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Abstract

Purpose Cardiac complications following non-cardiac surgery are major causes of morbidity and mortality. The Revised Cardiac Risk Index (RCRI) has become a standard for predicting post-surgical cardiac complications. This study re-examined the original six risk factors to confirm their validity in a large modern prospective database.

Methods Using the definitions in the original risk index, this study included 9,519 patients aged ≥50 undergoing elective non-cardiac surgery with an expected length of stay ≥ two days at two major tertiary-care teaching hospitals. The validity of the original predictors was tested in this population using binomial logistic regression modelling, area under the receiver operator curve (ROC) analysis, and the net reclassification index.

Results Rates of major cardiac complications with 0, 1, 2, ≥3 of the predictors were 0.5%, 2.6%, 7.2%, and 14.4%, respectively, in our patient cohort compared with 0.4%, 1.1%, 4.6%, and 9.7%, respectively, in the original cohort. Similar to the original report, binary logistic regression analysis showed that both preoperative treatment with insulin (odds ratio [OR] 1.4; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.7 to 2.6) and preoperative creatinine [176.8 mmol/L]−1 (OR 1.7; 95% CI 0.8 to 3.6) did not improve the predictive ability of the index. Analysis of the remaining four factors resulted in an area under the curve (AUC) identical to that seen for the reconstructed six-factor RCRI (AUC = 0.79). We found that a
glomerular filtration rate (GFR) < 30 mL min\(^{-1}\) was a better predictor of major cardiac complications (OR 2.2; 95% CI 1.2 to 4.3) than creatinine > 176.8 mmol L\(^{-1}\). The receiver operating characteristic analysis of this resultant 5-Factor model resulted in an AUC of 0.79, with 0, 1, 2, ≥ 3 of the predictors representing 0.5%, 2.9%, 7.4%, and 17.0% risk, respectively, among our patient cohort.

**Conclusion** Compared with the RCRI, a simplified 5-Factor model using a high-risk type of surgery, a history of ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, cerebrovascular disease, and a preoperative GFR < 30 mL min\(^{-1}\) results in superior prediction of major cardiac complications following elective non-cardiac surgery.

**Résumé**

**Objectif** Les complications cardiaques suite à une chirurgie non cardiaque constituent d’importantes causes de morbidité et de mortalité. L’indice de risque cardiaque modifié (IRCM) est devenu un étalon pour prédire les complications cardiaques après une chirurgie. Cette étude a réévalué les six facteurs de risque originaux afin de confirmer leur validité dans une importante base de données prospective et moderne.

**Méthode** À l’aide des définitions de l’indice de risque d’origine, cette étude a inclus 9519 patients âgés ≥ 50 ans subissant une chirurgie non cardiaque non urgente, dont la durée de séjour prévue était de deux jours ou plus dans deux importants hôpitaux universitaires de soins tertiaires. La validité des prédicteurs originaux a été testée dans cette population à l’aide d’un modèle de régression logistique binomiale, d’une analyse de la surface sous la courbe ROC, et de l’indice NRI (net reclassification index).

**Résultats** Les taux de complications cardiaques majeures avec 0, 1, 2, ≥ 3 des prédicteurs étaient de 0.5%, 2.6%, 7.2%, et 14.4%, respectivement, dans notre cohorte de patients, comparativement à 0.4%, 1.1%, 4.6%, et 9.7%, respectivement, dans la cohorte originale. Tout comme dans le compte rendu original, l’analyse de régression logistique binaire a montré que ni un traitement préopératoire avec de l’insuline (rapport de cotes [RC] 1.4; intervalle de confiance [IC] 95% 0.7 à 2.6), ni un taux de créatinine préopératoire > 176.8 mmol L\(^{-1}\) (RC 1.7; IC 95% 0.8 à 3.6) n’amélioraient la capacité prédictive de l’indice. L’analyse des quatre autres facteurs a donné une surface sous la courbe (SSC) identique à celle observée pour l’IRCM à six facteurs reconstruit (SSC = 0.79). Nous avons observé qu’un débit de filtration glomérulaire (DFG) < 30 mL min\(^{-1}\) était un meilleur prédicteur de complications cardiaques majeures (RC 2.2; IC 95% 1.2 à 4.3) qu’un taux de créatinine > 176.8 mmol L\(^{-1}\). L’analyse de la courbe ROC de ce modèle à 5 facteurs a donné une SSC de 0.79, avec 0, 1, 2, ≥ 3 prédicteurs représentant un risque de 0.5%, 2.9%, 7.4%, et 17.0%, respectivement, dans notre cohorte de patients.

**Conclusion** Par rapport à l’IRCM, un modèle simplifié à 5 facteurs utilisant un type de chirurgie à risque élevé, des antécédents de cardiopathie ischémique, une insuffisance cardiaque congestive, une maladie cérébrovasculaire et un DFG préopératoire < 30 mL min\(^{-1}\) donne une meilleure prédiction de complications cardiaques majeures après une chirurgie non cardiaque non urgente.

The most frequent cause of postoperative morbidity and mortality is as a direct result of an adverse cardiac event.\(^1\) This is a major public health issue since mortality rates remain in excess of 2%\(^1\),\(^2\) in the more than 200 million surgical procedures that occur annually around the world.\(^3\) In an effort to reduce this burden, the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association guidelines committee\(^4\) has adopted the Revised Cardiac Risk Index (RCRI)\(^5\) to preoperatively identify elective patients at risk of major cardiac complications. The RCRI has subsequently been found to be practicable, accurate, and generalizable.\(^6\)

The RCRI was derived from a prospective cohort of elective surgical patients and used creatinine kinase-MB (CK-MB) to identify postoperative cardiac events. The “revised” nomenclature specified that the RCRI built on and simplified an earlier index.\(^6\) The RCRI was derived from a cohort of 4,315 patients, where 2,893 were used to derive the index, i.e., the “derivation set”, and 1,422 patients were assigned to the “validation set”. The index is composed of six predictive factors: high-risk type of surgery, history of ischemic heart disease, history of congestive heart failure, history of cerebrovascular disease, preoperative treatment with insulin, and preoperative serum creatinine > 177 mmol L\(^{-1}\). Each factor in the model is equally weighted with one point assigned per predictor and with increasing point totals corresponding to an increase in the patient’s overall postoperative cardiac risk. Interestingly, the risk factors “preoperative treatment with insulin” and “preoperative serum creatinine > 177 mmol L\(^{-1}\)” did not remain significant in the validation process of the original communication. Nevertheless, these factors were included in the model and have remained in the index because comparison of the odds ratios in the derivation and validations sets were “not statistically different”. The original description did show that exclusion of these two factors, i.e., diabetes and chronic renal failure, resulted in a model with superior discrimination. Presently, almost a quarter century after the first patients were entered in the model, use of the RCRI is now widespread.\(^8\)\(^-\)\(^11\) In this interval, the diagnostic criteria
for myocardial infarction have changed, and we are unaware of any studies that have re-examined the two factors, diabetes and chronic renal failure. As a result, we submit there is a need to re-examine the accuracy and clinical utility of the index.

