Acute Pericarditis Diagnostic Score Development in Patients Admitted for Chest Pain

Authors

André Costa Meireles[1]; João Vitor Miranda Porto Oliveira[1]; Bruna de Sá Barreto Pontes[1]; Alexandre Costa Souza[2]; Laila Caroline Oliveira Souza Barbosa Gomes[2]; Thomaz Emanoel Azevedo Silva[1]; Milton Henrique Vitoria de Melo[1]; Gabriela Oliveira Bagano[1]; Márcia Maria Noya Rabelo[2]; Luis Claudio Lemos Correia[1,3,4,5]

Afilliations

[1]Bahiana School of Medicine and Public Health, Salvador, Brazil

[2]Department of Cardiology, Hospital São Rafael, Salvador, Brazil

[3]Department of Cardiology, Hospital Aliança, Salvador, Brazil

[4]Director, Center of Evidence Based Medicine – Bahiana, Salvador, Brazil

[5]Editor-in-chief, Journal of Evidence-based Healthcare

ABSTRACT

Background: Despite existing clinical, laboratory and electrocardiographic characteristics suggestive of acute pericarditis, there is no multivariate model as a diagnostic tool.

Objective: To develop a clinical score for diagnosis of pericarditis as the cause of acute chest pain, using admission data.

Methods: In a diagnostic case-control study, we compared 45 patients of the Chest Pain Registry diagnosed of pericarditis (confirmed by magnetic resonance imaging or the presence of pleural effusion in echocardiography) versus 90 patients with an alternative confirmed diagnosis, randomly selected from our registry. Six clinical characteristics, 16 chest pain characteristics and 4 complementary exams were tested. Logistic regression was used to derivate a probabilistic model composed by independent predictors of pericarditis.

Results: Among 17 variables associated with pericarditis, 5 remained independent predictors: age, pain aggravation with thorax movement; positive troponin; diffuse ST-segment elevation and C-reactive protein. Each independent predictor was attributed a score proportional to its regression coefficient. The final score presented discriminatory capacity represented by C-statistic of 0,97 (95% CI = 0,93 – 1,0). The best cutoff point was defined as > 6 points, with sensitivity of 96% (95% CI = 85 – 100), specificity of 87% (95% CI = 78 – 93), positive likelihood ratio of 7,2 (95% CI = 4,2 – 12) and negative likelihood ratio of 0,05 (95% CI = 0,01 – 0,2*)*.

Conclusion: The proposed multivariate score is accurate for diagnosis of pericarditis. It needs to be further validated in an independent sample.

INTRODUCTION

Pericarditis is a frequent cause of acute chest pain (1,2) of moderate severity and treatment mainly expectant, unlike other conditions such as acute coronary syndromes, pulmonary embolism, pneumonia and aortic dissection (3–5). Therefore, the differential diagnosis of pericarditis in the chest pain scenery has implications in prognostic estimative and definition of treatment. However, there is no method with excellent accuracy for pericarditis, making the diagnostic process based on clinical/laboratorial peculiarities and exclusion of other conditions (6,7).

Thus, pericarditis diagnosis is subject to clinical interpretation, based on symptoms' characteristics, presence of pericardial friction, electrocardiogram and imaging methods (8–10). This kind of process has limitations for its vulnerability to cognitive bias, unbalanced valuation of information and errors in sizing the weight of each variable. In the attempt of lowering subjectivity, it has been proposed that the numbers of suggestive characteristics define the diagnosis (11), however this is not an algorithm derived from epidemiological data and duly validated in its accuracy.

The diagnostic process based on multivariate scores allows the simultaneous use of a set of variables, structuring a value hierarchy for each variable. This discriminatory process tends to be more accurate than the disorderly influence of medical thinking based on clinical impression (12,13). To our knowledge, there are no validated probabilistic models for diagnosing pericarditis.

Thus, in the present study of diagnostic case-control, we identified independent predictors and derived a multivariate score to discriminate pericarditis in a random set of other etiological conditions.

METHODS

Diagnostic case-control, from prospective data collection by interview and medical record information.

