

BMJ Open

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 (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

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

BMJ Open

Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in U.S. adults, BRFSS 2015

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022990
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Guang-Ran; Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Department of Endocrinology; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Dye, Timothy ; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Li, Dongmei; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute
Keywords:	General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, metabolic syndrome, heart attack

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

View Only

1
2
3 **Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in**
4 **U.S. adults, BRFSS 2015**
5
6
7
8

9 Guang-Ran Yang^{1,2*}, Timothy D. Dye², Dongmei Li^{2*}
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 ¹ Department of Endocrinology, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical
17 University, Beijing, 100730, China
18

19
20 ² Clinical and Translational Science Institute, School of Medicine and Dentistry,
21 University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, NY 14620, United States of
22 America
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 * Corresponding author
30

31 Guang-Ran Yang
32 Department of Endocrinology
33 Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University
34 No 1 Dongjiaomin Xiang, Dongcheng District
35 Beijing, 100730, China
36 Tel: 86-13520055818
37 Fax: 8610-65288736
38 E-mail: gr.yang@ccmu.edu.cn
39
40 & Dongmei Li
41 Clinical and Translational Science Institute
42 School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester
43 265 Crittenden Boulevard CU 420708, 14642
44 Rochester, NY, USA
45 Tel: 1-5852767285
46 Fax: 1-5852761122
47 Email: Dongmei_li@URMC.rochester.edu
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Objectives: Evidence regarding which condition - MS or DM - is a better predictor for heart attack risk, however, is limited. This study aimed to compare the magnitude of the effects of DM and MS on heart attack using the 2015 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) database. **Design:** Observational study. **Methods:** A total of 332,008 subjects aged over 18 years were included in the analysis. All subjects were classified into four groups based on their DM and MS status: neither DM nor MS, DM alone, MS alone, and both DM and MS. Odds ratios and their 95% confidence intervals from hierarchical logistic regressions were used to examine the effect of DM and MS on heart attack after adjusting other covariates using the neither DM nor MS group as the reference. **Results:** Differences in weighted frequency distributions of gender, age category (over 45 years or not), smoking status, education, race, physical activity, and daily vegetables and fruits consumption were significantly different across the four groups ($p < 0.05$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack was 5.2% for neither DM nor MS group, 8.5% for DM only group, 11.0% for MS only group and 16.1% for both DM and MS group. The weighted prevalence of heart attack in MS only group was significantly higher than that in the DM only group ($p < 0.01$). After adjusting for confounding variables, DM only and MS only were both found to be independently associated with heart attack compared with those with neither DM nor MS (DM alone, OR = 2.09, 95% CIs = 1.72-2.54, MS alone, OR = 2.58, 95% CIs = 2.36-2.81). **Conclusion:** The BRFSS 2015 data indicated that MS alone and DM alone had comparable effects on risk of heart attack in US adults, and the odds of risk are doubled than US adults with neither DM nor

1
2
3 MS.
4
5
6

7 **Key Words:** Metabolic syndrome, Diabetes, Heart attack
8
9

10
11 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
12

- 13 ▶ BRFSS is a routine health-related telephone survey assessing a range of
14 conditions.
15
16 ▶ Weighted frequency distributions and summary statistics were used to
17 describe the sample characteristics in each group.
18
19 ▶ Limitation: chronic diseases were self-reported by answers.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Background

Coronary heart disease (CHD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. CHD alone caused approximately 1 of every 7 deaths in the U.S. with 370,213 deaths due to CHD in 2013.¹ Each year, around 660,000 Americans are estimated to have a new heart attack (defined as first hospitalized heart attack or CHD death) and around 305,000 Americans have a recurrent attack. Furthermore, an additional 160,000 silent heart attacks are estimated to occur each year.¹

Diabetes mellitus (DM), especially type 2 diabetes, is associated with clustered risk factors for CHD. Among adults with DM, the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and obesity is ranged 75% to 85%, 70% to 80%, and 60% to 70%, respectively.¹⁻³ Patients with DM had higher morbidity and mortality of CHD, including heart attack. In a subgroup analysis of the FRISC II trial, diabetic patients with unstable coronary artery disease had a significantly higher rate of heart attack than non-diabetic patients.⁴

Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a multi-component risk factor for CHD that includes a cluster of individual cardiometabolic risk factors related to abdominal obesity and insulin resistance. Clinically, MS is a useful entity for communicating the nature of lifestyle-related cardiometabolic risk for both patients and clinicians.¹ MS is a risk factor for heart attack in both women and men, from all regions and ethnic groups worldwide.⁵

DM and MS are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding whether MS alone has stronger association with heart attack than DM alone, however, are limited. The ongoing Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) assesses chronic conditions, such as DM, hypertension,

1
2
3 hypercholesterolemia, and heart attack.⁶ The objective of the present study
4 was to determine whether risk of heart attack differs in people with DM alone
5 and MS alone using the 2015 BRFSS database.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Methods**

12 ***Participants***

13
14 BRFSS is the nation's premier system of health-related telephone surveys that
15 collect state data about U.S. residents regarding their health-related risk
16 behaviors, chronic health conditions, and use of preventive services. BRFSS
17 completes more than 400,000 adult interviews each year, making it the largest
18 continuously conducted health survey system in the world.⁷ In 2015, 50 states,
19 the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico collected data from interviews
20 conducted both by landline telephone and cellular telephone. Questions used
21 in this study in 2015 BRFSS survey include heart attack history, diabetes
22 history, physical activity, dyslipidemia, hypertension awareness, chronic health
23 conditions, alcohol consumption, fruits and vegetables, and currently smoking.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 8

38
39 There were 441,456 subjects in the 2015 BRFSS survey. The response rate
40 from cellular telephone is 47.2%, which is slightly lower than that from landline
41 telephone (48.2%).⁹ Unknown responses or non-responses were coded as
42 missing in questions included in the study, and there were 332,008 subjects
43 included in the analysis after removing missing values.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 ***Measures***

53
54 Socio-demographic variables, such as age (18-44 year or 45+ year), race,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no), education, smoking
4 status (current smoker or not) and annual household income were categorized
5 according to the original variables.
6
7

8
9 Respondents' lifestyles were assessed by questions on their physical
10 activity, fruits, and vegetables consumption. Fruit consumption was
11 categorized as "consumed fruit one or more times per day" or "consumed fruit
12 less than one time per day". Vegetable consumption was categorized as
13 "consumed vegetables one or more times per day" or "consumed vegetables
14 one or more times per day". Physical activity index was categorized as whether
15 "meet aerobic recommendations" or not.
16
17

18
19 In the 2015 BRFSS, chronic diseases were self-reported by answers to
20 questions on chronic diseases history. Heart attack was defined as yes to the
21 question "ever told you had a heart attack, also called a myocardial infarction".
22 Diabetes was defined by a yes answer to the question "ever told you have
23 diabetes". Respondents with pre-diabetes, borderline diabetes, or gestational
24 diabetes were excluded. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by
25 self-reported height and weight. Similarly, hypertension was defined as a yes
26 answer to the question "have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other
27 health professional that you have high blood pressure". Borderline
28 hypertension, pre-hypertension, and gestational hypertension were all
29 excluded from the study. Dyslipidemia was defined as a yes answer to the
30 question "have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other health
31 professional that your blood cholesterol is high". Stroke was defined as yes to
32 the question of "ever told you had a stroke". Depression was a yes answer to
33 the question of "ever told you that you have a depressive disorder, including
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor”.

4 MS was diagnosed based on the ATP-III definition.¹⁰ The components of MS
5 were diabetes, hypertension, central obesity, and dyslipidemia. Respondents
6 who had more than three components were regarded as having MS. In this
7 study, the “MS alone” group means that respondents had the other three
8 components of MS excluding diabetes. Central obesity was diagnosed
9 according to the MS definition issued by the American College of
10 Endocrinology with BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m² regarded as central obesity.¹¹
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Statistical analysis**

23 Each record in the 2015 BRFSS data was weighted using raking weighting
24 methodology¹². Final weight was assigned to each respondent. Weighted
25 percentages of respondents who ever had heart attack were calculated.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Weighted Chi-square tests was performed to determine respondents’
32 characteristic differences across groups. Weighted hierarchical logistic
33 regression analysis was applied to investigate in greater depth. Odds ratios
34 (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were derived from
35 weighted hierarchical logistic regression analysis. Survey related procedures
36 in SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) were used for all data analysis. The
37 significance level was set at $p < 0.05$, and all tests were two-sided.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Patient and public involvement**

49 This study was an analysis of the 2015 BRFSS database. The database was
50 downloaded via the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Demographic Characteristics

There were 332,008 respondents involved in this study. All respondents were categorized into four groups as follows: neither DM nor MS, DM alone (having DM without MS), MS alone (having MS without DM), and DM plus MS. There were 237,334 respondents with neither DM nor MS, 45,191 respondents with DM alone, 8,416 respondents with MS alone and 41,067 respondents with both DM and MS (Table 1). Differences in the weighted percentages of gender, age category, smoking status, education level, race, ethnicity, and annual household income were statistically significant among the four groups ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the above characteristics were significantly different between DM alone and MS alone group ($p < 0.001$). In both MS and DM group, 91% were aged over 45 years, and 21.5% did not graduate high school, which were higher than the other three groups. Moreover, 17.6% of respondents in the MS and DM group had annual household incomes lower than \$15,000 and the low income percentage is much higher than the other three groups. Less people were white in the DM alone group (71.4%) compared with that in the MS alone group (80.4%). However, More respondents were Latino in the DM alone group (19.3%) than in the MS alone group (10.3%, $p < 0.001$), and more respondents were current smokers in the DM alone group (16.0%) compared with the MS alone group (15.3%, $p < 0.001$, Table 1).

Lifestyle

Lifestyle measurements were also compared in the four groups (Table 1). The weighted percentage of physical activity index, daily fruit consumption and

1
2
3 vegetables consumption were all significantly different across the four groups.
4
5 The physical activity index was statistically significant between the DM alone
6
7 and MS alone groups (48.2% vs 47.6%, $p<0.001$). The DM and MS group had
8
9 the least weighted percentage of respondents whose physical activity met the
10
11 aerobic recommendations. The weighted percentage of respondents who
12
13 consumed fruit one or more times per day was higher in the DM alone group,
14
15 compared to that in the MS alone group (58.8% vs 56.8%, $p<0.001$). However,
16
17 daily vegetables consumption was similar between the DM alone and the MS
18
19 alone groups (76.9% vs 76.8%, $p=0.019$). In the DM and MS group, the
20
21 weighted percentage of daily vegetable consumption is the least among the
22
23 four groups (73.4%)
24
25
26
27
28

29 ***MS components and chronic diseases***

30
31 Among the 332,008 respondents, 21,896 respondents had heart attack,
32
33 accounting for the weighted prevalence of 5.2%. MS alone had higher
34
35 weighted prevalence of heart attack than that in DM alone (11.0%, 8.5%,
36
37 respectively, $p<0.001$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack in the DM plus
38
39 MS group was the highest (16.1%, Table 2). The overall weighted prevalence
40
41 of dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, and central obesity was 36.6%, 37.5%,
42
43 13.2%, and 67.2%, respectively (Table 2). In the DM alone group, 83%
44
45 respondents had one component of MS other than DM, with 17% people
46
47 having no other components of MS besides DM.
48
49

50
51 The overall weighted prevalence of stroke was 3.6%. The weighted
52
53 prevalence of stroke were significantly different between the DM alone and MS
54
55 alone groups (4.8% vs. 6.6%, $p<0.001$). The weighted prevalence of stroke in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the DM plus MS group was the highest among the four groups (9.7%). The
4
5 overall weighted prevalence of depression was 18.2%. Compared with DM
6
7 alone, MS alone had significantly higher weighted prevalence of depression
8
9 (16.4% vs 24.1%, $p < 0.001$). The highest weighted prevalence of depression
10
11 was observed in the DM plus MS group (27.7%).
12
13

14 15 **Logistic regression**

16
17
18 Logistic regression was conducted to compare the difference among the four
19
20 groups in their association with heart attack, using the neither DM nor MS
21
22 group as the reference (Table 3). Results from unadjusted logistic regression
23
24 analysis showed that both DM alone (OR=3.275, 95% CI =2.812-3.815) and
25
26 MS alone (OR =4.366, 95% CI = 4.055-4.700) groups had significantly
27
28 elevated odds of heart attack than neither DM nor MS group. The DM plus MS
29
30 group had the highest odds of heart attack among the three groups (OR
31
32 =6.787, 95% CI =6.331-7.275)
33
34

35
36 To identify an independent relationship between DM, MS and heart attack,
37
38 hierarchical logistic regression analysis was performed. After adjusting for
39
40 confounders (gender, age, education, smoking, race, physical activity index,
41
42 daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption, stroke, and depression)
43
44 DM alone and MS alone were found to have independently increased odds of
45
46 heart attack compared with the neither DM nor MS group (DM alone, AOR
47
48 =2.089, 95% CI =1.716-2.543, MS alone, AOR =2.575, 95% CI =2.363-2.806).
49
50 The DM plus MS group had the highest odds of heart attack (AOR = 3.451,
51
52 95% CI = 3.156-3.772, p all < 0.001 , Table 3).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Predictive probability values

After adjusting for confounders such as gender, age, education, smoking, race, physical activity index, daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption, stroke, and depression, the predictive probability value of each respondent from the logistic regression analysis was calculated. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analyses were performed to determine the predictive probability value of different DM and MS groups in predicting heart attack. ROC analysis showed that the area under curve (AUC) for the predictive probability of heart attack was 0.788 (95% CI: 0.784-0.791, $p < 0.01$) in the whole population. In the DM alone, MS alone, and DM plus MS group, the AUC were 0.705 (95% CI: 0.685 - 0.726, $p < 0.01$), 0.678 (95% CI: 0.670 - 0.687, $p < 0.01$) and 0.678 (95% CI: 0.670 - 0.685, $p < 0.01$). There were no statistically significant differences among these three groups.

The sensitivity and the specificity of the predictive probability in predicting heart attack were also calculated. If the predictive probability value was over 0.5, the predictive probability was set as positive, otherwise as negative. The sensitivity and the specificity of the predictive probability in predicting heart attack in the whole population were 2.9% and 99.8%. In the DM alone group, the sensitivity was 0.5% (0-1.0%) and the specificity was 100%. In the MS alone group, the sensitivity was 2.5% (2.0%-2.96%) and the specificity was 99.6% (99.4%-99.8%). In the DM plus MS group, the sensitivity was 7.3% (6.62%-7.98%) and the specificity was 98.6% (98.3%-98.9%).

Discussion

In the 2015 BRFSS data, respondents with MS alone and DM alone were both

1
2
3 associated with elevated risk of heart attack and the amount of increase is
4 doubled compare to respondents with neither DM nor MS. MS did not appear
5 to be a greater hazard for heart attack than DM from our analysis results. MS
6 combined with DM increased more risk of heart attack by over 3.4 fold
7 compared with respondents with neither DM nor MS.
8
9

10
11
12
13 MS is a cluster of risk factors contributing to the pathogenesis of
14 atherosclerosis.¹³ There are several definitions of MS and different definitions
15 of MS had different components.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Many large-scale clinical trials and
16 meta-analyses have reported that the presence of MS is a strong predictor for
17 heart attack in many different populations.^{5, 17-19} In the INTERHEART
18 case-control study involving 26,903 subjects from 52 countries, MS was
19 associated with an increased risk of heart attack, both using the WHO
20 definition (OR=2.69) and the IDF definition (OR=2.20). The direction of
21 associations were similar across all regions and ethnic groups.⁵ A large family
22 study in Finland and Sweden of 4,483 subjects also identified the association
23 between MS and an increased risk of heart attack in all subjects using the
24 WHO definition.¹⁹ Similar results were observed when the 2001 NCEP and
25 2004 revised NCEP definitions were used.^{17, 18}
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 DM is one of the components in most definitions of MS. The risk for
42 cardiovascular disease (CVD) is 2-8 fold higher in the diabetic population than
43 that in the non-diabetic population of a similar age, sex and ethnicity and CVD
44 is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality among patients with type 2
45 diabetes.²⁰⁻²²
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Previous researchers have investigated the effects of DM on heart attack.
53 Consistent with our findings, it has been reported that DM was associated with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an increased heart attack risk in both men and women.²³ A cohort study using
4 the UK General Practice Research Database showed a much larger relative
5 risk of heart attack in DM.²⁴
6
7

8
9 Both DM and MS were associated with an increased risk of heart attack.
10 However, evidence regarding whether MS alone is better than DM alone for
11 evaluating heart attack are limited. There were studies to evaluate the
12 relationship between MS and DM on CVD events. Results from different
13 studies regarding differences in CVD events between DM and MS were
14 conflicting. The Ansung-Ansan cohort study showed that there was no
15 difference in the risk of incident CVD between individuals with DM alone and
16 MS alone.²⁵ Yet, in the REACH registry, presence of newly detected DM but
17 not MS was associated with an increased risk of CVD events.²⁶ Besides the
18 difference in population characteristics in these studies, the sample size and
19 the definitions of CVD maybe affect the results.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In the logistic analysis of this study, MS alone and DM alone were found to
34 have similar odds of heart attack. MS and DM have similar ROC, specificity
35 and sensitivity when each group used independently to predict the odds of
36 heart attack after adjusting all other covariates in the logistic regression model.
37 All these indicated that MS and DM may have similar effects on heart attack in
38 the US adults.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The diagnosis of MS in this study was different from the original definition of
47 MS. However, the association between MS and heart attack was consistent.
48 MS, regardless of its definition, was associated with heart attack.
49
50
51

52 DM typically co-presents with at least one metabolic abnormality. In our
53 analysis, the weighted prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidemia and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 overweight in DM alone group was 13.9%, 12.2% and 56.8%, respectively. Of
4 the respondents with DM, 83% had at least one or more components of MS
5 other than DM. As shown in a population-based cohort study, DM with only one
6 component of MS had more than twofold higher CVD risk than those with DM
7 only.²⁷ These associations may be helpful to explain in this study why DM and
8 MS had similar effects on heart attack. Further studies were needed to
9 evaluate the association between MS alone, DM alone with heart attack. Our
10 results indicated that to prevent heart attack or CVD, even a diabetic person
11 does not meet the criteria of MS, much more attention should be paid to control
12 metabolic abnormalities.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There were some limitations in our study. First, the definition of MS is revised according to the contents of 2015 BRFSS. MS was diagnosed based on the ATP-III definition.¹⁰ The components of MS were diabetes, hypertension, central obesity, and dyslipidemia. Respondents who had more than three components were regarded as having MS. According to the ATP-III definition, central obesity was diagnosed basing on waist circumference. We used BMI to classify individuals as central obesity because waist circumference was not available. The MS definition from the American College of Endocrinology recommends that BMI $>25\text{kg/m}^2$ or a waist circumference >40 inches for men, >35 inches for women was regarded as obesity.¹¹ Therefore in the present study, we used BMI $\geq 25\text{ kg/m}^2$ as the cut-off point for obesity. Secondly, in the 2015 BRFSS, there were no data on triglyceride and high-density lipoprotein. Dyslipidemia was assessed by whether respondents had ever been told their blood cholesterol was high. Thirdly, the self-reported nature of the cross-sectional study may lead to underestimate the actual

1
2
3 prevalence of heart attack. In this study, 13.2% respondents had diabetes.
4
5 However, some diabetic respondents may have silent heart attack without any
6
7 symptoms. Fourthly, gestational diabetes and pre-diabetes were excluded.
8
9 These two conditions are both important risk factors for DM that has been
10
11 excluded from the study.
12

13
14 In conclusion, even though the weighted percentage of heart attack in MS
15
16 alone was higher than that in DM alone, MS and DM had similar effects on
17
18 heart attack, which could double the risk of heart attack. Furthermore, when
19
20 MS is combined with DM, the risk of heart attack will be increased by over 3.5
21
22 fold. Considering the nature of the cross-sectional study in the 2015 BRFSS
23
24 data, prospective studies are needed to confirm the association between MS
25
26 alone, DM alone with heart attack.
27

28
29
30
31 **Contributors** GRY and DL designed the study and analyzed the data. GRY
32
33 draft the manuscript. DL and TD revised the manuscript. All authors read and
34
35 approved the final manuscript.
36

37
38 **Funding** This work was supported by Beijing Municipal Training Foundation
39
40 for Highly-qualified and Technological Talents of Health System [2014-3-013]
41
42 and Capital's Funds for Health Improvement and Research [2016-2-2054]. Dr.
43
44 Li's and Dr. Dye's time is partly supported by the University of Rochester's
45
46 Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) number UL1 TR000042 and
47
48 UL1 TR002001 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences
49
50 of the National Institutes of Health.
51

52
53 **Competing interests** None declared.

