



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Hacking stroke in women: towards aetiology-driven precision prevention

Os, H.J.A. van

Citation

Os, H. J. A. van. (2023, March 7). *Hacking stroke in women: towards aetiology-driven precision prevention*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3567865>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3567865>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

An abstract painting of a woman's face, rendered in a style reminiscent of Vincent van Gogh. The face is the central focus, with eyes closed and a serene expression. The skin tones are a mix of warm yellows, oranges, and reds, contrasted with cooler blues and greens in the shadows and background. On the forehead, there is a complex, layered structure that resembles a brain or a cluster of leaves, painted in shades of orange, yellow, and blue. The background is a dark, swirling composition of blues, greens, and yellows, with some sharp, radiating lines in the upper right corner. The overall effect is one of intense emotional and intellectual depth.

15. First-ever
cardiovascular event
prediction in patients
under 50 years using
complex data-driven
models on routine
care data

Hendrikus J. A. van Os, Jos P. Kanning, Tobias N.
Bonten, Margot M. Rakers, Hein Putter, Mattijs E.
Numans, Ynte Ruigrok, Rolf H. H. Groenwold,
Marieke J. H. Wermer

Accepted for publication at J American Heart Association

Abstract

Background: Prediction models for risk of cardiovascular events generally do not include young adults, and cardiovascular risk factors differ between women and men. Therefore, this study aimed to develop a prediction model for first-ever cardiovascular event risk in men and women aged 30–49, using a large Dutch electronic health record (EHR)-derived primary care population-based cohort and comparing complex data-driven models with Cox regression models.

Methods: We included patients from the Dutch STIZON routine care database. Patients aged 30–49 years without cardiovascular disease, or prescription of statins or thrombocyte aggregation inhibitors prior to baseline were included. Outcome was defined as first-ever cardiovascular event. Our reference models were sex-specific Cox proportional hazards models based on traditional cardiovascular predictors. In addition, we developed Cox elastic net and random survival forests models, and used two other predictor subsets with the 20 or 50 most important predictors from all information available in the EHR, based on the Cox elastic net model regularization coefficients. For all models we assessed the C-index and calibration curve slopes at ten years of follow-up. We stratified our analyses based on the 30–39 and 40–49 years age groups at baseline.

Results: We included 542,141 patients (mean age 39.7 years, 51% women). During follow-up, 10,767 first-ever cardiovascular events occurred (incidence rate: 19.7 [95%CI: 19.3–20.1] per 10,000 person years). Cox elastic net predictor selection resulted in several non-traditional cardiovascular predictors that were ranked as important, including socioeconomic status score and hormonal contraceptive use in women specifically. Discrimination of reference models including traditional cardiovascular predictors for both women and men was moderate (women: C-index: 0.648; 95%CI: 0.645–0.652; men: C-index: 0.661; 95%CI: 0.658–0.664). In women and men, the Cox PH model including 50 most important predictors resulted in an increase in C-index (0.030 in women and 0.012 in men), and a net correct reclassification of 3.7% of the events in women and 1.2% in men compared with the reference model. After stratification of the 30–39 and 40–49 years age groups at baseline, discriminatory performance was attenuated for all Cox PH models in both women and men.

Conclusions: Sex-specific EHR-derived prediction models for first-ever cardiovascular events in the general population under 50 have moderate discriminatory performance. Data-driven predictor selection leads to identification of non-traditional cardiovascular predictors which modestly increase discriminatory performance of models and correct reclassification of events, particularly in women.

Introduction

Cardiovascular events are a leading cause of disability and death worldwide.¹ In the last half century cardiovascular event-related mortality decreased continually. However, opportunities in primary prevention of cardiovascular events are still being missed.² Currently in Europe, decisions on preventive interventions in adults without prior cardiovascular disease aged 40–69 years are based on the absolute ten-year risk of cardiovascular events, resulting from the SCORE2 prediction model.³ Early identification of individuals at high risk of cardiovascular events is beneficial, because atherosclerosis is a chronic process that starts early in life.⁴ Therefore, early treatment of risk factors is beneficial, and accurate risk estimates applicable to younger persons are required.⁵

