Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Sujay Paul, Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education (ITESM), Mexico

REVIEWED BY

Katrien Jansen, KU Leuven, Belgium Yin Huang, Sichuan University, China Brian Mendel, National Cardiovascular Center Harapan Kita, Indonesia

*CORRESPONDENCE Songfeng Ma ⊠ 18099255370@163.com

RECEIVED 09 October 2024 ACCEPTED 06 January 2025 PUBLISHED 17 January 2025

CITATION

Zhou S, Liu L, Jin X, Dorikun D and Ma S (2025) Biomarkers predicting postoperative adverse outcomes in children with congenital heart disease: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Front. Pediatr. 13:1508329. doi: 10.3389/fped.2025.1508329

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Zhou, Liu, Jin, Dorikun and Ma. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Biomarkers predicting postoperative adverse outcomes in children with congenital heart disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Shifan Zhou^{1,2}, Lu Liu³, Xiaochuang Jin¹, Daniel Dorikun¹ and Songfeng Ma^{1*}

¹Pediatric Cardiothoracic Surgery, First Affiliated Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi, China, ²College of Pediatrics, Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi, China, ³Hematology Department, First Affiliated Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi, China

Objective: To statistically analyze biomarkers predicting postoperative outcomes in children with congenital heart disease (CHD).

Methods: PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and Web of Science were performed to search up to February 2024. The measured outcomes were biomarkers, mortality, length of hospital stay, complication rates, and infection rates. Adults with CHD were excluded. Standard deviation or odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95% CI) were extracted. A random-effects model synthesized SMDs or ORs with 95% CIs. Sensitivity analysis investigated heterogeneity, and Egger's test assessed publication bias.

Results: Seventeen eligible articles were included, the biomarkers involved include serum lactate, NT-Pro BNP, PaO2, serum creatinine, C1-INH activity, ST2, serum chloride concentration, GH, glycemia, cTOI, NLR, serum albumin, and glucose levels, with 2,888 patients who underwent surgery(modified Norwood procedure, arterial switch procedure, biventricular repair etc.). Serum lactate was higher in the postoperative death group (SMD: 1.18, 95% CI: 0.59–1.77). Lower postoperative N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide (NT-pro BNP) levels were associated with lower mortality (OR: 0.23, 95% CI: 0.08–0.68) and shorter mechanical ventilation time (OR: 0.40, 95% CI: 0.18–0.90). Higher serum albumin levels were associated with longer hospital stays (OR: 3.12, 95% CI: 1.66–5.84). Significant heterogeneity was found in serum creatinine, B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), serum lactate, and NT-Pro BNP. Publication bias was detected in some studies.

Conclusion: Serum lactate, NT-Pro BNP, and serum albumin are reliable biomarkers for predicting adverse outcomes in children with CHD after surgery.

Systematic Review Registration: PROSPERO [CRD42024512753].

KEYWORDS

congenital heart disease (CHD), biomarkers, postoperative outcomes, metaanalysis, pediatric cardiac surgery

1 Introduction

Structural abnormalities of the heart and/or great vessels present at birth are referred to as congenital heart disease (CHD) (1), with a global incidence of roughly 0.8%-1.2% in live births (2, 3). CHD subtypes span from comparatively uncomplicated and minor lesions, including ventricular septal defect (VSD) and atrial septal defect (ASD), to more intricate and infrequent lesions like hypoplastic left heart syndrome (HLHS), tetralogy of Fallot (ToF), and transposition of the great arteries (TGA) (4). Pharmacological interventions to alleviate symptoms, complications, and conventional surgery or minimally invasive interventional surgery, are the main methods for treating CHD (5, 6). The introduction of cardiopulmonary bypass has rendered the disease manageable (7). Despite significant reductions in mortality achieved through progress in surgery over recent decades, CHD continues to be a primary cause of deaths related to birth defects (2, 8).

Adverse events after surgery in children with CHD (mortality, length of hospital stay, complication rates, etc.) remain a focus concern. In China, the mortality rate of CHD is rising (9). Compared to older children, neonates and infants are more susceptible to adverse events after CHD surgery (10, 11). Amirnovin et al. (10) found that higher perioperative BNP levels were associated with a greater likelihood of adverse outcomes after surgery. Hunt et al. (12) discovered that elevated preoperative von Willebrand factor (VWF) activity was associated with postoperative thrombosis in children with CHD. Gupta et al. (13) confirmed that elevated NT-proBNP may be a useful marker of adverse outcomes after cardiac surgery in children with CHD. To date, several biomarkers have been shown to be associated with adverse outcomes after CHD surgery, but no combined the meta-analysis has data. This article comprehensively searched and analyzed existing studies to explore the value of biomarkers in predicting adverse outcomes in children with CHD after surgery and to lay a theoretical foundation for constructing a more accurate risk prediction model for postoperative outcomes in children with CHD in clinical practice.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Literature search

The meta-analysis following PRISMA guidelines (14) and was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42024512753). PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and Web of Science databases for literature searching up to February 2024 to identify English-language literature on the value of biomarkers in predicting postoperative outcomes in children with CHD. Terms followed were included: "congenital heart disease", "factor", "randomized controlled trial", "cohort study", and "case-control study". The search strategy for PubMed is as follows: (((((((((Defect, Congenital Heart [Title/ Abstract])) OR (Heart Abnormality [Title/Abstract])) OR (Congenital Heart Defect [Title/Abstract])) OR (Heart, Malformation Of [Title/Abstract])) OR (Malformation Of Heart [Title/Abstract])) OR (Defects, Congenital Heart [Title/ Abstract])) OR (Heart Abnormalities [Title/Abstract])) OR (Heart Defect, Congenital [Title/Abstract])) OR (Congenital Heart Disease [Title/Abstract])) OR (Disease, Congenital Heart [Title/Abstract])) OR (Heart Disease, Congenital [Title/ Abstract])) OR (Congenital Heart Defects [Title/Abstract]) AND (((((((Operative Procedures [Title/Abstract]) OR (Procedure, Operative [Title/Abstract])) OR (Surgical Procedure, Operative [Title/Abstract])) OR (Operative Surgical Procedures [Title/ Abstract])) OR (Procedure, Operative Surgical [Title/Abstract])) OR (Surgical Procedures [Title/Abstract])) OR (Procedure, Surgical [Title/Abstract])) OR (Operative Surgical Procedure [Title/Abstract])) OR (Ghost Surgery [Title/Abstract])) OR (surgery [Title/Abstract]) AND (factor [Title/Abstract]) AND ((((((randomized controlled trial [All fileds]) OR (randomized controlled trial [All fileds])) OR (RCT [All fileds])) OR (clinical trial [All fileds])) OR (cohort [All fileds])) OR (case-control [All fileds])) OR (clinical study [All fileds]). Furthermore, the reference lists of every qualifying study underwent a manual review. Two researchers, working independently, conducted searches and evaluated the studies that met the inclusion criteria. Any disagreements that arose during the literature search process were resolved through consensus-based discussions.

