

1 **Association of Marital/Partner Status with Hospital Readmission Among Young Adults**
2 **With Acute Myocardial Infarction**

3

4 **Authors and Affiliations:**

5 Cenjing Zhu, MPhil¹, Rachel P Dreyer, PhD^{2,3}, Fan Li, PhD^{3,4}, Erica S Spatz, MD, MHS^{1,5,6},

6 César Caraballo, MD^{5,6}, Shiwani Mahajan, MBBS, MHS⁵, Valeria Raparelli, MD, PhD^{7,8},

7 Erica C Leifheit, PhD¹, Yuan Lu, ScD^{5,6}, Harlan M Krumholz, MD, SM^{5,9,10}, John A Spertus,

8 MD, MPH^{11,12}, Gail D’Onofrio, MD^{1,2}, Louise Pilote, MD, MPH, PhD^{13,14}, Judith H

9 Lichtman, PhD¹

10

11 1. Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven,
12 CT, USA

13 2. Department of Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

14 3. Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

15 4. Center for Methods in Implementation and Preventive Science, Yale University, New
16 Haven, CT, USA

17 5. Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale University School of Medicine, New
18 Haven, CT, USA

19 6. Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of
20 Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

21 7. Department of Translational Medicine, University of Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy

22 8. University Center for Studies on Gender Medicine, University of Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy

23 9. Department of Cardiology, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

24 10. Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New
25 Haven, CT, USA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 11. Healthcare Institute for Innovations in Quality, University of Missouri – Kansas City,
27 Missouri, USA

28 12. Saint Luke’s Cardiovascular Outcomes Research, Saint Luke’s Mid America Heart
29 Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, USA

30 13. Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Research Institute, McGill University
31 Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

32 14. Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

33

34 **Correspondence to:**

35 Judith H Lichtman

36 Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health

37 60 College Street, New Haven, CT 06510

38 Email: judith.lichtman@yale.edu

39 Tel: 203-785-3025

40

41 **Short Title:** Marital/Partner Status and 1-year Readmission in Young Adults with AMI

42 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms:** AMI (acute myocardial infarction); VIRGO

43 (Variation in Recovery: Role of Gender on Outcomes of Young AMI Patients)

44

45

46 **Word Count: 3905**

47

48 **ABSTRACT**

49 **Introduction:** Despite evidence supporting the benefits of marriage on cardiovascular health,
50 the impact of marital/partner status on the long-term readmission of young acute myocardial
51 infarction (AMI) survivors is less clear. We aimed to examine the association between
52 marital/partner status and 1-year all-cause readmission, and explore sex differences, among
53 young AMI survivors.

54 **Methods:** Data were from the VIRGO study (Variation in Recovery: Role of Gender on
55 Outcomes of Young AMI Patients), which enrolled young adults aged 18-55 years with AMI
56 (2008-2012). The primary end point was all-cause readmission within 1 year of hospital
57 discharge, obtained from medical record, patient interviews, and adjudicated by a physician
58 panel. We performed Cox proportional hazards models with sequential adjustment for
59 demographic, socioeconomic, clinical and psychosocial factors. Sex-marital/partner status
60 interaction was also tested.

61 **Results:** Of the 2,979 adults with AMI (2002 women [67.2%]; mean age 48 [interquartile
62 range, 44-52] years), unpartnered individuals were more likely to experience all-cause
63 readmissions compared with married/partnered individuals within the first year after hospital
64 discharge (34.6% versus 27.2%, hazard ratio [HR]=1.31; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.15-
65 1.49). The association attenuated but remained significant after adjustment for demographic
66 and socioeconomic factors (adjusted HR, 1.16; 95%CI, 1.01-1.34), and was not significant
67 after further adjusting for clinical factors and psychosocial factors (adjusted HR, 1.10;
68 95%CI, 0.94-1.28). Sex-marital/partner status interaction was not significant (p=0.69).
69 Sensitivity analysis using data with multiple imputation, and restricting outcomes to cardiac
70 readmission yielded comparable results.

71 **Conclusions:** In a cohort of young adults aged 18-55 years, unpartnered status was
72 associated with 1.3-fold increased risk of all-cause readmission within 1 year of AMI
73 discharge. Further adjustment for demographic, socioeconomic, clinical and psychosocial
74 factors attenuated the association, suggesting that these factors may explain disparities in
75 readmission between married/partnered versus unpartnered young adults. Whereas young
76 women experienced more readmission compared to similar-aged men, the association
77 between marital/partner status and 1-year readmission did not vary by sex.

78

79 **Key Words:** acute myocardial infarction; marital status; young adults; all-cause readmission

80

81 **Introduction**

82 Despite an overall reduction in cardiovascular disease (CVD) prevalence and acute
83 myocardial infarction (AMI) mortality,(1) rates of AMI hospitalization in young adults (≤ 55
84 years) have increased over the last two decades.(2) Hospital readmission remains frequent
85 across all age groups of AMI survivors, with an overall 24% readmission rate within 90 days
86 post-AMI.(3) In a recent study of US young adults with AMI, about one-third had at least 1
87 hospitalization in the year after discharge, and young women experienced more adverse
88 events than men.(4) Risk profile for readmission among younger and older patients may be
89 different, as suggested by a study using data from the 2013 National Readmission Database,
90 where the effect of sex was more prominent in the younger age group.(3) Socio-demographic
91 and psychosocial characteristics have been suggested to play important roles in predicting the
92 risk of 1-year readmission for younger adults with AMI,(5) yet little is known about the
93 impact of marital/partner status on their long-term risk of readmission.

