

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic shock: a multi-center retrospective study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-081597
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Nov-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Yuxing; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Tao, Yuhang; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Yuan, Ming; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital yu, pengcheng; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhang, Kai; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital jiang, ruhong; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital
Keywords:	Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, CARDIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic shock: a multi-center retrospective study

Yuxing Wang^{1*}, Yuhang Tao^{1*}, Ming Yuan¹, Pengcheng Yu¹, Kai Zhang¹,Hangying Ying^{1†}, Ruhong Jiang^{1†}

Affiliations:

1 Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital, School of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.

* Co-first authors contributed equally

† Co-corresponding authors contributed equally

Address for Corresponding Authors: Hangying Ying, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P.R. China. E-mail: yinghangying@zju.edu.cn

Ruhong Jiang, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P.R. China. E-mail: jrh@zju.edu.cn

Declarations of interest: none

Abstract:

Objectives: We aimed to investigate the association between albumin corrected anion gap (ACAG) and the prognosis of cardiogenic shock (CS).

Design: A multi-center retrospective cohort study.

Setting: Data were collected from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV) and eICU Collaborative Research Database (eICU-CRD) datasets.

Participants: A total of 808 and 700 individuals diagnosed with CS from MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD respectively.

Primary and secondary outcome: The primary endpoint is short-term all-cause mortality including ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day mortality. The secondary endpoints are 28-day free from ICU and length of time intensive care needed.

Results: CS patients were divided into two groups according to the admission ACAG value: normal ACAG group (\leq 20 mmol/L) and high ACAG group (> 20 mmol/L). CS patients with a higher ACAG level exhibited increased short-term all cause mortality rates, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.43, 95%CI=1.05-1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.38, 95%CI=1.02-1.86, p=0.036), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.47, 95%CI=1.12-1.94, p=0.006), and 28-day mortality (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95%CI: 1.11-1.83, p=0.007). A positive linear correlation was observed between ACAG values and short-term mortality rates by restricted cubic splines. In comparison to AG, ACAG displayed a larger area under the curve for short-term mortality prediction. Besides, the duration of intensive care was longer while 28-day free from ICU was shorter in patients with a higher ACAG level in both cohorts.

Conclusion: ACAG value was independently and strongly associated with the prognosis of CS, which was superior than the conventional AG.

Strengths and limitations of this study:

1. This is the first study to explore the association between ACAG and the prognosis of CS.

2.CS patients are from a diverse and heterogeneous population with mixed etiologies from two distinct high-quality datasets.

3. As a nature of retrospective, the selection bias cannot be avoided and detailed information about cardiac function are not available.

Keywords: Albumin corrected anion gap, anion gap, cardiogenic shock, intensive care unit, acute cardiovascular care

1.Introduction

Cardiogenic shock (CS), a life-threatening clinical condition, is characterized by acute end-organ hypoperfusion resulting from reduced cardiac output [1]. Despite substantial progress achieved in CS management over the past three decades, the mortality rate of CS remains unexpectedly high, making it a formidable challenge within the intensive care unit (ICU)[2]. It is worth noting the one-year mortality rate in CS patients is approximately 50%-60%, with a substantial portion of cases (70% to 80%) occurring within the initial 30 to 60 days[3]. Therefore, early identification of CS patients with a poor prognosis holds paramount clinical importance for tailoring effective risk reduction strategies.

Anion gap (AG), a biomarker reflecting unmeasured anions, is calculated using the following formula: AG (mmol/l) = (sodium + potassium) - (chloride + bicarbonate)[4]. It is extensively utilized to assess the acid-base disorders and to evaluate the prognosis of various diseases in clinical practice[5]. Nevertheless, the accuracy of AG in predicting the prognosis of patients in the ICU remains debatable. While some studies have suggested that AG can effectively predict short-term mortality in patients with critical illness, others have yielded inconclusive results[6]. In 1985, Gabow observed that the AG value could be influenced by serum albumin levels[7]. Given that albumin carries a negative charge, any fluctuations in albumin levels can impact the final AG measurement[8]. Consequently, for patients with critical illness in the ICU, AG may sometimes appear to be pseudo-normal since hypoalbuminemia is very common in the setting of intensive care[9]. In order to address this problem, Figge J et al. introduced the concept of the albumin corrected anion gap (ACAG) in 1998[10]. Hatherill et al. discovered that ACAG exhibited superior predictive capabilities for metabolic acidosis compared to AG in pediatric patients with shock[11]. Furthermore, numerous studies have demonstrated the association between ACAG and the prognosis of critical conditions including cardiac arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], acute kidney injury[14], sepsis[15], and acute pancreatitis[16].

However, to the best of our knowledge, the relationship between ACAG and the prognosis of CS has not been investigated. Furthermore, it remains uncertain whether ACAG offers an improved predictive capability for short-term mortality when compared to AG. Therefore, in this study, our objectives are as follows: 1) to exam the correlation between ACAG and short-term mortality in patients with CS; 2) to compare the admission values of AG and ACAG for predicting CS mortality and assessing the severity.

2.Materials and methods

2.1 Datasets and ethics

In this study, we utilized the following two publicly-accessible dataset: (1) Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care IV/MIMIC-IV v2.2 dataset (2008–2019)[17]; (2) eICU Collaborative Research Database/eICU-CRD dataset (2014–2015)[18]. MIMIC-IV is an updated version of the MIMIC-III, containing de-personalized data of 73,181 ICU stays for 50,906 unique patients at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center between 2008 and 2019 (a single center dataset). The eICU-CRD is also a de-identified database and

contains 200,859 ICU stays for 139,367 unique patients admitted to 335 ICUs at 208 hospitals across the United States (a multi-center dataset). Importantly, as there is no shared hospital involvement between the MIMIC and eICU program, the eICU-CRD dataset remains entirely independent of MIMIC-IV.

The first author has successfully completed the online course and passed the Examination for Protecting Human Research Participants (Record ID: 11841860). Hence, he was granted permission to extract data from the two datasets mentioned above. Given that all identifying information had been removed, our study was considered exempt from ethical review by the institutional research board. Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

2.2 Study population and endpoints

This is a multi-center, retrospective, observational study. We screened all patients diagnosed with CS in MIMIC-IV dataset and eICU-CRD dataset. We excluded those who aged younger than 18 years old, length of stay (LOS) in ICU or hospital less than 24 hours, and lack of AG or albumin value within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. In cases of patients with multiple ICU admissions, we only included the first ICU stay for analysis. AG was calculated by the following formula: AG (mmol/I) = (sodium + potassium) - (chloride + bicarbonate). ACAG was determined as follows: ACAG (mmol/I) = [4.4-{albumin(g/dI)}] *2.5 + AG[11]. Additionally, we categorized the enrolled patients into two groups according to the admission values of ACAG based on the previous studies[14,15]: the normal ACAG group (< 20 mmol/I) and the higher ACAG group (≥20 mmol/I).

The primary endpoint of this study was short-term all-cause mortality, which included ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, as well as 28-day mortality (not available in eICU-CRD). The secondary endpoints encompassed 28-day free from ICU (not available in eICU-CRD) and LOS in ICU. 28-day free from ICU is a composite outcome which integrates both mortality and LOS in ICU. It was calculated as 28 minus the days spent in the ICU during the first 28 day and the dead patients were assigned the value of zero. LOS in ICU was defined as the duration that intensive care was required and was calculated based on the time to discharge alive from ICU, with death in ICU as a completing risk.

2.3 Variable extraction

We extracted the variables with structured query language in Navicat Premium (version 15.0.12). The codes for data extraction were based on <u>https://github.com/MIT-LCP/mimic-code</u> and <u>https://github.com/MIT-LCP/eicu-code</u>. For each patient, we collected a wide range of variables including demographic information, comorbidities, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, vital signs, and laboratory data. Demographic information included age at admission, gender, weight/body mass index, and race. Acute myocardial infarction, hypertension, atrial fibrillation, valvular disease,

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

cardiomyopathy, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes, and malignancy were identified as comorbidities. Vital signs encompassed heart rate, respiratory rate, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, mean blood pressure, and oxygen saturation. Additionally, we collected laboratory data, which included white blood cell, hemoglobin, platelet, bilirubin, creatinine, sodium, potassium, chloride, bicarbonate, albumin, AG, and ACAG.

All vital signs, laboratory data, and the SOFA score were extracted and calculated within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. If a variable was measured multiple times within the initial 24 hours of ICU admission, we used the first recorded value for analysis.

2.4 Statistical analysis

To address missing values, we initially conducted multiple imputation using chained equations. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the percentage of incomplete cases was 3.1%, and in the eICU-CRD cohort, it was 16.7%. Accordingly, we generated 5 datasets for MIMIC-IV and 17 datasets for eICU-CRD for further analysis and the results were combined according to the Rubin's rules[19].

We compared the baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients based on their hospital survival status and ACAG levels. Categorical variables were presented as numbers plus percentages and compared using Pearson's chi-square test. Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed to assess the distribution of continues variables. Since all continuous variables in two cohorts were both skewed-distributed, they were expressed as median [inter-quartile range (IQR)] and compared by Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Pearson correlation analyses were utilized to investigate the association between AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score. The ability of AG and ACAG to predict short-term mortality was compared by the area under curves (AUC) of the receiver operating characteristic curves (ROC). Z test was used to compare the predictive ability of AG and ACAG following the method of Delong et al[20]. Threshold values were determined by identifying the values that provided the highest specificity and sensitivity by calculating the Youden Index.

To evaluate the relationship between ACAG and ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day allcause mortality, ACAG was initially analyzed as a categorical variable (normal ACAG group and high ACAG group) and then as a continuous variable (ACAG values). Kaplan-Meier survival curves and Cox proportional hazards regression models were employed to calculate hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals. Furthermore, we investigated the association between ACAG values and short-term mortality using restricted cubic splines with four knots at 25%, 50%, 75% and 95%. Based on the previous studies and theoretical considerations, we selected clinically relevant confounding factors as covariates in the regression model. Variance inflation factor was used to test the multicollinearity between each covariate and the covariates with a high degree of collinearity (variance inflation factor > 5) were removed from the regression model. Finally, we constructed two models for adjustments. In model I, we adjusted for confounders including age, gender, race, and weight/body mass index. In model II, we further adjusted acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular heart disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury,

SOFA score, mean blood pressure, oxygen saturation, potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin.

Since ICU expire resulted in a shorter LOS, the correlation between ACAG and LOS in ICU was analyzed using the Fine-Gray competing risk model. In this model, a higher HR for earlier alive ICU discharge indicated a shorter LOS while a lower HR indicated a longer LOS in ICU.

Subgroup analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationship between ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality within various subpopulations, including age (<65 years, \geq 65 years), gender (male, female), acute myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, hypoalbuminemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL), and SOFA score (<8, \geq 8) using the stratified multivariable Cox proportional hazards model.

All statistical analysis were performed with R version 4.1.2. A P value < 0.05 for two sides is considered statistical significance.

3.Results

3.1 Baseline characteristics of enrolled patients

The flowchart of our study was presented in *Fig.1*. Overall, a total of 808 and 700 individuals diagnosed with CS were enrolled from the MIMIC-IV dataset and eICU-CRD dataset respectively. The short-term mortality rates of CS patients were similar in both cohorts. Specifically, the ICU mortality rates were 29%, 30% while in-hospital mortality rates were 36%, 37% in MIMIC-IV cohort and eICU-CRD cohort, respectively. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the 28-day all-cause mortality rates were 39%.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Table1 summarized the baseline characteristic of enrolled patients stratified according to the ACAG level. Obviously, patients with a higher ACAG level exhibited a greater predisposition to acute kidney injury/acute renal failure and had elevated values of the SOFA score, white blood cell count, sodium, potassium, creatinine, and total bilirubin. In comparison to the normal ACAG group, the short-term mortality rates (including ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, and 28-day mortality) were significantly higher while the 28-day free from ICU were notably shorter (20 [2-25] vs 9 [0-23], p<0.001) in patients with a higher ACAG level.

Furthermore, the baseline characteristic of enrolled patients stratified according to the hospital survival status were summarized in *eTable1*. Notably, we found that the ACAG value was significantly higher in the group of patients who did not survive in hospital, both in the MIMIC-IV cohort (21.0 [18.0-25.3] vs 19.0 [16.5-22.5], p<0.001) and the eICU-CRD cohort (22.0 [17.7-27.0] vs 19.0 [16.2-23.0], p<0.001). Additionally, among the non-survivors during hospitalization, we observed a higher rate of acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, lower values of hemoglobin, albumin, bicarbonate, and higher levels of age, creatinine, SOFA score.

3.2 Comparison of AG and ACAG for mortality prediction and severity assessment

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

The predictive performance of ACAG versus AG for ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day allcause mortality was assessed through ROC curve analysis (e*Fig.1*). As shown in *Table2*, ACAG outperformed AG for short-term mortality prediction, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.654 [95%CI: 0.613-0.696] vs 0.632 [95%CI: 0.589-0.674], Z =2.99, p= 0.003; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.613 [95%CI: 0.566-0.660] vs 0.594 [95%CI: 0.546-0.642], Z = 2.99, p=0.003), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: ACU: 0.629 [95%CI: 0.589-0.669] vs 0.599 [95%CI: 0.558-0.641], Z =4.13, p< 0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.628 [95%CI: 0.585-0.671] vs 0.603 [95%CI: 0.559-0.647], Z = 3.92, p< 0.001), and 28-day mortality prediction (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.641 [95%CI:0.602-0.680] vs 0.614 [95%CI: 0.574-0.654], Z = 3.95, p< 0.001).

Additionally, we conducted correlation analyses to investigate the association between AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score using Pearson's method. as depicted in eFigure2. In both cohorts, we observed positive correlations between both AG and ACAG values and the SOFA score (both p-values < 0.001). Intriguingly, we found that the correlation coefficient for ACAG was significantly higher than that of AG (MIMIC-IV cohort: AG: R=0.28 vs ACAG: R=0.35; eICU-CRD cohort: AG: R=0.30 vs ACAG: R=0.35). These findings highlight the stronger positive correlation between ACAG and the SOFA score, underscoring its potential as a valuable prognostic indicator.

3.3 Increased ACAG level correlates with higher risk of short-term morality

As demonstrated in *eFig.3*, the Kaplan–Meier survival curve showed an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate among patients with a higher ACAG level (HR: 1.85, 95%CI: 1.48-2.32, log-rank test, p-value <0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort. Furthermore, even after adjusting for confounding variables in model II, we observed that the individuals with an evaluated ACAG level still exhibited an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95%CI: 1.11-1.83, p=0.007).

Similarly, the relationship between ACAG levels and ICU/in-hospital mortality was assessed through multivariable Cox regression models as well. As presented in *Table3*, in comparison to the normal ACAG group, the results showed that the CS patients with a higher ACAG level experienced increased rates of ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.43, 95%CI=1.05-1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.38, 95%CI=1.02-1.86, p=0.036) and in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.47, 95%CI=1.12-1.94, p=0.006).

3.4 Linear relationship of ACAG value and short-term all-cause mortality

We extended our analysis to assess the association between ACAG values and short-term all-cause mortality rates. As presented in *Table3*, the adjusted HRs with 95%CI were 1.05 (1.03-1.07) for 28-day mortality, 1.04 (1.01-1.06) for ICU mortality, and 1.04 (1.02-1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the MIMIC-IV cohort while 1.06 (1.03-1.09) for ICU mortality and 1.05 (1.02-1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the eICU-CRD cohort respectively.

To further investigate the relationship between ACAG values and short-term all-

cause mortality rates, we utilized the adjusted restricted cubic splines. As shown in *Fig.2*, we observed a linear correlation between ACAG and short-term all-cause mortality, which includes 28-day mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.651), ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.693; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.183), and in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.948; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0

3.5 Association of ACAG and earlier alive discharge in ICU

Cumulative incidence ratio (CIR) of earlier discharge alive in ICU among ACAG levels was shown in *eFig.4*. Obviously, the unadjusted CIR for earlier alive discharge in ICU was significantly higher in lower ACAG group. The robustness of the results was further confirmed using Fine-Gray competing risk models after adjusting for confounding variables (*eTable2*). In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the adjusted HR (95%CI) for the relationship between ACAG level and earlier alive discharge in ICU was 0.77 (95% CI= 0.65–0.92; p = 0.004). However, in the eICU-CRD cohort, this relationship did not reach statistical significance (adjusted HR: 0.85, 0.69–1.04; p = 0.140).

Additionally, ACAG was analyzed as a continuous variable. Intriguingly, the association between ACAG value and earlier discharge alive was statistically significant in both cohorts, with adjusted HRs (95%CI) of 0.96 (95% CI=0.94-0.98; p <0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 0.97 (95% CI=0.95-0.99; p=0.001) in the eICU-CRD cohort. In summary, the ACAG value was inversely associated with earlier discharge alive in the ICU for patients with CS.

3.6 Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analysis was conducted to assess the stability of the consistency for the relationship between ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality across various subpopulations, including age group (<65 years, \geq 65 years), gender group (male, female), SOFA score (<8, \geq 8), and different clinical conditions such as acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury, hypoalbuminemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL). Adjustments for confounding factors were made as in Model II. As depicted in e*Fig.5*, all p-values for interaction tests within different subgroups were greater than 0.05, indicating that the relationship between ACAG level and 28-day all-cause mortality remained stable and consistent across the various subpopulations.

4.Discussion

In this large-sample retrospective study based on two distinct public-accessible datasets, we investigate the association of ACAG, a novel biomarker indicating metabolic acid load, and the short-term prognosis of CS patients with mixed etiologies. The main findings of our study are as follows: (1) ACAG is strongly and independently associated with short-term all-cause mortality rates (including ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day mortality)

and the duration of intensive care required in patients with CS, even after adjusting for disease severity using SOFA score; (2) ACAG outperforms AG in its ability to predict short-term mortality and evaluate the severity of CS.

It is widely acknowledged that metabolic acidosis is a frequent event in the setting of intensive care and has been consistently demonstrated to be associated with adverse outcomes in individuals with critical illness[21]. Notably, in patients with severe cardiovascular disorders, particularly those suffering from CS, acidemia may trigger a detrimental cycle via impairing cardiac contractile function, inducing malignant arrhythmias, and exacerbating circulatory failure[22]. Additionally, severe acidemia may further compromise the responses to catecholamines of cardiovascular systems and weaken the effectiveness of vasopressors to reverse hypotension[23]. A prior study has demonstrated that the severity of acidosis is strongly and positively correlated with both the degree of shock and short-term mortality rates in CS patients[24].

As one of the simplest methods for assessing acid-base balance, the anion gap (AG) is a widely used biomarker in clinical practice. The relationship between AG and shortterm mortality in patients with critical illness has been extensively investigated[25]. A previous study demonstrated a J-shaped association between AG value and the 30-day all-cause mortality rate in patients with CS based on MIMIC-III dataset[26]. Similarly, our study revealed that AG values were significantly higher in non-survivors when compared to survivors (MIMIC-IV cohort: 18 [15-22] vs 16 [14-20], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 18 [14-23] vs 16 [13-19], p<0.001) in our study. Moreover, AG has also been used for risk stratification in the setting of acute cardiovascular care. Recently, a study has combined the AG and SOFA to create the AG-SOFA score, which displayed improved predictive capabilities for short-term mortality in cardiovascular intensive care units[27]. Similarly, Eric et al incorporated AG into the BOS,MA2 score and exhibited superior performance than other pre-existing risk scores systems for CS prognostication[28]. However, the physiological AG primarily consists of inorganic phosphate and albuminate, which is a weak anion derived from serum albumin[5]. Given the involvement of albumin in the acidbase equilibrium, it may perplex the interpretation of acid-base data[29]. Theoretically, hypoalbuminemia can lead to a decrease in albuminate levels, resulting in a reduction in AG values[10]. Therefore, in the case of a patient with hypoalbuminemia and a normal AG value, it might indicate the presence of plasma acids. Similarly, we might underestimate the severity of metabolic acidosis based on the AG values for patients with low albumin levels. Notably, hypoalbuminemia is very frequent among patients with critical illness and has been demonstrated to be associated with unfavorable outcomes including higher rates of short-term mortality and longer LOS in ICU. The incidence of hypoalbuminemia is striking in patients with CS, with a reported rate of 75% from the previous CardShock study[30]. Similarly, our study also observed an exceptionally high frequency of hypoalbuminemia in patients with CS. Specifically, the incidence of hypoalbuminemia (defined as albumin < 3.5 g/dL) is 58.4% (472/808) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 74.1% (519/700) in the eICU-CRD cohort respectively. Furthermore, a recent study has established that serum albumin is an independent predictor for short-term mortality in CS patients [20]. Likewise, in this study, we found that the value of albumin was significantly lower in hospital death group than survival group (MIMIC-IV cohort: 3.4

BMJ Open

[3.0-3.7] vs 3.1 [2.7-3.6], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 3.1 [2.7-3.6] vs 2.9 [2.5-3.3], p<0.001).

ACAG, which combines the AG and serum albumin, has been proposed as a replacement for AG in differentiating acidosis caused by acid load or base deficit from a panel of expert's consensus about metabolic acidosis management[31]. As a ubiguitous abnormality in patients with critical illness, hypoalbuminemia has been demonstrated to complicate the interpretation of acid-base data when using diagnostic methods based on base excess or plasma bicarbonate concentration alongside AG [29]. In the presence of hypoalbuminemia, taking albumin levels into account can reveal the presence of plasma acid, which might otherwise be overlooked when relying solely on AG or base excess values. Previous studies have demonstrated that ACAG is a superior predictor compared to conventional AG for short-term prognosis prediction in patients with critical illness like cardiopulmonary arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], and sepsis[15]. Therefore, we hypothesized that ACAG may perform better than AG, particularly in a population at high risk of metabolic acidosis and hypoalbuminemia. As previously discussed, patients with CS are not only prone to hypoalbuminemia, but are also susceptible to metabolic acidosis. Hence, we posited that ACAG might outperform AG for risk stratification in the setting of CS. In this study, we compared AG and ACAG for mortality prediction and severity assessment for CS patients in two cohorts. Through the ROC curve analysis, we found that ACAG exhibited the highest AUC and Youden's index for short-term morality prediction in both cohorts, suggesting the better short-term mortality predicting capacity than AG for CS. Furthermore, using the Spearman's methods, we discovered that both AG and ACAG were positively correlated with the SOFA score. Importantly, the correlation coefficients with the SOFA score were significantly higher for ACAG when compared to AG. Taken together, our findings support the superiority of ACAG in predicting prognosis and estimating disease severity in patients with CS.

As a medical emergency requiring prompt evaluation and intervention, the mortality risk of CS is highest during the initial 48 hours following the onset of shock[32]. Therefore, mortality assessment in CS patients should be performed as early as possible after ICU admission. Given the rapid and widespread availability of AG and albumin in clinical practice, we recommend the inclusion of baseline ACAG levels in the prognostic biomarkers for patients with CS.

Indeed, our study has notable strengths. Firstly, it represents the pioneering study to explore the association between ACAG and the prognosis of CS. Second, the CS patients are from a diverse and heterogeneous patient population with mixed etiologies, enhancing its relevance and applicability to real-world clinical scenarios. Third, the data in this study are derived from two distinct high-quality datasets and the results are consistent with each other. However, several limitations of this study are deserved discussion. First, as the nature of retrospective, selection bias cannot be avoided. Second, detailed information about cardiac function (like left ventricular ejection fraction, ventricular size) and other important cardiac biomarkers (like troponin, N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide) are not included in this study due to a large amount of missing data. Third, the association between ACAG and the short-term mortality are established based on the first ACAG value within the first 24h of ICU admission. Monitoring the

dynamic changes of ACAG may be valuable for patients with CS. Further studies are needed to explore the relationship between the dynamic changes of ACAG and mortality of CS.

5.Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that the baseline ACAG value following ICU admission independently predicts the short-term mortality in patients with CS, which is better than AG. Given the high mortality risk of CS during the early phase of ICU admission, baseline ACAG value may help clinicians to identify patients at high risk of mortality. Therefore, we propose to incorporate the baseline ACAG into the risk stratification systems for CS.

Data availability

The datasets used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Author contributions

Yuxing Wang: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Data curation, Methodology, Resources. Yuhang Tao: Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft. Ming Yuan: Writing - review & editing. Pengcheng Yu: Writing - review & editing. Kai Zhang: Writing - review & editing. Hangying Ying: Project administration, Supervision Validation, and Writing - review & editing. Ruhong Jiang: Project administration, Supervision Validation, and Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest None

Reference:

- Van Diepen S, Katz JN, Albert NM, *et al.* Contemporary Management of Cardiogenic Shock: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;136. doi: 10.1161/CIR.00000000000525
- 2 Hunziker L, Radovanovic D, Jeger R, *et al.* Twenty-Year Trends in the Incidence and Outcome of Cardiogenic Shock in AMIS Plus Registry. *Circ: Cardiovascular Interventions*. 2019;12:e007293.
- 3 Berg DD, Bohula EA, Morrow DA. Epidemiology and causes of cardiogenic shock. *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2021;27:401–8.
- 4 Posen AK, Paloucek FP, Petzel R. Anion gap physiology and faults of the correction formula. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2022;79:446–51.
- 5 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Serum Anion Gap: Its Uses and Limitations in Clinical Medicine. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2007;2:162–74.

