The Impact of Environmental Factors on Heart Failure Decompensations
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Abstract:
Heart failure (HF) is defined as the incapacity of the heart to pump sufficiently to maintain blood flow to meet the body's needs. Often, this causes sudden worsening of the signs and symptoms of heart failure (decompensations), which may lead to hospital admissions, deteriorating patients' quality of life and causing an increment on the healthcare cost. Environmental exposure is an important but underappreciated risk factor contributing to the development and severity of cardiovascular diseases, such as HF. In this paper, we describe the development and results of a methodology to determine the effect of environmental factors on HF decompensations by means of hospital admissions. For that, a total number of 8338 hospitalizations of 5343 different patients, and weather and air quality information from open databases have been considered. The results demonstrate that several environmental factors, such as weather temperature, have an impact on the HF related hospital admissions rate, and hence, on HF decompensations and patient’s quality of life. The next steps are first to predict the number of hospital admissions based on the presented study, and second, the inclusion of these environmental factors on predictive models to assess the risk of decompensation of an ambulatory patient in real time.

1 INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) has been defined as global pandemic, since it affects around 26 million people worldwide and is increasing in prevalence (Ponikowski et al., 2014). In 2012 it was responsible for an estimated health expenditure of around $31 billion, equivalent to more than 10% of the total health expenditure for cardiovascular diseases in the United States (US) (Benjamin et al., 2016). And, according to the American Heart Association (Heidenreich et al., 2011), these costs are estimated to increase to $77.7 billion in 2030.

HF is characterized by the heart’s inability to pump an adequate supply of blood to the body to meet the body needs. Without sufficient blood flow, all major body functions are disrupted, which lead on HF patients’ decompensations and hospital admissions. As several studies have already demonstrated, environmental exposure is an important risk factor (Angelini et al., 2017; Brook et al., 2010; Gurri, 2012; Warren et al., 2002; Woolf and Aron, 2013), which may also contribute to the severity of HF. In the field of HF, limited studies investigate the impact of these factors (Burnett et al., 1997; Das et al., 2014; Levin et al., 2018; Morris et al., 1995; Stewart et al., 2002).

This paper presents a methodology to study the impact of different environmental factors on HF decompensations, and the results obtained in a real case study.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 – Related Work, introduces different studies related to our work. Section 3 – Datasets, presents the two types of datasets used for the study. Section 4 – Data Analysis, describes the type of data analysis proposed for the experiment. Section 5 – Results, provides the results obtained in the experiment. Finally, in Section 6 – Conclusion and Future Work, the conclusions and future studies that will follow this paper are discussed.
2 RELATED WORK

As mentioned before, several investigations about the impact of environmental factors in public health are already published. A relevant example is the American Heart Association scientific statement on "Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease" which concluded that exposure to particulate matter (PM) air pollution contributes to cardiovascular morbidity and mortality (Brook et al., 2004). This study was updated later giving new evidence of the impact of PM exposure with cardiovascular diseases (Brook et al., 2010). Moreover in D’Amato’s study (D’Amato et al., 2010), urban air pollution and climate change were demonstrated to be environmental risk factors of respiratory diseases. A similar research indicates that air pollution is a major preventable cause of increased incidence and exacerbation of respiratory diseases (Laubach and Kipen, 2012).

Nevertheless, as said before, fewer studies in the field of HF have been carried out, of which some most relevant are analysed in the following lines. In 1995, an article published in the American Journal of Public Health investigated the association between hospital admissions for congestive HF and air pollutants, where ambient carbon monoxide levels were positively associated with the admissions (Morris et al., 1995). Two years later, another Canadian study examined the role that ambient air pollution plays in exacerbating cardiac disease (Burnett et al., 1997). They found a positive association between daily admissions fluctuations of congestive elderly HF patients and variations in ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, and the coefficient of haze.

Additionally, other investigations about the effect of meteorology in HF health status have been carried out. In 2014, the International Journal of Cardiology published a text where the relationships between meteorological events and acute HF was globally explored (Das et al., 2014). The results showed that meteorological fluctuations appear most relevant in the 3 days prior to the HF hospitalization with temperature, demonstrating a relationship with HF. In contrast, some authors demonstrated that the number of hospitalizations for HF increases during winter (Levin et al., 2018). Others concluded that there is a substantial seasonal variation in HF hospitalizations and deaths (Stewart et al., 2002).

However, to the best of our knowledge, there is still further research to be done in order to better determine the impact of a set of several environmental factors on HF decompensations, being the field where our work is focused on.

3 DATASETS

This study makes use of two different sets of data: one related to the number of hospital admissions, and the other one related to the environmental factors to determine whether they have an impact on HF related decompensations.

