A 10-year prognostic model for patients with suspected angina attending a chest pain clinic

**Authors**

Neha Sekhri PhD1,

Pablo Perel PhD2,

Tim Clayton MSc2,

Gene S Feder BSc3,

Harry Hemingway FRCP4,

Adam Timmis FRCP4,5

Authors’ Institutional Affiliations:

1. Department of Cardiology, Barts Heart Centre, London, UK

2. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

3 Centre for Academic Primary Care, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, UK

4. Farr Institute of Health Informatics Research at London, London, UK; Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

5. NIHR Cardiovascular Biomedical Research Unit, Bart’s Heart Centre, London, UK

Corresponding Author;

Prof Adam Timmis, NIHR Cardiovascular Biomedical Research Unit, Barts Heart Centre, West Smithfield, London EC1A 7BE (email: [a.d.timmis@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:a.d.timmis@qmul.ac.uk) )

Word Count: 3099

"The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in HEART editions and any other BMJPGL products to exploit all subsidiary rights"

**Abstract**

*Background and Objective* Diagnostic models used in the management of suspected angina provide no explicit information about prognosis. We present a new prognostic model of 10-year coronary mortality in patients presenting for the first time with suspected angina to complement the Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model of disease probability.

*Methods and Results* A multicentre cohort of 8762 patients with suspected angina was followed up for a median of 10 years during which 233 coronary deaths were observed. Developmental (n=4412) and validation (n=4350) prognostic models based on clinical data available at first presentation showed good performance with close agreement and the final model utilised all 8762 patients to maximize power. The prognostic model showed strong associations with coronary mortality for age, sex, chest pain typicality, smoking status, diabetes, pulse rate and ECG findings. Model discrimination was good (C statistic 0.83), patients in the highest risk quarter accounting for 173 coronary deaths (10 year risk of death: 8.7%) compared with a total of 60 deaths in the three lower risk quarters. When the model was simplified to incorporate only Diamond-Forrester factors (age, sex and character of symptoms) it under-estimated coronary mortality risk, particularly in patients with reversible risk factors.

*Conclusion* For the first time in patients with suspected angina, a prognostic model is presented based on simple clinical factors available at the initial cardiological assessment. The model discriminated powerfully between patients at high risk and lower risk of coronary death during 10-year follow-up. Clinical utility was reflected in the prognostic value it added to the updated Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model of disease probability.

Words: 310

**What is already known about this subject?**

* In patients with suspected angina, diagnostic models of disease probability lie at the heart of contemporary management guidelines
* These diagnostic models provide no explicit information about prognosis
* There are no prognostic models available in this patient population

**What does this study add?**

* An internally validated prognostic model is presented for patients presenting for the first time with suspected angina
* The model was developed using clinical factors routinely available at the initial cardiac assessment
* The model discriminated powerfully between patients at high risk and at lower risk of coronary mortality during the 10-year follow-up period

**How might this impact on clinical practice?**

* The prognostic model provides clinicians with the potential to identify those high-risk patients with suspected angina who fall through the diagnostic net
* Clinical impact is reflected in the prognostic value the model adds to estimates of disease probability.
* To exploit clinical utility a user-friendly online prognosis in suspected angina (PISA) calculator is provided to inform clinical decision-making in the consulting room.

**Introduction**

In the patient with stable chest pain, the diagnosis of coronary artery disease (CAD) is a probability judgement based on clinical presentation and disease prevalence in the population group to which the patient belongs. Quantitative analysis of disease probability was provided by Diamond and Forrester based on patient age, gender and typicality of symptoms (1). The Diamond-Forrester estimate of disease probability, its recent update (2) and its modification in the Duke clinical score (3) lie at the heart of contemporary guidelines for management of patients with suspected angina (4-6). However, these diagnostic models provide no explicit information about prognosis and many patients diagnosed with atypical or non-cardiac chest pain based on low estimates of disease probability experience coronary events during follow-up (7). The importance of prognostic assessment is emphasised in stable coronary disease guidelines (5,8) but prognostic models have not previously been developed in patients with suspected angina among whom outcomes are likely to vary considerably according to the presence and severity of coronary artery disease. A prognostic model to identify those high-risk patients who fall through the diagnostic net would provide an opportunity for treatment to protect against myocardial infarction and coronary death (9).

In the present study we have examined associations between clinical variables available at first consultation and 10-year coronary mortality in a large cohort of patients presenting for cardiac assessment of previously undiagnosed chest pain. The main aim was to develop a new prognostic model of the 10-year coronary mortality risk in patients with suspected angina to complement the Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model of disease probability in their work-up and further management.

**Methods**

*Patients* The patient population has been previously described (7). In brief, we included consecutive patients attending six UK chest pain clinics (Newham, Oldchurch, Kingston, Blackburn, Manchester, Burnley). The purpose of the clinics was to identify patients with angina to initiate appropriate treatment, including secondary prevention with aspirin and statins. Data on 11082 patients were electronically recorded from 2 January 1996 to 31 December 2002 using identical databases, details of which have been reported previously (10). We excluded re-attendances during the study period (n = 448), patients without chest pain (n = 291), patients diagnosed with acute coronary syndromes on the day of visit (n = 246), patients who reported previously diagnosed coronary heart disease or revascularisation procedures (n = 579), patients for whom a diagnosis was either not entered (n = 132) or not identified as angina or non-cardiac chest pain (n = 83), those with missing data on key explanatory variables (n=501) and those who were not traced by the national death registry (n = 40) (11). The remaining 8762 patients with complete data and follow-up constituted the study group.

