

Comparative external validation of the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores in 4424 acute coronary syndrome patients treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor

Original

Comparative external validation of the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores in 4424 acute coronary syndrome patients treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor / Bianco, Matteo; D'Ascenzo, Fabrizio; Raposeiras Roubin, Sergio; Kinnaird, Tim; Peyracchia, Mattia; Ariza-Solé, Albert; Cerrato, Enrico; Manzano-Fernández, Sergio; Gravinese, Carol; Templin, Christian; Destefanis, Paola; Velicki, Lazar; Luciano, Alessia; Xanthopoulou, Ioanna; Rinaldi, Mauro; Rognoni, Andrea; Varbella, Ferdinando; Boccuzzi, Giacomo; Omedè, Pierluigi; Montabone, Andrea; Bernardi, Alessandro; Taha, Salma; Rossini, Roberta; Durante, Alessandro; Gili, Sebastiano; Magnani, Giulia; Autelli, Michele; Grosso, Alberto; Blanco, Pedro Flores; Giustetto, Carla; Garay, Alberto; Quadri, Giorgio; Quejia, Berenice Caneiro; Srdanovic, Ilija; Paz, Rafael Cobas; Fernandez, Maria Cespon; Pousa, Isabel Muñoz; Gallo, Diego; Morbiducci, Umberto; Dominguez-Rodriguez, Alberto; Lopez-Cuenca, Ángel; Cequier, Angel; Alexopoulos, Dimitrios; Iñiguez-Romo, Andres; Pozzi, Roberto; Assi, Emad Abu; Valgimigli, Marco.. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CARDIOLOGY. - ISSN 0167-5273. - ELETTRONICO. - 301:(2020), pp. 200-206. [10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.11.132]

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.11.132

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.11.132>

(Article begins on next page)

1
2
3
4 **Comparative external validation of the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores in**
5 **4,424 acute coronary syndrome patients treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor.**
6
7

8 Matteo Bianco¹ MD; Fabrizio D'ascenzo^{*2} MD; Sergio Raposeiras Roubin^{*3} MD, PhD; Tim Kinnaird⁴
9 MD; Mattia Peyracchia² MD; Albert Ariza-Solé⁵ MD, PhD; Enrico Cerrato⁶ MD; Sergio Manzano-
10 Fernández⁷ MD; Carol Gravinese¹ MD; Christian Templin⁸ MD, PhD; Paola Destefanis¹ MD, Lazar
11 Velicki⁹ MD; Alessia Luciano¹ MD; Ioanna Xanthopoulou¹⁰ MD, PhD; Mauro Rinaldi¹¹ MD, Prof;
12 Andrea Rognoni¹² MD; Ferdinando Varbella⁶ MD; Giacomo Boccuzzi¹³ MD; Pierluigi Omedè² MD;
13 Andrea Montabone¹³ MD; Alessandro Bernardi² MD; Salma Taha¹⁴ MD; Roberta Rossini¹⁵ MD,
14 PhD; Alessandro Durante¹⁶ MD; Sebastiano Gili⁸ MD; Giulia Magnani⁸ MD, PhD; Michele Autelli²
15 MD; Alberto Grosso² MD; Pedro Flores Blanco⁵ MD; Carla Giustetto² MD, Prof; Alberto Garay⁷ MD;
16 Giorgio Quadri⁶ MD; , Berenice Caneiro Queija³ MD; Ilija Srdanovic⁹ MD; Rafael Cobas Paz³ MD;
17 María Cespón Fernández³ MD; Isabel Muñoz Pousa³ MD; Diego Gallo¹⁷ Eng, PhD; Umberto
18 Morbiducci¹⁷ Eng, Prof; Alberto Dominguez-Rodriguez¹⁸ MD, Prof; Ángel Lopez-Cuenca⁷ MD;
19 Angel Cequier⁵ MD; Dimitrios Alexopoulos¹⁰ MD, Prof; Andres Iñiguez-Romo³ MD; Roberto Pozzi¹
20 MD; Emad Abu Assi^{**3} MD, PhD; Marco Valgimigli^{**19} MD, Prof.
21

22 1) Division of Cardiology, San Luigi Gonzaga University Hospital, Orbassano, Italy, 2) University of
23 Turin, 'Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino', Division of Cardiology, Turin, Italy, 3)
24 Department of Cardiology, Hospital Álvaro Cunqueiro, Vigo, Pontevedra, Spain, 4) Cardiology
25 Department, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff, United Kingdom, 5) Department of Cardiology,
26 University Hospital de Bellvitge, Barcelona, Spain, 6) Interventional Cardiology Unit, San Luigi
27 Gonzaga University Hospital, Orbassano and Infermi Hospital, Rivoli, Turin, Italy, 7) Department of
28 Cardiology, University Hospital Virgen Arrixaca, Murcia, Spain, 8) Department of Cardiology,
29 University Heart Center, University Hospital Zurich, Switzerland, 9) Medical faculty, University of
30 Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia and Institute of cardiovascular Diseases Vojvodina, Sremska
31 Kamenica, Serbia, 10) University Patras Hospital, Athens, Greece, 11) University of Turin, 'Città
32 della Salute e della Scienza di Torino', Division of Cardiac Surgery, Turin, Italy, 12) Catheterization
33 Laboratory, Maggiore della Carità Hospital, Novara, Italy, 13) Department of Cardiology, S.G.
34 Bosco Hospital, Torino, Italy, 14) Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University,
35 15) Division of Cardiology, A.O Santa Croce e Carle, Cuneo, Italy, 16) U.O. Cardiologia, Ospedale
36 Valduce, Como, Italy, 17) PolitoBIOMed Lab, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace
37 Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, 18) Department of Cardiology, University Hospital from
38 Canarias, Tenerife, Spain, 19) Swiss Cardiovascular Center Bern, Bern University Hospital,
39 Switzerland
40

41 *joint second authorship

42 ** joint last authorship
43
44
45

46 Correspondence to: Dr. Matteo Bianco, MD, Division of Cardiology, San Luigi Gonzaga University
47 Hospital, Orbassano, Italy. E-mail: matteo.bianco87@gmail.com; www.cardiogroup.org.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60
61
62 **ABSTRACT**
63
64

65 **Background.** The PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores (RSs) were recently developed to help
66 clinicians at individualizing the optimal dual antiplatelet therapy duration (DAPT) after
67 percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). Nevertheless, external validation of these RSs it has not
68 yet been performed in ACS (acute coronary syndrome) patients treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor
69 in a real- world scenario.
70
71

72
73
74
75 **Methods:** 4,424 ACS patients who underwent PCI and survived to hospital discharge, from
76 January 2012 to December 2016 at 12 European centers, were included. PRECISE-DAPT and
77 PARIS bleeding RS, as well as PARIS ischemic RS, were computed, and their performance at
78 predicting major bleeding (MB; BARC type 3 or 5) and ischemic events (MI and stent thrombosis)
79 during follow up was compared.
80
81
82
83

