X

JAHA Journal of the American Heart Association

This site uses cookies. By continuing to browse this site you are agreeing to our use of cookies.

Click here for more information.

OPEN ACCESS | RESEARCH ARTICLE

Typical and Atypical Symptoms of Acute Coronary Syndrome: Time to Retire the Terms?

Holli A. DeVon⊡, PhD, RN, Sahereh Mirzaei, and PhD, RN, and Jessica Zègre-HemseyPhD, RN

Originally published 25 Mar 2020 https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.119.015539 Journal of the American Heart Association. 2020;9:e015539

Abstract

Abstract

Studies indicate that symptoms labeled as "atypical" are more common in women evaluated for myocardial infarction (MI) and may contribute to the lower likelihood of a diagnosis and delayed treatment and result in poorer outcomes compared with men with MI. Atypical pain is frequently defined as epigastric or back pain or pain that is described as burning, stabbing, or characteristic of indigestion. Typical symptoms usually include chest, arm, or jaw pain described as dull, heavy, tight, or crushing. In a recent article published in the *Journal of the American Heart Association (JAHA*), Ferry and colleagues addressed presenting symptoms in men and women diagnosed with MI and reported that typical symptoms in women were more predictive of a diagnosis of MI than for men. A critical question is, are there really typical or atypical symptoms, and if so, who is the reference group? We propose that researchers and clinicians either discontinue using the terms *typical* and *atypical* or provide the reference group to which the terms apply (eg, men versus women). We believe it is past time to standardize the symptom assessment for MI so that proper and rapid diagnostic testing can be undertaken; however, we cannot standardize the symptom experience. When we do this, we are at risk of having study

results, such as those of Ferry and colleagues, that vary from prior evidence and could lead to what the authors hope to avoid: disadvantaging women in receiving expeditious diagnostic testing and treatment for acute coronary syndrome.

Symptoms are the trigger that propel individuals with symptoms suspicious of acute coronary syndrome (ACS) to seek emergent care for this potentially life-threatening condition. After 3 decades of research on sex differences in the symptoms of ACS, ample evidence suggests that although sex differences in symptoms exist, they are modest and do not contribute significantly to risk stratification or provide a rationale for diagnostic testing based on sex. In a large prospective study, we found that only 3 of 13 common symptoms were predictive of a diagnosis of ACS versus non-ACS. The predictive value of shoulder pain (odds ratio: 2.53 [95% CI, 1.29–4.96] versus 1.11 [95% CI, 0.67–1.85]) and arm pain (odds ratio: 2.15 [95% CI, 1.10–4.20] versus 1.21 [95% CI, 0.74–1.99]) for women were nearly twice that of men. Shortness of breath was predictive of a non-ACS diagnosis for men only.¹

Scores of authors have found some sex differences in symptoms of ACS,^{2, 3} but small differences were usually based on frequency and distribution of symptoms, not the type of symptom. In many studies, statistical significance was reached when sex differences were as small as a few percentage points. Kahn et al⁴ found, for example, that men reported chest pain more frequently than women (86.3% versus 81%; P=0.03). We must distinguish between clinical significance (whether the magnitude of difference is large enough to change clinical care) and statistical significance (which is subject to variability in sampling and measurement) in assessing patients for further intervention. A more critical issue than sex differences in symptoms is likely the magnitude of symptom overlap in individuals ruled in and out for ACS. Approximately 10% to 15% of patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) with symptoms suggestive of ACS are actually experiencing ACS,^{5, 6} yet the other 85% of patients look so similar that the same diagnostic testing and resources are required to safely rule them out for ACS. Numerous clinical-decision aids to assess risk for ACS in the ED have been validated over the years, some with 100% sensitivity.⁵ Many of these clinical-decision or prediction rules have facilitated transfer of low-risk patients to a chest-pain or clinical-decision unit or early discharge from the ED.⁷

