Circulation

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Combining High-Sensitivity Cardiac Troponin I and Cardiac Troponin T in the Early Diagnosis of Acute Myocardial Infarction

BACKGROUND: Combining 2 signals of cardiomyocyte injury, cardiac troponin I (cTnI) and T (cTnT), might overcome some individual pathophysiological and analytical limitations and thereby increase diagnostic accuracy for acute myocardial infarction with a single blood draw. We aimed to evaluate the diagnostic performance of combinations of high-sensitivity (hs) cTnI and hs-cTnT for the early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction.

METHODS: The diagnostic performance of combining hs-cTnI (Architect, Abbott) and hs-cTnT (Elecsys, Roche) concentrations (sum, product, ratio, and a combination algorithm) obtained at the time of presentation was evaluated in a large multicenter diagnostic study of patients with suspected acute myocardial infarction. The optimal rule-out and rule-in thresholds were externally validated in a second large multicenter diagnostic study. The proportion of patients eligible for early rule-out was compared with the European Society of Cardiology 0/1 and 0/3 hour algorithms.

RESULTS: Combining hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations did not consistently increase overall diagnostic accuracy as compared with the individual isoforms. However, the combination improved the proportion of patients meeting criteria for very early rule-out. With the European Society of Cardiology 2015 guideline recommended algorithms and cut-offs, the proportion meeting rule-out criteria after the baseline blood sampling was limited (6% to 24%) and assay dependent. Application of optimized cut-off values using the sum (9 ng/L) and product (18 ng^2/L^2) of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations led to an increase in the proportion ruled-out after a single blood draw to 34% to 41% in the original (sum: negative predictive value [NPV] 100% [95% confidence interval (CI), 99.5% to 100%]; product: NPV 100% [95% CI, 99.5% to 100%]) and in the validation cohort (sum: NPV 99.6% [95% CI, 99.0–99.9%]; product: NPV 99.4% [95% CI, 98.8–99.8%]). The use of a combination algorithm (hs-cTnI <4 ng/L and hs-cTnT <9 ng/L) showed comparable results for rule-out (40% to 43% ruled out; NPV original cohort 99.9% [95% CI, 99.2–100%]; NPV validation cohort 99.5% [95% CI, 98.9–99.8%]) and rule-in (positive predictive value [PPV] original cohort 74.4% [95% CI, 69.6–78.8%]; PPV validation cohort 84.0% [95% CI, 79.7–87.6%]).

CONCLUSIONS: New strategies combining hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations may significantly increase the number of patients eligible for very early and safe rule-out, but do not seem helpful for the rule-in of acute myocardial infarction.

CLINICAL TRIAL REGISTRATION: URL (APACE): https://www.clinicaltrial.gov. Unique identifier: NCT00470587. URL (ADAPT): www.anzctr.org.au. Unique identifier: ACTRN12611001069943.

Noreen van der Linden, MD, PhD*
Karin Wildi, MD*
et al

*Drs van der Linden and Wildi contributed equally.

Clinical Perspective

What Is New?

- Measuring both cardiac troponin T (hs-cTnT) and cardiac troponin I (hs-cTnI) for the diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction does not consistently increase overall diagnostic accuracy as compared with measurement of the individual troponins.
- Using a combination of cTnT and cTnI concentrations, both obtained at a single blood draw at presentation, leads to a substantial increase in the proportion of patients in whom an acute myocardial infarction can be safely excluded.
- In contrast, the combination of cTnT and cTnI does not improve the determination of patients with acute myocardial infarction.

What Are the Clinical Implications?

- Combining cTnT and cTnI may contribute to a clinically relevant 3- to 6-fold increase in the number of rule-outs after a single blood draw at presentation compared with the current European Society of Cardiology 0/3 hour algorithms.
- The increased rule-out of myocardial infarction at presentation may reduce the number of patients who have to wait for a consecutive cardiac troponin measurement, and may therefore favorably impact resource use and overcrowding in the emergency department.

Approximately 10% of all patients seeking medical attention at the emergency department (ED) report chest discomfort, a complaint that reflects many potential causes, including acute myocardial infarction (AMI).[1] Rapid identification of patients with AMI is of profound clinical importance for fast initiation of medical treatment and management.[2] In addition, rapid rule-out of patients without AMI can overcome prolonged patient anxiety, unnecessary resource use, and overcrowding in the ED.[3–7] Despite major improvements in diagnostic accuracy owing to the introduction of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin (hs-cTn) assays and data-driven optimized diagnostic algorithms, rapid, accurate, and safe rule-out based on a single measurement of hs-cTn is still possible only in a minority of patients.[2,3,8,9]

Current guidelines recommend measurement of 1 of the cardiac specific isoforms of the cardiac troponin (cTn) complex: cTnI or cTnT.[2,10] The development of high-sensitivity methods for the measurements of cTnT and cTnI concentrations has allowed the delineation of pathophysiological and analytical differences between cTnT and cTnI. First, hs-cTnT plasma concentrations exhibit a diurnal rhythm, whereas (hs)-cTnI does not.[11] Second, hs-cTnT concentrations seem to be a stronger predictor of death as compared with hs-cTnI concentrations.[12] Third, cTnI seems to be released from injured cardiomyocyte slightly earlier and possibly by less intense injury as compared with cTnT.[12] Fourth, the association with renal dysfunction is stronger for cTnT clearance than for cTnI.[13] Fifth, hemolysis, which is common in blood samples taken in the ED, seems to increase cTnI concentrations, but decrease cTnT concentrations.[14] Sixth, although analytically false-positive results overall seem rare with both hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI, they can be triggered by the re-expression of embryonic cTnT in the skeletal muscle of patients with neuromuscular disorders for hs-cTnT and heterophilic antibodies to cTnI for hs-cTnI.[15] Combining 2 signals of cardiomyocyte damage, hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI, might overcome some individual pathophysiological and analytical limitations and thereby increase diagnostic accuracy for AMI with a single blood draw.[11,16,17] Despite differences in biochemical characteristics and release kinetics,[18,19] a recent direct comparison between hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT showed similar, high diagnostic accuracy for AMI, emphasizing the similarities between both isoforms.[12] Based on the observation of an imperfect correlation between blood concentrations of cTnT and cTnI in chronic and acute disorders,[20,21] and in analogy to the quantification of renal function using creatinine and cystatin C, where the combination of 2 parameters associated with the same pathophysiological process but influenced by distinct factors led to a more precise and accurate indicator,[22] we hypothesize that combining hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations will overcome independent pathophysiological, preanalytical, and analytical differences of the individual molecules, and might therefore have higher diagnostic accuracy for AMI than either hs-cTnI or hs-cTnT alone. This hypothesis was tested in 2 large prospective, multicenter diagnostic studies.

METHODS

The data and study materials will not be made available to other researchers for purposes of reproducing the results or replicating the procedure. The analytical methods will be available on request.

Patients and Setting

The combination of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT for the diagnosis of AMI was investigated in 2 diagnostic cohorts: The primary cohort was the APACE study (Advantageous Predictors of Acute Coronary Syndrome Evaluation),[3,12,23,24] and the secondary (external validation) cohort was the New Zealand-Australia combined data from the multicentre 2-Hour ADAPT study (Accelerated Diagnostic Protocol to Assess Patients With Chest Pain Symptoms Using Contemporary Troponins as the Only Biomarker),[25] the ADAPT-RCT, and the EDACS (Emergency Department Chest Pain Score)-RCT.[26,27] For convenience we will refer to this combined cohort as the ADAPT cohort.

APACE is an ongoing prospective, international multi-center diagnostic study that enrolls patients presenting to the ED with acute chest discomfort with an onset of peak within the last 12 hours. Patients are enrolled regardless of their renal function. Only patients with terminal kidney failure on chronic dialysis are excluded. This analysis contains data of patients enrolled between April 2006 and May 2013 who had a final diagnosis adjudicated by 2 independent cardiologists (n=3029). For this analysis, patients were excluded if hs-cTnI or hs-cTnT blood concentrations at presentation were not available (n=661), if the final adjudicated diagnosis was ST–elevation myocardial infarction (n=74), or if the final diagnosis remained unclear after adjudication and ≥1 (hs)-cTn level was elevated (possibly indicating the presence of AMI; n=69).

