

Full title: Combined Effect of Inflammation and Malnutrition for Long-term Prognosis in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome: A Cohort Study

Cover Title: INTERPLAY OF INFLAMMATION AND MALNUTRITION IN ACS

Yang Yuxiu^{†1}, Xiaoteng Ma^{†1}, Fei Gao¹, Tao Liu², Jianping Deng², Qiuxuan Li¹, Zaiqiang Liu¹, Yufei Wang¹, Yang Zheng¹, Jingyao Yang¹, Zhijian Wang^{1*}

¹ Department of Cardiology, Center for Coronary Artery Disease, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100037, China

² Department of Cardiology, Beijing Anzhen Nanchong Hospital, Capital Medical University, Nanchong, Sichuan 637000, China

[†] Yuxiu Yang and Xiaoteng Ma have contributed equally to this work and share the first authorship.

* Correspondence to Zhijian Wang.

Corresponding Author:

Zhijian Wang, MD,

Department of Cardiology, Center for Coronary Artery Disease, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, 2 Anzhen Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China 100037

Email: zjwang1975@hotmail.com

Tel: (+86) 15711057972

Abstract

Background: Dysregulated inflammation with superimposed malnutrition may constitute a significant threat in acute coronary syndrome (ACS), which needs to be elucidated. We aimed to explore the prevalence and combined predictive value of inflammation and malnutrition in ACS patients.

Methods: Patients presenting with ACS undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) were retrospectively included and stratified into four groups: nourished without elevated high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP), nourished with elevated hs-CRP, malnourished without elevated hs-CRP, and malnourished with elevated hs-CRP. Elevated hs-CRP was determined as over 2.2mg/L, and malnutrition was defined according to the nutritional risk index (NRI). The primary outcome was major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs), the composite of cardiac mortality, non-fatal myocardial infarction, non-fatal stroke, and unplanned revascularization.

Results: A total of 1,743 patients were ultimately included; 646 (37%) presented elevated hs-CRP, and 119 (7%) were considered malnourished. During a median follow-up of 30 months, 351 (20.1%) MACEs occurred. The coexistence of malnutrition and elevated hs-CRP correlated with the worst outcomes among the four phenotypes, with a significantly increased risk of MACEs (adjusted hazard ratio: 2.446; 95% confidence interval: 1.464 - 4.089; $p < 0.001$). In the subgroup analysis, NRI displayed MACEs-predicting value merely among patients with elevated hs-CRP rather than those without (p for interaction = 0.005), suggesting the modifying effect of inflammation; simultaneously, the prognostic implications of hs-CRP were influenced by patients' baseline nutritional status, as it only existed in malnourished patients (p for interaction < 0.001).

Conclusions: Among patients with ACS undergoing PCI, the double burden of inflammation and malnutrition signifies poorer outcomes, and their prognostic implications may be amplified by each other, which would provide implications to facilitate more individualized ACS care.

Keywords: inflammation; malnutrition; acute coronary syndrome

Introduction

Acute coronary syndrome (ACS) is still among the leading causes of global mortality and morbidity regardless of region or ethnicity, even though there has been substantial scientific progress and mature management systems¹. As a systemic and dynamic process, inflammation plays multiple maladaptive roles contributing to the progression and destabilization of ACS, including atherogenesis, plaque evolution, thrombogenesis, as well as myocardial damage and repair^{2,3}. Decades of evidence have accumulated supporting that using high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP), white blood cell (WBC) count, or the neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) as an effective systemic inflammatory indicator among ACS patients to guide risk stratification and therapeutic approaches⁴⁻⁶. However, it's still pending to identify suitable patients who would benefit more from the proactive anti-inflammatory therapy on the road to more individualized ACS care.

Coronary artery disease (CAD) has long been addressed as one of the “diseases of affluence”, a corollary to the population-wide rise in overnutrition and increasing income in society⁷; studies in recent years have raised a particular concern that malnutrition is not insubstantial in patients with ACS in both developed and developing countries, even among those obese^{8,9}. Malnutrition fosters an increased burden through the vicious cycle of sarcopenia, cardiac dysfunction, and cardiogenic cachexia in cardiovascular diseases (CVD)^{10,11}, and it’s also a modifiable risk factor on which physicians could act¹²; however, the emphasis of which has not been placed enough in the current ACS guidelines and clinical practice^{13,14}. There is no one universal screening method for malnutrition but rather several diagnosing tools that have been validated for different settings; the nutritional risk index (NRI), the controlling nutritional status (COUNT) score, and the prognostic nutritional index (PNI) has been commonly used in these years’ studies for their simplicity and accessibility, each of them presents with different discrimination abilities in diverse diseases or conditions^{15,16}.

Dysregulated inflammation with superimposed undernutrition may constitute a significant yet relatively concealed threat in ACS pathophysiology, which needs additional attention and integrated responses. Here, we aimed to explore the combined effects and interplay of inflammation and malnutrition on outcomes in ACS patients to provide valuable information facilitating optimizing individualized care.

Methods

Study design and population

In this single-center, retrospective observational cohort, patients presenting with ACS undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) between June 2016 and November 2017 at Beijing Anzhen Hospital were consecutively included. Patients with missing data on nutrition-inflammation stratification or a known history of coronary artery bypass grafting were excluded. Baseline demographic data, previous medical history, clinical presentations, laboratory and echocardiographic results, angiographic and procedural characteristics, and medications were collected from the electronic medical records. This study followed the Helsinki Declaration of Human Rights and was approved by the institutional review board (IRB) of Beijing Anzhen Hospital (IRB number: 2016034x). The IRB waived the need for written patient consent as this study involved a retrospective analysis of clinically acquired data.

