

1 **The Trend of Ischemic Evaluation, Intervention, and In-Hospital Mortality**  
2 **and Outcomes among Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction and Atrial**  
3 **Fibrillation**

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Mirza Faris Ali Baig, MD

15

Asante Physician Partner

16

[baigfaris90@gmail.com](mailto:baigfaris90@gmail.com)

17

(630)-998-3986

18

2214 Haviland Drive, Grants Pass,

19

Oregon, USA, 97527

20

Manuscript word count: 4899

21 **Abstract:**

22 Background: Atrial fibrillation (AF) is associated with increased cardiovascular mortality. Data  
23 regarding the relationship between coronary artery disease (CAD) and AF is mixed. It is  
24 uncertain if AF directly increases the risk for future coronary events and if such patients are  
25 appropriately evaluated for CAD.

26 Methods: This is a cross-sectional study performed on hospitalized patients with AMI and  
27 concurrent AF in 2019 using National Inpatient Sample from HCUP. Patients with missing  
28 information and type II non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) were excluded. Using  
29 STATA 18, In-hospital mortality, ischemic evaluation, percutaneous treatment, rates of  
30 ventricular tachycardiac (VT), ventricular fibrillation (VF), cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest,  
31 average length of stay (LOS), and total hospitalization charges were studied. Regression models  
32 were used for data analyses.

33 Results: A total of 600,645 patients met inclusion criteria (219,660 females [36.5%], 428,755  
34 Caucasian [71%], 65,870 African American [10.9%], 51,155 Hispanic [8.5%]; mean [SD] age,  
35 66.7 [0.5] years), including 166,680 (28%) STEMI and 433,965 (72%) NSTEMI patients.  
36 109,520 (18%) patients with AMI had AF. For patients with AMI and AF, the adjusted odds of  
37 mortality increased by 23% (adjusted Odds ratio [aOR], 1.23; CI, 1.15-1.32;  $p < 0.001$ ). AF  
38 patients were less likely to undergo ischemic evaluation (aOR, 0.77; CI, 0.74-0.80;  $p < 0.001$ ) and  
39 ischemic intervention (aOR, 0.64; CI, 0.62-0.66;  $p < 0.001$ ). AF patients had higher odds of VT  
40 (aOR, 1.41; CI, 1.33-1.49;  $p < 0.001$ ), VF (aOR, 1.44; CI, 1.33-1.57;  $p < 0.001$ ), cardiogenic shock  
41 (aOR, 1.43; CI, 1.35-1.52;  $p < 0.001$ ), and cardiac arrest (aOR, 1.35; CI, 1.24-1.47;  $p < 0.001$ ). AF  
42 patients had longer LOS (mean, 1.39; SCD, 1.29-1.48;  $p < 0.001$ ) and higher total hospital charges  
43 (mean \$22,188; 19,311-25,064,  $p < 0.001$ ).

44 Conclusion: AF was independently associated with increased mortality in patients admitted with  
45 AMI. AF was associated with higher rates of cardiac complications. Patients with AF were less  
46 likely to receive ischemic evaluation or percutaneous intervention and had overall higher  
47 healthcare resource utilization. This study encourages AF to be viewed as an independent risk  
48 factor for CAD and suggests more efforts to diagnose CAD in such patients.

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63 **Clinical Perspective:**

64 What is new:

- 65 • Patients with acute myocardial infarction and atrial fibrillation have higher odds of
- 66 mortality.
- 67 • AMI patients with AF are subjected to lesser odds of undergoing ischemic evaluation and
- 68 intervention.
- 69 • Healthcare resource utilization is higher in this cohort.

70 What are the clinical implications:

- 71 • AF should be considered as an independent risk factor for increased mortality in AMI.
- 72 • Early ischemic evaluation should be considered to diagnose coronary artery disease in
- 73 this cohort.
- 74 • Increased awareness to recognize all risk factors of coronary artery disease.

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83 **Non-standard abbreviations and acronyms:**