Evidence on sex differences between cardiovascular risk factors is mounting, which pleads for including sex-specific risk factors such as preeclampsia and combined oral contraceptive pill use in prediction models.⁶ Derivation of sex-specific models for the prediction of cardiovascular risk in young individuals requires a large sample size. Pooling electronic health record (EHR) data results in large prospective cohorts, offering a great opportunity for the derivation of prediction models.⁷ The QRISK3 prediction model for the risk of cardiovascular events is an example of leveraging information from the EHR, and has been successfully externally validated in the general population in the United Kingdom.⁸ QRISK3 is a traditional regression model using predictors which are selected based on prior knowledge. However, because EHR-derived cohorts are constituted by both a large sample size and a very high number of potentially relevant predictors, complex data-driven modelling techniques may outperform traditional regression models in predicting the risk of cardiovascular event.^{9–11}

This study aimed to develop sex-specific prediction models for first-ever cardiovascular event risk in patients aged 30–49 in a primary care setting, using data from a large Dutch EHR-derived population-based cohort. We assessed whether the data-driven selection of predictors and the use of complex prediction models offer an increase in predictive performance, compared with a Cox regression model using only traditional cardiovascular predictors.

Methods

Data source

The research cohort in this study was derived from the STIZON database. STIZON directly receives data from EHRs of a large number of primary care providers throughout the Netherlands.¹² We only selected patients from general practice centers which were localized in catchment areas of hospitals participating in the

STIZON network. This enabled us to link hospital ICD-9 and ICD-10 diagnoses to primary care data. The STIZON dataset contains ATC medication prescriptions from primary care pharmacies during follow-up time, and ICPC diagnosis codes for clinical entities in principle starting from birth.^{13,14} ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes were available for all in-hospital diagnoses that occurred during follow-up. Inclusion criteria were an age of 30–49 at baseline, and subscription to a STIZON general practice center between January 1st 2007 and December 31st 2020 for at least one year, which was required because we defined the one-year as a run-in period. This run-in period was used for averaging the predictor values of laboratory or vital parameter assessments, if multiple of such measurements were present within this period. Exclusion criteria were cardiovascular disease, and use of statins or cardiovascular event-specific thrombocyte aggregation inhibitors at baseline. Follow-up time started at the end of the one year run-in period (January 1st 2008) or on the first general practice center subscription date after January 1st 2008. Patients were censored at the earliest date of the diagnosis of a first-ever fatal or non-fatal cardiovascular event, non-cardiovascular death, deregistration with any practice connected to the STIZON network, or the last upload of computerised data to the STIZON database (December 31st 2020). The ethics review board has provided a statement that this study was not subject to ethics review according to the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO). Because of the sensitive nature of the data collected for this study, data will need to be requested from a third party (STIZON).

Outcome definition

First-ever cardiovascular events were defined using ICD-9, ICD-10 or ICPC codes for fatal and non-fatal acute myocardial infarction and stroke (including ischemic, hemorrhagic and unspecified stroke, Table S1)

Predictors

All predictors which were used for analyses can be found in Table S1. Predictors included demographics, symptoms and diagnoses other than fatal and non-fatal cardiovascular events, and were based on ICPC, ICD-9, and ICD-10 codes, prescribed medication coded according to the ATC classification, laboratory test results performed in primary care, consultation dates and frequency.^{13, 14} In addition, the four-digit postal code area data was transformed into a socioeconomic status score based on income, education and occupation of the inhabitants.¹⁵ ICPC, ICD-9, and ICD-10 codes and condition-specific ATC-codes were clustered based on clinical knowledge by two domain experts (HvO & MR) if multiple codes constituted the same clinical entity. An example is the grouping of different types of malignancy diagnoses into an overall malignancy predictor. For computational

purposes, we only selected predictors that occurred in at least 0.1% of the total study population across the entire follow-up time, after clustering. All continuous predictors were standardized before analysis. Baseline information was assessed at the end of the one-year run-in period.

Missing value handling

With respect to missing predictor values, we made a distinction between binary predictors – such as registration of a certain diagnosis or prescription of medication – and continuous predictors such as measurements of laboratory parameters or blood pressure. For all binary predictors, we assumed that the absence of an EHR registration meant the absence of the clinical entity itself, and therefore no imputation was performed. However, for continuous predictors such as vital parameter or laboratory assessments, imputation of missing values was required for inclusion in the prediction models. Because in routine healthcare data the majority of such assessments is only performed in a small subset of the population, the extent of missingness may be large and the underlying mechanism of missingness is likely missing not at random. Because in our dataset for all continuous laboratory or vital parameter assessments missingness exceeded 25%, we chose not to impute the missing values to limit the risk of biased predictor value imputations. We only used binary indicators in the analyses, which indicated whether the assessment had been performed or not.

