

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>

Potential Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

lournal:	BM1 Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-046223
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	An, Tao; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart failure center Tian, Yue; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Echocardiography Guo, Jingfei; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Kang, Wenying; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Tian, Tao; Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College Fuwai Hospital, Zhou, Chenghui; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology
Keywords:	Adult anaesthesia < ANAESTHETICS, Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, Anaesthesia in cardiology < ANAESTHETICS
	·





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

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

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

Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Adult Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

Tao An¹, M.D, Ph.D; Yue Tian², M.D; Jingfei Guo¹, M.D; Wenying Kang, M.D; Tao Tian^{*3}, M.D, Ph.D ; Chenghui Zhou^{*4}, M.D, Ph.D,

¹State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart Failure Center, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, China ²Department of Echocardiography, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College, China

³Department of Cardiology, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing, China.

⁴Department of Anesthesiology, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, 100037, China

*Address for Correspondence: Tao Tian and Chenghui Zhou;
No. 167 Beilishi Road, 100037 Xicheng District, Beijing, China
Tel: 86-10-88398082, Fax: 86-10-88398082
E-mail: tiantaophd@163.com (Tian T); chenghuizhou@yahoo.com (Zhou Ch).

Word Count: 3053 words.

ABSTRACT

Introduction Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as one important complication in association with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality. The potential dose response effect of postprocedural cardiac troponin (cTn) levels on adverse clinical outcomes has not been studied. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on the all related prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between the postoperative elevated cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following noncardiac surgery.

Methods We will search PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, and ISI Knowledge via Web of Science database (from inception until Oct, 2020) to identify all prospective cohort studies using the related keywords. The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The second outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular event (MACE). Univariate or multivariate meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level. Sensitivity analyses were used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACE. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACE, studies with three or more categories will be included.

Ethics and dissemination Ethical approval is waived for the systematic review protocol according to the Institutional Review Board /Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Keywords: myocardial injury, noncardiac surgery, postoperative cardiac troponin,

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

PROSPERO registration number CRD42020173175.

to peer teriew only

2
3 ⊿
4
5
0
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
1/
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 24
24 25
35
30
3/
38
39
40
41
4Z
43
44 45
45 46
40
47 70
40 40
+7 50
50
57
52 52
54
55
56
57
58
50
~

60

Strengths and limitations of this study

1. This meta-analysis will be the first one to explore the potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn level and adverse clinical outcomes in adult non-cardiac surgery.

2. This meta-analysis will be the first one focusing the prognostic significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below URL.

3. This meta-analysis will include the largest study population with only prospective enrollment.

4. The baseline cTn level is not a regular test for patients undergoing noncardiac surgery resulting insufficient data.

5. This work could not rule out the potential influence of different detection kit and method for the cTn level in the included studies

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Introduction

Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as one important complication in association with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality¹. Some studies have showed that the incidence of MINS is common as many as $30 \sim 45\%$ based on postoperative high sensitive cardiac troponin(cTn) level²⁻⁴. The major proposed mechanism of MINS is imbalance of myocardial oxygen supply-demand including perioperative hypotension⁵, hypoxia⁶, anemia⁷, previous coronary artery disease⁸, and coronary thrombosis⁹. Postoperative cTn measurement is recommended in high-risk patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. According to the latest fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (UDMI) in 2018⁶, the cutoff value for regularly diagnosing MINS is the 99th percentile upper reference limit (URL) of postoperative cTn level. However, increase in the prognostic effect of cTn still requires the newly-onset ischemia-related evidence of myocardium including electrocardiogram, echocardiography, coronary computed tomography (CT), or coronary angiography⁶. However, these cardiac-specific examinations are not regularly used in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery, and may increase a large amount of cost during hospitalization.

Given the limited high-quality evidence and controversial findings from available studies concerning the long-term prognostic significance following noncardiac surgery, whether there is an optimal cutoff value for postoperative cTn level to diagnose MINS with improved prognostic significance remains unknown¹⁰⁻¹⁶. Moreover, quantitative analysis for the myocardial injury below the recommended URL has not been systematically studied¹⁷. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on the all related prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between the postoperative elevated cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following noncardiac surgery.

Objectives

The purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to explore the potential dose-response relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and adverse clinical outcomes after adult noncardiac surgery.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Search Strategy

We will report this meta-analysis following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guideline¹⁸. We will search PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, and ISI Knowledge via Web of Science database (from inception until Oct, 2020), and the reference lists of the retrieved articles. The related search keywords are listed in Table 1. This meta-analysis has been registered in the PROSPERO with registration ID CRD42020173175. The searching process is shown in Figure 1.

Type of Participants

We will include adult patients undergoing noncardiac surgery as study participants.

Type of Studies

We will include prospective cohort studies that have reported the associations of the postoperative cardiac troponin levels with the incidence of major adverse clinical outcomes. The publication language will be limited as English. The studies unable to extract odds ratio(OR) or hazard ration(HR) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) will be excluded.

Type of Outcomes

The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The second outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular event (MACE).

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

MACE is a combined endpoint including at least three of the following events: death, cardiovascular death, any cause for coronary revascularization, unstable angina, myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, major adverse arrhythmias requiring treatment, cardiac arrest, pulmonary embolism, or stroke. The follow-up duration will be divided into three time periods: 'short term (1-3 months)', 'medium term $(3\sim12 \text{ months})$ ', and 'long term (≥1 year)'. Both primary outcome and second outcome will be included in the analysis of potential dose-response effect.

Data Extraction

Data will be extracted by two independent authors (T. An and T. Yue). Discrepancies will be resolved by group discussion. The extracted data included study design (author, publication year, country, sample size, percentage of positive cTn levels), patient characteristics (mean age, male proportion, diabetes proportion, hypertension proportion, hyperlipidemia proportion, smoking proportion, coronary artery disease[CAD] proportion, previous myocardial infarction, chronic heart failure, atrial fibrillation, history of valvular heart disease, history of peripheral vascular disease, history of stroke or transient ischemic accident, kidney dysfunction, history of lung disease, history of liver disease, elective surgery proportion, vascular surgery proportion, general anesthesia, revised cardiac risk index[RCRI], beta-blocker usage, statin usage, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor[ACEI]/ Angiotensin Receptor Blocker[ARB] usage, calcium channel blocker usage, aspirin usage), follow-up period, detection kit of cTn, URL of cTn, detection limit of cTn, cutoff value of cTn, and the different categories for postoperative cTn level.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The methodological quality of the studies will be evaluated in accordance with the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (NOS)¹⁹.

BMJ Open

Data synthesis

The ORs or HRs in each study will be extracted or calculated from the elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level for the pooled analysis. Specifically, the HR will be calculated based on the Log-rank test or the Kaplan-Meier survival curve²⁰. Nonelevated category at the lowest cTn level will be chose as the reference. The DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model will be used in the pooled analysis for the potential clinical inconsistency regardless of heterogeneity test. Univariate or multivariate meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level²¹. Sensitivity analyses were used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACE. Publication bias assessment will be performed by the Begg's and Egger's test. If one study reported multiple categories (>2 categories), we will calculate the OR by using the number of event and total in all of the elevated categories and referent one for the high vs low analysis. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACE, studies with three or more categories will be included. If the category only provides the numerical value of elevated cTn level, we will convert this into the number of times the corresponding URL in each individual study. The average level of elevated cTn in each category will be estimated by the mean of the lower and upper levels. If the highest category had an open upper level, the mean level was estimated to be 1.2x the level of the lower levels²². P < 0.05(2-sided) was considered to be statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed in Stata software (version 10.0, StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA) and RevMan software (version 5.0, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom).