2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria: (1) study design was randomized controlled, cohort, or case-control; (2) study subjects were children with CHD; (3) Biomarker data can be extracted: The continuous variable data contains the mean±standard deviation, and the categorical variable contains the odds ratios (ORs) and the corresponding 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI); (4) at least one of the following outcomes was assessed: mortality, length of hospital stay, complication rates, or infection rates; (5) sufficient data were available to calculate odds ratios (ORs) or standardized mean differences (SMDs). We excluded reviews, letters, editorials, case reports, conference abstracts, unpublished articles, and non-English articles.

2.3 Data extraction and quality assessment

Two researchers (SF Zhou. and L Liu) extracted data independently. Any discrepancies were resolved by a third researcher (SF Ma) who made the final decision. First author, year of publication, study period, country, study design, sample size, age, weight, gender, disease type, biomarker, detection time, threshold, and incidence of adverse outcomes were extracted. When continuous variables were reported as medians with ranges or interquartile ranges in the studies, we calculated means \pm standard deviations using validated mathematical methods (15, 16). In instances where data was incomplete or not reported in the studies, we reached out to the corresponding authors to request the missing information. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was utilized to evaluate the quality, with scores ranging from 7 to 9 points indicating high-quality research (17). The assessment of quality and evidence level for eligible studies was carried out independently by two researchers. Any disagreements that arose during this process were resolved through open discussions.

2.4 Statistical methods

Review Manager version 5.4 was utilized to conduct evidence synthesis. Data were pooled using SMDs for continuous variables and ORs for dichotomous variables. All indicators were reported with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The chi-squared (χ^2) test (Cochran's Q) and inconsistency index (I^2) were applied for the evaluation of the heterogeneity of each outcome. $\chi^2 P$ value more than 0.05 or $I^2 < 50\%$ indicating non-significant heterogeneity and a fixed-effects model used for data synthesis. Conversely, when $\chi^2 P$ value less than 0.05 or $I^2 \ge 50\%$, a random-effects model was used. Moreover, we conducted sensitivity analysis to evaluate how the incorporated studies influenced the pooled findings for outcomes exhibiting substantial heterogeneity. To visually assess potential publication bias for outcomes with three or more included studies, we employed Egger's regression test utilizing the statistical software Stata, version 15.0. For publication bias, statistical significance was indicated by a *P*-value below 0.05.

3 Results

3.1 Identification of relevant studies

The initial search yielded a total of 6,747 potentially relevant studies. Duplicate studies were eliminated, leaving 6,085 unique records. After reviewing titles, abstracts, and full-text articles against the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, 17 studies met the eligibility requirements. These qualified studies encompassed a total of 2,888 children (involved patients younger than 18 years), which were included in the pooled analysis (10, 12, 13, 18–31). The flow chart was shown in Figure 1.

3.2 Study characteristics and quality assessment

Among the 17 included studies, 8 were prospective studies and 9 were retrospective studies. Regarding the time of biomarker measurement, 10 studies were preoperative, 6 were postoperative,



and 1 was not mentioned (Table 1). Three studies used serum lactate as a biomarker, two used NT-ProBNP, two used PaO2, and the remaining studies used serum creatinine, C1-INH activity, ST2, serum chloride concentration, GH, glycemia, cTOI, NLR, serum albumin, or glucose levels as biomarkers. The observed outcomes varied by study: 7 studies used mortality as an outcome, 4 studies reported the incidence of postoperative AKI, and the remaining studies used thrombosis (coronary thrombosis, arterial thrombosis, deep venous thrombosis, arterial stroke, cerebral sinus thrombosis, shunt thrombosis), prolonged hospitalization (Neonate >46 days, infant >17 days), capillary leak syndrome (the development of generalized noncardiac edema, ascites, pleural effusion, and a weight gain of more than 10%), prolonged PICU length of stay (>3 days), infection rate (positive culture from blood, urine, or wound), prolonged mechanical ventilation time (Neonate >184 h, infant >22 h) as outcome events. The quality evaluation utilizing the NOS scale revealed that 10 of the incorporated studies achieved scores ranging from 7 to 9 points, suggesting good quality and a low risk of bias. The characteristics and quality ratings of the eligible studies are presented in Table 1.

3.4 preliminary study synthesis

3.4.1 The pooled data for continuous variable showed

- 1.1 A summary analysis of the 95% CIs corresponding to the biomarkers and their outcomes extracted from the included studies showed that the serum lactate level was higher in the postoperative death group compared to the survival group in children with CHD (SMD: 1.18, 95% CI: 0.59–1.77), with significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 68\%$, P < 0.0001) and a random-effects model used (Figure 2A).
- 1.2 The BNP level was higher in children who died after CHD surgery compared to those who survived (SMD: 7.72, 95% CI: 0.55–14.89), with significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 97\%$, P = 0.03) and a random-effects model used (Figure 2B).
- 1.3 Preoperative VWF activity was higher in children with CHD who developed thrombosis after surgery compared to those without thrombosis (SMD: 0.58, 95% CI: 0.20–0.96), with a random-effects model used (Figure 2E).
- 1.4 Serum creatinine levels were not significantly associated with the occurrence of acute kidney injury (AKI) after surgery in children with CHD (SMD: 0.03, 95% CI: -1.02 to 1.08), with significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 95\%$, P = 0.95) (Figure 2C).
- Activation of the serum complement system was not significantly associated with the occurrence of capillary leak syndrome (CLS) after surgery in children with CHD (SMD: 0.20, 95% CI: -0.10 to 0.50) (Figure 2D).
- 1.6 No statistically significant difference was observed in the blood glucose levels of the two groups, whether they experienced complications after surgery or not (SMD: -0.13, 95% CI: -0.44 to 0.19) (Figure 2F).