84
85 **Results:** After a median follow-up of 14 (interquartile range 12-20.9) months, 83 (1.88%) patients
86 developed MB and 133 (3.0%) suffered an ischemic episode. PRECISE-DAPT performed better
87 than PARIS bleeding RS (c-statistic= 0.653 vs. 0.593; p= 0.01 for comparison) in predicting MB.
88 The RSs performance for MB prediction remained consistent in STEMI patients (c-statistic= 0.632
89 vs 0.575) or in those treated with prasugrel (c-statistic = 0.623 vs 0.586).
90
91

92
93
94
95 PARIS ischemic RS exhibited modest but superior discrimination in predicting ischemic
96 complications as compared to PRECISE-DAPT (c-statistic= 0.604 vs 0.568 p= 0.05 for
97 comparison).
98
99

100
101 **Conclusion:** Our data provide support to the use of PRECISE-DAPT in MB risk stratification for
102 patients receiving DAPT in form of aspirin and prasugrel or ticagrelor whereas the PARIS ischemic
103 RS has potential to complement the risk prediction with respect to ischemic events.
104
105
106

107
108
109
110
111
112
113 **Keywords:** DAPT, prasugrel, ticagrelor, bleeding; PRECISE DAPT; PARIS risk score
114
115
116
117
118

119
120
121 **INTRODUCTION**
122
123

124 Dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT), consisting of aspirin and a P2Y12 inhibitor (P2Y12i) is the
125 standard of care in patients treated with percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and stent
126 implantation. Yet, the most appropriate DAPT duration, especially in patients at high bleeding risk
127 with prior acute coronary syndrome (ACS) remains a subject of intense controversy.
128
129

130
131
132 The originally proposed “one-fits-all” strategy based on an at least twelve months regimen
133 of DAPT has been questioned and a tailored treatment duration informed by the individual
134 ischemic and bleeding risks has been more recently advocated ¹⁻⁴.
135
136

137
138 The PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores (RSs) have been recently developed to help
139 physicians in stratifying post-discharge bleeding and ischemic risk in patients treated with DAPT
140 after PCI^{5,6}. Although both scores demonstrated a moderate predictive ability, the European
141 Society of Cardiology (ESC) DAPT focused update exclusively endorsed, with a class IIb
142 recommendation, the use of PRECISE-DAPT score, in view of a gap in knowledge whether PARIS
143 RS improves the decision making on DAPT duration.
144
145
146
147
148
149

150
151 However, the recommendation of the ESC regarding the use of PRECISE-DAPT is based
152 on a single study where patients were largely treated with aspirin and clopidogrel⁵. Therefore,
153 further investigating the predictive capability and reliability of PRECISE-DAPT seems necessary
154 before generalizing its use to other populations with different clinical features, health systems and
155 more contemporary medications. In addition, PRECISE-DAPT was derived from clinical trial
156 patients, at variance with the PARIS RSs, which was developed from registry patients.
157
158
159
160
161
162

163 We sought to evaluate and compare the external validity of PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS
164 RSs in contemporary real-world ACS patients treated with aspirin and prasugrel or ticagrelor.
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177

178
179
180 **METHODS**
181

182
183 **Study Population**
184

185 The design and patient population of RENAMI (**RE**gistry of **N**ew **A**ntiplatelet therapy in
186 **M**ycardial **I**nfarction) was comprehensively described elsewhere⁷. Briefly, in RENAMI dataset,
187 consecutive ACS patients recruited at 12 European centers from January 2012 to December 2016
188 were included (**supplementary appendix**). The RENAMI registry included all comer patients with
189 a final diagnosis of ACS: unstable angina (UA), non ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction
190 (NSTEMI), or ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), aged at least 18 years, who
191 consented for participation in the study. All patients underwent in-hospital coronary angiography
192 and PCI with stent implantation followed by aspirin and either ticagrelor or prasugrel, at discretion
193 of the treating physician. All patients were discharged with DAPT (aspirin plus ticagrelor or aspirin
194 plus prasugrel). Excluded patients from the present analysis were those who experienced any
195 adverse event defined as major bleeding (MB), new MI, stent thrombosis (ST), cardiovascular
196 death or death for any causes during the index hospitalization. The institutional review board of
197 each center approved the study protocol.
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209

210
211 **Objectives**
212

213 We sought to evaluate and compare the performance of PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS RSs
214 at predicting post-discharge MB and ischemic events (MI and ST), in the overall cohort and in
215 subgroups of interest, including STEMI vs. NSTEMI, ticagrelor vs. prasugrel,
216 and according to different DAPT durations (< 12 months, 12 months, and > 12 months).
217
218
219
220
221

222 **Follow-up and definitions**
223

224 The follow-up was conducted at each single center with at least two in contact visits within
225 the first year after inclusion in order to assess the occurrence of any relevant clinical events and
226 assess drug-adherence. Data on vital status (alive or dead) and events during follow-up were
227 obtained from hospital clinical data records, as well as from administrative records (vital statistics
228 registers, hospital discharge data and emergency department data), and telephone contact was
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236

237
238
239 made with patients or their relatives and primary care physicians in particular cases for which
240
241 information was not available.
242

243
244 Follow-up time was ended by DAPT duration; therefore, the events recorded (MB or MI/ST
245
246 or cardiovascular death) occurred while patients were on DAPT. We only considered the first MB
247
248 or MI/ST episodes occurred during follow-up. Therefore, in patients who had developed more than
249
250 one complication, the follow-up time was ended at the time of the first of the prior complications.
251

252
253 Major bleeding was defined as those fulfilling type 3 or type 5 BARC criteria⁸. Ischemic
254
255 events were defined as a composite of new MI or stent thrombosis or cardiovascular death. A new
256
257 MI was defined according to the third definition of myocardial infraction⁹. ST was defined according
258
259 to Academic Research Consortium criteria¹⁰. Cardiovascular death includes deaths that result from
260
261 an MI, sudden cardiac death, death due to heart failure, death due to stroke, death due to
262
263 cardiovascular procedures.
264

265 **Risk scores calculation**

266
267 PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS were calculated in each patient on the basis of the original
268
269 definitions used in their development cohorts (**Supplementary Table 1-2, Supplementary Figure**
270
271 **1**)^{5,6}. PRECISE-DAPT assigns patients into four risk strata (very low: ≤ 10 , low: 11-17, moderate:
272
273 18-24, and high: ≥ 25 points), whereas PARIS bleeding risk score categorizes patients into three
274
275 risk groups (low: < 3 , moderate: 3-7, and high: ≥ 8 points). PARIS ischemic risk score also
276
277 categorized patients into three strata but with different cut points: low: < 2 ; intermediate: 3-4; and
278
279 high: ≥ 5 points.
280

281
282 To enable comparisons between the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk classification
283
284 systems we categorized all patients into three risk strata by considering the very low and low risk
285
286 categories in PRECISE-DAPT as a unique category.
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295

Data presentation and statistical analysis

Baseline and clinical characteristics of the RENAMI external validation population, and the derivation cohorts of the PRECISE- DAPT and PARIS scores are presented as mean \pm standard deviation (SD) and medians (interquartile ranges [IQR]) for continuous variables, and as proportions for categorical variables.