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

DISCUSSION

Although there has been several meta-analyses concerning about the perioperative troponin levels and adverse clinical outcomes in adult cardiac surgery, there are obvious weakness for these works (including a large amount of retrospective studies¹⁶, only focusing on preoperative troponin levels¹⁴ ²³, without distinguishing preoperative and postoperative troponin levels ²⁴. Moreover, no previous meta-analysis has studied the potential linear or non-linear dose-response relationship between postoperative troponin level and adverse clinical outcomes in adult cardiac surgery. In addition, several recent studies have reported the prognostic role of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury (below URL)¹⁷, which need to be paid attention for early risk stratification and improved outcomes in the future.

The strengths of this systematic review and meta-analysis include the prospective design in all the included studies, and its ability in gathering a large study population in this area. Moreover, for the first time, we will explore a potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn level and adverse clinical outcomes. In addition, the significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below URL will firstly be focused¹⁷. The limitations, on the other hand, are also existed in our analysis. Firstly, the univariate or multivariate meta-regression and subgroup analyses are mainly based on the aggregate patient data, but not individual patient data. Other confounding factors may be underestimated. Secondly, we will focus the effect of baseline cTn level in the analysis. However, the baseline cTn level is not a regular test for patients undergoing noncardiac surgery resulting insufficient data. Thirdly, we could not rule out the potential influence of different detection kit and method for the cTn level in the included studies. Fourthly, our analysis may not be sufficient for a diagnosis of myocardial infarction for lacking additional evidence of myocardial ischemia (electrocardiography, echocardiography, coronary CT or angiography) required in the fourth UDMI.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Ethical approval is waived according to the Institutional Review Board /Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Reference

1. Puelacher C, Lurati Buse G, Seeberger D, et al. Perioperative Myocardial Injury After Noncardiac Surgery: Incidence, Mortality, and Characterization. *Circulation* 2018;137(12):1221-32.

2. Kavsak PA, Walsh M, Srinathan S, et al. High sensitivity troponin T concentrations in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Biochem* 2011;44(12):1021-4.

3. Hietala P, Strandberg M, Kiviniemi T, et al. Usefulness of troponin T to predict short-term and long-term mortality in patients after hip fracture. *Am J Cardiol* 2014;114(2):193-7.

4. Gillies MA, Shah AS, Mullenheim J, et al. Perioperative myocardial injury in patients receiving cardiac output-guided haemodynamic therapy: a substudy of the OPTIMISE Trial. *Br J Anaesth* 2015;115(2):227-33.

5. Liem VGB, Hoeks SE, Mol K, et al. Postoperative Hypotension after Noncardiac Surgery and the Association with Myocardial Injury. *Anesthesiology* 2020;133(3):510-22.

6. Thygesen K, Alpert JS, Jaffe AS, et al. Fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (2018). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72(18):2231-64.

7. Sousa J, Rocha-Neves J, Oliveira-Pinto J, et al. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery (MINS) in EVAR patients: a retrospective single-centre study. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2020. (accessed Sep 4).

8. Gualandro DM, Campos CA, Calderaro D, et al. Coronary plaque rupture in patients with myocardial infarction after noncardiac surgery: frequent and dangerous. *Atherosclerosis* 2012;222(1):191-5.

9. Sheth T, Chan M, Butler C, et al. Prognostic capabilities of coronary computed tomographic angiography before non-cardiac surgery: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2015;350:h1907.

10. Devereaux PJ, Szczeklik W. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery: diagnosis and management. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41(32):3083-91.

11. Park J, Hyeon CW, Lee SH, et al. Mildly Elevated Cardiac Troponin below the 99th-Percentile Upper Reference Limit after Noncardiac Surgery. *Korean Circ J* 2020;50(10):925-37.

12. Millán-Figueroa A, López-Navarro JM, Pérez-Díaz I, et al. Evaluation of Perioperative High-Sensitive Cardiac Troponin I as a Predictive Biomarker of Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events After Noncardiac Surgery. *Rev Invest Clin* 2020;73(3)

13. Conti D, Ballo P, Ruggiano P, et al. Very early postoperative troponin increase and clinical outcome in patients admitted to the recovery room after noncardiac surgery with suspected cardiac events. *Indian Heart J* 2020;72(3):197-9.

14. Humble CAS, Huang S, Jammer I, et al. Prognostic performance of preoperative cardiac troponin and perioperative changes in cardiac troponin for the prediction of major adverse cardiac events and mortality in noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2019;14(4):e0215094.

15. Nagele P, Rao LK, Penta M, et al. Postoperative myocardial injury after major head and neck cancer surgery. *Head Neck* 2011;33(8):1085-91.

16. Levy M, Heels-Ansdell D, Hiralal R, et al. Prognostic value of troponin and creatine kinase muscle and brain isoenzyme measurement after noncardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Anesthesiology* 2011;114(4):796-806.

17. Cho SW. Subclinical and Tiny Myocardial Injury within Upper Reference Limit of Cardiac Troponin Should Not Be Ignored after Noncardiac Surgery. *Korean Circ J* 2020;50(10):938-9.

1	
2	
3	18. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and
4	mote analysis protocols (DRISMA D) 2015: alaboration and evaluation RMJ 2015:250:07647
5	meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015. elaboration and explanation. <i>Bivis</i> 2015,550.g7047.
6	19. Murad MH, Sultan S, Haffar S, et al. Methodological quality and synthesis of case series and case
/	reports. BMJ Evid Based Med 2018;23(2):60-3.
8	20 Williamson PR Smith CT Hutton II, et al. Aggregate data meta-analysis with time-to-event
9	20. Williamson FR, Sinth CT, Hutton JL, et al. Aggregate data meta-analysis with time-to-event
10	outcomes. <i>Stat Med</i> 2002;21(22):3337-51.
11	21. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med
12	2002-21/11)-1520-58
15	2002,21(11).1559-56.
14	22. Berlin JA, Longnecker MP, Greenland S. Meta-analysis of epidemiologic dose-response data.
15	Epidemiology 1993;4(3):218-28.
17	22 Shen IT, Yu M, Wu V, et al. Association of pre-operative troponin levels with major adverse cardiac
17	25. Shen 31, Xu W, Wu T, et al. Association of pre-operative troponin levels with major adverse cardiac
10	events and mortality after noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J
20	Anaesthesiol 2018;35(11):815-24.
20	24. Zhang LL Li N, Li V, et al. Cardiac Biomarkers Predicting MACE in Patients Undergoing Noncardiac
27	24. Zhang E, E N, E T, et al. cardiac biomarkers redicting where in rations ondergoing Noncardiac
23	Surgery: A Meta-Analysis. Front Physiol 2018;9:1923.
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
4/	
48	
49 50	
5U E1	
51	
J∠ 52	
55 57	
54	
55	
57	
58	
59	
60	

Author Contributions CZ and TT contributed to the conception and design of the study, and revision of the protocol. The manuscript of the protocol was drafted by TA. TA and JG will independently search and select the eligible studies and extract the data from the included studies. YT and WK will assess methodological quality and the risk of bias. All the authors approved the protocol publication.

Funding This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 81970290[Chenghui Zhou] and 81400271[Chenghui Zhou]).