In the ADAPT cohort, patients with ≥5 minutes of symptoms consistent with acute coronary syndrome,[28] but without ST–segment elevation, were enrolled at 2 EDs in Brisbane, Australia and Christchurch, New Zealand between November 2007 and July 2014.

Both studies were carried out according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, approved by the local ethics committees, and registered at clinicaltrial.gov (APACE: NCT00470587) or at the Australia-New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ADAPT: ACTRN12611001069943, ADAPT-RCT: ACTRN12610000766011, EDACS-RCT: ACTRN12613000745741). Written informed consent was obtained from all patients.

Routine Clinical Assessment

In both cohorts, patients underwent routine clinical assessment that included medical history, physical examination, standard blood tests including serial measurements of local (hs)-cTn, 12-lead ECG, chest radiography, continuous ECG rhythm monitoring, and pulse oximetry. Management of patients was left to the discretion of the attending physician.

Adjudicated Final Diagnosis

In the APACE cohort, adjudication of the final diagnosis was performed by 2 independent cardiologists at the core laboratory (University Hospital Basel) applying the universal definition of AMI[29] using 2 sets of data: first, all available medical records obtained during clinical care including history, physical examination, results of laboratory testing (including serial clinical (hs)-cTn concentrations, radiological testing, ECG, echocardiography, cardiac exercise test, lesion severity, and morphology in coronary angiography—pertaining to the patient from the time of ED presentation to 90-day follow-up; second, study-specific assessments including detailed chest pain characteristics using 34 predefined criteria, serial hs-cTnT blood concentrations obtained from study samples, and clinical follow-up by telephone or by mail. In situations of disagreement about the diagnosis, cases were reviewed and adjudicated in conjunction with a third cardiologist. These procedures were comparable with those in the ADAPT cohort, where the adjudication of the final diagnosis was performed by 2 independent cardiologists blind to results of the index-test biomarkers under investigation, but with knowledge of the clinical record, ECG, and serial cTnI results from routine care (details of adjudication are given in the online-only Data Supplement).

In both cohorts, AMI was defined and (hs-)cTn interpreted as recommended in the current guidelines.[2,30,31] In brief, AMI was diagnosed when there was evidence of myocardial necrosis in association with a clinical setting consistent with myocardial ischemia. Myocardial necrosis was diagnosed by ≥1 cTn value >99th percentile (or for the conventional cTn assays >10% imprecision value if not fulfilled at the 99th percentile) together with a significant rise or fall. The criteria used to define a rise or fall in conventional cTn and hs-cTnT are described in detail in the Method section in the online-only Data Supplement. All other patients were classified in the categories of unstable angina, noncardiac chest pain, cardiac but noncoronary disease (eg, tachyarrhythmias, perimyocarditis), and symptoms of unknown origin with normal concentrations of hs-cTnT.

Measurement of hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI

After centrifugation, serum was frozen at −80°C until measurement with hs-cTn assays. Hs-cTnI was measured by using the ARCHITECT High Sensitive STAT Troponin I assay (Abbott Laboratories). According to the manufacturer, the 99th percentile concentration is 26.2 ng/L, with a corresponding coefficient of variation of <5%.[32] Hs-cTnT was measured with the Roche hs-cTnT assay. The 99th percentile among healthy subjects is 14 ng/L, with a 10% analytical variation at 13 ng/L.[33] Data presented here were not affected by the 2010 to 2012 hs-cTnT low-end shift in APACE and appropriately corrected in ADAPT.[34–36] Calculation of the glomerular filtration rate was performed using the abbreviated Modification of Diet in Renal Disease formula.[37]

Statistical Analysis

We evaluated the diagnostic accuracy and performance of the combined hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT measurement in 2 different ways: First, we examined sum, product, and ratio. Second, we derived and tested a combination algorithm of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT. Data are expressed as median ± interquartile range (IQR) for continuous variables and as numbers (n) and percentages (%) for categorical variables. Continuous variables were compared with the Mann–Whitney U test, and categorical variables were compared by use of the Pearson χ^2 test. Cohen's κ statistic was used to examine the agreement between rule-in and rule-out at presentation based on hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI according to the 2 diagnostic algorithms recommended with a class I recommendation in the current European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines: the 0/3h-hs-cTn-algorithm and the 0h/1h-hs-cTn-algorithm.[2] Sum, product, and ratio were calculated from raw data. Undetectable low concentrations were assigned the concentration 0.1ng/L. Binary logistic regression analyses were used to calculate predicted probabilities for combined test variables.

Receiver-operating characteristics curves were constructed to assess diagnostic performance at presentation and 1h after initial presentation including the absolute change value. Diagnostic accuracy was reported as the area under the Receiver-operating characteristics curve (AUC) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The comparison of dependent and independent AUCs was performed as recommended by Hanley and McNeil[38] and for nested models with the comparison of −2 likelihood ratios as appropriate. Zero hour and 0h/1h serial sampled hs-cTn blood concentrations

were combined to represent the current gold standard of clinical care as suggested in the 2015 ESC guidelines.[2] Furthermore, integrated discrimination improvement was calculated.[39]

For the determination of optimal cut-off values for sum, product, and ratio (minimal negative predictive value [NPV] of 99.6% and a PPV of 75.0%, respectively, to match the performance of the 0h/1h-hs-cTn-algorithm[2,40,41]), the cohort was randomly divided in a derivation (80% of patients) and a validation subcohort (20% of patients).

For the cut-off values in the combination algorithm, the optimal rule-out combination was that which maximized the percentage ruled-out at a sensitivity of 99% and the optimal rule-in combination was that which maximized the percentage ruled-in at a PPV of 75%. We determined the optimal combination of hs-cTn thresholds based on a smoothed average of 500 bootstraps of the original cohort, in which we varied the hs-cTn threshold for each troponin assay in steps of 0.1 ng/L. This methodology is more extensively described in the Methods section in the online-only Data Supplement. We used an 'AND' approach to ensure a safe early rule-out, and an 'OR' approach to maximize rule-in.

All hypothesis testing was 2-tailed, and values of $P<0.05$ were considered statistically significant. We did not adjust for multiple testing. Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS for Windows 23.0 (SPSS Inc), MedCalc 9.6.4.0 (MedCalc software), and R version 3.2.4 (with packages 'boot' v1.3–18 and 'fields' v8.10).

RESULTS

Distribution of hs-cTn Concentrations at Presentation in Patients With Suspected AMI

Baseline characteristics of 2225 patients in the APACE cohort presenting to the ED with suspected AMI are shown in Table I in the online-only Data Supplement. The adjudicated final diagnosis was AMI (non–ST–elevation myocardial infarction) in 18% of patients (85% had type I and 15% type II AMI), unstable angina in 10%, cardiac but not coronary artery disease in 14%, noncardiac chest pain in 54%, and symptoms of unknown origin in 5%. AMI patients had higher concentrations of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT at presentation compared with the no-AMI group (hs-cTnI median 115.2 ng/L (IQR: 21.7–632.9) versus 3.5 ng/L (IQR: 2.2–7.2) $P<0.001$; hs-cTnT median 64.1 ng/L (IQR: 28.0–152.4) versus 7.0 ng/L (IQR: 4.0–12.4) $P<0.001$; Table II in the online-only Data Supplement and Figure I in the online-only Data Supplement). The correlation between hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations at presentation was high ($r=0.89$; Figure 1).

