Effect of Metabolic Syndrome on Risk Stratification for Left Atrial or Left Atrial Appendage Thrombus Formation in Patients with Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation

Yu-Yang Chen¹, Qi Liu², Li Liu³, Xiao-Rong Shu¹, Zi-Zhuo Su¹, Hai-Feng Zhang¹, Ru-Qiong Nie¹, Jing-Feng Wang¹, Shuang-Lun Xie¹

¹Department of Cardiology, Sun Yat-Sen Memorial Hospital of Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510120, China ²Department of Emergency, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong 518000, China ³Department of Internal Medicine, Liurong Road Community Health Service Center, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510180, China

Abstract

Background: Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a risk factor for stroke and thromboembolism event. Left atrial or LA appendage (LA/LAA) thrombus is a surrogate of potential stroke. The relationship between MS and atrial thrombus remains unclear. In this study, we sought to investigate the effect of MS on risk stratification of LA/LAA thrombus formation in patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation (NVAF). **Methods:** This cross-sectional study enrolled 294 consecutive NVAF patients without prior anticoagulant and lipid-lowering therapies. LA/LAA thrombus was determined by transesophageal echocardiography. Risk assessment of LA/LAA thrombus was performed using the CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores. Logistic regression analyses were performed to determine which factors were significantly related to LA/LAA thrombus. Odds ratio (*OR*) including 95% confidence interval was also calculated. The predictive powers of different scores for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus were represented by C-statistics and compared by receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis.

Results: LA/LAA thrombi were identified in 56 patients (19.0%). Logistic analysis showed that MS was the strongest risk factor for LA/LAA thrombus in NVAF patients (OR = 14.698, P < 0.001). ROC curve analyses revealed that the C-statistics of CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS was significantly higher than those of CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores (CHADS₂-MS vs. CHADS₂, 0.807 vs. 0.726, P = 0.0019). Furthermore, MS was helpful for identifying individuals with a high risk of LA/LAA thrombus in the population with a low risk of stroke (CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score = 0).

Conclusions: MS is associated with LA/LAA thrombus risk in patients with NVAF. In addition to the CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, the CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores provide additional information on stroke risk assessment.

Key words: Left Atrial Appendage Thrombus; Left Atrial Thrombus; Metabolic Syndrome; Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation; Risk Stratification; Transesophageal Echocardiography

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of atrial fibrillation (AF) will increase rapidly in the next few decades due to population aging and longer survival. AF confers a 5-fold increase in stroke risk and 2-fold increase in cardiac mortality.^[1,2] Moreover, the risk of stroke is high in any type of AF.^[3] To identify the risk for stroke in patients with nonvalvular AF (NVAF), the CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores are commonly used in clinical practice.^[4,5] However, their predictive powers remain limited in patients with low CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score.^[6]

Access this article online			
Quick Response Code:	Website: www.cmj.org		
	DOI: 10.4103/0366-6999.191744		

Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a cluster of common clinical disorders, including obesity, insulin resistance, glucose intolerance, hypertension, and dyslipidemia, which is a risk factor of cardiovascular disease. MS can lead to

> Address for correspondence: Dr. Shuang-Lun Xie, Department of Cardiology, Sun Yat-Sen Memorial Hospital of Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510120, China E-Mail: xieshuanglun@sina.com

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: reprints@medknow.com

© 2016 Chinese Medical Journal | Produced by Wolters Kluwer - Medknow

Received: 30-05-2016 **Edited by:** Li-Min Chen **How to cite this article:** Chen YY, Liu Q, Liu L, Shu XR, Su ZZ, Zhang HF, Nie RQ, Wang JF, Xie SL. Effect of Metabolic Syndrome on Risk Stratification for Left Atrial or Left Atrial Appendage Thrombus Formation in Patients with Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation. Chin Med J 2016;129:2395-402. vascular endothelial dysfunction, activation of coagulatory and inflammatory reactions, and subclinical damage in various organs, which are more severe than the harm caused by conventional risk factors.^[7] Recently, a study indicated that MS was associated with thromboembolic risk of AF, and CHADS₂-MS score was superior to CHADS₂ score in predicting the risk of AF-related stroke.^[8] Hence, MS may be a supplement of CHADS₂ score for predicting AF-related stroke.

Clinically, left atrial or LA appendage (LA/LAA) thrombus provides objective evidence of AF-related stroke in several studies,^[9,10] and it is used as a surrogate marker of potential stroke for the NVAF patients.^[6] However, it is uncertain whether MS is also linked to LA/LAA thrombus in patients with low CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. In this study, we sought to investigate the effect of MS on risk stratification of LA/LAA thrombus formation in NVAF patients.