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Flow Chart of the Trial Searching Process.

to beet eviewony

	The gy for Fubliced, EMIDASE, Cochrane Library, and ISI Knowledge va web of Science Database	
Database	Search items	
PubMed	ated to	
No	text a	
INO.	nd dat	
# 1	((((troponin) OR (troponins)) OR (TnI)) OR (TnT))	
# ว	(noncording surgery) OP (non cording surgery)	
# 2	(noncardiac surgery) OK (non-cardiac surgery)	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
EMBase	similar or	
# 1	troponin OR troponins OR tni OR tnt OR (myocardial AND injury)	
# 2	noncardiac AND surgery OR ('non cardiac' AND surgery)	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	

Page 17 of 21				BMJ Open Sp j
1 2 3 4				open-2020-046 yright, includ
5 6	Coch	rane Lib	rary	ing for
7 8 9	#1			troponin in All Text OR troponins in All Text OR TnI in All Text
10 11 12				OR myocardial injury in All Te
13 14	#2			noncardiac surgery in All Text OR non-cardiac surgery in All Text
15 16 17	#3			# 1 and # 2
18 19 20	ISI	Knowl	edge	ining, A
21 22 23	via	Web	of	l training
24 25 26	Scien	ce		g, and s
20 27 28	#1			(troponin) OR TOPIC: (troponins) OR TOPIC: (TnI) OR TOPIC: (TnT) OR TOPIC:
29 30 31				(myocardial injury)
32 33				Timespan: All years. Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, ME DLINE, RSCI, SCIELO.
34 35 36				Search language=Auto
37 38 39				rtment
40 41				GEZ-LT
42 43 44				For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
45 46				

	BMJ Open by copyric	Page
# 2	TOPIC: (noncardiac surgery) OR TOPIC: (non-cardiac surgery) Timespan: All years.	-
	Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, MEDLINE, RSCI, SCIELO.Search language=Auto	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
	wnloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, geschool . xt and data mining, Al training, and similar technolog	
	jies.	
	nt Dep	
	nt <u>o</u>	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

2



Based on the PRISN	1A-P guidelir	ies.	
Instructions to	authors		
Complete this checl	klist by enteri	ing the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.	
Your article may not	currently ad	dress 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	e "n/a" and provide a short explanation.	
Upload your comple	eted checklis	t as an extra file when you submit to a journal.	
In your methods sec	ction, say tha	t you used the PRISMA-Preporting guidelines, and cite them as:	
Moher D, Shamseer	L, Clarke M,	Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Revi	ew and Meta-
Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2	015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.	
		Reporting Item	Page Numbe
Title			
THU			
Identification	<u>#1a</u>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	<u>#1b</u>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	No update
Registration			
regionation			
	<u>#2</u>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	2
Authors			
Contact	<u>#3a</u>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing	1
		address of corresponding author	
Contribution	<u>#3b</u>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	12
Amendments			Not

Page 21 of 21

		such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support			
Sources	<u>#5a</u>	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	
Sponsor	<u>#5b</u>	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or	<u>#5c</u>	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
funder			
Introduction			
Rationale	<u>#6</u>	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	
Objectives	<u>#7</u>	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants,	
		interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
Methods			
Eligibility criteria	<u>#8</u>	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report	
		characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for	
		eligibility for the review	
Information sources	<u>#9</u>	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors,	
		trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
Search strategy	<u>#10</u>	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned	
		limits, such that it could be repeated	
Study records - data	<u>#11a</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	
management			
Study records -	<u>#11b</u>	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers)	
selection process		through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
Study records - data	<u>#11c</u>	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done	
collection process		independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	
Data items	<u>#12</u>	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any	

Page 22 of 21

Outcomes and	<u>#13</u>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and	6,7
prioritization		additional outcomes, with rationale	
Risk of bias in	<u>#14</u>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this	7
individual studies		will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data	
		synthesis	
Data synthesis	<u>#15a</u>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	8
Data synthesis	<u>#15b</u>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of	8
		handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of	
		consistency (such as I2, Kendall's T)	
Data synthesis	<u>#15c</u>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	8
		regression)	
Data synthesis	<u>#15d</u>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	8
Meta-bias(es)	<u>#16</u>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies,	8
		selective reporting within studies)	
Confidence in	<u>#17</u>	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	8
cumulative evidence			
None The PRISMA-P ch	necklist is	distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can b	pe completed
online using https://www	w.goodrep	ports.org/, a tool made by the EQUATOR Network in collaboration with Penelope.ai	
	F	or peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Adult Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-046223.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Feb-2021
Complete List of Authors:	An, Tao; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart failure center Tian, Yue; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Echocardiography Guo, Jingfei; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Kang, Wenying; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Tian, Tao; Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College Fuwai Hospital, Zhou, Chenghui; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology
Primary Subject Heading :	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Intensive care, Epidemiology, Diagnostics
Keywords:	Adult anaesthesia < ANAESTHETICS, Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, Anaesthesia in cardiology < ANAESTHETICS

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

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Adult Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

Tao An¹, M.D, Ph.D; Yue Tian², M.D; Jingfei Guo¹, M.D; Wenying Kang, M.D; Tao Tian^{*3}, M.D, Ph.D ; Chenghui Zhou^{*4}, M.D, Ph.D,

¹State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart Failure Center, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, China ²Department of Echocardiography, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College, China

³Department of Cardiology, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing, China.

⁴Department of Anesthesiology, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, 100037, China

*Address for Correspondence: Tao Tian and Chenghui Zhou;
No. 167 Beilishi Road, 100037 Xicheng District, Beijing, China
Tel: 86-10-88398082, Fax: 86-10-88398082
E-mail: tiantaophd@163.com (Tian T); chenghuizhou@yahoo.com (Zhou Ch).

Word Count: 3278 words.

ABSTRACT

Introduction Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as one important complication in association with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality. However, whether higher level of postoperative cardiac troponin (cTn) possess higher incidence of major complications remains controversial. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on the all related prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between the postoperative elevated cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following adult noncardiac surgery.

Methods We will search PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, ISI Knowledge via Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and VIP database (from inception until Oct, 2020) to identify all prospective cohort studies using the related keywords. The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The second outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular event (MACE). Univariable or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level. Sensitivity analyses will be used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACE. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACE, studies with three or more categories will be included.

Ethics and dissemination Ethical approval is waived for the systematic review protocol according to the Institutional Review Board /Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Keywords: myocardial injury, noncardiac surgery, postoperative cardiac troponin,

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

dose-response

PROSPERO registration number CRD42020173175.

for occreation work

3 / 15

Strengths and limitations of this study

 This meta-analysis will be the first one to explore the potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn level and adverse clinical outcomes in adult non-cardiac surgery.

2. This meta-analysis will firstly focus on the prognostic significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below URL of cTn.

3. This meta-analysis will include the largest prospective study population.

4. The baseline cTn level is not a regular test for patients undergoing noncardiac

surgery.

5. This work could not rule out the potential influence of different cTn detection kits and methods.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Introduction

Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as one important complication in association with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality¹. Some studies have showed that the incidence of MINS is common as many as $30 \sim 45\%$ based on postoperative high sensitive cardiac troponin(cTn) level²⁻⁴. The major proposed mechanisms of MINS include imbalance of myocardial oxygen supply-demand including perioperative hypotension⁵, hypoxia⁶, anemia⁷, previous coronary artery disease(CAD)⁸, and coronary thrombosis⁹. Postoperative cTn measurement is recommended in high-risk (previous CAD, previous heart failure, previous atrial fibrillation, previous heart disease, etc.) patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. According to the latest fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (UDMI) in 2018⁶, the cutoff value for regularly diagnosing MINS is the 99th percentile upper reference limit (URL) of postoperative cTn level. However, increase in prognostic effect of cTn still requires the newly-onset ischemia-related evidence of myocardium including electrocardiogram, echocardiography, coronary computed tomography (CT), or coronary angiography⁶. However, these cardiac-specific examinations are not regularly used in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery, and may increase a large amount of cost during hospitalization.

Given the limited high-quality evidence and controversial findings from available studies concerning the long-term prognostic significance following noncardiac surgery, whether there is an optimal cutoff value for postoperative cTn level to diagnose MINS with improved prognostic significance remains unknown¹⁰⁻¹⁶. Moreover, quantitative analysis for myocardial injury below the recommended URL has not been systematically studied¹⁷. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on the all related prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between the postoperative elevated cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following noncardiac surgery.