Definitions

Inflammatory status was preliminarily evaluated by the level of circulating hs-CRP, WBC counts, and NLR (measured by absolute neutrophil count/total lymphocyte count), and hs-CRP was finally chosen to stratify high-inflamed patients with the cut-off value of 2.2mg/L due to its highest predictive ability among the three indices; Nutritional status was graded using the NRI, COUNT score, and PNI, respectively, and the NRI was ultimately chosen as the malnutrition criterion, given its better predictive ability than COUNT or PNI in our cohort (**Supplementary Table 1**). The NRI was calculated using $[1.519 \times \text{serum albumin (g/L)}] + 41.7 \times (\text{current$

weight/ideal weight)] for patients under the age of 65 and $[1.489 \times \text{serum albumin (g/L)}] + 41.7 \times (\text{current weight/ideal weight})$ for those over 65, the latter formula is also known as the geriatric NRI (GNRI)¹⁷. The ideal body weight was considered using the Lorenz formula, that is, $[\text{height (cm)} - 100 - ([\text{height (cm)} - 150]/4)]$ for men, and $[\text{height (cm)} - 100 - ([\text{height (cm)} - 150]/2.5)]$ for women¹⁸. Scores of 97.5–100, 83.5–97.5, and <83.5 were considered mild, moderate, and severe malnutrition in patients younger than 65, while patients over 65 using scores of 92–100, 82–92, and <82 to stratify mild, moderate, and severe malnutrition¹⁷. The CONUT score was calculated as a sum of the scores based on the serum albumin, total cholesterol concentration, and absolute lymphocyte count and classified as normal, light, moderate, or severe for scores of 0–1, 2–4, 5–8 and 9–12, respectively¹⁹. PNI was calculated as $[\text{serum albumin (g/L)} + 5 \times \text{total lymphocyte count (10}^9/\text{L)}]$, and scores of 35–38 and <35 reflect moderate and severe malnutrition, respectively²⁰. Standard modifiable cardiovascular risk factors (SMuRFs) include hypertension, diabetes, hypercholesterolemia, and current smoking, and SMuRF-less refers to no evidence of SMuRF²¹. Anemia was defined as hemoglobin < 120 g/L for men and <110 g/L for women²².

Outcomes

The primary outcome was major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs), defined as the composite proportion of cardiac mortality, non-fatal MI, non-fatal stroke, and unplanned revascularization. The study index date was the admission date, and complete follow-up was until any MACE occurred or December 2020, whichever came first. Patients were followed up every six months by telephone or through available medical records.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were summarized as frequencies and percentages; numerical variables were summarized as the mean (standard deviation, SD) or median (interquartile range, IQR), depending on the data distribution. Categorical variables were compared with the χ^2 test, and continuous variables with Mann-Whitney non-parametric tests. Receiver-operating characteristic curve (ROC) analyses were performed to estimate the discriminative abilities of the nutritional scores and systemic inflammatory indicators on MACEs. The associations between the variables and the binary study outcomes were assessed using multivariable Cox proportional hazards regression models with a hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) in the total population and by stratified groups. Besides, the interactions between malnutrition and inflammation were tested by conducting likelihood ratio tests. Potential confounders selected by univariable Cox hazards analysis with $p < 0.05$ were included in adjusted models, which were heart rate, pulse pressure, family history of CAD, diabetes, peripheral artery disease (PAD), old MI (OMI), prior PCI, anemia, WBC, triglycerides (TG), total cholesterol (TC), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), CrCl, uric acid, fasting plasma glucose (FPG), glycated hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), left ventricular systolic dysfunction (LVSD), multivessel coronary artery disease, SYNTAX score, complete revascularization, discharged with aspirin plus clopidogrel, and discharged with beta-blocker; to be clear, systemic or diastolic blood pressure, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio,

hs-CRP, and albumin were not included in the adjusted model to avoid over adjustment bias even though their significant correlation with outcomes (**Supplementary Table 2**). Kaplan-Meier survival probability estimates were calculated from the date of PCI up to the total available follow-up at three years, stratified according to nutritional and inflammatory status, and assessed with the log-rank test. The concordance index, net reclassification improvement, and integrated discrimination improvement statistical analyses were performed to evaluate the incremental value of the hs-CRP or NRI in addition to the GRACE (Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events) risk model. All analyses were done with R software (version 3.5.0, Austria) and Prism software (version 5.0, USA). A two-sided p-value of less than 0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance.

Result

A total of 1,743 ACS patients treated with PCI who met the enrollment criteria were included, with an average age of 60 years, of whom 76.5% were male. Over a median follow-up of 30 months (IQR, 30–36months), 351 (20.1%) MACEs occurred, including 37 (2.1%) cardiac deaths, 43 (2.5%) non-fatal MI, 22 (1.3%) non-fatal stroke, and 249 (14.3%) unplanned coronary revascularization. The baseline characteristics of patients stratified by the occurrence of MACEs were summarized in **Supplementary Table 3**, thereinto 50%, 7%, and 0.3% of ACS patients were classified as malnourished by COUNT, NRI, and PNI, respectively, and no one was considered severely malnourished by any score.

Determined by ROC and Cox regression analyses, hs-CRP over 2.2mg/L and NRI were used to identify high-inflamed and malnourished patients, respectively (**Supplementary Table 1**). Patients were stratified into four phenotypes according to their nutritional status and hs-CRP categories as nourished without elevated hs-CRP group (n=1051), nourished with elevated hs-CRP group (n=573), malnourished without elevated hs-CRP group (n=46), and malnourished with elevated hs-CRP group (n=73). Compared with the other groups, malnourished patients with elevated hs-CRP were more prone to complicated diabetes, anemia, and renal dysfunction, presenting with larger proportions of AMI, worse cardiac function, and more complex coronary lesions; they were also more often to be prescribed with furosemide on discharge. After 30 months of follow-up, patients in the malnourished and elevated hs-CRP group showed the highest rates of MACEs (41.1%), cardiac death (12.3%), non-fatal MI (4.1%), and unplanned revascularization (24.7%) among the four groups (**Table 1**). The adjusted impact of inflammation or malnutrition on outcomes is shown in **Table 2**. Malnutrition showed a significant correlation to the subsequent cardiac death, unplanned revascularization, and overall MACEs; the high-inflamed status was related to the increased MACEs, mainly driven by the incidence of unplanned revascularization. Kaplan-Meier survival analyses showed that malnourished patients with elevated hs-CRP levels exhibited the most unfavorable prognosis in terms of MACEs, cardiac death, and unplanned revascularization. However, no difference among the four groups was found in non-fatal MI or non-fatal stroke (**Figure 1**).