3.4.2 The pooled data for categorical variables showed

- 2.1 Lower serum albumin levels were associated with an increased incidence of postoperative hypoalbuminemia in children with CHD (OR: 3.12, 95% CI: 1.66–5.84) (Figure 3C).
- 2.2 Lower serum albumin levels were associated with longer hospital stays in children with CHD after surgery (OR: 2.13, 95% CI: 1.14–3.97) (Figure 3D).
- 2.3 NT-pro BNP levels were not significantly associated with prolonged PICU stay in children after surgery (OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.23–3.29) (Figure 3A).
- 2.4 There was no significant difference in postoperative mortality between the high NLR and low NLR groups in children with CHD (OR: 1.09, 95% CI: 0.41–2.92) (Figure 3B).
- 2.5 There were no significant differences in postoperative mortality or infection rates between the high serum albumin and low serum albumin groups (OR: 1.45, 95% CI: 0.56–3.76) (Figure 3E) (OR: 1.30, 95% CI: 0.29–5.73) (Figure 3F).

We also statistically pooled studies that used mortality, AKI incidence, and thrombosis as outcome indicators, with details shown in Tables 2–4.

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

The sensitivity analysis aimed to assess the robustness of the findings by altering certain assumptions and provide an initial exploration into the potential sources contributing to the heterogeneity observed across the included studies. Our sensitivity analysis showed that when we excluded the data reported by Mariarosa et al. in 2011 (28), the new OR value changed from non-significant to significant (OR: 0.35, 95% CI: 0.23-0.53) (Figure 4C).

3.6 Publication bias assessment

Considering the limited number of included studies, Egger's test was used to assess publication bias for serum creatinine, glycemia, BNP, serum lactate, VWF, serum albumin, NLR, NT-ProBNP, and serum complement system activation. The results showed significant publication bias for glycemia (P = 0.02), VWF (P = 0.009), and NLR (P = 0.04), as well as publication bias for serum albumin in predicting postoperative mechanical ventilation time (P = 0.04) and mortality (P = 0.04); there was no significant publication bias for serum lactate (P = 0.21) and BNP (P = 0.10) in predicting postoperative mortality, serum creatinine (P = 0.18) in predicting postoperative AKI incidence, serum complement system activation (P = 0.82) in predicting postoperative CLS incidence, and serum albumin in predicting postoperative infection rate (P = 0.09), total hospital stay (P = 0.16), and prolonged PICU stay (P = 0.14).

TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics of include studies and methodological assessment.

	Study	Country	Study design		Gender		Age	Weight	Type of disease	Biomarker	Detection	Threshold	Quanlity	Mode of
	period				Male	Female					time		score	operation
Amirnovin et al. (<mark>10</mark>)	2005– 2009	USA	Prospective cohort	34	24	10	9 ± 8d	3.3 ± 0.4	UVH	Serum lactate	12 h Post-CPB	NA	5	Modified Norwood procedure, arterial switch procedure, biventricular repair
Molina Hazan et al. (18)	1999– 2001	Israel	Retrospective cohort	255	140	115	2.7 ± 4.3yr	NA	NA	Serum lactate	At the end of the surgical procedure	NA	6	NA
Hunt et al. (12)	2015- 2016	USA	Prospective cohort	133	79	54	NA	4.2 ± 1.4	SV, 2V	Serum lactate	Preoperative	NA	6	NA
Abella et al. (19)	2004- 2008	Italy	Case control study	48	24	24	4.6 ± 2mos	NA	TOF, TGA,AS, TA	PaO2	Pre-operative	NA	8	NA
Volovelsky et al. (22)	2016– 2017	USA	Prospective cohort	76	42	34	0.9 ± 0.9 years	NA	Cyanotic, non-cyanotic	Serum creatinine	Pre-operative	NA	7	NA
Stiller et al. (23)	NA	Germany	Prospective cohort	27	14	13	NA	NA	VSD, ASD, CAVSD, TAPVD, TOF, TGA, CoA, DOLV	C1-INH activity	Preoperative	NA	8	NA
Parker et al. (24)	2010- 2014	Lebanon	Prospective cohort	162	97	65	281 ± 1184.4days	12.1 ± 19.4	NA	ST2	Preoperative	NA	7	NA
Kimura et al. (25)	2013- 2017	Japan	Case control study	521	278	243	12.2 ± 4.4months	7.4 ± 4.8	NA	Serum chloride concentration	Preoperative	NA	7	NA
Leite et al. (26)	1994– 1996	Brazil	Prospective cohort	36	20	16	8.7 ± 6.5 months	NA	VSD, ASD, PDA, Cavsd, Tapvd, Dolv, Tof, Coa	GH	Fifth postoperative days	NA	6	NA
Lou et al. (20)	2009– 2009	China	Case control study	100	68	32	6.7 ± 0.3months	7.1 ± 0.2	SV, 2V	Glycaemia	Pre-operative	NA	7	NA
Aly et al. (27)	NA	USA	Prospective cohort	75	44	31	5.1 ± 0.8 days	3.4 ± 0.6	SV, 2V	сТОІ	Preoperative	58%	6	NA
Perez-Piaya et al. (28)	2007– 2008	Spain	Prospective cohort	68	21	47	29 ± 38.4months	6.8 ± 11.7	VSD, ASD, TAPVR, PR, AR, PS, CoA, PAIVS, TOF, SV, TGA	NT-ProBNP	Preoperative	3.4	5	NA
Gupta et al. (13)	2015– 2017	China	Retrospective cohort	873	304	569	NA	NA	VSD, ASD, TOF, TGA, PAVM, CoA, PAIVS, DOLV, PS	NT-ProBNP	Postoperative	NA	8	NA
Manuel et al. (29)	2011– 2017	Brazil	Retrospective cohort	61	24	37	NA	NA	NA	NLR	NA	NLR < 1	8	The bidirectional Glenn procedure
Henry et al. (30)	2007- 2013	USA	Case control study	200	120	80	NA	NA	NA	Serum albumin	Pre-operative	2.5	6	NA
Sznycer- Taub 2016	2015– 2017	USA	Case control study	93	54	39	7.6 ± 3 days	3.3 ± 0.2	NA	Pao2	The first 48 h	>193	8	NA

Zhou et al.