54
55 **Ethics approval** Not applicable.
56
57
58
59
60

Data sharing statement No additional data are available..

References

1. Writing Group M, Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha MJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2016 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2016 Jan 26;133(4):e38-360.
2. Selvin E, Parrinello CM, Sacks DB, Coresh J. Trends in prevalence and control of diabetes in the United States, 1988-1994 and 1999-2010. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2014 Apr 15;160(8):517-25.
3. Preis SR, Pencina MJ, Hwang SJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Savage PJ, Levy D, et al. Trends in cardiovascular disease risk factors in individuals with and without diabetes mellitus in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation*. 2009 Jul 21;120(3):212-20.
4. Norhammar A, Malmberg K, Diderholm E, Lagerqvist B, Lindahl B, Ryden L, et al. Diabetes mellitus: the major risk factor in unstable coronary artery disease even after consideration of the extent of coronary artery disease and benefits of revascularization. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2004 Feb 18;43(4):585-91.
5. Mente A, Yusuf S, Islam S, McQueen MJ, Tanomsup S, Onen CL, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction A Case-Control Study of 26,903 Subjects From 52 Countries. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2010 May 25;55(21):2390-8.
6. Mokdad AH, Stroup DF, Giles WH, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance T. Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment. Recommendations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Team. *MMWR Recommendations and reports : Morbidity and mortality weekly report Recommendations and reports*. 2003 May 23;52(RR-9):1-12.
7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). About BRFSS. . Available online: <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/about/index.htm> (accessed on 30 March 2017).
8. 2015 BRFSS overview. Available: online: https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/overview_2015pdf (accessed on 30 March 2017).
9. 2015 Summary Data Quality Report with Response Rates. Available online: https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/2015-sdqrpdf (accessed on 30 March 2017).
10. Expert Panel on Detection E, Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in A. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). *Jama*. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.
11. Einhorn D, Reaven GM, Cobin RH, Ford E, Ganda OP, Handelsman Y, et al. American College of Endocrinology position statement on the insulin resistance

- 1
2
3 syndrome. *Endocrine practice : official journal of the American College of*
4 *Endocrinology and the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists*. 2003
5 May-Jun;9(3):237-52.
- 6
7 12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance
8 System. Weighting BRFSS Data BRFSS 2015. Available online:
9 [https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage_content](https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage_content.pdf)
10 [pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage_content.pdf) (accessed on 30 March 2017).
- 11
12 13. Al-Aqeedi RF, Abdullatef WK, Dabdoob W, Bener A, Albinali HA, Gehani A.
13 The prevalence of metabolic syndrome components, individually and in combination,
14 in male patients admitted with acute coronary syndrome, without previous diagnosis
15 of diabetes mellitus. *The Libyan journal of medicine*. 2013 Mar 19;8:20185.
- 16
17 14. Alberti KG, Zimmet PZ. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes
18 mellitus and its complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus
19 provisional report of a WHO consultation. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British*
20 *Diabetic Association*. 1998 Jul;15(7):539-53.
- 21
22 15. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol Education
23 Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And Treatment of High
24 Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). *JAMA*. 2001 May
25 16;285(19):2486-97.
- 26
27 16. Alberti KG, Zimmet P, Shaw J, Group IDFETFC. The metabolic syndrome--a
28 new worldwide definition. *Lancet*. 2005 Sep 24-30;366(9491):1059-62.
- 29
30 17. Mottillo S, Filion KB, Genest J, Joseph L, Pilote L, Poirier P, et al. The metabolic
31 syndrome and cardiovascular risk a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of*
32 *the American College of Cardiology*. 2010 Sep 28;56(14):1113-32.
- 33
34 18. Shin JA, Lee JH, Lim SY, Ha HS, Kwon HS, Park YM, et al. Metabolic
35 syndrome as a predictor of type 2 diabetes, and its clinical interpretations and
36 usefulness. *Journal of diabetes investigation*. 2013 Jul 08;4(4):334-43.
- 37
38 19. Isomaa B, Almgren P, Tuomi T, Forsen B, Lahti K, Nissen M, et al.
39 Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with the metabolic syndrome.
40 *Diabetes care*. 2001 Apr;24(4):683-9.
- 41
42 20. Papa G, Degano C, Iurato MP, Licciardello C, Maiorana R, Finocchiaro C.
43 Macrovascular complication phenotypes in type 2 diabetic patients. *Cardiovascular*
44 *diabetology*. 2013 Jan 18;12:20.
- 45
46 21. Haffner SM, Lehto S, Ronnema T, Pyorala K, Laakso M. Mortality from
47 coronary heart disease in subjects with type 2 diabetes and in nondiabetic subjects
48 with and without prior myocardial infarction. *The New England journal of medicine*.
49 1998 Jul 23;339(4):229-34.
- 50
51 22. Brun E, Nelson RG, Bennett PH, Imperatore G, Zoppini G, Verlato G, et al.
52 Diabetes duration and cause-specific mortality in the Verona Diabetes Study. *Diabetes*
53 *care*. 2000 Aug;23(8):1119-23.
- 54
55 23. Laugsand LE, Janszky I, Vatten LJ, Dalen H, Midthjell K, Grill V, et al.
56 Autoimmune diabetes in adults and risk of myocardial infarction: the HUNT study in
57 Norway. *Journal of internal medicine*. 2016 Nov;280(5):518-31.
- 58
59 24. Mulnier HE, Seaman HE, Raleigh VS, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Colhoun HM,

- 1
2
3 Lawrenson RA, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction in men and women with type 2
4 diabetes in the UK: a cohort study using the General Practice Research Database.
5 *Diabetologia*. 2008 Sep;51(9):1639-45.
6
7 25. Bae JC, Cho NH, Suh S, Kim JH, Hur KY, Jin SM, et al. Cardiovascular disease
8 incidence, mortality and case fatality related to diabetes and metabolic syndrome: A
9 community-based prospective study (Ansung-Ansan cohort 2001-12). *Journal of*
10 *diabetes*. 2015 Nov;7(6):791-9.
11
12 26. Udell JA, Steg PG, Scirica BM, Eagle KA, Ohman EM, Goto S, et al. Metabolic
13 syndrome, diabetes mellitus, or both and cardiovascular risk in outpatients with or at
14 risk for atherothrombosis. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2014
15 Dec;21(12):1531-40.
16
17 27. Bruno G, Merletti F, Biggeri A, Barger G, Ferrero S, Runzo C, et al. Metabolic
18 syndrome as a predictor of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in type 2 diabetes:
19 the Casale Monferrato Study. *Diabetes care*. 2004 Nov;27(11):2689-94.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Demographic and lifestyle characteristics among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM alone	MS alone	DM plus MS	p value
Number	332,008	237334	8416	45191	41067	
Gender						<0.01
Male, n	144458	98983	4049	22377	19049	
(weighted %)	(49.9%)	(48.4%)	(56.4%)	(57.1%)	(51.8%)	
Female, n	187550	138351	4367	22814	22018	
(weighted %)	(50.1%)	(51.6%)	(43.6%)	(42.9%)*	(48.2%)	
Age						<0.01
<45 years, n	67420	61527	944	3054	1895	
(weighted %)	(36.9%)	(44.7%)	(20.4%)	(14.6%)	(9.0%)	
≥45 years, n	264588	175807	7472	42137	39172	
(weighted %)	(63.1%)	(55.3%)	(79.6%)	(85.4%)*	(91.0%)	
Annual household income						<0.01
<15000, n	26368	15248	1009	4100	6011	
(weighted %)	(9.8%)	(8.3%)	(15.2%)	(10.9%)	(17.6%)	
15000-25000, n	42954	27083	1459	6503	7909	
(weighted %)	(15.2%)	(13.6%)	(21.8%)	(17.3%)	(22.9%)	
25000-35000, n	29733	19853	877	4533	4470	
(weighted %)	(9.9%)	(9.4%)	(11.5%)	(11.0%)	(12.0%)	
35000-50000, n	40705	28453	1039	6103	5110	
(weighted %)	(13.6%)	(13.5%)	(13.3%)	(14.7%)	(13.7%)	
>50000, n	144082	112776	2616	17422	11268	
(weighted %)	(51.5%)	(55.2%)	(38.2%)	(46.1%)*	(33.8%)	

Latino							<0.01
Yes,	n	22487	16018	853	2257	3359	
(weighted %)		(13.8%)	(14.0%)	(19.3%)	(10.3%)*	(15.0%)	
No,	n	307115	219670	7490	42626	37329	
(weighted %)		(86.2%)	(86.0%)	(80.7%)	(89.7%)	(85.0%)	
Race							<0.01
White,	n	279446	202115	6730	38756	31845	
(weighted %)		(77.8%)	(78.4%)	(71.4%)	(80.4%)*	(72.7%)	
African		26653	16453	740	3815	5645	
America,	n	(12.4%)	(11.4%)	(13.9%)	(12.9%)	(18.1%)	
(weighted %)							
America		5718	3673	263	670	1112	
Indian,	n	(1.7%)	(1.6%)	(3.3%)	(1.5%)	(2.5%)	
(weighted %)							
Asian,	n	7092	5688	243	535	626	
(weighted %)		(4.8%)	(5.2%)	(7.3%)	(2.5%)	(3.5%)	
Native		1872	1338	49 (0.5%)	213	272	
Hawaiian,	n	(0.4%)	(0.4%)		(0.3%)	(0.3%)	
(weighted %)							
Other race,		4058	4058	215	647	839	
n		(2.7%)	(2.7%)	(3.5%)	(2.2%)	(2.6%)	
(weighted %)							
No		745	577	14 (0.1%)	60 (0.2%)	94 (0.2%)	
preferred		(0.3%)	(0.3%)				
race,	n						
(weighted %)							
Multiracial		6 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	
but preferred							
race not							
answered,	n						
(weighted %)							
Education							<0.01
Did not		21989	12296	917	3607	5169	

graduate high school, n
(weighted %)

Graduated	88636	58399	2672	14028	13537
high school, n (weighted %)	(26.9%)	(25.6%)	(29.4%)	(31.2%)	(31.1%)

Attended college or technical school, n (weighted %)	90001	63868	2238	12302	11593
	(31.5%)	(32.0%)	(28.1%)	(30.3%)	(30.2%)

Graduated from college or technical school, n (weighted %)	130722	102289	2561	15185	10687
	(29.8%)	(32.7%)	(22.3%)	(23.6%)*	(17.2%)

Currently smoking <0.01

No, n (weighted %)	280808	200158	6944	38788	34918
	(84.5%)	(84.4%)	(84.0%)	(84.7%)	(85.4%)
Yes, n (weighted %)	43947	31827	1230	5547	5343
	(15.5%)	(15.6%)	(16.0%)	(15.3%)*	(14.6%)

Physical activity index <0.01

Meet aerobic recommendations, n (weighted %)	164390	124593	3712	20530	15555
	(52.8%)	(55.4%)	(48.2%)	(47.6%)	(40.8%)

Did not meet aerobic recommendations, n	136791	90370	3735	20831	21855
	(47.2%)	(44.6%)	(51.8%)	(52.4%)*	(59.2%)

(weighted %)						
Fruit						
						<0.01
Consumed	195725	143690	4795	25173	22067	
fruit one or	(61.4%)	(62.9%)	(58.8%)	(56.8%)	(56.0%)	
more times						
per day, n						
(weighted %)						
Consumed	111948	76183	2854	16897	16014	
fruit less than	(38.6%)	(37.1%)	(41.2%)	(43.2%)*	(44.0%)	
one time per						
day, n						
(weighted %)						
Vegetable						
						<0.01
Vegetables	243504	177711	5766	32262	27765	
one or more	(79.7%)	(81.0%)	(76.9%)	(76.8%)	(73.4%)	
times per						
day, n						
(weighted %)						
Vegetables	58881	38567	1691	9081	9542	
less than one	(20.3%)	(19.0%)	(23.1%)	(23.2%)	(26.6%)	
time per day,						
n						
(weighted %)						

* Compared with DM alone group, p<0.05

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 2. Chronic diseases among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

Chronic diseases	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM alone	MS alone	DM plus MS	P value
Heart attack, n (weighted %)	21896 (5.2%)	8863 (2.7%)	851 (8.5%)	5310 (11.0%)*	6872 (16.1%)	<0.01
Hypertension, n (weighted %)	147655 (37.5%)	64705 (21.9%)	1411 (13.9%)	45191 (100.0%)*	36348 (87.6%)	<0.01
Dyslipidemia, n (weighted %)	140653 (36.6%)	62526 (22.2%)	1102 (12.2%)	45191 (100.0%)*	31834 (77.6%)	<0.01
Central obesity, n (weighted %)	223112 (67.2%)	135589 (59.1%)	4551 (56.8%)	45191 (100.0%)*	37781 (92.3%)	<0.01
Stroke, n (weighted %)	15013 (3.6%)	6910 (2.2%)	544 (4.8%)	3228 (6.6%)*	4331 (9.7%)	<0.01
Depression, n (weighted %)	64290 (18.3%)	40520 (16.1%)	1574 (16.4%)	10687 (24.1%)*	11509 (27.7%)	<0.01

* Compared with DM alone group, $p < 0.05$

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 3. The odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals of DM and MS related to heart attack in the hierarchy logistic regression analysis

	Odds Ratio	95% confidence intervals	p value
Model 1			
DM alone	3.275	2.812-3.815	<0.01
MS alone	4.366	4.055-4.700	<0.01
DM plus MS	6.787	6.331-7.275	<0.01
Model 2			
DM alone	2.097	1.768-2.486	<0.01
MS alone	2.852	2.637-3.084	<0.01
DM plus MS	4.058	3.756-4.384	<0.01
Model 3			
DM alone	2.116	1.748-2.562	<0.01
MS alone	2.820	2.594-3.067	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.987	3.660-4.344	<0.01
Model 4			
DM alone	2.089	1.716-2.543	<0.01
MS alone	2.575	2.363-2.806	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.451	3.156-3.772	<0.01

Model 1: unadjusted

Model 2: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race

Model 3: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day

Model 4 adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day, stroke, and depression

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

BMJ Open

Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2015

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022990.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Guang-Ran; Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Department of Endocrinology; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Dye, Timothy ; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Li, Dongmei; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Keywords:	General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, metabolic syndrome, heart attack

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in**
4 **U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor**
5 **Surveillance System 2015**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Guang-Ran Yang ^{1,2*}, Timothy D. Dye ², Dongmei Li ^{2*}
13
14

15
16
17 ¹ Department of Endocrinology, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical
18 University, Beijing, 100730, China
19

20
21 ² Clinical and Translational Science Institute, School of Medicine and Dentistry,
22 University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, NY 14620, United States of
23 America
24
25
26
27

28
29
30
31 * Corresponding author

32
33 Guang-Ran Yang
34 Department of Endocrinology
35 Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University
36 No 1 Dongjiaomin Xiang, Dongcheng District
37 Beijing, 100730, China
38 Tel: 86-13520055818
39 Fax: 8610-65288736
40 E-mail: gr.yang@ccmu.edu.cn
41
42 & Dongmei Li
43 Clinical and Translational Science Institute
44 School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester
45 265 Crittenden Boulevard CU 420708, 14642
46 Rochester, NY, USA
47 Tel: 1-5852767285
48 Fax: 1-5852761122
49 Email: Dongmei_li@URMC.rochester.edu
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Objectives: Diabetes mellitus (DM) and metabolic syndrome (MS) are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding which condition - MS or DM - is better associated with heart attack, however, is limited. The purpose of this study is to examine DM and MS, and their comparative associations with heart attack, using the 2015 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS).

