Usefulness of the CHADS\textsuperscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} scores for prognostic stratification in patients with coronary artery disease
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Objective: The current risk model for long-term prediction in coronary artery disease (CAD) is complicated, while a simple useful model is still lacking. We aim to investigate if CHADS\textsuperscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} scores could predict long-term outcome for patients with CAD.

Patients and methods: We enrolled 3,700 patients with CAD between November 2010 and September 2014 at the Department of Cardiology from Chinese PLA General Hospital. The CHADS\textsuperscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} scores were calculated. All cases were followed to track the incidence of composite end point consisting of cardiovascular (CV) death, myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, heart failure, and all-cause death.

Results: During a median 2.9-year follow-up, 443 patients experienced at least one element of the composite end point of CV death (n=168 [4.6%]), MI (n=59 [1.6%]), stroke (n=96 [2.6%]), heart failure (n=101 [2.8%]), and all-cause death (n=240 [6.6%]). Multivariate Cox regression analyses showed that the CHADS\textsuperscript{2} score (hazard ratio [HR]: 2.18, 95% CI: 2.00–2.38, p<0.0001) and the R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} score (HR: 1.93, 95% CI: 1.83–2.04, p<0.0001) were independently associated with composite outcome. Receiver-operating characteristic analysis showed that compared with the CHADS\textsuperscript{2} score, the R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} score had better discrimination for the prediction of long-term combined outcome (0.772 vs 0.791, p=0.0013).

Conclusion: CHADS\textsuperscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsuperscript{2} scores provide a quick and useful tool in predicting long-term outcome for patients with CAD.
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Introduction

Coronary artery disease (CAD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide.\textsuperscript{1} Therefore, risk factor assessment and risk stratification of patients with CAD became important aspects of current research. However, the current risk model for long-term survival prediction for these patients was complicated, while a simple useful model was still lacking.\textsuperscript{2,3}

The CHADS\textsubscript{2} (congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack) score, which assigns one point each for a history of congestive heart failure, hypertension, age ≥75 years, diabetes mellitus (DM), and two points for prior stroke/transient ischemic attack (TIA), was used for embolic risk stratification and guidance in the treatment of anticoagulation for patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation (AF).\textsuperscript{4} Recently, it was demonstrated that the CHADS\textsuperscript{2} score could predict clinical outcome in patients with acute myocardial infarction (MI),\textsuperscript{5} because the score included similar risk factors for poor prognosis.
A new risk model, the R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} (renal dysfunction, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/TIA) score, was proposed to be a powerful scoring scheme in predicting stroke or systemic embolism in AF patients.\textsuperscript{6} Renal dysfunction, the additional component of the R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} score, was associated with worse clinical outcomes in CAD patients.\textsuperscript{7} Compared with the CHADS\textsubscript{2} score, the R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} score was believed to have better prognostic predictive value for stroke of AF patients.\textsuperscript{8} However, few studies have investigated the association of R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} scores with long-term cardiovascular (CV) outcome in patients with CAD. Based on these experiences, we aimed to investigate if CHADS\textsubscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} scores could predict long-term outcome for patients with CAD.

**Patients and methods**

**Study populations**

We enrolled 3,700 patients with CAD between November 2010 and September 2014 at the Department of Cardiology from Chinese PLA General Hospital. Patients were included if they met the following criteria: age between 20 and 90 years, angiographic evidence of stenosis of 50% or greater in ≥1 coronary vessel and hemodynamically stable. Patients were excluded if they had cardiogenic shock, severe valvular heart disease, myocarditis, severe anemia, active inflammatory disease, or cancer. The Medical Ethics Committee of PLA General Hospital approved the research protocol. All participants provided written informed consent.