*Data collection* Clinical data were systematically recorded at the time of the initial consultation in a purpose-built electronic database that was utilised across the six study centres. The data included age, sex, ethnicity, clinical descriptors of chest pain (duration of symptoms before attendance, character, site and radiation of chest pain, duration of an episode, precipitating factors and relief with glyceryl trinitrate), smoking status, history of hypertension and diabetes, pulse rate and systolic blood pressure. Twelve-lead resting electrocardiograms (ECGs) were recorded as normal or abnormal, respectively, depending on assessment of rhythm, conduction, and the absence or presence of regional ST segment or T wave changes, left-ventricular hypertrophy and Q waves. Fields for all these clinical and ECG findings were included in the database and were populated by the attending clinicians during consultation in the chest pain clinic. Clinicians were also invited to enter into the electronic record their assessment of the patient’s chest pain as being “typical”, “atypical” or “non-anginal”.

*Follow-up* Patients were flagged for mortality with the Office for National Statistics (to 31st December 2011) (11). Successful matching was achieved in 99.5% of the cohort. Causes of death were defined by the World Health Organization *International Classification of Diseases* (ICD10 codes). Information about non-fatal events was unavailable because flagging of our patients with the NHS-wide clearing system had terminated in 2003.

*Main outcome measures*The primary end point was death due to coronary heart disease (ICD10 I20–I25). The secondary end point was cardiovascular death (ICD10 I00–I99)

*Bias* Bias in patient selection and data collection was minimised by including consecutive patients attending for the first time with suspected angina and by utilising a standardised electronic database across all study centres. Bias due to the variable demographic characteristics of the clinic populations was minimised by including a mixture of urban and suburban centres in this multicentre study.

*Ethical approval* Ethical approval was obtained from the multiregional ethics committee (MREC/02/04/095). Permission was given by the National Patient Information Advisory Group to link anonymised datasets without individual patient consent (12).

*Statistical analysis*

To derive the new prognostic model to predict coronary death we initially used data from the Newham centre (n=4412) as the development dataset because it comprised approximately . half of all patients enrolled. Validation was assessed with data from the other five centres (n=4350) by applying the coefficients of the model from the development dataset to the validation dataset. Overall rates and rates by categories of the candidate predictors were calculated. For all variables of interest data were complete or in two cases >99% complete (Table 1). Cox proportional hazard models (complete case analysis) were used to estimate the univariable and multivariable associations of the predictor variables with coronary death, . Candidate variables included demographics, cardiovascular disease risk factors, chest pain characteristics and ECG findings. We included these variables because they have been reported as predictors in previous prognostic models in related populations. (13-15) Predictor variables independently associated with coronary disease mortality were identified using a manual forward stepwise approach rather than an automated stepwise procedure to allow for clinical judgement and for variables not at first meeting the criterion for inclusion in the final multivariate model to be later re-considered. Smoking, for example, was forced into the final model based on its well-established association with coronary mortality. There are several measures to assess characteristics of chest pain. It was decided a priori that the symptoms of chest pain (typical, atypical or non-cardiac chest pain) should be the assessment included as it is easily measured without the need for further diagnosis and is the measure included in previous scores. The linear relationship of quantitative variables was considered and grouped into appropriate categories where necessary or for ease of interpretation. The risk of dying within 10 years from a coronary cause was calculated for each individual using Kaplan-Meier estimates to allow that a number of individuals had less than 10 years of follow-up (but more than nine years). Individuals were then divided into fourths of risk based on the quartile cutpoints so that there were 25% of patients in each risk group. The Kaplan-Meier survival curves were then plotted for each of these groups.

Agreement was very good between the development and validation datasets indicating that any bias consequent on single site (Newham) model development was minimal. In addition, a separate model was produced in the validation dataset using the variables identified in the development dataset. There was close similarity in the associations of predictor variables with coronary disease mortality in the two models, and therefore in order to maximise power and the precision of the estimates, the prognostic model was finalised using all 8762 individuals. The performance of the model was assessed in terms of calibration and discrimination. Calibration was assessed graphically by plotting the observed outcomes compared with the predicted probabilities (by quartiles of risk) and using the Hosmer–Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test. Discrimination was estimated by calculating the area under the receiver operating curve (c-statistic).

Risk estimates of coronary artery disease were calculated according to the updated Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model proposed by Genders, (2). The predicted risk of CAD was then tabulated by the observed mortality to see how well previously published models for CAD risk predicted actual 10 year mortality due to coronary heart disease. Additional analyses also tabulated predicted CAD risk by all-cause mortality and cardiovascular mortality.