Design: Cross-sectional study. **Methods:** A total of 332,008 subjects aged over 18-year were included in the analysis. All subjects were classified into four groups based on their DM and MS status: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS, MS without DM, and both DM and MS. Hierarchical logistic regressions were used to examine the effect of DM and MS on heart attack using the neither DM nor MS group as the reference. **Results:** Differences in weighted frequency distributions of gender, age category (over 45 years or not), smoking status, education, race, physical activity, and daily vegetables and fruits consumption were significantly different across the four groups ($p < 0.05$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack was 5.2% for neither DM nor MS group, 8.5% for DM only group, 11.0% for MS only group and 16.1% for both DM and MS group. The weighted prevalence of heart attack in MS only group was significantly higher than that in the DM only group ($p < 0.01$). After adjusting for confounding variables, DM only and MS only were both found to be independently associated with heart attack compared with those with neither DM nor MS (DM without MS, odds ratio=2.09, MS without DM, odds ratio=2.58, p all < 0.01). **Conclusion:** The BRFSS 2015 data indicated that MS without DM and DM without MS had comparable effects on heart attack in U.S adults, and the odds of risk are doubled than U.S. adults with neither DM nor MS.

1
2
3
4
5 **Key Words:** Metabolic syndrome, Diabetes, Heart attack
6
7
8
9

10 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
11

12 ▶ BRFSS is a routine health-related telephone survey assessing a range of
13
14 conditions.
15

16
17 ▶ Weighted frequency distributions and summary statistics were used to
18
19 describe the sample characteristics in each group.
20

21 ▶ Limitation: chronic diseases were self-reported by answers.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Background

Coronary heart disease (CHD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. CHD alone caused approximately 1 of every 7 deaths in the U.S. with 366,801 deaths due to CHD in 2015. ¹ Each year, around 660,000 Americans are estimated to have a new heart attack (defined as first hospitalized heart attack or CHD death) and around 305,000 Americans have a recurrent attack. Furthermore, an additional 160,000 silent heart attacks are estimated to occur each year. ²

Diabetes mellitus (DM), especially type 2 diabetes, is associated with clustered risk factors for CHD. Among adults with DM, the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and obesity is ranged 75% to 85%, 70% to 80%, and 60% to 70%, respectively.²⁻⁴ Patients with DM had higher morbidity and mortality of CHD, including heart attack. In a subgroup analysis of the FRISC II trial, diabetic patients with unstable coronary artery disease had a significantly higher rate of heart attack than non-diabetic patients.⁵

Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a multi-component risk factor for CHD that includes a cluster of individual cardiometabolic risk factors related to abdominal obesity and insulin resistance. Clinically, MS is a useful entity for communicating the nature of lifestyle-related cardiometabolic risk for both patients and clinicians.² MS is a risk factor for heart attack in both women and men, from all regions and ethnic groups worldwide.⁶

DM and MS are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding whether MS without DM has stronger association with heart attack than DM without MS, however, are limited. The ongoing Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) assesses chronic conditions, such as DM,

1
2
3 hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and heart attack.⁷ The objective of the
4 present study was to determine whether risk of heart attack differs in people
5 with DM without MS and MS without DM using the 2015 BRFSS database.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Methods**

13 14 ***Participants***

15
16 BRFSS is the nation's premier system of health-related telephone surveys that
17 collect state data about U.S. residents regarding their health-related risk
18 behaviors, chronic health conditions, and use of preventive services. BRFSS
19 completes more than 400,000 adult interviews each year, making it the largest
20 continuously conducted health survey system in the world.⁸ In 2015, 50 states,
21 the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico collected data from interviews
22 conducted both by landline telephone and cellular telephone. Questions used
23 in this study in 2015 BRFSS survey include heart attack history, diabetes
24 history, physical activity, dyslipidemia, hypertension awareness, chronic health
25 conditions, alcohol consumption, fruits and vegetables, and currently smoking.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

9
There were 441,456 subjects in the 2015 BRFSS survey. The response rate from cellular telephone is 47.2%, which is slightly lower than that from landline telephone (48.2%).¹⁰ Unknown responses or non-responses were coded as missing in questions included in the study, and there were 332,008 subjects included in the analysis after removing missing values.

60 ***Measures***

Socio-demographic variables, such as age (18-44 year or 45+ year), race,

1
2
3 ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no), education, smoking
4 status (current smoker or not) and annual household income were categorized
5 according to the original variables.
6
7
8
9

10 Respondents' lifestyles were assessed by questions on their physical
11 activity, fruits, and vegetables consumption. Fruit consumption was
12 categorized as "consumed fruit one or more times per day" or "consumed fruit
13 less than one time per day". Vegetable consumption was categorized as
14 "consumed vegetables one or more times per day" or "consumed vegetables
15 one or more times per day". Physical activity index was categorized as whether
16 "meet aerobic recommendations" or not.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In the 2015 BRFSS, chronic diseases were self-reported by answers to
27 questions on chronic diseases history. Heart attack was defined as yes to the
28 question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional ever told you had a
29 heart attack, also called a myocardial infarction". Diabetes was defined by a
30 yes answer to the question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional
31 ever told you have diabetes". Respondents with pre-diabetes, borderline
32 diabetes, or gestational diabetes were excluded. Body mass index (BMI) was
33 calculated by self-reported height and weight. Similarly, hypertension was
34 defined as a yes answer to the question "have you ever been told by a doctor,
35 nurse or other health professional that you have high blood pressure".
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60
Borderline hypertension, pre-hypertension, and gestational hypertension were
all excluded from the study. Dyslipidemia was defined as a yes answer to the
question "have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other health
professional that your blood cholesterol is high". Stroke was defined as yes to
the question of "ever told you had a stroke". Depression was a yes answer to

1
2
3 the question of “ever told you that you have a depressive disorder, including
4 depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor”.

5
6
7 MS was diagnosed based on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS
8 were abdominal obesity (waist circumference >40 inches in men or >35 inches
9 in women), triglycerides ≥ 150 mg/dl, high density lipoprotein cholesterol <40
10 mg/dl in men or <50mg/dl in women, blood pressure $\geq 130/85$ mmHg, and
11 fasting glucose ≥ 110 mg/dl. As these were no data of waist circumference,
12 blood pressure, fasting glucose and lipid profile. The diagnose of MS was
13 revised based on the questions in the BRFSS. The revised components of MS
14 included diabetes, hypertension, BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and dyslipidemia.
15 Respondents who had at least three components were regarded as having MS.
16 In this study, the “MS without DM” group means that respondents had the
17 other three components of MS excluding diabetes.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Statistical analysis**

36
37 Each record in the 2015 BRFSS data was weighted using raking weighting
38 methodology¹². Final weight was assigned to each respondent. Weighted
39 percentages of respondents who ever had heart attack were calculated.
40
41
42
43

44 Weighted Chi-square tests was performed to determine respondents'
45 characteristic differences across groups. Weighted hierarchical logistic
46 regression analysis was applied to investigate in greater depth. Odds ratios
47 (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were derived from
48 weighted hierarchical logistic regression analysis. The predictive probability
49 value of each respondent from the logistic regression analysis was calculated.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 Receivers operating characteristic (ROC) curve analyses, the sensitivity and

1
2
3 the specificity of the predictive probability were performed to compare the
4 association of different DM and MS groups with heart attack. Survey related
5 procedures in SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) were used for all data
6 analysis. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$, and all tests were
7 two-sided.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 ***Patient and public involvement***

18
19 This study was an analysis of the 2015 BRFSS database. The database was
20 downloaded via the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Results**

27 ***Demographic Characteristics***

28
29 There were 332,008 respondents involved in this study. All respondents were
30 categorized into four groups as follows: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS
31 (having DM without MS), MS without DM (having MS without DM), and DM
32 plus MS. There were 237,334 respondents with neither DM nor MS, 45,191
33 respondents with DM without MS, 8,416 respondents with MS without DM and
34 41,067 respondents with both DM and MS (Table 1). Differences in the
35 weighted percentages of gender, age category, smoking status, education
36 level, race, ethnicity, and annual household income were statistically
37 significant among the four groups ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the above
38 characteristics were significantly different between DM without MS and MS
39 without DM group ($p < 0.001$). In both MS and DM group, 91% were aged over
40 45 years, and 21.5% did not graduate high school, which were higher than the
41 other three groups. Moreover, 17.6% of respondents in the MS and DM group
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 had annual household incomes lower than \$15,000 and the low income
4 percentage is much higher than the other three groups. Less people were
5 white in the DM without MS group (71.4%) compared with that in the MS
6 without DM group (80.4%). However, More respondents were Latino in the DM
7 without MS group (19.3%) than in the MS without DM group (10.3%, $p<0.001$),
8 and more respondents were current smokers in the DM without MS group
9 (16.0%) compared with the MS without DM group (15.3%, $p<0.001$, Table 1).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Lifestyle**

22 Lifestyle measurements were also compared in the four groups (Table 1). The
23 weighted percentage of physical activity index, daily fruit consumption and
24 vegetables consumption were all significantly different across the four groups.
25 The physical activity index was statistically significant between the DM without
26 MS and MS without DM groups (48.2% vs 47.6%, $p<0.001$). The DM and MS
27 group had the least weighted percentage of respondents whose physical
28 activity met the aerobic recommendations. The weighted percentage of
29 respondents who consumed fruit one or more times per day was higher in the
30 DM without MS group, compared to that in the MS without DM group (58.8% vs
31 56.8%, $p<0.001$). However, daily vegetables consumption was similar between
32 the DM without MS and the MS without DM groups (76.9% vs 76.8%, $p=0.019$).
33 In the DM and MS group, the weighted percentage of daily vegetable
34 consumption is the least among the four groups (73.4%) .
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **MS components and chronic diseases**

57
58 Among the 332,008 respondents, 21,896 respondents had heart attack,
59
60

1
2
3 accounting for the weighted prevalence of 5.2%. MS without DM had higher
4 weighted prevalence of heart attack than that in DM without MS (11.0%, 8.5%,
5 respectively, $p < 0.001$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack in the DM plus
6 MS group was the highest (16.1%, Table 2). The overall weighted prevalence
7 of dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, and BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m² was 36.6%,
8 37.5%, 13.2%, and 67.2%, respectively (Table 2). In the DM without MS group,
9 83% respondents had one component of MS other than DM, with 17% people
10 having no other components of MS besides DM.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The overall weighted prevalence of stroke was 3.6%. The weighted
22 prevalence of stroke were significantly different between the DM without MS
23 and MS without DM groups (4.8% vs 6.6%, $p < 0.001$). The weighted
24 prevalence of stroke in the DM plus MS group was the highest among the four
25 groups (9.7%). The overall weighted prevalence of depression was 18.2%.
26 Compared with DM without MS, MS without DM had significantly higher
27 weighted prevalence of depression (16.4% vs 24.1%, $p < 0.001$). The highest
28 weighted prevalence of depression was observed in the DM plus MS group
29 (27.7%).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ***Logistic regression***

47 Logistic regression was conducted to compare the difference among the four
48 groups in their association with heart attack, using the neither DM nor MS
49 group as the reference (Table 3). Results from unadjusted logistic regression
50 analysis showed that both DM without MS (OR=3.275, 95% CI=2.812-3.815)
51 and MS without DM (OR=4.366, 95% CI=4.055-4.700) groups had significantly
52 elevated odds of heart attack than neither DM nor MS group. The DM plus MS
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 group had the highest odds of heart attack among the three groups (OR=6.787,
4
5 95% CI=6.331-7.275)
6
7

8 To identify an independent relationship between DM, MS and heart attack,
9
10 hierarchical logistic regression analysis was performed. After adjusting for
11
12 confounders (gender, age, education, smoking, race, physical activity index,
13
14 daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption, stroke, and depression)
15
16 DM without MS and MS without DM were found to have independently
17
18 increased odds of heart attack compared with the neither DM nor MS group
19
20 (DM without MS, adjusted OR=2.089, 95% CI =1.716-2.543, MS without DM,
21
22 adjusted OR =2.575, 95% CI =2.363-2.806). The DM plus MS group had the
23
24 highest odds of heart attack (adjusted OR=3.451, 95% CI =3.156-3.772, p all <
25
26 0.001, Table 3).
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Predictive probability values***

34
35 After adjusting for confounders such as gender, age, education, smoking, race,
36
37 physical activity index, daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption,
38
39 stroke, and depression, the predictive probability value of each respondent
40
41 from the logistic regression analysis was calculated. Receivers operating
42
43 characteristic (ROC) curve analyses were performed to determine the
44
45 predictive probability value of different DM and MS groups in predicting heart
46
47 attack. ROC analysis showed that the area under curve (AUC) for the
48
49 predictive probability of heart attack was 0.788 (95% CI: 0.784-0.791, p<0.01)
50
51 in the whole population. In the DM without MS, MS without DM, and DM plus
52
53 MS group, the AUC were 0.705 (95% CI: 0.685-0.726, p<0.01), 0.678 (95% CI:
54
55 0.670-0.687, p<0.01) and 0.678 (95% CI: 0.670-0.685, p<0.01). There were no
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 statistically significant differences among these three groups.
4

5 The sensitivity and the specificity of the predictive probability in predicting
6 heart attack were also calculated. If the predictive probability value was over
7 0.5, the predictive probability was set as positive, otherwise as negative. The
8 sensitivity and the specificity of the predictive probability in predicting heart
9 attack in the whole population were 2.9% and 99.8%. In the DM without MS
10 group, the sensitivity was 0.5% (0-1.0%) and the specificity was 100%. In the
11 MS without DM group, the sensitivity was 2.5% (2.0%-2.96%) and the
12 specificity was 99.6% (99.4%-99.8%). In the DM plus MS group, the sensitivity
13 was 7.3% (6.62%-7.98%) and the specificity was 98.6% (98.3%-98.9%).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Discussion**

29
30 In the 2015 BRFSS data, respondents with MS without DM and DM without
31 MS were both associated with elevated risk of heart attack and the amount of
32 increase is doubled compare to respondents with neither DM nor MS. MS did
33 not appear to be a greater odds for heart attack than DM from our analysis
34 results. MS combined with DM increased more risk of heart attack by over 3.4
35 fold compared with respondents with neither DM nor MS.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 MS is a cluster of risk factors contributing to the pathogenesis of
45 atherosclerosis.¹³ There are several definitions of MS and different definitions
46 of MS had different components.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Many large-scale clinical trials and
47 meta-analyses have reported that the presence of MS is a strong predictor for
48 heart attack in many different populations.^{6, 17-19} In the INTERHEART
49 case-control study involving 26,903 subjects from 52 countries, MS was
50 associated with an increased risk of heart attack, both using the WHO
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 definition (OR=2.69) and the IDF definition (OR=2.20) .The direction of
4
5 associations were similar across all regions and ethnic groups.⁶ A large family
6
7 study in Finland and Sweden of 4,483 subjects also identified the association
8
9 between MS and an increased risk of heart attack in all subjects using the
10
11 WHO definition.¹⁹ Similar results were observed when the 2001 NCEP and
12
13 2004 revised NCEP definitions were used.^{17, 18} In our analysis, the association
14
15 between MS and heart attack was consistent. MS, regardless of its definition,
16
17 was associated with heart attack.
18
19

20
21 DM is one of the components in most definitions of MS. The risk for
22
23 cardiovascular disease (CVD) is 2-8 fold higher in the diabetic population than
24
25 that in the non-diabetic population of a similar age, sex and ethnicity and CVD
26
27 is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality among patients with type 2
28
29 diabetes.²⁰⁻²²
30
31

32
33 Previous researchers have investigated the effects of DM on heart attack.
34
35 Consistent with our findings, it has been reported that DM was associated with
36
37 an increased heart attack risk in both men and women.²³ A cohort study using
38
39 the UK General Practice Research Database showed a much larger relative
40
41 risk of heart attack in DM.²⁴
42
43

44 Both DM and MS were associated with an increased risk of heart attack.
45
46 However, evidence regarding whether MS without DM is better than DM
47
48 without MS for evaluating heart attack are limited. There were studies to
49
50 evaluate the relationship between MS and DM on CVD events. Results from
51
52 different studies regarding differences in CVD events between DM and MS
53
54 were conflicting. The Ansung-Ansan cohort study showed that there was no
55
56 difference in the risk of incident CVD between individuals with DM without MS
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and MS without DM.²⁵ Yet, in the REACH registry, presence of newly detected
4 DM but not MS was associated with an increased risk of CVD events.²⁶
5

6
7 Besides the difference in population characteristics in these studies, the
8 sample size and the definitions of CVD maybe affect the results.
9

10
11
12 There were fewer studies conducted in U.S. adults to compare the effects of
13 MS and DM on heart attack. In the logistic analysis of this study, MS without
14 DM and DM without MS were found to have similar odds of heart attack. MS
15 and DM have similar ROC, specificity and sensitivity when each group used
16 independently to predict the odds of heart attack after adjusting all other
17 covariates in the logistic regression model. All these showed that MS and DM
18 may have similar effects on heart attack in the U.S. adults, which was different
19 from the results of previous study in U.S. population.²⁷ Our results indicated
20 that to prevent heart attack or CVD, even a diabetic person does not meet the
21 criteria of MS, much more attention should be paid to control metabolic
22 abnormalities.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 DM typically co-presents with at least one metabolic abnormality. In our
39 analysis, the weighted prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidemia and
40 overweight in DM without MS group was 13.9%, 12.2% and 56.8%,
41 respectively. Of the respondents with DM, 83% had at least one or more
42 components of MS other than DM. As shown in a population-based cohort
43 study, DM with only one component of MS had more than twofold higher CVD
44 risk than those with DM only.²⁸ These associations may be helpful to explain in
45 this study why DM and MS had similar effects on heart attack. Further studies
46 were needed to evaluate the association between MS without DM, DM without
47 MS with heart attack.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There were some limitations in our study. First, the definition of MS is
4 revised according to the contents of 2015 BRFSS. MS was diagnosed based
5 on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS were diabetes, hypertension,
6 BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and dyslipidemia. Respondents who had at least three
7 components were regarded as having MS. According to the ATP-III definition,
8 central obesity was diagnosed basing on waist circumference. We used BMI
9 ≥ 25.0 kg/m² to classify individuals because waist circumference was not
10 available. The MS definition from the American College of Endocrinology
11 recommends that BMI > 25 kg/m² or a waist circumference > 40 inches for men,
12 > 35 inches for women was regarded as obesity.²⁹ Therefore in the present
13 study, we used BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² as a component of MS. Secondly, in the 2015
14 BRFSS, there were no data on triglyceride and high-density lipoprotein.
15 Dyslipidemia was assessed by whether respondents had ever been told their
16 blood cholesterol was high. Thirdly, the self-reported nature of the
17 cross-sectional study may lead to underestimate the actual prevalence of heart
18 attack. In this study, 13.2% respondents had diabetes. However, some
19 diabetic respondents may have silent heart attack without any symptoms. In
20 the BRFSS survey the data of fatal heart attack are not included, which may
21 also underestimate the actual prevalence of heart attack. Fourthly, gestational
22 diabetes and pre-diabetes were excluded. These two conditions are both
23 important risk factors for DM that has been excluded from the study. In this
24 study, 24.8% subjects in the 2015 BRFSS data with unknown responses or
25 non-responses in questions included in the study were excluded from the
26 analysis under the assumption of missing completely at random, which might
27 result in some bias of the results when the assumption is not valid.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In conclusion, even though the weighted percentage of heart attack in MS
4 without DM was higher than that in DM without MS, MS and DM had similar
5 effects on heart attack, which could double the risk of heart attack.
6
7 Furthermore, when MS is combined with DM, the risk of heart attack will be
8 increased by over 3.4 fold. Considering the nature of the cross-sectional study
9 in the 2015 BRFSS data, prospective studies are needed to confirm the
10 association between MS without DM, DM without MS with heart attack.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Contributors** GRY and DL designed the study and analyzed the data. GRY
22 draft the manuscript. DL and TD revised the manuscript. All authors read and
23 approved the final manuscript.
24
25
26
27