Authors	Study period	Country	Study design	Patients		ender Female	Age	Weight	Type of disease	Biomarker	Detection time	Threshold	Quanlity score	Mode of operation
Odek et al. (31)	2008-2013	Turkey	Retrospective cohort	126	62	64	17.2 ± 32.3mos	7.9 ± 5.4	VSD, TOF, CAVSD, ASD, ASD + VSD, PDA, PAIVS, VSD + PDA, CoA, TAPVR, VSD + PAPVR, ASD + PAPVR, AL	Glucose levels	Postoperative	NA	8	VSD closure Pulmonary banding TOF repair AVSD repair ASD closure ASD + VSD closure PDA ligation BT-shunt Glenn procedure Fontan procedure VSD closure + PDA ligation Coarctation of aorta repair Subaortic ridge resection TAPVR repair PAPVR repair + VSD closure PAPVR repair + ASD closure Coronary switch Double aortic arch repair, Homograph patch augmentation Extended aortoplasty

UVH, univentricular heart; SV, single ventricle; 2V, two-ventricle repairs; TOF, tetralogy of Fallot; TGA, transposition of the great arteries; AS, aortic stenosis; TA, tricuspid atresia; VSD, ventricular septal defect; ASD, atrial septal defect; CAVSD, complete atrioventricular septal defect; TAPVD, total anomalous pulmonary venous drainage; CoA, coarctation of the aorta; DOLV, double-outlet left ventricle; PDA, patent ductus arteriosus; TAPVR, total anomalous pulmonary venous return; PR, pulmonary regurgitation; AR, aortic regurgitation; PS, pulmonary stenosis; PAIVS, pulmonary arteria with VSDPAVM, pulmonary arterio venous malformation; PAPVR, partial anomalous pulmonary venous return; ALCAPA, anomalous left coronary artery from the pulmonary artery; ST2, suppression of tumorigenicity; GH, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio; cTOI, cerebral tissue oxygenation index; NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio.



FIGURE 2

Forest plot of preliminary studies synthesis, lactic acid levels were compared between the dead group and the surviving group (A), BNP levels were compared between the dead group and the surviving group (B), serum creatinine levels were compared between the two groups whether AKI occurred (C), comparison of activation of the serum complement system and the occurrence of CLS after surgery in children with CHD (D), comparison of preoperative VWF activity between the two groups for postoperative thrombosis (E), comparison of blood glucose levels between the two groups for postoperative complications (F).

						Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgrou	p log[(Odds Rat	iol	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% Cl
Gupta 2019a		-0.8	44 0.	2567	35.6%	0.43 [0.26, 0.71]		
Gupta 2019b			273 0.		35.7%	0.28 [0.17, 0.46]		
Mariarosa 2011a		2.11	02 0.	6195	28.7%	8.25 [2.45, 27.78]		
Total (95% CI)		01-17 - 04		.	100.0%	0.86 [0.23, 3.29]		
Heterogeneity: Ta Test for overall eff				I = 2 (P	< 0.0000	11), 1"= 92%	0.05	0.2 1 5 20 Favours (high) Favours (low)
5						Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgrou	p log[C	odds Rati	io]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 95% Cl
Manuel 2020a		0.55	96 0.	7659	42.7%	1.75 [0.39, 7.85]		
Manuel 2020b		-1.10	87 1.	0767	21.6%	0.33 [0.04, 2.72]	_	
Manuel 2020c		0.25	46 0.	8372	35.7%	1.29 [0.25, 6.66]		
Total (95% CI)					100.0%	1.09 [0.41, 2.92]		
Heterogeneity: Tau Test for overall effe				: 2 (P =	0.44); l² =	= 0%	0.02	0.1 1 10 50
restion overall elle	501. 2 - 0.1	0(1 - 0.	.00)					Favours [high] Favours [low]
	YES		NO			Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup			vents	Total		M-H, Random, 95% C	1	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Henry 2019a	5	12	9	50	21.5%	3.25 [0.84, 12.62]	-	
Henry 2019b	4	12	8	40	19.3%	2.00 [0.48, 8.35]		
Henry 2019c	7	15	23	109	31.8%	3.27 [1.07, 9.97]		
Henry 2019d	7	16	10	60	27.4%	3.89 [1.17, 12.89]	I	
'otal (95% CI) 'otal events	23	55	50	259	100.0%	3.12 [1.66, 5.84]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =		2-0.61		P - n a	2): 12 - 0%			
Test for overall effect				- 0.5	2),1 = 0 %		0.1	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 Favours [YES] Favours [NO]
)	Yes	;	no			Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total E	vents	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	1	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Henry 2019a	4	12	11	50	20.6%	1.77 [0.45, 7.01]	
Henry 2019b	5	12	11	40	21.6%	1.88 [0.49, 7.20		
Henry 2019c	6	15	24	109	30.5%	2.36 [0.76, 7.29		
Henry 2019d	6	16	12	60	27.3%	2.40 [0.73, 7.92		
Total (95% CI)				259	100.0%	2.13 [1.14, 3.97	1	
	24	55	60					
Total events	21 - 0.00: Chi		58 df - 27	P - 0 0	01.12 - 00			
	= 0.00; Chi	i² = 0.17,	df = 3 ((P = 0.9	18); I² = 0%	ò	 0.1	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 Favours [YES] Favours [NO]
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² :	= 0.00; Chi	i² = 0.17, (P = 0.02)	df = 3 ((P = 0.9	18); I² = 0%	odds Ratio	 0.1	
Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Fest for overall effect Study or Subgroup	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total E</u>	df=3() NO vents	Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	 0.1	Favours [YES] Favours [NO]
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES <u>Events</u> 3	i ^z = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total Ev</u> 12	df = 3 () <u>NO</u> <u>vents</u> 10	Total 50	Weight 41.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85)	 0.1	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Fest for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES <u>Events</u> 3 1	i ^z = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total Ev</u> 12 12	df = 3 () NO <u>vents</u> 10 1	<u>Total</u> 50 40	Weight 41.4% 11.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Fest for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES <u>Events</u> 3	i ^z = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total Ev</u> 12	df = 3 () <u>NO</u> <u>vents</u> 10	Total 50	Weight 41.4% 11.1%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2	i ^z = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total Ev</u> 12 12 15 16	df = 3 () NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3%	Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total (95% CI)	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total Ev</u> 12 12 15	df = 3 () <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² :	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (<u>YES</u> <u>Events</u> 3 1 2 1 7 = 0.00; Chi ²	P = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 2 = 1.23, 0	df = 3 () NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f	Total 50 40 109 60 259	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 2 1 5 5 5 5 6 7 5 5 7 5 7 7 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) <u>Total E</u> 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P = 0.44)	df = 3 (NO vents 10 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60 259 P = 0.75	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M.H. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76)		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO]
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 2 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P P = 0.44)	df = 3 () NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (F	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60 259 P = 0.75	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I² = 0%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76) Odds Ratio		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u>	df = 3 () NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (F NC Events	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60 259 P = 0.75 D	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I ² = 0% Weight	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 [0.30, 5.85] 3.55 [0.20, 61.38] 0.89 [0.18, 4.34] 3.93 [0.23, 66.60] 1.45 [0.56, 3.76] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u>	-+ 0.02 CI	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO]
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 7 = 0.00; Chi t: Z = 0.77 (I YES Events 1	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u> 12	df = 3 (NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f NC <u>Events</u> 5	<u>Total</u> 50 40 109 60 259 P = 0.75 D Total 50	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I² = 0% Weight 38.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76) Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 (0.09, 7.7)	-t 0.02 CI 3]	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019a	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 7 = 0.00; Chi t: Z = 0.77 (I YES Events 1 0	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u> 12 12	df = 3 (NO vents 10 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f NC Events 5 0	<u>Total</u> 50 109 60 259 259 259 259 50 <u>Total</u> 50 40	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I ² = 0% Weight 38.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 [0.30, 5.85] 3.55 [0.20, 61.38] 0.89 [0.18, 4.34] 3.93 [0.23, 66.60] 1.45 [0.56, 3.76] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 [0.09, 7.7 Not estimab		Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 7 = 0.00; Chi t: Z = 0.77 (I YES Events 1	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u> 12	df = 3 (NO <u>vents</u> 10 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f NC <u>Events</u> 5	Total 50 40 109 60 259 259 259 259 250 50 40 109	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I ² = 0% Weight 38.4% 42.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76) Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 (0.09, 7.7)	0.02 <u>CI</u> 3] Ie 5]	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 2 5 7 5 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 8	$i^{2} = 0.17$, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 $i^{2} = 1.23$, $(P = 0.44)$ 5 <u>Total E</u> 12 12 15 16 12 15 16 12 16 16 12 16 16 12 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	df = 3 () NO vents 10 1 16 1 16 1 28 df = 3 (f S 2 vents 5 0 10	Total 50 40 109 60 259 259 7 Total 50 40 109 60 40 109 60 40 109 60 40	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I² = 0% Weight 38.4% 42.0% 19.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76) Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 (0.09, 7.7 Not estimab 0.71 (0.08, 5.9 11.71 (0.45, 301.6)	CI 0.02 3] 1e 5] 6]	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019b Henry 2019d Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d Fotal (95% CI)	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 2 5 7 5 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 8	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u> 12 12 12	df = 3 () NO 10 1 16 1 1 28 3f = 3 (f 20 <u>Events</u> 5 0 10 0	Total 50 40 109 60 259 P = 0.75 50 40 50 50 50 40 50 40 50 40 50 40 109 60 259	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I ² = 0% Weight 38.4% 42.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 (0.30, 5.85) 3.55 (0.20, 61.38) 0.89 (0.18, 4.34) 3.93 (0.23, 66.60) 1.45 (0.56, 3.76) Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 (0.09, 7.7 Not estimab 0.71 (0.08, 5.9 11.71 (0.45, 301.6)	CI 0.02 3] 1e 5] 6]	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect Study or Subgroup Henry 2019a Henry 2019a Henry 2019b Henry 2019c Henry 2019d	= 0.00; Chi t: Z = 2.38 (YES Events 3 1 2 1 7 = 0.00; Chi t: Z = 0.77 (I YES Events 1 0 1 1 3	i ² = 0.17, (P = 0.02) 12 12 15 16 55 ² = 1.23, (P P = 0.44) 5 <u>Total E</u> 12 12 15 16 55	df = 3 () 10 1 16 1 16 1 1 28 3/f = 3 (f 3 (f S 0 10 0 0 10 0 0	$\frac{\text{Total}}{50} \\ 40 \\ 109 \\ 60 \\ 259 \\ 259 \\ 0 \\ 109 \\ 109 \\ 60 \\ 259 \\ 0 \\ 109 \\ 60 \\ 259 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	Weight 41.4% 11.1% 36.2% 11.3% 100.0% 5); I ² = 0% Weight 38.4% 42.0% 19.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.33 [0.30, 5.85] 3.55 [0.20, 61.38] 0.89 [0.18, 4.34] 3.93 [0.23, 66.60] 1.45 [0.56, 3.76] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95%</u> 0.82 [0.09, 7.7 Not estimab 0.71 [0.08, 5.9 11.71 [0.45, 301.6 1.30 [0.29, 5.7]	CI 0.02 3] 1e 5] 6]	Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.1 1 10 50 Favours [YES] Favours [NO] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI

FIGURE 3

Categorical variables combined data analysis.NT-proBNP levels were not significantly associated with prolonged PICU stay in children after surgery (A). There was no significant difference in postoperative mortality between the high NLR and low NLR groups in children with CHD (B) the pooled data for categorical variables showed that lower serum albumin levels were associated with an increased incidence of postoperative hypoalbuminemia in children with CHD (C) lower serum albumin levels were associated with longer hospital stays in children with CHD after surgery (D) there were no significant differences in postoperative mortality or infection rates between the high serum albumin and low serum albumin groups (E,F).

TABLE 2 Data pooled with mortality as an outcome indicator.