With nourished without the elevated hs-CRP group as the reference, malnourished patients with elevated hs-CRP showed significantly higher MACEs, cardiac death, and unplanned revascularization in multivariate analyses (all $p < 0.05$); the nourished with elevated hs-CRP group presented with obviously increased cardiac death and unplanned revascularization (all $p < 0.05$). Interestingly, patients in the malnourished group without elevated hs-CRP exhibited no significant difference in affecting MACEs and each component compared with the reference group (**Table 3**). The same analyses were done in patients classified by hs-CRP and the COUNT score, which showed no significant differences among the groups (**Supplementary Table 4**).

To further understand whether the effect of elevated hs-CRP or malnutrition on the MACEs noted in the whole cohort was influenced by baseline nutritional or inflammatory status, we conducted stratified analyses within subgroups and calculated interaction statistics. As shown in **Table 4A**, the p-value for interaction between nutritional status (nourished vs. malnourished) and hs-CRP levels ($\leq 2.2\text{mg/L}$ vs. $> 2.2\text{mg/L}$) on MACEs was 0.248; when including hs-CRP in the model as a continuous variable, it remained a risk enhancer among the malnourished ($p = 0.003$) but not the nourished ($p = 0.620$), with evidence for interaction (p for interaction = 0.001). Simultaneously, as it was included in the model as a continuous variable, the NRI score still shared a significant correlation with MACEs in high-inflamed patients ($p = 0.003$) while failing to present it in those without ($p = 0.869$), with evidence for interaction (p for interaction = 0.005) (**Table 4B**). When hs-CRP and malnutrition were both included in the model as continuous variables, there was evidence for effect modification between each other on the association of MACEs (P for interaction = 0.046).

Finally, the incremental predictive effect of hs-CRP or NRI beyond the established GRACE risk model was evaluated. As adding each variate into the GRACE model significantly increased the original predictive value on MACEs or cardiac death, a synergistic effect showed when combining both hs-CRP and NRI with the GRACE model (**Table 5**).

Discussion

This study of retrospective data is the first to highlight the importance of an easily overlooked subgroup of ACS patients, who suffered a double burden of malnutrition and high-inflamed status. We observed that malnutrition combined with elevated hs-CRP is significantly associated with an increased risk of long-term cardiac outcomes among ACS patients, and inflammation and malnutrition may interplay by amplifying the harmful effects of each other.

The prevalence of malnutrition identified throughout the present ACS cohort and previous studies varied across different screening tools, population characteristics, and sample sizes. Komici et al. evaluated the nutritional status of 174 elderly AMI patients by Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA), and 12% of patients were malnourished²³; Tonet et al. reported that 4% of elderly ACS patients were undernourished using the MNA–Short Form²⁴. Li et al. surveyed 5,710 CAD patients with prediabetes or diabetes (49% were ACS), showing that malnutrition rate was 10%, 8%, 46%, and 20% according to GLIM criteria, PNI, COUNT score, and NRI, respectively²⁵.

In another cohort with 705 patients diagnosed with ACS and chronic kidney disease (CKD), malnutrition was found in 30%, 80%, and 90% of the population according to the PNI, CONUT, and GNRI, respectively²⁶. Data from 5,062 ACS patients suggested that malnutrition prevailed in over 50% of cases based on the CONUT score, NRI, or PNI²⁷. Another large cohort involving 10,161 AMI patients who underwent PCI showed that 11% were at risk of malnutrition as determined by GNRI²⁸. Recently, Kong et al. observed 1,829 AMI patients, 76.5%, 61.8%, and 39.3% of whom were malnourished according to the CONUT score, NRI, and PNI, respectively⁹. These variations reflect the necessity and importance of setting universal, standardized, and pragmatic nutritional evaluation criteria to facilitate risk stratification and management. In 2018, the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN) led the launching of the Global Leadership Initiative on Malnutrition (GLIM) as a consensus-based criterion of malnutrition²⁹; however, the need to be equipped with body composition measuring techniques may hinder its wide use in a general setting, and it has yet to get prospective clinical validation among CVD. Although the COUNT score has been frequently used in recent studies among CVD patients, its scoring outcome could be strongly perturbed by lipid-lowering therapies, especially in those with past pertinent history and are potentially at high risk, which partly explains why the COUNT score lacked discrimination ability in our cohort with 72% of the participants received statin pre-admission. Besides, the PNI showed a severely poor sensitivity in our cohort, which was in line with some previous studies^{9,25}. The NRI displayed the best risk-discriminating ability among the three screening tools in our cohort, which is inconsistent with an earlier study suggesting that the CONUT score had a higher predictive ability in AMI patients than the NRI and PNI. Thus, studies based on large ACS populations and thorough assessments are needed to establish a consensus on which nutritional evaluation method to use for patients with ACS.

In our cohort, elders, females, and lean people were found more frequently in the malnourished group, and they also displayed lower cholesterol levels; these clinical characteristics are consistent with the former studies^{9,27}. One of the notable observations of our study is that a heavy burden of systemic inflammation marked by elevated hs-CRP prevailed in malnourished ACS patients by over 60%, suggesting a possible close interaction between malnutrition and inflammation in the pathophysiology and progression of CVD. Inflammation is thought to be a key driver for sarcopenia elicited by an underlying illness, leading to disease-related malnutrition and increased mortality^{30,31}. CAD has been recognized as not only a lipid metabolic disorder but also an inflammation-mediated systemic disease, with the pro- and anti-inflammatory reactions interacting to exacerbate or ameliorate the atherosclerotic process and causing catabolic activity, energy expenditure and function loss. One of the primary underlying mechanisms is the circulating cytokines released from the systemic inflammatory response (i.e., interleukin 6, interleukin 1 β , and tumor necrosis factors), triggering mechanisms that contribute to the pathogenesis of malnutrition, including brain circuits disorder, protein degradation, and neuroendocrine disturbance, ultimately causing disease-related anorexia, sarcopenia, cognitive decline, and frailty^{2,3,32,33}. In 2012, ASPEN and the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics launched a consensus

statement emphasizing the need to identify inflammation early in the diagnostic procedure of malnutrition to determine its etiology and guide treatment³⁴. In a traumatic and acute stress-causing event like ACS, albumin serves as a practical plasma biomarker that can be used to indicate and monitor catabolic metabolism and systemic inflammatory response to reflect disease severity; hypoalbuminemia was also one of the most striking features of patients with MACEs in our cohort.