- 1985;27:472-83. 2012;7:193-9. 2013;19:283-8.
 - Rocktaeschel J, Morimatsu H, Uchino S, *et al.* Unmeasured anions in critically ill patients: Can they predict mortality?*: *Critical Care Medicine*. 2003;31:2131–6.
 - 7 Gabow PA. Disorders associated with an altered anion gap. *Kidney International*. 1985;27:472–83.
 - 8 Figge J, Bellomo R, Egi M. Quantitative relationships among plasma lactate, inorganic phosphorus, albumin, unmeasured anions and the anion gap in lactic acidosis. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2018;44:101–10.
 - 9 Gatta A, Verardo A, Bolognesi M. Hypoalbuminemia. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2012;7:193–9.
 - 10 Figge J, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Anion gap and hypoalbuminemia: *Critical Care Medicine*. 1998;26:1807–10.
 - 11 Hatherill M. Correction of the anion gap for albumin in order to detect occult tissue anions in shock. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2002;87:526–9.
 - 12 Hagiwara S, Oshima K, Furukawa K, *et al.* The Significance of Albumin Corrected Anion Gap in Patients with Cardiopulmonary Arrest. *Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2013;19:283–8.
 - 13 Jian L. Association between albumin corrected anion gap and 30-day all-cause mortality of critically ill patients with acute myocardial infarction: a retrospective analysis based on the MIMIC-IV database. 2023.
 - 14 Zhong L, Xie B, Ji X-W, *et al.* The association between albumin corrected anion gap and ICU mortality in acute kidney injury patients requiring continuous renal replacement therapy. *Intern Emerg Med.* 2022;17:2315–22.
 - 15 Hu T, Zhang Z, Jiang Y. Albumin corrected anion gap for predicting in-hospital mortality among intensive care patients with sepsis: A retrospective propensity score matching analysis. *Clinica Chimica Acta*. 2021;521:272–7.
 - 16 Li P, Shi L, Yan X, *et al.* Albumin Corrected Anion Gap and the Risk of in-Hospital Mortality in Patients with Acute Pancreatitis: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *JIR*. 2023;Volume 16:2415–22.
 - 17 Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, *et al.* MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Sci Data*. 2023;10:1.
 - 18 Pollard TJ, Johnson AEW, Raffa JD, *et al.* The eICU Collaborative Research Database, a freely available multi-center database for critical care research. *Sci Data*. 2018;5:180178.
 - 19 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues

and guidance for practice. Statist Med. 2011;30:377-99.

- 20 DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the Areas under Two or More Correlated Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves: A Nonparametric Approach. *Biometrics*. 1988;44:837.
- 21 Gunnerson KJ, Kellum JA. Acid–base and electrolyte analysis in critically ill patients: are we ready for the new millennium?: *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2003;9:468–73.
- 22 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Metabolic acidosis: pathophysiology, diagnosis and management. *Nat Rev Nephrol.* 2010;6:274–85.
- 23 Jentzer JC, Kashani KB, Wiley BM, *et al.* Laboratory Markers of Acidosis and Mortality in Cardiogenic Shock: Developing a Definition of Hemometabolic Shock. *Shock.* 2022;57:31–40.
- 24 Jentzer JC, Schrage B, Patel PC, *et al.* Association Between the Acidemia, Lactic Acidosis, and Shock Severity With Outcomes in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock. *JAHA*. 2022;11:e024932.
- 25 Glasmacher SA, Stones W. Anion gap as a prognostic tool for risk stratification in critically ill patients a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2015;16:68.
- 26 Zhang T, Wang J, Li X. Association Between Anion Gap and Mortality in Critically III Patients with Cardiogenic Shock. *IJGM*. 2021;Volume 14:4765–73.
- 27 Zhou Y-H, Pang S, Miao G-R, *et al.* Combining the anion gap with the sequential organ failure assessment score to evaluate the short-term prognosis of patients in the cardiac intensive care unit. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2023;370:381–7.
- 28 Yamga E, Mantena S, Rosen D, *et al.* Optimized Risk Score to Predict Mortality in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit. *JAHA*. 2023;12:e029232.
- 29 Fencl V, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Diagnosis of Metabolic Acid–Base Disturbances in Critically III Patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2000;162:2246–51.
- 30 Jäntti T, Tarvasmäki T, Harjola V-P, *et al.* Hypoalbuminemia is a frequent marker of increased mortality in cardiogenic shock. *PLoS ONE*. 2019;14:e0217006.
- 31 for the Société de Réanimation de Langue Française (SRLF), the Société Française de Médecine d'Urgence (SFMU), Jung B, *et al.* Diagnosis and management of metabolic acidosis: guidelines from a French expert panel. *Ann Intensive Care.* 2019;9:92.

32 Wigger O, Bloechlinger S, Berger D, *et al.* Baseline serum bicarbonate levels independently predict short-term mortality in critically ill patients with ischaemic cardiogenic shock. *European Heart Journal: Acute Cardiovascular Care.* 2018;7:45–52.

to beet terien only

Figure lengeds:

Fig.1: The flow chart of this study.

LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit, AG: anion gap

Fig.2: Restricted cubic spline for the associations between ACAG value and shortterm mortality

Fig.2A and Fig.2B showed the ICU mortality while Fig.3C and Fig.3D showed the inhospital mortality in MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD cohort respectively. 28-day mortality was shown in Fig.2E.

d The solid lines represent the adjusted hazard ratios (aHRs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) after multivariable adjustment in Model II.

Histograms represent the distribution of concentrations of ACAG in two cohorts.

3	Table1: B	aseline cha	racteristics of e	enrolled p	atients strati	fied by ACAG	level in	
5			tw	o cohorts	1			
6 7 8 9	Overall (n=808)	Normal ACAG (n=416)	Higher ACAG (n=392)	p-value	Overall (n=700)	elCU-CRD c Normal ACAG (n=353)	higher ACAG (n=347)	p-value
10Demographic of	characteristics	74 (04	70 (00 70)	0.0	07 (57	00 (57 77)		0.0
11Age 1 <u>2</u>	70 (60, 80)	81)	70 (60, 79)	0.3	67 (57, 76)	68 (57, 77)	67 (57, 75)	0.2
13Gender	1			0.2				-
14Female 15	347 (43%)	188 (45%)	159 (41%)		255 (36%)	130 (37%)	125 (36%)	Prot
16Male 17	461 (57%)	228 (55%)	233 (59%)		445 (64%)	223 (63%)	222 (64%)	ected
¹⁸ Weight/BMI ^a 19	80 (68, 95)	79 (67, 94)	81 (68, 97)	0.2	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	0.6 y 6
²⁰ Ethnicity	1			0.3		1		0.016
⁴ ¹ White 22	497 (62%)	255 (61%)	242 (62%)		531 (76%)	276 (78%)	255 (73%)	ight, i
⁴³ Black 24	71 (8.8%)	34 (8.2%)	37 (9.4%)		83 (12%)	32 (9.1%)	51 (15%)	ncludi
26 ^{Hispanic}	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.9%)	7 (1.8%)		32 (4.6%)	14 (4.0%)	18 (5.2%)	ng for
28Asian	18 (2.2%)	13 (3.1%)	5 (1.3%)	•	19 (2.7%)	15 (4.2%)	4 (1.2%)	uses
30Others/unkno 31wn	203 (25%)	102 (25%)	101 (26%) 🧹	6	35 (5.0%)	16 (4.5%)	19 (5.5%)	relate
³ ² Comorbidities	1		L		1	1	1	d to
33AMI 34	349 (43%)	187 (45%)	162 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)	152 (43%)	118 (34%)	0.014 to up
³⁵ Hypertension 36	241 (30%)	143 (34%)	98 (25%)	0.004*	365 (52%)	186 (53%)	179 (52%)	0.8 da
³⁷ Cardiomyopa ³⁸ thy	206 (25%)	105 (25%)	101 (26%)	0.9	119 (17%)	69 (20%)	50 (14%)	0.070 a min
Atrial 40 1 fibrillation	393 (49%)	199 (48%)	194 (49%)	0.6	144 (21%)	77 (22%)	67 (19%)	0.4 ing. A
42VHD 43	293 (36%)	150 (36%)	143 (36%)	>0.9	99 (14%)	64 (18%)	35 (10%)	0.002 * rain
44AKI/ARF ^a 45	573 (71%)	259 (62%)	314 (80%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	150 (42%)	173 (50%)	0.051 <mark>j</mark> ar
46COPD 47	71 (8.8%)	41 (9.9%)	30 (7.7%)	0.3	101 (14%)	53 (15%)	48 (14%)	0.7 <u>d</u> sim
4 ⁸ Diabetes 49	283 (35%)	116 (28%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	158 (23%)	70 (20%)	88 (25%)	0.080 ਵਿ
⁵⁰ Malignancy 51	80 (9.9%)	38 (9.1%)	42 (11%)	0.5	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.7%)	10 (2.9%)	0.3 chnol
⁵² SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	9 (6, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10)	9 (7, 12)	<0.00
54 Vital signs	00 (77	07 /74	02 (00 444)	~0.004*	01 (70	00 /77	02/70 444	بر
55 ^{Heart} rate	90 (77, 108)	87 (74, 102)	93 (80, 111)	<0.001*	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 105)	93 (78, 111)	0.088
₅₇ Respiratory ₅₈ rate	20 (17, 24)	20 (16, 23)	21 (17, 26)	<0.001*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)	20 (17, 25)	0.083
59Systolic BP	111 (97,	114 (99,	109 (95,	0.2	107 (91,	107 (92,	107 (90, 126)	0.8
<u></u> ⊴9Systolic BP 60	111 (97,	114 (99,	109 (95,	0.2 16	107 (91,	107 (92,	107 (90, 126)	0.8

60

2								
3	129)	127)	129)		122)	121)		
4 Mean BP	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 78)	0.5	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73)	62 (50, 77)	0.3
7 Diastolic BP	79 (68, 91)	79 (69, 91)	78 (66, 91)	0.4	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88)	78 (64, 91)	0.4
9 SpO2	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97(93, 100)	0.12	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (93, 100)	>0.9
1 Laboratory dat	а							
₁₂ White blood ₁₃ cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 16)	13 (9, 20)	0.002*
14Hemoglobin 15 16	11.5 (9.8, 13.4)	11.7 (10.1, 13.5)	11.4 (9.6, 13.1)	0.045*	12.1 (10.1, 13.9)	12.2 (10.3, 14.0)	11.8 (9.8, 13.7)	0.2 Protect
1 ⁷ Platelet 18 19	211 (152, 278)	210 (154, 278)	213 (149, 278)	0.8	196 (145, 260)	203 (151, 253)	192 (139, 268)	0.4 ed by co
²⁰ Sodium 21 22	138 (134, 141)	138 (135, 141)	137 (133, 141)	0.2	137 (134, 141)	137 (135, 140)	138 (133, 141)	>0.9 >0.9
24 Potassium 25 26	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.3 (3.8, 4.7)	4.6 (3.9, 5.1)	<0.001*	4.2 (3.7, 4.9)	4.1 (3.7, 4.7)	4.4 (3.7, 5.2)	<0.00therefore the second seco
27Chloride 28 29	103 (98, 107)	104 (100,10 8)	101 (96, 106)	<0.001*	103 (98, 107)	104 (100, 108)	101 (96, 105)	<0.009 Uses I
30Bicarbonate 31	20 (17, 23)	22 (20, 25)	18 (15, 21) 🧹	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	24 (21, 27)	19 (16, 22)	<0.00 atec
3 <mark>2AG</mark> 33	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	167 (13, 21)	13 (12, 15)	21 (18, 24)	<0.00
³⁴ Albumin 35	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.2 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.8, 3.6)	2.9 (2.5, 3.4)	<0.00and
30 37 38 30	20.0 (17.0, 23.5)	17.1 (15.3, 18.5)	23.5 (21.8, 26.5)	<0.001*	19.9 (16.7, 24.2)	16.7 (14.8, 18.3)	24.2 (21.9, 28.0)	<0.00ata min
40 ^C reatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.2 (0.9, 1.7)	1.8 (1.3, 2.9)	<0.001*	1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	1.3 (0.9, 1.8)	1.8 (1.3, 2.8)	
₄₂ Bilirubin 4 <u>3</u>	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.7 (0.4, 1.0)	0.8 (0.5, 1.5)	<0.001*	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1.3)	0.9 (0.5, 1.6)	0.055traini
44Outcomes	1		1	1			1	, en
45LOS in ICU	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	0.5	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 8)	5 (3, 9)	0.3 an
46LOS in 47hospital	10 (5, 17)	10 (6, 17)	10 (5, 18)	0.3	8 (5, 14)	9 (5, 15)	8 (4, 14)	0.017 <mark>%</mark> <u>s</u> .
48ICU death 49	231 (29%)	85 (20%)	146 (37%)	<0.001*	211 (30%)	87 (25%)	124 (36%)	0.001ਙ ਫ਼
⁵⁰ Hospital ⁵¹ death	289 (36%)	122 (29%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	260 (37%)	102 (29%)	158 (46%)	<0.00
1 ⁴ 28-day 53 death ^b	315 (39%)	126 (30%)	189 (48%)	<0.001*				gies.
528-day free 56 ^{from} ICU⁵	17 (0, 24)	20 (2, 25)	9 (0, 23)	<0.001*				
57	Abbreviation	: BMI: body	mass index, AM	II: acute m	yocardial infa	rction, AKI: acu	ute kidney	
58	iniury. ARF:	acute rena	I failure. COPD:	chronic c	bstructive ou	Imonarv disea	se. SOFA	
59	sequential or	rgan failure	assessment. BP	: blood pre	essure. AG: a	nion gap. ACA	, G albumin	
60	2		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		, 			

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	corrected anion gap, LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit p<0.05* a: body weight and acute kidney injury were shown in MIMIC-IV cohort while body mass index and acute renal failure were presented in eICU-CRD cohort due to data availability. b: 28-day all-cause mortality and 28-day free from ICU were reported in MIMIC-IV cohort
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	
45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 52	
54 55 56 57 58 59 60	18

Table2: ROC curve analysis of AG/ACAG and short-term mortality

	Table2. Note daily analysis of Non to and short term mortality							
	Factor	AUC	95%CI	Cut-off	Sensitivity	Specificity	Youden's index	
ICU mortality	AG	0.654	0.613-0.696	15.5	0.758	0.426	0.184	
(MIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.632	0.589-0.674	19.6	0.680	0.532	0.212	
ICU mortality	AG	0.594	0.546-0.642	18.1	0.526	0.654	0.180	
(eICU-CRD)	ACAG	0.613	0.566-0.660	25.4	0.351	0.857	0.208	
Hospital mortality	AG	0.599	0.558-0.641	20.5	0.346	0.796	0.142	
(MIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.629	0.589-0.669	24.6	0.322	0.869	0.191	
Hospital mortality	AG	0.603	0.559-0.647	18.1	0.523	0.673	0.196	
(elCU-CRD)	ACAG	0.628	0.585-0.671	21.6	0.527	0.705	0.232	
28-day mortality	AG	0.614	0.574-0.654	21.5	0.295	0.870	0.165	
(MIMIC-IV))	ACAG	0.641	0.602-0.680	22.9	0.400	0.805	0.205	

Abbreviation: AUC: area under curve, CI: confidence interval, AG: anion gap, ACAG: albumin corrected anion gap,

or operiod is the second

3		Table3: Associat	ion of ACAC	G and short-term a	ll-cause m	ortality	
4		Crude Moc	del	Model I		Model	1
5		HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value
0	28-day mortality (MIN	/IC-IV cohort)					
/ 0	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.07 (1.06-1.09)	<0.001	1.08 (1.06-1.10)	<0.001	1.05 (1.03-1.07)	<0.001
0	Higher ACAG level	1.85 (1.48-2.32)	<0.001	1.90 (1.52-2.39)	<0.001	1.42 (1.11-1.83)	0.007
10	ICU mortality (MIMIC	-IV cohort)	_	-	_	-	
11	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.09)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.04 (1.01-1.06)	0.005
12	Higher ACAG level	1.74 (1.33-2.28)	<0.001	1.87 (1.43-1.91)	<0.001	1.43 (1.05-1.93)	0.022
13	ICU mortality (eICU-0	CRD cohort)	1	1	1	1	1
14	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.06 (1.03-1.09)	<0.001
15	Higher ACAG level	1.61 (1.22-2.11)	<0.001	1.65 (1.25-2.17)	<0.001	1.38 (1.02-1.86)	0.036
16	In-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort)	1	I		I	1
17	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.04 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
18	Higher ACAG level	1.51 (1.20-1.91)	<0.001	1.58 (1.25-2.01)	<0.001	1.31 (1.01-1.71)	0.041
19	In-hospital mortality (eICU-CRD cohort)			1		
20	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.05 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
21	Higher ACAG level	1.81 (1.41-2.33)	<0.001	1.86 (1.44-2.39)	<0.001	1.47 (1.12-1.94)	0.006
22	Abbrevi	ation: ACAG: album	nin corrected	l anion gap, HR: l	nazard rati	o, CI: confidence	
23	interval						
24	Model I	adjusted for age, get	nder, race, a	nd weight/body mas	s index		
25	Model	Il adjusted for age	gender rac	e weight/body me	ee indev	acute myocardial	
26				the second base has a second			
27	Intarctic	n, cardiomyopatny,	atrial fibrilla	tion, valvular near	disease,	diabetes, chronic	
28	obstruc	tive pulmonary disea	ise, acute ki	dney injury, SOFA	score, mea	n blood pressure,	
29	oxygen	saturation, potassiun	n, chloride, c	reatine, and total bi	lirubin.		
20 21							
22							
32							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							
47							
48							
49							
50							
51							
52							
53							
54							
55							
56							
5/ E0							
50							
60							
50				20			

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open





The flow chart of this study

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

В

for ICU

¥

HR for ho

D

p-overall = < 0.001 non-linear = 0.183

p-overall = < 0.001 p-non-linear = 0.40

30

ACAG

20

ACAG

%

p-overall = 0.005

p-overall = < 0.001

p-non-linear = 0.948

30

p-overall = < 0.001

ar = 0.65

20

20

ACAG

20 25

ACAG

mortality (MIMIC-IV)

HR for ICU

(MIMIC-IV)

nortality

HR for I

nortality (MIMIC-IV)

15

20 25 ACAG



multivariable adjustment in Model II.

174x234mm (300 x 300 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES). Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

	BMJ Open	cted by	36/bmjo	Page 24 of 36
Albumin corrected anion retrospective study	gap is associated with the prognosis of cardioger	copyright, including for u	Sock: a multi-center	
1 5	Online Supplement material	Enseigne ses relati	ober 202	
eTable1: Baseline characteri	stics of enrolled patients stratified by hospital survival statu	is internet	to cohorts	
eTable2: Association of ACA	AG and earlier discharge alive in ICU	uperieu xt and c	nloaded	
eFigure1: ROC curve analys	sis of AG, ACAG and ICU mortality (A: MIMIC-IV col	iornir Iornir	eICU-CRD cohort),	
in-hospital morality (C: MIM	IIC-IV cohort; D: eICU-CRD cohort), and 28-day mortalit	y (PAI	ة MIMIC-IV cohort)	
eFigure2: Pearson correlation	n analyses of AC/ACAG and SOFA score in MIMIC-IV co	oho g it	$\mathbf{\tilde{g}}$, C) and eICU-CRD	
cohort (B, D)), and s	т. .com	
eFigure3: Kaplan–Meier surv	vival curve of ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality	imilar te	on Jur	
eFigure4: Cumulative incide	nce ratio of earlier discharge alive in the ICU in MIMIC-IV		क इंधt (A) and eICU-CRD	
cohort (B)		gies.	025 at <i>P</i>	
eFigure5: Subgroup analysis			vgence	
			Bibliog	
			aphiqu	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml		del	

eTa	ble1: Baseline	characteristics o	f enrolled patier	nts stratifie	ed by hospital s	ਤਾਂ survival statu ਫ਼ ii	g g wo cohorts	
		MIMIC-IV coho	rt (n=808)			elCU-CRD	offt (n=700)	
	Overall	Survivors	Non-survivors	p-value	Overall	Survivors 🤤	Non-survivors	p-\
	(n=808)	(n=519)	(n=289)		(n=700)	(n=440) uses r	រុទ្ធិ(n=260) ព្រឹ	
Demographic cha	aracteristics			1	1	elate	2024	
Age	70 (60, 80)	69 (59, 79)	74 (63, 81)	0.001*	67 (57, 76)	66 (55, 75)	70 (62, 79)	<0
Gender	1			0.018*		t su	Ň	0.4
Female	347 (43%)	207 (40%)	140 (48%)		255 (36%)	155 (35%) and a	8 100 (38%)	1
Male	461 (57%)	312 (60%)	149 (52%)		445 (64%)	285 (65%) a	4 160 (62%)	1
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (69, 95)	80 (66, 95)	0.7	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	8 28 (24, 33)	>0
Ethnicity				0.002*		hining,	http://h	>0
White	497 (62%)	336 (65%)	161 (56%)		531 (76%)	332 (75%) ^A t	199 (77%)	1
Black	71 (8.8%)	51 (9.8%)	20 (6.9%)		83 (12%)	52 (12%) and	31 (12%)]
Hispanic	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.3%)	7 (2.4%)		32 (4.6%)	ق و (4.5%)	12 (4.6%)	
Asian	18 (2.2%)	13 (2.5%)	5 (1.7%)		19 (2.7%)	14 (3.2%) and	5 (1.9%)]
Others/unknown	203 (25%)	107 (21%)	96 (33%)		35 (5.0%)	22 (5.0%) si	13 (5.0%)	
Comorbidities						ilar	r ug	
AMI	349 (43%)	231 (45%)	118 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)	181 (41%) ຄຼົ	5 89 (34%)	0.0
Hypertension	241 (30%)	160 (31%)	81 (28%)	0.4	365 (52%)	226 (51%)	j a139 (53%)	0.6
Cardiomyopathy	206 (25%)	143 (28%)	63 (22%)	0.072	119 (17%)	80 (18%) 🧕	ខ្ល 39 (15%)	0.3
Atrial fibrillation	393 (49%)	254 (49%)	139 (48%)	0.8	144 (21%)	88 (20%) 🤅	<mark>ه</mark> 56 (22%)	0.6
VHD	293 (36%)	203 (39%)	90 (31%)	0.024*	99 (14%)	62 (14%)	₿37 (14%)	>0
AKI/ARF ^a	573 (71%)	334 (64%)	239 (83%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	180 (41%)	g 143 (55%)	<0
COPD	71 (8.8%)	46 (8.9%)	25 (8.7%)	>0.9	101 (14%)	56 (13%)	2 ,45 (17%)	0.1

BMJ	Open
-----	------

			BM	J Open		cted	36/bi	
						by	njop	
						сор	pen-	
						yrig	202	
						ht, ii	3-08	
Diabetes	283 (35%)	171 (33%)	112 (39%)	0.10	158 (23%)	94 (21%)	5 5 64 (25%)	0.3
Malignancy	80 (9.9%)	41 (7.9%)	39 (13%)	0.011*	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.4%) ing	\$ 10 (3.8%)	0.034*
SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	10 (7, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10) ร ิ	0 10 (8, 13)	<0.001*
Vital signs						use	tob	1
Heart rate	90 (77, 108)	89 (75, 105)	92 (78, 111)	0.066	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 105)	2 93 (78, 111)	0.088
Respiratory rate	20 (17, 24)	20 (17, 24)	21 (17, 26)	0.023*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)	2 20 (17, 25)	0.083
Systolic BP	111 (97, 129)	113 (98, 129)	110 (96, 125)	0.2	107 (91, 122)	107 (92, 12	8 107 (90, 126)	0.8
Mean BP	66 (54, 79)	67 (55, 79)	63 (52, 78)	0.022*	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73) g	<u></u> 62 (50, 77)	0.3
Diastolic BP	79 (68, 91)	80 (69, 93)	78 (66, 90)	0.075	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88)	8 78 (64, 91)	0.4
SpO2	97 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	0.4	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	£ 98 (93, 100)	>0.9
Laboratory data						ita r B	om	
White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 19)	0.013*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) n.	13 (9, 20)	0.076
Hemoglobin	11.5	11.8	11.2	< <u>0.001*</u>	12.1	12.4 ^{g.}	11.6	0.003*
	(9.8, 13.4)	(10.0, 13.7)	(9.4, 12.5)		(10.1, 13.9)	(10.4, 14.2₽	(9.7, 13.4)	
Platelet	211	216	198	0.076	196	210 a	182	<0.001*
	(152, 278)	(155, 282)	(146, 274)		(145, 260)	(157, 266) ^{ឆ្}	(128, 242)	
Sodium	138	138	138	0.6	137	137 and	138	0.13
	(134, 141)	(134, 140)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 140) S i	(134, 142)	
Potassium	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.4 (3.9, 4.9)	4.4 (3.8, 5.0)	>0.9	4.2	4.2 a r	2 4.3	0.15
					(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) ह	5 (3.7, 5.1)	
Chloride	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	0.6	103	103 ho	j =103	>0.9
					(98, 107)	(99, 107) <u> <u> </u></u>	ខ្ល (98, 107)	
Bicarbonate	20 (17, 23)	21 (18, 24)	20 (16, 23)	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	22 (19, 25) ⁶	ີ <u>ຫຼ</u> 21 (17, 24)	0.002*
AG	17 (14, 21)	16 (14, 20)	18 (15, 22)	<0.001*	17 (13, 21)	16 (13, 19)	≩ 18 (14, 23)	<0.001*
Albumin	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.1 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.7, 3.6)	2.9 (2.5, 3.3)	<0.001*
		10.0	21.0	<0.001*	19.9	19.0	w 22.0	<0.001*

Page 27 of 36				BM.	J Open		cted by	36/bmjo	
1 2 3							copyright,	pen-2023-0	
4								8 1 5 5 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
5		(17.0, 23.5)	(16.5, 22.5)	(18.0, 25.3)		(16.7, 24.2)	(16.2, 23.0€	9 (17.7, 27.0)	
6 7	Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.6 (1.1, 2.6)	<0.001*	1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	1.4 (1.1, 2,3) ¥1.6 (1.2, 2.4)	0.021*
8	Bilirubin	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.4, 1.4)	0.4	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1.) b 0.9 (0.6, 1.5)	0.065
9	Abbreviation: BM	II: body mass inde	ex, AMI: acute m	nyocardial infarct	ion, AKI: a	cute kidney injur	ry, ARF: acut	👰 🛱 🖉 🖉	D: chronic
10	obstructive pulmo	onary disease, SC	OFA sequential o	rgan failure asse	ssment, B	P: blood pressur	ە, AG: anion 🛣	acAG albumin	corrected
11	anion gap, LOS:	length of stay, ICL	J: intensive care	unit		-	late	202	
12	p<0.05*	0 ,,					já t		
14	a: body weight a	nd acute kidnev i	niurv were showi	n in MIMIC-IV co	hort while	body mass inde	o and acute اظ	p⊋o ∳oma≰failure were pr	esented in
15		t due to data avail	lability						
16			aomry.				Ind	Prie	
17							dat	ur (
18							a T	AB	
20								ES)	
21							ng,		
22							A		
23							trai		
24							nın	en.t	
25							ų a	<u> </u>	
20 27							nd	8	
28							SIM	2	
29								n on	
30							teo		
31							in	e 1(
32							00	, 2	
33 34							gle	025	
35							, ,	'at	
36								Age	
37								nc	
38								B	
39								iblio	
40 //1								ogra	
42								ηdε	
43								iqu	
44								e Q	
45			For peer review of	nly - http://bmjope	n.bmj.com/	site/about/guidelir	nes.xhtml	e	
46									
47									

	eT	able2: Associatio	BMJ Open	er discharge alive	36/bmjopen-2023-081597 cted by copyright, incluc CU		
	Crude	e Model	Mo	odel I	ng S Model II		
	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (9 5%)	p-value	
LOS in ICU (MIM	IC-IV cohort)		·		use	·	
ACAG	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.96 (0.34.0,98)	<0.001	
Higher ACAG	0.62 (0.53-0.73)	<0.001	0.61 (0.52-0.72)	<0.001	0.77 (0.8 5 2 2)	0.004	
LOS in ICU (eICL	J-CRD cohort)			·	d to	·	
ACAG	0.96 (0.95-0.98)	<0.001	0.96 (0.94-0.98)	<0.001	0.97 (0. ల్రేహ్రీద్ 99)	0.001	
Higher ACAG	0.74 (0.62-0.88)	<0.001	0.73 (0.61-0.88)	<0.001	0.85 (0.50 204)	0.140	

Model I adjusted for age, gender, race, and weight/body mass index. heart disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury, SOFA score, mean blod a ssure, oxygen saturation, potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin.

ng, Al training, and similar technologies p://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l





Page 31 of 36

36/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . cted by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.