84 AMI: Acute myocardial infarction

85 AF: Atrial fibrillation

86 STEMI: ST-elevation myocardial infarction

87 NSTEMI: Non-ST elevation myocardial infarction

88 VT: Ventricular tachycardia

89 VF: Ventricular fibrillation

90 LOS: length of stay

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101 **Introduction:**

102 Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common cardiac arrhythmia globally.<sup>1</sup> The prevalence of AF  
103 in the US is at least 3-6 million and is projected to increase to 6-16 million by 2050.<sup>2</sup> The  
104 lifetime risk of acquiring AF is estimated to be 33%.<sup>3</sup> AF is known to increase mortality from  
105 sudden cardiac death, congestive heart failure, and stroke;<sup>4</sup> therefore, it is not surprising that  
106 healthcare costs associated with AF are significantly higher.<sup>5</sup> Coronary artery disease (CAD), on  
107 the other hand, is the most common cardiovascular disease.<sup>6</sup> It is the leading cause of mortality  
108 in the US, with approximately 610,000 deaths annually,<sup>7</sup> and the third leading cause of death  
109 worldwide, with 17.8 million deaths annually.<sup>8,9</sup> Healthcare costs related to CAD are estimated  
110 to be more than US\$200 billion annually.<sup>10</sup> Due to the colossal healthcare burden, considerable  
111 efforts have been made to understand the underlying risk factors. These risk factors are  
112 segregated into two large categories: modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors. The non-  
113 modifiable risk factors include age, gender, family history, and certain ethnicities. The known  
114 modifiable risk factors include hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, obesity,  
115 smoking, sedentary lifestyle, and stress.<sup>11</sup> Significant efforts are made to discover novel risk  
116 factors, aiming to formulate additional guidelines to alleviate substantial healthcare costs and  
117 mortality rates.

118 While both diseases are known to share a common risk factor profile, the intricate relationship  
119 between the two is still largely unclear. It is reported that CAD is a risk factor for AF;<sup>12</sup> however,  
120 studies have shown mixed results about AF being an independent risk modifier for CAD, with  
121 some proposing direct causality,<sup>13</sup> whereas others suggesting no causal relationship between AF  
122 and risk of CAD.<sup>14</sup> It is not uncommon in practice for patients to have both AF and CAD. AF is  
123 known to have a negative prognostic impact on CAD patients;<sup>15</sup> yet, it remains unclear if the

124 increased mortality is due to increased coronary ischemic events or from unfavorable  
125 hemodynamic effects, such as loss of atrial kick, high ventricular rate, and decreased cardiac  
126 output.<sup>16</sup>

127 Several studies have attempted to understand the impact of both diseases. While previous studies  
128 have explored the associated poor outcomes, no study has directly examined the pattern of  
129 diagnostic workup, intervention, and cardiac outcomes in this sub-population. This study aims to  
130 investigate the effect of AF on acute myocardial infarction (AMI) in terms of in-hospital  
131 mortality, serious cardiac complications, and hospital resource utilization and explore the  
132 national trend of ischemic evaluation and treatment in patients with both AMI and AF.

### 133 **Methods:**

134 This is a retrospective cohort study of adult patients hospitalized in the United States with the  
135 diagnosis of AMI. The study used the patient cohort from the National Inpatient Sample (NIS)  
136 database from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019. The NIS is a part of the Healthcare Cost  
137 and Utilization Project (HCUP), maintained by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality  
138 (AHRQ).<sup>17</sup> NIS is sampled from the State Inpatient Databases (SID), containing information on  
139 all hospital stays regardless of the payer source. NIS 2019 sampling frame included data from 49  
140 statewide organizations, estimated to have 97% of discharges from non-federal short-term US  
141 hospitals, covering 98% of the US population. NIS collects 20% of the stratified sample of  
142 discharge records from all HCUP-participating US community hospitals, excluding long-term  
143 acute care facilities and rehabilitation centers. Discharge weights are provided to produce  
144 national estimates, approximating 35 million discharges when weights are applied. This allows  
145 NIS to provide reliable information about cardiovascular diseases.

### 146 **Study patients:**

147 Patients who were adults ( $\geq 18$ ) and admitted non-electively were included. The ICD-10 CM  
148 codes were used to identify patients hospitalized for ST-elevation myocardial infarction  
149 (STEMI) and non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI). These patients were then  
150 accumulated under the diagnosis of AMI for data analysis. The ICD-10 codes used are listed in  
151 the attached Appendix. Patients with the diagnosis of NSTEMI type II or acute myocardial injury  
152 due to secondary causes or a procedural complication were excluded. Patients with missing  
153 information were also excluded from the analysis.

154 **Study variables:**

155 ICD-10 procedure codes were used to identify patients who underwent diagnostic evaluation for  
156 coronary artery disease. Diagnostic cardiac angiograms and non-invasive cardiac stress tests  
157 were identified using the ICD-10 procedure codes and gathered under a single variable.  
158 Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) procedure codes were used to identify patients who  
159 underwent any percutaneous intervention (see Appendix). Secondary diagnosis codes were used  
160 to identify AF patients. Separate variables were created for all other comorbid conditions. Length  
161 of stay (LOS) and total hospitalization charges are provided within the NIS data for each hospital  
162 admission. Covariates included in the study were age, gender, race, baseline comorbidity status  
163 using the Charlson Comorbidity Index, median annual income in the patient's zip code,  
164 geographic region of the United States (Northeast, Midwest, West or South), hospital location  
165 (urban vs rural), hospital teaching status, hospital bed size, primary insurance, hypertension,  
166 diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, smoking status, obesity, history of coronary artery disease,  
167 history of myocardial infarction, history of percutaneous coronary intervention, systolic heart  
168 failure, diastolic heart failure, combined systolic and diastolic heart failure, history of peripheral  
169 vascular disease, chronic pulmonary disease, pulmonary hypertension, obstructive sleep apnea,



170 acute kidney injury, chronic kidney disease, chronic liver disease, sepsis, septic shock, alcohol  
171 use, cocaine, amphetamine use and anemia of chronic disease.