Predictor selection

We used two methods for the selection of predictors which were used to develop prediction models. First, for the reference models we chose the traditional cardiovascular risk factors age, sex, smoking (ever), and either an ICD-9, ICD-10 or ICPC diagnosis code or condition-specific ATC medication prescription code for hyperlipidemia, hypertension, and diabetes mellitus, based on prior evidence.¹⁶ Since we excluded patients who received statin treatment at baseline, hyperlipidemia was based on diagnosis codes only. Second, we used data-driven predictor selection based on a Cox elastic net model (α of 0.00058 for women, α of 0.00072 for men; L1 to L2 regularization penalty ratio: 0.5) to select the most important 20 and 50 predictors based on the absolute regularized coefficients of a sex-specific Cox elastic net model.

Model development

The three different selections of predictors (traditional cardiovascular risk factors for the reference model, and the 20 and 50 most important predictors based on a Cox elastic net model) were used to develop Cox proportional hazards (PH) models, Cox elastic net models, and random survival forests. Models were developed for

women and men separately. Cox elastic net models and random survival forests are more flexible than Cox PH models, because they include hyperparameters. Hyperparameters of Cox elastic net and random survival forests were optimized using predefined hyperparameter grids (Table S2). To account for overfitting and internally validate our findings, we used a nested validation approach. First, the data was randomly split into a derivation and validation set, of respectively 80% and 20% of the population. Hyperparameter optimization was then performed on the derivation set, using 10-fold cross validation. Overall model performance was assessed using the hold-out validation set. We repeated this process 50 times using bootstrap resampling to assess variability in outcomes and to report empirical 95% confidence intervals. We did not take non-cardiovascular death into account as a competing event, since our population was young and non-cardiovascular mortality was expected to be very low. Model performance was defined by both model discrimination (concordance index or C-index) and calibration (calibration curve slope at ten years of follow-up). We expressed change in C-index between reference and other prediction models as difference relative to the full scale of the C-index, which is from 0.5 to 1. Further, we assessed net reclassification using the categorical net reclassification index (NRI). We chose a 2.5% ten-year absolute risk of first-ever cardiovascular events as threshold for high cardiovascular risk. This is in line with the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guideline for prevention of CVD in individuals under 50 years, and implies that risk factor treatment should be considered. Our predefined absolute risk threshold of 2.5% is therefore of clinical importance.¹⁷ In addition, we stratified our analyses based on two age groups (30–39 and 40–49 years at baseline). The 30–39 years age group is of particular interest, because the SCORE2 model starts at an age of 40. For all performance metrics we calculated empirical 95% confidence intervals (CI) by fitting a new model in each of the 50 bootstrap samples, and basing the CI on the standard deviation of the distribution of the performance metrics. Python version 3.10 was used for pre-processing and analysis of data. Our study adhered to the TRIPOD (Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis) statement for reporting.¹⁸

Results

We included 542,141 patients aged 30–49 years without prior CVD or statin use at baseline in this study, of whom 51% were women. During 5,461,316 person years of follow-up, a total of 10,767 first-ever cardiovascular events occurred. This resulted in an incidence rate of 19.7 (19.3–20.1) per 10,000 person years in the total population, 13.6 (13.2–14.0) in women and 26.2 (25.5–26.8) in men. Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of men and women in the total study population. The average age was 39.7 years (SD $\pm$ 5.7). Systolic blood pressure was assessed in 6.6%,

and total serum cholesterol in 2.4% of the total population. We, therefore, discarded continuous measurements and only included indicators of whether tests were performed.

Subsequently, after the data-driven selection of predictors using Cox elastic net models, the 20 most important predictors are shown in Table 2. The 50 most important predictors can be found in Table S3. Substantial differences in predictor importances were observed between women and men. For example, for women two female-specific risk factors (combined oral contraceptive use and intrauterine contraceptive use) are ranked in the top 20. The top 20 most important predictors for women and men, stratified based on the 30–39 and 40–49 years age groups, are shown in Table S4.