The primary objective of this study was to re-examine the validity of the inclusion of the two predictors, diabetes and chronic renal failure, in the RCRI using a large modern prospectively collected data set. Our hypothesis was that neither diabetes nor this definition of chronic renal failure improved the accuracy or discrimination of the RCRI. The secondary objectives of this study were to evaluate alternative definitions of preoperative renal function and diabetes or glucose tolerance on the predictive accuracy of the RCRI.

Methods

The University Health Network (UHN) Research Ethics Board approved this study and waived the need for informed consent. The UHN is a university-based tertiary care hospital that performs a full range of adult surgical procedures. Our goal a priori was to reproduce, as closely as possible, the conduct of the original investigation. We therefore included consecutive elective patients, over the age of 50, who were screened in the preoperative assessment clinic for elective inpatient non-cardiac surgery with a length of stay of at least two days. The preoperative data were prospectively collected from April 1, 2008 to December 31, 2010 and extracted from two separate electronic databases. Preoperative data were collected from our Clinical Anesthesia Information System (CAIS) (Adjuvant Informatics, Freelon, ON, Canada). The CAIS is a standardized web-based preoperative assessment tool developed by the UHN to evaluate all elective surgical patients. Patient information was entered into the CAIS by advanced practice nurses at pre-scheduled appointments. The CAIS collects information using standardized branched logic. The collected data include patient demographics, vital signs, detailed histories (and their treatments), including the components of the RCRI, preoperative lab values, results of noninvasive tests, and a full medication history, including instructions of when to stop or continue the medications. Postoperative data were extracted from the institutional electronic data warehouse (EDW) and included data relating to the surgical procedure, postoperative laboratory values, as well as postoperative patient outcomes. The EDW data are largely obtained from the International Classification of Diseases tenth revision (ICD-10) codes. Myocardial injury was assessed using troponin I on the Abbott ARCHITECT i2000SR® analyzer (Abbott Diagnostics Abbott Park, IL, USA). The peak postoperative troponin level—defined as the highest level at any time postoperative until discharge—was assessed. We have recently shown an error rate of <2% in a direct comparison of the patient chart vs the EDW data at the UHN.

During the study period, the UHN preoperative assessment clinics evaluated 15,597 consecutive patients, each having a complete CAIS data set. We excluded 4,073 patients who were under the age of 50 or had either urgent or emergent procedures. A further 2,005 patients were excluded due to a hospital length of stay that was less than two days, leaving a final study population of 9,519 patients. The six RCRI predictors and the outcome variable, major cardiac complications (MCCs), were reconstructed using the original criteria. We therefore defined MCCs using a definition similar to the original RCRI as the postoperative occurrence of any or all of myocardial infarction, pulmonary edema, or primary cardiac arrest. This differs from the primary paper in the following ways:

1) Due to limitations within the CAIS data, a history of paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea was excluded.
2) The term “pulmonary edema” was based on ICD-10 codes instead of a formal reading of the chest radiograph.
3) The terms “complete heart block” and “ventricular fibrillation” were not available and are thus excluded from the derivation of MCCs (Table 2).

All other predictors used were derived as outlined in the original investigation. Using the reproduced risk predictors, the eligible patients in the study database were then individually categorized as per the RCRI scoring system.

Statistical analysis was conducted with SPSS® version 19 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). A reproduced RCRI model using the CAIS data was generated in a fashion identical to the original RCRI using the original predictors and forced entry binary logistic regression. Next, to test the importance of the six factors to the overall quality of the model, a forward conditional entry model was generated, again using binary logistic regression. Finally, the addition of supplementary predictors to the simplified model was tested using individual substitution into the model and a forward conditional build. The candidate variables assessed in this aspect of the analysis were alternative definitions of diabetes. For diabetes, we sequentially assessed the terms “diabetic yes or no”, “preoperative glucose >11.1 mmol⋅L⁻¹”, and “glucose categories (<7.8, 7.8 to 11.1, and >11.1 mmol⋅L⁻¹). For renal failure, we also assessed two levels of glomerular filtration rate (GFR) (30 and 60 mL⋅min⁻¹), calculated using the Cockcroft-Gault...
The threshold for inclusion was $P < 0.05$ for all models generated. The generated models were then compared using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves and area under the curve (AUC) analysis and using the net reclassification index. Odds ratios for each of the original six factors and the additional factors tested were also calculated, and the discrimination of the new models (ROC and 95% confidence interval [CI]) was compared with those in the original report.

### Results

The two study populations, the original RCRI description of 4,315 elective patients and the CAIS population of 9,519, are compared in Table 1. Of importance is the slightly higher percentage of males in the CAIS data. The original data did not report the mean age of the study population or the percentage of the study population with hypertension. Each of six component risk factors is less frequent in the CAIS data compared with the original RCRI. The category “Other” surgery included genitourinary, neurosurgery, and ear nose and throat surgeries and included significantly more than in the original RCRI manuscript.

The prevalence of MCCs in each of the six component risk factors is compared with the original RCRI in Table 2. The CAIS and RCRI data sets show that events occurred more often in patients with a “history of ischemic heart disease” and “congestive heart failure”. The remaining four risk factors had similar rates of MCCs. The rates of myocardial infarction (MI) are measured by troponin I as compared with creatine kinase in the original RCRI description. The terms “complete heart block”, which was recorded in only 0.1% of the RCRI population (4/4,315), and “ventricular fibrillation”, were not available in the CAIS data. Ventricular fibrillation was combined with cardiac arrest in the RCRI data (0.4%, 16/4,315), but in the CAIS data, cardiac arrest was recorded alone (0.3%, 34/9,519) (relative risk [RR] 0.96; 95% CI 0.53 to 1.74). The overall rate of MCCs did not differ between the two studies (Table 3).

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study cohort comparison between RCRI and CAIS data: includes percentage breakdown by individual surgical category for the CAIS data</th>
<th>Women, %</th>
<th>Mean age, yr</th>
<th>High Risk Surgery, %</th>
<th>CAD, %</th>
<th>Diabetes, % (on insulin)</th>
<th>CHF, %</th>
<th>CVD, %</th>
<th>Renal Insufficiency, %</th>
<th>Hypertension, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al., 1999</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>NR (4.0)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIS data overall</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.0 (2.4)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Subtype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal ($n = 1,318$, 14%)</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>22.3 (4.7)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic ($n = 2,264$, 24%)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.6 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic ($n = 1,011$, 11%)</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>12.8 (1.5)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular ($n = 461$, 5%)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>27.5 (5.4)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ($n = 4,465$, 47%)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0 (2.2)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAIS = Clinical Anesthesia Information System; RCRI = original dataset for derivation and validation of the Revised Cardiac Risk Index; NR = not reported

1 Defined as intraperitoneal, intrathoracic or suprareginal vascular procedures, cardiac ischemia, use of nitrate therapy