METHODS

Study population

This study included 400 consecutive patients with symptomatic NVAF in the Sun Yat-Sen Memorial Hospital of the Sun Yat-Sen University from 2007 to 2014, and finally, 294 patients were enrolled according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. AF was diagnosed by 12-lead electrocardiogram or 24-h dynamic electrocardiogram. All the patients underwent transesophageal echocardiography (TEE) examination to detect LA/LAA thrombi. Exclusion criteria included acute myocardial infarction within previous 6 months, rheumatic heart disease or valvular heart disease, a history of cardiac surgery (e.g., coronary artery bypass graft and heart valve replacement), hyperthyroidism, cancer, end-stage renal disease, and gastroesophageal diseases, which are contraindications to TEE examination. As medicine may affect the thrombus formation and the diagnosis of MS, anyone who had received antiplatelet or anticoagulation agents (e.g., aspirin, clopidogrel, warfarin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, and apixaban) and lipid-lowering drugs (e.g., statins, fibrates, nicotinic acid, bile acid sequestrants) were also excluded from the study. The study was approved by the hospital's Ethics Committee, and informed consent was obtained from all patients.

Metabolic syndrome definition

MS was defined according to the 2009 MS harmonizing definition and the guidelines issued by the Chinese Diabetes Society of the Chinese Medical Association as having three or more of the following: (1) body mass index (BMI) \geq 28 kg/m², (2) fasting triglyceride (TG) \geq 150 mg/d1, (3) fasting high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) <40 mg/dl, (4) systolic blood pressure \geq 130 mmHg/diastolic blood pressure \geq 85 mmHg and/or a history of hypertension treatment, and (5) fasting glucose \geq 100 mg/dl or a history of diabetes (or on diabetes medication).^[11,12]

Transthoracic echocardiography and transesophageal echocardiography examination

All patients underwent transthoracic echocardiography with a GE VIVID 7 ultrasonograph and a 2.5-MHz transducer in a left lateral decubitus position before TEE examination. The LA diameter (LAD) and left ventricular end-diastolic diameter were obtained from M-mode tracing, and the left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) was calculated. TEE was performed with a 5-MHz multiplane probe, and live images were analyzed by an experienced physician who was blind to lipid levels. Continuous images of the LA and LAA were assessed to determine the presence or absence of thrombus. LA/LAA thrombus was defined as a well-circumscribed echogenic mass with a unique echotexture contrasting with the adjacent myocardium.

CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores, and clinical evaluation

In this study, both CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores were used as the same in the 2010 ESC guideline.^[6] Patients with CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score of 0, 1, and ≥ 2 were divided into low-, moderate-, and high-risk stroke groups, respectively. In addition, the MS score was calculated as the number of abnormal items in the MS criteria, and the total score ranged from 0 to 5. CHADS₂ score and MS score overlapped in high blood pressure (HBP) and diabetes mellitus (DM); therefore, CHADS₂-MS score was the combination of CHADS₂ score and additional MS score which removed HBP and DM components. Similarly, CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS was composed of CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and additional MS score which removed HBP and DM components.

Clinical data consisted of clinical status (e.g., age, gender, BMI, type of AF, HBP, DM, previous stroke/transient ischemic attack [TIA], vascular disease, and MS), medication history, electrocardiograms, echocardiograms, TEE, and blood sample results. Hypertension was defined as systolic blood pressure >140 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure >90 mmHg. DM was defined as the use of diabetic medications or fasting blood glucose >126 mg/dl. Chronic heart failure was defined as systolic heart failure or LVEF <40%. Previous and current stroke was confirmed by brain computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging. Vascular disease was defined as atherosclerotic disease (diagnosed by vascular angiogram or ultrasonography).

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are presented as mean \pm standard deviation or median (Q₁, Q₃), and categorical variables are presented as numbers and proportions. The differences between two groups were compared using independent samples *t*-test for normal distributed data and Mann–Whitney *U*-tests for non-normal distributed data. Discrete variables between two groups were compared using Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Logistic regression analyses were performed to determine which variables were significantly related to LA/LAA thrombus. Results of

the logistic regression were reported as odds ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. All the variables which were statistically significant at the 0.05 level in univariate analyses were entered into a multivariate logistic regression model with forward step-wise selection. At each step, the variable was entered at the 0.05 level and removed at the 0.10 level. For all scores, the relationships between risk scores or categories and the prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus were examined using Chi-square test. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were constructed, and C-statistics was measured for each score to compare the predictive powers for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus formation. Youden index (J) was calculated using the following formula: J = sensitivity + specificity - 1, and the maximum values of Youden index for each score system were calculated to determine the corresponding optimal cutoff points. PASW Statistics version 18.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, USA) was used in data analysis. All probability values were two-sided, and P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics of patients with and without left atrial/left atrial appendage thrombi

For all the 294 patients enrolled in this study, the median of CHADS₂ score and CHA₂DS₂-VASc score was 1.2 and 2.3, respectively. Fifty-six patients had LAA thrombi and 64 patients were diagnosed with MS. In 56 patients with LAA thrombus, there were 9, 19, and 28 patients with CHADS, score of 0, 1, and ≥ 2 , and 3, 11, and 42 patients with CHA₂DS₂-VASc score of 0, 1, and ≥ 2 , respectively. The baseline characteristics of the patients were listed in Table 1. Compared with patients without thrombi, patients with LA/LAA thrombi were elder (63.8 years vs. 60.6 years, P = 0.042), and had higher proportions of congestive heart failure (CHF) (10.7% vs. 1.7%, P = 0.004), HBP (75.0%) vs. 42.4%, *P* < 0.001), DM (35.7% vs. 12.2%, *P* < 0.001), previous stroke/TIA (35.7% vs. 10.5%, P < 0.001), vascular disease (46.4% vs. 28.6%, P = 0.011), and MS (57.1% vs. 13.4%, P < 0.001). In addition, higher BMI, larger LAD, higher serum levels of lipids (TG, total cholesterol [TC], and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol [LDL-C]), lower HDL-C, and estimated glomerular filtration rate were found in patients with LA/LAA thrombi. Furthermore, individuals with thrombi tended to have higher risk scores of CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, and CHA_2DS_2 -VASc-MS (P < 0.001 for all).