*Model presentation – online risk calculator* A prognosis in suspected angina (PISA) calculator utilizing our model coefficients is available at <https://www.sealedenvelope.com/trials/pisa/> allowing the estimated 10-year risks of coronary and cardiovascular mortality to be obtained for individual patients at the time of consultation (figure 1). By entering the predictor values the PISA mortality estimates are displayed and also the updated Diamond-Forrester estimates of disease probability (2).

*Role of funders.* Study funders acknowledged below played no role in the data collection, or its analysis and interpretation.

**Results**

The 8762 patients were followed up for a median of 10 years (minimum 9 years). 233 coronary deaths were recorded, representing a rate of 2.9 deaths per 1000 patient years. Patients in the highest quarter of risk were older and more commonly male compared with patients in the lower risk quarters (table S1). The frequency of diabetes and typical angina symptoms increased across quarters of risk.

*Model development and validation* The model produced in the development dataset (table S2) and its external validation in the validation dataset (table S3) both showed good discrimination (c=0.84 and 0.82, respectively), and good calibration (figure S1). Because external validation was good and multivariate associations with coronary death were similar in both the developmental and validation datasets (tables S2 and S3), the final prognostic model was developed among all 8762 patients to maximise power. The final model, based on clinical factors available at the first presentation, showed strong associations with coronary disease mortality for age, sex, chest pain typicality, smoking status, diabetes, pulse rate and ECG findings. (tables 1 and 2) Discrimination (c=0.83) and calibration (table 2 figure S2) were strong, patients in the highest quarter of risk accounting for 173 coronary deaths during follow-up compared with a total of 41, 14 and 5 deaths, respectively, in the lower risk quarters. Kaplan-Meier analysis confirmed wide and increasing separation of the survival curves for the highest risk quarter compared to the three lower risk quarters throughout the 10-year follow-up period (figure 2). Entry of the seven predictor variables into the on-line prognosis in stable angina (PISA) risk calculator at https://www.sealedenvelope.com/trials/pisa/ permits display of an individual patient’s risk estimates of coronary and cardiovascular mortality and also the Diamond-Forrester diagnostic estimates of disease probability. (figure 1).

*Added value of PISA model* Observed 10-year coronary mortality increased progressively with updated Diamond-Forrester estimates of disease probability ranging from 0.2% to 25.4% in groups with probability estimates of coronary disease <10% and >90%, respectively (table 3). Only in groups with a disease probability >30% was the 10-year coronary mortality >1%, representing an annualised mortality rate of only 0.1% Similar patterns of increasing cardiovascular and all-cause mortality were observed as the predicted risk of coronary disease increased. However, when the PISA model was simplified to incorporate only those factors used in the updated Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model (age, sex and character of symptoms), it caused it to under-estimate the predicted coronary mortality risk compared with the full PISA model, particularly in patients with reversible risk factors (tables S4, S5). For example, if the predictor variables are entered into the PISA on-line risk calculator for a 68 year old man with atypical chest pain and diabetes who is a non-smoker with a heart rate of 80 beats/minute and an abnormal ECG, the read-out for estimated 10-year coronary mortality is 14%, with a 62% probability of obstructive coronary disease (figure 1). If the simplified model is applied in the same patient, restricted to those factors used in the updated Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model (age, sex, character of symptoms), the coronary mortality risk is substantially under-estimated at only 5%.

**Discussion**

We have analysed long-term outcomes in 8762 patients presenting for the first time with suspected angina. A prognostic model is presented based on clinical factors routinely available at the initial cardiac assessment. The model discriminated powerfully between patients at high risk and at lower risk of coronary mortality during the 10-year follow-up period. Its potential clinical utility was reflected in the prognostic value it added to the updated Diamond-Forrester estimates of disease probability (2). To exploit clinical utility we have developed a user-friendly online prognosis in suspected angina (PISA) calculator that can be used in the consulting room to inform clinical decision-making.

International guidelines emphasise the importance of the clinical history in evaluating the patient with stable chest pain (4-6). However, while diagnostic models are widely used for assessing the probability of coronary disease, the only available prognostic models are those developed in populations with established disease (13-15). These are high-risk populations of little relevance to patients presenting for the first time with suspected angina, only a minority of whom have obstructive coronary artery disease to account for their symptoms (16,17). Overall risk in such patients is low, the recent Scot-Heart trial, which recruited 9849 patients with suspected angina, reporting an estimated cardiovascular mortality of only 0.3% during a median 1.7 years of follow-up (17). Risk, however, is spread more widely than among patients with established coronary disease and discrimination of the high risk minority from the lower risk majority, many of whom will have unobstructed coronary arteries is central to clinical evaluation and management strategies. Guidelines recommend risk assessment based on the results of non-invasive tests (4-6) even though the incremental value of such tests may be limited, the exercise ECG, for example, adding little to the diagnostic or prognostic information provided by the clinical assessment (16,18). This has provoked calls for more effective methods of risk stratification in this group of patients in order that high-risk subgroups might be identified for more intensive investigation and treatment. (19)

