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Abstract: Introduction: Screening of high risk patients and accelerating their treatment measures can reduce the burden of the disease caused by acute upper gastrointestinal (GI) bleeding. This study aimed to compare the full and modified Glasgow-Blatchford Bleeding Score (GBS and mGBS) in prediction of in-hospital outcomes of upper GI bleeding. Methods: In the present retrospective cross-sectional study, the accuracy of GBS and mGBS models were compared in predicting the outcome of patients over 18 years of age with acute upper GI bleeding confirmed via endoscopy, presenting to the emergency departments of 3 teaching hospitals during 4 years. Results: 330 cases with the mean age of 59.07 ± 19.00 years entered the study (63.60% male). Area under the curve of GBS and mGBS scoring systems were 0.691 and 0.703, respectively, in prediction of re-bleeding (p = 0.219), 0.562 and 0.563 regarding need for surgery (p = 0.978), 0.549 and 0.542 for endoscopic intervention (p = 0.505), and 0.767 and 0.770 regarding blood transfusion (p = 0.753). Area under the ROC curve of GBS scoring system regarding need for hospitalization in intensive care unit (0.589 vs. 0.563; p = 0.035) and mortality (0.597 vs. 0.564; p = 0.011) was better but the superiority was not clinically significant. Conclusion: GBS and mGBS scoring systems have similar accuracy in prediction of the probability of re-bleeding, need for blood transfusion, surgery and endoscopic intervention, hospitalization in intensive care unit, and mortality of patients with acute upper GI bleeding.
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1. Introduction

Upper gastrointestinal (GI) bleeding is a common cause of visiting the emergency department with a mean incidence of about 100 individuals in each 100000 population per year (1-3). The rate of mortality in these patients has been estimated to be between 2% to 15% and for cases with re-bleeding this rate rises to 10% to 30% (4, 5). Various factors such as age, hemodynamic status, need for blood transfusion, presence of bright blood in vomit or stool, and history of chronic hepatic diseases have been deemed related to the prognosis of these patients (6, 7).

Patients presenting to the emergency department with complaint of upper GI bleeding have a wide range from very low risk to very high risk regarding the risk of re-bleeding and need for surgical and endoscopic interventions. Screening of patients with higher risk and accelerating their diagnostic and treatment measures can be a big step towards reducing the burden of the disease, the financial cost, and mortality caused by it. Therefore, by understanding this concept, various studies have been performed with the aim of designing and comparing clinical decision rules for scoring of patients regarding the probability of dangerous outcomes occurring (8-10). Yet, each of these models has weak and strong points compared to another. One of these clinical decision rules is Glasgow-Blatchford bleeding score (GBS), the modi-
fied version of which (mGBS) has been introduced by elimination of qualitative factors. This system has moderate to good accuracy in prediction of outcomes such as probability of re-bleeding and need for interventions like endoscopy, surgery, and blood transfusion (11-13). The present study has been designed with the aim of comparing the GBS and mGBS in prediction of in-hospital outcomes of patients presenting to emergency department with symptoms of upper GI bleeding.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design and setting

In the present retrospective cross-sectional study, the diagnostic accuracy of GBS and mGBS models in predicting the outcome of patients with acute upper GI bleeding, presenting to the emergency departments of 3 teaching hospitals (Imam Hossein, Shohadaye Tajrish, and Taleghani), Tehran, Iran, from spring 2011 to winter 2016 (4 years) were compared. The researchers adhered to the ethical principles of clinical researches and kept patient data confidential. Methodology of the study was approved by the ethics committee of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences.

2.2. Participants

All patients over 18 years of age visiting the mentioned emergency departments with symptoms of upper GI bleeding (hematemesis, coffee ground vomit, melena, hematochezia) whose bleeding was confirmed via endoscopy were included via census sampling method. Incomplete medical profile, unavailability of data needed for calculation of score, and the outcome of the patient not being known were among the exclusion criteria.

2.3. Data gathering

Demographic data (age, sex), vital signs on admission (blood pressure, heart rate), clinical symptom on admission (syncope, melena, coffee ground vomit, hematochezia), history of illnesses (GI bleeding, hepatic disease, cardiac disease), history of consuming anti-coagulation drugs or platelet aggregation inhibitors, laboratory findings (hemoglobin and blood urea nitrogen levels), and finally, outcome of the patients were extracted from their clinical profile and gathered using a pre-designed checklist. The evaluated outcomes in the present study included: in-hospital mortality, re-bleeding in the present hospitalization duration, need for blood transfusion, hospitalization in intensive care unit (ICU), and need for an intervention, either endoscopic, surgical or radiologic. A senior emergency medicine resident was in charge of extracting and gathering data of the patients from their clinical profiles. Blood transfusion in these patients had been done based on the decision of the in-charge physician.