28 **Funding** This work was supported by Beijing Municipal Training Foundation
29 for Highly-qualified and Technological Talents of Health System [2014-3-013]
30 and Capital's Funds for Health Improvement and Research [2016-2-2054]. Dr.
31 Li's and Dr. Dye's time is partly supported by the University of Rochester's
32 Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) number UL1 TR000042 and
33 UL1 TR002001 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences
34 of the National Institutes of Health.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Competing interests** None declared.
45

46 **Ethics approval** The 2015 BRFSS annual survey data does not include any
47 identifiable information and is publically available from the Centers for Disease
48 Control and Prevention website
49 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Data sharing statement** All the data is publically available from the Centers
4 for Disease Control and Prevention website
5
6
7 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
8
9
10
11

12 **References**

- 15 1. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR,
16 Cheng S, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2018 Update: A Report
17 From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018 Mar
18 20;137(12):e67-e492.
19
20
21
22
- 23 2. Writing Group M, Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha
24 MJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2016 Update: A Report From the
25 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2016 Jan 26;133(4):e38-360.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
- 33 3. Selvin E, Parrinello CM, Sacks DB, Coresh J. Trends in prevalence and
34 control of diabetes in the United States, 1988-1994 and 1999-2010. *Annals of*
35 *internal medicine*. 2014 Apr 15;160(8):517-25.
36
37
38
39
40
- 41 4. Preis SR, Pencina MJ, Hwang SJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Savage PJ, Levy D,
42 et al. Trends in cardiovascular disease risk factors in individuals with and
43 without diabetes mellitus in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation*. 2009 Jul
44 21;120(3):212-20.
45
46
47
48
49
50
- 51 5. Norhammar A, Malmberg K, Diderholm E, Lagerqvist B, Lindahl B, Ryden
52 L, et al. Diabetes mellitus: the major risk factor in unstable coronary artery
53 disease even after consideration of the extent of coronary artery disease and
54 benefits of revascularization. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2004 Feb 18;43(4):585-91.
5

6 6. Mente A, Yusuf S, Islam S, McQueen MJ, Tanomsup S, Onen CL, et al.
7
8 Metabolic Syndrome and Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction A Case-Control
9
10 Study of 26,903 Subjects From 52 Countries. Journal of the American College
11
12 of Cardiology. 2010 May 25;55(21):2390-8.
13
14

15
16 7. Mokdad AH, Stroup DF, Giles WH, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance T.
17
18 Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment.
19
20 Recommendations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Team.
21
22 MMWR Recommendations and reports : Morbidity and mortality weekly report
23
24 Recommendations and reports. 2003 May 23;52(RR-9):1-12.
25
26
27

28
29 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor
30
31 Surveillance System (BRFSS). About BRFSS. . Available online:
32
33 <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/about/index.htm> (accessed on 30 March 2017).
34
35

36
37 9. 2015 BRFSS overview. Available: online:
38
39 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/overview_2015pdf (accessed
40
41 on 30 March 2017).
42
43

44
45 10. 2015 Summary Data Quality Report with Response Rates. Available online:
46
47 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/2015-sdqrpdf (accessed on 30
48
49 March 2017).
50
51

52
53 11. Expert Panel on Detection E, Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in A.
54
55 Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
56
57 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).

5
6
7 Jama. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.

8
9 12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor
10
11 Surveillance System. Weighting BRFSS Data BRFSS 2015. Available online:
12
13 [https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage](https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage_contentpdf)
14
15 [_contentpdf](https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the_data_webpage_contentpdf) (accessed on 30 March 2017).
16
17

18
19 13. Al-Aqeedi RF, Abdullatef WK, Dabdoob W, Bener A, Albinali HA, Gehani A.
20
21 The prevalence of metabolic syndrome components, individually and in
22
23 combination, in male patients admitted with acute coronary syndrome, without
24
25 previous diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. The Libyan journal of medicine. 2013
26
27 Mar 19;8:20185.
28
29

30
31 14. Alberti KG, Zimmet PZ. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes
32
33 mellitus and its complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes
34
35 mellitus provisional report of a WHO consultation. Diabetic medicine : a journal
36
37 of the British Diabetic Association. 1998 Jul;15(7):539-53.
38
39

40
41 15. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
42
43 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
44
45 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
46
47
48
49
50
51 JAMA. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.

52
53 16. Alberti KG, Zimmet P, Shaw J, Group IDFETFC. The metabolic
54
55 syndrome--a new worldwide definition. Lancet. 2005 Sep
56
57
58
59
60 24-30;366(9491):1059-62.

- 1
2
3
4 17. Mottillo S, Filion KB, Genest J, Joseph L, Pilote L, Poirier P, et al. The
5
6 metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular risk a systematic review and
7
8 meta-analysis. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2010 Sep
9
10 28;56(14):1113-32.
11
12
13
14 18. Shin JA, Lee JH, Lim SY, Ha HS, Kwon HS, Park YM, et al. Metabolic
15
16 syndrome as a predictor of type 2 diabetes, and its clinical interpretations and
17
18 usefulness. *Journal of diabetes investigation*. 2013 Jul 08;4(4):334-43.
19
20
21
22 19. Isomaa B, Almgren P, Tuomi T, Forsen B, Lahti K, Nissen M, et al.
23
24 Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with the metabolic
25
26 syndrome. *Diabetes care*. 2001 Apr;24(4):683-9.
27
28
29
30 20. Papa G, Degano C, Iurato MP, Licciardello C, Maiorana R, Finocchiaro C.
31
32 Macrovascular complication phenotypes in type 2 diabetic patients.
33
34 *Cardiovascular diabetology*. 2013 Jan 18;12:20.
35
36
37
38 21. Haffner SM, Lehto S, Ronnema T, Pyorala K, Laakso M. Mortality from
39
40 coronary heart disease in subjects with type 2 diabetes and in nondiabetic
41
42 subjects with and without prior myocardial infarction. *The New England journal*
43
44 *of medicine*. 1998 Jul 23;339(4):229-34.
45
46
47
48 22. Brun E, Nelson RG, Bennett PH, Imperatore G, Zoppini G, Verlato G, et al.
49
50 Diabetes duration and cause-specific mortality in the Verona Diabetes Study.
51
52 *Diabetes care*. 2000 Aug;23(8):1119-23.
53
54
55
56 23. Laugsand LE, Janszky I, Vatten LJ, Dalen H, Midthjell K, Grill V, et al.
57
58 Autoimmune diabetes in adults and risk of myocardial infarction: the HUNT
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 study in Norway. *Journal of internal medicine*. 2016 Nov;280(5):518-31.
5
6
7 24. Mulnier HE, Seaman HE, Raleigh VS, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Colhoun HM,
8
9 Lawrenson RA, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction in men and women with
10
11 type 2 diabetes in the UK: a cohort study using the General Practice Research
12
13 Database. *Diabetologia*. 2008 Sep;51(9):1639-45.
14
15
16
17 25. Bae JC, Cho NH, Suh S, Kim JH, Hur KY, Jin SM, et al. Cardiovascular
18
19 disease incidence, mortality and case fatality related to diabetes and metabolic
20
21 syndrome: A community-based prospective study (Ansung-Ansan cohort
22
23 2001-12). *Journal of diabetes*. 2015 Nov;7(6):791-9.
24
25
26
27 26. Udell JA, Steg PG, Scirica BM, Eagle KA, Ohman EM, Goto S, et al.
28
29 Metabolic syndrome, diabetes mellitus, or both and cardiovascular risk in
30
31 outpatients with or at risk for atherothrombosis. *European journal of preventive*
32
33 *cardiology*. 2014 Dec;21(12):1531-40.
34
35
36
37 27. Church TS, Thompson AM, Katzmarzyk PT, Sui X, Johannsen N, Earnest
38
39 CP, et al. Metabolic syndrome and diabetes, alone and in combination, as
40
41 predictors of cardiovascular disease mortality among men. *Diabetes care*.
42
43 2009 Jul;32(7):1289-94.
44
45
46
47 28. Bruno G, Merletti F, Biggeri A, Bargerò G, Ferrero S, Runzo C, et al.
48
49 Metabolic syndrome as a predictor of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in
50
51 type 2 diabetes: the Casale Monferrato Study. *Diabetes care*. 2004
52
53
54
55
56 Nov;27(11):2689-94.
57
58
59 29. Einhorn D, Reaven GM, Cobin RH, Ford E, Ganda OP, Handelsman Y, et
60

1
2
3
4 al. American College of Endocrinology position statement on the insulin
5
6 resistance syndrome. Endocrine practice : official journal of the American
7
8 College of Endocrinology and the American Association of Clinical
9
10
11 Endocrinologists. 2003 May-Jun;9(3):237-52.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1. Demographic and lifestyle characteristics among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	p value
Number	332,008	237334	8416	45191	41067	
Gender						<0.01
Male, n (weighted %)	144458 (49.9%)	98983 (48.4%)	4049 (56.4%)	22377 (57.1%)	19049 (51.8%)	
Female, n (weighted %)	187550 (50.1%)	138351 (51.6%)	4367 (43.6%)	22814 (42.9%)*	22018 (48.2%)	
Age						<0.01
<45 years, n (weighted %)	67420 (36.9%)	61527 (44.7%)	944 (20.4%)	3054 (14.6%)	1895 (9.0%)	
≥45 years, n (weighted %)	264588 (63.1%)	175807 (55.3%)	7472 (79.6%)	42137 (85.4%)*	39172 (91.0%)	
Annual household income						<0.01
<15000, n (weighted %)	26368 (9.8%)	15248 (8.3%)	1009 (15.2%)	4100 (10.9%)	6011 (17.6%)	
15000-2500 0, n (weighted %)	42954 (15.2%)	27083 (13.6%)	1459 (21.8%)	6503 (17.3%)	7909 (22.9%)	

25000-35000,	n	29733	19853	877	4533	4470	
(weighted %)		(9.9%)	(9.4%)	(11.5%)	(11.0%)	(12.0%)	
35000-50000,	n	40705	28453	1039	6103	5110	
(weighted %)		(13.6%)	(13.5%)	(13.3%)	(14.7%)	(13.7%)	
>50000,	n	144082	112776	2616	17422	11268	
(weighted %)		(51.5%)	(55.2%)	(38.2%)	(46.1%)*	(33.8%)	
Latino							<0.01
Yes,	n	22487	16018	853	2257	3359	
(weighted %)		(13.8%)	(14.0%)	(19.3%)	(10.3%)*	(15.0%)	
No,	n	307115	219670	7490	42626	37329	
(weighted %)		(86.2%)	(86.0%)	(80.7%)	(89.7%)	(85.0%)	
Race							<0.01
White,	n	279446	202115	6730	38756	31845	
(weighted %)		(77.8%)	(78.4%)	(71.4%)	(80.4%)*	(72.7%)	
African America,	n	26653	16453	740	3815	5645	
(weighted %)		(12.4%)	(11.4%)	(13.9%)	(12.9%)	(18.1%)	
American Indian,	n	5718	3673	263	670	1112	
(weighted %)		(1.7%)	(1.6%)	(3.3%)	(1.5%)	(2.5%)	
Asian,	n	7092	5688	243	535	626	
(weighted %)		(4.8%)	(5.2%)	(7.3%)	(2.5%)	(3.5%)	

Native	1872	1338	49 (0.5%)	213	272
Hawaiian, n	(0.4%)	(0.4%)		(0.3%)	(0.3%)
(weighted %)					
Other race,	4058	4058	215	647	839
n (weighted	(2.7%)	(2.7%)	(3.5%)	(2.2%)	(2.6%)
%)					
No	745	577	14 (0.1%)	60 (0.2%)	94 (0.2%)
preferred	(0.3%)	(0.3%)			
race, n					
(weighted %)					
Multiracial	6	4 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)
but	(0.0%)				
preferred					
race not					
answered, n					
(weighted %)					
Education					<0.01
Did not	21989	12296	917	3607	5169
graduate	(11.8%)	(9.7%)	(20.3%)	(14.9%)	(21.5%)
high school,					
n (weighted %)					
Graduate	88636	58399	2672	14028	13537
d high	(26.9%)	(25.6%)	(29.4%)	(31.2%)	(31.1%)
school, n					
(weighted %)					
Attended	90001	63868	2238	12302	11593
college or	(31.5%)	(32.0%)	(28.1%)	(30.3%)	(30.2%)
technical					

1							
2							
3	school, n						
4	(weighted						
5	%)						
6							
7							
8	Graduate	130722	102289	2561	15185	10687	
9	d from	(29.8%)	(32.7%)	(22.3%)	(23.6%)*	(17.2%)	
10	college or						
11	technical						
12	school, n						
13	(weighted						
14	%)						
15	Currently						<0.01
16	smoking						
17							
18	No, n	280808	200158	6944	38788	34918	
19	(weighted	(84.5%)	(84.4%)	(84.0%)	(84.7%)	(85.4%)	
20	%)						
21	Yes, n	43947	31827	1230	5547	5343	
22	(weighted	(15.5%)	(15.6%)	(16.0%)	(15.3%)*	(14.6%)	
23	%)						
24	Physical						<0.01
25	activity						
26	index						
27	Meet	164390	124593	3712	20530	15555	
28	aerobic	(52.8%)	(55.4%)	(48.2%)	(47.6%)	(40.8%)	
29	recommend						
30	ations, n						
31	(weighted						
32	%)						
33	Did not	136791	90370	3735	20831	21855	
34	meet	(47.2%)	(44.6%)	(51.8%)	(52.4%)*	(59.2%)	
35	aerobic						
36	recommend						
37	ations, n						
38	(weighted						
39	%)						
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							
47							
48							
49							
50							
51							
52							
53							
54							
55							
56							
57							
58							
59							
60							

1							
2							
3							
4							
5							<0.01
6	Fruit						
7	Consumed	195725	143690	4795	25173	22067	
8	fruit one or	(61.4%)	(62.9%)	(58.8%)	(56.8%)	(56.0%)	
9	more times						
10	per day, n						
11	(weighted						
12	%)						
13	Consumed	111948	76183	2854	16897	16014	
14	fruit less	(38.6%)	(37.1%)	(41.2%)	(43.2%)*	(44.0%)	
15	than one						
16	time per						
17	day, n						
18	(weighted						
19	%)						
20	Vegetable						<0.01
21	Vegetables	243504	177711	5766	32262	27765	
22	one or more	(79.7%)	(81.0%)	(76.9%)	(76.8%)	(73.4%)	
23	times per						
24	day, n						
25	(weighted						
26	%)						
27	Vegetables	58881	38567	1691	9081	9542	
28	less than	(20.3%)	(19.0%)	(23.1%)	(23.2%)	(26.6%)	
29	one time per						
30	day, n						
31	(weighted						
32	%)						

* Compared with DM without MS group, p<0.05

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 2. Chronic diseases among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

Chronic diseases	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	P value
Heart attack, (weighted %)	21896 (5.2%)	8863 (2.7%)	851 (8.5%)	5310 (11.0%)*	6872 (16.1%)	<0.01
Hypertension, (weighted %)	147655 (37.5%)	64705 (21.9%)	1411 (13.9%)	45191 (100.0%)*	36348 (87.6%)	<0.01
Dyslipidemia, (weighted %)	140653 (36.6%)	62526 (22.2%)	1102 (12.2%)	45191 (100.0%)*	31834 (77.6%)	<0.01
BMI \geq 25.0 kg/m ² , (weighted %)	223112 (67.2%)	135589 (59.1%)	4551 (56.8%)	45191 (100.0%)*	37781 (92.3%)	<0.01
Stroke, (weighted %)	15013 (3.6%)	6910 (2.2%)	544 (4.8%)	3228 (6.6%)*	4331 (9.7%)	<0.01
Depression, (weighted %)	64290 (18.3%)	40520 (16.1%)	1574 (16.4%)	10687 (24.1%)*	11509 (27.7%)	<0.01

* Compared with DM without MS group, p<0.05

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 3. The odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals of DM and MS related to heart attack in the hierarchy logistic regression analysis

	Odds Ratio	95% confidence intervals	p value
Model 1			
(n=332,008)			
DM without MS	3.275	2.812-3.815	<0.01
MS without DM	4.366	4.055-4.700	<0.01
DM plus MS	6.787	6.331-7.275	<0.01
Model 2			
(n=319,712)			
DM without MS	2.097	1.768-2.486	<0.01
MS without DM	2.852	2.637-3.084	<0.01
DM plus MS	4.058	3.756-4.384	<0.01
Model 3			
(n=282,332)			
DM without MS	2.116	1.748-2.562	<0.01
MS without DM	2.820	2.594-3.067	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.987	3.660-4.344	<0.01
Model 4			
(n=280,977)			
DM without MS	2.089	1.716-2.543	<0.01
MS without DM	2.575	2.363-2.806	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.451	3.156-3.772	<0.01

Model 1: unadjusted

Model 2: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race

Model 3: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day

Model 4 adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day, stroke, and depression

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7-8
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8-11
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-11

		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	11
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	11
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	13-15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	15

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2015

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022990.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-Apr-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Guang-Ran; Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Department of Endocrinology; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Dye, Timothy ; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Li, Dongmei; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Keywords:	General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, metabolic syndrome, heart attack

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in**
4 **U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor**
5 **Surveillance System 2015**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Guang-Ran Yang ^{1,2*}, Timothy D. Dye ², Dongmei Li ^{2*}
13
14

15
16
17 ¹ Department of Endocrinology, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical
18 University, Beijing, 100730, China
19

20
21 ² Clinical and Translational Science Institute, School of Medicine and Dentistry,
22 University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, NY 14620, United States of
23 America
24
25
26
27

28
29
30
31 * Corresponding author

32
33 Guang-Ran Yang
34 Department of Endocrinology
35 Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University
36 No 1 Dongjiaomin Xiang, Dongcheng District
37 Beijing, 100730, China
38 Tel: 86-13520055818
39 Fax: 8610-65288736
40 E-mail: gr.yang@ccmu.edu.cn
41
42 & Dongmei Li
43 Clinical and Translational Science Institute
44 School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester
45 265 Crittenden Boulevard CU 420708, 14642
46 Rochester, NY, USA
47 Tel: 1-5852767285
48 Fax: 1-5852761122
49 Email: Dongmei_li@URMC.rochester.edu
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Objectives: Diabetes mellitus (DM) and metabolic syndrome (MS) are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding which condition - MS or DM - is better associated with heart attack, however, is limited. The purpose of this study is to examine DM and MS, and their comparative associations with heart attack, using the 2015 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS).