Objectives

The purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to explore the potential dose-response relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and adverse clinical outcomes after adult noncardiac surgery.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Search Strategy

We will report this meta-analysis following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guideline¹⁸. We will search PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, and ISI Knowledge via Web of Science database (from inception until Oct, 2020), and the reference lists of the retrieved articles. The related search keywords are listed in Table 1. We will also search China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and VIP Database (from inception until Oct, 2020) using the translated Chinese search keywords accordingly. This meta-analysis has been registered in the PROSPERO with registration ID CRD42020173175. The searching process is shown in Figure 1.

Type of Participants

We will include adult patients undergoing noncardiac surgery as study participants.

Patient and public involvement

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

Type of Studies

We will include prospective cohort studies that have reported the associations of the postoperative cardiac troponin levels with the incidence of major adverse clinical outcomes. No language restriction will be used. For the studies unable to extract

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

odds ratio (OR) or hazard ratio (HR) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) , we will perform a related systematic review in a section.

Definition of MINS

We will not set a constant value for the definition of MINS. If a precise cutoff value has been provided in each study, the definition of MINS will be accepted. Three types of cutoff value will be existed: ① detection limit below URL; ② URL; ③ a value above URL. This definition is not according to the UDMI⁶ or Standardized Endpoints in Perioperative Medicine initiative¹⁹ for the exploration of dose-response relationship.

Type of Outcomes

The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The second outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular event (MACE). MACE is a combined endpoint including at least three of the following events: death, cardiovascular death, any cause for coronary revascularization, unstable angina, myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, major adverse arrhythmias requiring treatment, cardiac arrest, pulmonary embolism, or stroke. The follow-up duration will be divided into three time periods: 'short term (1-3 months)', 'medium term $(3\sim12 \text{ months})'$, and 'long term (≥1 year)'. Both primary outcome and second outcome will be included in the dose-response analysis.

Data Extraction

Data will be extracted by two independent authors (T. An and T. Yue). Discrepancies will be resolved by group discussion. The extracted data included study design (author, publication year, country, sample size, percentage of positive cTn levels), patient characteristics (mean age, male proportion, diabetes proportion, hypertension proportion, hyperlipidemia proportion, smoking proportion, CAD proportion, previous myocardial infarction, chronic heart failure, atrial fibrillation,

history of valvular heart disease, history of peripheral vascular disease, history of stroke or transient ischemic accident, kidney dysfunction, history of lung disease, history of liver disease, elective surgery proportion, vascular surgery proportion, general anesthesia, revised cardiac risk index, beta-blocker usage, statin usage, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor/ Angiotensin Receptor Blocker usage, calcium channel blocker usage, aspirin usage), follow-up period, detection kit of cTn, URL of cTn, detection limit of cTn, cutoff value of cTn, and the different categories for postoperative cTn level.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The methodological quality of the studies will be evaluated in accordance with the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (NOS)²⁰.

Data synthesis

The ORs or HRs in each study will be extracted or calculated from the elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level for the pooled analysis. Specifically, the HR will be calculated based on the Log-rank test or the Kaplan-Meier survival curve²¹. Nonelevated category at the lowest cTn level will be chose as the reference. The DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model will be used in the pooled analysis for the potential clinical inconsistency regardless of heterogeneity test. Univariable or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between elevated versus non-elevated categories of postoperative cTn level including but not limited to age, surgical types, sex, and cTn types (high sensitive versus non-high sensitive, cTnI versus cTnT, baseline cTn versus without baseline cTn)²². Sensitivity analyses will be used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACE. Publication bias assessment will be performed by the Begg's and Egger's test. If one

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

study reported multiple categories (>2 categories), we will calculate the OR by using the number of event and total in all of the elevated categories and referent one for the high vs low analysis. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACE, studies with three or more categories will be included. If the category only provides the numerical value of elevated cTn level, we will convert this into the number of times the corresponding URL in each individual study. The average level of elevated cTn in each category will be estimated by the mean of the lower and upper levels. If the highest category had an open upper level, the mean level will be estimated to be 1.2x the level of the lower levels²³. P<0.05 (2-sided) will be considered to be statistically significant. All statistical analyses will be performed in Stata software (version 10.0, StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA) and RevMan software (version 5.0, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom). 2.0

DISCUSSION

Although there have been several meta-analyses concerning about the prognostic effect of pre- and/or post-operative troponin levels in adult noncardiac surgery, there are obvious pitfalls for these works (including a large amount of retrospective studies¹⁶, only focusing on preoperative troponin levels¹⁴ ²⁴, without distinguishing preoperative and postoperative troponin levels ²⁵). Moreover, none of them have studied the potential linear or non-linear dose-response relationship between postoperative troponin level and adverse clinical outcomes in adult noncardiac surgery. In addition, the prognostic role of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury (below URL)¹⁷ has been largely ignored for early risk stratification and improved outcomes in adult noncardiac surgery.

The strengths of this systematic review and meta-analysis include the prospective design in all the included studies, and its ability in gathering a large study population

in this area. Moreover, for the first time, we will explore a potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn level and adverse clinical outcomes. In addition, the prognostic significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below URL will firstly be focused¹⁷. The limitations, on the other hand, are also existed in our analysis. Firstly, the univariablee or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses are mainly based on the aggregate patient data, but not individual patient data. Other confounding factors may be underestimated. Secondly, we will focus the effect of baseline cTn level in the analysis. However, the baseline cTn level is not a regular test for patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. Thirdly, we could not rule out the potential influence of different detection kits and methods for the cTn level in the included studies. Fourthly, our analysis may not be sufficient for a diagnosis of myocardial infarction for lacking additional evidence of myocardial ischemia (electrocardiography, echocardiography, coronary CT or angiography) required in the fourth UDMI. Lastly, elevated troponin has been observed in non-cardiac situations such as pulmonary embolism or renal dysfunction, and thus might not be a marker of only direct cardiac problems.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Ethical approval is waived according to the Institutional Review Board /Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Author Contributions CZ and TT contributed to the conception and design of the study, and revision of the protocol. The manuscript of the protocol was drafted by TA. TA and JG will independently search and select the eligible studies and extract the data from the included studies. YT and WK will assess methodological quality and the risk of bias. All the authors approved the protocol publication.

Competing interests None declared.

Funding This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

China (no. 81970290), and the Clinical Research Foundation of Fuwai Hospital (no.

2016-ZX033).

Reference

1. C. Puelacher, Lurati Buse G., Seeberger D., et al. Perioperative Myocardial Injury After Noncardiac Surgery: Incidence, Mortality, and Characterization. *Circulation* 2018;137(12):1221-32.

2. P. A. Kavsak, Walsh M., Srinathan S., et al. High sensitivity troponin T concentrations in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Biochem* 2011;44(12):1021-4.

3. P. Hietala, Strandberg M., Kiviniemi T., et al. Usefulness of troponin T to predict short-term and long-term mortality in patients after hip fracture. *Am J Cardiol* 2014;114(2):193-7.

4. M. A. Gillies, Shah A. S., Mullenheim J., et al. Perioperative myocardial injury in patients receiving cardiac output-guided haemodynamic therapy: a substudy of the OPTIMISE Trial. *Br J Anaesth* 2015;115(2):227-33.

5. V. G. B. Liem, Hoeks S. E., Mol Khjm, et al. Postoperative Hypotension after Noncardiac Surgery and the Association with Myocardial Injury. *Anesthesiology* 2020;133(3):510-22.

6. K. Thygesen, Alpert J. S., Jaffe A. S., et al. Fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (2018). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72(18):2231-64.

