

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031180
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Mai, Linlin Luo, Jianjing Wu, Yu Liu, Xinyue Zhu, Hailan Zheng, Haoxiao Liang, Guoquan Zhang, Yan Huang, YULi; Shunde Hospital of Southern Medical University, Cardiology
Keywords:	atrial fibrillation, acute coronary syndrome, oral anticoagulants

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Brief title: OAC Treatment in ACS patients with AF

Linlin Mai, MD,^{a*} Jianjing Luo, MD,^{a,b*} Yu Wu, MD,^{a*} Xinyue Liu, MD,^a Hailan Zhu, MD,^a Haoxiao Zheng, MD,^a Guoquan Liang, MD,^b Yan Zhang, BS,^a Yuli Huang, MD, PhD,^{a#}

^a Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Foshan, PR China.

^b Department of Cardiology, the Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, China.

* These authors contribute equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Professor. Yuli Huang. Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University, Jiazhi Road, Lunjiao Town, Shunde District, Foshan, 528300, PR China. Tel.: +86 757 22318610; Fax: +86 757 22223899; E-mail:

hyuli821@smu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVE: Oral anticoagulant (OAC) treatment is globally underused in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF), especially in combination with antiplatelet therapy. This study aimed to examine the patterns of OAC therapy in managing acute coronary syndrome (ACS) patients with AF in South China undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).

DESIGN: A retrospective cohort study.

SETTING: The study was conducted in the Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from January 2013 to 31 December 2018.

PARTICIPANTS: Patients were aged ≥ 18 years, hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment.

OUTCOME MEASURES: AF was diagnosed based on an electrocardiogram recording or a Holter monitor. Prescription of OACs and antiplatelets were determined from the discharge medication list.

RESULTS: A total of 3612 ACS patients were included; 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF, including 45 (1.2%) with paroxysmal AF and 241 (6.7%) with persistent/permanent AF. Although 95.5% of patients with AF were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2) for stroke, only 21.7% were discharged on OACs; 10.5% received warfarin and 11.2% received non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants. Patients with a HAS-BLED score < 3 , with persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OAC treatment at discharge.

1
2
3
4 **CONCLUSION:** We found that approximately 8% of patients who underwent PCI
5
6 during ACS hospitalization also demonstrated AF. Anticoagulant therapy was greatly
7
8 underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and an increased risk of bleeding were more
9
10 unlikely to receive anticoagulant treatment. Further efforts should be made to increase
11
12 the adherence to guideline recommendations for OACs.
13
14
15

16
17 **Keywords:** atrial fibrillation; acute coronary syndrome; oral anticoagulants
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study first documented the current real-world patterns of anticoagulation therapy in managing ACS patients with AF in Southern China.
- All the patients were with documented AF and received drug eluting stent implantation.
- The present study highlight further efforts should be made to increase adherence to guideline recommendations for OAC treatment among ACS patients with AF.
- Data were obtained from two large hospitals in Southern China, and do not represent the current treatment status in other regions.

Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common arrhythmia worldwide.¹ It is associated with a four to five-fold increased risk of ischemic stroke.^{2 3} Known or new-onset AF is a common comorbidity in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS). It has been reported that 2–21% of ACS patients have a history of AF.⁴ Patients with ACS and AF have a poor prognostic outcome, including a higher risk of stroke.⁵⁻⁷ Antithrombotic treatment with oral anticoagulants (OACs), such as warfarin or non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants (NOACs), is a cornerstone in the prevention of ischemic stroke in patients with AF.^{8 9} However, for patients with AF presenting with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) or coronary artery disease, undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) poses a great challenge with regard to the management of antithrombotic therapy.¹⁰ These patients need dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) to reduce the risk of subsequent myocardial infarction and stent thrombosis, and OAC treatment to reduce the risk of stroke.¹¹

Although academic guidelines recommend that a combination of OACs and DAPT should be initiated in these patients and then subsequently switched to monotherapy with OACs,^{1 12 13} OACs have been largely underused in real-world clinical practice.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ However, NOACs have not been applied in most reported studies.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ Recently, there has been a significant price drop in NOACs and more evidence concerning the safety of these agents compared with warfarin. These factors may lead to greater use of NOACs instead of warfarin in patients at higher risk of bleeding, including those undergoing concomitant anti-platelet treatment. However,

1
2
3
4 the prevalence of antithrombotic therapy in Chinese patients with ACS and AF has
5
6 not been explored after the introduction of NOACs. Therefore, the current study was
7
8 undertaken to examine current real-world patterns of OAC therapy in managing ACS
9
10 patients with AF in South China undergoing PCI.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Methods**

18 **Study population**

19
20 This was a retrospective cohort study conducted in the Shunde Hospital,
21
22 Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from
23
24 January 2013 to 31 December 2018.
25
26
27
28
29

30 We reviewed the medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years who were
31
32 hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment. ACS was defined as ST-segment
33
34 elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), non-ST-segment elevation myocardial
35
36 infarction (NSTEMI) or unstable angina (UA). STEMI was diagnosed based on
37
38 elevated levels of biomarkers for myocardial necrosis (including troponin T, troponin
39
40 I, or creatine kinase MB), with ST-segment elevation of 1 mm or more in at least two
41
42 contiguous electrocardiogram (ECG) leads,²⁰ while NSTEMI was defined as
43
44 ST-segment depression of ≥ 1 mm. Patients with typical ischemic symptoms and no
45
46 elevation in biomarkers for myocardial necrosis, with or without ECG changes were
47
48 classified as having UA.²¹ AF was diagnosed using an ECG recording or a Holter
49
50 monitor. Patients with AF lasting less than 7 d were classified as having paroxysmal
51
52 AF,¹ and were otherwise classified as having persistent/permanent AF. All of the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 patients received coronary angiography and PCI therapy. We excluded those without
5
6 ECG recording data, death or were transferred out within 3 days of hospitalization,
7
8
9 discharge medication list was not available and those had rheumatic heart disease or
10
11
12 mechanical heart valves.

13 14 15 16 17 **Risk stratification and anticoagulation treatment**

18
19
20 Baseline characteristics were collected. We used the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score to
21
22 evaluate the risk of stroke (congestive heart failure, hypertension, age ≥ 75 years
23
24 [doubled], diabetes mellitus, history of stroke/transient ischemic attack [doubled],
25
26 vascular disease, age 65–75 years and female sex). The risk of bleeding was evaluated
27
28 using the HAS-BLED score (hypertension, abnormal renal/liver function, history of
29
30 stroke, history of bleeding, labile internationally normalized ratio, age > 65 years,
31
32 non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs or alcohol abuse).^{1 12} Because data concerning
33
34 the time in therapeutic range for warfarin was not available, we defined the labile
35
36 internationally normalized ratio as ‘none’ and 0 points were given to all patients when
37
38 calculating the HAS-BLED score.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45 Prescription of warfarin, NOACs, aspirin, and clopidogrel was determined from
46
47 the discharge medication list. In the hospitals participating in the current study,
48
49 rivaroxaban and dabigatran were the two types of NOAC available. Standard dosages
50
51 of NOACs were defined as rivaroxaban 20 mg/day or dabigatran 150 mg twice daily
52
53 for patients with creatinine clearance ≥ 50 mL/min, and rivaroxaban 15 mg/day or
54
55 dabigatran 110 mg twice daily for creatinine clearance of 30–49 mL/min.^{22 23} Any
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 daily dosages less than this range were defined as reduced dosages.
5
6
7

8 9 **Statistical Analysis**

10
11 AF patients were divided into two groups based on whether they received OAC
12 treatment or not at discharge. Baseline characteristics, including CHA₂DS₂-VASc
13 score, HAS-BLED scores, and antiplatelet therapy were examined. Continuous
14 variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation),
15 as appropriate. Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).
16
17 Continuous variables were compared using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test or Student's
18 *t*-test after testing for normality using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Categorical
19 variables were compared using the chi-square or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Multiple logistic regression models were used to examine the association
33 between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment at discharge. Patients without
34 OAC treatment were used as the reference. The variables adjusted in the
35 multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension,
36
37 dyslipidemia, history of stroke, abnormal renal/liver function, non-steroidal
38 anti-inflammatory drugs or alcohol abuse, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of
39 ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), and type of
40 AF (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent). We further set the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score
41 and HAS-BLED score as independent factors in the model, while their individual
42 components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes, hypertension, history of stroke,
43 history of bleeding) were not included to avoid over-adjustment. Adjusted odds ratios
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are presented. All the statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). All comparisons are two-sided, with statistical significance defined as $P < 0.05$.

Ethical clearance

The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the institutional review board central committee at Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University, China. As this was a retrospective analysis, patients' informed consent was waived by the institutional review board.

Results

Baseline characteristics

We reviewed 3813 electronic medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years, who were hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment from January 2013 to November 2018. After excluding 121 patients who died or were transferred out during hospitalization, and 76 patients without a discharge medication list, 4 patients with mechanical heart valves, a total of 3612 patients were included in this study.

All of the patients received coronary angiography and drug eluting stent implantation, and 2219 of them (61.4%) were diagnosed with UA and referred for an elective procedure, while 1393 of them (38.6%) presented with AMI and received emergent PCI treatment.

Among all the included patients, 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF; 45 of

1
2
3
4 these (1.2%) had paroxysmal AF and 241 (6.7%) had persistent/permanent AF.
5
6 Compared with those without AF, ACS patients with AF were older and more likely
7
8 to be female, with a higher prevalence of hypertension, diabetes and cardiac
9
10 dysfunction, previous stroke/TIA, and higher mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc and HAS-BLED
11
12 scores (all $P < 0.01$, Table 1).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Anti-thrombotic therapy**

21
22 The in-hospital anti-thrombotic treatment regimens in ACS patients with and
23
24 without AF are presented in Table 2. The rates of parenteral anticoagulant treatment,
25
26 including low molecular weight heparin and fondaparinux, were higher in patients
27
28 with AF compared with those without AF (35.7% vs. 21.0%, $P < 0.01$). The in-hospital
29
30 use of antiplatelet agents, including aspirin and clopidogrel, was high and similar in
31
32 ACS patients with and without AF (all $P > 0.05$). Prescription of OACs in AF patients
33
34 was low ($n = 85$, 29.7%); 38 of them received warfarin (13.3%) and 47 of them
35
36 received NOACs (16.4%). In patients undergoing NOAC treatment, 42 of them
37
38 (89.3%) received reduced dosages.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 At hospital discharge, the use of anti-platelet agents was similar as in-hospital
46
47 usage, and nearly 99% of patients with and without AF received DAPT. However,
48
49 only 21.7% of patients with AF ($n = 62$) were discharged on OACs, and 10.5% of
50
51 them received warfarin and 11.2% received NOACs (Table 2). Similarly, in patients
52
53 undergoing NOAC treatment, 90.6% of them received reduced dosages.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Determinants of OAC treatment at discharge

We examined the association between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment at discharge. In all the included AF patients, only 4.5% were at moderate risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score 1), and 95.5% were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2) for stroke. In terms of bleeding, 31.8% of the patients had a HAS-BLED score ≥ 3 , which was defined as a high risk of bleeding. As shown in Table 3, patients with a HAS-BLED score < 3 , with persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OAC treatment at discharge. However, neither a high risk of stroke nor other clinical characteristics were associated with OAC treatment.

Discussion

There are three main findings in this study. First, the overall incidence of AF was 7.9% in patients with ACS who received PCI during hospitalization. Second, although most patients with AF had a high risk of stroke, less than 30% received OAC treatment at discharge. Third, patients with a lower risk of bleeding and persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive anticoagulation therapy.

