huang et al (21) published an elegant model to predict AKI after PCI using the large NCDR CathPCI dataset emanating from 1,694 US hospitals. They employed a generalized additive model to account for the potential nonlinear relationships. Depending on the definition of AKI (degree of rise in serum creatinine post-PCI) their model accuracy ranged from 77.7% to 84.9% with the more severe forms of AKI (serum creatinine absolute rise >1.0 mg/dl over baseline) predicted more accurately. Our definition of AKI corresponded to a mild increase in serum

creatinine (absolute rise >0.3 mg/dl). The predictive accuracy of our model for AKI (77.9%) was therefore comparable with that of the model developed by Huang et al.(21) In a similar fashion, risk models for predicting bleeding after PCI have traditionally reported predictive accuracy in the range of 65% to 79%.(22-24) A meta-analysis of 6 published studies that included separate validation datasets found that the aggregate predictive accuracy of risk models for PCI-related bleeding was 68% (95% CI 65% – 72%).(25) Thus, the current models for prediction of bleeding demonstrate only moderate level of accuracy. In contrast, our ANN-based model predicted bleeding with 86.5% accuracy – a substantial improvement over current models. The best predictive performance of our model, however, was for the outcome of all-cause mortality during hospitalization (predictive accuracy 90.3%) and was comparable with that of the currently used models (3) for mortality prediction. Together, our system of ANN models offered an improved and accurate prediction of three, PCI-related outcomes during index hospitalization – AKI, bleeding and death.

We and others have demonstrated the importance of contrast use limitation as a predictor of post-PCI AKI. Out second stage model for AKI did not include contrast use in the top 10 contributors to AKI prediction, neither did the S2 model greatly increase the performance of the stage 1 model (data shown in Table 2 and Supplementary Table 2). This result implies that in the dataset studied, the likelihood of contrast induced AKI may have been limited. In general, for all outcomes the stage 2 models in our dataset made only a small contribution to the final predictive accuracy. Training the models on larger datasets with richer procedural characteristics can therefore be expected to further augment the predictive performance of all the models.

Our model did not provide a satisfactory prediction of stroke after PCI. In this context, it is noteworthy that while efforts are underway to understand the determinants of stroke after PCI, currently there are no risk prediction models for this outcome. Hence comparison of the predictive performance of our model for stroke with other models is not possible. It is understood that trans radial intervention(26), receipt of ventilation, circulatory support, thrombolysis and acute coronary syndrome are predictors of ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke after PCI.(27) The list of important variables in our model (Supplementary Table 2) only partially concurred with this list. The inability of our model to predict stroke after PCI can be explained in part on the basis of following three reasons. First, the outcome of stroke in our study represented a composite outcome that included TIA, ischemic stroke and hemorrhagic stroke. As shown by Myint et al,(27) determinant of differ types of stroke after PCI may be different. Second, the prevalence of stroke in our dataset was low (0.27%) representing a scenario of potential imbalanced machine learning. A possible lack of adequate number of training sample in the stroke class could have limited the predictive ability of our model. Third, stroke maybe an inherently harder outcome to predict as compared to AKI, bleeding and death. Larger datasets with adequate number of training examples are needed before our approach can be used for prediction of stroke after PCI.

Our study used observational data and thus all the limitations implicit in such a dataset can be expected to be operational in our study as well. In addition, following limitations need to be considered. First, while all the models are temporally valid, the models can be made further clinically applicable by predicting time to events. Second, our model predicted the “any adverse outcome” as a composite outcome measure with good accuracy but a more specific model can

be envisioned that can exploit larger datasets to predict specific combinations of PCI-related outcomes. Third, in line with the model by Huang et al,(21) it could be clinically more useful to test the model performance for varying levels of absolute rise in serum creatinine. However, in our dataset the prevalence of high absolute serum creatinine rise (>1mg/dl) was below 1% and thus difficult to predict. Larger datasets with adequate representation of AKI severity classes can be used in future studies to further refine the AKI component of our system of models.