Design: Cross-sectional study. **Methods:** A total of 332,008 subjects aged over 18-year were included in the analysis. All subjects were classified into four groups based on their DM and MS status: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS, MS without DM, and both DM and MS. Hierarchical logistic regressions were used to examine the effect of DM and MS on heart attack using the neither DM nor MS group as the reference. **Results:** Differences in weighted frequency distributions of gender, age category (over 45 years or not), smoking status, education, race, physical activity, and daily vegetables and fruits consumption were significantly different across the four groups ($p < 0.05$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack was 5.2% for neither DM nor MS group, 8.5% for DM without MS group, 11.0% for MS without DM group and 16.1% for both DM and MS group. The weighted prevalence of heart attack in MS without DM group was significantly higher than that in the DM without MS group ($p < 0.01$). After adjusting for confounding variables, DM without MS and MS without DM were both found to be independently associated with heart attack compared with those without DM nor MS (DM without MS, odds ratio=2.09, MS without DM, odds ratio=2.58, p all < 0.01). **Conclusion:** The BRFSS 2015 data indicated that MS without DM and DM without MS had comparable effects on heart attack, and the odds of risk are doubled than U.S.

1
2
3 adults with neither DM nor MS.
4
5
6
7

8 **Key Words:** Metabolic syndrome, Diabetes, Heart attack
9
10
11

12 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

13

- 14 ▶ BRFSS is a routine health-related telephone survey assessing a range of
15 conditions.
16
- 17 ▶ Weighted frequency distributions and summary statistics were used to
18 describe the sample characteristics in each group.
19
- 20 ▶ Limitation: chronic diseases were self-reported by answers.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Background

Coronary heart disease (CHD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. CHD alone caused approximately 1 of every 7 deaths in the U.S. with 366,801 deaths due to CHD in 2015. ¹ Each year, around 660,000 Americans are estimated to have a new heart attack (defined as first hospitalized heart attack or CHD death) and around 305,000 Americans have a recurrent attack. Furthermore, an additional 160,000 silent heart attacks are estimated to occur each year. ²

Diabetes mellitus (DM), especially type 2 diabetes, is associated with clustered risk factors for CHD. Among adults with DM, the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and obesity is ranged 75% to 85%, 70% to 80%, and 60% to 70%, respectively.²⁻⁴ Patients with DM had higher morbidity and mortality of CHD, including heart attack. In a subgroup analysis of the FRISC II trial, diabetic patients with unstable coronary artery disease had a significantly higher rate of heart attack than non-diabetic patients.⁵

Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a multi-component risk factor for CHD that includes a cluster of individual cardiometabolic risk factors related to abdominal obesity and insulin resistance. Clinically, MS is a useful entity for communicating the nature of lifestyle-related cardiometabolic risk for both patients and clinicians.² MS is a risk factor for heart attack in both women and men, from all regions and ethnic groups worldwide.⁶

DM and MS are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding whether MS without DM has stronger association with heart attack than DM without MS, however, are limited. The ongoing Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) assesses chronic conditions, such as DM,

1
2
3 hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and heart attack.⁷ The objective of the
4 present study was to determine whether risk of heart attack differs in people
5 with DM without MS and MS without DM using the 2015 BRFSS database.
6
7
8
9
10

11 **Methods**

12 ***Participants***

13
14
15 BRFSS is the nation's premier system of health-related telephone surveys that
16 collect state data about U.S. residents regarding their health-related risk
17 behaviors, chronic health conditions, and use of preventive services. BRFSS
18 completes more than 400,000 adult interviews each year, making it the largest
19 continuously conducted health survey system in the world.⁸ In 2015, 50 states,
20 the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico collected data from interviews
21 conducted both by landline telephone and cellular telephone. Questions used
22 in this study in 2015 BRFSS survey include heart attack history, diabetes
23 history, physical activity, dyslipidemia, hypertension awareness, chronic health
24 conditions, alcohol consumption, fruits and vegetables, and currently smoking.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

9

There were 441,456 subjects in the 2015 BRFSS survey. The response rate from cellular telephone is 47.2%, which is slightly lower than that from landline telephone (48.2%).¹⁰ Unknown responses or non-responses were coded as missing in questions included in the study, and there were 332,008 subjects included in the analysis after removing missing values.

56 ***Measures***

Socio-demographic variables, such as age (18-44 year or 45+ year), race,

1
2
3 ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no), education, smoking
4 status (current smoker or not) and annual household income were categorized
5 according to the original variables.
6
7
8

9
10 Respondents' lifestyles were assessed by questions on their physical
11 activity, fruits, and vegetables consumption. Fruit consumption was
12 categorized as "consumed fruit one or more times per day" or "consumed fruit
13 less than one time per day". Vegetable consumption was categorized as
14 "consumed vegetables one or more times per day" or "consumed vegetables
15 one or more times per day". Physical activity index was categorized as whether
16 "meet aerobic recommendations" or not.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In the 2015 BRFSS, chronic diseases were self-reported by answers to
27 questions on chronic diseases history. Heart attack was defined as yes to the
28 question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional ever told you had a
29 heart attack, also called a myocardial infarction". Diabetes was defined by a
30 yes answer to the question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional
31 ever told you have diabetes". Respondents with pre-diabetes, borderline
32 diabetes, or gestational diabetes were excluded. Body mass index (BMI) was
33 calculated by self-reported height and weight. Similarly, hypertension was
34 defined as a yes answer to the question "have you ever been told by a doctor,
35 nurse or other health professional that you have high blood pressure".
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60
Borderline hypertension, pre-hypertension, and gestational hypertension were
all excluded from the study. Dyslipidemia was defined as a yes answer to the
question "have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other health
professional that your blood cholesterol is high". Stroke was defined as yes to
the question of "ever told you had a stroke". Depression was a yes answer to

1
2
3 the question of “ever told you that you have a depressive disorder, including
4 depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor”.

5
6
7 MS was diagnosed based on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS
8 were abdominal obesity (waist circumference >40 inches in men or >35 inches
9 in women), triglycerides ≥ 150 mg/dl, high density lipoprotein cholesterol <40
10 mg/dl in men or <50mg/dl in women, blood pressure $\geq 130/85$ mmHg, and
11 fasting glucose ≥ 110 mg/dl. As these were no data of waist circumference,
12 blood pressure, fasting glucose and lipid profile. The diagnose of MS was
13 revised based on the questions in the BRFSS. The revised components of MS
14 included diabetes, hypertension, BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and dyslipidemia.
15 Respondents who had at least three components were regarded as having MS.
16 In this study, the “MS without DM” group means that respondents had the
17 other three components of MS excluding diabetes.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 ***Statistical analysis***

36
37 Each record in the 2015 BRFSS data was weighted using raking weighting
38 methodology¹². Raking adjusted the BRFSS data to allow underrepresented
39 groups in the sample to be more accurately represented in the final data set.
40 Final weight was assigned to each respondent. All statistical analysis take the
41 complex sampling design into account through incorporate the final weight in
42 the data analysis. Weighted percentages of respondents who ever had heart
43 attack were calculated.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Weighted Chi-square tests was performed to determine respondents'
54 characteristic differences across groups. Weighted hierarchical logistic
55 regression analysis was applied to investigate in greater depth. Odds ratios
56
57
58
59
60

(OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were derived from weighted hierarchical logistic regression analysis. Survey related procedures in SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) were used for all data analysis. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$, and all tests were two-sided.

Patient and public involvement

This study was an analysis of the 2015 BRFSS database. The database was downloaded via the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website.

Results

Demographic Characteristics

There were 332,008 respondents involved in this study. All respondents were categorized into four groups as follows: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS (having DM without MS), MS without DM (having MS without DM), and DM plus MS. There were 237,334 respondents with neither DM nor MS, 45,191 respondents with DM without MS, 8,416 respondents with MS without DM and 41,067 respondents with both DM and MS (Table 1). Differences in the weighted percentages of gender, age category, smoking status, education level, race, ethnicity, and annual household income were statistically significant among the four groups ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the above characteristics were significantly different between DM without MS and MS without DM group ($p < 0.001$). In both MS and DM group, 91% were aged over 45 years, and 21.5% did not graduate high school, which were higher than the other three groups. Moreover, 17.6% of respondents in the MS and DM group had annual household incomes lower than \$15,000 and the low income

percentage is much higher than the other three groups. Less people were white in the DM without MS group (71.4%) compared with that in the MS without DM group (80.4%). However, more respondents were Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin in the DM without MS group (19.3%) than in the MS without DM group (10.3%, $p<0.001$), and more respondents were current smokers in the DM without MS group (16.0%) compared with the MS without DM group (15.3%, $p<0.001$, Table 1).

Lifestyle

Lifestyle measurements were also compared in the four groups (Table 1). The weighted percentage of physical activity index, daily fruit consumption and vegetable consumption were all significantly different across the four groups. The physical activity index in the DM without MS and MS without DM groups was 48.2%, 47.6%, respectively ($p<0.001$). The DM and MS group had the least weighted percentage of respondents whose physical activity met the aerobic recommendations. The weighted percentage of respondents who consumed fruit one or more times per day was higher in the DM without MS group, compared to that in the MS without DM group (58.8% vs 56.8%, $p<0.001$). However, daily vegetable consumption was similar between the DM without MS and the MS without DM groups (76.9% vs 76.8%, $p=0.019$). In the DM and MS group, the weighted percentage of daily vegetable consumption is the least among the four groups (73.4%).

MS components and chronic diseases

Among the 332,008 respondents, 21,896 respondents had heart attack, accounting for the weighted prevalence of 5.2%. MS without DM had higher

1
2
3 weighted prevalence of heart attack than that in DM without MS (11.0%, 8.5%,
4 respectively, $p < 0.001$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack in the DM plus
5 MS group was the highest (16.1%, Table 2). The overall weighted prevalence
6 of dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, and BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m² was 36.6%,
7 37.5%, 13.2%, and 67.2%, respectively (Table 2). In the DM without MS group,
8 83% respondents had one component of MS other than DM, with 17% people
9 having no other components of MS besides DM.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 The overall weighted prevalence of stroke was 3.6%. The weighted
20 prevalence of stroke were significantly different between the DM without MS
21 and MS without DM groups (4.8% vs 6.6%, $p < 0.001$). The weighted
22 prevalence of stroke in the DM plus MS group was the highest among the four
23 groups (9.7%). The overall weighted prevalence of depression was 18.2%.
24 Compared with DM without MS, MS without DM had significantly higher
25 weighted prevalence of depression (16.4% vs 24.1%, $p < 0.001$). The highest
26 weighted prevalence of depression was observed in the DM plus MS group
27 (27.7%).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 ***Logistic regression***

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Logistic regression was conducted to compare the difference among the four
groups in their association with heart attack, using the neither DM nor MS
group as the reference (Table 3). Results from unadjusted logistic regression
analysis showed that both DM without MS (OR=3.28, 95% CI=2.81-3.82) and
MS without DM (OR=4.37, 95% CI=4.06-4.70) groups had significantly
elevated odds of heart attack than neither DM nor MS group. The DM plus MS
group had the highest odds of heart attack among the three groups (OR=6.79,

95% CI=6.33-7.28)

To identify an independent relationship between DM, MS and heart attack, hierarchical logistic regression analysis was performed. After adjusting for confounders (gender, age, education, smoking, race, physical activity index, daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption, stroke, and depression) DM without MS and MS without DM were found to have independently increased odds of heart attack compared with the neither DM nor MS group (DM without MS, adjusted OR=2.09, 95% CI =1.72-2.54, MS without DM, adjusted OR =2.58, 95% CI =2.36-2.81). The DM plus MS group had the highest odds of heart attack (adjusted OR=3.45, 95% CI =3.16-3.77, p all <0.001, Table 3).

Discussion

In the 2015 BRFSS data, respondents with MS without DM and DM without MS were both associated with elevated risk of heart attack and the amount of increase is doubled compare to respondents with neither DM nor MS. MS did not appear to be a greater odds for heart attack than DM from our analysis results. MS combined with DM increased more risk of heart attack by over 3.4 fold compared with respondents with neither DM nor MS.

MS is a cluster of risk factors contributing to the pathogenesis of atherosclerosis.¹³ There are several definitions of MS and different definitions of MS had different components.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Many large-scale clinical trials and meta-analyses have reported that the presence of MS is a strong predictor for heart attack in many different populations.^{6, 17-19} In the INTERHEART case-control study involving 26,903 subjects from 52 countries, MS was

1
2
3 associated with an increased risk of heart attack, both using the WHO
4 definition (OR=2.69) and the IDF definition (OR=2.20) .The direction of
5
6
7 associations were similar across all regions and ethnic groups.⁶ A large family
8
9
10 study in Finland and Sweden of 4,483 subjects also identified the association
11
12
13 between MS and an increased risk of heart attack in all subjects using the
14
15
16 WHO definition.¹⁹ Similar results were observed when the 2001 NCEP and
17
18
19 2004 revised NCEP definitions were used.^{17, 18} In our analysis, the association
20
21
22 between MS and heart attack was consistent. MS, regardless of its definition,
23
24 was associated with heart attack.

25
26 DM is one of the components in most definitions of MS. The risk for
27
28 cardiovascular disease (CVD) is 2-8 fold higher in the diabetic population than
29
30 that in the non-diabetic population of a similar age, sex and ethnicity and CVD
31
32 is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality among patients with type 2
33
34 diabetes.²⁰⁻²²

35
36 Previous researchers have investigated the effects of DM on heart attack.
37
38 Consistent with our findings, it has been reported that DM was associated with
39
40 an increased heart attack risk in both men and women.²³ A cohort study using
41
42 the UK General Practice Research Database showed a much larger relative
43
44 risk of heart attack in DM.²⁴

45
46 Both DM and MS were associated with an increased risk of heart attack.
47
48 However, evidence regarding whether MS without DM is better than DM
49
50 without MS for evaluating heart attack are limited. There were studies to
51
52 evaluate the relationship between MS and DM on CVD events. Results from
53
54 different studies regarding differences in CVD events between DM and MS
55
56 were conflicting. The Ansong-Ansan cohort study showed that there was no
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 difference in the risk of incident CVD between individuals with DM without MS
4 and MS without DM.²⁵ Yet, in the REACH registry, presence of newly detected
5 DM but not MS was associated with an increased risk of CVD events.²⁶
6
7 Besides the difference in population characteristics in these studies, the
8 sample size and the definitions of CVD maybe affect the results.
9
10
11
12
13

14
15 There were fewer studies conducted in U.S. adults to compare the effects of
16 MS and DM on heart attack. In the logistic analysis of this study, MS without
17 DM and DM without MS were found to have similar odds of heart attack. This
18 showed that MS and DM may have similar effects on heart attack in the U.S.
19 adults, which was different from the results of previous study in U.S. population.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

27 Our results indicated that to prevent heart attack or CVD, even a diabetic person does not meet the criteria of MS, much more attention should be paid to control metabolic abnormalities.

DM typically co-presents with at least one metabolic abnormality. In our analysis, the weighted prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidemia and overweight in DM without MS group was 13.9%, 12.2% and 56.8%, respectively. Of the respondents with DM, 83% had at least one or more components of MS other than DM. As shown in a population-based cohort study, DM with only one component of MS had more than twofold higher CVD risk than those with DM only.²⁸ These associations may be helpful to explain in this study why DM and MS had similar effects on heart attack. Further studies were needed to evaluate the association between MS without DM, DM without MS with heart attack.

