

This is a repository copy of *Effectiveness of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation in coronary artery disease patients treated according to contemporary evidence based medicine : Update of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS-II)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/157898/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Salzwedel, Annett, Jensen, Katrin, Rauch, Bernhard et al. (6 more authors) (2020) Effectiveness of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation in coronary artery disease patients treated according to contemporary evidence based medicine : Update of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS-II). *European journal of preventive cardiology*. ISSN 2047-4881

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2047487320905719>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Effectiveness of Comprehensive Cardiac Rehabilitation in Coronary Artery Disease Patients Treated According to  
2 Contemporary Evidence Based Medicine – Update of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS-II)

3 Annett Salzwedel<sup>1</sup>, Katrin Jensen<sup>2</sup>, Bernhard Rauch<sup>3</sup>, Patrick Doherty<sup>4</sup>, Maria-Inti Metzendorf<sup>5</sup>, Matthes  
4 Hackbusch<sup>2</sup>, Heinz Völler<sup>1</sup>, Jean-Paul Schmid<sup>6</sup> and Constantinos H Davos<sup>7</sup>; on behalf of the ‘Cardiac Rehabilitation  
5 Section’, European Association of Preventive Cardiology (EAPC), in cooperation with the Institute of Medical  
6 Biometry and Informatics (IMBI), Department of Medical Biometry, University of Heidelberg, and the Cochrane  
7 Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders Group, Institute of General Practice, Heinrich-Heine University, Düsseldorf,  
8 Germany

9  
10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Research, University of Potsdam, Germany

11 <sup>2</sup>Institute of Medical Biometry and Informatics (IMBI), University of Heidelberg, Germany

12 <sup>3</sup>Institut für Herzinfarktforschung Ludwigshafen, Germany

13 <sup>4</sup>Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

14 <sup>5</sup>Cochrane Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders Group, Institute of General Practice (ifam), Medical Faculty, Heinrich  
15 Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany

16 <sup>6</sup>Department of Cardiology, Clinic Barmelweid, Switzerland

17 <sup>7</sup>Cardiovascular Research Laboratory, Biomedical Research Foundation, Academy of Athens, Greece

18  
19 Corresponding author:

20 Constantinos H Davos, Cardiovascular Research Laboratory, Biomedical Research Foundation, Academy of Athens, 4  
21 Soranou Ephessiou Street, 11527 Athens, Greece

22 Email: cdavos@bioacademy.gr

23 Word count: 7080 (4 Tables and 2 Figures)

24

25 Abstract

26 Background: Despite numerous studies and meta-analyses the prognostic effect of cardiac rehabilitation (CR) is still  
27 under debate. This update of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS II) provides a contemporary and  
28 practice focused approach including only CR interventions based on published standards and core components to  
29 evaluate CR delivery and effectiveness in improving patient`s prognosis.

30 Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis

31 Methods: Randomized controlled trials (RCT) and retrospective and prospective controlled cohort studies (rCCS, pCCS)  
32 evaluating patients after acute coronary syndrome (ACS), coronary bypass grafting (CABG) or mixed populations with  
33 coronary artery disease (CAD) published until Sep 2018 were included.

34 Results: Based on CROS inclusion criteria out of 7,096 abstracts 6 additional studies including 8,671 patients were  
35 identified (2 RCT, 2 rCCS; 2 pCCS). In total, 31 studies including n=228,337 patients were available for this meta-analysis  
36 (3 RCT, 9 pCCS, 19 rCCS; patients after ACS: n=50,653, after CABG: n=14,583, mixed CAD populations: n=163,101;  
37 follow-up periods ranging from 9 months up to 14 years).

38 Heterogeneity in design, CR delivery, biometrical assessment and potential confounders was considerable. CCS  
39 showed a significantly reduced total mortality (primary endpoint) after CR participation in patients after ACS [pCCS:  
40 hazard ratio (HR) 0.37, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.20-0.69; rCCS: HR 0.64, 95% CI 0.53-0.76; pCCS: odds ratio (OR)  
41 0.20, 95% CI 0.08-0.48], but the single RCT fulfilling the CROS inclusion criteria showed neutral results. CR participation  
42 also was associated with reduced total mortality in patients after CABG (rCCS: HR 0.62, 95% CI 0.54-0.70, one single  
43 RCT without fatal events), and in mixed CAD populations (rCCS: HR 0.52, 95% CI 0.36-0.77; 2 out of 10 CCS with neutral  
44 results).

45 Conclusion: CROS II confirms the effectiveness of CR participation after ACS and after CABG in actual clinical practice  
46 by reducing total mortality under the conditions of current evidence-based CAD treatment. The data of CROS II,  
47 however, underscore the urgent need to define internationally accepted minimal standards for CR delivery as well as  
48 for scientific evaluation.

49 Word count: 325

50 Keywords. cardiac rehabilitation, cardiac rehabilitation delivery, acute coronary syndrome, coronary bypass grafting,  
51 coronary artery disease, mortality

## 53 Introduction

54 Within the past 25 years, cardiovascular morbidity and mortality after acute coronary syndromes (ACS) showed  
55 remarkable decrease which is associated with the implementation of acute coronary revascularizations as well as the  
56 application of effective acute and long-term pharmacotherapy.<sup>1</sup> Supporting these results from the United States<sup>1</sup> the  
57 French FAST-MI registry revealed a mortality reduction six months after ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI)  
58 and Non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) from 17.2% to 5.3% and 6.3% respectively.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, on the  
59 basis of the SWEDEHEART registry a marked improvement of 2-years survival was found, but strictly associated with  
60 the use of acute coronary interventions and evidence-based long-term secondary prevention.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, current  
61 evidence-based treatment modalities of ACS and CAD do have a large impact on acute and long-term success of care  
62 delivered to these patients. Against this background the effects of special treatment modalities like cardiac  
63 rehabilitation (CR) need to be re-evaluated in light of their added short and long-term clinical and prognostic benefit.  
64 The Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS) aimed to evaluate the prognostic effect of CR after ACS and coronary  
65 artery bypass grafting (CABG) in the modern era of cardiovascular treatment modalities. On the basis of predominantly  
66 controlled observational studies including a large amount of patients, CROS confirmed a beneficial effect of CR (i.e.  
67 reduced all cause mortality after ACS and after CABG).<sup>4</sup> However, with CROS it became apparent that minimal  
68 requirements for CR delivery (based on published standards and core components)<sup>5–8</sup> had to be fulfilled to reach  
69 effectiveness. These minimal requirements have been addressed by other recent meta-analyses<sup>9–13</sup> with a focus on  
70 volume and intensity of exercise sessions and treatment of CV risk factors during CR. Not meeting these minimal  
71 requirements may explain in part the negative results of some recent studies and meta-analyses.<sup>14–16</sup>

72 Against this background, the aim of this CROS-update was to critically re-evaluate the results of CROS I in the light of  
73 newly published CR studies meeting the strict CROS inclusion criteria. Moreover, the aim of this update was to  
74 further elucidate the CR-effect on secondary and non-fatal clinical endpoints representing a heterogeneous field in  
75 clinical CR research. By evaluating controlled observational studies the CROS data finally reflect everyday clinical care  
76 thereby allowing an estimation of how guideline standards are actually translated into clinical practice.

77

78 Methods

79 This review was conducted and reported according to the PRISMA statement (Preferred Reporting Items for  
80 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses), and the MOOSE statement (Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies  
81 in Epidemiology).<sup>17,18</sup> The core methods used were essentially unchanged compared to the 2016  
82 publication. The study protocol was prospectively published in PROSPERO (CRD42014007084).<sup>19</sup>

83 Study eligibility criteria

84 Randomized controlled trials (RCT) as well as prospective and retrospective controlled cohort studies (pCCS,  
85 rCCS) of multi-component CR versus usual care, with a follow-up period of at least six months, were  
86 investigated. We included men and women of all ages after hospitalization for ACS or CABG, respectively. In  
87 addition, we included studies enrolling mixed populations of patients after ACS and/or after CABG as basic  
88 requirement, as well as patients with chronic stable coronary artery disease (CAD) with or without elective  
89 percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). Patient enrolment had to be carried out by 1995 or later. The  
90 primary endpoint was total mortality. Secondary endpoints mainly included non-fatal cardiovascular events,  
91 hospital readmissions and mixed endpoints. The detailed study selection criteria were previously presented  
92 (see [LINK TO SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL](#), Table SM 1).<sup>4</sup>

93 Search methods and identification of studies

94 For the previous review<sup>4</sup> highly sensitive search strategies were developed to identify two types of studies:  
95 RCT and CCS regardless of the studies' current status (published, unpublished, finished or ongoing). A  
96 detailed description of the elaboration of the search strategy is available in the previous review.<sup>4</sup>

97 For this update, we restricted our search to the following four databases: PubMed, Embase, Cochrane  
98 Central Register of Controlled Trials and the World Health Organization's International Clinical Trials Registry  
99 Platform (ICTRP). Databases, which did not contribute studies for inclusion in the previous review, were no  
100 longer deployed. The search informing this update comprised the period 23 December 2015 – 4 September

2018. No language restrictions were applied. Details of all search strategies are documented in supplemental material (LINK TO SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL, Table SM 2). In addition to searching electronic databases, the references of recent systematic reviews were screened.

#### Study selection

The titles and abstracts of all references were independently evaluated by at least two members of the reference selection board (AS, CHD, BR). Abstracts of potential interest were re-evaluated and selected for full text evaluation (FTE) and structured study evaluation (SSE), respectively, consented within the whole board. FTE for assessing main inclusion criteria and SSE with quality assessment was performed and consented within an extended reference selection board (AS, CHD, BR, PD) including a biometrician (KJ). The primary reasons for study exclusion are given in Table SM 4 (online version, supplemental material).

For the meta-analysis, the studies resulting from the SSE process of the current update were merged with the selected studies from the 2016 publication. The study selection process is outlined in Figure 1.

#### Study evaluation process

The study evaluation included design, data sources, information on population, interventions, controls, calculation and presentation of outcomes and handling of bias. For RCT the Cochrane risk of bias table (<http://tech.cochrane.org/revman/download>), and for the CCS the checklists of methodological issues on non-randomized studies,<sup>20,21</sup> and the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (NOS) were used.<sup>22</sup> To facilitate the study evaluation with respect to management of confounding, age, gender, smoking, diabetes, history of stroke, history of acute myocardial infarction (AMI), reduced left ventricular ejection fraction and acute or early PCI during AMI have been pre-specified as potential confounders.