The prognostic model developed in our study provides a ready means of risk-stratifying patients with suspected angina, being based on factors that are always available at the first clinical evaluation in the consulting room. Consideration of just seven factors - age, sex, typicality of symptoms, diabetes, smoking status, heart rate, ECG changes - permitted estimation of 10-year coronary mortality with excellent discrimination between patients in the highest and the lower risk quarters, as reflected in the 0.83 C statistic. The highest risk quarter accounted for >75% of coronary deaths during follow-up, the Kaplan-Meier estimate of 10-year mortality being close to 9% compared to <1% in the lowest risk quarter. The risk factors incorporated in the PISA model are well recognised but in the present study their influence on coronary mortality in a chest pain clinic population has been quantified for the first time with the development of a desk-top PISA calculator for use in the clinical setting. Discrimination between high and low risk patients provided by the prognostic model identifies it as a potentially important clinical tool for selecting those patients with suspected angina who might benefit from more intensive investigation and treatment. Importantly, our data showed that prognosis inferred from the factors included in the updated Diamond-Forrester diagnostic model under-estimated coronary mortality, particularly in patients with risk factors such as diabetes for whom chest pain presentations may be atypical, masking significant coronary mortality risk (20).

Guidelines recommend that decisions about the further investigation of patients with suspected angina should be informed by probability estimates of coronary artery disease (4-6) but these estimates are often exaggerated in contemporary populations and updated models have been developed that have already penetrated international guidelines (2,21). These updated models, however, like their predecessors, were developed in angiographic populations and it remains likely that they over-estimate disease probability in the lower risk populations presenting for the first time with suspected angina. Thus, we found that only in groups with a Diamond-Forrester estimate of disease probability >30% was the observed 10-year coronary mortality >1%, representing an annualised mortality rate of only 0.1%. Even groups with an estimated probability of coronary disease 60-90% (mean 74%) had an annualised coronary mortality rate of only 0.7%. This apparent mismatch between disease risk and mortality risk emphasises the importance of considering both diagnostic and prognostic indicators in patients with suspected angina in order that those at greatest risk might be identified.

The PISA web-based tool we developed has the potential to enhance the clinical assessment of patients with suspected angina by providing quantitative estimates of both disease probability, using the updated diagnostic model of Genders et al, and coronary and cardiovascular mortality using the prognostic model developed in our chest pain clinic population. The prognostic model, was designed to identify high risk patients presenting for the first time with stable chest pain and only those demographic and clinical factors consistently available at the first consultation were considered. Not considered, therefore, were factors that might later become available including the results of investigations such as non-invasive ischaemia tests and circulating lipid concentrations. For the same reason, treatment strategies adopted during the ten years of follow-up were also not considered. Despite this model performance was excellent based on just seven predictor variables which when entered into the PISA web-based tool provide a reliable estimate of 10 year coronary and cardiovascular mortality risk in patients with suspected angina. Use of the full model with entry of all seven predictor variables is important because prognostic assessment based simply on age, sex, and character of symptoms – the factors that populate the Diamond-Forrester model for estimating disease probability – takes no account of contributions made by risk factors, heart rate and ECG findings resulting in variable under-estimation of mortality risk. Because data were collected across 6 different UK centres, the PISA risk estimates are likely to be generalizable but further validation studies will be needed to confirm this.

Strengths of our study include the large multicentre patient population, the contemporaneous recording of chest pain characteristics and other clinical factors available at first consultation in a purpose built electronic registry and the ascertainment of long-term cause-specific mortality through linkage with the UK national death registry. It was our main purpose to develop a prognostic model for utilisation at the first clinic attendance before instigation of further testing or specific treatments. Nevertheless, the potential for treatment and life-style changes to distort the risk prediction is a relevant consideration and emphasises the importance of measuring model discrimination over a prolonged period and validating the model in different populations. The fact that the model discriminated powerfully between risk groups during 10 years of follow-up with comparable validity in 2 separate chest pain clinic populations speaks to its utility independently of subsequent treatment and life-style change. Completion of the baseline data collection 12 years ago is a limitation but allowed collection of the follow-up data and development of the long-term prognostic model that was the primary aim of this study. Other potential limitations relating to bias in patient selection, data recording, and catchment population characteristics were minimised by including consecutive patients with suspected angina, utilising a standardised database across study centres and recruiting from six different study centres in urban and suburban environments.

The broad spectrum of risk that characterises patients presenting with suspected angina challenges clinicians to identify the minority at high risk of coronary events. This can be achieved using the prognostic model and PISA on-line calculator developed in our study. The model is based on simple clinical factors available at the initial consultation and has the potential to complement diagnostic models of disease probability in identifying high-risk patients with suspected angina who merit more intensive investigation and treatment.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the MRC PROGnosis RESearch Strategy (PROGRESS) Partnership ([www.progress-partnership.org](http://www.progress-partnership.org)), which is supported by a Medical Research Council Partnership Grant (G0902393) involving University College London (HH), London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (PP), and Queen Mary University London (AT). Funding was also received from the National Health Service (NHS) Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) research and development programme. AT acknowledges support of Bart’s Cardiovascular Biomedical Research Unit, funded by the National Institute for Health Research.

**References**

1. Diamond GA, Forrester JS. Analysis of probability as an aid in the clinical diagnosis of coronary-artery disease. N Engl J Med 1979;300:1350–1358.

