

Left atrial appendage occlusion is promising, not concerning



Kasper Korsholm¹, MD; Jens Erik Nielsen-Kudsk^{1*}, MD, DMSc

Department of Cardiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark

We appreciate the interest of Dr Stöllberger and Dr Schneider in our recent study on aspirin monotherapy after left atrial appendage occlusion (LAAO) in a high bleeding risk population¹. The authors share their concerns about LAAO, in particular focusing on mortality. In the following, we will try to reply to their questions and comments.

In our study cohort, 20 patients died during follow-up (266 patient-years; 7.5/100 patient-years). The median time from LAAO to death was 403 days (IQR: 251-1,093). The cause of death was infection (n=6), aortic stenosis (n=3), heart failure (n=2), cancer (n=2), renal failure (n=2), intracranial bleeding (n=1), traumatic thoracic bleeding (n=1), major gastrointestinal bleeding (n=1), ischaemic stroke (n=1), and one unexplained death in a 93-year-old patient.

As highlighted by Dr Stöllberger and colleague, the mortality rate was higher compared to the PROTECT-AF, ASAP, and ACP studies. Novel results from the EWOLUTION registry report 6.9 deaths/100 patient-years², and the Iberian LAAO registry reported 5.8 deaths/100 patient-years³; both report CHA₂DS₂-VASC

scores similar to the aforementioned studies. However, CHADS₂ and CHA₂DS₂-VASC scores help to predict the stroke risk⁴. A wider range of risk factors and comorbidities than those summarised in the CHA₂DS₂-VASC score must be taken into account when comparing mortality rates. The mean HAS-BLED score in our study was 4.1, and was the highest among the mentioned studies (2.3-4.1). Though it is not reported explicitly, the lowest HAS-BLED score is expected in the PROTECT-AF trial, since this was based on warfarin eligible patients⁵. Other variations in baseline characteristics and comorbidities may affect mortality. For example, previous intracranial haemorrhage (ICH) was the primary indication for LAAO in 45% of our cohort. All-cause mortality for these patients ranges between 9.7 and 19.5 deaths/100 patient-years, depending on the post-ICH antithrombotic regimen⁶. In a recently published propensity score-matched study, LAAO was suggested to have major benefit over standard medical care in patients with AF and previous ICH⁷. Patients treated by LAAO had a significantly lower risk of the primary composite outcome of mortality, ischaemic stroke and major bleeding as compared to standard

*Corresponding author: Aarhus University Hospital, Palle Juul-Jensens Boulevard 99, DK-8200 Aarhus N, Denmark.
E-mail: je.nielsen.kudsk@gmail.com

medical therapy (hazard ratio 0.16 [0.07-0.37]). In addition, the separate risk of all-cause mortality was significantly reduced by LAAO (hazard ratio 0.11 [0.03-0.51]).

We agree with the authors that atrial natriuretic peptide (ANP) and brain natriuretic peptide (BNP) levels might be altered in relation to LAA elimination. However, clinical data after LAA ligation with the LARIAT® device (SentreHEART, Inc., Redwood City, CA, USA) suggest that neuroendocrine homeostasis is restored after four months⁸. No change in sodium, potassium, glucose or glomerular filtration rate was observed after four months⁸. Only systolic blood pressure was reduced, which may even be beneficial, since 82% had a diagnosis of hypertension at baseline.

At follow-up in our LAAO aspirin monotherapy cohort, 81% had complete sealing, 12% had 1-3 mm peri-device leak and 6% had 3-5 mm leak, while 1% had >5 mm leak. Studies have not found any association between peri-device leaks after transcatheter LAAO and increased risk of thromboembolism^{9,10}.

In conclusion, mortality may not easily be compared across studies based solely on CHA₂DS₂-VASC scores. In turn, the neuroendocrine alterations after LAAO appear temporary, without any data indicating a sustained negative effect on glucose or electrolyte homeostasis, while they might have a beneficial effect on hypertension. Thus, transcatheter LAAO, as a new therapy, is promising for stroke prevention in patients with atrial fibrillation and high bleeding risk, not concerning.