Discrimination of Cox PH reference models including traditional cardiovascular predictors for both women and men was moderate (women: C-index: 0.648; 95% CI: 0.645–0.652; men: C-index: 0.661; 95% CI: 0.658–0.664) and calibration was good (calibration curve slope in women: 0.999; 95% CI: 0.998–1.001; and in men: 1.001; 95% CI: 0.998–1.004; Table 3). In women, the Cox PH model including 50 most important predictors resulted in an increase in C-index of 0.030 compared with the reference model (20% difference with the reference model relative to the full scale of the C-index). In men, Cox PH model including 50 most important predictors also resulted in the relatively largest increase in C-index, although to a lesser extent compared with women (0.012 increase in C-index; 7% difference with the reference model relative to the full scale of the C-index). The more flexible modelling approaches (Cox elastic net and random survival forests) did not perform better than the Cox PH models across any of the different predictor subsets (Table S5).

For women and men, the categorical NRI was assessed for the Cox PH model with 50 most important predictors versus the reference Cox PH model. For women, net correct reclassification was for events 3.7% (95% CI: 3.2%–4.2%), and for non-events 0.0% (-0.1%–0.1%); and for men, net correct reclassification for events was 1.2% (0.8%–1.6%), and for non-events was -0.8% (-1.1%–0.4%). Absolute risks for the Cox PH model with 50 most important predictors is shown for women and men (Figure).

After stratification of the 30–39 and 40–49 years age groups at baseline, discriminatory performance was attenuated in the 30–39 years age group, and further decreased in the 40–49 years age group, for all Cox PH models in both women and men (Table 3).

Table 1. Baseline characteristics for women and men

Baseline characteristics	Women (n = 276,113)		Men (n = 266,028)	
	Cases (n = 3,800)	Controls (n = 272,313)	Cases (n = 6,915)	Controls (n = 259,113)
Demographic features				
Age (<i>mean ± SD</i>)	42.4 (5.0)	39.5 (5.7)	42.9 (4.8)	39.6 (5.6)
Socioeconomic status score (<i>mean ± SD</i>)	0.23 (0.75)	0.31 (0.71)	0.25 (0.74)	0.30 (0.72)
Follow-up time (<i>median years ± IQR</i>)	6.6 (3.8–9.4)	11.0 (8.3–13.0)	6.9 (4.0–9.6)	11.0 (8.0–13.0)
Cardiovascular risk factors, n (%)				
Smoking (current)	154 (4.1)	4897 (1.8)	264 (3.8)	5087 (2.0)
Hyperlipidemia	32 (0.8)	761 (0.3)	69 (1.0)	1261 (0.5)
Hypertension	157 (4.1)	3896 (1.4)	168 (2.4)	3339 (1.3)
Diabetes mellitus	43 (1.1)	1163 (0.4)	67 (1.0)	1295 (0.5)
Measurements, n (%) ^a				
Systolic blood pressure	485 (12.8)	20823 (7.6)	526 (7.6)	13907 (5.4)
Serum glucose	133 (3.5)	8245 (3.0)	171 (2.5)	4463 (1.7)
Total serum cholesterol	318 (8.4)	13585 (5.0)	468 (6.8)	12150 (4.7)

Cases: patients who suffered a first ever cardiovascular disease event during follow-up; controls: all other patients

^aAny laboratory or vital parameter measurement during the one-year run-in period

Table 2. Top 20 most important predictors for women and men separately

Women (n = 276,113)		Men (n = 266,028)	
Predictor	Coef. ^a	Predictor	Coef. ^a
Age	0.416	Age	0.533
Socioeconomic status score	0.115	Socioeconomic status score	0.101
Combined oral contraceptive use	0.070	Smoking: current	0.069
NSAID use	0.060	NSAID use	0.067
Gastroesophageal reflux medication	0.053	Diabetes mellitus	0.039
Smoking: current	0.052	Practice nurse contact for somatic complaints	0.035
Acetylsalicyc acid use	0.052	RAAS inhibitors	0.033
Comorbidity count	0.049	Psoriasis	0.031
RAAS inhibitors	0.045	Gastroesophageal reflux medication	0.027
Betablockers	0.043	Comorbidity count	0.026
Calcium channel blockers	0.040	Hyperlipidemia	0.019
Blood pressure measured last year	0.032	Epilepsia	0.019
Dermatological complaints	0.031	Calcium channel blockers	0.018
Intrauterine contraceptive use	0.030	Oral anticoagulant drugs	0.016
Hyperlipidemia	0.029	Esophageal disorders	0.014
Antibiotic use	0.028	Allergic rhinitis	0.014
Depression	0.027	Antibiotic use	0.014
HIV/AIDS	0.024	Alcohol use	0.014
Female sex organ complaints and symptoms	0.023	Kidney failure	0.014
Diabetes mellitus	0.023	Male sex organ complaints	0.014