Page 33 of 36

						ight, i
ure5: Su	bgroup a	nalysis				nclud
G: album	nin correc	ted anion	gap, HR: ha	zard ratio, CI: c	onfidence in	nterval, AMI: acute myocardial infarction, AF atral fibrillation, COPD: chronic
ructive p	oulmonary	/ disease, A	AKI: acute kic	iney injury, SOF	A: Sequentia	al Organ Failure Assessment of organization of the second se
ubgroup	ACAG<20	ACAG≥20		HR (95% CI)	p for interaction	s reigr
ge(years)	140	100		1 25 (0 02 to 0 20)	0.830	ate 224
Age<65	273	254		1.35 (0.82 to 2.22)	d ne t te
ender	215	204		1.43 (1.03 10 1.09	0.923	o t t
Female	188	159		1.41 (0.99 to 2.00))	ie S S T
Male	228	233		1.44 (1.03 to 2.01)	
MI					0.131	in c
No	229	230	֥	1.22 (0.89 to 1.68))	
Yes	187	162		1.75 (1.21 to 2.53)	at Co
ardiomypath	ıy				0.586	
No	311	291		1.47 (1.11 to 1.95)	
Yes	105	101	1	1.26 (0.77 to 2.07)	
F No	217	109		1 31 (0 03 to 1 85	0.494	
Yes	199	196		1.51 (0.95 to 1.65)	
alvular disor	ders	134	-	1.04 (1.10 to 2.10	0.660	
No	266	249		1.48 (1.10 to 1.99)	
Yes	150	143	+ -	1.32 (0.87 to 2.00))	
OPD					0.943	
No	375	362		1.42 (1.09 to 1.85)	S E
Yes	41	30		1.46 (0.67 to 3.20))	E <u>s</u>
iabetes					0.260	
No	300	225		1.58 (1.16 to 2.16))	
res	116	167		1.20 (0.82 to 1.76	0.400	
KI .	158	81		1 16 (0 68 to 1 90)	sch us
KI No	258	311		1.50 (1.13 to 1.98))	10
KI No Yes					0.157	
KI No Yes ypoalbumine	emia			1.24 (0.92 to 1.67))	ġi O2
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No	emia 221	251		1 70 11 10 1 0 07)	9 J
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes	emia 221 195	251 141		1.76 (1.16 to 2.67	/	S o
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes OFA	emia 221 195	251 141		1.76 (1.16 to 2.67	0.182	s. at
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes OFA <8	emia 221 195 221	251 141 138		1.76 (1.16 to 2.67)	0.182)	s. at Ag

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohortreporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

			Page		
		Reporting Item	Numberd		
Title and abstract	°Z				
Title	<u>#1a</u>	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Al training,		
Abstract	<u>#1b</u>	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	and simila		
Introduction			r tech		
Background / rationale	<u>#2</u>	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	nologies.		
Objectives	<u>#3</u>	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3		
Methods					
Study design	<u>#4</u>	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4		
Setting	<u>#5</u> For	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	3		
Page 35 of 36

BMJ Open

1			of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
2 3 4 5	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6a</u>	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.
6 7 8 9	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6b</u>	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
10 11 12 13 14	Variables	<u>#7</u>	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	<u>#8</u>	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
22 23	Bias	<u>#9</u>	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
24 25	Study size	<u>#10</u>	Explain how the study size was arrived at
26 27 28 29	Quantitative variables	<u>#11</u>	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why
30 31 32 33	Statistical methods	<u>#12a</u>	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
34 35 36	5		
37 38 39	Statistical methods	<u>#12b</u>	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
40 41 42 43	Statistical methods	<u>#12c</u>	Explain how missing data were addressed
44 45 46 47	Statistical methods	<u>#12d</u>	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed
48 49 50 51	Statistical methods	<u>#12e</u>	Describe any sensitivity analyses
52 53	5		
54 55	Results		
56 57 58 59 60	Participants	<u>#13a</u> For p	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

1 2 3 4			included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
5 6	Participants	<u>#13b</u>	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage
7 8 0	Participants	<u>#13c</u>	Consider use of a flow diagram
) 10 11	6		
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Descriptive data	<u>#14a</u>	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
19 20 21 22	Descriptive data	<u>#14b</u>	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
23 24	4		
25 26	Descriptive data	<u>#14c</u>	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
27 28 29	7		
30 31 32 33 34	Outcome data	<u>#15</u>	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
35 36 27	7		
37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Main results	<u>#16a</u>	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
44 45 46 47	Main results	<u>#16b</u>	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
48 49 50 51 52	Main results	<u>#16c</u>	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
53 54	/		
55 56	Other analyses	<u>#17</u>	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
57 58 59 60	Discussion	For p	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 37 of 36

BMJ Open

1 2	Key results	<u>#18</u>	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	
3 4 5 6 7	Limitations	<u>#19</u>	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	1
8 9 10 11 12	Interpretation	<u>#20</u>	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	
13 14 15	Generalisability	<u>#21</u>	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	1
16 17 18	Other Information			
19				
20 21 22 23 24	Funding	<u>#22</u>	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1
25				
26	The STROBE chec	klist is	distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY.	
27	This checklist was	comple	ted on 01 November 2023 using https://www.goodreports.org/ a tool made by the	
28		1 .		
29	EQUATOR Netwo	ork in co	Ilaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>	
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42 43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49 50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55 56				
50 57				
58				
59				
60		For	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic shock: a multi-center retrospective study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-081597.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Jun-2024
Complete List of Authors:	 Wang, Yuxing; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Tao, Yuhang; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Yuan, Ming; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital yu, pengcheng; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhang, Kai; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital jiang, ruhong; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital
Primary Subject Heading :	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Emergency medicine, Intensive care
Keywords:	CARDIOLOGY, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, Cardiovascular Disease

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic shock: a multi-center retrospective study

Yuxing Wang^{1*}, Yuhang Tao^{1*}, Ming Yuan¹, Pengcheng Yu¹, Kai Zhang¹,Hangying Ying^{1†}, Ruhong Jiang^{1†}

Affiliations:

1 Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital, School of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.

* Co-first authors contributed equally

† Co-corresponding authors contributed equally

Address for Corresponding Authors: Hangying Ying, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P.R. China. E-mail: yinghangying@zju.edu.cn

Ruhong Jiang, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P.R. China. E-mail: jrh@zju.edu.cn

Declarations of interest: none

Abstract:

Objectives: We aimed to investigate the association between albumin corrected anion gap (ACAG) and the prognosis of cardiogenic shock (CS).

Design: A multi-center retrospective cohort study.

Setting: Data were collected from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV) and eICU Collaborative Research Database (eICU-CRD) datasets.

Participants: A total of 808 and 700 individuals diagnosed with CS from MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD respectively.

Primary and secondary outcome: The primary endpoint is short-term all-cause mortality including ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day mortality. The secondary endpoints are 28-day free from ICU and length of time intensive care needed.

Results: CS patients were divided into two groups according to the admission ACAG value: normal ACAG group (\leq 20 mmol/L) and high ACAG group (> 20 mmol/L). CS patients with a higher ACAG level exhibited increased short-term all cause mortality rates, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.43, 95%CI=1.05-1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.38, 95%CI=1.02-1.86, p=0.036), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.47, 95%CI=1.12-1.94, p=0.006), and 28-day mortality (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95%CI: 1.11-1.83, p=0.007). A positive linear correlation was observed between ACAG values and short-term mortality rates by restricted cubic splines. In comparison to AG, ACAG displayed a larger area under the curve for short-term mortality prediction. Besides, the duration of intensive care was longer while 28-day free from ICU was shorter in patients with a higher ACAG level in both cohorts.

Conclusion: ACAG value was independently and strongly associated with the prognosis of CS, which was superior than the conventional AG.

Strengths and limitations of this study:

1. This is the first study to explore the association between ACAG and the prognosis of CS.

2.CS patients are from a diverse and heterogeneous population with mixed etiologies from two distinct high-quality datasets.

3. As a nature of retrospective, the selection bias cannot be avoided and detailed information about cardiac function are not available.

Keywords: Albumin corrected anion gap, anion gap, cardiogenic shock, intensive care unit, acute cardiovascular care

1.Introduction

Cardiogenic shock (CS), a life-threatening clinical condition, is characterized by acute end-organ hypoperfusion resulting from reduced cardiac output [1]. Despite substantial progress achieved in CS management over the past three decades, the mortality rate of CS remains unexpectedly high, making it a formidable challenge within the intensive care unit (ICU)[2]. It is worth noting the one-year mortality rate in CS patients is approximately 50%-60%, with a substantial portion of cases (70% to 80%) occurring within the initial 30 to 60 days[3]. Therefore, early identification of CS patients with a poor prognosis holds paramount clinical importance for tailoring effective risk reduction strategies.

Anion gap (AG), a biomarker reflecting unmeasured anions, is calculated using the following formula: AG (mmol/l) = (sodium + potassium) - (chloride + bicarbonate)[4]. It is extensively utilized to assess the acid-base disorders and to evaluate the prognosis of various diseases in clinical practice[5]. Nevertheless, the accuracy of AG in predicting the prognosis of patients in the ICU remains debatable. While some studies have suggested that AG can effectively predict short-term mortality in patients with critical illness, others have yielded inconclusive results[6]. In 1985, Gabow observed that the AG value could be influenced by serum albumin levels[7]. Given that albumin carries a negative charge, any fluctuations in albumin levels can impact the final AG measurement[8]. Consequently, for patients with critical illness in the ICU, AG may sometimes appear to be pseudo-normal since hypoalbuminemia is very common in the setting of intensive care[9]. In order to address this problem, Figge J et al. introduced the concept of the albumin corrected anion gap (ACAG) in 1998[10]. Hatherill et al. discovered that ACAG exhibited superior predictive capabilities for metabolic acidosis compared to AG in pediatric patients with shock[11]. Furthermore, numerous studies have demonstrated the association between ACAG and the prognosis of critical conditions including cardiac arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], acute kidney injury[14], sepsis[15], and acute pancreatitis[16].

However, to the best of our knowledge, the relationship between ACAG and the prognosis of CS has not been investigated. Furthermore, it remains uncertain whether ACAG offers an improved predictive capability for short-term mortality when compared to AG. Therefore, in this study, our objectives are as follows: 1) to exam the correlation between ACAG and short-term mortality in patients with CS; 2) to compare the admission values of AG and ACAG for predicting CS mortality and assessing the severity.

2.Materials and methods

2.1 Datasets and ethics

In this study, we utilized the following two publicly-accessible dataset: (1) Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care IV/MIMIC-IV v2.2 dataset (2008–2019)[17]; (2) eICU Collaborative Research Database/eICU-CRD dataset (2014–2015)[18]. MIMIC-IV is an updated version of the MIMIC-III, containing de-personalized data of 73,181 ICU stays for 50,906 unique patients at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center between 2008 and 2019 (a single center dataset). The eICU-CRD is also a de-identified database and

contains 200,859 ICU stays for 139,367 unique patients admitted to 335 ICUs at 208 hospitals across the United States (a multi-center dataset). Importantly, as there is no shared hospital involvement between the MIMIC and eICU program, the eICU-CRD dataset remains entirely independent of MIMIC-IV.

The first author has successfully completed the online course and passed the Examination for Protecting Human Research Participants (Record ID: 11841860). Hence, he was granted permission to extract data from the two datasets mentioned above. Given that all identifying information had been removed, our study was considered exempt from ethical review by the institutional research board. Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

2.2 Study population and endpoints

This is a multi-center, retrospective, observational study.. CS was defined based on the diagnostic codes from the MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD databases. These codes are in accordance with the standard clinical definitions. We excluded those who aged younger than 18 years old, length of stay (LOS) in ICU or hospital less than 24 hours, and lack of AG or albumin value within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. In cases of patients with multiple ICU admissions, we only included the first ICU stay for analysis. AG was calculated by the following formula: AG (mmol/l) = (sodium + potassium) - (chloride + bicarbonate). ACAG was determined as follows: ACAG (mmol/l) = [4.4-{albumin(g/dl)}] *2.5 + AG[11]. Additionally, we categorized the enrolled patients into two groups according to the admission values of ACAG based on the previous studies[14,15]: the

normal ACAG group (< 20 mmol/l) and the higher ACAG group (≥20 mmol/l).

The primary endpoint of this study was short-term all-cause mortality, which included ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, as well as 28-day mortality (not available in eICU-CRD). The secondary endpoints encompassed 28-day free from ICU (not available in eICU-CRD) and LOS in ICU. 28-day free from ICU is a composite outcome which integrates both mortality and LOS in ICU. It was calculated as 28 minus the days spent in the ICU during the first 28 day and the dead patients were assigned the value of zero. LOS in ICU was defined as the duration that intensive care was required and was calculated based on the time to discharge alive from ICU, with death in ICU as a completing risk.

2.3 Variable extraction

We extracted the variables with structured query language in Navicat Premium (version 15.0.12). The codes for data extraction were based on <u>https://github.com/MIT-LCP/eicu-code</u> and <u>https://github.com/MIT-LCP/eicu-code</u>. For each patient, we collected a wide range of variables including demographic information, comorbidities, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, vital signs, and laboratory data. Demographic information included age at admission, gender, weight/body mass index, and race. Acute myocardial infarction, hypertension, atrial fibrillation, valvular disease,

BMJ Open

cardiomyopathy, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes, and malignancy were identified as comorbidities. Vital signs encompassed heart rate, respiratory rate, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, mean blood pressure, and oxygen saturation. Additionally, we collected laboratory data, which included white blood cell, hemoglobin, platelet, bilirubin, creatinine, sodium, potassium, chloride, bicarbonate, albumin, AG, and ACAG.

All vital signs, laboratory data, and the SOFA score were extracted and calculated within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. If a variable was measured multiple times within the initial 24 hours of ICU admission, we used the first recorded value for analysis.

2.4 Statistical analysis

To address missing values, we initially conducted multiple imputation using chained equations. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the percentage of incomplete cases was 3.1%, and in the eICU-CRD cohort, it was 16.7%. Accordingly, we generated 5 datasets for MIMIC-IV and 17 datasets for eICU-CRD for further analysis and the results were combined according to the Rubin's rules[19].

We compared the baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients based on their hospital survival status and ACAG levels. Categorical variables were presented as numbers plus percentages and compared using Pearson's chi-square test. Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed to assess the distribution of continues variables. Since all continuous variables in two cohorts were both skewed-distributed, they were expressed as median [inter-quartile range (IQR)] and compared by Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Pearson correlation analyses were utilized to investigate the association between AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score. The ability of AG and ACAG to predict short-term mortality was compared by the area under curves (AUC) of the receiver operating characteristic curves (ROC). Z test was used to compare the predictive ability of AG and ACAG following the method of Delong et al[20]. Threshold values were determined by identifying the values that provided the highest specificity and sensitivity by calculating the Youden Index.

To evaluate the relationship between ACAG and ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day allcause mortality, ACAG was initially analyzed as a categorical variable (normal ACAG group and high ACAG group) and then as a continuous variable (ACAG values). Kaplan-Meier survival curves and Cox proportional hazards regression models were employed to calculate hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals. Furthermore, we investigated the association between ACAG values and short-term mortality using restricted cubic splines with four knots at 25%, 50%, 75% and 95%. Based on the previous studies and theoretical considerations, we selected clinically relevant confounding factors as covariates in the regression model. Variance inflation factor was used to test the multicollinearity between each covariate and the covariates with a high degree of collinearity (variance inflation factor > 5) were removed from the regression model. Finally, we constructed two models for adjustments. In model I, we adjusted for confounders including age, gender, race, and weight/body mass index. In model II, we further adjusted acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular heart disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury,

SOFA score, mean blood pressure, oxygen saturation, potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin.

Since ICU expire resulted in a shorter LOS, the correlation between ACAG and LOS in ICU was analyzed using the Fine-Gray competing risk model. In this model, a higher HR for earlier alive ICU discharge indicated a shorter LOS while a lower HR indicated a longer LOS in ICU.

Subgroup analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationship between ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality within various subpopulations, including age (<65 years, \geq 65 years), gender (male, female), acute myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, hypoalbuminemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL), and SOFA score (<8, \geq 8) using the stratified multivariable Cox proportional hazards model.

All statistical analysis were performed with R version 4.1.2. A P value < 0.05 for two sides is considered statistical significance.

3.Results

3.1 Baseline characteristics of enrolled patients

The flowchart of our study was presented in *Fig.1*. The differences between included and excluded patients were summarized in *eTable1*.Overall, a total of 808 and 700 individuals diagnosed with CS were enrolled from the MIMIC-IV dataset and eICU-CRD dataset respectively. The short-term mortality rates of CS patients were similar in both cohorts. Specifically, the ICU mortality rates were 29%, 30% while in-hospital mortality rates were 36%, 37% in MIMIC-IV cohort and eICU-CRD cohort, respectively. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the 28-day all-cause mortality rates were 39%.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Table1 summarized the baseline characteristic of enrolled patients stratified according to the ACAG level. Obviously, patients with a higher ACAG level exhibited a greater predisposition to acute kidney injury/acute renal failure and had elevated values of the SOFA score, white blood cell count, sodium, potassium, creatinine, and total bilirubin. In comparison to the normal ACAG group, the short-term mortality rates (including ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, and 28-day mortality) were significantly higher while the 28-day free from ICU were notably shorter (20 [2-25] vs 9 [0-23], p<0.001) in patients with a higher ACAG level.

Furthermore, the baseline characteristic of enrolled patients stratified according to the hospital survival status were summarized in *eTable2*. Notably, we found that the ACAG value was significantly higher in the group of patients who did not survive in hospital, both in the MIMIC-IV cohort (21.0 [18.0-25.3] vs 19.0 [16.5-22.5], p<0.001) and the eICU-CRD cohort (22.0 [17.7-27.0] vs 19.0 [16.2-23.0], p<0.001). Additionally, among the non-survivors during hospitalization, we observed a higher rate of acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, lower values of hemoglobin, albumin, bicarbonate, and higher levels of age, creatinine, SOFA score.

3.2 Comparison of AG and ACAG for mortality prediction and severity

assessment

The predictive performance of ACAG versus AG for ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day allcause mortality was assessed through ROC curve analysis (e*Fig.1*). As shown in *Table2*, ACAG outperformed AG for short-term mortality prediction, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.654 [95%CI: 0.613-0.696] vs 0.632 [95%CI: 0.589-0.674], Z =2.99, p= 0.003; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.613 [95%CI: 0.566-0.660] vs 0.594 [95%CI: 0.546-0.642], Z = 2.99, p=0.003), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: ACU: 0.629 [95%CI: 0.589-0.669] vs 0.599 [95%CI: 0.558-0.641], Z =4.13, p< 0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.628 [95%CI: 0.585-0.671] vs 0.603 [95%CI: 0.559-0.647], Z = 3.92, p< 0.001), and 28-day mortality prediction (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.641 [95%CI:0.602-0.680] vs 0.614 [95%CI: 0.574-0.654], Z = 3.95, p< 0.001).

Additionally, we conducted correlation analyses to investigate the association between AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score using Pearson's method. as depicted in eFigure2. In both cohorts, we observed positive correlations between both AG and ACAG values and the SOFA score (both p-values < 0.001). Intriguingly, we found that the correlation coefficient for ACAG was significantly higher than that of AG (MIMIC-IV cohort: AG: R=0.28 vs ACAG: R=0.35; eICU-CRD cohort: AG: R=0.30 vs ACAG: R=0.35). These findings highlight the stronger positive correlation between ACAG and the SOFA score, underscoring its potential as a valuable prognostic indicator.

3.3 Increased ACAG level correlates with higher risk of short-term morality

As demonstrated in *eFig.3*, the Kaplan–Meier survival curve showed an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate among patients with a higher ACAG level (HR: 1.85, 95%CI: 1.48-2.32, log-rank test, p-value <0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort. Furthermore, even after adjusting for confounding variables in model II, we observed that the individuals with an evaluated ACAG level still exhibited an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95%CI: 1.11-1.83, p=0.007).

Similarly, the relationship between ACAG levels and ICU/in-hospital mortality was assessed through multivariable Cox regression models as well. As presented in *Table3*, in comparison to the normal ACAG group, the results showed that the CS patients with a higher ACAG level experienced increased rates of ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.43, 95%CI=1.05-1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.38, 95%CI=1.02-1.86, p=0.036) and in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR:1.31, 95%CI=1.01-1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR:1.47, 95%CI=1.12-1.94, p=0.006).

3.4 Linear relationship of ACAG value and short-term all-cause mortality

We extended our analysis to assess the association between ACAG values and short-term all-cause mortality rates. As presented in *Table3*, the adjusted HRs with 95%CI were 1.05 (1.03-1.07) for 28-day mortality, 1.04 (1.01-1.06) for ICU mortality, and 1.04 (1.02-1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the MIMIC-IV cohort while 1.06 (1.03-1.09) for ICU mortality and 1.05 (1.02-1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the eICU-CRD cohort respectively.

To further investigate the relationship between ACAG values and short-term allcause mortality rates, we utilized the adjusted restricted cubic splines. As shown in *Fig.2*, we observed a linear correlation between ACAG and short-term all-cause mortality, which includes 28-day mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.651), ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.693; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.183), and inhospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.948; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for non-linear=0.404) in both cohorts. These findings suggest that a 1-unit increase in ACAG value is associated with approximately 5% increase in short-term all-cause mortality rates among patients with CS.

3.5 Association of ACAG and earlier alive discharge in ICU

Cumulative incidence ratio (CIR) of earlier discharge alive in ICU among ACAG levels was shown in *eFig.4*. Obviously, the unadjusted CIR for earlier alive discharge in ICU was significantly higher in lower ACAG group. The robustness of the results was further confirmed using Fine-Gray competing risk models after adjusting for confounding variables (*eTable3*). In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the adjusted HR (95%CI) for the relationship between ACAG level and earlier alive discharge in ICU was 0.77 (95% CI= 0.65–0.92; p = 0.004). However, in the eICU-CRD cohort, this relationship did not reach statistical significance (adjusted HR: 0.85, 0.69–1.04; p = 0.140).

Additionally, ACAG was analyzed as a continuous variable. Intriguingly, the association between ACAG value and earlier discharge alive was statistically significant in both cohorts, with adjusted HRs (95%CI) of 0.96 (95% CI=0.94-0.98; p <0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 0.97 (95% CI=0.95-0.99; p=0.001) in the eICU-CRD cohort. In summary, the ACAG value was inversely associated with earlier discharge alive in the ICU for patients with CS.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

3.6 Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analysis was conducted to assess the stability of the consistency for the relationship between ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality across various subpopulations, including age group (<65 years, \geq 65 years), gender group (male, female), SOFA score (<8, \geq 8), and different clinical conditions such as acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury, hypoalbuminemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL). Adjustments for confounding factors were made as in Model II. As depicted in e*Fig.5*, all p-values for interaction tests within different subgroups were greater than 0.05, indicating that the relationship between ACAG level and 28-day all-cause mortality remained stable and consistent across the various subpopulations.

4.Discussion

In this large-sample retrospective study based on two distinct public-accessible datasets, we investigate the association of ACAG, a novel biomarker indicating metabolic acid load, and the short-term prognosis of CS patients with mixed etiologies. The main findings of our study are as follows: (1) ACAG is strongly and independently associated

BMJ Open

with short-term all-cause mortality rates (including ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day mortality) and the duration of intensive care required in patients with CS, even after adjusting for disease severity using SOFA score; (2) ACAG outperforms AG in its ability to predict short-term mortality and evaluate the severity of CS.