#### Data extraction

Data extraction was performed by two biometricians independently (KJ, MH), using a standardized extraction form. Disagreements were solved by consensus. We extracted the following information from each eligible article: name of first author, year of publication, study location (country), study design, data

125 source, number of participants, population (ACS, CABG or mixed), inclusion period, inclusion criteria, follow-  
126 up time, mean age of participants, proportion of men, intervention characteristics, control characteristics,  
127 reported outcomes, information on outcomes, data on outcomes, covariates included in the adjusted  
128 models.

#### 129 Statistical analysis

130 The analyses were separated with regard to population (AMI, CABG or mixed) and study design (RCT,  
131 pCCS and rCCS). For time-to-event outcomes, the hazard ratio (HR) with its 95% confidence interval was  
132 chosen as effect measure per study. If possible, log HRs and their standard errors were extracted directly,  
133 preferably from an adjusted model and matched-group analysis. If they were not reported but adequate  
134 univariate analyses were available, an indirect estimation method was used.<sup>23,24</sup> In some study  
135 publications, instead of HR adjusted odds ratios (OR) at the end of follow-up or only absolute numbers of  
136 events to calculate ORs were reported. HRs and ORs were reported and pooled separately in the present  
137 review.<sup>25</sup> For dichotomous outcomes, the OR with its 95% confidence interval was used as the effect  
138 measure per study. If no event occurred in one or in both arms, a continuity correction of 0.5 per cell was  
139 applied. For consistency, we re-calculated the treatment effect to be in the same direction, as necessary,  
140 with an HR or OR above 1 indicating a higher risk for CR with respect to each outcome. HRs were combined  
141 using the generic inverse-variance method. ORs were pooled using the Mantel-Haenszel method or the  
142 generic inverse-variance method. The latter one was used when at least one study reported an adjusted OR.  
143 Random-effects models were used to calculate overall effect estimates and confidence intervals because we  
144 assumed heterogeneity between the 'true' effects of the different CR programs used in the studies. All  
145 results were investigated for statistical heterogeneity by I<sup>2</sup> statistics with 0-30% representing no or only  
146 small, 30-60% moderate, 50-90% substantial and 75-100% considerable heterogeneity.<sup>26</sup> A statistical  
147 investigation of potential publication bias based on a test of funnel plot asymmetry could not be done  
148 because of too few studies per single meta-analysis.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, sensitivity analyses for the outcome  
149 total mortality have been performed with respect to extracted results of alternative analysis techniques (e.g.

150 independent groups instead of matched groups). There are some deviations from the review protocol  
151 published in PROSPERO.19 ORs instead of RRs were used as effect measure for dichotomous outcomes  
152 because in some studies adjusted ORs and no absolute numbers are reported. Furthermore, it was not  
153 possible to undertake the planned subgroup analyses due to the small number of studies in each subgroup.  
154 R version 3.5.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2015) and the R “meta” package version 4.9-2  
155 (developed by Guido Schwarzer) was used for all statistical analyses.

## 156 Results

### 157 Study characteristics

158 Study characteristics (design, population, interventions, controls and primary results) of the newly identified  
159 studies are presented in Table 1. With respect to the design, only 2 RCT (n=240 patients) fulfilled the CROS  
160 criteria increasing the total number of RCT to 3 (n=2,053 patients). In addition, 2 rCCS (n=5,238 patients) and  
161 2 pCCS (n=3,193 patients) were newly identified. Thus, a total of 18 rCCS (n=211,334 patients) and 9 pCCS  
162 (n=15,386 patients) were considered for final analysis.

163 Three new studies enrolled 4,315 patients after ACS (total of 15 studies; n=50,653 patients), one additional  
164 study included 36 patients after CABG (total of 10 studies; n=14,583 patients), while 2 newly identified  
165 studies recruited 4,320 patients in “mixed populations” (total of 11 studies; n=163,101 patients).

166 CR setting was “out-patient” in all new studies (total of 27) and CR duration varied from 12 weeks to 12  
167 months, thereby not changing the range of 3-4 weeks up to 12 months identified in the previous CROS study.  
168 Moreover, the previously reported “CR intensity” ranging from 2 up to more than 5 exercise sessions per  
169 week plus motivation, information, education, and psychosocial interventions with variable intensities and  
170 combinations remained unchanged.

171 Notably, the included studies reveal a considerable heterogeneity not only with respect to the predefined  
172 study designs (RCT, pCCS, rCCS), and populations (after ACS, after CABG, mixed CAD populations), but also  
173 with respect to study endpoints and biometrical evaluation (Tables 2, 3a/b and Fig. 2). For this reason, the



174 majority of the secondary endpoints predefined by CROS could not be integrated into a meta-analysis (Table  
175 2, Figure 2).

### 176 Primary endpoint “total mortality”

177 A summary of the clinical outcomes is shown in Table 2. The primary endpoint “total mortality” was  
178 evaluated in 27 studies, one of them evaluating both, mortality after ACS and after CABG (Figure 2).<sup>27</sup>

179 Participation in CR was associated with a significant reduction of total mortality in all but 6 studies.<sup>14,28–32</sup>

180 After ACS a significant reduction of total mortality was confirmed by the newly added pCCS (4 studies, HR  
181 0.37, 95% CI 0.20-0.69;  $I^2=28\%$ ) and even strengthened by the newly added rCCS (4 studies; HR 0.64, 95% CI  
182 0.53-0.76;  $I^2=33\%$ ).

183 After CABG, the newly identified single RCT was small, only enrolling  $n=36$  low risk patients. During a follow-  
184 up period of one year, no deaths occurred, and the risk of “underpowering” has to be regarded as high in  
185 this study (see Table 3b, Figure 2).. No additional rCCS or pCCS were identified; consequently, the previous  
186 positive results on mortality reduction remained unchanged in this population.

187 In “mixed populations” the addition of one more pCCS confirmed the significant mortality reduction in CR  
188 participants (2 studies; HR 0.66, 95% CI 0.55-0.79) with zero heterogeneity. No additional rCCS calculating  
189 HR within the mixed populations could be included by the current search (HR 0.52, 95% CI 0.36-0.77,  $I^2=84\%$ ).

190 The single rCCS newly added within the group calculating OR did not change the neutral result reported  
191 before in this group (3 studies, OR 0.68, 95% CI 0.34-1.37) but heterogeneity was high ( $I^2=94\%$ ). Sensitivity  
192 analyses did not change the overall results.

### 193 Secondary endpoints

194 The results of CROS II with respect to the secondary endpoints are listed in Table 2, differentiating between  
195 the various study designs, populations and biometrical approaches. These results are summarized as follows:

196 Regarding the secondary endpoints “CV mortality” (3 additional studies, 7 studies in total) and “MACCE” (3  
197 studies, unchanged) all selected studies considerably differed with respect to populations and designs, and  
198 a “matching” of these studies for meta-analysis was not possible (Table 2). Focusing on the endpoint “CV  
199 mortality” and based on the two large controlled observational studies (pCCS, rCCS) there might be a trend  
200 in favor of CR participation after ACS and after CABG. With regard to the endpoint MACCE, however, the  
201 selected studies do not allow a final conclusion on the effect of CR-participation (Table 2).

202 The outcomes “non-fatal MI” (total 7 studies) and “non-fatal stroke” (total 3 studies) also did not show a  
203 clear trend, but all studies varied in design and population thus hindering a further evaluation by meta-  
204 analysis.

205 The same is true for studies investigating the variably predefined endpoints for “hospital readmission”  
206 (endpoints 6-9, see Methods). Most of these studies had heterogeneous designs, and matching of the  
207 studies for meta-analysis was not possible (Table 2).

208 In a descriptive way the results on “hospital readmission” may be summarized as follows: all studies included  
209 in CROS either showed a reduction of hospital readmissions in favor of CR-participation, or there was a  
210 neutral result. In 12 studies, combined endpoints with various components were evaluated. One more RCT  
211 has been identified showing a statistically reduced combined end-point (death, recurrent acute coronary  
212 events, or hospitalization for HF) after CR participation compared to usual care (HR=0.26, 95% CI 0.09–  
213 0.73).<sup>33</sup>

214 Quality evaluation of the studies:

215 The sum of positive adjudications estimated by NOS is presented in Table 3a (for details see online version,  
216 supplemental material: Table SM 5). Four additional studies were graded within a range of 5-7. In total, 5  
217 out of 28 studies (18%) were graded with 5 points or less. Limitations were found with respect to  
218 representativeness (6 studies), comparability of the cohorts (3 studies), adequacy of follow-up (5 studies),  
219 and the assessment of outcomes (2 studies).

220 On the basis of the checklist of methodological issues on non-randomized studies the following limitations  
221 were identified (Tables 3a/b):

222 Three studies were based on a secondary analysis of original studies with different original objectives

223 In 3 studies, either time or location differences between the study groups were apparent.

224 In most studies, the group formation was potentially influenced by health care decision makers and patient's  
225 preferences.

226 The majority of the studies had unclear study protocols and a consort flow diagram was presented only in  
227 seven out of 28 studies

228 Management of confounding was not reported in 3 studies, whereas the description of potential  
229 confounding domains remained unclear or has not been reported in 16 studies.

230 Predefinition and calculation of all confounding domains as pre-specified by CROS (see Materials and  
231 Methods) were performed to various degrees. In only 4 studies all 8 predefined confounders were  
232 considered for adjustment. Moreover, 6 studies only considered 3 or even less confounders as predefined  
233 by CROS. In general, adjustment for confounding was performed in 24 CCS with 4 studies not applying  
234 adequate biometrical methods.