There were some limitations in our study. First, the definition of MS was revised according to the contents of 2015 BRFSS. MS was diagnosed based

1
2
3 on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS were diabetes, hypertension,
4 BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and dyslipidemia. Respondents who had at least three
5
6 components were regarded as having MS. According to the ATP-III definition,
7
8 central obesity was diagnosed basing on waist circumference. We used BMI
9
10 ≥ 25.0 kg/m² to classify individuals because waist circumference was not
11
12 available. The MS definition from the American College of Endocrinology
13
14 recommends that BMI > 25 kg/m² or a waist circumference > 40 inches for men,
15
16 > 35 inches for women was regarded as obesity.²⁹ Therefore in the present
17
18 study, we used BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² as a component of MS. Secondly, in the 2015
19
20 BRFSS, there were no data on triglyceride and high-density lipoprotein.
21
22 Dyslipidemia was assessed by whether respondents had ever been told their
23
24 blood cholesterol was high. Thirdly, the self-reported nature of the
25
26 cross-sectional study may lead to underestimate the actual prevalence of heart
27
28 attack. In this study, 13.2% respondents had diabetes. However, some
29
30 diabetic respondents may have silent heart attack without any symptoms. In
31
32 the BRFSS survey the data of fatal heart attack are not included, which may
33
34 also underestimate the actual prevalence of heart attack. Fourthly, gestational
35
36 diabetes and pre-diabetes were excluded. These two conditions are both
37
38 important risk factors for DM that has been excluded from the study. In this
39
40 study, 24.8% subjects in the 2015 BRFSS data with unknown responses or
41
42 non-responses in questions included in the study were excluded from the
43
44 analysis under the assumption of missing completely at random, which might
45
46 result in some bias of the results when the assumption is not valid.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 In conclusion, even though the weighted percentage of heart attack in MS
57
58 without DM was higher than that in DM without MS, MS and DM had similar
59
60

1
2
3 effects on heart attack, which could double the risk of heart attack.
4
5 Furthermore, when MS is combined with DM, the risk of heart attack will be
6
7 increased by over 3.4 fold. Considering the nature of the cross-sectional study
8
9 in the 2015 BRFSS data, prospective studies are needed to confirm the
10
11 association between MS without DM, DM without MS with heart attack.
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Contributors** GRY and DL designed the study and analyzed the data. GRY
18
19 draft the manuscript. DL and TD revised the manuscript. All authors read and
20
21 approved the final manuscript.
22
23

24 **Funding** This work was supported by Beijing Municipal Training Foundation
25
26 for Highly-qualified and Technological Talents of Health System [2014-3-013]
27
28 and Capital's Funds for Health Improvement and Research [2016-2-2054]. Dr.
29
30 Li's and Dr. Dye's time is partly supported by the University of Rochester's
31
32 Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) number UL1 TR000042 and
33
34 UL1 TR002001 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences
35
36 of the National Institutes of Health.
37
38

39 **Competing interests** None declared.
40
41

42 **Ethics approval** The 2015 BRFSS annual survey data does not include any
43
44 identifiable information and is publically available from the Centers for Disease
45
46 Control and Prevention website
47
48 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
49
50

51 **Data sharing statement** All the data is publically available from the Centers
52
53 for Disease Control and Prevention website
54
55 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2018 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018 Mar 20;137(12):e67-e492.
2. Writing Group M, Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha MJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2016 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2016 Jan 26;133(4):e38-360.
3. Selvin E, Parrinello CM, Sacks DB, Coresh J. Trends in prevalence and control of diabetes in the United States, 1988-1994 and 1999-2010. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2014 Apr 15;160(8):517-25.
4. Preis SR, Pencina MJ, Hwang SJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Savage PJ, Levy D, et al. Trends in cardiovascular disease risk factors in individuals with and without diabetes mellitus in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation*. 2009 Jul 21;120(3):212-20.
5. Norhammar A, Malmberg K, Diderholm E, Lagerqvist B, Lindahl B, Ryden L, et al. Diabetes mellitus: the major risk factor in unstable coronary artery disease even after consideration of the extent of coronary artery disease and benefits of revascularization. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2004 Feb 18;43(4):585-91.
6. Mente A, Yusuf S, Islam S, McQueen MJ, Tanomsup S, Onen CL, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction A Case-Control

1
2
3
4 Study of 26,903 Subjects From 52 Countries. Journal of the American College
5
6 of Cardiology. 2010 May 25;55(21):2390-8.
7

8
9 7. Mokdad AH, Stroup DF, Giles WH, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance T.
10
11 Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment.
12
13 Recommendations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Team.
14
15 MMWR Recommendations and reports : Morbidity and mortality weekly report
16
17 Recommendations and reports. 2003 May 23;52(RR-9):1-12.
18
19
20

21
22 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor
23
24 Surveillance System (BRFSS). About BRFSS. . Available online:
25
26
27 <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/about/indexhtm> (accessed on 30 March 2017).
28
29

30 9. 2015 BRFSS overview. Available: online:
31
32 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/overview_2015pdf
33
34 (accessed on 30 March 2017).
35
36

37 10. 2015 Summary Data Quality Report with Response Rates. Available online:
38
39 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/2015-sdqrpdf (accessed on
40
41 30 March 2017).
42
43

44
45 11. Expert Panel on Detection E, Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in A.
46
47 Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
48
49 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
50
51 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
52
53
54
55
56 Jama. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.
57

58 12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor
59
60

1
2
3
4 Surveillance System. Weighting BRFSS Data BRFSS 2015. Available online:
5
6 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the-data_webpag
7
8 [e_contentpdf](#) (accessed on 30 March 2017).
9
10

11 13. Al-Aqeedi RF, Abdullatef WK, Dabdoob W, Bener A, Albinali HA, Gehani A.
12
13 The prevalence of metabolic syndrome components, individually and in
14
15 combination, in male patients admitted with acute coronary syndrome, without
16
17 previous diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. The Libyan journal of medicine. 2013
18
19 Mar 19;8:20185.
20
21
22

23 14. Alberti KG, Zimmet PZ. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes
24
25 mellitus and its complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes
26
27 mellitus provisional report of a WHO consultation. Diabetic medicine : a journal
28
29 of the British Diabetic Association. 1998 Jul;15(7):539-53.
30
31
32

33 15. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
34
35 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
36
37 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
38
39 JAMA. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.
40
41
42

43 16. Alberti KG, Zimmet P, Shaw J, Group IDFETFC. The metabolic
44
45 syndrome--a new worldwide definition. Lancet. 2005 Sep
46
47 24-30;366(9491):1059-62.
48
49
50

51 17. Mottillo S, Filion KB, Genest J, Joseph L, Pilote L, Poirier P, et al. The
52
53 metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular risk a systematic review and
54
55 meta-analysis. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2010 Sep
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 28;56(14):1113-32.
5

6 18. Shin JA, Lee JH, Lim SY, Ha HS, Kwon HS, Park YM, et al. Metabolic
7
8 syndrome as a predictor of type 2 diabetes, and its clinical interpretations and
9
10 usefulness. *Journal of diabetes investigation*. 2013 Jul 08;4(4):334-43.
11
12

13 19. Isomaa B, Almgren P, Tuomi T, Forsen B, Lahti K, Nissen M, et al.
14
15 Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with the metabolic
16
17 syndrome. *Diabetes care*. 2001 Apr;24(4):683-9.
18
19

20 20. Papa G, Degano C, Iurato MP, Licciardello C, Maiorana R, Finocchiaro C.
21
22 Macrovascular complication phenotypes in type 2 diabetic patients.
23
24 Cardiovascular diabetology. 2013 Jan 18;12:20.
25
26

27 21. Haffner SM, Lehto S, Ronnema T, Pyorala K, Laakso M. Mortality from
28
29 coronary heart disease in subjects with type 2 diabetes and in nondiabetic
30
31 subjects with and without prior myocardial infarction. *The New England journal*
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 of medicine. 1998 Jul 23;339(4):229-34.

40 22. Brun E, Nelson RG, Bennett PH, Imperatore G, Zoppini G, Verlato G, et al.
41
42 Diabetes duration and cause-specific mortality in the Verona Diabetes Study.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60
Diabetes care. 2000 Aug;23(8):1119-23.

23. Laugsand LE, Janszky I, Vatten LJ, Dalen H, Midthjell K, Grill V, et al.
Autoimmune diabetes in adults and risk of myocardial infarction: the HUNT
study in Norway. *Journal of internal medicine*. 2016 Nov;280(5):518-31.

24. Mulnier HE, Seaman HE, Raleigh VS, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Colhoun HM,
Lawrenson RA, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction in men and women with

1
2
3
4 type 2 diabetes in the UK: a cohort study using the General Practice Research
5
6 Database. *Diabetologia*. 2008 Sep;51(9):1639-45.

7
8
9 25. Bae JC, Cho NH, Suh S, Kim JH, Hur KY, Jin SM, et al. Cardiovascular
10
11 disease incidence, mortality and case fatality related to diabetes and metabolic
12
13 syndrome: A community-based prospective study (Ansung-Ansan cohort
14
15 2001-12). *Journal of diabetes*. 2015 Nov;7(6):791-9.

16
17
18 26. Udell JA, Steg PG, Scirica BM, Eagle KA, Ohman EM, Goto S, et al.
19
20 Metabolic syndrome, diabetes mellitus, or both and cardiovascular risk in
21
22 outpatients with or at risk for atherothrombosis. *European journal of preventive*
23
24 *cardiology*. 2014 Dec;21(12):1531-40.

25
26
27 27. Church TS, Thompson AM, Katzmarzyk PT, Sui X, Johannsen N, Earnest
28
29 CP, et al. Metabolic syndrome and diabetes, alone and in combination, as
30
31 predictors of cardiovascular disease mortality among men. *Diabetes care*.
32
33 2009 Jul;32(7):1289-94.

34
35
36 28. Bruno G, Merletti F, Biggeri A, Bargero G, Ferrero S, Runzo C, et al.
37
38 Metabolic syndrome as a predictor of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in
39
40 type 2 diabetes: the Casale Monferrato Study. *Diabetes care*. 2004
41
42 Nov;27(11):2689-94.

43
44
45 29. Einhorn D, Reaven GM, Cobin RH, Ford E, Ganda OP, Handelsman Y, et
46
47 al. American College of Endocrinology position statement on the insulin
48
49 resistance syndrome. *Endocrine practice : official journal of the American*
50
51 *College of Endocrinology and the American Association of Clinical*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Endocrinologists. 2003 May-Jun;9(3):237-52.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Demographic and lifestyle characteristics among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	p value
Number	332,008	237,334	8,416	45,191	41,067	
Gender						<0.01
Male, n (weighted %)	144,458 (49.9%)	98,983 (48.4%)	4,049 (56.4%)	22,377 (57.1%)	19,049 (51.8%)	
Female, n (weighted %)	187,550 (50.1%)	138,351 (51.6%)	4,367 (43.6%)	22,814 (42.9%)*	22,018 (48.2%)	
Age						<0.01
<45 years, n (weighted %)	67,420 (36.9%)	61,527 (44.7%)	944 (20.4%)	3,054 (14.6%)	1,895 (9.0%)	
≥45 years, n (weighted %)	264,588 (63.1%)	175,807 (55.3%)	7,472 (79.6%)	42,137 (85.4%)*	39,172 (91.0%)	
Annual household income						<0.01
<15000, n (weighted %)	26,368 (9.8%)	15,248 (8.3%)	1,009 (15.2%)	4,100 (10.9%)	6,011 (17.6%)	
15000-25000, n (weighted %)	42,954 (15.2%)	27,083 (13.6%)	1,459 (21.8%)	6,503 (17.3%)	7,909 (22.9%)	
25000-35000, n (weighted %)	29,733 (9.9%)	19,853 (9.4%)	877 (11.5%)	4,533 (11.0%)	4,470 (12.0%)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

35000-50000, n	40,705 (13.6%)	28,453 (13.5%)	1,039 (13.3%)	6,103 (14.7%)	5,110 (13.7%)	
(weighted %)						
>50000, n (weighted %)	144,082 (51.5%)	112,776 (55.2%)	2,616 (38.2%)	17,422 (46.1%)*	11,268 (33.8%)	
Ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no),						<0.01
Yes, n (weighted %)	22,487 (13.8%)	16,018 (14.0%)	853 (19.3%)	2,257 (10.3%)*	3,359 (15.0%)	
No, n (weighted %)	307,115 (86.2%)	219,670 (86.0%)	7,490 (80.7%)	42,626 (89.7%)	37,329 (85.0%)	
Race						<0.01
White, n (weighted %)	279,446 (77.8%)	202,115 (78.4%)	6,730 (71.4%)	38,756 (80.4%)*	31,845 (72.7%)	
African America, n (weighted %)	26,653 (12.4%)	16,453 (11.4%)	740 (13.9%)	3,815 (12.9%)	5,645 (18.1%)	
American Indian, n (weighted %)	5,718 (1.7%)	3,673 (1.6%)	263 (3.3%)	670 (1.5%)	1,112 (2.5%)	
Asian, n (weighted %)	7,092 (4.8%)	5,688 (5.2%)	243 (7.3%)	535 (2.5%)	626 (3.5%)	
Native Hawaiian, n (weighted %)	1,872 (0.4%)	1,338 (0.4%)	49 (0.5%)	213 (0.3%)	272 (0.3%)	
Other race, n (weighted %)	4,058 (2.7%)	4,058 (2.7%)	215 (3.5%)	647 (2.2%)	839 (2.6%)	
No preferred race, n	745 (0.3%)	577 (0.3%)	14 (0.1%)	60 (0.2%)	94 (0.2%)	

1							
2							
3							
4							
5	(weighted %)						
6	Multiracial but preferred	6 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	
7	race not answered, n						
8	(weighted %)						
9							
10							
11	Education						<0.01
12							
13	Did not graduate high	21,989 (11.8%)	12,296 (9.7%)	917 (20.3%)	3,607 (14.9%)	5,169 (21.5%)	
14	school, n (weighted %)						
15							
16	Graduated high school,	88,636 (26.9%)	58,399 (25.6%)	2,672 (29.4%)	14,028 (31.2%)	13,537 (31.1%)	
17	n (weighted %)						
18							
19	Attended college or	90,001 (31.5%)	63,868 (32.0%)	2,238 (28.1%)	12,302 (30.3%)	11,593 (30.2%)	
20	technical school, n						
21	(weighted %)						
22							
23	Graduated from college	130,722 (29.8%)	102,289 (32.7%)	2,561 (22.3%)	15,185 (23.6%)*	10,687 (17.2%)	
24	or technical school, n						
25	(weighted %)						
26							
27	Currently smoking						<0.01
28							
29	No, n (weighted %)	280,808 (84.5%)	200,158 (84.4%)	6,944 (84.0%)	38,788 (84.7%)	34,918 (85.4%)	
30							
31	Yes, n (weighted %)	43,947 (15.5%)	31,827 (15.6%)	1,230 (16.0%)	5,547 (15.3%)*	5,343 (14.6%)	
32							
33	Physical activity index						<0.01
34							
35	Meet aerobic	164,390 (52.8%)	124,593 (55.4%)	3,712 (48.2%)	20,530 (47.6%)	15,555 (40.8%)	
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

recommendations, n (weighted %)						
Did not meet aerobic recommendations, n (weighted %)	136,791 (47.2%)	90,370 (44.6%)	3,735 (51.8%)	20,831 (52.4%)*	21,855 (59.2%)	
Fruit						<0.01
Consumed fruit one or more times per day, n (weighted %)	195,725 (61.4%)	143,690 (62.9%)	4,795 (58.8%)	25,173 (56.8%)	22,067 (56.0%)	
Consumed fruit less than one time per day, n (weighted %)	111,948 (38.6%)	76,183 (37.1%)	2,854 (41.2%)	16,897 (43.2%)*	16,014 (44.0%)	
Vegetable						<0.01
Vegetables one or more times per day, n (weighted %)	243,504 (79.7%)	177,711 (81.0%)	5,766 (76.9%)	32,262 (76.8%)	27,765 (73.4%)	
Vegetables less than one time per day, n (weighted %)	58,881 (20.3%)	38,567 (19.0%)	1,691 (23.1%)	9,081 (23.2%)	9,542 (26.6%)	

1
2
3
4
5 * Compared with DM without MS group, $p < 0.05$

6 Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For peer review only

Table 2. Chronic diseases among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

Chronic diseases	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	P value
Heart attack, n (weighted %)	21,896 (5.2%)	8,863 (2.7%)	851 (8.5%)	5,310 (11.0%)*	6,872 (16.1%)	<0.01
Hypertension, n (weighted %)	147,655 (37.5%)	64,705 (21.9%)	1,411 (13.9%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	36,348 (87.6%)	<0.01
Dyslipidemia, n (weighted %)	140,653 (36.6%)	62,526 (22.2%)	1,102 (12.2%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	31,834 (77.6%)	<0.01
BMI \geq 25.0 kg/m ² , n (weighted %)	223,112 (67.2%)	135,589 (59.1%)	4,551 (56.8%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	37,781 (92.3%)	<0.01
Stroke, n (weighted %)	15,013 (3.6%)	6,910 (2.2%)	544 (4.8%)	3,228 (6.6%)*	4,331 (9.7%)	<0.01
Depression, n (weighted %)	64,290 (18.3%)	40,520 (16.1%)	1,574 (16.4%)	10,687 (24.1%)*	11,509 (27.7%)	<0.01

* Compared with DM without MS group, $p < 0.05$

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 3. The odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals of DM and MS related to heart attack in the hierarchy logistic regression analysis

	Odds Ratio	95% confidence intervals	p value
Model 1			
(n=332,008)			
DM without MS	3.28	2.81-3.82	<0.01
MS without DM	4.37	4.06-4.70	<0.01
DM plus MS	6.79	6.33-7.28	<0.01
Model 2			
(n=319,712)			
DM without MS	2.10	1.77-2.49	<0.01
MS without DM	2.85	2.64-3.09	<0.01
DM plus MS	4.06	3.76-4.38	<0.01
Model 3			
(n=282,332)			
DM without MS	2.12	1.75-2.56	<0.01
MS without DM	2.82	2.59-3.07	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.99	3.66-4.34	<0.01
Model 4			
(n=280,977)			
DM without MS	2.09	1.72-2.54	<0.01
MS without DM	2.58	2.36-2.81	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.45	3.16-3.77	<0.01

Model 1: unadjusted

Model 2: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race

Model 3: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day

Model 4 adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day, stroke, and depression

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8-11
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-11

		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	11
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12-15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	15

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2015

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022990.R3
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jul-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Guang-Ran; Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University, Department of Endocrinology; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Dye, Timothy ; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute Li, Dongmei; School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester, Clinical and Translational Science Institute
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Keywords:	General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, metabolic syndrome, heart attack

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Association between diabetes, metabolic syndrome and heart attack in**
4 **U.S. adults: a cross-sectional analysis using the Behavioral Risk Factor**
5 **Surveillance System 2015**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Guang-Ran Yang ^{1,2*}, Timothy D. Dye ², Dongmei Li ^{2*}
13
14

15
16
17 ¹ Department of Endocrinology, Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical
18 University, Beijing, 100730, China
19

20
21 ² Clinical and Translational Science Institute, School of Medicine and Dentistry,
22 University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, NY 14620, United States of
23 America
24
25
26
27

28
29
30
31 * Corresponding author

32
33 Guang-Ran Yang
34 Department of Endocrinology
35 Beijing Tongren Hospital, Capital Medical University
36 No 1 Dongjiaomin Xiang, Dongcheng District
37 Beijing, 100730, China
38 Tel: 86-13520055818
39 Fax: 8610-65288736
40 E-mail: gr.yang@ccmu.edu.cn
41
42 & Dongmei Li
43 Clinical and Translational Science Institute
44 School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Rochester
45 265 Crittenden Boulevard CU 420708, 14642
46 Rochester, NY, USA
47 Tel: 1-5852767285
48 Fax: 1-5852761122
49 Email: Dongmei_li@URMC.rochester.edu
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Objectives: Diabetes mellitus (DM) and metabolic syndrome (MS) are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding which condition - MS or DM - is better associated with heart attack, however, is limited. The purpose of this study is to examine DM and MS, and their comparative associations with heart attack, using the 2015 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS).