DAPT was recommended in ACS patients who underwent PCI to decrease the risk of stent thrombosis.²¹ However, antiplatelet treatments cannot prevent the activation of coagulation factors and are not as effective as OACs in preventing stroke in AF patients. For AF patients who undergo PCI, if the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2 , initial treatment with DAPT plus OACs (triple therapy) for at least 4 weeks is recommended under the current guidelines.^{12 24} However, such a “triple therapy”

1
2
3
4 strategy poses risks for bleeding and OACs are globally underused in clinical
5
6 practice.^{14-19 25} The China acute myocardial infarction (CAMI) registry found that
7
8 from 2013–2014, only 5.1% of ACS patients with AF were treated using warfarin,
9
10 and 1.7% were treated using both warfarin and DAPT.²⁵ No NOACs were prescribed
11
12 in ACS+AF patients in the CAMI study. In the current study, we found that this
13
14 situation had improved. Approximately 30% of ACS patients with AF who underwent
15
16 PCI received anticoagulation therapy at discharge, and half were prescribed NOACs.
17
18 This improvement may be caused by the accumulation of clinical research data, the
19
20 availability of consensus guidelines for treatment, increased physician awareness of
21
22 anticoagulation therapy and a price reduction in NOACs in China. However, it should
23
24 be noted that OACs were still significantly underused in AF patients who received
25
26 PCI, and further efforts should be made to increase adherence to guideline
27
28 recommendations for OAC treatment among eligible ACS patients with AF.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Compared with warfarin, NOACs are more convenient for use, including
39
40 advantages such as fixed dose regimens, no requirement for frequent blood
41
42 monitoring, no food and drug restrictions and less risk of bleeding.^{26 27} In the current
43
44 study, we found that there was a substantially increased use of NOACs in Chinese
45
46 patients during the past few years. This is consistent with data from the Danish
47
48 nationwide administrative registries, which found that by 2016, the use of NOACs in
49
50 any combination with antiplatelets was exceeding that of warfarin in combination
51
52 with antiplatelets.²⁸ However, in the current cohort, most patients (approximately 90%)
53
54 received a reduced dosage of NOACs, such as rivaroxaban 10 mg/day. This may be
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 driven primarily by the increased risk of bleeding caused by triple therapy. It has been
5
6 reported that in AF patients with AMI and/or PCI, when in combination with DAPT,
7
8 low-dose NOACs plus DAPT was associated with a lower rate of clinically significant
9
10 bleeding than a vitamin K antagonist plus DAPT.^{29 30}
11
12
13

14 In contrast with previous studies which showed that the use of OACs in patients
15
16 with ACS and AF was not influenced by either stroke risk or bleeding risk,^{18 19} the
17
18 current study found that patients with a HAS-BLED score <3 were more likely to
19
20 receive OAC treatment at discharge. These results suggest that physicians are still
21
22 hesitant to prescribe “triple therapy” because of concerns about the risk of bleeding. It
23
24 should be noted that many patients with a high risk of bleeding also have an increased
25
26 risk of stroke and stent thrombosis. Current guidelines on the management of AF have
27
28 proposed a clear algorithm for the management of these patients.^{1 12} However,
29
30 providing optimal treatment is still a great challenge in real-world practice.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The current study further found that patients with paroxysmal AF were less
39
40 likely to receive OACs than those with persistent/permanent AF. This was not a
41
42 surprise. Current guidelines recommend that for patients with paroxysmal AF, the
43
44 need for anticoagulant therapy should be determined based on the risk of stroke, same
45
46 with persistent AF.^{1 12} However, studies have shown that the risk of stroke in patients
47
48 with paroxysmal AF is lower than that those with persistent/permanent AF.^{31 32} The
49
50 benefit of anticoagulation in new-onset AF, occurring in the setting of an acute attack
51
52 with ACS, acute pulmonary disease, or sepsis, is associated with a higher risk of
53
54 bleeding, but not with a reduced risk of ischemic stroke.³³ Therefore, for paroxysmal
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 AF that occurs in the case of ACS, there is still much doubt about whether these
5
6 patients need long-term anticoagulant therapy. Recently, a study showed that in
7
8 patients with paroxysmal AF, a greater burden of AF is associated with a higher risk
9
10 of ischemic stroke.³⁴ Therefore, follow-up studies should be conducted to observe the
11
12 re-occurrence of AF in the future.
13
14
15

16
17 There are some limitations in the current study. First, we did not evaluate the
18
19 link between anticoagulant therapy and adverse events during hospitalization and after
20
21 discharge. Second, patient status was distinguished as paroxysmal AF or
22
23 persistent/permanent AF based on medical records, and misclassifications cannot be
24
25 totally avoided. Third, this study was a retrospective study. Data were obtained from
26
27 two large hospitals in Guangdong Province, China, and do not represent the current
28
29 treatment status of other regions. Finally, we also found that some patients without
30
31 AF were prescribed OACs; however, the indications were unrecorded.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Conclusion**

41
42 The current study found that nearly 8% of patients who underwent PCI during
43
44 ACS hospitalization had AF. Although these patients were at an increased risk of
45
46 stroke, anticoagulant therapy was greatly underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and
47
48 an increased risk of bleeding were more unlikely to receive anticoagulant treatment.
49
50 The promotion of NOAC use could increase the proportion of these patients who
51
52 receive anticoagulant therapy.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Contributors** YH and LM conceptualised the study, designed the protocol. YH, YW,
5
6 JL and LM analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. XL, HZ and GL collected
7
8 the data. YH, HZ and YZ revised the manuscript.
9
10

11
12
13
14 **Acknowledgements:** The project was supported by Scientific Research Fund of
15
16 Foshan, Guangdong, China (No: 2016AB003353), the National Natural Science
17
18 Foundation of China (No: 81600239), the Science and Technology Innovation Project
19
20 from Foshan, Guangdong (FS0AA-KJ218-1301-0006) and the Clinical Research
21
22 Startup Program of Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (CRSP2019001).
23
24 The funders had no role in the design and implementation of the study, in the
25
26 collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, and in the preparation, review, or
27
28 approval of the manuscript.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 **Competing interests:** None declared.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:

1. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, *et al.* 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2019;DOI: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2019.01.024.
2. Pokorney SD, Gersh BJ, Ahmad A, *et al.* Stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation: Closing the gap. *Am Heart J* 2018;210:29-38.
3. Rohla M, Weiss TW, Pecun L, *et al.* Risk factors for thromboembolic and bleeding events in anticoagulated patients with atrial fibrillation: the prospective, multicentre observational PREvention of thromboembolic events - European Registry in Atrial Fibrillation (PREFER in AF). *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e022478.
4. Jabre P, Roger VL, Murad MH, *et al.* Mortality associated with atrial fibrillation in patients with myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Circulation* 2011;123:1587-93.
5. Cordero A, Rodriguez-Manero M, Garcia-Acuna JM, *et al.* Incidence and predictors of stroke in patients discharged with the diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:20-25.
6. Johnson V, Schmitt J. A Chicken or Egg Dilemma: Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Poor Prognostic Outcome in Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)* 2018;DOI: 10.1016/j.rec.2018.11.003.
7. El-Battrawy I, Borggrefe M, Akin I. Atrial fibrillation as a risk factor for worse

1
2
3
4 outcome in acute coronary syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;246:53.

5
6 8. Han TS, Fry CH, Fluck D, *et al.* Anticoagulation therapy in patients with stroke
7
8 and atrial fibrillation: a registry-based study of acute stroke care in Surrey, UK. *BMJ*
9
10
11
12 *Open* 2018;8:e022558.

13
14 9. Huang X, Chen Y, Xiao J, *et al.* Electrophysiological characteristics and catheter
15
16 ablation of symptomatic focal premature atrial contractions originating from
17
18 pulmonary veins and non-pulmonary veins. *Clin Cardiol* 2018;41:74-80.

19
20
21
22 10. Ferreiro JL, Gomez-Hospital JA. Antithrombotic therapy after acute coronary
23
24 syndromes in patients with atrial fibrillation: Shouldn't we pay more attention to the
25
26 risk of ischemic and thromboembolic events? *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:38-39.

27
28
29
30 11. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, *et al.* 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on
31
32 myocardial revascularization. *Eur Heart J* 2019;40:87-165.

33
34
35 12. Lip G, Collet JP, Haude M, Huber K. Management of antithrombotic therapy in
36
37 AF patients presenting with ACS and/or undergoing PCI: A Summary of the Joint
38
39 Consensus Document of the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA), European
40
41 Society of Cardiology Working Group on Thrombosis, European Association of
42
43 Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI) and European Association of
44
45 Acute Cardiac Care (ACCA) endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS),
46
47 Asia-Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), Latin America Heart Rhythm Society
48
49 (LAHRS), and Cardiac Arrhythmia Society of Southern Africa (CASSA). *Eur*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 *Heart J* 2018;39:2847-2850.

58
59 13. Steffel J, Verhamme P, Potpara TS, *et al.* The 2018 European Heart Rhythm
60

1
2
3
4 Association Practical Guide on the use of non-vitamin K antagonist oral
5
6 anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation: executive summary. *Europace*
7
8 2018;20:1231-1242.
9

10
11 14. Chamberlain AM, Gersh BJ, Mills RM, *et al.* Antithrombotic strategies and
12
13 outcomes in acute coronary syndrome with atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol*
14
15 2015;115:1042-8.
16
17

18
19 15. Lopes RD, Li L, Granger CB, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation and acute myocardial
20
21 infarction: antithrombotic therapy and outcomes. *Am J Med* 2012;125:897-905.
22
23

24
25 16. Rohla M, Vennekate CK, Tentzeris I, *et al.* Long-term mortality of patients with
26
27 atrial fibrillation undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with stent
28
29 implantation for acute and stable coronary artery disease. *Int J Cardiol*
30
31 2015;184:108-14.
32
33

34
35 17. Guimaraes PO, Zakrotsky P, Goyal A, Lopes RD, Kaltenbach LA, Wang TY.
36
37 Usefulness of Antithrombotic Therapy in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Acute
38
39 Myocardial Infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 2019;123:12-18.
40
41

42
43 18. Nelson JA, Vavalle JP, May CH, *et al.* Warfarin use and long-term outcomes in
44
45 patients with acute myocardial infarction and atrial fibrillation. *J Thromb*
46
47 *Thrombolysis* 2014;37:331-7.
48
49

50
51 19. Lopes RD, Starr A, Pieper CF, *et al.* Warfarin use and outcomes in patients with
52
53 atrial fibrillation complicating acute coronary syndromes. *Am J Med*
54
55 2010;123:134-40.
56
57

58
59 20. [Guideline on the diagnosis and therapy of ST-segment elevation myocardial
60

1
2
3
4 infarction]. *Zhonghua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi* 2015;43:380-93.

5
6
7 21. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP, *et al.* 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of
8
9 acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment
10
11 elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients
12
13 Presenting without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of
14
15 Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:267-315.

16
17
18
19 22. Mahmood M, Lip G. Nonvitamin K Oral Anticoagulants in Patients With Atrial
20
21 Fibrillation and Severe Renal Dysfunction. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*
22
23 2018;71:847-855.

24
25
26
27 23. Potpara TS, Ferro CJ, Lip G. Use of oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial
28
29 fibrillation and renal dysfunction. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2018;14:337-351.

30
31
32
33 24. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, *et al.* 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of
34
35 the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial
36
37 Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart
38
39 Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society.
40
41
42
43 *Heart Rhythm* 2019;DOI: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2019.01.024.

44
45
46
47 25. Dai Y, Yang J, Gao Z, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation in patients hospitalized with acute
48
49 myocardial infarction: analysis of the china acute myocardial infarction (CAMI)
50
51 registry. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2017;17:2.

52
53
54
55 26. Geng YP, Lan DH, Liu N, *et al.* Patient-Reported Treatment Satisfaction with
56
57 Dabigatran versus Warfarin in Patients with Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation in China.
58
59
60
Thromb Haemost 2018;118:1815-1822.

- 1
2
3
4 27. Wu S, Xie S, Xu Y, *et al.* Persistence and outcomes of non-vitamin K antagonist
5 oral anticoagulants versus warfarin in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation. *J*
6
7
8
9 *Clin Nurs* 2019 ;28:1839-1846.
10
11 28. Sindet-Pedersen C, Staerk L, Lamberts M, *et al.* Use of oral anticoagulants in
12 combination with antiplatelet(s) in atrial fibrillation. *Heart* 2018;104:912-920.
13
14 29. Sindet-Pedersen C, Lamberts M, Staerk L, *et al.* Combining Oral Anticoagulants
15 With Platelet Inhibitors in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Coronary Disease. *J*
16
17
18
19 *Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:1790-1800.
20
21
22 30. Gibson CM, Mehran R, Bode C, *et al.* Prevention of Bleeding in Patients with
23 Atrial Fibrillation Undergoing PCI. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:2423-2434.
24
25
26 31. Zhang W, Xiong Y, Yu L, Xiong A, Bao H, Cheng X. Meta-analysis of Stroke
27 and Bleeding Risk in Patients with Various Atrial Fibrillation Patterns Receiving Oral
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
32. Ganesan AN, Chew DP, Hartshorne T, *et al.* The impact of atrial fibrillation type on the risk of thromboembolism, mortality, and bleeding: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:1591-602.
33. Quon MJ, Behloul H, Pilote L. Anticoagulant Use and Risk of Ischemic Stroke and Bleeding in Patients With Secondary Atrial Fibrillation Associated With Acute Coronary Syndromes, Acute Pulmonary Disease, or Sepsis. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol* 2018;4:386-393.
34. Go AS, Reynolds K, Yang J, *et al.* Association of Burden of Atrial Fibrillation With Risk of Ischemic Stroke in Adults With Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation: The

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

KP-RHYTHM Study. *JAMA Cardiol* 2018;3:601-608.

