

Lack of Prognostic Value of Type D Personality for Mortality in a Large Sample of Heart Failure Patients

James C Coyne, Tiny Jaarsma, Marie-Louise Luttik, Eric van Sonderen,
Dirk J van Veldhuisen and Robbert Sanderman

Linköping University Post Print

N.B.: When citing this work, cite the original article.

Original Publication:

James C Coyne, Tiny Jaarsma, Marie-Louise Luttik, Eric van Sonderen, Dirk J van Veldhuisen and Robbert Sanderman, Lack of Prognostic Value of Type D Personality for Mortality in a Large Sample of Heart Failure Patients, 2011, Psychosomatic Medicine, (73), 7, 557-562.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e318227ac75>

Copyright: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins

<http://www.lww.com/>

Postprint available at: Linköping University Electronic Press

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-71220>

Lack of Prognostic Value of Type D Personality for Mortality in a Large Sample of Heart Failure Patients

James C. Coyne, PhD (1,2)*, Tiny Jaarsma, RN, PhD(3,4), Marie-Louise Luttik, PhD (4), Eric van Sonderen, PhD (1), Dirk J. van Veldhuisen, PhD, MD (4), Robbert Sanderma, PhD (1)

1 Health Psychology Section, Department of Health Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

2 Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Health System, USA

3 Department of Social- and Welfare Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköpings universitet, Sweden

4 Dept. of Cardiology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

*Coyne JC (reprint author), University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Health Science, Health Psychology Section, HPC FA12, POB 196, NL-9700 AD Groningen, Netherlands, 01 (215) 662-7035, fax: 01 (215) 349-5067, email: jcoynester@gmail.com

The COACH study was supported by a program grant of the Netherlands Heart Foundation (2000Z003). Dr. van Veldhuisen is Clinical Established Investigator of the Netherlands Heart Foundation (D97-017).

RUNNING HEAD: COACH and Type D

Total word count: 2894

Journal Subject codes: 10,117

Abstract

Background: Type D personality has been proposed as a prognostic indicator for mortality in cardiovascular disease (CVD). However, most research examining this construct originates from one research group and it is critical that the predictive value of Type D personality for adverse cardiovascular outcomes is independently cross-validated. This study examined its prognostic value in heart failure, relative to B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) and depressive symptoms.

Methods: We studied the 706 patients with complete BNP, depressive symptom, and Type D personality and mortality data from 958 heart failure (HF) patients enrolled after hospitalization for a large multisite study of a disease management program. Multivariable models were adjusted for B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) and depression (measured by the Centers for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale).

Results At 18 months follow-up, there were 192 deaths (27.2%) among the 706 patients with complete data. No evidence was found for a prognostic value of Type D personality in the unadjusted model (HR = .893, CI = .582-1.370). In contrast, BNP was significantly predictive of mortality (HR = 1.588, CI = 1.391-1.812), whereas depression was not (HR = 1.011, CI = .998-1.024). Type D was also not predictive in covariate-adjusted models (HR = .779, CI = .489-1.242). Similar results were obtained when analyzing Type D as the interaction between continuous z-scores of its two components, negative affectivity and social inhibition ($p = .144$).

Discussion. In the largest study to date, Type D does not predict mortality, Future research concerning Type D should construe it as the interaction of continuous negative affectivity and social inhibition z-scores, rather than as a typology and consider additional analyses replacing negative affectivity with depression.

Keywords: Type D personality, heart failure, survival, B-type natriuretic peptide
(BNP), depression