Nutritional status influences the body's inflammatory response, and consistent nutritional management is crucial for patients with critical illness to recover from inflammatory injury^{33,35}. Although the prevalence of malnutrition exhibited significant discrepancies, its association with poorer outcomes remains clear and sound²³⁻²⁸. However, the importance of screening and monitoring for malnutrition in patients with ACS hasn't drawn enough concern from clinical guidelines and practice^{13,14}. The interaction analyses of our study suggested the bidirectional association between inflammation and malnutrition, while the present stratification standards to define high inflammation or malnutrition seemingly affected the results. In this sense, studies with larger sample sizes and ACS-suitable criteria for stratification seemed indispensable to facilitate the understanding of the interplay between inflammation and malnutrition. Given the existing results, we could speculate that patients with worse nutritional conditions may urgently need deactivating inflammation, and patients with higher hs-CRP would benefit more from nutritional support. Previous studies among hospitalized patients showed that baseline inflammatory status was associated with their response to nutritional therapy and that nutritional support alone is inadequate to prevent muscle loss during severe, sustained, or repeated bouts of inflammation^{36,37}, which emphasizes the importance of considering the double burden of inflammation and malnutrition in disease assessment, intervention, and monitoring. Regarding ACS patients, there is still a lack of evidence investigating the treatment response to nutritional support or anti-inflammatory therapy among subgroups with different degrees of inflammation or malnutrition.

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first analysis to investigate the interplay between inflammation and malnutrition in affecting cardiac outcomes among ACS patients, which would provide preliminary implications for future research. We are also aware of several limitations. First, as a retrospective observational study, we couldn't conclude direct causality; we also may not accounted for other potential confounding effects and unknown clinical or subclinical illness. Second, although we tested and compared the predictive ability of the three malnutrition screening tools, their diagnostic accuracy or practical value among ACS patients was yet to be confirmed. This is also a common problem in similar studies that need to be solved. Third, the serum hs-CRP, albumin, and body weight were measured only once at admission and are subject to measurement error and physiologic variability; the dynamic and long-term monitoring of inflammatory and nutritional status changes would provide valuable and indispensable information. Fourth, as it was a single-center study based on Chinese people, the results should be carefully interpreted and extended to other ethnicities.

Conclusions

Among patients with ACS undergoing PCI, the double burden of inflammation and malnutrition was not uncommon and strongly associated with long-term cardiac outcomes in a synergistic manner. Identifying patients' inflammatory and nutritional status will better facilitate the modern individualized care of ACS. Future prospective studies are needed to evaluate whether the heterogeneity in the therapeutic effect of nutritional support or anti-inflammatory interventions exists in patients with different inflammatory or nutritional burdens.

Funding: This research was funded by the Beijing Municipal Natural Science Foundation, General Program (7232039), and the Capital Health Research and Development of Special (2022-2-1052).

Reference

1. Mensah GA, Roth GA, Fuster V. The Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and Risk Factors: 2020 and Beyond. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2019; **74**(20): 2529-32.
2. Ross R. Atherosclerosis--an inflammatory disease. *N Engl J Med* 1999; **340**(2): 115-26.
3. Pearson TA, Mensah GA, Alexander RW, et al. Markers of inflammation and cardiovascular disease: application to clinical and public health practice: A statement for healthcare professionals from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2003; **107**(3): 499-511.
4. Arbel Y, Finkelstein A, Halkin A, et al. Neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio is related to the severity of coronary artery disease and clinical outcome in patients undergoing angiography. *Atherosclerosis* 2012; **225**(2): 456-60.
5. Kaura A, Hartley A, Panoulas V, et al. Mortality risk prediction of high-sensitivity C-reactive protein in suspected acute coronary syndrome: A cohort study. *PLoS Med* 2022; **19**(2): e1003911.
6. Chaudhury A, Noiret L, Higgins JM. White blood cell population dynamics for risk stratification of acute coronary syndrome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2017: 201709228.
7. Ezzati M, Vander Hoorn S, Lawes CMM, et al. Rethinking the "diseases of affluence" paradigm: global patterns of nutritional risks in relation to economic development. *PLoS Med* 2005; **2**(5): e133.
8. Freeman AM, Aggarwal M. Malnutrition in the Obese: Commonly Overlooked But With Serious Consequences. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020; **76**(7): 841-3.
9. Kong G, Zhang A, Chong B, et al. Long-Term Prognosis of Patients With Coexisting Obesity and Malnutrition After Acute Myocardial Infarction: A Cohort Study. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2023; **16**(4): e009340.
10. Doehner W, Frenneaux M, Anker SD. Metabolic impairment in heart failure: the myocardial and systemic perspective. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2014; **64**(13): 1388-400.
11. Yin J, Lu X, Qian Z, Xu W, Zhou X. New insights into the pathogenesis and treatment of sarcopenia in chronic heart failure. *Theranostics* 2019; **9**(14): 4019-29.

