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## I.Introduction:

Coronary artery disease(CAD) occurs due to an impairment in cardiac function because of inadequate blood flow to the heart compared to its needs.It is caused by obstructive changes in the coronary circulation.It presents with angina pectoris,myocardialinfarction,arrthythmias,heart failure and sudden death $[\mathbf{1 , 1 2}]$.
CAD should be considered an important public health problem due to changing lifestyles and an interplay of factors with regards to their existence, casualty and attributes ${ }^{[2,8,10]}$ It is a leading cause of death in India.The number of deaths due to CAD in 1985 was expected to have doubled by $2015^{[3,9]}$ As per reports of National Commission on Macroeconomics and Health,around 62 million people in India would have CAD by 2015 and around 23 million of them were below 40 years of age ${ }^{[4,11,13]}$ The conventional risk factors for CAD includes modifiable and nonmodifiable risk factors.The former includes diabetes mellitus,smoking,dyslipidemia,hypertension and obesity.The latter includes age,sex and family history.Recently a number of newer risk factors have been identified.Comparative studies on these newer risk factors show that Indiand have higher C-reactive proteins,plasminogen activator inhibitors and serum homocysteine levels ${ }^{[5]}$ Rapid urbanization and its accompanying lifestyle changes inckuding dietary habits,physicalinactivity,drugs and alcohol intake as well as increased prevalence of DM all contribute to increased incidence of $\mathrm{CAD}^{[6,7,14]}$.
Controlling the modifiable risk factors can significantly decrease premature morbidity and mortality due to CAD.

## II.Materials and Methods:

Study area: General Medicine ward and Cardiology ward of Medical College,Kolkata
Study period: April 2018 - July 2019
Study Population: Case and control subjects as per inclusion and exclusion criteria
Definition of the case:
Definite CAD is based on any of the following:

1) Documented evidence of prior Acute Coronary Syndrome(ACS) or treatment for CAD
2) Documented history of undergoing coronary angioplasty or CABG
3) More than $50 \%$ of epicardial coronary stenosis by coronary angiography
4) ECG showing pathological $Q$ wave
5) Imaging evidence of a loss of viable myocardium that is thinned and has a motion abnormality in absence of a non-ischemic cause
6) Angina plus ECG changes
7) Angina plus positive treadmill ECG Probable CAD is based on any of the following:
8) Angina without significant ECG changes
9) ECG changes without angina
10) Positive treadmeal ECG without angina
11) Absence of any of the other definite criteria

Definition of control:
A control is an individual who is admitted in the hospital or attends OPD for minor illness and not having any history of angina pectoris and myocardial infarction The total sample size of the study was 270(135 cases and 135 controls).

## Inclusion criteria:

1) All newly diagnosed CAD patients irrespective of co-morbidities
2) Previously diagnosed CAD patients who are on follow up treatment
3) Patients who had prior PTCA or CABG will also be included in the study
4) Patients must be fully alert, conscious, oriented regarding time, place and person

## Exclusion criteria:

1) Patients who donot give consent for the study
2) Patients who are unconscious, disoriented or unable to give proper history

## Study design:

It is a paired matched case-control study in which patients were selected according to inclusion and exclusion criteria and grouped into cases and controls. Then they were assessed regarding the presence or absence of various risk factors of CAD.

## Study variables:

These include different risk factors of CAD like:

- Demographic-

Age, sex, religion, residence, education, occupation, socioeconomic status, marital status

- Addiction history- Smoking, alcohol
- Dietary habits-

Vegetarian, non-vegetarian, mixed diet

- History of added salt intake-

Less than OR more than/equal to $5 \mathrm{~g} /$ day

- History of intake of oil/ghee
- Family history of CAD
- Physical inactivity
- Clinical parameters-

Height, weight, BMI, BP, Pulse

- Laboratory parameters-

CBC, FBS, PPBS, Urea, creatinine, LFT, Lipid profile,ECG-12 leads, Echocardiography

## Study tool:

1. History taking and clinical examination
2. Assessment of subjects regarding associated risk factors as stated above
3. ECG-12 leads with long lead II
4. 2D Echocardiography
5. Estimation of CBC, FBS, PPBS, Urea, creatinine, LFT, Lipid profile

## III.Result \& Analysis :

A total of 135 cases \& 135 controls were analyzed, mean age of cases \& controls were $58.57 \& 53.8$ respectively.