It is widely acknowledged that metabolic acidosis is a frequent event in the setting of intensive care and has been consistently demonstrated to be associated with adverse outcomes in individuals with critical illness[21]. Notably, in patients with severe cardiovascular disorders, particularly those suffering from CS, acidemia may trigger a detrimental cycle via impairing cardiac contractile function, inducing malignant arrhythmias, and exacerbating circulatory failure[22]. Additionally, severe acidemia may further compromise the responses to catecholamines of cardiovascular systems and weaken the effectiveness of vasopressors to reverse hypotension[23]. A prior study has demonstrated that the severity of acidosis is strongly and positively correlated with both the degree of shock and short-term mortality rates in CS patients[24].

As one of the simplest methods for assessing acid-base balance, the anion gap (AG) is a widely used biomarker in clinical practice. The relationship between AG and shortterm mortality in patients with critical illness has been extensively investigated[25]. A previous study demonstrated a J-shaped association between AG value and the 30-day all-cause mortality rate in patients with CS based on MIMIC-III dataset[26]. Similarly, our study revealed that AG values were significantly higher in non-survivors when compared to survivors (MIMIC-IV cohort: 18 [15-22] vs 16 [14-20], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 18 [14-23] vs 16 [13-19], p<0.001) in our study. Moreover, AG has also been used for risk stratification in the setting of acute cardiovascular care. Recently, a study has combined the AG and SOFA to create the AG-SOFA score, which displayed improved predictive capabilities for short-term mortality in cardiovascular intensive care units[27]. Similarly, Eric et al incorporated AG into the BOS,MA2 score and exhibited superior performance than other pre-existing risk scores systems for CS prognostication[28]. However, the physiological AG primarily consists of inorganic phosphate and albuminate, which is a weak anion derived from serum albumin[5]. Given the involvement of albumin in the acidbase equilibrium, it may perplex the interpretation of acid-base data[29]. Theoretically, hypoalbuminemia can lead to a decrease in albuminate levels, resulting in a reduction in AG values[10]. Therefore, in the case of a patient with hypoalbuminemia and a normal AG value, it might indicate the presence of plasma acids. Similarly, we might underestimate the severity of metabolic acidosis based on the AG values for patients with low albumin levels. Notably, hypoalbuminemia is very frequent among patients with critical illness and has been demonstrated to be associated with unfavorable outcomes including higher rates of short-term mortality and longer LOS in ICU. The incidence of hypoalbuminemia is striking in patients with CS, with a reported rate of 75% from the previous CardShock study[30]. Similarly, our study also observed an exceptionally high frequency of hypoalbuminemia in patients with CS. Specifically, the incidence of hypoalbuminemia (defined as albumin < 3.5 g/dL) is 58.4% (472/808) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 74.1% (519/700) in the eICU-CRD cohort respectively. Furthermore, a recent study has established that serum albumin is an independent predictor for short-term mortality in CS patients [20]. Likewise, in this study, we found that the value of albumin

BMJ Open

was significantly lower in hospital death group than survival group (MIMIC-IV cohort: 3.4 [3.0-3.7] vs 3.1 [2.7-3.6], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 3.1 [2.7-3.6] vs 2.9 [2.5-3.3], p<0.001).

ACAG, which combines the AG and serum albumin, has been proposed as a replacement for AG in differentiating acidosis caused by acid load or base deficit from a panel of expert's consensus about metabolic acidosis management[31]. As a ubiquitous abnormality in patients with critical illness, hypoalbuminemia has been demonstrated to complicate the interpretation of acid-base data when using diagnostic methods based on base excess or plasma bicarbonate concentration alongside AG [29]. In the presence of hypoalbuminemia, taking albumin levels into account can reveal the presence of plasma acid, which might otherwise be overlooked when relying solely on AG or base excess values. Previous studies have demonstrated that ACAG is a superior predictor compared to conventional AG for short-term prognosis prediction in patients with critical illness like cardiopulmonary arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], and sepsis[15]. Therefore, we hypothesized that ACAG may perform better than AG, particularly in a population at high risk of metabolic acidosis and hypoalbuminemia. As previously discussed, patients with CS are not only prone to hypoalbuminemia, but are also susceptible to metabolic acidosis. Hence, we posited that ACAG might outperform AG for risk stratification in the setting of CS. In this study, we compared AG and ACAG for mortality prediction and severity assessment for CS patients in two cohorts. Through the ROC curve analysis, we found that ACAG exhibited the highest AUC and Youden's index for short-term morality prediction in both cohorts, suggesting the better short-term mortality predicting capacity than AG for CS. Furthermore, using the Spearman's methods, we discovered that both AG and ACAG were positively correlated with the SOFA score. Importantly, the correlation coefficients with the SOFA score were significantly higher for ACAG when compared to AG. Taken together, our findings support the superiority of ACAG in predicting prognosis and estimating disease severity in patients with CS.

As a medical emergency requiring prompt evaluation and intervention, the mortality risk of CS is highest during the initial 48 hours following the onset of shock[32]. Therefore, mortality assessment in CS patients should be performed as early as possible after ICU admission. Given the rapid and widespread availability of AG and albumin in clinical practice, we recommend the inclusion of baseline ACAG levels in the prognostic biomarkers for patients with CS.

Indeed, our study has notable strengths. Firstly, it represents the pioneering study to explore the association between ACAG and the prognosis of CS. Second, the CS patients are from a diverse and heterogeneous patient population with mixed etiologies, enhancing its relevance and applicability to real-world clinical scenarios. Third, the data in this study are derived from two distinct high-quality datasets and the results are consistent with each other. However, several limitations of this study are deserved discussion. First, as the nature of retrospective, selection bias cannot be avoided. Second, detailed information about cardiac function (like left ventricular ejection fraction, ventricular size) and other important cardiac biomarkers (like troponin, N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide) are not included in this study due to a large amount of missing data. Third, we could not calculate CS stages of Society for Cardiovascular Angiography

and Interventions accurately due to specific data limitations in the MIMIC-IV and eICU databases. Fourth, the association between ACAG and the short-term mortality are established based on the first ACAG value within the first 24h of ICU admission. Monitoring the dynamic changes of ACAG may be valuable for patients with CS. Further studies are needed to explore the relationship between the dynamic changes of ACAG and mortality of CS.

5.Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that the baseline ACAG value following ICU admission independently predicts the short-term mortality in patients with CS, which is better than AG. Given the high mortality risk of CS during the early phase of ICU admission, baseline ACAG value may help clinicians to identify patients at high risk of mortality. Therefore, we propose to incorporate the baseline ACAG into the risk stratification systems for CS.

Data availability

The datasets used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding

None

Author contributions

Yuxing Wang: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Data curation, Methodology, Resources. Yuhang Tao: Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft. Ming Yuan: Writing - review & editing. Pengcheng Yu: Writing - review & editing. Kai Zhang: Writing - review & editing. Hangying Ying: Project administration, Supervision Validation, and Writing - review & editing. Ruhong Jiang: Project administration, Supervision Validation, and Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest None

Reference:

- Van Diepen S, Katz JN, Albert NM, *et al.* Contemporary Management of Cardiogenic Shock: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;136. doi: 10.1161/CIR.000000000000525
- 2 Hunziker L, Radovanovic D, Jeger R, *et al.* Twenty-Year Trends in the Incidence and Outcome of Cardiogenic Shock in AMIS Plus Registry. *Circ: Cardiovascular Interventions.* 2019;12:e007293.
- 3 Berg DD, Bohula EA, Morrow DA. Epidemiology and causes of cardiogenic shock.

 Current Opinion in Critical Care. 2021;27:401–8.

- 4 Posen AK, Paloucek FP, Petzel R. Anion gap physiology and faults of the correction formula. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2022;79:446–51.
- 5 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Serum Anion Gap: Its Uses and Limitations in Clinical Medicine. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2007;2:162–74.
- 6 Rocktaeschel J, Morimatsu H, Uchino S, *et al.* Unmeasured anions in critically ill patients: Can they predict mortality?*: *Critical Care Medicine*. 2003;31:2131–6.
- 7 Gabow PA. Disorders associated with an altered anion gap. *Kidney International*. 1985;27:472–83.
- 8 Figge J, Bellomo R, Egi M. Quantitative relationships among plasma lactate, inorganic phosphorus, albumin, unmeasured anions and the anion gap in lactic acidosis. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2018;44:101–10.
- 9 Gatta A, Verardo A, Bolognesi M. Hypoalbuminemia. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2012;7:193–9.
- 10 Figge J, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Anion gap and hypoalbuminemia: *Critical Care Medicine*. 1998;26:1807–10.
- 11 Hatherill M. Correction of the anion gap for albumin in order to detect occult tissue anions in shock. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2002;87:526–9.
- 12 Hagiwara S, Oshima K, Furukawa K, *et al.* The Significance of Albumin Corrected Anion Gap in Patients with Cardiopulmonary Arrest. *Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2013;19:283–8.
- 13 Jian L. Association between albumin corrected anion gap and 30-day all-cause mortality of critically ill patients with acute myocardial infarction: a retrospective analysis based on the MIMIC-IV database. 2023.
- 14 Zhong L, Xie B, Ji X-W, *et al.* The association between albumin corrected anion gap and ICU mortality in acute kidney injury patients requiring continuous renal replacement therapy. *Intern Emerg Med.* 2022;17:2315–22.
- 15 Hu T, Zhang Z, Jiang Y. Albumin corrected anion gap for predicting in-hospital mortality among intensive care patients with sepsis: A retrospective propensity score matching analysis. *Clinica Chimica Acta*. 2021;521:272–7.
- 16 Li P, Shi L, Yan X, *et al.* Albumin Corrected Anion Gap and the Risk of in-Hospital Mortality in Patients with Acute Pancreatitis: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *JIR*. 2023;Volume 16:2415–22.

17 Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, *et al.* MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Sci Data*. 2023;10:1.

- 18 Pollard TJ, Johnson AEW, Raffa JD, *et al.* The eICU Collaborative Research Database, a freely available multi-center database for critical care research. *Sci Data*. 2018;5:180178.
- 19 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Statist Med*. 2011;30:377–99.
- 20 DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the Areas under Two or More Correlated Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves: A Nonparametric Approach. *Biometrics*. 1988;44:837.
- 21 Gunnerson KJ, Kellum JA. Acid–base and electrolyte analysis in critically ill patients: are we ready for the new millennium?: *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2003;9:468–73.
- 22 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Metabolic acidosis: pathophysiology, diagnosis and management. *Nat Rev Nephrol.* 2010;6:274–85.
- 23 Jentzer JC, Kashani KB, Wiley BM, *et al.* Laboratory Markers of Acidosis and Mortality in Cardiogenic Shock: Developing a Definition of Hemometabolic Shock. *Shock.* 2022;57:31–40.
- 24 Jentzer JC, Schrage B, Patel PC, *et al.* Association Between the Acidemia, Lactic Acidosis, and Shock Severity With Outcomes in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock. *JAHA*. 2022;11:e024932.
- 25 Glasmacher SA, Stones W. Anion gap as a prognostic tool for risk stratification in critically ill patients a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2015;16:68.
- 26 Zhang T, Wang J, Li X. Association Between Anion Gap and Mortality in Critically III Patients with Cardiogenic Shock. *IJGM*. 2021;Volume 14:4765–73.
- 27 Zhou Y-H, Pang S, Miao G-R, *et al.* Combining the anion gap with the sequential organ failure assessment score to evaluate the short-term prognosis of patients in the cardiac intensive care unit. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2023;370:381–7.
- 28 Yamga E, Mantena S, Rosen D, *et al.* Optimized Risk Score to Predict Mortality in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit. *JAHA*. 2023;12:e029232.
- 29 Fencl V, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Diagnosis of Metabolic Acid–Base Disturbances in Critically III Patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2000;162:2246–51.

- 30 Jäntti T, Tarvasmäki T, Harjola V-P, *et al.* Hypoalbuminemia is a frequent marker of increased mortality in cardiogenic shock. *PLoS ONE*. 2019;14:e0217006.
- 31 for the Société de Réanimation de Langue Française (SRLF), the Société Française de Médecine d'Urgence (SFMU), Jung B, *et al.* Diagnosis and management of metabolic acidosis: guidelines from a French expert panel. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2019;9:92.
- 32 Wigger O, Bloechlinger S, Berger D, et al. Baseline serum bicarbonate levels independently predict short-term mortality in critically ill patients with ischaemic cardiogenic shock. European Heart Journal: Acute Cardiovascular Care. 2018;7:45for occurrence with a second 52.

Figure lengeds:

Fig.1: The flow chart of this study.

LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit, AG: anion gap

Fig.2: Restricted cubic spline for the associations between ACAG value and shortterm mortality

Fig.2A and Fig.2B showed the ICU mortality while Fig.3C and Fig.3D showed the inhospital mortality in MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD cohort respectively. 28-day mortality was shown in Fig.2E.

d The solid lines represent the adjusted hazard ratios (aHRs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) after multivariable adjustment in Model II.

Histograms represent the distribution of concentrations of ACAG in two cohorts.

3 4	Table1: B	aseline cha	racteristics of o	enrolled p	atients strati	fied by ACAG	level in	
5		MIMIC-IV co	ohort (n=808)			elCU-CRD c	ohort (n=700)	
97 8 9	Overall (n=808)	Normal ACAG (n=416)	Higher ACAG (n=392)	p-value	Overall (n=700)	Normal ACAG (n=353)	Higher ACAG (n=347)	p-value
10Demographic	characteristics				I	1	1	
₁₁ Age 1 <u>2</u>	70 (60, 80)	71 (61, 81)	70 (60, 79)	0.3	67 (57, 76)	68 (57, 77)	67 (57, 75)	0.2
13Gender	1	1		0.2		1		-
14Female 15	347 (43%)	188 (45%)	159 (41%)		255 (36%)	130 (37%)	125 (36%)	Prot
16Male 17	461 (57%)	228 (55%)	233 (59%)		445 (64%)	223 (63%)	222 (64%)	ected
¹⁸ Weight/BMIª 19	80 (68, 95)	79 (67, 94)	81 (68, 97)	0.2	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	0.6 by
²⁰ Ethnicity	1			0.3		1	1	0.016
⁴ White 22	497 (62%)	255 (61%)	242 (62%)		531 (76%)	276 (78%)	255 (73%)	ight, i
⁴³ Black 24 25	71 (8.8%)	34 (8.2%)	37 (9.4%)		83 (12%)	32 (9.1%)	51 (15%)	ncludi
26 ^{Hispanic}	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.9%)	7 (1.8%)		32 (4.6%)	14 (4.0%)	18 (5.2%)	ng for
28Asian 29	18 (2.2%)	13	5 (1.3%)		19 (2.7%)	15 (4.2%)	4 (1.2%)	uses
30Others/unkno	203 (25%)	102	101 (26%) 🧹	6	35 (5.0%)	16 (4.5%)	19 (5.5%)	relate
³² Comorbidities					1		1	d to
33AMI 34	349 (43%)	187 (45%)	162 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)	152 (43%)	118 (34%)	0.014 to up
³⁵ Hypertension 36	241 (30%)	143 (34%)	98 (25%)	0.004*	365 (52%)	186 (53%)	179 (52%)	0.8 da
³⁷ Cardiomyopa ³⁸ thy	206 (25%)	105 (25%)	101 (26%)	0.9	119 (17%)	69 (20%)	50 (14%)	
Atrial	393 (49%)	199 (48%)	194 (49%)	0.6	144 (21%)	77 (22%)	67 (19%)	0.4 ing, A
4 ₂ VHD	293 (36%)	150 (36%)	143 (36%)	>0.9	99 (14%)	64 (18%)	35 (10%)	0.002train
44AKI/ARFª 45	573 (71%)	259 (62%)	314 (80%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	150 (42%)	173 (50%)	0.051ق ف
46COPD 47	71 (8.8%)	41 (9.9%)	30 (7.7%)	0.3	101 (14%)	53 (15%)	48 (14%)	0.7 d. sim
⁴⁸ Diabetes 49	283 (35%)	116 (28%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	158 (23%)	70 (20%)	88 (25%)	0.080 <u>ਬ</u> ਰ
⁵⁰ Malignancy 51	80 (9.9%)	38 (9.1%)	42 (11%)	0.5	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.7%)	10 (2.9%)	0.3 chnol
SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	9 (6, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10)	9 (7, 12)	<0.00 [°] #*
Vital signs		. ,					· ·	
55 56	90 (77, 108)	87 (74, 102)	93 (80, 111)	<0.001*	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 105)	93 (78, 111)	0.088
7Respiratory 8 ^{rate}	20 (17, 24)	20 (16, 23)	21 (17, 26)	<0.001*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)	20 (17, 25)	0.083
oSvstolic BP	111 (97	114 (99	109 (95	02	107 (91	107 (92	107 (90 126)	0.8

60

2								
3	129)	127)	129)		122)	121)		
⁴ Diastolic BP	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 78)	0.5	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73)	62 (50, 77)	0.3
Mean BP	79 (68, 91)	79 (69, 91)	78 (66, 91)	0.4	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88)	78 (64, 91)	0.4
9 SpO2	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97(93, 100)	0.12	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (93, 100)	>0.9
1 Laboratory dat	a	,	I	1	, ,	,	1	
12White blood 13cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 16)	13 (9, 20)	0.002*
1 <mark>4Hemoglobin</mark> 15 16	11.5 (9.8, 13.4)	11.7 (10.1, 13.5)	11.4 (9.6, 13.1)	0.045*	12.1 (10.1, 13.9)	12.2 (10.3, 14.0)	11.8 (9.8, 13.7)	0.2 Protect
1 ⁷ Platelet 18 19	211 (152, 278)	210 (154, 278)	213 (149, 278)	0.8	196 (145, 260)	203 (151, 253)	192 (139, 268)	0.4 by co
20 21 22 23	138 (134, 141)	138 (135, 141)	137 (133, 141)	0.2	137 (134, 141)	137 (135, 140)	138 (133, 141)	>0.9
25 24 25 26	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.3 (3.8, 4.7)	4.6 (3.9, 5.1)	<0.001*	4.2 (3.7, 4.9)	4.1 (3.7, 4.7)	4.4 (3.7, 5.2)	< 0.00 th *
27Chloride 28 29	103 (98, 107)	104 (100,10 8)	101 (96, 106)	<0.001*	103 (98, 107)	104 (100, 108)	101 (96, 105)	<0.009 [°] * Uses r
30Bicarbonate 31	20 (17, 23)	22 (20, 25)	18 (15, 21) 🧹	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	24 (21, 27)	19 (16, 22)	<0.00 a teo
32AG 33	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	167 (13, 21)	13 (12, 15)	21 (18, 24)	<0.00
³⁴ Albumin 35	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.2 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.8, 3.6)	2.9 (2.5, 3.4)	<0.00
30 37 38 30	20.0 (17.0, 23.5)	17.1 (15.3, 18.5)	23.5 (21.8, 26.5)	<0.001*	19.9 (16.7, 24.2)	16.7 (14.8, 18.3)	24.2 (21.9, 28.0)	<0.00ata min
40 ^{Creatine}	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.2 (0.9, 1.7)	1.8 (1.3, 2.9)	<0.001*	1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	1.3 (0.9, 1.8)	1.8 (1.3, 2.8)	
4 ₂ Bilirubin 4 <u>3</u>	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.7 (0.4, 1.0)	0.8 (0.5, 1.5)	<0.001*	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1.3)	0.9 (0.5, 1.6)	0.055train
44Outcomes	1						1	ຼຸຍ
45LOS in ICU	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	0.5	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 8)	5 (3, 9)	0.3 an
46LOS in 47hospital	10 (5, 17)	10 (6, 17)	10 (5, 18)	0.3	8 (5, 14)	9 (5, 15)	8 (4, 14)	0.017 <mark>%</mark> <u>s</u>
4 ⁸ ICU death 49	231 (29%)	85 (20%)	146 (37%)	<0.001*	211 (30%)	87 (25%)	124 (36%)	0.001 ត្
⁵⁰ Hospital ⁵¹ death	289 (36%)	122 (29%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	260 (37%)	102 (29%)	158 (46%)	<0.00 ³ *
⁵² 28-day ⁵³ death ^b	315 (39%)	126 (30%)	189 (48%)	<0.001*				gies.
5528-day free 56from ICU ^b	17 (0, 24)	20 (2, 25)	9 (0, 23)	<0.001*				
57	Abbreviation	: BMI: bodv	mass index. AM	II: acute m	vocardial infa	rction, AKI: acu	ute kidnev	
58	iniury ARF	acute rena	I failure. COPD	chronic c	bstructive n	Imonary disea	se. SOFA	
59	sequential or	nan failure	assessment RD	hlood pre		nion dan $\Delta C \Delta C$	Galbumin	
60	Sequential O	yan lanure	abbeabilient, DF	. biood pie		non gap, ACA		

1	
3	corrected anion gap, LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit
4 5	p<0.05*
6	a: body weight and acute kidney injury were shown in MIMIC-IV cohort while body mass
7 8	index and acute renal failure were presented in eICU-CRD cohort due to data availability.
9	b: 28-day all-cause mortality and 28-day free from ICU were reported in MIMIC-IV cohort.
10	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23 24	
25	
26	
27 28	
29	
30 31	
32	
33 34	
35	
36 37	
38	
39 40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45 46	
47	
48 49	
50	
51 52	
53	
54 55	
56	
57	
59	
60	18

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Table2: ROC curve analysis of AG/ACAG and short-term mortality

	Factor	AUC	95%CI	Cut-off	Sensitivity	Specificity	Youden's index		
ICU mortality	AG	0.654	0.613-0.696	15.5	0.758	0.426	0.184		
(MIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.632	0.589-0.674	19.6	0.680	0.532	0.212		
ICU mortality	AG	0.594	0.546-0.642	18.1	0.526	0.654	0.180		
(eICU-CRD)	ACAG	0.613	0.566-0.660	25.4	0.351	0.857	0.208		
Hospital mortality	AG	0.599	0.558-0.641	20.5	0.346	0.796	0.142		
(MIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.629	0.589-0.669	24.6	0.322	0.869	0.191		
Hospital mortality	AG	0.603	0.559-0.647	18.1	0.523	0.673	0.196		
(elCU-CRD)	ACAG	0.628	0.585-0.671	21.6	0.527	0.705	0.232		
28-day mortality	AG	0.614	0.574-0.654	21.5	0.295	0.870	0.165		
(MIMIC-IV))	ACAG	0.641	0.602-0.680	22.9	0.400	0.805	0.205		

Abbreviation: AUC: area under curve, CI: confidence interval, AG: anion gap, ACAG:

or operiod is the second

albumin corrected anion gap,

2							
3 ⊿		Table3: Associat	ion of ACA	G and short-term a	II-cause m	ortality	
4 5		Crude Mod	lel	Model I	-	Model	I
6		HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value
7	28-day mortality (MIN	1IC-IV cohort)			.0.004		
8	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.07 (1.06-1.09)	<0.001	1.08 (1.06-1.10)	<0.001	1.05 (1.03-1.07)	<0.001
9	Higher ACAG level	1.85(1.48-2.32)	<0.001	1.90 (1.52-2.39)	<0.001	1.42 (1.11-1.83)	0.007
10			<0.001	1 07 (1 05 1 00)	<0.001	1.04 (1.01.1.06)	0.005
11		1.00 (1.04-1.09)	<0.001	1.07 (1.03-1.09)	<0.001	1.04 (1.01-1.00)	0.003
12	ICU mortality (elCU-0	<u>RD cohort</u>	10.001	1.07 (1.40-1.91)	NO.001	1.40 (1.00-1.90)	0.022
13	ACAG (per 1 unit)		<0.001	1 07 (1 05-1 09)	<0.001	1 06 (1 03-1 09)	<0.001
14	Higher ACAG level	1.61 (1.22-2.11)	<0.001	1.65 (1.25-2.17)	<0.001	1.38 (1.02-1.86)	0.036
15	In-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort)					
16	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.04 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
1/ 10	Higher ACAG level	1.51 (1.20-1.91)	<0.001	1.58 (1.25-2.01)	<0.001	1.31 (1.01-1.71)	0.041
10	In-hospital mortality (eICU-CRD cohort)	•		•	· · · ·	
20	ACAG (per 1 unit)	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.05 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
20	Higher ACAG level	1.81 (1.41-2.33)	<0.001	1.86 (1.44-2.39)	<0.001	1.47 (1.12-1.94)	0.006
27	Abbrevi	ation: ACAG: album	nin corrected	l anion gap, HR:	hazard rati	o, CI: confidence	
23	interval						
24	Model I	adjusted for ane de	nder race a	nd weight/hody may	se indev		
25			nuer, race, a				
26	Model	I adjusted for age,	gender, rad	ce, weight/body ma	ass index,	acute myocardial	
27	infarctio	n, cardiomyopathy,	atrial fibrilla	tion, valvular hear	t disease,	diabetes, chronic	
28	obstruc	tive pulmonary disea	ise, acute ki	dney injury, SOFA	score, mea	n blood pressure,	
29	oxvaen	saturation potassiur	n chloride c	reatine and total bi	lirubin	•	
30	oxygon						
31							
32 22							
22 24							
34							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							
47							
48							
49 50							
50 51							
57							
53							
54							
55							
56							
57							
58							
59							
60							

