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## Supplementary Table I

C-indices for all-cause mortality according to the different ABC -risk scores; ABC -death, ABC -stroke, and ABC -bleeding

Full cohort

| Derivation cohort |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| ABC-death | $0.74[0.73,0.76]$ |
| ABC-stroke | $0.68[0.67,0.70]$ |
| ABC-bleeding | $0.70[0.68,0.72]$ |
| $\mathrm{CHA}_{2} \mathrm{DS}_{2}$-VASc | $0.59[0.57,0.61]$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Validation cohort | $0.74[0.72,0.76]$ |
| ABC-death | $0.67[0.65,0.69]$ |
| ABC-stroke | $0.70[0.68,0.73]$ |
| ABC-bleeding | $0.58[0.56,0.61]$ |
| $\mathrm{CHA}_{2} \mathrm{DS}_{2}$-VASc |  |

## Supplementary Table II

C-indices for all-cause mortality according to the different $A B C$-risk scores; $A B C$-death, $A B C$ stroke, and ABC-bleeding

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Derivation cohort | $0.74[0.73,0.76]$ |
| ABC-death score | $0.68[0.67,0.70]$ |
| ABC-stroke score | $0.70[0.68,0.72]$ |
| ABC-bleeding score |  |
|  |  |
| Validation cohort | $0.74[0.72,0.76]$ |
| ABC-death score | $0.67[0.65,0.69]$ |
| ABC-stroke score | $0.70[0.68,0.73]$ |
| ABC-bleeding score |  |

## Supplementary Table III

Event rates and hazard ratios between ABC-death risk classes for the derivation and the validation cohorts

| Risk class | N | Events | Incidence rate* | Hazard ratio |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Derivation cohort |  |  |  |  |
| Low (0-2 \%) | 6488 | 183 | $1.39[1.20,1.61]$ | $1.00(\mathrm{ref})$ |
| Intermediate (2-5 \%) | 5556 | 368 | $3.44[3.10,3.81]$ | $2.49[2.09,2.97]$ |
| High (5-10 \%) | 1872 | 286 | $8.37[7.43,9.40]$ | $6.07[5.45,7.31]$ |
| Very high (> 10 \%) | 695 | 210 | $18.49[16.07,21.16]$ | $13.54[11.10,16.51]$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Validation cohort |  | 84 | $1.14[0.91,1.42]$ | $1.00(\mathrm{ref})$ |
| Low (0-2 \%) | 3642 | 325 | $3.51[3.06,4.00]$ | $3.07[2.39,3.95]$ |
| Intermediate (2-5\%) | 1161 | 166 | $7.55[6.45,8.79]$ | $6.63[5.10,8.62]$ |
| High (5-10 \%) | 483 | 119 | $14.25[11.81,17.05]$ | $12.60[9.53,16.66]$ |
| Very high (> $10 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## Supplementary Table IV

C-indices for the contemporary ABC-death score without GDF-15 in the full cohorts and in subgroups
A. All-cause mortality

|  | Full cohort |  | No prior <br> stroke/TIA | No prior <br> heart failure | TTR <65\% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

B. Cardiovascular mortality

|  | Full cohort |  | No prior <br> stroke/TIA | No prior <br> heart failure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Derivation cohort; Events/N | $532 / 14611$ | $406 / 11858$ | $268 / 10080$ | TTR <65\% |

TTR - Time in therapeutic range (INR 2.0-3.0)
Contemporary ABC-death - Age, $\underline{B} i o m a r k e r s ~(c a r d i a c ~ t r o p o n i n ~ a n d ~ N T-p r o B N P), ~ \underline{C l i n i c a l ~}$ history of heart failure)

NOAC - non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulation
*Apixaban in the derivation cohort and dabigatran in the validation cohort

## Supplementary Figure I

Calibration of the ABC-death model for all-cause mortality


## Supplementary Figure II

Kaplan-Meier estimated cumulative event rate by randomized treatment (colour) by predicted ABC-death risk classes (panel): 0-1\%, 1-2\%, and $\geq 2 \%$ for all-cause mortality


## Supplementary Figure III

Nomogram for the ABC-death for cardiovascular mortality
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## Total Points



1-year risk of CV death


For each predictor, read the points assigned on the $0-10$ scale at the top and then sum these points. Find the number on the "Total Points" scale and then read the corresponding predictions of 1-year risk of death below it.
Continuous variables are represented from the 1st to the 99th percentiles.
The prediction model is preferably used as a web-based calculator or app.