For peer review only

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
Age (year)	68 (58, 76)*	61 (52,74)
Sex [Female (%)]	128 (44.8)#	1285 (38.6)
SBP (mmHg)	129.3±22.4#	125.4±23.9
DBP (mmHg)	78.5±18.4#	76.2±17.9
Hypertension [n(%)]	123 (43.0)#	1214 (36.5)
Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L)	5.8±3.6#	5.4±3.2
Diabetes mellitus [n(%)]	65 (22.7)#	582 (17.5)
Serum creatinine (µmol/L)	96 (65,124)	92(63,136)
Current smoker	66 (23.1)	729 (21.9)
LDL-C (mmol/L)	3.2±1.9	3.0±1.8
HDL-C (mmol/L)	1.1±0.6	1.0±0.5
TC (mmol/L)	5.4±2.2	5.3±2.2
TG (mmol/L)	1.9±1.8	1.8±1.6
Dyslipidemia[n(%)]	103 (36.0)	1173 (35.3)
Previous stroke/TIA[n(%)]	17 (5.9)#	68 (2.0)
AMI[n(%)]	115 (40.2)	1278 (42.5)
UA[n(%)]	171 (59.8)	2048 (57.5)
Killip classification III-IV [n(%)]	84 (29.4)*	786 (23.6)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score	3.5±2.0*	3.1±1.8*
HAS-BLED score	3.0±1.6*	2.8±1.7*

Continuous variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation). Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; TIA, transient ischemic attack; UA, unstable angina

$P < 0.05$ vs. 'without AF' group. * $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.

Table 2. Anti-thrombotic treatment in ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
In-hospital		
Aspirin [n(%)]	280 (97.9)	3291 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	284 (99.3)	3318 (99.8)
Parenteral anticoagulants #[n(%)]	102 (35.7)*	698 (21.0)
OACs[n(%)]	85 (29.7)*	8 (0.2)
Warfarin[n(%)]	38 (13.3)*	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	47 (16.4)*	5 (0.2)
At discharge		
Aspirin [n(%)]	281 (98.3)	3289 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	282 (98.6)	3316 (99.7)
OACs [n(%)]	62 (21.7)	7 (0.2)
Warfarin [n(%)]	30 (10.5)	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	32 (11.2)	4 (0.1)

Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; NOACs, non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants; OACs, oral anticoagulants

* $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.

Table 3. Determinants of oral anticoagulant treatment at discharge

Determinants	OR	95% CI	P-value
Sex (male vs female)	0.98	0.65-1.48	0.92
Age (≥ 65 vs < 65 years)	1.56	0.36-6.76	0.55
Smoking (yes vs no)	1.22	0.23-6.47	0.82
Diabetes mellitus (yes vs no)	1.65	0.89-3.06	0.11
Hypertension (yes vs no)	1.34	0.46-3.90	0.59
Dyslipidemia (yes vs no)	0.99	0.58-1.69	0.97
Abnormal renal/liver function (yes vs no)	1.18	0.61-2.28	0.62
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs/alcohol abuse (yes vs no)	1.04	0.47-2.30	0.92
Cardiac function (Killip classification III-IV vs I-II)	1.44	0.78-2.66	0.24
History of stroke (yes vs no)	2.88	0.96-8.64	0.06
History of bleeding (yes vs no)	0.87	0.55-1.37	0.55
Type of ACS (AMI vs UA)	0.93	0.64-1.35	0.70
Type of AF (persistent/permanent vs paroxysmal)	4.75	1.89-11.9	0.0009
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score (≥ 2 vs < 2)	2.98	0.85-10.2	0.09
HAS-BLED score (< 3 vs ≥ 3)	3.12	1.25-7.78	0.01

The variables adjusted in the multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), and type of AF (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent). When CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and HAS-BLED score were included as independent factors in the model, the individual components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes, hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding) were not included to avoid over-adjustment.

1
2
3
4 ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial
5 infarction; UA, unstable angina
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

A Retrospective Cohort Study of Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031180.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Jul-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Mai, Linlin; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Luo, Jianjing; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology; The Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, Cardiology Wu, Yu; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Liu, Xinyue; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Zhu, Hailan; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Zheng, Haoxiao; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Liang, Guoquan; The Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, Cardiology Zhang, Yan; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Huang, YULi; Shunde Hospital of Southern Medical University, Cardiology
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	atrial fibrillation, acute coronary syndrome, oral anticoagulants

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

A Retrospective Cohort Study of Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Brief title: OAC Treatment in ACS patients with AF

Linlin Mai, MD,^{a*} Jianjing Luo, MD,^{a,b*} Yu Wu, MD,^{a*} Xinyue Liu, MD,^a Hailan Zhu, MD,^a Haoxiao Zheng, MD,^a Guoquan Liang, MD,^b Yan Zhang, BS,^a Yuli Huang, MD, PhD,^{a#}

^a Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Foshan, PR China.

^b Department of Cardiology, the Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, China.

* These authors contribute equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Professor. Yuli Huang. Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University, Jiazhi Road, Lunjiao Town, Shunde District, Foshan, 528300, PR China. Tel.: +86 757 22318610; Fax: +86 757 22223899; E-mail:

hyuli821@smu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVE: To examine the real-world patterns of oral anticoagulant (OAC) therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) and atrial fibrillation (AF) in South China undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and determine the clinical characteristics associated with OAC prescription.

DESIGN: A retrospective cohort study.

SETTING: The study was conducted in the Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from January 2013 to 31 December 2018.

PARTICIPANTS: Patients were aged ≥ 18 years, hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment.

OUTCOME MEASURES: AF was diagnosed based on an electrocardiogram recording or a Holter monitor. Prescription of OACs and antiplatelets were determined from the discharge medication list.

RESULTS: A total of 3612 ACS patients were included; 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF, including 45 (1.2%) with paroxysmal AF, 227 (6.3%) with persistent/permanent AF and 14 (0.4%) with unclassified AF. Although 95.5% of patients with AF were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2) for stroke, only 21.7% were discharged on OACs; 10.5% received warfarin and 11.2% received non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants. Patients with pre-admission use of OAC, a HAS-BLED score < 3 , with persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OAC treatment at discharge.

1
2
3
4 **CONCLUSION:** We found that approximately 8% of patients who underwent PCI
5
6 during ACS hospitalization also demonstrated AF. Anticoagulant therapy was greatly
7
8 underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and an increased risk of bleeding were less
9
10 likely to receive anticoagulant treatment. Further efforts should be made to increase
11
12 the adherence to guideline recommendations for OACs.
13
14
15

16
17 **Keywords:** atrial fibrillation; acute coronary syndrome; oral anticoagulants
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study to document the current real-world patterns of anticoagulation therapy in managing ACS patients with AF in Southern China.
- All the patients were with documented AF and received drug eluting stent implantation.
- The present study highlight further efforts should be made to increase adherence to guideline recommendations for OAC treatment among ACS patients with AF.
- Data were obtained from two large hospitals in Southern China, and do not represent the current treatment status in other regions.

Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common arrhythmia worldwide.¹ It is associated with a four to five-fold increased risk of ischemic stroke.^{2 3} Known or new-onset AF is a common comorbidity in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS). It has been reported that 2–21% of ACS patients have a history of AF.⁴ Patients with ACS and AF have a poor prognostic outcome, including a higher risk of stroke.⁵⁻⁷ Antithrombotic treatment with oral anticoagulants (OACs), such as warfarin or non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants (NOACs), is a cornerstone in the prevention of ischemic stroke in patients with AF.^{8 9} However, for patients with AF presenting with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) or coronary artery disease, undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) poses a great challenge with regard to the management of antithrombotic therapy.¹⁰ These patients need dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) to reduce the risk of subsequent myocardial infarction and stent thrombosis, and OAC treatment to reduce the risk of stroke.¹¹

Although academic guidelines recommend that a combination of OACs and DAPT should be initiated in these patients and then subsequently switched to single anti-platelet agent combined with OACs,^{1 12 13} OACs have been largely underused in real-world clinical practice.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ However, NOACs have not been applied in most reported studies.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ Recently, there has been a significant price drop in NOACs and more evidence concerning the safety of these agents compared with warfarin. These factors may lead to greater use of NOACs instead of warfarin in patients at higher risk of bleeding, including those undergoing concomitant anti-platelet treatment. However,

1
2
3
4 the prevalence of antithrombotic therapy in Chinese patients with ACS and AF has
5
6 not been explored after the introduction of NOACs. Therefore, the current study was
7
8 undertaken to examine current real-world patterns of OAC therapy in managing ACS
9
10 patients with AF in South China undergoing PCI.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Methods**

18 **Study population**

19
20 This was a retrospective cohort study conducted in the Shunde Hospital,
21
22 Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from
23
24 January 2013 to 31 December 2018.
25
26
27
28
29

30 We reviewed the medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years who were
31
32 hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment. ACS was defined as ST-segment
33
34 elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), non-ST-segment elevation myocardial
35
36 infarction (NSTEMI) or unstable angina (UA). STEMI was diagnosed based on
37
38 elevated levels of biomarkers for myocardial necrosis (including troponin T, troponin
39
40 I, or creatine kinase MB), with ST-segment elevation of 1 mm or more in at least two
41
42 contiguous electrocardiogram (ECG) leads,²⁰ while NSTEMI was defined as
43
44 ST-segment depression of ≥ 1 mm. Patients with typical ischemic symptoms and no
45
46 elevation in biomarkers for myocardial necrosis, with or without ECG changes were
47
48 classified as having UA.²¹ AF was diagnosed using an ECG recording or a Holter
49
50 monitor. For patients with length of hospital stay ≥ 7 days, those with AF lasting < 7 d
51
52 were classified as having paroxysmal AF,¹ and were otherwise classified as having
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 persistent/permanent AF. In patients with no prior history of AF and with length of
5
6 hospital stay <7 days, those with AF were defined as unclassified. All of the patients
7
8 received coronary angiography and PCI. We excluded those with rheumatic heart
9
10 disease or mechanical heart valves, death during hospitalization or were transferred
11
12 out within 3 days, or without discharge medication list available.
13
14
15

16 **Risk stratification and anticoagulation treatment**

17
18
19 Baseline characteristics including age, sex, smoking, history of hypertension,
20
21 diabetes, dyslipidemia, chronic kidney disease, previous stroke/TIA, history of AF
22
23 and pre-admission use of OAC, ACS type, Killip classification were collected via the
24
25 hospital medical record. Blood biochemical measurements, such as fasting plasma
26
27 glucose, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, total cholesterol, and triglyceride levels
28
29 were measured using an automated biochemical analyzer. Estimated glomerular
30
31 filtration rate was calculated using the modified Modification of Diet in Renal Disease
32
33 equation adapted for Chinese.²²
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 We used the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score to evaluate the risk of stroke (congestive
41
42 heart failure, hypertension, age ≥75 years [doubled], diabetes mellitus, history of
43
44 stroke/transient ischemic attack [doubled], vascular disease, age 65–75 years and
45
46 female sex). The risk of bleeding was evaluated using the HAS-BLED score
47
48 (hypertension, abnormal renal/liver function, history of stroke, history of bleeding,
49
50 labile internationally normalized ratio, age >65 years, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory
51
52 drugs or alcohol abuse).^{1 12} Because data concerning the time in therapeutic range for
53
54 warfarin was not available, we defined the labile internationally normalized ratio as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 'none' and 0 points were given to all patients when calculating the HAS-BLED score.
5

6
7 Prescription of warfarin, NOACs, aspirin, and clopidogrel was determined from
8
9 the discharge medication list. In the hospitals participating in the current study,
10
11 rivaroxaban and dabigatran were the two types of NOAC available. Standard dosages
12
13 of NOACs were defined as rivaroxaban 20 mg/day or dabigatran 150 mg twice daily
14
15 for patients with creatinine clearance ≥ 50 mL/min, and rivaroxaban 15 mg/day or
16
17 dabigatran 110 mg twice daily for creatinine clearance of 30–49 mL/min.^{23 24} Any
18
19 daily dosages less than this range were defined as reduced dosages.
20
21
22
23

24 25 **Statistical Analysis**

26
27 AF patients were divided into two groups based on whether they received OAC
28
29 treatment or not at discharge. Baseline characteristics, including CHA₂DS₂-VASc
30
31 score, HAS-BLED scores, and antiplatelet therapy were examined. Continuous
32
33 variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation),
34
35 as appropriate. Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).
36
37 Continuous variables were compared using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test or Student's
38
39 *t*-test after testing for normality using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Categorical
40
41 variables were compared using the chi-square or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Multiple logistic regression models were used to examine the association
50
51 between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment at discharge. Patients without
52
53 OAC treatment were used as the reference. The variables adjusted in the
54
55 multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension,
56
57 dyslipidemia, history of stroke, abnormal renal/liver function, non-steroidal
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 anti-inflammatory drugs or alcohol abuse, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of
5
6 ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), type of AF
7
8 (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent) and pre-admission use of OAC. We further set
9
10 the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and HAS-BLED score as independent factors in the model,
11
12 while their individual components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes, hypertension,
13
14 history of stroke, history of bleeding) were not included to avoid over-adjustment.
15
16 Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are
17
18 presented. All the statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS,
19
20 Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). All comparisons are two-sided, with statistical significance
21
22 defined as $P < 0.05$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Ethical clearance**