2 Defined as coronary artery disease

3 Defined as total % diabetics (CAIS), of this 2.4% are on insulin therapy (CAIS)

4 Defined as history of congestive heart failure (CAIS), excluded pulmonary edema on chest x-ray, paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea, physical exam showing bilateral rales or S3 gallop

5 Cardiovascular disease - defined as history of either stroke or transient ischemic attack (CAIS)

6 Defined as preoperative serum creatinine $>176.6$ mmol·L$^{-1}$ (CAIS)

7 Defined as history of hypertension (CAIS) or hypertension requiring medical control of blood pressure (CAIS)

*“Other” category composed of gastrointestinal, ear nose and throat, neurological surgeries

### A Note on Renal Function

A The Cockcroft-Gault equation is generated using age, weight, sex, and serum creatinine level glomerular filtration rate ($GFR = (140 - age \times weight \ [kg] \times constant) / serum \ creatinine \ [umol \cdot L^{-1}]$. The constant is 1.23 for men and 1.04 for women. This estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) is automatically calculated in the Clinical Anesthesia Information System using this equation. Available from URL: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renal_function](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renal_function) (accessed May 10, 2013).
The rates of MCCs in the original RCRI model were 0.4%, 1.1%, 4.6%, and 9.7% for 0, 1, 2, and ≥3 points, respectively, with an AUC value of 0.78 (95% CI 0.73 to 0.82). The comparable rates using the CAIS data were 0.5%, 2.6%, 7.2%, and 14.4% risk of MCCs, respectively, for the same categories. The AUC was 0.79 (95% CI 0.76 to 0.83) (Table 4). When the model was re-calculated using forward conditional entry, the terms “insulin therapy for diabetes” and “preoperative creatinine > 176 mmol·L\(^{-1}\)” did not remain in the model, creating the “4-Factor model”. The percentages of predicted MCCs by point class remain essentially the same, and the AUC value is unchanged in this model.

The relative risk compares the outcomes (MCCs) between CAIS and original data for each component risk factor.

RCRI data = original derivation and validation of the Revised Cardiac Risk Index; CAIS = Clinical Anesthesia Information System; CI = confidence interval.

**Table 2** Comparison of the components of RCRI: CAIS vs original (4): The occurrence of major cardiac complications (MCCs) postoperatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Cardiac Risk Index: predictors</th>
<th>CAIS data MCCs / n (%)</th>
<th>RCRI data MCCs / n (%)</th>
<th>Relative risk of MCCs (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High-risk surgery type</td>
<td>87 / 2,499 (3.4)</td>
<td>27 / 894 (3.0)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.75 to 1.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. History of ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>104 / 1,762 (5.9)</td>
<td>34 / 951 (3.6)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.13 to 2.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History of congestive heart failure</td>
<td>33 / 284 (11.6)</td>
<td>23 / 434 (5.3)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.35 to 3.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History of cerebrovascular disease</td>
<td>41 / 685 (6.0)</td>
<td>17 / 291 (5.8)</td>
<td>1.02 (0.59 to 1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preoperative treatment with insulin</td>
<td>12 / 225 (5.3)</td>
<td>7 / 112 (6.3)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.35 to 2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preoperative creatinine &gt; 176 mmol·L(^{-1})</td>
<td>9 / 131 (6.9)</td>
<td>9 / 103 (8.7)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.32 to 1.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative risk compares the outcomes (MCCs) between CAIS and original data for each component risk factor.

**Table 3** Primary outcome: comparison of the components of the composite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major cardiac complication</th>
<th>CAIS data (Total = 9,519) n (%)</th>
<th>RCRI data (Total = 4,315) n (%)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major cardiac complication</td>
<td>200 (2.1)</td>
<td>92 (2.1)</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myocardial infarction</td>
<td>163 (1.7)</td>
<td>46 (1.1)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary edema</td>
<td>19 (0.2)</td>
<td>42 (1.0)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac arrest/ventricular</td>
<td>34 (0.3)</td>
<td>16 (0.4)</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrillation*</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>4 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CAIS data did not include ventricular fibrillation data; CAIS = Clinical Anesthesia Information System; RCRI data = original derivation and validation data for the Revised Cardiac Risk Index.

**Table 4** Comparison of the original RCRI model with models generated using CAIS data: Individual risk stratification by point score and resultant model AUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Events/Total, by Model Score, n(/n) (%)</th>
<th>AUC (95% CI)</th>
<th>NRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Points</td>
<td>1 Point</td>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRI data 1999(^{4})</td>
<td>7 / 1,559 (0.4)</td>
<td>19 / 1,673 (1.1)</td>
<td>35 / 764 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIS data (Reconstructing RCRI)</td>
<td>25 / 5,276 (0.5)</td>
<td>81 / 3,145 (2.6)</td>
<td>65 / 897 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Factor model* (CAIS data)</td>
<td>25 / 5,397 (0.5)</td>
<td>87 / 3,156 (2.8)</td>
<td>70 / 842 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Factor model (Using eGFR &lt; 30 mL·min(^{-1}))**</td>
<td>21 / 4,446 (0.5)</td>
<td>78 / 2,693 (2.9)</td>
<td>56 / 753 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Original RCRI predictors, including high-risk type of surgery, a history of ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, cerebrovascular disease, but removing “insulin therapy for diabetes” and “preoperative serum creatinine > 176.8 mmol·L\(^{-1}\)”.

**4-Factor model with the addition of glomerular filtration rate (GFR) < 30 mL·min\(^{-1}\). Not all patients had data necessary to calculate GFR (n = 8,027 used, total MCCs n = 178). RCRI = Revised Cardiac Risk Index; CAIS = Clinical Anesthesia Information System; AUC = area under the curve; CI = confidence interval; NRI = net reclassification index; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; The NRI tables are in the Appendix.

The rates of MCCs in the original RCRI model were 0.4%, 1.1%, 4.6%, and 9.7% for 0, 1, 2, and ≥3 points, respectively, with an AUC value of 0.78 (95% CI 0.73 to 0.82). The comparable rates using the CAIS data were 0.5%, 2.6%, 7.2%, and 14.4% risk of MCCs, respectively, for the same categories. The AUC was 0.79 (95% CI 0.76 to 0.83) (Table 4). When the model was re-calculated using forward conditional entry, the terms “insulin therapy for diabetes” and “preoperative creatinine > 176 mmol·L\(^{-1}\)” did not remain in the model, creating the “4-Factor model”. The percentages of predicted MCCs by point class remain essentially the same, and the AUC value is unchanged in this model.