## Supplementary Figure IV

Cumulative risk of cardiovascular death by predicted 1-year ABC-death risk group for the derivation (dashed lines, $n=14,611$ ) and the validation (solid lines, $n=8,548$ ) data


## Supplementary Figure VI

Decision curve analysis for cardiovascular mortality


Net benefit of using a model to predict one-year event of cardiovascular death as compared with strategies of "assume high risk to all" or "assume low risk to all" for different thresholds. A multivariable model based on all clinical information was used for comparison. The analysis is based on 24,348 patients from the ARISTOTLE and RE-LY trials.

ABC-death - Age, Biomarkers (cardiac troponin, NT-proBNP, and GDF-15), Clinical history of heart failure)

All clinical information - a model solely consisting of clinical variables (age, gender, smoking, alcohol, prior stroke/TIA, diabetes, hypertension, heart failure, prior myocardial infarction, peripheral arterial disease, vascular disease, AF-type, and prior bleeding)

## Supplementary Figure VI

Nomogram for the ABC-death score using cTnl-hs (instead of cTnT-hs)


Total Points


1-year risk of death

| $\Gamma$ | 1 | 1 | 1 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.002 | 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.020 .03 | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 |

For each predictor, read the points assigned on the $0-10$ scale at the top and then sum these points. Find the number on the "Total Points" scale and then read the corresponding predictions of 1-year risk of death below it.
Continuous variables are represented from the 1st to the 99th percentiles.
The prediction model is preferably used as a web-based calculator or app.

## Supplementary Figure VII

Nomogram for the ABC-death score without GDF-15 for all-cause mortality
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For each predictor, read the points assigned on the $0-10$ scale at the top and then sum these points. Find the number on the "Total Points" scale and then read the corresponding predictions of 1-year risk of death below it.
Continuous variables are represented from the 1st to the 99th percentiles.
The prediction model is preferably used as a web-based calculator or app.

## Supplementary Figure VIII

Nomogram for the ABC-death score without GDF-15 for cardiovascular mortality


For each predictor, read the points assigned on the $0-10$ scale at the top and then sum these points. Find the number on the "Total Points" scale and then read the corresponding predictions of 1-year risk of death below it.
Continuous variables are represented from the 1st to the 99th percentiles.
The prediction model is preferably used as a web-based calculator or app.

## Supplementary Figure IX

Exemplified application of the nomogram
Example: A 64-year old man with atrial fibrillation, hypertension, chronic heart failure, NTproBNP level of $5000 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$, GDF-15 $2500 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$, and troponin T (high sensitivity) of $40 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{L}$. By using the ABC-death score nomogram receives 0 p for age, 1.5 p for heart failure, 4.75 p for NT-proBNP, 5.25 p for GDF-15, and 6.75 p for troponin levels. A total of 18.25 p would equal a predicted 1-year risk of all-cause mortality of approximately $14 \%$.


For the same patient, by using the ABC-death score nomogram for cardiovascular mortality, receives 0 p for age, 1.5 p for heart failure, 4.25p for NT-proBNP, 2p for GDF-15, and 7p for troponin levels. A total of 14.75 p would equal a predicted 1-year risk of cardiovascular mortality of approximately $8 \%$.


## Summary of the derivation and validation cohorts

## Derivation cohort

ARISTOTLE was a double blind, randomised clinical trial that enrolled 18,201 patients with AF at increased risk for stroke at 1034 clinical sites in 39 countries between December 2006 and April 2010. Patients included had paroxysmal, persistent or permanent AF, or atrial flutter, and one or more of the following risk factors; age $\geq 75$ years, prior stroke, transient ischemic attack (TIA), or systemic embolus, heart failure, diabetes mellitus, or hypertension requiring pharmacologic treatment. Among the exclusion criteria were; clinically significant mitral stenosis, mechanical heart valve, recent stroke, previous intracranial haemorrhage, creatinine clearance less than $25 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, or active alcohol or drug abuse. Participants were randomised to warfarin $(n=9,081)$ or apixaban $(n=9,120)$. The median length of follow-up was 1.7 years for the 14,537 participants with biomarker samples available at randomisation after exclusion of 45 ( $0.3 \%$ ) patients with missing data.