12. Freeman AM, Morris PB, Barnard N, et al. Trending Cardiovascular Nutrition Controversies. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017; **69**(9): 1172-87.
13. Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, et al. 2017 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2018; **39**(2): 119-77.
14. Amsterdam EA, Wenger NK, Brindis RG, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline for the management of patients with non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndromes: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2014; **130**(25): 2354-94.
15. Lin H, Zhang H, Lin Z, Li X, Kong X, Sun G. Review of nutritional screening and assessment tools and clinical outcomes in heart failure. *Heart Failure Reviews* 2016; **21**(5): 549-65.
16. Mueller C, Compher C, Ellen DM. A.S.P.E.N. clinical guidelines: Nutrition screening, assessment, and intervention in adults. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2011; **35**(1): 16-24.
17. Buzby GP, Knox LS, Crosby LO, et al. Study protocol: a randomized clinical trial of total parenteral nutrition in malnourished surgical patients. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1988; **47**(2 Suppl): 366-81.
18. Clark AL, Sze S. Impact of Malnutrition Using Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction. *JACC Heart Fail* 2019; **7**(8): 676-7.
19. Ignacio de Ulíbarri J, González-Madroño A, de Villar NGP, et al. CONUT: a tool for controlling nutritional status. First validation in a hospital population. *Nutr Hosp* 2005; **20**(1): 38-45.
20. Buzby GP, Mullen JL, Matthews DC, Hobbs CL, Rosato EF. Prognostic nutritional index in gastrointestinal surgery. *Am J Surg* 1980; **139**(1): 160-7.
21. Vernon ST, Coffey S, Bhindi R, et al. Increasing proportion of ST elevation myocardial infarction patients with coronary atherosclerosis poorly explained by standard modifiable risk factors. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2017; **24**(17): 1824-30.
22. Goddard AF, James MW, McIntyre AS, Scott BB. Guidelines for the management of iron deficiency anaemia. *Gut* 2011; **60**(10): 1309-16.
23. Komici K, Vitale DF, Mancini A, et al. Impact of Malnutrition on Long-Term Mortality in Elderly Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction. *Nutrients* 2019; **11**(2).
24. Tonet E, Campo G, Maietti E, et al. Nutritional status and all-cause mortality in older adults with acute coronary syndrome. *Clin Nutr* 2020; **39**(5): 1572-9.
25. Li T, Wang X, Liu Z, et al. Prevalence and Prognostic Significance of Malnutrition in Patients with Abnormal Glycemic Status and Coronary Artery Disease: A Multicenter Cohort Study in China. *Nutrients* 2023; **15**(3).
26. Ni W, Guo K, Shi S, et al. Prevalence and prognostic value of malnutrition in patients with acute coronary syndrome and chronic kidney disease. *Front Nutr* 2023; **10**: 1187672.
27. Raposeiras Roubín S, Abu Assi E, Cespón Fernandez M, et al. Prevalence and Prognostic Significance of Malnutrition in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020; **76**(7): 828-40.

28. Lim S, Choo EH, Choi IJ, et al. Impact of the risk of malnutrition on bleeding, mortality, and ischemic events in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2023; **33**(1): 65-74.
29. Cederholm T, Jensen GL, Correia MITD, et al. GLIM criteria for the diagnosis of malnutrition - A consensus report from the global clinical nutrition community. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2019; **10**(1): 207-17.
30. Morley JE, Thomas DR, Wilson M-MG. Cachexia: pathophysiology and clinical relevance. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2006; **83**(4): 735-43.
31. Cederholm T, Barazzoni R, Austin P, et al. ESPEN guidelines on definitions and terminology of clinical nutrition. *Clin Nutr* 2017; **36**(1): 49-64.
32. Schütz P, Bally M, Stanga Z, Keller U. Loss of appetite in acutely ill medical inpatients: physiological response or therapeutic target? *Swiss Med Wkly* 2014; **144**: w13957.
33. Stumpf F, Keller B, Gressies C, Schuetz P. Inflammation and Nutrition: Friend or Foe? *Nutrients* 2023; **15**(5).
34. White JV, Guenter P, Jensen G, Malone A, Schofield M. Consensus statement: Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics and American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition: characteristics recommended for the identification and documentation of adult malnutrition (undernutrition). *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2012; **36**(3): 275-83.
35. Singer P, Blaser AR, Berger MM, et al. ESPEN guideline on clinical nutrition in the intensive care unit. *Clin Nutr* 2019; **38**(1): 48-79.
36. Jensen GL. Inflammation as the key interface of the medical and nutrition universes: a provocative examination of the future of clinical nutrition and medicine. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 2006; **30**(5): 453-63.
37. Merker M, Felder M, Gueissaz L, et al. Association of Baseline Inflammation With Effectiveness of Nutritional Support Among Patients With Disease-Related Malnutrition: A Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020; **3**(3): e200663.




Figure 1 Kaplan-Meier survival curves for MACEs and each component up to 3 years.

Abbreviations: hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; MI, myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention.

Table 1 Baseline clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients stratified by the nutritional and inflammatory statuses.

Variable	Total population (n=1743)	Nourished without elevated hs-CRP (n=1051)	Nourished with elevated hs-CRP, ^a (n=573)	Malnourished without elevated hs-CRP (n=46)	Malnourished with elevated hs-CRP ^a (n=73)	p-value
Demography and anthropometric data						
Age, years	60 (53, 67)	61 (53, 66)	61 (52, 68)	63 (58, 69)	62 (54, 73)	0.028
Sex, male, n (%)	1333 (76.5)	824 (78.4)	428 (74.7)	29 (63.0)	52 (71.2)	0.030
Body mass index, kg/m ²	25.2 (23.6, 27.6)	25.3 (23.7, 27.5)	26.0 (24.0, 28.3)	21.6 (20.0, 23.3)	22.6 (21.1, 23.8)	<0.001
Heart rate, bpm	68 (62, 75)	67 (61, 73)	69 (63, 76)	70 (62, 74)	71 (66, 80)	<0.001
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	130 (120, 140)	130 (120, 140)	130 (120, 140)	100 (118, 133)	120 (110, 130)	<0.001
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	76 (70, 81)	78 (70, 82)	74 (69, 80)	71 (66, 77)	68 (64, 73)	<0.001
Pulse pressure, mmHg	50 (44, 62)	50 (44, 61)	52 (44, 64)	51 (44, 60)	50 (41, 64)	0.383
Family history of CAD, n (%)	554 (31.5)	335 (31.9)	192 (33.5)	6 (13.0)	21 (28.8)	0.035
CV risk factors and prior CV disease						
SMuRFs						
Hypertension, n (%)	1112 (63.8)	377 (64.4)	373 (65.1)	16 (34.8)	46 (63.0)	<0.001
Diabetes, n (%)	805 (46.2)	474 (45.1)	278 (48.5)	16 (34.8)	37 (50.7)	0.191
Hypercholesterolaemia, n (%)	1396 (80.1)	809 (77.0)	494 (86.2)	32 (69.6)	61 (83.6)	<0.001
Smoking, n (%)	1025 (58.8)	617 (58.7)	345 (60.2)	24 (52.2)	39 (53.4)	0.539
SMuRFs-less, n (%)	32 (1.8)	14 (1.3)	13 (2.3)	2 (4.3)	3 (4.1)	0.128
Peripheral artery disease, n (%)	183 (10.5)	91 (8.7)	78 (13.6)	4 (8.7)	10 (13.7)	0.013
Old myocardial infarction, n (%)	333 (19.1)	201 (19.1)	105 (18.3)	12 (26.1)	15 (20.5)	0.621
Prior PCI, n (%)	343 (19.7)	223 (21.2)	100 (17.5)	13 (28.3)	7 (9.6)	0.017
Prior Cardiac arrest, n (%)	2 (0.1)	0 (0)	2 (0.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.240
Atrial fibrillation/flutter, n (%)	74 (4.2)	45 (4.3)	24 (4.2)	2 (4.3)	3 (4.1)	1.000
Prior stroke, n (%)	102 (5.9)	53 (5.0)	44 (7.7)	3 (6.5)	2 (2.7)	0.103