2.4. Calculating patients’ scores in the 2 mentioned models

The method of calculating the scores of the patients based on GBS model is summarized in appendix 1. In mGBS model, only the scores of quantitative variables of GBS model are considered and the scores of the qualitative variables (history of cardiac and hepatic diseases as well as melena and syncope symptoms) are eliminated from calculations. Therefore, the ranges of obtainable scores in GBS and mGBS models are 0 to 23 and 0 to 16, respectively. In the present study, the score ranges of (0–3), (4–7), (8–11), and (12–23) were considered as the first to 4th quartiles of GBS system, respectively, and (0–1), (2–6), (7–9), and (10–16) were the first to 4th quartiles of mGBS system, respectively.

Appendix 1: Calculation of GBS score

| Variable                          | Score |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Heart rate (/min)                 |       |
| ≥ 100                             | 1     |
| Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)    |       |
| 100 – 109                         | 1     |
| 90 - 99                           | 2     |
| Less than 90                      | 3     |
| Blood urea nitrogen (mg/dl)       |       |
| 19 – 22.4                         | 2     |
| 22.4 – 28                         | 3     |
| 28 – 70                           | 4     |
| ≥ 70                              | 6     |
| Hemoglobin (male) (gr/dl)         |       |
| 12 – 13                           | 1     |
| 10 – 12                           | 3     |
| Less than 10                      | 6     |
| Hemoglobin (female) (gr/dl)       |       |
| 10 – 12                           | 1     |
| Less than 10                      | 6     |
| History of chronic disease        |       |
| Hepatic                           | 2     |
| Cardiac                           | 2     |
| Symptom                           |       |
| Melena                            | 1     |
| Syncope                           | 2     |

subsection Statistical analysis After entering data to a designed excel sheet, they were analyzed using SPSS 21 and STATA 11 statistical software. To report the findings, frequency and percentage or mean ± standard deviation were used. In addition, for evaluating the agreement rate between the 2 models in predicting the patients in need of at least one intervention (endoscopic, surgical, radiologic, or blood transfusion) Kappa coefficient was calculated. Comparison of the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was used for comparing the accuracy of the 2 models in predicting the mentioned outcomes. In this study, the area...
Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the studied patients

| Variable                        | Rates                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| **Sex**                         |                        |
| Male                            | 210 (63.6)             |
| Female                          | 120 (36.4)             |
| **Age (year)**                  |                        |
| 20 – 39.9                       | 63 (19.1)              |
| 40 – 59.9                       | 91 (27.6)              |
| > 60                            | 176 (53.3)             |
| **Symptoms on admission**       |                        |
| Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)  | 107.2 ± 22.8           |
| Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg) | 71.6 ± 12.4            |
| Heart rate (/min)               | 94.8 ± 16.7            |
| **Blood**                       |                        |
| Hemoglobin (gr/dl)              | 9.6 ± 2.4              |
| Blood urea nitrogen (mg/dl)     | 37.6 ± 32.5            |
| **Drug history**                |                        |
| Yes                             | 135 (40.9)             |
| No                              | 195 (59.1)             |
| **History of gastrointestinal bleeding** |            |
| Yes                             | 77 (23.3)              |
| No                              | 253 (76.7)             |
| **History of cardiac disease**  |                        |
| Yes                             | 101 (30.6)             |
| No                              | 229 (69.4)             |
| **History of hepatic disease**  |                        |
| Yes                             | 7 (2.1)                |
| No                              | 323 (97.9)             |

The rates are reported as either frequency (%) or mean ± standard deviation.

3. Results

3.1. Baseline characteristics

400 patients who had presented to the emergency department with complaint of upper GI bleeding were evaluated. 70 (17.5%) cases were excluded from the study due to missing data or lost to follow-up. In the end, 330 individuals with the mean age of 59.07 ± 19.00 (19 – 95) years entered the study (63.60% male). Table 1 depicts the baseline characteristics of the studied patients. Most of the patients (53.3%) were in the over 60 years age group and their most common symptom on admission to emergency department was melena (71.5%).