2. Genders TS, Steyerberg EW, Alkadhi H, Leschka S, Desbiolles L, Nieman K, Galema TW, Meijboom WB, Mollet NR, de Feyter PJ, Cademartiri F, Maffei E, Dewey M, Zimmermann E, Laule M, Pugliese F, Barbagallo R, Sinitsyn V, Bogaert J, Goetschalckx K, Schoepf UJ, Rowe GW, Schuijf JD, Bax JJ, de Graaf FR, Knuuti J, Kajander S, van Mieghem CA, Meijs MF, Cramer MJ, Gopalan D, Feuchtner G, Friedrich G, Krestin GP, Hunink MG; CAD Consortium. A clinical prediction rule for the diagnosis of coronary artery disease: validation, updating, and extension. Eur Heart J. 2011;32(11):1316-30.

3. Pryor DB, Shaw L, McCants CB, Lee KL, Mark DB, Harrell FE Jr, Muhlbaier LH, Califf RM. Value of the history and physical in identifying patients at increased risk for coronary artery disease. Ann Intern Med. 1993 Jan 15;118(2):81-90.

4. Timmis A, SkinnerJ, Adams P, Ashcroft J, Clark L, Coulden R, Hemingway H, James C, Jarman H, Kendell J, Lewis P, Patel K, Smeeth L, Taylor J, Turnbull N, Cooper A, Sparrow K, Calvert N, Sawyer L, Hill D, Cotterell M. Chest pan of recent onset: Assessment and diagnosis of recent onset chest pain or discomfort of suspected cardiac origin. NICE guidelines [CG95] 2010.

https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg95/resources/guidance-chest-pain-of-recent-onset

5. Task Force Members, Montalescot G, Sechtem U, Achenbach S, Andreotti F, Arden C, Budaj A, Bugiardini R, Crea F, Cuisset T, Di Mario C, Ferreira JR, Gersh BJ, Gitt AK, Hulot JS, Marx N, Opie LH, Pfisterer M, Prescott E, Ruschitzka F, Sabaté M, Senior R, Taggart DP, van der Wall EE, Vrints CJ; ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines (CPG), Zamorano JL, Achenbach S, Baumgartner H, Bax JJ, Bueno H, Dean V, Deaton C, Erol C, Fagard R, Ferrari R, Hasdai D, Hoes AW, Kirchhof P, Knuuti J, Kolh P, Lancellotti P, Linhart A, Nihoyannopoulos P, Piepoli MF, Ponikowski P, Sirnes PA, Tamargo JL, Tendera M, Torbicki A, Wijns W, Windecker S; Document Reviewers, Knuuti J, Valgimigli M, Bueno H, Claeys MJ, Donner-Banzhoff N, Erol C, Frank H, Funck-Brentano C, Gaemperli O, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, Hamilos M, Hasdai D, Husted S, James SK, Kervinen K, Kolh P, Kristensen SD, Lancellotti P, Maggioni AP, Piepoli MF, Pries AR, Romeo F, Rydén L, Simoons ML, Sirnes PA, Steg PG, Timmis A, Wijns W, Windecker S, Yildirir A, Zamorano JL. 2013 ESC guidelines on the management of stable coronary artery disease: The Task Force on the management of stable coronary artery disease of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur Heart J. 2013; 34(38):2949-3003

6. Fihn SD, Gardin JM, Abrams J, Berra K, Blankenship JC, Dallas AP, Douglas PS, Foody JM, Gerber TC, Hinderliter AL, King SB 3rd, Kligfield PD, Krumholz HM, Kwong RY, Lim MJ, Linderbaum JA, Mack MJ, Munger MA, Prager RL, Sabik JF, Shaw LJ, Sikkema JD, Smith CR Jr, Smith SC Jr, Spertus JA, Williams SV; American College of Cardiology Foundation; American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; American College of Physicians; American Association for Thoracic Surgery; Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association; Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions; Society of Thoracic Surgeons. 2012 ACCF/AHA/ACP/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS Guideline for the diagnosis and management of patients with stable ischemic heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines, and the American College of Physicians, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2012 Dec 18;60(24):e44-e164.

7. Sekhri N, Feder G, Junghans C, Hemingway H, Timmis AD. How effective are rapid access chest pain clinics? Prognosis of incident angina and non-cardiac chest pain in 8762 consecutive patients. Heart 2007; 93: 458-63

8. Timmis A, Henderson R, Antoniou S, Blauth C, Clark L, Fox K, Jacob L, MacDermott A, O’Leary H, Peebles C, Pye M, Shribman J, Till R. Management of stable angina. NICE guidelines [CG126] 2011

https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg126

9. Croft P, Altman DG, Deeks JJ, Dunn KM, Hay AD, Hemingway H, LeResche L, Peat G, Perel P, Petersen SE, Riley RD, Roberts I, Sharpe M, Stevens RJ, Van Der Windt DA, Von Korff M, Timmis A. The science of clinical practice: disease diagnosis or patient prognosis? Evidence about "what is likely to happen" should shape clinical practice. BMC Med. 2015 Jan 30;13(1):20.

10. Ray S, Archbold RA, Preston S, et al. Computer-generated correspondence for patients attending an open-access chest pain clinic. J R Coll Physicians Lond1998;32:420–1.