In conclusion, we have developed a system of ANN-based predictive models that accurately predict three PCI-related outcomes – AKI, bleeding and death. In the era of personalized medicine, expensive interventions and bundled payments, this work has important implications. The direct impact of these improved ANN-based prediction of PCI-related outcomes needs to be investigated and determined in future studies.

REFERENCES:

1. Moussa I, Hermann A, Messenger JC et al. The NCDR CathPCI Registry: a US national perspective on care and outcomes for percutaneous coronary intervention. Heart 2013;99:297-303.
2. Sukul D, Seth M, Dupree JM et al. Drivers of Variation in 90-Day Episode Payments After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. Circulation Cardiovascular interventions 2019;12:e006928.
3. Brennan JM, Curtis JP, Dai D et al. Enhanced mortality risk prediction with a focus on high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: results from 1,208,137 procedures in the NCDR (National Cardiovascular Data Registry). JACC Cardiovascular interventions 2013;6:790-9.
4. Inohara T, Kohsaka S, Miyata H et al. Performance and Validation of the U.S. NCDR Acute Kidney Injury Prediction Model in Japan. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2016;67:1715-22.
5. Rao SV, Dai D, Subherwal S et al. Association between periprocedural bleeding and long-term outcomes following percutaneous coronary intervention in older patients. JACC Cardiovascular interventions 2012;5:958-65.
6. Ronco C, Levin A, Warnock DG et al. Improving outcomes from acute kidney injury (AKI): Report on an initiative. The International journal of artificial organs 2007;30:373-6.
7. Guedeney P, Sorrentino S, Vogel B, Baber U, Claessen BE, Mehran R. Assessing and minimizing the risk of percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with chronic kidney disease. Expert review of cardiovascular therapy 2018;16:825-835.
8. Manoukian SV. The relationship between bleeding and adverse outcomes in ACS and PCI: pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic modification of risk. The Journal of invasive cardiology 2010;22:132-41.
9. Chatterjee S, Kundu A, Mukherjee D et al. Risk of contrast-induced acute kidney injury in ST-elevation myocardial infarction patients undergoing multi-vessel intervention-meta-analysis of

randomized trials and risk prediction modeling study using observational data. Catheterization and cardiovascular interventions : official journal of the Society for Cardiac Angiography & Interventions 2017;90:205-212.

10. Dauerman HL. Nonlinear Mathematics of Death and Vascular Access. Circulation 2016;133:1634-6.

11. Mehta RL, Kellum JA, Shah SV et al. Acute Kidney Injury Network: report of an initiative to improve outcomes in acute kidney injury. Critical care 2007;11:R31.

12. Rao SV, McCoy LA, Spertus JA et al. An updated bleeding model to predict the risk of post-procedure bleeding among patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: a report using an expanded bleeding definition from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry CathPCI Registry. JACC Cardiovascular interventions 2013;6:897-904.

13. Graves EE. onehot: Fast Onehot Encoding for Data.frames., 2017.

14. Olden JD, Jackson DA. Illuminating the 'black-box': a randomization approach for understanding variable contributions in artificial neural networks. Ecological Modeling 2002;154:135-150.

15. Bergmeir C, Benitez JM. Neural Networks in R Using the Stuttgart Neural Network Simulator: RSNNS. J Statistical Software 2012;46:1-26.

16. Beck MW. NeuralNetTools: Visualization and Analysis Tools for Neural Networks. J Statistical Software 2018;85:1-20.

17. Ensor J, Snell KIE, Martin EC. PMCALPOT: Stata module to produce a caibration plot of predction model performance. Statistical software components 2018:S458486.

18. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. Biometrics 1988;44:837-45.

19. Peterson ED, Dai D, DeLong ER et al. Contemporary mortality risk prediction for percutaneous coronary intervention: results from 588,398 procedures in the National Cardiovascular Data Registry. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2010;55:1923-32.

20. Tsai TT, Patel UD, Chang TI et al. Validated contemporary risk model of acute kidney injury in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary interventions: insights from the National Cardiovascular Data Registry Cath-PCI Registry. J Am Heart Assoc 2014;3:e001380.