Diagnostic Performance of hs-cTn Concentrations Measured at Presentation According to the ESC 0/3-Hour Algorithm

In the APACE cohort 721 of 2225 patients (32.4%) presented ≥6h after onset of chest pain and therefore


Figure 1. Log (base 10)-scale scatter plot of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T (hs-cTnT) and high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I (hs-cTnI) at presentation in the Advantageous Predictors of Acute Coronary Syndrome Evaluation (APACE) cohort.
Log-scale scatter plot displaying hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT concentrations at presentation in the APACE cohort (n=2225). The correlation coefficient is high (Pearson's $r=0.89$).

could be assessed by the late-presenter part of the ESC 0/3h algorithm with a single blood draw. Using hs-cTnT, AMI could be ruled-out in 441 patients (19.8% of overall cohort, 61.2% of late-presenters) by a baseline hs-cTn below the 99th percentile, and 4 AMIs were missed. Adding the clinical information (GRACE score <140 and pain free) resulted in 1 missed AMI and therefore in a sensitivity of 99.3% (95% CI, 96.2–100%) and a NPV of 99.4% (95% CI, 96.8–100%).

Using hs-cTnI, in 539 patients (24.2% of overall cohort, 74.8% of late-presenters) AMI could be ruled-out by a single blood draw at presentation, and 21 AMIs were missed. Adding the clinical information reduced the number to 3 missed AMIs; sensitivity 97.9% (95% CI, 94.0–99.6%) and NPV 98.5% (95% CI, 95.7–99.7%). The agreement on patient allocation between hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT for rule-out at presentation was good (κ=0.90; Table IV in the online-only Data Supplement).

Diagnostic Performance of hs-cTn Concentrations Measured at Presentation According to the ESC 0/1-Hour Algorithm

AMI could be ruled-out in 149 (6.7%, sensitivity 100%, NPV 100%) and 235 (10.6%, sensitivity 100%, NPV 100%) patients after a single blood draw at presentation, using hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT, respectively. Direct rule-in could be achieved in 331 (14.9%, specificity 95.6%, PPV 75.5%) and 273 (12.3%, specificity 2.4%, PPV 84.2%) subjects, using hs-cTnI or hs-cTnT, respectively. The agreement on patient allocation at presentation between hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT was moderate for rule-out (κ=0.42) and good for rule-in (κ=0.79; Tables V and VI in the online-only Data Supplement). Using the 0/1-hour algorithm 77% to 78% of patients need a second cardiac troponin measurement.

Diagnostic Performance of Combined hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT Concentrations Measured at Presentation

The diagnostic accuracy in the APACE cohort, as quantified by AUC, was evidently lower for the ratio than for the sum, product, or combination of hs-cTn and for the individual isoforms alone (Table 1 and Figure 2). Addition of a second isoform to 0h hs-cTn led to a numerically small increase in AUC above that for hs-cTnT alone, but not for hs-cTnI alone. Furthermore, addition of a combined measurement at presentation to the 0h and 0h/1h change concentrations led to a numerically small, but statistically significant improvement in diagnostic accuracy of hs-cTnI, but not of hs-cTnT (Table VII in the online-only Data Supplement). Reclassification statistics (integrated discrimination improvement) did not uniformly show incremental value of combining cardiac troponins at presentation when applied to the APACE cohort (Table VIII in the online-only Data Supplement). Diagnostic performance did not increase when 2 different cardiac troponin I signals were combined (Siemens c-TnI Ultra, Beckman hs-cTnI, and Siemens hs-cTnI Vista; Tables IX through XI in the online-only Data Supplement). Comparable results were found when hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT were combined using logistic regression analysis (Methods and Results sections in the online-only Data Supplement).

Early Allocation Based on Sum and Product

We examined the use of sum and product on the allocation of patients at presentation. In a randomly selected derivation cohort of 1799 patients (313 AMI, 1486 no AMI), thresholds for rule-out and rule-in achieving a NPV of ≥99.6% and a PPV of 75.0%, respectively, were rule-out cut-off for the sum of 9 ng/L and for the product of 18 ng^2/L^2 (NPV both 100% [95% CI, 99.4–100%]), and a rule-in cut-off for the sum of 99 ng/L and for the product of 1608 ng^2/L^2 (PPV sum 75.1% [95% CI, 69.3–80.3%], PPV product 75.1% [95% CI, 69.5–80.1%]). When these cut-off values were applied to the internal validation cohort of 426 patients (85 AMI, 341 no AMI),

we found comparable results for sum (rule-out: sensitivity 100% [95.8–100%], NPV 100% [97.5–100%]; rule-in: specificity 96.8% [94.3–98.4%], PPV 83.6% [72.4–91.6%]) and product (rule-out: sensitivity 100% [95.8–100%], NPV 100% [97.5–100%]; rule-in: specificity 96.8% [94.3–98.4%], PPV 83.6% [72.4–91.6%]; Tables 2 and 3). Application of these cut-off values in the original cohort (APACE) would cause a 3- to 5-fold increase in the number of rule-outs at presentation as compared with the 2015 ESC algorithms. This would decrease the percentage of patients that require a second cardiac troponin measurement one hour later from 77% to 78% to 50% to 52%.

When these cut-off values were applied to the external validation cohort (for patient characteristics see Table III in the online-only Data Supplement) of 2537 patients (408 AMI, 2129 no AMI), we found comparable results for sum (rule-out: sensitivity 99.0% [97.5–99.7%]; NPV 99.6%; [99.0–99.9%] rule-in: specificity 98.2% [97.5–98.7%]; PPV 87.5% [83.3–91.0%]) and product (rule-out: sensitivity 98.5% [96.8–99.5%], NPV 99.4% [98.8–99.8%]; rule-in: specificity 98.0% [97.3–98.5%], PPV 83.6% [83.2–90.6%]; Tables 2 and 3). Applying sum and product for rule-in and rule-out would lead to 45% to 49% of subjects that require a second cardiac troponin measurement after an hour in the ADAPT cohort.

Details of the subjects that were falsely ruled-out using sum and product are reported in Tables XII and XIII in the online-only Data Supplement.

Early Allocation Based on a Combination Algorithm Consisting of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT

The optimal cut-off combination with an NPV of at least 99.6% was hs-cTnT < 9.8 ng/L and hs-cTnI < 4.8 ng/L. From a pragmatic point of view, we rounded these cut-off concentrations down to hs-cTnT <9 ng/L and hs-cTnI <4 ng/L. In the original cohort (APACE) these thresholds combine to rule-out 48.4% of patients, to a 4-to-6-fold increase in the number of rule-outs at pre-

Table 1. Diagnostic Accuracy of hs-cTnI, hs-cTnT, the Combination, Sum, Product, and Ratio for the Diagnosis of Acute Myocardial Infarction at Presentation

Parameter	Area Under the Curve (95% Confidence Interval)	Compared With hs-cTnI Alone (*P* Value)	Compared With hs-cTnT Alone (*P* Value)
hs-cTnI alone	0.93 (0.92–0.94)		0.714
hs-cTnT alone	0.93 (0.92–0.94)	0.714	
hs-cTnI <4ng/L and hs-cTnT <9ng/L	0.93 (0.92–0.94)	0.789	0.002
Sum (hs-cTnI + hs-cTnT)	0.94 (0.93–0.95)	0.053	0.114
Product (hs-cTnI × hs-cTnT)	0.94 (0.93–0.95)	0.007	0.078
Ratio (hs-cTnI/hs-cTnT)	0.79 (0.78–0.81)	<0.001	<0.001

hs-cTnI indicates high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I; and hs-cTnT, high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T.

Figure 2. Receiver-operating characteristic curves of the diagnostic performance of high-sensitivity cardiac troponins (hs-cTns) and their ratio, sum, and product for non–ST–elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) in the Advantageous Predictors of Acute Coronary Syndrome Evaluation (APACE) cohort.
Diagnostic performance of hs-cTn for non–ST segment myocardial infarction at presentation to the emergency department with acute chest pain. ROC curves show the diagnostic accuracy of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT, their ratio, sum, and product.

sentation than the ESC 0/3h algorithm. In the external validation cohort the optimal rule-out combination would rule-out >50% of subjects (sensitivity 98.8% [97.2–99.6%], NPV 99.5% [98.9–99.9%]). The NPV in the external validation cohort was lower than the one in the original cohort (Table 4). Details of the subjects that were falsely ruled-out using this combination algorithm are reported in Tables XII and XIII in the online-only Data Supplement.