11. Office for National Statistics. A brief history of the ONS. http://www.bized.ac.uk/dataserv/ons/onshistory.htm

12. Anon. Patient Information Advisory Group. http://www.advisorybodies.doh.gov.uk/piag/

13. Clayton TC, Lubsen J, Pocock SJ, Voko Z, Kirwan BA, Fox KA, Poole-Wilson PA. Risk score for predicting death, myocardial infarction, and stroke in patients with stable angina, based on a large randomised trial cohort of patients. *BMJ* 2005;**331**:869.

14. Daly CA, De Stavola B, Sendon JL, Tavazzi L, Boersma E, Clemens F, Danchin N, Delahaye F, Gitt A, Julian D, Mulcahy D, Ruzyllo W, Thygesen K, Verheugt F, Fox KM. Predicting prognosis in stable angina—results from the Euro heart survey of stable angina: prospective observational study. *BMJ* 2006;**332**:262-267.

15. Rapsomaniki E, Shah A, Perel P, Denaxas S, George J, Nicholas O, Udumyan R, Feder GS, Hingorani AD, Timmis A, Smeeth L, Hemingway H. Prognostic models for stable coronary artery disease based on electronic health record cohort of 102 023 patients. *Eur Heart J. 2014;35:844-52.*

16. Genders TS, Steyerberg EW, Hunink MG, Nieman K, Galema TW, Mollet NR, de Feyter PJ, Krestin GP, Alkadhi H, Leschka S, Desbiolles L, Meijs MF, Cramer MJ, Knuuti J, Kajander S, Bogaert J, Goetschalckx K, Cademartiri F, Maffei E, Martini C, Seitun S, Aldrovandi A, Wildermuth S, Stinn B, Fornaro J, Feuchtner G, De Zordo T, Auer T, Plank F, Friedrich G, Pugliese F, Petersen SE, Davies LC, Schoepf UJ, Rowe GW, van Mieghem CA, van Driessche L, Sinitsyn V, Gopalan D, Nikolaou K, Bamberg F, Cury RC, Battle J, Maurovich-Horvat P, Bartykowszki A, Merkely B, Becker D, Hadamitzky M, Hausleiter J, Dewey M, Zimmermann E, Laule M. Prediction model to estimate presence of coronary artery disease: retrospective pooled analysis of existing cohorts. BMJ. 2012 Jun 12;344:e3485.

17. SCOT-HEART investigators. CT coronary angiography in patients with suspected angina due to coronary heart disease (SCOT-HEART): an open-label, parallel-group, multicentre trial. Lancet. 2015 Jun 13;385(9985):2383-91.

18. Sekhri N, Feder G, Junghans C, Eldridge S, Umaipalan A, Madhu R, Hemingway H, Timmis AD. Incremental prognostic value of the exercise electrocardiogram in the initial assessment of patients with suspected angina: cohort study. BMJ. 2008;337:a2240.

19. Skinner JS, Smeeth L, Kendall JM, Adams PC, Timmis A; Chest Pain Guideline Development Group. NICE guidance. Chest pain of recent onset: assessment and diagnosis of recent onset chest pain or discomfort of suspected cardiac origin. Heart. 2010 Jun;96(12):974-8.

# 20. Junghans C, Sekhri N, Zaman MJ, Hemingway H, Feder GS, Timmis AD. Atypical chest pain in diabetic patients with suspected stable angina: impact on diagnosis and coronary outcomes. Eur Heart J: Qual Care Clin Outcomes 2015;1: 37-43.

LEGENDS FOR FIGURES

**Figure 1.** Diagrammatic screen shot of on-line PISA calculator for predicting the risks of coronary and cardiovascular mortality and the probability of obstructive coronary artery disease in patients with previously undiagnosed stable chest pain.

**Figure 2.** Kaplan-Meier cumulative coronary mortality by quarters of risk for the full prognostic model (based on Table 2). There were 5, 14, 41 and 173 coronary deaths in risk groups 1 (lowest risk quarter) to 4 (highest risk quarter), respectively.

**Supplementary Figure S1.** Observed vs predicted percentage of 10 year coronary death by quarter of risk – NGH patients (based on model in table S1)

**Supplementary Figure S2** Observed vs predicted percentage of 10 year coronary death by quarter of risk in all patients.

Table 1 Univariable associations with coronary death – all patients

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Total Deaths Rate\* HR (95% CI) P-value

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

All patients 8762 233 2.9

..........................................................................................