Risk factors of the left atrial/left atrial appendage thrombus formation

The results of univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were shown in Table 2. Age \geq 75 years (*OR* = 3.882, *P* = 0.002), BMI \geq 28 kg/m² (*OR* = 3.576, *P* < 0.001), CHF (*OR* = 7.020, *P* = 0.003), HBP (*OR* = 4.069, *P* < 0.001), DM (*OR* = 4.004, *P* < 0.001), previous stroke/TIA (*OR* = 2.176, *P* < 0.001), LA>35 mm (*OR* = 4.335, *P* < 0.001), TG \geq 150 mg/dl (*OR* = 2.778, *P* = 0.001),

HDL-C <40 mg/dl (OR = 2.815, P = 0.001), CHADS₂ score ≥ 2 (OR = 8.628, P < 0.001), CHA₂DS₂-VASc score $\geq 2(OR=4.472, P=0.016)$, and MS score $\geq 3(OR=23.000, P<0.001)$ were associated with LA/LAA thrombus formation.

Multivariate logistic regression model included age, gender, BMI, CHF, HBP, DM, previous stroke/TIA, vascular diseases, TG \geq 150 mg/dl, TC \geq 200 mg/dl, HDL-C \leq 40 mg/dl, LDL-C \geq 130 mg/dl, MS, and CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc categories. The results showed that previous stroke/TIA (*OR* = 1.991, *P* = 0.001), LA >35 mm (*OR* = 2.823, *P* = 0.008), and MS score \geq 3 (*OR* = 14.698, *P* < 0.001) were independent risk factors for LA/LAA thrombus formation. Interestingly, traditional high-risk categories of stroke classified by CHADS₂ score \geq 2 or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score \geq 2 were not associated with LA/LAA thrombus formation.

Relationship between the left atrial/left atrial appendage thrombus and risk scores

For the stroke risk stratification of CHADS,, CHA, DS, -VASc, and MS scores, the prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus increased with elevated risk scores [Figure 1a, 1c, and 1e], and statistically significant trends were found (all P < 0.001). Similar to CHADS, and CHA2DS2-VASc scores, the prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus also increased in line with elevated CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores (both P < 0.001). For CHADS₂-MS score, the minimum rate of thrombus was 2.9% when CHADS₂-MS score = 0 and the maximum was 100% when CHADS₂-MS score ranged from 7 to 8 [Figure 1f]. Similarly, the minimum rate of thrombus was 0 when CHA_2DS_2 -VASc-MS score = 0 and the maximum was 100% when CHA2DS2-VASc-MS score ranged from 9 to 10 [Figure 1g]. The prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus also increased significantly with ascending CHADS, or CHA, DS, -VASc risk categories (both $P \leq 0.001$) [Figure 1b and 1d].

Comparisons of the predictive powers for the risk of the left atrial/left atrial appendage thrombus formation among CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores

The C-statistics of CHADS, CHA, DS, -VASc, MS, CHADS,-MS, and CHA, DS,-VASc-MS was 0.726, 0.710, 0.776, 0.807, and 0.792, respectively [Table 3 and Figure 2]. All the risk scores had moderate predictive powers for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus. There were no significant differences among the C-statistics of CHADS, CHA, DS,-VASc, and MS scores in predicting LA/LAA thrombus. However, the C-statistics of CHADS,-MS score was significantly higher than those of CHADS, score (0.807 vs. 0.726, $P_{\text{CM-C}} = 0.0019$), and the C-statistics of CHA, DS, -VASc-MS score was also significantly higher than those of CHA2DS2-VASc score (0.792 vs. 0.710, $P_{\rm CM-C} = 0.0007$). These results suggested that the predictive power of CHADS, score for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus was improved after mixing the MS score, and so was the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Table 1: Baseline characteristics of patients with and without LA/LAA thrombus						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Variables	Thrombi $(+)$ $(n = 56)$	Thrombi $(-)$ $(n = 238)$	Statistics	Р		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Demographic data						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Age, years	63.8 ± 10.4	60.6 ± 10.5	2.041*	0.042		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Male, <i>n</i> (%)	36 (64.3)	146 (61.3)	0.166 [†]	0.761		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	BMI, kg/m ²	26.3 ± 3.9	24.3 ± 3.4	3.375*	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Paroxysmal AF, n (%)	44 (78.6)	189 (79.3)	0.019^{+}	1.000		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Chronic heart failure, n (%)	6 (10.7)	4 (1.7)	8.678‡	0.004		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Hypertension, <i>n</i> (%)	42 (75.0)	101(42.4)	19.242†	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	20 (35.7)	29 (12.2)	18.071^{+}	< 0.001		
Vascular diseases, $n (%)$ 26 (46.4)68 (28.6)6.646*0.011Metabolic syndrome, $n (\%)$ 32 (57.1)32 (13.4)50.830*<0.001	Previous stroke/TIA, n (%)	20 (35.7)	25 (10.5)	22.225†	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Vascular diseases, n (%)	26 (46.4)	68 (28.6)	6.646 [†]	0.011		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Metabolic syndrome, n (%)	32 (57.1)	32 (13.4)	50.830 [†]	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	CHADS ₂ score	1.5 (1.0,4.0)	1.0 (0,1.0)	5.572§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	CHA,DS,-VASc score	3.0 (1.5,5.0)	2.0 (1.0,3.0)	4.981§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	MS score	3.0 (1.5,4.0)	1.0 (0,2.0)	6.627§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	CHA, DS, -MS score	3.5 (2.0,4.0)	1.0 (0,2.0)	7.307§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Clinical data} \\ \mbox{LVEF}, \% & 67.5 (61.0, 71.0) & 67.0 (64.0, 71.0) & 0.498^{\frac{1}{3}} & 0.620 \\ \mbox{LA diameter, mm} & 39.0 (36.0, 42.0) & 35.0 (32.0, 39.0) & 5.191^{\frac{1}{3}} & <0.001 \\ \mbox{LVEDD, mm} & 48.5 (45.5, 52.0) & 48.0 (45.0, 50.0) & 1.424^{\frac{1}{3}} & 0.155 \\ \mbox{TG, mg/dl} & 150.5 (118.7, 221.4) & 114.7 (87.7, 154.1) & 4.376^{\frac{1}{3}} & <0.001 \\ \mbox{TC, mg/dl} & 193.9 (167.8, 219.7) & 176.9 (157.8, 202.2) & 2.636^{\frac{1}{3}} & 0.008 \\ \mbox{HDL-C, mg/dl} & 42.0 (35.0, 50.3) & 46.8 (41.0, 52.6) & 2.814^{\frac{1}{3}} & 0.005 \\ \mbox{LDL-C, mg/dl} & 127.2 (110.8, 144.1) & 111.0 (94.4, 128.4) & 3.664^{\frac{1}{3}} & <0.001 \\ \mbox{eGFR, ml/min} & 62.9 (53.4, 70.0) & 73.0 (62.2, 84.6) & 4.625^{\frac{1}{3}} & <0.001 \\ \mbox{Medication before TEE, n} \\ \mbox{(\%)} \\ \mbox{ACEIs/ARBs} & 29 (51.8) & 60 (25.2) & 15.168^{\frac{1}{7}} & <0.001 \\ \mbox{CCBs} & 14 (25.0) & 36 (15.1) & 3.131^{\frac{1}{7}} & 0.112 \\ \end{array}$	CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc-MS score	5.0 (3.0,6.0)	2.0 (1.0,3.0)	6.892§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Clinical data						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	LVEF, %	67.5 (61.0,71.0)	67.0 (64.0,71.0)	0.498§	0.620		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LA diameter, mm	39.0 (36.0,42.0)	35.0 (32.0,39.0)	5.191§	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LVEDD, mm	48.5 (45.5,52.0)	48.0 (45.0,50.0)	1.424§	0.155		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	TG, mg/dl	150.5 (118.7,221.4)	114.7 (87.7,154.1)	4.376 [§]	< 0.001		
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} \text{HDL-C, mg/dl} & 42.0 (35.0, 50.3) & 46.8 (41.0, 52.6) & 2.814^{\$} & 0.005 \\ \text{LDL-C, mg/dl} & 127.2 (110.8, 144.1) & 111.0 (94.4, 128.4) & 3.664^{\$} & <0.001 \\ \text{eGFR, ml/min} & 62.9 (53.4, 70.0) & 73.0 (62.2, 84.6) & 4.625^{\$} & <0.001 \\ \hline \text{Medication before TEE, n} & & & & & & \\ (\%) & & & & & & & \\ \beta\text{-blockers} & 16 (32.7) & 69 (28.2) & 0.004^{\dagger} & 0.950 \\ \hline \text{ACEIs/ARBs} & 29 (51.8) & 60 (25.2) & 15.168^{\dagger} & <0.001 \\ \hline \text{CCBs} & 14 (25.0) & 36 (15.1) & 3.131^{\dagger} & 0.112 \\ \hline \end{array}$	TC, mg/dl	193.9 (167.8,219.7)	176.9 (157.8,202.2)	2.636§	0.008		
$\begin{array}{c cccc} LDL-C, mg/dl & 127.2 (110.8, 144.1) & 111.0 (94.4, 128.4) & 3.664^{\$} & <0.001 \\ eGFR, ml/min & 62.9 (53.4, 70.0) & 73.0 (62.2, 84.6) & 4.625^{\$} & <0.001 \\ \hline Medication before TEE, n \\ (\%) & & & & & \\ \beta\mbox{-blockers} & 16 (32.7) & 69 (28.2) & 0.004^{\dagger} & 0.950 \\ \hline ACEIs/ARBs & 29 (51.8) & 60 (25.2) & 15.168^{\dagger} & <0.001 \\ \hline CCBs & 14 (25.0) & 36 (15.1) & 3.131^{\dagger} & 0.112 \\ \hline \end{array}$	HDL-C, mg/dl	42.0 (35.0,50.3)	46.8 (41.0,52.6)	2.814§	0.005		
eGFR, ml/min 62.9 (53.4,70.0) 73.0 (62.2,84.6) 4.625 [§] <0.001 Medication before TEE, n (%)	LDL-C, mg/dl	127.2 (110.8,144.1)	111.0 (94.4,128.4)	3.664§	< 0.001		
Medication before TEE, n (%) β-blockers 16 (32.7) 69 (28.2) 0.004 [†] 0.950 ACEIs/ARBs 29 (51.8) 60 (25.2) 15.168 [†] <0.001	eGFR, ml/min	62.9 (53.4,70.0)	73.0 (62.2,84.6)	4.625§	< 0.001		
β-blockers16 (32.7)69 (28.2) 0.004^{\dagger} 0.950ACEIs/ARBs29 (51.8)60 (25.2)15.168^{\dagger}<0.001	Medication before TEE, <i>n</i> (%)						
ACEIs/ARBs29 (51.8) $60 (25.2)$ 15.168^{\dagger} <0.001CCBs14 (25.0) $36 (15.1)$ 3.131^{\dagger} 0.112	β-blockers	16 (32.7)	69 (28.2)	0.004^{\dagger}	0.950		
CCBs 14 (25.0) 36 (15.1) 3.131 ⁺ 0.112	ACEIs/ARBs	29 (51.8)	60 (25.2)	15.168 [†]	< 0.001		
	CCBs	14 (25.0)	36 (15.1)	3.131 [†]	0.112		