235 Both RCT evaluating the primary endpoint "total mortality" do have a considerable risk of being  
236 underpowered (Table 3b).<sup>14,30,33</sup>

237

238 Discussion

239 This update of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS II) confirms the beneficial prognostic effect  
240 of CR in CAD patients by significantly reducing the primary endpoint "total mortality" especially after ACS or  
241 CABG. However, the effects of CR-participation on secondary endpoints like "CV-mortality", "non fatal  
242 myocardial infarction", "non fatal stroke", "combined endpoints" and various forms of "hospital

243 readmission” remain less clear. This at least in part - is due to a considerable heterogeneity of the selected  
244 studies with respect to design, populations, predefined endpoints and biometry. Inconsistent results may be  
245 due to the kind of selected endpoints including “weak” endpoints with increased risks of confounding. This  
246 is particularly true for the variable forms of “hospital re-admission”, which may be influenced by local  
247 routines in medical services, individual comorbidities not necessarily associated with CV diseases, and the  
248 individual’s disease perception. Moreover, a longer survival of patients after AMI/CABG may reveal other  
249 diseases that primarily determine the number of hospital admissions during prolonged follow-up.

250 With regard to the secondary endpoint “non-fatal AMI” an overall “neutral” effect also has been reported  
251 by Cochrane (Anderson et al. 2016). As AMI and death are closely interrelated clinical events one might  
252 speculate that CR-participation effectively prevents death initiated by AMI, but also reduces the incidence  
253 of AMI (fatal + non-fatal) per se, resulting in an apparent “neutral effect” with respect to non-fatal AMI  
254 occurrence. Unfortunately, the data sources presently available for CROS do not allow to further evaluate  
255 this hypothesis.

256 One of the major strengths of this study is its robust approach to CR intervention aligned with published  
257 national CR standards and core components.<sup>5–7</sup> Our strict definition of a comprehensive multi-component  
258 CR underscores the importance of the amount of physical exercise provided, the adherence to exercise  
259 intervention and the adherence to non-exercise components on the patients’ prognosis. The results of  
260 recently published meta-analyses (some of them including studies of the modern era of novel medication  
261 and interventions) seem to support this approach and somehow elucidate our results. Thus, van Halewijn et  
262 al. have shown that a significant reduction in all-cause mortality was feasible in CAD patients only under the  
263 condition of a comprehensive CR program managing six or more CV risk factors,<sup>10</sup> while the recently  
264 published EU-CaRE study showed positive effects of comprehensive CR in 58% of older patients with three  
265 or more uncontrolled risk factors before CR.<sup>34</sup> These findings, coupled with CROS II results, strengthen  
266 clinical recommendations that comprehensive CR is preferable to standalone exercise based CR in reducing  
267 total and cardiac mortality, in post-MI patients.<sup>13</sup> The effectiveness of a comprehensive CR program is

268 increased by the patient's adherence and by the shared effort to consequently assess and treat the majority  
269 of all individual CV risk factors.

270 With regards to the importance of the CR dose, Santiago de Araujo Pio et al. established that total mortality  
271 reduction was only possible in cardiovascular disease patients experiencing medium and high doses of CR.<sup>12</sup>  
272 Similar CR dose and volume related effects on mortality have been published.<sup>9,35</sup> Finally, in a systematic  
273 review of multi-component CR, applying almost all CROS inclusion criteria, the study by Sumner et al. carried  
274 out a meta-analysis of observational studies published after the year 2000, concluding that all-cause and  
275 cardiac mortality were reduced in AMI patients following a CR program.<sup>36</sup>

276 Still, one has to keep in mind that this beneficial effect of CR-participation as shown in CROS may not apply  
277 to special subgroups like elderly and frail patients who need a particularly personalized approach.<sup>37</sup>  
278 According to Deaton C et al.<sup>38</sup> however, the average age of the CROS study population reflects actual clinical  
279 reality. Likewise, CR participation of patients with severe systolic heart failure may not result in mortality  
280 reduction as shown in previous meta-analyses.<sup>39–41</sup>

281 Apart from these limitations, CROS II presents a timely account of the effectiveness of CR when delivered to  
282 agreed published standards including scientifically proven CR core components.<sup>5–7</sup> Utilizing a strict  
283 approach to CR intervention study inclusion we can report a significant benefit (Table 2 and figure 2) in favor  
284 of CR with respect to all-cause mortality. However, at the same time this approach might be viewed as a  
285 significant weakness as it makes our findings almost incompatible with previous reviews which have been  
286 much more inclusive of CR interventions often defined by innovations in CR being evaluated as part of clinical  
287 trials rather than informed by interventions based on published CR program standards and core  
288 components. Only three RCT were selected for CROS II compared to 63 in the most recent Cochrane review  
289 which reported a significant reduction in cardiovascular mortality but not in all-cause mortality.<sup>9</sup> We are not  
290 suggesting that previous trial based reviews are erroneous. On the contrary, we agree that robust trials-  
291 based reviews remain top of the evidence base hierarchy. What we are proposing is that, the CROS II approach

292 differs to the extent that it should be viewed as an additional form of evidence that utilizes registry-based  
293 research reflecting a broader population in the modern cardiology era from 1995 onwards.

294 For a critical estimation of the CROS II results, the following aspects have to be emphasized:

295 Cardiac rehabilitation participation after ACS or CABG is associated with reduced total mortality if delivered  
296 on top of the current evidence-based treatment modalities (medication and acute coronary interventions).

297 Cardiac rehabilitation participation therefore may contribute to treatment adherence and further add  
298 effective individual life style changes necessary to significantly reduce patient`s cardiovascular risk.<sup>42–46</sup>

299 This positive effect of CR participation obviously works in current clinical practice of different countries  
300 provided a minimum of CR volume and intensity is delivered. This especially refers to the individually adapted  
301 and supervised exercise training and a rigorous treatment of all individual cardiovascular risk factors.  
302 9,12,13,47

303 Unfortunately, these prerequisites of successfully delivered CR - although outlined in detail in many position  
304 papers - are not necessarily followed in clinical practice. As noted in CROS II, these prerequisites are not  
305 sufficiently described in many clinical studies evaluating CR effectiveness. Therefore, there is an urgent need  
306 to effectively translate these well-known and evidence-based minimal standards into all day clinical practice  
307 wherever CR is offered. Moreover, these clinical standards need to be the adamant basis of future CR  
308 outcome studies. To this end, minimal standards for CR interventions in clinical practice and clinical trials  
309 should be based on robust published guidelines and research. We offer the CROS II definition and criteria as  
310 a useful guide for optimal CR intervention content and delivery; including multi-disciplinary and multi-  
311 component programs with structured, supervised exercise training delivered at least twice per week in  
312 combination with motivational techniques, risk factor modification education, dietary advices, psychosocial  
313 and vocational support delivered at least once per week. The CR setting could be in-, out-patient or mixed  
314 but the time between hospital discharge and CR initiation should be as low as possible, preferably within  
315 three months.

316 From this background it is one of the CROS study's aim not only to evaluate the results and clinical outcomes  
317 of the studies included, but also to critically evaluate strengths and deficiencies in detail of each single study  
318 included into the meta-analysis (see Table 3). As in the first evaluation in CROS, this update uncovers  
319 considerable deficits in current CR studies that need to be addressed and prevented in future. These deficits  
320 include predominantly insufficient description of CR content (e.g. applied components), frequency and  
321 volume of exercise sessions, CR initiation (i.e. after hospital stay for an acute cardiac event) and duration,  
322 absence of CR adherence at follow up as well as methodological issues such as the inadequate consideration  
323 of confounding parameters at the stage of study and statistical analysis design.

### 324 **Clinical implications**

325 Together with the results of other recent reviews, minimal requirements for a successful CR after ACS or  
326 CABG are apparent and need to be ensured in clinical practice:4,9,10,12,13,45

- 327 - Cardiac rehabilitation is multi-component including consequent treatment of the individual's  
328 cardiovascular risk factors, individually adapted physical exercise, information, motivation as well as  
329 individualized psychosocial support.4
- 330 - The individualized approach also reflects gender, age, frailty, heart failure, concomitant diseases,  
331 psychosocial background and effectors of the individual's health and capabilities.
- 332 - Cardiac rehabilitation is supervised and carried out by adequately trained health professionals  
333 including cardiologists.4
- 334 - During CR the "dose" of exercise training (number of weeks of exercise training × average number of  
335 sessions/week × average duration of session in minutes) exceeds 1.000.9
- 336 - The number of CR sessions (including physical exercise, information, education and psychosocial  
337 support) needs to exceed 36.12
- 338 - During CR all individually recognized cardiovascular risk factors need to be addressed and treated.10

339 Consequently, future studies on the effect of CR need to report in detail whether these minimal  
340 requirements were rigorously followed by the participating CR centres.

## 341 **Conclusions**

342 CROS II confirms the effectiveness of CR participation after ACS and after CABG in actual clinical practice by reducing  
343 total mortality under the conditions of current evidence-based CAD treatment. The CROS approach to more strictly  
344 predefined CR intervention and to include controlled registry based studies represents a valid hybrid approach that  
345 has clear utility in clinical decision-making.

## 346 **Acknowledgements**

347 EAPC Cardiac Rehabilitation Section, Nucleus members:

- 348 - Ana Abreu, Cardiology Department, Hospital Santa Marta, Lisbon, Portugal
- 349 - Marco Ambrosetti, Cardiovascular Rehabilitation Unit, “Le Terrazze” Clinic, Cunardo, Italy
- 350 - Thomas Berger, Cardiomed Linz, Austria
- 351 - Véronique Cornelissen, Research Group for Rehabilitation in Internal Disorders, KU Leuven, Belgium
- 352 - Wolfram Doehner, Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany
- 353 - Ines Frederix, Faculty of Medicine & Life Sciences, Hasselt University, Belgium
- 354 - Andreas Gevaert, Laboratory of Cellular and Molecular Cardiology, Universit t Antwerpen, Belgium
- 355 - Dominique Hansen, Biomedisch Onderzoeksinstituut (BIOMED), Universiteit Hasselt, Belgium
- 356 - Marie-Christine Iliou, Cardiac Rehabilitation and Secondary Prevention, Corentin Celton Hospital,  
357 APHP, Paris, France
- 358 - Hareld Kemps, cardiologist, M xima medisch Centrum, Netherlands
- 359 - Nicolle Kraenkel, Medizinische Klinik f r Kardiologie, Charit -Universit tsmedizin Berlin, Germany
- 360 - Jari Laukkanen, University of Jyv skyl  and Central Finland Health Care District, Finland
- 361 - Roberto Pedretti, Cardiologist, Clinic for Pressure monitoring and hypertension, Pavia, Italy
- 362 - Maria Simonenko, Federal Almazov North-West Medical Research Centre, St. Petersburg, Russian  
363 Federation
- 364 - Heinz V ller, University of Potsdam, Human Sciences Faculty, Potsdam, Germany
- 365 - Matthias Wilhelm, University Hospital of Cardiology, Bern, Switzerland



366 Systematic review registration

367 PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews (registration number: CRD42014007084):  
368 [http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/review\\_print.asp?RecordID=7084&UserID=5736](http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/review_print.asp?RecordID=7084&UserID=5736)

369 Previous review version

370 Rauch B, Davos CH, Doherty P, Saure D, Metzendorf MI, Salzwedel A, Völler H, Jensen K, Schmid JP. The prognostic  
371 effect of cardiac rehabilitation in the era of acute revascularisation and statin therapy: A systematic review and meta-  
372 analysis of randomized and non-randomized studies - The Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS). *Eur J Prev*  
373 *Cardiol.* 2016 Dec;23(18):1914-1939. doi: 10.1177/2047487316671181.