The optimal cut-off combination for rule-in was hs-cTnT ≥ 57 ng/L OR hs-cTnI ≥ 54 ng/L which in the APACE cohort ruled-in 259 (65.1%) of AMI patients. In the external validation cohort, 293 (71.8%) patients with a final diagnosis of AMI subjects would be ruled

Table 2. Performance of Sum and Product for Rule-Out

	Original Cohort (n=2225; 398 AMI, 1827 no AMI)	External Validation Cohort (n=2537; 408 AMI, 2129 no AMI)
Sum <9 ng/L		
All subjects	746 (33.5)	988 (38.9)
AMI	0 (0.0)	4 (1.0)
No AMI	746 (40.8)	984 (46.2)
Negative predictive value	100 (99.5–100)	99.6 (99.0–99.9)
Product <18 ng²/L²		
All subjects	782 (35.1)	1047 (41.3)
AMI	0 (0.0)	6 (1.5)
No AMI	782 (42.8)	1041 (48.9)
Negative predictive value	100 (99.5–100)	99.4 (98.8–99.8)

Values are n (%) or % (range).
AMI indicates acute myocardial infarction.

Table 3. Performance of Sum and Product for Rule-In

	Original Cohort (n=2225; 398 AMI, 1827 no AMI)	External Validation Cohort (n=2537; 408 AMI, 2129 no AMI)
Sum >99 ng/L		
All subjects	324 (14.6)	312 (12.3)
AMI	249 (62.2)	273 (66.9)
No AMI	75 (4.1)	39 (1.8)
Positive predictive value	76.9 (71.8–81.3)	87.5 (83.3–91.0)
Product >1608 ng²/L²		
All subjects	340 (15.3)	337 (13.3)
AMI	261 (65.6)	294 (72.1)
No AMI	79 (4.3)	43 (2.0)
Positive predictive value	76.8 (71.9–81.2)	87.2 (83.2–90.6)

Values are n (%) or % (range). AMI indicates acute myocardial infarction.

in (specificity 97.4% [93.7–95.6%], PPV 84.0% [79.7–87.6%]; Table 5). This would lead to 43% of patients that require a second cardiac troponin measurement after an hour.

DISCUSSION

We evaluated 4 methods to combine cTnI and cTnT for the early diagnosis of AMI in 2 large prospective diagnostic multicenter studies, and report 3 major findings.

First, the number of direct rule-outs at presentation using the algorithms of the current ESC guidelines[2] is limited (7% to 13% of subjects without an AMI) and assay-dependent. Second, the difference in diagnostic accuracy between the combinations of the cTn measured by the 2 assays and a cTn measurement by either assay alone is numerically small (except for when combined as a ratio). In addition, the results of the reclassification statistics indicated that the application of 2 cTn isoforms at presentation may add incremental value, but that this is not the case for the sum and product when applied to the whole cohort. Third, combining cardiac hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT, using the sum and product or a combination algorithm, achieved a very high NPV and led to a 3- to 6-fold increase in the number of rule-outs after a single blood draw compared with the ESC algorithms.

The findings from this study corroborate and extend previous work aiming to further improve the safety and efficacy of the rule-out and rule-in of AMI among patients presenting with acute chest discomfort to the ED.[2–4,6,7,8,42–44] The findings from this study corroborate and extend previous work aiming to further improve the safety and efficacy of the rule-out and rule-in of AMI among patients presenting with acute chest discomfort to the ED (quote), including 2 large meta-analyses providing exact estimates for the performance of single measurement rule-out strategies using very low

Table 4. Performance of the Combination Approach for Rule-Out

	Original Cohort (n=2225; 398 AMI, 1827 no AMI)	External Validation Cohort (n=2537; 408 AMI, 2129 no AMI)
hs-cTnI <4 ng/L and hs-cTnT <9 ng/L		
All subjects	886 (39.8)	1088 (42.9)
AMI	1 (0.3)	5 (1.2)
No AMI	885 (48.4)	1083 (50.9)
Negative predictive value	99.9 (99.2–100)	99.5 (98.9–99.8)
hs-cTnI <4 ng/L		
All subjects	1021 (45.9)	1210 (47.7)
AMI	5 (1.3)	6 (1.5)
No AMI	1016 (55.6)	1204 (56.6)
Negative predictive value	99.5 (98.9–99.8)	99.5 (98.9–99.8)
hs-cTnT <9 ng/L		
All subjects	1117 (50.2)	1440 (56.8)
AMI	12 (3.0)	16 (3.9)
No AMI	1105 (60.5)	1424 (66.9)
Negative predictive value	98.9 (98.1–99.4)	98.9 (93.7–97.7)

Values are n (%) or % (range).

AMI indicates acute myocardial infarction; hs-cTnI, high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I; and hs-cTnT, high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T.

Table 5. Performance of the Combination Approach for Rule-In

	Original Cohort (n=2225; 398 AMI, 1827 no AMI)	External Validation Cohort (n=2537; 408 AMI, 2129 no AMI)
hs-cTnI ≥54 ng/L or hs-cTnT ≥57 ng/L		
All subjects	348 (15.6)	349 (13.8)
AMI	259 (65.1)	293 (71.8)
No AMI	89 (4.9)	56 (2.6)
Positive predictive value	74.4 (69.6–78.8)	84.0 (79.7–87.6)
hs-cTnI ≥54 ng/L		
All subjects	327 (14.7)	322 (12.7)
AMI	247 (62.1)	283 (69.4)
No AMI	80 (4.4)	39 (1.8)
Positive predictive value	75.5 (70.4–80.0)	87.9 (83.8–91.2)
hs-cTnT ≥57 ng/L		
All subjects	256 (11.5)	240 (9.5)
AMI	218 (54.8)	206 (50.5)
No AMI	38 (2.1)	34 (1.6)
Positive predictive value	85.2 (80.1–89.2)	85.8 (80.8–90.0)

Values are n (%) or % (range). AMI indicates acute myocardial infarction; hs-cTnI, high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I; and hs-cTnT, high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T.

concentrations of hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI (quote).[45,46] To the best of our knowledge this work is the first systematic approach testing the clinical utility of combinations of hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT, the 2 most accurate biochemical signals in the early diagnosis of AMI.[2–4,6,43,44] Although there is broad agreement that hs-cTnI or hs-cTnT should be used as a key component in any AMI rule-out algorithm,[2,7,10,47,48] it has remained unclear whether a second biochemical signature could provide enough incremental value to potentially justify routine clinical use.

Although when used in conjunction with less sensitive cTn assays, some additional biochemical signals including copeptin and heart-type fatty acid–binding protein were able to provide incremental diagnostic value, this was no longer the case when using hs-cTnT or hs-cTnI as recommended in current guidelines.[49–54] The only additional analyte that recently was suggested to possibly provide incremental diagnostic value even if using hs-cTnT is cardiac myosin-binding protein C, a quantitative marker of cardiomyocyte injury that seems even more rapidly released from injured cardiomyocytes as compared with hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI.[55]

The novel concept investigated in this study was based on recent studies documenting that there could be remarkable differences between the cTnI and the cTnT signal, and the moderate agreement between clinical decisions made on these concentrations.[20,56,57] We hypothesized that combining the 2 biochemical signals might overcome independent pathophysiological, preanalytical, and analytical differences between the individual molecules such as (auto)antibodies and sug-

gested interference with troponin released from skeletal muscle,[12,15,58,59] and might therefore have higher diagnostic accuracy for AMI than either cTnI or cTnT alone.

This study shows that combining hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT may contribute to a clinically relevant increase in the number of rule-outs at presentation. The small increase in false-negative results when the derived thresholds were applied in the external validation cohort raises the question what is considered a still acceptable number of false rule-ins and rule-outs.[60] Furthermore, it illustrates the outlier-dependency of the determination of very low cut-off values, and advocates the use of extended (pooled) cohorts and the recalibration of cut-off values for the determination of more universally applicable decision rules.[61] A second point that merits attention are the, at first sight contrary, unconvincing results of the diagnostic accuracy and reclassification statistics. Because the AUC is already very high for either hs-cTn alone and because it is based on ranking with the large numbers of patients below the limit of detection having the same rank, the signal from an additional biomarker to increase the AUC would need to be massive and the biomarker itself may need to be a better marker even than hs-cTn. These findings are of limited additional value for the whole population, whereas combining hs-cTnI and hs-cTnT might be especially valuable in patients with low hs-cTn concentrations at presentation. Another reason for this discrepancy might be the 3-group (rule-out, observational, rule-in) approach that is used for the diagnosis of AMI and its outlier dependency.