Age (per 10yr) 8762 233 2.46 (2.19-2.76) <0.0001

Age group

<50 3341 22 0.68 1

50-<55 1151 17 1.54 2.27 (1.20-4.27) 0.011

55-<60 1163 21 1.92 2.82 (1.55-5.12) 0.0007

60-<65 1040 30 3.13 4.58 (2.64-7.94) <0.0001

65-<70 881 29 3.66 5.33 (3.06-9.28) <0.0001

70-<75 645 46 8.24 11.94 (7.19-19.85) <0.0001

75-<80 356 35 12.63 18.05 (10.59-30.77) <0.0001

80+ 185 33 26.12 36.65 (21.35-62.91) <0.0001

Sex

Female 4168 80 2.04 1

Male 4594 153 3.61 1.76 (1.34-2.31) <0.0001

Ethnicity

Other 2977 46 1.61 1

White 5785 187 3.54 2.18 (1.58-3.00) <0.0001

Pulse rate (per 10 beats/min) 8762 233 1.21 (1.10-1.33) 0.0001

SBP (10mmHg) 8762 233 1.20 (1.13-1.27) <0.0001

DBP (10mmHg) 8711 231 1.15 (1.03-1.29) 0.014

Current smoker

No 6667 174 2.80 1

Yes 2095 59 3.06 1.09 (0.81-1.47) 0.55

Hypertension

No 5717 118 2.20 1

Yes 3045 115 4.14 1.87 (1.45-2.42) <0.0001

Diabetes (y/n)

No 7844 178 2.43 1

Yes 918 55 6.63 2.71 (2.00-3.67) <0.0001

Family history of CAD

No 5851 161 2.98 1

Yes 2880 70 2.58 0.87 (0.66-1.15) 0.33

Character symptoms

Atypical 5079 93 1.95 1

Typical 2002 115 6.44 3.28 (2.50-4.31) <0.0001

Non-cardiac 1681 25 1.58 0.81 (0.52-1.26) 0.35

ECG normal

Normal 7291 128 1.86 1

Abnormal 1471 105 8.24 4.37 (3.38-5.66) <0.0001

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\* per 1000 person-years

Table 2 Multivariable predictors of coronary death (n=8762, 233 coronary deaths)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Variable HR (95% CI)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Age (per 10yr) 2.33 (2.05, 2.65) p<0.0001

Sex

Female 1 p<0.0001

Male 1.91 (1.45, 2.52)

Character symptoms

Atypical 1 0.0043

Typical 1.59 (1.20, 2.12)

Non-cardiac 1.05 (0.67, 1.63)

Pulse rate (per 10 beats/min) 1.22 (1.13, 1.33) p<0.0001

Current smoker

No 1 0.0016

Yes 1.64 (1.21, 2.23)

Diabetes (y/n)

No 1 p<0.0001

Yes 1.99 (1.46, 2.70)

ECG normal

Normal 1 p<0.0001

Abnormal 1.96 (1.49, 2.59)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Harrell’s C = 0.83

Adding hospital to the above model (non-NGH vs NGH) HR: 1.01 (95% CI 0.77 to 1.32), p=0.29

Table 3 Observed 10 year mortality by updated Diamond-Forrester estimates of coronary disease probability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predicted risk group of CAD | Total | Mean predicted risk of CAD | Mortality\* | | |
|  |  |  | Coronary | Cardiovascular | All-cause |
| <10% | 537 | 7.1% | 1 (0.2%) | 5 (0.9%) | 12 (2.3%) |
| 10-<30% | 3088 | 19.5% | 23 (0.8%) | 51 (1.7%) | 161 (5.3%) |
| 30-60% | 3296 | 43.5% | 81 (2.6%) | 124 (3.9%) | 312 (9.6%) |
| >60-90% | 1753 | 74.2% | 111 (6.8%) | 156 (9.6%) | 387 (22.5%) |
| >90% | 88 | 91.2% | 17 (25.4%) | 28 (39.1%) | 52 (60.4%) |

\* Percentages from KM estimate at 10 years

Figure 1. On-line PISA calculator (screen shot) for predicting the risks of coronary and cardiovascular mortality and the probability of obstructive coronary artery disease in patients with previously undiagnosed stable chest pain

PISA Model (Prognosis in Suspected Angina)





Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier curve by quarters of risk for coronary mortality by the full prognostic model (based on Table 2) There were 5, 14, 41 and 173 coronary deaths in risk groups 1 (lowest risk quarter) to 4 (highest risk quarter), respectively.



**Supplementary Tables**

Table S1 Characteristics by risk group

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Total Risk group

Group 1 Group 2 Group 3 Group 4

n (%) n (%) n (%) n (%)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

All patients 8762 2190 2191 2190 2191

CHD death

No 8529 2185 (99.8%) 2177 (99.4%) 2149 (98.1%) 2018 (92.1%)

Yes 233 5 (0.2%) 14 (0.6%) 41 (1.9%) 173 (7.9%)

Hospital

NGH 4412 1272 (58.1%) 1154 (52.7%) 1023 (46.7%) 963 (44.0%)

Non-NGH 4350 918 (41.9%) 1037 (47.3%) 1167 (53.3%) 1228 (56.0%)

Age at first visit

Mean (SD) 54.7 (13.0) 39.9 (6.7) 50.5 (6.5) 59.1 (7.1) 69.5 (7.9)

Age group

<50 3341 2045 (93.4%) 1032 (47.1%) 239 (10.9%) 25 (1.1%)

50-<55 1151 131 (6.0%) 582 (26.6%) 381 (17.4%) 57 (2.6%)

55-<60 1163 14 (0.6%) 418 (19.1%) 557 (25.4%) 174 (7.9%)

60-<65 1040 0 (0.0%) 142 (6.5%) 545 (24.9%) 353 (16.1%)

65-<70 881 0 (0.0%) 17 (0.8%) 328 (15.0%) 536 (24.5%)