Starting with an often-cited *Lancet* article (1), Type D personality, which has been defined as the tendency to experience negative emotions and to inhibit self-expression in social interaction, has been proposed as a prognostic indicator for mortality in CVD independent of biological factors, including disease severity. However, the original *Lancet* study excluded deaths in the first five years, with an observation period of 6-12 years. After exclusion of these 93 patients, only 21 deaths remained to be explained, too few events to justify the multivariate regression analyses, which were thus overfitted, with a high risk of spurious findings (2). A series of subsequent studies mostly had small samples, inconsistent scoring of the Type D measure, varying start and length of follow up periods, and overfitted regression equations, with 6 (3), 8 (4), 12 (5) and 4 (6,) deaths, respectively, being explained. These studies tended to have fewer events being explained than the number of covariates considered for entering into multivariate analyses. A later study reported on 47 deaths in a mean observation period of 30 months among heart failure patients and found a significant effect for Type D (OR=2.16; 95%CI:1.05–4.43, p=.04) that did not persist when confounds were controlled (7). More recently, Type D was not found to predict 123 deaths among 641 heart failure (HF) patients in bivariate or multivariate analyses (8). It is noteworthy that thus far all studies relating Type D personality to mortality, were conducted by the one investigator group, with the exception of one small study in which there were null findings, but only 11 deaths to explain (9).

Proposals have nonetheless been made for routine screening of CVD patients for Type D personality (10) and use of Type D for stratification purposes (11). The clinical utility of this variable remains to be independently established. We undertook an evaluation of Type D personality as a predictor of mortality among HF patients, taking

advantage of a large scale clinical trial with almost as many events (death) as all previous Type D mortality studies combined. Assessments of patients were also available with a biomarker, B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) that has emerged as a reliable indicator of severity of HF (12, 13), and assessment of depressive symptoms, an established prognostic indicator for clinical outcomes in coronary heart disease and heart failure (14).

Methods

Study design

This report draws on data from the previously reported COACH trial in the Netherlands (15, 16), a multicentre, randomized controlled trial with blinded end-point evaluation, designed to evaluate the effects of disease management, i.e., advising and counselling of patients with HF. The COACH trial revealed no significant treatment effects on mortality (16). Patients were assessed for Type D at baseline (during hospitalization) and followed for mortality for 18 months thereafter.

Study population

Patients were recruited between October 2002 and February 2005 while hospitalized for symptomatic HF (NYHA II-IV). Patients were required to be at least 18 years old and have evidence of structural underlying heart disease. Patients with impaired and preserved left ventricular function (LVEF) were included. Major exclusion criteria were concurrent inclusion in another study or HF clinic, inability to complete questionnaires, invasive procedures or cardiac surgery performed within the last 6 months or planned within the next 3 months, ongoing evaluation for heart transplantation and inability or unwillingness to give informed consent. Of the 958 patients enrolled in the trial, 706 had complete data for BNP, depressive symptoms, and Type D personality and so were included in the present analyses.

Once informed consent was signed, baseline data collection started and afterwards patients were randomized into 1 of 3 groups; basic support, intensive support or the control group. The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and the protocol was reviewed and approved by a central appointed ethics committee.

Data collection

Data on mortality were collected from medical records. All reported deaths were reviewed by an independent clinical end-point committee who defined the date and cause of death.

Type D personality was assessed at baseline using the Type D scale (DS14), consisting of two 7-item subscales, i.e. negative affectivity and social inhibition (17). As customary, patients were defined as Type-D when scoring ≥ 10 on both subscales. The DS14 is generally construed as measuring two temporally stable personality traits, as indicated by good test-retest reliability and to be independent from changes in mood (17).

Depressive Symptoms were assessed at baseline with the Center for Epidemiologic Studies -Depression Scale (18,19), a 20-item, well-validated measure that is commonly used with cardiac patients. Scores range from 0-60 and a validated cutpoint ≥ 16 is typically used to distinguish between low and high depressive symptomatology.

BNP measurement. BNP measurement in this sample is described elsewhere (20). Basically, BNP plasma levels were determined using a Triage®; fluorescence immunoassay kit within 4 hours of blood collection on the day of hospital discharge or one day before hospital discharge. For simplifying interpretation, BNP values were divided by 1000. Patients with available BNP levels did not differ for demographic or clinical characteristics, and rates of Type D personality were not significantly different ($p = .56$) between patients with available BNP levels (13%; $n=721$) and patients who did not have a BNP measurement (12%; $n=237$).

Statistical analysis.