Comorbidity						
Anemia, n (%)	57 (3.3)	17 (1.6)	25 (4.4)	3 (6.5)	12 (16.4)	<0.001
COPD, n (%)	26 (1.5)	12 (1.1)	12 (2.1)	0 (0)	2 (2.7)	0.273
Cancer history, n (%)	13 (0.7)	8 (0.8)	4 (0.7)	0 (0)	1 (1.4)	1.000
ACS presentation						
Type of ACS, n (%)						
STEMI	229 (13.1)	90 (8.6)	110 (19.2)	4 (8.7)	25 (34.2)	<0.001
NSTEMI	227 (13.0)	105 (10.0)	99 (17.3)	8 (17.4)	15 (20.5)	<0.001
Unstable angina	1287 (73.8)	856 (81.4)	364 (63.5)	34 (73.9)	33 (45.2)	<0.001
Killip class >1, n (%)	67 (3.8)	22 (2.1)	26 (4.5)	4 (8.7)	15 (20.5)	<0.001
The GRACE risk score, points	98 (82, 114)	94 (92, 108)	99 (82, 119)	105 (91, 118)	120 (102, 155)	<0.001
High risk at six months, n (%)	356 (20.4)	158 (15.0)	150 (26.2)	11 (23.9)	37 (50.7)	<0.001
Laboratory data and Echocardiographic data						
White blood cell, 10 ⁹ /L	6.3 (6.3, 7.5)	6.0 (5.2, 7.0)	7.1 (6.0, 8.1)	6.1 (5.0, 7.0)	7.3 (6.2, 9.6)	<0.001
Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio	2.2 (1.7, 3.0)	1.0 (0, 1.0)	2.4 (1.9, 3.2)	2.3 (1.9, 3.1)	3.1 (2.3, 4.2)	<0.001
High-sensitivity C-reactive protein, mg/L	1.7 (0.7, 3.5)	0.78 (0.4, 1.3)	4.6 (3.1, 8.9)	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	9.5 (4.8, 18.5)	<0.001
Triglycerides, mg/dL	1.5 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.0)	1.6 (1.2, 2.2)	1.1 (0.7, 1.7)	1.3 (1.0, 1.8)	<0.001
Total cholesterol, mg/dL	4.0 (3.4, 4.8)	4.0 (3.4, 4.7)	4.2 (3.6, 5.0)	3.6 (3.1, 4.2)	3.7 (3.4, 4.5)	<0.001
LDL-C, mg/dL	2.3 (1.8, 3.0)	2.3 (1.8, 2.8)	2.6 (2.0, 3.0)	1.9 (1.6, 2.4)	2.2 (1.8, 3.0)	<0.001
HDL-C, mg/dL	1.0 (0.9, 1.2)	1.0 (0.9, 1.2)	1.0 (0.8, 1.1)	1.0 (0.9, 1.3)	0.9 (0.8, 1.1)	<0.001
B-type natriuretic peptide, pg/ml	37 (21, 86)	33 (20, 67)	33 (20, 67)	40 (24, 90)	197 (52, 197)	<0.001
Albumin, g/L	42 (40, 45)	43 (40, 45)	45 (23, 118)	37 (36, 39)	36 (34, 38)	<0.001
Creatinine clearance rate, ml/min	96.7 (78.8, 116.7)	98.1 (81.2, 117.6)	97.8 (78.5, 120.0)	83.4 (67.1, 97.5)	80.1 (66.1, 92.9)	<0.001
Uric acid, µmol/L	333.2 (289.3, 397.8)	324.5 (287.0, 390.2)	345.3 (298.3, 413.2)	297.7 (248.0, 365.3)	325.4 (296.7, 398.2)	<0.001
Fasting plasma glucose, mmol/L	5.8 (5.2, 7.0)	5.8 (5.2, 6.8)	6.0 (5.3, 7.2)	5.6 (4.9, 6.7)	6.1 (5.3, 7.4)	0.007
Glycated hemoglobin A1c, %	6.1 (5.6, 7.1)	6.0 (5.5, 7.0)	6.3 (5.6, 7.3)	6.0 (5.5, 6.5)	6.3 (5.7, 7.4)	0.002