Evaluation of the alternative definitions of diabetes and renal failure were attempted after finding that “preoperative treatment with insulin” (odds ratio [OR]...
1.4; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.7 to 2.6) and
“preoperative creatinine > 177 mmol-L\(^{-1}\)” (OR 1.7; 95%
CI 0.8 to 3.6) were not significant and did not improve the
discrimination of the index. The terms “diabetic yes or no”
(OR 1.4; 95% CI 1.0 to 2.0), “preoperative glucose >
11.1 mmol-L\(^{-1}\)” (OR 1.5; 95% CI 0.8 to 2.6), and
“glucose categories (< 7.8, 7.8-11.1, > 11.1 mmol-L\(^{-1}\))”
(OR 1.2; 95% CI 1.0 to 1.6) were evaluated, but none of
these definitions improved the discrimination of the index
(Table A2). Furthermore, two alternative models were then
generated. In the model with five variables, the fifth
variable used GFR < 30 mL-min\(^{-1}\). This model showed
the same percent of predicted MCCs as the model without
GFR but improved calibration. The relative variances
between the RCRI point categories resulting from the
above modifications and the original reconstructed RCRI
model are detailed in Table A1. The 4-Factor model shifts
both MCCs and overall patients in the 2 and ≥ 3 point
categories to lower point ranges and results in no
significant change in the net reclassification index. The
5-Factor model with GFR < 3 0 mL-min\(^{-1}\) also loses
patients from the 2 and ≥ 3 categories but to a less extent
than the 4-Factor model and to a significantly less extent
than patients who experienced MCCs in the ≥ 3 category;
therefore, the net reclassification index is marginally
improved.

Discussion

This study reinforces the importance and validity of the
RCRI as a means of predicting major cardiac events after
elective surgery. Almost two decades later, in spite of
rapidly changing surgical techniques\(^{15,16}\) and
improvements to clinical diagnostic testing\(^{11,17,18}\) the
factors identified in the original report are relevant in a
modern elective surgical patient population. Through all of
the modelling procedures, any combination of the terms
(high-risk type of surgery, history of ischemic heart
disease, history of congestive heart failure, and history of
cerebrovascular disease) remained discriminatory.

The results of the present study are remarkably similar
to those in the original description, and in its current form,
the model contains two factors, documented in this
analysis, that do not improve its risk prediction. As in the
original description, the removal of these factors does not
affect the final risk stratification or the improved
discrimination of the index. A recent large prospective
analysis of the Veterans Affairs Medical Center surgical
database also failed to find diabetes as a significant
predictor of cardiac outcomes.\(^{19}\) Focused attempts to
include modified terms related to diabetes mellitus or
preoperative blood sugar levels could not significantly
improve the ability to predict the risk of MCCs or improve
the accuracy or the discrimination of the index.

Glycosylated hemoglobin has been advocated as an
important risk factor in diabetic outcomes and may be a
factor that could potentially improve the index\(^{20-22}\)
however, the data in our database were insufficient to
assess this variable. In our view, it would be important to
drop the diabetes terminology from the RCRI; inclusion
has the potential to create patient safety issues. We consider
this an important issue, even though investigation shows that
inclusion of diabetes does not influence the overall statistical
integrity of the predictive model. We do not debate that
diabetes continues to be highly associated with cardiac
disease, renal failure, and cerebral vascular disease, all of
which remain highly predictive of postoperative major
cardiac events. When diabetes is the ONLY risk factor, we
are concerned that it may lead to an inappropriate
intervention. Consider the pay per performance guidelines
that were implemented in the USA making beta-blockers a
quality of care indicator. In response, all patients with a
cardiac risk were required to have beta-blockers
administered perioperatively. Subsequently, at least two
investigations have shown a 30% increase in mortality when
beta-blockers were administered to patients where diabetes
was the ONLY risk factor\(^{9,23}\).

Our investigation did identify a potential alternative
definition of chronic renal failure, specifically, a
preoperative GFR of < 30 mL-min\(^{-1}\). A reconstituted
5-Factor model, including cardiovascular disease, coronary
artery disease, congestive heart failure, high-risk surgery,
and GFR < 30 mL-min\(^{-1}\), maintained the same discrimi-
nation value and slightly improved the net reclassification,
mostly in patients at higher risk for MCCs. The addition of
a calculated GFR of < 60 mL-min\(^{-1}\) resulted in less
improvement in either the discrimination or the calibration.
This definition does have the advantage of being the
threshold for chronic kidney disease as defined by the
National Kidney Foundation.\(^{19}\) On the basis of these
considerations, we would advocate for a 5-Factor model
where the renal component is denoted by a low GFR and
diabetes is dropped from the index.

This evaluation of a prospectively collected moderate-
risk elective non-cardiac surgical population has several
important differences compared with the original
population derived for the RCRI. All six RCRI predictors
are less prevalent in our study population compared with
the original derivation. In addition, the number of patients
at lowest risk of MCCs in our evaluation represents 55% of
the study population, whereas this risk stratum represents
27% of the original study population. In fact, in the original
study population, there were more patients in the second
risk stratum than in the first. This difference between two
consecutive patient populations is difficult to explain; we
can only reiterate that our series represents a consecutive series of patients from an organized central clinic using a universal web-based interrogation system. In contrast, the original data were derived from several different specialty clinics, resulting in variable entry to the study. Even so, the rate of MCCs are similar in the lowest risk stratum, and the overall rate of MCCs within our data is comparable with that seen in the RCRI data.

There were, however, important differences in the components of the composite outcome. The prevalence of myocardial infarction within the CAIS data was almost twice that seen in the original derivation. We suspect this is related to the use of high-sensitivity serum troponin measurements that are now the gold standard for the diagnosis of perioperative myocardial infarction and superior for the diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. The absolute number of pulmonary edema events is the same, but this represents an increased prevalence in our more recent data, since the number of patients with pre-existing congestive heart failure is one-quarter that of the original study. This lower incidence of preoperative congestive heart failure likely represents the improved chronic management of cardiac diseases in the 25 years between the two studies. Neither data set can comment on the severity of congestive heart failure; however, we would point out that the highest incidence of pre-existing congestive heart failure is in vascular surgical patients who are a decade older than the other surgical groups. Over this same time period, there have been improvements in perioperative fluid and transfusion therapy that have been shown to improve postoperative outcomes.

The rates of MCCs for each of the RCRI predictive variables show that the rates within the CAIS data are similar to those measured in the original descriptive data. The major differences (outlined above) are shown for “history of ischemic heart disease” and “history of cerebrovascular disease”, which are increased in the CAIS data compared with the RCRI data; however, the overall rates are similar.

The surgical subtypes differ from the RCRI data as well. The CAIS data encompass a greater number of “other” surgeries (genitourinary, neurosurgery, and ear nose and throat surgeries), and although the rate of abdominal surgeries is increased, there are fewer orthopedic and vascular procedures than in the RCRI data. This likely represents both a difference in the surgical emphasis at the study hospitals and factors such as vascular surgery and changes in preferred surgical practices over time (endovascular rather than open procedures). The accuracy and discrimination of vascular surgery in the RCRI has been questioned. A recent meta-analysis of the RCRI found that the area under curve for RCRI ranged from 0.60-0.74 with a pooled estimate of 0.64 (95% CI 0.61 to 0.68), which was less than that found in nonvascular surgery (ROC 0.75; 95% CI 0.72 to 0.79) A subgroup analysis in our population found a similar decrease in discrimination (ROC 0.73 for vascular patients compared with ROC 0.79 for non-vascular patients; data not shown).