The total RSs, as continuous variables, were entered into separate Cox regression models to test their association with ischemic and MB events. The ability to separate high-risk from lower risk patients was visually appraised by generation of Kaplan-Meier curves for events of interest and compared using the log-rank test. The magnitude of the association between each of the three predefined risk categories from the RSs was calculated and expressed as hazard ratios (HR) with their 95% confidence intervals (95% CI); the low risk category was considered as a reference category.

The predictive capacity of the RSs was tested by means of indices of discrimination and calibration. To assess discrimination, using the total RS as a global prognostic indicator, we calculated and compared the Harrell c-statistic for censored time-to-event data, for both scores¹¹. Calibration was computed using the Grønnesby and Borgan χ^2 test, and plotted observed vs. predicted outcomes.

The time-frame of 12 months was used to assess the ability of both scores to predict outcomes over the first year, in order to decide to stop or to prolong DAPT. The Kaplan-Meier curves end at 18 months in order to show the whole study follow-up.

We further assessed the net reclassification improvement index (NRI)¹². For the NRI calculation, individuals were compared based on their bleeding and ischemic risk using the three categories of the two RSs. Since the probability of MB and MI/ST was set at different thresholds in the respective risk categories of PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS, we further analyzed possible improvement in the discrimination ability of one score vs. the other by means of the “categoryless” NRI. Although there are no established benchmarks for category-free NRI (cfNRI), Pencina et al.

355
356
357 suggest cfNRI greater than 0.6 indicates a strong contribution and NRI(>0) between 0.2 and 0.6
358
359 implies moderate improvement^{13,14}.
360

361
362 Decision curve analyses (DCA) were also used to quantify the net benefit of the prediction
363 scores; the higher the net benefit, the better the RS, in terms of clinical usefulness. The theoretical
364 range of net benefit is from negative infinity to the incidence of disease.
365
366

367
368 Finally, we considered the average daily difference between ischemic and bleeding events
369 according to the risk categories of PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS risk scores limiting the analysis to
370 the first event occurring (MB, MI, death, ending of DAPT). The average daily rate for a given
371 interval was defined as the total number of events in that interval divided by the total number of
372 patient-days of follow-up (number of patients multiplied by how many days each patient was at risk
373 in that given period).
374
375
376
377
378
379

380
381 A two-sided $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. All statistical analysis was
382 performed using SPSS 24 and the statistical package for R 3.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical
383 Computing, Vienna, Austria).
384
385
386
387
388

389 RESULTS

390 391 392 **Baseline characteristics**

393
394 The baseline characteristics of the RENAMI population are summarized in **table 1**. Patients
395 in RENAMI were younger and less frequently females, as compared with those used to generate
396 the the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS RSs.
397
398
399

400
401 Most of patients in this study had STEMI and largely received drug eluting stent implantation. All
402 patients received DAPT in form of either prasugrel or ticagrelor. A total of 22.3%, 50.1% and
403 27.6% of the patients in the RENAMI study received DAPT for less then 12 months, 12 months or
404 more than 12 months, respectively.
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413

414
415
416 The PRECISE-DAPT varied from 0 to 75 points (17±10 points), and 20.4% of patients were
417 categorized as having high risk of bleeding. (**Figure 1**). In contrast, the PARIS bleeding RS values
418 ranged from 0 to 10 points (3±2 points), with only 3.9% of patients fulfilling the high-risk category
419 (**Figure 1**).

420
421
422
423
424
425 The PARIS ischemic score ranged from 1 to 13 points (4±2 points) with 23.1% of the patients
426 being categorized at high ischemic risk.
427

428 429 430 431 432 433 **Bleeding and ischemic risk assessment based on the RSs classification systems** 434

435
436
437 After a median follow-up of 14 (IQR: 12-20.9) months, 83 (1.88%) patients developed MB
438 and 133 (3.0%) suffered an ischemic episode. Median time for first MB was 5.0 (IQR 1.6-9.4)
439 months, and for ischemic events 9.6 (IQR 2.6-16.9) months. The Kaplan-Meier curves based on
440 risk categories assigned by each score for the occurrence of MB are shown in **Supplementary**
441 **Figure 2**. Both PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS bleeding RSs showed significant predictive capability
442 (log-rank test, $p < 0.01$). The observed bleeding rates for the two scores increased monotonically
443 from low- to high-risk categories. However, Kaplan-Meier curves diverged in a more pronounced
444 way with PRECISE-DAPT (χ^2 values were 23 [$p < 0.001$] for PRECISE-DAPT vs. 10 [$p = 0.002$] for
445 PARIS). After an adjustment for potential clinically relevant confounders (age, sex, hypertension,
446 diabetes mellitus, history of malignancies, prior-MI, prior-bleeding, anemia, creatinine clearance,
447 ACS or non-ACS clinical presentation, DES or BMS, enrolling center), with Cox regression models
448 both PRECISE DAPT and PARIS bleeding RSs confirmed their independent ability to predict MBs
449 on the basis of their risk categories (PRECISE DAPT moderate risk HR: 2.56 CI: 1.52 – 4.31 $p <$
450 0.0001; PRECISE DAPT high risk HR: 4.01 CI: 2.57 – 6.28 $p < 0.0001$ and PARIS bleeding
451 moderate risk HR: 2.11 CI: 1.39 – 3.21 $p < 0.0001$; PARIS bleeding high risk HR: 5.78 CI: 3.16 –
452 10.55 $p < 0.0001$). Similar results were observed for the prediction of ischemic events (PRECISE
453 DAPT moderate risk HR: 2.33 CI: 1.34 – 4.08 $p = 0.003$; PRECISE DAPT high risk HR: 3.07 CI:
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472

473
474
475 1.88 – 5.04 $p < 0.0001$ and PARIS ischemic moderate risk HR: 2.00 CI: 1.31 – 3.07 $p = 0.001$;
476
477 PARIS ischemic high risk 2.60 CI: 1.68 – 4.02 $p < 0.0001$).

479 Consistent findings were noted for the predictive value of both RSs in predicting MI/ST or
480
481 cardiovascular death (**supplementary materials Figure 3-4**)

486 487 **Discrimination**

488
489 Both PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS bleeding scores, as continuous variables, were better
490
491 than the chance for predicting MB. However, the PRECISE-DAPT performed better than the
492
493 PARIS bleeding RS at c-statistics (c-statistic= 0.653, [95%CI: 0.59-0.71]; c-statistic: 0.593, [95%CI:
494
495 0.528-0.658]; $p=0.01$ for correlated c-statistic values comparison).