The clinical implementation of a dual-marker approach combining cTnI and cTnT would likely be associated with substantial logistic obstacles because no diagnostic company currently is able to provide both hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI assays on the same laboratory platform. In addition, most hospitals currently do not have analyzers for both analytes running on a 24/7 basis or even have only the platform for 1 of the assays at all. Therefore, the cost-effective clinical implementation of the dual-marker approach would require either additional investment in infrastructure by the laboratories (installing another platform) or collaboration among diagnostic companies for the provision of both hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI assays on the analyzer that is used for clinical chemistry routine. The clinical implementation of a dual-marker approach combining cTnI and cTnT would likely be associated also with substantial educational efforts for clinicians working in the ED, as 2 similar, yet different analytes with different clinical decision values would then be in clinical use at the same institution. Nevertheless, rapid and safe clinical decision making based on a single hs-cTn measurement at presentation seems to be approaching its limits, and the exploration of new diagnostic strategies including combinations of biomarkers, risk-assessment scores, or imaging seems to be indicated.[8] From this point of view, overcoming these logistic obstacles by close collaboration between diagnostic companies, hospital laboratories, medical doctors, and researchers would be able to provide substantial medical value for patients and physicians, and economic value for hospitals and the health care system in general. Future studies are necessary to identify the best strategy and to better quantify the possible clinical benefit associated with the combination of cTnI and cTnT. Considering the relevant unmet clinical need as quantified by the high percentage of rule-out mismatches, the substantial increase in early rule-outs compared with the current ESC 0h/1h-algorithm and the substantial cost savings associated with reductions in the length of stay in the ED,[62] dedicated economic analyses can be expected to show substantial reductions in time to decision, time to discharge, and therefore treatment costs. Consecutive studies to objectify these claims are indicated. Furthermore, it is important to highlight that despite the very high diagnostic accuracy, hs-cTns and their combinations will always have to be used clinically only in conjunction with full clinical assessment including detailed patient history, physical examination, and the ECG.[2]

Some limitations of this study merit consideration. First, the central adjudication by 2 independent cardiologists based on the clinical dataset, including cardiac imaging and serial measurements of the local (hs)-cTn and the study-specific dataset including 34 chest pain characteristics, serial measurements of hs-cTnT, and follow-up in the APACE study, represents the highest quality possible in a diagnostic study. However, it possibly introduced a very small but unavoidable disadvantage for hs-cTnI regarding diagnostic accuracy. This is at large counterbalanced by the use of (h)s-cTnI for the adjudication ADAPT, as this possibly introduced a very small but unavoidable disadvantage for hs-cTnT regarding diagnostic accuracy. Second, patients with terminal kidney failure on chronic dialysis were excluded from APACE. Accordingly, we cannot comment on the possible clinical utility of the combination approach in these vulnerable patients. Third, the method we used to determine the cut-off values for the combination algorithm could not produce very smooth curves for rule-in. Alternative methods may therefore provide better results for rule-in. Fourth, an alternative approach to combine both cardiac troponins would be logistic regression. As shown in the online-only Data Supplement, this led to comparable results. Nevertheless, the strong correlation between cardiac troponins may lead to spurious beta coefficients, and therefore we did not use this method for our primary results.[63]

In conclusion, diagnostic strategies combining cTnI and cTnT measurements, sum, product, or a combination algorithm may significantly increase the number of patients eligible for very early and safe rule-out, but does not seem helpful for the rule-in of AMI.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Authors

Noreen van der Linden, MD, PhD; Karin Wildi, MD; Raphael Twerenbold, MD; John W. Pickering, PhD; Martin Than, MD; Louise Cullen, MD; Jaimi Greenslade, PhD; William Parsonage, MD; Thomas Nestelberger, MD; Jasper Boeddinghaus, MD; Patrick Badertscher, MD; Maria Rubini Giménez, MD; Lieke J.J. Klinkenberg, PhD; Otto Bekers, PhD; Aline Schöni, MD; Dagmar I. Keller, MD; Zaid Sabti, MD; Christian Puelacher, MD; Janosch Cupa, MD; Lukas Schumacher, MD; Nikola Kozhuharov, MD; Karin Grimm, MD; Samyut Shrestha, MD; Dayana Flores, MD; Michael Freese, RN; Claudia Stelzig, MSc; Ivo Strebel, PhDc; Òscar Miró, MD; Katharina Rentsch, PhD; Beata Morawiec, MD; Damian Kawecki, MD; Wanda Kloos, MD; Jens Lohrmann, MD; A. Mark Richards, PhD; Richard Troughton, PhD; Christopher Pemberton, PhD; Stefan Osswald, MD; Marja P. van Dieijen-Visser, PhD; Alma M. Mingels, PhD; Tobias Reichlin, MD; Steven J.R. Meex, PhD; Christian Mueller, MD

Correspondence

Christian Mueller, MD, Department of Cardiology and Cardiovascular Research Institute Basel (CRIB), University Hospital Basel, Petersgraben 4, CH-4031 Basel, Switzerland. Email christian.mueller@usb.ch

Affiliations

Department of Clinical Chemistry, Central Diagnostic Laboratory, Cardiovascular Research Institute Maastricht (CARIM), Maastricht University Medical Center (MUMC), The Netherlands (N.v.d.L., L.J.J.K., O.B., M.P.v.D.-V., A.M.M., S.J.R.M.). Department of Cardiology and Cardiovascular Research Institute Basel (CRIB), University Hospital Basel, Switzerland (K.W., R.T., T.N., J.B., P.B., M.R.G., A.S., Z.S.,

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

C.P., J.C., L.S., N.K., K.G., S.S., D.F., M.F., C.S., I.S., W.K., J.L., S.O., T.R., C.M.). Critical Care Research Group, The Prince Charles Hospital, Brisbane, Australia (K.W.). Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Christchurch, New Zealand (J.W.P., M.T., A.M.R., R.T., C.P.). Department of Emergency Medicine, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia (L.C., W.P.). School of Public Health, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia (L.C., J.G., W.P.). School of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia (L.C., J.G., W.P.). Emergency Department, CIBERES ISC III, Hospital del Mar – IMIM, Barcelona, Spain (M.R.). Emergency Department, University Hospital Zürich, Switzerland (A.S., D.I.K.). Emergency Department, Hospital Clinic, Barcelona, Spain (O.M.). Laboratory Medicine, University Hospital Basel, Switzerland (K.R.). 2nd Department of Cardiology and School of Medicine with the Division of Dentistry, Zabrze, Medical University of Katowice, Katowice, Poland (B.M., D.K.).