3.2. Outcomes

178 patients had needed at least one of the interventions of blood transfusion, endoscopy, or surgery. Frequency of need for the mentioned interventions was 137 (41.5%) cases of need for blood transfusion, 84 (25.5%) cases of need for endoscopic intervention, and 17 (5.2%) cases of need for surgery (some of the patients needed more than one intervention). None of the patients had undergone radiologic intervention. 49 (14.8%) patients were hospitalized in the ICU and 281 (85.2%) were hospitalized in the gastroenterology department. In the end, 90 (27.3%) patients were affected with re-bleeding and 55 (16.7%) patients had died.

3.3. Comparing the accuracy of the 2 models

Mean GBS and mGBS scores of the patients were 9.95 ± 4.22 (0 – 19) and 8.29 ± 3.77 (0 – 16), respectively. Table 2 shows the frequency of patients in various quartiles of GBS and mGBS scores and indicates the need for at least 1 intervention in each quartile (kappa = 0.752, p <0.001). There was a significant correlation between higher quartile of both GBS (r = 0.416, p < 0.0001) and mGBS (r = 0.422, p < 0.0001), and increase in need for at least one intervention. Area under the curves of GBS and mGBS scoring systems in prediction of re-bleeding (p = 0.219), need for surgery (p = 0.978), endoscopic intervention (p = 0.505), and blood transfusion (p = 0.753) were not significantly different. However, although area under the ROC curve of GBS scoring system was significantly higher regarding need for hospitalization in ICU (p = 0.035) and mortality (p = 0.011), the difference was not clinically significant. The highest accuracy of both models was in prediction of need for blood transfusion and re-bleeding.

4. Discussion

Based on the present study findings, GBS and mGBS scoring systems have similar accuracy in prediction of the probability of re-bleeding, need for blood transfusion, surgical intervention, and endoscopic intervention in patients with acute upper GI bleeding. Regarding prediction of need for hospitalization in ICU and in-hospital mortality, although the difference between the 2 models was statistically significant, it was not clinically important. The overall accuracy of the 2 models in predicting the mentioned outcomes was weak and the highest accuracy belonged to predicting the probability of re-bleeding and need for blood transfusion, which were in the moderate range (70-80).

Stanley et al. in 2011 compared GBS and Rockall systems in predicting the outcome of patients with acute upper GI bleeding and pointed out the superiority of GBS system regarding prediction of need for surgery intervention, endoscopy, and blood transfusion (9). Balaban et al. in a study titled "Predictors for in-hospital mortality and need for clin-
Table 2: Frequency of patients in various quartiles of GBS and mGBS scores and the rate of need for at least 1 intervention in each quartile

| Quartile | GBS frequency (%) | P | mGBS frequency (%) | P |
|----------|------------------|---|-------------------|---|
|          | Frequency        | Need for intervention |       | Frequency        | Need for intervention |       |
| First    | 31 (9.4)         | 3 (9.6)                  |       | 21 (6.4)         | 1 (4.7)                 |       |
| Second   | 50 (15.2)        | 8 (16.0)                 | 0.0001| 73 (22.1)        | 17 (23.2)               | 0.0001|
| Third    | 113 (34.2)       | 74 (65.4)                |       | 85 (25.8)        | 55 (64.7)               |       |
| Fourth   | 136 (41.2)       | 93 (68.3)                |       | 151 (45.8)       | 105 (69.6)              |       |

1: Score ranges of (0 – 3), (4 – 7), (8 – 11), and (12 – 23), were considered as 1st to 4th quartiles of GBS system, respectively, and (0–1), (2–6), (7–9), and (10–16) were considered the first to 4th quartiles of mGBS system, respectively.
2: Need for at least one of endoscopic, surgical, and radiologic interventions, and blood transfusion.

5. Limitation

Small sample size, retrospective design, and probability of selection bias might be among the most important limitations of the present study. Additionally, since selection of patients in need of intervention in various hospitals was based on the in-charge physician’s opinion and not a determined standard, therefore this may cause errors in selection of patients.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present study, GBS and mGBS scoring systems have similar accuracy in prediction of the probability of re-bleeding, need for blood transfusion, surgical intervention, and endoscopic intervention in patients with acute upper GI bleeding. Regarding prediction of need for hospitalization in ICU and in-hospital mortality, although the difference between the 2 models was statistically significant, it was not clinically considerable. The overall accuracy of the 2 models in predicting the mentioned outcomes was weak and the highest accuracy of the models belonged to predicting the probability of re-bleeding and need for blood transfusion, which were in the moderate range (70-80).
7.2. Author contribution
All the authors meet the standard criteria of authorship contribution based on the recommendations of the international committee of medical journal editors.