374 Declaration of conflicting interests

375 The author(s) declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of  
376 this article.

377 Funding

378 The author(s) disclose receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this  
379 article: Pfizer AG Switzerland (unrestricted grant), Deutsche Herzstiftung e.V. (German Heart Foundation), Deutsche  
380 Gesellschaft für Prävention und Rehabilitation von Herz-Kreislaufkrankungen e.V. (DGPR; German Society of  
381 Cardiovascular Prevention and Cardiac Rehabilitation), Schweizer Arbeitsgruppe für kardiovaskuläre Prävention,  
382 Rehabilitation und Sportkardiologie (SCPRS; Swiss Working Group for Cardiovascular Prevention, Rehabilitation and  
383 Sports Cardiology). The Sponsors did not have any influence on study initiation, conducting and reporting.

384 Author contribution

385 All authors participated in designing the study, generating hypotheses, interpreting data, and critically reviewing the  
386 report. The special responsibilities were as follows:

387 Initiation, organization and leading of the project: BR, CHD, PD, JPS, HV; literature search and search strategies: MIM,  
388 BR; study selection: AS, CHD, PD, BR; study evaluation: AS, CHD, BR, KJ; statistical and biometrical analyses: KJ, MH;  
389 writing: AS, HV, CHD, PD, KJ, MIM, BR; internal reviewing: JPS, BR, HV, AS, PD, CHD, and the nucleus members of the  
390 Secondary Prevention and Rehabilitation section of the European Association of Preventive Cardiology (EAPC).

## 391 **References**

392 1. Ford ES, Ajani UA, Croft JB, et al. Explaining the decrease in U.S. deaths from coronary disease, 1980-  
393 2000. *N Engl J Med* 2007; 356: 2388–2398.

- 394 2. Puymirat E, Simon T, Cayla G, et al. Acute Myocardial Infarction: Changes in Patient Characteristics,  
395 Management, and 6-Month Outcomes Over a Period of 20 Years in the FAST-MI Program (French Registry  
396 of Acute ST-Elevation or Non-ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction) 1995 to 2015. *Circulation* 2017; 136:  
397 1908–1919.
- 398 3. Szummer K, Wallentin L, Lindhagen L, et al. Relations between implementation of new treatments and  
399 improved outcomes in patients with non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction during the last 20 years:  
400 experiences from SWEDEHEART registry 1995 to 2014. *European Heart Journal* 2018; 39: 3766–3776.
- 401 4. Rauch B, Davos CH, Doherty P, et al. The prognostic effect of cardiac rehabilitation in the era of acute  
402 revascularisation and statin therapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized and non-  
403 randomized studies - The Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS). *European journal of preventive*  
404 *cardiology* 2016; 23: 1914–1939.
- 405 5. Piepoli MF, Corra U, Adamopoulos S, et al. Secondary prevention in the clinical management of patients  
406 with cardiovascular diseases. Core components, standards and outcome measures for referral and  
407 delivery: a policy statement from the cardiac rehabilitation section of the European Association for  
408 Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation. Endorsed by the Committee for Practice Guidelines of the  
409 European Society of Cardiology. *European journal of preventive cardiology* 2014; 21: 664–681.
- 410 6. Cowie A, Buckley J, Doherty P, et al. Standards and core components for cardiovascular disease  
411 prevention and rehabilitation. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)* 2019; 105: 510–515.
- 412 7. Balady GJ, Williams MA, Ades PA, et al. Core components of cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention  
413 programs: 2007 update: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Exercise, Cardiac  
414 Rehabilitation, and Prevention Committee, the Council on Clinical Cardiology; the Councils on  
415 Cardiovascular Nursing, Epidemiology and Prevention, and Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism;  
416 and the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation. *Circulation* 2007; 115:  
417 2675–2682.
- 418 8. Taylor RS, Anderson L, Oldridge N, et al. The Efficacy of Exercise-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation: The  
419 Changing Face of Usual Care. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2017; 69: 1207–1208.
- 420 9. Anderson L, Thompson DR, Oldridge N, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart  
421 disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2016: Cd001800.
- 422 10. van Halewijn G, Deckers J, Tay HY, et al. Lessons from contemporary trials of cardiovascular prevention  
423 and rehabilitation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Cardiology* 2017; 232:  
424 294–303.

- 425 11. Almodhy M, Ingle L and Sandercock GR. Effects of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation on  
426 cardiorespiratory fitness: A meta-analysis of UK studies. *International journal of cardiology* 2016; 221:  
427 644–651.
- 428 12. Santiago de Araujo Pio C, Marzolini S, Pakosh M, et al. Effect of Cardiac Rehabilitation Dose on Mortality  
429 and Morbidity: A Systematic Review and Meta-regression Analysis. *Mayo Clinic proceedings* 2017; 92:  
430 1644–1659.
- 431 13. Lawler PR, Filion KB and Eisenberg MJ. Efficacy of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation post-myocardial  
432 infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *American Heart Journal*  
433 2011; 162: 571-584.e2.
- 434 14. West RR, Jones DA and Henderson AH. Rehabilitation after myocardial infarction trial (RAMIT): multi-  
435 centre randomised controlled trial of comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation in patients following acute  
436 myocardial infarction. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)* 2012; 98: 637–644.
- 437 15. Powell R, McGregor G, Ennis S, et al. Is exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation effective?: A systematic  
438 review and meta-analysis to re-examine the evidence. *BMJ open* 2018; 8: e019656.
- 439 16. Blokzijl F, Dieperink W, Keus F, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation for patients having cardiac surgery: a  
440 systematic review. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2018.
- 441 17. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis  
442 protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015; 4: 1.
- 443 18. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal  
444 for reporting. *JAMA* 2000; 283: 2008–2012.
- 445 19. Rauch B, Doherty P, Schmid J-P, et al. The prognostic effect of cardiac rehabilitation in the era of acute  
446 revascularization and statin therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized and non-  
447 randomized studies. The Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study (CROS). PROSPERO 2014  
448 CRD42014007084, [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display\\_record.php?RecordID=7084](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?RecordID=7084) (2014,  
449 accessed 15 October 2019).
- 450 20. Wells GA, Shea B, Higgins JPT, et al. Checklists of methodological issues for review authors to consider  
451 when including non-randomized studies in systematic reviews. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2013; 4: 63–  
452 77.
- 453 21. Higgins JPT, Ramsay C, Reeves BC, et al. Issues relating to study design and risk of bias when including  
454 non-randomized studies in systematic reviews on the effects of interventions. *Research Synthesis*  
455 *Methods* 2013; 4: 12–25.

- 456 22. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of  
457 nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses,  
458 [http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp](http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp) (2008, accessed 20 May 2019).
- 459 23. Parmar MK, Torri V and Stewart L. Extracting summary statistics to perform meta-analyses of the  
460 published literature for survival endpoints. *Statistics in medicine* 1998; 17: 2815–2834.
- 461 24. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, et al. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data  
462 into meta-analysis. *Trials* 2007; 8: 16.
- 463 25. Symons MJ and Moore DT. Hazard rate ratio and prospective epidemiological studies. *Journal of Clinical*  
464 *Epidemiology* 2002; 55: 893–899.
- 465 26. Higgins JPT and Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0*  
466 [updated March 2011], <http://handbook.cochrane.org> (2011).
- 467 27. Vries H de, Kemps HMC, van Engen-Verheul MM, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and survival in a large  
468 representative community cohort of Dutch patients. *European Heart Journal* 2015; 36: 1519–1528.
- 469 28. Kim C, Kim DY and Moon CJ. Prognostic influences of cardiac rehabilitation in Korean acute myocardial  
470 infarction patients. *Annals of rehabilitation medicine* 2011; 35: 375–380.
- 471 29. Meurs M, Burger H, van Riezen J, et al. The association between cardiac rehabilitation and mortality risk  
472 for myocardial infarction patients with and without depressive symptoms. *J Affect Disord* 2015; 188: 278–  
473 283.
- 474 30. Aronov DM, Bubnova MG, Ioseliani DG, et al. The Complex Program of Rehabilitation of Patients With  
475 Ischemic Heart Disease After Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery in Ambulatory Cardiorehabilitational  
476 Department: Clinical Effects of Third Stage of Rehabilitation. *Kardiologia* 2017; 57: 10–19.
- 477 31. Schwaab B, Waldmann A, Katalinic A, et al. In-patient cardiac rehabilitation versus medical care - a  
478 prospective multicentre controlled 12 months follow-up in patients with coronary heart disease.  
479 *European journal of cardiovascular prevention and rehabilitation official journal of the European Society*  
480 *of Cardiology, Working Groups on Epidemiology & Prevention and Cardiac Rehabilitation and Exercise*  
481 *Physiology* 2011; 18: 581–586.
- 482 32. Doimo S, Fabris E, Piepoli M, et al. Impact of ambulatory cardiac rehabilitation on cardiovascular  
483 outcomes: a long-term follow-up study. *European Heart Journal* 2019; 40: 678–685.
- 484 33. Hautala AJ, Kiviniemi AM, Makikallio T, et al. Economic evaluation of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation  
485 in patients with a recent acute coronary syndrome. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*  
486 2017; 27: 1395–1403.