**Procedures**

Demographic characteristics including age, sex, history of DM, hypertension, current cigarette smoking, chronic heart failure, previous ischemic stroke or TIA, medical history of percutaneous coronary intervention and/or coronary artery bypass grafting, and biochemical and echocardiographic examination were obtained from the hospital records. Hypertension was defined as repeated measurements of systolic blood pressure ≥140 mmHg, diastolic blood pressure ≥90 mmHg, or chronic treatment with antihypertensive medications. Diabetes was defined based on hospital records, hemoglobin A1c ≥7.0%, or the use of antidiabetic medications. Congestive heart failure was defined as left ventricular ejection fraction <40%. Data on prior stroke, TIA, AF, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) were collected from the hospital records. Smoking was defined as smoking 10 cigarettes a day for at least 1 year without quitting. Family history was defined as the presence of heart disease or sudden cardiac death in a male first-degree relative aged <55 years or in a female first-degree relative aged <65 years.

**Calculation of CHADS\textsubscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} scores**

Thereafter, two experienced cardiologists, without knowledge of the patients’ prognosis, calculated the CHADS\textsubscript{2} and R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} scores. The CHADS\textsubscript{2} nomenclature represents congestive heart failure (C), HT (H), age (A), DM (D), and stroke (S). The CHADS\textsubscript{2} score was calculated by assigning one point each for the presence of congestive heart failure, HT, and DM and by assigning two points for a history of stroke or TIA. The glomerular filtration rate (GFR) was calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology (CKD-EPI) equation:

\[
\text{GFR} = 141 \times \min \left( \left[ \frac{\text{Scr}}{k, 1} \right]^{\alpha} \times \max \left( \frac{\text{Scr}}{k, 1} \right)^{-1.209} \times 0.993^{\text{age}} \times \left[ 1.018 \text{ if female} \right] \times \left[ 1.159 \text{ if black} \right] \right)
\]

The CKD-EPI equation was suggested to offer a more precise assessment of glomerular filtration, as compared to previous equations.\textsuperscript{6} The R\textsubscript{2}CHADS\textsubscript{2} score was derived by incorporating the components of the CHADS\textsubscript{2} score and awarding two points for renal dysfunction, defined as a GFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m\textsuperscript{2}. Scr is serum creatinine, k is 0.7 for female and 0.9 for male, a is −0.329 for female and −0.411 for male.

**Clinical outcome**

Follow-up data were collected by trained research coordinators through telephone interview and hospital records. We selected a composite end point consisting of MI, stroke, heart failure, and all-cause death. MI was defined as a clinical sign of infarction with recurrent chest pain and/or development of new electrocardiogram changes together with a rise of creatine kinase-MB or troponin-T measured following the chest pain. Stroke was defined as a new neurologic deficit, which could not be explained by other causes and with at least one image test (computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging) compatible with the diagnosis, as well as confirmation from a neurologist. Heart failure was defined as hospitalization for signs and symptoms involving at least two of the following: orthopnea, paroxysmal nocturnal dyspnea, elevated jugular venous pressure, pulmonary rales, third heart sound, and pulmonary edema on radiography. Supportive documentation of reduced cardiac output and elevated pulmonary capillary wedge pressure was assessed when available. All-cause death included CV death and death caused by other reasons. CV death was defined as documentation of diagnoses involving ischemic heart disease, acute coronary syndrome (ACS), heart failure,
cerebrovascular disease, arrhythmia, great vessel or peripheral vascular disease, valvular heart disease, or sudden death because of an unknown but presumed CV cause in high-risk patients. All patients were followed until they either reached the study end point or the end of study follow-up.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were performed for demographic and biomarker variables. The baseline data were summarized numerically as mean and SD and proportions for categorical variables. Differences between continuous values were assessed using ANOVA test for normally distributed variables. Differences between nominal variables were compared using the χ² test. Cox proportional hazards models were used to identify the predictors of composite end point, CV death and all-cause mortality. Associations are reported as hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% CIs. Kaplan–Meier curves were used to illustrate event rates for each risk level defined by score. A log-rank test was used to compare the survival curves among different patient groups. The receiver-operating characteristic curve was also used to demonstrate the sensitivity and specificity of the CHADS² score and the R₂CHADS² score and their cutoff values for predicting clinical events. The area under the curve (AUC) comparison of these scoring systems was performed using the DeLong method. A p-value of 0.05 was considered significant, and all tests were two tailed. Data were analyzed with SPSS software (version 19.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) and MedCalc Statistical Software version 12.2 (MedCalc Software bvba, Ostend, Belgium).