94 Marriage has long been known to offer cardiovascular health benefits, including its
95 association with lower risk of AMI incidence,(6) in-hospital and long-term mortality,(7–10)
96 and recurrent events.(11–13) Committed relationships that are not based on formal legal
97 unions, such as domestic partners and common-law marriages may also convey benefits, but
98 are less commonly described in prior studies.(7,9,10,12) Moreover, prior research has largely
99 focused on older populations, been conducted in foreign countries, and has not explored
100 readmission beyond the first month of discharge.(11,12) There is a paucity of data on the
101 impact of marital/partner status on the long-term readmission outcomes of younger AMI
102 patients. In addition, although evidence suggest that women may not benefit from marriage to
103 the same extent as men regarding mortality outcomes(14,15), less is known about whether
104 there are sex differences in the degree of “protection” conferred by marriage/partnership in a
105 younger population with AMI and as assessed by hospital readmission.

106 To address this gap in knowledge, we examined the association between
107 marital/partner status and all-cause and cardiac readmission within 1 year of hospital
108 discharge among a cohort of AMI survivors 18-55 years of age in the United States. A
109 secondary aim was to explore potential subgroup differences in the association by sex.

110

111 **Materials and Methods**

112 *Study Population*

113 We used data from the VIRGO study (Variation in Recovery: Role of Gender on
114 Outcomes of Young AMI Patients), the largest prospective, multicenter cohort study
115 designed to understand factors associated with adverse outcomes in younger adults (≤ 55
116 years) with AMI.(16) Between August 21, 2008 and May 1, 2012, a total of 2,979
117 participants were recruited from 103 US hospitals using a 2:1 female-to-male enrollment
118 design. The methodology of VIRGO has been described elsewhere.(16) In brief, eligible
119 participants had elevated cardiac enzymes (troponin or creatine kinase, with at least one of
120 these biomarkers $>99^{\text{th}}$ percentile of the upper reference limit) at the recruiting center within
121 24 hours of admission, and presented with other evidence supporting the diagnosis of AMI,
122 including either symptoms of ischemia or electrocardiogram changes indicative of new
123 ischemia (new ST-T changes, new or presumably new left bundle branch block, or the
124 development of pathological Q waves). Patients were excluded if their elevated cardiac
125 markers were due to a complication of elective coronary revascularization, or their AMI was
126 caused by physical trauma. Individuals were ineligible if they were incarcerated, did not
127 speak English or Spanish, or were unable to provide informed consent or be contacted for
128 follow-up.

129 This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
130 Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline (**Appendix in the Supplement**). De-identified

131 data were used for the current study. Institutional review board approval was obtained at each
132 participating institution, and individuals provided written informed consent for their study
133 participation.

134

135 *Assessment of Marital/Partner Status and Other Covariates*

136 Baseline data were collected by medical chart abstraction and standardized in-person
137 interviews administered by trained personnel during the index AMI admission.

138 Marital/Partner status was collected during patient enrollment interview through a question of
139 “Which best describes your current marital status” and was categorized into
140 “married/partnered” (having a response of “married” or “living as married/living with
141 partner” or “unpartnered” (having a response of “divorced”, “separated”, “widowed”, or
142 “single”). In a secondary analysis, “unpartnered” status was further classified into
143 “divorced/separated”, “widowed”, or “single”.

144 Demographic factors included sex (male/female), age (year, continuous), and self-
145 reported race (non-Hispanic white/non-Hispanic black/Hispanic/other [ie, American Indian or
146 Alaska Native and Asian or Pacific Islander]). Socioeconomic factors included education
147 level, financial strain, employment status, and health insurance. Education level was
148 categorized into less than high school, some high school, and more than high school.
149 Financial strain was defined as having “just enough to make ends meet” or “not enough to
150 make ends meet” (versus having some money left over) based on individuals’ response to the
151 question “In general, how do your finances usually work out at the end of the month”.

152 Clinical characteristics considered in our study included cardiac risk factors
153 (hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes, obesity, current smoker, and alcohol abuse), medical
154 history (prior CVD [AMI, percutaneous coronary intervention, coronary artery bypass
155 grafting, angina, heart failure, stroke, transient ischemic attack or peripheral artery disease],

156 renal dysfunction, and history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [COPD]), and
157 disease severity (type of AMI [ST-elevation myocardial infarction/non-ST-elevated
158 myocardial infarction], ejection fraction <40%, and hospital length of stay).

159 Psychosocial factors, including depression, low social support, and high stress burden,
160 were assessed at baseline by validated measures or questionnaires respectively. Depressive
161 symptoms were measured using the 9-item version of the Patient Health Questionnaire,(17)
162 with an overall score of 10 or more indicating depression. Social support was measured using
163 the 5-item Enhancing Recovery in Coronary Heart Disease Social Support Inventory.(18)
164 Low social support was defined as a score of 3 or less on at least 2 Social Support Instrument
165 items and a total score of 18 or less.(19) High stress burden was captured by answering
166 “Fairly often” or “Very often” to the 14-item Perceived Stress Scale(20) question “In the last
167 month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed?”