31
32 The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the
33
34 institutional review board central committee at Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical
35
36 University, China. As this was a retrospective analysis, patients' informed consent
37
38 was waived by the institutional review board.
39
40
41
42

43 **Patient and public involvement**

44
45 Patients and the general public were not involved in this study.
46
47
48
49

50 **Results**

51 **Baseline characteristics**

52
53 We reviewed 3813 electronic medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years, who
54
55 were hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment from January 2013 to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 December 2018. After excluding 121 patients who died or were transferred out during
5
6 hospitalization, and 76 patients without a discharge medication list, 4 patients with
7
8 mechanical heart valves, a total of 3612 patients were included in this study.
9
10

11 All of the patients received coronary angiography and drug eluting stent
12
13 implantation, 1393 of them (38.6%) presented with AMI and received emergent PCI
14
15 treatment, 2219 of them (61.4%) were diagnosed with UA and received PCI during
16
17 the index hospitalization after carefully non-invasive examination.
18
19
20

21
22 Among all the included patients, 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF; 45 of
23
24 these (1.2%) had paroxysmal AF, 227 (6.3%) had persistent/permanent AF and 14
25
26 (0.4%) with unclassified AF. According to the hospital medical record, 48 patients
27
28 were with document history of AF and 26 (54.2%) of them were received OAC
29
30 therapy prior to admission. Compared with those without AF, ACS patients with AF
31
32 were older and more likely to be female, with a higher prevalence of hypertension,
33
34 diabetes and cardiac dysfunction, previous stroke/TIA, and higher mean
35
36 CHA₂DS₂-VASc and HAS-BLED scores (all $P < 0.01$, Table 1).
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Anti-thrombotic therapy**

44
45 The in-hospital anti-thrombotic treatment regimens in ACS patients with and
46
47 without AF are presented in Table 2. The rates of parenteral anticoagulant treatment,
48
49 including low molecular weight heparin and fondaparinux, were higher in patients
50
51 with AF compared with those without AF (35.7% vs. 21.0%, $P < 0.01$). The in-hospital
52
53 use of antiplatelet agents, including aspirin and clopidogrel, was high and similar in
54
55 ACS patients with and without AF (all $P > 0.05$). Prescription of OACs in AF patients
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 was low (n = 85, 29.7%); 38 of them received warfarin (13.3%) and 47 of them
5
6 received NOACs (16.4%). In patients undergoing NOAC treatment, 42 of them
7
8 (89.3%) received reduced dosages.
9

10
11 At hospital discharge, the use of anti-platelet agents was similar as in-hospital
12
13 usage, and nearly 99% of patients with and without AF received DAPT. However,
14
15 only 21.7% of patients with AF (n = 62) were discharged on OACs, and 10.5% of
16
17 them received warfarin and 11.2% received NOACs (Table 2). Similarly, in patients
18
19 undergoing NOAC treatment, 90.6% of them received reduced dosages.
20
21
22
23

24 **Determinants of OAC treatment at discharge**

25
26 We examined the association between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment
27
28 at discharge. In all the included AF patients, only 4.5% were at moderate risk
29
30 (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score 1), and 95.5% were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2)
31
32 for stroke. In terms of bleeding, 31.8% of the patients had a HAS-BLED score ≥ 3 ,
33
34 which was defined as a high risk of bleeding. The baseline characteristics of the AF
35
36 patients received OAC or not at discharge were presented on Table 3. As shown in
37
38 Table 4, patients with pre-admission use of OAC, a HAS-BLED score < 3 , with
39
40 persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OAC treatment at discharge.
41
42 However, neither a high risk of stroke nor other clinical characteristics were
43
44 associated with OAC treatment.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Discussion**

57
58 There are three main findings in this study. First, the overall incidence of AF was
59
60

1
2
3
4 7.9% in patients with ACS who received PCI during hospitalization. Second, although
5
6 most patients with AF had a high risk of stroke, less than 30% received OAC
7
8 treatment at discharge. Third, patients with pre-admission use of OAC, a lower risk of
9
10 bleeding and persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive anticoagulation
11
12 therapy after PCI.
13
14
15

16
17 DAPT was recommended in ACS patients who underwent PCI to decrease the
18
19 risk of stent thrombosis.²¹ However, antiplatelet treatments have no clinical benefit in
20
21 the treatment of atrial fibrillation. For AF patients who undergo PCI, if the
22
23 CHA2DS2-VASc score ≥ 2 , initial treatment with DAPT plus OACs (triple therapy)
24
25 for at least 4 weeks is recommended under the current guidelines.^{1, 12} However, such
26
27 a “triple therapy” strategy poses risks for bleeding and OACs are globally underused
28
29 in clinical practice.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ The China acute myocardial infarction (CAMI) registry found
30
31 that from 2013–2014, only 5.1% of ACS patients with AF were treated using warfarin,
32
33 and 1.7% were treated using both warfarin and DAPT.²⁵ No NOACs were prescribed
34
35 in ACS+AF patients in the CAMI study. In the current study, we found that this
36
37 situation had improved. Approximately 30% of ACS patients with AF who underwent
38
39 PCI received anticoagulation therapy at discharge, and half were prescribed NOACs.
40
41 This improvement may be caused by the accumulation of clinical research data, the
42
43 availability of consensus guidelines for treatment, increased physician awareness of
44
45 anticoagulation therapy and a price reduction in NOACs in China. However, it should
46
47 be noted that OACs were still greatly underused.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 Compared with warfarin, NOACs are more convenient for use, including
59
60

1
2
3
4 advantages such as fixed dose regimens, no requirement for frequent blood
5
6 monitoring, no food and drug restrictions and less risk of bleeding.^{26 27} In the current
7
8 study, we found that there was a substantially increased use of NOACs in Chinese
9
10 patients during the past few years. This is consistent with data from the Danish
11
12 nationwide administrative registries, which found that by 2016, the use of NOACs in
13
14 any combination with antiplatelets was exceeding that of warfarin in combination
15
16 with antiplatelets.²⁸ However, in the current cohort, most patients (approximately 90%)
17
18 received a reduced dosage of NOACs, such as rivaroxaban 10 mg/day. This may be
19
20 driven primarily by the concern of increased risk of bleeding. It has been reported that
21
22 in AF patients with AMI and/or PCI, when in combination with DAPT,
23
24 low-dose NOACs plus DAPT was associated with a lower rate of clinically significant
25
26 bleeding than a vitamin K antagonist plus DAPT.^{29 30}

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 In contrast with previous studies which showed that the use of OACs in patients
36
37 with ACS and AF was not influenced by either stroke risk or bleeding risk,^{18 19} the
38
39 current study found that patients with a HAS-BLED score <3 were more likely to
40
41 receive OAC treatment at discharge. Furthermore, the number of patients treated with
42
43 OAC at discharge (21.7%) was significantly decreased than that during hospitalization
44
45 (29.7%). These results suggest that physicians are still hesitant to prescribe “triple
46
47 therapy” because of concerns about the risk of bleeding. Both the American College
48
49 of Cardiology (ACC)/American Heart Association (AHA)/ Heart Rhythm (HRS) and
50
51 the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA)/ European Society of Cardiology
52
53 (ESC) guidelines for the management of patients with AF have proposed a clear
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 algorithm for the management of these patients.^{1 12} The most recently
5
6 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline recommended that in patients with AF at increased risk of
7
8 stroke who have undergone PCI with stenting for ACS, double therapy with P2Y12
9
10 inhibitors (clopidogrel) and low-dose rivaroxaban 15 mg daily or dabigatran 150 mg
11
12 twice daily is reasonable to reduce the risk of bleeding as compared with triple
13
14 therapy.¹ The EHRA/ESC guideline also proposed that dual therapy with OAC plus
15
16 one clopidogrel may be considered in patients with excessive bleeding risk and have
17
18 low thrombotic risk.¹² However, providing optimal treatment is still a great challenge
19
20 in real-world practice. In our study, we found that patients with ACS after PCI and
21
22 AF were almost all treated with DAPT (nearly 99% of patients). However, OAC is
23
24 greatly underused. These results pointed out a very “awkward” situation, clinicians
25
26 are concern about the risk of bleeding as well as stent thrombosis, so they choose to
27
28 select DAPT but not double therapy with one P2Y12 inhibitor and OAC. These
29
30 results showed that there are great gap between real clinical practice and
31
32 recommendations from the academic guidelines. Further efforts should be made to
33
34 increase adherence to guideline recommendations for OAC treatment among eligible
35
36 ACS patients with AF.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 The current study further found that patients with paroxysmal AF were less
49
50 likely to receive OACs than those with persistent/permanent AF. This was not a
51
52 surprise. The AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for the management of AF recommend that
53
54 for patients with paroxysmal AF, the need for anticoagulant therapy should be
55
56 determined based on the risk of stroke, same with persistent AF.¹ However, studies
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 have shown that the risk of stroke in patients with paroxysmal AF is lower than that
5
6 those with persistent/permanent AF.^{31 32} The benefit of anticoagulation in new-onset
7
8 AF, occurring in the setting of an acute attack with ACS, acute pulmonary disease, or
9
10 sepsis, is associated with a higher risk of bleeding, but not with a reduced risk of
11
12 ischemic stroke.³³ Therefore, for paroxysmal AF that occurs in the case of ACS, there
13
14 is still much doubt about whether these patients need long-term anticoagulant therapy.
15
16 Recently, a study showed that in patients with paroxysmal AF, a greater burden of AF
17
18 is associated with a higher risk of ischemic stroke.³⁴ Therefore, follow-up studies
19
20 should be conducted to observe the re-occurrence of AF in the future.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 There are some limitations in the current study. First, we did not evaluate the
28
29 link between anticoagulant therapy and adverse events during hospitalization and after
30
31 discharge. Second, patient status was distinguished as paroxysmal AF or
32
33 persistent/permanent AF based on medical records, and misclassifications cannot be
34
35 totally avoided. Third, this study was a retrospective study. Data were obtained from
36
37 two large hospitals in Guangdong Province, China, and do not represent the current
38
39 treatment status of other regions. Finally, we also found that some patients without
40
41 AF were prescribed OACs; however, the indications were unrecorded.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Conclusion**

51
52
53 The current study found that nearly 8% of patients who underwent PCI during
54
55 ACS hospitalization had AF. Although these patients were at an increased risk of
56
57 stroke, anticoagulant therapy was greatly underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 an increased risk of bleeding were less likely to receive anticoagulant treatment. The
5
6 promotion of NOAC use could increase the proportion of these patients who receive
7
8 anticoagulant therapy.
9
10

11
12
13
14 **Contributors** YH and LM conceptualised the study, designed the protocol. YH, YW,
15
16 JL and LM analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. XL, HZ and GL collected
17
18 the data. YH, HZ and YZ revised the manuscript.
19
20

21
22 **Funding:** The project was supported by Scientific Research Fund of Foshan,
23
24 Guangdong, China (No: 2016AB003353), the National Natural Science Foundation of
25
26 China (No: 81600239), the Science and Technology Innovation Project from Foshan,
27
28 Guangdong (FS0AA-KJ218-1301-0006) and the Clinical Research Startup Program
29
30 of Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (CRSP2019001). The funders had
31
32 no role in the design and implementation of the study, in the collection, analysis, and
33
34 interpretation of the data, and in the preparation, review, or approval of the
35
36 manuscript.
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 **Acknowledgement:** We thank Conn Hastings, PhD, from Liwen Bianji, Edanz
44
45 Editing China (www.liwenbianji.cn/ac), for editing the English text during revision of
46
47 this manuscript.
48
49

50
51
52
53 **Data sharing statement:** For access to data of this study, please contact Dr Yuli
54
55 Huang. hyuli821@smu.edu.cn
56
57

58 **Competing interests:** None declared.
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Patient consent for publication:** Not required.
5

6 **References:**
7

- 8
9 1. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, *et al.* 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of
10 the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial
11 Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart
12 Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2019; pii: S0735-1097(19)30209-8
20
21
22 2. Pokorney SD, Gersh BJ, Ahmad A, *et al.* Stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation:
23 Closing the gap. *Am Heart J* 2018;210:29-38.
24
25
26
27 3. Rohla M, Weiss TW, Pecun L, *et al.* Risk factors for thromboembolic and
28 bleeding events in anticoagulated patients with atrial fibrillation: the prospective,
29 multicentre observational PREvention of thromboembolic events - European Registry
30 in Atrial Fibrillation (PREFER in AF). *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e022478.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 4. Jabre P, Roger VL, Murad MH, *et al.* Mortality associated with atrial fibrillation
38 in patients with myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 5. Cordero A, Rodriguez-Manero M, Garcia-Acuna JM, *et al.* Incidence and
47 predictors of stroke in patients discharged with the diagnosis of acute coronary
48 syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:20-25.
49
50
51
52
53 6. Johnson V, Schmitt J. A Chicken or Egg Dilemma: Patients With Atrial
54 Fibrillation and Poor Prognostic Outcome in Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Rev Esp*
55
56
57
58
59
60
Cardiol (Engl Ed) 2019;72:367-368.