^aAbsolute, regularized coefficient of Cox elastic net models (women: alpha = 0.00058; men: alpha = 0.00062)

^aComorbidity count: simple count of chronic conditions per patient, enlisted in Supplementary Table II

Table 3. Discrimination and calibration of sex-specific prediction models for different predictor subsets, stratified by age groups

Age range	Predictors	Women (n = 276,113)				Men (n = 266,028)			
		Performance metrics (95% CI)				Performance metrics (95% CI)			
		C-index	Δ C-stat.*	Δ C-stat.**	Calibration curve slope at 10 years	C-index	Δ C-stat.*	Δ C-stat.**	Calibration curve slope at 10 years
30–49	Baseline	0.648 (0.645–0.652)	Ref.	Ref.	0.999 (0.998–1.001)	0.661 (0.658–0.664)	Ref.	Ref.	1.001 (0.998–1.004)
	20	0.674 (0.671–0.677)	0.026	18%	1.000 (0.998–1.003)	0.673 (0.670–0.676)	0.012	7%	1.000 (0.998–1.002)
	50	0.678 (0.675–0.681)	0.03	20%	1.000 (0.997–1.002)	0.673 (0.671–0.675)	0.012	7%	1.001 (0.998–1.004)
30–39	Baseline	0.605 (0.601–0.609)	Ref.	Ref.	1.000 (0.998–1.003)	0.608 (0.604–0.612)	Ref.	Ref.	1.000 (0.998–1.003)
	20	0.651 (0.646–0.654)	0.049	47%	1.000 (0.997–1.003)	0.629 (0.625–0.633)	0.021	19%	1.001 (0.998–1.004)
	50	0.658 (0.654–0.663)	0.053	50%	0.999 (0.998–1.002)	0.629 (0.626–0.633)	0.021	19%	0.999 (0.996–1.002)
40–49	Baseline	0.572 (0.568–0.576)	Ref.	Ref.	0.999 (0.998–1.002)	0.578 (0.574–0.583)	Ref.	Ref.	1.001 (0.998–1.004)
	20	0.619 (0.615–0.623)	0.047	65%	1.000 (0.997–1.003)	0.600 (0.596–0.605)	0.022	28%	1.000 (0.997–1.003)
	50	0.624 (0.619–0.628)	0.052	72%	1.000 (0.997–1.002)	0.601 (0.597–0.605)	0.023	29%	1.001 (0.998–1.004)

Baseline traditional cardiovascular predictors: age, hypertension, antihypertensive medication, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, with Cox PH model using baseline predictors as reference model

*Difference in C-statistic compared with the reference model; **Difference in C-statistic compared with the reference model relative to full scale

Discussion

We found that in an EHR-derived population-based cohort of primary care patients aged between 30–49, sex-specific prediction models for first-ever cardiovascular events had moderate discriminatory performance and were well calibrated. Compared with the reference Cox PH models, the Cox PH models based on the 50 most important predictors had better discriminatory performance in both women and men, and were well calibrated. In women the improvement in discrimination was more substantial as compared with men, and the net correct reclassification of events was 3.7%. The more complex modelling methods Cox elastic net and random survival forests did not result in improvements in discrimination or calibration compared with the reference model, regardless of the predictor subset that was chosen. After stratification of the age groups at baseline, we found that discriminatory performance was attenuated in the 30–39 years age group, and further decreased in the 40–49 years age group. This was as expected, because we restricted the range of age, which is the most important predictor for cardiovascular events.

