

Anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation: a changing concept

BLANCA COLL-VINENT

Àrea de Urgències. Hospital Clínic. Barcelona, Spain.

Prevention of thromboembolism is one of the main challenges of atrial fibrillation (AF) treatment. Oral anticoagulants significantly reduce this risk¹, but the threshold above which treatment is required remains unclear. Anticoagulant treatment available to date, dicoumarinic drugs, represent a major burden for patients since they interfere with many other drugs and food, require periodic monitoring with laboratory tests, and increase the risk of haemorrhage, a major complication which can be severe or disabling, especially cerebral haemorrhage. This is now a matter of considerable research to find a drug with the same anticoagulant action but without the drawbacks of dicoumarinic agents, and in this respect dabigatran seems to have a promising future².

Not all patients with AF have the same risk for developing arterial embolism. Different scales have been published to evaluate the risk of an embolic event in high-risk patients who would benefit from anticoagulation treatment, and to identify low-risk patients who could be spared the complications of such treatment. The most widely used scales differ little between them³⁻⁵ and clearly identify high-risk patients, namely those with a history of stroke or transient vascular accident, or two moderate risk factors (aged over 75 years, congestive heart failure, moderate-severe left ventricular dysfunction, hypertension or diabetes). It is also clear that patients without any of these factors have a low probability of developing embolic complications and should not receive anticoagulation treatment. But there is a clear gap in the recommendations for patients at intermediate risk (with one moderate risk factor).

The lack of consensus on the treatment of these patients is reflected in clinical practice guidelines. In recent publications on the treatment of AF

by the American College of Cardiology, the American Heart Association and the European Society of Cardiology (August 2006)³, the indication for dicoumarinic treatment shows changes from the previous edition (October 2001)⁶, since the risk factors previously considered as moderate are currently considered high-risk. However, this change in the guidelines, which substantially increases the group of patients with intermediate risk, is based more on concern about the complications of anticoagulant therapy than on evidence from new studies. This lack of consistency is reflected in the study of Azua Jimenez et al presented in this issue of *Emergencias*⁷. In a population of 789 patients treated in an observation area of the emergency department, the authors analyzed antithrombotic prophylaxis and found that the need for anticoagulation changed for almost 30% of patients depending on whether they were classified using the 2001 or 2006 guidelines. The authors are right when they complain that the new guidelines, which theoretically combine theoretical knowledge acquired in the various studies and the experience of the experts, only succeed in placing the ball in another court, requiring greater responsibility on the part of physicians in their daily practice, who must choose either option at their discretion, according to the possibilities of compliance, the patient's wishes, the risk of bleeding or the potential and unconfirmed utility of antithrombotic treatment. Furthermore, new guidelines do not answer the questions logically arising from the change: What should we do with patients previously indicated for and receiving anticoagulation who now may only be indicated for antiaggregation? Can we withdraw the treatment and the burden it implies without subjecting them to the risk of serious complications of their disease?

CORRESPONDENCE: Dra. Blanca Coll-Vinent. Àrea de Urgències. Hospital Clínic. Villarroel, 170. 08036 Barcelona, Spain.
E-mail: bcvinent@clinic.ub.es

RECEIVED: 10-11-2009. **ACCEPTED:** 11-11-2009.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: None

Two important studies published recently are contradictory in their attempt to clarify this aspect. Singer et al.⁸ postulate no benefit for anticoagulation therapy in patients at intermediate risk in a population of 13,559 patients followed for an average of 6 years, comparing a dicoumarinic treatment group with a heterogeneous group consisting of untreated patients and others treated with different antiaggregants. In contrast, Healey et al. in a study involving over 6,706 patients followed for an average of 1.28 years showed significant though small benefit for intermediate-risk patients receiving anticoagulation compared to those receiving double antiaggregation⁹. This was especially evident in patients who had already received dicoumarinics, with fewer hemorrhagic complications, compared to those initiating this treatment, probably because the former handled the drug better. An important limitation should be mentioned: the two reports are posterior analyses of previous studies not designed for this purpose.

Clearly, prospective randomized studies with long-term follow up are required, with subgroups for each of the moderate risk factors, but for the moment it seems prudent not to withdraw anticoagulants from patients already receiving them. The issue is open to debate.

References

- 1 Atrial Fibrillation Investigators: Atrial Fibrillation, Aspirin, Anticoagulation Study; Boston Area Anticoagulation Trial for Atrial Fibrillation Study; Canadian Atrial Fibrillation Anticoagulation Study; Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation Study; Veterans Affairs Stroke Prevention in Nonrheumatic Atrial Fibrillation Study. Risk Factors for Stroke and Efficacy of Antithrombotic Therapy in Atrial Fibrillation. Analysis of Pooled Data From Five Randomized Controlled Trials. *Arch Intern Med.* 1994;154:1449-57.
- 2 Connolly SJ, Ezekowitz MD, Yusuf S, Eikelboom J, Oldgren J, Parekh A, et al. RE-LY Steering Committee and Investigators. Dabigatran versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;361:1139-51.
- 3 European Heart Rhythm Association; Heart Rhythm Society, Fuster V, Rydén LE, Cannom DS, Crijns HJ, Curtis AB, Ellenbogen KA, et al. American College of Cardiology; American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines; Writing Committee to Revise the 2001 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation. ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation—executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2001 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation). *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2006;48:854-906.
- 4 Singer DE, Albers GW, Dalen JE, Fang MC, Go AS, Halperin JL, et al. Antithrombotic Therapy in Atrial Fibrillation* American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines (8th Edition). *Chest.* 2008;133(6 suppl):S465-S9265.
- 5 Gage BF, Waterman AD, Shannon W, Boechler M, Rich MW, Radford MJ. Validation of clinical classification schemes for predicting stroke: results from the National Registry of Atrial Fibrillation. *JAMA.* 2001;285:2864-70.
- 6 Fuster V, Rydén LE, Asinger RW, Cannom DS, Crijns HJ, Frye RL, et al. American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines and Policy Conferences (Committee to Develop Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation); North American Society of Pacing and Electrophysiology. ACC/AHA/ESC Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: Executive Summary A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines and Policy Conferences (Committee to Develop Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation) Developed in Collaboration With the North American Society of Pacing and Electrophysiology. *Circulation.* 2001;104:2118-50.
- 7 Azúa Jiménez M, Gómez Bitrián J, Royo Hernández R, Aldea Molina E, Llera Guerra R, Miranda Harto P. Impacto clínico de las nuevas estrategias en anticoagulación oral para la fibrilación auricular. *Emergencias.* 2009;21:405-9.
- 8 Healey JS, Hart RG, Pogue J, Pfeffer MA, Hohnloser SH, De Caterina R, et al. Risks and Benefits of Oral Anticoagulation Compared With Clopidogrel Plus Aspirin in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation According to Stroke Risk. The Atrial Fibrillation Clopidogrel Trial With Irbesartan for Prevention of Vascular Events (ACTIVE-W). *Stroke.* 2008;39:1482-148.
- 9 Singer DE, Chang Y, Fang MC, Borowsky LH, Pomernacki NK, Udaltsova N, et al. The net clinical benefit of warfarine anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:297-305.