Values are present by mean \pm standard deviation or median (Q₁, Q₃), or number (percentages). *: Independent samples *t*-test; †: Chi square test; ‡: Fisher's test, §: Nonparametric test. LA: Left atrial; LAA: Left atrial appendage; BMI: Body mass index; AF: Atrial fibrillation; TIA: Transient ischemic attack; MS: Metabolic syndrome; LVEF: Left ventricular ejection fraction; LVEDD: Left ventricular end-diastolic diameter; TG: Triglyceride; TC: Total cholesterol; HDL-C: High density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: Low density lipoprotein cholesterol; ACEIs: Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs: Angiotensin receptor blockers. CCBs: Calcium channel blockers.

ROC curve analyses indicated that the optimal cutoff points of CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores in predicting thrombus were both \geq 3 [Table 4]. Compared with CHADS₂-MS score, CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS score \geq 3 was more sensitive in predicting LA/LAA thrombus formation (0.877 vs. 0.714) and had a lower negative predictive value (0.23 vs. 0.36). However, it was less specific than CHADS₂-MS score (0.555 vs. 0.786) in predicting LA/LAA thrombus. The positive predictive value of CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS score was also lower (1.96 vs. 3.33).

Additive effect of the metabolic syndrome score on the CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc risk categories in predicting the left atrial or left atrial appendage thrombus formation Since the CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores were superior in predicting LA/LAA thrombus formation, we attempted to investigate whether the thrombotic risk was increased when additional MS components (high BMI, high level of TG, and low level of HDL-C) were added to the CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. The prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus for patients with 0–3 additional MS

scores in conventional low-stroke risk group (CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores = 0), moderate-risk group (CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores = 1), and high-risk group (CHADS₂ or CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores \geq 2) is shown in Figure 3. In the low-risk group, the thrombotic prevalence of patients who had three additional MS scores was 50.0% for CHADS₂ category and 33.3% for CHA₂DS₂-VASc category, which were both higher than the high-risk group without any additional MS score (30.0% for CHADS₂ category and 16.5% for CHA₂DS₂-VASc category). In additional MS scores increased the prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus in each conventional risk category. All the patients in the high-stroke risk group with three additional MS scores suffered from LA/LAA thrombi.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we evaluated the additive effect of MS on risk stratification for LA/LAA thrombus formation in patients with NVAF and low CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. We found that MS was an independent risk factor for LA/LAA

Variables	Univariate		Multivariate		
	OR (95% CI)	Р	OR (95% CI)	Р	
Age, years					
65-74	1.269 (0.655–2.459)	0.480	_	_	
≥75	3.882 (1.661-9.074)	0.002	_	_	
Male	1.134 (0.619–2.079)	0.684	_	_	
BMI ≥ 28 (kg/m ²)	3.576 (1.846-6.929)	< 0.001	_	_	
Chronic heart failure	7.020 (1.910–25.797)	0.003	_	_	
Hypertension	4.069 (2.109-7.851)	< 0.001	_	-	
DM	4.004 (2.048-7.829)	< 0.001	_	_	
Previous stroke/TIA	2.176 (1.544-3.066)	< 0.001	1.991 (1.332–2.977)	0.001	
LA>35 (mm)	4.335 (2.216-8.483)	< 0.001	2.823 (1.317-6.051)	0.008	
$TG \ge 150 \text{ (mg/dl)}$	2.778 (1.528-5.050)	0.001	_	_	
HDL-C <40 (mg/dl)	2.815 (1.531-5.175)	0.001	_	-	
CHADS, score					
1	1.794 (0.713-4.516)	0.214	_	_	
≥ 2	8.628 (3.644-20.429)	< 0.001	_	-	
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score					
1	1.303 (0.320-5.300)	0.712	_	-	
≥ 2	4.472 (1.315-15.214)	0.016	_	_	
MS score					
1-2	3.526 (1.016-12.230)	0.047	2.502 (0.681-9.188)	0.167	
≥3	23.000 (6.554-80.720)	< 0.001	14.698 (3.907–55.290)	< 0.001	