168

169 ***Collection and Adjudication of Hospital Readmission***

170 The primary end point of this study is all-cause readmission within 1 year of hospital
171 discharge. During the 1-year follow-up period, hospital readmissions were identified by the
172 research coordinators at each site from medical record and self-report. The VIRGO
173 adjudication process was supported through the use of a custom-developed Research
174 Electronic Data Capture external module.(21) Adjudications of all-cause and cardiac
175 readmission were completed by five physicians and an advanced practice registered nurse at
176 Yale University who received extensive training and clear guidelines. Detailed process has
177 been described elsewhere.(5) In sensitivity analysis, we restricted outcomes to cardiac
178 readmission and results remained consistent.

179

180 ***Statistical Analysis***

181 Baseline characteristics were compared between married/partnered versus
182 unpartnered participants, overall and by sex, using χ^2 test for dichotomous variables and
183 Wilcoxon's rank-sum test for continuous variables that don't follow a normal distribution.
184 All variables had minimal missing values (<5%) except for financial strain (11%). In
185 sensitivity analysis, multiple imputation by chained equations was applied to generate 10
186 imputed datasets on which estimates were calculated and pooled by the Rubin's rule.(22)
187 Modeling was performed both with and without the imputation of missing values and because
188 results were almost identical, we reported the complete case analysis in the main paper and
189 presented the results from multiple imputation in **eTable 1** in the **Supplement**.

190 Time to readmission was compared between married/partnered and unpartnered
191 groups using the log-rank test. To examine the independent association of marital/partner
192 status with all-cause readmission over the subsequent 1 year after AMI, multivariable Cox
193 proportional hazard models sequentially adjusted for 4 domains of covariates including
194 demographics (age, sex, race), socioeconomic factors (education level, financial strain,
195 employment status, and health insurance), clinical characteristics (cardiovascular risk factors,
196 medical history and disease severity), and psychosocial factors (depression, low social
197 support, high stress burden). Covariates adjusted in the multivariable models were selected
198 using a combination of clinical judgement and insights from previous literature,(5,23,24)
199 with a detailed variable selection procedure described elsewhere.(5) Two-way interaction
200 between marital/partner status and sex was also tested in the fully-adjusted model using the
201 Wald χ^2 test. The proportional hazard assumption was checked by Schoenfeld residual with a
202 global test $p>0.05$ indicating no violation.

203 Due to competing risk from non-cardiac readmissions, in the sensitivity analysis,
204 Fine-Gray competing risk model were applied to examine the association between
205 marital/partner status with the cumulative incidence of cardiac readmission within 1-year post

206 discharge. The same set of covariates considered in the Cox model were adjusted for in the
207 Fine-Gray model.


208 All statistical analyses were conducted using R (Version 1.4.1106), with 2-tailed tests
209 for statistical significance indicated by $P=0.05$. Data analysis was performed from February
210 to July 2022.

211

212 Results

213 Among the 2,979 participants 18-55 years of age (median age 48 years, interquartile
214 range 44-52), 42.8% were unpartnered (781 divorced/separated, 91 widowed, 423 single;
215 47% for women and 37.2% for men). Baseline characteristics are presented in **Table 1**.
216 During the first year of follow-up, 904 patients had ≥ 1 all-cause readmission (50.3% were
217 married), 641 had ≥ 1 cardiac readmission (50.2% were married). Overall, compared to
218 married/partnered individuals, those who were unpartnered had higher risk of all-cause
219 readmission throughout the first year of recovery (**Figure 1A**). When further stratified by sex,
220 married male had the lowest risk, while unmarried female had the highest (**Figure 1B**).
221

Figure 1 Kaplan Meier curves for time to all-cause readmission



222

223 In multivariable analyses, compared with being married/partnered, being unpartnered
 224 was associated with a 24% higher risk of all-cause readmission after adjustment for
 225 demographic factors (age, sex and race) (aHR, 1.24; 95%CI, 1.08-1.42). The association
 226 attenuated after further adjusting for socioeconomic factors (education, financial strain,
 227 employment, insurance) (aHR, 1.16; 95%CI, 1.01-1.34), and further attenuated and became
 228 not statistically significant after adjusting for clinical factors (aHR, 1.11; 95%CI, 0.96-1.29)
 229 and psychosocial factors (aHR, 1.10; 95%CI, 0.94-1.28). Variables that were significant in
 230 the fully adjusted model include female sex, age, Hispanic race, financial strain,
 231 unemployment, diabetes, prior CVD, COPD, total length of stay, and depression. Details of
 232 the model output can be found in **Table 2**.