21. Huang C, Li SX, Mahajan S et al. Development and Validation of a Model for Predicting the Risk of Acute Kidney Injury Associated With Contrast Volume Levels During Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. JAMA network open 2019;2:e1916021.

22. Mrdovic I, Savic L, Krljanac G et al. Simple risk algorithm to predict serious bleeding in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention: RISK-PCI bleeding score. Circulation journal : official journal of the Japanese Circulation Society 2013;77:1719-27.

23. Dobies DR, Barber KR, Cohoon AL. Validity of a PCI Bleeding Risk Score in patient subsets stratified for body mass index. Open heart 2015;2:e000088.

24. Rao SC, Chhatriwalla AK, Kennedy KF et al. Pre-procedural estimate of individualized bleeding risk impacts physicians' utilization of bivalirudin during percutaneous coronary intervention. Journal of the American College of Cardiology 2013;61:1847-52.

25. Ko SQ, Valsdottir LR, Strom JB et al. Meta-Analysis of Bleeding Risk Prediction Scores in Patients After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention on Dual Antiplatelet Therapy. The American journal of cardiology 2018;122:1843-1852.

26. Shoji S, Kohsaka S, Kumamaru H et al. Stroke After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in the Era of Transradial Intervention. Circulation Cardiovascular interventions 2018;11:e006761.

27. Myint PK, Kwok CS, Roffe C et al. Determinants and Outcomes of Stroke Following Percutaneous Coronary Intervention by Indication. Stroke 2016;47:1500-7.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics, PCI-related data and observed outcomes in the study population.

Characteristic	Categories	Code	Training Set		Test Set		p
			Mean / N	SD / %	Mean / N	SD / %	
Clinical characteristics							
Age (y)	---	None	65.6	12.05	65.48	12.28	0.463
Female gender	Yes	1	7041	33.52	2249	32.12	0.0314
White Race	Yes	1	18414	87.67	6140	87.7	0.9425
Body Mass Index (Kg/m^2)		None	30.47	6.69	30.49	6.63	0.8049
Current smoker		1	5407	25.74	1818	25.97	0.7094
Diabetes		1	8510	40.52	2802	40.02	0.4664
Hypertension		1	17619	83.88	5853	83.6	0.5795
Dyslipidemia		1	17762	84.57	5896	84.22	0.4808
Diabetes therapy		1	307	1.46	105	1.5	0.349
	Diet	2	562	2.68	211	3.01	
	Oral	3	3884	18.49	1305	18.64	
	Insulin	4	3731	17.76	1173	16.75	
	Other	5	22	0.1	8	0.11	
Chronic lung disease		1	3702	17.63	1240	17.71	0.8693
Chronic kidney disease		1	5365	26.61	1742	25.88	0.2392
Current dialysis		1	643	3.06	220	3.14	0.7353
Anemia		1	1389	6.61	469	6.7	0.8022
Family history of CAD		1	5508	26.23	1825	26.07	0.7941
Past history of myocardial infarction		1	7004	33.35	2327	33.24	0.8682
Past history of heart failure		1	4434	21.11	1523	21.75	0.2543
Past history of peripheral arterial disease		1	3235	15.4	1021	14.58	0.0986
Past history of valve surgery		1	487	2.32	164	2.34	0.9076
Past history of PCI		1	10004	47.63	3289	46.98	0.3456
Past history of CABG		1	4511	21.48	1508	21.54	0.9116