172 **Outcomes:**

173 The primary outcome was in-hospital mortality. Secondary outcomes were ischemic evaluation,  
174 percutaneous ischemic intervention, rates of ventricular tachycardia (VT), ventricular fibrillation  
175 (VF), cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest, length of stay (LOS), and total hospitalization charges.  
176 NIS provides in-hospital mortality, LOS, and total hospital charges. Separate variables were  
177 created for other secondary outcomes.

178 **Statistical Analysis:**

179 STATA 18.0 was used to analyze the results. NIS is generated using a complex sampling design,  
180 including stratification, clustering, and weighting. STATA can run analyses to provide nationally  
181 representative unbiased results and generate p values.

182 Univariable and multivariable linear regression analyses were used to calculate means for  
183 continuous variables. Univariable logistic regression analysis was used to calculate unadjusted  
184 odds ratios (ORs) for categorical and dichotomous variables. A separate univariable logistic  
185 regression analysis was performed to isolate statistically significant variables with a p-value of  
186 less than 0.02. Those variables were then included in the multivariate logistic regression analysis  
187 to adjust for potential confounders. Another analysis was conducted incorporating variables with  
188 p-values between 0.02 and 0.05, along with those above 0.05 but known to be confounders in  
189 previous studies, to validate our findings.

190 Fisher exact test was used to compare proportions. Student t-test was used for continuous  
191 variables. All p-values obtained were two-sided. 0.05 was used as the threshold for statistical  
192 significance.

193 **Results:**

194 **Patient characteristics:**

195 A total of 35 million weighted discharges were included in the NIS 2019, of which 600,645 met  
196 the inclusion criteria of our study. 36% of the patients were females, and the predominant race  
197 was Caucasian (73%). 166,680 (28%) patients had a primary diagnosis of ST-elevation  
198 myocardial infarction (STEMI) and 433,965 (72%) with non-ST elevation myocardial infarction  
199 (NSTEMI). 109,520 (18%) patients had a secondary diagnosis of AF. Patients with the  
200 secondary diagnosis of AF were more likely to be older, Caucasian, and insured by Medicare  
201 compared to the patients without AF. Table 1 summarizes the baseline characteristics. The  
202 distribution of the female gender, Charlson comorbidity score, and other hospital-level  
203 parameters such as the US geographic region, hospital location, and hospital bed size were  
204 similar in both groups. Although these differences were statistically significant, the absolute  
205 differences were small.

206 **In-hospital mortality:**

207 The overall in-hospital mortality rate for AMI was 4.5%. The difference in mortality between  
208 patients with and without AF is presented in Table 2. AF independently predicted increased odds  
209 of mortality (adjusted OR, 1.23; CI, 1.15-1.32;  $p < 0.001$ ) on univariable and multivariable  
210 analyses that adjusted for patient- and hospital-level confounders. In-hospital mortality rates for  
211 STEMI and NSTEMI were 7.8% and 3.2%, respectively. Similar associations were found for  
212 STEMI (adjusted OR, 1.23; CI, 1.09-1.38;  $p < 0.001$ ) and NSTEMI (adjusted OR, 1.32; CI, 1.21-  
213 1.45;  $p < 0.001$ ), as summarized in Table 3.

214 **In-hospital ischemic evaluation:**

215 For patients admitted with AMI, the rate of in-hospital ischemic evaluation was 76%. Regarding  
216 in-hospital ischemic evaluation, AF patients were less likely to undergo ischemic evaluation with  
217 a diagnostic coronary angiogram or cardiac stress test after adjusting for confounders (adjusted  
218 OR, 0.77; CI, 0.74-0.80;  $p < 0.001$ ).

219 Ischemic evaluation was performed in 90% and 71% of patients with STEMI and NSTEMI  
220 admissions. As seen with AMI, patients with AF were less likely to undergo an ischemic  
221 evaluation than those without AF for STEMI (adjusted OR, 0.78; CI, 0.70-0.86;  $p < 0.001$ ) and  
222 NSTEMI (adjusted OR, 0.79; CI, 0.75-0.82;  $p < 0.001$ ). Like the primary outcome of mortality,  
223 we obtained similar results after including all the variables with  $p > 0.02$  but less than 0.05.