233

234 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the study participants by marital/partner status and**
 235 **sex**

	Married/Partnered (N=1675)			Unpartnered (N=1299)			P-value (unpartnered vs. married/partnered)
	Men (n=610)	Women (n=1065)	p-value	Men (n=362)	Women (n=937)	p-value	
<i>Demographics</i>							
Age (Median [q1, q3])	48 [44, 52]	48 [44, 52]	0.898	48 [43, 51]	48 [44, 52]	0.085	0.259
Race			0.319			<0.001	<0.001
Non-Hispanic white	476 (78.0%)	813 (76.3%)		252 (69.6%)	532 (56.8%)		
Non-Hispanic black	53 (8.7%)	134 (12.6%)		52 (14.4%)	275 (29.3%)		
Hispanic	43 (7.0%)	64 (6.0%)		39 (10.8%)	87 (9.3%)		
Other	38 (6.2%)	54 (5.1%)		19 (5.2%)	43 (4.6%)		
<i>Socioeconomic factors</i>							
Education level			0.148			0.005	0.007
Less than high school	10 (1.6%)	18 (1.7%)		6 (1.7%)	24 (2.6%)		
Some high school	220 (36.1%)	435 (40.8%)		183 (50.6%)	383 (40.9%)		
More than high school	376 (61.6%)	605 (56.8%)		169 (46.7%)	523 (55.8%)		
Financial strain			<0.001			0.029	<0.001

Yes	340 (55.7%)	686 (64.4%)		254 (70.2%)	729 (77.8%)		
No	212 (34.8%)	279 (26.2%)		55 (15.2%)	97 (10.4%)		
Missing	58 (9.5%)	100 (9.4%)		53 (14.6%)	111 (11.8%)		
Employment status			<0.001			0.075	<0.001
Unemployed	124 (20.3%)	434 (40.8%)		145 (40.1%)	440 (47.0%)		
Employed	483 (79.2%)	631 (59.2%)		217 (59.9%)	495 (52.8%)		
Health insurance			0.964			<0.001	<0.001
No	104 (17.0%)	187 (17.6%)		137 (37.8%)	246 (26.3%)		
Yes	504 (82.6%)	874 (82.1%)		221 (61.0%)	690 (73.6%)		
Clinical factors(cardiac risk factors and medical history, disease severity)							
Hypertension	378 (62.0%)	659 (61.9%)	0.999	249 (68.8%)	687 (73.3%)	0.264	<0.001
High cholesterol	563 (92.3%)	889 (83.5%)	<0.001	340 (93.9%)	787 (84.0%)	<0.001	0.997
Diabetes	152 (24.9%)	379 (35.6%)	<0.001	107 (29.6%)	417 (44.5%)	<0.001	<0.001
Obesity	300 (49.2%)	545 (51.2%)	0.735	164 (45.3%)	562 (60.0%)	<0.001	0.013
Physical inactivity	163 (26.7%)	361 (33.9%)	0.009	132 (36.5%)	373 (39.8%)	0.575	<0.001
Current smoker	210 (34.4%)	338 (31.7%)	0.529	80 (22.1%)	263 (28.1%)	0.091	<0.001
Alcohol abuse	282 (46.2%)	287 (26.9%)	<0.001	173 (47.8%)	266 (28.4%)	<0.001	0.994
Prior cardiovascular disease	189 (31.0%)	348 (32.7%)	0.775	128 (35.4%)	367 (39.2%)	0.448	0.003
Renal dysfunction	41 (6.7%)	111 (10.4%)	0.040	42 (11.6%)	142 (15.2%)	0.254	<0.001
COPD	31 (5.1%)	130 (12.2%)	<0.001	31 (8.6%)	153 (16.3%)	0.002	<0.001
Type pf AMI			<0.001			<0.001	0.417
STEMI	351 (57.5%)	501 (47.0%)		212 (58.6%)	417 (44.5%)		
NSTEMI	259 (42.5%)	564 (53.0%)		150 (41.4%)	520 (55.5%)		
EF<40%			0.259			0.033	0.333
Yes	60 (9.8%)	132 (12.4%)		48 (13.3%)	79 (8.4%)		
No	535 (87.7%)	898 (84.3%)		304 (84.0%)	830 (88.6%)		
Length of stay (Median [q1, q3])	3 [2, 4]	3 [2, 4]	0.178	3 [2, 4]	3 [2, 5]	0.02	0.009
Psychosocial factors							
Depression	108 (17.7%)	362 (34.0%)	<0.001	103 (28.5%)	390 (41.6%)	<0.001	<0.001
High stress burden	211 (34.6%)	554 (52.0%)	<0.001	156 (43.1%)	531 (56.7%)	<0.001	<0.001
Low social support	82 (13.4%)	172 (16.2%)	0.341	130 (35.9%)	253 (27.0%)	0.007	<0.001
1-year readmission outcomes							
All-cause readmission	124 (20.3%)	331 (31.1%)	<0.001	97 (26.8%)	352 (37.6%)	0.001	<0.001
Cardiac readmission	94 (15.4%)	228 (21.4%)	0.001	78 (21.5%)	241 (25.7%)	0.293	0.002