Past history of cerebrovascular disease		1	3365	16.02	1102	15.74	0.5793
Past history of heart failure within 2 weeks		1	4724	22.49	1550	22.14	0.5415
Cardiogenic shock within past 24 hours		1	402	1.91	139	1.99	0.7066
Cardiac arrest within past 24 hours		1	304	1.45	104	1.49	0.8175
NYHA class within past 2 weeks	I	1	326	6.91	105	6.77	0.8959
	II	2	1034	21.9	342	22.06	0.8959
	III	3	1823	38.61	584	37.68	0.8959
	IV	4	1538	32.58	519	33.48	0.8959
Past history of other major surgery		1	332	1.58	104	1.49	0.5767
Time elapsed since last CABG (days)		None	4227.66	2689.13	4217.65	2747	0.901
Time elapsed since last PCI (days)		None	1598.18	1811.28	1605.91	1830.02	0.8323
Time since onset of symptoms (days)		0	18992	90.08	6297	89.94	0.8813
		1	1356	21.79	456	21.88	
		2	328	5.27	117	5.61	
		3	223	3.58	65	3.12	
		4	91	1.46	35	1.68	
		5	38	0.61	16	0.77	
		6	38	0.61	11	0.53	
		7	8	0.13	4	0.19	
Anginal classification within 2 weeks	None	1	1254	5.97	403	5.76	0.3681
	CCS I	2	759	3.61	287	4.1	
	CCS II	3	1859	8.85	599	8.56	
	CCS III	4	8130	38.71	2720	38.85	
	CCS IV	5	9002	42.86	2992	42.74	

Cardiomyopathy or LV dysfunction		1	2859	13.61	1004	14.34	0.1262
Admission characteristics							
Insurance	Medicare/Medicaid only	1	6982	33.24	2243	32.04	0.1064
	Multiple	2	12730	60.61	4296	61.36	0.1064
CAD Presentation	No symptom, no angina	1	1004	4.78	324	4.63	0.666
	Symptom unlikely to be ischemia	2	436	2.08	163	2.33	
	Stable angina	3	2553	12.15	853	12.18	
	Unstable angina	4	10515	50.06	3481	49.72	
	NSTEMI	5	4087	19.46	1400	20	
	STEMI or equivalent	6	2409	11.47	780	11.14	
Hospital status	Outpatient	1	6082	28.96	2028	28.97	0.6108
	Outpatient converted to inpatient	2	3952	18.82	1353	19.33	
	Inpatient	3	10968	52.22	3620	51.71	
Admit source	Emergency department	1	5792	27.58	1965	28.07	0.7317
	Transfer from another acute care facility	2	4418	21.04	1464	20.91	
	Other	3	10788	51.38	3571	51.01	
PCI status	Elective	1	8025	38.21	2716	38.81	0.8336
	Urgent	2	10084	48.01	3333	47.63	
	Emergency	3	2860	13.62	937	13.39	
	Salvage	4	35	0.17	12	0.17	
Inpatient	Inpatient for this episode	1	14920	71.03	4973	71.03	0.9982
Door to balloon time (min)		None	77.45	336.78	65.81	82.56	0.3654
Symptom action time (min)		None	386.66	684.12	422.6	889.4	0.6099
Stress studies							
Stress echocardiogram	Low risk	1	166	14.12	57	14.92	0.6096
	Intermediate risk	2	941	80.02	298	78.01	
	High risk	3	67	5.7	27	7.07	
	Unavailable	4	2	0.17	0	0	

SPECT stress test	Low risk	1	425	8.56	128	7.78	0.099
	Intermediate risk	2	4357	87.74	1462	88.82	
	High risk	3	156	3.14	40	2.43	
	Unavailable	4	28	0.56	16	0.97	
Exercise stress test	Low risk	1	43	12.36	11	10.28	0.4438
	Intermediate risk	2	274	78.74	91	85.05	
	High risk	3	27	7.76	4	3.74	
	Unavailable	4	4	1.15	1	0.93	
Stress test with CMR	Low risk	1	2	7.14	1	14.29	0.779
	Intermediate risk	2	23	82.14	6	85.71	
	High risk	3	2	7.14	0	0	
	Unavailable	4	1	3.57	0	0	
Imaging studies							
Coronary calcium score	Yes	1	51	0.78	21	0.98	0.3871
Calcium score		None	856.61	961.73	609	841.03	0.3074
Cardiac CTA	No disease	1	18	28.13	11	42.31	0.1651
	1 vessel disease	2	17	26.56	3	11.54	
	2 vessel disease	3	21	32.81	9	34.62	
	3 vessel disease	4	2	3.13	3	11.54	
	Indeterminate	5	5	7.81	0	0	
Left main stenosis (%)		None	12.3	23.99	12.38	24.18	0.8251
Proximal LAD stenosis (%)		None	40.41	39.57	40.11	39.74	0.615
Mid/Distal LAD stenosis (%)		None	58.45	37.79	58.72	37.61	0.6218
Circumflex artery stenosis (%)		None	54.09	39.51	53.54	39.48	0.3404
Ramus stenosis (%)		None	16.9	32.24	17.46	32.48	0.4474
RCA stenosis (%)		None	64.44	37.32	64.33	37.41	0.827
Proximal LAD graft stenosis (%)		None	14.33	32.74	13.75	32.06	0.727
Mid/Distal LAD graft stenosis (%)		None	25.3	40.37	25.89	40.68	0.6671
Circumflex artery graft stenosis (%)		None	48.06	46.09	50.72	46.44	0.1149
RCA graft stenosis (%)		None	51.26	45.86	52.78	45.93	0.3667