497
498 In contrast, the discriminative capacity of PARIS ischemic RS, as compared to PRECISE-DAPT,
499
500 was slightly higher (c-statistic = 0.604, [95%CI: 0.550-0.657] and 0.568 [95%CI: 0.509-0.626];
501
502 $p=0.05$ for correlated c-statistics values comparison).

503
504 The c-statistic values for different DAPT duration, clinical presentation, P2Y12 inhibitors,
505
506 age and serum creatinine level are summarized in **table 2**. Briefly, the PRECISE-DAPT score was
507
508 able to predict MB reasonably well and better than the PARIS bleeding RS in almost all analyzed
509
510 sub-categories but its discriminative capacity for MB was found to be slightly reduced in patients
511
512 treated with prasugrel, patients > 75 years and in patients with STEMI at presentation compared to
513
514 those treated with ticagrelor, patients < 75 years and those with NSTEMI at presentation. Finally,
515
516 PARIS ischemic RS was better than PRECISE DAPT in predicting ischemic events in all subgroup
517
518 analyses with the exception of patients treated with ticagrelor in which the discrimination
519
520 performance of the scores is almost the same.

522 523 **Calibration**

524
525 Calibration of observed against predicted MB was good for both RSs, although PRECISE
526
527 DAPT slightly tended to underestimate the predicted probability of MB compared to PARIS

532
533
534 bleeding RS. The calibration of PRECISE DAPT for observed against predicted ischemic events
535 was suboptimal if compared with PARIS ischemic risk score as shown in **Supplementary figure 5**.
536
537 In the figure, for each bin, the y-value is the proportion of true outcomes, and x-value is the mean
538 predicted probability. Therefore, a well-calibrated model has a calibration curve that hugs the
539 predicted probability. Therefore, a well-calibrated model has a calibration curve that hugs the
540 straight line $y=x$ (blue line). The red points identify the observed probability of events based on the
541 estimate of the score, so that if they are above the blue line they indicate that the score
542 underestimates, and if they are below the blue line it indicates that the score overestimate.
543
544
545
546
547

548 **Average daily rate events**

549
550
551 PRECISE DAPT was able to predict the average daily difference between bleeding and ischemic
552 events better than PARIS risk scores in all the three risk categories in the first year as shown in
553 **supplementary materials Figure 6**. In particular, the average daily difference of events followed
554 the risk categories stratification for PRECISE DAPT whereas wide overlap between risk categories
555 and observed average daily rate events was noted for the two PARIS risk scores.
556
557
558
559
560

561 **Decision curves analyses for MB**

562
563
564 **Figure 2** compares the decision curves from classifying individuals using the PRECISE
565 DAPT and PARIS bleeding RSs, assuming all patients will bleed (all positive or all are at high risk
566 of bleeding), and assuming all patients as if none will bleed (all negative or all are at low risk of
567 bleeding; horizontal line at 0). The DCA showed that the use of PRECISE DAPT is superior to
568 PARIS bleeding RS at a risk threshold of $\geq 2\%$. PARIS bleeding RS did not prove to be
569 advantageous, as compared to no use of the score, at a risk threshold of $\geq 3\%$, whereas PRECISE-
570 DAPT RS continued to stratify the bleeding risk until a threshold of 10% MB risk. The net benefit
571 analysis for MB is summarized in **Supplementary Table 3**. The PRECISE DAPT showed superior
572 predictive capability for MB events as opposed to the PARIS bleeding RS with a moderate
573 improvement on risk prediction even when using a category-free NRI = 0.41 (95% CI: 0.20-0.65)
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583

584 **.DISCUSSION**

585
586 The main findings of this study are:
587
588
589
590

591
592
593 1) The PRECISE DAPT and PARIS bleeding RS perform moderately well in predicting MB
594
595 in patients treated with ticagrelor or prasugrel in the first fourteen months after discharge. 2)
596
597 PRECISE DAPT is significantly superior to PARIS bleeding RS for predicting MB. 3) The
598
599 performance of both the RSs is consistent in all the subgroups included in the analysis. 4) PARIS
600
601 ischemic RS is slightly better than PRECISE DAPT in predicting ischemic events.
602

603
604 There is an emerging need to focus on the trade off between ischemic and bleeding risks
605
606 when treating contemporary patients with prolonged potent anti-thrombotic medications. in order to
607
608 maximize the benefit and avoid the risks. The ischemic risk is progressively decreasing in the last
609
610 years thanks to a great technological improvement of the stents and of PCI techniques¹⁵. At the
611
612 same time, the use of more potent anti-platelets therapies in ACS patients and to the ageing of
613
614 patients undergoing routine treatment, the bleeding events have become prevalent and they are
615
616 able to dramatically affect the prognosis of our patients¹⁶⁻¹⁹.
617

618
619 Costa et al. and Baber et al. generated new models to better predict the incidence of MB
620
621 and ischemic events in the first 12 or 24 months of treatment respectively, overcoming the
622
623 limitations of previous studies, which mainly focused on in hospital events. The PRECISE DAPT
624
625 modeled exclusively the bleeding risk and found that a score ≥ 25 points may be used in the
626
627 decision-making of shortening DAPT duration to avoid bleeding. It was validated in patients
628
629 enrolled in the PLATO study and in the Bern PCI registry (both ACS and stable angina) and
630
631 showed superiority in the discrimination and reclassification performance respect to the PARIS
632
633 bleeding RS.

634
635 In our study we tested the performance of PRECISE DAPT and PARIS RSs in a real-world
636
637 registry with characteristics different from the derivation cohorts. First, all our patients were ACS
638
639 with more than fifty percent of those presenting STEMI and were treated with prasugrel or
640
641 ticagrelor. Yet, both bleeding RSs demonstrated a reasonable discriminative capacity to predict
642
643 MB, hence confirming the results of previous studies, which were largely undertaken in patients
644
645 treated with clopidogrel^{5,6}.
646
647
648
649

650
651
652 We found that PRECISE DAPT was superior to PARIS bleeding RS in predicting MB.
653
654 Despite similar results in the risk stratification of our population, the discrimination power, the
655
656 average daily difference between bleeding and ischemic events and net benefit of PRECISE DAPT
657
658 was superior particularly in the first year of follow-up. These results are consistent with the study of
659
660 Costa et al⁵.
661

662
663 A recent study of Abu-Assi et al provided opposite results in terms of performance of the
664
665 two bleeding RSs considered²⁰. This could be due to some differences in the baseline
666
667 characteristics between the prior study and this cohort. Patients included in the RENAMI study
668
669 were treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor, while in the study by Abu-Assi et al the majority of
670
671 patients received clopidogrel; moreover, twenty percent of the patients of Abu-Assi et al were
672
673 treated with a bare metal stent and data on the DAPT duration was not taken into account²⁰. Taken
674
675 all together, the prior study seems less generalizable to a population treated with the current
676
677 standard of care and this could explain the different performance of bleeding RSs observed.
678