- 1
2
3
4 7. El-Battrawy I, Borggrefe M, Akin I. Atrial fibrillation as a risk factor for worse
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
outcome in acute coronary syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;246:53.
8. Han TS, Fry CH, Fluck D, *et al.* Anticoagulation therapy in patients with stroke
and atrial fibrillation: a registry-based study of acute stroke care in Surrey, UK. *BMJ
Open* 2018;8:e022558.
9. Huang X, Chen Y, Xiao J, *et al.* Electrophysiological characteristics and catheter
ablation of symptomatic focal premature atrial contractions originating from
pulmonary veins and non-pulmonary veins. *Clin Cardiol* 2018;41:74-80.
10. Ferreiro JL, Gomez-Hospital JA. Antithrombotic therapy after acute coronary
syndromes in patients with atrial fibrillation: Shouldn't we pay more attention to the
risk of ischemic and thromboembolic events? *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:38-39.
11. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, *et al.* 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on
myocardial revascularization. *Eur Heart J* 2019;40:87-165.
12. Lip G, Collet JP, Haude M, *et al.* 2018 Joint European consensus document on the
management of antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation patients presenting with
acute coronary syndrome and/or undergoing percutaneous cardiovascular
interventions: a joint consensus document of the European Heart Rhythm Association
(EHRA), European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Thrombosis, European
Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI), and European
Association of Acute Cardiac Care (ACCA) endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society
(HRS), Asia-Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), Latin America Heart Rhythm
Society (LAHRS), and Cardiac Arrhythmia Society of Southern Africa (CASSA).

1
2
3
4 *Europace* 2019;21:192-193.
5

6
7 13. Steffel J, Verhamme P, Potpara TS, *et al.* The 2018 European Heart Rhythm
8
9 Association Practical Guide on the use of non-vitamin K antagonist oral
10
11 anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation: executive summary. *Europace*
12
13 2018;20:1231-1242.
14

15
16
17 14. Chamberlain AM, Gersh BJ, Mills RM, *et al.* Antithrombotic strategies and
18
19 outcomes in acute coronary syndrome with atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol*
20
21 2015;115:1042-8.
22

23
24
25 15. Lopes RD, Li L, Granger CB, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation and acute myocardial
26
27 infarction: antithrombotic therapy and outcomes. *Am J Med* 2012;125:897-905.
28

29
30
31 16. Rohla M, Vennekate CK, Tentzeris I, *et al.* Long-term mortality of patients with
32
33 atrial fibrillation undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with stent
34
35 implantation for acute and stable coronary artery disease. *Int J Cardiol*
36
37 2015;184:108-14.
38

39
40
41 17. Guimaraes PO, Zakrotsky P, Goyal A, Lopes RD, Kaltenbach LA, Wang TY.
42
43 Usefulness of Antithrombotic Therapy in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Acute
44
45 Myocardial Infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 2019;123:12-18.
46

47
48
49 18. Nelson JA, Vavalle JP, May CH, *et al.* Warfarin use and long-term outcomes in
50
51 patients with acute myocardial infarction and atrial fibrillation. *J Thromb*
52
53 *Thrombolysis* 2014;37:331-7.
54

55
56
57 19. Lopes RD, Starr A, Pieper CF, *et al.* Warfarin use and outcomes in patients with
58
59 atrial fibrillation complicating acute coronary syndromes. *Am J Med*
60

1
2
3
4 2010;123:134-40.
5

6
7 20. China Society of Cardiology of Chinese Medical Association, Editorial Board of
8
9 Chinese Journal of Cardiology; China Society of Cardiology of Chinese Medical
10
11 Association Editorial Board of Chinese Journal of Cardiology. [Guideline on the
12
13 diagnosis and therapy of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction]. *Zhonghua Xin*
14
15 *Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi* 2015;43:380-93.
16
17

18
19 21. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP, *et al.* 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of
20
21 acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment
22
23 elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients
24
25 Presenting without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of
26
27 Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:267-315.
28
29

30
31 22. Ma YC, Zuo L, Chen JH, *et al.* Modified glomerular filtration rate estimating
32
33 equation for Chinese patients with chronic kidney disease. *J AM SOC NEPHROL*
34
35 2006; 17:2937-2944.
36
37

38
39 23. Mahmood M, Lip G. Nonvitamin K Oral Anticoagulants in Patients With Atrial
40
41 Fibrillation and Severe Renal Dysfunction. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*
42
43 2018;71:847-855.
44
45

46
47 24. Potpara TS, Ferro CJ, Lip G. Use of oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial
48
49 fibrillation and renal dysfunction. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2018;14:337-351.
50
51

52
53 25. Dai Y, Yang J, Gao Z, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation in patients hospitalized with acute
54
55 myocardial infarction: analysis of the china acute myocardial infarction (CAMI)
56
57 registry. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2017;17:2.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 26. Geng YP, Lan DH, Liu N, *et al.* Patient-Reported Treatment Satisfaction with
5
6 Dabigatran versus Warfarin in Patients with Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation in China.
7
8
9 *Thromb Haemost* 2018;118:1815-1822.
10
11
12 27. Wu S, Xie S, Xu Y, *et al.* Persistence and outcomes of non-vitamin K antagonist
13
14 oral anticoagulants versus warfarin in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation. *J*
15
16 *Clin Nurs* 2019 ;28:1839-1846.
17
18
19 28. Sindet-Pedersen C, Staerk L, Lamberts M, *et al.* Use of oral anticoagulants in
20
21 combination with antiplatelet(s) in atrial fibrillation. *Heart* 2018;104:912-920.
22
23
24 29. Sindet-Pedersen C, Lamberts M, Staerk L, *et al.* Combining Oral Anticoagulants
25
26 With Platelet Inhibitors in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Coronary Disease. *J*
27
28 *Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:1790-1800.
29
30
31 30. Gibson CM, Mehran R, Bode C, *et al.* Prevention of Bleeding in Patients with
32
33 Atrial Fibrillation Undergoing PCI. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:2423-2434.
34
35
36
37 31. Zhang W, Xiong Y, Yu L, Xiong A, Bao H, Cheng X. Meta-analysis of Stroke
38
39 and Bleeding Risk in Patients with Various Atrial Fibrillation Patterns Receiving Oral
40
41 Anticoagulants. *Am J Cardiol* 2019;123:922-928.
42
43
44
45 32. Ganesan AN, Chew DP, Hartshorne T, *et al.* The impact of atrial fibrillation type
46
47 on the risk of thromboembolism, mortality, and bleeding: a systematic review and
48
49 meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:1591-602.
50
51
52
53 33. Quon MJ, Behloul H, Pilote L. Anticoagulant Use and Risk of Ischemic Stroke
54
55 and Bleeding in Patients With Secondary Atrial Fibrillation Associated With Acute
56
57 Coronary Syndromes, Acute Pulmonary Disease, or Sepsis. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2018;4:386-393.
5

6 34. Go AS, Reynolds K, Yang J, *et al.* Association of Burden of Atrial Fibrillation
7
8 With Risk of Ischemic Stroke in Adults With Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation: The
9
10 KP-RHYTHM Study. *JAMA Cardiol* 2018;3:601-608.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
Age (year)	68 (58, 76)*	61 (52,74)
Sex [Female (%)]	128 (44.8)#	1285 (38.6)
SBP (mmHg)	129.3±22.4#	125.4±23.9
DBP (mmHg)	78.5±18.4#	76.2±17.9
Hypertension [n(%)]	123 (43.0)#	1214 (36.5)
Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L)	5.8±3.6#	5.4±3.2
Diabetes mellitus [n(%)]	65 (22.7)#	582 (17.5)
Serum creatinine (µmol/L)	96 (65,124)	92(63,136)
eGFR (ml/min/1.73m ²)	62.2±25.1#	70.3±26.0
Current smoker	66 (23.1)	729 (21.9)
LDL-C (mmol/L)	3.2±1.9	3.0±1.8
HDL-C (mmol/L)	1.1±0.6	1.0±0.5
TC (mmol/L)	5.4±2.2	5.3±2.2
TG (mmol/L)	1.9±1.8	1.8±1.6
Dyslipidemia[n(%)]	103 (36.0)	1173 (35.3)
Previous stroke/TIA[n(%)]	17 (5.9)#	68 (2.0)
Previous CKD	19 (6.6)#	75 (2.3)
Previous AF	48 (16.8)	--
AMI[n(%)]	115 (40.2)	1278 (42.5)
UA[n(%)]	171 (59.8)	2048 (57.5)
Killip classification III-IV [n(%)]	84 (29.4)*	786 (23.6)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score	3.5±2.0*	3.1±1.8
HAS-BLED score	3.0±1.6*	2.8±1.7
Length of hospital stay	7.6±2.9*	7.1±2.6

Continuous variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation). Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial

1
2
3
4 infarction; CKD, chronic kidney disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; eGFR,
5
6 estimated glomerular filtration rate; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density
7
8 lipoprotein; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; TIA,
9
10 transient ischemic attack; UA, unstable angina

11 # $P < 0.05$ vs. 'without AF' group. * $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 2. Anti-thrombotic treatment in ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
In-hospital		
Aspirin [n(%)]	280 (97.9)	3291 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	284 (99.3)	3318 (99.8)
Parenteral anticoagulants #[n(%)]	102 (35.7)*	698 (21.0)
OACs[n(%)]	85 (29.7)*	8 (0.2)
Warfarin[n(%)]	38 (13.3)*	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	47 (16.4)*	5 (0.2)
At discharge		
Aspirin [n(%)]	281 (98.3)	3289 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	282 (98.6)	3316 (99.7)
OACs [n(%)]	62 (21.7)	7 (0.2)
Warfarin [n(%)]	30 (10.5)	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	32 (11.2)	4 (0.1)

Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; NOACs, non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants; OACs, oral anticoagulants

* $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.

Table 3. Characteristics of the AF patients received OAC or not at discharge

	OAC Treatment (n=62)	Non-OAC Treatment (n=224)
Age (year)	69 (57, 77)	68 (59, 76)
Sex [Female (%)]	30 (48.4)	98 (43.8)
Smoking [n(%)]	16 (25.8)	50 (22.3)
Hypertension [n(%)]	32 (51.6)	91 (40.6)
Diabetes mellitus [n(%)]	19 (30.6)	46 (20.5)
Dyslipidemia[n(%)]	20 (32.3)	83 (37.1)
Abnormal renal [n(%)]	5 (8.1)	14 (6.3)
Abnormal liver function [n(%)]	1 (1.6)	4 (1.8)
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs/alcohol abuse [n(%)]	4 (6.5)	21 (9.4)
Killip classification III-IV [n(%)]	21 (33.9)	63 (28.1)
History of stroke [n(%)]	8 (12.9) [#]	9 (4.0)
History of bleeding [n(%)]	2 (3.2)	19 (8.5)
AMI [n(%)]	25 (40.3)	90 (40.2)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score ≥2 [n(%)]	61 (98.4)	212 (94.6)
HAS-BLED score ≥3 [n(%)]	12 (19.4) [*]	79 (35.3)
Persistent/permanent AF [n(%)]	59 (95.2) [*]	168 (75)
Pre-admission use of OAC [n(%)]	19 (30.6) [*]	7 (3.1)

AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; OAC, oral anticoagulant

[#] $P < 0.05$ vs. 'non-OAC' group. ^{*} $P < 0.01$ vs. 'non-OAC' group.

Table 4. Determinants of oral anticoagulant treatment at discharge

Determinants	OR	95% CI	P-value
Sex (male vs female)	0.90	0.44-1.84	0.77
Age (≥ 65 vs < 65 years)	1.38	0.31-6.14	0.67
Smoking (yes vs no)	1.07	0.26-4.40	0.93
Diabetes mellitus (yes vs no)	1.48	0.80-2.74	0.21
Hypertension (yes vs no)	1.35	0.43-4.24	0.61
Dyslipidemia (yes vs no)	0.73	0.21-2.54	0.62
Abnormal renal (yes vs no)	1.25	0.55-2.84	0.59
Abnormal liver function (yes vs no)			
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs/alcohol abuse (yes vs no)	1.02	0.23-4.52	0.97
Cardiac function (Killip classification III-IV vs I-II)	1.40	0.65-3.02	0.39
History of stroke (yes vs no)	2.76	0.94-8.10	0.06
History of bleeding (yes vs no)	0.80	0.23-2.78	0.73
Type of ACS (AMI vs UA)	0.95	0.19-4.75	0.95
Type of AF (persistent/permanent vs paroxysmal)	4.32	1.25-14.9	0.02
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score (≥ 2 vs < 2)	2.65	0.93-7.55	0.07
HAS-BLED score (< 3 vs ≥ 3)	3.10	1.18-8.14	0.02
Pre-admission use of OAC (yes vs no)	8.92	2.69-29.6	0.0003

The variables adjusted in the multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), and type of AF (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent).