Limitations

As outlined, the CAIS data did not include data relating to the outcomes for complete heart block and ventricular fibrillation. Nevertheless, in the original descriptive data, these variables were small contributors to the total prevalence of MCCs and were often present in patients who concurrently suffered one of the other three complications. Also, a few differences existed in the factors used to categorize patients into the six risk predictors as outlined in the Methods section. A major limitation in both the original descriptive study and our study is the lack of universal serial monitoring for cardiac damage. In the original series, creatine kinase surveillance was not universal and measured only in patients who provided a priori consent. In the present study, troponin was systematically measured only in the vascular population, and the remainder of the troponin measurements were based on underlying risk and clinical signs. As a result, troponin was measured more frequently in patients with elevated RCRI scores, and we have previously documented and shown that this clinically based measurement can deliver up to a threefold underestimation of the rate of myocardial damage.

In conclusion, the four validated terms from the original RCRI (i.e., high-risk type of surgery, history of ischemic heart disease, history of congestive heart failure, and history of cerebrovascular disease) should continue to be used to estimate risk and allocate resources in elective surgical patients. The elimination of diabetes from the index would have little effect on the performance of the “index” except to move more patients to a lower risk category. Replacing the term for chronic renal failure with GFR < 30 mL-min⁻¹ results in a 5-factor index that has good discrimination and better calibration than all other alternatives. Future research should aim to validate these findings within similar consecutive cohorts of elective non-cardiac surgery.

Funding The investigation is supported in part by Research and Innovation Funds from the University Health Network Department of Anesthesia and Pain Management. Dr. Beattie is supported by the R. Fraser Elliot Chair in Cardiac Anesthesia Research. Drs Beattie and Wijeysundera receive funding support from the University of Toronto, Department of Anesthesia Merit Awards. Mr. Davis is a medical student at the University of Toronto, and this manuscript is the culmination of a summer project in 2011. The work was presented in abstract form at the June 2012 Canadian Anesthesiologists’ Society Annual Meeting in Quebec City.
Competing interests  The Department of Anesthesia Research and Innovation Fund has received donations from Abbott Corp, BMS, Baxter, Bayer, Fresenius Kabi, and GE Healthcare. None of these companies have participated in the any aspect of this report.

Appendix

Table A1  Reclassification comparison between the six-variable RCRI model and the model derived from the significant 4-Factors (n = 9,519)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original model (6 factors)</th>
<th>Patients with MCCs</th>
<th>Patients without MCCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCRI 0</td>
<td>RCRI 1</td>
<td>RCRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Factor model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net reclassification index is the sum of the patients who had MCCs correctly reclassified to a higher risk category (−17/200 = −8.5%) and the patients without MCCs correctly changed to a lower risk category (304/9,319 = 3.3%).

Reclassification index for the 4-Factor model was −5.2% (P = 0.246). RCRI = Revised Cardiac Risk Index; MCCs = major cardiac complications

Table A2  Reclassification comparison between the six-variable RCRI model and the model derived from the 5-Factors with GFR < 30 mL min⁻¹ (n = 8,027)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original model (6 factors)</th>
<th>Patients with MCCs</th>
<th>Patients without MCCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCRI 0</td>
<td>RCRI 1</td>
<td>RCRI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Factor model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GFR &lt; 30 mL min⁻¹)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net reclassification index is the sum of the patients who had MCCs correctly reclassified to a higher risk category (−4/178 = −2.2%) and the patients without MCCs correctly changed to a lower risk category (145/7,849 = 1.8%). Reclassification index for the 5-Factor model was −0.4% (P = 0.049).

RCRI = Revised Cardiac Risk Index; MCCs = major cardiac complications; GFR = glomerular filtration rate
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Objectives
The aims of this study were to perform an individual patient data meta-analysis of studies using B-type natriuretic peptides (BNPs) to predict the primary composite endpoint of cardiac death and nonfatal myocardial infarction (MI) within 30 days of vascular surgery and to determine: 1) the cut points for a natriuretic peptide (NP) diagnostic, optimal, and screening test; and 2) if pre-operative NPs improve the predictive accuracy of the revised cardiac risk index (RCRI).

Background
NPs are independent predictors of cardiovascular events in noncardiac and vascular surgery. Their addition to clinical risk indexes may improve pre-operative risk stratification.

Methods
Studies reporting the association of pre-operative NP concentrations and the primary study endpoint, post-operative major adverse cardiovascular events (defined as cardiovascular death and nonfatal MI) in vascular surgery, were identified by electronic database search. Secondary study endpoints included all-cause mortality, cardiac death, and nonfatal MI.

Results
Six data sets were obtained, 5 for BNP (n = 632) and 1 for N-terminal pro-BNP (n = 218). An NP level higher than the optimal cut point was an independent predictor for the primary composite endpoint (odds ratio: 7.9; 95% confidence interval: 4.7 to 13.3). BNP cut points were 30 pg/ml for screening (95% sensitivity, 44% specificity), 116 pg/ml for optimal (highest accuracy point; 66% sensitivity, 82% specificity), and 372 pg/ml for diagnostic (32% sensitivity, 95% specificity). Subsequent to revised cardiac risk index stratification, reclassification using the optimal cut point significantly improved risk prediction in all groups (net reclassification improvement 58%, p < 0.000001), particularly in the intermediate-risk group (net reclassification improvement 84%, p < 0.001).

Conclusions
Pre-operative NP levels can be used to independently predict cardiovascular events in the first 30 days after vascular surgery and to significantly improve the predictive performance of the revised cardiac risk index. (J Am Coll Cardiol 2011;58:522-9) © 2011 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation

More than 200 million major surgical procedures are performed annually worldwide. This is equivalent to 1 procedure for every 25 human beings and increases to 1 procedure for every 10 persons in developed countries (1).
with the majority of these procedures being noncardiac surgery. In a recent international randomized controlled study (8,351 patients, 190 hospitals in 23 countries), 6.9% of patients age 45 years or older with or at risk of cardiovascular disease who were hospitalized for noncardiac surgery had cardiovascular events (cardiovascular death, nonfatal myocardial infarction [MI], nonfatal cardiac arrest) within 30 days (2). Patients presenting for vascular surgery have a particularly high cardiovascular disease burden. As a result, they experience higher rates of perioperative mortality, adverse cardiovascular events, and rehospitalizations than patients undergoing other noncardiac procedures (3,4).

