Outcomes (% per year)							
	Warfarin	Dabigatran 150	Dabigatran 110	Warfarin	Rivaroxaban	Warfarin	Apixaban
	(n = 6022)	(<i>n</i> = 6076)	(n = 6015)	(n = 7133)	(n = 7131)	(n = 9081)	(<i>n</i> = 9120)
		(RR, 95% CI; <i>P</i> value)	(RR, 95% Cl; <i>P</i> value)		(HR, 95% CI; <i>P</i> value)		(HR, 95% CI; <i>P</i> value)
Stroke/systemic embolism	1.69	1.11 (0.66, 0.53–0.82; <i>P</i> for superiority <0.001)	1.53 (0.91, 0.74–1.11; <i>P</i> for non-inferiority <0.001)	2.4	2.1 (0.88, 0.75–1.03; <i>P</i> for non-inferiority <0.001, <i>P</i> for superiority = 0.12) (ITT)	1.6	1.27 (0.79, 0.66–0.95; <i>P</i> <0.001 for non-inferiority, <i>P</i> = 0.01 for superiority)
Ischaemic stroke	1.2	0.92 (0.76, 0.60–0.98; <i>P</i> = 0.03)	1.34 (1.11, 0.89–1.40; <i>P</i> = 0.35)	1.42	1.34 (0.94; 0.75–1.17; <i>P</i> = 0.581)	1.05	0.97 (0.92, 0.74–1.13; P = 0.42)
Haemorrhagic stroke	0.38	0.10 (0.26, 0.14–0.49; <i>P</i> <0.001)	0.12 (0.31, 0.17–0.56; <i>P</i> <0.001)	0.44	0.26 (0.59; 0.37–0.93; P=0.024)	0.47	0.24 (0.51, 0.35–0.75; P<0.001)
Major bleeding	3.36	3.11 (0.93, 0.81–1.07; P=0.31)	2.71 (0.80, 0.69–0.93; <i>P</i> = 0.003)	3.4	3.6 (<i>P</i> = 0.58)	3.09	2.13 (0.69, 0.60–0.80; P<0.001)
Intracranial bleeding	0.74	0.30 (0.40, 0.27–0.60; <i>P</i> <0.001)	0.23 (0.31, 0.20–0.47; <i>P</i> <0.001)	0.7	0.5 (0.67; 0.47–0.93; P = 0.02)	0.80	0.33 (0.42, 0.30–0.58; P<0.001)
Extracranial bleeding	2.67	2.84 (1.07, 0.92–1.25; <i>P</i> = 0.38)	2.51 (0.94, 0.80–1.10; <i>P</i> = 0.45)	-	-	-	-
Outcomes (% per year)							
Gastrointestinal bleeding	1.02	1.51 (1.50, 1.19–1.89; <i>P</i> <0.001)	1.12 (1.10, 0.86–1.41; <i>P</i> = 0.43)	2.2	3.2 (<i>P</i> <0.001)	0.86	0.76 (0.89, 0.70–1.15; P = 0.37)
Myocardial infarction	0.64	0.81 (1.27, 0.94-1.71; P = 0.12)	0.82 (1.29, 096-1.75; P = 0.09)	1.1	0.9 (0.81; 0.63–1.06; P = 0.12)	0.61	0.53 (0.88, 0.66–1.17; P = 0.37)
Death from any cause	4.13	3.64 (0.88, 0.77–1.00; <i>P</i> = 0.051)	3.75 (0.91, 0.80–1.03; <i>P</i> = 0.13)	2.2	1.9 (0.85; 0.70–1.02; P = 0.07)	3.94	3.52 (0.89, 0.80–0.99; P = 0.047)
% Discontinuation at the end of follow-up	10.2	15.5	14.5	22.2	23.7	27.5	25.3
% Discontinuation/year	5.1	7.8	7.3	.7	12.5	15.3	14.1

Watchman vs Warfarin



1065 patient-years FU

Primary efficacy endpoint (stroke, CV death, systemic Embolism): 3 per 100 patient-years vs 4.9 per 100 patient-years; Probability of non-inferiority >99.9%

Primary safety endpoint(PE, device embolization,Major bleeding):7.4 per 100 patient-years vs4.4 per 100 patient-years

Holmes DR et al. Percutaneous closure of the left atrial appendage versus warfarin therapy for prevention of stroke in patients with Atrial fibrillation: a randomized non-inferiority trial. Lancet 2009;374:534-42

Learning Curve Effect



Reddy VY, et al. Safety of percutaneous left atrial appendage closure. Circulation 2011;123:417-24.

Long-term Effect-All-cause Mortality



Reddy VY, et al. Long-term results of Protect AF HRS LBCT 2013.

Cause	Watchman Group (n=463)	Warfarin Group (n=244)	p value
Cardiovascular	13 / 2.8%	12 / 4.9%	0.1973
Cancer	10 / 2.2%	3 / 1.2%	0.5584
Pulmonary	9 / 1.9%	9/3.7%	0.2082
Neurologic	5 / 1.1%	3 / 1.2%	1.0000
Multisystem organ failure	5 / 1.1%	1/0.4%	0.6700
Hemorrhagic Stroke	2 / 0.4%	7 / 2. 9 %	0.0098
Other	9 / 1.9%	6 / 2.5%	0.7844



Reddy VY, et al. Long-term results of Protect AF HRS LBCT 2013.

	Watch	man Group (Warfarin Group (n = 244)	
Event	Total Events No. (%)	Early Events No. (%)	Late Events No. (%)	Events No. (%)
Serious pericardial effusion	22 (4.8%)	22 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	
Major bleeding	22 (4.8%)	3 (0.6%)	19 (4.1%)	18 (7.4%)
Procedure-related stroke	6 (1.3%)	5 (1.1%)	1 (0.2%)	
Device embolization	3 (0.6%)	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	
Hemorrhagic stroke	3 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)	9 (3.7%)
Other	4 (0.9 %)	4 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	

ESC A-Fib Guidelines 2012 Left Atrial Appendage Closure

Recommendations for LAA closure/occlusion

Recommendations	Class	Level
Interventional, percutaneous LAA closure may be considered in patients with a high stroke risk and contraindications for long-term oral anticoagulation	IIb	B
Surgical excision of the LAA may be considered in patients undergoing open heart surgery	IIb	С





Conclusions

AF management starts with clinical classification, identification of underlying pathology and assessment of symptom severity

Rate control is non-inferior to rhythm control approach by antiarrhythmic drugs in elderly population at risk of stroke

Conclusions

- Rhythm control can be achieved with poor to modest success with antiarrhythmic drugs
- Rhythm control with catheter ablation is more effective than with antiarrhythmic drugs
- Catheter ablation is indicated in drug
 -refractory PAF and can be considered as first-line therapy in symptomatic PAF

Conclusions

Stroke prevention in AF can be achieved with warfarin, novel anticoagulants or left atrial appendage occlusion