Abnormal renal function was defined as chronic dialysis, renal transplant, serum creatinine ≥ 2.3 mg/dL (200 μ mol/L);

1
2
3
4 Abnormal liver function was defined as chronic hepatic disease (eg, cirrhosis) or
5 bilirubin $>2 \times$ upper limit of normal, in association with aspartate
6 aminotransferase/alanine aminotransferase/alkaline phosphatase $>3 \times$ upper limit
7 normal.
8
9

10
11 When CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and HAS-BLED score were included as independent
12 factors in the model, the individual components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes,
13 hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding) were not included to avoid
14 over-adjustment.
15
16

17
18 ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial
19 infarction; UA, unstable angina
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	1 2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	6-7 NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8 8 8 NA 9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	10 NA NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	10 10 NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA

1	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-11
2			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
3			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	10-11
10				
11	Discussion			
12				
13	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
14	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	15
15				
16	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
17				
18				
19	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15
20				
21	Other information			
22	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16
23				
24				

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.

BMJ Open

A Retrospective Cohort Study of Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031180.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Mai, Linlin; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Wu, Yu; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Luo, Jianjing; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology; The Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, Cardiology Liu, Xinyue; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Zhu, Hailan; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Zheng, Haoxiao; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Liang, Guoquan; The Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, Cardiology Zhang, Yan; Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Cardiology Huang, YULi; Shunde Hospital of Southern Medical University, Cardiology
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	atrial fibrillation, acute coronary syndrome, oral anticoagulants

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

A Retrospective Cohort Study of Oral Anticoagulant Treatment in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome and Atrial Fibrillation

Brief title: OAC Treatment in ACS patients with AF

Linlin Mai, MD,^{a*} Yu Wu, MD,^{a*} Jianjing Luo, MD,^{a,b*} Xinyue Liu, MD,^a Hailan Zhu, MD,^a Haoxiao Zheng, MD,^a Guoquan Liang, MD,^b Yan Zhang, BS,^a Yuli Huang, MD, PhD,^{a#}

^a Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (The first people's hospital of Shunde), Foshan, PR China.

^b Department of Cardiology, the Second Hospital of Zhaoqing, Guangdong, China.

* These authors contribute equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Professor. Yuli Huang. Department of Cardiology, Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University, Jiazhi Road, Lunjiao Town, Shunde District, Foshan, 528300, PR China. Tel.: +86 757 22318610; Fax: +86 757 22223899; E-mail:

hyuli821@smu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVE: To examine the real-world patterns of oral anticoagulant (OAC) therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) and atrial fibrillation (AF) in Southern China undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and determine the clinical characteristics associated with OAC prescription.

DESIGN: A retrospective cohort study.

SETTING: This study was conducted in the Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from January 2013 to 31 December 2018.

PARTICIPANTS: Patients were aged ≥ 18 years, hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment.

OUTCOME MEASURES: AF was diagnosed based on an electrocardiogram recording or a Holter monitor. Prescription of OACs and antiplatelets were determined from the discharge medication list.

RESULTS: A total of 3612 ACS patients were included; 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF, including 45 (1.2%) with paroxysmal AF, 227 (6.3%) with persistent/permanent AF and 14 (0.4%) with unclassified AF. Although 95.5% of patients with AF were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2) of stroke, only 21.7% of them were discharged on OACs (10.5% received warfarin and 11.2% received non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants). Patients with pre-admission use of OAC, a HAS-BLED score < 3 , with persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OAC treatment at discharge.

1
2
3
4 **CONCLUSION:** We found that approximately 8% of patients who underwent PCI
5
6 during ACS hospitalization also demonstrated AF. Anticoagulant therapy was greatly
7
8 underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and an increased risk of bleeding were less
9
10 likely to receive anticoagulant treatment. Further efforts should be made to increase
11
12 the adherence to guideline recommendations for OACs.
13
14
15

16
17 **Keywords:** atrial fibrillation; acute coronary syndrome; oral anticoagulants
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study to document the current real-world patterns of anticoagulation therapy in managing ACS patients with AF in Southern China.
- All the patients were with documented AF and received drug eluting stent implantation.
- The present study highlight further efforts should be made to improve the adherence to guideline recommendations for OAC treatment among ACS patients with AF.
- Data were obtained from two large hospitals in Southern China, and do not represent the current treatment status in other regions.

Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common arrhythmia worldwide.¹ It is associated with a four to five-fold increased risk of ischemic stroke.^{2 3} Known or new-onset AF is a common comorbidity in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS). It has been reported that 2–21% of ACS patients have a history of AF.⁴ Patients with ACS and AF have a poor prognostic outcome, including a higher risk of stroke.⁵⁻⁷ Antithrombotic treatment with oral anticoagulants (OACs), such as warfarin or non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants (NOACs), is a cornerstone in the prevention of ischemic stroke in patients with AF.^{8 9} However, for patients with AF presenting with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) or coronary artery disease, undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI), it poses a great challenge with regard to the management of antithrombotic therapy.¹⁰ These patients need dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) to reduce the risk of subsequent myocardial infarction and stent thrombosis, and OACs treatment to prevent the risk of stroke.¹¹

Although academic guidelines recommend that a combination of OACs and DAPT should be initiated in these patients and then subsequently switched to single anti-platelet agent combined with OACs,^{1 12 13} OACs have been largely underused in real-world clinical practice.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ However, NOACs have not been applied in most reported studies.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ Recently, there has been a significant price drop in NOACs and more evidence concerning the safety of these agents compared with warfarin. These factors may lead to greater use of NOACs instead of warfarin in patients at higher risk of bleeding, including those undergoing concomitant anti-platelet treatment. However,

1
2
3
4 the prevalence of antithrombotic therapy in Chinese patients with ACS and AF has
5
6 not been explored after the introduction of NOACs. Therefore, the current study was
7
8 undertaken to examine current real-world patterns of OAC therapy in managing ACS
9
10 patients with AF in Southern China undergoing PCI.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Methods**

18 **Study population**

19
20 This was a retrospective cohort study conducted in the Shunde Hospital,
21
22 Southern Medical University and the second hospital of Zhaoqing, China, from
23
24 January 2013 to 31 December 2018.
25
26
27
28
29

30 We reviewed the medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years who were
31
32 hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment. ACS was defined as ST-segment
33
34 elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), non-ST-segment elevation myocardial
35
36 infarction (NSTEMI) or unstable angina (UA). STEMI was diagnosed based on
37
38 elevated levels of biomarkers for myocardial necrosis (including troponin T, troponin
39
40 I, or creatine kinase MB), with ST-segment elevation of 1 mm or more in at least two
41
42 contiguous electrocardiogram (ECG) leads,²⁰ while NSTEMI was defined as
43
44 ST-segment depression of ≥ 1 mm. Patients with typical ischemic symptoms and no
45
46 elevation in biomarkers for myocardial necrosis, with or without ECG changes were
47
48 classified as having UA.²¹ AF was diagnosed using an ECG recording or a Holter
49
50 monitor. For patients with length of hospital stay ≥ 7 days, those with AF lasting < 7 d
51
52 were classified as having paroxysmal AF,¹ and were otherwise classified as having
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 persistent/permanent AF. In patients with no prior history of AF and with length of
5
6 hospital stay <7 days, those with AF were defined as unclassified. All of the patients
7
8 received coronary angiography and PCI. We excluded those with rheumatic heart
9
10 disease or mechanical heart valves, death during hospitalization or were transferred
11
12 out within 3 days, or without discharge medication list available.
13
14
15

16 **Risk stratification and anticoagulation treatment**

17
18
19 Baseline characteristics including age, sex, smoking, history of hypertension,
20
21 diabetes, dyslipidemia, chronic kidney disease, previous stroke/TIA, history of AF
22
23 and pre-admission use of OAC, ACS type, Killip classification were collected via the
24
25 hospital medical record. Blood biochemical measurements, such as fasting plasma
26
27 glucose, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, total cholesterol, and triglyceride levels
28
29 were measured using an automated biochemical analyzer. Estimated glomerular
30
31 filtration rate was calculated using the modified Modification of Diet in Renal Disease
32
33 equation adapted for Chinese.²²
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 We used the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score to evaluate the risk of stroke (congestive
41
42 heart failure, hypertension, age ≥75 years [doubled], diabetes mellitus, history of
43
44 stroke/transient ischemic attack [doubled], vascular disease, age 65–75 years and
45
46 female sex). The risk of bleeding was evaluated using the HAS-BLED score
47
48 (hypertension, abnormal renal/liver function, history of stroke, history of bleeding,
49
50 labile internationally normalized ratio, age >65 years, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory
51
52 drugs or alcohol abuse).^{1 12} Because data concerning the time in therapeutic range for
53
54 warfarin was not available, we defined the labile internationally normalized ratio as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 'none' and 0 points were given to all patients when calculating the HAS-BLED score.
5

6
7 Prescription of warfarin, NOACs, aspirin, and clopidogrel was determined from
8
9 the discharge medication list. In the hospitals participating in the current study,
10
11 rivaroxaban and dabigatran were the two types of NOAC available. Standard dosages
12
13 of NOACs were defined as rivaroxaban 20 mg/day or dabigatran 150 mg twice daily
14
15 for patients with creatinine clearance ≥ 50 mL/min, and rivaroxaban 15 mg/day or
16
17 dabigatran 110 mg twice daily for creatinine clearance of 30–49 mL/min.^{23 24} Any
18
19 daily dosages less than this range were defined as reduced dosages.
20
21
22
23

24 25 **Statistical Analysis**

26
27 AF patients were divided into two groups based on whether they received OAC
28
29 treatment or not, at discharge. Baseline characteristics, including CHA₂DS₂-VASc
30
31 score, HAS-BLED scores, and antiplatelet therapy were examined. Continuous
32
33 variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation),
34
35 as appropriate. Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).
36
37 Continuous variables were compared using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test or Student's
38
39 *t*-test after testing for normality using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Categorical
40
41 variables were compared using the chi-square or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Multiple logistic regression models were used to examine the association
49
50 between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment at discharge. Patients without
51
52 OAC treatment were used as the reference. The variables adjusted in the
53
54 multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension,
55
56 dyslipidemia, history of stroke, abnormal renal/liver function, non-steroidal
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 anti-inflammatory drugs or alcohol abuse, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of
5
6 ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), type of AF
7
8 (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent) and pre-admission use of OAC. We further set
9
10 the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and HAS-BLED score as independent factors in the model,
11
12 while their individual components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes, hypertension,
13
14 history of stroke, history of bleeding) were not included to avoid over-adjustment.
15
16 Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are
17
18 presented. All the statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS,
19
20 Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). All comparisons are two-sided, with statistical significance
21
22 defined as $P < 0.05$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Ethical clearance**

31
32 The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the
33
34 institutional review board central committee at Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical
35
36 University, China. As this was a retrospective analysis, patients' informed consent
37
38 was waived by the institutional review board.
39
40
41

42 **Patient and public involvement**

43
44 Patients and the general public were not involved in this study.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Results**

51 **Baseline characteristics**

52
53 We reviewed 3813 electronic medical records of patients aged ≥ 18 years, who
54
55 were hospitalized for ACS and received PCI treatment from January 2013 to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 December 2018. After excluding 121 patients who died or were transferred out during
5
6 hospitalization, and 76 patients without a discharge medication list, 4 patients with
7
8 mechanical heart valves, a total of 3612 patients were included in this study.
9
10

11 All of the patients received coronary angiography and drug eluting stent
12
13 implantation, 1393 of them (38.6%) presented with AMI and received emergent PCI
14
15 treatment, 2219 of them (61.4%) were diagnosed with UA and received PCI during
16
17 the index hospitalization after carefully non-invasive examination.
18
19
20

21
22 Among all the included patients, 286 (7.9%) were diagnosed with AF; 45 of
23
24 these (1.2%) had paroxysmal AF, 227 (6.3%) had persistent/permanent AF and 14
25
26 (0.4%) with unclassified AF. According to the hospital medical record, 48 patients
27
28 were with document history of AF and 26 (54.2%) of them were received OAC
29
30 therapy prior to admission. Compared with those without AF, ACS patients with AF
31
32 were older and more likely to be female, with a higher prevalence of hypertension,
33
34 diabetes and cardiac dysfunction, previous stroke/TIA, and higher mean
35
36 CHA₂DS₂-VASc and HAS-BLED scores (all $P < 0.01$, Table 1).
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Anti-thrombotic therapy**