Pre-operative risk stratification enables both patients and physicians to make informed decisions regarding the appropriateness of surgery when considering the risk for a perioperative cardiovascular event. In addition, the identification of high-risk patients allows targeted resource allocation during the perioperative period by directing additional pre-operative testing and perioperative monitoring. Current guidelines make use of clinical risk factors, exercise tolerance, and type of surgery to estimate perioperative cardiovascular risk and direct pre-operative investigation (5). These clinical risk factors, which include a history of ischemic heart disease, compensated or prior heart failure, cerebrovascular events, diabetes mellitus, and renal insufficiency, have been derived from a set of risk factors known as the revised cardiac risk index (RCRI) (6). To date, the use of the RCRI and the performance of non invasive tests and imaging studies as directed by the guidelines have not provided good discrimination when applied to patients undergoing vascular surgery (7–9).

Ventricular cardiomyocytes secrete B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), a prohormone, and its inactive cleavage product N-terminal fragment (N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide [NT-proBNP]), into the blood in response to atrial or ventricular wall stretch. Pre-operative elevations of BNP or NT-proBNP have consistently and independently been associated with adverse cardiovascular events in noncardiac and particularly major vascular surgery (10–23). We aimed to study the following questions: 1) What is the optimal BNP cutoff to predict cardiovascular events after vascular surgery? 2) Does the use of pre-operative natriuretic peptides (NPs), BNP or NT-proBNP, improve upon current risk stratification tools?

**Methods**

We aimed to perform an individual patient data meta-analysis of studies using NPs to predict major adverse cardiac events (MACE) and all-cause mortality within 30 days of vascular surgery. MACEs were defined as the composite of cardiac death and nonfatal MI. In addition, we aimed to determine the NP cutoffs for: 1) a diagnostic test; 2) a general optimal test; and 3) a screening test (24), as well as to determine if the pre-operative use of NP assessment improves the predictive performance of the RCRI (6).

**Study identification and selection.** Studies reporting on the association of pre-operative NP concentrations and post-operative cardiovascular events in adults undergoing noncardiac vascular surgery were identified by electronic searches of the MEDLINE (July 5, 2010) and EMBASE (week 26 of 2010) databases. The electronic searches were completed by manual search of the reports’ reference lists. The terms used in the search strategy were “natriuretic peptides,” “surgery or surgical procedures,” and validated combinations of prognostic terms (25) and diagnostic terms (26,27). No language restriction was applied.

Congress abstracts, studies in cardiac surgery populations, and studies in which BNP administration was part of an interventional algorithm were excluded. To avoid the inclusion of duplicate study data from reports publishing partial results, the study with the most complete follow-up or largest sample size was included. Study quality issues in the study selection process were not considered. Working as 2 groups (C.S.B. and G.A.L.B., R.N.R. and G.A.L.B.), we independently selected studies according to predefined eligibility criteria. Selections inconsistencies were resolved by consensus.

**Data collection.** The investigators of eligible studies were contacted by e-mail a maximum of 3 times to obtain individual patient data for pre-operative BNP or NT-proBNP concentrations and the type of noncardiac surgery conducted, history of coronary artery disease, congestive cardiac failure, cerebrovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, and renal failure (creatinine >2 mg/dl) to obtain the individual RCRI for each patient. Information on all patients who had undergone vascular surgery was extracted from the individual databases as supplied by the investigators of each study and subsequently merged. After merging, a random sample of 20% of the cases were checked for accuracy against the original data sets provided by the investigators, and no errors were detected (kappa = 1).

**Study quality assessment.** All studies included for methodological and reporting quality were evaluated according to the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies checklist (28), adapting the checklist for the purposes of this review because all the included studies were prognostic in nature (Online Appendix). In the adapted checklist’s for-
mulation, “index test,” “target condition,” and “reference standard” were replaced by “natriuretic peptide concentrations,” “all-cause mortality,” and “outcome,” respectively. Criteria 3, 4, 7, and 13 of the original checklist (28) were regarded as not applicable in this context. Criterion 9 (execution of outcome assessment) of the original checklist was considered as not applicable for the studies addressing in-hospital all-cause mortality only. Two authors (G.A.L.B. and C.S.B.) independently rated study quality.

Statistical analysis. Frequencies are described as numbers and/or percents. Age is described as a mean and agreement between the authors for eligibility of the retrieved studies as a kappa value.

Before merging study data, the association between BNP concentration and MACE heterogeneity across studies was assessed using chi-square analysis, and a meta-analysis was conducted using Review Manager version 4.3 for Windows (The Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark).

---

**Table 1** Characteristics of Studies Identified as Including Vascular Surgery Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author, Year (Ref. #)</th>
<th>Proportion Vascular Surgery (%)</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Mean Age (yrs)</th>
<th>Patients With NP Levels Above Thresholds* (%)</th>
<th>Individual Patient Data Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeh et al., 2005 (31)</td>
<td>6/190 (3)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbertson et al., 2007 (30)</td>
<td>61/204 (30)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feringa et al., 2007 (15)</td>
<td>335 (100)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson et al., 2007 (16)</td>
<td>88/190 (59)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahla et al., 2007 (20)</td>
<td>218 (100)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibowitz et al., 2008 (19)</td>
<td>3/44 (7)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riemersma et al., 2008 (32)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolliger et al., 2009 (10)</td>
<td>133 (100)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi et al., 2009 (12)</td>
<td>534/2,054 (26)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goel et al., 2009 (17)</td>
<td>592 (100)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biccard et al., 2011 (33)</td>
<td>297 (100)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thresholds reflect the optimal general cut point as defined in each individual study.

NP = natriuretic peptide.
Random-effects or fixed-effects models were used according to the presence or absence of significant heterogeneity between studies, respectively.

The association between NP concentration and MACEs at 30 days was determined using backward stepwise logistic regression, and pooled dichotomous outcomes are reported as odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 15.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois).

The general optimal test cutoff value, also known as the optimal diagnostic point, is the point that optimizes the rate of true-positive results while minimizing the rate of false-positive results, thereby reflecting the point with the highest accuracy for the prediction of study endpoints. For both NT-proBNP and BNP, this was defined by receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) statistics using a 1:1 weighting of sensitivity and specificity and the point determined by the value with the minimal distance when using the formula distance \( \frac{1}{1 - \text{sensitivity}}^2 + \frac{1}{1 - \text{specificity}}^2 \) (24). The screening cutoff point was chosen at a sensitivity of 95% while optimizing specificity. Similarly, the diagnostic cutoff point was chosen at a specificity of 95% while optimizing sensitivity (24).

Patients were categorized according to their RCRI risk groups (0 = low risk; 1 or 2 = intermediate risk; 3, 4, or 5 = high risk) and then reclassified according to their pre-operative NP concentrations (above or below the general optimal test cutoff) (29). The reclassification by net reclassification improvement (NRI) was then tested for discrimination and reclassification calibration statistics.

Two-sided p values were used in all analyses, and values <0.05 were considered significant.


### Results

#### Study identification and selection.

The literature search retrieved 1,648 citations, of which 15 noncardiac surgery studies fulfilled the eligibility criteria (Fig. 1). The kappa value for eligibility was 0.809.

Of these 15 studies, 10 were identified as containing vascular surgery patients (10,12,15–17,19,20,30–32) (Table 1).