679
680 Of note, in our study, the use of both bleeding RSs was superior to the strategies of not
681
682 using the RSs for bleeding risk classification, as observed in the DCA. This means that the use of
683
684 PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS bleeding RS is of clinical value to drive clinical decisions in bleeding
685
686 risk stratification. Moreover, our work confirms the previous results from Raposeiras Roubin et al.
687
688 on the utility of the PARIS RSs but shows that the PRECISE DAPT score is even better. In fact,
689
690 over a risk score threshold of the 3% the PARIS bleeding RS failed to demonstrate a benefit over
691
692 the strategy of not using a RS. For this reason, our observations strengthen the recommendation
693
694 of the recent ESC position paper on anti-platelet therapy who recommend to use PRECISE DAPT
695
696 score in bleeding risk stratification¹.
697

698
699 Due to the great difference in baseline characteristics between RENAMI cohort and the
700
701 derivation cohorts of the PRECISE DAPT and PARIS RSs, we appraised the accuracy in predicting
702
703 bleeding and ischemic events in different patient subgroups. We found a modest reduction in the
704
705 accuracy of predicting MB events of PRECISE DAPT and PARIS bleeding RS in particular among
706
707 patients treated with prasugrel, in those presenting with STEMI and in those > 75 years. In this
708

709
710
711 three cohorts, the accuracy of both the scores was slightly reduced compared to the general
712 population but overall, as showed in **Table 2**, the discrimination capacity is consistent in all the
713 subgroups included in the analysis. The reduction in the discrimination ability of PRECISE DAPT
714 score in patients treated with prasugrel was already shown by Costa et al. and is probably related
715 to the average low bleeding profile of patients treated with prasugrel (< 75 years, > 60 kg and
716 without previous intracranial bleedings)⁵. Finally, our analysis confirmed that the accuracy of
717 bleeding risk scores decrease in elderly population as already shown in a previous study²².
718
719
720
721
722
723
724

725 The ischemic events prediction of PRECISE DAPT score is largely insufficient which is a
726 consistent observation with the fact that this model was purely generated for bleeding prediction
727 purposes.
728
729
730
731

732 The current results endorse the implementation of PRECISE DAPT score in the clinical
733 practice as novel tool, particularly within the first year after intervention, to balance the bleeding
734 and ischemic risks as shown by our average daily difference events analysis. The PRECISE-DAPT
735 score allows selecting patients who derive benefit from a short DAPT (3 or 6 months) as well as
736 those who should be treated with DAPT as long as possible, which is in keeping with current
737 European guidelines¹. On the other hand, the use of the PARIS risk scores does not seem to
738 provide clinicians with clear risk stratification information due to some degree of overlap among
739 different risk strata for bleeding and ischemic events.
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749

750 **LIMITATIONS**

751
752 This study has several limitations. This was a retrospective observational study, so we cannot rule
753 out the presence of selection bias and unmeasured confounding factors. Moreover, we used
754 treatment at discharge as a principle of intention-to-treat analysis, as we did have data on DAPT
755 duration during follow-up. However, this principle was also applied in the PLATO and Bern PCI
756 external validation cohorts used in the development of the PRECISE-DAPT score, and in the
757 PARIS development cohorts^{5,6}. Finally, BARC criteria were used to define bleeding in our study
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767

768
769
770 and in PARIS, in contrast to PRECISE-DAPT where bleeding definitions were based on TIMI
771
772 criteria. This point could have affected the comparability of the scores. However, BARC bleeding
773
774 criteria were also used as an alternative bleeding definition in the external validation cohorts of
775
776 PRECISE-DAPT. Additionally, BARC bleeding criteria are currently considered the standard
777
778 bleeding definition. Finally, Costa et al. showed a lower discrimination of PRECISE-DAPT score in
779
780 patients treated with proton pump inhibitors (PPI); these medications are very important to reduce
781
782 gastro intestinal bleedings in patients treated with DAPT, unfortunately we did not collect
783
784 systematically the PPI treatment in our database and we are not able to provide any analysis on
785
786 the influence of PPI in the performance of the RSs included in the analysis.
787
788
789
790

791 **CONCLUSION**

792
793 Our data provide support to the use of PRECISE-DAPT in MB risk stratification for patients
794
795 receiving DAPT in form of aspirin and prasugrel or ticagrelor whereas the PARIS ischemic RS has
796
797 potential to complement the risk prediction with respect to ischemic events.
798
799
800

801 **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

802
803 Prof. Valgimigli has received research grants to the institution from Terumo, Medicure, Abbott,
804
805 Astrazeneca and honorarium fees from Abbott, Chiesi, Bayer, Daiichi Sankyo, Amgen, Terumo,
806
807 Astrazeneca, Alvimedica and Biosensors.
808

809 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

810 The authors wish to thank Michael Andrews for his valuable contribution to the English revision.
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

Bibliography

1. Valgimigli M, Bueno H, Byrne RA, Collet J-P, Costa F, Jeppsson A, Jüni P, Kastrati A, Kolh P, Mauri L, Montalescot G, Neumann F-J, Petricevic M, Roffi M, Steg PG, Windecker S, Zamorano JL, Levine GN, ESC Scientific Document Group, ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines (CPG), ESC National Cardiac Societies. 2017 ESC focused update on dual antiplatelet therapy in coronary artery disease developed in collaboration with EACTS: The Task Force for dual antiplatelet therapy in coronary artery disease of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and of the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39:213–260.
2. Authors/Task Force members, Windecker S, Kolh P, Alfonso F, Collet J-P, Cremer J, Falk V, Filippatos G, Hamm C, Head SJ, Jüni P, Kappetein AP, Kastrati A, Knuuti J, Landmesser U, Laufer G, Neumann F-J, Richter DJ, Schauerte P, Sousa Uva M, Stefanini GG, Taggart DP, Torracca L, Valgimigli M, Wijns W, Witkowski A. 2014 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on myocardial revascularization: The Task Force on Myocardial Revascularization of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) Developed with the special contribution of the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI). *Eur Heart J*. 2014;35:2541–2619.
3. Levine GN, Bates ER, Bittl JA, Brindis RG, Fihn SD, Fleisher LA, Granger CB, Lange RA, Mack MJ, Mauri L, Mehran R, Mukherjee D, Newby LK, O’Gara PT, Sabatine MS, Smith PK, Smith SC. 2016 ACC/AHA Guideline Focused Update on Duration of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With Coronary Artery Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;68:1082–1115.
4. Gravinese C, Bianco M, Cerrato E, Destefanis P, Luciano A, Bernardi A, Bellucca S, Varbella F, Gaita F, Pozzi R. Is Aspirin Still the Cornerstone of Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With Coronary Artery Disease? An Historical and Practical Narrative Review. *Hosp Pract Res*. 2017;2:94–101.
5. Costa F, van Klaveren D, James S, Heg D, Räber L, Feres F, Pilgrim T, Hong M-K, Kim H-S, Colombo A, Steg PG, Zanchin T, Palmerini T, Wallentin L, Bhatt DL, Stone GW, Windecker S, Steyerberg EW, Valgimigli M, PRECISE-DAPT Study Investigators. Derivation and validation of the predicting bleeding complications in patients undergoing stent implantation and subsequent dual antiplatelet therapy (PRECISE-DAPT) score: a pooled analysis of individual-patient datasets from clinical trials. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2017;389:1025–1034.
6. Baber U, Mehran R, Giustino G, Cohen DJ, Henry TD, Sartori S, Ariti C, Litherland C, Dangas G, Gibson CM, Krucoff MW, Moliterno DJ, Kirtane AJ, Stone GW, Colombo A, Chieffo A, Kini AS, Witzenbichler B, Weisz G, Steg PG, Pocock S. Coronary Thrombosis and Major Bleeding After PCI With Drug-Eluting Stents: Risk Scores From PARIS. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67:2224–2234.
7. Raposeiras-Roubín S, Abu-Assi E, D’Ascenzo F, Fernández-Barbeira S, Kinnaird T, Ariza-Solé A, Manzano-Fernández S, Templin C, Velicki L, Xanthopoulos I, Cerrato E, Quadri G,