Descriptive sample statistics for baseline characteristics for the full sample were calculated, as well as prevalence of Type D personality and the relationship between Type D classification and key variables. Bivariate associations of Type D classification and mortality were calculated.

A Cox proportional hazards model was constructed for Type D personality. BNP and depressive symptoms were entered as the first block in an equation predicting mortality, with the entry of Type D in the second block testing the hypothesis that Type D classification had significant added prognostic value. Other potential control variables were considered, but had to meet the requirement of being related to both Type D personality and mortality, but also as potentially preceding or determining both Type D personality and mortality. We thus did not evaluate potential mediators of Type D on mortality as confounders (21,22).

Taxometric analyses (23) suggest that Type D is better represented as a dimensional rather than categorical construct. Moreover, there is a long-standing consensus among psychometricians and personality theorists that the practice of dichotomizing two continuous variables and constructing a typology in terms of a resulting 2 × 2 matrix of high-low groups is variously unnecessary, highly problematic, and prone to spurious associations and therefore should be avoided (24,25,26,27). We therefore also analyzed the arguably more appropriate prediction of mortality from z-scores for the component negative affectivity and social inhibition and their interaction term.

Results

Baseline Characteristics. The present analyses included 706 patients who had BNP assessments and CES-D scores and completed all 14 questions of the DS14. Analyses of differences between the 706 patients and the larger sample of 958 participants in the COACH trial from which they were drawn revealed differences only in that patients included in the study were lower in prescription of antidepressants, (6.1% vs 9.9%), t-test, $p < .04$. In total, 95 patients (13%) in the present sample were identified as having a Type D personality. Baseline characteristics of the study sample are provided in Table 1. Mean age of the study sample was 70.7 years and 38.2% were women. At hospital discharge, 49.4% of the patients were classified as having NYHA functional class II disease and 50.6% as having NYHA III or IV disease. A total of 43.2 % had ischemic heart failure with a history of a myocardial infarction. Type D classification was not associated with baseline characteristics with the exception of NYHA classification and use of antidepressants, and a strong association with depressive symptoms, whether measured dichotomously or with CES-D continuous scores. Pearson correlations between continuous CES-D scores and the two continuous components of Type D, negative affectivity and social inhibition, were .62 (N= 706, $p < .001$) and .34 ($p < .001$) respectively.

Table 2 provides baseline characteristics for both survival states. Survival was related to age, all clinical variables and including ACE/ARB medication, with the exceptions of LVEF%, and other medication. The only variable that was significantly related to both Type-D and survival was NYHA. Since we did not construe this variable as a determinant of Type-D, there was no need for controlling for this variable in the Cox proportional hazards analysis.

Relationship between Type D and Mortality. All cause mortality rate for the study sample was 27.1% (N=192). A Cox proportional hazards model relating Type D classification to mortality was not significant. Figure 1 depicts survival curves for Type D

versus non-Type D. Although not significant at 18 months, the advantage of Type D for survival would have to be reversed substantially for a disadvantage of Type to emerge at some point beyond our 18 month observation period.

As seen in Table 3, BNP and CES-D scores were entered as a first block in a Cox proportional hazards analysis, and the overall block proved a significant predictor of mortality, but this was due to the contribution of BNP, with the contribution of CES-D scores not significant (model 1). In model 2, the dichotomous variable Type-D was added. This did not improve the prediction of mortality.

Table 4 again starts with a model with BNP and CES-D scores (model 1). This time, in model 2, the two components of Type D, negative affection and social inhibition (z-scores), were entered together with their interaction. The interaction term was not significant in improving the prediction of mortality, again indicating that Type-D did not contribute to the prediction of mortality when using continuous scores. In order to interpret the main effects of negative affection and social inhibition, the interaction term was removed, resulting in the final model 3. BNP appeared to be the best predictor of mortality. Depression also predicted mortality, but to a limited degree.