70-<75 645 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 135 (6.2%) 510 (23.3%)

75-<80 356 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 5 (0.2%) 351 (16.0%)

80+ 185 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 185 (8.4%)

Sex

Female 4168 1277 (58.3%) 1126 (51.4%) 1012 (46.2%) 753 (34.4%)

Male 4594 913 (41.7%) 1065 (48.6%) 1178 (53.8%) 1438 (65.6%)

Character symptoms

Atypical 5079 1399 (63.9%) 1506 (68.7%) 1299 (59.3%) 875 (39.9%)

Typical 2002 67 (3.1%) 266 (12.1%) 576 (26.3%) 1093 (49.9%)

Non-cardiac 1681 724 (33.1%) 419 (19.1%) 315 (14.4%) 223 (10.2%)

Pulse rate (beats/min)

Mean (SD) 76.7 (11.8) 74.8 (10.1) 76.3 (11.2) 76.9 (11.6) 78.8 (13.8)

Current smoker

No 6667 1813 (82.8%) 1622 (74.0%) 1591 (72.6%) 1641 (74.9%)

Yes 2095 377 (17.2%) 569 (26.0%) 599 (27.4%) 550 (25.1%)

Diabetes (y/n)

No 7844 2155 (98.4%) 2046 (93.4%) 1945 (88.8%) 1698 (77.5%)

Yes 918 35 (1.6%) 145 (6.6%) 245 (11.2%) 493 (22.5%)

ECG normal

Normal 7291 2136 (97.5%) 2032 (92.7%) 1863 (85.1%) 1260 (57.5%)

Abnormal 1471 54 (2.5%) 159 (7.3%) 327 (14.9%) 931 (42.5%)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Table S2 Multivariable associations with coronary death – NGH patients (n=4412, 105 coronary deaths)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Variable HR (95% CI)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Age (per 10yr) 2.17 (1.82, 2.60) p<0.0001

Sex

Female 1 0.0004

Male 2.10 (1.39, 3.18)

Character symptoms

Atypical 1 0.12

Typical 1.55 (1.00, 2.41)

Non-cardiac 1.03 (0.59, 1.81)

Pulse rate (per 10 beats/min) 1.19 (1.05, 1.33) 0.0044

Current smoker

No 1 0.081

Yes 1.50 (0.95, 2.35)

Diabetes (y/n)

No 1 0.0023

Yes 1.95 (1.27, 3.01)

ECG normal

Normal 1 0.0005

Abnormal 2.08 (1.37, 3.16)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Harrell’s C = 0.84

Non-NGH patients using above model: Harrell’s C = 0.82

Table S3 Multivariable associations with coronary death – non-NGH patients (n=4350, 128 coronary deaths)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Variable HR (95% CI)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Age (per 10yr) 2.52 (2.09, 3.03) p<0.0001

Sex

Female 1 0.0025

Male 1.78 (1.23, 2.58)

Character symptoms

Atypical 1 0.0286

Typical 1.66 (1.13, 2.43)

Non-cardiac 1.04 (0.49, 2.23)

Pulse rate (per 10 beats/min) 1.28 (1.13, 1.46) 0.0002

Current smoker

No 1 0.0047

Yes 1.85 (1.21, 2.83)

Diabetes (y/n)

No 1 0.0024

Yes 1.99 (1.28, 3.09)

ECG normal

Normal 1 0.0008

Abnormal 1.88 (1.30, 2.73)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Table S4 Simplified prognostic model. Predictors of 10 year cardiac mortality using only factors for calculating the updated Diamond-Forrester estimates of disease probability – all patients

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Variable HR (95% CI)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Age (per 10yr) 2.35 (2.09, 2.65) p<0.0001

Sex

Female 1 p<0.0001

Male 1.94 (1.48, 2.55)

Character symptoms

Non-cardiac 1 p<0.0001

Typical 1.70 (1.10, 2.64)

Atypical 0.93 (0.60, 1.45)

——————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————————

Harrell’s C = 0.80

Global test of proportional hazards assumption, p=0.18

Adding hospital to the above model (non-NGH vs NGH) HR: 0.89 (95% CI 0.68 to 1.15), p=0.37

Table S5.Predicted quarters of risk for 10-year coronary mortality by simplified model and full model in 8762 patients

quarters   quarters(full model)

(summary

model) |     1          2          3          4 |     Total

-----------+--------------------------------------------+----------

         1 |     1,837        330         22          1 |     2,190

         2 |       353      1,417        398         23 |     2,191

         3 |         0        443      1,359        388 |     2,190

         4 |         0          1        411      1,779 |     2,191

-----------+--------------------------------------------+----------

     Total |     2,190      2,191      2,190      2,191 |     8,762

Figure S1: Observed vs predicted percentage of 10 year coronary death by quarter of risk – NGH patients (based on model in table S1)



|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 |
| 3 / 1103 | 4 / 1103 | 17 / 1103 | 81 / 1103 |

Figure S2 Observed vs predicted percentage of 10 year coronary death by quarter of risk in all patients



|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observed vs Expected | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 |
| 5 / 2190 | 14 / 2191 | 41 / 2190 | 173 / 2191 |