Ramus graft stenosis (%)		None	10.53	28.18	11.87	30.51	0.412
Dominance	Left	1	1702	8.11	550	7.86	0.5951
	Right	2	17668	84.23	5927	84.74	
	Co-dominant	3	1605	7.65	517	7.39	
LV ejection fraction		None	52.2	13.48	51.83	13.49	0.0867
Medications							
Antianginal - beta-blockers		1	13541	87.32	4460	87.02	0.5799
Antianginal - Ca-channel blockers		1	4388	28.3	1437	28.04	0.7222
Antianginal - Long acting nitrates		1	4616	29.77	1540	30.05	0.7025
Antianginal - ranolazine		1	631	4.07	198	3.86	0.5156
Antianginal - other		1	740	4.77	254	4.96	0.5937
Thrombolytics		1	82	3.42	25	3.21	0.7774
Laboratory investigations							
Pre-PCI CKMB		None	21.67	56.96	23.32	60.64	0.443
Pre-PCI TnI		None	5.07	25.23	5.01	18.02	0.9118
Pre-PCI TnT		None	0.45	2.18	0.44	1.39	0.8698
Pre-PCI Serum Creatinine		None	1.22	1.15	1.22	1.18	0.9977
Pre-PCI Hemoglobin		None	13.19	2	13.21	2.03	0.6364
PCI variables before start of PCI							
Time of PCI start	00:00 - 05:59 AM	0	463	2.2	168	2.4	0.1027
	06:00 AM - 11:59 AM	1	10205	48.59	3385	48.35	
	12:00 Noon - 5:59 PM	2	9102	43.33	3086	44.08	
	6:00 PM - 11:59 PM	3	1234	5.88	362	5.17	
Day of PCI	Sunday	0	600	2.86	204	2.91	0.5308
	Monday	1	4164	19.82	1428	20.4	
	Tuesday	2	4117	19.6	1321	18.87	
	Wednesday	3	3830	18.23	1239	17.7	
	Thursday	4	3854	18.35	1316	18.8	
	Friday	5	3753	17.87	1280	18.28	
	Saturday	6	686	3.27	213	3.04	
Diagnostic catheterization done		1	13971	66.52	4605	65.78	0.2568