Discussion

No evidence was found for the prognostic value of Type D personality for all cause mortality in HF patients, either in unadjusted Cox proportional hazards models or additive or independent of BNP in multivariate Cox proportional hazards models or as an effect modifier for BNP. These results held in analyses treating Type D as a dichotomous typology as well as in more appropriate analyses examining Type D in terms of the interaction of negative affectivity and social inhibition. These results stand in contrast to what was obtained for the prognostic value of BNP. Suggestions that Type D personality be routinely be assessed in HF patients or be used for stratification are premature, at least for the prediction of mortality in HF patients.

Type D classification was most strongly related to depressive symptoms and to treatment with antidepressants, a likely proxy for clinical depression. While the developers of the Type D measure assert that Type D is independent of mood (17), there is notable overlap in the content of measures assessing depressive symptoms and the two components of Type D, negative affectivity and social inhibition. Consistent findings that the components of Type D are related to depressive symptoms have led to suggestions that Type D and depressive symptoms are both facets of negative affectivity and that any prediction of clinically significant outcomes by Type D independent of depressive symptoms might, as been suggested previously, be considered to be an artefact of creation of a Type D personality typology from variables that are essentially continuous (28,23). In the present sample, the correlation between CES-D and one component of Type D, negative affectivity approached the maximum predicted from the respective reliabilities of the two scales.

Initial Cox proportion hazards models in our study were constructed consistent with all past studies testing the prognostic value of Type D for mortality, namely, with Type D treated as a typology with patients high in both negative affectivity and social inhibition being contrasted with the other three quadrants in a high-low, 2 x 2 cross tabulation of negative affectivity and social inhibition. Next, we obtained the same null results in our treatment of Type D in terms of the interaction between continuous negative affectivity and social inhibition z-scores. However, our second analytic strategy is more defensible and appropriate, given not only conclusions of taxometric analyses that indicate that Type D is best construed in continuous, dimensional terms rather than a typology, but a consensus that has emerged over 30 years in the psychometric and personality theory literature that typologies created from high-low, 2 x 2 crossings of continuous dimensional variables are inappropriate and prone to spurious findings (24,25,26,27). We find these arguments compelling and suggest that future Type D personality

research adopt our analytic strategy of focusing on the interaction of negative affectivity and social inhibition or explain why it is not being adopted.

In our present sample, depressive symptoms were not a significant predictor of mortality, although the association was in the expected direction. However, the present sample was limited to patients for whom both BNP and assessment of Type D personality were available (N= 706). These patients were drawn from a larger sample (N= 938) in which depressive symptoms were modestly associated with mortality (HR 1.169, P = 0.02) (20). The larger literature is mixed concerning the prediction of mortality in heart failure from depressive symptoms, particularly when mortality is examined separately, rather than simply treated as one aspect of a composite endpoint. A recent review of studies of the association of depressive symptoms and mortality in heart failure reported null findings for inpatient samples, but most studies of outpatients finding an association (29). The present sample was recruited and assessed during an inpatient stay.

The strong association between one component of Type D, negative affectivity, and both depressive symptoms and use of antidepressants raises the possibility that in addition to preserving the components of Type D as continuous variables, future research should examine whether depressive symptoms could be substituted for negative affectivity without any substantial loss of predictive power with respect to clinical variables. The association between depressive symptoms and cardiovascular outcomes is stronger and based on a more substantial literature than is the case for Type D. Routine screening for depression in cardiovascular patients has already been recommended by a number of professional organizations (30), even if the benefits of screening for cardiovascular outcomes are yet to be established (31). Furthermore, it is unlikely that calls for screening for Type D (11) will lead to the DS-14 supplanting measures of depression. Non-mental health clinicians are notably averse to introducing

and sustaining routine psychological screening (32) and report even brief depression screening measures such as the PHQ-9 are too long (33,34). If however, it could be shown that a brief, 7-item measure of social inhibition added substantially to the predictive ability of depressive symptoms, perhaps screening for social inhibition could be added to screening for depression.