44
45 The anti-thrombotic treatment regimens in ACS patients with and without AF are
46
47 presented in Table 2. During the hospital stay, the ratio of parenteral anticoagulant
48
49 treatment was higher in patients with AF compared with those without AF (35.7% vs.
50
51 21.0%, $P < 0.01$). The in-hospital use of antiplatelet agents, including aspirin and
52
53 clopidogrel, were similar in ACS patients with and without AF (both $P > 0.05$).
54
55
56 Prescription of OACs in AF patients was low ($n = 85$, 29.7%); 38 of them received
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 warfarin (13.3%) and 47 of them received NOACs (16.4%). In patients with NOACs
5
6 treatment, 42 of them (89.3%) received reduced dosages.
7
8

9 At hospital discharge, the use of anti-platelet agents was similar as in-hospital
10 usage, and nearly 99% of patients with or without AF received DAPT. However, only
11 21.7% of patients with AF (n = 62) were discharged on OACs, and 10.5% of them
12 received warfarin and 11.2% received NOACs (Table 2). Similarly, in patients with
13 NOACs treatment, 90.6% of them received reduced dosages.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Determinants of OACs treatment at discharge**

23
24 We examined the association between baseline characteristics and OAC treatment
25 at discharge. In all the included AF patients, only 4.5% were at moderate risk
26 (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score 1), and 95.5% were at high risk (CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥2)
27 of stroke. In terms of bleeding, 31.8% of the patients had a HAS-BLED score ≥3,
28 which was defined as a high risk of bleeding. The baseline characteristics of the AF
29 patients received OACs or not at discharge were presented on Table 3. As shown in
30 Table 4, patients with pre-admission use of OACs, a HAS-BLED score <3, with
31 persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive OACs treatment at discharge.
32
33 However, neither a high risk of stroke nor other clinical characteristics were
34 associated with OACs treatment.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Discussion**

54
55 There are three main findings in this study. First, the overall incidence of AF was
56 7.9% in patients with ACS and received PCI during hospitalization. Second, although
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 most patients with AF had a high risk of stroke, less than 30% received OACs
5
6 treatment at discharge. Third, patients with pre-admission use of OACs, a lower risk
7
8 of bleeding and persistent/permanent AF were more likely to receive anticoagulation
9
10 therapy after PCI.
11
12

13
14 DAPT was recommended in ACS patients who underwent PCI to reduce the risk
15
16 of stent thrombosis.²¹ However, antiplatelet treatments have no clinical benefit in the
17
18 treatment of AF. For AF patients who undergo PCI, if the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score ≥ 2 ,
19
20 initial treatment with DAPT plus OACs (triple therapy) for at least 4 weeks is
21
22 recommended under the current guidelines.^{1, 12} However, such a “triple therapy”
23
24 strategy poses risks for bleeding and OACs are globally underused in clinical
25
26 practice.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ The China acute myocardial infarction (CAMI) registry found that from
27
28 2013–2014, only 5.1% of ACS patients with AF were treated using warfarin, and
29
30 1.7% were treated using both warfarin and DAPT.²⁵ No NOACs were prescribed in
31
32 ACS patients with AF in the CAMI study. In the current study, we found that this
33
34 situation was improved. Approximately 30% of ACS patients with AF who underwent
35
36 PCI received anticoagulation therapy at discharge, and half of them were prescribed
37
38 with NOACs. This improvement may be caused by the accumulation of clinical
39
40 research data, the availability of consensus guidelines for treatment, increased
41
42 physician awareness of anticoagulation therapy and a price reduction in NOACs in
43
44 China. However, it should be noted that OACs were still greatly underused.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Compared with warfarin, NOACs are more convenient to use, including
57
58 advantages such as fixed dose regimens, no requirement for frequent blood
59
60

1
2
3
4 monitoring, no food and drug restrictions and less risk of bleeding.^{26 27} In the current
5
6 study, we found that there was a substantially increased use of NOACs in Chinese
7
8 patients during the past few years. This is consistent with data from the Danish
9
10 nationwide administrative registries, which found that by 2016, the use of NOACs in
11
12 any combination with antiplatelets was exceeding that of warfarin in combination
13
14 with antiplatelets.²⁸ However, in the current cohort, most patients (approximately 90%)
15
16 received a reduced dosage of NOACs, such as rivaroxaban 10 mg/day. This may be
17
18 driven primarily by the concern for increased risk of bleeding. It has been reported
19
20 that in AF patients with AMI and/or PCI, when in combination with DAPT, low-dose
21
22 NOACs plus DAPT was associated with a lower rate of bleeding than a vitamin K
23
24 antagonist plus DAPT.^{29 30}

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 In contrast with previous studies which showed that the use of OACs in patients
33
34 with ACS and AF was influenced by neither stroke risk nor bleeding risk,^{18 19} our
35
36 study found that patients with a HAS-BLED score <3 were more likely to receive
37
38 OACs treatment at discharge. Furthermore, the number of patients treated with OACs
39
40 at discharge (21.7%) was significantly decreased than that during hospitalization
41
42 (29.7%). These results suggest that physicians are still hesitant to prescribe “triple
43
44 therapy” because of concerns about the risk of bleeding. Both the American College
45
46 of Cardiology (ACC)/American Heart Association (AHA)/Heart Rhythm (HRS) and
47
48 the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA)/European Society of Cardiology
49
50 (ESC) guidelines for the management of patients with AF have proposed a clear
51
52 algorithm for the management of these patients.^{1 12} The most recently
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 AHA/ACC/HRS guideline recommended that in ACS patients with AF at increased
5
6 risk of stroke, double therapy with P2Y12 inhibitors (clopidogrel) and low-dose
7
8 rivaroxaban 15 mg daily or dabigatran 150 mg twice daily is reasonable to reduce the
9
10 risk of bleeding, as compared with triple therapy.¹ The EHRA/ESC guideline also
11
12 proposed that dual therapy with OACs plus clopidogrel may be considered in patients
13
14 with excessive bleeding risk and low thrombotic risk.¹² However, providing optimal
15
16 treatment is still a great challenge in real-world practice. In this study, we found that
17
18 patients with ACS after PCI and AF were almost all treated with DAPT (nearly 99%
19
20 of patients). However, OACs is greatly underused. These results pointed out a very
21
22 “awkward” situation, clinicians are concern about the risk of bleeding as well as stent
23
24 thrombosis, so they choose to select DAPT but not double therapy with one P2Y12
25
26 inhibitor and OACs. These results showed that there are great gap between real
27
28 clinical practice and recommendations from the academic guidelines. Further efforts
29
30 should be made to improve the adherence to guideline recommendations for OACs
31
32 treatment among ACS patients with AF.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The current study further found that patients with paroxysmal AF were less
44
45 likely to receive OACs than those with persistent/permanent AF. This was not a
46
47 surprise. The AHA/ACC/HRS guideline for the management of AF recommended
48
49 that for patients with paroxysmal AF, the need for anticoagulant therapy should be
50
51 determined based on the risk of stroke, same with persistent AF.¹ However, studies
52
53 have shown that the risk of stroke in patients with paroxysmal AF is lower than that
54
55 those with persistent/permanent AF.^{31 32} The benefit of anticoagulation in new-onset
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 AF, occurring in the setting of an acute attack with ACS, acute pulmonary disease, or
5
6 sepsis, is associated with a higher risk of bleeding, but not with a reduced risk of
7
8 ischemic stroke.³³ Therefore, for paroxysmal AF that occurs in the case of ACS, there
9
10 is still much doubt about whether these patients need long-term anticoagulant therapy.
11
12 Recently, a study showed that in patients with paroxysmal AF, a greater burden of AF
13
14 is associated with a higher risk of ischemic stroke.³⁴ Therefore, follow-up studies
15
16 should be conducted to observe the re-occurrence of AF in the future.
17
18
19
20
21

22 There are some limitations in the current study. First, we did not evaluate the
23
24 link between anticoagulant therapy and adverse events during hospitalization and after
25
26 discharge. Second, patient status was distinguished as paroxysmal AF or
27
28 persistent/permanent AF based on medical records, so misclassifications cannot be
29
30 totally avoided. Third, as a retrospective study, data were obtained from two large
31
32 hospitals in Guangdong Province, China, and do not represent the current treatment
33
34 status of other regions. Finally, we also found that some patients without AF were
35
36 prescribed with OACs, however, the indications were unrecorded.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Conclusion**

46
47
48 This study found that nearly 8% of patients who underwent PCI during ACS
49
50 hospitalization had AF. Although these patients were at an increased risk of stroke,
51
52 anticoagulant therapy was greatly underused. Patients with paroxysmal AF and an
53
54 increased risk of bleeding were less likely to receive anticoagulant treatment. The
55
56 promotion of NOACs use can increase the treatment of anticoagulation in these
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 patients.
5
6
7
8

9 **Contributors** YH and LM conceptualised the study, designed the protocol. YH, YW,
10 JL and LM analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. XL, HZ and GL collected
11 the data. YH, HZ and YZ revised the manuscript.
12
13
14
15

16 **Funding:** The project was supported by Scientific Research Fund of Foshan,
17 Guangdong, China (No: 2016AB003353), the National Natural Science Foundation of
18 China (No: 81600239), the Science and Technology Innovation Project from Foshan,
19 Guangdong (FS0AA-KJ218-1301-0006) and the Clinical Research Startup Program
20 of Shunde Hospital, Southern Medical University (CRSP2019001). The funders had
21 no role in the design and implementation of the study, in the collection, analysis, and
22 interpretation of the data, and in the preparation, review, or approval of the
23 manuscript.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Acknowledgement:** We thank Conn Hastings, PhD, from Liwen Bianji, Edanz
38 Editing China (www.liwenbianji.cn/ac), for editing the English text during revision of
39 this manuscript.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data sharing statement:** For access to data of this study, please contact Dr Yuli
49 Huang. hyuli821@smu.edu.cn
50
51
52

53 **Competing interests:** None declared.
54

55 **Patient consent for publication:** Not required.
56
57
58
59
60

References:

1. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, *et al.* 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2019; pii: S0735-1097(19)30209-8
2. Pokorney SD, Gersh BJ, Ahmad A, *et al.* Stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation: Closing the gap. *Am Heart J* 2018;210:29-38.
3. Rohla M, Weiss TW, Pecun L, *et al.* Risk factors for thromboembolic and bleeding events in anticoagulated patients with atrial fibrillation: the prospective, multicentre observational PREvention of thromboembolic events - European Registry in Atrial Fibrillation (PREFER in AF). *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e022478.
4. Jabre P, Roger VL, Murad MH, *et al.* Mortality associated with atrial fibrillation in patients with myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Circulation* 2011;123:1587-93.
5. Cordero A, Rodriguez-Manero M, Garcia-Acuna JM, *et al.* Incidence and predictors of stroke in patients discharged with the diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:20-25.
6. Johnson V, Schmitt J. A Chicken or Egg Dilemma: Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Poor Prognostic Outcome in Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)* 2019;72:367-368.
7. El-Battrawy I, Borggreffe M, Akin I. Atrial fibrillation as a risk factor for worse

1
2
3
4 outcome in acute coronary syndrome. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;246:53.

5
6 8. Han TS, Fry CH, Fluck D, *et al.* Anticoagulation therapy in patients with stroke
7
8 and atrial fibrillation: a registry-based study of acute stroke care in Surrey, UK. *BMJ*
9
10
11
12 *Open* 2018;8:e022558.

13
14 9. Huang X, Chen Y, Xiao J, *et al.* Electrophysiological characteristics and catheter
15
16 ablation of symptomatic focal premature atrial contractions originating from
17
18 pulmonary veins and non-pulmonary veins. *Clin Cardiol* 2018;41:74-80.

19
20
21
22 10. Ferreiro JL, Gomez-Hospital JA. Antithrombotic therapy after acute coronary
23
24 syndromes in patients with atrial fibrillation: Shouldn't we pay more attention to the
25
26 risk of ischemic and thromboembolic events? *Int J Cardiol* 2019;276:38-39.

27
28
29
30 11. Neumann FJ, Sousa-Uva M, Ahlsson A, *et al.* 2018 ESC/EACTS Guidelines on
31
32 myocardial revascularization. *Eur Heart J* 2019;40:87-165.

33
34
35 12. Lip G, Collet JP, Haude M, *et al.* 2018 Joint European consensus document on the
36
37 management of antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation patients presenting with
38
39 acute coronary syndrome and/or undergoing percutaneous cardiovascular
40
41 interventions: a joint consensus document of the European Heart Rhythm Association
42
43 (EHRA), European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Thrombosis, European
44
45 Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI), and European
46
47 Association of Acute Cardiac Care (ACCA) endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society
48
49 (HRS), Asia-Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS), Latin America Heart Rhythm
50
51 Society (LAHRS), and Cardiac Arrhythmia Society of Southern Africa (CASSA).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 *Europace* 2019;21:192-193.