LVSD (EF < 50%), n (%)	106 (6.1)	42 (4.0)	45 (7.9)	6 (13.0)	13 (17.8)	<0.001
Angiographic data						
Left main coronary artery lesion, n (%)	136 (7.8)	71 (6.8)	55 (9.6)	4 (8.7)	6 (8.2)	0.213
Multivessel coronary artery disease, n (%)	1457 (83.6)	866 (82.4)	493 (86.0)	35 (76.1)	63 (86.3)	0.116
Chronic total occlusion, n (%)	367 (21.1)	208 (19.8)	141 (24.6)	5 (10.9)	13 (17.8)	0.036
SYNTAX score	20 (13, 28)	19 (12, 27)	22 (15, 29)	21 (11, 30)	26 (17, 34)	<0.001
Complete revascularization, n (%)	1069 (61.3)	687 (65.4)	312 (54.5)	31 (67.4)	39 (53.4)	<0.001
Percutaneous transfemoral route, n (%)	27 (1.5)	21 (2.0)	4 (0.7)	0 (0)	2 (2.7)	0.122
Medical therapy						
Pre-admission, n (%)						
Antiplatelet agents	1272 (73.0)	781 (74.3)	403 (70.3)	37 (80.4)	51 (69.9)	0.205
Statin	1252 (71.8)	772 (73.5)	389 (67.9)	39 (84.8)	52 (71.2)	0.021
Discharge, n (%)						
Dual antiplatelet therapy	1727 (99.1)	1047 (99.6)	565 (98.6)	45 (97.8)	70 (95.9)	0.013
Aspirin plus clopidogrel	1587 (91.0)	968 (92.1)	508 (88.7)	42 (91.3)	69 (94.5)	0.086
Aspirin plus ticagrelor	140 (8.0)	79 (7.5)	57 (9.9)	3 (6.5)	1 (1.4)	0.050
Statin	1743 (100.0)	1051 (100.0)	573 (100.0)	46 (100.0)	73 (100.0)	-
Beta-blockers	1225 (70.3)	728 (45.8)	418 (72.9)	28 (60.9)	51 (69.9)	0.212
ACEI/ARB	841 (48.3)	481 (45.8)	301 (52.5)	20 (43.5)	39 (53.4)	0.045
Furosemide	114 (6.5)	53 (5.0)	46 (8.0)	2 (4.3)	13 (17.8)	<0.001
Malnutrition classified by NRI						
Moderate or severe malnutrition, n (%)	37 (2.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (30.4)	23 (31.5)	<0.001
Outcomes						
MACEs, n (%)	351 (20.1)	170 (16.2)	144 (25.1)	7 (15.2)	30 (41.1)	<0.001
Cardiac death, n (%)	37 (2.1)	12 (1.1)	14 (2.5)	2 (4.3)	9 (12.3)	<0.001
Non-fatal MI, n (%)	43 (2.5)	20 (1.9)	19 (3.3)	1 (2.2)	3 (4.1)	0.268

Non-fatal stroke, n (%)	22 (1.3)	9 (0.9)	12 (2.1)	1 (2.2)	0 (0)	0.121
Unplanned revascularization, n (%)	249 (14.3)	129 (12.3)	99 (17.3)	3 (6.5)	18 (24.7)	0.003

a. Hs-CRP level over the cut-off value of 2.2mg/L was classified as elevated CRP.

Abbreviations: ACEI, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockade; CAD, coronary artery disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CV, cardiovascular; EF, ejection fraction; GRACE, the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; NRI, Nutrition risk index; NSTEMI, non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction; PAD, peripheral artery disease; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; WBC, white blood cell.

Table 2 Predictive value of malnutrition or elevated hs-CRP for outcomes in univariate and multivariate proportional hazards regression analyses.

	Crude HR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted HR (95% CI)	p-value
Malnutrition ^a				
MACEs	1.790 (1.273, 2.516)	<0.001	1.629 (1.109, 2.393)	0.013
Cardiac death	6.158 (3.043, 12.465)	<0.001	4.014 (1.603, 10.049)	0.003
Non-fatal MI	1.260 (0.453, 3.502)	0.658	1.127 (0.346, 3.676)	0.843
Non-fatal stroke	1.995 (0.597, 6.666)	0.262	0.413 (0.088, 1.931)	0.261
Unplanned revascularization	1.429 (0.948, 2.153)	0.088	1.657 (1.064, 2.582)	0.025
Hs-CRP >2.2mg/L ^b				
MACEs	1.775 (1.440, 2.189)	<0.001	1.331 (1.055, 1.678)	0.016
Cardiac death	2.819 (1.451, 5.478)	0.002	1.335 (0.617, 2.886)	0.463
Non-fatal MI	1.935 (1.104, 3.391)	0.021	1.425 (0.741, 2.739)	0.288
Non-fatal stroke	2.582 (1.160, 5.748)	0.020	1.019 (0.948, 1.095)	0.615
Unplanned revascularization	1.624 (1.290, 2.045)	<0.001	1.336 (1.037, 1.720)	0.025

- The malnutrition was regarded as categorical variates classified by the NRI. In multivariate analysis, the NRI index was adjusted for heart rate, pulse pressure, family history of CAD, diabetes, PAD, OMI, prior PCI, anemia, WBC, hs-CRP, TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, BNP, CrCl, uric acid, FPG, HbA1C, LVSD, multivessel coronary artery disease, SYNTAX score, complete revascularization, discharged with aspirin plus clopidogrel, and discharged with beta-blockers.
- Hs-CRP determined the high-inflamed status over the 2.2mg/L cut-off value. In multivariate analysis, the hs-CRP was adjusted for heart rate, pulse pressure, family history of CAD, diabetes, PAD, OMI, prior PCI, anemia, WBC, TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, BNP, albumin, CrCl, uric acid, FPG, HbA1C, LVSD, multivessel coronary artery disease, SYNTAX score, complete revascularization, discharged with aspirin plus clopidogrel, and discharged with beta-blockers.

Abbreviations: BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; CAD, coronary artery disease; CI, confidence interval; CrCl, creatinine clearance rate; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; HbA1C, glycated hemoglobin A1c; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HR, hazard ratio; hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; MI, myocardial infarction; NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio; NRI, Nutrition risk index; OMI, old myocardial infarction; PAD, peripheral artery disease; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; WBC, white blood cell.

Table 3 Predictive value of each group on outcomes in multivariate proportional hazards regression analyses.