886
887
888 Rognoni A, Boccuzzi G, Montabone A, Taha S, Durante A, Gili S, Magnani G, Autelli M, Grosso A,
889 Flores Blanco P, Garay A, Varbella F, Tommassini F, Caneiro Queija B, Cobas Paz R, Cespón
890 Fernández M, Muñoz Pousa I, Gallo D, Morbiducci U, Domínguez-Rodríguez A, Baz-Alonso JA,
891 Valdés M, Cequier Á, Gaita F, Alexopoulos D, Íñiguez-Romo A. Annual Incidence of Confirmed
892 Stent Thrombosis and Clinical Predictors in Patients With ACS Treated With Ticagrelor or
893 Prasugrel. *Rev Espanola Cardiol Engl Ed.* 2019; 72: 298-304.
894

895 8. Mehran R, Rao SV, Bhatt DL, Gibson CM, Caixeta A, Eikelboom J, Kaul S, Wiviott SD,
896 Menon V, Nikolsky E, Serebruany V, Valgimigli M, Vranckx P, Taggart D, Sabik JF, Cutlip DE,
897 Krucoff MW, Ohman EM, Steg PG, White H. Standardized Bleeding Definitions for Cardiovascular
898 Clinical Trials: A Consensus Report From the Bleeding Academic Research Consortium.
899 *Circulation.* 2011;123:2736–2747.
900

901 9. Thygesen K, Alpert JS, Jaffe AS, Simoons ML, Chaitman BR, White HD, Writing Group on
902 the Joint ESC/ACCF/AHA/WHF Task Force for the Universal Definition of Myocardial Infarction,
903 Thygesen K, Alpert JS, White HD, Jaffe AS, Katus HA, Apple FS, Lindahl B, Morrow DA, Chaitman
904 BA, Clemmensen PM, Johanson P, Hod H, Underwood R, Bax JJ, Bonow RO, Pinto F, Gibbons
905 RJ, Fox KA, Atar D, Newby LK, Galvani M, Hamm CW, Uretsky BF, Steg PG, Wijns W, Bassand J-
906 P, Menasché P, Ravkilde J, Ohman EM, Antman EM, Wallentin LC, Armstrong PW, Simoons ML,
907 Januzzi JL, Nieminen MS, Gheorghide M, Filippatos G, Luepker RV, Fortmann SP, Rosamond
908 WD, Levy D, Wood D, Smith SC, Hu D, Lopez-Sendon J-L, Robertson RM, Weaver D, Tendera M,
909 Bove AA, Parkhomenko AN, Vasilieva EJ, Mendis S, ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines
910 (CPG). Third universal definition of myocardial infarction. *Eur Heart J.* 2012;33:2551–2567.
911

912 10. Cutlip DE, Windecker S, Mehran R, Boam A, Cohen DJ, Es G-A van, Steg PG, Morel M,
913 Mauri L, Vranckx P, McFadden E, Lansky A, Hamon M, Krucoff MW, Serruys PW. Clinical End
914 Points in Coronary Stent Trials: A Case for Standardized Definitions. *Circulation.* 2007;115:2344–
915 2351.
916

917 11. Kang L, Chen W, Petrick NA, Gallas BD. Comparing two correlated C indices with right-
918 censored survival outcome: a one-shot nonparametric approach. *Stat Med.* 2015;34:685–703.
919

920 12. Steyerberg EW, Pencina MJ, Lingsma HF, Kattan MW, Vickers AJ, Van Calster B.
921 Assessing the incremental value of diagnostic and prognostic markers: a review and illustration.
922 *Eur J Clin Invest.* 2012;42:216–228.
923

924 13. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, D'Agostino RB, Vasan RS. Evaluating the added predictive
925 ability of a new marker: from area under the ROC curve to reclassification and beyond. *Stat Med.*
926 2008;27:157–172; discussion 207-212.
927

928 14. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, Pencina KM, Janssens ACJW, Greenland P. Interpreting
929 incremental value of markers added to risk prediction models. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2012;176:473–481.
930

931 15. Gargiulo G, Valgimigli M, Capodanno D, Bittl JA. State of the art: duration of dual
932 antiplatelet therapy after percutaneous coronary intervention and coronary stent implantation -
933 past, present and future perspectives. *EuroIntervention J Eur Collab Work Group Interv Cardiol Eur
934 Soc Cardiol.* 2017;13:717–733.
935

936 16. Guerrero C, Garay A, Ariza-Solé A, Formiga F, Raposeiras-Roubín S, Abu-Assi E,
937 D'Ascenzo F, Kinnaird T, Manzano-Fernández S, Alegre O, Sánchez-Salado JC, Lorente V,
938 Templin C, Velicki L, Xanthopoulou I, Cerrato E, Rognoni A, Boccuzzi G, Omedè P, Montabone A,
939 Taha S, Durante A, Gili S, Magnani G, Conrotto F, Bertaina M, Autelli M, Grosso A, Blanco PF,
940 Quadri G, Varbella F, Tomassini F, Queija BC, Paz RC, Fernández MC, Pousa IM, Gallo D,
941 Morbiducci U, Dominguez-Rodriguez A, Valdés M, Alexopoulos D, Íñiguez-Romo A, Gaita F,
942 Cequier Á. Anemia in patients with acute coronary syndromes treated with prasugrel or ticagrelor:
943 Insights from the RENAMI registry. *Thromb Res.* 2018;167:142–148.
944