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open





The flow chart of this study

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

В

for ICU

¥

HR for ho

D

p-overall = < 0.001 non-linear = 0.183

p-overall = < 0.001 p-non-linear = 0.40

30

ACAG

20

ACAG

%



BMJ Open	36/bmjo	Page 24 of 42
Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic	copyright, including f	
retrospective study	Octob En	
Online Supplement material	er 2024 s relate	
eTable1: Baseline characteristics of included and excluded patients in two cohorts	. Down nent Su	
eTable2: Baseline characteristics of enrolled patients stratified by hospital survival status i	a cohorts	
eTable3: Association of ACAG and earlier discharge alive in ICU	from h r (ABEs	
eFigure1: ROC curve analysis of AG, ACAG and ICU mortality (A: MIMIC-IV cohor	تي قاري rt Bag eICU-CRD cohort),	
in-hospital morality (C: MIMIC-IV cohort; D: eICU-CRD cohort), and 28-day mortality (ر الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل	
eFigure2: Pearson correlation analyses of AC/ACAG and SOFA score in MIMIC-IV coho	رمی and eICU-CRD	
cohort (B, D)	n/ on Ju	
eFigure3: Kaplan–Meier survival curve of ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality	ine 10, 3	
eFigure4: Cumulative incidence ratio of earlier discharge alive in the ICU in MIMIC-IV c	မ္မိ, နို့ ဗေါ်လို့t (A) and eICU-CRD	
cohort (B)	Agence	
eFigure5: Subgroup analysis	Bibliographi	
For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	que de l	

						ight, inc)23-0815	
	eTable1	MIMIC-IV cohor	t (n=1684)	cluded and	excluded patie	elCU-CRD cent	0 /18 10 8 (n=1289)	
	Overall	Excluded		p-value	Overall			p
	(n=1684)	(n=876)	(n=808)	F	(n=1289)	(n=589) 🦉	ײ ָ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Demographic cha	iracteristics		(/			S C	n ber sei	
Age	72 (61, 81)	73 (63, 81)	70 (60, 80)	0.006*	68 (57, 77)	69 (58, 78)	8 8 67 (57, 76)	0
Gender				0.062		d t	men Do	0
Female	684 (41%)	337 (38%)	347 (43%)	_	473 (37%)	218 (37%) 👮	£ 255 (36%)	
Male	1000 (59%)	539 (60%)	461 (57%)		816 (64%)	371 (65%)	445 (62%)	
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	0.5	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	0
Ethnicity				0.3		tar		0
White	1072 (64%)	575 (66%)	497 (62%)		987 (77%)	456 (77%) ni	5 31 (76%)	
Black	144 (8.6%)	73 (8.3%)	71 (8.8%)		136 (11%)	53 (9.0%) ^g .	83 (12%)	
Hispanic	32 (1.9%)	13 (1.5%)	19 (2.4%)		62 (4.8%)	30 (5.1%) 🛓	32 (4.6%)	
Asian	40 (2.4%)	22 (2.5%)	18 (2.2%)		29 (2.2%)	10 (1.7%) ani	1 9 (2.7%)	
Others/unknown	396 (24%)	193 (22%)	203 (25%)		75 (5.8%)	40 (6.8%) ⁿ g,	35 (5.0%)	
Comorbidities						and	j.co	
AMI	719 (43%)	370 (42%)	349 (43%)	0.7	489 (38%)	219 (37%) s i	270 (39%)	0
Hypertension	490 (29%)	249 (28%)	241 (30%)	0.5	666 (52%)	301 (51%) <mark>a</mark>	2 365 (52%)	0
Cardiomyopathy	431 (26%)	225 (26%)	206 (25%)	>0.9	221 (17%)	102 (17%) <u>ຂ</u> ົ້	រ្ត្រី119 (17%)	0
Atrial fibrillation	856 (51%)	463 (53%)	393 (49%)	0.084	250 (19%)	106 (18%) <u>ອ</u> ັ	j <mark>ə</mark> 144 (21%)	0
VHD	660 (39%)	367 (42%)	293 (36%)	0.018*	184 (14%)	85 (14%) 🦉	8 99 (14%)	0
AKI/ARF ^a	1,118 (66%)	549 (63%)	569 (70%)	<0.001*	533 (41%)	^{يې} (36%) 210	5 323 (46%)	<
COPD	142 (8.4%)	71 (8.1%)	71 (8.8%)	0.6	191 (14%)	90 (15%)	≵101 (14%)	0
Diabetes	609 (36%)	326 (37%)	283 (35%)	0.4	294 (23%)	136 (23%)	a (23%)	0
Maliananav	146 (8.7%)	66 (7.5%)	80 (9.9%)	0.085	28 (2.2%)	12 (2.0%)	₽ 16 (2.3%)	0.

BMJ	Open	۱
-----	------	---

 Page 26 of 42

			ВЛ	/J Open		cted by	36/bmjc	
						y copyrigh	open-2023-	
SOFA	8 (5, 11)	8 (5, 10)	8 (5, 11)	0.003	8 (5, 11)	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	<u>6</u> 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<0.001
Vital signs						ding	on v v	
Heart rate	89 (77, 105)	88 (77, 103)	90 (77, 108)	0.2	90 (77, 107)	88 (76. 1053	6 91 (78, 108)	0.2
Respiratory rate	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24)	20 (17, 24)	0.056	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24) 🖉 🖳	2 20 (17, 25)	0.11
Systolic BP	109 (95, 125)	108 (93, 123)	111 (97, 129)	<0.001	106 (90, 122)	104 (88, 1222	107 (91, 122)	0.056
Mean BP	78 (67, 89)	76 (66, 88)	79 (68, 91)	<0.001	76 (64, 88)	74 (64, 87)	8 77 (65, 89)	0.019*
Diastolic BP	64 (52, 77)	63 (51, 75)	66 (54, 79)	<0.001	60 (49, 74)	59 (49, 71) a	2 62 (50, 75)	0.011*
SpO2	98 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	0.6	97 (93, 100)	97 (93, 100	<u>₹</u> 97 (93, 100)	0.5
Laboratory data	L					t en tran	oad	1
White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 17)	0.5	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) ຄູ່ ຊ	£12 (9, 18)	0.8
Hemoglobin	11.5	11.4	11.5	0.058	11.8	11.4 ^a	§12.1	<0.001*
U U	(9.5, 13.2)	(9.2, 13.2)	(9.8, 13.4)		(9.9, 13.7)	(9.6, 13.3) <u>n. m</u>	(10.1, 13.9)	
Platelet	201	196	211	0.001	192	189 ^g .	196	0.3
	(147, 269)	(142, 257)	(152, 278)		(143, 255)	(140, 251) A	.(145, 260)	
Sodium	138	138	138	0.015	138	138 崩	137	>0.9
	(135, 141)	(135, 141)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 141) ^{ឆ្}	(134, 141)	
Potassium	4.3	4.3	4.4	0.022	4.2	4.2 and	4.2	0.5
	(3.9, 4.9)	(3.8, 4.8)	(3.9, 5.0)		(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) sin	(3.7, 4.9)	
Chloride	103	103	103	0.3	103	103 a r	2103	0.5
	(98, 107)	(98, 107)	(98, 107)		(98, 107)	(98, 108) ຼີ	5 (98, 107)	
Bicarbonate	21	21	20	<0.001	22 (18, 25)	22 (18, 25)	5 22 (18, 25)	0.7
	(18, 24)	(18, 24)	(17, 23)			logi	202	
AG	17 (14, 20)	16 (13, 20)	17 (14, 21)	0.003	16 (13, 21)	16 (13, 20) ິ	ິ ³ ັ 17 (13, 21)	0.035*
Albumin	3.3	3.2	3.3	0.014	3.0 (2.6, 3.4)	2.9 (2.4, 3.4)	3 .0 (2.6, 3.5)	0.004*
	(2.8, 3.7)	(2.6, 3.6)	(2.9, 3.7)				enc	
ACAG	20.3	23.5	20.0	<0.001	20	21	ឆ្ 20	<0.001*
	(17,3,24,0)	(19.0, 30.5)	(17.0, 23.5)		(17, 25)	(18, 27)	₽ (17, 24)	

Page 27 of 42				BM	J Open		cted by	36/bmj	
1 2 3							y copyright, ir	open-2023-08	
5	Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	0.10	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.4 (1.0, 2. 4) § 1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	0.061
6	Bilirubin	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.6	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1,	\$ 0.9 (0.6, 1.4)	0.6
7	Abbreviation: BM	I: body mass ind	ex. AMI: acute m	vocardial infarct	ion. AKI: a	acute kidnev iniu	rv. ARF: acute	re p al failure, COPI	D: chronic
8 9	obstructive pulmo	onary disease SC)FA sequential o	rgan failure asse	ssment B	3P [.] blood pressur	e AG: anion G	ACAG albumin	corrected
10	anion dan 1 OS 1	length of stay ICI	l: intensive care i	unit	comont, E				concolou
11	anion gap, 200. 1	longin of stay, foc					ela	20) 20)	
12	p < 0.00	nd navita kidanavi			المعاسف بالمعالم			en.toiluna uuana mu	
13	a: body weight an	nd acute kidney ii	njury were snow		nort while	e body mass inde			sented in
14	elCU-CRD conort	t due to data avail	ability.				ext	Sup	
16							and	bado	
17							d: d	eur	
18							ata	(A)	
19							, min		
20							ling		
21							, A	//bn	
22							l tra	njor Of	
24							ini	oen	
25							ng,	.bn	
26							an	ı, Ç	
27							d Si		
28								g	
29							ar t	י ר	
30 31							ect	Ine	
32							nno	10,	
33							log	20	
34							ies.	25 8	
35							-	at A	
36								ger	
37								nce	
38								Bit	
40								slio	
41								gra	
42								р hi	
43								que	
44				1 1		/ . /	1.4	e de	
45			For peer review of	nly - http://bmjope	n.bmj.com/	/site/about/guidelir	nes.xhtml		
46									

			BM	U Open		cted by co	6/bmjoper	
eTa	ble2: Baseline	characteristics o	of enrolled patier	nts stratifie	ed by hospital s	pyright, inc urvival statu s	n-2023-0815 0815 199wo cohorts	
		MIMIC-IV coho	ort (n=808)			elCU-CRD	bhost (n=700)	
	Overall	Survivors	Non-survivors	p-value	Overall	Survivors ថ្មី	Non-survivors	p-value
	(n=808)	(n=519)	(n=289)		(n=700)	(n=440) ឆ្ល	⊡0 (n=260)	
Demographic cha	racteristics						nsei	
Age	70 (60, 80)	69 (59, 79)	74 (63, 81)	0.001*	67 (57, 76)	66 (55, 75)		< 0.001
Gender				0.018*			men Ó	0.4
Female	347 (43%)	207 (40%)	140 (48%)	1	255 (36%)		<u>∽</u> 25 100 (38%)	1
Male	461 (57%)	312 (60%)	149 (52%)	_	445 (64%)	285 (65%) a		-
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (69, 95)	80 (66, 95)	0.7	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)		>0.9
Ethnicity						ta a	(All	>0.9
White	497 (62%)	336 (65%)	161 (56%)	-	531 (76%)	332 (75%)	5 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-
Black	71 (8.8%)	51 (9.8%)	20 (6.9%)		83 (12%)	52 (12%) ^g	· 31 (12%)	
Hispanic	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.3%)	7 (2.4%)	\mathbf{N}	32 (4.6%)	20 (4.5%)	12 (4.6%)	
Asian	18 (2.2%)	13 (2.5%)	5 (1.7%)		19 (2.7%)	14 (3.2%) In	5 (1.9%)	-
Others/unknown	203 (25%)	107 (21%)	96 (33%)		35 (5.0%)	22 (5.0%) g	g13 (5.0%)	-
Comorbidities						anc		1
AMI	349 (43%)	231 (45%)	118 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)		89 (34%)	0.070
Hypertension	241 (30%)	160 (31%)	81 (28%)	0.4	365 (52%)	226 (51%) a	139 (53%)	0.6
Cardiomyopathy	206 (25%)	143 (28%)	63 (22%)	0.072	119 (17%)	80 (18%) है	39 (15%)	0.3
Atrial fibrillation	393 (49%)	254 (49%)	139 (48%)	0.8	144 (21%)	88 (20%)	5 56 (22%)	0.6
VHD	293 (36%)	203 (39%)	90 (31%)	0.024*	99 (14%)	62 (14%) g	837 (14%)	>0.9
AKI/ARF ^a	573 (71%)	334 (64%)	239 (83%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	180 (41%)	ຍັ 143 (55%)	<0.001
COPD	71 (8.8%)	46 (8.9%)	25 (8.7%)	>0.9	101 (14%)	56 (13%)	∠ 45 (17%)	0.10
Diabetes	283 (35%)	171 (33%)	112 (39%)	0.10	158 (23%)	94 (21%)	8 64 (25%)	0.3
Malignancy	80 (9.9%)	41 (7.9%)	39 (13%)	0.011*	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.4%)	 10 (3.8%)	0.034*

of 42				BM	J Open		cted by o	6/bmjop	
							copyright, in	ven-2023-081	
Γ	SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	10 (7, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10)	§ 10 (8, 13)	<0
Γ	Vital signs	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1		ding	9n	
Γ	Heart rate	90 (77, 108)	89 (75, 105)	92 (78, 111)	0.066	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 105 5)	6 93 (78, 111)	0.0
Γ	Respiratory rate	20 (17, 24)	20 (17, 24)	21 (17, 26)	0.023*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)ឆ្ល៏ ញ	2 20 (17, 25)	0.0
F	Systolic BP	111 (97, 129)	113 (98, 129)	110 (96, 125)	0.2	107 (91, 122)	107 (92, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 1	107 (90, 126)	0.
Γ	Mean BP	66 (54, 79)	67 (55, 79)	63 (52, 78)	0.022*	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73)	2 62 (50, 77)	0.
Γ	Diastolic BP	79 (68, 91)	80 (69, 93)	78 (66, 90)	0.075	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88) d n	878 (64, 91)	0.
F	SpO2	97 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	0.4	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	<u>≸</u> 98 (93, 100)	>(
	Laboratory data			· · · · · ·			tan	o ad	
	White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 19)	0.013*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) ត្តូទ័	13 (9, 20)	0.
	Hemoglobin	11.5	11.8	11.2	<0.001*	12.1	12.4 ¹	§11.6	0.
	-	(9.8, 13.4)	(10.0, 13.7)	(9.4, 12.5)		(10.1, 13.9)	(10.4, 14.2 ^m	(9.7, 13.4)	
F	Platelet	211	216	198	0.076	196	210 🤤	182	<(
		(152, 278)	(155, 282)	(146, 274)	\mathbf{N}	(145, 260)	(157, 266) A	(128, 242)	
	Sodium	138	138	138	0.6	137	137	138	0.
		(134, 141)	(134, 140)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 140) ⁹	g(134, 142)	
Γ	Potassium	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.4 (3.9, 4.9)	4.4 (3.8, 5.0)	>0.9	4.2	4.2 and	4.3	0.
						(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) si	(3.7, 5.1)	
Γ	Chloride	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	0.6	103	103 ar	103	>(
						(98, 107)	(99, 107) ह	a (98, 107)	
Γ	Bicarbonate	20 (17, 23)	21 (18, 24)	20 (16, 23)	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	22 (19, 25)	5 21 (17, 24)	0.
	AG	17 (14, 21)	16 (14, 20)	18 (15, 22)	<0.001*	17 (13, 21)	16 (13, 19) <mark>8</mark>	818 (14, 23)	<(
Γ	Albumin	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.1 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.7, 3.8)	2.9 (2.5, 3.3)	<
Γ	ACAG	20.0	19.0	21.0	<0.001*	19.9	19.0	≥ 22.0	<(
		(17.0, 23.5)	(16.5, 22.5)	(18.0, 25.3)		(16.7, 24.2)	(16.2, 23.0)	§ (17.7, 27.0)	
Γ	Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.6 (1.1, 2.6)	<0.001*	1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	1.4 (1.1, 2.3)	1 .6 (1.2, 2.4)	0.

				BM	J Open		cted by		Page 30 of 42
1 2							copyright		
4 5	Bilirubin	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.4, 1.4)	0.4 0.8 (0	0.5, 1.4) 0.	.8 (0.5, 1. 4)	0.9 (0.6, 1.5) 0.065	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	Abbreviation: BN obstructive pulme anion gap, LOS: p<0.05* a: body weight a eICU-CRD cohor	I: body mass inde onary disease, SC length of stay, ICL and acute kidney in t due to data avail	P. (0.9, 1.2) ex, AMI: acute m DFA sequential or intensive care u njury were shown ability.	yocardial infarct rgan failure asse unit n in MIMIC-IV co	ohort while body r	dney injury, <i>A</i> d pressure, <i>A</i> nass index ar	ARF: acute to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	al failure, COPD: chronic ACAG albumin corrected failure were presented in	
43 44 45 46			For peer review or	nly - http://bmjope	n.bmj.com/site/abc	out/guidelines.>	khtml e		

						copyright,	ben-2023-(
eTa	ble2: Baseline d	characteristics o	of enrolled patie	ents stratifie	ed by hospital s	urvival statu s ii	wo cohorts	
		MIMIC-IV coho	t (n=1684)			elCU-CRD c	o ∄ (n=1289)	
	Overall	Excluded	Included	p-value	Overall	Excluded q	Sincluded	p-val
	(n=1684)	(n=876)	(n=808)		(n=1289)	(n=589) ទ្ ខគ្ន	ۆ (n=700)	
Demographic cha	racteristics					s re	er 2	
Age	72 (61, 81)	73 (63, 81)	70 (60, 80)	0.006*	68 (57, 77)	69 (58, 78)	§ 67 (57, 76)	0.2
Gender		0		0.062		d to	Do	0.8
Female	684 (41%)	337 (38%)	347 (43%)		473 (37%)	218 (37%) 👮 🖉	<u>≸</u> 255 (36%)	
Male	1000 (59%)	539 (60%)	461 (57%)		816 (64%)	371 (65%) an e	8 445 (62%)	
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	0.5	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	0.4
Ethnicity								0.2
White	1072 (64%)	575 (66%)	497 (62%)	,	987 (77%)	456 (77%) ni	531 (76%)	
Black	144 (8.6%)	73 (8.3%)	71 (8.8%)		136 (11%)	53 (9.0%) ^G	83 (12%)	
Hispanic	32 (1.9%)	13 (1.5%)	19 (2.4%)		62 (4.8%)	30 (5.1%) [≱]	.32 (4.6%)	
Asian	40 (2.4%)	22 (2.5%)	18 (2.2%)		29 (2.2%)	10 (1.7%) b i	19 (2.7%)	
Others/unknown	396 (24%)	193 (22%)	203 (25%)	7 (75 (5.8%)	40 (6.8%) ^g	35 (5.0%)	
Comorbidities		-				and	<u> </u>	
AMI	719 (43%)	370 (42%)	349 (43%)	0.7	489 (38%)	219 (37%) s i	270 (39%)	0.6
Hypertension	490 (29%)	249 (28%)	241 (30%)	0.5	666 (52%)	301 (51%) a	2365 (52%)	0.7
Cardiomyopathy	431 (26%)	225 (26%)	206 (25%)	>0.9	221 (17%)	102 (17%) 🐔	a 119 (17%)	0.9
Atrial fibrillation	856 (51%)	463 (53%)	393 (49%)	0.084	250 (19%)	106 (18%) 5	þ 144 (21%)	0.2
VHD	660 (39%)	367 (42%)	293 (36%)	0.018*	184 (14%)	85 (14%) 🧕	8 99 (14%)	0.9
AKI/ARF ^a	1,118 (66%)	549 (63%)	569 (70%)	<0.001*	533 (41%)	210 (36%) [%]	¥ 323 (46%)	<0.0
COPD	142 (8.4%)	71 (8.1%)	71 (8.8%)	0.6	191 (14%)	90 (15%)	₫101 (14%)	0.7
Diabetes	609 (36%)	326 (37%)	283 (35%)	0.4	294 (23%)	136 (23%)	1 58 (23%)	0.8
Malignancy	146 (8.7%)	66 (7.5%)	80 (9.9%)	0.085	28 (2.2%)	12 (2.0%)	<u><u></u></u> <u></u>	0.8

BMJ	Open	۱
-----	------	---

 Page 32 of 42

			ВΛ	1J Open		cted by c	36/bmjope		
						opyright, in	m-2023-081		
SOFA	8 (5, 11)	8 (5, 10)	8 (5, 11)	0.003	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	5 8 (6, 11)	<0.001*	
Vital signs				÷		ling	9		
Heart rate	89 (77, 105)	88 (77, 103)	90 (77, 108)	0.2	90 (77, 107)	88 (76, 105)	§ 91 (78, 108)	0.2	
Respiratory rate	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24)	20 (17, 24)	0.056	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24)	5 2 20 (17, 25)	0.11	
Systolic BP	109 (95, 125)	108 (93, 123)	111 (97, 129)	<0.001	106 (90, 122)	104 (88, 122)	107 (91, 122)	0.056	
Mean BP	78 (67, 89)	76 (66, 88)	79 (68, 91)	<0.001	76 (64, 88)	74 (64, 87)	1 77 (65, 89)	0.019*	
Diastolic BP	64 (52, 77)	63 (51, 75)	66 (54, 79)	<0.001	60 (49, 74)	59 (49, 71)	862 (50, 75)	0.011*	
SpO2	98 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	0.6	97 (93, 100)	97 (93, 100)	<u>97 (93, 100)</u>	0.5	
Laboratory data						tan	oad		
White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 17)	0.5	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) ຄູ	1 2 (9, 18)	0.8	
Hemoglobin	11.5	11.4	11.5	0.058	11.8	11.4	B 12.1	<0.001*	
	(9.5, 13.2)	(9.2, 13.2)	(9.8, 13.4)		(9.9, 13.7)	(9.6, 13.3)	6 (10.1, 13.9)		
Platelet	201	196	211	0.001	192	189 ^g .	196	0.3	
	(147, 269)	(142, 257)	(152, 278)		(143, 255)	(140, 251) <mark>≜</mark>	(145, 260)		
Sodium	138	138	138	0.015	138	138 ^{ai}	137	>0.9	
	(135, 141)	(135, 141)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 141)ອຼີ	(134, 141)		
Potassium	4.3	4.3	4.4	0.022	4.2	4.2 and	4.2	0.5	
	(3.9, 4.9)	(3.8, 4.8)	(3.9, 5.0)		(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) si	(3.7, 4.9)		
Chloride	103	103	103	0.3	103	103 a	103	0.5	
	(98, 107)	(98, 107)	(98, 107)		(98, 107)	(98, 108) ថ ្	[(98, 107)		
Bicarbonate	21	21	20	<0.001	22 (18, 25)	22 (18, 25)	5 22 (18, 25)	0.7	
	(18, 24)	(18, 24)	(17, 23)			logi	202		
AG	17 (14, 20)	16 (13, 20)	17 (14, 21)	0.003	16 (13, 21)	16 (13, 20)	ີພູ17 (13, 21)	0.035*	
Albumin	3.3	3.2	3.3	0.014	3.0 (2.6, 3.4)	2.9 (2.4, 3.4)	₹3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	0.004*	
	(2.8, 3.7)	(2.6, 3.6)	(2.9, 3.7)				enc		
ACAG	20.3	23.5	20.0	<0.001	20	21	b 20	<0.001*	
	(173240)	(190 305)	(17.0, 23.5)		(17, 25)	(18, 27)	₽ (17, 24)		
Page 33 of 42				BM	J Open		cted by	36/bmj	
---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	------------
1 2 3							y copyright, in	open-2023-081	
5	Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	0.10	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.4 (1.0, 2. ²)	§ 1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	0.061
6	Bilirubin	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.6	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1, 4)	\$0.9 (0.6, 1.4)	0.6
7	Abbreviation: BM	I: body mass inde	ex. AMI: acute m	vocardial infarct	ion. AKI: a	acute kidnev iniu	v. ARF: acute	re o al failure. COPI	D: chronic
8	obstructive pulmo	onarv disease. SC) FA sequential or	rgan failure asse	ssment. B	P: blood pressur	e. AG: anion 🖣	n ACAG albumin	corrected
10	anion dan 1 OS [.] I	ength of stay ICU	l: intensive care i	init	bonnonn, E		s, , te : ellion as		concolou
11	n<0.05*	engur er etay, ree					e a	ign 202	
12	p < 0.00	ad aquta kidnov ir	auriumoro obour		bort while	hady maga inda			contod in
13	a: body weight an	nd acute kidney in	ijury were snowr		mort while	body mass inde			esented in
14	elCU-CRD conort	due to data avail	ability.				ext	Sup	
16							anc	oerid	
17							da	eur	
18							tar	(AE	
19							nini		
20 21							ing		
22							Þ	Ъ т	
23							trai	jop	
24							inin	en.	
25							, Ģ	bm	
26							and	<u>,</u> .	
27							sin	Ę	
29							nila	on	
30							r te	Jun	
31							chn	le 1	
32							10 0	0, 2	
33							gie	025	
34 35							Š	5 at	
36								Ag	
37								enc	
38								е D	
39								ibli	
40								ogr	
41 42								aph	
43								iiqu	
44								e d	
45			For peer review of	nly - http://bmjope	n.bmj.com	/site/about/guidelir	nes.xhtml	e	
46									

	eT	able2: Associatio	BMJ Open	er discharge alive	36/bmjopen-2023-081597 .cted by copyright, incluc .CU .n			
	Crude	e Model	Mo	odel I	ling M	ng 9 Model II		
	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (9 5%)	p-value		
LOS in ICU (MIM	IIC-IV cohort)				stob En			
ACAG	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.96 (0.546,0,98)	<0.001		
Higher ACAG	0.62 (0.53-0.73)	<0.001	0.61 (0.52-0.72)	<0.001	0.77 (0.55 5 0 92)	0.004		
LOS in ICU (eIC	U-CRD cohort)		· ·	·	d to	·		
ACAG	0.96 (0.95-0.98)	<0.001	0.96 (0.94-0.98)	<0.001	0.97 (0.97	0.001		
Higher ACAG	0.74 (0.62-0.88)	<0.001	0.73 (0.61-0.88)	<0.001	0.85 (0.599, 204)	0.140		
Model I adjusted	for age, gender, race	, and weight/body	mass index	·	ed fr d dat	·		