#### Table 2 Characteristics of the Vascular Studies From Which Data Were Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author, Year (Ref. #)</th>
<th>Patients Contributed</th>
<th>Biomarker</th>
<th>Diagnostic Assay</th>
<th>Cutoff (pg/ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahla et al., 2007 (20)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>NT-proBNP</td>
<td>Elecsys (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany)</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbertson et al., 2007 (30)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>ADVIA Centaur (Bayer Diagnostics, Leverkusen, Germany)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson et al., 2007 (16)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>Shinoria BNP kit, Shionogi &amp; Company, Ltd., Osaka, Japan</td>
<td>108.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibowitz et al., 2008 (19)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>ADVIA Centaur</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolliger et al., 2009 (10)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>AsSYM BNP (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biccard et al., 2011 (33)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>ADVIA Centaur Xp</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide; NT-proBNP = N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide.

### Table 3 Patient Characteristics of Merged Datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Patients (n = 850)</th>
<th>MACE at 30 Days (n = 75)</th>
<th>No MACE at 30 Days (n = 775)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td>65.3 ± 12.1</td>
<td>69.4 ± 8.8</td>
<td>65.0 ± 12.3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>561 (66%)</td>
<td>49 (65.3%)</td>
<td>512 (66.1%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular, infrainguinal</td>
<td>629 (74%)</td>
<td>50 (66.7%)</td>
<td>579 (74.7%)</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular, aortoiliac</td>
<td>217 (25.5%)</td>
<td>25 (33.3%)</td>
<td>192 (24.8%)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular, not specified</td>
<td>4 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.5%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRI class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (RCRI 0)</td>
<td>320 (37.6%)</td>
<td>19 (25.3%)</td>
<td>301 (38.8%)</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (RCRI 1 or 2)</td>
<td>476 (56%)</td>
<td>45 (60%)</td>
<td>431 (55.6%)</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (RCRI ≥3)</td>
<td>54 (6.4%)</td>
<td>11 (14.7%)</td>
<td>43 (5.5%)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRI components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary artery disease</td>
<td>327 (38.5%)</td>
<td>42 (56%)</td>
<td>285 (36.8%)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive heart failure</td>
<td>64 (7.5%)</td>
<td>14 (18.7%)</td>
<td>50 (6.5%)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease</td>
<td>145 (17.1%)</td>
<td>8 (10.7%)</td>
<td>137 (17.7%)</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>204 (24%)</td>
<td>25 (33.3%)</td>
<td>179 (23.1%)</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine ≥2 mg/dl</td>
<td>28 (3.3%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>22 (2.8%)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are mean ± SD or as n (%).

MACE = major adverse cardiac event(s); RCRI = revised cardiac risk index.
and 1 study measuring NT-proBNP concentrations in 218 vascular patients (20), for a total dataset of 850 patients having undergone both open and catheter-based vascular surgery. A study that has recently been accepted for publication and fulfilled the criteria was also included (33). The characteristics of the studies for which data were received are shown in Table 2. On analysis, the included studies showed significant heterogeneity (chi-square /H11005 13.37, I2 /H11005 70.1%) in the unadjusted association between BNP and 30-day MACEs.

Study quality. All of the 11 included studies fulfilled the requirements of a representative spectrum of patients by having clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, outcome verification of the whole cohort, equal outcome evaluation regardless of the NP results, sufficient description of NP measurement, and availability of clinical data. We considered the description of the NP measurement (index test) sufficient for replication in 9 of the studies (10,15–17,19,20,30,31,33). Of the 6 studies (10,15,16,20,30,32) that monitored for MACEs after discharge, 3 provided detailed descriptions of their follow-up methods (10,20,30). In only 2 studies were the NP results interpreted without knowledge of outcome (15,16), and only 5 stated that outcomes were determined without knowledge of the NP results (10,16,20,30,31). Two of the 7 studies that lost patients from follow-up provided reasons for this loss or withdrawal (30,34).

Predictive value of NPs. Figure 2 indicates the results of the meta-analysis of the individual studies in predicting MACEs before the merging of the datasets using a random-effects model. The 3 patients from the study by Leibowitz et al. (19) were not included in the analysis, because they provided only true-positive results.

Using the merged dataset, the general optimal test cut points for the BNP (116 pg/ml) and NT-proBNP (277.5 pg/ml) groups were determined as described in our “Methods” section. Patients were then classified as falling above or below this point.

The following independent predictors of MACEs were identified by backward stepwise logistical regression analysis: NP level higher than the optimal cut point (OR: 7.9; 95% CI: 4.7 to 13.3), aortoiliac surgery (OR: 2.1; 95% CI: 1.2 to 3.6), and diabetes mellitus (OR: 1.9; 95% CI: 1.1 to 3.3). The ORs for NP higher than the threshold were 4.3 (95% CI: 1.7 to 11.3) for cardiac death, 7.5 (95% CI: 4.1 to 13.6) for nonfatal MI, and 3.1 (95% CI: 1.4 to 6.7) for all-cause mortality within 30 days of vascular surgery.

Because only 1 NT-proBNP dataset was available, a ROC analysis for pre-operative BNP and the RCRI (n = 632) in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>BNP above cut point</th>
<th>OR (random)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>OR (random)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/N</td>
<td>95% CI (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>22/33</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>(19.43, 454.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbertson</td>
<td>2/57</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>(0.06, 26.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahla</td>
<td>14/85</td>
<td>25.31</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>(1.75, 14.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolliger</td>
<td>2/38</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>(0.35, 19.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biccard</td>
<td>13/53</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>(2.50, 13.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (95% CI)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>(2.23, 24.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total events: 53 (BNP above cut point) 22 (BNP below cut point)
Test for heterogeneity, Chi²=13.37, df=4 (P=0.001), I²=70.1%
Test for overall effect: Z=3.27 (P=0.001)
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Figure 2 Unadjusted ORs for a Pre-Operative BNP or NT-proBNP Concentration Above the Optimal General Cut Point (BNP 116 pg/ml, NT-proBNP 277.5 pg/ml) in Predicting Cardiovascular Outcomes 30 Days After Surgery

Forest plot showing the individual and pooled unadjusted odds ratios (ORs) from the included studies.
BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide; CI = confidence interval; NT-proBNP = N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide.

Table 4 AUCs for BNP and the RCRI in Predicting Perioperative Outcomes (n = 632)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>BNP</th>
<th>RCRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUC (%)</td>
<td>95% CI (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACEs</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>75.1-85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac death</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>71.5-88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfatal MI</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>72.2-85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>60.7-82.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC = area under the receiver-operating characteristic curve; BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide; CI = confidence interval; MI = myocardial infarction; other abbreviations as in Table 3.
predicting perioperative events was performed on the BNP dataset alone (Table 4).