Conflict of interest statement

J.E. Nielsen-Kudsk is a proctor for St. Jude Medical/Abbott. The other author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Korsholm K, Nielsen KM, Jensen JM, Jensen HK, Andersen G, Nielsen-Kudsk JE. Transcatheter left atrial appendage occlusion in patients with atrial fibrillation and a high bleeding risk using aspirin alone for post-implant antithrombotic therapy. *EuroIntervention*. 2016;12:2075-82.
2. Boersma LV, Ince H, Kische S, Pokushalov E, Schmitz T, Schmidt B, Gori T, Meincke F, Protopopov AV, Betts T, Foley D, Sievert H, Mazzone P, De Potter T, Vireca E, Stein K, Bergmann MW; EWOLUTION Investigators. Efficacy and Safety of Left Atrial Appendage Closure with WATCHMAN in Patients with or without Contraindication to Oral Anticoagulation: 1-year follow-up outcome data of the EWOLUTION trial. *Heart Rhythm*. 2017;14:1302-8.
3. López Mínguez JR, Asensio JM, Gragera JE, Costa M, González IC, de Carlos FG, Díaz JA, Martín Yuste V, González RM, Domínguez-Franco A, Buendía AB, Garibi JH, Hernández FH, Ribeiro VG. Two-year clinical outcome from the Iberian registry patients after left atrial appendage closure. *Heart*. 2015;101:877-83.
4. Lip GY, Nieuwlaat R, Pisters R, Lane DA, Crijns HJ. Refining clinical risk stratification for predicting stroke and thromboembolism in atrial fibrillation using a novel risk factor-based approach: the euro heart survey on atrial fibrillation. *Chest*. 2010;137:263-72.
5. Reddy VY, Sievert H, Halperin J, Doshi SK, Buchbinder M, Neuzil P, Huber K, Whisenant B, Kar S, Swarup V, Gordon N, Holmes D; PROTECT AF Steering Committee and Investigators. Percutaneous left atrial appendage closure vs warfarin for atrial fibrillation: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2014;312:1988-98.
6. Nielsen PB, Larsen TB, Skjøth F, Gorst-Rasmussen A, Rasmussen LH, Lip GY. Restarting Anticoagulant Treatment After Intracranial Hemorrhage in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and the Impact on Recurrent Stroke, Mortality, and Bleeding: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Circulation*. 2015;132:517-25.
7. Nielsen-Kudsk JE, Johnsen SP, Wester P, Damgaard D, Airaksinen J, Lund J, De Backer O, Pakarinen S, Odenstedt J, Vikman S, Settergren M, Kongstad O, Rosenqvist M, Krieger DW. Left atrial appendage occlusion versus standard medical care in patients with atrial fibrillation and intracerebral haemorrhage: a propensity score-matched follow-up study. *EuroIntervention*. 2017;13:371-8.
8. Maybrook R, Pillarisetti J, Yarlagadda V, Gunda S, Sridhar AR, Deibert B, Afzal MR, Reddy M, Atkins D, Earnest M, Ferrell R, Nath J, Kanmanthareddy A, Bommana S, Johnson R, Koripalli SR, Dawn B, Lakkireddy D. Electrolyte and hemodynamic changes following percutaneous left atrial appendage ligation with the LARIAT device. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2015;43:245-51.
9. Saw J, Tzikas A, Shakir S, Gafoor S, Omran H, Nielsen-Kudsk JE, Kefer J, Aminian A, Berti S, Santoro G, Nietlispach F, Moschovitis A, Cruz-Gonzalez I, Stammen F, Tichelbäcker T, Freixa X, Ibrahim R, Schillinger W, Meier B, Sievert H, Gloekler S. Incidence and Clinical Impact of Device-Associated Thrombus and Peri-Device Leak Following Left Atrial Appendage Closure With the Amplatzer Cardiac Plug. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2017;10:391-9.
10. Viles-Gonzalez JF, Kar S, Douglas P, Dukkipati S, Feldman T, Horton R, Holmes D, Reddy VY. The clinical impact of incomplete left atrial appendage closure with the Watchman Device in patients with atrial fibrillation: a PROTECT AF (Percutaneous Closure of the Left Atrial Appendage Versus Warfarin Therapy for Prevention of Stroke in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation) substudy. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;59:923-9.