

Heart, Lung and Circulation (2017) xx, 1–8
1443-9506/04/\$36.00
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hlc.2017.04.007>

Association of Systemic Inflammation Score With Atrial Fibrillation: A Case-Control Study With Propensity Score Matching

Q1 Huan Zhang, MD ^{a,b,1}, Jun Li, MD ^{c,1}, Xinghua Chen, MD ^{d,1},
Na Wu, MD ^{a,b}, Weijia Xie, PhD ^{a,b}, He Tang, MD ^e, Chengying Li, BS ^{a,b},
Long Wu, MPH ^{a,b}, Ying Xiang, MPH ^{a,b}, Li Zhong, PhD ^{d,2},
Yafei Li, PhD ^{a,b,2*}

Q2 ^aDepartment of Epidemiology, College of Preventive Medicine, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China

^bEvidence-based Medicine and Clinical Epidemiology Center, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China

^cDepartment of Thoracic and Cardiac Surgery, Southwest Hospital, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China

Q3 ^dDepartment of Cardiology, Southwest Hospital, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China

^eInstitute of Toxicology, College of Preventive Medicine, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China

Received 5 January 2017; received in revised form 4 April 2017; accepted 14 April 2017; online published-ahead-of-print xxx

Background

Inflammation plays a key role in the initiation and progression of atrial fibrillation (AF). We developed a novel systemic inflammation score (SIS) based on integration of biomarkers used routinely in clinical settings. We aim to explore the association between SIS and AF.

Methods

A matched case-control study with 376 pairs of AF cases and controls was performed using a propensity score matching system. Systemic inflammation score was developed by integrating albumin (ALB), neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio (NLR), platelet to lymphocyte ratio (PLR), and lymphocytes to monocytes ratio (LMR). Univariate and multivariate analyses were performed to examine the association of each marker and SIS with AF.

Results

The conditional multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that elevated levels of ALB and LMR were significantly associated with decreased risk of AF with an OR of 0.74 (95% CI: 0.65, 0.85) and 0.73 (95% CI: 0.64, 0.83), respectively. Patients with elevated SIS had a significantly higher risk of AF. Compared to the patients with SIS equal to 1, the patients with SIS equal to 3 and 4 had an OR of 2.16 (95% CI: 1.40–3.32), and 2.55 (95% CI: 1.66, 3.92), respectively. Systemic inflammation score was positively correlated with left atrial diameter and right atrial diameter in patients with AF.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study provides further clinical epidemiological evidence that systemic inflammatory status was correlated with AF. The SIS, as an index to evaluate the intensity of systemic inflammatory status, could be useful for early prediction of AF development and understanding of AF mechanism.

Keywords

Atrial fibrillation • Inflammatory factors • SIS • Cardiac structure

Q4 *Corresponding author at: Department of Epidemiology, College of Preventive Medicine, Third Military Medical University, NO. 30 Gaotanyan Street, Chongqing 400038, People's Republic of China. Telephone: +86 23 68752293., Emails: liyafei2008@hotmail.com, liyafei2008@tmmu.edu.cn

¹ These authors contributed equally to this work.

² These authors jointly directed the project.

© 2017 Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Australian and New Zealand Society of Cardiac and Thoracic Surgeons (ANZSCTS) and the Cardiac Society of Australia and New Zealand (CSANZ).

Please cite this article in press as: Zhang H, et al. Association of Systemic Inflammation Score With Atrial Fibrillation: A Case-Control Study With Propensity Score Matching. Heart, Lung and Circulation (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hlc.2017.04.007>

Introduction

Q8 Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common clinically arrhythmic 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 Q9 fibrillation has attracted great interest [4,5].

The systemic inflammation score (SIS) is a systemic inflam- 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113

In this study, a new SIS was developed by integrating 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113

Methods

Study Population

The study design was a matched case-control study. Patients 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126

of peripheral blood routine examination and heart colour 72
 Doppler detection before any treatments. Propensity-score 73
 matching was used to select cases and controls to minimise 74
 potential confounding bias. Atrial fibrillation patients were 75
 matched 1:1 to those without AF. A total of 376 matched pairs 76
 were generated. The study was approved by the Ethics 77
 Committee of the Third Military Medical University and 78
 all patients provided written informed consent to participate. 79

Systemic Inflammation Score

In this study, ALB, NLR, PLR and LMR were combined to 81
 establish the SIS. Owing to no widely accepted cut-point of 82
 these markers, the levels of ALB, NLR, PLR and LMR were 83
 stratified by quartiles. To evaluate the relative importance of 84
 these biomarkers, one traditional evaluation index is logistic 85
 regression coefficient. As the four inflammatory markers 86
 were correlated and might have the problem of multicollin- 87
 earity, the logistic stepwise regression models may have 88
 concealed some significant variables, and may not have been 89
 able to estimate the precise relative weight. Therefore, we 90
 chose relative weight analysis to calculate the relative weight 91
 of these biomarkers [12]. 92

The steps of relative weight analysis are as follows: (1) 93
 create new variables (Z_k) that were the maximally related 94
 orthogonal counterparts of the original variables (X_j); (2) 95
 regress each original variable (X_j) and dependent variable 96
 (Y) on the new set of orthogonal variables (Z_k), λ_{jk} is the 97
 regression weight linking the orthogonal variables (Z_k) to the 98
 original variables (X_j), and β_k is the regression weight linking 99
 the orthogonal variables (Z_k) to the dependent variable (Y); 100
 (3) square the elements of λ_{jk} (i.e., λ_{jk}^2) and β_k (i.e., β_k^2), the 101
 relative weight (ε_j) for the variable (X_j) would be calculated 102
 as: $\varepsilon_j = \lambda_{j1}^2 \beta_1^2 + \lambda_{j2}^2 \beta_2^2 + \dots + \lambda_{jk}^2 \beta_k^2$. Details of relative 103
 weight analysis were described by LeBreton et al. [12,13]. 104

Considering that the relative weights of the four inflam- 105
 matory markers were different, we adjusted the combining 106
 methods for SIS. We multiplied the level of each biomarker 107
 by $\% \varepsilon_j$, and added the product of each biomarker. The sum 108
 of results was then stratified by quartiles. The SIS was estab- 109
 lished according to the quartiles, and the lowest value to 110
 highest value of biomarkers were assigned a score of 1 to 4, 111
 respectively. In this study, SIS ranged from 1 (best) to 4 112
 (worst) for patients. 113

Statistical Analysis

Propensity score matching was performed to select cases and 114
 controls. The propensity score was constructed for each 115
 participant using the following categorical covariates: age, 116
 sex, comorbidities with stroke, hypertension, diabetes mellit- 117
 us, dyslipidaemia, coronary artery disease and cardiomyop- 118
 athy. We conducted propensity score matching using nearest 119
 neighbour matching and no matching samples were 120
 removed. Overall, 376 matched pairs were generated. Rubin 121
 recommends that B (the standardised difference in the means 122
 of the propensity scores) be less than 25 for the samples to be 123
 considered sufficiently balanced, the variance ratio in the 124
 propensity score between the treated and comparison group 125
 126

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8659778>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8659778>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)