Biomarkers	Mortality								
	Study	Metrics	Estimate [95%CI]	P value	l ²				
Serum lactate (continuous)	5	SMD	1.18 [0.59, 1.77]	< 0.0001	68%				
BNP (continuous)	3	SMD	7.72 [0.55, 14.89]	0.03	97%				
cTOI (continuous)	2	SMD	-0.59 [-2.03, 0.85]	0.42	91%				
NT-ProBNP (classified)	2	OR	0.23 [0.08, 0.68]	0.008	0%				
NLR (classified)	3	OR	1.09 [0.41, 2.92]	0.86	0%				
Glucose levels (classified)	2	OR	0.33 [0.10, 1.70]	0.06	30%				
Serum albumin (classified)	4	OR	1.02 [0.18, 5.94]	0.98	36%				

BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; cTOI, cerebral tissue oxygenation index; NT-Pro BNP, N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; NLR, neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

TABLE 3 Data merging with AKI as an outcome indicator.

Biomarkers	AKI									
	Study	Metrics	Estimate [95%CI]	P value	l ²					
Serum creatinine (continuous)	4	SMD	0.03 [-1.02, 1.08]	0.95	95%					
Serum chloride concentration (continuous)	2	SMD	0.21 [-0.04, 0.46]	0.1	75%					
Serum sodium concentration	2	SMD	0.05 [-0.31, 0.42]	0.78	88%					

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

TABLE 4 Data merging with thrombosis as an outcome indicator.

Biomarkers	Thrombosis								
	Study	Metrics	Estimate [95%CI]	P value	l ²				
Serum lactate (continuous)	2	SMD	0.70 [-0.68, 2.08]	0.32	90%				
VWF (continuous)	4	SMD	0.58 [0.20, 0.96]	0.003	31%				
ADAMTS-13 (continuous)	2	SMD	-0.46 [-1.04, 0.11]	0.12	41%				

VWF, von Willebrand factor; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval

4 Discussion

Congenital heart disease occur during cardiac development and are present at birth (32)and is a major global health problem (33). Although great progress has been made in the treatment of CHD in recent years, it remains a significant cause of childhood mortality (34). Among children undergoing surgery for CHD, 10% to 20% are unexpectedly readmitted within 30 days, and 4% of surgeries result in death (35-38). Repeated hospitalizations of children place an emotional and economic burden on patients' families and strain the healthcare system (39). There is strong interest in identifying early markers to predict impending major adverse events following surgical repair of CHD defects, driven by the significant mortality risk associated with most such surgeries (19, 40, 41). Currently, little attention is paid to the prediction of readmission, mortality, or postoperative complications in children after congenital heart surgery, especially the evaluation of biomarkers compared to standalone clinical models (13).

Our study found that the serum lactate level was higher in the postoperative death group compared to the survival group in children with CHD after surgery (SMD: 1.18, 95% CI: 0.59– 1.77). The end-product of glycolysis, pyruvate, is converted into serum lactate. In the presence of oxygen, lactate is converted back to pyruvate through mitochondrial processes. However, under anaerobic conditions, cellular lactate concentrations increase, resulting in elevated serum lactate levels. Therefore, hyperlactatemia may reflect tissue oxygen debt, and serum lactate levels can also serve as a clinical indicator of tissue perfusion and systemic oxygen delivery after CHD surgery (42). In response to increased pressure overload, volume expansion, and myocardial wall stress, ventricular myocytes synthesize and secrete NT-proBNP into the bloodstream (43). NT-proBNP has recently emerged as a potential prognostic marker for early postoperative outcomes in pediatric and congenital cardiac surgery (44-46). Nevertheless, inconsistencies exist regarding the findings. For instance, Qu et al. demonstrated NT-proBNP levels 1 h postoperatively strongly predicted prolonged mechanical ventilation, intensive care unit (ICU) stay, and inotropic therapy requirement (13). Our study found that lower postoperative NT-proBNP levels were associated with lower mortality (OR: 0.23, 95% CI: 0.08-0.68) and shorter mechanical ventilation times (OR: 0.40, 95% CI: 0.18-0.90) in children with CHD after surgery. Hypoalbuminemia caused by decreased serum albumin levels can develop through a combination of decreased synthesis, increased degradation, and the dilutional effect of resuscitation (30); our study found that children with higher serum albumin levels had longer hospital stays (random-



effects model, OR: 3.12, 95% CI: 1.66–5.84). For infants with preoperative hypoalbuminemia, treating and/or preventing potential protein malnutrition or heart failure, rather than supplementing albumin, may have a greater impact on improving postoperative outcomes.

In addition, our study found that the BNP level was higher in the postoperative death group compared to the survival group in children with CHD (SMD: 7.72, 95% CI: 0.55–14.89). BNP, a cardiac hormone with diuretic, natriuretic, and vasodilatory properties, is primarily secreted by the ventricles in response to volume expansion and pressure overload. BNP levels are elevated in various cardiovascular diseases, such as heart failure and myocardial infarction (47). Although BNP serves as a biomarker for diagnosing, risk stratifying, and managing heart failure in adults, its applications in neonates and infants undergoing surgical repair or palliation of congenital heart defects remain unestablished (10). VWF, a large multimeric glycoprotein, mediates platelet-platelet and platelet-subendothelial adhesion. After release from activated platelets and endothelial cells, VWF exists primarily as large, highly reactive multimers (12). Our analysis found that preoperative VWF activity was higher in children who developed thrombosis after surgery compared to those without thrombosis (SMD: 0.58, 95% CI: 0.20-0.96).

However, our meta-analysis also has certain limitations, we focused on the short-term predictive value of biomarkers after CHD surgery, and the data we could collect were too small to conduct a meta-analysis on the long-term prognosis (cardiac output, neurodevelopment eta.), which also suggests that a larger number of studies are needed to provide original data. The type of surgery received by patients and albumin was used preoperatively as resuscitation fluid may affect the predictive value of biomarkers. However, the data provided by the included literature were limited, and there was no way to conduct subgroup analysis, which led to a certain risk of bias in the study results, which needs to be solved by further research. Despite removing a highly sensitive study and resynthesizing the data, moderate heterogeneity persisted even with a random-effects model, potentially compromising the robustness of our conclusions. Secondly, some of the included studies were retrospective, with poor control of confounding factors, resulting in lower quality of some studies. Although this analysis included a wide range of biomarkers, the detailed data for each indicator were not sufficient, and some studies had high heterogeneity and publication bias. However, our study is the first and largest to explore the value of biomarkers in predicting adverse outcomes in children with CHD after surgery from an evidence-based medicine perspective. The analysis was relatively comprehensive and can provide guidance for future clinical treatment and a theoretical basis for constructing clinical risk prediction models.