Several previous studies reported on the prediction of cardiovascular events using large EHR-derived datasets and complex data-driven models. One study which used data from the CPRD database ($n = 378,256$ patients between 30–84 years at baseline) found that a neural network substantially outperformed a reference logistic regression model (C-index: 0.764 versus 0.728), and correctly reclassified 7.6% of events. However, no survival models were used which limits the possibilities for valid clinical implementation. Another study included 423,604 UK Biobank participants, and deployed an automated machine learning pipeline named AutoPrognosis. Compared with a Cox PH reference model which included only traditional cardiovascular predictors, a machine learning ensemble method including all 473 predictors resulted in a C-index of 0.774 versus 0.734 of the reference model, and a net correct reclassification of events of 12.5%. An important difference with our study is that the UK Biobank contained relatively complete information on continuous predictors such as systolic blood pressure and total cholesterol.

In general, improvement in model performance may be due to (i) information gain resulting from including more predictors, or (ii) modelling gain which is the ability of models to capture non-linear associations or interactions among predictors.¹⁹ In our study, the gain of complex (random survival forests) versus simple (Cox PH) models appeared to be limited. Random survival forests performed slightly more poorly compared with Cox regression models, potentially because of random forests methods are prone to overfitting.²⁰ We do seem to find information gain by including predictors which are ranked as most important according to Cox elastic

net models. This indicates that data-driven predictor selection results in the identification of valuable non-traditional cardiovascular predictors which increase predictive performance, such as socioeconomic status score and hormonal contraceptive use in women specifically. Because Cox PH and Cox elastic net models have a similar performance, Cox PH models would be preferred for clinical use since they can be interpreted more easily.²¹

Limitations and strengths

Our study has several limitations. First, EHRs are designed to record data that are routinely collected during the clinical workflow to streamline patient care, and not for the purpose of research.²² Despite standardization using universal ICPC, ICD and ATC coding, previous research shows substantial underreporting in clinical diagnosis codes and large variability in inter-practice data quality.²³ Underreporting leads to misclassification in predictors and outcome. Misclassification is not a problem in prediction research if the measurement error is similar in development compared with the deployment setting. Misclassification of the outcome may, however, lead to a biased estimation of absolute risk.²⁴ Fatal cardiovascular events could only be identified if they occurred in-hospital using ICD-9 or ICD-10 codes. It is possible that in our study incidence of these events has been underestimated. Cardiovascular mortality comprises a quarter of all total CVD events. Prior research shows that the discriminating ability of prediction models did not differ between the fatal and non-fatal cardiovascular events.²⁵ Further, to optimally exclude patients with a history of cardiovascular events at baseline, we excluded patients with prescriptions of thrombocyte aggregation inhibitors which were specific for cardiovascular events (clopidogrel, dipyridamole, ticagrelor) at baseline. We did not include acetylsalicylic acid in this definition because of its prescription as analgesic in the study period, hence specificity for cardiovascular events was low.²⁶ In addition, we did not develop lifetime risk models in this cohort of young patients, because of the risk of misclassification in predictors and outcome may aggravate cohort effects. Second, we did not take non-cardiovascular death into account as a competing risk because we assessed a young patient cohort at a maximum of 49 years at baseline. In this population, the cumulative incidence of non-cardiovascular death was very small (0.6%) compared with the entire population, limiting the competing risk effect on the estimation of stroke risk. It should however be noted that registration of mortality in our EHR data is of suboptimal quality. Third, the reference Cox PH model did not include continuous laboratory or vital parameter measurements such as systolic blood pressure and total serum cholesterol, which limits the head to head comparison with commonly used models such as SCORE2.³ However, such a comparison was not the purpose of this study. In addition, because we use data-driven selection of predictors, we identified predictor representations other than continuous measurements of blood pressure and cholesterol that did not

require imputation. This is an advantage because of the often very high extent of missingness of measurement data in the EHR. Fourth, our study population excluded patients receiving statin at baseline, which limits its use in patients already receiving statin treatment. However, our prediction models are specifically suited to support preventive interventions such as initiation of statin treatment, similar to the QRISK3 study in the United Kingdom, which is also based on EHR data.⁸ We did not choose to exclude patients who received antihypertensive but not statin treatment at baseline, since in these patients the clinical decision on the initiation of statin treatment is also relevant and our models could be used for this decision. Fifth, although the continuous NRI is a more sensitive measure to assess model reclassification, we chose the categorical NRI because the 10-year risk threshold of 2.5% represents a clinically relevant threshold.