## External validation cohort

RE-LY was a prospective, multicentre, randomized trial comparing two blinded doses of dabigatran with open label warfarin that enrolled 18,113 patients with AF at 951 clinical sites in 44 countries between December 2005 and Mars 2009. Inclusion criteria were documented atrial fibrillation and at least one of the following risk factors for stroke: previous stroke or TIA; congestive heart failure or reduced left ventricular ejection fraction (<40\%); at least 75 years of age; or at least 65 years of age with diabetes mellitus, hypertension, or coronary artery disease. Exclusion criteria included severe heart valve disorder, recent stroke, creatinine clearance less than $30 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$, or active liver disease. The median length of follow-up was 1.9 years for the 8,548 participants with biomarker samples available at randomisation.

## Statistical methods (detailed)

In the first step a model including all candidate predictors (listed in Figure 1 in the main article) was fitted in 14,611 patients from the ARISTOTLE trial. The full model was then approximated, blinded for the outcome to avoid overfitting, by a smaller model including the most predictive variables. The approximation was done in the following way. First an ordinary least squares model was fitted with the estimated linear predictor from the full model as outcome and including the same predictors as in the full model. This model had, by definition, an R-squared of 1.0. A fast backward elimination algorithm was then applied to the model removing the least important variables until a good enough approximation was achieved with as few variables kept as possible. An alternative model was created in the same manner but replacing cTnT-hs with cTnl-hs. Similarly, a model was developed for cardiovascular mortality. In a subset of patients with additional biomarkers available, an extended biomarker model was developed which also incorporated D-dimer and IL-6 among the candidate variables. The final models were presented as nomograms. Risk categories were created according to $0-2 \%, 2-5 \%, 5-10 \%$, and $>10 \%$ risk for death within one year and $0-1 \%, 1-2 \%, 2-5 \%$, and $>5 \%$ for cardiovascular death within one year. The reason for choosing different class limits is that the incidence rate for cardiovascular death is lower than for total death.

## Internal and external model validation

The model was internally validated using 150 bootstrap samples. External validation was conducted in 8,548 patients from the RE-LY trial. In the validation the predicted risk for each subject in the validation cohort was estimated by applying the model using the model coefficients derived in the derivation cohort. Thus, the model was not refitted in the validation data. In order to thoroughly compare the prognostication of death, the new
biomarker-based risk model was evaluated against a multivariable model solely based on clinical variables and the widely used $\mathrm{CHA}_{2} \mathrm{DS}_{2}$-VASc score, although originally created for stroke prediction.

Discrimination was assessed by Harrell's c-index ${ }^{26}$ and by comparing Kaplan-Meier curves and hazard ratios between the predefined risk categories. Calibration was assessed by comparing observed one-year event rates with predictions from the final model. Clinical usefulness and net benefit were estimated with decision curve analysis. ${ }^{27}$ The decision curve analysis estimate the net benefit of using the model for assigning subjects to either low or high risk for each possible threshold in comparison to not using the model and thus assuming either that everyone is at low risk or that everyone is at high risk. The net benefit at a given threshold gives the increased true positive rate without an increase of the false positive rate as compared to the two naïve approaches of assuming all low or all high risk. At a given threshold, the model with the highest net benefit is the superior model. The final model was also evaluated in different subgroups; without a history of stroke, without heart failure diagnosis, low time in therapeutic range (TTR), and in the groups randomised to apixaban and dabigatran therapy, respectively.

The analyses followed the framework for derivation and validation of prediction models proposed by Harrell, Steyerberg and Vergouwe, and Royston and Altman. ${ }^{26,28,29}$ The reporting followed the recently published TRIPOD statement. ${ }^{30}$ All analyses were performed using $R$ version 3.2.

## ABC-death score equations

## Models for all-cause mortality

Note that, in all models, before entering the variables in the equations, Age and NT-proBNP should be truncated as

```
Age = max(Age, 65)
```

NT-proBNP $=\max ($ NT-proBNP, 200)
and the biomarkers should be naturally log-transformed as

```
hs-cTnT = In(hs-cTnT)
hs-cTnl = ln(hs-cTnl)
NT-proBNP = In(NT-proBNP)
GDF15 = ln(GDF15)
```

with hs-cTnT:
$\operatorname{Prob}\left(\right.$ death within one year) $=1-0.9763^{\wedge} \exp \{\mathrm{Xb}\}$
where

```
Xb = -7.218 + 0.3416 Heart failure
-0.01305 Age + 0.0001723 max(Age - 66, 0)^3
- 0.0003446 max(Age - 74, 0)^3 + 0.0001723 max(Age - 82, 0)^3
+0.04248 NT-proBNP + 0.04728 max(NT-proBNP - 5.303, 0)^3
- 0.1139 max(NT-proBNP - 6.708, 0)^3 + 0.0666 max(NT-proBNP - 7.705, 0)^3
+ 0.7963 GDF15-0.1923 max(GDF15 - 6.608, 0)^3
+ 0.3410 max(GDF15-7.231, 0)^3 - 0.1487 max(GDF15 - 8.037, 0)^3
+ 0.6875 (hs-cTnT - 0.07336 max(hs-cTnT - 1.705, 0)^3
+ 0.1344 max(hs-cTnT - 2.389,0)^3-0.06104 max(hs-cTnT - 3.211, 0)^3
```