3.1 Hospital Admissions

The way to study HF decompensations is by means of hospital admissions. Therefore, the first dataset compiles the daily hospitalizations related to HF in the public hospital OSI Bilbao-Basurto (Osakidetza), located in the Basque Country (Spain). The hospital has been gathering this information since 1994, but only after 2010 this information started to be recorded in Electronic Health Records. Due to the adaptation to this new electronic system, the next two years the information was not usable. Therefore, the usable admissions dataset is from January of 2012 to August of 2017.

The dataset consists of two attributes: (i) date of admission for each patient, and (ii) date of discharge of the patient. Nevertheless, only the first attribute was used, being the date of discharge irrelevant for this study. A total number of 8338 hospitalizations of 5343 different patients are available in this dataset, with a mean of 4.02 admissions per day.

3.2 Environmental Data

This environmental dataset is separated in weather information and air quality information. This information was selected due to their demonstrated impact on HF decompensations in previous studies (Burnett et al., 1997; Das et al., 2014; Levin et al., 2018; Morris et al., 1995; Stewart et al., 2002).

3.2.1 Weather

The Basque Agency of Meteorology (Euskelmet) enables the possibility to access weather data recorded since 2003, from the Open Data Euskadi website (Basque Government, 2009). This information is collected every ten minutes by each station of Euskelmet distributed in Euskadi. The different attributes that can be found in these datasets are listed below (Table 1).
Among all the different stations distributed in the three provinces of Euskadi, for this study the data from the one located in Deusto (Bilbao) was selected since it is the closest one to the patients of the study. However, obtaining information from the nearest station for each patient seems to be the best option. But, as we are studying the general trend of each variable, a constant value for each one was needed. Henceforth, the error caused by this extrapolation is assumed.

The preprocessing of this dataset consisted in three steps.

First, the selection of the attributes for obtaining a complete dataset was done, since not all the variables were measured in all the years between 2012 and 2017 (some of them started to be measured later). In order to obtain a complete dataset, only the attributes measured in those years were taken into account. Thus, the parameters of air temperature, humidity, precipitation, and irradiation are the ones used for this experiment.

Second, each parameter was grouped per day (data was recorded every 10 minutes), calculating their mean value. In addition, as the literature suggests (Das et al., 2014), in the case of temperature, the minimum and maximum values for each day were also added to the dataset.

Finally, an imputation of missing values (0.33% of the data) was done, which may be caused by technical problems in the station. The imputation by Structural Model & Kalman Smoothing was used for this, as it is the one that best performs for time series with a strong seasonality (Moritz and Bartz-Beielstein, 2017). In summary, the dataset corresponding to weather consists of humidity (%), precipitation (l/m²), irradiation (w/m²), mean temperature (°C), minimum temperature (°C), and maximum temperature (°C).

### 3.2.2 Air Quality

The Open Data Euskadi website also gives the opportunity to recover information about the air quality (Gobierno Vasco, 2017). The dataset is formed by air quality specific parameters, which are described in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitric Oxide (NO)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOX)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropospheric Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter 10 (PM10)</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthoxylene</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>µg/m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After selecting the parameters that were giving a complete dataset between 2012 and 2017, the final dataset is containing the attributes Nitric Oxide (NO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Nitrogen Oxides (NOX), Particulate Matter 10 (PM10), and Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂).

For the preprocessing part of this dataset, the missing values that corresponded to an 11% of the data were imputed using the same method as for the previous dataset, the imputation by Structural Model & Kalman Smoothing (Moritz and Bartz-Beielstein, 2017).

### 4 DATA ANALYSIS

Before starting the analysis and to support our hypothesis that environmental factors may contribute to HF patients’ health status, a pre-analysis was done. For that, the daily mean value of the number of hospitalizations within each month was illustrated (Figure 1).

Figure 1 shows that in European warm period (from June to October) there are significant less admissions that in the cold period (from December to March), although some studies present the opposite results (Das et al., 2014). Hence, to confirm our hypothesis the following study was conducted.
4.1 Grouping

Note that the number of hospitalizations per day is 4.02 (Section 3.1). This is not a sufficient number to analyse the data within each day. Therefore, each attribute of the study was grouped by weeks: on the one hand, admissions related data is grouped by the total number of admissions in each week. On the other hand, the mean, maximum, minimum and the standard deviation of each week are used to group the environmental attributes.

Once the data was grouped by weeks, two different studies were done: (i) a univariate regression to determine whether the admissions may influence future hospitalizations’ prediction (Section 4.2), and (ii) a multivariate regression to determine the impact of environmental factors on admission rates (Section 4.3).