Strengths of this study includes the very large sample size of a cohort of patients under 50 years at baseline which is to our best knowledge among the largest to date. This offered a unique possibility to study data driven methods for the prediction of cardiovascular events in young patients. Further, all predictors used in our models are directly available in the EHR, which facilitates implementation of the models directly into the EHR. In addition, the linking of primary care and hospital diagnosis codes in the STIZON cohort enables validation of the cardiovascular outcome. Further, the data-driven predictor selection procedure results in that our models leverage predictive information from predictors other than continuous measurements of traditional cardiovascular predictors. Therefore, it is not necessary to impute these continuous measurements, which were missing in the vast majority of patients in our population.

Clinical implications

Our EHR-derived models will not replace traditional models such as SCORE2, but could be used in a two-step population health approach. First, at any given time point our models can automatically identify patient subgroups at increased risk for first-ever cardiovascular events above the absolute ten-year risk cut-off as specified by the ESC prevention guideline. Second, these patients subgroups could be invited to the primary care practice center for further cardiovascular risk assessment including measurement of systolic blood pressure and total- and HDL-cholesterol, after which traditional models such as SCORE2 could be used to estimate individualised risk. A previous modelling study found that such stepped strategy may result in more cost-effective cardiovascular risk management than the current opportunistic screening.²⁷ The ESC guideline states 2.5% ten-year risk of cardiovascular events as the threshold between moderate and high risk for women and men under 50 years, high risk being an indication for preventive pharmacotherapeutics. Although for patients under 50 years in our cohort absolute

ten-year risks are generally low, our data-driven models can be used to automatically identify patients whose absolute risk reaches the 2.5% risk cut-off. In women, we found that the Cox PH model with 50 most important predictors resulted in a net correct reclassification of events (3.7%) around this risk cut-off compared with the reference model. Although this percentage is low, application on a large scale could lead to sufficient clinical impact to justify the use of a relatively more complex model. After stratification based on the 30–39 and 40–49 year age groups, we found that men and women between the age of 30–39 years at baseline had substantially lower absolute risks of cardiovascular events compared with those aged between 40–49 years. However, since the ESC guideline uses the SCORE2 model which does not include patients under 40 years, the absolute risk threshold of 2.5% likely is too high for individuals between the age of 30–39 years. Therefore, to define meaningful thresholds that can guide preventive therapy, we call for further research into the age group of 30–39 years. The focus may in this context not be pharmacotherapeutic, but rather on lifestyle interventions for prevention of cardiovascular disease. In addition, for the 30–39 years age group lifetime risk estimation may further help in risk communication and interpretation. However, we should first invest in the creation of higher quality longitudinal data sources to derive valid lifetime risk prediction models. In addition, data-driven predictor selection has led to the identification of important non-traditional cardiovascular predictors such as socioeconomic status score and NSAID use. After stratifying for age subgroups, we found differences in the ranking of the 20 predictors that were most important in our prediction models. For example, in both women and men aged 30–39 years at baseline, the relative importance of NSAID use further increased compared with the 40–49 years age group.

Conclusion

Sex-specific EHR-derived prediction models for first-ever cardiovascular events in the general population under 50 have moderate discriminatory performance and are well calibrated. Data-driven predictor selection leads to identification of non-traditional cardiovascular predictors, which modestly increase discriminatory performance of models and correct reclassification of events, mostly in women.

References

1. Mendis S. Global status report on noncommunicable diseases 2014: World Health Organization.
2. van der Ende MY, Sijtsma A, Snieder H, van der Harst P. Letter to editor: Reply on question of marques jr et al. Regarding the paper entitled: "The lifelines cohort study: Prevalence and treatment of cardiovascular disease and risk factors". *Int. J. Cardiol.* 2019;294:57