Model II adjusted for age, gender, race, weight/body mass index, acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury, SOFA score, mean blood sure, oxygen saturation, potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin.

ng, Al training, and similar technologies p://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l











For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Page 39 of 42

						ʻight,
ıre5: Sul	bgroup ai	nalysis				includ
6: album	nin correc	ted anion	gap, HR: ha	zard ratio, CI: c	onfidence i	nterval, AMI: acute myocardial infarction, AF atral fibrillation, COPD: chronic
ructive p	oulmonary	v disease, A	KI: acute kic	lney injury, SOFA	A: Sequentia	il Organ Failure Assessment ទ័ក្ត ទួ ភ្លូទួ
ubgroup	ACAG<20	ACAG≥20		HR (95% CI)	p for interaction	s rela
ge(years)	1/3	138		1 35 (0 82 to 2 22	0.830	iter
Age≥65	273	254		1.43 (1.09 to 1.89)	
ender	215	207		1.40 (1.00 10 1.00	0.923	
Female	188	159		1.41 (0.99 to 2.00)	<u>ex s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s</u>
Male	228	233		1.44 (1.03 to 2.01)	
II				,	0.131	n rie
No	229	230		1.22 (0.89 to 1.68)	
Yes	187	162		1.75 (1.21 to 2.53)	
ardiomypathy	ıy				0.586	a és
No	311	291		1.47 (1.11 to 1.95)	
Yes -	105	101		1.26 (0.77 to 2.07)	
r No	217	109		1 31 (0 03 to 1 85	0.494	
Ves	199	190		1.51 (0.95 to 1.85)	
alvular disord	ders	104		1.04 (1.10 to 2.10	0.660	
No	266	249		1.48 (1.10 to 1.99)	ni e
Yes	150	143		1.32 (0.87 to 2.00)	
OPD					0.943	
No	375	362		1.42 (1.09 to 1.85)	S E
Yes	41	30		- 1.46 (0.67 to 3.20)	v. j
abetes					0.260	
No	300	225		1.58 (1.16 to 2.16)	
res	110	107		1.20 (0.82 to 1.76) 0.400	
(1	158	81		1.16 (0.68 to 1.99)	a jý
KI No	258	311		1.50 (1.13 to 1.98)	10 In 10
KI No Yes					0.157	Sio Sio
Kl No Yes ypoalbumine	emia		+ -	1.24 (0.92 to 1.67)	gie 02
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No	emia 221	251				
Kl No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes	emia 221 195	251 141		1.76 (1.16 to 2.67)	S OI
Kl No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes OFA	emia 221 195	251 141		1.76 (1.16 to 2.67) 0.182	s. at t
KI No Yes ypoalbumine No Yes OFA <8	emia 221 195 221	251 141 138	_ -	1.76 (1.16 to 2.67) 0.182)	s. Ag

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohortreporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

			Page
		Reporting Item	Number
Title and abstract		CZ CZ	ata mining,
Title	<u>#1a</u>	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Al training,
Abstract	<u>#1b</u>	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	and simila
Introduction			r tech
Background / rationale	<u>#2</u>	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	nologies.
Objectives	<u>#3</u>	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study design	<u>#4</u>	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
Setting	<u>#5</u> For	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	3

Page 41 of 42

BMJ Open

1			of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
2 3 4 5	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6a</u>	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.
6 7 8	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6b</u>	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
10 11 12 13 14	Variables	<u>#7</u>	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	<u>#8</u>	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
22 23	Bias	<u>#9</u>	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
24 25	Study size	<u>#10</u>	Explain how the study size was arrived at
26 27 28 29	Quantitative variables	<u>#11</u>	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why
30 31 32 33 34	Statistical methods	<u>#12a</u>	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
35 36 37	Statistical	#121	Describe any methods used to even in a subgroups and interestions
37 38 39	methods	<u>#120</u>	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
40 41 42 43	Statistical methods	<u>#12c</u>	Explain how missing data were addressed
44 45 46 47	Statistical methods	<u>#12d</u>	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed
48 49 50 51	Statistical methods	<u>#12e</u>	Describe any sensitivity analyses
52 53	5		
54 55	Results		
56 57 58 59 60	Participants	<u>#13a</u> For p	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2 3 4			included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
5 6	Participants	<u>#13b</u>	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage
7 8 9	Participants	<u>#13c</u>	Consider use of a flow diagram
10 11	6		
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Descriptive data	<u>#14a</u>	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
19 20 21 22	Descriptive data	<u>#14b</u>	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
23 24	4		
25 26 27	Descriptive data	<u>#14c</u>	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
27 28 29	7		
30 31 32 33 34	Outcome data	<u>#15</u>	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
35 36	7		
37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Main results	<u>#16a</u>	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
44 45 46 47	Main results	<u>#16b</u>	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
48 49 50 51	Main results	<u>#16c</u>	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
52 53	7		
54 55 56 57	Other analyses	<u>#17</u>	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
58 59 60	Discussion	For	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 42 of 42

Page 43 of 42

BMJ Open

Key results	<u>#18</u>	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	
Limitations	<u>#19</u>	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	1
Interpretation	<u>#20</u>	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	
Generalisability	<u>#21</u>	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	1
Other Information			
Funding	<u>#22</u>	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1
The STROBE check	klist is o	distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY.	
This checklist was	complet	ted on 01. November 2023 using https://www.goodreports.org/, a tool made by the	
EQUATOR Netwo	rk in co	llaboration with Penelope ai	
	<u> </u>		
	For	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
	Key results Limitations Interpretation Generalisability Other Information Funding The STROBE check This checklist was of EQUATOR Netwood	Key results#18Limitations#19Interpretation#20Generalisability#21Other Information#22Funding#22The STROBE checklist was Chis checklist was EQUATOR Network in constrainty	Key results #18 Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Limitations #19 Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias. Interpretation #20 Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence. Ceneralisability #21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results Other Information Image: Study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based The STROBE checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY, This checklist was completed on 01. November 2023 using https://www.goodreports.org/, a tool made by the EQUATOR Network in collaboration with Penclope at Key results Strippingen.bm/com/site/about/guidelines.shtml

BMJ Open

Relationship between the albumin-corrected anion gap and short-term prognosis among patients with cardiogenic shock: a retrospective analysis of the MIMIC-IV and eICU databases

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-081597.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Aug-2024
Complete List of Authors:	 Wang, Yuxing; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Tao, Yuhang; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Yuan, Ming; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital yu, pengcheng; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhang, Kai; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Ying, Hangying; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Jiang, ruhong; Zhejiang University School of Medicine Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital
Primary Subject Heading :	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Emergency medicine, Intensive care
Keywords:	CARDIOLOGY, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, Cardiovascular Disease





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Relationship between the albumin-corrected anion gap and short-term prognosis among patients with cardiogenic shock: a retrospective analysis of the MIMIC-IV and eICU databases Yuxing Wang^{1*}, Yuhang Tao^{1*}, Ming Yuan¹, Pengcheng Yu¹, Kai Zhang¹, Hangying Ying^{1†}, Ruhong Jiang^{1†} Affiliations: 1 Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital, School of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China. * Co-first authors contributed equally + Corresponding authors contributed equally Address for Corresponding Authors: Hangying Ying, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P. R. China. E-mail: yinghangying@zju.edu.cn Ruhong Jiang, M.D. Department of Cardiology, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital Zhejiang University School of Medicine 3 East Qingchun Road Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310016, P. R. China. E-mail: jrh@zju.edu.cn Conflicts of interest: None

Abstract:

Objectives: We aimed to investigate the association between the albumin-corrected anion gap (ACAG) and the prognosis of cardiogenic shock (CS).

Design: A multicentre retrospective cohort study.

Setting: Data were collected from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV) and eICU Collaborative Research Database (eICU-CRD) datasets.

Participants: A total of 808 and 700 individuals from the MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD, respectively, diagnosed with CS.

Primary and secondary outcomes: The primary endpoint was short-term all-cause mortality, including intensive care unit (ICU), in-hospital, and 28-day mortality. The secondary endpoints were the 28-day free from the ICU duration and the length of intensive care unit stay.

Results: CS patients were divided into two groups according to the admission ACAG value: the normal ACAG group ($\leq 20 \text{ mmol/L}$) and the high ACAG group (> 20 mmol/L). CS patients with higher ACAG values exhibited increased short-term all-cause mortality rates, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR: 1.43, 95% CI=1.05–1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR: 1.38, 95% CI=1.02–1.86, p=0.036), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR: 1.31, 95% CI=1.01–1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR: 1.47, 95% CI=1.12–1.94, p=0.006), and 28-day mortality (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95% CI: 1.11–1.83, p=0.007). A positive linear correlation was observed between the ACAG value and short-term mortality rates via restricted cubic splines. Compared with the AG, the ACAG presented a larger area under the curve for short-term mortality prediction. In addition, the duration of intensive care was longer, whereas the 28-day free from the ICU duration was shorter in patients with a higher ACAG value in both cohorts.

Conclusion: The ACAG value was independently and strongly associated with the prognosis of patients with CS, indicating that the ACAG value is superior to the conventional AG value.

Strengths and limitations of this study:

1. The included patients were from two distinct high-quality datasets with mixed aetiologies of CS.

2. We employed restricted cubic splines to reveal the association between the ACAG value and short-term mortality in CS patients.

3. Given its retrospective nature, selection bias cannot be avoided, and detailed information about cardiac function is not available.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Keywords: Albumin-corrected anion gap, anion gap, cardiogenic shock, intensive care unit, acute cardiovascular care

to peet teriewony

1. Introduction

Cardiogenic shock (CS), a life-threatening clinical condition, is characterized by acute end-organ hypoperfusion resulting from reduced cardiac output [1]. Despite substantial progress achieved in CS management over the past three decades, the mortality rate of CS remains unexpectedly high, making it a formidable challenge within the intensive care unit (ICU)[2]. Notably, the one-year mortality rate of CS patients is approximately 50%-60%, with a substantial portion of cases (70% to 80%) occurring within the initial 30 to 60 days[3]. Therefore, early identification of CS patients with a poor prognosis holds paramount clinical importance for tailoring effective risk reduction strategies.

The anion gap (AG), a biomarker reflecting unmeasured anions, is calculated via the following formula: AG (mmol/l) = (sodium + potassium) - (chloride + bicarbonate)[4]. It is extensively utilized to assess acid-base disorders and evaluate the prognosis of various diseases in clinical practice[5]. Nevertheless, the accuracy of the AG in predicting the prognosis of patients in the ICU remains debatable. While some studies have suggested that the AG can effectively predict short-term mortality in patients with critical illness, others have yielded inconclusive results[6]. In 1985, Gabow reported that the AG value could be influenced by serum albumin levels[7]. Given that albumin has a negative charge, any fluctuations in albumin levels can impact the final AG measurement[8]. Consequently, for patients with critical illness in the ICU, the AG may sometimes appear to be pseudonormal since hypoalbuminaemia is very common in the setting of intensive care[9]. To address this problem, Figge J et al. introduced the concept of the albumin-corrected anion gap (ACAG) in 1998[10]. Hatherill et al. discovered that the ACAG exhibited superior predictive capabilities for metabolic acidosis than did the AG in paediatric patients with shock[11]. Furthermore, numerous studies have demonstrated the association between the ACAG and the prognosis of critical conditions, including cardiac arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], acute kidney injury[14], sepsis[15], and acute pancreatitis[16].

However, to the best of our knowledge, the relationship between the ACAG and the prognosis of CS patients has not been investigated. Furthermore, it remains uncertain whether the ACAG offers an improved ability to predict short-term mortality compared with the AG. Therefore, in this study, our objectives are as follows: 1) to examine the correlation between the ACAG and short-term mortality in patients with CS and 2) to compare the admission values of the AG and ACAG for predicting CS mortality and assessing severity.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Datasets and ethics

In this study, we utilized the following two publicly accessible datasets: (1) the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care IV/MIMIC-IV v2.2 dataset (2008–2019)[17] and (2) the eICU Collaborative Research Database/eICU-CRD dataset (2014–2015)[18]. The MIMIC-IV is an updated version of the MIMIC-III, containing depersonalized data of 73,181 ICU stays for 50,906 unique patients at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center between 2008 and 2019 (a single centre dataset). The eICU-CRD is also a deidentified database and contains 200,859 ICU stays for 139,367 unique patients admitted to 335 ICUs at 208 hospitals across the United States (a multicentre dataset). Importantly, as there is no

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

shared hospital involvement between the MIMIC and eICU datasets, the eICU-CRD dataset remains entirely independent of the MIMIC-IV dataset.

The first author successfully completed the online course and passed the Examination for Protecting Human Research Participants (Record ID: 11841860). Hence, he was granted permission to extract data from the two datasets mentioned above. Given that all identifying information had been removed, our study was considered exempt from ethical review by the institutional research board. Patients or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

2.2 Patient and public involvement

Neither the patients nor the members of the public were involved in any part of this study.

2.3 Study population and endpoints

This was a multicentre, retrospective, observational study. CS was defined on the basis of the diagnostic codes from the MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD databases. These codes are in accordance with standard clinical definitions. We excluded those who were younger than 18 years old, had a length of stay (LOS) in the ICU or hospital of less than 24 hours, or lacked AG values or albumin levels from within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. For patients with multiple ICU admissions, we included only the first ICU stay for analysis. The AG value was calculated via the following formula: AG (mmol/l) = (sodium + potassium) -(chloride + bicarbonate). The ACAG value was determined as follows: ACAG (mmol/l) = [4.4-{albumin(g/dl)}] *2.5 + AG[11]. Additionally, we categorized the enrolled patients into two groups according to the ACAG admission value and previous studies[14,15]: the normal ACAG group (<20 mmol/l) and the high ACAG group (≥20 mmol/l).

The primary endpoint of this study was short-term all-cause mortality, which included ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, and 28-day mortality (not available in the eICU-CRD dataset). The secondary endpoints included 28-day free from the ICU duration (not available in the eICU-CRD dataset) and LOS in the ICU. The 28-day free from the ICU duration is a composite outcome that integrates both mortality and LOS in the ICU. It was calculated as 28 minus the days spent in the ICU during the first 28 days, and the dead patients were assigned a value of zero. The LOS in the ICU was defined as the duration that intensive care was required and was calculated on the basis of the time to discharge alive from the ICU, with death in the ICU as a completion risk.

2.4 Variable extraction

We extracted the variables with structured query language in Navicat Premium (version 15.0.12). The codes for data extraction were based on https://github.com/MIT-LCP/mimic-code and https://github.com/MIT-LCP/eicu-code. For each patient, we collected a wide range of variables, including demographic information, comorbidities, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, vital signs, and laboratory data. Demographic information included age at admission, sex, weight/body mass index, and

1 2 3

4

5 6 7

8

9

11

21

23 24

27

37

39

41

47

48

49

BMJ Open

race. Acute myocardial infarction, hypertension, atrial fibrillation, valvular disease, cardiomyopathy, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes, and malignancy were identified as comorbidities. Vital signs included heart rate, respiratory rate, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, mean blood pressure, and oxygen saturation. Additionally, we collected laboratory data, which included white blood cell count, haemoglobin, platelet, bilirubin, creatinine, sodium, potassium, chloride, bicarbonate, and albumin levels, and AG and ACAG values.

All vital signs, laboratory data, and SOFA scores were extracted and calculated within the first 24 hours of ICU admission. If a variable was measured multiple times within the initial 24 hours of ICU admission, we used the first recorded value for analysis.

2.5 Statistical analysis

To address missing values, we initially conducted multiple imputation using chained equations. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the percentage of incomplete cases was 3.1%, and in the eICU-CRD cohort, it was 16.7%. Accordingly, we generated 5 datasets for MIMIC-IV and 17 datasets for eICU-CRD for further analysis, and the results were combined according to Rubin's rules[19].

We compared the baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients on the basis of their hospital survival status and ACAG value. Categorical variables are presented as numbers plus percentages and were compared via Pearson's chi-square test. Shapiro–Wilk tests were performed to assess the distribution of continuous variables. Since all the continuous variables in the two cohorts were skewed, they are expressed as medians [interquartile ranges (IQRs)] and were compared via the Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Pearson correlation analyses were used to investigate the associations between the AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score. The ability of the AG and ACAG values to predict short-term mortality was compared by the area under the curve (AUC) of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. A Z test was used to compare the predictive ability of the AG and ACAG values following the methods of Delong et al.[20]. Threshold values were determined by identifying the values that provided the highest specificity and sensitivity via the calculation of the Youden index.

To evaluate the relationships between the ACAG value and ICU, in-hospital, and 28day all-cause mortality, the ACAG value was initially analysed as a categorical variable (normal ACAG group and high ACAG group) and then as a continuous variable (ACAG values). Kaplan–Meier survival curves and Cox proportional hazards regression models were used to calculate the hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals. Furthermore, we investigated the association between the ACAG value and short-term mortality via restricted cubic splines with four knots at 25%, 50%, 75% and 95%. On the basis of previous studies and theoretical considerations, we selected clinically relevant confounding factors as covariates in the regression model. The variance inflation factor was used to test the multicollinearity between each covariate, and the covariates with a high degree of collinearity (variance inflation factor > 5) were removed from the regression model. Finally, we constructed two models for adjustments. In Model II, we further adjusted for acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular heart disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury, SOFA score, mean blood pressure, oxygen saturation, and potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin levels.

Since ICU death resulted in a shorter LOS, the correlation between the ACAG value and LOS in the ICU was analysed via the Fine–Grey competing risk model. In this model, a higher HR for earlier alive ICU discharge indicated a shorter LOS, whereas a lower HR indicated a longer LOS in the ICU.

Subgroup analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationships between the ACAG value and 28-day all-cause mortality within various subpopulations, including age (<65 years, \geq 65 years), sex (male, female), acute myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury/acute renal failure, hypoalbuminaemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL), and SOFA score (<8, \geq 8), via stratified multivariable Cox proportional hazards model.

All the statistical analyses were performed with R version 4.1.2. A two-sided P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1 Baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients

The flowchart of our study is presented in *Fig. 1*. The differences between the included and excluded patients are summarized in eTable 1. Overall, a total of 808 and 700 individuals diagnosed with CS were enrolled from the MIMIC-IV dataset and eICU-CRD dataset, respectively. The short-term mortality rates of CS patients were similar in both cohorts. Specifically, the ICU mortality rates were 29% and 30%, whereas the in-hospital mortality rates were 36% and 37% in the MIMIC-IV cohort and eICU-CRD cohort, respectively. In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the 28-day all-cause mortality rate was 39%.

Table 1 summarizes the baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients stratified according to the ACAG value. Patients with a higher ACAG value clearly exhibited a greater predisposition to acute kidney injury/acute renal failure and had elevated SOFA scores; white blood cell counts; and sodium, potassium, creatinine, and total bilirubin levels. Compared with those in the normal ACAG group, the short-term mortality rates (including ICU mortality, in-hospital mortality, and 28-day mortality) were significantly greater, whereas the 28-day mortality rates in patients in the ICU were notably lower (20 [2-25] vs. 9 [0-23], p<0.001) in the high ACAG group.

Furthermore, the baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients stratified according to hospital survival status are summarized in *eTable 2*. Notably, we found that the ACAG value was significantly greater in the group of patients who did not survive in the hospital, both in the MIMIC-IV cohort (21.0 [18.0–25.3] vs. 19.0 [16.5–22.5], p<0.001) and in the eICU-CRD cohort (22.0 [17.7–27.0] vs. 19.0 [16.2–23.0], p<0.001). Additionally, among the nonsurvivors during hospitalization, we observed a higher rate of acute kidney injury/acute renal failure; lower haemoglobin, albumin, and bicarbonate levels; and higher age, creatinine levels, and SOFA scores.

3.2 Comparison of the AG and ACAG values for mortality prediction and

severity assessment

The predictive performance of the ACAG value versus the AG value for ICU, inhospital, and 28-day all-cause mortality was assessed through ROC curve analysis (e*Fig.* 1). As shown in Table 2, the ACAG value outperformed the AG value for short-term mortality prediction, including ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.654 [95% CI: 0.613– 0.696] vs. 0.632 [95% CI: 0.589–0.674], Z = 2.99, p= 0.003; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.613 [95% CI: 0.566–0.660] vs. 0.594 [95% CI: 0.546–0.642], Z = 2.99, p=0.003), in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: ACU: 0.629 [95% CI: 0.589–0.669] vs. 0.599 [95% CI: 0.558– 0.641], Z = 4.13, p< 0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: AUC: 0.628 [95% CI: 0.585–0.671] vs. 0.603 [95% CI: 0.559–0.647], Z = 3.92, p< 0.001), and 28-day mortality prediction (MIMIC-IV cohort: AUC: 0.641 [95% CI: 0.602–0.680] vs 0.614 [95% CI: 0.574–0.654], Z = 3.95, p< 0.001).

Additionally, we conducted correlation analyses to investigate the association between the AG/ACAG values and the SOFA score via Pearson's method. As depicted in eFigure 2, in both cohorts, we observed positive correlations between both the AG and ACAG values and the SOFA score (both p values < 0.001). Intriguingly, we found that the correlation coefficient for the ACAG value was significantly greater than that for the AG value (MIMIC-IV cohort: AG: R=0.28 vs. ACAG: R=0.35; eICU-CRD cohort: AG: R=0.30 vs. ACAG: R=0.35). These findings highlight the strong positive correlation between the ACAG value and the SOFA score, underscoring its potential as a valuable prognostic indicator.

3.3 An increased ACAG value is correlated with increased risk of shortterm morality

As shown in *eFig.* 3, the Kaplan–Meier survival curve revealed an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate among patients with a higher ACAG value (HR: 1.85, 95% CI: 1.48–2.32, log-rank test, p value <0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort. Furthermore, even after adjusting for confounding variables in Model II, we observed that the individuals whose ACAG value was evaluated still presented an increased 28-day all-cause mortality rate (adjusted HR: 1.42, 95% CI: 1.11–1.83, p=0.007).

Similarly, the relationship between the ACAG value and ICU/in-hospital mortality was also assessed through multivariable Cox regression models. As presented in *Table 3*, in comparison with the normal ACAG group, the high ACAG group experienced increased rates of ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: 1.43, 95% CI=1.05–1.93, p=0.022; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR: 1.38, 95% CI=1.02–1.86, p=0.036) and in-hospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: adjusted HR: 1.31, 95% CI=1.01–1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR: 1.31, 95% CI=1.01–1.71, p=0.03; eICU-CRD cohort: adjusted HR: 1.47, 95% CI=1.12–1.94, p=0.006).

3.4 Linear relationship between the ACAG value and short-term all-cause mortality

We extended our analysis to assess the association between the ACAG value and short-term all-cause mortality rates. As presented in *Table 3*, the adjusted HRs with 95% CIs were 1.05 (1.03–1.07) for 28-day mortality, 1.04 (1.01–1.06) for ICU mortality, and 1.04 (1.02–1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the MIMIC-IV cohort, and 1.06 (1.03–1.09) for ICU

mortality and 1.05 (1.02–1.07) for in-hospital mortality in the eICU-CRD cohort.

To further investigate the relationship between the ACAG value and short-term allcause mortality rates, we utilized adjusted restricted cubic splines. As shown in *Fig. 2*, we observed a linear correlation between the ACAG value and short-term all-cause mortality, which included 28-day mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.651), ICU mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.693; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.183), and inhospital mortality (MIMIC-IV cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.948; eICU-CRD cohort: p for overall<0.001, p for nonlinear=0.404) in both cohorts. These findings suggest that a 1-unit increase in the ACAG value is associated with an approximately 5% increase in short-term all-cause mortality rates among patients with CS.

3.5 Association of the ACAG value and earlier alive discharge from the ICU

The cumulative incidence ratio (CIR) of earlier discharge alive from the ICU among the different ACAG value groups is shown in *eFig. 4*. Obviously, the unadjusted CIR for earlier alive discharge from the ICU was significantly greater in the normal ACAG group. The robustness of the results was further confirmed via Fine–Grey competing risk models after adjusting for confounding variables (*eTable 3*). In the MIMIC-IV cohort, the adjusted HR (95% CI) for the relationship between the ACAG value and earlier alive discharge from the ICU was 0.77 (95% CI= 0.65–0.92; p = 0.004). However, in the eICU-CRD cohort, this relationship did not reach statistical significance (adjusted HR: 0.85, 0.69–1.04; p = 0.140).

Additionally, the ACAG value was analysed as a continuous variable. Intriguingly, the association between the ACAG value and earlier discharge was statistically significant in both cohorts, with adjusted HRs (95% CI) of 0.96 (95% CI=0.94–0.98; p<0.001) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 0.97 (95% CI=0.95–0.99; p=0.001) in the eICU-CRD cohort. In summary, the ACAG value was inversely associated with earlier discharge from the ICU for patients with CS.

3.6 Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analysis was conducted to assess the consistency of the association between the ACAG value and 28-day all-cause mortality across various subpopulations, including age groups (<65 years, \geq 65 years), sexes (male, female), SOFA scores (<8, \geq 8), and different clinical conditions, such as acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, atrial fibrillation, valvular disorders, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, acute kidney injury, and hypoalbuminaemia (<3.5 g/dL, \geq 3.5 g/dL). Adjustments for confounding factors were made as in Model II. As depicted in e*Fig.* 5, all p values for the interaction tests within different subgroups were greater than 0.05, indicating that the relationship between the ACAG value and 28-day all-cause mortality remained stable and consistent across the various subpopulations.