236

237 **Table 2. Multivariable Cox regression models output**

	Model1 (R²=4.7%)	Model2 (R²=9.1%)	Model3 (R²=15%)	Model 4 (R²=16%)
Marital status (Unpartnered vs. Married/Partnered)	1.24 (1.08-1.42) *	1.16 (1.01-1.34) *	1.11 (0.96-1.29)	1.10 (0.94-1.28)
Demographics				
Female sex	1.52 (1.31-1.78) *	1.43 (1.21-1.69) *	1.36 (1.14-1.62) *	1.26 (1.05-1.51) *
Age, year	0.99 (0.98-1.00)	0.99 (0.98-1)	0.98 (0.97-0.99) *	0.98 (0.97-0.99) *
Race (ref: non-Hispanic white)	-	-	-	-
Non-Hispanic black	1.22 (1.04-1.44) *	1.18 (0.98-1.4)	1.15 (0.95-1.38)	1.19 (0.98-1.44)
Hispanic	0.66 (0.50-0.88) *	0.70 (0.52-0.95) *	0.64 (0.47-0.88) *	0.62 (0.45-0.87) *
Other race/ethnicity	0.84 (0.61-1.17)	0.89 (0.63-1.26)	0.87 (0.61-1.25)	0.91 (0.63-1.32)
Socioeconomic factors				
Education (ref: less than high school)		-	-	-
Some high school		0.91 (0.55-1.51)	1.04 (0.61-1.78)	0.97 (0.56-1.68)
More than high school		0.86 (0.52-1.44)	1.00 (0.58-1.70)	0.93 (0.53-1.61)
Financial strain		1.41 (1.15-1.72) *	1.32 (1.08-1.63) *	1.33 (1.07-1.64) *
Unemployment		1.49 (1.30-1.72) *	1.30 (1.11-1.54) *	1.30 (1.10-1.52) *
No health insurance		1.23 (1.04-1.47) *	1.12 (0.93-1.34)	1.14 (0.95-1.37)
Clinical factors (Cardiac risk factors, medical history, and disease severity)				
Hypertension			1.05 (0.88-1.25)	1.01 (0.84-1.21)
High cholesterol			1.13 (0.89-1.42)	1.08 (0.85-1.37)
Diabetes			1.31 (1.12-1.54) *	1.33 (1.13-1.56) *
Obesity			0.89 (0.77-1.04)	0.88 (0.75-1.02)
Physical inactivity			1.08 (0.93-1.25)	1.05 (0.9-1.23)
Current smoking			1.07 (0.91-1.27)	1.11 (0.93-1.31)
Alcohol abuse			0.96 (0.82-1.13)	0.98 (0.83-1.16)
Prior cardiovascular disease			1.23 (1.06-1.44) *	1.22 (1.03-1.43) *
Renal dysfunction			1.19 (0.96-1.47)	1.23 (0.99-1.52)
COPD			1.35 (1.11-1.65) *	1.32 (1.07-1.62) *
STEMI			1.00 (0.87-1.16)	1.04 (0.89-1.21)
Ejection Fraction <40%			0.92 (0.73-1.16)	0.89 (0.7-1.13)
Total length of stay			1.03 (1.02-1.05) *	1.03 (1.01-1.05) *

<i>Psychosocial factors</i>				
Depression				1.35 (1.13-1.61) *
Low social support				0.97 (0.81-1.16)
High stress burden				1.07 (0.91-1.26)

238

239 *p<0.05 indicating statistical significance.

240 Note: Model 1 adjusted for demographics; Model 2 adjusted for demographics and socioeconomic factors; Model 3 adjusted for

241 demographics, socioeconomic, and clinical factors. Model 4 adjusted for demographic, socioeconomic, clinical and psychosocial factors.

242 Covariates were pre-selected based on prior literature and clinical implications. Interaction between marital/partner status and sex was tested

243 and was not significant in the fully adjusted models (p=0.628). Fully adjusted model does not violate the proportional hazard assumption

244 (global p>0.05).

245

246 In the fully adjusted model, the two-way interaction between marital/partner status

247 and sex was not significant (p=0.628). To provide additional information on the direction of

248 the interaction, the fully adjusted models were also stratified by sex. Details of the sex-

249 specific models output can be found in **eTable 2** in the **Supplement**.

250 Sensitivity analysis using data with multiple imputation, and restricting outcomes to

251 cardiac readmission yielded comparable results (**eTable 1** and **eTable 3** in the **Supplement**).

252 In the fully adjusted model with imputed data, no health insurance was also associated with

253 all-cause readmission. When restricting outcomes to cardiac readmission using the Fine-Gray

254 model, financial strain and depression were no longer significant in the fully adjusted model.

255 In a secondary analysis further classifying unpartnered participants into

256 divorces/separated, widowed, and single subgroups, similar pattern was found among

257 divorced/separated individuals as compared to the overall unpartnered group; widowed

258 individuals had the highest risk of all-cause readmission, yet the association was not

259 statistically significant due to the small size of widowed participants in current study; no

260 association was found among single individuals. (**Table 3**)

261

262 **Table 3. Association between marital/partner status subgroup and all-cause**
263 **readmission**

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Married/Partnered (1675)	ref	ref	ref	Ref
Unpartnered (1299)	1.24 (1.08-1.42) *	1.16 (1.01-1.34) *	1.11 (0.96-1.29)	1.10 (0.94-1.28)
Divorced/Separated (781)	1.26 (1.08-1.46) *	1.20 (1.02-1.41) *	1.17 (0.98-1.38)	1.15 (0.96-1.37)
Widowed (91)	1.39 (0.99-1.95)	1.29 (0.91-1.84)	1.09 (0.76-1.57)	1.04 (0.72-1.51)
Single (423)	1.17 (0.96-1.43)	1.06 (0.85-1.31)	1.00 (0.80-1.26)	1.00 (0.80-1.28)

264

265 *p<0.05 indicating statistical significance.