In a recent article published in the *Journal of the American Heart Association (JAHA*), Ferry et al⁸ addressed presenting symptoms in men and women diagnosed with myocardial infarction (MI) using sex-specific criteria in a substudy of the High-STEACS (High-Sensitivity Troponin in the Evaluation of Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome) trial. The definition of sex-specific criteria were troponin levels >99th percentile, which are 16 ng/L for women and 34 ng/L for men.⁹ The rationale for the study was that sex-specific thresholds for troponin have identified a population

of patients with MI that was previously unrecognized. Therefore, these patients would have been excluded from prior research on sex differences in symptoms. In addition, "atypical" symptom presentations are more common in women than men and may contribute to the lower likelihood of a diagnosis and treatment and result in poorer outcomes compared with men with MI. Atypical pain was defined by Greenslade et al¹⁰ as "epigastric or back pain or pain that was described as burning, stabbing, characteristic of indigestion, or other." Typical symptoms included "chest, arm, or jaw pain described as dull, heavy, tight, or crushing." The main study finding was that typical symptoms in women were more predictive of a diagnosis of MI than those in men.

We address several limitations to study methods that may mislead researchers, clinicians, and the public. In the High-STEACS parent study, 16% of men and 12% of women had type 1 MI (myocardial necrosis with troponin levels >99th percentile or myocardial ischemia on the ECG) and the remainder had type 2 (myocardial necrosis caused by increased oxygen demand or decreased supply).⁸ Importantly, patients with ST-segment-elevation MI (STEMI) were excluded from the study. The authors stated that patients with STEMI were not included because symptom differences are less important, as the diagnosis is based primarily on the ECG rather than on other features of the clinical presentation. Although ECG criteria for STEMI account for sex and age differences,¹¹ there are still notable delays in timely reperfusion among women with STEMI compared with men. Jneid et al¹² found that women with STEMI were less likely to receive fibrinolytic therapy alone, primary PCI, or the combination of fibrinolytic therapy and PCI (5.1% versus 6.2%, 47.3% versus 61.1%, and 3.9% versus 5.8%, respectively; P<0.0001). Women presenting with STEMI were also less likely to achieve timely door-to-needle time (28.3% versus 35.2%; P0.0005) and timely door-to-balloon time (39.0% versus 44.8%; P<0.0001). Mirzaei et al¹³ found that another factor contributing to women's less timely reperfusion was longer prehospital delay compared with men. This finding is concerning because ECGs are frequently not obtained within the recommended 10 minutes of arrival, and in one study, women with ischemic-type symptoms had a mean time of 53 minutes from presentation to ECG.¹⁴

It is vitally important to remember that symptoms are cues for patients that a problem exists. Symptoms trigger clinicians to obtain ECGs, which drive subsequent clinical decision-making such as activation of the cardiac catheterization laboratory for emergent percutaneous coronary intervention.¹⁵ Nearly all patients presenting to the ED are undifferentiated. Neither the patient nor the clinician knows what the diagnosis is until testing is complete. Many emergency medical systems now have the capacity to do prehospital ECGs, Nevertheless, we found in our recent study that only 44.6% of patients with ACS arrived at the ED via emergency medical systems. In addition, a minority of patients (24.6%) experienced STEMI, and only 56.3% of patients with STEMI called emergency medical systems. This leaves a large number of patients presenting to the ED without a diagnosis.¹³ In addition, individuals presenting to emergency medical systems with chest pain are significantly more likely to receive prehospital ECG compared with those who have nonchest symptoms. Consequently, despite greater availability of prehospital ECG

equipment, if the patient does not report chest pain, then they are disadvantaged from even receiving a prehospital ECG.¹⁶ Including patients with STEMI is vital to determining true differences or similarities in symptoms between female and male patients, particularly because STEMI is a true emergency requiring time-dependent reperfusion therapy.