5 Conclusion

Serum lactate, NT-proBNP, and serum albumin are valuable biomarkers for predicting adverse outcomes in children with CHD, as higher serum lactate and NT-proBNP levels and lower serum albumin levels indicate poorer postoperative prognosis in children with CHD. Nonetheless, further investigation is warranted to elucidate the relationship between these biomarkers and CHD prognosis.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

SZ: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. LL: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Validation, Writing – review & editing. XJ: Conceptualization, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – review & editing. DD: Supervision, Writing – review & editing. SM: Conceptualization, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

1. Liu Y, Chen S, Zühlke L, et al. Global birth prevalence of congenital heart defects 1970–2017: updated systematic review and meta-analysis of 260 studies. *Int J Epidemiol.* (2019) 48(2):455–63. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyz009

2. Bouma BJ, Mulder BJ. Changing landscape of congenital heart disease. *Circ Res.* (2017) 120(6):908–22. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.116.309302

3. van der Linde D, Konings EE, Slager MA, et al. Birth prevalence of congenital heart disease worldwide: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* (2011) 58(21):2241–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2011.08.025

4. Maddhesiya J, Mohapatra B. Understanding the genetic and non-genetic interconnections in the aetiology of isolated congenital heart disease: an updated review: part 1. *Curr Cardiol Rep.* (2024) 26(3):147–65. doi: 10.1007/s11886-024-02022-9

5. Cao M, Liu Y, Sun Y, Han R, Jiang H. Current advances in human-induced pluripotent stem cell-based models and therapeutic approaches for congenital heart disease. *Mol Cell Biochem.* (2025) 480(1):159–72. doi: 10.1007/s11010-024-04997-z

6. Baumgartner H, De Backer J, Babu-Narayan SV, et al. 2020 ESC guidelines for the management of adult congenital heart disease. *Eur Heart J.* (2021) 42(6):563–645. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa554

7. Wu W, He J, Shao X. Incidence and mortality trend of congenital heart disease at the global, regional, and national level, 1990–2017. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. (2020) 99(23):e20593. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000020593

8. GBD 2017 Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sexspecific mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories, 1980–2017: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2017. *Lancet.* (2018) 392(10159):1736–88. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32203-7

9. Hu Z, Yuan X, Rao K, Zheng Z, Hu S. National trend in congenital heart disease mortality in China during 2003 to 2010: a population-based study. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. (2014) 148(2):596–602.e591. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2013.08.067

10. Amirnovin R, Keller RL, Herrera C, et al. B-type natriuretic peptide levels predict outcomes in infants undergoing cardiac surgery in a lesion-dependent fashion. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* (2013) 145(5):1279–87. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012. 07.067

11. Diller GP, Kempny A, Liodakis E, et al. Left ventricular longitudinal function predicts life-threatening ventricular arrhythmia and death in adults with repaired tetralogy of fallot. *Circulation*. (2012) 125(20):2440–46. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.111.086983

12. Hunt R, Hoffman CM, Emani S, et al. Elevated preoperative von willebrand factor is associated with perioperative thrombosis in infants and neonates with

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

congenital heart disease. J Thromb Haemostasis. (2017) 15(12):2306-16. doi: 10. 1111/jth.13860

13. Gupta RK, Zheng H, Cui Y, et al. Change in N-terminal pro B-type natriuretic peptide levels and clinical outcomes in children undergoing congenital heart surgery. *Int J Cardiol.* (2019) 283:96–100. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.02.025

14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

15. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* (2014) 14:135. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-14-135

16. Luo D, Wan X, Liu J, Tong T. Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size, median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. *Stat Methods Med Res.* (2018) 27(6):1785–805. doi: 10.1177/0962280216669183

17. Kim SR, Kim K, Lee SA, et al. Effect of red, processed, and white meat consumption on the risk of gastric cancer: an overall and dose-response meta-analysis. *Nutrients*. (2019) 11(4):826. doi: 10.3390/nu11040826

 Molina Hazan V, Gonen Y, Vardi A, et al. Blood lactate levels differ significantly between surviving and nonsurviving patients within the same risk-adjusted classification for congenital heart surgery (RACHS-1) group after pediatric cardiac surgery. *Pediatr Cardiol.* (2010) 31(7):952–60. doi: 10.1007/s00246-010-9724-7

19. Abella R, Satriano A, Frigiola A, et al. Adrenomedullin alterations related to cardiopulmonary bypass in infants with low cardiac output syndrome. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* (2012) 25(12):2756–61. doi: 10.3109/14767058.2012.718393

20. Lou S, Ding F, Long C, Liu J, Zhao J, Feng Z. Effects of peri-operative glucose levels on adverse outcomes in infants receiving open-heart surgery for congenital heart disease with cardiopulmonary bypass. *Perfusion*. (2011) 26(2):133–9. doi: 10. 1177/0267659110389843

21. Manuel V, Miana LA, Turquetto A, Guerreiro GP, Fernandes N, Jatene MB. The role of the neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio for pre-operative risk stratification of acute kidney injury after tetralogy of fallot repair. *Cardiol Young.* (2021) 31(6):1009–14. doi: 10.1017/S1047951121001943

22. Volovelsky O, Terrell TC, Swain H, Bennett MR, Cooper DS, Goldstein SL. Preoperative level of FGF23 predicts severe acute kidney injury after heart surgery in children. *Pediatr Nephrol.* (2018) 33(12):2363–70. doi: 10.1007/s00467-018-4024-1

23. Stiller B, Sonntag J, Dähnert I, et al. Capillary leak syndrome in children who undergo cardiopulmonary bypass: clinical outcome in comparison with complement activation and C1 inhibitor. *Intensive Care Med.* (2001) 27(1):193–200. doi: 10. 1007/s001340000704

