

1 *Short report*

2

3 **Comparison of risk factors for coronary heart disease morbidity versus mortality**

4

5 G. David Batty,^{a,b} DSc (david.batty@ucl.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-1822-5753)

6 Mika Kivimäki,^a PhD (m.kivimaki@ucl.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0002-4699-5627)

7 Steven Bell,^c PhD (scb81@medschl.cam.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0001-6774-3149)

8

9 ^aDepartment of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

10 ^bSchool of Biological and Population Health Sciences, Oregon State University, Corvallis, USA

11 ^cDepartment of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

12

13 *Manuscript statistics:* 624 words, 6 references, 2 figures

14

15 *Correspondence:* David Batty, Department of Epidemiology & Public Health, University College

16 London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, UK, WC1E 6BT. E. david.batty@ucl.ac.uk

17

18 *Conflict of interest:* None to declare.

19

20 *Funding source:* There was no direct financial or material support for the research reported in the
21 manuscript.

22

23 *Access to data:* Data from The Health Surveys for England and The Scottish Health Surveys

24 (<https://data-archive.ac.uk/>) are available to researchers upon application.

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 **Abstract**

33 Owing to the often prohibitively high costs of medical examinations, or an absence of infrastructure
34 for linkage of study members to morbidity registries, much aetiological research in the field of
35 cardiovascular research relies on death records. Because they are regarded as being more distal to
36 risk factor assessment than morbidity endpoints, mortality data are generally maligned in this
37 context for seemingly providing less clear insights into aetiology. The relative utility of mortality
38 versus morbidity registries is, however, untested. In a pooling of data from three large cohort
39 studies whose participants had been linked to both death *and* morbidity registries for coronary heart
40 disease, we related a range of established and emerging risk factors to these two methods of
41 ascertainment. A mean duration of study member surveillance of 10.1 years (mortality) and 9.9
42 years (morbidity) for a maximum of 20,956 study members (11,868 women) in the analytical
43 sample yielded 289 deaths from coronary heart disease and 770 hospitalisations for this condition.
44 The direction of the age- and sex-adjusted association was the same for 21 of the 24 risk factor–
45 morbidity/mortality combinations. The only marked discordance in effect estimates, such that
46 different conclusions about the association could be drawn, was for social support, total cholesterol,
47 and fruit/vegetable consumption whereby null effects were evident for selected outcomes. In
48 conclusion, variation in disease definition typically did not have an impact on the direction of the
49 association of an array of risk factors for coronary heart disease.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Despite declining rates, coronary heart disease remains a burdensome cause of death and disability
53 worldwide.¹ In on-going efforts to identify new environmental and genetic risk factors for coronary
54 heart disease, events based on disease incidence are regarded as being preferable to events based on
55 deaths. Incidence data, which may be derived from record linkage or medical examination in
56 population-based cohort studies, are privileged because of their proximity to risk factor assessment,
57 seemingly providing clearer insights into aetiology. By contrast, mortality data comprise not only
58 the morbid event itself but, in the high probability of survival following a heart attack, prognosis.
59 Owing to the often prohibitively high costs of medical examinations, or an absence of infrastructure
60 for linkage of study members to morbidity registries, most investigators have to rely on death
61 records.^{2,3} In a pooling of data from three large cohort studies whose participants had been linked
62 to death *and* hospital registries for morbidity, for the first time, we assessed the relative utility of
63 each ascertainment method by relating them to a range of established and emerging risk factors.⁴

65 **Methods**

66 We pooled data from the Scottish Health Surveys which comprise three identical prospective cohort
67 studies, baseline data collection for which took place in 1995, 1998 and 2003. Described in detail
68 elsewhere,⁵ risk factor data were collected using standard, identical protocols. Individuals without a
69 history of heart disease hospitalisation were flagged for mortality using the procedures of the UK
70 NHS Central Registry and hospitalisations using Scottish Morbidity Records database.³ Ethical
71 approval for data collection was granted by the London Research Ethics Council, or local research
72 ethics councils. Participants gave informed consent.