Sample Selection

During the period from 2014 to 2018, all patients admitted due to chest pain in the coronary unit of a tertiary hospital were included in the prospective data record. From this record, it was selected 45 patients with evidence of pericarditis and 90 control patients with proven alternative etiology, randomly selected.

Pericarditis was defined by imaging method: magnetic resonance demonstrating pericardial edema, pericardial enhancement, myocardial enhancement, non-subendocardial myocardial enhancement or pericardial effusion or echocardiogram showing pericardial effusion. Controls were defined by patients with the following proven diagnosis: obstructive coronary disease (stenosis ≥ 70% by invasive coronarography); pulmonary embolism (confirmed by chest angio-CT); pneumonia (infectious condition and confirmation of a radiological exam); aortic dissection (confirmed by chest angio-CT); or gastrointestinal disease (ulcer or high grade inflammation on upper digestive endoscopy). The random selection was made by the patient's number on the registry, using SPSS tool: select random sample of cases.

The only exclusion criteria was the patient's refusal to participate the study. The protocol is in accordance with declaration of Helsinki, approved by Institution's Research Ethics Committee and all evaluated patients signed the informed consent form.

Predictor Variables

On admission, three groups of variables were registered as candidates to pericarditis prediction: medical history, pain characteristics and complementary exams. The first group included age, sex and previous history of smoking, systemic arterial hypertension, diabetes mellitus and coronary artery disease (CAD). The second group was composed by 16 chest pain characteristics; and the third set of variables included widespread ST segment elevation on electrocardiogram (≥ 1 mm in more than one cardiac wall); depressed PR interval (≥ 1 mm in more than one lead), positive troponin (Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Rochester, NY, EUA) and value of ultra-sensitive C-reactive protein (nephelometry, Dade-Behring, EUA). Positive troponin was defined as any value above detection limit (> 0,012 ug/L), not using 99 percentile

because this is the definition of infarction (14). Laboratory exams were performed on plasma collected at presentation in the emergency room. Medical history and chest pain characteristics were recorded by researchers trained to interview patients systematically, in order to reduce bias and improve reproducibility. Patients' electrocardiogram were interpreted blindly by two trained cardiologists (they were unaware of patient's history and diagnosis). The disagreement of any of the reports was discussed between the two cardiologists until a consensus was reached.

Statistical Analysis

Categorical variables were described by frequency, while numerical variables of normal distribution were expressed by mean and standard deviation, and numerical variables of non-normal distribution by median and interquartile range. The program used for statistical analysis was SPSS (Version 25, SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, USA).

Statistical analysis is represented in Figure 1. First, it was tested univariate associations between pericarditis and 26 variables candidates to predictors by qui-square to categorical variables and unpaired t-student test to numerical variables. Comparison of the score between the two groups was performed using Mann-Whitney non-parametric test. Variables associated with pericarditis with a P value < 0.10 were included in the multivariate logistic regression analysis. In order to reduce the number of predictors in the final model, intermediate logistic regression models were used for variables related to medical history and variables related to pain characteristics. Significant variables ($P < 0.10$) from the intermediate models and complementary exams that were associated with the outcome in univariate analysis entered the final model. Due to the premise that age influence on the diagnosis of pericarditis is not linear, for the final logistic regression model, age was categorized in four pre-defined groups by decades. Statistical significance in the final model was defined as $P < 0.05$.

For the creation of a point-based score, regression coefficients were approximated to the nearest whole value, which consisted of the points of score to each positive variable. In calculating the score, unknown values of the participating variables were imputed by the most frequent value in categorical variables and by the mean value in numerical variables. The score of each patient was assessed in relation to their discriminatory capacity by the area below the ROC curve.

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

The pericarditis group was composed by 45 patients, 87% of male sex, age mean 36 ± 14 years old (median 34, interquartile range 25 to 43, absolute amplitude 16 to 70). The control group consisted of 90 patients, distributed in 41 diagnosis of myocardial infarction, 29 unstable angina, 10 pulmonary embolisms, 2 aortic dissections, 2 pneumonias and 2 with gastrointestinal pain – Figure 2. The mean age of the control group (61 ± 15 anos) was significantly higher than patients with pericarditis ($P < 0.001$), without the evident predominance of males (57%) as observed in the pericarditis group – Table 1.