Other procedure with diagnostic catheterization		1	2911	13.86	963	13.76	0.8271
Fluoroscopy time (min)		None	17.26	13.41	17.49	13.52	0.2189
Fluoroscopy dose (mGy)		None	2156.1	1494.94	2220.65	1447.97	0.4495
Contrast volume (ml)		None	186.67	84.11	187.17	83.4	0.665
Number of diseased vessels		0	265	1.26	73	1.04	0.2583
		1	10097	48.07	3411	48.72	
		2	6290	29.95	2117	30.24	
		3	4352	20.72	1400	20	
Estimated glomerular filtration rate		None	69.94	20.1	70.4	20.11	0.1016
Cardiogenic shock at the start of PCI		1	450	2.14	133	1.9	0.2176
PCI procedure related characteristics							
Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors	Given	1	2883	13.73	1015	14.5	0.1067
Fondaparinux		1	11	0.05	6	0.09	0.4522
		2	2	0.01	2	0.03	
		3	1	0	0	0	
Low molecular weight heparin		1	1789	8.52	574	8.2	0.5252
		2	3	0.01	2	0.03	
Unfractionated heparin	Given	1	10054	47.87	3352	47.88	0.9916
Aspirin		1	19935	94.92	6621	94.6	0.5628
		2	117	0.56	43	0.61	0.5628
Bivalirudin		1	13532	64.43	4525	64.63	0.753
Clipidogrel		1	15517	73.88	5238	74.82	0.2914
		2	70	0.33	21	0.3	
Ticlopidine		1	20	0.1	8	0.11	0.8961
		2	35	0.17	11	0.16	
Prasugrel		1	2102	10.22	663	9.7	0.4622
		2	40	0.19	13	0.19	
Ticagrelor		1	2937	18.19	960	17.85	0.8284

		2	42	0.26	12	0.22	
		3	1	0.01	0	0	
Number of drug eluting stents		None	1.45	1.03	1.47	1.04	0.2011
Number of bare metal stents		None	0.18	0.56	0.18	0.57	0.4689
Minimum stent diameter (mm)		None	2.87	0.51	2.87	0.51	0.2165
Total stent length (mm)		None	31.48	21.93	31.98	22.23	0.1129
Number of lesions		None	0.13	0.6	0.13	0.61	0.6337
Transradial access		1	2460	11.71	799	11.41	0.4987
Vascular closure device		1	11595	55.2	3890	55.56	0.6001
Intra-aortic balloon pump	Present at the start of PCI	1	69	27.82	30	36.59	0.3239
	Inserted during PCI	2	59	23.79	17	20.73	
	Inserted after PCI	3	120	48.39	35	42.68	
Other mecahanical ventricular support	Present at the start of PCI	1	50	26.74	14	25	0.4269
	Inserted during PCI	2	116	62.03	32	57.14	
	Inserted after PCI	3	21	11.23	10	17.86	
Outcomes							
Acute kidney injury	Observed	1	955	4.55	328	4.69	0.6317
Bleeding	Observed	1	744	3.54	272	3.89	0.1838
Stroke	Observed	1	56	0.27	19	0.27	0.9466
Death	Observed	1	232	1.1	67	0.96	0.2982
At least one adverse outcome	Observed	1	1630	7.76	552	7.88	0.7371

Table 2. Predictive accuracy of the MLP classifier

Model	Outcome	Epochs	Accuracy in training set AUC (95% CI)	Accuracy in test set AUC (95% CI)
Pre-PCI model (model #1)	AKI	9	0.8197 (0.8050 - 0.8344)	0.7745 (0.7472 - 0.8019)
	Bleeding	11	0.8518 (0.8372 - 0.8645)	0.8508 (0.8287 - 0.8728)
	Stroke	65	0.7266 (0.6574 - 0.7957)	0.7174 (0.6163 - 0.8186)
	Death	8	0.9196 (0.9004 - 0.9386)	0.9116 (0.8737 - 0.9494)
	Any AO	9	0.8266 (0.8154 - 0.8379)	0.7981 (0.7782 - 0.8180)
PCI model (model #2)	AKI	9	0.6579 (0.6390 - 0.6768)	0.6253 (0.5923 - 0.6583)
	Bleeding	18	0.7745 (0.7563 - 0.7926)	0.7349 (0.7031 - 0.7607)
	Stroke	49	0.5690 (0.4885 - 0.6495)	0.4711 (0.3521 - 0.5900)
	Death	13	0.8429 (0.8149 - 0.8710)	0.8126 (0.7618 - 0.8633)
	Any AO	14	0.7107 (0.6967 - 0.7248)	0.6782 (0.6535 - 0.7026)
Final model	AKI	-	0.8175 (0.8023 - 0.8326)	0.7793 (0.7521 - 0.8065)
	Bleeding	-	0.8763 (0.8629 - 0.8898)	0.8590 (0.8363 - 0.8818)
	Stroke	-	0.7293 (0.6594 - 0.7993)	0.6990 (0.5882 - 0.8098)
	Death	-	0.9233 (0.9035 - 0.9431)	0.9035 (0.8684 - 0.9386)
	Any AO	-	0.8372 (0.8261 - 0.8482)	0.8057 (0.7862 - 0.8252)