- 945
946
947 17. Amin AP, Bachuwar A, Reid KJ, Chhatriwalla AK, Salisbury AC, Yeh RW, Kosiborod M,
948 Wang TY, Alexander KP, Gosch K, Cohen DJ, Spertus JA, Bach RG. Nuisance bleeding with
949 prolonged dual antiplatelet therapy after acute myocardial infarction and its impact on health
950 status. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:2130–2138.
951
- 952 18. Généreux P, Giustino G, Witzienbichler B, Weisz G, Stuckey TD, Rinaldi MJ, Neumann F-J,
953 Metzger DC, Henry TD, Cox DA, Duffy PL, Mazzaferri E, Yadav M, Francese DP, Palmerini T,
954 Kirtane AJ, Litherland C, Mehran R, Stone GW. Incidence, Predictors, and Impact of Post-
955 Discharge Bleeding After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015;66:1036–
956 1045.
957
- 958 19. Almendro-Delia M, García-Alcántara Á, de la Torre-Prados MV, Reina-Toral A, Arboleda-
959 Sánchez JA, Butrón-Calderón M, García-Guerrero A, de la Chica-Ruiz Ruano R, Hidalgo-Urbano
960 R, García-Rubira JC. Safety and Efficacy of Prasugrel and Ticagrelor in Acute Coronary
961 Syndrome. Results of a “Real World” Multicenter Registry. *Rev Espanola Cardiol Engl Ed*.
962 2017;70:952–959.
963
- 964 20. Abu-Assi E, Raposeiras-Roubin S, Cobas-Paz R, Caneiro-Queija B, Martínez-Reglero C,
965 Rodríguez-Rodríguez JM, Baz A, Íñiguez-Romo A. Assessing the performance of the PRECISE-
966 DAPT and PARIS risk scores for predicting one-year out-of-hospital bleeding in acute coronary
967 syndrome patients. *EuroIntervention J Eur Collab Work Group Interv Cardiol Eur Soc Cardiol*.
968 2018;13:1914–1922.
969
- 970 21. Raposeiras-Roubín S, Caneiro Queija B, D'Ascenzo F, Kinnaird T, Ariza-Solé A, Manzano-
971 Fernández S, Templin C, Velicki L, Xanthopoulou I, Cerrato E, Quadri G, Rognoni A, Boccuzzi G,
972 Montabone A, Taha S, Durante A, Gili S, Magnani G, Autelli M, Grosso A, Flores Blanco P, Garay
973 A, Varbella F, Tomassini F, Cobas Paz R, Cespón Fernández M, Muñoz Pousa I, Gallo D,
974 Morbiducci U, Domínguez-Rodríguez A, Baz-Alonso JA, Calvo-Iglesias F, Valdés M, Cequier Á,
975 Gaita F, Alexopoulos D, Íñiguez-Romo A, Abu-Assi E. Usefulness of the PARIS Score to Evaluate
976 the Ischemic-hemorrhagic Net Benefit With Ticagrelor and Prasugrel After an Acute Coronary
977 Syndrome. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*. 2019; 72:215-223.
978
- 979 22. Ariza-Solé A, Formiga F, Lorente V, Sánchez-Salado JC, Sánchez-Elvira G, Roura G,
980 Sánchez-Prieto R, Vila M, Moliner P, Cequier A. Efficacy of bleeding risk scores in elderly patients
981 with acute coronary syndromes. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*. 2014;67:463-70.
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003

1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

Supplementary Methods

Leading Study Centers

Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche, Divisione di Cardiologia, Città della Salute e della Scienza, Turin, Italy

Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Álvaro Cunqueiro, Vigo, Spain.

PolitoBIOMed Lab, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Politecnico di Torino.

Participating Study Centers

Department of Cardiology, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Torino, Italy.

Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Álvaro Cunqueiro, Vigo, Spain.

Cardiology Department, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff, United Kingdom.

Department of Cardiology, University Hospital de Bellvitge, Barcelona, Spain.

Department of Cardiology, University Hospital Virgen Arrixaca, Murcia, Spain.

Department of Cardiology, University Heart Center, University Hospital Zurich, Switzerland.

Institute of cardiovascular Diseases, Vojvodina, Serbia.

University Patras Hospital, Athens, Greece.

Interventional Unit, San Luigi Gonzaga University Hospital, Orbassano and Infermi Hospital, Rivoli, Italy.

Catheterization Laboratory, Maggiore della Carità Hospital, Novara, Italy.

Department of Cardiology, S.G. Bosco Hospital, Torino, Italy.

Department of Cardiology, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University.

U.O. Cardiologia, Ospedale Valduce, Como, Italy. Department of Cardiology, University Hospital from Canarias, Tenerife, Spain.

1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Supplementary table 1: variables comprising the PARIS bleeding risk score.

Variable	Assigned points
Age, years	
<50	0
50–59	1
60–69	2
70–79	3
≥80	4
Body mass index, kg/m ²	
<25	2
25–34.9	0
≥35	2
Current smoking	
Yes	2
No	0
Anaemia	
Present	3
Absent	0
Creatinine clearance <60 ml/min	
Present	2
Absent	0
Triple therapy on discharge	
Yes	2
No	0

1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180

Supplementary table 2: variables comprising the PARIS ischemic risk score.

Variable	Assigned points
Diabetes mellitus	
None	0
Non insulin-dependent	1
Insulin-dependent	3
ACS	
No	0
Yes Tn-negative	1
Yes Tn-positive	2
Current smoking	
Yes	1
No	0
Prior PCI	
Yes	2
No	0
Prior CABG	
Yes	2
No	0
Creatinine clearance <60 ml/min	
Present	2
Absent	0

Supplementary Table 3. Net benefit of using the PRECISE-DAPT and PARIS scores compared to alternative strategies for identifying **BARC type 3 or 5** bleeding risk conditional on different risk thresholds.

Risk threshold (%)	Net benefit of assuming all as low risk	Net benefit of assuming all as high risk	Net benefit of using PRECISE-DAPT	Net benefit of using PARIS
1	0%	0,9%	0,9%	0,9%
2	0%	-0,09%	0,38%	0,25%
3	0%	-1,07%	0,08%	0%

Note: net benefit at different risk thresholds is calculated as $\{ \text{true-positive classifications} - [\% \text{ risk threshold} / (100 - \% \text{ risk threshold}) \times \text{false-positive classifications}] \} / \text{total number of participants}$.

The number of additional true positives per 100 patients the risk scores can identify without additional false positives, is calculated as follows: $(\% \text{ net benefit of using the score of interest} - \% \text{ net benefit of the alternative strategy in question}) / [\% \text{ risk threshold} / 100 - \text{risk threshold}]$. This value is the equivalent to the reduction in false positive without a decrease in the number of true positives. The calculated net benefits are relative to not use any risk score.

Class of risk of patients in the RENAMI registry




Figure 1. Patients risk class in the RENAMI registry using the PRECISE-DAPT, PARIS bleeding and PARIS ischemic risk scores.




Figure 4: Decision curves for the PRECISE DAPT and PARIS bleeding RS derived risk thresholds for predicting MB bleeding.