4.2 Univariate Regression

In order to study the effect of admissions in future hospitalizations’ rate, firstly time series decomposition is performed (Section 4.2.1) as exploratory data analysis. Secondly, the best univariate ARIMA model is tentatively identified and finally determined (Section 4.2.2).

4.2.1 Decomposition

The hospitalization rate may vary on time depending on several factors. In order to determine how these variations behave, a decomposition process was conducted. This is a mathematical procedure which transforms a time series into three components, each of them depicting one of the underlying categories of patterns: seasonality, trend and random (Jebb and Tay, 2017). Seasonality represents patterns that are repeated in a fixed period of time (e.g. repeating pattern over years). Trend is the underlying tendency of the data, and random is the residuals of the original time series after the extraction of the seasonality and trend, which is also called noise or reminder.

In Figure 2 the decomposition of admissions on these three components is shown. The first graph represents the original admissions data series, and below the seasonality of it is illustrated. Next, admissions’ trend is presented, and the last graph reflects the random part of the time series after the extraction of seasonality and trend components.

Figure 2 shows a clear seasonality of admissions, since there is a similar pattern every year. In addition, the tendency represented in the third graph shows changes in the number of admissions over time.

4.2.2 Univariate ARIMA

Once the decomposition was done, the hospitalizations’ dataset was analysed as time series to determine the impact of admissions on following week’s hospitalizations. For that, the ARIMA model was implemented.

ARIMA stands for auto-regressive integrated moving average and it is a class of statistical models for analysing and forecasting time series data.
(Jenkins, 2014) It is specified by three order parameters: the auto-regressive (AR) parameter \( p \), which specifies the number of time lags used in the model; the \( d \) represents the degree of differencing (subtracting its current and previous values \( d \) times) in the integrated component (I); and the order \( q \) of the moving average component (MA) determines the number of terms to include in the model.

However, to determine the values of the order parameters \( p, d, q \) the autocorrelation function (ACF) and the partial autocorrelation function (PACF) were computed (Jain and Mallick, 2017). Figure 3, represents the ACF and PACF of admissions, considering the 53 weeks of a year. It shows that there is a correlation between the number of admissions in a week with the adjoining precedent weeks and with the week of the previous years.

![Figure 3: Autocorrelation (ACF) and partial autocorrelation (PACF) plots of admissions.](image)

The smooth decreasing shape of the ACF graph points at the AR as the best model to be applied in ARIMA (Jebb and Tay, 2017).

However, to obtain an optimal result to estimate the likelihood of a model to predict the future values, different values for \( p, d, q \) were tested. For that selection we took into account the Akaike information criterion (AIC), from which the one that presents the minimum AIC value was considered the optimal (Akaike, 1974). The results showed that ARIMA \((p, d, q) = (0,1,1)\) got the best results (minimum AIC).

Once these ARIMA orders were established, it was essential to determine whether the information extraction was performed correctly. This process occurs in two steps: (1) visually examining an ACF and PACF of the residuals, and (2) conducting a Ljung-Box test. In the visual analysis of the ACF and PACF of the residuals a significant correlation was observed every two months. As expected, in the widely used formal test of Ljung-Box test (Ljung and Box, 1978), applied in our study, we saw that there was still some remaining information extractable (\( p\)-value = 0.028), caused by the remaining correlation observed in the residuals every two months. However, it has not been possible to extract further information.

### 4.3 Multivariate Regression

The next step was to analyse the regression taking also into account the environmental information. To do that, the first step was to calculate the correlations between all environmental factors and admission rates. This way we could select the most significant factors for the experiment. Following, the multivariate ARIMA was implemented to determine their impact all together.

#### 4.3.1 Selection of Attributes

As mentioned before, the variables were grouped by weeks (see Section 4.1).

The correlation was estimated using the non-parametric test of Kendall, which measures the strength of dependence between two numeric variables (Rui and Vera, 2017) and it is one of the most used test for this type of non-parametric data. In addition, this analysis was done relating all the attributes with the number of admissions of the following week.

Note that, since the mean, maximum and minimum values of the environmental factors were closely related, only the one with the highest correlation was taken into account per attribute. In Table 3 we summarize the selected ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humidity</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.0469</td>
<td>0.2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0795</td>
<td>0.0461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.3794</td>
<td>1.44E-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irradiation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.2629</td>
<td>3.88E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.2107</td>
<td>1.82E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_2)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.1876</td>
<td>1.95E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_X)</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.2196</td>
<td>4.06E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-0.0485</td>
<td>0.3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_2)</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.2692</td>
<td>3.17E-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the most correlated attribute was the temperature, showing the highest (inversed) correlation value. This shows that the lower the temperature, the larger is next week admission rate. On the other hand, humidity, precipitation, and PM10 parameters do not have significant correlations in this study, neither relevant p-values.
Besides this analysis, environmental factors variations, such as temperature variations, might also affect the health status. Therefore, the impact of the highest temperature change per week, and the standard deviation (SD) of each attribute per week were also studied following the same procedure (Table 4).