Intermediate Predictors of Pericarditis

Between the six variables related to medical history, all showed statistically significant difference between the pericarditis group and the non-pericarditis group: age, male sex, smoking, hypertension, diabetes and previous coronary disease – Table 1. The frequency of pericarditis in the age groups < 30 years old, 30-39 years old, 40-49 years old and > 50 years old was 95%, 59%, 44% and 10%, respectively ($P < 0.001$). When these variables were included in the logistic regression model, age, male sex and previous CAD remained statistically significant (Intermediate Model 1 – Table 2).

As for the 16 chest pain characteristics, seven showed significant association with pericarditis: precordial pain, severe intensity, nitrate relief, similarity with previous acute myocardial infarction, worsening with compression, worsening with change in position and worsening with arm movement – Table 1. Of these variables, precordial pain, nitrate relief and worsening with change in position were the three independent predictors in Intermediate Model 2 – Table 2.

Between complementary exams, all showed significant difference in univariate analysis: widespread ST elevation, PR depression, positive troponin and value of C-reactive protein – Table 1. As they were tests that assess complementary aspects of the disease, they were directly included in the final model to be tested.

Independent Predictors of Pericarditis

The 13 variables independently associated with pericarditis in intermediate models 1 and 2 and four variables related to complementary exams were candidates to the final model, which was built from a logistic regression analysis using the stepwise method.

Considering the rationale that the predictive value of age is in younger age groups, for the construction of the score, age was categorized a priori as < 30 years old, 30-39 years old, 40-49 years old and > 50 years old, this last age range being the reference for the coefficient of the others.

The independent predictors of pericarditis in the multivariate analysis were: age [< 30 years old (OR = 141; 95% CI = 1.9 – 9464); 30-39 years old (OR = 18; 95% CI = 2.6 – 100); 40-49 years old (OR = 3.6; 95% CI = 0.32 – 27)]; change in pain with position (OR = 6,8; 95% CI = 2.1 – 54); positive troponin (OR = 41; 95% CI = 4.7 – 448); widespread ST elevation (OR = 74; IC 95% = 1.3 – 4201) e C-reactive protein (OR = 1.014; 95% IC = 1.001 – 1.026) - Table 3.

When these predictors were analyzed individually, the area under the curve of age was 0.87 (95% CI = 0.81 – 0.94) and of C-reactive protein 0.76 (95% CI = 0.68 – 0.84) – Table 4. Sensibility, specificity and positive and negative likelihood ratio of the variables change in pain with position, positive troponin and widespread ST elevation are shown in Table 4.

Pericarditis Predictor Score

Following proportionality with regression coefficients, each variable received different points for the formation of the score: widespread ST elevation: 4 points; positive troponin: 4 points; change in pain with position: 2 points; C-reactive protein: numerical value of C-reactive protein value multiplied by 0.014. Age range < 30 years old, 30-39 years old, 40-49 years old and > 50 years old respectively received 5 points, 3 points, 1 point and 0 points – Table 5.

The median score of patients with pericarditis was 11 (7.6 – 13), compared to 4.1 (1.0 – 5.2) of the control group (P < 0.001). The score showed excellent discriminatory capacity, with area under the ROC curve of 0.97 (95% CI = 0.93 – 1.0) – Figure 4A. In the distinction between pericarditis and acute coronary syndromes, the model presented an area under the ROC curve of 0.97 (95% CI = 0.93 – 1.0) – Figure 4B.

The best cut-off point was > 6 points, with a sensitivity of 96% (95% CI = 885 – 100), specificity of 87% (95% CI = 78 – 93), positive likelihood ratio of 7.2 (95% CI = 4.2 – 12) and negative likelihood ratio of 0.05 (95% CI = 0.01 – 0.2).