**Determination of BNP screening and diagnostic cutoff points.** Because there was only a single study in the NT-proBNP group, we calculated screening and diagnostic cut points for the BNP group only (n = 632). Having determined the optimal general cutoff point for BNP to be 116 pg/ml, the BNP level for a screening test with 95% sensitivity was determined to be 30 pg/ml, and a BNP level of 372 pg/ml was determined for a diagnostic test with 95% specificity. Table 5 shows the test characteristics at these 3 cutoff concentrations in predicting MACE at 30 days.

The area under the ROC curve (AUC) for BNP as a continuum in predicting MACE was 80.5% (95% CI: 75.1% to 85.8%). A reduced ROC curve using only these 3 cutoff points resulted in an AUC of 80.1% (95% CI: 74.3% to 85.8%). The incidence of MACE stratified according to these 3 cut points is shown in Table 6.

**RCRI reclassification.** Per the American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association guidelines on perioperative cardiovascular evaluation and care for noncardiac surgery (5), all 850 patients were classified into 3 risk groups according to their RCRI scores. A reclassification was performed on the basis of the patients’ NP levels. If levels fell below the optimal general cut point, patients were moved down 1 risk category, and if levels fell above the optimal general cut point, patients were moved up 1 risk category (29).

Table 7 shows the results of the reclassification process. In patients classified as low risk by the RCRI, 20% were reclassified as intermediate by the use of NP concentration. In patients classified as intermediate risk by the RCRI, 71% were reclassified as low risk and 28.5% as high risk. In those classified as high risk by the RCRI, 54% were reclassified as intermediate risk. Overall, the use of NP resulted in a statistically significant improvement in discrimination, with an NRI of 58% (z = 5.48, p < 0.001). In patients classified as intermediate risk by the RCRI, the NRI was 84% (z = 5.37, p < 0.001). Applying this cutoff point to the entire population, without predefining risk categories, results in a “continuous” NRI. This can be used to compare the predictive performance of BNP with other pre-operative risk predictors that may be identified in the future. The continuous NRI was 96.4% (z = 6.89, p < 0.000001).

**Discussion**

**Predictive value of NP.** This meta-analysis shows that among patients undergoing vascular surgery, elevated NPs were independently predictive of MACEs at 30 days in patients undergoing vascular surgery and that the addition of BNP to the widely used RCRI risk stratification system significantly improves risk discrimination in a large proportion of these patients.

This finding supports previous evidence of the independent significant association between pre-operative BNP concentrations and the occurrence of cardiovascular events after vascular surgery (18). The validity of this association between NP and MACEs was supported by evidence of a biological gradient, with increasing concentrations of NP being associated with an increase in the risk for MACEs.

As an individual patient data meta-analysis, this study enabled us to determine cutoff values for pre-operative BNP, thereby overcoming the limitations of previous meta-analyses (18,22,23). Previous studies have focused on the identification of a single optimal discrimination cut point with which to direct patient management. Although this single value is appealing, it may be more logical to make use of a categorical classification system. When used as a continuous variable to predict MACEs, BNP has an AUC of 80.5% which falls to 74.1% when the single optimal cutoff point is used.

We propose that a categorical classification system based on BNP cutoff points reflecting the clinical goals of screening and general optimal and diagnostic testing (24) be investigated for use in pre-operative risk stratification. The use of a categorical system would allow the maximization of sensitivity within the lower risk groups while maximizing specificity in the higher risk groups (35), while maintaining a high degree of diagnostic accuracy. Future studies should not focus on the identification of a single cutoff point alone.
Further work to define these cutoff points for NT-proBNP is required.

**Risk stratification in vascular surgery.** Previously, the RCRI has shown only modest performance in predicting perioperative cardiac events in vascular surgery (36). Similarly, this study has shown similar performance of the RCRI in predicting both MACEs (AUC: 61.6%; 95% CI: 54.6% to 68.6%) and all-cause mortality (AUC: 65.8%; 95% CI: 55.7% to 75.9%) in patients undergoing vascular surgery. This is probably due to the RCRI’s having been derived from a population of predominantly noncardiac nonvascular surgery patients. In fact, in the original study in which the RCRI was derived, the index did not perform well in patients undergoing abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery (AUC: 54.3 ± 9.2%) (6).

The addition of pre-operative NP concentration to the RCRI risk stratification resulted in the correct reclassification of 58% of patients. A correct reclassification occurs when a patient who had an event moves up into a higher risk category once restratified with NP concentration, or a patient who did not have an event is moved down a risk category. These results suggest that in patients risk stratified with the RCRI, the optimal BNP cutoff point should be used to reclassify patients, thereby obtaining a more accurate risk assessment. This would improve not only risk assessment accuracy but also the identification of high-risk patients who may benefit from further noninvasive testing. Further work should be undertaken to determine whether the RCRI improves pre-operative risk stratification in patients primarily risk stratified using NPs and to examine the role of the individual RCRI factors together with NPs in improving pre-operative risk stratification. The findings of this meta-analysis, together with the other studies in this area (36), raise concerns regarding the use of the RCRI in isolation in vascular surgery populations as proposed by the American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association algorithm.

**Study limitations.** First, individual patient data could not be obtained for all studies that the search strategy retrieved. In particular, the available datasets that measured NT-proBNP were under-represented; as such, we chose to limit the calculation of screening and diagnostic cutoff points to the BNP dataset only. Second, 3 different BNP assay methods were used in the studies included in this analysis (Table 2), with a lack of standardization between assays. The degree of imprecision is 3.5% to 4.4% for the ADVIA system (Bayer Diagnostics, Leverkusen, Germany), 5.5% for the AxSYM system (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, Illinois), and 8% for the Shionogi system (Shionogi & Company, Ltd., Osaka, Japan) (37–39) The ADVIA and Shionogi systems recognize similar BNP epitopes that differ from those identified by the AxSYM system. As a result, when compared with the AxSYM system, the ADVIA system on average results in lower BNP values (38). However, all 3 BNP assays make use of a cut point of 100 pg/ml (39), and the degree of imprecision around this shared cut point is consistently acceptable (37–39).

Third, the I² statistic of 70.1% indicates significant heterogeneity in the unadjusted OR between the studies. The incidence of MACEs is significantly different between the NP study groups but correlated with the degree of disease burden, as indicated by those patients with scores of 3 or more on the RCRI (Pearson’s correlation p = 0.01). It would seem that as the event rate within the surgical population increases, so does the predictive value of NP concentration.

**Conclusions**

Pre-operative NP levels are able to independently predict MACEs (OR: 7.9; 95% CI: 4.7 to 13.3), cardiac death (OR: 4.3; 95% CI: 1.7 to 11.3), and nonfatal MI (OR: 7.5; 95% CI: 4.1 to 13.6) in the first 30 days after vascular surgery. The cutoff points for pre-operative BNP when used as a screening, optimal general, and diagnostic test for MACEs in a vascular surgical population are 30, 116, and 372 pg/ml, respectively. Pre-operative NP levels are able to significantly improve on the predictive performance of the RCRI; their inclusion in existing pre-operative evaluation algorithms should be considered, and the role of the RCRI in vascular surgery should be reviewed.
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