Null findings from one large study might be contradicted by subsequent studies, but we note important limitations in the small studies that have been cited in support of a prognostic value for Type D personality with respect to mortality. Claims for the prognostic value of Type D may fit the pattern of other psychosocial variables purportedly predicting mortality, for instance, fighting spirit in the prediction of mortality of cancer patients (35). Namely, initial claims are based on underpowered studies, but cannot be validated in subsequent large scale studies with appropriate control of biomedical variables. Reasons for the rise, persistence and ultimate fall of such hypotheses are undoubtedly varied. They likely include early positive results capitalizing on chance or multivariate analyses where bivariate associations are not significant, and methodological limitations of the small studies, as well as publication bias (36,37). Supporting the hypothesis of a publication bias, we note that previous positive studies have had 4 to 21 deaths to be explained, too few to justify the multivariate analyses that were employed. Moreover, such a small number of deaths being explained in the individual studies could not be expected to generate a consistent pattern of positive findings unless an exceptionally large and unprecedented effect of personality on mortality were present.

This study had the advantage of an adequate sample size and being the first study with regard to mortality conducted outside the original Type D investigator group. Some of the patients included in this study were from the same clinical settings providing patients to the earlier studies and the remainder were drawn from the same larger

cultural and medical system context, the Netherlands. However, the prevalence of Type D personality (13%) was lower than in previous studies. It was nonetheless consistent across recruitment sites, including those involved in past studies of Type D... It is quite possible that recruitment to a disease management program such as COACH attracts a lower proportion of patients with Type D personality.

This study had the limitation of being a secondary analysis of a clinical trial not having been designed expressly to test the prognostic value of Type D. Its follow up period was limited to 18 months, and we cannot exclude the possibility that effects of Type D personality on mortality are not apparent until later. However, emergence of a disadvantage of Type D for survival would require a substantial reversal of trends apparent up to 18 months. We are unaware of any plausible mechanism by which Type D should come into play after 18 months and affect in a clinically significant way the survival of the patients who survive until then.

References

1. Denollet J, Sys SU, Stroobant N, Rombouts H, Gillebert TC, Brutsaert DL. Personality as independent predictor of long-term mortality in patients with coronary heart disease. *Lancet*. 1996;347:417-21.
2. Babyak MA. What you see may not be what you get: A brief, nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 2004;66:411-21.
3. Denollet J, Vaes J, Brutsaert DL. Inadequate response to treatment in coronary heart disease - Adverse effects of type D personality and younger age on 5-year prognosis and quality of life. *Circulation*. 2000;102:630-5.
4. Denollet J, Holmes RVF, Vrints CJ, Conraads VM. Unfavorable outcome of heart transplantation in recipients with type D personality. *Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation*. 2007;26:152-8.
5. Pedersen SS, Denollet J, Ong ATL, Sonnenschein K, Erdman RAM, Serruys PW, van Domburg RT. Adverse clinical events in patients treated with sirolimus-eluting stents: the impact of Type D personality. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation*. 2007;14:135-40.
6. Denollet J, Pedersen SS, Vrints CJ, Conraads VM. Usefulness of type D personality in predicting five-year cardiac events above and beyond concurrent symptoms of stress in patients with coronary heart disease. *American Journal of Cardiology*. 2006;97:970-3.
7. Schiffer AA, Smith ORF, Pedersen SS, Widdershoven JW, Denollet J. Type D personality and cardiac mortality in patients with chronic heart failure. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2009;142:230-35.
8. Pelle AJ, Pedersen SS, Schiffer AA, Szabó B, Widdershoven JW, Denollet J. Psychological distress and mortality in systolic heart failure. *Circulation Heart Failure*. 2010;3:261-7.
9. Volz A, Schmid JP, Zwahlen M, Kohls S, Saner H, Barth J. Predictors of readmission and health related quality of life in patients with chronic heart failure: a comparison of different psychosocial aspects. *J Behav Med*. 2011;34(1):13-22.
10. Albus C, Jordan J, Herrmann-Lingen C. Screening for psychosocial risk factors in patients with coronary heart disease-recommendations for clinical practice. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation*. 2004;11:75-9.
11. Denollet J, Martens EJ, Smith ORF, Burg MM. Efficient assessment of depressive symptoms and their prognostic value in myocardial infarction patients. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2010;120:105-11.
12. Kazanegra R, Cheng V, Garcia A, Krishnaswamy P, Gardetto N, Clopton P, Maisel A. A rapid test for B-type natriuretic peptide correlates with falling wedge pressures in patients treated for decompensated heart failure: A pilot study. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*. 2001;7:21-9.