## AGE

Table 1: Age-wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE | CONTROL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| AGE | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $31-40$ | 5 | $3.7 \%$ | 28 | 20.7 | VALUE |
| $41-50$ | 33 | $24.4 \%$ | 35 | 25.9 |  |
| $51-60$ | 45 | $33.3 \%$ | 32 | 23.7 |  |
| $61-70$ | 33 | $24.4 \%$ | 23 | 17.0 | 0.00046 |
| $>70$ | 19 | $14.1 \%$ | 17 | 12.6 |  |

Chi-Square $=20.1808$
28 patients out of 135patients in control group and 5 patients in the case group were in the age group of 31-40 years comprising $20.7 \%$ \& $3.7 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

SEX
Table 2: Sex wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  | CONTROL | P- | VALUE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SEX | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| F | 42 | 31.1 | 67 | 49.6 |  |  |
| M | 93 | 68.9 | 68 | 50.3 | 0.01929 |  |

Chi-Square $=9.6159$
67 patients out of 135patients in control group and 42 patients in the case group were female, comprising 49.6\% \& $31.1 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## RELIGION

Table 3: Religion wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  |  |  |  |  | CONTROL |  | P-VALUE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  | PERCENT |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 101 | 74.8 | 100 | 74.1 | 0.889033 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 34 | 25.2 | 35 | 25.9 |  |  |  |  |  |

Chi-Square $=0.0195$
100 patients out of 135 patients in control group and 101 patients in the case group were Hindu, comprising $74.1 \% \& 74.8 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## MARITAL STATUS

Table 4: Marital status wise distribution of cases and controls

| MARITAL <br> STATUS | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P-VALUE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |
| MARRIED | 127 | 94.1 | 131 | 97.0 | 0.237504 |
| UNMARRIED | 8 | 5.9 | 4 | 3.0 |  |

Chi-Square $=1.3953$
131 patients out of 135 patients in control group and 127 patients in the case group were married, comprising $97 \% \& 94.1 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## RESIDENCE

Table 5: Residence wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE | CONTROL | PDDS <br> P- <br> RATIO |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RESIDENCE | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| RURAL | 50 | 37.04 | 41 | 30.37 | 0.24657 | 1.22 |
| URBAN | 85 | 62.96 | 94 | 69.63 | 2 | 1.2 |

$$
\text { Chi-Square }=1.3426
$$

41 patients out of 135patients in control group and 50 patients in the case group were rural residents, comprising
$30.37 \%$ \& $37.04 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively .

## EDUCATION LEVEL

Table 6: Education Level wise distribution of cases and controls

| EDUCATION <br> LEVEL | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P-VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FREQUEN CY | PERCENT | FREQUENC Y | PERCENT |  |
| ILLITERATE | 24 | 17.78 | 21 | 15.56 |  |
| PRIMARY <br> (UPTO TO $5^{\text {TH }}$ STD) | 33 | 24.44 | 35 | 25.93 | 0.95696 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SECONDARY } \\ & \left(6^{\mathrm{TH}} \mathrm{TO} 10^{\mathrm{TH}}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 52 | 38.51 | 54 | 37.78 |  |
| HS AND ONWARDS | 26 | 19.26 | 25 | 18.52 |  |

Majority of the patients from case $\operatorname{gr}(52,38.51 \%) \&$ control $\operatorname{gr}(54,37.78 \%)$ were educated upto secondary level $\left(6^{\text {th }} 10^{\text {th }}\right.$ standard $)$.

## EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Table 7 : Employment status wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE | CONTROL |  |  | P- | PALUE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | \(\left.\begin{array}{l}Odds <br>

Ratio\end{array}\right]\)

Chi-Square $=7.1708$
$57.8 \%$ of the patients from case gr.\& $41.5 \%$ of patients from control groups were employed.

## OCCUPATION

Table 8: Occupation wise distribution of cases and controls

| OCCUPATION | CASE |  |  | CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| BUSINESSMAN | 24 | 17.78 | 23 | 17.03 |
| LABOUR | 10 | 7.41 | 8 | 5.92 |
| OTHERS(housewives, <br> retired,nil etc.) | 98 | 72.59 | 97 | 71.85 |
| SERVICE | 3 | 2.22 | 7 | 5.18 |

Chi-Square $=1.8486$
8 patients out of 135 patients in control group and 10 patients in the case group were labours, comprising $5.92 \%$ \& $7.41 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## H/O SMOKING

Table 9: H/O Smoking wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE | CONTROL | P- <br> VALUE | ODDS <br> RATIO |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| H/O <br> SMOKING | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| YES | 85 | 62.96 | 61 | 45.18 |  | 2.06 |


| NO | 50 | 37.04 | 74 | 0.004 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Chi-Square $=8.5904$
61 patients out of 135patients in control group and 85 patients in the case group were smokers, comprising 45.18\% \& 62.96\% of total controls and cases respectively.
FREQUENCY OF SMOKING
Table 10: Frequency of smoking wise distribution of cases and controls

| FREQUENCY OF <br> SMOKING | CASE |  | CONTROL |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ODDS } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | 0.000063 | 4.05 |
| $\geq 10$ day | 55 | 64.70 | 19 | 31.14 |  |  |
| <10/day | 30 | 35.29 | 42 | 68.85 |  |  |

Chi-Square $=16.0007$
$64.70 \%$ of total smokers in case gr \& $31.14 \%$ of total smokers in control gr. smoked $>10 /$ day.

## F/H CHD

Table 11: F/H CHD wise distribution of cases and controls

| F/H CHD | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P-VALUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODDS } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| YES | 43 | 31.85 | 3 | 2.22 |  |  |
| NO | 92 | 68.15 | 132 | 97.78 |  |  |

Chi-Square=41.9255
$31.85 \%$ of total cases \& $2.22 \%$ of total control gr patients had a positive family history of CHD.

## ALCOHOL INTAKE

Table 12:H/O alcohol intake wise distribution of cases and controls

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | CASE |  |  |  |  |  |

9 patients out of 135 in the control group and 26patients in the case group had history of alcohol intake, comprising
$6.67 \%$ \& $19.26 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## H/O HTN

Table 13: H/O HTN wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { P- } \\ \text { VALUE } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ODDS } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{HTN} \end{aligned}$ | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | 0.00001 | 3.43 |
| YES | 71 | 52.59 | 34 | 25.18 |  |  |
| NO | 64 | 47.40 | 101 | 74.81 |  |  |

Chi-Square $=41.9255$

34 patients out of 135patients in control group and 71patients in the case group had history of hypertension, comprising $25.18 \%$ \& $52.59 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## H/O DM

Table 14: H/O DM wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P- <br> VALUE | ODDS <br> RATIO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{DM} \end{aligned}$ | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| YES | 45 | 33.33 | 13 | 9.63 | 0.00001 | 4.69 |
| NO | 90 | 66.67 | 122 | 90.37 |  |  |

Chi-Square $=22.4854$
13 patients out of 135 in control group and 45 patients in the case group had history of DM, comprising $9.63 \%$ \&
$33.33 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## PHY. ACT.

Table 15: Physical activity wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE | CONTROL | P- |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | VALUE |
| PHY. ACT. | 80 | 59.26 | 56 | 41.48 |  |
| SEDENTARY | 55 |  | 79 | 58.52 | 0.003486 |
| NON |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEDENTARY | 55 | 40.74 |  | 10 |  |
| TOTAL | 135 | 100 | 135 | 100 |  |
| Chi-Square $=8.5338$ |  |  |  |  |  |

80 patients out of 135patients in case group and 56 patients in the control group performed sedentary activity, comprising $59.26 \%$ \& $41.48 \%$ of total cases and controls respectively.

## DIETARY HABITS

Table 16: Dietary habits wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  | CONTROL |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DIETARY <br> HABITS | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | PALUE | ODDS <br> RATIO |
| MIX | 123 | 91.11 | 120 | 88.89 | 0.542802 | 1.28 |
| VEG | 12 | 8.89 | 15 | 11.11 |  |  |

Chi-Square $=0.3704$
120 patients out of 135 in control group and 123 patients in the case group had h/o intake of mix diets, comprising $88.89 \%$ \& $91.11 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively .

## ADDED SALT

Table 17: Added salt wise distribution of cases and controls

|  | CASE |  | CONTROL |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ADDED |  |  |  |  | P- | ODDS |


|  |  |  |  | VALUE | RATIO |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SALT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  | 0.896991 |
| YES | 90 | 66.67 | 91 | 67.41 | 0.97 |  |
| NO | 45 | 33.33 | 44 | 32.59 |  |  |

CHI-SQUARE=0.0168
90 patients out of 135 in the case gr \& 91 patients in control group had h/o added salt intake ,comprising $66.67 \%$ \& $67.41 \%$ respectively.

## AMOUNT OF ADDED SALT

Table 18:Amount of added salt wise distribution of cases and controls

| Table 18:Amount of added sait wise distribution of cases and controls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | CASE |  |  |  |  |  |

Chi-Square $=8.6436$.
27 patients out of 135patients in control group and 46 patients in the case group took added salt greater than or equal to $5 \mathrm{gm} /$ day, comprising $20 \% \& 34.07 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## EXCESS SATURATED FAT / OIL INTAKE

Table 19:H/O excess saturated fat/oil intake wise distribution of cases and controls

| H/O EXCESS SATURATED FAT / OIL INTAKE | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P- <br> VALUE | ODDS RATIO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YES | 39 | 28.89 | 4 | 2.96 | 0.00001 | 13.30 |
| NO | 96 | 71.11 | 131 | 97.04 |  |  |

Chi-Square $=33.8848$
4 patients out of 135patients in control group and 39 patients in the case group had h/o excess saturated fat/oil intake in their diets, comprising $2.96 \% \& 28.89 \%$ of total controls and cases respectively.

## SOCIO ECONOMIC CLASS

Table 20: Socio economic class wise distribution of cases and controls

| SOCIO- <br> ECONOMIC CLASS | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |
| Class I | 11 | 8.15 | 16 | 11.85 |  |
| Class II | 46 | 34.07 | 47 | 34.81 | 0.43313 |
| Class III | 31 | 22.96 | 38 | 28.15 |  |
| Class IV | 42 | 31.11 | 31 | 22.96 |  |
| Class V | 5 | 3.70 | 3 | 2.22 |  |

Chi-Square=3.8044
Majority of patients in the case $\operatorname{gr}(46,34.07 \%) \&$ control $\operatorname{gr}(47,34.81 \%)$ belonged to socio-economic class -II .

## DYSLIPIDEMIA

Table 21: Dyslipidemia wise distribution of cases and controls
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| DYSLIPID EMIA | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODDS } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| PRESENT | 93 | 68.89 \% | 57 | 42.22 \% | 0.00001 | 3.03 |
| ABSENT | 42 | 31.11 \% | 78 | 57.78 \% |  |  |

Chi-Square=19.44
93 patients out of 135 in the case gr.\& 57 patients in the control gr had h/o dyslipidemia comprising $68.89 \%$ of total cases \& $42.22 \%$ of total controls respectively.

## OBESITY

Table 22: Obesity wise distribution of cases and controls

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OBESITY } \\ & \left(\text { BMI }>25 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | CASE |  | CONTROL |  | P- <br> VALUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODDS } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |  |  |
| YES(>25) | 28 | 20.74 | 12 | 8.89 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{NO}(<25)$ | 107 | 79.26 | 123 | 91.11 | ${ }^{0.00612} 5$ | 2.68 |

Chi-square=7.513
28 patients out of 135 in case gr. \& 12 patients in control gr. were obese,comprising $20.74 \%$ \& $8.89 \%$ of toal cases \& controls respectively.

Table 23: Age and sex-wise distribution of cases and controls

| Age group (in years) | CASE |  |  | CONTROL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male No. (\%) | $\|$Female $\quad$ No. <br> $(\%)$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { No. (\%) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Male No. (\%) | Female <br> $(\%)$$\quad$ No. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { No. (\%) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\leq 40$ | 3 (2.2\%) | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.5 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5 (0.0\%) | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (9.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & (11.1 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & (20.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 41-50 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 26 \\ (19.3 \%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 7 (5.2 \%) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 33 \\ (3.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 22 (16.3\%) | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (9.6 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 35 (25.9\%) |
| 51-60 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 28 \\ & (20.7 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 17 \\ & (12.6 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 45 (24.4\%) | 14 (10.4\%) | 18 (13.3\%) | 32 (23.7\%) |
| 61-70 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 26 \\ & (19.3 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7 (5.2 \%) | $3333.3 \%)$ | 7 (5.2\%) | 16 (11.6\%) | 23 (16.8\%) |
| $>70$ | 9 (7.4 \%) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 10 \\ (6.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 19 (38.5\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 12 \\ & (8.8 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5 (3.6\%) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 17 \\ (12.45) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| TOTAL | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & (68.1 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 43 \\ & (31.9 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 135 \\ & (100 \%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 68 (50.3\%) | 67 (49.7\%) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 135 \\ (100 \%) \end{array}$ |

Table 24: Comparison of various risk factors among cases \& controls

| RISK FACTORS | CASE | CONTROL |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SMOKING | 85 | 62.96 | 61 | 45.18 |
| ALOCHOL | 26 | 19.26 | 9 | 6.67 |
| H/O HTN | 71 | 52.59 | 34 | 25.18 |
| H/O DM | 45 | 33.33 | 13 | 9.63 |
| SENDENTARY |  |  |  |  |
| ACTIVITY(LIGHT) | 80 | 59.26 | 56 | 44.48 |
| ADDED SALT | 90 | 66.66 | 91 | 67.4 |
| DYSLIPIDEMIA | 93 | 68.84 | 57 | 42.22 |
| F/H CHD | 43 | 31.85 | 3 | 2.22 |


| Table ${ }^{\text {FACTORS }}$ | CASE |  |  |  | CONTROL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FREQUEN } \\ & \text { CY } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCEN } \\ & \mathbf{T} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\mathbf{Y}}{\mathbf{F R E Q U E N C}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCE } \\ & \text { NT } \end{aligned}$ | FREQUENC <br> Y | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERC } \\ & \text { ENT } \end{aligned}$ | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| SMOKING | 85 | 62.96 | 0 | 0 | 61 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.1 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| ALCOHOL | 26 | 19.26 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6.67 | 0 | 0 |
| H/O HTN | 47 | 34.81 | 23 | 17.04 | 14 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.3 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 20 | 14.81 |
| H/O DM | 30 | 22.22 | 15 | 11.11 | 5 | 3.70 | 8 | 5.92 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ADDED } \\ & \text { SALT } \\ & \text { INTAKE } \end{aligned}$ | 57 | 42.22 | 33 | 24.44 | 46 | $\begin{aligned} & 34.0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 45 | 33.33 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DYSLIPIDE } \\ & \text { MIA } \end{aligned}$ | 64 | 47.40 | 29 | 21.48 | 29 | $\begin{aligned} & 21.4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 28 | 20.74 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H} \text { OF } \\ & \mathrm{CHD} \end{aligned}$ | 28 | 20.74 | 15 | 11.11 | 1 | 0.74 | 2 | 1.48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Different risk factors \& their frequency in male \& female subjects between case $\boldsymbol{\&}$ control groups