	RENAMI	PRECISE-DAPT (derivation cohort)	PARIS (derivation cohort)
Number of patients	4424	14963	4190
Age (mean ± SD)	60.9 ± 11.5	---*	63.6±11.0
Age (median (IQR))	61.0 (53-69)	65.0 (56.9-73)	---*
Female, %	20.8	29.5	25.4
Weight, Kg	80.1 ± 13.8	74.0 (65-84)	---*
BMI (mean ± SD)	27.4 ± 4.1	---*	29.3±5.5
BMI median (IQR))	27 (25.0 - 29.0)	---*	---*
Active smoking, %	29.1	28	17.8
Hypertension (%)	54	71.9	81.4
Diabetes Mellitus (%)	29.9	27.8	34.1
LVEF (mean ± SD)	51.2 ± 9.4	---*	---*
Peripheral vascular disease,%	3.6	10.4	8
Prior MI,%	16.5	19.8	24.9
Prior PCI,%	17.9	---*	41.9
Prior CABG,%	0.9	---*	14.4
Prior stroke,%	5.2	3.6	3.5
Prior Bleeding,%	2.4	1.9	---*
Malignancy,%	4.5	---*	---*
UA,%	9	22.7	29.9
NSTEMI,%	33	14	7.9
STEMI,%	58	18.9	---*
Haemoglobin (mean ± SD)	14.1 ± 1.3		---*
Haemoglobin (median (IQR))	14 (13.2 - 14.5)	13.8 (12.7-14.9)	---*
Anaemia,%	1.9	---*	15
WBC count (10 ³ units/μL) (mean ±SD)	10602 ± 1381	---*	---*
WBC count (10 ³ units/μL) (median (IQR))	10.600 (8.200 - 12.335)	7.800 (6.300-10.200)	---*
CrCl (mL/min) (mean ±SD)	96.7 ± 37.3	79.1 (60.8-98.0)	---*
CrCl (mL/min) (median (IQR))	93 (71-118)		
CrCl <60 mL/min, %	15.9		17.8
DES,%	93	87.2	100
BMS,%	7	12.8	0
Treatment at discharge			
Aspirin,%	99.9	98.7	
Clopidogrel,%	0	87.7	92.1
Prasugrel,%	39	7.6	6.2
Ticagrelor,%	61	3.9	0
Statin,%	51	89.4	
ACE inhibitors/ARB II,%	34	66.7	
B-blocker,%	37	74.3	

Table 1: Baseline characteristics. LVEF= left ventricle ejection fraction. MI= myocardial infarction. PCI= percutaneous coronary intervention. CABG= coronary artery bypass graft. UA= unstable angina. NSTEMI=

non-ST segment elevated myocardial infarction. STEMI= ST segment elevated myocardial infarction.
ACE/ARB: ACE inhibitor or angiotensin-II receptor blocker. *Data not reported in the original study.


Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction by different DAPT durations		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
Overall, n° of MB events= 83	0.653 (0.591-0.714)	0.593 (0.528-0.658)
12 months, n° of MB events= 44	0.624 (0.530-0.718)	0.526 (0.432-0.620)
More than 12 months, n° of MB events= 14	0.648 (0.491-0.805)	0.666 (0.514-0.818)
Less than 12 months, n° of MB events= 25	0.689 (0.596-0.782)	0.633 (0.517-0.749)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for ischemic risk prediction by different DAPT durations		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS ischemic RS
Overall, n° of ischemic events= 133	0.568 (0.509-0.626)	0.604 (0.550-0.657)
12 months; n° of ischemic events= 54	0.525 (0.423-0.628)	0.571 (0.492-0.650)
More than 12 months; n° of ischemic events= 40	0.537 (0.431-0.643)	0.656 (0.564-0.755)
Less than 12 months n° of ischemic events= 39	0.648 (0.550-0.745)	0.597 (0.492-0.702)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in STEMI patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in STEMI: 48	0.632 (0.547-0.717)	0.575 (0.487-0.663)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for ischemic risk prediction in STEMI patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS ischemic RS
n° of ischemic events in STEMI: 70	0.574 (0.488-0.659)	0.629 (0.558-0.701)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in NSTEMACS patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in NSTEMACS: 35	0.682 (0.597-0.767)	0.619 (0.524-0.713)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for ischemic risk prediction in NSTEMACS patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS ischemic RS
n° of ischemic events in NSTEMACS: 63	0.551 (0.473-0.628)	0.569 (0.489-0.650)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in prasugrel patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in prasugrel treated pts: 25	0.623 (.504-.743)	0.586 (0.460-0.713)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for ischemic risk prediction in prasugrel patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS ischemic RS
n° of ischemic events in prasugrel treated pts: 49	0.525 (0.429-0.620)	0.639 (0.551-0.727)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in ticagrelor patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in ticagrelor treated pts: 58	0.648 (0.576-0.719)	0.573 (0.499-0.6488)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for ischemic risk prediction in ticagrelor patients		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS ischemic RS
n° of ischemic events in ticagrelor treated pts: 84	0.585 (0.514-0.657)	0.574 (0.505-0.642)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in patients > 75 years		
	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in the 581 pts > 75 years: 21	0.621 (0.559 - 0.691)	0.603 (0.547 - 0.663)
Discrimination capacity (C-statistic) for MB risk prediction in patients with serum creatinine > 1.5 mg/dl		

	PRECISE DAPT	PARIS bleeding RS
n° of MB events in the 261 pts with serum creatinine > 1.5 mg/dl: 7	0.744 (0.626 - 0.864)	0.693 (0.587 - 0.803)



Table 2: C-statistic analysis for RSs accuracy for different subgroups of patients.

Prof. Valgimigli has received research grants to the institution from Terumo, Medicure, Abbott, Astrazeneca and honorarium fees from Abbott, Chiesi, Bayer, Daiichi Sankyo, Amgen, Terumo, Astrazeneca, Alvimedica and Biosensors.




None of the other authors have any conflict of interests to declare





Supplementary materials figure 1: variables comprising the PRECISE-DAPT bleeding risk score.







Supplementary Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier curves for BARC type 3 or 5 bleeding. A) Using PRECISE-DAPT classification system, and B) using PARIS bleeding risk classification system.






Supplementary materials figure 3. Kaplan-Meier curves for cardiovascular death. A) Using PRECISE-DAPT risk strata. B) Using PARIS ischemic risk strata. C) Using PARIS RS risk strata.



Supplementary materials figure 4. Kaplan-Meier curves for Myocardial infraction/stent thrombosis. A) Using PRECISE-DAPT risk strata. B) Using PARIS ischemic RS risk strata.



- Supplementary Figure 5: Calibration of predicted against observed MB and **ischemic events (MI and ST)** with RSs.



Supplementary materials figure 6. Average daily difference between ischemic and bleeding events. A) Using PRECISE-DAPT B) Using PARIS bleeding RS risk. C) Using PARIS ischemic RS.