13. Goonewardena SN, Blair JEA, Manuchehry A, Brennan JM, Keller M, Reeves R, Price A, Spencer KT, Puthumana J, Gheorghide M. Use of hand carried ultrasound, B-type natriuretic peptide, and clinical assessment in identifying abnormal left ventricular filling pressures in patients referred for right heart catheterization. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*. 2010;16:69-75.
14. Rutledge T, Reis VA, Linke SE, Greenberg BH, Mills PJ: Depression in heart failure - A meta-analytic review of prevalence, intervention effects, and associations with clinical outcomes. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2006;48:1527-37.
15. Jaarsma T, van der Wal MHL, Hogenhuis J, Lesman I, Luttik MLA, Veeger N, van Veldhuisen DJ. Design and methodology of the COACH study: a multicenter randomised Coordinating study evaluating Outcomes of Advising and Counselling in Heart failure. *European Journal of Heart Failure*. 2004;6:227-33.
16. Jaarsma T, van der Wal MHL, Lesman-Leegte I, Luttik ML, Hogenhuis J, Veeger NJ, Sanderman R, Hoes AW, van Gilst WH, Lok DJA, Dunselman P, Tijssen JGP, Hillege HL, Van Veldhuisen DJ. Effect of moderate or intensive disease management program on outcome in patients with heart failure. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2008;168:316-24.
17. Denollet J. DS14: Standard assessment of negative affectivity, social inhibition, and Type D personality. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 2005;67:89-97.
18. Radloff L. Sex-differences in depression - Effects of occupation and marital-status. *Sex Roles*. 1975;1:249-65.
19. Schoevers MJ, Sanderman R, van Sonderen E, Ranchor AV. The evaluation of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression (CES-D) scale: Depressed and Positive Affect in cancer patients and healthy reference subjects. *Quality of Life Research*. 2000;9:1015-29.
20. Lesman-Leegte I, van Veldhuisen DJ, Hillege HL, Moser D, Sanderman R, Jaarsma T. Depressive symptoms and outcomes in patients with heart failure: data from the COACH study. *European Journal of Heart Failure*. 2009;11:1202-7.
21. Christenfeld NJS, Sloan RP, Carroll D, Greenland S. Risk factors, confounding, and the illusion of statistical control. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 2004;66:868-75.
22. Kurth T, Sonis J. Assessment and control of confounding in trauma research. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2007;20:807-20.
23. Ferguson E, Williams L, O'Connor RC, Howard S, Hughes BM, Johnston DW, Allan JL, O'Connor DB, Lewis CA, Greal MA, O'Carroll RE. A Taxometric Analysis of Type-D Personality. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. 2009;71:981-6.
24. Coyne JC, Whiffen VE. Issues in Personality as Diathesis for Depression - the Case of Sociotropy-Dependency and Autonomy-Self-Criticism. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1995;118:358-78.