#### 224 **In-hospital ischemic intervention:**

225 Among the patients admitted with AMI, 51.4% underwent PCI. 37.1% of patients with AF and  
226 AMI had PCI compared to 54.6% without AF. After univariable screening and multivariable  
227 logistic regression to neutralize potential confounders, AF patients were less likely to undergo  
228 PCI than patients without AF (adjusted OR, 0.64; CI, 0.62-0.67;  $p < 0.001$ ), detailed in Table 4.  
229 In a separate analysis, PCI was performed on 81.2% of all STEMI patients overall, though rates  
230 were lower for patients with AF (70%) than those without AF (83.1%). After adjusting for  
231 confounders, AF was an independent predictor of decreased odds of in-patient PCI (Adjusted  
232 OR, 0.65; CI, 0.59-0.70;  $p < 0.001$ ). 40% of patients admitted with NSTEMI underwent PCI.  
233 Patients diagnosed with AF had lower rates of PCI (28.2%) compared to patients without AF  
234 (43%). AF was again an independent predictor for lesser odds of in-patient ischemic intervention  
235 (Adjusted OR, 0.62; CI, 0.59-0.64;  $p < 0.001$ ).

#### 236 **Other important in-hospital cardiac outcomes:**

237 The study assessed the occurrence rates of in-hospital serious cardiac complications such as  
238 ventricular tachycardia (VT), ventricular fibrillation (VF), cardiogenic shock, and cardiac arrest.  
239 The rates of VT were 7.3%, 13.5%, and 4.9% for AMI, STEMI, and NSTEMI, respectively.  
240 Notably, these rates were elevated in individuals with AF, with 9.5% vs. 6.8% for AMI, 18.3%  
241 vs. 12.7% for STEMI, and 7.2% vs. 4.4% for NSTEMI.  
242 Similarly, VF rates were 3.4% in AMI, 8.7% in STEMI, and 1.3% in NSTEMI. Again, AF was  
243 associated with higher rates (4.2% vs. 3.2% for AMI, 12.3% vs. 8.2% for STEMI, and 1.98% vs.  
244 1.1% for NSTEMI). Incidences of cardiogenic shock were 6.7%, 14.1%, and 3.9% for AMI,  
245 STEMI, and NSTEMI, respectively. AF patients demonstrated elevated rates across all three  
246 groups (10.4% vs. 5.9% in AMI, 24.7% vs. 12.4% in STEMI, and 6.5% vs. 3.3% in NSTEMI).  
247 The rates of cardiac arrest were 2.9% in AMI, 5.9% in STEMI, and 1.7% in NSTEMI. Upon  
248 separate analysis based on AF status, higher cardiac arrest rates were observed in AF patients  
249 (4% vs. 2.7% in AMI, 9.1% vs. 5.4% in STEMI, and 2.6% vs. 1.5% in NSTEMI patients).

250 As summarized in

251 Table 5, AF independently predicted increased odds of VT, VF, cardiogenic shock, and cardiac  
252 arrest.

### 253 **Hospital length of stay and total hospitalization charges:**

254 Patients with AMI had a mean length of stay of 4.36 days, with associated hospitalization  
255 charges of \$108,409; STEMI patients stayed 3.9 days, incurring charges of \$126,896, while  
256 NSTEMI patients had a mean stay of 4.5 days with charges totaling \$101,301. Following  
257 adjustments for patient- and hospital-level variables, individuals with AF exhibited significantly  
258 prolonged hospital stays and higher hospitalization charges compared to those without atrial  
259 fibrillation, as summarized in Table 6 below:

260 **Discussion:**

261 This study demonstrates that patients with AMI and concomitant AF had poorer outcomes than  
262 those without AF. This subpopulation was not only found to have increased mortality, but they  
263 were also less likely to undergo ischemic evaluation and treatment, with higher rates of cardiac  
264 complications, increased length of stay, and higher total hospitalization charges.

265 The interaction and causality relationship between CAD and AF is complex, and a large number  
266 of studies in the past have shown varied results. The prevalence of CAD in AF was previously  
267 estimated to be between 18-46.5%, whereas the prevalence of AF in CAD was low, from 0.5 to  
268 5%.<sup>12,18</sup> In this study, the prevalence of CAD in AF was 40%, and the prevalence of AF in CAD  
269 was 29%. One plausible explanation for such divergence is that most previous studies captured  
270 longitudinal data and had fewer patients than this study. Previous research identified CAD as an  
271 independent risk factor for the development of AF,<sup>19</sup> and early onset AF post-AMI is linked with  
272 a dismal prognosis.<sup>20</sup> Studies have demonstrated poor short and long-term outcomes in patients  
273 with AMI and AF.<sup>21</sup> The large Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events (GRACE) showed a  
274 three-fold increased risk of death for patients with new-onset AF during index hospitalization for  
275 acute coronary syndrome.<sup>22</sup> This study concurs with previous findings and found AF as an  
276 independent predictor for increased odds of mortality while controlling for other known variables  
277 associated with increased mortality.