- 487 34. Prescott E, Mikkelsen N, Holdgaard A, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation in the elderly patient in eight  
488 rehabilitation units in Western Europe: Baseline data from the EU-CaRE multicentre observational study.  
489 European Journal of Preventive Cardiology 2019; 26: 1052–1063.
- 490 35. Abell B, Glasziou P and Hoffmann T. The Contribution of Individual Exercise Training Components to  
491 Clinical Outcomes in Randomised Controlled Trials of Cardiac Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review and  
492 Meta-regression. Sports medicine - open 2017; 3: 19.
- 493 36. Sumner J, Harrison A and Doherty P. The effectiveness of modern cardiac rehabilitation: A systematic  
494 review of recent observational studies in non-attenders versus attenders. PloS one 2017; 12: e0177658.
- 495 37. Vigorito C, Abreu A, Ambrosetti M, et al. Frailty and cardiac rehabilitation: A call to action from the EAPC  
496 Cardiac Rehabilitation Section. European journal of preventive cardiology 2017; 24: 577–590.
- 497 38. Deaton C. Addressing the paradox of age and participation in cardiac rehabilitation. European Journal of  
498 Preventive Cardiology 2019; 26: 1050–1051.
- 499 39. Bjarnason-Wehrens B, Nebel R, Jensen K, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in patients with  
500 reduced left ventricular ejection fraction: The Cardiac Rehabilitation Outcome Study in Heart Failure  
501 (CROS-HF): A systematic review and meta-analysis. European Journal of Preventive Cardiology 2019:  
502 2047487319854140.
- 503 40. Taylor RS, Long L, Mordi IR, et al. Exercise-Based Rehabilitation for Heart Failure: Cochrane Systematic  
504 Review, Meta-Analysis, and Trial Sequential Analysis. JACC Heart Fail 2019; 7: 691–705.
- 505 41. Taylor RS, Walker S, Smart NA, et al. Impact of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart  
506 failure (ExTraMATCH II) on mortality and hospitalisation: an individual patient data meta-analysis of  
507 randomised trials. European Journal of Heart Failure 2018; 20: 1735–1743.
- 508 42. Hammill BG, Curtis LH, Schulman KA, et al. Relationship Between Cardiac Rehabilitation and Long-Term  
509 Risks of Death and Myocardial Infarction Among Elderly Medicare Beneficiaries. Circulation 2010; 121:  
510 63–70.
- 511 43. Kavanagh T, Mertens DJ, Hamm LF, et al. Peak oxygen intake and cardiac mortality in women referred  
512 for cardiac rehabilitation. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 2003; 42: 2139–2143.
- 513 44. Martin BJ, Arena R, Haykowsky M, et al. Cardiovascular fitness and mortality after contemporary cardiac  
514 rehabilitation. Mayo Clinic Proceedings 2013; Mayo Clinic. 88: 455–463.
- 515 45. Dibben GO, Dalal HM, Taylor RS, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and physical activity: systematic review and  
516 meta-analysis. Heart (British Cardiac Society) 2018; 104: 1394–1402.
- 517 46. Janssen V, Gucht V de, Dusseldorp E, et al. Lifestyle modification programmes for patients with coronary  
518 heart disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. European Journal  
519 of Preventive Cardiology 2013; 20: 620–640.

- 520 47. Kavanagh T, Hamm LF, Beyene J, et al. Usefulness of improvement in walking distance versus peak oxygen  
521 uptake in predicting prognosis after myocardial infarction and/or coronary artery bypass grafting in men.  
522 Am. J. Cardiol. 2008; 101: 1423–1427.
- 523 48. Espinosa Caliani S, Bravo Navas JC, Gómez-Doblas JJ, et al. Rehabilitación cardíaca postinfarto de  
524 miocardio en enfermos de bajo riesgo. Resultados de un programa de coordinación entre cardiología y  
525 atención primaria. Revista española de cardiología 2004; 57: 53–59.
- 526 49. Lee JY, Ahn JM, Park DW, et al. Impact of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation on long-term clinical  
527 outcomes in patients with left main coronary artery stenosis. European journal of preventive cardiology  
528 2016; 23: 1804–1813.
- 529 50. Sunamura M, Ter Hoeve N, van den Berg-Emons, R. J. G., et al. Cardiac rehabilitation in patients with  
530 acute coronary syndrome with primary percutaneous coronary intervention is associated with improved  
531 10-year survival. Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes 2018; 4: 168–172.
- 532 51. Boulay P and Prud'homme D. Health-care consumption and recurrent myocardial infarction after 1 year  
533 of conventional treatment versus short- and long-term cardiac rehabilitation. Preventive medicine 2004;  
534 38: 586–593.
- 535 52. Norris CM, Jensen LA, Galbraith PD, et al. Referral rate and outcomes of cardiac rehabilitation after  
536 cardiac catheterization in a large Canadian city. J Cardiopulm Rehabil 2004; 24: 392–400.
- 537 53. Kutner NG, Zhang R, Huang Y, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and survival of dialysis patients after coronary  
538 bypass. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology JASN 2006; 17: 1175–1180.
- 539 54. Milani RV and Lavie CJ. Impact of cardiac rehabilitation on depression and its associated mortality. The  
540 American journal of medicine 2007; 120: 799–806.
- 541 55. Nielsen KM, Faergeman O, Foldspang A, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation: health characteristics and socio-  
542 economic status among those who do not attend. European journal of public health 2008; 18: 479–483.
- 543 56. Alter DA, Oh PI and Chong A. Relationship between cardiac rehabilitation and survival after acute cardiac  
544 hospitalization within a universal health care system. European journal of cardiovascular prevention and  
545 rehabilitation official journal of the European Society of Cardiology, Working Groups on Epidemiology &  
546 Prevention and Cardiac Rehabilitation and Exercise Physiology 2009; 16: 102–113.
- 547 57. Hansen D, Dendale P, Leenders M, et al. Reduction of cardiovascular event rate: different effects of  
548 cardiac rehabilitation in CABG and PCI patients. Acta cardiologica 2009; 64: 639–644.
- 549 58. Suaya JA, Stason WB, Ades PA, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and survival in older coronary patients. Journal  
550 of the American College of Cardiology 2009; 54: 25–33.

- 551 59. Junger C, Rauch B, Schneider S, et al. Effect of early short-term cardiac rehabilitation after acute ST-  
552 elevation and non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction on 1-year mortality. *Current medical research and*  
553 *opinion* 2010; 26: 803–811.
- 554 60. Goel K, Lennon RJ, Tilbury RT, et al. Impact of cardiac rehabilitation on mortality and cardiovascular  
555 events after percutaneous coronary intervention in the community. *Circulation* 2011; 123: 2344–2352.
- 556 61. Martin BJ, Hauer T, Arena R, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation attendance and outcomes in coronary artery  
557 disease patients. *Circulation* 2012; 126: 677–687.
- 558 62. Beauchamp A, Worcester M, Ng A, et al. Attendance at cardiac rehabilitation is associated with lower all-  
559 cause mortality after 14 years of follow-up. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)* 2013; 99: 620–625.
- 560 63. Lee HY, Kim JH, Kim BO, et al. Regular exercise training reduces coronary restenosis after percutaneous  
561 coronary intervention in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *International journal of cardiology*  
562 2013; 167: 2617–2622.
- 563 64. Marzolini S, Leung YW, Alter DA, et al. Outcomes associated with cardiac rehabilitation participation in  
564 patients with musculoskeletal comorbidities. *European journal of physical and rehabilitation medicine*  
565 2013.
- 566 65. Pack QR, Goel K, Lahr BD, et al. Participation in cardiac rehabilitation and survival after coronary artery  
567 bypass graft surgery: a community-based study. *Circulation* 2013; 128: 590–597.
- 568 66. Coll-Fernandez R, Coll R, Pascual T, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation and outcome in stable outpatients with  
569 recent myocardial infarction. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation* 2014; 95: 322–329.
- 570 67. Prince DZ, Sobolev M, Gao J, et al. Racial Disparities in Cardiac Rehabilitation Initiation and the Effect on  
571 Survival. *PM & R the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation* 2013.
- 572 68. Rauch B, Riemer T, Schwaab B, et al. Short-term comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation after AMI is  
573 associated with reduced 1-year mortality: results from the OMEGA study. *European journal of preventive*  
574 *cardiology* 2014; 21: 1060–1069.
- 575 69. Goel K, Pack QR, Lahr B, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation is associated with reduced long-term mortality in  
576 patients undergoing combined heart valve and CABG surgery. *European journal of preventive cardiology*  
577 2015; 22: 159–168.
- 578 70. Meurs M, Burger H, Riezen J, et al. The association between cardiac rehabilitation and mortality risk for  
579 myocardial infarction patients with and without depressive symptoms: *Journal of affective disorders*;  
580 188: 278–283.
- 581 71. Schlitt A, Wischmann P, Wienke A, et al. Rehabilitation in Patients With Coronary Heart Disease:  
582 Participation and Its Effect on Prognosis. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2015; 112: 527–534.

- 583 72. Waldmann A, Katalinic A, Schwaab B, et al. The TeleGuard trial of additional telemedicine care in CAD  
584 patients. 2 Morbidity and mortality after 12 months. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare* 2008; 14: 22–  
585 26.
- 586 73. Barba R, Bisbe J, Pedrajas JNA, et al. Body mass index and outcome in patients with coronary,  
587 cerebrovascular, or peripheral artery disease: findings from the FRENA registry. *European journal of*  
588 *cardiovascular prevention and rehabilitation official journal of the European Society of Cardiology,*  
589 *Working Groups on Epidemiology & Prevention and Cardiac Rehabilitation and Exercise Physiology* 2009;  
590 16: 457–463.
- 591 74. Rauch B, Schiele R, Schneider S, et al. OMEGA, a randomized, placebo-controlled trial to test the effect  
592 of highly purified omega-3 fatty acids on top of modern guideline-adjusted therapy after myocardial  
593 infarction. *Circulation* 2010; 122: 2152–2159.
- 594 75. Spijkerman TA, van den Brink RHS, May JF, et al. Decreased impact of post-myocardial infarction  
595 depression on cardiac prognosis? *J Psychosom Res* 2006; 61: 493–499.
- 596 76. van den Brink RHS, van Melle JP, Honig A, et al. Treatment of depression after myocardial infarction and  
597 the effects on cardiac prognosis and quality of life: rationale and outline of the Myocardial INfarction and  
598 Depression-Intervention Trial (MIND-IT). *American Heart Journal* 2002; 144: 219–225.
- 599 77. Schulz S, Schlitt A, Lutze A, et al. The importance of genetic variants in TNF $\alpha$  for periodontal disease in a  
600 cohort of coronary patients. *J Clin Periodontol* 2012; 39: 699–706.