266 Note: Model 1 adjusted for demographics; Model 2 adjusted for demographics and socioeconomic factors; Model 3 adjusted for

267 demographics, socioeconomic, and clinical factors. Model 4 adjusted for demographic, socioeconomic, clinical and psychosocial factors.

268 Covariates were pre-selected based on prior literature and clinical implications.

269

270 **Discussion**

271 In a cohort of young adults with AMI in the United States, we found a 1.3-fold higher
272 readmission rate in unpartnered compared to married/partnered individuals. The association
273 between marital/partner status and 1-year all-cause readmission attenuated and remained
274 significant after adjusting for demographic and socioeconomic factors, but was not
275 significant after further adjusting for clinical and psychosocial factors. Sex difference was not
276 evident in the fully adjusted model.

277 Prior research generally supported improved survival and fewer recurrent events in
278 married individuals compared to their unmarried counterparts within 1-year post AMI.(7–13)
279 However, only a few studies investigated the impact of marital/partner status on post-event
280 health outcomes beyond mortality among AMI survivors, with younger patients being
281 underrepresented.(11–13) Our study addresses this important knowledge gap using
282 adjudicated readmission data from a large nationwide cohort of young adults with AMI in the
283 United States. Compared to an Israeli study of AMI patients with a mean age of 64 years,(11)

284 which found no unadjusted association between marital status and 30-day readmission
285 (17.8% among married, 19.1% among nonmarried, $p=0.28$), our study showed a higher
286 unadjusted all-cause readmission rate within 1 year after AMI among unpartnered individuals
287 compared to married/partnered. Differences in the results could be due to a longer follow up
288 time in our study, and different participant characteristics (eg, younger age, different culture).

289 Previous studies that reported an independent association between marital status and
290 AMI outcomes have not generally accounted for socioeconomic or psychosocial factors in
291 their analyses.(11–13) However, mounting evidence has demonstrated that these factors are
292 more powerful predictors of adverse outcomes following AMI than physical health
293 indicators, especially in a younger population.(5) Our finding of the association being
294 attenuated after adjusting for socioeconomic status and clinical factors supported the roles of
295 both clinical (ie, diabetes, CVD history, COPD, length of stay) and socioeconomical
296 components (ie, financial and employment status) in explaining the complicated relationship
297 between marriage/partnership and health outcomes. Further, these findings align with
298 prevailing theories that explain the mechanism of marriage protection. First, the marriage
299 selection theory suggests that healthier people may be more likely to get and stay
300 married.(25) In our study we also observed poorer health at baseline, including clinical,
301 behavioral and psychosocial factors, among unpartnered compared to married/partnered
302 individuals. Second, the social causation theory centered on the health benefits from spousal
303 support with regard to treatment adherence, lifestyle changes, as well as greater
304 socioeconomic resources, which make healthy behaviors affordable.(26,27) In our study,
305 while further adjusting for psychosocial factors didn't substantially change the results,
306 findings provided a more comprehensive risk factor profile for young adults with AMI,
307 where unpartnered individuals were more likely to have depression, low social support, and
308 high stress burden at baseline. Our results lend support to marriage selection and social

309 causation theories in a younger population with AMI, but should be interpreted with caution
310 since our exploratory analysis can only generate associational evidence. Future research is
311 encouraged to include a formal mediation analysis to understand the complex relationship
312 and potential causal pathway associated with these findings.

313 Studies on sex differences in the impact of marital/partner status on cardiovascular
314 outcomes have yielded mixed findings, with the majority of prior work supporting a greater
315 marital benefit for men than women.(6,10,13,15) On the contrary, our study did not find such
316 a sex difference in the association in a younger population. The potential mechanism for such
317 findings is likely to be the offset of biological and psychosocial effects. Physiologically,
318 women were protected against heart disease by sex hormones such as estrogen that reduces
319 circulatory levels of harmful cholesterol, testosterone that increase the concentrations of low-
320 density lipoprotein and inflammatory markers that affect atherosclerosis and stroke
321 progression.(28) From a psychosocial perspective, however, women had distinct
322 vulnerabilities, including unique sources of psychosocial stress and discrimination, increased
323 perceived stress during adulthood, and twofold greater lifetime prevalence of depression and
324 anxiety disorders compared with men.(29–31) This was also evident in the current study that
325 unmarried women had the highest likelihood to have depression and high stress burden.
326 Taken together, while our study found the impact of marital/partner status being equal for
327 younger men and women, it might involve a mixture of biological and psychosocial effects
328 that warrant further investigation.

329

330 ***Study Implications***

331 This study adds to the understanding of the association between marital/partner status
332 and readmission outcomes up to 1 year post event in younger adults with AMI. Readmission
333 presents a complex interaction between patients, community, environment, and healthcare

334 system, and is an important measure indicating health outcomes and disease burden. Usually
335 perceived as a demographic variable, marital/partner status adds an important dimension of
336 social support and is also an easily attainable indicator. Clinicians may consider incorporate
337 patients' marital/partner status along with other socio-demographic factors into risk
338 assessment and decision-making to create a more patient-centered practice. Our study may
339 also inform potential interventions based on the social and psychological context of younger
340 adults with AMI. For example, support groups or secondary prevention programs could
341 widen participation of unpartnered individuals to improve their psychosocial well-being and
342 recovery.