278 Several mechanisms are considered the possible etiology behind increased mortality in this sub-  
279 population. One theory suggested that due to shared risk factors between the two conditions, AF  
280 and CAD are both the products of these underlying risk factors that promote atrial ischemia,  
281 induce AF, and encourage obstructive coronary artery disease.<sup>23</sup> Another hypothesis suggests  
282 reentry pathways with different refractory times create reentry circuits and, along with the

283 structural remodeling of the left atrium, increase vulnerability to AF.<sup>24,25</sup> Very few cases of  
284 thromboembolic AMI have been reported with AF due to the associated systemic inflammatory  
285 state promoting prothrombotic environment.<sup>26,27</sup> Lastly, the increased ventricular rate can induce  
286 subendocardial ischemic and cause NSTEMI.<sup>28</sup>

287 One study found no association between a history of AF and significant CAD in patients  
288 undergoing coronary angiograms.<sup>29</sup> In contrast, another research revealed that the vast majority  
289 of deaths in anticoagulated AF patients were from cardiac causes (37%) rather than stroke  
290 (9.8%).<sup>30</sup> Adding complexity, a prospective cohort study demonstrated an association between  
291 AF and NSTEMI and not with STEMI.<sup>31</sup> Despite AF showing an increased mortality in AMI,<sup>20</sup> it  
292 remains uncertain whether increased coronary events are the primary cause.

293 Pooled data from a 2016 meta-analysis showed a 39% elevated risk of AMI in AF patients and a  
294 two-fold increased likelihood of cardiovascular events or death compared to patients without  
295 AF.<sup>32</sup> In another longitudinal study, AF was associated with a two-fold increased risk for MI, and  
296 the risk of mortality was notably higher in an African American female on anticoagulation with a  
297 high ChadsVasc score.<sup>13</sup> However, our study found no statistically significant difference in  
298 mortality between genders (adjusted OR 1.02, p 0.498).

299 Single-center retrospective analysis showed no association between anatomical characteristics of  
300 CAD and AF; however, it found more severe CAD in patients with AF.<sup>33</sup> Given the high  
301 mortality linked with AF and AMI and previous studies indicating a higher likelihood of severe  
302 CAD in this patient population, data was analyzed in this study to assess the trend of ischemic  
303 evaluation and intervention in patients admitted with AMI and stratified them based on AF  
304 status. The study showed increased mortality and decreased odds of undergoing ischemic

305 evaluation with a nuclear stress test or diagnostic coronary angiogram. The study also showed  
306 lesser odds of receiving percutaneous interventions.  
307 Similarly, patients with AF were more likely to have serious cardiovascular complications such  
308 as VT, VF, cardiogenic shock, and cardiac arrest compared to patients without AF. The average  
309 length of hospital stays and total hospital charges were also high in AF. This study validates the  
310 previous findings of increased mortality in patients with CAD and concomitant AF. It further  
311 highlights the deficits in diagnostic evaluation in this patient population, which was not  
312 examined before. The study indicated an increased propensity for cardiac complications and  
313 elevated resource utilization, underscoring the crucial importance of treating AF as a distinct risk  
314 factor for CAD and advocating for early ischemic evaluation.

315 **Limitations:** Our study had the following limitations. It included all-cause mortality as the  
316 outcome instead of cardiovascular-specific mortality, as CV mortality is not available in the  
317 dataset. There is a potential for coding error as the ICD-10 codes' accuracy depends on the  
318 treating physician. The patients with missing information were excluded from the analysis,  
319 which may infer selection bias. The anticoagulation status of AF patients was not known.

### 320 **Conclusion:**

321 This study examined the impact of AF on CAD mortality, cardiac complications, length of stay,  
322 and total hospital charges. AMI patients with AF had higher odds of mortality. They were less  
323 likely to undergo ischemic workup or intervention, more likely to suffer serious cardiac  
324 complications, and, on average, had longer lengths of hospital stay and higher hospital charges.  
325 AF appears to affect cardiovascular mortality independently. AF should be considered as a  
326 marker for underlying CAD. More research is required to understand the challenges of obtaining

327 ischemic workup in AF patients. More education is needed to promote early consideration of  
328 ischemic evaluation in patients with AF.