REFERENCES

1. Nawar EW, Niska RW, Xu J. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 2005 emergency department summary. *Advance Data*. 2007;29:1–32. doi: 10.3886/ICPSR28261.v1
2. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP, Mueller C, Valgimigli M, Andreotti F, Bax JJ, Borger MA, Brotons C, Chew DP, Gencer B, Hasenfuss G, Kjeldsen K, Lancellotti P, Landmesser U, Mehilli J, Mukherjee D, Storey RF, Windecker S; ESC Scientific Document Group. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients Presenting without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37:267–315. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehv320
3. Reichlin T, Hochholzer W, Bassetti S, Steuer S, Stelzig C, Hartwiger S, Biedert S, Schaub N, Buerge C, Potocki M, Noveanu M, Breidthardt T, Twerenbold R, Winkler K, Bingisser R, Mueller C. Early diagnosis of myocardial infarction with sensitive cardiac troponin assays. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361:858–867. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0900428
4. Reiter M, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Haaf P, Peter F, Meissner J, Hochholzer W, Stelzig C, Freese M, Heinisch C, Breidthardt T, Freidank H, Winkler K, Campodarve I, Gea J, Mueller C. Early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction in the elderly using more sensitive cardiac troponin assays. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32:1379–1389. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehr033
5. Lipinski MJ, Escárcega RO, D'Ascenzo F, Magalhães MA, Baker NC, Torguson R, Chen F, Epstein SE, Miró O, Llorens P, Giannitsis E, Lotze U, Lefebvre S, Sebbane M, Cristol JP, Chenevier-Gobeaux C, Meune C, Eggers KM, Charpentier S, Twerenbold R, Mueller C, Biondi-Zoccai G, Waksman R. A systematic review and collaborative meta-analysis to determine the incremental value of copeptin for rapid rule-out of acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Cardiol*. 2014;113:1581–1591. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2014.01.436
6. Möckel M, Searle J, Hamm C, Slagman A, Blankenberg S, Huber K, Katus H, Liebetrau C, Müller C, Muller R, Peitsmeyer P, von Recum J, Tajsic M, Vollert JO, Giannitsis E. Early discharge using single cardiac troponin and copeptin testing in patients with suspected acute coronary syndrome (ACS): a randomized, controlled clinical process study. *Eur Heart J*. 2015;36:369–376. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu178
7. Thygesen K, Mair J, Giannitsis E, Mueller C, Lindahl B, Blankenberg S, Huber K, Plebani M, Biasucci LM, Tubaro M, Collinson P, Venge P, Hasin Y, Galvani M, Koenig W, Hamm C, Alpert JS, Katus H, Jaffe AS; Study Group on Biomarkers in Cardiology of ESC Working Group on Acute Cardiac Care. How to use high-sensitivity cardiac troponins in acute cardiac care. *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33:2252–2257. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehs154
8. Nestelberger T, Wildi K, Boeddinghaus J, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Giménez MR, Puelacher C, Jaeger C, Grimm K, Sabti Z, Hillinger P, Kozhuharov N, du Fay de Lavallaz J, Pinck F, Lopez B, Salgado E, Miró Ò, Bingisser R, Lohrmann J, Osswald S, Mueller C. Characterization of the observe zone of the ESC 2015 high-sensitivity cardiac troponin 0h/1h-algorithm for the early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016;207:238–245. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.01.112
9. Amsterdam EA, Wenger NK, Brindis RG, Casey DE, Ganiats TG, Holmes DR, Jaffe AS, Jneid H, Kelly RF, Kontos MC, Levine GN, Liebson PR, Mukherjee D, Peterson ED, Sabatine MS, Smalling RW, Zieman SJ. 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the management of patients with non–ST-elevation acute coronary syndromes. *Circulation*. 2014;130:e344-426.
10. Thygesen K, Mair J, Katus H, Plebani M, Venge P, Collinson P, Lindahl B, Giannitsis E, Hasin Y, Galvani M, Tubaro M, Alpert JS, Biasucci LM, Koenig W, Mueller C, Huber K, Hamm C, Jaffe AS; Study Group on Biomarkers in Cardiology of the ESC Working Group on Acute Cardiac Care. Recommendations for the use of cardiac troponin measurement in acute cardiac care. *Eur Heart J*. 2010;31:2197–2204. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehq251
11. Klinkenberg LJ, Wildi K, van der Linden N, Kouw IW, Niens M, Twerenbold R, Rubini Gimenez M, Puelacher C, Daniel Neuhaus J, Hillinger P, Nestelberger T, Boeddinghaus J, Grimm K, Sabti Z, Bons JA, van Suijlen JD, Tan FE, Ten Kate J, Bekers O, van Loon LJ, van Dieijen-Visser MP, Mueller C, Meex SJ. Diurnal rhythm of cardiac troponin: consequences for the diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. *Clin Chem*. 2016;62:1602–1611. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2016.257485
12. Rubini Gimenez M, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Wildi K, Haaf P, Schaefer M, Zellweger C, Moehring B, Stallone F, Sou SM, Mueller M, Denhaerynck K, Mosimann T, Reiter M, Meller B, Freese M, Stelzig C, Klimmeck I, Voegele J, Hartmann B, Rentsch K, Osswald S, Mueller C. Direct comparison of high-sensitivity-cardiac troponin I vs. T for the early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. *Eur Heart J*. 2014;35:2303–2311. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu188
13. Artunc F, Mueller C, Breidthardt T, Twerenbold R, Peter A, Thamer C, Weyrich P, Haering HU, Friedrich B. Sensitive troponins—which suits better for hemodialysis patients? Associated factors and prediction of mortality. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:e47610. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0047610
14. Bais R. The effect of sample hemolysis on cardiac troponin I and T assays. *Clin Chem*. 2010;56:1357–1359. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2010.144139
15. Lippi G, Aloe R, Meschi T, Borghi L, Cervellin G. Interference from heterophilic antibodies in troponin testing. Case report and systematic review of the literature. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2013;426:79–84. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2013.09.004
16. van der Linden N, Cornelis T, Klinkenberg LJ, Kimenai DM, Hilderink JM, Litjens EJ, Kooman JP, Bekers O, van Dieijen-Visser MP, Meex SJ. Strong diurnal rhythm of troponin T, but not troponin I, in a patient with renal dysfunction. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016;221:287–288. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.06.268
17. van der Linden N, Klinkenberg LJ, Bekers O, Loon LJ, Dieijen-Visser MP, Zeegers MP, Meex SJ. Prognostic value of basal high-sensitive cardiac troponin levels on mortality in the general population: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95:e5703. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000005703
18. Katrukha IA. Human cardiac troponin complex. Structure and functions. *Biochemistry (Mosc)*. 2013;78:1447–1465. doi: 10.1134/S0006297913130063

19. Wu AH, Feng YJ. Biochemical differences between cTnT and cTnI and their significance for diagnosis of acute coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J*. 1998;19(Suppl N):N25–N29.

20. Kimenai DM, Henry RM, van der Kallen CJ, Dagnelie PC, Schram MT, Stehouwer CD, van Suijlen JD, Niens M, Bekers O, Sep SJ, Schaper NC, van Dieijen-Visser MP, Meex SJ. Direct comparison of clinical decision limits for cardiac troponin T and I. *Heart*. 2016;102:610–616. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308917

21. Wildi K, Gimenez MR, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Jaeger C, Heinzelmann A, Arnold C, Nelles B, Druey S, Haaf P, Hillinger P, Schaerli N, Kreutzinger P, Tanglay Y, Herrmann T, Moreno Weidmann Z, Krivoshei L, Freese M, Stelzig C, Puelacher C, Rentsch K, Osswald S, Mueller C. Misdiagnosis of myocardial infarction related to limitations of the current regulatory approach to define clinical decision values for cardiac troponin. *Circulation*. 2015;131:2032–2040. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.014129

22. Inker LA, Schmid CH, Tighiouart H, Eckfeldt JH, Feldman HI, Greene T, Kusek JW, Manzi J, Van Lente F, Zhang YL, Coresh J, Levey AS; CKD-EPI Investigators. Estimating glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine and cystatin C. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367:20–29. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1114248

23. Haaf P, Reichlin T, Twerenbold R, Hoeller R, Rubini Gimenez M, Zellweger C, Moehring B, Fischer C, Meller B, Wildi K, Freese M, Stelzig C, Mosimann T, Reiter M, Mueller M, Hochgruber T, Sou SM, Murray K, Minners J, Freidank H, Osswald S, Mueller C. Risk stratification in patients with acute chest pain using three high-sensitivity cardiac troponin assays. *Eur Heart J*. 2014;35:365–375. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/eht218

24. Reiter M, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Benz B, Haaf P, Meissner J, Hochholzer W, Stelzig C, Freese M, Heinisch C, Balmelli C, Drexler B, Freidank H, Winkler K, Campodarve I, Gea J, Mueller C. Early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction in patients with pre-existing coronary artery disease using more sensitive cardiac troponin assays. *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33:988–997. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehr376