In the Clinical Perspective section of their article, Ferry et al⁸ state that women with MI are at risk of underdiagnosis and undertreatment if "correct" symptom presentations are not recognized. Researchers, including our team, have spent years attempting to identify sex differences in the symptoms of ACS to provide evidence for clinicians to facilitate expeditious diagnosis and for the public to be able to respond quickly to symptoms. To suggest that there is a "correct" presentation implies there is an "incorrect" symptom presentation, which is not supported by numerous previous studies.^{1, 17, 18} Assuming a correct presentation can also imply that there is a "standard" symptom presentation, also unsupported by the data to date. The critical question is, are there really typical or atypical symptoms, and if so, who is the reference group? We propose that researchers and clinicians either discontinue using the terms *typical* and *atypical* or provide the reference group to which the terms apply (eg, men versus women).

Many researchers have reported that upper back pain and fatigue are commonly reported symptoms during ACS, and up to 30% of patients do not experience chest pain.^{19, 20} This information is important to consider as we try to differentiate patients who will be ruled in compared with those ruled out for ACS. We found that although chest pain is a sensitive symptom for ACS, it is not very specific (Table).¹ In fact, few other symptoms were sensitive or specific for a diagnosis of ACS. In our multicenter prospective study, we found few symptom differences between patients with and without ACS presenting to the ED.¹³ Ferry et al⁸ defined chest pain as all descriptors of chest symptoms, including pressure or discomfort. Their rationale was that terms other than pain are "functions of sex-related language rather than symptom differences in symptom presentation." This is an opinion that is counterproductive to science and accurate assessment of symptoms, which are, by definition, subjective and what the patient says they are.

Symptom	Female		Male	
	Sensitivity, %	Specificity, %	Sensitivity, %	Specificity, %
Chest pressure	66 <mark>a</mark>	36	63 <mark>a</mark>	41
Shoulder pain	45	67 <mark>a</mark>	29	72 <mark>a</mark>

Table 1. Sensitivity and Specificity of Symptoms for ACS by Sex¹

Sweating	37	70 <mark>a</mark>	33	70 <mark>a</mark>	
Palpitation	27	66a	17	77a	
Chest discomfort	66 <mark>a</mark>	33	69 <mark>a</mark>	34	
Upper back pain	34	64 <mark>a</mark>	14	78 <mark>a</mark>	
Shortness of breath	58	39	41	40	
Arm pain	49	69 <mark>a</mark>	32	72 <mark>a</mark>	
Unusual fatigue	40	54	32	52	
Nausea	38	58	30	70a	
Lightheaded	40	55	34	58	
Chest pain	67 <mark>a</mark>	37	72 <mark>a</mark>	36	
Indigestion	30	78 <mark>a</mark>	18	76 <mark>a</mark>	
ACS indicates acute coronary syndrome.					
^a Sensitive and/or specific for a diagnosis of ACS.					

We believe it is past time to standardize the symptom assessment so that proper and rapid diagnostic testing can be undertaken; however, we cannot standardize the symptom experience. When we do this, we are at risk of having study results such as those of Ferry et al,⁸ that vary from prior evidence and could lead to what the authors hope to avoid: disadvantaging women in receiving expeditious diagnostic testing and treatment for ACS.

Sources of Funding

Some data provided here were funded by a grant from NINR (R01 NR012012) to Dr DeVon.

Disclosures

None.

Footnotes

*Correspondence to: Holli A. DeVon PhD, RN, FAAN, FAHA, School of Nursing, University of California Los Angeles, 700 Tiverton Ave., Factor Building, Room 2-244, Los Angeles, CA 90095. E-mail: hdevon@sonnet.ucla.edu.

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the editors or of the American Heart Association.

For Sources of Funding and Disclosures, see page 3.