329

330 **References:**

- 331 1. Andrade J, Khairy P, Dobrev D, Nattel S. The clinical profile and pathophysiology of  
332 atrial fibrillation: relationships among clinical features, epidemiology, and mechanisms.  
333 *Circ Res.* 2014;114(9):1453-1468.
- 334
- 335 2. Kornej J, Börschel CS, Benjamin EJ, Schnabel RB. Epidemiology of Atrial Fibrillation in  
336 the 21st Century: Novel Methods and New Insights. *Circ Res.* 2020;127(1):4-20.
- 337
- 338 3. Elliott AD, Middeldorp ME, Van Gelder IC, Albert CM, Sanders P. Epidemiology and  
339 modifiable risk factors for atrial fibrillation. *Nat Rev Cardiol.* 2023;20(6):404-417.
- 340
- 341 4. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP,  
342 Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, Delling FN et al. Heart Disease and Stroke  
343 Statistics-2020 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation.*  
344 2020;141(9):e139-e596.
- 345
- 346 5. Deshmukh A, Iglesias M, Khanna R, Beaulieu T. Healthcare utilization and costs  
347 associated with a diagnosis of incident atrial fibrillation. *Heart Rhythm O2.*



- 348 2022;3(5):577-586.
- 349
- 350 6. Olvera Lopez E, Ballard BD, Jan A. Cardiovascular Disease. In: StatPearls. Treasure  
351 Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; August 22, 2023.
- 352
- 353 7. Brown JC, Gerhardt TE, Kwon E. Risk Factors for Coronary Artery Disease. In:  
354 StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; January 23, 2023.
- 355
- 356 8. Ralapanawa U, Sivakanesan R. Epidemiology and the Magnitude of Coronary Artery  
357 Disease and Acute Coronary Syndrome: A Narrative Review. J Epidemiol Glob Health.  
358 2021;11(2):169-177.
- 359
- 360 9. GBD 2017 Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex-  
361 specific mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories, 1980-2017: a  
362 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet.  
363 2018;392(10159):1736-1788.
- 364
- 365 10. Murphy MM, Schmier JK. Cardiovascular Healthcare Cost Savings Associated with  
366 Increased Whole Grains Consumption among Adults in the United States. Nutrients.  
367 2020;12(8):2323.
- 368

- 369 11. Hajar R. Risk Factors for Coronary Artery Disease: Historical Perspectives. *Heart Views*.  
370 2017;18(3):109-114.  
371
- 372 12. Michniewicz E, Mlodawska E, Lopatowska P, Tomaszuk-Kazberuk A, Malyszko J.  
373 Patients with atrial fibrillation and coronary artery disease - Double trouble. *Adv Med*  
374 *Sci*. 2018;63(1):30-35.  
375
- 376 13. Soliman EZ, Safford MM, Muntner P, Khodneva Y, Dawood FZ, Zakai NA, Thacker EL,  
377 Judd S, Howard VJ, Howard G et al. Atrial Fibrillation and the Risk of Myocardial  
378 Infarction. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014;174(1):107–114.  
379
- 380 14. Yan T, Zhu S, Xie C, Zhu M, Weng F, Wang C, Guo C. Coronary Artery Disease and  
381 Atrial Fibrillation: A Bidirectional Mendelian Randomization Study. *J Cardiovasc Dev*  
382 *Dis*. 2022;9(3):69.  
383
- 384 15. Batra G, Svennblad B, Held C, Jernberg T, Johanson P, Wallentin L, Oldgren J. All types  
385 of atrial fibrillation in the setting of myocardial infarction are associated with impaired  
386 outcomes. *Heart*. 2016;102(12):926-933.  
387
- 388 16. Stojadinović P, Deshraj A, Wichterle D, Fukunaga M, Peichl P, Kautzner J, Sramko M.  
389 The hemodynamic effect of simulated atrial fibrillation on left ventricular function. *J*  
390 *Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2022;33(12):2569-2577.  
391

- 392 17. HCUP National Inpatient Sample (NIS). Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP).  
393 2019. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. [www.hcup-  
395 us.ahrq.gov/nisoverview.jsp](http://www.hcup-<br/>394 us.ahrq.gov/nisoverview.jsp)
- 396 18. Sharma YP, Batta A, Makkar K, Hatwal J, Gawalkar AA, Kaur N, Malhi TS,  
397 Kasinadhuni G, Gupta H, Panda P, et al. Angiographic profile and outcomes in persistent  
398 non-valvular atrial fibrillation: A study from tertiary care center in North India. *Indian  
399 Heart J.* 2022;74(1):7-12.  
400
- 401 19. Brandes A, Smit MD, Nguyen BO, Rienstra M, Van Gelder IC. Risk Factor Management  
402 in Atrial Fibrillation. *Arrhythm Electrophysiol Rev.* 2018;7(2):118-127.  
403
- 404 20. Jabre P, Roger VL, Murad MH, Chamberlain AM, Prokop L, Adnet F, Jouven X.  
405 Mortality associated with atrial fibrillation in patients with myocardial infarction: a  
406 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Circulation.* 2011;123(15):1587-1593.  
407
- 408 21. Tsigkas G, Kopsida G, Xanthopoulou I, Davlouros P, Koutsogiannis N, Makris G,  
409 Theodoropoulos K, Kassimis G, Gkizas V, Hahalis G, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of  
410 electrocardiographic ST-segment depression in patients with rapid atrial fibrillation for  
411 the prediction of coronary artery disease. *Can J Cardiol.* 2014;30(8):920-924.  
412
- 413 22. Mehta RH, Dabbous OH, Granger CB, Kuznetsova P, Kline-Rogers EM, Anderson Jr  
414 FA, Fox KAA, Gore JM, Goldberg RJ, Eagle KA. Comparison of outcomes of patients