7. J. Sousa, Rocha-Neves J., Oliveira-Pinto J., et al. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery (MINS) in EVAR patients: a retrospective single-centre study. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2020. (accessed Sep 4).

8. D. M. Gualandro, Campos C. A., Calderaro D., et al. Coronary plaque rupture in patients with myocardial infarction after noncardiac surgery: frequent and dangerous. *Atherosclerosis* 2012;222(1):191-5.

9. T. Sheth, Chan M., Butler C., et al. Prognostic capabilities of coronary computed tomographic angiography before non-cardiac surgery: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2015;350:h1907.

10. P. J. Devereaux, Szczeklik W. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery: diagnosis and management. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41(32):3083-91.

11. J. Park, Hyeon C. W., Lee S. H., et al. Mildly Elevated Cardiac Troponin below the 99th-Percentile Upper Reference Limit after Noncardiac Surgery. *Korean Circ J* 2020;50(10):925-37.

12. A. Millán-Figueroa, López-Navarro J. M., Pérez-Díaz I., et al. Evaluation of Perioperative High-Sensitive Cardiac Troponin I as a Predictive Biomarker of Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events After Noncardiac Surgery. *Rev Invest Clin* 2020;73(3)

13. D. Conti, Ballo P., Ruggiano P., et al. Very early postoperative troponin increase and clinical outcome in patients admitted to the recovery room after noncardiac surgery with suspected cardiac events. *Indian Heart J* 2020;72(3):197-9.

14. C. A. S. Humble, Huang S., Jammer I., et al. Prognostic performance of preoperative cardiac troponin and perioperative changes in cardiac troponin for the prediction of major adverse cardiac events and mortality in noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2019;14(4):e0215094.

15. P. Nagele, Rao L. K., Penta M., et al. Postoperative myocardial injury after major head and neck cancer surgery. *Head Neck* 2011;33(8):1085-91.

16. M. Levy, Heels-Ansdell D., Hiralal R., et al. Prognostic value of troponin and creatine kinase muscle

4	
1	
2	
4	and brain isoenzyme measurement after noncardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
5	Anesthesiology 2011;114(4):796-806.
6	17. S. W. Cho. Subclinical and Tiny Myocardial Injury within Upper Reference Limit of Cardiac
7	Troponin Should Not Be Ignored after Noncardiac Surgery Korean Circ 12020:50(10):938-9
8	
9	18. L. Snamseer, Moner D., Clarke M., et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and
10	meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ 2015;350:g7647.
11	19. W. S. Beattie, Lalu M., Bocock M., et al. Systematic review and consensus definitions for the
12	Standardized Endpoints in Perioperative Medicine (StEP) initiative: cardiovascular outcomes. Br J
14	Angesth 2021:126/1):56 66
15	
16	20. M. H. Murad, Sultan S., Haffar S., et al. Methodological quality and synthesis of case series and
17	case reports. BMJ Evid Based Med 2018;23(2):60-3.
18	21. P. R. Williamson, Smith C. T., Hutton J. L., et al. Aggregate data meta-analysis with time-to-event
19	outcomes. Stat Med 2002:21(22):3337-51.
20	22 P. Higgins, Thompson S. G. Quantifying beterogeneity in a meta-analysis, Stat Med
22	22. J. F. Higgins, monpson 3. O. Quantifying neterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat wea
23	2002;21(11):1539-58.
24	23. J. A. Berlin, Longnecker M. P., Greenland S. Meta-analysis of epidemiologic dose-response data.
25	Epidemiology 1993;4(3):218-28.
26	24. J. T. Shen, Xu M., Wu Y., et al. Association of pre-operative troponin levels with major adverse
27	cardiac events and mortality after noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Fur L
28	Angesthesial 2019/2E/11)/81E-24
30	Andeschesion 2018;35(11):815-24.
31	25. L. J. Zhang, Li N., Li Y., et al. Cardiac Biomarkers Predicting MACE in Patients Undergoing
32	Noncardiac Surgery: A Meta-Analysis. Front Physiol 2018;9:1923.
33	
34	
35	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	Patient consent for publication Not required.
52 53	
55 54	
55	Ducucanon and mean nonice. Not commissioned to 11 1
56	rovenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
57	
58	

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Flow Chart of the Trial Searching Process.

for per terier only

Knowledge Infrastruct	ture, Wanfang and VIP Database	
Database	Search items	
PubMed	June 2021 Erasm	
No.	o text and	
# 1	((((troponin) OR (troponins)) OR (TnI)) OR (TnT)) OR (napped ardial injury)	
# 2	(noncardiac surgery) OR (non-cardiac surgery)	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
EMBase	nd simila	
# 1	troponin OR troponins OR tni OR tnt OR (myocardial AND injury)	
# 2	noncardiac AND surgery OR ('non cardiac' AND agurgery)	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
Cochrane Library	rtment (

			BMJ Open Sp Sc Sp	Page 16
# 1			troponin in All Text OR troponins in All Text OR TnI in All Text	
			OR myocardial injury in All Text	
#2			noncardiac surgery in All Text OR non-cardiac surgery in All Text	
#3			# 1 and # 2	
ISI	Knowl	edge	ad to tex	
via	Web	of	t and a decision of the second s	
Sciend	ce		data m	
#1			(troponin) OR TOPIC: (troponins) OR TOPIC: (TnI) OR TOPI	
			(myocardial injury)	
			Timespan: All years. Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, MEDL	
			Search language=Auto	
#2			TOPIC: (noncardiac surgery) OR TOPIC: (non-cardiac surgery	
			Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, MEDLINE, RSCI, SCIELO.	
#3			# 1 and # 2	
			t GEZ-L	15 / 15
			TA	15715
			For peer review only - http://pmjopen.pmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xntml	



1 2 3 4	Reporting ch	nec	klist for protocol of a systematic review.	-
5 6 7	Based on the PRISMA-P	guideli	nes.	-
8 9 10	Instructions to auth	nors		P
11 12 13	Complete this checklist b	y ente	ring the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.	otected
14 15	Your article may not curre	ently a	ddress all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are a	certain that an
16 17	item does not apply, plea	ase wri	te "n/a" and provide a short explanation.	pyrig
18 19 20	Upload your completed o	checkli	st as an extra file when you submit to a journal.	ht, inclu
21 22 23	In your methods section,	say th	at you used the PRISMA-Preporting guidelines, and cite them as:	ding for
24 25	Moher D, Shamseer L, C	larke N	1, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Revie	ew and Meta-
26 27	Analysis Protocols (PRISI	MA-P)	2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.	Eras relate
28 29			Reporting Item	Page Number to s
30 ⁻ 31 32	Title		Z.	xt and da
33 34 35	Identification	<u>#1a</u>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1 arinin
36 37 38	Update	<u>#1b</u>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	No update g , Al tra
39 40 41	Registration			ining, an
42 43		<u>#2</u>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3 id simi
14 15 16	Authors			lar tech
47 48 19	Contact	<u>#3a</u>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1 nologies
50 51 52	Contribution	<u>#3b</u>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	10
53 54	Amendments			Not
55 56 57				Amendments
58 59 60		<u>#4</u>	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Page 19 of 19

		such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support			
Sources	<u>#5a</u>	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	1
Sponsor	<u>#5b</u>	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or	<u>#5c</u>	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
funder			
Introduction			
Rationale	<u>#6</u>	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	
Objectives	<u>#7</u>	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants,	
		interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	
Methods			
Eligibility criteria	<u>#8</u>	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report	
		characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for	
		eligibility for the review	
Information sources	<u>#9</u>	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors,	
		trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
Search strategy	<u>#10</u>	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned	
		limits, such that it could be repeated	
		minits, such that it could be repeated	
Study records - data	<u>#11a</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	
Study records - data management	<u>#11a</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	
Study records - data management Study records -	<u>#11a</u> <u>#11b</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers)	
Study records - data management Study records - selection process	<u>#11a</u> <u>#11b</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
Study records - data management Study records - selection process Study records - data	<u>#11a</u> <u>#11b</u> <u>#11c</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis) Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done	
Study records - data management Study records - selection process Study records - data collection process	<u>#11a</u> <u>#11b</u> <u>#11c</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis) Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	
Study records - data management Study records - selection process Study records - data collection process Data items	<u>#11a</u> <u>#11b</u> <u>#11c</u>	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis) Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any	