7.3. Funding/Support
No funds have been received.

7.4. Conflict of interest
There are none.

References
1. Lassen A, Hallas J, De Muckadell OB. Complicated and uncomplicated peptic ulcers in a Danish county 1993–2002: a population-based cohort study. The American journal of gastroenterology. 2006;101(5):945.
2. Van Leerdm M, Vreeburg E, Rauws E, Geraedts A, Tijsen J, Reitsma J, et al. Acute upper GI bleeding: did anything change?: Time trend analysis of incidence and outcome of acute upper GI bleeding between 1993/1994 and 2000. The American journal of gastroenterology. 2003;98(7):1494-9.
3. Targownik LE, Nabalamba A. Trends in management and outcomes of acute nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding: 1993–2003. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology. 2006;4(12):1459-66.e1.
4. Van Leerdm M. Epidemiology of acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology. 2008;22(2):209-24.
5. Tramer MR, Moore RA, Reynolds DJM, McQuay HJ. Quantitative estimation of rare adverse events which follow a biological progression: a new model applied to chronic NSAID use. Pain. 2000;85(1-2):169-82.
6. Lim C, Vani D, Shah S, Everett S, Rembacken B. The outcome of suspected upper gastrointestinal bleeding with 24-hour access to upper gastrointestinal endoscopy: a prospective cohort study. Endoscopy. 2006;38(06):581-5.
7. Kolkman J, Meuwissen S. A review on treatment of bleeding peptic ulcer: a collaborative task of gastroenterologist and surgeon. Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology. 1996;31(sup218):16-25.
8. Camellini L, Merighi A, Pagnini C, Azzolini F, Guazzetti S, Scarcelli A, et al. Comparison of three different risk scoring systems in non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleed- ing. Digestive and liver disease. 2004;36(4):271-7.
9. Stanley AJ, Dalton HR, Blatchford O, Ashley D, Mowat C, Cahill A, et al. Multicentre comparison of the Glasgow Blatchford and Rockall scores in the prediction of clinical end-points after upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage. Alimentary pharmacology & therapeutics. 2011;34(4):470-5.
10. Enns RA, Gagnon YM, Barkun AN, Armstrong D, Gregor JC, Fedorak RN, et al. Validation of the Rockall scoring system for outcomes from non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding in a Canadian setting. World journal of gastroenterology: WJG. 2006;12(48):7779.
11. Cheng D, Lu Y, Teller T, Sekhon H, Wu B. A modified Glasgow Blatchford Score improves risk stratification in upper gastrointestinal bleed: a prospective comparison of scoring systems. Alimentary pharmacology & therapeutics. 2012;36(8):782-9.
12. Yaka E, Yilmaz S, Ozgur Dogan N, Pekdemir M. Comparison of the Glasgow-Blatchford and AIMS65 scoring systems for risk stratification in upper gastrointestinal bleeding in the emergency department. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2015;22(1):22-30.
13. Quach DT, Dao NH, Dinh MC, Nguyen CH, Ho LX, Nguyen N-DT, et al. The performance of a modified Glasgow Blatchford score in predicting clinical interventions in patients with acute nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding: a Vietnamese prospective multicenter cohort study. Gut and liver. 2016;10(3):375.
14. Balaban DV, Strambu V, Florea BG, Cazan AR, Bratuca M, Jinga M. Predictors for in-hospital mortality and need for clinical intervention in upper GI bleeding: a 5-year observational study. Chirurgia (Bucharest, Romania : 1990). 2014;109(1):48-54.
15. Laursen SB, Hansen JM, Schaffalitzky de Muckadell OB. The Glasgow Blatchford score is the most accurate assessment of patients with upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage. Clinical gastroenterology and hepatology : the official clinical practice journal of the American Gastroenterological Association. 2012;10(10):1130-5.e1.
16. Yang HM, Jeon SW, Jung JH, Lee DW, Ha CY, Park KS, et al. Comparison of scoring systems for nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding: a multicenter prospective cohort study. Journal of gastroenterology and hepatology. 2016;31(1):119-25.
17. Cheng DW, Lu YW, Teller T, Sekhon HK, Wu BU. A modified Glasgow Blatchford Score improves risk stratification in upper gastrointestinal bleed: a prospective comparison of scoring systems. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2012;36(8):782-9.
18. Quach DT, Dao NH, Dinh MC, Nguyen CH, Ho LX, Nguyen NT, et al. The Performance of a Modified Glasgow Blatchford Score in Predicting Clinical Interventions in Patients with Acute Nonvariceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Vietnamese Prospective Multicenter Cohort Study. Gut Liver. 2015.