Table 3. Improved risk-stratification using the MLP-based classification

Characteristic	Parameter	AKI	Bleeding	Death
Accuracy	ΔAUC, p	0.0564, 2.2×10^{-26}	0.0526, 4.4×10^{-23}	0.0161, 0.0489
Discrimination	IDI, p	0.0486, 4.0×10^{-31}	0.0717, 9.2×10^{-34}	0.0602, 4.7×10^{-7}
Classification	NRI, p	0.0729, 0.0110	0.1765, 3.3×10^{-8}	0.6078, 1.4×10^{-25}

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Analysis pipeline for MLP-based predictive model. For details, please see text. The derivation and training sets are color coded as orange while the validation and test sets are color coded blue. Categorical variables are indicated by a stepwise gradient and continuous variables are indicated by a continuous gradient.

Figure 2. Predictive performance of the MLP-based classifier in the test set (n = 7,001). This trellis plot shows the accuracy (ROC curves), calibration (calibration plots) and stratification (bar graphs) for each outcome indicated on the left. AUC, area under the ROC curve; CI, confidence interval; E/O, expected over observed ratio; LR, level-specific likelihood ratio (subscripts indicate the tertiles); L, M, U, lower, middle and upper tertile, respectively.


Overall Data Split
Raw Data Set
Derivation Set (75%)
21,004 x 100
Validation Set (25%)
7,001 x 100
Preprocessing
One-Hot Encoding (categorical variables)
Normalization (continuous variables)
21,004 x 247
7,001 x 247
21,004 x 30
7,001 x 30
Model-specific Data Preparation
Model 1 Inputs (Pre-PCI data)
Model 2 Inputs (PCI-data)
Training Set
Test Set
21,004 x 205
7,001 x 205
21,004 x 72
7,001 x 72
Model 1
Pre-PCI data
Clinical variables
Admission variables
Stress test studies
Imaging data
Medications
Lab investigations
PCI variables
Biases
Biases
Outcome
Weights
Input Layer
Hidden Layer 1
Hidden Layer 2
Model 2
PCI data
Drugs used during PCI
Stents used during PCI
Access site
Closure devices
Ventricular support
Biases
Outcome
Weights
Input Layer
Hidden Layer 1
Final Predictions


Predictive accuracy
Calibration
Stratification
AKI
Bleeding
Stroke
Death
Any adverse outcome
Sensitivity
1 - Specificity
AUC 0.7793 95% CI 0.7571 - 0.8065
AUC 0.8590 95% CI 0.8363- 0.8818
AUC 0.6990 95% CI 0.5882 - 0.8092
AUC 0.9035 95% CI 0.8684 - 0.9386
AUC 0.7981 95% CI 0.7782 - 0.8019
Observed probability
Observed probability (x100)
Predicted probability
Slope: 0.983 E/O: 0.949
Slope: 1.009 E/O: 0.940
Slope: 0.990 E/O: 0.941
Slope: 1.008 E/O: 0.965
Slope: 0.987 E/O: 0.955
Observed probability (%)
LR_U = 2.66 LR_M = 0.55 LR_L = 0.20
1.0 2.7 10.8
LR_U = 3.33 LR_M = 0.36 LR_L = 0.09
0.4 1.5 11.0
LR_U = 1.77 LR_M = 1.33 LR_L = 0.14
.04 .36 .48
LR_U = 3.85 LR_M = 0.26 LR_L = 0.04
.04 .25 3.5
LR_U = 3.21 LR_M = 0.49 LR_L = 0.15
1.4 4.2 18.8
L M U
Tertiles of probability