24. Parker DM, Everett AD, Stabler ME, et al. Biomarkers associated with 30-day readmission and mortality after pediatric congenital heart surgery. *J Card Surg.* (2019) 34(5):329–36. doi: 10.1111/jocs.14038

25. Kimura S, Iwasaki T, Shimizu K, et al. Hyperchloremia is not an independent risk factor for postoperative acute kidney injury in pediatric cardiac patients. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* (2019) 33(7):1939–45. doi: 10.1053/j.jvca.2018.12.009

26. Leite HP, Fisberg M, Vieira JGH, De Carvalho WB, Chwals WJ. The role of insulin-like growth factor I, growth hormone, and plasma proteins in surgical outcome of children with congenital heart disease. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* (2001) 2(1):29–35. doi: 10.1097/00130478-200101000-00007

27. Aly SA, Zurakowski D, Glass P, Skurow-Todd K, Jonas RA, Donofrio MT. Cerebral tissue oxygenation index and lactate at 24hours postoperative predict survival and neurodevelopmental outcome after neonatal cardiac surgery. *Congenit Heart Dis.* (2017) 12(2):188–95. doi: 10.1111/chd.12426

28. Perez-Piaya M, Abarca E, Soler V, et al. Levels of N-terminal-pro-brain natriuretic peptide in congenital heart disease surgery and its value as a predictive biomarker. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* (2011) 12(3):461-6. doi: 10.1510/icvts. 2010.245803

29. Manuel V, Miana LA, Guerreiro GP, et al. Prognostic value of the preoperative neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio in patients undergoing the bidirectional glenn procedure. *J Card Surg.* (2020) 35(2):328–34. doi: 10.1111/jocs.14381

30. Henry BM, Borasino S, Ortmann L, et al. Perioperative serum albumin and its influence on clinical outcomes in neonates and infants undergoing cardiac surgery with cardiopulmonary bypass: a multi-centre retrospective study. *Cardiol Young.* (2019) 29(6):761–7. doi: 10.1017/S1047951119000738

31. Odek C, Kendirli T, Yildirim-Yildiz N, et al. Perioperative factors associated with hyperglycemia after pediatric cardiac surgery and impact of hyperglycemia on morbidity and mortality. *Turk J Pediatr.* (2018) 60(5):497–505. doi: 10.24953/turkjped.2018.05.005

32. Thomford NE, Dzobo K, Yao NA, et al. Genomics and epigenomics of congenital heart defects: expert review and lessons learned in Africa. OMICS. (2018) 22(5):301-21. doi: 10.1089/omi.2018.0033

33. Kwiatkowski DM, Ball MK, Savorgnan FJ, et al. Neonatal congenital heart disease surgical readiness and timing. *Pediatrics.* (2022) 150(Suppl 2): e2022056415D. doi: 10.1542/peds.2022-056415D

34. Tennant PW, Pearce MS, Bythell M, Rankin J. 20-year survival of children born with congenital anomalies: a population-based study. *Lancet.* (2010) 375(9715):649–56. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61922-X

35. Yang Q, Chen H, Correa A, Devine O, Mathews TJ, Honein MA. Racial differences in infant mortality attributable to birth defects in the United States, 1989–2002. *Birth Defects Res A Clin Mol Teratol.* (2006) 76(10):706–13. doi: 10.1002/bdra.20308

36. Kogon B, Jain A, Oster M, Woodall K, Kanter K, Kirshbom P. Risk factors associated with readmission after pediatric cardiothoracic surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg.* (2012) 94(3):865–73. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2012.04.025

37. Dabal RJ, Kirklin JK, Kukreja M, et al. The modern fontan operation shows no increase in mortality out to 20 years: a new paradigm. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* (2014) 148(6):2517–23.e2511. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2014.07.075

38. Knowles RL, Bull C, Wren C, Dezateux C. Mortality with congenital heart defects in England and Wales, 1959–2009: exploring technological change through period and birth cohort analysis. *Arch Dis Child.* (2012) 97(10):861–5. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2012-301662

39. Brown JR, Stabler ME, Parker DM, et al. Biomarkers improve prediction of 30-day unplanned readmission or mortality after paediatric congenital heart surgery. *Cardiol Young.* (2019) 29(8):1051–6. doi: 10.1017/S1047951119001471

40. Benavidez OJ, Gauvreau K, Del Nido P, Bacha E, Jenkins KJ. Complications and risk factors for mortality during congenital heart surgery admissions. *Ann Thorac Surg.* (2007) 84(1):147–55. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2007.02.048

41. Lacour-Gayet F, Jacobs ML, Jacobs JP, Mavroudis C. The need for an objective evaluation of morbidity in congenital heart surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg.* (2007) 84(1):1–2. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2007.04.065

42. Schumacher KR, Reichel RA, Vlasic JR, et al. Rate of increase in serum lactate level risk-stratifies infants after surgery for congenital heart disease. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. (2014) 148(2):589–95. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2013.09.002

43. Eindhoven JA, van den Bosch AE, Jansen PR, Boersma E, Roos-Hesselink JW. The usefulness of brain natriuretic peptide in complex congenital heart disease: a systematic review. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* (2012) 60(21):2140–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012. 02.092

44. Qu J, Liang H, Zhou N, et al. Perioperative NT-proBNP level: potential prognostic markers in children undergoing congenital heart disease surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* (2017) 154(2):631–40. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2016. 12.056

45. Eindhoven JA, van den Bosch AE, Ruys TP, et al. N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide and its relationship with cardiac function in adults with congenital heart disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* (2013) 62(13):1203–12. doi: 10.1016/j. jacc.2013.07.019

46. Cantinotti M, Giordano R, Scalese M, et al. Prognostic role of BNP in children undergoing surgery for congenital heart disease: analysis of prediction models incorporating standard risk factors. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* (2015) 53(11):1839–46. doi: 10.1515/cclm-2014-1084

47. Kapoor PM, Subramanian A, Malik V, Kiran U, Velayoudham D. B-type natriuretic peptide as prognostic marker in tetralogy of fallot surgery. *Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann.* (2015) 23(2):146–52. doi: 10.1177/0218492314534247