343

344 ***Limitations***

345 Limitations of this study merit discussion. Self-reported readmission were validated
346 with retroactive chart review but misclassification bias may still be present. Although our
347 study included an extensive array of demographic, socioeconomic and clinical factors,
348 residual confounding due to unmeasured characteristics that differ by marital/partner status
349 may still bias the results. Our modeling approach generated only associational evidence
350 instead of causation, therefore findings should be interpreted with caution. Participants
351 enrolled in the VIRGO study may not reflect those who did not enroll in the study or
352 hospitalized at other institutions.

353

354 ***Conclusions***

355 Compared to young adults with AMI who are married/partnered, unpartnered
356 individuals had 1.3 times higher risk of all-cause readmission within 1 year after hospital
357 discharge. The association attenuated yet remained significant after adjusting for
358 demographic and socioeconomic factors, but was not significant after further adjusting for

359 clinical and psychosocial factors. Sex difference was not evident in the association. Further
360 study is needed to explore causal relationships.

361

362 **Acknowledgements:** None.

363

364 **Sources of Funding:** The VIRGO study was supported by a 4-year National Heart, Lung,
365 and Blood Institute grant (No. 5R01HL081153). Dr Dreyer is supported by an American
366 Heart Association (AHA) Transformational Project Award (#19TPA34830013). This project
367 was additionally supported by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research project grant (PJT-
368 159508).

369

370 **Disclosures:** Dr. Spertus discloses providing consultative services on patient-reported
371 outcomes and evidence evaluation to Alnylam, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Merck, Janssen, Bristol
372 Meyers Squibb, Edwards, Kineksia, 4DT Medical, Terumo, Cytokinetics, Imbria, and United
373 Healthcare. He holds research grants from Bristol Meyers Squibb, Abbott Vascular and
374 Janssen. He owns the copyright to the Seattle Angina Questionnaire, Kansas City
375 Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire, and Peripheral Artery Questionnaire and serves on the Board
376 of Directors for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas City. No other authors report having any
377 other disclosures to report.

378

379 **References:**

- 380 1. Wilmot KA, O’Flaherty M, Capewell S, Ford ES, Vaccarino V. Coronary Heart Disease
381 Mortality Declines in the United States From 1979 Through 2011 Evidence for
382 Stagnation in Young Adults, Especially Women. *Circulation*. 2015 Sep 15;132(11):997–
383 1002.
- 384 2. Arora Sameer, Stouffer George A., Kucharska-Newton Anna M., Qamar Arman,
385 Vaduganathan Muthiah, Pandey Ambarish, et al. Twenty Year Trends and Sex
386 Differences in Young Adults Hospitalized With Acute Myocardial Infarction.
387 *Circulation*. 2019 Feb 19;139(8):1047–56.
- 388 3. Khera R, Jain S, Pandey A, Agusala V, Kumbhani DJ, Das SR, et al. Comparison of
389 Readmission Rates After Acute Myocardial Infarction in 3 Patient Age Groups (18 to 44,
390 45 to 64, and ≥ 65 Years) in the United States. *The American Journal of Cardiology*. 2017
391 Nov 15;120(10):1761–7.
- 392 4. Sawano M, Lu Y, Caraballo C, Mahajan S, Dreyer R, Lichtman JH, et al. Sex Difference
393 in Outcomes of Acute Myocardial Infarction in Young Patients. *Journal of the American*
394 *College of Cardiology*. 2023 May 9;81(18):1797–806.
- 395 5. Dreyer RP, Raparelli V, Tsang SW, D’Onofrio G, Lorenze N, Xie CF, et al.
396 Development and Validation of a Risk Prediction Model for 1-Year Readmission Among
397 Young Adults Hospitalized for Acute Myocardial Infarction. *Journal of the American*
398 *Heart Association*. 2021 Sep 21;10(18):e021047.
- 399 6. Wong CW, Kwok CS, Narain A, Gulati M, Mihalidou AS, Wu P, et al. Marital status and
400 risk of cardiovascular diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart*. 2018
401 Dec;104(23):1937–48.
- 402 7. Chandra V, Szklo M, Goldberg R, Tonascia J. The impact of marital status on survival
403 after an acute myocardial infarction: a population-based study. *American Journal of*
404 *Epidemiology*. 1983 Mar;117(3):320–5.
- 405 8. Hadi Khafaji HAR, Al Habib K, Asaad N, Singh R, Hersi A, Falaeh HA, et al. Marital
406 Status and Outcome of Patients Presenting with Acute Coronary Syndrome: An
407 Observational Report. *Clin Cardiol*. 2012 Jun 27;35(12):741–8.
- 408 9. Consuegra-Sánchez L, Melgarejo-Moreno A, Jaulent-Huertas L, Díaz-Pastor Á,
409 Escudero-García G, Vicente-Gilabert M, et al. Unraveling the relation between marital
410 status and prognosis among myocardial infarction survivors: Impact of being widowed on
411 mortality. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2015 Apr 15;185:141–3.
- 412 10. Quinones PA, Kirchberger I, Heier M, Kuch B, Trentinaglia I, Mielck A, et al. Marital
413 status shows a strong protective effect on long-term mortality among first acute
414 myocardial infarction-survivors with diagnosed hyperlipidemia – findings from the
415 MONICA/KORA myocardial infarction registry. *BMC Public Health*. 2014 Jan 30;14:98.
- 416 11. Marcus G, Litovchik I, Pereg D, Beigel R, Sholmo N, Iakobishvili Z, et al. Impact of
417 Marital Status on the Outcome of Acute Coronary Syndrome: Results From the Acute