Page 20 of 19

Outcomes and	<u>#13</u>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and	7
prioritization		additional outcomes, with rationale	
Risk of bias in	<u>#14</u>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this	8
individual studies		will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data	
		synthesis	
Data synthesis	<u>#15a</u>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	8,9
Data synthesis	<u>#15b</u>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of	8,9
		handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of	
		consistency (such as I2, Kendall's T)	
Data synthesis	<u>#15c</u>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	8,9
		regression)	
Data synthesis	<u>#15d</u>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	8,9
Meta-bias(es)	<u>#16</u>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies,	8,9
		selective reporting within studies)	
Confidence in	<u>#17</u>	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	8,9
cumulative evidence			
None The PRISMA-P ch	necklist is	distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can	be completed
online using <u>https://www</u>	w.goodrep	ports.org/, a tool made by the EQUATOR Network in collaboration with Penelope.ai	
	E	For near review only - http://hmionen.hmi.com/site/ahout/guidalinas.yhtml	
	Г	or peer review only inter, / only open.only.com/site/about/guidelines.xittin	

Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Adult Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-046223.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-May-2021
Complete List of Authors:	An, Tao; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart failure center Tian, Yue; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Echocardiography Guo, Jingfei; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Kang, Wenying; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology Tian, Tao; Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College Fuwai Hospital, Zhou, Chenghui; Fuwai Hospital State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Anestheisiology
Primary Subject Heading :	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Intensive care, Epidemiology, Diagnostics
Keywords:	Adult anaesthesia < ANAESTHETICS, Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, Anaesthesia in cardiology < ANAESTHETICS

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

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

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

Dose-response Effect of Postprocedural Elevated Cardiac Troponin Level on Adverse Clinical Outcomes Following Adult Noncardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review Protocol of Prospective Studies

Tao An¹, M.D, Ph.D; Yue Tian², M.D; Jingfei Guo¹, M.D; Wenying Kang, M.D; Tao Tian^{*3}, M.D, Ph.D ; Chenghui Zhou^{*4}, M.D, Ph.D,

¹State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Heart Failure Center, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, China ²Department of Echocardiography, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College, China

³Department of Cardiology, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing, China.

⁴Department of Anesthesiology, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, 100037, China

*Address for Correspondence: Tao Tian and Chenghui Zhou;
No. 167 Beilishi Road, 100037 Xicheng District, Beijing, China
Tel: 86-10-88398082, Fax: 86-10-88398082
E-mail: tiantaophd@163.com (Tian T); chenghuizhou@yahoo.com (Zhou Ch).

Word Count: 3387 words.

ABSTRACT

Introduction Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as an important complication associated with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality. However, whether a higher level of postoperative cardiac troponin (cTn) is associated with a higher incidence of major complications remains controversial. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on all relevant prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between elevated postoperative cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following adult noncardiac surgery.

Methods We will search the PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, ISI Knowledge via Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and VIP databases (from inception until October 2020) to identify all prospective cohort studies using the relevant keywords. The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The second outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs). Univariable or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between elevated versus nonelevated categories of postoperative cTn levels. Sensitivity analyses will be used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACE. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACE, studies with three or more categories will be included.

Ethics and dissemination Ethical approval is waived for the systematic review protocol according to the Institutional Review Board/Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Keywords: myocardial injury, noncardiac surgery, postoperative cardiac troponin, dose-response

2/16

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

PROSPERO registration number CRD42020173175.

to occure with only

BMJ Open

2
3
4
5
6
7
, 8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
20
∠U ⊃1
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
30
۸ <u>۵</u>
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
55

60

 The potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn levels and adverse clinical outcomes in adult noncardiac surgery will be explored.
 The prognostic significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below the URL of cTn will be focused.

3. This meta-analysis will pool the data from a number of studies to form the largest prospective dataset to date.

4. The baseline cTn level is not a routine test for patients undergoing noncardiac surgery.

5. This workcannot rule out the potential influence of different cTn detection kits and methods used in the included studies.

4 / 16

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Introduction

Myocardial injury after noncardiac surgery (MINS) has been recognized as an important complication associated with short-term and long-term morbidity and mortality¹. Some studies have shown that the incidence of MINS isas high as 30~45% based on postoperative high-sensitive cardiac troponin (cTn) levels²⁻⁴. The major proposed mechanisms of MINS include animbalance in myocardial oxygen supply and demand due to perioperative hypotension⁵, hypoxia⁶, anaemia⁷, previous coronary artery disease(CAD)⁸, and coronary thrombosis⁹. Postoperative cTn measurement is recommended for high-risk (previous CAD, previous heart failure, previous atrial fibrillation, previous heart disease, etc) patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. According to the fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (UDMI) published in 2018⁶, the cut-off value for the diagnosis of MINS is the 99th percentile upper reference limit (URL) of the postoperative cTn level. However, an increase in the prognostic effect of cTn levels still requires the new-onset ischemia-related including evidence in the myocardium that from electrocardiogram, echocardiography, coronary computed tomography (CT), or coronary angiography⁶. However, these cardiac-specific examinations are not regularly used in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery, and may increase the cost of hospitalization.

Given the limited high-quality evidence available and the controversial findings revealed by available studies concerning the long-term prognostic significance of cTn levels following noncardiac surgery, whether there is an optimal cut-off value for postoperative cTn level to diagnose MINS with improved prognostic significance remains unknown¹⁰⁻¹⁶. Moreover, quantitative analysis for myocardial injury below the recommended URL has not been systematically studied¹⁷. Hence, we will conduct a comprehensive dose-response meta-analysis based on all relevant prospective studies to quantitatively evaluate the association between elevated postoperative cTn levels and short-/long-term adverse clinical outcomes following noncardiac surgery.

Objectives

The purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to explore the potential dose-response relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and adverse clinical outcomes after adult noncardiac surgery.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Search Strategy

We will conduct this meta-analysis following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines¹⁸. We will search the PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, and ISI Knowledge via the Web of Science databases (from inception until October 2020), and the reference lists of the retrieved articles. The related search keywords are listed in Table 1. We will also search the China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang and VIP Databases (from inception until October 2020) using same search keywords translated into Chinese. This meta-analysis has been registered in PROSPERO with the registration ID CRD42020173175. The proposed search process is shown in Figure 1.

Type of Participants

We will include adult patients undergoing noncardiac surgery as the study participants.

Patient and public involvement

Patients and/or the public are not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

Type of Studies

We will include prospective cohort studies that have reported the associations between postoperative cardiac troponin levels and the incidence of major adverse

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

clinical outcomes. No language restriction will be used.

Definition of MINS

The definition of MINS with a precise cut-off value in each study will be accepted. The following three types of cut-off value will exist: ① detection limit below the URL; ② detection at the URL; ③ detection above the URL.This definition based only on biomarkers of myocardial injury is not based on the UDMI⁶ or Standardized Endpoints in Perioperative Medicine initiative¹⁹ due to the lack of availability of additional information such as electrocardiography, echocardiography, coronary CT or angiography data .