with hs-cTnl:
$\operatorname{Prob}\left(\right.$ death within one year) $=1-0.9770^{\wedge} \exp \{\mathrm{Xb}\}$
where

```
Xb}=-7.525+0.2902 Heart failure
- 0.006738 Age + 0.0001651 max(Age - 66, 0)^3
- 0.0003303 max(Age - 74, 0)^3 + 0.0001651 max(Age - 82, 0)^3
+ 0.009926 NT-proBNP + 0.04911 max(NT-proBNP - 5.303, 0)^3
-0.1183 max(NT-proBNP - 6.708, 0)^3 + 0.06919 max(NT-proBNP - 7.705, 0)^3
+0.8850 GDF15 - 0.2036 max(GDF15 - 6.608, 0)^3
+ 0.3611 max(GDF15-7.231, 0)^3 - 0.1575 max(GDF15 - 8.037, 0)^3
+0.6761 hs-cTnl - 0.07783 max(hs-cTnl-0.8329, 0)^3
+0.1262 max(hs-cTnl - 1.686,0)^3-0.04841 max(hs-cTnl - 3.059,0)^3
```


## Models for cardiovascular death

Note that, in all models, before entering the variables in the equations, Age and NT-proBNP should be truncated as

```
Age = max(Age, 70)
NT-proBNP = max(NT-proBNP, 200)
```

and the biomarkers should be naturally log-transformed as

```
hs-cTnT = In(hs-cTnT)
hs-cTnl = ln(hs-cTnl)
NT-proBNP = In(NT-proBNP)
GDF15 = ln(GDF15)
```

with hs-cTnT:
$\operatorname{Prob}\left(\right.$ death within one year) $=1-0.9876^{\wedge} \exp \{\mathrm{Xb}\}$
where
$\mathrm{Xb}=-5.952+0.4635$ Heart failure
-0.01244 Age +0.0003442 max(Age -71, 0)^3
$-0.0006393 \max (\text { Age }-77,0)^{\wedge} 3+0.0002951 \max (\text { Age }-84,0)^{\wedge} 3$
+0.05166 NT-proBNP +0.05677 max(NT-proBNP - 5.303, 0)^3

- $0.1367 \max (\text { NT-proBNP }-6.708,0)^{\wedge} 3+0.07998 \max (\text { NT-proBNP }-7.705,0)^{\wedge} 3$
+ 0.4796 GDF15-0.1769 max(GDF15-6.608, 0)^3
+ 0.3137 max(GDF15-7.231, 0)^3-0.1368 max(GDF15-8.037, 0)^3
+1.026 hs-cTnT - 0.1508 max(hs-cTnT - 1.705, 0)^3
$+0.2763 \max (\mathrm{hs}-\mathrm{cTnT}-2.389,0)^{\wedge} 3-0.1255 \max (h s-c T n T-3.211,0)^{\wedge} 3$
with hs-cTnl:
Prob(death within one year) $=1-0.9881^{\wedge} \exp \{\mathrm{Xb}\}$
where

```
Xb = -6.723 + 0.3977 Heart failure
- 0.001642 Age + 0.0003115 max(Age - 71, 0)^3
-0.0005785 max(Age - 77, 0)^3 + 0.000267 max(Age - 84,0)^3
+ 0.01869 NT-proBNP + 0.05777 max(NT-proBNP - 5.303, 0)^3
- 0.1391 max(NT-proBNP - 6.708, 0)^3 + 0.08138 max(NT-proBNP - 7.705, 0)^3
+ 0.6364 GDF15-0.2133 max(GDF15 - 6.608,0)^3
+0.3782 max(GDF15 - 7.231,0)^3-0.1649 max(GDF15 - 8.037, 0)^3
+0.9549 hs-cTnl - 0.1157 max(hs-cTnl - 0.8329, 0)^3
+0.1877 max(hs-cTnl - 1.686,0)^3-0.07197 max(hs-cTnl - 3.059,0)^3
```


[^0]:    * per 100 person-years