DISCUSSION

The present study brings the original proposal of a diagnostic score for pericarditis in patients with acute chest pain. The model was extracted from data usually present in the setting of acute chest pain, adding C-reactive protein as an inflammatory marker. Of the 26 candidate variables, five were consolidated as independent predictors: age, change in pain with position, widespread ST segment elevation, positive troponin and C-reactive protein value. Evaluation carried out in the same sample suggests an excellent accuracy to discriminate pericarditis from other causes, although this finding requires final validation in an independent sample.

In the absence of a gold standard exam, diagnosis of pericarditis is based on the exclusion of other causes and presence of suggestive clinical data (syndromic diagnosis). Paradoxically to the multifactorial nature of the diagnosis, the need to use diagnostic scores in this condition has not been emphasized. For example, the European Guidelines of Pericarditis suggest two out of four positive criteria: (1) chest pain, typically pleuritic and that changes with position; (2) pericardial friction; (3) widespread ST elevation or PR depression on EKG; and (4) pericardial effusion (8). However, these diagnostic criteria are not proven to be accurate and the low prevalence of friction and effusion raises doubt about the performance of these criteria. Unlike the diagnosis based on the number of criteria, a better approach is the use of multivariate models with weighting the value of the presence of each variable.

Our study shows that, in the setting of acute chest pain, clinical and laboratory variables significantly influence the diagnostic probability, demonstrating the potential accuracy of the multivariate and weighted approach (scores). This is a study of conceptual value, which should originate future investigations in order to derive and validate probabilistic models. Although with wide confidence intervals, the point estimate of the five risk predictors suggests that they have a high relative impact on the chance of disease. Among the categorical variables, widespread ST elevation is the one with the greatest impact, followed by positive troponin and with less weight, worsening pain with trunk movement. It is worth noting that we prefer to treat troponin as a categorical variable, as there is great variation in the measurement methods of this marker. Although troponin is a marker of myocardial injury that increases in many other circumstances, especially infarction, it was able to modulate the likelihood of pericarditis. And the model containing troponin showed good discriminatory capacity between pericarditis and infarction. Among numerical variables, age demonstrated a greater diagnostic influence than inflammation measured by C-reactive protein. In the final model, age was categorized in

decades under the premise that its influence is not linear, and its greatest weight is in younger age groups

The analysis of the PR interval depression and the widespread characteristic of the ST segment elevation were not predefined characteristics in this prospective record of acute chest pain. For this reason, it was necessary to reanalyze the electrocardiograms, opting for a case-control design, where all cases of pericarditis and a limited number of controls would have the electrocardiogram revised. This analysis was performed blindly in relation to the clinical condition and paired by two independent investigators. This design had some implications: in the case of a case-control study, it was not possible to calculate the prevalence of disease, which limits the calibration of the model to estimate probability. Thus, the present study validates the discriminatory capacity of the score but does not test the calibration of the regression formula. In other words, the tested model appears to be accurate to differentiate pericarditis from non-pericarditis, but not to offer the likelihood of pericarditis. In a future study, we will recalibrate the model across the sample.

On the other hand, the case-control design allows the analysis of the relative value of each covariate. Our model brings a differentiated view of prediction, not including uncommon findings, such as pericardial friction and pericardial effusion, and based on variables of great impact such as age and electrocardiogram, and new variables in this approach, such as positive troponin and degree of inflammation as C-reactive protein.

In this study, cases of pericarditis were defined by magnetic resonance imaging or pericardial effusion on echocardiogram. Although MRI is the best isolated diagnostic method, its sensitivity and specificity are not perfect (15). This makes us recognize that the inclusion criteria may have left out some typical cases of pericarditis or included false positives. However, it would be inappropriate to involve any other criteria in the definition of cases, as these criteria were being evaluated as candidates for the predictor model.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present study demonstrates the potential of multivariate and weighted approach in the form of a diagnostic score for the diagnosis of pericarditis in the context of chest pain.

FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1.



Figure 1: Flow chart of statistical analysis.

Figure 2.



Figure 2: Absolute diagnostic frequency of the sample, showing a greater predominance of acute coronary syndrome in the control group, followed by pulmonary embolism

Figure 3.



Figure 3: Panel A shows ROC curve of the predictor model discriminating between pericarditis and other causes. Panel B shows the ROC curve of discrimination between pericarditis and acute coronary syndrome.