Type of Outcomes

The primary outcome will be all-cause mortality. The secondary outcomes will include cardiovascular mortality and major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs). MACEs constitute a combined endpoint including at least three of the following events: death, cardiovascular death, coronary revascularization of any cause, unstable angina, myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, major adverse arrhythmias requiring treatment, cardiac arrest, pulmonary embolism, or stroke. The follow-up duration will be divided into the following three time periods: 'short term (1-3 months)', 'medium term ($3\sim12$ months)', and 'long term (≥1 year)'. Both the primary outcome and secondary outcomes will be included in the dose-response analysis.

Data Extraction

The data will be extracted by two independent authors (T. An and T. Yue). Discrepancies will be resolved by group discussion. The extracted data will include study design (author, publication year, country, sample size, percentage of positive cTn levels), patient characteristics (mean age, male proportion, diabetes proportion, hypertension proportion, hyperlipidemia proportion, smoking proportion, CAD

 proportion, previous myocardial infarction, chronic heart failure, atrial fibrillation, history of valvular heart disease, history of peripheral vascular disease, history of stroke or transient ischemic accident, kidney dysfunction, history of lung disease, history of liver disease, elective surgery proportion, vascular surgery proportion, general anesthesia, revised cardiac risk index, beta-blocker usage, statin usage, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor/angiotensin receptor blocker usage, calcium channel blocker usage, aspirin usage), follow-up period, kit used to detect cTn, the URL of cTn, the detection limit of cTn, cut-off value of cTn, and the different categories of postoperative cTn levels.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The methodological quality of the studies will be evaluated in accordance with the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (NOS)²⁰.

Data synthesis

The ORs or HRs in each study will be extracted or calculated from patients categorized as having elevated versus nonelevated postoperative cTn levels for the pooled analysis. Specifically, the HR will be calculated based on the log-rank test or the Kaplan-Meier survival curve²¹. Patients in the nonelevated cTn level category with the lowest cTn levels will be chosen as the reference points. The DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model will be used in the pooled analysis for potential clinical inconsistency regardless of the heterogeneity test result. Univariable or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses will be conducted for the comparison between patients with elevated versus nonelevated postoperative cTn levels to assess the impact of multiple potential influential factors such assurgical types, patient characteristics, and cTn types (high sensitive versus non-high sensitive, cTnI versus cTnT, baseline cTn versus without baseline cTn)²². Sensitivity analyses will be used to assess the robustness of our results by removing each included study at one time to

obtain and evaluate the remaining overall estimates of all-cause mortality or MACEs. Publication bias assessment will be performed by the Begg's and Egger's tests. If one study reported multiple categories (>2 categories), we will calculate the OR by using the number of events and the total in all of the elevated categories and reference one for the high vs low analysis. To conduct a dose-response meta-analysis for the potential linear or restricted cubic spline regression relationship between postoperative elevated cTn levels and all-cause mortality or MACEs, studies with three or more categories will be included. If only the numerical value of the elevated cTn levels is provided, we will convert this into the number of times the corresponding URL in each individual study. The average level of elevated cTn in each category will be estimated by determining the mean of the lower and upper levels. If the highest category has an open upper level, the mean level will be estimated to be 1.2x the level of the lower levels²³. P < 0.05 (2-sided) will be considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses will be performed in Stata software (version 10.0, StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA) and RevMan software (version 5.0, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom).

DISCUSSION

Although there have been several meta-analyses concerning the prognostic effect of pre- and/or postoperative troponin levels in adult noncardiac surgery, there are obvious pitfalls in these studies (including a large number of retrospective studies¹⁶, and studies focused onlyon preoperative troponin levels¹⁴ ²⁴ or, did not distinguish between preoperative and postoperative troponin levels ²⁵). Moreover, the potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative troponin level and adverse clinical outcomes in adult noncardiac surgery has not been studied. In addition, the prognostic role of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury (below the URL)¹⁷ has been largely ignored for early risk stratification and prediction of improved outcomes in adult noncardiac surgery.

BMJ Open

The strengths of this systematic review and meta-analysis include the prospective design of all the included studies, and its ability to gather a large relevant study population. Moreover, for the first time, we will explore the potential linear or nonlinear dose-response relationship between postoperative cTn levels and adverse clinical outcomes. In addition, we will focus on the prognostic significance of subclinical or tiny myocardial injury below the URL for the first time¹⁷. The limitations, on the other hand, also exist in our analysis. First, the univariable or multivariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses are mainly based on aggregate patient data, not individual patient data. Other confounding factors may be underestimated. Second, we will focus on the effect of baseline cTn level in the analysis. However, the baseline cTn level is not a routine test for patients undergoing noncardiac surgery. Third, we cannot rule out the potential influence of different detection kits and methods used to measure the cTn levels in the included studies. Fourth, our analysis may not be sufficient for a diagnosis of myocardial infarction due to the lack of additional available evidence for myocardial ischemia (electrocardiography, echocardiography, coronary CT or angiography) required in the fourth UDMI. Last, elevated troponin has been observed in noncardiac situations such as pulmonary embolism or renal dysfunction and thus might not solely be a direct marker of cardiac problems.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Ethical approval is waived according to the Institutional Review Board /Independent Ethics Committee of Fuwai Hospital. This meta-analysis will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed journal for publication and conference presentations.

Author Contributions CZ and TT contributed to the conception and design of the study, and revision of the protocol. The manuscript of the protocol was drafted by TA. TA and JG will independently search and select the eligible studies and extract the data from the included studies. YT and WK will assess methodological quality and

10 / 16

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

the risk of bias. All the authors approved the protocol publication.

Competing interests None declared.

Funding This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of

China (no. 81970290), and the Clinical Research Foundation of Fuwai Hospital (no.

2016-ZX033).

Reference

1. C. Puelacher, Lurati Buse G., Seeberger D., et al. Perioperative Myocardial Injury After Noncardiac Surgery: Incidence, Mortality, and Characterization. *Circulation* 2018;137(12):1221-32.

2. P. A. Kavsak, Walsh M., Srinathan S., et al. High sensitivity troponin T concentrations in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Biochem* 2011;44(12):1021-4.

3. P. Hietala, Strandberg M., Kiviniemi T., et al. Usefulness of troponin T to predict short-term and long-term mortality in patients after hip fracture. *Am J Cardiol* 2014;114(2):193-7.

4. M. A. Gillies, Shah A. S., Mullenheim J., et al. Perioperative myocardial injury in patients receiving cardiac output-guided haemodynamic therapy: a substudy of the OPTIMISE Trial. *Br J Anaesth* 2015;115(2):227-33.

5. V. G. B. Liem, Hoeks S. E., Mol Khjm, et al. Postoperative Hypotension after Noncardiac Surgery and the Association with Myocardial Injury. *Anesthesiology* 2020;133(3):510-22.

6. K. Thygesen, Alpert J. S., Jaffe A. S., et al. Fourth Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction (2018). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72(18):2231-64.

7. J. Sousa, Rocha-Neves J., Oliveira-Pinto J., et al. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery (MINS) in EVAR patients: a retrospective single-centre study. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2020. (accessed Sep 4).

8. D. M. Gualandro, Campos C. A., Calderaro D., et al. Coronary plaque rupture in patients with myocardial infarction after noncardiac surgery: frequent and dangerous. *Atherosclerosis* 2012;222(1):191-5.

9. T. Sheth, Chan M., Butler C., et al. Prognostic capabilities of coronary computed tomographic angiography before non-cardiac surgery: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2015;350:h1907.
10. P. J. Devereaux, Szczeklik W. Myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery: diagnosis and management. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41(32):3083-91.