75 **Results**

76 A mean duration of study member surveillance of 10.1 years (mortality) and 9.9 years (morbidity)

77 for a maximum of 20,956 study members (11,868 women) in the analytical sample yielded 289
78 deaths from coronary heart disease and 770 hospitalisations for this condition. Findings for risk
79 factors known to be causally linked to coronary heart disease are presented in figure 1; results for
80 emerging risk factors and those thought to be non-causally associated are depicted in figure 2.
81
82 The direction of the age- and sex-adjusted association was the same for 22 of the 24 risk factor–
83 morbidity/mortality combinations. As evidenced by the test for heterogeneity by outcome
84 ascertainment, there was, however, occasionally some differences in the magnitude of association,
85 such that somewhat stronger effects were apparent in mortality analyses for age, physical inactivity,
86 (figure 1), educational attainment, mental illness, lung function, and salivary cotinine (a biomarker
87 for cigarette smoke exposure) (figure 2). The only marked discordance in effect estimates, such
88 that different conclusions about the association could be drawn, was for social support (indexed by
89 relationship status), total cholesterol, and fruit and vegetable consumption whereby null effects
90 were evident for selected outcomes. Aggregating risk factors into the Framingham algorithm
91 revealed very similar predictive capacity for coronary heart disease whether based on morbidity or
92 mortality records.

93

94 **Discussion**

95 The main finding of the present analyses was that variation in disease definition – morbidity or
96 mortality – did not have an impact on the direction of the association of an array of known risk
97 factors for coronary heart disease. Comparable results reported for another cardiovascular outcome,
98 stroke, support the validity of our findings.⁶

99

100 Our findings suggest that for the most common presentation of cardiovascular disease there is no
101 obvious advantage to utilising morbidity records. This has implications for those investigators
102 operating outside countries with well-established data linkage procedures who only have access to


103 death registers. Our findings may also suggest that morbidity data collected via study member
104 attendance at designated clinical research centres have no additional utility, though no such direct
105 comparison was made herein. Lastly, whether morbidity records for other cardiovascular disease
106 sub-types such as peripheral vascular disease, heart failure, abdominal aortic aneurysm, amongst
107 others, also offer no analytical advantage to death records is unknown.
108

109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128

References


1. Collaborators GMaCoD. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2015;385(9963):117-71. doi: S0140-6736(14)61682-2 [pii];10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61682-2 [doi]
2. Seshasai SR, Kaptoge S, Thompson A, et al. Diabetes mellitus, fasting glucose, and risk of cause-specific death. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364(9):829-41.
3. Batty GD, Gale CR, Kivimaki M, et al. Assessment of Relative Utility of Underlying vs Contributory Causes of Death. *JAMA Open Network* 2019
4. Yusuf S, Reddy S, Ounpuu S, et al. Global burden of cardiovascular diseases: part I: general considerations, the epidemiologic transition, risk factors, and impact of urbanization. *Circulation* 2001;104(22):2746-53.
5. Russ TC, Hamer M, Stamatakis E, et al. Does the Framingham cardiovascular disease risk score also have predictive utility for dementia death? An individual participant meta-analysis of 11,887 men and women. *Atherosclerosis* 2013;228(1):256-58.
6. Hart CL, Hole DJ, Davey Smith G. Comparison of risk factors for stroke incidence and stroke mortality in 20 years of follow-up in men and women in the Renfrew/Paisley Study in Scotland. *Stroke* 2000;31(8):1893-96.

Figure 1. Age- and sex-adjusted hazard ratios (95% confidence interval) for risk factors causally linked to coronary heart disease



Hazard ratios are for a standard deviation increase in the risk factor where it is continuous; where it is categorical, comparisons are for the converse of the group labelled. The only exception is area-based deprivation, where hazard ratios are for a quintile increase. GGT, gamma-glutamyl transferase. Analytical sample size varies because selected risk factors were not gathered in all included studies.

Figure 2. Age- and sex-adjusted hazard ratios (95% confidence interval) for emerging risk factors for, or risk markers that show associations with, coronary heart disease



Hazard ratios are for a standard deviation increase in the risk factor where it is continuous; where it is categorical, comparisons are for the converse of the group labelled. The only exception is area-based deprivation, where hazard ratios are for a quintile increase. GGT, gamma-glutamyl transferase. Analytical sample size varies because selected risk factors were not gathered in all included studies.