Table 1. Comparison of medical history, chest pain characteristics and complementary tests between patients diagnosed with pericarditis and patients with another established diagnosis.

	Pericarditis		
	Pericarditis (n = 45)	**Control (n = 90)**	**P Value**
Medical History			
Age	36 ± 14	61 ± 15	**< 0.001**
Male sex	39 (87%)	49 (54%)	**< 0.001**
Smoking	1 (2%)	11 (12%)	**0.054**
Systemic arterial hypertension	7 (15%)	60 (66%)	**< 0.001**
Diabetes	3 (7%)	36 (40%)	**< 0.001**
Previous coronary disease	1 (2%)	30 (33%)	**< 0.001**
Chest Pain Characteristics			
Physical effort as trigger	1 (2,2%)	4 (4,4%)	0,519
Precordial pain	42 (93%)	63 (70%)	**0.002**
Opressive nature	24 (53%)	39 (43%)	0.325
Irradiation to neck	7 (16%)	25 (28%)	0,115
Irradiation to upper limb	13 (29%)	30 (33%)	0.601
Vagal symptons	26 (52%)	47 (58%)	0.541
Severe intensity	30 (67%)	74 (82%)	**0.043**
Number of episodes	1 (1 – 1)	1 (1 – 3)	0.635
Duration (minutes)	160 (76 – 663)	120 (30 – 611)	0.341
Intensity (scale from 1 – 10)	7.8 ± 1.7	8.1 ± 2	0.366
Nitrate relief	3 (6.6%)	23 (26%)	**0.007**
Similar to previous infarction	2 (4.4%)	76 (84%)	**0.044**
Worsening with compression	9 (20%)	6 (6.7%)	**0.02**
Change with position	24 (53%)	27 (30%)	**0.008**
Worsening with arm movement	8 (18%)	7 (7.7%)	**0.081**
Worsening with deep inspiration	15 (33%)	25 (27%)	0,505
Complementary Tests at Admission			
Widespread ST elevation	15 (46%)	3 (3.3%)	**< 0.001**
PR depression	8 (24%)	0 (0%)	**< 0.001**
Positive troponin	39 (89%)	46 (51%)	**< 0.001**
C-reactiva protein (mg/L)	15 (14 – 38)	9.4 (2.1 – 15)	**< 0.001**

Median (interquartile range); mean ± standard deviation; Positive troponin means any detection of troponin

Table 2 – Intermediate models of logistic regression of medical history (Model 1) and characteristics of chest pain (Model 2).

Variables	Multivariate Significance Level
Model 1 (medical history)	
Age	**< 0.001**
Male sex	**0.004**
Smoking	0.098
Hypertension	0.102
Diabetes	0.267
Previous CAD	**< 0.001**
Model 2 (pain characteristics)	
Precordial pain	**0.001**
Severe intensity	0.099
Nitrate relief	**0.001**
Similar to previous infarction	0.095
Worsening with compression	0.260
Change with position	**0.006**
Worsening with arm movement	0.513

Table 3 – Final logistic regression model defining independent predictors of pericarditis.

Variables	**βeta**	**Odds Ratio (95% CI)**	**P Value**
Age (years old)			
< 30	5.5	254 (4 – 16142)	0.009
30 - 39	3.0	21 (3.6 – 124)	0.001
40 - 49	1.6	5.0 (0.6 – 39)	0.125
> 50	Reference		
Change in pain with position	2.4	11 (2.0 – 54)	0.004
Widespread ST elevation	3.8	43 (3.8 – 484)	0.022
Positive troponin	3.8	47 (5.0 – 437)	0.001
C-reactive protein	0,015	1.015 (1.003 – 1.03)	0.017
Constant	-7.388	----	----
Excluded Variables			
Male sex	----	----	0.193
Previous CAD	----	----	0.871
Precordial pain	----	----	0.941
Nitrate relief	----	----	0.174
PR depression	----	----	0.999

Table 4 – Accuracy of isolated variables that composed the final predictor model.