4. Discussion

In this large-sample retrospective study based on two distinct publicly accessible datasets, we investigated the association of the ACAG value, a novel biomarker indicating

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

metabolic acid load, with the short-term prognosis of CS patients with mixed aetiologies. The main findings of our study are as follows: (1) the ACAG value is strongly and independently associated with short-term all-cause mortality rates (including ICU, in-hospital, and 28-day mortality) and the duration of intensive care required in patients with CS, even after adjusting for disease severity via the SOFA score; (2) the ACAG value outperforms the AG value in its ability to predict short-term mortality and evaluate the severity of CS.

It is widely acknowledged that metabolic acidosis is a frequent event in the setting of intensive care and has been consistently demonstrated to be associated with adverse outcomes in individuals with critical illness[21]. Notably, in patients with severe cardiovascular disorders, particularly those suffering from CS, acidaemia may trigger a detrimental cycle by impairing cardiac contractile function, inducing malignant arrhythmias, and exacerbating circulatory failure[22]. Additionally, severe acidaemia may further compromise the response of the cardiovascular system to catecholamines and weaken the effectiveness of vasopressors to reverse hypotension[23]. A prior study demonstrated that the severity of acidosis is strongly and positively correlated with both the degree of shock and short-term mortality rates in CS patients[24].

As one of the simplest methods for assessing acid-base balance, the anion gap (AG) is a widely used biomarker in clinical practice. The relationship between the AG value and short-term mortality in patients with critical illness has been extensively investigated[25]. A previous study demonstrated a J-shaped association between the AG value and the 30day all-cause mortality rate in patients with CS on the basis of the MIMIC-III dataset[26]. Similarly, our study revealed that the AG value was significantly greater in nonsurvivors than in survivors (MIMIC-IV cohort: 18 [15–22] vs. 16 [14–20], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 18 [14–23] vs. 16 [13–19], p<0.001) in our study. Moreover, the AG value has also been used for risk stratification in the setting of acute cardiovascular care. Recently, a study combined the AG value and SOFA score to create the AG-SOFA score, which displayed improved ability to predict short-term mortality in cardiovascular intensive care unit patients[27]. Similarly, Eric et al. incorporated the AG value into the BOS and MA2 scores and achieved superior performance over other preexisting risk score systems for CS prognostication[28]. However, the physiological AG value primarily consists of inorganic phosphate and albuminate, which are weak anions derived from serum albumin[5]. Given the involvement of albumin in acid-base equilibrium, the interpretation of acid-base data may be limited[29]. Theoretically, hypoalbuminaemia can lead to a decrease in albuminate levels, resulting in a reduction in AG values[10]. Therefore, in the case of a patient with hypoalbuminaemia and a normal AG value, it might indicate the presence of plasma acids. Similarly, we might underestimate the severity of metabolic acidosis on the basis of the AG value for patients with low albumin levels. Notably, hypoalbuminaemia is very common among patients with critical illnesses and has been demonstrated to be associated with unfavourable outcomes, including higher rates of short-term mortality and a longer LOS in the ICU. The incidence of hypoalbuminaemia is striking in patients with CS, with a reported rate of 75% from the previous CardShock study[30]. Similarly, our study revealed an exceptionally high frequency of hypoalbuminaemia in patients with CS. Specifically, the incidence of hypoalbuminaemia (defined as an albumin concentration < 3.5 g/dL) was 58.4%

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

(472/808) in the MIMIC-IV cohort and 74.1% (519/700) in the eICU-CRD cohort. Furthermore, a recent study established that the serum albumin concentration is an independent predictor of short-term mortality in CS patients [20]. Similarly, in this study, we found that the albumin level was significantly lower in the hospital death group than in the survival group (MIMIC-IV cohort: 3.4 [3.0–3.7] vs. 3.1 [2.7–3.6], p<0.001; eICU-CRD cohort: 3.1 [2.7--3.6] vs. 2.9 [2.5-3.3], p<0.001).

The ACAG value, which combines the AG value and serum albumin level, has been proposed as a replacement for the AG value in differentiating acidosis caused by acid load or base deficit from an expert consensus panel in metabolic acidosis management[31]. As a ubiquitous abnormality in patients with critical illnesses, hypoalbuminaemia has been demonstrated to complicate the interpretation of acid-base data when diagnostic methods based on base excess or plasma bicarbonate concentration are used alongside the AG value [29]. In the presence of hypoalbuminaemia, taking albumin levels into account can reveal the presence of plasma acid, which might otherwise be overlooked when relying solely on the AG or base excess values. Previous studies have demonstrated that the ACAG value is a superior predictor compared with the conventional AG value for shortterm prognosis prediction in patients with critical illnesses such as cardiopulmonary arrest[12], acute myocardial infarction[13], and sepsis[15]. Therefore, we hypothesized that the ACAG value may perform better than the AG value does, particularly in a population at high risk for metabolic acidosis and hypoalbuminaemia. As previously discussed, patients with CS are not only prone to hypoalbuminaemia but also susceptible to metabolic acidosis. Hence, we posited that the ACAG value might outperform the AG value for risk stratification in the context of CS. In this study, we compared the use of the AG and ACAG values for mortality prediction and severity assessment in CS patients in two cohorts. Through ROC curve analysis, we found that the ACAG value had the highest AUC and Youden's index for short-term mortality prediction in both cohorts, suggesting that the ACAG value has a better ability to predict short-term mortality than the AG value does for CS. Furthermore, using Spearman's methods, we discovered that both the AG and ACAG values were positively correlated with the SOFA score. Importantly, the correlation coefficients with the SOFA score were significantly greater for the ACAG value than for the AG value. Taken together, our findings support the superiority of the ACAG value in predicting prognosis and estimating disease severity in patients with CS.

As a medical emergency requiring prompt evaluation and intervention, the mortality risk of CS is highest during the initial 48 hours following the onset of shock[32]. Therefore, mortality assessment in CS patients should be performed as early as possible after ICU admission. Given the rapid and widespread availability of the AG value and albumin level in clinical practice, we recommend the inclusion of the baseline ACAG level as a prognostic biomarker for patients with CS.

Our study has notable strengths. First, this is a pioneering study to explore the association between the ACAG value and the prognosis of CS. Second, the CS patients were from a diverse and heterogeneous patient population with mixed aetiologies, enhancing its relevance and applicability to real-world clinical scenarios. Third, the data in this study are derived from two distinct high-quality datasets, and the results are consistent with each other. However, several limitations of this study deserve discussion. First, owing

58 59

60

to the retrospective nature of the study, selection bias cannot be avoided. Second, detailed information about cardiac function (such as left ventricular ejection fraction and ventricular size) and other important cardiac biomarkers (such as troponin and N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide levels) was not included in this study because of the large amount of missing data. Third, we could not calculate the CS stages based on the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions guidelines accurately because of specific data limitations in the MIMIC-IV and eICU databases. Fourth, the association between the ACAG value and short-term mortality was established on the basis of the first ACAG value within the first 24 h of ICU admission. Monitoring dynamic changes in the ACAG value may be valuable for patients with CS. However, further studies are needed to explore the relationship between dynamic changes in the ACAG value and mortality in patients with CS.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that the baseline ACAG value following ICU admission independently predicts short-term mortality in patients with CS, which is better than the AG value. Given the high mortality risk of CS during the early phase of ICU admission, the baseline ACAG value may help clinicians identify patients at high risk of mortality. Therefore, we propose incorporating the baseline ACAG value into risk stratification systems for CS.

Data availability

The datasets used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Ethics statements

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

Ethics approval

The study was an analysis of third-party anonymised publicly available databases with pre-existing institutional review board approval. Informed consent was not required in this database study because of the non-identifying and anonymous nature of the databases.

Funding

None

Author contributions

Yuxing Wang: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Data curation, Methodology, Resources. Yuhang Tao: Investigation, Software, Visualization, Writing - original draft. Ming Yuan: Writing - review & editing. Pengcheng Yu: Writing - review & editing. Kai Zhang: Writing - review & editing. Hangying Ying: Project administration, Supervision Validation, and Writing - review & editing. Ruhong Jiang and Hangying Ying are the guarantor.

Declaration of Competing Interests

None

References:

- 1 Van Diepen S, Katz JN, Albert NM, *et al.* Contemporary Management of Cardiogenic Shock: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;136. doi: 10.1161/CIR.000000000000525
- 2 Hunziker L, Radovanovic D, Jeger R, *et al.* Twenty-Year Trends in the Incidence and Outcome of Cardiogenic Shock in AMIS Plus Registry. *Circ: Cardiovascular Interventions.* 2019;12:e007293.
- 3 Berg DD, Bohula EA, Morrow DA. Epidemiology and causes of cardiogenic shock. *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2021;27:401–8.
- 4 Posen AK, Paloucek FP, Petzel R. Anion gap physiology and faults of the correction formula. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2022;79:446–51.
- 5 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Serum Anion Gap: Its Uses and Limitations in Clinical Medicine. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2007;2:162–74.
- 6 Rocktaeschel J, Morimatsu H, Uchino S, *et al.* Unmeasured anions in critically ill patients: Can they predict mortality?*: *Critical Care Medicine*. 2003;31:2131–6.
- 7 Gabow PA. Disorders associated with an altered anion gap. *Kidney International*. 1985;27:472–83.
- 8 Figge J, Bellomo R, Egi M. Quantitative relationships among plasma lactate, inorganic phosphorus, albumin, unmeasured anions and the anion gap in lactic acidosis. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2018;44:101–10.
- 9 Gatta A, Verardo A, Bolognesi M. Hypoalbuminemia. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2012;7:193–9.
- 10 Figge J, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Anion gap and hypoalbuminemia: *Critical Care Medicine*. 1998;26:1807–10.
- 11 Hatherill M. Correction of the anion gap for albumin in order to detect occult tissue anions in shock. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2002;87:526–9.
- 12 Hagiwara S, Oshima K, Furukawa K, *et al.* The Significance of Albumin Corrected Anion Gap in Patients with Cardiopulmonary Arrest. *Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2013;19:283–8.
- 13 Jian L. Association between albumin corrected anion gap and 30-day all-cause mortality of critically ill patients with acute myocardial infarction: a retrospective

 analysis based on the MIMIC-IV database. 2023.

- 14 Zhong L, Xie B, Ji X-W, *et al.* The association between albumin corrected anion gap and ICU mortality in acute kidney injury patients requiring continuous renal replacement therapy. *Intern Emerg Med.* 2022;17:2315–22.
- 15 Hu T, Zhang Z, Jiang Y. Albumin corrected anion gap for predicting in-hospital mortality among intensive care patients with sepsis: A retrospective propensity score matching analysis. *Clinica Chimica Acta*. 2021;521:272–7.
- 16 Li P, Shi L, Yan X, *et al.* Albumin Corrected Anion Gap and the Risk of in-Hospital Mortality in Patients with Acute Pancreatitis: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *JIR*. 2023;Volume 16:2415–22.
- 17 Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, *et al.* MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Sci Data*. 2023;10:1.
- 18 Pollard TJ, Johnson AEW, Raffa JD, *et al.* The eICU Collaborative Research Database, a freely available multi-center database for critical care research. *Sci Data*. 2018;5:180178.
- 19 White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Statist Med.* 2011;30:377–99.
- 20 DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the Areas under Two or More Correlated Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves: A Nonparametric Approach. *Biometrics*. 1988;44:837.
- 21 Gunnerson KJ, Kellum JA. Acid–base and electrolyte analysis in critically ill patients: are we ready for the new millennium?: *Current Opinion in Critical Care*. 2003;9:468– 73.
- 22 Kraut JA, Madias NE. Metabolic acidosis: pathophysiology, diagnosis and management. *Nat Rev Nephrol*. 2010;6:274–85.
- 23 Jentzer JC, Kashani KB, Wiley BM, *et al.* Laboratory Markers of Acidosis and Mortality in Cardiogenic Shock: Developing a Definition of Hemometabolic Shock. *Shock*. 2022;57:31–40.
- 24 Jentzer JC, Schrage B, Patel PC, *et al.* Association Between the Acidemia, Lactic Acidosis, and Shock Severity With Outcomes in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock. *JAHA*. 2022;11:e024932.
- 25 Glasmacher SA, Stones W. Anion gap as a prognostic tool for risk stratification in critically ill patients a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2015;16:68.

- 26 Zhang T, Wang J, Li X. Association Between Anion Gap and Mortality in Critically III Patients with Cardiogenic Shock. *IJGM*. 2021;Volume 14:4765–73.
- 27 Zhou Y-H, Pang S, Miao G-R, *et al.* Combining the anion gap with the sequential organ failure assessment score to evaluate the short-term prognosis of patients in the cardiac intensive care unit. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2023;370:381–7.
- 28 Yamga E, Mantena S, Rosen D, *et al.* Optimized Risk Score to Predict Mortality in Patients With Cardiogenic Shock in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit. *JAHA*. 2023;12:e029232.
- 29 Fencl V, Jabor A, Kazda A, *et al.* Diagnosis of Metabolic Acid–Base Disturbances in Critically III Patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2000;162:2246–51.
- 30 Jäntti T, Tarvasmäki T, Harjola V-P, *et al.* Hypoalbuminemia is a frequent marker of increased mortality in cardiogenic shock. *PLoS ONE*. 2019;14:e0217006.
- 31 for the Société de Réanimation de Langue Française (SRLF), the Société Française de Médecine d'Urgence (SFMU), Jung B, *et al.* Diagnosis and management of metabolic acidosis: guidelines from a French expert panel. *Ann Intensive Care.* 2019;9:92.
- 32 Wigger O, Bloechlinger S, Berger D, *et al.* Baseline serum bicarbonate levels independently predict short-term mortality in critically ill patients with ischaemic cardiogenic shock. *European Heart Journal: Acute Cardiovascular Care*. 2018;7:45–52.

Figure legends:

Fig. 1: Flow chart of this study.

LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit, AG: anion gap.

Fig. 2: Restricted cubic spline for the associations between the ACAG value and short-term mortality.

Fig. 2A and Fig. 2B show the ICU mortality rates, whereas Fig. 3C and Fig. 3D show the in-hospital mortality rates in the MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD cohorts, respectively. The 28-day mortality data are shown in Fig. 2E.

The solid lines represent the adjusted hazard ratios (aHRs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) after multivariable adjustment in Model II.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Histograms represent the distribution of the ACAG value in the two cohorts.

HR: hazard ratio; ICU: intensive care unit; ACAG: albumin-corrected anion gap.

3	Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the enrolled patients stratified by the ACAG										
4 5				value in t	he two cohorts						
6			MIMIC-IV co	ohort (n=808)			elCU-CRD co	ohort (n=700)	-		
7 8 9		Overall (n=808)	Normal ACAG (n=416)	Higher ACAG (n=392)	p value	Overall (n=700)	Normal ACAG (n=353)	Higher ACAG (n=347)	p value		
10	Demographic of	characteristics					-				
11 12	Age	70 (60, 80)	71 (61, 81)	70 (60, 79)	0.3	67 (57, 76)	68 (57, 77)	67 (57, 75)	0.2		
13	Sex				0.2						
14 15	Female	347 (43%)	188 (45%)	159 (41%)		255 (36%)	130 (37%)	125 (36%)	Prot		
16 17	Male	461 (57%)	228 (55%)	233 (59%)		445 (64%)	223 (63%)	222 (64%)	ected		
18 19	Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	79 (67, 94)	81 (68, 97)	0.2	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	0.6 by co		
20	Ethnicity				0.3				0.018		
21	White	497 (62%)	255 (61%)	242 (62%)		531 (76%)	276 (78%)	255 (73%)	ight, i		
23 24 25	Black	71 (8.8%)	34 (8.2%)	37 (9.4%)		83 (12%)	32 (9.1%)	51 (15%)	ncludi		
26 27	Hispanic	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.9%)	7 (1.8%)		32 (4.6%)	14 (4.0%)	18 (5.2%)	ng for		
28 29	Asian	18 (2.2%)	13 (3.1%)	5 (1.3%)		19 (2.7%)	15 (4.2%)	4 (1.2%)	Ense uses		
30 31	Others/unkno wn	203 (25%)	102 (25%)	101 (26%)	0	35 (5.0%)	16 (4.5%)	19 (5.5%)	eignen relatec		
32	Comorbidities								l to		
33 34	AMI	349 (43%)	187 (45%)	162 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)	152 (43%)	118 (34%)	0.01 fext a		
35 36	Hypertension	241 (30%)	143 (34%)	98 (25%)	0.004*	365 (52%)	186 (53%)	179 (52%)	erieur Ind da 0.8		
3/	Cardiomyopa thy	206 (25%)	105 (25%)	101 (26%)	0.9	119 (17%)	69 (20%)	50 (14%)	0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07		
40 41	Atrial fibrillation	393 (49%)	199 (48%)	194 (49%)	0.6	144 (21%)	77 (22%)	67 (19%)	() ing, A 0.4		
42 43	VHD	293 (36%)	150 (36%)	143 (36%)	>0.9	99 (14%)	64 (18%)	35 (10%)	0.00		
44 45	AKI/ARFª	573 (71%)	259 (62%)	314 (80%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	150 (42%)	173 (50%)	0.05 đ an		
46 47	COPD	71 (8.8%)	41 (9.9%)	30 (7.7%)	0.3	101 (14%)	53 (15%)	48 (14%)	0.7 d sim		
48 49	Diabetes	283 (35%)	116 (28%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	158 (23%)	70 (20%)	88 (25%)	0.08 9		
50 51	Malignancy	80 (9.9%)	38 (9.1%)	42 (11%)	0.5	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.7%)	10 (2.9%)	0.3 thnolo		
52	SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	9 (6, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10)	9 (7, 12)	<0.0 6 1*		
54	Vital signs								s.		
55 56	Heart rate	90 (77, 108)	87 (74, 102)	93 (80, 111)	<0.001*	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 105)	93 (78, 111)	0.088		
57 58	Respiratory rate	20 (17, 24)	20 (16, 23)	21 (17, 26)	<0.001*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)	20 (17, 25)	0.083		
59 60	Systolic BP	111 (97, 129)	114 (99, 127)	109 (95, 129)	0.2	107 (91, 122)	107 (92, 121)	107 (90, 126)	0.8		

Page 19 of 40

54 55

2									
3 4	Diastolic BP	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 79)	66 (54, 78)	0.5	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73)	62 (50, 77)	0.3
5 6 7	Mean BP	79 (68, 91)	79 (69, 91)	78 (66, 91)	0.4	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88)	78 (64, 91)	0.4
/ 8 9	SpO2	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97(93, 100)	0.12	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (93, 100)	>0.9
10	Laboratory dat	a	,		•	,			
11 12	White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 16)	13 (9, 20)	0.002*
13 14 15	Haemoglobin	11.5 (9.8, 13.4)	11.7 (10.1, 13.5)	11.4 (9.6, 13.1)	0.045*	12.1 (10.1, 13.9)	12.2 (10.3, 14.0)	11.8 (9.8, 13.7)	0.2 Prot
16 17 18	Platelet	211 (152, 278)	210 (154, 278)	213 (149, 278)	0.8	196 (145, 260)	203 (151, 253)	192 (139, 268)	0.4
19 20 21	Sodium	138 (134, 141)	138 (135, 141)	137 (133, 141)	0.2	137 (134, 141)	137 (135, 140)	138 (133, 141)	>0.9copyrigh
22 23 24 25	Potassium	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.3 (3.8, 4.7)	4.6 (3.9, 5.1)	<0.001*	4.2 (3.7, 4.9)	4.1 (3.7, 4.7)	4.4 (3.7, 5.2)	<0.00.1*
26 27 28	Chloride	103 (98, 107)	104 (100,10 8)	101 (96, 106)	<0.001*	103 (98, 107)	104 (100, 108)	101 (96, 105)	<0.0401* أסר us
29 30	Bicarbonate	20 (17, 23)	22 (20, 25)	18 (15, 21)	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	24 (21, 27)	19 (16, 22)	<0.0975eign
31 32	AG	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 18)	0.001*	167 (13, 21)	13 (12, 15)	21 (18, 24)	<0.0 to
33 34	Albumin	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.2 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.8, 3.6)	2.9 (2.5, 3.4)	<0.060155
36 37	ACAG	20.0 (17.0, 23.5)	17.1 (15.3, 18.5)	23.5 (21.8, 26.5)	<0.001*	19.9 (16.7, 24.2)	16.7 (14.8, 18.3)	24.2 (21.9, 28.0)	<0.000 data r
39 40	Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	1.2 (0.9, 1.7)	1.8 (1.3, 2.9)	<0.001*	1.5 (1.1, 2.4)	1.3 (0.9, 1.8)	1.8 (1.3, 2.8)	<0.0 ing
41 42	Bilirubin	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.7 (0.4, 1.0)	0.8 (0.5, 1.5)	<0.001*	0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	0.8 (0.5, 1.3)	0.9 (0.5, 1.6)	0.05 5
43	Outcomes								<u> </u>
44	LOS in ICU	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 9)	0.5	5 (3, 9)	5 (3, 8)	5 (3, 9)	0.3 _
45 46	LOS in hospital	10 (5, 17)	10 (6, 17)	10 (5, 18)	0.3	8 (5, 14)	9 (5, 15)	8 (4, 14)	0.01 <u>8</u> * ·
47 48	ICU death	231 (29%)	85 (20%)	146 (37%)	<0.001*	211 (30%)	87 (25%)	124 (36%)	0.00¥#*
49 50	Hospital death	289 (36%)	122 (29%)	167 (43%)	<0.001*	260 (37%)	102 (29%)	158 (46%)	<0.0 ថ្ក 1*
52 52	28-day death⁵	315 (39%)	126 (30%)	189 (48%)	<0.001*				ologie
54 55 56	28-day free from the ICU duration ^b	17 (0, 24)	20 (2, 25)	9 (0, 23)	<0.001*				ÿ
50		Abbreviations	: BMI: body	mass index, AM	I: acute my	ocardial infar	ction, AKI: acut	te kidney	
58	i	injury, ARF: a	acute renal	failure, COPD:	chronic ob	structive pulm	nonary disease	, SOFA:	

sequential organ failure assessment, BP: blood pressure, AG: anion gap, ACAG: albumin-

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

corrected anion gap, LOS: length of stay, ICU: intensive care unit. p<0.05*

a: Body weight and acute kidney injury are shown for the MIMIC-IV cohort, whereas body mass index and acute renal failure are presented for the eICU-CRD cohort because of data availability.

b: Twenty-eight-day all-cause mortality and 28-day free from the ICU duration were reported for the MIMIC-IV cohort.

to occurrences

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
54	
55	
56	
57	
51	

58 59 60 Table 2: ROC curve analysis of AG/ACAG values and short-term mortality

			•				
	Factor	AUC	95% CI	Cut-off	Sensitivity	Specificity	Youden's index
ICU mortality	AG	0.654	0.613-0.696	15.5	0.758	0.426	0.184
(MIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.632	0.589-0.674	19.6	0.680	0.532	0.212
CU mortality	AG	0.594	0.546-0.642	18.1	0.526	0.654	0.180
elCU-CRD)	ACAG	0.613	0.566-0.660	25.4	0.351	0.857	0.208
lospital mortality	AG	0.599	0.558-0.641	20.5	0.346	0.796	0.142
VIMIC-IV)	ACAG	0.629	0.589-0.669	24.6	0.322	0.869	0.191
ospital mortality	AG	0.603	0.559-0.647	18.1	0.523	0.673	0.196
ICU-CRD)	ACAG	0.628	0.585-0.671	21.6	0.527	0.705	0.232
3-day mortality	AG	0.614	0.574-0.654	21.5	0.295	0.870	0.165
/IMIC-IV))	ACAG	0.641	0.602-0.680	22.9	0.400	0.805	0.205
albumin-co	pris. Auc	nion gap.					

albumin-corrected anion gap.

between the ACAC value and short term all sauce

	Crude Model		Model I		Model II	
H	R (95% CI)	p value	HR (95% CI)	p value	HR (95% CI)	p value
28-day mortality (MIMIC-IV	cohort)	-				
ACAG (per 1 unit) 1.07 ((1.06-1.09)	<0.001	1.08 (1.06-1.10)	<0.001	1.05 (1.03-1.07)	<0.001
Higher ACAG level 1.85 ((1.48-2.32)	<0.001	1.90 (1.52-2.39)	<0.001	1.42 (1.11-1.83)	0.007
CU mortality (MIMIC-IV coh	nort)			-1		
ACAG (per 1 unit) 1.06 ((1.04-1.09)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.04 (1.01-1.06)	0.005
Higher ACAG level 1.74 ((1.33-2.28)	<0.001	1.87 (1.43-1.91)	<0.001	1.43 (1.05-1.93)	0.022
CU mortality (eICU-CRD cc	ohort)			_		
ACAG (per 1 unit) 1.06 ((1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.06 (1.03-1.09)	<0.001
Higher ACAG level 1.61 ((1.22-2.11)	<0.001	1.65 (1.25-2.17)	<0.001	1.38 (1.02-1.86)	0.036
n-hospital mortality (MIMIC	-IV cohort)					
ACAG (per 1 unit) 1.06 ((1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.06 (1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.04 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
Higher ACAG level 1.51 ((1.20-1.91)	<0.001	1.58 (1.25-2.01)	<0.001	1.31 (1.01-1.71)	0.041
n-hospital mortality (eICU-C	CRD cohort)					
ACAG (per 1 unit) 1.06 ((1.04-1.08)	<0.001	1.07 (1.05-1.09)	<0.001	1.05 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001
Higher ACAG level 1.81 ((1.41-2.33)	<0.001	1.86 (1.44-2.39)	<0.001	1.47 (1.12-1.94)	0.006
Abbreviations:	ACAG: album	nin-corrected	anion gap. HR: h	azard ratio	. CI: confidence	
intonyal		4	- J-F,		,	
Interval.						
Model I was ad	justed for age	, sex, race, a	nd weight/body mas	ss index.		
Model II was a	adjusted for a	ge, sex, rac	e, weight/body ma	ss index, a	acute myocardial	
infarction card	liomvonathy	atrial fibrillat	ion valvular heart	disease	diabatas chronic	
				uisease, t		
obstructive pull	monary diseas	se, acute kid	ney injury, SOFA s	core, mear	i blood pressure,	
oxygen saturati	ion, potassium	, chloride, cr	eatine, and total bili	rubin.		
	-					