- 415 with acute coronary syndromes with and without atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol.*
- 416 2003;92(9):1031-1036.
- 417
- 418 23. Polimeni L, Perri L, Saliola M, Basili S, Violi F. The risk of myocardial infarction in
- 419 patients with atrial fibrillation: an unresolved issue. *Intern Emerg Med.* 2010;5(2):91-94.
- 420
- 421 24. Lau DH, Nattel S, Kalman JM, Sanders P. Modifiable Risk Factors and Atrial
- 422 Fibrillation. *Circulation.* 2017;136(6):583-596.
- 423
- 424 25. Heijman J, Voigt N, Nattel S, Dobrev D. Cellular and molecular electrophysiology of
- 425 atrial fibrillation initiation, maintenance, and progression. *Circ Res.* 2014;114(9):1483-
- 426 1499.
- 427
- 428 26. Garg RK, Jolly N. Acute myocardial infarction secondary to thromboembolism in a
- 429 patient with atrial fibrillation. *Int J Cardiol.* 2007;123(1):e18-e20.
- 430
- 431 27. Tomcsányi J, Takó K, Sárman B. Recidív akut myocardialis infarctus pitvarfibrilláció
- 432 miatt [Recurrent acute myocardial infarction as a thromboembolic complication of atrial
- 433 fibrillation]. *Orv Hetil.* 2016;157(5):191-193.
- 434
- 435 28. Kea B, Alligood T, Manning V, Raitt M. A Review of the Relationship of Atrial
- 436 Fibrillation and Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Curr Emerg Hosp Med Rep.* 2016;4(3):107-

437 118.

438

439 29. Tomaszuk–Kazberuk A, Młodawska E, Łopatowska P, Kaminski M, Michniewicz E,  
440 Bachorzewska-Gajewska H, Dobrzycki S, Musial W. Atrial fibrillation as a factor  
441 associated with a finding of non-significant coronary disease on coronary angiography -  
442 difficulties in qualifying for coronary angiography - 15 853 patients study. *Eur Heart J*.  
443 2017;38(suppl\_1).

444

445 30. Marijon E, Le Heuzey JY, Connolly S, Yang S, Pogue J, Brueckmann M, Eikelboom J,  
446 Themeles E, Ezekowitz M, Wallentin L, et al. Causes of death and influencing factors in  
447 patients with atrial fibrillation: a competing-risk analysis from the randomized evaluation  
448 of long-term anticoagulant therapy study. *Circulation*. 2013;128(20):2192-2201.

449

450 31. Soliman EZ, Lopez F, O'Neal WT, Chen LY, Bengtson L, Zhang Z, Loehr L, Cushman  
451 M, Alonso A. Atrial Fibrillation and Risk of ST-Segment-Elevation Versus Non-ST-  
452 Segment-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities  
453 (ARIC) Study. *Circulation*. 2015;131(21):1843-1850.

454

455 32. He W, Chu Y. Atrial fibrillation as a prognostic indicator of myocardial infarction and  
456 cardiovascular death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7(1):3360.  
457 Published 2017 June 13.

458

459 33. Motloch LJ, Reda S, Larbig R, Wolff A, Motloch KA, Wernly B, Granitz C, Lichtenauer  
460 M, Wolny M, Hoppe UC. Characteristics of coronary artery disease among patients with  
461 atrial fibrillation compared to patients with sinus rhythm. *Hellenic J Cardiol.*  
462 2017;58(3):204-212.