References

1 ← DeVon HA, Rosenfeld A, Steffen AD, Daya M. Sensitivity, specificity, and sex differences in s ymptoms reported on the 13-item Acute Coronary Syndrome Checklist. J Am Heart Assoc. 201
4; 3:e000586. DOI: 10.1161/JAHA.113.000586. Link | Google Scholar

2 ← Canto JG, Canto EA, Goldberg RJ. Time to standardize and broaden the criteria of acute cor onary syndrome symptom presentations in women. Can J Cardiol. 2014; 30:721–728. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

3 ← Araujo C, Laszczynska O, Viana M, Melao F, Henriques A, Borges A, Severo M, Maciel MJ,
 Moreira I, Azevedo A. Sex differences in presenting symptoms of acute coronary syndrome: the
 EPIHeart cohort study. BMJ Open. 2018; 8:e018798. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

4 ← Khan NA, Daskalopoulou SS, Karp I, Eisenberg MJ, Pelletier R, Tsadok MA, Dasgupta K, Nor ris CM, Pilote L. Sex differences in acute coronary syndrome symptom presentation in young pa tients. **JAMA Intern Med**. 2013; 173:1863–1871. Medline | Google Scholar

5 ← Hess EP, Brison RJ, Perry JJ, Calder LA, Thiruganasambandamoorthy B, Agarwah D, Sadost y AT, Sivilotti ML, Jaffe AS, Montori VM, et al. Development of a clinical prediction rule for 30-da y cardiac events in emergency department patients with chest pain and possible acute coronary syndrome. **Ann Emerg Med**. 2012; 59:115–125. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

6 ← Goodacre S, Cross E, Arnold J, Angelini K, Capewell S, Nicholl J. The health care burden of

7 I Flaws D, Than M, Scheuermeyer FX, Christenson J, Boychuk B, Greenslade JH, Aldou S, Ha mett CJ, Parsonage WA, Deely JM, et al. External validation of the emergency department asses sment of chest pain score accelerated diagnostic pathway (EDACS-ADP). Emerg Med J. 2016; 33:618–625. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

8 I Ferry AV, Anand A, Strachan FE, Mooney L, Stewart SD, Marshall L, Chapman AR, Lee KK, J ones S, Orme K, Shah AS. Presenting symptoms in men and women diagnosed with myocardial infarction using sex-specific criteria. J Am Heart Assoc. 2019; 8:e012307. DOI: 10.1161/JAHA.1 19.012307. Link | Google Scholar

9 ← Shah AS, Griffiths M, Lee KK, McAllister DA, Hunter AL, Ferry AV, Cruikshank A, Reid A, Sto ddart M, Strachan F, et al. High sensitivity cardiac troponin and the under-diagnosis of myocardi al infarction in women: prospective cohort study. **BMJ**. 2015; 350:g7873.

Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

10 ← Greenslade JH, Cullen L, Parsonage W, Reid CM, Body R, Richards M, Hawkins T, Lim SH, Than M. Examining the signs and symptoms experienced by individuals with suspected acute c oronary syndrome in the Asia-Pacific region: a prospective observational study. Ann Emerg Me
d. 2012; 60:777–785. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

11 ← Thygesen K, Alpert JS, Jaffe AS, Chaitman BR, Bax JJ, Morrow DA, White HD, Mickley H,
 Crea F, Van de Werf F, et al. . Fourth universal definition of myocardial infarction (2018). Eur Hear
 t J. 2019; 40:237–269. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

I2 ← Jneid H, Fonarow GC, Cannon CP, Hernandez AF, Palacios IF, Maree AO, Wells Q, Bozkurt B, LaBresh KA, Liang L, et al. Clinical perspective. Circulation. 2008; 118:2803–2810.
 Link | Google Scholar

13 ← Mirzaei S, Steffen A, Vuckovic K, Ryan C, Bronas UG, Zegre-Hemsey J, DeVon HA. The ass ociation between symptom onset characteristics and prehospital delay in women and men with

acute coronary syndrome. Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2020; 19:142-154.

Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

14 ← Zègre-Hemsey J, Sommargren CE, Drew BJ. Initial ECG acquisition within 10 minutes of arr ival at the emergency department in persons with chest pain: time and gender differences. **J Em erg Nurs**. 2011; 37:109–112. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

15 ← Zègre-Hemsey JK, Asafu-Adjei J, Fernandez A, Brice J. Characteristics of prehospital electr ocardiogram use in north carolina using a novel linkage of emergency medical services and eme rgency department data. **Prehosp Emerg Care**. 2019; 23:772–779.

Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

16 ← Zègre-Hemsey JK, Patel MD, Fernandez AR, Pelter MM, Brice J, Rosamond W. A statewide assessment of prehospital electrocardiography approaches of acquisition and interpretation for ST-elevation myocardial infarction based on emergency medical services characteristics. **Preho sp Emerg Care**. 2019;1–7. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

17 ← Kreatsoulas C, Shannon HS, Giacomini M, Velianou JL, Anand SS. Reconstructing angina:
 cardiac symptoms are the same in women and men. JAMA Intern Med. 2013; 173:829–833.
 Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

18 ← Gimenez MR, Reiter M, Twerenbold R, Reichlin T, Wildi K, Haaf P, Wicki K, Zellweger C, Hoe Iler R, Moehring B, et al. Sex-specific chest pain characteristics in the early diagnosis of acute m yocardial infarction. JAMA Intern Med. 2014; 174:241–249.

Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

19 ← DeVon HA, Burke LA, Vuckovic KM, Haugland T, Eckhardt AL, Patmon F, Rosenfeld AG. Sy mptoms suggestive of acute coronary syndrome: when is sex important? **J Cardiovasc Nurs**. 2 017; 32:383–392. Crossref | Medline | Google Scholar

20 ← Isaksson RM, Brulin C, Eliasson M, Näslund U, Zingmark K. Older women's prehospital exp eriences of their first myocardial infarction. **J Cardiovasc Nurs**. 2013; 28:360–369.

<

∧ Back to top

Journal of the American Heart Association

AHA Journals

Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis, and Vascular Biology (ATVB) Circulation

Circulation

Circ: Arrhythmia and Electrophysiology

Circ: Genomic and Precision Medicine

Circ: Cardiovascular Imaging

Circ: Cardiovascular Interventions

Circ: Cardiovascular Quality & Outcomes

Circ: Heart Failure

Circulation Research

Hypertension

Stroke

Stroke: Vascular and Interventional Neurology

Journal of the American Heart Association (JAHA)

Journal Information

About JAHA

Editorial Board

Reprints

AHA Journals RSS Feeds

For International Users

All Subjects Arrhythmia and Electrophysiology Basic, Translational, and Clinical Research Critical Care and Resuscitation Epidemiology, Lifestyle, and Prevention Genetics Heart Failure and Cardiac Disease Hypertension Imaging and Diagnostic Testing Intervention, Surgery, Transplantation Quality and Outcomes Stroke Vascular Disease

Features

JAHA Early Career Board Spotlight: Cardio-Oncology Spotlight: Go Red for Women 2020 Conference Reads Basic Science for Clinicians Contemporary Reviews Go Red for Women 2019 1

/

Resources & Education

AHA Guidelines and Statements Indexing Frequently Asked Questions Information for Advertisers

For Authors & Reviewers Instructions for Authors Submission Site Author Reprints Top Reasons to Publish in JAHA Open Access Information



American Heart Association®

National Center 7272 Greenville Ave.

Dallas, TX 75231

Customer Service 1-800-AHA-USA-1 1-800-242-8721 Local Info Contact Us

ABOUT US

About the AHA/ASA	>
2016-17 Annual Report	>
AHA Financial Information	>
Careers	>
SHOP	>
Latest Heart and Stroke News	>
AHA/ASA Media Newsroom	>
Global Programs	>

OUR SITES

American Heart Association

American Stroke Association	>
Professional Heart Daily	>
More Sites	>
TAKE ACTION	
Advocate	>

Donate	>
Planned Giving	>
Volunteer	>

ONLINE COMMUNITIES

AFib Support	>
Garden Community	>
Patient Support Network	>
Privacy Policy Copyright Ethics Policy Conflict of Interest Policy Linking Policy Diversity Careers	
Suppliers & Providers Accessibility Statement State Fundraising Notices	

© American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved. Unauthorized use prohibited. The American Heart Association is qualified 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

*Red Dress ™ DHHS, Go Red ™; AHA; National Wear Red Day ® is registered trademark.