25. Humphreys LG. Doing Research the Hard Way - Substituting Analysis of Variance for a Problem in Correlational Analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1978;70:873-6.
26. MacCallum RC, Zhang SB, Preacher KJ, Rucker DD. On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods*. 2002;7:19-40.
27. Vargha A, Rudas T, Delaney HD, Maxwell SE. Dichotomization, partial correlation, and conditional independence. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*. 1996;21:264-82.
28. de Voogd JN, Wempe JB, Postema K, van Sonderen E, Ranchor AV, Coyne JC, Sanderman R. More evidence that depressive symptoms predict mortality in COPD patients: Is type D personality an alternative explanation? *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2009;38:86-93.
29. Pelle AJM, Gidron YY, Szabo BM, Denollet J. Psychological predictors of prognosis in chronic heart failure. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*. 2008;14:341-50.
30. Lichtman JH, Bigger JT, Blumenthal JA, Frasure-Smith N, Kaufmann PG, Lesperance F, Mark DB, Sheps DS, Taylor CB, Froelicher ES. Depression and Coronary Heart Disease: Recommendations for Screening, Referral, and Treatment: A Science Advisory From the American Heart Association Prevention Committee of the Council on Cardiovascular Nursing, Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on Epidemiology and Prevention, and Interdisciplinary Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research Endorsed by the American Psychiatric Association. *Circulation*. 2008;118:1768-75.
31. Thombs BD, de Jonge P, Coyne JC, Whooley MA, Frasure-Smith N, Mitchell AJ, Zuidersma M, Eze-Nliam C, Lima BB, Smith CG, Soderlund K, Ziegelstein RC. Depression Screening and Patient Outcomes in Cardiovascular Care A Systematic Review. *JAMA-Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2008;300:2161-71.
32. Valenstein M, Dalack G, Blow F, Figueroa S, Standiford C, Douglass A. Screening for psychiatric illness with a combined screening and diagnostic instrument. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 1997;12:679-85.
33. Bermejo I, Frey C, Kriston L, Schneider F, Gaebel W, Hegerl U, Berger M, Harter M. Stability of the effects of guideline training in primary care on the identification of depressive disorders. *Primary Care & Community Psychiatry*. 2007;12:99-107.
34. Bermejo I, Niebling W, Mathias B, Harter M. Patients' and physicians' evaluation of the PHQ-D for depression screening. *Primary Care & Community Psychiatry*. 2005;10(4):125-31.
35. Petticrew M, Bell R, Hunter D. Influence of psychological coping on survival and recurrence in people with cancer: systematic review. *British Medical Journal*. 2002;325:1066-69.
36. Ioannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. *PLOS Medicine*. 2005;2:696-701.

37. Young NS, Ioannidis JPA, Al-Ubaydi O. Why current publication practices may distort science. *PLOS Medicine*. 2008;5:1418-22.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Survival for Type D

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics in Relation to Type D Personality

	<i>Total Sample (n=706)</i>	<i>Type D (n=95; 13%)</i>	<i>nonType D (n=611; 87%)</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Demographic variables				
Age, yrs	70.7 (11.5)	69.3 (12.3)	70.9 (11.3)	.203
Female sex	38.2%	42.1%	37.6%	.405
Clinical variables				
LVEF, %	33.8 (14.3)	34.7 (15.2)	33.7 (14.2)	.533
History of AF	33.4%	34.7%	33.2%	.771
NYHA (at discharge)				
II	49.4%	37.6%	51.2%	
III–IV	50.6%	62.4%	48.8%	.015
Ischemic etiology	43.2%	45.3%	42.9%	.663
≥1 comorbidity	78.6%	76.8%	78.9%	.651
Prior HF admission	33.4%	34.7%	33.2%	.771
BNP	.674 (.72)	.659 (.61)	.676 (.74)	.697 (M-W)
Medication at discharge				
ACE/ARB	84.0%	80.0%	84.6%	.254
Diuretics	96.5%	96.8%	96.4%	.828
Beta-blockers	65.2%	60.0%	66.0%	.257
Lipid-lowering drugs	37.7%	35.8%	38.0%	.683
Antidepressants	6.1%	13.7%	4.9%	.001
Negative affectivity	6.4 (6.0)	15.8 (4.3)	4.9 (4.7)	
Social inhibition	7.9 (7.1)	16.8 (5.0)	6.5 (6.3)	
Depression				
CES-D	15.4 (10.7)	25.9 (10.7)	13.8 (9.7)	<.001
≥ 16, %	39.9%	76.8%	34.2%	<.001

Note. Values are mean (\pm SD) or %.