Table 2: Univariate and multivariate logistic regression model of LA/LAA thrombus with AF

OR: Odds ratio; *CI*: Confidence interval; LA: Left atrial; LAA: Left atrial appendage; AF: Atrial fibrillation; TIA: Transient ischemic attack; TG: Triglyceride; TC: Total cholesterol; HDL-C: High-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C: Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; MS: Metabolic syndrome; DM: Diabetes mellitus; –: Not available.

Table 3: Comparisons	of C-statistics and	d 95% <i>CI</i> s for th	ne risk of LA/LAA	thrombus among	I CHADS,, CHA,DS,	-VASc,
MS, CHADS,-MS, and	CHA, DS, -VASc-M	S scores				

-					
Variables	C -statistics	95% CI	P for C-statistics	Р _{см-с}	Р _{см-м}
CHADS ₂	0.726	0.671-0.776	< 0.001	-	-
CHA2DS2-VASc	0.710	0.654-0.761	< 0.001	-	_
MS	0.776	0.724-0.822	< 0.001	_	_
CHADS ₂ -MS	0.807	0.757-0.851	< 0.001	0.0019	0.2827
CHA2DS2-VASc-MS	0.792	0.741-0.837	< 0.001	0.0007	0.6625

P for C-statistics: *P* value for area under the curve of each score; P_{CM-C} : *P* value for the comparison of C-statistics between the CHADS2-MS score and the CHADS2 score or between the CHADS2-VASc-MS score and the CHADS2-VASc score; P_{CM-M} : *P* value for the comparison of C-statistics between the CHADS2-VASc-MS score and the CHADS2-VASc score; P_{CM-M} : *P* value for the comparison of C-statistics between the CHADS2-VASc-MS score and the CHADS2-VASc score; *CIS*: Confidence intervals; LA: Left atrial; LAA: Left atrial appendage; –: Not available.

Table 4: Sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores \geq 3 for predicting TEE risk factors

Variables	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
CHADS2-MS	0.714	0.786	3.33	0.36
CHA2DS2-VASc-MS	0.877	0.555	1.96	0.23
DDU D 11 1		XX XX	42.00	

PPV: Positive predictive value; NPV: Negative predictive value; TEE: Transesophageal echocardiography.

thrombus. Both $CHADS_2$ -MS and CHA_2DS_2 -VASc-MS scores had better predictive powers for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus than $CHADS_2$ and CHA_2DS_2 -VASc scores, respectively.

LA/LAA thrombus detected by TEE is considered a risk for stroke in NVAF. The patients with LA/LAA thrombi

were associated with 7.8% of the stroke per year and had 2.5-fold increase in thromboembolic events as compared with those without thrombi.^[13,14] In comparison with the other conventional risk factors such as HBP, DM, CHF, and previous stroke, LA/LAA thrombus was a visible marker of AF-related stroke and a direct evidence for anticoagulant therapy. The CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores were recommended for predicting the risk of stroke or thromboembolic events for NVAF patients,^[15,16] and both of them were associated with TEE risk factors for thromboembolism.^[17]

The vast majority of epidemiological and observational studies suggested that individuals with MS had a greater likelihood of AF than their non-MS counterparts.^[18-20] Furthermore, Tsai *et al.*^[8] found that MS was also associated with the increased thromboembolic rate of NVAF patients.



Figure 1: The prevalence (percentage) of the left atrial or left atrial appendage thrombus formation for CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores and their corresponding categories. The prevalence (percentage) of the left atrial or left atrial appendage thrombus formation for CHADS₂ score (a) and CHADS₂ category (b); for CHA₂DS₂-VASc score (c) and CHA₂DS₂-VASc category (d); for MS score (e); for CHADS₂-MS score (f); and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS score (g).



Figure 2: Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of predictive abilities of the risk of the left atrial or left atrial appendage thrombus formation by the CHADS₂, CHA₂DS₂-VASc, MS, CHADS₂-MS, and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores.

Our results showed that a graded positive association between the increasing number of MS components and the elevated rate of LA/LAA thrombus was identified, which was similar to the previous outcomes stated above. Previous pathophysiologic findings detected a possible link between MS and thromboembolism due to abnormal fibrinolysis, inflammation, and endothelial dysfunction. In patients with MS, the plasma level of fibrinogen, Factor VII, and Factor VIII was increased and the level of plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 was decreased, which resulted in a prothrombotic or hypercoagulable state.^[21]Another possible mechanism was that MS was a state of chronic inflammation with increased inflammatory factors, which induced atrial structural and electrical remodeling.^[22] Finally, all the components of MS contributed to the impairment of endothelial function, and AF led to a decreased antithrombotic ability in the damaged atrial endocardium and thus promoting thrombogenesis.^[23] In brief, NVAF patients with MS are more prone to developing a prothrombotic state and undergoing thromboembolic events than those without MS. The more components of MS someone has, the higher risk for him/her to have an LA/LAA thrombus.