Dichotomous Variables	Sensibility	Specificity	Positive Likelihood Ratio	Negative Likelihood Ratio
Change in pain with position	53% (95% CI = 38 - 68)	70% (95% CI = 59 - 79)	1,8 (95% CI = 1.2 – 2.7)	0,67 (95% CI = 0.47 – 0.94)
Widespread ST elevation	45% (95% CI = 28 - 64)	97% (95% CI = 91 - 99)	13 (95% CI = 4 - 44)	0,56 (95% CI = 0.41 – 0.77)
Positive troponin	89% (95% CI = 75 - 96)	49% (95% CI = 38 - 60)	1,63 (95% CI = 1.4 – 2.2)	0,23 (95% CI = 0.10 – 0.54)

Numerical Variables	Area Under ROC	Confidence Interval (95%)
Age	0.87	0.81 – 0.94
C-reactive protein	0.76	0.68 – 0.84

Table 5 – Final predictor score and its respective points

Variables	**Score**
Age (years)	
< 30	5
30 - 39	3
40 - 49	1
> 50	0
Change in pain with position	2
Widespread ST elevation	4
Positive troponin	4
C-reactive protein	value x 0.014

Interpretation	**Score**
Suggestive of Pericarditis	> 6
Suggestive of non-Pericarditis	≤ 6

N: numerical value of C-reactive protein.

REFERENCES

1. Lewinter MM. Acute pericarditis. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(25):2410–6.
2. Erhardt L, Herlitz J, Bossaert L, Halinen M, Keltai M, Koster R, et al. Task force on the management of chest pain. Eur Heart J. 2002;23(15):1153–76.
3. Montera MW, Mesquita ET, Colafranceschi AS, de Oliveira AC, Rabischoffsky A, Rochitte CE, et al. I Brazilian guidelines on myocarditis and pericarditis. Arq Bras Cardiol. 2013;100(4 SUPPL):1–36.
4. Imazio M, Gaita F. Diagnosis and treatment of pericarditis. Heart. 2015;101(14):1159–68.
5. Bassan R, Pimenta L, Leães PE, Timerman A. Sociedade Brasileira de Cardiologia: I Diretriz de Dor Torácica na Sala de Emergência. Arq Bras Cardiol. 2002;79(SuplII: 1).
6. Schwefer M, Aschenbach R, Heidemann J, Mey C, Lapp H. Constrictive pericarditis, still a diagnostic challenge: comprehensive review of clinical management. Eur J Cardio-thoracic Surg. 2009;36(3):502–10.
7. Lange RA, Hillis LD. Acute pericarditis. N Engl J Med. 2004;351:2195-202.
8. Adler Y, Charron P. The 2015 ESC Guidelines on the diagnosis and management of pericardial diseases. Eur Heart J. 2015;36(42):2873–4.
9. Klein AL, Abbara S, Agler DA, Appleton CP, Asher CR, Hoit B, et al. American society of echocardiography clinical recommendations for multimodality cardiovascular imaging of patients with pericardial disease: Endorsed by the society for cardiovascular magnetic resonance and society of cardiovascular computed tomography. J Am Soc Echocardiogr [Internet]. 2013;26(9):965-1012.e15. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2013.06.023
10. Troughton RW, Asher CR, Klein AL. Pericarditis. 2004;363:717–27.
11. Mikolich JR. New Diagnostic Criteria for Acute Pericarditis : A Cardiac MRI Perspective. 2015;15:1–7.
12. Grove WM, Zald DH, Lebow BS, Snitz BE, Nelson C. Clinical versus mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. Psychol Assess. 2000;12(1):19–30.
13. Yan AT, Yan RT, Tan M, Casanova A, Labinaz M, Sridhar K, et al. Risk scores for risk stratification in acute coronary syndromes: Useful but simpler is not necessarily better. Eur Heart J. 2007;28(9):1072–8.
14. Denmark KT, Bax JJ, Morrow DA, Task A, Members F, Kristian C, et al. Fourth universal definition of myocardial infarction (2018). 2018;(August):1–33.

15. Higgins, Charles B; Finck S. Constrictive Pericarditis and Restrictive Cardiomyopathy : Evaluation with MR Imaging. Radiology. 1992;