3. Score working group. Score2 risk prediction algorithms: New models to estimate 10-year risk of cardiovascular disease in europe. *Eur. Heart J.* 2021;42:2439-2454
4. Ference BA, Ginsberg HN, Graham I, Ray KK, Packard CJ, Bruckert E, et al. Low-density lipoproteins cause atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. 1. Evidence from genetic, epidemiologic, and clinical studies. A consensus statement from the european atherosclerosis society consensus panel. *Eur. Heart J.* 2017;38:2459-2472
5. Graham IM, Di Angelantonio E, Visseren F, De Bacquer D, Ference BA, Timmis A, et al. Systematic coronary risk evaluation (score): Jacc focus seminar 4/8. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2021;77:3046-3057
6. Appelman Y, van Rijn BB, Ten Haaf ME, Boersma E, Peters SA. Sex differences in cardiovascular risk factors and disease prevention. *Atherosclerosis.* 2015;241:211-218
7. Ohno-Machado L. Sharing data from electronic health records within, across, and beyond healthcare institutions: Current trends and perspectives. *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.* 2018;25:1113
8. Hippisley-Cox J, Coupland C, Brindle P. Development and validation of qrisk3 risk prediction algorithms to estimate future risk of cardiovascular disease: Prospective cohort study. *BMJ.* 2017;357:j2099
9. Steele AJ, Denaxas SC, Shah AD, Hemingway H, Luscombe NM. Machine learning models in electronic health records can outperform conventional survival models for predicting patient mortality in coronary artery disease. *PLoS One.* 2018;13:e0202344
10. Weng SF, Reips J, Kai J, Garibaldi JM, Qureshi N. Can machine-learning improve cardiovascular risk prediction using routine clinical data? *PLoS One.* 2017;12:e0174944
11. Alaa AM vdSM. Autoprognosis: Automated clinical prognostic modeling via bayesian optimization with structured kernel learning. International conference on machine learning. 2018.
12. Kuiper JG, Bakker M, Penning-van Beest FJA, Herings RMC. Existing data sources for clinical epidemiology: The pharma database network. *Clin. Epidemiol.* 2020;12:415-422
13. Lamberts H. WM. Oxford university press; USA: 1987. Iccpc, international classification of primary care.
14. WHO. Collaborating centre for drug statistics methodology. Atc index with ddds. Oslo; norway. 2002
15. Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau, www.scp.nl/Onderzoek/Lopend_onderzoek/A_Z_alle_lopende_onderzoeken/Statusscores, (Updated).

16. Damen JA, Hooft L, Schuit E, Debray TP, Collins GS, Tzoulaki I, et al. Prediction models for cardiovascular disease risk in the general population: Systematic review. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i2416
17. Visseren FLJ, Mach F, Smulders YM, Carballo D, Koskinas KC, Back M, et al. 2021 esc guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice. *Eur. Heart J*. 2021;42:3227-3337
18. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KG. Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (tripod): The tripod statement. *BMJ*. 2015;350:g7594
19. Alaa AM, Bolton T, Di Angelantonio E, Rudd JHF, van der Schaar M. Cardiovascular disease risk prediction using automated machine learning: A prospective study of 423,604 uk biobank participants. *PLoS One*. 2019;14:e0213653
20. Ishwaran H KU, Blackstone EH, Lauer MS. Random survival forests, the annals of applied statistics, 2008, vol. 2 (pg. 841-860).
21. James G, Witten, D., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. An introduction to statistical learning (1st ed.) [pdf]. Springer. 2013
22. Spasoff RA. Epidemiologic Methods for Health Policy. New York: Oxford University Press I.
23. de Lusignan S, Valentin T, Chan T, Hague N, Wood O, van Vlymen J, et al. Problems with primary care data quality: Osteoporosis as an exemplar. *Inform. Prim. Care*. 2004;12:147-156
24. Pajouheshnia R, van Smeden M, Peelen LM, Groenwold RHH. How variation in predictor measurement affects the discriminative ability and transportability of a prediction model. *J. Clin. Epidemiol*. 2019;105:136-141
25. van Dis I, Geleijnse JM, Boer JM, Kromhout D, Boshuizen H, Grobbee DE, et al. Effect of including nonfatal events in cardiovascular risk estimation, illustrated with data from the netherlands. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2014;21:377-383
26. Pijnstiling op recept. 2008;Pharmaceutisch Weekblad, Jaargang 143 Nr 39
27. Crossan C, Lord J, Ryan R, Nherera L, Marshall T. Cost effectiveness of case-finding strategies for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: A modelling study. *Br. J. Gen. Pract*. 2017;67:e67-e77