601 Tables

602 Table 1. Newly identified studies selected for quantitative analysis; baseline study characteristics and overall results

Study Publication year Country	Study design	Population (P): a. Data sources b. Number of included participants (N) c. Index events d. Inclusion period e. Other inclusion criteria and characteristics f. Age (y, mean±SD or as stated) g. Gender (male, %)	Intervention (I): a. Number (n) b. Structured and multi-component CR (SMC-CR)? c. Start after index event d. Duration (time period and/or total number of CR sessions) e. Frequency (CR exercise sessions per wk) f. CR-setting	Control (C): a. Number (n) b. Treatment, characteristics	Outcome (O): a. Follow-up period b. Outcomes according to the CROS criteria (numbers according to table 1) c. Other outcomes not predefined by CROS II	Overall results, with respect to endpoints 1–10 as defined by CROS. Definitions are given at the end of the table*	Remarks
Espinosa Caliani S et al. 200448 Spain	pCCS	a. Institutional, Hospital Clínico Universitario Virgen de la Victoria, Málaga, Spain. b. N=153 c. AMI d. not stated; after 1995 e. control group did not accept CR program f. 49.9±8.4 (CR+) 53.5±9.5 (no CR) g. 93.5	a. n=113 b. SMC-CR c. Immediately after discharge (phase I) d. 12 wk (phase II) at least 9 mo (phase III) e. n=3 (24 sessions) + educational talks, dietary and nutritional advice, psychological support (3mo, phase II). Maintenance phase III until 12 mo f. primary care centre (phase II, III)	a. n=40 b. CR non-attenders	a. 1 y1 y post AMI b. (10) c. Quality of life, exercise capacity, body mass index	Event rate (%CR+/noCR) Endpoint 10 (angina, hospitalization, re-infarction, cardiac insufficiency and/or death): 6.7/ 6.7 (p=NS)	- Only patients with low-risk MI - CR by patients' decision - CR supervised by "family doctor" not by cardiologist - CR program accredited by Cardiology Spanish Society

Lee JY et al. 201649 Canada	pCCS	<p>a. Data linkage: ASAN Medical Center-Left MAIN Revascularization registry (single-center retrospective database)</p> <p>b. N=3,040</p> <p>c. mixed population: patients with unprotected LMCA stenosis &gt;50% with subjective or objective ischemia; ACS (64.2%), silent ischemia (8%), stable AP (27.8%)</p> <p>d. 01/01/1995–31/12/2010</p> <p>e. Patients treated with PCI (37.7%), CABG (49.1%) or medically (13.2%); end of follow-up 31/08/2014</p> <p>f. 60.8±10.3 (CR+) 62.4±10.5 (no CR)</p> <p>g. 76.2 (CR+) 72.9 (no CR)</p>	<p>a. n=596 n=507 (matched pairs)</p> <p>b. SMC-CR</p> <p>c. Within 3 mo after index hospitalization (phase II)</p> <p>d. 3 mo (36 sessions)</p> <p>e. n=3</p> <p>f. outpatient</p>	<p>a. n=2,444 n=507 (matched pairs)</p> <p>b. CR non-attenders</p>	<p>a. Mdn 7.3y (IQR, 4.4- 10.2y)</p> <p>b. (1),(2),(4),(5),(8)</p> <p>c. Risk factors' modification, exercise capacity, QoL, return to work, psychological results</p>	<p>Event rate (%CR+/noCR))</p> <p>Endpoint 1: 13.3/ 18.5</p> <p>Endpoint 2: 10.4/ 15.5</p> <p>Endpoint 4: 3.0/ 6.7</p> <p>p&lt;0.001 for all</p> <p>Endpoint 5: 2.0/ 3.4</p> <p>p=0.07</p> <p>Endpoint 8: 7.3/ 10.9</p> <p>p=0.006</p> <p>HR (95% CI) after multivariate analysis</p> <p>Endpoint 1: 0.70 (0.49–1.00); p=0.05</p> <p>Endpoint 2: 0.69 (0.48–0.97); p=0.03</p> <p>Endpoints 4, 5, 8: p=NS</p> <p>HR (95% CI) propensity-matched pairs</p> <p>Endpoint 1: 0.62 (0.43–0.89); p=0.009</p> <p>Endpoint 2: 0.54 (0.36–0.80); p=0.002</p> <p>Endpoints 4, 5, 8: p=NS</p>	<p>- participation in CR was defined as attending at least one outpatient CR session (phase II) within 3 mo after index hospitalization</p>
Aronov DM et al. 201730 Russia	RCT	<p>a. Institutional Moscow Centre of Interventional Cardioangiology.</p> <p>b. N=36</p>	<p>a. n=18</p> <p>b. SMC-CR (educational program + physical training)</p> <p>c. 2–8 wk after CABG (mean 7.8±1.6 wk)</p>	<p>a. n=18</p> <p>b. CR non-attenders; only educational</p>	<p>a. 1 y</p> <p>b. (1), (6), (8), (10)</p> <p>c. Exercise and echocardiography parameters, lipid levels, QoL,</p>	<p>Event (nr CR+/nr no CR)</p> <p>Endpoint 1: 0/0</p> <p>Endpoint 6: 1/3</p> <p>Endpoint 8: 1/1</p> <p>Endpoint 10 (AP, MI, revascularization,</p>	<p>- publication in Russian language (translations received from Cochrane Russia</p>

		<p>c. patients with IHD who had undergone CABG</p> <p>d. not stated; after 1995</p> <p>e. --</p> <p>f. 58.6±7.0 (CR+) 55.9±7.0 (no CR)</p> <p>g. 100</p>	<p>d. 4 mo</p> <p>e. n=3</p> <p>f. monitored (medical supervision) or not-monitored (home based)</p>	<p>program available</p>	<p>AP attacks, return to work</p>	<p>hospitalization for IHD exacerbation): 2/7</p>	<p>and a private agency)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no statistical analyses of the results</li> <li>- CR had educational component only</li> <li>- contact to author not successful</li> </ul>
<p>Hautala AJ et al. 201733 Finland</p>	<p>RCT</p>	<p>a. EFEX-CARE (Effectiveness of Exercise Cardiac Rehabilitation) database of the Finnish Health care setting</p> <p>b. N=204</p> <p>c. ACS</p> <p>d. 02/2011–05/2014</p> <p>e. Exclusion criteria: NYHA ≥III, scheduled or emergency CABG, UA, severe peripheral atherosclerosis, diabetic retinopathy or neuropathy, inability to perform regular home-based exercises (i.e. severe musculoskeletal problems)</p>	<p>a. n=109 (drop-out, n=31)</p> <p>b. SMC-CR</p> <p>c. within 1 wk after hospital discharge</p> <p>d. 1 y</p> <p>e. n=4-5 (1 in hospital session per wk and home-based sessions for 6 mo; thereafter home based only) + information, motivation, education, social and vocational support</p> <p>f. outpatient</p>	<p>a. n=95 (drop-out, n=25)</p> <p>b. UC</p>	<p>a. 1 y</p> <p>b. (10)</p> <p>c. Health care costs, quality-adjusted life years, cost-effectiveness</p>	<p>Event rate (%CR+/no CR)</p> <p>Endpoint 10 after 1y: (combination of death, recurrent acute coronary event, or hospitalization for HF) 4.6/16.8, p=0.004</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Center-based CR under supervision of cardiologists and physiotherapists, all components of SMC-CR were available to most of the patients, no information about psychological support (information provided by the author)</li> </ul>

Doimo S et al. 201832 Italy	rCCS	f. 60±11 (CR+), 62±9 (no CR)					
		g. 73 (CR+), 71 (no CR)					
		a. Patients discharged from two tertiary hospitals	a. n=839; STEMI (n=251), NSTEMI (n=162), CABG (n=243), PCI (n=183)	a. n=441; STEMI (n=127), NSTEMI (n=103), CABG (n=110), PCI (n=101)	a. Mdn 82 mo (IQR 60 – 89 mo)	Event rate (%CR+/no CR)	- Group allocation by different hospitals - Multivariable regression model and propensity score matching analysis (covariates: age, sex, hypertension, LVEF, DM, smoking, CKD, dyslipidaemia, previous PCI, previous ACS, BB, ACEi/ARB, statins/ezetimibe)
		b. N=1,280	b. SMC-CR	b. CR non-attenders receiving all other components of CR	b. PEP: (9)	Endpoint 1: 17/18 (p=0.861)	
		c. mixed population; STEMI (n=378), NSTEMI (n=265), CABG with or without valve surgery (n=353) or planned PCI (n=284)	c. 89 d (average)		c. effect of CR in various subgroups	Endpoint 2: 6/6 (p=0.623)	
		d. 01/01/2009–31/12/2010	d. 5 mo (average)			Endpoint 6: 15/27 (p<0.001)	
		e. Non-residents in the region or with severe non-cardiac comorbidities (i.e. end-stage tumors), dementia, or immobilized patients, were excluded from the CR group. 13% of eligible patients did not attend CR	e. 1st part (10 sessions of 45min of cycle training 2 times/wk for 5 wks); 2nd part (18 sessions of 45min of gym training 3 times/wk for 6wks) supervised by trained nurse and physiotherapist. Other components: Lifestyle counseling at every visit + nutritional advice once/mo + psychological support			Endpoint 9: 18/30 (p<0.001)	
		f. 68±11 (CR+), 66±12 (no CR)	a. outpatient			HR (95% CI) Endpoint 9: 0.578 (0.432–0.773); p<0.001	
		g. 68 (CR+), 75 (no CR)				Event rate, propensity matched analysis (%CR+/ no CR)	
						Endpoint 1: 10/19 (p=0.002)	
						Endpoint 2: 2/7 (p=0.008)	
						Endpoint 6: 25/11 (p<0.001)	
						Endpoint 9: 29/13 (p<0.001)	

