Letters to the Editor

Anticoagulation and atrial fibrillation

EDITOR.—We would like to congratulate McNulty and colleagues on their excellent clinical audit of antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation.1 Their approach to the methods of audit has been impeccable, comparable in audit cycles by instigating a process of readout after the results from the original data set had been intensively presented to hospital colleagues, itself leading to a highly effective intervention.

We would, however, appreciate this opportunity to provide a brief update in a few aspects of the current knowledge of stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. The Lip and Lowe algorithm used for risk stratification was first published in 19962 and a refinement has since been proposed (box 1),3 which has been adapted for use in local and national guidelines.

The essential changes relate to the contribution of echocardiography and paroxysmal atrial fibrillation. In the Atrial Fibrillation Investigators overview on echocardiographic risk factors for thromboembolism, left atrial size per se does not appear to be an independent risk factor on multivariate analysis and is no longer used in the risk stratification schema;4 indeed, left atrial dilatation rarely occurs independent of "other" pathology, such as hypertension or heart failure which themselves constitute high risk features.5 In this analysis, moderate or severe left ventricular dysfunction on two dimensional echocardiography was the significant abnormality which appeared to be an independent risk factor for thromboembolic stroke in non-valvular atrial fibrillation.6 Other studies using echocardiography for risk stratification have rarely found that the investigation significantly contributed to antithrombotic therapy management decisions, as many patients already had clinical risk factors allowing effective risk stratification.7

According to the risk factors, hormonereplacement therapy use may also increase risk while alcohol consumption may be protective.8 McNulty and colleagues do not specifically address the problem of paroxysmal atrial fibrillation, which should be emphasised that such patients carry the same stroke and thromboembolic risk as sustained atrial fibrillation, especially in the presence of clinical risk factors.9 In general, our recommendation is to use warfarin in patients with paroxysmal atrial fibrillation unless they can be classified as having “lone” atrial fibrillation or there are contraindications to the use of anticoagulation, where aspirin should be used instead.

The safety and tolerability of long term anticoagulation titrated to conventional levels (international normalised ratio (INR) 2–3) is less clear in the very elderly (age older than 75 years), which is the age group encompassing perhaps half of the atrial fibrillation associated stroke patients. The elderly are also prone to more co-morbidity, polypharmacy, cognitive problems and frailty; indeed, biological age in some ways is more important than chronological age, and the decision must be based on the risk-benefit ratio, as with many things in clinical medicine. There have also been suggestions that an INR range of 1.6–2.5 can provide substantial, if partial benefits and risks of anticoagulation seen in the clinical trials can realistically be translated into everyday clinical practice.10


Box 1: Risk stratification and anticoagulation in non-valvular atrial fibrillation

ASSSESS RISK AND REASSESS REGULARLY:

(1) High risk (annual risk of CVA = 8%–12%)
- All patients with previous transient ischaemic attack or CVA.
- All patients aged 75 or over with diabetes and/or hypertension.
- All patients with clinical evidence of valve disease, heart failure, thyroid disease, and/or impaired left ventricular function on echocardiography.
(2) Moderate risk (annual risk of CVA = 4%)
- All patients aged under 65 with clinical risk factors: diabetes, hypertension, peripheral arterial disease, ischaemic heart disease.
- All patients aged over 65 who are not in high risk group.
(3) Low risk (annual risk of CVA = 1%)
- All patients under 65 with no history of embolism, hypertension, diabetes, or other clinical risk factors.

TREATMENT

High risk: give warfarin (target INR 2.0–3.0) if no contraindications and shareable in practice.
Moderate risk: either warfarin or aspirin 75–300 mg. In view of insufficient clear evidence, treatment may be decided on individual cases. Referral and echocardiography may help.
Low risk: give aspirin 75–300 mg daily.

Echocardiography: not needed for routine risk assessment but refines clinical risk stratification in case of impaired left ventricular function and valve disease. A large size per se is not an independent risk factor on multivariate analysis.

CVA = cerebrovascular accident.
time orally anticoagulated patients in their audit were in therapeutic INR range or on the incidence of thrombotic stroke and major haemorrhage in this patient group. As implementation of antithrombotic management in atrial fibrillation patients in their hospital remains suboptimal, even on follow up audit, INR control in the orally anticoagulated patient group could also be inadequate, thus jeopardising the hoped for reduction in strokes in this high risk atrial fibrillation group. In addition, the increase in patients on oral anticoagulation in the period between the two audits may have adversely affected the delivery of acceptable INR control by increasing demands on time and resources in a presumably already overstretched district general hospital haematology laboratory.

We suggest that, in future, similar audits of management of atrial fibrillation should include information on the quality of INR control in orally anticoagulated patients. If such patients are found to be inadequately maintained in therapeutic INR range, increased resources should be allocated to improve the efficacy of INR control. Possible areas of improvement in anticoagulant control might include the upgrading of laboratory coagulation equipment, better communication between clinicians and the anticoagulation clinic, adequate laboratory, clerical, nursing and medical staffing, ongoing and more effective patient and hospital staff education, computerised dosage systems assessing coagulated cases, patient self monitoring and self management.

P T MURPHY
Department of Haematology,
Royal Shrewsbury Hospital,
Shrewsbury SY3 8XQ, UK

M C CASEY
Department of Geriatric Medicine,
Keele University

Implementation of antithrombotic management in atrial fibrillation

EDITOR—We read the above original article of McNulty et al with interest particularly the antithrombotic management algorithm in fig 1.1 There is no mention of the time when the retrospective study was conducted. As was submitted in January 2000 we assume that the study was conducted sometime in 1999. The algorithm originally published in 1999 should be considered outdated in 1999/2000 because: first, in atrial fibrillation an age of 75 years or older is a high risk factor for thromboembolism to qualify for long term anticoagulation.2 Secondly, a large left atrium in patients with atrial fibrillation but without mitral valve disease is not an independent risk factor for thromboembolism.3 Therefore left atrium size of more than 4.5 cm per se should not be used to decide for long term anticoagulation in these patients. Thirdly, patients with atrial fibrillation who are below 65 years of age but with hypertension/ischecmic heart disease/diabetes mellitus are at high risk and should be given warfarin, not aspirin.4 Fourthly, patients with atrial fibrillation at high risk of thromboembolism in whom warfarin and aspirin are contraindicated should be considered for clopidogrel or at least dipyridamole.5 In patients with atherosclerotic vascular disease, clopidogrel has been shown to be more active than aspirin in reducing risk of ischaemic stroke, myocardial infarction or vascular death without increasing adverse effect.6 Patients intolerant of aspirin should be given modified release dipyridamole or clopidogrel.7 We believe that using such improved management protocol for atrial fibrillation either for audit purpose or clinical practice, is likely to further reduce the risk of ischaemic stroke.
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Techniques and Applications of Molecular Biology: A Course for Medical Practitioners
9–12 July 2001, University of Warwick, Coventry

This is a four day residential course for those in the medical profession wishing to improve their understanding of the principles and applications of genetic engineering techniques. Further information: Dr Charlotte West, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL (tel 029 7652 3540, fax 029 7652 3701, email charlotte.west@warwick.ac.uk).

Ninth Annual Pediatric Update
20–21 July 2001, Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital, Palo Alto, California

This conference is presented by the Department of Pediatrics at Stanford University School of Medicine and Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital. It is designed for paediatricians, family physicians, nurse practitioners, and health professionals and will highlight the most recent advances and issues in paediatrics. Further information: Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital CME Office at 1 408 497 8554 or email lpchcme@medcenter.stanford.edu.