Table 4 shows that the temperature change does not affect in the next week’s admission rate. However, some attributes’ instability (standard deviation) over the week seems to be correlated. Hence, the standard deviation of the attributes Irradiation, NO, NOX and SO2 will be checked in the multivariate ARIMA regression.

Table 4: Correlations of the attributes’ standard deviations and the temperature change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute SD</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humidity</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irradiation</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>4.13e-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.54e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.73e-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. change</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.58e-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Multivariate ARIMA

Using the model extracted from the univariate ARIMA analysis and after the selection of the most correlated environmental attributes, a multivariate ARIMA model was carried out.

For that, first we employed all attributes and tested the AIC value. If the p-value of an attribute was too high, this value was discarded, and the AIC value was checked again. If the value improved (AIC decreased), we kept that value out of our model. Otherwise we put it back. This process was done iteratively until AIC did not decrease anymore.

5 RESULTS

In this chapter, the results obtained from univariate and multivariate ARIMA regressions are presented. On the one hand, univariate ARIMA shows an AIC value of 1939.71, with p-values of <2.2e-16 for MA1 (moving average order 1 of admissions) and <6.248e-8 for SMA1 (seasonal moving average order 1 of admissions). It is noticeable that the result obtained is quite precise.

Even so, adding the environmental variables (multivariate ARIMA), it was found to be possible to improve the predictive power of the model. At the beginning, it was tested with all the attributes, slightly improving the result (AIC of 1631.6). After a filtering of attributes depending on their p-value, the optimal model was achieved with an AIC of 1620.59. This last model is represented in Table 5 with their respective p-values for each variable.

Table 5: Results of the multivariate ARIMA model study. Significant codes: 0.001 ***, 0.01 **, 0.05 *).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma1</td>
<td>-0.9230</td>
<td>0.0258</td>
<td>&lt;2.2e-16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sma1</td>
<td>-0.7075</td>
<td>0.1192</td>
<td>2.929e-09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.2935</td>
<td>0.1189</td>
<td>0.0136 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precip.</td>
<td>-0.0342</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>0.0197 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Temp.</td>
<td>-0.6056</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
<td>0.0012 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max SO2</td>
<td>0.3171</td>
<td>0.1176</td>
<td>0.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. NOX</td>
<td>-0.0797</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>0.0197 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5, the attribute with most impact on the number of admissions is the admissions itself. This is reflected in the variables called “ma1” and “sma1”, which are the moving average and the seasonal moving average (season of a year) respectively. Nevertheless, environmental factors also have a considerable influence. For example, the model predicts that when the mean temperature rises 1°C the estimated number of hospitalizations will decrease by 0.6 (when the rest of attributes remain constant). Moreover, the maximum value for SO2 within a week also has an effect (p-value = 0.007). Additionally, the variability of air quality parameter (NOX) also presents an impact on admissions predictions. Finally, the results also present that the more it rains, the less number of hospitalizations occur the following week.

The mean air temperature, which has high impact on admission rate prediction (see Table 5), is represented in a more visual way by comparing the number of admissions per weeks with the mean temperature, using a line graph (see Figure 4).
6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE GUIDELINES

In this paper, the impact of different environmental factors on Heart Failure (HF) decompensations by means of hospital admissions is studied. For that, a regression model for time series was built, and the external attributes that most affect the number of hospitalizations were tested. In this context, air temperature was concluded to be the most significant environmental factor, although some other attributes, such as precipitation, along with SO₂ and NOX air quality parameters, were also demonstrated to be relevant.

In the future, these environmental factors will be included on already built predictive models to assess the risk of decompensation of an ambulatory patient (Larburu et al., 2018). This model predicts the decomposition risk within seven days, using the previous days’ monitoring data of the patients. Adding the environmental factors described in this study may improve its predictiveness.

Moreover, despite the objective of the study was to just detect environmental attributes influence in the HF patients’ decompensations, a predictive model to predict the admissions’ number of the following week could be developed. This could be very useful for the physicians to anticipate a possible bed over-occupancy situation in hospitals. A first test of this model has been conducted with ARIMA predicting model. It predicts with a mean error of 4 admissions each week (when the number of hospitalizations per week is 28). Nevertheless, this testing error is achieved using the same dataset for training and for testing. Hence, unless it is not tested in a new dataset, the results cannot be generalized. Therefore, this test remains as future work.
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