

# **Cardiac implantable electronic device-detected atrial fibrillation—“To anticoagulate or not to anticoagulate, that is the question”: The noble or ignoble choice?**

Thomas F. Deering, MD, MBA, FHRS,\* Faiez Zannad, MD, PhD†

From the \*Arrhythmia Center, Piedmont Heart Institute, Atlanta, Georgia, and †Université de Lorraine and Inserm and CHRU, Nancy, France.

**Funding sources:** The authors have no funding sources to disclose.

**Disclosures:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

## **Address reprint requests and correspondence:**

Dr Thomas F. Deering, Piedmont Heart Institute, Suite 2045, 95 Collier Rd, NW, Atlanta, GA 30309. E-mail address: thomas.deering@piedmont.org.

Atrial fibrillation (AF) detected during interrogation of a cardiovascular implantable electronic device (CIED) is a common event,<sup>1</sup> with available studies suggesting that it is associated with an increased risk of stroke.<sup>2,3</sup> While current guidelines recommend oral anticoagulant (OAC) therapy for patients with AF and an elevated CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score,<sup>4</sup> controversy exists about whether the various components of CIED-detected AF (eg, duration, burden, and CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score) predict stroke and, if effective as predictors, which characteristics best define that risk.<sup>5</sup> As a result of this uncertainty, physicians concerned about thromboembolic risk often recommend OAC therapy for patients with CIED-detected AF. This was demonstrated in Predicting Determinants of Atrial Fibrillation or Flutter for Therapy Elucidation in Patients at Risk for Thromboembolic Events (PREDATE AF) Study and REVEAL AF studies, in which, respectively, 76.4% and 56.3% of patients meeting predefined duration criteria for new-onset CIED-detected AF were prescribed anticoagulants.<sup>6,7</sup>

In this issue of the Heart Rhythm Journal, Al-Gibbawi et al<sup>8</sup> address this clinical topic by investigating the roles of AF threshold burden (1%, 1%–10%, and >10%), duration of the longest AF episode (≤6, 6–24, and >24 hours), and the CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score (1, 2–5, and ≥6) in predicting a subsequent stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) over a mean of 3.26 ± 0.8 years in a retrospective record review of nonanticoagulated patients with CIED-detected AF at their institution. The incidence of new stroke or TIA at follow-up was 14.8%. After adjusting for the CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score, neither the overall burden (P = .582) nor the longest single AF episode (P = .544) predicted stroke- or TIA-free survival. Importantly, after multivariate analysis, the CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score remained an independent predictor of stroke- or TIA-free survival when analyzing models incorporating both the AF burden and the single longest AF episode duration (P = .001). Additionally, the stroke/TIA risk increased as the CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score increased (P = .001). Therefore, this study provides evidence that intrinsic stroke risk factors, defined by the CHA<sub>2</sub>DS<sub>2</sub>-VASc score, serve as better and independent predictors of a subsequent stroke than do either AF duration or burden. While these findings are important, the older age (76.7 years vs 69.8 years; P = .0001) and the higher prevalence rates of peripheral arterial disease (38.6% vs 21.7%; P = .011), hypertension (91.2% vs 77.7%; P = .02), and hyperlipidemia (82.5% vs 59.6%; P = .01) in patients presenting with a stroke or TIA raise the possibility that alternative causative etiologies might have been operative in an unknown number of cases.

These findings are consistent with the results of the Registry of Atrial Tachyarrhythmia/Atrial Fibrillation (AT/AF) Episodes in the Cardiac Rhythm Management

(CRM) Device Population (RATE Registry), in which AF duration failed to predict subsequent stroke,<sup>9</sup> and of the Mode Selection Trial (MOST),<sup>10</sup> Danish Multicenter Randomized Trial on Single Lead Atrial Pacing versus Dual Chamber Pacing in Sick Sinus Syndrome (Danpace) Trial,<sup>11</sup> and West Birmingham Atrial Fibrillation Project<sup>12</sup> studies, in which the CHA2DS2-VASc score was an independent predictor of death or stroke in patients with a CIED irrespective of the AF history. The Italian AT500 Registry, in which the underlying CHADS2 score had a higher predictive value than did AF duration, adds further evidence to the primacy of the underlying risk factors.<sup>13</sup> Data from The Relationship Between Daily Atrial Tachyarrhythmia Burden From Implantable Device Diagnostics and Stroke Risk: The TRENDS Study,

Asymptomatic Atrial Fibrillation and Stroke Evaluation in Pacemaker Patients and the Atrial Fibrillation Reduction Atrial Pacing Trial (ASSERT) & Randomized trial of atrial arrhythmia monitoring to guide anticoagulation in patients with implanted defibrillator and cardiac resynchronization devices (IMPACT) AF studies, in which a significant majority of patients did not have AF in the 30 days preceding a thromboembolic event, strengthen the argument that AF temporal characteristics have a lower predictive accuracy when compared to the risk factor profile.<sup>14-16</sup> Importantly, the results provided in this and other published studies, which position the risk factor profile defined by the CHA2DS2-VASc score as the most powerful independent predictor of stroke in patients with CIED-detected AF, align with the atrial myopathy theory suggesting that AF may function more as a marker of stroke risk than as its cause. However, given the existing state of the art, more definitive recommendations about whether the temporal AF characteristics, the risk profile, or a combination should best guide anticoagulation strategies in patients with CIED-detected AF will need to await outcomes generated from ongoing trials including Apixaban for the Reduction of Thrombo- Embolism in Patients With Device-Detected Sub-Clinical Atrial Fibrillation (Artesia Study: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT01938248; accessed October 28, 2020), Nonvitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants in Patients With Atrial High Rate Episodes (NOAH-AFNET 6 Study: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT02618577; accessed October 28, 2020), and the Atrial Fibrillation Detected by Continuous ECG Monitoring study (LOOP Study: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT02036450; accessed October 28, 2020) designed to assess this question.