	Nourished without elevated hs-CRP (n=1051)	Nourished with elevated hs-CRP ^a (n=573)	Malnourished ^b without elevated hs-CRP (n=46)	Malnourished ^b with elevated hs-CRP ^a (n=73)
MACEs				
Adjusted HR ^c (95% CI)	ref	1.302 (0.591, 2.866)	1.237 (0.971, 1.577)	2.446 (1.464, 4.089)
p-value		0.512	0.085	<0.001
Cardiac death				
Adjusted HR ^c (95% CI)	ref	14.940 (2.085, 107.033)	1.474 (0.579, 3.750)	25.740 (6.337, 104.554)
p-value		0.007	0.416	<0.001
Non-fatal MI				
Adjusted HR ^c (95% CI)	ref	11.809 (0.947, 3.456)	1.289 (0.158, 10.521)	2.186 (0.617, 7.746)
p-value		0.073	0.813	0.226
Non-fatal stroke				
Adjusted HR ^c (95% CI)	ref	22.225 (0.923, 5.363)	2.588 (0.271, 24.708)	- ^d
p-value		0.075	0.409	- ^d
Unplanned revascularization				
Adjusted HR ^c (95% CI)	ref	1.462 (1.120, 1.909)	0.489 (0.153, 1.566)	2.349 (1.321, 4.177)
p-value		0.005	0.228	0.004

a. Hs-CRP level over the cut-off value of 2.2mg/L was classified as elevated hs-CRP.

b. Malnourishment was classified by NRI.

c. Adjusted for heart rate, pulse pressure, family history of CAD, diabetes, PAD, OMI, prior PCI, anemia, WBC, TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, BNP, CrCl, uric acid, FPG, HbA1C, LVSD, multivessel coronary artery disease, SYNTAX score, complete revascularization, discharged with aspirin plus clopidogrel, and discharged with beta-blockers.

d. None case of non-fatal stroke was reported in the malnourished with elevated hs-CRP group.

Abbreviations: BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; CAD, coronary artery disease; CI, confidence interval; CrCl, creatinine clearance rate; EF, ejection fraction; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; HbA1C, glycated hemoglobin A1c; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HR, hazard ratio; hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; MI, myocardial infarction; NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio; NRI, Nutrition risk index; PAD, peripheral artery disease; OMI, old myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; ref, reference; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; WBC, white blood cell.

Table 4 Interplay of elevated hs-CRP or malnutrition on MACEs.

A) Examining the effect of inflammation on MACEs in patients stratified by nutritional status.

Examined variable	Nourished subpopulation			Malnourished subpopulation			p for interaction
	Events (%)	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	p-value	Events (%)	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	p-value	
Hs-CRP >2.2mg/L	324 (20.0)	1.237 (0.971, 1.576)	0.085	37 (31.1)	4.858 (1.353, 17.440)	0.015	0.248
Hs-CRP level, mg/L	324 (20.0)	1.006 (0.982, 1.030)	0.620	37 (31.1)	1.084 (1.027, 1.143)	0.003	0.001

B) Examining the effect of malnutrition on MACEs in patients stratified by inflammatory status.

Examined variable	Hs-CRP ≤2.2mg/L subpopulation			Hs-CRP >2.2mg/L subpopulation			p for interaction
	Events (%)	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	p-value	Events (%)	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	p-value	
Malnourished status	177 (16.1)	1.287 (0.587, 2.832)	0.531	174 (26.9)	1.927 (1.232, 3.014)	0.004	0.248
The NRI score ^b	177 (16.1)	1.002 (0.997, 1.028)	0.869	174 (26.9)	0.965 (0.943, 0.988)	0.003	0.005

a. Adjusted for heart rate, pulse pressure, family history of CAD, diabetes, PAD, OMI, prior PCI, anemia, WBC, TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, BNP, CrCl, uric acid, FPG, HbA1C, LVSD, multivessel coronary artery disease, SYNTAX score, complete revascularization, discharged with aspirin plus clopidogrel, and discharged with beta-blockers.

b. The NRI score was calculated using the formulas $[1.519 \times \text{serum albumin (g/L)}] + 41.7 \times (\text{current weight/ideal weight})$ for patients under 65 years old and $[1.489 \times \text{serum albumin (g/L)}] + 41.7 \times (\text{current weight/ideal weight})$ for those over 65 years old. A higher NRI score suggests better nutritional status.

Abbreviations: BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; CAD, coronary artery disease; CI, confidence interval; CrCl, creatinine clearance rate; EF, ejection fraction; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; HbA1C, glycated hemoglobin A1c; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HR, hazard ratio; hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; MI, myocardial infarction; NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio; NRI, Nutrition risk index; OMI, old myocardial infarction; PAD, peripheral artery disease; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; ref, reference; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; WBC, white blood cell.

Table 5 Incremental effect of inflammation or malnutrition beyond the GRACE risk model to predict cardiac death.

Model	C-index (95%CI)	p-value	Net reclassification improvement (95%CI)	p-value	Integrated discrimination Improvement (95%CI)	p-value
MACEs						
GRACE ^a	0.538 (0.514, 0.562)	0.003	ref		ref	
GRACE + NRI ^b	0.554 (0.530, 0.577)	<0.001	0.128 (0.011, 0.245)	0.032	0.005 (0.002, 0.009)	0.004
GRACE + hs-CRP ^c	0.590 (0.566, 0.613)	<0.001	0.196 (0.088, 0.303)	<0.001	0.006 (0.002, 0.010)	0.005
GRACE + NRI + hs-CRP	0.594 (0.570, 0.617)	<0.001	0.210 (0.094, 0.326)	<0.001	0.010 (0.005, 0.016)	<0.001
Cardiac death						
GRACE ^a	0.699 (0.677, 0.721)	<0.001	ref		ref	
GRACE + NRI ^b	0.733 (0.712, 0.754)	<0.001	0.629 (0.318, 0.940)	<0.001	0.020 (0.007, 0.033)	0.002
GRACE + hs-CRP ^c	0.702 (0.680, 0.723)	<0.001	0.369 (0.050, 0.688)	0.023	0.006 (0.001, 0.012)	0.049
GRACE + NRI + hs-CRP	0.738 (0.717, 0.759)	<0.001	0.666 (0.361, 0.971)	<0.001	0.023 (0.009, 0.037)	0.002

- a. The eight variables that constitute the GRACE risk score are age, history of heart failure, history of acute MI, heart rate and systolic blood pressure at admission, ST-segment depression, serum creatinine at admission, and elevated myocardial necrosis markers or enzymes.
- b. NRI was introduced to the GRACE model as a categorical variate.
- c. Hs-CRP was introduced to the GRACE model as a categorical variate.

Abbreviations: C-index, concordance index; CI, confidence interval; GRACE, the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; MACEs, major adverse cardiac events; NRI, Nutrition risk index; ref, reference.