ACE/ARB = angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor/angiotensin receptor blocker; AF = atrial fibrillation; CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; HF = heart failure; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA = New York Heart Association functional class.

Table 2. Baseline Characteristics in Relation to Survival

	<i>Total Sample (n=706)</i>	<i>Dead (n=192; 27%)</i>	<i>Alive (n=514; 73%)</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Demographic variables				
Age, yrs	70.7 (11.5)	74.4 (10.0)	69.3 (11.7)	<.001
Female sex	38.2%	33.9%	39.9%	.142
Clinical variables				
LVEF, %	33.8 (14.3)	33.3 (14.5)	34.0 (14.3)	.622
History of AF	33.4%	45.8%	28.8%	<.001
NYHA (at discharge)				
II	49.4%	38.9%	53.3%	
III–IV	50.6%	61.1%	46.7%	.001
Ischemic etiology	43.2%	51.0%	40.3%	.010
≥1 comorbidity	78.6%	87.0%	75.5%	.001
Prior HF admission	33.4%	45.8%	28.8%	<.001
BNP	.674 (.72)	.952 (.91)	.570 (.60)	<.001 (M-W)
Medication at discharge				
ACE/ARB	84.0%	76.6%	86.8%	.001
Diuretics	96.5%	97.9%	95.9%	.200
Beta-blockers	65.2%	59.9%	67.1%	.073
Lipid-lowering drugs	37.7%	37.5%	37.7%	.953
Antidepressants	6.1%	6.8%	5.8%	.644
Negative affectivity	6.4 (6.0)	6.2 (5.7)	6.4 (6.0)	.772
Social inhibition	7.9 (7.1)	7.8 (6.8)	7.9 (7.2)	.952
Type D Personality				

Depression	15.4 (10.7)	16.4 (10.3)	15.0 (10.8)	.114
CES-D	39.9%	44.3%	38.3%	.151
≥ 16, %				

Note. Values are mean (\pm SD) or %.

ACE/ARB = angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor/angiotensin receptor blocker; AF = atrial fibrillation; CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; HF = heart failure; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA = New York Heart Association functional class

Table 3. Cox proportional hazards analysis of survival status with Type-D dichotomized

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>HR</i>	<i>95% CI for Exp (B)</i>	
							<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
Model 1								
BNP	.46	.07	46.07	1	<.001	1.59	1.39	1.81
Depression	.01	.01	2.30	1	.130	1.01	.997	1.023
Model 2								
BNP	.46	.07	45.12	1	<.001	1.58	1.38	1.81
Depression	.01	.01	3.38	1	.066	1.01	.999	1.028
Type-D	-.25	.24	1.10	1	.294	.78	.49	1.24

BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide.

Note: Continuous score for depression was used

Table 4. Cox proportional hazards analysis of survival status with Type-D as interaction between negative affectivity and social inhibition

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>HR</i>	<i>95% CI for Exp (B)</i>	
							<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
<i>Model 1</i>								
BNP	.46	.07	46.07	1	<.001	1.59	1.39	1.81
Depression	.01	.01	2.30	1	.130	1.01	.997	1.023
<i>Model 2</i>								
BNP	.46	.07	43.27	1	<.001	1.58	1.38	1.80
Depression	.02	.01	5.01	1	.025	1.02	1.00	1.04
Neg. aff (z-score)	-.10	.10	1.12	1	.289	.90	.74	1.09
Soc. inh (z-score)	-.03	.08	0.15	1	.695	.97	.84	1.13
Neg.aff x Soc.inh	-.10	.07	2.13	1	.144	.90	.79	1.04
<i>Model 3</i>								
BNP	.46	.07	43.38	1	<.001	1.58	1.38	1.81
Depression	.02	.01	4.92	1	.027	1.02	1.00	1.04
Neg. aff (z-score)	-.14	.10	2.01	1	.156	.87	.72	1.05
Soc. inh (z-score)	-.03	.08	0.19	1	.659	.97	.83	1.12

BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide.

Note: Continuous score for depression was used.

Figure 1