Sunamura M et al. 201850 The Netherlands	rCCS	<p>a. Patients from Erasmus Medical Centre (no CR), Rotterdam were propensity score matched with patients from Capri Cardiac Rehabilitation Cater, Rotterdam (CR+)</p> <p>b. N=3,958</p> <p>c. ACS followed by primary PCI</p> <p>d. 2003 - 2011</p> <p>e. Excluded: patients with cardiogenic shock (2.3%) and with early (within 60 d post-PCI) death (5.2%)</p> <p>f. 59.0±9.9 (CR+), 58.8±11.83 (no CR)</p> <p>g. 77 (CR+), 78 (no CR)</p>	<p>a. n=1,159</p> <p>b. SMC-CR</p> <p>c. Mdn 4-6 wk</p> <p>d. 12 wk</p> <p>e. n=2 (1.5h group exercise session). Other components: verbal and written instructions on how to deal with exercise, diet, smoking cessation, and stress management. Individual consultations with psychiatrist, psychologist, and social workers was available if necessary. Complete CR if attended at least 75% of the physical program</p> <p>f. outpatient</p>	<p>a. n=1,159</p> <p>b. no CR participants</p>	<p>a. Mdn 10 y 4-12 y (range)</p> <p>b. (1)</p> <p>c. Mortality rates of CR completion vs non-completion</p>	<p>Cumulative rates (% CR+/no CR)</p> <p>Endpoint 1 at 5 y: 6.4/10.4</p> <p>Endpoint 1 at 10 y: 14.7/23.5</p> <p>HR (95% CI)</p> <p>Endpoint 1 at 10y: (unadjusted) 0.56 (0.43-0.73)</p> <p>(adjusted) 0.61 (0.46-0.81); p&lt;0.001</p>	<p>- Propensity score matching analysis 1:1 (covariates: age, sex, STEMI, current smoking, family history of CAD, HTN, hypercholesterolemia, DM, prior MI, prior history of PCI or CABG, proximal LAD lesion, socioeconomic status)</p>
--	------	--	---	--	--	---	---

603 Descriptive values of metric variables are given in mean or mean plus standard deviation (SD), if applicable. Other calculations are noted in the table. Mdn, median; N, number of total population, n, number of subpopulation; d, days; wk, week(s); mo, month(s); y, year(s)

605 ACEi, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors; (A)MI, (acute) myocardial infarction; AP, angina pectoris; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; BB, beta-blockers, ACEi/ARB CAD, coronary artery disease; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CR, cardiac rehabilitation; DM, diabetes mellitus; HF, heart failure; IHD, ischemic heart disease; IQR, interquartile range; LAD, left anterior descending coronary artery; LMCA, left main coronary artery; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; pCCS, prospective controlled cohort trial; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PEP, primary endpoint; QoL, quality of life; rCCS, retrospective controlled cohort trial; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SEP, secondary endpoint; SMC-CR, structured and multi-component CR; (N) STEMI, (non) ST-elevation myocardial infarction; UC, usual care including ambulatory supervision by family doctor and/or cardiologist, and may also include advise to exercise at home



612 Table 2. Summary of results

Outcome	Population (number of Studies)	Design (number of Studies)	Events/number of patients (CR)	Events/number of patients (control)	HR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI); pooling method	Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> ; tau <sup>2</sup> ; p-value	
Total mortality	ACS (11)	RCT (1)	82/903	84/910	1.01 (0.85-1.21)		NA	
		pCCS (4)	NO/3,519	NO/2,063	0.37 (0.20-0.69)		18%; 0.092; p = 0.30	
		rCCS (4)	NO/12,033	NO/24,266	0.64 (0.53-0.76)		33%;0.011; p = 0.22	
	CABG (6)	rCCS (2)	109/2,901	241/1,846		0.20 (0.08-0.48); MH	60%; 0.288; p = 0.11	
		RCT (1)	0/18	0/18		1.00 (0.02-53.12); NA	NA	
		pCCS (1)	1/149	5/89		0.11 (0.01-0.99); NA	NA	
		rCCS (4)	NO/5,109	NO/7,889	0.62 (0.54-0.70)		0%; 0; p = 0.71	
		Mixed (10)	pCCS (2)	254/3,407	398/2,939	0.66 (0.55-0.79)		0%; 0; p = 0.72
			rCCS (5)	NO/2,606	NO/3,577	0.52 (0.36-0.77)		84%;0.145; p < 0.01
			rCCS (3)	1,700/71,674	3,806/71,160		0.68 (0.34-1.37); NA	94%; 0.339; p < 0.01
Cardiovascular mortality	ACS (2)	pCCS (1)	18/2,505	32/1,042	0.44 (0.24-0.82)		NA	
		pCCS (1)	0/37	1/37		0.32 (0.01-8.23); NA	NA	
	CABG (2)	pCCS (1)	0/18	0/18		1.00 (0.02-53.12); NA	NA	
		rCCS (1)	NO/527	NO/4,747	0.64 (0.51-0.81)		NA	
	Mixed (3)	pCCS (1)	37/507	75/507	0.54 (0.36-0.80)		NA	
		rCCS (1)	34/719	46/719	0.67 (0.44-1.03)		NA	
		rCCS (1)	48/839	28/441		0.90 (0.55-1.45); NA	NA	
MACCE	ACS (2)	pCCS (1)	81/2,376	81/971	0.55 (0.39-0.77)		NA	
		rCCS (1)	212/2,756	281/1,791		0.70 (0.35-1.40); NA	NA	
	Mixed (1)	rCCS (1)	158/785	206/1,224	0.85 (0.74-0.98)		NA	
Non-fatal myocardial infarction	ACS (3)	RCT (1)	7/162	8/115		0.60 (0.21-1.72); NA	NA	
		pCCS (1)	43/2,362	27/946	0.75 (0.45-1.26)		NA	
		pCCS (1)	0/37	0/37		1.00 (0.02-51.73); NA	NA	

	CABG (1)	pCCS (1)	3/343	13/334		0.22 (0.06-0.77); NA	NA
	Mixed (3)	pCCS (1)	15/507	23/507	0.65 (0.34-1.26)		NA
		rCCS (1)	NO/785	NO/1,224	1.01 (0.74-1.37)		NA
		rCCS (1)	14/795	26/679		0.45 (0.23-0.87); NA	NA
Non-fatal stroke	ACS (2)	RCT (1)	0/162	1/115		0.23 (0.01-5.81); NA	NA
		pCCS (1)	10/2,364	13/954	0.35 (0.14-0.85)		NA
	Mixed (1)	pCCS (1)	8/507	13/507	0.92 (0.24-3.52)		NA
Hospital readmission for any reason	ACS (3)	pCCS (2)	794/2,447	351/1,035		0.96 (0.81-1.13); IV	0%; 0; p = 0.32
		rCCS (1)	NO/878	NO/824	1.00 (0.82-1.22)		NA
	CABG (1)	RCT (1)	3/18	1/18		3.40 (0.32-36.27); NA	NA
	Mixed (2)	pCCS (1)	NO/2,900	NO/2,432	0.77 (0.71-0.84)		NA
		rCCS (1)	253/795	258/679		0.76 (0.61-0.94); NA	NA
Unplanned readmission for any cardiovascular event	ACS (2)	RCT (1)	23/162	16/115		1.02 (0.51-2.04); NA	NA
		pCCS (1)	17/74	20/54		0.51 (0.23-1.10); NA	NA
	Mixed (2)	pCCS (1)	32/2,900	109/2,432	0.68 (0.55-0.84)		NA
		rCCS (1)	122/839	119/441		0.46 (0.35-0.61); NA	NA
Unplanned coronary revascularization	ACS (1)	pCCS (1)	4/69	7/72		0.57 (0.16-2.05); NA	NA
	CABG (1)	pCCS (1)	44/343	49/334		0.86 (0.55-1.33); NA	NA
	Mixed (1)	pCCS (1)	44/507	33/507	1.38 (0.88-2.16)		NA
		rCCS (1)	33/795	37/679		0.75 (0.46-1.22); NA	NA
Cardiovascular mortality and readmission Combined endpoints	ACS (1)	pCCS (1)	0/74	4/54		0.08 (0.00-1.43); NA	NA
	Mixed (1)	rCCS (1)	155/839	133/441	0.58 (0.43-0.77)		NA
	ACS (8)	RCT (1)	5/109	16/95	0.26 (0.09-0.73)		NA
		RCT (1)	24/162	25/115		0.63 (0.34-1.15); NA	NA
		pCCS (1)	NO/521	NO/522	0.65 (0.30-1.41)		NA
		pCCS (4)	47/620	69/567		0.58 (0.33-1.00); MH	21%; 0.080; p = 0.28
		rCCS (1)	183/2,756	263/1,791		0.41 (0.34-0.50); NA	NA
	CABG (2)	RCT (1)	2/18	7/18		0.20 (0.03-1.13); NA	NA
		pCCS (1)	44/343	68/334		0.58 (0.38-0.87); NA	NA
	Mixed (2)	rCCS (1)	NO/785	NO/1,224	0.77 (0.65-0.91)		NA
		rCCS (1)	259/795	263/679		0.73 (0.59-0.91); NA	NA



613 ACS, acute coronary syndrome; CABG, coronary artery bypass grafting; NO, sum of events has not been calculated, if one study of a specific subgroup did not report the  
614 number of events; MH, Mantel-Haenszel pooling; NA, not applicable; IV, inverse variance pooling; RCT, randomised controlled trial; rCCS, retrospective controlled cohort  
615 study; pCCS, prospective controlled cohort study; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