Results

Patient’s characteristics

After excluding patients with loss of follow-up (n=55) or missing data required for the calculation of CHADS² and R₂CHADS² scores (n=12), the remaining 3,633 subjects were the subjects of this secondary data analysis. The follow-up rate was 98.5%. The median age was 61.5±11.7 years, and subjects comprised 2,625 (72.3%) men and 1,008 (27.7%) women. The CHADS² score ranged from 0 to 6, with a mean±SD of 1.3±1.0 and a median of 1 (0–2), while the R₂CHADS² score ranged from 0 to 7, with a mean±SD of 1.6±1.3 and a median of 1 (0–2). Baseline clinical characteristics according to tertiles of R₂CHADS² score are presented in Table 1. Subjects in the highest tertiles were older and more likely to have a history of hypertension, stroke, DM,

Table 1 Baseline clinical characteristics of patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>0–2</th>
<th>3–5</th>
<th>6–8</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years</td>
<td>61.5±11.7</td>
<td>59.6±10.7</td>
<td>69.9±12.0</td>
<td>73.2±12.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, n (%)</td>
<td>2,625 (72.3)</td>
<td>2,211 (74.4)</td>
<td>378 (62.0)</td>
<td>36 (67.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking, n (%)</td>
<td>1,091 (30.0)</td>
<td>465 (15.7)</td>
<td>103 (16.9)</td>
<td>9 (17.0)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous stroke, n (%)</td>
<td>349 (9.6)</td>
<td>245 (8.2)</td>
<td>93 (15.2)</td>
<td>11 (20.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous MI, n (%)</td>
<td>447 (12.3)</td>
<td>329 (11.1)</td>
<td>104 (17.0)</td>
<td>14 (26.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension, n (%)</td>
<td>2,373 (65.3)</td>
<td>1,791 (60.3)</td>
<td>533 (87.4)</td>
<td>49 (92.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia, n (%)</td>
<td>1,126 (31.0)</td>
<td>961 (32.4)</td>
<td>158 (25.9)</td>
<td>7 (13.2)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes, n (%)</td>
<td>1,163 (32.0)</td>
<td>794 (26.7)</td>
<td>329 (53.9)</td>
<td>40 (75.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD, n (%)</td>
<td>85 (2.3)</td>
<td>50 (1.7)</td>
<td>30 (4.9)</td>
<td>5 (9.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF, n (%)</td>
<td>106 (2.9)</td>
<td>66 (2.2)</td>
<td>35 (5.7)</td>
<td>5 (9.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous PCI, n (%)</td>
<td>903 (24.9)</td>
<td>702 (23.6)</td>
<td>176 (28.9)</td>
<td>25 (47.2)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous CABG, n (%)</td>
<td>106 (2.9)</td>
<td>73 (2.5)</td>
<td>32 (5.2)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP, mmHg</td>
<td>135.2±22.0</td>
<td>134.3±21.9</td>
<td>139.0±22.3</td>
<td>142.8±23.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP, mmHg</td>
<td>75.8±16.6</td>
<td>76.2±17.3</td>
<td>74.0±12.6</td>
<td>72.3±13.8</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>25.6±3.4</td>
<td>25.7±3.4</td>
<td>25.1±3.6</td>
<td>25.9±3.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td>1.1±0.2</td>
<td>1.1±0.2</td>
<td>1.1±0.2</td>
<td>0.9±0.3</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEF, %</td>
<td>56.5±8.4</td>
<td>57.5±7.4</td>
<td>52.3±10.5</td>
<td>44.5±9.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC, mg/dL</td>
<td>4.0±1.1</td>
<td>4.0±1.1</td>
<td>4.0±1.1</td>
<td>3.8±1.3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG, mg/dL</td>
<td>1.6±1.0</td>
<td>1.6±1.0</td>
<td>1.6±1.0</td>
<td>1.5±0.8</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>1.1±0.3</td>
<td>1.1±0.3</td>
<td>1.1±0.3</td>
<td>1.0±0.3</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>2.4±0.9</td>
<td>2.4±0.9</td>
<td>2.4±0.9</td>
<td>2.2±1.0</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucose, mg/dL</td>
<td>7.0±4.8</td>
<td>6.8±4.5</td>
<td>7.8±5.9</td>
<td>7.9±3.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine, µmol/L</td>
<td>86.1±67.9</td>
<td>76.1±34.1</td>
<td>128.7±132.6</td>
<td>156.3±131.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivessel disease, n (%)</td>
<td>2,229 (61.4)</td>
<td>1,807 (60.8)</td>
<td>390 (63.9)</td>
<td>32 (60.4)</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
and MI. Demographic parameters such as systolic blood pressure, glucose, and creatinine were found to be significantly higher in patients with high R$_2$CHADS$_2$ score.