11. J. Park, Hyeon C. W., Lee S. H., et al. Mildly Elevated Cardiac Troponin below the 99th-Percentile Upper Reference Limit after Noncardiac Surgery. *Korean Circ J* 2020;50(10):925-37.

12. A. Millán-Figueroa, López-Navarro J. M., Pérez-Díaz I., et al. Evaluation of Perioperative High-Sensitive Cardiac Troponin I as a Predictive Biomarker of Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events After Noncardiac Surgery. *Rev Invest Clin* 2020;73(3)

13. D. Conti, Ballo P., Ruggiano P., et al. Very early postoperative troponin increase and clinical outcome in patients admitted to the recovery room after noncardiac surgery with suspected cardiac events. *Indian Heart J* 2020;72(3):197-9.

14. C. A. S. Humble, Huang S., Jammer I., et al. Prognostic performance of preoperative cardiac troponin and perioperative changes in cardiac troponin for the prediction of major adverse cardiac

1	
2	
4	events and mortality in noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One
5	2019;14(4):e0215094.
6	15. P. Nagele, Rao L. K., Penta M., et al. Postoperative myocardial injury after major head and neck
7	cancer surgery Head Neck 2011:33(8):1085-91
8	16 M Low Hools Ansdell D. Hirala P. et al. Drognostic value of troponin and creating kinase muscle
9	10. IN. Levy, Heels-Alisueli D., Hiralai R., et al. Proghostic value of troponin and creatine kinase muscle
10	and brain isoenzyme measurement after noncardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
12	Anesthesiology 2011;114(4):796-806.
13	17. S. W. Cho. Subclinical and Tiny Myocardial Injury within Upper Reference Limit of Cardiac
14	Troponin Should Not Be Ignored after Noncardiac Surgery. <i>Korean Circ J</i> 2020;50(10):938-9.
15	18. L. Shamseer, Moher D., Clarke M., et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and
16 17	meta analysis protocols (PRISMA P) 2015; alaboration and evaluation PAU 2015;250;37647
17	Ineta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015. elaboration and explanation. Bivis 2015,550.g/047.
19	19. W. S. Beattie, Lalu M., Bocock M., et al. Systematic review and consensus definitions for the
20	Standardized Endpoints in Perioperative Medicine (StEP) initiative: cardiovascular outcomes. Br J
21	Anaesth 2021;126(1):56-66.
22	20. M. H. Murad, Sultan S., Haffar S., et al. Methodological quality and synthesis of case series and
23	case reports BMI Evid Based Med 2018:23(2):60-3
24 25	21 D. D. Williamson, Smith C. T. Llutton L. L. et al. Aggregate data mata analysis with time to event
26	21. P. K. Williamson, Smith C. T., Hutton J. L., et al. Aggregate data meta-analysis with time-to-event
27	outcomes. Stat Med 2002;21(22):3337-51.
28	22. J. P. Higgins, Thompson S. G. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med
29	2002;21(11):1539-58.
30 31	23. J. A. Berlin, Longnecker M. P., Greenland S. Meta-analysis of epidemiologic dose-response data.
32	Epidemiology 1993;4(3):218-28.
33	24. J. T. Shen, Xu M., Wu Y., et al. Association of pre-operative troponin levels with major adverse
34	cardiac events and mortality after noncardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis Fur L
35	Angesthesiol 2019:2E/11):81E 24
37	
38	25. L. J. Zhang, Li N., Li Y., et al. Cardiac Biomarkers Predicting MACE in Patients Undergoing
39	Noncardiac Surgery: A Meta-Analysis. <i>Front Physiol</i> 2018;9:1923.
40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49 50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55 56	
50 57	
58	
59	
60	

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

for beer terien only

13 / 16

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Flow Chart of the Trial Searching Process.

to occurrences on the terms on the terms of the terms on terms

3 4

24

	BMJ Open Gr	Page 1
Table 1 Search strate	egy for PubMed, EMBase, Cochrane Library, ISI Knowledge a Web of Science, China	National
Knowledge Infrastruct	ure, Wanfang and VIP Database	
Database	Search items	
PubMed	Erasm	
No.	o text and	
# 1	((((troponin) OR (troponins)) OR (TnI)) OR (TnT)) OR (na contraction of the second sec	
# 2	(noncardiac surgery) OR (non-cardiac surgery)	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
EMBase	and similar	
# 1	troponin OR troponins OR tni OR tnt OR (myocardial AND injury)	
# 2	noncardiac AND surgery OR ('non cardiac' AND	
# 3	# 1 and # 2	
Cochrane Library	oartment C	
		15 / 16
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Page	17 of 21			BMJ Open BMJ Open copy o
1 2	#1			troponin in All Text OR troponins in All Text OR TnI in All Text
3 4 5				OR myocardial injury in All Text
6 7	#2			noncardiac surgery in All Text OR non-cardiac surgery in All Text
9 10 11	#3			# 1 and # 2
12 13	ISI	Knowle	dge	I to tey
14 15	via	Web	of	tt and c
16 17	Scien	ce		data r
18 19	#1			(troponin) OR TOPIC: (troponins) OR TOPIC: (Tnl) OR TOPI
20 21 22				(myocardial injury)
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33				Timespan: All years. Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, MEDL
				Search language=Auto
	#2			TOPIC: (noncardiac surgery) OR TOPIC: (non-cardiac surgery
				Databases: WOS, BIOSIS, KJD, MEDLINE, RSCI, SCIELO.
34 35 36	#3			# 1 and # 2
37 38				rtment
39 40 41				GEZ-L
42 43				For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
44 45				

16 / 16



Figure 1. Flow Chart of the Trial Searching Process.

127x116mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P 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 PRISMA-Preporting guidelines, and cite them as:
Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement.
Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.

2			Reporting Item	Page Number
, 1 5	Title			
5 7 }	Identification	<u>#1a</u>	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
) 	Update	<u>#1b</u>	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	No update
- 3 1	Registration			0
+ 5 5 7		<u>#2</u>	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
))	Authors			Jes.
, 2 3 4 5	Contact	<u>#3a</u>	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
5 7 3	Contribution	<u>#3b</u>	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	10
)		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3	Amendments			Not Amendments
4 5 6 7 8 9 10		<u>#4</u>	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
11 12 13	Support			
14 15 16	Sources	<u>#5a</u>	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	11
17 18 19	Sponsor	<u>#5b</u>	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	11
20 21 22 23	Role of sponsor or funder	<u>#5c</u>	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	11
24 25	Introduction			
26 27 28 29	Rationale	<u>#6</u>	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	5
30 31 32 33 34	Objectives	<u>#7</u>	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6
35 36	Methods			
37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Eligibility criteria	<u>#8</u>	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6
44 45 46 47 48 49 50	Information sources	<u>#9</u>	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	6
51 52 53 54 55	Search strategy	<u>#10</u>	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	6
56 57 58 59 60	Study records - data management	<u>#11a</u> For peer	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Study records - selection process	<u>#11b</u>	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	7
	Study records - data collection process	<u>#11c</u>	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	8
	Data items	<u>#12</u>	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	8
20 21 22 23 24	Outcomes and prioritization	<u>#13</u>	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	7
25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Risk of bias in individual studies	<u>#14</u>	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	8
32 33 34	Data synthesis	<u>#15a</u>	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	8,9
35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Data synthesis	<u>#15b</u>	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I2, Kendall's T)	8,9
44 45 46	Data synthesis	<u>#15c</u>	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	8,9
47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56	Data synthesis	<u>#15d</u>	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	8,9
	Meta-bias(es)	<u>#16</u>	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	8,9
57 58 59 60	Confidence in cumulative	<u>#17</u> For peer	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE) r review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	8,9

evidence

None The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u>, a tool made by the <u>EQUATOR Network</u> in collaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>

aborati

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies