UDC 616-01/616.127-005.8 **DOI** 10.17802/2306-1278-2021-10-4-48-57

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO RISK PREDICTION NON-COMPLIANCE IN PATIENTS WITH MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

A.G. Petrov¹, N.V. Abramov¹, D.YU. Sedyh², V.V. Kashtalap^{1,2}

¹ Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kemerovo State Medical University" of the Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, 22a, Voroshilova St., Kemerovo, Russian Federation, 650056; ² Federal State Budgetary Institution "Research Institute for Complex Issues of Cardiovascular Diseases", 6, Sosnoviy Blvd, Kemerovo, Russian Federation, 650002

Highlights

• The adherence to treatment of patients with myocardial infarction was comprehensively assessed and the risk of non-compliance in such patients was predicted on the basis of the original author's questionnaire. The minimum and maximum values of prognostic indices for 29 factors were determined. A personalized algorithm for a comprehensive assessment of non-compliance in myocardial infarction is presented which is based on the principle of normalized intensive parameters. It allows subsequent substantiating of the preventive programs expediency and the need to eliminate factors associated with low patient compliance in the treatment of the disease.

Aim	To develop a methodological approach in order to predict the risk of non-compliance in patients with myocardial infarction.
Methods	416 patients were questioned in the single-centered, prospective, non-randomized study using the original author's method. The patients were treated in specialized cardiological departments of the city of Kemerovo with the diagnosed myocardial infarction. The methodological approach to predicting the risk of non-compliance in patients with myocardial infarction covered 29 factors in 6 main blocks: sociodemographic and socio-economic characteristics, health status, medical and pharmaceutical culture of the patient, awareness of medical and pharmaceutical services, patient adherence to medical recommendations.
Results	Patients with myocardial infarction were characterized by insufficient adherence to the therapy, low awareness of the disease, which can negatively affect the long-term disease prognosis. The identification of a large number of subjective factors limiting adherence to the therapy is the reason for the widespread use of non-compliance risk measurement among patients with myocardial infarction, which will allow determining the range of the risk group for each individual patient.
Conclusion	The adherence to the treatment of patients with myocardial infarction is revealed as 80% which is indicated as low and requires the prophylactic use of educational and psychological programs that increase medical and social awareness and readiness to comply with the doctor's recommendations, and also justifies the need for complex risk measurement of non-compliance patients for personalized identification and addressing risk factors for poor adherence to therapy.
Keywords	Myocardial infarction • Factors of adherence to therapy • Noncompliance • Prediction of risk

Received: 05.08.2021; received in revised form: 16.09.2021; accepted: 14.10.2021

Список сокращений

MI - myocardial infarction NIP - normalized intensive parameter

Introduction

In recent years pathologies of the circulatory system have occupied a leading place among chronic nonepidemic diseases [1]. The studies in this sphere show that atherosclerotic diseases, in particular coronary heart disease, myocardial infarction (MI), strokes, are an unhappy lot of highly developed countries where socio–economic burden is growing in accordance with the progress of civilization [2, 3]. In our opinion this is explained by a number of reasons and the leading ones are the rare visits of people to medical organizations, insufficient availability of high-tech medical care, the lack of a unified methodology for the study and control of morbidity, and others. According to the registered cases of cardiovascular pathology in medical organizations and according to large population epidemiological studies, the basic trend today is the "rejuvenation" of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality including deaths from MI [1, 4]. In this respect the study of the main factors influencing the development of patient noncompliance in MI is of particular importance [3].

Adherence to treatment in MI is specified by a set of factors determined by the disease, the system of medical care, the medical worker and the patient. [5]. Nevertheless the most significant factors are related to the patient, as well as the psychological characteristics of the patient's personality [6–8]. The lack of deep understanding of noncompliance mechanisms formation, risk stratification and methods of its prediction in patients with MI makes this issue relevant for the study, especially in real clinical practice in which insufficient adherence to pharmacotherapy is traced both at the inpatient and outpatient stages, even among patients with adverse cardiovascular events in the anamnesis despite all intensive medical supervision [9–11].

The aim of the study is to develop a methodological approach to predicting the risk of noncompliance in patients with myocardial infarction

Methods

The present study is a single-centered prospective non-randomized study. The work protocol complies with the standards of Good Clinical Practice which means that all the participants signed an informed voluntary consent to take part in the questionnaire. The main object of the study is patients with the "myocardial infarction" diagnosed according to the current criteria of the Russian Society of Cardiology, hospitalized in the specialized cardiology departments of the CPSSZ Research Institute (2017). The survey of the patients with MI was carried out on the 3rd-7th day of their stay in hospital.

The study used the data from a questionnaire

survey of patients with MI which was conducted for a comprehensive study of this problem. The volume of the respondents' representative sample was based on the formula of a random non-repeated sample and included 416 people. 16 questionnaires were excluded from the analysis due to incorrect way of filling in the blanks. The collected material was processed in the Statistica 10.0 program (StatSoft Inc., USA).

To predict the risk of patients with MI noncompliance, a special questionnaire was developed. It included the main factors affecting this problem. When using the NIP method (normalized intensive parameters), the values of the studied phenomena must be calculated in intensive terms as a whole according to the data of the entire study (M). When the immediate risk factors are identified, it is necessary to determine the significance or "weight" of each. To do this a simple weighting factor is used which is called the relative risk indicator (R). This index is the ratio of the maximum intensity level of the indicator (c) to the minimum (d) within each individual factor (R = c/d).

Normalized intensive parameters were used in this study instead of the standard ones [14] which are calculated according to the formula (1):

$$N = r/m, (1)$$

where N is the NIP; r is the intensive patient compliance parameter; M is the normalizing parameter.

Results

The compliance parameter of patients with MI is assumed to be 80%. For example:

 $NIP_1 = 14.5/80 = 0.18$ (group up to 49 years old),

 $NIP_2 = 23.6/80 = 0.29$ (group 50–59 years old).

All factors NIP included in the study were calculated in the similar way (Table 1). Taking into consideration the equality of the importance weights of the selected factors, the calculation is made according to the formula (2):

$$\gamma = N \times R$$
, (2)

where χ is an integrated risk measure on the strength of influence of a particular factor (predictive coefficient); N – NIP specific factor; R is the relative risk (weight ratio).

Table 1. Integrated assessment of factors that form the risk of non-compliance in patients with myocardial infarction

Factor	Zone of influence	Parameter, %	NIP, N	Relativerisk indicator (weight coefficient), R	Integrated risk assessment, χ = N × R	
Socio-demographic characteristics						
Sex	male	56.4	0.70	1.24	0.86	
	female	43.6	0.54		0.67	
Age	up to 49	14.5	0.18	1.24	0.22	
	50–59	23.6	0.29		0.36	
	60 years and older	61.8	0.77		0.95	

Education	incomplete general	14.5	0.17		0.21
	complete secondary	5.5	0.06		0.76
	initial professional	1.8	0.02	1.07	0.25
	secondary vocational	50.9	0.63	1.27	0.80
	unfinished higher	5.5	0.06		0.07
	higher	21.8	0.27		0.34
	unemployed	5.5	0.06		0.07
	employed	32.7	0.41		0.50
Occupation	retiree	56.4	0.70	1.23	0.86
_	housewife	3.6	0.04		0.04
	disabled	1.8	0.02		0.02
	single/not married	9.1	0.11		0.13
	married	60.0	0.75		0.93
Family status	divorced	9.1	0.11	1.24	0.13
J	widow/widower	18.2	0.22		0.27
	in a civil marriage	3.6	0.05		0.06
	-		c characteristics		
	below the cost of living	14.5	0.18		0.02
Income	within and above the subsistence level	85.5	1.06	1.24	1.31
	subsistence level	Healt	h status		
	bad	7.8	0.10		0.01
Health	satisfactory	62.7	0.78	1.24	0.96
assessment	good	29.4	0.36	1.2.	0.44
Tl	yes	49.0	0.61		0.74
The presence of chronic diseases	no	51.0	0.61	1.22	0.75
	sldom	68.6	0.85		1.06
Frequency of	semiannually	15.7	0.20	1.25	0.19
visiting a doctor	once or more a month	15.7	0.20	1.23	0.19
Seeing a doctor	yes	27.5	0.20		0.41
in case of poor	no	72.6	0.91	1.24	1.13
health		29.1	0.36		0.44
Smoking	yes	70.9	0.88	1.24	1.09
	no	41.8	0.52		0.64
Drinking alcohol	yes	58.2	0.32	1.24	0.89
	no				
Di1:11:4	II	13.7	0.15	1.20	0.18
Disability group	III	7.8	0.08	1.20	0.09
	no Padiandi	78.4	0.97	14	1.16
			pharmaceutical	cuiture	
Attitude towards	positive, I try to always stick to it	51.0	0.63	1.24	0.78
a healthy lifestyle	positive, but I don't always follow it	49.0	0.61		0.75
Compliance with	constantly comply	43.1	0.53		0.64
the daily routine	do not comply	25.5	0.31	1.22	0.37
	observed in case of illness	31.4	0.38		0.46
Attitude towards	positively	66.7	0.82	1.23	1.01
self-medication	negatively	33.3	0.41	1.43	0.50

Compliance with	doing	82.4	1.02	1.24	1.26
doctor's orders	does not follow	17.6	0.22	1.47	0.27
Disease prevention	engage	31.4	0.38	1.23	0.46
	do not engage	68.6	0.85	1.23	1.04
Treatment	medication	88.2	1.10	1.25	1.37
preference	non medication	11.8	0.15	1.25	0.18
Assessment of	satisfied	94.1	1.17		2.24
the quality of medical care	dissatisfied	5.9	0.75	1.92	0.14
nearcar care			ıd pharmaceutica	Lervices	
	printed (booklets, leaflets)	32.2	0.41	i sei vices	0.51
-	oral (at the doctor's office)	32.2	0.41		0.31
Sources of nformation about	and advice from pharmacy workers	52.5	0.65	1.24	0.81
nedical services	tips from relatives and friends	5.1	0.06	1.24	0.07
	other sources (advertising, internet, television)	10.2	0.12		0.15
	from a doctor	74.5	0.92		1.09
	from relatives with MI	7.8	0.08		0.09
From whom more nformation about	from friends and acquaintances	5.9	0.07	1.19	0.08
he disease	from special literature	2.0	0.02		0.02
	from magazines, newspapers, television	7.8	0.08		0.09
	other	2.0	0.02		0.02
Assessing your	good	33.3	0.41		0.50
own awareness of medical and	sufficient	35.3	0.44	1.23	0.54
harmaceutical	insufficient	29.4	0.36		0.44
products	no	2.0	0.02		0.03
	Patient ad	herence to m	edical recommend	lations	
	forgetfulness	19.6	0.23	1.18	0.27
	other cases	5.9	0.07		0.08
Reason for not aking drugs	it gets worse from drugs	7.8	0.08		0.09
aking arags	other	3.9	0.05		0.06
	never missed	62.7	0.75		0.88
	strictly complies	80.4	1.01		1.26
Attitude towards the doctor's prescriptions	at first, I observe, as my health improves, I reduce my medication intake	17.6	0.22	1.24	0.27
brescribtions	I do not comply, I take medications as needed	2.0	0.02		0.02
Trust in the attending physician when prescribing a treatment regimen	yes	98.0	1.22	1.32	1.16
	no	2.0	0.10	1.52	0.13
Fear of unwanted	yes	25.5	0.31	1 22	0.38
side effects	no	74.5	0.92	1.23	1.13
Cases of early	yes	27.5	0.34		0.42
termination of	-	72.5	0.91	1.24	1.13
treatment	no	14.3	0.71		1.13

Reasons for early termination of treatment	unreasonable expectations of recovery	9.4	0.11	1.21	0.13
	forgetfulness	46.9	0.58		0.70
	knowledge of the disease	3.1	0.03		0.04
	due to the complexity of the regime	6.3	0.07		0.08
	duration of treatment	18.8	0.24		0.29
	adverse drug reaction	9.4	0.11		0.13
	ineffectiveness of prescribed therapy	6.3	0.07		0.08
Normalizing factor (M) – 80%		The sum of the relative risk indicators -36.5			

Note: MI – myocardial infarction; NIP – normalized intensive parameters.

Further on it is necessary to determine the range of risk values for the complex of factors taken. We find the minimum and maximum values of the prognostic coefficient (χ) for each of the 29 factors in the prognostic table. These values are summed up and divided by the sum of relative risk indicators (ΣR_n) given in the table $\Sigma \chi_n / \Sigma R_n$. In this case the minimum initial risk value is 0.20, the maximum is 0.81. The risk range is in the range of 0.20–0.81 (Table 2).

As an example we have a patient with MI: a 56-year-old man with a secondary professional education, income within the subsistence minimum, satisfactory health condition, married, has a chronic disease (coronary heart disease), does not always consult a doctor in case of deterioration of health, smokes, does not drink alcohol, treats a healthy lifestyle negatively, does not always follow the treatment regimen and doctor's prescriptions, prefers medication, is satisfied with the quality of medical care, the main sources of information are oral (doctor and pharmacist), trusts the attending physician, there is no fear of side effects of taking medications, forgets to take medications from time to time.

To determine the risk of developing noncompliance in this patient, it is necessary to use the prognostic table and find the corresponding coefficients (χ) for each factor, sum them up (Σx_n) and divide by the sum of the relative risk indicators (ΣR_n).

$$P = \chi_1 + \chi_2 + \chi_3... + \chi_n$$
, (3)

$$P = 0.86 + 0.36 + 0.80 + 0.50 + 0.93 + 1.31 + 0.96 + 0.74 + 1.06 + 0.44 + 0.89 + 1.16 + 0.5 + 0.46 + 0.27 + 1.37 + 2.24 + 0.81 + 1.16 + 1.13 + 0.7 = 18.65$$

$$P_1 = (\Sigma x_n / \Sigma R_n), (4)$$

where P1 is the NIP of noncompliance risk under the influence of a complex of factors taken for the study; ΣR_n is the sum of relative risk indicators given in the prognostic table.

$$P_1 = 18.65/36.5 = 0.51$$

The significance of the indicator is determined by the table 2. The obtained result indicates that the patient requires increased attention and intensive medical supervision in order to avoid anunfavorable outcome of the disease associated with noncompliance. Next we directly evaluate the noncompliance index according to the formula (5):

$$P_n = (\Sigma X_n / \Sigma R_n) \times M, (5)$$

where P_n is the predicted patient compliance indicator (in intensive terms); M is the normalizing value of the average patient compliance indicator according to the data of the entire study.

$$P_n = (18.65/36.5) \times 80 = 40.87$$

This value will be a predictive indicator of the patient's noncompliance in intensive terms. Under the influence of various factors it is possible to change the compliance of patients after discharge from the hospital.

Discussion

The present research assesses the patients' adherence to treatment by means of the questionnaire using A.G. Petrov's method which was previously successfully tested on miners with occupational diseases and showed

Table 2. Distribution of non-compliance risk groups in patients with myocardial infarction

Non-compliance risk range	Range size	The specific gravity of the range, %	Risk group
Low	0.20-0.39	≤23.6	Potentially favorable outcome of MI
Middle	0.40-0.61	23.7–33.6	"Attention!"
Maximum	0.62-0.81	33.6–100.0	Potentially poor outcome of MI

Note: MI – myocardial infarction.

greater effectiveness in comparison with the Morisky–Green test [10]. The analysis of the applicability of this technique in patients with MI in Kuzbass was carried out for the first time.

The assessment of risk factors for noncompliance in patients with MI can be theoretically and practically useful for a differentiated understanding of the adherence aspects of certain categories of patients, for example, in primary and repeated MI. The authors of the article have already performed a comparative analysis of the adherence of 145 patients. 74 of them were hospitalized with MI for the first time, 71 – with repeated MI. However, the prediction of the risk of noncompliance, taking into account the complex of the most significant factors (29), was not carried out in these groups of patients [3].

It was found that most of the patients had chronic diseases for a long time, clearly realizing that they were the result of cardiovascular risk factors and only few of them consulted cardiologists. The data collected during the research indicates that despite the doctor's prescriptions, some additional information about the right use of the therapy and some pharmaceutical support are needed. The works of N.B. Lebedeva, E.V. Gorbunova with co-authors have already provided the information about similar socio-demographic and anamnestic features of patients with primary and repeated MI who need information and psychological adaptation and the effectiveness of these measures in correcting target markers of cardiovascular health and motivation for compliance was revealed [15, 16].

It is worth saying that the use of predictive tables for conducting periodic and targeted preventive examinations will be effective. Unless the nature and degree of individual factors influence is known, it is impossible to determine the probability of pathological risk for an individual who has certain working conditions. This would make it possible to identify groups of people who are at pathological risk, although they do not have any pronounced signs.

Considering all mentioned above, the solution of such issues can be presented in the following way:

- identification of factors affecting the level of quantitative health indicators (morbidity, disability, injury, etc.);
- determination of the degree of risk factors influence on risk indicators;
- determination of the pathological risk probability for individuals and for groups of individuals, taking into account the coefficients of various factors.

It seems appropriate to conduct further studies that will allow evaluating the effectiveness of the prognostic methodology offered in the work, depending on the course of MI for a certain dynamic period.

Conclusion

The adherence of patients with MI to the treatment is only 80% and it indicates a special need for preventive measures, as well as it points out the need for comprehensive risk assessment in patients' noncompliance for personalized identification and elimination of risk factors for insufficient adherence to doctor's recommendations.

The methodological approach to a comprehensive assessment of the noncompliance risk introduced in this study makes it possible to determine the probability of non-adherence to prescribed therapy and substantiate the preventive measures. Thus, in order to achieve accessibility and improve the quality of medical and pharmaceutical care for patients with MI, along with social factors, behavioral determinants of noncompliance should be taken into account.

Conflict of Interest

A.G. Petrov declares no conflict of interest. N.V. Abramov declares no conflict of interest. D.Y. Sedykh no conflict of interest. V.V. Kashtalap is a member of the editorial board of "Complex Issues of Cardiovascular Diseases" journal.

Financing

The authors declare no funding for the study.

Author Information Form

Petrov Andrey G., PhD, Associate Professor, Professor at the Pharmacy Department of the Pharmacy Faculty, the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kemerovo State Medical University", the Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, Kemerovo, Russian Federation; **ORCID** 0000-0001-9543-1134

Abramov Nikolay V., lecturer at the Pharmacy Department of the Pharmacy Faculty, the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kemerovo State Medical University", the Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, Kemerovo, Russian Federation; ORCID 0000-0003-3682-6333

Sedykh Daria Yu., Ph.D., a researcher at the Laboratory of Circulatory Pathology, the Department of Clinical Cardiology, Federal State Budgetary Institution "Research Institute for Complex Issues of Cardiovascular Diseases", Kemerovo, Russian Federation; ORCID 0000-0001-7058-2008

Kashtalap Vasiliy V., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Professor at the Department of Cardiology and Cardiovascular Surgery, Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kemerovo State Medical University", the Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, Kemerovo, Russian Federation; the Head of the Department of Clinical Cardiology at the Federal State Budgetary Institution "Research Institute for Complex Issues of Cardiovascular Diseases", Kemerovo, Russian Federation; **ORCID** 0000-0003-3729-616X

Author Contribution Statement

PAG – contribution to the concept and design of the study, data collection and interpretation, manuscript writing, approval of the final version, fully responsible for the content

ANV – contribution to the concept and design of the study, data analysis, manuscript writing, approval of the final version, fully responsible for the content

SDYu – contribution to the concept and design of the study, data collection and interpretation, manuscript writing, approval of the final version, fully responsible for the content

KVV – contribution to the concept and design of the study, data collection and interpretation, manuscript writing, approval of the final version, fully responsible for the content

REFERENCES

- 1. Garganeeva A. A., Okrugin S. A., Borel K. N., Kuzheleva E.A.1, Parshin E.A.Myocardial infarction at the turn of two centuries: demographic and social trends. Klin. medicine. 2016; 6: 463-466. doi: 10.18821/0023-2149-2016-94-6-463-466 (In Russian)
- 2. Shalnova S.A., Konradi A.O., Karpov Yu.A., Kontsevaya A.V., Deev A.D., Kapustina A.V., Khudyakov M.B., Shlyakhto E.V., Boytsov S.A. Analysis of mortality from cardiovascular diseases in 12 regions of the Russian Federation participating in the study "Epidemiology of cardiovascular diseases in various regions of Russia". Ros. cardiologist. zhurn. 2012; 5: 6-11. (In Russian)
- 3. Sedykh D.Yu., Petrov G.P., Kashtalap V.V. Differences in adherence to therapy in patients with primary and recurrent myocardial infarction. Complex problems of cardiovascular diseases. 2018; 7 (4): 15-25. doi: 10.17802/2306-1278-2018-7-4-15-25 (In Russian)
- 4. Gafarov V.V., Gromova E.A., Panov D.O.1,2,3, Gagulin I.V.3, Gafarova A.V. The impact of stress at work on the risk of cardiovascular disease among the population aged 25-64 in Russia / Siberia (WHO MONICA-psychosocial program). Therapeutic archive. 2019; 91 (1): 13-18. doi: 10.26442/00403 660.2019.01.000022 (In Russian)
- 5. Volskaya E.A. Pharmionics. Patient Compliance Concept. Remedium. 2013; 11: 6-15. (In Russian)
- 6. Anokhin V. A., Bikmukhametov D. A. The problem of adherence to treatment in modern medicine. Practical medicine. 2005; 5: 26-28. (In Russian)
- 7. Koichuev A.A. Adherence to treatment: assessment methods, technologies for correcting insufficient adherence to therapy. Medical Bulletin. North Caucasus. 2013; 3: 65-69. (In Russian)
- 8. Alekseeva T.S., Ogarkov M.Y., Skripchenko A.E., Yankin M.Y. Factors affecting adherence to lifestyle modification in an organized population. Systemic hypertension. 2013; 10 (2): 19-22. doi:10.26442/SG28960 (In Russian)
- 9. Maksimov S.A., Tabakaev M.V., Chigisova A.N., Artamonova G.V. Results of a comprehensive assessment

- of risk factors for coronary heart disease in the working population. Hygiene and Sanitation. 2018.97 (4): 310-314. doi: 10.18821/0016-9900-2018-97-4-310-314. (In Russian)
- 10. Pereverzeva K.G., Loukianov M.M., Martsevich S.Yu., Andreenko E.Yu., Zagrebelnyy A.V., Boytsov S.A., Yakushin S.S. Long-term adherence to drug therapy in patients with ischemic heart disease and myocardial infarction in comparison with other cardiovascular diseases. Therapy. 2019; 1 (27): 54-59. doi:10.18565/therapy.2019.1.54-59 (In Russian)
- 11. Semenova Yu.V., Kutishenko N.P., Zagebelnyy A.V., Deev A.D., Ginzburg M.L., Martsevich S.Yu. Adherence to visiting medical institutions, the quality of therapy and the immediate outcomes of acute coronary syndrome: a study within the LIS-3 register. Rational Pharmacotherapy in Cardiology. 2016; 4: 430-434. doi: 10.20996/1819-6446-2016-12-4-430-434 (In Russian)
- 12. Petrov A.G., Knysh O. I., Semenikhin V.A. et al. Organizational and methodological foundations for improving specialized pharmaceutical care for workers in the coal industry: monograph / A.G. Petrov, Kemerovo: Kuzbassvuzizdat; 2019. 255 p. (In Russian)
- 13. Fofanova T.V., Ageev F.T., Smirnova M.D., Svirida O.N., Kuzmina A.E., Thostov A.S., Nelyubina A.S. Domestic questionnaire of adherence to therapy: testing and application in outpatient practice. Systemic hypertension. 2014; 2: 13-16. doi:10.26442/SG29010 (In Russian)
- 14. Shigan E.N. Methods of forecasting and modeling in social and hygienic research. Moscow: Medicine; 1986. 155. (In Russian)
- 15. Gorbunova E. V., Sedykh D. Yu., Maksimov S. A. Psychosocial factors of adherence to treatment in patients with myocardial infarction. Therapeutic archive. 2018; 90 (12): 34-38. (In Russian)
- 16. Lebedeva N.B., Lebedev O.V., Tarasov N.I., Yakusheva E.Yu., Barbarash O.L. Psychosocial characteristics of patients with myocardial infarction and the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs. Cardiovascular therapy and prevention. 2005; 4 (6): 65-69. (In Russian)

To cite: Petrov A.G., Abramov N.V., Sedyh D.Yu., Kashtalap V.V. Methodological approach to risk prediction non-compliance in patients with myocardial infarction. Complex Issues of Cardiovascular Diseases. 2021;10(4): 48-57. DOI: 10.17802/2306-1278-2021-10-4-48-57