A new scoring scheme called CHADS₂-MS score which was established by Tsai et al.[8] has a better predictive power for thromboembolism risk compared to CHADS, score. In our study, we evaluated the predictive power of this new scoring system for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus formation. In fact, the CHADS₂-MS score improved the predictive power of CHADS, score for the risk assessment of LA/LAA thrombus, and the situation was the same for the CHA, DS, -VASc-MS score. In addition, our analysis showed that NVAF patients with CHADS, or CHA, DS, -VASc score of 0 or 1 and three additional MS scores had a significantly higher prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus compared with those who had the same CHADS, or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score but without MS. All the above-mentioned findings suggested that the additional MS score was complimentary to the CHADS, or CHA, DS, -VASc score. High additional MS score could help identify patients at a high risk of developing stroke in the low-risk group stratified by the CHADS, or CHA₂DS₂-VASc score.



Figure 3: The prevalence (percentage) of the left atrial or left atrial appendage thrombus formation classified by additional MS score in low-, moderate-, and high-risk categories of CHADS, (a) and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores (b).

As we know, the key pathogenesis of MS is insulin resistance. All the components of MS are related to each other by insulin resistance. Besides, chronic inflammatory reaction, impairment of endothelial function, and hypercoagulable state related to LA/LAA thrombus are associated with insulin resistance. The more severe the degree of insulin resistance is, the more components of MS the patients will develop. Several studies proved that higher mortality of cerebro-cardiovascular disease was in line with the increasing components of MS,^[24,25] and MS was associated with an increased prevalence of AF.^[20] Although there was no previous report on the relationship between the number of MS components and LA/LAA thrombus formation, our observation provided novel evidence that there was a positive correlation between MS score and the prevalence of LA/LAA thrombus, and it might be a reasonable explanation for the improvement of predictive power for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus by adding MS scores.

In general, MS not only increases the predictive power of $CHADS_2$ and CHA_2DS_2 -VASc scores for the risk of LA/LAA thrombus, but also identifies individuals at a high risk of LA/LAA thrombus in low-stroke risk group classified by $CHADS_2$ or CHA_2DS_2 -VASc score. Anticoagulant therapy should be strengthened for the NVAF patients with higher additional MS score.

Our study also had several limitations. First, the sample size of this study was relatively small. In addition, most studies have chosen stroke or thromboembolic event as a major end point. LA/LAA thrombus might be a surrogate marker of stroke or thromboembolic events; however, it could not represent the prevalence of stroke or thromboembolic events completely. Finally, the CHADS₂-MS or CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scoring system should also be evaluated in Caucasian and other Asian populations. A further follow-up would be needed to assess their actual predictive powers on stroke and thromboembolic events.

MS is an independent risk factor for LA/LAA thrombus formation in NVAF patients. Because the CHADS₂-MS and CHA₂DS₂-VASc-MS scores can both identify individuals at a

high risk of LA/LAA thrombus in low-stroke risk population classified by CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, they are superior to the CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores in the risk stratification for LA/LAA thrombus formation. The present findings may help identify and control the risk factors for LA/LAA thrombus, thus preventing the occurrence of stroke and thromboembolism events.

Financial support and sponsorship

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation project (No.81670364) and Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province (No. 2016A030313356).

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Wolf PA, Abbott RD, Kannel WB. Atrial fibrillation as an independent risk factor for stroke: The Framingham study. Stroke 1991;22:983-8. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.22.8.983.
- Benjamin EJ, Wolf PA, D'Agostino RB, Silbershatz H, Kannel WB, Levy D. Impact of atrial fibrillation on the risk of death: The Framingham heart study. Circulation 1998;98:946-52. doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.98.10.946.
- Writing Group Members, Lloyd-Jones D, Adams RJ, Brown TM, Carnethon M, Dai S, *et al.* Heart disease and stroke statistics – 2010 update: A report from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2010;121:e46-215. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.109.192667.
- Van Staa TP, Setakis E, Di Tanna GL, Lane DA, Lip GY. A comparison of risk stratification schemes for stroke in 79,884 atrial fibrillation patients in general practice. J Thromb Haemost 2011;9:39-48. doi: 10.1111/j.1538-7836.2010.04085.x.
- Olesen JB, Lip GY, Hansen ML, Hansen PR, Tolstrup JS, Lindhardsen J, *et al.* Validation of risk stratification schemes for predicting stroke and thromboembolism in patients with atrial fibrillation: Nationwide cohort study. BMJ 2011;342:d124. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d124.
- European Heart Rhythm Association; European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery, Camm AJ, Kirchhof P, Lip GY, Schotten U, Savelieva I, *et al.* Guidelines for the management of atrial fibrillation: The task force for the management of atrial fibrillation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Eur Heart J 2010;31:2369-429. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehq278.
- Hajhosseiny R, Matthews GK, Lip GY. Metabolic syndrome, atrial fibrillation, and stroke: Tackling an emerging epidemic. Heart Rhythm 2015;12:2332-43. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2015.06.038.
- 8. Tsai CT, Chang SH, Chang SN, Hwang JJ, Wu CK, Wang YC, et al.