In the interim, while awaiting results from those investigations, physicians should base clinical decisions on approaches suggested in the 2017 European Heart Rhythm Association consensus document<sup>17</sup> and the 2019 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association/Heart Rhythm Society Focused AF Update.<sup>4</sup> At present, it appears reasonable for physicians to pursue a binary approach when considering OAC choices among patients with CIED-detected AF. They should first try to identify low-risk patients (eg, low CHA2DS2-VASc score, low AF burden, and short AF duration) in whom OAC probably can be avoided. Efforts to identify higher-risk patients, in whom OAC might be advantageous, will remain speculative until results from these ongoing clinical trials become available. Until then clinical decisions about initiating OAC therapy in these patients might be better rendered by placing more emphasis on the thromboembolic risk profile, as defined by the CHA2DS2-VASc score, and less emphasis on the temporal AF aspects.

## References

1. Ziegler PD, Glotzer TV, Daoud EG, et al. Incidence of newly detected atrial arrhythmias via implantable devices in patients with a prior history of thromboembolic events. *Stroke* 2010;41:256–260.
2. Glotzer TV, Daoud EG, Wyse DG, et al. The relationship between daily atrial tachyarrhythmia burden from implantable device diagnostics and stroke risk: the TRENDS study. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol* 2009;2:474–480.
3. Healey JS, Connolly SJ, Gold MR, et al. ASSERT Investigators. Subclinical atrial fibrillation and the risk of stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:120–129.
4. 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 in Collaboration With the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *Circulation* 2019;140:e125–e151.
5. Mahajan R, Perera T, Elliott AD, et al. Subclinical device-detected atrial fibrillation and stroke risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2018; 39:1407–1415.
6. Nasir JM, Pomeroy W, Marler A, et al. Predicting determinants of atrial fibrillation or flutter for therapy elucidation in patients at risk for thromboembolic events (PREDATE AF) study. *Heart Rhythm* 2017;14:955–961.
7. Reiffel JA, Verma A, Kowey PR, et al. Incidence of previously undiagnosed atrial fibrillation using insertable cardiac monitors in a high-risk population: the REVEAL AF study. *JAMA Cardiol* 2017;2:1120–1127.
8. Al-Gibbawi M, Ayinde HO, Bhatia NK, et al. Relationship between device detected burden and duration of atrial fibrillation and risk of ischemic stroke. *Heart Rhythm* 2021;18:338–346.
9. Swiryn S, Orlov MV, Benditt DG, et al. Clinical implications of brief device-detected atrial tachyarrhythmias in a cardiac rhythm management device population: results from the Registry of Atrial Tachycardia and Atrial Fibrillation Episodes. *Circulation* 2016;134:1130–1140.
10. Glotzer TV, Hellkamp AS, Lee KL, Lamas GA. CHA2DS2-VASc and CHADS2 scores predict adverse clinical events in patients with pacemakers and sinus node dysfunction independent of atrial fibrillation. *Can J Cardiol* 2015;31:1004–1011.
11. Svendsen JH, Nielsen JC, Darkner S, et al. CHADS2 and CHA2DS2-VASc score to assess risk of stroke and death in patients paced for sick sinus syndrome. *Heart* 2013;99:843–848.
12. Li Y-G, Miyazawa K, Pastori D, Szekely O, Shahid F, Lip GYH. Atrial high-rate episodes and thromboembolism in patients without atrial fibrillation: the West Birmingham Atrial Fibrillation Project. *Int J Cardiol* 2019;292:126–130.
13. Botto GL, Padeletti L, Santini M, et al. Presence and duration of atrial fibrillation detected by continuous monitoring: crucial implications for the risk of thromboembolic events. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol* 2009;20:241–248.
14. Daoud EG, Glotzer TV, Wyse DG, et al. TRENDS Investigators. Temporal relationship of atrial tachyarrhythmias, cerebrovascular events, and systemic emboli based on stored device data: a subgroup analysis of TRENDS. *Heart Rhythm* 2011;8:1416–1423.
15. Brambatti M, Connolly SJ, Gold MR, et al. Temporal relationship between subclinical atrial fibrillation and embolic events. *Circulation* 2014;129:2094–2099.
16. Martin DT, Bersohn B, Waldo AL, et al. Randomized trial of atrial arrhythmia monitoring to guide anticoagulation in patients with implanted defibrillator and resynchronization devices. *Eur Heart J* 2015;36:1660–1668.
17. Gorenek B, Bax J, Boriani G, et al. Device detected subclinical atrial tachyarrhythmias:

definition, implications and management—an European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) consensus document. *Europace* 2017; 19:1556–1578.