- 1
2
3
4 13. Steffel J, Verhamme P, Potpara TS, *et al.* The 2018 European Heart Rhythm
5 Association Practical Guide on the use of non-vitamin K antagonist oral
6 anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation: executive summary. *Europace*
7
8 2018;20:1231-1242.
9
10
11
12
13
14 14. Chamberlain AM, Gersh BJ, Mills RM, *et al.* Antithrombotic strategies and
15 outcomes in acute coronary syndrome with atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol*
16 2015;115:1042-8.
17
18
19
20
21
22 15. Lopes RD, Li L, Granger CB, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation and acute myocardial
23 infarction: antithrombotic therapy and outcomes. *Am J Med* 2012;125:897-905.
24
25
26
27 16. Rohla M, Vennekate CK, Tentzeris I, *et al.* Long-term mortality of patients with
28 atrial fibrillation undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention with stent
29 implantation for acute and stable coronary artery disease. *Int J Cardiol*
30 2015;184:108-14.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 17. Guimaraes PO, Zakrotsky P, Goyal A, Lopes RD, Kaltenbach LA, Wang TY.
38 Usefulness of Antithrombotic Therapy in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Acute
39 Myocardial Infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 2019;123:12-18.
40
41
42
43
44
45 18. Nelson JA, Vavalle JP, May CH, *et al.* Warfarin use and long-term outcomes in
46 patients with acute myocardial infarction and atrial fibrillation. *J Thromb*
47 *Thrombolysis* 2014;37:331-7.
48
49
50
51
52
53 19. Lopes RD, Starr A, Pieper CF, *et al.* Warfarin use and outcomes in patients with
54 atrial fibrillation complicating acute coronary syndromes. *Am J Med*
55 2010;123:134-40.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 20. China Society of Cardiology of Chinese Medical Association, Editorial Board of
5
6 Chinese Journal of Cardiology; China Society of Cardiology of Chinese Medical
7
8 Association Editorial Board of Chinese Journal of Cardiology. [Guideline on the
9
10 diagnosis and therapy of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction]. *Zhonghua Xin*
11
12 *Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi* 2015;43:380-93.
13
14
15
16
17 21. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP, *et al.* 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of
18
19 acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment
20
21 elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients
22
23 Presenting without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of
24
25 Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:267-315.
26
27
28
29
30 22. Ma YC, Zuo L, Chen JH, *et al.* Modified glomerular filtration rate estimating
31
32 equation for Chinese patients with chronic kidney disease. *J AM SOC NEPHROL*
33
34 2006; 17:2937-2944.
35
36
37
38 23. Mahmood M, Lip G. Nonvitamin K Oral Anticoagulants in Patients With Atrial
39
40 Fibrillation and Severe Renal Dysfunction. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*
41
42 2018;71:847-855.
43
44
45
46 24. Potpara TS, Ferro CJ, Lip G. Use of oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial
47
48 fibrillation and renal dysfunction. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2018;14:337-351.
49
50
51
52 25. Dai Y, Yang J, Gao Z, *et al.* Atrial fibrillation in patients hospitalized with acute
53
54 myocardial infarction: analysis of the china acute myocardial infarction (CAMI)
55
56 registry. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2017;17:2.
57
58
59
60 26. Geng YP, Lan DH, Liu N, *et al.* Patient-Reported Treatment Satisfaction with

1
2
3
4 Dabigatran versus Warfarin in Patients with Non-Valvular Atrial Fibrillation in China.

5
6 *Thromb Haemost* 2018;118:1815-1822.

7
8
9 27. Wu S, Xie S, Xu Y, *et al.* Persistence and outcomes of non-vitamin K antagonist
10 oral anticoagulants versus warfarin in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation. *J*

11
12
13
14 *Clin Nurs* 2019 ;28:1839-1846.

15
16
17 28. Sindet-Pedersen C, Staerk L, Lamberts M, *et al.* Use of oral anticoagulants in
18 combination with antiplatelet(s) in atrial fibrillation. *Heart* 2018;104:912-920.

19
20
21
22 29. Sindet-Pedersen C, Lamberts M, Staerk L, *et al.* Combining Oral Anticoagulants
23 With Platelet Inhibitors in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Coronary Disease. *J*
24
25
26
27 *Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:1790-1800.

28
29
30 30. Gibson CM, Mehran R, Bode C, *et al.* Prevention of Bleeding in Patients with
31 Atrial Fibrillation Undergoing PCI. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:2423-2434.

32
33
34
35 31. Zhang W, Xiong Y, Yu L, Xiong A, Bao H, Cheng X. Meta-analysis of Stroke
36 and Bleeding Risk in Patients with Various Atrial Fibrillation Patterns Receiving Oral
37
38
39
40 Anticoagulants. *Am J Cardiol* 2019;123:922-928.

41
42
43 32. Ganesan AN, Chew DP, Hartshorne T, *et al.* The impact of atrial fibrillation type
44 on the risk of thromboembolism, mortality, and bleeding: a systematic review and
45
46
47
48 meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:1591-602.

49
50
51 33. Quon MJ, Behloul H, Pilote L. Anticoagulant Use and Risk of Ischemic Stroke
52 and Bleeding in Patients With Secondary Atrial Fibrillation Associated With Acute
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60
Coronary Syndromes, Acute Pulmonary Disease, or Sepsis. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*
2018;4:386-393.

1
2
3
4 34. Go AS, Reynolds K, Yang J, *et al.* Association of Burden of Atrial Fibrillation
5
6 With Risk of Ischemic Stroke in Adults With Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation: The
7
8 KP-RHYTHM Study. *JAMA Cardiol* 2018;3:601-608.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
Age (year)	68 (58, 76)*	61 (52,74)
Sex [Female (%)]	128 (44.8)#	1285 (38.6)
SBP (mmHg)	129.3±22.4#	125.4±23.9
DBP (mmHg)	78.5±18.4#	76.2±17.9
Hypertension [n(%)]	123 (43.0)#	1214 (36.5)
Fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L)	5.8±3.6#	5.4±3.2
Diabetes mellitus [n(%)]	65 (22.7)#	582 (17.5)
Serum creatinine (µmol/L)	96 (65,124)	92(63,136)
eGFR (ml/min/1.73m ²)	62.2±25.1#	70.3±26.0
Current smoker	66 (23.1)	729 (21.9)
LDL-C (mmol/L)	3.2±1.9	3.0±1.8
HDL-C (mmol/L)	1.1±0.6	1.0±0.5
TC (mmol/L)	5.4±2.2	5.3±2.2
TG (mmol/L)	1.9±1.8	1.8±1.6
Dyslipidemia[n(%)]	103 (36.0)	1173 (35.3)
Previous stroke/TIA[n(%)]	17 (5.9)#	68 (2.0)
Previous CKD	19 (6.6)#	75 (2.3)
Previous AF	48 (16.8)	--
AMI[n(%)]	115 (40.2)	1278 (42.5)
UA[n(%)]	171 (59.8)	2048 (57.5)
Killip classification III-IV [n(%)]	84 (29.4)*	786 (23.6)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score	3.5±2.0*	3.1±1.8
HAS-BLED score	3.0±1.6*	2.8±1.7
Length of hospital stay	7.6±2.9*	7.1±2.6

Continuous variables are presented as median (inter-quartile range) or mean (standard deviation). Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial

1
2
3
4 infarction; CKD, chronic kidney disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; eGFR,
5
6 estimated glomerular filtration rate; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density
7
8 lipoprotein; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; TIA,
9
10 transient ischemic attack; UA, unstable angina

11 # $P < 0.05$ vs. 'without AF' group. * $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Anti-thrombotic treatment in ACS patients with and without AF

	With AF(n=286)	Without AF(n=3326)
In-hospital		
Aspirin [n(%)]	280 (97.9)	3291 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	284 (99.3)	3318 (99.8)
Parenteral anticoagulants #[n(%)]	102 (35.7)*	698 (21.0)
OACs[n(%)]	85 (29.7)*	8 (0.2)
Warfarin[n(%)]	38 (13.3)*	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	47 (16.4)*	5 (0.2)
At discharge		
Aspirin [n(%)]	281 (98.3)	3289 (98.9)
Clopidogrel [n(%)]	282 (98.6)	3316 (99.7)
OACs [n(%)]	62 (21.7)	7 (0.2)
Warfarin [n(%)]	30 (10.5)	3 (0.1)
NOACs [n(%)]	32 (11.2)	4 (0.1)

Categorical variables are expressed as number (percentages).

ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; NOACs, non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants; OACs, oral anticoagulants

* $P < 0.01$ vs. 'without AF' group.

Table 3. Characteristics of the AF patients received OAC or not at discharge

	OAC Treatment (n=62)	Non-OAC Treatment (n=224)
Age (year)	69 (57, 77)	68 (59, 76)
Sex [Female (%)]	30 (48.4)	98 (43.8)
Smoking [n(%)]	16 (25.8)	50 (22.3)
Hypertension [n(%)]	32 (51.6)	91 (40.6)
Diabetes mellitus [n(%)]	19 (30.6)	46 (20.5)
Dyslipidemia[n(%)]	20 (32.3)	83 (37.1)
Abnormal renal [n(%)]	5 (8.1)	14 (6.3)
Abnormal liver function [n(%)]	1 (1.6)	4 (1.8)
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs/alcohol abuse [n(%)]	4 (6.5)	21 (9.4)
Killip classification III-IV [n(%)]	21 (33.9)	63 (28.1)
History of stroke [n(%)]	8 (12.9) [#]	9 (4.0)
History of bleeding [n(%)]	2 (3.2)	19 (8.5)
AMI [n(%)]	25 (40.3)	90 (40.2)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score ≥2 [n(%)]	61 (98.4)	212 (94.6)
HAS-BLED score ≥3 [n(%)]	12 (19.4) [*]	79 (35.3)
Persistent/permanent AF [n(%)]	59 (95.2) [*]	168 (75)
Pre-admission use of OAC [n(%)]	19 (30.6) [*]	7 (3.1)

AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; OAC, oral anticoagulant

[#] $P < 0.05$ vs. 'non-OAC' group. ^{*} $P < 0.01$ vs. 'non-OAC' group.

Table 4. Determinants of oral anticoagulant treatment at discharge

Determinants	OR	95% CI	P-value
Sex (male vs female)	0.90	0.44-1.84	0.77
Age (≥ 65 vs < 65 years)	1.38	0.31-6.14	0.67
Smoking (yes vs no)	1.07	0.26-4.40	0.93
Diabetes mellitus (yes vs no)	1.48	0.80-2.74	0.21
Hypertension (yes vs no)	1.35	0.43-4.24	0.61
Dyslipidemia (yes vs no)	0.73	0.21-2.54	0.62
Abnormal renal (yes vs no)	1.25	0.55-2.84	0.59
Abnormal liver function (yes vs no)			
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs/alcohol abuse (yes vs no)	1.02	0.23-4.52	0.97
Cardiac function (Killip classification III-IV vs I-II)	1.40	0.65-3.02	0.39
History of stroke (yes vs no)	2.76	0.94-8.10	0.06
History of bleeding (yes vs no)	0.80	0.23-2.78	0.73
Type of ACS (AMI vs UA)	0.95	0.19-4.75	0.95
Type of AF (persistent/permanent vs paroxysmal)	4.32	1.25-14.9	0.02
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score (≥ 2 vs < 2)	2.65	0.93-7.55	0.07
HAS-BLED score (< 3 vs ≥ 3)	3.10	1.18-8.14	0.02
Pre-admission use of OAC (yes vs no)	8.92	2.69-29.6	0.0003

The variables adjusted in the multi-variable model were: sex, age (≥ 65 vs. < 65 years), diabetes, hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding, smoking status, type of ACS (UA or MI), cardiac function (Killip classification III–IV vs. I–II), and type of AF (paroxysmal or persistent/permanent).

Abnormal renal function was defined as chronic dialysis, renal transplant, serum creatinine ≥ 2.3 mg/dL (200 μ mol/L);

1
2
3
4 Abnormal liver function was defined as chronic hepatic disease (eg, cirrhosis) or
5 bilirubin $>2 \times$ upper limit of normal, in association with aspartate
6 aminotransferase/alanine aminotransferase/alkaline phosphatase $>3 \times$ upper limit
7 normal.
8
9

10
11 When CHA₂DS₂-VASc score and HAS-BLED score were included as independent
12 factors in the model, the individual components (age, sex, cardiac function, diabetes,
13 hypertension, history of stroke, history of bleeding) were not included to avoid
14 over-adjustment.
15
16

17
18 ACS, acute coronary syndrome; AF, atrial fibrillation; AMI, acute myocardial
19 infarction; UA, unstable angina
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	1 2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	6-7 NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8 8 8 NA 9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	10 NA NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	10 10 NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	NA

1	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-11
2			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
3			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9	Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	10-11
10				
11	Discussion			
12				
13	Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
14	Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	15
15				
16	Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
17				
18				
19	Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15
20				
21	Other information			
22	Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16
23				
24				

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.