Design: Cross-sectional study. **Methods:** A total of 332,008 subjects aged over 18-year were included in the analysis. All subjects were classified into four groups based on their DM and MS status: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS, MS without DM, and both DM and MS. A weighted hierarchical logistic regression was used to examine the difference between the four groups in their association with the risk of a heart attack. **Results:** Differences in weighted frequency distributions of gender, age category (over 45 years or not), smoking status, education, race, physical activity, and daily vegetable and fruit consumption were significantly different across the four groups ($p < 0.05$). The weighted prevalence of heart attack was 5.2% for neither DM nor MS group, 8.5% for DM without MS group, 11.0% for MS without DM group and 16.1% for both DM and MS group. The weighted prevalence of heart attack in MS without DM group was significantly higher than that in the DM without MS group ($p < 0.01$). After adjusting for confounding variables, DM without MS and MS without DM were both found to be independently associated with heart attack compared with those without DM nor MS (DM without MS, odds ratio=2.09, MS without DM, odds ratio=2.58, p all < 0.01).

Conclusion: The BRFSS 2015 data indicated that MS without DM and DM without MS had comparable effects on heart attack, and the odds of risk are

1
2
3 doubled than U.S. adults with neither DM nor MS.
4
5
6

7
8 **Key Words:** Metabolic syndrome, Diabetes, Heart attack
9
10

11
12 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
13

- 14
15 ▶ BRFSS is a routine health-related telephone survey assessing a range of
16
17 conditions.
18
19 ▶ Weighted frequency distributions and summary statistics were used to
20
21 describe the sample characteristics in each group.
22
23
24 ▶ Limitation: chronic diseases were self-reported by answers.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Background

Coronary heart disease (CHD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. CHD alone caused approximately 1 of every 7 deaths in the U.S. with 366,801 deaths due to CHD in 2015. ¹ Each year, around 660,000 Americans are estimated to have a new heart attack (defined as first hospitalized heart attack or CHD death) and around 305,000 Americans have a recurrent attack. Furthermore, an additional 160,000 silent heart attacks are estimated to occur each year. ²

Diabetes mellitus (DM), especially type 2 diabetes, is associated with clustered risk factors for CHD. Among adults with DM, the prevalence of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and obesity is ranged 75% to 85%, 70% to 80%, and 60% to 70%, respectively.²⁻⁴ Patients with DM had higher morbidity and mortality of CHD, including heart attack. In a subgroup analysis of the FRISC II trial, diabetic patients with unstable coronary artery disease had a significantly higher rate of heart attack than non-diabetic patients.⁵

Metabolic syndrome (MS) is a multi-component risk factor for CHD that includes a cluster of individual cardiometabolic risk factors related to abdominal obesity and insulin resistance. Clinically, MS is a useful entity for communicating the nature of lifestyle-related cardiometabolic risk for both patients and clinicians.² MS is a risk factor for heart attack in both women and men, from all regions and ethnic groups worldwide.⁶

DM and MS are both associated with heart attack. Evidence regarding whether MS without DM has stronger association with heart attack than DM without MS, however, is limited. The ongoing Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) assesses chronic conditions, such as DM,

1
2
3 hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and heart attack.⁷ The objective of the
4
5 present study was to determine whether the risk of heart attack differs in
6
7 people with DM without MS and MS without DM using the 2015 BRFSS
8
9
10 database.

11 12 13 14 **Methods**

15 16 17 ***Participants***

18
19 BRFSS is the nation's premier system of health-related telephone surveys that
20
21 collect state data about U.S. residents regarding their health-related risk
22
23 behaviors, chronic health conditions, and use of preventive services. BRFSS
24
25 completes more than 400,000 adult interviews each year, making it the largest
26
27 continuously conducted health survey system in the world.⁸ In 2015, 50 states,
28
29 the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico collected data from interviews
30
31 conducted both by landline telephone and cellular telephone. Questions used
32
33 in this study in 2015 BRFSS survey include heart attack history, diabetes
34
35 history, physical activity, dyslipidemia, hypertension awareness, chronic health
36
37 conditions, alcohol consumption, fruits and vegetables, and currently smoking.
38
39
40
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

9

There were 441,456 subjects in the 2015 BRFSS survey. The response rate from cellular telephone is 47.2%, which is slightly lower than that from landline telephone (48.2%).¹⁰ Unknown responses or non-responses were coded as missing in questions included in the study, and there were 332,008 subjects included in the analysis after removing missing values.

Measures

1
2
3 Socio-demographic variables, such as age (18-44 year or 45+ year), race,
4 ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no), education, smoking
5 status (current smoker or not) and annual household income were categorized
6 according to the original variables.
7
8
9
10

11 Respondents' lifestyles were assessed by questions on their physical
12 activity, fruit, and vegetable consumption. Fruit consumption was categorized
13 as "consumed fruit one or more times per day" or "consumed fruit less than
14 one time per day". Vegetable consumption was categorized as "consumed
15 vegetables one or more times per day" or "consumed vegetables one or more
16 times per day". Physical activity index was categorized as whether "meet
17 aerobic recommendations" or not.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In the 2015 BRFSS, chronic diseases were self-reported by answers to
29 questions on chronic diseases history. Heart attack was defined as yes to the
30 question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional ever told you had a
31 heart attack, also called a myocardial infarction". Diabetes was defined by a
32 yes answer to the question "has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional
33 ever told you have diabetes". Respondents with pre-diabetes, borderline
34 diabetes, or gestational diabetes were excluded. Body mass index (BMI) was
35 calculated by self-reported height and weight. Similarly, hypertension was
36 defined as a yes answer to the question "have you ever been told by a doctor,
37 nurse or other health professional that you have high blood pressure".
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Borderline hypertension, pre-hypertension, and gestational hypertension were
52 all excluded from the study. Dyslipidemia was defined as a yes answer to the
53 question "have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other health
54 professional that your blood cholesterol is high". Stroke was defined as yes to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the question of “ever told you had a stroke”. Depression was a yes answer to
4
5 the question of “ever told you that you have a depressive disorder, including
6
7 depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor”.
8
9

10 MS was diagnosed based on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS
11
12 were abdominal obesity (waist circumference >40 inches in men or >35 inches
13
14 in women), triglycerides ≥ 150 mg/dl, high density lipoprotein cholesterol <40
15
16 mg/dl in men or <50mg/dl in women, blood pressure $\geq 130/85$ mmHg, and
17
18 fasting glucose ≥ 110 mg/dl. As these was no available data on waist
19
20 circumference, blood pressure, fasting glucose and lipid profile. The diagnose
21
22 of MS was revised based on the questions in the BRFSS. The revised
23
24 components of MS included diabetes, hypertension, BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and
25
26 dyslipidemia. Respondents who had at least three components were regarded
27
28 as having MS. In this study, the “MS without DM” group means that
29
30 respondents had the other three components of MS excluding diabetes.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Statistical analysis**

39
40 Each record in the 2015 BRFSS data was weighted using raking weighting
41
42 methodology ¹². Raking adjusted the BRFSS data to allow underrepresented
43
44 groups in the sample to be more accurately represented in the final data set.
45
46 Final weights were assigned to each respondent. All statistical analyses and
47
48 prevalence estimates have been weighted. Weighted percentages of
49
50 respondents who ever had heart attack were calculated.
51
52
53

54 Weighted Chi-square tests was performed to determine respondents'
55
56 characteristic differences across groups. A weighted hierarchical logistic
57
58 regression was used to examine the difference between the four groups in
59
60

1
2
3 their association with the risk of a heart attack. Odds ratios (OR) and
4
5 corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were derived from weighted
6
7 hierarchical logistic regression analysis. Survey related procedures in SAS
8
9 v9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) were used for all data analyses. The
10
11 significance level was set at $p < 0.05$, and all tests were two-sided.
12
13
14
15
16

17 ***Patient and public involvement***

18
19 This study was an analysis of the 2015 BRFSS database. The database was
20
21 downloaded via the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website.
22
23
24
25

26 **Results**

27 ***Demographic Characteristics***

28
29 There were 332,008 respondents involved in this study. All respondents were
30
31 categorized into four groups as follows: neither DM nor MS, DM without MS
32
33 (having DM without MS), MS without DM (having MS without DM), and DM
34
35 plus MS. There were 237,334 respondents with neither DM nor MS, 45,191
36
37 respondents with DM without MS, 8,416 respondents with MS without DM and
38
39 41,067 respondents with both DM and MS (Table 1). Differences in the
40
41 percentages of gender, age category, smoking status, education level, race,
42
43 ethnicity, and annual household income were statistically significant among the
44
45 four groups ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the above characteristics were significantly
46
47 different between DM without MS and MS without DM group ($p < 0.001$). In both
48
49 MS and DM group, 91% were aged over 45 years, and 21.5% did not graduate
50
51 high school, which were higher than the other three groups. Moreover, 17.6%
52
53 of respondents in the MS and DM group had annual household incomes lower
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 than \$15,000 and the low income percentage is much higher than the other
4 three groups. Less people were white in the DM without MS group (71.4%)
5 compared with that in the MS without DM group (80.4%). However, more
6 respondents were Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin in the DM without MS
7 group (19.3%) than in the MS without DM group (10.3%, $p<0.001$), and more
8 respondents were current smokers in the DM without MS group (16.0%)
9 compared with the MS without DM group (15.3%, $p<0.001$, Table 1).

19 **Lifestyle**

21 Lifestyle measurements were also compared in the four groups (Table 1). The
22 percentage of physical activity index, daily fruit consumption and vegetable
23 consumption were all significantly different across the four groups. The
24 physical activity index in the DM without MS and MS without DM groups was
25 48.2%, 47.6%, respectively ($p<0.001$). The DM and MS group had the least
26 percentage of respondents whose physical activity met the aerobic
27 recommendations. The percentage of respondents who consumed fruit one or
28 more times per day was higher in the DM without MS group, compared to that
29 in the MS without DM group (58.8% vs 56.8%, $p<0.001$). However, daily
30 vegetable consumption was similar between the DM without MS and the MS
31 without DM groups (76.9% vs 76.8%, $p=0.019$). In the DM and MS group, the
32 percentage of daily vegetable consumption is the least among the four groups
33 (73.4%).

54 **MS components and chronic diseases**

56 Among the 332,008 respondents, 21,896 respondents had heart attack,
57 accounting for the prevalence of 5.2%. MS without DM had higher prevalence
58
59
60

1
2
3 of heart attack than that in DM without MS (11.0%, 8.5%, respectively,
4 p<0.001). The prevalence of heart attack in the DM plus MS group was the
5 highest (16.1%, Table 2). The overall prevalence of dyslipidemia, hypertension,
6 diabetes, and BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m² was 36.6%, 37.5%, 13.2%, and 67.2%,
7 respectively (Table 2). In the DM without MS group, 83% respondents had one
8 component of MS other than DM, with 17% people having no other
9 components of MS besides DM.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The overall prevalence of stroke was 3.6%. The prevalence of stroke was
20 significantly different between the DM without MS and MS without DM groups
21 (4.8% vs 6.6%, p<0.001). The prevalence of stroke in the DM plus MS group
22 was the highest among the four groups (9.7%). The overall prevalence of
23 depression was 18.2%. Compared with DM without MS, MS without DM had
24 significantly higher prevalence of depression (16.4% vs 24.1%, p<0.001). The
25 highest prevalence of depression was observed in the DM plus MS group
26 (27.7%).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 ***Logistic regression***

41
42 Logistic regression was conducted to compare the difference among the four
43 groups in their association with heart attack, using the neither DM nor MS
44 group as the reference (Table 3). Results from unadjusted logistic regression
45 analysis showed that both DM without MS (OR=3.28, 95% CI=2.81-3.82) and
46 MS without DM (OR=4.37, 95% CI=4.06-4.70) groups had significantly
47 elevated odds of heart attack than neither DM nor MS group. The DM plus MS
48 group had the highest odds of heart attack among the three groups (OR=6.79,
49 95% CI=6.33-7.28)
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To identify an independent relationship between DM, MS and heart attack,
4 hierarchical logistic regression analysis was performed. After adjusting for
5 confounders (gender, age, education, smoking, race, physical activity index,
6 daily fruit consumption, daily vegetable consumption, stroke, and depression)
7
8 DM without MS and MS without DM were found to have independently
9 increased odds of heart attack compared with the neither DM nor MS group
10 (DM without MS, adjusted OR=2.09, 95% CI =1.72-2.54, MS without DM,
11 adjusted OR =2.58, 95% CI =2.36-2.81). The DM plus MS group had the
12 highest odds of heart attack (adjusted OR=3.45, 95% CI =3.16-3.77, p all
13 <0.001, Table 3).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Discussion

29
30 In the 2015 BRFSS data, respondents with MS without DM and DM without
31 MS were both associated with elevated risk of heart attack and the amount of
32 increase is doubled compare to respondents with neither DM nor MS. MS did
33 not appear to be a greater odds for heart attack than DM from our analysis
34 results. MS combined with DM increased more risk of heart attack by over 3.4
35 fold compared with respondents with neither DM nor MS.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 MS is a cluster of risk factors contributing to the pathogenesis of
45 atherosclerosis.¹³ There are several definitions of MS and different definitions
46 of MS had different components.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Many large-scale clinical trials and
47 meta-analyses have reported that the presence of MS is a strong predictor for
48 heart attack in many different populations.^{6, 17-19} In the INTERHEART
49 case-control study involving 26,903 subjects from 52 countries, MS was
50 associated with an increased risk of heart attack, both using the WHO
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 definition (OR=2.69) and the IDF definition (OR=2.20) .The direction of
4
5 associations were similar across all regions and ethnic groups.⁶ A large family
6
7 study in Finland and Sweden of 4,483 subjects also identified the association
8
9 between MS and an increased risk of heart attack in all subjects using the
10
11 WHO definition.¹⁹ Similar results were observed when the 2001 NCEP and
12
13 2004 revised NCEP definitions were used.^{17, 18} In our analysis, the association
14
15 between MS and heart attack was consistent. MS, regardless of its definition,
16
17 was associated with heart attack.
18
19

20
21 DM is one of the components in most definitions of MS. The risk for
22
23 cardiovascular disease (CVD) is 2-8 fold higher in the diabetic population than
24
25 that in the non-diabetic population of a similar age, sex and ethnicity and CVD
26
27 is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality among patients with type 2
28
29 diabetes.²⁰⁻²²
30
31

32
33 Previous researchers have investigated the effects of DM on heart attack.
34
35 Consistent with our findings, it has been reported that DM was associated with
36
37 an increased heart attack risk in both men and women.²³ A cohort study using
38
39 the UK General Practice Research Database showed a much larger relative
40
41 risk of heart attack in DM.²⁴
42
43

44 Both DM and MS were associated with an increased risk of heart attack.
45
46 However, evidence regarding whether MS without DM is better than DM
47
48 without MS for evaluating heart attack is limited. There were studies to
49
50 evaluate the relationship between MS and DM on CVD events. Results from
51
52 different studies regarding differences in CVD events between DM and MS
53
54 were conflicting. The Ansong-Ansan cohort study showed that there was no
55
56 difference in the risk of incident CVD between individuals with DM without MS
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and MS without DM.²⁵ Yet, in the REACH registry, presence of newly detected
4
5 DM but not MS was associated with an increased risk of CVD events.²⁶
6

7
8 Besides the difference in population characteristics in these studies, the
9
10 sample size and the definitions of CVD maybe affect the results.
11

12
13 There were fewer studies conducted in U.S. adults to compare the effects of
14
15 MS and DM on heart attack. In the logistic analysis of this study, MS without
16
17 DM and DM without MS were found to have similar odds of heart attack. This
18
19 showed that MS and DM may have similar effects on heart attack in the U.S.
20
21 adults, which was different from the results of previous study in U.S. population.
22

23
24 ²⁷ Our results indicated that to prevent heart attack or CVD, even a diabetic
25
26 person does not meet the criteria of MS, much more attention should be paid
27
28 to control metabolic abnormalities.
29

30
31 DM typically co-presents with at least one metabolic abnormality. In our
32
33 analysis, the weighted prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidemia and
34
35 overweight in DM without MS group was 13.9%, 12.2% and 56.8%,
36
37 respectively. Of the respondents with DM, 83% had at least one or more
38
39 components of MS other than DM. As shown in a population-based cohort
40
41 study, DM with only one component of MS had more than twofold higher CVD
42
43 risk than those with DM only.²⁸ These associations may be helpful to explain in
44
45 this study why DM and MS had similar effects on heart attack. Further studies
46
47 were needed to evaluate the association between MS without DM, DM without
48
49 MS with heart attack.
50
51

52
53 There were some limitations in our study. First, the definition of MS was
54
55 revised according to the contents of 2015 BRFSS. MS was diagnosed based
56
57 on the ATP-III definition.¹¹ The components of MS were diabetes, hypertension,
58
59
60

1
2
3 BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m², and dyslipidemia. Respondents who had at least three
4
5 components were regarded as having MS. According to the ATP-III definition,
6
7 central obesity was diagnosed basing on waist circumference. We used BMI
8
9 ≥ 25.0 kg/m² to classify individuals because waist circumference was not
10
11 available. The MS definition from the American College of Endocrinology
12
13 recommends that BMI > 25 kg/m² or a waist circumference > 40 inches for men,
14
15 > 35 inches for women was regarded as obesity.²⁹ Therefore in the present
16
17 study, we used BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² as a component of MS. Secondly, in the 2015
18
19 BRFSS, there were no data on triglyceride and high-density lipoprotein.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Dyslipidemia was assessed by whether respondents had ever been told their
blood cholesterol was high. Thirdly, the self-reported nature of the
cross-sectional study may lead to underestimate the actual prevalence of heart
attack. In this study, 13.2% respondents had diabetes. However, some
diabetic respondents may have silent heart attack without any symptoms. In
the BRFSS survey the data of fatal heart attack are not included, which may
also underestimate the actual prevalence of heart attack. Fourthly, gestational
diabetes and pre-diabetes were excluded. These two conditions are both
important risk factors for DM that has been excluded from the study. In this
study, 24.8% subjects in the 2015 BRFSS data with unknown responses or
non-responses in questions included in the study were excluded from the
analysis under the assumption of missing completely at random, which might
result in some bias of the results when the assumption is not valid.