Cle, units




40	BMJ Open	cted by	
		r copyr	
		ight, in	
	Albumin corrected anion gap is associated with the prognosis of cardiogenic	sugsha	ock: a multi-center
	retrospective study	tor us	
	Online Supplement material	nseign es relat	
	eTable1: Baseline characteristics of included and excluded patients in two cohorts	ed to te	
	eTable2: Baseline characteristics of enrolled patients stratified by hospital survival status i	Superie	o cohorts
	eTable3: Association of ACAG and earlier discharge alive in ICU	ur (ABE data mi	
	eFigure1: ROC curve analysis of AG, ACAG and ICU mortality (A: MIMIC-IV cohor	ning B	eICU-CRD cohort),
	in-hospital morality (C: MIMIC-IV cohort; D: eICU-CRD cohort), and 28-day mortality (l tralizin	IIMIC-IV cohort)
	eFigure2: Pearson correlation analyses of AC/ACAG and SOFA score in MIMIC-IV coho	g, and (A, C) and eICU-CRD
	cohort (B, D)	similar t	
	eFigure3: Kaplan–Meier survival curve of ACAG levels and 28-day all-cause mortality	echnol	2 2
	eFigure4: Cumulative incidence ratio of earlier discharge alive in the ICU in MIMIC-IV c	ogie Shoa	t (A) and eICU-CRD
	cohort (B)	Adeline	
	eFigure5: Subgroup analysis		5
		у артт	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	due de l	

						y copyright, in	jopen-2023-081	
	eTable1	: Baseline chara	acteristics of in	cluded and	excluded patie	nts in two co	ré	
	.	MIMIC-IV coho	rt (n=1684)			elCU-CRD can	o£t(n=1289) ™	
		Excluded		p-value				p-value
<u> </u>	(n=1684)	(n=876)	(n=808)		(n=1289)	(n=589) 8	<u>n o (n=700)</u>	
Demographic cha				0.000*				
Age	72 (61, 81)	73 (63, 81)	70 (60, 80)	0.006*	68 (57, 77)	<u>69 (58, 78)</u>	<u>8</u> 67 (57, 76)	0.2
Gender				0.062				0.8
Female	684 (41%)	337 (38%)	347 (43%)		473 (37%)	218 (37%) 👷	255 (36%)	_
Male	1000 (59%)	539 (60%)	461 (57%)		816 (64%)	371 (65%) 🖻 🖷	<u>8</u> 445 (62%)	
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	80 (68, 95)	0.5	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	<u>4</u> 28 (24, 33)	0.4
Ethnicity	Γ			0.3				0.2
White	1072 (64%)	575 (66%)	497 (62%)		987 (77%)	456 (77%) <u>5</u>	531 (76%)	
Black	144 (8.6%)	73 (8.3%)	71 (8.8%)		136 (11%)	53 (9.0%) ^{ថ្មី} ·	83 (12%)	
Hispanic	32 (1.9%)	13 (1.5%)	19 (2.4%)		62 (4.8%)	30 (5.1%) 🛓	32 (4.6%)	
Asian	40 (2.4%)	22 (2.5%)	18 (2.2%)		29 (2.2%)	10 (1.7%) <mark>ai</mark>	1 9 (2.7%)	
Others/unknown	396 (24%)	193 (22%)	203 (25%)		75 (5.8%)	40 (6.8%) ^{ng}	35 (5.0%)	
Comorbidities						and	j.co	
AMI	719 (43%)	370 (42%)	349 (43%)	0.7	489 (38%)	219 (37%) s i	270 (39%)	0.6
Hypertension	490 (29%)	249 (28%)	241 (30%)	0.5	666 (52%)	301 (51%) a	2365 (52%)	0.7
Cardiomyopathy	431 (26%)	225 (26%)	206 (25%)	>0.9	221 (17%)	102 (17%) ខ្ល	a 119 (17%)	0.9
Atrial fibrillation	856 (51%)	463 (53%)	393 (49%)	0.084	250 (19%)	106 (18%)	5 144 (21%)	0.2
VHD	660 (39%)	367 (42%)	293 (36%)	0.018*	184 (14%)	85 (14%)	899 (14%)	0.9
AKI/ARF ^a	1,118 (66%)	549 (63%)	569 (70%)	<0.001*	533 (41%)	210 (36%).	¥ 323 (46%)	< 0.001
COPD	142 (8.4%)	71 (8.1%)	71 (8.8%)	0.6	191 (14%)	90 (15%)	▲ 101 (14%)	0.7
Diabetes	609 (36%)	326 (37%)	283 (35%)	0.4	294 (23%)	136 (23%)	1 58 (23%)	0.8
Malignancy	146 (8.7%)	66 (7.5%)	80 (9.9%)	0.085	28 (2.2%)	12 (2.0%)	<u>,</u> <u>,</u> 16 (2.3%)	0.8

f 40				BM	IJ Open		cted by	:6/bmjo	
							r copyright, ir	pen-2023-08	
Γ	SOFA	8 (5, 11)	8 (5, 10)	8 (5, 11)	0.003	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	5 5 6 1	<0.
	Vital signs						ding	on	
	Heart rate	89 (77, 105)	88 (77, 103)	90 (77, 108)	0.2	90 (77, 107)	88 (76, 1053)	6 91 (78, 108)	0.2
	Respiratory rate	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24)	20 (17, 24)	0.056	20 (16, 24)	20 (16, 24)	20 (17, 25)	0.1
	Systolic BP	109 (95, 125)	108 (93, 123)	111 (97, 129)	<0.001	106 (90, 122)	104 (88, 1222	107 (91, 122)	0.0
	Mean BP	78 (67, 89)	76 (66, 88)	79 (68, 91)	<0.001	76 (64, 88)	74 (64, 87)	2 77 (65, 89)	0.0
	Diastolic BP	64 (52, 77)	63 (51, 75)	66 (54, 79)	< 0.001	60 (49, 74)	59 (49, 71) 59	8 62 (50, 75)	0.0
	SpO2	98 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	0.6	97 (93, 100)	97 (93, 100)	9 <u>4</u> 97 (93, 100)	0.5
	Laboratory data						t an	oad /	
	White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 17)	0.5	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) ត្តូម	£12 (9, 18)	0.8
	Hemoglobin	11.5	11.4	11.5	0.058	11.8	11.4 ¹	§ 12.1	<0
	-	(9.5, 13.2)	(9.2, 13.2)	(9.8, 13.4)		(9.9, 13.7)	(9.6, 13.3)	(10.1, 13.9)	
	Platelet	201	196	211	0.001	192	189 ^g	196	0.3
		(147, 269)	(142, 257)	(152, 278)		(143, 255)	(140, 251) <mark>≜</mark>	(145, 260)	
	Sodium	138	138	138	0.015	138	138 <u>n</u>	137	>0
		(135, 141)	(135, 141)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 141) ຼ ືອ	(134, 141)	
	Potassium	4.3	4.3	4.4	0.022	4.2	4.2 and	4.2	0.
		(3.9, 4.9)	(3.8, 4.8)	(3.9, 5.0)		(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) sin	(3.7, 4.9)	
	Chloride	103	103	103	0.3	103	103 a r	103	0.
		(98, 107)	(98, 107)	(98, 107)		(98, 107)	(98, 108) ຼີ	a (98, 107)	
	Bicarbonate	21	21	20	<0.001	22 (18, 25)	22 (18, 25)	5 22 (18, 25)	0.1
		(18, 24)	(18, 24)	(17, 23)			logi	202	
	AG	17 (14, 20)	16 (13, 20)	17 (14, 21)	0.003	16 (13, 21)	16 (13, 20) ⁹	ធ្វី17 (13, 21)	0.0
	Albumin	3.3	3.2	3.3	0.014	3.0 (2.6, 3.4)	2.9 (2.4, 3.4)	₹3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	0.0
		(2.8, 3.7)	(2.6, 3.6)	(2.9, 3.7)				enc	
	ACAG	20.3	23.5	20.0	<0.001	20	21	2 0	<0
		(17.3, 24.0)	(19.0, 30.5)	(17.0, 23.5)		(17, 25)	(18, 27)	₩ (17, 24)	

			BM	IJ Open					cted by copyright, in	36/bmjopen-2023-08				Page 28 of 40
Creatine	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.1)	1.4 (1.0, 2.3)	0.10	1.4 (1	1.0, 2.3)	1	.4 (1.0	, 2. g)	5 1 1 1 1	5 (1.1,	2.4)	0.061	7
Bilirubin	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.5, 1.2)	0.7 (0.4, 1.3)	0.6	0.8 (0	0.5, 1.4)	0	.8 (0.5	, 1 , ∄)	\$ 0.9	9 (0.6,	1.4)	0.6	
Abbreviation: BM	I: body mass inde	ex, AMI: acute n	nyocardial infarc	tion, AKI: a	icute ki	dney inju	ury, I	ARF: a	icut	re o al	failure	, COP	D: chronic	
obstructive pulmo	onary disease, SC	OFA sequential o	rgan failure asse	essment, B	P: bloo	d pressu	ire, <i>I</i>	AG: an	ion ឆ្លា	ਗ਼ ਲ਼ੵੑੑੑੑੑ A(CAG a	lbumin	o corrected	
anion gap, LOS: I	ength of stay, ICL	J: intensive care	unit						rela	ər 20 Seigi				
p<0.05*									_ ated	1em				
a: body weight ar	nd acute kidney ii	njury were snow	n in MIMIC-IV co	onort while	body r	nass inde	ex a	ind act			llure w	ere pr	esented in	
		ability.							ext a	nloa				
									Ind	aded erieu				
									data	l fro Ir (A				
									min					
									ning,	s) tp://				
									≥	/bmj				
									train	ope				
									iing,	n.br				
									ano	nj.c				
									disir	om/				
									nilaı	on (
									r tec	June				
									hnc	e 10				
									olog	, 20				
									ies.	25 a				
										rt Ag				
										Jenc				
										ëB				
										iblio				
										gra				
										ohiq				
										ue c				
		For peer review o	nly - http://bmjope	en.bmj.com/	site/abo	out/guideli	lines.	xhtml		le I				

						ght, ir	23-08	
eTa	ble2: Baseline	characteristics of	of enrolled patier	nts stratifie	ed by hospital s	urvival status	new cohorts	
		MIMIC-IV coho	ort (n=808)	T		elCU-CRD	noaft (n=700)	
	Overall	Survivors	Non-survivors	p-value	Overall	Survivors 9	Non-survivors	p-
	(n=808)	(n=519)	(n=289)		(n=700)	(n=440) 5	ក្ខុង្គ័ (n=260)	
Demographic cha	racteristics			T	1	s rel		
Age	70 (60, 80)	69 (59, 79)	74 (63, 81)	0.001*	67 (57, 76)	66 (55, 75) }	2 70 (62, 79)	<
Gender			- F	0.018*		to	Do	0.
Female	347 (43%)	207 (40%)	140 (48%)		255 (36%)	155 (35%) ថ្	2 <u>≸</u> 100 (38%)	
Male	461 (57%)	312 (60%)	149 (52%)		445 (64%)	285 (65%)	1 60 (62%)	
Weight/BMI ^a	80 (68, 95)	80 (69, 95)	80 (66, 95)	0.7	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	28 (24, 33)	>(
Ethnicity			NO.	0.002*		ta n		>(
White	497 (62%)	336 (65%)	161 (56%)		531 (76%)	332 (75%) <u>ni</u>	5 199 (77%)	
Black	71 (8.8%)	51 (9.8%)	20 (6.9%)	h	83 (12%)	52 (12%) يق	31 (12%)	
Hispanic	19 (2.4%)	12 (2.3%)	7 (2.4%)		32 (4.6%)	20 (4.5%) ⁴	1 2 (4.6%)]
Asian	18 (2.2%)	13 (2.5%)	5 (1.7%)		19 (2.7%)	14 (3.2%) ai i	5 (1.9%)]
Others/unknown	203 (25%)	107 (21%)	96 (33%)		35 (5.0%)	22 (5.0%) ^ŋ g	13 (5.0%)]
Comorbidities	·					and	j.co	
AMI	349 (43%)	231 (45%)	118 (41%)	0.3	270 (39%)	181 (41%) S	89 (34%)	0.
Hypertension	241 (30%)	160 (31%)	81 (28%)	0.4	365 (52%)	226 (51%) 🛱	1 39 (53%)	0.
Cardiomyopathy	206 (25%)	143 (28%)	63 (22%)	0.072	119 (17%)	80 (18%) ह	3 39 (15%)	0.
Atrial fibrillation	393 (49%)	254 (49%)	139 (48%)	0.8	144 (21%)	88 (20%) 70	5 56 (22%)	0.
VHD	293 (36%)	203 (39%)	90 (31%)	0.024*	99 (14%)	62 (14%) હ	837 (14%)	>(
AKI/ARF ^a	573 (71%)	334 (64%)	239 (83%)	<0.001*	323 (46%)	180 (41%) [%]	1 43 (55%)	<(
COPD	71 (8.8%)	46 (8.9%)	25 (8.7%)	>0.9	101 (14%)	56 (13%)	≩ 45 (17%)	0.
Diabetes	283 (35%)	171 (33%)	112 (39%)	0.10	158 (23%)	94 (21%)	64 (25%)	0.
Malignancy	80 (9.9%)	41 (7.9%)	39 (13%)	0.011*	16 (2.3%)	6 (1.4%)	₽ 10 (3.8%)	0.
,	- ()	()		1	- ()		b i	1

BMJ	Open
-----	------

			BM	J Open		cted	6/bm	
						усо	jope	
						ругі	n-20	
						ght,	23-0	
SOFA	8 (5, 11)	7 (4, 10)	10 (7, 12)	<0.001*	8 (6, 11)	7 (5, 10) u	<u>8</u> 1 0 (8, 13)	<0.001*
Vital signs						ing	On Contraction of the second s	
Heart rate	90 (77, 108)	89 (75, 105)	92 (78, 111)	0.066	91 (78, 108)	90 (77, 10 5)	6 93 (78, 111)	0.088
Respiratory rate	20 (17, 24)	20 (17, 24)	21 (17, 26)	0.023*	20 (17, 25)	19 (16, 24)ឆ្ល៏ ញ	2 20 (17, 25)	0.083
Systolic BP	111 (97, 129)	113 (98, 129)	110 (96, 125)	0.2	107 (91, 122)	107 (92, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 12, 1	107 (90, 126)	0.8
Mean BP	66 (54, 79)	67 (55, 79)	63 (52, 78)	0.022*	62 (50, 75)	62 (50, 73)	2 62 (50, 77)	0.3
Diastolic BP	79 (68, 91)	80 (69, 93)	78 (66, 90)	0.075	77 (65, 89)	76 (67, 88) 6 9	7 8 (64, 91)	0.4
SpO2	97 (94, 100)	97 (94, 100)	98 (94, 100)	0.4	97 (93, 100)	97 (94, 100)	<u>98 (93, 100)</u>	>0.9
Laboratory data	· · · · ·					tan	oad	
White blood cell	13 (9, 17)	12 (9, 17)	13 (9, 19)	0.013*	12 (9, 18)	12 (9, 17) ត្តូទុ	13 (9, 20)	0.076
Hemoglobin	11.5	11.8	11.2	<0.001*	12.1	12.4 a a	§ 11.6	0.003*
	(9.8, 13.4)	(10.0, 13.7)	(9.4, 12.5)		(10.1, 13.9)	(10.4, 14.2⊉.0	(9.7, 13.4)	
Platelet	211	216	198	0.076	196	210 ^ي و .	182	<0.001*
	(152, 278)	(155, 282)	(146, 274)		(145, 260)	(157, 266) 🛓	. (128, 242)	
Sodium	138	138	138	0.6	137	137 aini	1 38	0.13
	(134, 141)	(134, 140)	(134, 141)		(134, 141)	(134, 140) ឆ្	(134, 142)	
Potassium	4.4 (3.9, 5.0)	4.4 (3.9, 4.9)	4.4 (3.8, 5.0)	>0.9	4.2	4.2 and	4.3	0.15
					(3.7, 4.9)	(3.7, 4.8) s i	(3.7, 5.1)	
Chloride	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	103 (98, 107)	0.6	103	103 ឆ្ន ី	₽ 103	>0.9
					(98, 107)	(99, 107) ຼົ ຄ	5 (98, 107)	
Bicarbonate	20 (17, 23)	21 (18, 24)	20 (16, 23)	<0.001*	22 (18, 25)	22 (19, 25)	5 21 (17, 24)	0.002*
AG	17 (14, 21)	16 (14, 20)	18 (15, 22)	<0.001*	17 (13, 21)	16 (13, 19) <u>8</u>	ខ្ល 18 (14, 23)	<0.001*
Albumin	3.3 (2.9, 3.7)	3.4 (3.0, 3.7)	3.1 (2.7, 3.6)	<0.001*	3.0 (2.6, 3.5)	3.1 (2.7, 3.8)	2.9 (2.5, 3.3)	<0.001*
ACAG	20.0	19.0	21.0	<0.001*	19.9	19.0	22.0	<0.001*
	(17.0, 23.5)	(16.5, 22.5)	(18.0, 25.3)		(16.7, 24.2)	(16.2, 23.0)	(17.7, 27.0)	
		1 1 (1 0 0 1)	16(1126)	<0.001*	15(1124)	14(1123)		0.021*

Page 31 of 40	BMJ Open	cted by	36/bmj
1 2 3		/ copyright, ir	open-2023-08
4	Bilirubin 07(0413) 07(0512) 07(0414) 04 08(0514) 08(051	<u>E</u>	¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹
6	Abbreviation: BMI: body mass index AMI: acute myocardial infarction AKI: acute kidney injury ARE: acute	<u>'ਰ'</u> †ਕਾਂਸ	Pal failure COPD: chronic
7	abstructive pulmenent disease. SOFA sequential argan failure assessment, RP: blood pressure, AC: apier	100 100	\mathbf{N}
8	obstructive pullionary disease, SOFA sequential organitatione assessment, DF. blood pressure, AG. anion	्युव	
9	anion gap, LOS. length of stay, ICO. Intensive care unit	ses	bbe
10	p<0.05 [*]	rela	r 20
12	a: body weight and acute kidney injury were shown in MIMIC-IV cohort while body mass index and acute		astailure were presented in
13	eICU-CRD cohort due to data availability.	to	Dov
14		text	winic
15		t an	oad
17		d d	ed
18		ata (A	from
19		mir	
20		ning:	
21		9, ►	//br
22		l tra	njo
24		aini	ben
25		ng,	.bn
26		ano	nj. o
27		si	om/
28		mila	on
29 30		ar te	ل د
31		€ch	ne `
32		nol	
33		ogie	202
34		ŝ.	5 at
35			Ag
37			lenc
38			й П
39			Sibl
40			Ög
41			Tap 1
42 43			hiqu
чэ 44			er c
45	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml		le l
46			
47			

	e7	able3: Association	BMJ Open	er discharge alive	36/bmjopen-2023-081597 cted by copyright, includ CU	
	Crude	e Model	Mo	odel I	ing M	odel II
	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (95%CI)	p-value	HR (9 5%)CI)	p-value
LOS in ICU (MIMI	C-IV cohort)				:tob En use	
ACAG	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.94 (0.92-0.95)	<0.001	0.96 (0.34.0.98)	<0.001
Higher ACAG	0.62 (0.53-0.73)	<0.001	0.61 (0.52-0.72)	<0.001	0.77 (0 5 6 0 92)	0.004
LOS in ICU (eICU	-CRD cohort)				. Do d to	
ACAG	0.96 (0.95-0.98)	<0.001	0.96 (0.94-0.98)	<0.001	0.97 (0.95 20 4 99)	0.001
Higher ACAG	0.74 (0.62-0.88)	<0.001	0.73 (0.61-0.88)	<0.001	0.85 (0.5 2 2 04)	0.140
Model I adjusted f	or age, gender, race	, and weight/body ma	ass index		ed fr eur (d dat	

Model II adjusted for age, gender, race, weight/body mass index, acute myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute kidney injury, SOFA score, mean blood sure, oxygen saturation, potassium, chloride, creatinine, and total bilirubin.

ng, Al training, and similar technologies p://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l





Page 34 of 40

Page 35 of 40



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

36/bmjopen-2023-081597 on 2 October 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . cted by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.



Page 37 of 40

						ight, i
ure5: Su	ıbgroup a	nalysis				incluc
G: albur	min correc	ted anion	gap, HR: ha	azard ratio, CI: c	onfidence i	nterval, AMI: acute myocardial infarction, AF 👼 atr 🔓 fibrillation, COPD: chronic
tructive p	pulmonary	/ disease, A	KI: acute kid	dney injury, SOFA	A: Sequentia	al Organ Failure Assessment 호 오
						Se En Stor
Subaroup	ACAG<20	ACAG≥20		HR (95% CI)	p for interaction	s reici
Age(years)			1		0.830	late
Age<65	143	138		1.35 (0.82 to 2.22))	ed m. 4
Age≥65	273	254		1.43 (1.09 to 1.89))	to
Gender					0.923	te series and the series of th
Female	188	159		1.41 (0.99 to 2.00))	х на стала стал
Male	228	233		1.44 (1.03 to 2.01)	0.121	an
AMI	220	220		1.00 /0.00 to 1.00	0.131	
Yes	197	162	·	1.22 (0.09 to 1.68)		da la fr
Cardiomypath	hv	102		1.75 (1.21 to 2.53	0.586	ta∑og
No	311	291		1 47 (1 11 to 1 95	0.000	
Yes	105	101		1.26 (0.77 to 2.07		
AF				1.23 (0111 10 2.01)	0.494	
No	217	198		1.31 (0.93 to 1.85)	
Yes	199	194	_ _	1.54 (1.10 to 2.16)	
Valvular disor	rders				0.660	Ta 8
No	266	249		1.48 (1.10 to 1.99))	
Yes	150	143	+ -	1.32 (0.87 to 2.00))	
COPD					0.943	
No	375	362		1.42 (1.09 to 1.85)	8 5
Yes	41	30		- 1.46 (0.67 to 3.20))	
Diabetes					0.260	in c
No	300	225		1.58 (1.16 to 2.16))	
Yes	116	167		1.20 (0.82 to 1.76)	
AKI					0.400	ec in
No	158	81		1.16 (0.68 to 1.99)	
Yes	258	311		1.50 (1.13 to 1.98	0.457	
Hypoalbumin	emia	251	-	1.04 (0.00 to 4.07	0.157	0 2 O
NO	221	201	1	1.24 (0.92 to 1.67		
SOEA	195	141		1.70 (1.16 to 2.67	0.182	s at
SUFA	221	138		1 78 (1 19 to 2 69	0.102	Ď
< 9	105	254		1.70 (1.10 10 2.08)		<u>Ď</u>
<8 >8	195	204		1.27 (0.94 to 1.71		

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohortreporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

			Page
		Reporting Item	Number
Title and abstract		CZ CZ	ata mining,
Title	<u>#1a</u>	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Al training,
Abstract	<u>#1b</u>	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	and simila
Introduction			r tech
Background / rationale	<u>#2</u>	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	nologies.
Objectives	<u>#3</u>	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study design	<u>#4</u>	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
Setting	<u>#5</u> For	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	3

Page 39 of 40

BMJ Open

1			of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
2 3 4 5	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6a</u>	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.
6 7 8 9	Eligibility criteria	<u>#6b</u>	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
10 11 12 13 14	Variables	<u>#7</u>	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	<u>#8</u>	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
22 23	Bias	<u>#9</u>	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
24 25	Study size	<u>#10</u>	Explain how the study size was arrived at
26 27 28 29	Quantitative variables	<u>#11</u>	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why
30 31 32 33	Statistical methods	<u>#12a</u>	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
34 35	5		
36 37 38 39	Statistical methods	<u>#12b</u>	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
40 41 42 43	Statistical methods	<u>#12c</u>	Explain how missing data were addressed
44 45 46 47	Statistical methods	<u>#12d</u>	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed
48 49 50 51	Statistical methods	<u>#12e</u>	Describe any sensitivity analyses
52 53	5		
54 55	Results		
56 57 58 59 60	Participants	<u>#13a</u> For p	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

1 2 3 4			included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
5 6	Participants	<u>#13b</u>	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage
7 8 9	Participants	<u>#13c</u>	Consider use of a flow diagram
) 10 11	6		
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Descriptive data	<u>#14a</u>	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
19 20 21 22	Descriptive data	<u>#14b</u>	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
23 24	4		
25 26	Descriptive data	<u>#14c</u>	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
27 28 29	7		
30 31 32 33 34	Outcome data	<u>#15</u>	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.
35 36 37	7		
37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Main results	<u>#16a</u>	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
44 45 46 47	Main results	<u>#16b</u>	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
48 49 50 51 52	Main results	<u>#16c</u>	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
53 54			
55 56 57	Other analyses	<u>#1/</u>	interactions, and sensitivity analyses
58 59 60	Discussion	For p	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 41 of 40

BMJ Open

1 2	Key results	<u>#18</u>	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	8
3 4 5 6 7	Limitations	<u>#19</u>	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	10
8 9 10 11 12	Interpretation	<u>#20</u>	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	9
13 14 15	Generalisability	<u>#21</u>	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	10
16 17 18	Other Information			
19 20 21 22 23 24	Funding	<u>#22</u>	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	10
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 9 50 51 52 53 45 55 56	EQUATOR Netwo	ork in co	Ilaboration with Penelope.ai	
58 59 60		For	peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	