616

617 Table 3a. Quality evaluation of cohort studies included into meta-analysis20,21

Study	Basic design	Were groups formed by:										Management of confounding (design stage)										
		NOS, sum of positive adjudications	Reporting of CR-characteristics †	Specific actions to select and compare the groups *	Time differences?	Location differences?	Health care decision makers?	Patient's preferences	On the basis of outcome?	Protocol pre-specifying study outcomes?	Was the intervention's effect a pre-specified study objective?	Were outcomes, as specified in the CROS protocol, measured and analyzed? †	Consort flow diagram available?	Potential selection bias?	Potential reporting bias (selectively reporting outcomes according to statistical significance?)	Potential reporting bias (selectively reporting multiple adjusting	General control for confounding	Have selection criteria for potential confounding domains been described?	Did researchers pre-specify and calculate confounding domains as specified by CROS? ‡	Adjustment for confounding? (analysis)	Method (adjustment for confounding) §	
Boulay 200451	R	3	+	1	Y	N?	Y?	Y?	N	Y?	Y	4,7	N	Y	N	NA	Y	N	1,2,7	N	NA	
Norris 200452	R	8	(+)	2	N	N	Y	N?	N	Y?	Y	1	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,4-7	Y	a,c,d	
Kutner 200653	R	7	↓	3	N	N	NC	NC	N	Y?	Y	1,2	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,4,6	Y	a,d	
Milani 200754	R	6	+	4	N	N	Y	NC	N	Y	Y	1	N	N	N	N	Y	N	1,2,4,7	Y	a,d	
Nielsen 200855	R	8	+	5	N	N	NC	NC	N	Y?	Y	1,4	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	1,2	Y	a	
Alter 200956	R	8	+	6	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y?	Y	1	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,4,6	Y	a,d,e	
Hansen 200957	P	6	+	7	N	Y	Y	NC	N	N	Y	1,4,8,10	N	Y?	N	N	Y	N	1,2-4,8	Y	a,d	
Suaya 200958	R	7	(+)	6	N	N	Y?	Y?	N	NC	Y	1	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,4-7	Y	a,b,d	
Jünger 201059	R	7	(+)	8	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1,3,10	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	1-8	Y	a,c,d	
Goel 201160	R	7	(+)	6,15	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y?	Y	1,2,4,8,10	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1-8	Y	b,c,d	
Kim 201128	P	4	(+)	9	N	N	NC	Y	N	NC	Y?	1,6,8,10	N	NC	NC	NA	Y	N	1,2,4,7	N	NA	
Schwaab 201131	R	6	(+)	10	N	NC	Y	Y	N	NC	Y?	1,4,6,8	N	NC	N	N	Y	N	1,2,7	Y	a	
Martin 201261	P	7	(+)	11	N	N	Y	Y?	N	Y?	Y?	1,6,7	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NC	1-8	Y	a,b	
Beauchamp 201362	R	7	(+)	12	N	N	Y	Y	N	NC	N?	1	N	N	N	NC	N	N	1,2,4	Y	a	
Lee 201363	P	8	(+)	13	N	N	Y	Y	N	NC	Y	2,4,10	N	N	N?	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA
Marzolini 201364	P	8	↓	14	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y?	1,10	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1-4	Y	a,c	
Pack 201365	R	7	+	15	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y?	Y	1	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	1-7	Y	a-d	
Coll-Fernandez 201466	P	8	↓	16	N	N	Y	Y?	N	NC	Y	1,10	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	1-4,8	Y	a,d	

Prince 201467	R	6	↓	17	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y?	Y	1	N	N	N	N	Y	N	1,2	Y	a
Rauch 201468	P	8	+	18	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1-6,8	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1-8	Y	a,c,d
Goel 201369	R	7	(+)	15	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y?	Y	1	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	1-3,5	Y	a,c,d
De Vries 201527	R	7	+	19	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,4,5,7	Y	a,c,d
Meurs 201570	R	5	(+)	20	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1,6	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1,2,6,7	Y	a,d
Schlitt 201571	R	4	(+)	21	N	N	Y	Y	N	NC	Y	1	N	Y	N	NC	Y	N	1-7	Y	a,d
Lee 201649	P	7	+	22	N	N	Y	NC	N	Y?	Y	1,4,5,8	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	a,b
Espinosa Caliani 200448	P	6	+	23	N	NC	NC	Y	N	NC	NC	10	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA
Doimo 201832	R	5	+	6, 24	N	Y	NC	NC	N	Y?	Y	1,7,9,10	N	N	N	N	Y	N	1-4,6,7	Y	a,d
Sunamura 201850	R	7	+	7	N	NC	NC	NC	N	NC	Y	1	N	N	N	N	Y	N	1-4,6	Y	a-d

618 † Reporting of CR-characteristics: +, sufficient; (+), information obtained by author or other sources; ↓, information limited

619 \* specific actions to compare groups: (1) prospectively evaluated intervention group versus retrospectively evaluated control group; (2) linkage of Canadian APPROACH and  
620 NACPR registry; (3) data extracted from the United States renal data System, USRDS; (4) retrospective identification of groups by questionnaires within a predefined study  
621 cohort; (5) retrospective identification of groups in a population surviving AMI for at least 30 d; (6) retrospective evaluation and formation of matched pairs; (7) groups were  
622 formed by two hospitals following different CR referral policies; (8) retrospective identification of groups by questionnaires and personal contact to relatives of deceased  
623 patients; (9) groups were formed prospectively according to predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria; (10) retrospective definition of the study groups out of an  
624 independent pre-existing study cohort on the basis of medical records;72 (11) propensity score matching; (12) retrospective evaluation of a pre-existing cohort of another  
625 study evaluating CR attendance after automatic referral; (13) predefinition of inclusion and exclusion criteria, but final group formation by patient`s preferences and health  
626 care decision makers; (14) selection of CAD-patients with musculoskeletal disease in addition. (15) retrospective definition of the groups; CR+ group was defined as attending  
627 at least one session within 6 mo after the index event; (16) prospective definition of the groups out of the FRENA registry;73 (17) patients referred to CR but not attending  
628 served as control; (18) groups were pre-specified from the OMEGA-trial cohort;74 (19) 180 days survival after index event required; (20) study population has been extracted  
629 from two pre-existent studies (DepeMI, MIND-IT);75,76 (21) retrospective recruitment of study population from two previous RCT not investigating CR or prognostic CAD  
630 outcomes;71,77 (22) data extracted from ASAN Medical Center-Left MAIN Revascularization registry and ASAN Medical Center cardiac rehabilitation database; (23) control  
631 group was formed of patients who did not accept CR program; (24) matching pairs from the Capri Cardiac Rehabilitation database and Erasmus Medical Centre database  
632 (control)

633 † Outcomes under investigation: the numbers refer to the predefined outcomes as outlined in Table 1.

634 ‡ Confounding domains as specified by CROS: 1, age; 2, sex; 3, smoker; 4, diabetes; 5, history of stroke; 6, history of acute myocardial infarction; 7, reduced left ventricular  
635 ejection fraction; 8, acute/early  
636 percutaneous coronary intervention during acute myocardial infarction.

637 § Biometrical methods to manage confounding: (a) multivariable regression analysis; (b) propensity score matching; (c) propensity score-adjusted multivariable regression  
638 analysis; (d) confounders described; (e) retrospective matched pairs. Adjusting only for age and gender has been regarded as insufficient for the limitation of confounding.  
639 APPROACH, Alberta Provincial Project for Outcomes Assessment in Coronary Heart Disease; NACRP, Northern Alberta Cardiac Rehabilitation Program; FRENA, Risk Factors  
640 and Arterial Disease registry (Factores de Riesgo y ENfermedad Arterial); OMEGA, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial to Test the Effect of Highly Purified Omega-3 Fatty

641 Acids on Top of Modern Guideline-Adjusted Therapy after Myocardial Infarction; DepreMI, Depression after Myocardial Infarction study; MIND-IT, Myocardial Infarction  
642 and Depression Intervention Trial.  
643 R, retrospective cohort control study; P, prospective cohort control study; Y, yes; Y?, probably yes; N, no; N?, probably no; NC, not clear, not reported; NA, not applicable;  
644 green → adjudication is in favor to reliability of results and reporting;  
645 yellow → item potentially increases risk of limited reliability of results and reporting;  
646 red → item increases risk of reliability of results and reporting.  
647

649 Table 3b. Quality evaluation of randomised controlled trials included into meta-analysis (according to the Cochrane risk of bias table)

Risk	West 201214	Aronov 201730	Hautala 201733
Under-powering	High risk	High risk	Unclear risk
Selection bias	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk
Random sequence selection bias	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk
Confounding variables	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk
Performance bias	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk
Detection bias	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk
Attrition bias (incomplete outcome data)	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Groups balanced at baseline	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk
Groups not receiving the same baseline treatment	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk
Intention to treat analysis	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Reporting bias	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Comments	Low recruitment (22.5% CR arm; 22.7% control arm), study participation influenced by patient`s preferences, random sequence generation is not reported, per protocol centrally organized randomization and blinded with respect to baseline characteristics, confirmation of exposure sufficient, CR status has been blinded before outcome assessment, follow-up reporting was completed in 95% of surviving patients, baseline treatment with respect to medication and medical supervision has to be assumed; control group may also have received life style support to a variable extend	No primary endpoint defined; no pre-estimation of sample sizes and effect sizes were described with respect to any endpoint measured), exclusively low risk patients, no randomization method described, potential confounding variables were not assessed, no allocation concealment, interactions between the study groups confounding performance cannot be excluded, Baseline values were presented in a descriptive way without statistical evaluation. At least in n=3 relevant clinical characteristics a balance between groups was not achieved	Primary endpoint: Cost / quality-adjusted life year of a cardiac patient (QALY) Secondary endpoint: Major Adverse Cardiac Event (MACE) Statistical power of the study has not been reported with respect to either of the presented endpoints

650 green → adjudication is in favour to reliability of results and reporting; yellow → item potentially increases risk of limited reliability of results and reporting; red → item  
651 increases risk of reliability of results and reporting.  
652

653 Figure legends

654 Figure 1. Study selection flow chart

655 a Other reasons PS level: reviews, letters, study protocol, only abstract available, b Other reasons FTE level: referral  
656 only, referral only, no information about CR enrollment and adherence available. ICTRP: International Clinical Trials  
657 Registry Platform; PS: primary selection of extracted studies; FTE: full-text evaluation; SSE: structured study  
658 evaluation and quality analysis according to the checklist of methodological issues on non-randomized studies.20

659 Figure 2. Analysis of total mortality

660 Forest plots presenting the evaluation of the endpoint “total mortality”. HR, Hazard ratio; OR, Odds ratio; MH,  
661 Mantel-Haenszel pooling method; CR, cardiac rehabilitation; no CR, no cardiac rehabilitation (control); CI, confidence  
662 interval; Events, number of events in the evaluated group; Total, number of patients in the evaluated group; Start  
663 (w), start of cardiac rehabilitation after hospital discharge in weeks; Follow-up, follow-up in years.