Table 26: Distribution of various risk factors \& their statistical significance in case \& control subjects

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { SMOKIN } \\ \text { G }\end{array} & 85 & \begin{array}{ll}62.9 \\ 6\end{array} & & 50 & 37.0 \\ 4\end{array}\right)$

## IV. Discussion :

The present study is designed as hospital based Case-control study to asses the role of various behavioral risk factors in the occurrence of coronary artery disease.A total of 270 subjects( 135 cases \& 135 controls) were studied. Among the total 135 cases $68.89 \%$ were males \& $31.11 \%$ were females,male predominance has also been reported by Zodpay et.al. ${ }^{27}$ also observed that prevalence of CAD was significantly ( $\mathrm{P}<0.001$ ) higher in men as compared to women in both urban ( $11 \% \mathrm{vs} 6.9 \%$ ) and rural ( $3.9 \% \mathrm{vs}$
$2.6 \%$ ) respectively.
Demographic data of the study population revealed that mean age of the cases \& controls were $58.57 \mathrm{yrs} \& 53.8 \mathrm{yrs}$ respectively. Largest no of cases were present in the age group 51-60yrs(33.3\%) followed by $41-50 \mathrm{yrs}(24.4 \%) \&$

61-70yrs(24.4\%).
Significantly higher no of cases were belong to urban area $(85,62.96 \%$ ) as compared to rural area $(50,37.04 \%)$, similar urban-rural difference was observed.The high prevalence of CAD among urban dwellers may be due to accumulation of various risk factors.

With regard to religion majority of cases were $\operatorname{Hindu}(101 / 135,74.8 \%)$ \& Muslims were (34/135,25.18\%). The controls comprise 100 no of $\operatorname{Hindus}(74.07 \%) \& 35$ no of Muslims(25.9\%) \&Out of 135 no of cases 127 no of subjects ( $94.07 \%$ ) were married.

Regarding the educational status majority $(52,38.51 \%)$ were educated up to secondary level $\left(6^{\text {th }}-10^{\text {th }}\right.$ standard).

Socio-economic classes were defined according to Modified BG Prasad Socioeconomic classification, Update2019 \& majority of cases were belong to socioeconomic class-II( $46,34.07 \%$ ). In the present study, higher socioeconomic status was significantly associated with CAD. Singh et al(1997) ${ }^{15}$.cited that higher socioeconomic status was significantly associated with CAD in both sexes.

In the present study, positive family h/o CHD was significantly associated with CAD. Gillurkar et al. $(\mathbf{1 9 9 8})^{16}$ also reported similar findings with that of present study. In their case-control study history of CHD was present in $17.8 \%$ of patients $\left(\mathrm{OR}=3.06, \mathrm{x}^{2}=9.03, \mathrm{P}<0.01\right.$ ). In our study, positive family history of CHD was present in $31.85 \%$ of $\operatorname{cases}(\mathrm{OR}=20.56, \mathrm{P}<0.00001)$. family history of CHD is known to increase the risk of premature death. Genetic factors appear to play an important role along with conventional and emerging risk factors.