25. Than M, Cullen L, Aldous S, Parsonage WA, Reid CM, Greenslade J, Flaws D, Hammett CJ, Beam DM, Ardagh MW, Troughton R, Brown AF, George P, Florkowski CM, Kline JA, Peacock WF, Maisel AS, Lim SH, Lamanna A, Richards AM. 2-Hour accelerated diagnostic protocol to assess patients with chest pain symptoms using contemporary troponins as the only biomarker: the ADAPT trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;59:2091–2098. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012.02.035

26. Than M, Aldous S, Lord SJ, Goodacre S, Frampton CM, Troughton R, George P, Florkowski CM, Ardagh M, Smyth D, Jardine DL, Peacock WF, Young J, Hamilton G, Deely JM, Cullen L, Richards AM. A 2-hour diagnostic protocol for possible cardiac chest pain in the emergency department: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014;174:51–58. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.11362

27. Than MP, Pickering JW, Aldous SJ, Cullen L, Frampton CM, Peacock WF, Jaffe AS, Goodacre SW, Richards AM, Ardagh MW, Deely JM, Florkowski CM, George P, Hamilton GJ, Jardine DL, Troughton RW, van Wyk P, Young JM, Bannister L, Lord SJ. Effectiveness of EDACS versus ADAPT accelerated diagnostic pathways for chest pain: a pragmatic randomized controlled trial embedded within practice. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2016;68:93–102.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2016.01.001

28. Luepker RV, Apple FS, Christenson RH, Crow RS, Fortmann SP, Goff D, Goldberg RJ, Hand MM, Jaffe AS, Julian DG, Levy D, Manolio T, Mendis S, Mensah G, Pajak A, Prineas RJ, Reddy KS, Roger VL, Rosamond WD, Shahar E, Sharrett AR, Sorlie P, Tunstall-Pedoe H; AHA Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; AHA Statistics Committee; World Heart Federation Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Epidemiology and Prevention; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Case definitions for acute coronary heart disease in epidemiology and clinical research studies: a statement from the AHA Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; AHA Statistics Committee; World Heart Federation Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Epidemiology and Prevention; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. *Circulation*. 2003;108:2543–2549. doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.0000100560.46946.EA

29. Thygesen K, Alpert JS, White HD, Jaffe AS, Apple FS, Galvani M, Katus HA, Newby LK, Ravkilde J, Chaitman B, Clemmensen PM, Dellborg M, Hod H, Porela P, Underwood R, Bax JJ, Beller GA, Bonow R, Van der Wall EE, Bassand JP, Wijns W, Ferguson TB, Steg PG, Uretsky BF, Williams DO, Armstrong PW, Antman EM, Fox KA, Hamm CW, Ohman EM, Simoons ML, Poole-Wilson PA, Gurfinkel EP, Lopez-Sendon JL, Pais P, Mendis S, Zhu JR, Wallentin LC, Fernández-Avilés F, Fox KM, Parkhomenko AN, Priori SG,

Tendera M, Voipio-Pulkki LM, Vahanian A, Camm AJ, De Caterina R, Dean V, Dickstein K, Filippatos G, Funck-Brentano C, Hellemans I, Kristensen SD, McGregor K, Sechtem U, Silber S, Tendera M, Widimsky P, Zamorano JL, Morais J, Brener S, Harrington R, Morrow D, Lim M, Martinez-Rios MA, Steinhubl S, Levine GN, Gibler WB, Goff D, Tubaro M, Dudek D, Al-Attar N; Joint ESC/ACCF/AHA/WHF Task Force for the Redefinition of Myocardial Infarction. Universal definition of myocardial infarction. *Circulation*. 2007;116:2634–2653. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.187397

30. Apple FS, Wu AH, Jaffe AS. European Society of Cardiology and American College of Cardiology guidelines for redefinition of myocardial infarction: how to use existing assays clinically and for clinical trials. *Am Heart J*. 2002;144:981–986. doi: 10.1067/mhj.2002.124048

31. Apple FS, Wu AH, Jaffe AS, Panteghini M, Christenson RH, Cannon CP, Francis G, Jesse RL, Morrow DA, Newby LK, Storrow AB, Tang WH, Pagani F, Tate J, Ordonez-Llanos J, Mair J; National Academy of Clinical Biochemistry; IFCC Committee for Standardization of Markers of Cardiac Damage Laboratory Medicine. National Academy of Clinical Biochemistry and IFCC Committee for Standardization of Markers of Cardiac Damage Laboratory Medicine practice guidelines: Analytical issues for biomarkers of heart failure. *Circulation*. 2007;116:e95–e98. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.185266

32. Koerbin G, Tate J, Potter JM, Cavanaugh J, Glasgow N, Hickman PE. Characterisation of a highly sensitive troponin I assay and its application to a cardio-healthy population. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2012;50:871–878. doi: 10.1515/cclm-2011-0540

33. Giannitsis E, Kurz K, Hallermayer K, Jarausch J, Jaffe AS, Katus HA. Analytical validation of a high-sensitive cardiac troponin T assay. *Clin Chem*. 2010;56:254–261. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2009.132654

34. Wildi K, Twerenbold R, Jaeger C, Rubini Giménez M, Reichlin T, Stoll M, Hillinger P, Puelacher C, Boeddinghaus J, Nestelberger T, Grimm K, Grob M, Rentsch K, Arnold C, Mueller C. Clinical impact of the 2010-2012 low-end shift of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care*. 2016;5:399–408. doi: 10.1177/2048872616642952

35. Hallermayer K, Jarausch J, Menassanch-Volker S, Zaugg C, Ziegler A. Implications of adjustment of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T assay. *Clin Chem*. 2013;59:572–574. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2012.197103

36. Kavsak PA, Hill SA, McQueen MJ, Devereaux PJ. Implications of adjustment of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T assay. *Clin Chem*. 2013;59:574–576. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2012.197434

37. Levey AS, Coresh J, Greene T, Stevens LA, Zhang YL, Hendriksen S, Kusek JW, Van Lente F; Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration. Using standardized serum creatinine values in the modification of diet in renal disease study equation for estimating glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med*. 2006;145:247–254. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-145-4-200608150-00004

38. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. A method of comparing the areas under receiver operating characteristic curves derived from the same cases. *Radiology*. 1983;148:839–843. doi: 10.1148/radiology.148.3.6878708

39. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB Sr, Demler OV. Novel metrics for evaluating improvement in discrimination: net reclassification and integrated discrimination improvement for normal variables and nested models. *Stat Med*. 2012;31:101–113. doi: 10.1002/sim.4348

40. Reichlin T, Schindler C, Drexler B, Twerenbold R, Reiter M, Zellweger C, Moehring B, Ziller R, Hoeller R, Rubini Gimenez M, Haaf P, Potocki M, Wildi K, Balmelli C, Freese M, Stelzig C, Freidank H, Osswald S, Mueller C. One-hour rule-out and rule-in of acute myocardial infarction using high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T. *Arch Intern Med*. 2012;172:1211–1218. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2012.3698

41. Jaeger C, Wildi K, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Rubini Gimenez M, Neuhaus JD, Grimm K, Boeddinghaus J, Hillinger P, Nestelberger T, Singeisen H, Gugala M, Pretre G, Puelacher C, Wagener M, Honegger U, Schumacher C, Moreno Weidmann Z, Kreutzinger P, Krivoshei L, Freese M, Stelzig C, Dietsche S, Ernst S, Rentsch K, Osswald S, Mueller C. One-hour rule-in and rule-out of acute myocardial infarction using high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I. *Am Heart J*. 2016;171:92–102.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2015.07.022

42. Raskovalova T, Twerenbold R, Collinson PO, Keller T, Bouvaist H, Folli C, Giavarina D, Lotze U, Eggers KM, Dupuy AM, Chenevier-Gobeaux C, Meune C, Maisel A, Mueller C, Labarère J. Diagnostic accuracy of combined cardiac troponin and copeptin assessment for early rule-out of myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care*. 2014;3:18–27. doi: 10.1177/2048872613514015