463

464

465 **Tables:**

466 Table 1. Patient characteristics

Patient characteristics	AMI with AF	AMI without AF	p-value
% of patients			
Women, %	37%	36%	0.0153
Age, mean	74 years (0.5)	65 years (0.2)	
Race/ethnicity, %			
Caucasian	80%	72%	0.000
African American	7.5%	12%	
Hispanic	6.5%	9.2%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6%	3%	
Native American	0.4%	0.6%	
Other	2.3%	3.1%	
Charlson comorbidity index score, no. (%)			

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

0	0	0	0.000
1	11.6%	26%	
2	19.5%	26%	
>3	69	48%	
Median annual income in patients' zip code, %			0.000
\$1 - 45,999	28.6%	31%	
\$46,000 - 58,999	27.2%	26.3%	
\$59,000 - 78,999	25%	24%	
> \$79,000	19.3%	18.3%	
Insurance type, %			0.000
Medicare	77%	54%	
Medicaid	5%	11%	
Private HMO	15%	30%	
Self-pay	2.3%	5.7%	
Hospital characteristics			0.000
Hospital region, %			
Northeast	17%	17%	
Midwest	24%	22%	
South	39%	41%	
West	20%	19%	
Hospital bed size, %			0.000
Small	19%	19%	

Medium	30%	30%	0.3233
Large	51%	50%	
Urban location	93%	93%	0.853
Hospital teaching status	74	74	0.0903
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation. Actual numbers not provided as the sample size was above 10,000			

467

468 Table 2. The difference in mortality between patients with and without AF

	Total	AMI with AF	AMI without AF
Total AMI no. (%)	26,955/600,645 (4.5%)	7860/109,520 (7.2%)	19,095/491,125 (3.9%)
STEMI no. (%)	13,025/166,680 (7.8%)	3165/23,320 (13.5%)	9,860/143,360 (6.8%)
NSTEMI no. (%)	13,930/433,965 (3.2%)	4695/86,200 (5.4%)	9,235/347,765 (2.6%)
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction			

469



470 Table 3. Adjusted and unadjusted odds of mortality in patients with AMI, STEMI, and NSTEMI  
471 and concomitant AF

Mortality	AMI		STEMI		NSTEMI	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
	1.91 (1.79-2.03)	1.23 (1.15-1.32)	2.12 (1.93-2.34)	1.23 (1.09-1.38)	2.11 (1.95-2.28)	1.32 (1.21-1.45)
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction						

472

473 Table 4. The unadjusted and adjusted Odds ratios of stress test, diagnostic coronary angiogram,  
474 and PCI in patients with AMI, STEMI, NSTEMI, and AF.

	AMI		STEMI		NSTEMI	
	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Stress test	0.83 (0.61-1.11)	0.70 (0.51-0.96)	1.67 (0.78-3.58)	1.51 (0.68-3.32)	0.71 (0.51-0.98)	0.64 (0.45-0.89)
Diagnostic	0.55 (0.53-0.56)	0.77 (0.744-0.80)	0.51 (0.47-	0.75 (0.67-	0.59 (0.57-	0.79 (0.75-

coronary angiogram			0.56)	0.82)	0.61)	0.82)
PCI	0.49 (0.47-0.50)	0.64 (0.62-0.67)	0.47 (0.44-0.51)	0.65 (0.59-0.70)	0.52 (0.50-0.54)	0.62 (0.59-0.64)
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention						

475

476 Table 5. Unadjusted and Adjusted Odds ratios for Ventricular tachycardia, Ventricular  
 477 fibrillation, Cardiogenic shock, and Cardiac arrest in patients with AMI, STEMI, NSTEMI, and  
 478 AF.

	AMI		STEMI		NSTEMI	
	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Ventricular tachycardia	1.44 (1.36-1.52)	1.41 (1.33-1.49)	1.53 (1.41-1.66)	1.44 (1.32-1.58)	1.68 (1.57-1.80)	1.44 (1.33-1.56)
Ventricular fibrillation	1.32 (1.22-1.42)	1.44 (1.33-1.57)	1.57 (1.43-1.73)	1.50 (1.34-1.68)	1.74 (1.52-1.98)	1.51 (1.30-1.76)
Cardiogenic shock	1.83 (1.73-1.93)	1.43 (1.35-1.52)	2.31 (2.14-2.49)	1.57 (1.43-1.73)	2.05 (1.89-2.22)	1.46 (1.33-1.59)

Cardiac arrest	1.52 (1.41-1.64)	1.35 (1.24-1.47)	1.74 (1.56-1.94)	1.50 (1.32-1.71)	1.73 (1.54-1.94)	1.43 (1.26-1.63)
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction						

479

480 Table 6. Adjusted length of stay and total hospital charges for AMI, STEMI NSTEMI, and AF

	AMI		STEMI		NSTEMI	
	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
LOS	2.23 (2.12-2.33)	1.39 (1.29-1.48)	2.5 (2.28-2.72)	1.49 (1.28-1.71)	2.11 (2.00-2.22)	1.34 (1.24-1.44)
Total charges	27,632 (24,445-30,818)	\$22,188 (19,311-25,064)	39,063 (33,125-45,000)	\$22,577 (16,622-28,532)	27,098 (23,817-30,379)	\$20,843 (17,898-23,788)
AMI, Acute myocardial infarction; AF, atrial fibrillation; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non-ST elevation myocardial infarction; LOS, length of stay						

481