Regarding dietary habits 127 no of cases $(91 \%$ ) take mix diet as compared to $12(8.89 \%)$ no of cases take veg diet. W.H.O stated that salt is an independent risk factor for hypertension, and intake of salt should be up to or less than
$5 \mathrm{gm} /$ day to prevent $\mathrm{CAD}^{17}$. In current study consumption of salt more than $5 \mathrm{gm} /$ day found to be more among cases $(46,34.07 \%)$ as compared to controls $(27,20 \%)$. W.H.O also stated that high fat intake (dietary fat representing $40 \%$ or over of the energy supply and a higher proportion of saturated fats is a major risk factor for

CAD ${ }^{18}$. In present study, significantly higher no of cases ( $28.89 \%$ ) were consumed excess saturated fats per day than controls( $2.96 \%$ ).
Hypertension is a very important risk factor for developing cardiac diseases.
In the present study person with hypertension $(71,52.59 \%)$ is at 3.43 times higher risk of CAD than normotensive subjects. Yoshihiro Miyake et $\mathbf{a l ( 2 0 0 0 )}{ }^{\mathbf{1 7}}$. W.H.O.international case-control study (1997) ${ }^{\mathbf{1 9}}$ also observed that hypertension was significantly associated with AMI.

In our study, diabetes mellitus was associated with increased risk of $\mathrm{CAD}(\mathrm{OR}=4.69, \mathrm{P}-0.00001)$. Similar results were reported in the previous studies ${ }^{\mathbf{2 0}}$. Both diabetic men and women are susceptible to coronary artery disease.

The most common cause of death in these patients are cardiovascular diseases. ${ }^{\mathbf{2 1}}$
This study showed association between dyslipidemia and CAD.(OR=3.03, P-
0.00001 ). Similar findings also noted by ToobaKazemi et al. ${ }^{22}$

In the present study, significant association was observed between smoking and $\mathrm{CAD}(\mathrm{OR}=2.06, \mathrm{P}$ $0.004)$ and a dose-response relationship was also observed between the frequency of smoking per day and CAD (OR=4.05, $\mathrm{P}-$
0.000063 ) which are well correlated with the observations of PremPais et al . ${ }^{23}$ in their study.

Significant association was also observed between alcohol drinking and CAD which is similar with the findings of SubrataBagchi et al. ${ }^{24}$

In present study, unhealthy behavior like smoking( $62.96 \%$ ), alcohol( $19.26 \%$ ) consumption were more among the males as compared to females in both cases and controls, similar findings were also observed by Waldron $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{2 5}}$ in their study. Possible reason may be that these types of unhealthy behaviors are more socially acceptable for males than for females.

Obesity has been defined as $\mathbf{B M I}>\mathbf{2 5 K g} / \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ as per Consensus statement for diagnosis of obesity, abdominal obesity and the metabolic syndrome for asian Indians ${ }^{\mathbf{2 6}}$. Obesity has been identified as a risk factor for CAD in study conducted by Zopady et al. ${ }^{27}$; in present study, significant association was also observed between obesity and $\mathrm{CAD}(\mathrm{OR}=2.68, \mathrm{P}-0.006125)$.

In the present study, sedentariness was significantly associated with the risk of $\mathrm{CAD}(\mathrm{OR}=2.05, \mathrm{P}$ $0.003486)$.

Gupta et al(1995) ${ }^{\mathbf{2 8}}$. Also found higher prevalence of CHD and sedentary lifestyle in urban population. Sedentary lifestyle has been shown to be important in the genesis of caloric imbalance, resulting obesity and all consequences of obesity.

## The present study has a number of limitations: -

Ideally, to identify association of risk factor to disease should be done through a prospective cohort study, but time constraint and limited resources bound us to choose a hospital-based case-control study.

1. Being a hospital-based case-control study the cases and controls may not be the representative of the general population.
2. To mitigate against confounding effects of multiple risk factors present in a patient, logistic regression analysis should have been done.
3. The study was confined to small no of subjects and period.

## V. Conclusion:

The present study assessed the prevalence of various risk factors of CAD among cases \& controls \& their individual influence in the causation of CAD.

In conclusion, the present case-control study showed that CAD is associated with several common but mostly preventable risk factors.

Hence we recommend a national initiative to quit smoking, to have more physical activities, to improve lifestyles and to promote healthy diets. We also propose screening programs for earlier detection of elevated blood pressure, high blood glucose, dyslipidemia and control of these atherosclerotic risk factors to reduce CAD.
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