- 418 Coronary Syndrome Israeli Survey. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2019 Jul
419 16;8(14):e011664.
- 420 12. Ohm J, Skoglund PH, Discacciati A, Sundström J, Hambraeus K, Jernberg T, et al.
421 Socioeconomic status predicts second cardiovascular event in 29,226 survivors of a first
422 myocardial infarction. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*. 2018 Jun
423 1;25(9):985–93.
- 424 13. Barbash IM, Gaglia MA, Torguson R, Minha S, Satler LF, Pichard AD, et al. Effect of
425 marital status on the outcome of patients undergoing elective or urgent coronary
426 revascularization. *American Heart Journal*. 2013 Oct 1;166(4):729–36.
- 427 14. Molloy GJ, Stamatakis E, Randall G, Hamer M. Marital status, gender and cardiovascular
428 mortality: Behavioural, psychological distress and metabolic explanations. *Soc Sci Med*.
429 2009 Jul;69(2):223–8.
- 430 15. Wang Y, Jiao Y, Nie J, O’Neil A, Huang W, Zhang L, et al. Sex differences in the
431 association between marital status and the risk of cardiovascular, cancer, and all-cause
432 mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 7,881,040 individuals. *Glob Health
433 Res Policy*. 2020 Feb 28;5:4.
- 434 16. Lichtman JH, Lorenze NP, D’Onofrio G, Spertus JA, Lindau ST, Morgan TM, et al.
435 Variation in Recovery: Role of Gender on Outcomes of Young AMI Patients (VIRGO)
436 Study Design. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2010 Nov;3(6):684–
437 93.
- 438 17. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity
439 measure. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001 Sep;16(9):606–13.
- 440 18. Enhancing Recovery in Coronary Heart Disease Patients (ENRICHD): Study design and
441 methods. *American Heart Journal*. 2000 Jan 1;139(1):1–9.
- 442 19. Vaglio J, Conard M, Poston WS, O’Keefe J, Haddock CK, House J, et al. Testing the
443 performance of the ENRICHD Social Support Instrument in cardiac patients. *Health Qual
444 Life Outcomes*. 2004 May 13;2:24.
- 445 20. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc
446 Behav*. 1983 Dec;24(4):385–96.
- 447 21. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, et al. The REDCap
448 Consortium: Building an International Community of Software Platform Partners. *J
449 Biomed Inform*. 2019 Jul;95:103208.
- 450 22. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues
451 and guidance for practice. *Stat Med*. 2011 Feb 20;30(4):377–99.
- 452 23. Raparelli V, Pilote L, Dang B, Behlouli H, Dziura JD, Bueno H, et al. Variations in
453 Quality of Care by Sex and Social Determinants of Health Among Younger Adults With
454 Acute Myocardial Infarction in the US and Canada. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021 Oct
455 20;4(10):e2128182.

- 456 24. Raparelli V, Benea D, Nunez Smith M, Behloul H, Murphy TE, D’Onofrio G, et al.
457 Impact of Race on the In-Hospital Quality of Care Among Young Adults With Acute
458 Myocardial Infarction. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2021 Sep
459 7;10(17):e021408.
- 460 25. Joung IMA, van de Mheen HD, Stronks K, van Poppel FWA, Mackenbach JP. A
461 longitudinal study of health selection in marital transitions. *Social Science & Medicine*.
462 1998 Feb 1;46(3):425–35.
- 463 26. Burman B, Margolin G. Analysis of the association between marital relationships and
464 health problems: An interactional perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1992;112(1):39–
465 63.
- 466 27. Goldman N. Marriage selection and mortality patterns: Inferences and fallacies.
467 *Demography*. 1993 May 1;30(2):189–208.
- 468 28. Shufelt C, Pacheco C, Tweet MS, Miller VM. Sex-specific physiology and
469 cardiovascular disease. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2018;1065:433–54.
- 470 29. Bale TL, Epperson CN. Sex differences and stress across the lifespan. *Nat Neurosci*.
471 2015 Oct;18(10):1413–20.
- 472 30. Medina-Inojosa JR, Vinnakota S, Garcia M, Arciniegas Calle M, Mulvagh SL, Lopez-
473 Jimenez F, et al. Role of Stress and Psychosocial Determinants on Women’s
474 Cardiovascular Risk and Disease Development. *Journal of Women’s Health*. 2019
475 Apr;28(4):483–9.
- 476 31. Gaffey AE, Gathright EC, Fletcher LM, Goldstein CM. Screening for Psychological
477 Distress and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease and Related Mortality: A SYSTEMATIZED
478 REVIEW, META-ANALYSIS, AND CASE FOR PREVENTION. *Journal of*
479 *Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation and Prevention*. 2022 Nov;42(6):404–15.
- 480

Supporting Information Captions

Appendix STROBE Statement Checklist

eTable 1. Multivariable Cox regression models output using multiple imputed data

eTable 2. Sex-specific Cox regression model output

eTable 3. Multivariable Fine-Grey models (cardiac readmission)