Additive effect of the metabolic syndrome score to the conventional CHADS2 score for the thromboembolic risk stratification of patients with atrial fibrillation. Heart Rhythm 2014;11:352-7. doi: 10.1016/j. hrthm.2013.11.014.

- Stöllberger C, Chnupa P, Kronik G, Brainin M, Finsterer J, Schneider B, *et al.* Transesophageal echocardiography to assess embolic risk in patients with atrial fibrillation. ELAT Study Group. Embolism in left atrial thrombi. Ann Intern Med 1998;128:630-8. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-128-8-199804150-00004.
- Thambidorai SK, Murray RD, Parakh K, Shah TK, Black IW, Jasper SE, et al. Utility of transesophageal echocardiography in identification of thrombogenic milieu in patients with atrial fibrillation (an ACUTE ancillary study). Am J Cardiol 2005;96:935-41. doi: 10.1016/j. amjcard.2005.05.051.
- 11. Alberti KG, Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ, Cleeman JI, Donato KA, et al. Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: A joint interim statement of the International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity. Circulation 2009;120:1640-5. doi: 10.1161/ CIRCULATIONAHA.109.192644.
- 12. Lu YH, Lu JM, Wang SY, Li CL, Liu LS, Zheng RP, et al. Comparison of the diagnostic criteria of metabolic syndrome by International Diabetes Federation and that by Chinese Medical Association Diabetes Branch (in Chinese). Natl Med J China 2006;86:386-9.
- Zabalgoitia M, Halperin JL, Pearce LA, Blackshear JL, Asinger RW, Hart RG. Transesophageal echocardiographic correlates of clinical risk of thromboembolism in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation III Investigators. J Am Coll Cardiol 1998;31:1622-6. doi: 10.1016/ S0735-1097(98) 00146-6.
- 14. Transesophageal echocardiographic correlates of thromboembolism in high-risk patients with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. The Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Investigators Committee on Echocardiography. Ann Intern Med 1998;128:639-47. doi: 10.7326/0 003-4819-128-8-199804150-00005.
- Lip GY, Nieuwlaat R, Pisters R, Lane DA, Crijns HJ. Refining clinical risk stratification for predicting stroke and thromboembolism in atrial fibrillation using a novel risk factor-based approach: The Euro heart survey on atrial fibrillation. Chest 2010;137:263-72. doi: 10.1378/ chest.09-1584.

- Poli D, Lip GY, Antonucci E, Grifoni E, Lane D. Stroke risk stratification in a "real-world" elderly anticoagulated atrial fibrillation population. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol 2011;22:25-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-8167.2010.01858.x.
- Willens HJ, Gómez-Marín O, Nelson K, DeNicco A, Moscucci M. Correlation of CHADS2 and CHA2DS2-VASc scores with transesophageal echocardiography risk factors for thromboembolism in a multiethnic United States population with nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2013;26:175-84. doi: 10.1016/j. echo.2012.11.002.
- Chamberlain AM, Agarwal SK, Ambrose M, Folsom AR, Soliman EZ, Alonso A. Metabolic syndrome and incidence of atrial fibrillation among blacks and whites in the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. Am Heart J 2010;159:850-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2010.02.005.
- Nyström PK, Carlsson AC, Leander K, de Faire U, Hellenius ML, Gigante B. Obesity, metabolic syndrome and risk of atrial fibrillation: A Swedish, prospective cohort study. PLoS One 2015;10:e0127111. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0127111.
- Tanner RM, Baber U, Carson AP, Voeks J, Brown TM, Soliman EZ, et al. Association of the metabolic syndrome with atrial fibrillation among United States adults (from the REasons for Geographic and Racial Differences in Stroke [REGARDS] Study). Am J Cardiol 2011;108:227-32. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2011.03.026.
- 21. Kaur J. A comprehensive review on metabolic syndrome. Cardiol Res Pract 2014;2014:943162. doi: 10.1155/2014/943162.
- Guo Y, Lip GY, Apostolakis S. Inflammation in atrial fibrillation. JAm Coll Cardiol 2012;60:2263-70. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012.04.063.
- Czernichow S, Greenfield JR, Galan P, Jellouli F, Safar ME, Blacher J, *et al.* Macrovascular and microvascular dysfunction in the metabolic syndrome. Hypertens Res 2010;33:293-7. doi: 10.1038/ hr.2009.228.
- Pedroza-Tobias A, Trejo-Valdivia B, Sanchez-Romero LM, Barquera S. Classification of metabolic syndrome according to lipid alterations: Analysis from the Mexican National Health and Nutrition Survey 2006. BMC Public Health 2014;14:1056. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-1056.
- Moebus S, Balijepalli C, Lösch C, Göres L, von Stritzky B, Bramlage P, *et al.* Age- and sex-specific prevalence and ten-year risk for cardiovascular disease of all 16 risk factor combinations of the metabolic syndrome – A cross-sectional study. Cardiovasc Diabetol 2010;9:34. doi: 10.1186/1475-2840-9-34.