In conclusion, even though the weighted percentage of heart attack in MS
without DM was higher than that in DM without MS, MS and DM had similar
effects on heart attack, which could double the risk of heart attack.

1
2
3 Furthermore, when MS is combined with DM, the risk of heart attack will be
4 increased by over 3.4 fold. Considering the nature of the cross-sectional study
5 in the 2015 BRFSS data, prospective studies are needed to confirm the
6 association between MS without DM, DM without MS with heart attack.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Contributors** GRY and DL designed the study and analyzed the data. GRY
15 draft the manuscript. DL and TD revised the manuscript. All authors read and
16 approved the final manuscript.
17
18
19
20

21 **Funding** This work was supported by Beijing Municipal Training Foundation
22 for Highly-qualified and Technological Talents of Health System [2014-3-013]
23 and Capital's Funds for Health Improvement and Research [2016-2-2054]. Dr.
24 Li's and Dr. Dye's time is partly supported by the University of Rochester's
25 Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) number UL1 TR000042 and
26 UL1 TR002001 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences
27 of the National Institutes of Health.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Competing interests** None declared.
38
39

40 **Ethics approval** The 2015 BRFSS annual survey data does not include any
41 identifiable information and is publically available from the Centers for Disease
42 Control and Prevention website
43
44
45
46
47 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
48

49 **Data sharing statement** All the data is publically available from the Centers
50 for Disease Control and Prevention website
51
52
53
54 (https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2015.html).
55

56
57
58 **References**
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR,
5
6 Cheng S, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2018 Update: A Report
7
8 From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018 Mar
9
10 20;137(12):e67-e492.
11
- 12
13
14 2. Writing Group M, Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha
15
16 MJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2016 Update: A Report From the
17
18 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2016 Jan 26;133(4):e38-360.
19
- 20
21
22 3. Selvin E, Parrinello CM, Sacks DB, Coresh J. Trends in prevalence and
23
24 control of diabetes in the United States, 1988-1994 and 1999-2010. *Annals of*
25
26 *internal medicine*. 2014 Apr 15;160(8):517-25.
27
- 28
29
30 4. Preis SR, Pencina MJ, Hwang SJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Savage PJ, Levy D,
31
32 et al. Trends in cardiovascular disease risk factors in individuals with and
33
34 without diabetes mellitus in the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation*. 2009 Jul
35
36 21;120(3):212-20.
37
- 38
39
40 5. Norhammar A, Malmberg K, Diderholm E, Lagerqvist B, Lindahl B, Ryden
41
42 L, et al. Diabetes mellitus: the major risk factor in unstable coronary artery
43
44 disease even after consideration of the extent of coronary artery disease and
45
46 benefits of revascularization. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*.
47
48 2004 Feb 18;43(4):585-91.
49
- 50
51
52 6. Mente A, Yusuf S, Islam S, McQueen MJ, Tanomsup S, Onen CL, et al.
53
54 Metabolic Syndrome and Risk of Acute Myocardial Infarction A Case-Control
55
56 Study of 26,903 Subjects From 52 Countries. *Journal of the American College*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of Cardiology. 2010 May 25;55(21):2390-8.
5

6
7 7. Mokdad AH, Stroup DF, Giles WH, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance T.
8
9 Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment.
10
11 Recommendations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Team.
12

13
14 MMWR Recommendations and reports : Morbidity and mortality weekly report
15
16 Recommendations and reports. 2003 May 23;52(RR-9):1-12.
17

18
19 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor
20
21 Surveillance System (BRFSS). About BRFSS. . Available online:
22
23 <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/about/indexhtm> (accessed on 30 March 2017).
24
25

26
27 9. 2015 BRFSS overview. Available: online:
28
29 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/overview_2015pdf
30
31 (accessed on 30 March 2017).
32
33

34
35 10. 2015 Summary Data Quality Report with Response Rates. Available online:
36
37 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/2015-sdqrpdf (accessed on
38
39 30 March 2017).
40
41

42
43 11. Expert Panel on Detection E, Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in A.
44
45 Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
46
47 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
48
49 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2015/pdf/weighting_the-data_webpag
5
6 [e_contentpdf](#) (accessed on 30 March 2017).
7

8
9 13. Al-Aqeedi RF, Abdullatef WK, Dabdoob W, Bener A, Albinali HA, Gehani A.
10
11 The prevalence of metabolic syndrome components, individually and in
12
13 combination, in male patients admitted with acute coronary syndrome, without
14
15 previous diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. *The Libyan journal of medicine*. 2013
16
17 Mar 19;8:20185.
18
19

20
21
22 14. Alberti KG, Zimmet PZ. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes
23
24 mellitus and its complications. Part 1: diagnosis and classification of diabetes
25
26 mellitus provisional report of a WHO consultation. *Diabetic medicine : a journal*
27
28 of the British Diabetic Association. 1998 Jul;15(7):539-53.
29
30

31
32 15. Executive Summary of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol
33
34 Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, And
35
36 Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
37
38 *JAMA*. 2001 May 16;285(19):2486-97.
39
40

41
42
43 16. Alberti KG, Zimmet P, Shaw J, Group IDFETFC. The metabolic
44
45 syndrome--a new worldwide definition. *Lancet*. 2005 Sep
46
47 24-30;366(9491):1059-62.
48
49

50
51 17. Mottillo S, Filion KB, Genest J, Joseph L, Pilote L, Poirier P, et al. The
52
53 metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular risk a systematic review and
54
55 meta-analysis. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2010 Sep
56
57 28;56(14):1113-32.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 18. Shin JA, Lee JH, Lim SY, Ha HS, Kwon HS, Park YM, et al. Metabolic
5
6 syndrome as a predictor of type 2 diabetes, and its clinical interpretations and
7
8 usefulness. *Journal of diabetes investigation*. 2013 Jul 08;4(4):334-43.
9
10
11 19. Isomaa B, Almgren P, Tuomi T, Forsen B, Lahti K, Nissen M, et al.
12
13 Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with the metabolic
14
15 syndrome. *Diabetes care*. 2001 Apr;24(4):683-9.
16
17
18 20. Papa G, Degano C, Iurato MP, Licciardello C, Maiorana R, Finocchiaro C.
19
20 Macrovascular complication phenotypes in type 2 diabetic patients.
21
22 *Cardiovascular diabetology*. 2013 Jan 18;12:20.
23
24
25 21. Haffner SM, Lehto S, Ronnemaa T, Pyorala K, Laakso M. Mortality from
26
27 coronary heart disease in subjects with type 2 diabetes and in nondiabetic
28
29 subjects with and without prior myocardial infarction. *The New England journal*
30
31 *of medicine*. 1998 Jul 23;339(4):229-34.
32
33
34 22. Brun E, Nelson RG, Bennett PH, Imperatore G, Zoppini G, Verlato G, et al.
35
36 Diabetes duration and cause-specific mortality in the Verona Diabetes Study.
37
38 *Diabetes care*. 2000 Aug;23(8):1119-23.
39
40
41 23. Laugsand LE, Janszky I, Vatten LJ, Dalen H, Midthjell K, Grill V, et al.
42
43 Autoimmune diabetes in adults and risk of myocardial infarction: the HUNT
44
45 study in Norway. *Journal of internal medicine*. 2016 Nov;280(5):518-31.
46
47
48 24. Mulnier HE, Seaman HE, Raleigh VS, Soedamah-Muthu SS, Colhoun HM,
49
50 Lawrenson RA, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction in men and women with
51
52 type 2 diabetes in the UK: a cohort study using the General Practice Research
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Database. Diabetologia. 2008 Sep;51(9):1639-45.
5

6 25. Bae JC, Cho NH, Suh S, Kim JH, Hur KY, Jin SM, et al. Cardiovascular
7 disease incidence, mortality and case fatality related to diabetes and metabolic
8 syndrome: A community-based prospective study (Ansung-Ansan cohort
9 2001-12). Journal of diabetes. 2015 Nov;7(6):791-9.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 26. Udell JA, Steg PG, Scirica BM, Eagle KA, Ohman EM, Goto S, et al.
17 Metabolic syndrome, diabetes mellitus, or both and cardiovascular risk in
18 outpatients with or at risk for atherothrombosis. European journal of preventive
19 cardiology. 2014 Dec;21(12):1531-40.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27. Church TS, Thompson AM, Katzmarzyk PT, Sui X, Johannsen N, Earnest
27 CP, et al. Metabolic syndrome and diabetes, alone and in combination, as
28 predictors of cardiovascular disease mortality among men. Diabetes care.
29 2009 Jul;32(7):1289-94.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 28. Bruno G, Merletti F, Biggeri A, Bargerò G, Ferrero S, Runzo C, et al.
37 Metabolic syndrome as a predictor of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in
38 type 2 diabetes: the Casale Monferrato Study. Diabetes care. 2004
39 Nov;27(11):2689-94.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 29. Einhorn D, Reaven GM, Cobin RH, Ford E, Ganda OP, Handelsman Y, et
47 al. American College of Endocrinology position statement on the insulin
48 resistance syndrome. Endocrine practice : official journal of the American
49 College of Endocrinology and the American Association of Clinical
50 Endocrinologists. 2003 May-Jun;9(3):237-52.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Demographic and lifestyle characteristics among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

	Total	Neither MS	DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	p value
Number	332,008	237,334		8,416	45,191	41,067	
Gender							<0.01
Male, n (weighted %)	144,458 (49.9%)	98,983 (48.4%)		4,049 (56.4%)	22,377 (57.1%)	19,049 (51.8%)	
Female, n (weighted %)	187,550 (50.1%)	138,351 (51.6%)		4,367 (43.6%)	22,814 (42.9%)*	22,018 (48.2%)	
Age							<0.01
<45 years, n (weighted %)	67,420 (36.9%)	61,527 (44.7%)		944 (20.4%)	3,054 (14.6%)	1,895 (9.0%)	
≥45 years, n (weighted %)	264,588 (63.1%)	175,807 (55.3%)		7,472 (79.6%)	42,137 (85.4%)*	39,172 (91.0%)	
Annual household income							<0.01
<15000, n (weighted %)	26,368 (9.8%)	15,248 (8.3%)		1,009 (15.2%)	4,100 (10.9%)	6,011 (17.6%)	
15000-25000, n (weighted %)	42,954 (15.2%)	27,083 (13.6%)		1,459 (21.8%)	6,503 (17.3%)	7,909 (22.9%)	
25000-35000, n (weighted %)	29,733 (9.9%)	19,853 (9.4%)		877 (11.5%)	4,533 (11.0%)	4,470 (12.0%)	

35000-50000, n	40,705 (13.6%)	28,453 (13.5%)	1,039 (13.3%)	6,103 (14.7%)	5,110 (13.7%)	
(weighted %)						
>50000, n (weighted %)	144,082 (51.5%)	112,776 (55.2%)	2,616 (38.2%)	17,422 (46.1%)*	11,268 (33.8%)	
Ethnicity (Hispanic, Latino/a, or Spanish origin or no),						<0.01
Yes, n (weighted %)	22,487 (13.8%)	16,018 (14.0%)	853 (19.3%)	2,257 (10.3%)*	3,359 (15.0%)	
No, n (weighted %)	307,115 (86.2%)	219,670 (86.0%)	7,490 (80.7%)	42,626 (89.7%)	37,329 (85.0%)	
Race						<0.01
White, n (weighted %)	279,446 (77.8%)	202,115 (78.4%)	6,730 (71.4%)	38,756 (80.4%)*	31,845 (72.7%)	
African American, n (weighted %)	26,653 (12.4%)	16,453 (11.4%)	740 (13.9%)	3,815 (12.9%)	5,645 (18.1%)	
American Indian, n (weighted %)	5,718 (1.7%)	3,673 (1.6%)	263 (3.3%)	670 (1.5%)	1,112 (2.5%)	
Asian, n (weighted %)	7,092 (4.8%)	5,688 (5.2%)	243 (7.3%)	535 (2.5%)	626 (3.5%)	
Native Hawaiian, n (weighted %)	1,872 (0.4%)	1,338 (0.4%)	49 (0.5%)	213 (0.3%)	272 (0.3%)	
Other race, n (weighted %)	4,058 (2.7%)	4,058 (2.7%)	215 (3.5%)	647 (2.2%)	839 (2.6%)	
No preferred race, n	745 (0.3%)	577 (0.3%)	14 (0.1%)	60 (0.2%)	94 (0.2%)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

(weighted %)

Multiracial but preferred race not answered, n (weighted %) 6 (0.0%) 4 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 2 (0.0%)

(weighted %)

Education <0.01

Did not graduate high school, n (weighted %) 21,989 (11.8%) 12,296 (9.7%) 917 (20.3%) 3,607 (14.9%) 5,169 (21.5%)

Graduated high school, n (weighted %) 88,636 (26.9%) 58,399 (25.6%) 2,672 (29.4%) 14,028 (31.2%) 13,537 (31.1%)

Attended college or technical school, n (weighted %) 90,001 (31.5%) 63,868 (32.0%) 2,238 (28.1%) 12,302 (30.3%) 11,593 (30.2%)

Graduated from college or technical school, n (weighted %) 130,722 (29.8%) 102,289 (32.7%) 2,561 (22.3%) 15,185 (23.6%)* 10,687 (17.2%)

Currently smoking <0.01

No, n (weighted %) 280,808 (84.5%) 200,158 (84.4%) 6,944 (84.0%) 38,788 (84.7%) 34,918 (85.4%)

Yes, n (weighted %) 43,947 (15.5%) 31,827 (15.6%) 1,230 (16.0%) 5,547 (15.3%)* 5,343 (14.6%)

Physical activity index <0.01

Meet aerobic 164,390 (52.8%) 124,593 (55.4%) 3,712 (48.2%) 20,530 (47.6%) 15,555 (40.8%)

1							
2							
3							
4							
5	recommendations, n						
6	(weighted %)						
7							
8	Did not meet aerobic	136,791 (47.2%)	90,370 (44.6%)	3,735 (51.8%)	20,831 (52.4%)*	21,855 (59.2%)	
9	recommendations, n						
10	(weighted %)						
11							
12							
13	Fruit						<0.01
14							
15	Consumed fruit one or	195,725 (61.4%)	143,690 (62.9%)	4,795 (58.8%)	25,173 (56.8%)	22,067 (56.0%)	
16	more times per day, n						
17	(weighted %)						
18							
19							
20	Consumed fruit less than	111,948 (38.6%)	76,183 (37.1%)	2,854 (41.2%)	16,897 (43.2%)*	16,014 (44.0%)	
21	one time per day, n						
22	(weighted %)						
23							
24							
25	Vegetable						<0.01
26							
27	Vegetables one or more	243,504 (79.7%)	177,711 (81.0%)	5,766 (76.9%)	32,262 (76.8%)	27,765 (73.4%)	
28	times per day, n						
29	(weighted %)						
30							
31							
32	Vegetables less than one	58,881 (20.3%)	38,567 (19.0%)	1,691 (23.1%)	9,081 (23.2%)	9,542 (26.6%)	
33	time per day, n (weighted						
34	%)						
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

* Compared with DM without MS group, $p < 0.05$

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

For peer review only

Table 2. Chronic diseases among the four groups according to the presence of metabolic syndrome and diabetes

Chronic diseases	Total	Neither DM nor MS	DM without MS	MS without DM	DM plus MS	P value
Heart attack, n (weighted %)	21,896 (5.2%)	8,863 (2.7%)	851 (8.5%)	5,310 (11.0%)*	6,872 (16.1%)	<0.01
Hypertension, n (weighted %)	147,655 (37.5%)	64,705 (21.9%)	1,411 (13.9%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	36,348 (87.6%)	<0.01
Dyslipidemia, n (weighted %)	140,653 (36.6%)	62,526 (22.2%)	1,102 (12.2%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	31,834 (77.6%)	<0.01
BMI \geq 25.0 kg/m ² , n (weighted %)	223,112 (67.2%)	135,589 (59.1%)	4,551 (56.8%)	45,191 (100.0%)*	37,781 (92.3%)	<0.01
Stroke, n (weighted %)	15,013 (3.6%)	6,910 (2.2%)	544 (4.8%)	3,228 (6.6%)*	4,331 (9.7%)	<0.01
Depression, n (weighted %)	64,290 (18.3%)	40,520 (16.1%)	1,574 (16.4%)	10,687 (24.1%)*	11,509 (27.7%)	<0.01

* Compared with DM without MS group, $p < 0.05$

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

Table 3. The odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals of DM and MS related to heart attack in the hierarchy logistic regression analysis

	Odds Ratio	95% confidence intervals	p value
Model 1			
(n=332,008)			
DM without MS	3.28	2.81-3.82	<0.01
MS without DM	4.37	4.06-4.70	<0.01
DM plus MS	6.79	6.33-7.28	<0.01
Model 2			
(n=319,712)			
DM without MS	2.10	1.77-2.49	<0.01
MS without DM	2.85	2.64-3.09	<0.01
DM plus MS	4.06	3.76-4.38	<0.01
Model 3			
(n=282,332)			
DM without MS	2.12	1.75-2.56	<0.01
MS without DM	2.82	2.59-3.07	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.99	3.66-4.34	<0.01
Model 4			
(n=280,977)			
DM without MS	2.09	1.72-2.54	<0.01
MS without DM	2.58	2.36-2.81	<0.01
DM plus MS	3.45	3.16-3.77	<0.01

Model 1: unadjusted

Model 2: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race

Model 3: adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day

Model 4 adjusted for gender, age (45 years or not), education, current smoking, race, physical activity index, fruits consumed one or more times per day, vegetable consumed one or more times per day, stroke, and depression

Abbreviation: DM: diabetes mellitus, MS: metabolic syndrome

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	8-11
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-11

		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	11
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12-15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	15

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.