Over a median follow-up of 2.9 years, 443 patients experienced at least one element of the composite end point of CV death (n=168 [4.6%]), MI (n=59 [1.6%]), stroke (n=96 [2.6%]), heart failure (n=101 [2.8%]), and all-cause death (n=240 [6.6%]). Kaplan–Meier plots showed that rates of composite outcome increased with increasing CHADS$_2$ and R$_2$CHADS$_2$ scores (Figures 1 and 2). In terms of all-cause death and CV death, similar results were observed.

### Predictors of combined outcomes

Using two separate multivariate Cox regression analyses (model 1 was adjusted for sex, smoking, body mass index, hyperlipidemia, GFR, total cholesterol, triglycerides, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, medication at discharge; model 2 was adjusted for the aforementioned covariates except GFR), the CHADS$_2$ and R$_2$CHADS$_2$ scores were strongly associated with the composite end point (Table 2).

Then, we separately evaluated the prognostic value of the two scores in patients with stable CAD and ACS. After adjustment for additional covariates (model 1 for CHADS$_2$ normosulinemia, and rectal temperature of 37°C to 38°C did not change the results.

#### Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Overall N=3,633</th>
<th>0–2 n=2,970</th>
<th>3–5 n=610</th>
<th>6–8 n=53</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAD type, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>907 (25.0)</td>
<td>786 (26.5)</td>
<td>113 (18.5)</td>
<td>8 (15.1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>2,297 (63.2)</td>
<td>1,857 (62.5)</td>
<td>405 (66.4)</td>
<td>35 (66.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEMI</td>
<td>125 (3.4)</td>
<td>88 (3.0)</td>
<td>35 (5.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTEMI</td>
<td>304 (8.4)</td>
<td>239 (8.0)</td>
<td>57 (9.3)</td>
<td>8 (15.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medication, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>3,398 (93.5)</td>
<td>2,825 (95.1)</td>
<td>526 (86.2)</td>
<td>47 (88.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clopidogrel</td>
<td>2,979 (82.0)</td>
<td>2,441 (82.2)</td>
<td>495 (81.3)</td>
<td>43 (81.1)</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>1,540 (42.4)</td>
<td>1,199 (40.4)</td>
<td>309 (50.7)</td>
<td>32 (60.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statin</td>
<td>3,431 (94.5)</td>
<td>2,830 (95.3)</td>
<td>555 (91.1)</td>
<td>46 (86.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blocker</td>
<td>2,627 (72.5)</td>
<td>2,134 (72.0)</td>
<td>455 (74.7)</td>
<td>38 (71.7)</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Data are presented as mean±SD or n (%). R$_2$CHADS$_2$, renal dysfunction, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack.

**Abbreviations:** ABI, ankle brachial index; ACEI, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor; AF, atrial fibrillation; BMI, body mass index; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; CAD, coronary artery disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MI, myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; SA, stable angina; SBP, systolic blood pressure; STEMI, ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; UA, unstable angina.

**Figure 1** Event-free survival curve for patients according to the CHADS$_2$ score.

**Note:** CHADS$_2$, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack.

**Figure 2** Event-free survival curve for patients according to the R$_2$CHADS$_2$ score.

**Note:** R$_2$CHADS$_2$, renal dysfunction, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack.
Table 2 Predictors for composite outcome in the entire cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.9378</td>
<td>0.9116–0.9647</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.9400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlipidemia</td>
<td>0.5801</td>
<td>0.4527–0.7433</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.5741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>0.8784</td>
<td>0.7794–0.9900</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>0.8791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C</td>
<td>0.6389</td>
<td>0.4546–0.8979</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>0.6444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFR</td>
<td>0.9807</td>
<td>0.9769–0.9846</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>0.7233</td>
<td>0.5372–0.9739</td>
<td>0.0328</td>
<td>0.6852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADS₂</td>
<td>2.1848</td>
<td>2.0075–2.3777</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R⁻CHADS₂</td>
<td>1.9299</td>
<td>1.8288–2.0365</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cox regression multivariate: model 1 was adjusted for sex, smoking, BMI, hyperlipidemia, GFR, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, and medication at discharge, while model 2 was adjusted for the aforementioned covariates except GFR. CHADS₂, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack; R⁻CHADS₂, renal dysfunction, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HR, hazard ratio; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.

Discussion

In this study, we found that the CHADS₂ score was a useful tool in risk stratification and long-term prognosis for patients with coronary heart disease. In particular, the new risk model, R⁻CHADS₂ score, had better predictability than the CHADS₂ score for composite outcome for patients with CAD. Both CHADS₂ and R⁻CHADS₂ scores could predict long-term clinical outcome for patients with stable CAD and ACS.

The original purpose of the CHADS₂ score was for risk stratification in stroke prevention of AF. Among several risk stratification indices, the CHADS₂ score is the most commonly used because it is simple to calculate, well validated, and endorsed in practice guidelines. Later, the utility of the CHADS₂ score in other CV fields attracted increasing attention.⁹ Tasolar et al enrolled 252 non-ST-segment elevation acute coronary syndrome (NSTE-ACS) patients and found that the CHADS₂-VASc-HS score, which incorporated hyperlipidemia and smoking, was positively correlated with

Table 3 Predictors for clinical outcome in stable CAD and ACS patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite outcome</th>
<th>Stable CAD</th>
<th></th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADS₂ ⁵</td>
<td>2.6671</td>
<td>2.1660–3.2843</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>2.1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R⁻CHADS₂ ⁶</td>
<td>2.0443</td>
<td>1.7664–2.3660</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>1.9184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-cause death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADS₂ ⁵</td>
<td>1.6533</td>
<td>1.1768–2.3228</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>1.5933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R⁻CHADS₂ ⁶</td>
<td>1.5429</td>
<td>1.2284–1.9379</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>1.6741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADS₂ ⁵</td>
<td>1.5574</td>
<td>1.3347–1.8173</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>1.5483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R⁻CHADS₂ ⁶</td>
<td>1.6492</td>
<td>1.4981–1.8156</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>1.6282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cox regression multivariate: model 1 was adjusted for sex, smoking, BMI, hyperlipidemia, GFR, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, and medication at discharge, while model 2 was adjusted for the aforementioned covariates except GFR. CHADS₂, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack; R⁻CHADS₂, renal dysfunction, congestive heart failure, hypertension, age, diabetes, and stroke/transient ischemic attack.

Abbreviations: ACS, acute coronary syndrome; BMI, body mass index; CAD, coronary artery disease; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HR, hazard ratio; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.
they severity and complexity of CAD.10 They also found that 
CHA\_DS\_2\_VASC\_HS was comparable with other risk scores
for the risk stratification of the in-hospital major adverse
cardiac events of NSTE-ACS patients. Welles et al enrolled
916 patients with stable CAD and no AF and reported that the
CHA\_DS\_2 score was strongly predictive of ischemic stroke/
TIA (AUC: 0.65).11 Poci et al enrolled 2,335 participants with
ACS and reported that long-term mortality was associated
with the CHADS\_2 score (HR: 1.38, 95% CI: 1.28–1.48).12

In line with these findings, this study demonstrated that
higher CHADS\_2 score was associated with higher risk of
combined outcome, all-cause death, and CV death in patients
with CAD. It is of great importance to assess the risk of
CAD patients to provide appropriate medical treatment and
reduce CV events and mortality. Thus, several risk predi-
c tion scoring systems, including various CAD risk factors,
have been developed.2,13,14 However, simple and reliable
tools to identify CAD patients’ risks are needed for routine
practice. CHADS\_2 score itself is proved to be a reliable and
convenient tool to predict outcome for CAD patients. In fact,
it is reasonable to expand the role of CHADS\_2 score in CAD,
since each component of the CHADS\_2 score is also a risk
factor of coronary heart disease and stroke itself also causes
disability, further contributing to mortality.

Renal function is a powerful risk factor for mortality in
patients with AF. Thus, Piccini et al have made attempts to
combine CrCl with the CHADS\_2 score and created R\_CHADS\_2
score.6 The CrCl was calculated with the Cockcroft–Gault
formula. In this study, when calculating GFR, we used the
CKD-EPI equation instead of the Cockcroft–Gault formula; it
was because a previous study showed that GFR-based scheme,
R\_GFR\_CHADS\_2, provided a significant improvement of
predictive ability for mortality risk in older patients with
AF.15 In a recent study, Huang et al enrolled 3,295 subjects
with CAD and found that R\_CHADS\_2 had comparable pre-
dictive ability of mortality to the Global Registry of Acute
Coronary Events score.16 Compared with the CHADS\_2
score (c-statistic =0.61), the R\_CHADS\_2 (c-statistic =0.66,
\( p<0.05\)) score provides better discrimination for mortality.
The results of this study suggested that the R\_CHADS\_2 score
could be used to predict composite events for patients with
CAD, and the AUC of the R\_CHADS\_2 was statistically
larger than of the CHADS\_2 score. The clinical utility of the
R\_CHADS\_2 score should be emphasized, for those with a
R\_CHADS\_2 score of \( \geq 3\) had a rate of adverse events as high
as 37.6%. These results indicated that reduced renal func-
tion played a critical role in the prognosis of CV outcomes
in patients with CAD. Several potential mechanisms may
explain these findings. Patients with reduced renal function
often have consequences such as anemia, volume overload,
and oxidative stress, which contribute to the poor outcomes.17

In addition, it has been reported that impaired renal function
causes decreased number of smooth muscle cells within the
plaque, which may accelerate the formation of vulnerable
plaque and increase the possibility of plaque disruption.18,19

To our knowledge, although the CHADS\_2 score has
already been tested in a previous study, the prognostic role
of the R\_CHADS\_2 score in long-term composite outcome
in patients with CAD has not been addressed before. This
study suggests that the R\_CHADS\_2 score may predict risk
with reasonable efficacy for patients with stable CAD
and ACS.

Limitations
This study has several limitations. First, detailed information
about the complexity of coronary artery lesions, such as the
SYNTAX score, total or non-total arterial revascularization,
was not evaluated. These factors are associated with long-
term CV outcomes. In addition, the results need to be further
validated in multicenter trials.

Conclusion
The CHADS\_2 and R\_CHADS\_2 scores can be used to estimate
the risk of clinical adverse events in patients with CAD. These

\[ AUC \quad 95\% \text{ CI} \]

\[ \text{CHADS}\_2 \quad 0.772 \quad 0.758–0.785 \]

\[ R\_CHADS\_2 \quad 0.791 \quad 0.777–0.804 \]
scoring systems could lead to optimization of therapy, which might reduce the risks of subsequent adverse events.
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