43. Lipinski MJ, Baker NC, Escárcega RO, Torguson R, Chen F, Aldous SJ, Christ M, Collinson PO, Goodacre SW, Mair J, Inoue K, Lotze U, Sebbane M, Cris-

tol JP, Freund Y, Chenevier-Gobeaux C, Meune C, Eggers KM, Pracoń R, Schreiber DH, Wu AH, Ordoñez-Llanos J, Jaffe AS, Twerenbold R, Mueller C, Waksman R. Comparison of conventional and high-sensitivity troponin in patients with chest pain: a collaborative meta-analysis. *Am Heart J*. 2015;169:6–16.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2014.10.007

44. Collinson P, Gaze D, Goodacre S. Comparison of contemporary troponin assays with the novel biomarkers, heart fatty acid binding protein and co-peptin, for the early confirmation or exclusion of myocardial infarction in patients presenting to the emergency department with chest pain. *Heart*. 2014;100:140–145. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2013-304716

45. Chapman AR, Lee KK, McAllister DA, Cullen L, Greenslade JH, Parsonage W, Worster A, Kavsak PA, Blankenberg S, Neumann J, Sörensen NA, Westermann D, Buijs MM, Verdel GJE, Pickering JW, Than MP, Twerenbold R, Badertscher P, Sabti Z, Mueller C, Anand A, Adamson P, Strachan FE, Ferry A, Sandeman D, Gray A, Body R, Keevil B, Carlton E, Greaves K, Korley FK, Metkus TS, Sandoval Y, Apple FS, Newby DE, Shah ASV, Mills NL. Association of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin I concentration with cardiac outcomes in patients with suspected acute coronary syndrome. *JAMA*. 2017;318:1913–1924. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.17488

46. Pickering JW, Than MP, Cullen L, Aldous S, Ter Avest E, Body R, Carlton EW, Collinson P, Dupuy AM, Ekelund U, Eggers KM, Florkowski CM, Freund Y, George P, Goodacre S, Greenslade JH, Jaffe AS, Lord SJ, Mokhtari A, Mueller C, Munro A, Mustapha S, Parsonage W, Peacock WF, Pemberton C, Richards AM, Sanchis J, Staub LP, Troughton R, Twerenbold R, Wildi K, Young J. Rapid rule-out of acute myocardial infarction with a single high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T measurement below the limit of detection: a collaborative meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166:715–724. doi: 10.7326/M16-2562

47. Hollander JE, Than M, Mueller C. State-of-the-art evaluation of emergency department patients presenting with potential acute coronary syndromes. *Circulation*. 2016;134:547–564. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA. 116.021886

48. Mueller C, Giannitsis E, Möckel M, Huber K, Mair J, Plebani M, Thygesen K, Jaffe AS, Lindahl B; Biomarker Study Group of the ESC Acute Cardiovascular Care Association. Rapid rule out of acute myocardial infarction: novel biomarker-based strategies. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care*. 2017;6:218–222. doi: 10.1177/2048872616653229

49. Devaux Y, Mueller M, Haaf P, Goretti E, Twerenbold R, Zangrando J, Vausort M, Reichlin T, Wildi K, Moehring B, Wagner DR, Mueller C. Diagnostic and prognostic value of circulating microRNAs in patients with acute chest pain. *J Intern Med*. 2015;277:260–271. doi: 10.1111/joim.12183

50. Haaf P, Zellweger C, Reichlin T, Zbinden A, Wildi K, Mosimann T, Twerenbold R, Reiter M, Balmelli C, Freidank H, Gimenez MR, Peter F, Freese M, Stelzig C, Hartmann B, Dinter C, Osswald S, Mueller C. Utility of C-terminal proendothelin in the early diagnosis and risk stratification of patients with suspected acute myocardial infarction. *Can J Cardiol*. 2014;30:195–203. doi: 10.1016/j.cjca.2013.11.020

51. Wildi K, Haaf P, Reichlin T, Acemoglu R, Schneider J, Balmelli C, Drexler B, Twerenbold R, Mosimann T, Reiter M, Mueller M, Ernst S, Ballarino P, Zellweger C, Moehring B, Vilaplana C, Freidank H, Mueller C. Uric acid for diagnosis and risk stratification in suspected myocardial infarction. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2013;43:174–182. doi: 10.1111/eci.12029

52. Haaf P, Balmelli C, Reichlin T, Twerenbold R, Reiter M, Meissner J, Schaub N, Stelzig C, Freese M, Paniz P, Meune C, Drexler B, Freidank H, Winkler K, Hochholzer W, Mueller C. N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide in the early evaluation of suspected acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Med*. 2011;124:731–739. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2011.02.035

53. Reiter M, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Mueller M, Hoeller R, Moehring B, Haaf P, Wildi K, Merk S, Bernhard D, Mueller CZ, Freese M, Freidank H, Campodarve Botet I, Mueller C. Heart-type fatty acid-binding protein in the early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. *Heart*. 2013;99:708–714. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2012-303325

54. Reichlin T, Hochholzer W, Stelzig C, Laule K, Freidank H, Morgenthaler NG, Bergmann A, Potocki M, Noveanu M, Breidthardt T, Christ A, Boldanova T, Merki R, Schaub N, Bingisser R, Christ M, Mueller C. Incremental value of copeptin for rapid rule out of acute myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;54:60–68. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2009.01.076

55. Kaier TE, Twerenbold R, Puelacher C, Marjot J, Imambaccus N, Boeddinghaus J, Nestelberger T, Badertscher P, Sabti Z, Giménez MR, Wildi K, Hillinger P, Grimm K, Loeffel S, Shrestha S, Widmer DF, Cupa J, Kozhuharov N, Miró Ò, Martín-Sánchez FJ, Morawiec B, Rentsch K, Lohrmann J, Kloos W, Osswald S, Reichlin T, Weber E, Marber M, Mueller C. Direct comparison of cardiac myosin-binding protein C with cardiac troponins for the early diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction. *Circulation*. 2017;136:1495–1508. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA. 117.028084

56. Reichlin T, Cullen L, Parsonage WA, Greenslade J, Twerenbold R, Moehring B, Wildi K, Mueller S, Zellweger C, Mosimann T, Rubini Gimenez M, Rentsch K, Osswald S, Müller C. Two-hour algorithm for triage toward rule-out and rule-in of acute myocardial infarction using high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T. *Am J Med*. 2015;128:369–79.e4. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2014.10.032

57. Mueller C, Giannitsis E, Christ M, Ordóñez-Llanos J, deFilippi C, McCord J, Body R, Panteghini M, Jernberg T, Plebani M, Verschuren F, French J, Christenson R, Weiser S, Bendig G, Dilba P, Lindahl B; TRAPID-AMI Investigators. Multicenter evaluation of a 0-hour/1-hour algorithm in the diagnosis of myocardial infarction with high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2016;68:76–87.e4. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2015.11.013

58. Guclu T, Bolat S, Şenes M, Yucel D. Relationship between high sensitivity troponins and estimated glomerular filtration rate. *Clin Biochem*. 2016;49:467–471. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2015.12.012

59. Adamczyk M, Brashear RJ, Mattingly PG. Circulating cardiac troponin-I autoantibodies in human plasma and serum. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2009;1173:67–74. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04617.x

60. Than M, Herbert M, Flaws D, Cullen L, Hess E, Hollander JE, Diercks D, Ardagh MW, Kline JA, Munro Z, Jaffe A. What is an acceptable risk of major adverse cardiac event in chest pain patients soon after discharge from the Emergency Department?: a clinical survey. *Int J Cardiol*. 2013;166:752–754. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2012.09.171

61. Pickering JW, Than MP. The small number problem in diagnostic algorithms and why we need to bootstrap. *Clin Biochem*. 2017;50:540–541. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2017.02.009

62. Shortt C, Xie F, Whitlock R, Ma J, Clayton N, Sherbino J, Hill SA, Pare G, McQueen M, Mehta SR, Devereaux PJ, Worster A, Kavsak P. Economic considerations of early rule-in/rule-out algorithms for the diagnosis of myocardial infarction in the emergency department using cardiac troponin and glycemic biomarkers. *Clin Chem*. 2017;63:593–602. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2016.261776

63. Bewick V, Cheek L, Ball J. Statistics review 14: Logistic regression. *Crit Care*. 2005;9:112–118. doi: 10.1186/cc3045